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Prolegomena

Shortly after beginning his highly evocative and personal narrative of the siege and conquest of Thessalonike in 1185 by the Norman armies of William II, Eustathios, the city’s stalwart bishop, hearkened back to the fateful death of emperor Manuel I Komnenos a few years earlier as the true start of the calamity which would befall the empire’s second largest city and even threaten the capital itself:

Μέλλον εἶναι φαίνεται, καθὰ θεῷ εὐηρέστητο, πεσόντι τῷ Κομνηνῷ βασιλεῖ Μανουήλ συγκαταστασεῖν καὶ εἰ τί ἐν Ῥωμαίοις ὥρθιν καὶ ἦν ἔκεινον ἐπιπλύντος ἀμαρὰν γενέσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς Οὐκοῦν ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖνος ἐνθα ἐχρῆν, διαδοχὴν ἀφεὶς γένους οὐχ οἷα ἐχρῆν Παῖδα γὰρ μικρὸν τὶ παρηλλαχότα τὸν παναφήλικα, μὴ ὅτι γε βασιλείας μεγίστης κρατεῖν οὐκ ἔχοντα δι’ ἑαυτοῦ.

It seems fated, in accordance with God’s wishes, that if it remained standing among the Romans it should collapse together with the demise of the emperor Manuel Komnenos and that like the sun, his departure would leave our empire in darkness. And so that man left for the place he had to go to, leaving as successor to his line one unsuited to the task. For his son had only just passed the stage of childhood, he was simply not going to be able to rule over a large empire on his own.

Few modern historians today would dispute Eustathios’ claim that Manuel’s sudden death ushered in a period of political instability and vulnerability such as the empire had not known in the century since Manuel’s grandfather, Alexios I, brought Byzantium back from the brink in the late eleventh century. Manuel had left behind an heir too young to rule and a foreign-born dowager empress unable to exercise effective authority. The situation would soon be exploited by various factions at court and, unsurprisingly, by the empire’s rivals, who saw the vacuum of leadership as an opportunity to wrest territory and concessions.²

Yet even as he composed those lines about the empire’s tragic plight, Eustathios may have experienced a twinge of irony at his retrospective. He himself had stood before Manuel’s tomb at the funerary ceremony and delivered a long, ennobling eulogy, extolling Manuel’s exemplary governance of the empire and providing assurances about the regency of his widow, Maria, who had assumed


² Sensing vulnerability in the absence of a warrior-emperor able to take the field, the empire’s rivals to the north and the east, king Béla III of Hungary and the Seljuk ruler Kiliç Arslan II, both invaded. Meanwhile additional concessions to Italian merchants and benefits to members of the aristocracy in exchange for their support further alienated critics of the regency.
power in the name of Manuel’s young son, Alexios II. Now, just five years later, contemplating the ruinous state of Thessalonike and the murderously vengeful politics besetting Constantinople, Eustathios could look back with candor and tacitly confess that his necessarily optimistic assessment at the time could not have been wider of the mark. We will never know what Eustathios’ true estimate of the regency may have been at the time. One detects a strain of apprehension alongside the sense of mourning, almost of an emerging realization that with Manuel’s death an age had likely come to an end. In principle, the regency held out the promise – later judged an illusion – of extending the long Komnenian century, then just one year shy of celebrating its centenary. But Eustathios’ recollection of a fatalism settling in over the court is probably accurate. The regency was too vulnerable to last, and most of those who might have provided it the necessary support had their own designs on the throne.

Eustathios would not have been alone in his dire estimate of the regency’s chances. A good rhetorician anticipated the mind and mood of his audience. If funerary oratory was bound by certain conventions, its infrequent performance at court (the last one would have been more than two generations before) left the rhetor some leeway to frame his subject. As I note in the introduction, Eustathios chose to compose an ἐπιτάφιος instead of a μονῳδία. The former could accommodate an unsentimental survey of imperial conduct and policies, without the lyrical but ultimately distracting pathos of the latter. His attachment to Manuel’s court was such that Eustathios was inclined to look back at the emperor’s reign as a time of prosperity and relative security. But he was also not without regard for the future and one may discern throughout the Ἐπιτάφιος unobtrusive normative formulations whose lesson transcends the longing for the deceased emperor and furnishes a perceptible template for prudent governance of the empire. Consolation had to be sought in an ideal of imperial governance.

Manuel I Komnenos died on 24 September, 1180. The historian Nicetas Choniates, who gives the fullest and most dramatic account of Manuel’s final hours, describes how unprepared those in attendance at his bedside were for his rapid demise and sudden death. It seems the emperor had been sick for months, but his confidence in his own diagnostic skills combined with the credence he placed in optimistic astrological forecasts about his recovery – both cast in doubt by the historian – prevented Manuel from making adequate arrangements for the succession.3 Once he became resigned to his impending death (though

3 Hist. 220.10–18. The reference to an additional fourteen years of life may be real, or simply Nicetas’ way of illustrating the preposterousness of the astrologers’ claims as well as Manuel’s own credulity.
not before he had tried a series of improbable cures), Manuel made hasty provisions for his soul, asking to take the monastic habit, a common practice in Byzantium but rendered slightly farcical by the last minute scramble of his attendants to find something akin to monastic garb to dress him in.\(^4\) Clothed in a commoner’s ill-fitting tunic, according to Choniates, Manuel died shortly thereafter, prompting those present to reflect on the frailty of the human condition as they regarded the half-naked emperor. Nicetas’ bathetic scene was intended as a poignantly pitiable coda to Manuel’s long and much celebrated reign. It also stood metonymically for the wider unpreparedness of the imperial court and the capital for what might follow.

As Eustathios would note later, Manuel had had a hand in this lack of planning. Eustathios had to address the paradox of a self-styled medical expert’s failure to take sufficient note of his own failing health. This was all the more striking, Eustathios points out in the Ἐπιτάφιος, given the emperor’s accurate diagnosis and therapeutic prescriptions for others suffering from the same disease:

\[
\text{ὅσοι πρὸς βασιλικὴν ἐξικνοῦντο θέαν, ὁμοίῳ πάθει προστετηκότα, μεθόδοις ἐνῆγε θεραπευτικαῖς προμηθέστατα. Καὶ ἐμέμφετο μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἷς ἑαυτοῦ ἀμελὴς ἐξέπιπτε· κατήρτιζε δὲ πρὸς ὑγίειαν. Εἰ δὲ οὕτω μὲν ἀπώνατο καὶ περίεστι, ὁ δὲ καθηγεμὼν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπελήλυθε, ἕτερος τις θαυμάσειε. (Ἐπιτάφιος, 43)\(^5\)
\]

And when he saw anyone who had an audience with him and suffering from the same illness, he would take the greatest care to instruct him how to treat the disease. And he criticized any man who recklessly neglected himself, while he instructed him how to restore himself to health. One may wonder, however, how it was that one man flourished and survived, while he who brought about the cure died.

In a bid to deflect attention from Manuel’s apparent inability to face his own mortality and perform one of the most decisive functions of an emperor, namely, to make provisions for his succession, Eustathios concentrated on resolving the apparent inconsistency of Manuel’s medical skill and his failure to foresee his own demise. Yet Eustathios could not lament Manuel’s inadequate planning, not yet at least. The future of the imperial throne was in the audience before him, in the persons of the deceased emperor’s young son and widow, who was governing in league with a regency council of courtiers, also in all likelihood in the audience during the funeral oration. Years later, Eustathios could look back and describe the precariousness of this ill-fated governing arrangement.\(^6\) At the

\(^4\) Hist. 221.52–222.64.

\(^5\) Henceforward Ἐπ.

\(^6\) Nicetas Choniates records the birth of a monstrous child which was seen by some as confirmation of unholy portents of “polyarchia...mother of anarchy” following Manuel’s death. See Hist. 225.50–55: Ἐπιτάφιος, ἐμέμφετο μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἷς ἑαυτοῦ ἀμελὴς ἐξέπιπτε· κατήρτιζε δὲ πρὸς ὑγίειαν. Εἰ δὲ οὕτω μὲν ἀπώνατο καὶ περίεστι, ὁ δὲ καθηγεμὼν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπελήλυθε, ἕτερος τις θαυμάσειε. (Ἐπιτάφιος, 43)
time, however, the Ἐπιτάφιος was intended, among other things, to shore up support for the regency by citing Maria/Xene’s long apprenticeship in governance at Manuel’s side, a fairly novel argument, as far as I can tell. Few seem to have paid much heed in any case. The regency’s days were numbered, as were those of Manuel’s young son.

Even if Eustathios had seen the coming disaster, as he later would claim, possibly in a bid to distance himself from the failed regency, a funeral oration was simply not the occasion for direct pronouncements about the current crisis at court. By the time he came to write the C...
emperor, though it is also an indirect acknowledgement that individual memory retained its independence from official oratory. Eustathios, I argue, harnessed an idealized conception of Manuel’s reign to an understated yet discernible paraenetic purpose. It is for this reason that the Ἐπιτάφιος at times reads like an extended secular sermon on good governance.

Although he makes no reference to it in the oration, at the time he delivered the Ἐπιτάφιος, Eustathios was already bishop of Thessalonike. He very likely travelled to Constantinople expressly for the purpose of delivering the eulogy for Manuel I, his long-time patron. Arguably secure on his ecclesiastical perch, Eustathios had little need of performing to secure commissions, and certainly not in order to exhibit his skill as an orator. His reputation as a virtuoso rhetor had by then been established. Perhaps for that reason, he reminds those gathered at Manuel’s tomb, that he almost did not compose the Ἐπιτάφιος. He would have been content to observe the passing of the emperor in silent albeit tearful mourning, he tells the audience of the Ἐπιτάφιος, by way perhaps of a captatio benevolentiae, lest anyone assume that Eustathios’ decision to deliver one last oration for Manuel was motivated by ambition. Yet he all but admits to being impelled by a sense of duty, joined to some professional pride. We may wonder whether this could have been more than a mere rhetorical ploy. Perhaps because he no longer needed to prove his worth as an orator, Eustathios could also afford to be unusually frank about what prompted him to compose the Ἐπιτάφιος, among his most accomplished long form texts.

No one, he insisted, had ever surpassed him in praise of Manuel. “Whenever the occasion presented itself,” he tells the audience of the funeral oration, “I never shrank from delivering the greatest possible praises.” This was not an altogether implausible claim. Eustathios’ are unquestionably the most rhetor-
cally ambitious and learned of the surviving court orations dedicated to Manuel, reflecting his experience as a teacher of advanced composition and literature to the capital’s elite.\textsuperscript{12} It seems he was determined not to be outdone on this, the final opportunity to celebrate Manuel’s legacy. Moreover, he adds, broaching the delicate subject of the rhetor’s suspect sincerity, failure to praise Manuel in death might have invited accusations of sycophancy while Manuel was alive:

Εἴη δὲ ἂν πάντων ἀτοπώτατον, περιόντος μὲν τῷ βίῳ μὴ διεκπίπτειν εἰσάγαν τοῦ ἐν λόγοις προθυμεῖσθαι, ἀπελθόντος δὲ, ὅπου τὰ κρείττονα, κατόπιν τῆς παλαιᾶς προθυμίας ἐλθεῖν, ἐνθα καὶ μάλιστα χρεῶν ταύτης. Ζώντων μὲν γάρ ἐπιστρόφους εἶναι, ὅποπτος ἡ χάρις, διὰ τὴν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αἰδώ· ἀπεληλυθότων δὲ, ἀλλὰ τότε τὸ εὔγνωμον εἰς ἀληθὲς διεκφαίνεται. (Ἑπ. 3)

And it would be the most paradoxical thing of all, to be exceedingly willing to draw up speeches while the emperor was alive, but now that he has departed to a higher sovereign plane to fall short of that old readiness, at that very moment when it is most needed. For favour is suspect when men are in the company of the living on account of the regard they show in the presence of one another. Their favourable opinion reveals itself as genuine only once they have departed.

The need for rulers to guard against sycophants was a familiar \textit{topos} of Greek didactic literature dating back to Hellenistic times. But the author’s self-interest and a genuine attachment to Manuel need not have been mutually exclusive. No less an expert on the unprecedented panegyrical literature on Manuel than P. Magdalino has concluded that “Eustathios was not just doing his rhetorical duty by Manuel…that he was inspired by the man rather than by the symbolism of an image is most apparent from the funeral oration which he delivered at the emperor’s tomb.”\textsuperscript{13} Magdalino singled out the Έπιτάφιος to illustrate Eustathios’ heartfelt admiration of Manuel’s rule because the funeral oration’s contents, as well as the care with which it was composed were not accounted for by panegyrical convention alone. Eustathios, Magdalino argues, was moved to “draw a recognizable and sympathetic human portrait” of Manuel.\textsuperscript{14} His verdict is shared by scholars who suppose that Eustathios was bound to Manuel by more than the

\textsuperscript{12} Apart from the standard βασιλικοὶ λόγοι, Eustathios delivered orations before the emperor on various special occasions, such as the arrival of Louis VII’s young daughter, Agnes, as bride to Manuel’s equally young son Alexios II, for which he composed a λόγος ἐπιβατήριος (Or. 15 [Λόγος Ξ]) or when he was granted leave to deliver a petition (δέησις) before the emperor asking for repairs to the city’s water supply in order to alleviate the consequences of a prolonged drought (Or. 17 [Λόγος Π]). One should add to these orations addressed to the patriarch but likely attended by Manuel, who comes in for praise in many of them: e.g., Or. 7 (Λόγος Ζ) 107.60sqq. There may well have been more besides over the course of nearly four decades.

\textsuperscript{13} Magdalino, \textit{Empire}, 486.

\textsuperscript{14} Idem 488, n. 254.
deference due an emperor and patron; that he felt the attachment of friendship. None of this cancels out the reasons Eustathios himself expresses for composing the funeral oration, namely, an abiding sense of obligation to the now deceased emperor, together with a vehement sense of rivalry among his peers.

As to the self-interest, there is no question but that Eustathios’ prospered as an orator and teacher under Komnenian patrons, and especially under Manuel. It is tempting to conclude that he had been made bishop of Thessalonike as a reward for his long service to Manuel’s court, eloquently articulating the desired “image” of the emperor. That, however, would be to reduce needlessly the mutual dependency of ruler and rhetor to a quid pro quo calculus. Besides being too cynical, such a conclusion is likely to be politically unrealistic. The bishopric of a city as important as Thessalonike was too big a “quid” for the relatively modest “quo” of court panegyric. Like most of the rhetors who went on to hold bishoprics after long careers of teaching and authoring panegyrical orations for the emperor and elites, Eustathios more likely earned the trust of Manuel’s court and was appointed bishop of this important and sometimes insubordinate city because his career demonstrated his capacity to command respect from both lay and clerical officials. Of course rhetors claimed that the honour of pronouncing imperial panegyric was payment enough. Theophylact of Ochrid, in an oration addressed to Manuel’s grandfather, Alexios I Komnenos, describes as sufficient reward the mere good fortune of being given a chance to praise the sitting emperor:

Ἐμελλον δὲ ἄρα, ὡσπερ τῶν πράξεων σου χρηστὰ ἀπελαύσαμεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς πράξεσι λόγων οὐ μικρὸν ὄνασθαι, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ τὸ μέρος ἀγαθὸν νομίζομεθα ὅτι τοῖς σοῖς ἐπάινοι τὴν γλῶτταν ἀπεκληρώσαμεν τήμερον. 

Just as we have enjoyed the benefit of your worthwhile actions, so were we bound to profit considerably from the speeches about your actions, since for our part we deem our lot to be fortunate in as much as it has fallen to us to sing your praises.

Theophylact no doubt expected some more tangible benefit. But he was not being disingenuous in describing his good fortune in simply being selected. Imperial panegyric afforded the professional rhetor a prestigious venue to showcase his talents. Those talents were deemed indispensable to the duties of the much

16 Λόγος εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα κύριον Ἀλέξιον τὸν Κομνηνόν 215.15–18.
17 F. W. Norris considers the nature of encomium as a function of its contribution to the encomiast’s standing in “Your honor, my reputation: St. Gregory of Nazianzus’s funeral oration on St. Basil the
coveted posts sought by highly educated men. There was a kind of administra-
tive, almost professional logic to appointing highly articulate individuals of wide
learning to bishoprics and similarly influential positions within the state admin-
istration. Theophylact was eventually made bishop of Ochrid, in the restive
Balkans, from where he put his rhetorical talent to work on behalf of his flock,
thereby consolidating the empire’s position there.

The recurring trope of reciprocity between rhetor and emperor bore sig-
nificance, especially during the Komnenian age, which can only be rivalled by
the later Roman empire and before that archaic Greece for the value it placed
on praise of rulers. Manuel even inherited his father, John II’s, panegyристы, as
an early poem attributed in the Ms. to the court poet Theodore Prodromos,
demonstrates:19

γίνωσκε, θείε βασιλεῦ, περὶ τοῦ σου Προδρόμου,
ὀτί οὐκ ἐγένετο ποτὲ δουλός πολλῶν κυρίων,
ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ πολυδέσποτος, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ χορογύρης,
οὐδ’ εἰς αὐλὰς ἐσέβηκα τοῦ δείνος καὶ τοῦ δείνος,
...
ἀλλ’ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς βρεφικῆς καὶ πρώτης ἡλικίας,
μίαν αὐλὴν ἐγνώρισα καὶ ἕναν αὐθέντην ἔσχον

The Prodromos figure of this poem emphasizes that he had been on a virtual
retainer to Manuel’s father and mother. In return, Prodromos had not sought out
other patrons for his talents. The emperor was thus assured of exclusive rights
to the poet’s skill in praise. Praise was a political commodity in twelfth-century
Byzantium. One way to read Manuel’s large number of panegyrics is as an at-
tempt to buy up as much of the available praise as possible, to corner the market
on acclaim, as it were.

An orator as skilled as Eustathios was valuable to Manuel. Besides being a
virtuoso rhetor, however, Eustathios was also a peerless scholar of ancient liter-
ature and among the most learned men in all of Byzantine history. His immense
erudition was widely respected and he appears to have been a much sought

Great,” Greek biography and panegyric in late antiquity, eds. T. Hägg, P. Rousseau (2000) 140–159. Some
of Norris’ conclusions about the literary character of Gregory’s praise for his deceased friend hold true
for post-classical funerary oratory more generally.

18 On the prevalence during this period of a career as διδάσκαλος in either a pivate or ‘public’ capac-
ity at a state or church sponsored school, combined with service as orator at court as preliminary to
appointment as bishop, See Angold, Church and society, 96; cf. Kazhdan, Studies, 121–124. The cursus
honorum, so to speak, for western bishops was often not that different.

19 For this text of Prodromos, see A. Majuri, “Una nuova poesia di Teodoro Prodromo in greco vul-
gare,” BZ 23 (1920) 397–407. Should we read in these verses an oblique reminder of the poet’s loyalty
and the implicit caution that without continued support, he might have to look for other patrons,
including rivals to the throne?
Due, in part, to his wide learning, but quite possibly to his temperament as well, Eustathios seems to have earned the emperor’s respect as a man of intellect and integrity. At least this is how I interpret Eustathios’ continued success and promotion, despite his sometimes vocal dissent from positions taken by Manuel.

Further evidence for this bond of reciprocity and trust between rhetor and ruler may be seen in an oration of the mid 1170s, probably among the last, and certainly among the longest, recited by Eustathios before Manuel. On this occasion Eustathios appears to have made use of the opportunity to respectfully turn down the bishopric of Myra. His appointment not long after to the much more coveted bishopric of Thessalonike vindicated Eustathios’ decision to hold out for a more prestigious ecclesiastical posting. The surprising initial refusal of a more modest bishopric may be interpreted as proof that Eustathios could presume on the emperor’s good will, as well as his own sense of worth. Near the start of the 1176 oration, Eustathios provides some background to his long history of service to Manuel. He recalls that his own career as an orator at court began in tandem with that of Manuel’s rise to the throne:

For I would be doing the Graces an injustice, if looking upon me with such cheer and smiling sweetly they lavishly bestowed such precious rewards for that imperial inauguration long ago... when I was still but a child and had barely grown my first downy whiskers, [Rhetoric, my beloved nurse] appointed me imperial orator at that time when God first sat you on this imperial summit....I become that youth of old, the one who greeted your rule with inaugural speeches and I will feel this gratitude for the rest of my life, even if, just as I was then a faltering speaker unworthy of that occasion, so now my voice trembles with old age; otherwise what ingratitude I would be accused of if I kept my tongue locked up to the one who opened my mouth that I might speak and earn a living? Indeed most benevolent emperor, you have raised me from a life of slimy affairs into a gleaming purity, transforming my life from one of mire into that of richly rewarding Paktolos and you have

---

20 A profile of Eustathios’ teaching activity remains a desideratum. I have been at work on filling this lacuna.

21 Eustathios had not shrunk from criticizing imperial initiatives surrounding a more accommodating form of conversion from Islam; or demurred from criticizing Christological formulas intended to bring about a measure of reconciliation between Orthodoxy and Catholicism; nor, finally, did he disguise his skepticism about astrology, by which Manuel set a great deal of store, trusting in it even more than he did in medicine, as Nicetas Choniates recounts.

22 The classification and dating of this oration as having been composed for Epiphany in 1176 was suggested by Magdalino, Empire, 457. The mention of the River Jordan has displaced that of St. Nicholas as the primary evidence for deducing the occasion. For the formalization of the assignment of the Epiphany oration to the μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, see Magdalino, Empire, 426–427; cf A. Stone, “A funeral oration of Eustathius of Thessalonike for Manuel I Komnenos,” Balkan Studies 41 (2000) 239–273.
substituted the chatter of the marketplace into a lively nobility, raising me from a mundane to a lofty speaker.  

Eustathios credits the emperor for his rise out of the “mire” of economic insecurity as a teacher and scribe in the patriarchal chancery. Gratitude is not Eustathios’ only point here, however. It is also a reminder of his rôle in the legitimizing ceremonies of Manuel’s inauguration: a talented but untried young rhetor commissioned to acclaim a fledgling emperor. We are reminded of Pindar’s dual emphasis on the co-dependence of victor and victory ode (standing in for the poet). The panegyrist’s perspective was not lost on Eustathios, as his own profile of Pindar makes clear. Manuel had given Eustathios his big break at court. Although it would take time, Eustathios would become his principal court orator, eventually assuming the chair of rhetorical instruction, the much prized post of μαίστωρ τῶν ρητόρων. It was only fitting then that having inaugurated Manuel’s rise to the throne, Eustathios should have also been the one to place the rhetorical capstone on his long reign.

The Ἐπιτάφιος reads in many respects as an extension of Eustathios’ earlier panegyrics for Manuel. More than a few passages are patently adapted from earlier orations. The frequent appearance in the apparatus parallelorum of citations closely resembling the text of his earlier speeches shows Eustathios drawing heavily from his own repertoire. Such reuse speaks simultaneously to the method of composition and to the near ritual continuity of motifs of court panegyric. Moreover, it suggests that he considered the Ἐπιτάφιος as forming a rhetorical

23 Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 203.37–204.60: ἦ γὰρ ἂν ἀδικοίην τὰς Χάριτας, ἐὰν αὐτὰς μὲν ἱλαρὸν οὕτω προσέβλεψαν καὶ γλυκὺ μοι προσεμειδίσαν καὶ τῶν πάλαι βασιλικῶν ἐκείνων ἐγκαινίων ἁμοιάς πολύτιμως ἐδαψιλεύσαντο... ἐπὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἐκείνῃ τοῦ βασιλέως ἑτέρῳ προσφέγγομεν, οὐκ ἂν κριθείην ἀγνωμοσύνης τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐγκλείσας τῷ ἐξανοίξαντί μοι τὸ στόμα καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ τρέφεσθαι; ναὶ γάρ, ὦ βασιλέως εὐεργετικότατε, σύ με καὶ ἀπὸ ἰλύος πραγμάτων εἰς λαμποσαν μετήνεγκας καθαρότητα, καὶ ἤμειψάς μοι τὸν τοῦ βίου πηλὸν εἰς πλουτοποιὸν Πακτωλὸν καὶ τὴν ἀγοραίαν στωμυλίαν εἰς εὐγενῆ λαμυρίαν μετέθηκας καὶ γῆθεν λαλοῦντά με πρὸς μετέωρον ὑψόσας.


25 Pro. ad Pi.

unity with its panegyrical forerunners, a kind of coda to his years of praise of the emperor who had reigned for most of his life. Still, the repetition, if not wholesale borrowing from one oration into another calls for some explanation. Despite our increasing respect for the ‘alterity’ of medieval culture, the predilection not just of authors but audiences as well for reiteration and recurrence of motifs, *topoi*, phrasing, etc., continues to vex our efforts to establish an aesthetic rationale for Byzantine literature. Modern scholarship has sometimes formulated this question as the dilemma of “originality” in Byzantine literature. Reflecting on his career as an orator, Eustathios obliquely addressed the question of forging a permanent rhetorical ‘stamp’ of the emperor’s image:

According to Solon’s law, it was wrong for a ringmaker to preserve the mould of a signet ring which he had already sold. He should destroy it and not use it to make a second copy. In the case of an emperor’s holy actions, on the other hand, one must always recall these and preserve them forever as one does those of God by means of a brilliant seal. And one should display them to all and recount these same actions as often as one can. Accordingly then, as far as I was able to produce eloquent speeches, I also described the emperor’s courage, the ardour of his audacity, his singular and truly extraordinary bravery, the extent of his valour.

Unlike the ancient signet ring-maker required by Solon’s law to discard the cast of any seal he manufactured, the Byzantine orator, Eustathios argues, must forever preserve the brilliant impression of the emperor’s deeds he had crafted in flowing speech. Besides raising significant questions about an implied concept of representation and the shifting relation of the word to the world, Eustathios’ characteristically learned simile provides a highly revealing rationale for what we still regard as rhetorically conditioned repetition. The image of the seal also helps to broach such features of imperial oratory as have earned the genre a reputation for irremediably clichéd, formulaic, or predictably commonplace and hackneyed language effectively hollowed out of any but the most platitudinous meaning; in short, all the shortcomings we associate with rhetoric.

The challenge of evaluating, in the broadest sense, a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος, stems in large part from the abidingly unfavourable qualities ascribed to rhetoric.
and the restrictive effect it is thought to have had on the authorial imagination and on intellectual life more broadly in Byzantium. Thus G. Kustas, who is rightly thought to represent a more sympathetic assessment of Byzantine rhetoric, concludes that “Byzantium bestowed upon the art of rhetoric an authority to define its intellectual and spiritual vision which is without parallel in the history of literate societies.”30 “Rhetoric,” he adds, “did not simply provide the machinery of literary endeavour; it was a key element of the Byzantine Weltanschauung.”31 Even when phrased as neutrally as Kustas does, such a conclusion handicaps the analysis of Byzantine texts deemed “rhetorical” by suggesting that their significance was coterminous with their form. As that form comes to seem less and less imaginative or original, its content or meaning appears to diminish. Byzantium may well be unique in having been perceived by modern scholars as relying exclusively on form, producing rhetoric for rhetoric’s sake.32 Even if this were true, and I think there are many reasons why it is not, it would still require us to consider how such a textual culture managed to flourish for as long as it did, at least by its own standard; the only one which mattered at the time, incidentally.

But most of contemporary literary history has been inimical to the luxuriating baroque styles of Byzantine prose. Edward Gibbon, himself a consummate rhetorician, set the tone for modern reception of Byzantine rhetoric with his severe judgement: “[I]n every page our taste and reason are wounded by the choice of gigantic and obsolete words, a stiff and intricate phraseology, the discord of images, the childish play of false or unseasonable ornament, and the painful attempt to elevate themselves, to astonish the reader, and to involve a trivial meaning in the smoke of obscurity and exaggeration.”33 The fact that even the staunchest defender of Byzantine literature feels some muted sympathy for Gibbon’s pronouncement demonstrates how deeply ingrained the assumptions of post-Romantic literary sensibility have become. As heirs to the Romantic valor-

31 In this same, vein, P. Wirth, prompted by long study of Eustathios’ corpus of orations, reflects on the need to revise our understanding of Byzantine rhetoric: “Die Bedeutung der byzantinischen Rhetorik beruht indes nicht nur auf ihrer politischen Aufgabe und nicht in ihrem Wert als Geschichtsquelle hohen Rangs: Sie gründet vielmehr auch auf ihrer Rolle als gewissermaßen eines Spiegels, der die Strahlen aller theologischen, philosophischen, ja überhaupt aller geistigen Bewegung einer Zeit in sich sammelt und widerstrahlt.” P. Wirth, Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen Rhetorik des zwölften Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften des Erzbischofs Eustathios von Thessalonike (München, 1960) 1.
32 This used to be said of the period known as the Second Sophistic before a reexamination of the texts came to rehabilitate its reputation. For a discussion of what prompted the reassessment, and bibliography on this now vast subject, see T. Whitmarsh, Greek literature and the Roman empire: the politics of imitation (Oxford, 2001) 1–40.
ization of sincerity and authenticity in literature, we have also inherited the prejudice against conspicuously crafted eloquence. Too much attention to style, the modern reader suspects, betrays a fatal lack of sincerity. We are wont to mistrust patently artful speech as disingenuous, at best, dissembling, at worst. This renders us practically deaf to the appeal of medieval Greek eloquence. We thus remain impervious to Byzantine oratory’s capacity to captivate and enchant its audiences, as it must have done on occasion in order to survive for as long as it did. Until we understand how it managed to do so, its significance will continue to elude us.

Style, as a locus of aesthetic value, is one way to pursue a redemptory approach to Eustathios’ prose and Byzantine rhetoric more generally. Everywhere we look in medieval Greek literature in the upper registers, we encounter ἐπίδειξις, the foregrounding of the designed-ness of the text. I discuss the significance of this for our understanding of the Επιτάφιος and of similarly conceived texts in the section titled “The Style which Shows.” Instead of condemning the opacity frequently lamented by scholars, I consider its historical value along an alternate rhetorical spectrum, one in which language is not coy about its artfulness. Byzantine oratory makes no pretense to the naturalism we have come to cherish in much modern prose. Writing of the underpinnings of literary creativity in Byzantium, Hans Georg Beck lamented the maligned rôle of rhetoric by observing that while the term itself is insufficiently “apotropaic,” in as much it does not ward off criticism, it is “apotreptic.” The label “rhetoric” has tended to discourage readers. “All the same,” asked Beck, “what exactly is rhetoric?”

Rhetoric has long been portrayed as representing both a mercenary attitude to language and a screen to conceal the absence of substance. The origins of this prejudice date at least as far back as fifth-century Athens, when the success of

34 Already in 1960 Wirth had called for more stylistic analysis of Byzantine prose as a means of overcoming the obstacles which stood in the way of a better understanding of Byzantine literature. “Der Zugang zur byzantinischen Rhetorik freilich wird durch die sprachlichen Schwierigkeiten versperrt, die dem Verständnis vieler Stellen entgegenstehen. Die Notwendigkeit sprachlicher und stilischer Untersuchungen, die Licht in das Dunkel bizarer syntaktischer Konstruktionen, weithergeholter Tropen und Figuren bringen könnten.” Wirth, Untersuchungen, 2.

35 “Rhetorik ist ein Begriff, der allein schon zwar nicht apotropäische aber doch apotreptische Wirkung auszuüben scheint. Doch was heißt eigentlich Rhetorik?” H.-G. Beck, Das literarische Schaffen der Byzan- tiner. Wege zu seinem Verständnis. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Band: 394/4 (Wien, 1974) 18. The reemergence of schools of rhetorical criticism has helped rehabilitate rhetoric’s constitutive role in language. The relevant scholarly literature on this subject is both vast and continually growing. Early attempts to illustrate the diversity of approaches produced collections such as those of Essays on rhetorical criticism, ed. T. R. Nilsen (New York 1968) and anthologies of sources like The rhetorical tradition: readings from classical times to the present, eds. P. Bizzell, B. Herzberg (Pittsburgh 1990). But new books and articles on both the origins and development of rhetoric, as well as thinking about the application of rhetoric, are published with astounding regularity.
professional speech ‘consultants’ such as Gorgias of Leontini and the early sophists who purveyed instruction in persuasion elicited Plato’s assault on rhetoric as intellectually fraudulent.36 Rhetoric continued to flourish, but at some cost to its historical standing vis à vis philosophy. Its long-term survival and influence was assured by the primacy it came to enjoy in the post-classical and medieval Greek curriculum, which only hurt its reputation later on. It was not the only academic subject, by any means, but rhetoric became the matrix of advanced education, on which nearly every other subject relied on for exposition. Kustas’ characterization of rhetoric as gradually coming to comprise a Weltanschauung is not an overstatement. It is a description of the decisive rôle granted to rhetoric in the epistemological formation of educated Byzantines. By the twelfth century, the hold of rhetoric on verbal sensibility among both authors and audiences was all but complete. It is probably a mistake to regard rhetoric as a literary strategy, much less a genre or type, as Hunger’s classification misleadingly suggests. It became synonymous with adept and effective use of language, the operating software to language’s hardware.

And yet this same historical success of rhetoric from antiquity down through to the early modern era, in both the Greek east and Latin west, eventually led to renewed criticism, albeit from a different standpoint. Rhetoric came to be seen as stifling the author’s voice. Originality, in form or content, was suppressed by the scripted formulas and conventions of rhetoric. It is worth noting, then, that one of the founding fathers of literary modernism, T.S. Eliot – who as far as I know never read any Byzantine literature – cautioned that “[rhetoric] simply cannot be used as synonymous with bad writing. The meanings which it has been obliged to shoulder have been mostly opprobrious; but if a precise meaning can be found for it, this meaning may occasionally represent a virtue.” 37 As an iconoclast in matters of style, Eliot understood that no aesthetic is inherently good or bad. Everything depends on the surrounding context in which a text’s formal choices are anchored.

And yet for all the foregrounding of literary aesthetics, at its root, the real objection to Byzantine rhetoric has always been ideological. As the ideological

36 The literature on the history and early perception of rhetoric is now too great to summarize. For an outline of the relevant arguments Byzantinists ought to be more conversant in, see E. Schiappa, The beginnings of rhetorical theory in classical Greece (New Haven, 1999); cf. J. A.E. Bons, “Gorgias the Sophist and early rhetoric,” and H. Yunis, “Plato’s rhetoric,” A companion to Greek rhetoric, ed. I Worthington (Oxford, 2007) 37–46, 75–89.
offspring of Orwell, we are wont to regard the subservience of language to politics in Byzantium with barely concealed contempt. Orwell is especially apt when discussing Byzantine oratory because his is the ethical programme we have adopted with respect to the duties of the writer to defend the language from the natural tendency of politics to coopt literature. At once intimidated and inhibited by the autocratic status quo, Byzantine authors are assumed to have shrank further and further from frank and honest depiction of their world. We presume that anyone sufficiently literate to compose as sophisticated a text as the Ἐπιτάφιος must have known he was fashioning a political fiction. The more obvious the recourse to rhetorical artfulness in political speech, the likelier that the author or speaker will be suspected of disingenuousness. Rhetoric is assumed to be the first step to becoming a propagandist. And Eustathios is by no means exempt from such a charge. It is hardly exculpating to say, as G. Dennis has, that while Byzantine panegyric constituted an “extreme, almost sickening flattery” of the emperor, Byzantine orators were “just doing their job.”

This makes a rhetor like Eustathios little more than a hired literary gun. But how conducive is this to an understanding of Byzantine imperial oratory, how it flourished, and what it may have meant to its audiences? “Imperial encomium,” writes Magdalino, “was not a sporadic event in Byzantine public life, something to which writers resorted under unusual duress.” It was, instead, “a basic component of the rhetoric which oiled the wheels of government.” To appreciate the role assigned to rhetoric in the political life of Constantinople and the empire, we must bear in mind that “authorities wanted to act through the spoken word and persuasion, not by force alone.” The paramount aim of rhetoric as a social institution never ceased to be persuasion, even if, as L. Pernot has argued, “the

39 Magdalino, Empire, 414. While virtuoso rhetors had addressed emperors as far back as the second century, the custom of delivering βασιλικοὶ λόγοι appears to have waned after the sixth century. The manuscript tradition suggests a sustained lacuna from the seventh century down to the mid-eleventh when the practice of court oratory seems to have resumed with considerable rhetorical and ideological vigour. Yet by any measure, Manuel’s reign was extolled by a cadre of virtuoso rhetors and poets to an extent never before seen in Byzantium. For the late Roman tradition of imperial encomia, see the recent collection of papers in Latin panegyric, ed. R. Rees (Oxford, 2012); cf. C.E.V. Nixon, B. S. Rodgers, In praise of later Roman emperors: the Panegyrici Latini: introduction, translation, and historical commentary, with the Latin text of R.A.B. Mynors (Berkeley, 1994) 21. B. Müller-Rettig, Panegyrici Latini: Lobreden auf römische Kaiser: lateinisch und deutsch / eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert (Darmstadt, 2009–2014).
aim of [epideictic] speech is a subtle one, to ‘intensify’ existing ideas, rather than to create new knowledge or a new understanding of a situation.”

Assessing the resilience of Byzantine political structures, Beck pointed to panegyric as a ritual reiteration of the prevailing “political orthodoxy.” Such a broadly persuasive function has generally been denied to court oratory, much less to a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος. But as R. Webb reminds us, “[t]he epideictic orator’s task was to pick out a single clear line of praiseworthy actions and qualities and to make them clear and acceptable to his audience ... against the multifarious range of existing opinion, interpretation and knowledge of events.” The panegyricist’s most significant contribution, as Webb suggests, may have been less that of a publicist or propagandist, but in rendering the otherwise commonplace aspects of a regime into normative, elevated language. Eustathios achieved this in the Ἐπιτάφιος by aligning Manuel’s conduct and character with received and widely shared ideals of good governance found across a range of textual precedents. “The orator,” as Pernot aptly observes, “enlights the community about its own sentiments, provides a rational foundation for its traditional practices, and translates its convictions into rhetoric’s respected language.”

Rooted in the tradition of epideictic rhetoric to which the Ἐπιτάφιος belongs, court oratory has too often been judged as a passive register of the regime’s manufactured image. While undeniably fulfilling this function, oratory could also participate in the shaping of ideological norms by offering enduring touchstones of imperial value and broad public welfare. Pernot notes that while epideictic speeches at court have too often been deemed as saying little of immediate or lasting material consequence, we should nonetheless acknowledge that the act of public speaking in official venues itself still amounted to a historical act. The text of an oration which seems a deficient and unreliable witness to contemporary reality can still comprise a historical artifact in its own right.

---


Reading the Ἐπιτάφιος as a kind of transcript of an oral performance instead of as a treatise encourages such a realization.

Another way to think about the funeral oration which I explore here is as an *illocutionary* act, following the paradigm outlined by J.L. Austin in his seminal *How to do Things with Words*. Austin proposed that we assign three distinct functions to language: as a *locutionary* act made up of the propositional content or accuracy of a statement; an *illocutionary* or performative act revealed in the contextual function of speech; and as a *perlocutionary* act measured by the effect of language upon the listener. While epideictic oratory like the Ἐπιτάφιος would no doubt fare poorly in the first and last of these categories – given that we would not want to set much store by its truth value or its immediately identifiable consequences in the world – our understanding of it as a performative utterance grows appreciably if it is acknowledged as an *illocutionary* act. This means approaching the Ἐπιτάφιος as an instance when saying something *amounts to doing something*. Besides expanding our options for analyzing Byzantine rhetoric, Austin’s locutionary heuristic has the added virtue of making interpretive sense of the contingent and contextual element of “occasional oratory.” In a society saturated by religious and social ritual, where formulaic language was perceived as almost incantatory in nature, ceremonial oratory was not simply an act of communication. It was also a rite, a form of social sacrament, in which the words lent significance to the occasion and helped complete its meaning. The occasion of a text’s delivery thus gave the words a resonance we cannot easily recover from the silent page.

Eustathios appears to have taken an almost sensuous delight in the handling of all Greek. Besides composing precisely wrought sentences, he collected words and expressions up and down the registers of the language. To judge from his long and prolific career as a teacher or rhetoric, as an author of diverse works across a remarkable range of genres, and not least as an orator in the palace and the pulpit, his audiences took an equal delight in the results of his literary la-

---


46 Eustathios appears to have been something of a word collector and to have cultivated a fascination for popular culture, as demonstrated by his compilation of proverbs. Besides the many incidental mentions of colloquial vocabulary in his Homeric commentaries as well as in diverse other texts, he appears to have indulged in the professional rhetor’s penchant for synonyms and study of linguistic variation, See A. Hotop, *De Eustathii proverbibus* (Leipzig, 1888); P. I. Koukoules, Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου τὰ γραμματικά (Athens, 1953); idem, Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου τὰ λαογραφικά, τόμ. Α-Β (Athens, 1950).
Known primarily as the author-compiler of works like the Παρεκβολάι, a gargantuan and exhaustive analytical commentary to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as well as of dense prose texts like his treatise on the reform of monasticism, he has, for the most part, been a mute writer to us. Even his many surviving sermons and occasional addresses at the imperial or ecclesiastical court have been read as long form essays, not as *orations*. Thus in trying to gauge the reception of the Ἐπιτάφιος at the point of its delivery, it has helped to note that Eustathios gained renown, as well as a loyal student following, as an accomplished orator. His eulogists, Euthymios Malakes and Michael Choniates, themselves former students, cite Eustathios’ skill as an orator in a bid to explain his success:

The gracefulness of Eustathios’ homilies dripped with honey just like some distilled nectar, whence his teachings entered deep into the marrow of his listeners’ soul and were seared there straightaway, being preserved there indelibly against the tide of forgetfulness.

The reference to “homilies” and “listeners” remind us that as distinct from our modern notion of an author, much of Eustathios’ career unfolded before live audiences, whether at the courts of the palace and the patriarchate, in churches before congregants, and one assumes, at least early on, in informal literary displays at privately sponsored *theatra*, like so many of his peers. And yet Eustathios is rarely, if ever, described as an “orator.” Indeed, both orator and oratory have been absent from our répertoire of meaningful designations of Byzantine literature.

Our assessment of the Ἐπιτάφιος must take into account that it was drawn up with listeners in mind. If I devote considerable attention to this aspect of the Ἐπιτάφιος, in both the introduction and commentary, it is because orality formed

---

47 Even if we were not aware of a number of lost works by Eustathios, he would still rank among the most prolific authors of Byzantium. The most recent and thorough inventory of his works may be found in *Or. quadr.* 7*-25*. For a list of Eustathios’ missing works, see J. Darrouzès, “Notes d’histoire des textes,” *RÉB*, t. 21 (1963) 232–242.

48 *Mon.* 287.8–12. Another former student, and possibly Eustathios’ literary executor, Euthymios Malakes likened his mentor’s oratory to a “river of speech greater even than the waterfalls of the Nile.” The graphic hyperbole substituted for a corresponding reality. Ἑθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη μητροπολίτου Νεών Πατρών (Ἰτάσης) [δευτέρον ἥμισυ ἢ' ἐκατ.] τὰ σωζόμενα, ed. K.G. Bonis [Θεολογική Βιβλιοθήκη 7] (Athens 1937) 3.5–10: ὁ δὲ τὴν πόλιν περικλύζων δεύτερος ποταμός, οὗ τὸ ῥεῦμα τῶν λόγων καὶ τοῦ Ἕλλου καταράκτας ἀπέκρυψεν, ἐπαύσατο ῥέων καὶ ὁ πολὺς ἐκεῖνος ῥοῖζος ἐσίγησε. καὶ νῦν οἱ χθές χανδὸν ἐκροφοῦντες καὶ τῷ μελιχρῷ τοῦ νάματος γλυκαζόμενοι, αὐαλέοι σήμερον καὶ περικαεῖς τῷ πυρί τῆς δίψης καμινεύονται.

49 *Mon.* 285.19–21, may not have been exaggerating much when he noted that both church and palace felt the loss of Eustathios’ talents as an orator: Ζητεῖ καὶ σύνοδος ιερά τῶν κατατήρησεστατών ὀρθολόγων καὶ τὰ βασιλεία τὴν περιαλοῦσαν ταῦτα φωνὴν καὶ περιγνωμένην τοῖς πέραστοι.
the enabling medium of the text, a fact most analysis of Byzantine imperial panegyric has made little effort to account for as a significant feature of the text. Many of the rhetorical and stylistic attributes of the Ἐπιτάφιος were conspicuously patterned to excite aural, sensory perception. In his monody cum mémoire of his former teacher and fellow bishop, Michael Choniates credits Eustathios with having transformed, and thus effectively “rescued,” the art of composition, by which he meant first and foremost oratory. Eloquence, he reports, had become imperiled at this time by encroachments on the part of colloquial language and grammar, the perennial bogeyman of classicizing Greek. Of course vigilance in policing the boundaries between the different registers of Greek had long been part of the Byzantine rhetor’s vocation. But this had always been easier to do in writing than in speech. Despite our general impression of upper register Greek prose as ‘bookish,’ vocal eloquence seems to have remained essential to its appeal among élite audiences, especially in light of competition from more popular, demotic entertainments. Eustathios, Choniates claimed, stemmed the tide of ‘vulgar’ speech by offering a more urbane, witty, and learned alternative, combining dignity with formal charm:

Πόσοι μέχρι τούτου ρητορικαῖς χάρισι θύειν ἐνόμιζον, ἕως τῶν Εὐστάθιου σειρήνων ἥκροάσαντο...Ω λόγων εκείνων, μήτε βυμολόγιοι εὐτραπέλαιοι γελοιαζόντων σκηνικώ- τεροι, μήτε ἀπεικόνιστοι στρωφόντες ἀμφαλοπλατίνης βαρότητι, ὑποσέμνω ἰκεχάραμεν ἀστειόσυνη καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ὑποθήκην ὑποτηθήκην θεῖα παρηρτημένην ἅλατι, ὡς τὸν ἄκρωμε- νον δημιουργούσαι ἀμένως, τῶν οίκων κατὰ τούς λωτοφαγοῦς λαθόμενον.

Prior to this man, how many thought they were honouring the Graces of rhetoric, until they heard the sirens of Eustathios...oh those orations of his, neither entertaining with ribald wit by being quite theatrical, nor repulsing with an onerous burden of a still incipient harshness. They were composed instead with a mix of solemn sophistication, given zest, as it were, by the salt of apostolic teaching, so that the audience would have gladly spent the whole day listening to him, forgetting to return home, like the famed lotus eaters.

Choniates’ account of Eustathios’ reputation as a rhetor lays stress on precisely those features of his style which have elicited censure from modern scholars as pretentious and occasionally bordering on the unintelligible. Consequently even a scholar with as high an estimate of Eustathios as A. Kazhdan could not but yield to the general antipathy for his prose style, noting that “Eustathius’ rhetoric can appear alarmingly opaque. He can ramble inconsequentially and interminably.” The challenge for us is to understand how the very same features which prompted Kazhdan’s disparaging verdict could have come in for such fulsome praise and have enjoyed consistent patronage in Eustathios’ own day.

I have attempted to situate the Ἐπιτάφιος in this oral, ceremonial setting in a bid to encourage a reading of the funeral oration as a historical event, and not simply as a rhetorically manufactured abstraction. We presumably no longer need to invoke the lessons of New Historicism in order to support the claim that texts are born of contexts. But texts can also bear on contexts. As an occasional address before the court during a time of manifest political uncertainty, Eustathios’ oration was bound to be perceived as both conventional and verging on the controversial. At least some of the passages rebutting criticism of Manuel’s policies or offering a political rationale for the regency suggest an undercurrent of political engagement. A further con-textualization involves mapping the many close correlations of the Ἐπιτάφιος with the vast body of literature it drew on, either directly and indirectly. We cannot make sense of such a text unless we gain a better appreciation of the wider, and ‘deeper’, linguistic and literary setting in which the Ἐπιτάφιος was embedded. The decision to bring this intertextuality to light in the apparatus fontium et parallelorum, once the locus of a more narrowly conceived inventory of “sources,” reflects a broader interpretive reading. Given his singularly wide reading (enabled, we presume, by access to the capital’s best libraries) Eustathios’ works exhibit an unusually dense intertextuality.

Until recently, we have had two dominant models for how to approach the works of an author like Eustathios. The one, represented by Herbert Hunger’s Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner, accounts for the contents and form of a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος by appeal to the strength of genre and the cultural imperative of mimesis in perpetuating rhetorical traditions. The other is represented by Alexander Kazhdan’s profile of Eustathios in Studies on Byzantine literature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The latter sees individual texts

53 Kazhdan, Studies, 140.
as expressions of the author’s own views, convictions, and sensibility, which Kazhdan in turn reconstructed from Eustathios’ considerable oeuvre. Each of these two approaches offers distinct, and necessarily partial insights. There can be no question but that we need a broad reassessment of Eustathios as an author and as an active intellectual of his time. But this can only come from close study of individual works prior to profiles of author or genre.

**WHY THE ἘΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ?**

The title of this study, *Not Composed in a Chance Manner* is derived from the heading accompanying the Ἐπιτάφιος in the single manuscript witness, Basileensis A.III.20. Added only at the stage of ‘publication’, the title appears to have been intended to market the text to prospective readers by underscoring that the author did not take the style and structure of the oration for granted, but had composed it in a manner befitting Eustathios’ desire to create a work apart. This would not have been the first time Eustathios sought to defy conventional expectations in otherwise familiar genres. Since the likely audience for such works after their initial delivery was other rhetors in search of models to whose style they might learn from, and even emulate, authors could not help but compose with one eye on the exemplarity of their own work.\(^{55}\) Such embedded professional self-consciousness was not new to court oratory, or to Eustathios’ authorial practice. Indeed, so ingrained was the habit of reflecting on his own craft that he made room even in a funeral oration to comment on matters of composition presented in the guise of praise for Manuel. In this respect, the Ἐπιτάφιος rationalizes its own study as a work deserving of close reading. My own aim has consequently been to inquire into the oration’s formal qualities, its style as an enduring feature of its substance or contents, alongside other aspects of its composition, performance, and reception. Making sense of the text nevertheless requires giving the historical reality addressed by the funeral oration its due in the interpretation.

For all its densely wrought ethical and broadly ideological generalities, the Ἐπιτάφιος is rich with allusions to actual events, policies, and specific circumstances.

While the oration itself is about Manuel I Komnenos (though I argue not just about him), this study is not intended primarily as a contribution to the now

excellent historiography about this emperor, except perhaps incidentally. But it was not the oration’s potential to supply further details about Manuel or the events surrounding his reign which drew me to this unsung text in the first place. In the wake of Paul Magdalino’s outstanding historical profile of Manuel – to which this study is greatly indebted – and to which most future work on this emperor is likely to serve as footnote, it is questionable whether the value of the Ἐπιτάφιος lies in its capacity to serve as an additional witness for Manuel the man and his reign. This is not due to the inherent partiality of a eulogy; nearly all the texts composed for the court acknowledge a similar panegyrical bent. But when considered alongside the remaining sources for Manuel’s life and reign, the Ἐπιτάφιος tells us little that we might not glean from other witnesses, not least Eustathios’ own orations before the emperor, many of which he cannibalized to compose this funerary speech.

And yet a lengthy and elaborate funeral oration for an emperor whose long reign witnessed so many noteworthy developments across the medieval Mediterranean might be expected to produce some information, if not about the man himself and his governance of the empire, at least about his “image” as Magdalino has aptly described the sometimes propagandistic, sometimes popular perception of Manuel, using a term which evokes modern political or celebrity “image-making.” I have nevertheless resisted the temptation to distil an impression of Manuel from the Ἐπιτάφιος. Such efforts, while understandable, do not only yield little in the way of new information, they also, in my view, greatly misrepresent the nature of a text like Eustathios’ funeral oration, whose aim was at once larger and more complicated than simply creating a digest of the emperor’s life and reign. So while Manuel is unquestionably at the center of this oration, he often serves as pivot and a pretext for ancillary topics, some bearing directly on his rule, some not. Three quick examples may suffice to illustrate this. Eustathios defends Manuel’s policy of recruiting prisoners of war from the frontiers whose freedom he presumably bought from their Byzantine masters, on broadly ethical grounds against slavery, buttressed by a kind of ethnographic rationale. The choice to include this among Manuel’s accomplishments probably reflected the controversy of the policy, but also Eustathios own ethical objections to slavery, spelled out in his will vouchsafing the manumission of his own slaves, as well as his sociopolitical estimate of the risk to Byzantine society of resentful slaves and fearful masters.

The second example, alluded to above, concerns the composition, delivery, and eventual publication of speeches for further recital or study. While Manuel
forms the ostensible subject of praise for having done this in the ideal way, with minimal changes to one’s text at each stage (and, it would appear, initial performance from memory, a practice generally thought to have waned in the middle ages), it is clear that Eustathios cannot resist the opportunity to expostulate with his peers on what he disapprovingly concedes has become common practice, namely, revising one’s text so that it bears little resemblance to the version performed before its original audience. A third and final example with which to illustrate the oration’s expansive subject matter, is the brief but fascinatingly precise reference to the imperially financed dispensation of free drug prescriptions for the poor. Though not credited to Manuel, the mechanism for making medicines available to those who could otherwise not afford them is invoked in the long excursus on Manuel’s own medical proficiency, one suspects in a bid to illustrate, as so often in the Ἐπιτάφιος, the obligations of the throne.

The funeral oration thus ranges over a variety of subjects, some more central to imperial rule, like defensive policy or financing of repairs to public buildings, some less so, like rhetoric and medicine. While I try to note the presence of these and other more conventional panegyrical motifs in the text, my paramount aim has been to alter the focus from the ostensible subject(s) of the oration to the oration itself as subject. In common academic parlance, I have tried to shift attention from the content to the form of the Ἐπιτάφιος, not least the manner and possible place of its delivery. Underwriting the aims of this study is a wider preoccupation with neglected features not just of the Ἐπιτάφιος but a variety of texts similar to it: namely, that a broad class of Byzantine texts routinely labelled “rhetorical” are often perceived as little more than elaborate epideictic exercises, having no greater purpose than to showcase their author’s verbal virtuosity, untethered from any reality beyond their own self-perpetuating poetics.

This charge is not entirely with some basis in the texts which made up the tradition of court oratory, including the handful of surviving imperial epitaphioi. Yet it fails to account for how such a centuries-long tradition sustained the support of its patrons and catered to the needs of audiences. Indeed, thinking about the audience of the Ἐπιτάφιος leads us to conjure the actual recital of the

---

56 Despite being characterized “the [Byzantine] rhetorical genre par excellence,” medieval Greek funerary literature has yet to benefit from more systematic study. In his indispensable survey of all surviving Byzantine funeral orations, A. Sideras had promised just such a study of the form or literary aspects of funerary texts as part of a triad of studies begun with the volume above. See A. Sideras, Die byzantinischen Grabreden. Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung 142 Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend, (Wien, 1994). For a review of the book and some important observations about Sideras’ narrow frame of reference see P. A. Agapitos, Hellenika 46 (1996) 195–205.
oration, a prospect sometimes deemed implausible by scholars who argue that such texts were too long, too labyrinthine in structure, and far too recherché in their range of allusion or citation to be intelligible to all but a handful of érudits. But as I argue in the course of this study, we must learn to regard occasional oratory as not just as a genre or set of genres, but as historical events in their own right. The Ἐπιτάφιος happened. Much of the evidence for such a historical and performative understanding of the funeral oration lies in the text itself, in its structure and style, and is corroborated by further parallels or information drawn from similar texts.

To answer these and a host of related questions meant also questioning how we might more productively study such a work, beginning with textual criticism and its apparatus, the need for translation as a way to resolve how the text functions, a commentary to shed light on the many otherwise obscure corners of a speech which could assume much shared knowledge amongst its listeners, and a series of introductory discussions which take up aspects ranging from the physical setting to the deliberate style of the oration. I do not claim to have exhausted what one may do with or learn from the Ἐπιτάφιος. My hope is only to have provided an example of how much lies both on and beneath the surface of a text like this. But studying the Ἐπιτάφιος in a systematic fashion meant first producing a new critical edition of the Greek text to replace G.L.F. Tafel’s serviceable but still outdated 1832 edition in his Opuscula of Eustathios’ writings drawn from the Basel manuscript containing a large portion of his oeuvre. Like many Byzantine texts of this period for which there are few or just one manuscript witness, newer editions produce few single dramatic improvements. Tafel in fact proved a capable and conscientious editor. Still, philology values even incremental advances and the accumulation of corrections, joined to a modern apparatus fontium et parallelorum can yield a better understanding of the text. Heeding the advice of scholars who have long argued that no edition of a Byzantine text should be published without an accompanying translation, I have rendered the Ἐπιτάφιος into English. While this is not the first translation of this text into a modern language, it is, I argue, the more accurate one. Finally, close study of the text invariably produced a series of observations about the text, its historical context, questions of etymology, grammar, and usage, as well as performance, and formal design. Some of this is gathered itself into broader thematic sections which make up the introduction. The remainder may be found in the commentary, together with more extensive discussion of textual problems.
I think I can safely say that long engagement with the Ἐπιτάφιος has taught me a great deal not just about this one text, its author, or even Byzantine literature of this period, but about the modern practice of Byzantine philology and the avenues of inquiry which still lie before it. Robert Browning once observed that the scholar’s choice of text “is like marriage; some scope must be left for personal preference.” 57 In this case, the betrothal proved precipitate at first. A number of little known works by Eustathios piqued my curiosity while I was rummaging around in search of a dissertation topic among the scores of Byzantine texts languishing in old and imperfect editions. Eager to get a jump on the thesis prospectus and confident I would eventually find a workable framework for the texts, I managed to convince my dissertation committee to let me pursue this project. In time, the difficulty of writing about texts which few scholars had ever thought warranted much attention became increasingly clear. It took a while, but in time I began to appreciate the value of working with texts whose significance was not a foregone conclusion.

I might never have gotten anywhere had it not been for the encouragement and insights of my supervisors. John Duffy, who has taught me as much about good humoured collegiality as he has about medieval Greek philology, proved a meticulous reader and a generous mentor during my graduate studies at Harvard’s Classics department. Roderich Reinsch made it possible for me to spend an unforgettable and instructive year as a DAAD Gastdoktorand of the Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin. Over the course of a balmy Berlin summer we sat in his office overlooking the garden of the institute in Podbielskiallee and immersed ourselves in Eustathios’ consumately crafted prose, emerging only to eat a quick lunch at the local Italian tavern before returning to our task. To Roderich I owe the insight that Eustathios, like many of his peers, composed to be heard, a lesson which has stayed with me as a key to unlocking much about Byzantine poetics lost on an age of mute readers. Angeliki Laiou, sorely missed by her friends and colleagues, not least former students who would surely now benefit from her steely acumen; upon reading a draft of the dissertation, she sent me a long and detailed list of questions which could serve as a glossary for philologists who wish to communicate with historians.

I was no less fortunate in the friendly, off-the-books counsel I got from peers. Ingela Nilsson leavened my souring on the project at a crucial stage with critical encouragement and Kanelbullar. Panagiotis Agapitos reminded me that

no matter the approach I was going to adopt in presenting Eustathios’ text, I would need to form my very own relationship to the work, wisdom I have in turn transmitted to students. Later, Alice-Mary Talbot and my cohort at Dumbarton Oaks offered sage advice and genuine fellowship. Of course I might never have found my way to Byzantine literature had it not been for those intellectually bracing tutorials on medieval Greek palaeography and all things Byzantine with A.R. Littlewood all those years ago. And I might never have survived the dissertation had Ludmilla and Vadim, Mika and Sasha, not offered shelter, friendship, and warm meals, along with a wider view of the stakes in learning.

Since completing the dissertation, I began to inquire less into what made the Ἐπιτάφιος unique – an understandable initial preoccupation in a field which has had to defend its texts against charges of ingrained conformism and unoriginality – and to ask instead what unexpected lessons we might gain from studying such texts as typical of Byzantine literary sensibility and not as exceptional works. As a project long in fruition, this study has benefitted in too many ways and from too many people to enumerate here. Still, I feel I must acknowledge the help of those without whom it would never have gotten done, or without whom it would be a good deal more imperfect. The Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies at Princeton University provided support for a sabbatical spent, in part, as a research fellow at the Byzantine section of the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, where colleagues welcomed me and placed the excellent resources of the Medieval Studies Institute at my disposal. My stay was made all the more fruitful by the access I was granted to the excellent and airy library of the Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik at the University of Vienna, where conversations with students and other visiting colleagues spurred me to greater efforts and occasioned new insights. Both were made possible by Claudia Rapp, whose welcoming collegiality is a model for how to bind an otherwise small field into something bigger than the sum of its parts. Near the end, Vincent Deroche read through the penultimate draft of the translation and saved me from occasionally over-translating Eustathios’ often exquisitely intricate prose, while showing me the way to greater accuracy throughout. Help with the bibliography and fastidious reading of multiple drafts were David Jenkins’ least contribution, since it is has been his value as a keen interlocutor unapologetically committed to philology that I have benefitted from the most. Finally, my eternal gratitude to Eric Cullhed, who midwifed the book with uncommon editorial diligence and a peerless eye for good Greek!
De mortuis nil nisi bonum: imperial funerary rhetoric

Of the ninety-four emperors who sat on the throne between the reigns of Constantine I and Constantine XI Palaiologos, over a period of roughly eleven hundred years, only seven are commemorated in extant funeral orations.\(^1\) Even if we allow for the extenuating fact that nearly half of those emperors were deposed, killed, exiled, or otherwise forcibly removed from power, making it less probable that their families and supporters could have marked their death with elaborate public eulogies, we are still left asking what became of the funeral orations for the remaining half. Did their families and successors not have every incentive to memorialize their reign, extol their character and thus lay claim to their legacy and legitimacy? Even if we concede a degree of irregularity in commemorative ceremonies brought about by extraordinary circumstances like war, or the high turnover of short-lived reigns of the eleventh century, there are still surprisingly few surviving imperial funeral orations.\(^2\)

To appreciate the magnitude of this gap in the manuscript record, we need only compare the number of surviving eulogies for deceased emperors with those for other high-ranking members of Byzantine society. In his comprehensive survey of Byzantine prose funerary orations, A. Sideras lists a combined total of 142 extant texts.\(^3\) Just ten of these, or around seven percent, are tributes to

\(^1\) L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l’Empire byzantin*. Paris, 1949) 17. It is of course possible to arrive at a slightly different total of emperors (as distinct from individual reigns, since some emperors, like Justinian II, returned to power a second time) by adding claimants to the throne in exile. These figures do not include co-emperors, or the so-called “emperors” of Trebizond. If they did, the numbers would not move very much. But the argument depends less on the overall number of emperors and more on the ratio of those who died on the throne vs. those who were killed or forced to abdicate. Interestingly, we have a much fuller inventory of imperial funeral orations from the Palaiologan period, a subject which I address in a forthcoming article. There is an obvious paradox to having a full complement of funeral orations for a handful of emperors whose rule coincided with the manifest weakening of what was becoming an empire in name only in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, while having so few for the emperors who ruled during periods when Byzantium prospered as an empire.


emperors, with three emperors eulogized in two orations apiece, adding up to a total of six of the ten surviving funeral orations. The total number of Byzantine emperors for whom we have a funerary oration, therefore, is in fact seven, out of a total of ninety-four. Even if we factor in a higher than usual rate of accidental loss of manuscripts, the ratio of extant funeral speeches to emperors is remarkably low. These numbers are striking enough to warrant some explanation. Perhaps the first question to ask is whether more such orations were in fact always performed and have since gone missing, or were the occasions on which funeral orations might be recited not fixed in imperial commemorative practice in Byzantium? Either of these, or some combination of the two, would entail significant implications for the nature of imperial funerary ceremony and memorialization of deceased emperors, as well as the secondary life of occasional texts in Byzantium.

Among the first conclusions to be drawn is that the historical stature of the laudandus, no matter how consequential his reign or reputation, did not ensure that a funeral oration – assuming the existence of such an oration – would be preserved. What few surviving imperial funeral orations we do have were probably not copied out of historical or biographical interest in the emperor celebrated but as models of eloquence. This means the record of surviving imperial funerary oratory is skewed to outstanding examples of applied rhetoric, though not necessarily for the purpose of eulogizing other deceased emperors. This explains why we have two funeral orations by Libanius for the emperor Julian, despite the latter’s infamous apostasy. We owe the preservation of these to the esteem in which Libanius was held as a model of occasional rhetoric. Likewise, the Ἐπιτάφιος for Manuel was preserved as part of Eustathios’ collected works.

Manuel II Palaiologos, 344–345; Bessarion for Manuel II Palaiologos, 361–362; Argyropoulos for John VIII Palaiologos, 380–381. Sideras preempted his diachronic study of the literary or rhetorical form of Byzantine funerary texts with a comprehensive inventory detailing Prosopography, Dating, and the Transmission history of the extant funeral orations. In this way he hoped to assemble all the relevant information which could serve as a prelude to a Corpus orationum funebrium Byzantinarum. His promised study of the form of Byzantine funerary literature unfortunately never saw the light.

This does not include funeral orations no longer extant but whose existence is corroborated by diverse evidence, including, significantly, mention of an oration for the emperor Maurikios (582–602) by Theophylaktos Symokattes which offers a stepping stone from earlier Roman commemorative practice to the middle and especially the late Byzantine period, where most of the surviving orations are clustered. For the evidence of such an oration, see Sideras, Grabreden, 437, nn.1, 2. Here the presumed losses of texts incurred during the transition from majuscule to miniscule may well have played a role in the record of funeral oratory, as it appears to have done in a great many genres which suffered a culling in the resource scarce aftermath of the Arab invasions and iconoclastic turmoil.

anticipating that future rhetors might wish to consult it as a model of applied rhetoric and erudition. Its worth was vouchsafed by Eustathios’ reputation as the outstanding rhetor of his time.

The ‘long’ twelfth century (beginning with Alexios I’s rise to power in 1181 and lasting until 1204) did not lack for ambitious authors eager to exhibit their skills. Not a few of these, like Theodore Prodromos or Nikephoros Basilakes, were equally determined to secure their legacy by creating authorized editions of their works. They were likely not the exceptions. Both Manuel’s father, John II Komnenos, nor his grandfather, Alexios I Komnenos, lacked for able panegyrists. Indeed, both were celebrated in their lifetime by talented court poets and eloquent rhetors who rhapsodized effusively about their military triumphs and praised their character as men born to rule the empire. Yet neither John II nor, more remarkably, Alexios I are the subject of a surviving funeral oration. It might be argued that the absence of such an oration in Alexios I’s case was due less to the vagaries of manuscript survival and more to the the bitterly contested succession among his children. A commemorative ceremony, usually attended by the imperial family, may have been politically untenable after Alexios’ wife and daughter Anna had openly opposed John II’s succession, which resulted in the confinement of both Irene Doukaina and Anna Komnene. And yet it seems improbable that Alexios I’s death was not marked by the funerary pomp, appropriate for the warrior-emperor who restored stability to the empire. With so many talented rhetors vying for prominence in the capital, the death of an emperor must have offered too great an opportunity to pass up, as Eustathios implies was the case in the wake of Manuel’s death in his own day.

6 Zonaras’ paradoxical account of the death and funeral of Alexios I was perhaps intended to play against this expectation. The twelfth-century chronicler is not clear whether Alexios failed to receive the honours he deserved out of some calculation on John II’s part, or simply the result of filial indifference. Epit. Hist. III, 764.10–765.1.Ὁ δὲ τούτου πατὴρ παρ’ ὅλην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐμπνέων ἦν καὶ δυσθανατῶν, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐξέλιπε, ζήσας μὲν ἔτη ἑβδομήκοντα ποι τὰ πάντα ἢ ὅτι ἐγγυτάτω, βασιλεύσας δ’ ἐκ τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν ἑπτά καὶ τριάκοντα ἐπι μηρὶ τέσσαρα καὶ ἡμέρας τοῖς. ἔθανε δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐξακισχιλιοστὸν ἑξακισχιλιοστὸν ἑκατόστον ἕκτον ἔτος, τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν διηνυσίως εὐτυχῶς, τὸ δὲ γε τέλος ὅχι ἡμιον ἐσχηκώς. καταλέλειπτο γὰρ πρὸ τῶν θεραπόντων σχεδὸν ἀπάντων, ὡς μηρὶ εἶναι τάχα τινὰς τοῖς τὸν ἐκείνου νεκρὸν τοῖς λοιπὰς τοῖς λυτροὶς ἀπορρύποντας, καὶ οὔτε κόσμος βασιλεία προσῆν τοῖς περὶ αὐτῶν, ἵν’ αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα κομηθεῖ βασιλικός, οὔτε μὴν ἐκφορὰς ἐγέρει βασιλεία καταλήκτων, καὶ τοῖς συν ἀλλοτρίου, ἀλλ’ ἐνεῖς διαδεξαμένου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶ, καὶ νεῖς, ἐν ἐκείνου τῆς βασιλείας ἠμωσίν. Cf. F. Chalandon, Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène (Paris, 1912) 191–193. Ironically enough, we do have a surviving funeral tribute to John’s sister, Anna Komnene, by Georgios Tornikes, in spite of her thwarted political ambitions; see R. Browning, “An unpublished funeral oration on Anna Comnena,” Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society [New series 8] (January, 1962) 1–12. It is unclear whether Tornikes’ oration was in fact recited at a ceremony. Anna Komnene appears to have been granted sufficient freedom to receive guests and maintain contact with elite society (judging from her own reports in the Alexiad) that a commemorative ceremony could be attended by enough of her relatives and acquaintances.
The same may be said of the death of John II. Beside a few short verse tributes by Theodore Prodromos, possibly intended as epitaphs for John's tomb, we have no extant funeral oration. Nor is there any evidence that Manuel commissioned such an oration, though it is hard to believe that there was no ceremony such as that held for Manuel.\footnote{Carm. hist. XXV; Hunger, Profane Literatur, 135. The inscription's conceit of the voice of the dead emperor speaking from the grave suggests it was intended literally as an "epitaph," to be placed on the tomb, rendering its function qualitatively different from a funeral oration.} We should perhaps look once more to the political circumstances immediately following the emperor's death. Manuel's \textit{de facto} succession was ensured by the proxy of John Axouch, since Manuel was campaigning on the eastern frontier and needed someone to secure the capital and represent his interests at court.\footnote{Magdalino, Empire, 195; for Axouch's rôle, see R. Guilland, "Le grand domestique," Recherches sur les institutions byzantines, Tome I (Berlin, 1967) 405–425.} Although Manuel's panegyrist would later represent the transition as quite seamless, it would appear that Manuel's nominal rule took some time to establish beyond worry of a challenge. The precautionary confinement in the Pantokrator monastery of Manuel's older brother Isaac and his uncle by the same name suggests as much. Yet Manuel commissioned a \textit{βασιλικὸς λόγος}, quite possibly Eustathios' first oration at court, for his inauguration. Might he have also commissioned a funeral oration for John II from a rhetor whose works did not have the good fortune to survive? That might explain the absence of a funeral oration for one emperor. It starts to strain credulity when it involves generations of emperors. If, on the other hand, we conclude, \textit{ex silentio}, that no funeral oration was performed for most of Manuel's predecessors, it follows that funerary orations were not a requisite of burial or later ceremonies marking an emperor's death, as they appear to have been for many high ranking members of the élite. The orations for Manuel would then amount to an extension of private aristocratic commemorative practice into the public or imperial realm. Questions inevitably arise then about funerary oratory for emperors as a sustainable part of the genre, absent opportunities to perform such speeches; just as they do about the ceremonial protocols surrounding the death, burial, and commemoration of an emperor.

Funerary speeches, or \textit{ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι}, had earned a distinguished place in the classical literary canon. They were preserved and transmitted during the middle ages because they became staples of the Byzantine rhetorical curriculum; this despite the fact that much of their content had long since ceased to be apposite to medieval reality. Sideras nevertheless ascribes the main contours of the Byzantine \textit{ἐπιτάφιος} to the post-classical models of funerary orations for
illustrious individuals. As a genre defined by its historical precedents, funeral oratory did not invite much innovation or experimentation. More important than any formalist or rhetorical mimesis, however, was the occasional nature of funerary oratory. As texts grounded in ceremony and ritual, funerary orations could not easily depart from the norm without risking the integrity of the commemorative occasion. The seeming rigidity of the genre does not appear to have dissuaded talented rhetors however. Funerary speeches seem at times to have become virtuoso pieces of rhetoric, polished not only to a degree commensurate with the status of the deceased, but also an opportunity for the rhetor to showcase his abilities before leading members of the patron class.

And yet one cannot help but be struck by the unusual degree of generic stability in the long tradition of funerary oratory. Bearing in mind the time elapsed, as well as the great differences in political organization, religion, and historical identity, the funeral orations for Byzantine emperors betray their origin in ancient exemplars, such as Isocrates’ eulogy for the Cypriot king Evagoras, or the two orations by Libanius for the ‘apostate’ emperor Julian. If mimesis accounts for some significant part of this generic stability in Byzantine funerary texts overall, and imperial funeral orations more specifically, it does not explain all aspects of the later texts. What’s more, as I note above with respect to the formalist imperative of mimesis, stability or rhetorical convention in occasional texts should not be seen as a mere end itself. It most likely proceeded from a desire for another kind of continuity, one we may abridge in the convenient and admittedly somewhat inflated notion of “ideology.” Byzantine funerary oratory was a distant descendant of a venerable tradition in both form and content. So while we, for obvious reasons, now associate ἐπιτάφιος with such revered orations as that attributed by Thucydides to Pericles’ in the Peloponnesian War, or Demosthenes’ funeral oration for the dead at the battle of Chaeronea against Philip of Macedon in 338, it was the public eulogies for ancient monarchs which served as exempla and shaped the genre of funerary oratory in the post-classical and

9 Sideras, Grabreden, 19; H. Caffiaux, De l’oraison funèbre dans la Grèce païenne, (Valenciennes, 1861) 1–19; J. Soffel, Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede in ihrer Tradition (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974) 19f.
11 2.34–2.46. For the ideological import of funerary rhetoric in Classical Greece, see the landmark study of Loraux, n. 10 above.
12 Or. 60.
Byzantine periods. The differences between the two types of funeral oration correlated closely with the more obvious ideological differences between democracy and monarchy. Byzantium inherited the latter model as a consequence of its unremitting commitment to a political paradigm inherited from the late Roman principate and from Hellenistic cultural emphasis on monarchy.

Pride of place in this turn of the genre traditionally goes to Isocrates, who is considered the first to have composed a funeral oration in prose dedicated to a recently deceased historical person, the fourth-century king of Cypriot Salamis, Evagoras. Byzantine rhetors were not unaware that Isocrates himself acknowledged the novelty of his rhetorical undertaking in delivering such an oration. The marked authorial self-consciousness of early funeral rhetoric became part of the genre’s thematic heritage. More than a millenium and a half later, Eustathios could still devote a considerable portion of his own Ἐπιτάφιος for Manuel to describing his own motives for composing the oration and rationalizing its contents for his audience, almost as if the genre had to constantly justify its choices and its omissions. Isocrates’ example was soon followed by others in his own time. The Suda includes mention of an Isocrates minor, a former student of his more illustrious namesake, who entered into prose contests against rival rhetors “at the funeral (sc. games)” probably in a bid to compose a funeral oration for the “king of Halicarnassus” Mausolus, ruler of Caria (377–353 B.C.).

13 The end of the classical age thus fittingly produced a symbiosis between kings and their panegyrists unseen since the days of Pindar and Bacchylides at the end of the archaic period. L. Kurke, The traffic in praise: Pindar and the poetics of social economy (Ithaca, 1991).

14 Byzantine chronicles compiled as late as the twelfth century preserved the memory of funeral orations recited at the graveside of Augustus. Cf. John Zonaras, Epit. Hist. 2.444, καὶ αὐτὸς τε ἐπ’ αὐτῇ δημοσίᾳ προτεθείσῃ ἐπιτάφιον εἶπε καὶ δρούσος: 3.4, ἐπὶ τινὶ αὐτῶν τελευτήσαντι αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω τον ἐπιτάφιον. Demetrios Kydones’ funeral oration for the fallen in the battle against the Zealot rebellion in Thessalonike in 1345–46 may be a rare, if not unique, instance of a deliberate hearkening to the classical epitaphios. See Sideras, Grabreden, 303–304. Interestingly, while most of the surviving handbooks are thought to be descendants of Hellenistic treatises, themselves derived from panegyric at courts of Hellenistic rulers, no such encomia from the Seleucid or Ptolemaic dynasties survive to illustrate the lessons of the handbooks. Besides a handful of short praise poems for Philip V of Macedon (238–179 BC) transmitted in the Palatine Anthology, the nearest thing to a surviving tribute to a Hellenistic monarch is ‘Theocritus’ 17th idyll, for king Ptolemy Philadelphus. See Theocritus, edited with a translation and commentary, ed. A.S.F. Gow (Cambridge, 1952 2nd ed.); K.J. Dover, Theocritus: A Commentary on Select Poems (London, 1971).

15 Or. 9. Menander-Rhetor (Men.-Rhet. 419.1–3) likens such a speech to Isocrates’ Evagoras: σύκον τοῦ μετὰ χρόνον πολύν λεγόμενον ἐπιτάφιον καθαρόν ἐστιν ἐγκώμιον, ὡς Ἰσοκράτους ὁ Εὐαγόρας. οὐκοῦν ὁ μετὰ πάντα πολύν λέγοντας ἐπιτάφιον καθαρόν ἐστιν ἐγκώμιον, ὡς Ἰσοκράτους ὁ Εὐαγόρας. εἰ δὲ μὴ πάντα μετὰ πολύν λέγοντας ἐπιτάφιον καθαρόν ἐστιν ἐγκώμιον μὲν λέγειν δεῖ.

16 Evag. 8. For recent scholarship on this pivotal oration, see Ισοκράτης Ἐβαγόρας: ερμηνευτική ἐκδοση, ed. V. Alexiou (Thessaloniki, 2005).

17 Lex. 1, 653. Ἰσοκράτης…μαθήτης καὶ διάδοχος τοῦ μεγάλου Ἰσοκράτους, διακόσια θυσίων, καὶ Μάτωνος τοῦ Φιλόσοφου, ὡς τοῦ Ἰσοκράτης καὶ Θεόδεκτη τῆς θητηρίας καὶ τραγῳδοδοτῆς θείᾳ καὶ ἔμποριζε τῆς Χίου, ἀμα τῷ Ἐρυθραίῳ Ναυκράτητι δηγγέσεστο περὶ λέγων εἰς τὸν ἐπιτάφιον Μαυσόλου τοῦ βασιλέως Αλ—
Funeral orations for rulers soon matured into a recognizable pattern, a genre, with its own commonplaces consecrated by repeated use. It is worth noting that while many of the topoi and encomiastic language of funeral orations for rulers seem to derive from panegyric or βασιλικὸς λόγος more generally, epitaphioi for monarchs preceded prose panegyric. Over time, however, funeral oratory became folded into the broader category of speech exalting the sovereign. In the Christian era, what biblical precedent existed for this largely secular genre was provided by David's lament for Saul and Jonathan in the Old Testament (2 Samuel 1:17–27). For a number of reasons, at once political and cultural – not least the proliferating use of Greek literary models in the eastern Mediterranean world – each successive period of the later Roman or early Christian era produced more funerary oratory than the previous one. Late Antiquity seems to have been especially fond of the genre.

It is worth noting here that the only imperial funeral oration in Greek from Late Antiquity was by a pagan author, Libanius, composed for a convert to paganism, Julian, thereby demonstrating that eloquence could be appreciated by Byzantine rhetors as something distinct from subject matter. There must have undoubtedly been other imperial epitaphioi composed, since Libanius nowhere suggests that his orations for Julian are a novelty. It is difficult to imagine that funeral orations were not composed to mark the death and burial of late Roman emperors, not least Constantine I, founder of “New Rome” and political redeemer of Christianity, or for his successors. But for one, probably spurious, text purporting to be a funeral oration for Constantine II preserved in a single καρνασσοῦ. Tradition preserves mention of a funerary eulogy for Xenophon's son Gryllus, as well as the eulogy in the Agesilaus by the same author.


Book I.22 of Eusebius’ Life of Constantine describes the funeral rites for Constantine’s father, including a procession led by Constantine to the accompaniment of “acclamations and praises for the thrice-blessed [emperor],” whom I take to be Κωνστάντιος, the deceased emperor, since another set of acclamations follow for his son: δήμων τε πλήθη μυρία στρατιωτῶν τε δορυφορίαι, τῶν μὲν ἠγονιμένων.
fifteenth-century manuscript (*Pal. gr. 117*), attributed by one scholar to Theodoros Palaiologos, we lack for copies of similar orations for most of the emperors of Late Antiquity. Might the rhetors commissioned to deliver funeral orations at the burials of Constantine I, Theodosius II, or Justinian I, have been insufficiently accomplished for their texts to leave any trace? Both pagan and Christian western imperial practice – for as long as there were emperors in the West – would appear to offer little guidance. Does the answer to this puzzle then lie with the identity of the emperor, or the ‘publication’ history of the individual authors? Different authors in almost all respects, Libanius and Eustathios were similar in this one regard: they (or their literary executors) appear to have taken care to produce a fairly complete corpus of their works in a bid to ensure the survival of their works.

It nevertheless strains our sense of probability that funeral orations continued to form a regular feature of commemorative ceremonies for deceased emperors but that none survive for emperors after Julian until the ninth century, when the emperor Leo VI (866–912) composed a funerary tribute for his father, the emperor Basil I, founder of the Macedonian dynasty. Leo’s lengthy oration preserves many of the original aspects of the genre. Just as importantly, it contains no rationalization of the nature or purpose of such an oration. This suggests that Leo expected the audience to recognize what he was doing. It is unlikely that the rhetorical conventions Leo appeals to were re-activated for a single occasion after many centuries, only to be allowed to lapse one more until their next revival. Leo’s oration gives us good reason to deduce that such eulogies con-

23 *Anonymi Graeci Oratio funebris in Constantinum* (II), ed. Carlo Enrico Frotscher (Friberg, 1856).

24 For a complete list of (Western) Roman funeral orations in Latin, including those for emperors, see W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio funebris: Interpretationen und Untersuchung zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1979) 137–149. Marc Antony’s funeral oration for Caesar (cf. *Senec. Dial.* III.1.3); Augustus was eulogized by both Tiberius and his son Drusus; cf. Kierdorf, *Laudatio*, 150–158.

25 For Libanius, see now R. Cribiore, *Libanius the sophist: rhetoric, reality, and religion in the fourth century* (Ithaca, 2013); for the ideological dimension of his thought, see H.-U. Wiemer “Emperors and empire in Libanius,” in *Libanius: a critical introduction*, ed. L. van Hoof (Cambridge, 2014) 187–219. There is, as yet, no comprehensive portrait of Eustathios as an author such as we might expect in light of his extensive and diverse corpus. A. Kazhdan’s intellectual and ideological profile, now over thirty years old, is long overdue for reassessment, especially in light of several new editions of works in genres as distinct as epistolography, lenten homilies, a long diatribe on monastic reform, and commentary on the canons.

26 Hom. 41.
continued to be performed for emperors, much as they were for other high-ranking élites, only for reasons we do not yet fathom they were rarely preserved.27

A long and rhetorically ambitious work closer in style to a monody, Leo’s oration has been pronounced derivative, assembled from the available topoi in the rhetorical handbooks.28 But as P. A. Agapitos has argued, when read against its historical circumstances Leo’s deployment of the stereotypes common to funerary rhetoric “yields a political meaning of crucial importance for understanding the problems of [Leo’s] first two years of rule.”29 This more immediate political relevance of funerary oratory is often rhetorically camouflaged by the conventional imagery and motifs of imperial panegyric. Such a political dimension should not come as a surprise. Even if most funeral orations for emperors were not composed by men with an immediate stake in the political legacy of the laudandus, an imperial funeral oration could provide a plausible and rhetorically safe pretext to articulate the rationale for rule by those claiming the legacy of the deceased. As I note below, the inevitable factionalism of the court following the death of an emperor ensured that an oration praising the recent record of the deceased was perhaps bound to be interpreted as supporting the side most closely affiliated with that emperor. Indeed, no matter how self-effacing and disinterested the author of a funeral oration might have been – and Eustathios was rarely either – he nevertheless spoke directly to the genuine political anxieties of his audience.

Surveying the broader development of post-classical funerary oratory, Agapitos has observed that the genre “moves away from the open domain of public experience within the polis and shifts towards the closed domain of pri-

27 Antonopoulou supposes that funeral orations generally were interrupted during the so-called Dark Ages, to be revived in the early ninth century by Theodore the Studite and other authors of this period. I am less certain that the extant orations represent the actual fate of funerary oratory. T. Antonopoulou, The homilies of the Emperor Leo VI (Leiden, 1997) 146. Again, unexplained significant lacunae emerge well after the supposed revival of the genre in the ninth and tenth centuries by Theodore the Studite, the emperor Leo, Peter of Argos, and Arethas. For funeral orations by each of these, respectively, see Sideras, Grabreden, 97–100, 101–103, 104–107, 108–109. By dating the start of the “interruption” in funerary oratory to Chorikios of Gaza in the sixth century, Antonopoulou omits the “lost” monody by Theophylaktos Symokattes for the emperor Maurikios, which both Sideras, Grabreden 437, and Hunger, Profanliteratur I 317, assumed was an independent text before being incorporated into Symokattes’ Hist. VIII 12.5–7.

28 This, at least, was the judgement of the text’s modern editors, Or. fun. 39–78, 26–29; cf. Sideras, Grabreden, 72, 83, n.246, 85 n.255, 91.

vate life within the principality. This trajectory from the public and political to the private and pathetic is largely accurate if applied to post-classical funerary texts, broadly speaking. Funeral orations for emperors, however, retained an inescapably public and political dimension, even as burial and commemoration came to be seen increasingly as a prerogative of the family. The lament of a funeral oration channeled not just the grief of the deceased emperor’s immediate family or dependents. It engaged a wider cross section of the élite in a kind or political mourning for the loss of an able ruler. It gave voice to the immanent anxieties about the future of the empire’s governance.

After Leo’s political monody for his father (and mother), there follows another hiatus of just over three centuries without a funeral oration for an emperor, until the two orations for Manuel I Komnenos, an epitaphios by Eustathios and a monody by Gregorios Antiochos. Once more, we are left asking whether the absence of imperial funeral orations in the manuscript record reflects a break in the practice of funerary orations or an idiosyncracy of Byzantine textual history and authorial culture. While I tend to favour the latter conclusion, with so few examples of imperial funerary oratory, it is difficult to plot a clear line of development up to and including the Ἐπιτάφιος. As the heading of the text tells us, Eustathios was not alone in composing a funeral oration for the deceased emperor. In fact, as Gregorios Antiochos’ surviving μονῳδία confirms, a number of fellow rhetors may have already beaten him to it. This serves as additional proof that contemporary rhetors were well versed in the rhetorical requirements of imperial funerary orations. It seems unlikely, therefore, that a number of authors collectively took up a lapsed genre at this crucial juncture. It is more probable that Eustathios and the other orators had both ancient and

31 I do not count here the curious incident referred to in a letter by Ioannes Tzetzes to an “audacious and shameless” correspondent he accused of having “purloined an imperial epitaphios from a friend of Tzetzes and claimed it as his own. See Ep. 42: Τῷ Βασιλικὸν λόγον βασιλικὸν ἐπιτάφιον τινὸς τῶν Τζέτζου φίλων ἀποσυλήσαντι καὶ ὡς οἰκεῖον μεταποιήσαντι. Tzetzes does not specify whether this was a progymnasma or an actual funeral oration, and if so, for which emperor. He lived through the death of John II, as well, perhaps, that of Manuel I.
33 Antiochos’ monody was first published anonymously in Fontes t. I. However, P. Wirth convincingly demonstrated that both this and another oration in Regel’s Fontes were by Antiochos. See P. Wirth, Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen Rhetorik des zwölften Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften des Erzbischofs Eustathios von Thessalonike (München, 1962) 10–12, 22f.
more recent exempla before them, most no longer extant. Absent such concrete examples, Eustathios and his peers would have had to rely almost exclusively on some combination of compositional template(s) furnished by the handbooks, translating the overly-broad and no longer directly applicable recommendations of the ancient rhetorical manuals into the pertinent language of a contemporary funeral oration.

Ironically, Eustathios himself indirectly encourages such an assumption when near the start of the oration he observes that he will depart from the conventional scheme of a funeral oration, in effect violating the “laws governing the composition of orations.” Eustathios finds warrant for such formal transgression in the example of “the fathers of the rhetorical rules,” who “often violate their own precepts:

Ωὕτως οὖν καθεσταμένου τοῦ μηδὲν οὖν σιγᾷν χρῆναι, ἀλλὰ τι λαλῆσαι, ὧν ἐθάδες ἦμεν, νόμους μὲν λογογραφίας ἔπεσθαί εἰς λεπτὸν, ὥστε ἂν ἦμιν ἀνάγκη ἐπικείεσθαι, εἰ γε καὶ οἱ τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ πατέρες νόμου πολλὰ παραποιοῦσι τῶν παρ’ αὐτῶν θεσμῶν, ὅτε καίριον· ἔκτοτε δὲ αὖθις πλάξεσθαι γράφοντας, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο παρανομεῖν ἐν τέχνῃ λόγων ἐστίν. Ἐπιλεκτέον οὖν τὸ τε ἔννομον ἐν ἐγκωμίοις καὶ τὸ ἐν περιστάσεσι εὐμέθοδον, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιτεκτονοῦσαν κἂν τοῖς τοιούτοις δεινότητα
(’Επ. 4)

And so having established that now is not the time to remain silent, but to speak out, as we were accustomed to doing, it would not be incumbent on us to follow the rules governing the composition of speeches down to the last detail, seeing that the fathers of the laws of rhetoric often alter their own rules when the occasion calls for it; then again, to fashion things in the course of writing which have no place in a speech, this is indeed to commit a violation in the art of composition. And so one must choose both what is lawful in encomia and what is most effective under the circumstances, in accordance with most forceful arrangement in these cases.

Possessed of an irrepressible academic temperament, Eustathios could not help but offer an apologia pro verbis suis in an oration as prominent as this. But broad and self-reflexive statements concerning rhetorical method are also not uncommon in various genres of Byzantine literature, including imperial panegyric. They are in keeping with the foregrounding of authorship, the epideictic ethos, discussed in the section on style. In the case of the Ἐπιτάφιος, the statement regarding “what is lawful in encomia and what is most effective” is made in a bid to solve two problems, one practical, the other literary or rhetorical. The practical problem is one of economy of time. Even a funeral oration on this scale for an emperor could not go on interminably and required the rhetor to select and elide, adapting the mould of a prescribed ideal epitaphios to the subject and
not composed in a chance manner

circumstances in question. The second aspect, which I call literary or rhetorical, involved the pursuit of a distinct style and the inclusion of memorable contents. A rhetor of Eustathios’ standing wished to avoid the impression of having composed in a manner that amounted to little more than simply shading within the existing lines. We see a similar readiness to flout the generic norms of funeral oratory in a Eustathios’ very personalized eulogy for Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites.34 A somewhat experimental text, by Eustathios’ own admission, this funeral oration was also accompanied by a programmatic title in the manuscript announcing the author’s stylistic and generic intentions with regard to the “laws of funerary oratory” (ἐπιτάφιον δὲ νόμῳ).35

It would nevertheless be mistaken, in my view, to read such a reference to rules governing funeral orations as betraying a practical and close dependence on the handbooks. It should instead be read as a foil for the declaration of Eustathios’ autonomy as an author. Eustathios underlines his readiness to draw on his own rhetorical resources, instead of submitting to received forms. It is the freedom or indulgence sought by the hands-on rhetor in the face of conventional prescriptions.36 The overall design or architecture of the Ἐπιτάφιος is nevertheless sufficiently consistent with the broad scheme laid out in the second treatise of Menander-Rhetor’s On Epideictic Speeches (Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν) to warrant consideration of the consonance of design between Menander-Rhetor’s guidelines and the particular form of Eustathios’ Ἐπιτάφιος for Manuel.37 The claim that Menander-Rhetor lies behind most Byzantine funeral orations and of panegyric more generally is not wrong per se. It is rather misleadingly insufficient in accounting for the form and contents of these genres. As both Pernot and Kennedy point out in their respective surveys of epideictic and rhetorical teaching in post-classical antiquity, we should not suppose that rhetors either in late an-

---

34 Or. 1 (Λόγος Α) 3–13.
35 Ibid., 3; this oration is insightfully analyzed in two highly pertinent articles by Panagiotis Agapitos, who spells out Eustathios’ authorial restlessness specifically in the genre of funerary oratory. See his “Ancient models,” 5–23; as well as P. A. Agapitos, “Mischung der Gattungen und Überschreitung der Gesetze: Die Grabrede des Eustathios von Thessalonike auf Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites,” JÖB 48 (1998) 119–146. Agapitos’ conclusions are in keeping with the now well established view of Komnenian literary culture as having encouraged an unprecedented measure of novelty, or certainly more claims to that effect.
36 Michael Psellos, whom most twelfth-century authors looked to as that rarest thing, a contemporary Byzantine paragon of rhetorical virtuosity, was able to furnish a precedent for the frustration with the constraints imposed by the received rules of encomium. See KD 2.13.18ff. ἄτεχνόν τι…τοὺς κάτω νόμου τῶν ἐγκωμίων.
37 Stone, “A funeral oration,” 239–273; Magdalino, too, cites Menander-Rhetor as the template for imperial, thus crediting the handbook with supplying a touchstone for most of the oratory at Manuel’s court; see Magdalino, Empire, 415–417.
tiquity or the middle ages had programmatic recourse to the kind of instruction we find in *Menander-Rhetor*. Handbooks were more likely seen as descriptive, a fairly reliable indication of common practice distilled into an ideal type, not a set of compulsory prescriptions. There is little evidence of adherence to generic models among Byzantine authors more generally, and even less by ambitious authors of the Komnenian age who regularly protest the straight-jacket of literary conventions, admittedly sometimes a little too insistently. But both Pernot and Kennedy point out that when compared with actual speeches, the number of manuscripts of the handbooks suggests that imitation of earlier orations was by far the more common source of instruction. Hands-on composition remained the only real school of rhetoric.  

In as much as the handbooks represented a conservative bent in Byzantine rhetorical culture, they nevertheless continued to exercise indirect influence on occasional genres. Of the two treatises on epideictic speeches preserved in the collection attributed to *Menander-Rhetor*, it is the second which treats funerary oratory. As befits the pedantic quality of the handbooks, *Menander-Rhetor* offers a potted history of the funeral oration, beginning with its venerable Athenian archetypes. This is not so surprising if we bear in mind that of the ancient exemplars of ἐπιτάφιος still in circulation when most of the handbooks were composed were almost exclusively by Athenian orators, including the best known of these, Demosthenes and Isocrates, but also the celebrated funeral oration ascribed to Pericles in Thucydides’ *Peloponnesian War*. This Atheno-centric understanding of the genre nevertheless dovetailed with the marketing, so to speak, of handbooks catering to the taste for Atticizing prose.

Written at a time when the canonical models of ancient funerary oratory had become ideologically obsolete, *Menander-Rhetor* attempts first to parse the occasions for which the different funerary speeches might be composed. He thus reminds us that funeral orations were still conceived as extensions of actual


39 Hunger exaggerates the binding nature of these treatises in my view when he characterizes Pseudo-Menandros (a.k.a Mendander-Rhetor) as a ”verbindliche Richtschnur” or “reliable guide.” Hunger, *Profane Literatur* I, 132.

40 *Men.-Rhet.* treatise II, 76–225. The most recent editors, Wilson and Russell (xxxiv–xl), conclude that the two treatises are by different authors, though probably near enough in origin to have been paired early in the text’s publication or circulation history. Of the rhetorical handbooks frequently consulted in Byzantium, only that of so-called Menander-Rhetor offers much advice on the composition of funeral orations, and most of that concerns the broad architecture of the speech, not the style.

41 The sections of the Περὶ Ἐπιταφικῶν dealing with funerary speeches are as follows: Περὶ Παραμυθητικοῦ 413.6–414.30; Περὶ Ἐπιταφίου, 418.5–422.4; Περὶ Μνημονίας 434.11–437.4.
ceremonies and not simply as abstract literary forms. The handbook then lays out the recommended sequence of topics and catalogues their prescribed contents, periodically adding a sample sentence by way of illustration. Significantly, the handbook testifies to an early division of funerary oratory’s sub-categories. Since it is delivered furthest in time from the death and/or burial, ἐπιτάφιος we are told, is furthest from the lament addressed to an audience still mourning. Consequently, it is nearest to a speech in praise of the life and conduct of the deceased, or akin to “pure encomium” (καθαρόν ἐστιν ἔγκωμιον), with token emphasis on bereavement and without the emotional outpouring of a monody (μονῳδία).42 There follows a thematic inventory of the funeral oration’s successive parts. One immediately notices that with the single, passing reference to Isocrates’ oration for king Evagoras, the funeral oration in Menander-Rhetor is analyzed here without further reference to imperial rank.43 This, of course, is true of a number or speech types in Menander-Rhetor, including the so-called ‘bedroom speech’ (κατευναστικός), the ‘birthday speech’ (γενεθλιακός), or closer to the funerary theme, the ‘consolatory speech’ (παραμυθητικός).

Arguably any kind of speech for an emperor, living or dead, would constitute a class of its own, including birthday or wedding speeches. Still, Menander-Rhetor makes no special allowance for funerary speeches on the occasion of an emperor’s death. The handbook does not recognize such speeches as a (sub-) category unto themselves, as we might have expected given the potential difference in content, to say nothing of the difference in occasion. And yet the logic by which the various kinds of speeches are thematically mapped in Menander-Rhetor implicitly extends to imperial funeral orations. If an epitaphios is much like an encomium, then it follows that a funeral oration for an emperor is not unlike an imperial panegyric, a continuation of βασιλικὸς λόγος.44 Unlike most ἐπιτάφιαι or μονῳδίαι for men and women below the rank of emperor, imperial funerary orations could draw on a substantial corpus of encomiastic speeches.

42 Men.-Rhet. 419.1–2.
43 Perhaps anticipating the demand for funeral orations for rulers, or at least for the ruling class, Menander-Rhetor likens “a funeral speech delivered long after the event” (ὁ μετὰ χρόνον πολύ λεγόμενος ἐπιτάφιος), to the funeral oration for the Cypriot king Evagoras, by Isocrates. See Men.-Rhet. 419.1–2.
The contents of a funeral oration, its tone and substance, the handbook makes clear, are largely a function of the oration’s timing. Assuming the distinctions laid out in *Menander-Rhetor* were still broadly in effect in the late twelfth century, as the preamble to Gregorios Antiochos’ monody indicates, it could serve as additional corroborative evidence for the approximate period in which Eustathios delivered the Ἐπιτάφιος. If an oration comes not too long after the death or burial – approximately seven or eight months later calculates the author of *Menander-Rhetor* – the epitaphios then should take the form of an encomium. This similarity has been described by H. Hunger as a gradual process early on in which encomiastic elements gradually “won the upper hand.”\(^{45}\) Should he wish, the author of the treatise adds, nothing prevents the speaker from including some consolatory words towards the end, as in fact happens in Eustathios’ oration.\(^{46}\) As grief dissipates, lament gives way to pure praise (καθαρόν… ἐγκώμιον). This would appear to match a broadly schematic outline of Eustathios’ oration for Manuel: sustained encomium of the emperor, his character, abilities, and record of governing, followed by a consolatory coda, a concession perhaps to the grief of Manuel’s kin, especially his wife and son.

A closely itemized comparison of the precise contents of the Ἐπιτάφιος with *Menander-Rhetor*’s schematic epitaphios shows Eustathios moving in and out of the prescribed plan, neither wholly independent of it, nor yielding entirely to it. This is perhaps not so surprising given the inevitable discrepancy between a Late Antique handbook on composition and the constraints and aims of a middle Byzantine author extolling a contemporary emperor.\(^{47}\) Alongside the enduring virtues projected onto the late Roman emperors at the time of *Menander-Rhetor*, twelfth-century panegyrists had to make room for features more consonant with medieval Byzantine ideology and sensibility, as well as traits or achievements associated with the particular laudandus.\(^{48}\) There is thus some truth to

\(^{45}\) Hunger, *Profane Literatur*, 133: “im Laufe der historischer Entwicklung der enkomiastische Charakter die Oberhand gewonnen habe”; for Hunger’s survey of extant Byzantine funerary texts and the Epitaphios in general, see 132–145.

\(^{46}\) *Men.-Rhet.* 419.1–6: οὐκόν ὁ μετὰ χρόνον πολὺ λεγόμενος ἐπιτάφιος καθαρὸν ἐστίν ἐγκώμιον… ἐπτὰ ποὺ μηνῶν ἢ ὀκτὼ παρελθόντων, ἐγκώμιον μὲν λέγειν δεῖ, πρὸς δὲ τῷ τέλει χρῆσθαι τῷ παραμυθητικῷ κεφαλαίῳ οὐδὲν κωλύσει.

\(^{47}\) L. Previale illustrates the enduring sense of the handbooks’ relevance by noting that as late as the fourteenth century the lessons of Menander-Rhetor were reproduced with almost no change by the court polymath Joseph Rakendyttes, despite the disconsonance of aims and circumstances a thousand years after the composition of the handbook. L. Previale, “Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino,” *Emerita* 17 (1949) 72–105, 74, n.1

\(^{48}\) Of course we should not assume that Late Antique authors consulting Menander-Rhetor would not have taken similar initiatives and adapted the prescriptions of the handbook to the particular cir-
Stone’s reading of the Ἐπιτάφιος the as “a highly individualized description of [Manuel],” though I do not agree that the oration amounts to “a comprehensive physical and psychological portrait,” since that was not the aim of a funeral oration.⁴⁹ Eustathios tailored his oration to a specific image, as P. Magdalino has referred to it, propagated about Manuel. Eustathios himself had helped create this image in earlier panegyrics, from which he drew extensively while composing this oration.

The synonymy of epitaphios with encomium in Menander-Rhetor, expressly underscored by the example of Isocrates’ oration for Evagoras, effectively set out the contents of a funeral speech for a deceased emperor as matching a βασιλικὸς λόγος, the principal encomiastic speech addressed to Byzantine rulers. Once again, Menander-Rhetor reflected rather than directed actual practice.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, the choice of epitaphios, with its adulatory rather than grief-stricken tone, may well have proceeded from Eustathios’ desire to exploit his fluency in imperial panegyric. Both in this and previous orations he acknowledged his long service as to Manuel’s court, for which he was rewarded with the appointment to the office of μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, the imperially sponsored ‘chair of rhetoric’ granting its holder recognition as primus inter pares among his fellow rhetors in the capital. The obligation to perform certain ceremonial orations effectively provided Eustathios with an imperial stage to showcase regularly his talent before the emperor and the capital’s élite.⁵¹

Any claim for historic continuity in the practice of funerary orations nevertheless risks flattening the individual texts into a uniform genre. In reality, how-

⁴⁹ A. Stone, “Funeral Oration,” 239–273, 239, 240. Stone is not always clear whether he ascribes the qualities attributed by Eustathios to Manuel to the image of the emperor or to Manuel himself. Magdalino admits that as a matter of methodological rigour we have no way to separate the man from the image, since the historical accounts were, in large part, also a reaction to the court’s image-makers, whether positive, like Ioannes Kinnamos, or frequently disapproving, like Niketas Choniates.

⁵⁰ Citing examples from Psellus’ funerary orations for the contemporary patriarchs Konstantinos Leichoudes and Ioannes Xiphilinos, Hunger notes the frequent synonymy between ἐπιτάφιος and ἐγκώμιον; see Hunger, *Profane Literatur*, 133, n.1. For the Psellan passages in question, see MB IV 388, 421. It is worth noting that the references to ἐγκώμιον all occur within the funeral orations, as though to preempt charges of excessive praise and distortion of the truth, since the funeral oration necessarily looked backward, thus bordering on historical narrative. Cf. Gregorius Pardus, *Comm. in Hermog. libr. Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος. Rhet. gr. 7.2: τὸ δὲ προοίμιον τοῦ εἰς τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον ἐπιταφίον ὑμολογέων έοικε μελέτην πολλὴν τὴν εἰς τὸ ἐγκωμίασαι τελείως.

⁵¹ We main gain a first impression of Eustathios’ activity as a speaker at court from the summaries provided by Wirth in his edition of the “minor works”, i.e., the orations, of Eustathios in Op. min. 15*-44*. For English translations of some of the more notable examples of such orations, see now Andrew Stone, *Eustathios of Thessaloniki: secular orations 1167/8 to 1179* (Brisbane, 2013).
ever, Eustathios’ Ἐπιτάφιος for Manuel illustrates well a point made by Agapitos with regard to Eustathios funeral oration for his ecclesiastical peer and friend, Nicholas Hagiotheodorites, cited above. If we pull back far enough, Agapitos points out, we discern only the broad contours of the genre’s continuity over time. While this may yield important conclusions about the longue durée of a genre, it does so by necessarily violating the integrity of the individual text’s particular formal choices as a response to a specific occasion and circumstances. If we take the time to read each text in a manner more alert to its author’s desire to render it apt to the circumstances, we may discern more variation than the bird’s-eye view of genre allow us to see.

It was only normal then that actual developments in the application of rhetoric should outpace the theoretical lessons of the handbooks. Such innovation as there was served as a catalyst for changes in the demand and supply of rhetorical talent. Rhetors sought the slightest stylistic pretext in a bid to outdo their rivals. This is underlined in the expression πρὸς διαφορὰν in the title of the Ἐπιτάφιος, a stylistic advertisement of sorts. Still, it is important not to misapprehend handbooks like that of Menander-Rhetor as constituting something akin to ‘theory’, in the sense of a unified conception of applied speech. The handbooks traced the broad contours of conventional practice. As products of the late Hellenistic and later Roman period the rhetorical practice they profiled dated back well over a millenium. Nowhere is this quite so immediately apparent as in the patent discrepancies between the sociopolitical world assumed by the handbooks and Byzantine reality. This makes the enduring use of these otherwise obsolete handbooks in Byzantium all the more remarkable and demonstrates the extent to which reality could be made to yield to tradition as encoded in rhetoric, rather than simply be obscured by it, as is often assumed. Mimesis in Byzantium was thus never simply a matter of literary form. It helped exert pressure on the shared conception of key facets of Byzantine life by stipulating the kind of language one could employ to describe that life.

We should nevertheless be cautious in describing funeral oratory as a genre, at least if by invoking genre we understand the Ἐπιτάφιος to have been defined

52 See n. 35 above: Agapitos, “Mischung.”
53 Ibid., 122: “entlang der horizontalen Fläche...die Makroperspektive der Gattung.”
54 For still relevant surveys of the aesthetic springs of change in the literary culture of this period, see H. Hunger, Die byzantinische Literatur der Komnenenzeit: Versuch einer Neubewertung (Graz, 1968) and A. Garzya, “Literarische und rhetorische Polemiken der Komnenenzeit,” Byzantinoslavica XXXIV (1973) 1–14; “Polemiche letterarie e retoriche nell’età dei Comneni,” Atene e Roma XVIII (1973) 34–49.
55 For the cultural context in which this handbook arose, see M. Heath, Menander: a rhetor in context (Oxford, 2004).
primarily by similarities in form, style, and subject matter, instead of being understood principally as rooted in the ceremonial occasion it marked. So while the various types of court oratory generally deferred to formal convention in their bid to enact a requisite ideological continuity, the texts themselves never became entirely untethered from the rituals and ceremony which invested them with meaning. They remained *occasional* in more than just a notional sense. But since the funerary or commemorative ceremonies have left little trace, the occasional dimension of orations like the Επιτάφιος has to be reconstructed from otherwise sparse evidence. In contrast, the survival of dozens of βασιλικοί λόγοι in books intended as repertoires of model speeches, like the celebrated *Barocelianus graecus* 131, now in the Bodleian library; or the corpora of authors like Eustathios, such as Basileensis A III 20, tend to encourage a conception of oratory as a principally literary practice whose primary referent is textual tradition itself. As Pernot has observed of encomium in the later Roman empire, when its practice became formally codified, it never became “an abstract rhetorical form, but... [remained] a social practice, embodied in concrete speech circumstances.”

In a similar vein, Sideras has noted the lack of any evidence for simulated or fictive texts among the corpus of extant funeral orations. The Επιτάφιος was primarily part of a historical event, and only secondarily an attempt to make literary history.

---


57 Sideras makes allowance for the single exception of Michael Psellos’ funeral oration for the metropolitan of Mytilene, John. Sideras, *Grabreden*, 112–114; for the text, see now Michael Psellus, *Or. fun.* 15
Although intended to underscore the preoccupation with formal virtuosity, the inclusion of ἐπιτάφιοι and μονῳδίαι by Herbert Hunger under the general rubric of “Rhetorik” in his magisterial survey of Byzantine secular literature provided strong backing to the view that such works were primarily intended as vehicles of rhetorical display largely untethered from actuality.1 Composed in language which seems to harken to the literary past instead of conjuring the present, orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος have been read as ostentatiously aloof from their surroundings, employing an archaizing vocabulary in a bid to insulate themselves not just from colloquial Greek, but from the reality around them. Hunger’s singling out of these genres as inordinately rhetorical was intended to underline what he regarded as the defining characteristic of the orations, namely, the extent to which formal considerations trumped all other factors in their composition. This emphasis on form has earned the canon of imperial oratory the dubious credit of being deemed a form of “literature.” The implication for funeral oratory is to regard the subject or occasion which prompted its composition as little more than a pretext for authorial exhibitionism.

In his census of the genre, Sideras rightly tries to dispel the misapprehensions encouraged by the classification of funerary oratory as a species of literature. He cautions against reading these texts as little more than rhetorical showpieces. They are not, he argues, the equivalent of exercises, like the laments or funerary encomia we find in progmynasmata.2 As evidence, Sideras cites references in the

---

1 Hunger, Profane Literatur, I 132–145. “Epitaphioi und Monodien” appears as the third subsection of the category “Rhetorische Praxis” following “Theorie der Rhetorik.” This suggests that the genres included here, among them Progymnasmata, Enkomia, Miscellaneous Occasional Speeches, Mirrors of Princes, Ekphrasis, bore an over-riding relation to one another as texts driven by rhetorical theory or teaching. Quite apart from the debatable assumptions which enable the grouping together of such heterogeneous texts, the common classification of rhetorical exercises (Progymnasmata) with funeral orations (Epitaphioi) suggests a false equivalence in their origins and aims. See below for Sideras’ advising against reading any Byzantine funerary text as a literary exercise in disguise.

2 Although he is willing to concede a significantly “literary” aspect, Sideras is quick to note that all the surviving funeral orations were indeed genuine, that is, they were composed on the occasion of
manuscript titles of a number of μονῳδίαι and ἐπιτάφιοι to the occasion of their delivery. While certain formal aspects of the Ἐπιτάφιος may be elucidated when considered as a product of literary history, it remains important not to lose sight of the historically contingent ceremonial setting of most surviving occasional oratory. This is especially true for an oration on the scale and of the formal attainment we find in the Ἐπιτάφιος, composed during a time of great political uncertainty brought about the unexpected death of a long-ruling emperor.

For this and other reasons it is perhaps surprising that we do not have any descriptions of actual imperial funerals; especially so in light of their potential to supply Byzantine authors with memorable scenes and ekphrastic material. The silence is as conspicuous as that of imperial ceremony more generally, since what little we know about the circumstances in which βασιλικοὶ λόγοι were delivered has to be inferred from the orations themselves – always a risky deduction – with some rare graphic depictions in illustrated manuscripts like the Madrid Skylitzes, which offers numerous deathbed scenes but only one obvious burial, for a princess. But then we know remarkably little about the pragmatic side for most literature in Byzantium, including the recently much touted theatron as a venue for the performance of literary virtuosity. As a result of this dearth of practical detail regarding the circumstances in which texts were delivered before live audiences, we lack details for such vital aspects of the performance as the location of most speeches; the disposition of the audience (did everyone stand or sit for long orations, regardless of rank?); the speaker’s location inside the church or palace hall (was there a daïs or podium of some sort, so that the audience further back might be able to see and hear the speaker better?); or the sequence of the ceremony. Consequently the term “occasional” risks becoming an abstract a real death and must have actually been performed at a funerary ceremony. See Sideras, Grabreden, 64–65.

3 Sideras, Grabreden, 65; by a curious set of coincidences, two of these are associated with Eustathios, and one with Manuel: the “mixed” funeral oration by Eustathios for Nicholas Hagioteodorites, his friend and fellow bishop; the monody for Eustathios by his former student and probably secretary, Euthymios Malakes; the monody for Manuel by Gregory of Antioch.

4 Michael Psellos describes the reactions of his fellow subjects as the funeral cortége of Romanos III († 1034) passed by; he does not, unfortunately, provide any detail about the ceremony. Chron. 1.55.1

5 There are imperial deathbed scenes on ff. 42, 128v, 139, 142 of the Madrid Skylitzes. On f. 52v the emperor Theophilos is depicted at what appears to be a funerary ceremony for his daughter with an accompanying caption that reads ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεόφιλος κυδεύων τὴν θυγατέρα του. V. Tsamakda, The illustrated chronicle of Ioannes Skylitzes in Madrid, (Leiden, 2002).

label, a mere classification rather than a designation signalling a concrete historical setting which enabled the performance of a text. In short, we need reminding that by “occasional literature” we mean an actual physical and ceremonial context, an *event*.

With few exceptions, we remain in the dark about the mechanics of oratory at the Byzantine imperial court. The stylized images of speakers reciting texts against a spare and visually coded backdrop in the Madrid Skylitzes only whet our appetite for more context. Michael Psellos’ vivid account of a monk whose renown as a charismatic ἀναγνώστης, able to vocally enact the drama of his text before a crowd of congregants who have come especially for his performance, gives us some idea of how responsive Byzantine audiences could be to a lively recital. Although Psellos implies that this particular monk was exceptional, his own vivid description reminds us that recital of texts in Byzantium was seen by audiences as both edification and entertainment. Psellos’ account also underscores the perils of our mute reading of Byzantine texts. Paradoxically, the greater ignorance about their performative setting only further encourages a tendency to read orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος as “literature,” in the sense of texts whose significance derives from the words alone, instead of the ritual or ceremonial settings which occasioned them in the first place.

As already noted, a proper understanding of the Ἐπιτάφιος depends on a recognition of its occasional character. Eustathios composed the oration for a ceremony to be held at a particular time and place, before a select audience. However this occasional dimension, so essential for completing the meaning of the text, remains largely invisible and inaudible. In rare cases, the headings in manuscripts supply clues. One such case happens (perhaps not coincidentally) to be another funeral oration by Eustathios, for Nicholaos Hagiotheodorites. The funerary tribute, we are informed, was delivered in a church of his namesake, Nicholaos Myroblites, on the outskirts of Thessalonike, for a commemorative service to be held for him before the body was brought to Constantinople where Nicholaos was to be buried alongside his illustrious relatives. The manuscript heading thus reads:

---

7 See the images of recital in the illustrated account of the Chronicle of Skylitzes: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Vitr.26–2, ff.110r, 125v, 128v. Cf. Tsamakda, *Illustrated Chronicle*.

8 Or. min. 37.
An oration recited on the outskirts of the illustrious city of Thessalonike, in the holy shrine of St. Nicholas Myrovlitis, beside the coffin bearing the corpse of the reverend most holy [bishop] of Athens whose renown is unforgettable, as he was being transferred to the great city.

The inclusion of this information in the heading suggests that the precise occasion of this oration’s delivery was deemed relevant. Such a historical interest in the circumstances of delivery would appear to have been germane to an understanding of the oration’s formal or stylistic character. Such details were intended to speak to the oration’s promise of generic novelty. The occasion was synonymous with certain expectations regarding the form and contents of an oration. It may also have authenticated Eustathios’ funeral speech, lending the copied text that necessary ‘reality effect’ by conjuring the actual circumstances of the recital. Yet even such unusually precise details about the occasion and location can hardly make up for the loss of ceremonial context.

We are thus left to reconstruct some semblance of the setting and the rituals from circumstantial evidence about Byzantine imperial burials more generally. The most detailed extant description of such a funeral remains that by Eusebius for Constantine the Great’s burial in the Vita Constantini. That both the authenticity and accuracy of Eusebius’ account have been called into question matters less when considering the text’s possible influence over imperial funerary custom in Byzantium. Eusebius describes vividly Constantine’s final acts in the knowledge that he would soon die, as well as reactions to the emperor’s death, which range from the measured and self-possessed to the publicly distraught. There follows a detailed narrative of the body’s preparation for burial, draped in purple and placed in a golden coffin, followed by transport to Constantinople.

---

9 A. Sideras, 25 unedierte byzantinische Grabreden (Thessaloniki, 1990) 31.2–5. Agapitos (“Mischung,” 143) thinks it probable that the text of the oration accompanied Nicholaos’ corpse and was to be recited at his interment in Constantinople. I see no reason to exclude the possibility of two recitals of the oration, one before a local Thessalonican audience – which may explain the layover on the city’s outskirts – and again before the mourners in the capital.

10 By “circumstantial” I mean evidence like that provided by the poet Corippus about the funeral of the Emperor Justinian in the Latin panegyric for his successor, Justin II. See the notes to Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris libri IV, ed. and trans. by A. Cameron (London, 1976) 179–182.

AAt the tomb: the occasional context of the text

Constantine died May 22, A.D. 337, near Nicomedia) in order to lie in state in the palace prior to burial. The funerary protocols described by Eusebius closely match those of subsequent accounts. Indeed they may have been modelled on them. Constantine was buried in a traditional Roman mausoleum which would eventually form part of the complex of the church of the Holy Apostles rebuilt by Justinian I two centuries later.

This church remained the burial place of most Byzantine emperors and their families from the time of Constantine I until 1028, when Constantine VIII, was the last emperor to be buried there. Curiously, Eusebius gives no precise date for Constantine’s burial. Moreover, he makes no mention of the actual funerary ceremony, as though it were not part of the overall public pageant. As Claudia Rapp has written, “the rituals surrounding imperial death retain a strongly familial character, yet also acknowledge the public aspect of [the emperor’s] rule.” It is nevertheless worth noting that little or no mention is ever made in the funeral oration itself of the wider funerary ceremony.

Similarly detailed but equally silent on key matters of funerary ceremony is the account in the compendious digest of court protocol entitled Ἡ τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως ἔκθεσίς τε καὶ υποτύπωσις, or *Book of Ceremonies*, commissioned in the tenth century by the emperor Constantine VII as part of a monumental project of ideological and cultural restoration, including imperial ceremony. This miscellany of court decorum is predicated on the widely shared notion in Byzantium that ceremony is the symbolic outward expression of a natural or divinely sanctioned latent order. Like most of the ceremonial protocol and ritual activity described in the book, the account of an imperial funeral

---

12 This church was located in the Western part of the city, close to one of the two main boulevards, or Μέρη, which bisected the city. Constantine VIII (1025–1028) was the last emperor to be buried in the Holy Apostles. On the building and its history, see W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbul* (Tübingen 1977), 405–11; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l’Empire byzantin, I: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique, tom. 3: Les églises et les monastères* (2nd ed. Paris 1969), 41–50. On the imperial burials in this church, see G. Downey, “The tombs of the Byzantine Emperors at the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople”, *Journal of hellenic studies* 79 (1959) 27–51. For a thorough survey of the sources on the known burials of Byzantine emperors down to 1042, see the excellent article by P. Grierson, “The tombs and obits of the Byzantine emperors (337–1042),” *DOP* 16 (1962) 3–63.


15 For a critical perspective on the nature of this and similar so-called “encyclopedic” projects, see the seminar article by P. Odorico, “La cultura della ΣΥΛΑΟΓΗ: 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2) Le tavole del sapere di Giovanni Damasceno,” *BZ* 83.1 (1990) 1–21.
reflects what should take place according to a properly observed convention be-
fitting the symbolic order represented by the emperor. The Book of Ceremonies, it
should be emphasized, does not tell us what in fact was actually done until that
time, or afterwards. Its normative purpose suggests ceremonial inconsistency
may have been the rule. We also have no way of confirming how successful it was
in imposing ceremonial uniformity. The prescriptions nevertheless bear exam-
ining since they preserve an ideal of ceremonial pageantry and can help us draw
analogous parallels for subsequent commemorative occasions.

The Book of Ceremonies stipulates that the emperor’s body is carried out
through the “Kavallarios,” a courtyard of the Great Palace also known as the
“inner Hippodrome,” probably on account of its shape. The “golden bier” on
which the emperor’s body lay is then placed in the Hall of the Nineteen Couches,
the imperial banqueting hall, where the body lies in state, dressed and crowned
in gold. Both the clergy and secular nomenclatura come to pay their respects,
and it is specified that they join in the chanting. The master of ceremonies (ὁ
tῆς καταστάσεως) then recites three times Ἔξελθε, βασιλεῦ, καλεῖ σε ὁ βασιλεὺς
τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων and the attendants carry the em-
peror’s body back into the Chalkê gatehouse and perform “the usual duties.”
When these are completed, we are told, the same master of ceremonies once
more shouts Ἔξελθε, βασιλεῦ. Then the emperor’s hand-picked men, those bear-
ing the title “imperial Protospatharioi,” carry the corpse in procession along the
Mesê (one of Constantinople’s two main thoroughfares bisecting the city) until
they reach the place of burial, where the Psalms are chanted “along with all that
is customary” (τὰ συνήθη). There follow more direct addresses to the deceased
from the master of ceremonies inviting him to enter the House of the Lord, after
which the crown is removed from the emperor’s head and corpse is laid in the
tomb.
Quite apart from their generic formulation, the blueprint for imperial funerals in the *Book of Ceremonies* had become anachronistic in a number of respects by the time of Manuel’s death. Undoubtedly the most obvious difference was at once a consequence and a catalyst of broader ideological changes among Byzantium’s ruling élite: the change of venue for imperial burial and its attendant ceremonies. Rather than be entombed in the church of the Holy Apostles, which had housed the sarcophagi of Byzantium’s emperors as far back as Justinian’s expansion of the Constantinian mausoleum into a church, beginning in the mid eleventh century Byzantine emperors chose to be buried in churches or monasteries founded by their families. This shift stemmed from the aristocratic ethos and private religiosity of the clans which rotated on the throne. Henceforward emperors chose to forego the big public funerals which had culminated with burial in the church of the Holy Apostles near the imperial palace, along with all the ritual and symbolism associated with imperial funerals.

The choice not to be buried in the Holy Apostles may have reflected a number of developments, including the possible exhaustion of space for new tombs in the church (although one suspects a solution to such a problem could have been found). However it is quite probable that ideological factors combined with practical ones. Whether because he could no longer afford the upkeep of the old, stately palace, or in order to make the merger between imperial authority and Komnenian identity even more conspicuous – quite likely both – Manuel’s grandfather Alexios I had transferred the imperial residence and seat of power from the so-called Great Palace near the district of Hagia Sophia, adjacent the Hippodrome, historically the capital’s twin sites of religious and secular authority, to the private Komnenian residence in the Blachernae district, in the northwestern suburbs of the capital.20 Imperial funeral processions had once set

---

20 On the Blachernae palace and district, see A. van Millingen, *Byzantine Constantinople: the walls of the city and adjoining historical sites* (London, 1899) 122–153; on Komnenian renovations and additions to the Blachernae complex, see idem, 122–130; cf. *ODB*, 293. The Blachernae palace is attested in the
out from there along the wide boulevards of the capital, past the ancient imperial fora, which could accommodate large crowds as the funeral cortège wound its way through the city before arriving at the Holy Apostles. In contrast, a procession setting out from the Blachernae imperial residence on its way to the chapel of some smaller religious foundation affiliated with a single family and lacking the political dimension of the city’s ancient churches would not likely have followed so ‘public’ a route or become so collective an event. Thus by the time of Manuel’s death, imperial funerals had contracted considerably, in both a practical and symbolic sense. They had gone from being a state funeral to a more family and court-centred affair, the two becoming increasingly indistinguishable, as had in fact happened during Komnenian rule.

What appears not to have changed, however, is the muted religious character of imperial burials. Indeed, the entire affair does not appear to have been considered a religious ceremony, sensu stricto. Thus both the Book of Ceremonies and the description in Theophanes Continuatus of Constantine VII’s burial in the Church of the Holy Apostles make no mention of clergy presiding, only attending. The funeral remained an affair for the emperor’s family and the imperial household to conduct. This helps explain why founders had to stipulate with such precision the commemorative rites of prayer, lighting of candles, and hymns to be sung by the monks or clergy at their tombs. And so despite being motivated by piety and concern for the soul of the deceased, the centerpiece of the commemorative ceremony, the funeral oration, was not part of a religious ritual. This accounts for the rather limited references in funerary texts to religious or theological aspects of death and the afterlife, or much about the fate of the deceased’s soul. Any such references were likely to have come during the actual burial rite. Funerary tributes, however, had another, more secular function.

Setting out from the Blachernae palace, Manuel’s funeral bier would have made its way to the church of Christ Pantokrator, the housed within the monastic complex by the same name founded by his parents, John II and Eirene, in what may have been the greatest act of public euergetism of the Komnenian

ceremonial protocols contained in the 10th-century Book of Ceremonies (De cerimon., chps. I.27, I.34, II.9, II.12). Manuel I, in particular, is credited with the construction of an elaborate outer wall,[4] and of several splendid new halls, such as the Hall of Irene (named after Empress Irene of Hungary) and the Polytmoros Oikos (“Valuable House”), cf. van Millingen, Constantinople, 128–129.

22 See now V. Marinis, Death and the Afterlife in Byzantium: The Fate of the Soul in Theology, Liturgy, and Art (New York, 2017).
era.23 Equipped with a well staffed hospital, the richly-endowed monastic foundation of the Pantokrator appears like an attempt to recapture something of the lost grandeur of earlier imperial foundations, especially the church of the Holy Apostles.24 Nestled between the twin churches of the Pantokrator was a specially constructed mortuary chapel dedicated to the archangel Michael, intended by its founders for their own and their descendants’ entombment.25 The chapel is referred to in both monastic charters and by historians as a herōon (ἡρῷον), an archaizing term apt not just to the classicizing style of Byzantine literature beloved by the Komnenian court but also apt to the aristocratic self-image of individual valour and heroism cultivated by the dynastic clan and especially by Manuel and his panegyrist.

Flanked by the two churches into which it gave access, the chapel was part of the holy precinct while nominally observing the rule forbidding burials in churches (Fig. 1 below). The chapel was thus designed to be at once liturgically independent of the churches while communicating with them. The most thorough archaeological studies of the building to date hypothesize that the chapel’s eastern bay was reserved for weekly liturgical services while the larger, western half housed the tombs of the founders, Eirene and John II, and their relatives. Manuel had had his own first wife, Eirene (née Bertha of Salzbach) buried there and had made lavish arrangements for his own interment, furnishing the central bay of the mausoleum with an imposing and highly distinct tomb which stood

---


24 R. Ousterhout observes that the chapel’s design was intended to recall the imperial mausolea at the church of the Holy Apostles. “Byzantine funerary architecture of the twelfth Century,” *Drevne russkoe iskustvo. Russi i stranii byzantinskogo mira XII vek* (St. Petersburg, 2002) 9–17, 9. For the ideological intention behind the Pantokrator, see now A. Berger, V. Stanković, "Komnenoi and Constantinople before the building of the Pantokrator complex," *The Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople* (Berlin, 2013) 1–32, 3.

25 R. Ousterhout has speculated that its founders had not initially intended the Pantokrator to serve as a family or dynastic mausoleum and only later adapted the design to this end. “Imperial impersonations: disguised portraits of a Komnenian prince and his father,” *John II Komnenos, emperor of Byzantium: in the shadow of father and son*, eds. A. Bucossi, A. R. Suarez (London, 2016) 135–155.
in the center of the chapel and incorporated the *opus sectile* floor around it.26 Thanks largely to its conspicuous colour and relief-work, Manuel’s is the only tomb of the Komnenians recorded in an extant source.27 Nicetas Choniates, the earliest witness we have, describes Manuel’s sarcophagus as follows:28

Τέθαπται οὖν παρὰ πλάγιον πλευρὰν τῷ τὸν νεὼν εἰσίοντι τῆς τοῦ Παντοκράτορος μονῆς, οὐκ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τεμένει, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ περὶ τούτον ἡρώω, τοῦ δὲ τοίχου τοῦ νεῶ εἰς αὐτὰ περιαχθέντος ἡ περὶ τὴν σορὸν εὑρίᾳ διαστέλλεται εἴσοδος. συνέχει δὲ τούτον λίθος τὴν μελανίαν ὑποκρινόμενος καὶ διὰ τούτο στυγνάζοντι ἐοικώς, ὃς καὶ εἰς ἑπτὰ διέσχισται λόφιας.

He was buried beside the entrance to the church of the Monastery of the Pantokrator, not in the temple itself but in the shrine attached to it. Where the church wall led round to an arch, a broad entrance way was opened around the sepulcher, which was faced with marble of a black hue, gloomy in appearance, and was divided into seven lofty sections.

Nicetas’ enigmatic description of Manuel’s sarcophagus has prompted much comment from scholars who have tried to solve the puzzle of its apparently sculpted surface.29 But its inclusion in Nicetas’ *History* is in itself revealing of the lengths to which Manuel himself, but more likely his widow, Maria, went in order to mark Manuel’s passing and to extol his memory. Besides the unusual carved sarcophagus, the most conspicuous artefact associated with Manuel’s tomb was the so-called ‘Stone of the Unction’, a slab on which Christ’s body was supposed to have been prepared for burial after his deposition from the cross.

Almost a decade before his death (c.1169–70), as part of an effort to rehabilitate his reputation as a self-gratifying and morally lax figure, as Magdalino has

26 Ousterhout, “Byzantine Funerary Architecture,” 10. The eventual inclusion of the so-called Stone of the Unction in the space adjacent Manuel’s tomb capped off an iconographic and ideological programme designed to symbolize the parallels between Christ and his namesake Manuel. For a hypothetical reconstruction of the iconographic programme of the chapel as deduced from the Typikon, see Ousterhout, “Byzantine Funerary Architecture,” 10–12, nn.16, 17; Magdalino, *Empire*, 486–488.

27 Cyril Mango discussed a drawing of 1750 which he concluded accurately represented Manuel’s luxuriously carved tomb—or, to be more precise, the lid of the tomb. C. Mango, *DOP* 16 (1962) 397ff.

28 *Hist.* 222.71–76.

29 Scholars have tried repeatedly to solve the archaeological riddle of the “divided into seven hills” described by Choniates. In 1962 Cyril Mango argued that one of a series of drawings depicting some recently unearthed sarcophagi near the Seraglio palace in 1750 by an eighteenth-century French merchant, Jean-Claude Flachat, then residing in Constantinople, corresponded fairly accurately to the tomb mentioned by Choniates. Flachat described the tombstone on one of the sarcophagi as being of verd antique and adorned with seven domes. Mango’s hypothesis, that Flachat had recorded the tomb of Manuel I, has been widely accepted. C. Mango, “Three imperial Byzantine sarcophagi discovered in 1750”, *DOP* 16 (1962) 397–402, 398. For lingering doubts, see A. Grabar, *Sculptures byzantines du moyen âge*, II (XIe–XIVe siècle) (Paris, 1976) 30. For further conjecture about how to translate Nicetas’ enigmatic description into a plausible image of Manuel’s carved tombstone, see Fatouros’ ingenious conjecture that the tombstone was surmounted by a relief carving of St. Melania; G. Fatouros, “Das Grab des Kaisers Manuel I. Komnenos,” *BZ* 93 (2000) 108–12; with proposed corrections by C. Sode, “Zu dem Grab Kaiser Manuels I. Komnenos,” *BZ* 94 (2001) 230–31. For some additional hypotheses about the seven domes on the tombstone, see N. P. Sevcenko, “The tomb of Manuel I Komnenos, again,” *On ikinci ve on üçüncü yüzyıllardan Bizans dinîyasında değişim* (İstanbul, 2010) 609–616.
argued, Manuel arranged to have the alleged relic transferred from Ephesos to Constantinople. Nicetas Choniates reports that the stone’s arrival at the Boucoleon harbour was celebrated with much pomp and that Manuel himself carried the stone part of the way from the harbour to the chapel of ‘Our Lady of the Pharos’, where it was originally housed as a holy relic before Manuel’s widow had it moved to the chapel of the Pantokrator. The stone’s *translatio* to Constantinople and Manuel’s physical participation in its arrival was fodder to the emperor’s panegyrists. In what may be a typically understated parody of Manuel’s encomiasts, Nicetas Choniates describes the emperor as “stretching his back below the stone like that of another god” (ὡς ὁμόθεον σῶμα).

The relic was eventually transferred by Manuel’s widow alongside the tomb sometime after his burial, with a probable *terminus ante quem* of 1182, when the regency fell. It is questionable whether the stone was already in the Pantokrator at the time of the Ἐπιτάφιος. It seems improbable that Eustathios would have passed up an opportunity to exploit its symbolism along with Manuel’s great physical act of piety. The stone’s eventual inclusion as part of the subsidiary chapel housing Manuel’s tomb provides one more marker on the timeline for the commemorative ceremony and the approximate date of the oration’s delivery. The splendour of Manuel’s tomb was confirmed just a few years later by Robert de Clari, a French knight campaigning with the fourth crusade who took it upon himself to describe all he saw in Constantinople, including the burial sites of the Byzantine emperors. Among the monuments he visited in the city was the chapel of the archangel Michael – to whom John II and Eirene had dedicated the funerary chapel – containing the tombs of the Komnenians up to that time. After noting that the “abbey” in question held the tomb of Manuel, whom the older crusaders no doubt recalled as the last Byzantine emperor on an equal footing with the western powers, Clari observed that “never was anyone born

---


on this earth, sainted man or sainted woman, who was so richly and so nobly sepulchred as was this emperor.”

The details about Manuel’s sarcophagus and the architectural and iconographic profile of the burial chapel allow us to anchor the Ἐπιτάφιος in an actual physical setting. Few, if any, Byzantine orations up to then can be concretely situated in this way. This is an important first step in building an occasional profile for the oration as something more than a generic label. The funeral orations for Manuel were no doubt intended to be commensurate in rhetorical splendour to their material and symbolic surroundings. Moreover, physically and chronologically situating the funeral oration as a genuinely occasional text offers us a necessary reprieve from an increasingly ideational conception of Byzantine rhetoric as a self-reflexive form of language with few referents in the world. So that when we read in paragraph 69 of the Ἐπιτάφιος: καὶ τὸν τάφον περιϊστάμενοι, τὸν τοσούτου καλυπτῆρα καλοῦ, ἐξαγόμεθα καὶ πρὸς οἴκτους οἱ παραμυθεῖσθαι καὶ ἑτέρους ὀφειλέται ὄντες (“[a]nd standing round his tomb, the covering of so good a man, we, whose duty it is to console others as well, are ourselves driven to laments”), we appreciate the physical immediacy of the reference to Manuel’s tomb. Likewise, a little further along in the oration (Ἐπ. 72), when Eustathios apostrophizes the tomb itself in a rare concession to the usual histrionics of funeral laments: Ὡ τάφος, τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπάνθισμα κρύψα, ὦ τῆς φρονήσεως πλάτος συστείλας, ὦ συγκλείσας τὸν ἀεικίνητον (“Oh tomb, you have hidden away the bloom of nature; you have enfolded the breadth of practical wisdom; you have confined the man who was ever on the move”), we may more accurately estimate the emotional contrivance involved in turning to address an actual tomb before a live audience.

Reconstructing the occasion for which an oration was composed and performed rejoins text to a context, quickening the imagination of the modern reader. Eustathios’ own proximity to Manuel’s entombed body, and the iconographic backdrop of the funerary chapel’s decoration, reminds us that rhetoric did not sever its tether to the world, even as it tried to present a formally elevated and edifying distillation of reality. Standing near the tomb, either in the chapel itself or not far from its entrance facing an audience gathered in either the north or southern church, Eustathios was performing in more than the suggestive sense

---

normally intended by this word. In the final paragraphs of the Ἐπιτάφιος, he appeals directly to the deceased emperor lying in the tomb only a short distance away with these words:

Oh most powerful emperor, oh most beautiful in appearance, most accomplished in deed, sweetest in eloquence; why have you hidden yourself, hiding along with you such virtues as well? Venerable is your grave, hiding within such a man, of whose our entire world is not worthy. Bitter is this grave, having snatched such sweetness from us all. And seeing it now, one runs to it as to a beehive, intending to gather the honey within; but he leaves having drawn bile, stung by the needle of bitterness and grief, and from it he harvests tears. And he drenches himself immoderately with these same tears. Oh great gravestone, hiding within that precious gem.

Eustathios muses in sorrow at the prospective visitors to Manuel's tomb, using language which recalls pilgrims seeking cures in the sweet-smelling miraculous liquids secreted by the tombs of holy men and women. In a fittingly mournful reversal of the image, Eustathios laments that such sweetness as there was to be had came from Manuel as long as he was alive; now there are only tears to savour. If there is something to gain from recovering the occasion of the text's delivery, it is that passages like those above cannot be dismissed out of hand as “mere rhetoric,” composed solely in accordance with generic expectations and checklists drawn from rhetorical manuals. The text should dispel any doubts about whether Eustathios intended the Ἐπιτάφιος to be delivered in situ, before a live audience gathered in a space redolent with the political legacy of the Komnenian dynasty. Surveying the ecclesiastical monuments of Constantinople, V. Marinis observes that the churches of the Pantokrator monastery were sumptuously decorated, even by the opulent standards of Byzantine imperial foundations. In such a visibly and materially epideictic setting, language had to be “consciously exalted to the level of an exalted theme.” As such, it had to adorn the occasion. It had to be made of rare materials, the best the language had to offer, a testament to the homage being paid to its august subject. As I argue in greater detail in the

34 J. D. Denniston, Greek prose style (Oxford, 1952) 2.
section on the style of the Ἐπιτάφιος, the orator’s eloquence formed part of the ceremonial spectacle. Here I would underline that the reverse was no less true. The ceremonial backdrop was itself an integral component of the oration. As Magdalino notes,”the intellectuals had won themselves an honourable place in state ceremonial from which they would not be dislodged.” Eustathios’ funeral oration was intended to demonstrate that the court orator’s place was alongside the emperor, even at death.

A further aspect of the oration either neglected or potentially misconstrued, absent consideration of its delivery in a real physical setting before a live audience, an occasion in every sense, is the fact of its much touted performance. It has become increasingly commonplace to speak of the performance of texts of all types, including Byzantine texts. To the extent that such emphasis on the inherent theatricality of literature across a variety of genres has made it possible to acknowledge the latent drama of texts, the so-called ‘performative turn’ in literary studies has been quite salutary. The designation by Byzantines of such events as theatra only shortens the step to performative understandings of medieval Greek literature. And yet the attention to textually encoded performance risks making the theatricality of the texts wholly rhetorical and interpretive in nature. Lost in such readings is an appreciation of actual physical or sensory enactment through voice and physical presence at a particular place and time which invested the performance with credibility. As the episode with the anagnostes related by Psellos above suggests, Byzantine audiences were eager for dramatic enactment of texts. Performance underwrote funeral orations as surely as it did panegyric more broadly. Indeed, as part of elaborately staged ceremonials, funeral orations had an inevitable theatrical dimension. We therefore need to imagine Eustathios, as plausibly as possible, acting out his rôle as panegyrical laureate to Manuel’s court, calibrating his voice in accordance with the dramatic require-

35 Magdalino, Empire, 427.
38 R. Pichon, Études sur l’histoire de la littérature latine dans les Gaules. [Tome 1, Les derniers écrivains profanes. Les panégyristes - Ausone - Le Querolus - Rutilius Namatianus] (Paris, 1906) 43. Pichon’s estimate of the contribution or function of the panegyrics at the court in Trier: “Le discours de rhéteur est un pièce nécessaire de la cérémonie, au même titre que le déploiement des soldats de lagerde impériale, la décoration du palais…Ce qu’on réclame de lui [du rhéteur], ce ne sont pas des idées sérieuses sur des sujets pratiques…on attend seulement que l’ éclat de sa parole donne à la solennité un nouvel embellissement, une nouvelle parure.”
ment of his text, possibly employing his hands, body, and head to underline the contents of the oration. Inquiring after the specifics of “occasional texts,” whether material or performative, brings us a little closer to the oration as a historical event.

Having established the occasional character of the Ἐπιτάφιος as a text recited before a particular audience in a specific place, it remains to be determined when such an oration might have been performed. The late Roman rhetorical manuals like *Menander-Rhetor* stagger the three types of funeral oration — μονῳδία, παραμυθητικός, and ἐπιτάφιος — according to a kind of emotional decorum. Each funerary type is assigned a period matching the countenanced emotional states of the bereaved: pure lament (μονῳδία) and consolation (λόγος παραμυθητικός) follow immediately after death; the more encomiastic and dispassionate funeral oration (ἐπιτάφιος) concentrating on the deceased’s virtuous traits and achievements is deemed appropriate only after sufficient time has elapsed and the intensity of grief has waned. The period of intense grieving was limited (sometimes by law) to nine days. But the prescribed period of mourning was one year, hence the final commemorative service in tribute to the dead. Although largely a matter of pious custom rather than liturgical regulation, family members appear to have observed a regular memorial calendar, holding μνημόσυνα for their dead on more or less precise dates following death and burial. These occurred most commonly on the third, ninth, and fortieth day after burial, as well as on the yearly anniversary of the death or burial. Élites able to fund regular

---

39 Although neither section in *Menander-Rhetor* makes explicit mention of the most suitable time for such speeches, the references to the speaker “[giving the appearance of] being out of his mind and distracted by emotion” (413.13–14) or descriptions of the recent funeral (436.11) place both speeches closer to the death and burial; in contrast, *epitaphios* (419.1–6) is not recommended until sufficient time has passed.


41 *John Chrysostom, PG* 62.431 εἰ δὲ ἐνιαυτοῦ παρελθόντος ὡς οὐδὲ γινομένου τινός, οὐ τὸν ἀπελθόντα θρηνεῖς…

commemorations frequently sponsored yearly memorials on the anniversary of the death of their relatives, which are documented in scrupulous detail in the many Byzantine monastic foundation charters.43

The Typikon of the Pantokrator monastery had special and rather detailed provisions for thrice weekly liturgies and all-night vigils, as well as yearly commemorative ceremonies, on behalf of its founders and their descendants on the anniversary of their death (or burial?).44 The main function of such remembrance ceremonies was to offer prayers on behalf of the souls of the dead.45 A subsidiary function, seen in both consolatory orations (παραμυθητικοί λόγοι) and consolatory epistles addressed to surviving family members, appears to have been to assuage and channel their grief (whose disruptive potential was a perennial concern of Greek society dating back to archaic times) into salutary forms of piety.46 Consequently, the most likely timeframe and occasion for a μονῳδία or ἐπιτάφιος was in the days, weeks, and months after death and burial.47

Laments, or μονῳδίαι, which addressed themselves with almost lyrical intensity to the still raw grief of the mourners, were quite likely delivered very soon after death. This probably accounts for the uneven ratio of μονῳδίαι to ἐπιτάφιοι in the manuscripts. Grief and mourning were both more immediate and inevitable τῶν νεκρῶν λειτουργίαι, ὑμνωδίαι τε καὶ ψαλμῳδίαι, τεσσαρακοστὰ σὺν τριτεννάταις, καὶ ἐτήσιοι μνήμαι καὶ τελεταί, αἵτινες οὐκ εἰς μάτην παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐπενοήθησαν. Cf. D. Abrahamse, "Rituals of death in the middle Byzantine period," Greek Orthodox theological review 29 (1984) 125–34; G. Spyridakis, "Τὰ κατὰ τὴν τελευτὴν θήμα τῶν Βυζαντινῶν," EEBΣ 20 (1950) 75–171; J. Kyriakadis, "Byzantine burial customs," Greek Orthodox theological review 19 (1974) 37–72.

43 Koukoules, Βυζαντινῶν βίος Δ 208. Cf. Sideras, Grabreden, 64–68. In Christian sources the earliest mention is found in the fourth-century Apostolic Constitutions, where there are directives about services in both churches and cemeteries, as well as for regular post-burial commemorations on the third, ninth, thirtieth (in some manuscripts fortieth) day, and then yearly. The Apostolic Constitutions also offer the first explanation of the meaning of and reason for these regular commemorations: the third day is for Christ’s resurrection, the ninth is in rememberance of the living and departed, the thirtieth reflects how long the Israelites grieved for Moses, and the yearly commemoration is offered in the memory of the deceased. Les Constitutions Apostoliques, 3 vols, ed. M. Metzger (Paris, 1985–1987) VI.30, VIII.42.


46 Like their ancient counterparts, the Byzantines, too, were concerned about excessive grieving for the dead. However, questions of faith came to eclipse concern about social decorum. Cf. M. Alexiou, Ritual lament, 24–35.

47 The burial itself might take place a soon after death, with the preparations and ceremony lasting only a few days, or it might stretch over weeks, as they did in the case of Constantine I. Cf. P. Karlin-Hayter, “L’ adieu à l’empereur,” Byzantion 61 (1991) 112–155, 114.
than the relatively detached panegyric of ἐπιτάφιος. Explaining his decision to compose an ἐπιτάφιος instead of a μονῳδία for his one time patron and fellow author, Nikephoros Komnenos, Konstantinos Manasses offers as an alibi his absence from Constantinople at the time of burial. He thus inadvertently confirms that a μονῳδία was intended primarily for the period immediately following death.

In much the same vein, Gregorios Antiochos, a former pupil of Eustathios, notes in the title to his own funeral oration for Manuel, that it was not performed until some four months after Manuel’s death. We learn from the same heading in the manuscript that although it had been prepared well beforehand, the oration was postponed in order to be performed at the memorial service marking forty days since Manuel’s death:

“Α funeral oration by the same author for the celebrated emperor, lord Manuel, rechristened Matthew after having adopted the holy and evangelical habit, performed 120 days after his death on account of the recital being postponed at the time of the forty day memorial ceremony, for which occasion the speech had been prepared well in advance.”

The contents of Gregorios’ oration can seem maudlin, and almost theatrically disconsolate, the product of a rhetorically contrived despair. Unlike the impassionate appraisal of the Ἐπιτάφιος, the major note of Antiochos’ oration was a highly rhetorically anguish, no doubt still appropriate for the period of intense mourning on the forty-day anniversary of Manuel’s death. The explicit mention in the heading to the τεσσαρακοστά, the memorial ceremony held forty days after...
lowing burial for which Gregorios composed the monody, tells us something about the climate of grief on the occasion.\textsuperscript{53} Manuel died on September 24, 1180. Assuming he was buried within a few days of death, by Gregorios’ own reckoning his oration was not delivered until \textit{circa} January 24. Antiochos does not mention what may have delayed the delivery of his oration. Was the commemorative ceremony itself postponed, or was Antiochos’ monody left off the program for that occasion? If the latter, then what could have been the new occasion for the recital of Gregorios’ funeral oration? Or should we assume that Antiochos or someone else arranged for its performance without benefit of a ceremony? Perhaps events at court preempted the commemorative ceremony of the \textit{τεσσαρακοστά}, until a later occasion. As the example of Leo VI’s funeral oration for his father, Basil I, demonstrates, one could compose a eulogy almost two years after a death.\textsuperscript{54}

Might Eustathios and Gregorios have composed such different funeral orations for the same occasion? It may well be that a division of labour had each orator perform a distinct eulogistic task. Antiochos took up the dirge while Eustathios revisited Manuel’s manner of governing, along with the accomplishments his supporters hoped would prove his enduring legacy. Antiochos’ lament is structured by a memorable parallelism between Manuel’s reign, in particular his ardent defence of the empire against enemies foreign and domestic (a reference perhaps to the very same faction which would soon seek to oust the regency), with a recurrent emphasis the Passion of Christ. The empire’s foes are cast as sinners, while Antiochos exploits the motif of crucifixion to describe Manuel’s self-sacrifice for the empire.\textsuperscript{55} The choice of the Christ-like motif, which

\textsuperscript{53} Byzantium had inherited the Greco-Roman notion of the progressive stages of the separation of the soul from the body on the third, ninth, and fortieth days after death. See G. Dagron, “Troisième, neuvième et quarantième jours dans la tradition byzantine. Temps chrétien et anthropologie,” \textit{Le temps chrétien de la fin de l’antiquité au Moyen Age–IIIe–XIIIe s.} [Colloques internationaux du CNRS 604] (Paris, 1984) 419–10; for the liturgical rites governing the distinct commemorations, see E. Velkovska, “Funeral rites according to the Byzantine liturgical sources,” \textit{DOP} \textbf{55} (2001) 21–51.

\textsuperscript{54} V. Grumel conjectured, quite plausibly in my view, that Leo VI delivered his funeral oration at the memorial marking the second anniversary of his father’s death. See V. Grumel, “Notes de chronologie byzantine,” \textit{Échos d’Orient} \textbf{35}, No.183 (1936) 331–335, 333. Similarly, Libanios’ \textit{Epitaphios} for Julian was not composed until two years after the latter’s death; and it was probably not circulated until a few years after that.

\textsuperscript{55} Antiochos initiates the comparison at the moment of Manuel’s death, as he is preparing to assume the monastic habit. He then works his way back to Manuel’s long reign. Magdalino has argued that Eustathios stops short of such Christ-like parallels (\textit{Empire}, \textit{487}). But midway through the ‘Επιτάφιος (‘Επ. 45), Eustathios describes Manuel’s initiative to go speak among the people as “not descending humbly, but \textit{condescending} in a divine manner” (οὐ καταβαίνων ταπεινῶς, ἀλλὰ συγκαταβαίνων τρόπον ἔνθεον). The use of such theologically fraught vocabulary associated with Christ’s redemptive descent into Hades to describe Manuel’s willingness to “condescend” to address the common people is characteristic of Eustathios’ almost facetious touch at times. In what was likely his last oration addressed to Manuel, Eustathios had used similarly allusive language to cast Manuel in the rôle of a Christ-like figure “hum-
in previous periods might have been perceived as verging on the blasphemous, confirms that praise of Manuel knew no bounds. With so many rhetors lining up to offer praise, encomiastic inflation was perhaps inevitable. Antiochos, however, was not the first to draw a parallel between Manuel and his divine namesake. Still, the comparison with Christ was the natural ceiling of earthly success.56

Of course just as Eustathios includes elements of pathos and lamentation, so Antiochos makes mention of Manuel’s military and broadly political achievements, though in more allusive language, less inflected by the kind of rationalizing we meet in the Ἐπιτάφιος. The difference lies as much in tone as in substance, however. While both the opening and closing of the Ἐπιτάφιος strike a somewhat disconsolate note similar to that of Antiochos’ monody, the rest of the funeral oration assumes a consistently unemotional attitude. It dwells on often highly specific aspects of Manuel’s personality and rule, instead of his death or the sorrow it elicited from his family or subjects.57 Thus despite its length, the Ἐπιτάφιος strictly limits the time devoted to mourning and reserves what few consolatory words it has to offer for the bereaved widow and child. Eustathios (and no doubt his patrons at court) wished to emphasize Manuel’s life, not his death. The reference at the start of the oration to other orators having struck up their song, forcing him “to join the chorus,” may indeed have been to a commemorative occasion, possibly lasting more than one day, during which multiple tributes to Manuel were delivered, Antiochos’ included. If Eustathios did share the stage with other rhetors on such an occasion, then a date of at least a few months after Manuel’s death and burial would seem more plausible, given the length and complexity of the text, but more importantly, in light of the minimal

bling himself” for his people; see Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 226.74–75 Ἐταπείνους, βασιλέων ὑπέρτατε, σχετάν, καὶ οὕτω τὸ σὸν ὕψιστον εἰς ἕνα τῶν πολλῶν κατεβίβαζες.56 Manuel had invited the association with the suffering Christ, going so far as to stage an elaborate penitential act by having the sepulchral slab from Christ’s tomb shipped from Ephesus, where it had been on display, to Constantinople. Kinnamos describes a processional ceremony in which the emperor himself “put his shoulder into it”, helping transport the stone from the Boukoleon harbour to the Pharos church in the palace (Επιτ. re. 277–278) οὕτως καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παλαιὸν τοῦ χρόνου κείμενον λίθον ιερὸν μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἑκατέρου προαρχόντων βασιλεὺς μέντοι καὶ τὸν ὦμον ὕπερ ὑπέρτατος καὶ ἰθύνον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰθύνοντος καὶ βασιλέως τέλους ἑκατέρου προαρχόντων. βασιλεὺς μέντοι καὶ τὸν ὦμον ὑπέρ τῆς κατεβίβασε. εὐληπτοὶ ὡς τῷ λίθῳ, ἐπεὶ τά γε τοσαῦτα καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν προσαγόμενοι;57 The dedication of at least two funeral orations for a deceased, one monody and one epitaphios, was not unprecedented. Libanius may, however, have been unique in composing both for a single person, the emperor Julian, an ἐπιτάφιος (Op. II, 236–371) and a μονῳδία (Op. II, 206–221). The monody was probably delivered at Julian’s funeral while the epitaphios was intended for a later commemorative ceremony, or even as a non-ceremonial tribute, circulated among Julian’s partisans.
time devoted to lament in the oration. This is supported by the implication in the heading to Anthiochos’ monody pointing out that he had composed the text for an occasion much closer to Manuel’s death. Some months after, a monody was no longer conventional or even appropriate. In this respect, at least, Menander-Rhetor’s schedule for funerary types remained current.

In a letter to Eustathios dated by the collection’s most recent editor to the late Spring of 1182, Michael Choniates makes reference to a “banquet-like monody” by Eustathios: τῆς δὲ μονῳδίας τοσοῦτον, ὅσον εἰ καὶ τράπεζαν…ὄψων πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν γέμουσαν. Choniates employs a metaphor favoured by Eustathios, that of rhetoric as a feast of delicacies. An earlier editor had hypothesised that the monody in question was in all likelihood Eustathios’ funeral oration for Manuel I Komnenos. Choniates’ use of μονῳδία instead of ἐπιτάφιος is hardly fatal to this conjecture, since the two terms were sometimes used interchangeably.

Nearly two years after Manuel’s death seems a rather late date for the Ἐπιτάφιος. Not only would it have been far from any conventional commemorative date, but more significantly, the oration would have been delivered near the height of the political turmoil which by then engulfed the court and which would soon see Andronikos I come to power, bringing both the regency of Manuel’s rightful heir Alexios II and the Komnenian dynasty to a wretched end. But such a late date for a commemorative occasion may have had its own, largely political logic. Indeed, there may have been no more appropriate time to recapitulate Manuel’s accomplishments and the temperament required to achieve them than in the period just before open conflict erupted among the factions competing for the throne. The Ἐπιτάφιος may well have been part of an effort to shore up support for the regency by rallying the court around the memory of Manuel. The part of the oration devoted to reassuring the audience that Manuel’s widow, Maria, was fit to rule pro tem as regent, by virtue of her long apprenticeship at Manuel’s side was intended to deflect criticism about Maria’s fitness to administer the empire:

58 I do not share A. Stone’s confidence in deducing the exact occasion as “days after the emperor’s death” from the single reference to λαμπάδας at the start of the text (Ἐπ.1: Καὶ οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες…ἀνάπτουσιν ἄρτι, ὥσπερ τὰς πρὸς αἴσθησιν, οὕτω καὶ λόγου λαμπάδας τῷ κειμένῳ) which he misleadingly translates as “torches”. These were the long candles used in liturgical or other processions. While such an early date cannot be ruled out, both the scale and purely encomiastic language with very little lament in the Ἐπιτάφιος favour a ceremony on a later date. Cf. A. Stone, “Funeral Oration,” 242.

59 Kolovou, Choniatae Epistulae, 52*. Kolovou follows G. Stadtmüller’s dating in “Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen,” Orientalia Christiana 33.2 (1934) 125–125, 239.

60 Kolovou, Choniatae Epistulae, Ep. 6: Τὸσον περὶ νηστείας λόγου οὔπω γεγεύμεθα, τῆς δὲ μονῳδίας τοσοῦτον, ὅσον εἰ καὶ τράπεζαν παραφέρων τις, ὄψων πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν γέμουσαν, πρὶν ἢ καὶ χεῖρας ἔβαλεν εὐθὺς ἥρπασε, τὸν δαιτυμόνα ἀφεὶς ἐπιχαίνοντα καὶ μόνῃ τῇ ὄψει ἀνιαρῶς παραψαύσαντα. Δοίη σοι θεός ζωὴν μακροχρόνιον.

61 Σ. Λάμπρος, Μηχανή Ακομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου - Τὰ Σωζόμενα, τόμ. Β’ (1880) 552.
At the tomb: the occasional context of the text

Καὶ μὴν ἡ κοινωνός σοι καὶ βίου καὶ βασιλείας, καὶ συνέσεως ἄκρας μέτοχος, καὶ (τὸ πᾶν συνελεῖν) βασιλεία ὅπως μεγάλες εἰς συμβίωσιν ἐπιπρέπουσα, καὶ συμπάρεστι τῷ νέῳ αὐτοκράτορι, καὶ πάντα οἶδεν, οἷς οἰκουμένη κατορθοῦται, τῆς σῆς ἀποναμένη καὶ μαθέσεως καὶ μιμήσεως· καὶ τὰ διδασκάλια ἔργοις προϊσχομένη, οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι μὴ οὐκ εἰς τὸ πᾶν κατευστοχεῖν τοῦ κοινωφελοῦς. Ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς καὶ νοῦν μὲν βασιλικὸν ἐθέλομεν καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖθεν ἀγαθά. (Ἐπ. 70)

And indeed your companion in both life and imperial rule, a woman of the highest intelligence, and (to sum up) one well suited to a common life with so great an emperor, stands at the side of the young emperor, and she knows everything by which the empire may prosper, having had the benefit of your teaching and example. And demonstrating in her deeds the lessons she has learned, she could not but achieve the common good in everything. But while we want both the understanding of imperial affairs and the good things which come from it.

A similar case could be made for such an endorsement of Maria’s rule soon after Manuel’s death, when scepticism about the empire’s future under a regency would have needed immediate quelling. Plausible arguments may of course be made for either. But they remain inside the time-frame circumscribed by events, with Manuel’s death at one end and the regency’s collapse at the other. The window for a suitable commemoration at which a funeral oration of this length and ambitious scope could have been recited is not especially long. Where on that timeline we place the likely occasion of its delivery may affect how we interpret parts of the oration, as well as its overall intent in the volatile circumstances. The value in trying to determine when the funeral oration was delivered does not lie so much in our success in fixing the exact date as it does in keeping before us the vicissitudes and contingent circumstances in which the funerary ceremony was composed and delivered.62 Thinking about the occasion and the timing of the oration encourages us to read the text in the world, and not as an artificial distortion of it, as C. Mango’s infamous characterization of Byzantine literature would have it. Only thus can we ensure that our understanding of the oration’s contents and aims are anchored in its historical context and not in a purely abstract textual tradition. Pernot’s observation regarding Roman panegyric remained in effect centuries later in Byzantium, namely, that “encomium was thought of [not] as an abstract rhetorical form but rather as a social practice embodied in speeches undertaken for specific occasions.”63 Only if we bear this mind can we leave aside the mistaken view that epideictic rhetoric of praise remained intrinsically aloof from reality.

62 On other funeral orations providing evidence for the time of their delivery, see Sideras, Grabreden, 65, nn. 117–119.
63 Pernot, Epideictic, 20.
In the case of Manuel’s death, the funeral oration was almost certain to acquire political overtones over and above any pietistic commemorative aim. This was more likely as long as the deceased emperor’s legacy could be invoked to bolster a fledgling succession. Andronikos’ designs on the throne even before Manuel’s death were well known, even if the stories told about them later took on an almost farsical and parodic cast. Eustathios must have therefore known that he was wading into politically troubled waters by composing a prose pan to Andronikos’ long-standing political nemesis while publicly endorsing his heir. What’s more, the Ἐπιτάφιος touches on a host of policies closely associated with Manuel’s not seldom controversial governance. Although non-narrative in structure, Eustathios’ funeral oration was necessarily retrospective in its timeframe and implicitly broached the future governance of the empire by means of normative and symbouleutic formulations. The occasion and the oration were perforce politicized. The conspicuous praise for Manuel, which until then had seemed a requirement of ceremonial protocol, risked being cast as vocal support for the regency.

Amid all this immanent conflict, Eustathios is not in the least coy about his desire to confer one last tribute to Manuel’s legacy, and by extension to affirm his allegiance to Manuel’s wife and son. Perhaps professional rhetors did not need to fear falling afoul of a new regime because they had rendered service to the old one. But by the time of Manuel’s death, Eustathios was no longer simply a senior rhetorician. He was bishop of the strategically important city of Thessalonike and his delivery of a funeral oration could be interpreted as an act of voluntary partisanship. In any event, Eustathios’ declared allegiance to Manuel’s widow and to heir, Alexios II, did not prove irreversible. Only a few years later he would write an account of the Norman occupation of Thessalonike in which he went to some lengths to explain his good faith support of the disgraced usurper Andronikos I, the Komnenian prince who had ordered the death of Manuel’s son Alexios. While not strictly part of the ceremonial frame of the occasion, these and similar considerations nevertheless must have coloured the context and were bound to be on the orator’s mind as he composed the Ἐπιτάφιος for an emperor whose robust rule in life was sure to produce a power vacuum in the immediate wake following his death.

The Ἐπιτάφιος as a paraenetic text; or a ‘distorting mirror’ of Princes

I hoped in the first place to encourage our Emperor in his virtues by a sincere tribute and, secondly, to show his successors what path to follow to win the same renown, not by offering instruction but by setting his example before them. To proffer advice on an Emperor’s duties might be a noble enterprise, but it would be a heavy responsibility verging on insolence, whereas to praise an excellent ruler (optimum principem) and thereby shine a beacon on the path posterity should follow would be equally effective without appearing presumptuous.

— Pliny the Younger, Epistulae III. xviii

Was the Ἐπιτάφιος political? To which one might reasonably answer, how could it not be? Consider the laudandus, the occasion, and the audience, against the historical backdrop of the period immediately following Manuel’s death: threats from abroad and ruthless ambition in the ranks of the ruling élite. Could a funeral oration for an emperor studiously avoid any and all allusion to this reality? And yet this may not have been the orator’s most significant contribution to political reflection in these circumstances. The characterization of the Ἐπιτάφιος as political can suggest a range of involvement, from the immediate affairs at court to the broad ideological plane. Determining any of these poses challenges to how we read such a text. Another way to put the question would be to ask whether the Ἐπιτάφιος did double duty as a kind of paraenetic or symbouleutic treatise, at times even as a kind of ‘mirror of princes’. The answers to these questions are anything but obvious, not least because there is no agreement as to what Byzantine political theory amounted to, or indeed whether it existed.

It is nevertheless fitting to ask the questions in relation to the Ἐπιτάφιος because the alleged absence of genuine political theory in Byzantium has long been seen as a direct symptom of the same ideological framework which re-
quired constant praise of the emperor, even after death. How could a system of governance which expected to hear itself celebrated in imperial oratory, or βασιλικοὶ λόγοι, also tolerate authentic reflection on the nature and just application of political power? Perhaps most insidious of all, we assume, was the channelling of Byzantine society’s eloquence to the abject flattery of rulers. If the best schooled minds were coopted by the very system of rule they might scrutinize, where would political thinking find a voice? But the flagrant obsequiousness we hear in the speeches before the emperor’s court was hardly a Byzantine innovation. As the apparatus to this text demonstrates, no small measure of the imagery and panegyrical formulas in the Ἐπιτάφιος had been bequeathed to Byzantium by ancient Greek and Roman archetypes. Theoretical texts on kingship were thus not unknown in Byzantium.

In one of the earliest attempts to describe the genres which might plausibly be grouped under the heading Fürstenspiegel, P. Hadot grouped encomia and ‘mirrors of princes’ together, since they often drew from a common pool of late Roman texts on ideal rule. In a similar vein, in his survey of secular prose genres, Herbert Hunger acknowledged that many encomia attempted to provide a magnificent portrait of the ideal virtuous ruler. The distinction between the rapidly multiplying encomia and the increasingly rare didactic texts on kingship lay in the following circumstance: the author of a ‘mirror of princes’ could count on his élite social rank and be more candid about his programmatic advice to the ruler. But that had long since ceased to be the case for most Byzantine encomiasts. So while Hunger noted the kinship between encomium and ‘mirrors of princes’, he nevertheless drew the line at funerary speeches. He did so by arguing that advice literature proper has a more immediate horizon for action it urges upon the ruler. This would have disqualified funerary speeches. Yet Hunger also noted that included among the texts drawn on by authors of Byzantine Fürstenspiegel,

2 M. Anastos, “Byzantine political theory: its classical precedents and legal embodiment,” The Past in medieval and modern Greek culture, ed. S. Vryonis (Malibu, 1978) 13–52. Even if Byzantine authors did not cultivate the Greco-Roman tradition of political theory, that does not mean they were unaware of such works.
3 Aelius Aristides, held up as an exemplar by aspiring Byzantine rhetors, provided a model with his treatise, ‘Εἰς βασιλέα. It matter little whether we think the work to have been authored by Aristides. The Byzantines thought it had been. See C. P. Jones, “Aelius Aristides, ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ,” The Journal of Roman studies 62 (1972) 134–152; cf. C. Körner, “Die Rede ΕΙΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ des Pseudo-Aelius Aristides,” Museum Helveticum, 59 (2002) 211–228.
4 P. Hadot, “Fürstenspiegel,” Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (Stuttgart, 1972) 8355–632; Themistius, Julian, Libanius, Synesios’ Περὶ βασιλείας, and Prokopios of Gaza, were all models for Byzantine panegyric.
5 Hunger, Profane Literatur, 158.
"Tenspiegel was Isocrates’ funeral oration for king Evagoras, at once an archetypal ἐπιτάφιος and a portrait of the ideal ruler. Unsurprisingly perhaps, scholars have been increasingly willing to discern a significant subtext of politics in the panegyrical tradition of Byzantium. Many see thinly disguised topical or immediate references, akin to criticism or endorsement of particular policies or decisions. And as I point out in the commentary, Eustathios includes a few such references to controversial policies. Though he does not veil them, for the most part, but comes out in open defense of Manuel’s governing decisions and the rationale behind them. Some, however, describe the political subtext of imperial oratory in more normative terms. They point to a tendency to formulate praise in language which renders the encomium an illustration of an ideal implicitly urged on current and future rulers. That tendency is marked in the Ἐπιτάφιος.

An additional consequence of such efforts at identifying latent political thought in texts usually regarded as little more than undisguised propaganda has been the intellectual rehabilitation of authors of encomia. This has been especially important for middle Byzantine literature, since many panegyrists were among Byzantium’s foremost intellectuals and writers: Arethas, Michael Psellos, Theophylact of Ochrid, George and Demetrios Tornikes, Konstantinos Manasses, Michael Italikos, Eustathios, Michael and Niketas Choniates, to name but the most prominent. All composed, and many will have performed, orations in praise of emperors. Byzantinists, for their part, have often felt embarrassed by the apparent lack of intellectual independence joined to a seemingly pliable integrity which led many of the empire’s most educated and well spoken men to surrender their literary skill to burnishing the image of autocracy. Too often the extant orations, including the Ἐπιτάφιος, read like shameless efforts to glorify imperfect rulers and to ingratiate oneself with the court. The problem with such a view is that it presumes nothing but cynicism on the part of the panegyrists and, one must assume, on the part of their audiences as well. While this is not the place to revise wholly our understanding of βασιλικὸς λόγος, what I describe in the section on style as a kind of illocutionary speech, the Ἐπιτάφιος as a form of ritual expression, does allow us to explore alternate readings of Byzantine panegyrical literature.

The way to such readings has been opened by the now well established concept of Byzantine Kaiserkritik. Historians eager to hear from Byzantines them-
selves how they hoped to be ruled have sought traces of a distinctly subtle form of *Fürstenspiegel* or ‘mirror of princes’ in the panegyrical literature of Byzantium.8 Responding to scholars who reduced imperial panegyric to uncritical praise of the emperor, P. Magdalino has written that “it is a mistake to assume that *encomium* necessarily lacked the edifying purpose of the ‘mirror of princes’.”9 Having received a thorough education in the precepts of ancient rhetoric, Byzantine orators would have been aware of the link between praise and *paraenesis* registered by no less an authority than Aristotle.10 While not as openly deliberative as the speeches of the Athenian assembly or the Roman republican senate, imperial oratory nevertheless had to vindicate the conduct of the emperor against what in many cases must have amounted to scepticism or open dissent, as is implied by the insistent rationale in the *Επιτάφιο* for some of Manuel’s most conspicuous policies.

Court orators were practiced in the art of putting the best face on a regime. This was done by working backwards from the best course of action. The emperor was routinely praised not for what he had done but for doing what he should have done. As A. Giannouli points out, panegyric and *paraenesis* were not systematically differentiated in earlier scholarship because their shared ideological idiom made them appear as distinct occurrences of the same aim.11 She

---


9 Magdalino, *Empire*, 417; cf. K. Emminger, *Studien zu den griechischen Fürstenspiegeln* (München, 1913). Appropriately enough the term *Fürstenspiegel* was coined by Gottfried of Viterbo in the late twelfth century (d. 1191) in his *Speculum Regum*, or ‘mirror of princes’, addressed to Henry VI. See P. Hadot, “*Fürstenspiegel*,” 556. See also the survey of the Western medieval tradition of ‘mirrors of princes’ by W. Berges, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1938; repr. 1952); none of these studies makes any allowance for Byzantine examples.

10 Rhet. 1.1367b36–1368a9. Hadot, “*Fürstenspiegel*,” 602, deems most ancient panegyric in Greek as Hellenistic-Roman in origin.

notes that Byzantine encomia shared both contents and form with traditional paraenetic texts. Praise proceeded from the same template of virtues and aimed at shoring up a model of imperial governance, what has come to be known as Byzantine Kaiserideologie. If the language is exalting instead of exhortatory, it need not mean that audiences did not hear the emperor and court being urged to pursue a course of action or adopt a standard of behaviour generally felt to be lacking. It might even be argued that all encomium is at once descriptive in principle and prescriptive in practice. Accordingly, D. Angelov describes how imperial encomia of the Palaiologan restoration following the period of exile in Nikaia accommodated a sometimes surprising degree of political controversy and debate. This could happen so long as programmatic politics were couched in ideologically reassuring formulas, cautiously broached and subtly expounded.

Angelov nevertheless cautions that “the rôle and function of imperial panegyric has not yet been sufficiently investigated to permit the passing of definite and unqualified judgement.” This would apply equally well to summary judgements dismissive of imperial panegyric’s genuine political function or its characterization as little more than unqualified celebration of individual emperors. All panegyric proceeds from certain ideal conceptions which give it a normative cast. We frequently reverse engineer the various topoi and clichés about emperors in a bid to arrive at the assumptions undergirding legitimate rule and good governance in Byzantium. But even as Byzantine orators “preached a sermon to the converted, including the emperor himself,” encomiastic oratory served to

Bieziehung. Beide heben die Tugenden des idealen Königs hervor und dienen der Verbreitung der Kaiserideologie, wobei sie ihre Themen und Motive aus der gleichen Tradition schöpfen.”


13 D. Angelov, *Imperial ideology and political thought in Byzantium: 1204–1330* (Cambridge, UK ; New York, 2007). Angelov discerns a greater temerity on the part of rhetors composing imperial panegyric in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, noting that they seem less shy in offering political counsel to imperial audiences.


15 Giannouli cites Demosthenes’ *Olynthiaca* III, 3.7–11 for the antiquity of the assumption that encomia conceal the true nature of rule while exhortatory texts seek to improve it. See Giannouli, “Paränese zwischen Enkomion und Psogos,” 121.

sustain faith in the ideal.\textsuperscript{17} Put differently, orators at court were entrusted with the ideological blueprint of Byzantine society. So even as it claimed to relate the merits of the \textit{laudandus}, court oratory was also proclaiming the particular archetype of excellence and virtue against which an emperor would be measured. Despotism, it should be remembered, had its own political and social logic, along with its own historical warrant, requiring frequent and persuasive re-articulation.\textsuperscript{18}

Rhetors in Byzantium were stewards of an ideological idiom in constant need of renewal.\textsuperscript{19} The problem, as S. Bartsch has described it for an earlier period of Roman imperial panegyric, was how to restore meaning and credibility to the clichés and hackneyed praises without making them seem forced and discredited by a reflexive recycling.\textsuperscript{20} The recurrence of \textit{topoi}, formulaic characterizations, stock imagery and clichés one may find in the \textit{Ἐπιτάφιος}, strike us ascripplingly unimaginative. It can appear as though Byzantine authors like Eustathios were afraid to venture out far beyond the safety of the well trodden phrase. Why else would authors who could call on such reserves of literary ingenuity and wide reading in both pagan and Christian classics have proven so reluctant to diversify their rhetorical, if not necessarily their political, idiom? One answer we have not considered sufficiently is that panegyrical language like that of the \textit{Ἐπιτάφιος} was conceived as part of a political ritual. Yes, \textit{topoi} or established motifs were subject to some depreciation through constant and expanding re-use. The rhetor was charged with making “old \textit{topoi} look as good as new.”\textsuperscript{21}

On the other hand, commonplaces and formulas provided a measure of reassurance and stability to people who who felt especially vulnerable to sudden and often wrenching mutability. Hence the traditional pejorative senses attached to novelty, or καινότης. In contrast, hearing a set of perennial norms invoked as touchstones of successful rule – the emperor’s prudence and self-control, his devotion to his soldiers and generosity to his people, his political shrewdness and diplomatic acumen, his ability to intimidate without necessarily resorting to violence – these had an almost ritual, iterative function in affirming the verities

\textsuperscript{17} Angelov, \textit{Imperial ideology}, 180.
\textsuperscript{18} As R. Webb observes, even speeches in praise of emperors, figures deemed too exalted to be subject to the normal procedures of evidence in support of praise, nevertheless assemble proofs to illustrate the ruler’s virtues in accordance with the requirements of forensic oratory. Webb, “Praise and persuasion,” 127–136, 131, n. 16. Cf. Men.-Rhet. 368,5–7.
\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Pernot, \textit{L’éloge}, 720ff.
\textsuperscript{20} S. Bartsch, \textit{Actors in the audience: theatricality and doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian} (Cambridge, Mass., 1994).
\textsuperscript{21} Magdalino, \textit{Empire}, 418.
of good imperial conduct. Since the emperor’s monopoly of coercion was never sufficient to keep him in power, a rationalizing ideology which underwrote that coercion had to be reiterated and acceded to voluntarily. The rhetorical formulas thus helped create what L. Pernot aptly describes as a ritualized political “grammar of the encomium.”

Orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος can nevertheless seem to us like instruments of heavy-handed propaganda. But the effect sought may have been more subtle. And it may have cut both ways. It articulated the court’s self-serving view of the emperor’s achievements and motives, to be sure; but it also had its stated ideals forcefully articulated back to itself. This meant submitting to a lofty standard which the emperor perennially risked falling short of. Rhetorical conventions made few discounts in the profile of the ideal ruler. Indeed, it is questionable how much influence individual emperors had on the repertoire of imperial panegyric, including those emperors who put their strong stamp on the organization and administration of the empire, as Manuel had done. So while any one rhetor appears to us fawning and sycophantic, when seen as part of a panegyrical tradition, Byzantine court oratory can seem remarkably impervious to ideological interference from the throne.

Assuming then that we accept the premise of a ‘mirror of princes’, what point was there in holding up a mirror to a dead prince? The question brings us back full circle to the function of the Ἐπιτάφιος. Was so lengthy and elaborate a panegyric of a recently deceased emperor simply about commemorating the memory of the deceased? What political function, if any, might commemoration have served? A funeral oration which eschewed lament in order to survey and celebrate an emperor’s reign and temperament as a ruler invariably constituted a model of governance; all the more so, perhaps, in a period wracked by uncertainty about the stability of the succession. No one in the audience would have been unaware of the barely concealed ambitions of the men present with designs on the throne; in some cases, like that of the soon to be emperor Andronikos I,

---

22 Pernot goes on to describe the lists of topoi as “reference schemes, duly elaborated, specified, and articulated...efficient analytical frameworks which enabled the ancient encomiast to perceive objects clearly and to appreciate their merits equitably.” What was true of the ancient encomiast remained true for his Byzantine counterpart. See Pernot, Epideictic, 49.

23 We should not underestimate the contribution βασιλικοὶ λόγοι, including funeral orations for recently deceased emperors, could make to internecine debates and conflicts over governance by supplying memorably articulated account of the reality in question. In addition to their ceremonial function, such speeches constituted one among many “varieties of knowledge and opinion that must have existed among the audience of any speech and even within individual listeners.” Webb, Praise and Persuasion, 134.
temperaments strikingly opposite to that profiled by the Ἐπιτάφιος. And even if Andronikos’ disastrous rule could not have been anticipated by Eustathios, his reputation for spirited recklessness and swashbuckling valour made him the perfect foil to the poised and prudent imperial figure profiled in the Ἐπιτάφιος. Elaborating on Iliad 9.334 (ἄλλα δ’ ἀριστήεσσι δίδου γέρα καὶ βασιλεῦσι) in the Παρεκβολαί, Eustathios had previously pointed to a deliberate distinction underlined by the ancient poet between those who displayed excellence and those who might become kings:

Ἐν δὲ τῷ «ἀριστήεσσι καὶ βασιλεῦσι» ὄρα τὴν διαφοράν. οὔτε γὰρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης οἱ ἀριστεῖς βασιλεύουσιν ὦτε βασιλέων τὸ ἀριστεύειν ἐστί.24

Although a misreading of the verse, sensu stricto, the observation is an example of how Eustathios’ rhetorical analysis of the Homeric portrayal of rule was informed by and tailored to Byzantine preoccupations with the nature of effective governance. All that was beneficial about monarchy, it was assumed, flowed from the excellence or virtue of the individual on the throne. This was a premise running through all of imperial oratory, the Ἐπιτάφιος included. Eustathios could read the verse as he did because the potential disjunction between the real and the ideal ruler was all too vivid a prospect in a system of government so dependent on aligning the two.25 Such an alignment nevertheless involved compromise from both ends, and in a telling episode presented in unusually vivid outline, Eustathios suggests that good emperors have also to be made, through wise counsel and political education. They are not simply born equal to the requirements of empire.

Thus early in the Ἐπιτάφιος Eustathios introduces a wider lesson about self-restraint and the dangers of impetuous decision-making by a future ruler. He locates the highly abridged story in the severe but also safe context of a paternal reprimand of the recklessly bellicose adolescent Manuel I by the young prince’s father, the emperor John II. After the young Manuel has thrown himself headlong into battle without regard for his own safety, he incurs the stern reproach of a father who is at once outwardly angry but inwardly proud of his audacious son’s martial spirit. John nevertheless hides his pride, lest he further encourage such behaviour in his young and politically immature son. He chooses instead to dissemble the part of an irate father in order to underscore the se-

24 Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.723.
25 The potential for vice in emperors is illustrated repeatedly by Nicetas Choniates, Hist. 110.20–21, 432.61–65, 444.57–90, 548.3–4, 549.9–11.
riousness of the lesson he will teach Manuel about the need for self-restraint, as well as responsibility towards his subjects. The twin feelings represent the need to reconcile opposite tendencies, self-restraint and valour, readiness for war and prudence in its conduct. The passage deserves to be quoted in full because its narrative concision leaves just enough space for the audience to conjure the dramatic encounter between father and son, and the importance to a future ruler of subordinating his nature to a broader duty:

For you could truly see his father the emperor setting forth the best teachings, while Manuel apprehended them easily, and he was immediately roused to demonstrate their fullest application; and there were times when his father even had to check his son’s exceeding vehemence, since his father supposed that the young emperor could err by reason of his immoderately noble nature. One time, when he was still too young and his hands still soft (for what else could they have been belonging to a child), he had the courage to get into a fight (which few would have gotten into, not even the bravest) and he was crowned with victory; his father privately rejoiced, having trained the boy for such feats, to which he was so adept, though he pretended outwardly to be severe, and he managed to have the effect on the student emperor which the enemy had not. For the young man did not shrink from these men, while his father the emperor, rebuking him, and it must be said, punishing him, taught him through fear, that so young a shoot should not expose itself to the winds, which may bend it from its upright position and lay it flat on the ground; he heard as well that “war never deliberately selects the wicked, but always the brave,” and whereas grim-faced battle may look disapprovingly at men quite severely hardened and worn by many contests, if they are still tender, she regards them straightaway with eagerness, and may take them before their time, so that they will have proven of little or no benefit to those whom they set out to help

And in all things he was instructed to progress gradually in their application, and to make way up the slope of virtuous deeds, step by step, as it were, in an orderly progression, so that reaching perfection he might prove useful to the world, a thing he later put into practice.
The episode assumes, somewhat improbably, that despite his rank in the succession, Manuel was being groomed by his father for rule. Quite significantly, Manuel’s feat of courage and his skill in fighting – natural sources of pride among warrior aristocrats like the Komnenians – though secretly admired by his father, do not come in for much praise from Eustathios. The episode of Manuel’s youthful courage and skill in battle belonged, it seems, to palace lore and was included as a reassuring harbinger in quasi-official accounts, like Kinnamos’ *Epitome*. The memorably epigrammatic quote from Sophocles («μηδένα φαῦλον ἄνδρα πόλεμον αἱρέσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀεὶ») thus comes as a counter-intuitive lesson to the boy who might have assumed that heroic courage, the valiant *ethos* of his Komnenian ancestors, might have met with unqualified praise. Instead, he learns that as future emperor he must take a wider (and arguably non-aristocratic) view of war and exercise a caution commensurate with his duties if he is to prove “useful” to the world (ἐϊ τῷ κόσμῳ χρήσιμος).

*Menander-Rhetor* instructs anyone composing an *epitaphios* to provide examples of the subject’s precocious nature with respect to later achievements (a prefiguration later borrowed by more biographic genres, including hagiography). Eustathios seems to conform to the rule and assures the audience that Manuel showed an early disposition to virtue, having before him the example of his ancestors. In some matters, however, he needed his father’s guidance, even though he proved preternaturally resourceful in uncovering for himself good principles, “and especially all those which will be reckoned as models of governance and of noble achievements among his descendants”:

almost from the time he was in swaddling clothes, and from childhood until he reached adulthood, he proved precocious in the demonstration of virtues, in some cases following in the footsteps of his ancestors, in others as a result of being guided by his father, though for the most part relying on his own resources, and making additional discoveries in the principles of virtue on his own, and especially all those which will be reckoned as models of governance and of noble achievements among his descendants.

If Manuel’s son and heir, Alexios II, was too young to grasp the *symbouleutic* implications of Eustathios’ framing of the episode as one of imparting knowledge of virtuous rule either directly or through example, then surely those in the audience attached to the regency might be counted on to hear the *paraenetic* lesson.
As a profile of Manuel’s exemplary conduct on the throne, the Ἐπιτάφιος was a distillation of all that the deceased emperor might have wished to impart to his heir and successor. The lesson taught in so dramatic a fashion by John II to his son thus holds up a mirror to the next prince.

The lesson elicited from John’s reprimand, to heed prudence and give due consideration to the fullness of the obligations of an emperor, is encapsulated in the recurring invocation of φρόνησις as the paramount virtue in the governance of the empire. Deliberating with himself which of the many virtues he should give priority to, Eustathios cannot but give pride of place to φρόνησις, “that attribute which is universally acknowledged to compliment all other virtues. As long as it is heeded prior to any act,” Eustathios assures his audience, the actions of a man will be ‘humane’, i.e., rational, and he will “in fact walk in the light”:

Only a little further along in the oration Eustathios praises Manuel for exhibiting the very attributes of careful deliberation and resistance to rash decisions, as his father had urged. Manuel, it seems, achieved the desired (im)balance between bravery and sound judgement, ἀνδρία and φρονήσις, accumulating more accomplishments through the latter than through sheer displays of courage:

26 The clauses are derived, respectively from Aristotle EN 1141b8–10: Ἡ δὲ φρόνησις περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ περὶ ὧν ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι· τοῦ γὰρ φρονίμου μάλιστα τοῦτ’ ἐργαν εἶναι φαμεν and Evang. sec. Io. 8:12: Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ιησοῦς λέγων, Ἐγώ εἰμί τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς. See the commentary ad loc. for more analysis.
Ἐντεῦθεν ἀἱ πανταχοῦ γῆς βασιλικαὶ πρόνοιαι πολυειδεῖς. Καὶ ἄνθρωπος εἷς οὕτος τοῖς μεγάλοις οἰκουμενικοῖς ἑαυτὸν μεγαλοφυῶς ἐπεμέριζε τμήμασιν εἰς τὸ ἐνεργόν, προβαλλόμενος, ὅσα καὶ χεῖρας ἀμφιδεξίους, τὰ πλείω δὲ ἀγχρήστα τῇ νόησι παρίστατο, καὶ ἀχρόνως οἷον τὸ νοουμένου ἐδράττετο, καὶ τούτου βαθύτατα, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἐπιπολάζειν κατὰ τοὺς ταχεῖς μὲν φρονεῖν, οὔ τι δὲ καὶ ἄσφαλεῖς. Ἡς καὶ καταμόνας εἰς μυρίον πλῆθος ὠνάμεθα (Ἐπ. 14.)

It was as a result of this that imperial precautions of every sort were adopted in every part of the land. And this single man divided his time generously between the wide parts of the empire in an energetic way, displaying the initiative of his courage and his burning intelligence in a manner resembling an ambidextrous man, as much in matters related to the rest of practical wisdom as in those requiring shrewdness. For while he exhibited thoughtfulness in great matters, deliberating at length; in the majority of cases his mind got close to the heart of the matter, and he lost not time in grasping the situation, right to its very depths, not superficially like those who are quick to come to a decision but without ensuring its reliability and soundness. And while he could also claim extraordinary deeds of bravery, far more numerous were his acts of prudent governance, which, even if we considered them individually, we enjoy in great numbers.

Byzantine intellectuals were aware that the call to balance rational judgement and prudence (φρόνησις) with manly bravery (ἀνδρία), had ancient pedigree. Eustathios’ audience would have understood this as shorthand for a readiness to commit not just himself to battle, but the whole empire.27 The twelfth-century Aristotelian scholiast, Michael of Ephesos, included in his commentary to the Nichomachean Ethics the observation: δοκεῖ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς πολλοῖς...ἀνδρεία αἱρετώτερα καὶ βελτίω εἶναι σοφίας καὶ φρονήσεως, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο.28 So while invoking φρόνησις in a funeral oration may strike us as oratorical bromide, when situated in a broader discourse about trying to redress the imbalance and risk of a warrior ethos of unchecked inclination to war, apparent cliché and topoi

---

27 As any survey of ancient literature across genres will show, φρόνησις in the conduct of state affairs enjoyed considerable pedigree in the classical canon, which supplied post-classical writers with the vocabulary to articulate its imperative through advanced education in rhetoric and literature. Cf. Pl. Symp. 209a; Arist. EN 11.4034a; Isoc. Or.12.204; Plu. Moralia 2.97e.

28 Michaelis Ephesi (φρόνησις) in parva naturalia commentaria. Pars II: Michaelis Ephesii in libros De partibus animalium, De animalium motione, De animalium incessu commentaria. Pars III: Michaelis Ephesii in librum quintum Ethicorum Nicomacheorum commentarium, eds. P. Wendland, M. Hayduck, Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca Vol. XXII.I-III Pars I (Berlin; 2013) 483. In fact, the advice that acts of bravery had to be balanced, indeed surpassed, by wise decision-making, had already been part of the speeches celebrating Manuel’s accession over four decades earlier, confirming perhaps that some at court were concerned about his temperament. Cf. Michel Italikos, lettres et discours, ed. P. Gautier [Archives de l’orient chrétien 14] (Paris, 1972) 276–294. The conventional keynote theme of φρόνησις would have struck some as having special bearing on a young emperor who had thus far earned a worrisome reputation for bravery on the battlefield and libidinous appetites off it. In that case Italikos appears to have been perhaps anticipating scepticism about Manuel’s immaturity and inexperience. Cf. Magdalino, Empire, 435.
take on more immediate significance. Eustathios grants φρόνησις a prominence commensurate with the priority he thought it should be given in imperial decision-making, including prioritizing it over Manuel’s (or any future emperor’s) martial spirit:

καὶ ἦν μὲν αὐτῷ λίαν καλὰ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀνδρίας σεμνά· περιττότερα δὲ γε τὰ τῆς φρονήσεως, ἣς καὶ καταμόνας εἰς μυρίον πλῆθος ἀνάμεθα.

Praise of the ruler’s self-possession and checking of impulse are understandable virtues to stress in an absolutist system of governance without systemic constraints on a ruler’s will. This was especially so in a case when the very same qualities which the society had need of in its head of state – resolve, authoritativeness, martial courage – were the same ones which could lead to disaster if exercised imprudently. Ensuring that the rational ruler had the upper hand over the impassioned one was not an innovation of Komnenian political rhetoric. But it did receive repeated stress in the imperial encomia of this period. Perhaps because a family of aristocrats, justifiably proud of their martial legacy, had to be constantly reminded to put the collective interest above personal honour and battlefield glory. Eustathios’ lesson here is consistent with A. Kazhdan’s observation that a dynasty which came to power as the Komnenians did on the strength of their warrior ethos brought with it a militarism not seen on the throne in generations. It is against this preeminence of heroic ethos cultivated by the Komnenian dynasty that we might perhaps read Eustathios’ more balanced emphasis on qualities of good governance, strategic foresight, and above all, prudent exercise of power and self-restraint in joining the battle. Eustathios endorses Manuel’s decision to command his armies at a safe distance from the

30 Magdalino notes that much of eleventh-century imperial panegyric stressed the peaceful pursuits of governance over the emperor’s martial exploits. He cites the example of Konstantinos Monomachos who was praised primarily for his patronage of learning, his support of monastic foundations and philanthropic generosity, as well as his building programme. See Magdalino, Empire, 418–425; cf. Dennis, “Imperial panegyric,” 134–136.
31 A. P. Kazhdan, “The aristocracy and the imperial ideal,” The Byzantine aristocracy, ed. Angold (Oxford, 1984) 43–57; see also, P. Magdalino, R. Nelson, “The emperor in Byzantine art of the twelfth century,” Byzantinische Forschung 8 (1982) 123–183. Addressing Alexios I, Theophylact of Ochrid had obliquely delivered the same lesson by drawing a likeness with Achilles, the martial figure par excellence, nevertheless stressing the Homeric hero’s achievement lay in his subduing of his θυμός by his λόγος and not just his peerless skill in war. See his Λόγος εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα κύριν Ἀλέξιον τὸν Κομνηνόν. Nicetas Choniates (Hist. 160.26) portrays Manuel’s audacious and “ill-timed ambition” (φιλοδοξία τις ἄκασπος) to mount an expedition to invade Ayyubid-ruled Egypt as war pursued for its own sake against an enemy who would not be dislodged from the lands he had long since conquered. It is telling, perhaps, that Eustathios makes no mention of a campaign on this scale. Cf. Magdalino, Empire, 8.
front lines of battle, from where he could deploy his forces as the need arose – hardly a conventional funerary motif or likely to produce a triumphal scene for the panegyrist. Eustathios nevertheless included this fact, since it illustrated well in his view the prudent exercise of judgement on the part of an emperor who might otherwise have wished to campaign from the front and meet the enemy himself head-on:

Τὰς μὲν οὖν ἄγαν ὑπερορίοις μάχαις οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐκρίνε δέον παρεῖναι, τοῦ ἀνέκαθεν χρόνου τὰ μεταξύ τὰ μὲν ἐκπολεμώσαντος, τὰ δὲ ἐν ὑπόπτῳ θεμένοι· οὗθεν καὶ ἦν ἀνάγκη, πρὸς τῷ μέσῳ εἶναι τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ καρδίας λόγω τὰ πέριξ θάλπειν καὶ ὑπογονεῖν · Οὔτ᾿ ἀν, εἰπέρ αὐτὸς ἐκρίνε (ἐκρίνε δὲ ἐν ἄπασι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ζέον), ἀδυσώπητος ἦν πρὸς γε τοῦ συγκλήτου λάχους καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ. Ἀμέλει καὶ προελθὼν τῆς βασιλίδος τῶν πόλεων, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν πολείων τῇ μὲν διῆγη τειμῶν τῷ στρατεύειματι, τῇ δὲ καὶ ὑπερμεσώσας, ἐξέστελλεν ἐγγύθεν τὸ στρατιωτικόν, καὶ κατεπράττετο, οἷα θεὸς ἐδίδοι, ὁ τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτῷ συνεπιλαμβανόμενος. (Επ. 63)

He did not deem it necessary to be present himself at battles far beyond the borders, since the preceding period saw some lands within the empire grow hostile, while others came under suspicion; for which reason it was necessary for the emperor to remain in the middle, and like the heart give life and warmth to the surrounding parts. Nor would he remain unswerving, even if he himself had decided something (since in all matters it was the passion of his soul which decided) in the face of the senate’s vote and that of the others. Indeed, whenever he set out from the queen of cities, sometimes encamping half way to the enemy, at other times more than half, he would despatch the army not far ahead, and he proceed to accomplish what God had provided, who collaborated with him in these works.

Were this any other emperor, we might suspect such praise as covering for timorousness. However, the audience would have recalled that this was the emperor who nearly got himself killed at the battle of Myriokephalon in 1176 by riding outnumbered directly into a pitched battle against the Turks. Indeed, this was the emperor whom court panegyrists extolled for having defeated the Serbo-Hungarian commander Bágyon in single combat at the battle of Tara in 1150. Here lay an emperor who was reported by contemporary historians and court poets alike as having crossed the Danube in a small boat at the head of his army to lead the attack on the mustered enemy on the other shore. For all the drama of John II’s lesson to the young and impetuous Manuel, the grown emperor did not heed his father’s lesson. Both Eustathios and his audience knew this. Praise for commanding from the rear joined to a rationale why an emperor should do so would seem to exceed any attempt simply to credit Manuel with a particular foresight in waging war.32 Kazhdan’s claim, therefore, that Eustathios endorsed

a “knightly ideal” in his portrait of Manuel would seem in need of qualification in this instance. He was concerned with the broader questions of good governance.33

Again and again in his orations to Manuel, and finally in the Ἐπιτάφιος, Eustathios stresses the temperament necessary to govern. Courage and skill in battle, he says, elicited awe (θαῦμα). But such virtues alone could not serve as examples of wise and effective rule for a future emperor, especially who might not prove as intrepid on the field. Of course it would not have entered Eustathios’ mind to minimize Manuel’s bravery and skill in battle. The Komnenians as a dynasty and Manuel as an individual emperor had too much of their political legitimacy invested in their military and strategic prowess. The emperor-soldier was simply too intrinsic an identity of Manuel and of his forefathers. Eustathios appears nevertheless to have sought a prescriptive balance in his commemorative profile of the emperor’s image. One could argue that with the Ἐπιτάφιος Eustathios tried to marshall Manuel’s legacy to a prescriptive ideal of effective rule. It is perhaps worth recalling here H. Hunger’s insight that acknowledging paraenesis in panegyric would amount to a better appreciation of the enduring political function of rhetoric in Byzantium.34 And while it would be a mistake to attempt to reduce the Ἐπιτάφιος to any single aim, it is also evident that Eustathios invested the oration with just enough political instruction as to transcend the historical contingency of Manuel’s reign. As R. Riedinger has observed, panegyric does not graduate into paraenesis; it is encomium which originates in the idealized portrait of governance.35 What symbouleutic elements might have formed part of the overall design of the Ἐπιτάφιος were likely rendered more effective for being consonant with the ritualized praise of the recent past.36

33 Kazhdan, Studies, 156; Kazhdan nevertheless sees an implicit critique of Manuel’s “aggressive adventures” which put such a strain on the empire. He notes as well Eustathios’ repeated hope that war itself will be banished. Idem, 157–158.

34 Hunger, Profane Literatur, I 71–74.


The Style which Shows: 
the poetics of prose in the ʾΕπιτάφιος

The ways by which the mannered speaker would ingratiate himself with mannered listeners, or the plain-spoken one with blunt listeners, may thus become style gone wrong when the two groups cross.

— Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and change*¹

The ʾΕπιτάφιος survives because of anticipated interest in its style, the very part of it we have tended to find most objectionable, and not, as I argue above, because of historical interest in its subject, the life and conduct on the throne of Manuel I Komnenos, our primary interest in it thus far. This points to the diametrical disparity between our own and Byzantine motives for reading many texts. A hard enough thing to identify in the first place, style in the study of medieval Greek literature has more often given way to rhetoric. Robert Browning once observed with regard to this that “features of style slip through the fingers, while features of language can be listed and counted.”² He was referring to the fact that the first principles of rhetoric are more easily identified and taught, which was as true in antiquity as it remains today. Style, on the other hand, is a thing far less easily specified, although invariably more decisive in gaining an author esteem. Something analogous may be said of the modern analysis of Byzantine literature. Although we have gained considerable proficiency at itemizing the various figures of Byzantine rhetoric, we are not, as a rule, adept at providing an account of the style of most authors or texts. With the single exception perhaps of the high-middle-low paradigm, a system of classification which I argue below actually forestalls discussion of prose style, we have tended to shy away from style as a productive category for the understanding of Byzantine literature. We have, in

effect, conceded to historical critics of Byzantine prose style its unredeemable quality. In its place, we have sought a formally and intellectually more generous understanding of rhetoric. But should we surrender style so easily, and can it still teach us things about Byzantine literature and its audiences?

In his magisterial survey of Byzantine secular literature, Herbert Hunger placed the entire corpus of funeral oratory, including the Ἐπιτάφιος, under the broad rubric Rhetorik. The implication, never quite spelled out but also never dispelled, has been that such works were the product of formulaic, intrinsically ‘generic’ composition. These texts may have been skillfully executed, Hunger’s presentation implied, but only according to fairly predictable conventions of recombining ready-made form and content. Vital to the designation of funeral oratory as a ‘rhetorical’ genre has been the concomitant claim that the paramount aim of such texts was “exhibition” – or ἐπίδειξις as the Greek would have it – of the author’s talent. Both these elements, self-display and conformity, are somewhat paradoxically bound up in the conception of ‘rhetoric’ as a sweeping category applied to a broad swath of Byzantine writings. The result has been a kind of double stifling: of the authors and texts, as well as of what modern analysis of them can reveal. By effectively precluding the possibility that at least some of the texts amount to more than the sum of their ‘rhetorical’ parts, Hunger’s otherwise useful overview of the broad contours of each genre made further study of individual texts seem almost superfluous. This is borne out by the often reflexive way Hunger’s Handbuch is cited to account for the formal features of each genre featured in his survey, and by extension the individual texts which make up that genre. Style is one way to redress this imbalance, since it is the point where rhetoric may rise to the level of aesthetics.

Striving too obviously after style in our culture is regarded not merely as an affectation, it is also suspected of masking a lack of substance, or worse, screening an author’s mercenary motives. We live in an age long accustomed to self-effacing prose styles in public life, and any foregrounding of style risks being perceived as a distraction from the text’s contents, a self-indulgence on the author’s part. But the style of Byzantine oratory as exemplified by the Ἐπιτάφιος was designed to make the audience perceive it as a thing made, a specimen of Kunstprosa. In an acutely epideictic setting like the occasions for which Eustathi-

4 The eminent historian and critic of rhetoric, Kenneth Burke, notes of literary style, that “[t]he artist’s means are always tending to become ends in themselves.” K. Burke, Counter-statement (Berkeley, 2nd ed. 1953) 54–55.
os frequently composed, language itself had to be “consciously exalted to the level of an exalted theme.” The patently performative character of texts like the Ἐπιτάφιος should prompt a different understanding of Byzantine prose style, one in which the orator’s eloquence and stylistic virtuosity formed part of the ceremonial spectacle.

But style is an aesthetic response to a set of circumstances. To find fault with a style, as the quote above from Kenneth Burke suggests, is often an indirect way to find fault with the situation which engendered that style. The text becomes a synecdoche for the occasion, audience, and expectations it satisfied. Byzantine oratorical style has been viewed as symptomatic of an intellectually suffocating sociopolitical order which protected itself against dissent by inhibiting the creative and honest use of language to describe reality. Habitually apprehensive of running afoul of church or the imperial court, Byzantine authors are said to have developed a talent for saying as little as possible in the most impressive way possible. But even if we assume this to have been true to the point of stifling the expression of any idea which could offend someone in power, it would still be incumbent on us as literary historians to ask whether all authors chose to demonstrate their ideological conformism in quite the same way. Yet a certain mismatch pervades the study of much Byzantine literature. Aligning our scholarly interests with those of the text’s intended reception is not easy.

As Eustathios, or his literary executor, correctly anticipated when he attached the heading to the Ἐπιτάφιος, citing its stylistic particularity as its chief attraction, Byzantine posterity looked to such texts primarily for the quality of their eloquence, not for information about their subject. But Byzantine literary style remains an obstacle. It is the shoal on which many discussions of Byzantine literature founder. And it happens in no small part because the historical analysis of style is not easily detached from our own deeply ingrained moral preconceptions regarding style, many of them the product of a post-Romantic view of language and authorship. By the late nineteenth century, when the systematic study of Byzantine literature received its modern impetus, cultural conditions had ceased to be auspicious for the appreciation of medieval Greek court oratory. Since then, some of the recent shifts in literary taste and aesthetics asso-

---

6 Although an account of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century scholarly reception of Byzantium, not least in matters involving the intersection of aesthetics and ideology, still remains a desideratum of the field, see now the rather comprehensive intellectual profile of the modern founder of Byzantine literary history, Karl Krumbacher, by P. A. Agapitos, “Karl Krumbacher and the history of Byzantine literature,” *BZ* 108/1 (2015) 1–52.
associated with post-modernism have afforded a measure of (possibly misguided) sympathy and appreciation of the poetics of Byzantine prose. Scholars raised on a strict diet of Romantic literary values, especially as regards the paramount virtues of sincerity and authenticity in the use of language, saw in Byzantine style the antithesis of their aesthetic value system. But a gradually mounting critical engagement with rhetoric as a form of social logic applied to language has also made the gradual rehabilitation of Byzantine literary style(s) more possible than ever.  

But can a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος really be said to possess anything as aesthetically exalted as a style? Indeed, one might ask whether style is itself a fitting or productive way to think about Byzantine oratory. Is it not simply too elusive and nebulous a subject, all too prone to subjective evaluation, perhaps best left to literary critics rather than historians of literature? I am suggesting that our understanding of such texts not only stands to gain, but that without an appreciation of something along the lines of style, we are likely to remain permanently alienated from the motives of Byzantine rhetoric. For something very much like what we mean by style appears to have been aimed at by Byzantine authors in the higher register, which was in turn appreciated and rewarded by Byzantine audiences. Moreover, while we may be reluctant to employ the term in our scholarship, we nevertheless continue to respond to it as readers.

As texts geared for ceremonial occasions attended by the capital’s élite, orations before the court were meticulously composed to foreground their formal attributes. The uncommon diction and striking manner of expression helped to underscore the importance of the event by adding a notable degree of verbal sumptuousness to the proceedings. We see just such an attempt to present the
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Ἐπιτάφιος as a verbal complement to the physical rites of commemoration in the lighting of candles and chanting by the monks:

Καὶ οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες, οἷς ὁ λόγος ἐλλάμπει, ἀνάπτουσιν ἄρτι, ὥσπερ τὰς πρὸς ἀσθήσεσιν, οὕτω καὶ λόγου λαμπάδας τῷ κειμένῳ, κατὰ τινα καὶ αὐτοδεξιῶσιν ὀφειλετικὴν καὶ ὀσίωσιν πρέπουσαν…Εἴη ἄγεννης, καὶ ἐν μὴ δέοντι ἔνεος, καὶ οὐκ εἰδῶς ἑαυτὸν μετρεῖν, ἔνθα μὲν σιγητέον, ἔνθα δὲ λαλητέον, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ἰμοίοτητα συνδεξαγόμενος. (Ἐπ. 1–2)

And the men who have only the best intention, in whom the word shines bright, have just lit the candles of speech for the man who lies here, just as they did the physical ones, like some willingly offered debt and fitting dedication… And anyone who does not in imitation join them in their efforts, would prove ignoble, inopportunist dumb, and incapable of judging for himself, when it is necessary to be silent or when to speak up.

Eustathios thus assimilates the act of performing to the larger commemorative ceremony. Here we have the first indication that the author intends the oration as something which cannot be reduced to its propositional content. To do so would be to proceed on the false yet abiding supposition that the form of the oration may be separated from the content. Such an assumption is contradicted not just by Byzantine tradition, but by the better part of most Greek literary history prior to, and including the Byzantine era.

As the heading accompanying the text of the Ἐπιτάφιος in the single manuscript witness, Basileensis A.III.20 (hence Basel codex), indicates, future interest in Eustathios’ funeral oration for Manuel I Komnenos was expected to turn on the rhetorical style of the work, and not on the reputation or memory of the deceased. To the extent that the emperor in question is mentioned in the title, it would appear to serve to identify the genre of the oration and the majesty of the occasion. When a prospective “cultivated” reader is mentioned in the reference to a discerning πεπαιδευμένος, it is the manner in which the oration has been devised (μεθώδευται) and the resulting stylistic effect (ἐστρυφνώθη) which take center stage:

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ γραφέν εἰς τὸν ἀοίδιμον ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεῦσι κύριν Μανουὴλ τὸν Κομνηνὸν. Ὅτερ ὅτι οὐ τυχόντως μεθώδευται, ὁ πεπαιδευμένος διακρινεῖ. Πολλῶν γὰρ ἄλλως γραψάντων, ἐστρυφνώθη πρὸς διαφοράν ὁ παρὼν ἐπιτάφιος. (Ἐπ. Titulus)8

8 For the possible origin of the heading and its codicological significance, see the commentary ad loc. For this sense(s) of μεθοδεύω relating to literary composition, see LSJ, s.v. μέθοδος, s.a, c; on the possible meanings of ἐστρυφνώθη as applied to the oration and its significance as a stylistic label more generally, see the discussion of στρυφνότης below.
Text by the same [author] dedicated to the lord Manuel Komnenos, celebrated among saintly emperors. Which the learned will discern has not been composed in a chance manner. For while many have written [similar orations] in a different manner, the present epitaphios was rendered in a more discordant style in order to distinguish it from the rest.

A kind of marketing caption for future readers, the heading dwells on what distinguishes this funeral oration from others. Its author, we are told, did not take its form for granted; the sense of οὐ τυχόντως being, I think, an indirect charge of complacency levelled at other rhetors. Instead, Eustathios is described as having deliberately chosen a style marked by στρυφνότης, an uncommon epithet for style designed to place the oration in a tradition of texts which included, among other works, the Homeric Iliad and Odyssey, Pindar’s Epinikia, as well as Thucydides’ Peloponnesian War. As so often in Byzantine manuscripts, the title’s formulation appears to derive, in part, from the contents of the text it headlines. Thus the reference to “many others having written” (πολλῶν γὰρ ἄλλως γράψάντων) appears abbreviated from the mention near the start of the oration to other rhetors having already eulogized Manuel. Indeed, among the reasons Eustathios cites for deciding to compose a funeral oration for the emperor in the first place is that his fellow orators had already done so, thereby prompting him to surpass them. Had the more silver-tongued rhetors kept their peace, he assures his audience, he too might have remained silent. But as they did not, Eustathios says he felt compelled “to join the chorus” (σιωπών μὲν τῶν ἐλλογιμωτέρων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄν· λαλοῦσι δὲ τὸ σύμφωνον ἐναρμόσεται).

The importance of an implicit rivalry cast in the language of propriety among rhetors (“I’d just as soon not have, but now that they’ve gone ahead and given speeches in honour of the emperor, I suppose I must as well”) testifies to the self-regard of the orator. It also implies the audience’s readiness to hear such motives foregrounded even on so solemn an occasion as an emperor’s funeral; or perhaps especially on so august an occasion. Orators were expected to vie with one another, regardless of subject matter or setting. The similarity with the verbal agon of antiquity was not coincidental. Byzantine rhetors saw themselves in a direct line of inheritance with the orators of antiquity. This was bound to move the formal attainment of occasional oratory to the foreground. Precisely because of the occasion, Eustathios is not coy about this rivalry. In a self-referential turn exhibiting a subtly mordant humor typical of his writings, Eustathios lays the blame on the human impulse to imitate one’s fellow man, “be he good

---

Hunger, Profane Literatur, 136, believes the heading to be apologetic for the structure and style of the oration. It is difficult to discern his rationale for such an interpretation.
or otherwise.” His fellow rhetors having availed themselves of the occasion to showcase their talents, he had to follow suit. He reminds the audience that his “life thus far had bred in him a desire not to be ranked inferior to anyone in speeches devoted to virtuous subjects”:

None of the usual false modesty here of a *captatio benevolentiae* in which the rhetor disingenuously underplays his talent as a prelude to a virtuoso display. After long service to Manuel’s court, and an illustrious career as a teacher of rhetoric and ancient literature to men who would go on to make their own mark in church and state, some as accomplished rhetors in their own right, Eustathios no doubt felt he had earned the right to be considered the doyen of the capital’s orators. Even a cursory reading of the text confirms that the Ἐπιτάφιος showcases throughout its rhetorical designed-ness, the fact of its having been meticulously constructed. There was, of course, no pretense to natural speech or the feigning of simplicity in Byzantine court oratory. The speaker’s stylistic virtuosity was given a leading rôle in the performance of any oration. The particular form this verbal flair took would have distinguished one rhetor from another, and made a few orators like Eustathios stand apart from the rest.

Style was not a foreign concept to Byzantine authors, even if they did not invoke it explicitly as frequently as modern critics are wont to do. An awareness of its importance to oratory, and to literature more broadly, had nevertheless made its way into the so-called handbooks on composition consulted by Byzantine teachers of rhetoric. Although often described in reductionist terms as “rhetorical manuals,” a number of these late Hellenistic and Roman compositional treatises spoke to elements or characteristics of literary form that we would readily identify as “style.” Hermogenes’ system of ἰδέαι was by far the
most popular but not the only influential stylistic exposition. Complemented
by numerous Byzantine commentaries, these works formed a theoretical canon
on style, often illustrated with both ancient and post-classical exemplars, like the
speeches of Demosthenes or the sermons of Gregory Nazianzus. Byzantine
stylistic understanding nevertheless remains elusive. This is due, in part, to the
imprecise nature of stylistic labels, as much a problem then as it is now. Howev-
However, Byzantine authors did occasionally comment on style. This usually took the
form of analysis of canonical ancient authors, like the abridged stylistic notices
in Photios’ so-called Bibliotheca, which afford a glimpse into Byzantine thinking
about the significance of matching style to subject and form to function. Simi-
larly, Michael Psellos’ comparative analyses of Euripides and George of Pisidia,
or Achilles Tatius contrasted with Heliodorus, are but some of the better known
eamples. Most would not have survived, if they were even written down in the
first place. As the leading Greek philologist of the entire Byzantine era, Eus-
tathios was extremely well placed to initiate us into the literary sensibility of his
time.

Widely acknowledged as a period of acute rhetorical self-consciousness,
even by Byzantine standards, the latter twelfth century was characterized by its

10 For its part, Byzantium inherited a variety of models for analyzing style. As in other aspects of
literary aesthetics, Byzantine rhetors exhibit considerable eclecticism (characterized as “confusion”
by Ševčenko in “Levels of style,” see note below) rather than systematic application of one doctrine
regarding style. But as Ševčenko observed, Hermogenes’ “horizontal” system of ἰδέαι (sometimes mis-
leadingly transliterated as “ideas”) eclipsed the earlier Hellenistic models of (pseudo)-Demetrios and
Dionysios of Halikarnassos, which were nevertheless partially retained to complement Byzantine sty-
listic understanding. Cf. G. R. Böhlig, Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner
mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften des Michael Psellos (Berlin, 1956) esp. 90, 184–185. We re-
main without a survey of Byzantine opinions about style alongside the Hellenistic inheritance on the
subject found in the Hermogenic corpus.

11 T. Conley, “Late classical and medieval Greek rhetorics,” in Rhetoric in the European tradition (Chi-
cago, 1990) 53–72; cf. idem, “Demosthenes dethroned: Gregory Nazianzus in Sikeliotes’ scholia on

12 A. R. Dyck, Michael Psellus: the essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and
Achilles Tatius [Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia 16] (Vienna, 1986). For a discussion of this
treatise’s place in the tradition of Byzantine literary criticism, see E.C. Bourbouhakis, “Literary crit-
cism and the ancient heritage in Byzantium,” in The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium, eds. A.

13 Agapitos characterizes this sensibility as the “literarischen Sprach- und Stilgefühls” of the second
half of the twelfth century. See P. A. Agapitos, “Mischung,” 119–146, esp.144. For all the attention to the
innovation of this period, we lack more close studies of the works of individual authors. Although cry-
ing to be replaced by a more synthetic monograph study, T. Hedberg’s Eustathios als Attizist (Uppsala,
1935) remains a significant and useful point of departure for the study of Hermogenic influence on
Eustathios’ stylistic practice; cf. P. Wirth, Eustathiana: gesammelte Aufsätze zu Leben und Werk des
Metropoliten Eustathios von Thessalonike (Amsterdam, 1986) 59–143. For the relevant editions of these
previously neglected Eustathian works, see the introductions to the editions of Or. quadr., De emend.,
Ep.
The style which shows: the poetics of prose in the Ἐπιτάφιος

The unprecedented literary experimentation and resourcefulness. It was only natural that it should have prompted authors to reflect on the compositional practice of their predecessors, as well as of their own day. In Eustathios’ case, we do not have to guess at his literary aesthetics simply by extrapolating them from his works. We have the immeasurable added benefit of his exquisitely detailed parsing of the style and significance of the Homeric epics in the astonishingly comprehensive philological commentaries known as the Παρεκβολαί. While a thorough assessment of the Παρεκβολαί as a creative resource for Eustathios’ forays into other genres remains a desideratum of Byzantine Studies, we may nevertheless gain some idea of how the study of Homeric poetry contributed to Eustathios’ stylistic sensibility by examining a notable instance of critical vocabulary imported, as it were, from the Παρεκβολαί to the Ἐπιτάφιος. This is the reference to στρυφνότης in the title:

Even if the title was not by Eustathios himself, as I suspect it was, the reference to στρυφνότης shows its author to have been well versed in Eustathios’ critical vocabulary. A conspicuous and somewhat enigmatic designation, στρυφνότης is usually taken to mean something like “harsh” or “austere,” almost always in a negative sense. It was probably the reference to στρυφνότης which led Hunger to conclude that the heading was a caveat for the singular structure and difficult style of the oration. However this contradicts the premeditation of οὐ τυχόντως μεθώδευται, to which ἐστρυφνώθη πρὸς διαφορὰν appears intended as a complement, characterizing Eustathios’ attempt to differentiate his funeral oration from others. The title strikes me more as an assertion of authorial skill than a disavowal of the oration’s style. Still, the promise of στρυφνότης in a title to a Byzantine text appears to be unique to the Ἐπιτάφιος. Its presence offers some insight into the contiguity between Eustathios’ philological work and his other writings, in particular his oratory. A rare enough term of literary analysis

14 The bibliography on the inventiveness, creativity, and all around literary flourishing of the twelfth-century is now too extensive to compress into a footnote. Good surveys may be found in recent publications such as I. Nilsson, Raconter Byzance: la littérature au XIIe siècle (Paris, 2014).

15 If a degree of authorial self-awareness is to be found in every literary tradition, those which relied on formal courses of rhetoric which systematically laid out alternatives and choices at every step of composition invariably inculcated a heightened sense of stylistic self-consciousness.

16 Comm. ad Hom. Il., Comm. ad Hom. Od. For the important rôle of the Παρεκβολαί in Eustathios’ activity as an author-orator, see the relevant section below.

17 See n.6 above.
in Byzantium, ἁρμονία is invoked with notable frequency in Eustathios’ own analysis of Homeric epic and his preliminary scholia on the Pindaric Epinikia, as well as on the writings of some contemporaries.

As a characterization of style, ἁρμονία dates back at least as far as Dionysius of Halicarnassos, the turn of the first-century critic who famously characterized the prose of Thucydides as discordant and harsh, and in whose writings Eustathios may well have come across the term:18

αὕτη ἡ λέξις ὅτι μὲν οὐκ ἔχει λείας οὐδὲ συνεξεσμένας ἀκριβῶς τὰς ἁρμονίας οὐδ᾿ ἔστιν εὐεπής καὶ μαλακή καὶ λεληθότως οὐλοθάνουσα διὰ τῆς ἁρμονίας ἀλλὰ πολὺ τὸ ἀντίτυπον καὶ τραχὺ καὶ στρυφνὸν ἐμφαίνει, καὶ ὅτι πανηγυρικής μὲν ἢ θεατρικῆς ὀλισθάνουσα κάλλος, ὡς πρὸς εἰδότας ὁμοίως τοὺς εὐπαιδευτέος ἀπαντας ὀδόν δέομα λέγειν ἄλλῳ τε καὶ αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ συγγραφέως ἰδανγείας, ὅτι εἰς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἄνευν ἐπιτερπῆς ἢ γραφῆ ἕστι, 'κτῆμα δ᾿ εἰσαι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα εἰς τὸ παρατικὰ ἀκοῦειν σύγκειται.19

I need not say, when all educated people know it as well as I, that this passage does not consist of smooth, polished and precise arrangements of words; that it is not fair- and soft-sounding, gliding imperceptibly through the ear, but exhibits many features that are discordant, rough and harsh; that it does not even begin to approach the elegance appropriate to an oration delivered at a public festival or in the theatre, but displays a sort of archaic and independent beauty of its own. Indeed, the historian acknowledges that his work is but little calculated to give pleasure to the hearer: “it is composed to be a possession for ever, not an occasional piece for a single hearing.”20

Variously rendered as “harsh,” “abrasive,” or “difficult,” the precise meaning of στρυφνός / στρυφνῶ / στρυφνότης as applied to prose evades us. The relevant definitions in the lexica trade on the metaphorical sense of στρυφνός as something “bitter, astringent, sour.”21 It is not, however, clear how the metaphor applies in most of the instances where it is applied. More importantly, despite the

18 Though it is equally plausible that Eustathios came across the term among the many Hellenistic-era scholia he must have plumbed while composing the Παρεκβολαί. See the list of scholia drawn on for the Παρεκβολαί in van der Valk’s “Praefatio” to Comm. ad Hom. Il., LI9xq.


21 See LSJ s.v. στρυφός, esp. II.2; cf. LSJ s.v. στρυφνῶ, II, where Eust. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 2.578 is cited for the relevant sense of the verb as applied to composition. The actual extent of Dionysios’ application of στρυφνότης is partially hidden by the alternate spelling στρυφνός in many manuscripts. A Hellenistic usage, στρυφός in the sense of “hard, firm, solid” may have been constructed by confusion with the Attic στρυφός meaning “solid, stout.” See LSJ s.v. στρυφός. For study of the diachronic signification of στρυφνότης and an analysis of the label as used in the Eustathian Παρεκβολαί to the Iliad and Odyssey, see E.C. Bourbouhakis, “Homer’s astringent style: στρυφνότης in the Παρεκβολαί of Eustathios of Thessalonike ” Mnemosyne [forthcoming]. Agapitos, “Mischung,” 130 n.64 translates
negative connotation of most translations, the sense implied in many of these instances is at best ambiguous or affirmative. The recourse to metaphor is a fairly strong indication that we are dealing with a stylistic quality for which there was no existing critical vocabulary. Consequently most translations of στρυφνός/στρυφνώ/στρυφνότης displace the stylistic riddle from a Greek metaphor to a corresponding one in Latin, German, or English. Still, the first attempt to translate the Ἐπιτάφιος into a modern language, by the nineteenth-century philologist Gottlieb Tafel, construed ἐστρυφνώθη more promisingly in German as dem Text eine mindergewöhnliche Form gegeben, or “to give the work a less customary shape.” Tafel’s translation left room for an endorsement of the style in question by implying a degree of innovation through a departure from the prevailing prose style. As I argue below, Tafel’s initial intuition was correct. In a note to this same translation, however, he went on to append the following amendment: “[e]igentlich ist ἐστρυφνώθη ὁ : acerbior et austerior facta est oratio sepulcralis,” which suggests he was of two minds about the implied sense of στρυφνός. Averbier et austerior lent themselves more readily to unfavourable judgements on the text, as has traditionally been the case with Dionysios of Halikarnassos’ verdict on the style of Thucydides. In fact, Tafel seems to have divided his translations between the two points made in the title. In German, he emphasizes the stated aim of making the oration “different,” or less conventional, as the phrase πρὸς διαφοράν in the title suggests. However, Tafel’s Latin gloss stresses the metaphorical origins of στρυφνός as acerbior et austerior, which variously translates to “sharp, bitter, severe,” as well as “rough, plain, austere.” Assuming we could match these qualities or effects to specific elements of any Greek text, ancient or medieval, how might we arrive at a conclusive judgement as to whether στρυφνότης was intended as a positive label or not?

As it happens, we have no better guide to the intended meaning of στρυφνόω during this time (and, by indirect testimony, to Hellenistic usage) than Eustathios himself. He invokes στρυφνότης as a characteristic of style more than two dozen times in his extant writings, with the majority of these coming from the Παρεκβολαί to the Ιλιάδ and Οδυσσεία. Στρυφνότης appears as both noun and verb repeatedly to characterize a key feature of Homeric poetics. Eustathios also cites ἐστρυφνώθη in German as rau, hart “rough, coarse, abrasive,” or “hard, severe,” the misunderstood connotations of which I discuss below. Cf. Comm. ad Hom. II, lx; cf. etiam, Pro. ad Pi. 54.

22 Of course this might be said almost equally of such common rhetorical traits as σαφήνεια, γοργότης, or μεγαλειότης. I argue that these constitute stylistic coordinates of Greek prose and are frequently misrepresented by our etiolated conception of “rhetoric.”

23 G. Tafel, Komnenen und Normannen (Ulm, 1852) 3.
στρυφνότης in the Prooimion to the (probably unexecuted) commentary for the Epinikia of Pindar.24 Finally, there are scattered but revealing uses of στρυφνόω applied to verbal expression in some of Eustathios’ orations at court, as well as in one letter.25 The appearance of a recherché philological label like στρυφνόω to describe the prose style of the Ἐπιτάφιος offers appreciable grounds for supposing that even if we cannot be certain about the authorship of the manuscript heading, its vocabulary is consistent with Eustathios’ own critical lexicon. The mention of στρυφνόω suggests someone thoroughly familiar with Eustathios’ writings and keen to underscore a stylistic virtue he himself had single-handedly revived in order to describe what he regarded as an important feature of the formal economy of Homeric poetry; an economy of style carried over by Eustathios from verse epic to prose panegyric.26

Used literally to refer to sour or bitter-tasting foods, στρυφνός acquired the extended sense of “austere” (cf. LSJ s.v. αὐστηρός), meaning an astringent and stern disposition as applied to character, as well as in manner of expression. Inclined to understand “bitter/harsh/austere” as absolute, and therefore negative, aesthetic judgements, we often misread the possible interpretations of στρυφνότης in relation to various types of composition. “Severity and astringency” were invoked as metaphorically apt to designate a style which made no concessions to sweetness or γλυκύτης of expression, itself a staple metaphor of stylistic criticism used to characterize texts which elicited pleasure in audiences by offering them an immediately intelligible and harmonious style. Dionysios’ use of στρυφνός here and elsewhere in his literary criticism has been variously rendered as “rough” or “harsh,” though without much explanation of what might have been meant by it, other than Thucydides’ style makes for difficult reading.27

24 Pro. ad. Pi., 54.
25 For a complete inventory of στρυφνότης in Eustathios and in Byzantium, see Bourbouhakis, “Homer’s astringent style.”
27 De Thucydidis idiomatibus, eds. L. Radermacher and H. Usener, Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant. (Leipzig,1899; repr. Stuttgart, 1965) 5.14: ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἴπω, τέτταρα μέν ἐστιν ὡσπερ ὄργανα τῆς Θουκυδίδου λέξεως· τὸ ποιητικὸν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τὸ πολυειδὲς τῶν σχημάτων, τὸ τραχὺ τῆς ἁρμονίας, τὸ τάχος τῶν σημασιῶν· χρώματα δὲ αὐτῆς τὸ στριφνὸν καὶ τὸ πυκνόν, καὶ τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ αὐστηρόν, καὶ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ τὸ δεινὸν καὶ [τὸ] φοβερόν, ὑπὸ ἅπαντα δὲ ταῦτα τὸ παθητικόν. τοιοῦτος μὲν δὴ τίς ἐστιν ὁ Θουκυδίδης κατὰ τὸν τῆς λέξεως χαρακτῆρα, ὡς ἐπεὶ τῶν άλλων διήνεγκεν. Cf. Demosthenes, according to Dionysios, modeled his style on that of Thucydides, including his “concise turns of phrase” (τὰς συστροφὰς) and the “sharp” and “acerbic” tone (τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ στριφνόν). De Demosthenis dictione, eds. L. Radermacher and H. Usener, Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant, 5.53: Ρητόρων δὲ Δημοσθένης
“Jarring,” “discordant,” or “unharmonious” are probably equally fitting terms and may be closer to the particular qualities of syntactical arrangement in question. Dionysios’ judgement nevertheless became accepted in the post-classical period, and Byzantine readers of Thucydides viewed his prose style as deliberately averse to the easy charm of mellifluous eloquence associated with most Classical authors.

For all the ambivalence expressed by post-classical authors regarding aspects of Thucydidean style – Tzetzes’ sarcastic verses on the ancient historian were composed in imitation of this practice – we should nevertheless hesitate to construe a term used by an ancient authority like Dionysios of Halikarnassos to describe as canonical an author as Thucydides with an uncomplicatedly negative meaning. As a stylistic label, στρυφνός seems to have been used to designate traits which could be either welcome or unappealing, depending on the nature of the text, its occasion, and audience. Paradoxically, it may have been this very ambiguous censure of his style that recommended Thucydides to Byzantine authors seeking to differentiate their texts from those of their peers, as Tafel suspected and which study of twelfth-century Byzantine poetics is increasingly bearing out.

By itself Dionysios of Halikarnassos’ assessment of Thucydidean style cannot account for the renewed currency of στρυφνότης in the twelfth century. Even if we could be certain that Eustathios appropriated the concept of στρυφνότης from Dionysios of Halikarnassos, it was its aptness to his reading of Homeric poetry, and to a commensurate degree the Pindaric odes, that seems to have convinced him of the usefulness of the term in describing certain stylistic features which might be transferable to prose more generally, and oratory more specifically. Eustathios appears to have thus given new life, and quite possibly expanded meaning, to στρυφνότης. Broadly speaking, he invoked it to designate a marked density of syntactic texture or economy of expression, often resulting in a degree of poetic opacity which he contrasts with an expected prosaic clari-

29 For an initial attempt at a more comprehensive treatment of this period which tries to encapsulate the now profuse scholarship on twelfth century literary culture, see Nilsson, Raconter Byzance.
To cite one example which may help us identify the alleged στρυφνότης of the Ἐπιτάφιος, we may look to Eustathios’ parsing of the verse in Iliad 1.258. To illustrate the poet’s use of στρυφνότης in the epic, Eustathios transposes the text from what he regards as its cryptic compactness to a more prosaic and, presumably, more transparent elaboration:

"Ὅτι τελείων ἀνθρώπων ἔπαινος τὸ «οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλῇ Δαναῶν, περὶ δ’ ἐστέ μάχεσθαι». αὐξάνων δὲ τις ποιήσει κατὰ πάντων ἐπίτευξεν τῇ βουλῇ περίεστε δὲ καὶ τῇ κατὰ πόλεμον δεξιότητι."

The verse “you, who surpass all Danaans in council, in fighting,” amounts to praise of flawless people. But if one were to further amplify the encomium, instead of all the Danaans he would say something else similar to it; but if he should wish to paraphrase it, he might shift from poetic compendiousness to clarity along these lines: “those of you who agree with the decision of the Danaans must also share in their prowess in war.”

Eustathios thus spells out more fully the highly abridged sense of the Homeric verse. He uses individual verbs for the subject of each clause and achieves syntactical and semantic balance, as well as unmistakable clarity, admittedly at considerable cost to style. But that is exactly his point. Homeric style involves trade-offs, including a willingness to risk the audience’s expectation of immediate intelligibility. Στρυφνότης appears here to describe the kind of compact, synoptic phrasing encouraged by the metrical requirements of verse. Enjoying the latter requires you accommodate the former. The second, more insipid, version in prose does not arrest the audience’s attention on the actual wording, which delivers the meaning with little stylistic fanfare. Eustathios did not think this was endemic to prose, nor did some among his more ambitious fellow rhetors, who studied Homer and other ancient Greek poets with an eye to assimilating their literary effects.

30 For a complete listing of instances of words based on the stem στρυφ- in the Παρεκβολαι to the Iliad, see the relevant entries in H.M. Keizer, Indices in Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensi commentarios ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editos a Marchino Van der Valk (Leiden, 1995); some illustrative instances include: Comm. ad Hom. Il. 4.392.15 γενεαλογίας, καὶ ὅτι τὰ μὲν πρῶτα, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ σοφοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος λεγόμενα, στρυφνότερον ἐγράφη καὶ γοργότερον καὶ ἐναγωνίως κατὰ σύγκρισιν; 2.749.3–5 στρυφνότερα μὲν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα τοῦ Ὀμήσσεως δημηγορία καὶ σεμνοτέρα καὶ, τὸ ὅλον εἰπεῖν, πρέπουσα πρέσβει βασιλείς. Ἡ δὲ ἐφεξῆς τοῦ Φοίνικος πειστικωτέρα; as well as two notable mentions in orations heard at court, the first of which includes praise of emperor Manuel’s writing ability (Or. 7 [Λόγος Ζ] 117.1) ἔχει καὶ τὸ στρυφνὸν τῆς συνθέσεως, διεκφαίνει ἐν τῇ τῆς ἡλικίας ὡς ὑπάρχον καὶ τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὸ σύννουν συναγόμενον· δίκαιο περὶ μελετῶν λόγον γενναίον εἰπεῖν ἢ πρᾶξιν σκεπτομένων προβάλεσθαι λόγου αἴξιν; (Or. 18 [Λόγος Ρ] 294.18) τὸ δὲ λόγον τὰ πολλὰ μὲν πρὸς ἄκουσον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον κανόνα, ἔχει δὲ τὶ πρὸς τῷ ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ ὅγκον διὰ ποιότητα προσωπικής, πεπλεκτὸ καὶ δὶς πρὸς τῷ συναγομένῳ καὶ ἐναγωγίῳ διὰ τῆς ἀναγγέλων ὡς ὅτι αἴξιον λόγον τῷ πράγματι ἐπιβάλλοντας.

Thus, in the analysis of *Iliad* 4.4.43 (οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει = "she pressed her head against heaven, while she treads upon the ground") Eustathios once more describes the poet as having expressed the thought in an "austere/compressed manner" (στρυφνῶς πέφρασται).32 He goes on to make clear the syntax and grammar of the verse, citing parallels for the relevant sense of στηρίζω33 before he proceeds to render the phrase in more explicit form: έως εἰς οὐρανόν ἐλθοῦσα οὐ δύναται ὑπεραναβῆναι ("and coming as far as the sky she is unable to climb any higher").34 In keeping with the post-classical preference for prepositions over unmediated use of the oblique cases, a trend already more pronounced in late classical prose, Eustathios re-construes the verse to match the specific sense he reads in it. Once more στρυφνότης is defined by saying more with less. So far, there is little we might characterize as "harsh", if by that word we mean something grating or unpleasantly expressed, though one begins to get a sense of the idea of phrasing which could be jarring to expectations of effortless listening or reading of a text.

So in a more expansive description of the language and structure of *Iliad* 17.98 (ὁππότ’ ἀνὴρ ἐθέλῃ πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι), Eustathius writes:

Τὸ δὲ «πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι»35 ταῦτόν μὲν ἑστὶ τῷ διὰ μέσου φωτὸς θεοφιλὸς δαιμονομαχεῖν, στρυφνῶς δὲ καὶ συνεστραμμένως πέφρασται διὰ συντομίας. Βούλεται δὲ λέγειν, ὅτι ὁ μαχόμενος ἄνδρι, ὅσα δαίμονι τιμᾷ, ἀλλ’ ἀληθῶς διὰ μέσου τοῦ τοιούτου δαίμονι μάχεσθαι.36

32 Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.784.20. The passage, Il. 4.442–445, in which Ἐρίς (Discord) instigates strife among the Achaeans, reads:

33 Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.784.21–23, Ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι Ὅμηρος μὲν εἰπών, ὡς Ἐρίς οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη, ἐντελῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀσφαλῶς ἔφρασεν. Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἐν τῷ «κῦμα οὐρανῷ στηρίζον» ὑπερβολικῶς τε ἔφη κατὰ ἀφέλειαν τοῦ λαλοῦντος προσώπου καὶ οὐδὲ ἀνελλιπῶς, εἰ μή τις τὸ στηρίζον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγγίζον εἴπῃ καὶ στηριζόμενον.

34 Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.784.20–785.2, Τὸ δὲ «οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη» στρυφνῶς πέφρασται ἀντὶ τοῦ «ἐως εἰς οὐρανόν ἐλθοῦσα οὐ δύναται ὑπεραναβῆναι». Ἰστέον δὲ, ὅτι Ὅμηρος μὲν εἰπών, ὡς Ἐρίς οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη, ἐντελῶς ἅμα καὶ ἀσφαλῶς ἔφρασεν. Εὐριπίδης δὲ ἐν τῷ «κῦμα οὐρανῷ στηρίζον» ὑπερβολικῶς τε ἔφη κατὰ ἀφέλειαν τοῦ λαλοῦντος προσώπου καὶ οὐδὲ ἀνελλιπῶς, εἰ μή τις τὸ στηρίζον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγγίζον εἴπῃ καὶ στηριζόμενον.

35 The full Homeric passage reads Il. 17.98.

While «πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι» is the same thing as [saying] 'to battle daemons by means of light from a favourable deity,' only expressed in densely abridged and intertwined way through brevity. What he means to say is that anyone fighting with a man whom the daemon honours, even if he appears to be fighting only a man, nevertheless is in fact fighting with a spirit through this man.

In this case Eustathios provides two further characteristics of στρυφνότης. The first is the frequent joint appearance of στρυφνῶς πέφρασται with συνεστραμμένως, suggesting that “intertwined” or tightly knit syntax contributed to the compactness of poetic expression he wished his students to emulate in their prose. The second, equally important, characteristic for an understanding of what ἔστρυφνωθή would have meant to someone studying the Επιτάφιος, i.e., the rhetorically πεπαιδευμένος referred to in the heading, may be seen in the amplitude of his entire analysis of the original Homeric phrase, πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι. The artfulness of the abridged expression is relative to the amount of information distilled into so few words. Given our perception of twelfth-century Byzantine high style prose as loquacious to a fault, often unnecessarily expansive and repetitive, instead of concise or abbreviated after the manner suggested by στρυφνῶς πέφρασται, it comes as something of a surprise to see Eustathios dwelling on a literary style which aimed at an almost elliptical succinctness and brevity, qualities not usually associated with Byzantine literature.

Moving in the opposite direction, we can also gauge what quality of the Επιτάφιος’ style would have qualified as στρυφνός by looking at those cases where Eustathios identifies unusually limpid passages in Homeric epic. Donning the composition teacher’s hat, Eustathios presumes to illustrate how Homer could have expressed himself more appropriately στρυφνῶς than he had:

For this sense of συνεστραμμένως, see LSJ s.v. συστρέφω, VII.b; cf. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 4.942.28f., καί «προπάροιθε ποδῶν Ἀχιλῆος ἐλυσθείς», ὁ ἐςτὶ συστραφεὶς. In a letter praising the style of his former pupil Gregory Antiochus, Eustathios reiterates his endorsement of στρυφνότης alongside more customary rhetorical virtues like γλυκὺς…ῥυθμός, ὕψος, and λέξεως χάρις. Comm. 325.76–78, Ἐπι μὲ ὁ γλυκὸς ἐκείνος ῥυθμός ἐπικροτεῖ· ἐπὶ μὲ περιάγει τὸ κάλλος· τῶν νοημάτων ψύχος, ἡ πυκνότης, ἡ στρυφνότης· ἡ αὐτὰς ἀνακεκραμενὴ γλυκύτης· ἡ τῆς λέξεως χάρις· ἢ ἐν σχήμασι ποικιλία. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 4.21.2–12.

In the [verse] “the two men bringing to mind”, namely, those recalling, “the one [thought] of Hector [and] cried uncontrollably, while Achilles wept for his own father, or at other moments for Patroclus” the poet arranged [the words] with novel clarity. Since he could have expressed the whole thing differently, in a tersely sophisticated manner: “both men remembered [their dead], the one Hector, Achilles his father, crying” which is the key word here.

Paradoxically, Eustathios concludes that all the significant relations amongst the parts of the verse in question are almost too clearly spelled out. Such lindness left too little room for the suggestive brevity and syntactic artistry he identifies with στρυφνότης. He stops short of calling it a fault – Homer remained the touchstone of rhetorical virtuosity, after all – but he does note that the poet has arranged things in a “novel” way for epic, i.e., unexpectedly lucid. To further illustrate his point, Eustathios offers what he regards as a paraphrase more consistent with the coordinated brevity and syntactical elision identified by Dionysios as befitting the best prose and poetry of antiquity.

Eustathios was interested in particular stylistic effects, such as conciseness, density, or intricacy of expression, as well as the means by which to achieve these in oratory, though without surrendering too much intelligibility, a concern for one composing for ceremonial occasions at court. Isolated from genre, these stylistic features could be found in both verse and prose, as the following example from a homily delivered by Eustathios to his diocesan flock in Thessalonike demonstrates.

In the sermon, Eustathios makes reference to the passage in I Corinthians, where Paul says: τὰ βρωματα τη κοιλια και η κοιλια των βρωμασιν. Even as he continues to address his congregation, Eustathios reflexively channels the philologist inside of him and in his own indomitably academic manner adds the following stylistic comment about the text of Paul, who, it must be remembered, was also widely acknowledged as “ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ῥήτωρ” (which may have provoked the stylistic criticism from the former μαίστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων):

στρυφνὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ ἡ φράσις ἀσυμφανὴς καὶ δυσόρατος ἡ τῆς ἐννοίας ἀκολουθία διὰ τὸ εὐπερίγραπτον καὶ πάνω ἐπίτομον καὶ οἰονεὶ ἀφοριστικὸν· ὡς δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ παραδηλῶσαι τὸ πᾶν, κατὰ τινα χαρακτῆρα ἐπιστολιμαῖον ἐσχηματίσθαι δοκεῖ.

40 Or. 9 (Λόγος Ζ) 160.87–92.
41 Wirth prints ἡ τῆς ἐννοίας ἀκολουθία, which makes little sense. ἀκολουθία was used of ‘sequence’ in general and could refer to logic, syntax, or rhythm, see LSJ s.v. ἀκολουθία; cf. Dion. Hal. De comp. 22.25. The correct expression joins ἀκολουθία to ἐννοια: as in Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.3.72 τῆς κατ’ ἐννοιαν ἀκολουθίαν; cf. Apoll. Dysc. De Constructione 1.2.65 (Grammatici Graeci, ed. G. Uhlig, vol. 2.2 [Leipzig, 1910; repr. 1965]) κατὰ μὲν τὴν τῆς ἐννοιας ἀκολουθιαν, Basil Caes. Epist. 188.9.1 (Saint Basile. Lettres, 3 vols. ed. Y. Courtonne [Paris, 1957–1966]).
The language is austere and the expression obscure and the sequence of thought hard to make out because of its concision and overall succinctness and, as it were, its sententiousness; so that it hints at the whole in very few words, and appears to have been composed in a manner resembling the style of a letter.

It might be argued that the characterization of Paul’s passage is not inapt to Eustathios’ own style, even if εὐπερίγραπτον καὶ πάνυ ἐπίτομον again do not readily come to mind as qualities of the Ἐπιτάφιος, or of Eustathios’ writing more generally. More striking perhaps, and therefore revealing of Eustathios’ composition, is to see the style of Paul’s letters being described in terms deemed equally apt to the poetry of Pindar:

Οὕτω δὲ στρυφνῶς φράζει ταῖς ἐννοίαις κατὰ πολύνοιαν, ως έργον εἶναι πολλαχοῦ μία τινι σταθερῶς ἐννοίᾳ ἐνευστοχῆσαι τὸν ἀναγινώσκοντα διὰ τὸ οὕτω καὶ οὕτω νοεῖσθαι αὐτὴν… ἔστι δὲ δεινὸς καὶ οὐ μόνον τὸ ἐν ἕπεκτείνειν παραφράσει καὶ περιφράσει καὶ τισιν ἑτεροίαις μεθόδοις.42

And in this way he expresses ideas in a dense manner allowing for multiple meanings, so that in many places the task of the reader is to accurately arrive at some stable meaning by understanding it in such and such a manner … and [Pindar] is quite able to extend [the meaning] not only of one thing with paraphrases and circumlocutions and certain other means.

As a description of what we now call Pindaric poetics, Eustathios’ stylistic profile in the Prooimion to his planned commentary on the victory odes reveals a consistent preoccupation with certain features of composition which invested the Epinikia with a density and complexity already deemed challenging in antiquity. These were qualities Eustathios thought correspondingly suitable to the formally ambitious prose performed at court, not unlike Pindar’s poetry had been.43

The revival of στρυφνότης as a critical term in the Παρεκβολαί and the extension of the concept to the analysis of the prose styles of ancient Christian and contemporary Byzantine authors no doubt reflected Eustathios’ academic bent. More significantly, I think, it formed part of a broader initiative towards literary renewal through a combination of creative archaism and experimentation.44

---

42 Sch. in Pi. 20.19.

43 Pro. ad Pi. 2.2, 3.2. Like his analysis of Homeric epic, Eustathios’ analysis of Pindaric style assumes a broad historical consonance between performers at courts and the depiction of aristocratic and kingly virtue. As an author and instructor of prose and oratory, Eustathios is interested primarily in what rhetoricians refer to as decorum – the aptness or suitability of a particular style to the occasion and subject at hand. This allowed the twelfth-century rhetor to bridge the nearly 1,800 years separating him from Pindaric poetry.

44 The now classic account of this “cultural change” and its construal as an incipient Byzantine humanism, is by A. Kazhdan and A. W. Epstein, Change. The most systematic attempt to evaluate the literary aesthetics of this period on their own terms remains Hunger, Komnenenzeit. For a discussion of
Having identified στρυφνότης as a distinctive feature of two of antiquity’s most eminent poets and exemplars of style, Homer and Pindar, Eustathios attempted to apply its lessons more broadly to the prose of his day. Accordingly, we hear him praise the eloquence of Michael Hagiotheodorites (the brother of his fellow bishop Nikolaos, for whom Eustathios composed an innovatively hybrid funeral oration). In describing Michael’s formal achievement, he invokes the same combination of συνεστραμμένον and στρυφνόν employed in the parsing of Iliad 17.98, adding the further characteristic πυκνόν, or “density of expression”:

τὸ τῆς ἐν προφορᾷ διαλέξεως σεμνὸν καὶ οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ συνεστραμμένον μὲν οἶον εἰς σφίγμα στρυφνόν, καλὸν δὲ ἄλλως καὶ ἠρτυμένον ἡδονῆς μέλιτι.45

[I commend] not just the nobility of your oratorical style, but the dense, intricate wording as well on the one hand, austere as though held in check by a restraining harness, though in other respects beautiful and garnished with the honey of pleasure.

Taken altogether, the references to στρυφνότης in the Παρεκβολαί and elsewhere in his works suggest that Eustathios, and by extension perhaps, his students and patrons, placed a premium on a kind of ‘poeticization’ of prose style.46 By this I mean an economy of expression achieved by omission and suggestive syntactical arrangements. These would have been different from the limpid syntax of balanced clauses and repetition demanded by the perennial injunction from authors of Greek to achieve σαφήνεια, a perennially contested aim in post-classical literary criticism. Each Byzantine author capable of composing in the highest registers was left to resolve the conflicting demands of clarity or intelligibility on the one hand and an appreciable style on the other. Στρυφνότης appears to have aimed at confounding the conventional economy of prose. Of course such a style demanded a more active participation from the audience or readership, as highly pronounced styles often do. Στρυφνότης was achieved by a tightly “interwoven” syntax (συνεστραμμένον), joined to tightly compressed, elliptical phrasing, which Eustathios likened to a harness, strap, or some form of “stringent fastening” (οἶον εἰς σφίγμα στρυφνόν). Of course by its very nature, such

the internal tensions which may have helped produce what we have come to call ‘Komnenian literature’, see A. Garzya, “Polemiken der Komnenenzeit.”

45 Or. (Λόγος Η) 145.54–56.

46 Some time ago M. Lauxtermann proposed that Byzantine homiletic oratory may have incubated the otherwise unprecedented accentual poetry which arose in later Byzantine periods. To do so, it had to supplant metrical poetry’s aesthetic appeal with its own euphony and prosaic melody. See M. Lauxtermann, The spring of rhythm [Byzantina Vindobonensia XXII] (Wien, 1999) 74–86.
a style might produce a measure of ambiguity and obscurity, as Eustathios acknowledges in the case of Homeric verse:

> Σημείωσαι οὖν ὅπως ὁ ποιητὴς ἐνταῦθα στρυφνῶς γράψας καὶ δεινώσας τὴν φράσιν ταῖς συχναῖς ἀντωνυμίαις, τῷ «οἱ μὲν» καὶ «οἱ δὲ» καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις, εἰς ἀσάφειαν τὸν λόγον περήγαγεν, ὡς ἐντεῦθεν τὸ χώριον τοῦτο μερισθῆναι εἰς τριπλῆν ἔννοιαν.⁴⁷

Note, then, how the poet makes his text here unclear by writing in a strenuously elaborate manner and intensifying the expression through repeated oppositions of “those on the one hand” and “those on the other,” so that as a result this passage is divided among three [possible] meanings.

It is important to appreciate, however, the difference between an *incidental* ἀσάφεια owed to striving after the formal compendiousness of poetry, and a *deliberate* ἀσάφεια sought for its own sake or as a tactic of ideological or religious subterfuge, such as G. Kustas has suggested certain Byzantine authors aimed for.⁴⁸ We may nevertheless note the diametrically opposite perspective from which we lament the lack of straightforward expression in Eustathios’ prose and contrast it with the elliptical, dense, literary aesthetic he appears to have rated rather highly in his analyses of ancient poetry. Given our perception of twelfth-century Byzantine *high style* prose as anything but concise, we may be surprised to see Eustathios approvingly profiling a literary style whose hallmarks he identifies as succinctness and *under-*elaboration. Neither of these qualities is normally associated with the notoriously prolix imperial oratory Eustathios and other rhetors of his age performed at court.

If the actual orations strike us as either a failure, or worse, as pretentious, we do well to recall that Eustathios was not composing for our tastes. Whatever else we may conclude about the meaning of στρυφνότης, it was unquestionably understood by Eustathios and by the title to the Ἐπιτάφιος as complimentary, a testament to authorial skill. Inevitably, however, we must ask whether we can discern the στρυφνότης vouchsafed to the prospective reader of the funeral oration, or are we simply too far removed from the rhetorical sensibility of late twelfth-century Constantinople to reconstruct confidently the aesthetic evaluation it represents? Almost any paragraph of the Ἐπιτάφιος may be read as bearing out some of the stylistic traits Eustathios identifies in the commentaries on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The traffic in perception of stylistic patterns probably went

---

⁴⁷ Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.239.15–18. For this sense of δεινώσις, see LSJ s.v. δεινώσις.
⁴⁸ Kustas, Studies, 63–100. For the seminal discussion of the motives and tradition of deliberately obscure and otherwise inscrutable texts, see F. Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge, MA, 1979).
both ways though. His composition affected what he sought or perceived in the epic poems, and his reading of ancient poetry seems to have left its mark on his prose. Admittedly the latter is harder for us to gauge because the correspondences are not going to be necessarily one to one. This is not simply because we are comparing verse with prose. It is because we are dealing with two distinct forms of Greek Kunstsprache, one archaic, the other medieval. It is nevertheless historically worthwhile see whether we can make out at least the contours of style represented by στρυφνότης in an elaborate prose text like the Ἐπιτάφιος.

The most significant feature of Homeric poetry Eustathios thought pertinent to prose oratory was the elliptical character of expression joined to a rapid movement he tried to emulate in short, sequential clauses. Again and again, Eustathios preempts expectations of more conventional prose structure through closely interwoven but syntactically loose phrasing, sometimes verging on the kind of elliptical, impressionistic sense we associate with verse. It was this syntactic disjointedness, I think, which he read as “harsh” or στρυφνός. Without metre to hold the words together, Eustathios had to rely on his delivery of the oration in order to help his audience hold the different parts of the text together and to move effortlessly from one thought to the next, often counting on internal rhythm more than grammatical structure alone. Modern, silent readers of the oration can testify to this challenge. Much of the Ἐπιτάφιος exhibits a highly compressed clausal structure, akin to a mix of asyndeton and anakolouthon though nearly always within the limits of prosaic coherence. Στρυφνότης signals the jarring quality resulting from frequent and sudden changes in grammatical construction, but above all the sense that the clauses accumulate rather join in concert, as the section below illustrates. Of course like any text, this one, too, cannot be reduced to any single stylistic trait. It remains for us to fashion a working vocabulary for Byzantine prose style which can accommodate the variations found both inside and among the different texts.

No Byzantinist would hesitate to label the Ἐπιτάφιος a high style prose text. For all the reluctance to pursue Byzantine literary style in any systematic fashion, the single most successful paradigm used to classify medieval Greek prose remains the venerable stylistic template of high-middle-low. For Byzantinists, the formal rationale for that model was given renewed force in a seminal paper by Ihor
Ševčenko nearly four decades ago. Attempting to bring order to the discussion of Byzantine prose style, Ševčenko had recourse to the high-middle-low division as “a doctrine both ancient and timely.” In his view, the adoption of the tripartite classification was a matter of “scholarly scruple,” since, “a working Byzantinist does not need a precise definition of levels of style. He perceives them instinctively.” Ševčenko conceded that there had been “little systematic treatment of the levels of style in Byzantine prose” and went on to list the main features of each.

Although it was not his intention, Ševčenko’s characteristically concise and learned affirmation of the high-middle-low paradigm proved so successful that it effectively forestalled further inquiry into Byzantine prose style. The matter has seemed settled ever since. So convinced are we of the explanatory power of this model, that Ševčenko’s template has become something of a methodological fixture in the study of Byzantine literature. Like most, I routinely reach for it when talking or writing about medieval Greek texts. And yet for all the appeal of its internal coherence, the high-middle-low system lacks more specific content. It identifies the style of one level of texts by contrasting it against that of another, instead of identifying the salient differences within levels of style. Perhaps most misleading of all, the vertical arrangement of high-middle-low implicitly coor-


51 The examples are all drawn from hagiography, one of few genres in medieval Greek which can supply texts from all three levels. Since he states from the outset that he will not broach “the relation between levels of style and genre,” (“Levels of style,” 292) Ševčenko does not confront the question of the stylistic incommensurability of Byzantine genres. Hagiography, for example, does not produce ‘high style’ prose on the order of, say, historiography, or of court oratory. The ‘three levels’ thus tend to be applied inside, rather than across, genres. For such a discussion, without the questioning of the ‘three levels’ theory, see H. Hunger, “Stilstufen in der byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung des 12. Jahrhunderts: Anna Komnene und Michael Glykas,” Byzantine Studies 5 (1978) 139–170.

52 Considered by many the American doyen of the study of prose rhetoric, Richard Lanham has perceptively written that “the problem with the tripartite division is not that it is vague and thus inapplicable” but that “it is so vague [that] it is nearly always applicable.” R. Lanham, Style, an anti-textbook (Philadelphia, 2007) 74.

53 Browning has made the point by noting that linguistic register, on which the Byzantine levels are primarily founded, does not amount to a style, though it can contribute to it. “Within the limits by the occasion, the literary genre, the expected audience, and his own education a Byzantine author,” Browning argued, “could choose between different linguistic patterns,” a somewhat roundabout description of style See Browning, “The language of Byzantine literature,” 103–133, 103, 105.
ordinates style with a corresponding social and cultural hierarchy of authors and audiences. There is a *prima facie* social logic to texts designated *high* in style to be seen as intended for audiences which answered to a similarly “high” rank. Styles labeled *low* are commensurately thought to have been composed for more “lowly” audiences. In this scheme, the middles, in both style and social hierarchy, find their place by maintaining equal distance from both ends, high and low. Such a stylistic paradigm can seem convincing in an abstractly logical way. But how well does it stand up to scrutiny when specific Byzantine texts like the Ἐπιτάφιος are brought to bear on it?

The high-middle-low scheme fails to map accurately the style of Byzantine prose texts, in as much as it fosters complacency about an author’s particular formal choices. It also fosters neglect of broader, and subtler, patterns which may not conform to the paradigm’s basic premise of contrasting registers instead of styles. One such pattern is concealed behind the assumption, underlined by Ševčenko, of the high style’s marked preference for periodic sentences and hypotactic syntax. This assumption is based less on profiles of individual Byzantine texts than on a reflexive ordering of syntax in accordance with certain ancient prose models, as well as modern European literature which consciously sought to imitate such models. In contrast, Ševčenko observes, works in *low* style are assumed to employ “largely paratactic structures”⁵⁴ This is consistent with a perceived linguistic competence whereby *parataxis* is viewed as a sign of literary underdevelopment rather than a stylistic choice. Since it is presumably harder to achieve, *hypotaxis* or a periodic style signals greater verbal fluency.

Highly developed *hypotaxis* is of course harder to follow, especially in oratory. And so it has gone largely unnoticed that otherwise sophisticated *high style* Byzantine oratory, including the Ἐπιτάφιος, actually tends to employ various degrees of paratactic syntax. The clauses of such texts function largely as self-contained units of meaning, proceeding in *seriatim* fashion. This, incidentally, is a syntactic formula apt to the στρυφνότης Eustathios identified in Homeric verse, with its internally dense units of meaning (a feature translators of these texts can attest to). Sentences are thus coordinated by strings of conjunctions (καὶ...καὶ...) or just as often appear without conjunctive links, a rhetorical device known as ἀσύνδετον, employed by Eustathios to great effect; especially, one assumes, when performed. The sense units of such prose correspond to the syntactic equivalent of individual *cola*. As D. R. Reinsch has noted, this is a compelling

---

rhythm-bearing structure. Parataxis allows prose to approximate the rhythmical impression of verse.\textsuperscript{55} This is quite significant for a text heard by its original audience. It is also a stylistic feature of oratory conspicuously unaccounted for by the high-middle-low paradigm.\textsuperscript{56} Of course, as students of poetry know, paratactic phrasing can be as contrived and stylistically marked as the most ostentatiously periodic prose.

Contrary to our own intuitions about high and low styles, Eustathios only infrequently introduces hypotactic syntax into his otherwise high style prose orations. Greek allows for a measure of periodic syntax with minimal subordination, sometimes approaching parataxis in the accumulation of meaning, as in the following example of a periodic-style interrogative:

Συγκρούσαι δὲ πολεμίους ἀλλήλοις, 
καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἄταράχω καὶ οὕτω καταστήσαι 
καὶ τὸ ἐν εἰρήνῃ γαλήνιον καταπράξασθαι, 
τίς ἄρα κατ’ ἐκεῖνον δεινότατος; (Ἐπ. 17)

Such exceptions are permitted because one immediately perceives the relevance, and anticipates the function of the clauses preceding the main sentence. Still, they are exceptional in the 'Ἐπιτάφιος and throughout most of Eustathios' oratory. More common to Eustathian prose are sentences that strike a compromise between parataxis and hypotaxis, such as the following detailing the equal distribution of Manuel's governance and euergetism throughout the empire:

Καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ βασιλικὸν τοῦτο προμηθὲς, ἱκανόν, 
καὶ συνυσίβηκε τοῖς ὅλοις, 
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνωθεν ἕως καὶ κάτω ἱκανοῦμενον, ἄνεγχετο ἐις τὰ κόκλω 
καὶ ψυχής δίκην, τοῖς τοῦ παντὸς ἑγκατέσπαρτο μέρεσι 
καὶ συμκρούσαν γεῖν αὐδέν, 
ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα θεία, 
καὶ ὁποῖα βλέπων τις, 
ἄνεγχε βασιλέα τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι καὶ μόνον, 
καὶ ἐαυτῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀρκοῦντα, 
καὶ μηδενὸς τῶν ἄπαντων ἐπιδεόμενον, 
εἰ μὴ ὃτι γε, εἰς τοσοῦτον, 
εἰς ὅσον αὐτοὺς βασιλεύεσθαι καὶ τὸ φύσει δουλευτικὸν ἐνδείκνυσθαι,


Even though they are syntactically subordinate, the hypotactic blocks represented by the indentation do not require the audience to first resolve their relation to the first degree of syntax in order to communicate their sense. This is hypotaxis with minimum periodicity, and it seems to have been a conscious choice of Byzantine author-orators of Eustathios’ caliber, adopted as a style. Mapped out syntactically, the typical passage of the Ἐπιτάφιος reveals itself to be at once syntactically uncomplicated but stylistically more intricate than we might expect. So while there is some subordination, almost inevitable given the length of the oration, it is rarely sustained or extended past what we might call the first degree of hypotaxis. Thus in a typical extended passage, describing Manuel’s generous assistance to the reconstruction of churches, Eustathios adopts short, narrative-like statements which formally catalogue the destruction visited upon the buildings, followed by the emperor’s generous interventions to reverse the effects of the damage. The passage reads as follows:

At some point, earthquakes convulsed these buildings and toppled them, and the earth churned up their foundations. But the imperial hand raised the fallen holy bodies. And in cases where evil did not conspire against the foundations, but allowed these to resist destruction, it nevertheless attacked the structure above. In such circumstances it seemed but a small thing for the emperor’s generosity to rebuild the part of the structure in need of repairs, at least when he did not proceed to fill the interior as well with sacred offerings as a result of an outpouring of his goodness. And there were times when fire broke out, either by accident or deliberately set, and it proceeded unchecked, not sparing public buildings, and consuming many of those to which entry is forbidden to most. And once more in this case imperial munificence responded to the occasion and restored the good that had been lost. And no one may say that there was any disaster demanding to be overcome which reached such a great height and which did not immediately vanish.
The implied narrative of the emperor’s generous euergetism is evenly distributed among the participles and verbs of this passage, with minimum subordination. Even a dependent clause like εἰ δὲ μὴ θεμελίοις ἐπεβόλευε τὸ κακὸν is rendered effectively paratactic, in as much as the condition is folded into the narrative sequence. Meanwhile, the two short relative clauses: ὃν ἦν τὸ πολλοῖς ἄβατον... ὃ μὴ ταχὺ εξηφάνιστο, introduce briefly sustained variation in the syntax, though little in the way of genuine circumstantial contingency. The effect of the syntax is to make Manuel’s repairs to the buildings seem decisively immediate. So where a hypotactic style relies causal or temporal conjunctions to reveal the relations between the different parts of a sentence, a paratactic style will tend towards polysyndeton, using frequent conjunctions, alternating with asyndeton. Rather significantly, such syntax relies on the audience to work out the implied, and for that reason sometimes ambiguous, relations among the statements. If we visualize the syntax of the passage, in place of cascading hypotactic structures we get a paratactic inventory along these lines:

Σεισμοὶ ποτε ἀναταράττοντες τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐμαχομολογεῖν ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡ γῆ τοὺς θεμελίους ἀνέπτυξε καὶ ἡ βασιλικὴ χεὶρ ἀνίστα τὰ ἱερὰ πτώματα. Εἰ δὲ μὴ θεμελίοις ἐπεβόλευε τὸ κακὸν ἀλλ αὐτὰ μὲν ἀφίει κατευμεγεθεῖν τοῦ βλάπτεσθαι τὸ δ’ ὑπερφαινομένου κατεπεχεῖρε, ἐνταῦθα μικρὸν ἐδόκει τῇ βασιλικῇ μεγαλοδωρε τὸ ἐνδέον ἀναπληρῶσαι τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὰ τέντω ἀγαθοχυσίας ἐμπλήσει τοῖς ἐν ἀναθίμασιν ἱεροῖς. Καιροὶ τίνες, καὶ ἀνήφη πῦρ ἢ αὐτόματον ἢ καὶ ἄλλως ἐκ μηχανῆς ἐπίβουλον, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖνα ἡμιαναδεάσαι, μήτε τῶν κοινῶν φειδόμενον, καταβοσκηθὲν δὲ καὶ πολλά ἢ μὴ τὸ πολλοῖς ἄβατον. Καὶ πάλιν κανταῦθα καὶ βασιλικὸν προημῆς ἀντεπεξῆγετο τοῖς καρφικοῖς, καὶ τὸ ἀπελθὸν καλὸν ἀποκαθίστατο. Καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔχει τίς εἰπεῖν κακὸν οὕτω φιλοεικηθὲν ἐκκορυφωθῆναι εἰς μήκιστον, δ’ μὴ ταχὺ εξηφάνιστο.

When looked at as printed prose, the clauses in the passage above appear more formally daunting than the actual breakdown of the syntax warrants. If recited, however, the paratactic structure emerges as a succession of grammatically self-contained clauses which generate meaning by accumulation rather than by means of subordinated qualification. So even if one were to argue for a degree
of dependence in some of the participles: ἀναταράττοντες...καὶ ἐκμοχλεύειν ἔχοντες, the passage would hardly qualify as hypotactic. Of course a paratactic style need not be completely free of subordination, as the following dependent clauses of the passage above illustrate: Εἰ δὲ μὴ...ἐπεβούλευε...εἰ μὴ...ἐμπλήσει... ἀν...ἀβατον...ὁ μὴ ταχὺ ἐξηφάνιστο. Similarly, a periodic or hypotactic style can occasionally introduce paratactic syntax without significantly compromising its hypotactic character. In the short passage of the oration just cited, the conjunction καί, the syntactic hallmark of parataxis, appears no fewer than ten times within the span of a few lines, joining the clauses like irregularly placed posts holding up a long string of telegraph wire on which information streams along. This meant that the audience could process most of what was said as it was being recited, a vital feature of any oration. Listeners did not hold long strings of propositions in their mind while waiting for a grammatical lynchpin to fall into place for the meaning of the whole to emerge. Even those passages containing more subordinated syntax mitigate the effects of genuinely hypotactic prose by organizing their contents in a manner which sustains the paratactic delivery of information, as the syntactic breakdown of the following passage illustrates:

Τί δὲ;
Γένος μὲν οὐ πολυπραγμονητέον ἐνταῦθα
οὔπερ ὁ κατάλογος ὑπὲρ τὰ ἡρωϊκά,
ἄν τὰ σεμνά, έστι κατανοεῖν τῷ μαθήσεως εὖ ἤκοντι, ἐς ὁςον
βραχύτητος περιγέγραπται:
τροφῆς δὲ κανόνα διαχειριστέον
ὅς δὲ τῷ γένει συναναφαίνεται.
Καὶ τίς ἄν ἐπιμετρήσῃ χρόνον ἄρκοντα,
ἐνθά τὸ ἀκροατήριον ὅλην μὲν ἔχει πρὸς τοῖς ὃς ἡμῶν ἀκροατήριον
πλείω δὲ εἰς ἑαυτὸ στρέφεται,
καὶ τῷ θαύματι πεπηγότες,
ἢ συστέλεουσι τὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεως ἐνεργήματα
ἐν οἷς καὶ τό ἀκροασθαι,
ἦ ὅπλα τῶν ψυχικῶν παρανοιγνύτες δέλτους ἀστοί λογογραφοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς κατ’ ἄλλος
ἀλλὸν τρόπον τοῖς τοῦ κειμένου ἐπεξώντες βαύμασιν;
ἐν οἷς, καὶ ως ἐκ σπαργάνων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ παιδός καὶ εἰς ἀκμαίον δι’
ἀρετῶν ἦκων προέκοπτε,
τὰ μὲν ἔτεροις προγονικοῖς ἐμβαίνων ἔγνες,
τὰ δὲ καὶ πατρικῶς ῥυθμιζόμενος,
πλείω δὲ καὶ προσευπορῶν,
καὶ ἀρχαῖας ἀγαθαῖς προσεξευρίσκουν αὐτῶς,
ὅσα καὶ αὐτὰ εἰς ἀρχάς καὶ ἀγαθοπραξίων ἀρχέτυπα τοῖς
ἐπιοῦσιν ἐγγράφεται.
Although nominally hypotactic across its three principal segments, the passage nevertheless shows a marked paratactic tendency within each syntactical sub-section. This is in keeping with the accumulative character of the oration and of Eustathian prose more generally. As I argue in the section on the orality of the Ἐπιτάφιος, the text was composed in adherence to the demands of an aural genre whose prevailing syntactical idiom, parataxis, catered to an audience of listeners. Moreover, parataxis favours the poet or orator who wishes to appear to be thinking on his feet, instead of the precarious and rehearsed-sounding syntactical architecture of hypotaxis. Paratactic syntax not only better imitates the spontaneity of actual speech, it also significantly frees the rhetor from the burden of reproducing every clause and phrase in a very precise order. It thereby leaves room for some studied improvisation of the sort Eustathios points to when he praises Manuel for having reproduced his own speeches nearly word for word.57

Even recited, a long text would have offered numerous opportunities for stumbling over complex syntax. This was more easily avoided by limiting subordination and long periods. While the “and…and…and” of paratactic prose may seem rather monotonous when read silently, in the mouth of a practiced orator able to dramatize the actions of the verbs and participles, modulating intonation to stress the qualities of the adjectives, such frequent connectives offer opportunities to slow down or quicken the pace of the speech in accordance with the thematic demands of the subject. Moreover, the rhetor could more effectively anticipate the natural emphases and dramatic turns, making the otherwise simple(r) syntax work to his advantage.58

Paratactic syntax occurs more frequently in Byzantine prose, at all levels, high and low, than is usually assumed by the hierarchical division of registers. The reason cannot have been linguistic competence. Authors at Eustathios’ level did not lack the necessary proficiency in classical prose to reproduce periodic

---

57 Ἐπ. 33; for analysis of the passage, see the section on orality in the introduction.
58 It should be added, however, that besides simplifying the relations between the propositional units, paratactic syntax also inevitably enlivens the pace of delivery. In Classical rhetorical theory such an accumulation of coordinated, generally shorter clauses with few conjunctive links and little subordination was thought to contribute to γοργότης, or “rapidity,” lending vigour to the phrasing or λέξις of the text. While this quickening of the oration’s pace would no doubt have also depended on the orator’s delivery, it nevertheless helped sustain a sense of forward motion in the text; a not unimportant virtue in a long oration. Cf. Hermogenes, Id. 2.13.19; cff. Comm. ad Hom. Il.1.306.13–16, ποιεῖ γὰρ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα οὐ μόνον ὁῖς ἔπραττε σπεύδοντα, ὡς προείρηται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁῖς κομματικῶς καὶ γοργῶς ἔλεγε. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς συνεπισπεύδων ὡσπερ καὶ τῷ καιρῷ συσχηματίζων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐλλειπτικῇ ἔνταθα ἔχρησα τε γέμισε διὰ γοργότητα.
syntax. In Eustathios’ case this ability was even more pronounced, given his long years of instruction and methodical parsing of ancient texts. Byzantine prose syntax was therefore a matter of choice, proceeding from a constellation of factors to which style was the response. One possible reason *parataxis* became the default syntax of so much Byzantine prose literature (it is almost unavoidable in most Byzantine metrical verse), and especially in ceremonial oratory, might be sought in the legacy of late Hellenistic literary style Herbert Hunger characterized as “die Zerhackung der Perioden in kleine Kommata” (“the chopping up of periodic sentences into small clauses”). More importantly, perhaps, paratactic syntax became synonymous with a particular gamut of prose styles whose aim was ἐπίδειξις. If that is the case, what happens to the division of high-middle-low when the high and low end up sharing a key feature of style? The question is important because it reveals the inherent unhelpfulness of the oft invoked ‘levels of style’.

Style has tended to be assigned to Byzantine texts *grosso modo*. We flatten most distinctions inside each “level” and emphasize broad continuity among authors and genres. This betrays an indifference toward such variations in style as might have seemed important to Byzantine authors and audiences, as the πρὸς διαφοράν of the heading to the Ἐπιτάφιος suggests, and indeed comments across a variety of Byzantine works indicate. These were the very same differences which could earn an author like Eustathios much coveted patronage and a following among aspiring authors. Somewhat ironically, it is texts in the *high style* which are regarded as most interchangeable in this respect, despite the pronounced efforts on the part of their authors to distinguish themselves in the relatively small and highly competitive *epideictic* environment of the capital, with its public and privately sponsored *theatra*. Eustathios confirms the merits of

---

59 It is worth noting that while we do not doubt our own students’ ability to imitate classical Greek periods and plausible Attic prose, we frequently assume that Byzantine authors raised on ancient Greek literature were somehow not capable of this. We rarely discuss the possibility that they simply chose not to compose exactly as fifth and fourth-century Attic authors had, much as we choose not to write in the style of eighteenth or nineteenth-century English authors, despite our deference to them as ‘classics’.

60 Hunger, *Profane Literatur*, 88. It may also have served to compensate as a relatively simple structure for the often learned diction and exacting phrasing which the heading of the Ἐπιτάφιος boasts as the distinguishing feature of Eustathios’ style. Individuals in the audience who may have lost the thread of the speech might have been able to recover more quickly from short hiatuses in comprehension caused by an unfamiliar word, an unconventional metaphor, or simply as a result of a wandering attention. In contrast, hypotactic syntax or a periodic style makeσ inordinate demands on its audience’s ability to follow a more labyrinthine pattern of thought.

an accomplished style when in the course of another oration he extols Manuel’s eloquence by singling out qualities he no doubt regarded as characteristic of his own prose as well:

εἴχομεν τοίνυν διὰ ταῦτα ὑπόδειγμα καὶ τοῦτο κράματος ἰδεῶν δυσκατεργάστου, τεθρυλημένου τοῖς γράφουσιν, ὅπερ ἐκτὸς τὸ συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐν νομίμων σεμνότητα καὶ λεπτότητα καὶ τῷ τοῦ λόγου εξάρματι ἐγκαταμείζα τὰς χάριτας· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως άσυνήμβατα, ὅσπερ βρυχάσθαι λεόντειον καὶ κελαδεῖν ἀηδόνειον οὕτω καὶ σεμνοπροσωπεῖν ἅμα τοὺς λόγους καὶ εἰς χάριν διαγελᾶν (ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ ἄλλως έχων κρίνεται), ἀλλ’ ἔνταυθα τεχνικῶς τὰ δυσχερῆ κεράννυσθαι μέμικται.

And this, too, may serve as a perfect example of a mixture of styles which is hard to achieve, legendary among authors, which is to join into one the importance and nuance of meaning while combining it with the pleasures associated with oratory’s cresting eloquence. For if things which are otherwise incongruous, such as roaring out [one’s speech] like a lion and singing like a nightingale, just as giving one’s speeches the appearance of seriousness at the same time as eliciting laughter for the sake of entertainment (for the one is lofty, while the other is judged lowly), well it is precisely here that contradictory styles have been expertly blended by being joined together.

Whatever else he may have had in mind when invoking the Hermogenic or Hellenistic ἰδέαι, Eustathios’ praise of a “mix of stylistic features…legendary among authors” (κράματος ἰδεῶν…τεθρυλημένου τοῖς γράφουσιν) was not intended to contrast Manuel’s style from those lower down the axis of styles but from those in the same level. Here, as elsewhere, Eustathios is contrasting one style with another, not one level with another. To be sure, some of these distinctions may strike us as little more than the proverbial narcissism of small differences carried over into prose composition. We must nevertheless rely on Byzantine witnesses for which differences were significant and which trivial, making note of formal choices which have hitherto gone unnoticed or seemed of a piece when seen from the lofty vantage of the high-middle-low scheme.

But if not through recourse to a high-middle-low paradigm, how else might we approach the question of style in works as elaborate and demanding as the Ἐπιτάφιος? There has long been a consensus that the programmatic statements


62 Or. 13 (Λόγος M) 226.89–96.

63 One could cite the telling example of the so-called metaphrastic lives of saints. After being ‘translated-rendered’ into another register, the high-middle-low scheme tells us too little about the choices available within each register. The ‘high’ style achieved for the metaphrastic corpus of saints’ lives, like the paraphrase of Anna Komnena’s history of Alexios’ reign, do not simply climb or descend a stylistic ladder adding or subtracting features according to a measure of difficulty. The texts had to be reconstructed and, invariably, altered. For the significance of such ‘translations’ in the fourteenth century, see G. Horrocks, Greek: a history of the language and its speakers (Cambridge, 1997) 196–200.
by Byzantine authors in commentaries to ancient rhetorical handbooks offer little guidance.\textsuperscript{64} The reliability of Byzantine pronouncements on style notwithstanding, the overall tendency of the terms employed points unmistakably to something we might characterize as an attitude or disposition toward style, rather than a combination of specific linguistic features. That attitude may be summed up as proceeding from what might be termed the \textit{epideictic habit}.\textsuperscript{65} By this I mean the marked tendency among certain authors in Byzantium to draw attention to their works \textit{qua} verbal artifice or composed text. Such texts underline their own \textit{designed-ness} by drawing attention to the fact of their composition. This meant foregrounding the style of a work: the deliberate and calculated arrangement of carefully selected words from any register, but especially the highest and lowest, into a kind of \textit{Kunstsprache}. Such arresting patterns would have been hard to ignore. This is what I call “the style which shows”: literature which foregrounds its formal choices. Such works, I argue, make their design a part of their message.

Instead of a vertical high-middle-low scheme which fails to provide much guidance within each “level,” even as it encourages a spurious social ranking of texts, we might distribute medieval Greek texts like the \textit{Ἐπιτάφιος} along a horizontal spectrum of style. This would range from the quite \textit{transparent}, formally insipid, to the stylistically ostentatious, highly wrought and \textit{opaque}. This last characterization, “opaque,” has rather tellingly been employed previously to describe what were perceived as the failings of Eustathian prose. In a lengthy and otherwise favorable intellectual profile of Eustathios as rhetor, scholar, and bishop, Alexander Kazhdan nevertheless felt it necessary to concede that “his rhetoric can appear alarmingly opaque.”\textsuperscript{66} Kazhdan was referring to the reputation of Eustathios for almost exasperatingly difficult, intricate, and dense prose. Significantly, Kazhdan did not find fault with Eustathios’ ideas, indeed he credited many of them with unusual originality and humanistic intelligence. He argued, instead, that a prolix, needlessly convoluted, and unfortunate style frequently obfuscates Eustathios’ message by erecting a kind of linguistic screen.\textsuperscript{67}


\textsuperscript{65} The phrase is a variation on Ramsay McMullen’s celebrated coinage “epigraphic habit,” used to characterize the epigraphical patterns of ancient Roman society and their contribution to ‘Romanization.’ R. MacMullen, “The epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire,” \textit{The American journal of philology}, 103/3 (Autumn, 1982) 233–246.

\textsuperscript{66} Kazhdan, \textit{Studies}, 140.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.
Opaque means a too visible and thereby non-transparent surface. By a kind of metaphorlic extension in literature, this has come to mean unintelligible or baffling prose, in as much as the "surface of the text" – its style, really – comes between us and the meaning we seek. It is, in effect, what happens when language makes itself felt too strongly as parole, in Ferdinand de Saussure’s pioneering formulation. The aptness of the metaphor aside, it is unlikely that generations of Byzantine authors and audiences failed to notice that their literature was not transparent enough, providing them an unimpeded view unto the world like a window, but opaque. We thus meet an enduring postulate in descriptions of Byzantine style, namely, that style gets in the way of substance. The characterization “opaque” reflects a widespread and often moralizing conviction that language, specifically prose, has a duty to be as transparent as possible. It must get out of the way so that the author’s message may be grasped quickly and with as little effort as possible. If the language of the text is too elaborate, we tend to assume, it distracts from that message, if it does not altogether disfigure it. It is as if the too precisely choreographed style of much high style Byzantine prose got the better of its authors. Implicit in negative appraisals of “opaque” styles is the conclusion that Eustathios and other Byzantine authors composed as they did faute de mieux.

Yet what if we were to begin by assuming that like any other feature of his works, any opaqueness in Eustathios’ style was not inadvertent (and thus infelicitous, as Kazhdan’s analysis implies). What if we were to assume, instead, that it was quite deliberate and, more importantly, that it might have also been quite effective as a style for precisely that reason? The relevant question might then be whether the audience is invited to look at (or listen to) the text’s surface as part of attending to its content. In such a scheme, texts which invite the audience to take notice of their style, as the Ἐπιτάφιος certainly does, would end up on the opaque end of the spectrum, in accordance with the degree to which their style makes itself felt as style, through marked figures of language, diction, the marshaling of patterns of sound or rhythm, etc. In poetry, this would mean that the stately, archaizing hexametric paeans of Theodore Prodromos to John II Komnenos be placed not too far from the Rabelaisian and patently demotic verses of the Ptochoprodromic corpus. Much of so-called vernacular Byzantine poetry

---


is arguably designed to showcase its “demotic” form and would be accordingly classified alongside the equally exhibitionist archaizing poetry or prose. By placing them, as we have, on different ends of the high-middle-low axis, we suggest that they were different in kind and overlook a vital common feature: their shared willingness to showcase their respective styles.

Debates among scholars for which author or work deserves to be placed further along the opaque scale would have the added benefit of promoting a closer analysis of Byzantine prose styles. For stylistic analysis to bear fruit, however, one must proceed from the premise that style is no mere ornament. It reflects an author’s attempt to respond to, and in turn to shape, the audience’s attitude toward the subject at hand. Such a perception of style could be termed aesthetic rather than strictly rhetorical, in as much as it elicits a degree of self-consciousness on the part of the audience about the verbal artifice on display; whereas rhetoric tends to draw our attention to the choices of authors. Might this not be a start in gaining a better sense of where the appeal of Byzantine court oratory may have rested with audiences?

A veteran instructor of rhetoric Eustathios was bound to have been self-aware as an author. We thus see him addressing his own authorial choices, including that of style, in the heading to another funeral oration, this one almost certainly overseen if not written by him, for his recently deceased friend and fellow cleric, Nikolaos Hagioteodorites, until then bishop of Athens. The funeral oration appears to have been intended for a ceremony in a church on the outskirts of Thessalonike. Hagioteodorites’ funeral cortège had scheduled a stop on its way to Constantinople, where Nikolaos would finally be laid to rest. Eustathios decided to exploit both the occasion’s irregularity and his intimacy with the deceased to depart from rhetorical convention. He therefore borrowed from the two main funerary genres, monody and epitaphios, joining the pathos of the one to the panegyric-like quality of the other. More to the point, we learn most of this once more from the equally revealing heading accompanying the manuscript:71


71 Sideras, Grabreden, 185–187. For the Eustathian authenticity of the heading, see Agapitos, “Mischung,” 127. Much depends on whether one believes Eustathios produced an “authorized” edition of
An oration by the same author recited on the outskirts of the glorious city Thessalonike in the sacred temple of St. Nicholas the Sweet-Scented in the presence of the casket bearing the remains of the estimable and thoroughly holy [bishop] of Athens, a man of truly lasting memory, as he was being taken to the great city. The oration was mixed, neither unrestrainedly monodic (for the pure form of such a type would be unfitting for both the man lying here and the author) nor designed wholly in conformity to the style of an epitaphios so that it might retain the character of an improvised speech, a blend of both so that it is passionate in the manner of a monody but shining as well with his accomplishments in accordance with the conventions of epitaphios, which will be presented with a brisk style. If additional things should be introduced into the oration, it is the result of the author’s own practice, who delights in proceeding this way generally.

In both cases the heading underlines the very deliberate nature of the oration’s form. Deeming an unreservedly emotional style unbecoming for both the deceased and the author – thereby acknowledging the idea of matching style to individual character – but not wishing to furnish the oration with all the rhetorical trappings typical of an epitaphios, lest it forfeit the character of an improvised speech, Eustathios is described as having mixed both styles while making sure that the inventory of Nikolaos’ achievements was delivered in a brisk pace. As a kind of authorial coda, the heading adds that any further features inserted in the oration are a function of the writer’s customary way of composing, “in accordance with his own pleasure.” Again, we are reminded of motives which align more closely with conceptions of style and not simply “rhetoric” in the mechanistic sense we are wont to think of.

72 The text of Eustathios’ funeral oration for Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites is contained in Codex Escorialensis Y-II-10 (cat. Andrés 265), ff.34r-37r, and was first edited by A. Sideras, Or. 3, 31–50; note that Sideras has a full stop after ἀνεκομίζετο and he separates everything after μικτὸς δὲ ὁ λόγος from the rest of the title and the main body of the oration. He offers no explanation, though the smaller typescript here suggests, perhaps, that he deemed it either an interpolation or a supplementary note by Eustathios or his editor. The oration is included in the critical edition of Eustathian occasional speeches by P. Wirth, Or. in Nic. Hag. (B) Λόγος Α, 3–16. For brief, mostly prosopographical, commentary on the text, see Sideras, Byzantinische Grabreden, op.cit. 185–187.
In a detailed and exemplary analysis of this text, P. A. Agapitos offers a lesson in what close attention to style can reveal. He notes the assertion of independence from the conventions governing such orations. By mixing the two main funerary sub-genres and flouting the received rules of rhetoric governing each, Agapitos argues that Eustathios took the necessary first step on the way to fashioning an “original literary work of art.” A key element of this was the perpetual reworking of familiar motifs and commonplaces into a new yet reliably suitable form. Agapitos observes that Eustathios’ attempted not only to introduce greater variety to the traditions governing funerary oratory, but to fashion altogether new kinds of works. In this, he represents a broader trend of the twelfth century. Moreover, by offering an account of Eustathios’ commitment to an originality seldom granted to ceremonial oratory of this period, Agapitos implicitly raises questions about our received model for classifying, rather than inquiring into, Byzantine prose style. Eustathios’ aim in this funeral oration, he concludes, was to create a verbally stylized semblance of the impassioned, spontaneous expression of grief characteristic of monodia, while retaining the encomiastic themes of epitaphios. We cannot appreciate the difference sought with this fusion unless we register style. Still, as revealing as Agapitos’ specific observations on the formal novelty of this funeral oration are, their larger significance lies in the methodological path he carves out for the future study of Byzantine prose style(s).

The rhetorically luxurious style of the Ἐπιτάφιος was intended as a fitting tribute to its subject, a verbal pageant in the emperor’s honour. It was also, however, a tribute to its audience. They, after all, were the ones alive to appreciate it, and in doing so, to share in the prestige its performance conferred on participants. Writing of the motives at work in a conspicuously Hellenizing, i.e., archaizing, style of Byzantine court literature, A. Kaldellis observes that orations were also a “performance [which] took place in an idiom sufficiently removed from spo-

---

73 Agapitos, “Mischung,” 145–146, with relevant illustrations of both styles in nn. 98, 98.
74 Idem, 146, n.100, where he notes Kazhdan and Franklin’s commensurate conclusions with regard to style in Studies, 224–225.
75 Speaking of “ancient models and novel mixtures” Agapitos has characterized the tendency towards stylistic and thematic novelty and variety in Komnenian society as “an experiment that gave conscious expression to artistic innovation and that, ultimately, elevated the transgression of boundaries and the mixture of genres to an important characteristic of literary production in Komnenian society.” (quoted from the text of a lecture delivered by the author at Harvard University’s Classics Seminar in the Spring of 2001, and made available to me by the author).
ken Greek [so as] to act as a marker of identity.” 76 With more and more rhetors entering the capital’s ranks of aspiring sophists seeking patrons among the élite, distinguishing oneself in the Hellenizing idiom of oratory meant fashioning a more distinct style. An inordinate concern with linguistic form and rhetorical technique inevitably spoke not just to the author’s reputation but to the self-image of those in attendance. A text addressing a status-driven audience gathered in settings rich in ceremonial, decorum, and solemnity, was bound to seek a style corresponding to the social and ideological significance of the event. And yet no issue has impaired discussion of high style Byzantine prose quite like that of its presumed (un)intelligibility to any but a small coterie of authors and intellectuals. Is there any sense, asks H. G. Beck, in seeking after the binding features of Byzantine literature (by which he means literature in the upper registers) “when only the most selective group of philological connoisseurs were able to deal with [the texts]?” 77 How many people in Byzantium, it has often been asked, had the training in rhetoric and the sustained experience of both ancient and Byzantine literature, secular as well as religious, in order to follow – much less appreciate – an oration by Eustathios?

Without necessarily conceding the claim that most high style texts were as daunting as they are often made out to be, we may perhaps ask how few readers or listeners are too few. For that matter, how many would we consider enough? 78 Estimates of no more than a few hundred sufficiently schooled audience members (the πεπαιδευμένοι of the manuscript heading) are often cited to back up the argument that high style, secular, Byzantine prose was a socially and culturally marginal affair with little reach beyond a small cadre. In this view, even an oration for a significant ceremonial occasion amounted to little more than a self-indulgent exercise in cultural preening by and for a self-selecting intellectual


77 Beck, in his admirably concise account of “literary creation in Byzantium” writes of a literature in the upper registers “deren Texte in einer schwer oder kaum verständlichen Sprache abgefaßt waren... eine Literatur ferner, die sich in einem Rahmen bewegte, der oft tat, als lebe man noch in den Zeiten Platon’s oder doch Lukian.” Beck, Literarische Schaffen, 9–10. Beck’s claim that the archaizing language of such literature must have been “hardly intelligible” is widely accepted, though rarely substantiated with the kind of evidence which might account for the simultaneous profusion of such allegedly unintelligible literature.

78 Might not similar objections be raised about many significant works of ancient Greek literature, about Dante, or Chaucer? Were all those who attended the great Dionysia equally equipped to fathom the more enigmatic choral strophes of Sophocles? Was every Pindaric treatment of myth in the singular idiom of the victory odes transparent to all who attended the victor’s celebrations?
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Yet given his many occasional addresses, it would seem that Eustathios composed for diverse, and at times, probably overlapping audiences. Some of those who heard his orations at court might have also heard his homilies, or attended private theatra where his essays were recited, or possibly heard his lectures on ancient literature. Moreover, as bishop of Thessalonike, Eustathios had to preach to large, mixed congregations in a city without the cultural resources of the capital. The occasional character of so many of his surviving works, along with the broader profile of the elites likely to have made up the audiences on ceremonial occasions, belies the claim that he would have been composing for a small fraction of the capital’s most proficient intellectuals. On the day of the funeral commemoration for Manuel, Eustathios would have expected the audience gathered in the Pantokrator to be drawn from τῶν…γλῶσσαν λογάδα ὁμιλούντων or τοῖς λαλοῦσιν εὐγενῶς. Those claiming such status exceeded the small coterie of superbly learned intellectuals sometimes described as making up the only audience with access to high style prose. This, after all, was the language which distinguished the upper strata of Byzantine society made up of the educated and well-born. To be sure, not everyone who counted him (or herself) among the well-born possessed equal proficiency in the richest forms of medieval Greek. It would have been enough, however, that they swelled the ranks of those who did.

79 The precedent for such calculations was initially set by Paul Lemerle in his influential study, Le premier humanisme byzantin, in which he estimated the number of students receiving the necessary education to become proficient in the so-called ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία to be between two and three hundred. Le premier humanisme byzantin, (Paris, 1971) 257. Lemerle’s figures, cited repeatedly over the years, were impressionistic, at best (indeed he himself cited the figure tentatively). The subject stands in need of considerable re-examination, taking into account such evidence as we have from a wider variety of genres, including metaphrastic hagiography, sermons, so-called “popular” poetry, and genres once thought to have been the preserve of very few, like historiography. For the kind of case-by-case study which should precede general conclusions about the audience of Byzantine ‘high’ literature, see the recent discussion by Athanasios Markopoulos, “Le public des textes historiographiques à l’époque Macédonienne,” Parekbolai 5 (2015) 53–74.

80 Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.117.23; Comm. ad Hom Od., 2.58.9. Elsewhere Eustathios contrasts such speech with ἄγροικως λαλεῖν (Opusc. 19.52). Contrary to claims about Byzantine dogmatism regarding the use of an unadulterated archaizing Greek in the ‘high style’, Eustathios expresses an appreciation for the creative contribution of ‘foreign’ loan words. E.g. Comm. ad Hom. Od. 2.189.14–16 ὅλως δὲ εἰπέν, γέμει διά τάς ἐπιμιξίας μιρίων ἐθνικῶν λέξεων ἡ Ἑλλάς γλῶσσα: ἤ περ εἰ καὶ παρεκβατικῶς τεθεώρηται, ἀλλ’ οὔτε ἀμούσως ἔχει, καὶ οὔτε τῆς κατὰ τὴν χοίνικα σκέψεως ἀπεσχοίνισται, εἰ χρή πάλιν ἐθνικήν εἰπέν λέξιν ὁποία ἡ σχοῖνος, ἀφ’ ἥς ἡ ἀπεσχοίνισθαι. As Koukoules noted, Eustathios showed an equal, if not greater, linguistic broad-mindedness and curiosity about the lowest registers of Greek (where the number of loan words was also the highest). See See Koukoules, Γραμματικά and Λαογραφικά.

81 K. Metzler defines the traits of such an audience while wisely avoiding pronouncement on its potential size. See De Emend. 53.

82 A situation analogous to that of today’s ‘literate’ college educated classes who attend and support the arts out of all proportion to their actual understanding of it.
Like everything else, quality and extent of education must have varied among the élite, as must have the commitment to literature. Intelligibility and enjoyment of artfully composed speeches would have risen and fallen in accordance with such education and individual experience of texts. Nevertheless, few of those in attendance at the ceremony for Manuel would have felt entirely excluded from the sense of having listened to the funeral oration, even if only a few may have been able to appreciate every historical allusion, play on words, or arcane piece of vocabulary. Rather than a single audience of fluent Atticists able to make sense of the Ἐπιτάφιος, we should perhaps conceive of concentric circles of comprehension. Those within each circle would have experienced the intelligibility of Eustathios’ funeral oration in accordance with their level of education, probably aided by repeated exposure to oratory containing similar panegyrical formulae and topoi. In some important respects, Byzantine occasional oratory created its comprehending audience. Most importantly, perhaps, the variously proficient members of the audience had every incentive to leave satisfied that they had participated at the event, much as modern wealthy patrons of high art do today, despite, say, having trouble following the libretto of an Italian opera or the score of a Mahler symphony.

In her detailed study of Eustathios’ polemical treatise calling for a reform of contemporary monasticism, K. Metzler similarly surmises that the monks who made up the audience of the text were “obviously well educated and intellectually sophisticated,” having probably come from the élite strata of Byzantine society. While Metzler is right to point to an élite audience, I am suggesting that it need not have excluded everyone but the most highly educated, since there would have been many among the lay and clerical élite who were somewhere on the sliding-scale of comprehension. Such a model is sometimes referred to by literary critics as one of “audiences within audiences.” The men and women who

---

83 On the audience’s understanding of texts composed in a rhetorically demanding style: Reinsch, “Literarische Bildung,” 29–46. Reinsch writes of a public which, if it was to understand what was said to it, had to read books.

84 Martin Gilbert recounts the story of a British officer who described a non-English audience hearing Winston Churchill speak: “Everyone was deeply moved, carried away by the emotion that surged from Churchill in great torrents. It was not necessary to understand his words to seize his meaning.” M. Gilbert, Finest hour: Winston Churchill 1939–41 (London, 1983) 444–445. Of course, unlike Churchill’s audience, those at the Byzantine court were in the main native Greek speakers and so likely to grasp no small part of any oration. But might this have also made them more likely to feel alienated from such lavish displays of eloquence? Perhaps a bit of both.

commissioned and sought instruction from epitomizers and exegetical works on ancient myth and literature from authors like Ioannes Tzetzes, for example, quite likely did so in order to participate more fully in the court culture presided over by the emperor and leading members of the Constantinopolitan élite. Some among this élite, like Nikephoros Komnenos, a cousin of the emperor, were such literary enthusiasts that they took up the pen themselves, achieving an estimable degree of rhetorical fluency. Nikephoros, as it happens, was a friend and, in all likelihood, a former student of Eustathios. One can imagine an audience at court made up of both Tzetzes’ decently educated patrons and Eustathios’ quite advanced former students, each group able to appreciate an oration to differing degrees, all the while forming a single audience.

Of course Byzantine authors were not unmindful of the fact that an elaborate style employing learned vocabulary might alienate the less educated among their audience. They did, however, seem to believe in the possibility of a common rhetorical frequency in which to address both the educated patrician and the “simple” man. Eustathios appears to address the question while praising Manuel’s ability to speak at once to the high and low-born, thereby confirming that striking such a balance between rhetorical ambition and intelligibility was at least an acknowledged, if elusive, virtue:

Oh what sweetness of speech, what richness of arguments, what depth of meaning, plumbed from obscurity by the depth of his knowledge, what brilliance of language shed-

86 K. Varzos, Η Γενεωλογία των Κομνηνών (Thessalonike, 1984) no. 115.
87 So Michael Psellos, in his praise of the Greek Church Fathers as stylists, singles out their ability to combine higher and lower registers in a bid to amplify their message and reach wider audiences, which he submits more than compensated for their trailing the illustrious orators of antiquity in style and structure. Psellos compares the sermons of each of the Church Fathers with a famous ancient paragon (Demosthenes, Thucydides, Isocrates, Herodotus, Lysias), noting however the versatily and accessibility of each: «τῶν δὲ παρ᾽ Ἕλλην ῥητόρων ἑκάστος μίαν ἰδέαν τοῦ λόγου μεθαρμοσάμενος, ἢ τὴν υψηλὴν ἢ τὴν μέσην ἢ τὴν λεπτήν, πρὸς μόνην αὐτὴν ἀπεικόνισται…ὁ δὲ μέγας Βασίλειος…οὐ ζηλοῖ τὰ πολλὰ τὰς ἐμμεθόδους τούτων δεινότητας· καὶ ἔστι μὲν αὐτῷν ὁ λόγος ἀνεπιτήδευτο, βρωτὰ δὲ ἀτέχνως ἀνευόμενος ὡσιν ἐκ νεφῶν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀποκρύπτει φωνήν. On the Styles 124–131.
88 Or. 13 (Λόγοι Μ) 226.77–89.
Eustathios validates here an inclusive model of style by ascribing it to the emperor, though we should not dismiss the possibility that as in many other things, Manuel was eager to showcase his skill and may even have tried his hand at oratory (or possibly commissioned texts from professional speech-writers). Without defining its outer boundaries, Eustathios invokes the venerable model of a style balanced between the learned and the lucid. It is worth noting here that we have no evidence that authors of Eustathios’ caliber sought to exclude everyone but the most learned members of any audience, whose make-up they could not control on ceremonial occasions. Otherwise this meant shutting out the largest part of the empire’s élite, whose education and literary proficiency would have placed them at various levels below the topmost rung of the intellectual hierarchy, though by no means altogether out of its reach.

It goes without saying that dense, learned prose can be difficult. We must nevertheless maintain some meaningful distinction between formally ambitious oratory and premeditated or deliberate obfuscation designed to exclude all but a very few. The former runs the risk of effectively baffling some in the audience; the second aims at confounding and mystifying most.89 There is no evidence that Eustathios had such an aim in mind. In contrast, there is plenty of reason to think that he strove, perhaps at times unsuccessfully, to combine stylistic virtuosity and a pragmatic degree of intelligibility, albeit within the bounds of a style fitting to the occasion. Otherwise we must explain a highly implausible cultural

---

89 It is especially interesting to find authors notorious for their convoluted, ponderous sentences – Arethas and Theodore Metochites come to mind – denouncing the style of rival intellectuals as exasperatingly incomprehensible. *Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis Scripta minora*, rec. L. G. Westerink. (Leipzig, 1968–1972) I 102.20–203.6; cf. a response written by Arethas to an unknown critic who had charged him with ‘obscurity’ (I, pp. 186–91). For the acrimony over, among other things, style, between Theodore Metochites and Nikephoros Choumnos, see Ihor Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Bruxelles, 1962). The acrimony over style has been viewed as insincere, a pretext for discrediting rival rhetors in what must have been a cramped cultural market. But even if that is the case, such publicly conducted animosity over style gives us a measure of the significance attached to it by prospective audiences and authors alike. Moreover, it underscores the diversity or range of styles perceived by the Byzantines themselves within the same register. This last fact is important given our own habit of lumping all ‘high style’ texts together into one category.
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model whereby a small group of rhetorical aficionados managed to procure support from an élite largely excluded from the texts they had sponsored or underwritten with precious resources. But can we really apply a cultural model to the Ἐπιτάφιος which rendered it little more than high-sounding gibberish to most of those who gathered on a solemn and politically charged occasion to hear a long-ruling emperor eulogized? Might we not more profitably consider a model of intelligibility which afforded a significant share of the court élite various degrees of access? The audiences who gathered to hear orations in praise of Byzantine emperors, living or dead, were conditioned to recognize the formal qualities of such speeches as the public eloquence of their time. The real difficulty, therefore, in discussing Byzantine prose style stems from the mismatch between Byzantine aesthetics and our own literary sensibility. Rigour in any discussion of Byzantine prose style(s) must ultimately be grounded in our best historical reconstruction of their aesthetic perceptions. Unless we can discuss the style of Byzantine texts like the Ἐπιτάφιος as an integral part of their performance and subsequent publication, the field will not have achieved the normalization it seeks for its subject.

90 Relying extensively on Kustas, Studies, A. Stone has argued for “obscurity” or deliberate ἀσάφεια, alongside Atticism and variety, as a stylistic aim of Eustathian panegyric, in conformity with Hermogenic compositional prescriptions. “The arcane quality of many passages in Eustathios,” he writes, “is very probably to be explained by a contemporary admiration of the virtue of obscurity.” He attempts to showcase such calculated obscurity in a passage from Eustathios’ Epiphany oration of 1176, an address to Manuel which may justly be regarded as having rehearsed many of the themes of the Ἐπιτάφιος. However, Stone fails to demonstrate how the motives identified by Kustas as underwriting the use of obscurity in writers like Sikeliotes and Geometres would have been equally suited to the circumstances or purposes of occasional oratory at the Komnenian court. A. Stone, “On Hermogenes’s features of style and other factors affecting style in the panegyrics of Eustathios of Thessaloniki,” Rhetorica: a journal of the history of rhetoric 19.3 (Summer 2001) 307–339, esp. 329. For a diachronic profile of ἀσάφεια as a literary or rhetorical device in post-Classical rhetoric, see Kustas, Studies, 63–100.

The Aurality of the Funeral Oration

“The words the reader sees are not the words that he will hear.”

— James Joyce, *Finnegan’s Wake*

A funeral oration, as the name should make obvious, was a text composed to be heard. Stressing the *aurality* of the Ἐπιτάφιος therefore seem like belabouring the obvious. The point has nevertheless to be made, and its implications acknowledged. Despite an impressive number of surviving orations, including panegyrics, occasional addresses, and not least sermons, Byzantium is not frequently credited with a living tradition of oratory. When we refer to a Byzantine author as a rhetor (ῥήτωρ), we tend to think of his commitment to a set of formal rules regarding composition, and not, as Byzantines did, to the performance of such compositions. In contrast, “orator” is a term rarely used of authors like Eustathios. And yet most Byzantine authors could not have expected their works to reach a wider audience in written form alone. Recital remained the most common means by which texts gained any kind of an audience. Copies of a text could always be had, of course, but at considerable expense and/or expenditure of time and effort. Economic and material scarcity meant that the ratio of texts to audiences continued to favour recital. Moreover, individual reading from any

---


but the most deluxe Byzantine manuscripts was not easy. With the exception of codices of the Bible, most Byzantine manuscripts make few concessions to readers, such as word division or unabbreviated forms of words. Most manuscripts assume an expert reader or ἀναγνώστης who is familiar with scribal conventions. Even educated Byzantines were generally more likely to hear literature recited to them than they were to peruse a copy of a text for themselves. Recital remained the default setting for first acquaintance with texts. As was the case for most of pre-modern history, writing and reading were seen as facilitating the spoken word, not displacing it.

A number of factors, not least that Byzantine orations survive in written form, with all too few concrete references to the occasion or setting for their performance, much less to the audience, has tended to mask this vital acoustic dimension. The muteness of the written text is further exacerbated by modern editorial conventions which print all texts in a manner which encourages modern reading habits. Thus the pragmatic necessity of reading orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος becomes part of our interpretive framework. So while there exists an abstract awareness that a great many works were initially intended to be heard by live audiences, this rarely figures in the close analysis of specific texts. Herbert Hunger, in the standard reference work on secular Byzantine literature, lists "miscellaneous occasional speeches" (Sonstige Gelegenheitsreden) as a sub-section of the sweeping category "Rhetorik," which is presented throughout as intended for readers. Hunger's Gelegenheitsreden does not explicitly refer to orality as a key constituent of either the occasion or the design of the texts. Instead it focus-
es on the enabling circumstances, the historical timing of the text. Hunger does admit a measure of orality, albeit not necessarily as a defining, structural characteristic of the texts inventoried. But an oration cannot be reduced to a text anymore than a musical performance can be reduced to its score. The Ἐπιτάφιος, to take the example at hand, was a part of a larger ceremony involving all the senses, including hearing.

Byzantine prose genres are more often than not discussed in the scholarship as though they were published treatises to be pored over by a succession of attentive readers. To be sure, there were readers in Byzantium, perhaps never quite as many than in the prosperous twelfth century, with its many schools. But readers would not have made up the majority of audiences for occasional works like the Ἐπιτάφιος. That audience was by necessity made up of listeners. Unsurprisingly, we find no fewer than eight direct references to hearing and to “listeners” in the Ἐπιτάφιος. It has been argued that such references to speech and hearing in literate contexts amounted to little more than a long fossilized usage, a feigned or vestigial orality. However, such designations run the risk of being presumptive. Varying degrees of orality and literacy no doubt co-existed, often in a kind of mutually reinforcing dialectic, such as we see in much of the medieval world. For all its legitimate cultural associations with monastic scrip-

---

6 Hunger suggested that recital of texts was perhaps intended to compensate for widespread illiteracy in Byzantium. Letters, whose reading aloud he cites as possible evidence, certainly lend themselves to such scenarios. A more literate acquaintance might have served as ἀναγνώστης and read from a letter for the benefit of its intended recipient. See Hunger, Schreiben, 125. Hunger’s apologia for orality assumes its inferiority. It is a thing in need of a justification.

7 On the question of readers and listeners in Byzantium, see the remarks of Cavallo, Lire, 57–66.


9 References to aurality have been interpreted as metaphoric markers of immediacy rather than necessarily bearing on context and occasion. This is sometimes described as a Sprache der Nähe and Sprache der Distanz, as first formulated by the Romance linguists P. Koch and W. Österreicher, for whom proximity and distance represent two different conceptions of communication. See idem., “Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte”, Romanistisches Jahrbuch 36 (1986), pp. 15–43. Whether such an understanding applies to Byzantine court oratory and other occasional prose texts cannot be settled definitively without further study of the phenomenon across a wider sample of works, perhaps even across genres, including poetry.

10 Among the scholars who have written most widely about the extent, as well as the limits of western medieval literacy, B. Stock has observed that “one cannot speak of [Christian] literacy without the primal force of the spoken word.” The history of medieval literature, in his words, was “the continual reworking of this arrangement” between recital and the written text, between orality and literacy. The medieval ‘symbiosis’ of voice and text has nevertheless proven a challenge to scholars. See B. Stock, Listening for the text: on the uses of the past (Baltimore, 1990) 4; cf. Orality and literacy in the Middle Ages: essays on a conjunction and its consequences in honour of D.H. Green, eds. M. Chinca, C. Young (Turnhout, 2005); see also, Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im englischen Mittelalter, Hrsg. W. Erzgräber
toria – associations underwritten largely by the emphasis on the copying and transmission of Classical rather than contemporary medieval literature – Byzantium remained throughout its millennium-long history a decidedly oral society, with a significant part of its literature intended for aural reception, usually through recital in what came to be called theatra, i.e., live audiences.\(^{11}\)

In spite of the centrality of various oral genres, including homilies, imperial addresses, hagiographical recitals, and myriad forms of ‘theatrical’ lectures, Byzantium has nevertheless failed to acquire a reputation for oratory \textit{per se}.\(^ {12}\) Indeed, the word itself is rarely used by the discipline. Oratory, after all, brings to mind the lofty eloquence of democratic Athens and republican Rome, or their modern heirs in the parliamentary speeches of a Gladstone and the addresses of Abraham Lincoln.\(^ {13}\) With the possible exception of sermons, we have difficulty conjuring the setting or circumstances in Byzantium where speech could make a difference in the lives of people. We therefore routinely understate its occurrence and significance. We carry around images of a scriptorial middle ages against a declamatory antiquity, with their visual analogues of monks hunched over manuscripts in dimly lit scriptoria contrasted with ancient orators and philosophers depicted holding forth or declaiming in well-lit settings surrounded by attentive, eager listeners. In short, oratory is implicitly assumed to have been predicated on the classical culture of debate and persuasion, elements thought to be missing from intellectual life in Byzantium.\(^ {14}\) Thus a society in which the

---

\(^{11}\) It is interesting to note that remarks such as the following by D. R. Reinsch are not assumed to be belabouring the obvious but to be calling attention to an often overlooked aspect of Byzantine literature, namely, its orality: “Die byzantinische Literatur war insofern eine mündliche Literatur, als ihr Ziel in aller Regel der mündliche Vortrag war. Dabei spielt es keine Rolle, ob die Literatur nur mündlich konzipiert oder sogleich beim Akt des Schaffens schriftlich festgehalten wurde. Auch wer schriftlich Fixiertes für sich allein las, tat dies normalerweise laut, zumindest gemurmelt mit Lippenbewegung; völlig stummes Lesen ist die große Ausnahme.” D. R. Reinsch, “Palinodien eines Editors,” \textit{From manuscripts to book: proceedings of the International Workshop on Textual Criticism and Editorial Practice for Byzantine Texts (Vienna, 10–11 December 2009)} = \textit{Vom Codex zur Edition: Akten des internationalen Arbeitsstreffens zu Fragen der Textkritik und Editionspraxis byzantinischer Texte (Wien, 10.–11. Dezember 2009)}, eds. A. Giannouli, E. Schiffer (Wien, 2011) 175–184, 175. Cf. the remarks of Cavallo, \textit{Lire}, 14–18.


\(^{13}\) It is worth recalling the primacy of the Attic orators in the Byzantine educational canon, alone among school texts to be reviewed by Photius in the \textit{Bibliotheca}. And yet Demosthenes, Isocrates, or Aeschines are rarely thought of furnishing models of oratory and presumed to be simply exemplars of good prose.

\(^{14}\) See the discussion on \textit{paraenesis} for the persuasive dimension of the Ἐπιτάφιος.
vast majority of people heard texts recited or performed, has nonetheless found itself without orators or oratory as a productive category of literature.

A prolific author of diverse and voluminous works, Eustathios is most often described as a writer. Yet he owed much of his success at the patriarchal and imperial courts to his talents as an orator. Eustathios gained favour by harnessing his skills as a public speaker to the interests of his patrons, the emperor and patriarch. His role as the pre-eminent orator of Manuel’s court and at the Patriarchate became so much a part of his public profile that his own eulogists cite it among his most important accomplishments.15 Michael Choniates, a former student and himself an accomplished author and orator, gives equal billing to Eustathios’ career as an orator as he does to his appointment as bishop of Thessalonike; tacitly acknowledging perhaps, that the latter honour was conferred in no small part in recognition of his skill and its potential for a cleric:

For he sang, on the one hand, the glory of emperors engaged in great deeds and of patriarchs seated high upon their throne, meanwhile hosts of sophists and every kind of listener flowed in, drawn as though by the strumming of Orpheus. And he stunned [his audience] in turn, with a thundering brilliance exceeding that of Pericles, who set all Greece astir with his public oratory, since he surpassed the stentorian eloquence of Demosthenes and the piercing grandiloquence of Polemo.

The comparisons with Orpheus, Pericles, Demosthenes and Polemo in Choniates’ paean to his former teacher’s career as an orator – all to the advantage of Eustathios, of course – point to a neglected dimension of what is usually characterized as Byzantine “rhetoric”: namely, that it was an oral phenomenon as much as an abstractly linguistic and broadly cultural one. Even if Byzantine rhetors are assumed to have made more extensive use of writing than did their ancient predecessors, they nevertheless persistently styled themselves as continuators of a tradition of public speaking and persuasive eloquence. This is further corroborated by the Hellenistic and Late Antique handbooks on rhetoric to which Byzantine education in composition had consistent recourse. These represented the consummation of an educational model which assumed that the “young stu-

16 Mon. 291.8–14.
dent learned how to read a text with attention to its dramatic performance. If many of the medieval Greek texts testifying to this oratorical elocution strike us as ill-suited to the task, rhetorically over-wrought and too rarefied in their vocabulary to be intelligible even to a modest sector of the Byzantine élite, we must nevertheless defer to the Byzantine valuation of their capacity to captivate, amuse, and edify listeners.

Although overshadowed by his voluminous commentaries on the Iliad and Odyssey, the better part of Eustathios’ remaining corpus would have made its debut in recital before an audience. In addition to more conventional panegyrics and other occasional speeches, Eustathios composed numerous sermons and hagiographic works, as well as various ‘theatrical’ texts intended for informal audiences of students, patrons, or friends, like his dialogue between two clerics debating the merits of their respective sacred names, a historical diatribe against hypocrisy, or an ethopoiia involving a proud monk. All of these exhibit the rhetorically exacting standards of aurally attuned composition. Choniates’ recurring praises for his teacher’s public eloquence become more plausible if we bear these in mind. For they reveal the extent to which Eustathios’ reputation was founded on his talent for displaying his verbal talents before appreciative audiences:

Ζητεῖ καὶ σύνοδος ἱερὰ τὸν ἑαυτῆς διαφανέστατον ὀφθαλμὸν καὶ τὰ βασίλεια τὴν περιλαλοῦσαν ταῦτα φωνὴν καὶ περιαγνυμένην τοῖς πέρασι...Μέλιτος γὰρ ἀπέσταζον αἱ τῶν ὁμιλιῶν Εὐσταθίου χάριτες ὡς ἀτεχνῶς ἀπορρῶγές τινες νέκταρος, ὅθεν καὶ εἰς ἄκρον ψυχῆς μυελὸν τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς εἰδομένη τὰ διδάγματα καὶ ἀντικρύς ἐγκαόμενα, διετηροῦντο ἀνέκπλυτα λήθης ῥεύματι...Πόσοι μέχρι τούτου ρητορικαὶ χάρις ὥθεν νόμιζον, ἐως τῶν Εὐσταθίου σειρῆνων ἡκροᾶσαντο.20

The holy synod seeks her most percipient eye and the imperial court the voice which pronounced these things and reached to the ends of the earth...The graces of Eustathios’ speeches dripped with honey as though naturally distilled from nectar, for which reason

17 Valiavitcharska, Rhetoric and rhythm, 94; Valiavitcharska cites the grammar of Dionysius Thrax, which remained a staple of Byzantine education throughout the middle ages. It is worth noting Dionysius’s definition of reading as “unerring pronounciation of verse or prose”: Ἀνάγνωσίς ἐστί ποιημάτων ἢ συγγραμμάτων ἀδιάπτωτος προφορά. For the central place of declamation in education as bequeathed to Byzantium by Late Antiquity, see R. Cribiore, Writing, teachers, and students in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Atlanta: 1996); also, by the same author, Gymnastics of the mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt (Princeton; Oxford, 2001).

18 Valiavitcharska, Rhetoric and rhythm, 101, with n.26, raises the intriguing possibility that Eustathios’ Παρεκβολαί might have been “rea[d] aloud in a social setting.” Valiavitcharska cites the example of Tzetzes commentaries. These, however, were quite different in kind from the detailed parsing one finds in the Παρεκβολαί. Tzetzes’ works on the Iliad were intended for a different level of audience.

19 Or. quadr.

his lessons penetrated deep into the marrow of the audience’s soul and seared directly onto it, preserved unscathed by the stream of oblivion…How many up to that time thought themselves to be offering sacrifices to the rhetorical Graces, until they heard the sirens of Eustathios.

Choniates attests to Eustathios’ legacy as a practicing orator, able to make someone “while away the whole day listening to him quite gladly, forgetting his own affairs like the storied lotus eaters” (ὡς τὸν ἀκροώμενον δημερεύειν ἄσμένως, τῶν οίκοι κατὰ τοὺς λωτοφαγοῦντας λαθόμενον).21 We may suspect that he dwells on Eustathios’ virtuosity as an orator precisely because it was a key skill which enabled men like himself to present themselves as candidates for high ecclesiastical office. Piety and thoroughgoing knowledge of scripture could only prove effective to a high-ranking cleric if harnessed to a requisite eloquence.22 This observation tracks well with the coincidence of those who had formerly held the grandiose title of μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, an imperially sponsored post as the capital’s leading instructor of rhetoric.23 The post itself has attracted its share of scholarly interest in no small part because it illustrates the institutional formalization of the symbiosis between the regime and its leading rhetoricians.24 This has generally been seen as being consistent with the preference for learned men in the hierarchy of church and state. But erudition alone does not account for the emphasis on oratory associated with this position. Choniates’ portrait of Eustathios may thus be read as a highly stylized but not inaccurate estimate of the latter’s activity and reputation as a professional orator while he held the post μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων.25

21 Idem., 290.9–10.
22 Ironically for someone who had praised his teacher as another Pericles and Demosthenes, Choniates would discover the limits of his own eloquence while addressing his Athenian congregation after being appointed as bishop of Athens. See Michael Choniates, Ῥασῳζόμενα, ed. S. Lampros (Athens, 1880) I, 124: Ἐγὼ μὲν ἤσκουν τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν παρέθηγον καὶ πρὸς ἀκροατὰς Ἀθηναίων ἀπογόνους ἐνεγυμναζόμην…Τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν φιλολόγων ἀπογόνους ἐλπίζων ἔχειν ἄκροατας, ἤσκουν ἐμαυτόν ὡς ἕνι μάλιστα καὶ πρὸς τὸ σοφότερον ἔβιαζόμην τι καὶ οὐ κεκομψευμένον, μὴ οὐκ ἀνάξιος τροφεύς τὰ ἐς λόγους τοιάς ἐπανήλθεντας καὶ οὐκ ἀνήγορος τῆς προσδοκίας ἐκπέπτωκα.
23 While the erudition and articulateness of candidates for important bishoprics is often mentioned in connection with the background in rhetoric many bishops had, their talents as practiced orators are elided. For the intellectual profiles of many high profile bishops under the Komnenians, see Angold, Church and society, 94, 146–147, 179.
24 For the institutional aspects of the office of μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, see J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les Ορθοπέδια de l’église byzantine, [Archives de l’Orient Chrétien ii] (Paris, 1970) 69, 78–79. Magdalino, Empire, 414–427, situates the μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων within the broader “image-making” machinery of the court, aptly likening his rôle to that of the mint which produced coins with the emperor’s profile.
25 Gregorios Antiochus informs us in a funeral oration for Nicholas Kataphloron, his and Eustathios’ common teacher (indeed so much a mentor to that Eustathios appears to have been known as τοῦ Καταφλόρων, later mistaken as his patronymic) their former teacher had also held the post of μαίστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων. Sideras, 25 Unedierte Grabreden, 51–74; cf. P. Wirth, “Zu Nikolaos Kataphloros,” Classica et mediaevalia XXI (1960) 213f.
Paul Magdalino has given us a landmark account of the contributions of the rhetors to Manuel’s ideological profile. Such a profile is possible in the first place because of the unusually high number of surviving orations praising Manuel, which Magdalino reasonably attributes to the dramatic increase in the production of panegyrical ‘literature’ during Manuel’s reign. And while he notes, in passing, that such encomia were “composed, in principle, for oral delivery to the ‘theatre’ over which the emperor presided,” the poetics and pragmatic requirements of this efflorescence in oratory – texts carried by the voice to the ear – is eclipsed in Magdalino’s account by the political and propagandistic motifs and topoi of the speeches.

In a much quoted earlier survey of the surviving corpora of imperial panegyric, George Dennis had attempted to address some of the questions which arise from consideration of these texts as a genre. More inclined to give form its due, Dennis asked whether it was possible to express a well grounded opinion about these texts, in light of the often overlooked fact that they had been composed to be heard, while the modern scholar can only read them. Dennis’ methodological quandary bears quoting at length since it allow us to appreciate how orality has been framed on those rare occasions when it has been invoked for specific texts. Also because the imperial panegyric he is referring to is similar in both form and content to the Ἐπιτάφιος:

It is very difficult to evaluate these panegyrics as rhetoric and as literature. These were speeches, and, unless we hear them delivered orally and in the language in which they were composed, accompanied by the appropriate gestures, we miss their full impact. Were they any better or worse than the baroque orations of, say, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries given at royal and pontifical courts? We dislike much about their speeches, but they clearly seem to have liked them. Certainly the emperors liked them; at any rate, they kept inviting the speakers back to give yet another speech…

Dennis’ admonition not to judge the aesthetic merits of panegyrical oratory, deferring rather to contemporary Byzantine taste now seems doubly out of step with current modes in scholarship. As staunch relativists in all matters of culture,
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we are unlikely today to formulate an opinion about the aesthetic merits of a medieval text like the Ἐπιτάφιος. More importantly, however, we are even less likely to insist on intrinsic pleasure as a decisive factor in their production of the text. The emphasis in current analysis on the broadly thematic or ideological content of encomia has relegated consideration of form or style and its gratifications to a largely subordinate, if not altogether peripheral, status. A focus on orality means the return of form to an equal footing with content; not so much on the basis of vague estimates of ‘taste’ but on the firmer ground of discernable rhetorical structure and other acoustic effects. One may thus ask how much of what is said in the Ἐπιτάφιος was at least as much a function of how it was said.

The dialectic between form and content, always present in any text, nevertheless becomes more pronounced when every formal choice must prove effective in recitation or performance.

By raising the issue of a largely irretrievable aural dimension of panegyric, Dennis was introducing a pragmatic, albeit slightly pessimistic, historicism to the study of these texts. Yet there is also something heterodox about Dennis’ argument. While it is routinely acknowledged that imperial panegyrics (which would include the Ἐπιτάφιος) were in fact intended as orations, Dennis also raised a potentially more interesting and methodologically consequential point. He asked, in effect, whether texts delivered in one medium, in this case an oral one, to which performative gestures may well have been added along with modulation of voice, physical setting, and the expectations engendered by a ceremonial occasion, can really be evaluated in another medium, the mute written text shorn of its performative dimension. Ultimately, the answer to Dennis’ question is furnished by the Byzantines themselves. These same texts were copied out and circulated in order to be studied as models of oratory, demonstrating that some basic measure of effective orality was thought to be transferable in writing, at least to readers with a practiced and discerning ear. Hence the reference to πεπαιδευμένοι and to the manner of composition in the heading to the Ἐπιτάφιος. No one commissioning a copy of the funeral oration for Manuel could have expected to see and hear it performed again.29 Practicing or aspiring Byzantine rhetors nevertheless assumed that they could, with occasional help from the manuscripts, read for oral effects. They were, in effect, listening for the

29 It is tempting to imagine such orations copied, then circulated in the provinces in order to be recited to local élites in a bid to bind them to the governing programme and ethos of the imperial court. I am unaware of strong evidence for such dissemination of court oratory, though it may be that we have not been looking for evidence of this. The illustrations of recital in the Madrid Skylitzes may offer some clues.
sound of the text’s structure. They could, therefore, read a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος and remain attentive to the aural potential of its syntactical cadences, calculated stress patterns, internal responson, sound play (like consonantal assonance), repetition with variation, rhythmic anaphora, occasional rhyming and accentual patterns. Such alertness to the acoustic features of oratory no doubt came more easily to ears accustomed to the manner, tempo, and the dramatic inflection of recitation.\textsuperscript{30} The ability to read for orality in the text, and not simply equate orality with the act of recitation, reminds us that orality is not something simply done to an existing text by means of the voice; it is something intrinsic to the rhetorical skeleton and sinews of a work, affecting nearly every facet of its composition, from diction to punctuation. It nevertheless remains for us to identify the orality of Byzantine oratory.\textsuperscript{31}

Rhetorical effects communicable by voice are more discernable in some cases. In a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος they can be more elusive. The most conspicuous form of aurality are the patently rhythmical clausulae which round off the sentences of certain prose texts. These were analyzed and comprehensively catalogued by Wolfram Hörandner in his seminal study, Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner.\textsuperscript{32} Hörandner asked a relatively simple question: do Byzantine prose texts exhibit the kind of discernable rhythmical flourishes at the end of periods as one finds in the stylistically mannered ‘Asi-anic’ Greek and Latin Kunstprosa of the late Hellenistic and Roman periods?\textsuperscript{33} His meticulous inventory of the various types and sub-types of medieval Greek rhythm-inducing accentual patterns which close the periods of Byzantine prose has since become a basic starting point for the study of embedded orality. The quasi-metrical, sing-song quality exhibited in the accentual patterns of some Byzantine prose, Hörandner emphasizes, were of a piece with rhetoric’s tradi-

\textsuperscript{30} Eloquence in composition was taught since antiquity as derived from word arrangement and clausal cadence: cf. Rhet. gr. 7.2.885–886, σύνθεσίς ἐστιν ἡ τῶν λέξων ἁρμονία…όπερ ἐν ἀναγγέλσει (“Composition is the harmony of words...evident when reading aloud.”) Like so many other features of prose style, elementary principles of rhythm in Byzantium were taught using Hermogenes’ On Types of Style, where rhythm is a function of word order (συνθήκη) and cadence (ἀνάπαυσις) (Hermogenis opera, ed. Rabe (Lipsiae, 1913) 219–221).

\textsuperscript{31} We may take some heart from precedent: scholars of ancient oratory continue to search for demonstrable traces of orality in texts whose fame rests in no small part on having been performed before live audiences of jurors or citizen-legislators. See M. Gagarin, “The orality of Greek oratory,” Signs of orality: the oral tradition and its influence in the Greek and Roman world, ed. E. A. Mackay (Leiden, 1999) 163–86.

\textsuperscript{32} Hörandner, Prosarhythmus.

\textsuperscript{33} Hörandner’s investigation took as its point of departure the equally seminal, if at times exaggerated, conclusions of Friedrich Blass’ Die Rhythmen der asiatischen und römischen Kunstprosa: Paulus, Hebräerbrief, Pausanius, Cicero, Seneca, Curtius, Apuleius (Leipzig, 1905).
tional appeal to “acoustic appreciation.” But while Hörandner’s specific findings have enjoyed wide acceptance, they have not prompted further inquiry into the necessary premise of his authoritative study, namely, that all rhythmical elements derive from, and in turn re-enforce, the acoustic reception and appreciation of Byzantine prose. For rhythm, like most features of Byzantine rhetoric, Hörandner observes, originated in a presumed orality (Mundlichkeit) whose venues ranged from the classroom, the ambo, the imperial audience hall, or the privately sponsored theatron.

The methodical study of accentual design in clausulae and periods has raised the possibility of isolating the rhythmical ‘signatures’ of different authors, a potential boon to the bedeviling work of Echtheitskritik, the attempt to either confirm or refute the authorship of particular works. Such utility aside, however, Hörandner’s seminal study has not fulfilled what I regard as its more fundamental promise. It has not prompted the kind of rigorous inquiry into a wider range of oral/aural features of Byzantine prose. We have made few gains in re-conceiving medieval Greek literature in more systematic fashion as intrinsically keyed to oral delivery and aural reception. To take the example at hand, authors of later medieval Greek literature destined for recital and performance were not likely to have been indifferent to the rhythm and cadence of their prose, even if they did not adopt the more obvious patterned clausulae recorded by Hörandner. But rhythm in oratory, including imperial encomia and funeral orations, was not likely to have been confined to a few syllables at the end of a final period, despite the musical effect. As Vessela Valiavitcharska observes in her close study of rhythm in the rhetorical prescriptions of the Late Antique handbooks, “the unit of prose rhythm is not simply the closing cadence.”

I would argue instead that oral delivery or recitation in various settings from the classroom to the refectory rendered Byzantine authors reflexively responsive to the aural requirements of composition. The absence, therefore, of discernable accentual patterns in a Eustathian oration like the Ἐπιτάφιος should not be

34 “All die Mittel, die die Metrik und auch die Rhetorik einsetzt, sind auf akustische Wahrnehmung angelegt, sei es im öffentlichen Vortrag, sei es in der Rezitation im kleinen Kreis der Freunde, sei im Übungsbetrieb der Schule.” Hörandner, Prosarhythmus, 50.
35 The rhythmical flourishes indexed by Hörandner inevitably bring back the aesthetic question raised by Dennis for imperial panegyric, though without the anachronistic factor of modern appreciation of Byzantine prose styles.
36 The tendency of Byzantine authors to write in formally distinct genres while adopting the conventions of those genres, limits the potential utility of an authenticating rhythmical ‘test.’
37 Valiavitcharska, Rhetoric and rhythm, 15–16.
38 Valiavitcharska, Rhetoric and rhythm, 38.
construed as an indifference to the rhythmical patterning of its content. In fact, it should prompt us to be on the look-out for more diffuse forms of rhythm and other sensory acoustic patterns. Eustathios’ own interest in rhythm, as both an instructor and practitioner of rhetoric, may be gauged by his attentiveness to the subject in his extensive and meticulous analysis of Homeric epic, which he cast as a form of apprenticeship for aspiring rhetors. Although there he broaches the subject of rendering a work rhythmical (εὐρύθμως) in connection with the metres of ancient poetry, it is the former which constitutes the lesson for his contemporaries since it was the more immediately relevant of the two.

Commenting on *Iliad* 9.122–123, where each dactylic foot aligns perfectly with the word division in the line, Eustathios observes that such a coincidence allows the rhythm to overwhelm the metre.39 In identifying an admittedly minor fault in versification (Eustathios stops short of labelling the verses cacophonous or otherwise unworthy of ‘the poet’), he reiterates a basic assumption about prose rhythm in the post-Classical era: namely, that it derived from discrete clausal sequences, which in turn depended on the internal cadence of individual words and their stress pattern across syllables. This tended to mark individual blocks of sense off as distinct rhythmical units. Moreover, the acoustic effect of rhythm was almost wholly dependent on the orator’s modulation and tempo during delivery, a facet of the text lost in our “silent and sluggish reading of Komnenian literature” which was originally designed to be performed by “trained orators.”40 Byzantine oratory thus generated, and proceeded to satisfy, a form of patterned aural anticipation we tend to associate with verse, albeit without the easily identifiable regularity of most ancient metres.41 In this respect, it is worth noting the degree to which the Byzantine perception of prose oratory can sometimes resemble a form of free verse if voiced as semantic sequences at once

---

39 *Il. 9.122–123 ἑπτ’ ἀπύρους τρίποδας, δέκα δὲ χρυσοῖο τάλαντα / αἴθωνας δὲ λέβητας ἐείκοσι, δώδεκα δ’ ἰπποῦς. For Eustathios’ rhythmical parsing of these two verses see Comm. ad Hom. Il. 2.671.27–672.9, Ἐνθά δυσὶ στίχοις φιλοτιμεῖται τέσσαρα δώρα ἐμπεριγράφαι, εἰπὼν «ἐπτ’ ἀπύρους τρίποδας, δέκα δὲ χρυσοί τάλαντα, αἴθωνας δὲ λέβητας ἐείκοσι, δώδεκα δ’ ἰπποῦς». Τούτων δὲ τῶν στίχων ἐκατέρου ἡ εἰς ἀνά δύο ἐννοιας τομη σοὶ πάντων μετρικῶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἵ φασίν, ὅτι τὸ μέτρον χαίρει μὲν συνδεσμεύει τοὺς πόδας ἀλλήλοις, ως κατά μηδέν εἰς μέρος ἀπαρτίσει λόγου, οἷον «Ἔνθων με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεος πέλασσε». Παρατίθεται δὲ ωσπερ τὸ κατὰ πόδα τέμνεσθαι, οἰον «ὕβριος εἵνεκα τῆς ἑθής, σὺ δ’ ἵσχε» ἔνθα καθ’ ἕνα ἕκαστον πόδα καὶ μέρος λόγου ἀπαρτίζεται, οὕτω καὶ τὴν δίχα τομήν ἔγινεν τὴν ὡς τὸ «ἔκακο ἐννοιας, ως τὸ ἔνθως ἀπτὴ ἰδομενεῖς τῆς βασιλείας» οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν τριχή καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖον διαίρεσιν. Ῥυθμικά γάρ, φασί, ταυτά ἡ μετρικά. Οὕκοι καί τὰ τριγέννα δύο ἐπὶ ῥυθμικότερον διάκειναι. καὶ οὕτω μὲν τούτῳ.


41 Hence the recommendation from Dionysius of Halicarnassus that prose “should appear metrical but not be in meter” (De comp. 25); cf. Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and rhythm*, 37, n.24 for further examples.
The aurality of the funeral oration is rhythmically independent and contextually interrelated. But as Valiavitcharska observes of the theoretical affinity between Byzantine analysis of verse and cadence in rhetoric, oratorical rhythm lay somewhere “at the intersection of prose and poetry.” Paradoxically enough then, between medieval Greek prose destined for an audience of listeners and one with equal amounts of Greek verse, it is prose which proves the more dependent on oral delivery in order to achieve its acoustic effects.

Assuming the Ἐπιτάφιος was delivered in some version not too dissimilar from the one we have. Is the orality of the text still perceptible? Can the mind, aided by the eye, without benefit of a historical ear, discern the aural surface and organization of the text? The real question, then, is how to uncover the vocal dimension in a transcribed text; how to read for voice. As I explain at greater length in the section dealing with the στίξις of the Basel Codex, the punctuation preserved by the manuscripts may provide some guidance for the suggested pacing of delivery, such as where to pause or halt for effect, or where to move briskly through the text, tying all the elements of the sentence together in a single articulated segment. This would not be possible in any systematic fashion unless it had been built into the design of the text. Employing the analogy once more of a musical score to its performance, the text of an oration is not unlike an unsung libretto. But the aurality of the Ἐπιτάφιος was not simply a function of the orator’s delivery, just as the drama in a script is not simply a matter of an actor’s locution. Orality framed the text’s composition, from its diction to its syntactical relations. And while we cannot replicate the experience of hearing the text performed, we may nevertheless be able to isolate enough of the features upon which the performance rested. We may thus be able to arrive at a partially reconstructed frame of reference for oral features of texts. Again, this should not be confused with anything like a step towards recreating the historical expe-

42 V. Valiavitcharska, Rhetoric and Rhythm, 89. Not coincidentally, perhaps, a formally stylized dimension of orality embedded in certain types of Byzantine prose was mapped by a specialist in Byzantine verse, W. Hörandner. Building on Hörandner’s work, M. Lauxtermann has conjectured that Byzantine twelve and fifteen-syllable accentual poetry evolved not from earlier verse models but from post-Classical rhythmically inflected prose designed for performance. See “The velocity of pure iamb: Byzantine observations on the metre and rhythm of the dodecasyllable,” JOB 48 (1998) 9–33; as well as the groundbreaking study by Lauxtermann, Spring of rhythm.

43 For the possibility of revisions prior to ‘publication’, see the discussion below.


45 In his landmark study of orality and sound in Western mediaeval literary genres, Paul Zumthor compared the difficulty of ‘listening’ to the extant texts with that of seeing the glass when looking at a mirror: “Il s’agit alors pour nous d’essayer de voir l’autre face de ce texte-miroir, de gratter au moins un peu de tain.” P. Zumthor, La lettre et la voix, ou de la “littérature” médiévale (Paris, 1987) 37.
perience of hearing the text. The use of the word ‘performance’ is intended here as a reminder that the delivery of the text on the specific occasion amounted to more than mechanical recital; it involved a sense of drama inherent to the text.\textsuperscript{46} This, more than the mere fact of voiced text, lay at the heart of Dennis’ reluctance to draw conclusions from panegyric speeches intended for recital and meaning to the audience.

Among the easiest aural elements to identify in the Ἐπιτάφιος are those perennial rhetorical devices involving patterned acoustic effects. Most of these rely on aurally conspicuous repetition whose effects though discernable to the alert eye nevertheless fall on the deaf ears of the silent reader and may simply be dismissed as formally and rhetorically shallow. Most commonly these involve alliteration (recurrence of an initial consonantal sound), assonance (resemblance of internal vowel sounds between words in sequence), consonance (resemblance of stressed consonants where the surrounding vowels differ), as well as homoioptoton (a cluster of words with similar case endings), homoioteleuton (strings of uninflected words with similar sounding endings), paromoiosis (parallelism of sounds between words of clauses of similar length, anadiplosis (repetition of last word of a clause or sentence to begin the next), anaphora (repetition of a word to begin successive clause or sentences), palillogia (repetition for the sake of vehemence or emphasis), polyptoton (repetition of words derived from the same root but in different cases), polysyndeton\textsuperscript{47} (repeated use of a conjunction between clauses). To these we may add the rhythmical effect of isosyllabic words, responsion both within and across clausulae, internal rhyme, syntactic parallelism, and occasional accentual responsion (which is distinct from the accentual formulas adopted at the end of clausulae or sentences described by Hörandner). Eustathios makes use of most of these, as well as others, in the Ἐπιτάφιος, as he does in most of his other orations. The following examples are intended to illustrate how diffuse such effects are in the Ἐπιτάφιος. Such parsing of the aural rhetorical devices in the oration proceeds from the premise that nothing in the text is there by chance, including noticeable patterns of sound which accompany the desired sense.\textsuperscript{48} We thus meet patterns which run the gamut from the mildly intrusive

\begin{footnotes}
\item[46] Cavallo, Lire, 63, notes the oral/aural aspect of βασιλικὸι λόγοι contributed to the virtual “mise en scène” of the occasion. He underlines the necessity of maintaining the appearance of a performance, in effect transforming the place of their delivery into “a sort of theatre.”
\item[47] This feature is explored more fully in the section on style under the rubric of paratactic syntax.
\item[48] It would matter little if it were there by chance or accident, since an audience conditioned to appreciate the occurrence of any acoustic pattern joined to semantic sense would regard any such feature as intentional.
\end{footnotes}
or perceptible to the brazen and unmistakable, ranging from a few words to a succession of clauses:

(Ἐπ. 7) τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς… εἰ τάχ᾿ ἃν ποτε δεσσωπηθεὶς ἤ δεσσπρόσωπος μάχη

With simple and brisk alliteration Eustathios underscores the capacity of proverbially malevolent-faced battle to ‘look askance at’ at its victims. Eustathios wanted the alliteration badly enough to seek out the passive use of this uncommon verb with an accusative object. Examples of alliteration abound in the Ἐπιτάφιος and throughout Eustathian panegyric.49

eἰς ὅσον δύναμις. Δύναμις δὲ... (Ἐπ. 11)

An example of anadiplosis, the repetition of the last word of a clause or sentence to begin the next.

ὁὶ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς θαυμαστώσαντες ἐκείνην ὕδων· ὀκνῶ γὰρ εἰπεῖν εὐμέθοδον ἐφοδον (Ἐπ. 21)

Combines alliteration (ὕδων· ὀκνῶ) with homoioteleuton (ὕδων... εὐμέθοδον ἐφοδον), effectively binding sense with sound. Here the words road, strategy, and campaign are inextricably linked for the listener to form a verbal triptych of strategic failure on the part of the western crusaders.50

ἡν δὲ δεινός, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιπολῆς καὶ κατ᾿ ὀψιν προσβάλλων, τὰ ἐν βάθει κατοπτεύειν καὶ ἐξακριβούθαι σοφωτάτῳ φύσεως γνώμον. Καὶ τὸ πράγμα σὺν ἢν στοχάζειν ἀλλ᾿ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐναί καὶ µὴ δεικτείται τὸ λαληθέν, ως καὶ εἰκοτολογίαν τινὰ συνελογίσατο ἐμβριθή (καὶ ἢν τοιοῦτος ὁ νοηθείς), ἀλλὰ εὐήθη. Καὶ σὺν ἢν ἔτεροις ὁ γνωματεύθης; διώπτευε τὸν κρυψίνουν, τῷ παντὶ πλέον τὸν ἐπίπολαίον, τοὺς τῶν λοιπῶν ἡθῶν ὁμοίως. Καὶ εἰπεν ἢν ἄν νυναθή ὁδὼν ἀπὸσσον, καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἐμβατείτεν ἀνθρώπων, ωσ τὴν φύσιν ενδοθέν ποθεν αὐτῷ ἐκλαλέντα τα καθ᾿ ἐαυτὴν ἀπόρρητα. (Ἐπ. 41)

a series of braided internal semantic correspondences backed up by suggestive alliteration (ὕδων... κατοπτεύειν... διώπτευε... ἐδών / φόσεως... φόσυν / γνώμων... γνωματεύθης / λαληθέν... ἐκλαλέν) are buttressed by frequent effects of aural equivalence, e.g., ἐμβριθή (καὶ ἢν τοιοῦτος ὁ νοηθείς), ἀλλὰ εὐήθη / τῷ παντὶ πλέον τὸν ἐπίπολαίον, to which must be added such features of the disciplined orator’s voice as rhythm, cadence, and intonation.

49 For examples of alliteration in the panegyrics of Eustathios, see A. Stone, "Aurality in the panegyrics of Eustathios of Thessaloniki," Theatron: rhetorical culture in late antiquity and the Middle Ages, ed. M. Grünbart (Berlin, 2007) 419–28, 422.

Συγκρούσαι δὲ πολεμίους ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀταράχῳ καὶ οὕτω καταστῆσαι, καὶ τὸ ἐν εἰρήνῃ γαλήνιον καταστῆσαι, τίς ἄρα κατ᾿ ἐκείνον δεινότατος; Μέθοδον γὰρ καὶ ταῖς στρατηγικῆς ἐτέχνου, τὸ μὲν ὕποκοον φυλάττειν ἀναίμακτον ἐπὶ μεγίσταις τροπαίων ἀναστῆσαι, προσφαρασοῦν δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἔμοιοι, καὶ ἐκπολεμοῦν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις τὸ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀμφότεροι, ώς καὶ ἐντεῦθεν αξίζεισθαι μὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα, μεινεκτεῖσθαι δὲ τὸ πολέμιον, καὶ τὸν Ἐνυάλιον μηκέτι ξυνὸν εἶναι, μηδ᾿ ἀμφοῖν τοῖς μεροῖς φθισήνορα, ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς ὅσοι ἐξ ἐκεῖνος εἰς ἀντίπαλον, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀπονενεμῆσθαι τὸν βροτολογόν.

(Ἐπ. 17)

Some variation of the root πολεμ- (πολεμίους, ἐκπολεμοῦν, πολέμιον, πολεμίοις) appears no fewer than five times (possibly in deliberate combination with ἀλλοφύλοις and ὁμοφυλον) in the short span of this passage, so that semantic sense of being on a constant war-footing is re-enforced through repetition and alliteration

Στάσιν δὲ ὀρθίαν, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐῤῥέθη, ὡςεὶ καὶ κίων ἐκπόνησαμεν ἀστραβής, καὶ ἀναστηλῶν ἐαυτὸν καὶ οὕτω πρὸς εὐκλείαν, οἷς ἀνεῖχεν ὑψὸ τὰ ἡμέτερα, γόνατα κἀκεῖνην ἀδίκης θεοῦ εὐχῆς λόγῳ, καὶ οὕτω προερήμων ἀμφίπρεπες τοῦ γουναζεσθαι, ἀρχέτυπος παράμιλλος ἦν τῷ μεγάλῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δικαίῳ, οὗπερ οἱ τῶν γονάτων τύλοι τὸ συχνὰ γονυπετές ἠγόρευον. Καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐν ἀριστεύμασιν ἀνάστημα πεπραγμένον, ὡς καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐν ἀριστεύμασιν ἀνάστημα πεπραγμένον, ὡς καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐν ἀριστεύμασιν ἀνάστημα πεπραγμένον, ὡς καὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐν ἀριστεύμασιν ἀνάστημα πεπραγμένον.

(Ἐπ. 59)

An example of the lexical dexterity and rhetorical ingenuity of Eustathius’ writing, employing the roots of ἵστημ-/ἵσταμ-/ἀναστηλ- and the root of γόν-/γουν-, as well as ταπειν- and ὑψο-, to weave a thematically consistent passage with internal echoes of alliteration, assonance, and a varying diacope through repetition of words across clauses and phrases.

Οὕτω Πέρσαι Πέρσαις ἀντίμαχοι μεθόδοις βασιλιαῖς· καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰρηναῖον ἐπαιανίζομεν Οὕτω Σκύθαι Σκύθας εἰς γῆν κατεστρώννυον (Ἐπ. 17)

An example of anaphora joined to polyptoton which reiterates aurally what the emperor is said to have achieved in practical terms, namely, that the emperor managed to pit the empire’s arch enemies to turn on one another.51

ἀγαθῶν ὑποῤῥεόντων ἦν καινιστής, ἀταξίας ἁρμοκῆς, ἐπισκευαστής τῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀφωρισμένων (Ἐπ. 48)

51 Stone,”Aurality,” 420, gives numerous examples of anaphora in Eustathian panegyrics.
Note the alternating, interwoven structure of genitive-nominative / genitive-nominative-genitive / nominative-genitive, with their audible succession of endings (*homoioptoton*).

There is hardly an extended passage of the funeral oration without some combination of such easily appreciable rhetorical or acoustic devices. There is an important element of sensual delight in all this which should not be underestimated. This is not to argue that every similarity of sound was part of a calculated effect; only that figures like alliteration, assonance, and variations on the theme of repetition at the beginning or end of words, phrases, or clauses, made up a significant part of the orator’s store of legitimate devices. In some cases, these could lend aural support to the idea being communicated by drawing the senses into the argument, inducing the mind to reach conclusions through rhetorical artifice.52 Were the orality of a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος limited to these, it would not be worth dwelling on and would hardly amount to a kind of oral poetics. Less easily identifiable is what I would call structural aurality; an aurality embedded in the syntactical, rhythmical, and acoustic architecture of the Ἐπιτάφιος. To isolate this aurality requires us to free ourselves provisionally from certain modern conventions of reading and to attempt to recreate something akin to a hypothetical, albeit necessarily visual, aurality on the page. As an example of such structural aural poetics I would like to consider three versions of the same text: the first (Fig. 1) is what the Ἐπιτάφιος looks like today when printed in conformity with modern editorial conventions; the second (Fig. 2) is what the text looks like in the manuscript, including its absence of word division, sectioning, original punctuation, and layout; finally, some examples (Figs. 3 and 4) of what I think the funeral oration sounded like when voiced, not so much to reproduce what the oration would have sounded like to the ear – an impossibility in any case – but a visual breakdown of the text and the distribution of sense across units of sound and syntax.

52 Some scholars would go further. Citing the concept of “aural suggestion” developed by Michael Silk to further bolster the manner of interaction between poetic imagery and the object represented in archaic Greek poetry, Stone (“Aurality,” 422–425) attempts to correlate acoustic features akin to those of assonance and alliteration with “sound pictures” matching the semantic contents of the text. But the examples Stone cites of the letter κ deployed repeatedly in a passage “to emphasize the smiting force of the wave created by the crusaders of the Second Crusade” presupposes a degree of certainty about the associations evoked by any given combination of sounds or “phonemes” that we simply do not possess. κ is “percussive” only in metaphorical and not necessarily cognitive or in strictly linguistic terms. See M. S. Silk, *Interaction in poetic imagery: with special reference to early Greek poetry* (London; New York, 1974), see esp. 191–193.
The syntactical breakdown mapped above, negotiable at its grammatical margins in certain instances, can serve as a first step to resolving the text into its constituent oral building blocks. One may begin by noting various acoustic devices inside and across these clauses, such as the *isocolon*, *anaphora*, and *homoi-optoton* of ἐνθάδε μὲν σηγητέον / ἐνθάδε λαλητέον cited in the first example, whose identical accentual pattern lends its rhythmical support to the semantic symmetry, combining meaning with something akin to vocalized meter: / – – – – / – | | / – – – – / – . Similarly, the balanced *anaphoric* structure of ἐπεὶ καλὸν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν τινος / ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ὡς ἑπέρω χόρνταν from the same passage, exploits the musical phrasing of *isocola* and near matching accentual patterns. A sentence by sentence, clause by clause analysis of the Ἐπιτάφιος would produce a significant number of such aural patterns.

The greatest and perhaps unavoidable weakness of this approach, however, is its reliance on aural patterns or effects that can be immediately seen, like the various figures of repetition (*alliteration*, *assonance*, *anaphora*, *homoi-optoton*, *homoioteleuton*, etc.) or noticeably symmetrical and balanced structures (*isocola*). Such conspicuously patterned sound effects were probably the proverbial tip of a text’s oral iceberg. There may well be a mass of acoustic effects lying under the surface of the manuscript page. The spell exercised on the listener by euphony is not so easily reducible to visible patterns or devices. So while I have marked the coincidence of cola and accentual phrasing in a handful of examples, I hesitate to say that I have isolated all the *heard* rhythms resulting from the vocalization...
Εἴη ἀγενής, καὶ ἐν μὴ δέοντι ἐνεός, καὶ οὐκ εἰδὼς ἑαυτὸν μετρεῖν, ἐνθα μὲν σιγητέον, ἐνθα δὲ λαλητέον, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος, Μίμησιν γὰρ ἔχων ἅπας ἄνθρωπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος. Μίμησιν γὰρ ἔχων ἅπας ἄνθρωπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος. Μίμησιν γὰρ ἔχων ἅπας ἄνθρωπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος. Μίμησιν γὰρ ἔχων ἅπας ἄνθρωπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος. Μίμησιν γὰρ ἔχων ἅπας ἄνθρωπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος.

Figure 3 of the words in the Ἐπιτάφιος. Too much would have depended on the orator’s rhythmical discretion. Elision or syncopation, inevitable features of any long structured speech given with an ear to effective delivery, no doubt played their part in rendering the text aurally persuasive. The architecture of aurality, may nevertheless be seen in the combination of choice and placement of words, variation and coordination of cola, the resonances of vowel and consonantal combinations, patterns of alliteration and assonance, as well as an eclectic mix of other rhetorical devices which heighten the aural quality of an oration, like palilogia, polyptoton, polysyndeton, to name but a few. If one adds the original punctuation of the manuscript to this visual breakdown of the aural syntax of the text, the oral, performative, design becomes even clearer.

53 See the discussion below in the section on the punctuation of the Basel Codex.
The different visualizations of the Ἐπιτάφιος in figures 1–4 above reflect differences in what linguists refer to as the pragmatics of the text, namely, the use made of a text in specific contexts; not least of all, the way in which a text generates meaning as a function of the way in which its audience experiences it. Of course each visualization serves as a kind of metonymy for a set of practices on the part of the author/orator and of the audience/reader of the text. I have already noted some of the consequences of tacitly approaching a text intended for oral delivery like the Ἐπιτάφιος with the mental habits engendered by the conventions of print (Fig. 1) – the baroque apparatus of a modern print edition, with word division, capital letters, fully spelled out words, consistent punctuation, paragraph division, page and line numbers, wide margins, and clear titles and introductory material, indexes, etc., all designed to facilitate reading of the text. Alongside these intellectual reflexes which attend reading are less easily discernable, yet
potentially significant, differences, such as the fact that silent reading is carried out by individuals, most often in relative isolation. In contrast, orally transmitted texts are heard by groups of listeners. Each member of an audience is cognizant of being addressed as part of a larger, collective identity, and will tend to listen as such. It is not just the author who selects his content with a specific collective audience in mind; the listeners, too, select for the meaning they regard as intended for the particular audience they are part of.

In comparison, the text as it appears in the manuscript (Fig. 2) appears aimed at a narrow compass of practiced readers well versed in scribal protocols ranging from systematic use of abbreviations and ligatures to the absence of word division. Indeed as anyone who has pored over a manuscript of a medieval Greek text can testify, reading such a text for sense invariably means re-reading, since the first time around one must 'locate' the text, as it were, word by word, identifying its syntactical architecture, and familiarizing oneself with its rhetorical arrangement and development (where in the sentence am I?). Such rehears- al, as it were, seems better suited to recital or oral delivery, not as a prelude to reading in silence on one’s own. This does not mean that no readers were ever envisioned for orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος; quite the contrary. As I point out in ‘The Style Which Shows’, the principal motive for including the Ἐπιτάφιος and other orations in the Basel Codex was to make it available for study, which may well have involved reading it aloud. Its exemplarity presumably lay in the way its particular style and arrangement, the στρυφνότης and μέθοδος of the title, were applied. With figures 3 and 4 we see, quite literally, orality/aurality on display. I hasten to note once more that this arrangement of the text is but a structural simulation of the text’s aural design. It cannot serve as a reproduction of what it would have sounded like to the audience on the occasion of its delivery. The resemblance, moreover, of this aural syntax to a kind of semi-structured verse is not coincidental. Paratactic syntax accumulates meaning much like poetry: in seriatim self-contained declamatory units of varying length. This would have allowed listeners to follow the speaker, even when one of them lost track of what was being said because of some obscurity in the diction, grammar, or simply because the listener’s attention lapsed, as must have periodically happened during long ceremonies.

Examining the orality of the Ἐπιτάφιος may also help us address the long be-devilling question of whether some of the most interesting Byzantine literature was in fact only intelligible to a very small community of professional literati. I leave aside the diversionary matter of what could have been understood by “or-
ordinary” people, since the question is often framed in a bid to challenge the utility of interpreting these seemingly esoteric texts. Hardly anyone asks whether “ordinary” Athenians could have made sense of Demosthenes’ most accomplished orations, or whether the “average” American could have understood Abraham Lincoln’s second inaugural address. These questions deserve an answer, but only as long as they are not posed as a litmus test for a text’s effective impact. In the present case, the audience which gathered to hear Eustathios speak at Manuel’s graveside in the mortuary chapel of the Pantokrator monastery was unlikely to count many “ordinary” Byzantines, if by that term we mean those who made up the majority of the illiterate and labouring population. Instead, besides Manuel’s surviving immediate family, the audience was likely made up of the higher ranks of church and state officials. Many of these would have benefited from an education that put them at least within reach of the contents of Eustathios’ polished prose. The audience for Byzantine rhetoric of such verbal craftsmanship as we find in the orations of Eustathios need not have been so large as to include the “ordinary” man or woman, but it was probably significantly larger than is often allowed.54

Exemplary specimens of the upper registers of medieval Greek, orations like the Ἐπιτάφιος are deemed formidably daunting to read. How could hearing them, one may reasonably ask, make them anything but more unfathomable? The question betrays its origin in a virtually mute literary culture. With the exception of childrens’ books, few modern texts are written to be read aloud anymore.55 We thus tend to reflexively convert any printed text into the silent idiom of modern reading habits. But I would argue that certain formal features of the Ἐπιτάφιος, like the largely paratactic syntax running throughout the oration, were intended, at least in part, as a concession to its listeners. In fact, it gives us reason to question the widespread assumption that so-called high style prose would have been too complicated for all but professional rhetors to follow. We are so accustomed to the assumption of high style Byzantine texts being exceedingly difficult to read that we have not thought to ask whether some part of the difficulty we

54 For a similar revision to the once standing assumption that Second Sophistic declamation had only a limited appeal among the ranks of professional rhetors and their students, see D. A. Russell, Greek declaration (Cambridge, 1983) 79ff., as well as G. Kennedy, The art of rhetoric in the Roman world, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300 (Princeton, 1972) and idem., Greek rhetoric under Christian emperors (Princeton, 1983).

55 The popularity of audio books, fiction and non-fiction alike, has not yet led to composition intended primarily for audiences of listeners, but it may be a matter of time and commercial viability.
experience is the result of the wrong medium, silent reading. Besides having the benefit of the practiced reader’s voice to guide them – slowing down delivery, or enunciating with greater emphasis where necessary – the audience of an oration would have been practiced listeners. The many topoi and clichés identified by modern scholars made audiences well versed in the rhetorical idiom of court oratory. Finally, when examining what could have been understood by audiences, we should recall that transparency and intelligibility are not synonymous with meaning, and that the audience of the Ἐπιτάφιος also drew meaning from the broader occasion itself. In other words, context could help the audience make sense of the text, while orality mediated that context.

Any argument about the orality of a long, well formed text must invariably contend with the question of possible revisions to the recited version. How certain can we be that the extant text of the Ἐπιτάφιος is in fact a verbatim copy of what the audience actually heard Eustathios recite on the day of its delivery? Revision with an eye (and ear) to polishing the text prior circulation, cannot be ruled out. Even if direct recital from a written text, as we see depicted in various scenes of the Madrid Skylitzes, increases the likelihood of a stable text, at least when contrasted with extemporaneous oratory, it does not exclude the possibility that Eustathios would have wanted to secure his reputation by later circulating the best possible version of his work.56 While such questions have been a staple of scholarship on oral texts of other periods and in other languages, like the dikanic or symbouleutic speeches of ancient Athens or the addresses in the Roman senate, as well as of various genres of western medieval literature, the relative inattention to the orality of Byzantine texts means we have yet to confront the question.57 Is there some way to gauge how faithful a version we have in the manuscript of what Eustathios actually said that day in the Pantokrator chapel? The simple answer is no. It is not implausible to imagine that Eustathios either composed a version approximating this one, perhaps slightly more forgiving in structure and occasionally less recherché in diction; or, alternately, that he de-

56 For a survey and analysis of the images of recital in the so-called Madrid Skylitzes, see the introduction to the edited volume of papers from the conference on orality and aurality in Byzantine literature. The sound of sense: aurality in Byzantine texts and contexts, ed. E. C. Bourbouhakis [Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy] (forthcoming).

livered more or less the same version of the extant speech from memory, with allowances for small lapses or variations brought about by the natural course of recital.58 This would be a matter of speculation had Eustathios himself not provided the grounds for such conjecture in a uniquely revealing passage of the Ἐπιτάφιος itself.

In a section devoted to Manuel’s intellectual gifts, which includes admiration for his prodigious memory, Eustathios describes how the emperor went about composing his imperial addresses. He is described as first dictating the text, then reciting it in its entirety from memory, with only occasional departures from the written text, minor lapses Eustathios is ready to forgive. Eustathios recounts how Manuel would then circulate a copy of the written text to those who happened to be present so that they might have a chance to study the contents of his speech more closely. As it turned out the oration Manuel had delivered to his first audience was almost verbatim identical to the text later circulated. In what appears as a pointed reproach to his fellow rhetors, Eustathios notes approvingly that this is how it ought always to be done. He adds, with regret, that it is rarely the case. Eustathios laments that such fidelity between the contents of an oration and its written copy had become a rare virtue in his time.59 Although nominally about memory, this part of the oration broaches a subject evidently close to Eustathios’ heart as an orator. Manuel is commended by the veteran rhetor for not departing in any significant way from what he had dictated in the transcribed speech. When the ‘published’ version of his text entrusted to parchment was in turn recited to others, the oral and written version were found to be virtually identical. But the most notable thing here, largely irrelevant to the eulogy of Manuel, is Eustathios’ insistence that such ought to be the standard practice of anyone who delivers speeches:

58 The nearest any scholar has come to taking up this question is B. Goodall, in his study of some homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the epistles of St. Paul. Dissenting from the opinio communis which has maintained that the ‘published’ or circulated text of Chrysostom’s homilies are unlikely to have been identical with the ex-tempore version delivered by him before his congregation, Goodall has argued that any such revisions were not substantial enough to allow us to posit a simpler, more demotic, version for the congregation at large and a more polished copy for self-selecting literate audiences. See B. Goodall, The homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon: prolegomena to an edition (Berkeley, 1979) 66–75.

59 A Roman example of the practice Eustathios disapproves of may be seen in the gratiarum actio of the Younger Pliny, delivered in September A.D. 100, then expanded considerably for later recitationes and publication. It is worth noting that even the polished, amplified version was intended for performance before audiences. One imagines that it would have been hard for a rhetor to recast a text so patently oral in its original design like Pliny’s actio, or the Ἐπιτάφιος for that matter, as though primarily for readers. For the afterlife through publication Pliny’s panegyric, see R. Rees, “Afterwords of Praise,” Pliny’s praise: the panegyricus in the Roman world, ed. P. Roche (Cambridge, 2011) 175–188.
And the speech he had made turned out to be no different from the written one. And one might say that this is what should happen in the case of every speech (although it does not happen in every case); nevertheless it is a rare quality found in very few instances. For his thoughts remained the same in both cases, whether delivered to the masses in an _ex tempore_ manner or when he let them be enclosed in books.

Eustathios here confounds our assumption that all recital in Byzantium was done with the aid of a written text. If that were indeed how all texts were delivered before audiences, he would have no basis to complain that too many speakers fail to memorize their speeches adequately. Moreover, he does not criticize them for relying on a written version, but for departing substantially from their original, which could be made available for closer scrutiny among those who had heard the original performance (a telling detail), while the ‘published’ text might in turn be circulated and recited directly from the written copy (τὸν δὲ μηνυθέντα τόκον προῆγεν ἐσπαργανωμένον ὥσπερ τῷ τόμῳ...καὶ ἀνελιχθεὶς ἤρχετο εἰς περιέλευσιν ἀκοῶν δι᾿ ἀναγνώσεως). This complicates the reality of the relation between written and spoken ‘text’, since this kind of oratory has rarely been acknowledged as a possibility, especially given the length and complexity of the surviving orations. H. Hunger questioned whether any of the ‘rhetorical’ genres, including funeral orations, could have been learned by heart, given their considerable length. It is worth noting, however, that length alone is rarely invoked as a prohibitive factor in the memorizing of oratory for the law courts and assemblies of ancient Athens, or in the senate chamber and courts of republican Rome. Eustathios’ observation, that too few orators manage to replicate their composed texts in recital, suggests that the written versions of occasional or-

---

60 See Cavallo, _Lire_, 57–66; esp. 62, where Cavallo expresses doubts that Byzantine rhetors delivered genuinely extemporaneous speeches without aid of a script or some kind of notes.

61 Hunger, _Schreiben_, 126. Could rhetorically complex texts have been learned by heart, then recited? It is worth bearing in mind that the standard term in Byzantium for the delivery of almost any text, including imperial panegyrics, was _ἀνέγνω_, see LSJ s.v. _II_, to ‘read aloud’. The question of when, and under what conditions, it became acceptable to recite from a written text has not, to my knowledge, been answered. Reading from a prepared text was frowned upon in the late fifth- and fourth-century Athens, but that only implies that it was not infrequently done. Partial answers may be sought in the following studies: Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen, ed. W. Kullmann (Tübingen, 1990); J.P. Small, “Visual copies and memory,” _Orality, literacy, memory in the ancient Greek and Roman world_, ed. E. A. Mackay (Leiden, 2008) 227–252; R. Thomas, _Oral tradition and written record in classical Athens_ (Cambridge, 1989); idem, _Literacy and orality in ancient Greece_ (Cambridge, 1992).
The aurality of the funeral oration were not necessarily what the audiences in attendance at ceremonies or *theatra* had actually heard.

Ostensibly intended to highlight Manuel’s feats of memory, this passage reads like a thinly disguised rebuke of contemporary oratorical practice. It also insists on a standard which can only be put to the test by combining composition, oral performance based on memory, and the all important final stage of ‘publication’ of the text, whether for closer study or even repeat recitals, presumably by other orators. This last feature of promulgation or ‘broadcasting’ of a text through recital would have reinforced the emphasis on declamation and orality more broadly in the study of rhetoric. This is perhaps less surprising when considered in practical terms. Most of the posts in the administrations of church or state would involve addressing audiences in a convincing manner, whether as a bishop or chancery secretary composing on behalf of the court. Eustathios’ remarks here raise a more immediate question: could he have invoked a model of performance from memory while reciting the Ἐπιτάφιος from a written copy, thereby including himself among those failing to live up to the ideal he had just expressed? Can we even entertain the possibility that he delivered a funeral oration – I purposely do not say, this text as we have it – from memory, with allowances for some permissible improvisation such as he was willing to forgive Manuel? In that case, is the text of the Ἐπιτάφιος what he had originally composed, or a revised version of his earlier draft? There were many ways to illustrate Manuel’s prodigious memory. Eustathios chose this one because it spoke to a matter he seems to have cared about.

It may well be that by assuming all oratory in Byzantium at this time to have been based on recital from a written text we have been neglecting other, equally significant evidence for mixed forms of recital, including recital from memory. The well attested school exercise of putting long passages of Homeric verse to memory would have not only furnished students with an example, it would have also exercised their precise recall of complex texts. So while the stress on memory in Byzantine education is acknowledged, its practical usefulness is often doubted. How hard would it have been for an author like Eustathios to memo-

---

63 A. R. Littlewood has made a strong empirical case against the presumption that Byzantine writers did not rely much on memory since they most often cited the same passages. He notes, as well, the near
rize an approximate version of the Ἐπιτάφιος? One way to answer this question is to bear in mind how much of the funeral oration might be characterized as *topos*-driven, built around motifs, often with formulaic expressions. A look at the *apparatus* and commentary reveals the remarkably high incidence of repetition through variation between the present work and Eustathios’ previous orations. Some of the themes of the Ἐπιτάφιος, like that of the emperor’s physical endurance and austerity while on campaign, were well established commonplaces of the genre and could have served as mnemonic anchors to tether larger passages. Others, like Manuel’s euergetism and “guardianship” of Orthodoxy, were commonplaces of Manuel’s panegyrical “image.” What’s more, many of these motifs were not exclusive to this oration. Elaborating them would not have taxed a practiced orator and teacher of rhetoric like Eustathios. While the insistence on a repertoire of stock imagery and ready-made phrasing has been seen as a symptom of intellectual timorousness and ideological conservatism among Byzantine authors, formally, at least, it would have also served as a highly adaptable store of easily recombined language for recurring ceremonial occasions. What was probably intended was not *verbatim* memorization, at least not as we have come to think of it.

All this may lead us to ask whether the Ἐπιτάφιος could have been performed by means of rehearsed improvisation. In an attempt to extol the faithfulness of Manuel’s memory, Eustathios insists on a degree of resemblance between the spoken and written version few speakers could have achieved, himself included perhaps. Might we infer that Eustathios’ peers were routinely inclined to revise the fair copy of their text before “swaddling” it in a book and releasing it for wider distribution? Could this have occurred even in cases where the text had been read aloud instead of being memorized, as many orations must have been? The rhetor had every incentive to keep revising his text before releasing it to be scrutinized by exacting professional peers. While the revision of texts should hardly surprise us, it does raise vexing questions about attempts to assign significance to the specific words used on a certain occasion, questions which should be acknowledged in our interpretations of texts.

---

L'incohérence d’un discours dépend de celui qui l’écoute. L'esprit me paraît ainsi fait qu’il ne peut être incohérent pour soi-même.

— Paul Valéry

Perhaps no facet of a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος deserves to be re-evaluated in light of its orality as much as its intelligibility to contemporary audiences. For a long time Byzantine texts exhibiting the rhetorical features we find in this funeral oration have been regarded by many scholars as hermetically sealed to anyone other than a highly circumscribed group of semi-professional rhetors, the core of the empire’s intelligentsia. Judged too recondite in content and labyrinthine in form to be comprehensible to most, works in the high style have been characterized at times as constituting a virtual foreign language. We thus meet the paradox of forms of artful discourse which flourished despite being allegedly unintelligible to the majority of the audience whose patronage they required. On the face of it, such a historical model would seem unsustainable. Unless we posit reasons why otherwise incomprehensible texts were produced and performed on ceremonial and ritual occasions. Did the cultural cachet of Byzantine literature, imperial panegyrics included, lie in its arcaneness, an obscurity which served to confirm its genuine sophistication? Such deliberate esotericism was not unknown in Byzantium. G. Kustas has surveyed the theoretical pedigree of deliberate ἀσάφεια in medieval Greek thought and literature. Obscurity had a specific cultural and philosophical warrant, however. Its application was circumscribed and constantly challenged by the equally established rhetorical imperative enjoining σαφήνεια, or clarity. Indeed unbounded obscurity was often censured in Byzantium. Some of the most notorious episodes of acrimony among professional rhetors involved reciprocal charges of a suspect unintelligibility.

65 Citing evidence going back to late antiquity, Cavallo depicts the typical audience for recitals as highly literate, a kind of medieval literary coterie gathering for the express purpose of delighting in displays of rhetorical prowess. See Cavallo, Lire, 60–61: “A Byzance les [hommes] de lettres avaient gardé l’habitude – comme déjà à l’époque gréco-romaine – de soumettre leurs propres oeuvres au jugement d’ «un cercle de savants».”
66 As indeed it had not been entirely unknown in the prescriptions of ancient theorists adopted by Byzantine teachers of rhetoric: John Sikeliotes, Rhet. gr. 6.451.22; John Geometres, ibid., 2.226.11. On ἀσάφεια as both an aesthetic and intellectual principle in medieval Greek rhetoric, see Kustas, Studies, 63–100, 95.
67 Consider Arethas’ defense of his prose against charges of obscurity, where he argues that an educated audience would appreciate his chosen style as appropriately dignified. See Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis Scripta minora, rec. L. G. Westerink (1968–1972) t. I, 270. The acrimonious rivalry of Theo-
Regardless of the accuracy of the claims, we can draw some conclusions from the fact that obscurity and unintelligibility had to be defended against.

The question of intelligibility spans more aspects of Byzantine rhetorical and literary practices than can be adequately addressed here. However, in as much as it foregrounds the medium in which author, text, and audience intersect, orality has some significant bearing on it. Arguments about the forbidding abstruseness of Byzantine texts like the Ἐπιτάφιος ask that we imagine all but a handful among the audience on that day to have simply endured the perplexity of the long speech they could not follow. But this scenario rests on at least one misrepresentation, and one uncorroborated assumption. The misrepresentation concerns the supposedly uncomprehending audience, sometimes referred to as “the ordinary person in Byzantium.” I have already noted that no such person is invoked to severely delimit the audience of many other formidable texts of other languages or periods, despite their notorious difficulty for modern audiences. None of the sort of people vaguely implied in the term “ordinary Byzantine” were likely to find themselves in the audience, trying to decipher the meaning of a Eustathian imperial oration. In fact, among those in attendance, more than a few were likely to have been sufficiently well educated to be at least within reach of the oration’s full meaning. No less important, however, and often overlooked, would have been the repeated exposure over decades to the language of imperial panegyric. Indeed, it might not be much of an exaggeration to say that repeat audiences at the Byzantine court had gained a degree of proficiency in the eclectic idiom of epideictic court rhetoric. This was, after all the same élite who sponsored the so-called theatron or private literary performances where aspiring authors tried to win the support of patrons in the hope of securing financing through subscriptions to their literary projects or as private secretaries and tutors in wealthy households; or better yet, a sinecure in the imperial or church administration.68

dore Metochites and Nikephoros Choumnos is another example of mutual charges of an unpardonable ἀσάφεια. See I. Ševčenko, Études sur la polémique.

68 For the link between patronage and the theatron, see the stinging indictment by Michael Choniates, possibly composed at the start of his career when he still held out hope of not compromising his talents to win over audiences. The performances Choniates characterizes as prostitution of an author’s intellectual integrity are all oral, live before an audience, perhaps even ex tempore, if the references to the sophist’s “protean” nature are taken to mean a degree of improvisation. See E.C. Bourbouhakis, “The end of ἐπίδειξις: authorial identity and authorial intention in Michael Choniates’ Πρὸς τοὺς αἰτωμένους τὸ ἀφλένδεκτον,” The author in middle Byzantine literature, ed. A. Pizzone (Berlin, 2014) 201–224.
By no means a mass or ‘popular’ audience by today’s standards, the élite that made up Eustathios’ audience was nevertheless significantly more populous than a small coterie of professional rhetors. The audience apostrophized in the Ἐπιτάφιος could not have been made up only of men with Eustathios’ learning. Quite a few of them, however, were likely to have been former students of teachers like Eustathios.69 Not a few of the students pursuing an advanced literary education would have been the sons (and judging by the number of Komnenian noblewomen who patronized the literary arts, perhaps not a few daughters)70 of the ruling élite. These were the scions of the capital’s ruling families who made up the privileged caste of “διωνατοί” in twelfth-century Constantinople. Most of them would have received a solid grounding in the Greek language and in literature, including rhetoric by means of composition exercises. At least some would have gone on to more advanced levels of education, always with an eye to eloquence. One such former student of Eustathios, Nikephoros Komnenos, became a friend and protector, as well as something of a fellow man of letters, to judge by the eulogies for him, including one by Eustathios.71 An outlier in the degree of his devotion to Byzantine belles-lettres and rhetoric, Nikephoros illustrates the wider compass of the court intelligentsia. He was likely not alone among his class in his devotion to the literary culture Eustathios personified. All this to say that conceiving of the Ἐπιτάφιος as fully fledged oratory demands that we account for its audience and their ability to comprehend its contents. Perhaps the audiences for such oratory were not quite so modest as is usually proposed.72 The élite at the Komnenian court had a great deal invested in education and the culture of eloquence it inculcated. This made them appreciative of learned speech, even when they could not grasp every last thing that was said. In this they would have resembled other historical élites eager to maintain their

69 The sort of persons to whom the preface to his commentary on the Iliad is addressed: alumni wishing to keep up their study of Homer.

70 In fact, apart from the emperors themselves, it is the women of the Komnenian dynasty who are best known to us as patrons of what have somewhat loosely been described as ‘literary salons.’ The scholarship on female patronage and the literary arts is now quite substantial. How likely is it that such high profile women of the court would not have seen to the education of their daughters, as well as of their sons? For a thorough survey of the cultural achievements of Byzantine women, including patronage, see M. Mavroudi, “Learned women of Byzantium and the surviving record,” Byzantine religious culture: studies in honor of Alice-Mary Talbot, eds. E. Fisher, S. Papaioannou, D. Sullivan (Leiden, 2012) 53–84.

71 See the little known monody dedicated to Nikephoros Komnenos delivered on the occasion of the latter’s seemingly premature death, ed. E. Kurtz, Vizantijski Vremennik 17 (1910) 290–302. I am currently preparing a new edition, with translation, of this funeral oration.

highbrow credentials, even when the uppermost limits of their understanding were put to the test. This found its counterpart in Eustathios' desire, at least in theory, to be understood by those whose patronage he needed and whose respect he sought.73

We thus encounter the recurring motif in Byzantine texts of the successful author or orator who is able to address both the common man and the élite in his audience. In one of his final orations at court before assuming the bishopric of Thessalonike, Eustathios praised Manuel's uncanny ability to ensure that his own speeches had something for everyone:

ὦ γλῶσσα πυρίνη πνεύματος μεριζομένη μὲν ποικίλως, ἑκάσταις δὲ ψυχαῖς καθ' ὁλότητα ἐν
αρμόττουσα, ἐνθα καὶ πλέον ἔκειτο τὸ ξενίζον τοῦ πράγματος καὶ πλείω τὰ τοῦ θαύματος διὰ
τὴν ἰδιοτροπίαν τοῦ κράματος· οὐ γὰρ τοῖς περὶ λόγους μὲν ὁ λόγος ἐκεῖνος ἦν εύπροσιτος,
ἐξέκλεε δὲ τὴν ἰδικωτέραν ἀκρόασιν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν ἐφείλκετο μὲν τὸν ἀπλούστερον ἅπτομαι
ποτ' ἐκείνον ἐκεῖνας ἀκρόασιν, οὐδὲ τὸν ὁλιγότιμον παντὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἐνέλαμπε
καὶ ἀπαγόρευμον ὅσιον ἦν τοῦ καλοῦ·74

oh tongue ablaze with the spirit and variously divided, suited in your entirety to each individual soul, wherein lay especially the strangeness of his ability and the largest share of the marvel achieved through the peculiarity of his mixed language: for it was not the case that his speech was accessible to professional rhetors, but excluded the lay audience, nor for that matter did it attract the simpler man while the one who mastered oratory left the occasion empty-handed, or that one part of his speech was to the benefit of this group, while another part was set apart for another group, but the value of his speech shone forth equally throughout and everyone in the audience had access to the whole of it.

Once more Eustathios' praise for Manuel's talents as a rhetor invites us to speculate as to the normative aims of the description. Manuel's ability to speak at once to the simple and the learned is characterized as “strange and marvelous,” and so perhaps not often tried, let alone achieved.75 It may well be that here, too, Eus-

73 M. Cunningham (Preacher and audience, 46), makes the case that literacy should not be regarded as a “necessary prerequisite for the comprehension of literary texts.” I would add only the stipulation that such texts had to have had occasions to be read aloud, recited or somehow performed before such audiences in order to be become intelligible.

74 Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 226.77–89.

75 Eustathios had made it a point of his encomia to Manuel to praise the emperor’s eloquence. Perhaps a rhetor knew no higher compliment. Still, I should stop short of discounting all references to Manuel as an effective speaker as merely panegyrical hyperbole. A little earlier in the same oration Eustathios once more acclaims Manuel's gifts as a public speaker. Or. 13.227.10–11, τὸ περίπλονό τῆς φωνῆς,
tὸ γλυκὰ τῆς λαλῆς, τὸ στρογγύλον τῆς φράσεως, καὶ ὅσιον μὲν ἄμα τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ μεγάλου ἅπτομαι ἀλλὰ καὶ κατηχητήριος ὤδιν μὲν ἄμα τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ μεγάλου ἅπτομαι. If we are reluctant to take the panegyrist’s word at face value, certainly Nicetas Choniates cannot be charged with flattery of Manuel. Cf. Hist. 210.72–76, Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοιγαροῦν οὗτος ἐθελωτικόν ἐντυχοντικόν ἀπὸ λαμπρὸς ἐπέστειλε μόνον, ἀλλὰ κατηχητήριος ὤδιν λέγομαι, οἷς δέ τις κοινήν ἀνέπτυσσε ἄκοιν.
tathios smuggled into imperial panegyric his abiding preoccupations regarding rhetorical instruction. Still, we should like to know whether he deemed his own oratory as meeting the standard he praised in Manuel. Or did he hide behind the feigned humility of not being as accomplished a rhetor as the emperor? The desideratum that a speaker addressing a necessarily mixed audience reach a wide gamut of listeners, that he speak to both the “simple man” (τὸν ἁπλούστερον) as well as to the one well versed in literature (ὁ…τοῦ λόγου τρόφιμος), was not a novelty. The necessary exclusivity which made advanced education a badge of social distinction had to be balanced against the utility of reaching a wider and socially significant audience at risk of alienation from the articulation of institutional authority. That concern must have been felt from each side, author and audience. The passage above nevertheless serves as a reminder that Byzantine sophists were not quite as complacent about the accessibility and appeal of their oratory as they are often thought to have been.

Once more, bearing in mind that many of the texts in question were delivered before live audiences compels us to make allowances for the inevitable fact that there were bound to be some present who struggled to follow the precise meaning of what was being said. Such people, Eustathios observes by way of reassurance, could nevertheless delight in the sound and sheer sensory effect of hearing the speaker intone his speech in a pleasing manner, at once sweet and melodious:

Τοιοῦτον ἡρωϊκὸν ἦχον προβάλλεταί σοι τὰ τῆς λαλιᾶς, καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς γλυκύτητα νοημάτων καὶ Μουσῶν ἐμμέλειαν προάγουσί σοι τὰ χείλη…ὁ δὲ μὴ καὶ εἰς νοῦν ἐμβαθύνειν ἔχων, ἀλλ’ ἐπιπολάζων τῷ τῆς λαλιᾶς ῥεύματι, βροντὴν ἂν εἴποι γαληναίαν ἐξ ὑψίστων ἐνωτίζεσθαι.76

Your speech projects so ‘heroic’ a sound, your lips utter meanings of such sweetness and with the melody of the Muses…indeed even one who us unable to penetrate into their depth but who borne upon the stream of your speech, might say that he is hearkening to a benevolent thunder coming from somewhere high above.

Eustathios thus made allowances for those in a mixed audience who were bound to be excluded from much in an oration. In doing so, he reminds us that oratory cannot be reduced to a mere cognitive relation between the text and its audience, as one tends to conceive of the relation between readers and the written text. An oration was part of an event, experienced by more than the faculty of pure understanding, and invested with no small amount of extra-textual mean-

76 Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 227.25–33.
ing. Eustathios is pointing to something familiar to anyone who enjoys hearings songs whose lyrics he does not understand, as so many opera goers do. His stress on the qualities of voice may be about something other than hyperbole. He repeatedly found cause to praise Manuel’s at once sweet and stentorian voice. Possession of an authoritative and dulcet voice, resonant and pleasing to the ear, mattered a great deal to a court society which continued to put so much store by the spoken or recited word.
The Basel Codex

The Ἐπιτάφιος for Manuel I Komnenos is transmitted in a single witness, Basileensis A.III.20 (also known as the “Basel Codex”), where it is found on ff. 163v-177v. The entry in the catalogue of the Universitätsbibliothek Basel, in Switzerland, describes the Basel Codex as a thirteenth-century manuscript, about which more below, written on so-called carta bombycina, or ‘silken paper’, whose approximate dimensions are 265 x 165 mm.¹ The date and attendant history of the manuscript’s production and purpose have some bearing on our understanding of the significance attached to a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος subsequent to its original, performative context. They also bear on questions regarding the ‘publication’ of a Byzantine author’s works, especially Eustathios’ possible supervision of this editorial and scribal enterprise (among the largest and most complete for any Byzantine author we know of), as well as questions of modern editorial partitioning of the contents of such books into individual editions such as the present one.

The Ἐπιτάφιος takes up 15 folia of the manuscript, the remainder of which is given over to 23 other works of a remarkable variety by Eustathios, including the sole witnesses to his first-hand account of the siege and conquest of Thessalonike, considered among the more unique works of Byzantine historiography; the philologically acute Prooimion to a (probably planned) commentary on the Epinikia of Pindar; a highly disputatious and important treatise on monastic reform; a number of lengthy Lenten orations, hagiographic essays and sermons; a neglected treatise on the nature of political obedience in a Christian state; as well as miscellaneous shorter works, intended perhaps for the classroom, as exhibition pieces for the theatron, or simply for circulation among appreciative

¹ H. Omont, “Catalogue des manuscrits grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse,” Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, t.III (1886) 9–10, 386–387; published separately as Catalogue Des Manuscrits Grecs: Des Bibliothèques de Suisse, ed. H. Omont (Bâle, 1886; repr. Montana, 2010) 24. See the appendix to this section for an image of the catalogue listing. For a meticulous chronicle of the manuscript’s known fate in the post-Byzantine period after arriving in Venice in the sixteenth century, as well as details of its purchase by the Universitätsbibliothek Basel in the earlier part of the seventeenth century, see Pro. ad Pi. 12°–20°. Once thought to have been made of cotton, carta bombycina was proven instead to be composed of flax-based linen. For papier bombycin and its implications for the study of Byzantine book production, see J. Irigoin, “Les premiers manuscrits grecs écrits sur papier et le problème du bombycin,” Scriptorium, Vol. 4/ 2 (1952) 194–204.
Figure 1: Basileensis A.III.20, folio 163v showing the heading and beginning of the Ἐπιτάφιος.
readers.\textsuperscript{2} With a few notable exceptions, the Basel Codex is our only witness for the works contained in it, including the Ἐπιτάφιος, which suggests that it was the Ur-exemplar from which other copies might be made. In fact, were it not for this one manuscript, we might never know of Eustathios’ true range as an author. Along with the lost manuscript from which numerous Eustathian works must have been copied into the well known codices Escorialensis graecus 265 (olim Y-II-10) in Madrid and Oxford’s Bodleianus Barocciianus 131, the Basel Codex appears to have been one installment in a larger effort to create a complete Eustathian corpus, minus the Παρεκβολαι, or commentaries, on the Homeric epics, whose scale and many years of revisions produced a manuscript tradition of their own.\textsuperscript{3}

While not entirely unusual for a learned author of Eustathios’ caliber, the scale of this editorial project, undertaken so close to Eustathios’ own lifetime, must be taken into account along with other palaeographical and codicological evidence for the genesis and projected aim of a complete ‘edition’ of his works.

By means of \textit{comparanda} with so-called “scholarly” scribal hands of the middle Byzantine period, the manuscript’s production has been dated to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, with a \textit{terminus post quem} late in 1185, the year of the Norman conquest of Thessalonike narrated in one of the texts included in the Basel Codex, though that date is likely too early.\textsuperscript{4} On the other hand, establishing a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the manuscript has proven more difficult. Since it is written on what is sometimes referred to as “oriental paper” (made of flax-based linen) thought not to have been in wide circulation in Byzantium before the thirteenth century, the editor of the catalogue, Henri Omont, placed the codex in that century, but without further comment about the likely context of a project on such a scale amid the violence and dislocation brought about by the Fourth Crusade and Latin occupation of the city.\textsuperscript{5} Some scholars have

\textsuperscript{2} For an analytical breakdown of the contents of Basil. A III 20, including the Ἐπιτάφιος, see \textit{Pro. ad Pi.} 4*-8*. Some of the smaller, though by no means less accomplished, texts seems not to have merited a mention in the Πίναξ added to the manuscript during its sojourn in Italy during the sixteenth century. I am currently preparing new editions, with translation and commentary, of some of these: ff. 13v–27v Περὶ υπακοῆς …πολιτεύματι χριστιανικῷ; ff. 32–34v Πρὸς τὸν βαρέως ἀκούοντα…παπᾶς; 37v-39v Ἐφ’ οίς ὑφριστᾷς τις Ἰεράρχης …δ προέθου; 40–42v; 66v–74 Περὶ υποκρίσεως; 113v–117v Διάλογος Ἰεροκλέους καὶ Θεοφίλου.

\textsuperscript{3} This was, in all likelihood, the same exemplar behind such late twelfth-/early thirteenth-century manuscripts as Parisinensis graecus 1182 and Basilensis A.VII.o. containing miscellaneous works by Eustathios.


\textsuperscript{5} A similar argument about the likely date of “oriental paper” in Byzantium has been used to rule out Eustathian autography of Marcianus graecus 448, a copy of the Suda lexicon, also attributed to Eustathios by Maas and rejected by the lexicon’s editor, Peppink, \textit{Suidae Lexicon} V (Leipzig, 1938)
argued that such a work would have been exceedingly difficult to carry out in the immediate aftermath of the ransacking of Constantinople's libraries following the conquest of 1204. A much later date, presumably at the initiative of someone close to the Byzantine court in exile in Nikaia and with intimate knowledge of Eustathios' works, runs up against both palaeographical arguments, as well as more practical obstacles, not least, access to what must have been the original copies of so many Eustathian works. For that reason, palaeographical, codico-logical, and broader historical arguments have overtaken Omont's dating of the manuscript. Still, no single factor has proven decisive in dating the codex more precisely, with significant consequences for any hypothesis about its origin and purpose.

Assuming Eustathios lived to some time in the mid 1190s, as the evidence suggests, this leaves almost a decade between the terminus post quem and his death in which he could have undertaken the compilation of a corpus of his own works. Even if he did not oversee the actual copying, he may well have set the editorial groundwork for such project. By this period, after having served as bishop of Thessalonike for some years, Eustathios would probably have been in a position to employ a secretary to help him create a master copy of his works in a bid to secure his legacy as the preeminent rhetor of his day. There were, in any case, precedents in the twelfth century for publication of this sort in an author’s own lifetime. Nikephoros Basilakes gathered a selection of his own works, and even supplied them with an author’s preface. And Michael Choniates, a former student of Eustathios eventually appointed bishop to the see of Athens, once occupied by Eustathios’ friend Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites, created something akin to a corpus of his own works at the urging of his younger brother, Niketas, who would prove an accomplished author in his own right, in part by making use of Eustathios’ writings to compose a history of this period. Eustathios’ possible involvement in the actual production of the Basel Codex has even been suspected on the basis of at least one of the scribal hands in the manuscript, discussed below.

The Basel Codex appears to have been intended as an exemplar of Eustathios’ work, rather than as a copy for reading in its own right. And although

---


Eustathios retained strong ties to the capital, including a household near the Pantokrator monastery where Manuel’s tomb would be placed, many of his writings after his appointment as bishop must have been composed in Thessalonike. His continued expansion of the Παρεκβολαί to the Iliad and Odyssey during the period of his bishopric suggest he had brought along his writings, as well as a decent selection of books. We can therefore not rule out Thessalonike as the Basel Codex’s birthplace. A further scenario has Eustathios’ exemplars(s) of the manuscript being carried off to the safety of Nikaia, where they were eventually copied into the Basel Codex as part of a wider cultural and ideological project of restoration designed to shore up both rhetorical education and ideological formation. Whatever its origins, the fate of the Basel Codex over the next two and a half centuries remains unknown. The manuscript bears no markings or signs regarding its subsequent Byzantine owners. It resurfaces in Italy, where the codex’s 251 folios were bookended by two sets of pages made of sixteenth-century paper, most likely of Venetian manufacture. This has led some to conclude that the manuscript’s first port of call after the Ottoman conquest was probably Venice, the main entrepôt for Byzantine goods, including books, dating back to at least the twelfth century. The manuscript itself is not attested in the catalogue of the Universitätsbibliothek Basel until 1622. It is unclear when or how it made its way from Italy to Switzerland, where it has been since.
Most studies of the Basel Codex over the last sixty years have focused primarily on the admittedly exciting possibility of its being a Eustathian autograph, and only secondarily on what the manuscript may tell us about the mechanics and goals of what we might fairly term ‘publication’ of a Byzantine author’s oeuvre in this period. Speculation about Basileensis A.III.20 being an autograph manuscript has stemmed from the broad similarity between one of the two hands which copied out the text and the scribal hand of the four manuscripts (Laurentianus Plut. 59.2–3, Marcianus graecus 460, Parisinus graecus 2702) containing Eustathios’ commentaries on the Homeric epics, widely accepted by scholars to be Eustathian autographs.13 As this is not the best venue to reexamine the case for and against the autography of these manuscripts, I have chosen to present the matter in outline in order to raise the question of its significance for the transmission of a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος.

The debate surrounding the autography of the Basel Codex dates back decades to Paul Maas’ proposed identity of this manuscript’s primary hand as that of Eustathios. Such an identification would put him in direct charge of the publication project.14 When Maas compared the characteristics of the presumed Eustathian autographs with the main hand of Basileensis A.III.20, he concluded that the Basel Codex was a close enough match to warrant its tentative acceptance as a Eustathian autograph. As part of his argument, Maas proposed that the Basel Codex formed an effort by Eustathios himself to create an authorized collection of his ‘minor works’. Maas’ hypothesis would have had significant implications not just for the evaluation of the Ἐπιτάφιος, but for the role individual authors could assume in shaping their own legacy.15 It would also have an effect on any possible doubts we may have about the text, seeing as Eustathios himself would have carried out the copying when not oversee ing it.

13 For a representative selection of the arguments and counter-arguments regarding Eustathian autography of the manuscripts containing the Παρεκβολαί, see Comm. ad Hom. II. Pars I, ix-xvi; for a recent assessment of the debate, see Cullhed, “Autograph manuscripts,” 445–461; cf. etiam the comments of Wilson, “Three Byzantine scribes,” 226–227.

14 P. Maas, “Zu den Basler Autographen des Eustathios,” Institutum Anatolikōn Spoudōn (Patriarchikē Vivliothēkē Alexandreias). Tome commémoratif du millénaire de la Bibliothèque patriarcale d’Alexandrie (Alexandrie, 1953) 139–144. Maas identified two hands at work copying Basil. A III 20. One, Eustathios’ (E), which carried out the largest share of the work; the other, probably that of a secretary (S), which relieved him. The notable differences between the two allowed him to delineate the exact sequence of hands: (E) ff.1r-11v; (S) 12r-13r; (E) 13v-27v; (S) 28r-74r; (E) 74v-253.

Maas’ palaeographical arguments regarding Eustathian autography found few supporters. Having examined folios 220v-254v of the Basel Codex for his edition of Eustathios’ account of the Norman siege of Thessalonike, S. Kyrriakides discovered too many scribal errors in a section attributed by Maas to Eustathios to be convinced that it could have been an autograph. Similarly, N. Wilson has concluded that neither of the two scribal hands in Basileensis A.III.20 belongs to Eustathios, though unlike subsequent scholars, he continued to place the manuscript’s copying in the late twelfth century. This ensured Eustathios’ possible oversight of the Basel Codex pre-production, scribal errors notwithstanding. Indirectly addressing the disputed autography, H. Hunger observed that the scholarly hands of the twelfth century – such as we find in the manuscripts containing Eustathios’ works – were themselves a partial outgrowth of the imperial chancery hands of the eleventh century, passed on from one generation of secretaries and similarly trained functionaries to the next. As might be expected, the young men destined to fill the ranks of the imperial bureaucracy had received the same training as those who would go on to make careers as “scribes and scholars,” as the title of N. G. Wilson and L. D. Reynold’s famous book would have it. Hunger’s observation reminds us of the likelihood of similarity among such scribal hands.

So while the argument for the Basel Codex being an autograph itself never found much support, its real significance lay not so much in the possession of

16 B. Laourdas agreed with Maas’ that Basileensis A III 20 was copied by Eustathios. He also supported the conclusion that the hand which had copied the Eustathian works in Scorialensis 265 (Y-II-10) matched the main hand of the Basel Codex, which would have meant that Eustathios penned those quires of the Escorial manuscript containing his own works, an intriguing possibility not dismissed outright by Wilson (see note below for Wilson, “Three Byzantine scribes”). See B. Laourdas, «Εἰς Εὐστάθιον Θεσσαλονίκης,» Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 23 (1953) 544–547.


18 Wilson, “Three Byzantine scribes,” 227, nn. 7–8. Wilson’s verdict was adopted by H. Hunger in his authoritative survey, Profane Literatur, 429. However, while he doubted the Basel Codex is a Eustathian autograph, Wilson was nevertheless willing to entertain Laourdas’ identification of the relevant folios of Scor. 265 (Y-II-10) as having been copied by Eustathios himself, thus further complicating the overall picture; see Wilson, “Three Byzantine scribes,” 226–228; idem., “Scholarly hands,” 221–239.

19 Wilson observes that a late twelfth century date is quite plausible given the imperfect state of our knowledge about the cursive, or scholarly, hands of this period. See Wilson, “Scholarly hands,” 239–231.


a manuscript in the author’s own hand, which we already had with the manuscripts of the Παρεκβολαι, but the possibility of Eustathios’ direct involvement in a project of this scale to ensure the survival of his works.\textsuperscript{23} We have no such evidence from equally prolific authors, like Michael Psellos or Theodoros Prodromos, for example, whose concern for their literary legacies cannot have been any less pronounced. The possibility of autography thus stands in for broader questions surrounding authorial ambition in the twelfth century. Where in previous periods authors may have relied on demand for model texts in collections of specific genres, such as we find in manuscripts containing various model “rhetorical” texts, like Scorialensis 265 (Y II 10) or Baroccianus 131, the increasingly personalized style of authorship ascribed by A. Kazhdan to the twelfth century may well have found expression in the simultaneous publication and circulation of a single author’s works, albeit for copying of individual texts bearing his name.\textsuperscript{24}

Besides the question of who copied the Basel Codex, however, we us still answer that of how this project was executed, in what kind of setting and with what aims in mind. The manuscript appears to be the work of not one but two separate scribal hands working closely with one another, occasionally and somewhat inexplicably alternating within the space of a few lines. This somewhat puzzling \textit{modus scribendi} has prompted questions about the relationship of the two scribes and led to hypotheses about the possible circumstances in which such a work might have been carried out. Hand A (=E in Maas, followed by much of the older bibliography) is untidy and stubby but practiced and consistent after the manner of ‘scholarly’ hands of this period. Hand A carried out the bulk of the

\textsuperscript{23} P. Maas maintained that some time before his death (which he dates c.1194), Eustathios must have tried to create a complete edition of his “Kleine Schriften,” that is, the many works comparatively smaller than his prodigious commentaries on the Homeric epics. See Maas, “Zu den Basler Autographen des Eustathios,” 139–144. In the case of the Παρεκβολαι, copies were not likely to be commissioned as exemplars of a genre but to be read in their own right. As Eustathios indicates in the introduction to the revised and expanded edition of the Παρεκβολαι on the \textit{Iliad}, they were intended as instructional books for both current and former students who wished to have a complete handbook on Homeric poetry at their side when reading ‘the poet’. Few would have presumed to emulate the work. On the uses of the Παρεκβολαι, see R. Nünlist, “Homer as a blueprint for speechwriters: Eustathius’ commentaries and rhetoric,” \textit{GRBS} 52 (2012) 493–509.

\textsuperscript{24} The phenomenon may be related to the emergence in this period of professional \textit{literati}, as first described in Kazhdan, \textit{Change}, 130–133. The well known case of Nikephoros Basilakes assembling an edition of his selected \textit{Progymnasmata} and supplying it with an introduction is perhaps justly seen as a milestone in Byzantine authorial identity. Similarly, Michael Choniates appears to have composed an introduction to his own collected works urged upon him by his younger brother, Nicetas Choniates. We have no such introduction by Eustathios for the Basel Codex, though the fact that he wrote one for the revised edition of the commentaries to the \textit{Iliad} invites speculation about similar, now lost introductions for his remaining works, as well.
work, copying ff. 4–27v and ff. 74–253v, with help from Hand B (=S in Maas), a more fluid but not so dissimilar hand which copied ff. 28r–74r after having stepped in briefly at f. 11r (Fig. 2), ff. 12r–13r, and again at ff. 22r–22v (Figs. 3–4).25 The folios containing the Ἐπιτάφιος, ff. 163v-177r were thus the exclusive work of Hand A, the same one thought by Maas and others to be Eustathios’ own, though rejected by most nowadays.

---

While scribes A and B collaborated closely, A not only wrote more of the text, but also appears to have had the responsibility for proof-reading the manuscript and making any corrections to the folios written by Hand B. The cooperation between the two scribes has given rise to numerous hypotheses about their respective roles, though no single theory has marshalled a consensus. Regardless of what one thinks about the question of autography, it remains unexplained why Hand B should have had to step in and help by copying with so few lines, even as Hand A had the responsibility for reviewing the manuscript and making any final corrections. Wilson has argued that the targeted interventions of B are more characteristic of those of a head of a scriptorium coming to the aid of a junior colleague who is having difficulty making out the letters of a passage in the exemplar.26 This is a plausible scenario, to be sure, save for the fact that the hand of the junior scribe appears to have been charged with reviewing the manuscript for mistakes, a responsibility usually assumed by his more practiced senior. Although evidently similar in their basic letter patterns, Hand B may be distinguished by its more closely formed, often curvier, and slightly longer right-leaning upright letters, as well as its repertoire of graceful ligatures (Fig. 5). This is in contrast to the relatively squat, often roughly hewn and irregular

26 Wilson, “Three Byzantine scribes,” 227; Maas identified Hand A with Eustathios and thought he had checked the copy against his own originals. But he offered no explanation for the intervention of Hand B in the folios listed above. See P. Maas, “Verschiedenes zu Eustathios,” BZ 45 (1952) 1–3, 3.
lettering of Hand A (Fig. 6). Of course a veteran scribe need not have produced a smoother script, just a more accurate one.

There have been two full scale codicological studies of Basileensis A.III.20, one by A. Kambylis and more recently by S. Schönauer. While Kambylis more precisely identified the book’s make-up and allowed us to date its historical itinerary prior to reaching the Basel collections, Schönauer’s analysis has yielded one especially significant finding. After a thorough re-examination of the codex, Schönauer has conjectured that the quires of the Basel Codex were probably originally bound in a different order than the one we see today. At f. 137r Schönauer detects an effort on the part of the scribe to stretch out the remaining text by slightly enlarging the letters and limiting the ruling to 22 lines (Fig. 7), in contrast to the usual economy of this hand which had managed an average of 28–31 lines per manuscript page, as may be seen on the previous folio, 136v (Fig. 8). However, midway down f. 137v the scribe is forced once more to tighten up the spacing, having presumably miscalculated the remaining proportions of text to space available (Fig. 9). Folio 138r, on the other hand, exhibits a better proportioned, more orderly script by this same hand A (Fig. 10). Schönauer has plausibly suggested that the tidier lettering here bears the signs of a neatly begun book which gradually grew more hurried and suffered the scribe’s miscalculations of space vs. text. She therefore deduces a hidden caesura at this point in the Basel Codex, explained perhaps by the possibility that ff. 138r-254v represents the original first half of the manuscript, while ff. 4r-137v made up the second half. For reasons not easily inferred from either the contents of the texts or their estimated original dates of composition, the two halves of the manuscript would have been (re-)assembled in reverse order, with the neatly written start buried in the middle instead of headlining the codex. The text of ff. 138r-139r, a canon dedicated to the protomartyr of Thessalonike, St. Demetrios, would certainly make a fitting

27 For Kambylis, see his Pro. ad Pi. 2*-12*; Schönauer, “Zum Eustathios-Codex,” 231–241.
29 See M. Formentin, “La grafia di Eustazio di Tessalonica,” Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferretta 37 (1983) 19–50, 45. Formentin, and before her, Maas, had noted that beginning at f. 138 the scribe’s writing became “più severa e regolare, con tratti più calligrafici e abbreviazioni meno frequenti…più ordinata perché queste non oltrepassano le delimitazione dello spazio scripturae, come spesso avviene nelle altre pagine.” However, she adds that this well-ordered and meticulous script lasts only as far as f. 160, after which it reverts to what we find in the other folios. Cf. Maas, “Zu den Basler Autographen des Eustathios,” 142.
Figure 7: Basel. A III 20 f.137r (Hand A, swollen to fill up the extra space)

Figure 8: Basel. A III 20, f.136v (Hand A, usual size and spacing)

Figure 9: Basel. A III 20, f.137v (Hand A, contracted and compressed)

Figure 10: Basel. A III 20, f.138r (Hand A, proportionately delineated)
opening to a codex containing the works of Thessalonike’s archbishop. Equally apt, the codex would then have closed with Eustathios’ Pauline-like epistle to his restive Thessalorecan flock, now found in ff.129r-137v. All this could be taken as further corroboration of the hypotheses mentioned above that Eustathios undertook the assembly of the Basel Codex while in Thessalonike.30

In addition to the original ordering of the quires of the Basel Codex, Schönauer’s rather plausible codicological scenario speaks to the difficulty of establishing the logic of scribal hands, or even of differentiating among them sometimes. Figures 6 through 10 are all presumably by the same Hand A, which copied out the largest share of the manuscript. But within the span of two folios we see significant variation in the scribe’s manner, though without ever altering the basic template of individual letter forms common to this scribal hand. Script types, like the so-called “scholarly” hand of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century, were widely adopted by both scribes and scholars of the period, as may be seen in the widely accepted Eustathian autographs, such as Parisinus graecus 2702 (Fig. 11). The likeness of the script in this manuscript with that of the Basel Codex is unmistakable and explains why some have seen Eustathios’ hand at work in Basileensis A.III.20. But just as likeness cannot prove identity, neither can differences which may be due to pragmatic considerations, such as the need for ‘clean’ copies of the commentaries to the Iliad and Odyssey destined for potential buyers, one possibility suggested by the prooimion attached to the Laurentian codex (Laur. plut. 59.2) containing the Παρεκβολαί to the Iliad.31 Such

30 As I note above, Cullhed, following on van der Valk’s earlier conjecture, has all but proven now that Eustathios’ philological labours continued unabated during his bishopric. See Cullhed, “Autograph manuscripts,” 459–461. Given the period in question, it probably helps account for the high incidence of parallel citations from the Παρεκβολαί in the Ἐπιτάφιος. These may well have been due to an intensified period of engagement with Eustathios’ own analysis of the Homeric scholia, thereby increasing the likelihood of repurposing, as it were, such material in his orations.

31 Comm. ad Hom. II. 1.1.1–1.9.6. J. Irigoin, noted that of the four manuscripts associated with the Παρεκβολαί, only one, about the Odyssey, was copied onto so-called oriental paper, leading Irigoin to conclude its less expensive material betrays its more humble target audience, some of whom at least
commercial incentives may well have elicited greater discipline from the author/copyist than he would have shown when transcribing a text whose function was to serve as an exemplar for further copying, rather than to be read. Moreover, we should bear in mind differences in layout and anticipated use between the Παρεκβολαί and the individual texts of the Basel Codex. The detailed analytical structure of Eustathios’ Homeric commentaries required a more precise format, which in turn acted as a regulating influence on the scribe.

Schönauer’s codicological analysis has led her to speculate about possible lost Eustathian works between the two halves of the manuscript which were either removed when it was taken apart and re-bound, or were simply never bound with the rest of the manuscript in the first place. Kambylis has suggested that additional quires of the Basel Codex remained unbound for a time in “booklets,” only to have been eventually distributed among different codices in the end. Such a scenario carries the potential for works going astray. But all these hypotheses remind us of the evolving nature of a project like that of creating a ‘collected works’ for a Byzantine author as prolific as Eustathios, even under his close supervision. Such an editorial cum scribal project was likely to have taken a while, and was thus subject to error, like the binding of the quires out of their original order, as well as changes prompted by lost works or delays in copying. Assuming Schönauer’s hypothesis to be correct, the original order of the works contained in the manuscript would have been as follows:

| ff.138r–139r | Canon ad S. Demetrium |
| ff.139v–151r | Laudatio S. Demetrii |
| ff.151v–163v | Ad Stylitam Quemdam Thessalonicensem |
| ff.163v–177v | Manuelis Comneni Laudatio Funebris |
| ff.177v–220v | De Emendanda Vita Monachica |
| ff.220v–254v | De Thessalonica Urbe a Latinis Capta |
| … … … … | (fort. desunt opera) |
| ff.2v–8v | In Sanctam Quadragesimam Oratio |


32 In the most comprehensive study of Eustathian autography to date, M. Formentin has compiled up a detailed profile of the hand(s) in the manuscripts judged Eustathian autographs, with sketches of each letter type, ligatures, and abbreviations. For a complete inventory of letter forms and ligatures in the manuscripts, see Formentin, “La grafía di Eustazio,” 33–41.

33 Kambylis had already noted the possibility of additional works coming before the first numbered folio (f. 4) of Basil. A III 20, in addition to the Πίναξ and the opening of the Lenten homily. See Pro. ad Pi. 9*–10*.

34 Ibid. 10*.
Such a re-ordering of the works in the Basel Codex raises the question of an original organizing principle in the distribution of the texts. Schönauer concedes that even if we assume an inversion of the two parts of the manuscript, no discernible thematic unity emerges. But an intentional order of works is not the same as a unified one. Thus if we assume the order implied by Schönauer’s hypothesis, the Ἐπιτάφιος appears fourth in the codex instead of twenty-second, right after the three Thessalonian texts with which the Basel Codex opens: the dedicatory canon to St. Demetrios, patron-saint of Thessalonike; an encomium to St. Demetrios; and an essay admonishing an overzealous Thessalonican stylite. This would have made the Ἐπιτάφιος the leading non-dedicatory secular text of the collection. More importantly, it would have been the first of the manuscript’s ‘core’ texts containing the exemplary prose most readers anticipated, since Eustathios had made a name for himself not as a hagiographer (a somewhat defunct or perfunctory genre in this period), but as a court orator and imperial panegyrist (as well as a scholar and teacher). Such an order of the texts need not have been systematic to be significant. The book-ending of the codex with works associated with Eustathios’ tenure as archbishop of Thessalonike suggests that the selection and arrangement of the texts sought to capitalize on Eustathios’ association with the city, probably while he still held the post. Moreover, the works foregrounded by the probably actual order, represented Eustathios’ most recent and authorially significant achievements, not least the delivery of the Ἐπιτάφιος

at so prestigious an occasion as the burial and commemoration of the emperor Manuel I Komnenos.

It is worth stressing here that both the palaeographic and codicological arguments are worth pursuing for what they can reveal about both the specific codex and about book production and publication among authors of Eustathios’ standing at the close of one of the most creative eras in Byzantine literary history. Reinsch has noted that in contrast with ancient literature, whose manuscripts went through many stages of transmission, most surviving medieval Greek works from the late ninth century onwards are either as yet unrecognized autographs, or were probably copied directly from such autographs and are in our possession. The likelihood of this increases as texts move up the linguistic register, with fewer and fewer copies in circulation. This means that even when it proves impossible to establish autography beyond a reasonable doubt, we can place the extant manuscript and the constitution of the text on the page as we find it close enough to the author’s original practice, including such elements as orthography, accentuation, and punctuation, as well other editorial features of the text, like the arrangement of works. This raises the question: how different might our conception of Byzantine literary history look if we published entire manuscripts, instead of parcelling out selected individual works, authors, or genres? The Basel Codex is rightly judged as especially revealing of late Komnenian rhetorical culture, pedagogy, ideology and aesthetics, all bound up in a series of editorial choices. To understand the significance of a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος we must appreciate its original manuscript setting as revealing of its earliest publication.

46 (A. III. 20). Eustathii Thessalonicensis opuscula.


Voy. l’éd. Tafel, Francfort, 1832, in-4°.


The apparatus fontium: Quellenforschung or Intertextuality?

Few aspects of modern editorial method in medieval Greek philology are proving quite so promising, or so unresolved, as the desired parameters and potential significance of the *apparatus fontium et locorum parallelorum* (henceforward *apparatus*).

1 Historically, the aim of an *apparatus* has been to reveal the “source” texts from which citations or identifiable allusions were drawn. More recently, however, the *apparatus* has served to lay bare the various and sometimes unexpected relations of a text to other texts, both earlier and contemporary. In the case of an author as proficient in the long literary heritage of Byzantium as Eustathios was, able to draw on a remarkably wide array of texts, both ancient and medieval, the *apparatus* holds out great potential for unraveling the poetics of his works.

2 Less certain, however, is how precisely to constitute an *apparatus* that can both accurately and instructively profile not just the direct impact of Eustathios’ wide reading on the *Ἑπιτάφιος*, but the more mediated effect of the broader textual culture which made its way into the oration by more circuitous paths. The combination of these two strands amounts to a layered, composite *intertextuality*.

The constitution of an expanding and more complex *apparatus* would probably not be a matter of editorial interest, much less debate, were it not for the steadily rising number of Byzantine texts being added to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (hence *TLG*) and the capacity of the latter to locate telling parallels among texts formerly thought to have borne no obvious resemblance to each other. But an expanding *TLG* has enabled a range of citations and parallels pre-

---

1 Different editors opt for variations on *parallela*, such as *similia*, usually without much explanation as to their potential difference. This terminological inconsistency follows from a general under-theorization of the modern *apparatus*. Calls for binding editorial guidelines, such as those proposed by D. R. Reinsch below, are not likely to address this problem unless preceded by sustained discussion of the desired aims of the *apparatus* and the practicable means of achieving them. A model for such discussion, accompanied by stimulating debates, is offered by the *Ars edendi* lecture series sponsored by Stockholm University. See *Ars edendi: lecture series. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis* 56–59, eds. A. Bucossi et al. (Stockholm, 2011–2014).

2 Hunger notes Eustathios’ talent for fusing material from pagan and Christian sources, see H. Hunger, *Reich der neuen Mitte: der christliche Geist der byzantinischen Kultur* (Graz, 1965) 343.
viously unforeseen by conventional citation, leading some editors to reconsider expanded uses for the *apparatus*. One may see this in numerous recent editions of Byzantine texts. Having started out by documenting only close citations or direct allusions to biblical or canonical ancient Greek texts, the *apparatus* has expanded over time to include a broader spectrum of “sources.” Increasingly, this has included potentially telling parallels drawn from both late antique and contemporary medieval Greek texts. These may disclose the more immediate literary and linguistic context of a work formerly compared only to similar, or often much older, texts.

We can chart this evolution in the scope and significance of the *apparatus* for Byzantine literature in a sequence of modern editions of Eustathian works. We thus compare Kyriakidis’ minimalist *apparatus* for the 1961 edition of the *Conquest of Thessalonike* with that supplied by Kambylis for his 1991 edition of the *Prooimion to the Commentary on Pindar*. From there we may note a steady expansion as we arrive at the editions published since then, beginning with Eustathios’ letters by Kolovou, the treatise on monastic reform edited by K. Metzler, and that of the Lenten orations by Schönauer. With each new edition, we see the *apparatus* being reconceived and expanded in line with the growing potential not just of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, but also of a concomitantly more apposite understanding of Byzantine literary culture.

In all these editions we meet various, and not always explicitly stated, rationales for the *apparatus*. Thus Kolovou, in her highly instructive edition of the surviving letters of Eustathios, describes the aim of the *apparatus fontium et testimoniorum* in deceptively conventional terms, despite having broken the mold by widening the parameters of relevant citation to a point not seen before in editions of Eustathios or almost any similar prose author. The goal, according to Kolovou, should be to identify the “sources” (*Quellen*), to which she adds parallel passages intended to render the text more intelligible, itself a significantly expanded rôle for the *apparatus*. Kolovou provides a lengthy analysis of Eustathios’ *Zitierweise* with which she buttresses her *apparatus*. Her approach to

---

3 *De capta Thess.* (Kyriakidis); *Pro. ad Pi.* (Kambylis); *Ep.* (Kolovou); *De emend.* (Metzler); *Or. quadr.* (Schönauer). All three, Kolovou, Metzler, and Schönauer provide extended quotation of *fontes* or *parallela/similia/testimonia* in the *apparatus fontium* in order to afford the reader an opportunity to make an immediate comparison. See Schönauer’s comments in *Prolegomena to Or. quadr.* 82*- 83*.

4 One need only compare the *apparatus fontium* of the latest editions of Eustathios’ works with those of earlier editions to see the expanding definition of “source” or “parallel”; cf. *Ep.* 25*- 75*; for Kolovou’s extensive discussion of the *Zitierweise des Eustathios*, detailing the links between individual citations in the letters and their sources.
citation effectively transcends the conventional understanding of “sources.” Her apparatus lays bare an entire way of conceiving of literary endeavour, in this case, applied to epistolary writing.

Likewise K. Metzler’s edition of De emendanda vita monachica, Eustathios’ long diatribe against the moral corruption of monasticism in his time, makes the most of the apparatus in a bid to spell out the evolution of the text from Eustathios’ earlier writings. She frequently includes passages characterized as *similia* which shed light on the text at hand while simultaneous locating it in wider homiletic and broadly moral discourses of the time. Until recently, most of these would not have been deemed “sources” in the conventional sense. Similarly, Schönauer’s edition of Eustathios’ seven surviving Lenten sermons incorporates a generously conceived apparatus which lists obvious allusions to, or borrowings from, scripture, as well as less direct echoes of ancient literature so fully absorbed into medieval Greek that attributing them to a “source” mistakenly suggests conscious quotation. Other citations are so partial and oblique as to constitute remote, though no less formative, derivations. Rather illustrative of this trend is Schönauer’s inclusion of a seamless range of citations which point less to direct borrowing or *mimesis* in the sense often ascribed to Byzantine authors. In its place she reveals a vast textual foundation which undergirds Eustathios’ sermons, not all of it ‘literary’ in either aim or reception. Often there are no obvious or direct lines to be drawn between such passages corresponding sufficiently in either form or content to warrant inclusion in the apparatus. Instead, the consonance between passages of the Lenten orations and a rather heterogeneous set of *fontes* invites the reader to reflect on the possible channels between various, often unrelated, discourses which found their way into Eustathios’ text and perhaps into the wider genre.

But the trend to an ever more expansive and therefore transformative approach to the apparatus can be seen in P. Cesaretti and S. Ronchey’s recent magisterial edition of Eustathios’ neglected *Exegesis in Canonem iambicum pen*

---

5 *Or. quadr.* 3.77.236: δυνατῷ καὶ ὑφελίμως; cf. *Pl. Rep.* 457c: ἀλλά πὴ τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν αὐτῷ ὄμολογεῖσθαι ἐς δυνατά τε καὶ ὑφελίμα λέγει; cf. etiam *Or. quadr.* 5.117.400: Σοφός τε καὶ ἄγαθός, et passim apud Platonem. 6 *Or. quadr.* 5.136.874–875, where the Eustathian sentence καὶ εἷς πρὸς ἕνα μετρεῖται καὶ μόνος μόνου γίνεται is matched to the Sophoclean passage in *Aj.* 1283sq.: χῶν᾽ αὕτης αὐτὸς Ἐκτορος μόνος μόνου, λαχών τε κάκελευστος, ἠλένην ἀντίος. 7 *Or. quadr.* 4.85.91–93; cf. 6.157.340, 157.347, 7.213.664–6. No less likely to beg the question of their function are parallels drawn with near-contemporary authors, such as Anna Komnene and Theodore Prodromos, who provide evidence for the currency of certain expression or motifs across genres, *Or. quadr.* 6.164.524–5.
The editors opt for an *apparatus* almost bursting at the seams with detailed references and precedents which underwrite the composition of the work. Cesaretti and Ronchey have made something of a quantum leap in editorial practice. They offer the reader of this previously understudied Eustathian work a thoroughly detailed breakdown of the text’s diverse “sources” while supplying parallel cross references within and beyond the Eustathian corpus. They thereby reveal the raw materials out of which the *Exegesis in Canonem* was fashioned. In doing so, they have opened avenues of interpretation of the work’s aims and intended reception that would otherwise remain hidden from the modern reader at the immediate point of contact with the text. Ironically, Cesaretti and Ronchey provide a somewhat understated estimate of what the *apparatus* can reveal, one not quite commensurate with their own pioneering use of the *apparatus*.9

The variations in the *apparatus* in each of these works reflect the editors’ estimate of what *fontes*, *loci paralleli*, or *testimonia* and *similia* may disclose about the composition and objectives of the text.10 As Giannouli observes, the varied citations of the *apparatus* “constitute essential material for the *constitutio textus* as well as for the better appreciation of the text, in particular its composition technique and literary impact.”11 While these vary in accordance with genre and the intent of individual authors, so does the role played by the direct or indirect citation of literature. All this variation has led some to call for an *apparatus* at once more tailored to medieval Greek texts and exhibiting greater uniformity.12

---

8 *Exeg. in can. iamb.*

9 They cite the potential of the *apparatus* for revealing Eustathios’ “*patrimonio di conoscenze, attinto, nel comporla, per consulta diretta o per ricorso mnemonico*.” But that is arguably a modest distillation of what we may glean from close study of the *apparatus* alongside Eustathios’ text. See *Exeg. in can. iamb.* 304*.

10 For a concise outline of the methodological questions, see now A. Giannouli, “Critical editions and the complementary apparatuses to a critical apparatus,” *Comparative oriental manuscript studies bulletin* 1/1 (Spring 2015) 21–28.


12 The need for greater consistency among critical editions of Byzantine texts has been authoritatively articulated recently by D. R. Reinsch, who has urged the field to arrive at some consensus regarding editorial standards. To this end, he has proposed a commission to set firmer editorial guidelines regarding the presentation of the text, including the application of accents and punctuation, as well as the make-up of the *apparatus fontium*. This would appear to make sense, but it risks precluding, or worse yet, inhibiting, discussion about the purposes which any individual edition may serve and the necessary experiments with such models. Indeed, Reinsch’s own landmark editions of Anna Komnene and to an even greater extent the more recent edition of Michael Psellus’ *Chronographia* are valuable because they depart from the received standards, at times even courting controversy with some of their editorial practice. See D. R. Reinsch, “Zum Edieren von Texten: über Zitate,” *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine studies, London 21–26 August 2006*, ed. E. Jeffreys, I: Plenary papers (Aldershot, 2006) 299–309, 299.
But a one-size-fits-all approach to the *apparatus* is unlikely to address the potential of every text to tell its unique story or to reveal otherwise elusive facets of Byzantine authorial practice and poetics more broadly. A degree of uniformity across editions must be balanced against the useful information the *apparatus* may yield in each case. To this end, editors should be free to fashion the *apparatus* best suited to revealing a specific text’s participation in a literary system or discourse.

An expanded understanding of the *apparatus*, especially with regard to *parallela* (or *similia*), *imitationes*, and *testimonia*, should aim at establishing the field(s) of discourse in which the text seeks to create a space for itself. This is likely to transcend the traditional conception of the *apparatus* as testifying exclusively to which texts an author may have consciously had in mind while composing a work and which he may have intended the audience to recognize. A. Failler, editor of George Pachymeres’ fourteenth-century historical narrative, argues as much when he refers to the function of his own *apparatus fontium et similiorum* as demonstrating that the author’s language – the metaphors, imagery, turns of phrase – are never entirely his own but the product of a common literary reservoir. Failler cautions against creating the false impression of a vast repertoire of “sources” methodically collected and consciously arranged by the author. Of course, it is just such a conception of the *apparatus* that has contributed to the perception of many a Byzantine author as an imitative, but not especially creative, figure.

In the case of a work like the Ἐπιτάφιος, usually regarded as having been composed according to the well-trodden conventions of its genre, the *apparatus* would tend to be conceived as merely confirming Eustathios’ wide reading, not least in ancient literature. But is that the most instructive conception of the *apparatus* for this particular oration? Might an expanded *apparatus* go some ways


14 See, for example, the analysis by Stone “Funeral oration,” 239–273. Surveying a cross section of Eustathios’ religious and secular works, H. Hunger arrived at an approximate ratio of biblical to pagan more or less direct citations of 3:2, with the Septuagint far outpacing the New Testament (though the disproportion of Psalms accounted for much of that imbalance); while Homer leads among the ancients, followed at some distance by Sophocles, Plutarch, Plato, Aristotle, Pindar, Euripides, Aeschylus, and sundry other authors. Hunger, *Reich*, 344. Hunger’s figures might need revising in light of the spate of modern editions. Even if the gross ratios do not move much, the internal distribution might. Patristic writings, for one, figure more prominently in the *apparatus* of Eustathios’ orations, including
in demystifying the composition and function of such a text? Concise and more restrained in its epideictic flourishes, the Ἐπιτάφιος does not flaunt its literary pedigree in quite the same way as many contemporary texts. So unostentatious and often understated is the function of citation that without the apparatus one might be excused for thinking that Eustathios made only minimal use of his wide literary and philological background in composing the oration. But a second, though less frequently discussed, question raised by the apparatus is what it may tell us about the vexing issue of the text’s intelligibility to its likely audience(s). To the extent that it can help establish a wider textual context, an apparatus which reveals the continuity with other discourses may check the propensity to regard most ‘high style’ Byzantine texts as inherently unintelligible by virtue of their uncommon diction and learned references.

While few of the questions concerning the apparatus of the Ἐπιτάφιος are without precedent, too few occasional addresses of its kind have been subjected to such close scrutiny with respect to their sources and parallels. In keeping with recent practice, I have tried to signal continuities between this oration and the wider Eustathian corpus, both in the apparatus and in the accompanying commentary. As observed already, however, citation will misrepresented an author’s modus scribendi if it encourages the inference that an author consulted or consciously recalled all the works cited in the apparatus. Properly understood, the use of parallela can mitigate this misleading impression of first-hand recollection and citation. Like authors of any period, Byzantine authors too had second or third-hand experience of literature through intermediate works, many of them by earlier or contemporary Byzantine authors. The problem thus addressed is not just the risk of misrepresenting “the Byzantine author’s education the Ἐπιτάφιος, than is usually acknowledged by scholarship on Eustathios, which has tended to highlight his admittedly prodigious knowledge of ancient literature.

15 Wirth furnished his edition of the Opera minora, containing most of Eustathios’ court orations, with a traditional, rudimentary apparatus fontium, citing mostly ancient and biblical literature.


17 Shakespeare is perhaps the most prominent example of an author more widely cited than read directly. Reinsch and Kambylis, whose apparatus to the Alexias is a model of thoroughness, (including a reference in Bk I, 9,9–10 to Kavafis’ poem dedicated to Anna Komnene!) do not offer much by way of an explanation in their Prolegomena of the function and significance of parallela; see Alex. *56. However, Reinsch’s articles and conference papers on editorial criticism have prompted renewed consideration of their role and of the apparatus more generally. See, for example, Reinsch, “What should an editor do,”131–154.

18 Reinsch gives the example of Anna Komnene employing a phrase (Alex. III.3,2 γοργωπὸν σέλας ἀφήσει τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν) which appears in Aesch., Prom. 356, though Anna most likely gleaned the expression either from the common store of learned language or, quite possibly, from Michael Psellus,
and the range of his actual readings,” as A. Giannouli correctly observes in her concise summary of current editorial practices.\textsuperscript{19} We may also misapprehend the way even the best educated authors actually composed.\textsuperscript{20}

For instance, when the most recent editors of the \textit{Alexias} cite Plutarch’s \textit{Life of Pericles} and Aristophanes’ \textit{Clouds} in the \textit{apparatus} in connection with an allusion to Pericles in the speech ascribed to Alexios I in Book VI (\textit{Alex.} 172,49), is the reader to infer that Anna Komnene drew directly on either text for her father’s argument regarding the financing of the empire’s defence? Likewise, the editors direct the reader’s attention to Sophocles (\textit{OT} 334–335) in connection with Anna’s aphoristic reference to Alexios’ ability to “soften the soul” in Bk VI (\textit{Alex.} 191,33–34). A little further down in the same passage, they cite Thucydides and Demosthenes as a parallel and a source, respectively, for Anna’s reference to the reconstruction of Athens after its destruction by the invading Persians (\textit{Alex.} 192,72–78; 78–79). Anna’s boast regarding her zeal for study of the classics notwithstanding, was her recollection of every passage cited in the \textit{apparatus} really unmediated by later texts? In other words, how do we establish whether we are dealing with a specific textual frame of reference or a more diffuse, mediated one? Is it not just as likely that phrases or recognizable events came unmoored from their original textual contexts and circulated as parts of other texts? The admittedly imperfect solution (a hedge, one might argue), has been the widespread use of “cf.” to designate an unspecified and almost deliberately ambiguous connection between the text cited in the \textit{apparatus} and the work in question.\textsuperscript{21} The reader is thus asked to note the similarity, without any more specific claim by the editor about the relation of the texts.

Similarly, A. Alexakis has argued that many biblical passages reverberating through Byzantine literature do so by way of liturgical texts and hymnography, rather than as direct quotations from the bible.\textsuperscript{22} The difference is important because it establishes the more immediate context of common reference between the text and its audience. A more difficult question arises when the text matches who uses it in his encomium to Konstantinos IX Monomachos. See Reinsch, “Zum Edieren”, 302. For Anna Komnene’s possible Psellan source, see Or. \textit{pan.} 230–231.


\textsuperscript{20} For an example of false assumptions regarding the manner of composition by learned Byzantine authors, see Littlewood, “Statistical survey,” 139.

\textsuperscript{21} For the use of “cf.” to designate passages of works bearing an uncertain relation to the edited text, see Reinsch, “Zum Edieren,” 304. For a partial resolution of this often imprecise relationship, see the discussion below on intertextuality.

\textsuperscript{22} A. Alexakis, \textit{The Greek life of St. Leo bishop of Catania} (BHG 981b) [Subsidia hagiographica 91] (Bruxelles, 2011) 138.
a passage from a plausibly direct "source," like the New Testament. A case in point may be the repeated invocation of the parable of the talents in the Ἐπιτάφιος (§ 18, 65, 79). While it unquestionably derives from the two (distinct) Gospel versions (Matt. 25:14–30 and Luc. 19:12–27), the sense of the parable intended by Eustathios appears to have been due as much to its widespread use as a kind of shorthand for the morally uncomplicated sense of multiplying one's estate than as an allusion to the elusive moral of the biblical contexts. The problem, moreover, in distinguishing systematically between fontes, and the variously classified parallela, similia, or testimonia, for a Byzantine text like the Ἐπιτάφιος lies with the often ill-defined and debatable notion of "source." This is especially so for the literary and rhetorical culture of Byzantium, which valued proficiency not just in specific canonical texts, but in the accumulated resources of the language. How should we differentiate between fontes and parallela which may testify to a more relevant but non-"original" source? To list even a sample range of such ambiguous cases would require a study in its own right. The Διήγησις Ὺιστορική of Nicetas Choniates furnishes us with an example of the often indeterminate nature of citations in the apparatus, fittingly involving Eustathios as possible fons or parallelum.

On two separate occasions, Choniates makes use of the expression πήδημα Θετταλόν to characterize the notorious exploits of Manuel's treacherous cousin Andronikos I. In the apparatus the editor, J. L. van Dieten, cites an etymological excursus from Eustathios' extended commentary to the Περιήγησις τῆς...
Οἰκουμένης of the late Roman geographer Dionysius. Van Dieten makes no specific claim about the relation of the Eustathian passage to Nicetas’ text, other than what the reader may infer from the use of “cf.” to explain the allusion. Does Eustathios’ account of πήδημα Θεττάλον testify to its current usage, as parallels are often perceived to do, or to an independent example of the same use drawn from a common “source”? Given his wide-ranging study of the ancient scholia (where Ioannes Tzetzes also probably came across πήδημα Θεττάλον), might Eustathios have been Nicetas’ “source” for the rarefied expression? How are such fontes laterales, so to speak, to be distinguished from the more commonly cited parallela? Eustathios made repeated use of πήδημα Θεττάλον, once in the Παρεκβολαί (Comm. ad Hom. ll. 1,517,31), the other, appropriately enough, in an oration addressed to Manuel I (Or. 16 [Δόγος Ο] 267.1–2), from which he drew extensively when the time came to compose his funeral oration for the emperor. To what then does the Eustathian reference testify? So-called “contamination” between contemporary texts must have been common, despite being difficult to demonstrate. But an author like Eustathios, who had occasion to peruse the ancient scholia and collect rare words, phrases, or historical information, was not just any contemporary author. His erudition, shared with peers through learned commentaries and “bookish” writings, as well as through more direct instruction, made him a likely candidate to serve as a “source” for the kind of recherché expressions and historical allusions prized by Byzantine audiences.

27 For the full ethnographic excursus, see Comm. in Dion. Perieg. 427. Cf. Schol. in Lyc. 245. The coincidence of references suggests the expression had only recently been revived, perhaps as a result of more intense study of the ancient scholia.

28 Van Dieten’s apparatus to the orations and letters of Nicetas Choniates makes few distinctions between the various references he groups under the general heading testimonia. See Or. et ep. Van Dieten followed the same practice in his edition of Choniates’ Διήγησις Ἱστορική, only this time expanding the apparatus testimoniorum to include not only contemporaries like Eustathios, but Nicetas’ own works as well, which he designates as fontes. See Hist. Van Dieten makes only the briefest mention of the “sogenannten Testimonienapparat” in his introduction (cii-cv), noting only which editions he will cite and nothing about the selection and imputed relationship of the testimonia to Choniates’ work. Cf. F. Grabler, “Das Zitat als Stilmittel bei Niketas Choniates,” in Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinisten-kongresses, München 1958 (Munich, 1960) 190–193.

29 See the discussion of ‘Kontamination’ inside the Eustathian corpus by Kolovou in Ep. 39°-43°. Were the literary record more complete, we might conduct more statistical surveys of the fontes across individual works and genres in order to discern patterns of influence between near contemporary authors. Psellus, for example, is often held to have served as a rare Byzantine paragon for subsequent generations of authors. Can his influence in literary citation be seen, and can it serve as an index of who read his works? Such an approach could help compensate for the desultory impression created by the low manuscript count of certain works.
These and similar editorial dilemmas of constituting a definitive *apparatus* for the Επιτάφιος illustrate the interpretive issues at stake. In each case, the citations prompt questions about the manner in which Eustathios composed this as well as his other works. The broader spectrum of citations in the *apparatus* may also cause us to think further about how the audience(s) of the Επιτάφιος might have been expected to make sense of the text’s often undeclared range of reference. Finally, the *apparatus* may prompt us to consider how an author’s intended meaning is fashioned not only “out of” or in accordance with existing texts, as *fontes* implies, but also as part of a bid to *resist* the surrounding discourse(s) by fashioning new contexts for ideas, images, and formulations already in currency. Below are some examples, selected almost at random, of the potential, as well as the limits, of the *apparatus* to reveal a text’s dependence (“immersion” may be more apt) on other texts for the creation of meaning.

(1) In a passage alluding to Manuel’s intervention to ensure the unity of the church in the face of a doctrinal dispute over the nature of Christ, Eustathios articulates a subtle but vital theological premise using language derived from past Christological polemics, including phraseology formally associated with both the Fathers of the church and more particularly John of Damascus. Should either be cited as the “source” or does a non-committal “cf.” suffice? The language in question may well have constituted a doctrinal *locutio communis* by the twelfth century, with no immediate reference or allusion to a specific earlier text or author in the mind of either the orator or his audience. A further passage, from an earlier imperial panegyric by Eustathios shows how embedded such expressions could become in rhetoric with little theological import and therefore unlikely to hearken back to a *fons* so much as to a widely disseminated discourse surrounding truths of the faith. The *apparatus* cannot fully resolve this association, but it can bring it to light:

[Ἐπ. 39] Ὑπέκειται οὖσαν εἰς τὸν ἑνώσας ἑαυτῷ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν, ἀφράστως καὶ ἀπερινοήτως, ἀτρέπτως δὲ καὶ ἀσυγχύτως, ψυχὴν ἔχουσα λογικὴν τε καὶ νοερὰν; cf etiam Io. Damasc. De duab. in Christ. volunt. 8, col 1 Ei μία φύσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἑνώσιν, πώς ονομαζότατα; Χριστότης δηλαδή ἢ θεανθρωπότητα; cf. etiam Eust. Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 228.60–63 νῦν δὲ καὶ ἐκείνο προστίθημι, ως ἁρα ἐκ δύο
(2) In the next example, the distinction between a source and a parallel passage cannot be easily drawn. Eustathios employs an expression, καρδίαις... ἐμβατεύειν, reminiscent of the language of the Old Testament (cf. LXX Regn. I, 16.7, ὁ θεὸς ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν) to describe Manuel's uncanny diagnostic ability when faced with a man who appears to be in good health but harbours a fatal illness. Despite the scriptural imagery, the expression καρδίαις... ἐμβατεύειν has no exact biblical precedent, though it is used repeatedly in the homilies of John Chrysostom, whence it probably entered Byzantine homiletic literature and most likely reached Eustathios. Its application in a secular, medical context in the Ἐπιτάφιος trades on the divine image of God looking into the heart of a man to learn his authentic self. As the parallela indicate, Eustathios’ only other use of a conspicuously similar expression in his treatise on monastic reform also exploits the image of divine omniscience. The apparatus puts all this before the reader with the aim of widening the relevant frame of potential reference without presuming to designate a “source”:


(3) Likewise, the apparatus may reveal the eclectic manner of composition by which Eustathios combines language drawn from different literary settings in such a way as to harness the context of their provenance, all the while fully integrating them in the new text. He is thus able to join the phrase κατὰ σκότον ἠλάσκει from the much quoted Empedoclean verse Ἀτης ἐν λειμῶνι κατὰ σκότον ἠλάσκουσιν, found in such late Roman authors as Synesius of Cyrene (Epist. 147; De provid. 1.1), with Circe’s description in Od. 10.494–494 of the gliding ghosts Odysseus will encounter in Hades. Unsurprisingly, the possibilities contained
in this language had been rehearsed by Eustathios in his analysis of the relevant passage of the *Odyssey* in his commentaries on Homeric epic, the *Parekbolei*:

> [Ἐπ. 12] parëwramenhs de, ἀλλὸ τι ἐκεῖνα, καὶ ὡς οἱ κατὰ σκότον ἡλάσκει ὁ ἐργαζόμενος, καὶ ὡς παρεγκλίνα τὸ φῶς σκιά τις ἀἴσσει ἁπαλωλεκυῖα τὸ στερέμνιον.

It may be argued that much of what may be accomplished in a more comprehensive apparatus, such situating individual passages of the text in a broader verbal and literary context, properly belongs in a commentary. But that, in my view, is to misapprehend the distinction between an *apparatus* and a commentary. While a commentary allows for more context and qualification, it does not present its contents to the reader as germane at the point of contact with the text, as the *apparatus* can. That said, in cases where the *apparatus* would in fact have swelled to an unreasonable size by the sheer volume of *parallela* or *similia*, I cite only a representative sample and consign the rest to the commentary for the more specialized reader. There are, however, important reasons for wishing to include significant *parallela* (or *similia* and *testimonia*) alongside the presumed *fontes* of a text. Chief among these is the need to constantly orient the reader by supplying the broader literary context(s) of a work like the *Επιτάφιος*, especially for the indispensable connotations and unstated associations generated by similarity to seemingly unrelated texts. In this way the reader may constantly

30 By way of a rationale for such a decision Alexakis cites the explanation given by L. Rydén for merging the *apparatus fontium* with the notes accompanying the translation to the *Life of Andrew the Fool*. The distinction between quotations, allusions and more or less unconscious reminiscences is vague. For Rydén’s comments, see The life of St. Andrew the Fool, vol.1 [Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia 4.1–2] (Uppsala, 1995) 146. For Alexakis’ discussion of the *fontes*, see Alexakis, *Greek life of St. Leo*, 137–138.
adjust the interpretation in light of ancillary witnesses to previous and current *topoi*, imagery, technical vocabulary, or even common expressions which undergo gradual evolution or subtle shifts from text to text. Reading with an eye to the *apparatus* reminds the reader of the need to acknowledge the shared nature of all language and the distributive origins of meaning.

(4) A number of the citations in the *apparatus* of the Ἐπιτάφιος have the character of gnomic statements, closely resembling passages from ancient literature, which citation usually implies they must have been modelled on. In one such example in the funeral oration, Eustathios recalls an episode in which the emperor John II reprimands his young son Manuel for the reckless way he has thrown himself headlong into battle without regard for his own safety, and by extension his responsibility to his future subjects.\(^{31}\) John issues a stern reproach, citing a piece of received wisdom:

\[
\text{[Ἐπ. 7] ὁ δὲ πατὴρ βασιλεύς, ἐμβριμησάμενος, αὐτὸ δὲ εἰπέν, καὶ ἐπιπλήξας, εἰς φρίκην συνήγαγε μαθόντα, μὴ χρήνα θάλος ὅσον ἀνέμως εἰστὶν παραβάλλειν... ἀκούσαντα τε καὶ, μηδὲνα φαύλον ἄνδρα πόλεμον αἱρέσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἄγαθοὺς ἀεὶ}
\]

\[
\muηδένα...ἀεὶ: fort. alludit ad Soph. Philoct. 436–437 πόλεμος οὐδέν’ ἄνδρ’ ἐκὼν αἱρεῖ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἀεὶ; cf. etiam Suda ai 296 Αἱρεῖ: αἱρεῖ, φονεύει. Σοφοκλής: πόλεμος γὰρ οὐδέν’ ἄνδρ’ ἐκὼν αἱρεῖ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἀεὶ; cf. etiam Pseudo-Zonaras Lexic. α 93 Αἱρεῖ: φονεύει, ἀναιρεῖ. [Σοφοκλῆς —πόλεμος γὰρ οὐδέν’ ἄνδρ’ ἐκὼν αἱρεῖ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἀεὶ.]\]

John II’s cautionary reproach to his son has as all the attributes of an apophoric *locus communis* about the fate of the brave during wartime. The idea itself had significant literary pedigree in no less an authority than Sophocles, who is cited in Byzantine lexicca less as a source than as an illustration of the idea. As we see towards the end of the oration, the claim that war willingly ravages the virtuous needed no ancient authority. Of course a career philologist like Eustathios was likely to have come across across the gnomic paradox in Sophocles’ play, or in scholia which cited the verses of Philoctetes.\(^{32}\) But its inclusion in the *Suda* and the lexicon of pseudo-Zonaras nevertheless testifies to the wider currency of the axiom. Listing the additional citations in the *apparatus* allows the reader to see

\[\text{31 For more on this episode, see the commentary at 'Ἐπ. ad loc.}\]

the layered structure of the sources. What’s more, the intermediary texts, though commonly regarded as being at a remove from the hallowed original, often have a more compelling claim to the status of fonts than the more ancient or prestigious text. The apparatus only misleads if it encourages us to identify Sophocles as the sole or effective “source,” and the rest as mere parallels.33

(5) Among the most frequently recurring texts cited in the apparatus of the Ἐπιτάφιος are those by Eustathios himself. The majority of these citations come from his orations at the courts of the emperor or the patriarch. A few more stem from miscellaneous speeches delivered on other occasions, like the ἐπιβατήριος λόγος for the arrival in Constantinople of Agnes, daughter of king Louis VII of France, betrothed to Manuel’s only son and ill-fated successor, Alexios II. Such repetition, or recycling, was not without its own rhetorical rationale. Eustathios provides a justification for orators to reuse previous works by citing the example of Homer, the perennial authority in matters of composition:

You should know that up to the point of Agamemnon’s threat (Il. 1.370–379) the poet, repeating himself, set down exactly the same verses that he had written before (sc. Il. 1.13–16, 22–25), thereby teaching, as he does in countless other places as well, that in many cases the orator can safely repeat the same words and need not alter what is well said, nor exert himself in vain when there is no pressing need, forever anxiously labouring [over his text].

Once formulated, a well enough expressed idea need not undergo alteration. Some of this reflects the professional rhetor’s need for economy of labour. Commissioned to compose panegyrics on a fixed set of subjects, the author could not be expected to keep producing new, equally apt formulations in well honed language. Such a rationale traded on certain deeply ingrained cultural assumptions about the relation of language to a permanent and recurring reality. Having already hit the mark, as it were, in previous encomia to Manuel, Eustathios saw no need to devise new formulations to characterize the emperor’s enduring virtues and achievements. But does this make Eustathios’ own earlier orations “sources” or parallels?

33 Similarly, Reinsch has underlined the need to differentiate between actual citations, i.e., direct references to a specific text, and passages which testify to the limited or widespread use of certain expressions, words, etc. Otherwise, he points out, we risk creating a false impression of an author’s literary intentions and the means at his disposal to achieve them. See Reinsch, “Zum Edieren,” 301.

34 Comm. ad Hom. Il. 120.20–24.
A similar dilemma is occasioned by the recurrence of language or motifs which match Eustathios’ own Παρεκβολαί to the Iliad and Odyssey, by far the most fertile “source” for parallela to the Επιτάφιος. The Παρεκβολαί furnished their author with a seemingly inexhaustible supply of Homeric as well as other ancient material he could adapt to almost any context. The range of sources cited in the commentaries had a substantial multiplier effect on the literary endowment drawn on by Eustathios. As Kolovou points out in her discussion of Eustathios’ Zitierweise in his surviving letters, the Παρεκβολαί do not simply map the breadth of his philological expertise; they allow us to detect references or allusions so well integrated into his works that they remain practically hidden from view. Being themselves elaborate scholia on the Homeric epics, with innumerable incidental references to ancient literature, the Παρεκβολαί are not generally regarded as fontes in the usual sense of the word. A number of Eustathios’ direct quotations, allusions or paraphrases of ancient texts, not least those from the Homeric epics, issued from his philological workshop. Cesaretti and Ronchey have aptly conjured the image of the “scrivania eustaziana,” on which the Παρεκβολαί appear constantly open and ready to supply apt parallela. In fact, the Παρεκβολαί complicate any easy understanding of Eustathios’ modus scribendi, since he often seems to be recalling the original texts within the philological context of his commentary, making it hard to assign priority to one over the other. Reading many of Eustathios’ later works alongside the Παρεκβολαί, one has the impression that the prolonged philological labour served as an extended progymnasma or rhetorical rehearsal for future works like the Επιτάφιος.

35 On the probable dates of composition of the Παρεκβολαί (c.1165–1175) see van der Valk, Comm. ad Hom. II. I §125, cxxxvii-cxxxix; Hunger sets Eustathios’ appointment as bishop of Thessalonike as the likely terminus ante quem; see Profrane Literatur, II, 66. For a convincing argument that Eustathios continued work on the Παρεκβολαί well after his appointment as bishop, thereby making their continued exploitation in composition more plausible, see the recent edition by Cullhed, Eustathios.

36 The editor of the Παρεκβολαί to the Iliad, M. van der Valk, credited Eustathios with a “memoria te-nacissima” which allowed him to make the most of his tireless philological experience. See van der Valk, Comm. ad Hom. II. lvi, with n.6. For the inevitable errors or discrepancies in quotation and allusion which such proficiency may introduce, see van der Valk, Comm. ad Hom. II. lvi-lvii, and cxliv-cxlv. For an inventory of the full range of fontes, testimonia, and loci paralleli in the Παρεκβολαί, see van der Valk’s list of compendia editionum, Comm. ad Hom. II. cliii-clx. The difficulty lies in assessing how much of this literature Eustathios knew first-hand and how much he had encountered in the ancient commentaries he had consulted in order to compose the Παρεκβολαί.

37 Ep. 25*-75*; for the consonances and discrepancies implied in the specific terms employed in each language, see idem 28*, with n.16.


One answer to the interpretive dilemmas occasioned by the definition of sources and parallels in the Ἐπιτάφιος might be to see the apparatus less as the product of Quellenforschung and more like an index of a work’s enabling intertextuality. Where the conventional understanding of an apparatus calls to mind an author selecting carefully among plausible fontes, intertextuality emphasizes meaning as deriving from the reciprocal relation between texts. Chief among the insights furnished by the concept of intertextuality is that texts do not possess, nor can they generate, wholly independent meaning. Instead, meaning is more correctly located in the reciprocal current between texts, the point of the inelegant but apt prefix inter-. Literature is sustained by a network of textual interdependence – what Reinsch has referred to as the spezielle intertextuelle Beziehungsnetz – in which the potential for words to combine into new meanings is an extension of their earlier configurations. In short, textual meaning is never entirely self-contained, it is systemic. “Sources” and “parallels,” though not without value, may be inadequate to such an understanding of sense.

It may be objected here that as a theoretical concept, intertextuality has proven too plastic to serve as a rationale for editorial practice. But its conceptual untidiness notwithstanding, intertextuality furnishes a broad paradigm for thinking about the relations between texts which may prove especially suitable to the opening up of Byzantine literature. This is especially so since we are often talking about a literature built on a sophisticated amalgam of citation, allusion, and varied forms of textual appropriation underwritten by mimesis. An essentially structuralist concept proceeding from Ferdinand de Saussure’s seminal insight into the relational nature of all linguistic meaning, intertextuality allows us to look beyond “sources” to the broad literary field in which a text operates.

---

43 For an acknowledgement of, as well as redress for, the sometimes debilitating lack of focus in the indiscriminate application of “intertextuality,” see the comments in the introduction to G. Allen, Intertextuality, 2nd ed. (Abingdon, 2011) 1–7.
45 F. de Saussure, Cours de linguistique générale, ed. critique par T. de Mauro, avec C. Bally, A. Scechhaye et A. Riedlinger (Paris, 1974); for a discussion of the work’s influence, see the introduction by J. Cullier, to F. d Saussure, Course in general linguistics, trans. Wade Baskin (London, 1974).
The merits of such an approach are not to be seen just in the more conspicuous literary citations, like the Homeric borrowing in the Ἐπιτάφιος, or in recognizable allusions to scripture. Intertextuality is often at its most revealing when it can foreground less marked parts of a text and show the depth and breadth of discourse which lies behind it. A more broadly conceived apparatus can correlate a work with texts the author was not likely citing in any conventional sense of the word, but which nevertheless paved the way for the meaning invoked by the author. Seen from such a vantage, the apparatus has the capacity to testify to more than just which books Eustathios and his peers had at their immediate disposal, though such inferences remain important. In many cases it matters less whether an author had direct access to specific works or whether he could recall them verbatim. It is rather a matter of gradual and near-unconscious assimilation of discourses. Such a conception of intertextuality allows us to move from a reductionist understanding of the apparatus as one author’s repertoire of “sources” to a more structural notion of texts perpetually joined to other texts. Of course no apparatus can provide an exhaustive inventory of possible “sources” in this expanded sense. Still, it can help situate the text in its wider cultural and discursive field, revealing its meaning as resting on complex ties to other texts, often in unexpected and elusive ways.

THE APPARATUS FONTIUM ET LOCORUM PARALELORUM OF THE ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ

In light of the analysis above, it would be inconsistent to claim anything but a modicum of systematization for the apparatus fontium et parallelorum of this edition. I have adopted as uncluttered and transparent a template as might help orient the reader in the (inter)textual thicket beneath the main text. For the most part, the method of citation follows widely adopted conventions. I have not opted for special symbols to differentiate among the texts cited, though I ac-

46 Or as Reinsch would have it, ”[Similien]...leisten nicht, einen speziellen Bezug des behandelten Autors...herzustellen.” See Reinsch, “Zum Edieren,” 301. For the question of citation from memory, see Kolovou’s dissent from the once dominant view that Byzantine authors misquoted their sources by virtue of their imprecise recollection of the text. In most cases, she notes, Byzantine authors adapted the original to suit the context of their own text, as rhetors were taught to do. Ep. 29*; cf. Wirth, Untersuchungen, 34.

47 For the varied potential of the apparatus to bring to light otherwise hidden dimensions of a text’s complex history and intertextual correspondences, see the ample apparatus fontium accompanying the new edition of Andronikos Kamateros’ anti-Latin tract on the procession of the Holy Spirit (Sac. arm.). For the merits of a more ambitious approach to the apparatus fontium, see the review of Bucossi by T. Kolbaba in The medieval review 15.08.10.
knowledge that such a method, devised for some recent editions, is not without significant advantages.48 We may see its use spread for certain texts if we are to take advantage of the growing potential of the TLG and the growing flexibility of digitally typeset editions which allow for more parameters in the formatting of the apparatus. For the purposes of this edition, when I deem that a passage in the Ἐπιτάφιος either manifestly cites or directly alludes to a particular text, traditionally labelled a “source,” then it appears in the apparatus without further comment. In cases where the relation between the main text and the citation is less obvious yet still worth noting, then the citation is preceded by the abbreviation “cf.” This second category, which makes up the majority of citations, includes the broad class of parallela from both older and near-contemporary texts, including Eustathios’ own corpus of surviving works.

One reason for not trying to differentiate further among the various citations is a desire to avoid alienating or disorienting even specialized readers by asking them to memorize a complex set of sigla drafted specifically for this one edition. Another is the difficulty of parsing the possible relationships between the Ἐπιτάφιος and the citations in question. In those cases where the possible sources or parallel passages would expand the apparatus well beyond what is reasonable, I instruct the reader to consult the commentary with vid. not. ad loc. Nevertheless, readers are asked to bear in mind that the apparatus is not merely an inventory of “sources.” Finally, all the texts in the apparatus, save one, are cited according to the print edition listed in the abbreviations of the bibliography. The single exception are the Παρεκβολαί or Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem (sive) Odysseam. These two works are not only rare in print, they are also impractical to cite in their published format. Following the successful citation method of the Παρεκβολαί adopted by Kolovou in her edition of Eustathios’ letters, I have therefore decided to supply the TLG reference instead, which is easy enough to match to van der Valk’s print edition, for anyone wishing to do so. In the case of texts for which no more current edition exists besides the Patrologia graeca, I note the volume and column numbers in parentheses next to the citation. Biblical passages are cited from the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland’s New Testament, abbreviated as Nov(um) Test(amentum), while citations from the Old Testament refer to the 9th edition of Rahlfs’ text and are abbreviated Septuag(inta). All other citations may be found in the bibliography.

48 For the rationale, as well as an example of such an approach in the apparatus fontium, see De emend. 53*–54*. 
Στίξις, or Punctuation as Performative Notation

History has left its residue in punctuation marks, and it is history, far more than meaning or grammatical function, that looks out at us, rigidified and trembling slightly, from every mark of punctuation.

— Theodor Adorno, “Punctuation Marks”

Perhaps the first thing anyone reading the Greek text of the Ἐπιτάφιος in this edition will likely trip over is the punctuation. Rather than punctuate the Greek text according to modern – or at least modern English – convention, I have chosen to preserve a significant measure of the Byzantine punctuation. I have done so in spite of the usual objections, all of which I acknowledge, and some of which I even share. However, the historical value in retaining the punctuation of the manuscript more than sufficiently compensates for the inevitable and, as I argue, salutary challenges to the student of medieval Greek oratory.

Until recently, most editors did not feel much need to account for the punctuation of the medieval manuscript(s), much less to justify not adopting said punctuation. Indeed, few editors would have thought of this as a decision or choice. It was an editorial reflex. Byzantine punctuation, after all, has generally seemed nonsensical, often verging on the absurd. So little account was taken of it, that the punctuation in Byzantine manuscripts had become practically invisible to most editors. This in turn created few incentives to study medieval punctuation, let alone to seriously consider its restitution to the Greek text. Thus a significant discrepancy between the manuscript testimony and the modern edi-


2 I do not reproduce all the punctuation marks as they occur in the Basel Codex. Deeming it a sufficient challenge to the reader to confront the higher incidence of punctuation, I have chosen to reduce the variety of Byzantine marks, especially the variable lower, middle, and upper dots alongside the comma to the standard comma, middle dot, and period. There are good arguments (see Liverani below) for distinguishing the length and emphasis of pause among the various dots, for example, as contrasted with commas. But my argument here depends first on acknowledging the elocutionary function of the punctuation; finer distinctions among them are not precluded by this approach.
tion of medieval Greek texts became routinely elided. The presumption of its irrelevance all but assured its irrelevance.

Though not articulated anywhere systematically, the impression of Byzantine punctuation as erratic, often “illogical” and counter-intuitive, was widely shared among scholars. In a short but seminal article published in 1995, Jacques Noret took an important step forward in rehabilitating Byzantine punctuation. Drawing primarily on manuscripts of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, Noret demonstrated that the Byzantine author/scribe’s application of punctuation was designed to achieve disambiguation in the text and thus prevent the reader/reciter from bundling the wrong words together as he read the continuous line of the text without word separation. The aim of punctuation was to preclude or resolve cases of διάνοια ἀπηρτισμένη, where words were mistakenly perceived as forming a complete unit of thought (sometimes also characterized as διάνοια κρεμαμένη or μεσοῦσα, i.e., ambiguous or otherwise equivocal propositions).

Noret showed that some Byzantine punctuation formerly deemed ungrammatical was in fact quite useful, and even consonant with our own conventions of preempting ambiguity. Noret thus helped restore a greater measure of historical credibility to Byzantine punctuation. But his defense of some medieval Greek στίξις also tacitly endorsed the modern, exclusively grammatical, function of punctuation. Thus any punctuation which did not help to resolve textual ambiguity by partitioning self-standing grammatical or syntactical units could be dismissed as otiose, at best. Still, Noret’s reassessment of some Byzantine punctuation demonstrated the potential which reconsideration of the whole might have to bring fresh insights to the study of medieval Greek texts.


4 Noret, “Notes de ponctuation,” 71–79; an example would be the following, where the absence of any pause would encourage the reader/listener to string together words belonging to different clauses of the sentence as found in Monac. gr. 223, f.220r, ll.15–17: Αὕτη τοίνυν ἡ σχέσις ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμοίωσις πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἡ θέωσις ἐστι κατὰ τὸν Ἀρεπάγητην.

5 Noret was not entirely insensitive to the potential of punctuation to generate greater appreciation of the language of Byzantine literature per se. See “Notes de ponctuation,” 69: “D’aucuns s’étonneront du sujet ici proposé: ponctuation…voilà bien un objet d’étude fort secondaire. Et en effet. Toutefois, le domaine est loin d’être connu autant qu’on le pense et il recèle des surprises qui permettent, je crois, de mieux saisir le génie propre de la langue grecque.”
be out. Surveying the state of the scholarship on punctuation in medieval Greek manuscripts by the late 1980’s, Patrizia Rafti observed that medieval punctuation had been unjustifiably absent from editorial considerations. Moreover she noted that even when punctuation was mentioned, it was more often than not simply a specious pretext for pointing to its inconsistency or incoherence, thus vindicating its continued neglect. Rafti’s was one in a sporadic series of voices calling for more attention to Byzantine punctuation.

More recently, Diether R. Reinsch has become the standard-bearer for a radically more sympathetic appraisal of Byzantine punctuation. As Reinsch sees it, our aim should be “to give back to the text its rhetorical structure, freeing it of the Procrustean bed of modern... grammars.” Citing earlier palaeographical scholarship, Reinsch argues that the punctuation marks of our manuscripts had recognizably distinct values. More importantly, he reminds us, Byzantine punctuation must have been both intelligible and appreciated by contemporary audiences, otherwise there would have been no incentive to keep using it. Like Noret, Reinsch insists that the punctuation of the manuscripts can still serve as an indispensable aid to a more precise understanding of the text’s structure. He cites examples from Michael Psellos’ Chronographia to illustrate that neglect of the manuscript punctuation by editors has led to significant misreadings of the syntax.

6 Noret’s influence may be seen in a recent volume on editorial practice and palaeographical questions edited by E. Schiffer and A. Giannouli, where five of the nine contributions involve fastidious scrutiny of the punctuation of diverse manuscripts, with each case exhibiting interesting particularities. From manuscripts to books: proceedings of the International workshop on textual criticism and editorial practice for Byzantine texts (Vienna, 10–11 December 2009) = Vom Codex zur Edition: Akten des internationalen Arbeitstreffens zu Fragen der Textkritik und Editionspraxis byzantinischer Texte (Wien, 10.-11. Dezember 2009), eds. A. Giannouli, E. Schiffer (Wien, 2011).


10 Reinsch, “What should an editor do,” esp. 146–148, where Reinsch illustrates his argument by showing how the presumptive disregard of the Chronographia’s manuscript punctuation by one recent
However, Reinsch goes a step further and considers the vocal or acoustic dimension of Byzantine punctuation as a system of rhetorical or dramatic cues.

In addition to marking the logical units of speech, argues Reinsch, medieval Greek punctuation was designed to aid the rhetorically effective delivery of texts for recital. This dimension of punctuation, as a kind of performative notation, is lost on an age of mute literacy. And yet already at the dawn of modern Byzantine philology, Karl Krumbacher had likened the function of punctuation in medieval Greek prose manuscripts to that of the στίξις of liturgical manuscripts, which guided the orthodox equivalent of the cantor, setting the pace, pausing for effect, helping orchestrate the text, as it were. The intention behind the application of punctuation, Krumbacher suggested, was to help the reader achieve effective recital by signalling not only sense-breaks but rhythmical cadence, as well. An early intimation of punctuation’s potential as performative notation, Krumbacher’s observation would languish for decades before being taken up by scholars who were unwilling to defer to previous estimates of Byzantine punctuation’s value.

The Byzantines turned for general instruction on punctuation to the authoritative Hellenistic-age grammars, especially that of Dionysius Thrax, who spells out the aims of ἀνάγνωσις, or reading, and supplements this with a succinct account of the signs of punctuation. Although assumed to have begun largely based on the received principles laid out by the standard grammatical handbooks, Byzantine punctuation has been perceived as having gradually come unmoored from the syntactical or grammatical logic of the text. Medieval Greek manuscripts thus appear to us illogically punctuated, often inconsistent or opaque. Even when the Byzantine author or scribe punctuates his text in the same place we might, to mark grammatically self-contained clauses, for example, a few words further down he will proceed to add a comma or dot mid-clause, separating subject and verb, for example, in defiance of all grammatical or syntactical sense, leading us to suspect that the application of punctuation was a

editor led to the introduction of a paragraph break midway through a sentence, thus shoe-horning its divided syntax into agreement with the preceding and subsequent text. Cf. S. Impellizzeri, Michele Psello, Imperatori di Bisanzio (Milano, 1984) 1, 19.11–20.11.

11 K. Krumbacher, Ein Dithyrambus auf den Chronisten Theophanes [Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Classe der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München 4, 1896] (München, 1897) 583–625; 600f. For the implications drawn from Krumbacher’s observation, see W. Hörandner’s remarks in the conclusion below.

hit and miss affair, not governed by a set of widely observed principles and thus perhaps best ignored altogether. Modern editors thus feel justified in paying it little heed. Its absence, in turn, from new editions has hidden it from view, except from specialists who study manuscripts, though they are less likely to be interested in the content of specific texts. All this has reinforced the tacit assumption that medieval punctuation has little to teach us about the text, or about Byzantine literary culture more broadly.\textsuperscript{13}

To illustrate the markedly different experience of texts intended for recital when punctuated in accordance with Byzantine practice, we may use an excerpt from another Eustathian oration, very similar in form to the Ἐπιτάφιος, delivered before Manuel I Komnenos, c.1176, in all likelihood when Eustathios was still court-appointed “master of the rhetors.”\textsuperscript{14} In the first example we have the punctuation of the most recent edition in the Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae; in the second, we may compare the punctuation as restored by Reinsch in his collation of the manuscript witnesses, Baroccianus 131 of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and Scorialensis Y.II.10 (Andrés 265) of the Real Biblioteca, San Lorenzo de El Escorial. Aptly enough, the passage in question extols the strength and eloquence of the emperor’s voice, a recurring theme both in Eustathian panegyric of Manuel as ideal ruler. The modern edition is punctuated thus:

\textit{ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὸ τρανὲς ἐν εὐγενεῖ φωνήματι τίθεμαι καὶ διαφοράν λιγέος φημὶ καὶ τοροῦ καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐν ὑφέσει κρίνω, τὸ δ’ ὑπερτίθημι καὶ ἐκείνο μὲν οὐκ ἀνδρώδους οὔτε ἡλικίας ήγούμαι οὕτε φύσεως, τοῦτο δὲ τελειώτατον τε καὶ ἀνδρικόν. ὁ δὲ καὶ τῇ σῇ ἐπιπρέπει φωνῆ, οὐδὲ βροντή πραείς οὐρανόθεν σεμνῶς ῥήγνυται οὐ πρὸς ἐμβρίθειαν οὔτε ἄγαν τραχύτητα, ὃς τελειότατον ἥρωικόν ἤχον προβάλεται σοι τὰ τῆς λαλιᾶς, καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς γλύκτητα νοημάτων <καί> Μουσῶν ἐμμέλειαι προάγουσι σοι τὰ τελείως, ὁ δὲ πληγεὶς ἄηρ εἰς βροντήν τορὸν μὲν, οὐ φρικτὸν δὲ λαλοῦσαν τὸν ἥχον ἐπεσχεδίασε,}

Whereas the collated manuscripts present the following pattern of punctuation:

\textsuperscript{13} Of course this disregard of historical punctuation was not unique to Byzantine texts. Surveying the ancient evidence for Latin prose colometry, T. Habinek has noted that despite their prevalence in nearly every medium of writing, the punctuation marks employed by authors and scribes in Roman antiquity have also been largely “ignored, or given unduly little importance, time and again by palaeographers and, to an even greater extent, by scholars interested in the pronunciation and style of ancient literature.” Habinek takes it for granted that modern editors will not adopt ancient punctuation. This produces a self-reinforcing cycle, since the punctuation of the originals, whether inscriptions or manuscripts, go unrecorded in scholarly transcriptions or modern editions, thereby effectively concealing them from the view of future readers who might discern significance in them. See T. N. Habinek, \textit{The colometry of Latin prose} (Berkeley, 1985) 42–88; 42.

\textsuperscript{14} Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 227.19–29.
Before moving to the significance of the divergences in punctuation between the two versions of the passage, it is worth noting, as Reinsch does, how often the two separate manuscripts witnesses agree in their punctuation of the Greek text; a fact to which I will return. The first passage reflects its modern editor’s syntactical division of the clauses into sense units, loosely based on German conventions, with sparing use of the Byzantine upper dot (μέση στιγμή) to bridge independent clauses not joined by a coordinating conjunction, much as we might use a semi-colon in English grammar. The text as punctuated in the modern edition makes sense to us, of course. But whereas the modern edition requires the contents to be grasped as six long grammatical clauses, the Byzantine text is sub-divided into eleven distinct declamatory units, sometimes spanning across strictly grammatical clauses. The difference, even when read silently but attentive to the intervals prompted by punctuation, can be felt immediately in the more calculated delivery of the words.

The first thing one notices in the second version is the greater density of punctuation.\(^{18}\) While the modern edition employs ten signs of punctuation, the Byzantine manuscripts report sixteen. Even more significant is the distinctive placement of the punctuation. While nearly every instance of the modern punctuation is matched by its medieval counterpart, the Byzantine manuscript(s) introduce pauses in unexpected places, such as after μὲν, or before a conjunctive καὶ, thus halting the grammatical continuity of the syntax, like speed bumps on a straight lane. The text of the manuscript thus seems partially punctuated in accordance with the grammatical, or logical, sense; as well as in defiance of that

---

\(^{15}\) For the emendation from φωνήματι to φώνημα, see Reinsch, "What should an editor do," 144, n. 45.

\(^{16}\) Reinsch notes that the manuscripts punctuate here with a semi-colon, marking a strong break. In order to avoid confusion with the interrogative, he places a period.

\(^{17}\) In addition to restoring the rhetorical structure of the period, the original punctuation also reveals the internal logic of the text. In this case the comma after the νοημάτων obviates the need to insert καὶ before Μουσῶν. Reinsch thus reads καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς γλυκύτητα νοημάτων as an accusativus Graecus.

\(^{18}\) The version retaining the punctuation of the Byzantine manuscripts, modified with an upper dot in place of the middle and low dots (μέση στιγμή and ὑποστιγμή), and a period in place of the upper dot to mark a sentence end.
sense. This seeming inconsistency has made Byzantine punctuation suspect to scholars accustomed to punctuation strictly *ad sensum*.

In contrast, the Byzantines punctuated *ad vocem*, as well. The latter may not have been as integral to the grammatical or propositional sense we struggle to distill from our silent reading of medieval Greek texts, but it was deemed integral to the performative, or as one Byzantine scholiast to the grammar of Dionysius Thrax put it, the "persuasive" aspects of recital. Of course the two need not be mutually exclusive, so long as we bear in mind the performative or occasional setting of a text like the Ἐπιτάφιος, composed to be delivered orally before an audience of listeners. The *combination* of grammatically and rhetorically-based punctuation helped the reader/orator parse the sense while also scoring a well-timed delivery. The result would have been heightened by the grammatical ‘irregularity’ of pausing between words intended to be logically construed together, playing on the listeners’ anticipation, an effect of dramatic delivery well known to stage actors and seasoned public speakers. But such effects need the

19 The combined use of punctuation aimed at sense and sound, as it were, was spelled out early on and may be seen in such works as the scholia to the grammar of Dionysios Thrax, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*, rec. A. Hilgard (Lipsiae, 1901) 479.24–26: ἡ τοῖνυν στιγμὴ αὕτη ἐστὶ τῇ διαστολῇ συνόμιος...ἤ δὲ διαστολή ἀμα τῇ φωνῇ καὶ τὰς διανόιας. A similar conclusion was reached by Lameere when writing of the Byzantine mss. containing the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He concluded that the punctuation “est-il déterminé par les nécessités de la lecture ou de la récitation à voix haute. Il n’est pas fondé, originellement du moins, sur l’analyse des éléments de la phrase ou des rapports des phrases entre elles au point de vue de la syntaxe.” W. Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie Homérique: à propos des papyrus de l’Iliade et de l’Odyssée des collections de Gand, de Bruxelles et de Louvain* (Paris, 1960) 85.

20 See the *Commentaria In Dionysii Thracis Artem grammaticam: scholia Vaticana partim excerpta ex Georgio Chororobosco, Georgio quodam, Porphyrio, Melampode, Stephano, Diomede*, ed. A. Hilgard [Grammatici Graeci 1.3] (Leipzig, 1901; repr. Olms, 1965) 171–172: ἀνάγνωσιν ὡς ἄναπασιν, ἀναπείθουσι γὰρ οἱ καλῶς ἀναγινώσκοντες...Ἀναγωγεῖσσε δὲ καθ’ ἐπόκρισιν, κατὰ προσῳδίαν, κατὰ διαστολὴν. Ἕποκρισίς ἐστὶ μίμησις ἁρμόζουσα τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις προσώποις ἐν τὸ λόγῳ καὶ σχήματι- οὐ μόνον γὰρ δεῖ μιμεῖσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πρόσωπα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων κινήσεις κατὰ τὸ ἀπαιτοῦν. The twin purpose of punctuation, aimed at both recital and comprehension, persisted throughout late antiquity, on the Greek as well as the Latin side. We thus have grammatical treatises underlining the need for *positurae* adapted to *lectio* or recital, while no less a pedagogue than Cassiodorus insists in his *Orthographia* on the indispensability of *distinctiones* for an orthodox reading of scripture by explaining that *positurae seu puncta quaedam viae sunt sensuum et lumina dictionum, quae sic lec tores docilis faciunt tamquam si clarissimis expostoribus imbuantur*. Cassiodorus nevertheless acknowledges that punctuation was intended to assist with recital by providing regular respite or ‘breathing’ pauses to the reader.

21 A mixed model of punctuation, involving both sense and performance, appears to date back to at least the period of the Roman grammarians. Writing of Latin prose colometry, Habinek observes that arguments about poorly understood individual marks of punctuation are bound to err if they “assume a strict distinction between logical and literary approaches to grammar.” By “literary” I take Habinek to mean rhetorical, or broadly elocutionary, uses of punctuation. The principal texts on Latin grammar which also prescribe the practice of punctuation are gathered in H. Keil, *Grammatici latini* (Lipsiae, 1855–80); on the grammarians as a wider sociocultural institution, see R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of language: the grammarian and society in late antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988).
voice in order to be perceived by the ear. They are mute to the eyes of readers no longer accustomed to listening to texts.

In his seminal work on the development of punctuation in western traditions hailing from medieval Latin, E.B. Parkes observes that:

…punctuation can delineate rhetorical structure, so that a reader can be explicitly alerted to certain formal contrivances relevant to the communicative significances embodied in a text. Punctuation can also encourage readers to import to the process of interpretation elements of their own wider behavioural experience.22

One may perhaps paraphrase Parkes and say that the history of punctuation practice reflects the pragmatics of the text. That is why even our resolutely ‘logical’ modern conventions of punctuation continue to allow for some rhetorical or dramatic latitude in the placement of pauses for effect. In the words of the noted English linguist Eric Partridge, punctuation contributes to the “orchestration” of the text, i.e., it helps arrange the parts for voice, even as it clarifies the thoughts expressed.23 Partridge, it is worth noting, is not referring here to pre-modern norms of punctuation; he is elucidating the workings of mid-20th c. English punctuation. I cite his example in order to make the point that, for all its apparent exclusive dependence on grammar and logical division, modern punctuation still allows for a residual degree of dramatically inflected elocutionary expression.24

We are thus reminded of Krumbacher’s likening of Byzantine punctuation to the stops of musical notation.25 Deliberatly drawing once more on historiography, the Byzantine ‘literate’ genre par excellence, Reinsch cites the example of Eustathios’ Conquest of Thessalonike. Eustathios, he argues based on a combination of diction and punctuation, intended the work for “aural comprehension” (“Hörverständnis”).26 Indeed, when we compare the punctuation of

22 M. Parkes, Pause and effect: an introduction to the history of punctuation in the West (Aldershot, 1992) 1.
23 E. Partridge, You have a point there: a guide to punctuation and its allies (London, 1953) ix.
24 Indeed much of the confusion about correct punctuation felt by English speakers and writers, native and especially no-native, may stem from the softer emphasis on grammar and latitude for rhetorical inflection.
25 The analogy with musical notation has become a locus classicus of popular writing on punctuation, revealing that even today’s more grammatically prescribed system of punctuation occasionally evokes a performative dimension. E.g., “punctuation...directs you how to read in the way musical notation directs a musician how to play,” in L. Truss, Eats, shoots & leaves: the zero tolerance approach to punctuation (New York, 2004) 13.
26 Reinsch finds corroborative evidence for punctuation as coordinating recital in the repeated references to hearing of the text: ex. gr., De capta Thess. 3.29: Καὶ τὰ άλλα δὲ συγγραφικά εἴδη σωφρόνως μεταχειριεῖται κατὰ μέθοδον ἴδιαν, οὕτω παράδειξα ἐκτεινεὶς ἀκόουσαμα κατὰ τὸν ἀπαθὴ ἱστορικὸν οὔτ’ άλλα; 18.6: ΄Αλλα τί δή παρενεχθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους καὶ τῶν ἄρτι καὶ ἐν φθαλμῷ γενόμενος ἀποπλανῶ τὸν χρόνο
the modern edition of the *Conquest of Thessalonike* with that of its manuscript, *Basilensis* A.III.20, the same manuscript containing the Ἐπιτάφιος, we notice a pronounced and calculated rhythmic pacing signposted by the punctuation. A keen eye and a sensitive ear prompted by some practice reading the text out loud can bring such aural cues to the fore. But if we accept that this may be true of the punctuation of a historiographic text like the *Conquest of Thessalonike* – in a genre we do not normally associate with oral performance – then the potential of punctuation to reveal rhetorical patterns destined for acoustic appreciation is arguably greater in texts composed for ceremonial occasions, be they homilies or *basilikoi logoi*, including funeral orations.

In light of such arguments, some editors have gone a step further than merely discussing historical punctuation, advocating in their critical editions for (an admittedly partial or modified) restoration of the punctuation found in the manuscripts. After all, Reinsch points out, no editor would be so presumptuous as to substitute Goethe’s punctuation for his own, much less do so without informing the reader, as editors of medieval Greek texts routinely do. To the extent that we can, Reinsch enjoins editors, we should defer to Byzantine practice. He makes the case for adoption, through some carefully controlled adaptation, of Byzantine punctuation, on the philologically unassailable grounds of getting closer to the intended experience of the text. That experience, Reinsch points out, was primarily aural:

> [W]e should adopt [Byzantine punctuation] if we want to understand these works in their aesthetic dimension, if we want to comprehend the intention of the author and how these texts were meant to be presented to the audience, indicating the pauses to be made by the performer or by the reader when reading them aloud which, of course, was nearly always the case in Byzantium (and not only there).

In Reinsch’s view, even a partial restoration of the punctuation of the manuscript(s) will bring to light a latent, more richly layered, structure than modern conventions of grammar and syntax joined to silent reading can reveal. A. Angelou, the first modern editor, to my knowledge, to reproduce the original punctuation (and accentuation) of a Byzantine manuscript in a critical edition, 

---

points out that “the Byzantine listener and reader must [have been] prepared to absorb...a sometimes massive series of minor units following each other in rapid succession but all within the flow of a single train of thought, before he eventually stop[ped] at a major pause, only to pass into yet another major unit, aided in the transition by one or more of the particles...; the whole text is a mosaic of such consecutive, alternating and interpenetrating minor and major declamatory units making up an intelligible pattern.”

Byzantine punctuation begins to make more sense when conceived of as a rhetorical device, rather than simply as a handmaiden to grammar and propositional sense-making. Moreover, while we are wont to think of punctuation as furnished by the author for the benefit of the reader, medieval punctuation had an intermediate end in mind, the person reciting the text aloud for an audience, whether the ἀναγνώστης reading the scriptures, a cleric delivering a homily before a congregation, or a ῥήτωρ performing an oration at court. Byzantine punctuation helped negotiate the boundary between the demands of orality and the visual organization of literacy on the page. In the words of J. DeVere Brody, author of a modern meditation on punctuation’s cultural (in)visibility, “[p]unctuation stages an intervention between utterance and inscription, speech and writing...it is seen and unspoken, sounded and unseen.”

For some time, the most comprehensive study of the punctuation in certain Eustathian manuscripts was that of van der Valk, the editor of the monumental Παρεκβολαί εἰς τὴν Ὑμήρου Ἰλιάδα. In keeping with the general impression of the time Van der Valk did not feel the need to explain Eustathios’ punctuation other than to remark “[p]auca dicenda sunt de interpunctione, quia in his quoque usus Eustathi a communi consuetudine discrepat.” Indeed Van der Valk felt it his duty to caution the prospective reader of the Iliadic commentary: “[p]raeterea moneo Laurentianos codices saepius comma omittere in eis locis, ubi a nobis vulgo scribitur.” More recently, the broad consensus about the manuscripts containing the Παρεκβολαί being autographs has unlocked their potential to serve as an authoritative point of reference for authorially-controlled punctuation. It was with this in mind that I. Liverani undertook a study of Eustathian

32 Comm. ad Hom. Il. § 36–37, XXX-XXXI.
33 Comm. ad Hom. Il. XXXI.
34 In the years since Van der Valk’s edition of the Παρεκβολαί a number of editions based on autograph manuscripts have paid greater attention to the original punctuation, without necessarily adopting it wholesale. See Nicephori Blemmydae autobiographia sive curriculum vitae necnon epistula univer-
punctuation in the Παρεκβολαί in a bid to arrive at Eustathios’ own punctuation practice. To that end, she studied closely the punctuation of Marc. gr. 460 and Par. gr. 2702, the principal witnesses for Eustathios’ Παρεκβολαί on the Odyssey. When she wrote her article, it was still possible to lament the dearth of systematic profiles of Byzantine punctuation. But the neglect Liverani justly criticized has since given way today to more rigorous analysis of Byzantine punctuation.

*Basileensis A.III.20 bears out much of this aural, performative arrangement of the punctuation. Instead of simply parsing the clausal structure of the written text, the punctuation also marks frequent intervals consistent with small, vocally nimble units of speech balancing the syntactical, prosaic flow of oratory with the exigencies of aural intelligibility and not least, rhetorical emphasis. Below is a transcription of the first paragraph of the funeral oration with its original στίξις as it appears in the Basel Codex:

Οὐκ ἦν μοι καραδοκοῦντι, τετολμηκέναι τινά μεγαλείῳ τοσούτῳ λόγου ἑαυτὸν παραβαλεῖν, ὡς οὕτω τὸν τηλικοῦτον ἐθελῆσαι βασιλέα κείμενον · λόγῳ ἐξάραι · καὶ στεγανῶσαι μὲν καρτερικῶς τὸ δάκρυον, ἐφεῖναι δὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν · μικροῖς μὲν γὰρ χαρακτῆρι τὸν μέγιστον ἐκτυπώσασθαι, οὐ πάντως τὰς ἀρίστης τίθεμαι γραφικῆς· ὑψῶσαι δὲ αὖ πάλιν πρὸς ἀξίαν λόγου τὸν ολόμπουν, οὐ μετρίου καὶ μακρὰ σκεφάζομενον· οὐκ εὐθυβολήσαι πρὸς τὰ σκοποῦ κίνδυνον· ἀλλ᾽ ἐπείπερ ἢ ἐν δέοντι θερμότης εὖ ποιοῦσα, ἐκνενίκηκε· καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγοις ἀνδρῶδε πεπαρρησίασται. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν, ψυχὴ φιλόκαλος, κατὰ τὸν ἐγκεκαλυμμένον ἐπὶ μῆτε προσώπῳ ἐκφαινομένη μήτε λόγος διαδεικνύσα τῷ ζῶσει καὶ οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες, οἷς ὁ λόγος ἐλλάμπει, αὔξανουσιν ἀρτι ἀνάπτουσι τὰς πρὸς ἀισθήσεως λάμπας τῷ κειμένῳ, κατά τινα καὶ αὐτοδεξίως καὶ ὀφειλετικὰ καὶ ὁσίως πρέπουσαν;

On a first read the punctuation appears at once perplexing, familiar, and inconsistent. So the very first comma, introducing a pause between καραδοκοῦντι and its complement τετολμηκέναι confounds our grammatically based expectations. A little further down, the two upper dots bracketing λόγῳ ἐξάραι similarly break the grammatical chain by detaching the complementary infinitive from its verb, ἐθελῆσαι.


35 In as much as it provides a systematic first point of comparison for the remaining manuscripts bearing Eustathios’ works, Liverani’s profile of the punctuation of the Παρεκβολαί is quite useful. It is not, however, definitive. The autograph manuscripts from which Liverani drew her conclusions about Eustathios’ punctuation contain only the Παρεκβολαί. But the Παρεκβολαί are not occasional texts intended for recitation or performance of any type, they cannot serve as an absolute touchstone for Eustathios’ norms of punctuation.

36 See for example the essays on punctuation in Giannouli-Schiffer, *From manuscripts to books*. 
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Again and again, the punctuation signals strong or weak pauses in a manner which seems to disrupt the syntax, for example, by placing an upper dot before a καὶ joining two infinitives; commas after ἄν; or separating a subject clause from its verb by a comma.

Can every one of these examples be explained by the concept of performative notation? I do not think so. But the error may lie in the search for a single logic to Byzantine punctuation. Much of the punctuation from the Basel Codex conforms, if not to the letter, than certainly the spirit, of punctuation as we conceive it. The discrepancies in these cases are not much greater than those between modern conventions governing punctuation in different European languages. We thus find a comma frequently before a disjunctive conjunction ἢ, as in Ἐπ. 20:

Δέει μὲν γὰρ τοῦ μὴ τι παθεῖν, προσβεέσθαι τινας, ἢ μελέτη τοῦ φθάσαι ζήτησιν ἐπικουρίας, εἰ που καὶ παραπέσοι τις ἀνέγκη, ἢ καὶ χρημάτων ενδεί, ὦφ' ἂν ἔσται καταπραχθήναι τὸ διὰ σπουδῆς, ἢ ὅλως προμηθεία τινο τοῦ μέλλοντος,

While most editors would not place a comma before an ἢ in these cases, the use of such commas while usually discouraged as bad style is not disqualifying in Romance languages, especially where there may be a succession of clauses. 37 Similarly, though commas are routinely placed by editors before both relative clauses and the protasis of conditions – in keeping with both medieval and modern practice – they are occasionally omitted in the Byzantine manuscript, most likely deliberately elided, as in Ἐπ. 27:

καθὰ μήδε θεόν οὗ καὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ θυμὸς βαρὺς τοῖς περὶ γῆν εἰ καὶ ἄκρα φιλανθρωπία συγκραταί
or Ἐπ. 35:

Σκέψαιτο γὰρ ἀλὶ τις εὐθυβόλως, μὴ γῆς ὄφελος εἶναι ἢ καρπὸς οὔτε σώματος ἀνθρώπινον ὃς μὴ ψυχῆς κάρπως ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς.

In some cases, such omissions produce a seemingly too long string of words, as in Ἐπ. 32, where the absence of commas suggests the orator intended to pronounce the whole thought as one:

Ἐπέβαλεν ἡ ὄψις τοπογραφίᾳ φέρε εἰπεῖν ἢ θέα προσώπων ἢ καὶ τισιν ἐτέροις ὡν ἔδει μνημοσύνην ἐνετεθήναι εἰς ψυχῆν.

37 For example, the placement of a comma before a restrictive relative or dependent clause is not observed in many European languages. An Italian, a German, and an English-speaking editor would each punctuate the edited Greek text differently.
In a use of punctuation more familiar to modern editors, commas were employed by the author/scribe of the Basel Codex to resolve ambiguities particular to Greek, such as commas used to disambiguate words which might mistakenly be read together, as in Ἐπ. 4: Ἐπιλεκτέον σὺν τό, τε ἔννοιον / Ἐπ. 52: τοίς μυθοῖς, τό τε ἀρχιτεκτονοῦν. In other cases familiar to us, the use of commas may be said to mark intervals between clusters of words in a bid to heighten the rhetorical effect, though without violating the canons of grammar or syntax, such as the example from Ἐπ. 62, where a string of commas following a series of adjectives mark pauses which help generate a sense of hearing a catalogue of virtues enumerated:

Ἱππότην μέντοι ἄριστον τεθεᾶσθαι, καὶ πεζομάχον, καὶ μονομάχον ῥώμην πνέοντα, καὶ πρόμαχον, καὶ πολιορκητὴν δεινότατον, καὶ λόχους καθίζειν δεξιόν, καὶ λοιπὰς ἁπάσαις παρεῖναι μάχαις θερμότατον,

While most of these examples represent some divergence from modern editorial conventions for punctuating the Greek text, they do not constitute the most important basis for objecting to the adoption of medieval punctuation, even in the cases of manifest omission. It is, instead, the apparent sins of commission which elicit most of the skepticism regarding the possible sense of Byzantine punctuation. Beginning with a slightly less controversial example, in Ἐπ. 14 a comma separates the predicate from the subject: Ἐντεῦθεν αἱ πανταχοῦ γῆς βασιλιακαὶ πρόνοιαι, πολυειδεῖς. Perhaps no use of punctuation quite offends our sense of how the Greek text ought to be grammatically perceived than the routine placement of commas immediately after μὲν and δὲ, as in Ἐπ. 35:

Καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκείνων, οἱ μὲν, ἐπανήρχοντο κατασχόντες τῆς παλαιᾶς φαυλότητος τῶν μαθητευσαμένων ἐθνῶν· οἱ δὲ, τῷ μακρῷ τοῦ χρόνου καμάντες

or Ἐπ. 38:

Ὅτε καὶ οἱ μὲν, τὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ σωτήρι θεανθρώπῳ φύσεων εὐκρινὲς, συνέχεον ὡς ἂν καὶ λαθοὶ τις στὸς ἐξαμαρτάνων, οἱ δὲ, τῇ ἀσυγχύτῳ ἑνώσει ἐπεβούλευον τῷ αὐθάδει τοῦ δυσαμβ. ἡμοῦ.

The confusion surrounding this seemingly inchoate and grammatically baseless punctuation is further compounded by inconsistency, since μὲν / δὲ clauses are not always interrupted by commas. This is consonant with other seemingly opaque uses of punctuation, such as at Ἐπ. 66, where the sense of the commas cannot be comprehended at first sight, but could well have been sounded:
Likewise, numerous passages in the manuscript transcription of the Ἐπιτάφιος show a sometimes baffling punctuation, as this excerpt from Ἐπ. 46:

Thus while the commas before ἱκανόν and after δίκην, οὐδὲν, and ὅτι γε, do little to promote the logical ties between the words around them, they temporarily suspend such ties. But in doing so in the course of recitation, such a suspension can create a kind of rhetorical or dramatic inflection, lending greater emphasis on the words and their relation to one another. While such seemingly erratic omissions and commissions in the manuscript’s punctuation strike us as evidence for the lack of systematization, it could well be that we have the wrong system in mind and that Byzantine authors enjoyed far greater discretion in applying punctuation in accordance with the manner in which they envisioned the text’s delivery. Such habits were likely to carry over texts which might not have been intended for oral performance but were nevertheless composed in conformity to similar rhetorical patterns. As T. Habinek observes of pre-modern Latin punctuation, its apparent inconsistency notwithstanding, “a system that fluctuates over centuries, and never resembles modern punctuation very closely, can nevertheless be systematic and revealing,” in as much as it helped reconstruct “the locations [in the text] that the Roman reader would have regarded as suitable for phonic marking.”

There can be no doubt that adopting historical punctuation poses challenges to the modern reader, even, or especially, one practiced in Greek. The accu-

---

38 Habinek, The colometry of Latin prose, 43.
39 Idem 44. Liverani confirms that the punctuation of the Eustathian autographs is consistent, for the most part, with the authoritative grammatical treatises of antiquity, as well as with the punctuation we observe in the Roman-age scholia. See I. A. Liverani, “Sul sistema di interpunzione di Eustazio di Tessalonica,” Medioevo greco i (2001) 187–197; cf. A. L. Gaffuri, “La teoria grammaticale antica dell’interpunzione dei testi greci e la prassi di alcuni codici medievali,” Aevum 68.1 (1994) 95–115; esp. 96–99.
mulation of breaks, pauses, lulls, and briefly held suspensions of voice prompted by the punctuation coalesce into a reading style, a subtle but consistently controlled cadence, like precisely prescribed (and for that reason also more easily intelligible) measures of speech. But the punctuation does not simply parcel out the prose into more easily digestable fragments; it often cues up successive phrases in a manner reminiscent of an actor or narrator who knows when to hold back just long enough to allow the words to achieve greater impact. At times this can border on a kind of prosaic theatricality, one no doubt very suitable to the attention-seeking of epideictic rhetoric. None of this can be said conclusively of all medieval Greek manuscripts, of course. We have only just begun to study Byzantine punctuation. We must still produce systematic surveys of individual manuscripts, authors, genres, known scribes, and then compare these in order to arrive at a profile of Byzantine punctuation. If such efforts were once deemed unwarranted by the minor proportions of medieval punctuation, our growing interest in the pragmatics of medieval Greek literature, its uses and reception in context, has restored to punctuation its value as another piece in the puzzle of Byzantine poetics.
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GREEK TEXT AND TRANSLATION
Τοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ γραφὲν εἰς τὸν ἀοίδιον ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεῦσι κύριν Μανουὴλ τὸν Κομνηνόν. Ὅπερ ὅτι ὦ τυχόντως μεθώδεται, ὁ πεπαιδευμένος διακρινεῖ. Πολλῶν γὰρ ἄλλως γραφάντων, ἐστρυφνῶθη πρὸς διαφορὰν ὁ παρὼν ἐπιτάφιον.

1 Οὐκ ἦν μοι καραδοκοῦντι, τετολμηκέναι τινά μεγαλείῳ λόγῳ ἑαυτὸν παραβαλεῖν, ὡς οὕτω ταχὺ τὸν τηλικοῦτον ἐθελῆσαι βασιλέα κείμενον, λόγῳ ἐξὰραι, καὶ στεγανῶσαι μὲν καρτερικῶς τὸ δάκρυον ἐφεῖναι δὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν. Μικροῖς μὲν γὰρ χαρακτῆρσι τὸν μέγιστον ἐκτυπώσασθαι, οὐ πάνυ τῆς ἀρίστης τίθεμαι γραφικῆς, ὑψῶσαι δὲ αὖ πάλιν πρὸς ἀξίαν λόγοις τὸ Ὀλυμπίον, οὐ μετρίου καιροῦ ἔνθα καὶ μακρὰ σκεψάμενον, οὐκ εὐθυβολῆσαι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ σκοποῦ κίνδυνος.

2 Ἐπείπερ ἡ ἐν δέοντι θερμότης εὖ ποιοῦσα ἐκνενίκηκε, καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγοις ἀνδρῶδες ἐπιπραρρησίασται. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν, ψυχὴ φιλόκαλος κατὰ τοὺς ἐν τραγωδίᾳ ἐγκεκαλυμμένους ἐπὶ μήκιστον διατεθείη μήτε προσώπῳ ἐκφαινομένη μήτε λόγοις διαδεικνύσας παρεῖναι τῷ ζῶντι. Καὶ οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες οἷς ὁ λόγος ἐλλάμπει, ἀνάπτουσι ἄρτι ὥσπερ τὰς πρὸς αἴσθησιν οὕτω καὶ λόγου λαμπάδας τῷ κειμένῳ κατὰ τινα καὶ αὐτοδεξιῶς ὀφειλετικὴν καὶ ὁσίωσιν πρέπουσαν.

3 Εἴη ἂν ἀγεννής καὶ ἐν μὴ δέοντι ἐνεός, καὶ οὐκ εἰδὼς ἑαυτὸν μετρεῖν ἐνθα μὲν σιγητέον ἐνθα δὲ λαλητέον, ὁ μὴ τοῖς τοιούτοις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα συνδιεξαγόμενος. Μίμησιν γὰρ ἐκων ἄπαν ἀνθρώπος διδάσκαλον, καὶ αὐτήν, ὅπη βούλοιτο, εἴτε καλοῦ τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ τινος εἴτε καὶ τῶν ὡς ἑτέρως ἐχόντων, σιωπώντων μὲν τῶν ἐλλογιμωτέρων καὶ αὐτὸς ἄλαλοῦσι δέ, τὸ σύμφωνον ἐναρμόσεται, καὶ μᾶλλον εἴπερ καὶ ὁ φθάσας βίος, τοιοῦτον τινὰ ἔτρεφε, μὴ θέλοντα τινῶν ὑστερεῖν λαλιᾶς τῆς ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ.
Text by the same [author] dedicated to the lord Manuel Komnenos, celebrated among saintly emperors; which the learned will discern has not been composed in a chance manner. For while many have written [similar orations] in a different manner, the present funerary oration was rendered in an intricate style in order to distinguish it from the rest.

I could not have anticipated that anyone would have dared to venture so grand an oration, that he might so quickly wish to exalt in a speech so great an emperor lying in his grave, and while patiently damming up his own tears, to let his tongue speak forth. To form an image of the greatest man by means of small figures, I consider to be altogether beneath the most accomplished writing. On the other hand, to raise this Olympian in a speech as he deserves can be inopportune, especially in a case where there is even a danger that one who has deliberated long may not hit the mark. But seeing that the ardor required in such circumstances won out in the end, my courage as an orator was also emboldened to express itself. For a soul fond of goodness would not be disposed for long neither to show its face nor demonstrate in speech that it is still among the living, like some shrouded figure of tragedy. And the men who have dedicated themselves to virtue, in whom the Word shines bright, have just lit the candles of speech for the man who lies here, just as they did the actual ones, like some willingly offered debt and fitting dedication.

And anyone who does not join them in imitation of their efforts would prove ignoble and senseless precisely when it is not warranted, incapable of judging when he should be silent or when he should speak up. Since as every person has imitation as his teacher, and may employ her in whichever direction he wishes, of either some good and worthy thing, or in imitation of its opposite, if the most eloquent orators stay silent, so might he. But now that they have begun to speak up he will add his own concordant voice in a harmonious fashion, all the more so, in cases when his previous life nurtured in him an unwillingness to lag behind others in the composition of speeches praising excellence. And we, too, set out describe the blessed emperor’s wondrous achievements. For whenever the occasion presented itself, we never shrank from the greatest possible praises.
ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ

3 Εἰ ή τέντων ἄτοπωτατον, περιόντος μὲν τῷ βιῷ, μὴ διεκπίπτειν εἰσάγαν τοῦ ἐν λόγοις προθυμεῖσαι· ἀπελθόντος δὲ ὅπου τὰ κρείττονα, κατόπιν τῆς παλαιᾶς προθυμίας ἔλθειν, ἐνθα καὶ μάλιστα χρεὼν ταύτης. Ζῶντων μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστροφῆς εἶναι, ὅποπτος ή χάρις διὰ τὴν ἐν όφθαλμοῖς αἰδώ· ἀπεληλυθότων δὲ, ἀλλὰ τότε τὸ εὐγνώμον εἰς ἀκριβὲς διεκφαίνεται.

4 Οὕτως οὖν καθεσταμένου τοῦ μηδὲν οὖν σιγὴν χρῆναι ἀλλὰ τι λαλῆηαι ὁν ἑθάδες ἦμεν, νόμοις μὲν λογογραφίας ἔπεσθαι εἰς λεπτόν, οὐκ ἂν ἤμιν ἀνάγκῃ ἐπικείσεται, εἰ γα καὶ οἱ τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ πατέρες νόμοι, πολλὰ παραποιοῦσθ' τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦς θεσμῶν ὅπε καίρον· ἐκτοτα δὲ αὕθες πλαξεισθαὶ γράφοντας, ἀλλὰ τούτῳ παραιμεῖν ἐν τέχνη λόγων ἐστίν. Ἐπιλεκτέον οὖν τὸ, τὸ ἔννομον ἐν εὐκακίᾳ καὶ τὸ ἐν περιστάσειν εὑμεθόδον, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχικοτυποποιήθην κάν τοὺς τοιούτους δεινδήτη, καθ' ἂν γένος μὲν ἐνταῦθα κεφαλαλαῖσθαι, οὔδεὶς δὲ, ὅτις ἐπιβαίνει μὴ τούτῳ καὶ μόνον ἐλόμενος ἔργον θεῦθαι· δὲ γα οὐδ' ὅτω κατευθυνεί τὴν τὸν λόγον βολήν ἐπίσκοπα. Οὐ γὰρ τριγόνων, δ' ἠφαίνομεν μετρήσασθαι κάνταυθα ἐστίν ἐν αἰς ἀπαχολήσας τὰς ἑαυτοῦ, οὐ πάνοι μακρὰν ἀνύποπτος καταλυσεῖν τὸν λόγον εἰς ἀνά παλιν· ἐπικαθηκὴ δὲ τελειώτης τὸ βασιλικὸν τὸ γένος κοσμεῖ. Καὶ δηοῦσι τοῖς κατ' αὐτῆς ἐπεξελθεῖσι συμώμασι, αὐτη μὲν πέρατι περικλειεται· οἱ δὲ πρὸς τεχνὴν ἐπαινετῆρι, ρυθησόνται μὲ γα ἐπαρένατα, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστροφήθησαι τὸ χρόνου τῷ κατὰ σκοπόν, ἀναλωθεῖσι τῆς ἐν τῇ τέλεια καὶ ἰσχύς καὶ αἰδείαις, εἰς τὰ μὴ πρὸ ἔργου τῷ γράφοντι.

5 Ἐκεῖνο τοῖς ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν τοῖς ἐνταῦθα μετρουμένοις τὸ καίριον, ὡς οὐκ ἄθεμελίωτα τῷ ἕμοιμένως τὰ τὸν βασιλεύειν, οὔδε ὡς οὖν εἰπεῖν ἀρρήστα· στρεῦός δὲ συμβολιώς ἐπικοδόμηται, τῇ προ ποποβεβηλημένη τῶν προγόνων εὐκλεία, καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τίς τοιαύταις, φυτὸν εὐθαλεστατον αὐτὸ ἄνεβλασθεν, οὐ ὡς καὶ σκιὰ κόπως ἀνέψυχε.
And it would be the most paradoxical thing of all, to be exceedingly willing to draw up speeches while the emperor was alive, but now that he has departed to a higher sovereign plane to fall short of that old readiness, at that very moment when it is most needed. For favour is suspect when men are in the company of the living on account of the regard men show in the presence of one another. Their favourable opinion reveals itself as genuine only once they have departed.

And so having established that now is not the time to remain silent, but to speak out, as we were accustomed to doing, it is not be incumbent on us to follow the rules governing the composition of speeches down to the last detail, seeing that the fathers of the laws of rhetoric often alter their own rules when the occasion calls for it. Then again, to fashion things in the course of writing which have no place in a speech, this is indeed to commit a violation in the art of composition. And so one must select both what is lawful in encomia and what is most effective under the circumstances, in keeping with the artfulness which guides [speeches] even in cases such as this. Consequently, it is not incumbent upon anyone to summarize here the man’s lineage, unless one had chosen to make this, and only this, his task; although even in this way the aim of his speech would fail to reach its target. For this is not one of those cases comprised of a threefold ancestry, as they say, in which one may busy himself, and after a brief while, having achieved his aim, come to an end. This imperial line is adorned by a sevenfold perfection. And [even] if it were required to go through their illustrious achievements going back seven generations, our speech is nonetheless confined to a limit. On the other hand, skillfully crafted speeches of praise will flow interminably, and the time available will not suffice to achieve the aim, since both one’s stamina for speaking and the license granted to a writer for things outside the scope of the task will have been spent.

To anyone making a precise evaluation of what is appropriate here, I would say this: imperial rule was not without foundations in the man being praised, nor, as we say, was it without roots. It had been built on stable foundations by the preceding illustriousness of his ancestors, and, on roots such as these did this plant sprout in full bloom, whose shade revived the efforts of those seeking its shelter out of the sweltering labour of life, and whose fruit fed those whom life’s...
τοῖς ἐκ καμάτων βιοῦ καυστήρων ὑποτρέχουσι, καὶ ὁ καρπός, ἔτρεφεν ὅσον δὲ ἐλάπαξεν ἐνδεία. Σεμινὸν μὲν οὖν, καὶ αὐτὸν τινα ἥξιώθαι, ἄρχην βασιλείας ἐστὶ τῷ προκαταβαλέσθαι, καὶ κατάρξῃ τῷ εἰσέπειται, γένει τοῦ ἁγάθου, καὶ τῇ βασιλικῇ χρυσέᾳ σειρᾷ ἐνδοῦναι ἄρχην τῷ παντὶ δὲ κρεῖττον, ἐξ διαδοχῆς ἐπικεκρίσθαι, περιθέσθαι διάδημα. Τούτῳ μὲν γὰρ, εἰς διπλῶν ἦκει ἑπαύνου, τὸ τε κατ’ αὐτόν, καὶ ὅσον εἰς βασιλείας προγόνους ἀναπέμπει τοὺς γράφοντα· ἐκείνο δὲ, | εἰς ἑνα περιέγραψε τὸ καλὸν, τὸν κατάρξαντα. Καὶ ἔτι ὁ μὲν ἄρχην βασιλικὴν ὑποστηρίζοντα, οὐ πάντως διδότων τῷ εἰσέπειται· ὁ δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι ἐπιγενέσθαι καὶ ταῦτα τῇ μεγάλῳ, ἐγγυμωνεῖν αὐχεῖ τῇ διαδοχῇ ἀγαθοῖς τοῖς φθάσαι προσεπιθεῖναι τὰ ὁίκοθεν. Ὅμως ἄρχην ὅποιοι παραδείγμαται ἰθαγενοῦς, τὸν νῦν ἀπερείσθαι καὶ ήμῶν διαβιβασθεὶς πρὸς μίμησιν, οὐ φέρει τοῖς προγόνοις αὐθεντεῖν ἑν ἀγαθοῖς.

6 Τί δὲ; Γένος μὲν οὐ πολύπραγμονεῖν ἐντάθαι, οὔστερ ὁ κατάλογος ὑπὲρ τὰ ἡρωϊκά, ἢν τὰ σεμινὰ ἔστι κατανόοντα τῷ μαθήσισι εὐ ἥκοντα, ἢς οὐκ ὁ προκατήκτης περιγραφαστα τροφῆς δὲ κανόνα διαχειρισθέντος ὅπερ τὰ ἐνδοῦναι ἀρχήν τῷ παντὶ δὲ κρεῖττον, ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἐπικεκρίσθαι, περιθέσθαι διάδημα. Τούτο μὲν γὰρ, εἰς διπλῶν ἑκείνου, τὸ τε κατ’ αὐτόν, καὶ ὅσον εἰς βασιλείας προγόνους ἀναπέμπει τοὺς γράφοντα, ἐκεῖνο δὲ εἰς ἕνα περιέγραψε τὸ καλὸν, τὸν κατάρξαντα.

7 Ὅμως ἀληθῶς ἰδεῖν τὸν μὲν πατέρα βασιλεά διδασκαλῶν τὰς ἀρίστας προβολῶν, τοῦτον δὲ, ὧν ἀντίλαμβανόμενος, καὶ εἰς προβολὴν εὐθὺς ἐνεργείας τελείας ἐρεθιζόμενος· κἀκέκαθεν ἐστὶν οὐ καὶ ἐπέχοντα τῆς εἰσάγαγος ὑποτρέχουσι καὶ πατρικὰς καὶ προσεπιστηκών καὶ ἐν οἷς καὶ ἄρχας εἰς ἀγαθασκεφάλων ἀρχέτυποι τοῖς προγόνοις κατέπραξον.
want had deprived of everything. So while it is a noble thing that some man be
deemed worthy to lay the foundation of imperial government for himself, and
that he should initiate this noble thing for his descendants, providing a start-
ing point for a golden imperial dynasty, it is nevertheless altogether better to be
selected through succession to wear the crown. The latter produces a twofold
praise, of the man himself and in as much as it directs the writer to his imperial
ancestors. Whereas the former restricts this achievement to the one who initiat-
ed it. And what is more, the one who founds an imperial line cannot provide re-
assurances about its future, while the one who follows, especially in the wake of
such ancestors, can claim that his succession is sure to add his own achievements
to those of his predecessors. For he has a homegrown example on which to fix
his mind, and driven by zeal to imitation he cannot bear to allow his ancestors to
surpass him in noble deeds.

What shall I mention next then? I should not enter into great detail here
about his ancestry, whose record far exceeds the deeds of heroes whose ac-
complishments a person well disposed to learning is able to grasp owing to the
succinctness of their outline. The regime of his upbringing, on the other hand,
should be treated, in as much as it goes together with his ancestry. And who
could grant us sufficient time in a case where the audience gets little from of
our speech. For the most part, the audience is turned in on itself, either riveted
in wonder or contracting the activity of their senses, including their hearing; or
they open the books of their souls themselves compose orations for themselves,
each man going through in detail the wondrous achievements of the man lying
here in different ways? Included among these was the fact that from the time he
was in swaddling clothes, and then from childhood until adulthood he proved
precocious in the demonstration of virtues, in some cases following in the foot-
steps of his ancestors, in others as a result of being guided by his father, though
for the most part relying on his own resources, and making additional discover-
ies in the principles of virtue on his own, discoveries that would be reckoned as
models of governance and of noble achievements among his successors.

For you could truly see his father the emperor setting forth the best teachings,
while Manuel apprehended them quite easily, and he was immediately roused
to demonstrate their fullest application. There were times when his father even
had to rein in his son's exceeding vehemence, since he supposed that the young
emperor could err by virtue of his immoderately noble nature. One time, when
he was still too young and his hands still soft (for what else could they have been,
belonging a child), he had the courage to get into a fight (which few would have
ποτε πρὸ ὧρας ύγρας ἔτι χερσί (καὶ τί γὰρ ἡ παιδικάς) ὁ μὲν, κατεδάφησε, μάχης
(ἡν δὲ οὐ πολλοῖ, οὐδὲ τῶν γενναιοτέρων), καὶ περιέκειτο νικήν- ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἔντος
μὲν, ἐχαίρειν, ἐπαλείφθαι ὡς ἀρετάς τὸν κατ’ αὐτὰς δεξιώσατο, τοὺς δὲ ἐκτὸς, ἐμβρί-
θώς ἐσχημάτιστο, καὶ ἤνυσεν ἐπὶ τῷ μαθητῇ βασιλεί τῷ μὴ τὸ πολέμιον κατεπράξα-
το. Τοὺς μὲν γὰρ οὖν ὑπεστάλη ὁ νεανίας- ὁ δὲ πατήρ βασιλείς, ἐμβριμησάμενος
αὐτὸ δ’ εἰτεῖν καὶ ἐπιπλῆξας, εἰς φρίκην συνήγαγε μαθώντα μὴ χρῆναι θάλος οὐτῶ
νέω, ἀνέμοις ἐαυτὸ παραβάλλειν οἱ ἐκστράζησι τῆς εἰς ὀρθὸν στάσεως καὶ ἐτί γαῖς
ἐκτανύσει ἢσχοςυσιν- ἀκούσαντά τε, καὶ μηδένα φαύλον ἄρδη πολέμιον αἰρεῖσθαι,
ἀλλὰ τόσος ἀγαθῶς ἀεὶ, οὐς κρατυνθέντας μὲν πάνω στερεῖς καὶ ἁθλοὶς ἐντριβέντας
μυρίως, τάχ’ ἂν ποτε δυσωπηθῇ ἢ δυσπρόσωπος μάχη, πανατάλως δὲ οὐσί, ταχὺ
ἐγχανεῖται, καὶ ἀπαγάγοι πρὸ ὧρας, μικρὸν ἢ οὐδὲν ὄφρηλήκτας τὸ βοηθούμενον-
καὶ ἐπὶ πάσι παιδευθέντα, ἡρέμα τὸ ἐμπρακτὸν προϊσχεσθα, καὶ βαθμίων οὖν τὴν
ἐν ἀρεταῖς ἄναβαν κατὰ εὐτάκτουμενήν προσαύξησιν, ἵνα τῷ τελείῳ προσβάς, εἰς
τῷ κόσμῳ χρήσιμος- ὁ καὶ εἰς ἔργον ἐκβάβηθην ὄστερον.

8 Ἀλλὰ τί μοι κατ’ ἀνάγκην λόγου καὶ τοιούτους ἐπεξέντηστο, οὕτε εἰς τὸ πάν ἐξεκ-
θαι, καὶ διεκπεσεῖν τοῦ τε καιροῦ τοῦ τε σκοποῦ, ἐς τόπος, ἢ ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς δυνατὴ
συμμετρία εἰς ωσοῦ μικράν γούν τινα τοῖς ἄκρωτας ἀνακινήσει μήνιμην καὶ θαῦμα,
tοῖς τῆς εὔγνωμοσύνης καρποῖς; Μεθοδευτέον οὖν ἡμῖν οὕτω τοῖς λόγοις, καὶ ἡ
ὑπὸ κλεψύδρᾳ, τῷ τοῦ καιροῦ μέτρῳ, τὸ τοῦ λόγου μετρήτεον ὕδωρ, μὴ καὶ ὁ ἀγών
φθάσας λελύσεται.

9 Μὴ μοι δὲ μηδὲ συμβόλων ἐκείνων μνηστέον, ἀ τὴν βασιλικήν προεδήλου καὶ
ἀνάρησεν καὶ λοίπην υψώσει, μὴ καὶ πληθύνας ὀράσεις τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ἀποκαλύψεσιν
ἐμβαθάνας, ἐκβήσατο τὸ ἄκροατήριον- ἐπεί τοι καὶ ἄλλως τοῖς ἀκροατών,

8–9 μηδένα... αἰεί: alludit ad Soph. Philoct. 436437 πόλεμος οὖθ᾽ ἀνδρ᾽ ἐκὼν αἰρεῖ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρηστοῖς αἰεί: cf. etiam Dio Chrys. Or. 31.165.6 ὁ μὲν πόλεμος ἐλθεῖ καὶ τοῖς φαυλοτέροις εὔχεσθαι καὶ κρατεῖν; cf. etiam Suda. Αἰ, 296 Αἱρεῖ: ἀναιρεῖ, φονεύει. Σοφοκλῆς· πόλεμος γὰρ οὐδέν’ ἄνδρ’ ἑκὼν αἱ-

8–15 ἐπεί τοι καὶ ἄλλως οὐ μακρὰ χρεία τοιούτων,
gotten into, not even the bravest) and he was crowned with victory. His father privately rejoiced, having trained the boy so well for such feats, though he pretended outwardly to be severe, and he managed to have an effect on the student emperor which the enemy had not. Although the young man did not shrink from these men, his father the emperor rebuked him, and it must be said, punished him, teaching him through fear that so young a shoot should not expose itself to the winds, which may bend it from its upright position and lay it flat on the ground. He heard as well that war never selects the wicked, but always the brave, and whereas grim-faced battle may look askance at men quite severely hardened and worn by many contests, if they are still tender, she regards them straightaway with eagerness, and may take them before their time, so that they will have proven of little or no benefit to those whom they set out to help. And in all things he was instructed to progress gradually in their application, and to make his way up the slope of virtuous deeds, step by step, as it were, in an orderly progression, so that reaching perfection he might prove useful to the world, a thing he later put into practice.

But what is the point of going over details such as these in order to conform to the requirements of an oration, when I am unable to get through all of them, and then fall short of both the allotted time and the aim, whose goal is to arrive at as much proportion as possible in the rest of the oration in hopes of stirring at any rate, some small measure of memory and admiration in the audience, the fruits of their goodwill and gratitude? Better then for us to proceed with the oration as though the water clock were running, the means to measure time, the water by which speech must be measured, lest the contest come to a premature end.

There is no need for me to remind you of the signs which foretold the public acclamation and future elevation of the emperor, lest by filling the speech with visions and by interpreting revelations, I risk distracting the audience. There is, in any case, no extensive need of such things in a case where the things which will follow later in the speech bear out the matter all the more. For one has no need to examine closely divine signs in a case where even if the great things des-
Ενθά τὰ στερνὰ τιμοῦν τὰ πρῶτα εὐκλεὲς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ πρόβλημα ἐνυπνίων... 

4–5 τὸ... σεμνύνεται: ad sermonem Graecum hodiernum admonet τὰ στερνὰ τιμοῦν τὰ πρῶτα εὐκλεὲς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ πρόβλημα ἐνυπνίων...
tined to happen had not been foretold in signs, with which God signals his will, these things would have occurred no less. Since it is not through the sign that the thing the sign represents is distinguished, but that which comes after it which gives the sign its distinction.

Even though every proem is good, in cases where the contest hastens us on, one must dispense with lengthy introductions. Likewise, we should not expend all our efforts on describing symbolic preludes, even if this brings much renown in its wake by another means, in so far as it characterizes the emperor’s relationship to God as being akin to that of men whose dedication to the Lord was presaged. The well known [pagan] signs of old, which have no place in our sacred chapel amid our gathering, are analyzed in books about dreams and visions. As for the signs in our own teachings, and all things of this sort, God himself has revealed them to those who seek after such fore-knowledge, and has vouchsafed to them the task of announcing what has been predestined.

And so having disposed of these things in such a manner, and to such an extent, we turn our attention now to those subjects that follow these, as best we can. Given the precisely allotted time for our speech, that ability would be like conducting our oration through the emperor’s virtues in the manner of a sea-faring ship. For it would cut as straight a line across the open sea as possible, making an occasional loop perhaps, so that countless other ships could sail to and fro in a similar manner and the whole ocean would still not be navigated. And yet the breeze supplied by our own rhetorical inspiration would be insufficient for us to ‘unfurl’ this subject, allowing us to sail a long straight course over the vast ocean of the emperor’s awe-inspiring deeds, which countless ships could not cover – whatever may be said in poetry of the ship with a hundred benches of rowers, whose power and speed were said to be great.

Such then being the circumstances, let some launch in whichever direction they wish and let them navigate with the wind at their back wherever they deem best. In contrast, we are surrounded by a chorus of imperial virtues, which we must join to the best of our ability. At this point, how could I therefore fail to award the first prize to prudence in all things, which like seasoning prepares all other virtues, like salt, so to speak, prudence being a universal virtue, with which all human deeds may be “flavoured”? In those cases where prudence precedes

Ωδοσής ἐγὼ θείοι λαθοίμην 28 φρόνησιν … ἀρετάς. cf. Eust. Or. 6 (Λόγος c) 93.30 ὁ πάνσοφος βασιλεύς, τὸ τῆς φρονήσεως καταγώγιον; cf. etiam Or. 8 (Λόγος Η) 149.23 βάθος τῆς φρονήσεως, δὴ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἄρτυμα
κόσμιον, δέ οὔ ἀπαίσιν ἀνθρωπικοῖς ἔργοις τὸ νόστιμον; ἥς προϊσταμένης μὲν τῶν πράξεων, ἀνθρώπων ἔργα τὰ πραττόμενα, καὶ ύπὸ φωτὶ εἰκόνας βαίνει τῷ ὄντως παρεισφορμένης δὲ, ἄλλο τι εἰκόνα, καὶ ώς οἷα κατὰ σκότον ἡλάσκει οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι, καὶ ώς παρεγκλίνα τὸ φῶς, σκιὰ τις ἀίσσει ἀπολωλεκυῖα τὸ στερέμνιον.

Ταῦτης ὁ συνετώτατος αὐτοκράτωρ κατακόρος εἶτε, καὶ οὗ πρὸς σύγχρυσιν, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὸ ἄληθες ἀνυπέρβλητον. Πραξάι γὰρ τι δεήσαν εἴτε καὶ εἰπίειν, κατάρξες μὲν, οὔκ εἰχε τὸν ἐπιπονομένον τι βέλτιον· ἐτέρα δὲ καταρχὴ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἐπιστρέφειν, ἀπέκρυπτε τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, καθά καὶ ἀστέρων φαύλοις ἀναφαίνει ὁ ἡλίος. Ὁ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως | διατιθέμενος, καὶ τὸ μὲν, ἐκφαινὼν ἑαυτὸν, οἷα κάνταθα δύναται, τὸ δὲ, καὶ γυνάζων εἰς μάχης του τοῦ νοῶν ἔρχοντας πρὸς αὐτό, μετέφερε ποτὲ τὴν γνώμην, ἐφ᾽ ὅπερ οὔ γάρ ἀυτὸς ἐλοίτο, καὶ ἐπιθανολογεῖ τὸ πράγμα, καὶ προάγων ἐπιχειρήσεις, καὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν στρογγυλλομένης, εἰς πειθὴ τὸν λόγον κατέστρεφεν· ὡς οὕτω δέον καὶ μὴ ἄλλως, τινα κατακραξάσθη οὐκ ἀμφοτέρως συμπεισθείς καὶ κατάθοιτο, καὶ ἡ μὲν βουλή πέρα τι συγκλεισθείη, καροφέος δὲ, τὴν χείρα ἐπέξεργασίας τα τοῦ βουλεύσατο, τότε δὴ ἀναλαβὼν ἄλλως τὸ πράκτον, ἀναποιῶν ἡν τῇ ἢ ἡ ἡ κατασκευασμένα· καὶ τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ἀπέκρινε, τῆς δὲ τῷ ὄντι πειθανάγκης ἐγίετο, κατά τὴν διανοίας ἐξέφαινε θησαυρὸν, πολὺ σοφίας πλούσιον ἦν τὰ ἤδη κατασκευασμένα καὶ τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ἀπέκρινε, τῆς δὲ τῷ ὄντι συμπεισθὲν καὶ κατάθοιτο, καὶ τὴν υἱότητα τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ τὸν τῆς διανοίας ἐξέφαινε θησαυρὸν, πολὺ σοφίας πλούσιον ἦν τὰ ἤδη κατασκευασμένα καὶ τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ἀπέκρινε, τῆς δὲ τῷ ὄντι συμπεισθὲν καὶ κατάθοιτο, καὶ τὴν μὴ βουλή πέρα τι συγκλεισθείη, καροφέος δὲ, τὴν χείρα ἐπέξεργασίας τα τοῦ βουλεύσατο, τότε δὴ ἀναλαβὼν ἄλλως τὸ πράκτον, ἀναποιῶν ἡν τῇ ἢ ἡ κατασκευασμένα· καὶ τὸ μὲν πιθανὸν ἀπέκρινε, τῆς δὲ τῷ ὄντι πειθανάγκης ἐγίετο, κατά τὴν διανοίας ἐξέφαινε θησαυρὸν, πολὺ σοφίας πλούσιον ἦν τὰ ἤδη κατασκευασμένα.
action, the acts are indeed those of a human being, and that man walks under the true light; but when prudence is neglected, the actions become something else and the person performing them wanders as if in darkness, and turning aside the light flits like some shadow having lost its solidity.

This virtue the wise emperor possessed to an immoderate degree; not just defying comparison, but to a truly unsurpassable extent. For if anything needed to be done or said, once he had begun there was no one who could conceive of anything better. While in cases where his own initiative followed that begun by another, he obscured the proposals of the others just as the sun outshines the stars when it appears. And when he was inclined to change his mind, partly in order to demonstrate his ability here as well, and partly in order to teach a lesson to those who were inclined to agree with him – he would periodically change his opinion to an idea which he himself would otherwise not have chosen, investing it with plausibility and providing the supporting rationale. He would then round out the argument he had constructed, managing to make a persuasive case that this is how one needed to proceed (and not in some other way). And so his audience relented and gave its consent, and the deliberation on the matter was brought to a close. But when the time came for him to implement his plan, he proceeded to act otherwise than he had originally proposed, revising the arguments he had earlier constructed. He rejected mere plausibility in the matter and supported what was actually constructed, thus displaying the treasure of his intellect, which housed a great wealth of wisdom. He showed himself to be full of intelligence, not disposed to expressing himself with the legendary double tongue of the ancients, where the scale of the mind remains for the most part balanced, and what needs to be done is not easily determined. But like a philosophical ledger, which tallies the good in one column, and consigns their opposites to one of their own, in this way resembling the wise example of Timotheos the lyric poet, who would first sing expertly to his initiates and then perform differently, noting

ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ

ἐπιστημόνως τοῖς μόσταις, ἢδοντος δὲ καὶ ως ἐτέρως, καὶ ἐπιλέγοντος, ως «οὕτω μὲν ἢδειν βουλομίην ἂν, τοὺς ἐμοὺς, οὕτω δὲ οὐκ ἃν ἀποδεχομίην ἢδοντας.»

14 Ἑντεύθεν· αἱ πανταχοῦ γῆς βασιλικοὶ πρὸνοιαὶ, πολυειδείς. Καὶ ἀνθρώπος εἰς οὕτος τοῖς μεγάλοις οἰκουμενικοῖς ἐαυτὸν μεγαλοφυῶς ἐπεμέρισε ἡμέρας εἰς τὸ ἐνηργόν, προβαλλόμενος σος καὶ χεῖρας ἀμφιδεξίους, τὸ τῆς ἀνδρίας δραστήριον, καὶ τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ἐμπύριον, δοὺς τε ἐν τῇ λοιπῇ φρονήσει, καὶ ὁπόσον εἰς ἀγχίνοιαν. Ἰδ. μὲν γὰρ καὶ σκεπτικῶς ἐχων ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις, καὶ ἐφιστάντως διανοητικῶς· τὰ πλεῖον, δὲ ἁγιαστὰ τῇ νοησίᾳ παράτετα, καὶ ἀχρόνως οἷον τοῦ νουμένου ἐδράττετο, καὶ τοῦτον, βαθύτατα, καὶ οὕτως ἐπιπολάζειν κατὰ τοὺς ταχεῖς μὲν φρονεῖν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς, καὶ οὐκ ἀντίκειται, ἢ καὶ μὲν αὐτῷ, λιαν καλὰ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀνδρίας οἰκυνα· περιπλέκει τέτοιας δὲ γάρ τὰς φρονήσεως, ἢς καὶ καταμόνας, εἰς μυρίον πλῆθος ὑπάμεθα.

15 Ἡ γοῦν Πυθαγορικὴ κατάρτυσις εἰτ' οὖν ἀγάπης κατὰ τοὺς τὰ τοιαύτα σοφοὺς εἰπεῖν, κατάανθη παρεσυδόσα καὶ τὴν ἐν ἐν σοφὸς ἀγριότητα ἡμέρας, διὰ τούτον πολὺς καὶ ἐφιστάντως τοῖς μεγίστοις, διὰ τοὺς τοῖς μεγίστοις διάνοιας παράτετα, καὶ ἐφιστάντως τοῖς μεγίστοις πλείονας, διὰ τὸν τούτον πλείονας ήμίν μὲν συνεφάσωμι. Ἀδελφα γάρ ἀληθῶς φρονεῖν τὸ τοῖς μεγίστοις, καὶ σύνεσις, καὶ κοινότοσθον τὸ ἐμπρακτόν παρὰ γάρ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἀληθῶς.

16 Εὕπορῳ δὲ ὡμοίως, εἰπεῖν τίρ' ἀληθῶς τὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς φρονήσεως καὶ μονήρας ὁρίζεται, καὶ τέως, ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἐνταῦθα μέγα τοῦ λόγου κεφάλαιον τὴν τῶν ἐκατασχέθην ὑψηλοῦς γενικοῦ τοῦ βασιλείας τῆς σεμνοῦς, καὶ τῆς αἰσχυνας καταγώγιον τῆς ἀνθρώπινης καὶ τῆς συνέσεως ἐμπύριον, τοῦ τῆς ἀνδρίας δραστήριον, τοῦ τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας ἀγχίνοιας. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ καὶ σκεπτικῶς ἐχει τοῖς μεγίστοις, καὶ ὁπόσον εἰς τῇ λοιπῇ φρονήσει, καὶ ὁπόσον εἰς ἀγχίνοιαν. Ἡ γοῦν Πυθαγορικὴ κατάρτυσις εἴτ' οὖν ἀγάπης κατὰ τοὺς τὰ τοιαύτα σοφοὺς εἰπεῖν, κατάανθη παρεσυδόσα καὶ τὴν ἐν σοφὸς ἀγριότητα κατήμορφον, διὰ τοῦτον πολὺς καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς, καὶ τὴν τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας ἀγχίνοιας καταγώγιον τῆς Ρωμαικῆς ὀλομελείας προσφύγου, ὡς ἐκτενεῖ, ὡς τοῦ πολυχειρίας δεήσεις. Τοῦτῳ ἦμιν τοῦ καλοῦ φυτοῦ τῆς σοφίας
“I should like my students to sing the first way; I would not accept them singing in the latter way.”

It was as a result of this that imperial precautions of every sort were adopted in every part of the land. And this one man divided his time generously between the wide parts of the empire in an energetic way, displaying the initiative of his courage and his burning intelligence in a manner resembling an ambidextrous man, who was as adept in matters related to the remaining areas of practical wisdom as he was in those requiring quick decisions. For while he exhibited thoughtfulness in important matters and deliberated carefully, in the majority of cases he reached the heart of the matter very quickly, losing no time in grasping the situation, in all its depth, and not superficially like those who are quick to come to a decision without ensuring its soundness. And while he could also claim extraordinary deeds of bravery, far more numerous were his acts of prudent governance, which we alone have enjoyed in great numbers.

At any rate, Pythagorean discipline, or a loving disposition, if you will, as those wise in such matters would have it, penetrated so far as to drive the savageness out of the barbarians, brought about a reprieve from wars for us as the foreign nations were pacified. That said, I sense some who are singing softly under their breath, sounding a sweet and harmonious tune to the effect that it was bravery in this case also which imposed peaceful tranquility on the foreign peoples. Very well I say to those who think so, let it be thus, make your song louder still, and I shall take up the melody with you. For bravery and understanding are indeed rightly thought to be like siblings, and they are joined by men of reason when things need to be done.

But it is easy for me to talk about those elements which define the uniqueness of his imperial prudence, which has been the fundamental point of this oration until this point, the union in the imperial lineage of high-born families from every side, through which he forged the imperial crown as if using some very valuable material, and in this way also expanding its original size, joining these noble forces to the whole of the Roman empire, which will extend, whenever it stands...
καρπὸς καὶ τὰ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἀγαθὰ αἱ σὺν θεῷ βασίλισσαι, ὥν ἡ μὲν οἶα καὶ ἰλιος ἐκ ἐφασι ἐφανεν, εἰ καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ νέφει | σκιάζεται, εἰ τι καὶ νέφος εἰπεν θαρρητῶν τὸ τοιούτον μέλαν, ἐν ὑ φαντέρον ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἰλιος θέος διουστεται- ἢ δὲ, ὡς ἀγχόθι που λελουμένη ἱδείαν έφορείου, καὶ αὐτὴ φωσφόρι έπήγασεν.

17 Ἀλλὰ τούτῳ μὲν, ἔς τοιούτῳ, μη καὶ ἰκεάνους ἐνταῦθα μοι ῦηρεταις ἀναρραγεῖς, ανακόψῃ τοῦ εὐθυπλεοιν. Συγκροτούσαι δὲ πολεμίους ἄλληλους, καὶ ἦμας ἐν ἄταρχῳ καὶ οὕτω καταστήσαι καὶ τὸ ἐν εἰρήνῃ γαλήνῃ καταπάραξαισαι, τὶς ἀρα κατ’ ἐκεῖνον δεινότατος; Μέθοδον γὰρ καὶ ταῦτῃ στρατηγικῇ ἐτέχνῃ, τὸ μὲν ὑπὸ καθαρόν φυλάττειν ἀνακομκτὸν ἐπί μεγίσταις τροπαίοις ἀναστάσει οσσοποράσσειν δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐκπολεμοῦντοι τοὺς ἀλλοφυλοῖς τὸ σφίσιν αὐτοὺς ὡμόφυλοι, ὡς καὶ ἑντεύθεν αὐξάσθαι μὲν τὸ ἡμέτερον, μειονεκτεῖθαι δὲ τὸ πολέμον, καὶ τὸν Ἐνυάλιον ἡμέτερον εἶναι, μηδ’ ἅμον τόν μεροῖς φθισήνορα ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς, ἕσοι ἐξήκρησαν εἰς ἀντίπαλον, μονοὺς δὲ τοῖς πολεμίους ἀποκεκρετῆσαι τὸν προολογον. Οὕτω Πέρσαι Πέρσαις ἀντιμαχοὶ μεθόδους βασίλικαι- καὶ ἢμεις εἰρήναις ἐπαινεῖμεν. Οὕτως Ἀβιδεῖ νεῖκης κατεστρων. Προβαθμοῦ ἦν ἄρα βασιλικῆς, μὴ μόνον περισώζεσθαι τοὺς ὑπακούοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσποράσσειν εἰς ὅσον χῶρα γίνεται. Καὶ ἐστὶ καὶ τούτῳ ταλάντῳ εὐαγγελίκῳ προσποράζης, ὅτι καὶ κληρονομίας θείας πρόσθεσις. Τὸτ δένον, εἰπερ ἐτερός τις τῶν ἀνέκαθεν χρόνου βεβασιλευκτῶν, ὁ νῦν ἐπαυτούμενος ἐκτε-

4 λελουμένη ὡκεανοῦ: Hom. II. 5.6 ὁστέρ’ ὑποφήν ἐναλίγκων, ὅτε τὰ μάλιστα / λαμπρῷ παμφαίνῃ λελουμένος ὡκεανοῦ 11–12 Ἐνυάλιον... ἀντίπαλον: Hom. II. 18.309 ἐναλίγκων, καὶ τοῦτον τοῖς κατεκτήσας. cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.211.11 ἦν ὄστερ’ ἢ κατά πόλεμον, ἀλλ’ ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο ἐν πολέμῳ προστίθεται, γινομένη ἐπαραλήθη, ὅτι ἐν ἄλλοις λέγεται 12 δικαιοσύνης: Hom. II. 1.8.308–309 τῶν ἤρων: ἄρεστος τοις ἀρμάνοις, ἀκρόπολις τοῦ πολέμου, ὅτι περὶ πάντων / ἔρχεται μαντοσύνας, ὅτι καὶ κλιμακιαῖς πρόκειται. Τοῦτο γοῦν, εἰπερ ἐτερός τις τῶν ἀνέκαθεν χρόνου βεβασιλευκτῶν, ὁ νῦν ἐπαυτούμενος ἐκτε-
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4 λελουμένη: scripsi λελουμένος B, vid. not. ad loc.
in need of greater support. And the precious things before our eyes, the godly empresses, were a harvest we reaped from this good plant of wisdom. Of these, one appeared out of the East like the sun, even if she is now under the shade of a cloud, if one may be so bold as to call her black garments a cloud, in which God, the sun of justice, can be all the more clearly discerned; while the other has also shone forth, like the evening star washed by the Western ocean nearby.

But enough about this matter, lest the ocean of rhetoric at this point in my speech swell too high and divert me from my course. To make enemies fight one another, while allowing us in this way, as well, to live undisturbed, to achieve the tranquility of peace – who has ever been as able as he was at this? This was the strategy he devised: he kept his own subjects free from bloodshed during his greatest triumphs, all the while setting our enemies upon one another, and going to war against foreigners with troops from their own nations. So that while our own strength grew by this means, that of our enemies diminished. And so the war-god Enyalios (Ares) was no longer ‘even-handed’, bringing destruction to men on both sides, to us and all those who became our foes. Instead the devourer of men fed only on our enemies. In this way did Persians become opponents of Persians as a result of imperial policy; and so we sang the paeans of peace. In this way did Skythians blanket the ground with Skythians; and so we remained standing. In this way did many western nations suffering from greed return to health by being brought to their senses. And the Romans were amazed at the means – barely perceived by anyone – by which an intractable madness for war was cured. And the island dragon, who wanted his fiery wrath to surpass the volcano of Aetna, while he was often prevented by imperial swords from coiling in his customary manner, for the most part he was confronted with enemies at home, whom the emperor’s policies roused to rebellion, striking them with his exceedingly sharp wisdom like some knife dividing his enemies.

His imperial foresight therefore sought not only to preserve those who had submitted to his authority, but to increase their numbers to as many as the land could support. This, too, amounted to a multiplying of the talent mentioned in the gospels, since it also increased the divine inheritance. Indeed, if any of
τέλεκε, πληθύνων τὸ ἁγαθόν. Καὶ οὐκ ἔστι γλώτταν εἰπεῖν ἐθνοῦς, ἢν οἱ παρέμιξε τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς εἰς χρῆσιμον. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐν λόγῳ μετοικίας τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐστέλλοντο, καὶ εὐρίσκοντες ἄνασάναυτὸς· οἱ δὲ, καὶ δώρων ἐπιβαλλόμενοι ὅσα τὸ βασιλικὸν μεγαλόδωρον εἰς πλῆσιον ἔχορηγῆ, τοῦ πλουτοποιοῦ κόλπου ἐγίνοντο, μισθοφοροῦντες μὲν τὴν ἄρχην· ότι δὲ εἰς ἐνδελεχῆς τὸ τοῦ πλουτοῦ ρέμα τοῦτος ἐπλήμμυρεν, οἰκήσιμον καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀλλοδαπὴν ποιοῦμενοι, καὶ πατρίδα κρίνοντες εἶναι πᾶσαι, ἐν ἑνὶ εὐπαθεῖν περιγίνεται. Καὶ ἤ μὲν παλαιὰ ιστορία, καὶ δούλων πόλιν τινα πράγαι πρὸς γνώσιν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πεπλήθυσται τὸ καλὸν. Αὐθρωπινὸς γὰρ, οὐς φύσις μὲν ἐλευθερία ζῆν ἄριστος, νεύρους δὲ στερροῖς ἐτόνωσε, καὶ ὅλως, εἰς ἀνδρῶν εὐθύμωσιν, βιοῦ δὲ κύκλος ἐπὶ δουλείαν στρέψας, εἰς τὴν τοῦ μεγάλου Κωσταντίνου περὶήγαγεν (συχνοὺς δὲ καὶ τούτους αὐτὴν πανδοκεύει, καὶ οίους κατὰ στίφι καὶ λόχους καὶ στίχους συντάξασθαι), ἐλύσαν μὲν ἡν καυρὸς ἐκείνος· τοῦ δὲ δεσποτικὸν, μεμνημένοι κατὰ τὸν Ὀμηρικόν ἐπον, τῆς ἐν τροφῇ ἀκομαθίας, καὶ νομῶν ἐκείνων βαρβαρὸς καλῶν, καὶ τῶν αὐτοφαύνων καὶ ἀπαραποτοῦντων λεοτρῶν, ὥσ τοὺς βαρβαρικοὺς στρατιώτας πρὸς ἀμάλθακα καρτερίαν, παραμεῖνοντες ἤγαγον. Ἡ δὲ αὐτοῖς θάτερος μὲν | τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖν οὐκοί. ὁ δὲ λεοπὸς εἰς φυγαδεύειν ἐβλεπε. Καὶ χεῖρ ἢ μὲν, διεπρᾶττε τὰ δουλικά, ἢ δὲ, ξίφους ἠθελόντες ἑτεράναυτα εἰς τοὺς που καὶ δριμύσατα, καὶ ἐγκούσα τοῖς ἐκείνοις. Καὶ οἱ κύριοι ἐντεύθεν οὐκ ἂν μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ μενοῦντες ἂν εἴποις καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν οἱ δεσπόται καὶ στρατιώται, μενοῦντες τὸ φαῦλον οἰκετικόν. Ἐξακούεται οὖν τὸ ἐκείνον εὐκταῖον. Ἐξακούεται οὖν τὸ εὐκταῖον. 

5 πλούτου ... ἐπλήμμυρεν: Hdt. 5.101 ἐπὶ τοῦ Παικτωλοῦ ποταμόν, δ’ ὁ σφι ψήφιος χρυσοῦ καταφερέως ἐκ τοῦ Τμαύλου διὰ μέσης τῆς ἀγορῆς ἔσχον, καὶ ἐπέστα οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄγιαν ποταμὸν ἐκδίδον; cf. Mich. Psell., Or. pan. 2.805 ἄλος τὸ ἐν γῆν ὡς μήτις ἐκείνος. καὶ τοῦ πλούτου ρέμα τοῦτο ἐρρέεσθαι καὶ ἐρρέεσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἐν τροφῇ ἀκοστήσεως, καὶ ἀρχῆς μὲν τὸν ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοὺς μὲν, την λίθον προσενέγκῃ, ἐλεύθερος γίνεται κἂν ξένος ἂν τινὰ προάγει πρὸς γνῶσιν ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πεπλήθυσται τὸ καλὸν. Ἀνθρώποι

8 πλούτου ... ἐπλήμμυρεν: Hdt. 5.101 ἐπὶ τοῦ Παικτωλοῦ ποταμόν, δ’ ὁ σφι ψήφιος χρυσοῦ καταφερέως ἐκ τοῦ Τμαύλου διὰ μέσης τῆς ἀγορῆς ἔσχον, καὶ ἐπέστα οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄγιαν ποταμὸν ἐκδίδον; cf. Mich. Psell., Or. pan. 2.805 ἄλος τὸ ἐν γῆν ὡς μήτις ἐκείνος. καὶ τοῦ πλούτου ρέμα τοῦτο ἐρρέεσθαι καὶ ἐρρέεσθαι, καὶ τῆς ἐν τροφῇ ἀκοστήσεως, καὶ ἀρχῆς μὲν τὸν ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοὺς μὲν, την λίθον προσενέγκῃ, ἐλεύθερος γίνεται κἂν ξένος ἂν τινὰ προάγει πρὸς γνῶσιν ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πεπλήθυσται τὸ καλὸν. Ἀνθρώποι
those who ruled in past times accomplished this, multiplying the good that is, it was the man being praised here. And there is no tongue, which is to say any nation, which he did not mix with our own to our advantage. Thus it was that some set out across our territory, one might say, like migrants who found rest for themselves. Others, yearning for the rewards which imperial generosity granted in abundance, entered the enriching fold of the empire; at first as mercenaries, but since the river of riches flooded upon them continually, they too made a foreign land their home, deeming as their fatherland any place in which they eventually prospered. Ancient history, on the one hand, reminds us of a certain city of slaves. But here this good has been multiplied. For the men whom nature has decreed should live in freedom, fortifying them with unshakable nerves and forging them thoroughly for the pursuit of bravery, even though the circle of life had turned and led them into slavery, bringing them to the city of Constantine the Great (she hosts quite a few of these, so many that they be marshalled into bodies of troops, files, and ranks) these men then – the times being such as they were – caused their masters grief. Since they recalled the sustenance of their upbringing, like the horse in the Homeric poem, and the beautiful pastures among the barbarians, all the free-flowing natural springs which wash barbarian soldiers and instill manly endurance in them. So these men kept one eye on where they were while the other looked to escape. And while one hand carried out their servile duties, the other was prepared to reach for the sword, if anyone ever mistreated them and severed their free will. As a result, I would go so far as to say that their masters, even though they were not themselves slaves, were rather more like prisoners, buffeted back and forth, all the while complaining that they were beset by such great evils and eager to see their misfortune go away. So their prayer was heard. And the emperor’s mercy was bestowed upon both masters and slaves alike, and the imperial treasuries were completely drained. The masters were glad to rid themselves of unreliable servants. Consequently, these men returned to their natural condition instead of being slaves. Rather than live...
ἀντί μὲν δούλων, ἦσαν τὸ φυσικόν, ἀντὶ δὲ ἀτίμων, στρατιώται, τὸ φίλον ἐκείνοις—οὐκέτι δὲ τοῦ λοιποῦ ὅσον τοιούτον ἄχριεί φίλου, τὸ πάν ὑπὸ δεσπόταις ἢ ἐστὶ. ἄλλά ὡσοι μὲν οὐκ εὐγενῶς ἐφιδρόσουν, ἐπασχον οὖτω, δουλεῖαν ἀτιμησάν ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸς κλέος, ἐλόμενοι, τάχα μὲν, ἀγεννῶς, τάχα ἐπὶ προμηθεία τοῦ βιοῦ ἀσφαλῶς. Οἷς δὲ στρατεύεσθαι ἦν ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐις ὅμοιον ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἐκ δούλων στρατιωτάς ἤρχοντο, χρῆσαι δημοσίους λόγους, καὶ ζωνήν στρατείας κοσμούμενοι. Καὶ πόλεις ἐπιλήψαν, καὶ εἰρμῷ συνεπλάκησαν βίου, καὶ διαδοχικὰς ἐπιλήπθησαν, καὶ τῆν βασιλικὴν προσήκην ἐθαυμάστωσαν, οὐ κατὰ τοὺς Ἐλευθέρος ἀναφύντες αὐτοῦματοι, ἀφ’ ἃς δὲ ἐξεστάσθησαν, μεταφυτευθέντες εἰς τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς γῆν, καὶ καρπὸν ἐκδεδωκότες τρόφιμον.

Τὸ δὲ καίνοτερον· καὶ ἀνδρας τούτων ἐτί πλείουσι, ἐκ πρὶν ἀρχαγώνας μεταγαγών ἀμφίπλωτον λόγων ἐπὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίακα, τῷ ἐκείνων ἀγριῶς τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἠμέρων ἐνεκτείνετον, καὶ εἰς χρηστοτήτα μετετηρήθην ἡ θείος ἂν, παράδειγμας οἰκείωςτην. Καὶ οὐ λέγει μόνον τοὺς ἐκ τῆς χερσός, τοὺς τῆς Ἀγας, τὸ Σκυθικόν, τὸ Παιονικόν, τοὺς ὑπὲρ Ἡσυρείν, καὶ δοσιδα ἀκαρφηνὶς βορδᾶς ἐπιπνεύτηκεν—ἄλλα καὶ ὅσους ἐκ τῆς πολυτρόπους ἡγκίστρευσε. Καί συνεπλάκας καί αὐτοὶ ταῖς ἠμέρας πόλεισιν εἰς οἰκήτορας. Καὶ ἔστην εἰς τοις πολλαπλασίους τὸ σεμνός οὐκ ἠπερε ἐπὶ τὸν Μάγνον Πομπηίου καθοροῦμενον, διδελεξάμενος πολῖν ἔφαι, ἐκείσι τοὺς περισσοτέρους τῶν πειρατῶν συνϕύκησε, ὅσους δὲν φασιν ἑγων σωτηρίας ἠξιώθαι καὶ προνοίας τοιν. Ἐι γούν ἱστορίας ἄξιον τὸ μίας πόλεως ἀγαθόν, τὶς οὐκ ἀν συγγράφατο τὸ πολύχοον καὶ πολλαῖς ἐπιπνεύσθεν πόλεισι; Τί μὴ λέγων ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐπὶ τὰς ἡμετέραις πόλεσιν εἰς οἰκήτορας. Καὶ οὐ λέγω μόνους τοὺς ἐκ τῆς χέρσου, τοὺς τῆς Ἄγας, τὸ Σκυθικόν, τὸ Παιονικόν, καὶ τοὺς ἁγιασμένους τοὺς τῆς Μεγαλοπόλεως ἐξέπιπτεν ἔρωτος, τοῦ καλοῦ βασιλέως ἐκείνου, τὰς φιλητικὰς ἐπαφιέσθης ἀπάσας ἰγγας; Καὶ ἢν ἐκάστη ψηλοῦ τῶν ἑκατέρων ἐπερβάλλον, ποιάν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ, τῶν πόλεων στέρξας, εἰς φιλουμενὴν...
without honor they became soldiers, a thing dear to them. From then on, not everyone who had been enslaved remained subject to masters. Only those without a noble disposition suffered that fate, having chosen ignoble slavery over a life committed to glory and renown, perhaps out of an innate lack of nobility, or possibly to secure the means of staying alive. But those who wished to join the army were subject to the same treatment as those who were recruited out of slavery, having been freed with public moneys, and adorned with a military girdle. These men came to populate cities, and their lives became entwined in the fabric of life. They left behind manifold descendants and multiplied the original imperial supplement, not sprouting spontaneously like the sown Dragon’s Teeth but transplanted into our land from the land out of which they were uprooted, and producing a flourishing crop.

And what was still more groundbreaking, he brought over to Roman territory even more of these men who had long proven a source of ill for us in order to defend the empire, grafting onto their wild strain our own civilized one, converting them to a usefulness which divine paradise might welcome as its own. And I am not referring here just to those from the mainland, the sons of Hagar, the Skythian nation, the Paionian, the ones beyond the Istros, and all those upon whom blows the sheer wind of the North; but also those whom he had lured by various means from the sea. And they, too, have joined our ranks to become inhabitants in our cities. And the feat in this case is many times greater than that recounted about Pompey the Great, who, having chosen an eastern city, settled the remnants of the pirates there; those whom they say he determined to be worthy of being saved and deserving of imperial support. Consequently, if an achievement involving one city deserves to be recorded in history, who might not record an accomplishment so widespread and shared among so many cities? Why should I not go even further, and say that not a single one of the cities of the empire was left uninitiated into the Great City’s love, since that good emperor sent forth his affectionate charms on all of them? And the deeply entrancing spell prompted each of them to wonder, which of the cities the emperor would look after so that

Vit. par. ( Agesil. et Pomp.) 3.2 ὁ δὲ καὶ τῶν πειρατῶν τοῖς μεταβαλομένοις πόλεις ἐδωκε; cf. etiam Strabo Geogr. 14.5.8.4 Πομπήιος Μάγνος κατόρθωσε τοὺς περιγενομένους τῶν πειρατῶν, οὓς μάλιστα ἔγνω σωτηρίας καὶ προνοίας τινὸς ἄξιος, καὶ μετωνόμασε Πομπηιόπολιν 22–23 βασιλέως... ἱππας: Eust. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 279.303 Τοιαύτας, ὦ βασιλεῦ κράτιστε, χάριτας ἐπαφίης ἁπανταχοῦ γῆς, δι’ ὅν ἐφέλκῃ ξύμπαντας· οὕτως ἀφύκτους πόθων ἱππας ταῖς ἁπάντων ἐντίθης ψυχαῖς, οὐχ’ ὥστε σε φιλεῖν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιθέναι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑπὲρ σοῦ
Δέχομαι τοὺς προσήνεσθές σοι ἐν τῷ καθαρῷ ἐλεον. καὶ ἀλλοφανής ἐκεῖνος πρέσβυς ταράττει καὶ ὁ μετ' αὐτὸν ἕτερος καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ οὗτος καὶ συχνοὶ τοιοῦτοι συχνοὶ, ἀλλόκοτον αὐτοὶ γένος ἀλλόγλωτον, θέαξενασά, οὐδὲν τῶν συνήθων παρεοικυῖα, τῷ τε καινοφανεῖ τοῦ στολισμοῦ εἰς θαῦμα παράγουσα καὶ τῷ τῆς διαλέκτου ἀλλοθροῦ ἐφιστῶσα τὸν ἀκροώμενον καὶ τῷ ἀσυνήθει τῆς θέας πηγνύσα τὴν ὄψιν τοῖς βλέπουσιν ἀλλογνώτους: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔλεγομεν ἀγαπητός; ὁ δὲ ὤλετο τηλόθι πάτρης / διογενῆ Ὀδυσσείᾳ ἐκεῖνῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ; cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. Od. 1.104.4448 Δῆμος δὲ ἀλλόγνωτος, ἢ ὁ πολέμιος, ἢ ἀλλὸς καὶ οὖς ἢ ἀναφθορμένος ἢ γίνωσκων ἤπειρος ἡμεῖς, ἢ ἀλλοίς καὶ οὐχ' ἡμεῖς γινωσκόμενος. ἐκ τοῦ γνωτὸς δὲ σύγκειται ὁ ἀλλόγνωτος. ὃν γνωστόν φασιν οἱ ὑστεροί. δοκεῖ δὲ ἀλλόγνωτος μᾶλλον εἶναι, ὁ ἄλλος γνωστός, ἤγου γαρ ταῦτα τῆς πάντων ἀλλόγνωτος ἀληθῶς, ὥς καὶ μόνον καὶ ἐντυχίας εὐκταίας, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ὑναίτιο διὰ τῆς ὁδοὺς οἰκεῖος. παρὰ τοὺς γνωστοὺς ἤτοι ἀδελφοί. ἄλλως γὰρ, οὐκ ἐκώλυε τὸν ποιητὴν εἰπεῖν ἀλλογνώστῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ, εἰς τούτοις τοῦ καθαροῦ ἐλεον. καὶ ἀλλοφανής ἐκεῖνος πρέσβυς ταράττει καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνος καὶ οὗτοι καὶ οὐκ' εἴς νομίμον πεπερατές, ὡς καὶ πίπτειν ἐν δυσχερεῖ, ἄνδρα εὐφέσθαι διήλωτον τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς διάλεκτον εἰς τὸ ἡμεδαπὸν μεταβάλλοντο. ἰστορήσατε ταῦτα τοῦ δημοσίου πολύ. Δέει μὲν γὰρ τοῦ μὴ παρασκευάζατε, ὑπερορίζωσαν. Καὶ πρὶν τῶν περί αὐτοῦ ἀκουσμάτων, καὶ ὡς ταῦτα πάντα εἰπεῖν, θαῦμα συλλεξαμένους, κομίσασθαι τοῖς εἰς προσθείαν διαπεμψαμένους. Ὅπως καὶ Σολωμόν- τος ἡ σοφία, πολλοῖς ξειλίκηκα, καὶ εἰ μὴ τοσούτους, ἀλλ' οὖν ἐρ' ἀπόσηκον. Καὶ ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα τὸ τῆς θαυμασίας πολύ. Ἐλθεῖν δὲ εἰς ἑπειροφίλον ἀγνώτως ἀνδρείᾳ, καὶ θελήσατε δεινά παραπέσοντες ἄνθρωπον καὶ συνήθει τῆς θέας πηγνύσα τὴν ὄψιν τοῖς βλέπουσιν, ἀλλογνώτους ἔστι τοῦ βασιλείου, πρέσβεις ὁρᾷ οὐ μόνες μὲν ἐκ τῶν δεκάδων μετρίας τινὰς, ἐκ τῶν ἑκασταχοῦ χωρῶν ἐνταῦθα ὡς εἰς δεχάδα κοινήν, καὶ σύστημα ποιοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀλλόκοτον τοῖς γε πλείοσι. Καὶ ἑώρα ἡ μεγίστη πόλις αὐτῆς ἀληθῶς, ὡς καὶ οὐδένι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς οὐδ' εἰς ὄνομα πεπείραται, ὡς καὶ πάντως εὑρέσθαι δίγλωττον τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς διάλεκτον εἰς τὸ ἡμεδαπὸν μεταβάλλοντο. Ἐξωτερικὰ δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ οὐ τὸν κατ' αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ οὐκ ἔστω τῷ τῆς θαυμασίας πολύ.
it should be ranked as his beloved. And all the cities became attached to our own like surrounding towns are to a metropolis. ‘Not’ being cherished, however, was akin to destruction and being wiped off the face of the earth.

And among the countless assemblies hosted by the imperial palace, one could see ambassadors—not just in modest groups of ten—streaming in from every land as into a common vessel, giving most of those present the appearance of a strange confederacy. And the greatest city herself saw truly unfamiliar men, whose name no one among us had ever heard of, so that it proved difficult to find anyone bilingual who could translate their language into our own. And the purpose of their journey and ultimate aim of their embassy was to observe the emperor face to face, to hear him speak, and to see him distinguish himself in exercises, as well as to collect songs and stories about him, gathering it all up into a single wondrous portrait to bring to those who had sent them on their embassy. In such a manner did the wisdom of Solomon attract many; if not quite this many, nevertheless as many he did. And here is a great cause for wonder.

Whenever embassies had to be sent in order to prevent some suffering, either on account of a timely request for help, if some need befell them, or because of a want of money which could serve to accomplish the task promptly, or simply for the sake of some promise of support in the future, all of these occasions served as shining opportunities to demonstrate the greatness, wealth, and many advantages of our circumstances thanks to our emperor. These, however, are only manifestations, not the man himself, so that they approach a kind of co-existence with him. But the fact that foreign men came from beyond our borders, willingly enduring the hardships which a long journey entails, solely for the sake of an audience, for even a chance meeting, we cannot call this a singular great event but must divide it into many wonders. For it is clear that the clamor which accompanied the emperor’s accomplishments reverberated like a great thunderclap.

But what point is there in me calling those wearing crowns ‘ambassadors’, when it was also possible to observe sovereigns come to our empire, some while

χόντες 12–13 Σολομόντος...σοφία: cf. Eust. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 262.57 δυσιόν τι...τῷ περιλαλουμένῳ Σολομόντι καὶ σοι περιτεύξομαι καθημένῳ ἐπὶ θρόνου δικαιοσύνῃ περιόπτῳ τοῖς ἁπανταχόθεν ἔθνεσι; cf. etiam Nic. Chon. Hist. 209 τῷ πλέον ἐδειξομένῳ Ρωμαίοις ὅπως ἔρχεται καὶ Χρυσοφόρει καὶ προσφέρει την προερχόμενοι, ἀλλ' εἰ μή καὶ σοφοί δοκοῦσι καὶ θεοείκετος τὴν μορφήν καὶ ἥρωες τὴν ἰσχύν ὡς Σολομῶν θεόσοφοι 24–24.6 κορυφαίας...κατάλογος: cf. Eust. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 263.7074 τὰς τῶν μεγάλων ἐθνῶν ἀπαρχάς ταῖς...καὶ τὸν μὲν Σκύθην ἔχω μαθὼν καὶ οὐ με ξενίζει τῇ θέᾳ, Παίονες δὲ καὶ Δαλμάται καὶ πᾶν, ὅσον τούτως πρόσοικον
ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ

λικῆν θέαν γένοιτ' ἀν, πορισόμενοι συμβολὴν ἱκανήν, τάς δὲ, καὶ μόνον ἐντυχεῖν καὶ πρὸς θάμβος θέασασθαι; Τὸν τοιούτου ὄρμαθον ὁ τῶν κατὰ Πέρσας ἐθνάρχης, καὶ ὁ τῶν Παλαιστινῶν ὑπεραναβαίνων ὡς ἐπιστρέφειν ἡ φήμη· Λοιπὸς δὲ ὁ ἀληθεύων ἐκεῖνος ὁ μέγας, καὶ ὁ τῆς γερμανικῆς ἀπάσης ὑπεριστάμενος γῆς, οἱ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς βαθμιστέως ἐκείνην εἶδον· ὅκνω γὰρ εἰπεῖν εὐμέθοδον ἐφοδοῦν. Τὸν γὰρ Πάιονα καὶ τὸν Ηπάιδα καὶ τὸν Σκύθην καὶ συναυτοῦ τοιούτους εἰπεῖν, μυρίος ὁς κατάλογος ἔτερος, υἱὸς (τὸ πάν ἐν βραχεί συνελεύειν) θάμβους καὶ φοβοὺς καὶ ζήτηους ἐπικουρίας, συνέλεγον εἰς ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἢ πάντα ταύτα, εἴτε καὶ τούτων τινά. Θάμβους, ἐφ' οἷς μαθαίνοντες καὶ ἐκπληγημένοι συνέρρησαν εἰς τὴν ἀκοήν· φοβοὺς καὶ συμβαίναν ἀλλως ἀναπτυκτός τούτως ἔξω τῶν βασιλικῶν σπλάγχνων πεσεῖν· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ τρίτον, εἰ τι που κακὸν ἐκείνος ἐπήρτητο ποθεῖν, ὡς μὴ εὔπετες ὅν σκορακίσαι τὸ κακὸν ἐτέρων, μὴ συνεπαλαμβανομένης δεξιάς ταύτης βασιλικῆς.

Ἡν δὲ οὖκ ἐκείνοι θαυμάζειν οὔτως, εἰ καὶνα μαθαίνεις οἱ τοιούτοι, καὶ οὐαὶ ἐπάγεσθαι τοὺς ἀκοούσας, κατὸτιν τῆς ἁκοῆς εἰς ὅτι παραρτότων ἐποντό. Ἡ τε γὰρ φήμη ἀνέντιος πτεροῦς διήπτασι καὶ ἡ παραδοξία τῶν φημιζομένων ἐπιστρέφειν συνελεύσατος ἡ φήμη· ἢς καὶνα μαθαίνεις οἱ τοιούτοι, καὶ οὐαὶ ἐπάγεσθαι τοὺς ἀκοούσας, κατὸτιν τῆς ἁκοῆς εἰς ὅτι παραρτότων ἐποντό. Καὶ ἢ πάντα ταύτα, εἴτε καὶ τούτων τινά. Θάμβους, ἐφ' οἷς μαθαίνοντες καὶ ἐκπληγημένοι συνέρρησαν εἰς τὴν ἀκοήν· φοβοὺς καὶ συμβαίναν ἀλλως ἀναπτυκτός τούτως ἔξω τῶν βασιλικῶν σπλάγχνων πεσεῖν· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν καὶ τρίτον, εἰ τι που κακὸν ἐκείνος ἐπήρτητο ποθεῖν, ὡς μὴ εὔπετες ὅν σκορακίσαι τὸ κακὸν ἐτέρων, μὴ συνεπαλαμβανομένης δεξιάς ταύτης βασιλικῆς.

Μη γὰρ ἐπεβῇ, ὅπερ εἰ τις ὑπεραναβαίνη, ἐγγραφήσεται ὡς εἰς γίγαντα καὶ ἡ φύσις ἀλλως αὐτοῦ ἡ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐστερέωσέν, εἰς ὁστινών ἀδράν καὶ ἡ φήμη εἰς λεοντώδη, ἀπευθύνασθαι ἐπεντρανίσαταί ταίναι, τοιαῖτ' εἰναι ἀληθῶς ἀποφήνατο καὶ τὸν ὅλον βασιλέα ἐν καρδίαις ἀνεβίβαζον διαλογιζόμενοι, ὡς εἰς τοίς ἐν τούτως μόνον καὶ ὡς καὶ τὰ τῶν διαστάσεων. Ἐντεύθεθεν ἐκεῖνος υἱὸς τοῖς πτεροῖς διΐπταται, καὶ τὸν τοῦ μεγαλείου αὔξην ἐκορύφωσεν. Ως δὲ τὴν τοῦ μεγαλείου αὔξην ἐκορύφωσεν, τοῦτο ἤπως ἢ Μή παραδοξία τῶν φημιζομένων ἐπιστρέψαι τοὺς φιλακροάμονας.
journeying on a different mission, which they would resume after having had an audience with the emperor in order to obtain a sufficient contribution; while others came for this purpose alone, to gaze upon this object of wonder? Among this string of visitors were the ethnarch of the Persian lands, as well as the rex who rules over the Palestinians. The rest included that great ruler of the Alamænæ, and the sovereign of the whole of German territory, who regarded that journey to our lands as a marvel. For I hesitate to call it a well paved road. To mention the Paian, the Gipædean, and the Skythian, as well as many others like them, would amount to another catalogue; men (to sum up the whole briefly) whom awe, fear and requests for help gathered to us. And all of these things happened at once or singly: awed at the things they had learned, they gathered, stunned, for an audience with him; or fearing lest events take an undesirable turn and as a result of their complacency they should fall out of favour with the emperor; the third and final reason, that some danger should ever arise from any quarter against them, a misfortune they might not otherwise easily dismiss without the pledged assistance of the emperor.

And it was no wonder, if men such as these, learning of novel and unusual things, such as attract those who hear about them, followed them from afar after hearing the reports. For reputation flies on nimble wings, and the strangeness of the things spread through report can prompt those who hearken to them to turn their attention in their direction. But what brought the increase of imperial magnificence to its peak was the following: once those men had arrived and it turned out that the things they had learned turned out to be true, they went away like heralds crying far and loud, “we see exactly what we had heard.” And this was not all: being filled with awe for some time, they brought with them a permanent sense of astonishment through their imaginative recalling of what they had seen, all the more so when reflecting upon him. They brought up the full image of the emperor in their hearts, a man who shone not just through his essential inner qualities, the marks of genuine humanity, but through his outer features as well.

For such was his height, that any man who surpassed him would have been reckoned a giant. Indeed nature provided him with a firmness different from that of others, adopting a stout and, so to speak, lion-like frame, straightening herself; with the result that, anyone examining his extremities would conclude that these were truly the sort which physiognomists agree characterize manly strength, which were in turn proportionate to his size. Hence he was not bur-
οὐδὲ σαρκῶν αὐτὸν ἐβάρυνε περιουσία ἐπαρχημόμενη πρὸς περιττότητα τῷ τε ἄει γυμναστικῶν ἄπερχομένου τοῦ πλεονάζοντος, καὶ ὁτι περὶ τὸν ἦς ἀληθῶς ἀνθρωπον ἦσαν δισύμβωσε τῆς φύσεως. Καὶ τὸ μὲν πελάριον φιλείωσατο ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἠπιστο τὸ δ’ θυγάιον. Οὐκοῦν ἀκολουθεῖς, οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔπιστοι ἀλλ’ εἰς κεφαλὴν κόσμου ἑαυτόν, καὶ τυγχάνον τοῦ ἐφετοῦ, εὐθετίζει τρίχας ἕμεφετο. Ἡνδ’ ἔρχεται καὶ ἡ θεοθεία τῆς φύσεως, τὸ ἐντάθη πολὺ τῆς ὑλῆς προσδαπανώσα ταῖς κρείττοσι, οὐκ ἠθέλετε τῇ κόμη χορηγεῖν τὸ ὑπέρπλεον, ἡ μηδὲ τὸν βασιλικότατον λέοντα πυκνοῦσα τριχὰς λασιότητι. 5

Τῇ δὲ τοιούτῃ σεμνότητι, καὶ τῷ τῆς χροιᾶς καλὸν συνδίδηκεν. Οὐ γὰρ θηλυπρεπὴς λειτουργία τὸ πρόσωπον ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ’ εὐφώς μιγνυμένη πρὸς τὸ ἀνδρώδες ἐκεκρατεῖ τοῦ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἱστορίας κατὰ γυμνασιαν καὶ λοιπῶν βασιλείᾳ, ἠλικίτε, καὶ μαλλιά. Οὐ γὰρ σκιατραφίαν ἐπραγματεύτηκε, ἐπεὶ μὴ διαλύναν τελή καὶ ἀργόν αἰθερίας δὲ παρέδωκεν ἔτη ἐφ’ ὅν πρὸς ἀνδρίας εὔωνερείτη τοῖς εὐθετίζειν τρίχας. Οὐ γὰρ τὸς εὐθετίσειν διηυθηκότος γέλωτος, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὸ λεοντώδες ἕκριβοτε. Κεκραμένη γὰρ ἔχριστον ἐφοβήθη τῇ τῶν κάλλων μεσότητι. 10

Καὶ δεήσαν μὲν ἐκαστάσησαι, ὅποι χρεῶν, καὶ ἀνθολογία κάλλους ποικίλῃ αὐτὸν ἠγαλλεῖ. Σεμνότερος μὲν γὰρ προελαμπτεί σφιχτος ἑαυτὸν καταστῆσαι, ὅποι χρεών, καὶ ἀνθολογία κάλλους νους ἐνθείτη. Ἀμαθῆς, ἀλαζόνας, βοώδης, καὶ ἀναίσθητον ἄνθρωπον, οὐκοῦν ἀκολούθως, οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔπιστοι, ἀλλ’ εὐθετίζειν τρίχας ἕκριβοτε. Οὐ γὰρ τὸς εὐθετίσειν διηυθηκότος γέλωτος, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὸ λεοντώδες ἕκριβοτε. Κεκραμένη γὰρ ἀκολούθως, οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔπιστοι, ἀλλ’ εὐθετίζειν τρίχας ἕκριβοτε. Οὐ γὰρ τὸς εὐθετίσειν διηυθηκότος γέλωτος, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὸ λεοντώδες ἕκριβοτε. Κεκραμένη γὰρ ἀκολούθως, οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔπιστοι, ἀλλ’ εὐθετίζειν τρίχας ἕκριβοτε. Οὐ γὰρ τὸς εὐθετίσειν διηυθηκότος γέλωτος, οὐδὲ μὴν ἀλλὰ τὸ λεοντώδες ἕκριβοτε. Κεκραμένη γὰρ ἀκολούθως, οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔπιστοι, ἀλλ’ εὐθετίζειν τρίχας ἕκριβοτε.
dened by a surplus of flesh making a nuisance of itself by its excess, since it was shed through both constant exercise, with the surplus being removed, and because nature busied itself with man as he truly is. And while his enormous size suited him, he nevertheless avoided the bearing of an oaf. And so accordingly he did not set his hair in too elegant a fashion, but he attended to himself as was appropriate for the head of the world. And having achieved this goal, he objected to straightening his hair. And since the divine wisdom of nature had already invested so many of its resources in stronger features, it did not wish to endow him with excess hair, since nature does not cover even the kingly lion with an abundance of hair.

And the quality of his complexion matched the dignity described thus far. His face did not display an effeminate paleness, but was instead suitably part of a manly mixture, a face right out of ancient history, weathered by exercises and other labours, not least by the sun. For he did not conduct his affairs indoors, in the shade, since he cared not for a soft and easy life. Instead he exposed himself to the elements, from which his skin drew its manly colouring, having aspired to an appearance that one does not find on womanly or soft people, but such as might adorn a heroic austerity. He was thus not prone to laughter; nor for that matter was he grim like a lion. Indeed, since his countenance combined with the Graces it was composed of just the right measure of beauty.

When the need arose to present himself, wherever he was obliged to do so, a varied bouquet of beauty adorned him. For while he shone forth more solemnly, his eyes gave the impression of cheerfulness and martial dignity through their brightness. A look of profound serenity gamboled on his face, it too was proportionate and had a healthy complexion. These joined to produce an attractive meadow, from which it was possible to harvest all the pleasure sought by those eager to look upon him.
Καὶ τοιούτος μὲν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅτε ἀθέτως εἶχε πρὸς τι παρακινοῦν καὶ τὴν ἐντὸς ὕποκύπτειν θάλασσαν, ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ πλάσσας ἔθετο. Ὄτε δὲ, ὅποια πολλά, θυμοδακές τι παραφανθεῖν ἀνάκυψαν ποθὲν, καὶ ἐχρῆ γῇ τῇ ψυχῇ τοῦ αὐτῆς δορυφόρου παραστήναι καὶ ἀμύνασθαι, τηλικοῦν τοῖς μὲν οὐκ ἐξέξεθεν, οὐδὲ καχλάζων ἀπο-φριζε κατὰ τοὺς εἰς ὅργῃν πυρίνους· βιαζόμενος δὲ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ αὐτὸν καὶ διαζωγραφοῖν εἰς θυμούμενον (ἠ γὰρ ἀνάγκη πάσα, ὅτι μηδὲ εἰς παίγνημον θετέον τὴν ὑστὲν σεμνότατην ἀρχήν), οὐκετε' ἁνὴ δὲ αὐτός ἢ, ἀλλὰ παραπτωμὸν τὸ ἐμφυτὸν ξωγράφημα, ἐξέπεμπε εἰς δόσα καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐμφρόν, τὸν μὲν πρὸν ἀποτιθέμενον, οὐκαὶ Καὶ ην ἐνταῦθα βλέπειν ἄλλο κράμα, κάλλους καὶ αὐτό. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱλαρόν, καὶ οὕτω τοῖς οὐκ ἁμβλυποτοῦσιν ἐξελάμπε, τὸ δὲ θυμούμενον τῆς ψυχῆς, ἐξερχεῖ καὶ ἀλλὼς τὸ προφανεῖνον, καθά πον κρύπτει μὲν ἐντὸς τὸ φωταυγὲς ἀφανίζει δὲ οὐκ εἰσάπαν. Καὶ ὁ τῷ βασιλικῷ περιτυχὼν ἐκείνῳ προσχήματι, φρίζας, ὅτι μηδὲν ἢ ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι (εἰ μὴ καὶ λέοντος θετέον τὸ πάντῃ πάντως ἐξήνευεν ἀθεράπευτον). Εν τοιούτως δέος ἐπάθεν ὁ συσταλείς, καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν ἱλαρόν προέτρεξε, καὶ ἀνελάμβανε καταπίπτοντα, καὶ μηδὲν παραστῆνα ἐκμυζήσας ἐπ' ἄρ' θημούμενον... ἐξερχεί: Gal. De plac. Hipp. et Plat. 5.7.87.6 διαφέρει τὸ θυμούμενον τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ λογιζομένου; Suda ψ 164.2 Ψυχῆ: πνεῦμα νοερόν. ὅτι μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς ὥς εἴδη τρία· λογιζομένου, θυμούμενον, ἐπιθυμοῦν 15 λέοντα... ἐπικόνιον: Hom. Il. 17.136 πάν τε τ' ἐπισκόπον κατώ θέλεται δόσε καλύπτων...
And such was the demeanor of the emperor anytime he felt indisposed toward anything stirring the latent sea-swell [of anger] within himself, which the creator instilled in us. When, on the other hand, as often happened, some maddening thing reared its head from some quarter, it became necessary for his soul’s sentinel to be present and take up the defence. In that case his anger did not boil over, nor did it bubble up in a froth in the manner of those who are easily inflamed to rage. Forcing himself instead and portraying himself as angry (for there was every need that such a noble ruler not be taken lightly), he did not remain the same man, but altering his innate character, he turned to what a wise teacher might do. And setting aside his milder self, since this was no longer what the students had need of, he donned the appearance of severity, which the students had elicited from him as a remedy for their ignorance, needing strong, not a mild cure.

And it was possible in his case to see another mixture, another thing of beauty. For while his ruddy cheerfulness shone forth in this way to anyone not dim sighted, the wrath of his soul could give an altogether different colour to his appearance, in a manner which hid the brightness within him, but without making it disappear altogether. And the man who encountered this appearance in the emperor was terrified, as was bound to happen (unless a man ever happened to pass by a lion gradually furrowing his brow without trembling). And while the man’s sight was thrown into confusion, so that he could see the surface appearance in front of him but not deeper to the inner light (for cowering in the face of some terrible thing the mind cannot discern clearly and concentrates on the surface instead), that man might wish to die rather than face the divine emperor’s indignation; just as he would not want to face the wrath of God, whose own anger also falls heavy on those who walk the earth, even if it is mixed with uttermost mercy. But no sooner had the cringing man felt such fear than the emperor’s good cheer hastened and raised up the prostrate man, offering him sweetness before he had even tasted bitterness; unless of course the man conducted himself in an altogether irremediable manner. For in such cases it would be idiotic to suppress one’s anger, thus giving one’s opposed room to cast himself over the precipice like a madman, leading many to their destruction through his example.

cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.27.2 Ἐπισκύνιον δὲ ἐστὶ...ὡ ἐπιχαλάται τοῖς τῶν λεόντων ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ καλύπτει αὐτοὺς προνοία φόσσεως; cf. Theocr. Idyll. 24.118 τοῖον ἐπισκύνιον βλοσυρῷ ἐπέκειτο προσώπῳ; cf. etiam Mich. Psell. Or. pan. 4.310 σπακὼς ἐκάθησο τὰς ὀφρῦς καὶ βλοσυρὸν βλέπων καὶ λεοντῶδες καὶ ἐς μήδες σύρας τὸ ἐπισκύνιον
Ἑπαύνω τὸν τοιούτον θυμὸν ἑγὼ, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ διορθωτὴς νόμος, ὅν οἱ αὐτοκρατοῦντες μετριάσαντες μὲν ἐπαινοῦντο ἂν, ἀπαλέψαντες δὲ οὐκ ἂν φθάνοιν τὴν τοῦ παντὸς τάξιν συγχάειτε. Καὶ ἴνα μὲν ὁ ἐπαινούμενος οὐτὸν χαρακτήρος ἠξίων καὶ καταστήματος τοῦ κατ’ ὄψιν, ὥστε ἐμφανίζῃ τις περιπέτεια τὰ γε εἰς τὸ πολιτεύεσθαι. Ο τόλμος γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐτεροῖαι εἰχε θυμομαχίαν, ἢν αἱ πράξεις διαξωγρα- 

5 φοῦσιν, ὡς αἱ βιβλιακὲς πτύχες ἀμφιέπουσιν. 

Καίρος δὴ τις καὶ ἀστείασθαι. Οὐ γὰρ δυστράπελος διὰ βίου παντὸς ἐν ἀνθρώ- 

ποις οὐδεῖς, εἰ γε καὶ Τίμων εφιλιάτεο- φιλία δὲ οὐδεμία τὸ ἀστεῖον ἀπεῖπα τοι- 

· καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς; cf. Eust. 

τοίνυν, ἀνὴρ οὔτε ἀμφιλαφὴς τὴν γνῶσιν κα- 

· ῥως εἰπεῖν πολυβενθής οὐ μὴν δὲ οὐδ’, ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ οὐκ ἐξελάλει τι καινὸν μὲν εἰς ἀκοήν, θεόπεμπτο δὲ εἰς νόησιν. Ἐγὼ 

α ὶ μὴν οὐδ’ ἐξέπιπτέ τι τῶν φιλοσοφούμενον ἐνεβάθυνεν, ἐκμυελίζων τὸ νόημα. 

ὁ δὲ λόγιος, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἔνδον φαινομένου ἦν, εἰς γλυκείαν αὐτὸ βάπτων ἔννοιαν. Καθό τις δή, ὃς ἂν ὑπείρωσιν ἀπέρρεε μέλιτος τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι. Μάλιστα μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἂν’ οὐρανοῦ μάννα ἔβρε- 

λιτεύσθαι. Ὁ πόλεμος γὰρ αὐτῷ ἑτεροίαν εἶχε θυμομαχίαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ εἴρηται. καὶ οὕτω μὲν αὐτοί 


11 ἄπ’ οὐρανοῦ: 2 B delevit Tafel, sed. vid. not. ad loc.
For my part I applaud such ire, since it is also the corrective law, which emperors are praised for when applied in moderation, and without which they would hasten to throw the order of everything into confusion. The man being praised here possessed just such a character. And this was his outward appearance on those occasions when some fit of anger might exceed the [regular] administration of government. For war awakened an altogether different violent anger in him, which his actions, detailed in the pages of books, illustrate.

There were however also occasions when conversational amiability were called for. No man can go through his entire life being dour and humourless, seeing as even Timon could make friends. No friendship rejects good-natured banter, just as no social gathering will, either. And there were indeed times when the emperor let honey flow from his mouth for those in his presence, so that it seemed to be raining Manna from heaven. For not even thus did the emperor’s speeches fall short of his elevated position. His peaceful countenance gave them a taste of another sweetness. It was like Manna, however, because the sweetness of his company took on varied forms, and anyone who hungered after beauty savoured diverse pleasures. And those who especially enjoyed its surface appeal, found some sweet significance in it. But a learned man also entered into its deeper philosophical significance, drawing out the very marrow of the meaning. Indeed, the emperor never uttered anything idle or, as it were, considered ‘hard to swallow’. He spiced his speech throughout with the salt of enduring good taste in handling [the idea], and with profound ideas; some as developed by the apostles and the Great Teacher who sent them on their mission, others being ideas on which those outside of our faith pride themselves.

In order, therefore, that I may put on view before you, as though in a solemn and illustrious triumphal procession, something that sustains the sense of wonder I mentioned earlier: he never made a speech in which he did not say something at once novel for the ear and a godsend for the mind. For my part, not being a man of wide and, so to speak, deep knowledge, though also not altogether without depth or stripped of learning, I would not claim to have ever been

12 τὸ ... γαλήνιον: cf. Them. Eἰς Θεοδόσιον 190.6 γαλήνη δὲ ἐπικέχυται παντὶ τῷ προσώπῳ 17 ἦρτυν... ἀλατί: Epist. Pauli ad Col. 4.6.2 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἀλατὶ ἤρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι; cf. Eust. Or. 8 (Λόγος Η) 146.34 πορείαν εὐσταλῶς ἀνύεις ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττονα· ἔστι δέ σοι καὶ τὰ τῆς βρώσεως ταύτης ἠρτυμένα λόγῳ, τῷ νοστιμωτάτῳ ἅλατι 24 ἀνήρ... ἀμφιλαφῆς: Suda Lex. Α 1740 Ἀμφιλαφῆ: διπλοῦν, τεχνικόν τε καὶ σοφιστικόν ἄνθρωπον εὔρρουν τε ἀμφιλαφῆ τὴν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὰς πολιτικὰς ἐξηγήσεις; cf. Eust. De capt. Thess. 74.3435 ἐξ πονηρίαν ἀδώρατος καὶ τὸ γε κρυψίνουν πολυβενθῆς

in an imperial audience in which, as far as I was concerned, I did not acquire knowledge of something astonishing or original in my mind worth learning. In fact this was a thing most beloved to the Athenians, whose love of novelty was a conspicuous characteristic. Put another way, they were a people thoroughly polished in eloquence who, in their craving for audiences, longed to add more innovative ideas to the existing ones. And it would have been apt in this case to cite the following from poetry, “that God crowns the king’s figure with words, attaching this most beautiful thing to the imperial crown.”

And while his conversation was indeed sweet, it proved even better in other respects as well. For the vehicle of his thought, the sonority and majesty of the emperor’s voice, furnished his audience with even more pleasant speech. They in turn had to divide their attention between the meaning, which was excellent, and the sound of his voice, which also helped adorn the meaning. This imperial virtue is also widely praised and documented in texts. And his readiness in debate, being quick to respond while also sharp in understanding what was meant, has no analogy when it comes to speed; unless one has recourse to the metaphor of the swiftness of an arrow flying through the air; or the quick spark of a lighting bolt’s blaze; or the image of a wing flapping into flight. The muse of poetry [Kalliope] honours the concentration of arguments and the wealth of proofs, likening them to a thick snowfall, especially in cases where the subject resembles a tirade either about some topical or is otherwise rough and heavy. For just then is the image of snow most appropriate. For vehement speech is densely packed like snowflakes this time of the season. And you might even say dreadful, like something causing one to shudder; and shining with the brightness of its clarity, rushing down as from a height with the majestic swelling of his greatness. Such were the vast resources of discourse possessed by this emperor, which experience alone could teach you. For it would be impossible to describe them to the extent warranted.
Τα δε της μνήμης, βιβλιος ην αναπάλευτος, γραφεις ἐγκεκολαμμένη θείως, κινουμένων δικτύους πνευματος. Και οδη μὲν η της ιστοριας πολυπραγμοσύνη, πρὸ δε ταυτης ή φύσες, ἀνθρωπίνην πλασάν την μὲν, οῖαν ράσοι μὲν καταλαβεῖν ράσον δε και ἀποβαλεῖ το μανθανόμενον, ὅποιον τι και σωλήνος πάθος, εἰσφροντι της ἀπόνων ύποκειμένου και ἐκροῆς την [δε, δύσπορον μὲν εἰσοικεσάζα το άκουσμα, λήθη δε ἀδυσώπητον. Και ομοιότης ην τούτω, κατὰ το έν άγγελος σύστομον, οῖο τὸ δυσδιέξοδον, διὰ το έν τη εἰσόδου στεγανόν. Και τοιαῦτα μὲν τινες φύσεις. Ἐνταῦθα δε και δραμεῖν εις ψυχήν πάνω εὐδοκας ταις εις αυτήν την πρεπούσας χριστομαθείας, και ἐκδραμεῖν οὗτος ο έν γένοιτο, καθα και τοις έκ λαβυρίνθων φυγεῖν σπεύδουνα. Ἐπεβαλεν ἡ όνης τοπογραφίας φέρε εἰπείν ήθε προσώπων ή και τις ετέρως ων ἔδει μνημοσύνην ἐντεθήναι εις ψυχήν. Και αυτὰ μὲν εὐμαρώς παρεδύοντο εις ἐντύπωσιν-κλεις δε συντηρίας εξεπετείθεσα μνήμονος, ἀνεπιβούλουν εὑράττατε την σφραγίδα έως ήν ἀναπτυχθήναι το της ψυχης ταιμείου καιρος. Τότε δε, εὐπετος ην οϊγνητο και φαντασίας ανακινούνης, εκανουργεῖτο τη μνήμη σαφης ή ανάγγεις, και τα εἰκότα συνήγαγο, και η περίστασις διήρθητο, και η γνώσης ήρημωστο, ἀπαξ μὲν ποτε γνωρισθήσεται, τω δε ἀποθέτω της μνήμης, ης μακρον οὕτω τι παραμείνασα. Ἐσφραγίστο γαρ εν τοις ψυχικοις θησαυροις θείωτον: το πολλα δε, και εις παιδος μεχρι και εις το υπέρακμον διεσώζετο-τόπος εκείνος, άνηρ εκείνος, χρόνος οδε τις, ομιλια τοιαδε, ποιστης πραξευς και τοιαυτα τινα, ων η αναξωγράφης εκανούργηγε την παλαιτάτην ἐντύπωσιν του γνωστου.  

'Ην δε και ετέρα της παρ' αυτω μνήμη, τω μὲν προσφάτω διεκφεύγειν δοκουσα το του μεμνησθαι τεραστιον, και τοιαυτα τινα, και εκείνους εις μακρον οὕτω τι παραμείνα.  

1 βιβλιος ... ἐγκεκολαμμένη: Cf. LXX Ex. 36.13, και ἐποίησαν ἀμφοτέρους τοις Λίθους της σωματούς συμπεπράγμενους και πρεπεσφυγωμένους χρυσος, γεγυγωμένους και εὐκεκολαμμένους ἐκκολάμμα σφραγι-δος εκ των ονοματων των εισων Ισραηλι; cf. etiam Chron. Pasch. 214.5 Αλλα και βιβλιον Σολομωνος, ωσ φα-σιν Εβραιοι, ιαμάτων παντος πάθος εγκεκολαμμένον; Suda Ε 277.11 ήν Σολομωνι βιβλιον εργασε της τον ναου φλα-γραφιων ... πνευματι: Epist. Pauli ad Corinth. ii. 3.3.2 ἐπιστολη Χριστου διακονηθεισα υπ' αυτως, εγγεγραμμενη ου μελαιν ἀλλα πνευματι θεος ζωντος 4 σω-ληνος παθος: Greg. Naz. de filio 1.1620 λόγων εισαγωγικων επενόησαν προς ἐξαπάτη των ἀπολυτέρων ή εὐπρεπεστέρων, και μη τη μηκη του λογου διασχητη τα νοσμενα, καθαπερ δωρ ου σωλην εργασιων, αλλα κατα πεδιον χρεμων και λυμων; cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 3.110.813 Δηλαι δε δωρ ή τους τη γραφη, ὅτι το πνευμα μεχρι το στοματος ανελθων και πληγουσαν αυτο εξεχθηθη, κατω της ἁθηθος της κεφαλης, ωστε ετι κανομυηνη της γλατης δοκειν την κεφαλην κατω κεμηνην φθεγγεσθαι. ουτω, φασι, και σωληνα μετον διατηρει ει διατηρει της, ή μην εκ της πησης επιρρα ειρηται, δε εντος έστι του σωληνος εκχειται 13 αναπτυχθησαι ... ταιμεων: loc. comm., cf. e.g. Plut. Quaest. conviv. 672Ε διον το τοστο της ψυχης τα-μειου ευπρεπεσων αποκειεσθαι; cf. etiam Clem. Alex. Strom. 77.49.7 καν εν αυτω της ταιμεως της ψυχης εν-νοιθη μονον; cf. etiam Basil. Caes. Ep. 74.1 αριστη, ετε λογος μνημης αξιος, ετε πολιτειαν ανδρων υπερ- 

23 δεξιος scripsi δεξιως B et Tafel
As for his memory, it was like an indelible book, engraved by a divine writing implement moved by the fingers of the holy spirit. Historical inquiry confirms this much about human creation, although nature had anticipated this: that at times it is quick to grasp what it has learned, but just as quick to discard it. This is characteristic of a tube, that things enter it with the same effortlessness as they exit. One part strains to admit what it hears, but cedes no ground to forgetfulness. And in this it resembles the narrow opening of certain vessels, which makes it hard for anything to exit on account of the tapering entrance. Such is the nature of some people. But in the present case, appropriately useful knowledge had easy entry into the soul while to escape would have resembled hurrying to free oneself from a labyrinth. Let us say, for example, that his glance fell upon a landscape, or upon the faces of some men, or anything else whose memory he had to fix in his soul. Such things were easily imprinted on his memory. Meanwhile, a protective key was placed upon the seal of his memory to guard against insidious attack by forgetfulness, until it was time for the treasury of the soul to be reopened. But then it would open right away, and once the faculty of his imagination had been stirred, the reading renewed itself clearly in the memory, the natural associations followed, the circumstantial details were filled in, and the knowledge became more precise. So that although he had encountered some knowledge but once, it nevertheless remained fixed for a long time in the storehouse of his memory. Since it was sealed in the treasury of the soul in a rather divine fashion. The majority of these memories had been preserved from childhood until well into old age: that location, that man, that occasion, or that gathering, the manner in which certain acts had been carried out, and various things of this sort, whose re-presentation renewed the oldest impression of the thing learned.

But he possessed another kind of memory, as well. As far as recent experiences were concerned, it seemed to go beyond the sheer magnitude of what he had to remember; but it was his ability to recall the exact sequence of things that was no less remarkable. And just as he was skilled at speaking in public, so was he able...
γραφίαν λαλεῖν, καὶ ταύτην, μικρού καὶ ἀπνευστέ, καὶ πρὸς τῷ πυκνῷ τῶν νοημάτων, καὶ ἀποτάδιν ἡμισομένην. Ὡς δὲ εἶχε τέλος ὁ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νοὸς εὐγενής τόκος καὶ ἐδεί πρὸς φώς αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν, ὁ σοφός βασιλεὺς (δεὶ γὰρ τοὺς μεγαλοπρεπεῖς εἰδέναι τοιούτους ὄντας καὶ τῷ σφετέρῳ καλῶ ἐλλάμπεσθαι) ἤθελε ποιεῖν οὕτω, καὶ ἐαυτὸν ἐκφαίνειν τοῖς οὖθε ἄλλως ἡγονηκόσι. Καὶ προεκθέμενος ὀλοσχερῶς τὸν τοῦ λόγου σκοπὸν, εἶτα καὶ ἀρχής ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς μέχρι καὶ περατώσαις τοῖς ἐπιχειρήμασιν ἐπεξεῖν, καὶ πάσι τοῖς καιριωτάτοις ἐνδραμών (τι δὲ, εἰπὲ βραχείας τοῖς ἐνέλιπε λέξειν;), αὐτὸς μὲν, ἐτέρου ἐγίνετο ἐργοῖ, τὸν δὲ μηνυθέντα τόκον προῆγεν ἐσπαργανωμένον ὥσπερ τῷ τῶν, καὶ προφήνας τοῖς παρατυχοῦσιν, ἐδίδον περιεργάζεσθαι, καὶ ἀνελιχθεῖς, ἥρχετο εἰς περιελευσθῆναι ἄκοιν δὲ ἀναγνώσεως. Καὶ ἦν εἰκός ὁ ἐκλαληθεὶς οὐδὲν ἐτεροφύομενος. Τούτῳ ἐχομονέμενος, ἡμῖν δὲ, πλείω τὰ τοῦ θαύματος φᾶμεν δ’ ὅτι καὶ πάσιν ἄλλοις κατασκόπησεν τοῖς πλείονοι, ὡς μὴ τοῖς φθάσασθαι ὑμῖν ἀκοὸν τῷ τοῦ δεύτεροι τῷ τῇ εἰς ἄκοιν ἐκλαλομένων λόγῳ πρὸς ἀνεντον χῶμα, καὶ τῷ βίβλω οὖν αὐτὸν ἀφεκύνη ἐγκατακλείεσθαι. Λήθη δὲ, όσι ἂν ἀνάρχοιτο κάντανθα μὴ κατακαλαμάται τῶν πλείδων, ὡς μὴ τοῖς φθάσασθαι ὑμῖν ἀκοὸν τῷ τῷ τοῦ τάχθαι μὲν καὶ διαπραγματεύομενος τῷ τοῦ παράτηρος, ἠπεράντος δὲ αὐτός τίς ὁ θεός ἃν ἂν ἠμέλοιτο καὶ πάντως ἂν εἰς τῆς ἐπαίνοις ἐξελεύνης, αὐταὶ μὲν, παλαιὰ, ἐκεῖνα δὲ καινά, ὧν ὁ λόγος οὔτι που μακρὰν ἐμέμνητο. Πρὸς γὰρ δὴ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὅτε συμπεσον οὕτω, μὴ τοῖς κοινοῖς ἐνασχολοῦμενος, μικρόν τι ἀδείας λάβοιτο, πόνοις παλαιῶς προσανεῖχεν, οἱ πρὸς λόγοις ἐγένοτο καὶ οὐ λέγω τοῦ προσεχθῆναι μόνον, καὶ οἱ χρόνοις ἀκριβοῦσιν πράξεως, καὶ μεθόδους τακτικὰς μηχανῶσιν οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ ἄλλοι πρὸς συλλογιστικὰς ἀπορθούνται κανόνας καὶ οὕτω τὴν τε ἐν τοῖς οὖν αὐτοῖς ἀκριβοῦσι, τῇ τον τῆς πρακτέος εὐθύτητα- ἀλλὰ καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς παρά τοῖς θείων καὶ αὐτοῦ ἠθεὸν.
to dictate a speech for transcription which was at once dense in meaning and
developed at some length, almost without taking a breath. And when the noble
offspring of his imperial mind had been completed, and the time came for it to
see the light, the wise emperor wished to do it in the following way and to pre-
sent himself to those who were not, in any case, unaware of his skill (for great men
should be aware of their abilities and shine forth by their own talents). Setting
out first the general aim of his speech, he would then go through the arguments
starting from the beginning until he had gone over them all. He went into great-
er detail for the most important parts (and what of it, if he missed a word here
or there?) and while he busied himself with something else, he would 'publish'
the dictated offspring as a book, like a swaddled infant. And showing it to those
who chanced to be present, he would give it to them to study carefully, and thus
unfurled it would make its way around to audiences through recital. And the
speech he had made turned out to be no different from the written one. And one
might say that this is what should happen in the case of every speech (although it
does not happen in every case); nevertheless it is a rare quality found in very few
instances. For his thoughts remained the same in both cases, whether delivered
to the masses in an ex tempore manner or when he let them be enclosed in books.
But here, too, forgetfulness triumphs over the majority of people, so that the
second version does not agree with the first. And once more it was his natural
ability to recall an exact sequence that was so admirable. But what is even more
incredible in our view (and, I would add, also in the view of those who pride
themselves on their ability to appreciate things worthy of praise), whenever ei-
ther he himself read an entire book or someone else did, so that he effectively
read it by hearing its contents, regardless of whether hardly any time or many
days had elapsed, he could sum up the whole thing without stumbling, bringing
out from the treasury of his memory things which were though old were new to
his audience, which we mentioned a short while ago.

For in addition to his other duties, (circumstances permitting) whenever it
happened that he was not busy with public affairs, he would seize some small
opportunity to devote himself to the literary labours of the ancients. I am not
referring just to books about geography, or works which give the precise dates
of events, or those which devise military tactics; even less those which quibble
about nature, or all those which set out the rules of logic and in this way precisely
define the true nature of being, as well as correct conduct in affairs. I mean in-
stead those works concerned with divine matters and with God himself.
Καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ ἐρίς, χερσὶ μὲν καὶ βουλαῖς κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ ἄλλως πολέμιον, λόγου δὲ πειθαρχίας ἐφέλκεσθαι, τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλοτριον. Καὶ εἶχεν ἤερα κολυμβήθρα συνεχῶς δι’ αὐτοῦ πολύ τὸ ἐνεργόν· καὶ τὸ προδρομικὸν ὁ θεός ζῆλος ἐν αὐτῷ πῦρ ἀνέκαιε, καὶ ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς σωτήριος Ἰορδάνης, τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις ἔπληθε, καὶ τοῖς ἐθνικοῖς διδασκάλοις, ὁλιγὸν τι τοῦ μοχθείν ἐλείπετο, τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις κάνταβθα τὸ τοῦ πόνου πλεῖον εαυτῷ ἄφωνος· πῦρ, μὴ ἀλλ’ ἄνα, μὴ τάχα νῦν ἔρις καὶ χερσὶ γένηται καὶ τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις· ἄφωνος, μὴ ἀλλ’ ἄνα, μὴ τάχα νῦν ἔρις καὶ χερσὶ γένηται.

Σκέψαιτο γὰρ ἄν τις εὐθυμῶς, μὴ γῆς ὄφελος εἴναι ἢς καρπῶς ὁ σουλιεύος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλότριον, ἀναθετεὶς καὶ ἀνθρώπουν ὑπὸ ψυχῆς κάρπιμος ἀγαθοῦ τίνος. Ἰστί δὲ καὶ ἀρίστουν οἰκονόμου, γῆς ἐρήμως οἰκεῖσθαι ποιῆσαι· καὶ διακάλους συνεχῶς διὰ τοῦ ἄλλος πολέμιον· ἂν γὰρ τό τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλότριον, καὶ τὸ βαπτιζομένοις πολὺ τὸ ἐνεργὸν, καὶ τὸ προδρομικὸν θείον λόγον τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλκυόλογον. Οἱ πλεῖοι καὶ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχῆς ὄφελος ἔφελκθαι καὶ προνοικός ἐμπεριπατήσθησαν. Οἱ πλεῖοι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχῆς ὄφελος ἔφελκθαι καὶ προνοικός ἐμπεριπατήσθησαν. Οἱ πλεῖοι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχῆς ὄφελος ἔφελκθαι καὶ προνοικός ἐμπεριπατήσθησαν.
And he vied with himself to subdue any enemies by means of his decisions as well as by his actions, while attracting those alienated from God by the persuasiveness of his arguments. And the holy baptismal font was kept very active through his actions; and divine zeal kept alive the Prodromic flame in him. And our very own Jordan river, which brings salvation, was filled with people being baptized. As for the teachers of the faith to other nations, there was little labour left for them to carry out; for the emperor took upon himself the greater part of this as well. His calculation was that of an emperor; namely, that it was no use for a ruler to command the bodies of his subjects while not taking sufficient charge of their souls. The right way to think about this would be that just as there is no gain to be had from land which bears no fruit, so there is none to be had from a human body whose soul cannot bring forth some good. It is also the mark of an excellent steward to settle deserted land; and that of a wise teacher, like the one just praised, to bring God to dwell in the very places which have been barren of every virtue and have him walk among the people displaying his providence.

And while the majority heard the emperor's own voice, and thereby acquired the benefit directly, many others received his teachings through missionaries, and they converted to our faith. And of those apostles sent out to proselytize, some returned after having defeated the old vice of the nations under their tutelage. Others still, after striving for a long time, remained abroad and died there, blessed in their chosen journey while also blessed in their departure from this world, having purchased souls they withdrew from the market, sharing their profits with the emperor. And so the name he received later on account of this was like some divine sign. His apostolic name was altogether appropriate for one named after God, the one sent from God to teach the correct faith, while sending in turn those who would shine by virtue of their teaching. But Manuel also conducted his apostolic mission of teaching in other ways as well. He did not entrust the teaching to be disseminated just through the mouths of others, but dispatched his own voice imprinted in books, an apostolic custom which brought renown to Paul, as well, the church's orator.

καὶ λόγος ἐφός, κακὸν Ἀνύριον, γλωσσαλγία Βαβυλωνία 

καὶ λόγος ἐφός, κακὸν Ἀνύριον, γλωσσαλγία Βαβυλωνία ὠρέτο κατὰ τοῦ θείου ποιμνίου, καὶ φωνῆν ἀπόφημον ἠρεύξατο, καὶ τρόπον δίχα εἰπεῖν· ἄλλοτριός τις ἄνηρ σοφὸς μὲν τὰ ἐαυτὸ τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα ὡς ἐν μέθης λόγῳ παραλαλω, κυνηδόν κατὰ τῶν θειώτατων ἅλατην, εἴτε καὶ τοὺς ἱπποὺς ἐξέλακτι

σε φρίμασσόμενος κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ ὁ ὁδὸς ἠπέγγον. Καὶ μελετᾶτας κενά, ξυνεφόρησαν ἁλλοκότους παραλογισμοῦς· καὶ δοκῶν πάγας πλέκειν, συνέχει καὶ βιβλιόν οἷόν συνθέμενον ἀποστασίον, ἐξέπεμπε μὲν τὴν συζευχθείσαν ἄνθρωπον παντὶ θεὸν γνώσις, ἐτέραν δὲ, ἢν οὔκ ἔρχηται, εἰσπουσάμενος, ἐδήλου τὴν ἀνοίαν τῷ καὶ χερσὶ δυνατῷ καὶ λόγος κραταίω βασίλει, ἐνδεικτικοῦς, δύνασθαι τι κατὰ τῆς εἶ ἡμῖν ἱερωτάτης θρησκείας λαλεῖ ταί, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀνιστᾶται, ὁ θήρ ἐβάλετο, αὐτὸς καὶ δοκῶν πάγας πλέκειν, συνέχει καὶ ἀλλότριός τις κυνηδὸν κατὰ τῶν θειοτάτων ὑλακτεῖν, εἴτε καὶ ὡς ἵππος ἐξελάκτι

καί τινα ἐξ ἄμμου οἰκοδομήν, κατα τοῖς τοιαύταις μάχαις ἐνησκημένοις. Καὶ τοῖς τοιαύταις μάχαις ἐνησκημένοις, ἔχαιρε. Καὶ δ᾽ ἀλλὰ τυγχάνει μέσης αὐτῆς. Καὶ τοῖς τοιαύταις μάχαις ἐνησκημένοις, ἔχαιρε. Καὶ δ᾽ ἀλλὰ τυγχάνει μέσης αὐτῆς. Καὶ τοῖς τοιαύταις μάχαις ἐνησκημένοις, ἔχαιρε. Καὶ δ᾽ ἀλλὰ τυγχάνει μέσης αὐτῆς. Καὶ τοῖς τοιαύταις μάχαις ἐνησκημένοις, ἔχαιρε. Καὶ δ᾽ ἀλλὰ τυγχάνει μέσης αὐτῆς.
And it was not so long ago, the wolf from the East, that wicked Assyrian, howled against the divine flock with a garrulous Babylonian tongue and threw up a defiant voice. To put it in words without recourse to figures of speech, he was a foreigner wise with respect to his own beliefs though deluded like a drunk with respect to our own. He barked against the most divine things like a dog, you could even say he kicked like a horse, neighing against the lord himself about things he did not understand. And brooding meaninglessly, he assembled some unusual fallacies. And thinking himself to have woven snares for us, he confounded everything and composed something like an apostate's treatise, professing on the one hand the knowledge from God imparted to each person, but introducing other ideas, which he should not have, thereby demonstrating his foolishness to the emperor, who was both physically and intellectually strong. And indicating that he thought he was able to say something against our most divine religion, he wished to raise up his own belief like a house built on sand, all the while proving himself childish in his attempt to knock down our own faith, which not even the gates of Hades can conquer. But the emperor intervened right away (for it was not his habit to be sluggish in the face of such things). And contemplating and troubling himself over what would silence the barbarian inanity, he published his refutation for those who sought arguments against them, acting like a good and holy general for soldiers who were themselves sufficiently trained in such battles. And all fired their arrows successfully against the beast, among was the emperor, equipped with a large quiver, full of so-called “winged” arguments. And the beast was not struck in the heart by the others, while the emperor hit the mark right in the middle. And God who watches over this hunt, to quote the Psalms, “blessed it,” and he rejoiced. And today that 'cho-
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Ev. Matt. 16.18 καὶ γὰρ δεῖ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκο-

---

κίχε νιν λέοντι ποτ' εὐρυφαρέτρας; cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 1.84.20 εἰ δὲ τινὲς παλαιῶν σοφῶν μεθοδικῶν τῆς
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κατ' αὐτὸ τέχ
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κατ' αὐτὸ τέχ
λοκάλος ἐν τῇ ὄψει φιλοθεάμος φέρεται, καὶ ὁ ἐπάφης ἐυλογεῖται μακαριζόμενος. 
Καὶ τῇ λυπῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐκείνῳ καὶ τόστο ἱγκύκεται καὶ εἰς μαρτύριον.

37 Ταύτης τῆς σοφίας μέρος οὐκ ὅσον ἐλάχιστον, καὶ οἱ φθάναντες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ἀγάνη ἐν ός καὶ αὐτοῖς, βασιλικά σὺν θεῷ ἐκνίκημα, καὶ θεομάχων γλώσσων ἐκρίζωσι, ὅσι την κοσμοσωτηρίον προσφοράν τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ θύτου καὶ θύματος, ἀπενόσφιζον αὐτοῦ, ἵδιακούσας ταύτης τῷ πατρὶ, ὡς εἰπεί εὐλαβοῦντο γλιστροτερον, μὴ ποτὲ τὰ τῆς προσαγωγῆς όυ εὶπε θεῷ ὑπερβληθεῖ τραίδει ἀρκέσοντα κάντενθεν αὐτὴν ἀφρόνου εἰς τῶν πατέρα μονάξουσα, καὶ τοιούτου κεφαλαίου παγκοσμίου σωτηρίας, ἀκοινώνησαν τὸν τὸν τῶν ἀφείσονται (τὸ γε εἰς αὐτᾶς ἢκον τὸ το πνεύμα, ὡς μηδὲν ὁν καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῦτον μετόν, 
Καὶ πρόκειται τὸ βασιλικὸν κάνταύθα πόνιμα, ἡ ἵερα ἐπίσκοπον ἂν τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ἀνάκτορον ἐντεθησαύριστα, τὴν βασιλικὴν μην νόσον σοφίαν καὶ τὴν υπὲρ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν μέριμναν.

38 Οὕτω πάντων ἐποίητο ἐπὸς ἐκείνῳ τὸ δογματικὸν, καὶ ὁ αὐτοφθονος δαίμων βασική νας, εἰπεὶ ἢ τὸ θεῦ ἐκκλησία εἰς ἐνότητα ἤρμοσται, καὶ τὴν διχόνονα σχάσασα, συνήκται εἰς ἓν, καὶ πρὸς πνευματικῆν συνήκται ὁμόνοιαν, περιέργαζε τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μείζων πρὸς τὸν τίνν, τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν ἐκλαλούμενον. 
Λογίαν ἐκχωρίσαιν ἐπὶ τῶν πλείον τοῦ τίμειτον τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἔπειτα πλείον τοῦ ἐπείραστον τῶν μὲν εἰκαίστων ἐντρεχόντων τῇ ἐνδυναμίᾳ ἡ ὁδῷ, ὅπως ἡ ἱλικῇ ἔν τε ὀπταῖ καὶ πάντῃ μέχρι πέρατος ἐκδραμεῖ τῆς ὀρθῆς, ἀλλ' εὐθείας ἐκεῖνος ἐμβιβασθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἀπωλείαν κατακυμάνθων βάραθρον, ὡς καὶ ἐμπετέσθαι αὐτοῦ ἐλέσθαι. Ότε καὶ οἱ μὲν, τὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ σωτήρι θεανθρώπῳ φύσεων ἑυκρίνες, συνήκειν ἀν καὶ λάθος τοὺς έκείνους ἐξαμαρτάνων, οἱ δὲ, τῇ ἀσυγχύτῃ ἑνώσει ἐπε- ἀλλ' εὐθείας ἐχείν ἐμβιβασθῆναι ποτὲ εἰς τὸ εὐθύτατον τῶν δὲ καὶ παντελῶς τῆς ἐκλαλούμενης, καὶ εἰς ἀπωλείαν κατακυμάνθων βάραθρον, ὡς καὶ ἐμπετέσθαι αὐτοῦ ἐλέσθαι. Ἐν ἐμπετέσθαι αὐτοῦ καὶ τοιοῦτον κεφαλαίου παγκόσμιου τοῦ, ἀπενόσφιζον αὐτοῦ, ἰδιάζουσαι ταύτην τῷ πατρί, ὡς εἴπερ εὐλαβοῦντο γλιστροτερον.
sen arrow’ may be found both in the hands of those fond of beauty and before the eyes of those who fond of contemplating things, while the one who fired the arrow is praised and blessed. And this, too, may be adduced as testimony the rest of his philosophical ideal.

And no small part of this wisdom could be seen in the recent ecclesiastical conflicts, the same ones during which, with the help of God, the emperor achieved victories, rooting out the tongues which waged battle against God, and sought to steal from the great sacrificer and sacrificed the salvation he offered the world, making it exclusive to the Father alone, as though they feared something worse, namely, that the attribution would not avail the most Holy Trinity, and for this reason they senselessly isolated it in the Father, thus leaving both the son without a share in this chapter of the world’s salvation (to the extent that they could) and the holy spirit, as a thing amounting to nothing and not participating in this with them. And the emperor’s effort may be seen here as well, in the holy book which the ecclesiastical palace houses as a treasure declaring the emperor’s wisdom and his concern for the churches of God.

As soon as the statement of our faith was proclaimed, malice incarnate, the devil, incensed lest the church of God become united and leave behind its discord combined into one and joined in spiritual harmony, he [the devil] set to meddling in the matter of the Father being greater than the Son, as is stated in the gospel. And there were stumbling blocks here as well, and thoughtlessness among the great majority, with some entering the path of the gospels without care, not so as to avoid entirely veering from the right path until the very end, but to be in a good position to be brought back at some point to the straight and narrow. While those who had left entirely the path of the kingdom perched over the pit of destruction as one who wishes to fall into it. It was at this point that some confused what is clearly distinguishable in the natures of the saviour God-man, so that in this way one might fail to realize that he is in error, while the others tampered with the unconfused union by means of their stubborn insistence on division. And here, too, the wise emperor immediately paved the way
ὁ τὴν ἀνδρίαν δεξιώτατος, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐν λογομαχίαις ὁ τῆς σοφίας τρόφιμος. Κι
παρεμενον, εἰς ἀλογίαν μεταπλάττηται, ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἀργία καταψηφισθείη λόγου σοφοῦ
ον τοῦ τοιούτου πλεονεκτήματος), μὴ καὶ λεληθότως ἑαυτοῦ τὸ λογιστικὸν στερό-
σαι τῶν ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καλῶν, τοὺς δὲ καὶ λογικοὺς καὶ λογίους στερήτως
ὡς ἐν πρακτέοις οὕτω καὶ ἐν σοφίᾳ μέγαν (οὐ γὰρ ζ
κατὰ τὸ αὐτόματον εὐοδοῦσθαι τὰ τεχνικά. Οὐκοῦν ἑαυτὸν εὖ εἰδὼς ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ,
μονα, ὡς οὕτω κινδυνεύει, ἀνεπιστημόνως τεχνοῦσθαι τὰ ἐπιστημονικά, καί πως
στρατηγὸν κύδιστον καὶ κυβερνήτην ἄριστον καὶ ἰατρὸν ἐπιστήμονα καὶ τὸν ὅλως
ἀξιώσοι, τὸν οὕτω σοφὸν αὐτοκράτορα, μὴ ἑαυτὸν τοιοῦτον ὄντα εἰδέναι, εἰ μὴ καὶ
κειοῖ καὶ πρὸς ὄνομα, ἐπιστραφέντες δὲ πάλιν καὶ ἀνὰ πόδα ἐπαινετῶς χωρήσαντες,
which leads to God, laying open the scriptures, and through them leading into the paradise of truth. And to those to whom it occurred not to obey the one calling them to salvation, they became ‘the sons of destruction’, and they were destroyed, suffering from arrogant confidence, on whose account they were struck down. Others who acknowledged the imperial teaching, which may be called divine and apostolic, though they had veered from the correct path briefly in which God dwells in name as well, returned once more and they advanced in a praiseworthy manner, profiting from being on our side and on the side of truth. Observe, these things have been written in the book of both kingdoms, both that of God and that of this earth, wherefore we are relieved of writing at length on this matter.

And in order that I may ratify all that I have said thus far in summation, such was the manner in which he employed spiritual arguments that a fire of divine zeal was sparked in his heart. And as soon as that was set alight brightly in him, he wished to speak up and to be consumed on behalf of the common union of those divided in matters of divine dogma. And he trusted in that select band of troops, trained by him, who exercised their divine duties diligently, as well as all those whom instruction by others had nurtured for such contests. Of course no one who knows how to exercise good judgement would deem such a wise emperor ignorant of his own abilities, unless he makes it a rule that a famous general, or an excellent captain, a learned physician and anyone possessed of some praiseworthy expertise, would be unaware of his own ability, with the resulting risk that matters requiring special knowledge are carried out without the necessary expertise, and somehow matters requiring knowledge are carried out in ignorance. And so, being fully aware of his greatness in practical matters as well as in wisdom (for it is not right that the other animals be endowed with an awareness of their own abilities, while those possessing reason and speech be deprived of this advantage), and so as to avoid allowing his faculty of reasoning to become imperceptibly dull and thus be transformed into irrationality, and thus be accused of idleness, since a wise saying exhorts each man to know himself, so the emperor boldly entered the fray, for like the man skilled in martial valour during armed conflicts, so did the nursling of wisdom not hesitate to enter in
Και οὐκές μὲν καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις. Ἑπεὶ δὲ καὶ οὗ συνοίων Παῦλος οὐ μόνον τῇ ὑψῷ ἐμεμνένον ἄρσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περὶ γῆν ποτὲ καὶ ταπεινὰ εἶχεν αὐτὸν, κατὼ μὲν βαίνοντα, συνοίων δὲ κάρη στηρίζοντα τῇ πρὸς τὸν ὑψῖστον ἐγγύτητι, τὸν ὁμοίον τρόπον καὶ αὐτόκρατος τοῖς τε ὑψηλοτάτοις ἐξήρετο φιλοσοφήσαν, συνδιϊκνεῖτο δὲ μεγαλοπρεπὸς καὶ τοῖς ὡσα περὶ γῆς καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπους, σοφίας αὐτῷ καὶ τούτῳ καταπραττομένῃς τὸ ἀγάθον. Φύσεως γούν κατασκέψασθαι βάθη καὶ αἰτιολογηθῶσαν γένεσιν καὶ ἀνακαλυφθῶσαν πλάσεως, οὕτ' ἂν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν λεπτότης εἶχεν εἰς σαφῆς οὕτως ἐκδόθησαν, οὔτε της λοιπῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ φυσικοῦ.

'Ἡν δὲ δεινός καὶ τοῖς ἐπιπολῇς καὶ κατ' ὑψίστον προσβάλλων, τὰ ἐν βάθει κατοπτεύειν καὶ ἕξακριβοῦσθαι σοφῶτας φύσεως γνωσμοί. Καὶ τὸ πράγμα, οὐκ ἦν στοχάζοντες οἵ ν' οὕτως τούτο ἐν ἀληθείᾳ εἶναι καὶ μὴ διεκπιπτεῖν τὸ λαληθὲν, ὡς καὶ εἰκοτολογῶσαν καὶ συνελογίσασθαι τὸ ἀγαθόν. Φύσεως γούν κατασκέψασθαι βάθη καὶ αἰτιολογηθῶσαν γένεσιν καὶ ἀνακαλυφθῶσαν πλάσεως, οὐτ' ἂν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν λεπτότης εἶχεν εἰς σαφῆς οὕτως ἐκδόθησαν, οὔτε της λοιπῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ φυσικοῦ.
debates. And in the manner of the curdling fig-juice, he was confident of joining together the divided parts of the church, though without extolling himself, lest his knowledge result in pride, the fault of many in the past whom a gusting spirit of arrogance has raised above the earth. He was carried instead on high by more divine elevation, and he scrutinized himself in the manner of a philosopher taking his own measure in accordance with the rules of rectitude. And he knew full well he must rely on himself, as well as on the other divine soldiers, should the time of reckoning ever come which calls forth the one who knows well the battle on behalf of God.

And such was his conduct in affairs of this kind, as well. Since even the heavenly Paul was not only distinguished by his elevation on high but was in fact also on occasion occupied with earthly and humble matters, walking here below while keeping his head fixed on the heavens by reason of his proximity to the lord on high, the emperor was raised up in the same way by his very lofty inquiries, analyzing thoroughly in an impressive manner all those things having to do with the affairs of man and this world, since his wisdom was able to accomplish this good as well. At any rate, neither the scrupulous precision of the Asklepiian physicians nor any other natural science could have demonstrated so clearly how to scrutinize the depths of nature, to account for the origins of things, and to investigate the mysteries of creation.

And he had a remarkable ability when attending to surface appearances and looking a person in the face, to look into the depths and arrive at an accurate evaluation by means of a highly skilful understanding of natural causes. And the matter was no mere guess but truly that very thing and what he had said was not off the mark, so that his diagnosis was deemed grievous (and the man in question was as [Manuel] had said), but one easily treated. And any man scrutinized did not turn out to be other than as he had said. He could see through the dissembling man, above all the man of outward appearance, and likewise men of other character. And anyone witnessing this might have said that Manuel
Εἰδὲ ποτε καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν ἐν λόγοις καθηγητήν, ὑπολόγων τινα νόσον τρέφοντα, ὑπερφυμενένος ὁ μακρὰν ἡμ NotImplementedErrorον τινα, καὶ θεραπεύοντα στρεφέντα. Καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις, ἀφροδίτην ἦν τὸ σημαντικόνον, ὁ δὲ, νοεροτέρας ἐπιβολαίς ὑγείᾳ, παρανοιομένας οἴου θυρίδας ἐσπαρκός, δεὶ ὅσον οἴδε ψυχὴ ἀπερχομένη, προεφή τὴν ὑμένα μακρὸν ἔξοδον τοῦ ἀνδρός. Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκείνος ὁ παραπροσθεσίας τὴν πρόγνωσιν. Νόσων δὲ ἀκέσεις, τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ αὐτὰ σειράς ἔχοντα. Οὐ γάρ χρηστὰ μόνον ἐξεύρη καὶ πιστὰ φάρμακα, δεὶ κὰ πείρας γνώνων τὴν κακούργησιν τοῦ ἀρρώστων, ὑποκνυτὶ καὶ τῇ δυστροπῇ τῆς νόσου πείρας ἐπεξαγαγέν ἐαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ ἐνταῦθα ὑποκνυτὶ μέν ἀκοήν, νοοὶ δὲ γνωματεύων τὴν κακούργησιν ἐξέστελλεν. Ἐλεπτολόγει δεὶ ἐρωτήμασιν τὰ τοῦ κειμένου, ἐμάνθανε, διεγίνωσκεν, ἐπέττατε, καὶ ἐπηκολούθει τὰ τῆς ἰάσεως. Τὰ πολλὰ δὲ, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς θανάτους τε καὶ ἦν εἰπεῖν προσφυές, ως μικροῦ ἐρωτῶν καὶ ποῦ ἐπήκολοθεῖ, ἀνίστα τῆς θανατηφόρου νόσου τὸν κάμνοντα.

"Ο δὲ καὶ εἰσείτι πλέον θαυμάζειν άξιον κατειργάζετο μὲν αὐτῶν ὁ χειριστὸς νόσου τὸν κοσμικὸν θεμέλιον ὑποκνυμενός. Καὶ αὐτὴ μὲν δεινὰ ἐποίηκεν, καθυποσπώντα τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὸν ὑποκνυτὶ νόσον τοῦ άνθρώπου βλάπτουσα. Οἱ γὰρ οὐκ ἐδίδου τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ὅσον, αὐτὸν παρεῖνε τὸν θεραπευτὴν αὐτοκράτορα ως καὶ πείρας γνώνων τὴν κακούργησιν τοῦ ἀρρώστων καὶ τῇ δυστροπῇ τῆς νόσου πείρας ἐπεξαγαγέν ἐαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ ἐνταῦθα ὑποκνυτὶ μέν ἀκοήν, νοοὶ δὲ γνωματεύων τὴν κακούργησιν ἐξέστελλεν. Καὶ ἐμέμφετο μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον οἷς ἑαυτοῦ ἀμελὴς ἐξέπιπτε· κατῆρτιζε δὲ πρὸς ὑγίειαν. Εἰ δὲ οὕτω μὲν ἀπώνατο καὶ περίεστι, ἕτερος ἂν, τις θαυμάσειεν. Ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐχ οὕτω δοτέον μαίνεσθαι ὡς τοιαῦτα νοεῖν. Αἰ δρίζεται ἡρωϊκῶς, καὶ συχνοὺς ῥίπτει τῶν πολεμίων, πίπτει δὲ ποτε καὶ αὐτός. Καὶ οὐκ ἦδη τὸ, ἀνδρεῖον περίαδεςθαι συγκαταπέπτωκε τῷ ἀνδρί. Μακρὰ τὶς κυβερνήσιας καὶ μιρίους δόσους περισσώμενος,
“entered into the hearts of men,” so that nature itself expressed to him her most hidden secrets from somewhere deep inside.

He once saw my professor of rhetoric, who harboured some festering disease at the time he was presiding over the sophists. And the man’s face signalled that he did not have long to live. And while the sign portended nothing to others, by observing him with a more studied approach, as though he had looked directly into open portals through which the soul is wont to leave, he foretold the man’s departure in the not too distance future. And the man died as the prognosis had foreseen. His cures for illnesses, too, belong to this same category. For he did not just create useful and reliable medicines, a distinction someone in fact ascribed to ancient Prometheus, but substances which could be called ‘imperial’ by those who used them and those who supplied them (the public stewards distribute these in ample doses without charge to those who need them). Besides these innovative discoveries he also made more remarkable use of the pre-existing old drugs. For in those cases where the imperial discharge of duties did not allow for the healer emperor to attend to the sick himself, so that he might diagnose the ill effects of the disease first hand and lead the charge skillfully against the irritation of the disease; in such cases he made use of reports while he conducted a mental diagnosis and dispatched the treatment. He inquired in great detail about the state of the patient, learned what it was, made a diagnosis, prescribed a cure, and he followed up on the treatment. And quite often, in the face of death itself, when it would have been almost natural to ask “where is he being buried?” he raised the suffering man from the deadly illness.

But what was even more worthy of admiration was that a most damaging illness had attacked him, undermining the man who was the foundation of this world. And although this disease had terrible effects, sapping his constitution and harming the outer man, the autokrator within was wholly preserved, while his remaining virtues were undiminished. And when he saw anyone who had an audience with him plagued by the same illness, he would take the greatest care to instruct him how to treat the disease. And he criticized any man who recklessly neglected himself, while he instructed him how to restore himself to health. One may wonder, however, how it was that one man flourished and survived, while he who brought about the cure died. For we should not be so mad as to think we can understand why such things happen. A brave man fights heroically, bringing down many of his enemies, yet he, too, eventually falls. The opportunity to sing the praises of valour did not however perish with the man. A man may thus steer a ship a long time and save countless thousands, until he himself enter the
εἴτα βασάμενος ἡς ἀληθῶς νεόνιον βυθόν, ἐξαπόλολε. Καὶ οὐ συγκατέεδυ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ τοῦ δεξιοῦ κυβερνητῆτα ὁνόμα. Ἀπελειπεῖν ἀντικατέστας καὶ συγχρόνως στεφανωσάμενος, οὐκ ἐσθ’ ὅπως οὐ πεσεῖται θανάτῳ. Καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις δικαίως τοὺς στεφάνους ἀφελεῖται τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἀλλὰ κληρονομεῖος τῆς νικητικῆς διὰ παντὸς ἐκείνος κλῆσει.

44 Ὅμως δὴ καὶ ὁ μνημονεύομεν, ἐν οἷς αὐτὸς ἐπαφείδει τοὺς πειρασμένους βοηθεῖν δυνάμενος, ὡς καὶ καλοτέχνους πρὸς τοῦ κρείττονος, ἀπελεύθερον ἐξω συμνύσεις τῇ καὶ τῶν συμφράσματών ἐπιστροφῆς, διὰ τῶν ἑκάστων ἀναγκῶν οἱ παραστατοῦν. Οίς μὲν οὖν τὸ θείον συμπεριλαμβάνεται, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνους εὐφράστειται, μέχρι καὶ εἰς σελήνην ἐξ ὑψώσεως χαλάσσει τῆς τῆς προνοίας σεμάτην — ἐπὶ δὲ γε τοὺς ἐκείδοι καὶ περὶ ἡμᾶς, μὴ ἄν, ἠθέλειν γλυφρεύσει τὴν τινος τινος συναχοῦνται, συγκατκεραματικῶς τούς οὔτω συνάχουσιν καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσιν την την ἐνθά μέχρι τὸ συμπεριπέτεια ἐπιλέγεται. Ἡ γὰρ ὁ παραγορεῖ θεόν ἀντικρύσθη τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἐνθά τὰ περί ἡμῶν οὔτω συνεχώς συμπεριλαμβάνεται, καὶ προσχέματι μεγαλειτομήτος εὐμεθάδεως κατασμακρύνεσθαι. Ἡ γὰρ οὐ τυραννοὶ θεός ἐνταῦθα, ἔνθα τὸ κοινὸν ἕν πρὸ συναχούσιν, ἡ τῆς προνοίας σειράν ἐπὶ δὲ γε τοῖς ἐκείδοι, καὶ μὴν, θεῖον ἀληθῶς ἡ ἐν προνοίᾳ λεπτοτομία, καὶ τὸ ἐν τοῖς ἁδροτέροις ἐντὸς εἶναι σοφιστευόμενος, καὶ τὰ κατ’ ἄνθρωπον, ὃς δὴ βασιλεύει τοῦ ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ προσχήματι μεγαλειότητος εὐμεθάδως κατασμικρύνεσθαι. Ἐγέρθη δὲ καὶ ἑνταῦθα, έπειτα βούλεται: καὶ οὐ φέρει παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀτέχνους συμνύσεις, καὶ προφοράμενοι μεγαλειτομητος εὐμεθάδεως κατασμακρύσσεσθαι. Ὅμως δὴ καὶ τὸ πειρασμένον, ἐν προνοίᾳ λεπτοτομία, τοῦ βασιλικοῦ βασιλεύοντος ἐν προνοίᾳ λεπτοτομία, ἕτερα βούλεται τοῖς οὕτω πολυσχιδέσι καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσαν ἐνθά τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐπιλέγεται. Ἦ γὰρ οὐ τυραννοὶ θεός ἐνταῦθα, ἕτερα βούλεται τοῖς οὕτω πολυσχιδέσι καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσαν ἐνθά τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐπιλέγεται. Οἷς μὲν οὖν τὸ θεῖον σμικρολογεῖται, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνοις εὐαρεστεῖται, μέχρι καὶ εἰς τὸν θαύματος κλήσεως. οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅπως οὐ πεσεῖται θανάτῳ.

2 δεξιοῦ… ὅνομα: cf. supra par. 39 et not. ad loc.; loc. comm., cf. e.g. Io. Maur. Canon. in s. Nicol. 3.5 Οἱ πνεύματος καὶ θαλάσσης / μαχόμενοι καὶ νείποντες / μαχομένοι καὶ δεξιοῦς κυβερνήτῃς αὐτούς ἱντεντος τοῦ κυρίου μεγαλειότητας. 10 Ὁ θεὸς δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, ἕτερα βούλεται τοῖς οὕτω πολυσχιδέσι καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσαν ἐνθά τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐπιλέγεται. Θεός δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, έπειτα βούλεται: καὶ οὐ φέρει παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀτέχνους συμνύσεις, καὶ προφοράμενοι μεγαλειτομητος εὐμεθάδεως κατασμακρύσσεσθαι. Ὅμως δὴ καὶ τὸ πειρασμένον, ἐν προνοίᾳ λεπτοτομία, τοῦ βασιλικοῦ βασιλεύοντος ἐν προνοίᾳ λεπτοτομία, ἕτερα βούλεται τοῖς οὕτω πολυσχιδέσι καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσαν ἐνθά τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐπιλέγεται. Ἦ γὰρ οὐ τυραννοὶ θεός ἐνταῦθα, ἕτερα βούλεται τοῖς οὕτω πολυσχιδέσι καὶ ἀπασχολοῦσαν ἐνθά τὸ σμικροπρεπὲς ἐπιλέγεται. Οἷς μὲν οὖν τὸ θεῖον σμικρολογεῖται, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνοις εὐαρεστεῖται, μέχρι καὶ εἰς τὸν θαύματος κλήσεως. οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅπως οὐ πεσεῖται θανάτῳ.
salty depths and perishes. But his reputation as a skilled captain does not go down with the man. Even when an Asklepian [i.e., a physician] stands victorious against maladies, and is often crowned with laurels, there is no way in which he may not himself succumb to death. And no one may justly deprive the man of his crown, instead that man will preserve his reputation for victory forever.

In this way also was the man being praised here able to help those affected by the disease from which he himself suffered. But called by the almighty, he departed, enjoying praise from the angels who stand at the side of God for the care he showed even to the humblest among us. Now those for whom the divine is curtailed are satisfied to let the chain of Providence descend from the highest realm only as far as the moon, while not wanting to squander the divine in the affairs from there until the point affecting us, fracturing itself among people so divided [in their minds], and busying itself in what is acknowledged as petty. But God has other intentions here as well: he does not suffer being extolled by us in a casual way, effectively diminished under the pretext of his majesty. For does he not openly set his rule above God, who leaves the matters on high as rightfully belonging to him, all the while cunningly arguing that the affairs concerning us are not within God’s sphere, thereby removing from God’s purview the affairs of mankind, who has been created to rule over the earth? So that this subtle parsing of Providence and the unraveling and analysis of mundane things would subversively deprive God of being an absolute ruler, and in fact truly divine, precisely on those counts where there is the greatest need for God, the one and only wise one who rules over all, to intervene. For not only did he not hesitate to descend among us, assuming bodily form to do so (ah, what a marvel) nor indeed condescending does he hesitate, working always according to the will of the father, to watch not just over the humblest things, those things deemed superficial, but entering into the deepest reaches, and just as he enters the ensouled world when he enters our hearts and minds, so does he enter upon the rest when he extends his providential word as far as the roots of the earth.

τὸν κόσμον προσίεται, προνοίᾳ μέντοιγε διοικούμενον... 24 καρδίαις... διαλογισμοῖς: cf. supra cap. 41; cf. Hesych. Comm. in Ps. 23.1-2.5 πύρωσον Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ ἐμβατεύων καρδίας καὶ διαλογισμοῖς; cf. etiam Cat. in Marc. (rec. ii) 285.22 κριτὴς ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἀφιέναι καὶ μή· ὁ δὲ Σωτὴρ ταῖς διανοίαις ὡς Θεὸς ἐμβατεύων, καὶ εἰδὼς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτῶν τὴν ἐνθύμησιν 24–25 μέχρι... γῆς: cf. Const. Manass. Carm. mor. 256 οὐκ ἔστι κρύφιον οὐδὲν ὃ μὴ πρὸς γνῶσιν φθάνει, κἂν ὑπὸ ρίζας κρυπτούσα γῆς ὑποπυθυμενίους
Τούτου γινόμενος ὁ ἐνθεός ἐκείνος βασιλεὺς τοῦ ὑποδείγματος, οὐ μόνον τοῖς λογαῖς καὶ μεγαλείοις τῶν ἐν ταῖς πράξεις λόγων ἐαυτοῦ ἐπεδίδου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς εἰς τὸ ὑποδείγμα τυφθεμενιζομένοις τὴν κηδεμονίαν ἐμείριζεν, ὁ καταβαίνων ταπεινώς, οὕτως συγκαταβαίνων τρόπον ἐνθεοῦ. Καὶ ἂν βλέπειν ἐκείνον ἐν λαῷ βαρεῖ καὶ συλλογῇ πληθοῦντι, οὐ μόνον εἰς κοινόν βροντώντα λόγοις, ὁν ἐχρήν ἐπὶ ἴσου μετέχειν ἀπαντάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατ’ ἄνδρα διομιλούσιν. Ἡ ἀκόμη μὲν ἂν ἄνθρωπος ἰν αὐτό κατακράτορα ἢ κατ’ ἁνθρώπου ἐννοοῦν περιπέτεια προκαλέσεται. Ταύτης τίς ἂν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἡ ἐγκαίτητος ὡς ἀν, εἴτε τις συράπτεται, ἐπειράτο, ταύτης οἱ περιοικίδες ἀπασαι, ταύτης ἂπαν Ὁρωμάκονς στρατόπεδον, καὶ φυλόν ἂπαν Ἀριστιανικός, καὶ ὁν ὅ ἄν ἀντίπαρ’ τό μέν, ἐπήκουν, τό δέ, εἰ καὶ παρήκουν, οἱ αὐτονόμοις ἠκείνην ἐχρῆν, ἀλλὰ τρόπον ἄλλον ὑπακούσιν καὶ αὐτό, οἷς ἡγηστὶ τὴν σιγόνα, ὁσ καὶ χαλινοῖς καὶ κηκοῖς ταῖς βασιλικαῖς ἀντιπράξεις, καὶ τῆς ἀπάτης φοράς εἰργόμενος, καὶ ὡς ἱόν ἀναχαιτίζομενος, τῆς θρασύτητος ἀνεσίβασε.
Following this example, our divine emperor did not just engage in discussion with the élites on grand occasions involving discussions about government, but divided his care as well among the ranks of humbler persons, not descending humbly, but condescending in a divine manner. And it was possible to see him amid a dense throng of the people and in crowded gatherings thundering with speeches to the whole assembly, in which everyone could not but have an equal share. But he could also be seen speaking individually to each man, whether it was about whatever each man brought up, or about anything the changing course of a man’s thoughts prompted the emperor to bring up. And this was often the experience, one might say, of our ‘city in the sky’, as it was for all the surrounding cities and for the whole Roman army and the entire Christian nation, and all that beyond it. Some of these were obedient subjects, others, even if they did not submit, since they wished to be self-governing, nevertheless also obeyed in another manner, their jaw curbed by the bit and muzzle of imperial reactions, preventing from making an unruly behaviour, their arrogance held in check like that of a horse trying to buck its rider.

And this imperial bestowal of care and generosity was sufficient to be distributed among all, with ample provision for those at the top all the way down to those at the bottom. And spreading itself all round in the manner of the soul it was sowed in all the parts of the whole, and there was nothing trifling about it since it was altogether divine, and anyone seeing this had one name for it—an emperor in want of nothing and self-sufficient in everything, requiring nothing at all; except for one thing, that the beneficiaries of his benevolence submit to being governed and demonstrate their natural obeisance, through which lawlessness and brutality are banished from life while the rule of law and public order are inculcated in them. One can reckon the number of men of the upper classes, can calculate separately the middle classes, can enumerate the scores of those below these, with whom he had perpetual contact; some of this took place in the course of affairs, as the need arose, while at other times it took the form of a speech, both that which chanced to be conducted live and that written down.
Εὐσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης

τῷ πάντω· ἐπιστ. Παύλου ἐπὶ τῶν πάντων γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω.

καὶ τάυτης δὲ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀρέτης τὰ καθ' ἐκακοῖς, αἱ συγγραφαὶ λαλεῖταις.

καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἀπέραντον ἐξαγαγεῖν τὰ τοῦ λόγου προτεθυμήμεθα, οἷς γε καὶ ψυχαῖς ἔκαας ἐκάκοις, ἀφιεῖσθαι τὸν κακόν ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μὲν ἀφίει κατευμεγεθεῖν τοῦ βλάπτεσθαι τοῦ δ' οὕτω πολυπληθὲς τῶν μνήμης ἀξίων. Εἰ δὲ μὴ θεμελίοις ἐπεβούλευε τὸ κακόν ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μὲν ἀφίει κατευμεγεθεῖν τοῦ βλάπτεσθαι τοῦ δ' ἐπικλύσεως, ὡς ἀγαθῶν ὑπορρεόντων ἦν καινιστὴς, ἀταξίας ἁρμοστὴς καιρικῆς, ἐπισκευαστὴς τῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀφωρισμένων ἐνδιαιτήσεως, χρόνου φθορὰς ἀντίπαλος. Ὡς γὰρ πάντα δαμάζειν ἐθέλων βαθὺ ἔχασκε κατά τε θείων ναῶν καὶ ὅσον αὐτοῖς εἴτε σύνναον εἴτε καὶ ἀλλῶς οἰκειοῦμεν ἐκεῖνον ὁ δὲ αὐτόκράτωρ ἐκ κενοῦ δ' φασὶ, χαίνειν αὐτόν ἀφιεῖσθαι ἀπερροεῖται, ἀφετέρους ἐπιδεῦξε τὰ καταπεπτωκότα, ἰᾶτο τὰ πεπονηκότα, πάντα ἐποίει ὡς χρονικῷ ἀντιπέπτει στόματι ἀνοιγομένως εἰς φθορὰν τῶν ὅσα μὴ ψυχαῖς φθείρεσθαι.

οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τοῖς εἰπεῖν κακῶς ὑπὸ φιλονεικηθὲν ἔκκορυφωθῆναι εἰς μήκιστον, δ' ἐπικλύσεως ἀναπληρῶσαι τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς ἀγαθοχυσίας ἐμπλήσει τοῖς ἐν ἀναθήμασιν ἱεροῖς. Καὶ πάλιν καὶ ἀνίστα τὰ ἱερὰ πτώματα. Εἰ δὲ μὴ θεμελίοις ἐπεβούλευε τὸ κακόν ἄλλη μὴν ἀφίει κατευμεγεθεῖν τοῦ βλάπτεσθαι τοῦ δ' ἐπικλύσεως, ὡς ἀγαθῶν ὑπορρεόντων ἦν καινιστὴς, ἀταξίας ἁρμοστὴς καιρικῆς, ἐπισκευαστὴς τῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀφωρισμένων ἐνδιαιτήσεως, χρόνου φθορὰς ἀντίπαλος. Ὡς γὰρ πάντα δαμάζειν ἐθέλων βαθὺ ἔχασκε κατά τε θείων ναῶν καὶ ὅσον αὐτοῖς εἴτε σύνναον εἴτε καὶ ἀλλῶς οἰκειοῦμεν ἐκεῖνον ὁ δὲ αὐτόκρατωρ ἐκ κενοῦ δ' φασὶ, χαίνειν αὐτόν ἀφιεῖσθαι ἀπερροεῖται, ἀφετέρους ἐπιδεῦξε τὰ καταπεπτωκότα, ἰᾶτο τὰ πεπονηκότα, πάντα ἐποίει ὡς χρονικῷ ἀντιπέπτει στόματι ἀνοιγομένως εἰς φθορὰν τῶν ὅσα μὴ ψυχαῖς φθείρεσθαι.

5 τῷ...πάντῳ: Epist. Pauli ad Cor. I 9.22 τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, ἣν πάντως τινὰς σώσων...14 πάντα...ἐκθέλων: LXX Dan. 2.4.2 καὶ βασιλεία τεταρτή ἡγίστρα ὅσπερ ὁ σίδηρος ὁ δαμάζων πάντα καὶ πάν δεάνστρι πολυπληθείς πάντως καὶ συνεθῆται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ Νομίζουσιν τὸν Κλαρκόν, ὡς, ἐπικλύσεως, ὡς αὐτοῖς εἴτε σύνναον εἴτε καὶ ἀλλής ἀπενεκρωθῆ συνεπίβλεπε τῶν τεθραμμένων τῆς ἐλπίδος...διὰ τῶν τοῖς εἰς ἀκοήν πάντως καὶ χριστιανοῦν τὰ τοῦ εἴτε· ἐπικλύσεως, ὡς ἀγαθῶν ὑπορρεόντων ἦν καινιστὴς, ἀταξίας ἁρμοστὴς καιρικῆς, ἐπισκευαστὴς τῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀφωρισμένων ἐνδιαιτήσεως, χρόνου φθορὰς ἀντίπαλος. Ὡς γὰρ πάντα δαμάζειν ἐθέλων βαθὺ ἔχασκε κατά τε θείων ναῶν καὶ ὅσον αὐτοῖς εἴτε σύνναον εἴτε καὶ ἀλλής ἀπενεκρωθῆ συνεπίβλεπε τῶν τεθραμμένων τῆς ἐλπίδος...διὰ τῶν τοῖς εἰς ἀκοήν πάντως καὶ χριστιανοῦν τὰ τοῦ εἴτε· ἐπικλύσεως, ὡς ἀγαθῶν ὑπορρεόντων ἦν καινιστὴς, ἀταξίας ἁρμοστὴς καιρικῆς, ἐπισκευαστὴς τῶν εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀφωρισμένων ἐνδιαιτήσεως, χρόνου φθορὰς ἀντίπαλος. Ὡς γὰρ πάντα δαμάζειν ἐθέλων βαθὺ ἔχασκε κατά τε θείων ναῶν καὶ ὅσον αὐτοῖς εἴτε σύνναον εἴτε καὶ ἀλλής ἀπενεκρωθῆ συνεπίβλεπε τῶν τεθραμμένων τῆς ἐλπίδος...διὰ τῶν τοῖς εἰς ἀκοήν πάντως καὶ χριστιανοῦν τὰ τοῦ εἴτε· ἐπικλύσεως.
And here I would rather not adapt the example of the sun to my speech, shining and emitting its benefits to all those basking in its good. I would compare him rather to a wise teacher, whose virtue is that he shares his teaching with all who have need of it. Put another way, it is a teacher’s obligation to apportion his solicitude to each, which is a thing said especially of God, who is all things to all people. Whence indeed the most eminent Paul drew on as a model to imitate the one who disburses what is advantageous to all in common and to specific groups of people, as well as to each soul individually.

And as for specific examples of the emperor’s aforementioned virtue, let the history books tell those stories. For we were not prepared to extend our oration ad infinitum, all the more so in a case where it is neither opportune to speak briefly when the mourners are not receptive nor when it is easy given the multitude of things worthy of being remembered. These included his role as renovator of crumbling structures, one who imposes order on periodic disorder, the repairer of dwellings dedicated to virtue, a man who stood in opposition to the decay of time. For time, who seeks to conquer everything, opened its jaws wide against both sacred shrines and all their affiliated buildings, be they chapels or buildings housing other activities. The emperor, meanwhile, allowing him to gape in vain, as they say, carried out repairs, restored, raised fallen buildings, healed the sickly ones, and did all that which offers resistance to the gaping jaws of time in its intent on destroying things which should not suffer destruction.

At some point, earthquakes convulsed these buildings and topple them, and the earth churned up their foundations. But the imperial hand raised the fallen holy bodies. And in cases where evil did not conspire against the foundations, but allowed these to resist destruction, it nevertheless attacked the structure above. In such circumstances it seemed but a small thing for the emperor’s generosity to rebuild the part of the structure in need of repairs, at least when he did not proceed to fill the interior as well with sacred offerings as a result of an outpouring of his goodness. And there were times when fire broke out, either by accident or deliberately set, and it proceeded unchecked, not sparing public buildings, and consuming many of those to which entry is forbidden to most. And once more in this case he responded with imperial munificence to the ravages of time and restored the good that had been lost. And no one may say that there was any disaster demanding to be overcome which reached such a great height and which did not immediately vanish.
Καὶ οὐ περιεγράφετο ἐν μόνοις ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ταύτι τὰ ἀγαθὰ· τὰ πλεῖον δὲ, οἱ τῆς ἐφώς λήξεως ἐκληροῦντο, καὶ τὸ Εὐρωπαῖον πλάτος, καὶ νῆσοι ἐγκαινίζομεν καὶ ὁμώ το προφητικῷ, οἷς ἐκ καὶνεῖ τὸ ἀποχῦσαμεν ἐν ἱεροῖς κάλλος ἀνεκομίστηκον. Καὶ ὁ ἐνταύθα κενούμενος πλοῦτος, δόξει μὲν ἄν, ἐκ μέρους στοχασθῆλῃ τοῦ εὐεργετείν, οἷς ἐκερματίζετο. Τὸ πλῆθος δὲ τις καταλέξας τῶν ἐπιποιηθέντων καὶ σεμνεῖων καὶ θείων ναών, πάνυ πολλάς ὁλότητας καὶ μεγίστας, δαπάνης ἐκκυριώσατο τῷ ἀδροτάτῳ τῆς ἐκχύσεως. Καὶ οἱ μὲν φθάσαντες τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοκρατόρῶν, μιᾶν δήπου ἐφ᾽ ἐκ δεύτερα κάλλος, δείξατε καὶ δευτέραν καλλονὴν θείαν, φωτὶ διαξάνεστε, σεμνὸν καὶ μέγα τι σοφὸς κέκρινται, καὶ ἀληθῶς πεποικασθῆ. Ὁ δὲ, συννοικόμενος κρεῖττον εἶναι φυλάττει τὸ εἰναὶ τοῖς οὕτως μὲν κινδύνου δὲ ὑπὸμένουσαν ἀπεισαί, πρὸς τῷ ἐργῷ τούτῳ εἶχε τὸ πάντα, φιλοτιμοῦμεν μηδέν τι τῶν ἱερῶν ἐργῶν ἀπογενέθεναι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶλαι κτιτορικόν αὐτοῦ ἐναντίωμεν μεχρῆ τέλους ἐκφώνημα πρὸς μνήμην τοῖς ἀνεγεράσθησαν. Ἐπικολούθει δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτοῦφορός ἐνετέθησεν, κληρονομεῖν αὐτὸν μάλιστα τῆς τοῦσδε κλήσεως. Καὶ τῷ μὲν πρώτῳ κτισαμένῳ ἢ ἦδη ἀπαλείφων ἥν ὁ χρόνος τοῦτο τῆς μνημονικῆς δέλτου τα γε εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκοντα· ὁ δὲ βασιλεῖς δεύτερος ἥν τῷ χρόνῳ, ἐκεῖνον τε αὖθις εἰς μνήμην ἐνέγραψε τὴν προτέραν, καὶ ἐστίν προσενέγραφεν· ὁτι μὴ δέ ἐστι τὸ νεάζον, λαθεῖν καὶ παρευδοκίμησθαι τῷ φθάσαντι, καὶ τῷ τῆς μνημοσύνης ἀπενέγκασθαι δευτερείον, ἐνθα τὸ παλαιὸν οὐκ ἄν συνεστηκεῖ ἡμῖν, τούτῳ τῷ νεάζοντος ἐπεγενότας.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν ἀγαθαῖς μιμήσεσιν ἐνετηκόμενον καὶ εἰς τῷ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν εἰς τοῦτο τούτῳ καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπενέγκασθαι εἰς μέτοχον, οὕτω ἀρκοῦν ἡγεῖται τὴν τοσαύτην ἐπιποίησιν, ἀλλὰ ὁλοκληροῖ καὶ αὐτὸς θεῖον ἐρῶν, καὶ αὐτὸ ὁ πρὸς κενὸν φαντασμὸν καὶ σοβαρὸν ὑγκωμα, ὡς ἄν δὲ ποταμάσειν ἵππον οὐ δράφει τῷ προσανατολήσατε. Ἐνταὐθανενομοί ἀνδρῶν κατακορών, καὶ ἀνιστασμένου οὗ τὸ μὲν ἀνακεχωρηκὸς, ἐρήμου τμῆς, τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἀναπλήρωσαν ἀνθρώπουν μονάδος βίου κατακόριτι οὗ τὸ μὲν ἀνακεχωρηκὸς, ἐρήμου τμῆς, τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἀναπλήρωσαν ἀνθρώπουν μονάδος βίου κατακόριτι, ἀντὶ τῶν συμμετέχετεν ἀπὸ τούτῳ μικροῦ ἀσώματος, καὶ τῷ νεάζοντος ἐπιγεγονότος. Εἰς ὁ δὲ τό παλαιὸν οὐκ ἄν συνεστηκεῖ ἡμῖν εἰς τῷ νεάζοντος ἐπιγεγονότος.
And these good works were not restricted just to our area. Those in the eastern part of the empire and the European plains were allotted the majority of the benefactions, while the islands were revived in the manner prophesied, as the lost splendour of their temples was restored anew. And the wealth expended there might appear to those among whom it was distributed to be calculated as a partial benefaction. But if one were to list the numerous monasteries and holy shrines refurbished, he would arrive at a sum total of a great many whole expenditures of the largest scale by calculating the abundance of the money poured out. Whenever any of our earlier emperors brought to light somewhere a single, or even a second, divine beauty in the form of a church, they were deemed to have built some great, pristine place of reverence, and in truth they had. Manuel, on the other hand, after reflection decided that it was better to preserve the existence of those churches which, though still standing, nevertheless ran the risk of falling. He devoted himself fully to this task, striving to ensure that no sacred building should perish, but that their original foundation should remain forever more an expression of the memory of those who built them. And so it followed that as a consequence the emperor naturally acquired the attribute of founder of the buildings himself. Time had already begun to erode the name of the original builder from the register of memory as, in any case, it is wont to do; but the emperor, who came after the founder both restored the memory of his predecessor and added his own as well, since the new should not be overlooked and surpassed in fame by its forerunner, carrying off the second prize in the contest of memory, in those cases where the old would not stand unless the newer structure were added to it.

And since one who was cast in the mold of virtuous exemplars, striving always towards eternal perfection, was bound to be a full participant in virtues such as these as well, he was not satisfied with having initiated such supplementary works; instead he, too, brought to completion a divine project, and this not as some hollow show of ostentation and imposing pride, but so that one inclined to sternness of mind might admire it; and showing favour to the one who had devoted himself entirely to the life of monk (for he was glad for such men more than he was for any other) he built a place of prayer and study, which was at once a place to withdraw from the world, like a section of desert, but whose beauty could supply material for a splendid celebratory speech. And its monastic rule might be most appropriately described as befitting angels. And now it is filled with men whose piety deservedly carries his name, stopping just short of the title Asomatoi in their vehement striving; men over whom an angel of light
οίς ἄγγελον φωτὸς ἐφίστασθαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ νομομάζονται καὶ πιστεύονται καὶ αὐτοὶ οἶδασ, καὶ περιάδεται λόγος ἐκείνου ὑμνητός, ὡς ὁ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησε, τοῖς ἐστών οἷον τούτους ἄνδρας, πάντων ὑπερεῖν τῶν ὁμοιοβίων. Καὶ ἢ ἐπιθυμία, εἰς ἄναλογον. Αὐτὸς το γὰρ οὐδένος τῶν φθασάντων ἐξέπιπτε δεύτερος ὁ σοὶ τοιούτους ἑνηγλαϊσθησαν ἄγαθοῖς, καὶ οἱ τῆς κατ’ αὐτόν εἰπεν δε καὶ τῆς κατὰ θεόν ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες, ὁφειλέται πάντων περιέμεναι ἄλλων. Καὶ τοίνυν γίνονται τοῦ τοιούτου καλὸς εἰς ὅσον οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐξεπιστευθῆναι ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἀμιλλώνται, τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς κρατεῖν στάδιον, ὠσκει καὶ εἰς ἀπαραμίλλους καταστήσθη παγκρατιαστάς. Καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπείπασθαι, ὡς θεοῦ ἐπαλειφότος, οὐκ ἐκπροδεύονται τῆς ἀγαθῆς προθέσεως.

52 Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οἶνον τὸ ἀκούσατε καὶ ἰδετε, ὡς ἡ πλοῦτος τῆς θείας τοῖς βουλομένοισιν ἐμβρωματίζεσθαι πρόκειται, ἀμα τὰ θέα γλυκοῦντος ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀμα ἐρωταῖς καὶ ἐπεὶ τὸ κερασθῆναι ὧς θέαν Σολομόντειος δαϊταλουργεῖν σοφία: καὶ δαπανήσατε τὸ παρατεθέν, ἐρεθίζετε εἰς πλείω ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ τῆς θείας οὐκ ἔχει τρυφής κορέννυσθαι τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκόσι τὸ Χριστιανοῦς ὀνομάζεσθαι ὀφειλέται ἀλλῶν: ἤπειρος ἀλλοιωσάμενος καὶ οἱ τῶν ὁμοίων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων καὶ καθαρεύονται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὑποτασσόμενοι οὕτως ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ἄνδρεια κατάστασις, οὐκ ἐσβέννυε τὴν λυχνίαν, δι’ ἥς ποδηγεῖται τις εἰς τοιαύτην ὅρθον βιοῦ τρίθον. Ἐξανῆπτε δε εἰς πλεῖον, ἀναφρίτζει μεταπατεί καὶ ἐτέρα ὁμοίων ἐπιβάλλειν πράγμασι. Καὶ οἱ τόποι, ἐν ἑτοίμῳ, ἐπιλεγέντες εἰς ἐπικρίσεως καὶ τὰ τῆς ἕλικης ἡμέρας πλέον ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ τὸ τεχνικὸν φῦλον προκατειλήπτο τοῖς μισθοῖς, τὸ τρίχρατον καὶ τὸ ὑποτριγγυκόν καὶ τοὔτων, οἱ μὲν τοῖς Ναζαραίους θέσθαι σκηνώματα ἐγγέγυσεν καὶ θεοῦ ἐπαλείφοντος οὐκ ἐκπεσοῦνται τῆς ἀγαθῆς προθέσεως. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οἷον τὸ ἀκοῦσατε «γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε,» ὅτε γλυκύτης θεία τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐμβρωματίζεσθαι πρόκειται, ἅμα ὁ τὰ θεία λιχνευόμενος ἤκουσε, καὶ ἅμα ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιε τὸ κερασθέν ὡς οἶδεν η Σολομώντειος δαιταλουργεῖν σοφία· καὶ δαπανήσας τὸ παρατεθέν, ἐρεθίζεται εἰς πλείω θεοῦ ἐπαλείφοντος, ὡς θεοῦ ἐκπεσοῦνται τῆς ἀγαθῆς προθέσεως. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οἷον τὸ ἀκοῦσατε «γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε,» ὅτε γλυκύτης θεία τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐμβρωματίζεσθαι πρόκειται, ἅμα ὁ τὰ θεία λιχνευόμενος ἤκουσε, καὶ ἅμα ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιε τὸ κερασθέν ὡς οἶδεν η Σολομώντειος δαιταλουργεῖν σοφία.
has been placed to watch, for whom they at once named and revered, as they
themselves know, and his praiseworthy declaration makes known to all, that he
ardently wished for these holy men of his to be superior to all their peers. And
this corresponded to his desire for himself. For he was second to none of his pre-
decessors who had been distinguished by such deeds, and the men who are in
accord with the emperor’s as well as god’s wishes owe it to him to surpass all oth-
ers. They therefore adopt this virtue to the full extent of their strength, and they
vie with one another in the arena of virtue, just as if they were being ordained
unrivalled champions. And it is not possible for them to fail, since with God as
their trainer they will not fall short of their virtuous intention.

For when the divine sweetness lies before those who wish to partake of it, it
is like hearing the words “taste and see”, since no sooner had the man craving di-
vine things heard this that he ate and drank what was poured for him, the sort of
banquet only the wisdom of Solomon knew how to lay out. And consuming all
that is before him, he is stimulated to further desire and he cannot get enough of
divine nourishment. And he, too, being this sort of man, truly blessed, and a be-
loved guest of the great banqueting host, tasted that it is good to carry out works
in this way; and his soul’s courageous disposition did not put out its lamp, by
which one is guided to such a correct path of life. But his flame burned brighter,
rekindled all the more by divine breath, passionately seeking God with his soul,
as a result of which he was persuaded to devote himself to other, similar deeds.
And the locations were ready, selected through careful judgement, the materials
were supplied, and the craftsmen had been secured in advance with wages, both
the engineers and the labourers; and of these, some were to raise temples for the
Nazarenes, which is almost to say for God himself, on account of the holiness of
the building, and because God normally dwells with those purifying themselves
in it and walks among them; others were assigned the building of accommo-
dation for visitors, those among them who had sustained injuries or who had
succumbed in some other way to illness. And he thus felt warmed by desire for

ἐγεύσατο ὅτι καλόν ἐστιν τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἀποσβέννυται δὴν τὴν νύκτα ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς

ποδηγεῖται... τρίβον: cf. Lycophr. Alex. 912 κλῶς ἄν, ἄναξ, κἀναπεμπάξον φρενὶ / πυκνῇ διοίχει δυσφά-

τοὺς αἰνιγμάτων / ὀμᾶς τυλίσουν, ἕπερ εὐμαθής τρίβος / ὅρθη κελεύθυ τὰν σκότω ποδηγετεῖ

τό-

ΕΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ

τῇ θείᾳ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐκθερμανθείς, καιομένην εἰχε τὴν καρδίαν ἐν αὐτῷ, εἴ πως ἵνα τὸ ἐπιθυμητὸν. Ὡς δὲ τὸ χρεὼν ἤπειρε ἀπῆλθη, προσάγων θεῷ τὴν ἔφεσιν καὶ τὴν ἐπίθυμην, οὕτως καὶ τὸν ἀγαθοῦ ἐκείνον, ἐκεῖνον ἐφιλοτιμησάμενον τὸ παντέλειον.

53 Ὁ δὲ τῇ αὐτῆς ἐπισκευής καὶ ἦ τοῖς πόλεοι καὶ φρουρίων τῶν μέν, ἐγερθεὶς έκ τοῦ πάλαι κείσθαι, τῶν δὲ, ποίησις, καὶ εἰπέν καιρωτέρων, κτίσις καὶ κανόνι. Καὶ Τιβέριῳ μὲν, προφορίας προσεμαρτύρηται ἀγαθοῦ, ὡς τολμᾶς πόλεις κατασκευάζεις, ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις ἄνελαβεν. Ὁ δὲ, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, εἰς ὅσον οὐκ εἰπέν ἤμιν εὐμαρεῖς ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι, μὴ καὶ τὴν ἐπιμετρημένην ὡς ἐντολήν ποιήσῃς, ἀριθμὸς ἐτέρως αὐτοὶ οὐχ ὤν μῆν ἐπεξευρέσθησθαι ταῖς λοιπαῖς. Οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἑκατὸν οποῖα οὔθεν εἰς διπλῶς τὸ πάλαι ἔνδον ἐπερείκει καὶ ὑπεραναβαίνειν, δι' ὅν ἐπιτειχίζων τοὺς πολεμίους ἔργη τῆς ἐκδρομῆς, ἐχόμενον τρίβου σκάνδαλα δικαίως καὶ τοῖς πολέμιοις, οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθε, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ ἐκ τῶν ὁποῖων ἦν ἐν παραμορφώμενο. 54 Οὐχ ἦτον δὲ τι καὶ ἐκείνον καινόν, ὅτι τοῖς πλείστοις τούτοις ἐργῶν, ἐαυτὸν ἀρχικοτεκνεῖν ἐφίστα, καὶ διεκρίνειν τὰ δι' ὅσον ἀσφαλῶς ἐστήθοντα τὰ πολλὰ δὲ, καὶ διακοσμεῖν καὶ χειρουργεῖν τοῖς πολίζουσι καὶ παραφορεῖν ὅσον χρήσιμον. Καὶ χθὲς μὲν, τὰς βασιλικὰς ἐτρίβους χεῖρας καὶ εἰσαύριον δὲ τρίψουσι, ἢ σάθη βαρυνομένη πολλῷ τῶν σιδηρῶν τοῖς ἐπικαίροις χωρίοις ἀνέστησεν, ἀριθμὸς δὲ καὶ προοδεύσατε μὲν καὶ παραφορεῖν ὅσον χρήσιμον. Καὶ τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῶν πόλεων καὶ φρουρίων τῶν μὲν, ἔγερσις ἐκ τοῦ πάλαι κείσθαι, τῶν δὲ, ποίησις, καὶ εἰπεῖν καιριώτερον, κτίσις καινή. Καὶ Τιβερίῳ μὲν, προφορίας προσεμαρτύρηται ἀγαθόν, ὅτι πολλὰς πόλεις κατασεισθείσας, ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις ἀνέλαβεν. Ὁ δὲ, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, εἰς ὅσον οὐκ εἰπέν ἤμιν εὐμαρεῖς ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι, μὴ καὶ τὴν ἐπιμεμετρημένην ὥραν τοπικοῖς ὀνόμασι προσδαπανήσωμεν· ὅσα δὲ καὶ ἐκκαίνις ἐν ἐπικαίροις χρόνοις ἀνέστησεν, ἀριθμὸς ἐτέρως αὐτοὶ οὐχ ὤν μῆν ἐπεξευρέσθαι ταῖς λοιπαῖς. Οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἑκατὸν οποῖα οὔθεν ἐπεξευρέσθησθαι ταῖς λοιπαῖς. Οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἑκατὸν οὐδὲ εἰς διπλῶς τὸ πάλαι ἔνδον ἐπερείκει καὶ ὑπεραναβαίνειν, δι' ὅν ἐπιτειχίζων τοὺς πολεμίους ἔργη τῆς ἐκδρομῆς, ἐχόμενον τρίβου σκάνδαλα δικαίως καὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις, οὕτως καὶ τὰς ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθε, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ ἐκ τῶν ὁποίων ἦν ἐν παραμορφώμενο. Ὁ δὲ, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, εἰς ὅσον οὐκ εἰπεῖν ἤμιν εὐμαρεῖς ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι, μὴ καὶ τὴν ἐπιμεμετρημένην ὥραν τοπικοῖς ὀνόμασι προσδαπανήσωμεν· ὅσα δὲ καὶ ἐκκαίνις ἐν ἐπικαίροις χωρίοις ἀνέστησεν, ἀριθμὸς δὲ καὶ προοδεύσατε μὲν καὶ παραφορεῖν ὅσον χρήσιμον. Καὶ τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῶν πόλεων καὶ φρουρίων τῶν μὲν, ἔγερσις ἐκ τοῦ πάλαι κείσθαι, τῶν δὲ, ποίησις, καὶ εἰπεῖν καιριώτερον, κτίσις καινή.
the divine, his heart burned within him, that he might somehow see his wish fulfilled. But when the time came for him to discharge his debt, he departed, bringing to God both his desire and his propensity toward virtue, like a work already completed, leaving the shortfall for his son the emperor to complete, and in this way having initiated this praiseworthy thing as well, all the while aspiring for that other state of perfection.

And he proceeded to repair cities and fortifications, raising those which had fallen in the past, while building others, or to put it more fittingly, a new foundation. History testifies to the emperor Tiberius’ munificence, since he rebuilt many earthquake-damaged cities through his patronage. Manuel, for his part, did this as well to such an extent that it would be unfeasible for us to describe, at the moment at any rate, lest we spend the time allotted for this oration on place names; while all those he raised anew in strategic districts would amount to a different number altogether, one not incomparable to the others. For these did not amount to a hundred, or twice that number, but the structures raised peaked well above that number. These he used as a bulwark to block the incursions of enemies, setting them up as a series of obstacles in the path of the foe, preventing them from advancing, while holding out the threat of death from behind if they managed to force their way along the road, requiring them to remain at home and either to set aside their passion for war or in their anger to break into open fighting amongst themselves.

And this was no less novel, that he himself took charge of the construction of the majority of these works, determining how they might stand securely, often helping and lending a hand to the builders, and carrying out whatever task was required. And the imperial hands were only yesterday being chafed and will again in times to come, either by the heavy iron sword, even before being cut down, whose strike our assembled enemies could not withstand, but cut down from life in large harvests they could be gathered into sheaves like corn; or, by the iron mace, which brings bronze sleep to those it strikes; or by the heavy spear,
οὐς ἑκάσεν ἂν, ποιητικὴ μεγαλοφωνία, ὡς εἰς νηὸς ἱστὸν ἐεικοσόροιο. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐς τοῦτον ὡς ἑκάσεν, τῆς ὑπομονῆς, καὶ τῆς μὲν, εἰς τὰ περὶ σώμα ἥχουσης, ἂν φερεπονίαν οὐκ ἔχει, τῆς δὲ, εἰς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐποχήν, δ ἦν ἐς τὴν ἐγκράτεια, τῆς δὲ εἰς παντὸς λυπουρίου κατακέρασμα, τούτω δὲ τὸ καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ καρδιῶν, ἂν μὴν καὶ πραὕτητος ἐκκίνησιμος, οὐκ ἐς τινὰς, περὶ ἤν ἐς τὸν ἐκκίνησιμον, βασιλεῖς κάνταυθα ὡς καὶ ἐκάστῳ, ότι μὴν ἐκρήν τον οὐκότως μεγάλως | ἐγείρεται, ἐκεῖνος τῶν χείρων. Διήρκει ὡς εἶπεν φερεπονίαν, πόνος μὲν ὑπομένων, ότι ἐν καὶ μεσαίτιαν τῆς ὑπομονῆς οὐκ ἐκεῖνον ἀκόντιν τὸν κάμπτων | ἀνείχε τε καὶ ἐχώρει. Καὶ τὰ μὲν τὰ περὶ καὶ εἰσαύριον ἐργαῖα τῷ βασιλεῖ | μεταξὺ δὲ, χάλικες ἐν χερσὶν ἁδροὶ καὶ ἀνδραξέων, προσκόμματος καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῖς ἐκάστων | ἀκόντιν, καὶ στήλην οὕτω καρδερῶς ἐκάστου ἀνίσων—ὁ δὲ ἐμφαίνετο καὶ ἐξεύρετηκε διὰ βιοῦ εἰς τὸ παντοῖος ὑπομετακόμιον ἐκάστων ἐκπολεμήσεως.

1 βριθὺ δόρου: Hom. ll. 5.746.747 βριθὺ μέγα στεφάρων, τῷ δάμνησι στίχων ἀνδρῶν; Georg. Torn. Orat. in Georg. Xiph. 2.11.11 ὁ βριθὺ τοῦτον ἀκόντιν καὶ δολικόσημον συνάθροισαν ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν; Nic. Chon. Hist. 373.16 εἰς ἔκρηκτον ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν ἀκόντιν καὶ άρσας ἐρέτες ἐς ἐκάστων | ἀκόντιν, χάλικες ἐν χερσὶν ἁδροὶ καὶ ἀνδραξέως, προσκόμματος καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῖς ἐκάστων ἀκόντιν, | καὶ ἐκάστην οὕτω καρδερῶς, ἐκάστις καὶ ἐκάστῳ, οὐκ ἐκουσάθην ἀκόντιν τὸν κάμπτων | ἀνείχε τε καὶ ἐχώρει. Καὶ τὰ μὲν τὰ περὶ καὶ εἰσαύριον ἐργαῖα τῷ βασιλεῖ | μεταξὺ δὲ, χάλικες ἐν χερσὶν, ἀνδραξέως, προσκόμματος καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῖς ἐκάστων | ἀκόντιν, καὶ στήλην οὕτω καρδερῶς ἐκάστου ἀνίσων—ὁ δὲ ἐμφαίνετο καὶ ἐξεύρετηκε διὰ βιοῦ εἰς τὸ παντοῖος ὑπομετακόμιον ἐκάστων ἐκπολεμήσεως.
which the poet’s grandiloquence could liken to the mast of a twenty-oared ship. For such was the spear the imperial hand raised and hurled. And such were the emperor’s works both yesterday and for times to come. But in the time between he carried bulky and back-breaking rubble in his hands, stones meant to serve as obstacles to the enemies of god. And doubtless it would have been appreciated if his labours had only extended this far. But his efforts stretched even further. Such therefore were his activities during the day, but the emperor applied himself to war planning at night as well, and he treated this time of rest as an opportunity to exert himself with burning zeal to such pursuits, remaining sleepless and vigilant ‘without bending his knee’ and thus raising himself into a pillar of perseverance. Indeed this was a thing at which he had studiously toiled throughout his life, namely, to achieve every sort of forbearance.

For generally speaking, his endurance divided into several kinds, the one having to do with the body, which we customarily refer to as ‘tolerance of hardship’; another which leads to the regulation of desires, which is defined as ‘self-control’; another still which tempers every form of grief, a thing won by prudence and forbearance, all the more so by mildness; there was no form of endurance which he did not have the highest reputation, demonstrating that in this case as well he ruled over himself, since it was not fitting for so great a ruler to yield to the worst tendencies. And so he was able to cope with every sort of hardship, either enduring the cold, as though he had come upon a temperate breeze compensating for the parching midsummer heat, or subjected in turn to the summer heat and withstand it, as if being cooled by invigorating breezes. As for thirst, he could endure it even more than the ‘Un-thirsty’ ones of history; and it was his considered judgement that hunger is the privilege of an idle man, while productive labours are wont to nourish, keeping the ambition of his soul fully occupied.

19 Στήλη καρτερίας ὁν Ἰὼβ / τιμάσθω παρ’ ἡμῶν; cf. Eust. Or. 2 (Δόγος Β) 43.19 ὃ δὲ καὶ τούτον κατεξανίσταται καὶ στήλην καρτερίας ἑαυτὸν ἀνιστῶν
15 βασιλεύς… ἑαυτοῦ: Io. Chrys. Fragn. in Prov. 64.73.7 Ἡ βασιλέα, τὸν πρὸ τῶν βασιλευμένων ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεύσαντα
19 οἱ… Ἀδίψοι: cf. Clearch. 74 apud Athen. Deipnosoph. VIII 345b: Κλέαρχος μνημονεύει ἐν τῷ περὶ θινῶν, φάσκων Ψαμήτηχον τὸν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέα παῖδας θρέψαι...ἀδίψους ἀσκῆσαι τοὺς ἐρευνησομένους τὰς ἐν Λιβύῃ ψάμμους; Eust. Or. quad. 2.43.17 ὁ δὲ καὶ ταύτην παρεκθέει τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς φύσεως, ὅπως μόχθου καιρός, καὶ κατὰ τούς θρειοσμένους διήσουσαν διακαρτερεῖ
20 λιμῶν... ἀνδρὶ: Hes. Op. et al. 302 αἰδοίη, βιότην δὲ τεχνοτρελομένους ἀδίψους διακαρτερεῖ / Λιμῶς γάρ τοι πάμπαν ἀεργῷ σέμφορος ἀνδρὶ
Διεννομένος, ἐξώθει τύραννον. Στρωμνὴ δὲ αὐτῷ πρὸς γῆς τραχύτητα, στρώμασι οὐχ ὁ βασιλέως τῷ πόματι (οὐ γὰρ ἡδὺ τὸ τῇ γεύσει μὴ προσήνες), ὅσον οἴμαι καταμημένος, καὶ ὁ στυφὼν χυλὸς ἔστι δὲ ὅπου καὶ ἠρέμα ὀξὺς ὁ κρίθινος. Εἰ δὲ καὶ οἴνῳ ἀργίᾳ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, καὶ τῶν σπουδαίων ἐκκόπτειν τὸν τῆς κοσμικῆς ἐργα-βασιλεὺς ἐπέταττε, καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἔργων καιρίοις ἐπιοῦσιν ὑπεξιστάμενος, καί πως καὶ ἐπιπετασθεὶς δὲ, ταχὺ ἀπεπήδα, μετρῶν ἑαυτόν, ὡς τῇ ἄρχουσι. Τῇ δὲ, καὶ προκαλούμενος ὕπνος οὐχ ὑπήκουε· τὸ γὰρ φροντιστικὸν, δέοι proposuit T afel2


18 ἐκκόπτειν: proposuit Reinsch ἐγκόπτειν B et Tafel 20 δότι…δέει: B et Tafel ὅτε τρυφάν δέοι proposuit Tafel2
Of course he held his appetite in check, like some statue, wishing to consume only as much as a man who has already had more than his fill; for neither might that man heap more upon a surplus nor was this man [Manuel] able to expand his stomach once he had contracted it by his will in order to eat as gluttons do. And the reason in both cases was the same. For that which is full cannot accept anymore, and anything with a very narrow opening will not allow something placed in it to enter inside.

Such was the control he exerted over his desires, that most dreadful parasite. And as for his passions, he banished them as a legitimate emperor might exile a tyrant. The rough ground served as his bed, and he slept without soft mattresses coming between himself and the ground, so that it was practical for him when the need arose, not to recline his whole body but to sit upright, and in this way to turn away the wise tranquilizing sleep of nature. Indeed treacherous sleep once flowed over Homeric Zeus against his will, a story which conveys the compulsion of sleep, not just among common men, but also among those who rule far and wide. But in the case of Manuel, even when called upon, sleep did not obey, for his worries won out over his needs. And even when sleep lighted upon him, it immediately leapt off, making its impact felt in moderation, as the emperor dictated, yielding on those occasions when there was work to be done, being somehow reluctant to be present at the side of a man in constant motion. It was as though sleep was contriving the death of a man deserving of immortality by rendering his senses idle, thus severing the one who created worldly order from his achievements.

Water was his favourite drink, tempting him, since he needed to indulge in some restrained form of pleasure, to which the sweet sap of the reed mixes in its share; still more in fact the viscous juice, and on occasion even slightly bitter beer. And if there was need of wine as well, it was unsweetened and served bitter, unappealing to most. And this was characteristic of the emperor’s drinking habit, not so much because he enjoyed this sort of drink (for that which does not appeal to taste is not pleasurable), but as a measure, I think, against excessive
χανωμένου τῆς ἀγαν ὀρέξεως. Καὶ οἶδα πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν ἀσκητὰς ἄνδρας τοιούτων ἑαυτοῖς οἰνοχοοῦντας κέρασμα, ὡς ἂν κατευμεγεθύσι καὶ αὐτὸι τοῦ ἐνδον ἐχθροῦ.

59 Στάσιν δὲ ὀρθιαν, δ ὁ καὶ ἐρρέθη, ὥσεὶ καὶ κλών ἐκπονήμενος ἀστραβής καὶ ἀναστήλων ἑαυτῶν καὶ οὕτω πρὸς εὐκλείαν οἷς ἀνείχεραν ὑψοῦ ἡ ἁμετρία, γόνατα κάμπτειν αὖθις ἡ ὕπ.startsWith(59, 62, 5)}\textit{κατευμεγεθῶσι...}

5 ἐχθροῦ: cf. Eust. Or. 2 (Λόγος Β) 38.47 ὃς οὐ μόνον βαρβάροις ἐχθροῖς κατευμεγεθεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ παθῶν ἀριστεῦται φιλοτιμούμενος, εἰς ὅσον ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει δίδωσι θεός, παμβασιλεὺς εἶναι καὶ αὐτός, βασιλέων τε πάνω τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ὑπέρτερος καὶ παθῶν ἀνώτερος; idem Or. 4 (Λόγος Δ) 55.17 ὃς σφᾶλε, Τροίας / ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κἰνωνά... : Epist. Pauli ad Ephes. 3.14 Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; cf. Greg. Naz. De pace PG 35.72.1.41 πάντα μοι ἦν ὑπεκακαίματα καὶ ὑπομνήματα τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν διαζεύξεως, ἀγρυπνίαι, νηστεῖαι, προσευχαὶ, δάκρυα, τύλοι γονάτων; cf. Eust. Or. 9 (Λόγος Θ) 160.6 εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ γόνατα τύλοις ἐκτραχυνθῶσιν εἰς γῆν κλινόμενα, ὁποίον τὸν κατ' ἐξοχὴν δίκαιον ἡ φιλόθεος ἱστορία παραδίδωσιν... ὁὐράνιον: cf. Eust. Or. quad. 7.58.2 ὦ καὶ πρὸς χάος ἄβυσσον κατὰ πρὸς ὑψοῦ ὁ αὐτός, τὸ πρῶτον, οἷς ταπεινοποιεῖ ἐκ μεταμέλου λιπαροὺς... εἰλαπινάζων: Hom. Il. 14.2.41 τῷ κεν ἐπισχοίης λιπαροὺς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων 14 ἀπαξιῶν... τίττησει: Xen. Anab. 8.8.19 Ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς δένα ὡς ἐπιχώριον αὐτοῖς μὴ ὁρᾶσθαι πεζῇ πορευομένοις, οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἐνδίκης ἤ τοῦ ὡς ἱππικωτάτους γίγνεσθαι; Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 3.819.31 ἐπὶ δ’ ἂν ἰπποκέλευθος κυριολεκτικῶς ὁ πεζὸς διαμετουργήσει τὸν πολλὸν, τὰ πλείω δὲ ἀναβάλλων ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ ἔφιππος προ... οὗ καὶ τὸ ἐν ἀριστεύμασιν ἀνάστημα πεπραγμά-τευτο. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐχρῆν τὸν εἰς θεὸν κατανεύοντα μὴ κατεξανίστασθαι τῶν ἐχθρῶν, μηδὲ τὸν ἐξ ὑψοῦ οὕτω μακροῦ ἑαυτῶν ταπεινοῦντα, μηθεόθεν ὑψοῦσθαι, καὶ τοῦ μέχρι καὶ εἰς γήν ταπεινοποιοῦ ἀντιλαμβάνειν ὑψωμα εὐκλείας ὑπόκλωμον.
appetite. And I know genuine ascetics who pour themselves such a mixture with precision so that they may overpower the enemy within.

He strove to maintain an upright stance, as has been noted, like an uncurving column, setting himself up this way also in a manner deserving of praise for the way he supported our empire, bending his knees in turn to prayer to God, and thus so fittingly consecrating his genuflection, like a rival to that great and just archetype, whose calloused knees testified to his frequent kneeling. And thus did he achieve prominence for his achievements. For there was no reason for the man who bowed before God not to stand up to his enemies, nor for one who humbled himself from such a height not to be raised up high by God, and to receive in exchange from the one who humbled himself to the ground a heavenly height of good repute.

His capacity for walking comes next, itself being another form of endurance. He did not put up his ‘smooth feet while feasting,’ nor did he always rely on the ease of a horse carrying him aloft speedily along the roads. But as the need arose, he would overtake those expert at going on foot, not denigrating walking, as the haughty ancient Persians had done, whom it pleased to lay down the following law, that with the exception of walking inside one’s house, all other transit should be made on horseback. When it was necessary, however, as in the case of triumphal processions, he approved of using a horse, while making vigorous use of his feet the rest of the time and showing great stamina.

In this way did he combine things which cause most people suffering and prompt bitterness to a contestant with the sweeter aspects of virtue, to which he owed his forbearance against malice, being indisposed to punish as a result of heeding his reason, giving those who had strayed onto the path of disgrace the opportunity to return, holding out before himself in such cases Christ the Saviour as his archetype, the one who stands above all and bears everything with providential care, whose direct involvement he imitated, as he did Christ’s self-reliance in his works, especially the most important ones. For he did not wish to execute virtuous works through the hands of others while having the achievements ascribed to himself, nor did he wish to simply hear about imperial
ἐπηγράφεσθαι, οὐδ’ ἀκοὰς παραβάλειν τοὺς βασιλικοὺς πρακτείοις, ὁφθαλμοὺς δ’ ἐπιβάλλειν καὶ χερσὶ καταβάλλειν τὸ ἀντικείμενον.

62 Ἀμέλει καὶ κινδύνους ἐαυτὸν παρενεπίθετε ἐνθά τοῦ στρατών ἁπλῶς ἢν ἀφρικτον. καὶ διδοὺς ἐαυτὸν ἐώς καὶ εἰς θάνατον, κατηλάττετο τοῖς λοιποῖς τὸ σώζεσθαι. Ὑθεν καὶ ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο τοῖς διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος τραύμασιν ἢπερ τοῖς ἐν διαδήματι ἀγάλαιμασι, καὶ σφραγίδας ταύτας ἐφερεν, ἐγγεγλυμένας τοῦ ἀνδρικοῦ. Βασιλέα μὲν οὐν θεωρεῖν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο διαδοχῆς ἢν θεὸς παραδόξως αὐτῷ δίέθετο, ἐπικρίνας εἰς βασιλέα τὸν ἐν ἄδελφοις μεγάλους τε καὶ καλούς, μικρὸν μὲν τηνικαύτα κάλλιστον δε, εἰς δε τὸ ἐπίον, καὶ μέγιστον. Στρατηγὸν δὲ, οὐκ ἄν εἰς πόρῳ τοῦ καὶ οὕτω βασιλεὰ διασκέπτεσθαι. Ἐστι γὰρ βασιλεῖς, ἀπὰς (οὐκ ἐξω λόγου εἰπεῖν) στρατηγῶν στρατηγός. Ἡπείρον μὲν τοῖς ἀριστοὶ τεθεάσθαι, καὶ πεζομάχον, καὶ μονομάχον ύστερα τνόντα, καὶ πρόμαχον, καὶ πολυποικήτην δεινότατον, καὶ λόγους καθίζειν καὶ λοιπαῖς ἀπάσισι παρείναι μάχαις θερμῶτας, ταύτα δε οὐκέτι διαδοχῆς αὐτοῦ συμπεπλεκτατε ει καὶ ἐγ γένους καθίκεν άχρι καὶ εἰς αὐτόν, ἀσκησεως δε ὁ μείρα συχνῆς, καὶ τριβής διαρκοῦσ, καὶ ὀργανόσωσις ἡν φώσις ἐφιλοτεχχυνσεν ὑπό δεω ἀρχιτεκτονί.
projects but preferred to look upon them with his own eyes, and to bring down anything opposing him with his own hands.

And indeed he exposed himself to dangers in situations where the army had no means of escape, and going so far as to expose himself to deadly risk, trading his own safety for that of the others. For this reason he was proud of the wounds all over his body, in the same way he was of the jewels on his crown, and he bore these like seals, the carved signs of his manly bravery. And so whereas looking upon him as an emperor was a matter of royal succession, which God had granted him unexpectedly, selecting as emperor among the older and decent brothers one who may have been at that time the youngest but was by far the best, and would in time prove the greatest. And to think of him as a general would not be all that different from thinking of him as emperor since (I think it apt to say) every emperor is the general of generals. To look upon him as an excellent knight, however, and as a foot-soldier, exuding strength in one-on-one combat, formidable at leading the charge and at laying siege, expert at setting ambushes, a fervent participant in every kind of battle – these things were no longer bound up in the chain of succession, even if these qualities were passed down to him from his ancestors, they were nevertheless the result of frequent training and constant practice, as well as his physical constitution, which nature lovingly fashioned under the guidance of God the master-builder.

He did not deem it necessary to be present himself at battles far beyond our borders, since the preceding period saw lands within the empire grow hostile, while others came under suspicion; for which reason it was necessary for the emperor to remain in the middle, and like the heart give life and warmth to the surrounding parts. Nor would he, even if he had already come to a decision (since in all matters it was the ardour of his soul which decided), remain unswerving in the face of the senate’s vote for the remainder of the time. Indeed, whenever he set out from the queen of cities, sometimes encamping half way to the enemy, at other times further afield, he would dispatch the army not far ahead, and he proceed to accomplish what God had provided, who collaborated with him in these works. And unless some big new obstacle befell them, there was no way for the imperial envoys to turn back from where they had been sent until they had arranged for everything. For the emperor sent along with them instructions, through which he achieved victory as though he himself had been present. Since he always achieved what he had resolved to do. And if ever a battle was lost on
μάχης, ἢ τὸ συμμαχικὸν οὐκ ἀπονήρως ἀμφισβητεῖ, τυχόν δὲ οὐτω, καὶ κύβος μάχης οὐ πρὸς ἀγαθὸν ἔρριπτο, τούτου μὲν ἀλλοθεν τὸ αἵτιον, τὸ βασιλικὸν δὲ ἔργον ἀναίτιον.

Καὶ οὕτω μὲν τὸ τῆς στρατείας διωκομεῖτο ἐκτοπον. Οὐκ ἂν δὲ τινι ἐγγένειο, συνήντα τοιαύτα ἐξαιρισθήσαται. Τὰ πλείω γὰρ αὐτὸς καὶ τῶν τοιοῦτων ἔργων ἐπέβαινε, οὐκ ἔχων ἐτέροις τὰ οὕτω μέγιστα πιστεύειν καὶ ἐπικινδύνει. Κίλικες οἴδας ταύτα, καὶ Ἀρμένια φύλα, καὶ γένος Ἀσσύριου, καὶ λοιπόν, ὅσον πρωτοφαίτεσίν βολαῖς ἥλιου βάλεται. Σκυθικὴ δὲ ἀγριότητα οὐ μόνος ὁ πολυαριστεὺς πατὴρ ἡμερῶν ἐλήμωσε, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἐπ᾽ οὕτῳ ἔλαττον. Ἰστρου δὲ τὰ πέραν οὕτω κατεδραμεὶν, ὡς εἰ καὶ αδεώς τις περιῳκοδομημένα θηρία κυνηγεῖτο, τὰ μὲν, ἀλλικει τὰ δ᾽ εἰς φόβον κινεῖ. καὶ αὐτὸ οὐκ εἰσάπαξ. Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ τότε πάθος, κατασχυσαντος μόνης τῆς τοιαύτης γενέσθαι περαιάς, καὶ ἀμα πεφευγός ἀμεταστρεπτικόν καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἐφημομένη χωρίου εἰπεῖν ἢ μή ταχύ περιεγίνετο, αὐτὸς τοῖς προτομεῖοις ἐπιδεδημηκώς. Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου μεγαλοῦργημα, ὡς-ἐστίν εἰπεῖν, ὅπου -καὶ τὸ τὸ Ἡρακλέως σειμὸν ἀπήλεγε. Αὐτή ἂν γὰρ μὲν τὴν Ἀορον (πέτρα δὲ αὕτη, τὸν Ἰνδὸν ποταμόν ὑπομένοντα ταῖς ῥίζαις προσαρασσόμενον), ἔλειν οὐκ ἔσχεν, εἰς τρίς μὲν προσβαλὼν τοσαυτὰς δὲ φασὶν ἀποκρουσθεῖσιν. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ, εἰσάπαξ προσβεβληκώς, εἴλεν ἐγκρατῶς.

Εἰ μὲν οὖν πρὸς πολλαίς τῶν πόλεων πόλλ᾽ ἐμόγησεν ὁ ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς πολιορκία τριβόμενος, πολέμου νόμος καὶ τοῦτο. Ἐξεῖ δὲ η συγγραφή καὶ ως ἄμα τε εἰδε καὶ τὰς μὲν, κατέρρυνεν δός οὐκ ἔχρην ἱσταθαι, τὰς δὲ, ἀφῆκεν ἐσταίναί δος τοῦ συντελεῖ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιδεδημηκώς. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ, εἰς τοῖς προτομεῖοις ἐπιδεδημηκώς, ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστάναι εἰσάπαξ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιδεδημηκώς. Εἶδον δὲ τούτοις ἐπιστῆσαι, συγγραφῆς ἔργον λεπτολογίας, καὶ ὅλῃς ἐντὸς βούλημα. Εἶδον ἡμέρας δύο ποτὲ πέντε πόλεις ἀνάρχουντας αὐτῶν τὸ πολὺν Ἀλέξανδρον. Καὶ τούτων οἷα μὲν τὰς τρεῖς ἐκεῖνος διεθέτο,
account of the army’s recklessness, or our mercenary allies acted treacherously, so that the dice of battle were not cast favourably, the cause of this lay elsewhere, while the emperor’s actions were not to blame.

This was how the army’s campaigns abroad were conducted. And it would not be possible for anyone to calculate the many such occurrences. For in most cases he took charge of such operations himself, not being able to entrust such important and dangerous things to others. The Kilikians know well of what I speak, as do the Armenian tribes and the Assyrian nation; as are all the rest who are struck by the first appearing rays of the sun. Moreover, his much accomplished father was not alone in taming the wild nature of the Skythians. Manuel, too, did so no less than his father. He raided on the far side of the Istros, like someone hunting wild beasts in a walled area, capturing some and striking fear into others. And he did this more than once. For this was Alexander’s problem, that having prevailed as soon as he crossed to the other shore, he was forced to flee straight back. And it was not possible to name a single fortified town where he did not overcome the rebels themselves as soon as he arrived. This was Alexander’s great achievement—and it is possible to say where this took place—he also surpassed the distinction of Herakles. To begin with, Herakles was not able to conquer the Aornian fortress (this is a great rock which withstands the flow of the Indus as it batters its roots) though he attempted three times, and three times they say he was repelled. Alexander, on the other hand, assailed it only once and he successfully conquered it.

If however our emperor exerted himself many times by laying siege to many cities, this was normal in wartime. But the historical record shows that there were cities that as soon as he came upon them, either he tore down since they should not have been built in the first place, leaving standing the ones which paid taxes to us. Ascertaining the precise number of these would be a task worthy of a detailed historical account from someone intending to compose an entire book. Alexander the Great once conquered and enslaved five cities in two days. And those who diligently record such things give no details about how he...
οὐκ ἀκριβοῦσιν οἱ τὰ τοιαύτα φιλοσοφήσαμεν. Αἳ γε μὲν λοιπὸν δύο, τοὺς σφῶν πολίτας ἀρδην ἀνηρμήνευς ἔκλαυσαν. Καὶ οὐκ οἶδα μὲν εἰπεῖν πρὸς ἀκριβείαν ἐφ᾽ ὅτι δὲ προὐπάρχοντ᾽ οὐκ ἔχω δὲ μὴ ἀπόρος ἔχειν, τί ποτ᾽ ἀν, ἢν ἐκεῖνο μέγα ὁ τοσοῦτος ἄνδρας βασιλείαν ἐξημίσκειν. Ἐνταύθα δὲ καὶ τὰ τρόποι οὐδὲν ἑλάττω, καὶ τὸ ἀλησκὸμενον ἐσωτερικοὶ καὶ περιποιεῖτο εἰς εὐχρηστούμενον· ἵνα καὶ οὕτω καθὰ καὶ ἀνότινον ὁ λόγος ὀρθῇ κρίσει ἑξυγοστάτει, τὸ θεῖον ἐπεξήγαγεν τάλαντον. Οἱ πῶς οὐκ ἂν τοῦ λοιποῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς Ρωμαίων γῆς πρόοιντο καὶ τὴν ἴωνην, ἀνήρωτοι θανάτῳ μὲν περιτετυχηκότες, πεφιλοτιμημένοι δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορος, πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τοῖς εἰς βίον ἀρκοῦσιν καταντλούμενοι δαψιλῶς; Ὁ εἰς καὶ ἀλλὰς ἀρκοῦν πρὸς μάχης ἑρεθισμὸν, τὸν ἐν πολέμῳ οὐ μόνον ἐκδοσθαὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέας τὰ εἰς τὸν Ἐνυάλιον διεγερτίρια, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν, προθέειν τῶν ἄλλων εἰς ἐργον καὶ προαρπάξεν τὸν στέφανον.

66 Ἡν γὰρ τῷ ὄντι παραθῆκε μὲν εἰς μάχην λόγους, Τυρταίοις ῥητορεία ἢ Τιμόθεου πρὸς μέλος ἄρμοσιν, ὡν ὁ μὲν, ἢδεται τοῖς εἰναι εἰς πόλεμον ὑπόνων, ὡς δεξιῶς ἔχειν ἑρεθισαί εἰς θάνατον. Τιμόθεος δὲ, τὸν πολῖν Ἀλέξάνδρου ἱδιὸν ποτὲ, εἰς υἱομόν εκμήνην Αρείκον, καὶ πείσα πρὸς ὅπλα δραμέειν, ὡς εἰ καὶ πόλεμος ἐνστατοπροθυμηθήναι δὲ εἰς ἐργον, ἀστραπῆς ἔχουν ἐξάλα, ἔργου δὲ γενεσθαι πῦρ ἔθλη δραττόμενον. Καὶ ἐστὶ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν οὐκ οἴδ᾽ οἷς ἀγνώστων. Ναὶ γὰρ εἰς ἀνδριὰν κραταιούσθαι τὸν ἐμφυλυμένον ἐκδικήθην ὅσῳ καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐγνώστο, ὡς ὁ γὰρ τῆς γῆς -ἡν δὲ τὸ ἄτο τοῦ ἑκαμούμενον τεμάς τουτής- οἶδε θάνατον ἐξενενενεθεὶ, ὡς ἐξενενενεθεὶ, οἶδε καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν, βασιλεῦς πανταχοῦ γῆς περιφερόμενος, καὶ ἀνδρείος οὐκ ἔστιν ὃν ἔτι τὴς ὀἰκησίμος γῆς. Ἐνταύθα τὶς ἂν, ἢγοι εἰς μεταχειρίζεσθαι τοὺς αὐτοφλικήν ὑπὸς καὶ ἀποκαλοῦσε καὶ ἀνεκμήνεται καὶ ἀπαλοῦσε καὶ υπερβαλοῦσεν· Βίβλιοι οἱ καὶ ταῦτα. Βιβλιογραφεῖν δὲ νῦν, τίς ἂν, αἰτήσεις ἢ ἀπαίτησειςν;

10 τὸ: Β τὸν proposuit Tafel²
treated three of these. The other two, at any rate, wept for their fellow citizens who were cut down all at once. And while I cannot say with any certainty what previous wrong could have been the reason for this, I cannot but be at a loss to explain what could have been so important as to cost the empire so many men. But in our case, there were just as many victories and those conquered survived and were transformed into something useful. So that in this way, too, just as earlier estimate prove accurate when we weighed the matter earlier in the oration, the divine talent was increased. And why would these people not risk even their lives on behalf of the lands of the Romans from then on, people who, though facing the prospect of death at every turn, were instead granted their lives by the emperor, in addition to which they were lavished abundantly with the means to support themselves? These were in any case men roused to battle not just by an emperor’s sounding the war cry of Ares but also when he himself led the charge and tried to seize the laurels of victory.

For one could, actually, compare the emperor’s calls to battle with the eloquence of Tyrtaios, or with the musical harmony of Timotheos. Of these two, the former is reputed to have been so adept at rousing men to war that he was perfectly capable of stirring them to their death; for his part, Timotheos incited such delirious passion for battle one time in Alexander the Great while singing his praises, that he convinced him to make a dash for his weapons, as though war itself was at hand. Once his passion had been aroused in the pursuit of something, he resembled a flash of lightning, and set upon his task like fire making its way through a forest. And these things, too, surely are well known. Indeed, it is clear that the man being praised here had no rival in courage, at least to all those whom the emperor made himself known to (across the entire world – at least the inhabited part of it – our neighbours were aware of his courage as well, as was the rest). He was hailed emperor in every part of the world and there was no part of the habitable earth where he was not known for his bravery. But who could go into greater detail about his acts of bravery, pressed for time like this? These things, too, would require whole books. But who would ask or demand from us now to write a book?
67 Ἀναμνηστέον τοῦ μεγάλου ἐκείνου πολέμου, ἐν ὕ μόνος ἀπάντων ὡσπερ βασιλεῶν ὑπερείχεν, οὕτω καὶ ἀνδραγαθιζόμενος, ἐαυτὸν τέ σῶζον ἐξ οὕτω μεγάλου μαχῆς κλύδωνος, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς εἰς ἐαυτὸν κατακλίζοντες, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι μὴ καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ὃ Ἑλλην ἐξειμείωσαν σημεῖνειν τὸν ἀπώτατον. 

Τὸ δὲ βάρβαρον, τότε τὴν Ἐλληνικὴν σοφίαν ὑπερανέβη, καὶ θειοτέραν ἑσχήματι παρ᾽ ἑαυτῷ ἐννοιαν, καὶ ἀγγείον τόπων τὸν αὐτοκράτορα προσεβίβαζε, καὶ ἐτὶ ἐπέτρεψεν 

68 Και οὐδ’ ἐνταῦθα πλεῖον ἡμῖν ἔστι διατρίβειν, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ὅς ἀνακινήσει τοῖς ἀκρουμένοις τὴν μνήμην, οὔδε ἄλλος καθεύδουσιν. Οὕτως γὰρ οὕτως ὑπηνόλος ὡς ἀπολεῖαι τὴν ἐν τούτοις ἐγγερίγορον. Ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν, ακμαίος ἦν τὴν ῥώμην, καὶ ἐργα, μέγιστο τέλος ἀπὸ σώματος ἐκεῖνος, εὔφωνου καὶ τῇς στοιχειακῆς κράσεως ἐυχείσας τὸ δὲ εἰσετέ ἐναγχωσα ὡς ἡ τοῦ Κλαυδίου γραυσὶς πόλις ἐνεκαλλωπίσατο, ἀλλὸ τότε βαθύν, ὅτι καὶ στρατηγοῦ ἐργα ἐκεῖνα οὐκ εὐθυνοῦσαν εἰς εὐφωβίαν,

ἀλλ᾽ οὕτως ἐξειμείωσεν τὴν ἑμελείσθαι, καὶ νόσκομειν εἰς ἰδίου, καὶ ἀνακαλέσθαι τὸ τῆς ὑγείας ἀπελθόν—ὅτε καὶ ἠγάφαν πάτρως καὶ σπουδῆς: τῆς μὲν, οὐκ ἔντωσαν ἑαυτοῦ, τῆς δὲ, θνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ. Καὶ ἦν τὸ πλεῖον ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἢ σπουδῆ ἑξελεία τὴν πόλιν. Καὶ ἦν μὲν νοσηλευσάμενος κλίνη αἰρέτο εἰς βαθύν τοῖς βλέπουσι, ἢπος δὲ τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ἐφέρεν, οὐ γυμνοτρόποις, οὐ καὶ μόνον χρεία ἦν ἀνδρὸς καταπάνως, ἀλλὰ μάχης φυτοτόμος, καὶ διατινάσσον τὸν ἐπιβάτην εἰς ἑαυτοῦ, τῆς δὲ, θνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ. Καὶ ἦν τὸ πλεῖον ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἡ σπουδὴ ἑξελεία τὴν πόλιν ἐνεκαλλωπίσατο, ἀλλὰ μάχης φυτοτόμος, καὶ διατινάσσον τὸν ἐπιβάτην εἰς ἑαυτοῦ.
We should recall that great war, in which he excelled over everyone in bravery in the same way as he exceeded all as emperor, saving both himself from so great a wartime tempest and drawing the remaining troops to himself as if to a harbour of salvation. And so it was fitting to liken the disciple of Christ the saviour, the one radiating with apostolic speeches, to Hermes, not because of any great resemblance in their appearance, but because the Greeks had no profounder honour to bestow upon the apostle. The barbarians, on the other hand, surpassed Greek wisdom in this case and conceived a more divine notion for themselves, placing the emperor closer to the realm of the angels, and to a still more powerful nature, on the assumption that it was incongruous to liken the things they had seen to human deeds.

And we cannot dwell on this subject either for very long, except as far as is necessary to stir the memory of the audience, which would not have lain dormant in any case. For no one is so prone to slumber as to lose completely the capacity to be stirred by such events. But back then he was at the peak of his strength, and while he achieved great feats, these were performed by a vigorous body, possessed of a healthy mixture of the bodily elements. But as for his still more recent feats, on the other hand, by which the ‘old woman’ of Claudiopolis was made fair, they were another sort of marvel, since they were the achievements of a general who was not flourishing in health, but who deserved to be looked after and to place himself under medical care, to restore the health he had lost. And there occurred at that point a contest between his physical nature and his zeal, with the one whispering, as it were, to him to take care of himself, while the other told him to sacrifice himself for the common good. And the latter predominated, and his zeal won over his physical nature. And to the amazement of those around him he not only abandoned the sickbed, but the horse which carried the emperor was no mere exercise steed, the only sort of horse a man in his condition should have been riding, but a high-spirited warhorse, which threw its rider into the contest. And once again the general-emperor led the way exuding courage, not as one recovering from illness but as one who has returned after a long rest; and learning that he would be leading a campaign with a few men at arms against many thousands, he showed even greater willingness, making it clear to all that he drew courage from God, wedded to which was also a fierceness which helped carry the burden on our behalf. Accordingly, with his first strike he achieved something no one could have conceived, the downfall of those arrogant enough to meet him face to face in battle, the flight of all those
τῶν ὅσοι προμηθεύτερον ἔσχον τοῦ ζῆν, εἰς πολλὰς μὲν χιλιοστάς κορυφοῦμενοι, κολοβωθέντες δὲ τῷ πλείον τῆς στρατιάς.

69 Ἡ ΥΣΤΑΘΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ ἀγαθόν ἀγαθῶν fort. per err. Tafel 2 μαθήσεως B : μαθέσεως fort. per err. Tafel 215 μαθήσεως B : μαθέσεως fort. per err. Tafel 2

69 Ταῦτα εἰς διάνοιαν ἀνασκάλλοντες, καὶ ὅσα τῇ συστοιχίᾳ ταύτη σύνθετα, οὐκ ἔχομεν ὅπως οὐ διὰ μακροῦ πενθεῖν· καὶ τὸν τάφον περιστάμενοι, τὸν τοσοῦτον καλυττήρα καλοῦ, ἐξαγομέθα καὶ πρὸς οἴκτους οἱ παραμιθείσαι καὶ έτέρους οφείλει ταίς οντες. Καὶ ὣς, φαμεν, ὅποι παρακάττησα τὸ κοινὸν ἦμιν ἄγαθον ὅποι πρὸς αἰσθηθην περιγέγραψα· καὶ πληρῶν τὰ πάντα δαυματος οἷς ἄνθραγαθιζουκ καὶ πληρώσων εἰσέπειτα. Ἔως εἰς δὲ θεὸς ἐπινεύων τοῖς λόγοις, ὁ κάλος λεοντιδῆς βασιλεὺς κραταυθῇ τοὺς ὅνυχας ὡς καὶ ἐμπείρειν ἔχεν τοὺς καθ’ ἡμῶν ἄγαθον θηρίοις. Τέωσ γὰρ, βρυχηθῆν διοικομεύτηται τὰ τοιαύτα βασιλικὰ καὶ σταθεραῖς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ μέλλοντος.

70 Καὶ μὴν ἡ κοινωνίας σοι καὶ βίου καὶ βασιλείας καὶ συνέσεως άκρας μέτοχος καὶ (τὸ πᾶν συνελεί) βασιλεύς οὐτω μεγάλω εἰς συμβίωσιν ἐπιπρέπουσα, καὶ συμπαρε- στὶ τῷ νέῳ αὐτοκράτορι καὶ πάντα οἴδεν οἷς οίκουμεν κατορθοῦτα, τῆς σής ἀπο- ναμενή καὶ μαθήσεως καὶ μιμήσεως· καὶ τὰ διδασκαλία ἐργοις προσιχομένην, οὐκ ἂν, ἔχοι μὴ οἴκτους εἰς τὸ πᾶν κατευθεῖαν τοῦ κοινωφελούς. Ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς καὶ νονοὺς μὲν βασιλικὸν εὕθελομεν καὶ τὰ εἶκενέν ἄγαθα· ποθούμεν δὲ καὶ ὀπλίτην ἄκρας σοι, καὶ χεῖρας οὔτω γενναίας, καὶ Αριεῖκον ἀτένισμα πρὸς τὸ ἀντίμαχον, καὶ ἀνδρώδες ἐξάλαμα, καὶ χύνου αἰματος οἰς οὔτε ἐρεί τὸ ἱερομίσθεν ἀγαθωσκειας εὐθυμοῦμενοι.

71 "Εδυς, ὣ μέγιστε βασιλεῦ ἠλί. Καὶ νῦν μὲν ἡ σή σελήνη φωσφορεῖ τοῖς περὶ γῆν Μέλαινα μὲν τῷ τε πενθήμω ζῷῳ καὶ τῷ προφαινομένῳ διὰ, καὶ καλὸν καὶ φεραυγές ἀπαστράπτουσα τοῖς βασιλείας δέθεν καὶ καθ’ ἡμῶν οὗτος ἄγαθος ἐμπείρειν τοὺς καθ’ ἡμῶν ὀργῶσι θηρίοις. Τέως γὰρ, βρυχηθήν εἰς διάνοιαν ἀνασκάλλοντες, καὶ ὅσα τῇ συστοιχίᾳ ταύτῃ σύνθετα, οὐκ ἔχομεν ὅπως οὐ διὰ μακροῦ πενθεῖν· καὶ τὸν τάφον περιϊστάμενοι, τὸν τοσούτος καλυττῆς καλοῦ, ἐξαγόμεθα καὶ πρὸς οἴκτους ὑπὸ τοιαύτῃ καὶ τῶν μακρῶν πόνων ἀνάπαυλαν· ἐδει τοὺς μακροὺς καμάτους παύσαντα, καθ’ ὑπὸ φωτὶ διάγει ἐκατέρωθεν δε ναϊκεῖται διὰ πιθανοῦ στῶν ὑπὸ σελήνης συστείλας, ὁ θεὸς καὶ τὸν ἄγαθον ἠλί τοῦτον εἰς ὅσον μήκιστον, καὶ τὸ καλὸν οὐρανὸν καθ’ ὑπὸ νῦν· ἔδει τοὺς μακροὺς καμάτους παύσαντα, καθ’ ἐμπείρειν τοὺς πλεῖστος αἰματος τοῖς βασιλείας εὐθυμοῦμενοι.

72 Ω τάφος, τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπάνθισμα κρύψας ὁ τῆς φύσεως ἀπάνθισμα κρύψας ὁ τῆς φρονήσεως πλάτος συ- στείλας, ὁ συγκλείσας τὸν ἀεικίνητον, αὐτοκράτορι· οὐκ ἔδει τοιαύτῃ τῷ βασιλεύ ἀποτελεύθην τῶν μακρῶν πόνων ἀνάπαυλαν· ἐδει τοὺς μακροὺς καμάτους παύσαντα, καθ’ ἐμπείρειν τοὺς πλεῖστος αἰματος τοῖς βασιλείας εὐθυμοῦμενοι.
who were more inclined to save their lives, their numbers rising to the many thousands, amputated from the majority of the army.

And as we recall these things by delving into them, as well as all the things which might be included in this catalogue of his achievements, we cannot help but mourn for a long time. And standing round his tomb, the covering of so good a man, we, whose duty it is to console others as well, are ourselves driven to laments. “Oh,” we say, “our common blessing, where have you ended up? What sort of place are you physically confined to, you who filled the world with wonder, through your feats of bravery, and will continue to do so in the time to come?” But until such time as God shall give his assent to our prayers, may the beautiful lion-cub emperor grow strong claws, so he may sink them into the beasts raging against us. Until then, such things are managed by means of the imperial lion’s roar and by the firm indications of what is to come.

And indeed your partner in both life and imperial rule, a woman of the highest intelligence, and (to sum up) one well suited to a common life with so great an emperor, both stands at the side of the young emperor and she knows everything by which the empire may continue to flourish, having had the benefit of your teaching and example. And demonstrating with her deeds the lessons she has learned, she could not but achieve the common good in everything. But while we want both the understanding necessary to imperial affairs and the good things which flow from such knowledge, we nevertheless desire a warrior like yourself, with courage in arms like yours, and Ares’ stern look towards our foes, as well as the manly readiness to leap into battle, to spill streams of blood with a sword held by imperial hands.

You have set, oh greatest of imperial suns. And now as your moon illuminates those on earth, though cast in black by her mournful gloom as well as by her outward appearance, she nevertheless radiates brilliant goodness with her God-given imperial loveliness and may she shine forth, not like the late setting stars, but as one which never sets, if in fact we may hope for such a thing. And may God grant that this sun, too, should go on as long as possible, and that the good to us be thus multiplied, and that we may live our lives under the light from both sources which knows no other succession than the one ordained by nature.

Oh tomb, you have hidden away the bloom of nature; you have enfolded the breadth of practical wisdom; you have confined the man who was ever on the move; there was no need for the emperor to end his days with such a rest from his long labours. He should have ceased his great exertions and remained at rest,
Η ἰδρύτας ἰδρύσασθαι τοὺς ἱδρῶτας ἀποψήσασθαι, καὶ βίον διατελέσαι ῥᾴδιον εἶτα, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐμφρονίαν ῥαστώνην καὶ ἄλυπον καταστάσεως. 'Ο δὲ, χθές τούτων πάνω πάνω πολέμων παγκρατιάζων καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀνεθεσθείς ἐφ' ὅσον στεφανώσητε, ἀφήκε μὲν τὰς πέρι γῆν στρατιάς καὶ δυνάμεις, τῶν δὲ ἀνώτατω γέγονεν.

5 Ὁ κράτιστε βασιλεὺς, ὃς καλίστε μὲν προφανῆναι, ἀριστεὶ δὲ πράξει, εἴπειν δὲ ἡδιστείς: τῇ πολιτικῇ καὶ συναπόκρυψατε Σεπτός ό κατὰ σὲ τάφον, τοσοῦτον ἔσω κατακραύσαν ἄνδρα, ποτὲ ὑπάρχαρας τὸ αὐθεντικόν ἀνάπτυσεν, πικρὸς ὁ τάραξας ἀπαγωγὴν ἀποκρυψάμενος εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἵνα καταφέρησιν. Ἡ δὴ τίς ἱδρῶτας οἷς ἐπὶ σύμβουλον δραμεῖται τούτων, ἐκφράσεως οὐ μέν ἐπὶ ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱδρῶτας τῆς θεοεικέλου σου μορφῆς καὶ τὴν Ἀρείας σκεύην ἀποθέμενος ἔμφρονα ῥαστώνην: ποτίστης ἐπὶ τῆς καταφάβησιν τῶν ἱδρῶτας τῆς θεοεικέλου σου μορφῆς καὶ τὴν Ἀρείας σκεύην ἀποθέμενος ἔμφρονα ῥαστώνην οὗτος τὰ πλείον τῶν ἱδρῶτας ἀποψήσασθαι καὶ βίον διατελέσαι ῥᾴδιον εἶτα, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐμφρονίαν ῥαστώνην καὶ ἄλυπον καταστάσεως. Ὁ δὲ, χθές τούτων πάνω πάνω παγκρατιάζων καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀνεθεσθείς ἐφ' ὅσον στεφανώσητε, ἀφῆκε μὲν τὰς περὶ γῆν στρατιὰς καὶ δυνάμεις, τῶν δὲ ἀνώτατω γέγονεν.

13 ἦν γὰρ ἀλήθιος τοὺς ἀεὶ καὶ ταρβήσαι καὶ τραπέσθαι εἰς φυγήν ἐφεμενεῖς· εἰ δὲ καὶ πίπτειν, ἀλλὰ τὸ στρατικὸν χείρος βασιλικῆς ἐργον, δρομούμενος ἐστιν ἃν εἰς ἀξίωμα λύχνην τῆς βαρβαρικῆς στρατιάς ἐν πυκνότητι λάσιν· οἷς καὶ βραχεῖς τι πάντως ἀπαγωγὴν ἀρτοῦ καὶ βελῶν καὶ τραυμάτων ἀπαγωγὴν, ὃς εἰς βάθος ἐντετηκυίας τὰς οὐλὰς καταφέρησιν, ὡςν νῦν διὰ τέλους καὶ ἀπαγωγήν ἀρτοῦ καὶ βελῶν καὶ τραυμάτων ἀπαγωγήν, ὃς εἰς βάθος ἐντετηκυίας τὰς οὐλὰς καταφέρησιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ στρατικὸν χείρος βασιλικῆς ἐργον, δρομούμενος ἐστιν ἃν εἰς ἀξίωμα λύχνην τῆς βαρβαρικῆς στρατιάς ἐν πυκνότητι λάσιν· οἷς καὶ βραχεῖς τι πάντως ἀπαγωγήν ἀρτοῦ καὶ βελῶν καὶ τραυμάτων ἀπαγωγήν, ὃς εἰς βάθος ἐντετηκυίας τὰς οὐλὰς καταφέρησιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ στρατικὸν χείρος βασιλικῆς ἐργον, δρομούμενος ἐστιν ἃν εἰς ἀξίωμα λύχνην τῆς βαρβαρικῆς στρατιάς ἐν πυκνότητι λάσιν· οἷς καὶ βραχεῖς τι πάντως
to wipe off the sweat, and to live out his life with greater ease and pass over to one of wise tranquility free from distress. But the one who only yesterday competed in the contests of war, and rested only long enough to be crowned the victor, has left behind the terrestrial armies and forces while joining those on high.

Oh most powerful emperor, most beautiful in appearance, most accomplished in deed, pleasantest speaker. Why have you hidden yourself away, hiding with you such virtues as well? Venerable is your grave, hiding such a man within, of whom our entire world is not worthy. Bitter is this grave, having snatched from us all such sweetness. And seeing it now, one runs to it as to a beehive, intending to gather the honey within; but he will leave having drawn bile, stung by the needle of bitterness and grief, and from it he will harvest tears. And he will shower himself with these same tears without restraint. Oh gravestone, hiding within yourself that precious gem.

For truly one could see that as soon as he charged the enemy he both terrified and turned them to flight, aiming always at the front ranks. And if they did fall in battle, it was by the emperor’s own hand, felling the thick ranks of the barbarian army like thickets of wood by an ax. The ones who had just had a reprieve and regained some strength, having rid themselves of the arrows and injuries whose deeply struck scars they still carry, are nevertheless unable to rejoice completely. They are deprived of the source of their delight, this great and unexpected miracle, even more so the departure of the archetype in whose image they wished to depict their ethnic leaders. For each man preferred to come to his own conclusion in this regard. And the opinion that they would not be suffering as badly as they were if such a general had been in charge of them, was well founded. Instead they would have won every battle, and would have been credited with being undefeated. For they agreed on this much, that the emperor did not govern by folding and unfolding his arms in idleness. Most times he dared to confront danger, demonstrating the strength of his hands, shielded by his victories. Indeed, the jaws of war often tried to gape at him as well in a bid to kill him. And he strove
φιλόνεικος ἤν, ἐπαληθεύσαι κάνταθα, ως ἀρα ὁ πόλεμος ἐν ἀνδράσι τὸ κρείττον ἅει ἐπιλέγησθαι αἱρέσθαι. Κίνδυνοι γονύν ἐν ποταμοῖς, κίνδυνοι ἐν ἐφόδιοις, κίνδυνοι ἐν λόχιοι, πλείονες ἐν σταδία μάχη, οὐκ ολίγοι ἐν πολιορκίαις· καὶ ὡς ἐν συναιρέσει φάναι, μυριάχου κίνδυνοι, εἰς τῷ τοῦ διάτωροφρονοῦντες. Επεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔπρεπε τοιαῦτης φύσεως κατακαυχήσασθαι σίδηρον, μηδε πεσεῖν αἰ- ματι περιφερένιν τὸν πολλὰ τῶν ἄλλοφθων θέαντα, ἵνα µή καὶ τὶς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀρτί τὰ ἔργα τάδε γενέσθαι σκώψειε, πίπτει κατὰ φύσιν µηδὲν τῶν ἄπαντων κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ δοὺς ἐναβρύνασθαι ὁ εἰςαἴ νικήτης, καὶ ὑποτὴν τὸν μακρὸν µὲν µακαρίως δὲ αὐθίς ἐγέρσιμον· αὐιοίµας µὲν τὸν πρῷην βίου, αὐιοίµας δὲ εἰσέπτελεν τὸν πρὸς τῷ τέλει, ὅτι καὶ βασιλείας ἑκένος αὐτῶν ἐπεβίβασεν ἡς εξαίσιαν τὸ ἀτελεύτητον. Τίς δὲ οὐκ ἂν ἐν τοιαῦτῃ κρίνει πρὸς θάµατος, ὅτι καὶ τὸν βίον ἤδη ἀποµετρῶν, καὶ πρὸς τῇ τῆς ἐν θνητότητι φύσεις εἶ καὶ µήπω ἐδεῖ τὸν τηλικοῦτον, πρὸς τῇ τῆς ἀνωθεν κλήσεως ἀείρασθαι καὶ τὸ σώµα µὲν ἀνάγκην ἔχων παρατίθεναι τῇ γῇ, τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τὸν ψυγιστόν ἀκούειν ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀντίληψε ταπεινὸν καὶ τοῖς σωληνωσάνναι αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀντέχειν· Μάχης γὰρ ὑπὸ ἀπασία, ὑπορείου ἐλήλατο· κατήπειγε, δὲ οὐδ’ ἄλλο ὑπὸ τὸ τι ἀπάντων, εἰς πόνον μείζονα. ἦρας τοῖς τεναυικοῖς ἐρρίπτε, τῇ τοῦ Ἡρακλεῖος σεμνοῦτο, ἑποχορίζομενος μάχην ταύτην ὡς ἐν γυμνάσματι. Τοῦ βασιλικοῦ δὲ τὸν ὑπένδοντος, κατὰ συγχάρα αὐθίς ἀναπτάλας ἐγίνετο τότε. Καὶ ἤ νόσος µὲν, ἤσυχαξεν προὐτέρπετο, ὣ ἀ ειρετε τῶν ἀρχιτόν ἐργῶν ἀπεχθείκετο· καὶ πῶς αἰώνιος αὐτὸν περίτρεχεν εὐρεθεῖν µὴ εἰς τὸ πάντ ἐγρηγοροῦτα ὁτε κληθήναι δεήσει. Καὶ τοῖς τῷ τοῖς ἂπασι εὐκταῖοι, οῖς µέτεστι τοῦ πρὸς ὅθον φρονήσεως ἑσταθα, ἔξηρκε σεµνῆ καὶ εἰς τῶς τοῦ ἀπεληλυθέναι εἰς τὸν πεποθηµένον θεόν, ἑαυτοῦ ὅν εἰς τῷ τᾶντο τῆς τελείεν· στέλλων πρεσβείας· ἐπιστέλλων ὅποι ἐχρῆν· χρη- µατίζον τοῖς µυριαχόθεν πρέσβεσι· δηµηγορῶν ἐµβριθῶς, ἀ δὶ τις ὑ νοµῶσι αὐν ᾄδῃ  ἀοίδιµος μὲν τοῦ τῶς βίου, ἀοίδιµος δὲ εἰσετι πλέον τοῦ πρὸς τῷ τέλει, ὅτι καὶ βασιλείας ἑκένοις αὐτῶν ἐπεβίβασεν ἡς ἐξαίσιον τὸ ἀτελεύτητον. Τίς δὲ οὐκ ἂν εἰς τοὐταίον, οἰς µέτεστι τοῦ πρὸς ὅθον φρονήσεως ἑσταθα, ἔξηρκε σεµνῆ καὶ εἰς τῶς τοῦ ἀπεληλυθέναι εἰς τὸν πεποθηµένον θεόν, ἑαυτοῦ ὅν εἰς τῷ τᾶντο τῆς τελείεν· στέλλων πρεσβείας· ἐπιστέλλων ὅποι ἐχρῆν· χρη- µατίζον τοῖς µυριαχόθεν πρέσβεσι· δηµηγορῶν ἐµβριθῶς, ἀ δὶ τις ὑ νοµῶσι αὐν ᾄδῃ
for victory, thereby confirming here as well, that war does indeed select the most valiant men to carry off. There were, at any rate, dangers in fording rivers, dangers in assaults, dangers in ambushes, even more in close combat, and not a few in sieges; in sum, there were countless dangers united in purpose with death.

But since it was not fitting that the sword should boast that it had brought down a man of his nature, or that one who had so often spilled the blood of foreigners should fall defiled by blood, lest some barbarian derisively claim to have carried out these acts, he succumbed to natural causes, and the eternal victor did not give any of those arrayed against him an opportunity to gloat. And he sleeps the long sleep, but from which he will in turn rise blessed. And while celebrated on account of his former life, he will be even more celebrated for his final days, since God raised him unto the kingdom whose immortality sets it apart.

And who would not consider it a marvel in such circumstances, that even as he was measuring out his last days, divided between his mortal nature—even if it was not yet the time for someone of his age—and the call from above, with his body on the one hand feeling the need to placed upon the earth, while his soul climbed to high heaven, he was afraid he might not depart this life in a noble way, coming instead to a humble end and suffering in a manner inconsistent with his previous accomplishments? And so while every battle had been driven beyond our borders, there was no urgent matter of any kind for him to exert himself. He therefore hunted young, vigorous beasts, a noble pursuit associated with Herakles, pretending this was a battle, as though he were exercising. As his stamina began to give way, he needed more frequent rests during these hunts. And while illness compelled him to rest, his hand would not cease from valiant works. Perhaps he was overcome by a sense of shame lest he might not be found entirely active and alert when the time came to be called to [by God].

And what is therefore to be hoped for by all, he remained in his right mind until the very end of his departure to yearned-for God, in perfect possession of his faculties. He sent out embassies, dispatched letters wherever necessary, gave audiences to ambassadors from every place, declaiming solemnly things which one who wanted to make the point more aptly with proverbs rather than employ garden variety expressions might designate as “from the imperial bedchamber.”
κλίνης βασιλικῆς καιρώτερον παροιμιάζεσθαι θέλων ἦπερ τά ἀπὸ κηπαίας λεγόμενα· ἀπομνημονεύων καὶ ἀνελίπτων σποουδαῖοι πράξεις, τάς μὲν, ἃς νοὺς βασιλικὸς ἐκεῖνος προεβάλλετο, τάς δὲ, παλαιὰς αἰς παραδειγματικῶς ἑαυτοῦ παρέβαλε· διατῶν ὑποθέσεις δὲ ἃν ἀπενθύωνται πόλεις· διδάσκων ἄτε δὴ καὶ ἀνήρ ἀποστολικός, εἰ ποὺ διδασκάλιον τί ἀπορθέησθαι· ἐν δικαιώμασι θεοῦ ἀδολεσχῶν μετὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ· 

—

θεολογίας ἐμβαθύνων λεπτῷ λογισμῷ καὶ θαρρῶ καὶ ὀλίγα μετέχοντι σώματος· τάσσων ἐμφρόνως τά κατ’ αὐτόν· ἐπιτάσσουν μεγαλοφυῶς τά μετ’ αὐτόν· εἰς τέλος προάγων αἱ μὴ φθάσας εὑρετικὰς εἰς ἐντέλες ἡγαγε· δημοσία τε καὶ κατ’ ἀνδρας, ἀξίας ἐμβιβάζων· πλούτους ἐπιβρέχων τοὶς ὅσα καὶ ἡ διψᾶ ἐπιδεομένοις· χρυσάς ἐπιτιθέντων κορωνίδες γράμμασι· σφραγίζων, ἐπισφραγίζων, τά μὲν, ἐκ καινῆς τάς δὲ ἐπεί ἐκείνα κατέβηκε, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησίων φροντίς καὶ προμήθεια ἢ ἡ ἐν γράμμασι· ἀξίας ἐκεῖνας ἐμβιβάζων· ἐπιτασσόμενος· ἐν ὑποθέσεσι δι’ ὧν ἀπευθύνεται πόλεις· διδάσκων ἅτε δὴ καὶ ἀνὴρ ἀποστολικός, εἴπον ἐπεί μετεὶ μὲν τὸ βιώσιμον, ἀποφιλής μὲν τὸ ἔμβιον, γίνεται δὲ τοῦ αἰῶνος. 

—

خدχοῦ που ἡμερῶν ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κορυφαία ἐκρότει περισαλπιγχθείσαν· τὸ πᾶν εἰπὲν, θεμελίους ὕφιστοι τὸν ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προμηθεία ἢ τὴν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν φροντὶς καὶ προμηθείαν ἢ τὴν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κορυφαίαν ἐκρότει περισαλπιγχθείσαν. 

—

τὸ πᾶν εἰπὲν, ἐν δικαιώμασι θεοῦ ἀδολεσχῶν μετὰ τοῦ Αἴαντος· ἐπιτάσσεται· ἐπιτάσσεται· ἐπιτάσσεται· ἐπιτάσσεται...
He described from memory important projects, some which his own imperially inclined mind had proposed, others drawn from the past, which he compared with his own by way of example. He oversaw the regulations by which the cities were to be administered; he offered lessons, like an apostle, whenever instruction of some kind was called for. He meditated on the justice of God by keeping company with the Psalms of David. He plumbed the divine teachings through subtle reasoning, which I dare say bore little relation to bodily existence. He ordered the affairs around him wisely, and prescribed with great intelligence what should be done after his passing. He made plans for the completion of projects he had undertaken as benefactor but not already completed; he conferred both public and individual honours; he poured down wealth on all those who stood in need of it like the ground which thirsts for rain; he placed his golden seal on replies to letters pleading for his assistance, sealing and ratifying them. Some of these were new requests, others asked for additional security, including the maintenance and supplies for churches, a thing which only recently their leading church loudly acclaimed, trumpeting it for all to hear. In a word, he built firm foundations for his son the emperor, who would inherit the edifice of the empire, and who was crowned with the diadem even as he was still wrapped in his swaddling clothes, and adorned from infancy with the imperial diadem, so that being an emperor all his life, the will to act as a benefactor proper to an emperor should be familiar to him as he grew up. This way [Alexios II] might thus also augment the divine within himself and a great emperor child might in the end turn into the greatest one, an emperor or emperors; which is a thing vouchsafed to us by revelation and demonstrated in signs which cannot be refuted and which leave no room for doubt.

But in my fervour I have perhaps included matters beyond the subject at hand. For his part, on the other hand, coming to the very end of his life he found everything in a superior state, so that he, too, could say “it is accomplished”, referring to both what he aimed to achieve and the course of his life. And so he has cast off his life and entered upon the lifeless state. And gold which imitates the sun, or the pearl which assumes the guise of light, gemstones burning with brilliance, as well as all those which surpass the full beauty of flowers, are deemed as nothing

κορώνης 21–22 ἤδη τετέλεσται: Ex. Io. 19.28 Μετὰ τὸ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται

Κηνυκτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἂν εἴη διαδοχή. · ἡμῖν ἅπασιν, εὐκταιότατον.

4 πων, ἔνθα τῶν εἰρημένων ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατέθειται δημίας τῆς ἐκεῖ, ποίαν τινὰ αὐτὴν οἴομεθα εἶναι ρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεως μου ἐφέστηκεν ὑπεφαινον μέλασιν, ζοφώσαντες ἑαυτούς, καὶ τῷ τοιούτῳ νέφει ὁμόλογον ὑετόν καὶ αὐτοὶ συγκατέπιπτον καὶ τὸ τοῦ βίου φῶς ἀπολωλεκότες, τὴν ἐντὸς, ἐκτὸς φρονοῦν εἰς ἄπρακτον καὶ τῷ οἰκοδεσποτοῦντι λογισμῷ ἐπιβουλευσάμενος, ἀπελπόθοντος δὲ, τῷ οἴκισκῳ κατακόμμασι ἐπιθέμενος, κατὰ ἐαυτοῦ δεδρακώς.

Καὶ οὕτως οἱ μὲν βασιλεῖς εὐλογίαν τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ λελοιπὼς τῇ τε ὁμοζύγῳ δεσποίνη καὶ τῷ βασιλεὶ τέκνῳ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ ὅσοι τὸ ἱερὸν περιΐσταντο σκήνωμα, συνῆπτο τοῖς ἀνωτάτω τάγμασι καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ παρέστη θεῷ οὗ πρὸς θεραπείαν νῃ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ τέκνῳ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ καταβὰς τὴν ἐν ταπεινώσει ταύτην κατάβασιν, ἀναβέβηκεν οὗπερ ἀνωτέρω οὐ ἐσχάτην ταύτην ἑαυτῷ τίθεται ὁ πολλάκις ὅμοια πεπονθώς οἷς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐνήθλει.
[at that point]. On the other hand, the dark garment meets with approval, which holds out the promise of the day to come, which might stand to reason if it is preceded by daybreak, since the night has no succession. And having submitted himself to such an identity, he renounced the high and comfortable bed, wishing instead that a reed mat be laid down for him to sleep on, and his wish was fulfilled. And a man who had submitted to similar hardship on many occasions when he had triumphed on our behalf made this his final bed, descending to this humble state of self-abasement, he rose up as far as it is permitted for humans to rise. And he reflected upon all those things which a pure and god-like soul does, withdrawing from its body, becoming aware of its impending liberation. He spoke quietly, and after hearing all that he needed to from those nearest to him, he was released from his bond; or rather, he did in fact truly depart on the journey, having bid farewell, which is in truth a most blessed thing and intently prayed for by all us human beings, at any rate. For to lie there breathing, imprisoned in silence, not even able to think for oneself, this might truly be called death. Still, to make the journey still able to speak such things as a man remembers fondly, able to think clearly, this could certainly be called a journey, itself a most blessed thing. And even if it is death, it will not cheat such a man of his mental ability even a little, or rob him of any part of his lifetime, or confine a man's intelligence to idleness, plotting against the mind which hosts it, but in assaulting the departing man's shell alone, death undermines himself.

And in this manner he gave his final blessing from God to both his conjugal spouse and to his imperial son, as well as to all the others who were standing around the divine body of the emperor. He joined the ranks of heaven, taking his place at the side of all-ruling God, in whose service he always governed the empire. As for the city—you would not have said it was the dwelling place of people possessing a voice; no, they would have preferred to no longer exist. Their foundation having collapsed, they, too, fell with it. And having lost the light of life, they showed outward the gloom inside of themselves, donning dark clothing, raining down a shower of tears corresponding to such a dark cloud. And they would have perished altogether had they not seen that site of the foundation being readied, our emperor and empress, the most divine pinnacle, who hold up...
τοῦ κράτους ὁ ὑπόφη τιμᾶν ὑπανέχουσιν. Οὔς καὶ εἰς συντήρων παγίως βεβηκότας ὁ μέγας οἰκοδόμος θεός, ὁ μὴ μόνον πόλεις οἰκοδομῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ πηλοποιοῦν πλάττων εἰς τὸ στερέμνιον, καὶ οἰκους ὁστῶς οἰκοδομῶν τοὺς τέ ἄλλους τοὺς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς μεγίστους οἱ πρὸς ἀλεωρῃν παντὸς κακοῦ τοῦ ἐν κόσμῳ ἄναψομήνρημα—τοὺς βασιλεῖς λέγω, ἐν οἷς τὸ κορυφαῖον οἱ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, ἄν τής εὐεργεσίας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἡ ἐβαλβίδων τοῦ τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας δρόμου ἀναυπαπλάμεθα λαβόντων μὲν ἐκεῖθεν τὸ τὸ παντὸς ἐνδόσιμον, προσεπαυξανόντων δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον τὸ ἐξομοιοῦν θεῶς τῆς εὐεργεσίας τάλαντον. ὁ δὴ αὐτὸς ἐκείνος ἃς ἀγαθοῖς οἰκονόμοις παρέθετο, θέλων ἐπιπλέον χεθήναι τὸ ἀγαθὸν κατὰ θείαν μίμησιν καὶ εἶναι πλεῖον τὰ εὐεργετούμενα καὶ γε τὰ εὔερ(γε)τήματα.

Ὡσιωσάμην τὸν λόγον, ὡ μακαριστὲ βασιλεῦ εἰς ὅσον ἐπεμέτρει καιρός. Εἰπεῖν γὰρ εἰς ὅσον καὶ δύναμις οὐκ ἂν ἀληθές ἀπελεγχθεὶ μοι ἐνδαψιλευσαμένῳ καὶ χρόνον έοικότα καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀδείας καλὸν. Απέστω δὲ νέμεσις.


11 εὐεργετήματα: (γε) suppl. Tafel εὐεργετήματα B
the roof of the state for us. May God the great builder preserve them on a steady footing. For he not only builds cities, but if he should not guard them, then their guards lose sleep in vain. But he also creates structures out of clay, building shelters in this way, those who walk among mankind; especially the greatest ones who are raised up as a bulwark against every evil in the world – I mean the emperors, among whom our own are the summit, whose patronage we are suffused with right from the starting gate of their imperial career. They took their cue from Manuel regarding all imperial affairs, but they increased even further the talent of good works in likeness to God, which he entrusted to them as good stewards, since it was his wish that this virtue should be dispensed in ever greater quantity in imitation of the divine, and that the number of both the beneficiaries as well as the benefits themselves should increase.

I have fulfilled the obligation of this oration, oh blessed emperor, to the extent that I could in the time available. For to say that I said all that I might have would have been proven false even had I been able to lavish both the appropriate time and enjoyed the license to do so. May Nemesis stay away!
COMMENTARY
Τοῦ αὐτοῦ: a reliable indication that the titles were composed in tandem with the production of the manuscript. αὐτοῦ, however, does suggest that there may have been room for another author, either in the original or the target manuscript. Commissioned copies might have had the author’s name inserted into the title if the preceding work was not by the same author. Occasionally this was overlooked, leaving modern scholars to puzzle out the identity of the rightful author, as happened with Gregorios Antiochos’ μονῳδία for Manuel, seemingly attributed by a scribe’s oversight to Michael the Rhetor in the manuscript (Scor. Y.II.10) and faithfully reproduced in *Fontes Rerum Byzantinarum*, eds. W. Regel et N. Novossadsky (Petropoli, 1917) 191–228. It is worth asking whether we would know that Eustathios composed the Επιτάφιος had it been similarly copied without his name into a collection by diverse authors.

τὸν ἀοίδιμον ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεῦσι: still strongly attached to the formulas of an archaic culture of renown through song, ἀοίδιμος was frequently employed in Byzantium. ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεῦσι was common in commemorative texts for emperors, at least those whose piety earned them a place among the saints; cf. *Synax. Const.* mens. Maii 29,3: Μαθὼν δὲ ταῦτα ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεῦσι μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος; Io. Geom. *Carm. hex. et eleg.* (ed. E.M van Opstall, *Jean Géomètre: Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques*, Leiden-Boston, 2008) 80.1: τίνας ἁν εἴποι λόγους ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις βασιλεὺς κύρι ὁ Διοκλήτιος, ἀποτεμνομένων τῶν εἰκόνων αὐτοῦ. It is surprising that the two only rarely appear as part of the same phrase; cf. Eust. Or. 18 (Λόγος Ρ) 294.5: Διάκονός τις ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς τῷ δεομένῳ ἐφημερίας προσηνέχεθαι ὁ παρὰ τὸ δέον κεμιλίοις ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρίδας ἀοίδιμον κύρι Λουκᾶ. With some notable exceptions like Constantine I, it was the office of emperor, not the man, who was consecrated. Cf. O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell. Vom oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken*. 2. Aufl. (Darmstadt, 1956) 40–44, nn. 54–56.

οὐ τυχόντως μεθώδενται, ὁ πεπαιδευμένος διακρινεῖ: the requisite meaning of μεθόδευω here derives from the sense “to do something in a systematic fashion” as applied to composition (LSJ, s. v. μεθοδεύω). E. uses μεθοδεύω in the Παρεκβολαί to designate the poet’s handling of the full range of choices involved in composition, from the arrangement of the narrative elements to what we might broadly define as style, cf. *Comm. ad Hom. II*. 1.401.4–5: έτι δὲ καὶ εἰς ψυχαγωγίαν ἄκροστον καὶ λέξεων δὲ πολυωνυμίαν ἀκριβοὶ καὶ ἄλα μυρία μεθοδέει. The word had acquired the technical sense of the specific rhetorical means
to achieve particular literary qualities, including choice of diction, motifs, arrangement, and other elements of style, cf. Hermog. Περὶ ιδεῶν λόγου 1.6; cf. etiam Greg. Pard. Scholia 7.2 (ed. C. Walz, Rhetores Graeci, Stuttgart, 1834) 1090: Σκοπός ἐστι τῷ Ἑρμογένει διδάξαι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ πραγματείᾳ, πῶς τεχνικῶς ἐν λόγω μεθοδεύσομεν ἐκαστὸν ἀν χρήζομεν, ἢ γενοῦν σχημάτων, ἢ ἄλλων χρησίμων εἰς ῥητορείαν. While πεπαιδευμένος never lost its association with what might be characterized as “civilized” conduct (cf. Isocr. Panath. 30), its most common Byzantine usage was that of “well educated” and “cultured” (LSJ s. v. παιδεύω, II). The author of the title employs it to designate the most likely prospective reader of such a text outside of its occasional setting. The “educated” in this case is someone interested in the compositional artistry of the text, its method. While many had incentives to become educated, those seeking to study an oration of this kind with an eye to its formal and structural qualities made up a more limited potential audience and would have come from the same ranks as Eustathios himself had when he began his career as a rhetor and teacher. The reference is significant in as much as it demarcates the secondary audience whose potential interest ensured the survival of the oration.

διακρίνει: the manuscript clearly reads διακρίνει, which suits the sense. In the notes to his translation, Tafel prints διεκκρίνει, an unknown form, probably as a result of error since he translates wird der Gebildeten wahrnehmen. διακρίνω appears frequently in E.’s surviving corpus, including at least 3 examples of the contract fut. διακρίνει: cf. Comm. ad Hom. II. 1.369.22; Comm. ad Hom Od. 1.33.18; Or. 5 [Λόγος Ε] 61.6. There are no extant examples warranting consideration of διεκκρίνω.

Πολλῶν γὰρ ἄλλως γραψάντων: besides a funerary poem by Io. Tzetzes (P. Matranga, Anecdota graeca, II 619–622) we possess one other funeral oration for Manuel I Komnenos, a μονῳδία (Scor. Y.II.10 = Andrés 265), ff.15v-23r81 in W. Regel, Fontes II, 191–228) by Gregorios Antiochos, himself a former student of Eustathios. Antiochos’ eulogy appears to have been initially composed for the funerary commemoration customarily held 40 days after burial (Regel, Fontes 191.15 ἐν τῇ τελετῇ τῶν τεσσεράκοστῶν) but was delayed and actually delivered some months later, at a different occasion, which made its sorrowful tone untimely. Given the large number of surviving panegyrics for Manuel –Magdalino, Empire 414, counts over seventy– it is not hard to imagine that multiple funerary texts, not all of them necessarily orations, were either commissioned or composed at the author’s will for the commemorative ceremonies marking Manuel’s death. E.’s Πολλῶν…γραψάντων was therefore probably not hyperbole. Like the
rest of the title, this too may derive directly from the contents of the oration rather than from the historical circumstances in which it was composed. Thus in Ἐπ. 2, E. refers to other rhetors having already bestowed praise on the deceased emperor as what prompted him to deliver an oration himself, suggesting a kind of *agon* among the capital’s orators. The mention of this in the title –the effort to make one’s oration stand out– provides an important clue to the anticipated audience of the manuscript.

主管 *πρὸς διαφορὰν ὁ παρὼν ἐπιτάφιος*: for the significance of ἐστρυφνώθη in the title and as part of Eustathios’ critical vocabulary, see the introduction. For the sake of economy and intelligibility, I render the term as “in an intricate style,” though this reflects only part of my broader analysis of Eustathios’ usage and may not find everyone in agreement. It is worth noting that the author of the title expected a prospective reader of the oration to see it as a distinguishing feature of Eustathios’ text.

The expression *πρὸς διαφορὰν* means something equivalent to “in contrast to” or “be at odds / at variance with” and appears to be a late Hellenistic coinage, with no text earlier than Plutarch testifying to its use; cf. Plut. *De frat. amore* 478e (ed. M. Pohlenz, *Plutarchi moralia*, vol. 3, 1929; repr. 1972) φύσις ἀδελφοὺς δύο καὶ τρεῖς καὶ πλείονας ἐποίησεν οὐ πρὸς διαφορὰν καὶ ἀντίταξιν, ἀλλ’ ὅπως χωρὶς χωρίς δντες ἄλληνοι μᾶλλον συνεργώσιν. The author of the title wished to underline that the Ἐπιτάφιος was deliberately composed to be distinguished from the other funeral orations. Sideras, *Byzantinische Grabreden*, 73–74, admits *variatio* within the canonical schemes of Byzantine funerary genres but summarily rules out originality; for a critique of this position, see the review by P. Agapitos in *Hellenika* 46 (1996) 195–205, esp. 199–200.

1 Οὐκ ἦν μοι καραδοκοῦντι… γλώσσῃ λαλεῖν: phrased as an elaborate impersonal construction, the opening sentence displaces the focus from the orator and the *laudandum* to the oration itself. E returns to the composition of the Ἐπιτάφιος again and again, in the self-conscious manner of so much epideictic oratory since antiquity. The feigned apprehension about not being up to the laudatory task was a commonplace of both Greek ἐγκώμιον and Roman *laudatio* intended to inflate even further the rhetor’s achievement. E. could look to precedent for metaphors to describe the encomiast’s task as practically beyond reach: Pind. *Ol*. II, 108–110; XIII, 45–46; Ael. Arist. *Isthm. 3 fin.; Sacr. Or*. I, 2; cf.

οὔτω ταχύ τὸν τηλικοῦτον...λόγῳ ἐξάραι: the rhetor’s complaint about having too little time to give due praise to his subject was a commonplace intended to preempt criticism that the orator had failed to mention some accomplishment or do the laudandum justice by underlining the constraints of time on the speech. E. invoked the limitation again and again throughout the funeral oration, making a rhetorical virtue out of a practical necessity; cf. Ἐπ. 4 καὶ οὖν ἐπιμετρηθήσεται τι χρόνον τῷ κατὰ σκοπόν; Ἐπ. 6 Καὶ τις ἂν, ἐπιμετρήσῃ χρόνον ἁρκοῦντα; Ἐπ. 8 καὶ διεκπεσεῖν τοῦ τε καιροῦ τοῦ τε σκοποῦ; Ἐπ. 11 Δύναμις δὲ τούς καθ’ήμας μεμετρημένοις τὸ λέγειν.

Μικροὶς μὲν χαρακτήρισι...γραφικῆς: the oration acknowledges the rôle of writing in composition. This does not necessarily mean E. was reading from a transcribed copy, though the little visual evidence for recitals before audiences at court in the illustrated Madrid Skylitzes depicts readers reciting from a written text in hand, cf. *The illustrated chronicle of Ioannes Skylitzes in Madrid*, ed. V. Tsamakda (Leiden, 2002) ff. 125v, 128v, 134r, 219v. E. exploits the incongruity between “small characters” used to depict “the greatest [man],” thus further amplifying the theme of the opening, namely, that any speech would be incommensurate to the scale of deserved praise. For this sense of γραφική, see LSJ s.v. γραφικός II, 2., 3.

ἐκτυπώσασθαι...ὑψῶσαι: the infinitival clauses are dependent predicates of τίθεμαι.

μετρίου καιροῦ: Tafel prints μικροῦ, probably as a result of misreading the -ε- before the ligature for –τρ-. The phrase is not common; cf. Zonar. *Vita s. Eupr.* (BHG 631m) 17: Μετρίου δ’ ἐπὶ τούτους παραρρυέντος καιροῦ.

τοὺς ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ ἐγκεκαλυμμένους: in spite of the masc. participle, any mention of veiling would have placed the accent on the markedly feminine inclination to surrender to grief. See M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 2002) 4–24. The reference might derive from such plays as Euripides’ *Alcestis* 1120–1125, whose heroine by the same name is led onto the stage at the end of eponymous play as a ghostly veiled figure. Many of the women in tragedy were depicted as veiled in statues and vase painting. E. may be conflating references to shrouded grieving figures in myth generally with tragedy *per se*. Greek vases were often decorated with scenes from myth or Greek epic in which women mourning are veiled, and the figure was a popular motif for

tó ἐν λόγοις ἀνδρῶδες πεπαρρησιάσται: the sense is that of giving voice courage, which consists of stepping forward and risking falling short of the mark in composing a suitable oration for such an occasion: οὐκ εὔθυβολῆσαι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ σκοποῦ κίνδυνος. The language is reminiscent of Plato *Rep.* 567b3: Οὐκούν καὶ τινὰς τῶν συγκαταστησάντων καὶ ἐν δυνάμει ὄντων παρρησιάζεσθαι καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλους, ἐπιπλήττοντας τοῖς γεγομένοις, οἳ ἂν τυγχάνωσιν ἀνδρικώτατοι ὄντες. E. was well aware of the more politically charged sense of παρρησία under monarchical regimes; cf. Comm. ad Hom. II. 3.381.6: Παρὰ γούν τοῖς Ἀχαίοις παρρησία τοῖς ἡγεμόσι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα πολλή and while the word was routinely used in a non-political sense, Byzantine orators had not entirely forfeited the claim to speak freely at court, even if they rarely exercised the privilege.

ἡ ἐν δέοντι θερμότης: for the claim to being moved to speak, cf. Athen. *Deipnosoph.* 1.1: τοιούτοιν ὁ θαυμαστὸς οὗτος τοῦ λόγου οἰκονόμος Ἀθήναιος ἴδιστον λογόδειπνον εἰσηγεῖται κρείττων τε αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ γιγνομένος, ὡσπερ οἱ Ἀθήνησι ρήτορες, ύπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν θερμότητος πρὸς τὰ ἐπόμενα τῆς βίβλου βαθμηδὸν ὑπεράλλεται.

οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀνδρεῖς: ἀγαθὴ ἐπιθυμία had become a formula to describe monks. Its use in the Septuag. (cf. Prov. 13.12) ensured it a long life as a ready description of those who took vows, apt to the ideal represented by those who turned their hopes and desires toward God, as may be seen in Basil of Cæsaria’s *Lesser Asketikon* or ‘short rule’, cf. *Regul. brev. tract.*, PG 31 col. 1185a: Ἐρωτησίας PNZ’. Ποταμῇ διαθέσει ὁφείλει τις δουλεύειν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ διὸς ἡ διάθεσις αὐτῇ τί ἐστιν; Ἀπόκρισις: Διάθεσιν ἀγαθὴν ἠγούμαι εἶναι ἐπίθυμιαν τῆς πρὸς Θεόν εὐαρεστήσεως φοιδράν. E. is almost certainly referring here to the monks of the Pantokrator monastery, founded by Manuel’s parents, John II Komnenos and Eirene. The *Typikon*, or foundation charter, contains a series of provisions pertaining to the funerary commemorations of the members of the imperial family buried there, including references to the candles and chanting alluded to here. See, P. Gautier, “Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator,” *REB* 32 (1974), 1–145, with text at 27–131: Οὗτοι δὲ πάντες κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τῶν μνημοσυνῶν... συνελεύσονται εἰς τὸν τῆς ὑπεραμώμου δεσποίνης καὶ Θεοτόκου ναὸν μετὰ καὶ τῶν δυναμένων μετακινεύονται ἀρρώστων, ποιοῦντες λειτήν καὶ ψάλλοντες τὸ Μνήσθητί, Κύριε, ὡς ἀγαθὸς τῶν δούλων σου, καὶ τὸ Μετὰ τῶν ἀγίων ἀνάπαυσον καὶ τὸ Πρε-
σβεία θερμή, εἰθούτως ἢν ποιῶν ἐκτενὴ δέησιν καὶ λέγωσι τὸ Κύριε ἐλέησον" τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τὸ Μακαρίσει ὁ Θεὸς τούς κτήτοράς... ἐφ’ ἐκάστη διηλόντι τῶν τοιούτων μνημοσύνων λεύκη, διδομένων καὶ φατλίων μεγάλων ὑπέρ τῶν λιτῶν του ὀλου χρόνου δεκαέξ, ὡστε ἔχειν ταύτα τοὺς πριμμικήριους πρὸς τὸ ἀνάπτεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τῶν λιτῶν.

ἀνάπτουσιν ἅρτι...καὶ λόγου λαμπάδας: the Typikon of the Pantokrator monastery (ed. Gautier, “Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator,” 35) required that during each celebration of the liturgy, the tombs of the imperial family be censed while the monks sang the Trisagion. It made further provision that prayers should be recited for the deceased emperors. On such prayers for the dead, see V. Marinis, Death and the Afterlife in Byzantium the Fate of the Soul in Theology, Liturgy, and Art (Cambridge, 2017) 93–106. In addition to daily liturgical commemoration, the charter also specified the continuous lighting of lamps at the imperial tombs, as well as the regular distribution of charity on behalf of the deceased emperors. ἅρτι suggests that the monks had just finished reciting a prayer for Manuel, perhaps while lighting the candles in the funerary chapel containing the tomb. The time marker places the oration in the precise moment of its delivery, thereby diminishing the rehearsed effect of reciting a text composed in advance. Should we conclude that E. could anticipate so precisely the sequence of ceremony that he could work it into the Ἐπιτάφιος? The text demonstrates once more the importance of collating, as it were, the literary and the liturgical, matching textual to archaeological evidence.

ἀὐτοδεξίωσιν ὀφειλετικὴν: unattested elsewhere, the compound αὐτοδεξίωσις appears to be a Eustathian coinage in the Ἐπιτάφιος (see LBG s.v. αὐτοδεξίωσις). The expression is deliberately self-contradictory, designed to underline that the monks make the required offering of prayers motivated by their very own desire to do so, which proves a fitting dedication to the deceased emperor. Cf. E. A. Congdon, “Imperial commemoration and ritual in the typikon of the Monastery of Christ Pantokrator,” RÉB 54 (1999) 161–99, 169.

Εἴη ἂν ἄγεννής...συνδεξαγόμενος: a relatively rare example of periodic syntax in the Ἐπιτάφιος. The use of the third person is intended to present E.’s decision to compose a funeral oration as observing widely acknowledged decorum. The passage passes from the general to the specific in the last sentence as E.
describes himself having conformed to the principles he has just laid out: οὗδ’ ἡμᾶς ὁ χρόνος εὑρεν ὀκνοῦντας τὰ δυνατὰ ἐγκώμια.

τοιοῦτοις: refers again to the monks lighting candles and chanting hymns on behalf of the deceased emperor.

Μίμησιν... διδάσκαλον: E. appears to cite a pedagogical or ethical maxim regarding “imitation” of exemplary conduct, appropriated here to explain and justify the decision to compose a funeral oration in the wake of others having already done so; cf. Ἐπ. 5: ἔθλω διαθερμανθείς πρὸς μίμησιν. The length at which E. dwells on his incentives to compose the Ἐπιτάφιος suggests he may have been trying to answer questions regarding his own motives. The significance attached to mimesis mirror’s that of E. ‘s argument in an essay on the evolution of hypokrisia from a term describing an actor’s prerogative to the more familiar one of the liar’s pretense to one thing while doing another; cf. Περὶ ὑποκρίσεως (Tafel, Opuscula, 88–98). There E. emphasizes the edifying effects of μίμησις on the ancient Athenian stage of both exemplary and unexemplary behaviour.

σιωπώντων μὲν τῶν ἐλλογιμωτέρων... λαλοῦσι δὲ: E. suggests that he might have remained silent had his most accomplished peers done so as well. Now that they have begun to raise their voice in tributes to Manuel, how can he do anything but add his voice to their chorus? As the former μαϊστωρ τῶν ρητόρων, a post which granted the title-holder imperial recognition as the leading man of letters in the capital, and especially of oratory, E. describes himself being drawn into praise of the emperor by his need to remind audiences of his continued rhetorical prowess. While such motives as peer rivalry and ambition are routinely invoked by scholars to explain the great flourishing and expansion of imperial panegyric throughout the twelfth century, it is perhaps unexpected to find such a frank admission of the rhetor’s true inducement to compose an oration. Or does its inclusion in a text governed by conventions of rhetorical decorum detract from its reliability as an expression of genuine motive? For the standard survey of the relevant genres, see Hunger, Profane Literatur, 120–145. The best description of the professional incentives for rhetors to outdo one another in praise of Manuel remains Magdalino, Empire, 413–489. This was not the first time E. made reference to rhetoric having nurtured him from his youth to the rôle of imperial orator; cf. Eust. Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 203.41–43: καὶ τὴν φίλην χρέπτειραν ρήτορειαν, ἡτις ἐπὶ παιδά με ὄντα καὶ οὐδὲ εἰς ίουλον ἀρτιφυὴ λασιούμε-νον ρήτορα βασιλικὸν παρεστήσατο.

ὁ φθάσας βίος... υστερεῖν λαλιᾶς: cf. Eust. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 266.78–82: Ἀλλ’ ὁ χρόνος εἰς τούτο με περιγαγῶν ὥρας, ὡς μὴ ἔχειν ἐμπλατύνεσθαι τοῖς βασι-
Not composed in a chance manner

λικοῖς τούτοις καλοῖς φειδοὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἐμαυτοῦ δυνάμεως, οίς ἄλλοι μὲν ἐν-
διέτριψαν πρὸ ἡμῶν, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἢκομεν δεύτεροι καὶ οὕτω ἡμῖν μέλον, εἰ τῷ χρόνῳ,
ἄλλ’ εἰ καὶ λόγου δυνάμει, ὡς, εἰ γε λέγειν ἦν ἡμῖν, οὐκ ἂν τὰ τῆς δευτερολογίας
ταύτης ὑκνήσαμεν.

ἡμᾶς ὡς ὀκνοῦντας τὰ δυνατὰ ἐγκώμια: E. had previously underlined his
service to Manuel’s “image”, as Magdalino has aptly described the cumulative
efforts of the court panegyrists to fashion a public persona of the emperor. Cf.
Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 204.65–66: Καὶ οὖτω μὲν τὸν ἐμαυτὸν ἐδικαίωσα μὴ πενιαυτίζειν
τὰς λαλιάς, ἄλλα συχνότερον φθέγγεσθαι καὶ τὰς βασιλικὰς ἀριστείας περικροτεῖν.
Further down (Ἐπ. 4) E. reiterates his obligation, as he see it, not to remain si-
lent in such circumstances but to speak up, as he was wont to do: μηδὲν οὖν σι-
γαν χρῆναι, ἄλλα τι λαλῆσαι, ὁν ἐθάδες ἦμεν.

ὅποι γὰρ ποτε παρήκοι: the optative παρήκοι is iterative (Smyth 2340a);
there is also a discernable alliterative effect in the quick succession of –π with –οι
at the end of the first and last word of the short clause. Such small acoustic ele-
ments accumulate over the course of the oration.
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περιόντος μὲν...ὑποποτος ἡ χάρις: as the citations in the apparatus illustrate,
E. combines two ideas: the ethical topos that kindness or favour shown to some-
one present is motivated by shame or social obligation, and is therefore subject
to suspicion of disingenuousness. A narrative and paraenetic discourse in antiq-
uity cautioned against the perils of flattery at court, e.g. Plutarch’s “How to Tell a
Flatterer from a Friend,” (Plutarch, Moralia, 48e-74e). E. cleverly turns what
ought to be a weakness of imperial panegyric, its perceived insincerity, into a
supposed strength of his funeral oration by stressing the absence of the deceased
and the purity of his motive in praising Manuel.

περιόντος μὲν...απελθόντος δέ: sc. τοῦ Μανουήλ.

ὅποι τὰ κρείττονα: the plural of τὸ κρέιττον was used in Late Antiquity by
Christian authors to refer to “higher things” or “higher orders of being”; see
Lampe s.v. κρέισσων, 3. a, c. This meaning was derived directly from its earlier,
pagan sense of “the Almighty” or “Providence” found in the Corpus Hermeticum
and the Epistles of Julian; see LSJ s.v. κρέισσων.

προθυμεῖσθαι...προθυμίας: a variation on poluptoton, a rhetorical figure
whereby a word from the same root is repeated in different declensions. The al-
literative effect was commonly used by Byzantine rhetors and E. makes frequent use of it here and in his other orations.

χρεῶν ταύτης: sc. τῆς παλαιᾶς προθυμίας, “that old desire”.


νόμοις μὲν λογογραφίας...πολλὰ παραποιοῦσι: announcing his intention to break with the prescriptions of rhetorical instruction (νόμοις...λογογραφίας), E. cites the precedent of paragons of speech-making who violated the very rules they embodied, “when the occasion called for it” (ὅτε καίριον). E. nevertheless cautions against taking too much liberty with the contents of an oration such as this by creating things which have no place in such a text: ἔκτοπα δὲ αὖθις πλάξεθαι γράφοντας, ἀλλὰ τούτο παρανομεῖν ἐν τέχνῃ λόγων ἐστίν, leaving us wondering just what such ἔκτοπα might amount to. The orator, he tells us, must strike a balance between convention and innovation by “select[ing] what is both lawful in encomia and what is most effective under the circumstances”: ἐπιλεκτέ-ον ὅν τὸ τε ἐννομον ἐν ἐγκωμίοις καὶ τὸ ἐν περιστάσεσιν εὐμέθοδον, κατὰ τὴν ἀρ-χιτεκτονοῦσαν κἀν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δεινότητα; this was intended, according to E. to ensure “the most forceful design in cases such as this”: κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιτεκτονοῦσαν κἀν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις δεινότητα. The methodological excursus serves to defend E.’s decision not to dwell on Manuels’ venerable ancestors, as rhetorical conventions mandated, with the added justification that were he to begin listing Manuel’s noble lineage, there would be no time left for the remainder of the funeral oration. The “fathers of rhetorical law(s)” (τοῦ ρητορικοῦ πατέρες νόμοι) did not need to be named since they would have been sufficiently well-known to educated Byzantines. They included the canonical ten Attic orators, as well as an eclectic selection of post-classical authors, like Aelius Aristides and Gregory Nazian-
zus; not, as some assume, the authors of the rhetorical handbooks, who could not be described as having violated the rules since they generally left no examples of their own orations. In contrast, the reference to the “laws of speech-making” would have brought to mind the lessons of the handbooks of the extensive Hermogenic corpus, Aphthonius, and *Menander-Rhetor*, who formed the theoretical backbone of basic instruction in composition. The authority and imprint of these lessons on Byzantine literature, especially on such ceremonial genres as *βασιλικὸς λόγος*, is frequently described in the scholarship as rather decisive. A case by case analysis of funerary orations, for example, or panegyric more broadly, reveals significant departures from the prescribed norms (see the Introduction). It might be argued that such statements were a posture of non-conformism, intended to disarm a cliché-weary audience. In E.’s case, we may acknowledge an abiding preoccupation not with novelty for its own sake but in pursuit of rhetorical effectiveness and aptness to the subject, an approach stressed in his commentaries. The only extensive survey of theoretical instruction in rhetoric in Byzantium remains Hunger, *Profane Literatur*, 75–92. For a more rarefied approach, see Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Thessalonikē, 1973) 27–63. The texts in question may best be considered as a body of instruction in G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Text Books of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Leiden, 2003).

**ἔκτοπα…πλάζεσθαι:** E. appears to be saying that he has no intention to innovate with respect to the contents of the speech, in order to balance his declaration earlier that he does not think it necessary to follow every prescription regarding such speeches to the letter. *ἔκτοπα πλάττω* appears to be a Eustathian coinage, cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. Od. 1.48.38: ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη νῆσος, ἔκτοπος καὶ ἀοίκητος ἀνδράσι πλάττεται.

**ἐπανακαὶ δὲ τελείότης…γένος κοσμεῖ:** E.’s methodological excursus at the top of this paragraph offers a theoretical rationale for his decision to abridge the genealogical account of the deceased’s ancestors. The one surviving handbook with fairly detailed blueprints for the various kinds of speeches, that of *Menander-Rhetor*, places description of the family at the beginning of a funeral oration –presumably in a bid to establish the prestige of the deceased’s bloodline and to show him as a worthy descendant. Cf. *Men.-Rhet*. Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν, 420.10–12: ἐγκωμιάσεις δὲ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τόπων τῶν ἐγκωμιαστικῶν, γένους, γενέσεως, φύσεως, ἀνατροφῆς, παιδείας, ἐπιτηδευμάτων. By a rhetorical sleight of hand, E. implies a family tree of such great accomplishments that it is best left out of the oration, lest it become the main focus of the Ἐπιτάφιος to the exclu-
sion of the task at hand: Κἀν δὲ ἡμής τοῦς κατ' αὐτὴν ἐπέξελθεῖν σεμνώμασιν... ἀνα-
λωθείσης τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν καὶ ἰσχύος καὶ ἀδείας εἰς τὰ μῆ πρὸ ἐργοῦ τῷ γράφοντι.
The expression τριγόνους... γονὰς was not strictly numeric, but referred to a long
and distinguished ancestry which could confer βασιλεία as a birthright; cf. Nic.
Chon. Or. 5.36.15–17: Ὡ γλυκείας ταύτης ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾧ νυμφεύεται βασιλεὺς νέος
νέαν, ὡραίος ὡραίαν, ἀνθοῦσαν ἀνθήν, ὦ ἐκ τριγονίας αὐχῶν τὸ γένος βασίλειον
τὴν Ἐκασάρων Ἰουλίων τὴν γένεσιν ἐλκοῦσαν. In keeping with the inflationary
norm of the panegyrical mode, E. feigns literalism and declares that if Manuel's
pedigree went back just three generations (the exact number for the Komnenian
dynasty up to his time), he might have been able to include their record of
achievement. Instead, Manuel's royal line was adorned by the accomplishments
of a sevenfold ancestry! For all its ideological legitimacy, a good rhetor could nev-
ertheless make the absence of pedigree a strength, as Nicetas Choniates did for
the Angeloi and for Theodore I Laskaris. cf. Nic. Chon. Or. 87.20–22; 55.7–26. For
the genealogy of the Komnenians, see K. Varzos, Η Γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών, 2
vol. (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1984). Relative upstarts from Anatolia in the previous centu-
ry, by the time of Manuel the Komnenians had come to project an image of im-
memorial power and heroism. In Ἐπ. 6, E. retreats from the subject of pedigree,
citing too long a record of accomplishment as his reason for not recapitulating
the feats and reputation of Manuel's ancestors: Γένος μὲν ὡς πολυπραγμονητέον
ἐνταῦθα... οὔπερ ὁ κατάλογος ὑπὲρ τὰ ἡρωϊκά. None of the historians of the
Komnenian dynasty, save perhaps for Anna Komnena, observes Tafel2 (not. ad
loc.) including Bryennius, and Manuel's (self-appointed?) apologist Ioannes
Kinnamos, indulged in such panegyrical hyperbole. But none of these authors
was writing in a patently epideictic, ceremonial genre like the βασιλικὸς λόγος or
the Έπιτάφιος. For an analysis as to how E. presumably arrived at a “sevenfold
perfection” in Manuel's genealogy, see Tafel2, n.4. This was not the first time E.
cast aside genealogy from the received sequence of panegyrical subjects. Speak-
ing in praise of the patriarch Michael III (also known as τοῦ Ἀγγαρέου) on the
occasion of the feast of Lazarus, E. offers various reasons why he will not enter
into the details of Michael's ancestral achievements. See Or. 6 (Λόγος ἡ) 79.47–
58. In light of the rationale for dispensing with genealogy in the Έπιτάφιος, it
becomes clear that E.'s objections were not really contingent so much as pro-
grammatic and formal in nature. He was, however, not alone in his impatience
with the received schema of praise. E.'s senior colleague, Michael Italikos, had
similarly rejected genealogy as befitting his encomiastic subject. See Mich. Ital.
Or. 2.72.9–16.
Not composed in a chance manner

ἐπεξελθεῖν σεμνώμασιν: this sense of ἐπεξέρχομαι construed with the dat. derives from the original meaning of proceed against, pursue, extended to examine carefully, cf. Pl. Georg. 492d ΣΩ. Όυκ ἰγεννώς γε, ὥς Καλλίκλεις, ἐπεξέρχη τῷ λόγῳ παρησιαξόμενος.

5 φυτὸν εὐθαλέστατον αὐτὸ ἀνέβλαστεν: the vegetal metaphor was a common feature of addresses to the emperor, Greg. Antiochos also uses it in his funeral oration for Manuel I, (ed. Regal, FRB, 197/14–19). Images of plant life were widely exploited by twelfth-century writers who had learned the rich metaphorical potential and the means to ‘cultivate’ such imagery in progymnasmata designed to teach students to write in the ekphrastic mode. See the example in A.R. Littlewood, The Progymnasmata of Ioannes Geometers (Amsterdam, 1972). Vegetal imagery like that of the tree became topoi or commonplaces of imperial encomium (see below, Ep. 16: τοῦ καλοῦ φυτοῦ τῆς σοφίας καρπός ; cf. Th. Prodr. Hist. Ged. nos. 1, 7, 13–14, 20) Like so many of the images used to portray the emperor’s virtues and accomplishments, the likeness to a tree “whose shade revived the efforts of those seeking its shelter out of the sweltering labour of life” is largely unassailable because it is at once vivid and imprecise.

Σεμνὸν…ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἑαυτῷ προκαταβαλέσθαι…τῇ βασιλικῇ χρυσά σειρᾷ ἐνδοῦναι ἀρχὴν: the interlaced repetition of key words (ἀρχὴν βασιλείας…βασιλικῇ …σειρᾷ ἐνδοῦναι ἀρχὴν) is a device E. employs throughout the oration. Panegyrical convention enjoined the orator to chronicle the dynastic succession down to the laudandum (cf. Men.-Rhet. 419.15–21), a further sign of the need to constantly shore up the legitimacy of an emperor by pointing to the enduring success of his ancestral line (οὐκ ἀθεμελίωτα τῷ ὑμνουμένῳ τὰ τοῦ βασιλείας). The insistence of the Komnenian clan on their illustrious lineage may be seen in E.’s mention of τῆς χρυσῆς ταύτης σειρᾶς in a letter to his patron and frequent correspondent, Nikephoros Komnenos; cf. Ep. 8.44–45. In the next paragraph, E. explains why he will forego the inventory of Manuel’s eminent ancestry: Γένος μὲν οὐ πολυπραγμονητέον ἐμπεθα. Although he does not name him, E.’s audience would have in all likelihood understood the ruler in question to have been Manuel’s grandfather, Alexios I Komnenos, who usurped power from Nikephoros III Botaneiates in 1081, since the memory of Isaac Komnenos’ short-lived reign in 1059–1061 was not frequently recalled in Komnenian dynastic accounts. Regardless of whether he was technically the founder of the
commentary

 dynasty, everyone credited Alexios with establishing the basis of his dynasty’s dominance or “golden chain” and it is he who answers best to E.’s description of a forefather whose feats were added to and surpassed by his descendant. For the Komnenian family tree, see K. Varzos, Η Γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών Vols. 1–3 (Athens, 1984).
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Τί δέ: for all the obvious preparation in the carefully premeditated eloquence of the oration, E. does not forego the seeming spontaneity of apostrophizing the audience with feigned deliberation about an issue, a rhetorical figure known as aporia. E. sustains the sense of uncertainty about which way to proceed again a little further down: Καὶ τις ἄν ἐπιμετρήσῃ χρόνον ἀρκοῦντα…τοῖς τοῦ κειμένου ἐπεξιόντες θαύμασιν; Both questions are designed to enlist the audience’s sympathy for the orator’s predicament, namely, that should he begin to chronicle Manuel’s upbringing, the audience will soon stop listening to his account and turn to their own memories, each one in effect composing his own distinct oration. Once more E. combines implicit praise of Manuel by rationalizing his reluctance to enter into the details of his achievements.

τὸ ἀκροατήριον…ἐπεξιόντες: the subject of the subordinate clause after ἐνθα is the neuter singular τὸ ἀκροατήριον, construed first with a singular verb, στρέφεται; then in a combined bid for grammatical variatio joined to vivid portrayal, E. conjures the members of the audience as individuals with a series of plural participles and verbs πεπηγότες…στρέφεται…ἐπεξιόντες θαύμασιν…ἐπεξιόντες. Though seemingly unremarkable as rhetorical devices go, variatio is hard to achieve seamlessly.

τὸ ἀκροατήριον…ἐαυτὸ στρέφεται: the claim that the family reputation of the laudandus was such that the audience had no need of an encomium formed part of the panegyrist’s repertoire. Cf. Psell. Or. 2.451–452: καὶ πατρίδα μὲν καταλέγειν καὶ γένος εἰ καὶ τεχνικόν ἐστιν ὑπερβήσομαι, οὔτε γὰρ πρὸς ἀγνοοῦσαν ἀκοήν φθέγγομαι, οὔτε τοῖς ἐξωθεῖν σε σκιαγραφήσαι τὸν καθ’ αὐτὸν ζωγραφούμενον βούλομαι. On the apostrophe to the audience, who are able to compose their own laments based on their individual memories of Manuel’s good works; cf. Eust. Or. 1 (Λόγος Α) 7.63–8.69: Ἀλλὰ τι μοι μακράν ὀδέειν τῷ λόγῳ… εἶτα καὶ ὁ καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐκτίθεσθε μοι τὰ τῶν ἐνεργετημάτων, οἷς ἐδεξιότο ύμᾶς.

ἲν τὰ σεμνὰ ἐστὶ κατανοεῖν τῷ μαθήσεως εὐ ἡκοντι: the periphrasis employing an impersonal construction with εἰμί and a dat. of relation (Smyth,
1495) strikes us as both verbose and stilted. Affectation alone does not explain the resort to such syntax, whose effect must be likened to the language of disinterested observation and general maxims.

οὐ̂περ ὁ κατάλογος ὑ̂πέρ τὰ ἡρωϊκὰ: the plural of ἡρωικός, meaning “having the attributes of the hero(es),” referred to the actual deeds of mythic heroes, and by extension to designate epic, hexametric poetry or “the heroic age,” cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.568.3–4: τοῦ δὲ Εὐριπίδου ἀναχρονίσαντος τὴν τοιαύτην ἱππείαν εἰς τὰ ἡρωϊκὰ. It is not implausible to construe the prepositional phrase to mean “exceeding the deeds of heroes.”

ποτὲ πρὸ ὥρας...περιέκειτο νίκην: whether by design or reputation, Manuel’s youthful proclivity for displays of daring became part of his later “image.” E. appears to be referring to an episode in which Manuel exhibited preternatural courage and military prowess. Kinnamos cannot corroborate the claim since he may have served as E.’s source; cf Epit. re. 1.9. Nicetas Choniates also included an account of the youthful future emperor’s memorable bravery; cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 35.28–38. Both historians underline that Manuel acted without his father’s approval, a point E. exploits to dramatize an important political lesson regarding prudence and self-control. The historicity of the event matters less than the repetition of it as something revealing about the emperor’s formation. The same historians invoked Manuel’s precocious bravery to explain his father’s eventual decision to pass over his older brother Isaac and appoint Manuel as his successor.

πατέρα βασιλέα διδασκαλιῶν...ἐρεθιζόμενον: having explicitly foregone the conventional catalogue of Manuel’s worthy ancestors, E. chooses to illustrate how Manuel’s innately brave character was shaped, or held in check, by his father; a relationship whose formative role E. is keen to emphasize by describing the future emperor as “following in his fathers’ footsteps,” (ἐμβαίνων ἰχνείων, τὰ δὲ καὶ πατρικῶς ῥυθμιζόμενοι). In a passage with distinctly paraenetic overtones, E. dramatizes the tragic flaw in the future emperor: his audacious and reckless willingness to cast himself with heroic fervour into the mêlée, with little thought to his own life sacrifice: πρὸ ὥρας ὑγραῖς ἔτι χερσὶ (καὶ τί γὰρ ᾗ παιδικαῖς) ὁ μὲν κατεθάῤῥησε μάχης (ἦν δὲ οὐ πολλοί, οὐδὲ τῶν γενναιοτέρων), καὶ περιέκειτο νίκην. Kinnamos reports that Manuel was 16 when he took his first prisoners in battle, possibly even the same battle which prompted John II to caution his
son against heedless courage; cf. Io. Kinn. *Epit. re.* 3.3; cf. Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 35.29–38, who gives an account of the episode, which appears to have been the source of stories such as the one abridged into the Ἐπιτάφιος which prefigure Manuel’s daring on the battlefield even as emperor. Indeed the episode feels slightly premonitory, setting the stage for Manuel’s narrow escape from certain death at the battle of Myriokephalon in 1176, against the victorious Seljuk forces, where Manuel’s bravery led to his being cut off and surrounded by the enemy: vid. infra Ἐπ. 62 and 67; cf. Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 183.66–74. The historical conceit of the episode is that it implies that Manuel, despite being fourth in line to succeed his father, was even at this time being groomed for rule by his father; cf. Ἐπ. 62: διαδοχῆς, ἢν θεὸς παραδόξως αὐτῷ διέθετο.

ῠγραῖς ἐτί χερσί: the translation notwithstanding, the dat. in the Greek is likely to be instrumental, “with hands still soft.” For this sense of “moist” or “wet” applied to the limbs, see LSJ s.v. ὑγρός II. The parenthetical statement (καὶ τί γὰρ ἡ παιδικαῖς) is very elliptical and compressed, in keeping with the economy of E.’s style: we should understand a suitable implied verb with the interrogative τί, while the dat. of παιδικαῖς is attracted to that of υγραῖς, even if it would not strictly parallel the construction.

ἤνυσεν ἐπὶ τῷ μαθητῇ βασιλεῖ...καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι παιδευθέντα: a memorably paraenetic passage, dramatized as a reproach from a father to his son, from a sitting emperor to his as yet unforeseen heir. We need not dismiss the possibility of its historicity in order to acknowledge its staged, programmatic character here. Though it stops short of the systematic teachings of a bona fide Fürsten-spiegel or Mirror of Princes, assuming the Ἐπιτάφιος served a current function beyond simply memorializing Manuel through evocative anecdotes, we may ask what was being communicated by the passage, and to what end? Manuel’s father counsels prudence and reminds the young man to check his impetuous desire for glory. Is this an instance of a royal or imperial ethic confronting an aristocratic one? For all his dependence on Komnenian patrons, E. appears ideologically attached to an imperial ideal, as against the narrower interests of aristocratic clans. For the socioeconomic background, see A. Kazhdan and S. Ronchey, *L’ aristocrazia bizantina* (Palermo, 1997) 92–95, 130–133. It is worth recalling that Manuel’s young son, Alexios II, was in the audience, and while he is reported to have been sickly and therefore unlikely to emulate his father’s physical daring, the more important lesson regarding prudence would not have been lost on those advising the designated heir.
συνήγαγε μαθόντα... ἀκούσαντα... παιδευθέντα: while the grammatical subject of the sentence is πατήρ βασιλεύς, the notional subject is in the three acc. participles representing distinct thematic unities of Manuel’s education and upbringing. The objects of his lessons are introduced by means of amplificatio, expanding, dividing, and particularizing each assertion in subordinate clauses short enough not to strain the ability of the audience to follow the syntax within each thematic unity:

(1) συνήγαγε μαθόντα,
(2) μὴ χρῆναι θάλος οὕτω νέον ἀνέμοις ἀντὸ παραβάλλειν,
(3) οἱ έκστρέψαι τῆς εἰς ὀρθὸν στάσεως καὶ ἐπὶ γαῖης ἐκτανύσαι
ισχύουσιν.

(1) ἀκούσαντα τε καὶ,
(2) μηδένα φαῦλον ἀνήρ εἰς ἑαυτὸ παραβάλειν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀεί,
(3) οἱ κρατυνθέντας μὲν πάντα στερρώς καὶ ἀθλοῖς ἐντριβέντας μιρίοις
(4) τάχ’ ἀν ποτε δυσωπηθείη ἢ δυσπρόσωπος μάχη
παναπάλοις δὲ οὕσι ταχύ ἔχανεται,
καὶ ἄπαγάγοι πρὸ ὄρας, μικρὸν ἢ οὐδὲν ὑγιεικότας τὸ
βοηθούμενον.

(1) καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι παιδευθέντα,
(2) ήρέμα τὸ ἐμπρακτόν προσχεθῆ, καὶ βαθμιδοῦν οἷον τὴν ἐν ἀρεταῖς ἀνάβασιν κατὰ εὐτακτουμένην
προσαύξησιν,
(3) ἵνα τῷ τέλειῳ προσβάς, εἴη τῷ κόσμῳ χρήσιμος:
ο καὶ εἰς ἔργον ἐκβίβῃκεν ὑστερον.

δυσωπηθείη ἢ δυσπρόσωπος μάχη: it is worth noting how frequently E. has recourse to such elementary rhetorical devices as simple assonance as we find in the juxtaposition of so similar-sounding words. An uncomplicated rhetorical figure, its appeal to the ear helps it register with the mind and the pleasant effect of its music engages the senses as a scaffolding for the argument.

Ἀλλὰ τί μοι... εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἔξικέσθαι: E. repeatedly offers rationales for not dwelling longer on the formative stages of Manuel’s life, be it his noble lineage or his upbringing in the palace (a subject we should have liked to know more about). Nevertheless, balancing the length of an oration against the desired aim,
to pay tribute to the deceased emperor in a manner befitting his character and reign was the orator’s perennial dilemma and indeed became a *topos* of panegyric, cf. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l’éloge*, 666–667, nn. 37–38, where Pernot cites examples from Plato as well as Aelius Aristides confronting the problem of time within the oration. The elusive proportions between the time available and the scale of the subject, what E. describes as ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς δυνατῇ συμμετρία, can only be achieved by leaving out much that might merit praise in return for having stirred some small measure of reminiscence and awe among the audience: μικρὰν γοῦν τινα τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς ἀνακινῆσαι μνήμην καὶ θαῦμα, τοὺς τῆς εὐγνωμοσύνης καρποὺς.

ὡς ὑπὸ κλεψύδρᾳ...τὸ τοῦ λόγου μετρητέον ὅδωρ: as if to underline the kinship of the Ἐπιτάφιος with ancient oratory, E. mentions the famed water clock, the bane of every ancient orator fearful that he might not make his case adequately before the water had run out from the vessel. Water clocks were used in Byzantium, though not to allot time to speakers. Having begun as a means to limit speeches in the courts, it eventually served to ensure fairness in epideictic competitions among orators. In combination with κλεψύδρα, the characterization of the occasion of the Ἐπιτάφιος as an ἀγών recalls the implicit rivalry cited by E. as having impelled him to compose a funeral oration of his own: μὴ θελοντα τινῶν ὑστερεῖν λαλῆσαι τῆς ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ. Solemnity thus shared the stage with Sophistic contest, a point reiterated in the title, which effectively advertises its formal difference from its rivals. An early variant of later, more accurate, water clocks of the Hellenistic age, the κλεψύδρα became a symbol of an orator’s disciplined effectiveness; for its use in Athenian courts, see P. Rhodes, *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981) 719ff. E.’s mention of the water-clock raises the question of how long the recital of the Ἐπιτάφιος would have taken. Based on estimates for analogous texts, a typical Eustathian oration would have required approximately one hour. Given its scale and occasion, we may assume a more generous allotment of time for the Ἐπιτάφιος. For examples of such calculations, see Pernot, *Epideictic rhetoric*, 82; ibid., *La rhétorique de l’éloge*, 454–460. If the length of the Ἐπιτάφιος seems out of all proportion to a live recital, it is because silent reading paradoxically adds time. We might speculate that Eustathios delivered a less elaborate, less amplified version of the oration at the actual ceremony –though he censures the practice when he praises Manuel’s for not needing to revise his speeches before circulating them. The constraints imposed by time were a *topos* of oratory, serving as an alibi against any criticism that the rhetor omitted some important aspect in the life of the laudandus and
his legacy. The commonplace nature of the motif does not mean that time was not a genuine preoccupation for orators, and E. closes the Ἐπιτάφιος by begging the indulgence of the blessed emperor, noting that he did his best in the time available: Ὡσιωσάμην τὸν λόγον, ὦ μακαριστὲ βασιλεὺ, εἰς δὸσον ἐπεμέτρει καιρὸς.

9 συμβόλων ἐκείνων...ἀ τὴν βασιλικὴν προεδήλου καὶ ἀνάρρησιν καὶ λοιπὴν ὅψωσιν: in the earliest extant oration in praise of Manuel not long after his precipitous accession to the throne, Michael Italikos dwelled at some length on the favourable portents of Manuel’s reign; see Mich. Ital. Or. 4.4.278: τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γενέσεως σύμβολα, τὰ μετὰ τὴν γένεσιν ἢ ἐξωθεὶν ἢ ἐπαχθέντα ἢ φύσει ἐπειδειχθέντα ἢ σπουδὴ συγκατορθωθέντα ἢ θέσθην οἰκονομηθέντα μέχρι καὶ τῆς βασιλείου ταύτης περιωπῆς; the portents were further reiterated by Manuel’s unofficial court historian Io. Kinnamos many years later; cf. Kinn. Epit. re. 23: ἔπει δὲ καὶ Μανουηλ ἔσχατος αὐτῷ γένουτο, φάσεις αὐτίκα ἐφοίτων καὶ συμβόλα βασιλείας εἰς τὸν παῖδα ἐγνωρίζετο, ὅν ἑνὸς ἢ δυοῖν ἐπιμνησθῆναι οὐ μοι ἔδοξεν ἄπο εἶναι καιροῦ. Kinnamos depicts Manuel’s father, John II, justifying his choice of heir by noting the signs; cf. Kinn. Epit. re. 28: εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν καὶ τῶν ξυμβόλων τινὰ ἢ τύχην τὴν παροῦσαν αὐτῷ προὔφαινε, εἴγε μὴ λόγον ἄλλως αὐτὰ νομισθῆναι τοῖς πολλοῖς ἠπιστάμην· οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἐς διαβολὴν ῥᾴδιον ἀνθρώποις ὡς ὀνείρων φάσεις καὶ μελλόντων ὁμφαὶ γίνεται. Politically marked omens and portents were a staple of royal panegyric since Hellenistic times, used to demonstrate cosmic or divine sanction of the ruler. Their inclusion in later Roman imperial encomia is encouraged by the fourth-century epideictic manual attributed to Menander-Rhetor, which deems them so indispensable to praise of the βασιλεὺς that the encomiast should ‘elaborate’ such signs where they exist and should not hesitate to ‘create’ them (presumably when they do not exist) in accordance with what is plausible; cf. Men.-Rhet. 81: ἔστω σοι μετὰ τὴν πατρίδα καὶ μετὰ τὸ γένος τρίτον κεφάλαιον τὸ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως, ὡς ἐκφάνη, <καὶ> εἰ τὸ σύμβολον γέγονεν περὶ τὸν τόκον ἢ κατὰ γῆν ἢ κατ’ ὀφρανὸν ἢ κατὰ θάλασσαν, [καὶ] ἄντεξέτασαν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ῥωμόνον καὶ Κύρον καὶ τοιούτοις τισί. [τὰ] κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν [καὶ] γὰρ κάκεινος συνέβη τινα θαυμάσια, τῷ μὲν Κύρῳ τὰ τῆς μητρὸς ὀνείρατα, τῷ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν λύκαιναν· κἂν μὲν ἢ τι τοιοῦτον περὶ τὸν βασιλέα, ἐξέγρασα, ἐὰν δὲ οἶδα τὸν τῇ καὶ πλάσασαι καὶ ποιεῖν τοῦτο πιθανόν, μὴ κατόκυνε. Byzantine church authorities dating back to the Greek fathers appeared to equivocate, at once rejecting astrology as residual paganism, underscored by the identification of heavenly bodies with the ancient
Greek pantheon, while Christian historians and hagiographers invoked the very same signs as manifestations of Providence and God's will, most notably exemplified in the NT description of the star (interpreted by some Byzantines as a comet) which appeared to the Magi. Astrology experienced a notable revival in the twelfth century, becoming a respectable subject for verses by Ioannes Kamateros and Theodore Prodromos (cf. E. Miller, *Poèmes astronomiques de Théodore Prodrome et de Jean Camatère* [Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale 23.2. Paris, 1872; cf. etiam L. Weigl, *Johannes Kamateros. Εἰσαγωγὴ ἀστρονομίας*, Leipzig, 1908]) prompting isolated though significant criticism from the self-appointed “guardians of Orthodoxy,” to employ Magdalino’s apt expression, including Eustathios, who voiced his scepticism about astrology; see the discussion in *Empire*, 377f. For surveys of Byzantine astrological treatises, see Hunger, *Profane Literatur* 1:269–71. On astrology in Byzantine life in general, see the still relevant discussion in Koukoules, *Βίος 1.2:218–26.*

*ὁ ράσεις...τὸ ἀκροατήριον:* here, perhaps, we get an intimation of E.’s own judgement regarding astrological signs. It is the historical outcome which bears out the truth of things, not the portents or signs of them, for the absence of signs does not diminish the achievement: κἂν εἰ μὴ ἐν συμβόλοις προδηλοῖτο τὰ μεγάλα μέλλοντα...όμως αὐτά πρὸς τέλος οὐδὲν ἔκβεβηκαν. ἐκστήσυ > ἐξίστημι carried the metaphorical sense of “drive one out of one’s mind or senses” (LSJ s.v. ἐξίστημι, A.2). The implication is clear: dwelling on astrological portents and “delving into revelations” (ἀποκαλύψεις ἐμβαθύνας) risks engrossing the audience to the point of distraction. In a lengthy homily on the prayer ‘Lord have Mercy on us’ (*Κύριε ἐλέησον*), probably dating to the period of his Thessalonican bishopric, E. had publicly, if obliquely, dismissed the power of the stars over the course of events, which belonged to God alone; cf. Eust. *Or* 5 (Λόγος Ε) 74.66–71: παντὸς κήδεται κόσμου, πάντων γενῶν, πασῶν ἡλικιών, τέχναις ἅπασαις ἐπιστατεῖν προκαλεῖται καὶ πείθει θεόν· ἀπάγει τῶν ματαίων ἀποτελεσμάτων, ἀφορίζει τοῦ τῶν ἀστέρων ὑμάς καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ἐπιλογυμενῆς εἰμάρμενης ἀφίστησι καὶ θεῷ πάντας προσάγει, ὡς τῆς ἐκείθεν ῥοπῆς αὐτοὺς ἔχεσθαι. E. now found himself eulogizing an emperor who had placed considerable trust in astrology, as Nicetas Choniates confirms (Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 154.51–55, only to express his contempt for the authority enjoyed by astrologers at Manuel’s court; cf. Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 220.23–221.31. See P. Wirth, “Zur Apologie Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos gegen den Vorwurf häretischen Vertrauens in die Macht der Astrologie.” in *Untersuchungen*, 30–32. The only one to confront Manuel openly about his partisalitiy to astrology was Michael Glykas, who put his doctrinal objections in writ-
ing in a long letter *cum* treatise in response to Manuel’s scientific ‘proofs’, cf.

ǒτι μηδὲ διὰ τὸ σύμβολον...τὸ πρὸ αὐτοῦ σεμνύνεται: the phrasing is deliberately arranged to underline the true logical sequence of events. The antecedent of the relative οὗπερ has been omitted but may be inferred from the sense as “the thing of which a sign exists” (Smyth, 2503–2516).

καλὸν ἀπαν προοίμιον: E. likens the parts of the oration traditionally dedicated to portents and signs –vital to shoring up support among all ranks of society who gave credence to such divine or prophetic tokens—to belaboring the preamble of a text, when one should get on with “the contest” (τὸ ἐναγώνιον). The pronounced alliterative sequence of -π- plosives (ἀπαν προοίμιον, ἀλλ’ ἐνδιά κατεπείγει τὸ ἐναγώνιον, περιορατέον τὸ τοῦ προιμίου πολύ) was probably not entirely unintentional. The mix of rhyming *homoioiteleuton* (προοίμιον ... ἑναγώνιον) in the first two of the three virtual isocola creates a sing song cadence. Such musical effects, at once felt but not so conspicuous as to interfere with the solemnity of the occasion, may be discerned in nearly every passage of the Ἐπιτάφιος.

φροιμιαζόμενον: φροιμιάζομαι, an aspirated, contracted form of προοιμιάζο-
μαι common to tragedy, *metri gratia*, adopted by later Attic prose.

ἡμῖν: a dat. of interest with μὴ δαπανάτω, equivalent to an adverbial “in our case”.

τοὺς ἐν ἐπαγγελίαις ώσιωμένους: most likely a reference to the prophets and other figures in the Old Testament, as well, perhaps, to saintly figures ‘announced’ or, as the term came to be interpreted, vouchsafed by God. ἐπαγγελία was nevertheless a strongly marked word associated with the messianic “promise” deemed fulfilled by Christ, cf. ex. gr. Greg. Naz. *In Mach. laud.* (Or. 15) *PG* 35.916.34: τὸν μονογενῆ, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. Manuel’s being a namesake of Jesus only further encouraged such analogies.

ἐνυπνίων καὶ ὁραμάτων: Although churchmen like himself have no part in dream interpretation, E. concedes, probably out of deference to the many (no doubt among the audience, as well) who trusted in the interpretation of dreams, that such practices were old and venerable: παλαιά, καὶ μηδὲ τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ιεράς αὐλῆς τε καὶ ὁμηγήρεις. Dreams and visions portending rise to the throne had been part of imperial lore for centuries. Among the best known examples because of the apparent reversal of fortune, were the multiple dream visions which
augured the unlikely rise of the humble Basil I, founder of the Macedonian dynasty, to the throne, in the biography commissioned by his grandson, Constantine VII Porphyrogennitos, *Vita Basilii* 8.7–14, 8.14–28, 9.5–40, 10.1–15 (ed. I. Ševčenko, *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris ampletitut.* Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 42. Berlin, 2011). For wide-ranging discussions of the meaning(s) attached to dreams in Byzantium, and especially their political utility, see *Dreaming in Byzantium and Beyond*, eds. C. Angelidi and G. T. Calofonos (Farnham, UK; Burlington, VT, 2014).

φιλοσοφοῦνται: the subject of the plural verb is the neuter plural παλαιᾶ, a departure from the archaizing grammar which observed the use of a singular verb with neuter plural subjects (cf. Smyth 958–959). Though not always adhered to even by classical writers (cf. Jannaris 1170), the σχῆμα Ἀττικὸν, as it was known, became one among many attestations of ‘correct’ Attic Greek among learned authors already by the late Hellenistic age when its use was revived by Second Sophistic rhetors and pedagogues who bequeathed the practice to Byzantine authors. E. normally adheres to the rule in the epitaphios: cf. (Ἐπ. 14) καὶ ἦν μὲν ...καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀνδρίας σεμνά; (Ἐπ. 23) ἠσχόλητο... τὰ τῆς φύσεως.

τοῖς τούτων ἐχόμενοις: the medial form of ἔχω may be construed with a gen. or dat. to mean “come after” or “follow closely upon.” See LSJ s.v. ἔχω C I 3.a

καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, θεός ...ἐπηγγείλατο ἐν αὐτοῖς: E. repeats here the argument he had made in his homily on the Κύριε ἐλέησον; cf. Eust. Or. 5 (Λόγος Ε) 74.66–71, where he subsumed all foreknowledge of events assigned to dreams and omens within God’s providence (cf. supra, Ἐπ. 9) as a rebuttal to claims on behalf of astrological prognostication and augury, whose popularity, especially with educated élites in no way diminished with the coming of Christianity and remained steady throughout the Byzantine middle ages. Indeed the circumspect way E. amends the authority of visions and signs by reassigning their source to God betrays the hesitation to openly criticize popular belief. It is not clear to whom, other than the prophets of the Bible, God may be said to have pledged the ability to “announce that which had been predestined.”

τοῖς τούτων ἐχόμενοις: as a result of the metaphorical use meaning “hold close/cling to,” the middle form of ἔχω came to mean “follow close upon” or “next in order” (LSJ s.v. ἔχω IV C.3), e.g., τὰ ἐχόμενα τούτως what follows, Pl. Grg.
494e. By the “subjects following these” E. is referring to the topics which usually come next in a conventional funeral oration or eulogy, thus at once acknowledging rhetorical tradition while flouting its binding authority in a case where it ran counter to E.’s own convictions, and perhaps to the planned structure of the Ἐπιτάφιος, which included long excurses on Manuel’s policies. For the sense of ἐπιβαλοῦμεν, see LSJ s. v. ἐπιβάλλω II.3, III.4 (sc. τὸν νοῦν) set to a thing, devote oneself to it, c. dat., e.g., τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν Plu. Cic. 4.

εἰς ὅσον δύναμις. Δύναμις: an example of anadiplosis, the repetition of the last word of a clause or sentence to begin the next as means of expanding on the last stated subject. The motif of rendering homage in accordance with one’s ability, or κατὰ δύναμιν, went back to archaic hymns to the gods; cf. Hes. Op. et di. 336 καὶ δύναμιν δ’ ἔρθεν ἱέρ’ ἀθανάτους θεοίσιν. Its effect was to preempt criticism through a show of modesty while simultaneously elevating one’s accomplishment by raising the threshold of success.

πελαγοστόλου νεῶς: πελαγοστόλος or “fit for sea-crossings” appears to be a Eustathian coinage (see LBG s.v. πελαγοστόλος, with a citation to this passage), most likely fashioned on the model of the existing, albeit rare, πελαγόστροφος and πελαγοδρόμος. To judge by the absence of any other attestations in later literature, it does not appear to have caught on. Like most neologisms coined by E. and his peers, it aimed at both aptness and at exhibiting the orator’s resourcefulness. Like many Greek compounds coined for the occasion, it would nevertheless have been reasonably transparent in meaning, combining as it does στόλος and πέλαγος, i.e., a ship “fitted out for crossing the sea” as a metaphor for an oration fully equipped with all the requisite rhetorical means to navigate the great sea of Manuel’s virtues and accomplishments.

Ἐκείνη: refers back to πελαγοστόλος ναύς above.

ἔλικας περιάγουσα: the extended nautical metaphor is shot through with references to rhetorical practice. The orations as ships “criss-crossing” their way over the sea of Manuel’s qualities and achievements, forming “winding,” i.e., involved sentences (cf. LSJ ἕλιξ (B) VI), merged poetic imagery with E.’s actual description of poetic style in the ancient poet Pindar, for whose panegyrical odes E. appears to have planned (but probably never completed) a commentary on the model of the Παρεκβολαί on the Iliad and Odyssey; cf. Eust. Pro. in Pi. 9.6 τὸ λαβυρινθῶδες τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ φράσεως καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀδιόδευτον ἀπευθύνουσι καὶ τὰς ἔλικας περιοδεύοντες.

ὡς ἦσαν … διαθέοι: for the impersonal use of ἐιμί with a dat. and infin., see LSJ s. v. VI. διαθέοι is an uncontracted infinitive of διαθέω. In Attic Greek we
should expect -θεῖν but as the complaints of the 2nd c. grammarian Phrynicus indicate, the uncontracted form had entered standard use by post-classical times, even among ‘Atticizing’ authors of the culturally nostalgic Second Sophistic (cf. Kühner-Blass ii.138). Tafel (10 n.8) translates, “damit auch die unzählig vielen andern Schiffe in gleicher Weise sich bewegen können, und so das ganze Meer schiffbar bleibe,” taking ως ἐξεῖναι as a final clause and recommending μηδὲ be dropped to accommodate the resulting sense. This, however, misses the point of the passage, namely, that the emperor’s virtues are like an ocean so vast that even if an armada of ships were to set sail, the whole of the emperor’s sea of virtue would still not be navigable, a point reiterated, as so often in Eustathian orations, in a subsequent clause: οὐκ ἔσται οὕτως ἱκανὸν … πολλὴ εὐθυπλοῆσαι τοῦ τῶν βασιλικῶν θαυμασίων ὥκεανοῦ, ὃν οὐδ’ ἂν ἀνάριθμοι νῆες διεξέλθοιεν.


tὸ τοῦ λογικοῦ φορὸν πνεύματος: an example of the rhetorical figure of σύγχησις whereby words are rearranged so that alternate words should be read together. The listener must be more than usually attentive to the pattern for the meaning to become clear. It was a common device of artful prose since antiquity.

ἐμπλατυναμένοις: sc. λόγοις; (LSJ s. v. πλατύνω, 4) had a technical sense in rhetorical analysis to mean “amplify” one’s speech or text; LSJ includes use of the Med./Pass. ἐμπλατυναμένοις with λόγοις to mean “expatiate on” (though the ref. given to Strabo Geogr. 8.7.3 does not contain the relevant words). The term recurs frequently with this rhetorical sense in both Eustathian scholarship and oratory: Comm. ad Hom. Od. 1.413.14 and ἱστορῶν ἐν βραχεί τὰ κατ’ αὐτὴν οἷα ως εἰκὸς φειδόμενος ἐμπλατύνεσθαι τοὺς περὶ τούτων λόγοις φησίν; cf. Eust. Or. 5 (Λόγος Ε) 67.13: εἴ τι χρὴ καὶ τοιούτως λόγοις προσεσχηκέναι (χρὴ δὲ ἄρα τὸν ἐμ- πλατύνεσθαι οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ καιρίου προθέμενον). E. is probably also punning on the sense of “unfurling” one’s sails, as in Philo Jud. De somniis (ed. P. Wendland, Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt [Berlin, 1898; repr. Berlin, 1962) 1.3: καὶ πλατυνθήσεται ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ λίβα καὶ βορράν καὶ ἀνατολάς.

ή παρὰ τῇ ποιήσει ἐκατόνζυγος: ἐκατόνζυγος (< ἐκατόξυγος) was a term of Homeric hyperbole intended to serve as an imaginary measure of the mutual hate felt by Greeks and Trojans for one another “which not even a ship with a hundred benches could carry off” (Il. 20.246–247: ἐστι γὰρ ἀμφοτέρους ὀνείδα μυθήσασθαι πολλὰ μάλ’, οὐδ’ ἂν νης ἐκατόξυγος ἄχθος ἄροτο). The Indian Rig Veda makes similar references to a “hundred-benced ship”, suggesting the the
nautical image had Indo-European roots. See L. P. Paine, *The Sea and Civilization: a Maritime History of the World* (New York, 2013). E. had had occasion to comment on the marvelously large ship in the Παρεκβολαι, likening it to descriptions of “long” ships by later orators: Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.401 Ἑκατόνζυγοι δὲ νῆες αἱ πολύκωποι, ἀς μακρὰς οἱ ρήτορες ἐκάλουν ὑστερον. Despite the allusion to Homeric epic, one would not have needed to have read or recalled the verses in question to make sufficient sense of a composite as self-explanatory as ἑκατόνζυγος.

οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀναγόντων τε ἑαυτούς ... ἡμᾶς δὲ: E. makes reference to the other rhetor-orators like himself who embarked on praise or eulogy of the deceased emperor, whence probably the reference to πολλῶν γὰρ ἄλλως γραψάντων in the title. Had those with a reputation for eloquence kept silent, E. explains, he would have done so as well: συμπώντων μὲν τῶν ἐλλογιμωτέρων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄν. But since they raise their voice in praise of Manuel, he too “harmonizes” with them: λαλοῦσι δὲ τὸ σύμφωνον ἐναρμόσεται. One can only guess to whom E. is referring with τῶν ἐλλογιμωτέρων; we can be fairly certain that the modesty of the comparative “more eloquent” was intended to have the opposite effect on the audience. We know the names of more of Manuel’s panegyrists than of almost any emperor before or after. Besides Eustathios, Manuel had heard his praises sung by Michael Italikos, Theodore Prodromos, Euthymius Malakes, Euthymius Tornikes, Gregorius Antiochus, as well as a few others, some known to us, a few probably not; see Magdalino, *Empire*, 413–488, esp. 413–421, 434–470.

ἀναγόντων ... ἑαυτούς: ἀνάγω is used in both the transitive and intransitive, especially in the middle, with a nautical sense “put a ship out to sea” (LSJ s. v. I.2, II.B.2); sometimes construed with ἑαυτόν (LSJ s. v. II.10) to mean to “fall back, retreat, or put back out to sea.” E. draws the other, in this case hypothetical, eulogists into the nautical metaphor by having them “put to sea [themselves].” The ability to select and sustain a metaphor in a manner apt to the desired point to be made was among the rhetor’s most prized talents.

φρόνησιν: φρόνησις appears a total of six times in the course of the Ἐπιτάφιος, across a variety of thematic units; if paired with σωφροσύνη, that number rises to nine, with each mention of either serving to emphasize a key characteristic of Manuel’s conduct as emperor and of his governing temperament reflected in his policies. As noted in the introductory section on subtle forms of parae-
nèsis running through the funeral oration, the emphasis on wisdom, prudence, and judiciousness denoted by φρόνησις – σωφροσύνῃ was intended to provide governing guidance to Manuel’s heir, the regency, and anyone else with the ear of the future emperor. In his account of Manuel’ reign, Kinnamos describes John II praising his son’s wise disposition: Io. Kinn. *Epit. re.* 12.28: ἃ δὲ προσμαρτυρεῖν αὐτῷ μόνου ἂν εἴη τοῦ πατρός, ἀκούσατε δὴ. πολλὰ πολλάκις ἐν οὐ μετρίαις ἐμοὶ πυνομένων πραγμάτων δυσκολίας οὗτος τῶν ἄλλων ἀπειρηκότων μέγας ἐν βουλαις ὤφη, ἱκανὸς μὲν χειμώνα προϊδέσθαι γινόμενον, δεξίος δὲ ἀποκλῖναι καὶ βιαῖς πνευμάτων ἀντισχεῖν; cf. the description provided by Nicetas Choniates, albeit some time later: *Hist.* 50.19–23 ὁ Μανουήλ, ἀσμένως παρὰ τῶν ταύτης οἰκητόρων προσδέχεται, τοῦτο μὲν ὡς τὴν πατρῷαν βασιλείαν παρειληφώς, τοῦτο δ’ ὅτι καὶ παρὰ πάσιν ἀσπάσιος ἦν, ἐπεί καὶ τῷ ὀυτῶν ἀκριβῶς μείρακε τὴν σύνεσιν ἐσωζε τῶν καταγηρασάντων ἐν τοῖς πράγμασι πλείονα: an increasingly foregrounded staple of Manuel’s carefully curated image.

φρόνησιν...ἀρτυούσαν ἀρετάς: E. draws a culinary simile with φρόνησις, which is likened to “the salt with which all human virtues are spiced, rendering human endeavours ‘tasty’”: τὴν ἁπάσαν ἀρτυούσαν ἀρετὰς, καὶ, ἡς ὀλον εἰπείν, ἄλας, καὶ αὐτὴν παγκόσμιον δι’ οὗ ἀπαιν ἀνθρωπικοῖς ἔργοις τὸ νόστιμον. Although not a Eustathios innovation, cooking imagery was a favourite trope of E., as some of the elaborate descriptions of food in his letters illustrate. For *opsopoiia*, or cooking of savoury meats, in the letters of E., see Kolovou, *Briefe*, 57*–73*. Possibly modelling his text on Eustathios’ clever culinary image, Michael VIII Palaiologos employed the salt and cooking imagery in the Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐν τῷ περιο νυμῷ βουνῷ τοῦ Αὐξεντίου μονῆς τοῦ Ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαήλ 4.769–794 (ed. A. Dmitrievsky, *Typika*, Kiev, 1895): Ἐν μὲν οὖν αρχὴ τῷ πράγματi,...καὶ ταύτην ἐπάνειμα ἄναπληθεῖν...καὶ ἔστι πιστεύειν τὸν ἀναλoγικόν ἐργα προσφυγικῶν ἀνθρώπου ἔργα: although in both instances the expression “human works” is intended to contrast implicitly with divine acts; cf. Athanasius *De sent. Dion.* (ed. H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, vol. 2.1, Berlin, 1940) 8.2.8: εἰς τὴν περὶ τῆς θεοτήτος αὐτοῦ πιστίν αὐτοῦς ἀναγάγωσι διεκνύντες, ὅτι τὰ γενόμενα ἔργα αὐξάνουσας ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ θεοῦ; the second appears to carry an added sense found in Aristotle’s *Nicomachaen Ethics* 1097b.29 (ed. J. Bywater, Oxford, 1894): ἀλλ᾽ ἰδοὺ τῇ μὲν εὐδαιμονίᾳ τὸ ἀριστον ἅγειν ὀμολογούμενον τι φαίνεται, ποιητεῖ δ᾽ ἐναργέστερον τι ἐστίν ἐπὶ λεχθῆναι. τάχα δὴ γένοιτ᾽ ἂν τοῦτ᾽,
εἰ ληφθείη τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀυλητῇ καὶ ἀγαλματοποιῷ καὶ παντὶ
tεχνίτῃ, καὶ ὅλως ὄν ἐστιν ἔργον τι καὶ πράξεις, ἕν τῷ ἔργῳ δοκεῖ τάγαθον εἶναι καὶ
tὸ εὖ, οὕτω δόξειν ἀν καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ, εἰπερ ἐστι τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ.

أهمية مقدمة الموارد: ής προϊσταμένης μὲν τῶν πράξεων: ής > sc. τῆς φρονήσεως. πράξεων is
complementary gen. with προϊσταμένης, cf. see LSJ s.v. προϊστημα B.II, to be at the
head of, to precede. Prudence or φρόνησις is our rational faculty at work and gives
our actions the stamp of human deliberation; when it is neglected (παρεωραμέ-
νης δὲ), our actions become something else, and the one carrying them out sim-
ply wanders in moral darkness and uncertainty

ὡς παρεγκλίνας τὸ φῶς σκιά τις ἀναφερμενεῖ: οὐ παρεωραμένης, an allusion to Od. 10.495, where Circe instructs Odysseus
to seek the counsel of Teiresias, the only man in Hades whose mind remains
“sure-footed” (τοῦ τε φρένες ἔμπεδοί εἰσι) and so exempt from the fate of ghosts
“darting about” aimlessly (τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσουσι) having lost all soundness of
mind (ἀπολωλεκυῖα τὸ στερέμνιον), an allusion to Od. 10.521 πολλὰ δὲ γονοῦσθαι
νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα. παρεγκλίνας is masculine nom. in agreement with its
antecedent ἐργαζόμενος; the syntax is strained by the switch to the feminine
σκιά, which serves as nom. subject of the simile comparing action without pur-
poseful judgement, intention, and reflection with the motion of the shades in
Hades.

Ταύτης: sc. τῆς φρονήσεως.

δεῖσαι: neuter participle of δέω, “to be in need of,” in an impersonal con-
struction with prolative infinitives πράξαι …εἰπεῖν.

ἀπέκρυπτε …ἀναφανεῖς ὁ ἥλιος: the simile of the sun shining so bright as
to obscure the faint light of the stars makes clever use of a conventional image
inherited from antiquity of the emperor as sol invictus or “unconquered sun,”
which became an official imperial cult under the emperor Aurelian in the third
century and appeared on coins struck under Constantine I, whence it was adopt-
ed in Byzantine panegyric. Near the end of the Ἐπιτάφιος, Ε. will apostrophize
the emperor/sun, bemoaning how he has “set”: Ἔδυς, ὦ μὲγιστε βασιλεῦ ἥλιε.
For the imperial cult of the sun, see now S. Berrens, Sonnenkult und Kaisertum
vizantiiskikh tekstov XII-XIII vi-e-kov / A.I. Papadopulo-Kerameus; ed. phototyp.
praef. K. Treu, 184: Ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ῥέμα σοφίας... ἐπίστασθε τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως σοφίαν... πῶς μὲν περὶ τὰς διαλέξεις υπὲρ τούς παλαί Σέξτους καὶ Πύρρωνας (πλουτεῖ δὲ οἱ τὴν πειθανάγκην ὁ λόγος), ύπερ τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου καὶ τῆς Στοᾶς, καὶ πῶς τὸ παρατυχόν ἄπαν ποιεῖται λαμπράν φιλοσοφίας ὑπόθεσιν, ἃν ψυχῆς ἐπιμνησθή, πρῶτα μὲν τὰ Φαίδωνος ἀνακινῶν καὶ Καλλίου καὶ ὀσά οἱ περὶ Σωκράτην περὶ ψυ- χῆς καὶ τάγαθού διεξέρχονται.

ἐπιχειρήσεις... κατασκευήν: ἐπιχειρήσεις carried both the sense of “operation” applicable in plans of attack or calculated undertaking (in light of references to πράξαι and καταπράξασθαι above and below, respectively) and of dialectical reasoning (cf. LSJ, s. v. ἐπιχείρημα II); E. may well have been trading on both, expecting at least some in the audience to hear the reference to Manuel’s skill in persuasive argument (καὶ ἐπιθανολόγει τὸ πράγμα... εἰς πειθὼ τὸν λόγον κατέ- στρεφεν; cf. LSJ s. v. καταστρέφω ΙV.2) in a passage underscoring the emperor’s intellectual superiority manifesting itself especially when he had to overturn opinion; similarly, κατασκευή could refer to both “preparations” in the sense required for battle or strategy, while also employed in discussions of logic and the formal layout of an argument in rhetoric (cf. LSJ, s. v. κατασκευή V and VI; cf. Hermog. Progymn. 5 Περὶ ἀνασκευῆς καὶ κατασκευῆς); note that κατασκευασμέ- να a little further down in the paragraph can mean at once the arguments already devised as well as the actual plans proposed.

Ὡς δὲ ἐπινεύσοι... κατάθοιτο... συγκλεισθείη: the string of optatives introduce an elaborate past conditional sentence designed to mark the repeated or iterative nature of the action described, extending to the end of the paragraph. Cf. Smyth 2340(a).

τὸ θρυλλούμενον... ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος: the adjective ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος gained considerable currency in the twelfth century, and nowhere more than in E.’s writings, in particular the commentaries to Homeric epic, where E. has recourse to variants of ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος to describe the poet’s equivocation, ambiguity, or penchant for setting up antithetical or inconsistent statements; cf. Comm. ad Hom. Μ. 2.161.2–8 Ὄρα δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὘μήρου ἀμφίστομον κάνταύθα ῥητορικήν καὶ τὸ οἶον εἰπεῖν ἐκείνου ἀμφοτερόγλωσσον, followed by an example from Bk. 5 of the Iliad where Telepomos and Sarpedon give differing accounts of Heracles’ feats in Ilium. Among other things, E.’s application of ἀμφοτερό- γλώσσος to Homer even in cases where individuals hold to different versions, reveals an understanding of literature common in Byzantium which viewed poetry as a broadly didactic vehicle and all ideas expressed therein as sanctioned by the poet himself. E. betrays his awareness of the association of ἀμφοτερόγλώσσος
Not composed in a chance manner

in accounts of early philosophy when he characterizes such ‘ambivalent speech’ as “dialectic”; cf. Comm. ad Hom. II. 3.382.15–16 Ταῦτα δὲ διαλεκτικῶς ως ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος μεταχειρίζεται ὁ ποιητής, διδάσκων ως παντὶ λόγῳ λόγος παλαιεί, i.e., made of opposing arguments, which he reminds the audience of the epigraphs was attributed to certain ancients (τὸ θρυλλούμενον ἐν τοῖς πάλαι), i.e., philosophers. His most likely source for this would have been the testimonia about Zeno in works such as Diog. Laert., Vit.phil. 9.25.4–5 περὶ τοῦτον καὶ Μελίσσου Τίμων φησὶ ταῦτα/ ἀμφοτερόγλωσσον τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδόν, or Plutarch’s Pericles 4.5.4–6 διήκουσε δὲ Περικλῆς καὶ Ζήνωνος τοῦ Ἐλεάτου πραγματευομένου <μὲν> περὶ φύσιν ως Παρμενίδης, ἐλεγκτικὴν δὲ τινα καὶ δι’ ἀντιλογίας εἰς ἀπορίαν κατακλείουσαν ἐξασκήσαντος ἐξίν, ως που καὶ Τίμων ὁ Φλειάσιος εἴρηκε διὰ τούτων. ἀμφοτερόγλωσσον τε μέγα σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδόν / Ζήνωνος, πάντων ἐπιλήπτορος. The didactic use of such ‘dialectic’ or ‘ambivalent speech’ appears in Simplicius, In Aristotelis physicorum libros commentaria 9.139.4 καὶ εἰκὸς μὲν ἦν τὸν Ζήνωνα ως ἐφ’ ἑκάτερα γυμναστικῶς ἐπιχειροῦντα (διὸ καὶ ‘ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος’ λέγεται) καὶ τοιούτους ἐκφέρειν λόγους περὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀποροῦντα, a possible exemplar for E. here, albeit indirectly. Georgios Tornikes, who succeeded E. as μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων in the 1190’s, exploited the metaphorical link between ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος and the image of the ‘forked tongue’ (ed. M. Loukaki, Discours annuels en l’honneur du patriarche Georges Xiphilin, Paris, 2005) 2.9.206–208: καὶ πρὸ γε τούτων τὴν ἀμφισβητούσαν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῖς ἀναλύσεις καὶ δυστέκματον καὶ τὴν ἀμφοτερόγλωσσον τὴν ἀμφίπλητον τῇ ῥητορικῇ διαλεκτικῇ καὶ δικράδον τὴν γλῶσσαν προβεβλημένην ὀφιωδῶς, οὐ μικρὰν καὶ ταύτην εἰσφέρουσαν τὴν συντέλειαν εἰς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας εὑρέσει καὶ διάγνωσιν.

ἔνθα…οὐκ εὐξύμβλητον: amplifies τὸ θρυλλούμενον above and is therefore still subject to the same negative οὐ, while ἀλλὰ introduces the second, positive, κατά which more aptly describes the manner of Manuel’s reasoning. εὐξύμβλητον: an uncommon enough compound (Ion. εὐσύμβλητον, cf. Hdt. Hist. 7.57.3), meaning εὐκόλως καὶ καλῶς νοούμενον[v]; E. employs the old Attic form, perhaps following Mich. Psellos Theol. (ed. Gautier) 5.4.68 διολισθαίνει πῶς ἡ διάνοια, ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς τῇ τοῦ λόγου καταδειλόντες τομῇ τὰ ἀντίθετα ταύτα τιμήματα, εὐξύμβλητα πρὸς τὸν ἡμέτερον ποιήσομεν νοῦν; or he may have met it in the works of Aeschylus or the ancient scholia he mined extensively for his own commentaries: Aesch. Prom. 775 ἢδ’ οὐκέτ’ εὐξύμβλητος ἡ χρησιμοδία; Schol. in Prom. Aesch. (scholia vetera) 775a. Ὡς μὴ νοήσασα τὸ μὴ θυμιστότα, λέγει ἡ Ἰώ· “αὐτὴ ἡ χρησιμοδία, οὕτως ὁ λόγος ὁν λέγεις, οὐδαμῶς ἐστὶν εὐκόλως καὶ καλῶς νοούμενον”. Ironically enough given the sense of this word, it raises questions about the intelligi-
bility of the oration and its possible recasting into even more rarefied language prior to ‘publication’ in the manuscript containing the Ἐπιτάφιος. The revival of long-dormant vocabulary by middle and later Byzantine writers is indicative of the archaizing cultural trend among the literati.

Τιμοθέου...ἀδόντας: the quote is attributed to the legendary aulist, or pipe player, of the Macedonian era (not Timotheos the lyre-player and dramatist of the Classical age, cf. OCD s. v. Timotheos (1)). His stirring musicianship became proverbial in later Hellenistic times. Lucian wrote a short dedicatory essay in which he figures as the wise mentor to the younger, fame-seeking, musician suitably named Harmonides, whose name the essay carries. It is in this rôle of pedagogue that he appears at this point in the Ἐπιτάφιος; cf. Luciani Opera (ed. M. D. Macleod, 1972–87). Timotheos appears again later (‘Επ. 66) in the role of the acclaimed court musician able to rouse even a seasoned warrior like Alexander the Great to battle-readiness with his thrilling melodies. E. may have drawn the quote from texts similar to Lucian’s, now lost, or may simply have manufactured it himself following the conventions of prosopopoeia.
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αἱ πανταχοῦ...πρόνοιαι πολυειδεῖς: βασιλικὴ πρόνοια was a deeply ideological pairing of Hellenistic origin (cf. Septuag., Maccab. ii. 4.6.1) invoked increasingly in late antiquity to characterize and vindicate the extensive arrogation of governing powers by Roman emperors who were credited with having singular abilities to anticipate events and thus take measures accordingly (cf. Cassius Dio, Exc. 160.7, ed. U.P. Boissevain, Cassii Dionis Cocceiani historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt, vol. 3., Berlin, 1901; repr. 1955). “Imperial foresight” (βασιλικὴ πρόνοια) was formulated on the analogy of “divine providence” (θεοῦ πρόνοια); cf. LSJ s. v. πρόνοια II.2; Lampe s.v. A. Although pagan in origin (Lampe s.v. B.1), the idea proved particularly apt to Byzantine imperial ideology; cf. Synesius, De regno 18c 3–7 (ed. N. Terzaghi, Synesii Cyrenensis opuscula, Rome, 1944): ἀπολαυόντων οἴκοι καὶ πόλεις καὶ δήμοι καὶ ἔθνη καὶ ἅπεροι προνοίαι βασιλικῆς καὶ κηδεμονίας ἐμφανον, ἣν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ ἐαυτὸν ἐν τοῖς νοητοῖς στήσας ἀρχέτυπον, διδωσιν εἰκόνα τῆς προνοίας, καὶ ἐθέλει τὰ τῆς τετάχθαι κατὰ μίμησιν ὑπέρκοσμον; cf. etiam Nic. Chon. Or. 7.58.31: οὕτω δὴ καὶ σύ, φιλανθρωπότατε βασιλεῦ, πάσι μεταδίδως προνοίαις βασιλικῆς. If taken to mean “care for” in a general sense, the statement would amount to little more than a platitude. The point here, however, is more likely that πρόνοια to the different parts of the empire could take
“many forms” (πολυειδεῖς), including but not limited to, military campaigns or other steps taken in anticipation of problems, at the discretion of the emperor’s wisdom and foresight. We may guess at the implied objection addressed here by the ratio of 3:1 in emphasis on intelligence (σύνεσις, φρόνησις, ἀγχίνοια) as against ‘manly audacity’ (ἀνδρίας δραστήριον), i.e., military measures. The point is underscored in the following sentence in which the policy is presented as a temperamental quality or personal virtue of Manuel’s: Ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ σκεπτικῶς ἔχων ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις…ταχεῖς μὲν φρονεῖν, οὔ τι δὲ καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς. E. praises and, by extension, endorses a policy of giving sufficient forethought before making decisions in matters of great import, i.e., military campaigns, rather than acting precipitously without regard for risk. It may matter less whether Manuel actually exhibited these traits than that E. attributed them to him as paramount virtues of an effective emperor. These become political prescriptions framed by a funerary motif. The idea is then amplified further in the next paragraph where we see an illustration of the trait. Interestingly, later in the oration (Επ. 19) E. does not use the term πρόνοια here in the sense of the controversial policy by the same name of granting large land holdings to foreigners in return for military service, although the latter term derived from the sense in question here; for that policy, see paragraph 18 below.

ἄνθρωπος εἰς…ἐπεμέριζε τμήμασιν: the emperor’s presence was understandably in constant demand throughout the empire since it brought greater protection from invasion or less noticed marauding (sometimes the distinction would have been hard to make), as well as the promise of imperial euergetism and the settlement of local disputes by appeal to the emperor. For relations between the capital and the provinces, see Magdalino, Empire, 109–179, 228–315; for specific examples of personal intervention, cf. Chalandon, Les Comnènes, 247–248, 385–386, 388–390. On the subject of provincial politics, see L. Neville, Authority in Byzantine Provincial Society, 950–1100 (New York, 2004).

ἀνδρία: the usual spelling of ἀνδρεία in Byzantine manuscripts; cf. infra τὰ τῆς ἀνδρίας; cf. etiam Επ. 15 (x2), 18, 24, 39, 66, 68, but ἀνδρεία at Επ. 52; not to be confused with ἀνδριάς at Επ. 56.

τὸ τῆς συνέσεως ἐμπύριον: a metaphor which mixes an intelligible quality like comprehension with the concrete image of ἐμπύριος, “fiery”. ἐμπύριος had the added, technical usage in combination with κόσμος to referred to the third, “fiery” sphere of existence (the other two being the “ethereal” or αἰθέριος and the “material” or ὑλαῖος), in accordance with Neoplatonic cosmology as outlined in Proclus and exegetical texts on Neoplatonism; cf. Procl. Theol. Plat. 4.39 (ed.

ὃσον τε ἐν τῇ λοιπῇ φρονήσει, καὶ ὁπόσον εἰς ἄγχινοιαν: the neuter relatives ὃσον ... ὁπόσον refer back to the two neuter substantives [τὸ] δραστήριον ... [τὸ] ἐμπύριον, either individually (δραστήριον ... ὃσον τε ἐν τῇ λοιπῇ φρονήσει / ἐμπύριον ... ὁπόσον εἰς ἄγχινοιαν) or, just as plausibly, in combination, so that both δραστήριον and ἐμπύριον are divided between the “other faculties” and the emperor’s “shrewdness.”

tῇ λοιπῇ φρονήσει: E. seems to divide φρόνησις into the diverse sorts of wisdom and prudence applicable in each circumstance; the “remaining” prudence/wisdom here would be that called for in practical governance (LSJ s. v. φρόνησις, II, cf. e.g. Pl. Smp. 209a; Arist. EN 1140a24, 1141b23; Isoc. Or. 12.204–217)

Πυθαγορικὴ κατάρτυσις...ἀγάπησις: the somewhat obscure expressions, κατάρτυσις and ἀγάπησις, are both technical terms derived from Pythagorean philosophy. This is their only appearance in the works of E., which is in itself noteworthy given his reliance on his own previous orations. Pythagoras was widely held by Greco-Roman culture to be the father of musical harmony and, by extension, the discoverer of the differing musical modes and their effect on people, since the soul and the body were thought to be subject to the same laws of proportion that govern music and the cosmos itself. This, together with the
many legends of Pythagoras’ skill and understanding of nature contributed to the influential and beatific portrait of him by the 3rd–4th c. Neoplatonic scholar Iamblichus, from which so much of the opening sentence of this paragraph is adapted. Iambl. De vita Pythagorica 20.95 (edd., L. Deubner and U. Klein [Stuttgart, 1975]: ἔπειτα εἰ παρέπεται τις αὐτοῖς ἀγάπης καὶ σωφροσύνη πρὸς τὰ διδασκόμενα. ἐπεσκόπει γὰρ πῶς ἔχουσι φύσεως πρὸς ἡμέρωσιν, ἐκάλει δὲ τοῦτο κατάρτισιν. While the NT as well as other Christian writings offered no shortage of approbation for ἀγάπη, E. has recourse instead to the teachings of a pagan philosopher, largely on account of the distinction of Neoplatonism among Byzantine intellectuals, as for the trademark erudition of the rhetor; cf. Neoplatonism and Christian Thought, ed. D.J. O’Meara. 1982. There are over thirty five references to Pythagoras and Pythagorean teaching in the Homeric commentaries; cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.694.23–24 Οὕτω, φασί, καὶ Κλεινίας ὁ Πυθαγόρειος ὅτε εἰς ὁργὴν προήχθη, λύραν ἀρμοσάμενος ἐκχύτηκε καὶ ἔλεγεν οὕτω πραύνεσθαι; cf. Ibid. 4.139.3–5 ὁ περὶ Πυθαγόραν ὄμιλος ἀρχὴν ἐλών ὁρίζετο λέγων, ὦτὶ ὁ φίλος ἄλλος ἐστίν ἐγὼ.

εἰρηναίαν γαλήνην...καταπράττεσθαι: not unlike today, medieval rulers claimed that peace was their paramount goal in foreign policy. The reassurance was no doubt attractive to many who had a great deal to lose from war, even though peace was the exception to the rule throughout the long history of the Byzantine empire. The idea of the emperor as “peacemaker” found scriptural sanction is the NT Matth. 5,9 Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοὶ· ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθῆσονται. E. had made a similar point about Manuel’s peace-making in an oration welcoming the emperor’s envoy Ioannes Doukas to Thessalonike; cf. Or. 12 (Λόγος Λ) 196.41–46: πόλεμός τε ἄδικα εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὰ ἐκ ταύτης καλά, καὶ αὐτὸν ἣ ἀδικία πολεμεῖ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ μάχην εξεγείρει ἀκάματον. ὁ τούτων τούς πολέμους παύνων εἰς ἄν δίκαιος καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀδικίας συγκαταπάυειν κακά· καὶ οὕτω μὲν ὁ κρατὺς ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων κακιῶν ἀνδρίζεται καὶ πᾶσαν στάσιν ἐκ μέσου αἴρει καὶ τὸ εἰρήναίον ἐφ’ ἀπασι καταπράττετα. For the idea of “Friedenspolitik” at least notionally at the heart of Roman foreign policy bequeathed to Byzantium in which the emperor claimed the mantle of εἰρηνοποιός, see O. Treitinger, Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell (Jena, 1938) 44, 230; cf. M. McCormick, Eternal victory : triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the early medieval West (Cambridge, 1986) 240, 312.

βαρβάροις ἀγριότητα...ἀδεται καταπράττεσθαι: it is tempting to look (or listen) for direct or indirect allusions to specific historical events in such lan-
guage, however, ἄλλοφυλον might refer at once to crusading Franks or Latins, invading Normans, any of the restless Balkan nations, as well as, Turks engaged in a perpetual war of attrition on the empire’s eastern frontier. Some form of truce was achieved at various times with each of these groups, either through force of arms or shrewd diplomacy tied to financial and other kinds of political incentives, like dynastic marriages. The treaty with the Seljuk sultan Kılıç Arslan II in 1161, which brought about an armistice of sorts for some time on the empire’s long contested eastern frontier, would have been only one such example of Manuel’s foreign policy called to mind by E.’s audience; cf. Kinn. *Epit. re.* 204–208: ὶπο τούτον τὸν χρόνον καὶ Κλιτζεσθέλαν ὁ σουλτάν ές Βυζάντιον αὐτόμολος ἠλθε περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἰμφόρων βασιλέως δειημένους, πράγμα ύψηλὰν τε καὶ δαμνιαν υπέρογκον καὶ σα ἐμὲ εἰδέναι ὡστο ἰλλοτε Ρωμαιοί εντυχήθηκεν πρότερον… ὁ δὲ ἱκετεύοντα προσηκάμενον ἐν φίλων μοιρα καὶ αὐτοῦς ἐσούμενοι, εἰρήνη τε τοῦ λοιποῦ σταθημά τὴν Ρωμαιών εἶχεν ἀρχήν. Similar examples of “pacification of the foreigners” (κατεσιγάζετο τὸ ἀλλόφυλον) would have been the treaties with Reynald of Antioch in the winter of 1158–9, or those with Serbian and Hungarian rulers in the period 1161 to 1172; cf. Magdalino, *Empire*, 76–78, 78–83, for diplomacy with Kılıç Arslan II and relations with Hungary and Serbia, respectively.

αἰσθάνομαι τινων ψαλαττόντων ἡρέμα, καὶ ὑποκρουομένων ἀπήχημα γλυκύ τε καὶ ἐναρμόνιον: E. pretends to be describing a gentle murmuring counterpoint from his audience – disarmingly characterized as a “sweet and harmonious song” – who point out that it was in fact Manuel’s bravery which imposed peace among the foreign peoples (ἀνδρία καὶ τὴν εἰρήναν γαλήνην ἐν ἔθνεσιν … καταπράττεσθαι) and not the “Pythagorean training and love” mentioned above. The rhetorical tactic of giving voice to dissenting opinion among the audience allows E. to ascribe both qualities to Manuel while making the more general point about the need to combine the two, intelligence and bravery (Ἀδελφὰ γὰρ ἀληθῶς φρονεῖται ἀνδρία τε καὶ σύνεσις, καὶ κοινοῦσθον τὸ ἐμπρακτόν παρὰ γε τοῖς ἐμφροσύν). It is not clear what the ‘gentle strumming’ (ψαλαττόντων ἡρέμα) refers to. Might E. be referring to versified, i.e., ‘musical’, laudationes for Manuel’s triumphs on the battlefield and the peace achieved in victory similar to those composed by Theodore Prodromos? Cf. Theod. Prodr. *Historische Gedichte*, ed. W. Hörandner, poem. XXX; XXXI a; XXXII c; LIV 46sqq.; LXXIV 22sqq. The pretense created by the present tense of perceiving the audience’s reaction as he speaks belongs to the oral character of the Ἐπιτάφιος, which preserves a modicum of extemporizing (see the section on orality).

εὖ γάρ: the antecedent of the relative pronoun is omitted cf. Smyth 2529sqq. For εἰπ in the sense of ‘occasions when’ see LSJ, s. v. εἰπ Α.ΙΙ.

tο τῆς βασιλικῆς φρονήσεως... ὁρίζεται: E. assures his audience that he can provide specific, individual examples of Manuel exhibiting the twin virtues of “courage” (ἀνδρία) and “intelligence” (σύνεσις) as “making common cause” (κοινοῦσθον) in the manner in which he ruled.

ὑψηλῶν γενῶν... πολυχειρίας δεήσειε: marriages designed to buttress the empire (and the imperial household) through multiple familial ties with foreign potentates (πολυχειρίας), or to preempt the hostility of potential rivals, were a common political practice in Byzantium starting at least as far back as Basil II’s reign with the marriage of his younger sister Anna to Vladimir I of Kiev in return for military support, alluded to here with πολυχειρίας δεήσειε. Manuel’s own father was betrothed to his mother Eirene (née Piroska), the daughter of king Ladislas I of Hungary, by Alexios I Komnenos in a bid to end hostilities on the Balkan frontier. Both of Manuel’s own marriages were to foreign brides: the first, in 1142, to Eirene (née Bertha) of Salzbach, sister-in-law of Conrad III, king of Germany (1138–52), with whom Manuel’s father John II sought a common front against Roger II of Sicily; the second marriage, after Manuel was widowed in 1161, was to Maria of Antioch, daughter of Raymond of Poitiers and Constance of Antioch, as part of a bid to cement the empire’s historical claim on that city; cf. Paolo Lamma, Commenti e Staufer: ricerche sui rapporti fra Bisanzio e l’Occidente nel secolo XII. Vol. 1, (Roma, 1955). Manuel expanded the practice by “export[ing] imperial princesses” to the courts of Latin kingdoms in a bid to shore up his ties with the rising powers of western Christendom, a policy which may have met with some resistance on the part of his own relatives and which may explain the continued effort by E. in the Επιτάφιος to vindicate the policy. For the marriage policy of Manuel’s reign, see Magdalino, Empire, 209–217. Both of Manuel’s children were betrothed by their father to foreign dynasties: his daughter Maria from his first marriage, after a number of failed engagements, first to Béla III of Hungary and then William II of Sicily, was eventually married to Renier of Montferrat in 1180; while Manuel’s son Alexios II was betrothed to Agnes of
France, daughter of Louis VII and Adèle of Champagne. The young girl’s arrival in Constantinople was the occasion for an ἐπιβατήριος λόγος or “disembarkation speech” by E. celebrating her advent and future marriage to the imperial scion; cf. Eust. Or. 15 (Λόγος Ξ) 250.1–3, Titulus: Τό αὐτοῦ λόγος ἐπιβατηρίως ἐκφωνηθεῖς ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκ Φραγγίας ἐλέευσε τῆς βασιλικῆς νύμφης εἰς τὴν μεγαλόπολιν. δι’ ἥς: sc. τῆς βασιλικῆς φρονήσεως.

ai σὺν θεῷ βασιλισσαί: E. makes reference to the two ‘empresses’ present, Manuel’s widow Maria of Antioch, described as ‘from the east’ (ἐξ ἑῴας) and his daughter-in-law Agnes of France (designated as ‘empress’ since Manuel’s son, Alexios II, had been crowned co-emperor in 1171) ‘like a star washed by the western seas’ (ὡς ἄγχοθί που λελουμένος ἰκεανοῦ ἐστερίου … φωσφόρος). After Manuel’s death Maria assumed the monastic habit, adopting the highly symbolic name Ξένη, ‘foreigner’; her decision to take vows may perhaps be partially explained as a way to thwart potential suitors seeking the throne during her regency, cf. Eust. De capt. Thess. 18.18–28: ἀμέλει καὶ ἐπέτρεψε φθάνας κηδεμόνι τὸν υἱὸν τῇ μητρί, ἐρώτων οὔσῃ ὡραίᾳ, εἰ καὶ κρύπτεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπηγγείλατο ἑκεῖνη, τὸν τοῦ κάλλους ἦλιον πνευματικῶς νεφώσασα κατὰ περιβολήν μελαιναν. Οἱ δὲ ἐρωτε ἐκεῖνοι πυρεύσαντες, ὡς ἂν εἰδεῖν αὐτοί, ἀνήψαν κακὸν κοσμικὸν … ἀλλ’ ἡ γυνὴ προεῖχε, οί καὶ γυνὴ καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ ἦν τὸν λουπὸν σκοπόν αὐτῆς διὰ τὸ προφαίνεσθαι, καὶ τινὲς ἐρωτος νόμῳ ἐτοξάζοντο κατ’ αὐτῆς λανθάνοντες, εἰ πως μεστεύσει τὰ τῆς βολῆς, ὡς ἐψκε, πρὸς βασιλείας ἐπιτυχίαν. E. exploits the rhetorical opportunity for the contrast between the black habit of Maria/Xene and her symbolic representation of light (ἡλιὸς … ὕπο νέφει σκιάζεται), a contrast in which the ‘divine sun’ of her religious vocation joined to her political regency may be discerned all the more clearly (ἐν φιλότερον ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἦλιος θεὸς διοπτεύεται).

τὴν τῶν ἐκασταχόθεν … συνφεῖαι: after the death of his first wife Bertha-Eireni, Manuel married Maria, youngest daughter of Raymond of Antioch (by means of which he concluded a treaty with Raymond). Manuel’s son from that marriage, Alexios II, was betrothed to Agnes of France, daughter of Louis VII of France, in a bid to forge an alliance against the growing influence of Frederick Barbarossa; for a detailed discussion of the political considerations behind the marriages to Maria and the betrothal of Alexios II to Agnes, see Magdalino, Empire, (Maria) 72, 201.243, 472–3, (Agnes) 100–1, 224, 456, 462.

ἐτεχνήσατο … μεγεθύνων … προσφύων … ἐκτενεῖ: Manuel is the only plausible new subject of the sentence.
λελουμένη: the manuscript clearly reads λελουμένος, presumably referring back to ἥλιος θεός. While not impossible, this strikes me as too interwoven a piece of syntax, even for E. The change of subject in ἦ δὲ invites emendation.

ἐς τοσοῦτον: sc. εἴη; note the old Attic/Ionic ἐς in place of the more common εἰς which became the exclusive form in the post-classical period, with the exception of texts in the archaizing upper registers which made eclectic use of the dialectical richness of literary Greek.

tοῦτο μὲν...Συγκροῦσαι δὲ: E. stretches μὲν...δὲ across two distinct subjects not so much in a bid to correlate or contrast their contents but in order to segue from one part of the oration to another. μὲν here refers to the oration itself, while δὲ takes up Manuel’s foreign policy again. We should perhaps understand this as a compromise between the demand for balanced structures in oratory and the rules governing the use of conjunctions, which E.’ careful reading of ancient authors would have no doubt taught him.

ώκεανὸς...εὐθυπλοεῖν: the phraseology reprises, in more compressed form, E.’s nautical metaphor in Ἐπ. 11 above where the emperor’s virtues were likened to a vast sea and the funeral oration but one ship unable to chart its boundless waters (εὐθυπλοήσαι τοῦ τῶν βασιλικῶν θαυμασίων óκεανοῦ).

Μέθοδον στρατηγικὴν: E. begins an excursus about Manuel’s broader strategy of orchestrating war between the empire’s enemies and thereby achieving “bloodless triumphs” (τὸ μὲν ὑπήκοον φυλάττειν ἀναίμακτον ἐπί μεγίστας τροπαίων ἀναστάσει) and making territorial gains while the empire’s enemies incurred losses. No specific conflict is cited, but the mention of Persians and Skyths may well have recalled particular historical events which bore out the overall strategy. The terms are common to manuals of military tactics, cf. Leo VI Tact. (ed. G. Dennis, The Tactica of Leo VI [CFHB 12], Washington, 2010) 4: ἀλλὰ ταῖς στρατηγικαῖς μεθόδοις τὴν σωτηρίαν πορίζεσθαι καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν φυλάττεσθαι μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπερχομένων πολεμίων. Manuel’s talent for exploiting the enmity among the empire’s foes is cited by Nicetas Choniates as well, who describes Manuel’s political cunning in fueling the antagonism between the Turkic rulers of Ikonion and Cappadocia; cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 117.16–118.20: ὁ δὲ ἐπαρώμενος ἀμφότερον πανώλειαν ἠγάπα μὴ μόνον μέχρι τοῦ ἐριθεύειν ἀπονεύειν ἀλλήλων καὶ ἀποσχίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅπλα ἄραντας εἰς μοῖραν διαστῆναι ἀντίθετον, ἵν’ ἦγων ἡρμῆιαν αὐτὸς τοῖς ἐκείνων ἐπιχαίρη λακωνίας ἐκάστης ἕλλεον καὶ ἀσέβων καὶ πέμπων λάθρᾳ.
ἀγέλους θάτερον θατέρων ἐνήγησεν εἰς πόλεμον. “Skythians blanketing the ground with Skythians” in the next sentence may be specific but unknown to us or simply a rhetorically expedient generalization intended to underscore the policy of encouraging internecine conflict among the tribes which harried the empire. The most comprehensive study of the broad parameters of Manuel’s foreign policy on each of the empire’s many active fronts, see Magdalino, Empire, 27–108.

προσαράσσειν δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐκπολεμοῦν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις τὸ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ὀμόφυλον: the two clauses are almost identical in meaning, but while the first clause focuses on “enemies” (πολεμίους) fighting one another, the second underlines foreign peoples (ἀλλοφύλοις) fighting their own kind. Note the precisely disposed alliteration and assonance across this rhythmically calculated sentence, with its AABB anaphoric structure of πολεμίους…ἐκπολεμοῦν and ἀλλοφύλοις…ὁμόφυλον; τὸ…ὁμόφυλον is the direct object of ἐκπολεμοῦν, while ἀλλοφύλοις functions as a dat. of reference (in this case, of disadvantage or dativus incommodi).

Ἐνυάλιον…βροτολοιγόν: Ἐνυάλιος was an archaic epithet of Ἄρης, the ancient Greek god of War (cf. Hom. II.17.211, 20.69); ξυνός = κοινός, i.e., common to all, invoked the universal quality of war’s effects. ξυνός Ἐνυάλιος (Hom. II.18.309) or ξυνός ἀνθρώπου Ἄρης (Archil. 62) had become the educated man’s proverbial phrase for war’s indiscriminating ravages; cf. Karathanasis, Sprichwörter, 22/6. Likewise, βροτολοιγός refers to the god Ares as the personification of war, the “ruin of men”; cf. Hom. II. 5.31, Od. 8.115, cf. etiam Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.211.12: ἡ νίκη ἐστὶν ἡ κατὰ πόλεμον, ἀλλ’ ἄλλα ἄλλις ἐκ πολέμου προστίθεται, γινομένη ἐτεραλκής. Ἐνυάλιος γὰρ Ἐνυάλιος καί τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα>, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις λέγεται. Σὺ δ’ ἂν, ὦ οὗτος, ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἐρεῖς καὶ ξυνὸν Ἐνυάλιον καί τὸν πολύφιλον καί κακόφιλον. E.’s point is that Manuel averted war’s tendency to kill men on both sides of a conflict: μηδ’ἀμφοῖν τοῖν μεροῖν φθισήνορα, ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἀντίπαλον, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς πολέμιοις ἀπονεμήσθαι τὸν βροτολογόν.

Οὕτω…Οὕτω…Οὕτω: an unusually conspicuous example of anaphora, with the repetition of a word at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences. This rhetorical device schematically underscores the intended equivalence of the events eliptically sketched out here. Rhetoric was indispensable to the formal economy of the oration as part of its political narrative.

Πέρσαι Πέρσαις…Σκύθαι Σκύθας: polyptoton, a popular rhetorical figure whereby the same word is declined into two or more cases, in this case nom./dat….nom./acc. The use of archaizing ethnonyms like Persians and Scythians to
refer to contemporary peoples, like the semi-nomadic tribes of Central Asian origin who had settled on Byzantium’s Balkan and eastern frontiers in the 9th and 11th c., such as “Persians” for Turks, and “Scythians” for Pechenegs or Cumans, has been cited as evidence of pretentious erudition prompted by abject imitation of Attic Greek, as well as a historical escapism encouraged by the refusal to acknowledge the world as it actually was, beginning with the names of one’s territorial rivals. It is alleged that the net effect of this practice was to further widen the gap between Byzantine political discourse and contemporary reality. For a recent explanation cum rehabilitation of Byzantine “Classicism” in ethnography, see A. Kaldellis, *Ethnography After Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 2013) 106–117.

πλεονεξίαν νενοσηκότα, ύγιούντο σωφρονιζόμενα: E. employs a thematic variation of *chiasmus*, a rhetorical figure sometimes illustrated as arranging a series of words or short phrases in an ABBA pattern. In the case the two sides of the *chiasmus* mirror each other negatively “arrogance (A) suffering (B) / health (B) temperance (A). Probably following Hdt. Hist. 7.149.17: οὕτω δὴ οἱ Ἀργείοι φασί οὐκ ἀνασχέσθαι τῶν Σπαρτιητέων τὴν πλεονεξίην, Anna Komnena (*Alex. XIV* 7, 2.93) first invokes πλεονεξία as a political ‘malady’ to describe the large scale attacks by Westerners and Easterners on Byzantine territory under Alexios I Komnenos. Her example was followed by Io. Skylitzes in his *Synopsis Historiarum*, Const. VII (iter.) 9 (ed. J. Thurn, Berlin, 1973): νοσήσας γὰρ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, a passage copied by Kedrenos for his *Compendium Historiarum* 2.330 (ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1839)).

μεθόδοις βασιλικαῖς: as the numerous uses in the present text indicate (cf. ......), μέθοδος was as indefinite in its designation of the way something was achieved as our own ‘method’ or ‘way’, the latter being a direct semantic match for the Greek. Eust. makes repeated use of μέθοδος as a technical term of rhetoric in the commentaries to Homeric epic to refer to the habitual or ‘systematic’ application of a point of view or a narrative approach, as in ‘Homer’s method’; cf. *Comm. ad Hom. Il.* 3.22.16: Καὶ ὅρα πάλιν τὴν Ὅμηρικὴν μέθοδον. Its immediate significance here, and a few lines below (cf. αἱ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος μέθοδοι) being that Manuel’s policy was the result of ‘methodical’ calculation or stratagems rather than chance or impulse. For an Old Testament precedent, cf. LXX 2 Macc. 13.18: Ὅ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἰληφὼς γεύμα τῆς τῶν Ιουδαίων εὐτολμίας κατεπείρασεν διὰ μεθόδων τοὺς τόπους.

καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰρηναῖον ἐπαιανίζομεν: the grammar of εἰρηναῖον is unclear. The abstract τὸ εἰρηναῖον was the more common expression, used repeatedly by E. and other authors of the 12th c. signifying ‘peaceful existence’, which suggests
that the article τὸ may have fallen out in the copying/transcription of the Basel manuscript; cf. Or. 12 (Λόγος Α) 196.19–21: καὶ οὕτω μὲν ὁ κρατὺς ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων κακιῶν ἀνδρίζεται καὶ πάσαν στάσιν ἐκ μέσου ἀφεὶ καὶ τὸ εἰρηναῖον ἔφ’ ἀπασι καταπράττεται; cf. Idem. 15.258.18–26 Τούτῳ τε οὖν τὸ εἰρηναῖον ἀγαθὸν οὕτως ἔξ ὑπογύου τετελεσται; cf. etiam Euth. Torn. Or. (ed. J. Darrouzès, “Les Discours d’Euthyme Tornikès [1200-1205]” REB 26, 1968) 1.7.26–31: δι’ ἣν εἰρηναίαν ύμιν κατάστασιν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπιγείειτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς τὸ διηνεκὲς περισσέει τὸ εἰρηναῖον τε καὶ ἀπόλεμον. An alternative solution may be an implied noun with the adjective εἰρηναῖον, either masculine or neuter: cf. Th. Symoc. Hist. 6.2.15 τῆς χάρας αὐτοῖς ἀγνοούσης τὸν σιδηρὸν κάτειδεν τὸν εἰρηναῖον καὶ ἀστασίαστον παρεχομένης τὸν βίον αὐτοῖς; Nic. Chon. Hist. 11.112.26–29 εἰρηναῖον καὶ ἀστασίαστον εἴη τὸ κράτος σου ἐς αἰ. ὁ πλομανια: the verb ὁπλομανεῖ, from which this unique instance of the noun was no doubt derived, appears only 8 times in the Greek corpus of the TLG, none earlier than the Hellenistic period. Neither the verb or noun appears in any of E.’s other works.

αἴσθοιτό: αἰσθημα appears sometimes in some manuscripts for αἰσθάνομαι (cf. Thuc. 5.26: καὶ οὐχ ἦσσον τοῖς Πελοποννησίων διὰ τὴν φυγήν, καθ’ ἡσυχίαν τι αὐτῶν μᾶλλον αἰσθέσθαι). Its uncommonness and association with classical authors like Thuc., Isocr., and Plato, no doubt recommended it to E.

Δράκων δὲ ὁ νησιωτικός: a number of ancient texts preserved legends of “islands” inhabited by or associated with “dragons/serpents”, including Salamis, Libya (despite the latter not being an island) and Ithaca, cf. Steph. Ethnika (Libri Δ-Ι) 4.126 Δράκοντος νῆσας: Λιβύης, ώς Πολυνιστώρ ἐν γ Λιβύκων; Schol. in Lycophr. 110 νῆσον δράκοντος τὴν Σαλαμῖνα λέγει τὴν γάρ Σαλαμῖνα πρώην δράκων κατείχεν. The mention of κρατῆρας Αἴτναίους to designate whence the “dragon” set out to “exhale the fire of his fury”, all but confirms that E. is referring to the Norman rulers of Sicily, most likely William I, the so-called ‘the Bad’ (1154–1168), fourth son of Roger II Guiscard (1130–1154), who inherited his father’s ambition to conquer Byzantium. E. credits Manuel with fomenting the revolt against William (τὰ πλεῖον δὲ πλειαδοκοίς ἐγχροίς συγκρονομένος, οὐς αἱ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος μέθοδος ἐπανίστων) in Sicily and Apulia, where he dispatched his envoy Michael Palaiologos and John Doukas with a modest force and large quantities of gold in a bid to turn Apulia (1155). For Manuel’s involvement, see J. W. Birkenmeier, The Development of the Komnenian Army: 1081–1180 (Leiden, 2002) 114. For Byzantium’s enduring, century-long hostilities with the Norman kingdom of Sicily, see Magdalino, Empire, 27–66, 83–95.
Προμηθείας... βασιλικής: with this E. begins a long, twofold excursus on Manuel’s decisions to α) settle captured foreign troops within the empire and β) buy the freedom of some already enslaved in exchange for military service. The first of these proved by far the more controversial, since it may have been adopted on a larger scale and involved much coveted land grants. Magdalino, Empire, 443, n. 88, cites panegyrics by Theodore Prodromos (Hist. Ged. XXX, 280–321) and the poems of so-called ‘Manganeios’ celebrating Manuel’s capture of large numbers of prisoners from campaigns in the Balkans in 1149 and 1150–1151, many of whom appear to have been resettled within the empire; cf. E. Miller, ‘Poèmes historiques de Théodore Prodrome’, Revue archéologique, 2nd. ser., 25 (1873) 4. E. made panegyrical hay of the policy in a number of orations by employing agricultural metaphors, such as the grafting of Roman civilized behaviour onto the wild vine of foreigners as he does here, Ἐπ. 18 ἀφ’ ἧς δὲ ἐξεσπάσθησαν, μεταφυτευθέντες εἰς τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς γῆν, καὶ καρπὸν ἐκδεδωκότες τρόφιμον...[Ἐπ. 19: τῷ ἐκείνων ἀγρίῳ τὸ καθ’ ἡμερὸν ἐνεκέντρισεν]; cf. the long passage detailing Manuel’s treatment of the captives from his most recent campaign, Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 247.93–248.38: note also the designation of “good farmer” in 248.29–31 μεταγμένων ἐνοίκων εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ μεταφύτευσιν βασιλεί τῷ καλῷ γεωργῷ. Cf. P. Wirth, “Die Bevölkerungspolitik der Komnenen- und Laskaridenkaiser”, Byz. Forsch. 7 (1979) 203–212. E. emphasizes the enlightened, even liberal character of Manuel’s policy, noting its advantage for the empire in terms of increase (see note below on the parable of the multiplying of the talents). E. may have been alluding to at least one aspect of the policy which engendered opposition in his description of Pompey’s decision to resettled “all [sc. of the captured pirates] he deemed worthy of being saved and of some providence (ὅς...δόσωι δὲν φασιν ἔγινω σωτηρίας ἡξώσθαι καὶ προνοίας τινός). Πρόνοια at this time referred to the controversial measure of awarding land grants and the fiscal revenues they generated to both ‘Romans’ and, increasingly under Manuel, to some foreigners, in return for imperial service. Nicetas Choniates describes Manuel (critically) as abusing a practice invented by his predecessors but used sparingly with enemies, cf. Hist. 208.21–209.43, where Nicetas channels the complaint that anybody could be tempted by the land grants to quit his occupation and join the army. The practice proved controversial, as peasants or paroikoi attached to the land found themselves working for “barbarian”, i.e., ‘foreign’, pronoia holders serving in the imperial armies. For the historical arguments regarding the nature of πρόνοιαι land grants and whether they constitute evidence for a

οὐκ ἔστι γλῶτταν εἰπεῖν ἔθνους, ἣν οὐ παρέμιξε τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς εἰς χρήσιμον: with the final phrase εἰς χρήσιμον E. appears to anticipate the criticism of the historian Nicetas Choniates, who reproached Manuel for having been “easily swayed and pliable... at the hands of foreign-speaking servants who spoke faulty Greek” (Nic. Chon. Hist., 204.3–5 Εὔκολος δὲ ὃν καὶ εὐχείρωτος...τοίς ἀπὸ γενῶν ἐργαλείαν ὑπενθύμιζον E. appears to anticipate the criticism of the historian Nicetas Choniates, who reproached Manuel for having been “easily swayed and pliable... at the hands of foreign-speaking servants who spoke faulty Greek” (Nic. Chon. Hist., 204.3–5 Εὔκολος δὲ ὃν καὶ εὐχείρωτος...τοίς ἀπὸ γενῶν ἐργαλείαν ὑπενθύμιζον ὑπηρέταις), a charge reflecting wider resentment at the influence of foreigners at Manuel’s court. Cf. P. Wirth, “Die Bevölkerungspolitik der Komnenen- und Laskaridenkaiser,” Byz. Forsch. 7 (1979) 203–212.

χείρ ἢ μέν... ἀπογενέσθαι τὸ δυστύχημα: E. paints an almost Hegelian vignette of the mutual resentment of masters and ‘slaves’ yearning to be liberated from one another. This serves as the social backdrop to Manuel’s decision to ‘empty the imperial treasury’ (18.22–23 θησαυροί βασιλείαν ἐκκενοῦνται) in order to redeem potentially restive ‘barbarian’ soldiers to whom Manuel offered the alternative of a return to a ‘natural’ state of freedom as soldiers risking their life instead of the dishonourable life of a slave, which E. frames in notably Homeric terms (18.5 δουλείαν ἀτίμουν ἦπερ ζῆν πρὸς κλέος ἑλόμε νοι). Cf. Magdalino, Empire, 221, n.129.

tαλάντου...προσεπαύξησις: Matthew 25:14–30 recounts the parable of the talent, in which the servants who multiplied the share of their master’s estate during his absence are rewarded while the servant who ‘buries’ the talent instead of investing it is banished by his master. The received reading of the parable’s moral, invoked here by Eust., favoured the servants who increased their master’s patrimony; the lesson of the parable seems less obvious today since it appears to ignore the charges of the servant who accuses his master of being “hard” and of reaping without having sowed.

παλαιά ἱστορία καὶ δούλων πόλιν τινὰ προάγει πρὸς γνώσιν: the ‘city of slaves’ is invoked repeatedly by Aristotle as a counterfactual; cf. Arist. Pol. 1283a16–19: εὐδόγματος ἄντιποιούνται τὸς τιμῆς οἱ εὐγενεῖς καὶ ἐλεύθεροι καὶ πλοῦσις. δεὶ γὰρ ἐλεύθερος τ’ εἶναι καὶ τίμημα φέροντας (οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἴη πόλις ἐξ ἀπόρων πάντων, ἄσπερ οὐδ’ ἐκ δούλων). Its origins may have been proverbial, cf.
CPG vol. I, Cent. 1.22.1: Ὅσκ ἐστὶ δοῦλων πόλις: διὰ τὸ σπάνιον εἴρηται. Its implausibility seems to have assured it a place in the broadly antiquarian reference works of the post-classical period, including the middle Byzantine historical lexicon known as the Suda, which cites as its source the ancient historians Ephoros and Theopompos, thus explaining E.'s crediting παλαιὰ ἱστορία with furnishing knowledge of the 'city of slaves': cf. Sud. Lex. Δ 1423: Δοῦλων πόλις: παροιμία· ἐν Λιβύῃ. Ἐφορος ε´· και ἕτερα ἱεροδούλων, ἐν ᾧ εἰς ἔλευθερός ἐστιν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ Δουλόπολις, ὡς Σωσικράτης ἐν τῇ ἄ´ τῶν Κρητικῶν; cf. Pausanias Αττικῶν ὀνοµάτων συναγωγή Δέλτα 25.2 (H. Erbse, Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika, Berlin, 1950): Δοῦλων πόλις: [παροιμία] ἐν Λιβύῃ, Ἐφορὸς πέμπτῃ καὶ ἑτέρα ἱεροδούλων, ἐν ᾧ εἰς ἔλευθερός ἐστιν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ Δουλόπολις, ὡς Σωσικράτης ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Κρητικῶν.

οὔς φύσις...ζῆν ὥρισε: as noted in the apparatus, the manuscript has the unlikely ἐλευθέρια, a neuter plural noun designating a festival dedicated to Liberty, held every four years at Plataea in memory of the victory against the Persians in 479 B.C. Assuming the accent was misplaced by the scribe, one may read either a nom. predicate (living = freedom) or the more likely adverbial dat. ἐλευθερία. The appeal to nature (φύσις), instead of God or Providence, as the guarantor of freedom, is perhaps surprising from a clergyman like E., but the characterization of slavery as contrary to nature had a long pedigree in antiquity, to which a Byzantine author was as likely to defer as he might to divine authority. Slavery appears in various Eustathian texts, often with an ethical dimension regarding the proper treatment of slaves (e.g. Tafel, Opusc. 22/51–61, 134/33–37, where cruelty is forbidden and corporal punishment best curtailed). But the objection to slavery is uncompromisingly laid out in a remarkable testament included among E.'s letters (cf. Ep. 27), in which it appears he intended to manumit his own slaves, while copies of the will were to be given to them as guarantees to prevent their re-enslavement by anyone claiming them as inheritance. E. prefaces this unique document with a brief anthropological account of slavery as an institution invented by some humans in order to burden others with toil and ensure the permanence of service necessary to a life of indolence and luxury. E. does not broach the venerable moral ambiguity of church teaching on slavery dating back to St. Paul (cf. Ephesians 6:5–8; I Corinthians 7:21; Galatians 3:28) and St. John Chrysostom's homily on St. Paul's letter to Philemon; instead E. categorically condemns slavery as inimical to God's intention (Eust. Ep. 27.12–15: ἦν ἂν οὖν ἄρεσκόν θεῷ, τὸ τῆς δουλείας εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν ἔλευθερίαν ἀποκαθιστάναι καὶ τὸ τῆς πλεονεξίας ἀμάρτημα ἐπανισοῦν φυσικῇ ἀδελφότητι); though he stops short of
calling for its abolition as an institution, he describes his decision to manumit the “little souls” (ψυχάρια) in his charge as a matter of conscience (ταῦτα καὶ αὐτός ἐννοούμενος). The contemporary historian Io. Kinnamos attributes similar sentiments regarding the ‘un-naturalness’ of slavery to Manuel’s desire to liberate (most likely through payment) the worrying number of once free but impoverished subjects who had indentured themselves into virtual slavery; cf. Kinn. Epit. re. 275–276: ἡ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπαραίτητος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀνάγκη πολλά τε κατά τὸν βιον ἐκαινοτόμησεν ἄλλα καὶ δὴ καὶ μισθοῦ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀποδόθαι πολλοὺς ἀναγκάζει (…) βασιλεὺς δὲ πρόρριζον ἀπὸ μέσης ἐξεσπακέναι τῆς πολιτείας αὐτὸ βουληθεὶς γράμμασι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν οἷς φώσει τὸ ἐλευθερόν ἐπεψήφιστο. ἐλευθέρων γὰρ ἄρχειν Ῥωμαίων, ὀψε καὶ ἀνδραπόδων αὐτὸς ἠθελεν. While manumission appears to have been exceptional in Byzantium, there seems to have been significant controversy surrounding slavery in this period, grounded in both ethical and political, as well as economic, rationales. See Kazhdan, Studies, 165–167, nn. 114–117.

βίον δὲ κύκλος ἐπὶ δουλεῖαν στρέψας: the idea of “life’s circle” by which one may experience a reversal of fortune, in this case, enslavement, was quite ancient, and like the reference to “nature” above, described here without mention of Providence. But no less a theologically-minded author than Gregory of Nyssa used similar language: cf. Greg. Nyss. In Eccles. (ed. W. Jaeger [et al.]. Vol.I, Leiden, 1960) 5.287: ἔστι γάρ τις καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἀνατολῆ τε καὶ δύσις. μία ὁδὸς τοῖς πᾶσιν, εἷς ὁ κύκλος τῆς τοῦ βίου πορείας. E. cites a different meaning with respect to the enslaved prisoners, namely, that life takes a turn towards something, for the better or worse, we might say; in this case, naturally free and brave people become enslaved. It is not clear which sense was more common. The misfortune of slavery, a real possibility for so many throughout antiquity and the middle ages, had become encoded in proverbial expressions exploited by E.; cf. Karathanasis, Sprichwörter, 68/122: δοῦλος ἀντ’ ἑλευθέρου φανεῖς, τοῖν ὀφθαλμοῖν: dual gen.; E. makes sparing use of the dual, often cited in the scholarship as a hallmark of Atticism among Byzantine authors. Cf. Eust. De emend. 57.3 ἄμφω; 45.9–10 ἀμφοῖν…τούτοιν; 130.17 δυοίν; Ep. 6.43–44 ταῖν χεροῖν; Or. 47.56 et passim.

οἴκοι: locative of οἶκος; used throughout the Παρεκβολαί, only occasionally in E.’s remaining works, cf. Pro. in Pi. 9.18; Or. 15.252.69, 16.274.59, 16.274.64; 16,280,51; Ep. 19.231.
Not composed in a chance manner

Σπαρτοῦς ἀναφύντες αὐτόματοι: the Σπαρτοί, or ‘sown-men’, were warriors who ‘sprang from the earth spontaneously’ out of dragon’s teeth sown by a mythological hero. The two most widespread versions involve the mythological figure of Cadmus, founder of Thebes, who removed the teeth from a dragon he had killed and populated the city with the offspring of these autochthonous men (cf. Pind. *Isthm.* 1.30; 7(6).10); another involved the retrieval of the Golden Fleece by Jason, who must meet the challenge set by King Aeëtes, requiring him to sow dragon’s teeth, and kill the armed warriors who spring up from the ground (cf. Pindar, *Pyth.* 4; Apollonius, *Argonautica* III). Of the two versions, that of Cadmus’ settlement of Thebes appears most apt to E.’s point here regarding the settlement of Σπαρτοί / warriors in the empire: cf. Eust. *Comm. ad Hom. II.* 1.39.11–14: καὶ συγχωρητέον τῷ μύθῳ…ὅς καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ δρυῶν καὶ πετρῶν εὐγένεια καὶ ἐκ γῆς δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀνεβλάστανεν ὡς τοὺς Σπαρτοὺς καὶ ἐκ μυρμήκων δὲ μετέβαλεν.

ἀκοστήσεως: this form of the gen., as though from a noun ἀκόστης may well have been a Eustathian variation on the rare ἀκοστή, meaning barley or grain fed to horses and, by extension, referring to their upbringing. The aorist participle ἀκοστήσας (from a verb ἀκοστέω/-άω) was most often used with direct reference to the simile of restless horses in their stable eager for the open plains and rushing streams of *Iliad* 6.506, 15.263: cf. Eust. *Comm. ad Hom. II.* 2.374.16–375.6: Ἄλλοι δὲ ἀκοστήσαί φασί τὸ σχεῖν ἄχος ἐν τῷ ἰστασθαι, ἕνιοι δὲ τὸ λαβεῖν ἄχθος [ἡ μᾶλλον, κατ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοῦτο εἰπέν, ἀκος] τῇ στάσει καὶ τῇ τῆς τροφῆς ἀπολαύσει (…) Τινὲς δὲ γράφουσιν ἁγοστήσας, ὅ ἐστι ῥυπανθεὶς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φαντασάμενος τὰς συνήθεις νομὰς καὶ τὰ πρόθυμα λουτρά. E. draws on the Homeric simile in order to invoke the ethnographic motif of the untamed barbarian hardened by nature to endure harsh conditions (ὅσα τοὺς βαρβαροὺς στρατιώτας πρὸς ἀμαλθακὸν καρτηρίαν ὑγραῖνουσιν). The Rousseauian noble savage may not have been developed into as extensive a critique of Byzantine society as Tacitus’ *Germania*, but such uses of ethnography in Byzantium have only just begun to be systematically examined. See now A. Kaldellis, *Ethnography After Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature* (Pittsburgh, 2013).

πατρίδα…πάσαν: similar to the Latin ubi bene ibi patria (cf. Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* V 108 patria est ubicumque est bene), the axiom that one’s homeland was a function of one’s well being had proverbial force in the ancient world and acted as a corrective to the strong pull of local identities. Cf. Karathanasis, *Sprichwörter* 67/118. The expression was a variant of the expression πάσα γῆ πατρίς, which of-
fered the promise that anywhere could become a homeland, cf. CPG Vol. I, Zeno.

Οἱ μὲν...ἐστέλλοντο...εὐρίσκοντες / οἱ δὲ ...ἐπιβαλλόμενοι ...ἐγίνοντο: E. strains the verbal aspect of the participle εὐρίσκοντες by using it as a finite verb logically following in time after ἐστέλλοντο, in order to achieve the chiastic arrangement of verb-participle / participle-verb = ἐστέλλοντο... εὐρίσκοντες / ἐπιβαλλόμενοι... ἐγίνοντο, punctuated by the alliteration of all four words beginning with ε–, with only a brief subordinate clause interrupting the second part of the chiastic figure. The meaning would not likely have been in doubt. The temporal aspect εὑρίσκοντες, normally absent in a participle, would have been supplied by the listener’s mind. Just as interesting, however, are the corresponding senses across the chiastic division: the first group ‘journeyed’ (στέλλω, LSJ II) and found perpetual rest for themselves; the second, in constant search for riches, settle in the rich gulf of the Aegean. We thus have finite movement + perpetual action / perpetual action + finite movement. Form lends shape to the content, while the content underscores the significance of the form.

tοῦ πλουτοποιοῦ κόλπου: E. appears to use the expression in the metaphorical sense of the empire’s “enriching bosom or embrace,” although the seafaring image was consonant with earlier, more literal uses of πλουτοποιοῦς in connection with bodies of water in his commentary to the Hellenistic geographer Dionysius Periegetes to describe the “enriching waters of the river Achelous”; cf. Comm. in Dion. Perieg. 431.39: τοῦ Ἀχελοῦ... τὸ πλουτοποιοῦν; cf. at least two orations addressed to Manuel I Komnenos, Or. 11 (Λόγος Κ) 194.27: πλουτοποιοῦ ἱεύματος ποταμοῦ; ibid. Or. 14 (Λόγος Ν) 248.56–7: τὸ Μαιάνδριον ῥεῦμα πλουτοποιοῦ.

ἀμάλθακος: ἀμάλθακτος was the more common adjective, cited in Byzantine lexic and used mainly by medieval authors, including at least one instance in E.; cf. Comm. in Dion. Perieg. 431.43. The alpha-privative with μαλθακός, a common enough word, though not attested, would nevertheless have been immediately intelligible. καρτερία is paired with μαλθακότης in a number of texts describing physical endurance; cf. Nic. Blemm. De virtute 15-16 (ed. E. Gielen, Nicphori Blemmydae De virtute et asceti, Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 80, Turnhout, 2016): Ἡ ἀκρασία τῆς ἐγκρατείας ἰδίως ἀντίθετος, καὶ ἡ μαλθακότης τῆς καρτερότητος.

ἔλεος ἐκ βασιλέως: for the reputation of clemency and mercy he tried to cultivate; cf. Eust. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 287.83–87: ύπο πόδας τῷ βασιλεῖ, οἷς τὰς χειρας ἐκτείνεις εἰς ἔλεον, καὶ γίνεται καὶ τούτο καιρία πληγή τοῖς βαρβάροις, καὶ τάσις
αὕτη χειρῶν δεσμεῖ τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ πλουτοποιῶς σκορπισμός (ἔσκόρπισας γὰρ, ἐδωκας τοῖς πένησι) σκεδάζει βουλὰς ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐθνὴ διασκορπίζει τὰ τοὺς πολέμους θέλοντα καὶ κατακαυχᾶται τῆς μάχης ἐλεος.

Οἱ δὲ στρατεύεσθαι ἢν ἐπιθυμεῖν: an example of the prolix style scholars sometimes complain about, the impersonal circumlocution with a double infinitive seems unnecessarily convoluted. Part of the explanation may be the need to vary the syntax, since both the previous and subsequent sentence employ active personal constructions. The somewhat stilted syntax of this sentence demands that we dwell on the decision of those who chose the perils of military service over servitude.

πλείους ἐκ πρὶν ἀρχεκάκων...εἰς χρηστότητα μετεποίησεν: E. reiterates the benefits to the empire of Manuel’s settlement policy. Cf. Or. 14 (Λόγος N) 24.8.32–38: καὶ ἡ μὲν τῶν Ἰταλῶν γῆ πάλαι ποτὲ πολλοὺς δεξαμένη Ἐλληνας μεγάλη ἐπωνομάσθη Ἐλλάς, γῆν δὲ ἔκεινην τὴν παρασχεδὸν ἡμῖν ἑτέραν καὶ ἅλλην, τὰς πανταχοῦ τῆς Εὐρώπης, ἐν αἷς τὸ Ἀγαρηνὸν φῦλον κατέσπαρται, εἰ ἂν εὐεπήβολος ἄνθρωπος ὁ νέαν ἐπονομάσας Περσίδα ἢ καὶ γῆν Εὐρωπαίαν Περσῶν· αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν πεπλήθυνται, οἱ μὲν πλείους ἄκοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἑκόντες μετοικιζόμενοι καὶ ἀποικιζόμενοι.

Μάγνου Πομπηίου καθιστορούμενον: in keeping with the panegyrical convention of funerary orations for emperors, E. likened Manuel’s accomplishments with those of illustrious historical figures, a variant on the older practice of comparing the laudandum with mythic figures like Hercules or Theseus (cf. Men.-Rhet. 421.8–10). Byzantine epitomizers and chroniclers preserved the memory of Pompey’s mission in 67 B.C. to curtail, if not entirely eradicate piracy on the Mediterranean seas. The Pompeian analogy is further supported by the fishing metaphor ὅσους...ηγκίστρευσε. As part of his swift and remarkably successful campaign, Pompey is said to have established a settlement in Dyme (modern Kato Achaia), in the eastern Peloponnese, for ‘reformed’ pirates, even renaming the city Πομπηιόπολιν after himself. The most likely sources in Byzantium for Pompey would have been Plutarch’s Pompeius 116–32.4 (ed. B. Perrin, Plutarch’s lives, vol. 5. Cambridge, Mass., 1917; repr. 1968), as well as Strabo’s Geographica Bk 14, ch. 5, 8. 4 (ed. A. Meineke, Strabonis geographica, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1877; repr. 1969). Pompey ‘the Great’, like Alexander ‘the Great’ later in the oration, serves as a foil for Manuel’s allegedly greater accomplishments. It is difficult...

τοὺς τῆς Ἄγαρ...όσοι ἀκραιφνῆς ὑπρᾶς ἐπιπνεῖ: cf. supra not. ad loc. Ἡπ. 17 Πέρσαι Πέρσαις...Σκύθως.

οὐδεμία τῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης πόλεων ἀνοργίαστος...ἐρώτος: Manuel was repeatedly characterized as the “emperor-lover” bestowing his “charms” on all the cities of the empire (τοῦ καλοῦ βασιλέως ἐκείνου τὰς φιλητικὰς ἐπαφιέντος ἄπασας ἱγγας), while they vied like nervous maidens to learn which he will choose as his favourite. The theme of Ἔρως βασιλεύς was at the center of the Byzantine revival of the ancient novel -the term Ἔρως βασιλεύς originates in the 12th c. prose novel Υσμίνη καὶ Υσμινίας- and it appears to have been a favourite theme of the Komnenian court of Manuel, whom E. depicts as being engaged in a virtual parlour game of political romance. For Manuel as benefactor of cities and harbinger of prosperity, cf. Eust. Or. 14 (Λόγος Ν) 232.4–10: ἀεὶ μὲν γὰρ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ ἔνθεος βασιλεύς, ἀλλ’ ὅτε καὶ ἐμφανίζεται, πολλαπλασιάζει τὰ ἀγαθά· εἰ γὰρ τὸ ἐγκαταλειφθήσεται ἡ θυγάτηρ Σιὼν ἀποστροφὴ θείαν δηλοῖ, πάσχοι ἂν ταὐτόν, ὡς εἰκός, ἐγκατάλειμμα καὶ πόλις, ἥν σὺχνα ἐπιβλέπων ὁ ἐν βασιλεῦσιν ὕψιστος εἶτα τὴν θέαν ἐπὶ μακρὸν τρέψεις· καὶ ἀντιστρόφως φάναι, θεὸς τε μὴ ἐγκαταλείπων πόλιν εἰς ἀγαθὸν αὐτὴν ἐπισκέπτεται καὶ ὁ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον τυπούμενος βασιλεὺς τοῦτο ποιῶν εἰς εὐετηρίαν ἀπασαν γίνεται. On Manuel’s notorious sexual appetite prompting associations with the mythical ‘Eros the King’, cf. Mang. Prodr. 14; for more on the relation of Eros and sexuality and ideology in Komnenian culture, see P. Magdalino, ‘Eros the king and the king of amours: some observations on Hysmine and Hysminias’, DOP, 46 (1992), 197–204; see also C. Cupane, “Ερως βασιλευς: la figura di Eros nel romanzo byzantino d’amore,” Atti dell’Academia di Scienze, Lettere e Arte di Palermo, serie 4, 33/2: 243–297.

<μὴ> στερχθήναι: the manuscript has καὶ στερχθήναι, followed by Tafel. But στερχθήναι (from στέργω) alone would mean that “being cherished was akin to destruction and being wiped off the face of the earth, making nonsense of ἀλλὰ τοῦτο. A solution is to emend to στερηθήναι, “deprived,” which could have been
corrupted or perhaps ‘corrected’ by an overzealous scribe who had just written στέρξας above. But στερέω normally requires a gen. of the thing one is deprived of, and we should expect something like ταύτης (sc. τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς), even in a style as eliptical as this; cf. Eust. Ep. 43.104–105: τούτου στερηθείς ἐγώ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα δυσφόρως ἔσχον. A <μή> before στερχθῆναι, would correspond with στέρ-ξας in the previous sentence and complete the sense of the whole.

σύστημα...ἄλλοκοτον: the pairing of σύστημα and ἄλλοκοτος appears unique in all Greek literature and testifies to E.’s willingness to experiment and expand the possible senses of words. E. had previously used σύστημα to refer to any organized body of persons sharing interests or an identity, at times close in meaning to our “class” or sociopolitical constituency; cf. Eust. De capta Thess. 90.21: Τὸ μὲν λαϊκὸν σύστημα τῆς πόλεως ὀστῶ πονούμενον ἦν καὶ ὑπὲρ δ ἐπάθει, τὸ δὲ τῆς λοιπῆς μερίδος ἐξακολούθησεν καὶ τοῦ ἰπποκόρου; cf. etiam 120.29 Καὶ τὸ ἐντεύθεν αὐτοὶ μὲν ἦσαν οἰκίαν ἐσω, τὸ δὲ πολεμικὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῖς ἐπιθέμενος ἑπάτομο, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς. With ἄλλοκοτον τοῖς γε πλείοσι. E. may be making an understated allusion to the mistrust felt by many in the capital towards foreigners as a ‘group’ at the court of Manuel as well as resentment at privileges granted them by the emperor.

ἀνδρά...δίγλωττον: translators and interpreters must have been indispensable to the functioning of the Byzantine empire, including both state and ecclesiastical diplomacy, command of foreign mercenaries, commerce, to name but a few. Despite this we have few references to “bilingual” persons able to translate, and those we do have tend to involve more learned individuals, usually Italo-Latin speakers from Byzantine territories in Italy, often identified as such by their patronymic, e.g., John Italos. We have only three examples, including this one, of δίγλωττον to designate a translator or interpreter, in the tenth century; cf. Sud. Lex. Δ 854; cf. etiam Nic. Chon. Hist. 1.190.92–94: καθ’ ἦν δὲ ἡμέραν τῶν ἐπισφαλῶν ἐκείνων ἐπέβαλε τρίβων ἀνήρ τις προσελθὼν αὐτῷ δίγλωττος, τὸ γένος Ῥω-μαίος, τούπτιλην Μαυρόπουλος. Claims that one attracted foreigners through one’s reputation became a topos of (self-)congratulation, as Michael Psellus boasted in a letter to the patriarch Michael Keroularios he had students from both West and East, cf. U. Criscuolo, “Michele Psello, Epistola a Michele Cerullario” Hellenica et Byzantina Neapolitana 15 (1973; repr. 1990) 21–31, ll. 96–101: ἀλλὰ Κελτούς μὲν καὶ Ἀρραβας ἀλωσίμους ἦμιν πεποίηκαμεν καὶ καταπεφοιτήκασι

τῆς πρεσβείας τὸ τελικῶτατον: “the ultimate aim of their embassy”; with two notable exceptions dating to the 3rd/4th c., τελικῶτατον appears to have come into wider circulation only after the eleventh century, where it refers to the ultimate or decisive nature of a thing; cf. Mich. Pselli Opusc. (eds. J.M. Duffy et D.J. O’Meara, Michaelis Pselli Philosophica minora, Leipzig, 1992) 7.58: τελικῶτατον αἴτιον. E. is implying, through the subtle extension of the superlative, that whatever the proximate aim (τέλος) of the embassies to the Byzantine capital, the final purpose was to see for themselves this ‘second Solomon’.

ιστορήσαι...βασιλέα: E. uses ἱστορέω in an almost Herodotean, technical sense to mean no just look upon but to examine for oneself in a bid to report to others. To appreciate the point we must recall the significance attached to physiognomy as indicative of character. And while in a previous oration before Manuel E. declined to dwell on Manuel’s physical features, he nevertheless mentions that they delighted his onlookers; cf. Eust. Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 224.25–29.

ἐρανίσασθαι...ἀκουσμάτων: we can only speculate about what sort of ἀκουσμα or “thing heard about Manuel” E. had in mind. It would have been familiar enough to his audience that he saw no need to spell it out. Manuel was celebrated in a variety of forms, both prose and verse. E. may mean that they hoped to procure for themselves copies of such texts, especially some of the many ‘political verses’ (πολιτικὸς στίχος) of a sing-song quality implied by ἀκουσμα quite popular at Manuel’s court. Linked to this is the idea of ἀκουσμάτων referring to ‘mirabilia’–i.e., songs about Manuel’s achievements, which together with their first-hand experience of the emperor would allow the ambassadors to bring back “wonders” (θαῦμα) to those who had sent them on their embassy. For the popularity of playfully panegyrical verses at the Komnenian court, see Kazhdan–Epstein, Change in Byzantine Culture, 85; for the formal evolution of πολιτικὸς στίχος and its potential aptness to culture of the Komnenian court, see M. J. Jeffreys, “The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse,” DOP 28 (1974) 141–195.

τισὶ τῶν γυμναστικῶν ἔργων ἰδεῖν ἐπιπρέποντα: Manuel is said to have been the first Byzantine emperor to wed the more traditional ‘athletic’ pursuits of the Byzantine aristocracy, such as hunting and falconing, with Western chivalric displays. His prowess with the lance is described with genuine ekphrastic

ἡ μελέτη τοῦ φθάσαι ζήτησιν ἐπικουρίας...ἡ καὶ χρημάτων ἐνδείᾳ: the causal dat.s μελέτη and ἐνδείᾳ, arrayed in chiastic (abba) order, further qualify the impersonal δέει + infinitive.

Ἀλλὰ τί μοι πρέσβεις λέγειν...τοὺς ὑπὸ στέμμασιν: E. had previously illustrated Manuel’s fame among foreign rulers by recounting how the king of Jerusalem, Baldwin IV, had visited Constantinople, drawn by reports of Manuel’s renown; cf. Eust. Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 213.82–214: Κείσεται μοι μέρος ἐνταῦθα τῆς ἀφηγήσεως καὶ τὸ τοῦ ῥηγὸς μεγαλώνυμον, ὡς ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἔδραμεν ἄκοη τε καταπεπληγμένος καὶ ἔργοι μακρόθεν τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξαισθαμαστον ἐπεγνωκώς, οἷς εὐηργέτητο καὶ ἐνεφορήθη καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ τῶν ὁμιλιῶν νέκταρος, τῆς ἐν διαλέξεσιν ἀμβροσίας, τῆς λοιπῆς βασιλικῆς γλυκύτητος. At different times various foreign rulers visited the Byzantine court, including (in the order cited above), the Seljuk sultan Kılıç Arslan II in 1161, described here in typical archaizing fashion as ‘ethnic leader of the Persians’; Baldwin IV, king of Jerusalem; Conrad III, king of Germany, referred to here as ὁ ἐξ Ἀλαμανῶν, while in keeping with Byzantine usage, Ludwig VII, king of France is described as ὁ τῆς γερμανικῆς ἁπάσης ὑπερηστάμενος. The last two were received in the Byzantine capital during the Second Crusade, which E. makes no mention of. In his translation, Tafel takes τοὺς ὑπὸ στέμμασιν in apposition to πρέσβεις and translates “wozu von Gesandten und ihrem Geweihten Schmucke reden”. But the subsequent references to κορυφαίας ἀρχὰς...ὁ κατὰ Πέρσας ἐθνάρχης, καὶ ὁ τῶν Παλαιστινῶν ὑπερκαθήμενος ρήξ. Λοιπὸς δὲ ὁ ἐξ Ἀλαμανῶν ἐκεῖνος ὁ μέγας, καὶ ὁ τῆς γερμανικῆς ἀπάσης ὑπερηστάμενος γῆς, strongly support reading πρέσβεις as predicative. The audience would have been guided to this conclusion by the orator’s intonation.
ἔργον ἑτερὸν… πορισόμενοι συμβολὴν ἱκανὴν: this sounds like a highly abridged and thinly veiled reference to the “substantial material support” or “contribution” (συμβολὴν ἱκανὴν) sought by the crusaders from the Byzantine emperor as they mustered near Constantinople on the way to the Holy Land. That this went on repeatedly for some time may explain the use of the iterative optative γένοιτ'. It is unlikely that the audience would not have perceived this as a patent euphemism for what was a kind of tribute paid to crusader leaders in order to encourage them to move swiftly across to the Asian side lest the crusading armies begin looting and pillaging the Byzantine hinterland. But in good panegyrical fashion, E. turns what had been an imposition on the Byzantine emperor (still hinted at in the purposive future participle πορισόμενοι) into a measure of his fame and status as a virtual patron of these foreign lords. E. had previously listed the many petitions brought before Manuel by “envoys”: Eust. Opusc. 185.34–186.39: πρεσβεῖαι ὡς ἑκάστοτε, ἄλλαι μὲν ἐκπεμπόμεναι, ἑτεραι δὲ εἰσδεχόμεναι, θεσμοθεσιῶν μελέται, κρίσεων εὐθεσιμοί, στρατιωτῶν ἐκλογισμοί, ἀκουσμάτων παλαισματα, ὃν τὰ πλεῖω ἔξωθεν καὶ ἐκ βαρβάρων, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ πλείους αἰ μέρμηνα, ὀικονομιῶν τύποι, πρακτέων ἐπικρίσεις, ὄχλοι δεομένων, καὶ οὗτοι μυριότροποι, καὶ ὁποία τὰ καθέκαστα ἀπεριληπτοί καὶ μέτρον ὑπερεκπίπτοντες.

θαυμαστώσαντες ἐκείνην ὅδὸν· ὀκνῶ γὰρ εἰπεῖν εὐμέθοδον ἔφοδον: E. would appear to be describing the arrival in 1147 of the crusading armies of Louis VII of France and the German king, Conrad III. The active participle from θαυμαστῶ is hard to construe precisely; it likely means something close to “[they] made the journey a thing to marvel at.” Tafel’s “welche jenen wunderlichen Zug nach unserem Land anstellen” fails to explain the transitive sense of θαυμαστώσαντες. Most translations of such parallels as Psalms 4.4 ἐθαυμάστωσεν κύριος τὸν ὅσιον αὐτοῦ, offer little guidance; cf. θαυμάστωσις in Eust. Opusc. 47.55: ὅδὸν…εὐμέθοδον ἔφοδον combines assonance and a device of repetition known as homoioteleuton, a series of similar sounding endings, which produce unexpected ties between words of distinct meaning. Here the words road-journey, plan-strategy, and campaign-crusade are an almost sarcastic comment on the failure of the crusade led by Ludwig VII and Conrad III. For the idea of εὐμέθοδου ἔφοδον; cf. Nic. Chon. Or. 14, 136.12: μέθοδος εὐμέθοδος καὶ εὐμήχανος πρὸς τὴν κατ’ ἀντιπάλων ἔφοδον.

ὁ κατὰ Πέρσας ἑθνάρχης: the Sultan of Ikonion (modern Konya) was leader of the breakaway Sultanate of Rum, a Seljuk state in central Anatolia, ruled for most of Manuel's reign by 'Izz al-Din Kılıç Arslan II (1156–1192). The ethnonym
Πέρσας is not entirely due to archaizing language since Persian was the official, though probably not common, language of the Sultanate court, as well as of its literature. For Kılıç Arslan’s stay as a guest of Manuel in the capital, see Kinn. *Epit. re.* 204.3–208.3; cf. Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 118.29–122.30.

ό τῶν Παλαιστηνῶν ὑπερκαθήμενος ρῆξ: Amalrich, king of Jerusalem (1163–1174), married Maria Komnena, a distant niece of Manuel I. He would eventually form a close military alliance with Manuel in order to launch an unsuccessful invasion of Egypt; cf. Magdalino, *Empire*, 73–75. Kinnamos, *Epit. re.* 280.10, mentions the visit, as he does a number of historical events in the *Επιτάφιος*, suggesting that E. may at the very least have consulted Kinnamos’ record to recapitulate Manuel’s achievements: Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ὁ Παλαιστίνης ρῆξ ἐπὶ Βυζάντιον ἠλθε περὶ ἧν ἔχρηζε βασιλέως δεησόμενος. τυχὼν δὲ ἃν ἐδείτο ἄλλα τε πολλά καὶ δουλείαν ἐπὶ τούτους βασιλεῖ διώμολογηκεν.

Τὸν γὰρ Παίονα...καὶ συχνοὺς τοιούτους: E. lists the nations on Byzantium’s northern frontiers who alternated as virtual vassals or invaders: Hungarians, Bosnians and Slavs, respectively, Paionians at this time would have likely meant Magyar ‘Hungarians’; ‘Gepids’ were most likely tribes living in what is present-day ‘Bosnia’; Skythians stood for Petchenegs, Russians, and other peoples from across the Danube. Cf. Eust. *Or.* 16 (Λόγος Ο) 263.72–74: καὶ τὸν μὲν Σκύθην ἔχω μαθὼν καὶ οὔ με ξενίζει τῇ θέᾳ, Παίονες δὲ καὶ Δαλμάται καὶ πάν, ὅσον τοῦτοι πρόσοικοι,

Καὶ ἡ πάντα ταῦτα, εἴτε καὶ τοῦτων τινά: sc. ἐστίν or ἦν. The statement appears to qualify the earlier conclusion about the motives of the visitors, acknowledging that these may have combined or been distinct in each case. Whether this was E.’s scholasticism speaking or some distinction important to the court is unclear. E. had already listed θάμβος and φόβος as the two principal reasons why foreign rulers wished an audience with the Byzantine emperor. Now he will proceed to explain each: awe of Manuel inspired by what they had learned about him; fear lest they fall out of favour; and a third motive, so far unmentioned, namely, the knowledge that should “evil befall them one day from some quarter” (εἴ τι πον κακὸν ἐκείνος ἐπήρτητό ποθεν), it would not be possible to be rid of it without help from the emperor. Tafel*2* (n.33) argues that contemporary sources in Greek, as well as Latin and Arabic, confirm that by reason of Manuel’s keenness to play a mediating rôle (to Byzantium’s advantage, naturally), the Byzantine capital served as a diplomatic point of exchange between Europe and Asia, and that E. was not indulging in empty flattery
μήποτε συμβαίη ἄλλως: the fear clause takes as its point of reference the implicit opposite of the previous clause, whereby their visit to the emperor meant they were in his good graces. So while they desired to retain the emperor’s favour, “they harboured a fear lest it ever turned out otherwise.”
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φήμη...φιλακροάμονας: E. appears to have enjoyed collecting proverbial language and making frequent use of it, though almost always in a manner that makes it seem apt. “Winged fame” was so familiar an expression that we actually meet it less often than one might expect; the combination with ἄνετος is E.’s own, though he had made passing references to φήμη πτερωτή before: cf. Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.153.14–16: καὶ ὁ Ζεῦς, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν πολλοῖς πέμπων ὁμοίως τὴν Ἰριν, εἴτε τις πτερωτὴν αὐτήν δαίμονα θέλει νοεῖν εἴτε τὴν ἐν ἀέρι φαινομένην εἴτε τὴν φήμην; cf. etiam Or. 8 (Δόγος Η) 141.16–17: καὶ ἢ τούτῳ τὸ σόφισμα τῷ Ἄνωνι φήμη τις πτερωτή καὶ τρόπον ἄλλον λόγοι περιτυγχάνεις.

ὅς ἔμαθον περιτυγχάνεις ἐκβαίνουσι πρὸς ἀλήθειαν: oǐς stands in the dat. instead of acc. as the result of attraction as the object of περιτυγχάνω, which takes a dat. (LSJ, s. v. περιτυγχάνω).

Ὡς ἐληλυθότες ἐκεῖνοι...ἀπῄεσαν διαπρύσιοι κήρυκες: the TLG has only one instance of the formulaic expression διαπρύσιος κήρυκες before the fourth century; cf. Thess. De virt. herb. 2.1 (ed. H.-V. Friedrich, Thessalos von Tralles, Meisenheim am Glan, 1968) and one of διαπρύσιος κηρύττω, on which the popularity of the expression in Byzantium is more likely based: Diod. Sic. Bibl. Hist. 11.38.6 οὐ γὰρ τῆς ἱστορίας δικαία μαρτυρία τετήρηκε τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμην, κηρύττοσα διαπρύσιος εἰς ἄπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα. cf. Greg. Naz. In theoph. (Orat. 38) PG 36 321c: Νοῦς μὲν οὖν ἦδη καὶ αἴσθησις, οὕτως ἀπ’ ἄλληλον διακριθέντα, τῶν ἰδίων ὅρων ἑνός εἰστήκεισαν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ Λόγου μεγαλειονέν ἐαυτοῦ ἐφερέται τὴς μεγαλουργίας, καὶ διαπρύσιοι κήρυκες. The marked increase in use of such ‘off-the-rack’ phrases in Byzantium is not easily explained by the size of literary record of he middle ages. It may be the expression was too common to have entered the genres of literature preserved by antiquity. The expression therefore started out life in a lower literary register and steadily rose through the linguistic ranks to end up in court poetry: Theod. Prod. Carmina 1.37–39 δεὶ δεὶ γὰρ κήρυκος ἦμιν ῥήτορος εὐρυφώνου / μεθ’ ὑψηλοῦ κηρύγματος, φωνή διαπρύσισι / κηρύσσοντος καὶ λέγοντος: «Ὤ ἄνδρες, ὁ Ἀδριαῖο». 
τοῦ ὅντως ἀνθρώπου: the Basel manuscript has ὅντως ἀνθρώπου, in all likelihood an error on the part of the scribe for τοῦ ὅντως ἀνθρώπου (vid. appar. ad loc.) since at least one form of the cursive “nu” (ν) used by E. can resemble an “ypsilon” (υ). See the letter tables of E.’s script in M. Formentin, “La grafia di Eustazio di Tessalonica,” Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata n.s. 37/1 (1983) 19–50. Assuming one wanted to remain unwaveringly faithful to the palaeographical dictate of lectio difficilior, one might try to read ὅντως ἀνθρώπου as equivalent to τοιούτου ἀνθρώπου, although no examples of this appear in either medieval or earlier Greek texts so far in the TLG. In contrast the expression ὅντως ἀνθρώπου had a long pedigree, especially in certain religious texts, cf. Greg. Nyss. De perf. Christ. ad Olymp. mon. PG 8.1: καὶ ὥσπερ εἰ τις διακρίνοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅντως ἀνθρώπου τὸν ὀμωνύμως ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνος λεγόμενον. E. had used the expression in an earlier oration addressed to Michael Hagitheodorites: Or. 8 (Λόγος Η) 141.27: ὅτι θεοῦ δῶρον αὐτὸς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πράγμα θειότατον, ὅτι ψυχῆς κόσμος κάλλος τὸ ὅντως ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἀληθοῦς· ἀναγωγὸς εἰς θεόν.

Μεγέθους μὲν γὰρ: γάρ offers an explanation of the previous statement, which editorially practical division into paragraphs can obscure. For the grammar of Μεγέθους... ἐπέβη cf. LSJ s.v. ἐπιβαίνω A. 1. 2. The claim that Manuel was so tall that “anyone exceeding him in height would be reckoned a giant” (εἰ τις ὑπεραναβαίη, ἐγγραφήσεται ὡς εἰς γιγάντα) is the kind of exaggeration permitted in the hyperbolic register of encomiastic rhetoric. The surviving accounts do in fact describe Manuel as tall, at least as a youth. Both Kinnamos (Epit. re. 206.2: βασιλεὺς μεγέθει σώματος ἀναλογωτάτου τὸν πάντα πληρῶν) and Nicetas Choniates mention Manuel’s height, noting that even as a youth he was “tall for his age”, even though “he stooped more than a little” (Hist. 51.76: εὐμήκης ὄν τὴν ἡλικίαν... κάν ἐπένευσε τι τοῦ ἱθυτενοῦ μέτριον).

ὁστέωσιν ἄδραν καὶ ως εἰπεῖν λεοντώδη: E. uses the simile of the lion-like emperor five times in the oration, as he had before; cf. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 275.6–8: ω τῆς λεοντοθύμου ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον τάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐφ’ οὕτω σοφοπλορκία ἐνστάσεως. The association of lions and kings was widespread in both antiquity and the middle ages, in both language and images, despite the absence of lions in Europe for more than ten thousand years. This suggests that the political association of the lion was created at a much earlier, pre-Hellenic or Indo-European phase.
οὐδὲ τὴν κόμην πρὸς τρυφερότητα ἔσκητο: an absence of inordinate concern for one’s hair style was a long-standing topos of panegyric and of character portraits of virtuous male aristocrats. The inference to be drawn is that the topos spoke to a reality of men who took great care with their grooming, as the satirical author Lucian, quite popular in twelfth-century Byzantium, illustrates by analogy with notorious ancient dandies: Luc. Rhet. praec. 11 (ed. A.M. Harmon, Lucian, vol. 4. Cambridge, Mass., 1925 [repr. 1961]): ἐν τούτοις δὲ καὶ πάνσοφόν τινα καὶ πάγκαλον ἄνδρα, διασεαλευμένον τὸ βάδισμα, ἐπικεκλασμένον τὸν αὐχένα, γυναικείον τὸ βλέμμα, μεληχρὸν τὸ φώνημα, μύρων ἀποπνέοντα, τῷ δακτύλῳ ἀκρωτίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν κοῦμενον, δλίγας μὲν ἐτί, σφαλας δὲ καὶ ύακινθίνας τὰς τρίχας εὐθετίζοντα, πάναβρόν τινα Ἀρδανάπαλλον ἢ Κινύραν ἢ αὐτὸν Ἀγάθωνα, τὸν τῆς τραγῳδίας ἐπέραστον ποιητήν. E. shows familiarity with this topos in both encomium and blame: Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.602.20–25 Ἰστέον δὲ καὶ, ὡσ εἴναι : adverbial = “with the result that”.

τοῖς ἀκρωτηρίοις ἐπεντρανίσαντα τίνα: the compound ἐπεντρανίζω appears side by side with the simpler form, ἐντρανίζω, among authors of the twelfth century; cf. LBG s.v. ἐπεντρανίζω, “(genau) betrachten, ansehen: τινί/τί” (“to scrutinize carefully”) construed with the dat. of the person or thing seen or scrutinized, in this case, τοῖς ἀκρωτηρίοις.

τα κατὰ φυσικοὺς γνώμονας: the ‘experts’ or γνώμονες on the physical constitution in question were the so-called φυσιογνώμονες of antiquity who observed human form and drew inferences from external physical features of the body about the internal disposition of character. Aristotle was credited with being the father of this psycho-physical science, and a work of the 3rd cent. B.C. titled Physiognomonica was (probably falsely) attributed to him. Two further works on physiognomy, known from translations into Latin and Arabic, by Posidonius (c.135–c.51 BC) and another by the popular sophist Polemo of Laodicea (c. AD 88–144) circulated widely in late antiquity and probably survived in some form in Byzantium. The Suda preserves at least the memory of this once impor-

τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀνθρωπὸν ἕσχολητο τὰ τῆς φύσεως: the sense of this sentence depends largely on the meaning of the grammatical subject τὰ τῆς φύσεως, an expression which a number of canonical ancient texts contrasted with τὰ τοῦ νόμου (cf. Plato, Gorgias 483a4: ἐὰν μὲν τις κατὰ νόμον λέγῃ, κατὰ φύσιν ύπερωτῶν, ἐὰν δὲ τὰ τῆς φύσεως, τὰ τοῦ νόμου). E. seems to use the expression as equivalent to the simple φῦσις; the middle ἀσχολοῦμαι is usually intransitive. At the heart of E.’s point here is the reference to τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀνθρωπὸν, which served as shorthand for the those parts of human existence addressed by Christian teaching (cf. Didym. Caecus. Fragm. in Psalm. 808: τῆς ἀνθρώπου προσηγορίας ἐνταῦθα μνημονεύει πρὸς δειξιν τὸν ἀληθῶς ἀνθρωπὸν τὸν κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὑμιῶσιν θεοῦ γεγενημένον). Although E. was sensitive to hypocrisy and dissembling, he does not intend here anything like “the real man” in our sense of the authentic or genuine person contrasted with the public persona. However, in his account of the Occupation of Thessalonike he describes of Andronikos’ turning inward to compensate for his wickedness and injustice: Eust. De capta Thess. 52.31: Καὶ ἦν μὲν ἴσως μέτριος τὴν κακίαν, εἰπερ ἐνταῦθα ἐλθὼν ἄδικήματος ἐληξε καὶ ἐστράφη πρὸς τὸν ἀληθῶς ἀνθρωπὸν.

δόξην...όποια κοσμοῖν ἄν ἡρωίκην στρυφνότητα: κοσμῶν is deliberately incongruous with στρυφνότης. Joined to ἡρωίκος the countenance or mien E. describes is that of the battle-hardened severity of expression on Manuel’s face. Although the single other instance of the phrase, Psellos’ use of it suggests it was in circulation. Cf. Mich. Psell. Encom. in matr. (ed. U. Criscuolo, Naples, 1989) 1674: πρὸς ἦν δὴ καὶ ἐπεπήγει τοῖς ὁμοίωσιν. ἐφεξής δὲ ὑπερμεγέθει τινί, στρυφνός τὴν ὀψιν καὶ σκυθρωπὸς τὴν ὄφρυν καὶ τὴν ἀσκητικὴν ἀποπνεών ζωήν.

θηλυπρεπῆς λευκότητης: the ancient topos fair or “white” skin was deemed unbecoming a ‘manly’ warrior-king whose campaigning under the sun ‘darkened’ his complexion. E. had commented on the origins of the topos: cf. Eust.
Comm. ad Hom. II. 1.720.6–15: Καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἡ παραβολὴ λευκὸν φύσει τὸν Μενέλαον ἱστορεῖ. εἰ δὲ καὶ θηλυπρεπὲς ἐν ἡρωσὶν ἡ λευκότης, διὸ τὸν Τρωίκον Κύκνον Θεόκριτος τοιοῦτον ὄντα θῆλυν ἀπὸ χροιᾶς ἐφη, ἀλλὰ ἐνταῦθα φασίν οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὅτι κἂν ἄλλως εὐπαθές τὸ λευκόν, ἴσχυρότερα δὲ τὰ μελάγχροα τῶν σωμάτων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοὺς Λάκωσι χαρακτήρ ἄνδριας ἢ λευκὸς χρώς καὶ κόμη ξανθή, ὁποῖον καὶ τὸν Αἰλιδιονυσίου δηλαδή, τὸ “οὐδὲν λευκῶν ἄνδρων ὑφέλως.

μιγνυμένη: while the gender of the participle derives from λευκότης in the preceding clause, it is the emperor's whole complexion which is the implied subject.

ἡλίοις: the dat. is perhaps best explained by ἐκέκρατο in the main clause. κεράννυμι usually requires a dat. of one of the objects 'mixed', the other here being λευκότης.

σκιατραφίαν: the manuscript appears to read σκριατραφίαν, a nonsense form. Might the scribe have meant to write σκιατραφία from σκοιός or been thinking of σκιαρός? σκιατραφία is nevertheless well enough attested in this period, including in E., to permit emending the text; cf. Eust. Ὁρ. 11 (Leodός Κ) 192.71–72: Οὐ καλὸν οὔτε σκιατραφεῖν τὸν ἄρχοντα κατ’ ἐκείνου τοὺς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀργούς. For a possible precedent to σκιατραφίαν, cf. Hesych. Lex. Σ (1049): σκοία· σκοτεινά. τινὲς κολόροβοι.

ἀνδρίας: = ἀνδρείας, gen. sing. of the feminine ἀνδρεία, often written ἀνδρία in Byzantine Mss., though ἀνδρία is attested in antiquity where the metre requires it, e.g. Eur. HF475 where two Ms. witnesses have μέγα φρονῶν ἐπ’ ἄνδρια (for which Elmsley conjectured εὐανδρία).

Κεκραμένη γάρ δὴ Χάρισιν: sc. ὑπίς, cf. supra.

καὶ λειμῶνα συνεκρότουν ἀξιοθέατον: the language here alludes to the ekphrastic imagery and poetic vernacular of the Byzantine novel, itself an aesthetic idiom going back to that crucible of later Byzantine literary sensibility, the Second Sophistic: cf. e.g. Eust. Macr. De Hysm. et Hysm. 4.125: ἡ γάρ τοι περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον χάρις αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ τοῦ λειμῶνος κάλλος ἀντήριξεν. For an example of the older parallels, from which persuasive arguments about intertextuality have been made; cf. Ach. Tat. Leuc. et Clit. (ed. E. Vilborg, Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and
Clitophon, Stockholm, 1955) 1.19,2.2.: τοιοῦτος ἦν Λευκίππης ἐπὶ τῶν προσώπων ὁ λειμών. For an exemplary approach to the mechanism of intertextuality in the novels, see I. Nilsson, Erotic paths, rhetorical pleasure: narrative technique and mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites’ Hysmine & Hysminias (Uppsala, 2001) 261–286. A century earlier reference to a ‘mosswood’ in literature might well have alluded to the ‘spiritual meadow’ most familiar to us in the work of John Moschos, rather than one which appealed so directly to the senses (ἐξ οὗ δρέπεσθαι ἣδονήν ὅσην ἔχην τοῖς φιλοθεάμοις). But as Kazhdan and Epstein have argued, literary sensibility, as a corollary to social and spiritual identity, underwent important changes in the 12th century; see Kazhdan–Epstein, Change in Byzantine, 197–230. 

ἀνθολογία... αὐτὸν ἤγαλλε: while all emperors were described as handsome and endowed with every manner of attractive feature, Manuel’s panegyrists too such care with his physical image that we may reasonably infer that his looks were important to him and to his supporters. Eust. Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 223.9–224.15: ‘Ὅσα μὲν οὖν ἡ φύσις, ἄριστε βασιλεῦ, ἀμφὶ σὲ φιλοτίμως ἠσχόληται καὶ ὅσον αὐτῆς τὸ περὶ σὲ φιλοτέχνημα, ἐσται μοι καλλιγραφῆσαι καιρός ἐτέρος: οὐ γάρ δὴ ποῦ τὸ ἀπόδημον βαρβαρώσει τὰ κατ’ ἐμέ, ὡς πάντη ἔπιπειν τὰ τοῦ λόγου χρώματα, δι’ ἐν ἐν γὰρ ἐστίν ἀν καταγράψασθαι τὸ κάλλος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, τὸ τῆς θέας γαλήνου, τὸ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ λάμπον καὶ ἡρωϊκόν, τὴν ὅλην εὐρυθμίαν τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀκροπόλεως, ἴνα ὁ βυσσινικόν θεὸς ἔπυργωσθε ἡμῖν εἰς ἀσφάλειαν.

ἐιρετός εἰσὶ πρὸς τι: LSJ s.v. ἄθετος II, following Hesychius, A 1569.1 (ed. K. Latte, Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon, vols. 1–2) lists ἄθετος ἤγαλλε as being synonymous in some cases with ἄθεσμος, or “lawlessly”; in this context, we might recall the political definition “despotically” (cf. Aesch. Prom. 150 Ζεὺς ἄθετος κρατύ-νει). We have a closer parallel in Plutarch (2.715b) joined to πρὸς τι, meaning unsuitable or inappropriate. The only other near-contemporary example is from Gregory Antiochus’ Laudatio patriarchae Basilii Camateri, 757 (ed. M. Loukaki, Grégoire Antiochos Éloge du patriarche Basile Kamatéros, Paris, 1996). It is not likely E. would have gone so far as to broach the possibility of unlawfulness or despotism (pejoratively understood) regarding Manuel’s behaviour. It is rather the tacitly affirmed obligation to restraint enjoined upon the ruler’s all too human instincts, which E. invokes in the expression ἄθετος εἰσί. It is perhaps instructive that the natural element chosen to illustrate the emperor’s temper should be the sea: τῆν ἑν τοῦ ὀποκυμαίνον θάλασσαν, whose sudden (and unprovoked) destruc-
tive tempests made seafaring one of the more dangerous pursuits of mediaeval life around the Mediterranean. The image of anger latent beneath the waves (LSJ does not record this clearly post-classical definition) may be found in an oration by one of E.'s former students and future eulogist, Michael Choniates, himself writing in praise of his own and E.' patron, the patriarch Micheal Anchialos and his mastery of his temper (ed. S.P. Lampros, Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα, Athens, 1879–1880; repr. 1968) I Or. 3.86: Θυμὸν γὰρ ἐπιπειθῆ τῷ λόγῳ σοφῶς ὑπέζευξε καὶ παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἄχολος τὸ παρ’ ἂπαν ὑπετοί παρ’ ὅσον τῷ θυμῷ μόνον έἰ ποτε ὑποκυμαίνων οἴδανται.

τὴν ἐντὸς ὑποκυμαίνον θάλασσαν...θυμοδακές τι: with this and the subsequent two paragraphs begins an extended rhetorical meditation on the emperor's temper and disposition. E. combines θάλασσα with ὑποκύμενος in a tense image of a restrained tempest; cf. Arist. Metaph. 1043a25 τί ἐστὶ γαλήνη; ὡς ἀλότης θαλάττης. Like many similes and metaphors in his works, E. likely adapted this one from his wide reading in ancient literature and commentary on Homeric epic. Cf. Schol. in Hom. Od. (libri γ—δ) versis 402c3 τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τοῦ ὕδατος / τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς θαλάσσης ὑποκυμαινούσης / κινήσει τῶν ὑδάτων.

καὶ ἔχρην τῇ ψυχῇ...παραστῆναι καὶ ἀμύνασθαι: the sense of δορυφόρος as it relates to ψυχή and θυμός is somewhat elusive. In a number of elliptical passages, including two from E.' own compendious commentaries, λόγος as the faculty of reason appears to act as a bodyguard (δορυφόρος) to the soul, defending it, it seems, from its own intemperance in the face of provocation. Cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 2.222.1–3: Τῷ ὄντι γὰρ προσδεῖται καὶ τοῦ ἀλόγου μέρους τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ θυμικοῦ διὰ τι συγγενές ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ φρόνησις, καθαὶ καὶ δορυφόρων οἱ βασιλεῖς. Cf. Phil. Jud. De conf. ling. (ed. P. Wendland, Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, vol. 2. Berlin, 1897; repr. 1962) II 98.7: τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβόντων πάντες οἱ δορυφόροι καὶ ὑπέρμαχοι ψυχῆς συμφρονήσουσι λογισμοῖ.

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἰλαρὸν...τοῖς οὐκ ἀμβλυωποῦσιν ἐξέλαμπε: in keeping with the general claim of the passages dedicated to rationalizing the emperor's disposition, this one, too, mitigates Manuel's seeming irritability by suggesting it was superficial. A keen observer might notice his more cheerful temper just below that surface.

tὸ δὲ θυμούμενον τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχρωξε...κατασιγάζων τὸ θυμικὸν: in one of the rhetorically most accomplished passages of the Ἐπιτάφιος, E. expands
on Manuel's absolute control over his temper (θυμός). Not given to outbursts of anger “like those easily inflamed by rage” (κατὰ τοὺς εἰς ὀργὴν πυρίνους), he had to force himself to dissimulate being angry (βιαζόμενος ... διαξωγραφών εἰς θυμοῦμενον) whenever the need arose. He therefore created a false image of his true nature (παρατυπῶν τὸ ἐμφυτὸν ζωγράφημα) he set aside his milder self (τὸν μὲν πράον ἀποτιθέμενος) in order to teach his subjects a lesson. A. Stone is almost certainly right to infer an attempt by E. to offer a benign explanation for Manuel's explosive temper. See Stone, “Epitaphios,” 243. The need for emperors to check their anger (θυμός) and exercise self-control (αὐτοκράτεια) was an enduring motif of imperial oratory, renewed by the very real fear of the consequences of an undisciplined temper. An anonymous βασιλικὸς λόγος addressed to Manuel's grandfather, Alexios I, speaks to the need for an emperor to retain his self-possession and suppress excessive anger. See R. Browning, “An Anonymous basilikos logos Addressed to Alexios I Comnenus,” Byzantion 28 (1958) 31–50, 38–42.

καταπέττοντα: the sense, if not the form of the implied verb, seems clear. The emperor's good disposition, τὸ βασιλικὸν ἱλαρὸν, raises up the despondent man. It could be argued that καταπίπτοντα or καταπεπτωκότα (LSJ s.v. καταπίπτω) would be expected in that case, since καταπέττοντα (probably derived from καταπέσσω) does not give the required sense, unless E. had an intransitive, absolute use in mind, instead of the more usual transitive metaphorical meaning to bear or suffer some hardship; Or. 9 (Λόγος θ) 153.11: καιρὸς τοῦ γογγύζειν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ καταπέττειν ἔσω τὴν λύπην καὶ μὴ λαλεῖν ἄκαρπα; cf. Sud. Lex. K 703.1: Καταπεσών: ἀντὶ τοῦ φοβοῦμενος.

Ἐπαινῶ τὸν τοιοῦτον θυμόν: E. distinguishes between undisciplined anger and a politically useful display of ire which would not be inconsistent with σωφροσύνη, the ruler's indispensable self-restraint.

ὁ διορθωτής νόμος: strictly speaking, the grammatical subject, νόμος, has no predicate and produces a syntactical anomaly as the subject of the relative clause, οἱ αὐτοκρατοῦντες, become the grammatical protagonists of the remainder of the sentence. νόμος standing in virtual apposition to θυμόν might not have confused listeners the same way it can disorient readers who cannot rely on the orator's mediating voice to designate relations between words, clauses, and larger verbal units by means of emphasis and shift in tone.
Commentary

29

Καιρὸς δή τις καὶ ἀστείσασθαι: ἀστείζομαι, to engage in witty or eloquent conversation (see LSJ s.v. ἀστείζομαι) was at once a form of recreation and a mark of status, since the wit and rhetorical fluency in question required the studied ease of the well educated and leisureed classes. The enduring association between city life and such sophistication may still be seen in the notion of being “urbane.” Manuel is described as combining purposeful eloquence with good natured humour and wit. For the vocabulary of ἀστειότης, cf. Sud. Lex. Α 4235: ἀστεῖος: εὐσύνετος, εὐπρόσωπος, χαρίεις, καλὸς, γελοιώδης. καὶ Ἀστεῖος, ἀστείζομένους, πολιτευομένους. εὐφημότερον ἀστείζεσθαι, τὸ ὡραίεσθαι, γελωτοποιεῖν, ἀτινα σκώπτειν. καὶ Ἀστείως, πρεπόντως, φρονίμως. The real contrast was not between well-schooled urbanity and inarticulate provincialism but that between the scowling and somber mien required of an emperor who instills apprehension in those who come before him (Οὐ γὰρ δυστράπελος διὰ βίου παντὸς ἐν ἀνθρώ-ποις ὡς) and the amiable and good-humoured man able to charm those around him with “sweetness of his speech” and the affability of his behaviour. On ἀστειότης as a sociocultural ideal, see F. Bernard, “Asteiotes and the ideal of the urbane intellectual in eleventh-century Byzantium”, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 47 (2013) 129–142; see also K. Beyer, M. Grünbart, Urbanitas und ἀστειότης. Kulturelle Ausdrucksformen von Status (10.–15. Jahrhundert). Einführung in die Tagungsthematik, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 45 (2011).

φιλία δὲ οὐδέμια τὸ ἀστεῖον ἀπείπατο καθάπερ οὐδὲ ὁμιλία ἡ πολιτευτική: For no friendship rejects wit and charm, just as political association does not; the adjective πολιτευτικὸς is not listed in LSJ and besides one mention in the Sud. Lex. Ν 384.8 and another in the late scholia to the preface of some plays of Aristophanes (ed. W.J.W. Koster, Scholia in Aristophanem: Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam [Scholia in Aristophanem 2.1] Groningen, 1978). The only other author known to have used the term is Mich. Chon. Ep. 129, 209.20–23: Τίς γὰρ σοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα σοφώτερος, διὰ τοσοῦτον βασιλείων καὶ τῆς ἐν μέσῳ τυ-ραννίδος ἔληλυθότος πολιτευτικῶς καὶ πείρᾳ μακρῇ τὴν ἀρίστην ἀρμονίαν τῆς μο-ναρχίας ἀκριβεσαμένου καὶ τῆς ὑπ’ αὐτήν πολιτείας τὰ κράτσατα. Once more the appearance of a rare but otherwise comprehensible word prompts questions about the emergence of a literary vernacular in the twelfth century in which long dormant words are reawakened and new ones are created to meet both conceptual and compositional needs closely entwined in the rhetorical precepts imbibed at school; social and political historians can only be intrigued by the analogy drawn here by E. between φιλία, whose significance to Byzantine men of
letters and nobility scholars have only recently begun to explore, and whatever form of political association, ὁμιλία ἡ πολιτευτική, attached to the emperor. 

Καίρος δὴ τις καὶ...Кαιρὸς δὴ τις καὶ: a conspicuous and extended example of anaphora: repetition of the same word(s) at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences. Like other rhetorical devices involving repetition on a small or larger scale across a few words or clauses, such alliteration, pareomion, homoioteleuton, or anadiplosis and epanalipsis, anaphora is at once rudimentary and yet enduringly effective, in as much as it harnesses elementary sensory experience to semantic and conceptual aims. In the passage in question, the exact parallel of anaphora underscores the disparity between Manuel and Timon; for if the notorious misanthrope could enjoy the company of friends, then surely the emperor could converse amiably also.

ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ...ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ: one might normally be tempted to bracket off the second ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ as an instance of dittography on the part of the copyist, although such mistaken repetitions of letters, words, or phrases are usually prompted by identical or similar words preceding them, which is not the case here. Instead, E. seems to be engaging in a kind of epexegetic repetition characteristic of more discursive prose, lending the funeral oration an air of improvisation.

ἐκμυελίζων τὸ νόημα: the metaphorical use of ἐκμυελίζω in the sense of to “draw out the meaning or essence of something like the marrow from a bone” appears unique to this Byzantine text. cf. Eust. Comm. in Dion. Perieg. 85–89 (ed. K. Müller, Geographi Graeci minores, vol. 2. Paris, 1861; repr. 1965): Ἡδη δὲ καὶ μυελὸν ὀστῶδες ἅπαν ποιητικῆς κληρονομικῆς σκληρότητος σφυσίνωσι, ὡς ἃν τούτων γε τὸν τρόπον τῷ ποιητικῷ ἐνάμιλλοι φαινομένα εὐδοκίαν κατέσοφισαν, ὡς ἂν τούτων τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑπακούσαντων ἀνρώπων κατεσοφίσαν τὴν φύσιν ἐξετρεφε. That word may have been familiar with the sense of LXX Num. 24.8 ἔδεται ἔθνη ἐκμυελιεῖ. The only instance I have found the word used in a positive sense of “get the full extent of something” is Michael Attaliates, Hist. (ed. I. Pérez Martín, Madrid, 2002) 2.50–51: ἄρδην ἁπάντων ἀπροόπτους καὶ λοιπάδας μεμηχανημένας κατεσοφίσαν καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν ὑποστηθών ἐκμυελιέων ἐντεῦθεν.

βαθείαις δὲ θεωρίαις...σεμνύονται: for the relevant sense of ἐξωτερικός here as “that of outsiders”, i.e., non-Christians, contrasted with those of the Apostles (cf. Epist. ad Cor. I.12 τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; οὐχὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε;).
eἰ γε καὶ Τίμων ἐφιλιάξετο: a notorious Athenian misanthrope, Timon appears to have lived in the time of Pericles, cf. Prosopographia Attica (ed. J. Kirchner, Berlin, 1903). Aristophanes is the first to refer to him (Aves, 1549; Lys. 809 sq.; he became known to Shakespeare by way of Plutarch’s Antonius 70.1–8 and Lucian’s dialogue by the same name). It is perhaps futile to guess at the source of the reference. A legendary figure like Timon could well have enjoyed a lengthy Nachleben independent of any specific text by repeated invocation. It is interesting to see how E. adapts the figure of Τίμων to quite distinct contexts and genres, as in the essay concerning inherent conflicts in matters of friendship, where Timon serves as a cautionary example about the risks of mishandling one’s friendships; cf. Eust. Or. 3 (Λόγος Γ) 54.5–6: μὴ καὶ βίον κίνδυνος εἰη ζην Τίμωνος, ὃς εἰ μὲν οὐδὲ γοῦν ἑνὸς πειραθεὶς ἐν ἀκεραίῳ φίλου, τὸ ἀνθρωπικὸν ἠθος ἀπεἶπατο.

ĥρτυε...βαθείαις δὲ θεωρίαις: the reference to ‘salting one’s speech’ is an allusion to Paul’s Epist. ad Coloss. 4.6.2 in which he instructs them to add salt to their speech, since “it is necessary for you to know how to address each man individually”: δ’ λόγος ύμων πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἀλατὶ ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ύμᾶς ἐν ἀκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι. The biblical allusion serves as a further illustration of the inclusiveness described above, with salt being the all purpose spice of rhetorical ‘savouriness’ which reaches every palate, and βαθείαις δὲ θεωρίαις reserved for those with the ‘acquired taste’ for such deep understanding. It also demonstrates both the skill of the orator and the taste of his audience for meaningful wordplay through combinations of ‘sweet’ (ἡδὺς) and savoury (ἀλατι).

Ὡν γάρ...θεατρίσω: E. makes implicit reference to the mandate of Greek authors to render the contents of their text vivid and their audience “spectators”; cf. LSJ s.v. θέαομαι. This was usually achieved by means of ekphrasis, enargeia, or similarly visual and therefore ‘dramaturgical’ effects of language. The economy of the Ἐπιτάφιος afforded little opportunity for such devices, but did not prevent its author from conjuring an image of the oration as a procession of Manuel’s virtues before their eyes. For a survey of the various senses attached to θεατρίων, see Theatron: rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter, ed. M. Grünbart (Berlin, 2007). For the imagery of a triumphal procession, see M. McCormick, Eternal victory: triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium, and the early medieval West (Cambridge; New York, 1986).
Not composed in a chance manner

ti kaiwōn mēn eis ākōēn: used to refer to “new,” “strange,” or “unusual” things, kaiwōn restricted to ākōēn may have referred to either the unconventional nature of Manuel’s argument or its uncommon formulation. It was not an unequivocal term of praise in most pursuits, especially in matters of doctrine or ideology. Still E. clearly intended it as an accomplishment of the emperor, reflecting perhaps a broader affinity for kainōtēs as forms of innovation and novelty, especially in matters of authorship and oratory, as the mention a little further down of the Athenian predilection for τὸ φιλόκαινον may demonstrate; cf. Corp. Herm. Peri eūrēsews 3.5.104–109: καὶ πάλιν ‘δεὶ καινοτομεῖν, ἡ λύσις ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος ‘καλόν γάρ τὸ καινοτομεῖν και ὁ βίος αἰει καινοτομεῖται τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο βελτίων γίνεται’· εἶτα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου ’δεὶ καινοτομεῖν Ἀθηναίους· ὡς νεωτεροποί γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐξήθροις ἐπαινοῦμεθα. E. thus invokes a venerable precedent for the sort of rhetorical innovation we have come to associate with Komnenian literary culture.

Έγὼ…οὔτε ἀμφιλαφής τὴν γνώσιν καὶ...ψιλὸς μαθήσεως: there would not have been much doubt that E. was paying Manuel’s rhetorical and intellectual ability the ultimate compliment, for the exaggerated modesty of οὔτε ἀμφιλαφής τὴν γνώσιν could not but have reminded the audience that E. enjoyed a reputation as the foremost scholar of his day as well as that of a highly successful orator. Praise of Manuel’s skill in composing speeches -by no means a requisite of encomium- thus carried added weight.

πολυβενθής: the Homeric allusion in the use of this adjective is fairly explicit, as ὡς εἰπεῖν makes clear. E. cites the word a number of times in the Παρεκβολαί (cf. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 1.200.17; Comm. ad Hom. Od. 1.172.36), though in keeping with epic usage (ex. gr. Il. 1.432, Od. 4.406), it always refers to the depth of actual bodies of water. Metaphoric use of the term shows E. and his audience were able to exploit the potential of such literary vocabulary in new contexts. A few years later E. reused the adjective in his account of the siege and capture of Thessalonike by the Normans in a pejorative sense, without alluding to its literary provenance; cf. De capt. Thess. 74.35: σιγῆς διὰ τὸ ἐχεμυθεῖν τὰ πλείω, ἄλλως δὲ κατὰ τοὺς λοχώντας πνίγων τὴν λαλιὰν ἄνθρωπος, ἐπέχων καὶ τὰ ἐς πονηρίαν ἀδιόρατος καὶ τὸ γε κρυψίνου πολυβενθής.

τι ξενίζον καὶ ἄρτιφανὲς ἐμοῖγ’: E. devotes considerable space in his commentaries on the Homeric epics to ξενίζον, in relation to both the form and content of the text, noting that when the poet introduces something ‘alien’ and unexpected to the aesthetics of the poem (cf. Comm. ad Hom. Il., I.11,18: ἐμεθώδευσε δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦτο ἄμα μὲν διὰ τὸ καινοπρεπὲς καὶ τῷ ἀνελπίστῳ ξενίζον). Similar-
ly, when something strange or unusual from the point of view of the audience or the characters appears in the story itself (cf. _Comm. ad Hom. Od._, I.239,39: εἰ δὲ τὸ ἔλαιον ὑ ἔρηται ἡ βασιλικὴ νεᾶς ἔχει τι ξενίζον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποφήγνασθαι). The key perhaps to the point of this phrase is the seemingly inconspicuous ἐμοίγ’, which in fact strengthens ξενίζον καὶ ἀρτιφανὲς, since the measure being invoked is not the common experience of novelty and originality in rhetoric, but E.’ expert experience. This virtual symbiosis between ‘celebrant’ and ‘celebrated’, or ‘praiser’ and ‘praisee’, runs through much of twelfth century panegyrical oratory; a study of it might therefore yield interesting insights into the novel authorial identity emerging at this time.

31 τὸ...τορὸν καὶ τρανέστατον: E. refers here, as he had done in previous orations in praise of Manuel, to his skill in delivery or recitation, as opposed to his skill in composition described in the previous paragraph. τορὸν καὶ τρανέστατον refer to qualities of voice, reflecting the importance of vocal ability in an enduringly oral society. Sound becomes the handmaiden to sense: τὴν ἀπηχητικὴν προφοράν συνεπικοσμοῦσαν καὶ αὐτὴν τὸ νοούμενον, an analogous duality to the one set out earlier in Ἐπ. 29 between τοῦ προφαινομένου and τὸ ἔνδον φιλοσοφούμενον. E. had had occasion to comment on the etymology and uses of τορὸν in the Παρεκβολαί, where he first combines τορὸν καὶ τρανές (Comm. ad Hom. Il. I.279.9). The significance attached to voice and delivery of speeches recalls Philostratus: Ἡ δὲ ἰδέα τῶν Πολέμωνος λόγων θερμὴ καὶ ἐναγώνιος καὶ τορὸν ἠχούσα, ὥσπερ ἡ Ὀλυμπιακὴ σάλπιγξ, ἐπιπρέπει δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ Δημόσθενικὸν (Flavii Philostrati opera, ed. C.L. Kayser, vol. 2 [Leipzig, 1871; repr. Hildesheim, 1964] Kap.1 [Olearius, p.542,6]).

ἔξυμνηται...καὶ βιβλίως ἐγκείται: this was not the first time E. had praised Manuel’s ability as a rhetor: cf. the long excursus devoted to Manuel’s rhetorical skill in Or. 13 (Λόγος Μ) 226.97–228.49. The imperial virtue in question was, presumably, the skilled combination of well-delivered speech matched to good sense, at once praised by people and documented in “books.” E. is referring here either to encomia of Manuel in which his oratorical skills and eloquence come in for praise or, more interestingly, to texts in Manuel’s own name, whose euphony was patently discernable. βιβλίως could in principle also mean historical accounts which refer to Manuel’s eloquence, though this strikes me as less plausible. The repeated references here to Manuel’s resourcefulness as a
rhetor –πολύ τὸ ἐν λόγοις τῷ βασιλεί πόριμον– testify to the significance attached to the identity of ‘sophist’ in the middle Byzantine period, as well as to the need for instruction and practice, which seems to be the point of οὗ πεῖρα καὶ μόνη διδάσκαλος further down. Byzantine panegyrical tradition offered precedents; Psellus had declared Konstantinos Monomachos’ another Demosthenes, cf. Or. 1 (ed. G.T. Dennis, 1994). The inevitable hyperbole of funeral oratory notwithstanding, we should not dismiss outright reports that Manuel was an accomplished enough speaker. Nicetas Choniates, who was not inclined to be charitable to Manuel’s reputation, confirms as much, cf. Hist. 210.72–73 Καὶ δ βασιλεύς τοιγαροῦν οὗτος εὐγλωττίαν εὐτυχηκὼς καὶ λόγου ἐμφυτὸν χάριν πεπλουτήκως.

τῆς ἱστορίας πολυπραγμοσύνη: the expression was not common in either Late Antiquity or the Byzantine middle ages and shows either E.’s first-hand knowledge of Polybius or familiarity with historical project bearing Constantine VII Porphyrogennitos’ name: Polyb. Hist. 5.75.6.5 (apud. Const. VII Porph. De sent., 129.29) καὶ ταῦτα δυνάμενοι μετ’ εὐσχήμονος ἀναπάντες ἁμα καὶ διαγωγής ἕκ τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης περιποιεῖσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἐμπειρίαν.

Τὰ δὲ τῆς μνήμης...κατὰ τὸ ἐν ἄγγειοις σύστομοι: compared to memory as indelible writing in a book (Τὰ δὲ τῆς μνήμης βιβλος ἦν ἀναπάλειπτο), the elaborate similes of tubes and vessels with tapering spouts to illustrate how different may retain what they learn seems fairly original. I have not found this imagery elsewhere and the language suggests that E. tried to undergird the comparison with alliterative diction: εἰσροῇ τε ἀπ όνῳ ὑποκειμ ένου καὶ ἐκροῇ ...τὸ δυσδιέξοδον διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ εἰσόδῳ στεγανόν. Attempts to explain the functioning of memory are rare in Byzantine literature, which had inherited a host of topos regarding the role of memory from classical literature. No less interesting is the rôle assigned to the re-creative imagination as enabling recollection (φαντασίας ἀνακινούσης ἐκαινουργεῖτο τῇ μνήμη). E. appears to follow Aristotelean teaching on this count, cf. Arist. De memor. et reminisc. 450a22–25: τίνος μὲν οὖν τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστι μνήμη, φανερόν, ὅτι οὔπερ καὶ ἡ φαντασία· καὶ ἐστι μνημονευτὰ καθ’ αὐτά μὲν ἄν ἐστὶ φαντασία, κατὰ συμβεβηκός δὲ ὅσα μὴ ἄνευ φαντασίας.

ἀναζωγράφησις: all told, as a noun the word appears only here in E.’s surviving corpus. A. Stone’s crediting its provenance to Diogenes Laertius (“Funeral Oration,” 364) seems to me unnecessarily restrictive. The link, moreover, with memory and φαντασία was established in Platonic and neo-Platonic commen-
although nominally about memory, this paragraph broaches a subject evidently close to E.’s heart as an orator. Manuel is commended by the veteran orator E. for not departing in any significant way from what he had dictated in the transcribed version of his speech, so that those otherwise ignorant of its contents (τοῖς οὐδὲ ἄλλως ἠγνοηκόσι) might have the benefit of its more or less verbatim text. When the ‘published’ version of his text entrusted to parchment was in turn recited to others, they were found to be virtually identical (ἡν ἐκείνος ὁ ἐκλαληθεὶς οὐδὲν ἐτεροιούμενος). Most notable here is the injunction that such ought to be the standard practice, joined to an observation that it is all too rare in E.’s day for orators to do this (Τοῦτο χρὴ μέν, ὡσὰν εἴποι τις, ἐφ’ἅπαντος λόγου γίνεσθαι (γίνεται δ’ ἐπὶ πάντων οὐχ οὕτω)· σπάνιον δὲ καὶ ἐν ὀλίγιστοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν. Νοῦς μὲν γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἑκατέροις τῷ τε εἰς ὄχλον ἐκλαλουμένῳ λόγῳ πρὸς ἄνετον χῦμα, καὶ τῷ βίβλοις ἑαυτὸν ἀφιέντι ἐγκατακλείσθαι). With this observation, E. confounds much that we assume about the recital of texts in Byzantium through by means of reading before an audience. Surprisingly, E. expects orators to speak without the aid of the transcribed text, as his favourable comparison of Manuel’s spoken and written speeches implies. Moreover, he does not appear to fault contemporary orators for relying on a written version so much as for the discrepancy between their oration and their published text.

a strengthened form of ἐκφεύγω, διεκφεύγω with an acc. object (τὸ…τεράστιον) must mean something along the lines of “his recollection went beyond the sheer magnitude of what he had to remember,” (LSJ s.v. ἐκφεύγω, 3.b). The correlative dat.s τῷ μὲν προσφάτω διεκφεύγειν and τῷ δὲ καθ’ εἴρμον συνεχεῖ are dat.s of specification or reference (Jannaris 1271–1272), whose use increased in the post-classical and medieval period.

E. returns to this point in a parenthetical statement in Ἐπ. 39 where he catalogues the emperor’s abilities: οὐ γὰρ ζῷοις μὲν
τοῖς ἑτέροις δοτέον αἰσθάνεσθαι τῶν ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καλῶν, τοὺς δὲ καὶ λογικοὺς καὶ λογισμὸς στερηθέον τοῦ τοιούτου πλεονεκτήματος.

ἀνελιχθεῖς...δι’ ἀναγνώσεως: the participle ἀνελιχθεῖς shifts the grammatical subject of the sentence from Manuel to his transcribed text. Its antecedent is the “book” or τόμος to which Manuel had transferred “the offspring of his mind” (τὸν δὲ μηνυθέντα τόκον προῆγεν ἐσπαργανωμένον ὥσπερ τῷ τόμῳ). The insistently paratactic syntax of the oration (see the Introduction, “The Style Which Shows”) preempts the subordinate relative clause we might expect in genuinely Atticizing prose. But sense would have easily compensated for syntax in this case.

Λήθη...οὐκ ἀνάσχοιτο: the second aorist optative with ἄν expresses a likelihood so strong in the speaker’s opinion that it amounts to a statement of fact. See Smyth 1824–1834. E. makes liberal use of the optative, as often as not conforming to the familiar “rules” of Attic. Cf. T. Hedberg, Eustathios als Attizist, 147–153; A. Stone, “Moods and Tenses,” 126–135.


ἀκούεσθαι τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ νοῦν ἀναλεξάμενος: the infinitive ἀκούεσθαι supplements the participle in what amounts to an adverbial construction.

ἀπρόσκοπα: the manuscript has ἀπρόσκοπα, which is the harder reading since its sense would mean “lack of progress” or something correspondingly negative; cf. LBG s. v. ἀπρόσκοπος nicht fortschreitend, PaulAl 65,16 nicht befördert, ohne Beförderung, ἀ. ἀναγνώστης Basil. ep. CCXVII, vol. II 212,69,3. The manuscript reading might be saved if we understand it as a rare adjective derived from the equally rare προκοπιάω; cf. (LSJ s. v., “labour, make effort previously, ex.gr. IG-Rom.3.739vi91 tantamount to “effortlessly.” However this would require E.’s listeners to supply an alternate sense to a word they already knew. This might be an example of a case which tests the limits of lectio difficilior. ἀπρόσκοπα is palaeographically plausible, since a single -σ- would not have been easily missed by the scribe, as well as contextually more coherent, as E. emphasizes Manuel’s unfail-
ing memory which freed him from the need to consult the text a second time “by looking at it” (LSJ s. v. ἀπρόσκοπος [B]). A strong case might also be made for ἀπρόσκοπτος, “without stumbling” (LSJ s. v. ἀπρόσκοπτος) for which there is some Eustathian precedent (Comm. ad Hom. Il. 3.454.5–6 Ἀκόλουθον δὲ τῷ θείῳ καὶ τὸ ἀσφαλέως, ἐπεὶ κυρίως ἀσφαλέως θείῳ λέγεται τις, ὅτε ἀπροσκόπτως τρέχει). Such a reading would require two consecutive errors on the scribe’s part. Tafel mistakenly prints ἀπρόσκυπα, which does not exist in Greek.

34 οὐ λέγω…περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ: the priamel-like catalogue of genres is intended to create the impression that Manuel read widely, if not prodigiously given the little time he could spare from governing. E. grants pride of place to the religious or theological works, a fact reflected in Manuel’s own purported writings. Nearly all the genres listed, from geography to military tactics, are of what might be termed a “practical nature”, including those on natural philosophy and ethics (in all likelihood commentaries on Aristotle). No mention is made of literature, i.e., poetry, novels, and other forms of belles lettres which saw a great flowering in Manuel’s time. This may be explained by the emphasis on those pursuits which were likely to be of benefit to the emperor’s subjects. The inclusion of such a list nevertheless underlines the need for a ruler to be well informed on a variety of subjects. The list allows us to reasonably infer that such works, deemed indispensable to good government, probably made up the core of the palace library collection. Cf. N. G. Wilson, “The Libraries of the Byzantine World”. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 8.1 (1967) 53–80.

35 Καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ ἔρις…ἐφέλκεσθαι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλότριον: E. bestows praise commensurate with Manuel’s efforts at converting mostly Muslim subjects. The most conspicuous recent example would have been the former Turkish prisoners resettled in the environs of Thessalonike and Thrace after the successful campaigns near the river Maiandros, cf. Or. 14 (Λόγος Ν) 231.87–232.93: ὡς ἀγγέλου θεοῦ…καταρτίζεις ἀποστολικῶς ἐξ ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐξ ἀλλοφύλων εἰς λαὸν μετάγων θεοῦ περιούσιον ὑποτάσσεις αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξ ἀλόγων μεταπλάττεις νοερῶς εἰς ὄντως λογικῶς διδασκαλίας μεταποιῶν εἰς ἀναγέννησιν τῷ θείῳ βαπτίσματι καὶ προφητικὸν μακαρισμὸν καρποῦμενος. E. describes Manuel’s motive as a desire to see their
souls aligned with their status as Byzantine subjects (Λογισμὸς γὰρ καὶ αὐτῷ βα-
σιλικὸς, μὴ χρῆναι σωμάτων μὲν ἐγκρατῶς ἐχειν τὸν ἄρχοντα, ψυχῶν δὲ μὴ ἐς δέον
περιγίνεσθαι). The effort to make it doctrinally easier for Muslims to convert to
Christianity without maligning their earlier faith may not have been completely
innocent of politics given the volatility of the eastern frontier. Manuel proved
determined to remove the anathema enjoined by the Orthodox catechism for
converts requiring them to explicitly renounce the god of Mohammed, a prop-
osal which elicited vehement opposition from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, not
least from E. himself, by then archbishop of Thessalonike, whom Nicetas Choni-
ates depicts delivering an impassioned speech against the emperor’s doctrinal
position and eliciting a contrite apology from Manuel, cf. Hist. 216.25–218.51; see
H. G. Beck, Geschichte der orthodoxen Kirche im byzantinischen Reich (Göttingen,
1980) 170–171. On the accommodation of Muslims in by Byzantine Christianity,
see now G. L. Hanson, “Manuel I Komnenos and the ’God of Muhammad’: A
Study in Byzantine Ecclesiastical Politics,” Medieval Christian Perceptions of Is-

tοῖς ἐθνικοῖς διδάσκαλοι... ἐλεύθεροι: Manuel proves himself so effec-
tive in his Christianizing efforts that the “teachers to the nations,” responsible for
instructing aspiring converts in the faith, are described as being left with little to
do. For the various διδάσκαλοι, see Darrouzès, Offikia, 66–86; Browning, Studies,
hearing Manuel’s own voice, preaching as it were, as well as to those who were
persuaded by treatises explicitly attributed to him: πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀποστολομαία
τά τῆς διδασκαλίας, καὶ ἐπεστρέφοντο... ἐπιπέμπων δὲ τὴν οἰκείαν αὐτὸς φωνήν
ἐνεσημαζομένην βίβλοι. Whether E. is here referring to religious treatises in
Manuel’s own name or works commissioned by him and circulated under his
auspices, is not clear; cf. K. Bonis, Ὁ Θεσσαλονικῆς Εὐστάθιος καὶ οἱ δύο “τόμοι”
tοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Μανουήλ Α Κομνηνοῦ (1143/80) ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὴν χριστιανικὴν
ὀρθοδοξίαν μεθισταμένων μωαμεθάνων, ΕΕΒΣ 19 (1939) 162–169. E. depicts Ma-
nuel as a kind of imperial John the Baptist (ὁ καθ’ἡμᾶς σωτήριος Ἰορδάνης). Even
in an oration devoted to the memory of the emperor, E. nevertheless pays trib-
ute to the “apostles,” in all probability monks who set out to evangelize
non-Christian lands, some of whom died abroad (τῇ ἐκδημί ἀπεκτάμενον).
The commercial metaphor applied to missionaries “quitting the trade while pur-
chasing souls, having split the profits with the emperor” is rather creative and
may well be due to the expansions of trade and economy in the twelfth century:
ψυχὰς ὀνάμενοι τῆς ἐμπορίας κατέπαυσαν, συνεπιμερισάμενοι τὰ τοῦ κέρδους τῷ αὐτοκράτορι.

ἡ ἱερὰ κολυμβήθρα: it is not clear whether E. is referring to an actual baptismal font or is making figural use of the image to symbolize conversion generally. In light of the responsibility for instructing converts in the tenets of Orthodox Christianity being assigned to the ἔθνικοι διδάσκαλοι attached to Hagia Sophia, and the emperor’s own involvement in reforming the catechetical requirements, it is not implausible that at least some baptisms were performed at the main imperial church itself in a bid to showcase the emperor’s success in proselytizing. If it is not a general allusion to baptism, ὁ καθ’ἡμᾶς σωτήριος Ἰωρδάνης might refer to actual baptismal font(s). Cf. R. F. Taft, “Quaestiones disputatae: The Skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the Entrances of the Liturgy. Revisited I,” Oriens Christianus 81 (1997) 1–35, 7.

tο τής ἐσύστερον κλήσεως: Manuel took the name of the evangelist Matthew upon his deathbed as a tonsured monk, prompting E. to suggest a measure of divine inspiration in Manuel’s choice and his previous ‘apostolic’ work (κατὰ τι θεῖον διὰ ταῦτα…τὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀποστολικὸν προσήρμοσται). cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 288.

tα τῆς διδασκαλίας…τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκείνων: we know little about such missionary work, not least because their successes seem not to have made much impression, pace E.’s praise of their efforts during Manuel’s reign. The most notorious example is of the mission of Sts. Constantine and Methodios, or Cyril and Methodius, whose evangelizing of the Slavs was hardly noted in Byzantine sources. See I. Ševčenko, Religious Missions Seen from Byzantium, HUkSt 12–13 (1988–89) 7–27; cf. C. Hannick, “Die byzantinischen Missionen,” in Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte, II, 1. Die Kirche des frühen Mittelalters (Munich 1978) 279–359. Although its overall thesis has lost ground, much valuable information may still be found in D. Obolensky, The Byzantine Commonwealth (New York, 1971) 83–97, 103f, 136–53, 173–201.

διδάγμασιν: construed as a dat. with διακονεῖσθαι in the sense of “ministering to the teachings [of Christianity].” See LSJ s.v. διακονέω.

λύκος ἑῷος…ὑλάκτησεν: it is somewhat frustrating for the modern historian to come upon so extensive an allusion to so ardent a religious polemicist, one “from the east” no less, and not be able to identify the individual. More impor-
stantly, one should like to know more about the channels of exchange which would have made such theological debate possible. The description of the man as ἀλλότριός τις ἀνήρ, σοφὸς μὲν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ suggests a non-Christian, since heretical beliefs were not commonly considered “one’s own doctrine.” The only rival faith recognized by Orthodox Byzantines at this time would have been Islam, almost surely the implication of κακὸν Ἀσσύριον, γλωσσαλγίᾳ Βαβυλωνίᾳ in the paragraph’s opening. It became established practice for Byzantine theologians, including some later emperors, to sharpen their skill in formal disputation and establish their religious bona fides by debating the merits of Islam, much as Christian theologians continued to rail against Jews.

κακόν Ἀσσύριον: the acc. should probably be construed as the direct object of an implied verb, as in [τὸν] κακόν Ἀσσύριον [λέγω].

τρόπου δίχα εἰπεῖν: lit. “to speak without figures of speech” (cf. LSJ s.v. τρό- πος, V). An example of how the punctuation of the manuscript can be misunderstood. The upper dot suggests to modern readers that there is a significant pause after εἰπεῖν, when in fact it introduces the non-figurative ἀλλότριός τις ἀνήρ ... οὐδὲ ἐπέγνω.

οὐδὲ ἐπέγνω: an alert listener might hear an echo of ἀνέγνως, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔγνως, the alleged reply of the bishops (sometimes attributed to Basil of Caesaria) to Julian’s letter informing them that he had “read, understood, and condemned” Christian teaching (ἀνέγνων, ἔγνων, κατέγνων). The anecdote is reported in Sozomen’s Ecclesiastical History, V.18.208. The comparison with Julian is all but explicit a little further down in the reference to “writing a book like that of an apostate” συνέχεε καὶ βιβλίον οἷον συνθέμενος ἀποστασίου.

ἄν: sc. τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα
toioótous èpínustákzein: èpínustákzo, to fall asleep over, is construed with the dat. in a variation of the constructio praegnans (Smyth, 1659a) in which the preposition, in this case part of the compound èpi- anticipates the rest of what follows the action of the verb: cf. “to fall asleep on the job.”

προβληματισάμενος έαυτῷ: προβληματίζω appears to be a late coinage, perhaps only gaining much currency among authors of E.’s generation (cf. LBG s.v. προβληματίζω). It has the sense of “raise questions” or “prompt a debate about”, akin perhaps to the modern “problematicize.” Although E. often uses the middle voice where an active would suffice grammatically, here the middle participle underscores that he deliberated very intently with himself, with the dat. reflexive pronoun making his personal deliberation more explicit.
εὐρυφαρέτρας: a good example of a high style literary allusion, in this case to Pindaric poetry (Pind. Pyth. 9.26 κίχε νιν λέοντί ποτ’ εὐρυφαρέτρας), no doubt appreciated by the cognoscenti but almost equally intelligible to a more modestly educated listener who had forgotten his Pindar lessons, or indeed had never read any Pindar.

ναὶ μὴν καὶ ψαλμικῶς: sc. εἰπεῖν, i.e., to quote the Psalms.

καὶ νῦν τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν ἐκείνο βέλος...φέρεται: the present tense joined to νῦν suggests that E. was perhaps referring to an existing text (Cf. Ἐπ. 37 below, τὸ βασιλικὸν κάντανθα πόνημα), possibly illustrated so as to appeal to φιλοκάλοις...φιλοθεάμοσι.

οἱ φθάσαντες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ἀγῶνες: whereas the previous paragraph dealt with external threats to the faith, E. turns here to internal religious controversies which elicited impassioned opinion within the ranks of both the political and ecclesiastical élite. The most acrimonious such theological quarrel of the later twelfth century, prompted in part by imperial intervention in doctrinal interpretation, was that concerning Christ’s statement in John 14:28, ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μοί ἐστιν. Manuel seems to have sympathized with those, including the patriarchs Lukas Chrysoberges and Michael III, who agreed with western theologians that Christ can only have been referring to his human nature, and he convened a synod on 2 March 1166 in order to decide the issue. What may have inflamed an otherwise overly subtle theological dispute was the decision to impose harsh penalties on dissenters by having their property confiscated and in some cases even exiling them. For the political significance of the controversy, see Magdalino, Empire, 279ff. E. depicts Manuel as having been on the traditional Orthodox side and against those who would have restricted the salvific power of the trinity to God, depriving the son of the father’s power.

τὸ γε εἰς αὐτὰς ἥκον: it is difficult to translate this parenthetical qualification in the text without being sure of the antecedent to αὐτὰς. The only grammatically plausible antecedent would be the “tongues” of θεομάχων γλωσσῶν above, reiterated in ἰδιάζουσαι and μονάζουσαι. E. thus makes the point that those who tried to restrict the participation of Christ and the Holy Spirit in salvation did so within the relevant limits. For this sense attached to the participle see LSJ s.v. ἥκω II.2.
μηδὲν ὁν καὶ αὐτοῖς τούτου μετόν: αὐτοῖς refers to the Son and the Holy Spirit, which the misguided interpreters of the Gospels preclude from having a share, i.e., participating, in salvation. For the grammar see LSJ s.v. μέτειμι II. Like so much phrasing in the oration, the two participles δν...μετόν are deliberately set alongside so as to combine the acoustic effect of alliteration with the subtle doctrinal semantics.

τὸ βασιλικὸν...πόνημα: this need not imply a work by the emperor; ἡ ἱερὰ βίβλος probably refers to an imperially commissioned bible bestowed as a gift to Hagia Sophia (τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ἀνάκτορον). The emperor’s patronage serves as a sign of his “wisdom” (τὴν βασιλικὴν μηνόν σοφίαν).

αὐτοφθόνος: a coinage of uncertain origin, it appears in late Byzantine redactions of christian poetry collections, and here in Eustathios, not coincidentally in connection with a statement about christian dogma. As with most αὐτο–compounds, the sense of the reflexive depends on the second half (LSJ s.v. αὐτός V), as a variation on “of oneself, of one’s own accord, independently.” Here it should mean something like unprovoked or entirely “self-generated” malice and envy, so as to preempt any allegation that the issuing of the statement of faith provoked the dissent which followed. The use of the rare term may reflect E.’s attempt to include the controversy (see next note) without assigning blame in a case where his loyalties were divided between the dissenting majority and his long-time patron, Manuel.

εἱρητὸ ἐπος...δογματικόν: this is the Novel of 1166, known as the ‘Conciliar Edict’ on the doctrinally vexing verse in John 14:28, the Father is greater than I (ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μού ἐστιν). According to contemporary accounts, Manuel made his support of the edict’s resolution of the matter known by posting a deluxe version of the text in Hagia Sophia, with red lettering on white marble plaques (ἰδοὺ γέγραπται καὶ ταῦτα...πρὸς αἴσθησιν), as well as despatching copies to all the ecclesiastical sees of the empire. Magdalino, Empire, 287–288, notes Manuel’s unprecedented involvement in securing a synodal decision consonant with his own view of the Christological controversy, as well as the measures taken to suppress vocal dissent among recalcitrant clergy. For the edict itself, see the edition and commentary by C. Mango, “The Conciliar Edict of 1166,” DOP 17 (1963) 317–330.
οὕτω...ἐν τοῖς θείοις δόγμασιν: the syntax here is difficult. οὕτω...ὡς is followed by an infinitive βαλεῖν (in what would normally be a natural) result clause; the subsequent infinitives ἐθέλειν...ἐκκαίεσθαι form the apodosis answering to the protasis εἰ...ἐξανήφθη, which I have rendered as an adverb, since English “if...” doesn’t convey the required sense.

πνευματικὴν ἐξήσκετο διαλεκτικήν: Manuel appears to have styled himself something of a theological dialectician. He engaged in public debates with both Byzantine and foreign clergymen, including on at least one occasion, a learned Muslim theologian. See Magdalino, Empire, 279–281, 287–289. For an illustration of what such debates might entail, vividly rendered as dialogue, see Nicetae Choniatae Thesauri Orthodoxae Fidei, PG 140, cols. 137–148. Although Manuel’s interest in doctrinal matters may have been at least partly prompted by the need to rehabilitate his earlier image of self-indulgence and moral slackness, the evidence suggests that he sincerely sought the mantle of ἐπιστημονάρχης (see next note), even priding himself on his skill in abstruse theological debate; cf. Kinn. Epit. re. 253: κάν γὰρ καὶ παιδείας ἄγευστος λογικῆς ἦν, ἀλλὰ φύσεως ὄξυτητι καὶ μεγαλείω νοήσεως πάντων καθάπαξ ἐκράτει τῶν ἐν τοῖς καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνοις γεγενημένων ἄνθρώπων... κάν τι διερμηνεύει διαθηματίην, σὺν ἐξαισία τινὶ προμηθείαν καὶ σαφείν οὗτος ἐπαίσκεται τοῦτο διεξαγαγεῖ... οἷς ἐν δὲ σιγή συνεχείᾳ κατασχηματίζομεν τὸν ἀποροῦντα γραφικὰς εἰσῆγε ζητήσεις καὶ περὶ τῶν λύσεων τουτωνὶ διεπυνθάνετο ξυναγείρων ὅσον ἔχαιρε λογιότητι.

πῦρ...ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ: the phrasing is reminiscent of Il. 20.195–196: ἀλλ’ οὐ νῦν ἐρύεσθαι οἴομαι, ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ / βάλλει; cf. Pi. O. 13.16: πολλὰ δ’ ἐν καρδίας ἀνδρῶν ἐβάλον / Ἡμεῖς πολιάνθεμοι ἀρχαία σοφίσμαθ’.

τὸν οὕτω σοφὸν αὐτοκράτορα...τεχνοῦσθαι τὰ ἐπιστημονικά: a justification for Manuel’s confident entry into matters of faith and reasoning more generally as an imperial obligation and a sign of necessary competence akin to other forms of knowledge required to govern, such as combat: ὥσπερ τὴν ἐν χερσὶ συμπλοκὴν ὁ τὴν ἀνδρίαν δεξιώτατος, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐν λογομαχίας ὁ τῆς σοφίας τρόφιμος. Not coincidentally, ἐπιστήμη is mentioned three times in this passage, evoking Manuel’s claim to the mantle of ἐπιστημονάρχης or “chief expert in knowledge.” Most of the historical documents chronicling Manuel’s rôle in the various theological controversies adopt a markedly panegyric stance towards the emperor’s contribution; cf. Magdalino, Empire, 280, 288. Manuel’s repeated
interventions in doctrinal matters no doubt struck many among the clergy as presumptuous. E. thus stresses not so much Manuel's correct doctrine here as his obligation as emperor to think himself competent to participate in such debates by appeal to Aristotelian-inspired natural philosophy: ζῶσι μὲν τοῖς ἐτέροις δοτέον αἰσθάνεσθαι τῶν ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καλῶν; cf. Arist. De sensu et sens. 436b9; cf. etiam Plot. Enn. 1.4.2.2.

ὁποὺ δίκην: the simile involving the acid juice of the fig-tree, used for curdling milk, therefore “binding things together,” is unusual. E. may have gotten the idea from the Homeric simile Il. 5.902: ὡς δ’ ὀπὸ γάλα λευκὸν ἐπειγόμενος συνέπηξεν / ὑγρὸν ἐόν. Cf. Emped. 33 (eds. H. Diels and W. Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, vol. 1, 6th edn., Berlin, 1951): ὡς δ’ ὀπὸ γάλα λευκὸν ἐγόμφωσεν καὶ ἔδησε, with the attached scholion: κατ’ Ἐμπεδοκλέα (τοιαύτην γάρ ἡ φιλία βούλεται ποιεῖν ἑνότητα καὶ σύμπηξιν) ἡ δὲ πολυφιλία διίστησι καὶ ἀποσπάει καὶ ἀποστρέφει, τῷ μετακαλεῖν καὶ μεταφέρειν ἄλλοτε πρὸς ἄλλον οὐκ ἕωσα κράσιν οὐδὲ κόλλησιν εὐνοίας ἐν τῇ συνήθεια περιχυθείσῃ καὶ παγείσῃ γενέσθαι.

tὸ ... πάθος: the Basel Codex, followed by Tafel, has πάρος, which is hard to defend. Reinsch proposed πάθος, on the model of Plat. Gorg. 513c5: πέπονθα δὲ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάθος; cf. etiam Heliod. Aeth. 3.16.2: πάσχων οἴμαι τὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάθος.

ὑψοῦ ... ἀρσεὶ: the adverbial use of ὑψοῦ derives from the otherwise rare locative case, see Smyth 342. For the present metaphorical use, see LSJ s.v. υψοῦ II, cf. ex. gr. ἐξάρας μὲ υ. having praised me highly, Hdt. 9.79; ὑ. αἴρειν θυμόν Soph. OT 914.

tὰ περὶ γῆν... εἶχεν αὐτὸν: E. changes subject, St. Paul becomes the object (αὐτόν) of τὰ περὶ γῆν... ταπεινά, and the implicit subject of the acc. participles βαίνοντα... στηρίζοντα. The phrase τῇ πρὸς τὸν ὕψιστον ἔργον συνδιϊκνεῖτο... τοῖς: sc. φιλοσοφήμασι or something correspondingly similar but more apt to the rare compound. The only other instance of συνδιϊκνέομαι currently in the TLG, though with a slightly different meaning, also comes from E.; Comm. ad Hom. II 4.262.5 Τὸ δὲ «ἔποντο» οὐ στάσιμον τὸ τῆς ὀρχήσεως ἔργον δηλοῖ, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῶν τρυγώντων κινήσει συνδιϊκνούμενον. ὅσα περὶ γῆς καὶ κατ’ ἀν-
commentary

θρωπον: explained by Φύσεως ... βάθη, καί αἵτιολογήσαι γένεσιν, καί ἀνακαλύψαι μυστήρια πλάσεως.

Ἀσκληπιαδῶν λεπτότης: in the plural, the “sons of Asclepius” referred to phycisians, whose diagnoses and treatments were thought to have proceeded from broad scientific knowledge, including the principles of natural philosophy, as the comparison with τις λοιπὴ ἐπιστήμη τοῦ φυσικεύεσθαι indicates; see LSJ s.v. φυσικεύομαι. By λεπτότης or “subelt” E. is referring here to the discerning scrutiny of Manuel in identifying medical conditions, equal to that he displayed when contemplating doctrinal matters. On the potential of funeral oratory to yield information about the perception of scientific knowledge in Byzantium, see Sideras, Grabreden, 86, n.267.

κατ’ ὄψιν... κατοπτεύειν: E.’s fondness for acoustic effects may be seen in the occasional concentration of assonance and alliteration underscoring the semantic patterns he wishes to emphasize: cf. ex. gr. ὄψιν... κατοπτεύειν... διώπτευε... ἰδών / φύσεως... φύσιν / γνώμονι... γνωματευθείς / λαληθέν... ἐκλαλεῖν / ἔνδοθέν ποθεν / ἐμβριθή (καὶ ἦν τοιοῦτος ὁ νοηθές), ἀλλὰ εὐήθη / τῷ παντὶ πλέον τὸν ἐπιπόλαιν. While alliteration or assonance may be on occasion be incidental, especially in a language with so small a root vocabulary as Greek, it is unlikely to be a function of chance in an oration whose every word was carefully selected for effect.

φύσεως γνώμονι: for the requisite of γνώμων as the measure or sign of something, see LSJ, s.v. II.5. E. trades here on the proximity of the expression to the ancient science of φυσιογνωμονία, the technique of observing and drawing inferences about a person’s character or other significant information from physical features of the body. The practice of physiognomy drew on both medicine and astrology, two areas of specialized knowledge in which Manuel styled himself an expert. For the ancient inheritance of physiognomic knowledge, see E. C. Evans, Physiognomics in the Ancient World (Philadelphia, 1969). Although a number of medieval manuscripts preserved treatises on aspects of physiognomy, including those of Adamantios (4th cent., but attributed to Aristotle; cf. A. Touwaide, A Census of Greek Medical Manuscripts: From Byzantium to the Renaissance, New York, 2016), there is no study of physiognomic science in Byzantium.

οὐκ ἦν στοχάζεσθαι ἀλλ’ : for this use of ἀλλὰ amounting to “however” or “nevertheless”, see Smyth, 2784.
the discrepancy between the outward or “surface” appearance (τοῖς ἐπιπολῆς) and the inner or “deep” reality (τὰ ἐν βάθει) is a recurring motif in E.’s work. Seen from a different perspective, the “superficial man” (τὸν ἐπιπολαίον ἀνθρώπον) is synonymous with unsophisticated person, contrasted with the man of depth, i.e., the man of reflection, learning, and penetrating intelligence, a spatial metaphor inherited from antiquity and still in currency. Cf. Eust. Or. 9 (Λόγος 1) 155.19–24: εἰ δὲ καί τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν κατὰ τῆς ἁπάντη γραφῆς ὑποπυτεύεται ρηθέν, ὡς εἰκός, ἐπιεικέστερον, ἀλλ’ οὐ πάνυ χύδην καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἐπιπολαίον ἄνθρωπον ἥμιν λόγος ἐκφωνηθήσεται, ὡς εἶναι πάντη πάντως δυσήκοος, ἀλλὰ (παραφρονών τυχὸν λέγω), καθάπερ ἄν τις τὸ τοιοῦτον μεταχειρίσηται καὶ πάντη παιδείας ἀνεχθῆν τοῦ ἡμῖν λόγος ἐκφωνηθήσεται, ὡς εἶναι πάντῃ πάντως δυσήκοος. While the difference between the inward reality and outward appearance referred to here is innocent, since E.’s former teacher did not himself know he was ill, the inconsistency between inner and outward man could be construed in moral or ethical terms, as E. notes with respect to Manuel’s ability to “see through” surface appearances: διώπτευε τὸν κρυψίνουν, τῷ παντὶ πλέον τὸν ἐπιπολαίον, τοὺς τῶν λοιπῶν ἠθῶν ὁμοίως. Dissimulation is the subject of a fascinating essay by E. titled (On Hypocrisy); see E.C. Bourbouhakis, “All the world’s a stage and the pious merely players: the Περὶ ὑποκρισίας of Eustathios” (forthcoming).

Εἰδέ: the Basel Codex has οἶδε, which may be defended as “he knew…[that] my teacher of rhetoric was suffering from a festering disease.” But the emphasis on sight in the subsequent clauses (καὶ ἡ ὄψις ἐμήνυεν… τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις, ἀπρόοπτον ἥν τὸ σημαινόμενον ὦ δὲ, νοερωτέραις ἐπιβολαίς ὄψεως) invites the slight emendation for what may have been a corruption to itacism. Εἰδέ…ὑπολογόν τινα νόσον: by all accounts, Manuel prided himself on his medical expertise, which unlike some intellectuals of his day, he was not above applying himself first-hand, even performing minor surgery and, as E. observes, devising new cures capable, in obviously hyperbolic terms which conflate Manuel’s acquired medical talents with his near divine resemblance to his namesake, Christ or Emanu’el, of “raising the dead” (ἀνίστα της θανατηφόρου νόσου τὸν κάμποντα). The court historian Kinnamos notes Manuel’s proficiency in medicine, going so far as to describe it as better than that of most physicians,
which would not have been hard to achieve in this period. Cf. Kinn. *Epit.* re. 130, 190. He also memorably describes how Manuel set the broken arm of Baldwin III after a hunting accident in 1159, an incident confirmed in the memoirs of William of Tyre (p.848). Similarly, Conrad III described how Manuel tended to his illness during the Second Crusade (ed. Jaffé, *Monumenta corbeiensia*, 356). Magdalino, *Empire*, 361–366; 451, n.127 notes how the poems attributed to the authorial persona of ‘Manganeios’ Prodromos allude to Manuel’s interest in medicine. While medical knowledge had long been considered the natural province of the well-rounded learned man, no emperor before Manuel had displayed such a flair for the therapeutic arts. See V. Grumel, “La profession médicale à Byzance à l’époque des Comnènes”, *REB* 7 (1949) 42–46; cf. O. Temkin, “Byzantine Medicine: Tradition and Empiricism,” *DOP* 16 (1962) 97–115.

εξεύρε καὶ πιστὰ φάρμακα…Προμηθεῖ σεμνολόγημα: besides fire, Prometheus was held to have taught humanity the pharmacological arts. Cf. Aesch. *Prom.*: 252–253 θνητοῦς γ᾽ ἔπαυσα μὴ προδέρκεσθαι μόρον / τὸ ποῖον εὑρὼ τῆς φάρμακον νόσου; idem 478–483: τὸ μὲν μέγιστον, ἐτὶ τις νόσου πέσοι / οὐκ ἂν ἄλλημ’ οὔδέν, οὔτε βρώσιμον / οὐ χριστόν, οὐδὲ πιστόν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων / χρεία κατεσκέλλοντο, πρὶν γ᾽ ἐγώ σφισιν ἔδειξα κράσεις ἠπίων ἀκεσμάτων / αἷς τὰς ἁπασάς ἐξαμύνονται νόσους.

tὸν ἐμὸν…καθηγητήν: the identity of this professor of rhetoric cannot be firmly established but the added qualification “when he presided over the sophists” (ὅτε τῶν σοφιστευόντων προῆδρευε) makes very likely that the καθηγητής in question was Nicholas Kataphloron, who had served as both διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἀποστόλου and οἰκουμενικός διδάσκαλος, the last of which he held simultaneously with the chair of rhetoric, or μαϊστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, which would have seen him “preside over the sophists”, a post which E. himself would eventually occupy. He appears to have died prematurely, in 1160, which would match well with the prognostication that ἡ ὄψις ἐμήνυεν οὐ μακρὰν ζωὴν τῷ ἀνδρὶ…προέφη τὴν οὐ μετὰ μακρὸν ἔξοδον τοῦ ἀνδρός. Scholarship on E.’s relation to the man has debated whether he was a family relation, or simply a mentor. I am inclined to the latter conclusion, not least to judge from this passage where (assuming Kataphloron is the professor in question) E. makes no reference to any relation besides that of “teacher.” For a summary of the question, see Kazhdan, *Studies*, 117–119, 200, 218. For Nicholas Kataphloron, see M. Loukaki, “Τυμβωρύχοι και σκυλευτές νεκρών: Οι απόψεις του Νικολάου Καταφλώρον για τη ηθοποιία και τοὺς ρήτορες στην Κωνσταντινούπολι του 12ου αἰώνα,” *Σύμμεικτα* 14 (2001) 143–166. It is not clear whether E. is referring to the same former instructor in one of
his letters, *Ep.* 30.129–133: ἀπεσαι ἁρ’ ἠμῶν καὶ ἀξίωσον μεμνήσθαι ἠμῶν…τὸν δεσπότην μου, τὸν δείνα μαίστορα. Kolovou (*Briefe*, 143–144) dates the letter to the early 1180’s when none of the serving patriarchs are known to have occupied the chair of μαίστωρ τῶν ρητόρων.

φάρμακα…δωρεάν τοῖς χρήζουσιν: it remarkable to get so much detailed information about the precise distribution mechanism for drugs to those who could not afford them (χορηγοῦσι δὲ δημόσιοι ταμίαι δόσιν ἄφθονον αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς δωρεάν τοῖς χρήζουσιν) a subject at best tangential to Manuel’s own accomplishments, since E. does not attribute the institution to Manuel, he only reminds his audience of the imperial sponsorship of the practice which earned such drugs the moniker “royal” (οἷς δὲ βασιλικοῖς ἐστιν ἐπιλέγεσθαι πρὸς τε τῶν χρωμένων, πρὸς τε τῶν χορηγοῦντων). For a survey of Byzantine pharmacology J. Scarbrough, *Early Byzantine Pharmacology*, *DOP* 38 (1984) 213–232; more recently, D. Bennett, *Medicine and Pharmacy in Byzantine Hospitals: A study of the extant formularies* (Abingdon, UK, 2016).

ὁ δὲ ἐντὸς αὐτοκράτωρ: I transliterate *autokrator* in order to underline how E. plays on the dual sense of the word αὐτοκράτωρ, employing at once the political title and the more literal sense “master of oneself,” i.e., in control of his mind and body.

ὁμοίω πάθει προστητῆκοτα: for the required passive sense of the perfect participle, see LSJ s.v. προστήκομαι. E.’s implicitly iterative participial construction suggests Manuel was suffering from some kind of commonly contracted disease for which he routinely prescribed a cure.

Εἰ δὲ οὕτω...τις θαυμάσειεν: a rare periodic construction in the oration, underlining the riddle of the fickleness of the disease. The sentence illustrates E.’s and, presumably his peers’, ability to compose in a more ‘classicizing’ periodic style. This further supports the argument that the syntax of the funeral oration, and many a text of its kind, was deliberate rather than the default style of Byzantine authors of E.’s ability. See Horrocks, *Greek*, 151f., 169–178; cf. the trends in usage proposed by S. Wahlgren, ”Case, Style, and Competence in Byzantine Greek,” *The Language of Byzantine Literature*, ed. M. Hinterberger (Turnhout, 2014) 170–175. There remains much work to be done on this subject.

Μακρά τις κυβερνήσας...ἐξαπόλωλε: possibly an allusion to Odysseus’ steersman, Baius, reputed to have drowned overboard. A variation on the events

Ἀσκληπιάδης…οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅπως οὐ πεσεῖται θανάτω: that ‘sons of Asclepius’, i.e., physicians, too, must die, recalls Asklepios’ own paradoxical death in myth, where his demise is attributed to divine anger for having brought the dead back to life (cf. *Apollo.n. Bibliotheca* 3.121), a fitting likeness to Manuel’s own healing of the near-dead at the end of par. 42 (τὰ πολλὰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς θανά- τοις τε καὶ ήν εἶπεῖν προσφυές, ὡς μικροῦ ἐρωτῶν, καὶ ποῦ θάπτεται, ἀνίστα τῆς θανατηφόρου νόσου τὸν κάμνοντα).

**σμικροτάτων...κατασμικρύνεσθαι:** the conspicuous repetition of words beginning with or containing σμικρ-, four times in this one passage, helps generate an anaphoric sense compounded by the alliterative effect. Given other examples of similarly alliterative effects in the oration, it is unlikely that the string σμικρο- τάτων... σμικρολογ...σμικροπρεπ...κατασμικρυν here was coincidental to the theme. It is more likely that E. intended to underline the scripturally unwarranted limits or “shrinking” of the divine at issue in the doctrinal dispute over Christ’s substance.

τὴν τῆς προνοίας σειράν: E. recapitulates the position of Clement of Alexandria against Celsus and other natural philosophers, whose cosmology held that the world was divided into a heavenly sphere which began in the topmost part of the heavens and reached as far as the moon (μέχρι καὶ εἰς σελήνην), beneath which was another sphere, which included the earth, a conception sometimes credited to Aristotle in the middle ages, effectively restricting the activity of the gods to the upper sphere of the heavens. Cf. *Clem. Alex. Protr.* (ed. C. Mondésert, *Clément d’Alexandrie. Le protreptique*, 2nd edn. [Sources chrétiennes


τοῖς λογάσι... ἐπεδίδου: μεγαλείοις τῶν ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι λόγων makes this a difficult clause to interpret. I take τῶν ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι λόγων as a partitive gen. restricting μεγαλείοις to something like “stately discussions about government”. The meaning may be arrived at by observing the contrast with the following clause in οὐ μόνον... ἀλλὰ καί. Cf. Theophyl. Λόγος εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα κῦριν Ἀλέξιον τὸν Κομνηνὸν 215.15–18: Ἔμελλον δὲ ἀρα, ὡσπερ τῶν πράξεων σου χρηστά ἀπεκληρώσαμεν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπι ταῖς πράξεσι λόγων οὐ μικρὸν ἐνασθαί, καί αὐτοῖς γὰρ τὸ μέρος ἀγαθὸν νομίζομεν ὅτι τοῖς σοῖς ἐπαίνοις τὴν γλώτταν ἀπεκληρώσαμεν τῆς ἡμέρας.

τοῖς... πυθμενιζομένοις: a hapax, πυθμενιζομαι was either modelled on the rare contract infinitive πυθμενεῖν attested in some mss., 117P of Lumbichus’ ‘In Nicom. arithm. introd. liber (ed. H. Pistelli, Leipzig, 1894); or, like it, derived from the noun πυθμήν. The required meaning accords best with the sense of “rooted or based in” (cf. LSJ s.v. πυθμήν).

καταβαίνων... ενθέων: for the joint senses of “descend” and “condescend” alluding to Christ’s incarnation, see Lampe s.v. συγ-
καταβαίνω 3.b. Even by the standards of Manuel’s effusive panegyrists, the repeated likeness with Christ tested the boundary between rhetorical deification and blasphemy. No subsequent Byzantine emperor would be praised in quite such terms again.

ὡς οἶον ἀναχαιτιζόμενον...ἀνεσειράζετο: does E. think the two are the same? cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. Il. 2.537.1–2 παράσειρος λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς ὅστερον, ἕτε ἀδικοίς σωφρόνες, ὡς δηλοῖ Σωφρόνις, ἀπὸ τῆς σειρᾶς. ὃν καὶ ἀνασειράζειν ἵππον τὸ ἀναχαιτίζειν; cf. etiam Comm. ad Hom. Od. 2.249.37–38: δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἀνακόπτειν παρὰ τοῖς ὅστερον καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνασειράζειν ἐπὶ ἵππων λέγεται, ὑμεῖς τῷ ἄνω ἀνασειράζειν.

τὸ βασιλικὸν...νόμιμον εἰσοικίζεται: one would be hard-pressed to find a more succinct rationale for Roman autocratic and imperial rule in Byzantium. For a discussion of this passage, see the introduction, under “Paraenesis.” Such passages have not been well integrated into the standard accounts of Byzantine political theory, cf. D.M. Nicol, “Byzantine political thought,” The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450 (Cambridge, 2008) 49–80; cf. etiam E. Barker, Social and Political Thought in Byzantium. From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents. Translated with an Introduction and Notes (Oxford, 1957).

ὅσοι τὸ τε ζῆν κληροῦται: sc. ὁμιλίαις, those interactions “to which it was allotted to be conducted live,” i.e., directly with the emperor himself, as opposed to correspondence. For the language of “living” vs. “lifeless” letters, cf. Plato, Phaedr. 276a8–9: Τὸν τοῦ εἰδότος λόγον λέγεις ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον, οὗ ὁ γεγραμμένος εἴδωλον ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγοντος τι ἀληθεύων.

οὐ πάνω φιλῶ...προσαρμόσαι τῷ λόγῳ: cf. Ἐπ. 13. E. had employed the venerable topos of likening the emperor to the sun on previous occasions, at times even elaborating it to great rhetorical effect; cf. Eust. Or. 14 (Λόγος Ν) 230.52–56: ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης κύριος, ὁ γλυκὺς ἡλίος, οὗτος ἐστι τῶν ἀκτίνων κορέσας τὸν ὑγιῆ βλέποντα. ἡλίος μὲν γὰρ ἀνίσχως ἔφευρεν ἐθνὸς ἀχθόμενον, ὡς αἱ ἱστορικὴ κεκράγασι, καὶ ἐπαραθεῖν τῷ κοσμικῷ φωστήρι ἐκείνῳ τὸ βάρβαρον (καυστικὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐπιβάλλων φρύγει καὶ διοχλεῖ), ἡλίος δὲ βασιλεύς ὅτος, ὡς καὶ ἀρχηγός
φωσφορήσει, ἣδο ἐπιλάμπει. The feigned renunciation of the topos here allowed him to claim independence from conventional imagery while still exploiting its familiar associations with light, warmth, and a primordial sense of life-giving. Before the oration ends, E. will revert to his customary practice: cf. Ἐπ. 71 Ἐδυς, ὁ μέγιστε βασίλειος ἠλιε. For further examples of the sun topos in E.’s oratory, see Or. 102.92, 174.54, 225.62, 230.49, 248.63, 262.29, 281.2, 286.55. The likening of the emperor to the sun drew on earlier imagery of the cult of Sol Invictus developed in Roman times and formally brought to an end under Constantine I; cf. S. Berrens, Sonnenkult und Kaisertum von den Severern bis zu Constantin I. 193–337 n. Chr. (Wiesbaden, 2004).

tῶν εἰς ἀρετῆν ἀφωρισμένων: cf. Ἐπ. 1, οἱ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες; Ἐπ. 52, τῆς κατὰ θεόν ἐπιθυμίας ἄνδρες.

ἐπεσκεύαζεν ...πάντα ἐποίει: the absence of any single notable building or monumental site associated with Manuel compels E. to emphasize his role as renovator and repairer of existing structures. For a survey of Komnenian, and specifically Manuel’s own, contribution to the upkeep of Constantinople’s religious foundations and other sites, see Magdalino, Empire, 117–123. For individual structures, see under “Constantinople” in the index, Ibid., Empire, 541. E. stresses that Manuel’s support of renovations and repairs was not limited to the capital, a perennial complaint of provincial officials who sought state financing for repairs to their own infrastructure. see now M. Mihaljević, Constantinopolitan Architecture of the Komnenian Era (1080–1180) and its impact in the Balkans, Volumes I-II. Ph.D. (Ph.D. Princeton University, 2010) 79–124. For the deliberate acoustic effects of assonance and alliteration, see the section on orality in the introduction.

ἔχασκε...εἰς κενόν, ὅ φασι, χαίνειν: E. employs two related expressions, both of ancient pedigree. The first is modelled on Hom. Il. 4.182: τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεία χθών by which nature seeks to swallow, i.e., destroy, something (cf. LSJ s.v. χάσκω); the second was a proverbial phrase derived from fables in which an animal is left mouth agape waiting to satisfy some desire which is ultimately thwarted by events, as in Ar. Fr. 337: λύκος ἔχανεν the wolf opened his mouth in vain and was used proverbially of futile expectations. In this case, time itself is put in the role of the frustrated, greedy animal. To illustrate Byzantine usage of the expression, Karathanasis, Sprichwörter 112/37, cites Eust. Ὑπ. 8, 42; 124, 40; as well as this passage from the Ἐπιτάφιος: “In der Grabrede auf Manuel Komne-

Σεισμοί ποτε ἀναταράττοντες: much of the territory ruled by the Byzantine empire was and remains prone to earthquakes. A number of sizable quakes are recorded during Manuel's reign, including in 1156, 1157, and 1170. Earthquake-damaged cities, towns, or buildings afforded an opportunity for showcasing imperial euergetism, a link established by a long tradition of oratory first petitioning, then celebrating Roman emperors for their patronage. E. had previously praised Manuel’s efforts to reconstruct all that an earthquake had brought down; cf. Or. 17 (Λόγος Π) 291.87–292.92. This made it possible for emperors with no significant building programmes to nevertheless be portrayed, as E. does here, as “raising corpses [=buildings] from the dead” (ἀνίστα τὰ ἱερὰ πτώματα) and for imperial munificence in carrying out necessary repairs (τῇ βασιλικῇ μεγαλοδωρεά, τὸ ἐνδεόν ἀναπληρώσαι τῆς οἰκοδομῆς), so that it justified “the emperor naturally acquiring the attribute of founder of the buildings” (Ἐπ. 50), an idea further amplified in Eust. De emend. 35.8: κρεῖττον ἦν ἢ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν θεμέλια ὀρυγῆναι τοιαύταις οἰκοδομαῖς ἢ ἀλλὰ τελεσφορηθείσας ἐκ μέσου γενέσθαι ἁρπυίαις καὶ σεισμοῖς καὶ θείῳ πυρί. Political pragmatism was thus joined to a rhetorical trope with a long pedigree. Aelius Aristides, a model of imperial panegyric throughout the Byzantine era, composed at least two orations well known to Byzantine orators, one seeking imperial support for the rebuilding of quake-ravaged Rhodes in 142 and a second for Smyrna in 177 A.D. (Or. XXV, XIX, ed. B. Keil, Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia, Berolini, 1898). Cf. Strabo Geogr. 13.4.8.14–15: ἡ πόλις…νεωστὶ ἀπό σεισμῶν ἀπέβαλε πολλὴν τῆς κατοικίας. ἢ δὲ τοῦ Τιβερίου πρόνοια τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἑγεμόνος καὶ ταύτην καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συχνὰς ἀνέλαβε ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις, ὅσαι περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἐκοινώνησαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάθους; cf. etiam Tacit. Ann. 2.47: Eodem anno duodecim celebres Asiae urbes conlapsae nocturno motu terrae, quo improvisor graviorque pestis fuit… nam centies sestertium pollicitus Caesar, et quantum aerario aut fisco pendebant in quinquennium remisit.

μεγαλοδωρεά: both post-classical, μεγαλοδωρεά alternates with μεγάλοδωρεία. This is the only instance of either in E.
_καιρικοῖς:_ the manuscript has κ- followed by a generic ligature ending in a dat. pl. Tafel interpreted this as κανονικοῖς, which is hard to construe as the indirect object of ἀντεπεξάγει (Diccionario Griego-Español s.v. ἀντεπεξάγω 2, tr. conducir a su vez contra, llevar contra αὐτοῖς τὴν στρατιάν I.AI 6.170, τὴν οἰκείαν δύναμιν I.AI 8.382 contrastar con, oponer c. ac. y dat. ἀντεπεξάγει πάλιν αὐτήν (πίστιν) τῷ νόμῳ Chrys.M.60.458). καιρικοῖς continues the motif of Manuel as a bulwark against the ravages of time; cf. Ἐπ. 48: ἀταξίας ἁρμοστής καιρικῆς, ἐπισκευαστής; cf. etiam supra Ἐπ. 49: Καιροί τινες.

_καλλονὴν θείαν:_ the expression is surprisingly rare, first appearing among surviving texts in the 2nd/1st c. pseudepigrapha of the Liber Jubilaeorum (ed. A.-M. Denis, Fragmenta pseudopigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca, Leiden, 1970) frag. e*: ἐκ τῆς τῶν κτισμάτων ἀναχθείσης καλλονῆς θείας ἐλλάμψεως ἡξιώθη. It appears infrequently through late antiquity and the middle ages, though never of a church. E. may well have coined the expression independently after using καλλονή in various contexts; cf. De capta Thess. 6.7–8: Ἀπήγαγε μὲν ὀνὴν αὐτήν τέλεον, ὡς μηδὲ λείψανον ἐναπομεῖναι παλαιὰς καλλονῆς.

_τὸ πάλαι κτητορικὸν:_ Tafel suggested emending to κτιστορικόν both here and in Ad stylit. Thess. 196.20, where the ms. also reads τὸ πάλαι κτητορικὸν, presumably on the grounds that while κτήτωρ / κτήσις relates to ownership, E. should be referring here to the “original construction” for which κτίστωρ / κτίστις would be more apt. But κτίστωρ does not appear in connection with church or monastic building, whereas κτητορικ- is well attested in charters or Typika when referring to “founders” and of the documents themselves as “founding charters”; cf. Τυπικὸν τῆς μονῆς τῆς Βεβαίας Ἑλπίδος (ed. H. Delehaye, Deux typica byzantins de l’époque des Paléologues, Mémoires, 8, Brussels, 1921) 4.1–2: Ἐπεὶ δὲ εἴωθεν ἐν τοῖς μοναστηρίοις κατ’ ἐτος μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς Μονῆς ἑορτὴν τὰ κτητορικά τελεῖσθαι μνημόσυνα; cf. etiam Dem. Chomat. Πολ. διάφ. (ed. G. Prinzinger, Πολνήματα διάφορα [CFHB 38] Berlin, 2002) 79: αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν τῆς ὑποταγῆς καὶ ὑπακοῆς τύπων ἐπανελέσθαι καὶ διάγειν ἐν τῇ μονῇ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν τῶν μοναχῶν καὶ κατὰ τὴν περιληψιν τοῦ διαλυθέντος κτητορικοῦ τυπικοῦ. The line between founding, i.e. “building,” and “owning” was blurry in many cases where the original patrons continued to exercise influence over the administration of monasteries.
τω μεν πρωτω κτησαιμενως: Tafel is probably on firmer ground here when he proposes κτησαιμενως, since E. is arguably referring to the actual construction (κτισις) here and not its “ownership/founding” (κτησις). I have reluctantly adopted the emendation, though the usual itacism seems to me insufficient to explain a possible error. Having just written κτητορικων a few lines earlier, the scribe may still have had the word in mind; more importantly, however, E. himself may have also had the word in mind when he composed, rendering the emendation unnecessary.

ἀπαλείφων: the manuscript clearly shows ἐπαλείφων, a difficult reading to defend when construed with the gen.: τούνομα τῆς μνημονικῆς δέλτου. The reference to Time in ὁ χρόνος suggests the more apt idea of erosion in ἀπαλείφω “to rub away, erase”; cf. Man. Holob. Or. (ed. M. Treu, Manuelis Holoboli orationes, Potsdam 1907) 2.88.2–4: χρόνος οἷς ἐξ ὅτου μακρός τὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀπαλειφθέντα μνήμης πάλιν ἀναλαμβάνεται σύμμετρον ὄνομα.

πλῆθος...θείω ναον...και μεγίστας δαπάνης: while Manuel built very little from scratch, he does seem to have expended substantial funds on renovations to existing buildings, both religious foundations and infrastructure, like city walls, town fortifications, and the water supply of Constantinople, which he was petitioned to do by E. himself in a δέησις; cf. Or. 17 (Λόγος ΠΙ) Titulus: δέησις εἰς τὸν βασιλέα κύριον Μανουὴλ τὸν Κομνηνὸν ως ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως, ὅτε αὐτὴν αὐχμὸς ἐπίεζεν. Among Manuel’s more significant subsidies was the financing of the ornate mosaic decorations of the Church of the Nativity in addition to other sites in the Holy Land. See A. Weyl Carr, “The Mural Paintings of Abu Ghosh and the Patronage of Manuel Comnenus in the Holy Land”, Crusader Art in the Twelfth Century, ed. J. Folda (Oxford, 1982) 215–244. E.’s praise of Manuel’s patronage of shrines and divine temples may well have been intended to offer a defence against the charge that he had abused the treasury and squandered money on “monasteries and temples, cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 204.83–89 ἢν δὲ τὰ συλλεγόμενα χρήματα οὐ τοσοῦτον ἀποθήκης ἀποτιθέμενα ἢ μονής γῆς ἐγκατορυττόμενα, ὅσον ἀμφότεραις ἀποκενούμενα καὶ ἀφειδώς παρεχόμενα καὶ μοναίς μὲν καὶ τεμένεσι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ἐλασσομένους, τὰ δὲ πλείστα ταῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν μεταγγίζομενα πανσπερμιαίς καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς Λατινικαίς ἐκφέροντα ὀμηγύρεισι. φιλοδωρίας γὰρ μεταδιώκων ἐπίδειξε ἀσώτως ἑσκόρπιζε καὶ ἀνήλισκεν ἀπέρ ἀμφότεραις ἐξελέγε τοὺς ἄκρως κερματιστάς φροντιστάς τῶν κοινῶν ἑφιστῶν.
ἀνιστᾷ φροντιστήριον: the monastery in question, perhaps Manuel’s only original foundation, was dedicated to the archangel Michael, cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 206.70–72. Ἱδρύσατο δὲ φροντιστήριον ιερὸν περὶ που τὸ τοῦ Πόντου στόμα, εἰς τόπον τινὰ Κατασκέπην λεγόμενον, εἰς ὅνομα τοῦ ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαήλ. The chapel housing the Komnenian imperial tombs, including Manuel’s sarcophagus, was dedicated to the archangel Michael. When E. comes to mention the founding monasteries in his lengthy treatise on the reform of monasticism, he makes no mention of Manuel’s patronage. Cf. G. L. F. Tafel, Betrachtungen über den Mönchsstand, eine Stimme des 12. Jahrhunderts (Berlin, 1847) 9 n.3, 10. n.1.


toῖς Ναζιραίοις θέσθαι σκηνώματα: E. emphasizes, and probably exaggerates, Manuel’s support of monasteries, perhaps to compensate for the backlash created by his πρόσταγμα abolishing the tax exemption for monastic foundations in Thrace and Macedonia, intended to prevent their use as virtual tax havens for wealthy landowning families. For the imperial decree, see F. Dolger, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, II, von 1025–1204. ed. P. Wirth (München, 1995) Nr. 1523.

τῶν πόλεων...τῶν μὲν ἔγερσις ἐκ τοῦ πάλαι κεῖσθαι: cf. Eust. Or. 17 (Λόγος Π) 290.33–38: πᾶσαι μὲν ἄλλαι πόλεις, ἂς οὐδὲ εὐχερὲς καθυποβαλεῖν ἀρίθμῳ, δόσαι τε παλαιός ἄρ’ οὐ χρόνος τὸν τῆς Ῥωμαϊκής ἄρχης κύκλον κοσμοῦσι καὶ ὅσας (πολ- λαί δὲ καὶ αὐτά και οὐ ραδίως μέτρῳ ληπταί) τὸ σὸν ἐνθευτος κράτος τὰς μὲν πάλαι κατενεχθείσας εἰς γόνυ ἀνήγειρε, τὰς δὲ ὄνοματι μόνω γνωριζομένας, τῷ δὲ λοιπῷ παντὶ κατὰ γῆς δεδυκυίας εἰς φῶς ἔγαγε καὶ τὸν πρώην κόσμον ἀπέδωκε.

Τιβερίῳ...ἀγαθόν: the likeliest source in Greek for Tiberius’ euergetism, an emperor otherwise better known for his parsimoniousness with respect to imperial benefactions, was Strabo, Geogr. 13.4.8: ἀναληφθεῖσα δ’ ἀξιολόγως ὕστερον διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν τῆς χώρας ἡ πόλις καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς λειπομένη τῶν ἀστυγειτόνων, νεω- στὶ ὑπὸ σεισμῶν ἀπέβαλε πολλὴ τῆς κατοικίας. ἡ δὲ τοῦ Τιβερίου πρόνοια τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἡγεμόνος καὶ ταύτην καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συχνὰς ἀνέλαβε ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις. For the Roman pedigree of the emperor’s image as ἐυεργέτης, see O. Treitinger, Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell. Vom oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken, 2 Aufl. (Darmstadt, 1956) 229f.

tοὺς πολεμίους εἰργε τῆς ἐκδρομῆς: E. is referring here to κάστρα, or fortifications, either built or reinforced during Manuel’s reign in bid to shore up the often porous and shifting frontier with the Seljuks. For the costly programme of fortification building and repairs undertaken first by John II, then continued by Manuel, see C. Foss and D. Winfield, Byzantine Fortifications (Pretoria, 1986) 56–59, 71–73, 145–150. Cf. J. W. Birkenmeier, The Development of the Komnenian Army (Leiden; Boston, 2002) 185, 204.

Οὐχ ἦττον...καινόν: some variant of “novelty, innovation, originality, unconventionality” appears ten times in the course of the oration, making Manuel out to be consistently exceptional, inventive, and novel: Ἔπ. 19 Τὸ δὲ καινότερον; Ἔπ. 30 έξελάλει τι καινόν; Ἐπ. 30 τὸ φιλόκαινον; Ἐπ. 30 τὰ καινότερα; Ἐπ. 32 έκαινουρ- γεῖτο...έκαινοντί; Ἐπ. 33 καινοπρεπῆς; Ἐπ. 42 τοῖς καινοῖς; Ἐπ. 63 καινὸν τι. While any single instance of “newness” or “novelty” may not be indicative of something larger, this many invocations of an otherwise ambiguous idea which historically tended to elicit apprehension more than admiration, bears consideration as an extension of the broader ethos of the twelfth century and may have linked cultural and political appetites for novelty.
nothing is beneath Manuel’s direct involvement. He is depicted as having had a direct hand in every aspect of planning, construction, and decoration. He is described as enrolling the builders by “helping and lending a hand to the builders, and carrying out whatever task was required” (καὶ διακονεῖν καὶ χειρουργεῖν τοῖς πολίξουσι καὶ παραφορεῖν ὅσον χρήσιμον).


χάλκεον ὑπνον: refers to the Iliadic metaphor of bronze sleep, or death brought about by bronze weapons, II. 11.241: ὃς δὲ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν κομίσατο χάλκινον βραχον.

eἰκασεν: the manuscript has the aorist with ἂν, denoting a past potential construction, in accordance with Classical grammar (cf. Smyth 1784); cf. Kolovou, Briefe, Index graecitatis: “indicativus aoristus cum ἂν particula,” 151. Tafel suggested emending to the optative εἰκάσειεν, implying that E. intended a future potential.

νῆσος ἱστὸν ἔεικοσόροιο... ἔχωρει: E. alludes to the great length of timber found inside the cyclop’s cave—likened in size to the mast of a twenty-oared ship—with which Odysseus and his men will blind the one-eyed giant. See Od. 319–322:

Κύκλωπος γὰρ ἔκειτο μέγα ῥόπαλον παρὰ σηκῷ, χλωρὸν ἐλαιόν· τὸ μὲν ἔκταμεν, ὄφρα φοροὶ ἀυανθέν, τὸ μὲν ἄμμες ἐεικοσόροιο μελαίνης ὅσσον θ’ ἱστὸν νῆσος ἔεικοσόροιο μελαίνης

The grammatical antecedent of τοιοῦτον is ἱστὸν, though the sense refers back to the “heavy spear” (βριθὺ δ όρυ) which the imperial hand “raised and hurled” (ἡ βασιλικὴ παλάμη ἀνεῖχέ τε καὶ ἐεικοσόροιο). For this sense of χωρέω applied to weapons, see Xen. Anab. 4.2.28: τὰ δὲ τοξεύματα ἐχώρει διὰ τῶν ἀσπίδων καὶ διὰ τῶν θω- ράκων.

χάλικες... λίθοι προσκόμματος: E. is surely employing the image metonymically, taking advantage of the opportunity to depict Manuel as carrying the building materials himself: χάλικες ἐν χερσὶν ἁδροῖ καὶ ἀνδραχθεῖς.

Μεθ’ ἡμέραν: for this use of μετά with an acc. ἡμέρα meaning “by day” and not “after”, see LSJ s.v. C.II.2.

ἄνπνοος: the image of remaining sleepless had scriptural precedent in the person of David, who is described in the Psalms as swearing that he will not allow
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**φερεπονίαν ὄνομάξειν:** for all his determination to fashion an oration different in style, E. nevertheless drew on a shared stock of panegyrical motifs. Cf. Theod. Prodr. *Carm. Hist.* XXX 91–94: ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ὑπομονὴν καὶ τὴν φερεπονίαν καὶ τὴν ἀκάματον ἰσχύν τῆς καρτερομελείας, ως ἀρχεῖαι ὑπνόν καὶ τροφῆς ὑποχειρίων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τῆς ψυχομελείας; cf. etiam Eust. *Comm. ad Hom. II.* 3.38.5–6: Καὶ ὅτι τὸ «σχέτλιος» οὐχ’ ὑβριστική λέξις, ἀλλὰ καρτερίας, ὃ ἐστι φερεπονίας, σημαντική, ἵνα δηλοῖ τὸν ἀνασχέσθαι καὶ τλῆναι δυνάμενο. A further example of how philology could dovetail with panegyric, and works as distinct in aim and method as the Παρεκβολαί and the Ἐπιτάφιος could share a common ideological vocabulary.

While it is easy to dismiss all references to Manuel’s remarkable capacity for enduring the rigours of campaigning and his physical resilience as nothing more than panegyrical clichés, it is worth noting that even a historian as critical of Manuel’s personal conduct as Nicetas Choniates concedes the emperor’s stamina. Cf. Nic. Chon. *Hist.* 206.57–60: Καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πόνους γὰρ ἀντεῖχε μάλα, καιροῦ καλοῦντος μοχθεῖν, καὶ ψῦχος ἔστεγε καὶ πνῖγος ἔφερε καὶ πρὸς ὑπνόν ἀπεμάχετο, καὶ ταῖς τρυφαῖς δὲ προσανεῖχε πολέμων ἄγων σχολὴν καὶ ἐνησμένιζε ταῖς ἀνέσεσιν.

**ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐποχήν:** the Basel Codex clearly shows ἐποχήν, which is apt to the sense here; Tafel read συνοχήν.

**βασιλεὺς κάνταβθα ὅν...εἴκειν τοῖς χείροισι:** an old and abiding motif about rule, that the ruler must first demonstrate full control over himself. Cf. Io. Argyr. Βασιλικὸς ἢ περὶ βασιλείας (ed. S.P. Lampros, *Ἀργυροπούλεια, Athens*, 1910) 39: Σωφροσύνην μὲν γὰρ οὖν ἀσπάζεται κομιδῇ ὡς μηδὲν δήσου τῶν φαινομένων ἡδῶν ἦττασθαι· ἄτοπον γὰρ τοῖς δόλοις νενόμικεν, εἰ δὲν ἂντηθητον ἑρήμην εἶναι δικαίως, οὖσιν ὑποσκόμπων ὑπὸ τῶν ἡδῶν ἄγοιτο τε καὶ φέροιτο, καὶ ὅν ἐλεύθερον ἐδει καὶ πάντων κρατοῦντα φαίνεσθαι, τούτον ἦττασθαί τοῖς χείροισι
καὶ ἄν εἶκεν καὶ πειθαρχεῖν ἐθέλοι λόγῳ κελεύοντι Ἀνδρείας δὲ τοσσοῦτον αὐτῷ περίεστιν, ὡς ἄνευ ταύτης μηδὲ βασιλείαν οἴσεθαι εἶναι μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ξυνεστάναι.

οἱ τῆς ἱστορίας Ἀδίψοι: Athenaei Deipnosophistae VIII 345e (ed. S.P. Peppink, Athenaei dipnosophistarum epitome, Vols. 2.1–2.2, Leiden, 1939) preserves a fragment of the Aristotelian philosopher Klearchos in which he recounts the story of a mythical king who bred ‘thirstless’ children to measure the sands of the Libyan desert, a task invoked by Greek writers in antiquity to illustrate futility: οὐκ ἀγνοῶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἰχθυοφάγους παιδας, ὧν Κλέαρχος μνημονεύει ἐν τῷ περί θινῶν, φάσκων Ἰαμώντινον τὸν Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέα παιδας θρέψαι ἵκθυοφάγους, τὰς πηγάς του Νείλου βουλόμενον εὑρεῖν· καὶ ἄλλους δὲ ἀδίψους ἀσκῆσαι τοὺς ἑρευνησομένους τὰς ἐν Λιβύη ψάμμους, ἀν ὁλίγοι διεσώθησαν.

λιμὸν...φιλοσοφῶν: E. exploits Stoic teaching regarding physical forbearance, a theme introduced by the reference to ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐποχήν, ὃ δὴ ἔστιν ἐγκράτεια in the opening to this paragraph, to underscore Manuel’s labours by noting that such lessons are unsuited to one who toils: ἐργατικῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀπροσάρμοστον. I am not aware of any diachronic study of Stoicism in Byzantium, despite its historically close association with Neoplatonic philosophy, widely commented on by Byzantine intellectuals. Cf. J. Sellars, Stoicism (New York, 2006) 29, 135f., 137.

56 οὖτε...ἐπισάττοι ἄν...οὖτ αὐτὸς εἶχε: the potential optative ἐπισάττοι ἄν may be explained as referring to what may be hypothesized of τις ἀνδριάς in the previous sentence, whereas the imperfect indicative εἶχε describes Manuel’s eating habits. The parallel οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος...οὔτ’ αὐτὸς joined to different syntax exploits the appeal of symmetry while trading on contrasts and variation.

περιστελλομένης ἀκριβῶς αὐτοῖς τῆς γαστρὸς καὶ σφιγγούσης πανταχόθεν. For the sense of λόγῳ here, see LSJ s.v. λόγος, IV.2.

κοιλιοδαίμονας: an uncommon word, the earliest witness to which are Eu- polis’ Fragm. 172 (ed. T. Kock, Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1880) and Athen. Deipnosoph. 3.52 (ed. G. Kaibel, Athenaei Naucratitae deipnosophistarum libri xv, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1890; repr. 1966). Despite its rarity, the obvious compound would have been transparent even to those without knowledge of the word’s literary pedigree.


στρώμασι…ἀμεσολάβητος: the required sense is clearly that of “not having between,” and not the ancient sense derived from wrestling competition of “not seized by the middle, i.e., undefeated,” cf. LSJ s.v. ἀμεσολάβητος, cf. Evagr. De octo spirit. malit. PG 79.1153: Ἀκτήμων μοναχός, ἀθλητής ἀμεσολάβητος. The Byzantine sense derives from a post-classical coinage, “to interrupt” or “come between” (see LBG s.v. μεσολαμβάνω). E. also employed it in an older, more common sense of “uninterrupted” or “continuous,” also construed with the dat.; cf. Eust. Or. 14 (Λόγος N) 236.60–61: Καὶ οὐκ ἔνεκόπη τοῦ λοιποῦ τὸ καλὸν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ συνεχῆ διήκει καὶ ἀμεσολάβητον χρόνῳ τέμνοντι πρόεισι. For the ideological significance of the Komnenian soldierly image, see A. Kazhdan, “The Aristocracy and the Imperial Ideal,” The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries, ed. M. Angold (Oxford, 1984) 43–57; cf. Kazhdan-Epstein, Change in Byzantine Culture, 110–116.

Τῷ δὲ…ὑπήκουε: the image of the indefatigable emperor, vigilant deep into the night, must have been a reassuring commonplace; cf. Greg. Ant. Monod. 198.1–6: τίθεις νυκτὶ καὶ ὑπνῷ μηδὲ τὸ παράπαν μεσούμενον, οὐτοὶ τε διὰ παντὸς ἀνυστάκτως ἔχων καὶ μακρὸν ἀγρυπνῶν τὰ νῦν ἐκάθευδες καὶ μακρότερον· τὸ γὰρ τοι οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀκοιμήτου καὶ τὸ οὐδὲ σοὶ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ πάντως ἐπήγεγεν ἀνέγερτον, οὕτω, καταδρόθηντι καὶ ἄδιππαιστον. Surrender to sleep and the attendant loss of autonomy seemed incompatible with the idea of absolute sovereignty. It is not clear when a minimal reliance on sleep became a hallmark of temperance and tenacity joined to achievement (still believed by some). For the practical ethics behind this premise, Byzantine tradition could draw on state-
ments like the following in the Aristotelian corpus: Arist. *Eth. Eud.* 1219a: ἔτι ἔστω ψυχῆς ἔργον τὸ ζῆν ποιεῖν, τοῦ δὲ χρῆσις καὶ ἐγρήγορσις· ὁ γὰρ ὑπὸνος ἀργία τις καὶ ἡσυχία. ὥστ’ ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον ἀνάγκη ἐν καὶ ταύτῳ εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἔργον ἀν εἰ ἡ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἰσιὴ σπουδαία.

Socrates famously goes on with his normal day after a long night of revelry in the Symposium as everyone else sleeps off the party; cf. Pl. *Symp.* 223d τὸν οὖν Σωκράτη, κατακοιμήσαντ᾽ ἐκείνου, ἀναστάντα ἀπιέναι, καὶ ἐλθόντα εἰς Λύκειον, ἀπονιψάμενον, ὡσπερ ἄλλοτε τὴν ἄλλην ἡμέραν διατρίβειν, καὶ οὕτω διατρίψαντα εἰς ἔστεραν φοικίον ἀναπαύεσθαι.


58 γλυκὺς...κάλαμος: E. appears to be referring to a sweetened, probably nonalcoholic, drink mixed with cane sugar. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν βίως και πολιτισμός*, Ε’ 131–132, likens it to the *serpētē* or *sorbetto*, for which the colloquial term in E.'s day was *σαχαρόθερμον*, cf. *Ptochoprod.* (ed. Eideneier, *Ptochropodromus: Einführung, kritische Ausgabe, deutsche Übersetzung, Glossar, Köln, 1991*) IV 576. The sweetness of the “reed” was so well established in Byzantium that E. could punningly praise the *glukētē* of someone’s writing by referring to the ‘reed’ (=pen); cf. Or. 8 (Δόγος Η) 148.59–61: ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν κάλαμον ἐπισκεῖται· οὗτος μὲν σοι καὶ ἄλλως οὗτος ὁ κάλαμος, οἷον διαπράττεται τὰς γραφὰς.

στύφων χυλός: this was a drink made by running water through the refuse grapes after the wine had been extracted, producing a kind of sour wine; cf. see LSJ s.v. *δύφαξ*.

ἀσκητάς ἄνδρας...οἰνοχοοῦντες κέρασμα: E. seems to be referring to the practice adopted by some monks of drinking a kind of sour wine which might quench their appetite for wine without causing them to crave more; cf. Mich. Chon. Or. 89.11–17: Καὶ οὔδεις οὗτος ἀθαλάττωτος καὶ ἀπειρόπλους ἀνήρ πόντον οἴνοπα πέφρικεν ὡς οὗτος τὸ ποτὸν μετ’ ἄχνης οἰνωποῦ κερανύμενον, ὡστε εἰ καὶ μὴ νέκταρ ὄλον ἔστιν, ὁποῖον ἐαυτοῖς οἱ τῆς ἐρημίας κυρίωσαν καὶ ὄντως μάκαρες ἀσκηταί, οἳ οὐ σῖτον ἔδουσιν οὐδ’ αἴθοπα οἶνον πίνουσιν, τὸ ἀμβρόσιον τοῦτο κέ-ρασμα τὸ τοῖς κατ’ ἐμὲ βροτοῖς ἄποτον ὅμως εἰρήσθω.
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Στάσιν δὲ ὀρθίαν, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐῤῥέθη: cf. supra μηδὲ τῷ παντὶ τοῦ μεγέθους κα-τακλίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καθῆσθαι ὀρθούμενον.

παράμιλλος ἦν τῷ μεγάλῳ δικαίῳ: E. is likely referring here to Paul, who writes in the epistle to the Ephesians, 3.14: Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. See apparatus font. ad loc.

Οὔδὲ γὰρ ἔχρην...ὑψόμα εὐκλείας οὐράνιον: E. adroitly arranges the two paradoxes here first into a chiasmic structure: “bowing before God (A) ... standing up to (B) enemies / from on high (B) ... humbling himself (A), followed by an additional paradoxical pairing of “receiving from the one who humbled himself as far as the earth a heavenly height of good repute.”
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Τὸ δὲ βαδιστικὸν: a further sign of the emperor’s humility, E. stresses Manuel’s readiness to share the travails of his troops by walking instead of riding a horse, as one might expect of a man born in the purple. One may compare E.’s satirizing remarks in his treatise calling for reform of monasticism, De emend. 26.18–23: καὶ οἱ μηδέποτε παραιτούμενοι πεζῇ τρίβειν τὴν γῆν ἀπείπαν αὐτὴν ὡς τὸ παντελὲς ή τιμώντες που τὴν μητέρα οὕτως καὶ καταπατεῖν αὐτὴν ὃκνοῦντες ή σοφιζόμενοι τὸ ὑπέργειον, ὡστε καὶ βάττον ἀν Πέρσης ὥ παρὰ τῷ καλῷ Ἑσηνοφάντι ἀνάσχοιτο ποσὶν εἰς βάδισιν χρήσασθαι εἰτε κένταυρος ἀπολέξεται τὸν ἵππον ἦπερ αὐτοὶ προτραπήσονται εἰς ὅδὸν την διὰ ποδῶν οἰκείων. A willingness and capacity to go on foot was distinct from one’s gait, cf. Alex. Aphr. In Arist. comm. (ed. M. Wallies, Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis topicorum libros octo commentaria [Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca 2.2] Berlin, 1891) 137: καίτοι ἡ βαδίσις οὐ κα-τηγορεῖται κατά τοῦ ἄνθρώπου, τὸ δὲ βαδιστικὸν κατηγορεῖται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἰδιον.
κατὰ τὸ πάλαι Περσικὸν ψηλόφρον: in the Cyropaedia Xenophon describes Cyrus’ wish to create a cavalry by decreeing that no Persian noble should go on foot but must always ride a horse, leading to the impression among some that the Persians are actually centaurs (4.3.22–23); cf. Anab. 8.8.19: Ἀλλὰ καὶ πρόσθεν μὲν ἣν ἐπιχώριον αὐτοῖς μὴ ὀρᾶσθαι πεζῇ πορευομένοις, οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ἐνεκα ἢ τοῦ ὡς ἱππικώτατος γίγνεσθαι. Both were texts well known at this period. See I. Pérez Martín, “The Reception of Xenophon in Byzantium: The Macedonian Period,” GRBS 53 (2013) 812–855.

νωθρευόμενος...Χριστὸν ἑαυτῷ κἀνταῦθα προίστων εἰς ἀρχέτυπον μιμήσεως: whether E. is characterizing a policy of tolerance towards those who had fallen out of favour, giving them an opportunity to return to the fold of their own volition, or is compensating for Manuel’s being quick to punish, we cannot be sure.

It almost does not matter since the emperor serves to illustrate an important principle of governance implicitly urged on the court, especially at a time when some were bound to fall afoul of the any regime. The lesson had significant precedent in scripture; cf. Septuag. Prov. 14.29: μακρόθυμος ἀνὴρ πολὺς ἐν φρονήσει, ὁ δὲ ὀλιγόψυχος ἰσχυρῶς ἄφρων.; 16.32 κρείσσων ἀνὴρ μακρόθυμος ἰσχυρὸς, ὁ δὲ κρατῶν ὀργῆς κρείσσων καταλαμβανομένου πόλιν.

κινδύνοις ἑαυτὸν παρενετίθει...διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἕως καὶ εἰς θάνατον: almost certainly an allusion to the battle of Myriokephalon, fought in mid-September of 1176, which brought to an ignominious end Manuel’s most ambitious campaign to recapture the lands of central Anatolia conquered by the Seljuks. Nicetas Choniates has a despondent Manuel himself draw the comparison with the disastrous defeat of Romanos IV at Manzikert a century earlier (Nic. Chon. Hist. 187–191). The sources, including Choniates’ younger brother and former student of E., Michael, describe Manuel’s humiliating defeat (Mich. Chon. Ep. 284.18–25). E. arguably had this devastating campaign in mind when he decided to insert the episode early in the oration with John II admonishing a young Manuel for exposing himself to risk heedless of the consequences. E. presents him here as ready to sacrifice himself –rather than in search of heroic glory– in order
to give his troops an opportunity to save themselves (διδοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἕως καὶ εἰς θάνατον κατηλλάτετο τοῖς λοιποῖς τὸ σώζεσθαι).

**diadochēs, ἣ θεὸς παραδόξως αὐτῷ διέθετο:** should we consider the fact that E. noted Manuel’s unexpected assumption of the throne given his rank in the succession as a sign that it was not forgotten, possibly even exploited in the service of Manuel’s “image”? Kinnamos (Epit. re. 1.10) and Nicetas Choniates (Hist. 3.10) both report that John II decided on his deathbed to bequeath the throne to his youngest son, Manuel, rather than to his older brother Isaac, traditionally next in line for the throne. The “paradox” E. refers to here was sufficient to prompt Manuel to have his brother kept under house arrest upon first coming to power lest he or any supporters decide to mount a challenge. E.’s point here underscores the additional claim that Manuel continually demonstrated his worthiness to sit on the throne, exhibiting skills which made him at once a master strategist, excellent knight, footsoldier, in single combat, on the front line, and a most effective besieger: στρατηγῶν στρατηγός…Ἱππότην μέντοι ἄριστον…καὶ πεζομάχον, καὶ μονομάχον ῥώμην πνέοντα, καὶ πρόμαχον, καὶ πολιορκητὴν δεινότατον. E. had lavished similar praise on Manuel when he was alive, not least for taking the field single-handedly; cf. Or. 16 (Λόγος Ο) 267.15–17: ὁ ἐμὸς μεγαλουργὸς καὶ μέγιστος βασιλεὺς καὶ στρατηγεῖ καὶ ἀνδρίζεται καὶ μόνος πολιορκεῖ τὴν σπουδαίαν ἐκείνην πόλιν καὶ πάντα μετὰ θάρσους ἐμφρονος.
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tὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους: sc. ὅδὸν

**Οὔτ’ ἄν…αδυνώπητος ἐμενε πρός γε τοῦ συγκλήτου λάχους: **it is not immediately clear how this observation, itself a further example of an ideal urged by the orator, fits in with the subject of this passage, namely, Manuel’s ostensible prudence in the conduct of war and quelling of potential rebellions. E. praises Manuel for “leading from behind” the lines as commander of the empire’s (admittedly limited) military resources. E.’s point about the “vote of the senate and the others” (τοῦ συγκλήτου λάχους καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ) most likely refers less to actual voting than to the counsel of the court to the emperor to reconsider his campaigning plans. E. takes care to phrase his praise in a manner which a future ‘commander in chief’ might find practicable as part of the broader paraenetic subtext of the oration.
Not composed in a chance manner

στρατοῦ ἀτασθαλία...τὸ βασιλικὸν δὲ ἔργον ἀναίτιον: when all credit for the empire’s military triumphs redounded directly to the emperor, it was imperative to ward off blame for the inevitable defeats. E. lists the possible treachery on the part of allies as well as ἀτασθαλία, presumptuousness or recklessness, on the part of the army, (more likely its commanders). It is worth noting that this was exactly what Manuel’s father had cautioned against in the impetuous young prince at the outset of the oration and one suspects that E. was deflecting criticism for losses suffered as a result of Manuel’s strategic or tactical failures. Cf. Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.584.7: Τὸ δὲ «ἀτασθαλίαις ὠλεσα λαόν» ταύτὸν ἐστι τῷ «ἡφι βίηφι πιθήςας ὠλεσε λαόν».

Κίλικες ...καὶ Ἀρμένια φύλα...γένος Ἀσσύριον: “Kilikians” and “Armenians” probably refers to the areas of southeastern Asia Minor consisting of two districts: Cilicia Pedias, a fertile plain bounded by the Taurus, Antitaurus and Mediterranean; and Cilicia Tracheia, the rugged southern Taurus mountains stretching west to Pamphylia settled by Armenians fleeing Seljuk conquest of historic Armenia in the eleventh century. It was reconquered by John II Komnenos in 1137 though Manuel had to reassert Byzantine suzerainty over parts of it again in 1159. It was definitively lost to the Armenians after 1176. The Armenians who served in the Byzantine army from this region did so as allies and not subjects of the emperor. See H. Hellenkemper, F. Hild, Neue Forschungen in Kilikien (Vienna 1986); for Manuel’s campaigns in Kilikia, see Magdalino, Empire, 66–68; for the region more generally under Komnenian rule, see the index in Magdalino under “Cilicia.” Κίλικες and Ἀρμένια φύλα are both contemporary names, in contrast γένος Ἀσσύριον was less an ethnic designation than a generic label for any non-Christian group inhabiting lands to the east or south east of Byzantine territory.

Σκυθικὴν δὲ ἀγριότητα...πατὴρ ἡμερώσατο: the reference is probably to the Pechenegs, “Alexios I Komnenos crushed the Pechenegs at Mt. Lebouion in 1091 and John II struck the final blow in 1122. A special feast celebrating the victory over the Pechenegs was established in Byzantium, cf. Nic. Chon. Hist. 27–29; Kinn. Epit. re. 1.3; see also Magdalino, Empire, 174.

πολυαριστεύς: a Eustathian coinage, fairly intelligible to almost any Greek speaker.
Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ τοῦτο πάθος…Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦτο μεγαλούργημα: two seemingly contrasted allusions to campaigns by “Alexander,” one flawed (πάθος), the other a great success (μεγαλούργημα). The references to Σκυθικὴν…ἀγριότητα and Ἰστρος immediately preceding the first mention of Ἀλεξάνδρου led Tafel², not. ad loc., to deem the text of the manuscript corrupt and to suggest Δαρείου in its place, on the premise that E. is referring here to Darius’ aborted campaign against the Skythians in Hdt. 4.83–142. The point would then be that unlike the Komnenian emperors, Darius’ quick victory was followed by a quick retreat from the Balkans, never to return (πεφευγότος ἀμεταστρεπτι). A further contrast then follows with Alexander the Great’s achievement during his campaigns on the Indus (Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦτο μεγαλούργημα), when he repeatedly assaulted the fortress at Aornos, finally capturing it for good (εἶλεν ἐγκρατῶς), just as Manuel and his father before him had maintained their supremacy over the “savage Skythians.” While this amounts to a plausible justification for emending the text, Tafel offered no explanation for how Ἀλεξάνδρου might have taken the place of Δαρείου. The second mention of a name might be explained by dittography, especially where the words immediately preceding or following are similar, as they are here (Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ τοῦτο…Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦτο). In this case, however, it would require proleptic dittography on the part of a scribe since he would have had to insert Ἀλεξάνδρου before he met it in the exemplar. The alternative is that E. meant to write Δαρείου but in anticipating the contrast with Alexander, wrote Ἀλεξάνδρου twice, and the scribe simply copied it faithfully, as he was trained to do. There is a third option, the best one, in my view: E. drew a contrast between two different campaigns waged by Alexander as described by Arrian in the Anabasis of Alexander, a favourite source of E. both for his orations and in the Homeric commentaries. The first reference is to Alexander’s campaign in the Balkans (Anab. 1.3–5), the second the sustained assault on the fortress of Aornos on the Indus river (Anab. 4.28–30). The former included a crossing of the Istros and a series of victories over local tribes (cf. E.’s κατισχύσαντος μόγις τῆς τοιαύτης γενέσθαι περαίας), followed by a decision on Alexander’s part to bring his men back to camp safely before heading southwest to quell further revolts in Thessaly after striking peace treaties with most of the Balkan tribes. Arrian’s account does not quite bear out the flight E. describes in πεφευγότος ἀμεταστρεπτι, but such distortions of the source material were common and it is a plausible enough adaptation to warrant keeping the reading of the manuscript.
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Ἐχεὶ δὲ ἡ συγγραφὴ: the only contemporary historical work we know of covering some significant part of this period to have circulated prior to Manuel's death is Ioannes Kinnamos' Epitome, which may well be the συγγραφὴ E. has in mind here, since it covered the better part of Manuel's reign down to 1176. Kinnamos accompanied Manuel on many a campaign as an imperial secretary, which would have allowed him to make a detailed inventory of "cities" razed and those absorbed into the fold (Ἀριθμὸν δὲ τούτων ἐπιστῆσαι, συγγραφικὴς ἐργὸν λεπτολογίας). It is worth recalling that we have what appears to have been an abridged version of Kinnamos' history. E. makes more than one reference to historical writing in the oration, suggesting he had consulted it before; cf. Ἐπ. 48: Καὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀρετῆς τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον, αἱ συγγραφαί λαλεῖτοσαν.

Εἰδον ἡμέραι δύο ... Ἀλέξανδρον: the Greek is all but impossible to render into idiomatic English. The attribution of perception to time is akin to such English formulations as "the Middle Ages knew no genuine legislation by the State."

οἷα ... διέθετο: the adverbial use of here is an extension of the neut. sg. oίον used as an adverb; cf. Hom. Οδ. 1.32 oίον δὴ νυ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται; cf. II. 5.601; cf. etiam Eust. Or. 2 (Λόγος Β) 39.15–16: ἀλλὰ καὶ ως οἷα τις ἀδάμας τοῖς ἄθλοις ἐπαποδύεται.

tοσούτοις ἀνδράσι βασιλείαν ἐξημιώκεν: for ζημίοω in the sense of levy a fine in kind (dat.) upon someone (acc.), see LSJ s.v. c. dat. rei; cf. Hdt. 6.21: ἐζημίωσάν μιν ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκήια κακὰ χιλίῃσι δραχμῆσι.
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Τυρταίου ῥητορεία ... Τιμοθέου πρὸς μέλος ἀρμοσίς: the ability of Tyrtaios and Timotheos to rouse men to war had become legendary well before the Byzantine era, as the anecdotes regarding each in Athen. Deipnosoph. 14.630 and Dio Chrys. Περὶ Βασιλείας, respectively, indicate. Tyrtaios, a seventh-century BC lyric poet from Sparta, composed elegiac verses exhorting Spartans to fight bravely. See C. Prato, Tyrtaeus (Rome, 1968). Timotheos, a celebrated aulos player from Thebes, accompanied Alexander the Great on his campaigns. After his death, anecdotes circulated about the overpowering effect of his music on Alexander (the subject of John Dryden's poem Alexander's Feast, later set to music by Handel). Timotheos' name became synonymous with the power of music to excite emotions and make men lose their wits. He was sometimes confused with Timotheus of Miletus, a famous lyre player, singer, and dithyrambic poet of the

ὅσον...καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν: perhaps an apt example of the στρυφνότης vouched-safed by the heading to the Ἐπιτάφιος, the prolepsis of –ὅσον γὰρ τῆς γῆς joined to the parenthetical –ἥν δὲ τὸ ὅπλα οἱ οἰκουμένους τιμήματος αὐτῆς are probably harder to read than they would have been to follow aloud.

ἐαυτὸν τε σώζων...εἰς λιμένα σωτήριον: almost certainly an allusion to the infamous battle near Myriokephalon in 1176, where the rout into which Manuel led his forces was partly eclipsed by the (probably deliberate) account of his own heroism. It is, however, possible, that Manuel did in fact show exceptional bravery on that occasion; Nic. Choniates, no credulous admirer of Manuel’s, depicts him as genuinely valiant in the face of unfavourable odds. For the effect of the defeat at Myriokephalon on *epanegyrics* about Manuel’s “crusading” policy, including those of E., see Magdalino, *Empire*, 463–464; for the military tactics and

στοιχειακής κράσεως: στοιχεία were the natural elements or components of existence, first used in this sense by Pl. Thaet. 201e. The adjectival στοιχειακ– is a later usage and does not necessarily refer back to Empedoclean physics or other ancient theories of matter. LSJ s.v. στοιχειακός illustrates the term with examples from Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 4.144.21–145.1: Τὸ δὲ «ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ τ’ ἀνθρώπου» παγκόσμιον τὴν ἐρυθρά δῆλοι, κατὰ ἀνθρώπους δῆλα καὶ κατὰ τὰς στοιχειακὰς ποιότητας. E. is referring to the physical elements which constitute a healthy body. Cf. Eust. De emend. 10.7: Ἑστή δὴ τάγμα τι καὶ τὸ μοναχικὸν… φύλακες ἀνθρωπίνων οὐ μόνον ψυχῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωμάτων, οἷς ὑγιάζουσιν ἀπαλλάττοντες ἁμαρτίων, αἱ καὶ τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν πολλάκις εὐάρμοστον στοιχειακὴν ἁρμονίαν παραλύουσιν.

εὐθηνομένου εἰς εὐεξίαν: a seeming circumlocution, acting as a euphemism for Manuel’s physical deterioration during these campaigns. εὐθηνεῖα and εὐεξία are often found in close proximity in both lexic and other, more technical texts, suggesting the phrasing here borders on the formulaic. Hesych. Lex. E 6849 (ed. K. Latte, Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon, vols. 1–2, Copenhagen,1953) εὐθηνεία. εὐεξία Callim. h. Cer. 136 τ.

ἡ τοῦ Κλαυδίου γραῦς πόλις: Claudiopolis, on the border with Bythinia, modern Bolu; cf. Eust., Opuscula, 32,60; 35, 66; cf. etiam Eust. Ad stylit. quend. Thessalon. 196,19–196,30 Τὰ ἐναγχός λέγω τρόπαια, τὰ περὶ τὴν πάλαι ποτὲ υμνομένην πόλιν, ἣν ὁ τῆς ἱστορίας Κλαύδιος εαυτῷ ἐπωνύμασεν.

εἰς διάνοιαιν ἀνασκάλλοντες: an uncommon verb, ἀνασκάλλω makes few appearances before the twelfth century, notably as the passive of ἀνασκαλεύω in a comic fragment attributed to Plato (Sym. fr. 3, Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum, ed. A. Meineke, vol. 2.2, Berlin, 1840; repr. Berlin, 1970). E., who may have revived use of the verb, construes it with either εἰς, in the sense “to bring to mind” (ex. gr., Eust. Comm. ad Hom. II. 3 page 662 line 15–16: Καὶ σημεῖα, ὡς καὶ πάλιν εἰς νοῦν ἀνασκάλλει συνήθως τὸν Ἀχιλλέα) or with a dat., although both instances
involving διάνοια have it in the dat., shifting slightly the sense and demonstrating the plasticity of the grammar to suit the context (ex.gr., Eust., Or. 6 [Λόγος Ζ] 81.9–10: ἡγώνιων ἀνασκάλλοντες τῇ διανοίᾳ, εἰ ποῦ τι καὶνόν ἑφευρηκότες παράθοιντό σοι πρὸς νόησιν; Eust. Serm. 7.722: ἀνασκάλλωμεν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν εὐκταίαν ταύτην κυριώτατον, καθ’ ἣν σκοπός ἦταν καύριος αὐτὸν ἐκείνων τὸν παμβασιλεά σωτῆρα ἐνοικίσασθαι ἐξ ψυχήν).

Nicetas Choniates, the only other contemporary author to use the verb, always construes it transitively with a direct object (ex.gr., Hist. 2.26–28: ἠγωνίων ἀνασκάλλοντες τῇ διανοίᾳ, ἐἴ πού τι καινὸν ἐφευρηκότες πάρθοιντό σοι πρὸς νόησιν; Eust. Serm. 7.722: ἀνασκάλλωμεν τῇ διανοίᾳ τὴν εὐκταίαν ταύτην κυριώτατον, καθ’ ἣν σκοπός ἦταν καύριος αὐτὸν ἐκείνων τὸν παμβασιλεά σωτῆρα ἐνοικίσασθαι ἐξ ψυχήν).

τὸν τάφον περιστάμενοι: for the physical setting of the funeral oration and what we may infer about the ceremonial context of the occasion, see the Introduction, “At the tomb: the occasional context of the text.” In Ἐπ. 72, E. apostrophizes Manuel’s tomb, thereby further embedding the performance of the oration in the actual physical and material setting, beyond simply the wider ceremonial context: Ω τάφος, τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀπάνθισμα κρύψας ὦ τὸ τῆς φρονήσεως πλάτος συστείλας, ὦ συγκλείσας τὸν ἀεικίνητον; cf. etiam Ἐπ. 73: ὁ τάφος οὗτος…Ὡ λίθος οὗτος τάφου.


βρυχηθμῷ…μέλλοντος: should we understand the young lion cub’s capacity to “roar” in βρυχηθμῷ…βασιλικῷ, or the regency’s, while Alexios II “grows strong claws”?

σταθερὰς ἐπαγγελίας would appear to refer to the assurance of constancy in the governance of the empire. σταθερὰς has been attracted into the case of ἐπαγγελίας, much as “steadfast indications” means “indications of steadfastness.” Cf. Theoph. Symoc. Epist. 75 (ed. G. Zanetto, Theophylacti Simocatae epistulae, Leipzig, 1985): ἐγὼ τὴν σωφροσύνην λοιπὸν ἀνήδονον οὕσαν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς μᾶλλον προσδέξομαι—τὸ γὰρ σταθερὸν ἐπαγγέλλεται.

70 ἡ κοινωνός σοι…βασιλείας: κοινωνός is used in a double sense, at once that of “partner…of life”, i.e., wife, and in the more technical political sense of “co-emperor,” ex.gr., Nic. Chon. Hist. 551.45–47: ἔπι τοιαῦτα τοῖνυν τοῦ βασιλείου ύψους
καταστροφαίς τὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν πριάμενος εἴσοδον συνεδρίας ἥξιωται πατρικῆς καὶ
βασιλείας προσέληπται κοινωνός. Manuel married Maria, daughter of Raymond
of Antioch, in 1161, after the death of his first wife, Eirene (née Bertha of Salz-
bach). She has been eclipsed in the scholarly literature by the dashing, confi-
dently assertive image of Manuel. Her actions during the ill-fated regency show
her trying desperately to ensure the throne for her son. As a foreigner in the
capital she could not call on the support of any family but her husband’s, the very
clan from which the greatest threats to the regency stemmed. Menander-Rhetor
makes special provisions for addressing the widow in a funeral oration; cf. Men.-
Rhet. II, Περὶ Ἐπιταφίου, 421.19–24: ἰδιὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναίκα, ἑξάρας πρότερον τὸ
πρόσωπον τῆς γυναικός, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς φαύλον καὶ εὐτελὲς διαλέγεσθαι δοκῆς πρόσ-
ωπον. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐ φέρει ψόγον ὁ λόγος ἄνευ τινὸς προκατασκευῆς λε-
γόμενος, ἐπὶ δὲ γυναικός ἀναγκαίως προκαταλήψῃ τὸν ἀκροατὴν τῇ ἀρετῇ τῆς
γυναικός.

Ἀρείκον ἀτένισμα: a later variant of the more classical ἀτένισις, ἀτενισμὸς is
attested a handful of times in Byzantine texts (see LBG s.v. ἀτενισμὸς). The neu-
ter variant, like the masculine, was originally modelled on the perfect middle –
σαι but expanded in Κοῖνη.

ὦ μέγιστε βασιλεῦ ἤλιε…(Ἐπ. 73) Ω κράτιστε βασιλεῦ: Sideras (Grabre-
den, 52–53) maintains that funeral orations (Grabreden) are nominally addressed
to the deceased, which would make the audience in attendance incidental wit-
nesses, as it were, overhearing the speech. This may have reflected an early form
of the lament as a direct address to the dead, such as we meet in Greek tragedy,
itself possibly reflecting older practices of propitiating the dead. See J. Goody,
Death, property and the Ancestors: a study of the mortuary customs of the LoDagaa
of West Africa (Stanford, 1962). Whatever its anthropological origins, the apos-
trophe seems to have lent an added dramatic and pathetic inflection to the ora-
tion, as E. appears to vainly keep trying to elicit a response from the deceased (ὦ
κάλλιστε…ἄριστε…ηδίστε). See L. Koenen, “Die Laudatio Funebris des Augustus
für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus (P.Colon.inv.nr. 4701),” ZPE 5 (1970)
217–83, 245–246; J. Soffel, Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede: in ihrer Tra-
dition (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974) 27, 31, 34.

ἡ σῇ σελήνη…φωσφορήσοι: Manuel’s widow, his second wife Maria,
daughter of Raymond of Poitiers, the crusader appointed Duke of Antioch, is
described as the moon to the emperor’s sun (cf. Greg. Ant. Monod. 199.20–24), which allows E. to trade on the double imagery, of the pairing of the two unequal but complementary bodies, as well as the “blackness” which follows upon the extinguishing of the light represented by the darkness of night accompanying the moon and the light radiated by the sun. This allows him to depict the otherwise “shining moon” as “black” (σελήνη φωσφορεῖ…μέλαινα), alluding to both her mournful countenance (πενθίμῳ ζῷφῳ) and her outward appearance (τῷ προφαινομένῳ), a reference either to her dressed in black to signal her status as a widow or to her monastic dress after having taken vows following Manuel’s death, as is reported by William of Tyre, Chron. XXII, 11 (10) 12–13 (Guillaume de Tyr Chronique, ed. R. B. C. Huygens [Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis 63]). The Byzantine sources are less clear on the matter; cf. Eust. De capita Thess. 18.17–21: βασιλείας μεγίστης κρατεῖν οὐκ ἔχοντα δι’ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ κατὰ παίδας διατεθείσαι στερεῶς, ἀμέλει καὶ ἐπέτρεψε φθάσαι κηδεμόνι τὸν υἱὸν τῇ μητρί, ἐρώτων οὔσῃ ὡραίᾳ, εἰ καὶ κρύπτεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπηγγείλετο ἐκείνη, τὸν τοῦ κάλλους ἥλιον πνευματικῶς νεφώσασα κατὰ περιβολὴν μέλαιναν; cf. Kinn. Epit. re. 210.5sqq. On the custom of grieving widows wearing black in Byzantium, see Kουκουλες, vol. 4, 218–219; cf. Mich. Glykas, Eἰς τὰς ἀπορίας τῆς θείας γραφῆς (ed. Εὐστρατιάδου, Athens, 1912) 227.9.


ὑπὸ φωτὶ...ἐκ φύσεως: combines two ideas, the benefits of Alexios II’s hoped for longlasting rule, as well as the dynastic legitimacy of such rule. The syntax turns, as it were, by possibly changing subjects and reflecting the interwoven compactness E. identified as στρυφνῶς πέφρασται in Homeric verse. An object clause dependent on Δοίη like the previous two built around the infinites ἐλθεῖν and πληθυνθῆναι, the subject of διάγειν should be an implied ἡμᾶς or an acc. standing in for the young emperor’s subjects, who lead their lives under the light coming from both (ὑπὸ φωτὶ ἑκατέρωθεν) the shining moon and “this sun,” Manuel’s widow Maria and his son Alexios II; φωτὶ is further elaborated in a relative clause which underlines the precarious politics of empire’s governance: ὃ διαδοχὴν οὐκον ἐτέραν οἴδεν ἡ τὴν εὐτακτομεῖνεν ἐκ φύσεως.
μακροῦς καμάτους παῦσαντα: E. had previously directed public pleas to the emperor to pause from his tireless labours on behalf of the οἰκουμένη, framing them as solicitude for the emperor’s well being; cf. Or. 11 (Δόγος Κ) 189.48 Αιδεῖται μὲν τὸ στάσιμον ὁ εἰς ἐργασίαν σπουδαίαν ἀεικήνητος, ἀλ' ἡ φύσις οἴδε καὶ κάματον. Kazhdan saw in E.'s entreaties a thinly veiled attempt to dissuade Manuel from further costly campaigning which was taking its toll on the empire’s resources, as well as risking the life of an emperor who was frequently inclined joined the battle himself. See Kazhdan, Studies, 157.


παντάρβην…λίθον: refers to brilliant and precious stones, like rubies or emeralds, said to be drawn from the rivers of India, cf. Ctes. Frag. 57.2. The stone was most familiar to Byzantine readers from the fantastical invocations of Παντάρβη in the eighth book of Heliod. Aethiopica, where Chariclea mentions an heirloom ring set with a “stone known as Pandarbe,” cf. Aeth. 8.11.8: λίθῳ δὲ τῇ καλουμένῃ παντάρβη. Its brilliance, paralleling that of the emperor as sun, was further expanded in another author familiar to Byzantine rhetors, cf. Philostr. Vita Apoll. 3.46: τῆς λίθου… τὴν παντάρβην… ὄνομα γὰρ αὐτὴ τοῦτο. οὐκτωρ μὲν οὖν ἡμέραν ἀναφαίνει, καθάπερ τὸ πῦρ, ἔστι γὰρ πυρσὴ καὶ ἀκτινώδης, εἰ δὲ μεθ’ ἡμέραν ὁρώτο, βάλλει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μυρίαις μυρίαις τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ φῶς πνεῦμα ἀρρήτου ἰσχύος. In the twelfth century the expression appears to have also been synonymous with the resilience of precious stones, cf. Konst. Manass. Carm. morale (ed. E. Miller, “Poème moral de Constantin Manassès,” Annaire de l’Association pour l’encouragement des études grecques en France 9 [1875] 30–75) 654: νικάς καὶ τὸν Ἰππόλυτον, νικάς τὸν ἐξ Ἰθάκης, νικάς καὶ τὸν ἀδάμαντα καὶ τὸν παντάρβην λίθον; cf. etiam Mich. Chon. Or. 1.5.109: οὐδὲ τοὺς τρεῖς παιδας προσβήσωμεν, ὃν τὰ σώματα ἡ νηστεία νεοττοτροφήσασα ὡς παντάρβη λίθος ἄψαυστα πυρί
διετήρησεν. It is not clear where Io. Tzetzes drew the information that the stone was magnetic, cf. Tzetz. Chiliad. (ed. P.L.M. Leone, Ioannis Tzetzae historiae, Naples, 1968) 68.642–644: Παντάρβη λίθος οὖσα τις τοὺς λίθους ἐπισπάται ...ὡς ἡ μαγνήτις σίδηρον ἐιώθεν ἐπισπάσθαι.

74 ἑφιεμένην: the clear reading of the manuscript, with the suspension for the acc. fem. -ην following the ligature for -μεν- and an accute over the penultimate syllable. However this makes for difficulty of interpretation: are we to understand φυγὴν ἑφιεμένην ἀεὶ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἐπισπᾶσθαι as “flight which always aimed at those in front,” with the participle transposed to qualify φυγὴν instead of τοῦτον, the more expected reading? This might imply that Manuel always charged into the frontline troops, putting them to flight, instead of perhaps attacking the flanks, as was common in attempts to break the formation of the enemy lines. Such a reading might encourage a more interventionist editor to emend the text here to ἑφίημενον, on the presumption that the scribe mistakenly altered the participle to match φυγὴν. The required sense of ἑφίημι with an objective gen. is paralleled by Plut. Pompeius (ed. B. Perrin, Plutarch’s Lives, vol. 5, Cambridge, MA, 1917; repr. 1968) 71.4–5: ὑπαντιάζουσι τοὺς πολεμίους, καὶ παριστάμενοι καθ᾽ ἱππῶν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθησαν, ὑψηλοῖς ἐχρῶντο τοῖς ὑσσοῖς, ἑφιεμένοι τῶν προσώπων. A variant of this interpretation, albeit less probable, is that the gen. τῶν ἐμπροσθέν is subjective, yielding the equivalent of “flight always sought by those in the front.” Despite its difficulty, I have maintained the reading of the Basel Codex since it yields sufficient, if somewhat unconventionally construed, meaning.

δρυοτομούσης: as though from a verb δρυοτομέω < (δρυο-) τέμνω. With the exception of Plato, Leg. 678d2 and Pol. 288d8, all subsequent uses of a participle are post-classical, infrequent, and rarely metaphorical.

ὑπνοὶ τὸν μακρὸν μέν, μακαρίως δὲ αὖθις ἐγέρσιμον: death as extended sleep was an ancient image. It became especially apt in Christian discourse with its promise of resurrection, tantamount to ‘waking up’. The image was additionally poignant when joined to the image of the sleepless emperor standing vigil over the defence and proper governance of the realm, Επ. 54 διακαρτερών ἀυπνος. Cf. Nic. Greg. Hist. Rom. 1.466: ἐκείνος ἦν ὁ νύκτας ὅλας ἐγρηγορώς τε καὶ ἀγρυπνος διαμένων, ὡς μὴ τὸν Ρωμαίκων πραγμάτων κλαπή τὸ συμφέρον- ἄλλα νῦν ἐν τάφῳ τὸν μακρὸν ὑπνόν ὑπνώστει. After the final defeat of the Byzantines in 1453, a folk legend took root that Constantine XI, whose corpse was never identified, had in fact fallen into a long slumber from which he would one day awake and redeem his subjects. See D. M. Nicol, The immortal Emperor: the life and legend of Constantine Palaiologos, last emperor of the Romans (Cambridge, 1992) 98, 101–15. For the varied depictions of death among the ruling classes, see D. R. Reinsch, “Der Tod des Kaisers. Beobachtungen zu literarischen Darstellungen des Sterbens byzantinischer Herrscher,” Rechtshistorisches Journal 13 (1994) 247–70.

ἐπαληθεύσαι…αἱρεῖται: E. alludes to the aphorism put in the mouth of John II near the start of the oration warning the young prince to be wary of war: Επ. 7 μηδένα φαῦλον ἀνδρα πόλεμον αἱρέσθαι, ἄλλα τούς ἀγαθοὺς ἄει; see commentary ad loc.

μήπω ἔδει τὸν τηλικούτον: Manuel was born on November 28, 1118, which would have made him sixty-two years old at the time of this death. With an average life expectancy for Byzantines calculated at approximately thirty-five years, anyone who reached sixty years of age would have been thought “old.” See A.-M. Talbot, “Old Age in Byzantium,” BZ 77 (1984) 267–78, esp. 268. Yet Manuel appears to have remained physically vigorous well into his fifties, thus warranting the impression that he had been taken before his time.
πρός τε τῆς...κλήσεως: such carefully balanced clauses marked by the anaphora of πρός τε τῆς...πρός τε τῆς and the rhyming φύσεως... κλήσεως, followed by the complementary τὸ σῶμα μὲν...τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ, show that E. catered to an appetite for jingle-like rhetorical devices. No Byzantine rhetor, no matter how accomplished, was ever above employing such rudiments of public speaking as the appeal of symmetry joined to sound.


Θήρας...τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τούτο σεμνόν: on Manuel’s passion for hunting, see Kinn. Epit. re. 127: ἐξῆλθε μὲν πρὸς θήραν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐνυνχος, ὡσπερ εἰώθη τὰ πολλά, κοιτασάμενος. ἢ γὰρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶς γενναιότης καὶ πρὸς ἄρκτους ἔξηγε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀγρίους ἀνθωπλίζε τῶν συνὸν προσέτα τὰ πλείστα σὺν ἀκοντίῳ ἥμεπλεκόμενον. ἐλέγετο δὲ ως καὶ τεθρωκάστο τὰ πρῶτα καὶ σχεδὸν τι ἑκάστω τὸ τοῖς ὁπλοῖς ἐν. Cf. here ὑποκοριζόμενος μάχης ἐν γυμνάσματι.

Enthusiasm for hunting as an aristocratic passtime substituting for battle peaked under the Komnenoi, when special ekphraseis on hunting were commissioned for patrons (ex.gr., Τοῦ Μανασσῆ κυροῦ Κωνσταντίνου ἐκφράσεις κυνηγεσίου γεγράνων, ed. E. Kurtz, “’Ετερα δύο ἀνέκδοτα πονήματα Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσῆ,” Vizantijskij Vremennik 12 (1906): 79–88. Deer and boars were the noblest hunts, the latter not least because of its danger. Ph. Koukoules, Kynegetika ek tes epoches ton Komnenon kai ton Palaiologon, EEBS 9 (1932) 3–33.

νόσος μὲν ἡσυχάζει προύτρέπετο: cf. Eust. Or. 9 (Λόγος Θ) 167,33–40: βασιλέων καὶ στρατιώτων καὶ στρατηγῶν ἀνδρειότατο...τί δή ποτε ἄλλο φοβερὸν καὶ καταπομποῦ ἀνθρωπίνην ισχὺν περιγενήσεται σου, εἰ μήτε νόσος ἀνδρίζεται κατὰ σοῦ μήτε χειμώνος βαρύτης μήτε τι ἐτερον τῶν ὁσα καταπομπεῖν οἶδε καὶ ἐκφοβεῖν καὶ τὸν πάνυ καρπορόθυμον; νοσεῖς, καὶ τοῦτο δεινότατα καὶ ως σύκ ἄν φέρειν ἔχοι τις.

τοῖς ἁπασὶν εὐκταῖον...τὸ πάντῃ τέλειον: despite his reputation for rhetorical opacity, scholars have also identified a refreshing streak of naturalism in E., seen in humane observations like this about staving off senility in old age, a condition dreaded especially by those who live by their wits. E. dwells on the subject repeatedly in the next paragraphs in a manner which suggests that dementia or the potential loss of one’s senses towards the end of life was a genuinely worrying
eventuality, cf. Ἐπ. 78: Κείσθαι μὲν γὰρ ἐμπνεόντα καὶ σωπὴ κατάσχετον καὶ οὐδὲ φρονεῖν εἰδότα, τοῦτο θνῆσκειν ἃν ἢ θνῆσκει ἀλήθως. Elsewhere E. writes: Εἰ δὲ καὶ θάνατος, ἀλλ’ οὕτως οὖν τι τοῦ νοεροῦ παρακερδήσας … οὐτέ μὴν κατακλείες τὸ φρονοῦν εἰς ἄπρακτον καὶ τῷ οἴκοδεσποτοῦντι λογισμῶ ἐπιβουλευσάμενος. For E.’s naturalism in descriptions of the human condition, see Kazhdan–Epstein, Change in Byzantine Culture, 216f.


ὀνομάσοι: the syntax here is challenging. Tafel suggested the text be emended to θαυμάσοι, misapprehending the syntax in my view by not reading ἀπὸ κλίνης βασιλικῆς as the predicate of ὀνομάσοι, which is contrasted with τὰ ἀπὸ κηπαίας λεγόμενα. E. frequently places a comma after ἄν where the grammar requires us to read the following words as part of the same clause, ex. gr., Ἐπ. 70 σοκ ἄν, ἧς έν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πᾶν κατευθοειν τοῦ κοινωφελοῦς; cf. etiam Ἐπ. 68 Καὶ τοῖνυν ἰσόων προοβλήματος ὃ τρίτη εἰς νόιν ἔλαβεν ἂν, πτῶσεις τῶν θαρρησάντων τῷ τῆς μάχης αντιπρόσωπον. I have translated the passage beginning from δημηγορῶν ἐμμυρίσθος as follows: declaring solemnly things which one who wanted to make the point more aptly with proverbs rather than employ garden variety expressions might designate as “from the imperial bedchamber.”
θαρρῶ: Tafel either mistakenly read or emended to θυμῶ without a note in the list of corrections in the preface to the *Opuscula* (xiv). The manuscript clearly reads θαρρῶ. Tafel may have assumed that καὶ θυμῶ at least grammatically complemented ἐμβαθύνων λεπτῶ λογισμῷ, though it does little for the sense of the passage. θαρρῶ gives voice to E.'s feigned presumption in surmising that Manuel's subtle theological analysis at that point was "disembodied," that is, the work of a mind all but free of its declining corporeality.

χρυσᾶς ἐπιτιθεῖς κορωνίδας: letters or decrees issued in the emperor's name were signed by the emperor in red ink and secured with the imperial golden seal (Lat. *bulla aurea*), cf. σφραγίζων, ἐπισφραγίζων in the next line. The expression became synonymous with the idea of successful culmination, based perhaps on literary models like Hom. *Il.* 4.111: πᾶν δ' εὖ λειήνας χρυσέην ἐπέθηκε κορώνην. Karathanasis, *Sprichwörter*, 75/141, cites this passage to illustrate the proverbial quality of the expression; cf. Mich. *Ep.* 29.18–19: ἀφορμή τοῦ ἐπιθεῖναι κορωνίδα χρυσέαν τοῖς καλοῖς ἀγωνίσμασιν.

χρυσὸς μὲν...ὡσεὶ οὐδέν. Ἐπικρίνεται δὲ...: a prose adaptation of the poetic focusing device known as a *priamel* involving a paratactic comparison achieved by enumerating things conventionally deemed of great value, only to dismiss them as nothing when compared with the true object of desire: "some people like x, others y, but I say the best thing is...." Antiquity furnished well known models in the opening lines to poems by Sappho (fr. 16) and by Pindar (Olympian 1). E. and the better-read members of his audience would have known at least the Pindaric example. For a survey of the priamel in antiquity and its significance, see W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden, 1982); cf. the still useful study by U. Schmid, *Die Priamel der Werte im griechischen von Homer bis Paulus* (Wiesbaden, 1964).

ῥίπας δὲ ὑποστορεσθῆναι: Tafel recommends emending to ῥύπος (heterocl. neut. of ῥύπος masc.); but ῥψ, used of wicker-work or straw mats, makes perfectly good sense here and anticipates στρωμνὴν ἐσχάτην in the next sentence. Manuel had renounced the elevated soft mattress (τὴν υψηλὴν καὶ τρυφερὰν στιβάδα) for the bed of reeds, such as he had slept on many times while campaigning (ὁ πολλὰκις ὄμοια πεπονθὼς), cf. ex. gr., cf. supra *Επ.* 57: Στρωμνὴ δὲ αὐτῷ πρὸς γῆς τραχύτητα, στρώμασι μαλακοῖς ἀμεσολάβητος οὔτω τι λελόγιστο φίλον.

τὸ ἱερὸν...σκήνωμα: for the metaphorical sense of σκήνωμα to mean the “covering” or “tabernacle” of the soul (τὸ σκήνωμα τῆς ψυχῆς), i.e., the body of the deceased, see LSJ s.v. σκῆνος II; cf. Eust. Or. 6 (Λόγος ζ) 93.44–46 καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ σκηνώσαντα τὸν θεὸν ἐσχηκώς, ὅτε καὶ ψάλλειν τις εἶχε τὸ τοῦ Δαυὶδ, ὡς ἀρα ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν ἑκεῖνῳ ἠλιόν ἠθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ. In par. 52 E. uses σκηνώματα in the sense of buildings housing monks. The range of the term may be seen in Io. Damasc. Exp. fid. (ed. Kotter) 84: ὡς ἀγιασθέν ἡ ἀφὴ τοῦ ἀγίου σώματος...τα ἱερὰ αὐτοῦ σκηνώματα, ἀτιμά εἰσίν ή φάτνη, τὸ σπήλαιον, ὁ Γολγοθᾶς ὁ σωτήριος, ὁ ἕως οὖσος τάφος, ή Σιὼν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἡ ἀκρόπολις, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια.


βαλβίδων...δρόμου: the language is that of the hippodrome. Employed mostly in the plural in this sense, the βαλβίδες (LSJ s.v. βαλβίς) were the posts to which was attached the rope marking the starting line of the race course; hence, the beginning of something, in this case, Manuel’s reign. The expression ἐκ/ἀπὸ βαλβίδος was the Byzantine equivalent of a sports metaphor or simile, commonly employed by historians in the twelfth century: Nic. Bryenn. Hist. (ed. P. Gau-tier, Nicéphore Bryennios ; introduction, texte, traduction et notes, Bruxelles, 1975) 3.9: δος ἐνδείξονται καὶ ταύτα εἰς πόλιν ἀνδρᾶς φέρουσαν ἀγαθοὺς καὶ ἐκ πρώτης, δ ὁτα, βαλβίδος ἐμφυλίω ἀμαρταί τὰς χεῖρας μιαοῦσιν.
E. closes with the same motif as he began, namely, the limitation of time, thereby betraying the orator’s preoccupation with judgments about his ability. Had he had but time, he assures his audience, he could have done justice to his subject: Εἰπεῖν γάρ, εἰς ὅσον καὶ δύναμις, οὐκ ἂν ἀληθὲς ἀπελεγχθεί μοι, ἐνδαψιλευσαμένω καὶ χρόνον ἐοικότα καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀδείας καλὸν.
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