Rummaging in Walz's Attic: Two Anonymous Opuscula in *Rhetores Graeci*

Thomas M. Conley

TWO SHORT ANONYMOUS PIECES are published by Walz in volume III of his *Rhetores Graeci*, Περὶ τῶν τέσσαρων μέρων τοῦ τελείου λόγου ("On the four parts of a complete speech," pp.570–587) and Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μέρων τοῦ ῥητορικοῦ λόγου ("On the eight parts of the rhetorical art," 588–609), that bring out some of the peculiar difficulties one encounters when trying to make sense of what are, apparently, examples of Byzantine teachings on rhetoric. Some of the difficulties are due not to the nature of the material but to the way Walz presents it. Granted, his labors were immense, as were those of the printers who set the type and produced the ten volumes of *Rhetores Graeci*; but his practice of referring the reader to other places to see what he saw in the manuscripts he transcribed is sometimes annoying—as in, for instance, the Anonymous "Ekthesis" at III 725–748, where we are repeatedly referred to the prolegomena by Maximus Planudes in volume V. Walz does the same sort of thing in his presentation of the two texts under consideration here. Accordingly, we will need to reconstruct the texts he saw; and that requires the "rummaging" alluded to in the title of the present paper.

Both pieces are, as published, rather unusual. To summarize: "On the four parts" begins with the reminder that Aphthonios teaches that a finished encomium will have a *prooimion*, a *diêgêsis*, an *agôn*, and an *epilogos*. *Prooimia* in general will have four parts and will vary from genre to genre; and there are good examples to be found in the orations of Gregory of Nazianzus (570.8–571.28). There follow some brief comments on narrations and the *agôn* ("contestation" or "argument" in the broadest sense) (571.28–572.6); and some equally brief remarks about *epilogoi*, which will differ depending on whether the

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 46 (2006) 101–122
© 2006 *GRBS*

speech is an encomium or a mere *lalia* ("talk"), as Menander teaches (572.7–24).

Here the manuscript contains a short chapter printed as part of the *Synopsis rhêtorikês* by Joseph Rhakendytes earlier in volume III (at 562.16–564.8), Περὶ τοῦ πῶς δεῖ ἀναγιγνώσκειν ῥητορικοὺς βίβλους ("How to read rhetorical works"), stressing the necessity of understanding the ὑπόθεσις developed by each author (563.19f.). Then we find (572.25–573.8) a list of authors to imitate in composing panegyrics, chiefly Gregory of Nazianzus, but also Aristeides' *Panathenaikos* and the speeches of Choricius and Michael Psellos. For deliberative oratory, look to Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and, again, Gregory of Nazianzus, whose speeches cannot be restricted to any one genre. The all-wise (σοφώτατος) Psellos is always useful. Models for letter-writing are next provided (573.9–25): Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Synesius, Libanius, and, once more, "the all-wise Psellos."

At this point in the manuscript, Walz tells us in a note, is a chapter on iambic composition that also appears in the *Synopsis rhêtorikês* by Joseph Rhakendytes at III 559.14–561.15. The section from 560.19 to the end (ἀρετὴ στίχων πρώτη …) is stylistically consistent with the Anonymous. The models here (562.10–15) are George of Pisidia, Nikolaos Kallikles (a late 11th-century physician-poet), Ptochoprodromos, Gregory of Nazianzus, Sophocles, and "the more eloquent parts" of Lycophron. In certain circumstances, we read where the Anonymous text resumes (at 573.26), dactylic hexameters are recommended, using diction from all sorts of dialects, especially "Ionic" (573.26–574.4). Models can be found in Homer, Oppian, Dionysius the Periegete, Tryphiodorus (in *The Fall of Troy*), Musaeus, and others.

The list of recommended authors is unusual. Even more unusual, however, is the assertion that an iambic verse should contain a complete thought and that enjambment should be avoided (560.19–561.7). Hence, instead of writing

> εἰς τὴν ἐρυθρὰν ἀβρόχοις ποσὶ πάλαι
> παρῆλθε Μωσῆς, ἡ δὲ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων
> φάλαγξ ὑποβρύχιος ἔνδον ἐκρύβη

one should write

> Μωσῆς περᾷ θάλασσαν ἀβρόχῳ δρόμῳ,
> Αἰγύπτιος δὲ τοῖς κύμασιν ἐκρύβη.

Moreover, lines that are built around the traditional six *peristatika* are to be emulated. Thus, Σταυροῖ Πέτρον κύμβαχον ἐν Ῥώμῃ Νέρων, which covers, in order, the *pragma* ("crucified Peter"), *chronos* (past tense), *tropos* ("upside down"), *topos* ("in Rome"), and the *prosôpon* ("Nero"), the *aitia* being understood. We will see these *peristatika* again later.

It is clear that the discussion has by this point drifted far from considerations of "the four parts." Here (574.5) a new title heading appears: Εἰσαγωγικὸν τοῖς μελλοῦσι γράφειν ῥητορικῶς ("Introductory material for those intending to write rhetorically"). There is much in the way of ideas (ἔννοια), subjects (ὕλη), and diction (λέξεις) to be found in the poets, who have much to offer the logographer. The text at 575.12ff. is very close to that of Rhakendytes at 562.18ff. in "How to read rhetorical works"; and Walz tells us in a note at 575.16f. that the manuscript at this point continues the text in Rhakendytes all the way to 564.3. Especially useful, Anonymous tells us, is Homer, from whom examples are provided in prose paraphrase (575.19–576.13). The discussion then turns to διηγήματα, of which there are three kinds: simple (ἁπλῆ), detailed (ἐνδιάσκευα), or very detailed (ἐγκατάσκευα). Examples are provided of each in different accounts of the madness of Ajax (576.13–578.27).

At 579.1 the discussion turns to λέξις, and there follws a disquisition on propriety as determined by subject-matter (ὕλη) and ideas (ἔννοια), with long lists of diction appropriate to, e.g., descriptions of meadows and battles. Diction may be refined or "natural," inflated or dry (examples are provided); and of particular importance in word-choice is mastery of the Attic dialect, for which Aristophanes and Thucydides provide models (582.19–586.21). For this section, too, we find many parallels (not noted by Walz) in the chapters περὶ λέξεως in Rhakendytes' *Synopsis*, at 526.28–534.28: e.g., Anonymous at 580.25ff. and Rhakendytes at 526.28f.; 581.5ff. and 527.10ff.; 582.15ff. and 529.15ff.; 584.13ff. and 533.15–534.5, etc.

At 586.21–587.16, we see a conclusion and, it appears from διδάξομεν at 586.24 and 587.13f. and the list of progymnasmata at 586.24–30, a transition to the piece immediately following, Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μέρων.

That title, in actuality, covers only the first section 588.4–590.5, where the author takes up in turn the traditional eight "parts" familiar from Hermogenes' *On Ideas*: ἔννοια, λέξις, σχῆμα, μέθοδος, κῶλον, συνθήκη, ἀνάπαυσις, ῥυθμός. Once these have all been defined and explained, the author turns to "the most serviceable" (χρειωδεστέρων, 590.6) progymnasmata.

These he takes up in exactly the same order as the list at the end of "Four parts," depending heavily on Aphthonios but explicitly leaving out χρεία and γνώμη (also left out are *koinos topos*, *synkrisis*, *thesis*, and *eisphora tou nomou*). Accordingly, he begins with μῦθος, offering an Aphthonian definition and three-way division of species, λογικός, ἠθικός, μικτός (590.8–591.7). The next is διήγημα, for which he also depends on Aphthonios, making his three-way division into δραματικόν, ἱστορικόν, πολιτικόν, and referring to the Aphrodite story; and, like Aphthonios, he stresses the role of the six περιστατικά: πρόσωπον, πρᾶγμα, χρόνος, τρόπος, τόπος, αἰτία (591.9–593.11). In the treatment of ἠθοποιία at 593.13–595.16, Aphthonios is once again the source, in the distinctions introduced between *ethopoiia*, *eidolopoiia*, *prosopopoiia* and in the three-way breakdown into *pathetikai*, *êthikai*, *miktai*. Indeed, 593.13–22 and 594.1–12 are almost verbatim versions of Aphthonios. The advice about style is also consistent with that of Aphthonios (ὁ τεχνικός at 594.31?).

In his treatment of the fourth exercise, ἔκφρασις (595.18–598.9), the author begins to depart from Aphthonios. Unlike Aphthonios' entry, that in "Eight parts" is far fuller; and it uses four of the six *peristatika* as an armature. First, then, descriptions of a person (*prosôpon*) should be both detailed and orderly, proceeding from top to bottom, he writes. Then comes description of *pragmata*, e.g. a battle scene with all the gory details (596.3–20). And there follow on this entries on description of a *kairos*, e.g. winter (596.20–30), and of a *topos*, e.g. a pond or a meadow, along with some general guidelines.

The treatments of ἐγκώμιον and ψόγος (598.11–601.17) are organized in a similar way. Praise, we are told, can be of

πρόσωπα, πράγματα, καιροί, τόποι, and "creatures without reason" (ἄλογα). In praising persons, one should speak about their native land, hometown, lineage, upbringing, pursuits and training, virtues both physical and spiritual, and κατὰ τύχην πράξεις. It is also useful to introduce comparisons. "Blame" is the antithesis of praise, but it uses the same headings (κεφάλαια). The section on κατασκευή and ἀνασκευή (confirmation and refutation) (601.11–609.9), very unlike the treatments in Aphthonios, are also organized around the *peristatika*: the person, place, time, manner, and reason. After covering those headings, one should introduce arguments from the contrary, amplify, make comparisons (συγκρίσεις), and provide examples. These can be used in any kind of λογογραφία (602.25–604.23). It is up to the writer to decide in what order these headings should be put; and every *diêgêma*—the account of the madness of Ajax, for instance—will cover the earlier discussed headings. There follows a long and exhaustive display on that theme (605.20–608.18) that seems to sum up both this and the previous lesson (reading, with the Paris MS., εἴπωμεν at 609.1).

If these two pieces can be described as disorganized and strangely proportioned, the same might be said of the late fourteenth-century manuscript Walz used, *Parisinus graecus* 2918. It is a rather large codex, 191 folio leaves measuring some 30 × 20 cm. "minutissimis scripta," as Walz puts it (I 140f.).[1] In the first 131 fol., we find the traditional Hermogenean corpus. Then, in a different hand, the following:

132–136ᵛ: Nikolaos Sophistes *Progymnasmata* (cf. I 266–394 Walz)
136ᵛ–140: Nikephoros Basilakes *Ethopoiiai* (I 423–525)
140ᵛ: Severus of Alexandria *Ethopoiiai* (partial) (I 539–548)
141–152: Nikolaos Sophistes *Progymnasmata* continued
152ᵛ–169: Libanius, progymnasmatic *meletai* (partial)
169–174: Nikephoros Basilakes *Progymnasmata* continued
174ᵛ–176ᵛ: Anonymous opusculum beginning πᾶσα λόγου ἰδέα ἐκ μερῶν ὀκτὼ σύγκειται …
177–179: Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων μερῶν (III 570–587)

[1] Photostats of pages from it can be seen in I. Lana, *I Progimnasmi de Elio Teone* (Turin 1959) Tav. II, and G. Ballaira, *Tiberii De figuris Demosthenicis* (Rome 1968) Tab. VII.

179ᵛ–181ᵛ: Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ μερῶν (III 588–609)
182–190: Theon *Progymnasmata* (I 145–257)
190ʳᵛ: Rufus *Technê rhêtorikê* (III 447–460)
190ᵛ–191ᵛ: Tiberius *Peri schêmatôn* (VIII 527–577)

Parisinus graecus 2918 is certainly not the only disorderly Byzantine manuscript, yet it does give the strong impression of having been rather hastily thrown together without regard for making it intelligible to what one would imagine was its primary audience, the student of rhetoric. It would have made more sense, for instance, to put Rufus and Theon at the beginning, along with, perhaps, the material in fols. 174–181 and Tiberius. These would then be followed by an extensive anthology of exercises for imitation (and perhaps inspiration). There are still problems, however. How does the brief exposition at fols. 174ᵛff. differ from that in 179ᵛ–181ᵛ, for instance? Why have both Nikolaos and Basilakes? The answer to that question may be that Basilakes uses biblical episodes; but why start with *ethopoiiai* instead of the traditional first exercises, *muthos* and *diêgêma*? Either the scribe who copied *Par.gr.* 2918 was working at great speed simply to transcribe an older manuscript or he did not know what he was doing—and there is plenty of evidence for the latter.[2]

Nor is *Par.gr.* 2918 the only place where "Four parts"—or something very like it—can be found. As Walz notes (III 570), an excerpt from *Ottobanianus* 173, fol. 148ff., printed by Bekker in a note at *Anecdota graeca* III 1081f., looks very like the text of "Four parts." And *Vat.gr.* 883, fol. 220ᵛ–223ᵛ, published by both A. Kominis and D. Donnet,[3] is also quite similar to Walz's text. Moreover, *Laur.* LVIII.21, fol. 206f. (the end of the manuscript is missing), and LV.7, fol. 324ᵛ–330ᵛ, contain what looks like Walz III 570–573.25 plus 559.14–560.16, which Walz prints as part of Rhakendytes'"Synopsis" of rhetoric; and which, as we have seen, appears also in 2918. In *Barberinianus*

[2] See Lana's collection of scribal errors in the Theon text alone, *Progimnasmi* 33–38.

[3] A. Kominis, *Gregorios Pardos* (Testi e studi bizantino-neoellenici 2 [Rome 1960]) 127–129; D. Donnet, *Le traité ΠΕΡΙ ΣΥΝΤΑΞΕΩΣ ΛΟΓΟΥ de Grégoire de Corinthe* (Brussels/Rome 1967) 319.137–323.282.

240, we find "Four parts" attributed to Psellos! And at *Laur.* LVIII.21, fol. 193–205, we find a work entitled Περὶ λογογραφίας that has the same opening as 2918, fol. 174f. All these manuscripts, like 2918, have been dated at mid- to late-fourteenth century.

But things are even messier. We noted earlier that various sections of "Four parts" appear also in Rhakendytes. Some but not all of the overlaps with his "Synopsis" are noted by Walz. There are many apparent parallels, especially in the section on *lexis* (at III 579ff.): e.g., Anon. 572.25–573.8 ≈ Rhak. 521.7–27; 580.1ff. ≈ 528.9–13; 580.25f. ≈ 526.28f.; 581.5f. ≈ 527.10f.; 581.20f. ≈ 527.24f.; 582.15f. ≈ 529.15f.; 583.6f. ≈ 532.18f.; 583.27f. ≈ 533.7f.; and 584.13ff. ≈ 533.15–534.5. Moreover, the lists of recommended writers in the alleged text of "Four parts" printed by Bekker seems closer to Rhakendytes at, e.g., 521.15ff. and 526.13ff. than to the text printed by Walz at III 572.25–573.25. Rhakendytes, of course, made no pretense to originality (indeed, he is quite open about his borrowings: see III 471.11–17). His *Encyclopedia*, from which the "Synopsis" is drawn, "borrowed" extensively from Nikephoros Blemmydes in the sections on physics and logic; and in the "Synopsis" itself, the chapter on the *basilikos logos* (III 547–558) is cribbed almost verbatim from Menander Rhetor (368–378 Spengel). Could it be that he also lifted the section on iambics at 559.14–562.15 and part of the chapter on "How to read rhetorical books" at 562.19–564.8 from "Four parts"? Or did Anonymous consult Rhakendytes' "Synopsis"? There is probably no definitive answer to this; but it is clear that there is more in "Four parts" that is not in Rhakendytes than there is that is in the "Synopsis." It is also clear that those two sections are the only ones in the "Synopsis" that are stylistically consistent with the style of "Four parts"—but more on that below.

Turning now to "Eight parts," this piece's title, like that of "Four parts," covers only the first section (588.4–590.5), which ends with an awkward transition to the sections on the various progymnasmata exercises that make up the rest of the treatise and which, as we have seen, owe their greatest debt to Aphthonios. And like that of "Four parts," the first section of "Eight parts" has nothing to do with what follows; but, once the progymnasmata are taken up, it is far better organized and

methodical than "Four parts"—particularly in its systematic deployment of the *peristatika* in its explanations of how to develop each exercise. This, incidentally, seems to be unparalleled in the progymnasmatic literature.

One might be tempted to see overlaps with Rhakendytes here at the beginning of "Eight parts," too. The opening sentence (588.4–7), for instance, is very close to what we read in the "Synopsis" at III 516.12f.; and the definitions of ἀνάπαυσις and ῥυθμός at 589.25–30 are very close to Rhakendytes' at 545.9f. and 545.19ff. Both, however, go back (at least) to Hermogenes *Peri ideôn* 1 (220.6ff. Rabe), where they are introduced as the basic elements of each of the stylistic *ideai*; and that list can be found throughout the Byzantine rhetorical tradition. So there is no need to bring Rhakendytes into the picture at all.

"Eight parts" appears also in *Laur.* LV.7 (which we saw earlier) at fol. 331–334, beginning πᾶσα γραφὴ ῥητορική, κἂν μείζων …, and ending at 605.19 in Walz's edition. Just before it is a short treatise that begins with the same words as the piece in *Par.gr.* 2918 at fol. 174v, πᾶσα λόγου ἰδέα ἐκ μερῶν ὀκτὼ σύγκειται. In the superscription, however, the contents are listed as εἰσαγωγικὸν περὶ λογογραφίας, περὶ ἐπιστολῶν, περὶ στίχων—which would seem to match the contents of the early parts of "Four parts" at 574.5–575.16+562.17–564.3 and 573.9–25+559.14–562.15. The superscription also attributes this piece to Gregory of Corinth; but Bandini notes that Gregory's name seems a later addition to the text[4] and in his view the treatises at fol. 324ff. and 331ff. constitute a single work.

Whatever Bandini's reasons were, the same might be said of the two pieces printed by Walz from *Par.gr.* 2918. I suggested earlier that the end of "Four parts" might be construed as a transition to "Eight parts"; but that, too, might be a scribal contrivance. Nevertheless, the two share a conspicuous stylistic feature. In "Four parts," we see almost 70 occurrences of second-person singular verb constructions or pronouns in just under seventeen pages, as against only 10 first-person verbs, most with σε or σοι as their objects, for instance:

[4] And see further on this attribution D. Donnet, "Précisions sur les oeuvres profanes de Grégoire de Corinthe," *BIHBelge* 37 (1966) 89–91.

καὶ τὸ ἐν τούτοις σοφὸν φιλοκρινήσεις, καὶ ἀνθολογήσεις καὶ ἀποταμιεύσεις τῷ λογισμῷ (575.6f.);
ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ποιητικώτερον μεταβάλῃς καὶ τὸ φράσεως κάλλος διαβλέπων προσοικειοῦν ἕξεις τῇ οἰκείᾳ φράσει ἐκ παραφράσεως πρὸς τὴν προκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν. ἀλλὰ φέρε καὶ αὐτοὶ μικρόν τι συνεισενέγκωμέν σοι καὶ εἰς ἔννοιαν καὶ εἰς φράσιν (576.10–14);
ὁρᾷς ὅπως καθαρά ἐστιν ἡ φράσις· ἐὰν δὲ ταπεινοτέρα σοι πρόκειται ἔννοια, τυχὸν ὅτι γυναῖκα ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔγημεν ἐπὶ τῷ τεκνοποιῆσαι, ἀπαγγείλῃς ὑψηλῶς (582.26–29).

Likewise, in "Eight parts," second-person verbs and pronouns appear over 50 times in 20+ pages, as against 10 first-person constructions, for instance

ὁρᾷς ὅπως πέφυκε ταῦτα πάντα γενέσθαι. καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν λεχθέντων παρὰ φύσιν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀδύνατον (592.6–8);
ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν γὰρ περιστατικῶν ἐπιχειρήσεις, ἀνατρέπων ἢ αὔξων ἐν τῷ ψέγειν τὸ κακόν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν τόπων τῶν ἐκτεθέντων σοι (605.16–19);
σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐπὰν ἐγκωμιάζῃς τινά, καὶ τὰ κατορθωθέντα τούτῳ κατὰ μέρος διέρχῃ, χρὴ ποιεῖσθαί σε καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν σύνκρισιν (609.1–4).

In each, imperatives appear five times. There is, in short, a very pronounced "addressed" quality to both—and indeed, at 590.6, we see φίλε.

Is this featuring of the second-person a mere literary device, or is φίλε addressed to a real person? It is in any event a feature not often found elsewhere in the rhetorical literature, the most conspicuous example being the treatise printed by Russell and Wilson[1] as Treatise II (pp.76–225 = 368–446 Spengel), which exhibits a very similar stylistic turn. It has parallels also, of course, in advice literature, such as the *Consilia et narrationes* attributed to Kekaumenos (late 11th cent.);[5] and in paraenetic discourse, e.g. Basil I's advice to Leo (*PG* 107.XXI–LVI). But

[5] D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981).

[6] Ed. B. Wassiliewsky and V. Jernstedt (St. Petersburg 1896); and see C. Roueché, "The Rhetoric of Kekaumenos," in E. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Aldershot 2003) 23–37.

these were surely not models for whoever composed the two treatises we have been considering.

There are, as it happens, some parallels from more closely related literature. In Psellos's "synopsis" of rhetoric, composed in the popular fifteen-syllable "political" verse around 1060 and dedicated to young Michael Doukas,[2] we see at the very beginning

> Εἰ μάθοις τῆς ῥητορικῆς τὴν τέχνην, στεφηφόρε,
> ἕξεις καὶ λόγου δύναμιν, ἕξεις καὶ λόγου χάριν,
> ἕξεις καὶ πιθανότητα τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων (1–3)

and later

> ἀφ' ἑνός που ὀνόματος πρόφασιν ἕξεις λόγων,
> οἷον γὰρ εἴποις ἀριθμόν, σύλλεγέ μοι τοσοῦτον
> ἐξ ἱστορίας, δέσποτα, τῷ λόγῳ προσηκούσης (266–268)

and

> σὺ δ' ἔχε μοι τὴν σύνοψιν, εἶτ ἐρώτα θαρρούντως,
> κἀγώ σοι τὴν διάλυσιν λέξω τοῦ ζητουμένου.
> εἶτ' οὐ θαυμάζεις, δέσποτα, τοῦ γράφοντος τὴν τέχνην,
> ἂν ἔχῃς εἰλικτάριον βραχὺ τῆς ὅλης τέχνης (287–290).

It might be added that the epithet στεφηφόρε shows up three more times; and δέσποτα ten times in all.

Although not nearly as "addressed" as Psellos's synopsis, John Tzetzes' "Epitome of Rhetoric" (III 670–686 Walz), composed about 1160, occasionally slips in an imperative (e.g. καὶ διάγνωσιν αὐτῶν ἀκούων μάθε at 679.14) and several second-person constructions and pronouns (e.g. ζητήματα γινώσκεις δὲ τὰς δεκατρεῖς τὰς στάσεις, 679.27; νῦν δὲ καὶ παραδείγμασιν ἐκεῖνα παρεισάξεις, 680.1; and, at the very end, ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο οὕτω σοι τανῦν ἐπεξηγοῦμαι, 686.6). It is not known who the addressee was, but Tzetzes' "cast of characters" includes mischievous elves (βάσκανοι τελχῖνες, 675.10), adulterers and profligates (μοιχοί, ἄσωτοι, 675.32), whoremasters (πορνοβοσκοί, 681.30, 683.2 [of Socrates!]); and his examples of exotic customs at 670.11–13 include polygamy among the Scythians, sex with mother among the Persians, and between siblings in the Caucasus. All of this suggests a young man as the intended

[7] *Poemata* pp.103–122 Westerink; also in Walz III 687–703.

audience, probably from an elite family, for composing poems for such families is how Tzetzes made the little money he did.

Nor are the parallels limited to treatments of rhetoric. The Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου ἤτοι περὶ τοῦ μὴ σολοικίζειν καὶ περὶ βαρβαρισμοῦ ("on the syntax of the sentence and how to avoid solecisms and barbarisms") by Gregory of Corinth, also composed in the mid-twelfth century, has a distinct "addressed" quality, as it reads like a transcript of a teacher's lessons to students. After each "lesson," we hear the teacher saying καὶ οὕτω συντάξεις ὀρθῶς.[6] The treatise has five basic parts: (1) On the parts of speech (lines 1–218); (2) On the cases (219–300); (3) On prepositions (301–403); (4) On the syntax of the verb (404–504); and (5) On barbarisms (505–631) No second-person constructions are found in sections 3 and 4; but in the other sections we find second-person constructions almost too numerous to inventory. Examples include

ὁρᾷς, ἰδοὺ τὰ ὀκτὼ μέρη τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν δύο ἀναγκαιότατα, τὸ ὄνομά φημι καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα (12f.)
ἰδὲ ὅπως τὰ συμπληρωτικὰ τῆς ἐννοίας ῥήματα ἀπεδόθησαν κάτω μετὰ πολλά. πρόσεχε οὖν καί, κἂν εἰς τὸ λίαν ἐκτεταμένον ἡ ἔννοια ἕλκῃ, τὸ ῥῆμα ζήτει τὸ ἀποδοτικὸν καὶ μηδέποτε στῇς, εἰ μὴ εὑρήσεις αὐτό (133–136)
πρόσεχε οὖν καί, κατὰ τοὺς ἀριθμούς … ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τοῖς πληθυντικοῖς, ὡς ὁρᾷς (192–195)
πρὸς ταῦτα γοῦν τὰ ἀρχέτυπα ἀπεικόνιζε καὶ ἀπεύθενε τὰς ἀμφιβαλλομένας σοι λέξεις καὶ οὐ βαρβαρίσεις (520–522)
οὕτω γράφων ἐν πᾶσιν οὐ βαρβαρίσεις … διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ γράφομέν σοι περὶ αὐτῶν (626–629).

It may be worth noting that the verbs and the pronouns are consistently singular, except for Gregory's occasional editorial "we," which suggests that it is not a class that is being addressed but an individual. Not much is known about Gregory's

[8] E.g. line 36 and repeatedly; references are to line numbers in Donnet's edition. Gregory (ca. 1070–1156), metropolitan of Corinth, also composed a commentary on Hermogenes' Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος (Walz VII.2 1090–1352) and a capacious treatise on Greek dialects (*Libri de dialectis linguae Graeci*, ed. G. Schaefer [Leipzig 1811]). Some MSS. attribute to him the brief Περὶ τρόπων at Walz VIII 763–778, as well.

career beyond the fact that he was a rhetorician and grammarian who became a bishop. While he may have occupied a chair in the Patriarchal School at some time, there is no explicit record of that or of any social circle he may have been close to.[7] In other words, the identity of the intended audience of this work will probably never be known.

Our last example is found in the Περὶ ὀρθότητος συντάξεως ("On correct syntax") by John Glykys,[8] a student of Gregory of Cyprus (of whom more below) who in 1315 was named patriarch of Constantinople. Glykys's grammar was composed for his son George (so the note at *Cod.Laur*. LV.7, fol. 416 [pp. XI–XII: ποιήσατο δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱόν, κύριν Γεώργιον); thus the several places where he introduces second-person formations, e.g.

καὶ οὕτω διὰ πάντων εὑρήσεις αὐτῆς τὴν σημασίαν … τὰ παραδείγματα δὲ κατωτέρω ἐκτεθέντα σαφέστερον ὁ λέγομεν ποιήσει. εἴ τι γὰρ καὶ δοκεῖ προσίστασθαι, τούτου σοι τὴν λύσιν παρεξόμεθα (p.9)
ταῦτα σοι καὶ περὶ τῆς τρίτης ἔστω συζυγίας τοῦ μὴ διαφυγεῖν σε χάριν μηδ' ἐπὶ τούτοις τὴν ἀκρίβειαν … ἴσθι ὡς ἡ δοτικὴ δύναμίν τινα ἰδίως ἔχει (27).
ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ τὴν τῶν ῥημάτων τε καὶ ὀνομάτων σύνταξιν κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν σοι διηρθρώσαμεν … καὶ περὶ ταύτης δοῦναί σοι, ὡς δυνατόν, τῆς ὀρθότητος τοὺς τύπους (34–35).

And he ends with

κἂν μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις δόξῃ τι καίριον ἠνύσθαι, χάριεν ἂν εἴη, εἰ σοῦ κηδόμενος, τοῖς ἄλλοις εὑρεθείημεν τὰ μέτρια ἐν τούτῳ χαριζόμενοι, καὶ οὐ μάτην οὐδ' εἰκῇ τὸν νοῦν ἐξώρως ἐπὶ ταῦτα τρέψαντες· εἰ δὲ τῆς βουλήσεως ἀπολειφθῆναι δόξομεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς γε δὴν υἱέσι παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀδελφὰ καί, ὅπη ποτ' ἂν ἔχοι, ποθητὰ δικαίως ἂν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἴη καὶ νομίζοιτο (59–60).

And if it seems to others that something worthwhile has been accomplished, it would be pleasant if, in our care for you, we might be found to have gratified others with a modest contribution to the field and not to have attended to it in vain, carelessly,

[9] For what little is known of Gregory's career, see R. Browning, "The Patriarchal School of Constantinople," *Byzantion* 33 (1963) 11–40, at 19–20.

[10] Citations are to the edition of Albert Jahn, *Joannis Glycae opus De vera syntaxeos ratione* (Bern 1849).

> and irrelevantly. But if we seem to have fallen short of your wishes, yet it comes with the love of fathers for sons, and however it turns out, it would be and be thought to be something that was rightly to be sought.

Even when we bear in mind that this is addressed to his son, Glykys here goes well beyond the conventional boundaries of sentiment in treatises on correct grammar.

Putting "Four parts" and "Eight parts" side by side with these epitomes of rhetoric and grammar suggests that we may be looking at a sort of sub-genre of instructional literature. They are in any event quite unlike the more discursive and detached works of Hermogenes, for instance, or even Doxapatres' "Lectures on Aphthonios" (published by Walz at II 81–563) or the "catechetical" introductions to treatment of *stasis* issues such as those published by Rabe in his *Prolegomenôn Syllogê* (218–228). The elementary nature of the material, the ample supply of examples, the distinct teacher-student quality of the instruction, and the pronounced "addressed" quality of the language may be rhetorical indications that, like Psellos's *Rhetorica*, they may all have been composed on special order. Of course, that invites speculation about who did the ordering and, in the cases of "Four parts" and "Eight parts," who complied. I will address this question in due course.

Another striking stylistic feature of "Four parts" and "Eight parts" is the frequent occurrence of rare, obscure, even mystifying diction. Some of these words can be traced back to Classical or Late Classical usage: ἐνδιάσκευος and ἐγκατάσκευος at 576.22, for instance, are terms used by Hermogenes at *Peri heureseôs* 2.7 (122.15–124.15 Rabe) (and also by Eustathios *passim* and by Tzetzes *Chil.* 11.270, for instance). Also attested in antiquity are, e.g., προᾳδομένοις (571.17), τεμάχιον (573.13), χορηγία (574.16), κελαρύζει (579.28), βυκάνη (580.5: "ox horn"), ἐφεστρίς (582.14), and ἀκρωτηριασμός (596.13). Others are attested in Byzantine sources: e.g. ἱστοριῶδες (571.10; see Tzetzes *Chil.* 4.781 et al.), ἐπιστατικώτερον (573.6), χασμῳδία (573.29; frequently in Eustathios), παρασύλα (575.25 and George Pachymeres *Hist.* 5.2, II 439.4 Failler), ὀρυκτίς (580.6, protective screen formed of interlocked shields; see Tzetzes *Chil.* 11.609), ἁλυσιδωτός (596.11, which, with θώραξ, seems to refer to chain mail; see Eustath. *ad Il.* 5.13), and ἄϋλος (602.1;

Tzetzes *Chil.* 10.496 and frequently in patristic texts). Some seem to be *hapax legomena*: προασχολεῖν (571.25), περιττολεξία (562.2, instead of the more usual περιττολογία, as at 583.9); πυργοσεῖσται (580.6: "towershakers," devices used by sappers?); and τραχυλεκτεῖν (580.18), τραχυλεξίαι (600.23), and τραχυλεξία (601.5). Others are puzzling. What does βάπτειν (570.11, βάπτοντα at 571.23) mean in a rhetorical context (of exordia)? Or εὐκτικοί (572.7), which in grammar designates the optative? And is σιμνοτέρας at 594.29 a scribal slip? In an age that valued pure Attic diction so highly (and see, e.g., the optative προσχοίης at 575.5 and the duals in the Ajax narrative: χεροῖν 577.23, βλεφάροιν 577.27—not to mention the excursus on Atticism at 583.6ff.), all of this is rather unusual.

The excursus on Atticism is interesting for at least two reasons. First, as obscure as many of the words might be (see, e.g., the catalogue of things to be named in a description of a battle at 580.1–8), all but a few of them can be found in the *Lexicon* compiled by one "Zonaras" some time between about 1190 and 1253 (the year our earliest manuscript was copied). "Zonaras" of course draws mainly on old sources; but he cites Psellos 70 times, and has one citation each to Tzetzes and Theodore Prodromos. Second, the list of approved Attic diction at 585.12–586.18 seems to draw heavily from the *De dialectis* of Gregory of Corinth: e.g., Anon. 585.12–13 ≈ Gregory p.52; 585.15–16 ≈ 62–63; 585.22 ≈ 110; 585.23 ≈ 123–124; 585.25 ≈ 159; 585.28 ≈ 171–172; 586.2–3 ≈ 172; 586.10–11 ≈ 59–60; 586.12 ≈ 38–39; 586.15–16 ≈ 40.[9]

Perhaps such diction makes up the λέξις τῶν νεωτέρων that so many "among us"—as Anonymous puts it—are so enthusiastic about. Who are these νεώτεροι? Chief among them seems to be ὁ σοφώτατος Ψελλός (573.8, 24; mentioned also at 572.29), along with Ptochoprodromos and Nikolaos Kallikles among the poets; and, evidently, "Zonaras" and Gregory of Corinth—i.e., late eleventh- to early thirteenth-century writers. References to proper comportment during speeches made in praise of the emperor (571.23f., 600.16ff.), moreover, bring to

[11] I owe this information to K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexicon des Oros* (New York/Berlin 1981) 23–36 and 129.

mind the orations delivered by the μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων, an office that did not exist before 1081.[10] And the references to encomiastic praise by comparison at 599.23ff.—comparisons with David, Aaron, Moses, and Joshua—may recollect a speech in praise of Isaak II Angelos by John Kamateros in 1193, who does just that:[3]

οἶμαι γὰρ … σὲ μετὰ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' εὖ ποιῶν ὁ λόγος εἰς μνήμην ἤνεγκέ με Δαβίδ (p.249.18–21);
κίνει πρὸς πόλεμον τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς ὁ Μωσῆς, καὶ οὗτος ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀαρὼν ταύτας ἀκαμάντως … γίνου μοι τὰ πρὸς πόλεμον στρατηγῶν, ὡς Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Ναυῆ (254.8–11).

All of this supposes that *Par.gr.* 2918 is an apograph of an older manuscript, not an original compilation. But if we are on the right track, we may put the *terminus post quem* for our anonymous opuscula in the last decade of the twelfth century.

If that is plausible, we should probably date the composition of the two treatises to the period of the Nicaean exile or shortly thereafter, i.e., between 1204 and about 1300. While it is true that the "elements" of each stylistic *idea* enumerated at the beginning of "Eight parts" and the doctrine of six *peristatika* so pervasive there go back to Hermogenes,[11] it is Aphthonios and Menander who are explicitly mentioned as authorities (570.5, 572.23f.); and, as we saw, the progymnasmata sections of "Eight parts" rely heavily on Aphthonios. The influence of Menander is perhaps most evident in the emphasis in both pieces on encomiastic matters; and the second-person constructions we discussed earlier might also suggest Menander as the model for whoever wrote the works under consideration. This in turn suggests that they were intended for a student (and not, as in much of the literature, for teachers of rhetoric) whose future mature rhetorical performances might take place in the

[12] It is generally agreed that this office was created during the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118). See A. Kazhdan, *ODB* II 1269.

[13] V. Regel, *Fontes rerum byzantinarum* II (St. Peterburg 1917).

[14] See *Peri ideôn* 1 (pp.218–220 Rabe) and *Peri heureseôs* 3.5 (140.16ff.). Of course, these had become so widespread in the literature that it is hard to say with confidence that our author(s?) actually had Hermogenes in mind.

setting of the court, although the reader is assured that many of the same principles will apply in deliberative or even forensic settings. We might also point out that the best manuscripts we have of Menander—*Baroc*. 131, *Vat.gr*. 306, and *Par.gr*. 2423 (which stops at p.390.30 Spengel, in the λαλιά chapter)—all date from the second half of the thirteenth century, evidence perhaps of the renewed interest in epideictic in a period when scholars were intent on recovering all they were able of Classical, Patristic, and, indeed, Byzantine literature. What we have, then, may be dated to the Palaiologan Revival, a full generation before Rhakendytes.[12]

If it is possible to date our opuscula to the Palaiologan Revival, the place of composition is clearly Constantinople, the only place where the works of the many authors recommended would be available—both to the author(s) and to the person to whom they seem to be addressed, the φίλε. Moreover, those works would not have been available to just anyone. Only someone of high social rank or someone not far removed could be expected to put his hands on texts of Demosthenes, Gregory of Nazianzus, George of Pisidia, Michael Psellos, and the rest. The list of recommended readings should also suggest that these works were probably not composed at the Nicaean court before 1261—nor, for that matter, in Thessalonica or Ephesus, where some rhetorical instruction was available—as there is every indication that books were in short supply at the Nicaean court during the 57 years of exile after the taking of Constantinople by the Latin crusaders. After the restoration, however, a great effort was made to recover the treasures of antiquity, the words of the Fathers, and the cultural glories of pre-1204 Byzantium.[13]

[15] Might the quotation at 585.6–8 also point to this conclusion? Walz sees in ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς γε τὸν Παίονα καὶ Ἰλλυριὸν παρασκευασμένον ἐπὶ πόλεμον καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα an allusion to Dem. 1.15, but this is far from what Demosthenes says. Who are ἡμεῖς? The Athenians certainly were not preparing for war with the Paionians and Illyrians; but in the 1260's and 1270's, the Palaiologoi were.

[16] See e.g. E. Fryde, *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261–c.1360)* (Leiden 2000); N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1996) 218–264. Of

If we are right to date the composition of the opuscula published by Walz to some time after 1261 and before Rhakendytes compiled his *Encyclopedia* (probably ca. 1320), then perhaps we are in a position to suggest some candidates for authorship. Of course, with what evidence we have, we shall never know with any certainty; but we should bear in mind that the selection of which works to preserve in manuscript and which manuscripts to copy was based largely on the reputation of the author. The anonymous works preserved in *Par.gr.* 2918 and the others we glanced at earlier must originally have been ascribed to recognized authorities.

A number of names from our period come to mind. Manuel Holobolos, μαΐστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων (an office reestablished after 1261) from about 1265 until his death in 1284, is one such name; Nikephoros Choumnos (ca. 1250–1327) is another. There is no evidence that Holobolos wrote anything like the treatises we have been discussing, however. As for Choumnos, we know that he personally provided instruction in rhetoric to his daughter, Eirene-Eulogia Choumnaina.[14] This might explain both the tone of the two works and the use of φίλε that we noted earlier. But here again, there is no evidence to support this possibility.

There is another possibility that may have some support. As mentioned earlier, the treatise at fol. 174vff. of *Laur.* LV.7 is attributed to Gregory of Corinth. Could it in fact be attributed, along with "Eight parts" at fol. 331ff., to another Gregory, Gregory of Cyprus? There are several extant *progymnasmata* exercises composed by this Gregory, a noted teacher in the service of the emperor Michael VIII and, from 1283 to 1289,

---

37 manuscripts held by G. Prato to have been produced during the Nicaean exile, only six are secular: three containing *rhetorica* (Hermogenes and Aphthonios in the main) and three the *Lexicon* of "Zonaras": G. Prato, "La produzione libraria in area Greco-orientale nel periodo del regno latino di Costantinopoli (1204–1261)," *Scrittura e civiltà* 5 (1981) 105–147.

[17] On Choumnaina see A. Hero, "Irene-Eulogia Choumnaina Palaiologina, Abbess of the Convent of Philanthropos-Soter in Constantinople," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985) 119–147.

patriarch of Constantinople.[15] There are also two encomia attributed to him, one to Michael VIII and one to Andronikos II.[4] And it is this Gregory of whom Nikephoros Gregoras wrote several years later (using Gregory's given name, George),

> καὶ ἦν τηνικαῦτα ἀνὴρ ἐν λόγοις ἐπίσημος τῷ βασιλικῷ συγκατειλεγμένος κλήρῳ Γεώργιος ὁ ἐκ Κύπρου, ὃς τὸν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εὐγενῆ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ῥυθμὸν καὶ τὴν Ἀττικίζουσαν γλῶσσαν ἐκείνην, πάλαι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον λήθης κρυβέντα βυθοῖς (*PG* 148.308C).

He was, that is to say, an outstanding *rhetor* in the imperial clergy who "rescued from the depths of the distant past" the noble fashion of the Greek language and the Atticizing tongue.

As a teacher, Gregory could claim some other outstanding rhetors as his students, among them Nikephoros Choumnos, who distinguished himself both as a scholar and as a high palace official; possibly Konstantinos Akropolites (d. 1324) and Maximus Planudes (1255–1305), the latter one of the greatest scholars of Byzantium; and, as we noted earlier, John Glykys.[16] As we also noted, Glykys shared with his teacher an intense interest in Attic purity; and the style of his "On correct syntax" shares many features with that of our anonymous opuscula. It is tempting, then, to see Glykys looking to Gregory as a model in writing a treatise on Attic syntax for his son, and to young Glykys as the φίλε to whom the opuscula seem to be addressed.

There is another possibility that is perhaps more intriguing. Yet another pupil of Gregory's was the *protovestiarissa* Theodora Rhaoulaina (ca. 1242–1300), the daughter of John Kantakouzenos and Eirene Palaiologina who became an important patron of letters and an accomplished writer in her own right.[17]

[18] See e.g. the *chreia* published by J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota graeca* (Paris 1829–30) II 269–273; and his speech in praise of the sea at *PG* 142.433–444.

[19] Boissonade, *Anecdota graeca* I 313–358, 359–393.

[20] On all these figures the best comprehensive survey is still C. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca. 1310)* (Nicosia 1982).

[21] A useful profile of this extraordinary woman can be found in D. M. Nicol, *The Byzantine Lady: Ten Portraits* (Cambridge 1994) 33–47; see also A.-

Among her other accomplishments, she founded the monastery of St. Andrew in Constantinople and renovated a small building nearby where she provided a residence for the aged Gregory and his extensive library after his resignation as patriarch in 1289.

Theodora and Gregory were long-time correspondents, as is shown by the inclusion of more than a dozen letters to her in a collection of Gregory's letters originally copied by none other than John Glykys, which has still not been properly edited.[18] The letters show that the relationship between the two was a warm one, as we find Gregory addressing her in one letter as τέκνον ἐμὸν σὺ καὶ μονογενὲς τέκνον … ἐγὼ δὲ πατὴρ τοιᾷδε (letter 194, p.597 Kugéas); and in another as θύγατερ ἐμή (letter 212, p.600). So it would not surprise us if he were to address her as φίλε in an introduction to rhetoric.

Terms of endearment do not of course bring us very close to a plausible identification of author and addressee. Let us turn from Gregory, then, and ask, Is there anything in Theodora's writing that suggest a connection with the opuscula in Walz? We might begin by looking at two manuscripts, one actually copied by her, *Vat.gr.* 1899, containing the orations of Aelius Aristeides; and the other produced under her supervision containing Simplicius' commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*, no. 3649 in the Historical Museum in Moscow.[19]

M. Talbot, "Bluestocking Nuns: Intellectual Life in the Convents of Late Byzantium," in C. Mango and O. Pritsak (eds.), *Okeanos: Essays Presented to Ihor Sevcenko* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1983) 604–618.

[22] S. Eustratiades published many of them, on the basis of two manuscripts in Vienna: *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 1 (1908), 2 (1908), 3 (1909, 4 (1909), 5 (1910). A fuller conspectus of the sources can be found in W. Lameere, *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondence de Grégoire de Chypre* (Brussels 1937). Excerpts from his letters to Theodora were published and commented on by S. Kugéas, "Zur Geschichte der Münchener Thukydideshandschrift Augustanus F," *BZ* 16 (1907) 592–603. On the collection copied by Glykys see S. Kourousis, "Ὁ λόγιος οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης Ἰωάννης ΙΓ ὁ Γλυκύς," *EpetByz* 41 (1974) 309–311.

[23] For the former, see A. Turyn, *Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII et XIV scripti* (Vatican City 1964) 63–65; for the latter, B. Fonkic, "Zametki o gre-

The first leaf of *Vat.gr.* 1899 bears the following inscription composed by Theodora:

Καὶ τὴν Ἀριστείδου δὲ τήνδε τὴν βίβλον
γραφεῖσαν ἴσθι παρὰ τῆς Θεοδώρας
καλῶς εἰς ἄκρον γνησίως ἐσκεμμένην
Ῥώμης νέας ἄνακτος ἀδελφῆς τέκος
Καντακουζηνῆς ἐξ ἀνάκτων Ἀγγέλων
Δουκῶν φυείσης Παλαιολόγων φύτλης
Ῥαοὺλ δάμαρτος Δούκα χαριτωνύμου
Κομνηνοφυοῦς πρωτοβεστιαρίου.

And at the beginning of the Moscow manuscript, we read another inscription by Theodora:

Καὶ δέλτον αὐτὴν τοῦ σοφοῦ Συμπλικίου
τὴν τῶν φυσικῶν ἐκδιδάσκουσα βίβλον
Ἀριστοτέλους οὗ σοφοῦ πολὺς λόγος
καλλιγραφεῖ τε καὶ μέτησι συντόνω
ἀδελφιδὴ κρατοῦντος ἡ θεοῦ δόρον
Δουκῶν Κομνηνῶν Παλαιολόγων φύσα
δάμαρ ἔχοντος τοῦ Ῥαοὺλ κλίσιν χάρι
τρόποις ἀρίστου καὶ κρατίστου τῷ γένει.

While it is true that these iambs hardly qualify as poetry, the absence of enjambment (more pronounced in the first than in the second) brings to mind the ἀρετὴ στίχων πρώτη laid down in the passage on iambics that Rhakendytes evidently lifted from "Four parts" (III 560.19; and see Walz's n.11 on p.573).

The absence of enjambment in Theodora's iambs is, of course, no evidence that she had "Four parts" in mind when she composed them; so we had better look elsewhere. Much more substantial evidence of Theodora's rhetorical skill can be found in her *Life* of saints Theodore and Theophanes, victims of persecution and torture in the ninth century for their refusal to comply with the iconoclasm mandated by the emperors Leo the Armenian and Theophilos.[20] This is a curious and complex

---

ceskich rukopisjach Sovietskich chralinisc," *Vizantjskij Vremmenik* 36 (1974) 134–138, with a plate at 137.

[24] Ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας* IV (Jerusalem 1897) 185–223. There is a brief account of the career

work that has attracted little attention from scholars beyond occasional notice of its implications for ecclesiastical controversies in which Theodora and Gregory were involved between about 1275 and 1289, having mainly to do with the status of the patriarch Arsenios. This is not the place to go into those controversies, nor to provide a detailed analysis of the *Life* composed by Theodora. But there are some rhetorical features in it that hint at the extent of Gregory's influence on Theodora and that are in line with principles laid down in "Four parts" and "Eight parts."

Like much Byzantine literature, Theodora's *Life* is packed with literary allusions, Classical and, particularly, Scriptural, as in passages that are virtual centos of passages from the prophets (at e.g. pp.200.4–27, 202.28–203.25, 215.29–216.17). Theodora also works into her account a variety of familiar adages, or *paroimia*; and it is interesting that of eight instances, almost all can be found in the collection of proverbs compiled by her master, Gregory of Cyprus (most accessible in *PG* 142.445–470): e.g., *Life* 189.1f. ξυρὸς εἰς ἀκόνην and δαλὸς πρὸς τὸ πῦρ = *PG* 142.464A, 465A; 199.3 πάντα κάλων ἐκίνει = 465B; 203.30 πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν = 465A; 204.14 βοῦν ἐπὶ γλώττης = 453B.

Theodora's diction, furthermore, is scrupulously Attic, reflecting perhaps the training she received from Gregory and reminiscent of the importance of *attikismos* in "Four parts" (e.g. III 583.6ff.). Aside from a few instances of Patristic or Byzantine items (e.g., σύγκελλος at 194.7, of Michael Synkellos), the diction of the *Life* is almost obsessively Attic—to the point, one might add, of obscurity. Theodora's lexicon was enormous, and full of rare usages of the sort that Hesychios and Eustathios labored to explain, e.g. σκαιώρημα at 198.25 or καταλιμπάνων at 209.12. One unusual expression occurs at 205.6f. in reference to Theodore and Theophanes, οὐδ' εἰς νοῦν βάψαντες, which seems to mean something like "not immersing in contemplation." This is not an expression one finds attested—at least, not in the standard references—in either Classical or

of Theophanes by D. Turner in *Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition*, ed. G. Speake (London 2000) 1630–1632.

post-Classical Greek, Attic or otherwise. As we noted earlier, however, there is something similar in the opening section of "Four parts": at 570.10ff. we read ἀρετὴ δὲ προοιμίου τὸ εἰς τὴν προκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν βάπτειν, and at 571.23 another reference to τὴν ὑπόθεσιν βάπτοντα. In the end, of course, it is hard to say what to make of this.

A stronger argument could be made if one could show, for instance, that Theodora follows the advice in "Eight parts" to organize one's narrative or descriptions around the six *peristatika* (III 592.14ff., 602.2–25). The only indication that Theodora had any such thing in mind, however, is when she explicitly brings up the heading of αἴτιον at 201.2. But in general, looking for the *peristatika* pattern in the *Life* would not advance an argument linking Theodora and "Eight parts," in any event. In the first place, on the one hand, "Eight parts" is a set of rather elementary lessons; and Theodora, by the time she composed the *Life*, was certainly sophisticated enough not to need such mechanical rules. And on the other hand, it seems obvious that any reasonably rounded account of a saint's life would address the "who, what, where, when, how, and why" topics at some level; and so finding them in play, as it were, would prove very little, if anything.

Our speculations have, at this point, carried us well beyond the confines of *Rhetores Graeci*; and we have found ourselves rummaging in attics other than Walz's. The results have not been very satisfying, either. But if identifying the author and audience of "Four parts" and "Eight parts" is not possible, after all, at least we have been able to situate those short pieces in a literary/rhetorical context and suggest a plausible time-frame for their composition. Whoever composed them probably did have a particular recipient in mind (as opposed to a fictional "you"), someone in the early stages of rhetorical education, but already well-versed in the works that made up the canon looked to by Byzantine students of literature. In short, there is more to them than meets the proverbial eye.

August, 2005

244 Lincoln Hall
University of Illinois
702 S. Wright St.
Urbana, IL 61801

t-conley@uiuc.edu