

Toward a Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis

Daria D. Resh

AROUND 980, Byzantine literature experiences a major shift. By imperial commission, Symeon Logothetes creates a new *Menologion*, a collection of Saints' Lives, arranged according to their calendar sequence. Almost immediately, Symeon's oeuvre acquires wide popularity that lasts for generations of Byzantine readers who refer to it as αἱ μεταφράσεις, paraphrases. Symeon and his team did not produce entirely new texts, but rewrote ancient Lives according to contemporary literary taste. This success marked the appearance of *metaphrasis* as a genre that dominated Byzantine hagiographical discourse from this point onward, involving a significant number of writers, scribes, illustrators, readers, and listeners.¹

With metaphrasis, hagiography transcended its traditional limits and became aligned with the higher register of Byzantine *logoi*, namely rhetoric. That is, the success of metaphrasis resided not only in its popularity, but also in the high appreciation that it enjoyed among the learned rhetoricians; the praises of Michael Psellos, the frequent citations in the *Suda* as

¹ Bibliography on Symeon Metaphrastes constitutes a very rich field, discussion of which would not fit the focus of the present work. See the most recent bibliography in "Symeon (27504)," *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* II.VI (2013) 228–233 (where the creation of Symeon's menologion is placed between 976 and 1004, possibly in the earlier part of this time span), and also in C. Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization* (Copenhagen 2002), and "Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement," in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography* II (Farnham 2014) 161–180.

well as in the *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, a Byzantine best seller in its own right, and, finally, the imitations by writers of the Palaiologan period are the most telling examples.²

Considering the impact of Symeon's menologion and the ongoing discussion on the origins of the metaphrastic movement—Symeon Logothetes' menologion was only the culmination of a trend, which started at least in the early ninth century—it is crucial to ask whether Byzantine sources contain any theoretical reflections on the notion of metaphrasis. Important contributions on this subject have been made recently.³ Nevertheless, several Byzantine discussions of metaphrasis remain un-

² The most recent discussion of the rhetorical features of the Menologion is in M. Hinterberger, "Between Simplification and Elaboration: Byzantine Metaphraseis Compared," in J. Signes Codoñer and I. Pérez Martín (eds.), *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: Between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung* (Turnhout 2014) 33–60, at 44–50. Psellos wrote for Metaphrastes a canon (ed. L. G. Westerink, *Michael Psellus. Poemata* [Stuttgart 1992] 277–283) and an encomium (ed. E. A. Fisher, *Michael Psellus. Orationes Hagiographicae* [Stuttgart 1994] 267–289; discussion in S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* [Cambridge 2013] 158–163, and E. Fisher, *Michael Psellos. On Symeon the Metaphrast and On the Miracle at Blachernae: Annotated Translations with Introductions* [online at <http://chs.harvard.edu>]). For the *Suda*, see the list of citations in A. S. Adler, *Suda Lexicon I* (Leipzig 1938) 96. For *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, see J. Grossmann, "Die Abhängigkeit der Vita des Barlaam und Ioasaph vom Menologion des Symeon Metaphrastes," *JÖB* 59 (2009) 87–94; and for the Late Byzantine metaphraseis, A.-M. Talbot, "Old Wine in New Bottles," in S. Ćurčić and D. Mouriki (eds.), *The Twilight of Byzantium* (Princeton 1991) 15–26; M. Hinterberger, "Hagiographische Metaphrasen. Ein möglicher Weg der Annäherung an die Literaturästhetik der frühen Palaiologenzeit," in A. Rhoby and E. Schiffer (eds.), *Imitatio, Aemulatio, Variatio: Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literature* (Vienna 2010) 137–151.

³ S. Efthymiadis, "John of Sardis and the *Metaphrasis* of the *Passio* of St. Nikephoros the Martyr (BHG 1334)," *RSBN* n.s. 28 (1991) 23–44, at 29–31; S. A. Paschalides, "Παρατηρήσεις στις μεταφράσεις τῶν βυζαντινῶν ἀγιολογικῶν κειμένων," in *Ἐν Ἀγίοις: εἰδικὰ θέματα βυζαντινῆς καὶ μεταβυζαντινῆς ἀγιολογίας* (Thessalonike 2011) 73–86, at 29–30. Högel, in *Ashgate Research Companion* 181–185; J. S. Codoñer, "Towards a Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium," in *Textual Transmission in Byzantium* 61–90.

explored or call for a new interpretation. The present study examines precisely such references in the field of rhetorical theory. My purpose is twofold: to investigate whether the fusion of hagiography and rhetoric in metaphraseis was also conceptualized on a theoretical level—whether, that is, Byzantine intellectuals incorporated metaphrasis among the categories of literary discourse; and to elucidate further the origins of rhetorical rewriting.⁴

Ioannes of Sardeis

In Byzantine Greek, *μετάφρασις* designates specifically a translated text, not the process of translation in general. Such a translated text could be both from another language and between different registers of the same language, for which case Christian Høgel proposed the labels intra-lingual translation or trans-phrasing, terms from the vocabulary of Roman Jakobson.⁵ By the end of late antiquity, metaphrasis is one of the technical terms used to designate summaries, explanations,⁶ and paraphrases of ancient texts, especially philosophical or biblical ones,⁷ as well as for the rhetorical exercise of converting poetry into prose.⁸ Up to the ninth century the term *metaphrasis* has no explicit relation to hagiography. For

⁴ In this paper, ‘metaphrasis’ stands for the genre in general, while ‘metaphraseis’ indicate the variety of texts written in this genre.

⁵ Høgel, in *Ashgate Research Companion* 181–182.

⁶ As in Eustathios of Thessalonike’s commentary on *Iliad* 7.691: ἡ γὰρ διασαφητικὴ τῶν λέξεων ἐρμηνεῖα μετάληψις καὶ μετάφρασις καίριος λέγεται (II 499.18–19 van der Valk); see also E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Leipzig 1912) 118 n.2.

⁷ Cf. Gregory Thaumaturgus’ *Μετάφρασις εἰς τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν τοῦ Σολομῶντος* (PG 10.988–1017) and Priscian of Lydia’s (6th cent.) *Μετάφρασις τῶν Θεοφράστου περὶ αἰσθήσεως* (I. Bywater, *Prisciani Lydi quae extant* [Berlin 1886] 1–37).

⁸ For example, Prokopios of Gaza’s *Paraphrases of Homer*, cf. A. Brinkmann, “Die Homer-Metaphrasen des Prokopios von Gaza,” *RhM* N.S. 63 [1908] 618–623). See further M. Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool 1985) 58–60.

example, Photios, Patriarch of Constantinople and author of the massive collection of book reviews called *Bibliothēke*, mentions both explanatory and versified metaphrasis, but he does not refer yet to any saints' lives in this genre.⁹

Not observed previously, the earliest surviving definition of *metaphrasis* comes from Ioannes, teacher of rhetoric and later in his career bishop of Sardeis (ca. 815), who wrote commentaries on Aphthonios' *Progymnasmata* and Hermogenes' treatise *On Invention*¹⁰ and, in addition, two Saints' Lives (on which more below). In his commentary on Aphthonios' *Progymnasmata*, Ioannes remarks in passing on paraphrase (64.23–65.5):¹¹

παράφρασις δέ ἐστὶν ἐρμηνείας ἀλλοίωσις τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν φυλάττουσα· τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ μετάφρασις προσαγορεύεται· δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὕτω ταύτην προφέρειν, οὔτε τοῦ λεχθέντος ἢ πραχθέντος ἀφισταμένουσ οὔτε ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς τῶν λέξεων μένοντασ.

Paraphrase is the alteration of expression¹² preserving the same meaning; the same thing is called also *metaphrasis*; for we must articulate the meaning in such a way, so that we neither depart from what was said or done, nor retain precisely the same words.

⁹ The case of Photios is considered in more detail below. He uses the term *metaphrasis* for Prokopios of Gaza's *Paraphrases of Homer* (cod. 160 [II 123.8 Henry]), Themistios' summaries of Aristotelian works (74 [I 153.16]), and poems on biblical events in hexameter by Eudokia Augusta (183–184 [II 195.4]); he also employs the verb μεταφράζω in the sense 'translate' (89 [II 15.38], 232 [V 79.17]).

¹⁰ On this commentary see K. Alpers, *Untersuchungen zu Johannes Sardinianus und seinem Kommentar zu den Progymnasmata des Aphthonios* (Braunschweig 2009).

¹¹ H. Rabe, *Ioannis Sardiani Commentarium in Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (Leipzig 1928).

¹² ἐρμηνεία is a difficult term to translate. Greek rhetorical theory uses it as a synonym for λέξις, for which translators have adopted the terms *diction* or *expression*: W. Rhys Roberts, "The Greek Words for 'Style' (with Special Reference to Demetrius περὶ Ἑρμηνείας)," *CR* 15 (1901) 252–255, and G. Thiele, *Hermagoras: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rhetorik* (Strasbourg 1893) 140–141.

This definition does not differentiate metaphrasis from paraphrase and renders both as a rhetorical figure aimed at variety of expression.¹³ In the context of *progymnasmata*, it may reflect a school practice, when students were asked to reproduce the same story in different words. Indeed, paraphrasing was an ancient element of rhetorical training. The earliest explicit evidence comes from Cicero's *De oratore* (1.154), where Licinius Crassus speaks critically about how in his youth he used to recast the greatest pieces of literature in his own words.

Leaving aside the rich material on the exercise of paraphrase in Greek and Roman education,¹⁴ let us proceed to the case that is immediately related to Ioannes of Sardeis' definition of metaphrasis. In the first century, paraphrase received a detailed treatment in the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon. The Greek text that has survived is most likely a mid-fifth-century redaction.¹⁵ This redaction lacks the description of five exercises, including that of the paraphrase. Fortunately, the surviving Greek text as well as its medieval Armenian translation¹⁶ provide enough information on Theon's views. First, the introductory part of the treatise, which discusses the ways of teaching rhetoric, contains a lengthy passage on the value of paraphrase (62.10–21):

¹³ Lehrs and later Roberts showed that in school practice and in the titles of literary works, *μετάφρασις* and *παράφρασις* are equally common for all kinds of rewriting: K. Lehrs, *Die Pindarscholien. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen Quellenkunde. Nebst einem Anhang über den falschen Hesychius Milesius und den falschen Philemon* (Leipzig 1873) 49–50; Roberts, *Biblical Epic* 25–26.

¹⁴ Roberts, *Biblical Epic* 5–53, and T. Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge 1998) 190–221, provide an overview of paraphrase in the Greek and Roman school tradition. See also R. M. de Oliveira Duarte, “A paráfrase como exercício preparatório na educação retórica: potencialidades literárias e didáticas,” in J. Ribeiro Ferreira (ed.), *A retórica greco-latina e a sua perenidade: actas do congresso II* (Porto 2000) 377–407.

¹⁵ M. Heath, “Theon and the History of Progymnasmata,” *GRBS* 43 (2003) 129–160, and M. Patillon, *Aelius Théon: Progymnasmata* (Paris 1997) VIII–XVI.

¹⁶ The lost text was reconstructed by Patillon from the Armenian translation: Patillon, *Aelius Théon* 107–110, and discussion at CIV–CVII.

ἢ δὲ παράφρασις οὐχ ὡς τισιν εἴρηται ἢ ἔδοξεν, ἄχρηστός ἐστι· τὸ γὰρ καλῶς εἰπεῖν, φασίν, ἅπαξ περιγίνεται, δις δὲ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται· οὗτοι δὲ σφόδρα τοῦ ὀρθοῦ διημαρτήκασι. τῆς γὰρ διανοίας ὑφ' ἐνὶ πράγματι μὴ καθ' ἓνα τρόπον κινουμένης, ὥστε τὴν προσπεσοῦσαν αὐτῇ φαντασίαν ὁμοίως προενέγκασθαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πλείους, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἀποφαινομένων ἡμῶν, ποτὲ δὲ ἐρωτῶντων, ποτὲ δὲ πυνθανομένων, ποτὲ δὲ εὐχομένων, ποτὲ δὲ κατ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον τὸ νοηθὲν ἐκφερόντων, οὐδὲν κωλύει κατὰ πάντα τοὺς τρόπους τὸ φαντασθὲν ἐπίσης καλῶς ἐξενεγκεῖν.

Despite what some say or have thought, paraphrasis is not without utility. The argument of opponents is that once something has been well said it cannot be done a second time, but those who say this are far from hitting on what is right. Thought is not moved by any one thing in only one way so as to express the idea (*phantasia*) that has occurred to it in a similar form, but it is stirred in a number of different ways, and sometimes we are making a declaration, sometimes asking a question, sometimes making an inquiry, sometimes beseeching, and sometimes expressing our thought in some other way. There is nothing to prevent what is imagined from being expressed equally well in all these ways.¹⁷

This remark is then accompanied by a list of examples from Greek authors (62.21–64.27). The apologetic tone of the passage probably responds to the critique of paraphrase initiated already by Cicero, but may also address some school teachers contemporary with the treatise. Just as in Ioannes of Sardeis' commentary, variety of diction (ἐρμηνεῖα, κατὰ πάντα τοὺς τρόπους ... ἐξενεγκεῖν) is juxtaposed to sameness in thought (διάνοια). Theon returns to this idea in the chapter on narration (87.14–91.12), where he explains how one can use various modes of expression (such as making a declaration, asking a question, etc.) on the example of Thucydides' nar-

¹⁷ Transl. G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta 2003) 6.

rative about Plataea (Thuc. 2.2).¹⁸

In the Armenian translation, which helps to reconstruct the lost Greek chapters of the treatise, paraphrasing (together with reading and listening) is one of the methods recommended to beginners, and it has four modes: addition, subtraction, recombination, and substitution. Paraphrasing may also aim at the imitation of particular style, as Theon advises one to rewrite a speech of Lysias in a Demosthenic manner and the reverse.¹⁹

Ioannes of Sardeis must have been well acquainted with school paraphrases; at the very least, he knew Theon's discussion of them.²⁰ Moreover, his gloss on paraphrase resembles the Armenian translation of the beginning of Theon's chapter on paraphrase, lost in Greek: "La paraphrase consiste à changer la formulation tout en gardant les mêmes pensées, on l'appelle aussi métaphrase."²¹ It is quite possible that, in the ninth century, the students of Ioannes were still practicing the same kind of exercise and that in fact Ioannes was familiar with a fuller Greek text of Theon.²²

However unrelated to hagiographic discourse, Ioannes of Sardeis' remark on metaphrasis in his commentary on Aphthonios appears in a different light if we take into account the fact that two rhetorical paraphrases of ancient *martyria* transmitted under his name bear the title *metaphrasis*. These are in fact the earliest attested instances of the use of this title in a

¹⁸ For the focus of this article, I forego discussion of this lengthy and rich passage, which addresses the practice of paraphrase rather than its definition.

¹⁹ Patillon, *Aelius Théon* 108.

²⁰ Ioannes extensively borrowed from Theon's *Progymnasmata*: Patillon, *Aelius Théon* cxxii.

²¹ Transl. Patillon, *Aelius Théon* 107. Cf. the relevant Greek text in Ioannes (757 above): παράφρασις δὲ ἐστὶν ἐρμηνείας ἀλλοίωσις τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν φυλάττουσα· τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ μετὰφρασις προσαγορεύεται.

²² See Patillon, *Aelius Théon* cxxvi–cxxviii, for discussion of the relationship between the Greek archetype, the Greek text known to Ioannes, and the Armenian version.

hagiographical context.²³ We may advance the hypothesis here that it is likely that the paraphrasing of Saints' Lives was one of the exercises that Ioannes of Sardeis would assign his students. It is, after all, from the ninth century on that the revival of rhetorical training was followed by the introduction of Christian topics and authors into traditional material.²⁴ A much later but famous example of such fusion is the work of the twelfth-century schoolteacher Nikephoros Basilakes, who wrote *ethopoïiae* on topics from hagiography.²⁵

Ioannes' metaphrastic Lives can be placed in a wider context. As Stephanos Efthymiadis has observed, it is very likely that he belonged to the circle of Patriarch Tarasios (784–806), whose *Vita* praises Tarasios for writing encomia in honor of ancient martyrs. Theodore Studite, abbot of the important monastery in Constantinople and Ioannes' pen-friend, refers to the same activity; in a letter to one of his disciples Theodore reveals his doubts about an anonymous *vita* of St. Pankratos, saying that contemporary orators compose encomia to the

²³ *Paris.gr.* 1452 (10th cent.): Μετάφρασις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Νικηφόρου (BHG 1334, ed. Efthymiadis, *RSBN* N.S. 28 [1991] 23–44); and *Barb.gr.* 517 (13th cent.): Μαρτύριον τῆς ἁγίας μεγαλομάρτυρος Βαρβάρας· δέσποτα εὐλόγησον· ἢ μετάφρασις (BHG 215i, unedited; I am preparing a critical edition of this text). Regardless of whether the titles belong to the author himself or are later additions, they do reflect the nature of the works in question and attest to the use of the term before the appearance of Symeon Metaphrastes' Menologion.

²⁴ In this context belongs also Georgios Choiroboskos (*floruit* between 843 and 913), who is discussed below. On the use of Christian topics in this period see also the letters of the anonymous tenth-century schoolteacher in A. Markopoulos, *Anonymi professoris epistulae* (Berlin 2000), and Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos* 56–63.

²⁵ C. Messis and S. Papaioannou, "Histoires 'gothiques' à Byzance: *Le saint, le soldat et le Miracle de l'Euphémie et du Goth* (BHG 739)," *DOP* 67 (2013) 15–47, at 39–40. See also some of the twelfth-century scholia based on hagiographical texts listed in I. Vassis, "Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαίσματα. Η συλλογή σχεδῶν του κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus Gr. 92," *Hellenika* 52 (2002) 37–68.

saints using their old *vitae*.²⁶ Theodore himself made a significant contribution to the hagiography of the period, writing both Lives of contemporary saints, especially those of his own family, and several laudatory speeches for ancient saints, such as John the Baptist and John the Evangelist. We may suggest that it was in this context of the early ninth-century intellectual revival that Ioannes of Sardeis used the technique of metaphrasis both for his own writings and for his teaching practice.

Photios

If Ioannes of Sardeis represents the perspective of a school-teacher who writes from within a specific rhetorical tradition, then in Photios' *Bibliothēke* we hear the voice of a learned reader who reacts to a variety of ancient and contemporary texts.²⁷ As we observed above, Photios uses the term *μετάφρασις* conventionally for explanatory and verse paraphrases. But more, and previously unnoticed, notions on the technique itself can be extracted by revisiting two of his book reviews.

In the first case, Photios confirms what we already know from Theon: the variety of style is a key component of metaphrasis; commenting on the metaphrasis of Homer by Prokopios of Gaza, he declares "they are expressed in the manifold forms of discourse, which are by their nature most capable of revealing the rhetorical force and habit of the man."²⁸

²⁶ *Ep.* 386.61–67, ed. G. Fatouros, *Theodori Studitae Epistulae* II (Berlin/New York 1992) 536; discussed in Efthymiadis, *RSBN* N.S. 28 (1991) 23, Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes* 46–47, and S. Papaioannou, "Voice, Signature, Mask: The Byzantine Author," in A. Pizzone (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions and Identities* (Berlin 2014) 21–40, at 33–34.

²⁷ W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington 1980), is a useful guide to the structure and composition of the *Bibliothēke*. The date of composition is still a matter of debate; the most recent hypothesis places it in 870–871: F. Ronconi, "Pour la datation de la Bibliothèque de Photius," in E. Juhász (ed.), *Byzanz und das Abendland II Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia* (Budapest 2014) 135–153, with a detailed overview of the problem, previous attempts at dating the text, and bibliography.

²⁸ Cod. 160, 103a.8: *στίχων ὀμηρικῶν μεταφράσεις εἰς ποικίλας λόγων ἰδέας ἐκμεμορφωμένοι, αἱ μάλιστα τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός περὶ ῥητορικὴν δύναμιν*

In codd. 183–184 Photios discusses the epic poems composed by Eudokia Augusta. Two of her poems paraphrase biblical material, but the third, *On Cyprian the Martyr*, elaborates on the martyrdom story of Cyprian and Justina. In the review of the first epic poem, we find a valuable commentary on the virtues of this metaphrasis (cod. 183, 128a.11–17):

ἐκεῖνο μόνον ταύτης [sc. τέχνης] ἔλλείπων, ὃ μέγιστόν ἐστιν εἰς ἔπαινον τῶν ἐγγύς ἀμείβειν λόγους ἀξιούντων· οὔτε γὰρ ἐξουσία ποιητικῆ μύθοις τὴν ἀλήθειαν τρέπων ἠδύνειν σπουδάζει μειρακίων ᾧτα, οὔτε ταῖς ἐκβολαῖς τὸν ἀκροατὴν διαπλανᾷ τοῦ προκειμένου, ἀλλ' οὔτω περὶ πόδα τὸ μέτρον ἔθετο τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ὡς μηδὲν ἐκείνων δεῖσθαι τὸν τούτοις ἐνομιλοῦντα. τὰς μὲν γὰρ διανοίας οὔτε παρατείνων οὔτε συστέλλων ἀεὶ φυλάσσει κυρίας. καὶ ταῖς λέξεσι δέ, ὅπου δυνατόν, τὴν ἐγγύτητα καὶ ὁμοιότητα συνδιαφυλάσσει.

Her work lacks only one feature, which is a very great merit in writers aiming at close paraphrase: for it does not attempt to charm the ears of young readers by deforming the truth with fables and use of poetic licence, neither does it divert the listener from the subject by digressions, but meter fits ancient texts so exactly, that the reader has no need of them. For it always preserves the main thoughts without extending or compressing them, and whenever it is possible it also keeps closeness and resemblance to phrasing.²⁹

This passage illustrates that biblical paraphrases in verse were intended primarily for school audiences (τὰ τῶν μειρακίων ᾧτα). Photios highlights the most valued features of such texts, namely, fidelity both to the biblical content and to the diction of classical poetry so that students could master the language of Homer while remaining unharmed by its pagan spirit.

Remarkably, in this passage Photios retains the title *metaphrasis* only for the epic poems on biblical subjects, which provide a clear reference to the authoritative *original* text of Holy Scrip-

καὶ μελέτην ἱκανὰ πεφύκασιν ἀπαγγέλλειν.

²⁹ Here and below translations of the *Bibliothēke* are modified from N. G. Wilson, *Photius, the Bibliothēca: A Selection* (London 1994), here 174.

ture: *μετάφρασις τῆς Ὀκτατεύχου* and *μετάφρασις προφητικῶν λόγων*. The authority of the older text inhibits Eudokia's epic poems from becoming an independent work of literature; metaphrasis is exactly the title that indicates the dependence of epic poems on an original text and, simultaneously, the transfer of biblical authority to the new text as well. The same logic, I believe, applies to other non-hagiographic texts entitled *metaphrasis* or *paraphrasis*: their overwhelming majority transpose Homer, Aristotle, and the Bible.

A different terminology is employed for Eudokia's poetic rendition of an anonymous Life of St. Cyprian. Photios observes that it is written in the same meter (*τῷ αὐτῷ τοῦ μέτρου χαρακτηρη*) and resembles the two previous compositions.³⁰ However, he calls this text "discourses" (*λόγοι*). This reluctance to define also the third composition of Eudokia as *μετάφρασις*, a reluctance which may stem either from the original title of the text or from Photios himself, suggests that he perhaps did not see hagiographical texts as qualifying for the use of this term, while recognizing that the epics on St. Cyprian was composed in the same technique of paraphrasing as the previous two poems.³¹

Georgios Choiroboskos

The most frequently cited definition of metaphrasis comes from the ninth-century treatise *Περὶ τρόπων* (*On Rhetorical*

³⁰ "These works showed, as children resemble their mother, that they too are products of the empress's labors" (*ἐδήλου δὲ ἄρα τὰ σπουδάσματα, ὡς παῖδες μητέρα, τῶν τῆς βασιλίδος, καὶ ταῦτα ὁδίνων ἔκγονα εἶναι*).

³¹ One may possibly object to this conclusion, arguing that Photios does not display much interest in hagiography in general and thus we cannot consider his judgments as a reliable source. For example, Tomas Hägg claims that Photios is interested primarily in historicizing Lives: "Photios as a Reader of Hagiography: Selection and Criticism," *DOP* 53 (1999) 43–58. However, Hägg does not include in his discussion several of Photios' reviews of hagiographic texts, such as the above-mentioned epics on the *Martyrdom of St. Cyprian*, the *Acts of the Apostles* by Leukios Charinos, *Homilies* by Clement of Rome, and the *Spiritual Meadow* by John Moschos; these counterbalance his interest in *vitae* of purely historical character.

Figures) written by the grammarian Georgios Choïroboskos.³² In the chapter on the trope called *periphrasis*, he explains how it differs from other kinds of paraphrase, including metaphrasis (812.23–813.2):³³

μετάφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν ἢ πλείονων ἢ ἐλαττόνων μετὰ ῥητορικοῦ κάλλους γινομένη, ὡς ὁ Μεταφραστὴς ἡμῖν δείκνυσιν ἐν ταῖς μεταφράσεσι.

Metaphrasis is the alteration in diction in terms of quantity (using either more or fewer words) along with rhetorical beauty, as Metaphrastes shows us in his *Metaphraseis*.

In Byzantine rhetorical theory, this is the *only* known definition of metaphrasis that connects rhetorical elaboration to hagiography. However, although this passage is almost a standard reference for metaphrasis in scholarly works, its date, authorship, and authenticity are quite problematic and have not yet been addressed adequately.

The posthumous fortune of Georgios Choïroboskos has been enviable. Like no other Byzantine author, he has gathered a star team of scholars including Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Roman Jakobson, Martin West, and Cyril Mango. Most of this attention was paid not exactly because of interest in Choïroboskos himself, but in order to use his works for establishing the dates of more prominent texts.³⁴

³² Efthymiadis, *RSHN* N.S. 28 (1991) 29; Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes* 58, calls it the “only inclusion of μετάφρασις in a detailed discussion of rhetorical methods.” See also Høgel, in *Ashgate Research Companion* 182, and Paschalides, in *Ἐν Ἀγίοις* 77.

³³ Here and below the text of the long version of the treatise is quoted from Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* VIII 799–820.

³⁴ A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus examined the dates of Choïroboskos in the framework of his study of the history of Greek etymological dictionaries: “Из истории греческих этимологиков,” *Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения* 319.2 (1898) 115–133; Roman Jakobson inspired a dissertation on the influence of the Slavonic translation of Περὶ τρόπων on the poetics of the Russian epic *Igor’s Tale*: J. Besharov, *Imagery of the Igor’ Tale in the Light of Byzantino-Slavic Poetic Theory* (Leiden 1956), with English transla-

Georgios Choïroboskos is known from a variety of sources as deacon and *chartophylax* (secretary) of the Patriarch of Constantinople.³⁵ His further epithet ‘grammarian’ reflects his literary activity, while the honorific title οἰκουμενικὸς διδάσκαλος attributed to him indicates that he served as a teacher of Scripture in the Patriarchal School at Hagia Sophia.³⁶ His works include commentaries on the grammatical works of Theodosios of Alexandria (4th–5th cent.), Apollonios Dyskolos (2nd cent.), Herodian, and Dionysios Thrax. He also wrote a treatise on orthography³⁷ and *Epimerisms* on the Psalms.

Until recently, the dates of Georgios Choïroboskos were very uncertain. Karl Krumbacher placed him in the sixth century, while Papadopoulos-Kerameus believed him to be contemporary with Symeon Metaphrastes.³⁸ On the basis of the work

tion of Choïroboskos’ Περὶ τρόπων by A. Parry. Martin West discussed the treatise in his edition of Tryphon’s composition on rhetorical figures: “Tryphon *De Tropis*,” *CQ* 15 (1965) 230–248. Cyril Mango used Choïroboskos’ dates to establish the date of the renovation of St. Sophia in Constantinople in 994: “The Collapse of St. Sophia, Psellus and the *Etymologicum Genuinum*,” in J. Duffy and J. Peradotto (eds.), *Gonimos. Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies presented to Leendert G. Westerink* (Buffalo 1988) 167–174.

³⁵ See “Georgios Choïroboskos (2200),” *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* I.II (2000) 7–8, with further bibliography; E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007) 80–81. For his position as *chartophylax* see P. Speck, *Die kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel* (Munich 1974) 65. The χαρτοφύλαξ was one of the most important officials in the Patriarchate of Constantinople; originally head of the archival and notary services, by the tenth century the *chartophylax* was a principal assistant and representative of the Patriarch: R. J. Macrides, *ODB* I 415–416; J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les offikia de l’église byzantine* (Paris 1970) 334–353 and 508–525.

³⁶ On the title see Speck, *Die kaiserliche Universität* 74–91, and Darrouzès, *Recherches* 68–72; also P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971) 85–107.

³⁷ Discussed in detail in K. Alpers, “Die griechischen Orthographien aus Spätantike und byzantinischer Zeit,” *BZ* 97 (2004) 31–36, and S. Valente, “Choeroboscus’ *Prolegomena* to *Orthography*: The Evidence of *Psalm-Epimerisms* and Ps.-Theodosius,” *GRBS* 50 (2010) 639–650.

³⁸ K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich 1891) 583–585; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Журнал Министерства Народного*

of Papadopulos-Kerameus and Christos Theodoridis, Mango proved that the end of iconoclasm must be taken as *terminus post quem*, for Choiroboskos cites John of Damascus as well as the hymnographer Clement, both iconodules. The reference to Clement is especially important, because he most likely lived during the second period of Iconoclasm (815–843) and died in exile. Since it is unlikely that an iconoclast Constantinopolitan teacher would use the works of publicly condemned iconophiles in his handbooks, Choiroboskos' *floruit* should be placed after 843.³⁹

The *terminus ante quem* is more difficult to establish. According to Mango, one of the two manuscripts of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, which has multiple glosses from Choiroboskos' works, can be assigned a precise date, as its colophon records that the book was completed on the day of the renovation of the Hagia Sophia in 994 after damage from a severe earthquake.⁴⁰ Lemerle and, subsequently, Mango, have also observed that the letters of the Anonymous Professor (between 925 and 944) contain a reference to Choiroboskos' *Epimerismi*.⁴¹

We may, however, suggest here an even earlier *terminus ante quem* based on the manuscript tradition of *Περὶ τρόπων*. The earliest manuscripts of the treatise, *Coisl.gr.* 120, *Vat.gr.* 423, and *Patm.gr.* 109, are securely dated to the beginning of the tenth

Πросвещения 319.2 (1898) 119–125.

³⁹ C. Theodoridis, "Der Hymnograph Klemens *terminus post quem* für Choiroboskos," *BZ* 73 (1980) 341–345; Mango, in *Gonimos* 171–174. Silvia Ronchey places Choiroboskos in the period of the second Iconoclasm: "Those 'whose writings were exchanged': John of Damascus, George Choeroboscus and John 'Arklas' according to the Prooimion of Eustathius's Exegesis in Canonem Iambicum de Pentecoste," in C. Sode and S. Takacs (eds.), *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck* (Aldershot 2001) 327–336, at 331–332.

⁴⁰ Mango, in *Gonimos* 171 and 173 ff.

⁴¹ *Ep.* 110.17–18, ed. A. Markopoulos, *Anonymi Professoris Epistulae* (Berlin/New York 2000); Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme* 252; Mango, in *Gonimos* 174.

century on paleographical grounds.⁴² All three codices contain the same collection of theological excerpts, with the *Erotapokriseis* of Anastasios Sinaites occupying the largest part, accompanied by data of an encyclopedic character. Chronological lists found in this collection facilitate further dating. The inventory of the Patriarchs of Constantinople reproduced in *Coisl.gr.* 120 (224^v–227^v) ends with the words Νικόλαος πάλιν (227^v), “Nikolaos again,” thus the second tenure of Nikolaos Mystikos (912–925), which allows us to date the manuscript soon after the year 912.⁴³

Preserved in the same collection, a catalogue of Byzantine emperors may further confirm this date. The full list survives only in *Laur.gr.* IV 6 (11th cent.), *Ottob.gr.* 414 (1005), and *Athon. Lauras* Γ 115 (13th cent.), but it is very likely that *Coisl.gr.* 120 originally had the same text: on its fol. 229^v we find the beginning of the catalogue. The next folium is lost, and the amount of text that could be written on the missing pages equals the amount needed to complete the catalogue.⁴⁴ *Ottob.gr.* 414 closes the table with the beginning of the first reign of Constantine VII (913–920), whereas two other manuscripts break off at the name of Alexander (11 May 912–6 June 913).⁴⁵

All this evidence, taken together, allows us to place Choïroboskos’ *floruit* between 843 and 913, and perhaps closer to the earlier date, as his *Περὶ τρόπων* would have needed some time before it was copied to several manuscripts during the first decades of the tenth century.

Since Choïroboskos lived much earlier than Symeon Metaphrastes, he could not have mentioned him in his rhetorical

⁴² N. F. Kavrus, “Греческие списки протографа ‘Изборника Святослава 1073 г’. конца IX–первой половины X века (палеографический анализ),” *Византийский Временник* 51 (1991) 103–105.

⁴³ M. V. Bibikov, *Византийский прототип древнейшей славянской книги: изборник Святослава 1073 г* (Moscow 1996) 318.

⁴⁴ Bibikov, *Византийский прототип* 260.

⁴⁵ H. G. Lunt, “On the *Izbornik* of 1073,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983) 359–376, at 373, and Bibikov, *Византийский прототип* 260–265.

treatise.⁴⁶ However, for the purpose of this study it is not enough to establish that the name of Metaphrastes alone is an interpolation to the text of Choiroboskos. We must also consider the possibility that the entire passage on *μετάφρασις* is a later addition. Høgel suggests that the definition of *metaphrasis* “depends on the meaning this term acquired after Symeon Metaphrastes” and was interpolated as a whole, but he leaves the question open.⁴⁷

The issue becomes more complicated because there are two versions of Choiroboskos’ treatise. The short version, found in the tenth-century manuscripts of *Περὶ τρόπων*, is less than half the length of the longer one, which alone contains the definition of *metaphrasis*. And the two redactions differ not only in length. The total of twenty-seven sections of the concise version have a coherent structure, which includes a definition of the rhetorical figure and several examples from Homer or the Bible.⁴⁸ The longer version both adds new sections and expands most of the earlier entries, also adding further examples.

In 1835, Christian Walz published the longer version from three fifteenth-century manuscripts, assuming it to be the original text of Choiroboskos. Until now, scholars have silently accepted this. But the relationship between the two redactions cannot be securely identified without critical editions of both, which has not yet been done. At the same time, the manuscript tradition and internal textual evidence may help us partly re-

⁴⁶ Here we do not consider the somewhat idiosyncratic idea that *μεταφραστής* refers to Dionysios Thrax: Krumbacher, *Geschichte* 584; endorsed by T. Conley, “Byzantine Teaching on Figures and Tropes: An Introduction,” *Rhetorica* 4 (1986) 335–374, at 341 n.14.

⁴⁷ Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes* 59.

⁴⁸ According to the calculations of Elena Granstrem, nine quotations come from the Bible and thirty-three from Homer: E. E. Granstrem and L. S. Kovtun, “Поэтические термины в Изборнике 1073 г. и развитие их в русской традиции (анализ трактата Георгия Хировоска),” in В. А. Ribakov (ed.), *Изборник Святослава 1073 г.* (Moscow 1977) 99–108, at 100–101.

solve the issue—as I propose to do here.

The numbers of manuscripts containing the short and the long redactions of the treatise are disproportionate. A preliminary study of the catalogue descriptions for thirty-eight manuscripts dating from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries as well as examination of some of the manuscripts, either *de visu* or from their online reproductions or from microfilms (when available) shows that all seventeen manuscripts dating from the tenth to the thirteenth century contain the short version.⁴⁹ As was discussed above, the three earliest manuscripts (*Coisl.gr.* 120, *Patm.gr.* 109, *Vat.gr.* 423) have the short version, as part of the Pseudo-Anastasian *Florilegium*.⁵⁰ The only eleventh-century manuscript, *Voss.gr.* Q 76, is a grammatical compendium from Southern Italy.⁵¹ This manuscript is considered to be an exact

⁴⁹ In total there exist 85 manuscripts; this list was compiled from the online database *Pinakes* (<http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr>), which however was checked against the information provided by catalogues of manuscript collections. My study covered all copies of Choïroboskos' treatise from the tenth to the fourteenth century, and included some fifteenth-century manuscripts as well.

⁵⁰ The Pseudo-Anastasian *Florilegium* is an edifying anthology compiled between 681 and 730; each chapter has a question-and-answer structure. In the medieval tradition it was attributed to Anastasios Sinaites. Along with sayings of church fathers, it contains encyclopedic entries, such as lists of emperors and names of the months. The inclusion of Choïroboskos' treatise follows the logic of an encyclopedic collection. See M. Richard and J. A. Munitiz, *Anastasii Sinaitae Quaestiones et responsiones* (Turnhout 2006); and D. Sieswerda, *Pseudo-Anastasius en Anastasius Sinaita: Een vergelijking. De Pseudo-Anastasiaanse "Quaestiones et responsiones" in de Soterios. Prolegomena, tekst en commentaar* (diss. Amsterdam 2004; downloaded from UvA-DARE, the institutional repository of the University of Amsterdam, <http://hdl.handle.net/11245/2.26950>). Cf. C. Macé, "Les *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem* d'un Pseudo-Athanase (CPG 2257). Un état de la question," in M.-P. Bussières (ed.), *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'antiquité profane et chrétienne* (Turnhout 2013) 121–150.

⁵¹ For a study of this MS. in its context see F. Ronconi, "Quelle grammaire à Byzance?" in G. De Gregorio e M. Galante (eds.), *La produzione scritta tecnica e scientifica nel Medioevo: libro e documenti tra scuole e professioni* (Spoleto 2012) 63–110, at 101–103.

copy of *Monac.gr.* 310 (10th cent.), which is now very poorly preserved and lacks many pages. Among these lost texts there could have been also Choïroboskos' treatise, and thus we may suppose that *Monac.gr.* 310 was a fourth copy of the short redaction dating to the early tenth century. The existence of a fifth, now lost, is almost certainly proved by Michail Bibikov, who studied the history of the Greek prototype of the Bulgarian translation of the Pseudo-Anastasian *florilegium*, also known in Slavonic cultures as *Izbornik*. The translation was produced in the second or third decade of the tenth century for the Bulgarian king Symeon. Bibikov proved that none of the existing manuscripts could be a prototype for the *Izbornik*, and thus a fifth early tenth-century manuscript with the short redaction must have existed, the one on which the Old Slavonic was based.

Most of the thirteenth-century manuscripts belong either to the tradition of *florilegia* or to that of grammatical compilations. In the books of this period, Choïroboskos' treatise begins to be added at the end of the more 'learned' collections that include texts of Euripides, Sophocles, and Homer (*Monac.gr.* 560, *Napol.* II D 4).

The earliest manuscript with the fuller version of the text, *Vindob.phil.gr.* 305, was written in 1280.⁵² This is a miscellany of school texts, such as John Tzetzes' *Allegories on the Iliad*, Hephæstion's tract on meter, and Herodian's notes on accentuation. Περὶ τρόπων is added to the very end of the codex, which may be a sign that it was not originally a part of this collection.

Two other codices with the longer redaction belong to the same intellectual milieu.⁵³ *Palat.gr.* 40 is a compilation of poetry, including Homer, Euripides, Pindar, Lycophron, Aratos, and Tzetzes. Choïroboskos' work is again attached to

⁵² H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Vienna 1961) 399–400.

⁵³ Both manuscripts are available online at the website of the Library of the University of Heidelberg (<http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>).

the end of the book. *Palat.gr.* 356 is a collection of letters, poetry, and excerpts from theological and grammatical books. Choïroboskos' treatise comes between the *Grammar* of Dionysius Thrax and Hephæstion's tract on meter.

The remaining copies of the longer version are found in books of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, with a late Renaissance selection of texts. A good example is *Paris.gr.* 2929 (16th cent.), used in the edition of Walz. It is obvious that the scribe of this manuscript gathered in one volume all the treatises on poetic figures that were accessible to him at the time.

The history of the manuscript transmission alone (without actual collation of the texts) is, of course, risky ground for conclusions. Moreover, we can only speculate about how many copies are lost. But a total of eighty-five surviving manuscripts including the three copies that date very close to the author's lifetime, is a significant amount that can allow probably reliable conclusions. As the table below shows, the distribution of the manuscripts of *Περὶ τρόπων* across the centuries is normal in comparison to other school texts; this too puts our observations on a safer ground.⁵⁴

Given that the majority of manuscripts with *Περὶ τρόπων* contain also the Pseudo-Anastasian *florilegium* or its fragments, we may suppose that the wide circulation of the short redaction Choïroboskos' treatise is due to the popularity of the *florilegium*.⁵⁵ As Ronconi has demonstrated, the random incorpo-

⁵⁴ F. Ronconi was first to propose a quantitative method in the study of the transmission of grammatical manuscripts: in *La produzione scritta* 65–72, with discussion of the reliability of this method. Columns 2 and 3 of our table reproduce the data provided in his article. Since Ronconi excluded MSS. dated after the sixteenth century, I too do not take into consideration seven such copies of Choïroboskos' *Περὶ τρόπων*, in order to make the results of my calculations comparable with Ronconi's.

⁵⁵ A quick search in *Pinakes* showed that this popularity was unmatched by the most ancient composition of the same kind, Tryphon's *De figuris*, which survives in only 33 MSS., the earliest dating to the fourteenth century. More research is needed to verify this information.

Century	% of the MSS. from X through XVI cent.				
	Περὶ τρόπων		Other works of Choiroboskos		Works of other grammarians
X	3.84	5.12	2.3	5.75	
X-XI	0		1.15		
XI	1.28		1.15		
XII	0		1.15		
XIII	15.38	75.61	8	67.9	61.84
XIII-XIV	1.28		1.15		
XIV	17.94		12.6		
XIV-XV	3.84		3.5		
XV	30.76		35.65		
XV-XVI	6.41		7		
XVI	19.23		26.45		31.5

Manuscripts of Περὶ τρόπων: chronological distribution

ration of grammatical works in books of miscellaneous content is typical for Constantinople, the city of Choiroboskos, while grammatical compendia started being produced from the tenth century onwards in Southern Italy (such manuscripts are, e.g., *Monac.gr.* 310 and *Voss.gr.* Q 76, both of Italian origin).⁵⁶ Both the form of the *florilegium* and that of grammar books, containing the short version, provide a logical framework for the circulation of Choiroboskos' treatise.

On the whole, these observations on the transmission of the two redactions of Choiroboskos' treatise speak in favor of the priority of the short version, since it was copied closer to the author's lifetime, and was more popular. Apparently, this must have been the original text. But by no means can this conclusion be definitive without further textual analysis and comparison of the two redactions.

We must preface such analysis with a note on the tradition to which Choiroboskos' treatise belongs. From late antiquity on, several treatises were written about poetical figures. While

⁵⁶ Ronconi, in *La produzione scritta* 72–110.

these texts were highly valued and were copied in many manuscripts, their transmission displays high variability even within the same text. Treatises were not simply copied, but glossed, rearranged, contaminated, and plagiarized. As a result, establishing their authorship, date, and relation to each other is problematic, not least because most of them do not have a critical edition. Choïroboskos' work itself derives from two late antique compositions on tropes, called *Tryphon I* and *Tryphon II*.⁵⁷

What is the relationship between the two redactions of Choïroboskos? We can note that the contents of the short version do not give the impression of being abbreviated. The structure is consistent from one entry to another: each starts with a brief definition of the term, followed by several examples from the Bible or Homer. Any section can perfectly well illustrate this pattern, so let us quote the shortest one:

ἡ ἀντίφρασις δέ ἐστι λέξις διὰ ἐναντίου τὸ ἐναντίον σημαίουσα ὡς ὅταν τις τυφλὸν πολυβλέποντα εἴποι.

Antiphrasis is an expression indicating a thing by its opposite, as when one calls a blind man “keen-eyed.”

Underlined in the Greek are those phrases that are repeated from one entry to another with little variation.⁵⁸ Most of the examples that follow these definitions come from Homer, the

⁵⁷ On these and other texts of the tradition see Conley, *Rhetorica* 4 (1986) 335–374, and West, *CQ* 15 (1965) 230–248. Tryphon I is attributed to Tryphon of Alexandria, grammarian and contemporary of Didymus. Tryphon II has uncertain origins: Walz ascribed it to Gregory of Corinth (12th cent.) and West argued that it is a redaction of Tryphon I, though the two texts differ significantly. West has suggested that Choïroboskos depends on the tradition of Tryphon II. Conley admits many parallels between all three texts, but objects to West's conclusion because “relations among these three texts are complicated.” However, none has considered a possibility that the short version of the treatise may be a separate and original work. I will argue that this suggestion helps untangle the issue.

⁵⁸ The phrase (rhetorical figure) δέ ἐστι noun + modifying participle occurs in 22 out of 27 entries. Examples are introduced with ὡς/οἷον followed by ὅταν εἴποι (λέγοι, εἴπωμεν, ὀνομάζοι).

Bible, and, occasionally, colloquial expressions (as above). Overall, the text of the treatise appears to be accurate and complete—qualities rarely found in an epitome. Moreover, while Choïroboskos belongs to the same tradition as Tryphon I and II, being perhaps more closely related to the first, he makes his own choices in the arrangement of material and examples. With rare exceptions, he never borrows from any text verbatim.⁵⁹

The structure of the long version is much less consistent and has multiple misalignments. Seventeen entries have the same text as the short redaction, with some minor textual alterations. Ten entries are longer than those of the brief redaction. And, at its end, the longer treatise includes six rhetorical figures, which are not counted in the number of twenty-seven tropes stated at the beginning of both redactions (ποιητικοὶ τρόποι εἰσὶν κζ'). These six are obviously a later addition.

The character of the extensions suggests that the original version was amplified by compiling passages from various examples of the same tradition of grammar treatises. In some cases, the entries became longer, because they added a second definition (e.g. the section on μετωνυμία). In this case the scribe simply copied the second entry without incorporating it into the text. This type of compilation happens in the entries on μετωνυμία, μετάληψις, συνεκδοχή, ὀνομασμοποιία, σύλληψις, and ὑπερβολή:

Trope	Text (short redaction in italics)	Source of addition
Συνεκδοχή	<i>συνεκδοχή ἐστὶ λέξις δι' ἑτέρου καὶ ἕτερον συνεκδηλοῦσα νόημα, ὡς ὅταν εἰρήνης οὐσης ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔστι πόλεμος εἶπη, οὐκ ἔνι ὅπλα νῦν, ἢ ἀργούσιν ὅπλα νῦν. ἢ συνεκδοχή ἐστὶ λέξις ἢ φράσις οὐ κατὰ τὸ πλήρες ἐκφερομένη,</i>	Tryphon II (West 7).

⁵⁹ One such exception is the definition of ὑπερβολή, which coincides with the one in Tryphon I.

	προσδεομένη δέ τινος ἔξωθεν δια- νοίας, ἔχει δὲ διαφορὰς τέσσαρας ... (examples omitted)	
Ὄνοματο- ποιία	<i>ὀνοματοποιία ἐστὶ λέξις κατὰ μίμησιν καὶ ὁμοιότητά τινα τοῦ σημαινομένου γεγονυία, ὡς ὅταν τις τοὺς ἀσήμους κτύπους φωνᾶς ὀνομάζη ... ἡ ὀνοματοποιία ἐστὶ λέξις ἢ μέρος λόγου πεποιημένον κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἀποτελουμένων ἤχων ἢ φωνῆς (examples omitted)</i>	Tryphon II (West 8).
Μετωνυμία	<i>μετωνυμία ἐστίν, ὅταν ἐκ τῶν περιεχόντων τὰ περιεχόμενα μετονομάσωμεν κατὰ τὴν θεϊαν γραφὴν, ἢ φησι ... ἡ μετωνυμία ἐστὶ λέξις διὰ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας τὸ συνώνυμον δηλοῦσα, οἶον (examples omitted)</i>	Definition as in Try- phon I and Anon. II (Walz VIII 716.13-14), examples the same as in Tryphon II (West 9) and Tryphon I. In <i>Palat.gr.</i> 356 and <i>Vindob. gr.</i> 305 this text is not included in the entry but added at the end of the treatise.
Ὑπερβολή	<i>ὑπερβολή ἐστὶ φράσις ὑπερβαί- νουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐξήσεως χάριν, ὡς ὅταν τις τὸν γοργῶς τρέχοντα εἴπῃ, ὅτι τρέχει, ὡς ὁ ἄνεμος· ἡ ὑπερβολή ἐστὶ λόγος ὑπεραίρων τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐμ- φάσεως ἢ ὁμοιώσεως ἔνεκα. ἐμφάσεως, οἶον ...</i>	Tryphon II (West 14) and Anon. II (Walz 721.11-21).
Μετάληψις	<i>μετάληψις ἐστὶ φράσις μεταλαμ- βάνουσα τῆς ὁμωνυμίας ἐκ τοῦ κυρίως ὄντος ἢ διὰ τῆς συνωνυ- μίας τὸ ὁμώνυμον δηλοῦσα, ὡς ὅταν τις τὸν γοργῶς τρέχοντα ὄξυν παρὰ τὸν δρόμον εἴπῃ, ἢ τὸν ταχυ- παθῆ χυμὸν ὄξυν καλέσῃ χυμὸν· ὄξυν γὰρ κυρίως τὸ ἠκονημένον ξίφος λέγεται, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ὄξυνεν ἐπὶ μαχαίρας ἢ ἐτέρου τινὸς ξί- φους παραλαμβάνεται. ἢ ὡς παρὰ</i>	Interpolations from Tryphon I (Walz 738.8- 16).

	τῷ Ὀμήρῳ ...	
Σύλληψις	σύλληψις ἐστὶ φράσις ἀφ' ἑνὸς τινος κυρίου κατὰ δύο ἢ καὶ πλειόνων λαμβανομένη· ἢ φράσις τὸ ἄλλῳ πραχθὲν ἐφ' ἕτερον ἔλκουσα, οἷον Βορέης καὶ Ζέφυρος ...	Cf. Tryphon I, though in this case the citation is not literal.

A repeated feature of such extensions is that they find literal parallels in two other treatises *περὶ τρόπων*, those of Tryphon I and Tryphon II. The compiler mechanically attached entire passages from the sources he had at hand. Such an approach differs from the shorter version, which we may term *Choiroboskos I*, where direct quotations from other treatises are avoided.

The patterns of compilation in four other sections (on *μεταφορά*, *κατάχρησις*, *ἀλληγορία*, and *αἴνιγμα*) are less straightforward. The definitions of these tropes resemble each other in *Choiroboskos I*, Tryphon I, and Tryphon II. As is made clear above, the editor of the longer version had the texts of Tryphon I and II at hand. When he realized that the definitions in the three texts differed only in depth of detail, he did not simply copy passages from Tryphon I and II and insert them after the text of the short redaction, but revised and combined them into one coherent unit with the addition of his own comments. A closer textual comparison of the three treatises is still to be made, especially given the uncertain attribution of Tryphon II. However, I offer one brief example demonstrating how these texts are related:

Short Redaction (Besharov)	Long Redaction (Walz)	Tryphon II (West)
μεταφορά δὲ ἐστὶν λόγος ἀφ' ἑτέρου εἰς ἕτερον μεταφερόμενος, καὶ ἔχει εἶδη δ'. (α') ἢ γὰρ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων εἰς ἔμψυχα μετὰγεται, (β') ἢ ἀπὸ ἀψύχων ἐπὶ ἄψυχα,	μεταφορά ἐστὶ λέξις ἀφ' ἑτέρου εἰς ἕτερον μεταφερομένη, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίως λεγομένου μεταφερομένη ὁμοιώσεως ἢ ἐμφάσεως ἔνεκα, ἔχει δὲ εἶδη δ'. ἢ γὰρ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων εἰς ἔμψυχα μετὰγεται, ἢ ἀπὸ ἀψύχων	μεταφορά ἐστὶ λόγου μέρος μεταφερόμενον <ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἐφ' ἕτερον> ἢ τοι ἐμφάσεως ἢ ὁμοιώσεως ἔνεκα. τῶν δὲ μεταφορῶν εἶδη ἐστὶ πέντε. αἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν

<p>(γ') ἢ ἀπὸ ἀψύχων εἰς ἔμψυχα, (δ') ἢ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων εἰς ἄψυχα.</p> <p>Cf. Tryphon I (Walz VIII 729.10 -730.6).</p>	<p><i>ἐπὶ ἄψυχα, ἢ ἀπὸ ἀψύχων εἰς ἔμψυχα, ἢ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων εἰς ἄψυχα.</i></p> <p>... ἔστι δὲ καὶ πέμπτον εἶδος μεταφορᾶς ὡς ἀπὸ πράξεως εἰς πράξιν, οἷον ἤδη πού τινα κείνος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μῆτιν ὑφαίνει. τὸ γὰρ ὑφαίνειν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑφασμάτων λεγόμενον νῦν ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς βουλῆς κατασκευὴν μετενήνεκται.</p>	<p>εἰσιν ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων ἐπὶ ἄψυχα, αἱ δὲ τοῦναντίον ἀπὸ ἀψύχων ἐπὶ ἔμψυχα, αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ ἐμψύχων ἐπὶ ἔμψυχα, αἱ δὲ ἐπὶ ἀψύχων ἐπὶ ἄψυχα, αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ πράξεως ἐπὶ πράξιν.</p> <p>ἀπὸ δὲ πράξεως ἐπὶ πράξιν, οἷον εἰ δὴ πού τινα κείνος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μῆτιν ὑφήνας. τὸ γὰρ ὑφαίνειν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑφασμάτων τάσσεται κυρίως, νῦν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τῆς βουλῆς εἴληπται.</p>
--	--	--

This table shows the ‘dappled’ structure of the entry on metaphor in the longer redaction. The relevant section of the short redaction of Choiroboskos’ treatise was complemented with rather disorderly additions, probably coming from Tryphon II. Both Tryphon I and Choiroboskos I divide metaphor into four categories, while Tryphon II recognizes five. The longer redaction of Choiroboskos follows Tryphon I in the beginning of the section and adds the fifth category at the end.

Finally, in only one entry, *periphrasis*, material has been added that does not correspond to any other text of the tradition. We reproduce here the text of the long redaction; italics indicate the verbal coincidence with the short version:

περίφρασις ἐστὶ περισσὴ φράσις διὰ πλειόνων λέξεων ἔν τι σημαίνουσα, ὡς ὅταν ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν μὰ τὸν θεὸν εἴπη τις μὰ τὴν φοβερὰν ἡμέραν τοῦ θεοῦ. οὐδὲ γὰρ πλέον τι ἐσήμαινε διὰ τῶν πολλῶν τούτων λέξεων εἰ μὴ τὸν θεόν.

διαφέρει δὲ φράσις, περίφρασις, μετάφρασις, ἔκφρασις, ἀντίφρασις καὶ σύμφρασις. φράσις μὲν γὰρ ἢ ἀπλῶς λέξις λέγεται, περίφρασις δὲ ἢ περισσὴ φράσις, ὡς τὸ κάλεσόν μοι τὴν βίην τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν Ἡρακλῆν, μετάφρασις δὲ ἢ ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν ἢ πλειόνων ἢ ἐλαττόνων μετὰ

ρήτορικοῦ⁶⁰ κάλλους γινομένη, ὡς ὁ Μεταφραστής ἡμῖν δείκνυσιν ἐν ταῖς Μεταφράσεσι.⁶¹ παράφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς τὸ μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, παραφράζων εἶπε, τὴν ὀργὴν εἶπε ὦ Μοῦσα. ἔκφρασις δὲ ἡ λεπτομερὴς διήγησις, ἡ ἐνεργῶς καὶ σχεδὸν εἰς ὅσιν φέρουσα ἡμῖν τὸ διηγούμενον, ὅπως ἔχει θέσεως καὶ κάλλους, ὡς ἡ ἔκφρασις τοῦ ἱεροῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἢ πόλεων ἐτέρων τινῶν. ἀντίφρασις δὲ ἡ δι' ἐναντίων λέξεων τὸ ἐναντίον σημαίνουσα, ὡς ἀργυροῦς Αἰθίοψ. σύμφρασις δὲ ἡ συνακολούθησις τοῦ λόγου ἢ λέξεων σύνθεσις, ὡς νωβελήσιμος ὑπέρτατος.

Periphrasis is excessive expression through several words indicating a single concept, as, for example, whenever one says “By God’s doomsday” instead of saying “By God.” For in these many words he did not indicate anything more than “By God.”

There is a distinction between *phrasis*, *periphrasis*, *metaphrasis*, *ekphrasis*, *antiphrasis*, and *symphrasis*.

- Plain diction is called *phrasis* [expression];
- *periphrasis* is excessive expression, such as “Summon for me the force of Heracles” [*Il.* 11.690, etc.] instead of “Heracles”;
- *metaphrasis* is the alteration in diction in terms of quantity (using either more or fewer words) along with rhetorical beauty, as Metaphrastes shows us in his *Metaphraseis*;
- *paraphrasis* is alteration in diction but using the same number of words, such as in paraphrasing “Goddess, sing me the anger” someone said “Muse, tell me the rage”;
- *ekphrasis* [description] is a detailed narrative vividly⁶² bringing the object almost in front of our eyes, how it is with respect to its appearance and beauty, such as the *ekphrasis* of the temple of Alexandria or of other cities;
- *antiphrasis* indicates a contrast expressed with contrasting words, such as “Silver Ethiopian”;

⁶⁰ *Paris.gr.* 2929 f. 50^v (my edition): μετ’ ἀρκτικοῦ (perhaps to be corrected to ῥητορικοῦ or ἀπτικοῦ).

⁶¹ *Paris.gr.* 2929 f. 50^v: τούτων γὰρ βίοι καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια πρὸς τὸ ἰδιωτικώτερον ἐξ ἀρχῆς συγγραφέντα, παρ’ ὧν δῆτα καὶ συνεγράφησαν, ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἐντεχνόν τε καὶ πάνυ ὠραῖον μετεφράσθησαν.

⁶² Reading ἐνεργῶς as equivalent to the more common ἐναργῶς.

- *symphrasis* is compound speech or the joining of words, such as “*nobellissimos hypertatos*.”

After the first paragraph, which is identical in both redactions, the long version makes distinctions between various periphrastic figures. The passage starts with the formula διαφέρει δέ,⁶³ followed by a brief definition of each figure with one example. Such coherence reveals that the second part of the entry was written by one person.

The same formula and pattern, διαφέρει δέ followed by a brief definition and one example for each case, is found also in the entries on κατάχρησις and αἴνιγμα, where it can be traced back to Tryphon I. Concerning the passage on periphrastic figures, specific examples come from texts of the rhetorical tradition: βίην τοῦ Ἡρακλέους appears also in Tryphon I and II, the ἔκφρασις τοῦ ἱεροῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας is in Aphthonios’ *Progymnasmata* (38.3), the ἀργυροῦς Αἰθίοψ in the twelfth-century *Commentary on Aristotle’s Rhetoric* (Rabe, *CAG XXI.2* 211.15). However, the combination of all these elements in the entry on *paraphrasis* is unique.

To conclude, the longer version of Περὶ τρόπων is a compilation of the original text with several other texts of the same tradition. It is too early to state that it was the short redaction that was written by Choiroboskos himself. Additions made to the text of the longer version reveal consistency and implicit logic, which may indicate that the longer text is the product of one person.

Thanks to a fortunate coincidence, it is possible to date the passage on periphrastic figures as well as the long redaction, if indeed these two belong to the same author. The unusual example illustrating the notion of *symphrasis*, νωβελήσιμος ὑπέρτατος, is a Byzantine honorific title. The title *nobellissimus* had been used in the Roman court since the time of Diocletian. But it was during the reign of Manuel II Komnenos (1143–

⁶³ Such a formula is frequent in grammatical treatises, cf. *passim* in the treatises of Alexander and Aelius Herodian *De figuris*.

1180) that composites with -ὑπέρτατος were in use among the Byzantine elite. The title πρωτονοβελισσιμοῦπέρτατος is attested from 1156 to 1206, at the same time as πανσεβαστοῦπέρτατος and πρωτοπανεντιμοῦπέρτατος. After the collapse of the Byzantine Empire in 1204 these titles disappear.⁶⁴

Since the title νοβελισσιμοῦπέρτατος is nowhere attested in Greek, we can further speculate that the text of Choïroboskos' treatise was damaged. In tachygraphic script, the prefix πρωτο- was conventionally abbreviated with the letter α. It is possible that initial α could have been lost in the further reception of the text: πρωτονοβελισσιμοῦπέρτατος → ανοβελισσιμοῦπέρτατος → νοβελισσιμοῦπέρτατος.

However this might be, the evidence examined above allows us to assert that the longer redaction was most likely *not* the work of Georgios Choïroboskos. Structurally this text is a compilation of the earlier version and two other treatises on rhetorical figures and may be the product of grammatical thought in the vibrant educational contexts of the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, certainly before 1280, the date of *Vindob. phil.gr.* 305. The definition of metaphrasis specifically can be securely dated in the second half of the twelfth century, about two hundred years after the completion of Symeon Metaphrastes' project, which it uses as its primary model.

Metaphrasis vs Metaphrastes

As I have tried to demonstrate, there is no trace of the connection between metaphrasis and hagiography in *theoretical* thought before the edition of Symeon Metaphrastes' Meno-

⁶⁴ W. Seibt, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich* (Vienna 1978) 296–297, with an example of the seal of πρωτονοβελισσιμου ἐξ ὑπερτάτου Γαβαλά Στεφάνου. See also W. Seibt and A.-K. Wassiliou, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich II* (Vienna 2004) 252, and S. N. Sakkos, *Ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν. Ἐριδες καὶ σύνοδοι κατὰ τὸν ΙΒ' αἰῶνα* (Thessalonike 1967) 154 and 30–34, for the use of the title at the Synod of 1166. I would like to thank Christos Stavrakos and Christos Malathras for their help with the identification of the title.

logion. Indeed, if we look at the evidence of book culture, it appears that, starting at least in the tenth century, the label metaphrasis emerges in the manuscript titles of hagiographical texts, and in the mid-eleventh century the Byzantines recognize metaphrasis as a separate type of book, analogous to other types such as the synaxarion or the panegyrikon.⁶⁵ The earliest (1059) and most famous example of such usage is in the testament of Eustathios Boilas, who mentions four volumes of Symeon's Menologion: μεταφράσεις βιβλία τέσσερα.⁶⁶ In the library lists, metaphrasis refers to a book as a physical object:

Michael Attaleiates Rule (1077): μετάφρασις βαμβυκίνη Σεπτέμβριος καὶ ὀκτώβριος

Patmos Inventory (1200): μετάφρα(σις) σωματώα Σεπτ(εμβ)ρ(ίου)

Eleousa Inventory (1449): βιβλίον βαμβακηρὸν πετζοσάνιδον, μετὰφρασις, πανηγυρικόν⁶⁷

The earliest attestation of hagiographical metaphraseis outside of the manuscript titles belongs to Ioannes Sikeliotēs, an intellectual and teacher of rhetoric ca. 1000, who cites μεταφράσεις τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων as an example of false rhetorical

⁶⁵ Several tenth-eleventh century manuscripts add the title metaphrasis to texts that do not belong to the collection of Symeon Logothetes, as in the already-mentioned case of *Lives* written by Ioannes of Sardeis. More examples are cited in Efthymiadis, *RSBN*.s. 28 (1991) 28–29.

⁶⁶ P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le 11^e siècle byzantin* (Paris 1977) 20–29, line 154.

⁶⁷ P. Gautier, “La diataxis de Michel Attaliatē,” *REB* 39 (1981) 5–143, at 93; C. Astruc, “L’inventaire dressé en septembre 1200 du Trésor et de la Bibliothèque de Patmos: Edition diplomatique,” *TravMém* 8 (1981) 15–30, line 182; L. Petit, “Le Monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine,” *Известия русского археологического института в Константинополе* 6 (1900–1901) 114–125, at 122.14–15. The list of examples could be expanded; for the use of the term in Byzantine *typica*: see the search results for μεταφρασις in the database L. Bender et al., *Artefacts and Raw Materials in Byzantine Archival Documents / Objets et matériaux dans les documents d'archives byzantins*: <http://www.unifr.ch/go/typika>; the Synaxarion of the monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis (mid-11th cent.) assigns readings from the metaphrastic menologion, see R. H. Jordan, *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis II* (Belfast 2000) 484 (I.27C, O-5), and *passim*.

force (δεινότης).⁶⁸ The activity of Symeon Logothetes evokes the rather acid response of his contemporary: Sikeliotēs states that the new redactions of Saints' Lives fail to achieve true rhetorical force even though they pretend to do so. The value of this testimony is difficult to overstate: it shows that the metaphrastic endeavor attracted enough attention to be discussed in the context of school education. Moreover, mentioning metaphrasis in a brief and unconcerned manner, Sikeliotēs must have been confident that his audience was familiar with the term.

Sikeliotēs' and Pseudo-Choiroboskos' passing notes remain the only theoretical remarks that connect metaphrasis to hagiography and Symeon Logothetes' project, but such an approach certainly does not dominate the concept of metaphrasis afterwards; more or less in the same period, Eustathios of Thessalonike still glosses metaphrasis as the "elucidative explanation of words" (διασαφητικὴ τῶν λέξεων ἐρμηνεία), which echoes the tradition of explanatory metaphraseis known in late antiquity;⁶⁹ and, similarly, the thirteenth-century *Lexicon* of Pseudo-Zonaras quotes Ioannes of Sardeis' definition.⁷⁰

Thus, while Byzantine book culture reflects rapid and sensitive reaction to the circulation of the Symeon Logothetes' Menologion, rhetorical theory seems to remain relatively blind to this important new genre/category, as it fails to produce any in-depth discussion of the matter. But this too is not exactly true. From the eleventh century onward, Byzantine intellectuals saw Symeon Logothetes as a model of style and theo-

⁶⁸ See S. Papaioannou, "Sicily, Constantinople, Miletos: The Life of a Eunuch and the History of Byzantine Humanism," in Th. Antonopoulou et al. (eds.), *Myriobiblos. Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture* (Boston/Berlin 2015) 261–284, at 280–281.

⁶⁹ See n.6 above.

⁷⁰ J. A. H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis* II (Amsterdam 1967) 1345.18–19. Paschalides, in *Ἐν Ἀγίοις* 77, mistakenly ascribes the definition to Pseudo-Zonaras himself and not Ioannes of Sardeis.

logical authority.⁷¹ It was the *author* and not the genre that attracted the attention of the literary milieu. While neither the texts of Symeon nor their reception in the manuscript culture allow us to suggest that Symeon actively promoted his authorial image, it was Byzantine rhetoricians who created the *Μεταφραστής*—a charismatic author, a saint, a theologian, and an icon of style—who personified rhetorical rewriting in hagiography. This ‘invention’ of Metaphrastes is the more impressive, inasmuch as the majority of the manuscripts that preserve his *Menologion* present it as an anonymous text.

In fact, the first mention of metaphrasis as a genre appears as late as the fifteenth century, in the manuscript *Harley* 5697, whose scribe has been identified as none other than Cardinal Bessarion.⁷² The book is a collection of Ioannes Chortasmenos’ (ca. 1370–1436/7) paraphrases and commentaries on the Her-mogenic corpus.⁷³ On fol. 115^r Bessarion drew a diagram representing various categories of panegyric speech. The same information, though not in the form of a diagram but simply given as a continuous text, is included also in MSS. *Vat.gr.* 1361 and *Riccard.* 58, which also contain Chortasmenos’ *Prolegomena* to rhetoric.⁷⁴ The classification thus may belong to Chortasmenos; the shape of the diagram could likely be the product of Bessarion’s thinking, though any secure attribution is impossible, given that such drawings are frequent in Byzantine manuscripts. The diagram in *Harley* 5697, however, is unusual.⁷⁵ One of its categories, τὸ διαλεκτικὸν πανηγυρικόν, includes τὸς μαρτυρικοὺς λόγους τῆς μεταφράσεως (my edition):

⁷¹ Papaioannou, in *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature* 38.

⁷² *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* I 41. On this MS. see Rabe, *Ioannis Sardi-
diani Commentarium* XV–XVI and *Prolegomenon Sylloge* (Leipzig 1931) LXIX.

⁷³ On his rhetorical works see H. Hunger, *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370–
ca. 1436/37). Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften* (Vienna 1969) 29–30.

⁷⁴ Rabe, *Prolegomena* lxx, with his edition of the text from *Vat.gr.* 1361.

⁷⁵ On f. 115^r: image at http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley_ms_5697_f112v.

καὶ τὸ πανηγυρικὸν αὐθις ὑποδιαιρεῖται

εἰς τὸ ὡς ἐν λογογραφίᾳ πανηγυρικόν, περιέχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ:	καὶ εἰς τὸ διαλεκτικόν πανηγυρικόν, ὃ περι- έχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ:	καὶ εἰς τὸ ὡς ἐν ποιητικῇ πανηγυρι- κόν, ὃ περι- έχει:	καὶ εἰς τὸ ὡς ἐν ῥητορικῇ τε καὶ μέλεσι πανηγυρι- κόν, ὃ περι- έχει ἐν ἑαυ- τῷ:
• τοὺς ἐγκωμιαστικούς τῶν λόγων·	• τοὺς ἀντιρρητικούς·	• τραγωδίαν·	• τροπάρια·
• τοὺς ἐπιταφίους·	• τοὺς μονοπροσώπως διαλεκτικούς·	• κωμωδίαν·	• κανόνας·
• τοὺς γενεθλιακούς·	• τοὺς κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν κομμοτι- κούς·	• μονωδοῦς.	• ἰδιόμελα·
• τοὺς προσφωνηματι- κούς·	• τοὺς κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον μέρος τῆς ἀντιφά- σεως ἀποδεικτικούς·		• ἀντίφωνα.
• τοὺς ἐπιστολιμαίους·	• <u>τοὺς μαρτυρικούς λό- γους τῆς μεταφρά- σεως.</u>		
• τὰς μονωδίας·			
• τὰς καλουμένας λα- λίας·			
• τοὺς ἐπικηδεῖους·			
• τοὺς στηλιτευτικούς·			
• τοὺς ἐξηγηματικούς·			
• τοὺς νόμους καὶ νομοθετικούς.			

Reforming the Aristotelian system, Hermogenes had subdivided all types of discourse into three categories: deliberative (συμβουλευτικός), forensic (δικανικός), and festive (πανηγυρικός). In the medieval period the interpretation of festive discourse underwent further modifications, gradually incorporating Christian forms. In particular, Ioannes Sikeliotēs placed “the antirrhetical (i.e. countering the accusations of pagan prosecutors) speeches of the saints” under the speech-writing subcategory of panegyric speech.⁷⁶ But Chortasmenos⁷/Bessarion’s scheme is an unprecedentedly detailed classification of Byzantine genres, including most of the literary forms actually practiced in Byzantium, such as ecclesiastical poetry and, what interests us here, metaphrastic lives (column ii, end).

The inclusion of metaphraseis in the genre of dialogue is an unexpected, but not completely odd turn. This may reflect the

⁷⁶ See the comprehensive overview in Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos* 103–106.

approach to the metaphrastic menologion as a dramatic or performative form of discourse. Two eleventh-century sources report that metaphrastic Lives used to be artistically read (if not ‘performed’) in the church of Hagia Soros in Constantinople. Michael Psellos describes such readings in his encomium of Ioannes Kroustoulas, whom he praises for the intelligent performance of the Metaphrastic text.⁷⁷ It is however clear that we are dealing with elite perceptions and not a wider understanding. The same applies to the classification of metaphrasis in the diagram drawn by Bessarion.

Some conclusions

This survey of references to metaphrasis in Byzantine rhetorical theory allows some preliminary thoughts. Though the popularity of metaphrastic hagiography is attested in many and different kinds of evidence, metaphrasis as a category related to the hagiographical practice appears only in the margins of the Byzantine theoretical tradition on rhetoric; and this never happens before the age of Symeon Metaphrastes. When Ioannes of Sardeis mentions metaphrasis in the ninth century, it is unclear whether it has any relevance to the hagiographic genre, while in later texts the term is conceived exclusively in relation to the work of Symeon Metaphrastes; such is the approach of the expanded version of Choïroboskos’ *Περὶ τρόπων*, dated after the mid twelfth century and before 1280, as argued here. And, though Byzantine readers for a long time knew of metaphrasis as a liturgical book, it was only in the late fourteenth century that rhetoricians remarked on the existence of metaphrasis as a separate rhetorical genre. The inherent conservatism of rhetorical theory resisted fluctuations and changes.

The extant Byzantine definitions thus restrict our understanding of metaphrasis to the perspective of a medieval

⁷⁷ For these texts see the discussion in S. Papaioannou, transl. and comm. of Psellos’ *Encomium for the Monk Ioannes Kroustoulas who read aloud at the Holy Soros*, in C. Barber and S. Papaioannou (eds.), *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art* (Notre Dame 2015).

schoolteacher: *μετάφρασις* is either combined with the school exercise of paraphrase or explained as stylistic improvement, *ῥητορικὸν κάλλος*, regarded as a principal feature of Metaphrastes' compositions. By modeling the notion of metaphrasis on two authorities—the ancient school tradition and the figure of Symeon Metaphrastes—the relevant Byzantine texts impose upon us a kind of teleological view, with the entire tradition centered on the *opus magnum* of Symeon and, subsequently, judged by its standards. Modern scholarship has been influenced by this understanding as well; starting with Leo Allatius, all honor, kudos, and equally stigma for initiating the process of rewriting in Byzantine hagiography has been placed upon Symeon. Whether hagiographical metaphrasis, a much wider Byzantine writing practice, conforms to the perception of Byzantine rhetoricians is a question that would require its own study.⁷⁸

April, 2015

Department of Classics
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912
daria_resh@brown.edu

⁷⁸ I would like to thank the Dumbarton Oaks Library and Research Collection and the Alexander Onassis Foundation for their support of this project, and to express warm gratitude to Stephanos Efthymiadis, David Konstan, Charis Mesis, and Elizabeth Schiffer for their valuable feedback as well as Kent Rigsby for his meticulous editorial work.