

Rhetorical Training in Byzantine Italy: The Evidence of *Paris.gr.* 3032

Minqi Chu

SCHOLARS HAVE LONG BELIEVED that, as an advanced subject in Byzantine education, rhetoric was taught from the ninth to the eleventh centuries almost exclusively in the capital or in major cities.¹ In Constantinople, aside from private schools, the institution of higher education established by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus dedicated one of its four chairs to rhetoric, and Psellos was proclaimed Professor of Rhetoric and Philosophy by Constantine Monomachus.² In the

¹ P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971) 242–246, and “‘Le Gouvernement des Philosophes’: Notes et remarques sur l’enseignement, les écoles, la culture,” in *Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle byzantin* (Paris 1977) 196; A. Markopoulos, “De la structure de l’école byzantine, le maître, les livres et le processus éducatif,” in B. Mondrain (ed.), *Lire et écrire à Byzance* (Paris 2006) 87, and “In Search for ‘Higher Education’ in Byzantium,” *Žbornik radova Vizantoloskog instituta* 50 (2013) 37.

² Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* 242–260, and in *Cinq études* 212–215; A. Markopoulos, “L’éducation à Byzance aux IX^e–X^e siècles,” *TM* 21.2 (2017) 66; R. Riedinger, “Quatre étapes de la vie de Michel Psellos,” *REByz* 68 (2010) 41–42; F. Pontani, “Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453),” in F. Montanari et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Leiden 2015) 341–356. On Psellos’ rhetorical theory see E. Papaioannou, “Michael Psellos’ Rhetorical Gender,” *BMGS* 24 (2000) 133–146, and *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* (New York 2013) 29–50; J. Walker, “Michael Psellos on Rhetoric: A Translation and Commentary on Psellos’ Synopsis of Hermogenes,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31 (2001) 5–13, and “These things I have not betrayed: Michael Psellos’ Encomium of his Mother as a Defence of Rhetoric,” *Rhetorica* 22 (2014) 49–

peripheral regions of the Empire, on the other hand, grammar might have occupied the highest level of the curriculum and was sufficient to access careers in local administration.³

Against this background it is surprising to find in Byzantine Italy indications of training at a higher level than grammar. The Greek rhetorical textbook preserved in MS. *Paris.gr.* 3032, a codex produced in Calabria in the tenth century, attests to the production and circulation of books on rhetoric in the Greek-speaking area of Byzantine Italy.⁴ In this regard *Parisinus* stands alone if one discounts the witness of some lexica.⁵

101; A. Kaldellis, “The Discontinuous History of Imperial Panegyric in Byzantium and its Reinvention by Michael Psellos,” *GRBS* 59 (2019) 693–713; M. Champion, “Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Transformation in the Thought of Michael Psellos,” in E. Anagnostou et al. (eds.), *Later Platonists and their Heirs among Christians, Jews, and Muslims* (Leiden 2023) 211–231.

³ F. Ronconi, “Quelle grammairre à Byzance? La circulation des textes grammaticaux et son reflet dans les manuscrits,” in G. De Gregorio et al. (eds.), *La produzione scritta tecnica e scientifica nel Medioevo: Libro e documento tra scuole e professioni* (Spoleto 2012) 92.

⁴ D. Arnesano, “Ermogene e la cerchia erudita. Manoscritti di contenuto retorico in Terra d’Otranto,” in N. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dei testi greci in Italia meridionale. Filagato da Cerami philosophos e didaskalos* (Bari 2011) 101.

⁵ The 10th-century Calabrian codex *Matrit.bibl.univ.* 116-Z-22 contains lexicons of Demosthenes’ *Orations* (fols. 281^r–292^v, 295^r–302^v), while *Crypt.ζ.α. XXX* preserves *Φιλιππικῶν ῥητορικῶν λέξεις*, *Ῥητορικαὶ λέξεις ἐτέραι*, and *Λέξεις τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν Δημοσθένους*. F. G. H. Muñoz, “El *Léxico demosténico* del Matr. Comp.30,” *Eikasmos* 28 (2017) 248–249; A. L. Fonseca et al. (eds.), *Catálogo de manuscritos medievales de la Biblioteca Histórica “Marqués de Valdecilla”* (Madrid 2019) 166. A. Rocchi, *Codices Cryptenses seu Abbatiae Cryptae Ferratae in Tusculano* (Rome 1883) 458–459; A. B. Drachmann, *Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars* (Copenhagen 1936) 54. In addition to the rhetorical lexicons, another 10th-century Italo-Greek MS., *Vat.gr.* 1834, transcribed at its end (on fol. 62^r) a 27-line passage of Lucian’s *Calumniarum non temere credendum*, but it is difficult to establish its relationship to the local training of rhetoric: see J. Irigoin, “La tradition de Lucien dans l’Italie méridionale (X^e siècle),” in A. Billault (ed.), *Opôra. La belle saison de l’hellénisme. Études de littérature antique offertes au Recteur Jacques Bompaire* (Paris 2001) 145–147.

In this article I focus on what we can learn from the *Parisinus* about rhetorical training from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, before the Norman conquest, in this western border of the Byzantine Empire. After contextualizing this discipline within the educational system of Greek-speaking Byzantine Italy, I characterize local rhetorical training through the philological, palaeographical, and codicological analysis of the *Parisinus*.

Rhetoric in the educational system of Byzantine Southern Italy

The state of education in Byzantine Italy, especially in the Greek-speaking regions of Calabria and Sicily, remains unclear.⁶ Local hagiographies from the ninth–eleventh centuries usually indicate in general terms that their saints received only a sacred education during childhood. Elias Speleotes, Phantinos, and Neilos of Rossano studied τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα.⁷ Vitale learned *sacras litteras et divinas* from his parents, as did Filaretos of Calabria.⁸ Sabbas the Younger was taught τὰ θεῖα μαθήματα by some διδάσκαλοι.⁹

Only the *Life of Neilos* explicitly mentions that one of the saint's followers named Proklos received an ἐγκύκλιος παιδευσίς.¹⁰ The hagiographical text, however, does not specify this secondary education, which must have included a significant amount of secular knowledge. The *Life of Filaretos*, composed in the eleventh century, helps us to understand this silence. It opens with the praise of ancient Sicily as the cradle of poets,

⁶ P. Degni, “Literary and Book Production in Byzantine Italy,” in S. Cosentino (ed.), *A Companion to Byzantine Italy* (Leiden 2021) 752.

⁷ Vita S. Eliae Spelarote, *AA SS. Septembris. III* 849B; E. Follieri, *La Vita di San Fantino il Giovane* (Brussels 1993) 402–404; R. L. Capra et al., *The Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2018) 6, 8.

⁸ Vita S. Vitalis Siculo, *AA SS. Martii IX* 26D–E. Vita S. Philareti Monachi, *AA SS. Aprilis VII* 607.

⁹ G. Cozza-Luzi, *Historia et Laudes SS. Sabae et Macarii* (Vatican 1893) 7.

¹⁰ *Life of Saint Neilos of Rossano* 128.

rhetors, and philosophers, but the narrator scorns this secular wisdom and its glory.¹¹ This negative attitude is typical of hagiographies. For instance, the *Life of Leone Luca* explicitly declares that its hero never received *otiosa mundanae philosophiae studia*.¹²

The rejection of secular knowledge in local hagiographies does not of itself imply the absence of training in these subjects. The eulogy at the beginning of the *Life of Filaretos* seems to acknowledge the existence in Sicily of poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy until the author's time. Sabbas, Neilos, and some of his followers, like Bartholomew of Grottaferrata, were bilingual. Sabbas translated the Greek dialogue *Μέλαις Βυθός* into Latin.¹³ The Nilian monks are believed to have translated patristic works from Greek to Latin.¹⁴ This suggests their mastery of grammar, if not rhetoric. Furthermore, the use of rhetorical techniques in the *Life of Neilos*, written by one of his disciples, indicates that the author had a certain level of knowledge and understanding of rhetoric.¹⁵

In addition to these local hagiographies, there is other evidence to verify the spread of the ἐγκύκλιος παιδείσις in Hellenic-speaking Byzantine Italy during the ninth–eleventh centuries. According to the *Life of Methodius the Patriarch* (whose composition is considered rather late), he was born in Syracuse

¹¹ AA SS. Aprilis VII 607: *sed quid ego oratorum ac philosophorum, quid vatum historicorumque, lumen splendoremque orationis commemoro? cum haec verborum lenocinia nihil apud nos sint, qui caelestia ac divina profiteamur, neque eorum placita ullo pacto sequi velimus, cum a rationibus nostris longe sint aliena, neque apta ad commendandum, quod apud nos est, bonum.*

¹² Vita S. Leonis Lucae, AA SS. Martii I 98F.

¹³ Cozza-Luzi, *Historia et Laudes SS. Sabae et Macarii* 92.

¹⁴ F. Ronconi, “*Graecae linguae non est nobis habitus*. Notes sur la tradition des Pères grecs en Occident (IV^e–IX^e s.),” in M. Cutino et al. (eds.), *Transmission et réception des Pères grecs dans l’Occident, de l’Antiquité tardive à la Renaissance* (Paris 2016) 351.

¹⁵ A. Garzya, “Note sulla lingua della *Vita* di san Nilo da Rossano,” in *Deputazione di storia patria per la Calabria* (Naples 1969) 80.

and received an education, probably in his hometown, that included the following subjects: *πάσαν γραμματικῆς τέχνην καὶ ἱστορίας, ὀρθογραφίαν τε καὶ ὀξυγραφίαν*.¹⁶ Significantly, this program seems not to have included rhetoric.

The experience of Constantine the Sicilian also draws our attention. He travelled to Constantinople from Sicily to further his studies under the renowned scholar Leo the Mathematician.¹⁷ This implies that Constantine had received in his homeland the education necessary to continue his studies in Constantinople. If so, his training in Sicily may have included grammar and even basic rhetoric.

Alongside historical records,¹⁸ local manuscripts provide a more precise picture of secondary education in the Greek language in Byzantine Italy. In the tenth and eleventh centuries several grammar textbooks were produced in this region: four manuscripts, *Monac.gr.* 310, *Leid.Voss.gr.* Q. 76, *Crypt.Ζ.* α. III, and *Vat.gr. Pii* II 47, copied and used intensively in Nilian monasteries;¹⁹ *Paris.gr.suppl.* 920 and *Messan.S.Salv.* 156, with fragments and epitomes of Herodian;²⁰ some fragments discovered in the Biblioteca Diocesana di Acerenza containing the *Pro-*

¹⁶ Vita S. Methodii Patriarchae, *PG* 100 1245B; V. Prigent, “À l’ouest rien de nouveau? L’Italie du sud et le premier humanisme byzantin,” *TM* 21.2 (2017) 152–153.

¹⁷ Prigent, *TM* 21.2 (2017) 152.

¹⁸ Nothing is known about the education in their own homeland of others who were originally from Sicily or southern Italy. Such are John Sikeliotēs and the grammarian Theognostus who wrote *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* and dedicated it to the Emperor Leo (V or VI). See Pontani, in *Brill’s Companion* 321; Prigent, *TM* 21.2 (2017) 150–151.

¹⁹ F. Ronconi, *I Manoscritti miscellanei. Ricerche su esemplari dei secoli IX–XII* (Spoleto 2007) 150–154, 173, 180; S. Lucà, “Testi medici e tecnico-scientifici,” in *La produzione scritta* 563, 567.

²⁰ Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 563; P. Degni, “I testi scientifici nell’Italia meridionale bizantina: forme, modelli, circolazione,” in *La conoscenza scientifica nell’alto medioevo* (Spoleto 2020) 832.

legomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione verborum of Georgios Choïroboskos;²¹ and some Italo-Greek palimpsests whose lower writings were grammatical treatises.²²

Treatises on classical grammar, particularly the *Ars grammatica* of Dionysius Thrax, played a prominent role in these textbooks, although the later works of Theodosius of Alexandria and Georgios Choïroboskos and other practical excerpts were also transmitted.²³ However, in the center of the Empire, in place of the classical works, grammatical training used almost exclusively ‘modern’ and practical extracts (such as tables of inflections, collections of *epimerismi*, and schedography developed especially in the eleventh century).²⁴ It seems, therefore, that southern Italy did not follow the pedagogical tools and methods prevalent in the center of the Empire.

²¹ S. Lucà and A. Vena, “Resti di un codice grammaticale greco ad Acerenza, in Basilicata,” *Nea Rhome* 11 (2014) 127–131.

²² For example, the lower text of *Vat.reg. Pii* II 35 was copied in 10th-century southern Italy: Lucà and Vena, *Nea Rhome* 11 (2014) 131–132. S. Lucà and F. Ronconi have rejected the Italo-Greek origin of four other manuscripts long believed to have come from southern Italy in the 10th–11th centuries that contain grammatical and orthographic treatises: *Rom.Vallie*. E 11, *Vat.barb.gr.* 70, *Paris.gr.suppl.* 388, and *Oxon.Barocci* 50. See J. Irigoin, “L’Italie méridionale et la tradition des textes antiques,” *JÖB* 18 (1969) 49, and “La culture grecque dans l’occident latin du VII^e au XI^e siècle,” in *La cultura antica nell’Occidente latino dal VII all’XI secolo* II (Spoleto 1975) 441; P. Canart, “Le livre grec en Italie méridionale sous les Règnes Normand et Souabe,” *Scrittura e Civiltà* 2 (1978) 103–162, at 141–142; S. Lucà, “La produzione libraria,” in R. Lavagnini et al. (eds.), *Byzantino-Sicula VI La Sicilia e Bisanzio nei secoli XI e XII* (Palermo 2014) 162; F. Ronconi, “Il codice Parisino Suppl. gr. 388 et Mosè del Brolo da Bergamo,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 47 (2006) 22–23, “Bodleian Library ms. Baroccianus 50: annotazioni codicologiche su un manoscritto miscelaneo,” in B. Atsalos (ed.), *Actes du VI^e Colloque International de Paléographie Grecque* (Athens 2008) 639–655, and in *La produzione scritta* 81–90.

²³ Ronconi, in *La produzione scritta* 101, 107; Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 563.

²⁴ Ronconi, in *La produzione scritta* 106–107.

Evidence that subjects of a level higher than grammar were taught in this province is extremely rare. A sign of local interest in logic, but insufficient to envisage training in this discipline during the Byzantine period,²⁵ is the transmission of John of Damascus' *Dialecticae* and the *Supplementum ad dialecticam brevem* (perhaps by the same author), both copied on fols. 31^r–32^r of *Vat.gr.* 1257 in Calabria at the end of the tenth century.²⁶

The situation of rhetoric is more complicated. *Messan.S.Salv.* 118, kept in the monastery of S. Salvatore before entering the Biblioteca Regionale Universitaria 'Giacomo Longo', comprises ancient commentaries on the works of (Ps.-)Hermogenes.²⁷ Its transcription had been placed in eleventh-century southern Italy, but S. Lucà gave it instead a Greco-Oriental origin.²⁸ On this view this rhetorical manuscript probably arrived in Sicily in the Norman period, after the twelfth-century foundation of the monastery by St. Bartholomew of Simeri under the patronage of Roger II.²⁹ *Messan.S.Salv.* 119, another Italo-Greek rhetorical

²⁵ *Paris.gr.* 2064, another Greek manuscript, contains commentaries on Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* and *Prior Analytics*, whose origin in Byzantine southern Italy alleged by Irigoien has been definitively rejected by Lucà. See J. Irigoien, "L'Italie méridionale et la transmission des textes grecs du VII^e au XII^e siècle," in N. M. Panagiotakes et al. (eds.), *L'Ellenismo Italiota dal VII al XII secolo* (Athens 2001) 93; S. Lucà, "Dalle collezioni manoscritte di Spagna: Libri originari o provenienti dall'Italia greca medievale," *RSBN* 44 (2007) 63, and "Il libro bizantino e postbizantino nell'Italia meridionale," *Territori della Cultura* 10 (2012) 34.

²⁶ Ronconi, *I Manoscritti miscellanei* 185–191.

²⁷ M. T. Rodriguez, "Su un codice di Ermogene del S. Salvatore di Messina," *Nea Rhome* 14 (2017) 81.

²⁸ Rodriguez, *Nea Rhome* 14 (2017) 83–84; S. Lucà, "Il Diodoro Siculo *Neap. B. N. gr.* 4 è italogreco?" *BBGG* 44 (1990) 73–74, and in *Byzantino-Sicula* VI 148–149.

²⁹ C. Torre, "Un Intellettuale greco di epoca normanna: Filagato da Cerami e il *De Mundo* di Aristotele," *Miscellanea di Studi Storici* 15 (2008) 80–81. Books brought from the center of the Byzantine Empire to southern Italy and Sicily grew more common in the Norman period. According to the *Life*

manuscript, was certainly copied in the twelfth century rather than in the Byzantine period.³⁰ R. Romano doubtfully identified Neilos of Rossano as the author of a commentary on Hermogenes' *De statibus*, transmitted by a tenth-century monk named Neilos in *Paris.gr.suppl.* 670.³¹

The *Parisinus* is therefore the only sure surviving witness to the production and circulation of rhetorical textbooks in the Greek-speaking area of Byzantine southern Italy. It alone proves the existence of local instruction in this advanced discipline.

The compilation of Theodosius of Syracuse and rhetorical training in Byzantine Southern Italy in the ninth century

This small parchment codex (132 x 105 mm) was copied in the second half of the tenth century by an anonymous scribe, probably in Calabria, using the typical Italo-Greek script *en as de pique*.³² The main decoration appears at the head of fols. 1^r,

of Bartholomew of Simeri, this saint travelled to Constantinople in search of sacred books. After he received many from Emperor Alexius I Comnenus and his wife Irene Doukaina, he stored them in the libraries of his monasteries. At the time of William I a Sicilian embassy headed by Henry Aristippus received from the Byzantine emperor as diplomatic gifts (*largitione susceptos imperatoria*) books like the Erythraean Sibyl's prophetic collection and Ptolemy's *Almagest* (MS. *Marc.gr.* Z.313). See C. H. Haskins, "Further Notes on Sicilian Translations of the Twelfth Century," *HSCP* 23 (1912) 156; Canart, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 2 (1978) 149; Canart (133–134) has shown that a more significant number of contemporary works were transmitted from the center of the Empire to southern Italy during the Norman period.

³⁰ J. Irigoin, "La tradition des rhéteurs grecs dans l'Italie byzantine (Xe–XIII^e siècle)," *SicGymn* 39 (1986) 78–81; Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 572.

³¹ R. Romano, "Il commentario a Ermogene attribuito a S. Nilo di Rossano (Par. suppl. gr. 670, ff. 1–179^v)," *EpetByz* 47 (1987–89) 253–274; F. Woerther, *Hermagoras, Fragments et témoignages* (Paris 2012) 274–275. On the monk Neilos and *Paris.gr.suppl.* 670 see M. Patillon, *Eustathe, explication des états de cause d'Hermogène* (Paris 2018) XL; Rodriquez, in *Nea Rhome* 14 (2017) 99; Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 571.

³² C. Förstel and M. Rashed, "Une rencontre d'Hermogène et de Cicéron dans l'Italie médiévale," *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 361; Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 572.

100^r, 111^r, and 150^r. It consists of elaborately intertwined illuminated bands with large palmettes at either end³³ and it serves to divide the codex into four sections.

The first (fols. 1^r–99^v) comprises six classical handbooks of rhetoric: the *Prolegomena* of Anonymous, Books 7–12 of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, Hermogenes' *De statibus*, some rhetorical excerpts, and Ps.-Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata* and *De methodo sollertiae*. At the end of this section (99^v) appear two diagrams on the anonymous prolegomena to Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *De compositione*.³⁴

The second section (100^r–110^v) contains two other late-antique rhetorical treatises, one by Maximus of Ephesus and the other by an anonymous author. These are no longer related to (Ps.-)Hermogenes. At the end appears a diagram on Maximus of Ephesus' *De objectionibus insolubilibus* (110^v).

These two sections represent a variant of the *Corpus Rhetoricum*, a rhetorical collection assembled by an anonymous teacher at the end of the fifth century.³⁵ In the ninth–eleventh centuries this corpus was transmitted by several Greek manuscripts and was considered the main textbook for rhetoric in the Byzantine Empire.³⁶

³³ Irigoin, *SicGymn* 39 (1986) 75.

³⁴ M. Patillon, *Corpus rhetoricum I* (Paris 2008) xxxvi.

³⁵ The complete version of this corpus comprises Anonymous' *Prolegomena*, Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, and four works of (Ps.-)Hermogenes: *De statibus*, *De inventione*, *De ideis*, and *De methodo sollertiae*. Added sometimes at the end were the *De insolubilibus obiectionibus* of Maximus of Ephesus and the *Methodus ad prouinciarum praefectos oratione accipiendos* from an anonymous author. See Patillon, *Corpus Rhetoricum I* x.

³⁶ Patillon, *Corpus Rhetoricum I* v–lxxxvi. See also V. Valiavitcharska, “Rhetoric in the Hands of the Byzantine Grammarian,” *Rhetorica* 31 (2013) 238 n.1. Aside from the *Parisinus*, other manuscripts in the tenth–eleventh centuries that transmitted this corpus are: *Ambros.* III 66 Sup., *Basileensis* 70, *Laur.plut.* 60.15, *Paris.gr.* 1983, *Paris.gr.* 2977, *Paris.gr.* 2983, *Paris.gr.* 2923, *Vat.gr.* 104, and *Vat.urb.gr.* 130. See Patillon, *Corpus Rhetoricum I* v, x–xi, xxxiv. On Byzantine rhetorical theory in general see G. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine*

The third section (111^r–149^v) comprises Phoebammon's *Περὶ σχημάτων ῥητορικῶν* and some scholia of classical handbooks entitled *Τετάρτη γραφή ἐκ τῶν στάσεων*, *Τεχνῆς ῥητορικῆς σχόλια*, and *Δευτέρα γραφή ἐκ τῶν στάσεων*.³⁷ At the end (149^{r-v}) were copied two patristic extracts of St. Athanasius of Alexandria and St. Basil.³⁸

The last section (150^r–152^v) is completely different: it contains four dodecasyllables and a letter to Leo the Archdeacon of Syracuse recounting the Arab occupation of the city in 878. Both were written by a ninth-century monk from Syracuse named Theodosius, whom the title of the letter calls a *grammatikos*, i.e. scholar or teacher for secondary education. S. Lucà suggests that he is Theodosius the Monk and Grammatikos, who was a lexicographer and the author of *Lexicon Iambicorum Canonum Iohannis Damasceni*.³⁹

Each section starts its own subjects on a new recto folio with the main decoration at the head. Except for the final section,

Rhetoric (Thessaloniki 1973); E. M. Jeffreys (ed.), *Rhetoric in Byzantium* (Aldershot 2003) 23–37, and “Rhetoric in Byzantium,” in I. Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford 2007) 166–184; Valiavitcharska, *Rhetorica* 31 (2013) 237–260, and *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium: The Sound of Persuasion* (Cambridge 2013); S. Papaioannou, “Rhetoric and Rhetorical Theory,” in A. Kaldellis et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Intellectual History of Byzantium* (Cambridge 2017) 101–112.

³⁷ The treatise *Δευτέρα γραφή ἐκ τῶν στάσεων* became the sole witness to certain developments from the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria during the time of Elias and David. It postulated that an overly apparent display of logical technicalities in a speech can hinder the speaker's ability to persuade or convince others. This was known only to Arab philosophers. See Förstel and Rashed, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 362–364.

³⁸ These two patristic extracts may be models for rhetorical exercises. See Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 573.

³⁹ V. von Falkenhausen, “La conquista di Siracusa (878) nella memoria storica di Costantinopoli,” in M. Palma et al. (eds.), *Per Gabriella. Studi in ricordi di Gabriella Braga II* (Cassino 2013) 837–839; Lucà, in *La produzione scritta* 576.

which is incomplete, all end with diagrams and extracts independent of the main texts. These seem to have been added after the main texts in each division had been completed and they fill the space left over before the start of the next section. It is therefore possible that each division was originally independent. Even if the *Parisinus* was assembled as a unit and transcribed in full by a single scribe, without interruption or disjointedness, it may have been assembled from four separate sources.

If the source of fols. 150^r–152^v is in fact Theodosius the Grammatikos, this suggests that he had a role in the constitution or transmission of this rhetorical textbook.⁴⁰ He may have assembled for his teaching in Syracuse this sequence of rhetorical texts, collecting them from three independent handbooks and adding his own at the end to provide his pupils with a contemporary local model for their learning and practice. Although the original book that he compiled has been lost, it remains available to us in the *Parisinus*, which derives from it. In *Parisinus* one finds evidence that Theodosius of Syracuse modified the contents of the works he compiled into his new rhetorical textbook. In the stemma of manuscripts, the *Parisinus* is a rather isolated variant⁴¹ which features textual adaptations that strengthen or specify transitions, explain or clarify statements, and replace or delete exercises.

The following instance of a modification that strengthens or specifies a transition, from the sixth chapter of Anonymous' *Prolegomena*, is illuminating.⁴² This chapter is devoted to the origin of rhetoric: Syracuse, a colony of Corinth and Sparta, received it first (*Corpus rhetoricum* I 27):

Εἰσεδέξαντο τοίνυν πρῶτον ἀπάντων αἱ Συράκουσσαι, πόλις τῆς Σικελίας. Σικελίας δὲ νῆσος μεγίστη κεκλήθη περὶ τὰ ἑσπέρια

⁴⁰ Förstel and Rashed, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 365.

⁴¹ Patillon, *Corpus rhetoricum* I xxxiv–xxxvi.

⁴² For further evidence of strengthening and specifying transitions see Patillon, *Corpus rhetoricum* I 29, 30, 35, 39–42, and 44.

μέρη. Αὕτη Κορινθίων μὲν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ἦν ἄποικος.

The *Parisinus* replaces the word Αὕτη at the beginning of the last sentence with αὐται (corr. αὔται) αἱ Συράκουσσαι. This strengthens the transition and specifies the meaning of αὕτη, making clear that it refers to the city of Syracuse, once a colony of Corinth and Sparta, rather than to the entire island of Sicily. The author of this intervention seems well acquainted with the history of Sicily and Syracuse.

For explanatory or clarifying statements we can look at the beginning of the eleventh chapter of the *Prolegomena*, where the anonymous author argued that Aristotle's definition of rhetoric was insufficient (ἐλλείποντα)—one of two traditional vices in definitions, the other being excess (ὑπεροχή). He then explains these faults further (I 31):

Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερέχει ὁ ὅρος τῇ λέξει, ἐλλείπει τοῖς πράγμασιν, εἰ δὲ ἐλλείπει τοῖς λόγοις, πλεονάζει τοῖς πράγμασιν.

The *Parisinus* adds at this point the definition of Ἄνθρωπος in order to clarify the statement (I 31):

Οἷον ὑπερέχων ὁ ὅρος κατὰ τὴν λέξιν· Ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἐστὶ ζῶον λογικόν, θνητόν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν, γραμματικόν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπλεόνασεν ἐνταῦθα τῇ λέξει κατὰ τὸ γραμματικόν, οὐ πάντας περιέλαβεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὁ ὅρος ἀλλὰ μόνους τοὺς γραμματικούς· διὸ καὶ λέγεται ἐλλείπειν τοῖς πράγμασιν· ἐὰν δὲ ἐλλείψῃ τοῖς λόγοις, πλεονάζει τὰ πράγματα· ἐὰν γὰρ εἴπῃς οὕτως· τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος; Ζῶον λογικόν, ἐπειδὴ ἐνέλειπες τὸ θνητόν, ἐπλεόνασε τὸ πρᾶγμα· συνεισήνεγκεν γὰρ καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ δαίμονας.

This practice of explaining and clarifying complex statements of literary analysis effectively improves the readability of the text.

The most significant evidence of modification of exercises concerns Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*. In the seventh book, on *Commonplace*, an original exercise was added on commonplace against the murderer, while the exercise *Κοινὸς τόπος κατὰ ἀργοῦ* (*Commonplace against a lazy man*), traditionally attributed to Niko-

laos in the fifth century, was substituted for Aphthonius' Κοινὸς τόπος κατὰ τυράννου (*Commonplace against a tyrant*).⁴³ Three exercises were deleted: Σοφίας ἐγκώμιον (*Praise of wisdom*) in the eighth book, on *Encomium*; Ψόγος Φιλίππου (*Blame against Philip II*) in the ninth, on *Invective*; and Σύγκρισις Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Ἑκτορος (*Comparison between Achilles and Hector*) in the tenth, on *Comparison*. Moreover, in the twelfth book, on *Description*, Aphthonius' exercise Ἐκφρασις τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀκροπόλεως (*Description of the acropolis in Alexandria*) was replaced by a new one taken from Libanius, Ἐκφρασις κήπου (*Description of a garden*).⁴⁴ The elimination of some exercises that were rich in ancient mythology or history, and the substitution of shorter, easier exercises for Aphthonius' longer, more intellectually demanding ones, were designed to simplify the contents of this textbook.

Evidently, these interventions were intended to make this rhetorical textbook more readily accessible to less educated users and students. Thus, as a rhetorical textbook the *Parisinus* likely circulated and was used where the teaching of rhetoric was not well developed. If all these adaptations are to be attributed to a single author, Theodosius the local Syracusan scholar, its likely compiler, is an excellent candidate. His goal must have been to adapt the text of his sources to his rhetorical teaching practice in Sicily, a peripheral area of the Byzantine Empire where education remained less developed than in the center. His Syracusan background and his knowledge of the city reinforce this hypothesis.

Thus, a brief reconstruction of the history of codex *Parisinus* is possible: Theodosius in the ninth century assembled three ancient rhetorical handbooks and added his own works at the end to produce a new textbook for his teaching of rhetoric in Syracuse. To make it suitable for his pedagogical practice in Sicily he adapted its content and made it more accessible. His

⁴³ Patillon, *Corpus rhetoricum* I 105–106.

⁴⁴ Patillon, *Corpus rhetoricum* I 106.

textbook circulated and was re-copied in the Greek-speaking region of southern Italy down to the transcription of the *Parisinus* by an anonymous scribe, probably in Calabria, in the second half of the tenth century.

The circulation of the rhetorical textbook of Theodosius of Syracuse in Greek-speaking Byzantine Italy

The history of codex *Parisinus* continued after the transcription by the anonymous Italo-Greek scribe. In addition to its main contents the scribe made various annotations in the margin. Subtitles and summarizing or explanatory annotations were often added in capital letters.⁴⁵ A typical Italo-Greek brachygraphic system was employed to write these majuscule notes, especially on fols. 89^v–98^r.⁴⁶ The scribe's fluent brachygraphic writing hints that these notes were not authored by him but merely transcribed from his source.

The in-line annotation symbols on fols. 24^r, 28^v, 30^{r-v}, 77^r, and 81^r provide further evidence to support this deduction. Identical symbols, one placed by the annotation and another within the relevant line of the text, link the marginal subtitles *πε(ρὶ) πραγμάτ(ων)* on 24^r, *πε(ρὶ) δικαί(ου) λογικῆς* and *πε(ρὶ) ἀντιλήψε(ως) στάσ(ις) δ'* on 28^v, and *περὶ μεταλήψε(ως) στάσ(ις)*

⁴⁵ Subtitles and notes summarize the content on fols. 18^v, 23^v–25^r, 26^v, 27^v–30^v, 31^v, 32^v–33^v, 37^v, 38^v, 39^v–43^r, 44^{r-v}, 46^r, 47^v, 49^r, 51^v–53^r, 54^r–55^v, 62^v, 66^v, 67^v–68^r, 70^r, 75^r, 77^r, 81^r, 82^{r-v}, 83^v–95^r, 96^r–98^v, 112^v, 117^r, and 126^v. Notes explaining vocabulary appear on 30^r, 77^v, 107^v, and 140^r. On 30^r the note ἀντινομία τὸ πταῖσμα attempted to explain the term ἀντινομία in Hermogenes' text (albeit incorrectly) by suggesting πταῖσμα (fault) as a synonym. On 77^v the note τιμῶν ἔναγχος interpreted the word πομπεύειν. On 107^v the phrase ἄντικρυς καὶ διαρρήδην was explained in the margin as σαφῶς φανερώς. On 140^r κοντάρι(ον) was used to describe the word ἐγχειρίδιον.

⁴⁶ N. P. Chionides believed that the notes in brachygraphy originated in Calabria in the mid-tenth century. J. Irigoien dated them in turn to a time close to the transcription of the manuscript. See Irigoien, *SicGymn* 39 (1986) 75; N. P. Chionides and S. Lilla, *La Brachigrafia Italo-bizantina* (Rome 1981) 29, 46.

ιγ' on 30^v to the corresponding passages of Hermogenes' *De stabilitus*, the text under consideration (1.8, 2.5, and 2.14). On 30^r a mark in the 14th line of the main text of Hermogenes 2.12 directs attention to the marginal note ἀντινομία τὸ παῖσμα. Two notes on 77^r, ποσαχῶς ὁ κακούργος and ἴδιον πῶς, summarizing two brief passages (οἶον κακούργος πᾶς ὁ κακόν τι ἐργαζόμενος and ἰδίως δ' ὁ κλέπτῃς) from Ps.-Hermogenes' *De methodo sollertiae* (1.2), are headed by two marks placed in the 8th and 9th lines of the main text. Finally, an annotation mark in the 10th line of 81^r points to the marginal summary τὸ περιπλέκειν ποῖος κ(αι)ρὸς ζηλωτ(ὸν) καὶ χρηστὸν ποιεῖ of Ps.-Hermogenes 8.1.

The fact that the annotation marks were included in the line itself, between words, rather than in the interlinear spaces, and that the corresponding marginal notes were written in capital letters, strongly suggests that both annotations and accompanying marks were already embedded in the source and that the scribe faithfully copied them. He is therefore not the author of these notes.

Notably, numerous minuscule notes that correct scribal errors are also present in the margins of the *Parisinus*. Apparently, these were also written by the same scribe.⁴⁷ Two of these are of especial interest. The first is found on fol. 85^r, a long note that is incomplete owing to the re-trimming of the right edge of this page:

ὅτι τὸ ὑπ(ερ)βατ(ὸν) ὁ[...] καλ(ὸν) σχῆμα ἀλλ' ἀναικαῖ(ον)· καὶ πότ' [...]γαγκαῖ(ον) σαφην[...] ὄργαν(ον) γίνεται· καὶ π[...]τε μακρὸν ὑπ(ερ)βα[...] ἐν ᾧ τι τ(οῦ) Ὀμήρ(ου) [...]μιζόμενον ὑπ(ερ)βατ(ὸν) οὐκ ἔστι καὶ διὰ τί [...]κ ἔστιν·

By referring to the main text on 85^r, from *Περὶ ὑπερβατοῦ* (*About hyperbaton*) of Ps.-Hermogenes' *De methodo sollertiae* (14.1–5), we can reconstruct the note as follows:

⁴⁷ Minuscule notes by the scribe correcting his transcription are on fols. 6^r, 28^r, 30^v, 32^v, 34^v, 38^r, 42^v, 45^v, 49^r, 50^{r-v}, 52^r, 53^r, 54^v, 55^v, 56^r, 57^v, 58^r, 59^r, 60^v, 73^v, 88^v, 91^r, 97^v, 102^v, 114^v, 115^r, 122^r, 133^v, 135^{r-v}, 136^v, and 140^r.

ὅτι τὸ ὑπ(ερ)βατὸν οὐκ (ἔστι) καλὸν σχῆμα ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον (ante corr. ἀναικαῖον)· καὶ πότ' (ἀ)ναγκαῖον σαφηνείας ὄργανον γίνετ(αι) καὶ πότε μακρὸν ὑπ(ερ)βατὸν ἐν ᾧ τι τοῦ Ὁμήρ(ου) νομιζόμενον ὑπ(ερ)βατ(ὸν) οὐκ ἔστι καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἔστιν·

This is a summary of Ps.-Hermogenes' text rather than an independent commentary.

On fol. 88^r πανουργ(οῦ) καὶ ψεύστ(ου) was added as a note to explain the uncommon term Εὐρυβάτου, the name of a Greek mythological character. It occurred in the chapter *Περὶ ἐγνωσμένου ψεύσματος καὶ πότε χρηστέον αὐτῶ* (*About an obvious lie and its use*) of the same text of Ps.-Hermogenes (19.2). The use of the word πανουργος to describe Eurybatus can be traced back to Aristotle's text, as cited by Suetonius: Εὐρύβατος· ὁ πανοῦργος καὶ Εὐρυβάτης ὁ αὐτός ... Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν πρώτῳ περὶ δικαιοσύνης κλέπτῃν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι φησὶν (fr.84 Rose). This interpretation remained popular in the meso-Byzantine period and was cited in the lexicons of Hesychius, Photius, and the *Suda*.⁴⁸ However, a search of the TLG did not yield any text that uses the word ψεύστης/ψεύστου to describe Eurybatus. Only the synonym ἀπατεών was found in Hesychius.⁴⁹ Therefore, while characterizing Eurybatus as a knavish liar was not exceptional in the Byzantine world, the note on 88^r was probably not quoted from other treatises but conceived by a reader or a copyist during the transmission of the textbook of Theodosius of Syracuse or its source material.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to establish that the *Parisinus*' scribe authored these annotations. Because their ink is of the

⁴⁸ Hesych.: Εὐρυβάτης· πανοῦργος, ἀπατεών, κέρκωψ (ed. Latte); Photius' *Lexicon*: Εὐρύβατος ... Νίκανδρος Αἰγιναῖον Εὐρύβατον πανουργότατον, οὗ μνημονεύει Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν α' περὶ δικαιοσύνης. Δούρις δέ ἐν δ' τῶν περὶ Ἀγαθοκλέα ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσεώς ἑταίρου (ed. Theodoridis); *Suda*: Εὐρύβατος ... Νίκανδρος· Αἰγίνεον Εὐρύβατον πανουργότατον· οὗ μνημονεύει Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν α' περὶ δικαιοσύνης (ed. Adler).

⁴⁹ A scholion to Aeschines' *Against Ktesiphon* (ad 3.137) uses ἄπιστος to describe Eurybatus: Εὐρύβατοι δύο ἐγένοντο ἄμφω πονηροί, ἄπιστοι, πανοῦργοι.

same color as the ink used for the adjoining content, we cannot exclude the possibility that that our scribe simply copied them from his model. They could therefore go back to earlier times, like the majuscule notes transcribed by the same copyist.

If these notes in majuscules and minuscules do not predate the alleged compilation of Theodosius, then they must have been composed in Byzantine Italy, where this new rhetorical textbook with the works of Theodosius of Syracuse exclusively circulated. Other than Theodosius' innovative compilation, local interest in rhetorical learning was apparently restricted to summarizing preexisting content or explaining difficult vocabulary. Unlike contemporary scholar-teachers in Constantinople, local annotators did not analyze or develop their own theories or compose their own commentaries.⁵⁰

If on the other hand these annotations were already present in the sources assembled by Theodosius—an alternative that seems distinctly less likely to me—then both he and his succes-

⁵⁰ Constantinopolitan scholar-teachers from the ninth–eleventh centuries such as John of Sardis, Anonymous, John Sikeliotēs, his near-contemporary John Geometres, and John Doxopatres all left commentaries on the works of (Ps.-)Hermogenēs and Aphthonius. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* 21–26; C. Jouanno, “Les Byzantins et la seconde sophistique: étude sur Michel Psellos,” *REG* 122 (2009) 118; S. Papaioannou, “Sicily, Constantinople, Miletos: The Life of a Eunuch and the History of Byzantine Humanism,” in *Myriobiblos. Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture* (Boston 2015) 271–277, and “Ioannes Sikeliotēs (and Ioannes Geometres) Revisited with an Appendix: Edition of Sikeliotēs' Scholia on Aelius Aristides,” *TM* 23.1 (2019) 659–679; P. Roilos, “Ancient Greek Rhetorical Theory and Byzantine Discursive Politics: John Sikeliotēs on Hermogenēs,” in T. Shawcross et al. (eds.), *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and Beyond* (Cambridge 2018) 159–184; C. A. Gibson, “The Anonymous *Progymnasmata* in John Doxapatres' *Homiliae in Aphthonium*,” *ByzZeit* 102 (2009) 83–84; S. Efthymiadis, “De Taraise à Méthode (787–847): l'apport des premières grandes figures,” *TM* 21.2 (2017) 177; D. Resh, “Toward a Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis,” *GRBS* 55 (2015) 754–787; B. D. MacDougall, “John of Sardis' Commentary on Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*: Logic in Ninth-Century Byzantium,” *GRBS* 57 (2017) 724–726.

sors in southern Italy would have merely reproduced and transmitted ancient summaries and lexical interpretations. On this view, local knowledge of rhetoric in southern Italy was sparse and derivative.

In either case, one may reasonably conclude that rhetorical learning in the Greek-speaking area of southern Italy fell to rather low levels during the Byzantine period after the ninth-century production by Theodosius the Grammatikos of his new rhetorical textbook in Syracuse. The local study of rhetoric was impoverished and restricted to a narrow circle. The very small number of locals interested in learning ancient rhetoric is reflected in the fact that throughout the Byzantine period only the scribe himself seems to have made notes in the *Parisinus*.⁵¹

The high quality of this manuscript supports this view. Codicologically, the regularity of the quires⁵² and the rarity of holes and untrimmed edges bear out this excellence. Its high cost is shown by the use of several colors in the decoration, particularly gold on fols. 3^v, 4^v, 7^v, 10^v, 13^r, 14^r, 16^r, 17^{r-v}, 19^r, 22^v, 23^r, 145^v, 146^r, 149^v, and 150^r;⁵³ and the expensive azure on 22^v, 34^v, 51^{r-v}, 100^r, 101^v, 111^r, 122^r, 127^v, 128^r, and 150^r. A codex of this quality is quite rare in southern Italy during the Byzantine period. It may therefore have been commissioned and used by a member of the local elite interested in reading or collecting texts on rhetoric. The study of this advanced subject was perhaps exclusively accessible to this small group.

⁵¹ This manuscript transmitted other annotations in Latin and Greek written in southern Italy or Sicily after the end of Byzantine rule; see Förstel and Rashed, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 365–370.

⁵² This manuscript comprises 19 regular quaternions.

⁵³ Gold appears rarely in the Italo-Greek manuscripts produced during the Byzantine period. See J. Leroy, “Le Parisinus gr. 1477 et la détermination de l’origine des manuscrits italo-grecs d’après la forme des initiales,” *Scriptorium* 32 (1978) 198.

Conclusion

In ninth-century Sicily a local scholar by the name of Theodosius compiled a new rhetorical textbook for his pedagogical practice in Syracuse. He assembled three ancient handbooks that were popular in Byzantium and added his own compositions at the end. To suit this textbook to his local audience, he modestly modified the contents, reinforcing or specifying transitions, explicating or clarifying statements, and replacing or omitting exercises.

After his innovative work, this new textbook of rhetoric circulated during the Byzantine period almost exclusively within a small circle of the elite. The local learning of rhetoric was brought to a low level that consisted at most in summarizing the content of parts of this textbook and interpreting difficult vocabulary. This conclusion is consistent with the impression one naturally obtains from the reading of the Siculo-Calabrian hagiographies, and with the fact that the *Parisinus* is the sole surviving Italo-Greek manuscript that features rhetorical texts.⁵⁴

July, 2023

Sorbonne Université
minqichu@gmail.com

⁵⁴ I would like to express my gratitude to Vincent Déroche (Professor at Sorbonne Université) and Filippo Ronconi (Directeur d'études at the École des hautes études en sciences sociales in Paris) for their invaluable remarks and suggestions. I also thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors for their thoughtful comments and corrections.