


Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 10 (1996)

SYMMEIKTA 10



A Passage of the 'Barbarograeca' Metaphrase of Niketas Choniates' Chronike Diegesis. Retranslated or Revised?

John DAVIS

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.809](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.809)

Copyright © 2014, John DAVIS



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

DAVIS, J. (1996). A Passage of the 'Barbarograeca' Metaphrase of Niketas Choniates' Chronike Diegesis. Retranslated or Revised?. *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 10, 127-142. <https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.809>

JOHN DAVIS

A PASSAGE OF THE 'BARBAROGRAECA' METAPHRASE
OF NIKETAS CHONIATES' *CHRONIKE DIEGESIS*:
RETRANSLATED OR REVISED?

The language of the 'Barbarograeca' version of the *Chronike Diegesis* of Niketas Choniates has been discussed on a number of occasions, chiefly in terms of its linguistic and stylistic level, and its relation to the vernacular of the late Byzantine period¹. However, two short passages of the Niketas-Metaphrase (hereafter *N-M*) invite us to observe a reviser at work and to speculate on the likelihood that, for some reason, the original metaphrase

**NCH* = *NICETAE CHONIATAE HISTORIA*, ed. J.-L. VAN DIETEN, (CFHB 11/I-II), Berlin-New York 1975.

1. J.-L. VAN DIETEN, Bemerkungen zur Sprache der sog. vulgärgriechischen Niketasparaphrasen, *BF* 6, 1979, 37-77; IDEM, Noch einmal über Niketas Choniates, *BZ* 57, 1964, 302-328, esp. 323-328; I. ŠEVČENKO, Levels of style in Byzantine literature, *XVI. Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress. Akten* 1/1 (= *JÖB* 31/1, 1981), 289-312, esp. 309-310; IDEM, Additional remarks to the report on levels of style, *JÖB* 32/1, 1982, 220-238; H. HUNGER, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz*, Munich 1989, 81; H.-G. Beck, *Das Byzantinische Jahrtausend*, Munich 1978, 150; IDEM, Die griechische volkstümliche Literatur des 14. Jahrhunderts, *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, Bucharest 1974, 125-138, esp. 126-128; IDEM, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, Munich 1971, 6; IDEM, Überlieferungsgeschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. I, Zurich 1961, 449-450; and R. BROWNING, A Fourteenth-Century Prose Version of the *Odyssey*, *DOP* 46, 1992, 27-36, esp. 29; IDEM, The Language of Byzantine Literature, in S. VRYONIS Jr., (ed.), *The 'Past' in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, Malibu 1978, 103-133, and esp. 125.

was reworked at this point, or that, on account perhaps of damage, it invited (or presented with the opportunity) a subsequent copyist to experiment or improvise slightly with the material he found before him, thus leaving us with two closely related but nonetheless quite distinct versions. These two passages occur in the chapter on the reign of Alexios II Komnenos (1180-1183)². The earliest of the manuscripts, Monacensis gr. 450 (second quarter of the fourteenth century), designated B since Bekker's edition (Bonn, 1835), is the witness to the one version³, while the other two manuscripts, Vindobonensis Suppl. gr. 166 (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), designated X by van Dieten⁴, and Scorialensis Ψ-IV-17 (early sixteenth century), designated S⁵, preserve the second. There is a further manuscript of *N-M* – Parisinus gr. 3142 – designated Y⁶, but it does not preserve the part with these passages; evidence from other parts of *N-M*, however, indicates that Y belongs to the XS group, therefore making B the odd man out among the four manuscripts of *N-M*. In our discussion here, we shall refer to X and S collectively as i, implying that they descend from a common original which differed to some degree from the text witnessed by B.

In lieu of a detailed analysis of the relationship of all the *N-M* manuscripts to one another⁷, it may be useful, firstly, to sketch briefly the way in which B and i relate to (and diverge from) one another in general, thus providing the likely context within which the present passage needs to be viewed, itself being only a part of a much larger whole. Firstly, the manuscript distribution of the divergences met with in the passage here, is

2. The first of the two passages is on fols 74-74^v, while the second, presented here, is on fols 80-81 of ms Monacensis gr. 450

3. For further details on this manuscript see *NCH*, I, pp. XXXIII-XXXIV. For a quick orientation through the manuscript tradition of the *Chronike Diegesis* see H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I, Munich 1971, 432-433.

4. *NCH*, I, pp. XXXIX-XLI.

5. *NCH*, I, pp. XLVI-XLVII.

6. *NCH*, I, pp. XLI and XXXVI-XXXVIII

7. I am at present preparing a critical edition of the Nicetas-Metaphrase as part of my doctoral research under the supervision of Dr A. Angelou at the University of Ioannina. The introduction will contain a detailed analysis of the manuscripts and their relationship to one another.

consistent with the pattern described above for the *N-M* manuscripts. Below are enumerated the kinds of variation encountered in B and i (scribal error and orthographical idiosyncracies apart):

- 1) Variation of lexical items (N[icetae Chon. Hist.]372,47-49):
πολλούς μὲν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐφόνευσεν B
πολλούς μὲν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπέκτεινεν i
 - 2) Simple alterations of word order (N356.26):
μέχρι ταύτης ἐλθεῖν τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως B
μέχρι ταύτης τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως ἐλθεῖν i
 - 3) B omits where i keeps items that correspond with N :
τὸ γένος λαμπροὶ καὶ ἐπίσημοι (N390,93)
ἐκ γένους λαμπροῦ B
ἐκ γένους λαμπροῦ καὶ ἐπισήμου i
 - 4) i omits or abbreviates where B keeps items that correspond with N:
τὴν δουρικὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Θρακησίων (N400,77)
τὴν τῶν Θρακησίων ἀρχὴν i
τὴν δουρικὴν τῶν Θρακησίων ἀρχὴν B
 - 5) B adds an item that does not correspond with N or i:
ὁ ταύτης τύραννος (N370,93)
τῷ ταύτης τυράννῳ Γιλιέλμῳ B
τῷ ταύτης τυράννῳ S
- or
- ἐκύκλωσάν με ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον (N367,18)
ἐκύκλωσάν με οἱ ἐχθροὶ μου ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον B
ἐκύκλωσάν με ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον i
- 6) i adds (in the form of expanding on a lexical item) where B corresponds with N:
τὸ ἔθνος ὅλον ἀνασεΐσαντες (N369,58)
τὸ ὅλον ἔθνος ἀνασεΐσαντες B
τὸ ὅλον ἔθνος ἀνασεΐσαντες καὶ ταράξαντες i

A count of these variations for the bulk of *N-M* reveals that nos. 4 and 6 above are the least common types of variation. In other words, i appears to be less divergent from N in terms of lexical and phrasal amplification. It needs to be borne in mind therefore that, while both traditions of *N-M* must surely derive from the same original (so much of the text being identical in both branches), the version witnessed by B shows a tendency to more radical

departure from the phraseology of N. Yet in matters of accuracy and detail (placenames, grammatical features and scribal errors) the B text, in the vast majority of cases, is more reliable than the other manuscripts. It will become clear to what extent the passage here conforms to this pattern.

In the case of the two versions presented here, a number of questions immediately come to mind. Firstly, perhaps the one version is merely a reworking of the other. Secondly, one may ask whether they both record separate attempts at translation, uninfluenced by one another, although this seems highly unlikely when one considers how the rest of *N-M* (242 folia in B) does not present other divergences of this extent, and the fact that both B and 1 have so many shared features, even within this particular passage. Then again, and less improbably, perhaps one of the versions represents a combination of the already existing metaphrase and a reworking from Choniates' original, an hypothesis that presupposes our scribe/reviser, at least for this part of *N-M*, having two exemplars before him, a (draft?) metaphrase and the original *Chronike Diegesis*. There is a fourth possibility, that of the intrusion of interlinear or marginal corrections or alterations, which will be considered below.

By selecting a number of points from the passage appended to this article it should be possible to propose some answers to the questions posed above. Although just one of the two passages concerned is presented here (neither has been previously published), it is the longer of the two, and best illustrates points which can also be found in the other.

A careful reading and comparison of N (the original *Chronike Diegesis*) and BXS indicates that *N-M* does deserve perhaps to be characterized as a 'translation' of sorts, rather than as a paraphrase proper⁸. If one can take the

⁸ See H. HUNGER, *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschliessung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache*, Vienna 1981, 7, n. 2. 'Daß man diese Schriften nicht als Paraphrasen, sondern besser als Metaphrasen bezeichnet, hat A. PIGNANI zu Recht betont. 'Parafraasi o metafraasi (a proposito della Statua Regia di Niceforo Blemmida)?' *Atti Acc. Pontan.* 24 (1976), 219-225." I use the description 'metaphrase' chiefly in order to preserve the looseness of character of the text, as well as to use the more frequently encountered Byzantine word for this kind of text. It generally hovers between paraphrase and translation proper, without apparent consistency or clear

liberty of applying the dictum of modern translation theory, namely, that the golden rule of translation is to fulfill the criteria of accuracy and economy⁹, to a text and linguistic undertaking of this sort (in the case of works such as Planudes' translation into Greek of Latin works as, for example, Augustine's treatise on the Trinity¹⁰, Boethius' *Consolatione philosophiae*¹¹ or Ovid's *Metamorphoses*¹², as well as translations considered to have been undertaken by others¹³, or even Galesiotes' and Oinaïotes' metaphrase of the *Βασιλικὸς ἀνδριᾶς* of Nikephoros Blemmydes¹⁴, this principle does indeed seem to have been applied), then clearly *N-M* falls lamentably short of satisfying such demands. Yet the looser designation of 'paraphrase', implying as it does a degree of explanation, although valid for many parts of the text,

method. It has been variously described by others as 'Barbarograeca', 'vulgärgriechische', a 'declassicization' of a high-style history, as well as a 'metaphrase'.

9. Wide-ranging and detailed accounts in the English language of modern translation theory and practice, with extensive bibliographies on this developing branch of linguistics, include P. NEWMARK, *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford 1982, M. BAKER, *In Other Words*, London 1992, and S. BASSNETT-MCGUIRE, *Translation Studies*, London 1982.

10. For a discussion of the recent bibliography on Latin philosophical and theological works translated into Greek, chiefly in the second half of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, and some recent editions of these works, see L. G. BENAKIS, 'Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen philosophischer Texte', in *Φιλῆλλον, Essays presented in honour of R. Browning* (forthcoming, Venice 1996).

11. E. BÉTANT (ed.), BOECE: *De la Consolation de la Philosophie. Traduction grecque de Maxime Planude*, Geneva 1871.

12. For a general discussion of other translations from Latin by Planudes see N. G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983, 230-232, and H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Munich 1971, II, 68.

13. That Maximos Holobolos also had translated some texts on logic by Boethius has been called into question by some scholars (see WILSON, *op. cit.*, 224-5). A more recent study, however, accepts the Holobolos attribution: D. Z. NIKETAS (ed.), BOETHIUS' *De topicis differentiis und die byzantinische Rezeption dieses Werkes (Boethius, De topicis differentiis και οι βυζαντινές μεταφράσεις τῶν Μανουήλ Ὀλοβώλου και Προχόρου Κυδώνη. Παράρτημα/Anhang: Eine Pachymeres-Weiterarbeitung der Holobolos-Übersetzung*, The Academy of Athens, Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi. Philosophi Byzantini 5, Athens 1990.

14. H. HUNGER- I. ŠEVČENKO, *Des Nikephoros Blemmydes Βασιλικὸς Ανδριᾶς und dessen Metaphrase von Georgios Galesiotes und Georgios Oinaïotes*, Wiener Byzantinische Studien 18, Vienna 1986.

can by no means be said to explain the general process that, with little consistency and less method, brought about the conversion of N to *N-M*. Failler, in his discussion of another ‘paraphrase’, probably of the same century, described that text as ‘more than a simple compendium, yet less than a true paraphrase’¹⁵. In comparing these two versions of this particular passage of *N-M*, therefore, we are faced with the added variable factor of dealing with a text whose precise identity, or self-awareness in respect of its linguistic status and literary objectives, is far from clear. But it nevertheless does seem to be the case that –to the extent his understanding of the original allowed– our metaphrast was indeed attempting to *translate* Choniates’ work into a more easily understood idiom, keeping as closely as he was able to the thread and turn of phrase of the original, though as we shall see, not always successfully.

In just the first few lines one can discern a number of features that will be seen to recur throughout the passage examined here. In the words immediately preceding the section where *N-M* splits into two versions (this split occurs in mid-sentence, as is also the case with the first of the two passages, beginning on fol. 74, ms. Monacensis gr. 450) both B and i share the same misplacement of the word *Basmouloi*: the result is that the *Basmouloi* (in other words Latino-Romans of the city)¹⁶ are joined with the *Rhomaioi* in the first group of warships, thereby creating a racially based category of soldiers to fill the decks of the ships of the *μὲν* clause, while Choniates places the Romans in the one part of the fleet without specifying

15. A. FAILLER, La tradition manuscrite de l’Histoire de Georges Pachymère (livres I-VI), *REB* 37, 1979, 164.

16. For the *Basmouloi*, or more commonly *Gasmouloi*, see G. MAKRIS, Die Gasmulen, *Thesaurismata* 22, 1992, 44-96. On pp. 87-93 MAKRIS discusses the two forms of the word (beginning with γ- and β-). His conclusions on the occurrence of the two forms, however, do not allow us to make any secure inferences about the use of the form *Basmouloi* in our text (he suggests that the two forms probably existed side by side in Constantinople in late Byzantium, reflecting simply Frankish (for γασ-) and Venetian (βασ-) dialectical differences in the pronunciation of the word. The metaphrast may have been translating the word *διαφορογενῶν*, a hapax legomenon (see *NCH*, II, p. 115) that is not closed, of course, to other, more likely, interpretations: *διαφορογενεῖς Λατῖνοι* must surely indicate an assortment of Latin westerners, such as Pisans, Genoans, Venetians, etc.

the origins of those ready to fight on deck, and the *διαφορογενεῖς Λατῖνοι* in the other part. This looks as if either the metaphrast has understood *διαφορογενεῖς* as meaning something like *διγενής* ('of dual descent'), and interpreted this as *Basmouloi*, or has chosen to reinforce the phrase *ἄσπονδον ἀνδρεῖον καὶ μάχιμον* (B) = *ὅτιπερ κράτιστον μέρος καὶ μαχιμότερον* N. (That these forces of *Basmouloi* were considered to be crack fighters is attested also in Gregoras I 113.) An explanation for the curious position of the word in the text may be that *Βασμοῦλοι* was written somewhere in the margin or interlinear spaces of a glossed text of N (or of the original *N-M*), close to the *διαφορογενῶν Λατίνων* or *κράτιστον ... μαχιμότερον*, but became misplaced in a later copying. The fact that the divergence between the two texts occurs in mid-sentence may hold a clue to the reasons behind the sudden break in their correspondence. One would have thought that if a scribe, out of choice, were to set about recasting the words of the text he was copying, then he would do so at a point that provided a more logical starting place than mid-sentence.

In this same section *i* supplies a new verb, *εἰσηξάν*, whose subject is presumably an impersonal 'they'. It looks as if *i* was not happy with leaving the verb *εἰσήρχοντο* to apply for the rest of the sentence, although he then failed to harmonise the new verb –and new plural subject– with the subject (Alexios the *protosevastos*) of the verb *ἔδωκε*. Therefore *i* seems to be attempting to produce simpler syntax at this point. Next (4), *i* reflects N more transparently (*ἐπληροφορεῖτο ὡς αὐτῶ βοηθήσωσιν i = τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀρήξουσιν N*), yet at the same time B does not render the text less correctly. In fact, in the case of the phrase *τὴν ἅπασαν ἐλπίδα εἶχεν αὐτοῦ* one could claim that *ἤπερ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀρήξουσιν* (N) was translated even more vividly by the B version. Here, however, it is evident that the exemplar (or exemplars) from which *i* and B were copying was such that it was open to varying interpretation or remodelling. While B seems to show more confidence than *i*, the latter appears to have some kind of window onto N or, more likely, a (draft?) metaphrase of N. This passage, as well as *N-M* as a whole, gives the impression that a text of some kind, with a number of minor corrections or improvements marked on it, at this point was heavily annotated, thus leading to a degree of confusion for future copyists

–hence the mixed quality of both B and i, and the uneven degree to which one can detect N now in B and now in i. This remark finds further support in B/i 5-8, where B looks to be interested chiefly in the content of the passage, i in the form, and, particularly, in B/i 8, although i keeps ‘Kontostephanos’ (as in N) it does not look as finished as B. The gap, shared by both B and i at the end of 9 would suggest that indeed B and i are both copying from a text containing the Metaphrase rather than the original *Chronike Diegesis*.

A feature observed in the fourteenth-century ‘paraphrase’ of Pachymeres’ *History*¹⁷, and which is also the case in much of *N-M*, was the rendering into direct speech of parts of the text that could –however remotely– be understood as reported speech. B and i use the opening clause *εἰπόντος ὡς* to introduce the words of Kontostephanos. The difference between the two versions of Kontostephanos’ words is marked. I is more overtly first person, inserting *ἐμὸν* to give his words greater vividness: *Οὐ δυνατόν ἐστιν ἕτερος τὸ ἐμὸν κεφαλαττίκιον δέξασθαι*. On the other hand, B’s *οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ ἀρμόζει ἢ τοῦ στόλου ἀρχῆ* clearly follows N more closely (*στολαρχίας* N = *ἡ τοῦ στόλου ἀρχῆ* B; use of dative personal pronoun; *προσηκούσης* N = *ἀρμόζει* B), while i has completely rephrased the statement, picking up on the word he had used earlier *κεφαλάδας* (5) with *κεφαλαττίκιον*. I thus begins to assume the profile of a lively though less faithful (or, to put it another way, freer) translation; yet in the next phrase, 8, the pendulum swings away from i: i is suddenly much closer to N (*τὴν βούλησιν* N = *ὃν εἶχεν σκοπὸν* i; *μετατίθησι* N = *μετέθηκε* i), while B has almost wholly recast the entire phrase. This alternation of greater lexical faithfulness of now B and now i towards N can be seen throughout the entire passage.

5 presents a puzzling mixture of choices on the part of B and i: B omits to use a dative construction with *παραδοῦναι τὸν στόλον*, thereby failing to

17. FAILLER, *op. cit.*, 171. Many of FAILLER’s conclusions about the language of the paraphrase of Pachymeres’ *History* can equally well be applied to *N-M*: transformation of long sentences, occurring frequently in the original, into shorter and simpler units; replacement of indirect speech by direct speech; omission of rare or archaising particles and pronouns; translation of rare or arcane words into more commonly understood terms.

give grammatical shape to the sentence; i, on the other hand, supplies an indirect object with the *εἰς* construction, but prefers to keep *κεφαλάδας ἐμβαλεῖν* (=ἐπιστήσαι τριηράρχας ? N) while omitting *παραδοῦναι τὸν στόλον*. It is possible, however, that i is merely reworking a text similar to B, recasting the phrase *παραδοῦναι τὸν στόλον* as *κεφαλάδας ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὰ κάτεργα* in order to improve the syntax of the sentence. This may be seen therefore as evidence that i was perhaps revising a text similar to B. The confusion in B at this point would seem to indicate, however, that B cannot have been working from i.

In 10 both B and i misinterpret N: *συνῆν...τι* is rendered as a single person rather than as a collective pronoun, therefore suddenly introducing an unspecified character who is supposedly related to another unspecified character; one can only guess which of the names in the previous sentences the metaphrast had in mind.

Syntactical weakness is evident in B in other places. 12-14 are grammatically incomplete, since we wait in vain for a main verb (with *ὄς* as its subject) that is expected after the string of participles (*ἰδῶν, δοῦς, ἀναγνούς*). This confusion on the part of B is all the more mystifying since N does not seem obscure here. If one wishes to seek the logic behind this omission (the metaphrast is, after all, working on the basis of the original text and endeavouring –at times with more and at times with less success– to recreate meaning), and if one does not wish to attribute the absence of a main verb simply to scribal error (this possibility cannot be discounted, of course), then it may be because B was expecting the main verb to appear further down in the sentence; however, no such verb that could have *ὄς* as its subject materialises, and the entire sentence remains hanging in the air. The conclusion to be drawn on the method of the B text here is that he either did not take the trouble to revise his work, or that the passage in question gives evidence again of having been copied from a draft or annotated metaphrase, that did not indicate clearly which part of the text should be copied¹⁸. I does

18. Nevertheless, the metaphrast seems at this point to have understood Choniates better than his modern translator into English. H. J. MAGOULIAS, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit 1984, 139, fails to recognise the genitive absolute in

not share this error (*δούς* B = *ἔδωκε* i, *ἀναγνοῦς* B = *ἐξεῖπεν* i), and even shows resourcefulness by rendering *γράμματα* as *χρυσόβουλλον* (since the *grammata* confer privileges on Andronikos).

In the next section, 15-17, there are no major differences of interpretation, but i is far more free in its rendering, while B keeps closer to N and its literal formulation: *μεγαλοφώνως ὁ Ἀνδρόνικος ἐξεβόησεν* (B) is considerably closer to *ὑπέρογκον φάσκων πρὸς ὀργήν* (N) than is the *παρορησία εἶπε ταῦτα* (i). The same applies throughout Andronikos' speech to the mission from Alexios; both versions differ radically, B generally keeping closer to the lexical items of N, though, in the last phrase, 22, only i has retained the simile with *στάχυς*.

In 23-24 i goes to the trouble of giving the name of the *megas doux* with the family name Kontostephanos, rather than with his first name Andronikos, so as to avoid confusion with the rebel Andronikos. This may be seen to contrast with 10 above where the precise characters intended are not clear, although in that case the confusion arose out of the metaphrast's preference to interpret *τί...συγγενικὸν καὶ οἰκίδιον* (N) as a single individual. In 23-24, therefore, the metaphrast is not simply working through his text word by word and line by line, but is generally taking pains to understand the relationship between its various elements, whether they be characters or events. Further, i 24 sees the interesting addition of *προστίθεται καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτῷ*, clearly a supplementary gloss for *μεταχωρεῖ ἐς Ἀνδρόνικον*, since the metaphrast perhaps felt that *ἀπέρχεται* –the verb he uses at the beginning of the sentence– does not render sufficiently the full meaning of *μεταχωρεῖ*. Again, here, i may be copying indiscriminately, while perhaps B has used judgment and decided to be content with *ἀπέρχεται πρὸς τὸν Ἀνδρόνικον*.

B and i 29-32 show striking differences that may very likely be due to the difficulty of N at this point. Characteristically both branches of *N-M* avoid the elaborate literary and biblical allusions of Choniates (31), but nonetheless struggle to incorporate some of their sense, albeit in drastically

the sentence, thus distorting the sense of the original by making Andronikos, rather than Xiphilinos, responsible for undermining the mission: *It is said that Andronikos undermined the negotiations undertaken by the envoy Xiphilinos and refused to yield* etc.

abridged form, into the main narrative. The phrase *καὶ ὑποστρεφόμενοι, εὐηγοετοῦντο* i, looks suspiciously like a marginal or interlinear note that has crept into the main body of the i text¹⁹. In fact, our surviving versions testify to a degree of differentiation that becomes more easily explained if we take a supposition of this kind into account.

32 provides evidence for a subject that will not be developed here, but can be mentioned in passing: it is still unclear from which version precisely of the original *Chronike Diegesis* the metaphrast was working²⁰. Van Dieten proposes a hybrid text of the history as the exemplar used by the metaphrast, most probably a manuscript closely related to W (Vindobonensis Hist. gr. 105). W is a manuscript of the late fourteenth and mid-fifteenth century, and since it post-dates the oldest manuscripts of *N-M* cannot itself have constituted a source for the Metaphrase, although it may well of course be a copy of such a source. The participle *δράσοντα* in the phrase *κακῶς τοὺς ὑπὸ κόλπον φέροντας δράσοντα* (N33), however, is preserved only in W as *δράκοντα*²¹, the same word used by i, though omitted entirely by B. One cannot insist on the reliability of this reading, however, since it may just be due to scribal error; however, it is tempting to see N's *ῥατιν* as lying behind the appearance of the word in i.

In 32, i expands by adding *καὶ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ* (not in N or B). Again this looks as if it may have crept in from the margin, where it properly belonged to 30. I, paraphrasing, also preserves the second half of N32, which was entirely omitted by B, thus indicating again the greater accuracy and completeness of i during the first part of the passage discussed here. (This is

19. For an interesting discussion of medieval Greek school books, and the method of glossing ancient Greek texts in the interlinear spaces (termed *ψυχγωγία*), see A. SKARVELI-NIKOLOPOULOU, *Τὰ μαθηματάρια τῶν ἐλληνικῶν σχολείων τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας*, Athens 1993, (published by the Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν Ὡφελίμων Βιβλίων), 293f.

20. *NCH*, I, pp. LXXXVI-LXXXVIII.

21. *NCH*, I, critical apparatus, p. 248, line 75. Most readings of the manuscripts containing *N-M* are not included in the critical apparatus of the *Chronike Diegesis* for reasons outlined by van Dieten himself (see pp. CIII-CIV). Thus van Dieten draws almost exclusively on B for readings from the Paraphrase, only using the other manuscripts (XYS) at those points where there are lacunae in B.

visually evident if one simply compares the amount of text in B and i from sections 1 to 40, after which the proportions are reversed).

33 again shows i expanding and clarifying, though not necessarily supplying information that cannot be gathered from elsewhere in the text itself: 'The *two* sons of Andronikos, John and Manuel, were released from prison *by the citizens*'. There is probably no need to seek the introduction of a new piece of information elsewhere. The latter agent noun could quite easily have been implied simply as a matter of inference from the context; in other words the explanation for the appearance of *παρά τῶν πολιτῶν* most probably lies in the grammatically driven desire to supply an agent for the passive verb *ἐκβάλλονται*. I then omits part of 33, while in 34 B and i show a pair of words for *ἐγκλείονται* (i.e. *δεσμοῦνται, φυλακίζονται*) and *προσέβλεπεν ἡμερον* (i.e. *εὐηργέτει καὶ ἀνεδέχετο* B, *ἀνεδέχετο καὶ ἠγάπα* i), again suggesting that we may be dealing here with interlinear or marginal notes that were later worked into a full text. 35 shows differences that reveal the uneven quality of both versions. B makes no alteration whatsoever to the meaning of the text at this point, but i seems to have taken the first part of the previous period as belonging to the next, thus creating confusion in the syntax, with two objects (*συγγενεῖς* and *πρωτοσεβαστόν*), untidily subsumed under the singular relative pronoun *αὐτόν* at the end of the sentence. Whereas i during the first sections of this extract read somewhat more cohesively than B, from this point onwards it appears that B starts to regain the generally better wrought character it displays throughout *N-M* as a whole.

Again, 36 indicates that i is attempting to improve on the original metaphor, perhaps using Choniates as a basis for this improvement, but also using imagination: the phrase *μετὰ σιδήρων ... καὶ προσοχῆς* is invention on the part of i, revealing that this is not a retranslation as such of N, but an attempt to make the text easier to understand, sometimes with the help of N, but also simply on the basis of the original *N-M* as this is in general preserved for us in B.

37-41 presents a broad range of lexical variations, again suggestive of the existence of alternatives noted in the interlinear spaces or margin of the scribes' exemplar (*παλινστρόφου φορᾶς* N, *μεταστροφή* B, *καταστροφῆς* i:

αὐθάδης καὶ λίαν ὑπέραυχος N, ἐπηρμένος καὶ μεγάλα καυχώμενος B, ἀλαζών i; περιβομβούμενος N, περιτριγυριζόμενος B, προσζυνοούμενος καὶ τιμώμενος i; ἀνέστιος N, ἄοικος Bi; ἐδυσχέραινε N, ἐλυπεῖτο B, ἐθλίβετο i; ἐῶτο N, ἠνεμπόδιζον αὐτόν B, ἐνεμπόδιζον αὐτῷ i). I, interestingly, translates ἐπιπιπτόντων (N) as ζοιντοῦντες, a word not used elsewhere in *N-M*²². B adds a (banal) comment of his own in 41 (τοιαῦτα γὰρ εἰσὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα), although yet again this looks like a marginal note, written at some stage by a reader or copyist of *N-M*, that perhaps became confused with the main text.

A legitimate question with regard to the two versions we have before us might be to what extent the one or the other version shows signs of being *δημιωδέστερον*, that is, of using vocabulary or grammatical forms that are more obviously closer to the spoken language of the time. The answer is aptly illustrated in 42-51: neither can claim to be a more thoroughly vernacular reworking of the original. While B less adventurously translates ἵπῳ βραχυτάτῳ ἐπικαθήμενος N as ἐπὶ ἵπῳ λίαν σμικρῷ τοῦτον καθίσαντες, i renders it as ἐν ἀλόγῳ ἀπόρῳ καθίσαντες αὐτόν, using ἐν as a preposition of movement, preferring ἀλόγῳ to ἵπῳ and interpreting βραχυτάτῳ as ἀπόρῳ. (It may well be, however, that i in fact reworked B at this point: ἀπόρῳ can also be seen as a free rendering of σμικρῷ rather than βραχυτάτῳ. Moreover, the apparent scribal error in 49 –πιεῖν B for ποιεῖν N– may explain the use of the word ἀβύσσους by i to describe the imperial treasury.) Yet further down it is B that uses *καλάμιν* (*καλάμιον* i), and *βάλλαν* (i *σανδάλιον*), forms which to a greater or lesser extent are more ‘vernacular’ in B than in i. Both B and i seem to be aiming at the same level with their rendering of the long conditional sentence in 46-48. The

22. The entry for ζοιντώ in E. ΚΡΙΑΡΑΣ, *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημιώδους γραμματείας*, Thessalonica 1968–, makes no reference to an occurrence of the word in *N-M* since its source for *N-M* is the critical apparatus of BEKKER’s edition (Bonn, 1835) of the *Chronike Diegesis*. Bekker’s edition did not use any of the other manuscripts containing the Niketas-Metaphrase. Kriaras therefore continues a tradition established by Ducange, who, in the seventeenth century, had included among his sources ms Monacensis gr. 450 (then in the Augsburg library) for his *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*, Lyon 1688 (reprinted Graz, 1958).

distribution therefore of distinctly vernacular language appears not to be guided by consistent linguistic preference, but more by chance, thus depriving us of the opportunity of characterising the one or the other text as a more radically popular recasting of the original *Chronike Diegesis*.

In 50-51 B is certainly more complete than i, but syntactically unsatisfactory. Perhaps with N's neut. acc. *ὀπλιτικόν* in mind, B proceeds to use the neutor acc. participle *ὑπάρχον* and adj. *πλέον* for the masc. acc. *στρατόν* of B's previous clause. I (perhaps for reasons of national pride?) altogether omits Choniates' comment on the braver Latin forces.

The last section (55-59) demonstrates very clearly the fact that the B and the i-texts are interdependent, yet at the same time appear to have turned to N for guidance. The use of the genitive absolute in i would seem to suggest that the subject of *πέμψας* is different. This was presumably not intended, and was simply the undesired result of the i reviser 'improving' on the original *N-M* by introducing a supposedly literary grammatical form. The word *συγκροτοῦσι* (B57) implies a plural subject, not provided by Choniates, and kept as singular in i. In 58, however, i omits *καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐς συνασπισμὸν παραθήξαντος* N (=ὄθεν καὶ ὁμογνωμονήσαντες B).

The picture that emerges of the two versions is decidedly mixed and uneven. I on a number of occasions appears to begin sentences with every intention of improving the material he finds before him, but frequently loses momentum, or declines into extemporisation that does not correspond precisely with either B or N. At other moments, however, i corresponds more closely to N than B. The nature of the divergences between the two traditions suggests, as already mentioned, that they in fact both derive from a single original metaphrase that may have been annotated with interlinear or marginal changes or corrections for which there was no clear indication for subsequent copyists as to which of these changes should be included or left out. An alternative interpretation is that the original metaphrase was written in the interlinear spacing of a Niketastext, thus explaining why B and i on separate occasions seem independently to bear witness to the Niketastext. The mere logistics, however, of such a source for the surviving witnesses to *N-M* would seem to rule out this hypothesis, implying as it does that here there is a third set of notes or text. One may surmise that the B and the i

versions represent two separate copyings (or descendents of those copyings) from an original metaphrase that was itself altered or corrected in some parts, specifically in the passages discussed here. Our subsequent surviving texts of *N-M* are, partly, two attempts at imposing order and coherence on an assortment of text and interlinear or marginal glosses. Both versions share the same stylistic level, with a number of interesting though mutually balancing variations, but it is tempting to see them as the work of two separate individuals (alterations such as *καλάμιν/καλάμιον*, and –from elsewhere in *N-M*– a consistent preference for *εἰς* in B and *πρός* in i, while perhaps the result of a copyist's preference, may rather indicate a differing idiolect). This stylistic level is not only dictated by the target idiom (I hesitate to use the word 'language') of the translated text, but also conceals (and frequently betrays) much about the literary and linguistic ability of the metaphrast, which, in the case of passages where Choniates uses highly rhetorical or florid language and complex allusions or similes (drawn invariably from Biblical or classical sources) is not sufficient to capture the spirit or tone of Choniates, if indeed the reference is understood at all. At those points where the narrative describes actions and events, such as the imperial delegation sent to the rebel Andronikos, and exchanges of dialogue, then the metaphrast comes into his own, and is able to produce a text that often succeeds in holding the reader's attention and even entertain for its immediacy and refreshingly simple style.

To answer the question posed in the title of this article, it would seem that both versions may well have been born of the same original metaphrase, but that one (i or its predecessor) revised, and, to a limited extent, retranslated N, guided, however, by a text similar to B. It remains a matter for conjecture (and will probably still remain so after an exhaustive collation of all the *N-M* manuscripts) what kind of exemplar the two branches of the *N-M* tradition descend from: it may well have been a single metaphrase that existed in an *ante* and *post correctionem* form, each of which resulted in the two subsequent branches of the *N-M* text. Perhaps the one version represents an experiment, carried out at random on these few folios of the Niketas-Metaphrase.

To close, we may once again draw attention to the famous marginal note found on fol. 2^v of ms. Vindobonensis Hist. gr. 53²³: οὐκ οἶδα τί φῆς ἐνθάδε, Χωνειάτα, σοφὸν τὸ σαφές συγγραφῶν εἶναι λέγεις, εἶτα γρουφώδη (sic) καὶ βαραθρώδη γράφεις. The motives behind the production of a translation of the *Chronike Diegesis* constitute the subject of an investigation that goes beyond the scope of this study. It cannot be denied, however, that the metaphrase as a whole, as well as this particular passage, represents an attempt to make the text *σαφές*, thereby removing it from the almost metaphysical realm of *γριφος* or *ἀσάφεια* ('obscurity'), and placing it fairly and squarely within the reach of all moderately educated readers,

διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἀσθένειαν²⁴.

23. The manuscript is of the early fourteenth century, but the note discussed here is written in a later hand. See *NCH*, I, p. XXXII.

24. NICETAS CHONIATES, *Orationes et Epistulae*, ed. J.-L. VAN DIETEN, Berlin 1972, 170. It is worth comparing H.-G. BECK's introductory remarks in *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, Munich 1971, 6, where he states that the translation of various historical works in the later Byzantine period into a simpler idiom was indicative of the desire of Byzantines 'not to allow any linguistic barrier to come between them and their own historical self-awareness', with a discussion of the rhetorical phenomenon of *ἀσάφεια* and the Byzantine theoretical justification for obscurity in G. L. KUSTAS, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*, *Analekta Vlatadon* 17, Thessalonica 1973, chapter 3, 63-100, and chapter 6, esp. 193-194, where he discusses the device of 'emphasis' (as well as Pollux' and Siceliotes' use of the term *γριφος*). These two opposing phenomena appear to have coexisted, if not even nurtured one another, throughout the last centuries of Byzantium.

The text that follows gives both versions of the *Nikeias Metaphrase* and, for ease of reference and comparison the corresponding text of *Niceetae Choniatae Historia* as edited by van Dieten in CFBH 111
N = *Niceetae Choniatae Historia* ed van Dieten CFBH 11/1 (Berlin 1975) 247 31 250 26 (=Bekker [Bonn] 321 325)

B = Mon gr 450 (first half of 14th c.) fols 80 81
I = Vindobonensis Suppl. gr 166 (14th/15th c.) fols 54^v 57 (14th c.) and Scotiatisis Ψ IV 17 (early 16th c.) fols 121^v 123^v

The first paragraph (corresponding to N 246 20 247 30) is given simply to indicate the closer agreement between B and XS outside the above passages

The division of the passage into numbered sections for analysis and discussion. Gaps in the passages are inserted merely in order to keep them roughly parallel to one another. While they do not imply lacunae in the manuscripts they do suggest that the *metaphrast* is deliberately abbreviating. Occasionally double square brackets are used to mark off sections that have no equivalent in the other versions

The paragraph division in the *Metaphrase* passages is that of the manuscripts

N

Αλιέιο, δι' ο' πρωτοσφρακτος, μη εχων δια πεζικου σφραγγος, αποσφρακται τονι πινια οι πολημιον (ηδη γαρ οι μεν μετβαριων του, γλωμιας γρημφωδης προς Ανδρονιζον οσοσος ουκ ην ολωσ αναδυνοσ, η προς εβαλον τουλα μεταφρασι του, δε αφεκτον εσ την προς τον κρατοινα τιπτιν λελοηιστο το επ οικου μονον καθησθαι και μηδενι προστιθεσθαι των μεσων ουτω γαρ φρονεν τε και λεγειν τοις πολλοις εξετασθαισ το της γνημης κερβαλασφρον και το δια φρονων αι και προχνησος, αμιατος τοις πλειουσ των βασιλευσ της Ρωμαικης επιφανειν αρχης) δια ναριμαχιασ επιρωτο τον προσωρεποντα κινδων αποκρουσασθαι

Τιτηρεις τοιωνν την Προποντιδα εκκαλιπτον αι μεν Ρωμαικος εχουσα τοις ερεσοντασ και τοις εκ των καταστροφιατων διαμαχεσθαι μελλοντασ

I αι δε των κατα τοιων διαφορογενων Λατινων **2** οτιπερ κρατιαστων και μαχιμων μεροσ **3** οίσ και τα χρηματα τοταμην επεξεοντο **4** επι και τοιτοι, επεποθει μαλλον ο χωρμενοσ πρωτοσφρακτοσ ημερ τοις Ρωμαικοισ αυτοις ωσ αφησουαν **5** ωρημεσ μεν ουν τουσ πιστοτατοισ αυτω επισηται τριποσραχασ και παδαδουαν τον στολον τοι, εκεινω κατα μενοσ εριζουσι **6** του δε μεγαλου δουκοσ του Κοινοσφρακου αντιπεισαντοσ και τησ στολαρχιασ παντι τροπω εξεγομενου **7** ωσ, αυτω και ουχ ετερω δη τινη τροποκοσμησ **8** αναγκαστωσ την βουλην μεταπθηαι **9** και δη ο μεν Κοινοσφρακοσ Ανδρονικοσ κυριοσ καθεισταιρηι του στολου παντοσ [Γραι καταπλουσ απασ τοις απο της εω πεφαικοιμενοσ, αποτειχεηιτο]]

B

Ο δε πρωτοσφρακτοσ, μη δυναμικνοσ, δια πεζικου στοατου απλιδωσσαι τον Ανδρονικον (οι πλειονεσ, γαρ τρωσ, αι τον κρημφωσ εφειγον και απηρογοντο οι ετεροι δε οτινις πιστιν ελεγον φηδαιπειν τω βασιλει επι τουσ οικουσ, αι των εκαθρητο μηδενι των δυο μερων προστιθεντεσ) εγω γονυ δια των κατεργων πολεμιασ και διωσα τον Ανδρονικον οικονομησσαν τοιωνν τα κατεργα και εις τα μεν εισηρογοντο Βασηουλοι και Ρωμαιοι μετα ρογασ αφρετισ και τολλαησ

I εις τα ετερα δε απο διαφρονων Λατινων γενων **2** οσον ην ανδρειον και μαχημιον **3** εις ουσ, και τα χρηματα ωσ ποταμοσ εγεοντο **4** ελεινουσ γαο και πλεον εβαρεη και ην απασαν εκτιδα εγεν αυτω **5** ηθελησεν ον εναι ουσ ηγειτο και υπελαμβηθε πιστουσ και φιλουσ εναι αυτω και συγγενεισ παδαδουαν τον στολον **6** αλλ ενειμποδισθη υπο του μεγαλου δουκοσ του Κοινοσφρακου επιοντοσ **7** ωσ ουδενι δαλω αφηδεη η του στολου αρχη **8** οθεν και υπο της αναγκησ ελκομενοσ και μη θελων **9** κυριον παντοσ του στολου αυτον καθιστα

I

Ο δε πρωτοσφρακτοσ μη δυναμικνοσ, δια πεζικου σφρακου αποδιωσαι τον Ανδρονικον (οι πλειονεσ, γαρ τρωσ, αι τον κρημφωσ εφειγον και απηρογοντο οι ετεροι δε οτινις πιστιν ελεγον φηδαιπειν τω βασιλει επι τουσ οικουσ αυτων εκαθρητο μηδενι των δυο μερων προστιθεντεσ) εγω ουν δια των κατεργων αποδιωσαι και τολεμιασ τον Ανδρονικον φλονομησσαν τοιωνν τα κατεργα και εις τα μεν εισηρογοντο Βασηουλοι και Ρωμαιοι μετα ρογασ ακρετησ, και τολλαησ

I εις τα ετερα δε φραγγουισ εισησαν αποδιωσασων γενων **2** ονομαστωαν και ανδρειουσ **3** οίσ και πειοσιστοεσαν εδωκε δωρεαν **4** τοιτοις γαο μαλλον εβαρεη ο πρωτοσφρακτοσ και επληροσφορειτο ωσ αυτω βοηθησασιν **5** ωρημεν ον κερβαλαδασ εμβηλειν εις τα κατεργα ουσ αυτοσ πιστουσ ηγειτο και μεγαλου δουκοσ του Κοινοσφρακου ελογηετο εκ των συγγενων αυτου **6** του δε αντιπατοσ αυτω και επιοντοσ **7** ωσ—Ου δυνατον εστιν επεφοσ το εμον κερβαλατιμιον δεξασθαι — **8** εξ αναγκησ μετπθηκε και αυτοσ ον ειχε σκοπον **9** και τον Κοινοσφρακον κυριον παντοσ του στολου επιουσε και πασαν του στολου την εξουσιαν αυτω δεδωκε

10 συνην δε τῷ Κοντοστεφανῷ και τι τοῦ πρωτοσεβαστοῦ συγγενικον και οικιδιον

11 Μετα βραχυ δε και πρεσβις απο του βασιλεως ες Ανδρονικον στελλεται τις των εντροφων του βηματος **12** ο Ξιφιλίνος ἦν οὗτος Γεωργιος, ὃς και εἰς ὄψιν τῷ τυραννῷ ἐληλυθως τα τε γραμματα ενεχειρισε και τα διαμηνυθέντα απηγγειλεν **13** ἦσαν δε ταῦτα δωρεῶν επαγγελια μειζονων και αξιωματων ἀναβαθμοι **14** και χαρις απο τοῦ πρυτανευοντος ειρηνην θεοῦ αποσταντι μεν τοῦ προκειμενου σκεμματος, εἰς οὐπερ ἐμφυλιοι συμβησονται πολεμοι, προς δε ἦθη τα προτερον ἐπανηκοντι **15** ο δε, τοῦ πρεσβευτοῦ, ως φασι, Ξιφιλινου την πρεσβειαν υπονοθευσαντος **16** και μη ενδοῦναι ολωσ ἢ βραχυ τι γοῦν καθυφεῖναι παρακελευσαμενου, την τε αἴτησιν ἀποπεμπεται και την προσλαλιαν ποιεῖται τοῖς διαπρεσβευσασμενοις **17** υπερογκον φασικων προς οργην **18** ὡς ἦν Ανδρονικον βουλοιντο παλινορσον αναζητεῖν ὅθεν ἐληλυθεν, **19** αποσκορακισθητω μεν ἐκ τοῦ μεσου ὁ πρωτοσεβαστος **20** και δοτω λογους ὧν πεπαρωνηκεν, **21** η δε τοῦ βασιλεως μητηρ καθ' ἑαυτην βιοτευετω την τριχα κειραμενη καθαπαξ την κοσμηκην, **22** ὁ δε βασιλευς κατα την πατρῶων διαθηκην ἀρχετω μη ὡς σταχυς αἴραις τοῖς παραδυναστευουσι συμπνιγομενος

23 Ἄλλ' οὕτω ἡμεραι σιγναι παρηλθοσαν, **24** και μεταχωρεῖ εἰς Ἄνδρονικον και ὁ μεγας δουξ Ἄνδρονικος τας μακρας νῆας παρελήφως, ὅπως ὁ Ῥωμαιων ἐπληρου καταλογῷ

10 ἦν δε και μετα του Κοντοστεφανου, φίλος τις και οικεῖος συγγινης τοῦ πρωτοσεβαστοῦ

11 Μετ' ὀλιγον δι και αποκρυσιαριος παρα του βασιλεως προς τον Ἄνδρονικον πειπεται, απο τῶν αρχοντων τῆς ἐκκλησιας **12** ο Ξιφιλίνος οὗτος Γεωργιος ἦν, ὃς και τον Ἄνδρονικον ἰδων, και τα γεγραμμενα δους και αναγνους, **13** ἔγραφον γαρ αὐτῷ, ἀξιωμάτων μεγαλων τιμαι και δωρεῶν ενεργετιαι πολλαι, **14** ὅπως μη εἰς το μεσον αὐτῶν, ἐμφυλιοι γενησονται πολεμοι, εἰ μονον θελησει εἰρηνεῦσαι, και επανα στρεψει ὅθεν ἐξῆλθε **15** τοῦ Ξιφιλινου δε ως ελεγετο την πρεσβειαν υποκλεψαντος, **16** και μηδολως συγκατατεθῆναι ἐν τινι πραγματι τοῦτο θελησαντος, **17** μεγαλοφωνως ὁ Ἄνδρονικος ἐξεβησεν, **18** ως Ἐαν θελωσιν ἵνα ἐξοπισθεν υποστρεψη ο Ἄνδρονικος, **19** ὃς ἐξεληθ ὁ πρωτοσεβαστος εκ τοῦ μεσου, **20** και ἄς δωσει λογον ὑπερ ὧν κακῶς ἐπραξεν **21** ἄς κουρευθῆ δε και ἡ δεσποινα, και ἄς ἀπελθη εἰς μοναστηριον, **22** και ἄς ἐξουσιάζει μονος ο βασιλευς τα πραγματα, και μηδεν συμπνιγεται και ἐξουσιάζεται παρ' αὐτῶν

23 Ου πολλαι ἡμεραι παρηλθοσαν, **24** και ὁ μεγας δουξ τα κατεργα παραλαβων ἀπερχεται προς τον Ἄνδρονικον

10 εἶχε γαρ και συγγενειαν προς αὐτον ὀλιγην **11** μετολιγον δε και ἀποκρυσιαριος παρα του βασιλεως απο των κληρικῶν τῆς μεγαλης ἐκκλησιας, προς Ἄνδρονικον πεμπεται **12** ο Ξιφιλίνος Γεωργιος ἦν, ὃς προς Ανδρονικον ἐλθων, χρυσοβουλλον αὐτῷ ἔδωκε και τα μνημυματα ἐξεῖπεν

13 Ἦσαν δε επαγγελιαι μεγαλων δωρεων, και αξιωμάτων μεγαλης τιμῆς, **14** και ἀπο θεοῦ εὐρησει βοηθειαν, εἰ ἐξοπισθεν στραφεῖ και παύσει τον πολεμον, ὡς ἂν μη χυθῶσιν ἀνθρωπων χριστιανῶν αιματο **15** λεγεται δε τον Ξιφιλινον, κρυφως τουτον ειπεῖν, **16** μη ὑποκυψαι ὅλωσ τοῖς τοῦ βασιλεως γραμμασιν, ἀλλα κρατεῖν στερεῶς και μενειν καθως εὑρισκεται στας οὖν εν μεσῷ ὁ Ἄνδρόνικος, **17** παρηρησια εἶπε ταῦτα, **18** —Εἰ θελει ὁ βασιλευς υποστρεψαι με ὀπισθεν, **19** ἄς ἐκβληθῆ ὁ πρωτοσεβαστος ἀπο μεσον τοῦ παλατιου **20** και ἄς κριθῆ εἰς δσα ἄτοπα ἐπραξε, **21** και ἡ δεσποινα και μητηρ τοῦ βασιλεως, ἄς υπαγη εἰς μοναστηριον και ἄς γενηται καλογραια, **22** και ἄς ἀρχη μονος ο βασιλευς, και μη ὑπο των πολλῶν ζιζανιων ὡς εἰς σταχυς μεσον τουτων συμπνιγεται

23 Ἡμεραι δε διαβιβασθεισα ὀλιγαι, **24** ἀπέρχεται και ο μεγας δουξ ο Κοντοστεφανος, μετα των κατεργων προς τον Ἄνδρονικον και προστιθεται και αὐτος αὐτῷ

16 εν μεσῷ επιμεσον S **21** το ante μοναστηριον add S II γενηται γενη S

25 καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον ἐπῆρε μὲν ὑπὲρ ἅπαν ἄλλο τὸν ἀποστάτην, **26** τὸν δὲ πρωτοσεβαστὸν ἠφάντισε τέλος, πάσας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἀπεγνωκότα καὶ κατακλασθέντα τὸ πρόθυμον. **27** οὐκ ἐτι γὰρ λαθραῖαι σίνοδοι τῶν Ἀνδρονίκῳ προσκεμμένων ἐγίνοντο, **28** ἀλλ' ἀνέδη τὸν πρωτοσεβαστὸν ἐρεσχελούοντες οἱ ταῖς τῶν πραγμάτων μεταβολαῖς χαίροντες ἐς Χαλκηδὸνα διεπλωῖζοντο· καὶ τῷ Ἀνδρονίκῳ κατὰ φατρίας συγγινόμενοι **29** φυτὴν ἐκείνου καὶ εἶδος ἀγπτόν καὶ γῆρας σεμνὸν ἀπεθαύμαζον **30** καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐκείνου γλώττης τρυγῶντες μελίκρον **31** καί, ὡς ἄγνωστis δῆμῳ ἢ δρόσον Ἀερμωνίτην τὰ ὄρη Σιών, ἃ ἦν ὑψηγοῶν προσιέμενοι μετὰ πλείστis ἐπανέστρεφον χαρμονῆς, [ὡς εἶπερ τὰς ἄδομένας χρυσᾶς ἔννας καὶ τὴν ἀλληλεσμένην τοῦ μύθου διαίταν ἢ τὴν ἡλίου λεγομένην τράπεζαν παρακειμένην εὗραντο καὶ κατακορεῖς αὐτῆς ἐγεγόνεισαν.] **32** ἦσαν δ' οἱ καὶ πρῶτης ὄψεως εὐθὺς τὸν ἐν δέσματι προβάτου κεκρυμμένον λύκον ἐγνώρισαν καὶ τὸν ὄσον οὐλῳ μετὰ θάλασσαν ἐπιθησόμενον δῆμῳ καὶ κακῶς τοὺς ὑπὸ κόλπον φέροντας δρᾶσοντα.

33 Ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀνιένται μὲν τῆς εἰρηκτῆς αὐτοῦ τε τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου οἱ παῖδες ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ὁ Μανουὴλ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ, οὓς καθεῖρξεν ὁ πρωτοσεβαστός, **34** ἐγκλείονται δ' ἕτεροι, οἓς οὗτος προσέβλεπεν ἡμερον καὶ ὄσοι τῆς αὐτοῦ μερίδος καὶ συγγενείας.

25 καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον, ὑπερύψωσε μὲν τὸν ἀποστάτην, **26** τὸν δὲ πρωτοσεβαστὸν τελίως ἠφάνισεν, ἀπέγνω γὰρ παντελῶς, καὶ ἡ ἅπασα αὐτοῦ προθυμία ἐνεκρώθη. **27** οὐκ ἐτι γὰρ ἔκτοτε κρυφίως συνήγοντο, **28** ἀλλὰ φανερώς τὸν πρωτοσεβαστὸν ὑβρίζοντες καὶ ἐξουθενῶντες, διεπεραιούοντο εἰς τὴν Χαλκηδὸνα, καὶ ἀπήρχοντο πρὸς Ἀνδρόνικον, **29** ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ μεγαλύνοντες τὸ τε γένος καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ γῆρας, **30** καὶ τὸ τῆς γλώττης αὐτοῦ γλυκερόν· **31** καὶ δροσιζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου λόγων ὡς ἀπὸ δροσίου ἀεριῶν, ὑπεστρέφοντο.

32 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τινες, οἱ ἀπὸ μόνης θεωρίας τὸν ὄν εἶχεν ἐντὸς κεκρυμμένον λύκον καταστοχάζοντες. **33** ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἐλευθεροῦνται μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς οἱ τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου υἱοὶ ὁ τε Ἰωάννης καὶ Μανουὴλ, καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι οὓς ὁ πρωτοσεβαστός ἐφυλάκισε, **34** δεσμοῦνται δὲ πάλιν καὶ φυλακίζονται οὓς ὁ πρωτοσεβαστός εὐηγεῖται καὶ ἀνεδέχεται.

25 καὶ τοῦτο μὲν τὸ ἔργον ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐμεγάλυνε τὸν ἀποστάτην Ἀνδρόνικον· **26** τὸν δὲ πρωτοσεβαστὸν κατέβαλε καὶ ἠφάνισε τέλος, ἀπογνόντα τὴν αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν· **27** ἔκτοτε δὲ, οὐκ ἐτι κρυφίως οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὸν Ἀνδρόνικον προσέκειντο καὶ ἐπορεύοντο, **28** ἀλλὰ φανερώς τὸν πρωτοσεβαστὸν καὶ ἀδιαντρόπως ὑβρίζοντες, πρὸς Χαλκηδὸνα ἐπεραιούοντο συστήματα, **29** οὕτινες καὶ προσέκυνον αὐτῷ. [καὶ ὑποστρεφόμενοι, εὐηγετοῦντο·] καὶ ἐδόξαζον καὶ ἐπαίνουν καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τὸ τε γῆρας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὀρθὴν ἡλικίαν, **30** καὶ τὸ τῆς γλώττης μελίτατον.

32 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ τινὲς οἱ ἀπὸ μόνης τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, καταλαμβάνοντες τὸν ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ δράκοντα, κατανοοῦντες καὶ οἷον θηρίον εἰς μέσην αὐτοῦ ἐμβαλεῖν σπεύδουσι. **33** μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκβάλλονται μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἱ δύο τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου υἱοί, **34** καὶ φυλακίζονται ἕτεροι οὓς ἀνεδέχεται καὶ ἡγάπα ὁ πρωτοσεβαστός, τοὺς δὲ συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ

35 και αυτος δι ο πρωτοσεβαστος κατα τα ανακτορα συλληφθεις και φρουρα διαληφθεις Γερμανων οι καταμαδον τους ετεροστομους πελεκεις ανεγουσιν απροιτος εμενεν **36** αυθις δε των μεν βασιλειων λαθραιως και περι μεσας νυκτας εξαγεται τοις δε κατα το ιερον ανακτορον οικημασι διδοται ων δομητωρ ο πατριαρχης γεγονε Μιχαηλ μετα της αυτης και παλιν και πλειονως ασφαλεστερας φρουρας

37 Ω πραγματων παλινστροφου φορας και θαιτον η λογος μετακλινομενης ενιοτε **38** ο κατα της εκκλησιας χθες εισενεγκων ακηρυκτον πολεμον και θρασυς και αυθαδης και λιαν υπεραυχος και τους φυγαδας εκειθεν αποσπων ως ουκ εδει και μυριασιν οχλων περιβομβουμενος **39** σημερον δεσμιος και ανεστιος μηδεν εχων οπαδον και συλληπτορα η τον σωζοντα και λυτρουμενον **40** ο δε εδυσχεραينه μεν καιπι τουτοις επαθαινετο δε πλεον οτι μη εφω υπνωττειν υπο των φυλακων αι επιλιπτοντων αυτω προς υπνον τρεπομενω και βιαζοντων ισταν τους οφθαλμους ωστερ κερας η σιδηρον **41** ο δε πατριαρχης μη μνησικακων αλλ οικτειρων της μεταβολης τον ανθρωπον θεραπειας τε ικανης μετεδιδου και συγγινομενος το ακθος εκουφιζε και μετριως εκεινω προσφερεσθαι παρηνει τοις φυλαξι μηδε γινεσθαι βαρυτερους τυχης της ενεστωσης

42 Ου μην αλλ ημερων τινων διαλειπουσων ιφος απαγεται του νεω ιπρω βραχυτατω επικαθημενος και προοδουσαν εχων σημαian επι καλαμω ηνεμωμενην και παραινουμενος ουτω κατρει προς θαλασσαν

35 και αυτος δι ο πρωτοσεβαστος κρατηθεις και δεσμευθεις εντος των παλατιων περιοριζεται και υπο των Βαραγγων φυλαττειται **36** ειτα εξαγεται δια μεσης της νυκτος και φερεται εις το πατριαρχειον εις τα παλατια αυτα εκτισεν ο πατριαρχης Μιχαηλ και ην παλιν μετα τοιαυτης ασφαλειας ως και το προτερον

37 Ω πραγματων μεταστροφη και συντομωτερα του λογου μεταβολη **38** οτι ο χθες κατα της εκκλησιας εχθρος και θρασυς και επημενος και μεγαλα καυχωμενος και τους εν αυτη καταφειγοντας αποσπων και επαιρων και υπο μυριων ανθρωπων περιτριγυριζομενος **39** σημερον δεσμιος και αιικος μηδεν εχων τον ακολουθουντα η τον ελευθερουντα και σωζοντα **40** ο πρωτοσεβαστος δε επι πλεον ελυπειτο και επασχεν οτι ηνεμωδιζον αυτον κοιμασθαι οι τουτον φυλασσοντες αλλ ηναγκαζον αυτον ανεωγμενους εχειν αι ποτε τους οφθαλμους **41** ο πατριαρχης δε μη μνησικακων αλλ ελειων τον ανθρωπον την τοσαυτην μεταβολην θεραπειε τουτον και παρηγορει και ελεγε τους φυλασσοντας αυτον και παρηνει μη κατ αυτου βαρεως φερεσθαι [[τοιαυτα γαρ εισι τα ανθρωπινα]]

42 Ημερων δε ολιγων διελθουσων εκβαλλουσι τουτον απο των εκεισε παλατιων και επι ιπρω λιαν σμικρω τουτον καθισαντες και εμπροσθεν αυτου εις καλαμιν φλαμουλον εμβαλοντες ενεπαιζον αυτω προπορευομενοι εμπροσθεν μεχρι ουν της θαλασσης αυτον καταγαγοντες


35 και αυτον τον πρωτοσεβαστον εν τω παλατιω κρατησαντες και φυλακισαντες Βαραγγους ταρα δεδωκασι φυλαττειν αυτον

36 Κατα δε το μεσονυκτιον εξαγεται απο της του παλατιου φυλακης και φερεται εις τον ναον της αγιας Σοφιας εν τω πατριαρχικω οικω ω ο πατριάρχης Μιχαηλ εκτισε μετα σιδηρων και πλειοτερας ασφαλειας και προσοχης

37 ω συντομοτατης καταστροφης των πραγματων **38** ο γαρ χθες θρασυς και αλαζων και τους προσηγους απο της εκκλησιας αποσπων και εκβαλλον και υπο μυριων ανθρωπων προσκυνουμενος και τιμωμενος **39** σημερον φυλακισμενος και αιικος μηδεν εχων τον υπηρετουντα αυτον η τον βοηθουντα και σωζοντα **40** ο δε πρωτοσεβαστος εθλιβετο μεν επι τουτοις επασχε δε πλεον οτι ενεμωδιζον αυτω οι φυλασσοντες κοιμασθαι αι κουντουντες αυτον και βιαζοντες ως αν τους οφθαλμους αυτου ανοικτους εχη και ισταμενους ορθους ωστερ σιδηρον **41** ο δε πατριαρχης μη μνησικακησας αυτον αλλα ελεισας την αθροαν αυτου μεταβολην θεραπειας ηξιωσε και παρηγορει και τοις φυλαξι παρηνει δοιλαγωγειν αυτω

42 ημερων δε ολιγων διελθουσων εξαγεται του ναου και εν αλογω απορω καθισαντες αυτον και εμπροσθεν αυτου καλαμιν μιταφλαμουλου ποιησαντες ενεπαιζον αυτον και προς τον αιγιαλον κατεβιβασαν

35 τοι — πλ οτι σεβαστιν om S **36** με τ ν κ τ λ S **37** S οκ X5 **39** κ τ κ τιμα S **41** q λαειν S **42** και εν αλεγγ — κ θισσαντε με τ λ π X || μ εμπε ιθην — αι τ λ om S



43 κάκειθεν παραρριφείς ἀλιάδι ἐς τὸ πέραν ἀνάγεται πρὸς Ἀνδρόνικον, **44** ἔπειτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξορύττειται, κοινῶς ἀπάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ συνελθόντων καὶ μετ' Ἀνδρόνικου τὴν τοιαύτην πράξιν κυρωσαμένων.

45 Καὶ τοιοῦτο μὲν τὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ παραδυναστείας ἢ μᾶλλον οὕτω παγείσης ἀκριβῶς τυραννίδος πέρας εἰλήφεσαν. **46** εἶχε δ' ἄν, εἰ τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς παράταξιν ὤπλιστο καὶ τοὺς δακτύλους πρὸς πόλεμον ἐδεδίδακτο καὶ μὴ ἦν μαλθακὸς αἰχμητῆς καὶ βάρταλος **47** καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ὄργων τὸ ὑπερήμιον, **48** τῷ τε Ἀνδρόνικῳ τὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν πάροδον ἀποκλείσας καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀπείρατον διαφυλάξας τοῦ τότε κακοῦ· **49** ποιεῖν γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς βασιλείοις ἠδύνατο θησαυροῖς ὅποσα ἠβούλετο **50** καὶ ταῖς τριήρεσιν ἐνὴν χρῆσασθαι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀνθισταμένου καταπολέμησιν, αἱ τὸ ἐκ Λατίνων εἶχον ὀπλιτικόν, **51** οὕτω μὲν ἐπικρατέστερον ὄν τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ ναυτικοῦ, οὕτω δὲ πάγκαλον καὶ ὄλον αἰμοχαρῆς. **52** ἀλλὰ τοῦ μορσίμου, ὡς εἴκεν, ἀντικρούσαντος, **53** ὁ μὲν τὸ πρόθυμον ὑπεχάλασεν, **54** Ἀνδρόνικος δ' ἐπιτείνας ὑπεσκέλισε τουτονὶ ἀντιτρέχοντα καὶ τὴν νίκην λαμπρὰν ἀπηνέγκατο.

55 Ὃς καὶ κατὰ τὴν περσῖαν ἔτι διατρίβων στείλας τριήρεις, ὅσαι ὀπίσω τοῦ μεγάλου δουκὸς ἠκολούθησαν, **56** καὶ τῶν συνακολουθησάντων αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πάροδον χωρῶν στρατιωτικῶν καταλόγων ἅπαν ἐπιλέκτον **57** πόλεμον συγκροτεῖ κατὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει Λατίνων. **58** καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῆς πόλεως ἀναθαρρήσαντος κατ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐς συνασπισμὸν παραθῆξαντος, **59** ἐπιθαλάττιος ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐπίγειος ἕρις φύεται.

43 εἰς βάλκων ἱμβάλλουσι, καὶ διαπερῶσι καὶ ἀπάγουσι τοῦτον πρὸς τὸν Ἀνδρόνικον· **44** καὶ κοινῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ψήφῳ πάντων μετ' Ἀνδρόνικου, ἐκτυφλοῦσιν αὐτόν. **45** καὶ τοιαῦτα μὲν τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν τὰ τῆς τυραννίδος τοῦ πρωτοσεβαστοῦ ἀπέβησαν. **46** πλὴν εἰ ἠγωνίζετο, καὶ ἦν πρὸς πόλεμον πρόθυμος καὶ ἔτοιμος, καὶ οὐδὲν ἦν μαλακὸς καὶ ὀρθύμος **47** καὶ τὸ πλεῖον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκοιμάτο, **48** εἶχεν ἄν καὶ αὐτὸν Ἀνδρόνικον ἀποκρούσασθαι, καὶ ἑαυτὸν διαφυλάξαι ἄτρωτον καὶ ἀβλαβῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ οὐ ἔπαθιν. **49** ἐπεὶ καὶ τοσοῦτους εἶχε βασιλικούς θησαυρούς, ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ποιεῖν ὅσον ἠθέλε, **50** καὶ οὐδὲ τὰ κάτεργα ἔδιδεν ἄτινα εἶχον τὸν ἐκ τῶν Φράγγων ὄγευθέντα στρατόν, **51** ἀνδρειότερον ὑπάρχον καὶ πλεόν τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ στρατοῦ εὐρισκόμενον· **52** ἀλλ' ὡς εἴοικε τὸ μέλλον, οὐδεὶς ἐκφυγεῖν δύναται· **53** ὅπερ καὶ τότε ὠκονόμησε τὸν πρωτοσεβαστὸν εἰς χαν-όττητα ἐμπεσεῖν, **54** τὸν δὲ Ἀνδρόνικον εἰς ἀνδρείαν διήγειρε καὶ ἐγρήγορσιν.

55 Ἔστειλε δὲ τότε ὁ Ἀνδρόνικος καὶ τὰ κάτεργα ἄτινα ἀπῆγεν ὁ μέγας δούξ πρὸ τοῦ ταῦτα γενέσθαι, **56** εἰσάξας ἐντὸς καὶ πλῆθος ἐκλελεγμένου στρατοῦ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν χωρῶν. **57** καὶ συγκροτοῦσι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν εὐρισκομένων καὶ ἐντὸς κατοικούντων τῆς πόλεως Φράγγων. **58** συνήχθη δὲ καὶ ὁ δήμος τῆς πόλεως κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων Φράγγων ὅθεν καὶ ὁμογνωμονήσαντες μετὰ τῶν κατέργων ὁμοῦ, **59** πόλεμος θαλάττιος ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐπίγειος ἀνεγίρεται.

49 ποιεῖν . π.τιν εod.

43 εἶτα εἰς σανδάλιον ὀίγει, εἰς τὸ πέραν πέμπεται πρὸς Ἀνδρόνικον. **44** ὁ δέ, μετὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ παντων συμβουλευσάμενος, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐξορύττει. **45** καὶ τοιοῦτον μὲν τῆς παραδυναστείας τοῦ πρωτοσεβαστοῦ τέλος εἴληφε. **46** καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν μαλθακὸς καὶ γυναικῶδης, ἀλλ' ἦν ἀνδρείος καὶ τολμηρὸς,

48 εἶχε φυλάξαι ἐναντὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ οὐδὲ τὸν Ἀνδρόνικον εἰσιλθεῖν ἐντὸς παρεχώρει, **49** ἐπεὶ χρημάτων εἶχεν ἀβύσσους,

51 καὶ ξενικὸν ἐνταῦθα λαὸν Φραγγικόν. **52** ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ μέλλον ἐκφυγεῖν οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν, **53** τὴν προθυμίαν αὐτοῦ ἐχάλασε, **54** καὶ τὸν Ἀνδρόνικον νικητὴν ἀπέδειξε κατ' αὐτοῦ.

55 ἔτι δὲ τοῦ Ἀνδρόνικου εἰς τὸ ἀντίπεραν εὐρισκομένου, πέμψας τὰ κάτεργα ὅσα μετὰ τοῦ μεγάλου δουκὸς προσήλθον αὐτῷ· **56** καὶ εἰσάξας ἐντὸς καὶ οὗς εἶχεν ἐπιλέκτους στρατιώτας ἀπὸ τῶν χωρῶν, **57** πόλεμον ἐγείρει κατὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνοικούντων Φράγγων. **58** θαρρήσαντες δὲ καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι τῆς πόλεως, ὄρμησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ κατὰ τῶν Φράγγων· **59** καὶ γίνεται ὁ πόλεμος θαλάττιος ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐπίγειος.

43 τον ante Ἀνδρόνικον add. S **51** ἐνταῦτα S

|
