


Byzantina Symmeikta

Vol 21, No 1 (2011)

BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA 21



A poem on the refortification of Dorylaion in 1175

Foteini SPINGOU

doi: [10.12681/byzsym.1029](https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.1029)

Copyright © 2014, Foteini SPINGOU



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:

SPINGOU, F. (2012). A poem on the refortification of Dorylaion in 1175. *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 21(1), 137-168.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/byzsym.1029>

FOTEINI SPINGOU

A POEM ON THE REFORTIFICATION OF DORYLAION IN 1175

Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180) decided to organize a campaign against the Seljuk Turks in order to maintain Byzantine power in the East¹. Before starting the expedition, in the summer or autumn of 1175², he set about rebuilding or re-establishing Dorylaion and Soublaion, aplekta (supply centres) on the plateau of Asia Minor, which had been affected by Turkish nomads³. According to Niketas Choniates, Manuel first rebuilt Dorylaion and then Soublaion⁴. After his journey to Soublaion, he returned to Constantinople

* I wish to thank Prof. Marc Lauxtermann, my academic supervisor, for his invaluable help. I would like also to thank Dr. Georgi Parpulov, Dr. Ida Toth, Dr. Christos Simelidis, and Prof. Michael Grünbart for their suggestions. All remaining mistakes, of course, are mine. This article would not have been possible without the generous support of the Foundation for Education and European Culture (founded by Mr. Nikos Trichas).

1. See P. MAGDALINO *The empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge U.P. 1993, 95-8. A. STONE, Dorylaion Revisited: Manuel I Komnenos and the Refortification of Dorylaion and Soublaion in 1175, *REB* 61 (2003) 183-99, esp. 186, 195.

2. K. BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη: Τὰ σωζόμενα (a), *Theologia* 19 (1941-8) 717.

3. Dorylaion was a new construction, 3 km north of the old city (BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (a), 713-4. A. STONE, Eustathian Panegyric as a Historical Source, *JÖB* 51 (2001) 241; STONE, Dorylaion Revisited, 191). According to the exposition of imperial expeditions and roster of aplekta by Constantine Porphyrogenetos (Ὑπόθεσις τῶν βασιλικῶν ταξειδίων καὶ ὑπόμνησις τῶν ἀπλήκτων = Text A, 4, ed. J. F. HALDON, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions. Introduction, Edition, Translation and Commentary* [CFHB 28], Wien 1990, 80-1, cf. *ibid.* 252) the Byzantine emperor used to stop in this aplekton during his journeys.

4. According to another view, Manuel rebuilt Dorylaion in order to establish “a network of fortresses ... to protect the agricultural population which had previously lived in open villages so that they could cultivate the land in security and pay their taxes”.

Επιμέλεια έκδοσης: ΕΛΕΩΝΟΡΑ ΚΟΥΝΤΟΥΡΑ-ΓΑΛΑΚΗ, IBE/EIE

(before Epiphany, 1176)⁵. There, Euthymios Malakes delivered a panegyric speech to the Emperor during the feast of Epiphany⁶, and Eustathios of Thessaloniki wrote his Lenten oration⁷. Both refer to the expedition and to the refortification of Dorylaion. The following year, Manuel waged war against Konya, but his plans quickly failed. He was defeated at Myriokephalon on 17 September 1176⁸.

Manuel Komnenos is the second most praised emperor in Byzantine history. More than seventy monodies, panegyrics, orations and many other rhetorical texts were dedicated to him⁹. Therefore, it is not surprising that a poem was dedicated to the refortification of Dorylaion in 1175.

Dorylaion was a thriving city during the tenth and eleventh centuries, but the Turkish invasions forced the inhabitants to abandon it¹⁰. This area

CL. FOSS, The Defences of Asia Minor against the Turks, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 27 (1982) 152 (= idem, *Cities, Fortresses and Villages of Byzantine Asia Minor* [Variorum], Aldershot 1996, V, 152).

5. Niketas Choniates (*Νικήτα τοῦ Χωνιάτου Χρονικὴ Διήγησις*, ed. J.-A. VAN DIETEN, *Nicetae Choniatae Historia* [CFHB 11/1], Berlin 1975), 177, 86-90.

6. Cf. BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (a), 69-72.

7. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγος προεισόδιος τῆς ἀγίας Τεσσαρακοστῆς (Εὐσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης Λόγοι, ed. P. WIRTH, *Eustathii Thessalonicensis: Opera Minora (magnam partem inedita)* [CFHB 32], Berlin 2000 = Eustathios of Thessaloniki), B, 17-45.

8. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 95-8. J. W. BIRKENMEIER, *The Development of the Komnenian Army: 1080-1180* [History of Warfare 5], Leiden 2002, 54 (opposite view about the meaning of the defeat in Myriokephalon). For the reconstruction of Dorylaion, see BIRKENMEIER, *Komnenian Army*, 106-7, note 10.

9. D. ANGELOV, *Imperial ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*, Cambridge 2007, 30. Among these rhetorical encomia there are many texts in verse written by various authors such as Theodore Prodromos, "Manganeios Prodromos", or the anonymous poets of the collections in manuscript *Marcianus gr. 524*. The poets praised the Emperor either at official ceremonies or in the so-called *theatra* (See M. MULLETT, Aristocracy and Patronage in the literary circles of Comnenian Constantinople, in: *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. ANGOLD [BAR International Series 221], Oxford 1984, 173-201. Cf. P. MARCINIAK, Byzantine Theatron - A Place of Performance?, in: *Theatron. Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. M. GRÜNBART [Millennium-Studien 13], Berlin-New York 2007, 277-85, esp. 278-9 and A. STONE, Euthymios Malakes in Theatron, *Byzantina* 30 (2010) 55-65).

10. SP. VRYONIS, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*, Berkeley 1971, 123.

between Bithynia, Phrygia and Galatia¹¹ was a “matter of dispute” between the Byzantines and the Turks for over a hundred years. At first, crusaders of the First Crusade chased Turkish settlers out of Dorylaion (1097)¹². However, the status quo was unstable and new Turkish invasions allowed nomads to re-settle in the same area¹³. Due to the continuous warfare, the city was abandoned for almost a hundred years¹⁴. It is worth noting that Manuel (after 1159) had also driven away the nomads from Dorylaion, but they returned shortly after. The Turks did not have the strength to withstand organized military expeditions. They tried to infiltrate the city only during periods of peace or political upheaval. Manuel attempted to solve this problem by reconstructing the fortress and by stationing soldiers ready for battle¹⁵.

A terminus post quem for the dating of the poem is the year 1171, when Alexios II was nominated as co-emperor¹⁶. The poem refers to a city in Asia Minor¹⁷ that had been renovated by the Emperor. There are good grounds for assuming that the poem refers to the reconstruction of Dorylaion during the autumn of 1175¹⁸.

11. Dorylaion was the third major city of the theme of Opsikion according to *De thematibus* (Περὶ Θεμάτων, ed. A. PERTUSI, *Costantino Porfirogenito. De thematibus* [Studi e Testi 160], Città del Vaticano 1952), 4.18, and was included in Phrygia Epictetus (Επίκτητος). On the theme of Opsikion, see T. LOUNGHIS, Θέμα Οψίκιον in: *Asia Minor and its themes. Studies on the Geography and Prosopography of the Byzantine Themes of Asia Minor (7th–11th centuries)*, ed. E. KOUNTOURA-GALAKE – ST. LAMPAKES – T. LOUNGHIS – A. SAVVIDES – V. VLYSSIDOU, Athens 1998, 163–200, esp. 188 and 191.

12. VRYONIS, *Decline*, 116, 185.

13. VRYONIS, *Decline*, 110. According to John Kinnamos (Επιτομή, ed. A. MEINEKE, *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum* [CSHB], Bonn 1836), 295, 6 two thousand nomads were settled there with their flocks.

14. VRYONIS, *Decline*, 153.

15. VRYONIS, *Decline*, 188. Cf. H. GLYKATZI-AHRWEILER, Les fortresses construites en Asie Mineure face à l'invasion Seldjoudide, in: *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses*, München 1960, 189.

16. The author refers to Alexios II twice (vv. 45 and 59).

17. The enemies are “the Persians”, i.e. the Turks, (see vv. 8, 29)

18. SP. LAMPROS, Σύμμικτα, *NE* 5 (1908) 332; P. WIRTH, Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos und die Ostgrenze, *BZ* 55 (1962) 21. K. BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη: Τὰ σωζόμενα (b), *Theologia* 20 (1949) 146. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 96. Manuel had an ambitious refortification programme (AHRWEILER, *Fortresses*, 186–7; STONE, *Panegyric*, 242). The refortification of Dorylaion was of utmost importance and, therefore, it was much praised in imperial

The verses have the characteristics of an official encomium. The author portrays the Emperor “as a shining example of the virtues, especially wisdom, courage, justice and moderation”¹⁹. Spyridon Lampros suggested that it was written either by a dweller of Dorylaion or by Theodore Prodromos, and that it was probably performed in Constantinople by a person who claimed to be a dweller in the city²⁰. Paul Magdalino contended that it was a verse inscription on the walls of Dorylaion²¹. It is possible that a court poet, who either accompanied the Emperor or was well informed about what was happening in the campaign, wrote a poem for a small feast organized to celebrate the reconstruction of the city walls of Dorylaion²².

The vocabulary and the imperial ideology expressed in the poem suggest that it was perhaps performed in Dorylaion, after its refortification, in front of a highly cultivated audience. The fact that the author does not name the city provides evidence for this hypothesis: he refers to Dorylaion only as “this” city because the audience presumably knew what he was talking about²³. Furthermore, if the poem has been performed in Constantinople,

panegyrics. See also F. CHALANDON, *Les Comnène. Études sur l'empire byzantin au XIe et XIIe siècles*, vol. 2: *Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)*, Paris 1912, 502-4 and TIB 7, 240-2.

19. Cf. G. T. DENNIS, Imperial Panegyric: Rhetoric and Reality, in: *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. MAGUIRE, Washington D.C. 1994, 131-40.

20. LAMPROS, *Σύμμιχτα*, 332. Reviewed by W. HÖRANDNER, *Theodoros Prodromos. Historische Gedichte* [WBS 9], Wien 1974, 68 (no. 219).

21. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 96 (note 281) and 456.

22. According to Kinnamos (297, 17; cf. STONE, *Dorylaion Revisited*, 190) the construction was completed after just forty days (cf. v. 50). It is unlikely that this poem is a verse inscription (MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 96, note 281), because verse inscriptions are usually in dodecasyllable, and the few verse inscriptions composed in dactylic hexameters or elegiac distichs are usually relatively short and usually date from earlier periods (Cf. A. RHOBY, *Byzantinische Epigramme auf Fresken und Mosaiken* [Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 374. Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung 23], Wien 2009, 62-3), with the exception of the sepulchral epigram on the tomb of Manuel Komnenos, C. MANGO, Notes on Byzantine Monuments, *DOP* 23-24 (1970) 372-5; on the latter inscription, see G. FATOUROS, Das Grab des Kaisers Manuel I. Komnenos, *BZ* 93 (2000) 108-12, and its review: CL. SODE, Zu dem Grab Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos, *BZ* 94 (2001) 230-1). Furthermore, the content of the poem does not support such usage.

23. vv. 3, 47, 50, 51. The reading *τάδε* presupposes a gesture by a performer. This is an extra indication for a possible performance of the poem.

we would expect the poem to refer to Soublaion as well. Soublaion is not mentioned, most likely because the Emperor had not yet undertaken the refortification there²⁴.

What is more, the only “description” of the city is a rhetorical exercise. Oddly enough, the orator does not refer to the fertility of the area – a topos for the other texts that describe the reconstruction of Dorylaion²⁵. This further supports the idea that the poem was performed in Dorylaion and so the audience had no need to hear a description of the area. A rhetorical personification of the city would have been attractive to them. But what was the audience for a poem like this? Any listener would be an educated Greek-speaker. It is known that the city had been almost abandoned by its Greek dwellers. As a result, there is no question of the citizens understanding the poem. It seems more probable that a small ceremony might have taken place before the walls of Dorylaion, after the construction works came to an end and before the Emperor left for Soublaion.

The anonymous author of the Dorylaion poem was very well informed. There are allusions to facts; for instance, it is implied that Manuel took part in the building work in order to inspire his men²⁶. As the poem states, he laid down the foundation stone and then the other men followed his example. Euthymios Malakes in the oration states clearly: “You, my Emperor, helped do the work with your hands and you were the first to carry stones”²⁷.

The reference to Mount Olympus is puzzling. It is not certain whether it is factual. According to the poem, Manuel “stretched out his man-saving hand from Mount Olympus” (v. 38). This time, the poet includes an implicit reference to Manuel’s itinerary. According to John Kinnamos, when Manuel started the expedition, “he himself crossed the strait of Damalis [the Bosphorus] and went straight to Melangeia²⁸. After he had assembled there

24. If the rebuilding of Soublaion had already taken place, it would probably have been mentioned, given that the poet is usually accurate enough (e.g. vv. 46-47).

25. Kinnamos 294, 12-295, 1. Malakes (BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (a), 530, 8-25) praises the beauty of the city which Manuel has restored. STONE, *Dorylaion Revisited*, 186-187.

26. See vv. 46-7. Choniates 176, 55-9. Malakes 533, 27-30 and 534, 20-6. AHRWEILER, *Fortresses*, 188. STONE, *Dorylaion Revisited*, 192 and 184, 187.

27. Malakes 533, 25-6: *σὺ βασιλεῦ ἔδωκάς σου τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ τοὺς λίθους πρῶτος ἐβάστασας*.

28. Kinnamos uses the names Melagia/ Malagia/ Malagna for the town of Metavole, which was the major centre of the region of Malagina (CL. FOSS, *Byzantine Malagina and the*

an adequate force from the villages of Bithynia and Rhyndakos, he went to the plains of Dorylaion”²⁹. John Kinnamos’s narration does not give us any space to suppose that Manuel went to Mount Olympus, as the Dorylaion poem suggests. However, the poem can be used as evidence that, while the troops were assembled in Melangeia, Manuel went to the monasteries in Mount Olympus in order to meet monks and pray before starting his expedition, as many emperors had done in the past.

If the hypothesis that the poem was written to be performed at a small celebration is correct, then the audience consisted of the Emperor, his son³⁰, members of the court³¹ and soldiers³². The poem certainly corresponds to the tastes of the Komnenian-Constantinopolitan court and to their strong literary interests. Images familiar to the court orators are repeated and

Lower Sangarius, *Anatolian Studies* 40 (1990) 163-4 and 182 = idem, *Cities, Fortresses ...*, VII, 163-4 and 182). The fortress of Metavole (Paşalar) was the main *aplekton* on the way to the East (R. BONDAUX, Les villes, in: *La Bithynie au Moyen Âge*, ed. B. GEYER – J. LEFORT [Réalités byzantines 9], Paris 2003, 394-5. FOSS, *Byzantine Malagina*, 167). It had been rebuilt by Manuel after the year 1145 (FOSS, *Byzantine Malagina*, 163 and 171).

29. Kinnamos 294, 8-9: Ὁ δὲ τὸν Λαμιάεως πορθμὸν διαβάς εὐθὺς Μελαγγείων ἐχώρει. ἔνθα ἔκ τε Βιθυνίας καὶ τοῦ Ῥυνδακοῦ χωρίων στράτευμα ἀγείρας ἱκανὸν ἐξήκει ἐπὶ τὰ Δορυλαίου πεδία. See: CHALANDON, *Les Comnène*, 502. TIB 7, 118.

30. Alexios II was probably with his father on this campaign, even if he was just 6 or 7 years old. See v. 59. Cf. K. VARZOS, *Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, Thessaloniki 1984, no. 155. For P. WIRTH (*Kaiser Manuel*, 28) this was not certain, while A. STONE (Dorylaion Revisited, 193-4) gives evidence that Alexios was actually there. See Eustathios of Thessaloniki B, 45, 34-7. A. STONE also argues that Euthymios Malakes is not as clear on the issue as Eustathios. In a different oration of Eustathios, Alexios is also said to have accompanied Manuel on his expedition. The fact that he accompanied the expedition (despite his tender age) encouraged the soldiers to carry on (Eustathios of Thessaloniki A, 201, 93-4).

31. According to Choniates, Manuel was accompanied by “the [...] most illustrious kinsmen” in his later expedition against Ikonion (Choniates 184, 95; transl. H. J. MAGOULIAS, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Detroit 1984, 104). There are more instances in which aristocrats accompanied the emperor. See for example the poem that Manganeios wrote on the tent of the sevastokratorissa (M. JEFFREYS, Manuel Komnenos’ Macedonian Military Camps: A Glamorous Alternative Court?, in: *Byzantine Macedonia: Identity, Image, and History. Papers from the Melbourne Conference. July 1995*, eds J. BURKE – R. SCOTT [ByzAus 13], Melbourne 2000, 190).

32. It is likely that at least most of them were not able to understand the poem (MULLETT, *Aristocracy and Patronage*, 187, briefly discusses the education of soldiers).

the highbrow style is employed for a poetic encomium appropriate for the Emperor.

The poem begins with a picture: “There was a time when this city was a vigorous offshoot with shady leaves and large foliage, [prospering] under the Roman plane of the Ausonians (Romans)³³. But [swept] by a furious and barbaric storm, a hurricane, a violent typhoon, it was torn away like a nubile girl from her mother” (vv. 1-5). It is not the first time that a simile comparing an emperor to a great plane tree had been used for a member of the Comnenian family. When Theodore Prodromos was celebrating the conquest of Kastamon (1133), he used a similar comparison for John II Komnenos³⁴. Interestingly, in an epigram in the collection in *Marc. gr.* 524, the writer refers to an image of the three emperors (John, Manuel and his son Alexios), saying, “these three trees sprout up from the purple, covering and refreshing their citizens under the shady foliage of their benefactions”³⁵. Therefore, the comparison of an emperor to a tree (and especially to a plane tree) was frequent enough. In this instance, it is not the Emperor himself but his authority that is compared with a plane tree shading the citizens.

Constantinople and Dorylaion are then presented as mother and daughter (vv. 5-9). The personification of the cities is an image from Late Antiquity³⁶. Following this, the Turkish conquest of Dorylaion is described as the rape of a young, nubile girl³⁷.

33. *LBG*, 2, 232-3.

34. *Τῷ πορφυρογεννήτῳ καὶ βασιλεῖ κῦρ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Κομνηνῷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Κασταμονῆς* (ed. HÖRANDNER, *Theodoros Prodromos*), no. 3, 110-6 (cf. p. 196).

35. SP. LAMPROS, Ὁ Μαρκιανὸς κῶδιξ 524, *NE* 8 (1911) 318, vv. 1, 7-9: Πάππος, πατήρ, παῖς, βασιλεῖς Ῥώμης νέας [...] ἐκ πορφύρας τὰ δένδρα ταῦτα τὰ τρία, / σκέποντα καὶ ψύχοντα τοὺς ὑπηκόους / εὐεργεσιῶν ταῖς σκιαῖς ὡς φυλλάδων. See also: P. MAGDALINO – R. NELSON, *The Emperor in the Byzantine Art of the Twelfth Century*, *BF* 8 (1982) 146-7.

36. G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, 49-50 and 56-60. Cities were frequently represented as maidens – a usage that hails back to the Hellenistic era. For the relation between Manuel and the revitalized *New Rome*, see MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 424-5.

37. In his speech delivered at the occasion of the Epiphany of 1176, Euthymios Malakes talks about the “rape” of the city as well (Malakes 529, 4-5. Cf. Eustathios of Thessaloniki, *B*, 41, 80-4 (extremely similar to the poem). See also vv. 54-62). In this speech, Dorylaion is presented as a young girl torn away from her mother, Constantinople. Cf. Theodore Prodromos in his poem on the re-conquest of Kastamon (no. 3, 15-7) described Constantinople as a mother who laments the loss of her children.

Moreover, the image of the Emperor also falls into *topoi* well established in panegyric literature. Manuel is described as indefatigable (ἀκάμας³⁸, ἄτρυτος)³⁹, working excellently (ἀριστοπόνος)⁴⁰, magnanimous (μεγάθυμος)⁴¹, seven-times king (ἐπταμέδων)⁴², the sacker of cities (πολίπορθος)⁴³ and as standing above earthly needs⁴⁴. His “man-saving hand” is also praised. Such expressions were common for court orators and poets⁴⁵. He is also called a “killer of beasts” and a hunter (v. 13). Further in the poem, at v. 33, the Turks are compared to deer and the Emperor is again a mighty hunter⁴⁶. Finally, the anonymous poet praises the Emperor for

38. Manuel is praised also for his vigilance, for fasting and for his resistance to the earthly needs (vv. 20-22). Cf. Malakes 535, 2; 535, 13-16; 536, 10-3. Eustathios of Thessaloniki (Λ, 200, 74-6, 88-90 and 201, 9-13) urges John Doukas Kamateros to imitate the emperor and his ceaseless fasting and waking.

39. Malakes 537, 12-4. Cf. BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (b), 145-6.

40. v. 11. Theodore Prodromos in the aforementioned poem (no. 3) uses a similar characterization for John II Komnenos: ἄναξ πολύμοχθε (v. 38).

41. A characteristic connected to the mythical heroes. Choniates 2, 520. Cf. Ἐκφρασις διὰ στίχων ἡρωϊκῶν τῆς ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Κασταμόνδος προελεύσεως τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κυροῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ, Theodore Prodromos, no. 6, 55. This adjective is often used in the Iliad and the Odyssey.

42. The number seven is used in order to be demonstrated the great authority of the Emperor, his eternal and perfect power. LBG translates it as “siebenfach Herrschend”. The number seven is a very important number in the Old Testament, where it “appears to be used, as we say a score or a dozen, for a large indefinite number” (J. HADLEY, The Number Seven in: idem, *Essays Philological and Critical*, New York 1873, 333; cf. ibid. 334). It symbolises God’s perfection, His sovereignty and holiness. Seven is one of the key numbers in the Old and New Testaments, while seven is the central figure of quantities in the Book of Revelation. Certainly, the possible meanings and implications of number seven in literature need to be discussed in a separate article.

43. Homeric vocabulary. Theodore Prodromos (no. 3, 22) uses the same words to praise John II.

44. Cf. Eustathios of Thessaloniki B, 38, 63-4. Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Εἰς τὰ ἅγια Φῶτα*, PG 36, 353. He uses the same word for John the Forerunner.

45. v. 33. See also vv. 46-47. Cf. *Marc. gr.* 524, no. 258, vv. 10-11 (the city garlands the hand of the king which exterminates the infidels). On the concept of the king’s hand in rhetorical works, see GR. KARLA, Das literarische Porträt Kaiser Manuels I. Komnenos in den Kaiserreden des 12. Jh., *BZ* 101 (2008) 675-6.

46. Eustathios of Thessaloniki (B, 38, 94-39, 3; B, 41, 84-5) also uses the same metaphor. The picture of the Emperor as a hunter should be connected with the martial interests of the Komnenoi and the fact that hunting was a part of the social image of the Emperor during

his writing abilities and theological expertise⁴⁷, as would be expected from court orations in the final period of his reign⁴⁸.

Manuel is also connected to God. Endurance, sleeplessness and the ability to fast – already attributed to the imperial character by the time of John Komnenos – bestow a sense of sanctification upon the Emperor⁴⁹. Furthermore, Manuel's characterization as "godlike" provides evidence of his divine cult⁵⁰. Court poets, as well as the anonymous poet⁵¹, mention that Manuel has the same name as Christ (Emmanuel-Manuel). The topos occurs on seals as well. For instance, the reverse of a seal now deposited in the Vatican reads *Μανουήλ Δεσπότης*; the obverse reads *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Ἐμμανουήλ*⁵². The poet draws a further parallel between Christ and the Emperor: Manuel first refers to Christ as "Creator Lord" (v. 41) and Manuel is then mentioned as "king protector of the city" (v. 57).

According to the poem, Manuel and the Byzantines will ultimately win because they are God's chosen people. In vv. 25-27, there is a reference to the Old Testament: God told Gideon to decrease the number of the soldiers

the twelfth century. Cf. A. KAZHDAN – A. WHARTON EPSTEIN, *Changes in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, California 1985, 110. A. SINAKOS, Το κυνήγι κατά τη μέση βυζαντινή εποχή (7ος-12ος αι.), in: *Ζωά και περιβάλλον στο Βυζάντιο (7ος-12ος αιώνας)*, eds I. ANAGNOSTAKIS – T. G. KOLIAS – E. PAPADOPOULOU [NHRF/IBR International Symposium 21], Athens, 2011, 71-86. For the earlier centuries, see E. PATLAGEAN, De la chasse du souverain, *DOP* 46 (1992) 257-63, esp. 259.

47. vv. 15-16: "the sweet-sounding instrument of the pious words, the leader [on the path] of unerring spiritual ascent".

48. See MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 465-7. Cf. KARLA, Das literarische Porträt, 676. Euthymios Malakes (BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (a), 532, 32 - 533, 1) also praises him as a "sweet writer". Cf. BONIS, Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη (b), 56.

49. For the *μίμησις* Θεοῦ, see H. HUNGER, *Prooimion: Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden* [WBS 1], Wien, 1964, 58-63. Cf. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 420.

50. v. 39. See also MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 424 and 480. R. MACRIDES, From the Komnenoi to the Palaiologoi: Imperial models in decline and exile, in: *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial renewal in Byzantium 4th -13th Centuries*, ed. P. Magdalino, Aldershot 1994, 278. Euthymios Malakes (534, 21; 534, 23; 536, 33) and Eustathios of Thessaloniki (N, 229, 1-19; cf. KARLA, Das literarische Porträt, 674 and 678) also compare Manuel to God.

51. v. 39.

52. V. LAURENT, *Les sceaux byzantins du Médaillier Vatican*, Città del Vaticano 1962, 9-10 (no. 13).

before going into battle. Gideon's army initially consisted of twenty-two thousand men, later of ten thousand and finally just of three hundred men. Gideon only selected the men who lapped the water with their hands to their mouths and not those who got down on their knees to drink water from the river⁵³. Thus, the victory was attributed to God and not to the strength of the army⁵⁴. In court orations, the Emperor is often praised for vanquishing his enemies without the need for troops.

The poem – and especially the last verses – is indicative of the general mood at the time. The rebuilding of Dorylaion had a special significance for the Byzantines⁵⁵. The world domination again seemed possible to the poet and his audience⁵⁶.

The manuscripts

Turning to the manuscript tradition, the poem can be found in three manuscripts: *Parisinus gr.* 2644 in the Bibliothèque nationale de France and *Barocci* 194 and *Auctarium* T.1.10 (Misc. 188) in the Bodleian Library. It was first edited by Spyridon Lampros in 1908, solely on the basis of *Barocci* 194.

The handwriting of the main scribe of manuscript *Parisinus gr.* 2644 (P) dates from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries⁵⁷. The edges

53. Jud. 13: 6.

54. Jud. 13: 2-8.

55. Cf. STONE, *Dorylaion Revisited*, 185.

56. At this point, the author paraphrases the Old Testament: “The Lord said to Abram, after Lot had separated from him, “Raise your eyes now, and look from the place where you are, northwards and southwards and eastwards and westwards; for all the land that you see I will give to you and to your offspring forever” (Gen. 13: 14-15).

57. The handwriting shares characteristics with the *Fettaugenstil* (cf. G. PRATO, I manoscritti greci dei secoli XIII e XIV: note paleografiche, in: *Paleografia e codicologia greca. Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino-Wolfenbüttel, 17-21 ottobre 1983)*, eds D. HARLFINGER – G. PRATO, vol. I, Alessandria 1991, 139-42 and tables 3 and 6); see for instance the *fettaugen*-gross omega and beta, the lunar sigma with the exaggerated semicircular loop, the capital nu and the ligatures especially for epsilon-rho and omicron-sigma. No watermark is found on any of the folia of the manuscript. The lack of watermarks and the handwriting corroborate the argument that the manuscript dates from the late thirteenth century (probably from the last quarter of the century) and not from the fourteenth, because it became common to have watermarks after the early fourteenth century. H. OMONT (*Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale. 3ème partie. Ancien fonds grecs*, Paris 1888,

of the manuscript were trimmed when it was re-bound (in the sixteenth century)⁵⁸ and thus some words from the margins are missing. The poem was copied along with various works by Tzetzes and some anonymous works⁵⁹. It is found in a part of the manuscript without ascriptions, consisting of two prose works⁶⁰ and two poems. The first poem, which deals with the death (or possibly murder?) of John II Komnenos, was attributed to John Tzetzes by Robert Browning, but unfortunately without providing solid arguments⁶¹.

The poem can be found on ff. 250^{r-v}. The title, written in red ink in the right margin, reads “heroic verses” (Στίχοι ἡρωικοί). The poem is written in medium brown ink. It has been copied in two columns. Each verse is distinct. The first forty-six verses are written in the last twenty-three lines

17-8) describes it as a fourteenth-century manuscript. Cf. P. A. M. LEONE, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Napoli 1968, x (“saec. XIV exaratus”). The ms. has some later additions on ff. 1-9^v and 325-326^v; these too date from the late thirteenth century.

58. LEONE, *Historiae*, x. Cf. bookbinding with the initial F (=François I) engraved on the red leather and the watermark on the flyleaves.

59. ff. 10^v-324^v.

60. The first work (a part of an epitaph for an unspecified person) has been preserved without title and without beginning on ff. 249^{r-v} (inc. ἐπὶ τούτοις οἶμοι οὐ σοβαρός τις ἦν, des: οἱ καὶ πρὸς θειοτέραν λήξιν βαδίσαντες). The second bears the title “Speech offered to the patriarch” (Χαριστήριος λόγος πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην) on ff. 249^v-250 (inc.: ἐφοίτων ποτὲ καὶ πρὸς αἰακὸν εὐθυμοῦντες, des: ἱερέως ἀγαθοῦ, ταῖς πρὸς Θεὸν ἰκετεῖαις βεβαιοῦντος τὴν νίκην). Edited by V. L. KONSTANTINOPOULOS, *Inedita Tzetziانا*. Δύο ἀνέκδοτοι λόγοι τοῦ Ἰωάννη Τζέτζη, *Hellenica* 33/1 (1981) 178-81. The editor of the two orations takes for granted that the author of both is John Tzetzes. He states that the *Χαριστήριος λόγος* was written for John IX Agapitos. Unfortunately, he does not provide any evidence for such identification. He also offers a different title than the one preserved in the manuscripts (*Χαριστήριος λόγος πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχην καὶ Ἰωάννην*).

61. R. BROWNING, *The death of John II Comnenus*, *Byzantion* 31 (1961) 232. He takes for granted that the works included in this manuscript are the work of Tzetzes. However, he seems a bit doubtful about the authorship of the poem that he edits on p. 234: “if we suppose the poem not to be by Tzetzes at all”. The poem was republished by M. ARCO MAGRÌ, *Il carmine inedito di Giovanni Tzetzes De imperatore Occiso*, *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 9 (1961) 73-5. The latter argues that the poem does not refer to John Komnenos, but “a un duce di milizie imperiali, vissuto appunto di Manuel I Comneno” (ibid. 75). However, she also believes that “non v' è alcun motivo per constatare l'attribuzione del carme a Tzetzes” (ibid.). C. WENDEL (*Tzetzes Ioannes RE VII, A.2*, 1948, 1961) attributes the poem to Tzetzes and he argues that it refers to emperor Andronikos Komnenos.

(of forty-one lines per page) on f. 250⁶² and the last sixteen verses of the poem in eight lines on f. 250^{v63}. The scribe did not capitalize any letters, nor did he use the subscribed iota. Final sigmas are written as σ . Diaeresis is noted on ι and v . Accentuation, abbreviations and ligatures are regular. The hyphen is not used consistently⁶⁴.

Manuscript *Barocci* 194 (B) has been kept in the Bodleian Library in Oxford since 1628/29⁶⁵. Judging by the writing style⁶⁶ and the watermarks⁶⁷, it dates from the mid fifteenth century. There is no evidence for its provenance. On the basis of its contents, it can be assumed that it was written by someone with a strong interest in Greek philology and religious subjects⁶⁸. The manuscript was probably written by a single scribe named

62. Inscribed surface 230 x 135 mm.

63. Inscribed surface 40 x 135 mm. The rest of the page is ruled, but it was left blank.

64. Only for the name of Manuel (v. 14).

65. H. D. COXE, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, pars prima recensionem codicum Graecorum continens*, Oxford 1969 (reprinted with corrections from the edition of 1853), 330-6. F. MADAN – H. H. E. CRASTER, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Oxford 1922, 3. J. L. QUANTIN, Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and the Christian Antiquity, in: *History of Scholarship: a selection of papers from the seminar on the history of scholarship held annually at Warburg Institute*, ed. CH. LIGOTA – J. L. QUANTIN, Oxford 2006, 321.

66. Handwriting: minuscule of the “Hodegon type”; cf. L. POLITIS, Eine Schreiberschule im Kloster τῶν Ὁδηγῶν, *BZ* 51 (1958) 261-87.

67. f. 7: Piccard (= G. PICCARD, *Piccard Wasserzeichen, Veröffentlichungen der Staatlichen Archivverwaltung Baden-Württemberg*, vol. 1-25, Stuttgart, 1961-1997 = www.piccard-online.de): No. 116058 (Leuven 1419)

ff. 13-14: Piccard No. 150018 (Pesaro 1433)

ff. 18, 20, 22-24, 26-27, 30: Piccard: 68725 (Wien 1418)

ff. 48-49, 50, 52, 54, 56, 148-149: Piccard No. 153202 (Vicenza 1447)

ff. 60-61: Piccard No. 150009 (Padua 1423)

f. 62: Piccard No. 150610 (Vicenza 1427)

f. 67: Piccard No. 153202 (Vicenza 1447)

ff. 68, 74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 150, 154-155, 162-163b, 165, 170, 173, 176: Piccard No. 122456 (Udine 1437)

ff. 85-7, 102, 156-157, 178-179: Piccard No. 150910 (Bologna 1417)

ff. 95-6, 99, 100-101, 103-104: Piccard No. 116055 (Leuven 1418)

ff. 126-128: Piccard No. 150012 (Udine 1437)

ff. 133, 136, 138: Piccard No. 124333 (Ravenna 1439).

68. It contains works by various authors: a life of Aesop (Vita W), poems of Cato translated into Greek by Maximos Planoudes, the “Golden epics” of pseudo-Pythagoras,

Makarios⁶⁹, but at different periods of time. It appears to have been written for the scribe's own use⁷⁰: he constantly added new materials; instead of offering whole treatises, he often chose to copy excerpts of works; and some pages are obviously spare notes, which have been incorporated at a later stage⁷¹. The poem is again entitled "heroic verses" (Στίχοι ἡρωικοί)⁷².

The text has been copied on f. 95^v in black ink; it fills the last nineteen lines of the page⁷³. It has been written in one column (not in two or three, as is usual for poems), but the scribe sometimes indicates the beginning of the verse with a regular medium colon. He did not capitalize any letters and he did not use the subscribed iota. Sigma at the end of the word is noted either as σ or as c. Diairesis is noted upon ι and υ. The accentuation, the abbreviations and the ligatures are regular, while the hyphen is not used consistently.

explanations on various antiquarian subjects, such as ancient Greek myths (Commentaries on the orations of Gregory of Nazianzus by Pseudo-Nonnus, excerpts from Tzetzes' *Ἰστορίαι* (*Chiliades*), rules for grammar, syntax and metre, rhetorical theory, commentaries on the Psalter, a part of the chronicle of George the Monk, a canon for the Virgin Mary, astronomical - astrological texts and scholia to the Nomocanon by Theodore Balsamon and John Zonaras. H. O. COXE, *Bodleian Library. Quarto Catalogues I: Greek manuscripts*, Oxford 1969, 330-336. LEONE, *Historiae*, xxi - xxii.

69. See: ff. 48^{r-v} where the scribe created a poem by verses from eight different poems, forming the acrostic ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ; note on f. 174: Μακαρίου ἱερομονάχου τὸ παρὸν σχόλιον περὶ τοῦ σα(ββά)του τοῦ καὶ τήνδε γράψαντος δέλτον; furthermore the capital M on f. 105^v forms the name Μακάριος (M is written and the other letters are written in its edges). Makarios cannot be identified: his handwriting is not similar to that of the scribe of *Vat. Barb. 113* (f. 30^v), nor to that of the scribe of *Lond. Add. 40755*, f. 55^v (comparison on the basis of the reproductions in H. HUNGER, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800-1600*. 3. Teil *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Roms mit dem Vatikan*. B. *Paläographische Charakteristika* [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik III/3B], Wien 1997, 147-148 (no. 403) and idem, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800-1600*. 1. Teil *Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Grossbritanniens*. B. *Paläographische Charakteristika* [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik III/1B], Wien 1981, 105 (no. 244).

70. "Bücher für einzelne Personen": cf. H. HUNGER, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz: Die byzantinische Buchkultur*, München 1989, 71-4.

71. For instance, the scribe copied only a few lines from each chapter of Hephaestion's treatise on metre. He omitted the examples which were cited in the original text and he copied whatever he thought was important.

72. The title is written in the same black ink in the left margin.

73. Of forty-seven lines per page in total. Inscribed surface: 240x160 mm.

Auctarium T. 1.10 (*Misc. gr.* 188) (A) was written by professional copyists between 1539 and 1542 in Venice⁷⁴. It contains the same works by Tzetzes and the same anonymous works as P⁷⁵. The Dorylaion poem has the same title as in the other two manuscripts: “heroic verses”⁷⁶.

The poem can be found on f. 306^v. It is written in medium black ink in two columns and in thirty-one lines (of thirty-four overall)⁷⁷. Each verse is written separately and the text displays the same writing habits as P and B.

The manuscripts including the poem seem to derive from a common source. All of them contain Tzetzes’ works. So, the general impression is that they must have been copied from the same manuscript: archetype α.

B and A offer better readings than P in v. 1 and offer readings that are as good or as bad as P in v. 59.

P and A offer better readings than B in vv. 4, 44 and 50 and offer readings as good or as bad as B in vv. 20, 31, 37 and 49.

P and B offer better readings than A in vv. 35 and 56.

A omits words in vv. 42, 46 and 56. There is no explanation for the fact that A twice confuses ζ with π (vv. 21 and 24).

A offers better readings in vv. 22 and 51. B offers better readings in vv. 40 and 47.

So far, P and A appear to be closer to each other than to B. However, the example of the sixty-two verses is not enough to give absolute support to this


74. COXE, *Catalogi codicum*, 740-1. A. CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts from the Meerman Collection in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 2011, 125-30. The watermark dates from 1538 (C. M. BRIQUET, *Les filigranes*, Paris 1907, no. 513). The copyists of the manuscripts are – according to a letter of R. Barhour – George (ff. 90-124) and Nicholas (ff. 2-89^v and 124^v-402^v) Kokolos, who worked in Venice from 1539 to 1542 (A. CATALDI-PALAU, *Les copistes de Guillaume Pellicier, évêque de Montpellier (1490-1567)*, *Scrittura e Civiltà* 10 (1986) 207-8 and 226 (tables IV and V) and O. MASSON, *Notes sur quelques manuscrits de Jean Tzetzés*, *Emerita* 19 (1951) 116; see also A. McCABE, *A Byzantine encyclopaedia of horse medicine: the sources, compilation, and transmission of the Hippiatrica*, Oxford 2007, 31-2). A. Cataldi-Palau in her recent description of the catalogue suggests that George has written ff. 2-89^v and 121^v-402^v, while Nicholas ff. 90-121. She also dates the watermark in 1540.

75. The two prose works can be found on ff. 304^v-307^v and on ff. 307^v-308. The poem for the death of John can be found on ff. 306^{r-v}.

76. The title is written in red ink in the right margin.

77. Inscribed surface: 190x150 mm.

conclusion. As stated above, the poem has come down to us together with other works by Tzetzes, namely the *Chiliades* and some of the *Letters*. Their editor P.A.M. Leone, in his recent critical edition, discusses the manuscript tradition extensively. He establishes that all three manuscripts derive from the same branch of the stemma. Leone's essential reconstruction of what has happened is shown in the following stemma⁷⁸:



78. LEONE's view about the two different branches for B and P-A can be corroborated by the fact that some works have been omitted by B and some completely irrelevant words have been added in the left and right margins of the poem in B (f. 95^v). There we find a word-list which appears to be completely irrelevant to the text, as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| κηδοσύνη (yearning) | τρίβος (path) |
| σωφροσύνη (prudence) | φόβος (fear) |
| κεβλή (macedonian form of κεφαλή) | γηραιδος (unattested word) |
| κεφαλή (head) | γραιδος (genitive of γραις, old woman) |
| ψέφος (darkness) | ἄφιπον (unattested word) |
| σκότος (darkness) | ἀντίπιστον (unattested word) |
| δέμας (body) | θέναρ (the palm of the hand) |
| σῶμα (body) | ἄφή (touch) |
| | ἄμαλλα, δεματικόν (sheaf) |

Given the fact that in the first line of the poem there is a superscripted alternative word for *τανυπέτηλον* (i.e. *ὀξύπετρον*), it can be assumed that the poem was preceded or followed either by scholia that are now lost or by a dictionary belonging to the tradition of Pseudo-Zonaras' Lexicon (See *κεβλή* in K lin. 2 p. 1189; *ψέφος* in Ψ lin. 9 p. 1871; *δέμας* in Δ lin. 1 p. 483; *θέναρ* Θ lin. 8 p. 1035; *ἄμαλλα* A lin. 5 p. 141. *Γραιδος* cf. Γ lin. 12, p. 453. *Ἄφιπον* cf. Ἄφιποι A lin. 16 p. 351?).

Contrary to what Leone's stemma suggests, it cannot be excluded that P is the exemplar used by the scribe of A. At this point, it should be noted that only the main part of the P (i.e. ff. 10-324^v) is relevant for the following discussion, because ff. 1-9^v and 325-326^v are later additions⁷⁹. The two manuscripts have identical contents:

-
79. f. 1^{r-v}. *Chiliades* I, 1, 51 – I, 1, 105 (Hand B)
 f. 2^{r-v}. Lexicon, close to Pseudo-Zonaras tradition (Hand C)
 f. 3. *Chiliades* I, 2, 106 – I, 3, 154 (Hand D)
 f. 4^{r-v}. *Θρηνητικὸς ἐπὶ τῇ θυγάτρει τῆς παλαιολογίνας ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ* [missing] (Hand D)
 inc. *φεῦ μοι καλλίστη θύγατερ φεῦ μοι σεμνὴ τρυγῶνα*
 des. *καὶ συνδρομῆς περιασπασμῶν ὑφ' ἧς κατεβροντούμην* fol. 5. blank
 f. 5^v. *Ἔκθεσις ἀκροστιχίδος πρὸς τὸν λογιώτατον κύριον Σταμάτιον Γυράρδος τῷ περιποθήτῳ μοι ἀδελφῷ.* (Hand E)
 Acrostic: *Γυράρδος τῷ περιποθήτῳ μοι ἀδελφῷ*
 inc. *γυρίζω τοίνυν λογισμῷ καταμετρῶ τὰς λέξεις*
 des. *ὀσφραίνομαι τὰς λέξεις σου τὰς τρεῖς πεντασυλάβας* (sic)
 f. 6. On the same subject. (Hand E)
 Acrostic: *Κυρῷ Σταματίῳ τῷ σεβαστῷ χαίρουιν* (sic) *ἀ(μὴν)*
 inc. *Κωρώνης τοίνυν ὁ λαμπρὸς καὶ γέννημα τῆς Κρήτης*
 des. *ἀμὴν ἀμὴν καὶ γένοιτο γένοιτο γένοιτό μοι*
 f. 6^v Blank
 f. 7. Various gnomological texts (Hand F)
 f. 7^v. Originally blank with several notes. There is a note which reads: *ὁ ταπίνος* (sic) *ἀνδρέας*. His hand is similar to that of Scribe F
 f. 8. *Περὶ ἀλώπεκος* (Hand F)
 inc. *ὁ ὄρχις αὐτοῦ ὁ δεξιὸς ξηρὸς λεῖος ἐπισπασθεῖς.*
 (almost the two thirds of the page are missing)
 f. 8^v. blank
 f. 9^{r-v}. Various notes (Various hands)
 ff. 325-326^v. Notes on Homer (Hand D)
 inc. *Μενέλαος τῷ ξίφει δε*
 des. *τίπτει γῇ ὀίπτει δὲ καὶ τὸ δόρυ.*

| Contents | P | A |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Ἱστορίαι (Chiliades) I, 1 – IV, 141</i> | ff. 10-59 | ff. 2-54 ^v |
| <i>Chiliades IV, 470-779</i> | ff. 59 ^v -63 | ff. 54 ^v -60 |
| P.A.M. Leone noted that there are twenty political verses added into the main text in manuscript A (f. 58 ^v ¹). The same text can be found in P (f. 62 ^v) as a marginal text. In short, the copyist of A inserted a marginal note into the main text. | | |
| <i>Ἐπιστολή (Letter) 1</i> ² | ff. 63 ^v -64 | ff. 60-61 ^v |
| <i>Index:</i> <i>Πίναξ ἐπιστολῶν. Πίναξ λέξεων ἱστοριοδῶν καὶ ἱστοριῶν τῆσδε τῆς γραφείσης ἐπιστολῆς</i> | f. 64 ^v | f. 61 ^v |
| <i>Chiliades IV, 780 – V, 23 (v. 192).</i> | ff. 64 ^v -69 | ff. 62-68 |
| <i>Letters 2-107</i> | ff. 69-105 | ff. 68-125 |
| <i>Index.</i> <i>Πίναξ ἱστοριῶν τῶν ἐν τῇδε τῇ βίβλῳ γεγραμμένων ἐπιστολῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτῆς δευτέρας ἐπιστολῆς μέχρι τέλους.</i> | ff. 105-111 ^v | ff. 125 ^v -136 ^v |
| <i>Chiliades V, 193-201 and the verses to Kotertzes</i> | f. 111 ^v | f. 136 ^v |
| <i>Chiliades V, 1, 202 – XIII, 496</i> | ff. 111 ^v -232 ^v | ff. 137-285 |
| <i>Στίχοι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου (Poem on various kinds of poetry)</i> ³ | ff. 233 ^v -234 ^v | ff. 285 ^v -288 ^v |
| <i>Διδασκαλία σαφεστάτη περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς στίχοις μέτρων ἀπάντων (Poem on metre)</i> ⁴ | ff. 235-249 | ff. 288 ^v -304 ^v |
| <i>Acephalous work</i> ⁵ . inc. ἐπὶ τοιούτοις οἶμοι οὐ σοβαρὸς τις ἦν des. οἶμαι πρὸς θειοτέραν λῆξιν βαδίσαντι | ff. 249-249 ^v | ff. 304 ^v -305 ^v |
| <i>Χαριστήριος λόγος πρὸς τὸν πατριάρχη.</i> inc. ἐφοίτων ποτὲ καὶ πρὸς αἰακὸν des. ἱερέως ἀγαθοῦ ταῖς πρὸς Θεὸν ἰκετεταῖς βεβαιούντος τὴν νίκην | ff. 249 ^v -250 | ff. 305 ^v -306 |
| <i>Ἰαμβοὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα καταθέντα θρηνητικοὶ</i> ⁷ | f. 250 | ff. 306-306 ^v |
| <i>Στίχοι ἡρωικοὶ (Dorylaion poem)</i> | ff. 250-250 ^v | ff. 306 ^v |
| <i>Ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Ὀμήρου ἀλληγορηθεῖσα (Allegory to the Iliad)</i> ⁸ | ff. 251-324 ^v | ff. 307-402 |

1. LEONE, *Historiae*, XII.

2. Edition: P. A. M. LEONE, *Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*, Leipzig 1972.

3. Edition: W. J. W. KOSTER, *Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, Nubes* [Scholia in Aristophanem 1.1A], Groningen 1975, 84-109.

4. Edition: J. A. CRAMER, *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 3, Oxford 1836, 302-333.

5. Edited by KONSTANTINOPOULOS, *Inedita Tetziana*, 183-4.

6. Edited by KONSTANTINOPOULOS, *Inedita Tetziana*, 180-1.

7. Editions: BROWNING, *The death*, 232-3 and ARCO MAGRÌ, *Il carmine inedito*, 73-4.

8. Edited by J. F. BOISSONADE, *Tetzzae Allegoriae Iliadis*, Paris 1851. For the order of the excerpts see: CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, 127.

Furthermore, minor differences can be found between the readings offered by P and A, not only for the Dorylaion poem, but also in the Chiliades and the Letters of Tzetzes. These differences could perhaps safely be regarded as being scribal mistakes.

Historical evidence supports the hypothesis that A is a direct copy of P. Manuscript P was sold by Antonios Eparchos, a Greek refugee and merchant of manuscripts in Venice, to Guillaume Pellicier, on behalf of François I, in 1540⁸⁰. P was deposited in the Bibliothèque de Fontainebleau after 1545, since it can be found in the catalogue of 1550 (no. 484), but not in the catalogue of 1545⁸¹. Pellicier also commissioned A, which was copied between 1540 and 1542 in Venice⁸². A became one of the manuscripts of his collection⁸³. Therefore, it is highly probable that Pellicier commissioned a copy of the manuscript for himself before depositing P in the royal library. Pellicier's library passed to Claude Naulot in 1573, four years after Pellicier's death. Indeed, two notes indicate that Naulot read this book in this year⁸⁴. Pellicier's collection (along with this manuscript) subsequently passed to the Jesuits of Clermont, then to Gerard Meermann in 1764, and finally to the Bodleian library⁸⁵. These observations suggest the new stemma below:

80. H. OMONT, Catalogue des manuscrits Grecs d'Antoine Éparque (1538), *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 53 (1892) 95-110, no. 68, pp. 105, 96: Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ ἱστορίαι καὶ ἀλληγοριῶν Ὀμηρικῶν λέξεις. Pellicier, in a letter dated to July the 10th 1540 appears to have seen the catalogue, send an improved copy to France and purchased the manuscripts (H. OMONT, Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de Guillaume Pellicier, *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 46 (1885), 45-83 and 594-624, esp. 613 (letter 1). On the french ambassadors in Venice, see: J. IRIGOIN, Les ambassadeurs à Venise et le commerce des manuscrits grecs dans les années 1540-1550, in: *Venezia centro di mediazione tra oriente e occidente (secoli XV-XVI). Aspetti e problemi*, Firenze, 1977, vol. 2, 399-415, esp. 400-1 and 409, and CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, 2-3.


81. H. OMONT, *Catalogues des manuscrits grecs de Fontainebleau sous François Ier et Henri II*, Paris 1889, 161-2.

82. See note 75.

83. OMONT, *Pellicier*, no. 138, p. 80: Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἱστορίαι καὶ λέξεις ἱστοριώδεις. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ διαφορᾶς ποιητῶν. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ διδασκαλία σαφειστάτη περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς στίχοις μέτρων ἀπάντων, διὰ στίχων πολιτικῶν. Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὑπόθεσις Ὀμήρου ἀλληγορηθεῖσα τῇ κραταιοτάτῃ βασιλείᾳ. See also CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, 4-6

84. ff. 1 and 402^v. On Claude Naulot du Val, see CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, 5-7.

85. See CATALDI-PALAU, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts*, 129.



Authorship and manuscripts

None of the manuscripts provides a clear indication of the authorship of the poem. It is worth noting, however, that manuscript P and its copy A are manuscripts that solely contain works by Tzetzes, and manuscript B contains some of these works as well. As for the *Chiliades* and *Letters*, their last editor, P.A.M. Leone, established that manuscripts P, A and B belong to the same family⁸⁶. Furthermore, the poem was also copied as part of the same anonymous texts in P (and A). B includes the poem, but not the other three texts. A possible explanation could be that the scribe of B, Makarios, considered this poem a good example of hexametric poetry, a kind of poetry described in the preceding *Poem on Metre* (*Περὶ μέτρων*)⁸⁷. Even if the title is not important⁸⁸, the fact that the poem is found between the treatises

86. LEONE, *Historiae*, xcix; LEONE, *Epistulae*, xvi.

87. In B, the word *ἐλεπούργησεν* is noted just after the preceded *Poem on Metre* (*Περὶ μέτρων*) (f. 95^v). Usually the scribe marks a cross when he finished writing a paragraph or a chapter of a work. However, in this case he marked a colon and a cross before the word and after this, he noted another colon, indicating that he refers to the next one, while the subject of the verb is the same as the previous one (i.e. John Tzetzes). Unfortunately, this cannot be confirmed by the meaning of the word. According to *LSJ*, it means either “do fine work” or “recount in detail”. Later derivatives of the same word have similar meaning (see *λεπούργημα* in *LBG*). As a result, most probably this word refers to the previous poem: “he recounted in detail (the rules about the metre)”.

88. In Byzantine and post-Byzantine manuscripts, it is very common for titles to provide information only on the metre, not on the topic of a poem. See M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres. Texts and Contexts* [WBS 24/1], Wien 2003, 69. Cf. P. PAGONARI-ANTONIOU, Τὰ βυζαντινὰ ἐπιγράμματα τῶν κωδίκων Βατοπεδίου 36, *Marc. gr. 507 καὶ Ζαγοῦᾶς 115*, *Diptycha* 5 (1991-92) 39 n. 17.

of John Tzetzes⁸⁹ and Hephaestion on metre in B may suggest that it was copied as an example of the dactylic metre⁹⁰. Another hypothesis is that the sub-archetype of B (if there was one) did not include the other three works, but only the Dorylaion poem. As a result, Tzetzes could be a possible candidate for the authorship⁹¹.

Although John Tzetzes, the well-known prolific scholar of the twelfth century, was a protégé of the aristocracy, he never served at the court as a poet laureate⁹². Even the sepulchral verses that he wrote on the death of Manuel Komnenos are more a rhetorical game than a real poem⁹³. The Dorylaion poem is a good example of imperial propaganda. As mentioned above, the poem must have been commissioned to add lustre to the festive occasion of Dorylaion's refortification. It would be surprising if Tzetzes, "proud of his independence"⁹⁴, was the author of the poem. Finally, the known biographical information on John Tzetzes is general and, especially for this period of his life, completely obscure. There are no letters dated after 1166, while the pace of his writing slackens in the 1160's. As a result, he might already have been dead by 1175⁹⁵.

Tzetzes wrote more poems in hexameter⁹⁶. However, a metrical comparison with these poems is of little help in ascertaining whether Tzetzes

89. ff. 92-95^v. Tzetzes, *Διδασκαλία σαφειστάτη περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς στίχοις μέτρων ἀπάντων* (ed. J. A. CRAMER, *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, vol. 3, Oxford 1836), 302-333.

90. Cf. Barocci 48, which on f. 46^v, before and after an excerpt of Tzetzes' *Poem on Metre* (304, 12-23), quotes some verses as examples in order to illustrate various grammatical and metrical rules.

91. Cf. WENDEL, Tzetzes, no. 39 who attributes the poem to Tzetzes as well. See also notes 61-62.

92. For works written by, or attributed to, Tzetzes, see WENDEL, Tzetzes, 1959 and N. G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983, 191.

93. Στίχοι τοῦ Τζέτζου, Ἰαμβοὶ Κλημακωτοί: Πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα κῆριν Μανουήλ. Ἐπιτάφιοι (ed. P. MATRANGA, *Anecdota Graeca e mss. bibliothecis Vaticana, Angelica, Barberiniana, Vallicelliana, Medicea, Vindobonensi deprompta*, vol. II, Romae 1850), 619-22. For the opposite point of view, see ARCO MAGRÌ, *Carmina Inedita*, 75.

94. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 348.

95. I am most grateful to Prof. Michael Grünbart for this remark.

96. See P. A. M. LEONE, Ioannis Tzetzae Iambi, *RSBN*, n.s. 6-7 (1969-70) 144. *Poem on Metre*, 302, 31-304, 17 and 333, 1-10. *Τὰ πρὸ Ὀμήρου, τὰ Ὀμήρου, τὰ μεθ' Ὀμήρου* (ed. EM. BEKKER, *Ioannis Tzetzae. Antehomerica, homerica et posthomerica*, Berlin 1816), 3-86.

was the poet behind the Dorylaion poem. The main metrical and prosodic features of Tzetzes' genuine poems and the Dorylaion poem are common to most Byzantine poets after the seventh century: a tendency to feminine caesura, the appearance of median caesura, and prosodic errors.

The different subject of the poems could possibly be the cause of the linguistic difference between the Dorylaion poem and the other poems by Tzetzes. The Dorylaion poem has more linguistic similarities to the panegyrics written in hexameter by Theodore Prodromos on the re-conquest of Kastamon⁹⁷. It is out of the question that Prodromos was the author of the poem, because the poem is datable long after his death. The similarities can be explained on the basis of their similar subject and the use of a common poetic style⁹⁸.

It is well known, that frequently poets were writing epigrams on demand of the members of the Constantinopolitan elite⁹⁹. It is highly possible that our anonymous poet was one of these professional poets. His knowledge of the conventions of court poetry supports this view.

Prosody and metre

The poem is written in hexameters. The hexameter of Byzantine authors is more akin to Homer's hexameters than to those of Nonnos¹⁰⁰. In the twelfth century, it was not unusual for this metre to be used for the

97. The poem begins with the phrase ἦν ὅτε ("there was once") – just as does the poem of Theodore Prodromos (no. 3, 1) (written also in hexameter) for the triumph of John II Komnenos after the conquest of Kastamon (1133). Furthermore, Theodore Prodromos too described Constantinople as a mother who laments the loss of her children (*ibid*, 15-17). Prodromos also uses the Homeric adjective πολίπορθος (sacker of the cities) for John II Komnenos (*ibid*, 22). The last two verses of the Dorylaion poem resembles strongly v. 128 of the poem on Kastamon's reconquest.

98. An example of this poetic jargon is the archaistic name *Persians* in order to indicate the Turks: v. 29. Cf. W. HÖRANDNER, Η εικόνα του άλλου. Λατίνοι, Φράγκοι και Βάρβαροι από τη σκοπιά της αυλικής ποίησης των Κομνηνών, *Dodoni* 23 (1993) 118.

99. Cf. MULLETT, Aristocracy and Patronage, 177, 180-1. See also LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry*, 36.

100. E. M. VAN OPSTALL, *Jean Géomètre: poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques*, Leiden 2008, 69. H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 2, München 1978, 91. On Nonnus hexameters, see the comments by G. AGOSTI, Literariness and levels of style in epigraphical poetry of Late Antiquity, *Ramus* 37/1-2 (2008) (= *Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Poetry*, eds K. CARVOUNIS - R. HUNTER, Bendigo 2008), 198-202 and 207.

composition of poetry¹⁰¹. Theodore Prodromos, for instance, wrote not only epigrams, but also long poems in hexameter¹⁰². Isaac Komnenos, the founder of the Kosmosoteira monastery, composed, among others, also poems in hexameters¹⁰³. In his testament (written in 1152), he demands that the book with his works will “be given often as a reading”¹⁰⁴. John Tzetzes in letter 89 mentions that someone sent him a text in hexameter¹⁰⁵.

As the prosodic differentiation between long and short syllables had already disappeared in Late Antiquity, the author, like so many other Byzantine poets, struggled with the rules of ancient prosody¹⁰⁶. More precisely, the main classical rules are generally in use: ϵ and o are short and η and ω are long, although there is one exception to this – the omicron in $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu$ (v. 47) is measured as long. It was very difficult for the author to follow the ancient rules, especially for the dichrona: there are twelve instances of short alpha measured as long¹⁰⁷, four instances of short iota measured as long¹⁰⁸, and two instances of long upsilon measured as short¹⁰⁹.

101. MAGDALINO, *Manuel*, 431. For the production of poems in hexameter during the twelfth century, see E. JEFFREYS, Why produce verse in twelfth-century Constantinople?, in: *Doux remède... Poésie et poétique à Byzance. Actes du IVe colloque international philologique EPMHNEIA, Paris 23-24-25 février 2006*, eds P. ODORICO – P. AGAPITOS – M. HINTERBERGER [Dossiers byzantins 9], Paris 2009, 223-4.

102. For example the encomiastic poems (Theodore Prodromos, nos. 42, 56b, 67). Cf. the paraenetic poem to monk Ioannikios (no. 62) and the poem to Logothetes Stephanos Meles (nos. 68 and 69).

103. On sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos, see VARZOS, *Ἡ γενεαλογία*, vol. 1, 238-54, esp. 252-3 (no. 36).

104. G. PAPAZOGLOU, *Τυπικὸν Ἰσαακίου Ἀλεξίου Κομνηνοῦ τῆς μονῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς Κοσμοσωτείρας* [Θρακική Βιβλιοθήκη 3] Komotini, 1994, lin. 1920-5. Available in English translation: N. PATTERSON ŠEVČENKO (transl.), Kosmosoteira: Typikon of the Sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira near Bera, in: *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, eds J. THOMAS – A. CONSTANTINIDES HERO [DOS 35], Washington D.C. 2000, no. 29, vol. 2, § 106, p. 844 (the translation is based on the earlier, excellent, edition by L. PETIT, Typikon du monastère de la Kosmosotira près d'Aenos (1152), *IRAIK* 13 (1908) 17-75).

105. Tzetzes, *Letters*, no. 89, lin. 6-7: *γραμματείου γάρ μοι προσενεχθέντος ἐγκεχα-ραγμένην ἡρωικὴν ἔχοντος μοῦσαν*. For the works of Tzetzes in hexameter, see n. 104.

106. See M. D. LAUXTERMANN, The Velocity of Pure Iambs. Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable, *JÖB* 48 (1998) 10-11.

107. vv. 5, 8, 15, 29, 30, 31, 33, 51, 54, 59, 60, 62.

108. vv. 2, 41, 49, 50.

109. In v. 8 and in the corrupted v. 24.

The prosodic value of vowels and diphthongs may be lengthened in the case of “position”, or shortened in the case of epic and attic correption¹¹⁰. Finally, proper names are counted freely¹¹¹.

Although the author tried to avoid hiatus by using either euphonical -v¹¹² or words with elision¹¹³, he failed many times¹¹⁴.

There is no clear tendency to regulate the position of the stress accent at the verse end in Byzantine hexameters¹¹⁵: 45.14% (28) of the verses are accented on the penultimate, 29.08% (18) on the last syllable and 25.78% (16) on the antepenultimate.

The masculine caesura has been used ten times¹¹⁶, the feminine twenty-four times¹¹⁷, the median caesura nineteen times¹¹⁸, the caesura after the second foot eight times¹¹⁹, and finally the hephthemimeral caesura once¹²⁰.

The position of the stress accent before the masculine, feminine and median caesura is as follows:

110. One can find position in almost every verse. The only peculiarity is in verse 53 where the double ϱ in ἐγκαταροήξας does not make position. Epic correption can be found twice (vv. 41 and 46) and attic correption twelve times (vv. 4, 15, 20, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 55, 56, 60).

111. vv. 14, 23, 27, 29, 57.

112. v. 3: τελέεσκεν, v. 13: οὔρεσιν, v. 24: βάσκειν, v. 34: δοῦρασιν.

113. δὲ (vv. 6, 8, 26, 29, 31, 42, 43, 48, 54), τε (vv. 9, 16, 61), γε (v. 23), κε (v. 21), οὐδὲ (vv. 10, 20, 25, 35), ταῦτα (v. 10), οὐκέτι (v. 32), ἀπὸ (v. 36), σχοίνισμα (v. 43), φείσομαι (v. 45), ἥντε (v. 49).

114. vv. 1, 8, 12, 24, 28, 40, 41, 57, 58, 59, 62.

115. See M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *The Spring of Rhythm. An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* [BV 22], Wien 1999, 70.

116. vv. 5, 12, 15, 26, 29, 46, 47, 51, 52, 59. M. L. WEST, *Introduction to Greek meter*, Oxford 1987, 19.

117. vv. 3, 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 53, 54, 57, 60, 61, 62. WEST, *Greek meter*, 19.

118. vv. 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, 17, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 33, 37, 42, 44, 48, 50, 55. HUNGER, *Literatur*, 90.

119. vv. 2, 8, 11, 25, 39, 45, 49, 58.

120. v. 56.

| | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|----|--------|--------|
| Masculine | Oxytone | 3 | 30.00% | 16.13% |
| | Paroxytone | 6 | 60.00% | |
| | Proparoxytone | 1 | 10.00% | |
| Feminine | Oxytone | 2 | 8.33% | 38.71% |
| | Paroxytone | 2 | 8.33% | |
| | Proparoxytone | 20 | 83.34% | |
| Median caesura | Oxytone | 3 | 15.07% | 30.64% |
| | Paroxytone | 3 | 21.07% | |
| | Proparoxytone | 12 | 63.16% | |

This confirms the observation that there is a clear tendency in twelfth-century hexameters to put the stress accent on the antepenultimate before the feminine caesura (on the second biceps)¹²¹.

The poet is not very skilful: he strives after a highbrow style, but with little success in the end. He attempts to write in hexameters and in a kind of Homeric Greek. Strong enjambment is also one of the characteristics of the poem¹²². Finally, the following hapax legomena appear in the poem:

- v. 2. *τανυπέτηλος*,
- v. 15. *μελιχρόφθογγος*,
- v. 33. *βριαροπάλαμνος*,
- v. 38. *σωτιάνειρα*.

Special textual problems

Verse 13 is syntactically highly problematic: part of a compound (*θηρ*-) appears to be the antecedent of the relative pronoun *ὅσσα*.

Verse 24 is corrupted. The reading of P and B, *ἀναδυμένοιο*, is a not an attested form of *ἀναδύομαι*; A's reading *ἀναδυομένοιο* looks like an emendation by a humanist scribe. Furthermore, the verb *ἀναδύομαι* is never attested in this meaning. One would expect a form of the verb *ἀνατέλλω* or *ἀνίσχω*.

121. M. LAUXTERMANN, Book review of GR. PAPAGIANNIS, *Theodoros Prodromos. Jambische und hexametrische Tetrasticha auf die Haupteerzählungen des Alten und des Neuen Testaments. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Indices*, Wiesbaden 1997, in: *JÖB* 49 (1999) 367.

122. vv. 3- 4, 17-8, 26-7, 55-6.

In the same verse, the reading $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\gamma$, offered in all the manuscripts, is grammatically incorrect. One could change it into $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\grave{o}$ (the fire itself), into $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\ \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma$ (he let out a battle-cry (towards) the fire of the rising sun) or $\pi\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\gamma\eta$ (the radiant (thing), the radiance).

Verse 26 is corrupt. On the one hand, if the reading of B is accepted, then the poem has an unacceptable enjambment. On the other hand, if we follow the scribes of P and A, the text becomes gibberish.

Verse 41. Two possible caesurae can be found in this verse: a feminine caesura and a hephthemimeres. Thus, the audience could possibly have heard either “Be gracious, Creator and Lord [of the universe], to me – Thy suppliant”, or “Be gracious, Creator [of the universe] to me – Thy king-suppliant”.

TABULA NOTARUM IN APPARATU CRITICO ADHIBITARUM

P = ms. *Paris. gr* 2644, ff. 250^{r-v} (s. XIII ex. – XIV a.)

B = ms. *Barocci* 194, f. 95^v (s. XV)

A = ms. *Auct. T.* 1.10, f. 306^v (s. XVI)

L = Sp. Lampros, *Σύμμικτα*, NE 5 (1908) 329-331.

add. = addidit

cod. = codex

coni. = coniecit

corr. = correxit

exp. = expunxit

fort. = fortasse

leg. = legit

m.c. = metri causa

mg. = in margine

mutil. = mutilatus

s.s. = suprascriptum

Στίχοι ἡρωικοὶ

- Ἦν ὅτε ῥωμαϊκὴν ὑπὸ Αὐσονιτῶν πλατάνιστον
 πρέμνον ἐριθαλές, εὐσκιόφυλλον, τανυπέτηλον
 ἦδε πόλις τελέεσκεν· ἀτὰρ ζαμενοῦς ὑπ' ἀέλλης
 βαρβαρικῆς ἰδὲ λαίλαπος ἠδὲ τυφῶνος ἀγρίου
- 5** κουριδίη νεᾶνις ἄτε μητρὸς ἀπέσπαστο φίλης,
 χειραμένη δ' ὑπὸ βόστρυχον ἀγλαὸν ὥστο χαμάζε·
 ἥύτε γὰρ πλοκαμίδας ἀμύξατο τείχεα πυκνά,
 ἦθεα περσικὰ δ' ὠλοφύρατο ἐπεὶ μετέλαχεν
 εὐνομίης θεοφίλος εὐσεβέων τ' ἀπὸ θεσμῶν.
- 10** οὐδ' ἄρα κοιρανέοντος ταῦτ' ἐπιήνδανε θυμῷ,
 σκηπτροκρατοῦς, ἀκάμαντος, ἀριστοπόνου, μεγαθύμου,
 Κομνηιάδεω, ἀγακλυτοῦ βαρβαροφόντου,
 θηρολετῆρος, ἐς ὅσα περ οὖρεσιν ἀμφινέμονται,
 Μανουῆλ ἐπταμέδοντος, ἐρισθενέος, πτολιπόρθου,
- 15** εὐσεβέων τε λόγων μελιχροφθόγγιο δόνακος,
 πνευματικῆς θ' ἡγήτορος ἀμβάσεως ἀπλανοῦς,
 πορφυρόπαιδος· ὃν οὐ θέμις ἐκ μερόπων ἐπικήρων
 φύτλης ἐκγεγάασθαι, ἀπ' οὐρανίων δ' οἶεσθαι,
 ἄτρυτον ἐν καμάτοισιν ἀεικελίοισιν ἑόντα,
- 20** ἄτροφον, οὐδ' ὑπνόνοντα περιχθονίων κατὰ πληθὺν
 καὶ φυσικῶν ἐφύπερθεν ἀναγκῶν, αἳ κ' ἐθέλησιν.
 οὐκοῦν οὐκ ἐπιήνδανε, παμβασιλῆι δὲ Χριστῷ
 φραξάμενος, τόν γ' οὐκ Ἄγαρ οὐκ Ἰσμαὶλ θεοκλυτεῖ,
 βάσκειν ἐς ἡέλιιο † ἀναδυμένοιο πῦρ αὐτὴν †

23 cf. Gen. 16:7-14

Titl. in mg. B στ(ί)χ(οι) ηρω[ικοί] in mg. P (cod. mutil.) στίχοι ηρωϊκοῖ in mg. A **1** αὐσονίτην P **2** εὐσκιόφυλλον P ὀξύπτερον s.s. τανυπέτηλον B **4** ἰδὲ τυφῶνος BL ἠδὲ φῶνος A **5** ἀπέσπαστο P **6** ὑποβόστρυχον P ὑπο βόστρυχον BA χεμάζε P χέμαζε B χενάζε A χαμάζε L **7** ἥύτε P ἥτε A ἥτε L πλοκαμίδας PBL πλοκωμίδας A τειχεα P τόχεα A **8** δώλοφύρατο PB δωλοφύρτο A **9** εὐρομίης PBA corr. L τὰπὸ PBA **10** οὐδ'ἄρα A **12** Κομνηνιαδεῶ A **13** θηρολετῆρος ἐς ὅσα PBA θηρολετῆρες ὅσα leg. L θηρολετῆρος ὅσα ed. L ὅσα m.c. οὖρεσίν P **14** ἐρισθενέως leg. L **15** μελιχροφόγγου ὁ sic A **16** ἀναβάσεως BL ἀναβάσιος PA **17** ὃν Bὸν AL **18** ἐκγεγαίασθαι PBA corr. L οἶεσθαι A **20** οὐδὲ πνόνοντα L περὶ χθονίων PBA corr. L καταπληθην B καταπληθῶν P κατὰ πληθὼν A corr. L **21** αἳ κεθέλησιν P αἳ κε θέλησιν B αἵτε θέλησιν A αἳ κε θέλησιν L **22** οὐκοῦν PBAL ἐπικύδανε PBL ἐπιήνδανε A παμβασιλῆ ἰδὲ P παμβασιλῆιδὲ B παμβασιλῆ ἰδὲ A παμβασιλεῖ ἰδὲ L **23** οὐκ'άγαρ PBA Ἄγαρ L **24** βάσπεν A ἡέλιιο B ἡελίου L ἀναδυμένοιο B ἀναδυομένοιο A

αὐτομάτως οὐδ' ἀξιόλεκτον ἄγειρε φάλαγγα, 25
 ὥς δ' ὅτε περ Γεδεὼν τὸ λαφύξαν ἀγάγετο καὶ τε
 Μαδιανίτιδας ὤλεσε πανστρατιάς ὑπερόπλους
 ἐν δὲ κεραυνὸν ἀπ' ἄντυγος αἰθερίοιο ἀτειρῇ
 Πέρσαι καθοράαν οἶσαντο, λάθοντο δ' οἶστοῦ,
 ἐς δὲ φυγὴν ἐτράποντο λυγρὰν αὐδὴν λαλαγοῦντες. 30
 στέρνα δ' ἀνὰ πολυχανδῇ γαίης πουλυβοτείρης
 οὐκέτ' ἐπιτροχώνοντες ἐς ἄγκρα μακρὰ δύσαντο,
 δορκαλίδες τρομέουσαι θῆρα βριαροπάλαμνον
 πολλὰ δὲ δούρασιν ἀμφὶ μετάφρενα τραυματέοντο,
 οὐδ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ στήθεσφι βολίδος ἔμμινον ἐρωήν. 35
 ὥς οἱ μὲν δραπέτευσαν ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίοιο δόμοιο,
 κηφῆνες δὲ μελισσῶν οὐκέτι σίμβλα τρυγῶσι,
 χεῖρα δὲ σωτιάνειραν ἀνασχόμενος δι' Ὀλύμπου
 κοίρανος ὄλβιος ἡδὲ θεώνυμος ἡδὲ θεουδῆς
 λίσσετο ὑψιμέδοντα λάχους ἔνεκεν θεολέκτου 40
 «Ἰλαθι, δημιουργὲ ἀναξ ἰκέτης δέ τοι εἰμί,
 χριστιανῶν δ' ἐπιλήσιμονα μὴ μέχρι τέρατος εἶναι,
 ὄμμασι δ' εὐμενέεσσι τεδὸν σχοίνισμ' ἐπιβλέψαι.
 σοῦ χάριν, οὔτε τι σώματος, οὐ στέφους πολυτίμου
 φείσομ' ἐγὼ ποτε, οὐ τέκεος τὸ χάρισας ἄμμιν». 45
 Ἥ ῥα καὶ ἀμβροσίην διὰ δεξιὰν ἔνθετο λίθον,
 ἥ κάββαλε δὲ κρατερὸν ἐς ὑπόρρυχα τῆσδε πόλιος, P 250^v

25 cf. Il. 3.77 26 cf. Jud. 7:5-8 31 cf. Il. 11. 619 32 cf. Il. 22.189-190 38-40 cf. Il. 1. 374 43
 cf. Psalm. 104:11 Odes 2:1, 9 Deut. 32:9

25 οὐδαξιόλεκτον A 26 τὸ λαφύξαν ἀγάγοιενοκάρτεον P τὸ λαφύξανἀγάγετο καὶ τε
 B τὸ λαφύξ(εν) ἀγάγοιενιητάν A 28 ἀπάντυγος B ἀπᾶντυγος A 31 ἀνὰ PA ἀνὰς B
 ἀνὰ corr. L πολυχαρδῆς expr. P πολυχαρδαίης scr. P πολυχανδεῖς B πολυχανδῆς A
 πολυχανδῇ corr. L πολυβοτείρης PBA πουλυβοτείρης corr. L 32 οὐκ' ἔτ' L δυσαντο B 33
 θηραβριανοπάλαμνον A 34 δε P ἀμφι μετάφρενα P ἀμφιμετάφρενα B 35 ἄρ' ἐπὶ P στήθες
 expr. P στήθες φιβολίδος PB στήθεσσι βολίδος AL ἐρώων PBA corr. L 36 δραπετεύσαν B
 ἀπαλλοτρίοιο PB ἀπαλλοτρίοιο ὁ A 37 οὐκ' ἐτι L σίμβλα P σύμβλη B σύμβλα A corr. L
 τρυγῶσι P 38 διολύμπου A 39 ἡδὲ θεώνυμος A 40 ὑψιμέδοντα λάχους P ὑψιμέδοντος
 λάχιος A 41 δέ τοι P 42 σ' PAL ἐπιλήσιμονα B εἶναι om. A 43 εὐμενέεσι A 44 οὐ B 45
 οὐτέκεο τι χαρίσας ἄμμιν P οὐτέκεο το χαρίσας ἄμμιν BA οὐτέκετο χαρισάμην leg. L
 οὔτε κ' ὅτω χαρισάμην conl. L 46 ἡ ῥὰ P ῥὰ A τ' ant. ἀμβροσίην B ἔνθετο τὸ λίθον
 B ἔνθετο in mg. B ἔνθε τὸ λίθον PA 47 κρατερὸν PBAL κρατερὸν m.c. ὑπόρυχα A
 πτόλοος P πόλοος A

- καὶ δ' ἔβαλον μεγαλήτορες ἄνδρες ἀριπρεπέες τε
 ἔστε δομήτορες, ἥϊτ' ἀδινῶν φύλα μελισσῶν,
50 ἔργον ἀρίζηλον τόδε συμπέραναν παραχρῆμα.
 ῥωμαῖδος τε πάλιν μέρος οὐκ ἐλάχιστον τάδε
 λυσσητῆρ δὲ κύων, ὃς κάρχαρον ἔγκατεΐασκε†
 γνάθον, ὀδυνήσαιο λίθον μόνον ἐγκαταρρήξας.
 θύγατρα δ' ἀπολαβοῦσα τὴν ἀπόδημον ἐς μακρόν,
55 λευκόπεπλον, τανυβόστρυχον, εὐστέφανον, διὰ φύκος
 παρειᾶς ἐπιχρῶσαμένην, πάμπαν ἐρατεινήν,
 Αὔσονίτις, σκίρτησε. πολιούχῳ δὲ ἄνακτι
 ἔνθεν ἔπευξαι ἡελίου ἀπερείσια κύκλα
 καὶ μονοκρατορίην χθονὸς νιεί ἅμα φαεινῷ·
60 κύκλῳ γὰρ ἐπάρασα βλεφαρίδας, ὥς φατο θέσπις,
 τέκνα θ' ὀρῶσα γέγηθε συνηγμένα πάντοθεν αὖθις
 δύσιος ἀντολῆς τε ἀτεκμάρτων τε θαλασσῶν.

49 Il. 2.87 **60-62** cf. Is. 60:4 and 49:18; Gen. 13:14.

48 καδδ' ἔβαλον PB καδ'ἔβαλον A μεγαλείτορες P ἀριπρεπέεστε PB **49** ἔσδε P ἐς δε B ἐς δε A ἔστε L ἥϊτ' ἀδονῶν PB ἥϊτ' ἀδινῶν A ἥϊτ' ἀδινῶν em. L φύλλα A μελισσῶν B **50** οὔργον B **51** ῥωμαῖδος P τε om. A οὐκἐλάχιστον PA τάδε A τάδειας P τὰδ'έν B τὰδ' ἦν L **52** δε P **53** ἐγκαταρρώξ P ἐγκαταρρώξας B ἐγκαταρρώξας A corr. L **54** ες A **55** εὐστέφανον L **56** ἐπιχρῶσαμένην PB παμπανερφαεινήν A **57** αὐσονίτις PBA corr. L **58** ἐπαύξας P ἐπεύξας BA ἐπεύξαθ' L **59** φαεινῷ P φαενῷ BA φαεινῷ corr. L **60** ἐπάρασθαι L ὥς φάτο PB ὥς φατο A corr. L **61** αὖθις P **62** θαλασσῶνB.

Translation

There was a time when this city was a vigorous offshoot with shady leaves and large foliage, [prospering] under the Roman plane of the Ausonians. But [swept] by a furious and barbaric storm, a hurricane, a violent typhoon, it was torn away like a nubile girl from her mother [5], and was torn down to the ground, a girl shorn of her fair locks – for she undid her mighty walls as if she undid her hair. She cried loudly when, instead of divine laws and pious institutions, she had to follow Persian customs [9].

This was not pleasing to our leader, the sceptre-bearing, indefatigable, excellently working and magnanimous Comnenian scion, the famous slayer of the barbarians, the killer of the wild beasts that roam in the mountains, Manuel, the absolute ruler, the mighty one, the sacker of cities, the sweet-sounding instrument of pious words [15], the leader [on the path] of unerring spiritual ascent, the purple-born, [about] whom it is not right [to say that] he was born from mortals; consider him [one] of the heavenly beings, as he does not weary of terrible toils and he does not eat and does not sleep like most men [20], but he is above earthly needs, if he wishes.

So this pleased him not, and protected by the Almighty Christ, whom neither Hagar nor Ishmael venerate, he went to [the very fire of the rising sun], of his own volition. And he did not assemble a significant battalion [25], but it was like when Gideon led the “lapping” [soldiers] and routed the haughty army of the Midianites. For the Persians deemed they saw an unceasing lighting at the rim of the heavens, forgot their arrows, and turned to flight while uttering woeful shrieks [30]. They ceased to run over the wide plains of the life-giving earth and hid themselves in the deep mountain glens, like deer afraid of the mighty-pawed beast. And many shoulder-blades were pierced by lances – they did not wait for the spears to thrust into their chests [35].

While thus they fled from other people’s dwellings, [expelled from] the beehives [which] they no longer reap as drones, our blessed ruler, who is named after God and who is godlike, stretched out his man-saving hand from Mount Olympus and beseeched God Almighty on behalf of the Christian lot [40]: “Be gracious, Lord of the Universe, to me – Thy suppliant. Forget not the Christians until the end [of all time], but look on Thy portion with benevolent eyes. For Thee, I will not spare my body, nor my precious crown, nor the child that Thou hast given to us” [45].

He spoke and placed a stone with his divine right hand. He laid it down as the mighty foundation stone of this city, and so too did the magnanimous and illustrious men: they laid [stones] until the builders, like swarms of clustering bees,

had completed this admirable work on the spot [50] and this had again become a very significant part of the Roman Empire. The mad dog, who has broken his sharp jaws, shall hurt himself if [he dares] set his teeth in this [wall of] stones [53].

[Now that] you have regained your daughter who has been away for so long (your daughter white-garmented, long-locked, well-girdled, her cheeks painted with orchil, utterly lovely), oh Ausonian woman, rejoice! And in return wish the Emperor, the protector of the city, many years of life and supreme rule together with his glorious son [59]! For when you lift up your eyes all around, as the Prophet says, and when you see that your children are once again gathered from all quarters, from West and East and from the boundless seas, rejoice and be merry!

Appendix
Index verborum memorabilium

| | | |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| ἀγακλυτός, 12 | ἐρατεινή, 56 | μεγάθυμος, 11 |
| ἄγκος, 32 | ἐρίθαλλος, 2 | μεγαλήτωρ, 48 |
| ἄγλαός, 6 | ἐρισθενής, 14 | μελιχρόφθογγος, 15 |
| ἄδινός, 49 | ἐρωή, 35 | μέροψ, 17 |
| ἄεικελῖος, 19 | εὐσκιόφυλλος, 2 | μεταλαγχάνω, 8 |
| ἄελλα, 3 | εὐστέφανος, 55 | μετάφρενον, 34 |
| αἰθέριος, 28 | ἐφύπερθεν, 21 | μῖμνω, 35 |
| ἀκάμας, 11 | ζαμενής, 3 | μονοκρατορία, 59 |
| ἄμβασις, 16 | ἡέλιος, 24, 58 | οἶστος, 29 |
| ἄμβροσία, 46 | θεόκλυτος, 23 | ὄλβιος, 39 |
| ἄμύσσω, 7 | θεόλεκτος, 40 | ὀλοφύρομαι, 8 |
| ἀμφινέμομαι, 13 | θεουδής, 39 | οὔρος, 13 |
| ἀντολίη, 62 | θεοφιλής, 9 | παμβασιλεύς, 22 |
| ἄντυξ, 28 | θεσμός, 9 | περιχθόνιος, 20 |
| ἄξιόλεκτος, 25 | θέσπις, 60 | πλατάνιστος, 1 |
| ἄπλανής, 16 | θεώνυμος, 39 | πλοκαμῖς, 7 |
| ἀπόδημος, 54 | θηρολετήρ, 13 | πνευματική, 16 |
| ἄρῖζηλος, 50 | θυγάτηρ, 54 | πολιοῦχος, 57 |
| ἄριπρεπής, 48 | κάματος, 19 | πολυβότειρα, 31 |
| ἄριστοπόνος, 11 | κάρχαρος, 52 | πολυχανδής, 31 |
| ἄτειρής, 28 | κεῖρω, 6 | πορφυρόπαις, 17 |
| ἄτέκμαρτος, 62 | κεραυνός, 28 | πρέμνος, 2 |
| ἄτρυτος, 19 | ἰκέτης, 41 | πτολίπορθος, 14 |
| αὐδή, 30 | κοιρανέω, 10 | σίμβλος, 37 |
| Αὐσονίτις, 57 | κοίρανος, 39 | σκηπτοκρατής, 11 |
| Αὐσονίτης, 1 | Κομνηνιάδης, 12 | σκιρτάω, 57 |
| βαρβαροφόντης, 12 | κουριδῖος, 5 | στέρα, 31 |
| βάσκω, 24 | κρατερός, 47 | σχοίνισμα, 43 |
| βλεφαρίς, 60 | κύων, 52 | σωτιάνειρα, 38 |
| βριαροπάλαμος, 33 | λαῖλαψ, 4 | τανυβόστρυχος, 55 |
| δορκαλῖς, 33 | λαλαγέω, 30 | τανυπέτηλος, 2 |
| ἐπιανδάνω, 10, 22 | λαφύσσω, 26 | ὑπέροπλος, 27 |
| ἐπίκηρος, 17 | λάχος, 40 | ὑψιμέδων, 40 |
| ἐπιτροχάω, 32 | λενυκόπεπλος, 55 | χαμᾶξε, 6 |
| ἐπταμέδων, 14 | λυσσητήρ, 52 | |

A POEM ON THE REFORTIFICATION OF DORYLAION IN 1175

In the summer/autumn of 1175, Manuel Komnenos (1143-1180) undertook the rebuilding of Dorylaion, one of the major *aplekta* in Asia Minor. For this occasion a poem was written. The strong acquaintance of the poet with the conventions of court literature, the occasional content of the poem and its panegyric character, suggest that the text was written for a small ceremony which took place at Dorylaion. The author is probably an anonymous professional court poet who accompanied Manuel in his expedition. The authorship is further discussed since the manuscript tradition might suggest that John Tzetzes was the author. After a close look at the language, style and metre of the poem, this identification is excluded. In 1908, Spyridon Lampros published the poem on the basis of manuscript *Barocci* 194 (fifteenth century) of the Bodleian Library. This study re-edits the poem on the basis of two more manuscripts: manuscript *Parisinus gr.* 2644 (late thirteenth century) of the Bibliothèque Nationale and *Auctarium* T.1.10 of the Bodleian Library (sixteenth century). The history of each manuscript is analyzed and the relation between them examined. The *Auctarium* is proved to be a direct copy of the Parisian manuscript. The metrical analysis of the poem is also included in the article and special textual problems are discussed. Finally, the translation of the original text is provided.