THE "LEGACY" OF APHTHONIOS, HERMGENES AND PSEUDO-MENANDER: ASPECTS OF BYZANTINE RHETORIC UNDER THE PALAIOLOGOI

Introduction

Around the middle of the 14th century the Cypriot Scholar George Lapithes wrote a long didactic poem, in which he gave moral and practical rules for private and public life; in the section of the poem concerning the “skills” one should have in order to succeed in life, we read:

“At first you should pursue those arts that are common and necessary to all, and be trained in them. These are rhetoric and the art of law. No one who lacks these (skills) can ever act the right way in his life. For, how can one talk to his fellow-men, when he doesn’t know how to speak? How can one have dealings with others, when he ignores the law?”

For Lapithes rhetoric is, along with the art of law, a prerequisite for a “successful” life, which in its turn points to the importance given to rhetoric in his times, that is in the Palaiologan period; it is rhetoric that helps one get/keep in contact with other people, and as such it can be considered as the fundament of social/public life.

The “fundamental” role of rhetoric in Byzantine intellectual life and society in general was not, of course, stressed for the first time in the age of the Palaiologoi, although the Palaiologan, along with the Comnenian era was one of the richest in rhetorical production. What Lapithes says here is what H.-G. Beck has summarized for the whole Byzantine culture as follows:

“Rhetoric was for the Byzantines equal to paideia ... The logos peistikos taught by rhetoric was the fundament of social life and of every communal and political organization. The rhetorical speech, the logos was the logically structured expression of the human’s inner thoughts and images, and as such it served the communication bet-

---

ween the members of the society. Thus, the rhetor was in the sense of Isocrates the ideal teacher, the ideal politician, and the ideal statesman.”

“Education” and “politics” are two keywords one should have in mind when dealing with Byzantine rhetoric, and rhetoric in general. The connection goes back to classical Greece, where the sophists taught rhetoric to young aristocrats as a means of achieving social and political advancement. With Isocrates rhetoric claimed its part in the curriculum of every learned man, while with Aristotle it took a standard place in the education provided by philosophical schools. Speaking (and writing) logically and elegantly was a matter of (social and political) prestige and influence: in order to be socially and politically effective, one should speak (and write) in a way that was stylistically elegant and syntactically correct; it was rhetoric that taught the art of elegant and, thus, effective discourse.

The role of rhetoric in education was strengthened by the trend called “atticism” that appeared by the end of the first century A.D., and claimed the superiority of “pure” Attic language, that is a language close to the old Attic dialect, against the “simpler” language that had developed since the Hellenistic period. In this context rhetoric undertook the task of teaching the methods of “Attic” discourse, through the study of ancient Greek authors.

Rhetorical education, which—as shown above—was synonymous to classical education, was adopted in the 4th century by the Byzantine state and Church, and became hereafter one of the most distinctive and all-pervasive elements of Byzantine intellectual life and culture in general. Both the state and the Church recruited their officials from among the better-trained students in rhetoric, because the drawing up of official documents (laws, treaties, ecclesiastical documents and other public records) presupposed a very high level of prose that was clear, precise, and elegant at the same time. These documents propagated the official ideology of the Byzantine state, whether political or ecclesiastical, and it is especially this role of rhetoric as a means of stabilizing the system that made it “ubiquitous” throughout the Byzantine period.

---

The flourishing of rhetoric under the Palaiologoi: prerequisites and general characteristics

The recapture of Constantinople in 1261, which marks officially the beginning of the Palaiologan period, was somehow equal to a re-establishment of the Byzantine state, although the sense of (political and cultural) continuity of the Empire had not been lost during the period of the Nicaean exile. Given the primarily political role of rhetoric that was outlined above, it does not surprise us that the education of lay and ecclesiastical officials was one of the priorities of the first Palaiologan emperor Michael VIII, and that rhetoric held the central place in the framework of the restored “educational system”.

The revival of learning (and rhetoric) after 1261 is linked to the person of the megas logothetes George Akropolites, who was already a distinguished scholar in the Nicaean Empire and teacher of the emperor Theodore II Laskaris. The information about Akropolites’ teaching activity derives mainly from the autobiography of his student George/Gregory of Cyprus, as well as from the latter’s encomium on Michael VIII Palaiologos. According to Gregory, Akropolites was the most erudite man of his time and he was deeply concerned with the “drought” of learning in the newly recaptured Byzantine capital; thus, the emperor relieved him of his duties in the civil service, so that he could devote himself to his teaching activities. Among the materials taught by Akropolites we find, of course, rhetoric, that was considered one of the highest disciplines and its place in the curriculum was after the teaching of syllogistics and analytics, that is the first level of aristotelian philosophy, and before proceeding to the higher degrees of the teachings of the Stageirite.

The Church also showed its concern for the education of its future officials, and the first step taken towards this direction was the appointment of Manuel Holobolos as

---

7 On George Akropolites, see PLP no. 518.
rhetor around 1265. Holobolos was officially appointed as a teacher in logic, but his duties as rhetor of the Church were rather linked to the imperial ceremonial, since he delivered orations and poems for the emperor on special occasions, and it was through his writings that the official imperial image of Michael VIII was articulated and disseminated, an element which points again to the close connection between rhetoric and politics/the imperial court. The flourishing of rhetoric under Michael VIII is especially praised by Holobolos in one of the orations he delivered in honour of the emperor, where he observes that “the torches of rhetoric that had (long) blown out, light now again.”

We do not possess any evidence about other Palaiologan emperors stimulating and supporting the study of rhetoric until the times of Manuel II, who intervened in favour of the school run by John Argyropoulos; nevertheless the information we have—especially from the rich correspondence between the scholars—proves that rhetoric remained an essential part of the so-called *enkyklios paideia* throughout the Palaiologan era, until the fall of the Byzantine Empire. Another factor that also supported the flourishing of rhetoric in the period under examination was the intensification of the study of the classical past, which we usually describe with the term “Palaiologan Renaissance”. The classical heritage was, of course, present in the Byzantine culture in all its phases, but during the Palaiologan period the links to the classical past were strengthened and “hellenism”, that is the consciousness of being heirs of the ancient Greek language and culture, often worked for the Byzantines as a counterbalance to the gradual political decline of their state. In this framework grammar, poetry, and rhetoric were the disciplines that offered the keys to the knowledge of the classical/hellenic past.

---

14 Cf. Mergiali, *L’enseignement*, pp. 27, 93, 163, 230, and *passim*.
Throughout the Palaiologan period we read about the so-called theatra, that is circles of intellectuals, who gathered to present their rhetorical works, and to listen to the works of their “colleagues” being performed. At the top of these theatra stood that of the emperor, at which every rhetor aspired at the prospect of improving his social prestige and status. A rhetorical performance before the emperor has often marked the beginning of a career in the civil/imperial service, as in the case of Theodore Metochites, the most distinguished scholar and powerful statesman in the court of Andronikos II Palaiologos. But except for the court or other private theatra, the rhetors of the Palaiologan era claimed sometimes the right to address a wider audience, that is certain urban circles, and to take a stand on social or even political matters of their times, thus reviving the so-called genos symbouleutikon that had fallen into disuse since the Roman Imperial Period.

If we count as “rhetors” those that have composed at least one piece of secular oratory (theoretical texts and rhetorical exercises included), we can speak of about 70 (or a little more) out of the about 180 known scholars of the Palaiologan period that have tried their hand in the field of rhetoric, that is c.38-40 per cent. Among them we find about 10 persons which are known to us only from their rhetorical works, mostly encomia/epitaphs on emperors/members of the imperial family or other prominent individuals. As for the social status of the authors, they came from the three basic social groups, where the intellectuals of the time belonged: they were either state/court officials/dignitaries (among them high-ranking ones, such as George and Constantine Akropolites, Theodore Metochites, Nikephoros Choumnos, and Demetrios Kydones) or ecclesiastics, that is learned monks, church officials, metropolitans or even patriarchs, while a relatively small number earned their living as free-lance teachers of grammar and rhetoric. Thus, the connection with the court and/or the Church, an inherent characteristic of Byzantine rhetoric as described above, is also reflected in the social status of its representatives.

The absolute number of rhetorical texts produced in the Palaiologan period is not easy to define: those surviving amount to over 300, but we also have evidence about
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16 On the term theatron in the Palaiologan period, see Gaul, Magistros, pp. 18-53.
17 On Theodore Metochites and his rhetorical work, see below.
18 On this development, see Gaul, Magistros, pp. 172-74.
19 For a list of the intellectuals in the Palaiologan period, see Matschke, K.P./Tinnfeld, Fr., Die Gesellschaft im späten Byzanz. Gruppen, Strukturen und Lebensformen, Köln 2001, pp. 373-85. A list of the “rhetors” is provided in the “Appendix” at the end of this chapter.
rhetorical pieces that have not come down to us. The lion’s share belongs, of course, to epideictic oratory, the rhetorical genre that was almost exclusively cultivated in Byzantium. Encomia and addresses to the emperors, along with epitaphs are the two predominant genres, in which the rhetorical production of the Palaiologan era almost surpasses that of all other periods of Byzantine literature. Encomia (ekphraseis) of cities--either free standing or integrated into other texts--also flourished for the first time in this period. On the other hand, the historical circumstances of the time often gave the occasion for the composition of speeches referring to contemporary events, such as the siege or the fall of Byzantine cities to the enemies, but also for the composition of advisory speeches addressed to wider audiences, as already mentioned above. Even in the field of the so-called “school rhetoric” the Palaiologan era has some “innovations” to display, such as the revival of the so-called meletai or gymnasiai, a type of advanced rhetorical exercises that had been neglected since the 6th century.

Theory of rhetoric, rhetorical manuscripts and exercises

The rich rhetorical production of the Palaiologan era presupposed, of course, a good rhetorical training, which in its turn was based on handbooks containing the theory of rhetoric, that is the rules for the composition of various kinds of rhetorical texts. Throughout the Byzantine millenium the teaching of rhetoric was based on certain key texts of the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D., more specifically on the various treatises of Hermogenes of Tarsos, the so-called Corpus Hermogenianum, and the Progymnasmata of Aphthonios. These canon-texts were copied in the next centuries and served as teaching material, while they generated a significant number of commentaries, which testify to their importance in the instruction process. Apart from the works of Aphthonios and Hermogenes, the treatises attributed to Menander of Laodikeia on the various forms of epideictic oratory also provided an important tool for rhetorical composition, especially if we take into consideration the almost exclusive cultivation of epideictic oratory in Byzantium, but they never gained a place in the “rhetorical curriculum”, and only rarely they were included in handbooks of rhetoric, such as the Synopsis by Joseph the Philosopher, which we will discuss below.

The first to deal with the theory of rhetoric in the Palaiologan period was Maximos Planoudes (1255-1305), a learned monk and one of the most erudite scholars of the ti-

21 On this development, see Hunger, Literatur, vol. 1, pp. 67-68, and id., Aspekte, p. 4.
22 On the genre of meletai in the Palaiologan period, see below.
me, who was also active as a teacher. Planoudes re-edited the whole Hermogenian corpus, along with a commentary based on the so-called P-Corpus, as well as on John Doxapatres’ commentary on Aphthonios, and he wrote his own Prolegomena to the work. Although not original, Planoudes’ work is indicative of what was regarded as useful in the study of rhetoric at the end of the 13th century, and it also points to the traditional character of rhetorical education in Byzantium.

At the beginning of the 14th century another erudite scholar, Demetrios Triklinios, who was based in Thessalonike, copied in his own hand a manuscript containing the works of Aphthonios and Hermogenes. This manuscript is the codex Oxoniensis, New College 258, and its copying was completed in August 1308.

The importance given to rhetorical education in the Palaiologan period as a part of one’s universal learning can be verified in the case of Joseph the Philosopher, or Rhakendytes (c.1280-1330). Joseph was born in Ithaka and came later in Thessaloniki, where he became a monk and teacher, while he also spent some years in Constantinople. He was a person highly esteemed by his contemporaries and he was even offered the patriarchate, which he declined. His only surviving work is his Encyclopedia, an introduction to the liberal arts, such as physics, anthropology, mathematics, ethics, and theology; in this context rhetoric is the first discipline to be treated, and it is this part of the whole Encyclopedia that has been mostly transmitted in the manuscripts. Interestingly Joseph devoted a chapter of his Synopsis of Rhetoric to epideictic oratory, deriving from Menander, as already pointed out above.
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25 On Maximos Planoudes, see PLP no. 23308, and recently Taxidis, I., Μάξιμος Πλανούδης. Συμβολή στη μελέτη του κορπος των επιστολών του (Βυζαντινά κείμενα και μελέτες, 58), Thessaloniki 2012.
26 The work has been edited by Walz, Rhetores Graeci, vol. 5, pp. 212-610 (cf. also Rabe, Prolegomenon Sylloge, pp. 64-73 [Prolegomena]). On the character of the work and its sources, see Rabe, Rhetoren-Corpora, pp. 332-37; Wendel, C. “Planudes Maximos”, Realenzyklopädie 20 (1950), 2230-32; and Kennedy, Greek Rhetoric, pp. 323-24.
27 Cf. Kennedy, Greek Rhetoric, p. 324.
28 On Demetrios Triklinios, see PLP no. 29317; Mergiali, L’enseignement, pp. 55-57; and Fryde, Renaissance, pp. 268-94.
29 For the manuscript, see Turyn, A., Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Great Britain, Washington 1980, pp. 71-72.
30 On Joseph the Philosopher, see PLP no. 9078; Mergiali, L’enseignement, pp. 85-86; and Fryde, Renaissance, pp. 208-10.
A Synopsis of Rhetoric has also been preserved under the name of Matthew Blastares, a priest-monk from Thessaloniki, who was active c.1335-50.\textsuperscript{33} The text, except for the Prolegomena, is still unedited, and survives in the codex Paris. gr. 2830 (fols. 201r-216v); it is rather a summary based on Blastares’ reading of the rhetorical manuals.\textsuperscript{34} Later in the century an anonymous (teacher of rhetoric?) compiled a new collection of theoretical texts on rhetoric, along with scholia, which presupposes the rhetorical corpus of Maximos Planoudes; it is the so-called \textit{Rhetor Monacensis} (from the codex Monac. gr. 505, where the compilation survives).\textsuperscript{35}

With John Chortasmenos we move to the beginning of the 15th century.\textsuperscript{36} The famous bibliophile and copyist, who became later metropolitan of Selybria, wrote his own Prolegomena to rhetoric, which he included in his “homebook”, the codex Vind. Suppl. gr. 75; he excerpted among others from the works of John Doxapatres and Maximos Planoudes.\textsuperscript{37} In another manuscript, the codex Riccard. gr. 58, Chortasmenos appears as the author of a commentary to the \textit{Progymnasmata} of Aphthonios; the manuscript also contains excerpts from Hermogenes and from Aristoteles’ \textit{Rhetoric}.\textsuperscript{38}

A younger contemporary of Chortasmenos was John Argyropoulos, mostly known for his teaching of Greek philosophy in Italy.\textsuperscript{39} At the beginning of his career he was named head of a school in Constantinople, where he must have taught grammar and rhetoric.\textsuperscript{40} For the purposes of his teaching he must have composed his Prolegomena to the \textit{Progymnasmata} of Aphthonios, which are based on John Doxapatres and the Souda-Lexicon.\textsuperscript{41}

Finally, the rhetorical manuals attributed to Matthew Kamariotes may fall out of the limits of the Byzantine era. They are probably connected with Kamariotes’ teaching activities as \textit{megas rhetor} of the Patriarchate, a post that he was granted sometime after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{33} On Matthew Blastares, see PLP no. 2808.

\textsuperscript{34} See Paschos, P.B., \textit{Ὁ Ματθαῖος Βλάσταρης καὶ τὸ ὑμνογραφικὸν ἔργον του}, Thessaloniki 1978, pp. 115-17.

\textsuperscript{35} For the “Rhetor Monacensis”, see Rabe, \textit{Rhetoren-Corpora}, pp. 345-57.

\textsuperscript{36} On John Chortasmenos, see PLP no. 30897.


\textsuperscript{39} On John Argyropoulos, see PLP no. 1267.

\textsuperscript{40} Cf. Mergiali, \textit{L’enseignement}, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{41} For the text of the Prolegomena, see Rabe, \textit{Prolegomenon Sylloge}, pp. 156-58, and Lampros, \textit{Ἀργυροπούλεα}, pp. 175-80. See also Hunger, \textit{Literatur}, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{42} On Matthew Kamariotes, see PLP no. 10776. His Synopsis of Aphthonios has been edited by Walz, \textit{Rhetores Graeci}, vol. 1, pp. 121-26, while his Synopsis of Hermogenes is to be found ibid., vol. 6, pp. 601-44. On Kamariotes’ rhetorical works, see also Hunger, \textit{Literatur}, vol. 1, pp. 79 and 88.
The scholars of the Palaiologan period were not only interested in the traditional theoretical texts on rhetoric, but they also showed their concern in acquiring and producing manuscripts containing the works of the ancient rhetors, such as Demosthenes, Ailios Aristeides and Libanios, who also served as their models in the rhetorical praxis. This concern derived primarily from the lack of books after the destruction of 1204, and it was enhanced by the rising classicism of the time.

The case of Gregory of Cyprus, who had studied rhetoric under George Akropolites and later became patriarch of Constantinople (1283-89) is illuminating in this aspect: in his correspondence, dating before but even after his accession to the patriarchal throne, Gregory speaks about his efforts to acquire or to prepare his own copies with works of the ancient rhetors, primarily Ailios Aristeides, who became fashionable among the scholars of the time. Five of his letters refer to Aristeides: Gregory possessed his own copy with the orations of the rhetor, consisting probably of two volumes, which he sought to collate with other copies circulating among his contemporaries, in order to prepare a model “edition”. He also undertook to correct a copy of Ailios Aristeides that was in the possession of the learned princess Theodora Raoulaina, and could be identified with the codex Vatic. gr. 1899, an autograph of Raoulaina. The codex Paris. gr. 2998, an autograph of Gregory, is a rhetorical collection which also contains works of Ailios Aristeides, along works of Demosthenes, Aischines, Libanios, Themistios, and Synesios of Kyrene, while Gregory mentions manuscripts of Demosthenes in three of his letters, and he also cites from this rhetor in his correspondence. Another autograph of Gregory, the codex Paris. gr. 2953, is a further testimony to his interest in Ailios Aristeides.

Gregory’s opponent, the unionist patriarch John Bekkos, also possessed his own copies of the ancient rhetorical works. Among the books he bequeathed with his testament to his spiritual son, Constantine Sinaites, we find Aristoteles’ Rhetoric, commen-
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43 See above p. 00.
44 See Kotzabassi, Gregor, p. 7, and Constantinides, “Rhetoric”, p. 46 (both with references to Gregory’s correspondence).
47 Cf. Kotzabassi, Gregor, pp. 6-7.
48 See Pérez Martín, I., El patriarca Gregorio de Chipre (ca. 1240-1290) y la transmisión de los textos clásicos en Bizancio, Madrid 1996, pp. 32-36.
49 On John Bekkos, see PLP no. 2548.
taries on Hermogenes’ *On Staseis* and *On Ideas*, as well as on Aphthonios’ *Progymnasmata*, and the Declamations of Libanios. None of these books has been yet identified in the surviving manuscripts.

Demosthenes, Ailios Aristeides, Libanios and Synesios of Kyrene were especially popular among the scholars of the time. About 18 manuscripts containing works of these rhetors were copied in the first half of the 14th century in Thessaloniki, the second city and major cultural center of the Empire, and are more or less linked to the circle of Demetrios Triklinios, who has already been mentioned for his copy of Aphthonios and Hermogenes. Triklinios prepared two manuscripts with works of Synesios (Paris. Mazarine 4453 and Laur. Plut. 80.19), while he participated in the copying of three manuscripts with works of Libanios (Mosqu. Synod. gr. 489, Neap. II.E.17, and Vatic. gr. 83). Another member of the Triklinios family, Nikolaos Triklines (Demetrios’ brother?), prepared a collection with works of Demosthenes, Libanios, and Ailios Aristeides preserved in the codex Esor. R.I.20 and participated in the copying of the codices Vatic. gr. 81, 83, and 941 containing works of Libanios. John Katrares, who was also active in Thessaloniki in the first half of the 14th century, copied the codex Vatic. gr. 1299 with works of Ailios Aristeides, and he was also one of the copyists of the codex Vatic. gr. 224, a collection of Lucian, Libanios, and Ailios Aristeides.

In the case of the bibliophile John Chortasmenos we observe a certain predilection for Libanios. The codex Ambrosianus L. 64 sup., containing works of Libanios, was in Chortasmenos’ possession, while the codex Vatic. Chis. R.VI.43 is partly an autograph of his and Vatic. gr. 939 contains marginalia and corrections by his hand.

---

52 See above, p. 00.
54 See Bianconi, *Tessalonica*, pp. 116-17, 181, and 249.
57 On John Kateres, see *PLP* no. 11544. On the manuscript, see Turyn, *Codices Vaticani*, p. 128. See also Bianconi, *Tessalonica*, pp. 146, 180, and 250.
A complete list of the rhetorical manuscripts produced or owned by scholars of the Palaiologan period cannot, of course, be given within the limits of this chapter. One last example takes us to the end of the period, when John Dokeianos, a person known mainly from his rhetorical works addressed to members of the family of the Palaiologoi, copied part of the codex Ambrosianus G 69 sup., which contains works of Aischines, Aillas Aristeides, Themistios and Demosthenes. The manuscript was in Dokeianos' possession; on fol. 344 we read an autograph catalogue of the books that formed part of his personal library: among them we find Hermogenes' Rhetoric, as well as a volume with Themistios' Orations.

Except for the models of the distant past, the scholars of the Palaiologan period also kept in contact with specimens of oratory from earlier eras of Byzantine history, and especially from the Comnenian period. Notes in the margins of the famous Escorial manuscript Y.II.10 with 12th-century rhetorical works are an indication that the manuscript circulated in late Byzantium and it was available to the rhetors of the time. The codex Bodleianus Barocci 131 is a manuscript of the second half of the 13th century, which also contains rhetorical works of the 11th and 12th centuries, as well as parts of Menander's treatise De epideicticis, and quite similar is the case with the codex Vindobonensis Philosophicus Graecus 321, which was copied in Constantinople around the same period and contains works by court authors from the middle of the 13th century, along with rhetorical works of 12th-century authors. The exact impact of earlier Byzantine oratory on the works of the rhetors of the Palaiologan period has yet to be investigated.

The first stage of rhetorical training comprised the composition of rhetorical exercises based on the models provided by Hermogenes, and especially Aphthonios in their Progymnasmata, that is a set of 14 exercises arranged according to their difficulty,

60 On John Dokeianos, see PLP no. 5577. For his rhetorical works, see below.
61 For the table of contents (probably by the hand of Dokeianos), see Lampros, Sp., “Αἱ βιβλιοθήκαι ᾿Ιωάννου Μαρμαρᾶ καὶ ᾿Ιωάννου Δοκειανοῦ”, Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων 1 (1904), 305-307.
62 For the catalogue of Dokeianos' library, see Lampros, “Αἱ βιβλιοθήκαι”, pp. 300-301.
64 For the manuscript, see De Andrés, G., Catálogo de los códices Griegos de la Real Biblioteca de el Escorial, Madrid 1965, pp. 120-31.
66 For the manuscript, see Hunger, H., Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 1: Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici, Vienna 1961, pp. 408-19.
from the most simple to the most complicated one. Teachers of rhetoric composed their own sets of *progymnasmata* for their teaching purposes, but complete sets are rather rare, and in most of the cases we have to do with more or less “free-standing” examples on certain chapters of Aphthonios, which are not always linked directly to the school praxis.

Gregory of Cyprus wrote, probably during his student years, 17 fables (*mythoi*), a tale (*diegema*) on the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, and a characterisation (*ethopoiia*). These exercises have a relatively sparse manuscript transmission compared to Gregory’s latter rhetorical works, among which we also find two small rhetorical exercises: a *chreia* on Socrates’ saying that the reason is the virtuous creator of the soul, and an encomium of the sea, which praises the goods of water for the human life and is probably owing to Gregory’s origin from an island.

A complete set of *progymnasmata* survives under the name of George Pachymeres, the famous historian of the early Palaiologan period. It is not clear whether Pachymeres composed these exercises during his student years, like Gregory of Cyprus, or later, as *rhetor* of the Church. Some of the topics he deals with had already been treated by earlier authors of *progymnasmata*: this is, e.g., the case with his *diegema* on Odysseus and Palamedes, a subject also treated by Nikephoros Basilakes in the 12th century, as well as his *gnome* on Demosthenes’ saying that money is the driving force in all things, and his comparison (*synkrisis*) between the olive-tree and the vine. In the chapter on *ekphrasis* Pachymeres describes an equestrian statue of Justinian I
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67 For the *progymnasmata*, see Hunger, *Literatur*, vol. 1, pp. 92-120.
69 For the text of the *chreia*, see Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 2, pp. 269-73.
70 For the encomium of the sea, see *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 142, cols. 433-44. For Gregory’s motives for the composition of the text, cf. Kotzabassi, *Gregor*, p. 11.
71 On George Pachymeres, see PLP no. 22186. See also Lampakis, St., *Γεώργιος Παχυμέρης, πρωτεκδίκος καὶ δικαιοφύλαξ εἰσαγωγικὸ δοκίμιο*, Athens 2004. For the edition of the *progymnasmata*, see Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 1, pp. 551-96. For an analysis of the texts, see Lampakis, *Παχυμέρης*, pp. 136-50.
72 See Lampakis, *Παχυμέρης*, p. 136. According to P. Golitsis, “George Pachymère comme didascale. Essai pour une reconstitution de sa carrière et de son enseignement philosophique”, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 58 (2008), 62 (with n. 46), Pachymeres could have succeeded Manuel Holobolos as *rhetor* of the Church after 1273, when the latter was forced to abandon his post, because of his opposition to the Union of the Churches.
74 See Lampakis, *Παχυμέρης*, pp. 140-41.
75 See Lampakis, *Παχυμέρης*, p. 146.
standing in front of the Augusteion, and derives from the 6th-century historian Prokopios.\textsuperscript{76}

The church historian Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos wrote \textit{progymnasmata} for the purposes of his rhetorical teaching, as it is evident from the title that accompanies these pieces in the unique manuscript they survive.\textsuperscript{77} Only the examples on the first four chapters of Aphthonios (fable, tale, \textit{chreia} and \textit{gnome}) have come down to us, but there is a strong possibility that Nikephoros had written examples on all of Aphthonios’ chapters.\textsuperscript{78} It is interesting to note that in the case of \textit{gnome} Nikephoros analyses a saying opposite to the one treated by Pachymeres, and praises (based on a citation from Gregory of Nazianzos) the goods of poverty and humbleness.\textsuperscript{79} All four pieces testify to Xanthopoulos’ strong dependence on Aphthonios.\textsuperscript{80}

The \textit{progymnasmata} of Constantine Akropolites form a rather exceptional case. Constantine was the elder son of George Akropolites, as he is mostly known for his rhetorical reworkings of older hagiographical texts, thanks to which he was given the attribute “Neos Metaphrastes”.\textsuperscript{81} Like many of his hagiographical works, his \textit{progymnasmata} seem also to have been written on instigation of Akropolites’ friends and may not have served teaching purposes, as it has been suggested.\textsuperscript{82} The collection consists of 14 pieces, which correspond to seven of Aphthonios’ chapters (fable,\textsuperscript{83} tale,\textsuperscript{84} 

\textit{vituperation,\textsuperscript{85} comparison,\textsuperscript{86} characterisation,\textsuperscript{87} ekphrasis,\textsuperscript{88} and thesis\textsuperscript{89}). Worth mentioning is Akropolites’ predilection for religious topics, especially in his five characterisations, a tendency also known from the 12th-century rhetor Nikephoros Basilakes,\textsuperscript{90} although

\begin{footnotes}
\item[76] See Lampakis, \textit{Παχυμέρης}, pp. 147-48.
\item[77] On Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, see \textit{PLP} no. 20826. For his \textit{progymnasmata}, see Glettner, J., “Die Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopulos”, \textit{Byzantinische Zeitschrift} 33 (1933), 1-22, 255-70 (for the interpretation of the title, see pp. 4-5).
\item[79] See Glettner, “Xanthopulos”, pp. 10-12, 264-68.
\item[81] On Constantine Akropolites, see \textit{PLP} no. 520.
\item[82] See Romano, “Etopee inedite”, p. 313 (with n. 19). Constantinides (\textit{Higher education}, p. 101) suggested that Akropolites’ \textit{progymnasmata} could have been composed for ecclesiastical students.
\item[84] Unedited in the codex Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Hieros. gr. 40, fols. 8r-12r.
\item[85] Unedited in the codex Hieros. gr. 40, fols. 12r-13v.
\item[86] Ed. Ph. Photopoulos, in \textit{Νέα Σιών} 11 (1911), 863-64.
\item[87] Ed. Romano, “Etopee inedite”.
\item[88] Ed. Ph. Photopoulos, in \textit{Νέα Σιών} 12 (1912), 279-80.
\item[89] Ed. Ph. Photopoulos, in \textit{Νέα Σιών} 11 (1911), 864-69.
\end{footnotes}
we do not find any common topics between the two authors. Akropolites reconstructs, e.g., Lazaros’ words after his resurrection or the reaction of Constantine the Great after his healing from leprosy; the idea of salvation of the Christian through God is common in all these pieces.\footnote{91}

A series of “free-standing” rhetorical exercises based on the relevant \textit{progymnasmata} also survives from the Palaiologan period. These pieces often surpassed the mere school purposes and formed literary works of their own merit. The school environment still lies behind Maximos Planoudes’ lengthy \textit{synkrisis} between Winter and Spring,\footnote{92} since the four seasons offered a suitable topic for many chapters of the \textit{progymnasmata}, as it is evident from the surviving examples. A comparison between Winter and Summer can be found, e.g., in the model exercises of Nikolaos the Sophist, and it proves the superiority of the former over the latter.\footnote{93} Planoudes’ text also highlights the merits of Winter against the shortcomings of Spring, but his arguments go far beyond those found in the rhetorical handbooks. Moreover, Planoudes’ text should rather be read as part of a “literary controversy”, for it is supposed to be a response to a contemporary rhetorical work, which supported the opposite view.\footnote{94}

The comparison between Demosthenes and Ailios Aristeides by Theodore Metochites was not, of course, conceived as a school exercise.\footnote{95} Metochites composed this text in 1330-31, at the age of 60, after his release from the exile in Didymoteichon and his retirement in the Chora monastery.\footnote{96} This kind of \textit{synkrisis} went back to Dionysios of Halikarnassos and his comparison between Isaios and Lysias, while the analysis of the literary merits of the ancient rhetors was a subject treated by many late antique authors, such as Lucian, Plutarch, Sopatros, and Hermogenes, as well as by Byzantine ones, among them Photios and Michael Psellos.\footnote{97} Demosthenes was regarded as the

\footnote{92} For the text, see Boissonade, \textit{Anecdota Graeca}, vol. 2, pp. 310-39. Its edition by M. Treu (\textit{Maximi monachi Planudis comparatio hiemis et veris, Progr. Gymnas. Ohlau 1878}) was not accessible to me.
\footnote{94} Cf. Boissonade, \textit{Anecdota Graeca}, vol. 2, pp. 310, line 8-311, line 9: καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα νῦν, ὅτε τις τῶν τοῦ ἣμετέρου συστήματος, τοῦ λογικοῦ καταλόγου, ἀνήρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα φίλτατος πάντων ἐμοί, καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἄκρως ἐχόμενος, διενότατος δὲ εἰπεῖν, καὶ λόγους πράγμασιν ἰκανός ἔξισώσαι, ἔστι δὲ ὥστε ὁ πρὸς ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑπερβαλέσθαι, ἔαρος μὲν καὶ τῶν κατ᾿ αὐτὸ μακρὸν διεξῆλθε τὸν ἐπαινὸν ἐν μέρει λογικῆς παιδιᾶς καὶ διαχύσεως, χειμῶνα δὲ πολλά τε καὶ ἀηδῆ ἐξωνείδισε, τόσον δὲ τὸν ἐμοὶ ἐξελπεῖν τὸν λόγον καὶ χάριτι κεραβάμενος, ὡστε, εἰ μὴ γυμνασία τις ἢν, μηδ᾽ ἐπίδειξις τῆς περί λόγους ἀσκήσεως, ἀντικρυ ἄλληθεν ὑπελήφθαι τὰ εἰρημένα, τὸν χειμῶνα τέ κινδυνεύειν ἐντεῦθεν ὅσον ὅπως τοῦ ἀρίστου ἀποπίπτειν, ἄλλα μηδ᾿ τὰς ἀρχαῖς συνεξετάζεσθαι.
\footnote{95} On Theodore Metochites, see \textit{PLP} no. 17982, as well as the relevant chapter in this volume. For the edition of the text, see Gigante, M., \textit{Teodoro Metochites. Saggio critico su Demostene e Aristide}, Milan 1969.
\footnote{96} For the dating of the text, see Ševčenko, \textit{Études}, p. 143.
top representative of political/counseling oratory; Aristeides, on the other hand, devoted himself to epideictic oratory, since he lived in an absolute monarchy. For Me-}

tochites the latter could serve as a better model for the students of his time, because they lived under the same kind of regime.\(^98\)

Another type of *progymnasma* that gave some “free-standing” pieces in the Palaiologan period was the characterisation (*ethopoiía*). The two texts in question date from the late 14th/early 15th century, and they are both linked to historical circumstances, something quite uncommon for Byzantine rhetoric that almost systematically avoided references to contemporary reality.\(^99\) In the 1390s John Chortasmenos wrote a fictitious address of Tamerlan to the heads of his troops, when the Mongols were fighting against the “Scyths” of Tohtamyş; Chortasmenos not only invents the words of Tamerlan, but he also calls upon a supposed ear-witness.\(^100\) Some years later Manuel II Palaiologos composed another rhetorical piece, where Tamerlan is the protagonist: in a short *ethopoiía* Tamerlan addresses the Turkish sultan Bayazid after the defeat of the Turks in the battle of Ankara (1402),\(^101\) and blames Bayazid for not bearing his defeat like a man.

The unlimited potential of rhetoric can be verified in two more rhetorical pieces from the last century of Byzantium. They both belong to the genre of *encomium*, they deal with animals and they are addressed to emperors/rulers of the time. The first one comes from Demetrios Chrysoloras, who wrote an eulogy of the flea—subject treated in the past by Michael Psellos—, and sent it to the emperor Manuel II Palaiologos.\(^102\) The second one goes beyond the limits of the Byzantine era: it is an encomium

---

\(^98\) See Gigante, *Saggio critico*, p. 82, lines 1-13: ἄτεχνως γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς, τῷ τῆς τέχνης ἐπιδεικτικῶς πλείον ἢ κατὰ τάλα τῶν αὐτῆς εἴδη καὶ ἐλευθερίων πρὸς τὴν φοράν, τὸν αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ Ἀριστείδην ὁμοίωμα τοῖς πειρωμένοις καὶ συνασκουμένοις, εὖ μάλα τὸν νοῦν προσέχοι τῇ πολυφορίᾳ τοῦ ἀνδρός καὶ ῥᾳστώνη μετ᾽ εὐχρηστίας ἀπάσις καὶ ἀκριβείας αὖ: Δημοσθένης γάρ, ἄλλοις ἐξυμβῶσας πράγμασι καὶ τὸ μέγιστον περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς φύσεως ταῦτα ἐπείδειξάμενος καὶ τὴν τελειότητά τῆς καλλίστης ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἔξως, οὔ πολὺ χρησιμοῦσαν καὶ κατ᾽ Ἀριστείδην τοῖς νῦν χρωμένοις ὃρε- 


\(^101\) On Manuel Palaiologos, see *PLP* no. 21513. For the text, see *Patrologia Greaca*, vol. 156, cols. 580-81. See also Hunger, “Zeitgeschichte”, pp. 156-57.

\(^102\) On Demetrios Chrysoloras, see *PLP* no. 31156. For the text, see De Andrés, G., “Demetrio Crisoloras el Palaciego, Encomio de la pulga”, *Helmantica* 35 (1984), 51-69. See also the letter nr. 50 of Manuel Palaiologos in Dennis, G.T., *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 8), Washington 1977, pp. 142-45.
of the dog written by Theodore Gazes and addressed to Muhammad the Conqueror. Gazes must have had in mind a female dog owned by Muhammad, but as he explicitly states in the epilogue, he composed this text as a kind of literary game and as a plaything for the ruler.

Except for the progyrmnasmata, another type of rhetorical exercise that was cultivated during the Palaiologan period was the so-called melete or gymnasia. The term melete was used to describe a fictitious speech, which the student composed on a given historical (or mythological) situation, and which he was supposed to deliver in the name of a historical (or mythological) person; in this sense, the melete was close to the ethopoia, but in the case of melete the emphasis was given to the complete treatment of the subject, and not so much to the depiction of the character of the speaking person. The meletai had been especially fashionable during the late antiquity, and they were composed for public recitation/performance in the theatra. Their subjects derived mainly from the speeches of Demosthenes, the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars, the history of Alexander the Great, as well as the Greek mythology. In Byzantium the genre had been neglected after the 6th century, and it was in the early Palaiologan period that it found again its place in the rhetorical production of the scholars.

The revival of the genre of meletai in the early Palaiologan period could be linked to the person of George Akropolites, although no relevant text of his has been preserved. However, both Gregory of Cyprus and George Pachymeres, who cultivated this genre, were Akropolites’ students, therefore the original inspiration could go back to him. Gregory of Cyprus wrote four meletai: two of them are responses to the relevant meletai of Libanios, while another one is a response to Synesios’ encomium of baldness. The meletai of George Pachymeres, on the other hand, amount to 13, and the number points probably to the author’s effort to systematically revive the genre. Pachymeres derives his subjects from Hermogenes’ On Staseis, and each one of his meletai corresponds to a different stasis. Two of the texts refer to historical personalities (Demo-
while we also have examples on the supposed errors of generals and the accusations brought against them,\textsuperscript{112} on cases of distinction for bravery,\textsuperscript{113} and on several issues of social interest.\textsuperscript{114}

Quite exceptional is the recently published \textit{melete} of Sophonias the monk, who should be probably identified with the homonymous paraphrast of Aristotle who lived in the late 13th/early 14th century.\textsuperscript{115} Unlike its contemporary \textit{meletai}, which are linked to the classical tradition, Sophonias’ text elaborates on a subject from the New Testament, the famous discourse of the Apostle Paul in the Areopagus, thus creating a parallel to the \textit{ethopoiiai} of Constantine Akropolites.\textsuperscript{116}

Apart from the pedagogic role, the re-enactment of the classical past in the \textit{meletai} could sometimes function on a different level, and serve as a means of making allusions to contemporary reality. This has been argued for the \textit{meletai} of Thomas Magistros, which must have been composed in the first two decades of the 14th century, and especially for the two texts that are based on Demosthenes’ speech \textit{Against Leptines}. Magistros was one of the most famous philologists of the Palaiologan era, but he is also known, as we shall see, for his political speeches.\textsuperscript{117} His six \textit{meletai} draw on ancient Greek history, and they form three pairs, each subject being treated in both its positive and its negative aspect.\textsuperscript{118} The example of the two Leptinean \textit{meletai} shows that Magistros sometimes deliberately altered the details of the original situation, in order to create parallels with the current political affairs; the author must have seen a connection between the \textit{ateleiai} that Leptines tried to reduce with his law, and the \textit{pronoiai} that Andronikos II Palaiologos was trying to reduce in his times, in order to face the critical economic and military situation of the Empire.\textsuperscript{119}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[115] On Sophonias the monk, see \textit{PLP} no. 26424. For the \textit{melete}, see Searby, D.M./Sjörs, A., “A Rhetorical Declaration of Sophonias the Monk and Paraphrast”, \textit{Byzantinische Zeitschrift} 104 (2011), 147-82.
\item[116] Cf. above p. 00.
\item[118] On the texts and their editions, see Gaul, Magistros, pp. 402-403.
\item[119] See Martin, G., “Rhetorical Exercise or Political Pamphlet? Thomas Magistros’ Exploitation of Demosthenes’ \textit{Against Leptines}”, \textit{Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies} 46 (2006), 207-26.
\end{footnotes}
Worth mentioning is finally a single melete by the learned emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. Rather than being a school exercise, the text seems to have been inspired from the same playful mood that lies behind Manuel’s characterisation of Tamerlan, which we have discussed above.\textsuperscript{120} The situation treated in this case has nothing to do with ancient Greek history or mythology: the author presents a drunken man appealing to the court against his son—who as a ruler of the city has ordered the devastation of vineyards, in order to bring his father to reason—and seeking to prove that this is not a legitimate child of his.\textsuperscript{121}

\textit{Practical uses of rhetoric: Imperial orations}

The hard school training was, of course, a prerequisite for the practical uses of rhetoric, which, as already stressed, centred on the field of epideictic oratory.\textsuperscript{122} The main genre that the Byzantines cultivated in this field was the basilikos logos (imperial oration), that is an encomium addressed to the emperor, according to its definition by Menander of Laodikeia, who set out the rules for the composition of such kind of texts.\textsuperscript{123} A basilikos logos dealt with the emperor’s origins, his physical appearance, his virtues and his achievements in war and peace.\textsuperscript{124} Given the chiefly political function of rhetoric, it is clear that the basilikos logos was the principal medium for the propagation of the official imperial ideology, since it projected the image of the ideal emperor; thus, it comes to no surprise that the specific rhetorical genre flourished throughout the Byzantine era, and gave some of its masterpieces in the Palaiologan period. The composition of imperial orations in the late Byzantine period was further supported by certain historical facts, which contributed to the “revival” of the genre, especially in the times of the first two Palaiologoi, Michael VIII and Andronikos II. The Palaiologoi were the new dynasty in the imperial throne, after the usurpation of the imperial office by Michael VIII, therefore their rule had to be legitimized. Moreover, the sei-

\textsuperscript{120} Cf. above p. 00.

\textsuperscript{121} For the text, see Boissonade, \textit{Anecdota Graeca}, vol. 2, pp. 274-307.

\textsuperscript{122} See above p. 00.

\textsuperscript{123} See Menander, \textit{De epideicticis} 368.3, ed. Russell/Wilson, p. 76: ὁ βασιλικὸς λόγος ἐγκώμιον ἐστὶ βασιλείας. Except for the treatise of Menander, the \textit{progymnasmata} of Hermogenes and Aphthonios also contained rules on how to compose an encomium; see Rabe, H., \textit{Hermogenis Opera} (Rhetores Graeci, 6) Leipzig 1913 (repr. Stuttgart 1969), pp. 14-18, and id., \textit{Aphthonii Progymnasmata} (Rhetores Graeci, 10), Leipzig 1926, pp. 21-27.

zure of power by the new dynasty coincided with the recapture of Constantinople in 1261, a fact that also had an impact on the official ideology of the Byzantine state and put its stamp on the contemporary rhetorical praxis.\textsuperscript{125}

The first surviving rhetorical texts reflecting this “renewed” Byzantine imperial ideology are three imperial orations for Michael VIII Palaiologos penned by Manuel Holobolos.\textsuperscript{126} Holobolos has already been mentioned above as the first holder of the re-instated position of the rhetor of the Church.\textsuperscript{127} After the reconquest of Constantinople Michael VIII took special care in reviving imperial ceremonial; in his efforts he was supported by the patriarch Germanos III (1265-66),\textsuperscript{128} who also showed an interest in reviving neglected customs, and re-established for this purpose the post of the professional rhetorician of the patriarchate. During the Comnenian epoch the rhetor’s duty was to deliver panegyrics in honour of the emperor at Epiphany; the custom was slightly modified under the Palaiologoi, and the recitation of imperial panegyrics was held at Christmas.\textsuperscript{129} Holobolos must have been the first \textit{rhetor} of the Church to deliver such orations in honour of the emperor in the Palaiologan period.\textsuperscript{130}

Holobolos’ orations were delivered in the course of three subsequent years, in all likelihood 1265-1266-1267.\textsuperscript{131} The three texts were conceived to form a series, as it is evident from the fact that at the beginning of each oration the author summarizes the contents of the previous one.\textsuperscript{132} Moreover, Holobolos places his orations within the realm of the former rhetorical tradition, and describes them as “verbal/annual tribute” to the emperor according to an ancient custom, thus providing the link with the older rhetorical practices.\textsuperscript{133} Although he is aware of the rhetorical rules for the composition of an encomium,\textsuperscript{134} nevertheless he does not follow them strictly. The first oration begins with Michael’s birth and upbringing, describes his access to the throne, which is a reward for his pains for the sake of the Romans, and deals with some major events of his early reign in Asia Minor. The second oration is dedicated to the reconquest of Constantinople and the emperor’s triumphal entry in the Byzantine capital; in this context Michael is described as “New Constantine”, that is as a new founder of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{125} Cf. Angelov, \textit{Imperial Ideology}, p. 42.
\item \textsuperscript{126} For the edition of the texts, see Treu, M., \textit{Manuelis Holoboli Orationes}, Programm des Victoria Gymnasiums zu Potsdam 1906-1907, pp. 30-98.
\item \textsuperscript{127} See above p. 00.
\item \textsuperscript{128} On Germanos III, see PLP no. 17091.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Cf. Macrides, “New Constantine”, p. 40.
\item \textsuperscript{131} For the dating, see Macrides, “New Constantine”, pp. 19, 37 (with n. 137).
\item \textsuperscript{132} Cf. Macrides, “New Constantine”, pp. 16, 18.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Cf. Macrides, “New Constantine”, pp. 27, 30.
\item \textsuperscript{134} See Manuel Holobolos, \textit{Encomium I on Michael VIII}, ed. Treu, \textit{Manuelis Holoboli Orationes}, p. 32.16-35.
\end{itemize}
Constantinople, a title which he had assumed as part of his official signature at least since 1262. Finally, the third oration deals with the emperor’s efforts for the restoration of the capital and the reestablishment of the “educational system”. All three texts are composed in high Attic style, with lots of rare words and references to ancient literature (e.g., Homer, Pindar, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, even Virgil). However, there are much more references to the Scriptures, while the synkrisis of the emperor with older rulers, as it was prescribed by the rhetorical theory, derive almost equally from the Old Testament and the ancient history.

Holobolos’ encomia on Michael VIII are the only imperial orations of the Palaiologan period that are known to have been delivered within the fixed annual cycle of court ceremonial. Although the genre flourished much more under Michael’s son, Andronikos II, who is, along with Manuel I Komnenos, one of the most eulogized Byzantine emperor’s of all times, most of the panegyrics in his honour were recited within the framework of rhetorical performances at the court, in the presence of the emperor’s entourage. In some cases we have evidence of rhetorical shows, in which the orators participated and which lasted for several days. The intended audience of the orations must not have been very wide, including mostly the emperor himself and members of the court, that is high officials and prominent ecclesiastics.

Gregory of Cyprus, who has already been mentioned as a student of George Akropolites, provides the link between the age of Michael VIII and Andronikos II, for he eulogized both emperors. His panegyric on Michael VIII dates from the early 1270s, when Gregory had just completed his higher education and joined the imperial clergy as protoapostolarios, probably with the intervention of Akropolites. In the text he pays tribute to his teacher, in praising the revival of learning in Byzantium after 1261, of which Akropolites had been the mastermind. The oration follows more or less the instructions of Menander and sets out with a lengthy praise of Constantinople, the imperial city and emperor’s fatherland; the praise of the Byzantine capital appears as a structural element especially in the imperial orations of the early Palaiologan pe-

---

137 See Menander, *De epideicticis* 376.31-377.9, ed. Russell/Wilson, p. 92.
138 See the table in Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, p. 87.
140 See above p. 00.
141 For the dating of the text, see Angelov, *Imperial Ideology*, p. 71 (with n. 160); see also Kotzabassi, *Gregor*, p. 7.
142 See above p. 00.
period, and it should be related to the impact of the reconquest of Constantinople. Gregory presents the course of Michael’s life from his birth to his accession to the throne and the recapture of the old seat of the empire, which crowns the emperor’s deeds; the influence of Holobolos’ orations is perceptible not only in the subjects the author deals with, but even in the wording of certain passages. The panegyric on Andronikos II, which dates from the early months of his reign, before Gregory was elected patriarch in March 1283, is modelled on the same patterns, and focuses on the termination of the Union of Lyons, one of the first political acts of Andronikos II, which dominates the image of the emperor in the contemporary literature.

Gregory’s encomium on Andronikos II served itself as a model for later imperial orations, such as those composed by Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites. Choumnos was the older of the two orators, and at the time of delivering the encomium (c.1284-1285) he held the title of koiaistor, but he soon climbed to a higher position in the court hierarchy and became mesazon. His panegyric follows closely that of Gregory of Cyprus—of course with variations of accent—, and adds some new features in the literary image of Andronikos II, to be repeated in later texts, such as the emperor’s mildness and his aversion towards corporeal punishment, as well as his fondness of philosophical discussions and the participation in intellectual gatherings at the court.

It was the rhetorical skills of the twenty-year old Theodore Metochites that attracted Andronikos II and marked the beginning of Metochites’ brilliant political career, which made him the most powerful man in the Empire. Metochites’ two orations in honour of Andronikos II date from the 1290s. The first one is more “traditional” in its contents and structure, and bears outspoken resemblances to the older encomia of Gregory of Cyprus and Nikephoros Choumnos. However, Metochites knows to inno-
vate, when he resorts to late antique authors, such as Synesios of Kyrene and Philo Judaeus, and presents traditional material, that is basic notions of the Byzantine imperial ideology, in a new light. The second oration is not a typical encomium according to the instructions of Menander, but falls rather in the generic category of “laudatory address” (prosphonetikos logos), it deals with the emperor’s expedition to Asia Minor in the years 1290-93, yet it was delivered in Constantinople some years later.

The second oration is not a typical encomium according to the instructions of Menander, but falls rather in the generic category of “laudatory address” (prosphonetikos logos); it deals with the emperor’s expedition to Asia Minor in the years 1290-93, yet it was delivered in Constantinople some years later.

The coronation of Andronikos’ son Michael IX as co-emperor on 21 May 1294 was celebrated for several days, including feasting and delivery of panegyrics. Invited by the emperor, Maximos Planoudes delivered on this occasion his Basilikos, a panegyric on Michael IX, which mixed the praise with some piece of counsel. This oration has been classified by the scholars as a sample of the so-called “political panegyric”, a genre described by Hermogenes and also discussed by Planoudes in his commentary on the Hermogenian corpus. In the counseling part of his speech the rhetor sought to influence the military policy of the future emperor and indirectly criticized Andronikos’ decision to dismantle the Byzantine fleet in 1285.

The first encounter of a rhetor with the emperor offered, of course, a suitable occasion for the delivery of an encomium in honour of the latter. This was the case with the first panegyric of Nikephoros Gregoras for Andronikos II, which the author addressed to the emperor on occasion of their first meeting in 1321-22. Gregoras was a student of Metochites and entered the intellectual circles of Andronikos II probably with the intervention of his master. He wrote in total three panegyrical addresses to the old emperor, praising primarily his intellectual and rhetorical skills. The second panegyric seeks to prove that Andronikos II is a fan of Plato, thus presenting some of the emperor’s traditional virtues in the light of Platonic philosophy.

---

152 See Polemis, Βασιλικοὶ λόγοι, pp. 73-98.
153 See Menander, De epideicticis 414.31-418.4, ed. Russell/Wilson, pp. 164-72.
154 On the historical circumstances, see Polemis, Βασιλικοὶ λόγοι, pp. 42-59.
158 For the text, see Leone, “Nicephori Gregorae Orationes”, pp. 503-10. See also Guilland, Essai, pp. 148-49.
of the third oration lies rather in its linguistic form than in its contents, for Gregoras has written it in Ionic dialect.\footnote{159}

The unparalleled flowering of court culture during the reign of Andronikos II Palaiologos did not continue under his successors. The civil war of the 1340s for the succession of Andronikos III, and later the conflict between Matthaios Kantakouzenos and John V Palaiologos, along with the rapid diminishing of Byzantine territories did not offer favourable conditions for the flourishing of court oratory and intellectual life in general. Very few imperial orations survive from this period, and they rather have the form of short laudatory addresses, such as the oration of Demetrios Kydones to John VI Kantakouzenos shortly after the latter’s entry in Constantinople in 1347\footnote{160} or the orations of Nikolaos Kabasilas for Anna of Savoy and Matthew Kantakouzenos, dating from 1347-1351 and 1354 respectively.\footnote{161}

It was under the learned emperor Manuel II and his son John VIII Palaiologos that court oratory, and thus the genre of imperial oration flourished again, although not to the same extent as under the first two rulers of the dynasty; but the historical circumstances had also changed.\footnote{162} Manuel himself was the addressee of four panegyrics, the earliest dating from shortly after his return to Constantinople from his long journey in the West in 1403. The text has traditionally been attributed to Isidore of Kiev, yet his authorship cannot be certain;\footnote{163} apart from the emperor’s pains for the sake of his subjects, the author also praises Manuel for his rhetorical skills that make him a philosopher in the imperial throne, just like the ideal king of Plato, a standard motif in the praises of Manuel.\footnote{164} One more panegyric has recently been attributed to Manuel’s

\footnote{159} For the text, see Leone, “Nicephori Gregorae Orationes”, pp. 510-15. See also Guilland, Essai, pp. 149-50.


\footnote{161} On Nikolaos Kabasilas, see PLP no. 30539. For the texts, see Jugie, M. “Nicolas Cabasilas, Panégyriques inédits de Mathieu Cantacuzène et d’Anne Paléologine”, Izvestija Russkago Archeologičeskago Instituta v Konstantinopol’ 15 (1911), 112-21; see also Laurent, V., “Un nouveau témoin de la correspondance de Démétrios Cydonès et de l’activité littéraire de Nicolas Cabasilas Chamaétos: le codex Meteor. Barlaam 202”, Ελληνικά 9 (1936), 201-204 (different readings from the codex Barlaam 202, as well as the end of the oration on Anna of Savoy missing from the edition of Jugie).

\footnote{162} This late “revival” of court oratory should be regarded as an effect of the Turkish defeat in the battle of Ankara, which led to a temporary halt to the expansion of the Turks, and gave Byzantines the opportunity to reconquer some territories, thus enhancing their self-confidence; see Schmitt, “Kaiserrede und Zeitgeschichte”, p. 210.

\footnote{163} For the text, see Polemis, “Two Praises”, pp. 705-13. On Isidore of Kiev, see PLP no. 8300.

\footnote{164} Cf. Polemis, “Two Praises”, p. 713 (with n. 63).
friend Makarios Makres, and it must have been delivered in Thessaloniki sometime around 1408-10, while the other two encomia date from c.1417-18 and they were penned by Demetrios Chrysoloras and John Chortasmenos. Chrysoloras’ text is an important source for the emperor’s activity in Peloponnese in the years 1414-16 and the building of Hexamilion; moreover, the author extols Manuel’s literary achievements, with reference to his works, thus exploiting a common motif, as already pointed out above. Interesting, on the other hand, in the case of Chortasmenos is the fact that the author provided his text with a protheoria, in which he analyses the rhetorical character of his speech drawing on Hermogenes’ treatise On Ideas; literary analyses of this kind, not attested for earlier rhetorical texts, must have become “fashionable” in the circle of Manuel Palaiologos, as it will be clear in the case of the emperor’s epitaph on his brother Theodore.

Manuel’s figure is also present in some of the encomia that were written for his son, John VIII Palaiologos, who succeeded him to the throne in 1425. Of special interest is the lengthy panegyric composed by Isidore of Kiev and delivered by the author himself in Constantinople sometime between Sping and September of the year 1429. The text reminds of the panegyrics composed in the times of Michael VIII and Andronikos II Palaiologos, with the extensive laus Constantinopolitana being one of the conjunctive elements with the older texts. Moreover, this panegyric constitutes an important historical source, containing a detailed account of contemporary events, which is unusual for rhetorical texts, an indication that rhetoric assumed in this pe-

165 For the edition of the text, see Dendrinos, Ch., “An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Manuel II Palaeologus”, in Dendrinos, Ch./Harris, J./Charvalia-Crook, E./Herrin, J. (eds.), Porphyrogenita. Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides, Aldershot 2003, pp. 423-56. Dendrinos has considered the text to be an epitaph, yet it has been argued convincingly that we rather have to do with an encomium, composed while the emperor was still alive; see Polemis, “Two Praises”, pp. 699-704, where the text is attributed to Makarios Makres. On Makarios Makres, see PLP no. 16379.


167 See Hunger, Chortasmenos, pp. 217-24. For the dating of the text, see ibid., pp. 55-57.


170 For the protheoria, see Hunger, Chortasmenos, pp. 225-26.

171 See below p. 00.


period some of the traditional functions of historiography. In reconstructing the glorious past of the City and the family of Palaiologoi, and praising in extenso the emperor’s deeds, Isidore might have aimed at breathing courage and self-confidence to his contemporary Byzantines on the eve of their definite fall. Furthermore, in the case of Isidore’s panegyric the manuscript tradition provides evidence for a redrafting of the text before its final version, a practice that is also attested for other major rhetorical texts of this late period, and points to the importance given to these pieces, which were not always conceived as ephemeral compositions.

Even the last Byzantine emperor, Constantine XI Palaiologos, was the addressee of at least three imperial panegyrics, not to mention some shorter prophonematia. John Dokeianos delivered an encomium on Constantine, before the latter assuming the imperial authority. The text dates from c.1441, and it was delivered in Constantinople. Its overall disposition is quite simple, and echoes some traditional topoi of the genre (e.g., the comparison of the volume of the subject with the sea or the reference to Achilles’ apprenticeship with Cheiron, when it comes to speak about the emperor’s education), yet it is not devoid of a certain historical value for the earlier life of the emperor (capture of Patras, first despotate in Peloponnese). Another encomium of Dokeianos, also delivered in Constantinople, praises Constantine’s benevolence towards his subjects and his efforts for the establishment of the Byzantine rule in Peloponnese, while a third text is defined by the author as epibaterios logos (speech of

---

176 For the different versions of Isidore’s text, see Mercati, G., Scritti di Isidoro, il cardinale Ruteno, e codici a lui appartenuti (Studi e Testi, 46), Rome 1926, pp. 6-7. See also Schmitt, “Kaiserrede und Zeitgeschichte”, p. 214 (with n. 25), and Toth, “Rhetorical Theatron”, pp. 446-47.
177 For the edition of the text, see Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια και Πελοποννησιακά, vol. 1, pp. 221-31.
178 For the dating, see Topping, “Dokeianos”, p. 5.
disembarkation), and was delivered on occasion of Constantine’s second despotate in Peloponnese, at the end of 1443.\textsuperscript{184}

The last oration to discuss in this context was written by John Argyropoulos. In this case we do not have to do with a traditional imperial encomium, but rather with a theoretical text on kingship and a mirror of the ideal emperor.\textsuperscript{185} After analysing the basic imperial virtues (piety, prudence, bravery, justice, providence, mildness, intelligence), Argyropoulos concludes his oration with an exhortation to the emperor to intensify his efforts for the salvation of the Greeks (\textit{sic}), by turning for help to the West;\textsuperscript{186} thus, the text offers an interesting mixture of epideictic and advisory oratory, standing in line with the \textit{Basilikos} of Maximos Planoudes.\textsuperscript{187}

\textit{Practical uses of rhetoric: Funeral orations}

The second major type of epideictic oratory that was cultivated in the Palaiologan period was that of the \textit{epitaphios logos} (funeral oration) in its various forms. The instructions for the composition of this kind of oration were also provided by Menander, who discerned between \textit{monody}, that is a \textit{threnos} (lamentation) for the loss of a person,\textsuperscript{188} and an \textit{epitaph} proper, which focused on the praise of the deceased.\textsuperscript{189} Most of the funeral orations produced during the Palaiologan period belong rather to the genre of \textit{monody},\textsuperscript{190} although the elements of mourning and praise are very often combined. These texts were presented in the course of a funeral or memorial service, but despite their conventional character, they provide us in some cases with useful prosopographical and historical information. The number of funeral orations that survive from the age of the Palaiologoi amount to 74, that is more than 50 per cent of the total 142 texts, which survive from the whole Byzantine era.\textsuperscript{191} In the following, I shall give a general outline of the evolution of the genre, with reference to its main representatives.

The earliest funeral oration surviving from the Palaiologan period was written by Theodore Metochites and it is dedicated to empress Theodora Palaiologina, the wife of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{184} See Lampros, \textit{Παλαιολόγεια και Πελοποννησιακά}, vol. 1, pp. 232-35 (especially for the genre of the text cf. p. 234, line 27: τοὺς σοὺς ἐπιβατηρίους ἐπαίνους). For the dating, see Toping, “\textit{Dokeianos}”, p. 5.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{185} See John Argyropoulos, \textit{Basilikos or On Kingship}, ed. Lampros, \textit{Αργυροπούλεια}, pp. 29-47.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{186} See John Argyropoulos, \textit{Basilikos or On Kingship}, ed. Lampros, \textit{Αργυροπούλεια}, p. 47, lines 2-18.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{187} See above p. 00.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{188} See Menander, \textit{De epideicticis} 434.10-437.4, ed. Russell/Wilson, pp. 200-207.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{189} See Menander, \textit{De epideicticis} 418.5-422.4, ed. Russell/Wilson, pp. 170-79.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{190} Cf. Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, p. 245.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{191} Cf. Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, p. 245.}
\end{footnotes}
Michael VIII, who passed away on 4 March 1303.\textsuperscript{192} The oration was delivered during the empress’s burial,\textsuperscript{193} in the presence of her son, Andronikos II, to whose grief the author makes special reference.\textsuperscript{194} Metochites develops his subject—according to the rhetorical theory—on two levels, those of the present and past,\textsuperscript{195} which alternate with each other: on the level of the present he extols the enormity of the bereavement for all the Romans,\textsuperscript{196} while on the level of the past he praises the virtues of the deceased empress, with reference to her philanthropy and her role in the restoration of churches and monasteries.\textsuperscript{197} A further text of Metochites, which has often been classified as an “epitaph”, is concerned with Joseph the Philosopher and was written after 1328; its literary character could be better described, if we define it as an “encomium in the form of an epistle”.\textsuperscript{198}

Except for the emperors and empresses, a substantial number of funeral orations in the Palaiologan period were dedicated to other members of the imperial family. The two sons of Andronikos II, John and Michael IX Palaiologos,\textsuperscript{199} who died in 1307 and 1320 respectively, were honoured with more than one epitaph each. Alexios Lampenos, a person known only from his funeral orations for members of the Palaiologan family,\textsuperscript{200} composed in total four monodies in honour of John Palaiologos, each one linked to a different occasion (announcement of death, memorial services, translation of mortal remains).\textsuperscript{201} All four texts share with each other common motives and stylistic devices, with the topos of mors immatura—John died at the age of 21—being the dominant one; the balance between lamentation and praise varies in each case, but the encomiastic element prevails over the wailing as the time lapses.\textsuperscript{202} The situation is

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[192] On Theodora Palaiologina, see PLP no. 21380. For the edition of the text, see Sideras, \textit{25 unedierte Grabreden}, pp. 249-67. See also Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 262-64.
\item[195] See Menander, \textit{De epideicticis} 435.16-436.10, ed. Russell/Wilson, p. 204.
\item[199] For the edition of the text and its dating, see Treu, M., “Der Philosoph Joseph”, \textit{Byzantinische Zeitschrift} 8 (1899), 1-64. For its literary character, see the discussion in Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 55-56.
\item[200] See PLP 21475 and 21529 respectively.
\item[201] On Alexios Lampenos, see PLP no. 14423.
\item[202] For the edition of the texts, see Lampros, Sp., “Αἱ μονῳδίαι Ἀλεξίου Ἀνδρονίκου Α´ Παλαιολόγου”, \textit{Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων} 11 (1914), 386-400. See also Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 275-79, and Taxidis, I., “Les monodies et les oraisons funèbres pour la mort du despote Jean Paléologue”, \textit{Mediævo Greco} 9 (2009), 267-84.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
similar with the orations on the death of Michael IX Palaiologos: John Staphidakis composed a monody to be delivered probably during Michael’s funeral in Thessaloniki,\textsuperscript{203} a text which is full of apostrophes to persons, cities, and elements of nature, in order to participate in the lamentation for the death of the co-emperor.\textsuperscript{204} A second monody, written by Theodore Hyrtakenos, was delivered in Constantinople on occasion of a memorial service for Michael;\textsuperscript{205} in this case the author turns the \textit{threnos} into an indirect encomium of the deceased, using a lot of citations from/allusions to ancient Greek literature, which serve sometimes as a mere display of Hyrtakenos’ erudition.\textsuperscript{206}

A special reference should be made to the funeral orations on two prominent intellectuals and statesmen of the early Palaiologan period, Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites. Choumnos died in 1327 and was honoured with an epitaph by Theodore Hyrtakenos, with whom he was also in correspondence. The intellectual merits of the deceased are in this case in the foreground, yet the encomium culminates in Choumnos’ relationship with the emperor Andronikos II, which is presented as the crown of his bliss.\textsuperscript{207} In the epitaph on Theodore Metochites by Nikephoros Gregoras, which was delivered probably by the author himself during Metochites’ burial, the close relationship between Metochites and Andronikos II is the main subject; the temporal proximity of the death of the two men—Metochites died exactly one month after the emperor—must have also played a role in the choice of this point of emphasis.\textsuperscript{208}

Nikephoros Gregoras integrated in his historical work two more epitaphs dedicated to the two emperors of his time, Andronikos II and Andronikos III Palaiologos. The epitaph on Andronikos II was delivered, as the author explicitly states, on the second day after the emperor’s death (that is on 14/15 February 1332) on instigation of the latter’s daughter Simonis. Gregoras defines his text as \textit{threnos} and follows closely Menander’s instruction for the composition of monodies, according to which the author of a monody should present the encomium of the deceased as the occasion for the la-

\begin{footnotes}
\item[203] On John Staphidakis, see PLP no. 26734. For the edition of the text, see Meschini, A., \textit{La monodia di Stafidakis}, Padova 1974. See also Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 280-82.
\item[205] On Theodore Hyrtakenos, see PLP no. 29507. For the edition of the text, see Boissonade, \textit{Anecdota Graeca}, vol. 1, pp. 254-68. See also Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 259-60.
\item[208] The epitaph has been incorporated by Gregoras in his historical work; see Nikephoros Gregoras, \textit{Historia Romana} X.2, ed. Schopen, vol. 1, pp. 475, line 1-481, line 13. See also Sideras, \textit{Grabreden}, pp. 293-95.
\end{footnotes}
The encomium of Andronikos II runs on the basic *topoi* of Byzantine imperial ideology (wakefulness, providence, benefaction, philanthropy), and repeats some of the motifs of the orations in honour of the emperor (piety, patronage of learning), while the participation of the elements of nature in the lamentation underlines the enormity of the disaster. Gregoras’ epitaph on Andronikos III, on the other hand, was delivered in the imperial palace on the third day after the emperor’s death (that is on 17/18 June 1341); it displays some common motifs with the epitaph on Andronikos II, yet it is the military virtues of Andronikos III that stay in the foreground, as well as his personal intervention in the controversy between Barlaam and Palamas in the Council of 1341.

Among the epitaphs of the Palaiologan period the most prominent place deserves the one composed by the emperor Manuel II for his brother Theodore, the despot of Mistra. Theodore I Palaiologos was the third son of John V Palaiologos, and he was sent c.1382 as a ruler in Peloponnese, where he stayed until his death in 1407. Not a long time thereafter Manuel composed a lengthy epitaph for his brother, which was delivered on occasion of a memorial service in Mistra, partly by Isidore of Kiev and partly by a certain Gazes. With about 100 printed pages in its modern edition, it is the lengthiest epitaph of the whole Byzantine era. For the most part it is concerned with the Byzantine affairs in Peloponnese under the rule of Theodore, thus serving as an official apology for the policies of the Palaiologoi. In terms of literary structure, the text is organized basically as an encomium (praise of the fatherland and parents, natural gifts of the deceased, praise of the latter’s deeds), and it contains also some dialogical parts, a feature to be found mostly in metrical epitaphs. Furthermore, the study of the manuscript tradition reveals at least seven different stages of reworking of the text by its author, which testify to the literary value attributed to it. This becomes also clear from the fact that Manuel sent the epitaph to his contemporaries,

---

212 On Theodore I Palaiologos, see PLP no. 21460.
among them Guarino of Verona and Manuel Chrysoloras, asking for their criticism. In fact, Chrysoloras replied with a long epistolary treatise, which analyses the literary merits of Manuel’s work in terms of content and style. Two shorter pro theorai on the content and literary character of the oration were penned by George Gemistos Plethon and Ioasaph of Ephesos.

Manuel Palaiologos’s epitaph marked the beginning of a new flourishing of the rhetorical genre during the first half of the 15th century. We have in total 40 epitaths surviving from this period, which proves to be the richest in the production of funeral orations compared to the whole Byzantine era. Two of the texts are dedicated to Manuel himself, who died in 1425; the one was penned by his friend Makarios Makres, while the other is the work of Bessarion. Both texts were delivered on the tomb of the emperor during a memorial service, which, however, cannot be further specified. Interesting in both of them is the address of the rhetor to the letters, which should lament on the loss of their wise patron.

Ten out of the forty Byzantine epitaths of the 15th century were produced in Mistra for prominent persons of the despotate. A case to mention are the epitaths on Kleopa Palaiologina, the early deceased wife of the despot Theodore II Palaiologos. Kleopa died on Good Friday of the year 1433, and she was honoured with at least five funeral orations written by scholars of the time, among them Bessarion and George Gemistos Plethon. Most of the orations praise the dead princess for her piety, her devotion to her husband, and her love for thy neighbour; Plethon’s text stands alone for the absence of lament and its final digression on the immortality of the soul.

Both Plethon and Bessarion, who have been mentioned so far as authors of epitaths, were honoured in their turn with funeral orations by their contemporaries.

---

219 See Chrysostomides, Manuel Palaeologus, p. 70. On Ioasaph of Ephesos, see PLP no. 8916.
220 See Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 63 and 245.
221 For the edition of the text, see Sideras, 25 unedierte Grabreden, pp. 299-307. See also Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 344-45.
222 The text has been edited by Sp. Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια και Πελοποννησιακά, vol. 3, pp. 284-90; see also Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 361-62. On Bessarion, see below.
223 Cf. Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 463-64.
224 On Kleopa Palaiologina, see PLP no. 21385.
225 For the epitaths on Kleopa Palaiologina, see Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 322-26, 333-34, 335-36, 356-57, and 365-66.
Plethon marked with his personality and innovative ideas the intellectual life in Mistra during the first half of the 15th century; he died on 26 June 1452. During his burial his disciple Gregory the monk, who is otherwise unknown, delivered a funeral oration, in which he praised the universal learning of his master comparing him with wise men of the past; in the consolatory part of his oration Gregory speaks about the immortality of the soul, drawing mainly on the ideas of Plato. Another disciple of Plethon, Charitonymos Hermonymos, dedicated an epitaph to his master at a later stage. Like Gregory, he also praised Plethon’s wisdom, comparing him to Socrates and Plato, and maintained that the death of a wise man is a bigger loss than the death of a king.

The only surviving Greek epitaph on Bessarion, on the other hand, is chronologically the last piece of this rhetorical genre and goes, in fact, beyond the limits of the Byzantine era. Bessarion was born in Trebizond and counts also among the disciples of Plethon. As bishop of Nicaea he participated in the Council of Ferrara/Florence in 1438-39; being a fervent supporter of the Union of the Churches, he espoused later the Catholic creed and became cardinal of the Roman Church. He died in November 1472 in Ravenna. It was a Latin epitaph that was delivered during his funeral, yet his protégé Michael Apostoles composed also a Greek epitaph, when the news of Bessarion’s death reached Creta, where Apostoles was established at the time. The ecomiastic element prevails over the wailing in this case; as the author explicitly states, the lament limits itself to the preamble, while the rest of the text has a pure ecomiastic character. It is interesting to observe that Apostoles drew among other sources on Plethon’s epitaph on Kleopa Palaiologina, something which points again to the literary value attributed to such texts.

Among the epitaphs of the Palaiologan period there is also one text which is dedicated not to a single person, but to a group of persons, just like in the case of the ancient epitaphios logos. The text was written by Demetrios Kydones, a prominent scholar of the second half of the 14th century who served as mesazon under John VI Kantakouzenos.

---

227 Plethon’s ideas on the reform of the Byzantine state will be discussed below, in the chapter on symboleutic oratory.
228 On Gregory the Monk, see PLP no. 4605. For his funeral oration, see Patrologia Graeca, vol. 160, cols. 811-20. See also Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 358-59.
230 On Bessarion, see PLP no. 2707.
231 On Michael Apostoles, see PLP no. 1201. For the edition of the text, see Riehle, A., Die Grabrede des Michaelos Apostoles auf Bessarion, Munich 2006. See also Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 387-88.
233 Cf. Riehle, Apostoles, p. 29*. 
Kouzenos and was later in the service of John V Palaiologos. Kydones’ oration is concerned with the Zealot revolt in Thessaloniki in 1345 and the massacre of the about one hundred partisans of Kantakouzenos in the city, to whose party the author belonged. It stands out for the vivid description of the hostilities on the one hand and the encomiastic ekphrasis of Thessaloniki on the other, which is skillfully placed at the beginning of the oration, in order to underline the contrast with the present situation in the city.

Natural phenomena and the disasters they caused could also gave the occasion for the composition of monodies. Ailios Aristeides and Libanios had written, e.g., speeches on the destruction of cities or monuments after an earthquake or a fire. A few such texts survive from the Palaiologan period, like, for example, the short monody of George Galesiotes on the fall of Hagia Sophia due to an earthquake in 1346. The symbolic role of the specific church for the whole Byzantine culture justifies the great impact of the fact in contemporary literature and the eschatological dimensions attributed to it; some years later, when the monument was restored in 1353-54, Alexios Makrembolites composed another rhetorical text, in which he presented the fall of Hagia Sophia as a sign for the imminent end of the world.

Finally, a reference should be made to a group of monodies, which were produced in the late years of the Byzantine empire and are concerned with the fate of Byzantine cities, which, the one after the other, fell into the hands of the Turks. It was Thessaloniki that first came under Turkish occupation in 1430 and gave the occasion for the composition of three monodies lamenting on the lost grandeur of the city: one of them was penned probably by John Anagnostes, who also wrote a historical account of the events, while the other two are the works of the brothers Mark and John Eugenikos, both known for their vigorous opposition to the Union of the Churches. As it
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234 On Demetrios Kydones, see above p. 00.
235 For the text, see Patrologia Graecca, vol. 109, cols. 639-52. See also Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 73 and 302-304, and Kultsogianni/Kotzabassi/Paraskevopoulou, Η Θεσσαλονίκη στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία, pp. 54-58.
236 See Sideras, Grabreden, pp. 48 (with n. 17) and 49 (with n. 18).
237 For the text, see Kourousis, “Αἱ ἀντιλήψεις περί τῶν ἐσχάτων τοῦ κόσμου”, pp. 241-50. On George Galesiotes, see PLP 3527.
238 The text has been edited by Kourousis, “Αἱ ἀντιλήψεις περί τῶν ἐσχάτων τοῦ κόσμου”, pp. 235-40. On Alexios Makrembolites, see PLP no. 16352.
239 On John Anagnostes, see PLP no. 839. For the text, see Tsaras, G., Η τελευταία άλωση τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης (1430), Thessaloniki 1985, pp. 70-77.
240 On Mark Eugenikos, see PLP no. 6193. The text has been edited by Pilabakis, Εάλω Θεσσαλονίκη, pp. 13-65.
241 On John Eugenikos, see PLP no. 6189. For the text, see Pilabakis, Εάλω Θεσσαλονίκη, pp. 76-85.
is typical for monodies, the lament intermingles with the encomium of the fallen city and the glorious past of Thessaloniki is opposed to its gloomy present. The same scheme is repeated 23 years later in the monodies on the fall of Constantinople. Most of them prove to be indirect encomia of the Byzantine capital dressed with a mourning veil. Among their authors we find again John Eugenikos, as well as Andronikos Kallistos, who was a teacher of Greek language in Italy. Common in most of the texts is the description of the fall of Constantinople as an earthquake and a storm with universal dimensions, and the comparison with the fall of other cities, such as Troy, Jerusalem and Babylon. However, the point of emphasis varies in each case: Andronikos Kallistos, e.g., gives a comprehensive (though indirect) encomium of Constantinople, which comprises most of the topoi of the laudes Constantinopolitanae, in order to stress the enormity of the disaster for the whole world; John Eugenikos, on the other hand, circumscribes the praise to a few adjectives and attributes and addresses his lament to Theotokos, who has denied her protection to the City.

Encomia (ekphraseis) of cities

Among the rhetorical genres that flourished especially in the Palaiologan period were the encomiastic descriptions (ekphraseis) of cities. The genre had a long tradition going back to ancient Greece, yet it was Ailios Aristeides that systematically cultivated it in the 2nd century A.D. Menander of Laodikeia in his De epideictics also gave instructions on the composition of such encomia. According to Menander, the encomium of a city should include chapters on the country and on individuals; in praising the country, the rhetor should refer to the geographical position of the city, its climate, and nature; the praise of the individuals, on the other hand, should draw on their origins, actions, and accomplishments. The flourishing of the genre in the Palaiologan period should be attributed to a combination of factors: at first it was the impact of the reconquest of the Byzantine capital in 1261 that gave the motivation for the com-
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242 See Kaltsoyanni/Kotzabassi/Paraskevopoulou, Η Θεσσαλονίκη στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία, pp. 76-85.
245 See Fenster, Laudes, pp. 281-89.
246 See Menander, De epideictics 346.26-367.8, ed. Russell/Wilson, pp. 32-75. See also Fenster, Laudes, pp. 8-13.
position of praises of the imperial city, both free-standing and integrated into other texts (e.g., imperial orations
248). Furthermore, the Byzantine state was at the time nothing else but a set of individual cities (Constantinople, Thessaloniki, and later Mistra) with their surrounding territories, a historical development that “enhanced” somehow their political role and importance. To this one should add the interest of the intellectuals of the period in Ailios Aristeides, as attested in their efforts to acquire manuscripts with the works of the rhetor;
249 as well as in the citations from the latter that can be traced in contemporary rhetorical works. In the following I shall discuss only the free-standing encomia of cities that were produced in the Palaiologan period.

The first two examples are to be found among the rhetorical works of Theodore Metochites. The earliest one is a praise of the city of Nicaea, which served as capital of the exiled Byzantine empire in the period 1204-1261.
250 Metochites composed this text c.1290 and delivered it in Nicaea, in the presence of the emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos, who is directly addressed at the end of the speech as the most precious ornament of the city.
251 The structure of Nicaeus follows closely Menander’s guidelines:
252 it begins with a reference to the past of Nicaea and its renovation by the emperor Trajan, and then the author praises the setting and the surroundings of the city, its walls, and the public buildings (especially the churches, monasteries, and philanthropic institutions); the encomium culminates in the praise of Nicaea as host of the First and Seventh Ecumenical Councils,
253 as well as the one that preserved the seeds for the later “revival” of the empire.

Metochites’ second encomium is entitled Byzantios or About the Imperial Megalopolis and it is a long praise of Constantinople, which the author composed as a gift for his native city and nurse in letters.
254 Byzantios was written probably between 1305 and

---

248 See above p. 00.
249 See above p. 00.
254 The text has been recently edited by I. Polemis, Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης. Βυζάντιος ή περί τῆς βασιλίδος μεγαλόπολεως. Κοσμολογία καὶ ῥητορικὴ κατὰ τὸν ΙΔ´ αἰώνα, Thessaloniki 2013. For the motives behind its composition, cf. Rhoby, “Byzantios and Other City Encomia”, p. 86.
In terms of length, it is approximately nine times longer than the *Nicaeus*, so that it is uncertain if the speech was delivered in public at all. Its overall structure is (on the surface) similar to that of the *Nicaeus* and the basic precepts of Menander can easily be detected throughout the text: the praise of Constantinople’s setting as a bridge between Europe and Asia is followed by chapters on the establishment of the City by Constantine the Great, the description of its fortifications and buildings (with special reference to the church of Hagia Sophia), and the comparison with renowned cities of the past, such as Babylon, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome: all of them are defeated by Constantinople, which blossoms eternally and constantly renews itself, thus resembling the nature of the world. The ecumenical role of the Byzantine capital is expressed in a variety of motives and pictures, while *Byzantios* also reflects some of the discussions among intellectuals at the imperial court, as well as the author’s philosophical preoccupations, an element that makes the text raise above the narrow limits of rhetorical theory.

“Complete” city encomia, such as the above mentioned texts of Theodore Metochites and those integrated into imperial orations, are a special characteristic of the early Palaiologan rhetoric. Moreover, the “rhetorization” of hagiography in the same period had as a result that many learned hagiographers, following the prescriptions of rhetorical theory, included praises of the saint’s native city in their works. It was especially Thessaloniki that was mostly praised in this context, in the texts dedicated to Saint Demetrios and other local saints. Authors such as Constantine Akropolites, Theodore Metochites, Nikephoros Gregoras, Nikolaos Kabasilas, and especially Philotheos Kokkinos, all of them “payed their tribute” to the second city of the empire and extolled the virtues of Thessaloniki, using sometimes the same *topoi* that appear in the contemporary encomia of Constantinople.

---

255 For the dating, see Polemis, *Βυζάντιος*, pp. 20-21. See also Voudouri, “Representations of Power”, pp. 110-111 and 118, where the author suggests as a possible *terminus post quem* the years 1306-1307.

256 See Rhoby, “Byzantios and Other City Encomia”, p. 85, and Polemis, *Βυζάντιος*, p. 27. On the contrary, Voudouri, “Representations of Power”, pp. 111-113 supports the view that the speech was probably delivered orally.


260 For the encomia of Thessaloniki in the hagiographical texts of the Palaiologan period, see Kaltso-gianni/Kotzabassi/Paraskevopoulou, *Η θεωσαλωνική στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία*, pp. 143-213.
Some free-standing city encomia survive also from the 15th century, but they are concerned in their majority with cities of the periphery, as we shall see below. As far as Constantinople is concerned, a reference should be made to a text composed by Manuel Chrysoloras and often cited as *Comparison between Old and New Rome*, although the title does not seem to go back to the author himself and does not fully correspond to the content.\(^\text{262}\) In fact, we have to do with a lengthy epistle of Chrysoloras to the emperor Manuel II Palaiologos dating from 1411,\(^\text{263}\) in which the former narrates to the latter his first impressions of Rome, where he is established at the time. Taking as a starting-point the encomiastic words of authors of the past, such as Libanios and John Chrysostomos, for Rome, Chrysoloras seeks to prove that the greatness of the city’s past is still reflected in the ruins of public buildings;\(^\text{264}\) above all, Rome is a city rich in reliques, as well as the one that hosts the tombs of the apostles Peter and Paul, elements that underline its role as seat of christianity. Constantinople, on the other hand, is for Chrysoloras the “New Rome”, the “daughter” of the “Old Rome” that has surpassed the beauty of her “mother” in all aspects. However, after, the lengthy *ekphrasis* of Constantinople, which comprises most of the *topoi* prescribed by the rhetorical theory, the author concludes that both cities—and especially Rome—offer proofs for the transitory glory and power.\(^\text{265}\)

Turning now to the free-standing topographical *ekphraseis* that survive from the first half of the 15th century, the most prominent place deserves the lengthy encomium of Bessarion for his native city, Trebizond.\(^\text{266}\) Like Theodore Metochites in his *Byzantios*, Bessarion also states that he composed the speech as an expression of gratitude to his birthplace that gave him the gift of life. The encomium was meant to be

---


\(^{264}\) For the role of antiquities in the late Byzantine encomia of cities, especially *Byzantios* and the *Synkrisis* of Chrysoloras, see Magdaolino, P., “The Beauty of Antiquity in Late Byzantine Praises of Constantinople”, in Odorico/Messis, *Villes de toute beauté*, pp. 101-21. For Chrysoloras’ owing to the rhetorical tradition of the Second Sophistic as this is reflected especially in the *ekphrasis* of the ancient monuments of Rome, see Webb, R., “Describing Rome in Greek: Manuel Chrysoloras’ *Comparison of Old and New Rome*”, in Odorico/Messis, *Villes de toute beauté*, pp. 123-33.


\(^{266}\) The text has been edited by Sp. Lampros, “Βησσαρίωνος ἐγκώμιον εἰς Τραπεζοῦντα”, Νέος Ἑλληνικὸς Νομισμάτων 13 (1916), 145-204.
delivered in public and dates probably from 1436-37.\textsuperscript{267} Trebizond was the capital of the independent state that was established after 1204 by members of the Comnenian family along the south-eastern coastline of the Black Sea, and lead an autonomous existence until its conquest by the Turks in 1461. Bessarion gives details on the history of the city during the antiquity--its establishment, though indirectly, goes back to Athens--drawing on Herodotus and Plutarch, he describes vividly the commercial activity in the market, which is due to the favourable setting of Trebizond and the natural harbours of the area, and praises the military skills of the inhabitants, who are constantly trained, in order to be ready to defend their country against the enemies.\textsuperscript{268} Although it deals with some of the basic topics proposed by the rhetorical theory for the encomium of a city, yet Bessarion’s speech is quite unique in its contents and disposition, and proves to be more than a rhetorical exercise; the Antichikos of Libanios has been identified as the author’s basic model.\textsuperscript{269} It has also been suggested that in praising the great past and the other virtues of Trebizond, Bessarion sought to encourage his contemporaries to defend their city against the Turkish threat.\textsuperscript{270}

A much shorter encomiastic \textit{ekphrasis} of Trebizond was penned about a decade later by John Eugenikos, who has been mentioned above for his monodies on the fall of Thessaloniki and Constantinople.\textsuperscript{271} Eugenikos wrote in total four topographical \textit{ekphraseis}: except for Trebizond, he praised Imbros,\textsuperscript{272} Corinth\textsuperscript{273} and the village Petrina in Laconia.\textsuperscript{274} All four texts share common motives and expressions, an indication that the author probably drew on a standard repertoire: all four places with their surroundings are presented as \textit{loci amoeni}, there are references to the flora and fauna, the author makes puns with the place-names and defines in concluding his texts as gifts to the respective places, mostly for their hospitality.\textsuperscript{275}

\textsuperscript{267} For the dating, see Lampsidis, “Περὶ τὸ ἐγκώμιον”, pp. 159-60.

\textsuperscript{268} For a summary of the contents, see Lampsidis, “Περὶ τὸ ἐγκώμιον”, pp. 161-68, and Hunger, \textit{Literatur}, vol. 1, pp. 175-76.

\textsuperscript{269} See Fatouros, G., “Bessarion und Libanios. Ein typischer Fall byzantinischer Mimesis”, \textit{Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik} 49 (1999), 198-204.


\textsuperscript{271} For the edition, see Lampsidis, O., “Ἰωάννου Εὐγενικοῦ ἔκφρασις Τραπεζοῦντος. Χρονολόγησις καὶ ἔκδοσις”, Άρχεῖον Πόντου 20 (1955), 3-39.


\textsuperscript{274} See Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά, vol. 1, pp. 49-55.

The “revival” of the “genos symbouleutikon”

It has already been mentioned that advisory oratory in the form it had been practiced by the Attic rhetors of the 5th and 4th centuries BC had fallen into disuse since the Late Antiquity, due to the historical and political developments that led from the Athenian democracy to the Hellenistic states and later to the Roman Imperium.\(^{276}\) Very few rhetorical texts from the whole Byzantine era can be classified as “counseling speeches”, and most of them were produced at the court environment by persons who were close to the emperor—one should think, e.g., of the so-called “mirrors of princes” which contained advices for the emperor, yet they were composed in their majority by men of his milieu, and only rarely they deviated from the patterns of the official imperial ideology.\(^{277}\) However, small grains of counseling and criticism can even be detected in “propaganda texts” such as the imperial orations, as we have seen, e.g., in the case of the “Basilikos” of Maximos Planoudes.\(^{278}\) Furthermore, there exist a few rhetorical works from the Palaiologan period, which are concerned with social and political matters of the time and they are not directly linked to the court environment, so that they can be evaluated as pieces of “independent” political thought; interestingly enough, these works were not produced, as we shall see, in the capital, but in Thessaloniki, whose role as an urban centre was enhanced during the late Byzantine period.

The first two texts to be discussed in this section are actually concerned with the historical developments in Thessaloniki during the first half of the 14th century. The earliest one was penned by Nikephoros Choumnos, a high state official under Andronikos II Palaiologos who served as judge in the city sometime between 1286-1295.\(^{279}\) Choumnos’ text is defined in the title as a “counseling speech”, and it is addressed to the people of Thessaloniki (and especially to the city’s Senate), in order to counsel them on the issue of justice.\(^{280}\) Writing from Constantinople between 1295-1316 (probably c.1310),\(^{281}\) the author expresses at first his “erotic” disposition against Thessaloniki, which is developed in a lengthy encomium of the city according to the rules of Menander; this part of the speech serves somehow as captatio benevolentiae, before Choumnos proceeds to the main, counseling part, in which he castigates the greed of the rich people who appropriate the estates of the poor, and urges the Senate of Thes-

\(^{276}\) Cf. above p. 00.
\(^{277}\) On this rhetorical genre, see below p. 00.
\(^{278}\) Cf. above p. 00.
\(^{279}\) For the person, see above p. 00.
\(^{280}\) For the edition of the text, see Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 2, pp. 137-87.
\(^{281}\) For the dating, see Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos*, pp. 49-51, and Gaul, *Magistros*, p. 66 (with n. 24).
The speech culminates in an encomium of the emperor Andronikos II, who is especially concerned with the maintenance of law and order in Thessaloniki, an element that makes the author be heard like the emperor’s voice.

In the case of Thomas Magistros’ speech *To the People of Thessaloniki on Unity*, on the other hand, we hear the voice of a citizen who is preoccupied with urban affairs. Magistros’ concern for the affairs of his native city is demonstrated in a variety of texts, such as his speech in defense of the general Chandrenos, which he delivered as an official envoy of Thessaloniki before Andronikos II. His speech *On Unity* dates from the period of the civil war between Andronikos II and Andronikos III (1321-28), when part of Thessaloniki’s population sided with the latter, thus bringing the conflict into the city and causing social and political upheaval. Magistros juxtaposes the benefits of unity to the evils of conflict: unity is extolled as the foundation of civil life and as a prerequisite for the prosperity of a city/state; it was unity that lay behind the glorious deeds of the Athenians during the Persian wars, while they lost their power when they started having internal political conflicts. The people of Thessaloniki should cease hostilities, live in concord with each other, and make their city a model of civil life.

Among Magistros’ sources the scholars have identified Ailios Aristeidès’ oration *On Unity of the Cities*; it has been suggested that this creates a parallel between the social/political preoccupations of the rhetors of the Second Sophistic and the concerns of the intellectuals in the early Palaiologan period.

A number of counseling speeches from the Palaiologan period were motivated by the critical historical circumstances of the time; high state officials, patriarchs, and emperors addressed the Byzantine citizens in the face of the growing Turkish threat, in order to boost their spirit or to induce them to take specific actions. In 1354 the Turks conquered Kallipoli and established their first beachhead on European ground,
which allowed them to make raids into Thrace and the Byzantine territories around Constantinople. In 1366 Amadeus of Savoy reconquered the peninsula and offered it back to the Byzantines, on the condition that they espoused the Catholic creed; it was on this occasion that the “prime minister” of the emperor John V Palaiologos Demetrios Kydones, who had already professed himself Catholic, composed a counseling speech, in which he urged his contemporaries to accept the alliance offered to them by the Latin West and reminded the Byzantines of their common Roman past with the Latins. Some years later (in 1371) Kydones addressed another counseling speech to his contemporaries, advising them not to give Kallipoli back to the Turks, who had requested it as a condition of a peace treaty.

The next two pieces to be discussed are concerned with the fate of the two major Byzantine cities, Constantinople and Thessaloniki, in the face of an imminent Turkish attack. Thessaloniki and its environs were sieged by the Turks from 1382 to 1387, when the city was conquered for the first time by the enemies. Manuel II Palaiologos, who had served as ruler of Thessaloniki between 1369-1373 and was residing in the city at the beginning of the siege, spoke in autumn 1383 before the assembly of the people of Thessaloniki and delivered a counseling speech, in which he advised against a potential capitulation to the Turks and urged the Thessalonikeans to struggle to death in order to defend their city and the surrounding territories. At the end of the 14th century Constantinople was also blockaded for the first time by the Turks of Bayazid (from 1394 to 1402), but the City remained unaissailable for the time being thanks to its strong walls; the walls were, actually, the only means of defense for the Byzantine capital, although they had suffered serious damages in the course of time. The reparation of the City’s walls is the subject of a short oration by the priestmonk Joseph Bryennios, which the author delivered in the imperial palace shortly after 1415, in the presence of the emperor, the patriarch, high state officials and the clergy. Bryennios urges all the citizens of Constantinople, both the rich and the poor, to contribute to the restoration of the walls, for in this way they will keep safe the city

---

288 On Demetrios Kydones, see above p. 00. For the text, see Patrologia Graeca, vol. 154, cols. 961-1008; see also Loenertz, “Démétrius Cydonès”, p. 64, and Ryder, The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones, pp. 43, 144-46, and 153-60.
290 See Laourdas, B., “Ὁ 'Συμβουλευτικὸς πρὸς τοὺς θεσσαλονικεῖς' τοῦ Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου”, Μακεδονικά 3 (1953-55), 290-307. See also Kaltsogianni/Kotzabassi/Paraskevopoulou, Η θεσσαλονική στη βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία, pp. 60-62.
which is the seat of the Orthodox faith and, thus, the “mother” of all Christians. A short *laus Constantinopolitana* belongs, of course, to the basic structural elements of the speech.

As a subgenre of symboleutic oratory we should consider the so-called “mirrors of princes”. These were counseling texts addressed to the emperor/the heir of the throne and projecting the image of the ideal ruler, according to the traditional tenets of the official imperial ideology; they shared many common features with the imperial orations proper, yet they had a clear prescriptive and instructive character and they could offer more sincere and concrete advice, for their authors were mostly persons close to the addressee. Traditional manuals of rhetoric did not contain rules for the composition of mirrors of princes—the term itself is of western origin—, despite the fact that such kind of texts had a long tradition going back to the pseudo-Isocratean speeches *Ad Nicoclem* and *Ad Demonicum*.

We have two free-standing mirrors of princes surviving from the Palaiologan period. The earliest one was written by the politically engaged and often mentioned Thomas Magistros. The date of composition, as well as the addressee of the speech cannot be determined with certainty: the earliest date proposed is c.1304, while other scholars have dated it to the second, third or even the fourth decade of the 14th century; as for the person of the emperor, he has been identified alternatively with...

---


294 Except for free-standing texts, mirrors of princes were at times incorporated into other literary works (e.g., novels or monastic florilegia); see Prinzinger, G., “Beobachtungen zu integrierten Fürstenspiegeln der Byzantiner”, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 38 (1988), 1-31.

295 It has been edited by P. Volpe-Cacciatore, Toma Magistro: La regalità, Naples 1997.
An Andronikos II, Michael IX, and Andronikos III. Magistros’ text is entitled On Kingship, and the title itself creates a parallel to the homonymous oration that Synesius of Cyrene addressed to the emperor Arcadius in 398, the oldest surviving Byzantine mirror of princes; common expressions and ideas testify to the author’s familiarity with the older text, which served for him not only as a literary model, but also as a “model of criticism” on contemporary policies. Magistros begins with common tenets of the Byzantine imperial ideology: the emperor should be an imitator of God in terms of mildness, philanthropy, and generosity/charity, he should provide for the well-being of his subjects, select able and honest officials, and make ready for war; however, in the course of the speech the author gives more concrete counsel, especially on fiscal issues, he attacks the policy of employment of foreign mercenaries (having probably in mind the so-called “Catalan company”), and criticizes the dismantling of the Byzantine fleet, an issue discussed also by Maximos Planoudes in his Basilikos. What crowns the image of the ideal emperor in the view of an intellectual like Magistros is, of course, learning, which the emperor should patronize so that his state looks like a theatron of the Muses; this concept stands in line with the image of Andronikos II in the contemporary imperial orations, and points probably to the real addressee of the speech.

The second surviving mirror of princes forms part of the literary production of Manuel II Palaiologos. Manuel composed this text for his son and heir to the throne John VIII, and he must have presented it to the latter c.1406. In contrast to Magistros’ text, Manuel’s mirror is not structured like an oration proper, but it is divided in 100 chapters. As H. Hunger has already pointed out, moral and theological issues stay here in the foreground, such as, e.g., the vanity of worldly matters or the relationship between the emperor and the Church; practical issues, on the other hand, are rarely touched upon, although they are not totally absent from Manuel’s reason-

296 See Angelov, Imperial Ideology, pp. 189-90, and Gaul, Magistros, pp. 330-37 (both with references to older literature).
299 See above p. 00.
301 See Manuel Palaiologos, Precepts of Imperial Conduct, in Patrologia Graeca, vol. 156, cols. 320-84. For the dating, see Leonte, Rhetoric in Purple, pp. 144-46 (with references to older literature).
ing (e.g., the strategy to lead an army in the battlefield).303 There are, of course, some common topics which link Manuel’s work to the older tradition of advisory texts for rulers—it has been suggested that the author used Agapetos’ mirror of Justinian as one of his basic models—,304 yet it appears that the learned emperor was more interested in projecting the image of the ideal moral human character and not only that of the ideal ruler, thus expanding the scope of his text and making approaches to other kinds of advice literature, such as the *gnomologia* and *kephalaia*.305

Finally, a reference should be made to the admonitory addresses of George Gemistos Plethon. These texts are discussed in this session, for, like the mirrors of princes, they offer advice for an effective conduct of the state affairs, although they do not belong to this specific rhetorical genre. Plethon was exiled in Mistra by Manuel II Palaiologos in 1405 on the suspicion of heresy and paganism, but later he was rewarded with various public services and became head of the circle of intellectuals at the despotate. Between 1407-15 he addressed a counseling speech to the despot Theodore II Palaiologos, in which he expressed his concern for the defense of Peloponnese in the face of the Turkish threat and proposed reforms for the improvement of the economic and military conditions in Morea. Plethon suggested that the state should rely on a citizen army rather than mercenaries and insisted on the exemption of the soldiers from taxation, so that they can devote themselves to the defense of their fatherland; taking this principle as a starting point, he proposed a new state organization for the despotate of Morea, according to which the population should be divided in three separate classes with a specific function: manual workers, service workers, and ruling class including military.306 This model, which is roughly based on Plato’s *Politeia*, repeated Plethon in a later counseling address to Manuel II Palaiologos in 1418.307

---

303 On the contents and structure of the “Precepts”, see Leonte, *Rhetoric in Purple*, pp. 147-48 and Appendix 7.
305 See the discussion in Leonte, *Rhetoric in Purple*, pp. 158-75.
306 The text has been edited by Sp. Lampros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, vol. 4, pp. 113-35. For an analysis of the contents, see Blum, *Plethon*, pp. 36-41; a German translation with notes can be found *ibid.*, pp. 151-72. On the social and political views of Plethon, see Nikolau, Th., *Αἱ περὶ πολιτείας καὶ δικαίου ἱδέα τοῦ Πλήθωνος* (Βυζαντινά κείμενα και μελέτει, 6), Thessaloniki 1974.
307 For the edition of the text, see Lampros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, vol. 3, pp. 246-65. See also Blum, *Plethon*, pp. 41-44 and 173-87 (German translation with commentary).
Conclusion

Not all aspects of Palaiologan rhetoric can be discussed within the limits of this chapter. The above presentation has concentrated only on free-standing rhetorical texts, and has not considered embedded uses of rhetoric, e.g. in historiography, hagiography or epistolography;\(^{308}\) it has also (arbitrarily) not taken into account the field of “ecclesiastic oratory”, which followed to a great extent the same patterns and--especially by the end of the period--touched very often upon secular issues,\(^{309}\) as well as versified rhetorical texts (primarily imperial encomia and epitaphs), which however are relatively few compared to other periods.

The volume of the rhetorical texts produced in the Palaiologan era makes it, of course, difficult to summarize some basic trends: the focus on epideictic oratory is common with the previous periods, and the same applies to the close connection of the rhetors with the imperial court. Traditional forms continued to serve as basis for rhetorical composition, as it is evident from the manuscripts of and commentaries to the manuals of Hermogenes and Aphthonios that were produced in the late Byzantine period and from the texts themselves. Nevertheless, the rhetors of the Palaiologan period “re-discovered” authors of the Second Sophistic such as Ailios Aristeides, and paid their tribute to the “master” of epideictic oratory, Menander of Laodikeia, by incorporating a basic chapter of his treatise in their rhetorical manuals. Moreover, neglected forms were brought into light, sometime in order to give (even if indirectly) expression to contemporary preoccupations, like e.g. in the case of meletai.

Despite the fact that rhetoric flourished throughout the Palaiologan period, yet the great mass of rhetorical production concentrates either in the times of the first two Palaiologoi, Michael VIII and Andronikos II, or in the first half of the 15th century; the historical circumstances of the second half of the 14th century did not favour rhetoric and literary activity in general. Although it remained “traditional” in its basic forms and subjects, rhetoric assumed during the last centuries of the Byzantine empire under circumstances a more “pragmatic” role, and served sometimes as a means of approaching contemporary reality, yet in a “refined” way.


\(^{309}\) One should bear in mind, for instance, the homilies of Isidore Glabas, where the author often discussed social matters of his time (see Christoforidis, B., “Ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος θεοσαλονίκης Ἰσίδωρος Γλαβᾶς καὶ τὰ κοινωνικὰ προβλήματα τῆς ἐποχῆς του”, Ἐπιστημονική Ἐπετηρίς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστήμιου θεσσαλονίκης 29 [1986-89], 519-90), or the politico-historical orations of Symeon of Thessaloniki (see Balfour, D., Politico-Historical Works of Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica [1416/17 to 1429]. Critical Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary [Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 13], Vienna 1979).
APPENDIX:
THE “RHETORS” OF THE PALAIOLOGAN PERIOD

1) Akropolites Constantine
2) Akropolites George
3) Anagnostes John
4) Apostoles Michael
5) Argyropoulos John
6) Asanes Constantine
7) Bessarion
8) Blastares Matthew
9) Bryennios Joseph
10) Chamaetos Kabasilas Nikolaos
11) Cheilas Nikephoros
12) Chortasmenos John
13) Choumnos Nikephoros
14) Chrysoberges Maximos
15) Chrysoloras Demetrios
16) Chrysoloras Manuel
17) Gabalas Manuel (Matthew of Ephesos)
18) Gabras John
19) Gabras Michael
20) Gazes Theodore
21) Galesiotes George
22) Gemistos George (Plethon)
23) Glykys John XIII
24) Gregoras Nikephoros
25) Gregory II of Cyprus
26) Gregory the Philosopher
27) Dokeianos John
28) Eugenikos John
29) Eugenikos Mark
30) Hermetianos John (Hermonynos Charitonymos)

310 The following list has been compiled with the help of the Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit.
31) Holobolos Manuel
32) Hyrtakenos Theodore
33) Ibankos Constantine
34) Ioasaph of Ephesos
35) Isidore of Kiev
36) Joseph (the Monk?)
37) Joseph the Philosopher
38) Kabasilas Theodore
39) Kalekas John XIV
40) Kalekas Manuel
41) Kallistos Andronikos
42) Kamariotes Matthew
43) Karbones George
44) Katadokeinos Demetrios
45) Kokkinos Philotheos
46) Kydones Demetrios
47) Lampenos Alexios
48) Lampenos Nikolaos
49) Loukites Constantine
50) Magistros Thomas
51) Makrembolites Alexios
52) Makres Makarios
53) Metochites Theodore
54) Moschos John
55) Neokaisarites Manuel
56) Oinaiotes George
57) Pachymeres George
58) Palaiologos Manuel II
59) Pediasimos Theodore
60) Pepagomenos Demetrios
61) Philotheos of Selybria
62) Planoudes Maximos
63) Potamios Theodore
64) Sabios Manuel
65) Scholarios George/Gennadios
66) Serbopoulos Laskaris
67) Staphidakis (John?)
68) Symeonakis John
69) Theodore Nomikos
70) Xanthopoulos Nikephoros
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ABSTRACT

Forming always part of the Byzantine curriculum and being a means of stabilizing the political system through the propagation of official ideology, rhetoric continued to play a significant role in the intellectual life of the Palaiologan era. Court oratory flourished under the patronage of learned rulers, while the death of emperors or other prominent persons was often commemorated in high style epitaphs. Moreover, significant historical events, such as the siege or the fall of Byzantine cities, became the occasion for the composition of rhetorical speeches with epideictic or advisory character; the uncertain historical conjuncture also led to a “revival” of counseling oratory, a genre that had been neglected throughout the Byzantine era to that days. The aim of this contribution is to give a taste of the various forms of rhetorical speech that was produced in the late Byzantine period and point out the basic trends to be observed in each individual genre (e.g., imperial encomia, funeral orations, praises of cities, counseling texts, speeches on historical occasions), with reference, of course, to their main representatives.
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