

APPENDIX IV

Vat. Pal. gr. 367

Vat. Pal. gr. 367 (s. XIV in.), fols. 139^r–146^v, contains several poems dating from the tenth and eleventh centuries. Since the existing editions, as well as the scholarly publications dealing with these poems generally lack clarity, I shall describe the contents of this part of the manuscript and attempt to date the authors and their poems.

Before this part of the manuscript we find poems by two thirteenth-century poets, Makarios Kaloreites and Constantine Anagnostes (fols. 135^v–139^r)¹; and after this part of the manuscript we find two poems by Prodromos (fol. 146^v)² and several anonymous poems that cannot be dated (fols. 146^v–147^v)³. Fols. 139^r–146^v can be divided into five sections:

- (1) 139^r–140^r anonymous poems
- (2) 140^r–140^v poems attributed to Geometres (see Appendix II)
- (3) 140^v–143^r poems attributed to Michael the Grammarian
- (4) 143^r–143^v poems attributed to Geometres (see Appendix II)
- (5) 143^v–146^v poems attributed to Π^ο.

* *
*

Section (1), fols. 139^r–140^r, is a miscellany of various poems⁴. It is highly unlikely that these poems all derive from the same source. Lines 1–3 of the first poem, εἰς τὸν ψαλτῆρα, can be found in Ambros. gr. 783, fol. 193^r, a Psalter dating from the early tenth century; the whole poem can be found in Ambros. gr. 439, fol. 1^r, a thirteenth-century manuscript⁵. Poems 3, 4 and 11 (L. 40, 13;

¹ Makarios Kaloreites: ed. ANASTASJEWIČ 1907: 493–494 and N. BANESCU, Deux poètes inédits du XIII^e siècle. Bucarest 1910, 11–14. Constantine Anagnostes: ed. BANESCU, 14–18. See also S.G. MERCATI, *ROC* 22 (1920–21) 162–193 (repr. MERCATI 1970: I, 206–235).

² HORANDNER 1974: 47 (nos. 127 and 121). See also PAPAGIANNIS 1997: 18.

³ Ed. LAMBROS 1922: 57, 8 – 59, 12 and MERCATI 1927: 423–425.

⁴ Ed. LAMBROS 1922: 39, 1 – 44, 4. See MERCATI 1927: 407–410.

⁵ See MERCATI 1927: 407.

40, 20; and 43, 20) can be found in the collections of riddles compiled by Psellos, Basil Megalomytes and others⁶; since Byzantine riddles cannot be dated, we do not know when these three poems were written. The miscellany also contains an epitaph on an empress Eudokia, whose untimely death was lamented by her husband Romanos (L. 41, 11). This is Bertha, daughter of Hugo of Provence, who was renamed Eudokia after her marriage to Romanos II: she died in 949⁷. There is also an epitaph on a certain Theophylaktos Magistros, whom I have not been able to identify, but whose title indicates that he probably lived in the tenth century (L. 42, 20). None of the other poems can be dated with any certainty.

* *
* *

The third section, fols. 140^v–143^r, contains seven poems by Michael the Grammarian. Mercati published these poems as meticulously as always, but unfortunately he committed two errors that have led to some confusion⁸. First of all, Mercati published not only the seven poems by Michael the Grammarian found in Vat. Pal. gr. 367, but also two poems attributed to a certain Michael the Hieromonk, which he discovered in Vat. gr. 578 and Barb. gr. 41 and 551⁹. Mercati suggested that the two Michaels are actually one and the same person, because Vat. gr. 578 and Vat. Pal. gr. 367 were copied in the same scriptorium¹⁰. That is why his article is entitled: “Intorno a Μιχαήλ γραμματικὸς ὁ ἰερομόναχος”. Mercati’s argument does not justify the whimsical identification of two authors bearing the same name, but different titles. In fact, we are not even dealing with two, but three different authors: Michael the Grammarian and two others, both named Michael the Hieromonk. Michael the Hieromonk, who wrote no. II, a catanyctic poem, obviously enjoyed a solid education: he has a thorough knowledge of the classics, indulges in obsolete words (such as ἔλλοψ) and quotes the beginning of Euripides’ *Phoenissae*. The second Michael the Hieromonk, on the contrary, must have had no more than a simple monastic education: in his paraenetic alphabet, no. III, he uses ordinary words, standard phrases and hackneyed images.

⁶ See BOISSONADE 1829–33: III, 432 (Psellos’ collection, no. 10); N. VEIS, *Parnassos* 6 (1902) 109 (no. 8); BOISSONADE 1829–33: III, 442 (Basil’s collection, no. 16).

⁷ K. DYOVOUNIOtis in LAMBROS 1922: 37, incorrectly identifies the subject of the epitaph as Eudokia Makrembolitissa (probably because of the word *συνανέστης* in Lambros’ edition, whereas the ms. reads *συνευέτης*; see MERCATI 1927: 408).

⁸ Ed. MERCATI 1917: 115–117 and 128–135 (nos. I and IV–IX).

⁹ Ed. MERCATI 1917: 118–120 (nos. II–III).

¹⁰ See MERCATI 1917: 121–122.

Secondly, in the same year that Mercati was preparing his edition, Lambros also published the poems by Michael the Grammarian found in Vat. Pal. gr. 367¹¹. His edition is clearly inferior to that of Mercati, but it contains an interesting observation on the *floruit* of Michael the Grammarian. The first poem by Michael is a monody on a certain Lykoleon bearing the title βέστης. Lykoleon is an extremely rare name and, in my view, Lambros therefore rightly drew attention to a poem by Christopher Mitylenaios (no. 68) about an icon that had been illegally removed by a villain named Lykoleon¹². Mercati did not agree with Lambros because Michael's monody portrays Lykoleon as a noble and virtuous citizen, whereas Mitylenaios shows a strong dislike of him¹³. This again is not a convincing argument, for we all know that character judgments may vary from person to person. There are three arguments in favour of Lambros' dating of Michael the Grammarian. Firstly, as Mercati himself had to admit, "la relativa correttezza della versificazione lascia piuttosto supporre che il nostro giambografo non sia di molto posteriore al secolo X–XI"¹⁴. Secondly, Lykoleon's title, *vestes*, was only in use at the Byzantine court in the hundred years between the reigns of John Tzimiskes and Alexios Komnenos. Thirdly, the second poem by Michael the Grammarian (no. IV, vv. 20–21 in Mercati's edition) makes fun of an unnamed bishop of Philomelion who was born in a backward village where people pronounced κρούον as κρίον and ξύλον as ξίλον. Since the shift of /y/ (=v, ου) to /i/ took place in most dialects in the tenth to the eleventh centuries¹⁵, Michael's snobbery must be seen as the by-product of a period of transition in which some intellectuals still knew how the v used to be pronounced, whereas most people had long since forgotten the distinction between /y/ and /i/. There is little doubt, therefore, that Michael the Grammarian lived in the eleventh century. If Lambros' identification of Lykoleon is correct (as I am inclined to think), Michael's monody on Lykoleon must have been written after 1043–1045, the date of Chr. Mityl. 68¹⁶. This also implies that Michael the Grammarian must have been a contemporary of the three great eleventh-century poets: John Mauropous, Christopher Mitylenaios and Michael Psellos.

* *
*
*

¹¹ Ἐπιγράμματα ἀνέκδοτα Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Γραμματικοῦ. *NE* 14 (1917) 3–13.

¹² *NE* 14 (1917) 4.

¹³ See MERCATI 1917: 126.

¹⁴ See MERCATI 1917: 127.

¹⁵ See G. HORROCKS, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London / New York 1997, 205 and HÖRANDNER 1991: 418.

¹⁶ See ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ 1990: 2 and 11, n. 38.

Section (5) of Vat. Pal. gr. 367, fols. 143^v–146^v, bears the heading: τοῦ Π^ο, which Lambros interprets as: τοῦ Πατρικίου. Though I am not certain whether the abbreviation should be interpreted as Lambros does, I will henceforth refer to this author as the *Anonymous Patrician*. Since the Anonymous Patrician's poems follow immediately after section (4) containing Geometres, some scholars have suggested that these poems should in fact be attributed to John Geometres¹⁷. This is impossible for chronological reasons: as Geometres was born around 935¹⁸, he cannot be the author of poems dating from the 940s. Other scholars confuse the Anonymous Patrician with Christopher Mitylenaios, who was also a patrician, but lived some hundred years later. Although Kurtz already explained a century ago why Mitylenaios cannot have been the author of the poems in Vat. Pal. gr. 367¹⁹, this unfortunately is one of those scholarly errors that seem to persist.

The poems by the Anonymous Patrician were published by Lambros, except for those on fol. 144^r, of which he apparently had no photograph²⁰. Mercati published the poems on fol. 144^r and rectified many of the errors made by Lambros in his transcription of the other poems²¹. In the following, *L.* indicates Lambros' edition and *M.* Mercati's. The collection of the poems by the Anonymous Patrician contains the following 42 items: **(1–6)** epigrams on a Paraklesis donated by Constantine VII (L. 47, 10 – 49, 10; M. 415, 1–6)²²; **(7–15)** epigrams on mosaics donated by Romanos Argyros the Kensor (M. 415, 7 – 416, 48; L. 49, 13 – 50, 6)²³; **(16)** a riddle (L. 50, 7–10); **(17–31)** epigrams on images of the Archangels donated by Theophanes (L. 50, 11 – 52, 22)²⁴; **(32–33)** epitaphs to Joseph (L. 52, 23 – 53, 4); **(34)** epitaph to Bardas (L. 53, 5–9); **(35–36)** epitaphs to Katakalon (L. 53, 10 – 54, 17); **(37–38)** programmatic poems (L. 54, 18 – 55, 18); **(39–40)** satirical poems (L. 55, 19 – 56, 22); **(41)** epigram on an icon of female saints (L. 56, 23 – 57, 2); and **(42)** epigram on an icon of St. Theodore donated by Theodore (L. 57, 3–7).

¹⁷ See SAJDAK 1930–31: 527, n. 21 and HÖRANDNER 1970: 114

¹⁸ See LAUXTERMANN 1998d.

¹⁹ KURTZ 1903: XVIII–XIX.

²⁰ LAMBROS 1922: 47–57.

²¹ MERCATI 1927: 412–421.

²² Lambros' numbering is not correct: his no. 3 consists of two different epigrams (48, 21–24 and 49, 1–4).

²³ M. 415, 13–16 and 17–20 belong together. They form one epigram: see chapter 5, pp. 184–185, n. 87.

²⁴ Lambros unfortunately brackets together some of these epigrams. As MERCATI 1927: 417 pointed out, all these epigrams are quatrains. There are in total 15 quatrains: L. 50, 11–14; 15–18; 19–22; 23–25 (one verse lacking); 51, 1–4; 5–8; 9–12; 13–16; 17–20; 51, 21–22 and 52, 1–2; 52, 3–6; 7–10; 11–14; 15–18; 19–22.

The first six epigrams describe an image of the Virgin Paraklesis, which was donated by Constantine VII; since no. 5 imitates a well-known epigram by Geometres²⁵, who was born c. 935 and started to write his first poems in the 950s, these six epigrams obviously date from the last years of the reign of Constantine VII. No. 34 is an epitaph to Bardas, magistros and domestikos of the Scholae. This is the famous Bardas Phokas the Elder, who died in 969. The epitaphs to Katakalon (nos. 35–36) date from the years 945–946²⁶. The first epitaph states that Katakalon, ὁ σεργός (...) Θεσσαλῶν στρατηλάτης, died on the battle-field, while fighting against the Huns (L. 53, 10–18). Katakalon showed exceptional courage in combat, not only because of his love for God, but also because he was much devoted to Emperor Constantine VII and his son Romanos II (L. 53, 13–16). Katakalon is known to us from various historical sources. He is mentioned in two documents in the archives of the Protaton of Athos dating from 942 and 943, in which he holds the following titles: βασιλικὸς πρωτοσπαθᾶριος and στρατηγός or στρατηλάτης Θεσσαλονίκης²⁷. There are also some tenth-century lead seals that can be attributed to him: Κατακαλῶ or Κατακαλῶν βασιλικῶ πρωτοσπαθαριῶ καὶ στρατηγῶ Μακεδονίας²⁸. Katakalon probably died in a battle against the Magyars, who, starting from the thirties of the tenth century, frequently invaded the Byzantine territories. In 943 the Magyars once again made a raid into the Balkan peninsula. Though an official peace treaty was concluded in the same year, warfare between the Hungarian nomadic tribes and the Byzantine armies continued on an irregular basis for another three years until 946²⁹. Katakalon, the strategos of Thessalonica, must have died in one of these skirmishes, probably after April 945, because the reference to Romanos II seems to indicate that Romanos was co-emperor at the time of Katakalon's death.

The collection of the Anonymous Patrician's poems also contains fifteen epigrams on two unusual images of the Archangels donated by Theophanes.

²⁵ See pp. 169 and 299.

²⁶ N. BANESCU, *Bulletin de l'Academie Roumaine. Section historique*, 11 (1924) 27–29, identifies this Katakalon with the grandfather of the author Kekaumenos, who, he thinks, was related to the Katakalon family. However, Kekaumenos' grandfather was strategos of Larissa in the years 976–983 and thus cannot have died during the reign of Constantine VII. This mistake is repeated by A. SAVVIDIS, *Δίπτυχα* 4 (1986–87) 14, n. 5.

²⁷ Archives de l' Athos. VII. Actes du Prôtaton, ed. D. PAPACHRYSSANTHOU. Paris 1975, nos. 4 and 6. See also G. ROUILLARD, *Byz* 8 (1933) 108–109.

²⁸ V. LAURENT, Documents de sigillographie Byzantine. La collection C. Orghidan. Paris 1952, 114, no. 211. G. ZACOS, Byzantine Lead Seals, II. Bern 1984, no. 931. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals. *Dumbarton Oaks* 1986, 70–71, no. 65.

²⁹ See N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Südost-Forschungen* 32 (1973) 3 (repr. in: idem, Documents et études sur les institutions de Byzance (VII^e–XV^e s.). London 1976, no. XXII).

Quatrains 17–23 describe a picture of the Archangel Michael, on which Christ, the Holy Virgin, John the Baptist and various martyrs were also represented. Quatrains 24–30 describe a picture of the Archangel Gabriel, accompanied by the same heavenly host. Quatrain 31, dealing with the Archangel Michael, implicitly informs us that these two pictures were to be seen in a monastery: ἔνοπλος εἰκὼν Μιχαὴλ πρωταγγέλου, καθὼς Ἰησοῦν, ῥωννύει μονοτρόπους (L. 52, 19–20). The epigrams are unfortunately silent on the precise nature of the pictorial composition. The verse ὁ Χριστὸς ἐγγὺς σὺν τεκούσῃ καὶ φίλῳ (L. 51, 19) may suggest some sort of Deësis and the verse πρὸς ὕψος ἤρθης ὡς μετάρσιος φύσιν (L. 50, 19) may indicate that the Archangels were represented hanging in mid-air. However, as I do not know of any iconographic equivalent, I have no idea how to visualize these two images. The epigrams emphasize the military role of the two Archangels. Theophanes, who commissioned these two images, repeatedly supplicates the Holy Virgin, John the Baptist and the Martyrs to ensure that Christ will send his two Archangels, Michael and Gabriel, to fight against the enemies. In Byzantine poetry the theme of military success is nearly always connected with the person of the emperor; even if a poem is composed to celebrate a great general (for instance, Katakalon), it seldom omits to mention the name of the reigning emperor for whom the general is fighting. However, in the Theophanes epigrams the name of the emperor is passed over in silence, although the emperor is ultimately, in the eyes of the Byzantines, the very embodiment of victory on the battle-ground. It is very likely, therefore, that Theophanes was not just an ordinary military commander, but a dignitary close enough to the emperor to assume prerogatives emanating from imperial power. The dedicatory epigram in the *Naumachika*, a treatise on naval warfare commissioned by Basil the Nothos in 959, constitutes an analogous case. It celebrates Basil's glorious victories on land and it expresses the hope that Basil may be equally victorious at sea (a reference to the impending Cretan expedition of 961)³⁰. Basil the Nothos is portrayed in the epigram as if he were the emperor, and his valour, wisdom and military experience are represented as virtues that are truly imperial. In 959 Basil the Nothos, the parakoimomenos of Constantine VII, was undoubtedly one of the most influential figures at the imperial court. More or less the same may be said of Theophanes. Between 940 and 970, the *floruit* of the Anonymous Patrician, there is only one Theophanes who really qualifies: the parakoimomenos of Romanos I, a powerful dignitary who enjoyed considerable influence between 925 and 944³¹. Theophanes' greatest military achievement was the crushing

³⁰ Ed. ST. KYRIAKIDIS, *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς ΑΠΘ 3* (1939) 281–288. For comments on this edition, see F. DÖLGER, *BZ* 40 (1940) 181–191. See also C. MAZZUCCHI, *Aevum* 52 (1978) 267–318.

³¹ See E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *BZ* 10 (1901) 166–181; H. GRÉGOIRE and P. ORGELS, *Byz* 24 (1954) 155–156; and CH. ANGELIDI, *Ὁ Βίος τοῦ ὀσίου Βασιλείου τοῦ Νέου*. Ioannina 1980, 146–164.

victory over the Rus' in 941 when he was in command of the imperial fleet. It is reasonable to conjecture that Theophanes commissioned the two pictures of the Archangels in order to celebrate the glorious victory of 941.

Some of the poems by the Anonymous Patrician deal with people who I have not been able to identify. Nos. 32–33 are epitaphs to a certain Joseph who died at a very young age; the lemma attached to no. 32 supplies the information that he was the brother of $\kappa\upsilon\theta$ Συμεών. No. 42 is a dedicatory epigram on an icon donated by an unknown Theodore. In nos. 39–40 the Anonymous Patrician addresses an opponent who had attacked him and his monastery in verse, but had not revealed his name. Nos. 7–15 are dedicatory epigrams on a church decoration which had been donated by a certain Romanos Argyros, who is variously called “judge” and “kensor”: see M. 415, 15–16; M 416, 41–42; and L. 49, 16–17. Romanos' church decoration consisted of nine mosaics which depicted the images of the feast cycle³². The church where these mosaics could be seen was probably the *katholikon* of the monastery called the $\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ Ἀργυρῶν or the $\mu\omicron\nu\eta$ / οἶκος τοῦ Ἀργυροπόλου, which was situated in the city-quarter called Kynegion³³. Can we also identify its patron? Of course, the name of Romanos III Argyros immediately comes to mind, since we know his splendid career in the legal profession: beginning from the rank of quaestor to that of eparch³⁴. As Romanos III Argyros was born in 968, he cannot have held the function of kensor before the year 990, at the earliest. However, as the earliest poems by the Anonymous Patrician date from 941 (Theophanes) and 945–946 (Katakalon), it seems unlikely that the Anonymous Patrician was active as a poet after c. 990. Byzantium certainly knew its Methuselahs, but without solid evidence, we should not augment the number of Byzantine octogenarians just like that. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that we are dealing with an unknown member of the famous Argyros family, who was called Romanos (like his renowned namesake), held the legal function of kensor³⁵ and lived in the mid-tenth century.

The Anonymous Patrician cannot be identified either. Some of his poems (nos. 37–40) indicate that he was living in a monastery at some point, but there

³² On this feast cycle, see chapter 5, pp. 184–186.

³³ See JANIN 1969: 51. Chr. Mityl. 68 talks about an icon that had been taken away from its original church and placed in the οἶκος τοῦ Ἀργυροπόλου; vv. 9–10 supply the information that the monastery of Argyros was in the city-quarter called Kynegion. See also Balsamon, ed. HORNA 1903: no. 31.

³⁴ See J.-F. VANNIER, *Familles byzantines: les Argyroi (IX–XII^e siècles)*. Paris 1975, 36–38.

³⁵ The legal function of kensor was introduced sometime after the reign of Romanos I. It is recorded for the first time in the Escorial *Taktikon* of 971–975. See OIKONOMIDES 1972: 325 and N. OIKONOMIDES, *FM* 7 (1986) 187 (repr. in: *Byzantium from the Ninth Century to the Fourth Crusade*. London 1992, no. XII).

is no reason to assume that he wrote all his poems in the monastery. Nos. 37–38 are programmatic poems which the Anonymous Patrician declaimed to his fellow monks as an introduction to the lecture of some edifying text (in the case of no. 37 the eighth ἀκρόασις of a *Life of John Chrysostom*). In nos. 39–40 the Anonymous Patrician defends himself and his monastery against the evil defamations of an unnamed opponent. The poems of the Anonymous Patrician unfortunately do not reveal more details about his life. All we know is that he wrote poems between c. 940 and 970 and that he probably belonged to the upper echelons of Byzantine society because he wrote poems for Constantine VII, Bardas Phokas, Theophanes the Parakoimomenos, Katakalon the strategos of Thessalonica and Romanos Argyros. The fact that we know so little about the Anonymous Patrician is much to be regretted, for, apart from John Geometres, there is no tenth-century poet who has left us so many poems and epigrams.