

# JÖB

---

Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik

SONDERDRUCK

JÖB

---

Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik

### *Herausgeber / Editors*

CHRISTIAN GASTGEBER (ÖAW, ABF)  
JOHANNES PREISER-KAPPELLER (ÖAW, ABF)  
CLAUDIA RAPP (Universität Wien / ÖAW, ABF)  
ELISABETH SCHIFFER (ÖAW, ABF)

Christian.Gastgeber@oeaw.ac.at  
Johannes.Preiser-Kapeller@oeaw.ac.at  
Claudia.Rapp@univie.ac.at  
Elisabeth.Schiffer@oeaw.ac.at

### *Redaktionelle Assistenz / Editorial Assistant*

COSIMO PARAVANO (Universität Wien)

### *Administrative Assistenz / Administrative Assistants*

PETRA GREGER (Universität Wien)  
INGRID WEICHSELBAUM (ÖAW, ABF)

ÖAW, ABF: Abteilung Byzanzforschung des Instituts für Mittelalterforschung  
der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften  
A-1020 Wien, Hollandstraße 11–13, 4. Stock

Universität Wien: Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien  
A-1090 Wien, Augasse 2–6, Universitätszentrum 1 (UZ1), Block A

### *Wissenschaftlicher Beirat / Advisory Board*

Wolfram Brandes (Frankfurt / M.), Leslie Brubaker (Birmingham),  
Salvatore Cosentino (Bologna), Arne Effenberger (Berlin), Olivier Delouis (Paris),  
John Haldon (Princeton), †Wolfram Hörandner (Wien), Sofia Kalopissi-Verti (Athen),  
Johannes Koder (Wien), Taxiarchis Koliass (Athen), Andreas E. Müller (Wien),  
Günter Prinzing (Mainz), Alexander Riehle (Harvard), Maciej Salamon (Krakau),  
Werner Seibt (Wien)

### *Internet-Homepage*

[www.oeaw.ac.at/byzanz/joeb](http://www.oeaw.ac.at/byzanz/joeb)  
[www.univie.ac.at/byzneo/](http://www.univie.ac.at/byzneo/)



# JÖB

---

Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik

Band 70 / 2020

 VERLAG DER  
ÖSTERREICHISCHEN  
AKADEMIE DER  
WISSENSCHAFTEN

*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*

Herausgegeben vom Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Abteilung Byzanzforschung der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und vom Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien

*Fortsetzung des Jahrbuches der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*

Als internationale wissenschaftliche peer reviewed Zeitschrift mit Unterstützung der Historisch-Kulturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien gedruckt



universität  
wien

Historisch-Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie, detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Lektorat: Nicola Wood (Englisch)

Die verwendete Papiersorte in dieser Publikation ist DIN EN ISO 9706 zertifiziert und erfüllt die Voraussetzung für eine dauerhafte Archivierung von schriftlichem Kulturgut.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten  
AU ISSN 0378-8660  
ISBN 978-3-7001-8893-3

Copyright © Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 2021

Satz: Christian Gastgeber (ÖAW, ABF)  
Druck und Bindung: Prime Rate, Budapest

<http://hw.oeaw.ac.at/joeb>  
<http://verlag.oeaw.ac.at>  
Made in Europe

## Inhaltsverzeichnis

<i>Siglenverzeichnis</i> .....	XIII
 <i>Artikel</i>	
Beatrice DASKAS, πτερόν, πτέρυξ, πτερύγιον. A Cultural-Historical Study of a Classical Greek Architectural Term and Derivatives, and their Post-Classical Meaning .....	1
Arne EFFENBERGER, Topographica corrigenda. Annakirche am Deuteron – <i>columna virginea</i> – Nikolaoskloster – Doppelkloster der Theotokos Kecharitomene und des Christos Philanthropos .....	39
Christophe ERISMANN, John the Grammarian and Photius. A Ninth-Century Byzantine Debate on Depiction, Visual Perception and Verbal Description .....	67
Christian GASTGEBER, Byzanz und das Konzil zu Basel und Ferrara. Neue Dokumente der Kaiser- sowie Patriarchatskanzlei und der Umgang mit Latein im Kontakt mit dem Westen .....	89
Filip HORÁČEK, The Astronomical Situation and a Hitherto Unregistered Comet in Synesius' <i>Calvitii encomium</i> 10, 5 / 209, 8–14 .....	197
Nikoletta KANAVOU, Reflections on the Relationship between the <i>Life and Passion of Saints Galaktion and Episteme</i> and the Ancient Greek Novel .....	209
Katharina KASKA, Zur hochmittelalterlichen Überlieferung von Maximus Confessor, <i>Capita de caritate</i> in der Übersetzung des Cerbanus .....	221
Ewald KISLINGER, Drei lateinische Lese Früchte zu <i>res byzantinae</i> .....	249
Dirk KRAUSMÜLLER, Assertive Bishops and a Wily Emperor. Nicholas Mouzalon on the Election of Patriarch Nicholas III Grammatikos (1084) .....	261
Lev LUKHOVITSKIY – Varvara ZHARKAYA, The Age of Πειθανάγκη. A Note on Remembrance and Reinvention of Ancient Words under the Komnenoi .....	271
Caroline MACÉ – Patrick ANDRIST, Understanding the Genesis of a Multi-Layered Byzantine Manuscript. The Illuminated Copy of Elias of Crete's Commentary on Gregory Nazianzen (Basel, UB, AN I 8) .....	289
Filip VAN TRICHT, Who murdered Archbishop William of Rouen (†1217)? The Valley of Philippi under Latin Rule (1204–circa 1224/25) .....	305
 CLUSTER 1: GEORGE OF PISIDIA	
Nicole KRÖLL, Introduction .....	335
Alice COSME, “Ποίαν γλώττης οὐκ ἐκίνησεν λύραν;” Poetic Style and Diction in the <i>Bellum Avaricum</i> of George of Pisidia .....	343
Anna Maria TARAGNA, Leo Choiosphaktes, Reader of George of Pisidia. Notes on the Language and Style of the So-Called <i>Thousand-Line Theology</i> .....	357
Nadine VIERMANN, Merging Supreme Commander and Holy Man. George of Pisidia's Poetic Response to Heraclius' Military Campaigns .....	379
Mary WHITBY, The Patriarch Sergius and the Theotokos .....	403

CLUSTER 2: DISCONTINUITY REVISITED. INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES IN SEVENTH- AND EIGHTH-CENTURY BYZANTIUM AND ARMENIA	
Christophe ERISMANN, Introduction .....	427
Benedetta CONTIN, Intertwining Aristotelian Ontology and Logic with Theology. The Early Armenian Non-Chalcedonian Perspective. The <i>Book of Beings</i> and the <i>Questions Addressed to the Heretical Diophysites</i> .....	429
S. Peter COWE, The Inception of Armenian Grammatical Thought out of the Matrix of Hellenic Paideia .....	465
Vessela VALIAVITCHARSKA, The Advanced Study of Rhetoric Between the Seventh and the Ninth Century .....	487
<i>Besprechungen</i>	
Dimitris K. AGORITSAS, Βίος και πολιτεία τῶν ὁσίων Νεκταρίου καὶ Θεοφάνους τῶν Ἀψαράδων κτιτόρων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Βαρλαάμ. Βίος – διαθηκῶν γράμμα – ἐγκωμιαστικά κείμενα ( <i>Eirini Afentoulidou-Leitgeb</i> ) .....	509
Coptica Palatina, Koptische Texte aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung (P.Heid.Kopt.), ed. A. BOUD’HORS – A. DELATTRE – G. SCHENKE – T. S. RICHTER – G. SCHMELZ ( <i>Stefan Bojowald</i> ) .....	509
Jean-Claude CHEYNET, Les sceaux byzantins de la collection Yavuz Tatış ( <i>Werner Seibt</i> ) .....	512
Leah DI SEGNI – Yoram TSAFRIR – Judith GREEN, The Onomasticon of Iudaea-Palaestina and Arabia in the Greek and Latin Sources, Vol. II, Part I and II ( <i>Basema Harmarneh</i> ) .....	513
Andrei GANDILA, Cultural Encounters on Byzantium’s Northern Frontier, c. AD 500–700: Coins, Artifacts and History ( <i>Johannes Preiser-Kapeller</i> ) .....	514
Andreas E. GKOUTZIOUKOSTAS, Θεσσαλονίκη επιγραφικά μελετήματα. Χρονολογικές και ερμηνευτικές προσεγγίσεις βυζαντινών κτητορικών επιγραφών από τα τείχη της πόλης και τη βασιλική του Αγίου Δημητρίου ( <i>Andreas Rhoby</i> ) .....	516
Martin HURBANIČ, The Avar Siege of Constantinople in 626. History and Legend ( <i>Nikolas Hächler</i> ) .....	518
Andrija JAKOVLJEVIĆ, Κατάλογος Χειρόγραφων Κωδίκων Βυζαντινής Μουσικής Ιερᾶς Αρχιεπισκοπῆς Κύπρου ( <i>Gerda Wolfram</i> ) .....	521
Emma LOOSLEY LEEMING, Architecture and Asceticism: Cultural Interaction between Syria and Georgia in Late Antiquity ( <i>Annegret Plontke-Lüning</i> ) .....	521
Robert G. OUSTERHOUT, Visualizing Community. Art, Material Culture and Settlement in Byzantine Cappadocia ( <i>Neslihan Asutay-Effenberger</i> ) .....	529
<i>Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae</i> .....	535

## SIGLENVERZEICHNIS

AA	Antichità Altoadriatiche
AASS	Acta Sanctorum. Antwerpen – Bruxelles 1643–1925
ABME	Ἀρχεῖον τῶν βυζαντινῶν μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος
ABSA	Annual of the British School at Athens
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, ed. E. SCHWARTZ [et al.]. Berlin 1927–
AD	Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον
AHC	Annuario Historiae Conciliorum
AHG	Analecta Hymnica Graeca, I. SCHIRÒ consilio et ductu edita, I–XII. Rom 1966–1980
AJA	American Journal of Archeology
AnBoll	Analecta Bollandiana
ArchMed	Archeologia Medievale
ArchPont	Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου
ASCL	Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania
ASM	Archivio Storico Messinese
ASN	Archivio Storico per le provincie Napolitane
ASNP	Annali della Scuola Normale superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia
ASP	Archivio Storico Pugliese
ASS	Archivio Storico Siciliano
ASSO	Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale
BBA	Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten
BCH	Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
BF	Byzantinische Forschungen
BHG	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca. 3 <sup>e</sup> éd. par F. HALKIN. I–III. Novum Auctarium. Bruxelles 1957. 1984
BMGS	Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies
BNJ	Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher
BNV	Byzantina et Neograeca Vindobonensia
BollGrott	Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata
BAR	British Archaeological Reports
BHM	Bulletin of the History of Medicine
BSI	Byzantinoslavica
BV	Byzantina Vindobonensia
Byz	Byzantion
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CAG	Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca, I–XXIII. Berlin 1882–1909
CahArch	Cahiers Archéologiques
CARB	Corsi di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantine
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CIG	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. I–IV. Berlin 1828–1877
CIMAGL	Cahiers de l'Institut du moyen-âge grec et latin
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum, ed. M. GEERARD. I–V. Supplementum. Turnhout 1974–2018
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DACL	Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. I–XV. Paris 1913–1953
DChAE	Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας
DGE	F. ADRADOS [et al.], Diccionario griego-español. Madrid 1980–
DHGE	Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques. Paris 1912–
DIEE	Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος
DNP	Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike. I–XVI. Stuttgart – Weimar 1996–2003
DOML	Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library



DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
DOS	Dumbarton Oaks Studies
DOT	Dumbarton Oaks Texts
EEBS	Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν
EO	Échos d'Orient
EpAnt	Epigraphica Anatolica
EPhS	Ὁ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος
FM	Fontes Minores
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller
GRBS	Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies
HdA	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
Hell	Ἑλληνικά
IJNA	International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration
IRAIK	Izvestija Russkago Archeologičeskago Instituta v Konstantinopol'e
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
JbAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JHSt	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JÖB	Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik (1969–)
JÖBG	Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft (1951–1968)
JRA	Journal of Roman Archaeology
JRSt	Journal of Roman Studies
KyprSpud	Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαί
LBG	Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, erstellt von E. TRAPP [et al.]. I–VIII. Wien 1994–2017
LCI	Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie. I–VIII. Rom u.a. 1968–1976
LexMA	Lexikon des Mittelalters. I–IX. München 1980–1998
LSJ	H.G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT – H. STUART JONES – R. MCKENZIE, A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford <sup>1</sup> 1925–1940. Revised Supplement, ed. by P.G.W. GLARE with the assistance of A.A. THOMPSON. Oxford 1996
LThK <sup>2</sup>	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. I–X. Freiburg <sup>2</sup> 1957–1968
LThK <sup>3</sup>	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. I–XI. Freiburg <sup>3</sup> 1993–2001
Maked	Μακεδονικά
MBM	Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia
MEFRA	Melanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome
MEG	Medioevo Greco. Rivista di storia e filologia bizantina
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
Mill	Millennium
MiÖG	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung
MM	F. MIKLOSICH – I. MÜLLER, Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi I–VI. Wien 1860–1890
MMB	Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae
NE	Νέος Ἑλληνομῆμων
OC	Orientalia Christiana
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
ODB	The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. by A. P. KAZHDAN [et al.]. Vol. I–III. New York – Oxford 1991
PAA	Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν
PG	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca, ed. J.-P. MIGNE. 1–161. Paris 1857–1866
PL	Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina, ed. J.-P. MIGNE. 1–221. Paris 1844–1880
PLP	Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, erstellt von E. TRAPP [et al.]. Wien 1976–1996
PLRE	The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, ed. A. H. M. JONES – J. R. MARTINDALE – J. MORRIS [et al.]. 1–3. Cambridge 1971–1992
PmbZ I/II	R.-J. LILIE [et al.], Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Erste Abteilung (641–867), Zweite Abteilung (867–1025). Berlin 1999–2013
PO	Patrologia Orientalis, ed. R. GRAFFIN – F. NAU. 1–. Paris 1904–
PRK	Das Register des Patriarchats von Konstantinopel, hrsg. v. H. HUNGER – O. KRESTEN [et al.]. 1–. Wien 1981–
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. I–. Stuttgart 1950–
RbK	Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst. I–. Stuttgart 1966–
RE	PAULYs Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung ... v. G. WISSOWA [et al.]. 66 Halbbde, 15 Suppl.-Bde. Stuttgart – München 1893–1978.

REB	Revue des Études Byzantines
REG	Revue des Études Grecques
RESEE	Revue des Études Sud-Est-Européennes
RGK	Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten. I–. Wien 1981–
RHM	Römische Historische Mitteilungen
ROC	Revue de l’Orient Chrétien
RSBN	Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici
RSL	Rivista di Studi Liguri
SBN	Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici
SBS	Studies in Byzantine Sigillography
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
Script	Scriptorium
SicArch	Sicilia Archeologica
SIFC	Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica
StT	Studi e Testi
Symm	Σύμμεικτα
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
Tgl	Thesaurus Graecae Linguae I–VIII. Paris 1831–1865
ThEE	Θρησκευτική και Ἡθική Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία. I–XII. Athen 1962–1968
TIB	Tabula Imperii Byzantini. I–. Wien 1976–
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. CD-ROM E. University of California at Irvine 2000, jeweils aktuelle Version unter <a href="http://www.tlg.uci.edu">www.tlg.uci.edu</a> (mit <i>site licence</i> ).
TM	Travaux et Mémoires
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
VTIB	Veröffentlichungen d. Kommission für die TIB
VV	Vizantijskij Vremennik
WBS	Wiener Byzantinistische Studien
WSt	Wiener Studien
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZMNP	Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvěščenija
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZRVI	Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta

ANNA MARIA TARAGNA<sup>a</sup>

## Leo Choiosphaktes, Reader of George of Pisidia

*Notes on the Language and Style of the So-Called Thousand-Line Theology\**

**ABSTRACT:** The paper deals with the linguistic and stylistic reception of George of Pisidia's poetic work by Leo Choiosphaktes in his didactic poem *Thousand-Line Theology* (*Chiliostichos Theologia*), offering a short overview of cases that reveal the close connection between these two authors. Choiosphaktes composed his poem "by means of" Pisides, a master carefully read and studied, whose poems he reworked with a *cento* technique for his selected readers, in the choice and disposition of the words into the verses, in the search for technical effects, eminently acoustical and structural, but mostly without constructing a literary allusive game with Pisides' texts.

**KEYWORDS:** George of Pisidia's *Nachleben*, Leo Choiosphaktes, *Thousand-Line Theology* (*Chiliostichos Theologia*), Cento Technique, Verse-Structural Correspondences, Wordplays

### INTRODUCTION: THE RECEPTION OF GEORGE OF PISIDIA

When we look at the reception of George of Pisidia's poetic work throughout Byzantine times, we find a rather particular situation<sup>1</sup>.

As is known, George was highly appreciated in later centuries: the Byzantines considered him as the "archetype" of iambic poetry and model for τὸ ἐνθυμηματικόν (the concise style in presenting rhetorical arguments)<sup>2</sup>, and a poet similar to (or even better than) Euripides in versification, as

<sup>a</sup> Anna Maria Taragna: University of Turin, Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Via sant'Ottavio, 20-10124 Turin; annamaria.taragna@unito.it

\* This article is the written version of a paper given at the colloquium "From Athens to Constantinople. IV. Late Antique Greek and Byzantine Literature in Context. The Poetry of George of Pisidia" at the University of Vienna on January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020. I sincerely thank Herbert Bannert, Christian Gastgeber and Nicole Kröll for their kind invitation and the two anonymous reviewers for their precious remarks and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography on this reception is not very extensive: after the fundamental studies of L. STERNBACH (*De Georgii Pisidae apud Theophanem aliosque historicos reliquias; De Georgii Pisidae fragmentis a Suida servatis. Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci, Wydział filologiczny*, ser. II, 15 (1900), 1–107 and 108–198 [repr. in: IDEM, *Studia philologica in Georgium Pisidam*. Kraków 1900, 1–107 and 108–198]), there has not been an overall work about this topic. A major inquiry into the broad *Hexaemeron's* *Nachleben* is provided by F. GONNELLI (*Giorgio di Pisidia, Esamerone. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e indici*. Pisa 1998, 40–42, 103–107 and the *apparatus* of quotations, imitations, echoes in the Byzantine iambic poems from the seventh to the fifteenth century).

<sup>2</sup> George is proposed as a model of succinct argumentation (τὸ ἐνθυμηματικόν) in a passage by Ps.-Gregory of Corinth (thirteenth century), *On the Four Parts of the Perfect Speech* (Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων μερῶν τοῦ τελείου λόγου): Τὸ μέντοι ἐνθυμήμασι χρᾶσθαι κοσμεῖ μὲν καὶ μᾶλλον τὰ μέτρα, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τούτων ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀπλῶς ῥητορείας καὶ λογογραφίας. Ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τὰ ἱαμβεῖα λογογραφία τίς ἐστιν εὐρυθμος, ζηλούσθω σοι καὶ τὸ ἐνθυμηματικὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ἔχεις ἀρχέτυπον τὸν Πισίδην, νεωτέρους τὸν Καλλικλῆν, τὸν Πτωχοπρόδρομον καὶ εἴ τις τοιοῦτος· ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τὸν Θεολόγον, τὸν Σοφοκλῆν, ἐκτὸς τῶν ποιητικῶν ἰδιωμάτων αὐτοῦ, τὰ εὐφραδέστερα τοῦ Λυκόφρονος καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον (ed. W. HÖRANDNER, *Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios, Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede. MEG* 12 (2012) 87–131, 108, 160–165; see 129: "Diese Aufzählung ist nicht uninteressant: Pisides steht sozusagen zwischen den Zeiten, er schreibt noch korrekte jambische Trimeter und hält in den Augen der Byzantiner dem Vergleich mit antiken Dichtern stand"). The passage is reproduced nearly *verbatim* by Joseph Rhakendytes (thirteenth–fourteenth century) in his *Synopsis of Rhetoric* (Σύνοψις ῥητορικῆς, ed. Ch. WALZ, *Rhetores Graeci*, 9 vols. Stuttgart – Tübingen 1832–1836, III (1832) 465–569: 562, 6–15). See W. HÖRANDNER, *Beobachtungen zur Literaturästhetik der Byzantiner. Einige byzantinische Zeugnisse zu Metrik*

Michael Psellos wrote in a short essay, comparing these two authors<sup>3</sup>.

But the *Nachleben* of George of Pisidia is very peculiar. Even if his poems were quoted and included in Byzantine lexica and gnomological collections, they have been transmitted in just a few manuscripts<sup>4</sup>. His six panegyrics can be found in a restricted number of *codices*: *In Heraclium ex Africa redeuntem*, *In Bonum patricium*, and *In restitutionem Sanctae Crucis* are preserved in only one manuscript, the Paris. Suppl. gr. 690 (which is also the *codex unicus* for the poem *In Alypium*); only four manuscripts preserve *Bellum Avaricum* and *Heraclias*<sup>5</sup> and only five manuscripts preserve the *Expeditio Persica*<sup>6</sup>. George's other ethical-religious poems (*Contra Severum*, *In Christi resurrectionem*, *De vanitate vitae* and *De vita humana*) likewise survive in four, four, eight and four manuscripts respectively<sup>7</sup>. In sharp contrast to this manuscript tradition, George's *Hexaameron* has come down to us in no fewer than fifty *codices* and was also translated into Armenian (eighth–ninth century) and into Slavonic (thirteenth–fourteenth century)<sup>8</sup>.

---

und Rhythmik. *BSI* 56 (1995 = Stephanos. *Studia byzantina ac slavica Vladimíro Vavřínek ad annum sexagesimum quintum dedicata*. Ediderunt R. Dostálová – V. Konzal. L. Havlíková adiuvante) 279–290 (esp. 287–289); A. RHOBY, Labeling Poetry in the Middle and Late Byzantine Period. *Byz* 85 (2015) 259–283.

If the identification is correct, George of Pisidia was also considered as the “father” of the Muse Calliope: see *AP* XVI 312: Καλλιόπη βασίλεια Γεώργιον εἶπεν ἰδοῦσα / “Οὗτος ἐμὸς γενέτης γνήσιος, οὐ Κρονίδης” (ed. H. BECKBY, *Anthologia Graeca*. Griechisch–Deutsch, 4 vols. Munich 1957–1958: IV [Books XII–XVI. 1958] 470. See also *The Greek Anthology*. With an English Translation by W. R. PATON, 5 vols. [Loeb Classical Library 67. 68. 84–86]. Cambridge, MA – London 1916–1918: V [Book XIII–XVI. *Loeb Classical Library* 86. 1918] 346 [Ἀδελφον. Εἰς εἰκόνα Γεωργίου] and 347, n. 1: “Probably George of Pisidia (seventh century A.D.), author of numerous poems”). Cf. *AP* IX 454 (ed. BECKBY: III [Books IX–XI. 1958] 284), Οὗτος ἐμὸς γενέτης γνήσιος, οὐ Κρονίδης, and see PATON, *Greek Anthology*, III (Book IX. *Loeb Classical Library* 84. 1917) 254 (Ἀδελφον. Τίνας ἄν εἶποι λόγους Καλλιόπη εἰς Γεώργιον).

<sup>3</sup> Ο αὐτὸς ἐρωτήσαντι “Τίς ἐστίχζε κρείττον, ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἢ ὁ Πισίδης;” (ed. A. R. DYCK, *Michael Psellus, The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodoros and Achilles Tatius* [BV 16]. Vienna 1986, 40–50). See A. KAMBYLIS, *Michael Psellos’ Schrift über Euripides und Pisides. Probleme der Textkonstitution*. *JÖB* 44 (1994 = ΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ. Herbert Hunger zum 80. Geburtstag, ed. W. Hörandner – J. Koder – O. Kresten) 203–215; IDEM, *Michael Psellos’ Schrift Τίς ἐστίχζε κρείττον ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἢ ὁ Πισίδης. Textkritische Bemerkungen*. *JÖB* 56 (2006) 135–149. About the reception of George of Pisida by Michael Psellos, cf. also A. M. TARAGNA, *Sulla fortuna di Giorgio di Pisidia in Michele Psello. Il caso del carne In Christi resurrectionem*, in: *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Hinterberger – E. Schiffer (*Byzantisches Archiv* 20). Berlin – New York 2007, 308–329.

<sup>4</sup> On Pisides’ manuscript tradition, see A. PERTUSI, *Dei poemi perduti di Giorgio di Pisidia*. *Aevum* 30 (1956) 395–427: 400–408; see also IDEM, *Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (Studia Patristica et Byzantina 7)*. Ettal 1959, 49–67. Cf. M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, 2 vols. (*WBS* 24/1–2). Vienna 2003–2019, I 57–58, especially 57 n. 12 “Pertusi’s list is slightly outdated [...]. But although Pertusi’s list is not entirely reliable and new manuscripts will undoubtedly be discovered, the overall picture will not change radically”. In this regard, see F. GONNELLI, *Il De vita humana di Giorgio Pisida*. *Bollettino dei Classici*, ser. III, 12 (1991) 118–138: 121–122; IDEM, *Esamerone 17–37*. For an updated survey of the manuscript tradition of some of Pisides’ poems see LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 30 n. 36 (*In Christi resurrectionem*); II 148 n. 7 (*De vanitate vitae*); II 148 n. 8 (*De vita humana*).

<sup>5</sup> Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, Vat. gr. 1126, Roman. Corsin. 1104 (41.F.25), Roman. Vallic. gr. 130.

<sup>6</sup> Paris. Suppl. gr. 690, Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, Vat. gr. 1126, Roman. Corsin. 1104 (41.F.25), Roman. Vallic. gr. 130. 121. 142.

<sup>7</sup> *Contra Severum* in Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, Vat. gr. 1126, Vat. Barb. gr. 279, Roman. Corsin. 1104 (41.F.25). *In Christi resurrectionem* in Paris. Suppl. gr. 690, Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, Vat. gr. 1126, Vat. Barb. gr. 279 (there was also the Taur. gr. 360, lost in the great fire in 1904 that reduced to ashes the National Library of Turin). *De vanitate vitae* in Paris. Suppl. gr. 690, Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, Paris. gr. 1630, Vat. gr. 1126, Vat. Ottob. gr. 324, Cantabr. UL LL.IV. 12; two manuscripts, Monac. gr. 416 and Paris. gr. 1220 preserve a short fragment, vv. 41–56, transmitted with the poems of Gregory of Nazianzos, as poem I 2, 18; also for the *De vanitate vitae* there was the burnt Taur. gr. 360. *De vita humana* in Paris. gr. 1630 (the only manuscript that offers the whole text); Monac. gr. 416, Paris. Coisl. 56 and Paris. Suppl. gr. 1090 have transmitted a fragment, vv. 1–58, with the poems of Gregory of Nazianzos.

<sup>8</sup> See G. FERMEGLIA, *Studi sul testo delle due versioni (slava ed armena) dello “Hexaameron” di Giorgio Pisida*. *Memorie dell’Istituto Lombardo – Accademia di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di Lettere – Scienze morali e storiche* 28 (1964) 227–333;

The reason for this paradox—as modern scholars have shown<sup>9</sup>—is simple: the *Hexaemeron* was widely read in Byzantium (and therefore it was widely copied over the centuries) because of its useful theological, philosophical and scientific information. This information was always considered interesting and “modern” by the readers of the future generations; whereas the rest of Pisides’ poetry—for which George was widely acclaimed in his own time by the audience at the court of Herakleios (610–641) and in the presence of Patriarch Sergios (610–638)—was considered less useful by Byzantines of later generations, probably because those poems were too ephemeral, linked to George’s historical moment. As Marc Lauxtermann writes: “Pisides’ occasional poems attracted a large audience of listeners, but only a select public of readers.”<sup>10</sup>

Among these selected readers from later generations is Leo Choiosphaktes, who will be examined, in this contribution, in comparison with George of Pisidia.

### GEORGE OF PISIDIA AND LEO CHOIROSPHAKTES

In many respects, the life and the literary production of Leo Choiosphaktes<sup>11</sup>—who lived approximately three centuries after George, in the first period of the Macedonian dynasty—resembles the life and the literary production of Pisides.

Like George of Pisidia—and many other Byzantine *literati*—, Choiosphaktes survived not only by his pen, but he also had an administrative career, albeit not in the ecclesiastical environment (as George did, in the service of Patriarch Sergios), but at the imperial court, under Basil I (867–886) and Leo VI (886–912), of whom he was a relative<sup>12</sup>. Unlike Pisides, however, Leo Choiosphaktes, at a certain point of his career, fell from favour and, at first, was banished to a place in the stronghold of Petra, then—because of his implication in the failed *coup d'état* of Constantine Doukas against the regency government of Constantine VII—he was forced to enter the Stoudios monastery, where he presumably remained until his death, sometime after 920.

The literary production of Leo Choiosphaktes, just like that of George of Pisidia, encompasses a wide range of works, in verse, above all, as well as in prose, with secular topics as well as religious ones, both linked to contemporary persons and circumstances (like his letters and Anacreon-

G. ULUHOGIAN, In margine alla versione armena dello ‘Hexaemeron’ di Giorgio di Pisidia. *Rivista di Bizantinistica* (= *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi* 6) 1 (1991) 91–109.

<sup>9</sup> PERTUSI, Poemi perduti 408–409; LAUXTERMANN, Byzantine Poetry I 57–58; I. VASSIS, George of Pisidia: the Spring of Byzantine Poetry?, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhoby – N. Zagklas (*Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World* 4). Leiden – Boston 2019, 149–165.

<sup>10</sup> LAUXTERMANN, Byzantine Poetry I 58.

<sup>11</sup> For his biography, the most important study is G. KOLIAS, Léon Choerosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice. *Biographie – Correspondance* (Texte et traduction) (*Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie* 31). Athens 1939, 15–73. See also P. MAGDALINO, In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choiosphaktes and Constantine Manasses, in: *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. Maguire. Washington, D.C. 1997, 141–165 (esp. 146–161); F. CICCOLELLA, Cinque poeti bizantini. Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 5). Alessandria 2000, 58–64; G. R. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro e la Bisanzio del IX secolo. Le Anacreontee e il carme *Sulle Terme Pitiche*. Catania 2012, 43–70. For an updated survey of Leo’s life and works, see I. VASSIS, Leon Magistros Choiosphaktes. Chiliostichos Theologia. Editio princeps. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Indices (*Supplementa Byzantina. Texte und Untersuchungen* 6). Berlin – New York 2002, 1–18.

<sup>12</sup> Choiosphaktes married a relative of the emperor and was in turn a relative—perhaps a brother—of Zoe Karbonopsina, the fourth wife of Leo VI. Under Basil I, Leo became μυστικός (the first to hold this office) and personal imperial secretary (ἐπι τοῦ κανικλείου), while Leo VI granted him the three higher dignities of μάγιστρος, ἀνθύπατος and πατρικίος (indicated in the acrostic that links the chapters of Choiosphaktes’ *Thousand-Line Theology*: see *infra*). On the relationship of Choiosphaktes with the emperor Leo VI see also S. F. TOUGHER, *The Reign of Leo VI (886–912). Politics and People* (*The Medieval Mediterranean* 15). Leiden – New York – Cologne 1997.

tic poems) and not<sup>13</sup>. But in this regard, we have to remember that Leo’s authorship, unfortunately, has been confused with that of two homonyms of the same centuries: Leo VI the Wise and Leo the Mathematician, all three sometimes being designated as Leo the Philosopher<sup>14</sup>. The work that will be analysed here, the so-called *Thousand-Line Theology* (Χιλιόστιχος Θεολογία), is a work of certain attribution to Choiosphaktes, closely connected—as we will see—with the literary production of George of Pisidia.

It is very likely, indeed, that the two poets, George and Leo, were already closely connected in the opinion of the Byzantines. In a text that has come down to us in one manuscript under the name of Michael Psellos, but that must have been written in the twelfth century or even later—*i.e.* the Ps.-Psellian poem 68—, the author criticizes his addressee for his bad verses, disguising his criticism with heavy sarcasm, namely by mentioning authors who cannot compete with the addressee. And here, George of Pisidia is mentioned together with four other authors (vv. 81–85)<sup>15</sup>:

<p>σὺ δ’ αὖ, ὑπέριμε Ψελλέ,  Λέων καὶ Θεοφύλακτε  δεινὴν καὶ πάνυ χαλεπὴν  προμεταστάντες ὑπὸ γῆν  85 τούς στίχους οὓς μοι πέπομφεν</p>	<p>Πισίδη, Χριστοφόρε,  πρόεδρε Βουλγαρίας  ὑπέστητε ζημίαν  καὶ μὴ μεμαθηκότες  μόνος ὁ στιχοπλόκος<sup>16</sup>.</p>
---	--

Three authors can easily be recognized as Michael Psellos, Christopher of Mitylene and Theophylaktos of Ohrid (all of the eleventh century), whereas “Leo” refers, most probably, to “our” Leo Choiosphaktes, poet of the *Thousand-Line Theology*<sup>17</sup>.

George and Leo are two poets who really stand very close to each other, especially from a linguistic and stylistic point of view, in addition to the metrics and the literary genre, and the debt of Leo to George in versification is beyond any doubt and deserves more attention than, perhaps, it has received until now.

#### THE SO-CALLED *THOUSAND-LINE THEOLOGY* OF LEO CHOIROSPHAKTES

We will focus on the so-called *Thousand-Line Theology* (Χιλιόστιχος Θεολογία), which is the most ambitious among the surviving works of Choiosphaktes.

It is transmitted, with many corruptions and lacunas, by a *codex unicus*—the Vaticanus gr. 1257 (ff. 39r–57r), a tenth-century miscellaneous manuscript copied in Calabria very near the date of

<sup>13</sup> The complete list of works either written by or attributed to Choiosphaktes (but also either lost or incorrectly attributed to others, like his didactic poem *On Thermal Springs*: ed. C. GALLAVOTTI, *Planudea* (X). 37. *L’anacreontica De Thermis* di Leone Magistro. *Bollettino dei Classici*, ser. III, 11 (1990) 78–103: 86–89; cf. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro 135–167, who rejects the attribution to Choiosphaktes) is in VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 10–18 (with bibliography).

<sup>14</sup> As Alexander Kazhdan writes “It is not improbable that some poems which are commonly considered the works of Leo VI may in fact have originated from the pen of Choiosphaktes” (A. KAZHDAN, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000)*, ed. Chr. Angelidi [National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. Research Series 4]. Athens 2006, 80).

<sup>15</sup> *Michaelis Pselli poemata*, ed. L. G. WESTERINK (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*). Stuttgart – Leipzig 1992, 454, 81–85.

<sup>16</sup> “And you, hypertimos Psellos, Pisides, Christophoros, Leon and Theophylaktos, bishop of Bulgaria, you have suffered a terrible and hard loss, by going under the sod prematurely, without having read the verses that this single versifier has sent to me”, in the translation by F. BERNARD, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025–1081 (Oxford Studies in Byzantium)*. Oxford 2014, 53–54. On this poem, see W. HÖRANDNER – A. PAUL, *Zu Ps.-Psellos, Gedichte 67 (Ad monachum superbum) und 68 (Ad eundem)*. *MEG* 11 (2011) 107–137; cf. W. HÖRANDNER, *The Byzantine Didactic Poem – a Neglected Literary Genre? A Survey With Special Reference to the Eleventh Century*, in: *Poetry and its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, ed. F. Bernard – K. Demoen. Farnham – Burlington 2012, 55–67, 62.

<sup>17</sup> BERNARD, *Writing and Reading* 54; for other suggestions, see HÖRANDNER – PAUL, *Zu Ps.-Psellos* 123 (with bibliography).

Leo's composition<sup>18</sup>—and it is now available in the excellent edition by Ioannis Vassis, published some years ago, in 2002, in the series *Supplementa byzantina. Texte und Untersuchungen*<sup>19</sup>. The work consists of around 1150 dodecasyllables, distributed in forty chapters, the initial letters of which form an acrostic identifying the poem as the work of Leo *magistros*<sup>20</sup>. Choiosphaktes must surely be considered the author, while the identification of the addressee has raised some problems. The *Chiliostichos Theologia* is a didactic poem addressed, in effect, to a person referred to as μύστης (“disciple”, “initiate”)—at the beginning of chapters I, X and XXII: vv. 9, 266 and 618 (where it recurs twice)—, τέκνον (vv. 224, 818, 969) and τέκνον ἡγαπημένον (in the same line 618, with the two μύστα), as well as φίλτατον κάρα (v. 646), but also as ἄναξ (v. 1048) and “glory of the palace” (τῶν ἀνακτόρων κλέος) at the beginning of the last chapter, XL (v. 1131)<sup>21</sup>. At the same time, in the prologue there is a reference to friends (φίλοις, v. 4) who must be expert in sciences to read this book<sup>22</sup>. As Vassis has convincingly argued, the addressee is the young Constantine VII (913–959) and the poem was composed between 908 and 912, perhaps when Choiosphaktes was still in exile and Constantine (born in 905) was only three, and at most seven years old<sup>23</sup>; while the πρόλογος—as Hörandner rightly says—is “an addition made at a later date (perhaps by an anonymous reader) when the poem was no longer *only* for Constantine”<sup>24</sup>.

In any case, the *Thousand-Line Theology* is not exactly a work for a child! It is very difficult to understand in its arguments and requires a very learned reader, equipped with all the intellectual capacities needed to decode and appreciate this didactic poem. It is, in fact, a demonstration of the

<sup>18</sup> For the manuscript, see P. CANART, Le Vaticanus graecus 1257 et une poésie inédite de Jean Damascène. *BollGrott* 54 (2000) 141–154; F. RONCONI, I manoscritti greci miscellanei. Ricerche su esemplari dei secoli IX–XII (*Testi, studi, strumenti* 21). Spoleto 2008, 185–199. A short fragment of six lines (L. Ch. *Chil.* I 14–19 = 22–27 [74–75 VASSIS]) of the *Thousand-Line Theology* has been preserved, as an epigram, in thirty other manuscripts, for which see VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 57–62.

<sup>19</sup> The whole text had already been edited by Andreas Rhoby, but his dissertation has not been published: A. RHOBY, *Die Chiliostichos Theologia des Leon Choiosphaktes*. Edition und Kommentar. Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des Magistergrades der Philosophie eingereicht an der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien, Vienna 1997. Parts of the text were published, in the same year, 1997, by Paul MAGDALINO (*Byzantine Courtier* 149–159), who called his own edition “an imperfect working transcription” (149).

<sup>20</sup> The acrostic, which links all the chapters, is the following: Λέοντος μαγίστρου ἀνθυπάτου πατρικίου πόνημα. In the Vat. gr. 1257 the text is prefixed by a prologue of eight verses [73 VASSIS], followed by 1151 verses, instead of the 1200 that were expected in the forty chapters, each one formed by thirty lines (Στίχοι ιαμβικοί... ἀφορισμένοι κατὰ τριακοντάδας: as we can read in the title of the poem [71 VASSIS]).

<sup>21</sup> The word μύστα is always in the same position before the caesura: Λάτρευε, μύστα, τῷ φύσει θεῷ μόν[ω] (L. Ch. *Chil.* I 1 = 9 [74 VASSIS]); Γνώναί σε, μύστα, τὴν ἀνέκφραστον φύσιν (X 1 = 266 [92 VASSIS]); ὦ μύστα, μύστα, τέκνον ἡγαπημένον (XXII 2 = 618 [116 VASSIS]). With the exception of this last verse, which also presents the *syntagma* τέκνον ἡγαπημένον, the word τέκνον is always at the verse ending, as the final term of the line: ὄντων ἀπείρων τῶν γενητῶν γάρ, τέκνον (VIII 19 = 224 [89 VASSIS]); ἐγγηγόρωσ οὖν εὐσέβει καλῶς, τέκνον (XXVIII 27 = 818 [129 VASSIS]); δόξαζε καὶ σὺναπτε φῶς πρὸς ἓν, τέκνον (XXXIV 2 = 969 [140 VASSIS]). In the same way, φίλτατον κάρα, ἄναξ and τῶν ἀνακτόρων κλέος close their lines: Τὰ τῆς προνοίας ἔργα, φίλτατον κάρα (XXIII 1 = 646 [118 VASSIS]); εἰ γάρ τις εἴποι μηδ' ὀπωστιοῦν, ἄναξ (XXXVII 4 = 1048 [146 VASSIS]); τί δογματίζω, τῶν ἀνακτόρων κλέος (XL 2 = 1131 [152 VASSIS]).

<sup>22</sup> Vv. 3–4 (73 VASSIS): εἰ δ' αὖ μαθημάτων γε νῆς τυγχάνεις, / ἄ μὴ νοεῖς ἕασον εἰδῶσιν φίλοις (“but if you are not expert in sciences, leave, what you do not know, to expert friends”, in the translation by W. HÖRANDNER, *Teaching with Verse in Byzantium*, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhoby – N. Zagklas [*Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World* 4]. Leiden – Boston 2019, 459–486: 475).

<sup>23</sup> VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 22–24. Constantine VII was the addressee of another didactic poem by Leo Choiosphaktes, *On Thermal Springs* (see *supra* n. 13), which has come down to us in two different versions: a longer version dedicated to Constantine VII when his father Leo VI was still among the living (*i.e.* in the same years 908–912 as the *Chiliostichos Theologia*), and a shorter version addressed to Everyman (*i.e.* fellow intellectuals) and “incorrectly attributed to Paul the Silentary in the *Planudean Anthology* and its apographs”: LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 207–210 (esp. 207, which continues: “there is no reason to doubt that Leo Choiosphaktes wrote both versions for different occasions and different audiences [...]. It was certainly not unusual for didactic poems to circulate in more than one version and with dedications to different people”).

<sup>24</sup> HÖRANDNER, *Teaching* 475.

nature of God, of His transcendent oneness, of the omnipresence of His providence in time and space, and of the threefold manifestation of His glory. This demonstration is expressed in the terms of apophatic theology, according to which knowledge of God is attainable only through negation, and which has its main source in Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. This demonstration, moreover, is accompanied, on the one hand, by a polemic against heretical views (refutation of pantheism, polytheism, dualism) and, on the other, by a cosmological account, where Leo argues that the material world is not uncreated, uncontrolled or infinite, but is the evidence for the unity and the providence of the divine mind. At the same time, however, the poet is silent on many other important issues of Christianity, mostly regarding the figure of Christ, the salvation of men through His incarnation, and the role of the Church. “In essence—as Magdalino wrote—the content of the work boils down to a philosophical argument, in Neoplatonic terms, for a monotheistic Christian cosmology.”<sup>25</sup>

Therefore, with the *Chiliostichos Theologia*, Choiosphaktes follows the lines of the patristic and philosophical tradition, providing great proof of his knowledge and his ability as a *literatus*, even if this was not appreciated by all his contemporaries: Leo was subject, in effect, to a virulent attack by the metropolitan of Caesarea, Arethas, who in a text entitled *Χοιροσφάκτης ἢ μισογόνος* (*Choiosphaktes or the Hater of Trickery*) accused him of Hellenism and impiety<sup>26</sup>. But the reading of Choiosphaktes’ work—in which the author omits vital elements of the orthodox creed, to give more emphasis to *logos* than to the faith, and (last but not least) marginalizes the Church—effectively might have been offensive for the clergy of his time<sup>27</sup>.

#### THE FIRST STROPHE OF THE *THOUSAND-LINE THEOLOGY*

##### I: TECHNICAL DEVICES

Beyond the content, it is with regard to the language and style, in connection with the metre and rhythm, that we find one of most remarkable features in the *Thousand-Line Theology* and the field, we would say, where Leo really wants to challenge his reader. The work is undoubtedly a high rhetorical exercise, which shows: I. regular metrics in the form of the so-called “pure” iambs, *καθαροὶ στίχοι*, *i.e.* iambs “unadulterated”, characterized by the total absence of metrical resolutions, as they are defined in the title of Leo’s poem in the *codex Vaticanus*<sup>28</sup>; II. familiarity with

<sup>25</sup> MAGDALINO, *Byzantine Courtier* 150. For the philosophical and patristic sources of the *Thousand-Line Theology*, see VASSIS, *Chiliostichos app.* and 227–239 (Index locorum, *passim*): “Wie man mit einem Blick auf den *apparatus fontium* oder auf den *Index locorum* dieser Edition leicht feststellen kann, gehören zu Leons Gewährsmännern zum einen der bei den Byzantinern als der Theologe *par excellence* geltende Gregor von Nazianz, dessen Homilien und Gedichte Leon oft sklavisch imitiert, zum anderen Pseudo-Dionysios Areopagites, der Hauptvertreter der negativen Theologie” (VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 32).

<sup>26</sup> Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis scripta minora, 2 vols., ed. L. G. WESTERINK (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*). Leipzig 1968–1972, I 200–212. See P. KARLIN-HAYTER, Arethas, Choiosphaktes and the Saracen Vizir. *Byz* 35, 1965, 455–481 (repr. in: EADEM, *Studies in Byzantine Political History. Sources and Controversies*. London 1981, IX); cf. KAZHDAN, *Byzantine Literature (850–1000)* 79–82.

<sup>27</sup> Moreover, Magdalino observes that, in post-iconoclastic Byzantium, the “lack of reference to any contemporary controversy, notably Iconoclasm, might have aroused suspicions”, and these suspicions would have been confirmed, among other things, by the subtext of Choiosphaktes’ theology, which is “nothing less than a subtle apologia for the science of astrology”; the message of Leo is in fact clear: “mere faith is not enough; only those with *logos* can rise toward God, and *logos* is the science of reading the codes which God has written into the book of creation” (MAGDALINO, *Byzantine Courtier* 151 and 157); cf. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 208.

<sup>28</sup> In four cases, however, the *Thousand-Line Theology* shows verses of thirteen syllables: see VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 47. About the concept of “pure” iamb, see M. D. LAUXTERMANN, *The Velocity of Pure Iambs. Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable*. *JÖB* 48 (1998) 9–33: “the term *καθαρός* occasionally is to be found in lemmata attached to Byzantine poems, the earliest instance of which [...] is the title of *Χιλιόστιχος Θεολογία* by Leo Choiosphaktes in Vat. gr. 1257 (s. X): *στίχοι ιαμβικοί περὶ θεολογίας τρίμετροι καθαροί*” (18). In general, for the dodecasyllable, the Byzantine derivative of the classical iambic trimeter, the fundamental study is P. MAAS, *Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber*. *BZ* 12 (1903) 278–323 (repr. in: IDEM, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. W. Buchwald. Munich 1973, 242–288), and see now A. RHOBY,



classical texts<sup>29</sup>; III. a great sensitivity and a peculiar attention to the collocation of the words in the verses, with a predilection for parallelisms and symmetric constructions in two or more successive verses (*isokola*, as they are called in rhetorical theory), structural pyrotechnics and sound effects<sup>30</sup>; IV. a rich vocabulary, with an inclination for the coinage of new expressions, the use of rare words—either from ancient writers, such as Aristophanes, or Hellenistic writers, such as Lycophron, as well as patristic writers, such as Gregory of Nazianzos *in primis*—and the use of multi-component (and sometimes extravagant and bizarre) compounds<sup>31</sup>, like ψευδοτεχνοκαπνοβορβορόστομος (“having a deceitful mouth, which belches smoke and mud”: a monster of eleven syllables in XXXII 28 = 936 [137 VASSIS]): a stylistic peculiarity for which Choirosphaktes was ridiculed by Constantine the Rhodian in a poem which makes use of thirty-seven sesquipedalian neologisms (words filling entire twelve-syllable lines, such as ὀλεθροβιβλοφαλσογραμματοφθόρε “Oh, you pernicious word-twister and falsifier of texts!” v. 12, Ἐλληνοθησκοχριστοβλασφημοτρόπε “Oh, you pagan believer with your blasphemies against Christ!” v. 15, or πρεσβευτοκερδοσυγχυτοσπονδοφθόρε “Oh, you greedy, havoc-wreaking, treaty-breaking ambassador!” v. 25), all of them insulting Leo<sup>32</sup>.

Let us have a look, for instance, at the beginning of Choirosphaktes’ work. The first strophe of the *Chiliostichos Theologia*’s first chapter is the following (I 1–13 = 9–21 [74 VASSIS]):

	Λάτρευε, μύστα,	τῷ φύσει θεῷ μόν[ω]	
10	τῷ τρισσοφεγγεῖ,	τῷ μόνῳ πρωτ[αιτίῳ],	
	τῷ λαμπρότητι	παγκλεεῖ τιμωμένῳ,	
	τῷ ταυτότητι	πανσθενεῖ τηρουμένῳ,	
	τῷ γνῶσιν οὐ λήγουσαν	οὐσιωμένῳ,	I 5
	τῷ μέλλον οὐδέν	οὐδαμῶς κεχρημένῳ,	
15	τῷ τοὺς λόγους ἔχοντι	τῶν νουμένων,	
	τῷ τοὺς τρόπους ὀρῶντι	τῶν ἐγνωσμένων,	
	τῷ παντοποιῷ	καὶ συνεκτικωτάτῳ,	
	ὄς τὴν ἄυλον	φωτόμορφον οὐσίαν	I 10
	ἴστησιν ἀρχικόσμον	εἰς στρατηγίαν,	
20	ὄς εἰκονιστικόν τι	μὴ σχῆμα βλέπων	
	ἀγαλαμάτωσας	εἰδοποιεῖ τὴν φύσιν <sup>33</sup> .	

Vom jambischen Trimeter zum byzantinischen Zwölfsilber. Beobachtungen zur Metrik des spätantiken und byzantinischen Epigramms. *WSt* 124 (2011) 117–142; cf. W. HÖRANDNER, *Forme et fonction. Remarques sur la poésie dans la société byzantine (Séminaires byzantins 4)*. Paris 2017, 48–51. On the metrical characteristics of Leo’s poem: Vassis, *Chiliostichos* 44–48; cf. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 265–383 (Appendix metrica, *passim*).

<sup>29</sup> See VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 40–41.

<sup>30</sup> See VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 43 and 209–216 (Index graecitatis, *passim*). As C. DE STEFANI observes (Critical Review of VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*. *Orpheus* n.s. 26 [2005] 227–231), “il carme si avvale di uno spericolato *ordo verborum*, che, unito ad una ferrea panoplia retorica, dà all’opera un vistoso aspetto γριφῶδες” (229) and “Quasi di regola lo stile si fa più lambiccato e enigmatico verso la fine di ciascuna τριακοντάς, per lo più dedicata ad attacchi contro pagani, eretici o suoi (non specificati) detrattori (questi ultimi saranno i veri bersagli). Questo *shifting* è così conseguente da farlo divenire una sorta di elemento strutturale del poema” (229 n. 6).

<sup>31</sup> See VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 217–226 (Index verborum notabilium, *passim*); M. HINTERBERGER, *The Language of Byzantine Poetry: New Words, Alternative Forms, and “Mixed Language”*, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhozy – N. Zagklas (*Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World* 4). Leiden – Boston 2019, 38–65: 45–46; cf. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* I 137. For the relevant presence of Gregory of Nazianzus’ language in Choirosphaktes’ poem, see *supra*, n. 25.

<sup>32</sup> Ed. P. MATRANGA, *Anecdota graeca*, 2 vols. Rome 1850, II 624–625. See LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 125–128 (126 for the translation of the examples quoted in the main text).

<sup>33</sup> VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 74: “Verehere, Schüler, den von Natur aus einzigen Gott, (10) den dreifachleuchtenden, den einzigen Urgrund, der in ruhmreichem Glanz verehrt wird, der seine allgewaltige Identität bewahrt, der als sein Wesen unendliches

Among these thirteen verses—eight with a caesura (*Binnenschluss*) after the fifth syllable (B5 in vv. I 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13 = 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21) and five with a caesura after the seventh syllable (B7 in vv. I 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 = 13, 15, 16, 19, 20)—there is a strong connection, which Leo makes through word-plays and rhetorical devices such as:

- 1 *anaphora*, of τῶ in eight consecutive lines (from I 2 = 10 to I 9 = 17), and of ὅς, soon after, in two separated lines (I 10 = 18 and I 12 = 20);
  - 2 *homoioteleuton* (or rhyme), of -μένω/ων in six consecutive verses (from I 3 = 11 to I 8 = 16);
  - 3 *homioptoton*, with four lines in -μένω (I 3–6 = 11–14), two lines in -μένων (I 7–8 = 15–16) and two lines in -ίαν (I 10–11 = 18–19);
  - 4 couples of verses, which are the same as regards the caesura, length (*i.e.* number of syllables of the words composing the verses) and sounds: see the two participle constructions in I 3–4 = 11–12 and in I 7–8 = 15–16. In the first (τῶ λαμπρότητι παγκλεῖ τιμωμένω, / τῶ ταῦτότητι πανσθενεῖ τηρουμένω: I 3–4 = 11–12), we have the same caesura B5, the same “type” of words (article, noun, adjective, participle in the dative case) and these words have the same length in the two lines (as number of syllables: 1–4–3–4) and similar sounds, at the beginning of each term after τῶ ([l]a[m]-/[t]a[ff]-, pan-, ti-) and at their end (-otiti, -[kl]ei/-[sth]e[n]i, -[m]omeno/-[r]oumeno).
- In the second couple, I 7–8 = 15–16 (τῶ τοὺς λόγους ἔχοντι τῶν νουμένων, / τῶ τοὺς τρόπους ὀρῶντι τῶν ἐγνωσμένων), we have the same caesura B7, the same “type” of words in the same cases, and these words have the same length (as number of syllables: 1–1–2–3–1–4) and similar sounds (*to, tous, [l]o[g]ous/[tr]o[p]ous, -onti, ton, noumenon/-[g]no[s]menon*)<sup>34</sup>.

As regards the vocabulary<sup>35</sup>, we would like to point out the choice of the first word of this section, the imperative Λάτρευε (“Worship”, “Serve” God), which no poet, before or after Leo, has used in this position at the beginning of a verse. Choïrosphaktes also resorts to this expression also in other parts of his poem, mostly in this same *sedes*, as the first three feet of the line, and sometimes in connection with other similar expressions (προσκύνει, τίμα): see

9	Λάτρευε, μύστα,	τῶ φύσει θεῶ μόν[ω]	I 1
87	λάτρευε δὴ μοι	τὴν πεπηγυῖαν φύσιν	III 28
186	λάτρευε ταύτην,	σὺν πόθῳ τρι<- ~ x>	VII 11
905	λάτρευε τοῦτο,	προσκύνει, τιμῶν σέβου	XXXI 27
962	λάτρευε καὶ δίδασκει	λατρεύειν φίλους.	XXXIII 25
1136	λάτρευε, τίμα,	προσκύνει καταχρέως,	XL 7 <sup>36</sup>

with these two exceptions, with λάτρευε at the end of the first hemistich, before the caesura

---

Wissen angenommen hat, der sich in keiner Weise des Künftigen bedient hat, (15) der die Ursachen der intelligiblen Welt kennt, der die Wesensart des Erkannten erfaßt, der alles hervorbringt und zusammenhält, der die immaterielle lichtartige Wesenheit zur Leitung der Welt einsetzte, (20) der, ohne ein maßgebendes Vorbild zu erblicken, der Natur wie ein Bildhauer Gestalt gibt”.

<sup>34</sup> See also the couple of verses L. Ch. *Chil.* I 5–6 = 13–14 (τῶ γνῶσιν οὐ λίγουσαν οὐσιωμένω, / τῶ μέλλον οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς κεχημένω), with the same sounds for the *anaphora* at the beginning and the *homioptoton* at the end of the line (*to...-meno*), and with a more particular homophonic game in the centre of the verse: οὐ λίγουσαν / οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς, with the sounds *ou...-ou-a-*.

<sup>35</sup> Patristic, for the most part—see VASSIS, Chiloistichos *apparatus* and commentary *ad loc.* (74 and 156), with allusive reference to Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (especially from *De divinis nominibus* and *De coelesti hierarchia*) and Gregory of Nazianzos—, and with a neologism, παγκλεῖς (L. Ch. *Chil.* I 3 = 11), used by Leo, in the same *sedes* of the verse (sixth to eighth foot), also in IX 24 = 259 (91 VASSIS; see, moreover, παγκλεῶς in XXXII 22 = 930 [137 VASSIS]).

<sup>36</sup> See 74, 79, 86, 135, 139, 152 VASSIS.

589 μὴ τοὺς μικροὺς λάτρευε  
1077 ταύτην λάτρευε,

μείζοσιν χύδην  
τίμα, προσκύνει πόθῳ

XXI 3  
XXXVIII 5<sup>37</sup>

but in the last case, we find the same similar expressions (τίμα, προσκύνει, and also πόθῳ: cf. VII 11 = 186 [86 VASSIS]) that we have observed.

To sum up, as is evident from this first strophe, Leo Choiosphaktes is an accomplished poet, who loves to play with words (and himself...) so much and loves to take risks in his language and style so much—in the choice and disposition of the terms into his verses, in the search for technical effects, eminently structural, with a heavy use of rhetorical devices aimed at acoustic effects—, that he almost seems to have more interest in the “form” of his work, than in the content he has to express.

#### THE FIRST STROPHE OF THE *THOUSAND-LINE THEOLOGY* II: THE “USE” OF PISIDES

As Vassis rightly points out<sup>38</sup>, Leo’s preference for parallel constructions, oxymora, antitheses and other rhetorical figures is unmistakable, but since George of Pisidia—and under his strong stylistic influence—it has belonged to the arsenal of every Byzantine poet who has any high literary aspiration. This may be true, but we think that in Leo Choiosphaktes there is not just an “influence” of George of Pisidia—recognizable in the use of the same rhetorical devices as well as in the same taste for the creation of new words<sup>39</sup>—, but there is the willingness to compose a work “by means of” Pisides, a master carefully read and studied, whom Leo imitates and often quotes *verbatim* in the selection and collocation of words in his “pure iambs”. To some extent, Choiosphaktes even aspires to emulate George in the versification of the *Chiliostichos Theologia*: even the choice of the literary genre—didactic poetry (which, after George and his *Hexaemeron*, was silent till Leo)<sup>40</sup>—may provide proof of this deep relationship between the two authors<sup>41</sup>.

Let us return to the first strophe of the *Thousand-Line Theology*.

I. The second expression of the first line, μύστα (“disciple”, “initiate”, that identifies the addressee), is a rare word in poetry before Leo; but it is noteworthy that this peculiar word, in exactly this same position (at the fourth and fifth feet) before the caesura B5, and with similar sounds before (-ve/-vle) and after it (to/ton), can be found only in George of Pisidia<sup>42</sup>, in his poem *On the*

<sup>37</sup> See 114, 148 VASSIS.

<sup>38</sup> VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 43.

<sup>39</sup> About George of Pisidia as one of the most remarkable creators of neologisms, see HINTERBERGER, *The Language* 44–45.

<sup>40</sup> LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 203–210 (with reference to John Geometres too—and his poem on the ideal qualities of horses—who lived after Leo, in the second half of the tenth century).

<sup>41</sup> See MAGDALINO, *Byzantine Courtier* 150: Leo’s “work may owe more than its metrical form to the inspiration of George of Pisidia’s *Hexaemeron*”. What may be suspicious is also the number of terms, from Church Fathers and later Byzantine theologians, that VASSIS (*Chiliostichos* 42) offers as examples of Leo’s lexicon: among the twenty-one words that are indicated, six (almost a third) are Pisides’ words: ἀντίλοχος XI 18 = 313 (95 VASSIS), γιγαντιάω II 28 = 63 (77 VASSIS), πανόμματος XXVIII 9 = 800 (128 VASSIS), φατινιάω XIII 22 = 376 (99 VASSIS), φονοκτόνος XXVIII 2 = 793 (128 VASSIS), φρενοφθόρος XV 27 = 437 (103 VASSIS).

<sup>42</sup> In the following, the abbreviations and editions for Pisides’ poems are: *Alyp.* (*In Alypium*: ed. L. STERNBACH, Georgii Pisidae carmina inedita. *WSt* 13 [1891] 1–62: 1–4); *Bell. Avar.* (*Bellum Avaricum*: ed. PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 176–200); *Bon. patr.* (*In Bonum patricium*: ed. PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 163–170); *Chr. resurr.* (*In Christi resurrectionem*: ed. J. M. QUERCUS – P. F. FOGGINIUS. Opera Georgii Pisidae, Theodosii Diaconi et Corippi Africani Grammatici [*Corporis Historiae Byzantinae Nova Appendix*]. Rome 1777. Repr. in: *PG* 92, 1161–1754: 1373–1384); *Epigr. Q.* 1–13 (*Epigrammata*: ed. QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1732–1740); *Epigr. St.* 5–106 and 108 (*Epigrammata*: ed. STERNBACH, Carmina inedita. *WSt* 13 [1891] 1–62: 16–18; *WSt* 14 [1892] 51–68); *Exp. Pers.* (*Expeditione Persica*: ed. PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 84–136); *Heracl.* (*Heraclias*: PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 240–261 and 276–292); *Heracl. ex Afr. red.* (*In Heraclium ex Africa redeuntem*: ed. PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 77–81); *Hex.* (*Hexaemeron*: ed. GONNELLI, Esamerone 112–242); *Rest. Cruc.* (*In restitutionem*

*Restoration of the Holy Cross*, in reference to the Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul (“initiate” to the ineffable mysteries):

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 9	Λάτρευε, μύστα,	τῷ φύσει θεῷ μόν[ω]	I 1
G. P. <i>Rest. Cruc.</i> 39	ὦ Παῦλε, μύστα	τῶν ἀπορρήτων λόγων <sup>43</sup>	

We can also see and compare, with this verse of Pisides, the second place in which Leo uses the term μύστα, in the first line of the tenth chapter:

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 266	Γνωναί σε, μύστα,	τὴν ἀνέκφραστον φύσιν	X 1
G. P. <i>Rest. Cruc.</i> 39	ὦ Παῦλε, μύστα	τῶν ἀπορρήτων λόγων <sup>44</sup>	

Here the word μύστα, in the same position as George (at the fourth and fifth feet), again has similar adjacent sounds—the vowel-sound (*e*) before and the consonant-sounds (*t*, *n*) after it—, but it is interesting to note that the other words of Leo’s line have, on the one hand, the same length, as number of syllables, as the terms of George’s line, with an inversion at the beginning (2–1/1–2 + 2–1–4–2), and, on the other hand, they show some similar sounds (as appears especially with the *syntagma* in the second hemistich, with the presence of a similar “apophatic” adjective<sup>45</sup>).

II. In the verse I 5 = 13<sup>46</sup>, where Leo refers to God, who has an infinite knowledge (a “not-ending” knowledge, like His being), the poet employs some single words that George has already used in the same position, and with similar sounds nearby, in his poem *Expeditio Persica*, talking about the moon, goddess of Persia, which “comes to an end” when it eclipses:

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 13	τῷ γνωῶσιν οὐ λήγουσαν	οὐσιωμένῳ	I 5
G. P. <i>Exp. Pers.</i> III 4	φθίνουσα καὶ λήγουσα	καὶ μειουμένη <sup>47</sup>	

The opposition “without” vs “with an end” is obtained through a *variatio*: οὐ ... οὐ in Leo, καὶ ... καὶ in George, in the same circular construction around λήγουσα(ν).

III. Choiosphaktes also takes his inspiration also for the line I 7 = 15 from Pisides’ *Persian Expedition*:

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 15	τῷ τοὺς λόγους ἔχοντι	τῶν νοουμένων	I 7
G. P. <i>Exp. Pers.</i> II 156	τῷ σῶ λόγῳ τρέχοντι	συγκινούμενα <sup>48</sup>	

*Sanctae Crucis*: ed. PERTUSI, Panegirici epici 225–230); *Sev.* (*Contra Severum*: ed. QUERCI, PG 92, 1621–1676); *Van. vit.* (*De vanitate vitae*: ed. QUERCI, PG 92, 1581–1600); *Vit. hum.* (*De vita humana*: ed. GONNELLI, De Vita Humana 123–130). Pisides’ poems and epigrams can also be found in Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia, ed. L. TARTAGLIA (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell’età bizantina*). Turin 1998, who gives a reprint of the previous editions with some changes (see: “Nota critica”, 58–60). VASSIS, Chiliostichos, bases the quotations from the *Hexaemeron* on the earlier edition in QUERCI, PG 92, 1425–1578.

<sup>43</sup> See 74 VASSIS; 227 PERTUSI and 242 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>44</sup> See 92 VASSIS; 227 PERTUSI and 242 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>45</sup> See S. LILLA, La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino. *Helikon* 22–27 (1982–1987) 211–279 [= I]; 28 (1988) 203–279 [= II]; 29–30 (1989–1990) 97–116 [= III]; 31–32 (1991–1992) 3–72 [= IV]. On Pisides’ negative language and apophatic rhetoric, see D. J. NODES, Rhetoric and Cultural Synthesis in the *Hexaemeron* of George of Pisidia. *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996) 274–287.

<sup>46</sup> See *supra*, n. 34, for the particular homophonic game with the following verse, L. Ch. *Chil.* I 6 = 14 (74 VASSIS).

<sup>47</sup> See 74 VASSIS; 115 PERTUSI and 112 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>48</sup> See 74 VASSIS; 104 PERTUSI and 96 TARTAGLIA.

If, in the first case (*Chil.* I 1 = 9), about the “initiate” whom the poet addresses, it is possible to find a similar allusive reference from George of Pisidia (*Rest. Cruc.* 39)—because Constantine VII, addressee of Leo, and Saint Paul in Pisides are two similar initiates to mysteries—, while in the second case (*Chil.* I 5 = 13) the references by Leo and George (*Exp. Pers.* III 4) are opposite—God, who has a “not-ending” knowledge *vs* the goddess Moon, which “comes to an end” with its eclipse—, here, in this third case, content and context are without any link: Leo talks about God who knows the causes of what is intelligible, while George describes the “waves” of Heraclius’ army (ἐκεῖνα τοῦ στρατοῦ τὰ κύματα: *Exp. Pers.* II 155 [104 PERTUSI and 96 TARTAGLIA]), moved all together by the emperor’s quick commands. However, the formal similarities between these two verses are very striking, as regards the choice of the words—which are identical (even if with different syntactical functions) or strongly assonant—and their collocation in the line. Undoubtedly Leo wants to talk about his theme (God) “with” the words and the metrics of George, independently of the reference that those words have in Pisides.

IV. This observation may be confirmed by the verse I 9 = 17 (τῷ παντοιοῦ καὶ συνεκτικωτάτῳ [74 VASSIS]), which refers to God “who is the author of everything and holds everything together”. In its content—as Vassis notices<sup>49</sup>—, it is a reminiscent of a passage of Gregory of Nazianzos’ *Oration* 28, *De Theologia*, where God is described as “efficient cause of everything and cause that has its principle in itself” (τοῦ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι Θεόν, καὶ τὴν πάντων ποιητικὴν τε καὶ συνεκτικὴν αἰτίαν)<sup>50</sup>. From the formal point of view, however, it is a very peculiar verse, with two long compounds, the second of which (συνεκτικωτάτῳ, of six syllables)—used another three times in the *Chiliostichos Theologia*, always in this position<sup>51</sup>—is found in poetry, before Leo, only in George, in his two longest theological poems: the *Hexaemeron* (364, about the planets, “the major stars”, τῶν ἀστέρων τε τοὺς συνεκτικωτάτους<sup>52</sup>, from a cosmological section, vv. 362–372, which Leo knows very well and quotes at other times) and *Against Severus* (520 Δέον γὰρ οἶμαι τὰς συνεκτικωτάτας<sup>53</sup>, in reference to the “statements”, φωνάς, by Cyril of Alexandria).

V. In the last four lines of this section (I 10–13 = 18–21), connected by the *anaphora* of ὄς in I 10 = 18 and I 12 = 20, Leo takes and reworks, in his first couple of verses, the first two verses that open the *Expediatio Persica*<sup>54</sup>:

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 18–19	ὄς τὴν ἄβυλον ἴστησιν ἀρχίκοσμον	φωτόμορφον οὐσίαν εἰς στρατηγίαν	I 10–11
---------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------

<sup>49</sup> VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (74).

<sup>50</sup> Greg. Naz. *Or.* 28, 6, 1–2 (ed. P. GALLAY – M. JOURJON, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes [SC 250]. Paris 1978, 110). VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 156, in the commentary *ad loc.*, also notices the reminiscence of concepts from Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite and Proclus, In Plat. Parm. VII (ed. V. COUSIN, Procli Philosophi Platonici Opera inedita. Pars Tertia continens Procli Commentarium in Platonis Parmenidem. Hildesheim 1961, 1209, 37–38): οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἐν ἐπονομάζεται ὡς τῆς ἐνώσεως καὶ τῆς συνοχῆς πᾶσιν αἴτιον.

<sup>51</sup> L. Ch. *Chil.* VIII 18 = 223 (ὡς οὐσίωσιν εἰς συνεκτικωτάτην [89 VASSIS]), XXX 22 = 959 (ἐνώσις ἐστὶν ἡ συνεκτικωτάτη [139 VASSIS]) and at the beginning of the last chapter, XL 3 = 1132 (τὴν οὐσίωσιν τὴν συνεκτικωτάτην [152 VASSIS]: very similar to VIII 18 = 223 [89 VASSIS]).

<sup>52</sup> See 140 GONNELLI and 332 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>53</sup> See QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1660 and 294 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>54</sup> See 74 VASSIS; 84 PERTUSI and 72 TARTAGLIA. Also VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (74), notices the reference to George, but he indicates only one verse from Pisides (“18–19 cf. Georg. Pis. *Exp. Pers.* I 1 Pertusi”): Leo, clearly, in his two verses, also reworks the second verse of the *Expediatio Persica*, as is shown by the term φῶς, φωτός in the compounds (L. Ch. *Chil.* I 10 = 18 φωτόμορφον; G. P. *Exp. Pers.* I 2 φωσφόρῳ). Moreover, the change of caesura (first at B5, after the fifth syllable, then B7, after the seventh syllable) made by the two poets in their respective two consecutive lines is not irrelevant.

G. P. <i>Exp. Pers.</i> I 1–2	Ἦ τὰς ἀῦλους Τριάς διευθύνουσα	τῶν ἄνω στρατηγίας φωσφόρω λόγῳ
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

while, in the final verse I 13 = 21, it is interesting to notice that Choirosphaktes employs the verb εἰδοποιεῖ that—although very common in Greek—is a *hapax* in the *Chiliostichos Theologia* and can be found, in exactly the same position, in the poems of George again as a *hapax*, in his *Hexaemeron*:

L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 21	ἀγαλματώσας	εἰδοποιεῖ τὴν φύσιν	I 13
G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 1615	καὶ τὰς ἀμόρφους	εἰδοποιῶν οὐσία <sup>55</sup> .	

#### THE RECEPTION OF PISIDES' POEMS IN THE *THOUSAND-LINE THEOLOGY* EXAMPLES

As we can see, the first strophe of the *Thousand-Line Theology* offers many clues that suggest that the relationship between Choirosphaktes and Pisides is, on the one hand, very close (more than has been observed until now), while on the other hand, it concerns mostly the external *facies* of the work. In the versification, in the linguistic and stylistic construction of the verses, in the search for technical effects, through the selection and disposition of words, Leo is constantly striving for formal perfection, which he finds in, and openly borrows from, George of Pisidia's poems. In the following, we will give a short overview of the broad *spectrum* of Leo's varieties in his "debt" to George, proposing a few examples, among the most significant, as regards the choice and collocation of: I. two or more words; II. only one word, in the verses.

I. The reception of Pisides' poems in the versification of the *Chiliostichos Theologia* is very clear if we focus on common *syntagmata* and simple connections of two or more Pisidian words—whether one next to the other or separated—, that Leo places either in the same position as George or with a little change of place.

Here there are two explicit borrowings from George<sup>56</sup>, which concern almost all the words of the single line, mostly identical or strongly assonant, and with the same length (as number of syllables) in the verse:

a.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 257	οὐκ ἔστεγεν γὰρ	ἡ κτίσις δεδεγμένη	IX 22
	G. P. <i>Heracl.</i> I 4	οὐκ ἔστεγεν γὰρ	ἡ κτίσις τιμωμένη <sup>57</sup>	
b.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 136	χαυνοῖ τὸν ὄγκον,	κἂν ἐρῶμεν ἐμπόνως	V 20
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 1254	χαυνοῖ τὸν ὄγκον,	τῶν κρατούντων ἐμφρόνως <sup>58</sup> ;	

<sup>55</sup> See 74 VASSIS; 226 GONNELLI and 408 TARTAGLIA. Also VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (74), with reference to the QUERCI edition ("21 cf. Georg. Pis. Hex. 1658 [PG 92, 1563A]"); while in the commentary *ad loc.* (156), the reference is to Greg. Naz. *Or.* 44, 4 (PG 36, 609D: τὴν ὕλην... εἰδοποίησεν).

<sup>56</sup> Both observed by VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (91 and 83 respectively).

<sup>57</sup> See 91 VASSIS; 240 PERTUSI and 194 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>58</sup> See 83 VASSIS; 202 GONNELLI and 386 TARTAGLIA. See another example in L. Ch. *Chil.* VII 9 = 184 (καὶ δὴ παρ' αὐτῆς ἀσφαλῶς ἐγνωσμένη [86 VASSIS]: about the ἑναρχος αἰτία) from G. P. *Van. vit.* 138 (ὡς ἂν δι' αὐτῆς ἀσφαλῶς ἠρμοσμένης [QUERCI, PG 92, 1591, and 436 TARTAGLIA]), with words that have the same length, as number of syllables, in ascending *climax* (1–1–1–2–3–4): from the point of view of the content, VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (86), notices echoes of I Cor. 2, 11 (τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ [ed. K. ALAND – M. BLACK – C. M. MARTINI – B. M. METZGER – A. WIKGREN, *The Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart 1968, 582]).

See also L. Ch. *Chil.* XVII 20 = 489 (καὶ τοῦτο δὴ σοι γραπτέον προμηθία [107 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Hex.* 578 (καὶ τοῦτο τῆς σῆς δέσποτα προμηθίας [154 GONNELLI and 346 TARTAGLIA]): Leo's verse may be compared with Eurip. *Suppl.* 510

The different last term of each line, in assonance in each couple (δεδεγμένη/τιμωμένη, ἐμπόνως<sup>59</sup>/ἐμφρόνως), helps to express a change of meaning and references<sup>60</sup>, but, as we have already observed, Leo talks about his topic by means of the Pisidian words, mostly employing them independently of the content and context that those words have in George.

In the following two examples, in addition to the words that are repeated in the same position as George (as a whole hemistich), we may also notice the *variatio* made by Leo in changing another Pisidian term of the same line (in the other hemistich) as regards either the word-order ([–]φόρτον, in case c.) or its form in a “synonymical” term (νοῦς/λόγος, in ἐννοῆσαι/ λογισμοῖς, in case d.):

c.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 128	τὸν ὄγκον αὐτὸν	φόρτον ἐξηρηνησάμην	V 12
	G. P. <i>Alyp.</i> 9	τὸν ὄγκον αὐτῶν	καὶ τὸ δύσφορτον βάρως <sup>61</sup>	
d.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 231	ὡς ἐννοῆσαι	τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν οὐσίαν,	VIII 26
	G. P. <i>Sev.</i> 138	ἰσχνοῖς λογισμοῖς	τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν οὐσίαν <sup>62</sup> .	

A comparable example is offered by the following case e., with the variation which concerns the morphological category of the elements in the *syntagma* (the proclitic conjunction of negation, with objective/subjective value, οὐ/μή, and the verb ῥέω, as present participle active/aorist infinitive passive):

e.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 24	αὐτὸς μετασχὼν	οὐ ῥεούσης τετράδος	I 16
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 188	εἰς ἀλλόφυλον	μὴ ῥυῆναι τετράδα <sup>63</sup>	

(καὶ τοῦτο τοὶ τάνδρειον, ἢ προμηθία [ed. J. DIGGLE, Euripidis fabulae. Oxford 1981, II 22]), but in Euripides’ verse there are not the same word-length, caesura and assonances as in Pisides’ verse, the model for Leo’s line.

<sup>59</sup> L. Ch. *Chil.* V 20 = 136 is part of a brief sequence of three lines (V 19–21 = 135–137 [83 VASSIS]), linked together through the assonance of the last term of the verse (εὐκόλως/ἐμπόνως/εὐτόνωος).

<sup>60</sup> So, in case a., Leo says that the creation (ἡ κτίσις), consisting of matter (*Chil.* IX 23 = 258 [91 VASSIS]: ἔνυλος οὐσα), could not receive and bear (οὐκ ἔστεγεν... δεδεγμένη) God, who is the immaterial being (*Chil.* IX 23 = 258 [91 VASSIS]: τὴν ἄυλον οὐσίαν), while George describes the creation that, although honoured (τιμωμένη) by Chosroes, could not bear (οὐκ ἔστεγεν) the Persian king because of his impiety. In case b., the passage in the *Hexaameron* concerns the threads of the silk-worm, dyed with purple, that wisely (ἐμφρόνως) weaken the pride of the rulers, while Leo is talking about the divine nature, which is incomprehensible to the human mind and requires great effort (ἐμπόνως) to be understood, but knows that what is not easily attained does not lose consistency.

<sup>61</sup> See 82 VASSIS; STERNBACH, Carmina inedita, *WSI* 13, 1, and 458 TARTAGLIA. See another example of *variatio* in word order, with the term μετροῦν/μετρουμένη, in L. Ch. *Chil.* I 21 = 29 (ποθεῖς τὸ μετροῦν οὐρανῶν φρυκτωρίαν; [75 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Hex.* 156 (Μετρουμένη γὰρ οὐρανῶν ἀμετρία [126 GONNELLI and 320 TARTAGLIA]). VASSIS, Chiliostichos, *app. ad loc.* (75), refers to Ps. 146, 4 (ὁ ἀριθμῶν πλήθην ἄστρον, καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα καλῶν [ed. A. RAHLFS, Septuaginta. Stuttgart 1935, repr. 1971, 160–161]), while in commentary *ad loc.* (158), he writes that the *syntagma* οὐρανῶν φρυκτωρίαν is a reminiscence from the *Orations* of Gregory of Nazianzos (*Or.* 45, 2 [PG 36, 624C8–10]: οὐρανὸς ἄνωθεν φρυκτωρεῖ, and *Or.* 40, 5, 19–21 [ed. C. MORESCHINI – P. GALLAY, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38–40. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes (SC 358). Paris 1990, 206]: τὴν ἄνωθεν φρυκτωρίαν). The construction of Leo’s line, however, may come from Pisides, from the long astronomical section, at the beginning of the *Hexaameron* (from v. 81 [120 GONNELLI and 316 TARTAGLIA]: cf. G. BIANCHI, Sulla cultura astronomica di Giorgio di Pisidia. *Aevum* 40 [1966] 35–52), surely well known to Choiosphaktes.

<sup>62</sup> See 89 VASSIS; QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1632 and 270 TARTAGLIA. This same Pisidian verse may be the model of L. Ch. *Chil.* XXII 1 = 617 (Ἄγειν λογισμῶ τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν αἰτίαν [116 VASSIS]), which is similar in respect of many repeated words (λογισμ-τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν), the same number of syllables in each term and for the assonance of the last word (αἰτίαν/οὐσίαν).

<sup>63</sup> See 75 VASSIS; 128 GONNELLI and 322 TARTAGLIA. It is interesting to notice that here Leo, talking about God who does not participate in the four flowing natures (ῥεούσης τετράδος: fire, air, water, earth), takes words from a passage where Pisides talks about Christ (the Son incarnate, the only One, not divided in a quaternity), a topic not developed in the *Chiliostichos Theologia*. See also *infra*, case g. (L. Ch. *Chil.* XVI 21 = 461 [105 VASSIS] from G. P. *Sev.* 230 [QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1640 and 276 TARTAGLIA]) and the example in n. 69 (L. Ch. *Chil.* III 11–12 = 74–75 [78 VASSIS] from G. P. *Sev.* 282–283 [QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1643 and 280 TARTAGLIA]).

In general, the reuse of Pisidian *syntagmata* may be found as a “whole” hemistich (cases f., g., h.), but even “between” the two hemistichs, immediately before and after the caesura (case i.):

f.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 240 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 1470	χρηζον βοηθοῦ τῆς παναλκοῦς	καὶ σοφῆς ἐποψίας καὶ σοφῆς ἐποψίας <sup>64</sup>	IX 5
g.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 461 G. P. <i>Sev.</i> 230	μερίζεται δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι	καὶ μερίζει τὰς φύσεις καὶ μερίζεις τὰς φύσεις <sup>65</sup>	XVI 21
h.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 724 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 716	τίς ἤρμοσεν φῶς ὅπως ἔχοιμεν	ταῖς βολαῖς τῶν ὀμμάτων ταῖς βολαῖς τῶν ὀμμάτων <sup>66</sup>	XXV 20
i.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 710 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 869	τίς τὸν πυραυγῆ ἢ καὶ πυραυγῆ	δίσκον ἡλίου στρέφει δίσκον ἡλίου βλέπων <sup>67</sup>	XXV 6

In the following examples, we see the adoption of more words from two consecutive verses of George in two consecutive verses of Leo (cases j. and k., both also with the variations made by Choïrosphaktes in changing the word-order and the form of a term: χωρητικὴν/χωρεῖ and μορφοποιεῖς/μορφοῦσα) and the reminiscence of a Pisidian section in a *Chiliostichos Theologia*'s section (case l.):

j.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 130–131 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 893–894	ἀπειρίαν δοῦς χωρητικὴν μόνη δὲ ἢ σὴ γὰρ ἀκτίς εἰς πάντα χωρεῖ	μηδαμοῦ χωρουμένην, τῇ μετουσίᾳ μηδαμοῦ χωρουμένη, μηδαμοῦ στενουμένη <sup>68</sup>	V 14–15
k.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 169–170 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 1563–1564	φεῦ, μορφοποιεῖς καὶ σωματουργεῖς καὶ σωματουργεῖ μορφοῦσα τὰ πρόσωπα	τὴν τύπων ἀνωτέραν τὴν ἀπλῶν ἀπλουστέραν τὰς ρεούσας εἰκόνας, τῆς ἀμορφίας <sup>69</sup>	VI 24–25
l.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 378–380 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 363 370–371	νόησον οὖν ἄρχουσιν δοῦλην δὲ δυσκίνητον, καὶ τὴν ἀεικίνητον καὶ τὴν ἀεικίνητον οὐ τὴν ἄτρεπτον	αἰτίαν μίαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ αἰτίαν, ἐν ὑλικοῖς τρίτην ἦν ἔχει βίαν ἐννοήσας οὐσίαν	XIII 24–26

<sup>64</sup> See 90 VASSIS; 216 GONNELLI and 400 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>65</sup> See 105 VASSIS; QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1640 and 276 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>66</sup> See 123 VASSIS; 164 GONNELLI and 354 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>67</sup> See 122 VASSIS; 174 GONNELLI and 362 TARTAGLIA. This last case is also observed by VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (122). See other examples of “simple” *syntagmata* at the beginning of the verse, not exclusively Pisidian, but in any case attested in George’s poems: L. Ch. *Chil.* VI 16 = 161 (*καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι ταῦτα ποῦ δεῖξεις μένειν*; [85 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Bell. Avar.* 163 (*καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τοὺς συνήθεις ὄμφακας* [183 PERTUSI and 166 TARTAGLIA]); L. Ch. *Chil.* VIII 23 = 228 (*καὶ γὰρ πέφυκε τῶν ἀναγκαίων κλέος* [89 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Sev.* 161 (*καὶ γὰρ πέφυκε ἡ Τριάς φύσις μία* [QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1633 and 272 TARTAGLIA]); L. Ch. *Chil.* IX 15 = 250 (*καὶ μηδὲν εἶναι πρῶτον αἴτιον λέγοι* [90 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Van. vit.* 167 (*καὶ μηδὲν εἶναι σωφρόνως πεπεισμένος* [QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1594 and 438 TARTAGLIA (as v. 166)]).

<sup>68</sup> See 82 VASSIS; 176 GONNELLI and 364 TARTAGLIA. Also VASSIS, *Chiliostichos*, *app. ad loc.* (82), notices the reference to George, but he indicates only one verse from Pisides (“130 cf. Georg. Pis. Hex. 903 (*PG* 92, 1503A)”), *i.e.* *Hex.* 893 ed. GONNELLI. Leo clearly reworks, in his two lines, also *Hex.* 894, as shown by the reminiscence of χωρεῖ in his χωρητικὴν, that reproduces the rhetorical figure of the anadiplosis employed by George.

<sup>69</sup> See 85 VASSIS; 222 GONNELLI and 404–406 TARTAGLIA. See another example in L. Ch. *Chil.* III 11–12 = 74–75 (*πάντως ἐς ἀπλὴν ἢ διπλὴν πεπλεγμένην / ἀλλ' εἰς ἀπλὴν μὲν τὴν στροφ[ὴν] ἐφαρμόσας* [78 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Sev.* 282–283 (*ἀπλὴν νομίζεις ἢ διπλὴν λέγειν θέλεις; / Ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἀπλὴν, πῶς σεσαρκῶσθαι λέγεις*; [QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1643 and 280 TARTAGLIA]), again from a passage where Pisides talks about Christ (see *supra*, cases e., g., and n. 63).



δοῦλῃν νομίζει                      τὴν ἀείτρεπτον φύσιν<sup>70</sup>;

II. In his reception of Pisides' poems, Leo also takes many single terms—which, as regards their meaning and use, may be very common as well as very peculiar, because rare in poetry or unique or even created by George—and places them mostly in the same position as his model and often in connection with other words of the same length and with similar sounds nearby.

The clearest examples come from some *primum dicta* borrowed from Pisides: new words created by George and not attested before Choiosphaktes, like the term ἐργεπείκτης (“taskmaster”, in case a., taken from a section of the *Hexaemeron* about the sun<sup>71</sup>) and κομπορήμων (“braggart”, in case b.—not in the same position, but with the similar sound φα- nearby in the same hemistich—, again adopted from the *Hexaemeron*, from a famous section about the spider's web<sup>72</sup>):

a.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 539	ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης	ἐργεπείκτην δεικνύων	XIX 12
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 228	ἔστι δὲ κοινὸς	ἐργεπείκτης τῶν κάτω <sup>73</sup>	
b.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 299	χωριστὸν εἶδος·	φάσμα κομπορρημόνων	XI 4
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 1233	καὶ μὴ τις ἡμᾶς	κομπορήμων φαυλίση <sup>74</sup>	

There are some interesting *hapax legomena* and very rare terms of George that also appear as *hapax* or rare terms in Leo, like the words ἐκθεῶω (“deify”: case c.) and αὐτοδέσποτος (“being one's own master”: case d.), which are usual in prose, not in poetry, and used by George and Leo in the same position in the verse:

c.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 355	Τὸ τοὺς πεσόντας	ἐκθεοῦν ἀσωμάτους	XIII 1
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 994	καὶ μέχρι μυίας	ἐκθεοῦντες τὴν κτίσιν <sup>75</sup>	
d.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 207	τὴν πρωτόφωτον	αὐτοδέσποτον φύσιν	VIII 2
	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 1049	κινεῖν ἑαυτὴν	αὐτοδεσπότην κράτει	XXXVII 5
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 341	καὶ μηδὲν ἡμᾶς	αὐτοδέσποτον βλέπειν	
	G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 791	καὶ τὰς ἐν ἡμῖν	αὐτοδεσπότης φρένας <sup>76</sup>	

<sup>70</sup> See 99 VASSIS; 140 GONNELLI and 332–334 TARTAGLIA. Leo's three verses are part of a short section at the end of the chapter (*Chil.* XIII 24–30 = 378–384 [99 VASSIS]), replete with wordplays (*isokola*, *homoioptota* and assonances): the line XIII 26 = 380 is one of the four cases in the *Thousand-Line Theology* with thirteen syllables (see *supra*, n. 28). It recalls the cosmological Pisidian section of the *Hexaemeron* (περὶ κινήσεως οὐρανοῦ, vv. 362–372 [140 GONNELLI and 332–334 TARTAGLIA]), also reused by Leo on other occasions: see *supra*, ad v. I 9 = 17 (74 VASSIS), for the word συνεκτικωτάτω, from G. P. *Hex.* 364 (140 GONNELLI and 332 TARTAGLIA).

<sup>71</sup> G. P. *Hex.* 214–238 (130–132 GONNELLI and 324–326 TARTAGLIA).

<sup>72</sup> It is the first line of the section *Hex.* 1233–1250 (200–202 GONNELLI and 386 TARTAGLIA), in which Pisides reuses the image of the spider's web (already used as a metaphor in Basil the Great's first *Homily on the Hexaemeron*), presenting it as a sublime homage to God the Creator: on this passage and the reuse “by later authors, such as Mitylenaios and Philes”, see LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* II 221–223.

<sup>73</sup> See 110 VASSIS; 130 GONNELLI and 324 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>74</sup> See 94 VASSIS; 200 GONNELLI and 386 TARTAGLIA. Another example may be found with the word πανόμματος (“all-seeing”: see *supra* n. 41), indicated as *primum dictum* by GONNELLI, *Esamerone* 267: L. Ch. *Chil.* XXVIII 9 = 800 (εἰς δεῖγμα μίσους τῆς πανομμάτου Δίκης [128 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Hex.* 1449 (ἢ μᾶλλον ἐμπέφυκε τῇ πανομμάτῳ [214 GONNELLI and 398 TARTAGLIA]); cf. the anonymous epigram *AP* I 117 (ed. BECKBY: I [Books I–VI. 1957] 176): “Ἐβλεψε τυφλὸς ἐκ τόκου μεμυσμένος / Χριστὸς γὰρ ἦλθεν, ἢ πανόμματος χάρις (and see LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry* I 89–98, and 182, with bibliography, about the Christian epigrams in *AP* I).

<sup>75</sup> See 98 VASSIS; 182 GONNELLI and 370 TARTAGLIA.

<sup>76</sup> See 88 and 146 VASSIS; 138 and 168 GONNELLI and 332 and 358 TARTAGLIA. In the *Thousand-Line Theology*, at the beginning of chapter VIII (88 VASSIS), we find two of Leo's neologisms (the two compounds μεγαστόλεκτος and πρωτόφωτος: see *Chil.* VIII 1–2 = 206–207 Μεγιστόλεκτον αἶνον ἄλλον προσφέρω / τὴν πρωτόφωτον αὐτοδέσποτον φύσιν), to which αὐτοδέσποτος is added, a term that is very late and rare in poetry before Leo, attested twice in the *Hexa-*

Also some common terms may be noticed, such as ἔσοπτρον (“mirror”: case e.), ἄβυσσος (“abyss”: case f.) and the very peculiar word, in theological works, πίθηκος (“monkey”: case g.), which all show similar sounds nearby:

e.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 33 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> CVII 8	ἴδοις ἔσοπτρω τούτοις ἔσοπτρω	τὰς σκιάς τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς ὑπὲρ νοῦν οὐσίας <sup>77</sup>	I 27
f.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 34 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 57	κενεμβατῶν ἄβυσσον ὃ πλουσίων ἄβυσσος	εἰς αἰνιγμάτων ἐννοημάτων <sup>78</sup>	I 28
g.	L. Ch. <i>Chil.</i> 88 G. P. <i>Hex.</i> 944	λάλων πιθήκων λέων πιθήκους,	ἐκφυγῶν πανουργίας οἱ δὲ κύκνοι βατράχους <sup>79</sup>	III 29

### CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of these examples, we think that the strong reception of George of Pisidia by Leo Choiosphaktes is clear.

On the one hand, the familiarity that Leo shows with Pisides’ language and style in his *Thousand-Line Theology* makes Leo one of the most passionate readers of George’s poems in Byzantium: a reader who carries in his memory what he has carefully read and learned by heart, and who sometimes makes an unabashed use of it in his work (with *verbatim* quotations), showing himself as an emulator of Pisides, as is also proved by the choice of the literary genre of didactic poetry which, after Pisides’ masterpiece, the *Hexaemeron*, was silent till Leo. However, Choiosphaktes does not necessarily aim to make all his Pisidian reminiscences and parallels recognisable to his readers. He does not imitate George’s poems in an effort to construct a sophisticated literary allusive game with its source text: this is shown especially by the usual total absence of link with the original Pisidian content and context as well as by the “daring” formal reworkings made by Leo. We can say that Choiosphaktes is certainly proud to be a sort of μύστης (“disciple”, “initiate”) of George, but he mostly strives for formal, metrical and rhetorical perfection and loves to play with words, that he finds already “in the right place” in George’s poems and that he reworks in different contexts and in an original way by means of a sort of *cento* technique<sup>80</sup>. Leo’s primary purpose is to

*emeron* (cf. however G. P. *Heracl.* III *acroaseos fragmenta* 3, 5 [276 PERTUSI and 224 TARTAGLIA]: <ἅπαντες> αἰδεσθῶμεν αὐτοδέσποτον).

<sup>77</sup> See 75 VASSIS; 242 GONNELLI and 424 TARTAGLIA. The word ἔσοπτρον is a *hapax* in Pisides, present in the *carmen* CVII STERNBACH, *i.e.* in the subscription of the *Hexaemeron*. The word can also be found, in the same position, in the poems of Gregory of Nazianzus (*e.g. Carm. mor. PG* 37, 686, 8: Ὅσον δ’ ἔσοπτροις τοῦ κάλλους φαντάζεται; *Carm. de se ipso PG* 37, 1324, 4: Σμήξας, ἔσοπτρον τῷ Λόγῳ παραστήσομαι; cf. moreover VASSIS, *Chiliostichos, app.* and commentary *ad loc.*, 75 and 159), but without the similarities of sounds and the same length as the other words (2–3–1–2–1–3) as in Pisides.

<sup>78</sup> See 75 VASSIS; 120 GONNELLI and 314 TARTAGLIA. It is from the opening section of the *Hexaemeron*, where George praises the Scriptures, and the Psalms in particular, with Psalm 103, primary source of his inspiration. In Leo’s poem, the single word ἄβυσσος is rare (there is only one another attestation in XXXVII 27 = 1070 [147 VASSIS]); for I 28 = 34, VASSIS, *Chiliostichos, app. ad loc.* (75), notices the comparison with Job 38, 16 (ἦλθες δὲ ἐπὶ πηγὴν θαλάσσης, ἐν δὲ ἴχνεσιν ἄβυσσου περιεπάτησας; [ed. A. RAHLFS, *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart 1935, repr. 1971, 335]): the reminiscence of Pisides’ place may be confirmed by the assonances nearby and the last term of the verse in particular.

See another example with the word *λειτουργία* in L. Ch. *Chil.* I 22 = 30 (τὸ κρεῖττον, ἴσθι, εὐκτικῇ *λειτουργίᾳ* [75 VASSIS]) from G. P. *Hex.* 1442 (καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπλῶς ψυχικὴν *λειτουργίαν*; [214 GONNELLI and 398 TARTAGLIA]), with similar sounds nearby and the same length of the verse’s words, as number of syllables (1–2–2–3–4, in ascending *climax*).

<sup>79</sup> See 79 VASSIS; 178 GONNELLI and 368 TARTAGLIA. The word πίθηκος, *hapax legomenon* in George and in Leo, is also present in Gregory of Nazianzos (*Carm. mor. PG* 37, 854, 6: Εἶ σοι πίθηκον εἰς λέοντα σκευάσας, and *PG* 37, 935, 4: Τί γὰρ πιθήκῳ κέρδος, ἦν δοκῆ λέων), but without the same sounds nearby as in our two poets.

<sup>80</sup> See the same type of intertextual relationship between Christophoros Mitylenaios’ poem 52 and Homer, as clearly explained by BERNARD, *Writing and Reading* 222–229 (esp. 225–227): “this poem mines the Homeric poems simply for reasons of versification, which is indicated by the exact verse–structural correspondences. In this way, Christophoros can make use of convenient metrical blocks which are already ‘in place’, ensuring a correct prosodical verse structure” (226).

appear a very talented poet to his selected readers and to demonstrate his mastery of metrical and rhetorical technique, but without engaging with Pisides on an interpretative level.

On the other hand, the type of use that Leo makes of Pisides' language and style, in the construction of his verses, confirms the didactic function of George's poems, which were in effect regularly used in Byzantine schools, as Lauxtermann has stressed with great clarity<sup>81</sup>. Pisides was the prime example of versification: a model especially for the "practical" formal construction of a poem (as regards metric and rhythm, vocabulary and rhetorical figures), independently too—as we have seen with Choirosphaktes—of the content that a Byzantine poet would have expressed in his work. Pisides' poems were therefore a sort of "basin" from which a Byzantine poet could take "words, words and words"<sup>82</sup> for his own literary composition.

In this regard, on the basis of what we have seen, it is also interesting to notice that almost all of George's poems—the religious and the encomiastic ones, the most famous as well as the most peculiar (like the poem *On Alypius*)—have been the object of a careful reading by Choirosphaktes. The examples in fact show that Leo's chief focus of interest was on George's theological poems, notably the *Hexaemeron* (and some sections in particular: the most cosmological) and the *Contra Severum*: but this is obvious, considering the content, and therefore the language, of the *Chiliostichos Theologia*. In any case, George's other religious and ethical poems, too (*On Christ's Resurrection* and *On the Vanity of Life*), and the most popular of Pisides' panegyrics (*Heraclias*, the *Persian Expedition* and the *Avar War*) as well as the short poem *On the Restoration of the Holy Cross*, were a direct model for Leo's versification<sup>83</sup>.

At this point, we would like only to suggest a further final topic. The close connection of Leo with George's poems may be useful, perhaps, for the emendation of the *Chiliostichos Theologia*'s text, which—in the only manuscript to preserve it—is transmitted with so many corruptions and lacunas. We give only one example, again from the first strophe of the first chapter: in the second verse (I 2 = 10) we read, in the edition (74 VASSIS), τῷ τρισσοφεγγεῖ, τῷ μόνῳ πρωτ[αιτίῳ]. Vassis writes in his critical *apparatus* "πρωτ[αιτίῳ] ex. gr. supplevi : possis etiam πρωτεργάτη : πρώ[τω φάει] Rh<sup>84</sup>.". In George of Pisidia we find the word πρωτεργάτης as verse ending in *Heraclias* and in *Contra Severum* (*Heracl.* II 7 ὁ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς συμφορῶν πρωτεργάτης [251 PERTUSI and 210

See also H. HUNGER, On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature. *DOP* 23–24 (1969–1970) 17–38 for the strictly formal aspects of Byzantine *mimesis* and the *cento* technique in particular.

<sup>81</sup> See LAUXTERMANN, The Velocity 15–16 and 29; cf. LAUXTERMANN, Byzantine Poetry II 218. In general, about the different ways in which poetry and education interacted in Byzantium, see BERNARD, Writing and Reading, esp. 209–251 (with bibliography).

<sup>82</sup> We would express it thus, from the title of an article by Mary WHITBY (George of Pisidia and the Persuasive Word: Words, Words, Words..., in: Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001, ed. E. Jeffreys [*Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications* 11]. Aldershot 2003, 173–186).

<sup>83</sup> And here, again, some sections were preferred by Leo, like the initial parts of the *acroaseis* of *Heraclias* or *Expeditio Persica*. In this regard, is it possible to identify the manuscript that Choirosphaktes may have had in his hands? If we consider the list of George's works that we most frequently find in Leo—i.e. the religious (*Hexaemeron*, *Contra Severum*, *In Christi resurrectionem*, *De vanitate vitae*) and the encomiastic (*Heraclias*, *Expeditio Persica*, *Bellum Avaricum*)—we can reasonably think of the hyparchetype from which two other codices are derived: the Vat. gr. 1126 and the Paris. Suppl. gr. 139, both from the fourteenth century and which have the same choice of George's poems and the same anonymous metrical textbook, at the beginning, in the Vaticanus code (ff. 1r–7r), and at the end, in the Parisinus (ff. 150r–157v). The reminiscence of *In restitutionem Sanctae Crucis* and *In Alypium*, as well as *In Bonum patricium*—as noticed by VASSIS, *Chiliostichos* 111, *app. ad vv.* XIX 24–25 = 550–551 (from G. P. *Bon. patr.* 157–159 [170 PERTUSI and 152 TARTAGLIA])—leads us to think also of the Paris. Suppl. gr. 690, of the eleventh–twelfth century, which is the oldest textwitness of Pisides' production (see G. ROCHEFORT, Une anthologie grecque du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle: le Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 690. *Scripta* 4 [1950] 3–17). But, we cannot say any more.

<sup>84</sup> I.e. Andreas Rhoby, who is the author of the first edition of the *Chiliostichos Theologia* in an unpublished dissertation at the University of Vienna: see *supra*, n. 19.

TARTAGLIA]; *Sev.* 544 φιλοσοφίας γὰρ οὗτος ἦν πρωτεργάτης: QUERCI, *PG* 92, 1661 and 294 TARTAGLIA): so, πρωτεργάτη may be a very significant correction of the text. But we may also propose the word πρωτοχρόνω, *primum dictum* in George (*Hex.* 1167 πρωτοχρόνους δὲ τοὺς ἀράχνας λεκτέον [196 GONNELLI and 380 TARTAGLIA]) and a very rare word in Greek, used after George as verse ending, always in the genitive form πρωτοχρόνου, by Manuel Philes<sup>85</sup>, who was closely connected to the poetry of Pisides. With the conjectural emendation πρωτοχρόνω, of Pisidian inspiration, we would also have a connection for *homoiototon* and *homoioteleuton* and with similar sounds with the final term of the first verse of the chapter:

9	Λάτρευε, μύστα,	τῷ φύσει θεῷ μόν[ω]	I 1
10	τῷ τρισσοφεγγεῖ,	τῷ μόνω πρωτ[οχρόνω]	I 2

This, however, is only a suggestion and an idea for possible other studies.

#### LIST OF THE MANUSCRIPTS MENTIONED IN THE ARTICLE AND THEIR *DIKTYON* NUMBERS

- Cambridge, University Library  
LL.IV.12 (*Diktyon* 12221)
- München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek  
gr. 416 (*Diktyon* 44864)
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France  
Coisl. 56 (*Diktyon* 49198)  
gr. 1220 (*Diktyon* 50825)  
gr. 1630 (*Diktyon* 51252)  
suppl. gr. 139 (*Diktyon* 52909)  
suppl. gr. 690 (*Diktyon* 53425)  
suppl. gr. 1090 (*Diktyon* 53754)
- Roma, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana  
1104 (41.F.25) (*Diktyon* 56112)
- Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana  
gr. 121 (*Diktyon* 56229)  
gr. 130 (*Diktyon* 56235)  
gr. 142 (*Diktyon* 56246)
- Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria  
gr. 360 (*Diktyon* 63550) [destroyed]
- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana  
Barb. gr. 279 (*Diktyon* 64825)  
Ottob. gr. 324 (*Diktyon* 65567)  
Vat. gr. 1126 (*Diktyon* 67757)  
Vat. gr. 1257 (*Diktyon* 67888)

<sup>85</sup> See Manuelis Philae Carmina, 2 vols, ed. E. MILLER. Paris 1855–1857 (repr. Amsterdam 1967): poems 1, 309; 59, 7; 81, 2; 131, 80; and Manuelis Philae Carmina inedita, ed. E. MARTINI (*Atti della R. Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti* 20). Naples 1900: poems 44, 66; 76, 145; 92, 41.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- Arethas of Caesarea, *Choiosphaktes or the Hater of Trickery*, ed. L. G. WESTERINK, Arethae archiepiscopi Caesariensis scripta minora, 2 vols. (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*). Leipzig 1968–1972, I 200–212.
- Constantine the Rhodian, *Satirical poem against Choiosphaktes*, ed. P. MATRANGA, *Anecdota graeca*, 2 vols. Rome 1850, 624–625.
- Euripides, *The Suppliants*, ed. J. DIGGLE, Euripidis fabulae. Oxford 1981, II 3–53.
- George of Pisidia, *Against Severus*, ed. J. M. QUERCIUS – P. F. FOGGINIUS. Opera Georgii Pisidae, Theodosii Diaconi et Corippi Africani Grammatici (*Corporis Historiae Byzantinae Nova Appendix*). Rome 1777. Repr. in: *PG* 92, 1161–1754: 1621–1676; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 262–306.
- George of Pisidia, *Avar War*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 176–200; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 156–190.
- George of Pisidia, *Epigrammata* Q. 1–13, ed. J. M. QUERCIUS – P. F. FOGGINIUS. Opera Georgii Pisidae, Theodosii Diaconi et Corippi Africani Grammatici (*Corporis Historiae Byzantinae Nova Appendix*). Rome 1777. Repr. in: *PG* 92, 1161–1754: 1732–1740; repr., but not in the same order, by L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 468–504 (25, 96, 107, 109, 110, 114, 115).
- George of Pisidia, *Epigrammata* St. 5–106 and 108, ed. L. STERNBACH, Georgii Pisidae carmina inedita. *WSI* 13 (1891) 1–62: 16–18; *WSI* 14 (1892) 51–68; repr., but not in the same order, by L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 468–504 (*Epigrammata* 1–24, 26–95, 97–106, 108, 111–113).
- George of Pisidia, *Heraclias*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 240–261 and 276–292; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 194–236.
- George of Pisidia, *Hexaameron*, ed. F. GONNELLI, Giorgio di Pisidia, Esamerone. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e indici. Pisa 1998, 112–242; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 310–422.
- George of Pisidia, *On Alypius*, ed. L. STERNBACH, Georgii Pisidae carmina inedita. *WSI* 13 (1891) 1–62: 1–4; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 458–464.
- George of Pisidia, *On Bonus the Patrician*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 163–170; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 142–152.
- George of Pisidia, *On Christ's Resurrection*, ed. J. M. QUERCIUS – P. F. FOGGINIUS. Opera Georgii Pisidae, Theodosii Diaconi et Corippi Africani Grammatici (*Corporis Historiae Byzantinae Nova Appendix*). Rome 1777. Repr. in: *PG* 92, 1161–1754: 1373–1384; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 250–258.
- George of Pisidia, *On Herakleios' Return from Africa*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 77–81; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 62–68.
- George of Pisidia, *On Human Life*, ed. F. GONNELLI, Il *De vita humana* di Giorgio Pisida. *Bollettino dei Classici*, ser. III, 12 (1991) 118–138: 123–130; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 448–454.
- George of Pisidia, *On the Restoration of the Holy Cross*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 225–230; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 240–246.
- George of Pisidia, *On the Vanity of Life*, ed. J. M. QUERCIUS – P. F. FOGGINIUS. Opera Georgii Pisidae, Theodosii Diaconi et Corippi Africani Grammatici (*Corporis Historiae Byzantinae Nova Appendix*). Rome 1777. Repr. in: *PG* 92, 1161–1754: 1581–1600; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 428–444.
- George of Pisidia, *Persian Expedition*, ed. A. PERTUSI, Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi. I. Panegirici epici. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento (*Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 7). Ettal 1959, 84–136; L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998, 72–138.
- George of Pisidia, *Poems and epigrams*, ed. L. TARTAGLIA, Carmi di Giorgio di Pisidia (*Classici greci. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina*). Turin 1998.
- Greek Anthology*, ed. H. BECKBY, *Anthologia Graeca*. Griechisch–Deutsch, 4 vols. Munich 1957–1958; *The Greek Anthology*. With an English Translation by W. R. PATON, 5 vols. (*Loeb Classical Library* 67. 68. 84–86). Cambridge, MA – London 1918.

- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Poems (Carmina de se ipso)*, ed. PG 37, 969–1029, 1166–1452.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Poems (Carmina moralia)*, ed. PG 37, 521–968.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Oration 28 (Second Theological Oratio)*, ed. P. GALLAY – M. JOURJON, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes (SC 250). Paris 1978, 100–174.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Oration 40 (On Baptism)*, ed. C. MORESCHINI – P. GALLAY, Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38–40. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes (SC 358). Paris 1990, 198–310.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Oration 44 (On the New Sunday after Easter)*, ed. PG 36, 608–621.
- Gregory of Nazianzos, *Oration 45 (On Easter)*, ed. PG 36, 624–664.
- Joseph Rhakendytes, *Synopsis of Rhetoric*, ed. Ch. WALZ, Rhetores Graeci, 9 vols. Stuttgart – Tübingen 1832–1836, III (1832) 465–569.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *Epigrams 1–4*, ed. G. KOLIAS, Léon Choerosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie – Correspondance (Texte et traduction) (*Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie* 31). Athen 1939, 130–132.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *Epithalamia*, ed. F. CICCOLELLA, Cinque poeti bizantini. Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 5). Alessandria 2000, 76–82, 86–88, 110–114; G. R. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro e la Bisanzio del IX secolo. Le Anacreontee e il carme *Sulle Terme Pitiche*. Catania 2012, 75–76, 79–80, 85–86.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *Letters*, ed. G. KOLIAS, Léon Choerosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie – Correspondance (Texte et traduction) (*Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie* 31). Athen 1939, 76–129.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *Monody*, ed. F. CICCOLELLA, Cinque poeti bizantini. Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 5). Alessandria 2000, 66–70; G. R. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro e la Bisanzio del IX secolo. Le Anacreontee e il carme *Sulle Terme Pitiche*. Catania 2012, 73.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *On the Bath of Leo the Wise*, ed. F. CICCOLELLA, Cinque poeti bizantini. Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 5). Alessandria 2000, 94–106; G. R. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro e la Bisanzio del IX secolo. Le Anacreontee e il carme *Sulle Terme Pitiche*. Catania 2012, 81–83.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *On Thermal Springs*, ed. C. GALLAVOTTI, Planudea (X). 37. L'anacreontica *De Thermis* di Leone Magistro. *Bollettino dei Classici*, ser. III, 11 (1990) 78–103: 86–89; G. R. GIARDINA, Leone il Magistro e la Bisanzio del IX secolo. Le Anacreontee e il carme *Sulle Terme Pitiche*. Catania 2012, 147–152.
- Leo Choiosphaktes, *Thousand-Line Theology*, ed. I. VASSIS, Leon Magistros Choiosphaktes. *Chiliostichos Theologia*. Editio princeps. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Indices (*Supplementa Byzantina. Texte und Untersuchungen* 6). Berlin – New York 2002, 71–153.
- Manuel Philes, *Poems*, ed. Ae. MARTINI, Manuelis Philae Carmina inedita (*Atti della R. Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti* 20). Naples 1900.
- Manuel Philes, *Poems*, ed. E. MILLER, Manuelis Philae Carmina, 2 vols. Paris 1855–1857 (repr. Amsterdam 1967).
- Michael Psellos, *On Euripides and George of Pisidia*, ed. A. R. DYCK, Michael Psellus, The Essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius (*BV* 16). Vienna 1986, 40–50.
- Proclus, *Commentary on Plato's Parmenides*, ed. V. COUSIN, Procli Philosophi Platonici Opera inedita. Pars Tertia continens Procli Commentarium in Platonis Parmenidem. Hildesheim 1961.
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Celestial Hierarchy*, ed. G. HEIL – A. M. RITTER, Corpus Dionysiicum II: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De coelesti hierarchia, de ecclesiastica hierarchia, de mystica theologia, epistulae (*Patristische Texte und Studien* 36). Berlin 1991, 7–59.
- Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, *On the Divine Names*, ed. B. R. SUCHLA, Corpus Dionysiicum I: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus (*Patristische Texte und Studien* 33). Berlin 1990, 107–231.
- Ps.-Gregory of Corinth, *On the Four Parts of the Perfect Speech*, ed. W. HÖRANDNER, Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios, Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede. *MEG* 12 (2012) 87–131, 102–108.
- Ps.-Michael Psellos, *Poem 68*, ed. L. G. WESTERINK, Michaelis Pselli poemata (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*). Stuttgart – Leipzig 1992, 451–455.
- Testament, New*, ed. K. ALAND – M. BLACK – C. M. MARTINI – B. M. METZGER – A. WIKGREN, The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart 1968.
- Testament, Old (Septuagint)*, ed. A. RAHLFS, Septuaginta. Stuttgart 1935 (repr. 1971).

## SECONDARY LITERATURE

- F. BERNARD, Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025–1081 (*Oxford Studies in Byzantium*). Oxford 2014.
- G. BIANCHI, Sulla cultura astronomica di Giorgio di Pisidia. *Aevum* 40 (1966) 35–52.
- P. CANART, Le Vaticanus graecus 1257 et une poésie inédite de Jean Damascène. *BollGrott* 54 (2000) 141–154.
- F. CICCOLELLA, Cinque poeti bizantini. Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 5). Alessandria 2000.

- C. DE STEFANI, Critical Review of I. VASSIS, Leon Magistros Choiosphaktes. *Chiliostichos Theologia*. Editio princeps. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Indices (*Supplementa Byzantina. Texte und Untersuchungen* 6). Berlin – New York 2002. *Orpheus* n.s. 26 (2005) 227–231.
- G. FERMEGLIA, Studi sul testo delle due versioni (slava ed armena) dello “Hexaameron” di Giorgio Pisida. *Memorie dell’Istituto Lombardo – Accademia di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di Lettere – Scienze morali e storiche* 28 (1964) 227–333.
- M. HINTERBERGER, The Language of Byzantine Poetry: New Words, Alternative Forms, and “Mixed Language”, in: A Companion to Byzantine Poetry, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhoby – N. Zagklas (*Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World* 4). Leiden – Boston 2019, 38–65.
- W. HÖRANDNER, Beobachtungen zur Literarästhetik der Byzantiner. Einige byzantinische Zeugnisse zu Metrik und Rhythmik. *BSI* 56 (1995 = Stephanos. *Studia byzantina ac slavica Vladimíro Vavřínek ad annum sexagesimum quintum dedicata*. Ediderunt R. Dostálová – V. Konzal. L. Havlíková adiuvante) 279–290.
- W. HÖRANDNER, The Byzantine Didactic Poem – a Neglected Literary Genre? A Survey With Special Reference to the Eleventh Century, in: *Poetry and its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, ed. F. Bernard – K. Demoen. Farnham – Burlington 2012, 55–67.
- W. HÖRANDNER, Forme et fonction. Remarques sur la poésie dans la société byzantine (*Séminaires byzantins* 4). Paris 2017.
- W. HÖRANDNER, Teaching with Verse in Byzantium, in: A Companion to Byzantine Poetry, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhoby – N. Zagklas (*Brill’s Companions to the Byzantine World* 4). Leiden – Boston 2019, 459–486.
- W. HÖRANDNER – A. PAUL, Zu Ps.-Psellos, Gedichte 67 (Ad monachum superbum) und 68 (Ad eundem). *MEG* 11 (2011) 107–137.
- H. HUNGER, On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature. *DOP* 23–24 (1969–1970) 15–38.
- A. KAMBYLIS, Michael Psellos’ Schrift über Euripides und Pisides. Probleme der Textkonstitution. *JÖB* 44 (1994 = ΑΝΔΡΙΑΣ. Herbert Hunger zum 80. Geburtstag, ed. W. Hörandner – J. Koder – O. Kresten) 203–215.
- A. KAMBYLIS, Michael Psellos’ Schrift Τίς ἐστὶν αὐτῶν κρείττον ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἢ ὁ Πισίδης. Textkritische Bemerkungen. *JÖB* 56 (2006) 135–149.
- P. KARLIN-HAYTER, Arethas, Choiosphaktes and the Saracen Vizir. *Byz* 35 (1965) 455–481 (repr. in: EADEM, *Studies in Byzantine Political History. Sources and Controversies*. London 1981, IX).
- A. KAZHDAN, A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000), ed. Chr. Angelidi (*National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute for Byzantine Research. Research Series* 4). Athens 2006.
- G. KOLIAS, Léon Choiosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie – Correspondance (Texte et traduction) (*Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie* 31). Athens 1939.
- M. D. LAUXTERMANN, The Velocity of Pure Iambs. Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable. *JÖB* 48 (1998) 9–33.
- M. D. LAUXTERMANN, Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometers: Texts and Contexts, 2 vols. (*WBS* 24/1–2). Vienna 2003–2019.
- S. LILLA, La teologia negativa dal pensiero greco classico a quello patristico e bizantino. *Helikon* 22–27 (1982–1987) 211–279 [= I]; 28 (1988) 203–279 [= II]; 29–30 (1989–1990) 97–116 [= III]; 31–32 (1991–1992) 3–72 [= IV].
- P. MAAS, Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber. *BZ* 12 (1903) 278–323 (repr. in: IDEM, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. W. Buchwald. Munich 1973, 242–288).
- P. MAGDALINO, In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choiosphaktes and Constantine Manasses, in: *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. Maguire. Washington, D.C. 1997, 141–165.
- D. J. NODES, Rhetoric and Cultural Synthesis in the *Hexaameron* of George of Pisidia. *Vigiliae Christianae* 50 (1996) 274–287.
- A. PERTUSI, Dei poemi perduti di Giorgio di Pisidia. *Aevum* 30 (1956) 395–427.
- A. RHOBY, Die *Chiliostichos Theologia* des Leon Choiosphaktes. Edition und Kommentar. Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des Magistergrades der Philosophie eingereicht an der Geisteswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Wien, Vienna 1997.
- A. RHOBY, Vom jambischen Trimeter zum byzantinischen Zwölfsilber. Beobachtungen zur Metrik des spätantiken und byzantinischen Epigramms. *WS* 124 (2011) 117–142.
- A. RHOBY, Labeling Poetry in the Middle and Late Byzantine Period. *Byz* 85 (2015) 259–283.
- G. ROCHEFORT, Une anthologie grecque du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle: le Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 690. *Script* 4 (1950) 3–17.
- F. RONCONI, I manoscritti greci miscellanei. Ricerche su esemplari dei secoli IX–XII (*Testi, studi, strumenti* 21). Spoleto 2008.
- L. STERNBACH, De Georgii Pisidae apud Theophanem aliosque historicos reliquius; De Georgii Pisidae fragmentis a Suida servatis. *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci, Wydział filologiczny*, ser. II, 15 (1900), 1–107 and 108–198 (repr. in: IDEM, *Studia philologica in Georgium Pisidam*. Kraków 1900, 1–107 and 108–198).
- A. M. TARAGNA, Sulla fortuna di Giorgio di Pisidia in Michele Psello. Il caso del carne In Christi resurrectionem, in: *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Hinterberger – E. Schiffer (*Byzantinisches Archiv* 20). Berlin – New York 2007, 308–329.
- S. F. TOUGHER, The Reign of Leo VI (886–912). Politics and People (*The Medieval Mediterranean* 15). Leiden – New York – Cologne 1997.
- G. ULUHOĞIAN, In margine alla versione armena dello ‘Hexaameron’ di Giorgio di Pisidia. *Rivista di Bizantinistica (= Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi)* 6 (1991) 91–109.

- I. VASSIS, George of Pisidia: the Spring of Byzantine Poetry?, in: *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. W. Hörandner – A. Rhoby – N. Zagklas (*Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World* 4). Leiden – Boston 2019, 149–165.
- M. WHITBY, George of Pisidia and the Persuasive Word: Words, Words, Words..., in: *Rhetoric in Byzantium. Papers from the Thirty-fifth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001, ed. E. Jeffreys (*Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Publications* 11). Aldershot 2003, 173–186.



