

**LOGOI HISTORIAS ACROSS TIME:
EVOLUTION AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS
IN THE WRITING OF SPEECHES AND LETTERS
IN BYZANTINE HISTORICAL WORKS**

ANNA MARIA TARAGNA

Introduction

The report of someone's spoken or written words, mostly in the form of speeches and letters, is a typical and somehow standardized element of Byzantine historical works related to classical models.¹ Throughout the centuries, however, this literary element does not remain entirely unchanged, and this "evolution", together with the presence of historiographical *logoi* in other types of history writing as well (namely chronicles and ecclesiastical histories, which in principle preferred to avoid the elaborate discourses of rhetorical historiography),² may provide some insights into the difficulties posed by the traditional "boundaries" and "opposi-

This article is the written version of a paper given at the Symposium "Literary history in a Medieval Eurasian environment: Methodological and interpretive approaches" held at Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz on 9-11 January 2023. I sincerely thank Prof. Panagiotis A. Agapitos for inviting me and for all his precious remarks and suggestions.

- 1 As is known, since the writings of the logographers, ἔργα and λόγοι have been the basic compositional elements of any historical narrative, but it is especially since the work of Thucydides that λόγοι have been felt as a typical, and ineradicable, feature of the historiographical genre. As Lucian of Samosata said in the 2nd century AD, all authors who want to compose a συγγραφή compete with Thucydides (ἅπασι [...] πρὸς [...] τὸν Θουκυδίδην ἢ ἄμιλλα) and thus they insert discourses modelled on his example in their works (*Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 26, 4-6 Kilburn). In turn, the *logoi* of Byzantine classicizing historical works have been repeatedly described as flatly imitative of ancient models, rigid, fixed, unoriginal and overly rhetorical (in a negative sense).
- 2 On the one hand, ecclesiastical historians, driven by the need for a Christian and teleological interpretation of events and a narration of Church history, preferred authentic documents (conciliar acts, imperial edicts, protocols), and not "invented" *logoi*, recreated *ad sensum*; on the other hand, the authors of the universal chronicles, moved by the need for simple communication for a wide audience, preferred to avoid the long, difficult δημηγορίαί of the high tradition. But while the separation of church history and universal chronicle from high Byzantine historiography might have made sense at the beginning of the 4th and 5th centuries, it lost its rationale in the course of time, as is well known, given the changes in the context of the production of these texts in the following centuries.

tions” that still govern the taxonomy of texts in Byzantine literature (*i.e.* secular *vs.* religious texts, literary *vs.* scientific works, poetry *vs.* prose, and learned *vs.* vernacular language).³

This article will necessarily only provide an exemplification of this topic, which is very complex, not only because of the large number of historical works, but also because of the heterogeneity of phenomena that can be observed in a text. The reproduction of the words expressed in oral or written form by an individual is in fact a kind of *continuum*, in which we move from more “diegetic” forms (speech/letter as the object of narration) to more “mimetic” forms (speech/letter as the object of representation), and this mimetic form too may have a wide variety of ways in which it is reported, so that, from a practical point of view, lists of *logoi* inserted in historiographical texts can never be exhaustive.⁴

-
- 3 The analysis of this particular literary element – the *logoi* in the *Histories* – aims to be a case-study about the problems chiefly posed by what P.A. Agapitos has appropriately called the “Krumbacher paradigm”, with its four boundaries: thematic (*i.e.* religious *vs.* secular texts) and aesthetic (*i.e.* literary *vs.* scientific works), as regards the “content”; formal (*i.e.* poetry *vs.* prose) and linguistic (*i.e.* learned *vs.* vernacular language), as regards the “expression” of texts, still present today in the way we look at Byzantine literature. See especially P.A. AGAPITOS, *The Periodization of Byzantine Literature: From a Historical to a Literary Model*, in: I. GRIMM-STADELMANN – A. RIEHLE – R. TOCCI – M.M. VUČETIĆ (eds.), *Anekdotia Byzantina: Studien zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur. Festschrift für Albrecht Berger anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstags (BA, 41)*. Berlin–Boston 2023, 1-20. Cf. ID., *Karl Krumbacher and the History of Byzantine Literature*. *BZ* 108 (2015) 1-52; ID., *Contesting Conceptual Boundaries: Byzantine Literature and its History*. *Interfaces – Medieval European Literatures* 1 (2015) 62-91; ID., *Franz Dölger and the Hieratic Model of Byzantine Literature*. *BZ* 112 (2019) 707-780; ID., *The Insignificance of 1204 and 1453 for the History of Byzantine Literature*. *MEG* 20 (2020) 1-56.
- 4 The variety and complexity of this topic is confirmed also by the different – if not antithetical – theoretical statements developed by ancient Greek historians and rhetoricians on the nature, content, form and function of historiographical *logoi* within a historical work. On the one hand, there is the idea that *logoi* are an “essential element” of both the unfolding of History (thus Thucydides [*Hist.* I 22, 1-2], who places ἔργα and λόγοι on the same level, or Polybius [*Hist.* XII 25a3], for whom discourses themselves would be πράξεις) and the historiographical exposition (for Marcellinus [*Vita Thuc.* 38], δημιουργοίαι «give life» to the bare narrative of the work; in the first half of 14th century Nikephorus Gregoras still remarks on the usefulness of *logoi* in explaining the souls of characters and reflecting the meaning of events in a historical work [*Rhom. Hist.* XIII 3, 2]); on the other hand, on the contrary, Lucian [*Hist. conscr.* 58] remarks that discourses are a simple “accessory element” in the body of the historical narrative. As for the content of *logoi*, someone emphasises the importance of ἀλήθεια (Thucydides and Polybius), someone else thinks the πρέπον (Dionysius of Halicarnassus [*Epist. ad Pomp.* 3, 20]) or the εἰκός (Lucian) are enough. The idea, finally, that the author’s δόξα may have an influence only in the selection of occasions and topics of the *logoi* (as in Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus) finds opposition in the words of Lucian, who talks about the possibility for a

A selection will therefore be made here with regard to the authors and the works and the *logoi* within them, looking, on the one hand, at the “typology” of *orationes* and *epistulae* in relation to their form and content and the actors involved (the *actor-addresser* and the *actor-addressee*), and without considering, on the other hand, the historical and documentary reliability of these *logoi*: they will rather be analysed as genre connotations, compositional elements of works written by an *author-addresser* to a *reader-addressee*⁵ according to a peculiar literary genre, the γένος of the ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν.

This contribution will focus in particular on an extended moment in the passage of time, the 6th and 7th centuries, where we will see at first, in a “vertical”, diachronic way, three great representatives of Byzantine classicizing historiography: Procopius of Caesarea (c. 500-565) with the *Bella* and the so called *Historia arcana*, Agathias of Myrina (c. 530-580) with the *Historiae*, and Theophylact Simocatta (first half of the 7th century) with the *Historia universalis*; and then, in a “horizontal”, synchronic way, the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus (c. 536-594) and the so-called *Chronicon Paschale* (first half of the 7th century), in comparison especially with Theophylact Simocatta and the “Christian dimension” of his work. With regard to the “imperial dimension” of Simocatta’s *Historia universalis*, there will also be a foray into the 11th and 12th centuries, to see two peculiar historical works related to the education of an emperor (or similar figure): the *Historia syntomos* attributed to Michael Psellos (c. 1018-1080) and the *Synopsis Chronike* by Constantine Manasses (c. 1130-1187).

historian to exhibit his oratory skills with speeches. For an analysis of all these and other passages, with bibliographical references, see A.M. TARAGNA, *Logoi historias. Discorsi e lettere nella prima storiografia retorica bizantina (Hellenica, 7)*. Alessandria 2000, 17-61 (“Le teorie sul *logos* storiografico”); J. MARINCOLA, *Speeches in Classical Historiography*, in: ID. (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols. Malden (MA)–Oxford–Carlton (Victoria) 2007, vol. 1, 118-132; M. FOX – N. LIVINGSTONE, *Rhetoric and Historiography*, in: I. WORTHINGTON (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Malden (MA)–Oxford–Carlton (Victoria) 2007, 542-561.

- 5 We adopt the terminology proposed by Joseph D. Frendo as an adaptation of Roman Jakobson’s schematic representation of the constitutive factors in any act of verbal communication, *i.e.* the expansion of “the primary and antithetical pair *addresser/addressee* into *actor addresser/actor addressee* and *author addresser/reader addressee*”: J.D. FREND, *Three Authors in Search of a Reader. An Approach to the Analysis of Direct Discourse in Procopius, Agathias and Theophylact Simocatta*, in: C. SODE – S.A. TAKÁCS (eds.), *Novum millennium: Studies in Byzantine History and Culture Presented to Paul Speck*. Aldershot 2001, 123-136: 125.

1. Procopius of Caesarea

The major work of Procopius of Caesarea (c. 500-565), the *Wars (Bella)*, constitutes a privileged ground for the study of *logoi* in Byzantine rhetorical historiography. Indeed, the number of speeches and letters within this text is particularly marked, as we can record about 165 instances of extended *logoi*, divided into 120 *orationes* and 45 *epistulae*, most of them – 134 cases, equivalent to about 80% of the whole – with an average length of 40 lines of the Haury–Wirth edition (but there also 5 speeches with more than 70 lines, up to 95).⁶ In total, they occupy about one sixth of the work.

Their distribution is uniform: none of the eight books is devoid of *logoi*, as can be seen in the following Table.

Procopius' <i>Wars</i> : Distribution of the extended <i>logoi</i>					
Book	<i>Logoi</i>	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>	Topic	Events of the years
I	17	12	5	<i>Persian Wars</i>	527-549
II	21	18	3		
III	14	7	7	<i>Vandal Wars</i>	533-546
IV	20	12	8		
V	26	19	7	<i>Gothic Wars</i>	535-549
VI	28	20	8		
VII	22	18	4		
VIII (published after the first seven books)	17	14	3	<i>Persian, Vandal, Gothic Wars</i>	550-552/3
	Tot. 165	Tot. 120	Tot. 45		

6 See the speeches in II 15, 14-30 (73 lines), VII 34, 6-24 (82 lines), VII 16, 9-26 (87 lines), II 3, 32-53 (88 lines), VII 25, 4-24 (95 lines): ed. J. HAURY, *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*. Editio stereotypa correctior addenda et corrigenda adiecit G. WIRTH, 4 vols. Lipsiae 1962-1964: vols. 1-2. For a complete classification of *Bella's logoi*, see TARAGNA, *Logoi historias* (cit. n. 4), 63-139 (with bibliography) and 221-236 (Table). About Procopius, the scholarly bibliography is vast: for authoritative overviews, see especially Av. CAMERON, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*. Berkeley–Los Angeles 1985; D. BRODKA, *Die Geschichtsphilosophie in der spätantiken Historiographie*. Studien zu Prokopios von Kaisareia, Agathias von Myrina und Theophylaktos Simokattes. Frankfurt 2004; A. KALDELLIS, *Procopius of Caesarea. Tyranny, History and Philosophy at the End of Antiquity*. Philadelphia 2004; and all the contributions, with bibliography (especially the studies by G. GREATREX), in: M. MEIER – F. MONTINARO (eds.), *A Companion to Procopius of Caesarea (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World, 2)*. Leiden–Boston 2022.

The first consideration that can be drawn from these data is that, for Procopius, *logoi* are an element of primary importance in the composition of the *Bella*. Their frequent inclusion, their rather extensive length, and, above all, the search for a certain regularity in their distribution testify to the special care the author wished to devote to them. The main reason for this interest can be easily identified. With the *Wars* Procopius intended to place himself “within” the great Greek historiographical tradition. In this regard, the very beginning of his work is a proof, for the connection established by the author with the proemial phrases of Thucydides’ and Herodotus’ *Historiae*:

Proc. *Bell.* I 1, 1

Προκόπιος Καισαρεύς τοὺς πολέμους ξυνέγραψε, οὓς Ἰουστινιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς πρὸς βαρβάρους διήνεγκε τοὺς τε ἐφούς καὶ ἐσπερίους, ὥς πη αὐτῶν ἐκάστῳ ξυνηχέθη γενέσθαι,

ὥς μὴ ἔργα ὑπερμεγέθη ὁ μέγας αἰὼν λόγου ἔρημα χειρωσάμενος τῇ τε λήθῃ αὐτὰ καταπρόηται καὶ παντάπασιν ἐξίτηλα θῆται, ὥνπερ τὴν μνήμην αὐτὸς ᾤετο μέγα τι ἔσεσθαι καὶ ξυνοῖσον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τοῖς τε νῦν οὔσι καὶ τοῖς ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα γενησομένοις, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ὁ χρόνος ἐς ὁμοίαν τινὰ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀνάγκην διάθοιτο.

Thuc. I 1, 1-2

Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων,

ὥς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων, τεκμαιρόμενος ὅτι ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν ἐς αὐτὸν ἀμφοτέρω παρασκευῇ τῇ πάσῃ καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ὄρων ξυνοστάμενον πρὸς ἑκατέρους, τὸ μὲν εὐθύς, τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον. Κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὥς δὲ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων.

Hdt. *Pr.*

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε,

ὥς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἑλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ <δὴ καὶ> δι’ ἦν αἰτίη ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.

From the very first words of the *Bella* – and with many lexical and structural similarities –, Procopius signals to his readers that his work “belongs” to the tradition of classical historiography, and he identifies Thucydides and Herodotus as his main models for the theme (the account of wars) and the purpose of the work (the remembrance of great deeds, to save them from oblivion) and, of course, also for the structure and the language, and the literary elements (as the

logoi). Therefore, Procopius inserts speeches and letters because it is an expected literary element within the γένος ιστορικών.

The comparison with Procopius' other historical work, the scandalous *Anecdota* (*Historia arcana*), is significant. Conceived by him as a historiographical complement to the *Bella*, the *Secret history* does not belong to the traditional γένος ιστορικών, rather to a different literary genre – a sort of ψόγος or a diary of Belisarius' home and court life, very much based on “hearsay” –, which, in any case, requires other rules of form (such as the exaggeration in the criticism against the protagonists and their crimes), but not the extensive use of *logoi*. In fact, in the *Anecdota* there are only 2 speeches and 2 letters and some phrases, which covers a very small portion of the overall work (only about one to two per cent).⁷

Another interesting feature of the *logoi* in Procopius' *Bella* is their typology of form and content.

As for the form, these *logoi* are for the most part in *oratio recta*: 146 cases (101 *orationes* and all the 45 *epistulae*) against 12 speeches in indirect form and 7 with mixed-form (with a transition from a first part in *oratio obliqua* to a second part in *oratio recta* and *vice versa*):⁸

7 There are two *orationes* (2, 6-11 and 15, 27-33, of 28 and 20 lines respectively) and two *epistulae* (2, 33-35 and 4, 27-28, of 9 and 7 lines), for an overall percentage of *logoi* of only 1,48%: ed. HAURY-WIRTH, *Procopii Caesariensis opera* (cit. n. 6), vol. 3.

8 Speeches in *oratio recta*: all *orationes* in Book I (4, 22-26; 11, 13-18; 14, 13-19; 14, 21-27; 16, 1-3; 16, 4-8; 17, 30-39; 18, 17-23; 18, 27-29; 21, 24-25; 24, 26-30; 24, 33-37) and Book IV (1, 13-25; 2, 9-22; 2, 24-32; 11, 23-36; 11, 38-46; 12, 12-16; 15, 16-29; 15, 30-39; 15, 54-57; 16, 12-24; 20, 5-9; 27, 11-18); alongside most of those of Book II (2, 4-11; 3, 32-53; 6, 3-6; 7, 20-22; 7, 23-33; 8, 31-32; 9, 1-6; 10, 10-15; 15, 14-30; 16, 6-15; 18, 5-15; 19, 6-14; 19, 36-43; 26, 32-37), Book III (10, 8-17; 12, 11-21; 15, 2-17; 15, 18-30; 16, 2-8; 19, 2-10), Book V (7, 14-15; 7, 17-21; 8, 7-11; 8, 12-18; 8, 29-40; 9, 23-28; 10, 30-33; 10, 40-42; 10, 43-45; 11, 12-25; 13, 17-25; 20, 8-14; 20, 15-18; 28, 6-14; 28, 24-27; 29, 3-12), Book VI (3, 13-22; 3, 23-32; 6, 4-12; 6, 14-22; 6, 22-26; 12, 15-22; 16, 6-13; 18, 12-22; 18, 23-26; 21, 5-9; 21, 30-37; 23, 23-28; 23, 29-34; 28, 9-15; 28, 16-22; 29, 8-14; 30, 5-10; 30, 11-15; 30, 18-24), Book VII (4, 2-8; 4, 10-18; 7, 11-16; 8, 15-24; 11, 1-9; 16, 9-26; 16, 27-32; 17, 2-7; 21, 1-11; 25, 4-24; 34, 6-24; 34, 25-39), Book VIII (8, 6-13; 12, 4-13; 14, 14-21; 19, 9-21; 23, 14-22; 23, 23-28; 24, 12-24; 24, 25-29; 30, 1-6; 30, 7-20).
Letters in *oratio recta*: I 11, 7-9; I 14, 1-4; I 14, 5-6; I 14, 7-10; I 14, 11-12; II 4, 17-25; II 20, 22-23; II 20, 25-27; III 9, 10-13; III 9, 15-19; III 9, 20-23; III 10, 29-31; III 16, 13-14; III 24, 3-4; III 25, 11-18; IV 5, 12-17; IV 5, 19-24; IV 6, 15-26; IV 6, 27-30; IV 7, 7-9; IV 11, 2-8; IV 11, 9-13; IV 22, 7-10; V 3, 17-18; V 3, 19-27; V 5, 8-9; V 6, 15-21; V 6, 22-25; V 7, 23-24; V 24, 1-17; VI 16, 15-16; VI 18, 28; VI 21, 13-15; VI 21, 17-22; VI 24, 7-10; VI 25, 20-23; VI 26, 6-7; VI 26, 8-13; VII 9, 7-18; VII 12, 3-10; VII 21, 21-24; VII 22, 8-16; VIII 16, 23-31; VIII 23, 4-6; VIII 28, 2-3.

Speeches in *oratio obliqua*: II 6, 18-19; II 21, 13-14; II 26, 38-39; II 26, 45-46; III 20, 18-20; V 4, 5-8; V 27, 26-29; VI 18, 4-9; VII 32, 16-20; VII 37, 11-14; VII 37, 15-17; VIII 35, 33.

Speeches in mixed form: V 2, 11-17; VII 21, 12-16; VII 32, 5-11; VII 40, 26-28; VIII 18,

Procopius' Wars: Form of the extended <i>logoi</i>			
Form	<i>Logoi</i>	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Oratio recta</i>	146	101	45
<i>Oratio obliqua</i>	12	12	–
Mixed form	7	7	–
	Tot. 165	Tot. 120	Tot. 45

a choice behind which we can see, first of all, the example of Thucydides, who preferred the long *logoi* in *oratio recta* (while the *oratio obliqua* and the mixed form were typical of Polybius), but there is also Procopius' desire to provide a realistic "representation" of the original *logos*, as if the actual *actor-addresser* produced it. With the direct form the author can give the reader the impression that he is making a faithful reproduction of the original, telling the truth of what was actually spoken or written by someone. Accordingly, for instance, when Procopius reports diplomatic negotiations, he uses *logoi* in direct form for "official" discussions and messages, while he sets forth in indirect, diegetic form the "unofficial" arrangements made either in secret (λάθρα) or in private (ιδίῳ).⁹ In general, he also puts *logoi* in direct form in the "contemporary history" sections, excluding them from the "archaeological" sections of his work (where he talks about events before 527).¹⁰

As is well known, the report in *oratio recta* does not prevent a formal reworking of the contents, as was the case in Thucydides' *Histories*. Thus, Procopius reworks the *logoi* at the level of their internal logical-argumentative structure, in particular by connecting the contingent situation with abstract ideas, set forth either in the form of broader general reflections or in the form of sentences

18-20; VIII 20, 14- 20; VIII 35, 34-35.

9 See especially the embassy between Justinian and Amalasantha described in V 3. Justinian sends Alexander, a man of the senate, to investigate the whole situation with regard to Amalasantha, but officially to protest on certain issues. The envoy relates the emperor's secret message to Amalasantha (τούς τε βασιλέως λόγους ἀπήγγειλε λάθρα: V 3, 16), but openly (ἐς τὸ ἐμφανές: *ibid.*) he gives her an official letter, which Procopius reports in *oratio recta* in V 3, 17-18. In her turn, Amalasantha responds officially (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφαναοῦς: V 3, 28) with another long epistle – also reported in *oratio recta* in V 3, 19-27 –, but «secretly (λάθρα: V 3, 28) she agreed to put the whole of Italy into his hands».

10 The "archaeological" sections, *i.e.*, relating to events before 527 (the year of Justinian's accession to the throne) with which in particular the *Bellum Persicum* (I 1-10) and *Bellum Vandalicum* (III 1-8) open – sections that allow Procopius to summarize Byzantine policy towards Persians and Germanic peoples during the last century and a half – present only brief *logoi*, direct or indirect (with the sole exception of the direct speech in I 4, 22-26, within the story of the Persian king Peroz' pearl).

(γνώμαι), and above all by using the dialectic of “contrary opinions”, corresponding to the rhetorical taste for antithesis and antinomy. This reworking concerns both speeches and letters, so that the *logoi* of *Bella* mostly show a substantial uniformity in their stylistic development: no real “epistolary style” can be discerned; at most, for letters, Procopius uses a greater brevity in reporting the written words.

Regarding the taste for antithesis, we can also say that Procopius has almost an “obsession” with it, since he very often structures two *logoi* in an antithetical relationship. Behind this there is again the example of Thucydides and his so-called antilogies, but this is no mere homage to tradition. Procopius loves this technique with great passion: it is his personal “stylistic signature”. Below are the Tables with the different antilogies in Procopius’ *Wars*.

There are *antilogiae in praesentia*, when two *actor-addressers* face each other *vis-à-vis* in a verbal confrontation, especially in assembly debates (an ἀγών), which in the *Bella* are military rather than political debates: Procopius reports the numerous meetings of Byzantine officers in which he himself, as secretary to General Belisarius, most likely participated. But one can also speak of antilogies *in praesentia* when one person replies with his letter to the epistle of another.

Procopius’ <i>Wars</i> : Antilogical structures <i>in praesentia</i> . Assembly <i>agones</i>			
III 15, 2-17	III 15, 18-30	Archelaus <i>vs</i> Belisarius	Meeting of Byzantine officers in 533, at the time of the landing in Africa
VI 18, 12-22	VI 18, 23-26	Belisarius <i>vs</i> Narses	Meeting of Byzantine officers in 538, during the Gothic war against Vittigis

Procopius’ <i>Wars</i> : Antilogical structures <i>in praesentia</i> . Verbal and thought clashes			
I 14, 1-4 I 14, 7-10	I 14, 5-6 I 14, 11-12	Belisarius (and Hermogenes) <i>vs</i> the Persian Peroz	Exchange of epistles
I 16, 13	I 16, 4-8	Rufinus, Justinian’s envoy <i>vs</i> Persian king Cabades	Verbal clash
II 7, 20-22	II 7, 23-33	Persian king Cabades <i>vs</i> Megas, bishop of Beroea	Verbal clash
II 20, 22-23	II 20, 25-27	Byzantine generals Justus and Buzes <i>vs</i> Belisarius	Exchange of epistles

II 26, 32-37	II 26, 38-39	Stephanus of Edessa <i>vs</i> Persian king Chosroes	Verbal clash
III 9, 15-19	III 9, 20-23	Justinian <i>vs</i> the Vandal king Gelimer	Exchange of epistles
III 24, 3-4	III 25, 11-18	Tzazon <i>vs</i> the Vandal king Gelimer, his brother	Exchange of epistles
IV 5, 12-17	IV 5, 19, 24	Belisarius <i>vs</i> the commanders of the Goths in Sicily	Exchange of epistles
IV 6, 15-26	IV 6, 27-30	commander Pharas <i>vs</i> the Vandal king Gelimer	Exchange of epistles
IV 11, 2-8	IV 11, 9-13	Moors' leader <i>vs</i> Belisarius' advisor Solomon	Exchange of epistles
V 3, 17-18	V 3, 19-27	Justinian <i>vs</i> Amalasantha	Exchange of epistles
V 6, 15-21	V 6, 22-25	King of the Goths Theodatus <i>vs</i> Justinian	Exchange of epistles
V 7, 14-15	V 7, 17-21	King of the Goths Theodatus <i>vs</i> Justinian's envoys	Verbal clash
V 10, 40-42	V 10, 43-45	Stephanus <i>vs</i> Asclepiodotus, in the presence of Belisarius	Verbal clash
V 20, 8-14	V 20, 15-18	envoys of the king of the Goths Vittigis <i>vs</i> Belisarius	Verbal clash
VI 3, 13-22	VI 3, 23-32	inhabitants of Rome <i>vs</i> Belisarius	Verbal clash
VI 26, 6-7	VI 26, 8-13	Goths in Auximum <i>vs</i> Vittigis, the king of the Goths	Exchange of epistles
VI 30, 5-10	VI 30, 11-15	Goths' envoys <i>vs</i> Uraias, nephew of Vittigis	Verbal clash
VII 16, 9-26	VII 16, 27-32	Totila <i>vs</i> Pelagius, envoy of the inhabitants of Rome	Verbal clash
VII 37, 11-14	VII 37, 15-17	Totila's envoys <i>vs</i> Diogenes and Byzantines	Verbal clash
VIII 24, 12-24	VIII 24, 25-29	Leontius, envoy <i>vs</i> King of the Franks Theudibald	Verbal clash

Then, there are *antilogiae in absentia*, when the author, for the benefit of his reader, puts two *logoi* in antithetical opposition, close to each other within the work, but beyond actual space and time, as is typical with the exhortatory speeches delivered by the two opposing generals to their respective armies before battle.

Procopius' <i>Wars</i> : Antilogical structures <i>in absentia</i> . Fictitious antilogies	
I 11, 7-9 I 11, 13-18	Πρεσβευτικὸς λόγος ¹¹ of the Persian king Cabades and ὑποθήκη of the Byz. <i>quaestor</i> Proclus addressed to Justin and Justinian
I 14, 13-19 I 14, 21-27	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the battle of Dara in 530: Persian Mirranes Peroz vs Belisarius and his assistant Hermogenes
I 24, 26-30 I 24, 33-37	Ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ λόγοι during the Nika riot of 532: Senator Origenes vs Empress Theodora
II 2, 4-11 II 3, 32-53 II 4, 17-25	Πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι addressed to the king of the Persians Chosroes: envoys of the king of the Goths Vittigis vs the Armenian Bassaces vs Justinian
IV 1, 13-25 IV 2, 9-22 IV 2, 24-3	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the final battle (533) between Byzantines and Vandals: Belisarius vs the Vandal king Gelimer (to the whole army) and Tzazon his brother (to Vandals who had returned with him from Sardinia).
IV 11, 23-36 IV 11, 38-46	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the battle of Mammes in the Byzacium in 535: Byzantine Solomon vs the leaders of the Moors
IV 15, 16-29 IV 15, 30-39	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the battle of Membresa in 536: Belisarius vs Stotzas, leader of mutinous Byzantine soldiers in Libya
IV 15, 54-57 IV 16, 12-24	Στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι during the mutiny of Byz. soldiers in Libya in 537: the rebel leader Stotzas vs Justinian's nephew, Germanus
V 28, 6-14 V 29, 3-12	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the 537 pitched battle of Rome: Belisarius vs Vittigis, the king of the Goths
VI 28, 9-15 VI 28, 16-22	Πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι addressed to the king of the Goths, Vittigis, in 539: Franks' envoys vs Belisarius' envoys
VII 34, 6-24 VII 34, 25-39	Πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι addressed to Justinian in 536: the envoys of the Lombards vs the envoys of the Gepids
VIII 23, 14-22 VIII 23, 23-28	Παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι before the naval battle of Ancon in 551: Byzantine commanders John and Valerian vs leaders of the Goths

11 For this and the following terminology, used for the classification of the historiographical *logoi* as regards their content, see *infra*.

VIII 30, 1-6 VIII 30, 7-20	Παρακλητικοί λόγοι before the clash of Taginae in 552: Narses vs the king of the Goths Totila
VIII 35, 33 VIII 35, 34-35	Πρεσβευτικός λόγος of the captains of the Goths and ὑποθήκη of John (grandson of Vitalian) addressed to Narses

Alongside these major forms of antithesis, there are other structures that the author uses, such as forms of opposition linked to the same *actor-addresser* who, in relation to the situation or his *actor-addressee*, holds two opposing *logoi* at short intervals.¹² Procopius also inserts the so-called “intertwined ἀγῶνες”,¹³ which consist in two antithetical *logoi*, by two different *actor-addressers*, reported at rather distant points in the work: as for the antilogies *in absentia*, it is once again the *author-addresser* who creates a fictitious antilogy for his *reader-addressee*.

Procopius' Wars: Antilogical structures <i>in absentia</i> . Intertwined <i>agones</i>	
II 2, 4-11 II 3, 32-53 II 4, 17-25 II 10, 10-15	To the king of the Persians, Chosroes: – the speech of the envoy of Vittigis, king of the Goths – the speech of the Armenian Bassaces – Justinian's letter – and the speech of the envoys from the city of Antioch
V 8, 7-11 V 8, 12-18 V 8, 29-40 VII 7, 11-16	During the siege of Naples, 536 A.D.: – the envoy of the Neapolitans, Stephanus – vs Belisarius; – the δημηγορία of Pastor and Asclepiodotus – and Totila's speech to the Neapolitans during the siege in 542
V 27, 26-29 V 28, 24-27	Rome, 537 A.D. – Belisarius to his friends – vs Principius and Tarmutus to Belisarius

Finally, in Procopius' *Bella* we can also find what can be called a “tragic ἀγών”: the debate between Belisarius and the envoys of the Goths described in VI 6. Here there are, one after the other, a *logos* of introduction by the Goths (VI 6, 4-12), two long *orationes* in antilogy – uttered by the Goths (VI 6, 14-22) and by Belisarius (VI 6, 22-26), who uses the keyword ῥῆσις referring to the long speech of the

-
- 12 For instance, in I 18, Belisarius pronounces a στρατιωτικός λόγος aimed at curbing the excessive ardour of those who want to get straight to the fight with the enemies (I 18, 17-23); but, when the soldiers start railing against him, accusing him of being a coward, he changes his exhortation (ἀντιστρέψας τὴν παραίνεσιν: I 18, 25) and switches to inciting his men with a παράκλησις (referred to in a diegematic form).
- 13 Another Thucydidean element: see M. CAGNETTA, Gli «agoni intrecciati» nell'opera di Tucidide. *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 111 (1983) 422-434.

envoys –, then two short speeches (of 5/6 lines) by the Barbarians (VI 6, 27) and Belisarius (VI 6, 28-29); finally, a kind of *dystichomythia*: a tight dialogue, with two questions by the Goths and two answers by Belisarius, each one of two lines and each one introduced by the same expression. It is a very particular structure, where we can see a sort of a mixture of literary genres (tragedy and historiography), or the “intrusion” of poetry into the prose, from the formal point of view: a “transgression” that clearly does not trouble an author, such as Procopius, who is so careful with the elements of historiographical tradition.¹⁴ This is for the form.

As regards the types of content of speeches and letters in the *Bella*, we can observe the three fundamental types of historiographical *logoi* used in practice since Thucydides, but defined, with a kind of theoretical classification, by Polybius (c. 200-118 BC) in some fragments of Book XII of his *Histories*, devoted to the polemic against Timaeus of Tauromenium (4th-3rd cent. BC) in whom Polybius recognizes the negative paradigm of bookish and exhibitionist historiography, contaminated by an excessive rhetoric.

Polyb. XII 25 a 3:

ἵνα δὲ καὶ τοὺς φιλοτιμότερον διακει-
μένους μεταπέισωμεν, ῥητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ
τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ μελέτης τῆς κατὰ
τὰς δημηγορίας καὶ τὰς παρακλήσεις, ἔτι
δὲ τοὺς πρεσβευτικούς λόγους [...]

But to convince those also who are dis-
posed to champion him [*i.e.* Timaeus
of Tauromenium], I must speak of the
principle on which he composes public
speeches, harangues to soldiers, the dis-
courses of ambassadors [...]

The tripartition given above returns a little later in XII 25 i 3:

ὡς δ' ἀληθές ἐστι τὸ νυνὶ λεγόμενον
καὶ ἐκφανέστατον γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπὶ τε τῶν
συμβουλευτικῶν καὶ παρακλητικῶν, ἔτι
δὲ πρεσβευτικῶν λόγων, οἷς κέχρηται
Τίμαιος.

How true what I have just said is will be
most clear from the speeches, political,
exhortatory, and ambassadorial, intro-
duced by Timaeus.¹⁵

14 It should be noted that also in the *Anecdota* there is a similar intrusion of the theater: in 15, 34, to a patrician – «an old man who had spent a long time in office» – who pleads through tears to recover a large credit given to a servant of Theodora, the empress replies, chanting «O patrician So-and-So» (naming him), and the chorus of eunuchs says responsively «It's a large hernia you have!». It is a scene from the theater, from mime in particular, which is moreover the *milieu* from which Theodora comes. Earlier (*Anecd.* 15, 23-24) Procopius recalls that she ridiculed and mocked (διασύρουσα καὶ χλευάζουσα) the accusers of her *protégés*, and did her best to change even the most serious matters to an occasion for buffoonery (εἰς γελωποποιίαν μεταβάλλειν), as though she were on the stage in the theater (ὥσπερ ἐν σκηνῇ καὶ θεάτρῳ).

15 Here and above, translation from Polybius, *The Histories*. Vol. 4: Books 9-15. Transl. by W.R. PATON. Revis. by F.W. WALBANK – CHR. HABICHT. Cambridge (MA) 2011 (*Loeb Classical Library*, 159), 411 and 427.

Therefore, alongside the deliberative genre of Aristotelian tradition, the συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι – also defined as δημηγορίαι and understood as speeches delivered before an assembly, be it a council, the βουλή, or a gathering of people, the δῆμος –, Polybius identifies two further categories of historiographical *logoi*:

- the παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι (or παρακλήσεις), addressed as exhortations by generals to soldiers in the imminence of a battle, a type which, in some way, belongs both to the deliberative genre, on the one hand, because these *logoi* are a sort of “advice”/“impulse” (προτροπή) towards what is good (βέλτιον), and a “dissuasion” (ἀποτροπή) from what is bad (χειρόν): cf. Aristot. *Rhet.* I 3, 1358b 8 ff.; and, on the other hand, to the epideictic genre, because of their praise (ἔπαινος) of the virtue of courage and, conversely, their blame (ψόγος) of cowardice;
- and the πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι, delivered by envoys: a type about which we can find some notes in the treatise on epideictic speeches of Menander Rhetor (3rd or 4th cent. AD), but a broader theoretical treatment, together with the παρακλήσεις, in Byzantine military manuals, such as the so-called *Rhetorica militaris* and the *Περὶ στρατηγικῆς* of the so-called Byzantine Anonymous.¹⁶

These three types of speech continue through the centuries in Byzantine historiographical rhetorical tradition, in practice as well as in theory: fourteen centuries after Polybius, the historian John Zonaras (1110-1165) talks about the same three types, when he explains the formal register of his own work, as a middle way between the rhetorical connotations of learned historiography and the simple, unpretentious literary elements of the chronicle.

Joh. Zon. *Epit. Hist. pr.*

<p>τίνοι γὰρ ἔσται τις λυσιτέλεια [...] ἐκ τοῦ γινῶναι τί μὲν ὁ δημαγωγὸς ὄδε διειλέχθη τῷ δήμῳ, τί δὲ τοῖς στρατιώταις ὁ στρα-</p>	<p>For whom will there be any advantage as a result of knowing what this demagogue said to the people, what the general said</p>
---	--

16 See especially Δημηγορίαι προτρεπτικαὶ πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἐκ διαφόρων ἀφορμῶν λαμβάνουσαι τὰς ὑποθέσεις, known as *Rhetorica militaris* (ed. A. KÖCHLY, Anonymi Byzantini *Rhetorica militaris*, in: ID., *Opuscula academica*, II. Lipsiae 1856; Siriano. *Discorsi di guerra. Testo, traduzione e commento* di I. ERAMO, con una nota di L. CANFORA. Bari 2010; transl. G. THEOTOKIS – D. SIDIROPOULOS, *Byzantine Military Rhetoric in the Ninth Century. A Translation of the Anonymi Byzantini Rhetorica Militaris*. Abingdon–New York 2021), for the παρακλήσεις; and chap. 43 of the *Περὶ στρατηγικῆς* by the Byzantine Anonymous (ed. G.T. DENNIS, *Three Byzantine Military Treatises [CFHB, 25]*. Washington, D.C. 1985), taken up as a preface to the *Περὶ πρέσβων Ῥωμαίων πρὸς ἔθνικούς* of the *De legationibus* section in the *Excerpta Constantiniana (ELR pr.)*, for the ambassadorial speeches.

τηγός, ἢ τί τοῖς πρέσβεσιν ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐκεῖνος ἔφη τοῖς ἐκ Περσῶν, ἢ ἄλλος τοῖς ἐκ Κελτῶν ἢ Σκυθῶν ἢ τοῖς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τυχὸν ἢ τοῖς ἐκ Δακῶν τε καὶ Τριβαλλῶν, τί δ' ἕτερος τῆ συγκλήτῳ βουλῇ ἢ τῆ πλιθύι τῆ δημότιδι δημηγορῶν προσωμίλησε; to the soldiers, or what that emperor said to the ambassadors from the Persians, or another to those from the Celts or Scythians or perhaps to those from Egypt or those from the Dacians or the Triballians, or how another, delivering a speech, conversed with the senatorial council or the plebeian throng?¹⁷

On this basis, as in the content, in Procopius' *Bella* we find the three types of historiographical *logoi*, in full respect of the tradition: the following is a Table, where the more general term στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι (which is present in the *Rhetorica militaris*: 1, 3) is used instead of παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι, to indicate the speeches that may have, as *actor-addressers*, the commanders of armies (be they generals or kings of enemy peoples) addressing their στρατιῶται, simple soldiers and officers, not only before a battle (in the form of the παρακλητικοὶ λόγοι proper), but also on other occasions.

Procopius' Wars: Classification of the <i>logoi</i> as regards their content according to the traditional (Polybian) tripartition			
Book	Συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι	Στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι	Πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι
I	4	4	9
II	5	2	14
III	3	4	7
IV	1	11	8
V	4	5	17
VI	7	3	18
VII	4	4	14
VIII	2	6	9
165	Tot. 30	Tot. 39	Tot. 96

Bella's subject-matter, namely the account of Justinian's wars against Persians, Vandals and Goths, certainly justifies the presence of these types of speeches and letters, but there is also the clear desire, on the part of the author, to adhere to the established literary elements of the γένος ἱστορικών. The comparison with

17 Ed. L. DINDORF, Ioannis Zonarae epitome historiarum, 3 vols. Leipzig 1868-1870, vol. I, 3, 12-20. Translation from: The History of Zonaras. From Alexander Severus to the Death of Theodosius the Great. Translation by T.M. BANCHICH – E.N. LANE. Introduction and Commentary by T.M. BANCHICH. Abingdon–New York 2009, 24.

the *Anecdota* is again a proof: in this kind of ψόγος, where Procopius shows the background of the actions and the politics of Justinian, Belisarius and their respective wives (Theodora and Antonina), the author does not include the traditional historiographical *logoi* – which are public in nature and uttered by envoys, generals and politicians –, but rather *logoi* that belong instead to a private, family sphere¹⁸ or to a hidden, secret, unofficial political activity.¹⁹

At the same time, we can again see a personal imprint of Procopius in the marked predilection for the πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι: there are 96 cases (nearly two thirds of the total), with many subcategories, as can be seen from this Table:

Πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 96)	Before the battle (tot. 38)	
	To avoid the start of hostilities	6
	To call the opponent to compliance	13
	To ask for help and form an alliance	14
	To declare war	5
	During the battle (tot. 47)	
	To plead for an end to violence	9
	To complain about a certain situation	10
	To induce surrender	13
	To ask for reinforcements or supplies	12
	To communicate military actions	3
	At the end of the battle (tot. 7)	
	To negotiate a truce	4
	To make peace pacts and agreements	3
	Unrelated to war actions (tot. 4)	

In addition, the author pays attention to all the elements that define a diplomatic mission: he does not leave envoys anonymous, but reports their names and titles; he explains the vicissitudes the envoys have to face and the rules to follow when

18 See the speech in 2, 6-11 (Belisarius, after learning the news of the love affair between his wife Antonina and his adopted son Theodosius, asks his stepson Photius, born from Antonina's first marriage, to avenge him) and the epistle in 4, 27-28 (Empress Theodora informs Belisarius that she has decided to drop the charges against him).

19 See both the epistle in 2, 33-35 (Theodora invites Zaberganes, minister of Chosroes, to persuade the Persian king to make peace, and promises great benefits from her husband Justinian) as well as the speech in 15, 27-33 (an elderly patrician, unable to recover a large credit granted to a servant of Theodora, comes to her private chambers to accuse the debtor and defend his rights. Regarding Theodora's answer, see *supra* n. 14).

foreign ambassadors are received.²⁰ All this, with the great variety of situations that are proposed with the *πρεσβευτικοὶ* speeches and letters, is noteworthy.

A certain typological variety is also to be found with the *στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι*: both the *παρακλήσεις* pronounced before the battle to instill courage in the soldiers, and often referred to in pairs (in *antilogia in absentia*, with the *logoi* uttered by the two enemy generals to their respective armies), and the *στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι* pronounced at different moments and situations: *i.e.* to exhort the soldiers to behave loyally; to give tactical instructions; to call to order soldiers and officers who are undisciplined or who criticise the dispositions taken by the general; to curb the excessive ardour of soldiers eager to come to an immediate confrontation with the enemies. In the case of the *συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι*, we have the “public” speeches, which may be delivered in an assembly (the so-called *ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ λόγοι*) or before a large audience but without a debate (the *δημηγορίαι*); and the “private” speeches, which a character addresses to his superior to give him advice (the *ὑποθήκαι*). See the Tables below.

στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 39)	To give soldiers courage (real <i>παρακλήσεις</i>)	24
	To call to order	8
	To give tactical instructions	3
	To exhort to behave loyally	2
	To curb excessive ardour	2
συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 30)	“Public” speeches (<i>ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ λόγοι</i> and <i>δημηγορίαι</i>)	18
	“Private” speeches to give advice (<i>ὑποθήκαι</i>)	12

The last point to note concerns the *actor-addressers* whose *logoi* are reported. In a work that presents the memory of an extraordinary event – as were the wars fought in Justinian’s time – the protagonists of these *ἔργα* have a decisive weight in the narrative. Therefore, Procopius tries to delineate the characters by describing their actions, tracing brief biographical profiles, sometimes expressing direct assessments of them, but also using the report of the *logoi* as an element for characterization, to provide an intellectual and moral portrait of each of them. In this way, *orationes* and *epistulae* have a fundamental function in representing and interpreting reality: the *logoi* are a means of emphasising aspects of historical reality and individual personalities and conveying the author’s judgment about

20 To be noted: Procopius himself carries out two missions (to Siracuse and Naples) on behalf of Belisarius: see *Bell.* III 14 and VI 4.

them. Here is a Table with the distribution of the extended *logoi* in Procopius' *Wars* according to the main characters.

Procopius' <i>Wars</i> : Distribution of the extended <i>logoi</i> according to the main characters			
Byzantines			
Character	<i>Logoi</i> (tot.)	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
Belisarius (general)	33	24	9
Justinian (emperor)	8	–	8
Solomon (Belisarius' advisor)	4	3	1
Narses (general)	3	3	–
Theodora (empress)	1	1	–
Barbarians			
Character	<i>Logoi</i> (tot.)	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
Totila (king of the Goths)	10	8	2
Gelimer (king of the Vandals)	5	1	4
Vittigis (king of the Goths)	4	3	1
Chosroes (king of Persia)	3	3	–
Cabades (king of Persia)	2	1	1

It is not at all surprising that the greatest number of *logoi* is attributed to Belisarius, who is the true protagonist and hero of the *Bella*: speeches and letters portray him according to all the virtues of the excellent στρατηγός, but also justify his actions in relation to events that ended unfavourably. Two other aspects are worth mentioning. The first concerns the Barbarians, in particular the king of the Goths, Totila, to whom a large number of *logoi* are attributed (10 cases: 8 speeches and 2 letters). As studies have shown,²¹ in the *Bella* Totila appears as Belisarius' *alter ego*: he is an enemy, but he is also a “gentleman king”, a good general and ruler, a model of *pietas* and ἀρετή. The large number of his *logoi* is significant, as is their content, because in many respects these *logoi* are similar to those attributed to Belisarius. When he speaks, his “voice” sounds like that of Belisarius.

The second thing to note concerns the imperial couple. As for Justinian, nothing corresponds to Belisarius and Totila. In the *Bella* the emperor does not have an extensive direct speech. We never “hear” his direct voice; his statements

21 See especially L.R. CRESCI, Lineamenti strutturali e ideologici della figura di Belisario nei *Bella* procopiani. *Serta Historica Antiqua* 1 (1986) 247-276.

are presented by Procopius only through epistles (official, bureaucratic letters, perhaps written by his secretaries). This choice certainly cannot be without significance. The author of the *Bella*, through the specific type of *logos*, indirectly conveys to his *reader-addressee* the idea that the Byzantine emperor is in fact an extraneous character to the events: he is the man who wanted to subvert the good order, to upset the whole world, but who did not think about the consequences. As Belisarius says of him in II 16, 10 «he is altogether ignorant of what is being done, and is therefore unable to adapt his moves to opportune moments». Thus, through the *logoi*, there is an indirect criticism of the emperor, which joins other criticisms (against his incompetence and crimes), expressed in other ways within the work (as well as in the *Historia arcana*, as is well known).²² To Theodora, on the other hand, Procopius attributes, during the Nika revolt of 532, a long συμβουλευτικός λόγος (an ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος) in I 24, 33-37, placed in fictitious antilogical connection (*antilogia in absentia*) with that of the senator Origenes in I 24, 26-30. It is a significant speech, providing a portrait of a woman who is indeed greedy, but also particularly strong and certainly braver than the men around her: in some respects, her speech even sounds like that of a general before a battle (a παρακλητικός λόγος). Thus, with this speech, Procopius indirectly shows a certain admiration for this woman, for her intelligence and energy. In the *Anecdota*, Procopius criticises her, but again it should be noted that the large number of *logoi* in this work are *logoi* of Theodora (two letters and a few sentences).²³

2. *Agathias Scholasticus*

Procopius' *Bella*, as is well known, had a huge success among later generations and was adopted as a model as much as, if not more than, Thucydides.²⁴ Among

22 «Prokopios [...] wrote about a living emperor and his purpose was to expose the corruption, incompetence, and criminality of Justinian's regime. He did so covertly in the *Wars*, through a variety of literary devices including the use of speeches and through subtle allusions to ancient texts that 'filled out' the point he was hinting at, and openly in the *Secret History*, a unique reportage that lists the regime's crimes and depravity, supplementing the *Wars*»: A. KALDELLIS, *Byzantine Historical Writing, 500-920*, in: S. FOOT – CH.F. ROBINSON (ed.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*. Oxford 2012, vol. 2, 201-217: 206.

23 It should be noted that, in the epistle in *Anecd.* 2, 33-35 (cf. *supra*, n. 19), Theodora writes to Zaberganes, Chosroes' minister, that her husband Justinian «can be counted upon to carry out no measure whatever without consulting my judgment».

24 Procopius himself, in the proem of Book VIII of his *Bella* – published in the summer of 553, two years after the other seven books –, proudly points out that his work had already appeared in every part of the Roman Empire. Three centuries later, Photius writes in his *Bibliotheca*, Codex 160, that Procopius «composed his historical work [...] in order that

these later historiographers, there is first and foremost Agathias Scholasticus with the five books of his *Histories* written around 580.²⁵

He is a totally different author from Procopius: he is a lawyer (out of necessity) and a poet (out of passion) and he writes the *Historiae* continuing Procopius' *Bella* up to the events of 559, only due to pressure from friends and a high imperial secretary, Eutychianus. Unlike Procopius, therefore, Agathias is not an eyewitness to the events he narrates, does not participate directly in them and has no strong personal motivation to write a historiographical work, other than the prospect of gaining glory and money. He would rather just write poetry.

However, he agrees to write a historiographical work, because (as Eutychianus reminds him)

Agath. *Hist. pr.* 12

οὐ πόρρω τετάχθαι ἱστορίαν ποιητικῆς, ἅμφορ ἄμφορ ταῦτα εἶναι ἀδελφὰ καὶ ὁμόφυλα καὶ μόνω ἴσως τῷ μέτρῳ ἔστιν ἢ ἀλλήλων ἀποκεκριμένα

history was not far removed from poetry, but [...] both were kindred and related disciplines differing radically perhaps only in the matter of metre²⁶

Agathias certainly knows that a historical work has its own purpose and, above all, its own literary elements. For this reason, like Procopius, Agathias includes in his

it might be a great possession and help, and has left of himself an imperishable glory among the most zealous scholars». The ἀείμνηστον αὐτοῦ κλέος of which Photius speaks derives from the excellence of Procopius' *Bella* on the historiographical level: the absence of thematic and formal uncertainties, the accuracy of the historical information, and the rigour in the use of the literary connotations of the historiographical tradition (as the *logoi* we analyse), which made the work an exemplary model of γένος ἱστορικόν on a par with the texts of ancient historians. For this success with later generations, see the extensive use of the work in the writings of Byzantine historians (as underlined by the numerous quotations and imitations in them) and in encyclopaedic collections (especially in the *Excerpta historica* of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and in the *Suda*), as well as the many acknowledgments of Procopius' writing skills.

25 «Agathias of Myrina is the only direct continuator of Procopius who wrote with the explicit purpose of bringing Procopius' narrative down to his own times: "since most of the events of the reign of Justinian have been accurately recorded by the rhetor Procopius of Caesarea I feel I can dispense with the necessity of covering the same ground, but I must give as full an account as possible of subsequent events" [*Preface* 22]»: M. JANKOWIAK, Procopius of Caesarea and His Byzantine Successors, in: MEIER – MONTINARO (eds.), *A Companion to Procopius of Caesarea* (cit. n. 6), 231-251: 231. On Agathias' *Histories*, see Av. CAMERON, *Agathias*. Oxford 1970; for the edition: R. KEYDELL, *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque* (CFHB, 2). Berlin 1967; for the translation: J.D. FRENO, *Agathias. The Histories* (CFHB, 2A). Berlin 1975; P. MARAVAL, *Agathias. Histoires: Guerres et malheurs du temps sous Justinien*. Paris 2007.

26 FRENO, *Agathias* (cit. n. 25), 5.

Histories the speeches and letters which are expected as literary elements within the γένος ιστορικόν, as the following Table shows.

Agathias' <i>Histories</i> : Distribution of the extended <i>logoi</i>			
Book	<i>Logoi</i>	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
I	2	2	–
II	1	1	–
III	2	2	–
IV	4	3	1
V	2	1	1
	Tot. 11	Tot. 9	Tot. 2

In Agathias' *Historiae* there are 11 cases of extended *logos*, divided into 9 *orationes* and 2 *epistulae*: this is not a large number of instances, especially when compared to Procopius' 165 *logoi*, but these eleven *logoi* occupy about one-sixth of the total work (as do the *logoi* in the *Bella*). The extent of the eleven *logoi* is not the same: they range from less than 30 lines of Keydell's edition to almost 200 lines,²⁷ while their distribution throughout the work is fairly uniform, since none of the five books of the *Historiae* is devoid of *logoi*.

The most interesting aspect concerns their typology. Agathias' choices are marked by a certain fixity, both in form (9 instances in *oratio recta* and 2 in mixed-form,²⁸ and the use of antilogy) and in content, with the three types identified by Polybius: there are four πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι, with the requests for alliance and help addressed by the envoys of the Goths to the Franks and by the envoys of the Misimians to the Persians, and the two letters, both of the emperor Justinian – whose “voice”, again, we do not hear in this work –, sent to Byzantine generals about Gubazes and to Sandilch, leader of the Utigurs Huns; three στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι, with the exhortations addressed to the troops by the two main heroes of

27 The most extensive are the speeches in V 17, 1-18, 11 (86 lines) and especially the four speeches in antilogy, which each exceed the 100-line limit: III 9, 1-10, 12 (103 lines) connected with III 11, 4-13, 11 (153 lines) and IV 3, 2-6, 6 (161 lines) connected with IV 7, 4-10, 6 (187 lines). The other four *orationes* have the following length: I 5, 3-10 (39 lines), I 16, 3-10 (36 lines), II 12, 1-9 (40 lines), IV 12, 2-6 (27 lines). As for the two *epistulae*, they are similarly extended: IV 2, 3-6 (29 lines) and V 24, 3-7 (27 lines). For a complete classification and analysis of Agathias' *logoi*, see TARAGNA, *Logoi historias* (cit. n. 4), 141-181 (with bibliography) and 237-238 (Table).

28 The mixed-form, with a transition from a first (short) part in *oratio obliqua* to a second (long) part in *oratio recta*, is present in the speeches in I 5, 3-10 e in IV 12, 2-6. All other speeches and letters cited *supra*, in n. 27, are in direct form.

the Justinian wars, Narses (two speeches) and Belisarius (one speech), but the extent of the lines for the two *actor-addressers* is the same; and two συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι (of the special type of ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ λόγοι) with the different proposals, expressed in antilogy, that the two dignitaries Aetes and Phartazes addressed to the assembly of the Lazi (Colchians). See the Table below.

Agathias' <i>Historias</i> : Classification of the <i>logoi</i> as regards their content according to the traditional (Polybian) tripartition		
πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 4)	Request for alliance addressed by the Goths to the Franks	I 5, 3-10
	Request for alliance addressed by the Misimians to the Persians	IV 12, 2-6
	Letter of the emp. Justinian sent to Byz. generals about Gubazes	IV 2, 3-6
	Letter of the emp. Justinian sent to Sandilch, leader of the Utigurs	V 24, 3-7
στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 3)	Exhortation to the troops by Narses	I 16, 3-10
	Exhortation to the troops by Narses	II 12, 1-9
	Exhortation to the troops by Belisarius	V 17, 1-18, 11
συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι (tot. 2)	Assembly of the Lazi (Colchians): ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος by the dignitary Aetes	III 9, 1-10, 12
	Assembly of the Lazi (Colchians): ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος by the dignitary Phartazes	III 11, 4-13, 11

In any case, the author's effort to avoid repetition of arguments and constructions is noteworthy. This is especially true with the two categories of *logoi* that reveal more usual elements: πρεσβευτικοὶ and στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι. In the first case, both speeches delivered by the Goths' and Misimians' envoys are aimed at calling for an alliance, but in the first case there are political reasons which are explained, in the second, strategic reasons. As regards the στρατιωτικοὶ λόγοι, they are reserved only for the great Byzantine generals of the Justinian wars, Belisarius and Narses, and not also for the enemies with *antilogiae in absentia* as in Procopius. This is because, through these speeches in *oratio recta*, Agathias wants to give a moral portrait of the major figures of his work, as men distinguished by virtue. However, the parenetic speeches of Belisarius and Narses are different: while the latter seeks to instill soldiers with courage and vigour, the former dampens ardour and calls for prudence in the face of imminent dangers. This corresponds to the different characters of the two generals (one more daring, the other more

cautious), but both appear as a model of wisdom for the *reader-addressee*.

In all the *logoi* of the three types can be observed what Agathias calls τὸ θέλγον: the charm of words, the power of fascination by *logos*, its psychagogical effect, that is also the general ideal of Agathias, the medium which, at the same time, in his opinion, brings together History and Poetry²⁹ – the poetic compositions to which Agathias has devoted himself since childhood are θελκκτήρια: *Hist. pr.* 8 – and differs History from Political Science (φιλοσοφία ἢ πολιτική), as Agathias explains again in his proem:

Agath. *Hist. pr.* 4-5

[...] οἶμαί γε αὐτὴν [*scil.* τὴν ἱστορίαν] φιλοσοφίας τῆς πολιτικῆς οὐ μάλα μειονεκτεῖσθαι, εἰ μὴ τι καὶ μᾶλλον ὀνίνησιν. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ [*scil.* φιλοσοφία ἢ πολιτική] οἷα τις ἀστεμφοῦς δέσποινα καὶ ἀθώπευτος κελεύει καὶ διατάττει, ὁποίων τε ἔχεσθαι καὶ ὁποῖα διαφεύγειν προσήκει, ὥσπερ τῷ πείθοντι καταμινύσα τὸ ἀναγκάζον· ἡ δὲ [*scil.* ἡ ἱστορία] τῷ θέλγοντι πλείστῳ χρωμένῃ καὶ οἷον καρκεύουσα τὰς ἀπαγγελίας [...] λανθάνει ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡρέμα τὰς ἀρετὰς εἰσοικίζουσα. Τὸ γὰρ προσηνὲς αὐταῖς καὶ αὐθαίρετον μᾶλλον τι ἐμφύεται καὶ προσιζάνει.

[...] it is my opinion that she [*scil.* the History] is by no means inferior to Political Science, that is if she is not actually more beneficial. Political Science issues her orders and instructions, her fiats and her caveats like a stern and unyielding mistress mixing compulsion with persuasion. History [...] makes everything as attractive as possible, rendering her message more palatable [...] unobtrusively instills virtue into men's hearts. For views pleasingly presented and voluntarily assumed win wider and deeper acceptance.³⁰

Agathias emphasises this element in many places in his *Historiae*, particularly in his speeches and letters, which are all reported, for this reason, in *oratio recta* (with the exception of two cases in mixed form): whereas in Procopius the choice of the direct form is aimed at emphasising the documentary veracity of the *logoi*, in Agathias it is aimed at emphasising the argumentative, logical, formal articulation of each discourse. Therefore, Agathias uses in his *logoi* all possible techniques, all the “tricks” of rhetoric, to make them as attractive as possible: a powerful tool of persuasion, a strong means of domination, capable of “capturing” or even “deceiving” men's minds. Every *actor-addresser* (even an uncultured barbarian) achieves success and gets the desired result on his *actor-addressee*.

29 On this aspect of Agathias' thought see A.M. TARAGNA, 'Ιστορία e θέλγον: per un'interpretazione del pensiero storiografico di Agazia Scolastico. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia, Linguistica e Tradizione classica dell'Università degli Studi di Torino* 9 (1998) 311-321. In general, cf. A. KALDELLIS, Agathias on History and Poetry. *GRBS* 38 (1997) 295-305.

30 Agath. *Hist. pr.* 4-5.

However, with regard to the typology of *logoi*, the most singular thing to note in the *Histories* of Agathias is the inclusion of two speeches belonging to the genre of δικανικοί λόγοι (judicial rhetoric). These are the two longest speeches of the *Historiae*, connected by antilogy (*antilogia in praesentia*) and reported on the occasion of the judicial trial for the murder of Gubazes, King of the Lazi (Colchians): the accusation speech uttered by the Lazi delegates against two Byzantines, Rusticus and John (*Hist.* IV 3, 2-6, 6 = 161 lines), and the defence speech delivered by the two defendants (*Hist.* IV 7, 4-10, 6 = 187 lines). The epistle sent by the Emperor Justinian to his generals about Gubazes (*Hist.* IV 2, 3-6) can also be related to this area, as its public reading is requested by the prosecution as evidence at the beginning of the trial.

This is an oratorical genre for which Agathias had a particular predisposition, given his profession as a lawyer (σχολαστικός): his personal preparation and competence can also be easily seen in the attention he devotes to all the elements that define the setting of the trial: the arrival of the judge followed by judicial officers, guards and executioners; the accusers taking their places on the right, while the defendants on the left; the public reading, by an officer, of Justinian's letter; the speeches of the two contending parties; the reactions of the public; the verdict and its execution. In the classical historiographical tradition, judicial speeches were not typical. Their presence in Agathias' *Historiae* should therefore be understood as a sign of the influence that, even on the most traditional elements of a historical work (such as the *logoi*), an author's training or special interest can exert. Perhaps even more than in Procopius, here we have Agathias' personal imprint, his personal stylistic signature in the work, and again, a mixture of literary genres (historiography and judicial rhetoric) and the intrusion of a technical (somewhat "scientific") element into the literary prose, in terms of content.

3. *Theophylact Simocatta*

With Theophylact Simocatta's *Historia universalis* (*Ecumenical History* – as titled in the main manuscript, cod. Vaticanus Graecus 977)³¹ we can talk of a novelty

31 Ed. C. DE BOOR – P. WIRTH, *Theophylactus Simocatta, Historiae*. Stuttgart 1972: *index*, 22 (Οικουμενικής ιστορίας βιβλίον κτλ.). When the 9th-century scholar Photius described the work (*Bibl.* cod. 65), however, he called it *Histories*: ιστοριῶν λόγοι ὀκτώ. For the translations: MARY WHITBY – MICHAEL WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta: An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford 1986; P. SCHREINER, *Theophylaktos Simokates, Geschichte*. Stuttgart 1985. On Simocatta, see MICHAEL WHITBY, *The Emperor Maurice and His Historian: Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare*. Oxford 1988; S. EFTHYMIADIS, *A Historian and His Tragic Hero: A Literary Reading on Theophylact Simocatta's Ecumenical History*, in: R. MACRIDES (ed.), *His-*

in the genre of the ἱστορίαν ξυγγράφειν. Written in the first half of the 7th century, during the reign of Heraclius (610-641), probably under the protection of a Patriarch – Patriarch Sergius (610-638): and this is something new compared to what we saw with Procopius and Agathias –, the work of Theophylact shows in fact an innovation of the formal and content elements of the γένος ἱστορικών.

Firstly, there is an explicit Christian interpretation of the events and the parallel inclusion of narrative and stylistic elements typical of ecclesiastical history and chronicle, such as the accounts of miracles (of the martyr Sergius in V 1-2, 13-14; of St. Euphemia in VIII 14), the reference to the cult of saints' relics (the bones of Glyceria in I 11; St. Golinduch in V 12) and *verbatim* quotations from Holy Scriptures. Simocatta's text visibly "absorbs" a multitude of features from other types of historical writing and displays a mixture that appears natural both to the author – who feels no need to justify it – and to his contemporary audience or readership.

Second, and more importantly, in Simocatta's *Historia universalis* there is a new criterion for the chronological delimitation of events, which is, for the first time, the life of a *basileus*. The author chooses to report events that took place within the "limited", "defined" years of the reign of an emperor, in this case Maurice (582-602), successor to Tiberius I Constantine (578-582). In this way, above the chronological-annalistic articulation, which is also present, with Theophylact Simocatta the portion of History object of narration is delimited by the "birth" of Maurice as ruler (*i.e.*, by his proclamation as *basileus*, at the beginning of the work) and by his death (with which the eighth book ends).³² These two points, the Christian and the imperial dimensions – a reflection of both the author's more explicit Christian faith and the growing ideological consolidation of the imperial institution that developed from the Justinian age onwards – bring numerous new features, as we will see, in the construction of the historiographical *logoi*, as regards their typology and the actors involved.

In general, as in the *Wars* of Procopius and in the *Histories* of Agathias, about one-sixth of the total of the de Boor–Wirth edition of Theophylact's work

tory as Literature in Byzantium. Farnham 2010, 169-186; a profile and bibliography in L. NEVILLE, *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*. Cambridge 2018, 47-51.

32 It is the first example of a type of historiographical narration that would find full application in the following centuries, especially from the 10th century onwards, with the *Basileiai* of Genesios: a work in four books, each dedicated to an emperor (Leo V [813-820], Michael II [820-829], Theophilos [829-842] and Michael III [843-867]). On this work and the issues connected to it, see A. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Genesios: A Study*, in: S. ΚΟΤΖΑΒΑΣΣΙ – G. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΑΤΙΣ (eds.), *Realia Byzantina* (BA, 22). Berlin–New York 2009, 137-150.

is occupied by *logoi*: 29 cases, divided into 22 *orationes* and 7 *epistulae*. However, unlike the works of his two predecessors, the extent of Simocatta's *logoi* is extremely varied,³³ as is also their distribution in the eight books of the *Historia universalis* (with seven *logoi* in the fourth book, and only one in the eighth), as we can see from this Table.

Theophylact Simocatta's <i>Ecumenical History</i> : Distribution of the extended <i>logoi</i>			
Book	<i>Logoi</i>	<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
I	4	4	–
II	2	2	–
III	2	2	–
IV	7	4	3
V	5	2	3
VI	6	5	1
VII	2	2	–
VIII	1	1	–
	Tot. 29	Tot. 22	Tot. 7

As regards their classification, in any case, we find the three basic types “of Polybius”: στρατιωτικοί λόγοι, with the exhortations to the troops (παρακλήσεις) by the Byzantine generals; πρεσβευτικοί λόγοι, with the speeches and letters addressed both by the Avar and Persian envoys to the Byzantines and by Byzantines to them;³⁴ συμβουλευτικοί λόγοι, of the type of ἐκκλησιαστικοί λόγοι, with the

33 Two speeches from the fourth Book (IV 13, 4-26 and IV 16, 1-26, respectively 118 and 117 lines in de Boor–Wirth edition) are the longest, while the speeches in I 11, 18-19 and VIII 12, 5-7 (a funeral oration for the emperor Maurice by Theophylact himself, but mutilated due to the loss of about two pages in the cod. Vaticanus Graecus 977) are only 10 lines long. The other speeches (I 1, 5-20; I 5, 1-16; I 15, 3-10; II 13, 2-14; II 14, 1-12; III 11, 8-11. 13; III 13, 1-21; IV 4, 1-18; IV 5, 2-12; V 4, 5-15; V 15, 5-7; VI 2, 12-15; VI 6, 7-12; VI 7, 10-16; VI 10, 7-12; VI 11, 9. 10-15; VII 10, 5-7. 8; VII 11, 1-5) extend between 12 and 89 lines, while the epistles (IV 7, 7-11; IV 8, 5-8; IV 11, 1-11; V 7, 1-2; V 13, 4-6; V 14, 2-11; VI 5, 13-15) do not exceed 52 lines. For a complete classification and analysis of Simocatta's *logoi*, see TARAGNA, *Logoi historias* (cit. n. 4), 183-212 (with bibliography) and 239-241 (Table). Cf. FRENDO, *Three Authors* (cit. n. 5); A. KOTŁOWSKA – Ł. RÓŻYCKI, *The Role and Place of Speeches in the Work of Theophylact Simocatta. Vox Patrum* 36 (2016) 353-382.

34 All the embassies that correspond to these *logoi* – except the one with Theodore's speech in VI 11 – are recorded with a special entry in the *capitulum conspectus* transmitted by the

speeches delivered in antilogy by a tribune and a veteran before the assembly of the Byzantine army, and by the Persian king Hormisdas and by Bindoes (relative by birth of the king Chosroes) before the assembly of Persian dignitaries.³⁵ See the Table below.

Theophylact Simocatta's <i>Ecumenical History</i> : Classification of the <i>logoi</i> as regards their content according to the traditional (Polybian) tripartition		
στρατιωτικοί λόγοι (tot. 2)	Exhortation to the troops by Byz. general Justinian	III 13, 1-21
	Exhortation to the troops by Byz. general Priscus	VI 7, 10-16
πρεσβευτικοί λόγοι (tot. 6)	Speech by the Byz. envoy Comentiolus to Avars' Chagan	I 5, 1-16
	Speech by the Persian Mebodes to the Byz. general Philippicus	I 15, 3-10
	Letter from the Persian king Chosroes to the emperor Maurice	IV 11, 1-11
	Speech by a Persian envoy to the emperor Maurice	IV 13, 4-26
	Speech by the Avar envoy Koch to the Byz. general Priscus	VI 6, 7-12
	Speech by the Byzantine Theodore to the Chagan	VI 11, 9. 10-15
συμβουλευτικοί λόγοι (tot. 4)	before the assembly of the Byzantine army: antilogy with the speeches by a tribune and a veteran	II 13, 2-14 II 14, 1-12
	before the assembly of Persian dignitaries: antilogy with the speeches by the Persian king Hormisdas and by Bindoes	IV 4, 1-18 IV 5, 2-12

Alongside these *logoi*, there are also two particular cases, with which the other two branches of classical oratory – *i.e.* forensic oratory and epideictic oratory – enter into historiography, thus completing, together with the deliberative oratory of the

cod. Vaticanus Graecus 977: I 5 (entry 12 of Book I: Πρεσβεία Ῥωμαίων πρὸς Ἀβάρους); I 15 (entry 34 of Book I: Πρεσβεία Περσῶν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους); IV 11 (entry 12 of Book IV: Πρεσβεία Χοσρόου πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα); IV 13 (entry 16 of Book IV: Πρεσβεία Χοσρόου πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα); VI 6 (entry 11 of Book VI: Πρεσβεία Ἀβάρων πρὸς Ῥωμαίους).

35 See in the *capitum conspectus*: entry 21 of Book II (Ἐκκλησία Ῥωμαίων, εἰ πολεμητέον, καὶ δημηγορία καὶ ἀντιδημηγορία, εἴπερ χρὴ τὸν Κομεντίολον ταῖς τῶν Ἀβάρων δυνάμειν ἐπιτίθεσθαι); and entries 4 and 5 of Book IV (Ἐκκλησία Περσῶν, ἐν ἧ δέσμιος Ὁρμισδᾶς δημηγορεῖ – Δημηγορία Βινδόου τοῦ Πέρσου).

συμβουλευτικοί λόγοι, the three Aristotelian types of the tradition. There are in fact a δικανικός λόγος – namely, the defence speech (ἀπολογία: VI 10, 7-12) that a man of Gepid race, accused of murder, utters before the Byzantine court; and a case of ἐπιδεικτικός λόγος in the form of a funeral speech in the eighth book (VIII 12, 5-7). The latter is the ἐπιτάφιος that Theophylact Simocatta himself delivered in honour of Emperor Maurice shortly after the new ruler Heraclius ascended the throne, probably at a state funeral for Maurice organized by Heraclius, which provided an occasion for ambitious orators to offer grandiloquent eulogies.³⁶ Although we can only read it in part, due to a lacuna in the main 12th century manuscript of the work, what is important to note is that, with this ἐπιτάφιος by the historian, we do not only have the author’s personal interests and competence directing and “shaping” the historiographical *logoi* (as seen with the πρεσβευτικοί λόγοι and the *antilogiae* in Procopius, and with the two long δικανικοί λόγοι of the lawyer Agathias); here in addition we have the author’s person who inserts his own, personal speech: the *author-addresser* becomes *actor-addresser*, giving himself an interesting performative opportunity.³⁷

Theophylact Simocatta’s <i>Ecumenical History</i> : Classification of the <i>logoi</i> as regards their content according to the Aristotelian tripartition		
συμβουλευτικοί λόγοι	Deliberative oratory	Assembly of Byzantine army (II 13, 2-14 and II 14, 1-12) Assembly of Persian dignitaries (IV 4, 1-18 and IV 5, 2-12)
δικανικός λόγος	Forensic/ judicial oratory	Defence speech (ἀπολογία) uttered by a man of Gepid race, accused of murder, before the Byzantine court (VI 10, 7-12)
ἐπιδεικτικός λόγος	Epidelictic oratory	Funeral speech (ἐπιτάφιος) uttered by Theoph. Simocatta, in honour of Maurice after the accession of Heraclius (VIII 12, 5-7)

As mentioned, however, the most important novelties, with regard to the types of *logoi*, as form and content, and the types of actors involved (especially the *actor-*

36 See WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 227 n. 70.

37 This is one more special opportunity than the “basic” one offered by the rhetorical construction of all historiographical *logoi*. See KALDELLIS, *Byzantine Historical Writing* (cit. n. 22), 206: «whereas Prokopios probably wrote to be read, Agathias and Theophylaktos intended their works also for performance in the capital. So the speeches they gave their characters (especially generals before battle) and the *pro-contra* legal debates practically constituted rhetorical displays by the authors themselves, who thereby advertised their learning and skill as orators before the court».

addressers), are connected to the innovative approach the *Historia universalis* develops with its Christian and imperial perspectives.

3.1. *The Christian perspective in Theophylact Simocatta.*

A comparison with Evagrius Scholasticus and the Chronicon Paschale

In the first case, a kind of *logos* «hitherto undreamed of in the framework of classicizing historiography»³⁸ is the speech we find in the fourth book (IV 16, 1-26): the homily uttered by Domitianus, bishop of Melitene (580-602), from the pulpit of the church of Martyropolis, to celebrate the victory over the Persians and the Byzantine recovery of the city in the winter of 590. The sermon – very long, with its 117 lines – takes the form of a victory-hymn to Christ (ἄσμα καινὸν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐπινίκιον: *Hist.* IV 15, 18), a thanksgiving to God and a celebration in honour of the city's martyrs (ἐορταστική, as defined in the *capitulum conspectus*³⁹ transmitted by cod. Vaticanus Graecus 977). From all points of view, then, this is a historiographical *logos* that conspicuously testifies to the mixture of literary genres, with the inclusion both of another type of oratory – alongside the Aristotelian and Polybian ones –, namely the “sacred” one (the homiletics), and of features of ecclesiastical history into the classicizing one (to remain in the field of history writing). But here there is something more, as observed in the studies.⁴⁰ The whole homily – rich in phraseology, allusions and imagery taken from the Holy Scriptures – bears in fact, at the same time, striking verbal and conceptual similarities to a letter, preserved in the *Paschal Chronicle*, i.e. the very long victory dispatch which the emperor Heraclius sent from the war front, in 628, to be read out the Day of Pentecost, from the pulpit of St. Sophia, in order to announce the final overthrow and death of the Persian king Chosroes. Here are some passages with some resemblances.

Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* IV 15, 18-16, 26

Chron. Pasch. 727-728

[IV 15, 18] ἐπὶ τῶν βημάτων τῶν ὑψηλῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας γενόμενος, παιωνίζων ἄσμα καινὸν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐπινίκιον τοῖς ὡς τοῦ κατεκκλησιασθέντος λαοῦ τάδε πού διηγόρευεν [...] «[16, 1] πρέπει γὰρ καὶ πολεμικοῖς ὀργάνοις ὑμνεῖσθαι θεόν·

ἀνεγνώσθησαν ἀποκρίσεις ἐπ' ἄμβωνος ἐν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, σταλεῖσαι ἐκ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν μερῶν ὑπὸ Ἡρακλείου τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν βασιλέως [...] «εὐφρανθήτωσαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ γῆ καὶ τερφθήτω ἡ θά-

38 FRENDO, *Three Authors* (cit. n. 5), 130.

39 Entry 21 of Book IV.

40 See especially WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 127-128 n. 65; FRENDO, *Three Authors* (cit. n. 5), 130.

ἀρχιστράτηγος γὰρ οὗτος ἐκτάξεως κρα-
ταιός τε καὶ δυνατὸς ἐν πολέμοις πρε-
σβεύεται. [...] [6] πάλιν δεξιὰ κυρίου
ἐποίησε δύναμιν ἐπάρσεως καταδαιτῶσα
Χαλδαϊκῆς, οὐκ ἐν τοίχῳ, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ
τὴν προαγόρευσιν γράφουσα. καὶ διαι-
ρεῖται Βαβυλώνια σκῆπτρα, καὶ ὕβριστῆς
καταβάλλεται θρόνος, καὶ πάροις βα-
σιλεία συστέλλεται, καὶ τιμᾶται πάλιν
τὸ ταπεινούμενον, καὶ κρατύνεται τὸ νι-
κώμενον. [...] [23] εὐφραινέσθωσαν οἱ
οὐρανοί, καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθω ἡ γῆ, καὶ τὰ
πεδία χαιρέτωσαν».⁴¹

λασσα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. καὶ πάν-
τες οἱ χριστιανοὶ αἰνοῦντες καὶ δοξολο-
γοῦντες εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ μόνῳ θεῷ,
χαίροντες ἐπὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματι
χαρὰν μεγάλην. ἔπεσεν γὰρ ὁ ὑπερήφα-
νος καὶ θεομάχος Χοσρόης. ἔπεσεν καὶ
ἐπτωματίσθη εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, καὶ ἐξω-
λοθρεύθη ἐκ γῆς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ
ὁ ὑπεραιρόμενος καὶ λαλήσας ἀδικίαν ἐν
ὑπερηφανίᾳ καὶ ἐξουδενώσει κατὰ τοῦ
κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθι-
νοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀχράντου μητρὸς αὐτοῦ
τῆς εὐλογημένης δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτό-
κου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ἀπώλετο ὁ
ἄσεβῆς μετ' ἡχοῦς».⁴²

Beyond the formal connections, the message conveyed to the reader is rich in meaning: behind a homily connected to past events (and pronounced by bishop Domitianus, the “narrative” *actor-addresser*), there is in fact contemporary propaganda linked to Heraclius, who is the indirect, “real” *actor-addresser* of this *logos*, and of whom the *author-addresser* Theophylact is a medium in front of his

41 WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 127-130: «Standing on the lofty pulpit in the church, he chanted a new victory-hymn to Christ, and addressed words such as these to the ears of the assembled people [...]. For it is fitting for God to be hymned even on the instruments of war, since he is supreme commander of the battle-array and a strong and powerful champion in wars. [...] Once again the right hand of the Lord has acted powerfully by condemning the pride of the Chaldaeans, writing his proclamation not on a wall, but in heaven. The sceptres of Babylon are rent asunder, the throne of insolence is cast down, the wine-sodden kingdom abased, the humbled are once more honoured, and the conquered hold sway. [...] let the heavens be glad, let the earth exult, and let the plains rejoice for the war-loving nations have been cast down».

42 Ed. L. DINDORF, *Chronicon paschale (CSHB)*. Bonn 1832 (repr. in *PG* 92, 70-1161). Translation: MARY WHITBY – MICHAEL WHITBY, *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*. Liverpool 1989, 182-183: «from the *ambo* in the most holy Great Church were read out dispatches which had been sent from the eastern regions by Heraclius our most pious emperor [...] “Let the heavens be joyful and the earth exult and the sea be glad, and all that is in them. And let all we Christians, praising and glorifying, give thanks to the one God, rejoicing with great joy in his holy name. For fallen is the arrogant Chosroes, opponent of God. He is fallen and cast down to the depths of the earth, and his memory is utterly exterminated from earth; he who was exalted and spoke injustice in arrogance and contempt against our Lord Jesus Christ the true God and his undefiled Mother, our blessed Lady, Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary, perished is the profaner with a resounding noise».

audience. In this way, our historiographer elaborates a rhetorical exaltation of the new ruler Heraclius, to whom he reserves an “indirect” ἔπαινος reported in the *Historia universalis* through different allusions and stylistic means, ranging from a more general rehabilitation of the memory of Maurice, to a praise of Heraclius’ family – with a detailed account of the successes achieved in war by Heraclius *senior* (the father of the current *basileus*: II 3, 2 ff.): not striking successes, but certainly emphatically presented – to descriptions of past situations in terms suggestive of contemporary ones, as in the case of Domitianus’ *logos*.⁴³ The laws of historiography, which impose a clear separation of it from the explicit praise of the living, would thus be respected, but the solution adopted would also accord with the author’s more contingent needs of opportunity towards the new *basileus*.

The Christian perspective and the mixture of genres also influence other elements of Simocatta’s *logoi*. As in the Church histories, Theophylact inserts epistles in the form of documents, as can be observed with the two letters attributed to Chosroes II in the fifth book (V 13, 4-6 and V 14, 2-11): they are two examples of *gratiarum actio*, written by the Persian king, converted to Christianity, when he sent rich gifts to the shrine of the martyr Sergius, in thanksgiving to his heavenly helper. The two *ex voto* texts are preserved also in the *Historia ecclesiastica* by Evagrius Scholasticus,⁴⁴ with minor, but significant variations, as we can see in the passage below taken from the first text connected with a golden cross (the differences are underlined).

Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* V 13, 4-6

τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἐν τούτοις δῆτα ἐτύχχανεν ὄντα: οὐκ ἀμείψω γὰρ τῆς λέξεως τὸ ἀρχέτυπον.

“Τοῦτον τὸν σταυρὸν ἐγὼ Χοσρόης βα-

Evagr. Schol. *Hist. eccl.* VI 21

Πέμπει δὲ καὶ ἕτερον σταυρὸν χρυσοῦν, καὶ ἐπέγραψεν ὁ Χοσρόης τῷ σταυρῷ Ἑλλήνων γράμμασι τάδε: “Τοῦτον τὸν σταυρὸν ἐγὼ Χοσρόης βασιλεὺς βασιλέ-

43 Another example is the campaign of Philippicus in 585 – described in *Hist.* I 14 – which is reminiscent in its modalities of Heraclius’ Persian campaign of 614. The controversial *Dialogue* between the personifications of Philosophy and History, with which the *Historia universalis* opens in the cod. Vaticanus Graecus 977, would also confirm this interpretation, due to the praise it develops for the Heraclides (*dial.* 6: mythological image for Heraclius) and the insistent connected *Kaiserkritik* against the Καλυδώνιος τύραννος, the μισοβάρβαρος ἄνθρωπος, the κυκλώπειον γένος, the Κένταυρος (*dial.* 4) Phocas, guilty of the brutal murder of Maurice and the usurpation of the throne in 602. For this “imperial perspective”, see *infra*, 3.2.

44 Ed. J. BIDEZ – L. PARMENTIER, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*. London 1898 (repr. Amsterdam 1964). Translation: A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *Évagre. Histoire Ecclésiastique*. Byz 45 (1975) 187-488; F. CARCIONE, *Evagrio di Epifania. Storia ecclesiastica*. Introduzione, traduzione e note. Roma 1998; MICHAEL WHITBY, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. Translated with an Introduction. Liverpool 2000. Commentary: P. ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus, the Church Historian*. Leuven 1981.

σιλεὺς βασιλέων, υἱὸς Χοσρόου, ὅτε ἐκ διαβολικῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ κακουργίας τοῦ δυστυχεστάτου Βαράμ, υἱοῦ Βαργουσιγᾶς, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ καβαλλαρίων εἰς Ῥωμανίαν ἀπήλθομεν, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔρχεσθαι τὸν δυστυχή Ζαδεσπράτην ἐκ τοῦ στρατοῦ εἰς τὸ Νισίβιος ἐπὶ τῷ ὑποσῦραι τοὺς καβαλλαρίους τοῦ μέρους τοῦ Νισίβιος εἰς τὸ ἀντᾶραι καὶ συνταράξαι ἐπέμψαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς καβαλλαρίους μετὰ ἄρχοντος εἰς τὸ Χάρχας, καὶ διὰ τῆς τύχης τοῦ ἀγίου Σεργίου τοῦ πανσέπτου καὶ ὀνομαστοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν δοτῆρα εἶναι αὐτὸν τῶν αἰτήσεων, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν, μηνὶ Ἰανουαρίῳ ἐβδόμη, ἡτησάμεθα, ὡς, ἐὰν οἱ καβαλλάριοι ἡμῶν σφάξωσι τὸν Ζαδεσπράτην ἢ χειρώσωνται, σταυρὸν χρυσοῦν διάλιθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ πέμπομεν διὰ τὸ πάνσεπτον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα. καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου μηνὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Ζαδεσπράτου ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ ἡμῶν. ἐπιτυχόντες οὖν τῆς αἰτήσεως ἡμῶν, διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον ἀναμφίβολον εἶναι, εἰς τὸ πάνσεπτον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα τὸν σταυρὸν τὸν παρ' ἡμῶν γενόμενον, μετὰ τοῦ πεμφθέντος σταυροῦ παρὰ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀμιξίας τῶν δύο πολιτειῶν ἐνεχθέντος ἐνταῦθα παρὰ Χοσρόου, βασιλέως βασιλέων, υἱοῦ Κοάδου, τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρός, καὶ εὐρεθέντος ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις θησαυροῖς, ἐπέμψαμεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πανσέπτου Σεργίου.”

ων, υἱὸς Χοσρόου, ὅτε ἐκ διαβολικῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ κακουργίας τοῦ δυστυχεστάτου Βαράμ Γουσιγᾶς καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ καβαλλαρίων εἰς Ῥωμανίαν ἀπήλθομεν, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔρχεσθαι τὸν δυστυχή Ζαδεσπράμ μετὰ στρατοῦ εἰς τὸ Νισίβιος ἐπὶ τὸ ὑποσῦραι τοὺς καβαλλαρίους τοῦ μέρους τοῦ Νισίβιος εἰς τὸ ἀντᾶραι καὶ ταράξαι ἐπέμψαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς καβαλλαρίους μετὰ ἄρχοντος εἰς τὸ Χάρχας, καὶ διὰ τῆς τύχης τοῦ ἀγίου Σεργίου τοῦ πανσέπτου καὶ ὀνομαστοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν δοτῆρα εἶναι αὐτὸν τῶν αἰτήσεων, ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν, μηνὶ Ἰανουαρίῳ ἐβδόμη, ἡτησάμεθα ὡς, ἐὰν οἱ καβαλλάριοι ἡμῶν σφάξωσι τὸν Ζαδεσπράμ ἢ χειρώσωνται, σταυρὸν χρυσοῦν διάλιθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ πέμπομεν διὰ τὸ πάνσεπτον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα, καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου μηνὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ Ζαδεσπράμ ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ ἡμῶν· ἐπιτυχόντες οὖν τῆς δεήσεως ἡμῶν, διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον ἀναμφίβολον εἶναι, εἰς τὸ πάνσεπτον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα τοῦτον τὸν σταυρὸν τὸν παρ' ἡμῶν γενόμενον, μετὰ τοῦ πεμφθέντος σταυροῦ παρὰ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀμιξίας τῶν δύο πολιτειῶν ἐνεχθέντος ἐνταῦθα παρὰ Χοσρόου, βασιλέως βασιλέων, υἱοῦ Καβάδου, τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρός, καὶ εὐρεθέντος ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις θησαυροῖς, ἐπέμψαμεν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἀγίου πανσέπτου Σεργίου.”

In particular, Theophylact's τὸν σταυρὸν, in the final part of the text, is opposed to Evagrius' τοῦτον τὸν σταυρὸν, but this variation is understandable – as plausibly observed⁴⁵ – if it is assumed that, whereas Evagrius has transcribed the actual inscriptions on the offerings, Theophylact has copied the text of the *ex voto* from

45 See especially M.J. HIGGINS, Chosroes II's Votive Offerings at Sergiopolis. *BZ* 48 (1955) 89-102; ALLEN, Evagrius (cit. n. 44), 259-261.

Chosroes' letter: it is for this reason that Simocatta promises that he will change nothing of the original (οὐκ ἀμείψω γὰρ τῆς λέξεως τὸ ἀρχέτυπον).

The Christian perspective finally leads Theophylact to make churchmen protagonists of speeches traditionally attributed to other *actor-addressers*. In the fifth book (V 4, 5-15), in the imminence of a battle against the Persians in 591, there is a στρατιωτικὸς λόγος, a παράκλησις, delivered not by the “traditional” general of the Byzantine armies, but by a prelate, the bishop Domitianus, the *actor-addresser* of the homily in the fourth book quoted above. At the same time, in the *Church history* of Evagrius Scholasticus (VI 12) we have the inclusion of a στρατιωτικὸς λόγος which Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, addressed to persuade the mutinous Byzantine troops to accept the general Philippicus as their leader.⁴⁶ In both cases, we find something that may seem surprising: two cases of “hybridism”, with literary genres exchanging and “absorbing” each other’s peculiar structural and narrative traits.

It is therefore clear: Theophylact Simocatta does not feel boundaries in the writing of the γένος ἱστορικόν and mixes classicizing historiography with other literary genres, *in primis* ecclesiastical history and the universal chronicle. At the same time, this mixture, in the 7th century, appears “reciprocal”, as we can observe by making a few more brief remarks about the *Ecclesiastical history* by Evagrius Scholasticus and the universal chronicle known as *Chronicon Paschale*, which we have cited.

In general, in the six books of the *Church history* of Evagrius Scholasticus – who was a lawyer (like Agathias), but in the service of a patriarch (like Simocatta), the Chalcedonian patriarch Gregory of Antioch (570-593) – we find instances of *logoi* which are typical in early ecclesiastical histories, modelled on the example of Eusebius of Caesarea. There are in fact a lot of documents, to which Evagrius had access as a legal adviser to the patriarch. These are “technical” texts, obsessively quoted *verbatim* (πρὸς λέξι, ἐπὶ λέξεως, ἐπὶ ῥήματος are the expressions the author usually uses in this regard): in many cases, the original documents have reached us, and comparison shows that Evagrian variants are minimal and inconsequential.⁴⁷ The author reports them both in full and in excerpts (when

46 ALLEN, Evagrius (cit. n. 44), 255 n. 51: «All Gregory’s homilies surviving in Greek tabulated in CPG 111,7384-87 exhibit an adherence to principles of prose rhythm which is absent in the so-called address to the troops, and also in Evagrius’ work. On stylistic grounds the speech must be accepted as coming from the pen of Evagrius».

47 For instance, Evagrius quotes in full the *sententia damnationis* against Nestorius (*Hist. eccl.* I 4 = ACO 1, 1, 2): the variations between the two texts are minimal (see ALLEN, Evagrius [cit. n. 44] 77-78). The same is true in the case of the extracts from the letter *Laetentur coeli*, which sealed the act of union between the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria in

the texts are very extensive, such as Cyril's famous letter *Laetentur coeli* in I 6).⁴⁸ Evagrius even inserts an *appendix* made only of documents at the end of the second book,⁴⁹ and at the end of work in the sixth book (VI 24) he says he also composed another work, which has not survived, consisting only of documents: a documentary collection – he writes – highly appreciated by the imperial authorities.⁵⁰ In this way we can read otherwise unknown attestations or news, as in I 7, with large excerpts from Nestorius' writings.⁵¹ Therefore, the *logoi* in the

433; Evagrius quotes these extracts in *Hist. eccl.* I 6 (= ACO 1, 1, 4): the selection of the variants in Evagrius' text – reported by ALLEN, Evagrius (cit. n. 44), 78, to illustrate the nature of its divergence from that of the *acta* – shows that «Evagrius' text then is a faithful copy, and its (unimportant) variations are usually attested in the MS tradition of the *acta*». In some cases, however, there is not a full coincidence: see the supplication of the bishops of Asia to the usurper Basiliscus in III 5: Evagrius reports no less than five extracts from this document, some of which, however, do not appear in the Pseudo-Zachariah *compendium* that has come down to us; the others do not coincide *verbatim*.

- 48 To move from one excerpt to another, Evagrius uses the words «and further on» (Καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα) or «and a little later» (Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα).
- 49 In accordance with what is stated in II 4 and II 10, Evagrius adds in II 18 an appendix in which he reports the Chalcedonian acts, clearly in order to counter the reconstructions of Monophysite historiography. He also reproduces the full text of three documents already given in II 4. This appendix is justified by Evagrius himself also as a way not to bore the reader. See II 4: «As for the detailed version of these, which is extended at great length but also encompassed in the proceedings at Chalcedon, I have appended this to the present book of the history, lest I seem to be long-winded to those who are eager for the end of the events; thereby I have given an opportunity to those who wish to know everything minutely both to peruse them and to form an accurate impression of everything»; cf. II 10: «The transcripts of these are preserved in the so-called Encyclicals, but they have been passed over by me so as not to introduce bulk into the present work» (WHITBY, *The Ecclesiastical History* [cit. n. 44], 68 and 92).
- 50 «There has been prepared by me another volume, which contains reports, letters, decrees, speeches, discussions and other similar matters; almost all the reports contained in it were composed in the name of Gregory of Theopolis. As a result of these works I also obtained two honours, since Tiberius Constantine invested me with the rank of *quaestor*, and Maurice Tiberius sent me prefectural diptychs for what we composed at the time when he freed the empire from the disgrace and brought Theodosius into the light, providing a foretaste of every happiness for himself and for the state»: WHITBY, *The Ecclesiastical History* (cit. n. 44), 317.
- 51 «Evagrius' information about Nestorius in this chapter is extremely important, in that it gives us documentary evidence of the heresiarch's fate after 431». Although his survey of Nestorius' works, such as the *Liber Heraclidis*, «is cursory», the report of some of the contents from the so-called Nestorius' *Apologia* (or *Tragoedia*) «can be considered very close to the original text itself, and the attestation of a correspondence between Nestorius and the governor of the Thebiad, and the citations from the two letters are unique»: ALLEN, Evagrius (cit. n. 44), 81. Evagrius is the only witness to other letters as well: the letter of Bishop Eustathius of Beirut (II 2) and the letter of Peter Mongus to Acacius (III 17).

Ecclesiastical History are not only the “classical” *orationes* and *epistulae*, but other “new” types, as we can see in the following Table.

Evagrius' <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> : Classification of the <i>logoi</i> -documents	
<i>Acta Conciliorum</i>	<i>Acta</i> of the councils of Ephesus I in 431 (I 4), Ephesus II in 449 (I 10), Chalcedon in 451 (II 4 and appendix in II 18), Constantinople in 553 (IV 38), and Roman synod in 484 (III 18-21)
<i>Sententiae damnationis</i>	against heretics like Nestorius (I 4)
<i>Definitiones fidei</i>	Professions of faith such as the Chalcedonian formulation [ὄρος] (II 4)
<i>Litterae Encyclicae</i>	ἐγκύκλια by patriarchs and bishops
Antencyclical missives	ἄντεγκύκλιον by the usurper Basiliscus (III 4)
Religious edicts	by the emperors, as Τὸ ἐνωτικὸν by Zeno (III 14)
Petitions	δέησεις by citizens or by bishops

At the same time, however, alongside these types, we find cases of *logoi* typical of classicizing historiography. We have already talked about the στρατιωτικὸς λόγος in the final book of the work (VI 12): the speech addressed by the patriarch of Antioch, Gregory, to the soldiers. We can also observe, in III 4-9, a double *antilogia in absentia*: an “intertwined ἀγών” – as seen in Procopius – with two antithetical *logoi*, both by the same character and by two different *actor-addressers*, reported at rather distant points in the work:

Evagrius' <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> : Antilogical structure <i>in absentia</i> . Intertwined <i>agon</i>		
A1	ἐγκύκλιον	encyclical missive “anti-Chalcedonian” by the usurper Basiliscus (III 4)
B1	δέησις	petition by the bishops of Asia who assented to Basiliscus' Encyclicals and annulled the Council of Chalcedon (III 5)
A2	ἄντεγκύκλιον	antencyclical missive “pro-Chalcedonian” by Basiliscus, declared a heretic by Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople (III 7)
B2	δέησις	petition by the bishops of Asia to Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, to ask for forgiveness after the murder of Basiliscus (III 9)

Evagrius clearly combines the literary elements of ecclesiastical history together with those of rhetorical, classicizing historiography: and if the first three books

of his work have a purely historical-ecclesiastical purpose and character, from the fourth book the author writes a work full of mixtures with “profane” history. He uses Procopius’ *Wars* for the events of the Justinian Age; he makes a catalogue of historians (V 24), joining ecclesiastical ones (such as Eusebius, Theodoret, Sozomen and Socrates) with profane ones (such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius, Appian, Diodorus Siculus) and even with the chroniclers (he recalls John Malalas: I 16, II 12, III 10 and 28, IV 5); he paraphrases Herodotus (II 8) and Thucydides (IV 29 and 38, V 12); and goes so far as to regretfully admit that he does not possess the language of Thucydides (III 39):

Evagr. Schol. *Hist. eccl.* III 39

Ἵπερμέγεθες δὲ κατεπράχθη αὐτῷ καὶ θεῖόν τι χρῆμα, ἢ τοῦ καλουμένου Χρυσαργύρου ἔς τέλος κωλύμη· ἦν καὶ λεκτέον, τῆς Θουκυδίδου γλώσσης ἢ καὶ μείζονός τε καὶ κομψότερας ἐπιδειομένην· λέξω δὲ κἀγώ, οὐ λόγῳ πεποιθώς, τῇ δὲ πράξει πίσυνος.

An exceedingly great and wonderful achievement was accomplished by the same man, the complete abolition of the so-called Chrysargyron; this must also be told, although it requires the eloquence of Thucydides or indeed one greater and more elegant. But even I shall tell of it, not trusting in word, but confident in the deed.⁵²

So, it is not surprising that also Evagrius’ *logoi* show some similarities to those of the classicizing historians, because in his (as in Simocatta’s) idea of history writing there is no real closure and no real boundaries.

The same thing can be said about the so-called *Chronicon Paschale*, whose text is found in the 10th century cod. Vaticanus Graecus 1941.⁵³ The anonymous *Paschal Chronicle* is both a universal history from the Creation until 628, as well as an extended argument about the proper calculation of the dates of liturgical feasts: it opens in fact with a discussion of the proper method for correctly reckoning the date of Easter in accordance with solar and lunar cycles. However, as the author – probably a member of the Constantinopolitan clergy (although some scholars believe he was a layman working in the imperial administration)⁵⁴ – describes events closer to his time (the beginning of the 7th century), the entries for each

52 WHITBY, *The Ecclesiastical History* (cit. n. 44), 183.

53 We lack a modern edition of this text: we use DINDORF’s edition in *CSHB* (cit. n. 42), reproduced in MIGNÉ’s *Patrologia Graeca*. Christian Gastgeber and Erika Juhász are preparing a critical edition for Series Vindobonensis of *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*.

54 We know nothing about the author. For WHITBY – WHITBY, *Chronicon Paschale* (cit. n. 42), the author was a member of the clergy; others – like W.T. TREADGOLD, *The Early Byzantine Historians*. New York 2007, 341-342 – suggest that he was a layman working in the imperial administration.

year become more detailed, as in an ecclesiastical history, but the text focuses on political and military history from the perspective of Constantinople. Therefore, it has been defined an “urban chronicle”, more than a “universal chronicle”,⁵⁵ in some ways near to a secular, classical history.

The *logoi* are in line with the peculiar nature of this work. As regards their typology, in the first part we find single sentences either uttered or written, short dialogues, and also chants and choral voices, as is typical of chronicles. Here the *actor-addressers* are partly the emperors – with their phrases at the time of their proclamation as ruler, or near their death, or on important occasions: for instance, when the author speaks of the Nika revolt of 532, he quotes many phrases (orders) of Justinian that are absent in Procopius’ *Bella* –, but mainly the martyrs and priests (rather than the great bishops, as in the church histories) and also the people (with their chants).⁵⁶ Further on, instead, in the second “contemporary” part of the work, there are, on the one hand, long official documents, in the style of the ecclesiastical histories – two religious edicts issued by Justinian (in 533 and 552)⁵⁷ and two official letters⁵⁸ –, which the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* quotes *verbatim*, even when their length might seem disproportionate to the overall economy of the work; on the other hand, there are *πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι* in the style of the classical histories.⁵⁹

55 It contains a first-hand account of events in Constantinople in the early 7th century: the coup of Heraclius, reactions in the capital to the disasters of the 610s, the siege crisis of the 626, and the reception of the news of Heraclius’ victory in 628.

56 For instance, there is the report of an anti-Chalcedonian chanting following the earthquake of 533 (ed. DINDORF 629): «when morning came, the entire people who had been chanting litanies cried out, “[...] Augustus Justinian, may you be victorious. Destroy, burn the document issued by the bishops of the Synod of Chalcedon”» (WHITBY – WHITBY, *Chronicon Paschale* [cit. n. 42], 128). The author’s lack of enthusiasm for Chalcedonian orthodoxy emerges both from the brevity of the reference to the Synod of Chalcedon itself and the mention of this anti-Chalcedonian chant after the earthquake of 533, and again from the report of Justinian’s two neo-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical edicts (in the years 533 and 552: see *infra*, n. 58).

57 They are two neo-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical edicts: the Theopaschite Edict of 533 and the Three Chapters Edict of 552 (48 pages of DINDORF’s edition).

58 The two official letters are from the senate to Chosroes (in 615) and from Heraclius to the people of Constantinople (the victory dispatch sent by Heraclius from the war front, in 628, which we have mentioned above, in connection with Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* IV 15, 18-16, 26: the homily uttered by Domitianus, bishop of Melitene, in 590).

59 See, for instance, in 522, under Justin I (*logoi* between the Persian envoys and the *basileus*), and in 615, the long letter sent to Chosroes and quoted in full (ed. DINDORF 707-709): «the author of *CP* seems to have had access to an accurate copy of this letter, which displays the periphrastic rhetoric typical of much late Roman diplomacy» (WHITBY – WHITBY, *Chronicon Paschale* [cit. n. 42], 162 n. 444).

3.2. *The imperial perspective in Theophylact Simocatta and a foray into the 11th and 12th centuries*

The opening of the *Historia universalis* towards the imperial institution, which is the reason for the new structure of the work – where the chronological delimitation of events is defined by the life of Maurice as *basileus* (582-602) –, is also the cause of the introduction of a type of *logos* that constitutes an absolute novelty in Byzantine classicizing historiography of the 6th and 7th centuries: *i.e.* the investiture speech (demegory for the ἀνάρρησις/ἀναγόρευσις) with which the dying emperor appoints his successor. In Simocatta's work there are two instances in *oratio recta*: the discourse at the beginning of the work (I 1, 5-20), by which Emperor Tiberius I Constantine (578-582) proclaims Maurice as *Augustus* in 582, and the discourse, mentioned later – in a digression of the third book (III 11, 8-11. 13) –, but chronologically earlier, which Emperor Justin II (565-578) uttered four years before his death when he proclaimed Tiberius Constantine as *caesar* in 574.⁶⁰

As regards their form, the first speech by Tiberius to Maurice is very long (75 lines of the edition) and elaborated, sharply divided into two parts, roughly equivalent in length, connected by a shorter passage section (I 1, 12-14, half the extent of the other two): the first part (I 1, 5-11) is set in dramatic and personal tones,⁶¹ while the second large section (I 1, 15-20) is directly addressed by the dying ruler to the new *basileus*, to whom Tiberius offers exhortations and admonitions expressed with imperative verbs (usually placed as the first term)

60 On these peculiar *logoi*, see Av. CAMERON, An Emperor's Abdication. *BSI* 37.2 (1976) 161-167 (the speech by Justin II); FRENO, Three Authors (cit. n. 5), 128-130 (the speech by Justin II); A.M. TARAGNA, Le regole per il buon governo nella prima storiografia bizantina. *L'Historia universalis* di Teofilatto Simocatta, in: P. ODORICO (ed.), *L'éducation au gouvernement et à la vie. La tradition des "règles de vie" de l'Antiquité au Moyen-Âge. Colloque international – Pise, 18-19 mars 2005, organisé par l'École Normale Supérieure de Pise et le Centre d'études byzantines, néo-helléniques et sud-est européennes de l'E.H.E.S.S. Paris 2009*, 75-102; KOTŁOWSKA – RÓŻYCKI, The Role and Place of Speeches (cit. n. 33), 374 ff. (*Imperial speeches*); M. LOUKAKI, Quand l'empereur byzantin nomme son successeur (VI^e-XII^e s.): le discours d'investiture. *TM* 21.1 (2017) 333-342 (esp. 334-338).

61 Addressing the assembly, Tiberius in fact focuses on the great worries that afflict him at that moment: anguish at his approaching death and what awaits him after his passing (to give an account to God for what he has done in this life), but even more anguish at what he is about to leave on earth, the empire in the first place and his family (his wife and daughters), both in need of a wise guide. For this second anguish, the most pressing, Providence has nevertheless provided the right solution in the person of Maurice, whom Tiberius – in the central part of his speech (I 1, 12-14) – presents to the assembled dignitaries, designating him as the new emperor and at the same time the future husband of his daughter Constantina.

and mostly followed by explanatory sentences introduced by γάρ.⁶² The second speech by Justin II to Tiberius is instead very short (22 lines), lacking an opening section and an elaborate rhetorical structure,⁶³ but consisting – almost in the same way as the second section of Tiberius' *logos* – of sentences constructed either with verbs in the imperative form or in the form of a negative exhortation with μή and the subjunctive, accompanied by concise explanatory expressions, variously articulated.⁶⁴ Actually, the first speech (I 1, 5-20) – of which we have

62 *Hist.* I 1, 15-20 de B.-W.: (15) σὺ δέ μοι, Μαυρίκιε, κάλλιστον ἡμῖν ἐπιτάφιον τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν πεποιήσο. κόσμι τὸν ἐμὸν τάφον ταῖς σαῖς ἀρεταῖς, μήτε τὰς τῶν πεπιστευκότων καταισχύνων ἐλπίδας, μήτε τὰς σὰς ἀγνωμονῶν ἀρετὰς τὴν τε τῆς ψυχῆς δραπετεύων εὐγένειαν. (16) χαλίνου λόγῳ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, φιλοσοφία τὸ κράτος οἰάκιζε· βασιλεία γάρ ὑψηλὸν τι χρῆμα καὶ μετέωρον, ἐς μέγα τὸν ἐπιβάτην ἀπαιωρούσα τοῖς τε λογιμοῖς ἐκφρουάττουσα. δόκει μὴ πάντων ὑπερέχειν τῷ φρονιμώτατος εἶναι, εἰ καὶ τὰ τῆς τύχης ὑψηλά σοι παρὰ πάντας. (17) θηρῶ παρὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων ἀντὶ μὲν φόβου τὴν εὐνοίαν, ἀντὶ δὲ κολακείας τίμα τὸν ἔλεγχον οἷα διδάσκαλον ἄριστον· ἀνουθέτητον γάρ ἐξουσία καὶ παιδείας οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον. ἔστω πρὸ τῶν σῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σύνοδος ἡ δίκη πρυτανεύουσα τῶν βεβιωμένων ἀντίδοσιν. (18) νόμιζε τὴν πορφύραν, τῷ φιλόσοφος εἶναι, εὐτελές τι ῥάκος ἀμπέχεσθαι, τὸν δὲ στέφανον μηδὲν τι διοίσειν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς αἰγιαλοῖς τῆς θαλάττης ψηφίδων. στυγνὸν τὸ τῆς ἀλουργίδος ἄνθος, καὶ μοι δοκεῖ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι παρεγγυᾶν μετριοπαθεῖν ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐπραγίαις, καὶ μὴ περιγάνυσθαι καὶ φρυάττεσθαι τῇ πενθίμῳ ταύτῃ τῆς μοναρχίας στολῇ· οὐ γάρ ἐξουσίαν ἀκολασίας ἀλλὰ δουλείαν ἔνδοξον τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς βασιλείας φιλοσοφεῖν ἐπαγγέλλεται. (19) ἠγγείσθω τῆς ὀργῆς τὸ φιλάνθρωπον, τῆς δὲ σωφροσύνης ὁ φόβος, ἐξέταξε γάρ καὶ ταῖς μελίτταις ἠγεμόνας ἡ φύσις, ἀχώρησε δὲ καὶ κέντρῳ τὸν βασιλέα τὴν μέλιτταν ὡσπερ τι κράτος αὐτόματον ἐγκεντρίζουσα πῶς αὐτῷ, ἵνα καὶ πλήττειν ἔχη τὸν μὴ δικαίως πειθόμενον. (20) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖνη τὸ κέντρον τυραννικόν, δημωφελὲς δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ δίκαιον. οὐκοῦν ἐκεῖνης ἐσόμεθα μιμηταί, εἰ μήγε λόγος δεδύνηται χαρίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ μειζονα. ταῦτα μὲν ὁ προβολεὺς ἐγώ· ἔξεις δὲ τῆς γνώμης ὡσπερ δικαστὴν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀδέκαστον, ἢ τιμῶσαν τὰς ἀρετὰς ἢ τὴν κακίαν φαυλίζουσαν.

63 It is «completely shapeless», as Frenodo has said: FRENODO, Three Authors (cit. n. 5), 128.

64 It is also worth noting the recurrence of three instances of οἶδας. See the text in *Hist.* III 11, 8-11. 13 de B.-W.: (8) Ἦ Ἰδε, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀγαθῶν σε. Τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα ὁ θεὸς σοι δίδωσιν, οὐκ ἐγώ. Τίμησον αὐτό, ἵνα καὶ τιμηθῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Τίμα τὴν μητέρα σου τὴν ποτε γενομένην σου δέσποιναν· οἶδας ὅτι πρῶτον δοῦλος αὐτῆς ἦς, νῦν δὲ υἱός. (9) Μὴ ἐπιχαρῆς αἴμασιν, μὴ κοινωνήσης φόνων, μὴ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδώς, μὴ εἰς ἔχθραν ὁμοιωθῆς ἐμοί. Ἐγὼ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰσωδιάστην (καὶ γὰρ πταιστός ἐγενόμην) καὶ ἀπέλαβον κατὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας μου. Ἀλλὰ δικάσομαι τοῖς ποιήσασί μοι τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. (10) Μὴ ἐξεπάρη σε τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα ὡς ἐμέ. Οὕτω πρόσοχε πᾶσιν ὡς ἑαυτῷ. Γνώθι τί ἦς καὶ τί εἶ νῦν. Μὴ ὑπερηφανήσης, καὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτάνεις. Οἶδας τί ἦμην καὶ τί ἐγενόμην καὶ τί εἰμί. Ὅλοι οὗτοι τέκνα σου εἰσι καὶ δοῦλοι. Οἶδας ὅτι τῶν σπλάγγνων μου προετίμησά σε. Τούτους βλέπεις, ὅλους τοὺς τῆς πολιτείας βλέπεις. (11) Πρόσοχε τῷ στρατιώτῃ σου. Μὴ συκοφάντας προσδέξῃ. Μὴ εἴπωσι σοὶ τινες ὅτι ὁ πρὸ σου οὕτω διεγένετο· ταῦτα γὰρ λέγω ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθον. Οἱ ἔχοντες οὐσίας ἀπολαυέτωσαν αὐτῶν· τοῖς δὲ μὴ ἔχουσι δώρησαι. [...] (13) Ἐὰν θέλῃς, εἰμί· ἐὰν μὴ θέλῃς, οὐκ εἰμί. Ὁ θεὸς ὁ

no direct source or comparable evidence (it is missing, for example, in Evagrius Scholasticus)⁶⁵ – was not directly delivered by Tiberius Constantine, because he was seriously ill. He designated a skilled orator as imperial spokesperson, the *quaestor* John, «who through the clarity of his eloquence ennobled [τῷ διατόρῳ τῆς εὐγλωττίας ἐμεγαληγόρει] the imperial commands in a manner worthy of royal majesty»⁶⁶ (I 1, 3). This fact justifies the high rhetorical, formal elaboration of this first investiture speech. The second *logos*, instead, briefly quoted also by Evagrius Scholasticus,⁶⁷ was uttered by Justin himself (III 11,8-11. 13) during an interval of lucidity in his mental illness, and was more essential. Simocatta justifies, in this case, the non-rhetorical form of the speech, which he does not change, as he says:

Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* III 11, 5-6

παραθήσομαι δὲ καὶ τὰς ὑποθήκας τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος, ἃς Τιβερίῳ τῷ Καίσαρι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀναρρήσεως δημηγορῶν παραδέδωκεν, οὐ καλλύνων τὸ τῆς λέξεως ἀκαλλῆς οὐδὲ τι μεταμορφῶν τὸ μὴ κεκαλλιεπημένον τῆς φράσεως, ἀλλὰ που γυμνῆν τὴν τῶν ῥημάτων ἔκθεσιν ὑποστορέσω τοῖς ἀφηγήμασιν, ἵνα τῷ but I will also present the emperor's advice which he gave in a public speech to Tiberius Caesar, on the occasion of the proclamation, not beautifying the ugliness of the diction, nor making any change to the inelegance of the expression; but I will spread out nakedly, as it were, in my narrative the exposition of his

ποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν πάντα, ὅσα ἐπελαθόμην εἰπεῖν σοι, αὐτὸς ἐμβάλῃ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου.

- 65 Evagrius relates the moment of Maurice's accession to the throne in a very essential manner, in a few lines of *Hist. eccl.* V 22, preferring to dwell, in the preceding chapter (V 21), on the extraordinary prodigies that heralded Maurice's reign. The list of these θεοσημεῖα – the altar cloth which seemed to catch fire in front of him, the apparition of Christ who asked to defend him, the extraordinary and unusual perfume that was released at Maurice's birth, etc. – shows much in common with the hagiographic literature of Evagrius' time and complements the praise of Maurice's virtues presented in V 19: cf. ALLEN, Evagrius (cit. n. 44), 236-237.
- 66 Translation from: WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 19.
- 67 Evagr. Schol. *Hist. eccl.* V 13. The version of the *logos* in Evagrius Scholasticus, compared to that of Simocatta, has only a few sentences with two imperatives: «Μὴ πλανᾶτω σε τῆς ἀμπεχόνης ἢ φαντασίας, μηδὲ τῶν ὀρωμένων ἢ σκηνῆς, οἷς ὑπαχθεὶς ἔλαθον ἑμαυτὸν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ποιναῖς ὑπόδικος γενόμενος. Ἀνόρθωσον τὰς ἐμὰς ἀμαρτὰδας, διὰ πάσης εὐπαθείας ἄγων τὸ πολίτευμα». Καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας δὲ δεικνὺς ἔλεγεν ἦκιστα χρῆναι τούτοις πείθεσθαι, προσθεὶς ὡς «αὐτοὶ με ἐς ἄπερ ὀρᾶς ἤγαγον», καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα ἄπερ ἅπαντας ἐς κατάπληξιν καὶ δακρῶν ἄμετρον χύσιν ἤγαγεν. Cf. also Johann. Eph. *Hist. eccl.* III 5 (in Syriac, on which see: CAMERON, *An Emperor's Abdication* [cit. n. 60], 162-164).

ἀναμφιάστῳ καὶ ἀπαραχαράκτῳ τῆς λέξεως, ὡς ἔχει φύσεως, τὸ τῶν παρηκολουθηκότων προέλθει ἀνόθευτον. words, so that the veracity of what follows may appear from the simplicity and authenticity of the nature of the diction.⁶⁹

Thus, if high eloquence (εὐγλωττία), in the first case, serves to ennoble the imperial speech, the simplicity (or even ugliness, τὸ ἀκαλλές) of diction, in the second case, serves to show the historical veracity of the imperial exhortation. They are two different ways of emphasising, on the part of the author, the content and the function of those *logoi* which are, in many respects, typologically similar.

The two *logoi* are actually special cases of συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι (ὑποθήκαι), because they perform the primary function of “impulse” (προτροπή) towards what is good (βέλτιον), and “dissuasion” (ἀποτροπή) from what is bad (χεῖρον), by a sovereign to the newly designated. They propose a series of advice and exhortations to properly exercise imperial power in the years to come and, at the same time, aim to dissuade all that is unworthy of the one who, by God’s will, rules the government of the ecumene. Theophylact therefore reworks, in an “imperial dimension”, the traditional, Aristotelian, element of the συμβουλευτικὸς λόγος, specifically re-adapting it on the direct inspiration of the political texts from the Justinian age, *in primis* the *speculum principis* of Agapetus Diaconus (with his *Ekthesis* of 72 *Capitula admonitoria* for the emperor Justinian).⁶⁹ Indeed, many consonances can be observed between Theophylact’s two *logoi* and Agapetus’ *Advisory Chapters*: here below we have a Table with the comparison between the second part of the speech by Tiberius to Maurice and Agapetus’ “mirror for prince”.

68 Translation from: WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 89.

69 About Agapetus Diaconus and the literary genre of the *specula principis*, the scholarly bibliography is vast: see recently N.-L. PERRET – S. PÉQUIGNOT (ed.), *A Critical Companion to the ‘Mirrors for Princes’ Literature*. Leiden–Boston 2023 (especially: G. PRINZING, *Byzantine Mirrors for Princes: An Overview*, 108-135, with bibliography). Edition of Agapetus’ *Ekthesis*: R. RIEDINGER (ed.), *Agapetos Diakonos. Der Fürstenspiegel für Kaiser Iustinianos*. Athens 1995 (with German transl.); Translation: W. BLUM, *Byzantinische Fürstenspiegel*. Agapetos, Theophylakt von Ochrid, Thomas Magister. Stuttgart 1981, 59-62; S. ROCCA, *Un trattatista di età giustiniana: Agapeto Diacono*. *Civiltà Classica e Cristiana* 10 (1989) 303-328: 318-319; P.N. BELL, *Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus, Advice to the Emperor; Dialogue on Political Science; Paul the Silentary, Description of Hagia Sophia*. Liverpool 2009, 99-122.

Theoph. Sim. ⁷⁰	Advice / Concept	Agapetus ⁷¹
I 1, 16; I 1, 18	On pride associated with imperial power	14, 33, 71. Cf. 13, 21
I 1, 17; I 1, 19	On the benevolence and philanthropy of the ruler as the basis of the consent by his subjects	35, 40. Cf. 55, 60
I 1, 17; I 1, 19	On the importance of avoiding both the fear of the subjects and their adulation	12, 19. Cf. 22, 31, 56
I 1, 17	On reprimand and power education	32, 57
I 1, 18	On the Platonic image of the ruler <i>philosophos</i>	17

The speech of Justin, for its part, moves from an *incipit* of theocratic inspiration, which strongly resembles the opening lines of Agapetus:

Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* III 11, 8

Agap. *Ekth.* 1

ἴδε, ὁ θεός ὁ ἀγαθύνων σε. τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα ὁ θεός σοι δίδωσιν, οὐκ ἐγώ. *Τί μῃσον* αὐτό,⁷² ἵνα καὶ τιμηθῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

Τιμῆς ἀπάσης ὑπέρτερον ἔχων ἀξίωμα, βασιλεῦ, *τιμᾶς* ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας τὸν τούτου σε ἀξιώσαντα θεόν [...]

70 For the text of the following passages, see *supra*, n. 62.

71 Here is the text of the main chapters listed in the Table: Agap. *Ekth.* 12 Ἀποστρέφου τῶν κολάκων τοὺς ἀπατηλοὺς λόγους κτλ.; Agap. *Ekth.* 14: Εἴ τις κεκαθαρμένον ἔχει τὸν λογισμὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀπάτης [...], εἰς τὸν τῆς ὑπεροψίας οὐκ ἐμπεσεῖται κρημνόν, κἂν ἐν ἀξιώματι ὑπάρχη ὑψηλῶ; Agap. *Ekth.* 17 Ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἀνεδείχθη τῆς εὐζωΐας ὁ χρόνος, ὃν προεῖπέ τις τῶν παλαιῶν ἔσσεσθαι, ὅταν ἡ φιλόσοφοι βασιλεύσωσιν ἢ βασιλεῖς φιλοσοφήσωσι· καὶ γὰρ φιλοσοφοῦντες ἠξιώθητε τῆς βασιλείας καὶ βασιλεύσαντες οὐκ ἀπέστητε τῆς φιλοσοφίας· εἰ γὰρ τὸ φιλεῖν σοφίαν ποιεῖ φιλοσοφίαν, ἀρχὴ δὲ σοφίας ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ φόβος, ὃν ἐν τοῖς στέρνοις ὑμῶν ἔχετε διαπαντός, εὐδηλον ὡς ἀληθὲς τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ λεγόμενον; Agap. *Ekth.* 19 [...] ἡ γὰρ διὰ φόβον γινομένη θεραπεία κατεσηματισμένη ἐστὶ θωπεία, πεπλασμένης τιμῆς ὀνόματι φενακίζουσα τοὺς αὐτῇ προσανέχοντας; Agap. *Ekth.* 32 Ἦγοῦ τούτους εἶναι φίλους ἀληθεστάτους μὴ τοὺς ἐπαινοῦντας ἅπαντα τὰ παρὰ σοῦ λεγόμενα, ἀλλὰ τοὺς [...] συνηδομένους μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς χρηστοτέροις, ἐπιστυγνάζοντας δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις· κτλ.; Agap. *Ekth.* 33 Μὴ μεταβαλλέτω σοὶ τὴν μεγαλόφρονα γνώμην τῆς ἐπιγείου ταύτης δυναστείας ὁ ὄγκος, ἀλλ' [...] ἄτρεπτον ἔχε τὸν νοῦν ἐν πράγμασι τρεπτοῖς, μήτε ἐν ταῖς εὐθυμίαις ἐξυψούμενος, κτλ.; Agap. *Ekth.* 35 Νόμιζε τότε βασιλεύειν ἀσφαλῶς, ὅταν ἐκόντων ἀνάσσης τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τὸ [...] τοῖς δεσμοῖς τῆς εὐνοίας κρατούμενον βεβαίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ κρατοῦν τὴν εὐπείθειαν; Agap. *Ekth.* 40 [...] τὸ μὲν ἀπάνθρωπον ὡς θηριώδες ἀποστρεφόμενον, τὸ δὲ φιλόφρονον ὡς θεοεῖκελον ἐνδεικνύμενος; Agap. *Ekth.* 57 [...] τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀγλαΐζεται κράτος, ὅταν [...] μανθάνει μὲν ἀνεπαισχύντως κτλ.; Agap. *Ekth.* 71 Ὁ σοβαρὸς καὶ ὑπέροφρος ἄνθρωπος μὴ ὡς ταῦρος ὑψίκερος ἐπαιρέσθω, ἀλλ' ἐννοεῖτω τῆς σαρκὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν καὶ παυέτω τῆς καρδίας τὴν ἔπαρσιν. κτλ.

72 The correspondence between the two passages is even more pronounced if in Theophy-

In both cases, moreover, some particular concepts are emphasised. Tiberius I Constantine, in two successive occurrences, dwells on the importance of mastering pride and haughtiness through reason and *philosophia* (I 1, 16 and 18),⁷³ and on the need to achieve, through justice and *philanthropia* (not unconditional, but guided by prudence), a mutual brotherhood between the *basileus* and his subjects (I 1, 17 and 19-20);⁷⁴ Justin II, in addition to the invitation to shun bloodshed (III 11, 9) and arrogance towards subjects (III 11, 10), admonishes the future *basileus* to attend to his army (III 11, 11: Πρόσεχε τῷ στρατιώτῃ σου): the latter being a piece of advice absent from both Justin's speech reported by Evagrius Scholasticus – who instead recommends the most minimal confidence in the Palace notables – and Agapetus' treatise, which, as seen, strongly influences the composition of the two speeches in the *Historia universalis*. Of all these exhortations, Theophylact presents – in the second part of Book I, in the case of Tiberius' *logos*, and in the opening and concluding part of Book III, in the case of Justin's *logos* – a concrete reflection of events, with the narration of historical episodes (such as a serious case of army insubordination under the reign of Maurice, in 588: *Hist.* III 1-4)⁷⁵

lact's text one accepts the correction αὐτόν, instead of αὐτό – thus referring to θεός and not σχῆμα –, proposed by WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* (cit. n. 31), 89 n. 53, and corroborated by the analysis of G. PRINZING, *Beobachtungen zu "integrierten" Fürstenspiegeln der Byzantiner*. *JÖB* 38 (1988) 1-31: 27-29.

- 73 Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* I 1, 16: «Rein authority with reason; steer power with wisdom [φιλοσοφία τὸ κράτος οἰάκιζε]. Kingship is an exalted and lofty matter, which elevates on high its rider and puffs him up in his reasoning. Reckon that you do not surpass all men in degree of intellect, even though you have achieved heights of fortune beyond all»; I 1, 18: «Like a philosopher [τῷ φιλόσοφος εἶναι], regard the purple as some cheap rag to dress in, and the crown to be no different at all from the pebbles on the seashores. The brilliance of the purple is detestable, and my advice is to recommend kings to be moderate in their good fortune and not to be exuberant over, and exult in, this sorrowful garb of monarchy; for the sceptre of kingship professes to pursue not authority for intemperance, but glorious servitude» (WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* [cit. n. 31], 20-21). Full Greek text quoted *supra*, n. 62.
- 74 In this regard, Tiberius resorts to the image of the queen bee in the closing of his speech: the ruling bee has been endowed by nature with a sting so that it can also strike those who do not correctly obey. «But the sting is not tyrannical [ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκείνη τὸ κέντρον τυραννικόν] in the bee; rather it is a public benefit and just [δημωφελὲς δὲ μάλλον καὶ δίκαιον]. Therefore we shall be imitators of the bee»: Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* I 1, 19-20 (WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* [cit. n. 31], 21). Full Greek text quoted *supra*, n. 62.
- 75 As regards Tiberius' *logos*, the story in I 11, 3-21 of the magician Paulinus and his son, tried and punished by death, is noteworthy: the emperor Maurice, at first, shows himself benevolent to his subjects (Paulinus and his son), acting with *philanthropia*, but the need to be prudent finally leads him to punish them with death: Maurice really behaves like the queen bee who uses the sting (of capital punishment) for a purpose of justice and utility

which are a sort of “practical exemplification” of the goodness of those concepts and advice, according to the Thucydides-inspired *erga-logoi* connection.

Therefore, the “imperial dimension” of the *Historia universalis* seems broader and full of aspects both in general, as regards the construction of the entire work, and in the peculiar elaboration of the historical *logoi*. Theophylact Simocatta integrates, in the “literary” genre of historiography, the more “technical”, “scientific” genre of *speculum principis*, which is proposed to the reader both in a “theoretical” and “practical” nature: theoretical with the investiture speeches, practical with the narration of events confirming the admonitions of those *logoi* for the ἀνάρρησις. The *Historia universalis* with this *integrierte Fürstenspiegel* becomes, in this way, a fundamental work *ad usum imperatoris*, a text for the education of the emperor in good government. Agathias had emphasised how History, making everything as attractive as possible (τῶ θέλγοντι πλείστῳ χρωμένῃ), was by no means inferior to Political Science, which instead «like a stern, inflexible mistress» gives orders and prescriptions and obtains persuasion through compulsion. Theophylact, for his part, literally “integrates” History and Political Science. He chooses to cast in a past historical context (the time of the ἀνάρρησις of Tiberius in 574 and of Maurice in 582) always valid rules for good government which have, as immediately intended audience, the current emperor, *i.e.* the contemporary Heraclius, who is not only a indirect, “real” *actor-addresser* of *logoi* (as seen with Domitianus’ *logos*), but is also the indirect, “real” *reader-addressee* of Simocatta’s work.

In this sense, the peculiar *Dialogue* that is placed at the opening of the *Historia universalis*, and which has posed so many problems of interpretation,⁷⁶ can be understood with regard to the two main characters who talk together: *History* and

(in this case, the defence of orthodoxy against «the abominable and impious sorcery of the wizards» (WHITBY – WHITBY, *The History of Theophylact Simocatta* [cit. n. 31], 37).

76 This introductory *Dialogue* (cf. *supra*, n. 43) – which is without parallel in classical and Byzantine historiography – has been the focus of scholarly discussion concerning its origin (as an earlier and separate composition from Simocatta’s *Histories* or as an authentic introduction to the work) and regarding the identification of the real historical persons who would be behind the personifications of *Philosophy* (the Alexandrian philosopher Stephen or Simocatta himself? Someone else?) and *History* (Theophylact Simocatta or any other historical author?) and behind other elements alluded to in the text. See: T. OLAJOS, *Contributions à une analyse de la genèse de l’Histoire Universelle de Théophylacte Simocatta*. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 29 (1981) 417-424; WHITBY, *The Emperor Maurice* (cit. n. 31), 40-41; J. FRENDO, *History and Panegyric in the Age of Heraclius: The Literary Background to the Composition of the Histories of Theophylact Simocatta*. *DOP* 42 (1988) 143-156; P. SCHREINER, *Photios und Theophylaktos Simokates. Das Problem des ‘Inhaltsverzeichnis’ im Geschichtswerk*, in: C.N. CONSTANTINIDES – N.M. PANAGIOTAKES – E. JEFFREYS – A.D. ANGELOU (eds.), *Φιλέλληνη: Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*. Venice 1996, 391-398.

Philosophy. If it is highly probable that Ἱστορία is the image of Simocatta himself, in the character of Φιλοσοφία – who declares she was banished from court until the arrival of the Heraclides (*dial.* 5-6) – it becomes plausible to identify an allegory of the good *basileus*, πολιτικὸς φιλόσοφος, first of all in the person of Heraclius, who sits on the highest throne of the Empire after the tyranny of Phocas, and now, from the work of Theophylact, is waiting to be taught and instructed.

The new perspective that begins with Theophylact Simocatta and leads to focus on the *basileus* as potential or real reader of a historical work, which is remodelled, as we have seen, with the inclusion of new elements and mixture of genres for education in good government, may find interesting points of comparison in two particular cases from the 11th and 12th centuries.

At first, it is important to observe the so-called *Historia syntomos* (*Concise History*) ascribed to Michael Psellos (c. 1018-1080) in the single 14th century manuscript which survives (cod. Sinaiticus 1117).⁷⁷ As is known, it is a “problematic” brief textbook of Roman history, organized around biographies of rulers, but riddled with errors⁷⁸ and relatively lacking in detailed descriptions, in contrast to the well-informed accounts of imperial reigns in the *Chronographia*. It begins with Romulus and tells the stories of the emperors until Basil II, with whom the major work starts. The author explicitly states that this work is intended so that the reader «may either imitate the good deeds of the emperors, or criticise and despise the bad ones» (*Hist. synt.* 15).⁷⁹ The *Concise History* is therefore overtly didactic and evidently addressed to an emperor or an heir to the throne without a high literary education: scholars have therefore supposed that it was commissioned by Constantine X (1059-1067) as a schoolbook for his son Michael – future emperor Michael VII Doukas (1071-1078) – whom Psellos served as tutor.

77 «The *Concise History* is such a problematic work that its attribution to Psellos has been challenged, but ascribing it to someone else would create even more problems than accepting Psellos as its author»: W. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*. Basingstoke–New York 2013, 282. Edition and translation: W.J. AERTS (ed.), *Michaelis Pselli Historia syntomos* (*CFHB*, 30). Berlin 1990. See also: J. DUFFY – S. PAPAIOANNOU, Michael Psellos and the Authorship of the *Historia Syntomos*: Final Considerations, in: A. AVRAMEA – A. LAIOU – E. CHRYSOS (eds.), *Byzantium: State and Society. In Memory of Nikos Oikonomides*. Athens 2003, 219-229; R. TOCCI, Questions of Authorship and Genre in Chronicles of the Middle Byzantine Period: The Case of Michael Psellos’ *Historia Syntomos*, in: A. PIZZONE (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature. Modes, Functions and Identities* (*BA*, 28). Boston–Berlin 2014, 61-75; D. DŽELEBDŽIĆ, New Considerations on the *Historia syntomos* of Michael Psellos. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Theologia Orthodoxa* 66 (2021) 193-206.

78 A list of mistakes in TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (cit. n. 77), 283.

79 Translation: AERTS (ed.), *Michaelis Pselli* (cit. n. 77), 11.

The explicit “imperial-didactic” purpose of this historical work and the need to adapt it to the expectations and cultural competences and skills of the young *reader-addressee* can explain both the linguistic form of the text, which has a deliberately simple style, with short and not very elaborated sentences (together nonetheless with some rare words and Atticisms) and the historiographical *logoi* too, with their peculiar form and content. Psellos well knows the traditional Polybian tripartition of *logoi* which is typical of historiography, but he also likes to break the conventions of history writing and reinterpret the compositional elements of a work in a very personal way. The major work of the *Chronography* offers some examples to this regard, with the insertion of sophistic, technical discourses – which reinvent the traditional συμβουλευτικός⁸⁰ or πρεσβευτικός λόγος⁸¹ –, or with the mixture of literary genres, as is the case with the insertion

80 The insertion of long *logoi* in *oratio recta* in the *Chronographia* begins when Psellos has direct knowledge of the court's events. The first extended *logos* in direct form is therefore in *Chr.* IV 20-22. It is a συμβουλευτικός λόγος (an example of ὑποθήκη) – the speech by the eunuch John the Orphanotrophos to his brother Michael (the emperor Michael IV the Paphlagonian [1034-1041]) –, but this is not really what Aristotle defined “advice”, “impulse” (προτροπή) towards what is good (βέλτιον), and “dissuasion” (ἀποτροπή) from what is bad (χειρόν). For the content, in fact, it is a «more specious, than honest» *logos* (these are the words used by Psellos), because John wants to persuade Michael, and through him the Empress Porphyrogenita Zoe, to have the son of their sister adopted (the future emperor Michael V Kalaphates [1041-1042]). As regards the form of this *logos*, Psellos as *author-addresser* gives an articulated explanation of all the tricks of his *actor-addresser's* persuasive speech (the insistence on the words πείθω, πιθανότης is noteworthy), showing it piece by piece, in its *exordium* and *argumentation*, to the benefit of the *reader-addressee*: it is a partly new way of representing this traditional discourse within a historiographical work, revealing the mechanisms of its sophistic and deceitful construction. Edition: D.R. REINSCH (ed.), *Michaelis Pselli Chronographia*. Berlin 2014. Engl. translation from which we quote: E.R.A. SEWTER, *The Chronographia of Michael Psellus*. London 1953; see also: É. RENAULD (ed.), *Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976-1077)*, 2 vols. Paris 1926 (repr. 1967); Michele Psello. *Imperatori di Bisanzio (Cronografia)*. Introduzione di D. DEL CORNO. Testo critico a cura di S. IMPELLIZZERI. Commento di U. CRISCUOLO. Traduzione di S. RONCHEY. 2 vols. Milano 1984; D.R. REINSCH, *Leben der byzantinischen Kaiser (976-1075)*. *Chronographia: Michael Psellos*. Berlin 2015. As a starting point in a huge bibliography on Psellus' *Chronography*, see S. PAPAIOANNOU, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*. Cambridge 2013; NEVILLE, *Guide* (cit. n. 31), 139-144.

81 In the seventh book (*Chr.* VII 26 ff.), we read the long πρεσβευτικός λόγος which the author himself uttered, as envoy, to Isaac Comnenus. Psellos is, at the same time, *author-addresser* and *actor-addresser*. It is his occasion to show, once again, his rhetorical skills: so he does, and explains all the details and rhetorical devices employed, also with “technical words” (see in VII 39), which he welcomes, even though he says he was ashamed to have used them on that occasion, in contrast to the “language of the body” (head, eyes, hand) of Isaac Comnenus, who was extremely sober in speech. Also in this case the tradition

of tragedy into historiography in the fifth book (*Chr.* V 22 ff.).⁸² In the *Historia Syntomos*, the mixture of literary genres continues as regards the *logoi*, and, in order to reach his didactic goal in a simple way, Psellos interestingly combines historical (biographical, portrait-based) narrative with the tradition of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. A striking feature of the *Concise History* – and probably the most original literary aspect of this work – is in fact its large number of “sayings” of emperors, the quotation of short sentences uttered by the *basileis*, which constitutes a new form of the “traditional” historiographical *logos*.⁸³ To be noted: also at the end of the *Chronographia* (VII a29) Psellos inserts *logoi* in the form of *apophthegmata*: a series of sayings attributed to Constantine X Ducas (1059-1067), for which the author uses the expression *παρεφθέγατο*.⁸⁴ In the *Historia Syntomos* the *apophthegmata* are much more used.

Actually, these *apophthegmata* can only be found in a certain section of the work, not throughout the text; they appear loosely based on earlier sources, often abstract or common in terms of content (for instance, many recall the instability of the emperor’s fate or of human fate at large), or too much connected to the opinions of Psellos himself.⁸⁵ For these reasons, their origin has been debated,

of the historiographical *logoi* is somewhat revisited.

- 82 On occasion of Zoe’s exile from the Palace ordered by Michael V, Psellos gives voice to the Empress, to her state of mind and lament: in this way, we have the intrusion of a tragic *προλαλιά θρηνώδης* (a rhythmic lamentation, «a kind of dirge»), in V 22, which later, in V 26, has its counterpart in the lamentations of the women in procession. It is a tragedy – Psellos uses the term *ἐπετραγώδησε* (*Chr.* V 41) – which ends with the blinding of John the Orphanotrophos and his nephew Michael V Kalaphates.
- 83 Cf. D. DŽELEBDŽIĆ, Τα αποφθέγματα των βασιλέων στην Ιστορία Σύντομο του Μιχαήλ Ψελλού. *ZRVI* 44 (2007) 155-172; T. ΚΑΜΡΙΑΝΑΚΙ, Sayings Attributed to Emperors of Old and New Rome in Michael Psellos’ *Historia Syntomos*, in: N.S.M. ΜΑΤΗΟΥ – ΤΗ. ΚΑΜΡΙΑΝΑΚΙ – L.M. ΒΟΝΔΙΟΛΙ (eds.), *From Constantinople to the Frontier: The City and the Cities*. Leiden–Boston 2016, 311-325; TOCCI, *Questions of Authorship* (cit. n. 77).
- 84 Cf. also *Chr.* I 27, where Psellos uses the expression *τοῦτο δὴ τὸ δημῶδες καὶ κοινὸν ἀνεφθέγατο* to report a single “famous” saying of the emperor Basil II about the rebel Sclerus («The emperor, seeing him approaching some way off, turned to the bystanders and made his celebrated remark (everyone knows the story): ‘So this is the man I feared! A suppliant dotard, unable to walk by himself!’»: SEWTER, *The Chronographia* [cit. n. 80], 65).
- 85 «For instance, Heraclius [...] is quoted as ardently praising both philosophy and astronomy, both interests of Psellos not otherwise known to have been shared by that military emperor»: TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (cit. n. 77), 284. Cf. Psell. *Hist. synt.* 76 «Sayings of Heraclius [...]. Those emperors who wished to be generals but declined philosophy [μὴ φιλοσοφεῖν δέ] were qualified by this emperor as half-blind: in the right eye. Heraclius occupied himself intensively with astronomy and used to say that those who had no use for astrology refused to read God’s letters»: AERTS (ed.), *Michaelis Pselli* (cit. n. 77), 67.

and it has been hypothesised either that they were a new creation by the author (directly or indirectly inspired by earlier writings) or that Psellos had at his disposal a collection of imperial sayings, a *corpus* of gnomological materials that could have circulated in the Palace and that the author may also have used in the composition of the *Chronographia*.⁸⁶ Whatever their origin, the *apophthegmata* are ascribed to various emperors from Claudius II (268-270: *Hist. synt.* 48) to Philippicus (711-713: *Hist. synt.* 85) and very few others who reigned earlier or later than them.⁸⁷ The number of sayings for each emperor ranges from one to six. They are reported mostly at the end⁸⁸ of the chapter which describes the life of the *basileus* and, in many cases, they are introduced by the explicit title: Ἀποφθέγματα followed by the emperor's name.⁸⁹

These peculiar *logoi*, and in general the work in which they are inserted, clearly have a “mentoring role” for the *reader-addressee*, the future *basileus* Michael VII, because they serve to summarize (or even add information to) the historical or military events set out in the narrative, to depict essential character-traits or behavior-patterns of each emperor, and above all to give advice and exhortations to properly exercise imperial power: all this, through the filter of the author's specific interests and personal selection of what is important to convey. We can see, as an example, just the cases of the *apophthegmata* by Justin II (*Hist. synt.* 72) and Tiberius I Constantine (*Hist. synt.* 73), so as to have a comparison with Theophylact Simocatta and Evagrius Scholasticus.

For Justin II, Psellos quotes four *apophthegmata* (in the following: Just. *apoph.* 1-4),⁹⁰ reported without the introductory title, while there are six sayings for Ti-

86 This is seen in Psellos' account of the emperor Basil II, to whom the author attributes three witty sayings (for one of these, see *supra*, n. 84).

87 Single sayings are attributed also to Titus, son of Vespasian (79-81: *Hist. synt.* 26), Nikephoros I (802-811: *Hist. synt.* 92), and Romanos II (959-963: *Hist. synt.* 103). Conversely, there are no *apophthegmata* for Constantine, the son of Heraclius (*Hist. synt.* 77).

88 «In the period from Justinian I up to Philippicus, *apophthegmata* occur at the end of the biographical vignettes. There is only one exception: in the portrait of the emperor Maurice, the *apophthegma* appears at the beginning of the vignette. [...] If we look at the earlier period, stretching from Claudius II to Anastasios I (491–518), the position occupied by the sayings fluctuates: they can be found either at the beginning or at the end of the account, or even, in some cases, in the middle of the portrait, between two narrative sections (for instance, in the section devoted to Quintillus, emperor in 270)»: TOCCI, Questions of Authorship (cit. n. 77), 69.

89 See *Hist. synt.* 71: Ἀποφθέγματα Ἰουστινιανοῦ; 73: Ἀποφθέγματα Τιβερίου; 74: Ἀποφθέγματα Μαυρικού; 75: Ἀποφθέγματα τοῦ τυραννικοῦ Φωκά; 76: Ἀποφθέγματα Ἡρακλείου; 80: Ἀποφθέγματα Κωνσταντίνου, υἱοῦ Κώνσταντος; 81: Ἀποφθέγματα Ἰουστινιανοῦ; 82: Ἀποφθέγματα Λεοντίου; 85: Ἀποφθέγματα Φιλίππου βασιλέως.

90 *Hist. synt.* 72 (AERTS [ed.], Michaelis Pselli [cit. n. 77], 56 and 58): Just. *apoph.* 1 Ἐλεγε

berius (in the following: Tib. *apoph.* 1-6),⁹¹ introduced in the manuscript with Ἀποφθέγματα Τιβερίου. In both cases, the sayings recall general recommendations: the concepts of possible failure and error on the part of a *basileus* (Just. *apoph.* 1); the instability of fate (Tib. *apoph.* 1, 4, 5, 6) and the importance of mastering pride and vanity for possessions and luxuries and triumphs (Just. *apoph.* 3 and 4); the need of *philanthropia* and a prudent *euergesia* towards subjects instead of excessive punishments (Just. *apoph.* 2 and 4; Tib. *apoph.* 2). There is not the more practical advice⁹² which we find in the corresponding investiture speeches by Theophylact and (as regards Justin) by Evagrius, and certainly, in comparison to those *logoi*, more or less articulated, a series of four or six simple

ὁ βασιλεὺς οὗτος, ὅτι ‘συγγνωστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς σφαλῆς ἐπὶ τινὶ πράγματι, εἰ δ’ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ αὐθὶς σφαλεῖη, ἀσύγγνωστος;’ *apoph.* 2: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς τὰς τιμωρίας τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐλάττους αἰεὶ ποιῶν ‘πῶς ἄν’ φησὶ ‘τοὺς ἀμαρτήσαντας νικήσωμεν, εἰ μὴ φιλανθρωπότερον τούτους τιμωρησαίμεθα;’ *apoph.* 3: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς ἐπαιρομένους τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ τῷ τῷ κάλλει τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῷ τῆς κεφαλῆς διαδήματι ἀγνοεῖν ἔφασκε τούτους, ὅτι λίθοι εἰσὶ τὰ περιβλήματα ταῦτα καὶ σιρῶν νήματα, τοὺς δὲ ἠλλοιωμένους ἐπὶ τῇ λαμπροτέρῃ τῆς τύχης μεταβολῇ φρενιτιῶντας ὠνόμαζεν ὡς ἐπιλεησμένους τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως; *apoph.* 4: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔλεγε δεῖν τὸν βασιλέα μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς θριάμβοις, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τρόποις λαμπρύνεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς τιμωρίαις, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις τὴν βασιλικὴν δύναμιν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι.

91 *Hist. synt.* 73 (AERTS [ed.], Michaelis Pselli [cit. n. 77], 58): Tib. *apoph.* 1: ‘Ἐλεγε Τιβέριος ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ μὴ δεῖν βασιλέα ἐγγυᾶσθαι τὰ μέλλοντα, ἵνα μὴ τῶν πραγμάτων καταπεσόντων ψεύστης ἀποδειχθεῖ;’ *apoph.* 2: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν, ὡς οὐ χρὴ τὸν βασιλέα πέρα τοῦ μετρίου εὐεργετεῖν, ἵνα μὴ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιλειπόντων αὐτῷ τοῦ εὐεργετοῦντος δέηται;’ *apoph.* 3: Εἶωθε λέγειν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὡς εἰ μὴ βασιλεὺς ἦν, τὸν ιδιώτην ἂν εἶλετο βίον· εἰ γὰρ ἄδοξον, ἀλλ’ ἀκίνδυνον; *apoph.* 4: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς κατηγορεῖ πολλάκις τῆς τύχης ὡς ἀγνώμονος· δεξιῶς γὰρ ταύτη χρησάμενος, ἐν πολλοῖς ἐγγώκει δυσμενῆ καὶ ἐπαρίστερον;’ *apoph.* 5: ‘Ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς εὐτυχῶν μὲν ἠγάλλετο, δυστυχῶν δὲ οὐκ ἠνιάτο λέγων δεῖν πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσι μὲν ἀγαθοῖς εὐφραίνεσθαι, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐφεστηκόσι κακοῖς μὴ ἀνιάσθαι, τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐλπίδα ἑαυτῷ προβαλλόμενον;’ *apoph.* 6: Οὗτος ἀδείας οὔσης ἐγυμνάζετο τὴν ψυχὴν ὄμβροις καὶ θάλπει ταλαιπωρούμενος, ‘ἵν’ ἔχοιμί’ φησὶ ‘τούτοις ὡς συνήθεσιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνάγκης κεχρησθαι.

92 In many respects, the *integrierte Fürstenspiegel* which we find in the first book of *Chronographia* (Chr. I 28) is more “concrete” in its admonitions. It is a dialogue in *oratio obliqua* – Psellos uses the words διάλογος and κοινολογία, “conversation” – between the emperor Basil II and the rebel Sclerus (see *supra*, n. 84), who justifies his attempt at usurpation. We read: «After this Basil II questioned him [*i.e.* Sclerus], as a man accustomed to command, about his Empire [ἡρωτήκει περὶ τοῦ κράτους]. How could it be preserved free from dissension? Sclerus had an answer to this, although it was not the sort of advice one would expect from a general; in fact, it sounded more like a diabolical plot. ‘Cut down the governors who become overproud,’ he said. ‘Let no generals on campaign have too many resources. Exhaust them with unjust exactions, to keep them busied with their own affairs. Admit no woman to the imperial councils. Be accessible to no one. Share with few your most intimate plans» (SEWTER, *The Chronographia* [cit. n. 80], 67).

sayings loses vividness and dramatic tones.⁹³ However, the choice of Psellos is very useful for the didactic purpose of the work. The form of *apophthegmata* for the historiographical *logoi* gives universal validity and clarity to the discourse, and it is well suited to the target audience, the young reader Michael Doukas. The imperial-dimension of the historiographical *logoi*, which from Theophylact Simocatta onwards become a means for the education of the prince, leads to different forms of these *logoi* both according to the author's freedom of choice and artistic inclination and adapting to the concrete need to gratify the target and level of education of the reader-*addressee*. In this sense, it may be useful to briefly mention one more case, looking at another innovative example in the writing of history – and historiographical *logoi* – *ad usum imperatoris*: a chronicle written not in the “traditional” prose, but in verse.

This is the Σύνοψις χρονική (*World Chronicle*)⁹⁴ that was composed by Constantine Manasses, a Constantinopolitan writer working in the third quarter of the 12th century, author of a great variety of genres, including a verse novel in nine books, *Aristander and Callithea*, today preserved only in fragments. His *World Chronicle*, which instead survives in almost a hundred Greek manuscripts and a Slavonic translation,⁹⁵ is an elementary introduction to history from Creation

93 To be noted: in the *Chronography*, Psellos also inserts an investiture speech when he talks of the transmission of the throne by Isaac Comnenus to Constantine X Doukas (*Chr.* VII 89). It is a short demegory for the ἀναγόρευσις, which does not present an *integrierte Fürstenspiegel*, as seen in Simocatta's *Histories*. Psellos' primary interest is to set out the information that is essential to him, namely that Isaac did not follow the custom of passing the throne to his parents by blood, but, obeying to a personal choice, elected Constantine X Doukas for his virtue.

94 Edition: O. LAMPSIDIS (ed.), *Constantini Manassis breviarium chronicum*. 2 vols. (*CFHB*, 36). Athens 1996. Translation: L. YURETICH, *The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses*. Translated with commentary and introduction. Liverpool 2018. On Manasses' *Synopsis*, see NEVILLE, *Guide* (cit. n. 31), 200-204; see especially I. NILSSON, *The Past as Poetry: Two Byzantine World Chronicles in Verse*, in: A. RHOBY – W. HÖRANDNER – N. ZAGKLAS (eds.), *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World, 4)*. Leiden–Boston 2019, 517-538; EAD., *The Literary Voice of a Chronicler: The Synopsis Chronike of Constantine Manasses*. *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7 (2021) 9-40 (with bibliography).

95 The translation into Bulgarian for Tsar Ivan Alexander is preserved in a richly illuminated manuscript now in the Vatican Library: see J. BOGDAN (ed.), *Die slavische Manasses-Chronik, mit einer Einleitung von J. SCHRÖPFER*. München 1966; E. BOECK, *Imagining the Byzantine Past: The Perception of History in the Illustrated Manuscripts of Skylitzes and Manasses*. Cambridge 2015. Manasses' *Synopsis Chronike* was also “paraphrased” into prose and vernacular Greek in the 13th century: a paraphrase which «seems to have been popular, inspiring also continuations of the chronicle, in some cases even as far as to include the Turkish sultans» (NILSSON, *The Literary Voice* [cit. n. 94], 29).

to 1081 (the accession to the throne of Alexios I Comnenus), which was commissioned by the sister-in-law of the *basileus* Manuel I (1143-1180), widow of the *sebastokrator* Andronikos: the *Sebastokratorissa* Irene. Here, again, we are in the court environment, with the enigmatic figure of Irene, who is described as a great patron of letters,⁹⁶ but curiously rather under-educated for an aristocratic woman of her era. Scholars have in fact supposed that she was born abroad and commissioned introductory texts to catch up on her classical education.

Manasses' *Synopsis* too, like the *Historia Syntomos* of Psellos, has therefore a didactic purpose for a "special" *reader-addressee* near to the *basileus*. The Σύνοψις χρονική offers a clear and neatly arranged presentation of history, as we can read in the prologue,⁹⁷ but there is something more: it is also explicitly intended to entertain and amuse the recipient. For this reason, Manasses focuses on those aspects of history that would be entertaining and literarily interesting: for instance, there is a predilection for wicked characters, juicy stories, and especially erotic adventure, reported whenever possible.⁹⁸ For this reason too, the author writes his work in verse,⁹⁹ not in prose (always considered the perfect vehicle for writing history). The metre chosen by Manasses is the fifteen-syllable line: the so-called

96 She promoted a "circle" of scholars where probably Constantine Manasses performed his works; she was involved with numerous writers of the period, including Theodore Prodromos and John Tzetzes. See E. JEFFREYS, *The sebastokratorissa Irene as Patron*, in: L. THEIS – M. MULLETT – M. GRÜNBART (eds.), *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*. Wien-Köln-Weimar 2011-2012, 175-192.

97 *Syn. Chron.* 7-13 Lampsidis: ἐπεὶ γοῦν ἐπεπόθησας οἶα τροφίμη λόγου / εὐσύνοπτόν σοι καὶ σαφῆ γραφὴν ἐκπονηθῆναι, / τρανώς ἀναδιδάσκουσαν τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας / [...] ἡμεῖς ἀναδεξόμεθα τὸ βάρος τοῦ καμάτου, / κἂν δυσχερές, κἂν ἐπαχθές τὸ πρᾶγμα, κἂν ἐργῶδες: («Since you, as a foster child of learning, have desired / that a comprehensible and clear narrative should be composed for you, / teaching ancient history in a plain manner / [...] I will take on the burden of this toil, / even though it is a difficult and burdensome task, involving much work»: NILSSON, *The Literary Voice* [cit. n. 94] 12).

98 The work also employs an episodic narrative technique, reminiscent of the novel: for all these reasons, the *Synopsis* has been described by scholars as a "novelistic" chronicle, written by an author who – as mentioned – was a novelist, with his *Aristander and Callithea*, probably also composed for the *Sebastokratorissa* Irene.

99 TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (cit. n. 77), 401: «It was not the first verse chronicle in Greek: Apollodorus of Athens had written such a chronicle in the second century BC, though by Byzantine times it had long been lost and Manasses is unlikely to have known about it». In the early 14th century another Byzantine chronicle was written in verse by Ephraim of Ainos: a voluminous work – comprising no less than 9588 verses and covering the period from the reign of Caligula until 1261, when Michael VIII Palaiologos entered Constantinople and Latin rule came to an end –, which has come down to us in only two manuscripts, one of which is a copy of the other: see NILSSON, *The Past as Poetry* (cit. n. 94).

“political verse”, a “prosaic” verse, here employed for didactic purpose, because its stress rhythms lends itself to a relaxed and easily understandable syntax. At the same time, however, the style is “poetic”: it has been called “florito”, “baroque”, “pompeuse”. The author employs epic and unusual words, frequent neologisms, metaphors and numerous rhetorical figures such as rhyme and alliteration.¹⁰⁰ The work has a certain literary ambition without doubt, and is the first middle Byzantine history that we have reason to think was read aloud by its author.¹⁰¹

As for the *logoi*, they are well suited to the work’s particular purpose (education and entertainment) and form (poetry). They are inserted, in form of single sentences, into biblical or mythical episodes,¹⁰² in relation to important charac-

100 With the *Chronicle* of Ephraim of Ainos we have the opposite as metre and style. Ephraim uses in fact the more elevated twelve-syllable verse and a plain style, with fewer embellishments. Also the socio-cultural contexts of the two chroniclers are very different: «Manasses worked in an environment in which ancient Greek literature and its usefulness in contemporary rhetoric was constantly underlined and turned into a social reality for teachers and functionaries in the service of the imperial court. [...] Moreover, the verse form itself had a social function, endowing verse with a particular value for those who patronized and consumed works written in that discursive register. By the time Ephraim wrote his chronicle, a certain literary nostalgia made authors look back to, and draw inspiration from, Komnenian production. [...] it is likely that the form of Ephraim’s *Chronicle* was influenced by that literary trend, but we know little of the exact circumstances under which his chronicle was composed. While Manasses had a patron, presumably having certain specific demands [...] Ephraim’s impetus for a new take on historical form remains obscure» (NILSSON, *The Past as Poetry* [cit. n. 94], 533).

101 See TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (cit. n. 77), 401-402: Manasses’ *Synopsis* «is clearly divided into two at the fall of the Western Roman empire, in 476. There Manasses interrupts himself to praise Irene and Manuel I before resuming with the verses, “But now let my account embark once again on its journey, / And let it complete what remains of the course of its history” [*Syn. Chron.* 2513-2514]. Since reading the *Synopsis* aloud would have taken about six hours, obviously too long for one sitting, this looks like a break between two long but not unbearable sittings of roughly two and a half and three and a half hours».

102 For instance, in the opening section of the work, consisting of an elaborate rewriting of the Creation (about which: I. NILSSON, *Narrating Images in Byzantine Literature: The Ekphraseis of Konstantinos Manasses*. *JÖB* 55 [2005] 121-146), see the speech of God, in *oratio recta* (11 verses), about the Tree of Knowledge (*Syn. Chron.* 287-297), and the serpent’s reply to Eve (4 verses), in antilogical connection (*antilogia in absentia*) to God’s *logos* (*Syn. Chron.* 315-318). See also in the section about the Trojan War, which Manasses wants to describe «not» relating «it as Homer did [...], for although Homer was sweet of tongue and an enchanter, he used cunning devices to manipulate his narrative and in some places be twisted and distorted events» (YURETICH, *The Chronicle* [cit. n. 94], 60: *Syn. Chron.* 1113-1117): see, e.g., the *antilogia in praesentia*, in mixed form (*Syn. Chron.* 1190-1205), between Proteus, *basileus* of Egypt, and Paris/Alexander with Helen, which is closed by Proteus’ speech in *oratio recta* (10 verses: *Syn. Chron.* 1195-1204).

ters, mostly in the final moments of their life (see e.g. Caesar;¹⁰³ but nothing, for instance, by Justin II for the succession of Tiberius Constantine and by the latter for Maurice), to “mark” their character in a didactic way, but without the form of Psellos’ “series” of *apophthegmata*. Moreover, prophecies and predictions, in *oratio recta*, are often involved, which make the telling of events more interesting and entertaining. What is especially noteworthy is that there are no long military speeches or imperial speeches, no ecclesiastical edicts or documents reported in such a way as to appear genuine and reliable, no didactic list of sayings. In this respect, Manasses’ *Synopsis* bears no resemblance to the 7th century *Chronicon Paschale*,¹⁰⁴ as well as the other types of history writing (classicizing and ecclesiastical), but it certainly marks another – very successful – “innovation” in the tradition of the *Histories* and their historiographical *logoi*.

Conclusion

In Byzantine historical works related to classical models and composed with a literary style, the report of someone’s uttered or written words, mostly in the form of *orationes* and *epistulae*, sometimes still considered by scholars with scepticism, is actually not such a rigid, fixed and standardized element. We have seen, with a few cases, how one can speak of “evolution” of the historiographical *logoi* over the

103 *Syn. Chron.* 1915-1923: «When Caesar was about to leave those here, he summoned before him the people together with the consuls. He said, “I found the city of the Romans built of clay, but I have made it full of beautiful, strong marble towers. Since I am being removed from the hustle and bustle of affairs, I want many to applaud at my death, to experience merriment, and to clap their hands, as if at the death of a mime, a jester or an actor”. He made these arrangements to mock life [του βίου καταπαίζων]» (YURETICH, *The Chronicle* [cit. n. 94], 87).

104 Cf. S. MARIEV, *Byzantine World Chronicles: Identities of Genre*, in: G. GREATREX – H. ELTON – L. MCMAHON (eds.), *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*. Abingdon–New York 2015, 305-317 (esp. 316-317): «the verse chronicle by Constantine Manasses [...] is a chronicle in the sense that it adheres closely to the linear structure of the Christian world chronicle, and it contains the same episodes [...] and mentions the same figures [...] as its numerous antecedents. However, this work turns everything (motives, entire episodes, language) into a literary *divertissement*: [...] into a joke, a conceit or parody for the amusement of the court. In this original version it contained very little chronological information. The impressive manuscript tradition of this work (more than 100 manuscripts and a paraphrase into colloquial Greek) proves, on the one hand, the enormous popularity that it enjoyed in the subsequent period. On the other hand, the transformations which the chronicle underwent at this stage, which entailed various attempts to emend the original text, especially by inserting dates, can be interpreted as attempts by readers and copyists outside the court to transform a parody of a chronicle or a literary diversion back into a more serious and more traditional chronicle».

centuries, and first and foremost of “originality”, to varying degrees, with regard to their form and content. In particular, the analysis of the historiographical *logoi* in the 6th and 7th centuries, with the works of Procopius, Agathias and Theophylact Simocatta, as well as Evagrius Scholasticus and the *Chronicon Paschale*, leads us to the following observations and conclusions.

In the 6th and 7th centuries, these authors write their works without feeling impassable “boundaries” and “oppositions” among literary genres. Classicizing historiography is distinguished by Church history and universal chronicle in terms of core subject, but these genres are parallel rather than separate: they focus on conflict – external and military with classicizing history; internal and doctrinal with Church history; both, military and doctrinal, with the chronicle – and their respective authors have received similar literary education and work in similar workplaces (related to high personalities up to the patriarch and *basileus*). For this reason, we can find mixture, inclusion, “absorption” of literary elements from different genres (and specifically, among them), as well as a personal interpretation, by these authors, of the literary element of the *logos*.

Why is all this the case? There is a fundamental motivation behind it: the lack in Byzantium of an autonomous theory of historiography and of a specific literary training reserved for the historians. From its beginnings and throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, historiography never got, in terms of methods and purposes, the epistemological *status* of “science”, as we understand the “writing of history” today, but it was always configured as a literary genre. A literary genre, however, with a different fate from other literary genres (εἶδη). While ποιητική and ῥητορική became τέχναι, developing around themselves a complex normative system (a system of “laws”), historiography, on the other hand – which perhaps, more than the other genres, would have needed detailed norms, “laws” relating not only to the purely “aesthetic”, literary level (regarding subject matter, structure, and language), but methodological (*i.e.* ways of investigation and reconstruction of events) –, never obtained its own “theoretical” and “practical” teaching within the school: which is striking, given the enormous development of its production. The only treatise that has come down to us on the composition of a historical work, the *Quomodo historia conscribenda* by Lucian of Samosata, is more a “descriptive” than a “normative” manual: it is a collection of *topoi* and not an articulate reflection on historical methods. And the few περὶ ἱστορίας writings of which we are aware – but of which we possess little more than simple attestations – were mainly focused on stylistic or literary issues, and in any case there is no trace of their survival or influence in the Byzantine centuries.¹⁰⁵

105 Cf. R. NICOLAI, *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*. Pisa 1992; E.V. MALTESE, *La sto-*

For this reason, at Byzantium, the acquisition of the norms of the γένος ιστορικόν took place with personal study, through the reading and the imitation of models, namely the great historiographical works of the past. And the literary elements of a historiographical work, such as the *logoi*, were therefore subject to individual interpretation by Byzantine authors: each writer, with his own cultural background and interests, forged his own idea about how to “write history in the manner of the ancients”, with an *imitatio* that sometimes became an *aemulatio* of the models, a desire to match or surpass the models, and with a personal *variatio*. At the same time, each writer, with his own cultural background and interests, forged his own idea about how to include *logoi*, as typology of content and form, without impassable boundaries, as we have seen.¹⁰⁶

Certainly, in the writing of history (and of historical *logoi*) there is also a general adaptation to the changes in mentality: after the 7th century there is no longer a need to “defend” the Church and the Christian interpretation of events with ecclesiastical histories¹⁰⁷ (a genre which ends with Evagrius, despite an isolated revival around 1320 by Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos), while it is more “normal” to focus on the imperial dimension, the “life” of the *basileis*: the second perspective arising with Theophylact Simocatta, as an innovation, and which we have seen with a foray into the 11th and 12th centuries through the comparison with two peculiar historical works by Psellos and Constantine Manasses. The analysis of these latter two texts, with their new, simplified forms *ad usum imperatoris*, also reveals how it is the “demand” by the audience and the environment that determines the “supply”, *i.e.* the type of text produced by the authors: in this regard, one may only quote the *metaphraseis* in a low style of historical works (such as those by Anna Comnena and Niketas Choniates) or *specula principis* (such as that of Nikephoros Blemmydes) which were written, with the same purpose, in the last centuries of Byzantium, around the 13th-14th cent.¹⁰⁸

riografia, in: G. CAMBIANO – L. CANFORA – D. LANZA (ed.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. 2: *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*. Roma 1995, 355-388: 357.

106 To this regard, see also the wide variety of theoretical statements developed by ancient Greek historians and rhetoricians on historiographical *logoi*, as their nature, content, form and function, which we have cited *supra*, n. 4.

107 See KALDELLIS, *Byzantine Historical Writing* (cit. n. 22), 210: «Eusebius had defined Church history in opposition to the military and political interests of the ancient historians (Book 5, preface). His successors, however, especially Sokrates in the early fifth century (Book 5, preface), had to admit that the two spheres could not be separated, especially in a Christian empire».

108 The bibliography is vast: see in particular J. DAVIS, *Anna Komnene and Niketas Choniates 'translated': The Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Metaphrases*, in: R. MACRIDES (ed.), *History as Literature in Byzantium*. Farnham 2010, 55-70; M. HINTERBERGER, *Between Sim-*

When we look at Byzantine literary culture, one must consider “all” the actors involved, namely not only the *author-addressers*, but also the *reader-addressees*. As E.V. Maltese writes, reaching a circle of readers – and thus producing a text that meets their cultural capabilities and gratifies their aesthetic expectations – is an essential part of an author’s programme, not to say that it is sometimes the driving force behind the entire textual enterprise. Reconnecting certain features of a work to the characteristics of its potential readers helps, therefore, to better understand some of its connotations, which do not originate exclusively in the author’s subjectivity, that is, in his level of education, in his rhetorical and artistic inclinations; it helps, above all, to discern in the strong fragmentation of the overall panorama not only the reflection of different literary individualities, but also the pressure exerted by a multiplicity of readers differing in education, ability, and needs.¹⁰⁹

In conclusion, because of the absence of an autonomous theory of historiography and of a specific literary training reserved for historians, Byzantine authors forge their own ideas about how to include *logoi*, both according to their own interests and adapting to new needs: readers’ demands and changes in mentality. This happens without seeing insurmountable “boundaries” in the writing of the historiographical *logoi*. We have talked about mixture and interrelationship among different literary genres; interchanges between secular and religious content, prose and poetry, learned and simple language, also literary and “scientific” texts, union of the didactic and the entertaining, seeing in action, as a sort of *fil rouge*, what is the great ability of Byzantines: the creative and always innovative (at various levels) re-writing of literature, whose richness cannot be captured through rigid schemes and paradigms.

*Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università di Torino*

plification and Elaboration: Byzantine Metaphraseis Compared, in: J. SIGNES CODOÑER – I. PÉREZ MARTÍN (eds.), *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung (Lectio, 2)*. Turnhout 2014, 33-60; ID., From Highly Classicizing to Common Prose: The Metaphrasis of Niketas Choniates’ History, in: K. BENTEIN – M. JANSE (eds.), *Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek*. Berlin–Boston 2021, 179-200; A.P. ALWIS – M. HINTERBERGER – E. SCHIFFER (eds.), *Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature*. Turnhout 2021; S. EFTHYMIADIS, Rewriting, in: S. PAPAIOANNOU (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*. Oxford 2021, 348-364.

109 English adaptation from E.V. MALTESE, *Dimensioni bizantine. Tra autori, testi e lettori*, Alessandria 2007, VIII; cf. S. PAPAIOANNOU, Readers and their Pleasures, in: ID. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook* (cit. n. 108), 525-556; R. KRAMER – G. WARD, Audience and Reception. *Medieval Worlds* 15 (2022) 36-49.

ABSTRACT

The report of someone's spoken or written words, mostly in the form of speeches and letters, is a typical and somehow standardized element of Byzantine historical works related to classical models. Throughout the centuries, however, this literary element does not remain totally unchanged, and this "evolution", together with the presence of historiographical *logoi* also in other types of history writing (namely chronicles and ecclesiastical histories), may provide some insights into the difficulties posed by the traditional "boundaries" and "oppositions" that still govern the taxonomy of texts in Byzantine literature. In this paper some case-studies will be analysed, with selected authors from the 6th and 7th centuries (Procopius of Caesarea, Agathias of Myrina, Theophylact Simocatta, Evagrius Scholasticus and *Chronicon Paschale*) and a foray into the 11th and 12th centuries (with the *Historia syntomos* attributed to Michael Psellos and the *Synopsis Chronike* by Constantine Manasses).