THE BYZANTINE REVIEW

ByzRev 03.2021.029
doi: 10.17879/byzrev-2021-3583

MARINA LOUKAKI, Les Grâces à Athènes : Éloge d'un gouverneur byzantin par Nikolaos Kataphlôron (Byzantinisches Archiv 36). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter 2019. XXIX, 206 pp. – ISBN: 978-3-11-063386-3 (€ 102.95)

• ANTONIA GIANNOULI, University of Cyprus (agiannou@ucy.ac.cy)

In this book MARINA LOUKAKI [ML] publishes, for the first time in its entirety, the *Encomium* addressed to a high ranking official by Nikolaos Kataphloron (ca. 1120–1160). The volume opens with a preface, a combined list of primary and secondary literature (pp. XIII–XXIX) and a comprehensive introduction (pp. 1–79) dealing with the biography of the author, the identity of the addressee, and then the edited text, its structure and content. The final introductory section clarifies the *ratio edendi*, which is appropriate to a text transmitted by a *codex unicus*, and specifically the famous anthology of the early thirteenth century *Scorialensis* 265 (Y–II–10) [Diktyon 15478], fol. 324r–337r. The critical edition is accompanied by a parallel translation in French with detailed scholia (pp. 82–165). The book ends with three special indices for references to the scriptures and other writings, proper names, and notable words in Kataphloron's text, accompanied by a general index.

This critical edition is the product of ML's long engagement with a variety of philological and historical issues raised by this highly demanding literary text. Excerpts from the text, published from 2001 onwards, accompanied by commentary, have offered glimpses into this unique example of Kataphloron's prose (his only known work to date), highlighting his compositional techniques but also his attitudes towards male and female virtues as well as his criticism of the intellectual decline and the exploitative system of taxes in his days.

In her introduction, ML examines all the information about Nikolaos Kataphloron from two sources; the funeral oration written for him by his student Gregorios Antiochos and his self-references in the edited *Encomium*. Taking into account the historical circumstances of the period and by drawing parallels with other better-known *didaskaloi*, ML reconstructs the course of Kataphloron's career. After his studies in the trivium and in theology, he pursued a career as a teacher of the "patriarchal school", successively

holding the posts of the *didaskalos of the Apostle* (in 1153), the *didaskalos of the Gospel* (by the end of 1154), and later concurrently the post of the *maistor of the rhetors* (after 1156) until his untimely death. The *Encomium* must have been written after 1134, since there is a mention of the empress's death (Piroska-Irene), while further historical implications have led ML to suggest an approximate date of 1148–1154 (or more specifically round 1150). Textual and linguistic similarities with contemporary works, may suggest that these scholars had a special relationship with Kataphloron, though ML has sensibly refrained, even in the case of Michael Choniates, from identifying this as a relationship between teacher and student.

With the aim of identifying the anonymous addressee, ML examined the references in the *Encomium* to his personality, family, education and career. He was a man of power and excellent education, with considerable rhetorical ability, who had addressed an oration to the emperor and had given speeches to the soldiers on the battlefield. Kataphloron presents him as a great benefactor, including to himself, and asserts that he had known his family for a long time: his – by then deceased – grandfather and parents who lived in Constantinople; his brothers who pursued military careers; his sisters who became nuns; and his spouse who was related to the imperial family. To each of them the author devotes a eulogy, some brief and some lengthier, thus magnifying the importance of his laudandus, before sketching in his subject's career. As an imperial dignitary and person of trust in the service of the Empress Piroska-Irene, he collaborated with a prominent architect in the construction of the monastic complex of the Pantokrator in Constantinople. Only the architect's name, Nikephoros – concealed by Kataphloron – has been detected by ML through other sources. An undefined period of time after the death of the empress, he was appointed *megas doux* and *praetor* by John II and moved to Athens to rule Hellas. However, despite an abundance of references, their implicit nature does not help identify the addressee with one of the known praetors of Athens. Nonetheless ML's systematic historical and prosopographical survey of high officials and aristocrats in the mid-twelfth century (pp. 13–35) sheds light on his duties, time and milieu.

Lacking explicit thematic or generic specification in its vague superscription "τοῦ Καταφλῶρον κυροῦ Νικολάου", the text discloses a rich combination of genres. A close analysis of its content and structure makes clear that it is an encomium, as defined by Pseudo-Menander's guidelines. The author's awareness of the relevant theoretical precepts (§ 10,2) corrobo-

rate this. The encomium concludes by asking the addressee to describe the current cultural and intellectual life in Athens, and whether it preserves its ancient glory (§ 40). This is a typical way of ending letters, as ML observes, which suggests that the praise was sent to the addressee in the form of a letter rather than being delivered in person. Furthermore, ML demonstrates how Kataphloron combines techniques and features from diverse genres, introducing, for example, an ekphrasis and its allegorical interpretation, a funeral oration, autobiographical references and even a lively criticism of contemporary orators in Constantinople not excluding himself (§ 5–6). Furthermore, a variety of quotations, allusions, and references to earlier literature attest to the author's erudition and indicate his expectation that the addressee would appreciate this literary gift.

This critical edition and commentary are the result of remarkably thorough work. In the last section of her introduction, ML offers a clear presentation of the *ratio edendi.* Editor's interventions are noted in the critical apparatus and choices are explained in the comments. In the critical apparatus, apart from incorrect readings, the editor notes scribal corrections in the text and marginal annotations and positive assessments by readers. A rich apparatus of sources and parallels (p. 70) unveils the plenitude of Kataphloron's references and allusions to ancient Greek, Christian and profane literature. Of these proverbs and related expressions represent the lion's share, as is apparent in the *index locorum*; references to Suda and Homeric poetry come next. Thanks to the editor's comments – appended as footnotes in the translation – the author's intertextuality is brought to light.

The editor has been sensitive to the scribe's choices – not least because of the latter's chronological proximity to the author – and in general to the *usus scribendi et interpungendi* in contemporary manuscripts in dealing with the transmitted text. The rendering of the punctuation in the edited text was explicitly one of the major challenges for the editor. In recent decades, studies on Byzantine autographs and similarly reliable manuscripts as well as critical editions have convincingly shown that the transmitted punctuation system reveals how the author meant his text to be performed orally and have urged editors to be alert to this fact. It is thus welcome that ML chose to preserve the manuscript's punctuation system, contributing to the familiarisation of the modern reader with the historically correct form of the text, particularly since it represents a rhetorical text designed to be read aloud. For this reason, the punctuation primarily supports the rhetorical rather than the syntactical structure of the text, e.g., § 3,2–5 Ἀλλὰ νῦν περιφανέστατε …

καὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἀλληγορουμένης ἐγκύμον Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐκ σοῦ μοι καὶ διὰ σοῦ· λέλυται μὲν τὸ αἴνιγμα; § 4,14 ἀλλὰ φιλῶ μέν, ἐμαυτὸν οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι. Some concessions to modern punctuation, however, are inevitable. The division of the text into (forty-one) sections, not marked in the manuscript, sheds light on its thematic structure. On the other hand, the combination of the dot and comma (;) in the manuscript more often serves various purposes other than marking the end of an interrogative phrase (LIVERANI, 2001, pp. 193–194), a fact which makes the employment of dashes (–) and the question mark (;) desirable in the edited text. When this combination (;) marks the end of a conditional clause preceding the apodosis in the manuscript (cf. p. 78), it should be rendered in the edition with a comma rather than a dash, e.g., after ἐρῶ (§ 6,5), μαθεῖν (§ 7,2). The combination of dash and double dot (–:) employed after εἰκόνων (§ 2,5) is not based on the manuscript.

The editor explicitly preserves the transmitted accentuation of the enclitics in the edited text (p. 79). This should also apply to the conjunction δέ, which in specific cases the anonymous scribe of this text treats – as several Byzantine intellectuals do – as an enclitic (JACQUES NORET, L'accentuation Byzantine : En quoi et pourquoi elle differe del' accentuation « savante » actuelle, parfois absurde. In: MARTIN HINTERBERGER, The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature (Byzantioς, Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 9). Turnhout 2014, pp. 96–146, at p. 124). In a dozen cases the editor indeed followed the usus of the manuscript: τόν δ' ἀλλὰ (§ 1,7), Σύ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶν (§ 3,5), σοί δ' ἐνεργὰ (§ 3,11), Ἅ δ' ἔχω (§ 14, 12), τόν δ' ἐκάλυψε (§ 17,3), ἥ δ' ἀνεζώσατο (§ 18,9), μεσημβρινός δ' ἐπανήκων (§ 20,12), παραυτά δ' ἀπεμάνθανες (§ 20,20), σύ δ' ἐπεσκεύαζες (§ 25,3), σοί δ' ἀλλὰ (§ 26,4), τό δ' ὑπανέχων (§ 29,15), τό δ', οὐκ (§ 36,23). It is worth noting that TLG – which incorporated Kataphloron's text based on this edition – provides the aforementioned phrases "corrected" (i.e. normalised according to the classical school grammar and employed a gravis accent), thus distorting the picture of the Byzantine usus in this case, something that should be taken into consideration by editors resorting to TLG in order to check the existence or frequency of a word(form) or expression. In some other cases, however, the edited text diverges from the transmitted accentuation by not considering the elided δ' as enclitic: ταὐτὸν δ' εἰπεῖν (§ 2,14), ἐγὼ δ' οὕτως (§ 8,16), σοὶ δ' ὅμως (§ 10,2), ὁ δ' ἔπαθε (§ 31,9), Κἀμοὶ δ' ὡσαύτως (§37,20), σαὐτὸν δ' οὐ (§ 38,7). Finally, I will restrict myself to mentioning just two instances of misreading: μεγάλ(ως) instead of μεγάλα (§3,7 χαρίζῃ μεγάλα); and θέλ(ειν) instead of ἐθέλειν (§ 3,15), since ε is not discernible and there is no trace of at least a breathing mark.

The word θέλω occurs another six times in Kataphloron's text, while ἐθέλω only once (§ 38,1).

In conclusion, this book represents a laudable editorial achievement in view of the demanding language, style, and allusive character of the text as well as the challenges of its textual witness. ML's explicit aim in the preface (pp. VII–VIII: to understand the author's ideas and intentions, decipher his allusions, immerse herself in his style, and establish a modern critical edition of the encomium) is fully accomplished. Thanks to the comprehensive introduction, the rich apparatus of sources and parallela, the translation and the extensive comments, the *Encomium* emerges as a remarkable piece of rhetoric, expanding our knowledge of the evolution of the genre and forms of literary communication among members of the intellectual elite in one of the most fruitful periods for rhetorical literature in Byzantium.

Keywords
Byzantine rhetoric; Nikolaos Kataphloron