Michael ο του 'Αγχιάλου, Patriarch of Constantinople from January 1170 to March 1178, is known as an inflexible opponent of compromise with Latins or Armenians, and several of his dogmatic writings are preserved. Before his elevation to the Patriarchal throne he was ὑπάτος τῶν φιλοσόφων. The inaugural lecture which he delivered in the presence of the emperor Manuel Comnenus has occasionally been referred to and quoted, but never published in full. It is interesting not only as a good example of the formal rhetoric of the twelfth century, but also for the information which it provides on the teaching and study of philosophy in the middle of the century and on Byzantine-Hungarian relations in the second half of Manuel's reign. Until relatively recently the abundant panegyrical literature of the twelfth century has been neglected as a historical source, and many texts of interest remain unpublished.


2. Cf. F. Fuchs, Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter Byzantinisches Archiv 8), Leipzig, 1926, 50 - 51. Many frequently consulted reference books, e.g. Dictionnaire de théologie catholique 10 (1927/30), 1674, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche, 7 (1935), 164 erroneously state that the text is published in fasc. 2 of W. Regel's Fontes Rerum Byzantinarum, Petrograd, 1917. As Regel's work is unobtainable outside a few large libraries, scholars may have been discouraged from editing Michael's speech by the belief that it was already published. Curiously, the speech is not included among the published and unpublished rhetorical sources for Byzantine-Hungarian relations in the twelfth century listed by Gy. Moravcsik, A magyar történet bizánci forrásai, 1934, 206 - 208, nor by I. Rácó, Bizánci költemények Mánuel császármagyar hadjáratairól (Magyar-görög tanulmányok 16) 1941, 11.

3. Cf. M. Bachmann, Die Rede des Johannes Syropulos an den Kaiser Isaak II. Angelos nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte des Kaisers aus zeitgenössischen rhetorischen Quellen, Munich, 1935, 5; Gy. Moravcsik, op. cit. 206; M. Bachmann-F. Döger, die Rede des megas droungarios Gregorios Antiochos auf den Sebastokrator Konstantinos Angelos, BZ 40 (1940) 353 - 354; P. Lamma, Manuele Commeno nel pane-
The present speech is preserved in two manuscripts, both well-known Byzantine rhetorical miscellanies. They are cod. Escorialensis Y-II-10 (E), where it occurs on fol. 132-139, and cod. Bodl. Baroccianus 131 (O), where it is found on fol. 186v-190.

It may well also lie concealed in a manuscript of one of the less thoroughly catalogued collections. Certain common errors, e.g. ςαμίσας for θύμας 1.89, and a common punctuation which is not infrequently wrong, show that both the E and O texts descend from a common archetype, perhaps a collection of the speeches and letters of Michael. E omits a long passage (l. 197-214) while two short passages can no longer be read in O because of damage to the lower margin of fol. 189.

The speech of Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγχιάλου was delivered in the presence of Manuel Comnenus, shortly after the appointment of Michael to the post of ὑπατος τών φιλοσόφων, on the occasion of an ecclesiastical ἐορτή which cannot be further determined. The place of its delivery is not mentioned. But if it is the normal lecture-room of the professor of philosophy, then it must have been somewhere in the Great Palace, perhaps in the Magnaura itself. The date of the speech lies between January 1170, when Michael was consecrated as Patriarch, and the date of the victory over and treaty with the Hungarians described at length in the concluding section. As will be seen, a much more precise dating can be established with some probability.

The chronology of Manuel Comnenus' Hungarian campaigns is complex and to some extent disputed. However, in the present connection we can neglect the earlier campaigns of 1152, 1155, 1156 and probably 1161, because of reference in the speech to Manuel's victory over the Cilician Armenians in 1158 (τὰ κατὰ τῶν Περσῶν καί Κιλίκων σεμνολογήματα 1. 377), to the treaty with Sultan Kilidj Arslan of Iconium in autumn.
1161, confirmed during his visit to Constantinople later in the same year. 1 (καὶ σοι δουλεύειν καὶ Ἰσμαήλ ὁ βάρβαρος κατεπείγετο καὶ ἐμαυτῷ δεινολίαν ἔπεισε ὁμάδα τοῦ κατεστήματος II. 146 - 155), and to the guaranteeing of the truce by King Vladislav II of Bohemia (τῷ τῆς Βοημίας ἀρχηγῷ καὶ ἄλλους ἔπιστήμους δυναστείας ἄνεξομένους, ὅσοις ὁ Πατριάρχης εἰς ἑξέγγυον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας παρατείνετο καὶ παρέδωκε, II. 539 ff.), who was an uneasy ally of the Hungarians from 1163 - 4) 2. This leaves the campaign against Stephen III of Hungary, from 1164 to 1167, for consideration.

In attempting to identify the campaign described in the speech, we should be guided less by Michael’s description of the military operations than by his account of the general political frame of reference. The future patriarch was no soldier, and the conventions of panegyric made for vagueness and inaccuracy. Indeed it is impossible to discover from the speech whether a battle actually took place between the Byzantine and Hungarian armies or not. The suggestion—and it is in accordance with the traditions of panegyric 3—is that the mere appearance of the Emperor’s forces utterly discomfited the enemy. Briefly, what Michael Anchialos says is this. The King of Hungary, unmindful of his treaty obligations (αὐτὸς τίς καὶ οἱ συνήψαν, l. 427), incited the Serbs 4 to revolt, and then invaded Srem (the Fruska Gora, or Φραγγοχώριον, between the Danube and the Sava), which had recently been added to Byzantine dominions (ὁπὸς οὖς τῶν Ῥωμαίων εὐκλεεστάτως κληροδοτέμασιν ὁ . . . αὐτοκράτωρ πρὸ μικροῦ συνηψε καὶ συναπένεμε), Manuel dealt quickly with the Serbs, reduced them to subjection, appointed a new ἀρχηγός (l. 496), and then took his army to the Danube, where they were victorious over the Hungarians, and a treaty was concluded, the terms of which are given in some detail (ll. 555 - 583).

Now until 1165 Fruška Gora was a Hungarian possession 5. The campaign of 1164, in which Manuel crossed the Danube and succeeded in obtaining the capitulation of the Hungarians without a battle, was followed

1. Not 1162 as generally stated. Cf. P. Lamma, Comneni e Stauffer, I, 32, n. 1, who bases his dating on a panegyric by Euthymios Malakes.
2. Cl. Vine Prag. s.a. 1164, MGH, SS. xvii, 681.
3. Cf. poem published by I. Rácz, op. cit. 25 - 42, l. 59 for the same motif in connection with a victory over the Hungarians.
4. This is the only possible identification of the wild Dacians of the mountains, who extend from the Danube to the Adriatic and Ionian seas (ll. 439 - 442).
5. The line of the Sava and the Danube as the ‘normal’ southern frontier of Hungary in the twelfth century is frequently mentioned in contemporary sources. Cf. the passages cited or mentioned by M. Győni, Magyarország és a magyarság a bizánci források tükrében (Magyar-görög tanulmányok 7), 1938, 25 - 29.
by a treaty ceding Croatia and Dalmatia to Béla, the younger brother of King Stephen III (F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, 1455). As Béla was a Byzantine protégé, and was soon to be betrothed to Manuel's daughter Maria and recognised as joint heir to the throne, this in effect made Croatia and Dalmatia Byzantine provinces, and in fact in 1166 we find a Byzantine dux Dalmatiae et Dioscleæ. But Srem still remained in Hungarian hands. In 1165 Manuel first raised the question of Srem, which he claimed belonged to the appanage of Béla, sent troops to occupy Zemun, where they were promptly besieged by a Hungarian army. He then prepared for a major war and entered into negotiations with Russian princes, with Frederick Barbarossa, with Henry II of Austria, and with Venice. In the meantime the Hungarians captured Zemun. Manuel hastened to the Danube and retook the city, whereupon the Hungarians signed a treaty acknowledging Byzantine claims to Srem. Only from late summer 1165 onwards could a Hungarian invasion of Srem be spoken of as a violation of a treaty. The Hungarians were unwilling to accept this situation, and began negotiations to form an anti-Byzantine alliance. In spring 1166 they attacked the Byzantine garrison in Srem, and went on to occupy parts of Croatia and Dalmatia. In 1167 Manuel gathered a large army in Sofia and sent it to Srem under the command of Andronikos Kontostephanos, while the imperial fleet sailed up the Danube. On St. Procopius day (18th July) 1167 a battle was fought near Zemun in which the Hungarians were routed. This defeat ended the long series of Byzantine-Hungarian wars which filled the middle years of Manuel’s reign.

The campaign described in the speech must be either that of 1165 or that of 1167. It is not easy to choose between the two dates. In favour of the former the following arguments suggest themselves:

i) There was no actual battle in 1165.

ii) The presence of King Vladislav of Bohemia in Hungary is not recorded for 1167, though the argument from silence is always dangerous.

---

4. F. Šišić, *op. cil*, 88. where the sources are cited. The chronology of these events is not entirely certain, but Šišić’s reconstruction seems the most plausible.
5. F. Šišić, *op. cit. 89 - 91.*
iii) King William I of Sicily, who died on 7 May 1166, may be referred to as still alive in the speech (ll. 132 ff. καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἷκείου ἀτρεμεῖ φωλεοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καταδύσεως, καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἀπεκδεχόμενος δυσον ἡδη καὶ τὴν πληγήν ὁμού καὶ τὸν ὀλέθρον).

iv) The apparent presence of the emperor with the army. In 1167 Manuel seems to have established his headquarters at Sofia.

In favour of the later date the following arguments are worthy of consideration:

i) The claim that Srem had been occupied by the Hungarians in contravention of a treaty with Byzantium would be strictly true only after 1165. But it must be admitted that the Byzantines themselves seem to have claimed some kind of rights in Srem even in 1165 (Kinnam. p. 231).

ii) There was a Serbian contingent among the Byzantine forces in 1167 (Kinnam. p. 271), but there is no mention of one in connection with the campaign of 1165.

At the end of the speech (ll. 758 ff.) Manuel is described as 'setting out for the holy Jordan'. Now he did not go to Palestine either in 1165 or 1167. But in the latter year he may well have intended to do so. On 29th August his grand-niece Maria Comnena was married in Tyre to Amaury, King of Jerusalem. She was escorted to Palestine by George Palaiologos the μέγας ἐταιρειάρχης and the Sebastos Manuel Comnenus, and the Basileus would clearly never have demeaned himself by going to Tyre to give away the bride. But it may well have been his intention, now that a durable settlement with Hungary had been reached, to go to Palestine himself a little later. For more was at stake than merely strengthening the bonds between the empire and the Kingdom of Jerusalem without making any concessions regarding the status of the Principality of Antioch. It was probably at the time of the marriage of King Amaury and Manuel's grand-niece that the first negotiations took place concerning intervention in Egypt, which bore fruit later in the ill-fated joint Egyptian expedition of 1169. The weakness of the Fatimite monarchy was clearly recognised at the time, and the plans of Manuel and Amaury were not obviously foredoomed to failure. A reconquest of Egypt under Byzantine auspices would entirely change the balance of forces in the Mediterranean, and greatly strengthen the empire not only vis-à-vis the Moslem powers, but, what was perhaps more important, vis-à-vis the Latins. It was an enter-

1. Will. Tyr. 20. 1; on the date cf P. Lamma, op. cit. 161 n. 1.
prise which could count on support from the maritime cities of Italy. In
Manuel’s dreams of a Justinianic restoration of the empire it would be
the counterpart in the South of the success just achieved in Hungary. We
do not know why Manuel did not in the end go to Palestine; but one
possible reason is his discovery that things were not so settled on the
north-western frontier as he had supposed. In the following spring the
new Grand Župan of Serbia, Stephen Nemanja, tried to establish his power
in Croatia and the Kotor region. After a force under the command of
Theodoros Padiates had failed to bring him to book, Manuel had to take
the field himself in order to reduce his troublesome vassal. No doubt he
had wind of what was brewing long before hostilities actually broke out.

If our argument has been correct, it follows that the speech was
delivered either in late summer 1165 or some time after 18th July 1167,
shortly after the return of Manuel to Constantinople. One difficulty which
arises on either supposition is that the speech makes Manuel ‘shrink
from a triumphal procession’ (αναδτίη τον ἐπιδίφριον θρίαμβον I. 303),
whereas Niketas Akominatos describes in some detail his triumphal entry
into the city. However the remark in the speech does not refer to Manuel’s
Hungarian victory, but is quite general in its reference. Furthermore, our
speaker makes Manuel attribute his success to the Theotokos (τῇ δὲ ὑπερ-
μάχῳ καὶ νικοποιῷ στρατηγῷ τὴν ἀμφικτηλαίαν τῆς σῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀνατι-
θεμένος, II. 309-310), which, according to Niketas Akominatos is precisely
what he did in his triumph in 1167 (ἐρυτο δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἁμο-
μάχου συμμάχου καὶ ἀκαταγώνιστου συστρατήγου τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡθομίτορος
(p. 205. 22ff) (Both writers, incidentally, echo the words of the Patriarch
Sergius’ Prologue to the Ἁκάθιστος ύμνος). And in any case, Manuel
celebrated a triumph in 1165 also, so this difficulty is not surmounted
by assuming the earlier date.

The speech gives two new pieces of information about the campaign,
the role of the Serbs, and the terms of the treaty. In the former connection,
it should be remembered that Serbia was the weak link in Byzantine control
of the Balkan peninsula in the middle of the twelfth century, and that
there was a powerful pro-Hungarian element among the Serbian nobility.

4. For the custom of placing the Ikon of the Theotokos on the triumphal
chariot, while the emperor walked on foot, cf. Leo Diac. p. 158.10 ff., Synopsis
Sathae, M.B. VII. 195. 20 ff.
6. Cf. the Serbian revolts fomented by Hungary in 1153 and 1155 mentioned
Niketas Akominatos' complacent remarks on the ease with which the Serbs were reduced to submission every time they made common cause with Germany or Hungary, is a testimony to the frequency of their disaffection. And a canonical response of Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges (1157-1169/70) points in the same direction. It declares that the thirteenth Canon of St. Basil, enjoining penance on those who kill in war, must be applied without distinction, be the enemy Turk, Hungarian or Serb. It is the necessity of securing the routes through Serbia that explains Manuel's delayed response to the Hungarian occupation of Srem in spring 1166. And his success is borne out by the presence of a Serbian contingent among the Byzantine forces in 1167. The Grand Župan who led the revolt may well have been Desa, who in earlier years looked to Hungarian support in his fight for independence from Constantinople. As for the new Grand Župan, it is tempting to identify him with Stephen Nemanja, who is expressly stated by Niketas to have been in power in Serbia—and to have revolted—in 1168. But the whole problem of the identity and antecedents of Stephen Nemanja is so complex and disputed that no inference can be made with confidence.

More interesting is the information furnished regarding the Byzantine-Hungarian treaty. Though it was evident that there must have been such a treaty, scholars have often remarked that there is no trace of it in our sources. We can now fill this lacuna in the record. Before discussing what the future patriarch says of the treaty, it would be well to summarise what we know of the other Byzantine-Hungarian treaties of the mid-twelfth century. They are:

1. Treaty with King Géza II, 1153. Arrangements for the return of Hungarian prisoners in Byzantine hands (Kinnam. p. 120).

by Michael τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης in W. Regel, Fontes rerum byzantinarum 142-143, 163.
1. Nik. Ak. 207.
2. V. Grumel, Les régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, No. 1107. 11.
6. Cf. Historija naroda Jugoslavije I, 1953, 268, the authors of which believe that Desa remained Grand Župan until 1168.
7. Cf. F. Chalandon, op. cit. 490 'Nous ne savons pas si un traité de paix fut alors conclu'; F. Šišić, op. cit 91 'Izvori ne kažu ništa o skopljenom miru i njegovim uslovima'.
8. The most probable date. But the chronology of these Hungarian wars is uncertain, and some scholars, e.g. F. Dölger, prefer the date 1152.
2. Treaty with Géza II; 1155; συμβιβασθέντες μετά τοῦ βασιλέως, ὡς ὁ καιρὸς τὸτε ἐδοκεν (Nik. Ak. 134). Probably a mere local agreement.

3. Treaty with Géza II; 1156; τοὺς τε δορυκτήτους Ἱππαιον ἀποδόσειν αὐτίκα ἀπίγγελε, καὶ εἰσέπειτα δὲ πάντα αὐτῷ ὑπηρετήσειν, διασερ ἀν βουλομένῳ ἔσται. (Kinnam. p. 134). This treaty, which was clearly of wider scope than the preceding two, seems to have recognised the Danube-Sava line as the frontier. Any claims to Byzantine supremacy in Hungary which it may have embodied were soon rendered ineffective by the rout of the imperial forces in Italy and the consequent weakening of the Byzantine position in the west.

4. Treaty with King Ladislaus II, 1161/2, Sudendorf, Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte II, 138. Soon rendered nugatory by the death of the pro-Byzantine Ladislaus, who in any case never succeeded in establishing his position in Hungary.


The treaty described in Michael’s speech provides for:

i) Sirmium recognised as Byzantine territory τὸ Σίρμιον ἔφροτω...τῆς σῆς ἐστω εξουσίας τοῦτο και κυριότητος, II. 555 - 557).

ii) Croatia and Dalmatia recognised as Byzantine territory, without apparently any mention of Béla-Alexios (ἔστω τὰ ἐντεύθεν...ὁ Χορβατής καὶ ὁ Βοσναϊος τοῖς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐγγραφήτωσαν ἀξοσιν, II. 560 - 569).

iii) The Hungarian archbishopric of Esztergom to be subject to the Byzantine government (συγκατελεγέσι...τῆς συνέχους κραταιότητι, II. 569 - 571). What precisely this meant I leave to students of Hungarian ecclesiastical history. It clearly does not imply the subjection of the Hungarian church to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This would not be a subject of negotiation between the two governments, and in any case, though it must have been a long-term objective in the mind of Manuel, it was not one immediately attainable in 1167. But however the expression is to be interpreted, it certainly implies some kind of Byzantine supremacy in Hungary 2.

---

1. F. Šišić, op. cit. 70.

2. On the implications of the sending of a crown to Géza I by Michael VII cf. F. Dölger, Ungarn in der byzantinischen Reichspolitik, Archivum Europae Centrum-Orientalis 8 (1949) 315 - 342, especially 329 - 332; O. Treitinger, Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee, 1956, 203 - 204. This clause in the 1167 treaty must be intended to reassert the claim to supremacy originally implied by the gift of the crown.
iv) Some form of tribute to be payed by Hungary to the Byzantine empire (ὑποφορά σοι ἐστι τὰ ὄλι...βέβαιοι κατεγγυηταί, II. 571 - 576).

v) A number of Hungarian notables to be handed over as hostages (οὐκ ἄλλοις...τὸν ὅδιον κάθυσθεν, II. 579 - 583).

Not only are the terms of this treaty preserved in greater detail than those of the preceding treaties, but the relation between the two states which it embodies is radically different from that in the earlier years of Manuel's reign. And this treaty or one very like it, since the agreement of 1167 must have been similar to that of 1165, apparently remained in force until Manuel's death in 1180, in spite of the dropping after the birth of Alexius II of the plan to unite the empire and Hungary under a single monarch, and the catastrophe of the Byzantine army at Myriokephalon in 1176. Historians have sometimes remarked that our sources often seem to speak of Hungary in the latter half of Manuel's reign as if it were a vassal state of the empire. It now appears that this attitude corresponds with the de jure position, if not always with the political realities. Manuel had attained the goal of his far-reaching foreign policy in this quarter if in no other.

We may now discuss briefly Michael's appointment as ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων. The last traceable holder of this appointment was Theodoros of Smyrna, the successor of John Italus. He must have survived until after 1112, if he engaged in anti-Latin polemic prompted by the mission to Constantinople of Petrus Chrysolanus in that year, and so far as we know he remained in office until his death. It is only an assumption, though not an unlikely one, that he was the last ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων until the appointment of Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγχιάλου in 1165 or 1167. Be that as it may, the sources agree that for a long time before this time the official teaching of philosophy had lapsed. Michael Akominatos' well-known words πολὺς γὰρ ἔρρυη καίρος εξ οὗ, λιπούσα τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον ὡς ἤ πιθ "Ποιήσαν Δίκη παρθένος, εἰς τὸν αθάνατον χώρον ἀνέπτατο a.s.o. are amply borne out by the text of the present speech. Cf. in particular II. 52ff., 237ff. The speaker goes on to say that philosophy has now had the doors of the palace opened to her and been allowed to approach the
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throne, as she did before (II. 55ff.), has been restored, and that he himself receives a salary from the emperor in virtue of his office (II. 99ff.). His appointment, however, is not a mere restoration of the status quo ante; philosophy is now to be the handmaiden of religion; it is to be purged of false and corrupting doctrines (II. 71ff.) and to be used as a weapon against heresy (II. 74ff.); its purposes are to be the comprehension of the unseen through the study of that which can be seen, the praise of the creator, and the winning of divine goodwill (II. 91ff.). This tamed philosophy is to consist mainly of the study of Aristotle (II. 105ff.) and above all of his meteorological works, which would especially reveal the wisdom of the creator (II. 249ff.). With this bowdlerised Aristotelianism must be connected the curious passage, omitted in E, in which Michael attacks μυθο­πλάσται and φανεροληπτοί, followers of pagan theology, who believe matter to be uncreated, (II. 197ff.). Now this last point forms the burden of one of the charges against John Italus 1 in 1082, who was also accused of reviving other errors of the ancient philosophers on the soul and other questions, and of regarding profane literature as a fountain of truth. Italus had his heirs two generations later. Indeed, as Uspenskij and others remark, a long argument between realists and nominalists goes on throughout the twelfth century in Constantinople, parallel to and not unconnected with the similar argument in the Latin west 2. Throughout this argument there is a correlation between Nominalism, inclination towards Neoplatonism, and the asking of theologically awkward questions. Among the pupils of Italus, the monk Neilos was condemned in 1087 for views tending towards Monophysitism 3, Leo of Chalkedon in 1092 for a false doctrine of images 4, and Eustathios of Nicæa, himself well known as a commentator on Aristotle, in 1117 for christological errors traceable to a Plotinian doctrine of hypostases 5. In 1156 Soterichus Panteugenes, Patriarch-elect of Antioch, together with a number of followers, among whom were two of the leading men of letters and theological teachers of the Patriarchal School, Michael ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης and Nikephoros Basilakes, was con-

1. F. Uspenskij, Deloproizvodstvo po obvineniju Ioanna Ital v eresi, IRAIK 2 (1897).
2. F. Uspenskij, Očerki po istorii vizantijskoj obrazovannosti, 1891 (1892), 146 - 245; B. Tatakis, La philosophie byzantine [E. Bréhier, Histoire de la philosophie, fasc. supplémentaire II], 1949, 210 - 222.
demned for heretical interpretation of the liturgy of the eucharist. It was no less a person than Nikolaos of Methone, the leading theologian of the age, who connected the heresy of Soterichus and his friends expressly with the Platonic doctrine of ideas, which, he declared, had been refuted by Aristotle. The same Nikolaos of Methone saw fit to refute Neo-Platonic theology at some length in his Αναπτυξις της θεολογικης θοιοικεσιως Πρόκλου. A modern scholar speaks of ‘die Proklos-Schwärmerei, die damals manche literarische Kreise erfasst zu haben scheint und die wohl auf die psellianische Renaissance zurückgeht’. It was during the reign of Manuel Comnenus that the heretical doctrines on questions of christology and the eucharist of Myron or Michael Sikidites, alias Michael Glykas the chronicler, first attracted attention, though his synodal condemnation did not occur until many years later. Sikidites was an astrologer and thaumaturge. It has been plausibly suggested that he and his colleagues were putting forward a whole systematic cosmology of Neo-Platonist character.

This is the background against which Michael’s polemic against the Hellenisers and his claims for his own philosophical teaching must be seen. In the middle sixties of the twelfth century the argument over the interpretation of the text ὁ πάτηρ μου μείζων μου εστίν was at its height, and the years 1166 and 1167 saw a series of synodal decisions and condemnations arising out of this question. Among those condemned were Joannes Pantechnes, Chartophylax, George, Metropolitan of Nicaea, Samuel, deacon and canstrisios of St. Sophia, and Basil του Ἀγιοπάντων, alias Basil Pediadites, teacher of grammar in the Patriarchal school and many years later Bishop of Corecyra. The trouble was not confined to Const-
tinople, since in the summer of 1167 we find Nikolaos, Metropolitan of Ephesus, obliging the Bishops of his province to sign an orthodox interpretation of the passage in question. If we are right in dating our speech to the summer of 1167, or even if it belongs to 1165, the Hellenisers against whom the speaker inveighs with such force are likely to be those Nominalists whose interpretation of the celebrated text led them to take up an almost Arian position in theology. Indeed, we may go further and suppose that it was the flourishing of this fresh crop of heresies upon the fertile soil of Neo-Platonising philosophy which led Manuel to reinstate the office of ὑπάτος τῶν φιλοσόφων and to appoint to it an eminent and learned churchman—he had been πρωτέκδικος and ὑποτομικῶς φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ ὑποτομεύειν ἐμφιλοσόφους ἐσκέψατο—with the express charge of teaching a limited and innocuous philosophical curriculum as a buttress for orthodoxy. Manuel had always to be ready for discussions and negotiations with Latin church in the course of his policy of expansions and consolidation; and he was anxious that his own church should speak with one voice. Needless to say, the Emperor’s purpose was not achieved. Michael’s tenure of the ὑπατεία τῶν φιλοσόφων cannot have lasted much more than four years, but even had he remained in office longer, the enterprise was foredoomed to failure. Unlike bad money, bad philosophy does not drive out good; and application of the philosophical methods and doctrines of antiquity to problems of theology was part of a great movement in European thought which could not be stemmed by courses of lectures. It is interesting, however, that one of the successors of Michael, perhaps his immediate successor, was an interpreter and ‘populariser’ of Aristotle. In cod. Vat. Barb. gr. 74, a miscellany in the hand of Leo Al-latius, there appears on fol. 40 the following poem:

Εἰς Κωνσταντίνον τὸν ὑπατον τῶν φιλοσόφων, ἀδηλον:

'Αριστοτέλης ἐγγράφως ἐσπαρμένην τὴν φιλόσοφον προλαβὼν γνώσιν πάλαι τοῖς πάσιν αὐτὴν διαδεικνύων γράφει, τὸν νοῦν δὲ βλάψας δεινότητι τῶν λόγων.

2. Sp. Lampros, Μιχαήλ 'Ακομινάτοι τα σωζόμενα, I, 80. The somewhat left-handed compliment was no doubt meant in all sincerity.
This Constantine is probably to be identified with Constantine of Nicaea the philosopher, author of two speeches in Cod. Escur. Y-II-10, fol. 301v-303 and 303-306v, the latter of which is addressed to Johannes Dukas, Megas Hetaireiarches, a prominent figure throughout the reign of Manuel Comnenus, and friend of Eustathios, who was still alive in 1177

In publishing the text of the speech, I have recorded in the critical apparatus all variant readings other than those showing merely phonetic confusion or misplaced accents. In the provisional commentary I have tried to explain such of the allusions as I can, and to indicate some of the sources of Michael’s language and thought. No doubt much more remains to be done; Michael was a very learned man, and at the same time capable of vigorous and original imagery. And there are passages where I am not at all sure that the text as it stands is correct; these I have indicated. Rather than translate the text in extenso, I have thought it more helpful to provide a summary of its argument.

Postscript. P. Wirth, Das bislang erste literarische Zeugnis für die Stephanskrone aus der Zeit zwischen dem X und XIII Jahrhundert, BZ 53 (1960) 79-82 appeared after the present article had gone to press. Dr. Wirth’s observations supplement what I have written on p. 180. His dating of the speech, I am glad to see, agrees with my own.

Summary

As the eagle seeks the eagle-stone before building his nest and raising his family, so I turn to him who is the corner-stone of the church before beginning my speech, so that my humility may be adequate to describe the grandeur of your achievements, Sire. You are not only a paragon of all the military virtues, but a friend of the Muses and a patron of philosophy. You have recalled her from her

1. F. Chalandon, op. cit. 551.
former neglect and restored her to her place in the Palace. Now all that is false in the teachings of the philosophers will be rejected, and she will herself furnish weapons for the confutation of her former errors. It is your plan that the study of the visible world should lead to knowledge of the invisible, and to that praise of the Creator which wins divine favour. For this purpose I have been appointed and given a salary from imperial funds. To this end I shall interpret the works of Aristotle, selecting from them what is good and rejecting what is bad. We thank God that he has inspired you to take this measure, and for all else that you have done under his guidance. You have routed the dragon from the west and driven him back to his lair. You have defeated two other foes from the west. The kingdoms of the earth revere you. Ishmael has become your humble ally. Your have won victory upon victory on land and sea. All this you have done in your own person, like Alexander the Great and the old Roman emperors, whom indeed you surpass. What have the followers of false Hellenic theology to say to this, those who believe the world to be uncreated? I abhor their errors; I believe you to have been sent by God to protect us, and to be an ideal monarch, beloved by all your subjects. Among your other deeds of virtue you have now restored philosophy to her rightful place. Her students will now investigate astronomy, optics, meteorology, and study all the wondrous works of the Creator, all to the glory and adornment of your reign. You are a true father of your people, without the faults of Alexander. All the victories which you have won you ascribe, with typical modesty, to divine favour. Long may you reign, so that we may enjoy lasting peace! Lawyers tell of your amendments to the law; citizens tell of your fortification of the city, your chain across the sea, your repair of the walls, your adornment of the palace; churchmen speak of your reduction of taxation on ecclesiastical property in the capital and throughout the empire; soldiers tell of your skill in the arts of war; your courage, your endurance, your campaigns against Hungarians, Turks, Cilicians, the raiders on the Danube, and Serbians. Your courage enables you to face and kill leopards single-handed, though the very sight of their dead bodies terrifies most men. I come now to your latest exploit. When the Hungarians, with their usual duplicity, broke their oath, sought a secret alliance with the Serbians, and made war against us, trying to conquer Sirmium and the territory beyond the Danubian plains, you dealt first of all with their Serbian allies, easily reducing them to submission. They repented of their error, accepted the ruler whom you appointed over them, and so destroyed the hopes of the Hungarians. Then you mustered a great army and led it to the Danube, accompanied by a naval force. Dismayed by this display of invincible force, the Hungarians repented of their folly and approached you as suppliants; humbly surrendering and giving up all their grandiose pretensions. Their ruler offered as guarantee of his good behaviour the King of Bohemia and other dignitaries. Then the Hungarian notables gathered to ratify the peace. Admitting their utter defeat, they accepted the following terms: Sirmium, Croatia and Bosnia are to be Byzantine possessions henceforth. The Church of the Holy Crown of Hungary and its metropolis are to be subject to Byzantium. The country is to be tributary to the Emperor. Prince, bishops, clergy, nobility, officers, soldiers and common people are to take a solemn oath of loyalty. Eleven Hungarian nobles are to be hostages. So the Hungarians were overcome and rued their reckless folly. For this we praise you as you return to Constantinople and set out for the Jordan. We join the common throng in acclaiming your victory.
Λόγος τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου κυρόν Μιχαήλ τοῦ τοῦ Ἀγγείας εἰς τὸν ἁγίον αὐτοκράτορα κυρόν Μανουήλ τὸν Κομνηνόν, γραφεῖς καθ᾽ ἐν καιρὸν ἦν ὁποῖος τῶν φιλοσόφων.

Εἰτα δὲ μὲν ὅροις ὁ ἅγιος οὐχ ἣν πρότερον πῆξαν καλιάν, εἰ μὴ τὸν ἀετίτου λίθον προὑποβάλητε καὶ προεναρμόσετε—Ἡγνόση γὰρ οὐδ᾽ οὕτως τῆς φύσεως τοῦ τῆν ἱδιότητα—.Encoding error: unexpected end of data for text
προστησάμενοι τοίνυν τοῦ λόγου τὸν καὶ τάχος ἐπιτάττοντα τοῖς βρα-
δέσι καὶ θέρος χειμώνι καὶ γαλήνην τῷ κλυδώνι, μεθ' οὗ καὶ εἰς χιλίους
dιώδεται καὶ μυριάδας δύο μετακινήσουσι, παρ' ὦ καὶ οἱ ἀπόκρυφοι θησαυροί
tῆς σοφίας ὅμοιο καὶ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πάσης ἐπιστήμης ἐξεύρεσις ἀποτα-
μείωνται, ἐπιβαλούμεν τῷ ἐγχειρήματι. καὶ ἐπὶ τοιούτῳ τῷ θεμελίῳ
tὰς πρώτας ὑποβάθρας κατατήρησομεν, ὑπὸ τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀρχιτεκτονίᾳ κατὰ
tὴν τὸν παρακλήτην λαμπρὰν καὶ οὐρανοχῶρον κάθισμα τὰ κατὰ τὸ
ἔργον κατατάξαμε καὶ διανευσώσασθαι πειρασόμεθα, έκατούς κατὰ τὸ ἐγχω-
ροὺς ὅποι παρείκοι παραβιώνοντες τέ καὶ παρενείροντες.

οὐκ ἂρα μόνον δημαγωγίας πέρι καὶ πυκνωμάτων λόγου καὶ λειω-
μάτων στρατού καὶ στορμάτων καὶ μετώπων στρατοπέδου καὶ παρατάξεως
ἐμέλλει θεόθεν δεξίος παιδοτρίβης καὶ γνωριμότατος ἀκρός τοῖς τῶν Ἀρ-
mαϊῶν σκῆπτρων ἐπιφορτυμηθῆναι, μέγιστον βασιλεύ, ἀθιγνομένα
τοὺς τῆς βασιλείας ἢ στρατηγίας διασωζόμενος γνωμόνοις, καὶ τοὺς τῆς
τακτικῆς ἐξουδετέρας χαρακτήρας ἀκριβῶς διατηρών, ἐν βουλαῖς παννυχί-
ζων καὶ περί τὰ έργα διατροχάζουν ύπό Ἰλίου διός ἀνένδοτος, άλλα καὶ
Μοδίς ἐναγκαλισθηκαί καὶ παραλαβέν τούς παρατίθεσιν, καὶ φιλοσοφικὰν συνα-
γαγεῖν τὴν ἐνεχομένην καὶ αὐτόσκεπον, έπεὶ τῆς σοφίας ο ἐρως καὶ θείοτερὸς
καὶ παρεκολούθησε κατὰ τὸν παρακλήτου λαμπρὰν καὶ οὐρανοχῶρον κάθισμα, καὶ ο λόγος
μέγας δυνάστης, κατὰ τὸν εἰρηκότα σοφόν, ἐν εὐπεριορίστῳ καὶ εὐσυνόπτῳ
τῷ σώματι τὰ τελειοποιά δυνάμενος καὶ θείοτατον.

οὕς της ἀπομενήν ἀνεκαλέσω καὶ συσταλεῖσαν ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν εἰς
κευθμώνας καὶ ταπεινὰς καταδύσεις, καὶ περί ἑαυτὴν στρατοπεδεῖ
cαὶ ἐντεῦθεν συσταθεῖσαν ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν εἰς
κευθμώνας καὶ ταπεινὰς καταδύσεις, καὶ περί ἑαυτὴν στρατοπεδεῖ
cαὶ ἐντεῦθεν συσταθεῖσαν ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν εἰς
όπλοφορεῖν διαρκώς καὶ ὀπλιτεύειν ἐπικαιροτάτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγαλοφυῖς
tαῖς ἐνόσφοις ἐνευδοκιμεῖν ἐπιδείξεσι, καὶ φαίνῃ βασιλικώτερος ἐαυτοῦ κυδα-
ζόμενος ἐντεύθεν καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν ἐπικοίμησιν μὴ ἀποποιούμενον,
καὶ ἔχε μοι ὠτὸ τοῦ κραταίῳ βασιλεῖ τὰ χαριστήρια ὁ Περίπατος’ ἐπικοι-
νώνει καὶ ἡ Ἀκαδημία τοῦτο τοῦ βούματος’ ἀνανεώσεως τὸ Λύκειον, καὶ ἡ τῆς

προετοιμάσεις Στοὰς σεμνοπρέπεια. ὅσον ὑπόσχοντας καὶ ἱππότον οὐκ ἕμιν ἀπερ-
ρίθω τὸν μεταφέρεται ὡς ἀχρηστοῦ’ ὅσον ἐντεχνεῖ καὶ κομψὸν καὶ συνεργὸν
| εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἀπαινοζέσθω καὶ ἐκλεγέσθω εἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ ψεύδους καὶ τῆς

ὁμολογίας ἀνατροπήν. τὸ σφυροκόπω τὴν σφύραν ἐντεύθεν, ὁ σίδηρος,
ἐν ὅποι’ αὐτοῦ μετάγηται σφυροκοπόμενος εἰς τὸ εὐχρηστὸν’ ὁ βρών ἐπι-
χρησινεὶστ̄ο τὸ πτερόν τῷ τύχευσιν, ἦν καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ βέλος
ἐχθ’ περιβολούμενον. ὁ ὀρχις δανειζέτω τοῖς ’Ασκηπείακχας τὰς σάρκας, ἐν

τοῖς οἰκείοις βέλεσι βαλλομένη ἀπεργῇ καὶ ἀπαρχῇ, τὸ καὶ ἐντεύθεν τοῦ
tοῦ βασιλέως τὸ ἐπινόημα, τοῦτο τοῦτο τὸ θεσμόθετημα εἰς τῶν ἀρχαῖον
φέρον θεσμόν, εἰς τὸν ἀρχαίον
φέρον θεσμόν, εἰς τὸ παλαιόν όροθέτημα, κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λεπτοῖς εὐκακγε-
λοῖς σαγηνὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ κοσμικῇ καθιεμένην θαλάσσῃ καὶ εἰς ἀπαντός γέ-
νους συνάγουσαν, ἦν καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν τῶν ἀκαθάρτων καὶ ανιέρων ὅσον εἰκός
καὶ ἄξιον ὡς ἀγνόν παραλαμβάνει καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν, τὸ δ’ ἄλλος ἐχθ’ ὡς

ἀπαθῆς καὶ ὑπαρχεῖ καὶ ἀπόβλητον.

διὰ ταύτα καὶ τὸ τῆς σοφίας ἀνίστησι παιδευτήριον, καὶ ἐγκαινίζει

τὴν Πειράην τὴν τῶν Μουσῶν βρεφοκόμοι καὶ τίθην, καὶ τὸ ὅθεν τὰς μέντον ἐπέκλωσε, τὸ διεξοδεύειν άκινδυνον τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τὴν δυσδιάφυ-
kτον θεσμοθετημα εἰς τόν τοῦ εὐκακγελοῖς σαγηνὴν τῆν καθιεμένην καὶ ἐξ ἀπαντοῦ ὃς

καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν καὶ ἀνιέρων ὃς εἰκὸς καὶ ἄξιον ὡς ἀγνὸν παραλαμβάνει καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν, τὸ δ’ ἄλλος ἐχθ’ ὡς

ἀπαθῆς καὶ ρυπαρὸν διαπτύτω καὶ ἀπόβλητον.

διὰ ταύτα καὶ τὸ τῆς σοφίας ἀνίστησι παιδευτήριον, καὶ ἐγκαινίζει 85
tὴν Πειράην τὴν τῶν Μουσῶν βρεφοκόμοι καὶ τίθην, καὶ τὸ ὅθεν τὰς μέντον ἐπέκλωσε, τὸ διεξοδεύειν άκινδυνον τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τὴν δυσδιάφυ-
kτον θεσμοθετημα εἰς τόν τοῦ εὐκακγελοῖς σαγηνὴν τῆς καθιεμένης καὶ ἐξ ἀπαντοῦ ὃς

καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν καὶ ἀνιέρων ὃς εἰκὸς καὶ ἄξιον ὡς ἀγνὸν παραλαμβάνει καὶ ἀκαθαρσίαν, τὸ δ’ ἄλλος ἐχθ’ ὡς

ἀπαθῆς καὶ ρυπαρὸν διαπτύτω καὶ ἀπόβλητον.

ἐπὶ τούτως ἀρτὶ τὴν ἄστιβή | βαδίζειν ἡμεῖς ἐλάχομεν ἐπὶ τούτως ἢ ἐν

πολύδωρος δεξιά, ἡ εὐδωρος, ἡ βασιλική, ἐκ τῶν ἐαυτῆς πρωτανείων ἐπὶ- 100

68 ἀποκόσμησιν Ο 70 τοῦτον Ο διδάσκειν codd. 71 σαρπὸν : σα-

δρόν Ε 74 ἀποκόσμησιν Ο 83 ἀκινδύνων Ε 87 διδάσκειν Ο

88 -89 τῶς τοῦτον πολυστροφοῦς Ο 89 τοῦ τοῦ νόθου Ε 91 τῆς ομ. Ο 96 τοῦ τοῦ

νόθου Ε 97 τῆς : om. Ο 98 τοῦ τοῦ
σιτισμόν ἡμίν ἐξαπέστειλε, καὶ τὰς πηγὰς ὑπάνηκε τοῦ σωτηρίου, καὶ πρὸς
προσώπου ἡμῖν διώρυξεν ἀπὸ τῆς χρυσίτιδος τοῦ μεταλλεύειν
ἡμᾶς καὶ χρυσοφορεῖν καὶ ἐνιαύσιον δρέπεσθαι θέρος χρυσοῦ ὀμοῦ καὶ ἀνή-
ροτον· ἐπὶ τούτους τὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς περισταταὶ προμηθεῖας, καὶ οὕτως ὁ
θεσμὸς καὶ τοῦτο τὸ πέρας τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφιστείας καὶ ὑπατείας· ἐπὶ
tούτους τὰς Σταγειρόθεν κελαινὴ Σφιγγί τοῦ τῶν ὀντων λόγους συνδιασκέ-
πτομαὶ, καὶ τοὺς γρίφους περισκοπῶ καὶ ἀναζητῶ διὰ τῶν ταύτης ἀδύτων,
καὶ ἀνιστορεῖ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα. περισυρὼ τὸ χλωρὸν κατὰ τὸν ἀπλαστὸν Ἰακώβ
tῆς ἀσαφίας τὸ ἐπικάλυμμα, καὶ ἐκλεπίζω τὸ ἐπισκίασμα, καὶ εὐκάτοπτος
οὐτῳ καὶ κομίδη λευκωσσαμένος ὁ τοῦς οὐσιν ἐναποκείμενος λόγος μοι ἀνα-
φαινεται, ὃς εὐχεστάτη καὶ διατόρω διαβοαν τῇ φωνῇ, «ὁ βάθος σοφίας
θεοῦ καὶ γνώσεως». ἐν ταῖς ληνοΐς γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων ποτιστηρίων τῆν τῆς
dυνάμεως βάθος ἐνέκινη καὶ αὐτός, καὶ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς εἰς Χριστὸν ἀχµα-
λωτίκων ἐπανὰ ἐννόημα, διόν γυλκαζὼν καὶ πότερον ἐνέτειλεν καὶ προσίεμαι
καὶ ἀρύομαι, διὸν δ’ ἐμπικρον καὶ μεστὸν ἠλυκός καὶ τεναγώδες ἀποπεμ-
πόμενος ἀποστρέφομαι, καὶ τὸ πικρὸν οὐ λέγω γυλκό, τὴν ἀράν τῆς προφη-
tείας ἀποστοιούμενος.

dόξα γοῦν καὶ χάρις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χάριν τῷ εὐεργετῇ τῶν ἄλων τῷ
βασιλεῖ καὶ θεῷ, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ σε, βασιλέως ἔγκαλλησα καὶ διατόρω καὶ
πότερον έννόημα, διὸν γυλκαζὼν καὶ πότερον ἐνέτειλεν καὶ προσίεμαι
καὶ ἀρύομαι, διὸν δ’ ἐμπικρον καὶ μεστὸν ἠλυκός καὶ τεναγώδες ἀποπεμ-
πόμενος ἀποστρέφομαι, καὶ τὸ πικρὸν οὐ λέγω γυλκό, τὴν ἀράν τῆς προφη-
tείας ἀποστοιούμενος.
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106 μελαινὴ Ε. ὄντων: ἄλων Ο 114 καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ Ε γὰρ ταῖς
ληνοίς Ο 117 ἀποπεμπόμενοι: om. Ε 120 τῶν ὅλων τῶ: om. Ε 122 καὶ:
om. Ο ύμνήσαι Ο Ε 128 ἀπεστάλει Ο μέγα Ο 136 ἐφοβήθης Ο

130 135
κατεξοντων ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, ἀλλ’ ἀνέλαμψας ὁ μέγας γίγας ὁ λάμπων ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα, καὶ ἐςκόρτησας τὸν ζῷον καὶ τὸν καπνὸν διεσκέδασας, καὶ τὴν ὄψιν τῶν ὄμοιτων | ἐκείνων ἡμιβλύσας: καὶ οὐκ ἤσχυναν ἄντωπησάι σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰερος πενήντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἀπεργύγαντες, εἰς σκότων ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, ἀλλ’ ἀνέλαμψας ὁ μέγας γίγας ὁ λάμπων ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα, καὶ ἔσκόρπισας τὸν ζόφον καὶ τὸν καπνὸν διεσκέδασας, καὶ τὴν ὄψιν τῶν ὄμμάτων | ἐκείνων ἓκείλυσας’ καὶ οὐκ Ἰσχύσαν ἀντώπησαί σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπέμποντες. τὰ τῆς σής καὶ ἄκων ἡνιοχείας καταδέχεται φίλωτρα, καὶ οὐκ ἄποσκιρτα οὔδ’ ἀφηνίαζε οὔδ’ ἀποπτύει τὸν χαλινόν, οὐτὸ τής σής καὶ άκων ήνιοχείας καταδέχεται φίλωτρα, καὶ οὔτε άποσκιρτα οὔδ’ ἀφηνίαζε οὔδ’ ἀποπτύει τὸν χαλινόν, οὐ τής σής καὶ άκων ήνιοχείας καταδέχεται φίλωτρα, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπέμποντες. τὰ τῆς σής καὶ ἄκων ἡνιοχείας καταδέχεται φίλωτρα, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπέμποντες. τὰ τῆς σής καὶ ἄκων ἡνιοχείας καταδέχεται φίλωτρα, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες, καὶ οὐκ Ἀρεος πνέοντες καὶ πόλεμον καὶ μάχην ἐπεργάνην εἰς ἐσχατῶν ἐσχάτως συνεπεπείγοντες.
καὶ τὸ δή καὶ νὸν ὅτι τὰ μεγάλα καὶ πάντα διαπονεύς αὐτοσώματος· καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἀπὸ λόγου τοῦ πρώτου· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἱστρών ἐκείνος θαυμάζομεν, δοσὶ τῆς ἄμφετρόχης ζηγνόμενοι καὶ τὸν χιτωνισμόν διαδησάμενοι αὐτοὶ καὶ τὴν τοιῆς ἐπιφέρουσιν ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ μεταχείριζοντα τὸ σιδηριον, καὶ τᾶς τοῦ ἱγέρω ἁνώνίας ἀνέχονται ὑποδέχεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δρᾶσι καὶ πάσχουσιν. καὶ βασιλεῶν ἐκείνων ἐφημεῖν καὶ μεγαλύνειν εἰσώθηκαν τοὺς προκινδυνευτέως τῶν ὑπηκόων ἐθέλοντας, καὶ στρατιωτικὴν περιβάλλομενος σχετικὴν καὶ πρὸ τῆς φάλαγγος ἀριστευόντας, ἵνα τοῖς τοῖς βασιλείσιν ἐνθαλαμεύοντας καὶ ἱερωτάτοις καὶ τούς τῶν Ιχώρων ράνιν ἀνέχονται ὑποδέχεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δρώσι καὶ πάσχουσιν. καὶ βασιλέων ἐμεθυμεῖιν, καὶ τῶν φιλαράχων καὶ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν περιβαλλόμενος τῶν προκινδυνευόντων, καὶ τῶν πλείστων ὑπηκόων ἐκείνων προκινδυνεῦσιν, καὶ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν περιβαλλόμενος προκινδυνεύσιν.
έπλασε καὶ παρήγαγε καὶ κατασκόμησε λόγῳ καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπείρων καὶ ἀμυθήτων ἐνέπλησεν ἐπὶ δόξη αὐτοῦ, ἵκαὶ ὤμως, τὰ τῆς κτίσεως καὶ τὴν κτίσιν τεκνηγάμοις καὶ προσφυγαπλόσας μοι ἄρρητοίς προνοίας ἦνοικείες, κάμε καὶ ταύτην διαχυβερναν καὶ διεξάγει ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον, συνέχας θεσμοὺς ἄρρητος καὶ συντηρῶν τὰ τῆς στάσεως, ἐπέχων ἐνθα δεὶ παραιτούμενον, ἐπισυνάγων καὶ συγκρατῶν ἀλλοκότος με ταῖς θυμαίας ἐκβαθευῶμεν, περιέπων ἐπιμόνως καὶ ταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπισκιαζῶν με πτέρυξιν, οὕτω τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς δὲ τῶν ἑλών θεοῖς προμηθούμενοι καὶ σε τὸν ἐν βασιλεύσι τὸ κράτος ἀνάδησάμενον ἀπαράμιλλον τῇ κληρονομίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ περιουσίῳ λαῷ οἰκονόμονι δεξιὸν ἐχαρίσατο, θάλασσαν χαρίτως, ἀγαθῶν ἀκένωτον πέλαγος, ἀνδρείας υπόδειγμα, στήλην ορθοδοξίας, φύσεως φιλοτιμία, ἀκάθαρτον δμμα, δπλον ἀήττητον, καθαιρέτην εχθρῶν, ἀναιρέτην κακίας, ἕκλοντος πύργον, κοινόν εὐεργέτην, 'Ρωμαίων ἐρείσμα, χρήμα γάρ παντοδαπόν αὐτός έδόθης οὐρανόθεν ένθα μή δεῖ παροιστρούμενον, έπισυνάγων καὶ συγκρατῶν άλλοκότοις με ταΐς ρύμαις ἐκβακχεύομεν, περιέπων έπιμόνως καὶ ταϊς αὐτού έπισκιαζῶν με πτέρυξιν.
νουσαν. Ιδού γὰρ ἀναπλάττεται σοι καὶ τρέφεται καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκεῖαν ἀκμὴν ἀναβλαστάνει καὶ ἀνατρέχει, καὶ κυίσκει καὶ τίκτει παιδὰς ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ αὐτῆς περικείμενος εὐγένειαν. καὶ περικέχεται ταύτῃν ἔμερος καὶ κε-
stος, οὐκ ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐκλυτὸς τε καὶ εὐδιάρρυτος, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐξασκούσιοι ἀρετὰ λα-
giκαί, καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀκρατῶν λειμῶνων ἄνθη καὶ ἡ τῶν θεῶν ὁμοίω τῶν ἄνθρωπῶν ἡγοῦσε τε καὶ ἀνάληψις. ἔχουσιν οἱ παιδὲς οὕτωι φιλοσοφεῖν οὗρονους περί ἀπόστασις καὶ συμφάσεις ἀστέρων, καὶ τὰ φαινόμενα πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, καὶ συνόδους καὶ ἀπόστασις διασωστικῆς τὸ ἀμετάπτωτον, καὶ πλάτη καὶ μῆκος τοῦτον διασαφείται καὶ τὴν ἀλήθείαν ποικιλῆς τοῦτον ὁμοίω καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν ἡγομένων σοφίαν καὶ κατεμάλαξας. ἐγίγνετε αὐτοκράτορ, τὰ έαυτής γεννήματα φιλοσοφία σοι παριστά, τοιαύτα σοι καρποφορεῖ τὰ γεώργια. έντεύθεν σοι τὴν πολιτείαν διακοσμεῖται καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων ἀμείλικτον κατεμάλαξας. πέφυκας γάρ θεοειδής καὶ βασιλεύεις εὔνοιαν ἐπισπώμενος. ἀλλά ὁ δὲ ἐπιστήμων ὁ Κάμβυςος διὰ τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὴν ἀμυνήν, ἐντεύθεν σοι τὰ τῆς πολιτείας διακοσμοῦται καὶ κατεμάλαξας. ἔνα σύμφωνα μεμέστωσα ΟΟ 253 μεμέστωσα Ο 254 διαφοράν Ο 255 έφ'εαυτό om. E 256 άνέλ"κει : άνέχει Ο 262 πάντοθεν Ο 271 κατελέανε Ε 271 -272 ήμύνατο... ἀπέκτεινε om. E 275 τῆς ἡλικίας : τὰ τῆς ἡλικίας codd. τὰ om. E 279 in mar-
gine άνδριοπος δὴ λογισμὸς έζωγραφημένος Ε
πνους και ζών και διομιλών και ἀνυστορούμενος, φροῦδα πρὸς τὰ σὰ τὸν Μακεδόνος παραβαλλόμενα. καὶ γὰρ Βάκτρα διεβῆ, Ἰνδοῖς ἐπεκώμασε, παρε- 
στήσατο πόλεις καὶ λαοὺς | ἐπεστάσατο. ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐκατούριθμὸν καὶ τὴν ὁμαλότητα τοῦ ἤθους οὐ διεσώσατο. τὸ γὰρ διαπρέπει τῶν ἐρῶν ὁ μετα-
ροποιομένος τοῦ τρόπου ὑστερον ἐπεσκέψασθαι. ἀνδρείας οὕτω, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάροι-
nος, τροπαίων καὶ νικητῆς, ἀλλὰ κατεπόθη τῷ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἀνοιχθῇ 
καὶ ἔνθετη, καὶ ἐνεβίρευν εἰς τὸ φίλον, καὶ ἀντὶ "Ἐλληνος διεγελάτω ὡς 
βάρβαρος, καὶ ἀπεγύμνου τὰ ξίφη καὶ τῶν ἱδίων ὑπασπιστῶν καὶ τοὺς συν-
εργάτας τῶν πόνων καὶ τῶν τροπαίων συγκοινωνίας ἡμεῖσατο, 
καὶ πρὸς φορτὺν ἐτέρων ἐπέσπασε πράξεων. οὐ δὲ σεαυτὸν τὴν τε-
τρακτύτων τῶν ἐγκοσμιών θέσεων διεμέρισας· οὐ μὲν διεπεπονήκης ἀρκτώνος:
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αὐτὸς τῷ τῆς μεσομήβης ἐβλήθης καὶ ὧν μὲν διεπεπολλήθης ἀκμαῖος· ἐσπέρως παμληθῆς τροπαίω-

285 

χίας ἀνήγειρε, ἐῶς συνανέτατος τῷ ἡλίῳ καὶ ἤμιν ἀπὸ Θαυμαν ἀστήρ ἐπι-

290 

νῆθες ἀρίζηθος, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν λήξιν ταύτην ἀριστερῶν ἀνε-
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πλήρωσις, καὶ ὡς δὴ ἀριστερῶν καὶ κατεσταθέν τῶν Περσῶν ὑστερος καὶ 
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καὶ τῶν τούτων κατενεμήθης ὡρᾶ καὶ φόβος μέγας ἐνετάκη τὰς καρδίας 
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αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐτὶ ἐγέρθη καὶ ἀνεφέρθην εἰς τὸν θυμόν, καὶ ἀνακηρύξεις 

310 

τὴν ἀνοίγημα καὶ ἀνακαινίζεται, καὶ προχωρῶν αὐτὸς ἀκτών νι-

καὶ, φιλανθρωπίας ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπίας, δικαιοσύνης ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἐπ’ 
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eὐφρενίας ἐνεργεῖας αὐξῶν καὶ μεγεθυνών, καὶ ἀγαθῶν τὴν κληρονομίαν, 
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καὶ βελτίων ἔναντι, ἀνακαινίζεται, ἐπὶ δὲ τοσοῦτοις ὑπεργιάσεις μετριοπά-
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θην, νικῶν μὲν οὐκ ἔθελες τῷ νικητῇ ὑπέρχεν στεφάνῳ τῆς καρδίας, ἀλλ’ 

ἀναδύθη τὸν ἐπιδίφριον θρίαμβον, ἀποπέμπη τὴν δημότικὴν ὑψηλότητα, καὶ 

330 

αναχρήσεις, ἐπί ζῶν τῶν μηδὲν εἰσενεγκάμενοις συμμετρίζεις τῷ 

πλήθει, καὶ τῇ ἁμάφθη νάσχῃ τὸ πᾶν ἐπιγράφεσθαι, καὶ μάλα καλῶς ποίην, 

335 

καὶ χαλκὸν ἀστράπτοντας, ἐπιτερίγεισας τοὺς νικητηρίους καὶ προπορεύτη 

φιλοτίμως ἔξαδων τὰ προστάτευον. ἦν γὰρ οὕτως ἀκμαίοτέρα, ἐπὶ 

340 

καὶ τῆς Ηγεμόνας αὐτοῦ ἔστηκε καὶ παρατήρησε τῷ θριάμβω καὶ ἑφίεμενος διὰ τὸν ἐπί 

μετριοπάθεια καὶ ἐπί θυμοῦ καὶ ἀνακαινίζεται, καὶ πετώντες ὡς ἀετός, ὡς αὐτῇ τοῖς 

345 

παραιτήτω, καὶ ἀκατάκαθεν καὶ διακάθοικα, καὶ ἀμφότερος ἐκ τῆς ἡγεμο-

350 

νικητήρια Ο 313 an legen-
dum πετροφυήσειας?
πτοίας καί τῷ παρατυχόντι ἐκδειματομέμον. θείη σοι πᾶσαι τὴν γῆν τῷ ἐν καλοῖς καὶ μεγάλοις ἄδελφοῖς υἱῷ ἐκλεκτῷ οὗ τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ βασιλεύς, καὶ οὗτος τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἀργήσοι τῇ ὅπλᾳ καὶ αἱ ζημίαι τούτων εἰς δρέπανα μεταποιηθήσανται. εἰρήνης ἔξαρχεις, δεῖ τοῦτο βασιλικὼν· καταλύεις πολέμους, δεῖ τούτο φιλόνεικον καὶ ἀνάγκης υἱὸς ὁ πόλεμος· συνέχεις τὸ πολίτευμα· τὴν εὐνομίαν διατηρεῖς· δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐπικαταλαμβάνεις τὸ δίκαιον.
καὶ κατάλεγέ μοι, δικορρητόρων ἡ φάλαιξ, τοῦ βασιλέως τᾶ νεαρὰ διατάγματα, τῆν διόρθωσιν τοῦ χωλεύοντος, τῆν ἀνάπληραν τοῦ ἐνδέοντος, διηγοῦ τοῦ τῆν καλοῖς καὶ μεγάλοις ἀδελφοῖς υἱῷ ἐκλέκτῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βασιλεύς, καὶ οὕτω τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἀργήσοι τὰ διπλὰ καὶ αἰς ζιβύνας τούτοις εἰς δρέπανα μεταποιηθήσανται. εἰρήνης ἔξαρχεις, δεῖ τοῦτο βασιλικὸν καταλύεις πολέμους, δεῖ τοῦτο φιλόνεικον καὶ ἀνάγκης υἱὸς ὁ πόλεμος· συνέχεις τὸ πολίτευμα· τὴν εὐνομίαν διατηρεῖς· δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐπικαταλαμβάνεις τὸ δίκαιον.
καί κατάλεγέ μοι, δικορρητόρων ἡ φάλαιξ, τοῦ βασιλέως τᾶ νεαρὰ διατάγματα, την διόρθωσιν τοῦ χωλεύοντος, την άναπλήρασιν τοῦ ένδέοντος, διηγού τον τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος βαθεὶς φρένα καὶ εὔεπήβολον· πῶς καὶ ὃ μιν τοῖς ποσὶ καὶ φαῖς καὶ λύκοις οὕτως ἑγέρνει, καὶ εὐρέθη ὡς ὁρθὸς έτοιμος τὸ προφητικὸν, καὶ οὕκ ἄλλο τῶν παρίʻ ὁμίλοις σκοτεινοῖς διελεύκανεν. ὁ πολιτικὸς ἀνιστόρει τὸν πολιούχον, τὸν πολυμήχανον, τὸν εὐμήχανον, τὰ τῆς θαλάσσης έρυματα, τὰ τῆς γῆς οχυρώματα, τὸν παράκτιον κολωνὸν, τὸν ἐνάλιον σκόπελον, διότι οὕλις τὰ ξύλα συνέβαλεν εἰς πολύ τὸ βάθος διήκονα, καὶ τὸ κόστος ὑπερῆρσεν εἰς θεμελίου χρείαν ἀρκούσης τοῖς έρματίζουσιν, καὶ ἕδρασεν τῷ τρόπῳ τῶν παράκτιων μεταποιηθοῦντος, τὸ πολιούχον τῷ μυστικῷ, τῷ πολυμήχανῷ, τῷ εὐμήχανῷ, τῷ παράκτιῳ κολωνῷ, τῷ ἐνάλιῳ σκόπελῷ, διότι οὕλις τὰ ξύλα συνέβαλεν εἰς πολύ τὸ βάθος διήκονα, καὶ τὸ κύτος ύλῆς ἐπλήρωσεν εἰς θεμελίου χρείαν άρκούσης τοῖς έρματίζουσιν, καὶ ἔδρασεν τῷ τρόπῳ τῶν παράκτιων μεταποιηθοῦντος.
τών ἀναθημάτων τὸν ἄγγισ, τὴν ἀξύλην τῆς γραφῆς τὴν πάντας ὀρθαλμοὺς καὶ εὐωγχύσαν καὶ ἐπιστρέφουσιν, τοὺς κοινοσμοὺς τῆς ἀγαθῆδον καὶ τῶν φόρων τὴν ἄνεσιν τοὺς μὲν, τοὺς θειότατοις λέγω τεμένεσιν, ἐπιφυλακθεῖσιν ἰδίως ἐρ’ δ’ ὅσοι νεωκροῦσιν οἱ τῆς μυστικῆς τελεταρχίας ἐξάρχοντες, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς κοινῶς διαβάσαν, δοὺς κατὰ πάσαν τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων σχηματοφυλακθεῖσιν τῇ ἐπικράτει ὑποτιμοῦσιν καὶ θειότερον ἔτελεσθέν τοῖς ὑπέχωσιν συγκαταλέγηται. μετὰ τούτως καὶ σὺ, ὁ στρατιώτης, διατόροις κατακελάδει φωναὶς τὰ ὑπερφυή τοῦ βασιλέως πλεονεκτήματι,—ιδοὺ καὶ τῇ σῇ παρόδῳ τῶς βαλβίδας ὑπανήκε τὸ Πάνελληνο,—τὴν τῆς φύσεως δεξιότητα, τῆς πολεμικῆς ἐμπειρίας τὴν ἐνδείξει, τὰς ἀγχιστρόφους περιδινήσεις καὶ τὸ περιόν τῆς πολεμικῆς έπιστρέφαντας, θάμα καὶ ἐδέσθαι καὶ ἐνώτισθαι· καὶ ὅπως κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς 'Ἀκαρνάνας σιδηροφορῶν μονονούχη συμπέφυκε τῇ σχευῇ, λέγε πῶς ὁ ἀρχείος κρυμός καὶ ὁ τοῦ θέρους καυσίμος εὔκρασίας ἁέρων τῶν αὐτοκράτορι, καὶ Πλειάς δύνουσα καὶ ἐπιτέλλων Ὄριων τούτου θαμά τοῖς πολέμοις ἐξουσίων ἐπιπίπτοντα, καὶ τὸν ἐν ἐκείνους τῶν πολεμικῶν ἀκόρεστον ἔρωτα πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν εἰρήνης τρέποντα τε καὶ μεταβάλλοντα. οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ οὔτ᾽ εἰς πείραν χειρῶν ἔλθείν δλως ὑπέμειναν, ἀλλ’ ἦρξαν τὰς τῆς πείρας ἐργάσασθαι, καὶ διέξατε μὲν εἰς δορατίων ἀφεσιν οὐκ ἀπέτειναν, εἰς δὲ σπονδάς καὶ συνθήκας καὶ λιαν εὐθυμοις ἠπλώσαν. | καταριθμεῖ τὰ ἐν ὑπερορίοις δαπέδοις καὶ πολεμικοῖς Ἀπυλάσια, τὰς ἁγρονομοὺς δίαιτας, τὸς ἐξαγριωμένου ἠρέα, τὸν φρουράχας καὶ τὸν φρουρόν, οὕτω δέρει τό ὑπηκόω τὴν ἀσφάλειαν κατακτώμενος, καὶ ἀντεισάγων δέ ἀπόκτητα τό σωτηρίον, καὶ μεθιστῶν τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸς εὐπάθειαν, τὰ κατὰ Παιάνων στρατολογήματα, τὰ κατὰ Περσῶν καὶ Κιλίκων συγκοιτήματα, τῶν παριστρίων πειρατῶν τὴν πανωλεθρίαν, τὰς Παννονίων εἰτούς Γηπαίδων ἀλληλεπίδες, δι’ αὐτής καὶ Σκύθης ὑπέκυψε καὶ Σαυρομάτης ἐδούλευσε, καὶ συνεστάλη παν τὸ ἀλλόφυλον, τὴν εὐστοχωτάτην ἱππείαν, τὴν διαρκεστάτην ὀπλοφορίαν, τῶν ἀριστῶν ἐργῶν τὴν αὐτουργίαν, πῶς καὶ Περσῶν πολλὰ παρατάξεις φρακτίστης ἐξορμήσας διέλυσε, τοὺς μὲν διατεκίνας, τοὺς δέ ζωγρήσας, ἀλλ’ οὕτως δὲ Ακαρνάνας παρατάξας, ἀνείλε μόνος τοῦ πλῆθους ὑπεκδραμοῦν καὶ παμπληθεῖ τῷ στρατοπέδῳ προσε-
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μηδὲ καιρὸν ἀναμένονι λαβεῖν προσελέωσείς τε καὶ ὑποπτώσεως. προστιθεὶ
tοις εἰρημένοις καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς εὐτολμίας ὑποτυπώματα, καὶ σοι δια-
tρανοῦσθα τὸ ἐν δεινοῖς ἀκατάπληκτον παράδειλεις οἰστροφοῦμαν καὶ ἄρκτος
ἀρωμένας ὑποδείκνυμι τῷ φιλοθεάμονι.

ἡ πάρδαλις τὸ ζῴον ἦταν τὸ θηρίον καὶ βλασφεμὸν πῦρ ἐμβλέπει,
φρίττει τὴν λοφίαν, τὴν δειρήν ὀρθίαν τοισὶ δεινοὶς ἀποφθείμενοι καὶ
τοῖς στέρνοις περιφέρον σφοδρὸν τὸ πῦρ ἀκουλιζόμενον του ἔθιμον. ἐπισυνάψει
δὲ κατὰ γραμμήν εὐθέαν καὶ τὰς ὄρρυς, δεινὸν τι καὶ φρικαλέον ἐπιχάλα
καὶ τὸ ἐπισκύνιον, καὶ τὴν χαίτην ἔλαυθέραν ἐπάροιν, ὡς μυκτηρίν ὀρθίοις
μαχρῶν καὶ κυρόφιν ἀνασκιρτά, τὰς ἀκώκας τῶν ὄνυχων ἀποτυποῦει ὡς
πλατείαις ταῖς βάσεις προσελέομενον, στέρνον καὶ γαστέραν καὶ τὸ εἰς ὄνυχα
ξὸν τὰ πάντα λάσιαν, στικτὸν καὶ ἀμφιλαφές, ἐκ βοροὺ τοῦ γενείου τοὺς
odontas ὑποφαίνει καὶ ὑπομορίαν ἐπακτήμενος, καὶ σοὶ διατρανοῦσθω τὸ ἐν δεινοῖς
ἀκατάπληκτος παρὰτειλεῖς, καὶ κύνας Λάκαιως καὶ τὴν τοῦτον ἐνη-
λασίαν παραίτησαμενος, καὶ δορυφόρων πληθὺν καὶ συμμορίαν ἐπακτήρων
ἀποφθείμενον, ἀνεμοτρεφές καὶ στερρόν ἐπανετεινός, ἀνεμοτρεφεῖς καὶ στερρῷς
τὸ τοῦ Γενείου τῶν ὄνυχων καὶ τῶν ὀδόντων μείωσας καὶ βοροῦς. ὡς
taὐτὰ ταύτα τὰ θήρια καὶ πτοιαλέον τίθησι καὶ τῶν θρασυκάρδων. οὐ δὲ τράχη ἐπὶ ὄνυχας
καὶ κατασπάται ό δεινός ἐκεῖνος καὶ φρικαλέος εἰς γην, οὐκ ὀλίγους μεν τῶν
ἀπολέκτων καὶ κατασπατών, τοὺς δὲ πολλοὺς καὶ νεκροὺς. ὡς οἶον τοῦτον εἰδὼν
ῄει μὲν οὕτω ταῦτα. καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἥρωος πρᾶξις αἰει νικᾷ, καὶ χαίρει
καὶ ὁ λόγος ἤπτωμενος καὶ λέγειν ἐτὶ λιχνεύεται. καὶ γὰρ ἡ τῆς παροιμίας

388 χανεῖν αὗτοῖς om. O 394 βλασφεμὸν Ε ἐμβέπτει O 398 ἐξέθορε τοῦ
399 ἐπετόλμησας Ε έπετόλμησας O 390 οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον οὐκ ἀνεχό-
400 ομ. οῦκ οὐκ υποφαίνει καὶ ἀκατάπληκτον. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐτί με-
405 τέωρος φέρεσθαι ἐνθα τὸ συνάπτον τὴν πλάτην τὴ δέρη διελάσαν τὸ ἀκόν-
tιον Ι ὑποδέχεται, ἀμα δ' ἐγγίσας καὶ τὴν ἄνω γένυν τῷ ξίφει πλήττεται,
410 καὶ συνεκκόπτεται καὶ τὰς γνάθους καὶ διαδονεῖται καὶ κατασπάται οὐ
tῶν ἄκοντιον οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον, οὐκ ὀλίγους μὲν τῶν ἀπολέκτων καὶ τῶν
σπαίρειν εἰκατέρμενοι. οὐκ οἶον τοῦτον εἰδὼν ἐγὼ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχείων ἐκτάδεν καὶ
411 μάλα καιρίαν οὐ ἐπετόλμησας Ο 401 τοῦ om. O 393 τιθέον Ε ἐπετόλμησας O 407 ἀλλο Ο
412 ζχει μέν οὐτω ταῦτα. καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἥρωος πρᾶξις αἰει νικᾷ, καὶ χαίρει
καὶ ὁ λόγος ἤπτωμενος καὶ λέγειν ἐτὶ λιχνεύεται. καὶ γὰρ ἡ τῆς παροιμίας
Σκύθης, δ φασί, καὶ πάλιν τὸ ἕαυτον, καὶ ὁ λίθος ἀθύης ἄδιαντος καὶ σκληρὸς κάκιν ἐφέμονεν διέμεινεν εἰς μαχρόν ὅτι τῷ Παίου τὸ παλαιὸν καὶ πάλιν ἀφρώστημα, κατὰ τὸν εἰρήκοτα τοῦ τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων δεσμοὺς, ἐξῆσθενε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ Φεύδης καὶ τὴν διήθητα ἔβδελυκέτο.  

εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσει καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ ἑξοργίζομαι ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίου μου καὶ αἱ συνθέκαι οἰχέσθωσαι. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων ἄληθείας τῆς ἀκίνητος, τὸν οἶκον τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐδέσμευσε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ ψέυδει καὶ τὴν ὄσιότητα ἐβδελύγετο. εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσω καὶ τὰ βρεκιά ἐξορχήσομαι ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίονός μου καὶ αἱ συνθήκαι οἰχέσθωσαν. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων ἄληθείας τῆς ἀκίνητος, τὸν οἶκον τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐδέσμευσε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ ψέυδει καὶ τὴν ὄσιότητα ἐβδελύγετο. εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσω καὶ τὰ βρεκιά ἐξορχήσομαι- ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίονός μου καὶ αἱ συνθήκαι οἰχέσθωσαν. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων ἄληθείας τῆς ἀκίνητος, τὸν οἶκον τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐδέσμευσε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ ψέυδει καὶ τὴν ὄσιότητα ἐβδελύγετο. εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσω καὶ τὰ βρεκιά ἐξορχήσομαι- ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίονός μου καὶ αἱ συνθήκαι οἰχέσθωσαν. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων ἄληθείας τῆς ἀκίνητος, τὸν οἶκον τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐδέσμευσε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ ψέυδει καὶ τὴν ὄσιότητα ἐβδελύγετο. εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσω καὶ τὰ βρεκιά ἐξορχήσομαι- ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίονός μου καὶ αἱ συνθήκαι οἰχέσθωσαν. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων ἄληθείας τῆς ἀκίνητος, τὸν οἶκον τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων, ἐδέσμευσε καὶ ἐνετάκη τῷ ψέυδει καὶ τὴν ὄσιότητα ἐβδελύγετο. εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἁγιᾷ ποιήσω καὶ τὰ βρεκιά ἐξορχήσομαι- ἐνδύσομαι τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ βραχίονός μου καὶ αἱ συνθήκαι οἰχέσθωσαν. οὐκ ἐλογίσατο διὸ τὸ πρόσωπον χυρίου ὥρᾳ εὐθύτητας καὶ ἱσχυρόν καὶ σκληρὸν ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν καὶ ἑρμητικὸ ἀνήθινον κατὰ τὸν θεόν Ἱωβ ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἤγιστο ἐκ τῶν προλαβόν...
στασίαζε καιρού λαβόμενον καί άντεξισταίται: | το δε τοις δεσμοίς της ευνοίας κρατούμενον βεβαίαν ἔχει πρὸς το κρατός την εὐπεθείαν. τῷ τοίνυν τῆς ἀνευσταθοῦς φρενὸς εὐρίπῳ φερόμενος τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εὐρήγης ἐπιβούλους χεῖρας ἐπέβαλε, καὶ τούς εὐγενεῖς χαρακτῆράς ταύτης ἐνώθησε, τοὺς τιθέντας δροὺς μετέπειξε, κατέλυσεν ἀ κακυδόμησε, παρὰ τὰς αὐλακας τοῦ ἱδίου γεωργίου πεπλάνητο. τὸ τῆς γῆς ἐκεῖνο πιῶτατον καὶ ἐμψιόν ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὸ Σίρμιον, ἐμελέτησεν ὑποστάσασθαι καί τὰ τῶν παρατρισίων πεδίων ἐπέκειναι, ἐν φυλάτας ἀλλογλώσσιοις καὶ ἐνθεσίαις μεγίσταις καὶ χώραις ἐπιγραφαῖ κεφαγομόμεναι, ὡς τοις τῶν Ἀρακάδων ἐυκλεστάτους κηρυδοθήμενοι ο τῶν πάποτο σκηπτούχων ἐχώπασθας τροποιικοὶ καὶ νικητῆς αὐτοκράτωρ πρὸ μικροῦ συνήψε καὶ συναπένειμε. τι γούν οὖτος | αὐτός τὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης περιλάλητον ὑμνά τε καὶ ἀκουσμα; ὁ τῆς ὑλικῆς δύαδος ἐπέκεινα νοῦς, ὁ πεπυκνωμένος καί ἀπὸ πείρας καί ἀπὸ φύσεως, ἐπίσης φευγόν ἐκατέρα καὶ τάχος ἀπερίσκεπτον καὶ μέλλησιν ἀπράκτον, λέων, δ φασι, μετὰ ξίφους, ἐπέρχεται πρότερον τῷ τὴν ἀποστάσια προσαλεστάτῳ ποιητά σοι τὸν λασιοκώφω Δακί, πάνω ἀπορεύει καὶ ὑπό παραμυθή καὶ τὴν ἐπιστρεφομένη καὶ ἐνθέσιας άλλοθρόοις καὶ πόλεσι μεγίσταις καὶ χώραις ἐπιγραφαῖς ὅπωστοι τῶν Ἁρμακίων ἐκεῖνος παρακατῆμενοι ὁ τῶν κρατούσ τὴν ἀνεύσθατος φρένως εὔριπω φερόμενος, ὁ τῶν Παίονι συνελούσας, καὶ ἐμολύνθη, τὸ παροιμιώδες, πίσσης ἀψάμενος, καὶ ἀνθράκος γυμνω ποδί μή δυνάμενος ἐπιψάυειν, τὸ Σολομώνειον, δειμαίνομεν ἐξεπλάγη, ἐπέδωκεν εἰς ἀνετασμούς εαυτόν, εἰς δουλείαν ἐσχάτην, εἰς υπουργίαν καί αὐτοπροαίρετου τῷ βασιλικῷ στρατεύματι συνεληλυθότος πληγῆν καὶ τῶν ἀποστατήσαντος, τὸν πάσαν διαταγεῖς ὁ παπσωμένος καὶ τῶν ἐπιστρεπτικῶν μαστίγων καταμιαίνοντες, ὁ δε νυκτὶ ὄμωτος ὅτι ἔξω τοις ἀκαθαρταῖς καὶ παραβάσεσι καὶ παρασιτοῖς, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνετε τῶν ἐκείνων βορβόροις τὰς καρδίας καταμιαίνουντες. ανομία γάρ άνομου οὐ μή κακώση τὸν άνομον ἐν ἡ αν ημέρα ἀποστρέψη ἀπό τῆς άνομίας αὐτοῦ. οὐκοὖν τῷ Παίονι διασκεδάσθη τὸ διαβούλιον καὶ ἀπέπτη καὶ ἡ μεγάλη ἐλπίς, καὶ οὐδὲ ταύτην συνέσχεν Ὁ πίθος ἀλλὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ὁχυρώμασι
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συνεξέπεσε, καὶ εἰς μοιρὰν ἀντιμάχου ἀντικατέστη ὁ σύμμαχος καὶ τῆς φθο­
ρᾶς τούς μίτους αὐτῆς ἑπέκλωθεν. ὡς γοῦν ὁ Δάξ ἐν ἀποτόμοις ἀκρω­
ρείαις κινδύνου γέγονε καὶ ἐν συνοχῇ καρδίας ἐξελάσατο τὸν εὐμελικτον, καὶ
tῇ τῆς ἐπικτῆς δουλώσεως ζεύγη τοῦ τοῦ τραχήλου νεύρων ὑπέθετο, καὶ
tὸν δοθέντα ὑπεδέξατο ἀρχηγόν, ὡς γοῦν οὐτοί καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς τούς μίτους αὐτῆς ἑπέκλωθεν. ὡς γοῦν οὕτως ὁ Δάξ ἐν ἀποτόμοις ἀκρω­
ρείαις κινδύνου γέγονε καὶ ἐν συνοχῇ καρδίας ἐξιλάσατο τὸν εὐμείλικτον,
tῇ μὲν τῆς κατὰ τῶν Παιόνων παρατάξεως ἡδη εὐμελικτον ὑπεδέξατο καὶ ἐκάστος
eώρα δεινῶν καὶ τὸν εὐκλεῖα μετεπορεύτηκε θάνατον. ἀνέφριτο τὸ βίβλιον τοῦ
tοπομοῦ πρὸς ἀνάρρους τῷ ἑν τῶν υπεδέξατο αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπε­
φαίνετο μέλαν τῶν οἰδαιμόνων ὑποπίπτον καὶ σκιαζόμενον. ἐφίρττε καὶ τὰ
περὶ τὰς δρόμους τοῦ Ἱστοροῦ πέρας τῶν πυκνῶν μελιῶν, καὶ ὡς ἐν
παραγόμενοι τῶν πυκνῶν μελιῶν, καὶ τῶν Παιόνων παρατάξεως ἡ διατάξις ἐν τοῖς ἀποτόμοις κατασκεύαζετο. τὰ δὲ πυραὶ πολλὰ καὶ
ταῦτα τὸ πρατήριον ὑπανακοπτυότα. αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀνετείνετο τὰ σχοινίσματα. ήρθησαν αἱ σημαίαι αὐτοῦ. ἐνέπειρεν τὸν νείρα καὶ τὸν ἐνδόσιμον 
πλήρα καὶ τῶν μονῆρων καὶ τῶν Δωρίων καὶ τῶν πληθύντων ἑταίρων καὶ τῶν
ἀλλαὶς χρησίμοις ἔκαθεν καὶ αἱ νεώρια καὶ τὰ καθηκόντων καὶ 
συνεκτότετο τοῖς φαινομένοις ὁ Παιόν, καὶ ὡς διακόσμηθεν ἵππων συνασπιστεῖκα τὸ τροπαγέας προκατεβάλετο. κατά τακτικὰς διαιρέσεις καὶ πληθυντὸς 
συνασπισμοῦ καὶ συγκεκριμένη ενώσει προκεχώρηκε τὰ στρατεύματα κατεπήρηντο αἱ σκηναὶ έπλήρου τῶν οπλῶν καὶ τὰ προάυλια ἀμφότερα καὶ τὸν κατασκοπεῖον, καὶ ἐκάστος 
έωρα δεινὸν καὶ τὸν εὔκλεα μετεπορεύετο θάνατον, ἀνέφριτο τὸ ρέμα τοῦ 
ποταμοῦ πρὸς ἀνάρρους τῷ ἕναντίῳ ύπανακοπτυότα. έφριττον καὶ τὰ 
περὶ τὰς Ιέχθας τοῦ Ἰστροῦ ἐνάτασε τῶν πυκνῶν μελιῶν, καὶ ὡς ἐν
παραχθαῖσι τοῖς κατακλίνετο, κατασχεῖτο τὸν βασιλέα τῇ χείρᾳ, ἀμα θώρακι καὶ τῇ
καθηκόντων σκευῇ πρὸς τὴν μάχην καταρτυόμενον. ἀντίπορθμος τῷ χείλει 
τοῦ ποταμοῦ παρεκάθετο, καὶ θαλαττοὺς ἐλιθάζετο θερμῶ τῷ ρείματι τῶν δακρυῶν καταβρέχων τὸν ἱολον. ἐχρημάτιζε διὰ πρέσβεων καὶ 
γλώσσῃ τούτως ἐχρήτο, διότι καὶ 
ηγεμόνοις καὶ προσριπτούμενοι καὶ ὑποφερόμενος καταδειμαινόμενος γάρ καὶ γυμνός καὶ σύσκευος ἰκέτης

492 ἀντικατέστη ὁ 493 ἑπέκλωθεν ὁ γύρῳ ὁ Δαξ ὁ Δαξ ὁ Δαξ ὁ Δαξ 494 ἐν ὁμ. Ε 497 τῶν ὁμ. Ο 498 κατά ὁ κατὰ ὁ κατὰ ὁ Ο 500 ψαρχοὶ Ο 512 ἐπὶ Ε 514 τῶν Ε 513 ἐνεπίτηρας Ε ἐνεπίπτως ὁ Ε 515 ἐνευδοσίμῃ ὁ Ε 516 ἐνθεο­
μένῃ ὁ 517 ἐνεμερίσθης ὁ ἑκάτερες ὁ 530 δόροις Ο 521 κατοικίας Ο
προσήρχετο τ' Ἡράκλειον παρητείτο διασκευήν ἡντιβδεί, καὶ προμηθευθεῖ τι ἐπανειν. τὸ βόσπολον ἀπεπέμπτε. πυγμαίος χαμαίζηλος τῆς Βασιλείως ἀνή κεφαλαργοριφθη ήκένθηκα λεοντήν, καὶ διεξιδιούμενος, οἱ τής Παιονίας πρέσβεις προσελιπάρουν τὴν ἁνεχθήν ὡς εἴδον καὶ μᾶλλον ἀπέτασθείαν τὴν φοινικίδα, καὶ τὸ βασιλεῖον κνήμας καὶ τὰ περικαλλά σφύρα σιδηρένδυτα. παν ὅτι καταθύμιον τῆς τούτου θεοστεφεί ἐξουσίαι καταδίκηθεν μετεκομίζετο. ὁμιριζότο τῇς καταθέσεως, καὶ ἄλλοις μὲν ἄλλα τῇ καὶ τῷ τῆς Βασιλείας ἀρχηγός καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπισήμοις ἐνεξουσιάζοντος ὅσον ὁ Παιονάρχης εἰς ἐχέγγυον. τού βασιλείου συνήχθησαν ἂνοχήν ώς εἴδος καὶ μᾶλλον ἀπέτασθείαν τής Σιρίμου ἐρρέτω τῆς Παιονίας πιότατον, τῷ ἰππάσιμον καὶ κατάρρυτον τῆς σής ἐξουσίας καὶ κυριότητος. ἀστρά μὲν δή προβέβηκε, παρωχηκε δὲ πλείω νύξ, τοιτάτη δὲ τῇς Ηλλυρίδος καὶ τῶν Εὐρωπαίων Δαρδάνων τῶν σῶν ὀρίων καὶ...
σχοινισμάτων, ἀπεσάσθω τῶν ἡμετέρων, προσενοῦσθι τοῖς σοῖς. ἐφ' ὁσον τοῦ σοῦ δόρατος ἐφράσεν ἡ σικᾶ ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῶν σῶν πτερύγων πιπέτω, καὶ τὰ τούτων ἐπέκεινα μόνον ἄνεος ἡμῖν. καὶ μὴ ὁὗτο φοβερὸς καὶ οἷα κατακαίων προστή ἐπίκεισο· μῆκετι πλῆξες ἡμᾶς. πνεῦμα ἐξουσιαστῶν ἄνεβη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ τότον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἀφήκαμεν, διὶ καταπαύσει ἀμαρτίας μεγάλας ἡμᾶς. ἀπάλειφον ὡς νεφέλην τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ ὡς γνόφον τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν. καὶ ὁ Ὀρόβατος καὶ ὁ Βουσκάς τοῖς τῶν Ἡρωμάτων ἐγγραφήσουσαν ἤξοσιν. συγκαταλεγέσθωσαν τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν σήν σκηπτουχίαν καὶ τὸ καινοῦργος τῆς Πανονίας ναῖς καὶ ἡ περὶ τούτων μητρόπολις, ἕνα τῶν Πανοναρχῶν βασιλεύουσας στέφανος τῇ σῇ συνέχεια κραταίοτητη. ὑπόφορά σοι ἔστω τὰ δόλα καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἡμῶν ἐξουσίας ἀνατιτλούσθωσαν κύρους. γιαοιδείας ἐκτίθησα. δασιμοφορεῖτο τὸ πᾶν ἐν τίτλοις· μηδὲν ἀσυντελεῖς ἔστω, ὁ ἀρχηγός, οἱ ἱεραί ἀγελάρχαι, ὁ χορὸς τῶν Ἔρωμαστῶν, οἱ λογάδες τοῦ πλήθους, οἱ στρατηγοὶ καὶ οἱ ὑποστράτηγοι καὶ τοῖς τῶν Ἱερομυστών, οἱ λογαρίθμοι καὶ οἱ τούτων λοιπῶν παρατάξεων, οἱ κοινότεροι καὶ σύγκλυδοι λαοί ἐνορκοί, εὐφόροι, άσφαλεῖς φίλοι, άδιάπτωτοι τῶν συνθηκῶν περικλείοντες τοῖς ἐνδεκατούροις ἀρχηγοῖς καὶ περιόπτοις εἰς ἐχέγγυον ἐνέδυσασιν, άφιεσθαι τὰς πίστεις διδόσιν, ίνα μηδέν Ιχνεύον υπολείποιτο. οὐκ ολίγος καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκκρίτων ἐπί άσφαλεΐ τή βεβαιώσει ἐμπαρεχόμενοι, σφαιραίοι τοῖς ἐνδεκατούροις ἀρχηγοῖς καὶ περιόπτοις ἐν τήν οἰκουμένην περιεδίνησας. τοιότις τῆς σῇς χειρὸς ἀπηωρημένης ή μάλλον ἐπικειμένης τοῖς Παί­οσι, θειότατε βασιλεύ, ἀπήντησεν αὐτοῖς ἐσχάτη ταπείνωσι. ἔταλανασι ἐαυτούς διὶ σοι δλως αντικατέστησαν ἐμακάρισαν ἐαυτούς διὶ συνήκαν καὶ ἐπεστράφησαν, καὶ τοῖς κόλποις τοῖς σοίς έπεστράφησαν, καὶ σωτηρίοι ίμάτιον ἐνεδύσαντο. έθλίβησαν διὶ περ ὁπίσω τῆς πονηρᾶς διανοίας αὐτῶν ήκολούθησαν, καὶ τῆς καθεστηκυίας φρενός ἐξεπλέυσαν. ηύφρανθησαν διὶ μετεκυλίσθησαν, καὶ ἔγενον ώς κάλαμος ὑποκείμενος. ἔντευθεν ἔμεγαλύνθης σφόδρα, κράτιστε βασιλεύ, καὶ οἱ διαλογισμοὶ σου ἐνεβαθύνθησαν. καὶ προσελάβου καὶ τὰ ἄνελπιστα, ψυφάς τὰς κέρας σοῦ, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην περιεδίνησας. τοιούτους σε τοῖς δεξιοῖς τῷ ιερῷ Ιορδάνην καταίροντα παραπέμπεσιν. τοιούτους σε δεξιούμεθα. καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πλήθους ἰδοῦ καὶ κοινότερον άνακράζομεν τὰς φίλας τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὴν εὐφημίαν τὴν ἐπινίκιον.
NOTES

4. \textit{elēa} 'indignantis' is much affected as opening word of a speech or letter by Byzantine rhetoricians of the eleventh and twelfth century. Cf. Michael Psellus \textit{ep. 40} (Sathas, M.B. 5, 273), \textit{Monodia in Georgium Vestiarium} (Orbis Romanus 5, 1936, 211), \textit{In mercatorem factum advocatvm} (ibid. 69), Eustathius \textit{ep. 50}, Michael Akominatos \textit{Paneg. in Isaac Angelum} (Lambros, 1, 208), \textit{In sanctum Leonidem} (ibid. 1, 150), Theodore Prodromus \textit{ep. 2}, \textit{ep. 3}, \textit{ep. ad Euthymium} (Papadimitriu, Feodor Prodrom, 305). Tzetzes \textit{ad Aristoph. Plut. 79} (ed. Massa Positano) says of such an example 'περισσός 'Αττικώς κείται'.

5. τόν ἀτείτην λίθον: Source is Philostr. \textit{Vit. Apoll. 2. 144} ἅτοι μὲν καὶ πελαγοὺς καλύμες ὅπε ἕν πίξαντο μὴ πρὸτερον αὐτάς ἐναρμόσαντες ὃ μὲν τὸν ἀτείτην λίθον ὃ δὲ τὸν λυχνίτην.

προσαναμίσσεται: Not in lexica.

6. τόν πολυτελῆ κτλ.: cf. \textit{LXX Is. 28. 16} Ἰδοὺ ἅγιο ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών λίθον πολυτελῆ, ἔκλεισαν, ἀνρωπονιαίον, ἔντιμον εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς.

8. ἐς χιλίονς κτλ.: Cf. \textit{LXX Deut. 32. 30} πῶς διώξεται ἐις χιλίους καὶ δύο μετακινήσουσι μυριάδας;
taught, according to various scholars, in a church of St. Peter, a church of St. George, or a portico opposite the Senate House (cf. Fuchs, op. cit. 28 - 29). None of the arguments is conclusive. In view of the present passage, it may well be that the official lecture-room of the ὑπάτας τῶν φιλοσόφων continues to be in the Magnaura, as it had been in the time of Leo the Mathematician (Cf. Genesios p. 98, Theoph. Cont. 4. 26 p. 185).

60. ἐννας must be corrupt, though some geographical name parallel to 'Ἐλικώνα might be expected. The accentuation of the MSS is against the conjecture εὖνάς, with a possible reference to the chrysotriclinos in the Great Palace.

61, 62. στρατογραφεῖν, στρατογράφιον: Not in lexica.

74. θυλολογία: Not in lexica.

65. εννας must be corrupt, though some geographical name parallel to Έλικώνα might be expected. The accentuation of the MSS is against the conjecture εὐνάς, with a possible reference to the chrysotriclinos in the Great Palace.

61, 62. στρατογραφεῖν, στρατογράφιον: Not in lexica.

77. ἡ ὑδρις δανειζέτω κτλ.: On the use of snakes’ flesh in ancient materia medica cf. Cossen - Steier, R.E. II A, 506. The image of snake’s flesh as an antidote is common in the writings of Gregorios Palamas; cf. Défense des Saints hé-syceastes (ed. J. Meyendorff) I. 1.11, I. 1.20, II. 1.15, etc. I have not identified the patristri text from which the image is no doubt drawn.

80. όρθοδήμη: Not in lexica.

τὴν ἐν τοῖς εἰρεῖς εὐγενελίους σαγηνήν: Cf. N.T. Matth. 13.47 ὑμοία ἐστίν ἢ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγηνή βλητεις οἱ τὴν ἡλίασαν καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγοσθή.

86. βρεφοκόμον: Not in lexica.

87. δουδάφρυστον: Not in lexica; Suidas has δουδαφρυστον· δουχρισως λανθάνον, which is quite another meaning.

89. τῆς πειθανάγκης τὸ ἔστεχον: 'The skill with which one is forced to a conclusion'. πειθανάγκη is glossed and supported by citations in Suidas.

91. δυνών: On this form in Byzantine texts cf. Bohlig, op. cit. 69. τοῦ τε is answered by καὶ του 1.122.

92. τὰ νοητά καὶ ἀόρατα κτλ.: Cf. N.T. Rom. 1.20 τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήσαν νοούμενα καθοράται.

106. τῇ Σταγειρόθεν κελαίνη Σψιγγί: I cannot find any parallel for this curious expression. The point presumably is that Aristotle’s utterances require interpretation to be of any use.

110. περισσόν τοῦ χλωροῦ κτλ.: Cf. LXX Gen. 30. 37 and περισσόν τοῦ χλωροῦ ἑραίνετο ἐπὶ ταῖς ραβδίσ τοῦ λευκοῦ, ὃ ἐλέπισεν, ποικιλόν.

114. ἐν ταῖς ληνοῖς κτλ.: Cf. LXX Gen. 30. 38 and παρέθηκε τὰς ραβδίσ τοῦ ὑδάτος ἐλέπισεν ἐν ταῖς ληνοῖς τῶν ποτιστήρων τοῦ ὑδάτος.

115. εἰς Χριστὸν αἰχμαλωτίζουν κτλ.: Cf. N.T. II Cor. 10. 5 αἰχμαλωτιζόντες πάν νόμημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

118. τὸ πικρὸν οὐ λέγω γλυκύ κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 5.20 οὐδὲ οἱ λέγοντες τὸ πονηρὸν καλὸν, καὶ τὸ καλὸν πονηρὸν, οἱ τιθέντες τὸ σκότος φῶς καὶ τὸ φῶς σκότος, οἱ τιθέντες τὸ πικρὸν γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ γλυκὺ πικρὸν.

123. ἔδωκε σέ ύπερασπισμόν σωτηρίας κτλ.: Cf. Menander, π. ἐπιδεικτικῶν Spengel. θεοῦ κατοικεῖσαν ἀνωθεὶν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος καὶ βουλήθεις ταῖς εὐδαιμονίαις παραμυθήσασθαι τὴν σάν παρῆλθε γένεσιν ἐπ’ ἀγαθῇ μοίρᾳ τῆς οἰκουμένης.

124. πάροχον λαχύς κτλ.: Cf. LXX Ps. 60 (61) 4 ὠδήγησοι με, ὃτι ἐγενήθης ἐλπὶς μου, πύργος ἱσχύς ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ.
125. ἡδες γὰρ μετὰ ἴσχυος κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 40. 10 ἵδον κύριος μετὰ ἴσχυος ἔφθαται καὶ ὁ βραχίων μετὰ κυρείας.

128. ἀπεστάλης ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 10. 12 ἐπισκέψομαι ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν, ἐπὶ τὸν ἰσχυον τῶν Ἀσσυρίων, καὶ ἐπί τὸ ὄψις τῆς δόξης τῶν ὀρθοδοξίων αὐτού. (13) εἶπε γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἴσχυι ποιήσω, καὶ ἐν τῇ σοφία τῆς συνέσεως ἀφελω ὄμιχ ἐννών, καὶ τὴν ἴσχυιν αὐτῶν προνομεύσω. Who is this τυφών from the west who is compared to the King of Assyria? The most obvious interpretation would be to take it of Roger II of Sicily. The difficulty is that this potentate is said to be still alive (1. 167-170), whereas Roger II died in 1154. His son, King William I of Sicily, in fact inflicted a severe defeat on the Byzantine forces in Italy and drove them from the peninsula in 1156. By the following year his fleet was operating in the Aegean and had even risked approaching Constantinople. In the meantime, however, a small Byzantine force and much Byzantine money had been sent to Ancona, and soon a considerable army was in the field there. A series of minor victories over the Sicilian forces in the autumn of 1157 was crowned by the defeat of a Sicilian army near San Germano on 6 January 1158. This partial success, which did not change the real relation of forces in Italy, enabled Manuel to conclude a peace treaty with William II without loss of face, and to withdraw his troops from Ancona (on these events cf. F. Chalandon, Les Comnène II: Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène, 367 - 381, where the sources are cited. Seen in the distorting mirror of panegyrical rhetoric, this could well be described in the words used in the text. I am therefore inclined to suppose that William I is the τυφών from the west; he died on 7 May 1166, which would point to the earlier rather than the later of the suggested dates for the present text.

131. ἐν τῇ σῇ ὄμφασι κτλ.: Cf. LXX Ps. 77 (78). 62 συνέκλεισεν εἰς ὄμφασιν τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

135. ἀπαντήσαι: Byzantine literary usage favours the 'Aeolic' forms of the aorist optative; cf. Böhlig, op. cit. 77 - 78.

136. ὁς ἠδέωσεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 7. 4 μὴ φοβού, μηδὲ ἡ ψυχὴ σου ἀσθενεῖτο ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ξύλων τῶν δαλῶν τῶν καπνιζομένων τούτων. The image of the two burning brands is used by Michael ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης in Regel, Fontes Rerum Byzantinarum 174. 15ff. σὺν ἐπιτύμβῳ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο δαλῶν τῶν καπνιζομένων, ὡς φησιν ὁ εἰς, apparently with reference to the Serbs and Bosnians in 1149. The identification of the two brands from the west in the present passage is not easy. They may be merely the Hungarians and Serbs who are spoken of later. They may be Roger II and William I, successive Kings of Sicily. They can hardly be the Emperor Conrad and Louis VII of France, in view of the terms in which they are spoken of here.

141. ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν κτλ.: Cf. LXX Ps. 118 (119). 25 ἐκολλήθη τῷ ἐδάφει ἡ ψυχή μου.

144. Ἰουδαίας κατάρχεις: Byzantine circles were inclined to interpret the treaty between Baldwin III of Jerusalem and Manuel, and subsequent triumphal entry of the Emperor into Antioch in April 1154 followed by Baldwin, as an acknowledgement of Byzantine suzerainty over the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine Empire, 427, where the relevant literature is cited. Αἴθιοπία προφθάνει κτλ.: Cf. LXX Ps. 67 (68). 31. ἦσσον πρόεδροι ἔξε Αγγέλων, Αἴθιοπία προφθάσαι χείρα αὐτῆς τῷ θεῷ.
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ἐκ Δαμά λίβανος: Cf. LXX Jer. 6. 20 ἵνα τί μοι λίβανον ἐκ Σαβαφί φέρετε καὶ καινώμομον ἐκ γῆς μακρόθεν (v. 2 Δαμά).

146. ὡς φᾶς αἱ ὁδοὶ σου κτλ.: Cf. LXX Prov. 4. 18 αἱ δὲ ὁδοὶ τῶν δικαιῶν ὁμοίως φατὶ λάμπουσιν.

καὶ σου δουλεῖν καὶ Ἰσχαμιλ κτλ.: The reference in this long passage seems to be to the treaty with Sultan Kilidj Arslan of late 1161, confirmed during his visit to Constantinople in winter 1161-2, in which the Sultan undertook to provide troops to the Byzantine empire. Cf. Kinn. p. 201.

158. τὰ περὶ τὰς ἐσχατίας τῆς Μερόης κτλ.: Meroe and Syene are merely conventional expressions for the extreme south. But in the 60's of the twelfth century many in Constantinople were dreaming of conquests in Egypt. Cf. Nik. Ak. 208 ἄλλα τίνα τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις; ἐρᾶ καὶ στρατεῖας ὑπερορίου, καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἀλγύπτου ἐνωτικάμενος πύμωφορ, καὶ ὅσα γεωχήει Νειλός ὁ καρποδότης καὶ ἐστοχασί, τοῖς πήχει μετέρω τὸ εἴδαιμον, κτλ.; K. Horna, Eine unedierte Rede des Konstantin Manasses, W. St. 28 (1906) 178 ἐφοβίσε τοῦ τούτου τὴν σπάθην ὁπόσοι Νειλόν πάνωσιν ὕδωρ καὶ ὅσα τὰς ἐσχατίας οἰκούσι τῆς γῆς.

166. οἱ κατὰ τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν κτλ.: The Greek victors at Salamis.

168. τῶν στοιχείων καινοτόμος κτλ.: Xerxes.

173. αὐτοσώματος: Not in lexica. The word recurs in 1.388.

134. οί κατὰ τὸν τῶν Περσῶν κτλ.: Cf. Arrian Anab. 4. 33 βάλλεται λίδω αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος βιαίος τὴν τε κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸν αὐχένα at Cyropolis.

187. Εὔφημοι καὶ Καίσαρες κτλ.: This hexad does not seem to occur elsewhere.

200. παρεισφέροντες: The active use of the compounds of φθείρω in an imprecatory sense is not recorded in the lexica.

202. μεταχρονίζοντες: Not in lexica.

209. καὶ ἓνων seems corrupt.

213. ἀλλοκότοις με ταῖς φύμαις κτλ.: Cf. 1. 578 ὤμαις ἀλλοκότοις καθεπαχχεῖτο. This is probably a citation, but I have not found the source.


227. σώφρων καὶ ἀνδρείος κτλ.: A variation on the theme of the four royal virtues ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, and φρονήσις. Cf. Menander, Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν 2 (Spengel, Rh. Gr. 3. 373). Significantly μεγαλοπρέπεια has replaced δικαιοσύνη.

234. Λαίδαλος ἑκών κτλ.: Cf. Il. 18. 590ff. ἐν ὀ γορό ποικίλλε περικλήτος ἀμφιγυήεις / τῷ ἱκλον, οἶνον ποτ' ἐν Κνωσό εὐφρείῃ / Δαίδαλος ἤσκησεν καλλιπλοχαίμῳ Ἀρμαύεν.

247. οὐκ ἐκείνος ὁ ἐκλυτός τε κτλ.: The reference is to Aphrodite’s girdle, described in II. 14. 214 etc., but probably not to any specific passage.

250. οὕτως περιόδους κτλ.: In so far as there is any reference to a particular work of Aristotle, it is to Book I of the Meteorologica. According to Bonitz’ Index σύμφωνες occurs only in Meteor. I 342 b 28

251. ἥλιον καὶ σελήνης μεγέθη καὶ κάλλη: Here again the reference is probably to Meteor. I, in which the size of the sun is discussed at 345 b 1ff. Apparently Aristotle does not discuss the size of the moon anywhere. τῶν πλανητών σύνοδοι are dealt with in 343 b 30 ff.

253. τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἄέρα κτλ.: Probably Meteor. I 345 b ff., where the cause of haloes and the like appearing on heavenly bodies is treated, though the reference could be to Optics 419 a.

256. άνέλκει τὸν χοῦν κτλ.: Neither the subject-matter nor the phraseology of this passage seems to be Aristotelian.

266. διὰ τὸν Πέρσαν Κόρον κτλ.: Cf. Herod. 3. 89. 3.

276. Μέτελλος διὰ τὸ γῆρας οἰκουρών: The reference is probably to Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, cos. 143, died 115, his four sons and two sons-in-law all being at that time consuls. But the immediate source escapes me.

279. ομώνυμος: According to Aristotle ομώνυμα λέγεται ὅν ὄνομα μόνον κοινὸν ὁ δὲ κατὰ τοῦνομα λόγος τῆς σύνθεσις ἔτερος (Cat. I a 1). Aristotle cites many examples of such words, e.g. κλείς. Presumably some such play upon words is meant here. Perhaps the reference is more particularly to the passages in the zoological works in which organs which are not part of a living organism are said to be called by their names ομώνυμος, e.g. Περὶ ξώων γενέσεως II b 24 οὐ γάρ ἔστι πρόσωπον μὴ ἔχον ψυχήν, οὐδὲ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ φυτεύεται ομώνυμως λεχθῆται τὸ μὲν εἶναι πρόσωπον τὸ δὲ σάρκα, ὡσπερ κἂν ἐγίγνετο λίθως ἢ ξύλα.

294. τῶν Περσῶν: Probably the campaigns or 1160 and 1161 against the Sultanate of Iconium.

309. τῇ ὑπερμάχῃ κτλ.: Cf. Patriarch Sergius’ prelude to the Akathistos Hymnos τῇ ὑπερμάχῃ στρατηγῷ τῷ νικητῇ.
317. *ai ζιβύναι τούτοις κτλ.*: Cf. LXX Is. 2. 4 and similar cognates with the same root, and *taι τις* in Ps. 118 (119) 105 λόγος τοις ποσίν μοι ὁ λόγος σοι καὶ φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις μοι (or the νόμος which Michael evidently had in mind here).

319. *ανάγκης υιός ὁ πόλεμος*: This looks like a quotation, but I have been unable to trace it. In view of Michael’s vigorous imagery it may therefore be original and not derivative.

322. **τοῦ βασιλέως τὰ νεαρὰ διατάγματα**: The surviving Novels of Manuel are to be found in Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Jus Graeco-Romanum III*. Cf. also id., *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, 36 - 37.

325. *τοῖς ποσὶ καὶ φῶς καὶ λόγοι*: Cf. LXX Ps. 118 (119) 105 λόγος τοῖς ποσίν μοι ὁ λόγος σοι καὶ φῶς ταῖς τρίβοις μοι (or the νόμος which Michael evidently had in mind here).

328. **τὸν παράκτιον κολωνόν**: Cf. LXX Hos. 6. 4 ὡς ὀρθάδικοι ἠπίσταμεν εὐφύσιοι αὐτῶν.

329. **τὸν βασιλέως τα νεαρά διατάγματα**: The surviving Novels of Manuel are to be found in Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Jus Graeco-Romanum III*. Cf. also id., *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, 36 - 37.


337. *ὁ επισκευασμὸς τῶν τειχῶν*: Cf. Kinn. 274 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν τε τειχῶν τῆς Κωνσταντινούπολεως ἐπιμελητήριον μέρεσι πολλοῖς ὕπο χρόνου καμμώτων. There seems to be no mention of the new stretch of wall built by Manuel at the northern end of the land walls, stretching from the Kerkoporta to the neighbourhood of the Tower of Heraclius’ wall; cf. R. Janin, *op. cit.*, 248 - 249, 265 - 266. This construction must therefore be later than the present speech.

342. **τῶν ψηφίδιον συνθέσεις**: The church was decorated with mosaics.

348. **τῶν Ιερῶν σηκών**: What tombs were in the Church of St. Irene? Is this a reference to another work of Manuel’s?

351. **τοὺς κούφιαμονς τῆς άχθηδόνος κτλ.**: Two enactments reducing taxation on ecclesiastical property are described. One seems to have been of limited geographical extent, the other to have extended to the whole territory of the empire. It is not easy to identify either enactment with confidence. The first may be the χρυσόβουλλος λόγος of August 1153 restoring all landed property confiscated from St. Sophia and freeing it from tax (*J.G.R. III* 446 - 449), or the χρυσόβουλλος λόγος of March 1158 guaranteeing possession of their existing lands to all monasteries in Constantinople and nearby regions and granting them certain fiscal advantages, but at
the same time forbidding them to extend their holdings (Kinn. 276). The second may possibly refer to the series of enactments of 1144 granting immunity from taxation to δημοσιακοί ιερείς—apparently priests enrolled in the cadasters of landed estates—throughout the empire; cf. Balsamon on second synod of Nicaea, ch. 4 (MPG 707-708). But one would scarcely expect a measure dating back more than twenty years to be given such prominence. I am more inclined to suppose that between 1158 and the date of the speech the provision regarding security of tenure of monastic estates and their partial immunity was extended to cover the whole empire. There appears to be no other trace of such an enactment. Manuel’s generosity to the church, whatever its actual form, was long remembered: cf. anonymous chronicle in cod. Oxon. Laud. gr. 27 fol. 129v Μανουήλ ὁ νεός αὐτὸς ὁ πορφυρογέννητος χρώνος λβ’, ὀρθοδόξος, ταξιδιάμοιος: ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐχαρίσατο τῇν ἀτέλειαν τοῖς ἱερεῖοιν ’Ρωμανίας.

360. τῇ ςῃ παρόδῳ κτλ.: I do not know what this means.

363. μᾶ πληγὴ τρεῖς κελλητίζοντας ἡξεσφαίρασε: Many such stories were told of Manuel. Cf. F. Chalandon, op. cit. 207.

364. κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς Ἀκαρνάνας: Cf. Thuc. 1.5.


377. Κύλλων: The reference is presumably to the campaign of 1158 against the Cilician Armenian Kingdom of Thoros.

378. τῶν παριστρίων πειράτων: Probably a reference to the campaign against the Cumans of 1148.

tὰ Πανοικίων εἶτον Ἐρμαίων: On the names given to the Hungarians of J. Darkó, Die auf die Ungarn bezügliche Volksnamen bei den Byzantinern, BZ. 21 (1912) 472-487; Gy. Moravcsik, Die archaisierenden Namen der Ungarn in Byzanz, B.Z. 30 (1929-30) 247-253. All four terms here refer to the Hungarians.

384. Δασιῶν τὸς ἀρίστους κτλ.: The reference might be to any occasion when Manuel personally took the field against the Serbians. It cannot be to the single combat between Manuel and the Serbian (or Hungarian) Župan Bakchinos in 1150 (Cf. Nik. Ak. 127, Kinn. 111-112, I. Râcz, Bizánci költönmények Manuel császár magyar hadjáratairól 1941, 23-24), since the emperor here fights παμπληθεΐ τψ στρατοπέδω.

388. χανεν αὐτὸς τῆν γῆν: Cf. II. 4.182 τότε μοι χάνοι εὔρεια χόων.

394. ἦ πάρδαλις τὸ ζῷον κτλ.: This passage seems to bear little similarity to any description of a leopard in earlier literature, and is original in general form though derivative in detail. The leopard is still indigenous in Asia Minor, where the hunt must have taken place. In the literature of Byzantium and the Near East the leopard is more often a hunting animal than a quarry. Cf. Digenis Akritas, ed. Macrogorado, 3565 οἶκ εἶχε κόινας μετ’ αὐτῶν ἦ πάρδους πολυδρόμος. Luxorius, A.L. 1. 360, De pardi manueletis, qui cum canibus venationem faciebant’, Other examples from mediaeval literature are cited by J. Aymard, Essai sur les chasses romaines, 389 n. 2. The animal referred to in these passages is no doubt rather the cheetah than the leopard.
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421. την πληγήν καιρίαν : Cf. Aesch. Ag. 1292, 1343.

424. τής παροιμίας Σκύθης : Cf. Leutsch - Schneidewin, Corpus Paroemographorum Graecorum I, 452. 4ff. Σκύθης τόν λασιοστέρνον κέντορα παρδαλίων.

427. τούς των οικειων, άμαρτημάτων κτλ. : Cf. LXX Sirac. 12. 12 μή δεσμεύσεις δις άμαρτίαν, εν γάρ μή άπώφησης, added in certain manuscripts.

434. πύρ υπό σποδίη κτλ. : Cf. Callim. ep. 44. 1 - 2 έστι τι ταύτη καθιστήμενον νύ και μή Άρωνοςι από τή σποδίη.

441. Βουμελίων : A variant of the name Βουλιμείς (Ptol. Geog. 2. 16, Dionys. Per. 387, Eustath. ad loc), Βουλινοί (Ps. - Scymn. 404, Scylax 22, Steph. Byz. s.v. Βουλινοί), etc. Cf. Tomaschek, R.E. 3.1046. 23 - 53. The form is no doubt a learned etymologising construction; βουμέλια = ἀκανθόν

452. Όσοι with future or future equivalent is common κοινή but condemned by the Atticists, e.g. Phrynichus.


562. Σίρμιον : Clearly the region of Srem, and not, as sometimes, the town of Mitrovia or even Zemun.

463. Ώς φιλέταις ἀλλογλώσσοις κτλ. : The Hungarian ethnic element seems to have been negligible south of the Drava, though Hungarian sovereignty extended to the Sava in the first half of the twelfth century.
464. ἐπιγραφαῖς: ἀπογραφὴ is the commoner word for ‘tax-assessment’, ‘tax-roll’, but ἐπιγραφή occurs in this sense; cf. L.-S.® s.v. But we really need an adjective or adjectival phrase, which neither ἐπιγραφαῖς nor ἀπογραφαῖς can be. Perhaps we should read ἐπιγράφοις, assuming a sense of 'entered in tax-roll'.

gεωγραφούμενα: 'surveyed for taxation purposes'. Cf. Ioannes Diogenes ap. Regel; Fontes Rerum Byzantinarum 311. 4 νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὕτω τῶν Ἰστορον περιαγωγοὺς πᾶσαν ἐκεῖνῷ τὴν χώραν ἐγεωγραφήσας.


470. λέον μετὰ ξίφος: Cf. Leutsch-Schneidewin, C.P.G. I. 429. 11 λέον ξίφος ἐγὼν; ἐπὶ τὸν φίλον μὲν ἀνδρείαν, ἐτέραν δὲ προσλαμβανόντων ἐξωθέν βοήθειαν.

471. λασιοκώφος: v.l. of Clarkianus in Plato, Phaedr. 253c, and in Synesios' citation of the passage; cited as a lemma by Hesychius, Photios, and Suidas.

473. μετὰ ἴσης κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 40. 10 ισός μετὰ ἴσης ἐρχεται καί ὁ βραχυίου μετὰ κυρείας.

474. ἐργαμένον κτλ.: Cf. LXX Is. 66. 18 κάκιν τὰ ἐργα αὐτῶν καί τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτῶν ἐπίσταται ἐργαμένον συναγαγείν πάντα τὰ ἐνθέων καί τὰς γλώσσας.


478. ἐμολυνθή κτλ.: Cf. LXX Sirac. 13. 1 ὁἀπτόμενος πίσας μολυνθήσεται. ἀνθρακος γυμνώ πόδι κτλ.: Cf. LXX Prov. 6. 28 περιπατήσει τις ἐν ἀνθρακων πυρός, τοῖς δὲ πόδας οὐ κατακαῦσε;

481. ἀνεστασίς: Not in lexica.

483. πνεύμα γὰρ φησι: Cf. LXX Baruch 3. 1 ψυχὴ ἐν στενοΐς καί πνεύμα ακηδιών κέκραγεν πρύς σὲ. The variant στερνοΐς is not recorded in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint.

485. συνάχθητι κτλ.: Cf. LXX Soph. 2. 1 συνάχθητε καί συνδέθητε τὸ ἔθνος τὸ ἀπαίδευτον, πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι ὡς ἀνθός παραπορευόμενον.

488. ἀνομία γὰρ ἀνάμι κτλ.: Cf. LXX Ezech. 33. 12 ἀνομία ἀσεβοίς ὡς μὴ κακωθεί αὐτῶν ἐν ἀνομίας ἀποστρέψῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν.


492. εἰς μοίραν αντίμαχος κτλ.: Cf. Michael ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης ap. Regel, Pontes Rerum Byzantinarum 144. 6 ἐν τὴν συναγωγήν τοῖς ἔθνοις τοῦτον εἰς ἀνταλλαγμάς ἐκανοντόμησας.

493. ἄνεφραίας κυριόν: I have not found another example of this figurative use of ἄνεφραια.

494. εἰς συνοχὴ καρδίας: Cf. N.T. 2 Cor. 2. 4.

496. τοῦ δοθέντα υπεδέξατο ἄρχηγόν: Cf. p. 179.

501. τὰ προαύλια κτλ.: These are presumably open spaces and parade grounds in the camp. But προαύλιον in Byzantine Greek usually means the forecourt or vestibule of a church.
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508. σχοινίσματα : 'measures of land', i.e. the tents occupied a large area. But the expression is clumsy, and the text may be corrupt.

511. ώς διακατη ψαγμυού : The simile of the bursting dyke or dam seems original.

515. ἔξεδυσάμην κτλ. : Cf. LXX Cant. 5. 3 ἔξεδυσάμην τον χιτώνα μου, πώς ἐν-δύσομαι αὐτόν; 

518. ἐνεπίμητα κτλ. : The imagery is very confused here. αὐτὸν presumably refers to the King of Hungary and not to his χιτών. What the 'purple gate' (κλισιάς=κλεισιάς) is I am not at all clear, except that it is some attribute of the emperor.

532. οἰκίδιον : Apparently 'domestic establishment, household', for which I cannot find another example. But οἰκίδιος=οἰκείος is well attested.

536. ἀπετασθεῖσαν : ἀπετάιῳ not in lexica.

538. ὁμηρεύετο κτλ. : The sentence is very awkward. I take it to mean: 'The truce was guaranteed in particular by the King of Bohemia and other potentates offered as sureties for himself by the King of Hungary; they risking their kingdoms and indeed their lives if he countervened the terms of agreement on which the emperor had desirous to receive him'.

539. τῶ τῆς Βοεμίας ἄρχηγῷ : Cf. ρ. 176.


544. of the Παινιόνος άρχοντες : Does this refer to Stephen III and his heir apparent, the Byzantine protégé Béla - Alexios? Or to the Hungarian notables in general? Byzantine diplomatic relations with Hungary sometimes involved direct dealings with the notables over the head of the King. Cf. Nik. Ak. 166.

545. εἰς ὁικοδομῶν κτλ. : Cf. LXX, Sirac. 34. 23 εἰς οικοδομῶν καί εἰς καύαιρων.


552. ὡς βαθυχειλοί κτλ. : Cf. LXX Ezech. 3. 5 ὡς πρὸς λαὸν βαθυχειλοῦ καὶ βαρύ-γλωσσοῦν συν ἐξαποστέλλῃ πρὸς τὸν Οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. (6) ὡς πρὸς λαοὺς πολλοὺς ἄλλοφωνον καὶ ἄλλογλώσσον, ὡς στιβαροὺς τῇ γλώσσῃ ὄντας (V.I. βαθυγλωσσον). 

553. ὡς κατοπίνυ κτλ. : Cf. LXX Sap. 5. 12 ὡς κατοπίνυ ὑπὸ ἀνέμου διεχύΟη. 5.23 ὡς λαίλαψ ἐκλικμήσει αὐτοῖς.

554. ὡς χανοντητῶν πῦρ κτλ. : Cf. LXX Mal. 3. 2 εἰς πῦρ ἐλεγείται ὡς πῦρ χανοντητῶν καὶ ὡς πῦρ πλυνόντων. Sap. 3. 6 ὡς χανοντὶς ἐν χανοντητῷ ἐδοκίμασεν αὐτοῖς.

558. ἀστρα μέν δή προβέβηκε κτλ. : Cf. II. 10. 252 - 3. 

561. τῶν Εὐρωπαίων Δαρδάνων : To distinguish them from those of Mysia in Asia. On Δαρδανία, corresponding approximately to Yugoslav Macedonia, cf. Ptol. Geog. 3. 9. 6. The ἐπαρχία Δαρδανίας is recorded in Hierocles Synecd. 655 with three cities Σκουμπομητρόπολις, Μηρίων and Ούλπιάνα. This information is repeated in Const. Porph. De Them. 56.

565. τῶν Εὐρωπαίων Λαρδάνων : To distinguish them from those of Mysia in Asia. On Δαρδανία, corresponding approximately to Yugoslav Macedonia, cf. Ptol. Geog. 3. 9. 6. The ἐπαρχία Δαρδανίας is recorded in Hierocles Synecd. 655 with three cities. Σκουμπομητρόπολις, Μηρίων and Ούλπιάνα. This information is repeated in Const. Porph. De Them. 56.

567. ἀπάλειπόν ὡς νεφέλην : Cf. LXX Is. 44. 22 ἀπάλειπται ὡς νεφέλην τὰς ἀνομίας σου, καὶ ὡς γνόφον τὴν ἄμαρτίαν σου.

568. ὁ Βοσναϊος : Bosnia appears as a Hungarian dependency in the titulature
of the King of Hungary in 1103 (Fejer, *Codex Diplomaticus Hungaricus* II, 39), 1135 (ibid. 82) and 1138 (ibid. 109). In 1137 King Béla appoints his son László Duke of Bosnia (ibid. 88). In 1155 and 1163 Boritz, Ban of Bosnia, appears as a Hungarian vassal (Kinn. 131, Fejer, op. cit. II, 166). The river Drina formed the boundary between Bosnia and Serbia (Kinn. 104).

569. ὁ ταινιούχος τῆς Παιονίας ναὸς: The Metropolitan Church of Esztergom (Gran), in which was kept the Holy Crown of Hungary.


572. ἀνατιτλοῦσθαι: Not in lexica. τίτλως is used by Malalas 245. 11 = 'confiscate'.

573. δασμοφορεῖ τὸ πῶς: Manuel's policy towards Hungary as early as 1161 was directed partly towards the extraction of tribute. Cf. Nik. Ak. 166 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς...κατὰ νόμον ἀναπολῆσας ως...σχοινί ἠν τὰ πρώτα κλέος αὐτὸς, ἔφειτα ἡ βασιλεία Ῥωμαίων μέρος ἵσως ἑκτίθεν δασμοῦ. The whole passage is interesting in the light of subsequent events.

581. τοῖς ἐνδεκα...ἀρχηγοῖς:Apparently eleven Hungarian notables surrendered as hostages. The syntax of this passage is confused, and the text may be corrupt. is ἀρχηγοῖς...ἐκδεδώκοσι a second instrumental dative parallel to σφραγίσιν διαπτώτοις, or is it a dative absolute, a not infrequent construction in Byzantine Greek (cf. G. Böhlig, *op. cit.* 123).

583. ἀνεκμόχλευτον: Not in lexica

590. φρενός εξέπλευσαν: Cf. Herod. frg. 3. 155, Suidas s.v. ἐκπλεύσαντες=Aelian frg. 240.

291. ώς κάλαμος ὑποκεκυφώς: Cf. LXX II Mac. 2. 21. κράδάνας αὐτὸν ὡς κάλαμον ὑπά ἀνέμου.

593. οἱ διαλογισμοὶ σου ἐνεβαθώθησαν: Cf. LXX Ps. 91 (92), 5 σφοδρὰ ἐβαθώθησαν οἱ διαλογισμοὶ σου. The variant ἐνεβαθώθησαν is introduced, no doubt unconsciously, in order to ensure an even number of syllables between the last two accented syllables of the sentence. Michael observes this Byzantine practice with great strictness.

595. πρὸς τὸν ἱερὸν Ἰορδάνην καταίροντα: Cf. p. 177-178.
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