

International Workshop

“Edition and Interpretation”

University of Cyprus, 6–8 December 2013

Abstracts

Eirini AFENTOULIDOU-LEITGEB – Jürgen FUCHSBAUER (Vienna)

The *Dioptra* and its Versions as a Challenge for the Editors

The *Dioptra* is a work of approximately 7000 political verses written in 1095 by Philippos Monotropos. Two years later a revised version, originating in the circle of Philippos, was released. The *Dioptra* is structured in five books: the *Klauthmoi*, a poem of contrition addressed to the Soul, and four books of a dialogue between the Soul and the Body, which are personified as Mistress and Maid. In the Dialogue, the Soul poses questions on various theological and philosophical issues, to which the Body replies, basing its answers mainly on scriptural and patristic knowledge. Because of the themes discussed, the simple language, the metre, and a certain literary character the *Dioptra* became immensely popular in the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine periods, as is testified by 82 manuscripts transmitting the *Dioptra* as a whole or in excerpts. Around the middle of the 14th century the *Dioptra* was translated into Middle Bulgarian Church Slavonic. Thenceforth it enjoyed great popularity also among the orthodox Slavs, to which 200 extant manuscripts deriving from the 14th to the 19th century bear witness.

A critical edition of both the Greek and the Slavonic *Dioptra* has been a desideratum for a long time. The project “Die *Dioptra* des Philippos Monotropos” (Einzelprojekt Nr. P18245) and the follow-up projects “The Slavonic Translation of the *Dioptra*” and “*Dioptra*. Edition of the Greek Version” (Einzelprojekte P21250 and P21811 respectively), financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), intend to fill this gap. In our paper we shall discuss the specific challenges this text posed to us when editing – albeit in separate volumes – both the Greek original and its Slavonic translation and present the solutions we found.

Theodora ANTONOPOULOU (Athens)

Editing and Interpreting Homilies and Hagiographical Works

My paper will focus on two unedited hagiographical works: the ancient *Passion of St Clement of Ancyra*, of which I am currently preparing the *editio princeps*, and the *Life of John Chrysostom* by Nicetas David of Paphlagonia, of which the *editio princeps* is forthcoming, prepared by S. Paschalides and myself.

In the first case I will present the complex situation posed by the manuscript tradition of the text as exemplified in its opening lines, as well as a probable source which is crucial for the constitution of the text of this passage.

In the second case I will focus on the perplexing relationship of the text with its sources and its subsequent uses, and present some of the issues involved.

A couple of homilies also come into question in relation to these texts.

Albrecht BERGER (Munich)

Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos

Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos wurde um 1310 begonnen; die Arbeit daran wurde, bevor sie vollendet war, in den Jahren nach 1320 eingestellt. Im erhaltenen bzw. ausgeführten Teil wird die Geschichte der Kirche von den Anfängen bis um das Jahr 600 nach alten Quellen beschrieben, die Fortsetzung bis zum Jahr 912 ist in der Inhaltsangabe zu Beginn noch erwähnt.

Der *codex unicus* des Werks, der Vindob. hist. gr. 8, galt lange als Widmungs-exemplar für den Kaiser Andronikos II. Palaiologos, der im einleitenden Enkomion angeredet wird, ist aber tatsächlich wohl einige Jahrzehnte jünger. Als Arbeits-grundlage wurden außerdem mehrere Handschriften mit den Texten der spät-antiken Kirchenhistoriker und mit Exzerpten angefertigt, von denen der Bodl. gr. 142 die wichtigste ist.

Da die Kirchengeschichte zum Großteil aus Paraphrasen und Zitaten älteren Materials besteht, müssen im *apparatus fontium* die von Nikephoros tatsächlich herangezogenen Sekundärquellen von den Primärquellen seiner Vorlagen unterschieden werden. Im Bereich der nicht-literarischen Quellen sind die Nachrichten des Nikephoros aus älteren Texten oft inhaltlich bekannt, ohne dass sich aber eine konkrete Quelle festlegen ließe.

Die Edition soll sich im Sinn einer quasi-diplomatischen Praxis bei der Gliederung des Textes und der Interpunktion mehr als bisher zumeist üblich am *codex unicus* orientieren. Hier muss diskutiert werden, inwieweit dieses Verfahren sinnvoll ist und wo seine Grenzen liegen.

David BIRNBAUM (Pittsburgh) – Lara SELS (Leuven)

see Lara SELS (Leuven) – David BIRNBAUM (Pittsburgh)

Andrea CUOMO (Vienna)

Ioannes Kananos, his Language and his Sources:
Thoughts about a New Critical Edition

In the first part of my paper, I will focus on the apparent dichotomy between the rhetoric competence of Ioannes Kananos, which emerges from the prologue, and the so called *soloicobarbara elocutio*, which characterizes the whole account of the siege of Constantinople in 1422. In the second one, I will point out Kananos' communicative strategies and the pragmatic function of some (patristic?) quotations.

I will address some complementary questions concerning the role of the editor of Byzantine texts as well as the research project 'Imitation / Innovation: The Vocabulary of Late Byzantine History Writing', financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF – Project nr. P23912-G19).

John DAVIS (Athens) – Martin HINTERBERGER (Nicosia)

Editing Byzantine Metaphrases:
the Experience of Editing the Metaphrase of the *Chronike Diegesis*

In the 1340s an anonymous author (or authors) transposed Nicetas Choniates' *Chronike Diegesis* into a linguistically and stylistically simplified form.

Our principal hypothesis is that the Metaphrasis was meant to be read independently of Choniates' History, that it makes sense by itself, and accordingly deserves its own independent edition.

The critical edition of this text poses specific problems that stem from two main facts:

- 1) The Metaphrasis occasionally transgresses established rules of spelling, morphology and syntax. Though not a truly vernacular text, the “transgressions” which it contains nevertheless reflect the background pressure of the vernacular (e.g. modern nominal paradigms or verbal forms, conflation of indicative and subjunctive). Accordingly, on a case by case basis the editor has to decide whether genuine scribal error has occurred or whether certain rules simply have less authority, and require less strict adherence, in texts of this kind.
- 2) In its unusual status as a reworking of an already existing older text, the “message” of the Metaphrasis is, of course, largely dependent on the “message” of the *Chronike Diegesis*. In several instances, however, the Metaphrast appears deliberately to depart from his source text, providing a new meaning that nevertheless makes clear sense. Elsewhere, it is evident that semantic differences between the Metaphrasis and the original History are indeed due to misinterpretation or misunderstanding by the Metaphrast, such that the text becomes garbled or, at worse, meaningless. In other words, again, the editors of this text have to decide to what extent it is appropriate to “correct” or “repair” the Metaphrasis by appealing to Choniates' original.

We feel that the purpose of the Metaphrasis was not to standardise or present a model for emulation, and must therefore be allowed to stand, by and large, “as is”, without excessive editorial intervention or correction.

Charalambos DENDRINOS (London)

An Electronic Edition of George Etheridge's Greek Autograph Encomium on Henry VIII Addressed to Elizabeth I

The paper presents the electronic edition of the autograph Greek Encomium on King Henry VIII addressed to Queen Elizabeth I composed by Dr George Etheridge, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Oxford in 1566. The first part of the paper is devoted to the author and the text. It briefly examines Etheridge's life and career, dominated by the ever changing events related to English Reformation, and the circumstances that gave rise to the composition of his Encomium, which is preserved in the British Library Royal MS 16 C X. Composed in verse, this short rhetorical text sheds further light not only on the life and personality of the author but also on the reception and development of Greek studies in Tudor England, highlighting Henry's cultural politics through the establishment of Regius Professorships at Oxford and Cambridge. It also reflects the national concern for Elizabeth's succession as a precondition for the security of the kingdom. The second part of the paper presents the electronic edition of the text concentrating on new approaches and techniques involving digital humanities developed for this purpose, including the production of an original interface which dynamically links corresponding words in the manuscript digital image with the transcribed and edited Greek text, English translation, online dictionaries, editorial comments, historical and philological annotation, and palaeographical, codicological and textual information. A separate section of the edition introduces the reader/user to the British Library's Greek manuscript collection currently being digitised.

The product of collaboration between the British Library and a team of scholars, postgraduate students and technical advisers at the Hellenic Institute of Royal Holloway, University of London, this on-going interactive and exploratory editorial project, which combines traditional scholarship with innovative technology, is accessible online, free of charge, at:

<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Etheridge/>

Christian GASTGEBER (Vienna)

Editing the Register Books of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (14th c.): Between Contemporary Copies and Original Texts

The *hieron kodikion* of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (usually referred to as „register“) confronts the editors with a mixture of an intentional collection of copied documents (and, occasionally, subscriptions) and original texts which seem to exist only in these versions unless copies were handed over to involved persons (e.g. confessions of faith). By using the (classical) philological editing method for both types editors ignore the rules of diplomatic editions; the mode of editing was up to now a mixture of both systems. This text transmission provokes a deeper discussion of handling copied and original (including autograph) texts and respecting their script peculiarities.

Besides, documents summarizing and explaining the preceding actions which caused a special decision and extending over some clauses and sub-clauses, evince a particular punctuation form: a *hypodiastole maior* as one could term it: a marker for the reader in order to indicate the turn from the subordinate clauses to the main clause. As Byzantine punctuation is a very controversial point of discussion among editors, such aspects, useful for the Byzantine as well as the modern reader (at least to understand the Byzantine reading and composition units), drop off their agenda.

Documents are moreover good examples of audience manipulation, a fact which “classical” printed edition cannot highlight. It is therefore argued in favour of co-respecting sociolinguistic aspects as regards the effect on the audience from linguistic and psychagogic point of view by starting with multi-functional e-publications.

Antonia GIANNOULI (Nicosia)

Editing Byzantine Commentaries and Exegetical Works

According to Martin West, some kinds of texts have always been subject to “revision or rearrangement”, because they were “rightly regarded as collections of material to be pruned, adapted or added to, rather than as sacrosanct literary entities”. Not only do commentaries and exegetical works belong to this category, but so did the sources they are based on. The detection of the “direct” sources (*fontes*) is thus often an insurmountable challenge to an editor, in her/his attempts to reconstruct the compositional method used by the author of their text. But, even when these sources come to light, further questions arise; issues which test the possibilities of the “conventional” editions, as well as an editor’s skill in terms of both textual criticism and editorial technique.

In my paper, I will illustrate some of these questions by referring to two specific examples derived from work in progress.

- a. The first one concerns a theological commentary on the Great Canon by Andrew of Crete dating back to the first half of the thirteenth century, but which also survives in a later – partly divergent – version from the fifteenth century. Additionally, one of its main sources has been detected; a text, which has been incorporated in it in full and verbatim. Since all the texts, the source and the two versions of the commentary, remain unedited, a critical and synoptic edition seems more appropriate to demonstrate the commentary tradition on the liturgical hymn.
- b. The second case concerns the exegetical orations on psalms composed by Leon Balianites, a teacher in the Patriarchate at the end of the twelfth century. It has been detected that the texts, which are written in high level language, are based on a catena that was well known at that time. In this case, the author uses his source selectively; he chooses passages, rephrases and adapts them according to his requirements and personal taste. Since the catena is not critically edited (apart from some excerpts from the Fathers), a critical edition of the oration citing the relevant passages from the catena seems to be the best way of revealing the compositional technique of this Byzantine teacher.

Stefan HAGEL (Vienna)

Handling Textual Variants and Parallel Versions with the *Classical Text Editor*

The presentation of variants of texts and textual variants – a distinction about the boundaries of which “old” and “new” philology may disagree – presents particular problems, whether envisaged in print or electronically. I will discuss these and possible approaches focusing on the *Classical Text Editor* as a tool for collation, text establishment, layout and preparation of a TEI-encoded edition.

Diether Roderich REINSCH (Berlin)

Editionen als hermeneutische Vorgaben: Die fünf Ausgaben der *Chronographia* des Michael Psellos zwischen 1874 und 2015

Der Beitrag behandelt die Rolle der Editionen für die Einschätzung des Textes der *Chronographia* durch die Leser. Das beginnt beim Redaktor, der das Werk als Teil einer Weltgeschichte in die Vorlage des *codex unicus* Parisinus gr. 1712 eingebaut hat und bei dem wahrscheinlich von ihm stammenden Titel „Chronographia“, der nur sehr bedingt über den Inhalt Auskunft gibt. Es wird dann dargelegt, welche verschiedenen Titel die modernen Editoren verwendet haben und wie sie mit der überlieferten Bucheinteilung umgegangen sind. Dabei wird ihre Tendenz deutlich, dass sie dem Text ein Prinzip aufnötigen, das sie für richtig halten, aber so nicht vorgefunden haben. Ähnlich steht es mit der Untergliederung der Bücher in einzelne Abschnitte und Kapitel. Auch hier verfahren die Editoren zum Teil willkürlich, wodurch der vorgegebene Rhythmus der Erzählung verändert wird; im Extremfall führt das bis zum handgreiflichen Missverständnis des Textes. Es wird kurz skizziert, wie die neue Edition verfahren wird.

Der zweite Teil des Beitrags beschäftigt sich mit der Behandlung der *fontes* und *testimonia* in den bisherigen Editionen. In nennenswertem Umfang hat nur Criscuolo in der Edition von Impellizzeri (Mailand 1984) *fontes* verzeichnet; sein Verfahren wird kritisiert. Ein eigener *apparatus testimoniorum* wird zum ersten Mal der neuen Ausgabe beigegeben. Er soll helfen, die Rezeption des Textes durch nachfolgende Autoren klarer zu zeichnen. Am Beispiel einer bereits von anderen mehrfach behandelten Stelle wird versucht, das Verhältnis zwischen der *Chronographia* und dem Werk des Attaleiates zu klären.

Die Editoren geben so auf vielfältige Weise einen hermeneutischen Rahmen für den in ihnen edierten Text vor.

Alexander RIEHLE (Vienna)

Editing Byzantine Letter-Collections:
Hermeneutical Implications, Methodological Challenges, Practical Solutions

The Byzantine letter as it survives today has gone through a process of multiple physical and functional transformations. Most commonly serving as a medium of communication between two or more spatially separated people, letters were subsequently often “re-functionalized”. Authors regularly kept copies of their missives so as to reuse the texts for various purposes: as samples for future letters, to show or send them to other people, to read (or rather perform) them in gatherings of *litterati*, and to incorporate them into a collection of their writings. In these contexts, the letters assumed new functions and meanings. In the framework of a collection, letters that were originally not related, but shared similarities in terms of their subject matter, literary motifs or compositional structure, were often grouped together in order to create a seamless transition from letter to letter, thus providing the collection with a continuous narrative. In this sense, a letter-collection can be regarded not only as assemblage of disjointed texts, but as an independent, coherent literary work. Moreover, in order to adapt a letter to its new context, its text was – sometimes significantly – changed. Through these processes of re-functionalization the surviving “letters” have become multi-layered texts.

This paper argues that representing such multi-layeredness in a critical edition is of paramount importance for an adequate understanding and interpretation of Byzantine epistolary literature, and highlights the challenges and possibilities of editing letter-collections in this light.

Charlotte ROUECHÉ (London)

Why Digitise Kekaumenos?

The digital edition of Kekaumenos has just (November 2013) been published online, at <http://www.ancientwisdoms.ac.uk/library/kekaumenos-consilia-et-narrationes/>

In the paper I shall explain the thinking behind it and the problems which we experienced; explore the advantages – and the disadvantages – of this approach to publications; and invite comments and suggestions from other participants.

Reconciling Diplomatic Editions of Manuscripts with Critical Editions of Texts

The simultaneous preparation of diplomatic editions of manuscripts and critical editions of texts often entails separate effort, such as the manual transcription of a manuscript for diplomatic publication followed by the manual normalisation of that transcription for use in a text-critical edition. The normalisation process is especially important where textual variants are to be collated with the help of computational alignment tools because computers are effective at exact string matching, but may not easily distinguish significant from superficial variation in surface forms in situations where the match is only partial. Our current research, which explores several manuscript traditions from different periods and locations in the Orthodox Slavic world, seeks to use diplomatic transcriptions directly as the input for the collation of variants, so that the researcher does not have to prepare separate transcriptions for the two purposes or edit one manually to turn it into the other. Because the available open-source applications with which we are acquainted (e.g., Juxta, CollateX) are not easily able to collate texts that exhibit the degree of orthographic variation that is common in the Slavonic tradition, we are developing, in Python, our own open-source tool, using a modification of the Soundex algorithm for pattern matching and an implementation of suffix tries for the efficient identification and alignment of corresponding variants in our witnesses.

The present methodological report is part of an ongoing collaborative project to prepare diplomatic and text-critical editions of materials from the middle Bulgarian *Vidin miscellany*, which will be explored as a case study at the ATTEMPT workshop at King's College London, 19–20 December 2014.

Raimondo Tocci (Komotini)

Zwischen Tradition und Neuerung: Zur Edition byzantinischer Geschichtswerke

Unsere Kenntnisse der Orthographie, Akzentuierung und Interpunktion byzantinischer Handschriften sind in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten durch zahlreiche Abhandlungen bereichert worden. Dennoch bedarf es zweifelsohne, wie Diether Roderich Reinsch in seinem Nachwort zu dem im Jahr 2009 in Wien abgehaltenen Workshop "Vom Codex zur Edition" im Zusammenhang mit der Editionspraxis hochsprachlicher byzantinischer Prosatexte bemerkte, weiterer detaillierter Untersuchungen zur Praxis einzelner Autoren und Zeitabschnitte auf diesen Feldern. Die daraus gewonnenen Ergebnisse werden einem zu erstellenden Ratgeber für künftige Editoren hochsprachlicher byzantinischer Texte gewiss dienlich sein.

Im Referat soll der Befund zu Orthographie, Akzentuierung und Interpunktion in Handschriften, welche die sogenannte *Epitome* des Ioannes Kinnamos überliefern, an ausgewählten Beispielen vorgestellt und diskutiert werden. Im Blickfeld der Untersuchung stehen der Vaticanus gr. 163 aus dem 13. Jh. (Haupthandschrift der *Epitome*), der Neapolitanus gr. III B 26 aus dem späten 16. Jh., der aus dem Vaticanus geflossen ist, und der Vaticanus Barb. gr. 192 aus dem ersten Viertel des 17. Jh., der auf den Neapolitanus zurückgeht. Der Kopist der Haupthandschrift ist uns nicht bekannt. Es handelt sich aber um eine sorgfältige, fehlerarme, mit zahlreichen Abkürzungen versehene Kopie eines gebildeten Schreibers, in der der byzantinische Usus auf den genannten Feldern für viele Phänomene zu konstatieren ist. Der Neapolitanus wurde von Alexandros Laskaris, der am *Collegio Greco* in Rom Philosophie und Theologie studierte und später dort Altgriechisch und Latein lehrte, angefertigt (Identifikation mit Alexandros Laskaris von mir vorgeschlagen auf dem CIPG 2013). Für die Kopie der *Epitome*, überliefert im Barb. gr. 192, zeichnet Leo Allatius verantwortlich. Die erstellten Kopien werden als quasi eigenständige Editionen der *Epitome* aufgefasst, welche der Interpretation durch ihre Kopisten/Editoren unterliegen.

In diesem Rahmen soll darüber hinaus der These nachgegangen werden, ob und, wenn ja, inwieweit die Abwendung vom byzantinischen Usus, die für die Edition des Altphilologen August Meineke vom Jahr 1836 bezeugt werden kann, bereits in der postbyzantinischen Überlieferung der *Epitome* zu beobachten ist. Die Erhärtung dieser These erhellt den Wandel der Editionspraxis der *Epitome* im Laufe der Jahrhunderte und liefert ein weiteres Argument für die Berücksichtigung bzw. Beibehaltung der byzantinischen Gewohnheiten in den Bereichen Orthographie, Akzentuierung und Interpunktion in der anzufertigenden Neuedition der *Historia* des Ioannes Kinnamos.

Elisabeth SCHIFFER (Vienna)

Editing Byzantine Hagiographical Metaphrases:
Problems and Possibilities

*Metaphrása*is, for some time now aptly referred to as “intralingual translations into another literary register”, are read and analyzed for various aspects, *i.e.* mostly with a philological, historical or socio-historical objective. Speaking of hagiographical *metaphrása*is we are allowed to presume also religio-historical and, in some cases, theological interests of their modern readers. An edition of a hagiographical *metáphrasis* has therefore to meet several kinds of requirements: in addition to working on a text-edition (and ideally on a translation), editors are expected to scrutinize the relationship between the texts and their models and to describe and visualize the process of rewriting. For this reason we are used to prepare the text in a dissected form. Breaking up the text into its component parts is a necessary studying tool, while we should keep in mind that this might be detrimental to the readability of the edition, when we are going to present the text to the modern reader. It is through these challenges that the editor of a *metáphrasis* has to find his way.

On the occasion of this workshop examples will be drawn from the *Life* of St John Chrysostom (BHG 875) which is transmitted within the Menologion related to Symeon Metaphrastes. This *vita* stands quite at the end of a row of adaptations of the *Life* of the popular saint. The Metaphrast has also incorporated – dependently as well as independently – passages originating from the literary remains of John Chrysostom himself. Thus we face various layers of the text demanding our interpretation.

Sonja SCHÖNAUER (Cologne)

Work in Permanent Progress

Mutual Amendments in the Manuscripts of Ioannes Kantakuzenos' *Historiai*?