Metaphrasis

Mapping Premodern Rewriting

Stavroula Constantinou

[S]ince rewritings can be shown to have had a not negligible impact on the evolution of literatures of the past, the study of rewritings should no longer be neglected. Those engaged in that study will have to ask themselves who rewrites, why, under what circumstances, for which audience.¹

1 Introduction

Rewriting—the inter- and intralingual reworking of a previous text—is for the famous Franco-Czech novelist and critic Milan Kundera not just as a creative act as writing, but also an act that “calls for even more talent, cultivation, and creative power than writing [...] does.”² Indeed rewriting is, as Michelle Woods points out, Kundera’s “*modus operandi*,” the inherent nature of his poetics.³ Woods shows how, on the one hand, Kundera rewrites his first works in Czech, which now exist in various and extensively rewritten editions, and how, on the other hand, he reworks his translated work to generate diverse versions of supposedly the same text in both the same and different languages.⁴ Rewriting,

- 1 André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (Abingdon, UK, 2017), p. 5.
- 2 Milan Kundera, *Testaments Betrayed: An Essay in Nine Parts*, trans. Linda Asher (New York, 1996), p. 268.
- 3 Michelle Woods, *Translating Milan Kundera* (Topics in Translation) 30 (Buffalo, NY, 2006), p. 62.
- 4 As Woods emphatically remarks, Kundera’s novel *The Joke*, for instance, exists in four versions in Czech (1967, 1968, 1969, 1991), three versions in French (1968, 1980, 1985), and five versions in English (1969, 1969, 1970, 1983, 1993), *Translating Milan Kundera*, p. 66.

which Kundera himself describes as “the spirit of our times,”⁵ is according to a number of contemporary theorists, such as Jean Baudrillard, Linda Hutcheon, Fredric Jameson, and Christian Moraru, an essential feature of postmodern literature and culture.⁶

What has been described as postmodernism’s “urge to retell” is in fact a persistent characteristic of Western literature from antiquity to the present:⁷ from Homer to Nonnos of Panopolis, to Symeon Metaphrastes, to Boccaccio, and to Margaret Atwood.⁸ As pointed out in the oldest surviving *progymnasmata*—ancient and Byzantine textbooks teaching among other things the art of rewriting⁹—which was produced by Ailios Theon probably in the 1st century CE,

5 Milan Kundera, *The Art of the Novel*, trans. Linda Asher (New York, 1988), p. 149.

6 Jean Baudrillard, *The Illusion of the End*, trans. Chris Turner (Stanford, CA, 1994); Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-century Art Forms* (New York, 1985); Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction* (New York, 1988); Hutcheon, *The Politics of Postmodernism* (London, 1989); Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC, 1991); Christian Moraru, *Rewriting: Postmodern Narrative and Cultural Critique in the Age of Cloning* (Albany, NY, 2001).

7 James A. Schiff, “Contemporary Retellings: A *Thousand Acres* as the Latest *Lear*,” *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 39.4 (1998), 367–81, at 367.

8 The Homeric works retell oral poetry (see, for example, Gregory Nagy, *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge, UK, 1996); Nagy, *Homeric Questions* (Austin, TX, 1996)). In the 5th century CE, Nonnos produced a *paraphrase* of Saint John’s Gospel in hexameters (see, for instance, Mary Whitby, “The Bible Hellenized: Nonnus’ *Paraphrase* of St. John’s Gospel and Eudocia’s Homeric Centos,” in *Texts and Culture in Late Antiquity: Inheritance, Authority, and Change*, ed. J. H. D. Scourfield (Swansea, UK, 2007), pp. 195–232 and Part 3 in Domenico Accorini, ed., *Brill’s Companion to Nonnus of Panopolis* (Boston, MA, 2016), pp. 215–350). Symeon Metaphrastes whose work will be further discussed in this volume (see below, pp. 8–9, 17, 26, 48–49, and mainly Chapters 8 and 10) is the Byzantine hagiographical rewriter par excellence (see Christian Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes: Rewriting and Canonization* (Copenhagen: 2002) and Høgel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement,” in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, ed. Stephanos Efthymiadis, 2 vols. (Farnham, UK, 2011–14), 2:181–96). For instance, Boccaccio’s novel *Il Filocolo* constitutes a rewriting of the 12th-century popular medieval romance *Floire et Blancheflor* (see, for example, Roberta Morosini, “Boccaccio the Poet-Philosopher of the *Filocolo*: Rewriting *Floire et Blancheflor* and Writing Literary Theory,” *Exemplaria* 18.2 (2006), 275–98). Finally, Atwood’s novella *The Penelopiad: The Myth of Penelope and Odysseus* (2005) rewrites Homer’s *Odyssey* (see, for example, Gabrielle Neethling, “Margaret Atwood’s Exploration of Homer’s Penelope in Her Novella *The Penelopiad*,” *English Academy Review* 32.2 (2015), 115–31, and Elodie Rousselot, “Re-Writing Myth, Femininity, and Violence in Margaret Atwood’s *The Penelopiad*,” in *Myth and Violence in the Contemporary Female Text: New Cassandras*, ed. Sanja Bahun-Radunović and V. G. Julie Rajan (Burlington, VT, 2011), pp. 131–44).

9 There is a considerable bibliography on *progymnasmata*; see, for instance, David J. Fleming, “The Very Idea of a *Progymnasmata*,” *Rhetoric Review* 22.2 (2003), 105–20; Craig A. Gibson, “The Evidence of the Treatises on *Progymnasmata*,” *Classical Philology* 99 (2004), 103–29; Malcolm Heath, “Theon and the History of the *Progymnasmata*,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 43 (2002/03), 129–60; Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der*

Μαρτύρια δὲ τούτου καὶ παρὰ ποιηταῖς [...] καὶ ἱστορικοῖς, καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντες οἱ παλαιοὶ φαίνονται τῇ παραφράσει ἄριστα κεχρημένοι, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀλλήλων μεταπλάσσοντες. (*Progymnasmata*, 62.21–25)

There is evidence of this and in poets and historians [...], and in brief, all ancient writers seem to have used paraphrase (*paraphrasis*) in the best possible way, rephrasing (*metaplasis*) not only their own writings but those of each other.¹⁰

Theon goes on to give examples of how an author is rewritten by and rewrites another writer or himself. He shows, for instance, how Homer is rewritten by Archilochos, Demosthenes, and Aeschines; how Theopompos, Demosthenes, and Philistos rewrite Thucydides; and how Demosthenes paraphrases his own writings (*Progymnasmata*, 62.26–33, 63.1–29, 64.1–24). Theon does not restrict himself to giving examples of authors who have employed rewriting, but he also suggests rewriting exercises for students and prospective authors. These exercises are found in a part of his treatise which has not survived in its original form, but in an Armenian translation.¹¹ Theon's exercises concern either rewritings of one author's work in the style of another (e.g. the rewriting of a Lysian speech in the style of Demosthenes) or rewritings of given passages by keeping as much as possible their wording.¹² For Theon, there are four major types of rewriting: "variation in syntax, by addition, by subtraction, and by substitution, plus combinations of these."¹³ Translation (change from one language to another) and transliteration (change of literary form, for example, from prose to verse and vice versa) are also considered by Theon and his successors as rewriting methods.¹⁴

Theon's treatment clearly manifests that rewriting is a constant and ongoing process through which literature from the era of Homer until his own times evolves, a fact that is repeated centuries later in André Lefevere's words that constitute this chapter's epigraph. In short, Theon proves true the idea that

Byzantiner, 2 vols. (Munich, 1978), 1:92–120; Ruth Webb, "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden, 2001), pp. 289–316.

10 Ed. in Michel Patillon and Giancarlo Bolognesi, *Aelius Theon, Progymnasmata* (Paris, 2002); trans. (with a slight modification) in George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World) 10 (Atlanta, GA, 2003), p. 6.

11 It is edited in Patillon and Bolognesi, *Aelius Theon*, pp. 102–12.

12 See Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, pp. 64, 70–71.

13 Trans. in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 70.

14 Fleming, "Idea of a *Progymnasmata*," p. 108.

rewriting is “as old as the literary system itself,” and, therefore, “one could argue that all writing is a ‘rewriting,’” yet “not all writing is rewriting in the same sense.”¹⁵ Literally, to rewrite a text means to write it once again. Thus, rewriting might involve a number of various undertakings: copying a manuscript, editing or reediting a text, translating, paraphrasing, and adapting a work, writing from memory, and retelling a myth, legend, or story that circulates both orally and in a written form.

Premodernity, therefore, in which there is no fixed text, but different realizations of a work (e.g. epic, apocryphal acts, novel/romance, paradoxography, martyr legend, chronicle, and hymn) that derive from both an oral and manuscript transmission, constitutes the rewriting culture par excellence.¹⁶ To name the great instability of premodern texts, the famous Swiss-French and Canadian medievalist Paul Zumthor has coined the term “*mouvance*,”¹⁷ which concerns a dynamic process of variation involving writing, speaking, improvisation, modification, scribal intervention, adaptation, reinterpretation, translation, and dissemination. Yet rewriting in premodernity is not just the natural consequence of an oral and manuscript culture, but also an essential element of its ideology and aesthetics.

Ancient epic and tragic poets, for instance, draw their stories from a familiar “myth kitty” while medieval authors often take their own non-Christian story matter from their ancient predecessors. For medieval authors, further sources for drawing their story matter constitute also the Bible and the writings of the early Christian authors. In general, premodern authors are not interested in achieving originality; they show their “artistry less in [their] invention than in [their] plotting—that is, in [their] adaptation of familiar myths.”¹⁸ Medieval

15 Didier Coste, “Rewriting, Literariness, Literary History,” *La Revue LISA* 2.5 (2004), 8–25, at 10 and 8. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4000/lisa.2893>. Accessed Aug. 27, 2019.

16 For example, Dennis MacDonald, Virginia Burrus, and Christine Thomas have shown how different versions of apocryphal acts originate from oral traditions (Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia, PA, 1983); Virginia Burrus, *Chastity as Autonomy: Women in the Stories of the Apocryphal Acts* (Studies in Women and Religion) 23 (Lewiston, NY, 1987); Christine M. Thomas, *The Acts of Peter, Gospel Literature, and the Ancient Novel: Rewriting the Past* (Oxford, 2003)). Thomas in particular has demonstrated how the numerous versions of the *Acts of Peter* are updated throughout time according to their contemporary oral retellings, and how these versions reflect the fluidity of oral tradition.

17 Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris, 1972), pp. 65–75 and “Intertextualité et mouvance” *Littérature* 41 (1981), 8–16.

18 Genevieve Liveley, *Narratology* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 35 and 37; see also Rubén R. Dupertuis, “Writing and Imitation: Greek Education in the Greco-Roman World,” *Forum* 1.1 (2007),

authors in particular constantly strive to show how their own pieces are in accordance with or constitute continuations, improvements, updatings, clarifications, and interpretations of previous highly regarded works, either ancient or medieval, since it is “through their contribution to an ongoing tradition” that they “gain authority.”¹⁹ To these ends, medieval authors engage in extensive borrowing and reworking, and in so doing they become the forefathers of their postmodern counterparts.²⁰

Even though Kundera's rewritings, which constitute powerful manifestations of what he understands as literary creativity, resemble ancient and medieval rewrites, there is, generally speaking, an essential difference between premodern and postmodern rewriting. The first is mostly, as Moraru has described it, “*underwriting*”; it validates, celebrates, and updates the model text. The second in contrast, is mainly a “*counterwriting*”; it undoes the previous text and its ideologies.²¹ For Moraru, as well as for the aforementioned theorists of postmodernism, current rewritings, in contrast to their premodern counterparts, convey an urgent need to revise, subvert, and strongly criticize previous literary representations of the Western culture's foundational stories, which promote patriarchal and imperial ideologies.

As suggested above, rewriting can take various forms. For the purposes of the present volume, which is devoted to medieval, mostly Byzantine Greek, hagiographical rewriting, Moraru's definition is largely adopted:

I define rewriting as an *intertextual form* that entails a strong tie to “chronologically *prior works*,” the “trace” of which is *discernible* in the text (Owen Miller 28, 31) and is marked by the author as an “*intentional*” presence

3–29, at 13. For the issue of originality in Byzantine culture, see Antony R. Littlewood, *Originality in Byzantine Literature and Music* (Oxford, 1995). As for the Western Middle Ages, see Gerald L. Bruns, “The Originality of Texts in a Manuscript Culture,” *Comparative Literature* 32.2 (1980), 113–29. See also, Simon Gaunt, *Retelling the Tale: An Introduction to Medieval French Literature* (London, 2001).

19 Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Nicholas Watson, Andrew Taylor, and Ruth Evans, “Authorizing Text and Writer,” in *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory, 1280–1520*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Nicholas Watson, Andrew Taylor, and Ruth Evans (Pennsylvania, 1999), pp. 1–18, at p. 5.

20 For the affinities between medieval and postmodern authors, see Carolyn Dinshaw, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham, NC, 1999). For the “postmodernity” of Byzantine writers in particular, see Stavroula Constantinou, “A Byzantine Hagiographical Parody: The *Life of Mary the Younger*,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 34.2 (2010), 160–81.

21 Moraru, *Rewriting*, pp. 6–10.

rather than as an elusive, faint “echo” (Hollander 64). [...] Rewriting as *re-creation dislocates* the *hierarchical relationship* between the original and the replica, the donor and the receiver of forms. (emphasis added)²²

What is mostly under examination here, therefore, is not Zumthor’s *mouvance* that defines medieval textuality, which is inherently fluid and unstable, but the conscious and intentional rewriting of a previous (mostly canonical) text. The model text is traced in the rewrite, and it constitutes the reason for the latter’s creation. Evidently, the rewrite is mainly analyzed and understood through the model text: the language, style, form, and character of the first are examined in relation to those of the second. To a great extent thus, a literary analysis of a rewrite is a comparative discussion in which the model text and its rewriting are treated in equal terms (“rewriting [...] dislocates the hierarchical relationship between the original and the replica”).²³ Concerning medieval literature, nevertheless, it is not always easy to undertake a comparative analysis between the original text and its rewrite, either because the first has not survived or because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to establish which version of the model text was used by the rewriter.²⁴ A case in point is the monumental work of Symeon Metaphrastes, a large collection of saints’ legends consisting

22 Moraru, *Rewriting*, pp. 19 and 128. The references that Moraru makes to Miller, Hollander, and Lefevere are from the following works: Owen Miller, “Intertextual Identity,” in *Identity and the Literary Text*, ed. Mario J. Valdés and Owen Miller (Toronto, 1985); John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley, CA, 1981); André Lefevere, “Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites?,” in *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, ed. Theo Hermans (London, 1985), p. 234.

23 Rita Copland, for example, shows how medieval writers, such as Chaucer and Gower, produce “secondary translations” through which they proclaim their independence as vernacular authors and implicitly assert equal status with the classical *auctores* they rewrite (*Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge, UK, 1991), pp. 179–220). See also Christian Høgel, “The Authority of Translators: Vendors, Manufacturers, and Materiality in the Transfer of Barlaam and Josaphat along the Silk Road,” *Postscripts* 8.3 (2012), 221–41.

24 Referring to hagiographical rewritings, Kristoffel Demoen puts it thus: “A major problem every scholar has to face is the uncertainty about which old text(s) was or were used by the redactor. Even in the (utopian) best case, when both all the known premetaphrastic versions of a *Life* and the *metaphrasis* itself are available in critical editions—or when the scholar has access to manuscripts of the several versions—it always remains possible that intermediate versions, now lost, account for noteworthy changes” (“John Geometres’ Iambic Life of Saint Penteleemon: Text, Genre and Metaphrastic Style,” in *Philomathestatos: Studies in Greek and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Bart Janssens, Bram Roosen, and Peter Van Deun (Leuven, 2004), pp. 165–84, at p. 173). See also Chapters 3 (Wortley) and 8 (Demoen) in this volume.

of 148 texts (10th c.), which, in turn, underwent a number of rewritings from the Middle Ages to the present.²⁵

The rewrites discussed in the present volume are composed either in the same language (yet in another linguistic form: archaic, biblical, vernacular, or in a new combination of these forms) with the model text or in a different language. Both author and translator are hence treated as rewriters, since, as Réka Forrai rightly remarks, “a medieval author/compiler [...], as well as a translator [...], would all use the same methods of rewriting.”²⁶ In fact, a premodern translator, unlike a contemporary one, works as an adapter: he/she takes the freedom to change a work written in another language according to her/his own aesthetic and other intentions, as well as the nature and expectations of the rewrite’s audience.²⁷

As Moraru’s definition indicates, and as is also attested by the polymorphous premodern rewrites that have come down to us, rewriting is not a particular literary genre, but it is a mode employed for the production of texts belonging to all major premodern genres (epic, historiography, biography, hagiography, epistolography, hymnography, homiletics, drama, novel/romance, fable, and poetry).²⁸ Yet there are genres, such as exegesis, commentary,

- 25 Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*, pp. 150–56. For the difficulties in identifying Metaphrastes’ actual sources for each legend included in his collection, see Martin Hinterberger, “Between Simplification and Elaboration: Byzantine Metaphraseis Compared,” in *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: Between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung*, ed. Juan Signes Codoñer and Immaculada Pérez Martín, Lectio 2 (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 33–60, at pp. 47–50, as well as Chapter 10 in this volume.
- 26 Réka Forrai, “Translation as Rewriting: A Modern Theory for a Premodern Practice,” *Renaissanceforum: Tidsskrift for renaissanceforskning* 14 (2018), 25–49, at 35.
- 27 There are a number of studies showing how a medieval translator works as a rewriter. Apart from Forrai, “Translation as Rewriting,” see also the ongoing Brepols series titled “The Medieval Translator” (1996–) edited by René Tixier, Catherine Batt, and Roger Ellis, as well as the following: Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Luise von Flotow, and Daniel Russell, eds., *The Politics of Translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Ottawa, 2001); Stavroula Constantinou, “Retelling the Tale: The Byzantine Rewriting of *Floire and Blancheflor*,” in *Hybridität und Spiel: Der europäische Liebes- und Abenteuerroman von der Antike zur Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Jutta Eming and Martin Baisch (Berlin, 2013), pp. 227–42. Ruth Evans, Andrew Taylor, Nicholas Watson, and Jocelyn Wogan-Brownie, “The Notion of Vernacular Theory,” in *Idea of the Vernacular*, pp. 314–30; Daniel King, “Translation,” in *Companion to Late Antique Literature*, ed. Scott McGill and Edward J. Watts (Oxford, 2018), pp. 539–54. See also Chapters 2 (Wiśniewski), 4 (Staat, Van Pelt, De Temmerman), and 5 (Andreou) in this volume.
- 28 In the Middle Ages, rewriting is employed also for the transmission of scientific and theological knowledge; see, for instance, Sonja Brentjes, “Translation and Transmission of Ancient Scientific Texts,” in *A Companion to Science, Technology, and Medicine in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Georgia L. Irby, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2016), 988–1008; Elizabeth A. Fisher

florilegium, and excerpt collections,²⁹ which are by definition rewrites, as they are created—mostly for didactic purposes—on the basis of previous authoritative, yet difficult, works. Texts belonging to these genres, in turn, undergo their own rewritings throughout time.³⁰ The fact that rewriting pervades pre-modern literary genres is a further indication of its importance in understanding “the evolution of literatures of the past.” But how precisely is a rewrite created? And what are the principles and laws governing its very creation?

2 Rewriting, its Terminology, and Art

Following Moraru, rewriting should be seen as an intertextual form that could be more accurately described through Gérard Genette’s notion of *hypertextuality*,³¹ that is “the relationship uniting a text B (*hypertext*) to an

“Arabs, Latins and Persians Bearing Gifts: Greek Translations of Astrolabe Treatises, ca. 1300,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36.2 (2012), 161–77; Dimitri Goutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society (2nd–4th/8th–10th centuries)* (London, 1998); King, “Translation,” pp. 525–29 and 535–36; Tom O’Loughlin, “The Latin West in the Period of Transition from ‘the Late Roman Empire’ to ‘Early Medieval Europe’: Consolidation and Innovation,” in *A Companion to Religion in Late Antiquity*, ed. Josef Lössl and Nicholas J. Baker-Brian (Oxford, 2018), pp. 81–97; Ken Parry, ed., *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Oxford, 2015); Ihor Ševčenko, “Remarks on the Diffusion of Byzantine Scientific and Pseudo-Scientific Literature among the Orthodox Slavs,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 59.3 (1981), 321–45; Kevin T. Van Bladel, “The Arabic Reception of Late Antique Literature,” in *A Companion to Late Antique Literature*, ed. Scott McGill and Edward J. Watts (Oxford, 2018), pp. 569–82.

29 For an introduction to *exegesis*, see Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Mark Sebanc and E. M. Macierowski, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI, 1998–2009); for commentary, see Ralph Hanna et al., “Latin Commentary Tradition and Vernacular Literature,” in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson, 9 vols. (Cambridge, UK, 2005), 2: *The Middle Ages*, pp. 363–421; for florilegia, see Alexakis Alexander, “Byzantine Florilegia,” in *Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, pp. 15–50; for excerpt collections, see Catherine Holmes, “Byzantine Political Culture and Compilation Literature in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Some Preliminary Inquiries,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 64 (2010), 55–80.

30 See, for instance, Georgia Kolovou, “Le réécriture des scholies homériques dans les *Parekbolai* sur l’*Illiade* d’Eustathe de Thessalonique,” in *Remanier, métaphraser: Fonctions et techniques de la réécriture dans le monde byzantin*, ed. Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić and Bernard Flusin (Belgrade, 2011), pp. 149–62.

31 Genette’s *hypertextuality* has already been used by a number of scholars to approach rewriting in premodern literature: see, for example, Pierre Bouet and François Kerlouégan, “La réécriture dans le latin du Haut Moyen Âge,” *Lalies* 8 (1986), 153–68; Jean-François Cottier, “La paraphrase latine, de Quintilien à Erasme,” *Études Latines* (2002), 93–109; Forrai, “Translation as Rewriting”; Monique Goullet, “Vers une typologie des réécritures

earlier text A (*hypotext*).³² In his famous work *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Paris, 1982), the most thorough and systematic examination of the process of rewriting, Genette identifies a number of rewriting techniques that he calls “transformations” or “transpositions” through which a new text (*hypertext*) comes into being by the reworking of a previous text (*hypotext*). Genette’s taxonomic system develops out of three main interdependent categories: I. formal transformations (changes in language, style, and form); II. narrative transformations (changes in narrative elements: time, space, action, character, and motivation); and III. quantitative transformations (changes in the dimension of the new text).³³

Each rewriting category has its own internal subdivisions for which Genette develops a detailed nomenclature. Mostly, the quantitative transformations are substantiated in the other two categories (formal and narrative transformations), and more specifically in the *hypertext*’s style (e.g. use of shorter sentences or adoption of an elaborate style), form (e.g. the transformation of a historical or hagiographical work into an *epitome* through massive textual cutting), and narrative elements (e.g. the addition of narrative comments may change the course of action and characterization). Changes in style and form (e.g. substitution of vernacular words with archaic words, or transformation of the *hypotext*’s poetic form into a prose form), on the other hand, might affect changes in narrative elements (e.g. the adoption of an archaic style might put a previously lesser character into a different light) and vice versa (e.g. the change of a character’s evaluation might necessitate the adoption of a different style). In short, any changes in the *hypertext*’s dimension (quantitative transformations) through abbreviation or amplification are responsible for

hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France. Avec une édition synoptique des deux Vies de saint Èvre de Toul,” in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l’occident médiéval: Transformations formelles et idéologiques*, ed. Monique Goulet and Martin Heinzelmann (Beihefte der Francia) 58 (Ostfildern, 2003), pp. 109–44; Kristian Larsson, “Intertextual Density, Quantifying Imitation,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133.2 (2014), 309–31. See also the contribution of Stavroula Constantinou in this volume (Chapter 13).

32 Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln, NE, 1997), p. 5.

33 Genette does not introduce his categories in this order. He starts with the examination of formal transformations, then he moves to quantitative transformations, and finally he analyzes narrative transformations. The order chosen here has been determined by the fact that quantitative transformations cannot take place without affecting each or both of the other two categories (for some explanation about how these processes take place, see my discussion above).

possible alterations in a formal and/or narrative level, which, in turn, lead to further qualitative changes through which the new text is created.

Genette's rewriting theory is employed here not only because his categories (formal, narrative, and quantitative transformations) are useful in understanding the workings of premodern rewriters, but also because these very categories—yet not all their subcategories and inventive terminology—are anticipated in ancient and Byzantine *progymnasmata* (Homeric) scholia, commentaries, lexica, and even the premodern rewriters' comments. The fact that ancient criticism has considerably influenced the work of Genette and that of contemporary narratologists has been brilliantly shown in a recent book by Genevieve Liveley, *Narratology*, who summarizes her findings in the following words:

Amongst the ancient scholia critics and commentators, we come across ultimately appreciation for such modern narratological concepts as variant, deviant, and embedded focalization [...]. These ancient theorists and critics turn out to have a specialist narratological lexicon as rich (and as vexing) as anything dreamt up by their modern counterparts too. [...] The Greek scholia employ a highly eclectic technical vocabulary (borrowing heavily from the rich lexicon of ancient rhetorical theory) and are aware not only of key narratological phenomena such as the differences between plot and story, but of the various stages involved in the building and arrangement of a storyworld. [...] They are also interested in prolepsis (flashforward or foreshadowing) and in analepsis (flashback or backshadowing) of various different kinds—akin to the variants described by Genette as “repeating” and “completing” analepsis (described by the scholia as *anakephalaiosis* or recapitulation, and *anaplerosis* or completion).³⁴

Of course, Genette's borrowings from premodern criticism are beyond the scope of this chapter, even though a few of them will be discussed below in an attempt to apprehend the workings of Byzantine rewrites. At this point it should be mentioned that Genette appears to adopt the *progymnasmata* tradition when he devotes his *Palimpsests*—which, by the way, is inspired by an object of medieval writing culture, the palimpsest codex that attests to the fluidity of premodern texts—to the art of rewriting. Furthermore, Genette seems to follow Theon's example when he discusses how one author rewrites another and when, for instance, he rewrites the first stanza of Paul Valéry's poem “Le

34 Liveley, *Narratology*, pp. 2 and 87.

cimetière marin" (1920) in alexandrines or when he proposes a retelling of Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (1865) from the point of view of the protagonist's daughter.³⁵

For these reasons, a comparative discussion of Genettean theory with premodern rewriting criticism is not only valid, but it also contributes to the better understanding of both. At the same time, it brings to the fore the richness and complexity of premodern rewriting, along with some of the limitations of Genette's theory that does not take into consideration rewrites in collections, and ignores techniques that are applicable to nonnarrative rewrites, such as poetic and rhetorical works. Additionally, Genette does not deal with questions similar to those raised by Lefevere in the above quotation, who insists that those who work on rewritings should "ask themselves *who* rewrites, *why*, under *what* circumstances, for *which* audience" (emphasis added). He is neither interested in the ideologies and motives determining the choice of particular rewriting techniques and the exclusion of others nor in what connects a rewriter's hidden decisions to the *hypotext's* interpretation and reception. For reasons of space, such questions will be dealt with only partly within the limits of this introductory chapter while some of them are given further consideration by at least three of the volume contributors.³⁶

In the remaining part of this section, Genette's three rewriting categories and their subcategories, along with those mentioned and employed by premodern Greek critics and rewriters will be briefly examined in relation to the corresponding Greek terminology—this derives chiefly from ancient and Byzantine *progymnasmata*, scholia and commentaries, Byzantine lexica, the titles of Byzantine rewrites (that are often later additions), and comments made by the rewriters themselves. The Genettean categorization and subcategorization will be exemplified through reference to Byzantine rewrites, and when applicable through a parallel discussion of a Byzantine Greek rewrite, the anonymous 13th-century *War of Troy* (WT).

The WT is a rewrite of another rewrite, Benoît de Saint-Maure's 12th-century *Roman de Troie* (RT) that is the French *hypertext* of two Latin *hypotexts*: Dares Phrygius' *De Excidio Troiae Historia* (5th c. CE), which is presented as a Latin translation of a Greek original allegedly produced by Cornelius Nepos (c.110 BCE–c.25 BCE) and Dictys Cretensis' *Ephemeridos Belli Trojani* (4th c. CE),³⁷ another supposed translation of a Greek original that, unlike

35 Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 416–17 and 287–88.

36 Chapters 7 (Alwis), 12 (Hinterberger), and 13 (Constantinou).

37 The RT is largely based on Dares' work. That of Dictys is used for the last part of the RT which relates the fate of the surviving Greeks and Trojans after the destruction of

that of Dares, seems to have existed.³⁸ Even though Benoît de Saint-Maure claims in his prologue that he “has followed faithfully the Latin version” of his sources,³⁹ he in fact rewrites them on an extremely grand scale. In Benoît’s hands, the relatively short prose accounts of Dares and Dictys are transformed into a monumental poetic work consisting of 30,316 octosyllabic verses. For example, Benoît rewrites Dares’ repetitive phrase “fit magna caedes” (“a great slaughter took place”) with 23 battle scenes, the largest of which comprises 2,500 lines. Benoît’s battles are intertwined with elaborated *ekphrases*, and love stories which either occur briefly in the *hypotexts* or do not feature at all.

Whether these two late antique texts (Dares and Dictys) are actually Latin translations of Greek accounts or forgeries is irrelevant for us now.⁴⁰ In one way or another, both works constitute *hypertexts* of other *hypotexts* that are part of a large chain of rewrites which go back to the Homeric epics. Being the oldest *hypertexts* of Western literature, Homer’s works have initiated the production of innumerable rewritings which also have produced further rewritings throughout the centuries, showing how a work can be simultaneously a *hypotext* and *hypertext*, a model for and product of reception.⁴¹ In fact, the RT is an exemplary work of the chain of Homeric rewritings, since, due to its great popularity in the Middle Ages, it has instigated a new cycle of *hypertexts*: it has become a rich source for rewrites in French and other medieval vernacular languages,⁴² including the aforementioned Greek WT. The WT, in turn, has

Troy, information that is not available in Dares. For a recent introduction to the RT, see Glyn S. Burgess and Douglas Kelly, *The Roman de Troie by Benoît de Sainte-Maure*, Gallica 41 (Woodbridge, UK, 2017), pp. 1–31.

38 For these two works and their great influence in the Middle Ages, see Frederic N. Clark, “Reading the ‘First Pagan Historiographer’: Dares Phrygius and Medieval Genealogy,” *Viator* 41 (2010), 203–26; Werner Eisenhut, “Spätantike Troja-Erzählungen—mit einem Ausblick auf die mittelalterliche Troja-Literatur,” *Mitellateinisches Jahrbuch* 18 (1983), 1–28; R. M. Frazer, *Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian* (Bloomington, IN, 1966), pp. 3–15; Nathaniel Edward Griffin, *Dares and Dictys: An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy* (Baltimore, MD, 1907); Wolfgang Luppe, “Zum Dictys-Cretensis-Papyrus P. Tebt. II 268,” *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 57 (2011), 8–22; Stephan Merkle, *Die Ephemeris belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie) 44 (Frankfurt am Main, 1989); Knut Usener, “Dictys und Dares über den Troischen Krieg: Homer in der Rezeptionskrise?,” *Eranos* 92 (1994), 102–20.

39 Trans. in Burgess and Kelly, *Roman de Troie by Benoît de Sainte-Maure*, p. 44.

40 For Genette, in fact, forgery as the simulated rewriting of an imaginary text is another instance of *hypertextuality* (*Palimpsests*, p. 251).

41 John A. Scott, *Homer and His Influence* (New York, 1963).

42 Marc René Jung, *La légende de Troie en France au Moyen Âge: Analyse des versions françaises et bibliographie raisonnée des manuscrits* (Romanica Helvetica) 114 (Tübingen, 1996).

been produced toward the end of a long tradition of Byzantine rewrites of the Homeric works.⁴³ For our purposes here, the WT is a good case in point also because its Greek-speaking rewriter employs a large number of the rewriting methods discussed by Genette and his premodern counterparts. In so doing, he/she produces a *hypertext* that is well situated in the literary system of the Palaiologan period.⁴⁴

In Genettean terminology, as stated above, the process of rewriting is called “*transformation(s)*” or “*transposition(s)*” (emphasis added). Similarly, the premodern Greek terms for rewriting, which are much more numerous, are compound words entailing the sense of adaptation and alteration: the change of language, style, form, narrative, and meaning. The Greek terms, which largely have the corresponding prefixes “*meta-*” and “*para-*” are the following: *metaphrasis* (“μετάφρασις”), *metabole* (“μεταβολή”), *metaplasia* (“μετάπλασις”), *metapoiesis* (“μεταποίησις”), *metathesis* (“μετάθεσις”), *methermeneusis* (“μεθερμηνεύσις”), and *paraphrasis* (“παράφρασις”).⁴⁵ In his commentary on a work

- 43 For Homeric reception in Byzantium, see Robert Browning, “Homer in Byzantium,” *Viator* 6 (1975), 15–37; Adam Goldwyn, “John Malalas and the Origins of the Allegorical and Novelistic Traditions of the Trojan War in Byzantium,” *Troianalexandrina* 15 (2015), 23–49; Christian Høgel, “Homeric Listeners in Byzantium: Eustathios of Thessaloniki on Homer’s Similes,” in *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens VI*, ed. Erik Hallager and Sine Riisager (Athens, 2009), pp. 277–83; Elizabeth Jeffreys, “Constantine Hermoniakos and Byzantine Education,” *Dodone* 4 (1978), 81–109; Renata Lavagnini, “Tales of the Trojan War: Achilles and Paris in Medieval Greek Literature,” in *Fictional Storytelling in the Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, ed. Carolina Cupane and Bettina Krönung (Leiden, 2016), pp. 234–59; Ingela Nilsson, “From Homer to Hermoniakos: Some Considerations of Troy Matter in Byzantine Literature,” *Troianalexandrina* 4 (2004), 8–34.
- 44 Stavroula Constantinou, “Homosocial Desire in the *War of Troy*: Between (Wo)men,” in *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance: A Handbook*, ed. Adam J. Goldwyn and Ingela Nilsson (Cambridge, UK, 2019), pp. 254–71; Constantinou, “Angry Warriors in the Byzantine *War of Troy*,” in *Emotions Through Time*, ed. Douglas Cairns et al. (Heidelberg, 2021), in press; Elizabeth Jeffreys, “From Herakles to Erkoulios, or the Place of the *War of Troy* in the Late Byzantine Romance Movement,” in *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance*, pp. 166–87. For Palaiologan approaches to hagiography, see Part 4 of this volume.
- 45 To a lesser extent, Byzantines use also other terms with the meaning of rewriting, such as *exegesis* (“ἐξήγησις”) and *hermeneia* (“ἐρμηνεία”). The work of the 14th-century author Constantine Hermoniakos, for example, which is a rewriting of the *Iliad*, is called both “*metaphrasis*” and “*exegesis*” (proem.1.1 and pinax.2.1; ed. in Émile Legrand, *La Guerre de Troie: poème du XIV^e siècle en vers octosyllabes par Constantin Hermoniacos* (Paris, 1890)). As for *hermeneia*, Eusebios’ rewriting of the psalms is described in the work’s title as such (“Εὐσεβίου εἰς τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς τῶν ψαλμῶν. ἐρμηνεία τινῶν κατ’ ἐπιτομὴν,” *Patrologia Graeca* 23, 66.3–4). For an introduction to the Byzantine Greek terminology of rewriting, see Juan Signes Codoñer, “Towards a Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium,” in *Textual Transmission in Byzantium*, pp. 61–90; see also Daria Resh, “Toward a Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis,” *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 55 (2015), 754–87.

from the Hermogenic corpus,⁴⁶ *On Method of forceful Speaking*, the Byzantine author Gregory Pardos (11th/12th c.),⁴⁷ for instance,⁴⁸ employs half of the above terms (*paraphrasis*, *metabole*, and *metapoiesis*) to talk about rewriting and its techniques:⁴⁹

- 46 For the great influence of the Hermogenic corpus and other rhetoric treatises of the Second Sophistic on Byzantine authors, see, for example, Costas N. Constantinides, "Teachers and Students of Rhetoric in the Late Byzantine Period," in *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies) 11 (Aldershot, UK, 2003), pp. 39–53; Romilly J. H. Jenkins, "The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 17 (1963), 38–52, at 47–49; George A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Eugene, OR, 1983), pp. 265–326; George L. Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," *Viator* 1 (1971), 55–74; Panagiotis Roilos, "Ancient Greek Rhetorical Theory and Byzantine Discursive Politics: John Sikeliotis on Hermogenes," in *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and Beyond*, ed. Teresa Shawcross and Ida Toth (Cambridge, UK, 2018), pp. 159–84; Vessela Valiavitcharska, "Figure, Argument, and Performance in the Byzantine Classroom," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41.1 (2011), 19–40; Jeffrey Walker, "Michael Psellos on Rhetoric: A Translation and Commentary on Psellos' Synopsis of Hermogenes," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31.1 (2001), 5–40.
- 47 For Gregory's work, see Athanasios Kominis, *Gregorios Pardos metropolites Korinthou kai to ergon autou* (Rome, 1960). See also Anthony Kaldellis, "Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," in *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. Charles Barber and David Jenkins (Leiden, 2009), pp. 1–43.
- 48 Byzantine authors considered *On the Method of Speaking Effectively* a work of Hermogenes of Tarsos (1st/2nd c. CE). Modern scholarship, however, has shown that this work could not have been produced by Hermogenes (see George A. Kennedy, trans., *Invention and Method: Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World) 15 (Atlanta, GA, 2005), pp. xiii–xiv).
- 49 As for examples of the use of the other three Greek terms for rewriting, the following are provided: (a) *metaplasis*: in the passage from Theon's *Progymnasmata* quoted above (p. 5), *metaplasis* is used as synonymous with *paraphrasis*; (b) *metathesis*: a central concept in the work of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (1st c.) is *metathesis*, which means rewriting (see, Casper C. De Jong, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassos on Language, Linguistics and Literature* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 367–88); (c) *methermeneusis*: in one of his letters, Bessarion (1399/1400–72) talks about his possession in rewritings of important works. As he writes, "we have rewritings (*methermeneuses*) of Theophrastos' *On Plants* [...] and of Origen's *Against Celsus*" ("τῶν περὶ φυτῶν Θεοφράστου μεθερμηνεύσεων ἔχομεν [...] Ὀριγένους δὲ τὰ κατὰ Κέλσου [...] ἔχομεν," *Letter* 37.489.34–36, in Ludwig Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis: Abhandlungen, Reden, Briefe von Bessarion, Theodoros Gazes, Michael Apostolios, Andronikos Kallistos, Georgios Trapezuntinos, Niccolò Perotti, Niccolò Capranica. Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann* (Funde und Forschungen) 3 (Paderborn, 1942). For *methermeneusis* as a term for rewriting, see Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, *The Life and Miracles of Thekla: A Literary Study* (Hellenic Studies) 13 (Washington, DC, 2006), p. 75.

Ἡ δὲ αὐτὴ καὶ τοῦ παραφράζειν μέθοδος. ὥσπερ ἐν μελέταις, ἢ ἐν ἀλληλογραφίαις, ἔστι σοι τὰ αὐτὰ μὲν λέγειν, λανθάνειν δὲ ὑπαλλάττοντι τὴν λέξιν, ἢ τὰ συνεσταλμένα ἐκτείνοντι, καὶ τὰ ἐκτεταμένα συστέλλοντι, οὕτω καὶ ὅταν παραφράξης τινὰ νοῦν ἀλλότριον, ἡγούν ὅταν μεταβάλλης ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀσαφεστέρου ἐπὶ τὸ σαφέστερον. ὥσπερ ὁ Θεμίστιος πολλὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους, ἔνθα καὶ πη μὲν τὴν τάξιν ὑπαλλάσσει, ἢ τὰ συνεσταλμένα ἀναπτύσσει. τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ Σώπατρος ἐν ταῖς μεταβολαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ μεταποιήσεσι τῶν Δημοσθενικῶν χωρίων. (ch.24.1293.26–28 and 1294.1–6, emphasis added)⁵⁰

The method of *paraphrasis* is the same. When you have to say the same things, either in prose exercises or in the exchange of verses, but you secretly change the style by extending the brief passages and shortening the extended ones, you do the same when you paraphrase someone else's thoughts, namely when you rework the less clear ones to make them clearer; as Themistios has done with many Aristotelian writings by changing their order or unfolding the short passages. The same is done also by Sopatros in his own rewritings (*metabolai*) and adaptations (*metapoieses*) of Demosthenean passages.⁵¹

However, the most common Greek terms for rewriting are *metaphrasis* and *paraphrasis*, which are often treated as exact synonyms,⁵² as attested by a definition of John of Sardis (9th c.) included in his *Commentary on Aphthonios' Progymnasmata* (64.23–65.1):⁵³ “παράφρασις δὲ ἐστὶν ἐρμηνείας ἀλλοίωσις τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν φυλάττουσα. τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ μετάφρασις προσαγορεύεται” (“*Paraphrasis* is the alteration of style while keeping the same meaning; the same thing is called also *metaphrasis*”). In the Byzantine world, and more specifically from the 10th century onward, and under the immense influence of Symeon Metaphrastes' work, *metaphrasis* becomes the dominant term for rewriting.⁵⁴ Apart from being employed as general terms for rewriting, the

50 Ed. in Christian Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 9 vols. (Stuttgart, 1834), 7.2:1090–1352.

51 Unless otherwise stated, English translations of the ancient and Byzantine sources are my own.

52 Michael Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool, UK, 1985), pp. 25–26.

53 For John of Sardis, see Chapter 6 in this volume. As for this particular text, see Klaus Alpers, *Untersuchungen zu Johannes Sardonios und seinem Kommentar zu den Progymnasmata des Aphthonios* (Braunschweig, 2009).

54 Demoen, “John Geometres' Iambic Life of Saint Penteleemon,” pp. 171–73; Resh, “Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis.”

six Greek words given above have in different texts and contexts also specific meanings concerning particular rewriting methods, such as translation and stylistic and formal transformation. Examples of these meanings are given below in the discussion of Genette's taxonomy, to which I now turn.

3 Formal Transformations

3.1 Translation

Genette's formal transformations include three different groups of rewriting techniques: translation, stylistic changes, and changes in form. Whereas translation in Genette has a single meaning: the conversion of a text's language into another language, in premodern Greek terminology it has both this meaning and a second one that concerns intralingual translation: the transposition of classical Greek into Byzantine Greek and vice versa. Intralingual translation was a common practice in Byzantium that considered itself as the inheritor of classical Greek *paideia*. Intellectuals of the Byzantine elite, such as Anna Komnene (12th c.) and Niketas Choniates (12th/13th c.), wrote their historical works in atticizing Greek, but in the 14th century they were translated into Byzantine Greek to become accessible to wider audiences.⁵⁵ On the other hand, texts, such as saints' legends, which were originally written in a spoken language were translated into an archaic form of Greek that Byzantine intellectuals, such as Niketas David Paphlagon (9th/10th c.) and Nikephoros Xanthopoulos (14th c.), considered more appropriate for texts devoted to holy subjects.⁵⁶

55 The *metaphrasis* of the *Alexiad* is edited in Herbert Hunger, *Anonyme Metaphrase zu Anna Komnene, Alexias XI–XIII. Ein Beitrag zur Erschließung der byzantinischen Umgangssprache* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien) 15 (Vienna, 1981). An edition of the *metaphrasis* of *Chronike Diegesis* is under preparation by John Davis and Martin Hinterberger. For these two rewritings, see John Davis, "A Passage of the 'Barbarograeca' Metaphrase of Niketas Choniates' *Chronike Diegesis*: Retranslated or Revised?," *Byzantina Symmeikta* 10 (1996), 127–42; Davis, "The *History Metaphrased*: Changing Readership in the Fourteenth Century," in *Niketas Choniates: A Historian and a Writer*, ed. Alicia Simpson and Stephanos Efthymiadis (Geneva, 2009), pp. 145–64; Davis, "Anna Komnene and Niketas Choniates 'translated': The Fourteenth-century Byzantine Metaphrases," in *History as Literature in Byzantium*, ed. Ruth Macrides (Farnham, UK, 2010), pp. 55–70; Stephanos Efthymiades, "Déclassiciser pour édifier? Remarques et réflexions à propos de la métaphrase de l'*Alexiade* d'Anne Comnène," *Travaux et mémoires* 21.1: *Οἱ δῶρόν εἰμι τὰς γραφὰς βλέπων νόει: mélanges Jean-Claude Cheynet*, ed. Béatrice Caseau, Vivien Prigent, and Alessio Sopracasa (2017), 139–50.

56 For Paphlagon and other archaizing hagiographers, see Bernard Flusin, "Vers la métaphrase," in *Remanier, métaphraser*, pp. 85–99; Symeon Paschalidis, *Νικήτας Δαβίδ*

The terms which are often used to denote both inter- and intralingual translation are the following: *metaphrasis*, *eksellenizein* (“ἐξελληνίζειν”) and *methermeneia*. The terms *metaglottismos* or *metaglottis* (“μεταγλωττισμός,” “μεταγλώττισις”) and *hermeneia*, on the other hand, have the meaning of interlingual translation. The *Suda* lexicon (10th c.), which includes a large array of meanings for the word *metaphrasis*,⁵⁷ provides its sense as interlingual translation, for instance, in the following entry: “Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καίσαρ, ὁ πρῶτος μοναρχήσας. οὗτος ἔγραψε μετάφρασιν τῶν Ἀράτου Φαινομένων καὶ τέχνην γραμματικὴν Ῥωμαϊκῶς” (emphasis added; Letter Gamma, 10; “Gaius Julius Caesar, the first monarch: he wrote a Latin translation of Aratus’ *Phenomena* and of an art of grammar”).⁵⁸ Concerning *metaphrasis*’ meaning as intralingual translation, Michael Synkellos (8th/9th c.), for example, uses this term to refer to an intralingual translation of a Homeric verse: “ἡ γὰρ μετάφρασις τοῦδε τοῦ στίχου τοιάδε ἐστὶν” (*On Syntax*, 1612, “and the *metaphrasis* of this verse is the following”).⁵⁹

In the prologue of the Byzantine Greek version of *Kalila wa Dimna* rendered as *Stephanitis and Ichnelelatis*, the 11th-century rewriter Simeon Seth employs the term “*eksellenizein*” to describe his act of translation: “Συγγραφὴ [...] ἐξελληνισθεῖσα δὲ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει προστάξει τοῦ αἰοιδίμου βασιλέως κυροῦ Ἀλεξίου τοῦ Κομνηνοῦ” (Pr.1.4–5; “A work [...] that has been translated in Constantinople by the order of the illustrious emperor [and] gentleman Alexios Komnenos”).⁶⁰ The same term is employed, for example, by Gregory of Nazianzos (329–90) to eulogize the ability of his deceased friend Basil the Great to translate spoken language into the correct Greek language by following the grammar of classical

Παφλαγών: Το πρόσωπο και το έργο του: Συμβολή στη Μελέτη της Προσωπογραφίας και της Αγιολογικής Γραμματείας της Προμεταφραστικής Περιόδου (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1999). As for Xanthopoulos, see Chapter 13 in this volume.

57 More meanings will be given below.

58 Ed. in Ada Adler, *Suidae lexicon* (Lexicographi Graeci) 1.1–1.4, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1928–35).

59 Ed. in Daniel Donnet, *Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michel le Syncelle de Jérusalem* (Études de philologie, d’archéologie et d’histoire anciennes) 22 (Brussels, 1982).

60 Ed. in Lars Olof Sjöber, *Stephanites und Ichnelelatis: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Text* (Studia Graeca Uppsaliensia) 2 (Stockholm, 1962). For a couple of recent studies on the influence of *Kalila wa Dimna* and its Byzantine adaptation, see George Grigore, “*Kalila wa Dimna* and Its Journey to the World Literatures,” in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the History of Arabic Literature, Kyiv, May 19–20, 2016*, ed. Olena Khomitska and Bohran Horvat (Kiev, 2018), pp. 73–84; and Bettina Krönung, “The Wisdom of the Beasts: The Arabic Book of *Kalila and Dimna* and the Byzantine Book of *Stephanitis and Ichnelelatis*,” in *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, pp. 427–60.

Greek (“Τίς δὲ γραμματικὴν, ἢ γλῶσσαν ἐξελληνίζει”; Oration 43.23.16–17),⁶¹ which was considered as the model description of Greek language.⁶²

Methermeneia has the meaning of translation in the following passage from Joseph Bryennios (c.1350–1430): “οἱ τῶν Λατίνων ἀρχαῖοι διδάσκαλοι, ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος φωνῆς τὴν θείαν Γραφήν, καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἡμῶν διδασκάλους εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων γλῶτταν μεθερμηνεύοντες” (Oration 11, 324–26; “The ancient teachers of the Latins translated the Greek language of the Holy Scripture and [the works of] our holy teachers into the Latin language”).⁶³ An example in which *methermeneia* is used in the sense of intralingual translation reads as follows: “Τὸ δὲ κατεκείρετε ἐπαινεῖται τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἳ φασιν ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἐμφαντικώτερον ἢ λέξις μεθερμηνευθείη” (Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Parekbolai*, vol. 2, pp. 271.24–25; “The [choice of the] word ‘waste’ is acclaimed by the ancient [scholiasts], who say that there is no other word that could translate it in a more illustrative way”).⁶⁴

As Juan Signes Codóner remarks, *metaglottismos* or *metaglottis* and *hermeneia* are introduced to Byzantine terminology for interlingual translation in the second half of the 12th century to avoid confusion with the terminology for intralingual translation. The three terms concern mostly translations from Hebrew to Greek and from Greek to Latin and vice versa.⁶⁵ The term *metaglottismos* is, for example, employed in the title of Maximos/Manuel Holobolos’ (13th/14th c.) translation of Boethius’ work *De topicis differentiis*:⁶⁶ “Βοετίου φιλοσόφου λατίνου περὶ τόπων διαλεκτικῶν διαίρεσις ἀρίστη μεταγλωττισθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ ἀξιολογωτάτου ῥήτορος κυροῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Ὀλοβώλου” (“The highly excellent *Division Concerning Dialectical Topics* of the Latin philosopher Boethius, translated by the most estimable Rhetor [and] gentleman, Maximos Holobolos”).⁶⁷ *Hermeneia*, on the other hand, appears in the title of Gennadios Scholarios’ (15th c.) translation of the *Summaries of Logic*, a work by the Latin philosopher

61 Ed. in Jean Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 42–43* (Sources Chrétiennes) 384 (Paris, 1992), pp. 116–306.

62 Signes Codóner, “Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium,” p. 76.

63 Ed. Eugenios Boulgares, *Ιωσήφ μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὐρεθέντα*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1768; repr. 1991), 1:29–345.

64 Ed. in Johann Gottfried Stallbaum, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1826; repr. Hildesheim, 1970), 2.

65 Signes Codóner, “Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium,” pp. 82–86.

66 Trans. with a minor amendment in Elizabeth A. Fisher, “Planudes, Holobolos and the Motivation for Translation,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 43 (2002/03), 77–104, at 84.

67 Ed. in Dimitrios Z. Nikitas, *Boethius, De topicis differentiis Καὶ οἱ βυζαντινὲς μεταφράσεις τῶν Μανουὴλ Ὀλοβώλου καὶ Προχόρου Κυδώνη* (Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Philosophi Byzantini) 5 (Athens, 1990), pp. 95–145.

and medical author Peter of Spain (13th c.; “Ἐκ τῆς διαλεκτικῆς τοῦ Μαΐστωρος Πέτρου ἑρμηνεία τοῦ Σχολάρχου”).⁶⁸

The anonymous rewriter of the WT, like a number of other Byzantine authors who do not mention their foreign models,⁶⁹ does not use any of the above translation terms to refer to his/her rewriting of the RT, neither does he/she mention Benoît.⁷⁰ This does not mean, however, that such Byzantine rewriters are not aware of their translation act. As a parallel reading of the WT and RT reveals, our rewriter seems to be a competent translator who fully understands the language and content of his/her source which he/she successfully translates into the language of Palaiologan literature.⁷¹ By choosing not to mention their foreign *hypotexts*, rewriters such as that of the WT just follow a common premodern practice of text dissemination and transmission where a culture's accessibility to an important and appealing work of another culture is more significant than any reference to its original author who addresses an audience with different characteristics and needs. Another reason for not revealing a medieval translation's *hypotext* is related to the fact that it would interfere with the frequent use of translation as *translatio imperii*, the ideological construction of an empire which through the *hypertext* establishes its authority and cultural independence.⁷² In general, translation is a very widely spread form

68 Ed. in Martin Jugie, Louis Petit, and Xénophon A. Sideridès, *Œuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1928–36), 8:283–337.

69 See, for example, the author of *Florios* (13th/14th c.), the Byzantine Greek version of the French romance *Floire et Blancheflor* (12th c.), which is based on an Italian version of the French model. Another example is the Greek rewriter of the Latin *Passion of Perpetua and Felicity* (3rd c.).

70 As Manolis Papathomopoulos and Elizabeth Jeffreys characteristically remark in their introduction to the edition of the WT, the Greek poet “seems eager to conceal his debt to the French original.” However, for reasons that will become obvious through the following analysis, I do not agree with the two editors' explanation of this concealment: the “translator is ashamed of the incongruity between his subject matter and his immediate source. [...] The translator's choice of meter and the language he uses indicates that he did not set high standards of learning for himself or his audience” (Manolis Papathomopoulos and Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, eds., *The War of Troy* (Byzantine and Modern Greek Library) 7 (Athens, 1996), pp. lxii, lxiii).

71 For the Greek translator's competence and his translation techniques, see Theodore Markopoulos, “Linguistic Contacts in the Late Byzantine Romances: Where Cultural Influence Meets Language Interference,” in *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance*, pp. 144–65, and Papathomopoulos and Jeffreys, *War of Troy*, pp. li–lxvii.

72 See Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* p. 135; Sharon Kinoshita, “Translatio/n, Empire, and the Worlding of Medieval Literature: The Travels of Kalila wa Dimna,” *Postcolonial Studies* 11.4 (2008), 371–85; Luise von Flotow, “Translation in the Politics of Culture,” in *Politics of Translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, pp. 9–15. For the use of Troy matter in the Middle Ages and particularly the production

of rewriting in premodern times, as it makes available to geographically dispersed audiences a large array of texts having imperial, ideological, religious, and educational significance.⁷³

3.2 *Transtylization*

Genette's group of stylistic changes, which he calls with one word "*transtylizations*," are divided into three subgroups: (a) *transtylization*: a change of style that concerns the rewriting of an existing text in the new author's (personal) style without elevating or lowering it stylistically; (b) *stylization*: a transformation from a lower to a higher style; and (c) *destylization*: the opposite process of *stylization*, namely the transformation from a higher to a lower style. *Transtylizations* are the most common rewriting techniques in Byzantine literature,⁷⁴ and there are at least four general Greek terms which are used to designate all three transtylization processes: "*metaphrasis*," "*paraphrasis*," "*metapoiesis*," and "*metabole*," yet the most common ones are once again "*metaphrasis*" and "*paraphrasis*."⁷⁵

An example in which both *metaphrasis* and *paraphrasis* have the meaning of stylistic change is given in George Choïroboskos' definition of the two terms:⁷⁶

μετάφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγή τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν ἢ πλείονων ἢ ἐλαττόνων μετὰ ῥητορικοῦ κάλλους γινομένη, ὡς ὁ Μεταφραστής ἡμῖν δείκνυσιν ἐν ταῖς μεταφράσεσι· παράφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγή τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς τὸ μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, παραφράζων εἶπε, τὴν ὀργὴν εἶπε ᾧ Μοῦσα. (*On Poetic Figures*, 14.17–21, emphasis added)

of RT and WT as *translatio imperii*, see Teresa Shawcross, "Re-inventing the Honteland in the Historiography of Frankish Greece: The Fourth Crusade and the Legend of the Trojan War," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 27.1 (2003), 120–52.

73 For the importance and uses of translation in premodern societies, see the following in addition to the references given above (n. 28): Amelia Brown and Bronwen Neil, eds., *Byzantine Culture in Translation* (Byzantina Australiensia) 21 (Leiden, 2017); Carolina Cupane, "Intercultural Encounters in the Late Byzantine Vernacular Romance," *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance*, pp. 40–68; Adam J. Goldwyn, "Arthur in the East: Cross-Cultural Translations of Arthurian Romances in Greek and Hebrew, Including a New Translation of 'Ο Πρέσβυς Ιππότης' (The Old Knight)," *LATCH* 5 (2012), 75–105; King, "Translation," pp. 539–54; Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht and Helga Bennett, "Literary Translation and Its Social Conditioning in the Middle Ages: Four Spanish Romance Texts of the 13th Century," *Yale French Studies* 51 (1974), 205–22; Christian Høgel, "World Literature Is Trans-Imperial: A Medieval and a Modern Approach," *Medieval Worlds* 8 (2018), 3–12.

74 Signes Codoñer, "Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium," p. 76.

75 Signes Codoñer, "Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium," pp. 79 and 82.

76 For a recent discussion on whether a part of the following passage has not been written by Choïroboskos, but constitutes a later interpolation, see Resh, "Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis," pp. 764–87.

Metaphrasis is the alteration in diction in terms of quantity (using either more or fewer words) along with rhetorical beauty, as Metaphrastes shows us in his *Metaphraseis*. *Paraphrasis* is alteration of diction but using the same number of words, such as in paraphrasing “Goddess, sing me the anger” someone said “Muse, tell me the rage.”⁷⁷

For Choiroboskos, *metaphrasis* designates the change from a lower to a higher style through amplification or reduction, that is stylization in Genette’s terms. In the case of *metaphrasis*, Choiroboskos suggests that stylistic change is achieved through alterations in the rewrite’s dimension, something that likewise brings us to the Genettean quantitative transformations, which, as noted before, have effects also on the *hypertext*’s style.

Paraphrasis in Choiroboskos, on the other hand, means the change of style without altering textual dimension. The example that Choiroboskos gives here to explain *paraphrasis*—the adaptation of the epic style of a Homeric verse (*Iliad*, 1.1)—constitutes a destylization in Genettean terminology; it is namely a transformation from the higher Homeric style into a lower, vernacular style. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether with the term “*paraphrasis*” Choiroboskos means only *destylization*. It is possible that he invests the term with a double meaning, as both *destylization* and *transtylization* (the change of style without modifying its level), since he does not provide any term or example of the latter which is equally employed by Byzantine rewriters.⁷⁸ Choiroboskos’ distinction between *metaphrasis* and *paraphrasis*, however, does not occur in other textbooks of rhetoric, such as those of Hermogenes and Pardos where *paraphrasis* refers to all categories of stylistic changes (*transtylization*, *stylization*, and *destylization*).⁷⁹

As far as *metapoiesis* is concerned, its use in the sense of stylistic change can be found *On Invention*, another work of the Hermogenic corpus, where we read the following:

τῆς τετρακώλου ταύτης καὶ ἡ χρεῖα καλλίστη ἐν ταῖς μεταποιήσεσιν, ὅτι καὶ δύναται στρέφεσθαι· τετράκις γὰρ μετασχηματιζομένη ἐκ τῶν προτάσεων καὶ τῶν ἀποδόσεων ἀλύπως δύναται λεχθῆναι τετράκις· εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ χιασθῆναι αὐτήν, τότε δὴ τότε δύναιτο ἂν τις αὐτήν ἐκ τῆς τῶν νοημάτων ἀνάγκης καὶ πλεονάκις στρέφειν. (*On Invention*, 4.3.110–16, emphasis added)

77 Ed. in Leonardi Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1853–56), 3:244–56; trans. in Resh, “Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis,” p. 779.

78 See Ihor Ševčenko, “Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31.1 (1981), 289–312.

79 See, for instance, Pardus’ definition of *paraphrasis* which is cited above.

The best use of this period with four cola is in *metapoiesis* because the order of the clauses can be interchanged. It is possible to change the order of protases and apodoses so as to be said in four different ways without harm to the thought, and if there is need to use chiasmus, then sometimes one might invert the period even more, depending on the thoughts.⁸⁰

Similarly, the scholar Basil Bessarion (15th c.) employs the term “*metabole*” with the meaning of stylistic change: “μεταβολή πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον στοχασμὸν τὸν λόγον μεταποιῶμεν” (*In verbum evangelii*, 2,6.3–4; “with *metabole* we change expression according to the same meaning”).⁸¹

Since *transtylizations* involve a number of rhetorical techniques through which a rewriter may alter the style of the *hypotext* with the intention of either preserving or changing its level, ancient and Byzantine authors use a number of terms to make a clear reference to the technique that is used each time. The most common techniques related to *transtylizations* are represented by the following terms: *paragrammatismos* (“πααραγραμματισμός”), *metathesis*, *metaplasmos* (“μεταπλασμός”), *periphrasis* (“περίφρασις”), *pleonasmos* (“πλεονασμός”), and *epanalepsis* (“ἐπανάληψις”). These terms concern stylistic changes in three different textual levels: within a word, a sentence, and a larger textual unit.

Paragrammatismos, *metathesis*, and *metaplasmos* refer to changes within a word. The first two involve the rearrangement of a word's letters while *metaplasmos* is the rearrangement of its syllables: “*paragrammatismos*: when one letter is changed by another” (“Παραγραμματισμός: ὅταν γράμμα ἀντὶ γράμματος τεθῇ,” *Suda* lexicon, Letter Pi: 317.1); “*metathesis* is when the first letter of the same syllable becomes second” (“ἔστι δὲ μετάθεσις, ὅταν τὸ πρῶτον στοιχεῖον τῆς ἰδίας συλλαβῆς γίνηται δεύτερον,” Gregory Pardos, *On Dialects*, 4.575–76);⁸² “*metaplasmos* is when the last syllable of a word is changed into another one” (“Μεταπλασμός ἐστιν ὅταν τραπῇ ἡ τελευταία συλλαβὴ τῆς λέξεως εἰς ἄλλην συλλαβὴν,” *Etymologicum Gudianum* [ζεῖδωρος—ῶμαι]).⁸³ The process involved in *paragrammatismos* in particular is presented by Genette as the most

80 Ed. in Hugo Rabe, *Hermogenis opera* (Leipzig, 1913; repr. 1969), pp. 93–212; trans. in Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, p. 153.

81 Ed. in Mohler, *Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis*, pp. 71–87.

82 Ed. in Gottfried Heinrich Schäfer, *Gregorii Corinthii et aliorum grammaticorum Graecorum libri de dialectis linguae Graecae* (Leipzig, 1811), pp. 1–623.

83 Ed. in Friedrich Wilhelm Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita* (Leipzig, 1818; repr. Hildesheim, 1973), pp. 229–584.

elementary form of rewriting, even though he does not use the Greek or any other term to describe it.⁸⁴

The other three rhetorical techniques: *periphrasis*, *pleonasmos*, and *epanalepsis* are performed through textual amplifications that take place within a sentence or in larger textual units. The first, which Choiroboskos defines as an “excessive expression through several words indicating a single concept” (“Περίφρασις ἐστὶ περισσὴ φράσις διὰ πλείονων λέξεων ἓν τι σημαίνουσα,” *On Poetic Figures*, 14.9–10),⁸⁵ effects a stylistic alteration within a sentence. *Pleonasmos* and *epanalepsis*, on the other hand, might be performed both within and between sentences and passages. The last two terms are also included in Choiroboskos’ treatise *On Poetic Figures* where they are described as follows: “*pleonasmos* is when there is an extra word which does not mean something different [...]. Repetition is when a word is mentioned twice for reasons of emphasis and amplification” (“Πλεονασμός ἐστὶν, ὅταν πλεονάζῃ λέξεις μῆδέν τι πλεόν σημαίνουσα [...]. Ἐπανάληψις ἐστὶ λέξεις δις παραλαμβανομένη ἐπιτάσεως εἴτουν αὐξήσεως χάριν,” *On Poetic Figures*, 16.8–9 and 17.12–13). Choiroboskos’ definitions of *pleonasmos* and *epanalepsis* suggest that these occur within a sentence. Both terms, however, may be used to also refer to the repetition of phrases, lists or ideas in larger textual units.⁸⁶

Examples of *transtylization*, which concerns the rewriting of an existing text by adopting one or more of the above rhetorical techniques without elevating or lowering the *hypotext*’s style, are numerous in Byzantine literature. These include, for instance, the different adaptations of vernacular romances, such as the *Tale of Achilles* (14th/15th c.) that has come down to us in three vernacular versions,⁸⁷ the various (premetaphrastic) versions of a saint’s Life (e.g. the two middle Byzantine Lives of Philaretos the Merciful),⁸⁸ or the many saintly Enkomia of a popular martyr, such as Demetrios whose cult in Thessalonike

84 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 7.

85 Trans. in Resh, “Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis,” p. 779.

86 See, for instance, the definition of the two terms in other manuals: “*pleonasmos* is a surplus phrase within a part of diction [...]. *Epanalepsis* is to mention again a previous catalogue” (“Πλεονασμός ἐστὶ φράσις μέρει λόγου τινὶ περισσεύουσα [...]. Ἐπανάληψις ἐστὶ τῶν προειρημένων πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς κατάλογος οἶον,” Kokondrios [1st c. BCE], *On Figures of Speech*, 28.5–6 and 29.9–10; ed. in Christian Walz, *Rhetores Graeci ex codicibus Florentinis Mediolanensibus Monacensibus Neapolitanis Parisiensibus Romanis Venetis Taurinensibus et Vindobonensibus*, 9 vols. (Leipzig, 1832–36), 8:783–98).

87 For the different versions of the *Tale of Achilles*, see Ole L. Smith, ed., *The Oxford Version of the Achilleid* (Opuscula Graecolatina) 32 (Copenhagen, 1990) and Smith, ed., *The Byzantine Achilleid: The Naples Version* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien) 21 (Vienna, 1999).

88 Alexander Kazhdan and Lee F. Sherry, “The Tale of a Happy Fool: The ‘Vita’ of St. Philaretos the Merciful (BHG 1511z–1512b),” *Byzantion* 66.2 (1996), 351–62.

prompted, according to *Bibliographica Hagiographica Graeca*, the production of more than 20 Enkomia, with the first going back to the 7th century and the last one dating to the 14th century.⁸⁹

Concerning the other two transtylization categories (*stylization* and *de-stylization*), two cases in point are the Grottaferrata (14th c.) and the Escorial (15th c.) versions of the epic *Digenes Akrites*. The two texts, which constitute adaptations of a now lost text,⁹⁰ are written in vernacular Greek, yet the style of the older text (Grottaferrata) can be described as elevated compared to that of the later text (Escorial) which has a lower style.⁹¹ Lastly, the most celebrated Byzantine example of *stylization* is the aforementioned *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, yet, as Elisabeth Peyr has shown, this is not always the case in Symeon's corpus where there are instances in which the other two transtylization categories are employed.⁹² Palaiologan hagiographical rewritings, in contrast, are characteristic examples of *stylization*.⁹³

3.3 *Changes in Form*

In his last group of formal changes, Genette includes three techniques that can be found in Byzantine rewrites: *versification*, *prosification*, and *transmetrisation*. *Versification* is the transformation of a prose text into a poem. *Prosification* involves the opposite process: the rewriting of a poetic text in prose, while *transmetrisation* is the transposition from one poetic meter into another. Again, in this case Byzantine rewriters or their readers mostly use the

89 François Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* 111 (Brussels, 1957), pp. 160–64. For the early Byzantine cult of Demetrios, see James C. Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector 4th–7th Centuries CE* (Harrisburg, PA, 1999).

90 Elizabeth Jeffreys, ed., *Digenis Akritis* (Cambridge Medieval Classics) 7 (Cambridge, UK, 1998), pp. xiii–lxii.

91 Richard Dietrich, “Style-switching in the Grottaferrata Text of *Digenes Akrites*,” *Revue des Études Byzantines* 64/65 (2006/07), 365–68; Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis*, pp. xiii–lxii; Jorie Soltic, “The Distribution of Object Clitic Pronouns in the Grottaferrata Manuscript of *Digenis Akritis*,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36.2 (2012), 178–97.

92 Elisabeth Peyr, “Zur Umarbeitung rhetorischer Texte durch Symeon Metaphrastes,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992), 143–55.

93 Martin Hinterberger, “Hagiographische Metaphrasen: Ein möglicher Weg der Annäherung an die Literarästhetik der frühen Palaiologenzeit,” in *Imitatio, Aemulatio, Variatio: Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur* (Wien, 22–25 Oktober 2008), ed. Andreas Rhoby and Elisabeth Fischer (Vienna, 2010), pp. 7–21; Alice-Mary Talbot, “Old Wine in New Bottles: The Rewriting of Saints’ Lives in the Palaeologan Period,” in *The Twilight of Byzantium: Aspects of Cultural and Religious History in the Late Byzantine Empire*, ed. Slobodan Ćurčić and Doula Mouriki (Princeton, NJ, 1991), pp. 15–26; Talbot, “Hagiography in Late Byzantium (1204–1453),” in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 1:173–195, at pp. 177–88.

terms “*metaphrasis*” and “*paraphrasis*” to refer to these formal changes. For instance, the title of Manuel Philes’ (13th/14th c.) poetic rewriting of an Aesopian myth reads as follows: “*Metaphrasis of a common myth*” (“Μετάφρασις εἰς μῦθον κοινόν,” *Carmina* 37).⁹⁴ An example of the use of *metaphrasis* in the sense of *prosification* is found in the title of Gregory Thaumaturgos’ (213–70 CE) prose rewriting of *Ecclesiastes*: “*Metaphrasis of Solomon’s Ecclesiastes*” (“Μετάφρασις εἰς τὸν Ἑκκλησιαστὴν τοῦ Σολομῶντος”).⁹⁵ In his *Chiliades*, Tzetzes employs the word “*metaphrasis*” to refer to *transmetrisation*: “Aeschylus rewrites Homer’s words in iambic verses” (“Αἰσχύλος καὶ τοῦ Ὀμήρου τὰ ῥητὰ ἰάμβοις μεταφράζει,” *Chilias* 8.180.217–18).⁹⁶ Examples of the use of *paraphrasis* in the senses of *prosification* and *transmetrisation* are given in the titles of two other rewritings: Euteknios’ (3rd/5th c. CE) “*Paraphrasis of Oppian’s Kynegitika*” (“Παράφρασις εἰς τὰ τοῦ Ὀππιανοῦ κυνηγητικά”),⁹⁷ and Psellos’ “*Paraphrasis in iambic verses of the canon of our holy father Kosmas of Maiuma the bishop*” (“Τοῦ ὑπάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων κυροῦ Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Ψελλοῦ παράφρασις διὰ στίχων ἰαμβικῶν εἰς τὸν κανόνα τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κοσμᾶ τοῦ Μαΐουμᾶ ἐπισκόπου,” Poem 24).⁹⁸

In addition to *metaphrasis* and *paraphrasis*, a third term is used to connote *versification* and *transmetrisation*. This is the aforementioned term *metapoiesis* and its derivatives which are employed also with the meanings of rewriting (in a general sense) and *transtylization*. In his treatise on heresies and synods, the iconophile patriarch Germanos I (7th/8th c.) referring to the work of Apollinaris the bishop of Laodicea in Syria (4th c.) writes: “the man had turned into verses some scriptural books” (“ὁ ἀνὴρ [...] τινὰς Γραφικὰς βίβλους μεταποιήσας πρὸς τὸ ἔμμετρον,” §23).⁹⁹ A use of *metapoiesis* as *transmetrisation* is made by patriarch Photios (9th c.) in his *Bibliotheca* where he notes: “Read a *Paraphrase of the Octateuch*. It was converted into the metre of epic” (“Ἀνεγνώσθη μετάφρασις τῆς Ὀκτατεύχου ἡρῶν δ’ αὐτὴν μέτρον μετεποιεῖ,” *Bibliotheca*, cod. 183.4–5).¹⁰⁰

Likewise, the rewriter of our case study, the WT, yet without employing the term “*metapoiesis*,” applies the technique of *transmetrisation*. He/she adapts the octosyllabic meter of the French *hypotext* to the 15-syllable political verse.

94 Ed. in Emmanuel Miller, *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1855–57; repr. 1967), 1:3–460 and 2:3–426.

95 Ed. in *Patrologia Graeca* 10:988–1017.

96 Ed. in Petrus Aloisius M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae historiae* (Naples, 1968).

97 Ed. in Otto Tüselmann, *Die Paraphrase des Euteknios zu Oppians Kynegitika* (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl. N.F.) 4.1. (Berlin, 1900).

98 Ed. in L. G. Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli poemata* (Stuttgart, 1992).

99 Ed. in *Patrologia Graeca* 98:40–88.

100 Ed. René Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1959–77); trans. in N. G. Wilson, *Photius: The Bibliotheca* (London, 1994), p. 173.

The anonymous rewriter's *transmetrisation* could be explained in two ways. On the one hand, octosyllabic verses, which were used in earlier vernacular Byzantine poetry,¹⁰¹ were not in fashion in the 13th century when the corresponding meter was the political verse.¹⁰² On the other hand, the octosyllable verse is in fact related to the 15-syllable meter, which, according to Marc Lauxtermann, emerged from the pairing of two verses: an octosyllable and a heptasyllable one.¹⁰³ Interestingly, in the 14th century (c.1320) Constantine Hermoniakos returns to the old-style octosyllabic verse when he composes his own rewriting of Homer. Hermoniakos' *Iliad* is not as long as the WT, but it is a substantial poem consisting of about 9,000 octosyllabic verses.¹⁰⁴ Like Benoît, who produces the octosyllabic RT under the patronage of the Norman/Angevin King Henry II (1133–89), Hermoniakos composes his *Iliad* for his own patron, John Komnenos Angelos Doukas, Lord of Epiros.

In contrast to Genette, ancient and Byzantine criticism mentions a fourth formal transformation, the mixture of prose and verse which is termed "*paraploke*" ("παραπλοκή"). More precisely, *paraploke* is the insertion of verses into a prose text and the incorporation of prosaic discourse into a poem. An example of the first instance exists in an anonymous rewrite of the 5th century, the *Life of Thekla*—a prose *metaphrasis* of the 2nd-century apocryphal *Acts of Thekla*—into which the hagiographer incorporates verses from Homer and the psalms.¹⁰⁵ As for insertions of prose discourse into poetic rewrites, some examples are detected in the WT. When, for instance, the rewriter-narrator adds moralistic interpretations concerning the course of events he/she refers to aphorisms drawn from common speech, as attested by the insertion of the phrase: "as proverbial speech would have it" ("ὡς λέει δημῶδης λόγος").¹⁰⁶

101 Marc Lauxtermann, *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* (Byzantina Vindobonensia) XXII (Vienna, 1999).

102 For a recent discussion of political verse, see Michael Jeffreys, "From Hexameters to Fifteen-Syllable Verse," in *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. Wolfram Hörandner, Andreas Rhoby, and Nikos Zagklas (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World) 4 (Leiden, 2019) pp. 66–91.

103 Lauxtermann, *Spring of Rhythm*, p. 18.

104 Hermoniakos' work, in turn, becomes the *hypotext* of a 16th-century rewrite, Lucanis' *Iliad* which is also written in octosyllabic verses. For an examination of Lucanis' poem, see Pedro Bádena de la Peña, "La metáfrasis de la *Ilíada* al griego vulgar: A propósito de la *Ilíada* de Nicolás Lucanis," *Emerita* 63.1 (1995), 129–44. For Hermoniakos, see Jeffreys, "Constantine Hermoniakos and Byzantine Education".

105 See, for example, *Life of Thekla*, 6.23–26 (*Iliad*, 8.213); 9.74–75 (*Ps.* 44.5); ed. in Gilbert Dagron, *Vie et Miracles de Sainte Thècle* (Subsidia Hagiographica) 62 (Brussels, 1978).

106 Ed. in Papathomopoulos and Jeffreys, *War of Troy*, ll.1305 and 2491.

Paraploke is, according to another work of the Hermogenic corpus, *On Types of Style*, a method employed by authors to create stylistic pleasure:

Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ αἴτιον οἶμαι τοῦ καὶ τὰς παραπλοκάς τῶν ποιημάτων ἐν λόγῳ ἡδονὴν ἔχειν. [...] εἰδέναι μέντοι χρή, ὅτι αὐταὶ αἱ παραπλοκαί, εἴτε ἰδίων εἴτε ἀλλοτρίων εἶεν ποιημάτων, εἰ μὴ οὕτω παραπλέκονται, ὥστε ἐν δοκεῖν εἶναι σῶμα αὐτῶν τε καὶ τοῦ πεζοῦ λόγου, ἀλλ' ἐκ διαστάσεως λέγοντο, ὥσπερ οἱ νόμοι καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὅτε ἀναγινώσκονται. (*Peri Ideon*, 2.4.161–62, 192–97, emphasis added)

I think that for the same reason poetic references and reminiscences in a passage also give pleasure. [...] Moreover, you must realize that whether you are quoting your own poetry or someone else's, the references must be woven into the passage in such a way that the quotations from poetry and prose seem to form one body rather than distinct entities, as when laws and decrees are read out during speeches.¹⁰⁷

Hermogenes, who is addressing students and prospective rhetors, describes *paraploke* as the insertion of verses into prose rather than as the introduction of prose discourse into poetry. As he makes clear, the inserted verses may be produced by the student/rhetor himself or may be extracted from another poetic work. Hermogenes also draws his readers' attention to how to make a successful use of *paraploke*. In order for a *paraploke* to be effective, the added verses should form an organic unity with the passage into which they are inserted. Hermogenes goes on to give an example of a good use of *paraploke*: the mixing of laws and decrees with rhetorical speeches. However, he does not provide directions on how to perform a good mixing of two different forms of discourses. This learning gap is filled in a shorter chapter which is included in another text of the Hermogenic corpus, *On Method of Forceful Speaking*, whose author is unknown. The chapter in question is titled "On Use of Verses in Prose" and reads as follows:

Περὶ χρήσεως ἐπῶν ἐν πεζῷ λόγῳ
Κατὰ πόσους τρόπους ἐν πεζῷ λόγῳ χρήσις ἐπῶν γίνεται; κατὰ δύο, κόλλησιν καὶ παρωδίαν. καὶ κόλλησις μὲν ἐστίν, ὅταν ὁλόκληρον τὸ ἔπος εὐφυῶς κολληθῇ τῷ λόγῳ, ὥστε συμφωνεῖν δοκεῖν. [...] Κατὰ παρωδίαν δέ, ὅταν μέρος

107 Ed. in Rabe, *Hermogenis opera*, 213–413; trans. in Cecil W. Wooten, *Hermogenes' "On Types of Style"* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1987), pp. 79–80.

εἰπὼν τοῦ ἔπους παρ'αὐτοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν πεζῶς ἐρμηνεύσῃ καὶ πάλιν τοῦ ἔπους εἰπὼν ἕτερον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσθῇ, ὥς μίαν γενέσθαι τὴν ἰδέαν. (*Peri Methodou Deinotetos*, ch. 30, emphasis added)

On Use of Verses in Prose

In how many ways are verses used in a prose? In two: by gluing and by *parodia*. It is gluing whenever one quotes the whole verse gracefully in the speech so that it seems to harmonize with it [...]. It is *parodia* whenever, after quoting a part of the verse, one in his own words expresses the rest in prose and then quoting another verse adds something of his own, so that it becomes a single idea.¹⁰⁸

For Pseudo-Hermogenes, *paraploke* is performed with two techniques which could be combined in the same text. The first technique is that of collage (“κατὰ κόλλησιν”): without undergoing any changes, ready-made verses are harmoniously pasted within the body of a prose piece. Through the second technique, parodic mimesis (“κατὰ παρωδίαν”), on the other hand, verses become an organic part of a passage after being altered. Parodic mimesis may take various forms: (a) part of the verses are cited and the rest are rephrased with the rewriter’s prosaic words; (b) the ideas expressed in the verses are alluded to, described, or summarized; and (c) different parts of the verses are mixed with prose.

Concerning the instances of *parodia* detected in the two aforementioned Byzantine rewrites (*Life of Thekla* and *WT*), they take the forms mentioned by Pseudo-Hermogenes who, however, does not discuss the ways in which the collage technique could be used. Yet the authors of these and other premodern rewrites appear to use the collage technique in at least two different ways. First, they might mention the source’s name and/or add a declarative or demonstrative word, such as the verb “φησί” or “λέει” (“he/it says”). Second, they might avoid referring to the origin of the past verse. If this is a famous one, the reader or listener does not need an introduction to recognize it. When the verse is less known, the audience is expected to understand its different origin through its metric form and linguistic variation.

Through his rewriting of the Hermogenic or Pseudo-Hermogenic notions of *kollesis* and *parodia*, Tzetzes brings to the fore further issues concerning the two techniques and their relationship with other rhetorical methods.¹⁰⁹

108 Ed. in Hugo Rabe, *Hermogenis opera*, pp. 414–56; trans. with some modifications in Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, pp. 252–55.

109 A number of Byzantine commentators of the Hermogenic corpus have been preoccupied with the concepts of *kollesis* and *parodia* in an attempt to make them more accessible

Περὶ παρωδιῶν καὶ κόλλησεων

Ἐν τῷ περὶ μεθόδου σοι δεινότητος διδάσκει | ὁ Ἑρμογένης κόλλησιν ὁμοῦ καὶ
παρωδιαν, | λέγων ὥς καὶ ἀμφοτέρω γλυκαίνουσι τοὺς λόγους. | Μάθε δὲ τί ἡ
κόλλησις καὶ τί ἡ παρωδία. | Ἄν ἀλλαχόθεν λάβῃς τι καὶ μίξης τοῖς σοῖς λόγοις, |
εἴτε πεζὸν ἢ μετρικὸν κόλλησιν κάλει τοῦτο, | οἷον εἰς διαφθείραντα παρθένον
λέγω οὕτω· | ζητεῖτε, ἄνδρες δικασταί, τί οὗτος ἐδεδράκει· | “παρθένον ἐξήρπα-
ξεν ἀναινομένην τ’ ἐδάμασσε.” | Τοῦτο μὲν ἐστὶ κόλλησις, οὐ μὴν καὶ παρωδία. |
Ὅπιανοῦ γὰρ εἴρηκα μὴ παρατρέψας στίχον. | Εἰ θεῖς δὲ στίχον ἢ πεζὸν ἐτέρου
τινὸς λόγον, | καὶ μετατρέψω τι ῥητόν, κόλλησις μὲν καὶ τότε, | ἀλλὰ καὶ παρω-
δία δὲ καθότι μετετρέπη· | [...] | “Ἐγὼς τί ἐστὶ κόλλησις καὶ τί ἡ παρωδία. |
Παραγραμματισμός δ’ ἐστὶν ἔγγιστα παρωδίας, | καὶ Ἑρμογένης οὐδαμῶς εἶπε
καὶ περὶ τούτου, | οἷμαι δοκήσας καὶ αὐτὸ τυγχάνειν παρωδιαν. | “Ὀλῆς τροπὴν
δε λέξεως νόει τὴν παρωδιαν, | ἐνὸς δὲ μόνου γράμματος τὰς παραγραμματί-
σεις· | οἷον ἄνπερ εἶπωμεν ἀντὶ τοῦ κόραξ, κόλαξ, | ἀντὶ τοῦ ῥω τὸ λάμβδα γὰρ
ἡλλάξαμεν καὶ μόνον. | “Ἐγὼς μοι τί ἡ κόλλησις καὶ τί ἡ παρωδία, | καὶ τί σὺν
τούτοις πέφυκε παραγραμματισμός δε. (Chilias 8.169.94–121)

Concerning *parodies* and collages

In his work *On Method of Forceful Speaking*, teaches you | Hermogenes
the technique of pasting as well as that of *parodia*, | Saying that both
of them sweeten the speeches. | Learn what collage and *parodia* are. | If
you take something from another source and have it interwoven in your
work, | Whether it is in prose or verse, you should call this a pasting. | For
instance, concerning the ravished maiden I speak thus: | Judges, you are
asking about the crime that this man has committed? | “He ravished a
maiden and tamed her against her will.” | This is pasting, and certainly
not a *parodia*. | For I have cited a verse of Oppian without changing it. |
If by quoting someone else’s verse or passage, | I change some words,
this is a collage, | But also a *parodia*, because it has been adapted; | [...] |
Now you have learned what the pasting is and what the *parodia*. |
Paragrammatismos is closest to parody, | Even though Hermogenes did
not say anything on this, | I believe that this, too, happens to be *parodia*. |

to their readerships. See, for example, Psellos’ poetic *Synopsis of Hermogenes*, poem 7.538–40 (in Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli poemata*; trans. and discussion in Jeffrey Walker, “Michael Psellos on Rhetoric: A Translation and Commentary on Psellos’ Synopsis of Hermogenes,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31.1 (2001), 5–40); John Sikeliotēs’ (11th c.) commentary *On Types of Style*, 399–401 (in Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 6:80–504); Pardos’ commentary *On the Method of Speaking Effectively*, ch.30.1320–23 (in Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 7.2); and Joseph Rhakendytes’ (13th/14th c.) *Synopsis of Rhetoric*, ch.1.510–12 (in Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3:478–569).

You should understand *parodia* as the alteration of an entire word, | And the *paragrammatismos* as the change of one letter; | For instance, when we say *kolax* instead of *korax* | We just replaced the letter *rho* with the letter *lambda*. | Now, you have learnt by me, what pasting and *parodia* are, | Also you have learnt along with them what *paragrammatismos* is.¹¹⁰

Even though he, too, treats pasting and *parodia* together, Tzetzes does not describe them as the two different methods of *paraploke*. In fact, the term “*paraploke*” does not feature anywhere in his *Chiliades* despite the fact that he rewrites the Hermogenic corpus in three different parts of the work in question (*Chiliades* 6.79, 8.169, and 11.369). In contrast to the Hermogenic corpus, Tzetzes understands pasting and *parodia* as ways of inserting any quotation into a text, either prosaic or poetic. Furthermore, Tzetzes, unlike Hermogenes or Pseudo-Hermogenes, considers pasting and parodic imitation as two different instances of the technique of collage. Irrespective of whether a quotation is inserted into a new text with or without changes, in both cases the author observes the same practice: the mixing of at least two different literary styles and forms within the same passage.

Finally, Tzetzes revises further his sources when he introduces *paragrammatismos* into the discussion, an approach that allows him to allude to the double meaning of the word “*parodia*”: as paraphrase and parody (a figure of comic style).¹¹¹ In a playful way, Tzetzes seems to suggest that if parodic imitation is a technique of collage which involves adaptation, and if parody is also performed through a method, such as *paragrammatismos* that is another form of alteration, then along with pasting and *parodia*, parody could function as a third rhetorical technique of collage. As for *paragrammatismos*, despite the fact that it is an elementary form of stylistic rewriting it could play an instrumental role in the performance of other formal transformations.

110 For a discussion of *Chiliades*, see Wolfram Hörandner, “Bemerkungen zu den *Chiliades* des Ioannis Tzetzes,” *Byzantion* 39 (1969), 108–20.

111 In chapter 34 with the title “On Speaking in Comic Style” included in the treatise *On Forceful Speaking*, Pseudo-Hermogenes lists parody among the “three methods of speaking the style of comedy and [...] mocking in the ancient way” (Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, p. 259).

4 Narrative Transformations

Apart from rewriting in terms of language, style, and form, premodern school exercises and rhetorical treatises discuss narrative issues.¹¹² In his *Progymnasmata*, for example, Theon writes about narrative and its elements:

Διήγημά ἐστι λόγος ἐκθετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων. στοιχεῖα δὲ τῆς διηγήσεως εἰσιν ἕξ, το τε πρόσωπον, εἴτε ἐν εἴῃ εἴτε πλείω, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα τὸ πραχθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προσώπου, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἢ πρᾶξις, καὶ ὁ χρόνος καθ' ὃν ἢ πρᾶξις, καὶ ὁ τρόπος τῆς πράξεως, καὶ ἕκτον ἢ τούτων αἰτία. Τούτων δὲ ὄντων τῶν ἀνωτάτω στοιχείων, ἕξ ὧν συμπληροῦται ἡ τελεία διήγησις, ἐξ ἀπάντων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν συνεδρευόντων αὐτοῖς συνέστηκεν. (*Progymnasmata*, 78.15–23, emphasis added)

Story (*diegema*) is a descriptive account of things that have happened or as though they had happened. The elements (*stoicheia*) of narration (*diegesis*) are six: the person (*prosopon*), whether that be one or many; and the action (*pragma*) done by the person; and the place (*topos*) where the action was done; and the time (*chronos*) at which it was done; and the manner (*tropos*) of the action; and sixth, the motive (*aetia*) behind these. Since these are the most comprehensive elements from which it is composed, a complete narration (*diegesis*) consists of all of them and of things related to them.¹¹³

In this introductory paragraph which opens Theon's chapter on narrative, the author starts his discussion with an important issue concerning narrative constitution, that is the distinction between what contemporary narratologists call "story" and "plot": the chronological order of events and the order in which they are narrated. Both *diegema* and *diegesis* (story and narration) are the two kernels around which a narrative work is created, but whereas a story is the sum of given events, narration is the art of reporting on these events and as such it can be learned and cultivated. As a teacher of rhetoric, Theon takes an interest in *diegesis* to which he devotes the rest of his chapter.

¹¹² As a rule, narrative is treated second (after fable) in *progymnasmata* and rhetorical treatises (see, Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. xiii).

¹¹³ Trans. with slight modifications in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 28.

In his attempt to present the narrative transformations taking place during a rewriting process, Genette does not only make the same distinction with Theon, but he also adopts some of his terminology and definitions. We thus read in *Palimpsests*:

The *story* told by a narrative [...] is a concatenation, or sometimes more primitively a succession, of events and/or actions; the *diegesis* [...] is the world wherein the story occurs. The obvious metonymic relation between story and diegesis (the story takes place within the diegesis) facilitates the shift in meaning, deliberate or not. [...] [T]his distinction is relevant and necessary, for transposition operates precisely (among other things) by dissociating action and diegesis: e.g., by transferring the same—or almost the same—action into another world.¹¹⁴

Examining these two passages together, it would not be an exaggeration to say that Genette rewrites Theon or a premodern rewriter of Theon when he forms his theory of narrative transformations for which he coins the term “*transdiegetizations*.”¹¹⁵ Now for Genette whose theory is used for approaching premodern rewriting, *diegesis* is one of the most, if not the most, suitable area for rewriting. Compared to the other subjects offering opportunities for rewriting (language, style, form, textual dimension), *diegesis* provides the rewriter with numerous possibilities for a creative adaptation of the *hypotext*. This is so because *diegesis* creates a whole fictive world whose many different elements can easily undergo multifarious changes and modifications. These elements are no other than those listed by Theon in the above passage (person, action, time, space, manner, and motivation), and are, as will be shown below, the ones upon which Genette’s categories of narrative transformations are based. Seen as “the things from which it [*diegesis*] is composed and into which it is analyzed,”¹¹⁶ the six narrative elements (*stokheia*) are described by Theon thus:

παρακολουθεῖ δὲ τῷ μὲν προσώπῳ γένος, φύσις, ἀγωγή, διάθεσις, ἡλικία, τύχη, προαίρεσις, πρᾶξις, λόγος, θάνατος, τὰ μετὰ θάνατον. τῷ δὲ πράγματι μέγα ἢ σμικρόν, κινδυνῶδες ἢ ἀκινδυνόν, δυνατὸν ἢ ἀδύνατον, ῥᾶδιον ἢ δυσχερές, ἀναγκαῖον ἢ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον, συμφέρον ἢ ἀσύμφορον, δίκαιον ἢ ἀδίκον, ἐνδοξον

114 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 295.

115 For the influence of Theon’s work on later authors of rhetorical treatises, see Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, pp. ix–xiv.

116 “στοιχεῖα μὲν ἐστί τὰ, ἐξ ὧν συντίθεται τι καὶ εἰς ἃ ἀναλύεται” (*Commentary on Aphthonius’ Progymnasmata*, 18.8–9); trans. in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 184.

ἢ ἄδοξον. τῷ δὲ χρόνῳ παρέπεται τὸ παρεληλυθός, τὸ ἐνεστός, τὸ μέλλον, τί πρῶτον ἢ δεύτερον καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἢ τί τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίῳ πρέπει, τί τῷ παλαιῷ, ἐπὶ πᾶσιν αἱ προθεσμῖαι, ἃς κατὰ κοινὸν ἢ κατ' ἰδίαν ἄνθρωποι συντίθενται· ἔπειτα χειμῶνος ὄντος ἢ ἔαρος, θέρους ἢ μετοπώρου, νυκτὸς οὔσης ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν, ἐκκλησίας οὔσης ἐγένετο τὸ πρᾶγμα ἢ πομπῆς ἢ ἐορτῆς· καὶ πότερον γάμων ὄντων, ἢ φίλων ὑποδοχῆς, ἢ πένθους, ἢ τοιαύτης βιωτικῆς περιστάσεως. τῷ δὲ τόπῳ παρακολουθεῖ μέγεθος, διάστημα, γειτνιώσα πόλις ἢ χώρα, ἱερὸς ἢ ὁ τόπος ἢ βέβηλος, ἴδιος ἢ ἀλλότριος, ἔρημος ἢ οἰκούμενος, ὄχυρὸς ἢ ἐπισφαλής, πεδινὸς ἢ ὀρεινός, ἀνυδρὸς ἢ κάθυγρος, ψιλὸς ἢ δενδρῶδης, καὶ πάντα τὰ παραπλήσια. τῷ δὲ τρόπῳ ἀκουσίως ἢ ἐκουσίως· ἐκάτερον δὲ εἰς τρία διαιρεῖται, τὸ μὲν ἀκούσιον εἰς ἄγνοιαν καὶ τύχην καὶ ἀνάγκην, τὸ δὲ ἐκούσιον, πότερον βίᾳ γέγονεν ἢ λάθρα ἢ ἀπάτη. τῇ δὲ αἰτίᾳ τῶν πράξεων παρέπεται, πότερον ἕνεκεν ἀγαθῶν κτήσεως γέγονεν ἢ χάριν κακοῦ ἀπαλλαγῆς, ἢ διὰ φιλίαν, ἢ διὰ γυναῖκα, ἢ τέκνων χάριν, ἢ διὰ τὰ πάθη θυμόν, ἔρωτα, μῖσος, φθόνον, ἔλεον, μέθην, καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια. (*Progymnasmata*, 78.24–31 and 79.1–19, emphasis added)

The properties of the *person* are origin (*genos*), nature, training, disposition, age, fortune, morality, action, speech (manner of) death, and what followed death. Those of the *action* are great or small, dangerous or not dangerous, possible or impossible, easy or difficult, necessary or unnecessary, advantageous, or not advantageous, just or unjust, honorable or dishonorable. To *time* belong what has gone by, what is present, what is going to be; what was first or second and so on; or what is appropriate to life in our time, what in ancient times; in all cases, the dates people have set in public or private life; then whether in winter or spring, summer or autumn, during the night or by day, whether the action took place during a meeting of the assembly or during a procession or festival; and whether at weddings or a reception of friends or in time of grief or any such circumstance of life. To *place* belong size, distance, near a city or town, whether the place was sacred or unhallowed, owned or someone else's, deserted or inhabited, strong or insecure, flat or mountainous, dry or wet, barren or wooded, and all similar things. To manner belong unwillingly or willingly, and each of these is divided into three things: the unwilling into done by ignorance, accident, and necessity; the willing into whether something was done by force or secretly or by deceit. To the *cause* of actions belong whether they were done to acquire good things or for the sake of escape from an evil, or from friendship or because of a wife or for children or out of the passions: anger, love, hate, envy, pity, inebriation, and things like these.¹¹⁷

117 Trans. with slight modifications in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, pp. 28–29.

According to the above definitions, a narrative (or *diegetic*) person is a character with an identity, a family, an educational and social background, and particular bodily, emotional, and moral features, who speaks and acts according to the quantity and quality of her or his very features. An action, which is performed by a narrative person, can be described in terms of size, difficulty, importance, and function, and in relation to its effects upon the actant or other persons of the narrative. Time signifies a character's past, present, and future; the order, duration, and frequency of events, as well as the season, the time of the day, the occasion, and the circumstances in which they take place; finally, time concerns the author's and the different audiences' past and present at the time when a particular *diegesis* is written, read, or listened to. Place is described according to size, form, material, temperature, owner, location, and function. Manner concerns action and the different ways in which it may be performed in relation to the actant's willingness or unwillingness that are determined by disposition, coincidence, and necessity. Lastly, motivation refers to the reasons and causes leading the narrative persons to perform actions such as the ones described above.

It is, therefore, quite obvious that the world of *diegesis* provides a rewriter with many avenues of modification. He/she could, for instance, alter the feeling(s) of the *hypotext's* character(s), diminish or increase the importance of action(s), reorder time sequence, add features to place that do not exist in the *hypotext*, change the way(s) actions are performed, and modify motivation(s). At the same time, Genette does not fail to give some outlines concerning *transdiegetizations*. A rewriter is faced with certain limitations; he/she cannot always transform the *hypotext's diegetic* elements. For example, the need for "*diegetic* faithfulness" involves restrictions, such as the preservation of the characters' names: "An almost infallible sign of *diegetic* faithfulness is the preservation of the characters' names, which is a sign of their *identity*—i.e. of their inscription within a diegetic world: a nationality, a gender, a family background, etc."¹¹⁸ Here again, Genette's description of a character's identity recalls that of Theon given in the above passage.

Taking into consideration the aforementioned elements of the world of *diegesis*, but not in the order given by Theon, along with their interrelations, Genette distinguishes four categories of *transdiegetization*: 4.1. *transdiegetization*, 4.2. *transpragmatization*, 4.3. *transmotivation*, and 4.4. *transvaluation*. These categories and their main subcategories will be presented below and discussed through a short analysis of their uses in the WT.

¹¹⁸ Genette, *Palimpsests*, 297.

4.1 *Transdiegetization*

Transdiegetization concerns changes in the spatiotemporal world of the narrative: “an action can be transposed from one period to another, or from one location to another, or both.” Such alterations, of course, have effects on “the action itself.”¹¹⁹ *Diegetic* transposition can be *homodiegetic* or *heterodiegetic*. Through *homodiegesis*, the rewriter maintains a *diegetic* faithfulness, as he/she does not alter the place names and time period where the *hypotext*’s action takes place. With *heterodiegesis*, on the other hand, the *hypotext*’s spatiotemporal identity is changed to achieve different (*diegetic*) purposes.

The WT is predominantly *homodiegetic*, as it maintains the place names, the geography, and the time of the RT which is also a largely *homodiegetic* rewrite of Dares’ and Dictys’ works. The Greek rewriter’s fidelity to the place names of the *hypotext* is often so great that he/she rewrites their French versions instead of using their original Greek forms.¹²⁰ Thus, Mykenae, “Miceine” in French (RT, v. 5602), is rewritten as “Μύκωνα” (WT, v. 13579) and not as “Μυκῆναι.” Another example is Kolchis, which Benoît followed by his Greek rewriter considers as an island. The French version “Colcos” (RT, v. 765) becomes “Κολκούς” instead of being rewritten as “Ιωλκός.” There are times, however, in which the WT becomes *heterodiegetic*, that is when the Greek rewriter chooses to change the scenery and setting of action.

A case in point is the place of the first meeting of Paris and Helen. In the RT, this occurs in Venus’ temple in Kythera (RT, vv. 4315–72), a choice that lies in accordance with the goddess’s promise in the episode of Paris’ Judgment that takes place in a dream sent to the hero (RT, vv. 3845–928). In the WT, in contrast, which excludes the Judgment of Paris,¹²¹ the hero meets Helen in the temple of Apollo instead (WT, vv. 1755–59). Probably, with this change the Greek rewriter aims at drawing a parallel between the temple of Apollo in Kythera and that of Apollo in Troy where another fatal erotic meeting is scheduled to take place: that of Achilles and Polyxena which results in the hero’s treacherous murder by Paris (WT, vv. 10010–10135). Furthermore, through such an alteration the

119 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 296.

120 The rewriter preserves *diegetic* faithfulness also for the names of characters. For a discussion of his/her ways of rewriting the characters’ names, see Papat homopoulos and Jeffreys, *War of Troy*, pp. lxiii–lxiv; Jeffreys, “Herakles to Erkoulios,” pp. 166–67. As for a linguistic approach to the rewriting of names, see Markopoulos, “Linguistic Contacts in the Late Byzantine Romances,” pp. 160–62.

121 The Greek rewriter’s removal of Paris’ Judgment might be related to the fact that previous Byzantine authors have shown a negative attitude toward it; see Papat homopoulos and Jeffreys, *War of Troy*, p. lxv; Elizabeth M. Jeffreys, “The Judgement of Paris in Later Byzantine Literature,” *Byzantion* 48.1 (1978), 112–31.

Greek rewriter avoids mentioning the goddess of love who features nowhere in the WT while at the same time he/she has the opportunity to introduce once again Apollo, the god of truth and prophecy, whom he/she presents as the god with the strongest influence on the course of action.¹²²

4.2 *Transpragmatization*

While *transdiegetization* refers to the rewriting of spatiotemporal identity, *transpragmatization* takes place at the level of action (*pragma* in Theon's terms): the rewriter changes the *hypotext's* course of action and its (material) support. Our Greek rewriter does not alter the course of the *hypotext's* main action which takes place in a male homosocial world that initiates women's kidnappings (those of Hesione, Helen, Briseis, Polyxena, and Helen's daughter Hermione) to sustain male plots of desire, war, and revenge.¹²³ Nevertheless, he/she makes alterations that influence the way in which the course of action is explained and perceived. While Benoît, for instance, repetitively ties his narrative's chain of events to the workings of Fate, Fortune, and Adventure through which a cause-and-effect sequence unfolds,¹²⁴ the Greek rewriter refrains from doing so.

The WT's deviation from the RT in this respect might be related to the fact that apart from some exceptions (e.g. the romance *Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe* (14th c.)),¹²⁵ contemporary and earlier Byzantine authors avoid using Fate and Fortune as literary devices, as they are considered inconsistent with the Christian principles that dominate their culture.¹²⁶ Concerning Adventure (*aventure*), this is a Western medieval narrative device that does not

¹²² In fact, Apollo appears in the WT more times than any other ancient Greek god. As Papatomopoulos and Jeffreys remark, "his [the rewriter's] attitude to the pagan gods seems ambivalent. Apollo is apparently acceptable: references to Apollo are even inserted in oaths [...]. A temple of Apollo is added [...]; other references to Apollo Alsaio are inserted" (*War of Troy*, p. lx).

¹²³ Constantinou, "Homosocial Desire in the *War of Troy*," pp. 254–71.

¹²⁴ As Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner emphatically remarks, "in the *Roman de Troie*, Destiny, Adventure, and Fortune are more powerful than any human claims on honor and justice as they multiply 'little causes' [...] into great and greater catastrophes" ("Remembering the Trojan War: Violence Past, Present, and Future in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*," *Speculum* 90.2 (2015), 366–90, at 384).

¹²⁵ See Gonda A. H. Van Steen, "Destined to Be? Tyche in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and in the Byzantine Romance of *Kallimachos and Chrysorroï*," *L'antiquité Classique* 67 (1998), 203–11.

¹²⁶ Vasiliki Zali, "Fate, Divine *Phthonos*, and the Wheel of Fortune: The Reception of the Herodotean Theology in Early and Middle Byzantine Historiography," *Histos Supplement* 4 (2015), 85–126.

feature in Byzantine narratives.¹²⁷ If, as Genette notes, a rewrite transposes the *hypotext* “to bring it up to date and closer to its own audience,” then a possible narrative use of Adventure, and even Fate and Fortune, in the WT would not have been appreciated by its Byzantine audience.¹²⁸

4.3 Transmotivation

Transmotivation is the process in which a character’s action is given a different cause in the *hypertext*. Characters’ motives for their actions, as remarked also by Theon in his chapter on *diegesis*, may be moral, emotive, bodily, familial, or friendship driven. Furthermore, social, religious, and ideological reasons might lie behind a character’s behavior and acts. Genette divides *transmotivation* into three subcategories: *motivation*, *demotivation*, and *remotivation*. With *motivation*, the rewriter inserts a cause for an action which does not have any in the *hypotext*. *Demotivation* allows the rewriter to conceal or leave out a motivation presented in the *hypotext*. Finally, *remotivation* replaces the original motive with another one.

The Greek rewriter of the WT employs all *transmotivation* subcategories. He/she has the tendency to add, delete, and substitute the motivations of female rather than male characters in an attempt to present them in an even more negative light than the *hypotext*. While in the RT heroines, such as Helen, Hermione, Briseida, and Medea, are complex characters undergoing internal conflicts, in the WT they are transformed into flat characters whose actions are driven by their immorality. In the case of Helen and her daughter Hermione, for example, the Greek rewriter adds the motivation of wickedness that, as he/she concludes, leads to the destruction of the whole world. Thus, addressing the poem’s audience in what has come down to us as the final verses of the WT,¹²⁹ the narrator talks about the two heroines as follows:

Ἦκουσες πόσον τὸ κακὸν γέγονε παρ’ Ἑλένης.
 Ἔως ὁ κόσμος ὄλλυται Ἀνατολῆς καὶ Δύσης,
 εἷη παρ’ ἐκείνης ὄνομα οὐαί, ἀνάθεμά την.
 Καὶ πάλιν γὰρ ἐξόπισθεν παρὰ τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς
 γέγονε θλίψις φοβερὰ καὶ ζημία μεγάλη,
 ὅπου πολλοὺς τὴν ἑκλαίαν χρόνους οἱ Ἑλληνίδες. (WT, vv. 14396–401)

127 See, for example, Howard R. Bloch, *Medieval French Literature and Law* (Berkeley, CA, 1977), pp. 141–43.

128 Genette, *Palimpsestes*, p. 304.

129 According to the text’s editors, the last sections of the WT are defaced (see Jeffreys, “Herakles to Erkoulios,” p. 167).

You have now heard how much evil has been caused by Helen. | Until the world from East to West has been destroyed, | this has happened for her person, alas, damn her. | And again, after her, through her daughter | a terrible sorrow and great damage have occurred, | for which Greek women have wept for many years.

The Greek rewriter cuts in half Briseida's long soliloquy (more than 100 verses; RT, vv. 20237–40) where her emotional sufferings for being torn between the love of two men (the Trojan Troilus and the Greek Diomedes) are expressed. In so doing, the rewriter creates a superficial character who is exclusively interested in her own well-being (she is with the winners' side) while at the same time she appears indifferent for the harm she would cause Troilus for deciding to accept Diomedes' love. As summed up by Tina Lendari, "in the *War of Troy* Briseida's conduct towards both Troilus and Diomedes appears as that of a heartless woman, a manifestation of female vanity, treachery and folly."¹³⁰ Medea receives similar treatment where the Greek rewriter employs *remotivation*. Her motive of true love for following Jason in the RT (vv. 1241–99) is transposed into that of an uncontrolled passion in the WT. In short, the modest Medea of the RT is transformed into a shameless and lustful heroine in the WT (vv. 285–337, 707–17).¹³¹

4.4 *Transvaluation*

Transvaluation, the last of Genette's narrative transformations, is "any operation of an axiological nature bearing on the value that is implicitly or explicitly assigned to an action or group of actions: namely, the sequence of actions, attitudes and feelings that constitutes a 'character.'"¹³² *Transvaluation* can be *homogeneous* and *heterogeneous*. In the first case, the *hypotext* has no real value conflicts, whereas in the second case it has a conflict of values, and as result it "takes the opposite side of its *hypotext*, giving value to what was devalued and vice versa."¹³³

130 Tina Lendari, "Gazes in Love Scenes and Glances at their Depiction: Notes on the *War of Troy*," in *His Words Were Nourishment and His Counsel Food: A Festschrift for David W. Holton*, ed. Efrosini Camatsos, Tassos A. Kaplanis, and Jocelyn Pye (Cambridge, UK, 2014), pp. 7–22, at p. 15.

131 See Lendari, "Gazes in Love Scenes and Glances at their Depiction," pp. 8–13. For an eco-critical approach to the Medea of the WT, see Adam J. Goldwyn, "Towards a Byzantine Ecocriticism: Witches and Nature Control in the Medieval Greek Romance," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 39.1 (2015), 66–84, pp. 72–78; Goldwyn, *Women, Nature and Power in the Medieval Greek Romance* (London, 2018), pp. 155–79.

132 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 343.

133 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 367.

The Greek rewriter of the WT makes use of both *homogeneous* and *heterogeneous transvaluation*. At a thematic level, the WT is *homogeneous* with its *hypotext*; it generally adopts the *hypotext*'s thematic synthesis and its male homosocial ideologies that at times are further stressed, as the treatment of the female characters discussed before attests. Concerning the characters' emotions, which are essential for the development of the plot in the RT, since they lead to actions that in turn incite further actions, the Greek rewriter adopts a similar approach. There are cases, however, in which he/she deviates from the *hypotext* in two ways: by stressing further or reducing the power of some feelings and by substituting one strong emotion for another (e.g. anger for sorrow).¹³⁴

The Greek rewriter's most important *heterogeneous transvaluation* is detected in his/her treatment of the two oppositional armies. While Benoît favors the Trojans, the Greek rewriter sympathizes with the Greeks. Benoît takes the side of the Trojans because he writes "for an Anglo-Norman king who traces his ancestry back to one of the heroes [Aeneas] to escape Troy's destruction [...]. Demonstrated in multiple ways, that favour also includes a greater focus on heroic Trojan deaths."¹³⁵ Additionally, Benoît's admiration for the Trojans is manifested in his long descriptions of Trojan marvels, such as the Alabaster Chamber of Beauties that was offered by Priam to Helen as a marital gift when she became Paris' wife (RT, vv. 14631–958),¹³⁶ which are not included in the WT. At the same time, Benoît shows his dislike for the Greeks by presenting their victory as an act of treason.

The rewriter of the WT, on the other hand, who writes for a Greek audience—and most probably for a patron that sees himself as a descendant of the ancient Greeks¹³⁷—has a vested interest in promoting the Greek heroes of the Trojan War and their deeds. He/she, therefore, undertakes a reverse strategy in an attempt to move the focus from the Trojans to the Greeks. References in the *hypotext* that stress the Trojans' superiority are removed and substituted by comments showing the supremacy of the Greeks, while Benoît's criticism for the Greeks becomes in the WT a criticism of the Trojans.¹³⁸

134 See Stavroula Constantinou, "Angry Warriors in the Byzantine *War of Troy*," in press.

135 Tomaryn Bruckner, "Remembering the Trojan War," p. 134.

136 Luke Sunderland, "Emotions, History and Presence in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 54.4 (2018), 443–64.

137 See Jeffreys, "Herakles to Erkoulios," pp. 169–76; Shawcross, "Re-inventing the Honteland in the Historiography of Frankish Greece," pp. 140–45.

138 Shawcross, "Re-inventing the Honteland in the Historiography of Frankish Greece," pp. 141–43.

5 Quantitative Transformations

Like premodern rhetorical theorists, Genette identifies two fundamental operations through which a rewrite's dimension may change: "These two operations consist in one case of abridging the text—we shall call that *reduction*—and in the other of extending it: we shall call that *augmentation*."¹³⁹ The Greek terms mostly employed for the first process are "μείωσις" (*meiosis*) and "συστολή" (*systole*) while those mainly used for the second operation are "αύξησης" (*auxesis*) and "ἐπέκτασις" (*epektasis*) or "ἔκτασις" (*ektasis*).¹⁴⁰ Theon, for example, mentions both sets of terms in his *Progymnasmata*. In the chapter on fable, he employs the terms "μείωσις" and "αύξησης" (*Progymnasmata*, 78.8–9) whereas in the chapter on narrative that follows he uses the words "συστολή" and "ἐπέκτασις" (*Progymnasmata*, 86.6) to talk about alterations in a rewrite's length.

As Genette points out, "there are certainly many ways to reduce or to extend a text."¹⁴¹ He then goes on to distinguish three main methods of reducing a text, each of which has its own internal subcategories. In contrast to the many ways of reducing a narrative, Genette defines a more or less equal number of augmentation techniques. He also observes that even though *reduction* and *augmentation* are opposing terms they are, in fact, not as detached as they appear. Many textual transformations, premodern rewritings included, "result from their combination, according to the formula *addition* + *suppression* = *substitution*. [...] The genesis of haphazard tribulations of a hypertextual work

¹³⁹ Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 228. See, for instance, the following passage from the Hermogenic treatise *On Forceful Speaking*: "Περὶ τοῦ λεληθότως τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν ἢ ἑαυτῷ ἢ ἄλλοις: Τοῦ ταῦτὰ λέγοντα ἢ ἑαυτῷ ἢ ἄλλῳ τινὶ μὴ δοκεῖν τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν διπλῇ μέθοδος· τάξεως μεταβολή, καὶ μήκη καὶ βραχύτητες. ἢ δὲ αὐτὴ καὶ τοῦ παραφράζειν μέθοδος· ἢ γὰρ τὴν τάξιν μεταβάλλεις, ἢ περ ἐκεῖνος ἐχρήσατο, ἢ τὸ μέτρον· εἴπερ γὰρ διὰ μακρῶν ἐκεῖνος, ταῦτα ἐν βραχείσιν συνελὼν λέγεις, ἢ τὸ ἐναντίον" (emphasis added; *Peri Methodou Deinotetos*, Ch.24.1–5; "On Escaping Notice While Repeating What You or Others Have Said: There are two methods of repeating your own or someone else's words without seeming to do so: change of order, and lengthenings and shortenings. The method is the same as paraphrasing, for you either change the order the other speaker used or the measure; for if the first version was lengthy, you will say these things compressed into few words, or the opposite"; trans. in Kennedy, *Invention and Method*, p. 243).

¹⁴⁰ For quantitative transformations in medieval literature, see Romina Luzi, "The Acculturation of the French Romance *Pierre de Provence et la belle Maguelonne* in the Byzantine *Imperios* and *Margarona*," in *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance*, pp. 101–24; Arthur George Rigg, "The Long or the Short of It? Amplification or Abbreviation?," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 10 (2000), 46–73; Mary B. Speer, "The Long and the Short of Lancelot's Departure from Logres: Abbreviation as Rewriting in *La Mort le roi Artu*," in *Text and Intertext in Medieval Arthurian Literature*, ed. J. Lacy Norris (New York, 1997), pp. 219–39.

¹⁴¹ Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 228.

may also provide examples of an opposite movement resulting in a zero sum: *addition + suppression* (of the addition itself).¹⁴²

Genette's principal techniques of reduction are: *excision*, *concision*, and *condensation*.¹⁴³ *Excision* is defined as a "simple erasure or scissor cuts."¹⁴⁴ It is achieved through eliminating sections of the *hypotext* without making any attempt to include any of their content in the *hypertext*. *Concision* is a reduction of the *hypotext*'s length by keeping its main parts which are shortened in the *hypertext*. Lastly, *condensation* is the rewriting of the *hypotext* in a summary form.

These three reduction techniques are examined also by premodern Greek theorists who employ corresponding terms to refer to them.¹⁴⁵ The term "ἀφαίρεσις" (*aphaeresis*; removal) stands for the Genettean *excision*.¹⁴⁶ The word "συντομία" (*syntomia*; conciseness) is largely employed for *concision*.¹⁴⁷ As for *condensation*, it is often signified by one of the following synonymous terms: "σύνοψις" and "ἐπιτομή" (*synopsis*, *epitome*; summary). *Synopsis* and *epitome* appear also in the titles of Byzantine works that claim to be or are treated (by copyists or later readers) as summaries of previous texts (e.g. Skylitzes' *Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*, Manasses' *Σύνοψις Χρονική*, Zonaras' *Ἐπιτομή Ἱστοριῶν*, and Xanthopoulos' *Ἐπιτομή τῶν ἐν τοῖς τέσσαρσιν Εὐαγγελίοις ὑπερφυῶν θαυμάτων τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ*). There are cases, however, in which the terms "*synopsis*" or

142 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 269.

143 For reasons of space, Genette's subcategories of each reduction and augmentation category will not be discussed here.

144 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 235.

145 For references to reduction techniques in ancient Greek scholia, see René Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge, UK, 2009), pp. 208–09. For reduction in Byzantine rewriting, see Signes Codoñer, "Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium," pp. 68–69.

146 "σχεδὸν γὰρ ἅπασαι αἱ ἰδέαι τῶν λόγων δι' ἀλλήλων εὐρίσκονται τε καὶ γίνονται καταφανεῖς ἢτοι κατὰ ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ χωρισμόν, ὥσπερ ἐνταῦθα πεποιήκαμεν, οἷον ὅτε ἐλέγομεν, ὅτι σχήματά ἐστι καθαρά ὅσα τῆς περιβολῆς ἐστὶν ἀπηλλαγμένα (1.3.116–20), ἢ κατὰ πρόσθεσιν, ὥσπερ ὅτε ἔφαμεν σαφήνειαν ὑπ' εὐκρινείας γίνεσθαι καὶ καθαρότητος" (1.3.120–23) (emphasis added; Hermogenes, *Peri Ideon Logou* 1.3.116–23; "For almost all the types of style can be best manifested in relation to other types. Sometimes [this takes place] through reduction and division, as we have done here, when we said that those means of expression are pure and are the opposite of these that create Abundance or through addition when we stated that Clarity is produced by Distinctness and Purity"; trans. with modifications in Wooten, *Hermogenes' "On Types of Style,"* p. 12); see also Theon's *Progymnasmata*, 76.27 and 83.18.

147 "ἔστι γὰρ ἡ συντομία λόγος τὰ καιριώτατα τῶν πραγμάτων σημαίνων, μήτε προστιθεὶς τὸ μὴ ἀναγκαῖον μήτε ἀφαιρῶν τὸ ἀναγκαῖον κατὰ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν λέξιν" (Theon, *Progymnasmata*, 83.15–18; "Conciseness in language signifying the most important of facts, not adding what is not necessary nor omitting what is necessary to the subject and the style"; trans. in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 32).

“*epitome*” are seen as synonymous with “*syntomia*,” as attested, for example, in the lexicon of Pseudo-Zonaras where the following definition is included: “Ἐπιτομή. Συντομία, ἢ σύντομος τῶν κεφαλαίων παράδοσις” (*Pseudo-Zonaras Lexicon*, Letter Epsilon: 805.17; “*Epitome. Syntomia* or the concise treatment of chapters”).¹⁴⁸

The Greek rewriter of the WT—whose main rewriting tool is *reduction*—makes use of all three reduction techniques in various parts of his/her work. When he/she excludes whole parts, such as the RT’s long prologue and description of the aforementioned Chamber of Beauties, *excision* is employed. *Concision* is detected when the Greek author includes essential parts of the RT’s central episodes (e.g. the love stories of Medea and Jason, Helen and Paris, and Polyxena and Achilles), but at much shorter length. Finally, the Greek rewriter has the tendency to use *condensation* for Benoît’s catalogues and descriptions that he/she includes in the WT. For example, Benoît’s catalogue of the most important Greek and Trojan warriors’ portraits consisting of 489 verses is summarized into 97 verses in the WT.

Genette’s three augmentation techniques are *extension*, *expansion*, and *amplification*. *Extension*—“πρόσθεσις” (*prosthesis*) or “προσθήκη” (*prostheke*) in premodern Greek terminology—is the addition of parts that do not exist in the *hypotext*.¹⁴⁹ *Extension* may take various forms. The Hermogenic treatise *On Invention*, for example, names the following ways in which a narrative may be extended thematically: addition of material that has been omitted, explanation of the causes of events, and presentation of the planning of actions (*On Invention*, 2.7.22–32).

While *extension* is thematic elaboration, *expansion* concerns stylistic augmentation; it “consists in doubling or tripling the length of each sentence in the *hypotext*.”¹⁵⁰ In his attempt to describe *expansion*, Genette refers to ancient *progymnasmata*:

148 Ed. in J. A. H. Tittmann, *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1808; repr. Amsterdam, 1967). The same definition of *epitome* is also given by Choירוboskos in his *prolegomena* to Theodosios Alexandrinus (ed. in A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1894–1910; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), 4.1:103–417, at pp. 118.23–24).

149 See Theon: “ἐάν μὲν λογικὴ ἢ χρεία, προσθήσομεν αὐτῇ, τὸ ρηθὲν μνήμης ἔτυχε, ἢ λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος. [...] ἐάν δὲ πρακτικὴ ἢ χρεία, εἰ μὲν παθητικὴ εἴη, προσθετέον” (*Progymnasmata*, 101.30–31 and 102.10–11; “If the chreia is a saying, we shall add to it that the saying ‘has become memorable,’ or ‘The story is remembered of X saying [...]’ If the chreia describes an action, and if that is passive, one should add”; trans. in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 20). Bessarion defines addition thus: “Προσθήκη [...] ἀναπληροῦν ἐθέλωμεν, ἅπερ ἡμῖν ἐλλείποντα εἶναι δοκεῖ” (*In verbum evangelii*, 2, 5.3–4; “*Prostheke* is when [...] we wish to fill up these which seem to us that are missing”).

150 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 260.

Expansion is essentially what classical rhetoric practices when it assigned its pupils the exercise that it more generally named “amplification” (but I prefer to reserve the term for a different purpose). A distinction was made—a somewhat specious one, as we will see—between amplification by “figures” (introducing figures of speech into a reputedly literal text) and amplification by “circumstances”: i.e., singling out details that had been merely mentioned or implied in a supposedly concise or laconic text, and working them out through descriptions, animations, etc. The traditional victims of such scholastic, or other, exercises of expansion were the fables of Aesop.¹⁵¹

Genette does not specify which are the “classical rhetoric practices” he is referring to, yet Theon’s work and that of his premodern followers come to mind when reading the above passage. It should be mentioned though that in Greek *progymnasmata* and rhetorical treatises, the corresponding term used to refer to what Genette means by *ex-pansion* (i.e. stylistic amplification) is not “ἀΰξησις” (“amplification”), but the aforementioned “ἐπ-έκτασις,” which also denotes the process of *augmentation* in general.¹⁵² Some of the techniques of rhetorical amplification that are discussed by premodern theorists (e.g. *periphrasis*, *pleonasmos*, and *epanalepsis*) have been briefly presented above.

As becomes obvious from Theon’s treatment of *extension* and *expansion*, and as also Genette remarks, these two augmentation techniques are “rarely found in their pure state, and [...] no literary augmentation of any consequence limits itself to one or the other. [...] [They] should therefore be considered as the two primary paths of augmentation in general, which most often consists of their synthesis and convergence.”¹⁵³ It is the merging of *extension* and *expansion* that constitutes Genette’s last category of augmentation, *amplification*, that he also describes “as the obverse of a *condensation*.”¹⁵⁴ The most common Greek term for *amplification* is “ἐξεργασία” (*exergasia*) which is defined by Theon thus:

Exergasia is language that adds what is lacking in thought and expression. What is “lacking” can be supplied by making clear what is obscure; by filling gaps in the language or content; by saying some things more strongly, or more believably, or more vividly, or more truly, or more wordily—each

151 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 260.

152 Theon employs the term “ἐπέκτασις” and its derivatives in the sense of rhetorical augmentation in the following passages: *Progymnasmata*, 75.17, 104.1–15.

153 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 262.

154 Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 262.

word repeating the same thing—or more legally, or more beautifully, or more appropriately, or more opportunely, or making the subject pleasanter, or using a better arrangement or a style more ornate.¹⁵⁵

According to Theon, *exergasia* is the most difficult form of rewriting, and as such he treats it toward the end of his *Progymnasmata*:

ὡμολόγηται γὰρ παρὰ πᾶσιν, ὅτι τοῦ ῥήτορος ἔργον ἐστὶ το τε ἀποδείξει τὰ ἀμφισβητούμενα καὶ τὸ αὐξῆσαι τὰ ἀποδεδειγμένα· προτερεῖ μὲν οὖν τῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ χρήσει ὁ ἀποδεικτικὸς λόγος, ἔπεται δὲ ὁ αὐξητικός. [...] οὐ μὴν ὥσπερ τῇ φύσει προτερεῖν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἔφαμεν τῆς αὐξήσεως, οὕτω καὶ τὴν γυμνασίαν ἔχειν συμβέβηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶν τοῦναντίον· πρότερα γὰρ τὰ ῥάονα τῶν δυσχερεστέρων· ῥάον δὲ αὐξῆσαι τὸ φανερόν ἢ τὸ ἀφανὲς ἀποδείξει [...] τῇ δὲ ἀναγνώσει καὶ τῇ ἀκροάσει καὶ τῇ παραφράσει χρησόμεθα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, τῇ δὲ ἐξεργασίᾳ [...] ὅταν ἔξιν τινὰ περιποιησώμεθα.

It is agreed by all that the function of an orator is to demonstrate what is in doubt and to augment what has been demonstrated. Demonstrative argument, therefore, both by nature and practice, comes first and augmentation follows. [...] But although we said that, by nature, demonstration comes before augmentation, in exercises the opposite is true. Easier things should be learned before more difficult ones, and it is easier to augment what is clear than to demonstrate what is unclear. [...] We shall make use of reading and listening and paraphrasing from the beginning, and of *exergasia* [...] when we have attained some facility.¹⁵⁶

Reduction might be the main method of the Greek rewriter of the WT, yet he/she does not fail to employ the augmentation technique of *extension*. This is done, of course, on a small scale, primarily through the insertion of some phrases and verses. Most additions in the WT have an explanatory character, as they are made to offer a better understanding and to remind the audience of some of the characters' identities, relationships, and actions. For example, in verse 10265 when Achilles' son Pyrrhos is introduced into the narrative his second name (Neoptolemos) and that of his mother (Deidamia) are added. In order to highlight Hermione's evil character, to mention a second example, the

155 Trans. in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, p. 71. Theon's chapter on *exergasia* has come down to us in the Armenian version of his *Progymnasmata*.

156 Theon, *Progymnasmata*, 65.1–25; trans. with slight modifications in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, pp. 8–9.

Greek rewriter adds the following verses: “Ἐμπρὸς δὲ παρὰ πλήρωσιν ταύτης τῆς ἱστορίας, | <νὰ> μάθετε πόσα κακά καὶ τί ζημία ἐγένη | ἀπὸ τὴν κόρην, ἤξευρε, ταύτην τὴν Ἑρμιόνην” (WT, vv. 13581–84; “Behold for the ending of this story, | you will learn how many evil deeds and damage was caused | by the daughter, you should know, this Hermione”). All in all, the Greek rewriter makes a successful use not only of quantitative transformations, but also of formal and narrative transpositions through which he/she creates a work corresponding to the literary trends and the ideological stance of his/her times and audience.

6 Transformations for Collections

Despite his thorough theory of rewriting, Genette, as mentioned earlier, does not take into consideration the transformations taking place when literary collections (e.g. tale collections) undergo a process of rewriting or when parts from different works are rewritten to create new collections (e.g. florilegia). If, as has been shown above, ancient *progymnasmata* and rhetorical treatises have informed to a great extent Genette's approach it is not surprising that he does not consider the rewriting involved in collections, since ancient theorists have not taken into consideration this kind of rewriting either.

Nevertheless, an examination of premodern rewriting cannot ignore the transformations taking place within the framework of collections, an extremely important premodern literary form. Since the Hellenistic times and until the late Middle Ages, the rewriting of existing collections or the production of collections made of excerpts from various other works had been a common practice serving mostly educational, edifying, religious, and ideological purposes.¹⁵⁷ Such collections played a significant role to the systematization and transmission of knowledge, as well as to the establishment of dogma and to the promotion of certain political ideologies.¹⁵⁸

157 Henry Chadwick, “Some Ancient Anthologies and Florilegia, Pagan and Christian,” in *Studies on Ancient Christianity*, ed. Henry Chadwick (Aldershot, UK, 2006), xix: 1–10; Holmes, “Byzantine Political Culture and Compilation Literature in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.”

158 For Byzantine florilegia and anthologies, see, for example, Alexander Alexakis, “Byzantine Florilegia”; Richard Marcel, “Florilèges spirituels grecs,” *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 33.34 (1962), pp. 475–512; Paolo Odorico, “La cultura della Συλλογή: 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2) Le tavole del sapere di Giovanni Damasceno,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83.1 (1990), 1–21; Odorico, “Un esempio di lunga durata della trasmissione del sapere: Cacaumeno, Sinadinos, l'Antichità, l'età moderna,” in *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico* 1, ed. Maria Serena Funghi (Florence, 2003), pp. 283–99; Odorico, “Du premier humanisme à l'encyclopédisme: une construction à revoir,” in *Autour du premier*

The Greek terms “ἐκλογή,” “συλλογή” (*ekloge*, *sylloge*; collection/selection of existing materials), “συναγωγή” (*synagoge*; a bringing together of existing materials), and “ἀνθολόγιον” or “ἀνθολογία” (*anthologion*, *anthologia*; collection of extracts), which are used to refer to the collections in question,¹⁵⁹ imply their connection with one or more *hypotexts* that are chosen, brought together, and adapted to create a new text for different purposes and audiences. According to content, these collections may be divided into various categories: scientific, philosophical, theological, gnostic, and literary. For our purposes here, Byzantine literary collections which belong mainly to the genres of hagiography, historiography, poetry, and fable that were popular among Byzantine rewriters of collections are relevant. These rewriters seem to employ similar techniques that are determined by the collection's character rather than by generic conventions.

So far, the most systematic studies of the rewriting techniques involved in the production of a hagiographical collection, such as the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes, are those of Christian Høgel.¹⁶⁰ Through his investigations, Høgel has brought to the fore how Metaphrastes and his team collect, edit, and reorganize their material to create a vast liturgical collection. Høgel also shows some of the formal and narrative transpositions used by the metaphrastic rewriters. Marina Detoraki and Bernard Flusin are in the process of

humanism byzantine et des Cinq études sur le XI^e siècle, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle, Travaux et Mémoires 21.2, ed. Bernard Flusin and Jean-Claude Cheynet (Paris, 2017), pp. 23–42. For historical collections, see Benjamin Anderson, “Classified Knowledge: The Epistemology of Statuary in the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 35.1 (2011), 1–19; Andreas Nemeth, “The Imperial Systematization of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and His Historical Excerpts,” in *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. Jason König and Greg Woolf (New York, 2013), pp. 232–58; Roberto Umberto, “Byzantine Collections of Late Antique Authors: Some Remarks on the *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*,” in *Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Laura Mecella (Berlin, 2009), pp. 71–84; Peter Van Deun and Caroline Macé, *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the International Conference Held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009* (Leuven, 2011). As for Western medieval collections, see, for example, Philippa Bright, “Anglo-Latin Collections of the *Gesta Romanorum* and Their Role in the Cure of Souls,” in *What Nature Does Not Teach: Didactic Literature in the Medieval and Early-Modern Periods* (Disputatio) 15, ed. Juanita Feros Ruys (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 401–24; Toni Davenport, *Medieval Narrative: An Introduction* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 238–77.

159 Signes Codoñer, “Vocabulary for Rewriting in Byzantium,” pp. 69–73.

160 Høgel, *Symeon Metaphrastes*; Høgel, “Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement”; Høgel, “The Reduction of Symeon Metaphrastes: Literary Aspects of the Metaphrastic Martyria,” in *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography*, KULT 59, ed. Høgel (Bergen, 1996), pp. 7–21.

examining the situation in which the *Synaxarion* of Constantinople came into being and the approach and rewriting methods of its composer.¹⁶¹

In his PhD dissertation (submitted recently to the University of Ghent), Panagiotis Manafis provides the most thorough investigation of the rewriting processes involved in the productions of historiographical collections, such as the *Excerpta Anonymi* (10th c.), the *Excerpta Salmasiana* (8th–11th c.), and the *Excerpta Planudea* (13th c.).¹⁶² Through his analysis, Manafis shows that the rewriting techniques of historiographical collections are similar to those of hagiography. Furthermore, Manafis demonstrates the ways in which the historical collections under examination are composed and organized, and discusses some of the quantitative transformations performed by their rewriters. However, more studies are needed to achieve a better understanding of the various rewriting transformations (formal, narrative, quantitative, and other) that take place in the creation of the numerous literary collections produced in Byzantium.¹⁶³ The relevant chapters in the present volume are some first steps toward filling this gap.¹⁶⁴

7 Premodern Hagiographical Rewriting and This Volume

Hagiographical rewriting is the most prolific form of premodern rewriting. This “is not surprising,” since, as Robert Bartlett justly formulates it, “some saints have been venerated for a thousand years and more. [...] A saint can have a different nature at different times and places and for different groups.”¹⁶⁵ Consequently, a popular saint’s legend—and popular saints are not a few, but

¹⁶¹ The first results of their research are presented in this volume (Chapter 9).

¹⁶² Panagiotis Manafis, “Collections of Historical Excerpts: Accumulation, Selection and Transmission of History in Byzantium,” PhD thesis (Ghent, 2018).

¹⁶³ Some recent articles on the much less studied poetry and fable collections are the following: Kristoffel Demoen, “La poésie de la συλλογή: Les paratextes métriques des manuscrits byzantins et le (vocabulaire du) recueil,” in *Pour l’amour de Byzance: Hommage à Paolo Odorico*, ed. Christian Gastgeber and Charis Messis (Frankfurt, 2013), pp. 89–98; Foteini Spingou, “Byzantine Collections and Anthologies of Poetry,” in *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*, ed. Wolfram Hörandner, Andreas Rhoby, and Nikolaos Zagklas (Leiden, 2019), pp. 381–403; Ida Toth, “Fighting with Tales: 2 The Byzantine Book of Syntipas the Philosopher,” in *Fictional Storytelling in the Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond*, pp. 380–400; Høgel, “Wisdom of the Beasts.”

¹⁶⁴ See Chapters 3 (Wortley), 8 (Demoen), 9 (Detoraki and Flusin), 10 (Franco), and 13 (Constantinou).

¹⁶⁵ Robert Bartlett, “Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?” *Saints and Worshippers from the Martyrs to the Reformation* (Princeton, NJ, 2013), p. 541.

numerous—turns into a hagiographical dossier consisting of texts belonging to different genres. Such a dossier may, in turn, take various shapes across time, geography, and cultures. Translation in particular, which makes available popular legends in different language communities, is one of the earliest and “one of the most dramatic forms of hagiographical rewriting.”¹⁶⁶ The first hagiographical translations were made from Greek to Latin and then from Greek to a number of other languages: Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavic. Translations from Greek to Latin were later retranslated into a number of Western vernacular languages.¹⁶⁷ Subsequently, vernacular versions operated as *hypotexts* for later versions in the same or in a different language. Famous legends originally written in Latin, Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and Georgian were also adapted into Greek and other languages.¹⁶⁸

Premodern hagiographical rewriting, either in the form of inter- or intralingual reworking, falls into three main phases which are reflected in the tripartite structure of the present volume's contents, excluding this introductory part. The first phase—titled here “Early Rewriting, East and West” (Part 2)—focuses on a period from the 4th to the 8th centuries. The second phase (“Development of a Praxis and a Concept” (Part 3)), which is devoted exclusively to Byzantine Greek hagiography, lies between the 9th and 11th centuries. Lastly, the third phase (“Late Rewriting” (Part 4)) examines late Byzantine hagiographical rewrites and their characteristics in the 14th century.

There might be some imbalance in the volume's three parts. Part 2 consists of four chapters, Part 3 has six contributions, while Part 4 includes only two chapters. Of course, this imbalance does not reflect the Byzantine reality. As

166 Bartlett, “*Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?*” p. 578.

167 For relevant examples, see Thomas Head, ed., *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology* (New York, 2001).

168 For hagiographical translations from and into these and other languages, see, for example, Dimitri Brady, “Eastern Christian Hagiographical Traditions: Eastern Orthodox,” Eva Synek, “Eastern Christian Hagiographical Traditions: Syriac Hagiography,” Youhanna Nessim Youssef, “Eastern Christian Hagiographical Traditions: Oriental Orthodox: Coptic Hagiography,” Vrej Nerses Nersessian, “Eastern Christian Hagiographical Traditions: Oriental Orthodox: Armenian Hagiography,” in *Blackwell Companion to Eastern Christianity*, pp. 420–61; Bernard Flusin, “Palestinian Hagiography (Fourth–Eighth Centuries),” Sebastian Brock, “Syriac Hagiography,” Bernadette Martin-Hisard, “Georgian Hagiography,” S. Peter Cowe, “Armenian Hagiography,” Arietta Papaconstantinou, “Hagiography in Coptic,” Mark N. Swanson, “Arabic Hagiography,” Ingunn Lunde, “Slavic Hagiography,” Xavier Lequeux “Latin Hagiographical Literature Translated into Greek,” in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 1:199–226, 259–83, 285–98, 299–322, 323–43, 345–67, 369–83, and 385–99; Anna Lambadaridi, “Traduire et réécrire la *Vie d'Hilarion* (BHL 3879): L'apport d'une nouvelle version grecque,” in *Remanier, métaphraser*, pp. 45–60; See also Chapters 2 (Wiśniewski), 4 (Van Pelt, Staat, De Temmerman), and 5 (Andreou) in this volume.

already suggested, hagiographical rewriting has been a continuous phenomenon in Byzantine culture. Yet, it seems that the middle Byzantine period, the golden time of hagiographical production, was also the golden age of hagiographical rewritings. In the Palaiologan period, on the other hand, there is also a very substantial production of hagiographical rewrites, and, therefore the volume's final part is not representative of the Byzantine situation.

Even though they are not exhaustive, each of the volume's chronologically arranged parts includes approaches to different hagiographical genres and rewriting techniques. Altogether, the most important hagiographical genres and forms are discussed: *Apophthegmata Patrum*, Passion, saint's Life, Enkomion, miracle story collection, *Synaxarion*, and *Menologion*. The examined rewriting techniques include all three categories analyzed above (formal, narrative, and quantitative transformations) that are employed by the discussed rewriters to achieve a number of purposes related to literary trends, authorial intentions, audience expectations, and ecclesiastical and imperial propaganda.

The origins of the vast corpus of hagiographical rewrites that have come down to us go back to the 4th century when the genre of hagiography started taking its shape.¹⁶⁹ The need for the first hagiographical rewrites emerged from the cult of martyrs, which started within the early Christian communities (possibly in the 2nd c.), and was intensified in the 4th century through the exhortations and writings of the Church Fathers.¹⁷⁰ A case in point is the legend of

169 Most scholars place the beginnings of hagiographical rewriting much later. For Symeon Paschalidis and Martin Hinterberger, it starts in the 6th century (Symeon Paschalidis, "Παρατηρήσεις στις μεταφράσεις των Βυζαντινών αγιολογικών κειμένων," in *En agiois: Eidika théματα byzantinής kai metabyzantinής agiologías*, vol. 1, ed. Paschalidis (Thessalonike, 2011), pp. 75–88, at p. 78; Hinterberger, "Between Simplification and Elaboration," p. 35). Claudia Rapp sees the beginnings of hagiographical rewriting in the 7th century ("Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians, Seventh to Tenth Centuries," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 21 (1995) *Bosphorus: Essays in Honour of Cyril Mango*, ed. Stephanos Efthymiadis, Claudia Rapp, and Dimitris Tsougarakis, 31–44, at 35), while for other scholars, such as Efthymiadis, Høgel, and Resh, hagiographical rewriting does not start earlier than the 9th century (Stephanos Efthymiadis, "John of Sardis and the *Metaphrasis* of the *Passio* of St. Nikephoros the Martyr (BHG 1334)," *Rivista di Studi bizantini e neellenici* 28 (1991), 23–44, at 23; Christian Høgel, "Metaphrasis in Byzantium," in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Belgrade, 22–27 August 2016, Round Tables*, ed. Bojana Krsmanović and Ljubomir Milanović (Belgrade, 2016), pp. 363–67, at p. 366; Resh, "Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis").

170 See, for example, Bartlett, "Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?," pp. 3–26; Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London, 2004); Vasiliki M. Limberis, *Architects of Piety: The Cappadocian Fathers and the Cult of the Martyrs* (Oxford, 2011); Johan Leemans, "'Schoolrooms for Our Souls': The Cult of the Martyrs: Homilies and Visual Representations as a Locus for Religious Education in Late Antiquity," *Paedagogica Historica* 36.1 (2000), 112–27; Leemans, "Individualization and the Cult of the Martyrs:

Stephen, the first martyr, which in the 4th century underwent a number of rewritings.¹⁷¹ Based on earlier material, Gregory of Nyssa wrote the first two homilies on the martyr, the oldest of which was soon rewritten by Asterios.¹⁷² About the same time, Proklos of Constantinople wrote his own homily on Stephen, that is another rewrite of the saint's legend.¹⁷³

Hagiographical rewriting in the 4th century was accelerated also through the emergence of a new genre, the saint's Life. Athanasios' *Life of Antony*, the first saint's Life, which was composed shortly after Antony's death in 356 (around 360), initiated a number of rewritings, the first of which was an anonymous Latin version that was composed shortly after the production of the Greek *hypotext*. The first Latin rewrite led to the production of another Latin version that was composed in 373 by Evagrius of Antioch. These two Latin versions, in turn, functioned as *hypotexts* for the production of further rewrites in Western vernacular languages.¹⁷⁴

Chapter 2 of the volume "Relate and Retell: Eastern Monastic Stories and the Beginnings of Latin Hagiography" deals with some of the early hagiographical rewritings of the 4th and 5th centuries. Robert Wiśniewski discusses Latin rewritings of Greek monastic stories, some of which have their origins in Antony's Life. According to Wiśniewski, the Western rewritings of Eastern stories take two major forms: translation and incorporation into a new Latin hagiographical work with a different protagonist. As a case study of the first instance, Wiśniewski discusses the Latin translation of the *Historia Monachorum* by Rufinus. Through an examination of Rufinus' rewriting techniques, which

Examples from Asia Minor in the Fourth Century," in *The Individual in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. Jörg Rüpke (Oxford, 2013), pp. 187–212; Johan Leemans, Wendy Mayer, Pauline Allen, and Boudewijn Dehandschutter, *"Let Us Die That We May Live": Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine and Syria (c. AD 350–AD 450)* (New York, 2003).

171 François Bovon, "The Dossier on Stephen, the First Martyr," *Harvard Theological Review* 96.3 (2003), 279–315, at 288–89.

172 Boudewijn Dehandschutter, "Asterius of Amasea," in *"Let Us Die That We May Live,"* pp. 162–193, at p. 176.

173 J. H. Barkhuizen, "Proclus of Constantinople, Homily 17: 'Encomium on the Holy Stephen, First of the Martyrs': Translation and Analysis," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 15 (2004), 1–21.

174 For the two Latin versions, see the recent edition of Pascal Bertrand and Lois Gandt, *Athanasius Alexandrinus, Evagrius Antiochenus, Anonymous. Vitae Antonii Versiones Latinae* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina) 170 (Turnhout, 2018). Due to its great popularity, Antony's Life, was adapted into a number of other languages, such as Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, and Slavic. For the Life's popularity and importance, see Stephanos Efthymiadis, "Hagiography of the Greek Fathers," in *Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, pp. 370–84, at pp. 370–72; Tomas Hägg, "The *Life of St Antony* between Biography and Hagiography," in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 1:17–34.

belong mostly to the category of quantitative transformations, Wiśniewski reveals the rewriter's pro-Origenist stance and his different approach toward monasticism.

The second instance is illuminated through an examination of two Latin saints' Lives: Jerome's *Life of Paul of Thebes* and Sulpicius Severus' *Life of Martin*. In the *Life of Paul of Thebes*, the first monastic Life produced in Latin, Jerome rewrites an episode from Athanasios' *Life of Antony* employing some narrative transformations with a twofold intention. First, he aims at creating a work that is superior to that of Athanasios. Second, he is interested in promoting his own monastic ideals which differ from those of Athanasios. Similarly, Sulpicius uses narrative transformations to present his hero as the protagonist of stories which constitute reworkings of Greek monastic tales.

An important Greek hagiographical rewrite of the 5th century, which is not discussed in this volume, is the anonymous *Life of Thekla* that has as its *hypotext* the 2nd-century apocryphal *Acts of Thekla*. A second rewrite of the latter was produced in the 10th century by Symeon Metaphrastes. Concerning the 5th-century rewrite, it constitutes a considerable amplification of the 2nd-century *hypotext*. The anonymous rewriter creates a high-quality work in which many formal, narrative, and quantitative rewriting techniques are sophisticatedly used to serve aesthetic, religious, and authorial purposes.¹⁷⁵

Rewritings of the 6th century are discussed in the volume's third chapter ("The Anomalous Transition of Beneficial Tales"). Like Wiśniewski, John Wortley examines Eastern monastic tales. He considers, however, the stories' rewritings in a Greek milieu and not any of their innumerable versions in other languages. As Wortley remarks, the transmission of the Greek tales is far too complex due to the large number of manuscripts entailing different versions of the stories. His case study is *The Tale of the Converted Robber* which he examines in five different manuscripts.

The five versions of the tale differ from each other both significantly and marginally. Wortley's analysis is based on a shorter and a longer version which do not seem to be directly connected. The rewriting techniques that he detects are narrative and quantitative transformations which provide the tale with humour and ingenuity. Unlike other hagiographical rewrites, such as the 5th-century *Life of Thekla*, beneficial tales do not undergo any stylistic or other formal transformations. Their vernacular style remains unchanged throughout their numberless early rewritings.

¹⁷⁵ See Stavroula Constantinou, "Thekla the Virgin: Women's Sacrifice and the Generic Martyr," in *The "Other" Martyrs: Women and the Poetics of Sexuality, Sacrifice, and Death in World Literatures*, ed. Alireza Korangy and Leyla Rouhi (Wiesbaden, 2019), pp. 73–86; Johnson, *Life and Miracles of Thekla*.

The fourth chapter (“The Greek *Vita Malchi*: Rewriting Jerome”) by Klazina Staat, Julie Van Pelt, and Koen De Temmerman concerns rewriting in the framework of another hagiographical genre, the saint’s Life. Their case study, the Greek Life of Malchus, is a rewrite whose composition cannot be established with certainty. It is dated between the 5th and the 7th centuries. This chapter examines the Greek rewriter’s strategies in his/her attempt to minimize the interpretative problems of the Latin *hypotext*, Jerome’s *Vita Malchi*, which, due to its double ego narrative might have appeared to a Christian audience as an ambiguous and a less reliable narrative.

According to the chapter’s authors, the ambiguities of Jerome’s text are an instance of the Latin hagiographer’s influence from ancient fiction in which various levels of ego narration complicate the audience’s understanding. The Greek rewriter of Malchus’ Life “improves” the *hypotext* by employing a number of rewriting strategies. These are discernible also in another Greek rewrite of a Jeromian work, the *Vita Pauli*. By using techniques of formal, narrative, and quantitative transformations, the Greek rewriter minimizes the primary narrator’s presence in the narrative while at the same time he/she improves characterization morally. He/she creates a protagonist who is closer to Christian ideals of holiness than Jerome’s hero whose characterization reminds that of an ancient novel’s hero. In so doing, the Greek rewriter updates the Jeromian work to conform with the needs of later audiences from a different culture.

Some other significant rewrites of the 7th century not examined here involve saints John the Merciful and Anastasios the Persian. Leontios of Neapolis’ *Life of John the Almsgiver* is a rewrite of an earlier account produced by Sophronios and John Moschos. As is the case with most influential rewrites, Leontios’ work initiates further rewritings, the oldest of which is that of Symeon Metaphrastes.¹⁷⁶ As for Anastasios, his first Greek Passion is rewritten by George of Pisidia in the form of an Enkomion that becomes the *hypotext* of another Enkomion composed by an anonymous rewriter in the late 9th or early 10th century. A bit later, a new version of the Passion is accomplished once again by Symeon Metaphrastes. The hagiographical dossier of Anastasios also initiated a chain of Western rewrites in languages such as Latin and Old English. According to Bernard Flusin, the early rewrites of Anastasios’ Passion attest to the development of his cult in Constantinople and reflect the struggles of Palestinian monks over religious orthodoxy. Furthermore, George

176 Vincent Déroche, *Études sur Léontios de Néapolis* (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia) 3 (Uppsala, 1995), pp. 117–53; Déroche, “Les réécritures de la Vie de Jean l’Aumônier de Léontios de Néapolis (BHG 886),” in *Remanier, métaphraser*, pp. 61–69.

of Pisidia's rewrite serves Herakleios' imperial propaganda of the victory over Persia.¹⁷⁷

The next chapter ("Many Faces, a Single Pair: Rewriting Mary and Zosimas in the Legend of Mary of Egypt") focuses also on rewritings mostly performed in the genre of saint's Life. Under investigation here, is the popular legend of Mary of Egypt, which, as Andria Andreou remarks, constitutes the very definition of rewriting, as it was constantly rewritten across time, geography, cultures, and media. More specifically, Andreou concentrates on how the legend's two protagonists Mary and Zosimas are written and rewritten in some of the legend's numerous Eastern and Western versions that were produced within a timespan of six centuries (7th–13th c.).

Andreou approaches the characterization of Mary and Zosimas through the Lacanian concepts of the Gaze and Voice. By initiating a dialogue among different rewritings of Mary's legend, both prose and poetic, Andreou shows how the interaction between Mary and Zosimas evolves across time and cultures. She concludes that while some aspects of this interaction persist in the Byzantine tradition they undergo considerable changes in its Western counterpart. For instance, the Byzantine versions are structured around the interdependence of Mary and Zosimas who play an equally central role in the narrative. In the Western versions, in contrast, the protagonist's role is chiefly assigned to Mary who stands for the Voice that serves the didactic purpose of these narratives.

As mentioned before, the time from the end of the 8th until the end of the 10th century is the golden period of Byzantine *metaphrasis*. In this period, greater numbers of hagiographical texts undergo a rewriting process while the creation of liturgical collections with hagiographical rewritings is initiated.¹⁷⁸ As Daria Resh remarks in Chapter 6 ("What is *Metaphrasis*? The Case of John of Sardis [BHG 215i]") which opens Part 3 of the volume, "it would not be an exaggeration to say that in this period rewritings of existing legends outnumber the creation of new ones." In contrast to the earlier rewriters who are to a great extent anonymous and who compose one or a few rewrites, the Byzantine rewriters of the middle phase are mainly eponymous *literati* and prolific rewriters: Theodore of Stoudios, Kosmas Vestitor, John of Sardis, Niketas David Paphlagon, Evaristos, and Symeon Metaphrastes.¹⁷⁹

177 Bernard Flusin, *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VII^e Siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1992), 1:7–181; Mary Whitby, "George of Pisidia and the Persuasive Word: Words, Words, Words ...," in *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, pp. 173–86, at 177–81.

178 Rapp, "Byzantine Hagiographers as Antiquarians."

179 For Theodore of Stoudios, see Efthymiadis, "Hagiography of the Greek Fathers," pp. 379–80; for Cosmas Vestitor, see K. I. Diovouniotis, "Κοσμά Βεστίτωρος ανέκδοτον εγκώμιον εις Ιωάννην τον Χρυσόστομον," *Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών* 1 (1940), 148–55;

Resh's chapter maps the development of *metaphrasis* in the second phase of Byzantine hagiographical rewriting presenting the contemporary understanding of the process, as well as important authors and works of the period.¹⁸⁰ She then goes on to focus on John of Sardis' rewriting techniques in his version of Barbara's Passion, which she identifies as the *hypotext* of the anonymous *Metaphrasis with Enkomion* and Symeon Metaphrastes' own version of the Passion. The fact that Barbara's legend was very popular in Byzantium and beyond, and as a result initiated a notable chain of rewritings allows Resh to put her discussion of Sardianos' version in a comparative perspective. She thus examines Sardianos' rewrite in relation to both previous and later texts of Barbara's dossier: the old Passion (BHG 213–14) and John of Damascus' *Enkomion*, as well as the aforementioned anonymous *Metaphrasis with Enkomion* along with the version of Symeon Metaphrastes. Resh's comparative study concludes that the development of rewriting techniques in the period in question are strongly related to John of Sardis and his rhetorical education through *progymnasmata* that provided him with the know-how of composing narrative rewrites.

Chapter 7 by Anne Alwis ("The Shape of Water: Rewriting Iconoclasm, Islam, and Deleuze in Byzantine Hagiography") also deals with rewritings of martyr legends that outnumber those devoted to the lives of confessors. Alwis examines *metaphrasis* as a rhetorical exercise. Her case study is the legend of Tatiana of Rome, an anonymous rewriting of the old Passion composed at some point between the 8th and 11th centuries. Taking stylistic upgrade as a point of departure, Alwis explores how a phenomenically innocent *stylization* might allow a rewrite, such as the middle Byzantine version of Tatiana's Passion, to operate as an iconophile text, an iconoclast polemic, or as a response to Arab invasions.

In Chapter 8, "*Metaphrasis and Versification: The Paradeisos as a Reworking of Apophthegmata Patrum*," Kristoffel Demoen focuses on a probably anonymous poetic rewrite of the 10th century, which, like the rewrites examined by

François Halkin, "Zacharie, père de Jean Baptiste: Trois panégyriques par Cosmas Vestitor BHG 1881q, r, s," *Analecta Bollandiana* 105.3.4 (1987), 251–63; for John of Sardis, see Chapter 6 (Resh) in this volume; for Paphlagon and his work, see Bernard Flusin, "Vers la métaphrase," in *Remanier, métaphraser*, pp. 85–100; Paschalidis, *Νικήτας Δαβίδ Παφλαγών*; for Evaristos, see Chapter 9 (Detoraki and Flusin), and for Metaphrastes, see Chapters 10 (Franco) and 11 (Høgel), as well as the preceding studies of Høgel mentioned above (n. 160).

180 For other hagiographical rewrites of the same period, see Christian Høgel, ed., *Metaphrasis: Redactions and Audiences in Middle Byzantine Hagiography* (Bergen, 1996); Marina Detoraki, "La métaphrase du Martyre de S. Arethas (BHG 166y). Entre les Actes anciens (BHG 166) et Syméon Métaphraste (BHG 167)," *Analecta Bollandiana* 120 (2002), 72–100.

Resh and Alwis, and in contrast to the ones discussed in the rest of Part 3, was not composed in the framework of a liturgical collection, that was the dominant hagiographical rewrite of the period. Yet *Paradeisos* is a rewrite that has the form of a collection which constitutes the *hypertext* of another collective work, the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. The complex tradition of the *Apophthegmata* does not allow an identification of the *Paradeisos*' exact *hypotext*(s), and as Demoen emphatically writes, "the detective work" is complicated also by the fact that the 10th-century rewriter "combines several *apophthegms* into one piece, or attributes the anecdote to a different Desert Father from the one given in the preserved prose collections."

In the early phase of hagiographical rewriting, which is explored in Part 2 of the volume, the *Apophthegmata*, as stated, underwent different forms of rewriting: translation and quantitative and narrative transformations. In the 10th century, however, the time of encyclopedism and stylistic improvement of earlier texts, the term "*apophthegma*" is replaced by its ancient Greek equivalent "*chreia*." Additionally, the oral and unpretentious prose style, as well as the vernacular language of the ancient *Apophthegmata* are transposed in the learned rewriter's hands into what Demoen describes as "a classicizing style, epic-like language and a sophisticated meter."¹⁸¹ Through such style, language, and meter, the rewriter has the opportunity to demonstrate his/her ancient Greek *paedia*. By attempting an analysis of *Paradeisos*' rewriting techniques of selection, stylization, and quantitative and narrative transformations, Demoen concludes that they serve the rewriter's intention to update the ancient function of the *Apophthegmata* as monastic literature of edification into a new function. The new function would correspond to the needs and expectations of the rewriter's 10th-century audience by providing secular entertainment and exposure to ancient *paedia*.

As far as liturgical collections are concerned, two types of works emerge under imperial patronage: the aforementioned *Synaxarion* of the Church in Constantinople composed by Evaristos and the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes. Both works soon became the *hypotexts* of other *Synaxaria* and *Menologia*.¹⁸² The contents of both types of collections are arranged according

181 For other hagiography in verse, see Stephanos Efthymiadis, "Greek Byzantine Hagiography in Verse," in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 2:161–79.

182 For the *Synaxarion* of Evaristos and other *Synaxaria*, see Marina Detoraki, "Un parent pauvre de la réécriture hagiographique: l'abrégé," in *Remanier, métaphraser*, pp. 71–83; François Halkin, "Le synaxaire grec de Christ Church à Oxford," *Analecta Bollandiana* 66 (1948), 59–90; Andrea Luzzi, "Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople," in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 2:197–210; Paolo Odorico, "Idéologie politique, production littéraire et patronage au Xe siècle: L'empereur Constantin VII et le synaxariste Évariste,"

to the liturgical calendar, but while the *Synaxarion* includes abbreviated versions of hagiographical *hypotexts* the *Menologion* consists of full-length Passions and saints' Lives.

In Chapter 9 (“À la recherche d’Évariste: Remarques sur les notices du Synaxaire de Constantinople”), Marina Detoraki and Bernard Flusin treat Evaristos’ *Synaxarion* as a unique work that owes its character to the inventiveness of its producer, who is commissioned to create an immense work consisting of abridgements of many saints’ stories. Evaristos points to the difficulty of this task: he cannot find enough sources for each saint while at the same time he has to produce satisfactory biographical notices that would conform to the holiness of their subjects and adjusted to the limits of an extremely brief narrative. His successful dealing with these problems, which Detoraki and Flusin explain as an instance of his inventiveness, might in fact be related to an ability shared also by John of Sardis, which according to Resh derives from his rhetorical education.

As Evaristos writes, his notices include the following information: the saint’s identity (“τίς τε ἦν ἕκαστος”), that of his/her adversaries (“πρὸς οὓς ἀντετάχθη”), the time when he/she acts (“τὸν χρόνον”), and the ways in which he/she acts (“τὸν τρόπον”). Taking into consideration the discussion in the previous part of this chapter concerning the essential features of a narrative according to *progymnasmata* (person, action, time, manner, and reason of action), Evaristos, like John of Sardis, is probably aware of these very teachings which he follows for the creation of the *Synaxarion*. His rewriting work, as Detoraki and Flusin demonstrate, involves a number of rewriting techniques that result in the production of various notices that require further study.

In contrast to Evaristos’ *Synaxarion* which has just started attracting literary approaches, Metaphrastes’ *Menologion* has received a number of literary studies from different perspectives. One of these, is Chapter 10 by Laura Franco (“Psychological Introspection and the Image of Sanctity in the Metaphrastic *Menologium*”), which focuses on characterization. Based on a small group of metaphrastic Lives and Passions, Franco examines how Symeon and his team rework the central characters’ psychology (the saint and his/her adversary). She concludes that the examined texts have a deeper psychological introspection than their *hypotexts*. According to Franco, Symeon’s more elaborate

Medioevo Greco 1 (2001), 199–219. For Symeon’s *Menologion*, see the studies of Høgel mentioned above (n. 160). For other *Menologia*, such as that of Basil II, see S. Der Nersessian, “Remarks on the Date of the *Menologium* and the Psalter Written for Basil II,” *Byzantion* 15 (1940–41), 104–25; Der Nersessian, *El “Menologio” de Basilio II Emperador de Bizancio* (Vat. gr. 1613) (Madrid, 2005).

treatment of characterization in some of the *Menologion's* texts is part of his general approach to provide rhetorical amplification, clarification of the narrative, and explanatory comments.

Part 3's final chapter is Christian Høgel's "Sanctification of Hagiographers in Byzantium: The Canonization of Symeon Metaphrastes," which moves from rewrites to rewriters to examine how the most famous Byzantine rewriter is sanctified in the 11th century. Symeon's sanctification is attributed to the important intellectual Michael Psellos (1018–81?) who composed an Enkomion and a liturgical *akolouthia* of Symeon. Høgel brings to the fore the paradoxical nature of Psellos' endeavour who composes a hagiographical dossier that is solely based on information extracted not from Symeon's biography, but from his rewriting techniques. Psellos' canonization of Symeon as a rewriter and not as someone who has led a pious life is "a first clear instance in Byzantium of a purely literary canonization" that attests to the importance of rewriting in Byzantine culture.

The last phase of Byzantine hagiographical rewriting is also rich.¹⁸³ Indeed, the rewriters of this period are several *literati* and monks who undertake to rewrite the legends of old saints, and particularly martyrs. Their production amounts to 125 texts.¹⁸⁴ The most famous and prolific rewriters of the period are Constantine Akropolites and Philotheos Kokkinos. It has to be pointed out that late Byzantine hagiographical rewriting emerges out of different political and ecclesiastical situations. This is the time when after a long Latin occupation (1204–61) Constantinople returns to Byzantine hands. The Palaiologan dynasty seeks to bring restoration and to establish political and social security. Within this framework, hagiographical rewrites become useful tools for imperial and ecclesiastical propaganda, as attested in the volume's last two chapters (Part 4).

Martin Hinterberger in Chapter 12 ("Hagiographical Encomia as *Metaphrasis* in the 14th Century: Some Preliminary Observations") examines for the first time the hagiographical rewritings of Joseph Kalothetos, Nicholas Kabasilas, and Makarios Makres. His literary analysis of the texts in question reveals essential characteristics of the late Byzantine rewriters, their stylistic methods, and approaches. At the same time, he shows how literature becomes the servant of ideology. Finally, Stavroula Constantinou ("A Rewriter at Work: Nikephoros Xanthopoulos and the *Pege* Miracles") demonstrates how an important author

183 For the richness of hagiographical rewriting in late Byzantium, see Talbot, "Old Wine in New Bottles," pp. 15–26; Talbot, "Hagiography in Late Byzantium (1204–1453)," in *Ashgate Research Companion*, 1173–195.

184 Talbot, "Hagiography in Late Byzantium," p. 176.

of the 14th century makes use of his literary talent to support and promote the propaganda of the Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282–1328).

In contrast to the middle Byzantine hagiographical rewrites, those of the late period, despite their richness, are much less studied. Alwis's forthcoming book *Narrating Martyrdom: Rewriting Late-Antique Virgin Martyrs in Byzantium* (Liverpool, 2020), along with this volume will hopefully initiate more studies that will allow a better understanding of the forms and workings of late Byzantine hagiographical rewrites. But, of course, neither early nor middle Byzantine rewriting are sufficiently studied. A lot of work remains to be done by examining more rewrites of these periods and taking into consideration André Lefevere's questions quoted at the outset: "who rewrites, why, under what circumstances, for which audience"?