

Introduction

Few Byzantine emperors had a life as eventful and as rich as Manuel II Palaiologos (1350–1425). Living and ruling during the last decades of the empire, Manuel witnessed rapid territorial loss, dire socio-economic problems and civil wars between his own family members. Both his father, paternal grandfather and maternal grandfathers were emperors – not to mention his brother and nephew. The last two Byzantine emperors were Manuel’s sons. His own reign saw the Ottomans lay no less than three sieges on Constantinople and intense communications with Rome for a Church union. Even as a prince, he faced rebellions and was left behind as a hostage in foreign territories by his father. As a young man, Manuel ruled Thessalonike, one of the major cities of the empire, in his own right and withstood a siege of the city for five years. As emperor, he was compelled to accompany the Ottoman sultan on his campaigns, fighting to ensure the success of the rival empire. He had to strive against the centrifugal tendencies of the Byzantine elite and the increasing gap between the rich and the poor. Theological disputes further engulfed his society. In 1399–1402, when he travelled to Western Europe to seek help against the Ottomans, Manuel also became famous as the only Byzantine emperor to visit London and Paris. This celebrated voyage was recorded in Europe both in textual and visual sources.

In short, Manuel sat at the crossroads of Byzantine, Western and Ottoman history. He was part of a fascinating era that witnessed the rise of the Ottoman Empire and the beginnings of the Italian Renaissance. He crossed paths with many influential figures. In Europe he was hosted by Charles VI, the mad king of France, and Henry IV of England, and he visited their courts at a time when authors such as Christine de Pizan and Chaucer flourished. Manuel feasted and exchanged gifts with the uncle of the French king, the renowned art collector Jean de Berry. He campaigned, hunted and clashed with Sultan Bayezid, the Ottoman ruler nicknamed ‘the Thunderbolt’. The emperor was also in contact with

early Renaissance scholars such as Guarino of Verona, as well as with French and Ottoman theologians. Manuel's own Byzantine literary circle boasted famous figures such as Demetrios Kydones, Manuel Chrysoloras, Joseph Bryennios and Isidore of Kiev; all famed literati, authors and teachers of the period. Even more exceptionally, Manuel himself was a notable author. He penned thirty-three surviving works across an impressive array of genres. These works amount to more than 1000 pages in modern editions: letters, orations, sermons, poems, prayers, dialogues, ethico-philosophical and theological treatises. His oeuvre is remarkable for its erudition, its literary style and the insights it provides into the emperor's own life. The life of the author-emperor, Manuel II Palaiologos offers a fascinating window into the last decades of the Byzantine Empire.

Naturally, this intriguing Byzantine historical figure has attracted a fair amount of scholarly interest. Many works have been devoted to aspects of Manuel's life, especially those concerning his reign and political career.¹ In the last decades, editions of the emperor's works have also significantly progressed, while studies have also started to emerge on selected works of his oeuvre, and of his philosophical and theological thought.² Undoubtedly, the monumental monograph by John Barker, written in 1969, remains the

¹ J. Berger de Xivrey, 'Mémoire sur la vie et les ouvrages de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue', *Mémoires de l'Institut de France, Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres* XIX, 2 (Paris, 1853). See also, Th. Khoury, 'L'empereur Manuel II Paléologue (1350–1425), esquisse biographique', *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 15 (1965), 127–44; A. A. Vasiliev, 'Putešestvie vizantijskago imperatore Manuila Palaeologa po zapadnoi Evrope (1399–1403)', *Žurnal Ministerstva Naradnago Prosvěšeniia*, N. S. 39 (1912), 41–78, 260–304; and G. Schlumberger, *Un empereur de Byzance à Paris et Londres* (Paris, 1916). R. J. Loenertz, 'Manuel Paléologue et Démétrius Cydonès: remarques sur leurs correspondances', *Echos d'Orient* (1937/38), 271–87; 474–87 (1938), 107–24; 'La première insurrection d'Andronic IV Paléologue (1373)', *Echos d'Orient* 38 (1939), 334–45; 'Manuel Paléologue, épître à Cabasilas', *Μακεδονικά* 4 (1956), 38–46; 'Notes sur le règne de Manuel II à Thessalonique, 1381–1387', *BZ* 50 (1957), 390–6; and 'L'exil de Manuel II Paléologue à Lemnos 1387–89', *OCP* 38 (1972), 116–40; G. T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica (1382–1387)* (Rome, 1960). See also the studies in G. T. Dennis, *Byzantium and the Franks, 1350–1420* (London, 1982). Bibliographic references will be abbreviated from Chapter 1 onwards, for reasons of convenience.

² *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*, ed. and trans. G. T. Dennis (Washington DC, 1977); *Funeral Oration to his Brother Theodore*, ed. and trans. J. Chrysostomides (Thessalonike, 1985); *Dialogue with the Empress Mother on Marriage*, ed. and trans. A. Angelou (Vienna, 1991); and *Dialoge mit einem Perser*, ed. E. Trapp (Vienna, 1966); Ch. Dendrinos, *An Annotated Critical Edition (editio princeps) of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' Treatise On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (PhD thesis, Royal Holloway and New Bedford College, University of London, 1996); C. Kakkoura, *An Annotated Critical Edition of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' Seven Ethico-political Orations* (PhD thesis, Royal Holloway, The University of London, 2013); F. Leonte, *Rhetoric in Purple: The Renewal of Imperial Ideology in the Texts of Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos* (PhD thesis, Central European University, 2012). This thesis has now been published as a monograph, but it appeared too late to be included in this biography, see F. Leonte, *Imperial Visions of Late Byzantium. Manuel II Palaiologos and Rhetoric in Purple* (Edinburgh, 2020).

authoritative work on Manuel.³ It is a comprehensive and masterly study of the political aspects Manuel's reign and is of immense value as a narrative history of the emperor's statesmanship. Since its priorities and aims were different, however, it largely leaves out the voluminous literary output and the personal life of Manuel.

Aims and Methodologies of this Study

This book is not a narration of Manuel's reign, nor is political history at its core. Rather, it is a biography that seeks to construct an in-depth portrait of Manuel as a writer, ruler and a personality. Despite his fame as a scholar-emperor, Manuel's works are generally used to extract information about the political and socio-economic circumstances of the period. The literary features of these works are seldom discussed and Manuel's authorship is mostly valued mainly because he was an emperor. However, he also deserves recognition as an author, and not solely for providing scholars with 'historical data' and ideological insights through his politically charged works. I will focus on Manuel as an author, and on discussing his literary, theological and philosophical works. This biography offers, for the first time, a comprehensive study of his complete oeuvre. Several of the emperor's works are analysed for the first time, while his more well-known works are given new interpretations. The biography focuses especially on Manuel's self-representation in his works and examines some features of his literary style. Related to his study as an author, the book also traces several aspects of Manuel's philosophical and theological views.

Another major theme of this biography is a more 'personalized' study of Manuel's life, including his relationships with family, friends and foes; his everyday life; his thoughts and feelings on people and on events and the world around him. Although a portrayal of the emperor as a personality may not alter the Palaiologan historical narrative, it can enrich our understanding of Manuel as a person; a real human being who once lived, loved, hated and hoped. After all, history is not only about political, socio-economic, religious or cultural phenomena, but also people themselves. Although the book will offer some new insight into his rulership, an exploration of Manuel's rulership is a subsidiary subject here and thus will not become a central discussion. As a whole, I envision this present

³ J. W. Barker. *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick, 1969).

study as an amalgam of literary and personal biography, supplemented by discussion of Manuel's rulership.

The developments in the study of Byzantine literature over the last two decades are especially relevant and merit some discussion for any treatment of Manuel and his oeuvre. It is against this scholarly backdrop that I look at Manuel's works and authorship. Scholarship on Byzantine authors and texts has not only flourished, but also drastically changed its approach. Previously, Byzantine texts were considered a poor imitation of antiquity; their lofty language, veneration of ancient authors and adherence to the classical literary tradition were frowned upon. Their high register Attic Greek, complex and difficult language, metaphors, puns, quotations and allusions were discarded as being mere artifice and unnecessary ornamentation. The abundance of these elements, the reliance on established rhetorical forms, the references to classical and biblical works were all seen as manifestations of a lack of sincerity, creativity and as a sign of the 'unoriginality' of Byzantine texts and those who composed them. Scholars generally conceded that Byzantine texts could very rarely – that is, almost never – be read for pleasure and enjoyment. One could only use these works, be they letters, orations or histories, to extract the historical data that was hidden under 'the veneer of rhetoric'. Similarly, Byzantine authors were deemed as lacking in creativity and thus literary merit. Manuel II Palaiologos, also suffered his fair share of such critiques.

This unfortunate understanding has now been largely discarded. The study of Byzantine literature has been transformed thanks to the pioneering works of scholars such as Alexander Kazhdan, Margaret Mullett, Panagiotis Agapitos, Paolo Odorico and Stratis Papaioannou. Now, Byzantinists emphasize the need to study Byzantine literature in context and on its own terms. These works were composed as 'literary' artefacts, and not as receptacles of historical information for future historians to plunder; they deserve serious study of their literary features.⁴ It is also argued that what a Byzantine author

⁴ Although the bibliography is vast, see especially P. Odorico and P. A. Agapitos (eds.) *Pour une nouvelle histoire de la littérature byzantine: problèmes, méthodes, approches, propositions. Actes du colloque international philologique 25–28 Mai 2000, (Paris, 2002)*; M. Mullett, 'The Classical Tradition in the Byzantine Letter', in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition: University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies* 1979, eds. M. Mullett and R. Scott (Birmingham, 1981), 75–93; M. Mullett, 'Originality in the Byzantine Letter: The Case of Exile', in *Originality in Byzantine Art, Literature and Music: a Collection of Essays*, ed. A. Littlewood (Oxford, 1995), 39–53; M. Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (Aldershot, 1997); S. Papaioannou, 'Letter Writing', in *The Byzantine World*, ed. P. Stephenson (Routledge, 2010), 188–99; A. Kazhdan, and S. Franklin (eds.) *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the 11th and the 12th Centuries* (Cambridge, 1984); and I. Ševčenko, 'Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose', *JÖB* 31/1 (1981), 307–12; S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos. Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2013), Henceforth, Papaioannou, *Psellos*. N. Gaul, *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik. Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten der frühen*

and reader might have enjoyed in these texts was drastically different from the modern scholar's preferences. Atticizing Greek, complex sentence structures, classical and biblical allusions and rhetorical devices were not considered by the Byzantines to be signs of literary artifice or insincerity. They were an indispensable part of their literary tradition, essential elements that they desired and appreciated in compositions.⁵ Quotations, allusions, puns, similes, metaphors and other such devices were the features that imbued these works with their aesthetic quality, lending them beauty and affording pleasure to the reader. More often than not, these also presented the reader and the audience with additional layers of meaning that could be peeled away through slow and careful thought.

Adherence to literary tradition, or established rhetorical forms and devices, was likewise a much-desired feature for the Byzantine audience. Imitation (*mimesis*) of authors such as Plato, Demosthenes or Gregory of Nazianzos was an integral part of the Byzantine literary tradition. Contrary to modern values, *mimesis* was imbued with positive qualities; imitation was seen as a praiseworthy emulation of models of virtue.⁶ The preoccupation with 'originality' and 'creative genius' is a far more recent phenomena which chiefly emerged in the eighteenth century. Hence, Byzantine authors and audience did not share this concern with modern readers. Moreover, as recent studies have amply demonstrated, staying within the confines of tradition does not render one author indistinguishable from the another. While operating within the established forms and practices, many Byzantine authors developed their own style and introduced 'innovative', personalized touches to the established textual practices. One can thus speak of 'originality' and 'individual style' within tradition – that is, innovation and change did not take place against the tradition, but rather within it. Recent research has also demonstrated that many Byzantine texts were intended for circulation and for oral performance. This also changes our perception of the intended audience and the composition.⁷

Palaiologenzeit (Wiesbaden, 2013) and A. Pizzone (ed.) *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature. Modes, Functions and Identities* (Berlin, 2014). The following discussion on Byzantine literature is based upon these studies.

⁵ See M. Lauxtermann, 'Byzantine didactic poetry', in *Doux Remede, Poésie et poétique à Byzance, Actes du IVe colloque international philologique, Paris 23–24–25 février 2006*, eds. P. Odorico and P. Agapitos (Paris, 2009), 37–46, and the introduction in M. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres* (Vienna, 2003) for some observations on this issue.

⁶ Papaioannou, *Psellos*, 90.

⁷ One such study is I. Toth, 'Rhetorical theatron in Late Byzantium: The Example of Palaiologan Imperial Orations', in *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, ed. M. Grünbart (Berlin and New York, 2007), 429–48. For scholarship in Western literary history and literary theory, see S. Burke, *The Death and the Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault*

One example illustrating this change in scholarly approach is the case of Byzantine epistolography. Earlier scholarship considered Byzantine letters to be artificial and empty displays of rhetorical flourish: the language was unduly complex, and they were adorned with puns, metaphors and allusions. Moreover, they were seen to contain little ‘concrete’ information, as the author seldom referred to his or her life, nor to the socio-political or economic situation of the empire. Letters read as if they had been composed in a timeless vacuum, and were laced with constant themes of separation, friendship and the desire for aesthetic pleasure. What, then, scholars asked, was the purpose of writing a letter at all?

Margaret Mullett’s work on the letters of Theophylact of Ochrid, however, demonstrated that Byzantine authors did not compose these works in the same spirit as ‘modern’ letters, that is, to convey concrete information to their recipient, but rather as beautifully ornate, polished compositions filled with literary features. The chief goal of a Byzantine letter, unlike a ‘modern’ one, was not to convey information about one’s mundane life. Further, if necessary, such messages could be orally delivered by a letter-bearer. Thus in sending a letter the author signalled several things to his/her recipient: that he or she wished for contact, that he/she deemed the recipient worthy of receiving a letter and that he/she valued the recipient’s friendship. The mere act of sending of a letter was a message in itself; it expressed a desire for communication and regard for the recipient.

Instead of offering concrete information, a letter thus aimed at providing literary delight to the recipient; sophisticated language, metaphors, allusions and quotations were highly desired and appreciated features in this context. For instance, Manuel’s allusions to Aristophanes in his letters from Asia Minor in 1391 were not mere embellishments, they imbued layers of meanings to the text and lent it a sense of humour. A Byzantine letter was meant to be read aloud and re-read many times, discovering new layers of meanings in its metaphors or allusions with each reading. In this context, it is now also understood that letters were not private communications between two people. Letters were meant to be circulated among a literary circle, and sometimes performed aloud in literary gatherings called *theatra*. A letter was to be made known to many people, each of

and Derrida (Edinburgh, 1998); M. Biriotti, ‘Introduction: Authorship, Authority, Authorization’, in *What is an Author?*, eds. M. Biriotti and N. Miller (Manchester and New York, 1993); T. J. Miller, *Poetic License: Authority and Authorship in Medieval and Renaissance Contexts* (New York and Oxford, 1986); J. Pucci, *The Full Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven, 1998); and R. Corradini (ed.) *Ego Troubles: Authors and their Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2010).

whom evaluated its literary features and gave an ear to its political or personal messages. In this manner, one advertised his or her views and formed a network. Through this network, letter writers sought patrons, political and literary support, as well as asked for favours or help. When these letters are analysed in this way, scholars gain invaluable insights into the Byzantines' own aesthetic criteria, as well as into the social and cultural functions of the letter.

Another current research topic in Byzantine literature which has significance for Manuel's biography, is the issue of self-representation. The primary example of this is Stratis Papaioannou's insightful study of Michael Psellos and his self-representation.⁸ It produces a detailed examination of Psellos' self-representation and omnipresence in his texts: how did Psellos fashion his self-image in his writings? What were the factors that influenced his opting for a particular persona, and under which circumstances? How did he contextualize his self-representation in the Byzantine literary tradition, and on which models did he build? Psellos' 'I' voice in the texts is not an organic and direct reflection of Psellos himself, but rather a constructed literary persona; an act of self-portraiture. This holds true not only for Psellos, but also for all Byzantine authors. Hence, it is not Psellos' psyche that is examined through his texts, but rather his self-representation. This self-representation bears traces of his predilections, fears and desires, as well as being conditioned by audience, occasion, style and genre. It reflects how the author wished to be perceived by the audience and for posterity. Through such analysis of self-representation, one gains invaluable insight into Psellos' authorship and also for other Byzantine authors.

Another crucial debate in the scholarship surrounds the the questions: what is Byzantine literature? How does one decide which Byzantine texts are literature and which are not? And how did the Byzantines conceive their own texts? These are questions that naturally pertain greatly to Manuel's case as an author. Did he produce literature, and how can one classify his texts? It has been amply demonstrated that the Late Antique and Byzantine concept of literature was distinct from our modern sense, if such a concept existed at all. Many of these texts were produced with aesthetic pleasure as a secondary goal. They had political, social and educational goals that have nothing to do with our modern perception of literature. Rhetoric supplied all of the tools for any textual production, be it a letter, poem or theological treatise. All texts sprang from patterns, practices and

⁸ See footnote 4 above; Papaioannou, *Psellos*, especially 3–4.

devices found in rhetorical manuals and earlier models. The Byzantines did not even have a word that directly and exclusively corresponded to literature. The term *logos* (pl: *logoi*) was used for literary, rhetorical, philosophical and theological works. *Logos* was also used to signify learning, belles-lettres and even literate education in broad subjects. Thus, the modern term literature and *logoi* do not overlap strictly. The Byzantines also employed the word *techne*, skill or art, to refer to the act of writing. They could use the term *logos* to denote any work and refer to an author's *techne* when speaking about writing. In this regard, a prominent scholar has pointed out that it is no coincidence that the modern Greek word for literature is a combination of the two: *logotechnia*.⁹

There is thus no proper definition of literature in a Byzantine context. Nor is there scholarly consensus on what constitutes Byzantine literature or on the requirements for a text to be considered 'literary'. As one scholar succinctly illustrates: '... these texts have an undeniable literary dimension – though it remains to be discovered what it is.'¹⁰ A marked preoccupation with textual aesthetics can lead to a text being considered literary. A surplus of rhetorical/literary devices, such as the employment of features like characterization, allusions, sound harmony, metaphors and imagery, can also result in a particular text being recognized as 'literary', though not always. To complicate matters further, the boundaries between Byzantine literary, rhetorical, philosophical and theological were blurred; philosophical works could be composed as elegant poems, and literary letters could have theological digressions. Further, official documents might include elegantly composed preambles replete with rhetorical elements. Ultimately, defining a Byzantine work as 'literary' or 'literature' is a difficult and complicated issue. Is an imperial oration 'literature' because it makes use of beautiful imagery? Likewise, when the preamble of an imperial document is laden with rhetorical/literary elements, does it become literature? What about the Acts of the church synods? Is a rhetorical school exercise of character portrayal literary or not? These questions have been met with a wide range of answers from scholars: some believe that the majority of Byzantine written artefacts should be considered literary, while others propose that these texts should be considered non-literary works, albeit with a pronounced rhetorical flavour. The boundaries for defining the literary are as flexible as opinions are diverse.

⁹ See P. Magdalino, 'A History of Byzantine Literature for Historians', in *Pour une nouvelle histoire*, 167–84. See footnote 4 above.

¹⁰ Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid*, 3. See footnote 4 above.

Thus, we return to an important question for this book: did Manuel produce literature? None of Manuel's works can be called literature in the modern sense, since they were all composed with political, social and educational goals that have very little to do with the function of modern works of literature. As the definition of Byzantine literature is so elusive, in this biography none of Manuel's writings are referred to specifically as works of literature. Nor does this study attempt to strictly categorize his oeuvre as literary, rhetorical or philosophical. Instead, I will speak of 'literary features' or 'literariness'. Although classifying Manuel's orations as rhetorical compositions is easy, in the case of a work like the *Dialogue with a Persian*, a theological dialogue displaying remarkable literary features, it is much more difficult. The *Dialogue* is a theological work, but on occasion, it has almost novel-like qualities. Manuel's entire oeuvre, be it a theological treatise, a letter or a prayer, reveals his remarkable interest in and penchant for literary aspects of writing: characterization, complex strategies of self-representation, imagery and metaphors. And it is in these elements that one can observe Manuel's style as an author as well as his personal touches to the textual traditions. Thus, when attempting to discuss the emperor as an author one needs to study his complete body of work.

How did the Byzantines themselves evaluate their texts? What would have made Manuel's works 'good' in the eyes of his audience? Byzantine rhetorical manuals give us some insight into the Byzantines' own criteria for their *logoi*. These handbooks assign a more secondary role to aesthetics, and instead focus on the ethical and educational dimensions of a text. However, this does not mean that textual aesthetics did not matter; quite the contrary. This is also suggested by the common Byzantine association of painting or sculpture, with writing. Several significant criteria can be gleaned through rhetorical handbooks and the texts of several Byzantine authors, including Michael Psellos, Theodore Metochites and Demetrios Kydones.¹¹ Notions such as gracefulness and charm (*charis*), clarity (*saphe-
nia*), dignity (*semnotes*) and force (*deinotes*) dominate their criteria. These could be achieved by employing the appropriate style and form for the occasion, by harmonizing the sound, and by combining various rhetorical/literary elements in a seamless, organic fashion.

¹¹ G. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, 1983), 4–5, 97–100; *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art: A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics*, eds. and trans. C. Barber and S. Papaioannou (Indiana, 2017); *Theodore Metochites on Ancient Authors and Philosophers. Semeioseis gnomikai 1–16 & 71*, ed., trans. and notes K. Hult (Gothenborg, 2002), 156–7, 164–75; *Démétrius Cydonès Correspondance*, 2 vols., ed. R. J. Loenertz (Rome, Vatican City, 1951–60).

An advisory oration, for instance, should have a persuasive and forceful style, and powerful and ear-catching sounds. Similarly, a work of history could charm by incorporating myths or allusions appropriate to the occasion. Along with the flow and rhythm of language, the sound harmony and the well-blended presentation of rhetorical/literary elements, the ideas presented and the emotional expression were of equal importance. Other important criteria included the ability to communicate many things with a few words and to choose the most appropriate style and form for each occasion. Thus, imagery, metaphors, allusions, puns, jokes or quotations were not meant to be piled upon each other indiscriminately, in the best cases they were chosen with care to fit the text; not merely adorning it but enriching its meaning.

All textual composition relied on the earlier models, devices and strategies found in rhetorical handbooks. However, many Byzantine authors introduced their own touches by deviating from set practices, altering and cancelling patterns, and by experimenting with and mixing various elements.¹² An author could thus alternate forms, styles and produce variations on established devices such as commonplace imagery. In this way, if two Byzantine authors relying on the same pre-existing model were to compose, say, imperial orations on the same topic, they never produced identical works. The adherence to established forms and practices, moreover, did not mean that the Byzantines did not appreciate ‘personal’ touches and departures from tradition. Any variation, whether it pertained to textual structures or elements such as metaphors, was noted and appreciated. This appreciation of variation can be seen in the comments made by many Byzantine authors who evaluated the ancient or contemporary authors.

It has been proposed that looking at verse or prose rhythm, archaic or elated language, fiction, story-telling and the intent to charm, educate or entertain, is beneficial when studying Byzantine texts and their ‘literariness’. After all, such features clearly and consciously reveal a preoccupation with the literary. However, this leads to another debate that asks: what is the exact difference between a rhetorical device and a literary feature? And is there a strict division between the two? Characterization, sound patterns, imagery, metaphors and all other such devices were discussed in Byzantine rhetorical handbooks. Similarly, conveying ideas and feelings appropriate to a given text and occasion, setting the mood, or how to evoke the desired emotion, were explained in rhetorical manuals. Rhetoric was indeed the

¹² E. Bourbouhakis, ‘Rhetoric and Performance’, in *The Byzantine World*, ed. P. Stephenson (Oxford and New York, 2010), 175–87.