

This is an extract from:

*The Crusades from the Perspective  
of Byzantium and the Muslim World*

*edited by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh*

published by

*Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection  
Washington, D.C.*

© 2001 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

[www.doaks.org/etexts.html](http://www.doaks.org/etexts.html)

# The “Wild Beast from the West”: Immediate Literary Reactions in Byzantium to the Second Crusade

---

Elizabeth Jeffreys and Michael Jeffreys

The purposes of this study are two: the first and more important is to draw attention to two scappily published and largely ignored Byzantine poems on the Second Crusade.<sup>1</sup> They were written for eyewitnesses of events, with a little hard information caught up in a web of allusive references that require interpretation, typical products of the propaganda machine of Manuel I Komnenos. But the rhetoric is worth analysis, for there is evidence that both poems were written and very likely given some kind of public performance within days, certainly within weeks, of the passage of the Crusade. They may thus be taken as examples of immediate Byzantine reactions to the Crusaders. The less significant purpose is to examine the operation of some of the rhetorical structures of the poems, which, it seems to us, give an unusual degree of insight into the way a twelfth-century rhetorician might use his skills to show his audience how to react to contemporary events.

The poems concerned are nos. 20 and 24 in the huge series of poems attributed to “Manganeios Prodromos,” a conventional name invented by modern scholarship to avoid the difficulties of the word anonymous.<sup>2</sup> This study assumes that Manganeios Pro-

<sup>1</sup> E. Miller, *Recueil des historiens des croisades: Historiens grecs*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1881) (hereafter Miller, *Recueil*), edited only extracts useful for his purposes, some very short, marking poem 20 as from fols. 30r–33r of the manuscript, poem 24 from fols. 35r–37r. Miller wrongly includes in poem 20 the 122 lines of poem 19, which is in a different meter and on another subject. Thus the line numbers he provides for substantial extracts from poem 20 should be reduced by 122 (his numbers are marked here with the prefix Mi). This error is not found in his transcription of Manganeios in Paris, BN suppl. gr. 1219. The extracts he publishes from the two poems are: *Recueil*, pp. 220–25 (poem 20.17–20 [no Mi line numbers], 56–266 [Mi 178–388]); *Recueil*, pp. 228–29 (poem 20.287–307 [Mi 409–29]); *Recueil*, p. 757 (poem 20.329–39 [Mi 451–61]); *Recueil*, p. 188 (poem 20.355–58 [no Mi line numbers]); *Recueil*, pp. 757–58 (poem 20.414–22 [Mi 536–44], 479–87 [Mi 601–9], 582–90 [Mi 702–10]); *Recueil*, pp. 758–59 (poem 24.1–2, 38–39, 88–93, 142–63, 189–90, 212–13, 240–66).

<sup>2</sup> On Manganeios Prodromos, see S. Papadimitriou, “Ο Πρόδρομος του Μαρκιανού κώδικος XI 22,” *Viz-Ūrem* 10 (1903): 123–32; W. Hörandner, “Marginalien zum ‘Manganeios’ Prodromos,” *JÖB* 24 (1975): 95–106; A. Kazhdan and S. Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley, 1985), 87–93; R. Beaton, “The Rhetoric of Poverty: The Lives and Opinions of Theodore Prodromos,” *BMGS* 11 (1987): 1–28; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), esp. 494–500. Quotations from Manganeios Prodromos not taken from Miller, *Recueil*, are from our forthcoming edition of the corpus. To help elucidate the allusions, without which a modern reader cannot follow the poet’s meaning and intentions, we plan to provide in the edition an additional apparatus of “Keywords” on the page

dromos was a different person from the most prominent court *littérateur* of the period, Theodore Prodromos.<sup>3</sup> The name Manganeios acknowledges this poet’s ultimately successful campaign for admission to the hospice of the Mangana complex. Some of his poems were explicitly written for particular patrons, and many others suggest a framework of patronage. He wrote a great deal for the Sevastokratorissa Eirene, Manuel Komnenos’ sister-in-law, but his talents were also available to other patrons, particularly in the imperial administration.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, poem 20 and especially poem 24, as we shall see, were probably imperial commissions.

Both poems are textually straightforward. Like the bulk of the corpus they are preserved in one manuscript only, Marcianus graecus XI 22, a thirteenth-century compendium of twelfth-century court rhetoric, perhaps part of a Nicaean attempt to preserve or revive Komnenian court practices.

Poem 20 deals with the progress of Conrad III’s German crusading army through Thrace in the autumn of 1147. It opens at the top of fol. 30r, in the middle of a speech: the beginning of the poem has been lost as the result of physical damage to the manuscript. Since the order of folios has also been disturbed, it is impossible even to guess how many lines might have disappeared. However, with 642 lines, poem 20 is already one of the longest in the corpus; it is unlikely that it was originally much longer. The meter is the Byzantine twelve-syllable, less common in Manganeios’ work than its other major meter, the fifteen-syllable. We have a subjective impression that Manganeios is less comfortable with the twelve-syllable than with the fifteen-syllable, since the syntax in the former is often strained and the meaning rather muddy. It is also worth mentioning that Manganeios in his surviving corpus repeats far more twelve-syllable lines than fifteen-syllables, as if he is determined to make maximum use of them once they have been forged.<sup>5</sup>

The lines run continuously, with no formal divisions into stanzas. Analysis by content, however, suggests that it falls into five sections of unequal length:

Lines 1–266: Conrad has reached Philippopolis. The poem narrates clashes around the city (88 ff) and at Adrianople (109 ff), culminating in a long description of a

---

below the text, giving references to a “Keyword glossary” at the back of the projected volume. Some of the glossary entries are used experimentally in this study. The poem numbers given here (and in the new edition) are those of E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiae codicum graecorum manuscriptorum catalogus*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1970), 116–25.

<sup>3</sup> Most evidence for the distinction to be made between the two poets was set out by Papadimitriou, “Πρόδρομος,” 123–32, which our edition will repeat with a few additions. Doubts over Papadimitriou’s conclusions are expressed by Kazhdan and Franklin, *Studies*, 87–93. The centerpiece of their argument is a new interpretation of Manganeios, poem 37, which Papadimitriou and others (including ourselves) take as a reference to Theodore as a dead colleague—preventing at a stroke any attribution of the corpus to him. However, Kazhdan and Franklin’s reinterpretation of the poem was successfully attacked by R. Beaton, “Rhetoric,” 17–23. Beaton also goes on to equate the two Prodromos poets, but his own reinterpretation of poem 37 is no more convincing than that which he had demolished. The issue will not be examined further here. Internal evidence shows that the two poems under discussion were written in Constantinople in 1147; beyond that, for present purposes their authorship is immaterial. However, it is worth pointing out that the deconstruction undertaken here of the rhetorical structures that underpin the poems shows poor authorial control, which is characteristic of the Mangana corpus but looser than may be observed in most of the works securely attributed to Theodore.

<sup>4</sup> Magdalino, *Manuel*, 510.

<sup>5</sup> Many lines of poem 20, for example, recur in poem 108, and there is overlap between poems 67 and 69.

flash flood in the camp at Choirobacchoi (131 ff), where many Germans were swept away in a torrent of mud.

Lines 267–286: A transition passage on the forging of the speech by the metaphor of hammering, providing an opportunity to turn attention to tongs as a metaphor for the Virgin, praising her for her miraculous intervention and demonstration of her concern for the imperial city.

Lines 287–346: Conrad's arrival in Constantinople and camping in the suburb of Pikridion, followed by further skirmishes with the Byzantines and his crossing of the Bosphoros to Damalis.

Lines 347–473: An encomium of Emperor Manuel, in the persona of the poet.

Lines 474–642: A further encomium of Manuel, this time put into the mouth of the City of Constantinople.

Poem 24 is much shorter (284 lines), though the difference in length is partly compensated by the fact that it is in fifteen-syllable verse. It is divided into stanzas varying from four to fifteen lines each—a feature that elsewhere in Manganeios' work suggests a fairly formal level of performance before a public audience. Each stanza is marked in the manuscript by a capital letter at the beginning of its first line. The title suggests that the poem is addressed to the emperor as from the City of Constantinople,<sup>6</sup> as a reaction to the crusading armies. It may be summarized as follows (note that the stanzaic division imposes greater fragmentation of sense):

Lines 1–22: The City addresses Manuel, congratulating him because the wild beasts, the Crusaders, have fled, terrified by her new teeth and revitalized appearance.

Lines 23–50: Manuel has dressed the City like a bride with burgeoning flowers.

Lines 51–70: Manuel's good sense has seen off the enemy.

Lines 71–85: The City has been well paid for the cost of bringing him up.

Lines 86–105: He has shown the kings from Old Rome the vigor of New Rome.

Lines 106–141: Manuel has proved unshakable in the face of attack.

Lines 142–149: The crusading armies are depicted begging helplessly for food at the monastery of St. Mamas and on the opposite Asiatic shore of the lower Bosphoros.

Lines 160–194: Manuel is the City's savior, greater than Constantine or Alexander.

Lines 195–228: An eclipse marked the eclipse of the kings; New Rome, invigorated by Manuel, is superior to Old Rome; Manuel has been aided by the Virgin.

Lines 229–284: Manuel shines brilliantly, surpassing his father and grandfather.

Similar events are narrated by Kinnamos and Choniates.<sup>7</sup> The three accounts show considerable, though not complete, unanimity. Manganeios adds a few details and adopts a far more hostile point of view toward the Crusaders than the other two. Both Manganeios' poems show a publicity agenda likely to appeal to employers (or potential employ-

<sup>6</sup> The content of the poem supports the title (not always the case in this corpus): Ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα ὅτε κατέλαβον οἱ ῥήγες ὁ Ἀλαμανίας καὶ ὁ Φραγγίας.

<sup>7</sup> *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, ed. A. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), 73–80; *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. J. L. van Dieten (Berlin–New York, 1975), 63–65. One suspects that the imperial equivalent of press releases for the period were available to all three writers.

ers) in the imperial administration. But whatever spin he was putting on events, we should remember that he was writing as an eyewitness for an audience of eyewitnesses. When he states, for example, that Manuel replaced the City’s teeth under the threat of attack from the Crusaders and that her walls blossomed unseasonably in September,<sup>8</sup> in spite of the vagueness of expression, we should assume some repair of the walls in 1147 and a spectacular display of fabrics to impress the Westerners. Such details command a high degree of credibility. It is the contemporaneity of his accounts that distinguishes Manganeios. In this connection, it is striking that the focus is on Conrad and the German army while the French forces and Louis VII are barely alluded to. The reason may perhaps be because the latter were more amenable, or maybe the events of their passage gave less scope for dramatic representation.

When were these two poems written? A reply to this question may use only internal evidence, prefaced by an indication of Manganeios’ practice elsewhere. The preparation of a preliminary edition of the text of all 148 poems of the corpus has led us to the belief that he usually wrote very fast under the pressure of events, and that poems containing historical narrative may usually be dated shortly after the last event mentioned. The last activity noted in poem 20 is the Germans’ crossing to Damalis (near the modern Üsküdar),<sup>9</sup> and indeed the whole poem is a thanksgiving for the safe removal of this menace from the City’s territory. A poet who shows obvious glee at every sign of the discomfiture of the Germans in Europe could not have ignored the far greater disasters that met them in Asia, had the poem been written late enough to include them. In poem 24 there is a reference to the city’s reaction to the Germans’ arrival in September and to a recent eclipse, perhaps dated to the end of October.<sup>10</sup> It would thus seem likely that both poems were written (and probably performed) around this date, as the Crusaders set out into

- <sup>8</sup> 24.8–13      Πεσόντας τοὺς ὀδόντας μου μαθόντα τὰ θηρία  
ἦλθον ὡς ἂν θηρεύσωσι καὶ καταφάγωσί με·  
ἀλλ’ ὡς Χριστὸς Ἐμμανουὴλ ὁ Μανουὴλ ὁ νέος  
πληρόδοντον ἀνέδειξε καὶ νέαν με τὴν γραΐαν,  
καὶ τρέμει τῶν ὀδόντων μου τὰς νεαρὰς ἐκφύσεις,  
καὶ φεύγει θῆρ τὸ θήραμα, κὰν ὑλακτεῖ καὶ φύσει.  
24.38–44      Ἐξήνηθησαν τὰ τεῖχη μου καθάπερ αἱ κοιλάδες.  
Ἐξέστησαν οἱ βλέποντες Ἀλαμανοὶ καὶ Φράγκοι·  
ἦνθου ὡς κρίνον τὸ λευκόν, τὸ κόκκινον ὡς ῥόδον,  
ὡς κρόκον τὸ χρυσόχρουν, τὸ πράσινον ὡς χλόην,  
τὴν οὐρανόχρουν δὲ βαφὴν ὡς ἄνθος ὑακίνθου,  
ὡς ἴον τὸ λεγόμενον τὸ κατοξέος χρώμα·  
καὶ πάντες κατεπλάγησαν τὴ παραδόξῳ θεῷ.

Cf. Miller, *Recueil*, 758.

<sup>9</sup> 20.333–34: Miller, *Recueil*, 757 [Mi 455–56].

- <sup>10</sup> 24.47–48      Ἐγὼ δ’ ἠρξάμην ἀναζῆν ἀπὸ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου,  
καὶ κατὰ τὸ φθινόπωρον χλοάζω καὶ νεάζω.  
24.195–99      Μέγας ἄστηρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δεινοπαθήσας πρώην  
τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ συνέστειλεν ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ταῖς ὥραις,  
καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἔδειξεν ἐσπέραν παραδόξως,  
καὶ τῶν φωστήρων τῶν ῥηγῶν ἐκείνων τῆς ἐσπέρας  
τὴν ἔκλειψιν ἐμήνυσεν ἐκλείψας ἐν ἡμέρᾳ.

V. Grumel, *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), 466, lists a solar eclipse for 26 October 1147.

Asia Minor, and certainly before Conrad was rescued at Ephesos and brought back to Constantinople, where he celebrated Christmas.<sup>11</sup>

The question of performance is often an insoluble problem in connection with twelfth-century court poetry. Presumably these two texts were to be performed at some gathering or gatherings in Constantinople to celebrate the departure of the Crusaders, since poem 20 uses ἐνθάδε, “here,” in a way that can only mean the City.<sup>12</sup> Manganeios could normally not guarantee his work getting a hearing, though in the case of poem 20 he is optimistic, for the speech refers to its own performance.<sup>13</sup> It is hard, however, to deduce from either poem any details of the occasion.

It is time to look at the two texts more closely, following both the agendas announced at the beginning of this study. We shall examine attitudes shown toward their main characters, Manuel, the City of Constantinople, and the Virgin on one hand, and Conrad and the crusading army on the other, trying to gauge Manganeios’ reactions to the pressure of events and the feelings he expected in his audience, insofar as we are able to discern them. At the same time we shall seek to evaluate the poet’s rhetorical techniques and the frameworks in which he presents the events and personalities of 1147. Since the poems have been published only in scraps, there will inevitably be many quotations in the footnotes to support our analysis. To reduce their number, we shall refer to E. Miller’s publication where we can, despite its faults, and we shall not quote words that seem to us purely conventional (for example, praise applicable to any emperor). The chief conclusion of the second head of the inquiry will point to Manganeios’ use of the small-scale rhetorical reaction at the expense of any overall ideological framework for the poem, leading to inconsistencies at various levels. Evidence for this will be either quoted in full or fully explained with a reference to Miller.

Both poems are dominated by the figure of the emperor. The beginning of Manuel’s reign four years earlier had been a moment of great political tension. His father and two of his three older brothers had died in a brief space of time. Isaac—the remaining brother—and others had dreamed of forestalling him on the throne. It is plain that Manuel’s claims needed all possible public exposure and support, and much contemporary work of court poets and rhetoricians may be read as a concerted attempt to achieve this. The huge output of such material at the beginning of the reign has been well analyzed by P. Magdalino, who shows that attempts were made to convert the emperor’s youth into a glamorous asset.<sup>14</sup> But by the autumn of 1147, Manuel, now aged twenty-nine, had begun to gain experience; he had waged a not unsuccessful campaign against the Seljuk Masud in Ikonion and had been married for more than a year. The rhetoric bol-

<sup>11</sup> Wibald of Stavelot, *Epistula* 78, ed. P. Jaffé, *Monumenta Corbiensia: Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1864), 153; cf. F. Chalandon, *Les Comnène*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1912), 308 n. 2.

<sup>12</sup> Poem 20.121, 130 (Mi 243, 252); Miller, *Recueil*, 222.

<sup>13</sup> At, e.g., 8.214–17 and 15.137–39 he complains that the emperor did not notice his work and at 49.178–98 that he is fourth in the queue of speakers. Cf. 20.54–55:

ὅπως δὲ τοῦτον οἷος ἦν ἐφανέρου  
ὁ νῦν κροτηθεὶς παραδηλώσει λόγος.

<sup>14</sup> “Eros the King and the King of *Amours*: Some Observations on *Hysmine and Hysminias*,” *DOP* 46 (1992): 197–204; *Manuel*, 434–54.

stering his claims to authority no longer needed to be so defensive. Yet one has a sense that the administration had set up a propaganda machine that now continued under its own momentum.

Manganeios molds our perception of Manuel both by isolated remarks in the course of the narrative and by formal encomia. The most common reference is to Manuel’s name, which, being one syllable different from Christ Emmanuel (as befits a created being), endows Manuel with a Christlike disposition.<sup>15</sup> This leads to references to his virtue, generosity, and tireless work on behalf of the City; he is also compared to David as a youngest son selected ahead of older brothers.<sup>16</sup> He is a second Solomon, a second and greater Alexander, the lion’s cub,<sup>17</sup> a glorious bridegroom. The overt encomia include similar comments but also focus on his appearance and physique, his good sense, and his only campaign, that against Ikonion.<sup>18</sup> Manuel is an unshakable rock amidst a sea of troubles. He cares for the City of Constantinople, tends it and renews it, he is its second founder and greater than the first for he has restored it to its former glory.<sup>19</sup> He

<sup>15</sup> 20.97–100 (Mi 219–22): Miller, *Recueil*, 221.

20.312–14      σὺ δὲ προτυπῶν χριστομιμήτοις τρόποις  
τοῦ πρωτοτύπου τὸ πρόσωπον δεσπότητος,  
ὁ χριστοκλητώνυμος, ὁ πρῶτος φύσει . . .

24.171            ἐν σοὶ τῷ ρύσῃ βασιλεῖ, τῷ μόνῳ χριστωνύμῳ.

<sup>16</sup> 20.353–6      σὺ γὰρ ὁ γράφων τοῦ Δαυὶδ τὴν εἰκόνα  
χρῶμασι πρῶτος εὐανθεστάτης  
καὶ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ὡς Δαυὶδ ἔφυς νέος  
ὑστατον ἄνθος ὑστερόρηξ τῷ χρόνῳ . . .

Cf. Miller, *Recueil*, 188.

24.87            καὶ νέος γέγονας Δαυίδ, μακρόθυμος καὶ πρῶτος.

David appears frequently in the corpus as author of the Psalms and a major character in the narrative books of the Old Testament. His first role is to mark some of Manganeios’ many references to the Psalms in direct speech, which adds variety to the poems’ narrative. The second is as a prototype ruler, making Manuel a new David. The closest comparison is that both gained power despite several older brothers. One may add similarity in strength and military skill and in moral character: patience, modesty, meekness, goodness. Both fought a Goliath (in Manuel’s case the Hungarian Bakchinos), and both are celebrated for routing tens of thousands (cf. 1 Sam. 18:7) and for great achievements in marshy areas.

<sup>17</sup> 20.414            Σκύμνον σε τοῦ λέοντος οὐκοῦν καλέσω;

“Lion cub” is a warrior image with imperial links (indistinguishable categories for the Komnenoi). The source is biblical (e.g., Gen. 49:9, Deut. 33:22). It usually refers to emperors, but includes sons, a grandson, and a son-in-law. Reference is mostly to Manuel I, sometimes without mention of a lion father. More often it involves Manuel’s father, occasionally glorifying the son from the father, but usually referring to the son’s precocious development to equality with his father, even the son’s superiority. John II is a lion, Manuel a frisky cub who becomes a lion among cubs, then a lion, then even more of a lion than his dead father.

<sup>18</sup> 20.485–91      ὄτ’ ἐς πόλιν πέφθακας Ἰκονιέων  
ἦν ἐκ παλαιῶν οὐδ’ ἐγνωσμένων χρόνων  
οὐκ εἶδεν ἄλλος οὐδ’ ἐτόλμησε φθάσαι.  
Ἐφριττον οἱ πάντες γὰρ αὐτὴν ὡς Ἴθην·  
σὺ δὲ φθάσας ἐκλείσας αὐτῆς τὸ στόμα  
τὸν Κέρβερον τε τὸν φύλακα τὸν κύνα  
ἔτρεψας ὑλάττοντα, μὴ δάκνοντά σε.

The novelty of the attack on Ikonion is emphasized to an outrageous extent.

<sup>19</sup> 20.461–67      Σὺ γὰρ πολιστής δευτερεύων δεικνύη  
ἄξιος ὄντως ἀνδριάντος χρυσέου,  
εἰ νῦν παρῆν τις Ζεῦξις ἢ καὶ Φειδίδας.  
Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀνήγειρεν αὐτὴν ἐκ βάρθρων

is in fact the celestial light that illuminates the New Rome, supported by the Virgin and defending orthodoxy.<sup>20</sup> The image that is projected here is of a youthful, vigorous, responsible—and handsome—leader, fully justifying the trust placed in him, for he is already surpassing his father and his grandfather, particularly in his competent dealings with the crusading armies.<sup>21</sup> It is also in this context that Manuel is praised for achieving a bloodless victory and for using gold judiciously to achieve it.

Next, the City of Constantinople. In the poems we are considering and elsewhere in the corpus, the City is personified, in the ancient manner, as a female figure. In addition to several isolated references, the City in this persona addresses two formal encomia to Manuel, in the last 170 lines of poem 20 and the whole of poem 24. The figure of the City embodies contradictions that enable the poet to stress both the venerable prestige of Constantinople and the particularly vigorous (and apparently youthful) phase she is passing through in Manuel's reign. The pattern is announced in the first two lines of poem 24: "The City, Lord, shedding the wrinkles of old age and dressed up today as a bride."<sup>22</sup> She is a woman wrinkled with age and lame, an elderly empress,<sup>23</sup> but she becomes a young and beautiful bride, brightly dressed.<sup>24</sup> She is also Manuel's nurse who reared him and looks forward to rearing his children,<sup>25</sup> and whose efforts in nurturing him are now well recompensed. The City's transformation is due to Manuel, who has reversed the roles of mother and child by dressing her in brilliant clothing and persuading

- 
- 24.67–69 σὺ δ' ἐκ βάθρων μέλλουσαν εἰς πτώσιν ῥέπειν  
ἔσωσας, ἐστήριξας αὐθις ἠδράσω,  
ἠλιπισμένου πτώματος αὐτὴν ἐρρύσω.  
καὶ κήτωρ πρωτοδεύτερος ὡς κρείττων ἀνεφάνης.  
Ὁ μὲν γὰρ μόνον ἔκτισε, σὺ δὲ φθαρεῖσαν σώξεις,  
κατακλιθεῖσαν ἀνορθοῖς, στηρίζεις κλονηθεῖσαν . . .
- <sup>20</sup> 20.432–33 τεῖνας δὲ βλέμμα πρὸς μόνην τὴν προστάτιν  
ἐφ' ἣ τὸ κλεινὸν ἄστυ καυχᾶται τόδε . . .
- 20.548–49 ἀσπάζεται σου τὰς κραταιὰς ὠλένας  
δῶρυ στρεφούσας ὑπὲρ ὀρθοδοξίας.
- <sup>21</sup> 20.405–6 Τὰ παππικὰ σοὶ κατὰ Λατίνων κράτη  
ἀντεξετάσω τοῖς νεουρηγῆμασί σου.
- Cf. 24.246–53: Miller, *Recueil*, 759.
- <sup>22</sup> Miller, *Recueil*, 758.
- <sup>23</sup> 20.516–19 Ἴδου γὰρ ἡ γραῦς τῷ χρόνῳ κατεκλίθην  
ὀρᾶς ὅπως ἔκαμψα καὶ τὰς ἰγνύας,  
ὅπως δὲ συγκύπτουσα κεῖμαι πρὸς γόνυ,  
πῶς κατεκάμφθην ὑπὸ ταλαιπωρίας.
- 20.533–35 Νοσεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴ κάμπτεται τε τῷ χρόνῳ  
καὶ τὴν παλαιότητα νῦν δείκνυσί σοι  
ὡς ἂν παρεξῆς χεῖρα μητρὶ μὴ πέση.  
πόλις, τροφός σοι, βασιλὶς γηραλέα . . .
- 20.592 Ὁ βασιλεὺς μου σήμερον ὡς νύμφην με στολίσας  
παστάδα μὲν τὸ τεῖχος μου, θαλάμους δὲ τοὺς πύργους . . .
- <sup>24</sup> 24.32–33 καὶ τοῖς κυκλώσασιν ἐχθροῖς ἡ γραῦς ὀρῶμαι κόρη  
καὶ νύμφη καὶ βασίλισσα καταπεποικιλμένη.
- 24.36–37
- <sup>25</sup> 20.525–27 Γενήσομαι γὰρ χρησίμη σοὶ καὶ πάλιν·  
ἴσως ἀνάξω καὶ γλυκεῖς σοὺς ἐγγόνους·  
ὡς ἐκγόνους θάλψω δὲ καὶ κόλπων ἔσω.



her to put on her cosmetics and conceal her wrinkles.<sup>26</sup> He has renewed her and made her young again. Twentieth-century taste may find some of the images grotesque. The rouge with which the City enhances her cheeks is the blood of the Germans,<sup>27</sup> an image that does not sit well with praise for Manuel’s bloodless victories. The City had lost her teeth, but Manuel had renewed them—probably, as noted above, a reference to repairs to the city walls. The audience is imbued with a sense of civic pride in ancient tradition, a self-confident perception of renewal, and an appreciation that the city’s fate is intimately connected with the emperor and the ruling dynasty. As the Virgin supports Manuel and comes to the City’s defense, so the City is God-built and protected by God.

When we turn to Manganeios’ presentation of Conrad and the crusading army and the motives attributed for their arrival, we find that he assumes that the forces had come with hostile intent. At several points in poem 20, Conrad is said to have planned to capture Constantinople and its territories, to intend a secret attack, and to have designs on the City’s wealth.<sup>28</sup> In its present form, poem 20 opens with Conrad’s schemes to impose his faith on Constantinople and to set up a Latin patriarch in the City.<sup>29</sup> Poem 24 is predicated on the Crusaders’ hostile intentions: at the outset we were told that they had come hunting the aged City, under the impression that she was now toothless and defenseless.

When we look in more detail, we find that Conrad and his army are boorish, bestial, greedy, deceitful, and aggressive.<sup>30</sup> Conrad himself is wily, arrogant, and destruc-

- <sup>26</sup> 20.520–24 Ἐν σοὶ σαλεύω· σὴν τροφὸν μὴ παρίδης.  
Ξέσον τὸ γῆρας, ἀφελοῦ τὰς ρυτίδας,  
τὰ γείσσα μοι στήριζον, ἔνθεες κρηπίδας,  
τὸ πίπτον ἀνόρθωσον, ἀντέρειδέ μοι,  
στόλιζε καὶ καίνιζε τὴν γραῦν ὡς νέαν.
- 24.26–27 Σὺ δὲ στολίζεις καὶ κοσμεῖς, υἱέ μου, τὴν μητέρα,  
καὶ κρύπτεις τὰς ρυτίδας μου καὶ περιβάλλεις φύκος.
- <sup>27</sup> 24.210–14 Σὺ γὰρ ἐχθροῖς με δυνατὴν εἰργάσω καὶ σφριγῶσαν,  
σύ μου τὸ γῆρας ἔξεσας, ἔκρυψας τὰς ρυτίδας,  
καὶ πάλιν ἀνεκαίνισας κοσμήσας καὶ φοινίζας,  
καθάπερ ἐρυθήμασιν Ἀλαμανῶν τοῖς φόνοις  
καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνων αἵμασιν ὡς φύκει με λαμπρύνας.
- <sup>28</sup> 20.61–63 (Mi 183–85): Miller, *Recueil*, 221.  
20.308–10 Ὅ μὲν γὰρ ἐφλέγμασιν οἷς προεσκόπει  
καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὄλβον ἀφορῶν τῶν ἐνθάδε  
ἔσωθεν ὡς θῆρ ἐσπαράττετο βρυχῶν . . .
- 20.631–33 Τὴν σὴν γὰρ αὐτοὶ κατακρατήσαι πόλιν  
καὶ πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐξαλεῖψαι τοῦ βίου  
ἄρδην ἐβουλεύσαντο καθ’ ἡλικίαν.
- <sup>29</sup> 20.1–3 Θρόνον δὲ ταυτόγλωσσον ἐγκαθιδρύσω·  
ὡς ἱεραρχῶν κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ἔθος  
ἄζυμα θύσει τὴν νομικὴν θυσίαν.
- <sup>30</sup> 20.14–17 τοὺς βαρβαρικοὺς ἀποτειχίζον λόχους  
ὡς τισι λόχμασι τοῖς κατασκίοις δόλοισι.  
Ταῦτα προγράψας καὶ καλύψας ἐν σκότει  
τῇ λανθανούσῃ τῆς δίκης ὑποκρίσει . . .
- 20.6–11 ἀλώπεκος μὲν ὑπόκρισιν δεικνύων  
ἐντὸς δὲ κρύπτων τὴν ὄλην σκαιορίαν,

tive.<sup>31</sup> The Crusaders are wild boars, Gadarene swine,<sup>32</sup> fittingly rolled in mud, wild beasts and insatiable serpents from the West; they are from the land of the evening and fit to be eclipsed. They are innumerable, more than the stars or the sand, they are like ants;<sup>33</sup> they are a turbulent sea surging around the rock that is the emperor. Conrad is a fox in disguise, a chameleon, a secret wolf, a savage beast.<sup>34</sup> In other words, Manganeios draws on a pejorative vocabulary and, in particular, on pejorative animal imagery. This can become bizarre: toward the end of poem 24, we are told that the δράκων, dragon, the Latin ruler of Antioch, has become a puppy scrabbling at Manuel's imperial feet.<sup>35</sup> We should remember that the only animal image regularly used in connection with Manuel is of the lion cub.

The Crusaders are also shown in humiliating situations. Manganeios gloats over the disastrous flood at Choïrobacchoi. He takes advantage of the opportunities the name offers for pejorative comments on Bacchic frenzies, on the porcine banquets that the corpses fittingly offer.<sup>36</sup> He relishes the ironies of the army's bitterness in the suburb of Pikridion and starving outside the monastery of St. Mamas.<sup>37</sup> Conrad's pride had provoked divine retribution, and he is reduced to trembling fear.<sup>38</sup>

The few mitigating features in Manganeios' account are used only to paint the rest of the picture darker by contrast. For example, though they are not orthodox (as we can see in the opening passage in poem 20 on the use of unleavened bread), the Crusaders are co-religionists nonetheless and not to be killed.<sup>39</sup> Though now driven wild like the Gadarene swine, they had previously been rational.<sup>40</sup> Conrad is said to be a dedi-

---

καὶ τοῦ προβάτου τὴν δορὰν ἔξω φέρων,  
ἀναιρέτην λύκον δὲ καλύπτων ἔσω,  
καὶ τὸν χαμαιλέοντα τοῖς τρόποις γράφων  
τοῖς ποικίλοις χρώμασι τῶν βουλευμάτων.

20.238 (Mi 360): Miller, *Recueil*, 224.

20.604–9 τὰς ἀκορέστους διψάδας τῆς ἐσπέρας  
κατὰ ποταμὸν ὡσπερ ἐξαντλουμένων  
πρὸς τὰς χαρῦβδεις τὰς αἰὲ κενουμένας . . .

<sup>31</sup> 20.142–43 (Mi 264–65): Miller, *Recueil*, 222.

<sup>32</sup> 20.215–19 (Mi 337–41): Miller, *Recueil*, 224.

<sup>33</sup> 24.51–54 Εἶδετε πὼς ἐμαύρισαν οἱ κάμποι ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους,  
καὶ πὼς βουνοὶ καὶ φάραγγες καὶ νάπαι καὶ κοιλάδες  
ὑπὲρ ἀστέρων ἀριθμόν, ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης ἄμμον,  
κατὰ σωρὸν ἀνέβρυν μυρμηκῶν ἀμετρήτων.

<sup>34</sup> 20.323–27 Ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ πρὶν ὑπουλος, ὁ κρυπτὸς λύκος,  
οὐκ εἶχε κρύπτειν τὴν φυσικὴν μαρίαν  
ἀλλ' ἀναφανδὸν κατὰ τῆς μάνδρας ἔθει  
θῦσαι τε τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας  
καὶ πᾶν σπαράξει τοὺς ὁδοῦσιν ἀρνίον.

<sup>35</sup> 24.254–56: Miller, *Recueil*, 759.

<sup>36</sup> 20.132–34, 181–89 (Mi 254–56, 303–11): Miller, *Recueil*, 222–23.

<sup>37</sup> 24.142–59: Miller, *Recueil*, 758; cf. J. Pargoire, "Les Saints Mamas de Constantinople," *IRAIK* 9 (1904): 261–316, where extensive use is made of Manganeios' account.

<sup>38</sup> 20.105–8 (Mi 227–30): Miller, *Recueil*, 222.

<sup>39</sup> 20.96 (Mi 218): Miller, *Recueil*, 221.

<sup>40</sup> 20.220–23 (Mi 342–45): Miller, *Recueil*, 224.

cated Crusader taking no account of God, his armies hymn the cross but destroy the faithful.<sup>41</sup>

Manganeios’ audience is thus presented with a heroic emperor, a multifaceted city, and bestially aggressive foreigners with few positive features. His audience’s reception of these figures is ruthlessly controlled by the use of loaded adjectives and images, especially animal imagery. Nothing is left to chance in the manipulation of the audience’s sympathies.

The text is enmeshed in a web of biblical allusions. These often show little regard for consistency of reference, as may be shown in the opening passage of poem 20.<sup>42</sup> The initial justification for the sequence of motifs is that Constantinople is the New Jerusalem (20.19)—a regular part of the Byzantine thought-world.<sup>43</sup> If this is so, then Conrad is a Sennacherib, the Assyrian king whose host swept down on Jerusalem (20.20), and may

<sup>41</sup> 20.58 (Mi 180): Miller, *Recueil*, 221.

20.620–21 ναί, δυσμενεῖς ἔλαυνε, ναί, τροποῦ γένος  
σταυρὸν μὲν ὕμνου, τοὺς δὲ πιστοὺς ὀλλύου.

<sup>42</sup> 20.16–48 Ταῦτα προγράψας καὶ καλύψας ἐν σκότει  
τῇ λανθανούσῃ τῆς δίκης ὑποκρίσει  
ἐπεστράτευσε σὺν στρατιᾷ μυρία  
20 ἐν τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς Ἱερουσαλὴμ νέα  
ὁ καὶ Συναχηρεῖμ τε καὶ Δωῆκ νέος·  
εἰ γὰρ θυσίας ἀνελεῖν τὰς ἀρτίαις  
ἔμελλεν οὗτος οὐ σφαγεὺς ἦν τις ἄρα·  
Ὅ γὰρ τὸν ἄρτον μὴ Θεῷ θέλων θύειν  
τὸν ἄρτον αὐτῷ προσφέρεισθαι καλύει·  
25 ὁ κωλύων δ’ αὐτῷ ἱερεῖς ἄρτον θύειν  
τούτους ἀναιρεῖ καὶ λατρεύει τῷ νόμῳ·  
ὁ δεύτερος νῦν Ῥαψάκης καὶ κακίων  
ὁ καὶ λαλήσας κατὰ νοῦν καὶ κρυφίως  
καθαιρετικὰ τῆς Θεοῦ κοινωνίας  
30 —ἄρτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ Θεοῦ μετουσία—  
ὁ μὴ κορεσθεὶς αἱμάτων κατὰ Κύρον,  
ζητῶν δὲ τούτων τὴν μέθην κατακόρω,ς  
ὃς καὶ μετᾶσχοι τῆς καταδίκης Κύρον  
ἦν ἡ Τόμυρις ἡ Σκυθὶς ἐκεκρίκει  
35 εἰς ἄσκον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐνδίκως  
αἵματος ἐμβλήσασα πεπληρωμένον  
καὶ «λάβε, Κύρε, τὸν κόρον τῶν αἱμάτων»  
πρὸς ἀκόρεστον αἰμοχύτην εὐστόχως  
τὸ ῥῆμα τοξάσασα καθάπερ βέλος.  
40 Ὅ προσκυνητῆς τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσορ,  
ὁ πρόσφατος νῦν τοῦ Σατὰν Ὀλοφέρνης,  
ὁ καὶ στρατεύσας ὡς ὁ πρὶν μετ’ ἐλπίδων  
οἶων ἐκεῖνος καὶ φρενῶν καὶ ῥημάτων  
κατ’ Ἐζεκίου τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ νέου,  
45 ὁ θεὸς πρὸς ὕψος οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὸ στόμα  
ὄν τις Ἰουδεῖθ ἡ Θεοῦ χεῖρ ἐκτέμει  
τοῦ καὶ πρὶν ἐκτρίψαντος Ἀσσοῦρ τὸ κράτος  
καὶ τοῦ κραταίου τὸ θράσος λελυκότος.

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., C. Mango, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome* (London, 1980), 207–8, and M. Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge, 1995), 508.

also become, in the same line, Doeg, Saul's herdsman.<sup>44</sup> For David, read Manuel. Doeg we will return to in a moment. Sennacherib's opponent in Judaea was Hezekiah, so a little later (20.44) a new Hezekiah (read Manuel) is the hapless victim of invasions. But the invader this time is Holofernes (read Conrad); it may be pedantic to point out that Holofernes was an emissary of Nebuchadnezzar, not Sennacherib, and it was against Sennacherib and not Nebuchadnezzar that Hezekiah organized resistance. We must assume that the overall precision of allusion is of little importance to Manganeios in comparison with the resonance set off in his audience by each opposition.

This is one of the more elaborately worked out sets of biblical allusions. Other cases may be brief: for example, the flood at Choirobacchoi parallels Samuel's experience at Masifat (Mizpah)<sup>45</sup> (for Samuel, read Manuel). Or they can be more complex, as demonstrated by the most prominent comments found in connection with the flood at Choirobacchoi. Here Manganeios uses two parallels. The first is with the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, an excellent watery precedent.<sup>46</sup> But the poet has to work hard to

<sup>44</sup> The chief of Saul's herdsmen (1 Sam. 21–22), responsible (in the Septuagint) for the murder of eighty-five priests suspected of taking David's side against Saul. On the symbolism of Doeg, see most recently P. Devos, "Doèk dans l'hagiographie byzantine, chez S. Augustin et dans une lettre de S. Basile," *AB* 111 (1993): 69–80.

<sup>45</sup> 20.256–61 (Mi 378–83): Miller, *Recueil*, 225. At Mizpah, after Samuel's sacrifice, God intervened with a thunderous voice (apparently without flood) on Israel's behalf against the Philistines, leading to the rout of the latter (1 Sam. 7:5–11). However, one line of interpretation (e.g., Athanasios, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG 27:201) makes God's intervention a violent hailstorm.

<sup>46</sup> 20.144–80

145	Ἄλλ' ὁ στρατηγῶν καὶ διευθύνων πάλαι διαπερώσαν τὰς Ἐρυθραίας δίνας στρατιᾶν ἀήτητον Ἰσραηλίτιν ἐκεῖνος αὐθις θαυματουργεῖ κρειττόνως. Ἐκεῖσε γὰρ θάλασσα πρὶν διηρέθη καὶ τριστάτιν φάλαγγα Φαραωνίτιν
150	ἄρδην συνέσχε τοῖς ὕδασιν ὡς τάφοις· ἡ νῦν τροπή δὲ καὶ παραδοξουργία τὴν ξηρὰν ὑγρὰν καινοποιεῖ μειζόνως· καὶ γὰρ θαλαττοῖ καὶ νάπας καὶ κοιλάδας καὶ ρευμάτων πέλαγος ἐν πεδιάδι
155	αὐθαρῶν ἀπλοῖ καὶ τὸ ρεῖθρον ἀνάγει ὑπὲρ κεφαλᾶς δυσθανῶν ἀλαστόρων κατὰ τροχιᾶς κυμβάχων στρωφουμένων. Καὶ Φαραῶ μὲν οὐ βυθίζει τῷ τέως, πολλοὺς δὲ τοῖς ὕδασι καταστρωννύει
160	ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖνος συμφοραῖς ἀλλοτρίαις μαθὼν πρὸς οἴαν ἀντιτάττεται κόρην πορθεῖν ἐάση τὴν μερίδα τῆς κόρης. Ὅρα γὰρ οἶα θαυματουργεῖται ξένα· ὁ μὲν ποταμὸς ἐβρυχάτο μακρόθεν,
165	τὸ δὲ στράτευμα καταπλαγὲν τῷ ψόφῳ πληθὺν βαρείας συνδρομῆς στρατευμάτων καὶ δοῦπον ὑπόπτειυσεν ὡς ἐξ ἰππέων καὶ παραχρήμα θωράκων καὶ κνημίδων καὶ παντὸς ἀντείχοντο συνήθους ὅπλου
170	καὶ τὸν σίδηρον ἐνδυθέντες, ὡς ἔθος, ἴσταντο πάντες τὰς σπάθας ἐσπασμένοι γίγαντες αὐτόχρομα σιδηρενδύται

make it apply to Chirobacchoi. Many of the enemy drowned: for Pharaoh’s men, read the German army; for the Israelites, read the Byzantines. But in Exodus the Red Sea divided and water became dry land before the sea rushed back: at Chirobacchoi, the land was dry and became sea, or at least a flooding river. According to Manganeios, the flood was unprecedented, though Choniates calls it an annual occurrence.<sup>47</sup> In Old Testament terms, Pharaoh (read Conrad) was drowned, but now Conrad survived: this, says Manganeios (20.160), was so that he could learn the strength of the Virgin’s support of his enemies. The Lord had worked a greater miracle, a modern improvement on Exodus (20.147, 152). Manganeios is convinced that the present can be better than the past, and gets round the differences between the two situations by the brazen claim that God had now achieved a more spectacular success.<sup>48</sup>

The rhetorical point that Manganeios was impressing on his audience was an equation of the Byzantines with the Israelites, the Lord’s chosen people, and of their enemies with the Israelites’ enemies. There is no need to explain the moral superiority in the conflict conferred by this equation. But the inconsistency involved is much wider than the list of incongruous parallels given above, and in fact it undercuts the whole of the first part of the poem. The same passage in which Manganeios enthusiastically accepts the Jewish part of the Byzantine heritage, as we have seen, also accuses Conrad, directly and by implication, of Judaizing. The Old Testament appears on Manganeios’ list of positive rhetorical exempla for the claiming of righteousness, while accusations of Jewish religious practices are also prominent in Byzantium as negative exempla, means of condemning nonorthodox Christians.<sup>49</sup> Both sets of references seem to be invoked automatically, and there is no overall control of the ideological framework sensitive enough to pick up the clash. There could hardly be a more convincing demonstration of the small-scale, mechanical operation of Manganeios’ rhetorical methods.

A second biblical parallel used in connection with the flood at Chirobacchoi involves the Gadarene swine, a reference for which the name Chirobacchoi, with its scope for porcine puns, admirably suited Manganeios’ purposes. This leads to another major tool used by Manganeios: wordplay. Punning is a significant feature of Manganeios’ style, as for many Byzantine writers. Poems 20 and 24 provide ample instances. Some are trivial, like the play on λόχος and λόχη in 20.14–15<sup>50</sup> or on πεποιθέναι and πέπονθεν in

---

175 πρὸς Ἄρεος κίνησιν ἠῦτρεπισμένοι  
πρὸς εἰσβολὴν ἔτοιμον ἰστώντες δόρυ.  
Ῥοῆς δὲ μικρᾶς ἐκδραμούσης ὀξέως  
ὁ Φαραῶ πρῶτιστος εὐθύς ἰπότης  
ἀντιστάτης ἔφευγεν ἀλλ’ οὐ τριστάτης  
ἕως τὸ κύμα τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ῥόου  
180 συρρεῦσαν ἐστρόβησε πολλοὺς ἀθλείους  
ἐν Χοιροβάκχοις τὸν βίον λελοιπότας.

<sup>47</sup> Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 64.62–67.

<sup>48</sup> Compare other analogies with Alexander and Constantine mentioned above, where Manuel is unhesitatingly called greater than his ancient parallels. Such self-confidence seems particularly common in the 12th century.

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., the discussion by G. Dagron, “Judaïser,” *TM* 11 (1991): 359–80, at 364.

<sup>50</sup> 20.14–15 τούς βαρβαρικούς ἀποτειχίζων λόχους  
ὥς τισι λόχημαίς τοῖς κατασκίους δόλοις.

20.122.<sup>51</sup> Some have become an almost automatic response, for example, the use of *χριστομίμητος* for Manuel, referred to above. In other cases Manganeios is taking serendipitous advantage of opportunities presented by geographical names: for example, the play on *δέρκει* and *Δέρκος* at 20.332 or *ἀδάμας* and *Δάμαλις* at 20.334; or the name of the river that flooded: a blacknamed (*μελανώνυμος*) flood suddenly poured down and hid the army in black death (*μέλανι θανάτω*).<sup>52</sup> As we know from Choniates, the river that runs over the plain of Choroibacchoi is the Melas, the Black.

At times Manganeios develops these chance opportunities extensively. He seizes on the fact that the German armies camp in the district of Pikridion to play with concepts of bitterness:<sup>53</sup> Conrad's bitter mood, caused by his setbacks (20.300), and bitter herbs associated with the Jewish use of unleavened bread (20.302)—for Manganeios a defining feature of nonorthodox Christians, as is clear from the opening of poem 20. Choniates and Kinnamos confirm that the German army was encamped at Pikridion,<sup>54</sup> so we need have no suspicion that the demands of rhetoric are taking over the narrative. In other cases we should perhaps be more wary.

Let us look at two instances. In poem 20, at lines 31 to 37 (cited in note 42 above), we find wordplay on *κόρος* and *Κύρος*, “excess” and “Cyrus.” In spite of the loss of the poem's opening lines, it is clear that what is being expressed is the questioning of Conrad's motives in coming to the East and, in particular, suspicion that he intends to impose the Latin rite on the Eastern church. Conrad is then denigrated with a series of animal images. But “unleavened bread” has flicked Manganeios' rhetorical switch marked “Judaism” and has set him off on the series of biblical allusions already discussed, with references to the new Jerusalem (20.19, meaning Constantinople) and Sennacherib (20.20) and the “new Doeg.” Doeg's relevance here is as a murderer: he stands for Conrad's violence, although Conrad has not yet in fact inflicted any bloodshed on Byzantine troops. This is no hindrance to Manganeios. Conrad, he says, is proposing to impose the use of unleavened bread, a practice that will prevent the use of *ἄρτος*, the true bread (20.24), which is tantamount to murder. One senses that Manganeios may have realized after writing the line that his reference to Doeg went beyond the facts. However, instead of crossing it out, he decides to justify it by the rather strained claim of theological murder. At this point, Manganeios, having exhausted his biblical references, switches his symbolic register to the classical: Conrad is like Cyrus, insatiable. With the Scythian queen Tomyris and a tag from Herodotus comes the punch line, “*Λάβε, Κύρε, τὸν κόρον τῶν αἱμάτων*” (20.37).<sup>55</sup> This whole passage shows an escalation of rhetorical paradigms further and further away from the historical situation.

A passage in poem 24, lines 145 to 159, is another interesting example where it is not impossible that rhetoric has got the better of geography (see note 37 above). Manganeios depicts the plight of the starving German army, reduced to begging for food. He de-

<sup>51</sup> 20.122 (Mi 244): Miller, *Recueil*, 222.

<sup>52</sup> 20.332–34 (Mi 454–56): Miller, *Recueil*, 757; 20.205–7 (Mi 327–29): Miller, *Recueil*, 224.

<sup>53</sup> 20.298–307 (Mi 420–29): Miller, *Recueil*, 229.

<sup>54</sup> Choniates, ed. van Dieten, 65.3; Kinnamos, Bonn ed., 75.14.

<sup>55</sup> On Tomyris and Cyrus, see Herodotus, 1.205–14.

scribes them crossing the Bosphoros toward its southern end, from the suburb, or harbor, of St. Mamas. Choniates and Kinnamos give no confirmation for this place name: Manganeios seems to be the sole authority for this detail.<sup>56</sup> However, the name provides a splendid opportunity for a play on words that puts the threatening foreign hordes into a humiliating perspective, using the Greek “baby talk” word for food, which remains in use to this day: καὶ ψηλαφοῦσι Μάμαντα καὶ Μάμαντα φωνοῦσι (20.148). Granted the pun, there would be a temptation for Manganeios to shift the point of embarkation to St. Mamas, if indeed it had taken place elsewhere. It must, of course, have been close enough to pass the test of the eyewitness audience to which we have referred.

Within a year the wholly negative picture of the Crusaders given in these two poems had to be adjusted in public, for political reasons. Conrad himself, his army decimated, was brought back to Constantinople and healed by Manuel’s medical skill; Conrad’s brother Heinrich Jasomirgott was married to the most eligible unmarried female of the Komnenoi, Theodora, third daughter of the Sevastokratorissa Eirene and the emperor’s deceased brother Andronikos. This German alliance was to be a central plank of Manuel’s Western policy, aimed particularly against Roger II and the dangerous Normans of Sicily. Manganeios, perhaps because of his close connection with the bride’s mother, wrote an official Epithalamion for the wedding. He used stanzas of ten fifteen-syllable verses each, which we believe to be the mark of his most prestigious poems written for public performance: “Dance, Alamania, and leap and shine brilliantly! For the Sevastokrator’s most beautiful daughter is being united to the glorious duke, to his great good fortune, and he is becoming more brilliant from her greater brilliance and much more glorious from her greater glory.”<sup>57</sup>

The tone is one of almost unalloyed jubilation and triumphant and brilliant ceremonial. The magnificent emperor, Manuel, is bestowing a glorious bride, Theodora, upon a worthy bridegroom, Heinrich. The emperor is a radiant sun, shining brilliantly all around him, while the bridegroom is also a luminary, though a lesser one, “a star who has come from the West to the dawn of daylight”; Manuel is asked not to let the full beams of his radiance blot him out.<sup>58</sup> But even so, “the most fortunate duke . . . is advancing from glory to greater glory, he is being promoted from honor to higher honor.”<sup>59</sup>

There are few shadows in this picture. The bridegroom and his German background

<sup>56</sup> See Pargoire, “Les Saints Mamas,” 303; cf. F. Chalandon, *Les Comnène*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1900), 278 n. 2.

<sup>57</sup> 22.1–5 Ἄλαμανία, χόρευε καὶ σκίρτα καὶ λαμπρύνου·  
τοῦ γὰρ σεβαστοκράτορος τῆ παγκαλλίστη κόρη  
ὁ δούξ ὁ μεγαλόδοξος πανευτυχῶς ἐνοῦται,  
καὶ γίνεται λαμπρότερος ἀπὸ τῆς λαμπροτέρας,  
καὶ μεγαλοδοξότερος ἐκ τῆς ἐνδοξοτέρας.

Ed. C. Neumann, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber und Geschichtsquellen im XII Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1888), 65–68.

<sup>58</sup> 22.16 τὸν ἐξ ἐσπέρας εἰς αὐγὴν ἡμερινὴν ἐλθόντα.  
22.17–20 Μὴ πάσας τὰς ἀκτίνας σου, μὴ πάσαν σου τὴν αἴγλην,  
μηδὲ τὸ φῶς τοῦ δίσκου σου, μηδὲ τὸ πᾶν σου σέλας  
εἰς τὸν ἀστέρα σήμερον ἐκπέμψης τῆς ἐσπέρας,  
ἵνα μὴ κρύψῃς τῷ πολλῷ φωτὶ σου τὸν ἀστέρα.

<sup>59</sup> 22.35–36 ἀπὸ γὰρ δόξης σήμερον πρὸς μεῖζω βαίνεις δόξαν,  
ἀπὸ τιμῆς εἰς κρείττονα τιμὴν ἀναβιβάζῃ.

are firmly subordinated to Manuel and the Byzantines: but the praise, though faint, is real. The only negative hints come in the list of Manuel's martial achievements, for it is said that he has "shown the Kelts too to be boastful skeletons and to have humbled the lofty pretensions of the Kings"—a characteristic pun within a reference to the Second Crusade which was to become a cliché.<sup>60</sup> In the last line of this poem, Manuel becomes the "benefactor of him who did you harm,"<sup>61</sup> that is, the bridegroom had been involved in events (surely the crusade) that called for the exercise of benevolence by Manuel.

But through Manganeios we have also privileged access to the reactions of the bride's family at less public moments. In a series of poems written within three years of the marriage, which we believe were performed within the family, the loss of Theodora is described as a major disaster in the life of Eirene the Sevastokratorissa. Eirene's life was tempestuous, and her reactions to misfortune were always intense, as may be seen from the words of Manganeios and other writers close to her. But her response to the fate of Theodora is shown as unusually and consistently vehement, over several poems and several years: the complaint is that Theodora had been torn from her mother and handed over to a savage monster, to live a gloomy life of exile. Elsewhere, Eirene is consoled for the loss of a golden chick, a nightingale imagined as singing mournfully amid rocks and precipices, surrounded by a flock of birds of prey.<sup>62</sup> This is presumably, in part at least, an expression of natural maternal distress that remained keen even years after the marriage. Theodora was the first Komnene bride to be married outside the empire, so that the maternal sensitivities of the ladies of the imperial family were not yet blunted.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore, it is possible that Theodora was being sent to an area to which Eirene was personally antipathetic. If Eirene was of Norman background (as we have suggested elsewhere), she may have objected to the use of her daughter to cement a Byzantine alliance with the German dynasty, opponents of the Normans.<sup>64</sup> We have no evidence that the mar-

<sup>60</sup> 22.53–55      ὁ καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας καθελῶν καὶ τὸν αὐτῶν σατράπην,  
καὶ σκελετοὺς καὶ τοὺς Κελτοὺς τοὺς ἀλαζόνας δεῖξας,  
καὶ τῶν ῥηγῶν καταβαλὼν τὰς ὑψηλὰς ἐπάρσεις . . .

Western kings (ῥήγες) for Manganeios, including the unrecognised Western Emperor, are naturally of inferior status to the Byzantine Emperor. Reference is positive when the king is an ally, usually linked by marriage, as with the ancestors of Manuel's wife, Bertha-Eirene, Conrad of Germany and the King of Jerusalem. But kings on crusade are shown negatively, even the same Conrad. The plural, "kings," becomes shorthand for the Second Crusade, when the Kings of France and Germany are astounded, humbled, beaten off, and routed.

<sup>61</sup> 22.96      ὅτι καὶ τοῦ λυπήσαντος ἐφάνης εὐεργέτης.

<sup>62</sup> 41.46–55      Βλέπω σε γὰρ στυγνάζουσαν ἐν μέσῃ χαρμοσύνῃ,  
καὶ τὸν παρόντα γλυκασμὸν μιγνύσαν ἀπινθίῳ,  
ὅτι μὴ βλέπεις τὸ χρυσοῦν ἐκεῖνο σου στρουθίον,  
τὸ πρὸ μακροῦ συμπετασθὲν καὶ μὴ συναναζεῦξαν.  
50      Ἄλλὰ γὰρ λέγε μοι λοιπόν, χρυσόθριξ, χρυσοχίτων,  
ἐν ποίῳ τόπῳ τὸ τερπνὸν αὐλίζεται στρουθίον;  
Ποῦ κελαδεῖ τὸ λιγυρὸν τῆς ἀθυμίας μέλος;  
Ποῦ μουσουργεῖ τὸ πενθικόν, ποῦ τὸ θρηνώδες ᾄδει,  
ἐν φάραξι, ἐν ὄρεσιν, ἐν πέτραις, ἐν σπηλαίοις,  
ἐν ἀκρωρείαις, ἐν κρημοῖς, ἐν τόποις κατασκίτοις;

<sup>63</sup> P. Magdalino, *Manuel*, 201–17; see also R. Macrides, "Dynastic Marriages and Political Kinship," in *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, ed. J. Shepard and S. Franklin (Aldershot, 1992), 263–80.

<sup>64</sup> E. M. and M. J. Jeffreys, "Who Was the Sevastokratorissa Eirene?" *Byzantion* 64 (1994): 40–68, at 65–66.



riage was unhappy in personal terms. A poem written around 1151, describing a visit by Theodora to her mother in Constantinople, accompanied by one of her sisters, makes purely conventional comments.<sup>65</sup> And the marriage was a dynastic success: Theodora’s symbolic role was significant in the establishment of the Babenbergs in Austria and of Austria as an independent political entity.<sup>66</sup>

This study has provided documentation for an immediately negative Byzantine reaction to the Second Crusade—a reaction of suspicion and intolerance which one might anticipate, but which is otherwise difficult to demonstrate. In at least one part of the ruling dynasty of the Komnenoi, this attitude may be confirmed by its continuation after the end of the Crusade, with Eirene the Sevastokratorissa being encouraged by Manganeios to put aside the diplomatic niceties of the marriage of her daughter and to relive the painful moment of her loss via the demonization of the bridegroom, using the same pejorative animal imagery we have seen in operation in the poems written during 1147: “When did such a union of opposites take place? When did a maiden cohabit with a flesh-eating beast? When did a delicate girl unite with a dragon? When has a tender calf been joined to a wild boar? All this I endured when I saw my tender daughter defiled, when the wild beast from the west was joined with her, and I wept over my living daughter as though she were dead.”<sup>67</sup>

Exeter College, Oxford, and the University of Sydney

<sup>65</sup> Poem 55, dated (probably accurately) by Magdalino to 1150. In the title, Theodora and her sister are returning ἀπὸ τοῦ ταξιδίου (from campaign), i.e., from the imperial army camps which made a kind of alternative court during Manuel’s reign. There is no indication that her sister had been to Austria with her.

<sup>66</sup> This subject is dealt with exhaustively by K. J. Heilig, “Die Verwandtschaft der Theodora im byzantinischen Kaiserhaus,” in *Kaisertum und Herzogsgewalt im Zeitalter Friedrichs I.*, ed. T. Mayer, K. Heilig, and C. Erdmann (Leipzig, 1944), 229–71.

<sup>67</sup> 47.116–23

Πότε τοιαύτη γέγνε τῶν ἐναντίων μίξις;  
 Πότε θηρὶ συνώκησε παρθένος ὠμοβόρω;  
 Πότε συνήλθε δράκοντι μαλθακωτάτῃ κόρῃ;  
 Πότε συνήθη μονίῳ τρυφερωτάτῃ μόσχῳ;  
 120 Ἄλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο γεγονός ἐπέστην οὐχ ἔκοῦσα,  
 καὶ τὸ τερπνὸν θυγάτριον λελυμασμένον εἶδον,  
 ὅπῃ θῆρ ἐσπέριος ἐκεῖνῳ συνηώθη,  
 καὶ ζῶσαν ἀπεθρήνησα κατὰ νεκρὰν τὴν παῖδα.

Cf. Miller, *Recueil*, 768–69.