SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL
OF
BYZANTINE
AND
MODERN GREEK STUDIES

Editorial

In this third volume of the Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, we are happy to welcome a guest-editor, Dr AnnaLinden Weller, who has edited five articles from a conference that she organized at Uppsala University in 2016 within the frame of the 'Text and Narrative in Byzantium' research network. The articles are written by Baukje van den Berg, Stanislas Kuttner-Homs, Markéta Kulhánková, Jonas J. H. Christensen and Jakov Đorđević, provided with an introduction by AnnaLinden Weller. In addition, the journal includes two more articles – one by David Konstan, based on his 2016 lecture in memory of Professor Lennart Rydén, and one by Adam Goldwyn – and two book reviews.

In October 2018, Modern Greek Studies in Lund will organise the 6th European Congress of Modern Greek Studies, and according to the number of submitted abstracts it promises to be an interesting event for scholars from many countries around the globe to come together.

The journal is open for unpublished articles and book reviews related to Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies in the fields of philology, linguistics, history and literature. It is published in collaboration with Greek and Byzantine Studies at Uppsala University and we welcome contributions not only from Scandinavian colleagues, but from scholars all around the world.

Vassilios Sabatakakis
Modern Greek Studies
Lund University

Instructions for contributors to

SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL
OF
BYZANTINE
AND

MODERN GREEK STUDIES

SJBMGS encourages scholarly contributions within Byzantine and Modern Greek philology and history.

Manuscripts of articles to be considered for publication should be sent to Marianna.Smaragdi@klass.lu.se or Marianna Smaragdi, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University, Box 201, 22100 Lund, Sweden.

Your article will be refereed. If it is accepted for publication, you will be asked to supply a final version on e-mail. Authors will receive five copies of the journal volume.

The SJBMGS is a nonprofit venture to be distributed on an exchange basis to scholars and libraries.

Copyright: The authors and the editor.

Scenic narration in the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* of spiritually beneficial tales[1]

Markéta Kulhánková

> The stories [...] seem extremely simple – perhaps even simple-mind-ed and inept – if we ask of them the questions which many modern stories invite us to ask. It is bad enough that the characters are what we call two-dimensional, with no revealed depths of any kind; what is much worse, the "point of view" of the narrator shifts among them with a total disregard for the kind of technical focus or consistency generally admired today. But if we read these stories in their own terms, we soon discover a splendid and complex skill underlying the simplicity of effect.[2]

With these words Wayne C. Booth characterised *Decameron* and went on to demonstrate Boccaccio's skilfulness in com-bining the two basic modes of narration, *telling* and *showing*. This statement would seem even more fitting when it is applied to ear-lier medieval narrative literature, and especially to hagiography. In this paper, I will make use of the methods of contemporary literary theory and, following Booth's exhortation, I will ask several questions about one genre of early Byzantine hagiography. The aim is to uncover the features specific to the so-called *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier*, a group of tales written down by an anonymous author (or perhaps authors) at the end of the 6th century.[3]

---

[2] Booth 1983, 9.

[3] For this analysis, I will work with the eight stories edited by Dahlman 2007 and will

Together with the almost contemporary *Spiritual Meadow* by John Moschus or *Lausiac History* by Palladius (early 4th century), it is one of the most distinguished representatives of the edifying story (also called spiritually beneficial tale), a minor but prolific genre[4] of early Byzantine hagiography closely connected to the beginnings and growth of monasticism in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria.[5] I will argue that the literary technique of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* is unusual within the genre, especially concerning the systematic preference for the *showing* mode of presentation.

The notions of *telling* and *showing* are widely used in contemporary narrative theory, but theorists do not always present mutually compatible interpretations. Some theorists create a strict distinction between the presence or absence of a narrator and that of dialogue. While previous scholars considered *showing* to be superior to *telling*,[6] more recently narratologists have turned to the question of how an author can effectively combine narratorial comments with *showing*.[7] The debate has been strongly influenced by Gérard Genette. He focused his interest on distinctions between the narrator's greater or lesser distance from what he or she is telling as well as between the "narrative of events" and the "narrative of words", which, according to Genette, can be seen only as actual *mimesis*.[8] Without aspiring to involve myself in the debates about which mode is superior or about the possibility or impossibility of "showing" with words, I will ground my approach in the currently

---

not consider other tales also attributed to abba Daniel, such as those included in the older edition by Clugnet 1901 or the one edited by Skaka & Wortley 2004. For other language versions, see also Vivian 2008.

[4] I follow the concept of *hagiography* as a superordinate term for a group of various congeneric genres (*vita, passio, apophthegm, edifying story*, etc.), some of which can be further divided into subgenres (see, e.g., Constantinou 2004 or Kulhánková 2015, 17–19). This concept, in my view more useful than treating *hagiography* as a single genre, has been also adopted by Efthymiadis 2014, the most recent referential work for Byzantine hagiography.

[5] For the characteristics of the genre and its representatives, see Wortley 2010, Binggeli 2014, and Kulhánková 2015, 13–33.

[6] See, e.g., Lubbock 1965, 62.

[7] See Booth 1983, 8–9.

[8] Genette 1980, 162–185.

prevailing view, which can be briefly summarised as follows. *Telling* (also called *diegesis* or the *diegetic mode*) explicitly describes the characters' traits, has a higher degree of narrative speed, gives less detailed descriptions of events and draws attention to the storyteller; at the same time, it is characterised by partiality and the feeling of a large distance between the narrator and the story. In contrast, *showing* (also *mimesis* or the *mimetic*, *scenic*, *impersonal,* or *dramatic* mode) leaves the characters' traits to be inferred by the reader, has a lower degree of narrative speed, gives more detailed descriptions of events, and draws attention to the story; at the same time, it is characterised by objectivity and the feeling of a short distance between the narrator and the story.[9]

In what follows, I will try to demonstrate that, in contrast to other similar texts, the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* has several prevailing narrative elements: a tendency to minimise narratorial comments and explications; efforts to present events vividly; and involvement of the audience in the story. I aim to pinpoint the techniques used for creating such an impression and the functions served by such a set of techniques.

Concerning the structure and method of the analysis, I draw on the work of the German medievalist and narratologist Eva von Contzen and her concept of medieval narratology. Von Contzen begins by noting that classical narratology is biased both temporally and generically and that the ahistorical focus and exclusion of context discourages medievalists from applying its methods, to the detriment of both medieval studies and narratology.[10] Subsequently, von Contzen attempts to systematise medieval narratology as an autonomous section of narratology and to provide a better methodological grounding for it. She maintains that medieval narratology requires both close reading and the inclusion of the historico-cultural context and that it has to be incorporated within the framework of post-classical narratology.[11] She also attempts to provide a set of methodological tools which would enable not only an examination of the diachronic development of individual features or groups of

---

[9] See a useful survey of the concept and its development by Klauk & Köppe 2014.
[10] Von Contzen 2014a, 4–6.
[11] Ibid. 16.

such features,[12] but also a comprehensive synchronic analysis of entire works. Her search for suitable methods led her to combine pragmatics and discourse analysis with narratology to form "pragma-narratology", as she called it. She has devised the following three broad categories, which, as she puts it, should be used free of expectation and narratological prejudice: *focalisation*, which refers to all instances of point of view; *localisation*, which comprises all instances of time and space; and *vocalisation*, which covers all representations of voicing, such as the narrator's voice and the character's direct or indirect discourse. For the sake of this paper, I have adopted these three categories, and I will try within these categories to isolate, collect, and interpret the most important elements of the text. The second and most crucial step, in accordance with von Contzen, is to link these features and structures to their functions as meaningful parts of narrative communication (directed both inwards, into the narrative, and outwards, towards the audience).[13] I will start the analysis with a look at space, time, and narrative levels (localisation) and then proceed to techniques more closely connected with the characters and the narrator (focalisation and vocalisation).

I. Localisation

ἐν μιᾷ οὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν λαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ γέρων καὶ ἀνέρχεται εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν· ἔθος γάρ ἐστι τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τῆς Σκήτεως ἀνέρχεσθαι πρὸς τὸν πάπαν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἑορτῇ. καὶ ἔφθασαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὡς περὶ ὥραν ἑνδεκάτην, καὶ ὡς περιπατοῦσιν εἰς τὸν δρόμον, βλέπουσιν ἀδελφὸν γυμνὸν περιεζωσμένον καμψαρικὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ψυῶν αὐτοῦ. ἦν δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἐκεῖνος προσποιούμενος τὸν σαλόν, καὶ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι σαλοί. καὶ περιῆγεν ὡς σαλὸς καὶ ἐξηχευόμενος καὶ ἁρπάζων τὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ παρέχων τοῖς ἄλλοις σαλοῖς. εἶχε δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Μάρκος ὁ τοῦ Ἵππου. δημόσιον δέ ἐστιν ὁ Ἵππος. ἐκεῖ ἔκαμνεν ὁ Μάρκος ὁ σαλός, καὶ κατέλυεν ἑκατὸν νούμια τῆς ἡμέρας· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκοιμᾶτο εἰς τὰ σκαμνία. ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἑκατὸν νουμίων ἠγόραζεν ἑαυτῷ ἀννώναν δώδεκα νουμίων, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα παρεῖχε τοῖς ἄλλοις σαλοῖς.

---

[12] Something with which Monika Fludernik and other German scholars have already been engaged, see, e.g., Fludernik 1996 and 2003.

[13] Von Contzen 2014b, 183–185.

πᾶσα δὲ ἡ πόλις ἐγνώριζε Μάρκον τὸν τοῦ Ἵππου διὰ τὴν ἐξηχίαν αὐτοῦ.[14]

> One day the elder took the disciple and went up to Alexandria, for it is customary for the *hegoumenos* of Sketis to visit the pope at the Great Feast. They arrived at the city towards the eleventh hour. As they were walking in the street, they saw a brother who was naked, wearing only a loincloth around his loins. This brother was pretending to be a fool, and with him were other fools. He went around like a fool and a madman snatching away things in the market and giving them to the other fools. He also bore the name Mark of the Hippos (the Hippos is a public bath). There Mark the Fool worked, and he earned one hundred *noummia* a day, he bought provisions for himself for twelve *noummia*; the rest he gave to the other fools. All the city knew Mark of the Hippos because of his insanity.[15]

This extract from the tale about *Abba Mark the Fool* (no. 2) is indicative of the construction of the setting, both in terms of space (and location) and time. As with most of Daniel's tales, the narrative begins with the departure of the abba and his disciple from the desert for the turbulent secular world. The reader is provided with minimal information about the monks' living place. In contrast, details of the places they visit are provided frequently (see the passage about the Hippos public bath and Mark's salary there). Only three (nos. 1, 7, and 8) of the eight stories edited by Dahlman are partly set in the desert, but this part usually constitutes more or less the exposition to the factual narrative which, again, predominantly takes place in the secular environment. The desert has the rather symbolic function of a peaceful harbour where stories are told, not experienced (see, e.g., 6, 52–56). It is opposed but not hostile to the secular world, and it is the secular world where, in most cases, the hidden sanctity is revealed by the abba.[16]

---

[14] 2, 6–19.

[15] Translation (here and elsewhere): Dahlman 2007.

[16] This image corresponds to the development of the genre, initially set in the monastic environment of the (mainly Egyptian) desert and addressed to a predominantly monastic audience. In later collections, we observe a gradual shift towards the secular environment connected with the opening of the genre towards also a secular audience.

Thus, the setting of the narratives is mostly Alexandria and its surroundings, although sometimes also more distant places such as Constantinople (nos. 6 and 8) and Antioch (no. 7). Typical for the presentation of space is the journey: the heroes are constantly on the move (see the verbs of motion in the first part of the cited passage: ἀνέρχεται, ἀνέρχεσθαι, περιπατοῦσιν, περιῆγεν), and the setting changes several times within one tale. For example, the relatively brief story no. 1 (*Abba Daniel from Sketis*) is initially set in Sketis; it then moves to the unspecified location of Daniel's captivity, the hero subsequently travels to all five seats of the patriarchs and Ephesos, and the story culminates in Alexandria, from where the hero returns to his home in Sketis. Similarly, the setting of tale no. 6 (*Eulogios the Stonecutter*) switches among Sketis, Eulogios' home village, Constantinople, and Alexandria.

Concerning time, the narrator usually provides a mix of absolute (ὡς περὶ ὥραν ἑνδεκάτην) and relative (μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀναχωρῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μετ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας[17]), definite (τῇ μεγάλῃ ἑορτῇ) and indefinite (ἐν μιᾷ οὖν τῶν ἡμερῶν) data so that the impression of authenticity and eyewitness testimony is aroused without, however, giving any exact information (as is typical for hagiography in general). Even in tale no. 6, which contains a great deal of both absolute and relative data about time, the reader's awareness of the sequence of time remains relatively vague.[18]

The above-demonstrated dynamics concerning location finds a counterpart in the dynamic treatment of time. Three different ways of changing the narrative rhythm can be observed in three tales that cover a relatively long period of time (at least relative to the circumstances of the genre). The tale about abba Daniel (no. 1) is one of the briefest texts

---

See Kulhánková 2015, 67–86.

[17] 3, 21.

[18] From the context, it can be deduced that Eulogios found the treasure and travelled to Constantinople sometime during the year 525 (during the reign of Justin the Elder) and escaped from there in 532 after the Nika revolt, in which, according to the tale, he was involved. From this relative chronology, it can be deduced that the first narrative level, the pilgrimage of Abba Daniel and his disciple to Eulogios' village, took place around 565, a date which is also considered as the terminus post quem for Daniel's death. See Dahlman 2007, 224–227.

in the collection but covers the longest period of all the tales, at least 44 years. It moves chronologically, with a noticeable gradual slowdown in narrative speed. The first 12 lines of Dahlman's edition comprise a *summary* of the first approximately 43 years of Daniel's life.[19] Subsequently, again in 12 lines, a brief account of Daniel's travels to Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Ephesos, Jerusalem, Antioch, and back to Alexandria is given, a span which could have lasted from a couple of months to a couple of years. The next 12 lines are dedicated to events lasting approximately one month related to Daniel's imprisonment in Alexandria. After his release, the abba decides to find a leper and take care of him, as repentance for the murder he had committed, and he immediately puts this decision into effect. The closing 12 lines of the text comprise what has been theorised in narrative theory as a *pause*: the story which had actually reached the end of its narrative culminates with a depiction of the treatment of the leper, observed through the eyes of Daniel's disciple.

The tale about Eulogios the stonecutter (no. 6) covers approximately 40 years and stands out due to its relatively complex structure with three narrative levels. The main story is embedded within a kind of narrative frame about the peregrination of Daniel and his disciple, which could be seen, in relation to the main story about Eulogios, as *external prolepsis*.[20] The organising element of the narrative consists of four visions of Daniel (85–94, 111–114, 145–152, and 162–180). Each vision represents a *pause* in the narrative and a cue for the next shift in the plot.

The span of the tale about Andronikos and Athanasia (no. 7) is about 36 years. The narrative of events[21] (in the form of a *summary*) or words[22] (in the form of a *scene* constituted by a dialogue) is interrupted by an *ellipse* three times, with each time lasting 12 years. The story begins with the couple's marriage and the birth of their two children (7, 52–53). Afterwards, the narrative immediately advances to the death of the chil-

---

[19] For the various types of changes in the narrative rhythm, see Genette 1980, 86–112, or Bal 2009, 98–109.

[20] For kinds of prolepsis, see Genette 1980, 67–78.

[21] For the notion of a "narrative of events", see ibid. 164–169.

[22] Ibid. 169–185.

dren, when the older one is 12 years old. Another *ellipse* follows the return of the couple from the Holy Land – again 12 years of Andronikos' stay with Abba Daniel was condensed into 6 words (καὶ ἔμεινεν παρ' αὐτῷ ἔτη δώδεκα).[23] After the reunion of the couple (unconscious from the side of the husband), they travel together back to the Holy Land and then live together for another 12 years in one cell.[24]

To conclude this section, it can be suggested that the treatment of time, space, and place is characterised by dynamics which is by no means accidental, but which aims to enliven the narrative by changing the location, while providing illustrative details and changing the narrative rhythm.

II. Focalisation

For most collections of beneficial tales, such as John Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow*, Palladius' *Lausiac History*, and the two collections by Anastasius of Sinai, "the textual presence of the author plays a decisive role in the structure of the work".[25] This is not the case for the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier*. There is no prologue and the tales are not connected by authorial or narratorial remarks. The link is the specific theme of secret holiness[26] as well as the distinctive narrative technique, which I will try to delineate in this paper.

The narrator on the first narrative level is impersonal, and there is almost no effort to communicate with the authorial audience. In only three cases (nos. 6, 7, and 8) and always at the end of the tale, the narrator switches to the first person plural to invite with a metanarrative comment to the audience to partake in the spiritual profit of the narrative:

---

[23] 7, 122–123.

[24] This third 12-year span is referenced by a few more words oscillating about ellipsis and summary, a boundary form Mieke Bal called *pseudo-ellipsis* or *mini-summary*; see Bal 2009, 101–102.

[25] Hinterberger 2014, 209.

[26] See Dahlman 2007, 70–89.

εὐξώμεθα οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς ταπεινωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ, ἵνα ἐν τῷ φοβερῷ αὐτοῦ βήματι εὕρωμεν ἔλεος ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.[27]

Therefore let us pray that we, too, may be humbled in Christ, that we might find mercy in his awesome seat of judgement in the presence of his glory.

However, the impersonal narrator often adopts the point of view of Daniel's anonymous disciple, a character which appears in all of the tales except one (no. 7). We learn very little about him. He had stayed with a certain brother Sergios, after whose death Abba Daniel granted him "freedom of speech, for he loved him".[28] He performed services for Abba Daniel (1, 46–48), prepared food for him (6, 40–41), and, despite his deep love and respect for the abba, sometimes quarrelled with him (6, 6–14). In most cases, this disciple is the *focalisor*[29] of the narrative who, along with the recipient, only gradually understands and appreciates the hero's secret holiness and Abba Daniel's intentions. In tale no. 5 (*The Woman Who Pretended to Be a Drunkard*), the abba and his disciple visit a nunnery and meet a supposed drunkard who is in fact a holy woman. Daniel, who, unlike his disciple, is aware of the heroine's holiness, orders the disciple to find out where the drunkard sleeps and lets him see her true nature with his own eyes.

καὶ ὅτε ἐκοιμήθησαν πᾶσαι αἱ ἀδελφαί, λαμβάνει ὁ γέρων τὸν μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατέρχεται ὀπίσω τοῦ σιφαρίου, καὶ θεωροῦσι τὴν μεθύστριαν ὅτι ἀνέστη καὶ ἐπέτασε τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὰ δάκρυα αὐτῆς ὡς ποταμός, καὶ τὰς μετανοίας ἐποίει ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους, καὶ ὅτε ἠσθάνετο ἀδελφὴν ἐρχομένην εἰς τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἔρριπτεν ἑαυτὴν χαμαὶ ῥέγχουσα.[30]

When all the sisters had fallen asleep, the elder went with his disciple behind the screen, and they saw that the drunkard had got up and

_____

[27] 6, 233–235.

[28] 2, 4–5.

[29] Regarding focalisation, see Genette 1983, 185–198, and Bal 2009, 145–165.

[30] 5, 81–87.

stretched her hands to heaven. Her tears were like a river, and in repentance, she prostrated herself on the ground. When she noticed that a sister was approaching the privy, she threw herself to the ground and snored.

In a similar way, in tale no. 1 the recipient learns through the eyes of the disciple details about Daniel's care for a leper (1, 44–55). He reveals in no. 2 the death of Abba Mark (2, 51–53) and in no. 8 the female gender of Abba Anastasios (8, 51–52). The point of view of the disciple is established not only by "seeing with his eyes" but also by conveying his feelings:

οὐκ ἠδύνατο γὰρ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἰδεῖν τὸν γέροντα θλιβόμενόν ποτε· ἠγάπα γὰρ αὐτὸν πάνυ.[31]

The brother could not bear seeing the elder afflicted at any time, for he loved him very much.

In addition, dialogues the disciple is involved in are rendered in detail:

καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἑρμοῦ πόλιν λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ αὐτοῦ· ὕπαγε κροῦσον εἰς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μοναστήριον καὶ εἰπὲ ὅτι ὧδέ εἰμι. [...] καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκρουσεν. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ θυρωρὸς λεπτῇ τῇ φωνῇ· σωθείης· καλῶς ἦλθες· τί κελεύεις; καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ· φώνει μοι τὴν ἀμμᾶν τὴν ἀρχιμανδρίτην· θέλω αὐτῇ λαλῆσαι. ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· οὐ συντυγχάνει τινί ποτε, ἀλλ' εἰπέ μοι τί κελεύεις καὶ λέγω αὐτῇ. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· εἰπὲ αὐτῇ· μοναχός τις θέλει σοι λαλῆσαι.[32]

When they came to Hermopolis, he said to his disciple: "Go and knock at that monastery and tell them that I am here." [...] The disciple went and knocked, and the portress said to him in a faint voice: "Greetings; welcome; what do you want?" He said to her: "Call the mother archimandrite for me! I wish to speak with her." She said: "She never meets with anybody; but tell me what you want and I will tell her." He said: "Tell her: 'A monk wishes to speak with you'."

---

[31] 6, 49–51.

[32] 5, 22–31.

It has occasionally been argued that the anonymous disciple was the real author of the tales. The fact that the events are often reported from his point of view supports this assumption. Moreover, camouflaging the author behind the use of the third person has several parallels in early Byzantine hagiography.[33]

In some of Daniel's stories, a secondary level of narrative is introduced, wherein the disciple becomes the intra-textual audience to a story from Eulogios (no. 6) or Anastasia Patrikia (no. 8) narrated by Abba Daniel or from Abba Mark narrated by the hero himself (no. 2). In both cases, as *focalisor* and as intra-textual audience, the disciple stands close to the purported extra-textual audience. He can serve as a model for their anticipated reactions, and he also functions as an intermediary between the audience and the story. Moreover, the fact that the narration is focalised by Daniel's disciple emphasises once again the impression that the reader or listener is witnessing events rather than being told about them.[34]

III. Vocalisation

In this section, I will focus on the features and techniques derived from or imitating oral discourse. Pseudo-orality[35] is widespread in literary texts and can perform many different functions. First, there is the literal function of discourse markers, namely to help organise the narrative, especially if the text is intended for both reading and oral transmission, as is true of early Byzantine hagiography. Several oral expressions gradually developed into a kind of genre code or formula, e.g., indicating the

---

[33] See, e.g., the *Lausiac History*, chap. 71, where under the title "Περὶ τοῦ συνόντος αὐτῷ ἀδελφοῦ" an autobiographical account of the author is provided, or the account of the miracles of Sts. Kyros and John by Sophronios, chap. 70. Cf. Hinterberger 2000, 154–155; idem 2014, 218–219, and idem 2004, 254.

[34] In his study of the intra-textual audience in the pre-metaphrastic Passions, Christodoulos Papavarnavas reaches similar conclusions on the role of some secondary characters; see Papavarnavas 2016.

[35] Also called feigned orality in accordance with the German term "fingierte Mündlichkeit" introduced for the first time by Goetsch 1985.

beginning of a story (διηγήσατο ἡμῖν ὅτι).[36] Other uses of oral features aim at more sophisticated and often symbolic or metaphoric functions; as Paul Goetsch puts it: "Orality in written texts is no more itself, but it is always feigned and so a component of the written style and often also of the deliberate strategy of the actual author."[37]

The features of oral discourse, skilfully integrated into a written narrative, may aim to arouse the illusion of oral narration, which has been characterised as the "language of immediacy",[38] in order to evoke spontaneity and confidence and engage the addressee. They can thereby support the text's didactic function, which is especially important for hagiography, the main goal of which, as has often been argued, was to provide a Christian audience with examples for imitation.[39] Moreover, the narrators of hagiographic stories (or sometimes the *focalisors*[40]) are often depicted as eyewitnesses to events and the language of immediacy can support the authenticity and credibility of their testimony.[41] On the other hand, especially in later collections, it is also possible to consider the existence of a referential function of the pseudo-orality, as Roderick Beaton suggested for late-Byzantine vernacular poetry: the oral features refer the receiver to the tradition of oral storytelling as the source from which the written text derives not just the events it describes but also its authority for describing them.[42] Furthermore, the integration of oral storytelling features can also perform ideological functions or problematise the written style and culture.[43] Last but not least, specific techniques

---

[36] Monika Fludernik, in her seminal and methodological paper (Fludernik 2003), studied the development of similar metanarrative formulas used for scene shifts in English literature from the late medieval period to the early 20th century.

[37] "Mündlichkeit in geschriebenen Texten ist nie mehr sie selbst, sondern stets fingiert und damit eine Komponente des Schreibstils und oft auch der bewussten Schreibstrategie des jeweiligen Autors." Goetsch 1985, 202.

[38] See Koch – Oesterreicher 1985.

[39] See, e.g., Rapp 1998 and 2010 or Papavarnavas 2016.

[40] See the previous section of this paper.

[41] The claim of truth and the connected topos of the eyewitness testimony are common for both hagiography and historiography. See Reinsch 1991, 408; Kulhánková 2015, 97–100; Hinterberger 2014, 213; Rapp 1988.

[42] Beaton 1996, 37.

[43] See Goetsch 1985, 217–218.

derived from oral discourse, such as the historical present tense and dialogue, are used in order to create vividness in the narrative and are one strategy of the *showing* mode.

In most collections of beneficial tales, a simple style employing some of the techniques and features typical for oral narration has been preserved: parataxis prevails to a large extent over hypotaxis; discourse markers indicating new utterances (with καὶ in the first position) or quotative markers (different forms of the verb λέγω usually connected with ὅτι) are used; and dialogues or the historical present tense are used in all of the collections, albeit in various ways.[44]

In Daniel's tales, the frequent and purposeful use of the historical present tense, the intentional treatment of discourse markers, and the predilection for dialogue are the most striking features of pseudo-oral discourse. In order to identify the particularities of this collection, I will compare tales from *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier*, Palladius' *Lausiac History*, and Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow*. Tale no. 5 of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* and chapter 34 of the *Lausiac History*[45] offer two versions of a tale about a female fool.[46] The educated author of the *Lausiac History*, although preserving simplicity as the main stylistic feature of the genre, stands regarding the employment of oral features in the text at the opposite end of the scale to the author of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier*. The triad is completed by tale no. 150 from the *Spiritual Meadow*,[47] which narrates a miracle conducted in order to demonstrate the innocence and holiness of a bishop of Romilla. This was chosen primarily due to having approximately the same word count as the other two tales.

---

[44] The influence of the style of the New Testament is an issue which requires further investigation. See, e.g., regarding the historical present tense Leung 2008 or Runge 2011.

[45] Ed. Bartelink 1974.

[46] Although the type of holy fool was popular in Byzantine hagiography, female versions were rare: these two tales are actually its only occurrence; see Constantinou 2014, 346, as well as the seminal analysis of this type of hagiographic hero by Ivanov 2006, 51–59.

[47] Ed. PG 87.3, 3013–3016.

All three short texts consist of approximately 450 words.[48] The historical present tense occurs 10 times in the *Lausiac History*, among which 9 occurrences are the forms λέγει or λέγουσιν used as markers introducing direct speech. In the *Spiritual Meadow*, we find 8 occurrences, 3 of which are again present forms of the verb λέγω introducing direct speech, while in Daniel's tale the historical present tense occurs 25 times, including 11 instances of the verb λέγω as a quotative marker. The conjunction καί occurs 27 times in the *Spiritual Meadow*, 28 times in the *Lausiac History*, and 53 times in Daniel's tale.

The tendency of the author of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* to more often use both the historical present and the conjunction/discourse marker καί is confirmed also by looking at the entire collection: καί represents 6% of the entire word count of the *Lausiac History* and 6.2% of the *Spiritual Meadow*, while in the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* it represents 8.5%. Even more distinct is the difference regarding present forms of the verb λέγω (λέγει, λέγουσιν, λέγων, λέγουσα): in the *Lausiac History* such forms comprise 0.6% of all words, in the *Spiritual Meadow* 1.2%, and in the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* 1.8%. Taking into account that these forms are predominantly used to introduce direct speech, these numbers testify also to the more frequent use of dialogue in Daniel's tales.

To obtain a clearer idea of the treatment of the aforementioned devices, we can take a closer look at the final part of the story about the "mad" sister in the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* and that by Palladius. The author of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* narrates the escape of the holy woman from the monastery as follows (καί used as a discourse marker is in bold; verbs in the historical present tense are underlined):

> **καὶ** ἔγνω αὐτὴ **καὶ** <u>ἀπέρχεται</u> εὐφυῶς ὅπου ἦν κοιμώμενος ὁ γέρων, **καὶ** <u>κλέπτει</u> τὸ ῥαβδίον αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐπιρριπτάριν, **καὶ** <u>ἀνοίγει</u> τὴν θύραν τοῦ μοναστηρίου **καὶ** <u>γράφει</u> πιττάκιον **καὶ** <u>βάλλει</u> εἰς τὸ κλείδωμα τῆς θύρας λέγουσα· εὔξασθε καὶ συγχωρήσατέ μοι εἴ τι ἔπταισα εἰς ὑμᾶς. **καὶ** ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο. **καὶ** ὅτε ἡμέρα ἐγένετο

---

[48] For the sake of the comparison, I will work with only a part of Daniel's tale: lines 53–102.

ἐζήτησαν αὐτὴν **καὶ** οὐχ εὗρον. **καὶ** <u>ἀπέρχονται</u> εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα, **καὶ** <u>εὑρίσκουσιν</u> ἀνεωγμένην τὴν θύραν καὶ τὸ πιττάκιον ἐπ’ αὐτῇ, **καὶ** γίνεται κλαυθμὸς μέγας ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ.[49]

She heard of this, slipped away quietly to where the elder was sleep-ing, and stole his staff and cowl. She opened the door of the mon-astery, wrote a note and put it into the key-hole of the door. It said: "Pray, and forgive me for the sins I have committed against you." And she disappeared. At daybreak they searched for her, but they did not find her. They went to the porch and found the door open and the note in it. There arose a great lamentation in the monastery.

The text is divided into 13 short utterances, 12 of which are initiated by the discourse marker καὶ and the 13th by the quotative marker λέγουσα. The briefness of the utterances evokes rapidity, while the addressee is thoroughly informed about all of the details of the heroine's secret task. The historical present tense (used seven times) and the exact wording of the message increase the vividness of the text.

In contrast, Palladius' report of the same situation is much more laconic and much less colourful (καὶ as a discourse marker is again in bold; there are no instances of the historical present tense):

Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ὀλίγας μὴ ἐνεγκοῦσα ἐκείνη τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῶν ἀδελφῶν, **καὶ** ταῖς ἀπολογίαις βαρυνθεῖσα, ἐξῆλθε τοῦ μοναστηρίου· **καὶ** ποῦ ἀπῆλθεν, ἢ ποῦ κατέδυ, ἢ πῶς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἔγνω οὐδείς.

After a few days, unable to tolerate the esteem and respect of the sisters and weighed down by their excuses, she went out from the monastery.[50] Where she went, where she hid away, or how she died, nobody knew.

In the beginning of the same tale, the narrator of the *Lausiac History* explicitly states that the heroine was a holy fool, while the one in Dan-iel's tale shows how she enacted her foolishness. Thus, as we have seen,

---

[49] 5, 93–102.
[50] Translation: Wortley 2015, 80.

while Palladius tends more to explaining and interpreting events for his readers or listeners, the narrator of Daniel's tale presents them to his audience in detail, but almost entirely avoids commenting on them.

Conclusion

In the introduction, I characterised the narrative of the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* through the tendency to present events vividly and to involve the audience in the story. In the course of the analysis, we observed a series of techniques that aimed at generating this impression. Within the category of localisation, the key feature was providing the audience with details concerning the time and the location and emphasising the dynamics considering both the place (repeated shifts in scene) and the time (changes in rhythm). Moving to the category of focalisation, we noted the absence of narratorial comments and remarks and the focalisation of the narration on Daniel's anonymous disciple. The latter serves as an intermediary between the audience and the story and a model of their anticipated reactions. Finally, within the frame of vocalisation, we turned our attention to the increased use of direct speech, discourse markers, and the historical present tense, techniques derived from oral narration but used, similarly as with the other devices, in an elaborated and purposeful way, which is, in spite of the simplicity of the style, closer to literariness than to orality. All of these techniques are more typical of the *showing* mode of narration than the *telling* mode. Considering the character of the genre, it can be concluded that favouring the showing mode distinguishes the *Daniel Sketiotes Dossier* from other representatives of the genre and well serves its purpose: with the help of these techniques, it is not only vividness and verisimilitude that are emphasised, but also the impression of immediacy and the authority of the eyewitness testimony that fulfil a referential function and support the didactic aim and the overall spiritually beneficial intention.

Bibliography

Primary literature

Daniel Sketiotes Dossier. Ed. B. Dahlman, *Saint Daniel of Sketis*. Uppsala 2007.

Daniel Sketiotes Dossier. Ed. E. Skaka & J. Wortley, "The Tale of Daniel's Sister: Text, Translation and Commentary. De sorore Danielis, BHG 1438hb", in Mullet, M. (ed.) 2004. *Metaphrastes, or, Gained in Translation*. Belfast, 194–209.

Daniel-Sketiotes-Dossier. Ed. L. Clugnet, *Vie (et récits) de l'abbé Daniel de Scétiote*. Paris 1901.

John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow*. Ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca)* (*PG*) 87.3, 2852–3112. Paris, 1857–1866.

Palladius, *The Lausiac History.* Ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, *Palladio. La storia Lausiaca*. Verona 1974.

Palladius, *The Lausiac History.* Tr. J. Wortley, *Palladius of Aspuna. The Lausiac History*. Athens, Ohio 2015.

Secondary literature

Bal, M. 2009. *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto.

Beaton, R. 1996. *The Medieval Greek Romance*. London.

Binggeli, A. "Collections of Edifying Stories", in Efthymiadis (ed.) 2014, 143–159.

Bonnet, M. (rev.) 1904. "Clugnet L., Vie (et récits) de l'abbé Daniel de Scétiote". *BZ* 13, 166–171.

Booth, W. C. 1983. *The Rhetoric of Fiction,* Chicago [1961].

Constantinou, S. 2004. "Subgenre and Gender in Saints' Lives", in Odorico, P. & Agapitos, P. A. (eds.), *Les vies des saints à Byzance. Genre littéraire ou biographie historique?* 411–423, Paris.

Constantinou, S. 2014. "Holy Actors and Actresses. Fools and Cross-Dressers as the Protagonists of Saints' Lives", in Efthymiadis (ed.) 2014, 343–362.

Efthymiadis, S. (ed.) 2014. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography* II. *Genres and Contexts*. Farnham.

Fludernik, M. 1996. *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology*. London.

Fludernik, M. 2003. "The Diachronization of Narratology". *Narrative* 11, 331–348.

Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse. Ithaca, N. Y.* [1972].

Goetsch, P. 1985. "Fingierte Mündlichkeit in der Erzählkunst entwickelter Schriftkulturen". *Poetica* 17, 202–218.

Hinterberger, M. 2000. "Autobiography and Hagiography in Byzantium". *SO* 75, 139–164.

Hinterberger, M. 2004. "Ἡ αυτοβιογραφική αφήγηση στις διηγήσεις θαυμάτων", in Kountoura-Galaki, E. (ed.) 2004. *Οι ήρωες της ορθόδοξης εκκλησίας. Οι νέοι αγίοι, 8ος – 16ος αιώνας,* 251–263. Athina.

Hinterberger, M. 2014. "The Byzantine Hagiographer and his Text", in Efthymiadis (ed.) 2014, 211–246.

Ivanov, S. A. 2006. *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*. Oxford.

Klauk, T. & Köppe, T. 2014. "Telling vs. Showing", in Hühn, *P. et al.* (eds.). *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. URL = http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/telling-vs-showing.

Koch, P. – Oesterreicher, W. 1985. "Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36, 15–43.

Kulhánková, M. 2015. *Das gottgefällige Abenteuer. Eine narratologische Analyse der byzantinischen erbaulichen Erzählungen*. Červený Kostelec.

Leung, M. M. 2008. "The Narrative Function and Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present in The Fourth Gospel". *JETS* 51, 703–720.

Lubbock, P. 1965. *The Craft of Fiction*. London. [1922].

Papavarnavas, Ch. 2016. "The Role of the Audience in the Pre-Metaphrastic Passions". *AB* 134, 66–82.

Rapp, C. 1998. "Storytelling as Spiritual Communication in Early Greek Hagiography: The Use of Diegesis". *JECS* 6, 431–448.

Rapp, C. 2010. "The Origins of Hagiography and the Literature of Early Monasticism: Purpose and Genre between Tradition and Innovation", in Kelly, Ch. & Flower, R. & Williams, M. S. (eds.), *Unclassical Tra-*

ditions I. *Alternatives to the Classical Past in Late Antiquity,* 119–130, Cambridge.

Reinsch, D. R. 1991. "Autor und Leser in frühbyzantinischen hagiographischen und historiographischen Werken", in *XVIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Major Papers,* 400–414, Moscow.

Runge, S. E. 2011. "The Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present Indicative in Narrative", in Runge, E. E. (ed.), *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn,* 191–224, Bellingham, WA.

Vivian, T. *et al*. 2008. *Witness to Holiness. Abba Daniel of Scetis*. Kalamazoo.

Von Contzen, E. 2014a. "Why We Need a Medieval Narratology: a Manifesto". *Diegesis* 3.2, 1–21, URL: http://elpub.bib.uni-wuppertal.de/servlets/DerivateServlet/Derivate-4413/dej14030201.pdf

Von Conzten, E. 2014b. "Saints' Lives as Narrative Art? Towards a Pragma-Narratological Approach to the *Scottish Legendary*", in Fludernik, M. & Jacob, D. (eds), *Linguistics and Literary Studies: Interfaces, Encounters, Transfers,* 171–197, Berlin.

Wortley, J. 2010. "The Genre of the Spiritually Beneficial Tale". *Scripta & eScripta* 89, 71–91, URL = http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=8a0f51c9-cc01-4cc2-b4a3-c24778fe6e3d.