Zachary Rothstein-Dowden

UNRAVELING THE CORD:
THE SCHEDOGRAPHY OF NIKEPHOROS BASILAKES

MA Thesis in Comparative History, with a specialization
in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Central European University

Budapest

May 2015

UNRAVELING THE CORD:
THE SCHEDOGRAPHY OF NIKEPHOROS BASILAKES

by

Zachary Rothstein-Dowden

(United States of America)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Interdisciplinary

Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

Chair, Examination Committee

_____

Thesis Supervisor

_____

Examiner

_____

Examiner

Budapest

UNRAVELING THE CORD:
THE SCHEDOGRAPHY OF NIKEPHOROS BASILAKES

by

Zachary Rothstein-Dowden

(United States of America)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

External Reader

Budapest
May 2015

UNRAVELING THE CORD:
THE SCHEDOGRAPHY OF NIKEPHOROS BASILAKES

by

Zachary Rothstein-Dowden

(United States of America)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2015

I, the undersigned, **Zachary Rothstein-Dowden**, candidate for the MA degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 20 May 2015

_____

Signature

Abstract

This thesis examines a difficult passage in the *Prologos* of Nikephoros Basilakes in which the author speaks of a kind of schedography that he credits as being his own invention. It begins with a short biography of the author. It then attempts to trace the evolution of schedic performances from their beginnings in the eleventh century through to the time of Basilakes in the mid-twelfth century. The argument is that *schedē* began as *epimerismoi*, analytical exercises, which, unlike the latter, were performed competitively in front of an audience. These exercises focused on testing knowledge of both vocabulary and orthography. Soon the orthographic, that is to say antistoichic, element took firmer hold, and exercises became more complex. By the end of the century some *schedē* were no longer performance pieces, but visual puzzles for students, where word boundaries had to be reassigned and graphemes adjusted to give the correct reading. Frequently these exercises hinged on vernacularisms. Basilakes seems to have taken these word games to a new level, creating elaborate puns that used exclusively Atticist Greek.

Acknowledgements

Ἐν μὲν ἀρχῇ εὐχαριστεῖν πρέπει τῷ Νίελς Γαύλῳ
Ὅς ἦν ὁ σύμβουλος ἐμοῦ, δεδῶκέ τε τὸ θέμα,
Μετὰ δ’ αὐτὸν τῷ Ἴστουαν Πέρτσελ ἐγῷδα χάριν,
Τῆς σωφροσύνης *εἶ λειμὼν* πλήρης ἀνθῶν *ὑλίμων*.
Καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς καθηγηταῖς, ἐχθροῖς τῆς ἀμαθίας,
Ὅσοι μοι ἐβοήθησαν· δωτῆρές ἐστ’ ἐάων.

* * *

Ἐν μὲν αὐτῇ τῇ θέσει μου πάντα τὰ εὐπρεποῦντα,
Ἀλλότρια, ἐμοὶ δὲ δή εἰσιν αἱ ἁμαρτάδες.

Table of contents

Introduction

This thesis attempts, through a close comparative analysis of a problematic passage in the *Prologos* of the twelfth-century Byzantine author, schoolteacher, and rhetorician Nikephoros Basilakes, to examine the poorly understood institution of antistoichic schedography, a type of performative school exercise extant from at least the beginning of the eleventh century. To this aim, I first provide a detailed biography and overview of the life and works of Basilakes, drawing information particularly from his own writing and other primary sources. As the thesis uses Basilakes as its starting point and focus, it is necessary to establish exactly who he was and in what circles and environment he moved. This is all the more necessary because no such thorough biography exists, and those interested are compelled to turn to meticulous readings of primary sources or the disparate secondary literature. This chapter, therefore, while it guides the later discussion of schedography, is in and of itself a useful and original contribution to scholarship and to our understanding of Basilakes.

The lack of scholarly activity concerning Basilakes hinges partly on the sheer physical inaccessibility of his works before the publication of the modern critical editions in 1983 and 1984.[1] Some *progymnasmata* had appeared in earlier collections.[2] The *Prologos* was first brought to light by Emmanuel Miller in 1873 in which the author translates only piecemeal for the professed reason that the text is "très-difficile à comprendre."[3] In the twentieth century two of the orations were published individually.[4] In the 1960s, in connection with their work on the critical editions, Garzya, Pignani, and others published short general articles related to

[1] Basilakes, *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*; Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie*; Reinsch, "A. Garzya/A. Pignani, Niceforo Basilace."
[2] Basilakes, "Modoi, diēgēmata kai ēthopoiïai"; Walz, *Rhetores graeci, ex codicibus florentinis, mediolanensibus, monacensibus, neapolitanis, parisiensibus, romanis, venetis, taurinensibus et vindobonensibus*.
[3] Miller, "Préface d'un auteur byzantin," 136.
[4] Basilakes, *Il Panegirico di Niceforo Basilace per Giovanni Comneno*; Korbeti, "Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν πατριαρχὴν Νικολάον δ' τὸν Μουζαλώνα."

Basialkes' works and the details of the his life.[5] More recent scholarship focusing specifically on Basilakes has continued to explore literary aspects of his works and to contextualize and supply historical details to personages and events.[6]

Sadly, Garzya and Pignani's editions are riddled with errors, providing no dependable basis for the interpretation of the already obscure texts. I have nevertheless been compelled to rely on these only modern editions, with the welcome corrections provided by Reinsch in his review of the text.[7] Reinsch also warns against the overabundant *apparatus fontium* with which these editions are equipped. Many of the supposed quotations cited are simply reflections of the LSJ dictionary entries and their selective examples. A study of Basilakes' primary literary influences, essential to the study of his works but not undertaken here due to a lack of time and space, would necessarily involve a careful reappraisal of the given sources.

The bulk of the thesis then turns to the question of eleventh- and twelfth-century schedography in an attempt to explain a difficult passage in Basilakes' *Prologos* in which he discusses his own schedographic activity (p. 33 below). In order to do this, it is first necessary to take a step back and examine the origins of schedography and its evolution from the beginning of the eleventh to the middle of the twelfth century. I suggest that schedography

[5] Garzya, "Un lettré du milieu du XII siècle: Nicéphore Basilakès"; Garzya, "Precisazioni sul Processo di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Il Prologo di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Intorno al prologo di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "La produzione oratoria di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Fin quando visse Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Encomio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Alessio Aristeno"; Garzya, "Encomnio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Giovanni Axuch"; Garzya, "Quatro Epistole di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Nicéphore Basilakès et le mythe de Pasiphaé"; Garzya, "Una Declamazione Giudiziaria di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Varia Philologica VII"; Garzya, "Literarische und rhetorische Polemiken der Komnenenzeit"; Maisano, "Encomio di Niceforo Basilace per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone"; Maisano, "Per il testo dell'encomio per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone di Niceforo Basilace"; Maisano, "La clausola ritmica nella prosa di Niceforo Basilace"; Wirth, "Wohin ward Nikephoros Basilakes verbannt?"; Wirth, "Cruces der Basilakestradition"; Criscuolo, "Per la tradizione manoscritta della monodia di Niceforo Basilace per il fratello Costantino."

[6] Ioannis Polemis, "A Note on the Praefatio of Nikephoros Basilakes," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 94, no. 2 (2001): 605–7; Aglae Pizzone, "Anonimity, Dispossesion and Reappropriation in the *Prolog* of Nikēphoros Basilakes," in *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 225–43; Paul Magdalino, "The Bagoas of Nicephoros Basilakes: A Normal Reaction?," in *Of Strangers and Foreigners (Late Antiquity-Middle Ages)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

[7] Reinsch, "A. Garzya/A. Pignani, Niceforo Basilace"; Hörandner, "Zu den Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Basilakes: Bemerkungen zur kritischen Neuedition."

began as performances of simple grammatical analyses. With time, the orthographic and antistoichic element of these exercises began to take precedence. By the end of the eleventh century *schedē*, at least in the context of the *theatron*, had taken on the form of antistoichic puzzles, which students were called upon to solve or even compose in front of an audience. By the time of Basilakes, some had even taken on the full character of phonetic riddles. Basilakes' claim seems to be that he took up the newest schedography, which employed vernacularisms to reach its effect, and instead created a kind of schedography that used Atticist Greek in both the "inner" and "outer" level of its puns.

Schedography received its first monographic treatment at the hands of the Danish Byzantinist R. Henrichsen in a little-read booklet of 1843.[8] Despite his failure to leave a serious mark on secondary literature, Henrichsen's contribution to the understanding of schedography is significant, representing the first overview of the issue and an attempt at a definition. Henrichsen was followed by Krumbacher, who takes up schedography in the second edition of his history. He treats the topic briefly and with contempt, asserting that such exercises belong "zur untersten Gattung der Schulbücher" only one step above *psychagogiai*, or interlinear texts, "die sich nun in den Katalogen stolz als 'Codices graeci' brüsten," and sneers that "die meisten dieser Elementarschulbücher ruhen verdientermaßen in dem Staub der Bibliotheken."[9] This negative attitude did not prevent Nicolaus Festa from preparing a critical edition of a grammar book by a so-called Longibardos, dating from the eleventh century.[10] The issue of schedography was once more directly addressed by Giuseppe Schirò, who examines the testimony of eleventh- and twelfth-century authors in order to shed light on a set of anonymous

[8] For several previous and brief discussions of *schedē* and schedography, cf. Heeren, *Geschichte des Studiums der classischen Litteratur seit dem Wiederaufleben der Wissenschaften*, vol. 1, sec. 118; Wilken, *Rerum ab Alexio: I. Joanne, Manuele et Alexio II. Comnenis Romanorum byzantinorum imperatoribus gestarum libri quatuor*, 488; Komnene, *Alexias*, vol. 131, col. 1165 note 91. None of these, however, reaches definitive results.
[9] Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, sec. 250. Krumbacher's analysis of schedography only appears in the second edition of his history.
[10] Festa, "Note preliminari su Longibardos"; Festa, "Longibardos."

poems dedicated to the School of the Forty Martyrs. Schedography was treated briefly but incisively by Hunger his handbook on profane literature.[11] More recently there has been an increase of interest in *schedography*, possibly spurred on by a rising interest in the Byzantine education system and a growing realization of the importance of this poorly understood phenomenon. Groundwork has been laid through overviews and analyses of mostly unpublished manuscripts.[12] Highly relevant to this thesis are also two recent articles of Panagiotis Agapitos who deals with the period relevant to Basilakes and closely examines testimonies on and attitudes towards schedography, particularly with an eye to schedography as a convergence of high and low registers of language.[13] Floris Bernard examines schedography in its connection to early education and poetry at the end of the eleventh century as well as its competitive aspect.[14] Niels Gaul has written on an instance of peripheral late-Byzantine schedography and speculates more generally on schedography and its parallels in the Latin West.[15]

But despite a century and a half of study and the recent flourishing of interest, the most fundamental facts about schedography remain obscure. Defining schedography has proved difficult on the basis of the texts that we have, and is complicated by the fact that most are unpublished and possibly also as-yet unidentified. The only scholar since Henrichsen to attempt to find a definition was Hunger, who concedes that "in Beantwortung der eingangs gestellten Frage nach dem Wesen der Schedographie müssen wir also aufgrund des byzantinischen Sprachgebrauchs, soweit wir ihn überprüfen können, eine gewisse Variationsbreite für die

[11] Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2:22–28.
[12] In particular attention has been paid to the collection of Moschopoulos, for which see below. Keaney, "Moschopulea"; Browning, "Il codice Marciano gr. XI.31e la schedografia bizantina"; Gallavotti, "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo"; Polemis, "Προβλήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς σχεδογραφίας"; Vassis, "Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαίσματα"; Vassis, "Graeca sunt, non leguntur."
[13] Agapitos, "Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training"; Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage."
[14] Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 254ff.
[15] Gaul, "Rising Elites and Institutionalization"; ibid., 269ff.

termini *schedos*, *schedographein* und *schedographia* annehmen." [16] Surely this "Variationsbreite" is largely the result of a long chain of development and evolution of schedography, but the secondary literature contains little to no discussion of this key issue. This study attempts to contribute to scholarship by trying to read a chronology in the sparse and enigmatic sources. It presents schedography as aggressively progressive and innovative from the beginning of its wide spread adoption to the time of Basilakes. By doing so I also hope to provide some additional insight into the Byzantine school system of the time, which is to say the way that Atticist Greek was taught to children.

[16] Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2:29.

Chapter 1 – Nikephoros Basilakes

This chapter introduces Nikephoros Basilakes. While partial biographies are to be found in the secondary literature, none of these has been executed in a systematic or thorough way.[17] Though information is admittedly sparse, it is nevertheless essential for situating the author in time, space, and society, which in turn is a necessary preliminary for a historical interpretation of his writing. It therefore seems useful to go through the source material carefully and collect, systematize and interpret the available information, providing direct references to support all information. The chapter concludes with a survey of his works.

1.1 Biography

Little is known about Basilakes' family history. He speaks of his brother, maternal uncle and mother directly in his writings, but also mentions "the rest of his family" (τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ γένους), assuring us of the presence of other, likely more distant, relatives.[18] The one member of the family who is conspicuous by his absence in Nikephoros' father, who is mentioned elusively and only once.[19] This likely means that he died in the boys' infancy. Indeed, if the father were living, he would certainly have a place in the monody for the brother according to the standard rules of composition. A father is mentioned in Basilakes' other surviving monody for a nameless friend, a fact that bolsters this claim.[20] He does, however, mention his maternal uncle twice. This uncle, according to the *Prologos*, occupied a high position in the civil service, and Nikephoros, as a talented Atticist, helped him to compose dignified letters.[21] In the monody for his brother, Nikephoros describes this uncle as *tropheus*, possibly indicating that he took

[17] See for instance Garzya, "Un lettré du milieu du XII siècle: Nicéphore Basilakès"; Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 473–74.
[18] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum*, ed. Pignani, p. 242, ll. 146-7.
[19] Ibid., p. 249, ll. 320-4.
[20] Basilakes, *Monodia in amicum quemdam*, ed. Pignani, p. 257, l. 124 et passim.
[21] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum*, ed. Pignani, p. 238, ll. 67-9; Basilakes, *Prologos*, ed. Garzya, p. 5, ll. 10-15.

charge of the boys in the father's absence.[22] It was in any case also a general phenomenon in the eleventh and twelfth centuries that the extended family grew in importance and that it would be quite normal for Basilakes to have a close association with his uncle.[23]

His brother, Konstantinos Basilakes, was schooled in rhetoric by Nikephoros himself.[24] He was therefore likely considerably younger. This might also be inferred from a metaphor where Nikephoros equates himself to Laertes and Konstantinos to Odysseus.[25] Konstantinos served on the Italian expedition of Manuel I Komnenos, and was killed in battle just before Nikephoros' exile, of which there is no mention in the monody. This would seem to place his death somewhere in the years 1155-6.[26] Yet this dating seems to be contradicted by a letter addressed to his "ὁμόσπορος" written while in exile (post 1157) and with the words τῶι οἰκείωι ἀδελφῶι superscribed in the title in both extant manuscripts.[27] Most likely Garzya's attribution of the recipient as Konstantinos is incorrect, and the word is simply meant metaphorically and in a broader sense.[28] While in the military, Konstantinos was chosen to serve on multiple embassies, apparently for his rhetorical ability and knowledge of Latin, an unusual and useful skill in the twelfth century.[29] He also served as a royal scribe, a fact corroborated by Kinnamos, and had a role in finance abroad.[30] Nikephoros reports that he begged him to devote himself to scholarship and politics, but that his passion for war could not be hemmed.[31] It is also noteworthy that Konstantinos was not married, a fact which can be inferred from the monody,

[22] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum*, ed. Pignani, pp. 240-1, ll. 120ff.
[23] Kazhdan and Wharton, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 100–101.
[24] Ibid., p. 249, ll. 305-7.
[25] Ibid., p. 251, ll. 368-71.
[26] For a discussion of the dating, see Criscuolo, "Per la tradizione manoscritta della monodia di Niceforo Basilace per il fratello Costantino," 33 note 1; Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie*, 63. It seems to be clear in any case that the death occurred after 1155.
[27] Garzya, "Varia Philologica VII," 575.
[28] Basilakes, *Adversus Bagoam*, ed. Garzya, p. 114, l. 5.
[29] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum*, ed. Pignani, p. 242, ll. 152-7.
[30] He is described somewhat ambiguously in the monody as "ταμίας τῶν ἐπ'ἀλλοδαπῶν χρημάτων" Ibid., p. 243, ll. 171ff; Kinnamos, *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, 146.
[31] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum*, ed. Pignani, p. 249, ll. 309-10.

which does not mention a wife or children, otherwise a formal rhetorical requirement, as observed by Pignani.[32]

As to the history of the family, Basilakes writes that it is known to be a family of warriors and scholars.[33] Certainly his and his brothers' careers support this statement. This may also give just cause to speculate that Basilakes was a descendent of the more famous Nikephoros Basilakes of the previous century who led a revolt against Nikephoros III Botaneiates.[34] The name does not seem to have been a common one, and an allusion to an illustrious ancestor was in keeping with the general interest in genealogy and nobility of descent that characterized the eleventh and twelfth centuries, particularly concerning the military aristocracy.[35]

Nikephoros himself clearly received the best possible education in his youth, starting at an early age.[36] In the *Prologos,* Basilakes immodestly describes himself as a highly gifted student, so much so that he incurred the jealousy of many of his classmates.[37] Since this work was written during the author's exile, it is easy to see in this comment a reference to the events leading to his banishment. He gives us no hint as to who his teachers were, but presents himself as being aggressively innovative and dissatisfied with the canonical styles.[38] It was during his time as a student and that Basilakes composed a number of works now lost, including the *Onothriambos, Stypax, Stephanitai* and *Ho Talantouchos Hermes*. These comic works were destroyed by the author himself when he turned to God later in life.[39] He also names several other works that he did not destroy but which have nevertheless not been preserved. These

[32] Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie,* 64.
[33] Basilakes, *Monodia in Constantinum Basilacum,* ed. Pignani, p. 244, ll. 190-7.
[34] Garzya, "Un lettré du milieu du XII siècle: Nicéphore Basilakès," 611–12.
[35] Kazhdan and Wharton, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 102–103.
[36] Basilakes, *Prologos,* ed. Garzya, p. 2, ll. 25-7.
[37] Ibid., p. 3, ll. 30-7.
[38] Ibid., ll. 18-23.
[39] Krumbacher suggests that these works were most likely prose satires in the style of Lucian as can be found in the works of Theodoros Prodromos. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur,* 473.

include the *Hieroi*, the *Exegematikoi*, the *Ortholektes*.[40] He later likely served as a court scribe like his brother, a fact discovered by Garzya who notes that the cod. Laur. gr. 32.33 gives him the title of *notarios.*[41] This is further supported by a letter of Michael Italikos, in which the author complains that the position of notary, for which he himself had applied, had been given to a certain Basilakios.[42]

He later came himself to occupy the office of διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου in the "Patriarchal School."[43] The exact role of the διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου is unknown. It was one of only four positions, which were titled διδάσκαλος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου/οἰκονομικὸς διδάσκαλος, διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου, διδάσκαλος τοῦ ψαλτῆρος and μαΐστωρ τῶν ρητόρων. A comparison of these titles suggests that his chief responsibility was to lecture on the epistles of Paul.[44] This supposition is confirmed by Basilakes' own account of his exegesis of the letters of Paul in the *Prologos*, which apparently led to controversy.[45] He is also

[40] For a critical discussion of Basilakes' self-portrayal as an author liberal and careless with his own works, see Pizzone, "Anonymity, Dispossesion and Reappropriation in the *Prolog* of Nikēphoros Basilakes."
[41] Treu, "Michael Italikos," 17–18.
[42] Cf. Michael, *Lettres et discours*, 163 note 12.
[43] For further information on the Patriarchal School see Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," 1962, 195.
[44] In fact very little is known about the responsibilities of the various professors. The case of Basilakes helps to illustrate the issue more generally.
[45] Basilakes, *Prologos*, ed. Garzya, pp. 6-7, ll. 26-4: "I was once discussing Paul's ministry and was describing the speech from the (letters) to Timothy, that (phrase in which he says) 'be sober in all things' while carrying out your ministry. But he heard even this with displeasure, and again knitted his brow deeply, arching his eyebrows and raging uncontrollably. For he understood my praise of Paul to be mockery of him himself and scorned celebration of virtue. And finally he gave me a book containing an abridged commentary on the Epistles of Paul, (appropriate) to a lazy woman, ignorant of theology (what other than a sloppy woman and a queen?) whom one of the ancients wooed, as Carneades the Athenian once fawned upon Cleopatra. He hoped that through my possessing this small handbook of great and apostolic thought, he could straighten and press my tongue so that I would stutter like him and would not be able to make any rejoinder." (Διήειν ποτὲ τὴν Παύλου ποιμαντικὴν καὶ ὑπεζωγράφουν τῷ λόγῳ τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐκεῖνο τὸ 'νῆφε ἐν πᾶσιν' ἱεροφαντῶν, καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἡδέως ἤκουσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν ἐπισυνῆγεν ἡμῖν βαρὺ τὸ ἐπισκύνιον τοξοποιῶν τὰς ὀφρῦς καὶ μηνιῶν ἀκάθεκτα. τὸν γὰρ τοῦ Παύλου ἔπαινον σαρκασμὸν οἰκεῖον ἡγεῖτο, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐδυσχέραινε κρόταλα. καὶ τέλος καὶ βιβλίον δοὺς ἐπίτομον φέρον τῶν Παύλου ἐπιστολῶν τὴν ἐξήγησιν, ὃ καὶ πρὸς γυναῖκα βραχύπονον καὶ ὀλιγόνουν τὰ θεῖα (καὶ τί γὰρ ἢ γυναῖκα ρυφῶσαν καὶ βασιλίδα;) τῶν <τις> παλαιοτέρων ἐθώπευσεν, ὡς Καρνεάδης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος πάλαι τὴν Κλεοπάτραν ὑπῄει, οὗτό με φέροντα μεγάλης καὶ ἀποστολικῆς διανοίας μικρὸν ἐγχειρίδιον ἠξίου τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἀποστενοῦν καὶ ὑποθλίβειν, ὁπόσον ἂν κἀκεῖνος ὑπεβαττάρισε, καὶ μηδὲ τὴν λέξιν ὑπαλλάττειν μηδ' ὁτιοῦν). I follow the punctuation of Polemis. For a discussion of the identity of the opponent, whom Garzya improbably associates with Michael Italikos, see also Polemis, "A Note on the *Praefatio* of Nikephoros Basilakes," 605; For the correction of τινα to τις, the true manuscript reading, see Reinsch, "A. Garzya/A. Pignani, Niceforo Basilace," 86.

described in this capacity by Niketas Choniates.[46] It seems likely that Basilakes' own teaching of grammar dates to a time before he held this august position, but the alternative cannot be excluded given how little we know of the "Patriarchal School" and the possibility that even the most qualified teachers could conceivably have been employed with tutor the children of the elite.

The men who held these positions in the "Patriarchal School" were public figures and frequently became bishops in important provincial cities after their tenure as teachers.[47] This was not the case for Basilakes, who was forced to leave Constantinople in 1157 after becoming embroiled in a theological dispute. The conflict, to which Basilakes alludes in his *Prologos*, is related more fully by Kinnamos in his history.[48] A certain deacon named Basil began to abuse Basilakes and his colleague, Michael of Thessaloniki (ὁ τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης), in his sermons. Concerning the former, little is known. The latter, so called as being a favorite and possibly a relative of an archbishop of Thessaloniki, held at the time the positions of διδάσκαλος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου and μαΐστωρ τῶν ρητόρων simultaneously.[49] Basilakes and Michael attended one such sermon and publicly ridiculed Basil for saying that the Son and the Spirit receive the Eucharist together with the Father. Despite the formidable backing of Soterichos, who published a series of dialogues in support of Basilakes, the case was lost. Michael recanted, Basilakes was banned from Constantinople, and Soterichos was forced to give up his promised position of patriarch in Antioch.[50]

[46] Niketas Choniates, *Historia*, Man.7, ed. van Dieten, p. 211.5-8: ὁ Βασιλάκης Νικηφόρος τὰς τοῦ Παύλου ἀναπτύσσων ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολὰς καὶ διαλευκαίνων τῷ τῆς καλλιρρημοσύνης φωτὶ ὅσαι τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ῥήσεων τῇ ἀσαφείᾳ ὑπομελαίνονται καὶ τῷ βάθει τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπιφρίσσουσι.
[47] Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," 1962, 168.
[48] Cinnamos, *Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*, 4.16, ed. Meineke, p. 176.13-; Garzya, "Precisazioni sul Processo di Niceforo Basilace."
[49] Wirth, "Michael von Thessalonike?"; Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," 1963, 13.
[50] Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081-1261*, 83, 97–98, 146; Grolimund, "Die Entwicklung der Theologie der Eucharistie in Byzanz von 1054-1453," 164ff; Oeconomos, *La vie religieuse dans l'empire Byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges*, 30ff.

Basilakes seems to have spent his years of exile in the Bulgarian city of Philippopolis.[51] If this is true, he may have once more come into contact with Michael Italikos, who was appointed metropolitan of Philippopolis in 1146, although neither mentions the other in his writing. That he bitterly resented his estrangement from the high culture and Atticist Greek of the capital is evident from his letters, which, together with the *Prologos*, were composed during these years at the urging of his friends.[52] Even in exile he was unable to avoid conflict. He had a disagreement, the details of which are not recorded, with a certain Macedonian.[53] It is unclear how long he remained in exile. He likely returned to Constantinople at some point where he remained until his death, which can be dated to sometime after the year 1182, as is demonstrated by his correspondence with Michael Choniates while the latter was already metropolitan of Athens.[54]

Concerning Basilakes' personal life very little is known. We know from no sources whether he had a wife or any children of his own, though neither possibility can be ruled out. We do, however, have three letters written from exile to his students, as well as the above-mentioned letter to his brother, clearly demonstrating a close personal connection. Unfortunately none of these students is named in the letters. It is interesting to speculate which other contemporary authors could have been his pupils. If so, it was for the earlier part of his education, because Basilakes went into exile when the latter was about fourteen. If this is true, it can color our reading of Kinnamos' account of the Christological debate in which Basilakes took part. If the dating of van Dieten of Niketas' birth to sometime between 1155 and 1157 is

[51] Wirth, "Wohin ward Nikephoros Basilakes verbannt?," 389–92.
[52] Basilakes, *Prologos*, ed. Garzya, pp. 5-6, ll. 35-7.
[53] Basialkes, *Epistolae*, 1, ed. Garzya, p. 112.19-22
[54] The heading of a letter addressed to Michael Choniates survives without text in the cod. gr. 508 (594 Litzica) of the Romanian Academy Library in Bucarest. See: Antonio Garzya, "Fin Quando Visse Niceforo Basilace," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 64 (1971): 301–2.

correct, Niketas Choniates was too young to have been Basilakes' student before his exile, but several years of leeway could allow for this possibility as well.[55]

1.2 Works

Basilakes' works are remarkable for their wide variety of themes and styles, which would surely be all the more astounding if his full corpus had been passed down intact. They span many genres, from school exercises to satire (now lost) to autobiography to epistolography. His literary output merits a discussion not only because these works are the sources on which the discussion of schedography will frequently draw, but also because the lack of translations renders a full survey a useful contribution to scholarship, as no such survey, to my knowledge, exists.[56]

Basilakes' work of greatest significance for this study is his *Prologos*, which contains a short autobiography of the author and was designed as a preface to a collection his works. It is transmitted by a single thirteenth-century manuscript in conjunction with the monody for Konstantinos and is noteworthy for several reasons. It provides useful information on the rhetorical culture of its age, and particularly on the issue of schedography, which Basialkes claims to have reformed. It is also notable as in instance of a Byzantine author editing a collection of his own work. As a near contemporary, one might compare Michael Choniates (ca. 1155-1215), who wrote an autobiographical introduction to his collected works as well, and later authors such as Gregory II of Cyprus (1241-1290), Joseph Phiosophos Rhakendytes (ca. 1260 or 1280-1330) and Theodoros Metochites (2370-1332). In terms of the autobiographical component, several of Basilakes' colleagues offer parallels in their inaugural

[55] Jan-Louis van Dieten, ed., *Nicetae Choniatae Historia* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 18–20.
[56] For a partial translation of Basilakes' *Prologos*, see: Miller, "Préface d'un auteur byzantin"; Garzya, "Il Prologo di Niceforo Basilace"; Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie*; Maisano, "Encomio di Niceforo Basilace per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone."

orations at the at the "Patriarchal Scool," including George Ternikes, Eustathios of Thessalonike, Michael Italikos and George Stilbes.[57] The *Prologos* can be dated with certainty to the author's exile.[58]

A series of *progymnasmata* comprises the largest part of his surviving opus. These exercises seem to have been Basilakes' most enduring legacy for the remainder of the Byzantine period. They have been passed down to us piecemeal in twelve manuscripts dating from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as well as three later manuscripts, two from the sixteenth century and one from the seventeenth or eighteenth century. All of these codices contain collections of rhetorical material.[59] Basilakes' *progymnasmata* contain no instructions to the student on composition, but were meant rather to be used as models and learned by heart, as was the norm. They may even have been intended as performance pieces, as they are significantly more polished than are their predecessors.[60] The *progymnasmata* of Basilakes are remarkable in that they are the first to include biblical themes, drawing from both the Old and New Testaments.[61] These are implemented only in the *ēthopoiïai*. This is both a mark of how conservative the world of Byzantine rhetoric was, as well as of the willingness of Basilakes to innovate within the system. The *progymnasmata* provide little information that would help to date them, but it seems likely that they stem from Basilakes' time as a grammar teacher before his exile despite their not being mentioned directly in the *Prolog*.

[57] Hinterberger, *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz*, 22:80.
[58] For a recent treatment of the *Prologos* and Basilakes' authorial technique, see: Pizzone, "Anonymity, Dispossesion and Reappropriation in the *Prolog* of Nikēphoros Basilakes". Pizzoni sees in the authorial themes of the *Prolog* a treatment of the key issues of Basilakes trial. See also: Garzya, "Intorno al prologo di Niceforo Basilace"; Garzya, "Il Prologo di Niceforo Basilace"; Miller, "Préface d'un auteur byzantin"; Polemis, "A Note on the Praefatio of Nikephoros Basilakes"; Hinterberger, *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz*, 22:349–352.
[59] Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie*, 51; Hörandner, "Zu den Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Basilakes: Bemerkungen zur kritischen Neuedition."
[60] Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, 33–40.
[61] Hunger, "On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature," 20–21.

In connection with the *progymnasmata* Basilakes' single surviving *meletē,* the "Adversus Bagoam" merits discussion. *Meletai* are exercises in declamation which are attempted at a higher level of study. They are longer and less restricted than *progymnasmata*, drawing on the full range of rhetorical theory and technique. *Meletai* in general continue the antique genre of the forensic speech, centuries after the practical applications of such had disappeared. The exact use of such *meletai* is therefore the subject of speculation, though it seems likely that a performative element was involved. The *Adversus Bagoam* is of particular interest as being the only *meletē* from the Komnenian era. It is a speech against a man of Persian origin, with the identifying name Bagoas, who undeservedly attained a high position in the church which he abused during a scandal in which another priest by the name of Hierotheos smeared honey on the icons of the church and accused a certain Kosmas of having previously defiled them with dung. Bagoas paid the bail for Hierotheos and is now himself attacked by an anonymous prosecutor, i.e. Basilakes.[62] The work begins with a *protheoria*, a short and technical discussion of the rhetorical technique employed, written in the first person by Basilakes. The whole is of both literary and historical interest, and has so far been only little used by Byzantinists. It is transmitted by only one thirteenth-century manuscript, cod. Vind. phil. gr. 321. For this thesis the manuscript has been consulted in conjunction with the critical edition of Garzya. The composition can be tentatively dated to the time of Basilakes' exile, because it is mentioned in the *Prologos* as the work that "dissolved his last birthing pains," being therefore the final work written before the composition of the *Prologos* itself, but sometime after the composition of the monody for his brother. The possibility that the work

[62] The name Bagoas is born by three separate figures in the histories of Alexander the Great. The first of these was a high-ranking official in the court of Artaxerxes. The second was appointed trierarch by Alexander. The third was a eunuch who became the lover of Alexander. It is surely the third to whom is alluded here. Cf. Werba, *Die arischen Personennamen und ihre Träger bei den Alexanderhistorikern: Studien zur iranischen Anthroponomastik*, Diss., Univ. of Vienna, 1982*;* s.v. Bagoas; Badian, "The Eunuch Bagoas."

was in fact composed during the controversy that led to Basilakes' exile is tempting and cannot be ruled out based on internal evidence. [63]

The two monodies have been published by Pignani together with the *progymnasmata*. One is addressed to his brother and the other to an anonymous friend. The first, already mentioned above, is an important source of information regarding the author and his family. It is transmitted by four manuscripts, all from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, of which two contain also *progymnasmata*, attesting to its use as school text.[64] The other monody is transmitted by only one manuscript, namely Vind. phil. gr. 321, which is also the unique source for the *Adversus Bagoam*. It is likely only an exercise, as it contains little personal information about the friend and is also shorter than the surely authentic monody for Konstantinos. The former may have been composed around 1155 (see above) and the latter cannot be surely dated.

This compilation, made by the author while in Philippopolis also contained a selection of orations.[65] Two of these were written for Alexios Aristenos, but only one has survived. Garzya suggests that it may have been the first of the two, based on Basilakes' description in the *Prologos*. It most likely dates to the period between 1140 and 1150.[66] The whole is a praise of the rhetorical ability of its subject, in keeping with the standard guidelines for an encomium. The second surviving oration (third in the original edition) is for John, bishop in Bulgaria, formerly Adrianos Komnenuos, which discusses the imperial family and includes details of the Syrian campaign of 1137-38. The third is an encomium of John Komnenos dealing with the same period. The fourth is an encomium of Nikolaos Mouzalon, who was made bishop of Cyprus in 1107 but then abdicated and returned to the capital. The oration was composed during

[63] For a general analysis of the *Adversus Bagoam*, see: Magdalino, "The Bagoas of Nicephoros Basilakes: A Normal Reaction?"
[64] Cf. Basilakes, *Progimnasmi e monodie*, 65; Criscuolo, "Per la tradizione manoscritta della monodia di Niceforo Basilace per il fratello Costantino."
[65] Cf. Garzya, "La produzione oratoria di Niceforo Basilace."
[66] Cf. Garzya, "Encomio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Alessio Aristeno," 93–4.

the controversy of 1147-1151 when Manuel I Komnenos attempted to appoint Mouzalon patriarch. Basilakes claims in the *Prologos* to have written this for one of his young students and states that this is the reason for its simpler style.[67] The final oration is for the Grand Domestic John Axouch. It praises him for his military exploits and support of the empreror. There is also a fragment, which appears at the end of Garzya's edition, and which the editor suspects to be part of this oration.[68]

We also have four letters of Basilakes, mentioned above. These were composed during his exile and complain bitterly of his living conditions and the absence of culture. Like the *Prolog*, these letters have been transmitted only by Scor. gr. Y.II.10, with the exception of the first which is also transmitted by Neap. gr. III A (A) 6. The first is addressed to two friends. The second and fourth are addressed to a group of former students, confirming for us the close personal bond between important teachers like Basilakes and their students. The third is understood by Garzya as addressed to Basilakes' brother. However, because Konstantinos died previously to Basilakes' exile, this conjecture requires re-evaluation, as mentioned above.[69] Basilakes had gained experience as a letter writer while helping his maternal uncle in his youth, as he mentions in the *Prologos*.[70]

It should now be clear to the reader that Basilakes, whom Krumbacher already termed "einer der fruchtbarsten und gewandtesten Redner des 12. Jahrhunderts" has been wrongly neglected.[71] The reason for this neglect has been a lack of good editions, a lack of translations, and the need for a foundation on which to build a criticism of his life and works. Let this be

[67] Cf. Maisano, "Encomio di Niceforo Basilace per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone"; Maisano, "Per il testo dell'encomio per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone di Niceforo Basilace."
[68] Garzya, "Encomnio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Giovanni Axuch."
[69] This letter is also attributed to Theodore Prodromos, but a comparison with the other letters reveals that its other could only be Basilakes. Cf. Garzya, "Varia Philologica VII."
[70] For a brief assessment of Basilakes' epistolographic output, see: Garzya, "Quatro Epistole di Niceforo Basilace," 228–29.
[71] Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 473.

justification enough for the preceding introduction to this study's principal personage. Now let us turn the question of schedography.

Chapter 2 – The Birth of Schedography in the Eleventh Century

In 1902 Leo Sternbach wrote that *schedographiae Byzantinae primordia … etiam post eximias Krumbacheri curas subobscura*.[72] The situation has improved little. This chapter attempts to lay bare the most fundamental problems associated with early schedography. First the Byzantine school system of the eleventh and twelfth century is described, this being the setting where *schedē* were composed and used. Then attention is turned to *schedē* themselves, the meaning of the word, its first implementation in schools, its diffusion, and its ultimate function.

2.1 Byzantine Education in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries

Schedography must be understood and interpreted in the context of the Byzantine education system of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The purpose of this system, especially in the early years of children's education, was first and foremost to educate students in understanding and producing Atticist Greek, which differed significantly from the Greek spoken on the streets of Constantinople in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the more than one thousand years since the venerated Classical authors had committed their works to writing, the spoken language of the period had seen far-reaching phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic changes. Educated speakers and writers attempted to produce Greek as similar as possible to the Classical authors, and were largely successful in every category except that of phonology. Here, the modern pronunciation was so deeply entrenched and the ancient so poorly understood, that orthography attained a difficulty comparable to that of English.

[72] Sternbach, "Spicilegium Laurentianum," 72.

Education in Atticist Greek was the ticket to entering and belonging to the higher levels of Byzantine society and was therefore in high demand both among the upper class and the aspiring middle class, eager to enter the world of the court, imperial administration or the church. Information about specific schools is disappointingly sparse, but the occasional anecdote brings into sharper focus the connection between student and teacher and even the frustrations of teaching sometimes ungrateful young students.[73] Children generally began attending the first level school at about twelve years of age, though education surely began much earlier in most cases.[74] In his encomium of Alexios Aristenos, Basilakes commends Alexios' parents for seeing to his childhood education: "your parents, oh admirable one, learned from the poem that 'you should teach what is good (to your son) while he is still a child' … and entrusted you to grammarians" (Οἱ γάρ σε τεκόντες, ὦ θαυμάσιε, τὸ 'χρὴ παῖδ' ἔτ' ἐόντα καλὰ διδάσκειν ἔργα' παρὰ τῆς ποιήσεως ἐδιδάχθησαν καί σε … γραμματισταῖς παρακατετίθουν).[75]

The first years of formal schooling were taken up with the study of basic grammar, spelling, meter, and Classical poetry. Students would begin with Homer, focusing on the *Iliad*, and memorize large sections of text daily, thirty lines being a somewhat standard number.[76] Homer was the principal author despite his mixed dialect, and even gained in prominence in the twelfth century. He was seen as a rhetorical author, ideal for learning how to express one's thoughts as well as how to express thoughts that other have previously expressed. His works were further useful for young students because of the perfection of their form, and their ethopoetic value. Homer furthermore didn't represent a serious threat to the church.[77] As we shall see, Eustathios of Thessaloniki even sees examples of *schedē* in Homer. They would then

[73] Gaul, "Rising Elites and Institutionalization," 266–67.
[74] Markopoulos, "De la structure de l'école byzantine," 89.
[75] Basilakes, *Oratio in Alexium Aristenum*, 18, ed. Garzya, p. 17 ll. 13-16.
[76] Gaul, "Rising Elites and Institutionalization," 268 n. 181.
[77] Basilikopoulos-Ioannidou, *Ἡ ἀναγέννησις τῶν γραμμάτων κατὰ τὸν ιβ' αἰῶνα*, 57–60.

move on to the tragedians, who are possibly the most cited Classical authors during this period, after perhaps Homer himself. They would continue through the classical cannon as well as the Psalms of David, working also with summaries of the texts, and would be both lectured to and interrogated by their teachers.[78] It is clear from this list that poetry constituted a principal part of early education. The playwrights in particular were useful models because they push the Attic language to its limits and provide excellent examples of unusual usages. And yet these works of poetry were, in some contacts, looked down on because of their association with the lowest levels of education and as being puerile.[79]

The *ēthopoiïai*, mentioned above, were also an important part of grammatical education of this period. *Ēthopoiïai* are brief compositions that begin by posing the question, "what would X have said when Y," taking instances from Classical mythology, history, current events, and for the first time in those of Basilakes, the Bible. The *ēthopoiïai* seem to mark the climax in the series of *progymnasmata*, which begin with simple mythological stories. Presumably students memorized the stories in collections such as that of Basilakes and used them as models in the composition of their own. Given this situation and the apparent performability of *ēthopoiïai*, it is somewhat strange that *schedē* and not these were the premier performance pieces of the time.

Another point of the Byzantine grammar school of this period that deserves special comment is its apparent competitive nature. It is common for authors of the eleventh and twelfth century to use military metaphors to refer to competitions in a school setting or associated with rhetoric.[80] So for instance Basilakes speaks of Demosthenes as "covered more than any other in the dust of the arena of Hermes" (τὴν Ἑρμοῦ κονίστραν εἴπερ τις ἄλλος

[78] Markopoulos, "De la structure de l'école byzantine," 89.
[79] Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 213–215.
[80] Ibid., 253ff.

ἀκριβῶς κονισάμενος).[81] This belligerence was surely the product of a more general competitive atmosphere, particularly among the middle class as they fought for upwards mobility, and as we shall see, was a key factor in the development of schedography.

An institution which deserves special comment is that of the *theatron*. This word, much like the word *schedos*, has seen a number of usages in Byzantine sources, ranging from the technical to the general or metaphorical.[82] Bernard connects the word with the "contests in *hoi logoi*" which served as a venue for schedic performances. These early eleventh-century *theatra* were then fairly concrete performance spaces. Such *theatra* were presided over by judges and heavily formalized.[83] By the twelfth century the word had extended to be used for learned communities who would gather to read works in high style.[84] Here evidently, the audience and not the physical space was the defining factor. As is clear from Basilakes' use of the word, however, it maintained its earlier technical meaning as well, at least in an academic context.

It is worth pausing to examine the contribution of Basilakes' writing to our understanding of this essential institution of the middle and late Byzantine periods. A broad concept of *theatron* is exemplified in Basilakes' oration for Alexios Aristenos where he speaks of "the *theatron* of all Greeks" (ὑπὸ Πανελληνίῳ τῷ θεάτρῳ), where all the world is a stage for Alexios' eloquence.[85] A more restricted use of the word can be found in the *Prologos*, where Basilakes asserts that he "did not go to *theatra* as one who is tasteless, but rather as one invited there, (where) I either pursued the work of rhetors or took on the burden of teaching, in which things all ambition is excusable," (οὐ[χ] ὡς ἀπειρόκαλος εἰς θέατρα καταβαίνων, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸ τοῦτο καλούμενος ἢ ῥητόρων ἔργα μετιὼν ἢ διδασκαλικοὺς πόνους ἐπιφορτισθείς, ἐν οἷς ἅπαν

[81] Basilakes, *In Nicolaum Muzalona*, 1, ed. Garzya, p. 75.7.
[82] For an overview of meanings that this word could take in the later period, see particularly: Gaul, *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik*, 18–23.
[83] Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 253ff.
[84] See particularly: Mullett, "Aristocracy and Patronage"; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, 337ff.
[85] Basilakes, *Oratio in Alexium Aristenum*, 4, ed. Garzya, p. 11.27-8

εὐάφορμον τὸ φιλότιμον).[86] Here we seem to see a glimpse of something that is at once a learned circle and a didactic setting. In Basilakes' writings we can also find examples of spaces being turned into *theatra* by a sudden public consensus, showing that the *theatra* for him were not restricted to a specific physical area. So, for instance, in his encomium of John Komnenos he speaks of the people assembling a *theatron* (θέατρον συναγείρομεν) for the public appearance of the emperor.[87] Similarly in the *meletē* against Bagoas, when Bagaos and Hierotheos make their accusation, the latter "calls together all manner of priests for the spectacle. He gathers arch-priests, altar attendants, the droves of councilmen, the townsmen, the foreigners; when he had called together such an audience, he exposed disgrace of the clergy, made a spectacle of the pollution of the church, and seems <…> towards piety." (ἱερέων ὅλα γένη συγκαλεῖται περὶ τὴν θέαν, ἀρχιερέας ἀθροίζει, τοὺς τοῦ βήματος προκαθημένους, τὰ τῆς βουλῆς [στίφη], τοὺς ἄστεως, τοὺς ἐπήλυδας· τοιοῦτον θέατρον συγκροτήσας ἐκπομπεύει τὸ τῶν ἱερέων αἶσχος, θεατρίζει τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄγος, καὶ δοκεῖ <...> πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν).[88] Indeed this *meletē* contains such a range and density of what seems almost gratuitous dramatic and theatrical technical terminology, that it is evident that it was intended itself to be performed in such a setting.

Basilakes, in his oration for John of Bulgaria, former Adrianos Komnenos, speaks of the importance of practice and preparation for before one enters the competition (ἀγών) and the arena (θέατρον), making it clear that the eleventh century conception of the word was still very much alive in the school context of Basilakes time.[89] He writes that the sophistic art "takes joy in *theatra*, loves the arena and longs for the stage"(χαίρει θεάτροις καὶ κονίστρας ἐρᾷ καὶ

[86] Basilakes, *Prologos*, 8, ed. Garzya, p. 5.26-28. If the reading given by Garzya is correct, it is of interest that Basilakes uses the word ὡς prepositionally. This (pseudo-)preposition is generally reserved for humans, and Basilakes' use of the word here suggests that he may indeed have conceived of the *theatron* rather as a group of people rather than as a place. Insertion of [χ] is my own for Garzya κ.
[87] Basilakes, *In Ioannem Comnenum Imperatorem*, 1, ed. Garzya, p. 49.5-10.
[88] Basialkes, *Adversus Bagoam*, 6, ed. Garzya, p. 96.25-29. The first lacuna in the edition of Garzya is filled by Reinsch.
[89] Basilakes, *Oratio in Ioannem Ep. Bulgariae ex Adriano Comneno*, 1, ed. Garzya, p.26.1-9; p. 27.1-3.

βήματος γλίχεται).[90] It is therefore quite tempting to take his testimony from the *Prologos* as being an equally technical use of the word as it was used in the previous century. Speaking of his education, he writes that "by performing frequently, I drew entire troops of youths to myself" (θαμὰ θεατρίζων ὅλας νέων ἀγέλας εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπεσπώμην).[91] Whether he is speaking of his time as a student or already as a young teacher, the setting is clearly didactic, just as in the passage cited above where he speaks of attending the *theatron* as a teacherly responsibility. At the same time, the frequent mention of *theatra* in the orations seem to bespeak a non-academic environment.

2.2 The History of Schedography

Schedē, as school exercises, seem to have grown directly out of this competitive and performative milieu. It is generally held that they have their origins in the beginning of the eleventh century.[92] They are discussed by Michael Psellos (1018-1078) in several of his letters, showing that *schedē* played a role in his life as a teacher.[93] More definitive still is the reference in a poem by Christophoros Myteleneos (c. 1000-1050) to the new *schedē* of the school of St. Theodoros of Sphorakios (τῶν πάντων κρατέουσι νέων σχεδέων).[94] The "new *schedē*" would seem too imply an older variety as well.

The word *schedos* itself is first attested in the writings of the seventh-century life of Saint Theodoros Sykeotes and in the writing of Anastasios Sinaites. Its meaning here, judging by the context, seems to be "notes."[95] It is likely that the word was taken up from the spoken language of the time. As with many vernacular words, its etymology poses some problems. It

[90] Basilakes, *Oration in Ioannem Comnenum*, 2, ed. Garzya, p. 50.10-11.
[91] Basialakes, *Prologos*, 3, ed. Garzya, p. 3.18.
[92] Giuseppe Schirò, "La schedografia a Bisanzio nei secoli XI-XIIe la scuola dei SS XL Martiri," *Bollettino della Badia di Grotiaferrata* III (1949): 15–16.
[93] See: Psellos, *Scripta minora*, ep. 16 and 24, ed. Kurtz-Drexel, pp. 19.20-20.19 and 30.22-31.23.
[94] Christophoros Mytilenaios, *Versus varii*, 10.15, ed. de Groote, p. 11.
[95] Gregorios Sykeotes, *Vie de Théodore de Sykeôn*, sec. 165, ed. Festugière; Anastasios Sinaites, *Viae Dux*, 24(.1).131, ed. Uthemann, p. 320.

ultimately belongs to a family of words associated with writing and composition. The Classical σχέδιος, "hastily thrown together" (from the adv. σχεδόν) provided the Classical Latin adjective *schedius* "hastily built" and the noun *schedium*, "an extemporaneous poem." Latin *scheda,* with an alternate form *scida*, "a strip of papyrus," already attested in Pliny the Elder, is a new formation within Latin and may show a contamination with the Greek verb σχίζω, "to cut."[96] Isidore of Seville defines *scheda* as a work not yet ready for publication.[97] This word was re-borrowed into Greek as σχέδη, "page." [98] Classical Greek also had a verb (αὐτο-)σχεδιάζω, "to do a thing off-hand" from the adjective σχέδιος. This is already used for literary composition by Polybios.[99]

The word *schedos*, then, was taken up by the competitive schoolmasters of the eleventh century and applied to a new form of school exercise. But what was this exercise? A glance at Byzantine lexicons only serves to deepen the confusion. The twelfth-century *Etymologicum Magnum* contains the following entry:

> *Schedos*—alongside χέω, "pour" χέδος and σχέδος, as though (referring to the act of) dissolving well and dividing words and phrases. Or alongside σκεδάζω σκεδάσω σκέδος and σχέδος, for the words are broken up, and as it were, divided logically into fine (constituents) and are comprehended by means of logic.[100]

This definition seems to point in the direction of the Henrichsen-Krumbacher analysis of *schedē* as an outgrowth of *epimerismoi*, grammatical parsing exercises. On the other hand, its language could equally well point to the later form of schedography, which called on students to re-analyze word boundaries (διαμερίζον τὰς λέξεις καὶ τοὺς λόγους) and pleasingly

[96] Plinius maior, *Naturalis historia*, 13.23(77); 13.24(80), ed. Ian-Mayhof, p. 443.17; p. 444.16.
[97] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum siue Originum libri XX*, 6.14.8, ed. Lindsay, p. 201.9-11: *Scheda est quod adhuc emendatur, et necdum in libris redactum est; et est nomen Graecum, sicut et tomus.*
[98] Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, s.v. schedon. Chantraine also indicates the likelihood of contamination with *schizō* in the word *schedē* in the meaning of "page."
[99] Polybios, *Historiae*, fr. 46, ed. Büttner-Wobst, p. 520.11-12.
[100] *Etymologicon Magnum*, ed, Gaisford, s.v. σχέδος: <Σχέδος>: Παρὰ τὸ χέω χέδος καὶ σχέδος, οἱονεὶ τὸ διαχέον καλῶς καὶ διαμερίζον τὰς λέξεις καὶ τοὺς λόγους. Ἢ παρὰ τὸ σκεδάζω σκεδάσω σκέδος καὶ σχέδος· διασκεδαζόμεναι γὰρ αἱ λέξεις καὶ οἱονεὶ μεριζόμεναι εἰς λεπτὰ διὰ τοῦ λόγου εἰς γνῶσιν παραλαμβάνονται.

confounds (τὸ διαχέον καλῶς) with its riddles and wordplay. A gloss in cod. Reg. 930 gives schedography the ambiguous alternative etymology "next to σχῶ, to hold, (for) *schedos* (is) that which holds many things together" (ἢ παρὰ τὸ σχῶ, τὸ κρατῶ, σχέδος τὸ τῶν πολλῶν συνεκτικόν), pointing vaguely in the direction of the didactic content of a *schedos*.[101] To this discussion we might also add the entry of Hesychios, the fourth-century Alexandrian lexicographer, for a similar sounding word: "σχεδιάζειν—(1.) to approach. (2.) To speak impromptu, said also of doing something quickly."[102] The first meaning is purely etymological, as though the verb were productively formed from σχέδιος, discussed above. The second seems in a way to bespeak the impromptu aspect of Byzantine schedic performance. It is this which led Gaul to note a passage in the letters of the Anonymous schoomaster (mid tenth-century) which seems to represent a kind of proto-schedography.[103] The Anonymous schoolmaster recounts asking his students to draft (σχεδιάζειν) iambic verses and post them in public squares, where the impromptu element and the phonetic similarity of the words hint at a connection.[104]

The words σχέδος and σχεδιάζειν, which were surely associated by eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantines, are also explicitly understood as connected by an unlikely thirteenth-century source. Thomas Aquinas defines schedography in words almost identical to those of Hesychios: "a decree made suddenly is called a *schedos*, whence (the word) *schediazo*, that is, to do something suddenly, whence (the law) is termed *aposchediasmenos*, that is, lacking the required forethought."[105] The context is a discussion of legal justice, and Thomas' source is obscure. Likely these "technical" terms were brought to the West by crusaders who

[101] apud Henrichsen, *Om Schedographien i de Byzantinske Skoler*, 11.
[102] Hesychios, *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, ed. Hansen, s.v. σχεδιάζειν: <σχεδιάζειν>· ἐγγίζειν. ἐκ παρατυχόντος ἐν ἑτοίμῳ λέγειν. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ταχέως ποιεῖν.
[103] Gaul, "Rising Elites and Institutionalization," 273.
[104] *Anonymi professoris epistulae*, ep. 94.5, ed. Markopoulos, p. 83.
[105] Thomas Aquinas, *Sententia libri Ethicorum*, 5.2.905, ed. Pirotta, p. 247: *schedos dicitur dictamen ex improviso editum, inde schediazo, idest ex improviso aliquid facio, unde potest dici lex aposchediasmenos, idest quae caret debita providentia.*

had encountered them in Constantinople. This is, to my knowledge, the only use of the term in the Latin West, and one that has until now not claimed the attention of scholars.

At least one text from this period does seem to exist, and this is the grammatical work of the so-called Longibardos.[106] Little is known about the author or the precise dating of the work. If this Longibardos is the same as the one to whom Anna Komnene refers (see below 36), or the same as Psellos' addressee, he can be comfortably situated within the early to mid-eleventh century.[107] As the title of his work makes clear, it is intended as a schoolbook with exercises in syntax and orthography. The title given in cod. Vat. gr. 883 even terms it a work on schedography. The very first sentence contains strings of similar-sounding words that could be easily confused or misspelled (Πολλοὶ τῶν ἀρχιαιτέρων καὶ ἀρχαιοτέρων καὶ ἀρχαιτέρων….) and continues in this vein.[108] The author seems to have composed this work (sixty-one pages in the edition of Festa) with the express purpose of using as many potentially difficult or similar sounding words as possible for the benefit of students. Yet despite the work's self-identification, at least in one manuscript, as a collection of *schedē*, there is not the slightest indication that this work could have been intended for performance, and it is in fact difficult to imagine how it would even be possible to execute such a performance. It lends itself much more to a classroom dictation exercise (in terms of orthography) or to rote memorization (in terms of learning vocabulary, morphology and case usage).

An example of similar "*schedē*" can be found in the *Schedē of the Mouse*. Both the authorship of this work and the period of its composition are disputed.[109] It presents neither epimerismatic exercises nor riddles. It is rather a collection of two short stories about mice,

[106] Festa, "Longibardos"; Festa, "Note preliminari su Longibardos."
[107] Psellos, *Oratoria minora*, 18, ed. Littlewood.
[108] Longibardos, Παρεκβόλαια, ed. Festa, p. 112.4-5
[109] For the text and a deiscussion of authorship and dating, see: Papademetriou, "Τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μυός: new sources and text."

which, like Longibardos' work, contain interesting words that are either unusual or difficult to spell, particularly words associated with food. The first is addressed to children or students (Εἰ βούλεσθε, ὦ παῖδες, τραφῆναι τήμερον λογικῶς, ἰδου ὁ μῦς ὑμῖν τὸ συσσίτιον δίδωσι).[110] It is likely futile to try to identify this little work with one of the great eleventh- or twelfth-century authors. It was more likely written by a humble teacher in the eleventh century.

Yet another type of *schedos*, chiefly represented in the later manual of Moschopoulos, seems to bear a close affinity to the so-called *epimerismoi*.[111] The opening of the compilation requests that Christ illumine the mind of the student now beginning to write *schedē* and to bless the opening of this *schedos* (φώτισον τὸν νοῦν τοῦ νέου τοῦ νῦν ἀρξαμένου τοῦ σχεδογραφεῖν, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐλόγισον τοῦ σχέδους). Needless to say, this strongly suggests that the subject matter, at least in the early fourteenth century, was seen as typical schedography.[112] These *schedē* analyze the syntax and particularly the morphology of words in a sentence in a more or less systematic way, providing lists of related words and derivatives. So for instance one entry begins with the following pedantic maxim:

> Take into account, oh child, the sayings and phrases which are being written for you. They are more valuable than gold, more precious than countless silver coins, and sweeter than honey or honeycomb. For these will make you famous, magnificent, conspicuous, glorious and far-famed.[113]

Clearly this saying is designed to be learned by heart, both as a moral lesson and a lesson in vocabulary and orthography. This is then followed by a word by word analysis:

[110] Anonymous, *Τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μυός*, 1.1-2, ed. Papademetriou, p. 219.1-2.
[111] The book contains twenty-two *schedē* and has survived in a large number of manuscripts. Moschopoulos, *Περὶ σχεδῶν*; Gallavotti, "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo"; Keaney, "Moschopulea."
[112] One questions what exactly is meant by σχεδογραφεῖν. Were these perhaps copying exercises with which a student might begin his academic career? Or were such epimerismatic texts used as models for original analyses? Moschopoulos, *Περὶ σχεδῶν*, 3.
[113] Ibid., 133. Ἔχε ἐπὶ λογισμῶν ὦ παῖ τὰ γραφόμενά σοι ῥησείδια καὶ λεξίδια, τὰ τιμιώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον, καὶ προτιμώτερα ὑπὲρ μυριάδας ἀργυρίων· καὶ ἡδύτερα ὑπὲρ μέλι καὶ κηρίον. Ταῦτα γάρ σε θήσει κλεινὸν καὶ ἀρίδηλον, καὶ ἀρίζηλον καὶ ἀριδείκετον, καὶ ἐν βροτοὶς περιώνυμον.

> Ἔχ. The dictionary form: ἔχω. The ε is short. Words derived from ἔχω are written with short ε such as Βρέχω, which is ῠ̈ω in Attic. Τρέχω. Ἀμπέχω, 'to put on.' Ἔχω, and similar (words). The (words) that start with ε followed by χ are mostly written with short ε. However, some of them are also written with the diphthong αι. Which are written with short ε? The following. Ἔχω, (meaning) to bear, possess, or hold. Ἔχις, a species of snake. Ἔχτος, (a word for) hatred (used by) poets, as well as ἐχθαίρειν, 'to hate.' Ἔχιδνα, a species of snake. Ἐχενηΐς, a species of fish. Ἐχέτλη, the upper part of a plough, which farmers use to move the entire plow. Ἐχῖνος, a marine creature (but also a) land (creature) as well as, in Attic, a bronze vessel of the court stand in which they sealed notes (of evidence). Ἐχῖνος is also a city, which Demosthenes mentions in (his) Philippics. Ἐχθρὸς is the local (enemy) and πολέμιος the one from another country. Ἐχθραίνω. Ἐχυρόν (means) secure. Ἐχεμυθῶ, (means) to hold one's peace. And others. Which (words are written) with the diphthong αι? The following: Αἰχμὴ, the point of the spear, and hence the entire spear. From which (are derived) αἰχμάλωτος, αἰχμαλωσία, and αἰχμητής, one who uses a spear. αἰχμάζω· to throw a spear but also to arm, as in Sophocles(*'Ajax*): "Did you also arm your hand against the sons of Atreus?" and μεταίχμιον, (meaning) between two armies, which is also pronounced μεσαίχμιον. And others.[114]

The analysis proceeds to treat every noun, adjective and verb, ending with περιώνυμον. As above, first a "dictionary" form of the word is given (e.g. ἔχω for ἔχε). This is then followed by an antistoichic/orthographic observation, in this case that the "e" is short. Then follows a list of pseudo-derivatives and folk etymologies that share the same grapheme. These themselves receive definitions (e. g. ἔχω $\rightarrow$ βρέχω $=$ Attic ῠ̈ω). Then a practical rule is stated: $(/\varepsilon/ + \chi \xrightarrow[usually]{} \varepsilon\chi$ but sometimes $\alpha\iota\chi)$. Two paragraphs follow, in which first the rule and then the exception is treated with examples for each spelling. Both sections are introduced with a rhetorical question.

[114] Ibid., 133-134: Ἔχε. Τὸ θέμα, ἔχω. Τὸ ε ψιλόν. Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἔχω ῥήματα, διὰ τοῦ ε ψιλοῦ γράφονται. οἷς Βρέχω, τὸ παρὰ τοῖς ἀττικοῖς ῠ̈ω. Τρέχω. Ἀμπέχω, τὸ ἐνδύω. Ἔχω. καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Καὶ ἄλλως. Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ε ἀρχόμενα, ἔχοντα ἐπαγόμενον τὸ χ, ὡς ἐπὶ το πλεῖστον διὰ τοῦ ε ψιλοῦ γράφονται. Τινὰ δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τῆς αι διφθόγγου. Τίνα διὰ τοῦ ε ψιλοῦ; Ταῦτα. Ἔχω τὸ φορῶ, καὶ κέκτημαι, καὶ διάκειμαι, καὶ κρατῶ. Ἔχις, εἶδος ὄφεως. Ἔχθος παρὰ ποιηταῖς, τὸ μῖσος. καὶ ἐχθαίρειν, τὸ μίσειν. Ἔχιδνα, εἶδος ὄφεως. Ἐχενηΐς, εἶδος ἰχθύος. Ἐχέτλη, τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ἀρότρου. ὃ κρατοῦντες οἱ γεωργοὶ, κινοῦσιν ὅλον τὸ ἄροτρον. Ἐχῖνος, ζῶον θαλλάττιον καὶ χερσαῖον. καὶ σκεῦός τι παρὰ ἀττικοῖς χαλκοῦν, τῆς δικαστικῆς τραπέζης, ἐν ᾧ τὰ γραμματεῖα ἀπετίθεσαν. Ἐχῖνος καὶ πόλις, ἧς μνημονεύει Δημοσθένης ἐν φιλιππικοῖς. Ἐχθρὸς, ὁ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ· πολέμιος δὲ, ὁ ἀπ'ἀλλοτρίας γῆς. Ἐχθραίνω. Ἐχυρὸν, τὸ ἀσφαλές. Ἐχεμυθῶ, τὸ τοῦς λόγους φυλάσσω. καὶ ἕτερα. Τίνα διὰ τῆς αι διφθόγγου; Ταῦτα. Αἰχμὴ, τὸ ξίφος τοῦ δόρατος. Καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου, ὅλον τὸ δόρυ. ἀφ'οὗ αἰχμάλωτος. καὶ αἰχμαλωσία. καὶ αἰχμητὴς, ὁ τῇ αἰχμῇ χρώμενος. αἰχμάζω, τὸ ἀκοντίζω. καὶ τὸ ὁπλίζω. ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ, ἦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρείδαισιν ᾔχμασας χέρα. καὶ μεταίχμιον, τὸ μετὰ τῶν παρατάξεων. ὃ καὶ μεσαίχμιον λέγεται. καὶ ἕτερα. etc.

The importance of this type of *schedos*, and the reason why it is worth examining it in detail, is that it is clear that it would have lent itself easily to performance. We might easily imagine that an eleventh-century schoolmaster could have presented a contrived saying of this sort to his students, or possibly to a student of the other team, and that the students' job was then to go through and create a performative *epimerismos*, analyzing and defining each words, demonstrating knowledge of orthographic rules, and exemplifying these with a wide variety of words, to which he would add definitions. The rhetorical questions also work especially well in an oral context, as the speaker would use them to shape his response and draw in his listeners—creating some dramatic tension would have been important in such a performance! Indeed, similar impromptu performances are sometimes held in Indian middle and elementary schools, though the object is not grammar, merely performative word association.[115]

The idea that this could have been the form of the early *schedē* is quite attractive because of its apparent congruence with the facts so far given.[116] Such *schedē* could be impromptu, building off aphorisms that lent themselves to analysis because they contained difficult or similar words, and presented the possibility of being done as a written exercise or an oral performance; Longibardos can then be viewed, with Festa, as having compiled an idiosyncratic and innovative quasi literary school text drawing on the epimerismic tradition, and possibly the *Schedē of the Mouse* as well.[117] These could have then formed a bridge to the later schedography.

This surmise regarding the *schedē* of Moschopoulos' so-called Περὶ σχεδῶν is supported also by the manuscript titles, many of which call the work collectively the "first

[115] Such competitions are common in India today and are termed "*extempo*s." For an example of such a performance, see: Johar, *Kuch Kuch Hota Hai*, 10:58.
[116] Nineteenth-century scholarship took this a general definition of schedography. Cf. Henrichsen, *Om Schedographien i de Byzantinske Skoler*; Komnene, *Alexias*, vol. 131, col. 1165 note 91; Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, sec. 250.
[117] Festa, "Longibardos" 104.

schedos" (πρῶτον σχέδος).[118] There are in fact larger collections of *schedē* under the name of Moschopoulos, grouped by Keaney into three classes, and these could then potentially represent a second and even a third *schedos* respectively.[119] But regardless, the appellation of "first *schedos*" could also speak for the antiquity of the style. If we imagine that this kind of epimerismatic *schedos* was the original variety used in competitions, there is little reason to think that the new *schedē* fully supplanted it, especially considering the apparent heightened complexity of the later works. Likely they continued to exist side by side, the older *schedē* relegated to the first levels of education, the later to higher levels. So, for instance, Basialkes suggests that he began practicing his *schedē* not in his first years of school, but rather after his study of grammar.[120] In this way the "first *schedos*" could be both the first in the curriculum and the first historically.

Let us now test this hypothesis against some of our early testimony about schedography. Essential practical evidence is provided by a set of three poems by Christophoros Mitylenaios.[121] These seem to reveal a number of characteristics of early eleventh-century schedography that are essential for the discussion of its evolution. They make it clear that schedography was associated with schools and with specific teachers. The first two poems are addressed to the school of St. Theodoros of Sphorakios and the third to a teacher at the school of the Chalkoprateioi.[122] The role of a good teacher is further emphasized. The success of the school St. Theodoros of Sphorakios is attributed to its excellent teacher Leon with the words "(the school) will never see a humiliating defeat in *sched*(*ic* combat) as long as their teacher is the noble Leon(/lion)," (ἦτταν δὲ δεινὴν οὔποτε σχέδους ἴδῃ, / ἕως μαΐστωρ ἐστὶ γεννάδας

[118] Gallavotti, "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo," 4–5.
[119] Keaney, "Moschopulea"; Gallavotti, "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo," 9.
[120] Basilakes, *Prologos*, 3, ed. Garzya, p. 3.14-15.
[121] Christophoros Mytilenaios, *Versus varii*, 9-11 ed. de Groote, p. 10-12.
[122] Both of these schools were historically connected with the clergy of the Hagia Sophia. See: Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," 1962, 172.

Λέων) and since they also "possess Stylianus, an unbreakable pillar, as *proksimos*." (πρώξιμον κεκτημένη / τὸν Στυλιανόν, ἀρραγῆ τινὰ στύλον).[123] The competitive aspect is also clearly evident here. The final poem likewise compares a greedy teacher of the Chalkoprateioi to Midas, because of the way he eagerly sells his *schedē*.[124] Following the analysis presented here, these must have been practice pieces, to be learned by heart, to provide material on which a student could draw in his analyses in schedic combat.

The short poems also provide evidence that schedography was seen as a new invention in the first half of the eleventh century, as mentioned above. The school of St. Theodoros of Sphorakios "has command of all the new *schedē* (when they take part) in competitions." (τῶν πάντων κρατέουσι νέων σχεδέων ἐν ἀγῶσιν).[125] If indeed the word was taken up from the vulgar language, it may first have referred to grammatical exercises in general. The "new *schedē*" then likely represent the introduction of the formal impromptu grammatical analyses described above, seen by Christophoros as an innovation in the educational system of such importance that it did not need to be more closely defined for his audience.

Further evidence can be drawn incidentally from the writings of Michael Psellos. Psellos reprimands two of his students for competing with each other. Instead, they should wait for the proper occasion, one the choruses of two schools come together.[126] Psellos also shows that *schedē* could be a written exercise when he writes of two exceptionally talented students who "have already written (out) very many of the useful *schedē* that I myself have composed and compel and force me to request other," while his addressee, a certain Romanos, is in the position to provide more being "a treasury of *schedē* and, if truth be told, a honeycomb, as when an industrious bee plucks and gathers for itself all that is most beautiful and useful, and

[123] Christophoros Mytilenaios, *Versus varii*, 9.5-6, ed. de Groote, p. 10; Ibid. ll. 3-4.
[124] Ibid. 11, p. 12.
[125] Christophoros Mytilenaios, *Versus varii*, 10.15, ed. de Groote, p. 11.
[126] Psellos, *Oratoria minora*, 20, ed. Littlewood.

which is as though made of most beautiful *schedē*."[127] Schirò believes that Psellos is speaking here of the *schedē* that he himself once composed as a student, but this does not fit the context.[128] It seems more likely that Psellos composed the sentences which his students then analyzed in writing as a practice for schedic competitions. He is requesting more such phrases, with difficult vocabulary and orthographic problems from a friend who, like him, composes and gathers such exercises for his students.

It is noteworthy that neither author speaks of riddles or mentions register in their brief allusions to schedography, two aspects practically come to define schedography by the end of the century. I will examine this later aspect of schedography in the next chapter more closely. Instead, the focus is entirely on schools, teachers, competitions, and orthography, issues that can all be easily subsumed under the type of *schedos* proposed above. In closing I would like to add one more indirect testimony to the discussion. The schoolbook published by Max Treu, as Lemerle notes, does not seem to mention or allude to schedography.[129] The slightly problematic dating of this work notwithstanding, the absence of the otherwise ubiquitous schedography is noteworthy.[130] This could be attributed to the idiosyncratic and restricted subject matter of the text, namely dialogue between teacher and student. It could also be that the text is simply from a time or place slightly before or the predominance of *schedē.*

[127] Michael Psellos, *Scripta minora,* ep. 16, ed. Kurtz-Drexel, p. 20.4-16: Φοιτᾶτον παρ' ἡμᾶς νέω περὶ ὀρυογραφίας πονοῦντε καὶ περὶ τούτων ταὴν πᾶσαν καταβάλλοντε σπουδήν. Οὗτοι, φύσει τε ὄντες δεξιοὶ καῖ σπουδῇ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν χρησίμων γεγραφότες σχεδῶν, ὧν καὶ ποτε αὐτὸς σχεδογραφῶν ἔτυχον, βιάζουσιν ἡμᾶς καὶ κατεπείγουσιν, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ἑτέρους τοιαῦτα αίτεῖν, βαρέως φέροντες, εἰ μη χανδὸν πάντων σχεδὸν σιτήσονται. ἔγωγ' οὖν ἀπορῶν, ᾧ χρήσομαι τούτοις, ἐπὶ σὲ τὸν ἀληθῆ καταφεύγω φίλον, δεῖν κρίνας οὐκ ἄλλῳ ἢ τῇ ἀγαθῇ σου ψυχῇ ταύτην προσενεγκεῖν τὴν ἀξίωσιν· ταμιεῖον γὰρ σὺ σχεδῶν καὶ (το γε ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν) σίμβλον, πᾶν εἴ τι κάλλιστον καὶ ὀνησιφόρον ἀπανθισάμενος ἑαθτῷ καὶ συλλέξας οἶά τις φιλεργὸς μέλισσα, καὶ σχεδῶν καλλίστων ὁμοῦ καὶ πεπονημένων. (sic)

[128] Schirò, "La schedografia a Bisanzio," 13–14.

[129] Treu, "Ein byzantinisches Schulgespräch."

[130] Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le Xie siècle byzantin*, 241.

Chapter 3 – The Schedography of Nikephoros Basilakes

It now remains to examine the further development of schedography into the first half of the twelfth century. Testimony is rather sparse, and for comparison we must rely largely on information found in the works of Theodoros Prodromos, John Tzetzes, Niketas Eugenianos, Eustathios of Thessalonike, Gregorios Pardos and Anna Komnene. Previous scholarship has been quick to comment on Anna Komnene's apparent condemnation of schedography and is divided in its interpretation of her assessment of its history. The nearly contemporaneous testimony of Basilakes on the same subject has been largely overlooked.[131] I will here suggest that the evidence bears out this new hypothesis: Basilakes pioneered a variety of schedography that both relied on sophisticated puns and maintained a high Atticist register.

3.1 The Testimony of Basilakes

In his autobiographical *Prologos*, Basilakes describes his own engagement in the composition and performance of *schedē* in the following, enigmatic way:

> To such things did I aspire, such were my goals, it was to this purpose that I exercised my tongue in this way, and it was as though I was ascending a ladder, studying with zeal and filling my mind with all learning. And so, after becoming acquainted with grammar, which I consider to be a beautiful vestibule into the other wisdom, I followed this new children's sophistry which, as it were, plays tricks with words. For the artifice of this Hermes enchanted me, and so, performing often, I led entire troops of youths to him. I did not, however, fashion these labyrinths in the old way. For speaking without beauty struck me as sour, outdated and of unpolished art, or even as complete barbarism. For which reason I never let off from riddles and word games, tracing the external to a splendid appearance but also twisting and weaving the internal to a state of beauty. And I became famous in this respect, and I had a band of followers around me who were not lazy in their emulation of this method or in their desire for this cultivation, such that nearly all the youths who were well-spoken and well-built switched over from the old-fashioned and outdated *schedē* to my own

[131] For a discussion of both, see: Agapitos, "Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training"; Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage."

> sweet-spoken *schedē*, which that which is apparent spreads with honey and that which is hidden makes splendid. And back then "basilakizing" was said of riddlers just as "gorgiazing" was formerly said of sophists, and much jealousy was kindled in those who pursued the old-fashioned and the stale due to their lack of learning and poorness of nature, the enemies of the Graces, those who were false and risible for their artifice of speech, and above all those who spoke using provincialisms, and those who were proclaiming thereby to be teaching grammar, the pursuit of which is speaking well and speaking correctly, those who were acutely uneducated and steadfastly ignoble and exaltedly base, those, moreover, who accused my followers of Basilakism as though it were Philippism or Medism.[132]

Here Basilakes, writing from his exile and looking back on his childhood in Constantinople, inserts the standard encomiastic *topos* of education in his life narrative, in which the subject of the encomium is described as excelling among his peers. In so doing, he significantly chooses to highlight schedography as the essential aspect of this period of his life and in fact the mode in which he initially distinguished himself. The importance of the centrality given by Basilakes to schedography cannot be overstated, and the passage merits a close discussion.

The first notable point is that Basilakes seems to place schedography after the study of grammar when he writes "after becoming acquainted with grammar, which I consider to be a beautiful vestibule into the other wisdom, I followed this new children's sophistry which, as it were, plays tricks with words." This statement would seem to place schedography in an

[132] Basilakes, *Prologos*, 3-4, ed. Garzya, p. 3, ll. 12-37: Τοιαῦτα ἐφιλοτιμούμην τοιούτων ἐγλιχόμην, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἥσκουν τὴν γλῶτταν ταύτῃ τοι καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ κλίμακος ἐποιούμην τὰς ἀναβάσεις, φιλομαθῶν καὶ παιδείας ξυμπάσης τὸν νοῦν ἐμπιπλῶν. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μετὰ τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν, ἣν ἐγὼ πάγκαλόν τι προτεμένισμα τίθεμαι σοφίας τῆς ἄλλης, μετῄειν δὴ τὴν νέαν ταύτην καὶ ὡς ἐν παισὶ σοφιστικήν, τὴν [ὡς] ἐν ὀνόμασι κλεπτικήν. ἔθελγε γάρ μου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τούτου τὸ δόλιον καὶ θαμὰ θεατρίζων ὅλας νέων ἀγέλας εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπεσπώμην. οὐ τὸν ἀρχαῖον μέντοι τρόπον τοὺς λαβυρίνθους τούτους διετεχνώμην· ἀγλευκὲς γάρ μοι ἐδόκει καὶ ἀρχαιολογίας καὶ τέχνης ἀξέστου τὸ μὴ ξὺν ἡδονῇ λέγειν ἢ καὶ ὅλως ὑποβαρβαρίζειν. ὅθεν οὐκ ἀνίην τοὺς γρίφους καὶ τὰς πλεκτάνας, καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς μὲν εἰς ἀγλαΐαν ὑπογράφων, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς ἱκανῶς βοστρυχίζων καὶ διαπλέκων εἰς ὥραν· καί τις ἔδοξα τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, καὶ ἦν ἑταιρία περὶ ἐμὲ οὐ φαύλη ζήλῳ τοῦ ἐπιτηδεύματος καὶ ἱμέρῳ τῆς εὐπαιδευσίας ταύτης, ὡς ὀλίγου μεταρρυῆναι πάντας ὁπόσοι τῶν νέων εὔστομοί τε καὶ ἀκροφυεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχαιοτρόπου καὶ παλαιᾶς σχεδικῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἡδυεπῆ ταύτην καὶ ἡμετέραν, ἣν καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον καταμελιτοῖ καὶ τὸ κρυπτόμενον ἀγλαΐζει. Καὶ ἦν ἤδη λεγόμενον τὸ βασιλακίζειν ἐν σχεδοπλόκοις, ὡς πάλαι τὸ γοργιάζειν ἐν σοφισταῖς. καὶ ὁ φθόνος πολὺς ὑπεκάετο τούτοις δὴ τοῖς τὸ ἀρχαιότροπον καὶ σαπρὸν μεταδιώκουσιν ὑπ᾽ ἀμαθίας καὶ τοῦ μὴ φύσεως εὖ ἔχειν, τοῖς τῶν χαρίτων ἐχθροῖς, τοῖς ὑποξύλοις καὶ γελοίοις τὴν πλοκήν, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ὑποσολοίκοις, καὶ ταῦτα γραμματικὴν ἐπαγγελλομένοις ἐκπαιδεύειν, ἧς τὸ εὖ λέγειν καὶ ὀρθοεπεῖν ἐπιτήδευμα· ὧν καὶ τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἀμαθὲς καὶ τὸ εὐσταθὲς ἀγεννὲς καὶ τὸ ὑψηλὸν χθαμαλόν, οἳ καὶ βασιλακισμὸν ὡς φιλιππισμὸν ἢ μηδισμὸν τοῖς τῶν ἡμετέρων ζηλωταῖς ἐνεκάλουν. The addition of ὡς is given by Reinsch as being the correct manuscript reading. See: Reinsch, "A. Garzya/A. Pignani, Niceforo Basilace," 88.

intermediate stage of education between the study of morphology and metrics and the higher rhetorical arts. If this is to be taken seriously, it represents a notable change from the eleventh century where *schedē* went hand in hand with basic grammar and poetics.[133] This fact in and of itself suggests that *schedē* had gained a significant added layer of complexity by the time of Basilakes' school years (c. 1130).

Furthermore Basilakes apparently composed *schedē* as a student. To what extent this goes against evidence from the previous century is unclear. Psellos, for instance, writes both of composing *schedē* for his students, and of students writing *schedē* as discussed above.[134] This point is, however, not entirely clear. It is also conceivable that Basilakes jumps from describing his own childhood to his time as a teacher, drawing in students with his *schedē* like Leon and Stylanos. But while an *a priori* conception of schedography would lead to this reading, the necessary jump forward in time in the narrative without clear transition seems to me rather too jarring to be likely for Basilakes' otherwise smooth style. Furthermore, if we take this to be the "excelled among his peers" *topos*, as proposed above, the former reading suggests itself all the more.

Most striking, however, is Basilakes' bold and self-laudatory statement that other students "switched over from the old-fashioned and out-dated *schedē* to my own sweet-spoken *schedē*" because he was unwilling to "fashion these labyrinths in the old way." Such a claim to an innovation in schedography hardly seems to refer to the issues so far mentioned, whether coming from Basilakes the student or Basilakes the teacher, and it poses a problem to our understanding of the nature and development of schedography during the twelfth century.

[133] Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry*, 214.
[134] Michael Psellos, *Scripta minora*, ep. 16, ed. Kurtz-Drexel, p. 20.4-16, reproduced in full in the previous section.

3.2 The Testimony of Anna Komnene

Before continuing to evaluate the testimony of Basilakes, it is worthwhile to turn our attention to the much-discussed passage of Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, which addresses schedography and seems in some way to tally with Basilakes' statement. In the final book of her history, the princess describes the famous *orphanotropheion* which her father had built to benefit the city of Constantinople:

> And you would encounter these churches and holy monasteries on the left as you enter, but to the right of the large church stands a grammarians' school for orphaned children gathered together from every race, in which some teacher presides and children stand around him, some excited about grammatical questions, others writers of so-called schedē. And there you can see a Latin being trained, and a Scythian speaking Greek and a Roman studying the writing of the Hellenes and the un-lettered Hellene speaking Greek correctly; such were Alexios' additional exertions for the literary education (of the orphans). But the art of the *schedos* is an invention of the moderns and (particularly) of our own generation. I disregard Stylianoi and so-called Longobardoi and all those who made lists of all kinds of words, and Attikoi and those who have become part of the sacred catalogue of our great church, whose names I omit. But now the study of these illustrious poets and even of the prose-writers, as well as the knowledge that can be gained from them is not even given second place. Petteia is their pursuit, and other immoral activities. And I say this because I am distressed by the complete neglect of general education (ἐγκυκλίου παιδεύσεως). For this enflames my soul, because I have spent much time studying these very things, even if I later distanced myself from this childish pastime of theirs and turned to rhetoric and engaged in philosophy and arrived at the poets and prose-writers through the sciences and through these smoothed out the unevenness of my speech, and then, with the help of rhetoric, rejected the much-tangled web of schedography.[135]

[135] Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν τὰ τεμένη καὶ ἱερὰ φροντιστήρια εἰσιόντι σοι κατὰ λαιὰν ἀπαντήσειε· κατὰ δὲ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ μεγάλου τεμένους παιδευτήριον ἔστηκε τῶν γραμματικῶν παισὶν ὀρφανοῖς ἐκ παντοδαποῦ γένους συνειλεγμένοις, ἐν ᾧ παιδευτής τις προκάθηται καὶ παῖδες περὶ αὐτὸν ἑστᾶσιν, οἱ μὲν περὶ ἐρωτήσεις ἐπτοημένοι γραμματικάς, οἱ δὲ ξυγγραφεῖς τῶν λεγομένων σχεδῶν. Καὶ ἔστιν ἰδεῖν καὶ Λατῖνον ἐνταῦθα παιδοτριβούμενον καὶ Σκύθην ἑλληνίζοντα καὶ Ῥωμαῖον τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγράμματα μεταχειριζόμενον καὶ τὸν ἀγράμματον Ἕλληνα ὀρθῶς ἑλληνίζοντα, τοιαῦτα καὶ περὶ τὴν λογικὴν παίδευσιν τὰ τοῦ Ἀλεξίου σπουδάσματα. Τοῦ δὲ σχέδους ἡ τέχνη εὕρημα τῶν νεωτέρων ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενεᾶς. Παρίημι δὲ Στυλιανούς τινας καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους Λογγιβάρδους καὶ ὅσους ἐπὶ συναγωγὴν ἐτεχνάσαντο παντοδαπῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς καὶ τοὺς γεγονότας τοῦ ἱεροῦ καταλόγου τῆς μεγάλης παρ' ἡμῖν ἐκκλησίας, ὧν παρίημι τὰ ὀνόματα. Ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐδ' ἐν δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τὰ περὶ τούτων τῶν μετεώρων καὶ ποιητῶν καὶ αὐτῶν συγγραφέων καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐμπειρίας· πεττεία δὲ τὸ σπούδασμα καὶ ἄλλα τὰ ἔργα ἀθέμιτα. Ταῦτα δὲ λέγω ἀχθομένη διὰ τὴν παντελῆ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδεύσεως ἀμέλειαν. Τοῦτο γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναφλέγει, ὅτι πολὺ περὶ ταὐτὰ ἐνδιατέτριφα, κἂν, ἐπειδὰν ἀπήλλαγμαι τῆς παιδαριώδους τούτων σχολῆς καὶ εἰς ῥητορικὴν παρήγγειλα καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἡψάμην καὶ μεταξὺ τῶν ἐπιστημῶν πρὸς ποιητάς τε καὶ ξυγγραφέας ᾔξα καὶ τῆς γλώττης τοὺς ὄχθους ἐκεῖθεν ἐξωμαλισάμην,

This passage raises a number of interesting points on the *schedē* of her time. Anna Komnene's observation that schedography is an invention of "the moderns and (particularly) of our own generation" (τοῦ δὲ σχέδους ἡ τέχνη εὕρημα τῶν νεωτέρων ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενεᾶς) has constituted at once a prominent source for the history of schedography and generated much confusion through its ambiguous wording. Sternbach understands Anna to mean that schedography was a recent invention of her time. He writes off the statement as an error, it being clear that schedography was practiced in Byzantium over half a century before her birth in 1083.[136] Schirò suggests extending the period of reference to cover the beginnings of schedography and sees no contradiction.[137] The phrase οἱ νεώτεροι is too ambiguous to allow for a definitive interpretation. It is used, for instance, by Eustathios of Thessaloniki frequently to contrast Attic usages with Homeric usages, which is of course not the case here. But whether the meaning is very specific (Anna's own lifetime), or very broad (Byzantine), Anna felt the need to specify in a second clause exactly what she is referring to, namely her own generation (τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενεᾶς), which leaves little room for doubt. Anna has a specific variety of schedography in mind that was created within her own lifetime.

This assertion is further supported by the list of authors she then names. It is certainly tempting to associate Stylianos with the teacher mentioned by Christopher Mitylenaios, as argued most recently by Agapitos.[138] Nothing else is known of him. The "schedographic" collection published under the name of Longibardos likewise presents itself as an obvious source for Anna's reference.[139] Her description of Longibardos as a compiler of words is

εἶτα ῥητορικῆς ἐπαρηγούσης ἐμοὶ κατέγνων τῆς {τοῦ} πολυπλόκου τῆς σχεδογραφίας πλοκῆς. Anna Komenne, Alexiad, 15.7.9, ed. Reinsch–Kambylis, pp. 484–485 ll. 109-129.

[136] Sternbach, "Spicilegium Laurentianum," 75. *in magno errore versatur ... anno 1083 nata, cum schedographiam suae aetatis hominum inventum declarant*.

[137] Schirò, "La schedografia a Bisanzio," 15.

[138] Agapitos, "Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training," 101. For further suggestions see: Buckler, *Anna Comnena*, 188.

[139] For further suggestions for identifications, see: Buckler, *Anna Comnena*, 188–189.

certainly an apt description based on the book that has been passed down to us. The reference to an Attikos is obscure, while the members of the church are likely people who were formerly associated with the "Patriarchal School." This list also further confirms that Anna had a good understanding of the history of schedography, and that her chronogical assertions are to be taken seriously. Yet if we accept these attributions, Anna explicitly dismisses them as not being representative of the schedography that she has in mind. It therefore seems justified to speak of a change in schedography within Anna's own lifetime, the start of which is surely to be at the end of the eleventh century during Anna's childhood and continued into the beginnings of the twelfth century and into the years of Basilakes' own childhood, such that he could state that he played a role in its development.

One further point which requires discussion here is the nature of Anna's relationship to schedography. Scholarship has generally seen her as condemning *schedē* and taking a high-handed attitude towards their practice. As Agapitos has shown, this is not likely the case. Anna sees schedography as an appropriate part of early education, no more, no less, but one which one eventually leaves in order to engage in loftier persuits.[140]

3.3 The Missing *schedē*

What then was this change? I believe that the answer is to be sought in two aspects of schedography of this period, which receive especial weight from contemporary authors. The first is the use of antistoichic riddles. The second is the question of register.

Riddles and puns have played a part in Greek culture from the archaic period right up to the present. Odysseus presents a kind of riddle to Polyphemos, which the latter fails to see through to his cost. Some, inspired by Saussure, have proposed various hidden phonological

[140] Agapitos, "Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training," 93–97.

word plays in archaic Greek verse and epic.[141] One thinks also of the puzzles in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Riddles were associated with oracles—they are grouped together with these and with mathematical problems in book XIV of the Greek Anthology—and are at the center of the Oedipus myth.[142] Book VII of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae,* riddles are bantered between the banqueters.[143]

The most common antique word for riddle is γρῖφος, is also employed by Basilakes in the passage cited above. It originally designated a basket used by fishermen, a use that is common in post-Classical texts. The semantic passage from basket to riddle is not difficult to understand. It was evidently the complex, interwoven structure of the basket which was transposed metaphorically onto the riddle, a series of intertwined phonetic and semantic elements that the hearer must unravel. It is for this reason that the verb (δια)λύω is used for finding the solution, as in many other languages.

To see that this association was not merely etymological, but rather present and active in the minds of speakers, it is only necessary to glance at the language used to discuss riddles in Antiquity. A fragment of the fourth-century comedian Antiphanes provides an early example:

> P. Woe is me, you ask too many complicated questions (περιπλοκὰς). L. I will tell you plainly: if you know anything about the abduction of the child, you must tell me quickly before you are hanged. P. Do you challenge me to speak this

[141] Toporov, "Die Ursprünge der indo-europäischen Poetik"; Watkins, "Pindar's Rigveda"; Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon*, 108. A striking example is adduced by Watkins who finds an anagrammatic message in Sappho's *Hymn to Aphrodite:* **Πο**ικιλό**θρον**' ἀθάνατ' Ἀφροδίτα, / παῖ Δίος δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε, / μή μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα, / **πό**τνια **θ**ῦμ**ον**. This first stanza contains an anagram of the word πόθος, "desire" in both the first and last line, encapsulating the stanza with ring composition and reinforcing its topic semantically (POikiloTHrON ↔ POtnia THumON ≡ POTHON).

[142] The oracle given to Laius and the Sphynx's riddle to not appear in the surviving works of Sophocles but were known to the Byzantines, both appearing in scholia. *Anthologia Graeca,* XIV, ed. Beckby.

[143] A wide variety of riddles appears, of which some are obscure. Cf. Smith, "Clearing Up Some Confusion in Callias' Alphabet Tragedy."

> riddle (γρῖφον), master, whether I know anything about the abduction of the child, or what do your words mean? [144]

Here the idea of interlacing implicit in γρῖφος is made explicit by the use of περιπλοκή, literally a twine, from the verb πλέκω, "to braid." It is clear that the same associations, likely through a combination of folk tradition and cultivated learning, are equally present in the twelfth century and are particularly employed to describe the schedography of this period.[145] Basilakes' description of his schedography is laden with words that suggest riddling. *Schedē* are described as riddles and twisted cords (οὐκ ἀνίην τοὺς γρίφους καὶ τὰς πλεκτάνας). Basilakes even coins a new word, σχεδοπλόκος with the apparent meaning of "one who weaves *schedē*." He also describes his rivals of the period as risible for their (poor) braid (γελοίοις τὴν πλοκήν). It seems likewise clear that something quite similar is meant by labyrinths (οὐ τὸν ἀρχαῖον μέντοι τρόπον τοὺς λαβυρίνθους τούτους διετεχνώμην).[146] More problematic is the question of the surface vs. internal structure, to which we will return later. Suffice it to note here that the former is twisted and braided until it reaches a state of beauty (τὰ ἐντὸς ἱκανῶς βοστρυχίζων καὶ διαπλέκων εἰς ὥραν).

With this in mind, it is easy to detect similar language in the writings of Basilakes' contemporaries on schedeography. So Anna Komnene, as we have seen, writes that she reject "the much-tangled web of schedography," (τῆς πολυπλόκου τῆς σχεδογραφίας πλοκῆς). Niketas Eugeneianos describes the schedography of his teacher Prodromos a "monstrous web,"

[144] Antiphanes, *Fragmenta*, ed. Kock, fr. 74, ll. 1-7. {Π.} οἴμοι περιπλοκὰς / λίαν ἐρωτᾷς. {Λ.} ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σαφῶς φράσω. / τῆς ἁρπαγῆς τοῦ παιδὸς εἰ ξύνοισθά τι, / ταχέως λέγειν χρὴ πρὶν κρέμασθαι. {Π.} πότερά μοι γρῖφον προβάλλεις τοῦτον εἰπεῖν, δέσποτα / τῆς ἁρπαγῆς τοῦ παιδὸς εἰ ξύνοιδά τι / ἢ τί δύναται τὸ ῥηθέν;

[145] This fact is noted by Hunger, who however seems to see this as a general characteristic of *schedē* rather than one that is period-specific. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2:26.

[146] A labyrinth is not necessarily a riddle. It is any complex problem, but like a riddle it can be solved. Cf. Hippolytos, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. Marcovich, 10.5.1, p. 380.1-3. Τὸν λαβύρινθον τῶν αἱρέσεων οὐ βί(α) διαρρήξαντες, ἀλλὰ μόνῳ ἐλέγχῳ <καὶ> ἀληθείας δυνάμει διαλύσαντες, πρόσιμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξιν. Nevertheless the association between riddles and labyrinths in quite old within Byzantine literature, cf. John Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Romanos*, ed. Migne, p. 409, ll. 55-6. λαβυρίνθῳ τινὶ καὶ γρίφοις ἔοικεν, οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ τέλος ἔχουσα.

(τεραστίαν πλοκὴν).[147] Further examples abound.[148] Gregorios Pardos writes that verbs with multiple case-constructions as being "useful for the double fold of the schedic plait," (ὡς χρήσιμα εἰς τὴν διπλόην τῆς σχεδικῆς πλεκτάνης).[149] In the *Chiliades* as well when Tzetzes compares woven *schedē* to the labyrinth of the Minotaur, making use of the words, from which Theseus escapes using a thread (μίτος). The short poem ends with Tzetzes' assertion that "I have now, with rhetorical power, rather figuratively called the meanings of the fashioners of *schedē* labyrinths" (Ἐγὼ δὲ τροπικώτερον δεινότητι ῥητόρων / τὰ σχεδουργῶν νοήματα νῦν λαβυρίνθους ἔφην). The poem itself includes antistoichic elements (e.g. διὰ λιμόν γαρ καὶ λοιμὸν) and emphasizes the fact that it is young boys who are traveling to Crete, this being thematically relevant because it is young boys who engage in schedography.[150] Tzetze's meaning is clear. During the poem the parallel between schedography had been merely implicit, based on words and images that, to the Byzantine of the twelfth century, were clearly taken from a schedographic context. He makes this comparison explicit at the end in the passage cited above.

But the most important testimony comes from Eustathios of Thessaloniki, a colleague of Basilakes at the "Patriarchal School."[151] In a passage in his commentary on the *Odyssey* already noted by Hunger and Agapitos, Eustathios provides one of the more detailed accounts of schedography that has been passed down to us.[152] Eustathios begins by discussing the word

[147] Niketas Eugenaios, *Monodie de Nicétas Eugénianos sur Théodore Prodrome*, ed. Petit, p. 461, l. 21. For a discussion of this passage see Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: A Scientific Paradigm and Its Implications," 17-18.

[148] The earliest hint of an association between "riddles" and schedography can be found in an epigram of John Mauropos, which is itself quite unclear and taken from a single manuscript. Presumably this was published late in his life, showing that the introduction of riddles does predate Prodromos. John Mauropos, *Epigrammata*, 33.30-34, ed. de Lagarde, p. 18: τὸ γὰρ σαφές τε καὶ πρόδηλον ἐν λόγοις / λογογράφοις ἥδιστον, οὐ σχεδογράφοις, / καὶ ταῦτα κλῆσιν τὸ σχέδην κεκτημένοις. / γρίφους δὲ σοὶ πλέκοντι τοὺς ἐν τῷ σχέδει / ἐπαχθές ἐστι πᾶν πρόχειρον καὶ σχέδην.

[149] Gregorios Pardos, Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου, 67.407-411, ed. Donnet, p. 207.

[150] John Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 11.379, ed. Leone, p. 442 ll. 542-668.

[151] The dating is uncertain but the two may have worked together for several years just before Basilakes exile.

[152] Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2:26 note 3; Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage," 10–11.

game that Odysseus plays with Polyphemus and comments on the double meaning of the line "Οὖτιν(᾽) ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι," focusing explicitly on the pun created by the ambiguity as to whether οὖτις δ-stem with an accusative in -ν or an ν-stem with an accusative in -να. He then proceeds to compare this to *schedē*:

> The moderns, engaging in these and similar pursuits—many similar things are to be found in the ancient authors as has been shown in numerous places—made it a practice to weave *griphoi*, which they called *schedē*. At first these were somewhat meager and such as one might easily solve, but later (they became) dense and ineluctable. And the ancients…called them "a sentence within a sentence" because, just as in a riddle, that which was spoken is different from what is meant. And the (moderns) as well, when they speak *schedē*, accordingly call the *griphoi* that they form "meanings" (νοήματα), because the schoolboy (must) first seize the meaning and not that which is spoken.[153]

Eustathios provides what to my knowledge is unique, explicit, first-hand testimony on the development of *schedē*. He makes it quite clear that *schedē* have seen a steady increase in complexity and become of late labyrinthine and difficult to solve. What is yet more important is his discussion of the nature of the riddles. These riddles are, according to him, "a sentence within a sentence," and lest we misunderstand him, he provides examples taken from *Deipnosophistae*. The sentence "going to dwell with Aigeus the son of Pandion" (Αἰγεῖ συνοικήσουσα τῷ Πανδίονος) can be equally well understood to mean "going to dwell with Pandion's goat," (αἰγὶ συνοικήσουσα τῷ Πανδίονος).[154]

It is notable that this riddle, like that of Odysseus, contains two grammatical readings, unlike the *schedē* of earlier writers discussed above or even of Prodromos, discussed below, a fact which is made explicit by the description "a sentence within a sentence." This seems to be

[153] Eustathios, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 1634.12-18, ed. Stallbaum, p. 348.29-37. οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι ταῦτα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ζηλώσαντες, πολλὰ δ᾽ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς εὕρηται ὅμοια ὡς πολλαχοῦ δεδήλωται, γρίφους ἐμελέτησαν πλέκειν οὓς ὠνόμασαν σχέδη. τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν λεπτούς τινας καὶ οἵους ῥᾷον ἐκδιαδράσκεσθαι, τέλος δὲ ἀδροὺς καὶ δυσδιαφύκτους. καὶ οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ τὸ ῥηθὲν τοῦ Ἐπιχάρμου νόημα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος, καὶ ὅσα δὲ ἀρχαῖα τοιαῦτα, θαυμασίως ἐκάλουν ὡς ἐνομοθέτησεν ὁ Ἐπίχαρμος, λόγον ἐν λόγῳ αὐτὰ εἰπών, διὰ τὸ, ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι ἄλλον μὲν εἶναι τὸν λαλούμενον λόγον, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν νοούμενον. οἱ δὲ τὰ σχεδικὰ λαλοῦντες ἀκολούθως καὶ αὐτοὶ νοήματα καλοῦσιν ἅπερ γριφεύονται, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν γραμματέα παῖδα μὴ τοῦ λεγομένου ἀλλὰ τοῦ νοουμένου γίνεσθαι.

[154] Ibid. 1634.20-36, pp. 348.39-349.1.

strong enough evidence to posit a general trend, especially because Eustathios is writing for an audience well acquainted with schedography and is using the familiar phenomenon to make the Homeric passage more understandable to his readers.

Let us return briefly to Basilakes. We may now be in a better position to understand his assertion that his *schedē* are distinctive for their "tracing the external to a splendid appearance but also twisting and weaving the internal to a state of beauty" (καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς μὲν εἰς ἀγλαΐαν ὑπογράφων, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς ἱκανῶς βοστρυχίζων καὶ διαπλέκων εἰς ὥραν), and that all the best boys switched from "the old-fashioned and outdated *schedē* to my own sweet-spoken *schedē*, which that which is apparent spreads with honey and that which is hidden makes splendid" (ἣν καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον καταμελιτοῖ καὶ τὸ κρυπτόμενον ἀγλαΐζει). The distinctive internal and external layers may very well be the "sentences within sentences" that Eustathios associates with schedography.

A fascinating parallel is furnished by Prodromos. Prodromos describes his own *schedos* as being "as though in the form of the best oysters, rough like a pot on the outside, but like a pearl on the inside" (ὡς ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ τῶν ἀρίστων ὀστρέων, / ἔξω μὲν ὀστρακῶδές ἐστι τὸ σχέδος, / ἔσσω δὲ μαργαρῶδες). He again uses a similar image in another *schedos*, writing "a viewer should indeed not disdain the inner beauty as he regards the outer refuse" (οὔκουν τὸν ἐκτὸς συρφετὸν βλέποντί τῳ / τὴν ἔνδον εὐπρέπειαν ἀτιμαστέον).[155] The imagery is similar to that employed by Basilakes and Eustathios, but here the outside is rough and jumbled and only the inside is even. This is because in the *schedē* of Prodromos the "outside" is frequently nonsensical or makes use of vernacular, everyday words while the "inside" forms correct sentences. Take for example the sentence "ἐρρέθη δὲ καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις ἡ δόξα τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κοινώνημ'αἰρῶν," meant to be read "ἐρρέθη δὲ καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις ἡ δόξα τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κοινῶν

[155] apud Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage," 15, 17.

ἡμερῶν."[156] The first as a whole makes no sense but the second can be translated "the glory of our common days on earth has also been voiced by others."[157]

The question of register is indeed a recurring motif in schedography. Once more Tzetzes provides valuable testimony. In the *Chiliades*, he jokes that some people confuse Thessaly with Thessaloniki. He then describes Thessaly, and closes the poem by returning the joke at the beginning, specifying more closely who would make such a mistake. As it turns out, the culprits are "the majority, who have become barbarous through *schedourgia* and do not ever read the books of the ancients" (ἐβαρβαρώθησαν οἱ πλείους σχεδουργίαις, / βίβλους ἀναγινώσκοντες τῶν παλαιῶν οὐδόλως), and these are deceived because the give heed only to the "labyrinthine web" (πλοκῇ λαβυρινθώδει) of fraudulent teachers.[158] Tzetzes may simply be commenting on the fact that those who study *schedē* overstep real knowledge, but the word ἐβαρβαρώθησαν once more hints at possible contempt for vernacular elements.

Basilakes, on the other hand, prides himself on his Atticist Greek and holds in contempt those teachers who use vernacularisms in their writing. In speaking without beauty or even speaking in a lower register of Greek (τὸ μὴ ξὺν ἡδονῇ λέγειν ἢ καὶ ὅλως ὑποβαρβαρίζειν), his immediate predecessors struck him as sour, old-fashioned and unpolished (τέχνης ἀξέστου). One can directly juxtapose the unpolished exterior to which Basilakes makes reference to the rubble or earthenware jug of Prodromos. Instead, he traces the outer layer of his *schedē* so that they attain a luster (καὶ τὰ ἐκτὸς μὲν εἰς ἀγλαΐαν ὑπογράφων) and are spread with honey (ἦν καὶ τὸ φαινόμενον καταμελιτοῖ). He once more emphasizes the sweetness of the new schedography that he had created as opposed to the old-fashioned and antiquated schedography that it replaced (ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχαιοτρόπου καὶ παλαιᾶς σχεδικῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἡδυεπῆ ταύτην καὶ

[156] Cod. Vat. Pal. gr. 92 apud Vassis, "Graeca sunt, non leguntur," 18.
[157] On register in Prodromos' *schedē*, see: Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage."
[158] John Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 9.280, ed. Leone, pp. 366-367 ll. 703-709.

ἡμετέραν), and finally describes his opponents as pursuing a form that is outdated (ἀρχαιότροπον) putrid (σαπρὸν) and above all those who use base provincialisms in their speech (οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ὑποσολοίκοις) while at the same time purporting to teach grammar, which is the very pursuit of eloquence and correct Atticist speech (ἧς τὸ εὖ λέγειν καὶ ὀρθοεπεῖν ἐπιτήδευμα).

Such comments were surely aimed at what we might term the school of Prodromos.[159] Prodromos himself was only slightly older than Basilakes and the schedography of his generation would necessarily be that against which Basilakes and others would innovate.[160] Prodromos himself likely taught at the Patriarchal School around 1142, so he and Basilakes would have been in direct contact.[161] This then seems to have been Basilakes' particular contribution in his own view, a personal push towards schedography that formed genuine riddles with double meanings while maintaining high Atticist register throughout on all levels. In doing so he seems to have been taking a minority stance, since the *schedē* that have been published tend to exploit the vernacular registers, and most evidence points in this direction.[162] The details will, however, only be clear once the extant *schedē* have been catalogued and published.

[159] I use the term extremely loosely. Agapitos makes a good argument for Prodromos as an innovator, at the same time it is clear that *schedē* containing vernacularisms were not restricted to his work and also that riddles in *schedē* predate Prodromos (cf. note 148). It is only a matter of chance that more have not been preserved, discovered and published. Agapitos, "Grammar, Genre and Patronage."

[160] The most recent scholarship by Kazhdan and Franklin suggests that Theodore Prodromos was born around the year 1100 and died around 1170. The dates have been a subject of controversy, and for a full account see: Kazhdan and Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 92ff.

[161] Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," 1962, 22–23.

[162] Of particular interest in this respect is the originally twelfth century antistoichic dictionary contained in cod. Par. gr. 400, see: Gaul, "Ἄνασσα Ἄννα, σκόπει – Fürstin Anna, bedenke! Beobachtungen zur Schedo- und Lexikographie in der spätbyzantinischen Provinz," 680ff.

Conclusion

This thesis has posited a theory on the evolution of schedography. It seems that at the beginning of the eleventh century, *schedē* were essentially a resetting of *epimerismoi*; whereas the latter had been written school exercises, the competitive and performative spirit of the eleventh century, centered around the nascent *theatron*, turned these into impromptu performances pieces. The text was apparently provided by the teacher and the solution was somehow presented by the young student before an audience. These events simultaneously functioned as advertisements for the schools and allowed students to show a public, in later years even a quite august audience, what they were capable of.

Many of these exercises contained orthographic challenges, mostly along the lines of correcting vowels that had been exchanged for their antistoichic counterparts. These challenges quickly became more complex and labyrinthine, and toward the end of the eleventh century had spread across word boundaries to produce exercises with false spellings and antistoichic puzzles that could be solved relatively easily with a creative mind and good knowledge of Atticist Greek, when the text was read aloud, as there was generally only one grammatical reading. The exercise was then perhaps still first and foremost one of producing the correct orthography.

The final step seems to have taken place around the 1120s. It involved the shift from mere orthographic puzzles to true riddles. These were texts that had double meanings, rather like Sanskrit *śleṣa* poetry.[163] There is also some evidence that students would create their own riddles in this period, where before they had merely been provided exercises by their teachers.

[163] The *śleṣa* tradition of poetry stems from the sixth century and specializes, in its more mature forms, in simultaneous narration. Unlike schedography, the ability of *śleṣa* to create complex "puns" hinges on lexical, rather than phonetic, ambiguity. For a general overview, see: Bronner and Bronner, *Extreme Poetry*.

When this latter change took place remains unclear. This shift parallels the shift in the function of the *theatron* from that of an arena for student competitions to a more sedate gathering for scholarly readings. Basilakes' *progymnasmata* likewise represent a step in this progression, as being polished works of Atticist Greek rather than mere school sketches.[164]

The thesis has also presented *schedē* as being aggressively innovative during the period under discussion, indeed the main innovation in the Byzantine education system. This period of innovation seems to have climaxed in the mid twelfth century, as later authors provide little testimony that would speak to any profound changes in schedic performance or composition practice. *Schedē* continued to be used, but were rather gathered, compiled and imitated than seriously developed as a genre.[165] This thesis has further postulated that the *schedē* contained in the popular later collection of Moschopoulos represent a conservative variety of *schedē* that had little to do with the elaborate *schedē* of the twelfth century.

These epimerismatic *schedē* must have remained popular even after the demise of the agonistic *theatron* because they were so effective as teaching instruments. Their first function was to train students in speaking Atticist Greek, a goal which they surely accomplished, being likely more engaging than, for instance, *progymnasmata*. Both they and their more complex descendents also compelled students to think in a creative and metaphorical way, a skill essential for a Byzantine intellectual, who was required to, in the words of Basilakes, "explain all that is mysterious and enigmatic" (ὑπαναπτύσσειν ὅσον μυστεριῶδες καὶ γρῖφον) in his ancient and religious texts.

[164] Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, 33–40.
[165] Gallavotti, "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo."

Bibliography

Primary

Anastasios Sinaïtes. *Anastasius Sinaïtae viae dux*. Edited by K.-H. Uthemann. Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca 8. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981.

Athenaios. *Deipnosophistarum libri xv*. Edited by G. Kaibel. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1965.

Basilakes, Nikephoros. *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*. Edited by Antonio Garzya. Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

———. *Progimnasmi e monodie*. Edited by Adriana Pignani. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1983.

Beckby, H., ed. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. Munich: Heimeran, 1965.

Christophoros Mytilenaios. *Christophori Mitylenaii versuum variorum collectio cryptensis*. Edited by Marc de Groote. Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 74. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.

Eugenaios, Niketas. "Monodie de Nicétas Eugénianos sur Théodore Prodrome." *Vizantinskij Vremenik* 9 (1902): 446–63.

Eustathios. *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. Edited by J. G. Stallbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1826.

Gaisford, T., ed. *Etymologicum Magnum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967).

Georgios Syceota. *Vie de Théodore de Sykeôn*. Subsidia hagiographica 48. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1970.

Hesychios. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon: Π-Σ*. Edited by Peter Allan Hansen. Vol. 3. Sammlung Griechischer und Lateinischer Grammatiker 11. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter , 2005.

Hippolytos. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Isidore of Seville. *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*. Vol. 1. of 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

John Chrysostom. "In epistulam ad Romanos." In *Patrologiae cursus completus*, 60:391–682. series Graeca, 1857.

Kinnamos, Joannes. *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*. Edited by A. Meineke. Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae. Bonn: Weber, 1836.

Kock, T., ed. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1884.

Komnene, Anna. *Annae Comnenae Alexias*. Edited by Athanasios Kambylis and Diether R. Reinsch. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis 40. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Longibardos. "Παρεκβόλαια περὶ συντάξεως καὶ ἀντιστοιχῶν." Edited by Nicolaus Festa. *Byzantion* VI (1931): 101–222.

Markopulos, Athanasios, ed. *Anonymi professoris epistulae*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter , 2000.

Mauropos, John. *Joannis Euchaitorum Metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano graeco 676 supersunt*. Edited by P. de Lagarde. Abhandlungen der historisch-philologischen Classe der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 28. Göttingen: Dietrichianis, 1882.

Moschopoulos, Manuel. *Περὶ σχεδῶν. De ratione examinandae orationis libellus*. Edited by Robert Estienne. Lotitia: Robertus Stephanus, 1545.

Papademetriou, John-Theophanes, ed. "Τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μυός: New Sources and Text." In *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by his Students and Colleagues at The University of Illinois, 1924-60*, edited by Burton A. Milligan, 210–22. 58. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Plinius Maior, *Naturalis historia*, Edited by L. Ian and C. Mayhoff. Leipzig: Teubner, 1892-1909.

Polybios. *Polybii historiae*. Edited by Theodor Büttner-Wobst. Vol. 4 of 5 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904.

Psellos, Michael. *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora*. Edited by Edward Kurtz and Franz Drexl. Vol. 1 of 2 vols. Milan: Società Editrice, 1936.

Thomas Aquinas. *Sententia libri Eithicorum. In decem libros Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum expositio*. Edited by A. M. Pirotta. Turin: Marietti, 1934.

Tzetzes, John. *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*. Edited by P.L.M. Leone. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1968.

Secondary

Agapitos, Panagiotis A. "Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse." *Νέα Ῥώμη* 10 (2013): 89–109.

———. "Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: A Scientific Paradigm and Its Implications." *Jahrbuch Der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 64 (2014): 1–22.

Angold, Michael. *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081-1261*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Badian, E. "The Eunuch Bagoas." *The Classical Quarterly* 8, no. 3–4 (1958): 144–57.

Basilakes, Nikephoros. *Il Panegirico di Niceforo Basilace per Giovanni Comneno*. Translated by Franca Fusco. Napoli: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1968.

———. "Modoi, diēgēmata kai ēthopoiïai." In *Excerpta varia graecorum so-phistarum*, edited by Leo Allatius, 125–220. Rome, 1641.

———. *Progimnasmi e monodie*. Edited by Adriana Pignani. Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1983.

Basilikopoulos-Ioannidou, Agne. *Ἡ ἀναγέννησις τῶν γραμμάτων κατὰ τὸν ιβ' αἰῶνα εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ὁ Ὅμηρος*. Βιβλιοθήκη Σοφίας Ν. Σαριπόλου 14. Athens: University of Athens, 1971.

Bernard, Floris. *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025-1081*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Bronner, Yigal, and Michael Bronner. *Extreme Poetry: The South Asian Movement of Simultaneous Narration*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Browning, Robert. "Il codice Marciano gr. XI.31e la schedografia bizantina." In *Miscellanea Marciana di Studi Bessarionei*, 21–34. Medioevo e Umanesimo 24. Padova, 1976.

———. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century." *Byzantion* 32 (1962): 167–202.

———. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century." *Byzantion* 33 (1963): 11–40.

Buckler, Georgina. *Anna Comnena: A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck, 2000.

Criscuolo, Ugo. "Per la tradizione manoscritta della monodia di Niceforo Basilace per il fratello Costantino." *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 20 (1972): 33–36.

Dieten, Jan-Louis van, ed. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

Festa, Nicolaus. "Note preliminari su Longibardos." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 16 (1907): 431–53.

———. "Longibardos." *Byzantion* VI (1931): 101–222.

Gallavotti, Carlo. "Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e sui suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodomo." *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini*, 1983, 1–34.

Garzya, Antonio. "Encomio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Alessio Aristeno." *Byzantinische Forschung* 1 (1966): 92–114.

———. "Encomnio inedito di Niceforo Basilace per Giovanni Axuch." *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 6–7 (1970): 71–79.

———. "Fin quando visse Niceforo Basilace." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 64 (1971): 301–2.

———. "Il Prologo di Niceforo Basilace." *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione dell'edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 19 (1971): 55–71.

———. “Intorno al prologo di Niceforo Basilace.” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 18 (1969): 57–71.
———. “La produzione oratoria di Niceforo Basilace.” *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 2–3 (1965): 205–29.
———. “Literarische und rhetorische Polemiken der Komnenenzeit.” *Byzantinoslavica* 34 (1973): 1–14.
———. “Nicéphore Basilakès et le mythe de Pasiphaé.” *Latomus* 26, no. 2 (1967): 477–79.
———. “Precisazioni sul Processo di Niceforo Basilace.” *Byzantion* 40 (1970): 309–16.
———. “Quatro Epistole di Niceforo Basilace.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 56, no. 2 (1963).
———. “Una Declamazione Giudiziaria di Niceforo Basilace.” *Epeteris tes Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon* 36 (1968): 81–103.
———. “Un lettré du milieu du XII siècle: Nicéphore Basilakès.” *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 8 (1970): 611–21.
———. “Varia Philologica VII.” In *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio de Falco*, 573–77. Napoli: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1971.
Gaul, Niels. “Rising Elites and Institutionalization — Ēthos/Mores — ‘Debts’ and Drafts: Three Concluding Steps towards Comparing Networks of Learning in Byzantium and the ‘Latin’ West, c.1000–1200.” In *Networks of Learning. Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, C. 1000–1200*, edited by S. Steckel, Niels Gaul, and M. Grünbart, 235–80. Byzantinische Studien und Texte. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2014.
———. *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik: Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten der frühen Palaiologenzeit*. Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.
———. “Ἄνασσα Ἄννα, σκόπει – Fürstin Anna, bedenke! Beobachtungen zur Schedo- und Lexikographie in der spätbyzantinischen Provinz.” In *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie: Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, edited by Lars M. Hoffmann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005. 401-443.
Grolimund, Archimandrite Vasilios. “Die Entwicklung der Theologie der Eucharistie in Byzanz von 1054-1453.” In *The Eucharist in Theology and Philosophy: Issues of Doctrinal History in East and West from the Patristic Age to the Reformation*, edited by István Perczel, Réka Forrai, and György Geréby. Leuven University Press, 2005.
Heeren, Arnold Hermann Ludwig. *Geschichte des Studiums der classischen Litteratur seit dem Wiederaufleben der Wissenschaften*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1797.
Henrichsen, Rudolph. *Om Schedographien i de Byzantinske Skoler: et Bidrag til Grammatikens Historie*. Copenhagen, 1843.
Hinterberger, Martin. *Autobiographische Traditionen in Byzanz*. Vol. 22. Wiener Byzantinische Studien. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999.
Hörandner, Wolfram. “Zu den Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Basilakes: Bemerkungen zur kritischen Neuedition.” *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 36 (1986): 73–88.
Hunger, Herbert. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner: Philologie, Profandichtung, Musik, Mathematik und Astronomie Naturwissenschaften, Medizin, Kriegswissenschaft, Rechtsliteratur*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978.
———. “On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24 (1970 1969): 15–38.
Johar, Karan. *Kuch Kuch Hota Hai*. Bollywood, 1998.
Kazhdan, Alexander, and Simon Franklin. *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Cambridge England; New York; Paris: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Kazhdan, Alexander, and Annabel Jane Wharton. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. University of California Press, 1985.

Keaney, John. “Moschopulea.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 64 (1971): 303–21.
Kinnamos, Joannes. *Ioannis Cinnami epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum*. Edited by A. Meineke. Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae. Bonn: Weber, 1836.
Komnene, Anna. *Alexias*. Edited by Charles du Fresne du Cange, Pierre Poussines, and Jacques Paul Migne. Vol. 131. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Paris: Migne, 1864.
Korbeti, E. “Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν πατριαρχὴν Νικολάον δ’ τὸν Μουζαλώνα.” *Ἑλληνικά* 7 (1934): 302–22.
Krumbacher, Karl. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches, 527-1453*. 2nd ed. Munich: Beck, 1897.
Lemerle, Paul. *Cinq études sur le Xie siècle byzantin*. Le mond byzantin. Limoges: Éd. du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977.
Magdalino, Paul. “The Bagoas of Nicephoros Basilakes: A Normal Reaction?” In *Of Strangers and Foreigners (Late Antiquity-Middle Ages)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
———. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Maisano, Riccardo. “Encomio di Niceforo Basilace per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone.” *Bollettino della badia greca di Grotiaferrata* 28 (1974): 65–82.
———. “La clausola ritmica nella prosa di Niceforo Basilace.” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 25 (1976): 87–104.
———. “Per il testo dell’encomio per il Patriarca Nicola IV Muzalone di Niceforo Basilace.” *Bollettino della badia greca di Grotiaferrata* 29 (1975): 164–66.
Markopoulos, Athanasios. “De la structure de l'école byzantine: les livres et le processus éducatif.” In *Lire et écrire à Byzance*, edited by Brigitte Mondrain, 85–96. Monographies 19. Paris: Association des amis du Centre d’histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 2006.
Michael, Italikos. *Lettres et discours*. Edited by Pierre Gautier. Archives de l’Orient Chrétien 14. Paris: Institut Français d’Études Byzantines, 1972.
Miller, Emmanuel. “Préface d’un auteur byzantin.” *Annuaire de l’Association pour l’encouragement des études grecques en France* 7 (1873): 135–57.
Moschopoulos, Manuel. *Περὶ σχεδῶν. De ratione examinandae orationis libellus*. Edited by Robert Estienne. Lotitia: Robertus Stephanus, 1545.
Mullett, Margaret. “Aristocracy and Patronage in the Literary Circles of Comnenian Constantinople.” In *The Byzantine Aristocracy: IX to XIII Centuries*, 173–201. BAR International Series 221. Oxford: BAR, 1984.
Oeconomos, Lysimaque. *La vie religieuse dans l’empire Byzantin au temps des Comnènes et des Anges : Préf. de M. Charles Diehl*. Repr. d. Ausg. 1918. New York: Franklin, 1972.
Papademetriou, John-Theophanes. “Τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μυός: new sources and text.” In *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by his Students and Colleagues at The University of Illinois, 1924-60*, edited by Burton A. Milligan, 210–22. 58. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969.
Pizzone, Aglae. “Anonymity, Dispossesion and Reappropriation in the *Prolog* of Nikēphoros Basilakes.” In *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature*, 225–43. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
Polemis, Ioannis. “A Note on the Praefatio of Nikephoros Basilakes.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 94, no. 2 (2001): 605–7.
———. “Προβλήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς σχεδογραφίας.” *Ἑλληνικά* 45 (1995): 277–302.
Reinsch, Diether R. “A. Garzya/A. Pignani, Niceforo Basilace.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 80 (1987): 84–91.

Roilos, Panagiotis. *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2005.
Schirò, Giuseppe. "La schedografia a Bisanzio nei secoli XI-XIIe la scuola dei SS XL Martiri." *Bollettino della Badia di Grotiaferrata* III (1949): 11–26.
Smith, Joseph A. "Clearing up Some Confusion in Callias' Alphabet Tragedy: How to Read Sophocles Oedipus Tyrannus 332–33 et Al." *Classical Philology* 98, no. 4 (October 1, 2003): 313–29.
Sternbach, Leo. "Spicilegium Laurentianum." *Eos* 8 (1902): 65–86.
Toporov, Vladimir. "Die Ursprünge der indo-europäischen Poetik." *Poetica* 13 (1981): 189–251.
Treu, M. "Ein byzantinisches Schulgespräch." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 2 (1893): 96–105.
Treu, Max. "Michael Italikos." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 4 (1885): 1–29.
Vassis, Ioannis. "Graeca sunt, non leguntur: zu den Schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodromos." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 86–87, no. 1 (2009): 1–19.
———. "Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαίσματα. Ἡ συλλογὴ σχεδῶν τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92." *Ἑλληνικά* 52 (2002): 37–68.
Walz, Christian. *Rhetores graeci, ex codicibus florentinis, mediolanensibus, monacensibus, neapolitanis, parisiensibus, romanis, venetis, taurinensibus et vindobonensibus*. Stuttgart: sumtibus J. G. Cottae, 1832.
Watkins, Calvert. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
———. "Pindar's Rigveda." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, no. 2 (April 1, 2002): 432–35. doi:10.2307/3087640.
Werba, Chlodwig. *Die arischen Personennamen und ihre Träger bei den Alexanderhistorikern: Studien zur iranischen Anthroponomastik*. Vienna: Diss., Univ. of Vienna, 1982.
Wilken, Friedrich. *Rerum ab Alexio: I. Joanne, Manuele et Alexio II. Comnenis Romanorum byzantinorum imperatoribus gestarum libri quatuor*. Mohrius et Zimmer, 1811.
Wirth, P. "Cruces der Basilakestradition." *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 7 (1969): 255–58.
———. "Michael von Thessalonike?" *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 55 (1962): 266–68.
———. "Wohin ward Nikephoros Basilakes verbannt?" *Byzantinische Forschung* 1 (1966): 389–92.