Dunja Milenkovic

KNOWLEDGE AND ABUSE:

TWO SATIRES BY THEODORE PRODROMOS

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

Central European University

Budapest

May 2017

KNOWLEDGE AND ABUSE:

TWO SATIRES BY THEODORE PRODROMOS

by

Dunja Milenkovic

(Serbia)

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

KNOWLEDGE AND ABUSE:

TWO SATIRES BY THEODORE PRODROMOS

by

Dunja Milenkovic

(Serbia)

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

KNOWLEDGE AND ABUSE:

TWO SATIRES BY THEODORE PRODROMOS

by

Dunja Milenkovic

(Serbia)

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

I, the undersigned, **Dunja Milenkovic**, 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, 18 May 2017

_____

Signature

Abstract

This thesis analyses two understudied satirical works written by Theodor Prodromos, Philoplaton or Leather Tanner and The Ignorant and Self-Proclaimed Grammarian. The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the recognition of their literary value and to demonstrate how Prodromos by means of invective displays his own erudition and constructs the self-image of an overall intellectual authority. I will argue how Prodromos by the choice of a theme and generic form positioned his works in line with a specific tradition of satirical writing. By means of intertextual comparison I will also demonstrate that Philoplaton and Grammarian should not be regarded as a mere Lucianic imitations without literary imitations of their own. And finally by examination of Prodromos's rhetorical skills, I will examine how he through attack against incompetent adversaries portrays himself as a competent grammarian, rhetorician and teacher.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Floris Bernard and István Perczel for their guidance and support. Without their help, I would not be here and the impact they made on my overall development, both as a student and a person, is immense. I owe them many thanks for their assistance in the translation of the source material that I used in my thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank all professors of the Medieval Department, it was a real pleasure to work with them, particularly with Professor Volker Menze, as he was always there for me to give advice or encouragement. My thanks go to Zsuzsa Reed for her understanding and advices that helped me to improve my writing skills. And finally, I am particularly grateful to Csilla Dobos for hugs and support which helped me to overcome moments of despair in past two years.

My gratitude also goes to Dane Miller, my colleague, and Jelena Maksić, my sister-in-law, who offered me advices regarding the grammar issues during the thesis writing period. The whole experience of studying at CEU would be unimaginable without all the people I met and friends that were there to share a laugh with. Many thanks especially to Anastasia Theologou and Andra Juganaru because their strength inspired me. Also, I am more than grateful to Dusan Ljuboja who has been my anchor for past two years. Finally, I am truly thankful for the support and guidance that I received from my family, to them I send my love.

Table of Contents

Introduction

During the reign of Komneni in the twelfth century, Byzantine Empire experienced not only economic and political prosperity, but also revival in intellectual production. The patronage of the ruling Komnenian dynasty and other influential noble families provided fruitful soil for many scholars, teachers and intellectuals to conduct their educational pursuits. One of these intellectuals was also Theodore Prodromos, a renowned twelfth-century Byzantine poet and a private teacher.

Despite the fact that he was a prolific writer and left a huge literary corpus behind, many things about his life are unknown and obscure.[1] Besides scattered information about Prodromos in the works of his contemporaries, friends and admirers, the data regarding his life mainly come from his own works.[2] The life span of this Byzantine polymath is uncertain, but it is most likely that he was born around 1100 in Constantinople.[3] Prodromos was not of a noble origin, but his family was well-situated. Although his father hoped that Prodromos will became a soldier, due to his poor health Prodromos had not fulfilled expectations of his father and turned to studying. Nevertheless, it is evident from his poetry that he admired soldiers and military in general. After acquiring his education which encompassed training in grammar, rhetoric and philosophy, Prodromos was patronized by Irene Ducaena (*ca*. 1066 – *ca*. 1132), wife of

[1] For the life of Theodore Prodromos see: Wolfram Hörander, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 11 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1974), 21-35; Alexander Kazhdan, and Simon Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 87-114; Tommaso Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti," (Ph.D. diss., Università di Pisa, 2010), xi-xxiii; Nikos Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos: the Neglected Poems and Epigrams (Edition, Translation and Commentary)*, (Ph.D. diss, University of Vienna, 2014), 52-87.

[2] Alexander Kazhdan (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 3 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 1726-27.

[3] Kazhdan, and Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 93-100.

Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (*r*. 1081-1118). When the empress died, Prodromos continued his work under the patronage of her son, Emperor John II Komnenos (*r*. 1118-1143). During the reign of John II, Prodromos was in charge of poetic celebrations of the victories of Byzantine army. There are not much information about his position at the beginning of Manuel I Komnenos's reign (*r*.1143-1180) since few of his works survive from this period. His laudatory poems for military achievements and several official eulogies for Manuel I come from after 1149. Prodromos spent the last years of his life in the Church of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul in Constantinople, where he died as Monk Nicholas probably around 1170.[4] Prodromos enjoyed great popularity among his contemporaries and in the generations after him. His death was lamented by Niketas Eugeneianos in a monody and many of his works were imitated.[5]

The enormous corpus of the authentic Prodromos works attests to a huge and diverse corpus of poetry, panegyric orations, monodies, theological writings, letters, many rhetorical and satirical works, as well as some grammatical, philosophical, astrological works and one romance.[6] Following Nicholas Kallikles, Prodromos developed the genre of poetic panegyric in which he praised the military achievements of emperor and noble generals. His panegyrics are not unoriginal and impersonal representations of the emperor, but full of personal observations and thoughts. His *Rodhanthe and Dosikles* made a great contribution to reviving the genre of erotic romance, which is full of reflections on the political realities of his own time. Furthermore he composed an astrological work in which he gives an allegorical description of the twelfth months of the year, as well as several philosophical works such as a commentary on Aristotle's *Analytica Posterior*, *Xenedemos* and treatise *On Big and Small*.

[4] Kazhdan and Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature*, 103.
[5] Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* III, 1726-27.
[6] The most detailed overview of Prodromos's literary production is available in: Hörander, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*, 34-68.

From his satirical corpus perhaps the most famous is the satirical poem *Katomyomachia* (*The Cat and Mouse War*) which, although composed in an archaic framework, also reflects his contemporary reality.[7] He also composed other satirical works in verse such as *Against the Lustful Old Woman* and *Against the Old Man with Long Beard*. In his satirical pieces in prose, such as *The Executioner or the Doctor*, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, *To the Emperor or about the Green Color*, *Amarantos or about Old Man's Love, The Sale of Political and Poetical Lives*, *The Ignorant or the Self-proclaimed Grammarian*, he mocks intellectuals, lewdness, dentists, political and poetical figures of his own time, and henpecked husbands.[8]

In my thesis I will analyze two understudied prose satires by Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner* and *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*.[9] While in Philoplaton Prodromos provides criticism against incompetent Platonist, in *Grammarian* he delivers the systematic refutation of incompetent teacher. Even though both of these pieces received three modern editions accompanied with translations into Italian language they did not attract much attention in the contemporary scholarship.[10] To best of my knowledge, apart

[7] Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, III, 1726-27.

[8] Hörander, *Historische Gedichte,* 57-61; Prodromos's authorship is doubtful for several other pieces. Thus, for instance, the poems by Ptochoprodromos ("The Poor Prodromos") and Manganeios Prodromos were traditionally ascribed to him. However, Prodromos's authorship is still an object of scholarly debates because there is still no certain evidence whether he can be identified with these authors or not. Marina Bazzani, "The Historical Poems of Theodore Prodromos, the Epic-Homeric Revival and the Crisis of Intellectuals in the Twelfth Century," *Byzantinoslavica* 65 (2007), 211-228.

[9] *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner* and *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* are preserved together in two manuscripts Vat. gr. 305 and Vat. Ottobon. gr. 466 in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. While the first manuscript comes from the thirteenth century, the second one is from the seventeenth century and it is most probably an apograph of the earlier manuscript. *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* is also preserved in three other manuscripts Bodl. Barocc. gr. 165 (fifteenth century), Bodl. Barocc. gr. 187 (sixteenth century) and Matr. Gr. 99 (fourteenth century). See: Giuditta Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 1, *Aevum* 19 (1945): 240–41.

[10] *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* received its first modern edition in John A. Cramer (ed.), *Anecdota Graeca e Codd. Manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Prisiensis*, vol. III (Oxford: E Typographeo Academico, 1836) 222-27. Other modern editions with translations into Italian: Giuditta Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 1, *Aevum* 21 (1945) 242-252; Roberto Romano, *La satira bizantina dei secoli XI-XV* (Torino: Unione tipografico editrice torinese, 1999), 298-309; Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo," 29-49. *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner* is available following modern editions with translations into Italian: "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 2, *Aevum* 21 (1947) 4-12; Romano, *La satira bizantina dei secoli XI-XV*, 326-336; Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo," 69-83. For both *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* and *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner* I used the most recent edition provided by Tomasso Migliorini with my own translation from ancient Greek.

from sporadic mentions of both pieces in the contemporary historiography and Michael Kyriakis's brief analysis of the *Philoplaton*, so far there is no study which provides detailed insight into these satirical works.[11]

Purpose of my thesis is not only to fill missing gap in scholarship, but also to examine how Prodromos by means of invective and critique displays his own erudition and constructs the self-image of an overall intellectual authority. By analysis of Prodromos' *Philoplaton* and *Grammarain* I also want to contribute to the recognition of their original literary merits.

Both of these pieces are in more or less loose manner usually described as satires. Although I do not think that this approach is completely wrong, it is evident that in both pieces invective tone prevails. Therefore, in the first chapter I will analyze and re-examine their generic position in order to provide better understanding of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* within a broader literary tradition. Firstly, I will examine to what extent these two pieces can be regarded as a satires and what satirical form they assume. Secondly, I will discuss whether these pieces should be regarded as an invectives or not. And finally, I will shortly explain in what manner broader cultural phenomena influenced generic modifications.

Philoplaton and *Grammarian* are quite frequently labelled as a Lucianic imitations. This kind of approach certainly diminishes the value and original aspects of these pieces. Therefore, by following Marciniak's methodology, I will examine the intertextual relationship between these two pieces and works of Lucian of Samosata. In this way, I will be able to demonstrate to what extent Prodromos exploits Lucianic motifs and how he transforms them for the purposes of his own works. This approach will allow me to show that Pordromos's pieces are not mere imitations of Lucian, but they display a great literary merit of their own.

[11] Michael J. Kyriakis, "Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium", *Byzantina* 5, 293-296;

And finally, in the third chapter I am going to examine how Prodromos uses attack against unskilled adversaries to successfully represent himself as a competent grammarian, philosopher and rhetorician. Firstly I will examine how Prodromos's constructs attack against an incompetent grammarian not only based on his grammatical expertise, but also on his rich philosophical knowledge. Secondly, I will analyze how Prodromos displays his rhetorical knowledge by application of various rhetorical techniques in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*. This will allow me to demonstrate not only how he skillfully composes the invective against his adversaries, but also a boastful self-representation through display of erudition in classical Greek texts. Also, I will examine how through invective in Philoplaton Prodromos establishes his own philosophical authority and displays an interest in Platonic Theology.

Chapter 1 – Generic questions: Satire or Invective?

Generic recognition, as Margaret Mullet points out, is valuable for several reasons. Among other things, genre represents the communication system in writing, reading, and interpreting processes, and it allows us to recognize the author's intention to position himself within a certain tradition. In most cases, according to Mullet, a genre can be determined through the intersection of the form (dialogue, letter, oration, lyric, etc.) and the "rhetorical" type or the occasion for which a text was created.[12] However, to determine exactly the genre of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* is not an easy task, especially if we take into account that this question has not been the object of advanced scholarly debate. So far, most of the scholars addressed these pieces in a more or less loose manner either as a satires or as works of a satirical character.[13] Although I do not think that I will be able to give a definite answer and pinpoint the exact genre of the *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*, I think it is important to reconsider their generic position in order to better understand these works within literary tradition.

1.1. Satirical Prose Monologue

However, how to recognize whether a certain piece is a satire or not? Or to what extent it has satirical character? According to Gilbert Highet, this could be determined on the basis of a generic definition given by the author himself, the author's explicit statement that his work is in line with previous specific satires, the choice of theme and method employed by previous

[12]Margaret Mullett, "The Madness of Genre," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992), 233.

[13]Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 1, 239–40; Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 2, 3-4; Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* , II, 154; Roberto Romano, *La Satira bizantina dei secoli XI-XV* (Turin: Unione Tipografica 1999), 7-21; Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo," xx-xxxvii; Anthony Kalldelis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: the Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 230-31, 250; Kyriakis, "Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium," 292-293; Eric Cullhed, "Theodore Prodromos in the Garden of Epicurus", in *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, ed. Averil Cameron and Niels Gaul (New York: Routledge, 2017).

satirists, quoting or referring to the actual words of a prominent satirist and, to a certain extent, by the very subject matter of satire. Furthermore, satire employs very characteristic language characterized by cruelty, irony, exaggeration, paradox and violence, and addresses relevant issues and tries to show the truth. And finally, satire is utilized to expose absurd situations or corrupted people.[14]

Almost all these features can be found in Prodromos's *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton*. Even though Prodromos does not state explicitly that he is writing satirical pieces and that his works are similar to those of some previous satirists, by exploiting ideas from Lucian's works such as *The Ignorant Book-Collector*, *A Professor of Public Speaking* and *The Dead Come to Life,*[15] and by his choice of a theme which corresponds to these works – the critique of inept intellectual, Prodromos implies that *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* are indeed of satirical character. Therefore, Prodromos's intention is not to superficially imitate works of Lucian, but rather to position his works in line with a specific tradition of satirical writing. Also, he addresses relevant contemporary issue – that of underqualified educated men – and wants to expose the truth to the audience. His language is abusive and violent, he exaggerates the incompetence of persons under attack and reveals paradoxes related to their personality.

If we follow further Highet's approach, according to which there are three main types of satires – satirical monologues or diatribes, parodies, and narratives – Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* can be identified with diatribe-style satires or, to be more precise, with introvert satirical monologues in prose.[16] This is evident not only through the connection which

[14]Gilbert Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire (*Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 15-19.
[15]Lucian, "The Ignorant Book-Collector", in *Lucian*, vol. 3, trans. A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 172-212; "The Dead Come to Life, or the Fisherman", in *Lucian*, vol. 3, 3-81; and "A Professor of Public Speaking" in *Lucian*, vol. 4, trans. by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 135-171.
[16]Highet*, The Anatomy of Satire*, 25-67, explains that diatribes or satirical monologues can be delivered in form of verse or prose mixed with verse. Furthermore, satirical monologues could follow two chief patterns: introvert– addressed to a single individual or to a small group of friends, and extravert - strong protests addressed to a broad public in order to instruct or awake from lethargy. According to Highet the variations on satirical monologue are

Prodromos establishes with Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector,* which is delivered in the same form, but also through the fact that in both texts Prodromos states clearly his position on the relevant issue, provides examples for his argumentation and harshly attacks the opponent.

Those diatribe style-satires, which are written prose mingled with verse, whose roots can be found in diatribe-oral teaching methods applied by Stoic and Cynic's philosophers, are inseparable from Menippean satirical tradition. Mennipean satires are named after Cynic philosopher Menippus from Gadara (ca. 340 – ca. 270 BC). Beside diatribe, they employ other literary forms as well, such as dialogues, narrative fictions, symposia, and satirical eulogies.[17] Through Lucian's literary oeuvre, Prodromos was well acquainted with all of the literary forms of Mennipean satires. This is especially evident in Prodromos's literary production which, beside satirical monologues such as *Philoplaton*, *Grammarian,* and *Executioner or Doctor*, includes also dialogues like *The Sale of Poetical and Political Lives* and *Amarantos, or the Erotic Desires of an Old Man*.[18]

Diatribes, both in verse and prose mingled with verse, cannot be regarded as a strict genre because of their spontaneous character, which seemingly does not have a set logical structure. They are written in the form of a monologue, usually with interspersed internal dialogue with an absent interlocutor. Diatribes are characterized by incessant alterations of tone and their language is full of mockery, playfulness, paradox, irony, sarcasm, and puns. Diatribe style-

satire as a monologue of victim, satire as an ironic monologue, satire as a letter and satire as a pre-arranged dialogue.

[17]On the origins and characteristics of Menippean satire see: Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 118-120; Joel Relihan, *Ancient Menippean Satire*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Howard D. Weinbrot, *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 11-50; Charles A. Knight, *The Literature of Satire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 217-220.

[18]For *Sale of Poetical and Political Lives* see: Przemysław Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013): 219-39; for *Amarantos, or the Erotic Desires of an Old Man* see: Eric Cullhed, "Theodore Prodromos in the Garden of Epicurus", in *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, ed. Averil Cameron and Niels Gaul (New York: Routledge, 2017).

satires display a variety of rhetorical techniques such as personification, proverbs, comparisons, anecdotes, invective, praise, historical examples, and fables.[19]

1.2. Invective

In his *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian,* Prodromos employs all elements which characterize satirical monologues in prose. However, compared to Lucianic diatribes, Prodromos's pieces reflect more fixated structure and an invective tone prevails. So, are Prodromos's works invectives instead of being satires? Satirical prose monologues also employ invective (*psogos*) as a rhetorical device, but it is evident that Prodromos is, in both cases, mainly focused on abusive insults and refutation of his opponents. Invective as a literary genre, as Anna Novokhatko explains, serves to publicly denigrate its object which is openly named. Even though Prodromos exploits some of the invective's traditional rhetorical elements such as origin, education, physical appearance, pretentiousness, deeds, and comparisons, *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton* cannot be regarded as invectives in the proper sense of a genre for several reasons.[20] As Highet explains, invective is, besides lampoon, comedy, and farce, the "closest kin of the satire" and it is "full of hatred." In Highet's words:

> The man who writes an invective would be delighted if, after delivering it, he were told that his subject had been overwhelmed by shame and obloquy and had retired into oblivion. [...] As for satire, the satirist always asserts that he would be happy if he heard his victim had, in tears and self-abasement, permanently reformed; but he would in fact be rather better pleased if the fellow were pelted with garbage and ridden out of town on a rail. […] The purpose of invective and lampoon is to destroy an enemy. […] The purpose of satire is, through laughter and invective, to cure folly and to punish evil; but if it does not achieve this purpose, it is content to jeer at folly and to expose evil to bitter contempt.[21]

[19]Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire*, 39-41.
[20]Anna A. Novokhatko, *The Invectives of Sallust and Cicero: Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 12-15.
[21]Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire*, 155-56.

Although harsh invective and refutation of opponents prevails in both pieces, from the texts it does not appear at all that Prodromos's intention would only be to destroy and publicly humiliate his opponents. He uses invective also to construct a boastful self-representation. In order to get a clearer picture, I think that it would be useful to compare these works of Prodromos, for instance, with some aspects of Francesco Petrarch's (1304 – 1374) prose invectives. Even though longer and more elaborated, Petrarch's invectives are convenient for comparisons because they exploit similar topics, form, and abusive language as Prodromos does in his pieces. Petrarch's invectives were composed as responses to personal attacks (*Invectives against a Physician*), refutation of a person and his treatise (*Invective Against a Detractor of Italy)*, and out of personal enmity (*Invective Against a Man of High Rank*).[22]

The similarity between the two pieces of Prodromos and Petrarch's invectives can be found in the fact that Petrarch does not address his adversaries openly either. The real identity of Petrarch's opponents is evident only from implications given in the content itself and the historical context in which these invectives were produced.[23] Petrarch apparently assumed that it would be an easy task for his audience, undoubtedly familiar with contemporary issues, to recognize the identity of his adversaries based purely on matters discussed in his invectives. One of the reasons behind concealing the names of his opponents, for instance, could be found in *Invectives Against a Physician* in which Petrarch "insists not to flatter his opponent by not naming him" as David Marsh points out.[24] Therefore, it is not impossible to assume that Prodromos does not name his adversaries for the very same reasons. Perhaps, he was convinced that the audience could easily decipher who is attacked based on some implicit information in the texts, or he also thought that his opponents were not worthy enough to be named and thus deserve to be sent to oblivion. Of course, it is not excluded that Prodromos is not openly

[22]Francesco Petrarca, *Invectives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).
[23]*Ibid*. vii-xvi.
[24]*Ibid*. xii.

naming his opponents because attack is directed against some type of persons – inept Platonists and incompetent teachers with whom his audience was certainly familiar.

However, while it is hardly probable to state with a great certainty what the motives behind Prodromos's decision not to name his adversaries openly were, it is important to emphasize that, contrary to the aforementioned statement by Anna Novokhatko, invectives can be addressed to the persons whose names are not openly stated. However, in the comparison of Prodromos's pieces with Petrarch's invectives several other differences emerge. For instance, contrary to Petrarch's invectives, in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* there is a strong presence of internalized dialogue with targeted person more characteristic for prose diatribes. Petrarch's invectives indeed employ rhetorical questions addressed to his adversaries, but there are not any presupposed answers in the sense of what his opponents "would say" or "would do" – the opponent is attacked only on the basis of what he has already said or done.

Furthermore, while Petrarch in his invectives is content to make only slanderous attacks, Prodromos even advices his adversaries how to improve themselves. Thus, Prodromos states that he would cure a "fan of Plato" who in return has to put down works of Plato or at least not offend his works publicly, and advises the "ignorant grammarian" to industriously work on gradual improvement of his knowledge starting from basics.[25]

Although the very manner in which these pieces of advice are delivered is obviously offensive, they can indicate to a certain extent the presence of Highet's purpose of satire – "to cure folly and to punish evil".[26] Therefore, *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* cannot be regarded as invectives in a proper sense of the word, because Prodromos's intention – at least formally – is not only to utterly denigrate his opponents in front his audience, but also to remedy their

[25]Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 99-102 and 124-28, 71; Theodore Prodromos, The Ignorant, or Self-Proclaimed Grammarian, lines 117-123, 32.
[26]Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire*, 156.

stupidity. Thus, although Prodromos's statement fits into generic requirements of the satire it certainly does not mean that it is sincere. However, it should be underlined that a satire can aim at annihilating an adversary, but not openly admit this, while an invective can also aim at the improvement of the opponent.

In terms of Byzantine rhetorical education, invective or *psogos* was part of the progysmnasmata – rhetorical school exercises – and more specifically, besides encomium (*enkōmion*), comparison (*synkrisis*), and characterization (*ethopoeia*), it belonged to panegyrical progymnasmata.[27] As a rhetorical device, as Marciniak points out, *psogos* can be applied to attack both "a specific person and more general subject."[28] However, contrary to prose encomium and verse invective, a prose *psogos* was not written conventionally as an independent literary form outside Byzantine school environment.[29] Also, if *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* are indeed to be regarded as invectives in an independent form, to the best of my knowledge, these would be, together with Prodromos's other piece of similar character *Exectutioner or Doctor*, among unique examples in Byzantine literature.[30] The possibility that they were part of some school exercise or served as a teaching material,[31] does not necessarily diminish their literary merit.[32] However, I think that if we take into consideration the competitive intellectual environment in twelfth century Byzantium, it would also be reasonable

[27]Geroge L. Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," *Viator* 1 (1971), 56-58; Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, (München: Beck, 1978) 92- 116.
[28] Przemysław Marciniak, "Prodromos, Aristophanes and a Lustful Woman", *Byzantinoslavica - Revue internationale des Etudes Byzantines* 73 (2015), 26.
[29]Emilie van Opstall, "The pleasure of mudslinging: an invective dialogue in verse from 10th century Byzantium," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108, no. 2 (2015), 789.
[30]Marciniak refers to *Satire of the pedagogue Christophoros Zabariotesas* written by emperor Theodore II Lascaris and John Argyropoulos's Comedy of Katablatas as examples of independent invectives in Byzantine literature. See footnote 15 in Marciniak, "Prodromos, Aristophanes and a Lustful Woman", 25.
[31]Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Kommenos*, 333, briefly implies that Philoplaton was "luqianesque school excercise".
[32]Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," 225, explains that there is possibility in case of Prodromos's *Sale of Lives* to be some school exercise and that this does not diminishes the literary merit of the piece.

to assume that *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* were independent prose satirical monologues through which harsh invective was delivered.

Psogos as a rhetorical device was an important part of Byzantine literary expression. Invective was a powerful tool for refuting various matters, opinions, and adversaries both in literature and in real life. In a competitive scholarly environment in which many intellectuals contended for patronage, teaching positions, and posts in imperial service, *psogos* was an extremely convenient agent for denigrating rivals and personal enemies. Invectives are helpful not only to demonstrate the intellectual inferiority of the opponent and humiliate him in every imaginable manner, but also to construct a positive self-image of the author.[33] Invective as a rhetorical device was used in various forms of literature, both in prose and verse. For instance, in the tenth century there are unique examples of invective poetic exchange between John Geometros and Stylianos, and between Constantine the Rhodian and Theodor Pahplagon.[34] There are also examples of invective poems from the eleventh century, such as those written by Michael Psellos and Christophoros Mytilenaios.[35] Prodromos himself is also the author of two poems with an invective tone against stereotypical characters – *Against a Lustful Old Woman* and *Against an Old Man with a Long Beard*.[36]

1.3. Generic Modifications: Audience and Purpose

Prodromos's pieces are part of broader cultural phenomena and reflect the Byzantine sense humor. Byzantines preferred, as Lynda Garland points out, abusive and insulting humor. To a

[33]Opstall, "The pleasure of mudslinging: an invective dialogue in verse from 10th century Byzantium," 771, 789-90.
[34]Constantine the Rhodian, "Poems Against Leo Choirosphaktes and Theodore Paphlagon," in *Anecdota graeca*, ed. P. Matranga, vol. 2 (Rome, 1850), 625–32; Opstall, "The pleasure of mudslinging: an invective dialogue in verse from 10th century Byzantium," 775-77.
[35]Floris Bernard, *Writing and reading Byzantine secular poetry, 1025-1081* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 90-92, 280-90.
[36]Przemyslaw Marciniak, "Prodromos, Aristophanes and a lustful woman: a Byzantine satire by Theodore Prodromos", *Byzantinoslavica* 73 (2015) 24.

modern reader, the Byzantine sense of humor may even seem to be cruel and primitive. Byzantines used almost every possible occasion to exercise humor through mockery, puns, anecdotes, violent threats, and personal insults. They were especially keen to ridicule things such as outward appearance and physical defects, lifestyle, ignorance, real life situations, accidents, foreigners and incompetence of state officials, intellectuals and clergy.[37] Thus, it is not surprising that in Prodromos's prose diatribes an abusive tone prevails – it was in accordance with Byzantine taste. Prodromos's insults and violent and derogatory language were also in accordance with Lucianic tradition. But while Lucian in his diatribes makes long digressions with historical and mythological examples, Prodromos reduces this kind of discourses to a minimum and focuses on abuse and invective in order to satisfy the preferences of his audience.

But for what kind of audience Prodromos wrote these two pieces? Whom exactly Prodromos attacks? Does he targets a specific persons or rather a stereotypical characters? Although it is hard to give a definite answer on this questions, it is important to at least discuss some possibilities. It could be that *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* are aimed against some rival teacher or an intellectual, a former student or a friend. However, the possibility that the text is addressed against a group of intellectuals with similar educational background, philosophical attitudes and affiliations should not be excluded as well. The competitiveness in intellectual communities was evident both among the individuals and among the groups of intellectuals. For instance, as Floris Bernard demonstrated, in eleventh century Byzantine intellectual community rivalry was evident at all levels – among students, teachers, schoolmasters and different schools. The affiliation of students to a specific school or teacher was reflected in

[37]Lynda Garland, "'And His Bald Head Shone Like a Full Moon ...': an appreciation of the Byzantine sense of humour as recorded in historical sources of the eleventh and twelfth Centuries." *Parergon* 8, no. 1 (1990): 1-5, 25-28; *Ibid*, "Mazaris's Journey to Hades: Further Reflections and Reappraisal," 185-88.

mutual support and animosity toward rival schools, teachers and group of students.[38] The same rivalry can be encountered in twelfth century Byzantium when restricted availability of posts in imperial and administrative service and high social mobility of the lower strata of the society enhanced the competitive spirit among the educated elite. While many private schools and independent teachers competed to attract more pupils, students themselves competed to acquire well-paid positions after completed education.[39]

A target audience of Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* was probably group of intellectuals which was able not only to understand references to classical Greek authors, but also to recognize the relevant issues in contemporary intellectual community which Prodromos criticizes and to identify with his position. These texts were probably performed by aloud reading during the gatherings which could take place in school environment, private houses or even in imperial palace.[40]

Genre is not an unalterable entity – it changes, develops and interacts with other genres, and what is more important, it does not restrict creative freedom of the author.[41] Thus, Prodromos is not strictly following the form of Lucianic diatribe. He plays with various rhetorical techniques employed by satirical monologue, but the invective as rhetorical device prevails throughout both *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*. Prodromos adjusts genre in accordance with the requirements of his own time, a literary taste of audience, and his personal preferences.

[38] Bernard, *Writing and Reading Byzantine Secular Poetry: 1025-1081*, 253-290.
[39] Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Kommenos: 1143-1180* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 325-329.
[40] Prezemysław Marciniak, "Byzantine Theatron – A Place of Performance?", in M. Grünbart, Theatron. Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 277–85.
[41] Mullett, "The Madness of Genre," 234-35.

Chapter 2 – The Lucianic Influence

Philoplaton or Leather Tanner and *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* are quite frequently, together with some other Prodromic works such as *The Executioner or Doctor*, *Sale of Poetical and Political Lives* and *Amarantos or Lustful Old Man*, unjustly classified as a Lucianic imitation by many modern scholars. Thus, for instance, the title of both articles by Giuditta Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo" implies that these works were just Lucianic satires by Theodore Prodromos.[42] This approach is followed by Herbert Hunger, who in his monumental Handbuch refers to these pieces simply as "Lukian-Imitation".[43] Furthermore, Michael Kyriakis, who provides a general analysis of Prodromos's *Philoplaton,* also states that this piece is Lucianic imitation without drawing any kind of comparison with Lucian's works.[44] Tommaso Migliorini indeed argues in the introduction of his unpublished dissertation that the aforementioned works of Prodromos should not be simply regarded as Lucianic imitation, but he does not delve into a detailed explanation of the complex relationship between Lucian's literary pieces as role models and Prodromos's works.[45] However, a great contribution to the revision of this simplistic approach toward some of Prodromos's literary works is that of Przemysław Marciniak who among other things examines their position within the Lucianic tradition in several recent articles.[46]

[42]Giuditta Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 1, *Aevum* 19 (1945): 239–52; Giuditta Podestà, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo," pt. 2, *Aevum* 21 (1947): 3-25.
[43]Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978), II, 154.
[44]Michael J. Kyriakis, "Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium," *Byzantina* 5, 292.
[45]Tommaso Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti," (Ph.D. diss., Università di Pisa, 2010), xx-xxxvii.
[46]See the following articles: Przemysław Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013): 219-39; "Prodromos, Aristophanes and a lustful woman," *Byzantinoslavica: Revue internationale des Etudes Byzantines* 73 (2015): 23-34; Janek Kucharski and Przemysław Marciniak, "The Beard and its Philosopher: Theodore Prodromos on the Philosopher's Beard in Byzantium," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2016): 45-54.

The above-mentioned works of Prodromos, including *Philoplaton*, are not the only Byzantine literary pieces characterized as imitations of Lucian. For instance, scholarship has treated other Byzantine satirical works, such as *Timarion* and *Mazaris,* in a similar manner and this approach has been revised only in the past few decades.[47] Barry Baldwin appropriately points out that "paradoxically, these two pieces are both more and less Lucianic than their editors suggest."[48] From my point of view, this statement can apply to Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* as well.

The very use of the term "imitation" to describe a literary piece, as understood by contemporaries, is derogatory and bears negative connotation since it implies unoriginality, plagiarism, and lack of creativity. Also, it is questionable, as Herbert Hunger points out, whether the Byzantines perceived the "hundredfold application of ancient motifs, figures, and quotations as imitation."[49] The labelling of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* simply as Lucianic imitation not only diminishes their value and originality, but also simplifies the complex and multifaceted relationship with the works of Lucian. Therefore, I think that it is important to avoid the term "imitation" to describe these literary pieces in the first place. Secondly, it is

[47]For the revised approach toward the *Timarion* and *Mazaris* within the tradition of Lucianic writings see: Margaret Alexiou, "Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the Timarion (ch. 6–10)," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 8, no. 1 (1982): 29-45; Barry Baldwin, "The Authorship of the Timarion," in *Roman and Byzantine Papers,* ed. Barry Baldwin (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1989): 324-28; Barry Baldwin, "The 'Mazaris': Reflections and Reappraisal," *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993) 345-58; Lynda Garland, "Mazaris's Journey to Hades: Further Reflections and Reappraisal," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007): 183-214; Anthony Kaldellis, "The Timarion: Toward a Literary Interpretation," in *Le face cachée de la litterature byzantine: Le texte en tant que message immediat (Actes du colloque international, Paris 6-7-8 Juin 2008),* ed. Paolo Odorico (Paris: École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Centre d'études byzantines, néo-helléniques et sud-est européennes, 2012): 275-88; Dimitris Krallis, "Harmless Satire, Stinging Critique: Notes and Suggestions for Reading the Timarion," in *Power and Subversion in Byzantium: Papers from 43rd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies: Birmingham March 2010*, ed. Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby (Farnham: Ashgate 2013): 221-45; Michał Bzinkowski, "Notes on Eschatological Patterns in a 12th Century Anonymous Satirical Dialogue the *Timarion*," in *Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum* 102, vol. 1 (2015): 129-48.

[48]Barry Baldwin, "A Talent to Abuse: Some Aspects of Byzantine Satire," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 8 (1982), 20.

[49]Herbert Hunger, "On the Imitation (MIMHSIS) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23 (1969): 21.

crucial to determine their position regarding Lucian's works in order to recognize the original aspects of Prodromos's literary output.

In a recent study, Przemysław Marciniak demonstrates the complex relationship between the Prodromos's and Lucian's *Sale of Lives* by applying Gerard Genette's five transtextual categories: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and hypertextuality.[50] As Sayyed Ali Mirenayat explains, Gennete's intertextual relationship between the two texts is established through echoes, quotations, parallelisms, plagiarisms, allusions, allegories, and metaphors, and it can be "explicit or implicit; covert or overt; hidden or open." Paratextual relationship implies connections between the main body of the text and the text which surrounds it. This relationship can be manifested as peritextual: titles, subtitles, epigraphs, notes and prefaces, and epitextual: journal reviews, interviews and letters of an author, and cover designs. Metatextuality indicates one text's implicit or explicit commentary, interpretation, criticism, or description of another text. Architextuality denotes relationship in terms of a genre and discourse. And finally, hypertextuality implies relationship in which hypertext (later text) "transforms, modifies, elaborates or extends" the hypotext (earlier text).[51]

Marciniak's approach proves to be a quite useful in providing crucial insight not only into multifaceted interactions between Lucian's *Bion Prasis* and Prodromos piece as its "sequel," but also into intertextual relationship of Prodromos's *Sale of Lives* with other classical texts. The same methodological approach can certainly contribute to a better understanding of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* as well. However, due to my limited expertise, I will not follow Marciniak's methodology in its entirety, but I will only confine my analysis here to the relationship of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* with others works of Lucian in terms of

[50]Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," 219-39.
[51] Sayyed Ali Mirenayat and Elaheh Soofastaei, "Gerard Genette and the Categorization of Textual Transcendence," *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (2015): 534-36.

intertextuality and shared literary motifs. This will allow me to show how Prodromos exploits certain Lucianic features which he further elaborates and transforms in the original manner.

But before I start with my analysis, I think that it is important to mention that, as in the case of Prodromos's *Bion Prasis*,[52] there is an evident architextual relationship of *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton* with certain works of Lucian. As I explained in the previous section, both Prodromos's satirical monologues in prose are delivered in the same generic form as Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector*. I also believe that Prodromos used this piece as a basic hypotext for both of his works. Furthermore, in terms of a discourse, *Philoplaton* and especially *Grammarian* can also be related to Lucian's works such as the satirical dialogue *The Dead Come to Life or Fisherman*[53] and ironical monologue *A Professor of Public Speaking*.[54] In the same manner as in *The Ignorant Book-Collector*, Lucian criticizes in these two works incompetent intellectuals – phony philosophers and unlearned rhetoricians. Criticism of intellectuals and ridiculing of their miserable lives was characteristic discourse in Lucian's works. As Charles Knight explains: "The range of Lucian's satire suggests a persistent if not systematic treatment of intellectual discourses – philosophical and historical, rhetorical and sophist – as instances of the futility of human activity."[55] Obviously, Prodromos in his *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton* operates within the same discourse which is extremely relevant for his own social milieu of contemporary intellectuals.

[52]Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," 224.
[53]Lucian, "The Dead Come to Life or Fisherman", in *Lucian*, vol. 3, trans. A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 1-82;
[54]Lucian, "A Professor of Public Speaking", in *Lucian*, vol. 4, trans. by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925), 133-72.
[55]Charles A. Knight, *The literature of satire,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 27-31.

2.2. “Philoplaton or Leather Tanner”

In respect to the connection with Lucian’s works, Prodromos exploits mostly the motifs and ideas from Lucian’s *The Ignorant Book Collector* which are reflected only in two passages of *Philoplaton*.[56] After a short eulogy of Plato at the beginning of the text, in the second passage, Prodromos starts with his attack against the person who pretends to understand Platonic philosophy even though he is completely inept in his teachings. It is evident that more than a half of this passage is inspired by Lucian’s piece. However, Prodromos does not simply insert the text from Lucian’s piece into his work, but plays with several different excerpts which are skillfully intertwined and originally embedded into a completely new text.

In the opening lines of the second passage, Prodromos exploits the excerpt in which Lucian mocks the intellectual abilities of “book-collector” who, although able to fluently read aloud his books with eyes wide open, fails to understand their content and to recognize whether writer applies expressions properly or not.[57] But the person under attack in Prodromos’s work not only does not succeed in comprehending the subject-matter of his readings, but even worse, he is not even able to read properly:

> Aren’t you, the most miserable among men, totally raving and out of your mind? Even though you are completely inexperienced not only in Plato’s philosophy - definitively, I should not follow you in your babbling of this kind , – but you are not versed even in the practice of reading it aloud correctly, yet you open the book of Plato upside-down, by Heaven, you place it on your knee, you place your elbow with your cheek in your hand, in every manner you imitate a man who is reading, by whispering with your lips and lowering your eyelids, so that with these signs you feign to devour the entire Plato.[58]

The insolence of Prodromos’s “philoplaton” does not end here. Contrary to Lucian’s “book collector” who is only being unable to differentiate good and false expressions, “Philoplaton”

[56]Lucian, “The Ignorant Book-Collector,” 172-212
[57] *Ibid*. 177.
[58]Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 27-35, 69.

is audacious to the extent that he would even dare to reproach the wording of Plato and to correct Plato's alleged mistakes by inserting his own novelties! Prodromos's fierce attack is also strengthened with a motif borrowed from another passage of *The Ignorant Book-Collector* which he artfully interlaces here. Thus, similarly to the inept intellectual in Lucian's piece, Prodromos's opponent, in case that anyone makes inquiries about the book in his hand, would be able only to say what the title of the work is but not to answer questions regarding its content.[59]

Here Prodromos combines and completely transforms two passages from Lucian piece. In this way, he produces an attack which is more humiliating, harsher and perhaps more personal. While in Lucian's passage it is possible to find at least some positive traits of his opponent, Prodromos's "friend of Plato" possesses none – his incompetence is total. It is not excluded that Prodromos's descriptions are also inspired by a real-life example, but I think that he rather emphasizes the ineptness of his adversary on purpose.

In this passage Prodromos also makes another intertextual relationship with Lucian's *The Ignorant Book Collector*. Lucian briefly mentions that his opponent is like a donkey who listens to the sounds of lyre[60] and emphasizes that ownership of the books does not make their owners educated, because in that case only rich people, such as his target, and book dealers would be knowledgeable.[61] Lucian also explains that possession of the flute of Timotheus, Ismenias, Marsyas or Olympus does not make a previously uninstructed owner able to play the instrument, and later in the text, among other examples, he tells the story of an ungifted man who thought that possession of Orpheus's lyre would make him able to play. But while Lucian argumentation is elaborated and followed by many examples, Prodromos, inspired by its use,

[59]Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 35-39, 69; Lucian, "The Ignorant Book Collector," 194-97.
[60]Lucian, "The Ignorant Book-Collector", 179.
[61]*Ibid*. 177 – 81.

borrows several ideas which he transforms in a completely original manner and synthesizes in one sentence:

> We, however, do not have noses so full of old drivel and we do not need a nurse to wipe our noses, according to that famous saying, so that, if we saw the donkey loaded with lyre of Orpheus or flute of Timotheus, we would never assume that the donkey was Orpheus or Timotheus, for it seems that this donkey is not only unable to sing to the sound of the lyre, but also to listen lyre altogether, as the proverb says; and you, donkey of Cumae, or rather pack mule, assume that if you are loaded with one of the Platonic tablets, that you also load the reputation of philosophy with it.[62]

Migliorini is completely right to point out that Prodromos's reference to driveling noses and a nurse wiping them probably comes from a passage in Plato's *Republic* in which Trasymachus attacks Socrates, claiming that if he has a nurse, she probably does not take proper care of him because he is driveling. As Migliorini explains in his comments, this is common place in ancient sources which symbolizes the wisdom of an adult, who as opposed to children or very old people who are unable to take care of themselves, does not need someone else to wipe his nose.[63] Prodromos uses the same motif also in *Grammarian* when he asks his adversary to give him an answer after he wipes off the driveling from his nose – so when he is wise enough to provide a response.[64] Even though it is doubtless that Prodromos was well acquainted with Plato's *Republic*, it is important to emphasize that this expression was also widely exploited by Lucian. Beside Lucian's *Alexander or False Prophet* which Migliorini mentions in his comments, Lucian used this motif in several other works among which is also *The Ignorant Book-Collector*.[65]

[62]Theodrore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 47-52, 70.
[63]Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo", 44-5; Plato, "Republic", trans. George Maximilian Antony Grube, rev. C.D.C. Reeve, in *Plato: Complete Works* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009), ed. John Madison Cooper, 987.
[64]Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 73-74, 31.
[65]Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo", 45; Lucian, "Lover of Lies", 333; "The Ignorant Book-Collector," 201; "Alexander the False Prophet" 203 in *Lucian*, vol. 4, trans. by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925), 203; "The Passing or Peregrinus", in Lucian, vol. 5, trans by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), 5; "The Ship or the Wishes", in *Lucian*, vol.

Although the proverbial usage of "the donkey who listens to the lyre and wags his ears" is not explicitly stated in Lucian's piece, Prodromos recognizes it and provides a maxim in a similar form which conveys the same meaning.[66] This maxim, recorded in several similar forms, refers to uneducated people and enjoys great popularity in Byzantium.[67] Prodromos then further elaborates on the proverbial donkey and continues word play by addressing his opponent as a "donkey of Cumae." The inspiration for this insult could be traced to at least three different sources with which both Prodromos and his audience were certainly acquainted. Firstly, it is possible that Prodromos exploits maxim which serves to denote something paradoxical and rare.[68] Since the meaning of this proverb derives from Aesop's fable *The Donkey in the Lion's Skin,* it is not excluded that inspiration for Prodromos's insult came from his source as well. According to one version of the fable, foolish citizens of Cumae were intimidated by the donkey in the lion's skin until some foreigner exposed the donkey's true nature.[69] And finally, this story is also employed in Lucian's *Fisherman* with which Prodromos was undoubtedly familiar.[70]

The last intertextual connection with Lucian's *The Ignorant Book–Collector* is to be found in the closing passage of *Philoplaton*: Prodromos states that the only remedy for his "lover of Plato" is to put down the book and not to read it, because otherwise, it may happen that one of Plato's "more noble friends" (i.e. persons who are better acquainted with Plato's

6, trans K. Kilburn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959) 485; "Dialogues of the Dead", in Lucian, vol. 7, trans. by M. D. MacLeod (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961) 31, 83.

[66]Lucian, "The Ignorant Book-Collector", 179.

[67]*Ὄνος λύρας ἀκούων* ἐπί τῶν ἀπαιδεύτων, Diogenian VII 33, in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I, ed. Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch and Friedrich Wilhelm Schneidewin (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 1839), 291-292; See also: Gregory of Cyprus IV 66, Macarius VII 38, and Michael Apostolios XII 91a) in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* II, ed. Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch (Gottingen: Sumptus fecit libraria Dieterichiana, 1851), 125, 193, 566.

[68] *Ὄνος εἰς Κυμαῖαν:* ἐπί τῶν παραδοόξων καί σπανίων, Micheal Apostolios XII 82, in Corpus *Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, II, 564.

[69]Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek. "323. The Farmers, The Donkey and the Lion Skin (Laura Gibbs, translator)." Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/323.htm.

[70]Lucian, "The Dead Come To Life or Fisherman", 49.

teachings) would tear his book and punch him. Beside the fact that Lucian's "book collector" is also advised not to offend books by reading them, Lucian's example of Demetrius the Cynic snatching and tearing the book of an ignorant man indicates the similarity with the literary motif employed by Prodromos.[71] Perhaps Prodromos assumes the familiarity of targeted audience with Lucian's work because the tearing of the book would imply the lesser harm than that which could befall the book if the "lover of Plato" would have read it. However, it should be underlined that this kind of abusive humor which includes physical threats, though Lucianic feature, was popular in Byzantium.[72] Thus, for instance, in twelfth century satire *Timarion*, anonymous author depicts comical fight in underworld between John Italos and Diogen the Cynic.[73]

However, it can be only speculated if Prodromos perhaps found inspiration for his "fan of Plato" in Ion, a character from another work of Lucian – *Lover of Lies or Doubter*. Ion is one of the persons who participates in telling false stories at Eucrates's gathering and he is depicted by Lucian in a mocking manner as someone who thinks that he should be admired for his knowledge of Platonic teachings and their correct interpretation.[74] Needless to say, Prodromos's lover of Plato, in the same manner, assumes the role of someone who understands Plato's teachings correctly and who feels adept enough to audaciously correct his writings.[75] The second relationship between the two texts can be established only on the basis of mere speculation. The title of Prodromos work *Φιλοπλάτων ἢ σκυτοδέψης* resembles that of Lucian's piece, *Φιλοψεδής ἢ ἀπιστῶν*. In terms of paratextuality, it is possible that Prodromos's choice

[71] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 126-128, 71; Lucian, "The Ignorant Book Collector," 196-97.
[72] Garland, "'And His Bald Head Shone Like a Full Moon ...': an appreciation of the Byzantine sense of humour as recorded in historical sources of the eleventh and twelfth Centuries," 25-26.
[73] *Timarion*, trans. by Barry Baldwin (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), 72-74.
[74] Lucian, "The Lover of Lies or the Doubter," in *Lucian*, vol. 3, trans. by A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921), 328-29.
[75] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 39-42, 69.

of title wanted to position this text within the Lucianic tradition and to make it recognizable for the targeted audience. Also, since Lucian in his *Lover of Lies* ridicules persons who are fond of falsehood and who lie not out of necessity but for lying's sake, Prodromos might allude to Lucian's title in order to signify that his *Lover of Plato* was also a deceitful person and a fraud.

Nevertheless, while possible connections between Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and Lucian's *Lover of Lies* are merely of speculative character, the intertextual relationship with Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector* is more than obvious. Lucian's "book-collector" was a rich person able to buy expensive books, but incapable of understanding their content. The main motivation behind his actions was to build a self-image of a profound intellectual which would appeal to the emperor and enhance his opportunities at the imperial court. Perhaps, Prodromos's choice to make connection with this Lucian piece corresponds not only to the attack against an incompetent intellectual, but also with the social aspirations and intrinsic motivations of both Lucian and his adversary. The competition for imperial favor among intellectuals was certainly relevant issue in Prodromos's own time. Furthermore, in twelfth century Byzantium, as Magdalino points out, books were expensive commodities and usually available in isolated collections. Prodromos himself complains about this issue in his encomium to the Patriarch John IX Agapetos (1111-34).[76]Also Prodromos surely found as appealing the fact that Lucian portrays himself as a poor and competent scholar, as opposed to the wealthy unskilled adversary. Therefore, it is not surprising that Prodromos found Lucian's piece inspirational to reflect on contemporary issued in his own intellectual community.

2.2. "The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian"

The intertextual relationship between Prodromos's *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* and Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector* seems to be more complicated. Beside

[76]Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 323-325.

the latter piece, it is evident that Prodromos also uses other works of Lucian such as *A Professor of Public Speaking*, *The Dead Come to Life, or Fisherman* and *Dialgues of Sea Gods*. In *Grammarian,* Prodromos is not merely making allusions to these works, but rather exploits Lucianic technique to construct the argumentation. Furthermore, even when Prodromos exploits Lucianic motifs, he, at the same time, demonstrates that he is acquainted with other sources which Lucian himself employs.

In the opening lines of *Grammarian*, Prodromos exploits mythological stories about two famous figures, namely the flute-player Marsyas and Arion, the harper from Methymna. The purpose of Prodromos's account is to make a convenient introduction for argumentation which is to follow – the self-proclaimed grammarian has to be examined so that he can prove that he is competent enough by his deeds and not by mere assertion. Although Lucian makes references to both Marsyas and Arion in his works,[77] I think that here Prodromos is not simply drawing from Lucian, but rather using motifs with which his audience was familiar through the educational curriculum in general. For instance, while Lucian in his *Ignorant Book-Collector* just briefly mentions that the mere possession of Marsyas's flute does not enable someone to play it without any previous instruction,[78] Prodromos's account is far more elaborated:

> If someone were to ask the flute-player Marsyas: "Dear Marsyas, do you think that you are excellent in flute-playing?", and he were to answer: "Of course I do, o, man, so much so that I even competed about this with Apollo once"; and the man were to say: "Marsyas, I know this, too: that you had competed about the music with the ever-young god once, and that, when the Muses heard both of you, they granted victory to the god; and I also have heard the rest of the story about the blows that Apollo inflicted upon you and that, because of this, a river was made from the streams of your blood and named after you; however, if the story is neither a deformation of the true one, nor a poetic invention, come on, take this flute and show me!" – and if, then, Marsyas were to put the instrument

[77]Lucian, "Harmonides", in *Lucian*, vol. 6, trans. K. Kilburn, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959) 219; "Dialogues of the Sea-Gods", in *Lucian*, vol. 7, translated by M. D. MacLeod (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961) 197-199; "Dialogues of the Gods" in *Lucian*, vol. 7, translated by M. D. MacLeod (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961) 327.
[78]Lucian, *The Ignorant Book-Collector*, 181.

> in the hands of the man, would we accept this man's behavior, if he were to test the flute-player in this way?[79]

Thus, Prodromos through this fictitious dialogue provides a more complete account of the story regarding the competition between Marsyas and Appolo, than Lucian does in any of his pieces. Lucian's reference to Marsyas' competition with Appolo is more detailed only in his Dialogues of Gods, but he does not mention at all the river which is named after Marsyas.[80] In his comments on *Grammarian,* Migliorini only indicated that Marsyas's story is mentioned in various sources among which are also Plato's *Republic* and *Symposium*.[81] While in the *Republic* there is only a brief reference to Marsyas, in Plato's *Symposium* Alcibiades compares Socrates with the famous flute-player by saying that he enchants his listeners with words as Marsyas does with his flute.[82]

No matter how much is tempting to link the inspiration for Prodromos's account either to Lucian or Plato, I think that, because of the detailed information which he provides, other possible sources should be mentioned as well. Marsyas story was quite well known as a part of the general education and it is also mentioned by John Tzetzes in *Chiliades*.[83]However, the first reference to the story is made in the seventh book of Herodotus's *Histories* where he briefly explains that Appollo flayed Marsyas's skin after the contest.[84] The more detailed account is provided in Apollodoros's *The Library of Greek Mythology* as well.[85] However, the account most similar to that of Prodromos can be found in the first book of Xenophon's *Anabasis*. Xenophon explains that when Apollo won in musical competition, he stripped off

[79] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 7-16, 29.
[80]Lucian, Dialogues of Gods, 327.
[81]Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo", 41, in his comments on *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian* only indicated that Marsyas's story is mentioned in Plato's Republic and Symposium among many other sources.
[82]Plato, *Symposium*, 497-498.
[83] John Tzetzes, *Biblion Istorikēs tēs dia stichōn politikōn alpha de kaloumenēs = Historiarum variarum chiliades*, ed. Gottlieb Kiessling (Leipzig: Sumptibus F. C. G. Vogelii, 1826), IV, 11, p. 154-155.
[84]Herodotus*, The Histories*, trans. Robin Waterfield (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 418.
[85] Apollodorus, *The Library of Greek Mythology,* trans. Robin Hard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 32.

Marsyas's skin and hung it up in the cave where springs the river which is because of that named after Marsyas.[86] It seems very convincing to me that Prodromos, though familiar with the story from various sources, probably took the information about the origin of the river's name from Xenophonos. This is reasonable assumption, especially if it is taken into account that Prodromos later criticizes the self-proclaimed grammarian for his position on Xenophon's name etymology.[87]

Prodromos's choice to open his work with reference to Marsyas's story is perhaps not accidental. Marsyas, although skilled in flute-playing, is someone foolishly proud and dangerously overconfident to challenge Apollo and because of that, he is severely punished. It can only be speculated that Prodromos's intention here is to indicate that his adversary is as impudent as Marsyas. However, a more rational explanation is that Prodromos wants to demonstrate that as it is legitimate to examine the legendary stories about famously skilled people such as Marsyas, so it is reasonable to examine the fictional story about the competence of his adversary. This is especially in keeping with the following example which Prodromos's provides:

> If one were not to accept easily the account about the singer and harp-player from Methymna [i.e. Arion] – his song, the dolphin and the astonishing ride on the sea, but Arion would then protest that the story is not false, and the man were to say: "all this is very decent, dear Arion but, I do not know why, I am not able to believe the story, unless you first start to play the harp and sing in the same way as on the bow back then" so, if he were to demand this, would he be missing the truth?[88]

The story about Arion from Methymna is to be found also in Lucian's *Dialogues of Sea Gods*. In one of these dialogues the dolphin re-tells the famous story from his own perspective to

[86]Xenophon, *Anabasis*, trans. Carleton Lewis Brownson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 13.
[87]Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 73-87, 31.
[88]*Ibid*. lines 17-24, 29.

Poseidon.[89] However, the first account about the renowned harp-player is provided by Herodotus in which he, among other things, tells us that Arion invented dithyramb. According to Herodotus, Arion, who was under the patronage of Periander, a Corinthian ruler, at some point decided to visit Italy and Sicily. When he earned great wealth there with his musical performances, Arion decided to go back to Periander's court with some Corinthian sailors. However, intentions of sailors were insincere and they plotted to kill him and seize his money. After unsuccessful attempts to soften their hearts, Arion at least got the opportunity to sing on the lyre for one last time before he threw himself into the sea. And when he did so, a dolphin saved his life by carrying him to the coast of Cape Tainaron. Arion immediately told the whole story to Periander who did not believe him until he caught those sailors in a lie when they arrived.[90] Same as in the case of Marsyas, the story about Arion was part of general education and it would be hard to pinpoint exactly from which sources Prodromos's knowledge derives.[91]

However, the rhetorical technique in which Prodromos constructed the aforementioned examples can be related to that of Lucian. Thus, for instance, Lucian, in his dialogue *The Dead Come to Life or Fisherman*, emphasizes the necessity that people who claim to be philosophers have to be tested whether they are indeed following their own philosophical doctrines.[92] This piece is a sequel to Lucian's *Philosophies for Sale*, where Lucian mocks upon various philosophical schools through a sale of their famous philosophers conducted by Zeus.[93] In the Fisherman philosophers, angry because they were mistreated in Philosophies for Sale, come back from death and attack Lucian who, in the dialogue, assumes the character of "Frankness", which is not surprising because παρρησία is a crucial principle both for cynic philosophy and

[89]Lucian, "Dialogues of Sea Gods," 197-99.
[90]Herodotus, *The Histories*, 11-12.
[91] See also: John Tzetzes, *Biblion Istorikēs tēs dia stichōn politikōn alpha de kaloumenēs = Historiarum variarum chiliades*, I.17, 17-18.
[92]Lucian, "Dead Come to Life", 57-71.
[93]Lucian, "Philosophies for Sale", in *Lucian*, vol. 2, trans. A. M. Harmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1915) 449-519.

Mennipean satire.[94] In front of the attack of the deceased philosophers, Lucian defends himself that his intention was not to mock them but the self-styled philosophers who follow philosophical doctrines only by outward appearance and not by practice.[95] For this reason, it is decided that all these phony philosophers have to be tested as "eaglets against the sun."[96]

Prodromos, whose *Sale of Poetical and Political Lives* is modelled after Lucian's *Philosophies for Sale*,[97] was definitely acquainted with its follow-up piece. It appears that Prodromos through various historical examples, mythological stories, and direct refutations makes a well-constructed argumentation which similarly justifies the necessity to test his opponent – he has to prove through his acts and not just by mere saying that he is knowledgeable enough to be a grammarian. For instance, Prodromos argues:

> So then, it will not be sufficient for you either to say that you are a grammarian, to prove that you are one, if you will not have been tested first; soon, indeed, the Lydian stone will expose the fake coin (τὸ κιβδηλόν), the Rhine the illegitimate child, and the Sun [that] which is not an eaglet.[98]

Apparently, Prodromos was familiar with the story provided by natural historians according to which sea-eagles tested their younglings by forcing them to gaze at the sun. Allegedly they kept just those eaglets who passed the test, while eaglets who cried during the sun-gazing were killed.[99] It is evident that Prodromos strengthens Lucian's reference to the testing of eaglets by adding two following examples. For instance, he makes reference to the Lydian stone which was used as a touchstone for testing the purity of silver and gold. Prodromos also uses this

[94]Lucian, "Dead Come to Life, or Fisherman," 1-82; Highet, *Anatomy of Satire*, 33-34.
[95]Lucian, "The Dead Come to Life," 45-57.
[96]*Ibid.*, 69.
[97]See: Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal," 219-239.
[98]Theodroe Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 45-53, 30.
[99]Migliorini in his notes explains that the testing of eaglets is first mentioned by Aristotle in his *Natural History* and informs us that beside Fisherman, Lucian also uses this reference in *Dialogues of Dead*. He also gives information about the legend regarding German custom to test their newborns by putting them in the Rhine to float on a shield. For details see: Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo," 51; For other narratives about the test of eaglets see also: Marcel Detienne, *The gardens of Adonis: spices in Greek mythology*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 31.

phrase in *Philoplaton* regarding Diogenes the Cynic who tested the lives of the philosophers and of the money-changers with his reasoning "as coins with Lydian stone."[100] In a proverbial sense this expression is employed to denote the ability to accurately examine and judge things.[101]

Nevertheless, Prodromos's attack does not revolve only around the notion that the abilities of his opponent should be scrutinized. He also argues that his target cannot be a grammarian without being well-instructed and advises him to work industriously on gaining knowledge, starting from basics and to improving gradually, until he is able to seize "the fortress of grammar."[102] Prodromos's advice here can be connected to motif employed in Lucian's *A Professor of Public Speaking*. In this ironical monologue, Lucian gives instructions to a certain person on how to become a rhetorician. Lucian sarcastically advises the future rhetorician not to repeat his own mistake and listen to Hesiod as he did and spend years in toilsome studying and gradually improving, but to immediately climb the highest peak and become public speaker without any previous instructions. This would not be an impossible task for a mere public speaker, especially if Hesiod succeeded in transforming from a shepherd into a poet simply by the grace of Muses.[103] It seems that Prodromos used this motif from *A Professor of Public Speaking,* but contrary to Lucian, his advice is not ironical – he provides serious remarks on how his opponent has to earn the status of grammarian.[104] However, besides making a similar remark on Hesiod's two paths from *Works and Days*, Prodromos makes also a clear allusion to an excerpt from Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector*. Similarly as Lucian, Prodromos argues against his inept grammarian that Muses made Hesiod wise by granting him a laurel wand,

[100]Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 82-86, 70.
[101]"Λυδία λίθος: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκριβῶς ἐξεταζόντων καὶ διακρινόντων τὰ πράγματα," Macarius (V Century, 75) in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* II Macarius (V Century, 75) in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* II, 186.
[102]Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 117-23, 32.
[103]Lucian, "A Professor of Public Speaking", 135-45.
[104]Theodroe Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines, 117-21, 32.

while for his adversary it would be just as if he struck him with a thick pomegranate stick because of his stupidity.[105]

Prodromos's usage of Lucianic denigratory techniques is also evident in his interrogation of his opponent who either stands silent in front of his questions as a statue of clay or is able to give answers only by nodding his head.[106] Although Lucian employs this kind of interrogative technique in many of his pieces, it is reasonable to assume that Prodromos was particularly inspired by the questioning present in Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector*.[107] By this convenient rhetorical device, Prodromos successfully humiliates his adversary and emphasizes his ignorance and stupidity.

In Prodromos's *Grammarian*, the relationship with works of Lucian is not merely a repetition of motifs, quotations, and allusions. He combines ideas from three different works of Lucian to construct original argumentation against his adversary, who has to prove his expertise not only by speech and outward appearance (*Fisherman*), but needs to be previously instructed (*The Ignorant Book-Collector*) and has to put forth industrious effort to achieve knowledge (*A Professor of Public Speaking*). Not only does Prodromos skillfully modify these motifs for the purposes of his own work, but he also recognizes the classical allusions which Lucian himself makes, elaborates on them and thus displays great expertise in classical texts.

[105]Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 131-36, 33; Lucian, "The Ignorant Book-Collector", 177.
[106]Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 90-108, 31-32.
[107]Lucian, "The Ignorant Book-Collector", 181; Migliorini, "Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo," 45, does not mention *The Ignorant Book-Collector* as possible source, but he gives references to other works of Lucian such as *The Dream of the Cock*, *Symposium*, *The Downward Journey or The Tyrant*, *Anacharsis or Athletics, Menippus or The Descent Into Hades* and *Dialogues of the Dead*.

Chapter 3 – Display of Knowledge

Prodromos was one of the most educated men in twelfth century Byzantium. His erudition is displayed in vast literary output which he left behind. However, Prodromos played eminent role not only a court poet, as Nikolaos Zagklas points out, but also as a private teacher. His teaching practice as a grammarian is perhaps best evidenced by a number of *schedoi* – puzzle-like school exercises in grammar and orthography, and a grammar treatise attributed to him. His role as a teacher, rhetor and philosopher was also recognized by his contemporaries. For instance, while Niketas Eugenianos compares Prodromos's teaching authority to that of Plato and Aristotle, a certain monk Ioanikios praises him as the noblest grammarian, rhetorician and philosopher. Also, Prodromos himself makes references to his advanced teaching abilities and profound erudition in grammar, rhetoric and philosophy. In this way he wanted, as Zaglklas emphisizes, to represent himself merely as a grammarian, but rather as a universal teacher.[108]

In both *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton*, Prodromos's reflect the same tendency. In attack against unskilled adversaries he successfully manages to portray himself as a competent grammarian, philosopher and rhetorician. Therefore, I will here analyze how through invective and critique of his opponents Prodromos displays his own knowledge and constructs an overall intellectual authority.

[108] Zagklas, "Theodore Prodromos: the Neglected Poems and Epigrams", 58-72; See also: Panagiotis A. Agapitos, "New Genres in the Twelfth Century: The Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos," *Medioevo greco* 15 (2015): 1-41; Nikolaos Zagklas, "A Byzantine grammar treatise attributed to Theodoros Prodromos", *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 16 (2011): 77-86.

3.1. The Byzantine Educational Curriculum: General Overview

Education played an eminent role in Byzantine society. As Michael Grünbart points out, not only was education a prerequisite for obtaining positions in civil service and at the imperial palace, but it was also an important aspect for social representation for both the educated men who were patronized and the wealthy patrons who supported intellectuals.[109]

Byzantine education mainly leaned on the Hellenistic educational system which was modified during the course of time. After mastering the basic writing, reading and arithmetic skills, students were entrusted to a grammarian. His main tasks as a teacher were to instruct students into complex morphology, fluent reading and critical understanding of classical Greek literature. The literary instruction of the grammarian was mainly focused on the analysis of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and less frequently on Hesiod's *Works and Days* and works of the Attic dramatic triad. The main handbooks for teaching at this stage were the *Canons* of Theodosios of Alexandria, which contained rules for the inflection of nouns and verbs in Attic Greek and *The Art of Grammar* of Dionysios the Thracian.[110] The importance of Dionysius's handbook particularly, is attested by numerous scholia written on this piece.[111]

After completing the necessary grammatical education, students continued with rhetorical training which enabled them in the art of speech, of composing declamations and independent literary works. At this stage of education, students were mainly instructed in different rhetorical modes which are introduced through *progymnasmata* – preliminary school exercises. However, it should be mentioned that students received instruction is some of these rhetorical genres such

[109] Michael Grünbart, "Paideia Connects: The Interaction Between Teachers and Pupils in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," in Networks of Learning*: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, C. 1000-1200*, ed. S. Steckel, N. Gaul, and M. Grünbart (Zürich, 2014), 17–19.
[110] Robert Browning, "Teachers," in *The Byzantines*, ed. by Guglielmo Cavallo, translated by Thomas Dunlap, Teresa Lavender Fagan and Charles Lambert, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997) 95-97.
[111] Robert Henry Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, (Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993), 41-42.

as fables, maxims and anecdotes at an earlier stage of education. The conventional number of these rhetorical modes is fourteen, but only twelve of them were deemed essential for any literary composition. Together with several rhetorical treatises such as Hermogenes' *On Issues* and *On Kinds of Style* and Menander's *Division of Epideictic Styles* and *Epideictic Speeches*, the handbooks of preliminary exercises were crucial for Byzantine rhetorical education.[112] Although the four handbooks of *progymnasmata* attributed to Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Nicolaus are preserved, the usage of Aphthonius's *progymnasmata* handbook was prevalent in the Byzantium due to its clarity of exposition, good structure and intelligible examples.[113]

The rhetorical modes which are introduced in *progymnasmata* handbooks, as George Kustas explains, are divided by Byzantine commentators into three species: symbouleutic or deliberative, dicanic or judicial and epideictic or panegyrical. The deliberative species are: *mythos* or fable, *chreia* or anecdote, and *gnōmē* or maxim. To the judicial type belong: *anaskeuē* or refutation, *kataskeuē* or confirmation, *eisphora nomou* which is support of or opposition to a given law, and *koinos topos* or common place. Finally, panegyrical are: *enkōmion* or encomium, *psogos* or invective, *synkrisis* or comparison and *ēthopoeia* or characterization. Kustas also explains that, while *thesis* or posing the question of general interest, is considered as both deliberative and panegyrical, *ekphrasis* or description and *diēgēma* or narrative are regarded as a part of all three categories.[114] While almost all of these

[112] Elizabeth Jeffreys, "Rhetoric in Byzantium", in Ian Worthington (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, (Malden (Mass.): Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 170-171.
[113] George A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009) 203-207.
[114] George Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," *Viator* 1 (1971): 55-74. The divison on three main rhetorical categories, namely symbouleutic (deliberative), dicanic (judicial) and panegyrical (epideictic) is made by Aristotle in his treatise *On Rhetoric* and they were crucial in classification of all rhetorical modes. Theon in his handbook emphasizes this logical division and indicates for what rhetorical category is each rhetorical technique useful. He also introduces another categorization by explaining what rhetorical modes should be used in five parts of oration. See: Kennedy, *A History of Classical Rhetoric*, 4, 207; Penella, "The *Progymnasmata* in Imperial Greek Education", 86-87.

rhetorical modes can be used when embedded in larger compositions, only some of them can be employed as independent literary forms, such as, for instance, encomium, characterization, description and fable.[115]

People trained in the grammar and the rhetoric were part of small educated elite. After rhetorical education, pupils were enabled to pursue studies of logic and philosophy. However, many students probably acquired superficial knowledge of philosophy, while only small group studied it in depth.[116] Although both Aristotelianism and Platonism were equally present in the twelfth-century Byzantine education, the latter was under constant suspicion because of its Neoplatonic phase.[117] By the twelfth century the Christian Platonism, an integral part of Christian thought before Justinian and a tolerated one after him, came under increasing pressure. After the trial against John Italos in 1082, motivated both by political factors and by a growing intolerance toward philosophical inquiry, the repression of philosophy is reflected in a number of trials conducted in the following century. The target is mainly Proclus and a kind of a Christian Neoplatonism, a subject that still awaits much clarification. Thus, for instance, in the mid twelfth century, Nikolaos, bishop of Methone, refutes Proclus in one of his treatises, the refutation aiming, at a closer reading, at the application of Proclian philosophical method to Christian dogmatic, mainly Trinitarian issues, while Michael Anchialos, Consul of the Philosophers, used Aristotle to rebut Neoplatonism.[118] On the other hand, while Platonism and Neoplatonism were treated with increasing distrust, philosophical interest in Aristotle flourished. This is attested in numerous commentaries written on Aristotle's works and the Aristotelian circle formed around Anna Komnena, the daughter of emperor Alexios I Komenos

[115] Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," 59, 62; Jeffreys, "Rhetoric in Byzantium", 172-177.
[116] Browning, "Teachers", 102-103.
[117] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 331.
[118] Kaldellis, *The Hellenism in Byzantium*, 254.

(*r*. 1081-1118).[119] However, even though Platonism was less favored by official authorities and the Church than Aristotelianism, the interest for Platonic philosophy was still present among Byzantine intellectuals. Thus, for instance, Michael Italikos, Prodromos's teacher fostered great interest in Platonic philosophy so that he was even called by his contemporaries "Plato after Plato".[120]

Teaching practice was usually conducted in the schools attached to the monasteries and churches. Beside schools already existing schools in Constantinople attached to Hagia Sophia, St Peter, the Forty Martyrs, St Theodore ton Sphorakiou, ta Diakonisses, and Chalkoprateia, twelfth century sources mention also other three schools attached to the Chalke, the Holy Apostols and St Paul of the Orphanage. The latter was established or re-stablished by Alexios I Komnenos and it provided free instruction in grammar for orphans, poor children and some children of foreign origin. The access to free education for children without means certainly increased social mobility because it enabled them to get positions in imperial and administrative service. However, the schools attached to the churches and monasteries were not only means for acquiring the education. Many "schools" were actually conducted by private teachers who frequently organized lectures in their own houses. In many cases the line between teaching areas of grammarian, rhetorician and philosopher was blurred so it happened that they provided instructions in two or three different domains. These private teachers depended on the fee paid by the parents of a well-situated students. Thus they had to deal with fierce competition with their colleagues in order to keep or acquire a new students.[121]

[119] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 331-333.
[120] *Ibid*. 333.
[121] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 325-328; Browning, "Teachers", 101-108.

3.2. The Grammarian

In his satirical piece *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, Prodromos undoubtedly displays both theoretical and practical knowledge as a teacher. However, Prodromos's attack is not only based on his grammatical expertise, but also on his philosophical erudition. Thus, apart from Sextus Empiricus's treatise *Against the Grammarians*, Dionysios Thrax's *Art of Grammar* and most probably extensive commentaries on this piece, Prodromos also applies Platonic and Aristotelian philosophical ideas to construct a systematic refutation of his opponent.

In terms of the art of grammar, Prodromos's attack is focused on three main points: the definition of discipline, interpretation of etymologies and critical approach to poetry. Thus, after demonstrating the necessity to examine the abilities and expertise of his opponent, Prodromos starts with a systematic refutation of the manner in which his opponent defines the art of grammar:

> Tell me, how one who gives training in the discipline regards grammar as an art and again defines it as experience? Perhaps you assume that there are two grammars – the one more incomplete and the other more accomplished, and you hold the opinion that one is to be called experience and the other art? Or you bestow upon one both nouns, as if the art and the experience were the same? However, neither would you, I suppose, assume that art and experience are the same thing, nor would I agree with your opinion, as long as I am listening to Aristotle, who teaches that experience is born from many recollections, and that art is developing from this. I am afraid that, I would fall into contradiction from another point of view, too, assuming that the same thing does not and does have and have rationality, since I know that experience is an irrational habit and I listen to Plato, who thinks that it is not appropriate to call an art that which is irrational, had I identified experience and art as synonymous. So there remains to assume that there are two grammars and apply one name to the first one, and another [name] to the other one. Therefore, o admirable man, the first is somewhere here with us and long is the line of professors [i.e. grammatici] who are named after it; the other you should discover yourself. But I don't believe

you could, even if you were to endure the countless toils; unless you like to call it such as the elementary grammar.[122]

Prodromos here refers to a controversy about different approaches to the definition of the grammar. According to Dionysios Thrax "grammar is the experience of the usages of language" and is divided into six parts: training in fluent reading, interpretation of poetical figures, explanation of dialectical peculiarities and allusions, discovery of etymology, accurate account of grammatical regularities (analogies) and critical approach to poetical works.[123] However, it seems that Dionysios' definition of grammar was inconsistent because he calls grammar an art in the very title of his work and he later explains that critical judgement of poetry is "the noblest part of grammatical art." Perhaps this discrepancy implies, as Alfons Wouters and Pierre Swiggers point out, that Dionysios understands art as the systematization of empirical intention to reconcile two contradictory concepts.[124]

Ancient authors tried to move further from Dionysios's definition of the grammar by adjusting it and proposing alternative solutions which are summarized by Sextus Empiricus in his treatise *Against the Grammarians*.[125] The controversy regarding the definition of grammar revolved around the question whether grammar should be regarded as more empirical and conjectural, or to be more precise art. Although Dionysius's definition of the grammar mainly remained at use in Byzantium, many scholiasts made objections to it. Thus, for instance, one commentator claims that "by calling it 'experience,' he downgraded the science; experience is

[122] Theodore Prodromos*, The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 55-70, 30-31.
[123] Dionysius Thrax, *The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax*, trans. Thomas Davidson, (St. Louise: R.P. Studley, 1874), 3-4.
[124] Dionysius Thrax, The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax, 3-4; Alfons Wouters and Pierre Swiggers, "Definitions of Grammar", in *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship,* vol. 1, ed. Franco Montanari, Stephanos Matthaios, and Antonios Rengakos.
[125] Sextus Empiricus, "Against the Grammarians", in Sextus Empiricus, *Against Professors*, trans. R. G. Bury (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949) 35-53.

routine practice without underlying principle." Another commentator on Dionysios's *Art of Grammar* underlines its importance as a skill, experience, art and science. [126]

Prodromos seems to draw attention to the logical inconsistency in Dionysius's definition of the grammar which his opponent apparently understands as both an empirical practice and an art. By introducing Aristotle's position from *Metaphysics* according to which art and science are acquired through empirical practice and Plato's stance from *Gorgias* according to which empirical practice is irrational and therefore cannot be regarded as an art, Prodromos demonstrates that art and empirical practice are not the same things.[127] Thus, he argues that grammar cannot be defined as both but rather only as an art.

The next step in Prodromos's criticism revolves around the inability of his adversary to use etymology properly:

> […] how come that according to you the name Xenophon could be derived from foreign lands in which your ancient [author] was killed? Was he killed because he is called in that manner? Or is he called so because he was killed? If the first is the case, then those who have given the name to the man are misanthropes, if because of this he had to be killed on foreign soil; or they give evidence of their shortage of names so that they had left aside Diomede, Pherecydes, Themistocles, Pericles, Aristodemus, Alcinous, and many other honorable names, and they came across this most ominous name of Xenophon. If, however, he is called so because he was killed, it escapes my notice how he could have been killed first, and [only] then born and named.[128]

Generally speaking the main task of etymology was to discover the true meaning of the word by analyzing and interpreting its roots.[129] However, Prodromos implies that this approach is

[126] Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 45.
[127] Aristotle, "Metaphysics", trans. William David Ross, in Jonathan Barnes, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translatio*n, vol. II (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), 2-3; Plato, "Gorgias", in John M. Cooper (ed.) *Plato: Complete works*, (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009), 808-809.
[128] Theodore Prodromos, The Ignorant or Self-Proclaimed Grammarian, lines 74-83, 31.
[129] Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, 47.

not always applicable because in some cases can lead to contradictory results.[130] His opponent is apparently unable to go beyond this simplistic methodology because, as Prodromos explains, he can only give glimpse into models and the outward appearance of etymologies and not to philosophize about them.[131] Thus Prodromos's adversary is not merely criticized for being an inept grammarian, but rather because his expertise is not philosophical and does not go beyond the basic scope of grammar.

In this passage Prodromos makes playful reference to *Cratylus* in which Plato argues about and most probably mocks different etymological approaches. One position is presented by Hermogenes who thinks that names are assigned according to custom and that there is no prerequisite connection between nature of the things and names. According to Cratylus all names derived from a divine name giver and indicate the true nature of a thing named. Things or persons whose names are improperly assigned do not have right to have that names. Socrates takes middle position and argues that original names have divine origin but that they may alter over the time. He also claims that names can be given either correctly in which case they indicate a true nature of the thing or incorrectly when a true nature is not necessarily signified.[132] In *Grammarian* Prodromos apparently mocks both Cratylus's position and the etymological practice of his adversary when he underlines that he is aware of many persons named Xenophon who died neither abroad not violently. Therefore, according to Prodromos, one has to either remove their name or consider them unworthy to be called Xenophon in order to escape logical inconsistency.[133]

[130] Name Xenophon derives from two words *xeno* - strange or foreign, and *phōne* – voice. Here it seems that *phōne* is understood as a battle outcry so it is perhaps interpreted that it designates also someone who dies in a battle. It is also possible that he criticizes some historically based interpretation of the name's etymology.
[131] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant of Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 87-9, 31.
[132] George A. Kennedy, "Language and Meaning in Archaic and Classical Greece," in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism,* vol. 1, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 86-87.
[133] Theodore Prodromos, The Ignorant or Self-Proclaimed Grammarian, lines 83-87, 31.

The final point of criticism that Prodromos levels at his opponent's grammatical practice regards his inability to give a correct judgement of a poetry. One of the main tasks of grammarians is to instruct students in the practical reading of prose and poetical works. However, their instruction was mainly concerned with Homeric poems, and less frequently with Hesiod and Attic tragedians.[134] Prodromos interrogates his adversary, who as a grammarian is claims authority to judge poetry, which poet he prefers the most. Even though his adversary seemingly gives a correct answer by endorsing Homer above all other poets, and then Hesiod after him, Prodromos refutes his stance because it is in disagreement with Plato's teaching according to which youths should not be instructed in Homeric poetry.[135] Prodromos furthers continues his criticism of the self-proclaimed grammarian by mocking him that Hesiod's piece *Works and Days* is useful not for teachers, but rather for farmers and sailors who are unable to read him.[136]

Prodromos criticism goes beyond the expertise of his opponent as a grammarian. The inept teacher is rebuked also because his knowledge is insufficient in respect of Platonic philosophy. This seems to indicate that the line between grammarian and philosopher as teachers is blurred. An excellent grammarian has to possess also higher philosophical erudition in order to provide the best possible education for his students. The indication for overlapping areas of expertise between a grammarian and someone who deals with philosophy can be also found in *Philoplaton*. There Prodromos denigrates an inept Platonist by revealing his insufficient training in the art of grammar. For instance, Prodromos attacks his adversary not only for being untrained in philosophy as defined by Plato, but also for his inept reading

[134] Browning, "Teachers", 97.
[135] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 93-108, 31-32.
[136] Theodore Prodromos, The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian, lines 109-116, 32; Anthony Bryer, "Byzantine Agricultural Implements: The Evidence of Medieval Illustrations of Hesiod's Works and Days." in *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 81 (1986): 51-52, underlines the possibility that Prodromos here mocks his contemporary John Tzetzes and his edition of *Works and Days*.

practice: "and also you are not versed in the reading it aloud according to the prosody". [137] While in the first stage of education pupils had to master basic reading and writing skills, at the more advanced level taught by grammarian it was expected from them to learn how to read poetic or prose pieces fluently with respect to expression, prosody and pauses. As Dionysios Thrax explains: "Through the expression we learn the merit of the piece; from the prosody, the art of the reader; and from the pauses, the meaning intended to be conveyed." [138] Thus, Prodromos's inept Platonist is not displaying even the basic aspect of erudition – reading aloud classical Greek literature according to the correct pronunciation. In addition to this, Prodromos reproaches his adversary who wrongly claims that some of Plato's words should be phrased differently and even corrects Plato's alleged mistakes by inserting his own novelties.[139] In this way Prodromos makes another reference to the unskilled grammatical practice of his opponent who is unable to properly recognize grammatical regularities.

3.3. The Rhetorician

In both *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* Prodromos plays with various rhetorical techniques characteristic for diatribe prose satires. Usage of various rhetorical techniques in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* displays not only Prodromos's advanced literary skills, but also his profound knowledge of classical authors. In his literary play Prodromos also employs a variety of rhetorical figures such as metaphor, metonym allegory, simile, hyperbole and irony. It would be difficult indeed to specify all rhetorical modes and figures which Prodromos applies with precision, for they are often skillfully intertwined with each other. Therefore, I will analyze just some of the rhetorical devices employed in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* to demonstrate

[137] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner,* lines 28-31, 69.
[138] Dionysius Thrax, *The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax*, 4.
[139] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 39-42, 69.

how Prodromos manipulates them to construct systematic refutations of his fictitious or perhaps even real opponents.

In both of his works, Prodromos plays with deliberative rhetorical progymnasmata such as fables, anecdotes and maxims. These rhetorical devices are usually given in an unelaborated form and embedded into larger rhetorical units such as refutation, invective and hypothesis. Thus, for instance, in the refutation of his opponent's assertion of being grammarian, Prodromos uses an unelaborated reference to Aesop's fables with the words: "How do I know if under the lion-skin the donkey will bray again, the mouse will expose the weasel, a bride until then, and a croaking raven will starve?"[140] With these allusions Prodromos ridicules his opponent in a very succinct and original manner. In other words, his adversary should not assume the title of a grammarian because he will be exposed by his own incompetence and the lack of intellect. Also, he should not be convinced by flattering of his untrustworthy friends that he is a grammarian, because he is not.[141]

Fables enjoyed a great popularity in Byzantium.[142] The educated audience could without difficulties recognize allusions to Aesopic fables, in this case *The Donkey and the Lion Skin,* [143]*Aphrodite and the Weasel*,[144] and *The Fox and the Raven*,[145] and to understand the moral

[140] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 45- 46, 30.
[141] Lucian, *The Ignorant Book-Collector*, 185, also ridicules his adversary that he should not be seduced by flattering of his companions, because they laugh behind his back.
[142] Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," 62.
[143] *The Donkey and the Lion Skin* fable (Perry 358/Aphthonius 10/ Babrius 139) tells the story about the donkey who wanted to change his appearance by putting the lion skin, but with his braying he revealed his true nature and was beaten to death. Moral: "A story about a donkey, urging us not to yearn for more than we deserve" and "Adornments that do not belong to you can be dangerous." See: Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek, "323. The Farmers, The Donkey and the Lion Skin (Laura Gibbs, translator)." Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/323.htm.
[144] *Aphrodite and Weasel fable* (Perry 124/Aphthonius 29/Babrius 77) narrates about the weasel which was in love with a man and changed her appearance with the help of Aphrodite. However, during the wedding ceremony her true nature came out when she saw a mouse and started to hunt him. Moral: "Nature had proved stronger than Love". See: Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek, "350. Aphrodite and the Weasel (Laura Gibbs, translator). Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/350.htm.
[145] *The Fox and the Raven* fable (Perry 50/ Babrius 32) tells a story about the fox which with flattering tricked the raven into singing, so he dropped his cheese and remained hungry. Moral: "A story about a fox and a raven which urges us not to trust anyone who is trying to deceive us." and "If you follow your enemies' advice, you will get

behind them. Thus, for instance, the fable about the weasel-bride to which Prodromos refers is also employed by other authors such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Ignatios the Deacon, John Tzetzes and Michael Choniates.[146] Furthermore, *The Donkey and the Lion Skin* fable apparent enjoyed a lot of popularity in Byzantium and Prodromos himself deemed it as a convenient tool to expose the pretense of his adversaries. For instance, while in *Executioner or Doctor* he uses this fable to denigrate doctors,[147] in *Philoplaton* he assaults his adversary with the proverbial donkey of Cumea.[148] This donkey story found its place also in the monumental antiquarian work *Book of Histories (Chiliades*) of Prodromos's contemporary, John Tzetzes.[149]

However, it should be underlined that Prodromos's Aesopic references in *Grammarian* seem to have a more proverbial character.[150] Prodromos also employs a similar kind of fable-proverbs in *Philoplaton* to deride his opponent in a vivid way: "Once I saw a ruby, beautiful and great stone, hanging on the nostril of a pig, and a golden ring on the finger of a monkey, and a purple raiment on the body of a cat, and seeing that, I was quite delighted with the spectacle and I laughed so loud at that sight."[151] In other words, through skillful play with Lucianic and proverbial motives Prodromos emphasizes that Platonic philosophy is as suitable to his opponent as luxurious things to these ignoble animals.[152] Also, in his refutation of the

hurt." See: Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek, "104. The Fox and the Raven (Laura Gibbs, translator)," Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/104.htm.

[146] John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou, "Some Aesopic Fables in Byzantium and the Latin West: Tradition, Diffusion, and Survival", *Illinois Classical Studies* 08 (1983), 125-127.

[147] Theodore Prodromos, *The Executioner or Doctor,* lines 40-41, 51.

[148] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, line 50, 70.

[149] John Tzetzes, *Biblion Istorikēs tēs dia stichōn politikōn alpha de kaloumenēs = Historiarum variarum chiliades*, ed. Gottlieb Kiessling (Leipzig: Sumptibus F. C. G. Vogelii, 1826), IV, 11, 154-155.

[150] Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 203-204.

[151] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, 66-69, 70.

[152] For instance, Lucian, *Ignorant Book-Collector*, 179, uses similar proverb: "A monkey is always monkey, says the proverb, even if he has a birth tokens of gold". It seems that Prodromos also plays and transforms analogous proverb about cat and monkey: "Πίθηκος ἐν πορφθύρᾳ: οἱ φαυῦλοι κἂν καλοῖς περιβληθῶσιν, ὅμως διαφαίνονται πονηροί," Diogenian VIII 94, in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I, 303; "Ταλῆ χιτώνιον: ἐπί τῶν τὰ ἑαυτῶν περιβλήματα ἐσθιόντων," Micheal Apostolios V 25, in *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* II, 339.

unversed grammarian, Prodromos uses another proverbial expression to emphasize the firmness of his attitude against the person who claimed for himself the title of a "grammarian":

> […] so I wouldn't easily call anyone a cobbler, even if Diomedian necessity is laid upon me with a sword striking my back, unless he has applied the curving knife and the awl cleverly, and arranged sandals well, and sew a half-boot and small slippers skillfully."[153]

The proverbial "Diomedian necessity" derives from the story about Diomedes and Odysseus's theft of the Palladium, the Trojan protective statue of Athena Pallas. According to the explanation in Zenobius's collection of proverbs, the story goes as follows: when Odysseus and Diomedes were carrying the stolen Palladium toward the ship, Odysseus, who wished to be the only one getting the credit for the theft, attempted to murder Diomedes who was in front of him with the Palladium. However, Diomedes saw the sword's glare, so he captured Odysseus, tied his hands and beat his back with a sword.[154]

As a rhetorical device, the proverb is very similar to the *gnome* or the maxim. However, the proverb differs from the maxim because it does not always derive from a literary source and its truth is almost always expressed through a metaphor.[155] The maxim, on the other hand, is a universal declaration which contains urging or dissuading advice. Although the maxim is also similar to *chreia* (saying or anecdote), these two rhetorical devices are differentiated on several bases. While the maxim is only a saying, not necessarily ascribed to someone, and always states the universal truth, the *chreia* can be an action or a saying, always attributed to a person and states both the universal and the particular.[156]

[153] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 40-3.
[154] For detailed information about other sources and versions of the story, see the comments in Zenobius III 8, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I, 59-60.
[155] Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* III, 1750.
[156] Nicolaus the Sophist, "The Preliminary Excercises of Nicolaus the Sophist," in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. by George Kennedy (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 143.

Prodromos in both of his works exploits many *chreiai* of various classical authors such as Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, Pindar, Plato and Pythagoras, and a few maxims. He conveniently uses them as a part of invective and refutation to support his argumentation and to prove his point. However, due to their numerous usages in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*, it would be difficult to analyze all of them. Therefore, I will just briefly reflect on one example of each type. In *Grammarian*, for instance, Prodromos refers to a saying of Hesiod according to which "gods put sweat before virtue" when he attacks his opponent who thinks that he will become a teacher without any kind of toil.[157] In *Philoplaton*, for instance, he uses one statement from Plato's *Phaedo* in the form of a maxim: "for it is not permitted for the impure to approach what is pure."[158] The usage of this maxim is twofold. While on the one hand he mocks his adversary that he, as a Platonist, should be aware of this principle, on the other, he implies that due to impurity of his low nature he is unable to acquire a pure and divine knowledge, which could be only achieved through refraining from material things and bodily pleasures.

Prodromos applies all panegyrical rhetorical devices in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*. However, because an invective tone prevails in both pieces, encomium, comparison and characterization are usually embedded or intertwined with this invective. As a rhetorical technique, the *psogos* exploits the same topical elements as an encomium but with the opposite purpose, which is to censure, blame and insult. The object of the invective can be both general and particular. Prodromos in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* mainly exploits topical elements of the invective such as origin, behavior, acquired education, prudence and physical appearance. Thus, for instance, Prodromos implies the low origins of an inept Platonist by insulting him through stating that while until yesterday the opponent was manning an oxen-pulled plough, he pretends now to be a philosopher. Although Prodromos probably exaggerates in order to

[157] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*,
[158] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 94-95, 71; Plato, "Phaedo", trans. by G.M.A. Grube, in John M. Cooper (ed.), *Plato: Complete Works* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009), 58.

humiliate his adversary, it is not impossible that his insult is aimed against a person or a stereotypical character who came from the countryside into Constantinople to acquire education and compete for posts in the imperial service or for teaching positions.[159] Prodromos also mocks the Platonist's intelligence by emphasizing that his true nature is ignoble and vulgar. A faux Platonist is someone who with his physical appearance and intellectual abilities looks more like a farmer or a sailor, than a man of letters. The unversed Platonist has the hands of a butcher and no expertise. Not only he does not understand the Platonic matters, he does not even know how to read properly. Although he pretends that he is involved into hard studying, he himself reveals his own foolishness by reading books upside-down. His means of judgement are so poor that he is unable to even give an answer on simple questions or to understand the wisdom of the poets.[160]

In a similar manner, Prodromos exploits elements of the invective in *Grammarian* to denigrate his opponent. Prodromos's grammarian is an audacious person who is only able to pretend that he is a teacher through his outward appearance and behavior. Thus, he is capable to sit with magnificence while leaning his elbows on both sides of the chair and strokes his beard acting as if he were earnestly thinking about something. However, the moment he opens his mouth to speak, he proves only his stupidity. So, the incompetent teacher is completely unable to demonstrate any kind of abilities through practice. He is someone who not only has a very poor understanding of etymology and poetry, but is lacking knowledge of the basic principles of the grammarian discipline.[161]

In addition to the harsh invective, Prodromos also employs encomium as a rhetorical device in *Philoplaton*. Encomium is used to praise individuals, groups, abstract concepts and things.

[159] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos,*
[160] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner,* lines 50, 71-74, 91-93, 70-71.
[161] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 53-161, 30-34.

Common elements in the praise of individuals are origins, upbringing, deeds, comparison with another person and epilogue.[162] However, in a short encomium to Plato, which is given at the very beginning of *Philoplaton*, Prodromos is not employing all elements of a proper encomium. Apart from a short mentioning of his ancestry ("son of Ariston"), Prodromos is mainly focused on Plato's scholarly achievements. It seems to me that this praise has a twofold purpose. While on the one hand it provides contrast between the two opposite rhetorical modes - encomium and invective which is to follow, on the other it serves to make a contrast between Prodromos and the person under attack.

By eulogizing Plato and emphasizing his authority in the higher education curriculum – *quadrivium* (music, arithmetic, astronomy and geometry), metaphysics and ethic - Prodromos actually demonstrates his own educational background and thus emphasizes his own authority to criticize his adversary. Prodromos further highlights his Platonic expertise by listing the works of Plato which he admires the most: "I admire your Phaedo or on the soul, your Timaeus or on the nature, the famous beautiful Phaedrus, the famous rhetorician Gorgias, the Theaetetus, the Axiochus and the rest of Plato."[163] Throughout the whole piece Prodromos implicitly demonstrates his expertise and intellectual authority and thus opposes his own persona to his inept adversary. However, this eulogy to Plato represents perhaps the most skilfully constructed comparison not only between Plato and the unversed Platonist, but also between Prodromos himself and his fictitious opponent.

The comparison or *synkrasis* as an element permeates all rhetorical techniques and is particularly essential for encomium, invective, description and common place. The rhetorical figure simile can be regarded as the simplest form of comparison. As Geroge Kustas points

[162] Kennedy, A New History of Classical Rhetoric, 205; See also: *Aphthonius the Sophist*, "The *Preliminary Excercises* of Aphthonius the Sophist," in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. by George Kennedy, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 108-111.
[163] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 15-18, 69.

out, the comparison is embedded in a rhetorical system itself because the praise is commonly followed by censure, refutation is accompanied by confirmation and thesis implies existence of anti-thesis.[164] As a rhetorical device in general, a comparison represents either a combination of two praises or a mixture of a praise and censure. The comparison can be conducted by juxtaposing things or persons as a whole, or by contrasting compartments topically divided as in encomium.[165]

The aforementioned example of a short encomium to Plato contrasted to the invective against the incompetent Platonist implies the comparison of objects as a whole. However, in both *Grammarian* and *Philoplaton,* Prodromos employs many comparisons on smaller-scale basis, usually as elements of refutation and invective. In *Philoplaton*, for instance, Prodromos uses a comparison which combines praise and censure of Diogenes and an inept Platonist respectively as a part of an invective against his adversary. In Prodromos' words "…the nature in Diogenes, even in the midst of moneychangers, was philosophical; yours is, even in the midst of books, that of the agora [i.e. vulgar] and of craftsmanship [i.e. ignoble]." [166]After comparing their natures, Prodromos continues with juxtaposing their acting with regards to theology and philosophy. While Diogenes preferred a simpler Cynic philosophy, and did not put his hands on theology straightaway from the agora, because he knew that theology requires proper preparation of both soul and mind, Prodromos's inept adversary became a Platonist instantly from a retailer, and theologian from cattle-man.[167] In this way, Prodromos not only systematically refutes his opponent, but also underlines his own understanding of the correct approach to philosophy and theology.

[164] Kustas, *The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric*, 61.
[165] Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 205.
[166] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 84-86, 70.
[167] *Ibid*. lines 86-93, 70-71.

To the vividness of Prodromos's works also contributes the usage of ēthopoeia, rhetorical technique, which presents characters through invented speech. As a commentator of Aphthonius's handbook explains: "Ethopoeia (or speech in character) is suitable in all parts of a speech and especially in the proofs; for it makes the language alive and moves the hearer to share the emotion of the speaker by presenting his character."[168] According to rhetorical handbooks, there are three different types of characterization: *ēthopoeia* which is in the narrower sense representation of a real historical figure, *prosōpopoeia* which represents the characterization of an invented or mythological person and *eidolopoeia* which represents the ghost of a real person. Furthermore, the characterization can be ethical, pathetical and mixed.[169] While ethical characterization introduces the character just according to what he would say in particular instances, pathetical represents emotional speech, and mixed is combination of both.[170] According to Hermogenes, a characterization can be attributed to "both definite and indefinite persons."[171]

Taking all this into account, it is clear that Prodromos in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* mainly exploits ethical *prosōpopoeia* for both specified and unspecified persons. For instance, in *Philoplaton*, Prodromos uses characterization to construct the possible dialogue which could take place between his opponent and an anonymous interrogator. Through these characterizations Prodromos shows in a very vivid manner the foolishness and ineptness of his adversary. Thus, if someone were to ask the inept Platonist about Platonic matters, he would not be able to answer.[172] In *Grammarian*, for instance, Prodromos employs the characterization

[168] John of Sardis, "Selections from the Commentary on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthnonius Attributed to John of Sardis, Including Fragments of the Treatise on Progymnasmata by Sopratos," in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* trans. by George Kennedy (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 213.
[169] Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, 205-206.
[170] Aphthonius the Sophist, "The Preliminary Excercises of Aphthonius the Sophist,"116.
[171] Hermogenes, "The *Preliminary Excercises* Attributed to Hermogenes," in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, trans. by George Kennedy, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 85.
[172] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 35-39, 69.

to construct both a fictive dialogue between Marsyas and an unknown interlocutor, and an account of what someone would say to Arion when he doubts his story.[173] In both cases anonymous characters demand from famous interlocutors to demonstrate their abilities and skills. Thus, by means of *ēthopoeia* Prodromos makes a convenient introduction for his attack against the inept grammarian who, in the same manner, has to prove that he is qualified for a/the teaching position. The vivid characterizations in Prodromos's works not only enhance the strength of his abusive argumentation, but also contribute to the literary merit of his works.

Prodromos's play with various rhetorical devices is in accordance with diatribe-style satires and the similar usage of different rhetorical modes is also evident in Lucian's works.[174] Prodromos's carefully constructed argumentation demonstrates both skillful application of different rhetorical techniques and his deep knowledge of classical authors. However, the possibility that *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* have a didactic purpose, should not be excluded. As Marciniak explains this possibility in the case of Prodromos's *Sale of Poetical and Political Lives*: "It is conceivable that the work was written for his advanced students who were able to recognize quotations (in various places changed by Prodromos) and allusions as well as appreciate the jokes connected with their education."[175] Perhaps, the same can be assumed for *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* because of Prodromos's numerous applications of rhetorical techniques as introduced by preliminary school exercises. However, since it is impossible to state with certainty for what occasion these two texts were written, the purpose of *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* is still enigmatic.

[173] Theodore Prodromos, *The Ignorant or the Self-Proclaimed Grammarian*, lines 7-25, 29.
[174] Robert J. Penella, "The *Progymnasmata* in Imperial Greek Education, Classical World 105, no. 1 (2011): 89.
[175] Marciniak, "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis; A Reappraisal", 225.

3.4. The Philosopher

As already explained in the previous section, Prodromos establishes his own authority in Platonic matters at the very beginning of *Philoplaton*. In a short encomium of Plato, Prodromos not only emphasizes his own expertise by enlisting his favorite Platonic works such as *Timaeus*, *Gorgias*, *Phaedo*, *Theaetetus*, and *Axiochus*, but he also implies what kind of philosophy he is practicing by acknowledging, among the other things, the importance of Plato in "philosophical rhetoric and rhetorical philosophy."[176] In this way, Prodromos puts himself in the line of the eleventh and twelfth century Byzantine intellectuals, who were particularly concerned with the combined practice of philosophy and rhetoric. The purpose of rhetoric in this combination is to adorn philosophy, while the purpose of philosophy is to give meaning to rhetoric.

Studies of rhetoric and philosophy in Byzantium, as Magdalino points out, were never completely separable form each other. However, the synthesis of philosophy and rhetoric culminated in the eleventh century with Psellos who advocates the importance of both in many of his works.[177] For instance, in the encomium of his teacher, John Mauropous, Psellos emphasizes that "philosophy without rhetoric has no grace, and rhetoric without philosophy no content". He also underlines the importance of this joint practice in one of his letters. Psellos criticizes his correspondent, saying that although he knows philosophy and rhetoric, he does not know how to combine them, so "there is no philosophizing rhetoric as well as rhetoricizing philosophy."[178]

Needless to say, Psellos's synthesizing approach toward philosophy and rhetoric, certainly influenced by Neoplatonism, was widely accepted and exercised a great impact on subsequent Byzantine intellectuals such as Theodore of Smyrna, Michael Italikos and Michael

[176] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 7-20, 69.
[177] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 331.
[178] Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," 69.

Choniates.[179] Prodromos is undoubtedly one of these literati who followed Psellos's pattern and this is clearly underlined in his short encomium to Plato. Also, in terms of practice, it is evident that Prodromos in *Philoplaton* applies rhetoric to subtly embed his own philosophical views which are cunningly hidden behind the harsh invective against his opponent.

Even though Prodromos criticizes the inept philosopher for being unversed in Platonic matters in general, it seems that he is particularly irritated with the opponent's treatment of Plato's theology. Thus, for instance, when he mocks the reading practice of his adversary, Prodromos addresses him in following manner:

> But let me ask you, theologian, and answer me, in the name of your Proclus of Lycians; what does it mean to you to hold the book upside-down and so to say, inverted?[180]

Prodromos's subversive addressing is clearly aimed against the person who tries to deal with Neoplatonic teachings, most probably, with Proclus's *Elements of Theology.* However, what seems to be unclear at the first glance is the nature of Prodromos's attitude toward Proclus and Neoplatonic philosophy. Thus, two possible interpretations can be speculated based on Prodromos's ironical add. The first solution would be that Prodromos himself was against Proclus's teachings and thus he aims his criticism against someone who follows it. The second possibility is that Prodromos himself approves of Proclus and reproaches the person who simply does not understand either Proclus or Plato.

However, even though the acceptance of the first possibility would easily fit in the anti-Neoplatonic atmosphere of twelfth-century Byzantium, it seems as an improbable interpretation for several reasons. First of all, the official hostility toward philosophical teachings which were in discordance with Christian dogma did not put an end to enduring

[179] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 333-334.
[180] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 53-55, 70.

interest in Plato and Neoplatonism. For instance, Michael Italikos, Prodromos's teacher, often openly quoted not only works of Plato, but also works of Porphyry, Proclus and Simplicius.[181] So, it is reasonable to assume that Prodromos, as his pupil and a friend, was also inclined to favor the same teachings. Secondly, Prodromos himself faced accusations for heresy because of Platonic philosophy and thus had to defend his Orthodoxy in a poem *Against Barys, Who Blurted the Name of Heretic at Him*.[182] Therefore, I think that Prodromos's subversive tone rather implies the inability of his opponent to cope properly with Proclus and Platonic theology.

Prodromos mostly combines quotations and ideas from Plato's *Republic* and *Phaedo* to refute his opponent. Thus, for instance, in the comparison of his adversary with Diogenes the Cynic, Prodromos underlines that the inept Platonist has a vulgar and ignoble nature. He also emphasizes that, opposite to Diogenes who understood that whoever wants to deal with theology, needs to detach oneself from the bonds of knowledge and material things in order to prepare soul and mind for the most divine sights. Prodromos continues to ridicule his opponent who until yesterday was doing farmer's work, and now reads Plato's *Republic* which is implicitly stated through quotation from the beginning of Plato's piece.[183] Pordromos then warns his opponent by quoting Plato's *Phaedo* that "it is not permitted for the impure to approach what is pure."[184]

Prodromos here plays with ideas presented in *Phaedo* about the perfect philosophical life and eschatology. In this dialogue, which happens several hours before Socrates' death, Plato discusses the theory of Forms, argues about the immortality of the soul and at the end tells a myth about what happens to the soul after death. Among other things, Socrates explains that

[181] Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 333.
[182] Magdailono, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, 390.
[183] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 84-94, 70-71; Plato, "Republic", 972.
[184] Theodore Prodromos, *Philoplaton or Leather Tanner*, lines 94-95, 71; Plato, "Phaedo", 58. The same quotation is also employed by Proclus's *Theology of Plato*. See: *Poclus, The Six Books of Proclus, the Platonic Successor, on the Theology of Plato*, trans. Thomas Taylor (London: Printed for the author by A. J. Valpy, 1816), 5.

pure knowledge can be only acquired after death when the soul is freed from the material body, while in this life a philosopher needs to purify himself and refrain from all bodily pleasures in order to get as close to pure knowledge as possible.[185] Prodromos apparently inserts his own philosophical erudition to criticize his opponent who does not practice a true philosophical life and therefore is unable to attain the highest theological knowledge.[186]

He also seems to play with Platonic ideas about the destiny of the soul after the death from *Pheado* at the very end of his work. So Prodromos advises his opponent to read the Platonic book silently for himself because someone might hear him and punish his ignorance. And this person certainly cannot be Plato "because long ago his 'his soul fleeting from his limbs was gone to Hades', but rather one of his more noble friends."[187] Thus, by borrowing quotation from Homer's *Iliad*, Prodromos makes playful reference to Platonic teachings about the afterlife.

From *Philoplaton* it is evident that Prodromos fostered interest for Platonic theology. This is also attested in his *Verses of Lamentation on the Devaluation of Learning* where "Plato's Theology" is mentioned as one of the objects of his vast erudition.[188] Nevertheless, Prodromos's philosophical pursuits are certainly better reflected in his philosophical works such as commentaries on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, a treatise *About the Big and the Small*, and the philosophical dialogue *Xenedemos, or Voices*.[189] Thus, for instance, in *Xenedemos or Voices*, Prodromos criticizes the predicables as formulated by Porphyry in *Isagoge*, the introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*. In this dialogue, Xenedemos tells the story to his friend Musaeus about a conversation which he had with Theocles many years ago. Xenedemos, a

[185] Plato, "Phaedo," 58.
[186] Prodroms allusions about necessity of the soul and mind to prepare for the divine vision by detaching from bonds of common knowledge and material things also seem to derive from Proclus's *Theology of Plato*. See: Proclus, *The Six Books of Proclus, the Platonic Successor, on the Theology of Plato*, 132.
[187] Theodore Prodromos, Philoplaton or Leather Tanner, lines 124-132, 71.
[188] Zagklas, "Theodore Prodromos: the Neglected Poems and Epigrams", 289.
[189] Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium*, 252; Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*, 50.

young student then, met Theocles accidently on the street. When he found out that Xenedemos was taking classes at the school of the famous philosopher Hermagoras and that he was studying Aristotle's *Categories*, Theocles started the conversation about the definition of five predicables or "voices" in Porphyry's *Isagoge*. Theocles was asking Xenedemos to tell him Porphyry's definition of each predicable, namely genus, species, differentia, property and accident, and then through questions was demonstrating that Porphyry's definitions are wrong.[190]

Xenedemos or Voices, though fictive dialogue, clearly reflects the relevant philosophical issues in twelfth-century Byzantium.[191] Prodromos's criticism of Porphyry's definition is particularly valuable if we take into account that, together with Aristotle's *Categories*, *On Interpretation* and *Prior Analytics*, Porphyry's *Isagoge* was part of the standard curriculum in Byzantine higher education.[192] However, *Xenedemos* as well as his commentary on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* and a treatise *About the Big and the Small* still require detailed philosophical studies which could give us a more complete picture of Prodromos's philosophical pursuits.

[190] Oksana Y. Goncharko and Dmitry A. Chernoglazov, "«Ксенедем» Феодора Продрома: возрождение платоновского диалога в Византии XII Века" [Theodoros Prodromos «Xenedemos»: Renaissance of Platonic Dialogue in the 12th century Byzantium]. *Вестник Русской христианской гуманитарной академии* 16 (2015), 30-35.

[191] Based on internal information which text itself provides, modern scholarship tried to identify one of the two main interlocutors, Theocles, with Michael Psellos and John Italos. For instance, see: Oksana Y. Goncharko and Dmitry A. Chernoglazov, "Платоновский диалог Ксенедем Феодора Продрома: псевдоантичные герои и их византийские прототипы," [Platonic Dialogue 'Xenedemos' by Theodoros Prodromos: Ancient Protagonists and their Byzantine Prototypes], ΣΧΟΛΗ. Философское антиковедение и классическая традиция 2 (2016), 571-582.

[192] Katerina Ierodiakanou and Dominic O'Meara, "Philosophies," in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys John Haldon, and Robin Cormack, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 716-718.

Conclusion

In my thesis I have shown how Prodromos in *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* used critique against incompetent intellectuals to display his own intellectual authority as a teacher, rhetorician and philosopher. I also demonstrated how he transforms Lucianic motifs and adjusts generic features in order to address a relevant contemporary issues in his own intellectual community.

In the first chapter I examined the generic position of Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian*. I demonstrated that although Prodromos does not explicitly state that he is writing satires, by exploiting ideas from Lucian's works and by his choice of theme – a critique of an inept intellectual, Prodromos positioned his works in line with a specific tradition of satirical writing. I argued that both of his works are written in a form of a satirical prose monologue through which Prodromos's delivers a harsh invective against incompetent scholars. I underlined that Prodromos probably writes his pieces either against a rival teachers or intellectuals or against stereotypical characters. The target audience of these pieces was probably a group of intellectuals, who were able to understand not only classical allusions, but also to identify with relevant issues in contemporary intellectual community which Prodromos criticizes. However, Prodromos does not follow strictly the form of Lucianic prose diatribes and he is mainly focused on the systematic refutation of his opponents. Compared to other satirical monologue, in Philoplaton and Grammarian invective ton prevails. This was not only in accordance with his own intention, but also with Byzantine sense of humor. Thus, Prodromos adjusts genre in accordance with the requirements of his own time, a literary taste of audience, and his own personal preferences

In the second chapter I demonstrated that Prodromos's *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* are not superficial imitation of Lucian's works without any literary merit of their own. While both

of his works were certainly inspired by Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector*, Prodromos in *Grammarian* exploits also ideas from other Lucian's works such as *Fisherman* and *A Professor of Public Speaking.* By examining the intertextual relationship between the aforementioned works of Lucian and two satires of Prodromos, I have demonstrated how Prodromos exploits them in a very original manner to construct harsh invective against his adversaries. Thus, Prodromos does not merely repeat motifs, quotations and allusions from Lucian's works, but skillfully modifies them for the purposes of his own work. Furthermore, by recognizing and elaborating on allusions to other classical texts which Lucian himself makes, Prodromos displays a great erudition in Attic Greek literature.

However, Prodromos choice to establish the generic and thematic connection with Lucian's *The Ignorant Book-Collector* for both of his works is not accidental. I argued that Prodromos certainly found this piece inspirational not only because it delivers attack against an incompetent intellectual, but also because Lucian portrays himself as a poor and competent scholar, as opposed to the wealthy unskilled adversary. For Prodromos, who himself lamented over degradation of intellectuals, difficulties to get access to the book collections and his own unenviable financial status, this was certainly appealing topic.

In third chapter I demonstrated how Prodromos through attack against unskilled adversaries successfully manages to portray himself as a competent grammarian, philosopher and rhetorician. In *Philoplaton* and *Grammarian* Prodromos plays with various rhetorical techniques characteristic for diatribe prose satires. I have shown that Prodromos in this manner displays not only advanced literary skills, but also a versatile classical erudition. Furthermore, Prodromos cunningly manipulates with different rhetorical devices in order to construct both a systematic refutation of his adversaries and a boastful self-image of experienced intellectual.

In terms of the art of grammar, I have shown that Prodromos's displays a great theoretical and practical expertise. I demonstrated that Prodromos's attack in *Grammarian* is not only based on his grammatical expertise, but also on his philosophical erudition. Thus, Prodromos criticism goes beyond the expertise of his opponent as a grammarian. The inept teacher is rebuked also because his knowledge is insufficient in respect of Platonic philosophy. An excellent grammarian has to possess also higher philosophical erudition in order to provide the best possible education for his students. This indicates not only that areas of expertise between teacher and philosopher were blurred, but also Prodromos's self-perception as universal teaching authority. I also demonstrated that Prodromos in *Philoplaton* establishes his own philosophical expertise by displaying a versatile Platonic knowledge which is skillfully in a short encomium to Plato. Prodromos manages in very skillful manner to put himself in the line of the eleventh and twelfth century Byzantine intellectuals, who were particularly concerned with the combined practice of philosophy and rhetoric. Furthermore, I underlined that in criticism against his opponent, Prodromos implies a particular interest in Platonic Theology.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Aesop. "104. The Fox and the Raven." In *Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek*, translated by Laura Gibbs. Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/323.htm.

———. "323. The Farmers, the Donkey and the Lion Skin." In *Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek*, translated by Laura Gibbs. Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/323.htm.

———. "350. Aphrodite and the Weasel" In *Aesopica: Aesop's fables in English, Latin and Greek*, translated by Laura Gibbs. Accessed April 30, 2017. http://mythfolklore.net/aesopica/oxford/350.htm.

Aphthonius the Sophist. "The Preliminary Exercises of Aphthonius the Sophist." In *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, translated by George Kennedy, 89-128. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Apollodorus. *The Library of Greek Mythology*. Translated by Robin Hard. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Aristotle. *On poetry and style*. Translated by George M. A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1989.

———. "Metaphysics." In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translatio*n, vol. II, translated by William David Ross, edited by Jonathan Barnes, .Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.

John of Sardis. "Selections from the Commentary on the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius Attributed to John of Sardis, Including Fragments of the Treatise on Progymnasmata by Sopratos." In *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, translated by George Kennedy, 173-228. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Lucian. "A Professor of Public Speaking." In *Lucian*, vol. 4, translated by A. M. Harmon, 135-171. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

———. "Alexander the False Prophet." In *Lucian*, vol. 4, translated by A. M. Harmon, 173-255. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

———. "Dialogues of the Dead." In *Lucian*, vol. 7, translated by M. D. MacLeod, 1-177. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

———. "Dialogues of the Gods." In *Lucian*, vol. 7, translated by M. D. MacLeod, 239-355. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

———. "Dialogues of the Sea-Gods." In *Lucian*, vol. 7, translated by M. D. MacLeod, 177-239. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961.

———. “Harmonides.” In *Lucian*, vol. 6, translated by K. Kilburn, 215-227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

———. “Philosophies for Sale.” In *Lucian*, vol. 2, translated by A. M. Harmon, 449-519. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1915.

———. “The Dead Come to Life, or the Fisherman.” In *Lucian*, vol. 3, translated by A. M. Harmon, 3-81. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

———. “The Ignorant Book-Collector.” In *Lucian*, vol. 3, translated by A. M. Harmon, 172-212. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

———. “The Lover of Lies or the Doubter.” In *Lucian*, vol. 3, translated by A. M. Harmon, 319-383. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.

———. “The Passing or Peregrinus.” In *Lucian*, vol. 5, translated by A. M. Harmon, 1-53. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

———. “The Ship or the Wishes.” In *Lucian*, vol. 6, translated by K. Kilburn, 429-489. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum I, edited by Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch and Friedrich Wilhelm Schneidewin. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 1839.

Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum II, edited by Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch. Gottingen: Sumptus fecit libraria Dieterichiana, 1851.

Constantine the Rhodian. “Poems against Leo Choirosphaktes and Theodore Paphlagon.” In *Anecdota graeca*, vol. 2, edited by Pietro Matranga, 625–32. Rome: Typis C.A. Bertinelli, 1850.

Herodotus. *The Histories*. Translated by Robin Waterfield, introduction by Carolyn Dewald. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hermogenes. “The Preliminary Exercises Attributed to Hermogenes.” In *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric,* translated by George Kennedy, 73-88. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Hörandner, Wolfram. *Theodoros Prodromos: Historische Gedichte*. Wiener Byzantinistiche Studien 11. Vienna: Österreichische Adademie der Wissenschaften, 1974.

Nicolaus the Sophist. “The Preliminary Exercises of Nicolaus the Sophist.” In *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, translated by George Kennedy, 129-173. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Novokhatko, Anna A, trans. and ed. *The invectives of Sallust and Cicero: critical edition with introduction, translation, and commentary*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Invectives*. Translated and edited by David Marsh. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Plato. “Republic.” In *Plato: Complete works*, translated by George M. A. Grube, revision by C.D.C. Reeve, edited by John M. Cooper and Douglas S. Hutchinson, 971-1224. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009.

———.“Gorgias.” In *Plato: Complete works*, translated by Donald J. Zeyl, edited by John M. Cooper and Douglas S. Hutchinson, 791-870. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009.

Prodromos, Theodore. “The Executioner or Doctor.” In “Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti.”, edited by Tommaso Migliorini, 51-69. Ph.D. diss., Università di Pisa, 2010.

———. “The Ignorant, or Self-Proclaimed Grammarian.” In “Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti.”, edited by Tommaso Migliorini, 29-51. Ph.D. diss., Università di Pisa, 2010.

———. “Philoplaton or Leather Tanner.” In “Gli scritti satirici in greco letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, edizione, traduzione e commenti.”, edited by Tommaso Migliorini, 69-83. Ph.D. diss., Università di Pisa, 2010.

Sextus Empiricus. “Against the Grammarians.” In *Sextus Empiricus*, *Against Professors*, translated by Robert G. Bury, 33-53. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Taylor, Thomas. trans. and ed. *The Six Books of Proclus, the Platonic Successor, on the Theology of Plato*. London: Printed for the author by A. J. Valpy, 1816.

Thrax, Dionysius. *The Grammar of Dionysius Thrax*. Translated by Thomas Davidson. St. Louis: R.P. Studley, 1874.

———. *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*. In *Grammatici Graeci*, III. Edited by Alfred Hilgard. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1901.

Theon, Aelius. “The Exercises of Aelius Theon.” *In Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, translated by George Kennedy, 1-72. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Tzetzes, John. *Biblion Istorikēs tēs dia stichōn politikōn alpha de kaloumenēs = Historiarum variarum chiliades*. Edited by Gottlieb Kiessling. Leipzig: Sumptibus F. C. G. Vogelii, 1826.

Xenophon. *Anabasis*: *books I-VII*. Translated by Carleton Lewis Brownson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

***Secondary literature**:*

Agapitos, Panagiotis A. “New Genres in the Twelfth Century: The Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos.” *Medioevo greco* (2015)15: 1-41

Alexiou, Margaret. “Literary Subversion and the Aristocracy in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Stylistic Analysis of the Timarion (ch. 6–10).” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 8, no. 1 (1982): 29–45.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky Poetics*. Edited and translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

-Baldwin, Barry “A Talent to Abuse: Some Aspects of Byzantine Satire.” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 8 (1982): 19–28.

———. “The Authorship of the Timarion.” In *Roman and Byzantine Papers,* edited by Barry Baldwin, 324-28. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1989.

———. “The ‘Mazaris’: Reflections and Reappraisal.” *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993): 345–58.

Bazzani, Marina. “The Historical Poems of Theodore Prodromos, the Epic-Homeric Revival and the Crisis of Intellectuals in the Twelfth Century.” *Byzantinoslavica* 65 (2007): 211-228.

Bernard, Floris. *Writing and reading Byzantine secular poetry, 1025-1081*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Browning, Robert. “Teachers.” In *The Byzantines*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo, translated by Thomas Dunlap, Teresa Lavender Fagan and Charles Lambert, 95-116. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. Originally published in Guglielmo Cavallo, ed., *L’Uomo bizantino*, (Rome: Giuseppe Laterza & Figli 1992).

Bzinkowski, Michał. “Notes on Eschatological Patterns in a 12th Century Anonymous Satirical Dialogue the *Timarion*.” *Eos: Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum* 102, vol. 1 (2015): 129-48.

Cullhed, Eric. “Theodore Prodromos in the Garden of Epicurus.” In *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, edited by Averil Cameron and Niels Gaul. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Detienne, Marcel. *The gardens of Adonis: spices in Greek mythology*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Garland, Lynda. “‘And His Bald Head Shone Like a Full Moon ...’: an appreciation of the Byzantine sense of humour as recorded in historical sources of the eleventh and twelfth Centuries.” *Parergon* 8, no. 1 (1990): 1-31.

———. “Mazaris’s Journey to Hades: Further Reflections and Reappraisal.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007): 183-214.

Goncharko, Oksana Y., and Dmitry A. Chernoglazov. “«Ксенедем» Феодора Продрома: возрождение платоновского диалога в Византии XII Века.” [Theodoros Prodromos «Xenedemos»: Renaissance of Platonic Dialogue in the 12th century Byzantium]. *Вестник Русской христианской гуманитарной академии* 16 (2015): 30-37.

———. “Платоновский диалог Ксенедем Феодора Продрома: псевдоантичные герои и их византийские прототипы.” [Platonic Dialogue ‘Xenedemos’ by Theodoros Prodromos: Ancient Protagonists and their Byzantine Prototypes]. ΣΧΟΛΗ. *Философское антиковедение и классическая традиция* 2 (2016): 571-582.

Grünbart, Michael. “Paideia Connects: The Interaction Between Teachers and Pupils in Twelfth-Century Byzantium.” In *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, C. 1000-1200*, edited by Sita Steckel, Niels Gaul, and Michael Grünbart, 17–33. Zürich: Byzantinistische Studien und Texte LIT, 2014.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Hunger, Herbert. "On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23/24 (1969/1970): 15-38.

———. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. II. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978.

Ierodiakanou, Katerina and Dominic O'Meara. "Philosophies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys, John Haldon, and Robin Cormack, 711-720. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth. "Rhetoric in Byzantium." In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington, 166-184. Malden (Mass.): Wiley-Blackwell 2010.

Kazhdan, Alexander and Simon Franklin. *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Kaldellis, Anthony. *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. "The Timarion: Toward a Literary Interpretation." In *La face cachée de la littérature byzantine: Le texte en tant que message immédiat.* Actes du colloque international, Paris, 5-6-7 juin 2008 organisé par le centre d'études byzantines de l'EHESS, edited by Paolo Odorico, 275-88. Paris: École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Centre d'études byzantines, néo-helléniques et sud-est européennes, 2012.

Kennedy, George A. "Language and Meaning in Archaic and Classical Greece." In *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism,* vol. 1, edited by George A. Kennedy, 78-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

———. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Krallis, Dimitris. "Harmless Satire, Stinging Critique: Notes and Suggestions for Reading the Timarion." In *Power and Subversion in Byzantium: Papers from 43rd Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies: Birmingham March 2010*, edited by Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby, 221-45. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Knight, Charles A. *The literature of satire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Kucharski, Janek, and Marciniak, Przemysław. "The Beard and its Philosopher: Theodore Prodromos on the Philosopher's Beard in Byzantium." *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2016): 45-54.

Kustas, George L. "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric." *Viator* 1 (1971): 55-74.

Kyriakis, Michael J. "Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium." *Byzantina* 5 (1973): 290-306.

Magdalino, Paul. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, *1143-1180.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Marciniak, Przemysław. "Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis: A Reappraisal." in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013): 219-39.

———. "Prodromos, Aristophanes and a Lustful Woman.", *Byzantinoslavica - Revue Internationale des Etudes Byzantines* 73 (2015): 23-34.

Mirenayat, Sayyed Ali, and Elaheh Soofastaei. "Gerard Genette and the Categorization of Textual Transcendence." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5 (2015): 534-536.

Mullett, Margaret. "The Madness of Genre." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992): 233-243.

Papademetriou, John-Theophanes A. "Some Aesopic Fables in Byzantium and the Latin West: Tradition, Diffusion, and Survival." *Illinois Classical Studies* 08 (1983): 122-136.

Papaioannou, Stratis. Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Penella, Robert J. "The *Progymnasmata* in Imperial Greek Education." *Classical World* 105, no. 1 (2011): 77-90.

Podestà, Giuditta. "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo." pt. 1, *Aevum* 19 (1945): 239–252.

———, "Le satire lucianesche di Teodoro Prodromo." pt. 2, *Aevum* 21 (1947): 3-25.

Relihan, Joel. *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Robins, Robert Henry. *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 70). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993.

Romano, Roberto. *La Satira bizantina dei secoli XI-XV*. Turin: Unione Tipografica 1999.

Van Opstall, Emilie. "The pleasure of mudslinging: an invective dialogue in verse from 10th century Byzantium." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 108, no. 2 (2015): 771-796.

Weinbrot, Howard D. *Menippean satire reconsidered: from antiquity to the eighteenth century*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Wouters, Alfons and Pierre Swiggers, "Definitions of Grammar." In *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship,* vol. 1, edited by Franco Montanari, Stephanos Matthaios, and Antonios Rengakos, 514-544. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Zagklas, Nikos. "Theodore Prodromos: the Neglected Poems and Epigrams." PhD diss., University of Vienna, 2014.