

# “Hurry up, reap every flower of the *logoi!*” The Use of Greek Novels in Byzantium

*Ingela Nilsson and Nikos Zagklas*

THE REAPPEARANCE of the Greek novel in twelfth-century Constantinople, about 800 years after Heliodorus had composed the ‘last’ ancient novel, is most often described as a novelistic revival. The ancient models were rediscovered and explored in a series of Komnenian rewritings, composed by learned members of the intellectual and courtly circles of the Byzantine capital.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, the ancient novels had never quite disappeared from the Byzantine literary tradition; when they ‘reappeared’ they had been read, used, and commented upon for centuries.<sup>2</sup> The Komnenian novels may accordingly be seen rather as the culmination of a long-term interest, reflected also in the overall twelfth-century popularity of ‘novelistic’ or ‘romancing’ modes of composition

<sup>1</sup> For two recent surveys with updated bibliographies see I. Nilsson, “Romantic Love in Rhetorical Guise: The Byzantine Revival of the Twelfth Century,” and P. Roilos, “‘I grasp, oh artist, your enigma, I grasp your drama’: Reconstructing the Implied Audience of the Twelfth-Century Byzantine Novel,” both in C. Cupane and B. Krönung (eds.), *Fictional Storytelling in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond* (Leiden/Boston 2016) 39–66 and 463–478. Edition with Italian translation of all four Komnenian novels in F. Conca, *Il romanzo bizantino del XII secolo* (Turin 1994), and English translation with introductions and brief notes in E. Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* (Liverpool 2012).

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. P. A. Agapitos, “Narrative, Rhetoric and ‘Drama’ Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus,” in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus* (Cambridge 1998) 125–156; J. B. Burton, “Byzantine Readers,” in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel* (Cambridge 2008) 272–281.

in various genres, including historiography and hagiography.<sup>3</sup> Given these circumstances, it has recently been argued that the Komnenian novels can be seen as a key to understanding the literary trends of twelfth-century Byzantium.<sup>4</sup>

Here we wish to offer a related but slightly different perspective by considering the Komnenian use of the ancient novels beyond the rewriting of fiction and the use of ‘novelistic’ discourse. We shall start by offering a brief account of the late antique and Byzantine testimonia up to the twelfth century, previously published and discussed by other scholars. In the second section we discuss a series of epigrams on Greek novels (both ancient and Komnenian), which to a certain extent have been ignored in previous scholarship. We shall then proceed to two new text witnesses that point in the direction of educational circles in Komnenian Constantinople: two grammar exercises (*schede*) based on Achilles Tatius’ novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*. We offer a preliminary edition and translation of these two texts, along with some brief commentary. Finally, we shall discuss some evidence that highlights the association of the Komnenian novels with the contemporary educational setting. By bringing this material together and discussing the potentially educational relation between the ancient and the Komnenian novel, we hope to offer a more nuanced image of the novel and its contexts of use in twelfth-century Byzantium.

*‘Brimming with grace and flowers’ – the usefulness of the novels*

The reception of the Greek novel in Byzantium has most often focused on Heliodorus’ *Charicleia and Theagenes* (or *Aethi-*

<sup>3</sup> See esp. M. Mullett, “Novelisation in Byzantium: Narrative after the Revival of Fiction,” in J. Burke et al. (eds.), *Byzantine Narrative: Papers in Honour of R. Scott* (Melbourne 2006) 1–28 (repr. M. Mullett, *Letters, Literacy and Literature in Byzantium* [Aldershot 2007], no. XI), and Ch. Messis, “Fiction and/or Novelisation in Byzantine Hagiography,” in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography II Genres and Contexts* (Farnham 2014) 313–341. For the relation between novel and hagiography see also n.18 below.

<sup>4</sup> I. Nilsson, *Raconter Byzance: la littérature au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 2014).

*opica*), which may be explained by the rather large number of testimonia referring to this novel.<sup>5</sup> In contrast, the reception of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* has received less attention, perhaps because of the modern idea that it was less appreciated by the Byzantines. The most thorough discussions of the novels of Heliodorus and Tatius are to be found in Photios' *Bibliothēke* (9<sup>th</sup> cent.) and in the *Synkrisis* by Michael Psellos (11<sup>th</sup> cent.), both of whom pointed out similarities and differences as regards the two novels' content and style.<sup>6</sup> *Charicleia* was considered more chaste as far as content was concerned, because of the behaviour of the heroine, but in spite of the indecency of *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Photios appreciated its stylistic qualities. Psellos, too, while primarily defending *Charicleia* against its alleged critics, underlined the sweetness of Tatius' style.<sup>7</sup> When the Komnenian novelists chose their models, Theodore Prodromos in his verse novel *Rhodanthe and Dosicles* opted for a Heliodorian opening and a chaste tone, but he also borrowed extensively from Tatius; Niketas Eugenianos used a similar opening in his *Drosilla and Charikles*, but combined it with a bucolic and playful style drawn from Hellenistic poetry and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.<sup>8</sup> Their contemporary Eumathios Makrembolites<sup>9</sup> paraphrased large parts of *Leucippe and Clitophon*

<sup>5</sup> First gathered and published in A. Colonna's edition of Heliodorus, *Heliodori Aethiopica* (Rome 1938), then discussed in H. Gärtner, "Charikleia in Byzanz," *A&A* 15 (1968) 47–69, followed three decades later by Agapitos, in *Studies in Heliodorus* 125–156.

<sup>6</sup> For a thorough discussion see Agapitos, in *Studies in Heliodorus* 128–137.

<sup>7</sup> Photios *Bibl. cod.* 87; Psellos *Synkrisis* 6–13 and 67–69 Dyke.

<sup>8</sup> For a comparison of the two openings modelled on Heliodorus see Agapitos, in *Studies in Heliodorus* 148–151, discussed by Nilsson, *Raconter Byzance* 74–86. On bucolic poetry in Eugenianos see J. B. Burton, "A Re-emergence of Theocritean Poetry in the Byzantine Novel," *CP* 98 (2003) 251–273, and "From Theocritean to Longan Bucolic: Eugenianos' *Drosilla and Charicles*," *GRBS* 52 (2012) 684–713.

<sup>9</sup> On the name Eumathios (rather than Eustathios) Makrembolites see Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* 159–160.

in his prose novel *Hysmine and Hysminias*.<sup>10</sup> The fragmentary state of the novel by Constantine Manasses, *Aristandros and Kallithea*, makes it difficult to assess his use of models, but the preserved verses point in the direction of Heliodorus, Tatius, and Longus, while some of his other works draw rather extensively on Tatius.<sup>11</sup>

In fact, both ancient novels were used in accordance with their respective benefits: whereas a beautiful form could be imitated and turned into one's own, the content could—if needed—be interpreted symbolically or allegorically. Such a reading is offered in the interpretation (ἐρμηνευμα) that has come down to us under the name Philippos the Philosopher.<sup>12</sup> Datings of this text have varied between the fifth and the twelfth centuries, though most scholars now seem to agree on a late date, a Sicilian setting, and the author Philagathos of Cerami.<sup>13</sup> Similar readings of both novels are suggested in

<sup>10</sup> I. Nilsson, *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure: Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' Hysmine & Hysminias* (Uppsala 2001) 166–260.

<sup>11</sup> See e.g. I. Nilsson, “Narrating Images in Byzantine Literature: The Ekphraseis of Konstantinos Manasses,” *JÖB* 55 (2005) 121–146, here 136 n.39 (on the *Synopsis Chronike*), and Ch. Messis and I. Nilsson, “Constantin Manassès, La description d'un petit homme. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaires,” *JÖB* 65 (2015) 169–194, here 173 (on the *Description of a Little Man*).

<sup>12</sup> First published by R. Hercher, “Τῆς Χαρικλείας ἐρμηνευμα τῆς σώφρονος ἐκ φωνῆς Φιλίππου τοῦ φιλοσόφου,” *Hermes* 3 (1869) 382–388; included in Colonna, *Heliodori Aethiopica*, as no. XIII (identifying the author as Theophanes/Philagathos of Cerami, bishop of Rossano, d. 1154); Engl. transl. R. Lambertson, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (Berkeley 1986) 306–311.

<sup>13</sup> On the issue of Philippos vs. Philagathos see P. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel* (Cambridge [Mass.] 2005) 130 n.79. Cf. now N. Bianchi, *Il codice del romanzo: tradizione manoscritta e ricezione dei romanzi greci* (Bari 2006) 7–75; M. Duluş, “Philagathos of Cerami and the Monastic Renewal in the Twelfth-Century Norman Kingdom: Preaching and Persuasion,” in N. Bianchi (ed.), *La Tradizione dei testi Greci in Italia Meridionale, Filagato da Cerami philosophos e didaskalos. Copisti, lettori, eruditi in Puglia tra XII e XVI secolo* (Bari 2011) 54–62. Only Acconcia Longo has

epigrams from various centuries, to which we shall return below. Here we focus rather on the usefulness of novelistic discourse that both Photios and Psellos noted, and which is expressed also in a text recently dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century by Wolfram Hörandner, the anonymous *On the four parts of the perfect speech*. Here both novels are included in a list of recommended readings for emulation:<sup>14</sup>

ἀνάγνωθι Λευκίππην, Χαρίκλειαν, Λουκιανόν, Συνέσιον, Ἀλκίφρονος ἐπιστολάς, ἢ πρώτη χαρίτων καὶ ἄνθους γέμει, ἢ δευτέρα χαρίτων μετὰ σαφροσύνης πλήρης, ὁ τρίτος παντοδαπὸν ἔχει τὸ καλόν, ὁ τέταρτος σεμνὸς καὶ ὀγκηρός. αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ πολὺ τὸ πιθανὸν καὶ εὐπλαστον ἔχουσι. [...] εἰ θέλεις εὐδοκιμεῖν ἐν τοῖς νῦν καιροῖς, μικτοὺς ἐργάζου λόγους ἔκ τε ῥητορικῶν ἐννοιῶν καὶ φιλοσόφων.

Read *Leucippe*, *Charicleia*, Lucian, Synesios, letters of Alkiphron. The first is brimming with grace and flowers, the second is filled with grace and self-control, the third has all sorts of good things, the fourth is solemn and pompous. The letters are very persuasive and well written. [...] If you wish to succeed in our times, compose discourses mixed from both philosophical and rhetorical ideas.

The passage echoes ideas expressed by both Photios and Psellos, underlining the usefulness of reading and imitating and thus composing “mixed discourses”—to create your own style based on those of others. Such a practice is underlined especially in Psellos’ treatise *On the different styles of certain writings* (Περὶ χαρακτήρων συγγραμμάτων τινῶν),<sup>15</sup> in which the

adhered to a fifth-century dating: “La ‘questione’ Filippo il Filosofo,” *Nea Rhome* 7 (2010) 11–40, and “La letteratura italogreca nell’XI e XII secolo,” *Byzantino-sicula* 6 (2014) 107–130, esp. 126 n.107.

<sup>14</sup> W. Hörandner, “Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios *Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede*,” *Medioevo Greco* 12 (2012) 87–131, here 105; transl. P. Marciniak, “Reinventing Lucian in Byzantium,” *DOP* 70 (2016) 209–223, here 216 (slightly revised).

<sup>15</sup> In J. F. Boissonade, *De operatione daemonum* (Nuremberg 1838) 48–52; Engl. transl. C. Barber and S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art: A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics* (Notre Dame 2017) 99–107.

process of building solid rhetorical compositions is likened to that of building a house—you need both the foundational authors (such as Demosthenes, Thucydides, Plato, Plutarch, and Gregory of Nazianzus) and the more charming and decorative building blocks (such as the novelists, Lucian, and Philostratus).

As a result, both Heliodorus and Tatius are used for ‘flower-picking’ in various periods and contexts, ranging from Musaeus’ use of *Leucippe and Clitophon* in his *Hero and Leander* (late fifth century)<sup>16</sup> to the borrowings from both Heliodorus and Tatius in a sermon of Maximus the Confessor (seventh century)<sup>17</sup> and those from Tatius in the tenth-century *Life of Theoktiste of Lesbos*.<sup>18</sup> In the twelfth century such procedures become even more intense; apart from the Komnenian novels, we may note for instance the recently discovered use of Helio-

<sup>16</sup> For a recent discussion of *Hero and Leander*, its date, and its relation to the novel, see N. N. Dümmler, “Musaeus, *Hero and Leander*: Between Epic and Novel,” in M. Baumbach and S. Bär (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and its Reception* (Leiden 2012) 411–446. It should be noted that the dating of Musaeus’ poem to the end of the fifth century remains uncertain.

<sup>17</sup> Maximos Conf. *Serm.* 3 (PG 91.744), cf. Heliodorus 4.4.4 and Tatius 1.5.6 (on the force of love): see S. MacAlister, *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London/New York 1996) 110 n.39.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. I. Nilsson, “The Same Story but Another: A Reappraisal of Literary Imitation in Byzantium,” in A. Rhoby and E. Schiffer (eds.), *Imitatio – aemulatio – variatio* (Vienna 2010) 195–208, here 204–205. On the relation between novel and hagiography more generally see I. Nilsson, “Desire and God Have Always Been Around, in Life and Romance Alike,” in *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the Poetics of Love and the Erotics of Reading* (Copenhagen 2009) 235–260; Messis, in *The Ashgate Research Companion* 313–341; and St. Papaioannou, *Christian Novels from the Menologion of Symeon Metaphrastes* (Cambridge [Mass]. 2017) xiii–xviii. This relation is now at the focus of the ERC project “Novel Saints. Ancient novelistic heroism in the hagiography of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages” at the University of Gent, led by Koen de Temmermann and expected to result in numerous studies, including closer analyses of the use of both Heliodorus and Tatius in late antique and Byzantine hagiography.

dorus in the anonymous satirical dialogue *Timarion*<sup>19</sup> and that of Tatius in a long anonymous south-Italian poem addressed to George of Antioch in the 1140s.<sup>20</sup> Against this background of a practically unbroken tradition of using both Greek novels for various rhetorical and literary purposes,<sup>21</sup> we now turn to a series of epigrams associated with ancient and Byzantine novels in order to take a brief look at the kind of readings they impose on them and what evidence they provide about their contexts of use.

*The novels and the 'epigrammatic habit':  
levels of readership and contexts of audience*

The circulation of ancient novels was constant and more or less uninterrupted, even before the reappearance of novel-writing in the twelfth century. Beyond the fair number of

<sup>19</sup> B. MacDougall, "The Festival of Saint Demetrios, the *Timarion*, and the *Aithiopika*," *BMGS* 40 (2016) 136–150.

<sup>20</sup> See the numerous references in the edition by I. Vassis and I. Polemis, *Ένας Έλληνας έξοριστος στην Μάλτα του δωδεκάτου αιώνα. Το ποίημα του Έλληνικού Κώδικα της Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης της Μαδρίτης 4577* (Athens 2016). At one point (2250–2268), the poet even borrows the entire myth of Pan and Syrinx from Tatius' novel. Interestingly, one manuscript of Tatius' novel circulated in twelfth-century southern Italy: S. Lucà, "Note per la storia della cultura greca della Calabria medioevale," *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 74 (2007) 43–101, here 55.

<sup>21</sup> The slight evidence for the 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> centuries should probably be expected in light of the overall situation, but one should note the use of Tatius in the ε recension of the Alexander romance, dated to the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> century; see C. Jouanno, *Naissance et métamorphoses du Roman d'Alexandre* (Paris 2002) 392–400, and S. Trzaskoma, "Some New Imitations of Achilles Tatius in the ε Recension of the *Alexander Romance*," *Exemplaria Classica* 18 (2014) 73–79. Trzaskoma's interest in the Byzantine use of Tatius has also led him to authors such as Theodoros Daphnopates and John Kaminiates (both 10<sup>th</sup> cent.): "The Storms in Theodoros Daphnopates (Ep. 36), Symeon Metaphrastes (BHG 1878) and Achilles Tatius (3.1.1–5.6)," *Byzantion* (forthcoming), and "Another Question addressed to the Scholars who believe in the Authenticity of Kaminiates' 'Capture of Thessalonica,'" *BZ* (forthcoming).

manuscripts that have come down to us,<sup>22</sup> quite a few ‘metrical paratexts’ or ‘book epigrams’<sup>23</sup> survive, either attached to a copy of a novel in a manuscript—the ‘epigrammatic habit’, as Paul Magdalino calls it<sup>24</sup>—or as ‘literary epigrams’ in various poetic anthologies and *syllogai*. In either case, they illustrate the wide use of the novels and at the same time help us to contextualize their Byzantine reading.

Such a ‘literary epigram’ is included in the *Greek Anthology* (9.203), written in the ninth century by either Photios or Leo the Philosopher.<sup>25</sup> A moralizing and potentially allegorical reading of Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon* is presented, ending with a sort of reading recommendation:

ἔρωτα πικρόν, ἀλλὰ σόφρονα βίον  
 ὁ Κλειτοφῶντος ὡσπερ ἐμφαίνει λόγος·  
 ὁ Λευκίπης δὲ σωφρονέστατος βίος  
 ἅπαντας ἐξίστησι, πῶς τετυμμένη  
 5 κεκαρμένη τε καὶ κατηχρειωμένη,  
 τὸ δὴ μέγιστον, τρὶς θανοῦσ’ ἔκαρτέρει.  
 εἴπερ δὲ καὶ σὺ σωφρονεῖν θέλῃς, φίλος,  
 μὴ τὴν πάρεργον τῆς γραφῆς σκόπει θεᾶν,  
 τὴν τοῦ λόγου δὲ πρῶτα συνδρομὴν μάθε·  
 10 νυμφοστολεῖ γὰρ τοὺς ποθοῦντας ἐμφρόνως.

<sup>22</sup> For example, Colonna, *Heliodori Aethiopica* VIII–XXVII, enumerates twenty-seven Byzantine and Post-Byzantine manuscripts.

<sup>23</sup> For the term see M. D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts* I (Vienna 2003) 197–212; also the database of Byzantine Book Epigrams, <http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/>.

<sup>24</sup> P. Magdalino, “Cultural Change? The Context of Byzantine Poetry from Geometres to Prodromos,” in F. Bernard and K. Demoen (eds.), *Poetry and its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium* (Farnham/Burlington 2012) 19–36, here 32.

<sup>25</sup> A. Colonna, “Un epigramma di Teodoro,” in S. Felici (ed.), *“Humanitas” classica e “sapientia” cristiana: scritti offerti a Roberto Lacoangeli* (Rome 1992) 61–63, attributes it to Photios (“attribuita con molta verosimiglianza al patriarca Fozio, dove la figura dell’eroina viene descritta ed esaltata con espressioni simili”), while Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry* I 200, writes that the author is Leo the Philosopher.



The story of Clitophon almost brings before our eyes a bitter passion but a moral life, and the most chaste conduct of Leucippe astonishes everyone. Beaten, her head shorn, vilely used, and above all, thrice done to death, she still bore all. If, my friend, you wish to live morally, do not pay attention to the adventitious beauty of the work, but first learn the conclusion of the discourse; for it joins in wedlock lovers who loved wisely.<sup>26</sup>

Regardless of who the author was, we should note that he was willing to read the novel as an adventurous story and, at the same time, a stylistic discourse. We need to acknowledge this acceptance of different levels (style, plot, and potential allegory) in order to understand not only the reading of novels, but Byzantine reading and composition at large. Moralizing, symbolic, and allegorical readings do not exclude other kinds of readings, so if the allegorical interpretation of Heliodorus by Philagathos of Cerami was indeed written in the twelfth century, it does not indicate that all novels were read allegorically in Byzantium, but rather that both ancient and Byzantine novels were considered particularly apt for allegorical interpretation: the rhetorically embellished representations of the sufferings of the protagonists and their struggle to be together could easily be read as the spiritual journey of the Christian soul—as may be suggested by the poem in the *Greek Anthology*.<sup>27</sup>

Furthermore, the novel by Heliodorus was frequently supplemented by such metrical paratexts throughout the Byzantine period. For instance, a dodecasyllabic two-line epigram is placed by the scribe between the title and the main text of the novel on fol. 1<sup>r</sup> of the thirteenth-century manuscript *Marc.gr*.

<sup>26</sup> Transl. W. R. Paton, slightly revised.

<sup>27</sup> On the understanding of novels as allegories see K. Plepelits, *Eustathios Makrembolites, Hysmine und Hysminias* (Stuttgart 1989); J. B. Burton, “Reviving the Pagan Greek Novel in a Christian World,” *GRBS* 39 (1998) 179–216; Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia*, esp. 113–224. For a Byzantine allegorical interpretation of a Palaiologan romance, often adduced as an indication that also Komnenian novels were read allegorically, see S. C. E. Martini, “A proposito d’una poesia inedita di Manuel File,” *RIL SER. II* 29 (1896) 465–469.

Z.409 (coll. 838),<sup>28</sup> while an epigram in elegiac couplets survives in at least two manuscripts.<sup>29</sup> In addition to these texts, there is a dodecasyllabic poem which has not yet been discussed in relation to the novels:<sup>30</sup>

ἔστυφελίχθην,<sup>31</sup> ὦ Χαρίκλεια κόρη,  
 ψυχὴν, λογισμὸν καὶ φρένας καὶ καρδίαν,  
 ἔγνωσεν σε καὶ ποθοῦσαν ἐξ εὐστοργίας,<sup>32</sup>  
 ὡς ὑπερηγάσθην σε καὶ κατεπλάγην  
 5 τοῦ σώφρονος νοῦ, τῶν καλῶν βουλευμάτων,<sup>33</sup>  
 τῆς καρτερίας πρὸς κακῶν ἀμετρίαν,  
 τοῦ τληπαθοῦς ἔρωτος εἰς Θεαγένην.  
 ὡς ὀλβία σὺ ταῖς ἐρώσασιν παρθένους,<sup>34</sup>  
 ἐρωμέναις δὲ πάλιν ὀλβιωτέρα.  
 10 κἄν δυστυχῆς ὁ πρῶτος ἐγνώσθη βίος,  
 ἀλλ' εὐτυχῆς ὁ λοῖσθος εὐρέθη γάμος.  
 Πεῖραν λαβοῦσα ληστρικῆς κακουργίας  
 ἄλλων τε δεινῶν ἐν μεθέξει μυρίων,  
 μακρὸν πλάνητον ἐκμετρήσασα χρόνον,

<sup>28</sup> The text is: χαράν γε πάντως ἀποδίδει οὐ κλέος / τῆς Χαρικλείας τοῦτο δὴ τὸ βιβλίον; for further information see <http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occurrence/view/id/7939/>.

<sup>29</sup> It survives isolated in the Latin MS. *Sloane* 2424, see R. Browning, "An Unpublished Epigram on Heliodorus' *Aethiopia*," *CR* 5 (1955) 141–143; and in the 16<sup>th</sup>-century *Vat. Barb. gr.* 69, see A. Colonna, "Su un nuovo epigramma al romanzo di Eliodoro," *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione della edizione nazionale dei Classici Greci e Latini* 4 (1956) 26–27.

<sup>30</sup> Colonna, in "Humanitas" 61–63; the poem is not mentioned by Agapitos, in *Studies in Heliodorus*.

<sup>31</sup> This rare form occurs twice in Eugenianos: *Drosilla and Charikles* 5.283 and 6.226.

<sup>32</sup> The same is attested for first time in Prodroimos: *Rodanthe and Dosikles* 7.312.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Eugenianos *Drosilla and Charikles* 8.163–164: ὦ σώφρονος νοῦ καὶ καλῶν βουλευμάτων / τῶν σῶν Χαρικλῆς πρὸς Δροσίλλαν ἀντέφη.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Eugenianos *Drosilla and Charikles* 6.457: ἡμᾶς τυραννεῖν τὰς ἐρώσας παρθένους.

15 τέλος συνήφθης – ὦ<sup>35</sup> καλῶν νυμφευμάτων –  
 τρισευτυχεῖ σῶ νυμφίῳ Θεαγένει.

I was astonished, Charicleia my girl, / in my soul and reason, my  
 mind and heart, / to find out that you suffered from love, / for  
 which I truly admired you and was amazed / by your chaste  
 disposition, your good sense, / your perseverance in countless  
 sufferings, / your long-suffering desire for Theagenes. / Thus,  
 you are blessed among maidens in love, / among those who are  
 desired the most blessed. / Even if the first part of your life was  
 unfortunate / the final marriage was fortunate. / Having experi-  
 enced piratical wickedness / and participated in a myriad of  
 other bad things, / having measured a long time of wanderings, /  
 you were finally united—o what lovely marriage ties!—/ with  
 your thrice-blessed bridegroom Theagenes.

The poem survives in three manuscripts, just after the text of  
 Heliodorus' novel: *Monac.gr.* 157 (first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> cent.; fol.  
 167<sup>v</sup>), *Paris.gr.* 2905 (16<sup>th</sup> cent.; fol. 154<sup>v</sup>), and *Vatic.Pal.gr.* 125  
 (16<sup>th</sup> cent.; fol. 159<sup>r</sup>).<sup>36</sup> However, Aristide Colonna has ten-  
 tatively attributed the authorship of the epigram to Prodrornos  
 on the basis of a lexical resemblance. He has claimed that  
 τρισευτυχής (16) is attested only in Prodrornos' historical poem  
 no. 9, sung by the Deme on Christmas.<sup>37</sup> But the word also  
 occurs in other poems by Prodrornos<sup>38</sup> and in the so-called  
*Astrological Poem* by Manasses,<sup>39</sup> while (as noted above) there are

<sup>35</sup> The editor gives ὦ.

<sup>36</sup> In all three the epigram is followed by another couple of epigrams (see  
 Colonna, *Heliodori* 372). However, they cannot be works of Prodrornos given  
 their numerous prosodic flaws; cf. W. Hörandner, "Zur Topik byzanti-  
 nischer Widmungs- und Einleitungsgedichte," in V. Panagl (ed.), *Dulce  
 melos: la poesia tardoantica e medievale* (Alessandria 2007) 319–335, here 334.

<sup>37</sup> Colonna, in "Humanitas" 62–63; for the text see W. Hörandner, *Theo-  
 doros Prodrornos, Historische Gedichte* (Vienna 1974) 246, poem 9C.9.

<sup>38</sup> Historical poems nos. 39.30 and 43D.1 and 24, as well as in a prose  
 epithalamion by Prodrornos, ed. P. Gautier, *Nicéphore Bryennios, Histoire*  
 (Brussels 1975) 351.23.

<sup>39</sup> Ed. E. Miller, "Poèmes astronomiques de Théodore Prodrome et de  
 Jean Camatère," *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale* 33.2

many more similarities between Prodromos' and Eugenianos' works in terms of wording. Moreover, there do not seem to be any prosodic errors that could be used as evidence against such an attribution.<sup>40</sup> Thus, even if Prodromos is not the author,<sup>41</sup> it is very likely that this epigram was written in the twelfth century and later copied and placed by the scribes next to Heliodorus' novel.

If this hypothesis is correct, the epigram affords us a glimpse into the reading of the ancient novels by a twelfth-century author who could be a novelist. Consistent with the other epigrams on the ancient novels, the narrator of the epigram, who can be identified with the reader of the novel, stresses that he is astonished by the sufferings that Chariclea underwent for the sake of her love for Theagenes and her chaste disposition throughout these wanderings. If we now turn to epigrams that were written for the Komnenian novels, we can see that their subject-matter similarly focuses on the sufferings and wanderings of the heroes. The epigram that was most probably added by George Hermonymos before Eugenianos' novel in the MS. *Paris.gr.* 2908 (ca. 1500) summarizes the novel by focusing on the very same features.<sup>42</sup> More importantly, Prodromos' dedicatory epigram for his *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*, which survives in the thirteenth-century *Pal.gr.* 43, is very similar in content to all the epigrams discussed above.<sup>43</sup>

---

(Paris 1872) 187. It also occurs in an anonymous verse chronicle written in 1394: C. Matzukis, *Ἡ Ἀλωσις τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Τετάρτη σταυροφορία – The Fall of Constantinople. Fourth Crusade* (Athens/Peristeri 2004) 271.

<sup>40</sup> In accordance with the Byzantine rules of prosody, the vowels ε and ο are always short, and η and ω always long, while the dichrona are scanned completely freely. As for the caesurae, eleven verses have it after the fifth syllable (of which seven are paroxytonic and four oxytonic) and the remaining five after the seventh (of which one paroxytonic and four proparoxytonic); cf. Hörandner, *Theodoros Prodromos, Historische Gedichte* 334.

<sup>41</sup> As has been argued by Gärtner, *A&A* 15 (1968) 69 n.61.

<sup>42</sup> For a discussion see Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* 343.

<sup>43</sup> For the text see P. A. Agapitos, "Poets and Painters: Theodoros Pro-

κούρης ἀργυφῆς καλλιστεφάνου τε Ῥοδάνθης  
 καὶ κούρου Δοσικλήος ἀγαπρεπέος τε καὶ ἐσθλοῦ  
 ταῦτα, φυγαί τε πλάναι τε κλυδώνων οἴδματα, λησταί,  
 ἀργαλαί στροφάλιγγες, ἐρωτοτόκοι μελεδῶνες,  
 5 δεσμά τ' ἀλυκτοπέδαί τε καὶ ὄρφοφόροισι μελάθροις  
 εἴρκτοσύναι, θυσίαι τε παναισχέες, ἄλγεα πι[κρά],  
 φαρμακόμεντα κύπελλα καὶ ἀρμονίης παραλύσεις,  
 ἐν δὲ γάμος τε λέχος τε καὶ ἡμερόεντες ἔρωτες.

These [are the adventures] of the silvery girl Rhodanthe with  
 the lovely garland / and of the valiant and comely youth  
 Dosikles, / the flights and wanderings and tempests and billows,  
 brigands, / grievous eddies, sorrows that give rise to love, /  
 chains and indissoluble fetters and imprisonment in gloomy /  
 dungeons, grim sacrifices, bitter grief, / poisoned cups and  
 paralysis of joints, / and then marriage and the marriage bed  
 and passionate love.

Prodromos went beyond the allegorical reading of his novel,  
 since in the dedicatory stanza that precedes the epigram he  
 included the simile of the writer as a painter,<sup>44</sup> but there are  
 certainly common motifs and themes in all epigrams written for  
 both ancient and Komnenian novels.<sup>45</sup> Such similarities are  
 only to be expected, since all these works belong to the literary  
 form of 'book epigrams' and both the ancient and the Kom-  
 nenian novels could be submitted to allegorical interpretation.

Furthermore, it is important to stress that all these metrical  
 paratexts function as hermeneutic anchors; once they are  
 attached to a novel, they create a framework within which the  
 reader may approach the work. Frequently, they even provide  
 some indications about the occasional audience of the novel,  
 especially in the absence of any other tangible evidence. Pro-

dromos' Dedicatory Verses on his Novel to an Anonymous Caesar," *JÖB*  
 50 (2000) 173–185, here 175–176; transl. Jeffrey, *Four Byzantine Novels* 20.

<sup>44</sup> On this theme see Agapitos, *JÖB* 50 (2000) 179–181.

<sup>45</sup> It may be worth noting the parallels between this epigram and the be-  
 ginning of Book 8 (8.1) in Chariton's *Chaïreas and Callirhoe*, probably the first  
 ancient novel, dated to the first century BCE.

dromos' dedicatory epigram is a case in point, since it tells us that a copy was presented to the son-in-law of Irene Doukaina: Nikephoros Bryennios, a well-known literary patron.<sup>46</sup> On this basis, it has been argued that the novel by Prodromos may have been composed for the literary circle of Irene Doukaina, the wife of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos.<sup>47</sup> These epigrams may accordingly help us to determine some details about the Byzantine reading and context, but at the same time we should not underestimate the circulation potential of the novels, be they ancient or Komnenian. Just as allegorical readings did not exclude other kinds of readings, the novels were not read by only one kind of audience (e.g. the circles of the Constantinopolitan literary magnates).<sup>48</sup> In particular, it cannot be ruled out that they were also used in an educational setting. For example, in the thirteenth-century south-Italian MS. *Marc.gr. Z. 410* (coll. 522) there is a six-line epigram right after the end of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (on fol. 121<sup>v</sup>).<sup>49</sup> The epigram concludes with an invitation to the reader/audience of his work to "hurry up" and "reap every flower [or learning] of the *logoi*," σπεύδαιολοιπὸν πᾶσαν δρέπε γνῶσιν λόγων—which points in the direction of an educational use. In fact, there is some further evidence for the use of both the ancient and the Komnenian novels in the twelfth-century educational setting.

*Leucippe and Clitophon in two twelfth-century schedae*

*Schedae* ('sketches' or 'improvisations') are Byzantine compositions—particularly popular in the Komnenian period—that

<sup>46</sup> For the dedicatory poem see Agapitos, *JÖB* 50 (2000) 173–185, and Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* 7–10 (with references to previous literature).

<sup>47</sup> Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* 9–10 (with bibliography).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Roilos, in *Fictional Storytelling* 39–66.

<sup>49</sup> The epigram has been attributed to Philagathos of Cerami, since it survives before his allegorical interpretation of Heliodorus: A. Colonna, "Un epigramma di Filagato da Cerami sul romanzo di Eliodoro," in *Lirica greca da Archiloco a Elitis: Studi in onore di Filippo Maria Pontani* (Padua 1984) 247–248.

trained the students in recognizing and correcting ancient grammar and syntax.<sup>50</sup> Some of them have the form of rhetorical exercises (e.g. ethopoeia or ekphrasis), while some paraphrase texts by ancient authors such as Homer, Aelian, Euripides, Libanios, or Lucian. They are written in prose or in verse, or sometimes in a ‘mixed form’.<sup>51</sup> Until quite recently there was little interest in these school exercises, but schedography has received a reevaluation in the last few years, not least in the series of articles by Agapitos.<sup>52</sup> Like any school exercise, schedography influenced the production of texts and is therefore crucial for our understanding of Komnenian literature.

There are about twenty manuscripts with schedographic collections,<sup>53</sup> with the thirteenth-century *Vat.Pal.gr.* 92 being one of the richest and most important. There is no consensus for this manuscript’s place of production: whereas Daniele Arnesano has argued that it was produced in Salento,<sup>54</sup> Ioannis

<sup>50</sup> For a description of the aims a *schedos* intended to serve see P. A. Agapitos, “Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: A Scientific Paradigm and its Implications,” *JÖB* 64 (2014) 1–22, here 5. For further considerations on the function of *schede* see I. Vassis, “Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαιίσματα: Ἡ συλλογὴ σχεδῶν τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92,” *Hellenika* 52 (2002) 37–68, esp. 39–44.

<sup>51</sup> See Agapitos, *JÖB* 64 (2014) 5, and N. Zagklas, “Experimenting with Prose and Verse in Twelfth-Century Byzantium: A Preliminary Study,” *DOP* 71 (2017).

<sup>52</sup> Agapitos, *JÖB* 64 (2014) 1–22; “Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse,” *Νέα Πώμη* 10 (2013 [2014]) 89–107; “Literary Haute Cuisine and its Dangers: Eustathios of Thessalonike on Schedography and Everyday Language,” *DOP* 69 (2015) 225–241; “New Genres in the Twelfth Century: The *Schedourgia* of Theodore Prodromos,” *Medioevo Greco* 15 (2015) 1–41; “Learning to Read and Write a *schedos*: The Verse Dictionary of Paris. gr. 400,” in S. Efthymiadis et al. (eds.), “*Pour une poétique de Byzance*”: *Hommage à Vassilis Katsaros* (Paris 2015) 11–24; “John Tzetzes and the Blemish Examiner: A Byzantine Teacher on Schedography, Everyday Language and Writerly Disposition,” *Medioevo Greco* 17 (2017) 1–57.

<sup>53</sup> See Agapitos, *JÖB* 64 (2014) 5.

<sup>54</sup> D. Arnesano, *La minuscula “barocca”*: *Scritture e libri in Terra d’Otranto nei*

Polemis has put forward the hypothesis that the manuscript was copied in Epiros.<sup>55</sup> The greatest portion of the material in the manuscript remains unpublished and thus understudied. In addition to paraphrases of texts of many well-known ancient authors, the manuscript preserves two little-known prose paraphrases of Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*.<sup>56</sup> We shall return to the question of why this novel might have been suitable for schedographic reworkings, but let us first look at the *schede* in question.

The first *schedos*, anonymously transmitted (fol. 144<sup>v</sup>–145<sup>r</sup>), offers a paraphrase of *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.18, an emotionally charged scene in which the hero Clitophon is handed a letter from his beloved Leucippe, whom he believes to be dead.<sup>57</sup>

144<sup>v</sup> οὕτω μὲν ὁ Σάτυρος ὀρέγει μοι τὴν ἐπιστολήν. ἐγὼ δὲ  
γνωρίσας τὰ γράμματα, καὶ θρήνου πλησθεὶς, δάκρυον

<sup>55</sup> *secoli XIII e XIV* (Galatina 2008) 78.

<sup>55</sup> I. D. Polemis, “Μία ὑπόθεση γιὰ τὴν προέλευση τῆς σχεδογραφικῆς συλλογῆς τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus graecus 92,” in E. Karalengou and E. D. Makrygianni (eds.), *Αντιφίλησις: Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture: In Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou* (Stuttgart 2009) 558–565.

<sup>56</sup> Vassis, *Hellenika* 52 (2002) 49 (no. 57) and 58 (no. 158).

<sup>57</sup> In following the example of other editors (e.g. I. Vassis, “Graeca sunt, non leguntur. Zu den schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodromos,” *BZ* 86/87 [1993/94] 1–19, esp. 14–19, and I. D. Polemis, “Προβλήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς σχεδογραφίας,” *Hellenika* 45 [1995] 277–302), the text of the two *schede* is firstly edited in a diplomatic form along with an apparatus that provides all the interlinear glosses of the manuscript; thereupon, we attempt to present a critical edition along with a translation in order to facilitate their understanding for the modern reader. However, it is important to stress that what we offer is far from the definitive text, since there are still some unsettled issues (especially regarding the second *schedos*). This is hardly surprising, for there has not yet been an edition of an entire schedographic collection that will shed light on all the kinds of puzzles that such texts contain. Fortunately, Ioannis Vassis and Ioannis Polemis are working on the edition of the whole collection of *schede* preserved in *Vat.Pal.gr.* 92.



ἀνηκόντιζον ἀπ' ὠπῶν· οὐ μικροῦ· ἐφλέγετό μου ἡ καρδία,  
 καὶ ἔτ' ἠπίσται συνελαυνομένη ἐπὶ τὸ ἀναμιμνήσκεσθαι τῶν  
 5 συμβάντων μοι τῷ τότε λυπηρῶν· εἴτ' ὠχρία καινῆ συμφορᾶ  
 συσχεθεῖς, ἐνεχαράττετο τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ῥησεῖδια τοιάδε· οἶδας  
 μὲν, ὅσα διὰ σὲ πέπονθα ἢ ἀθλία· διὰ σὲ τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίαν  
 κατέλιπον, αἶ. ὡς συσχεθεῖσα πάθει ἐρωτικῷ. διὰ σὲ φίλτρον  
 οὐκ ἐνεδειξάμην ἄστοργος φανεῖσα τῇ φύσει· κατέσχον με διὰ  
 10 σὲ ὑπ' ἄλαις συνεχεῖς πόνοι· διὰ σὲ δαῖς πω, τὰ ναβάγια πέ-  
 145<sup>r</sup> πονθα· βαρβάρων γεγонуῖα ληστῶν· καὶ τέθηκα || δῖς σοι  
 ἀκέραιον ἤδη τὸ φίλτρον φυλάττουσα. καὶ ἄλλα μυρία  
 ὑπέστην δεινά· διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα πέπονθε μῶν. ἢ ἀθλία Λευ-  
 κίπη ἴνα σὺ μιγῆς ἐταίρα γυναικὶ κ' ἐγὼ δ' ἐτέρῳ σύζυγος  
 15 ἔσομαι.  
 ὄναιο λοιπὸν Κλειτοφῶν καινῶν γάμων·  
 ἔρρωσο καὶ γίνωσκε παρθένο(ν) μένειν  
 τὴν πρὶν ποθεινὴν νῦν δέ σοι μισητέαν.

Suprascripts: 3 ὠπῶν] ὀφθαλμῶν 5 καινῆ] χαλεπῆ 6 τοιάδε]  
 τοιαύτα 8 αἶ] φεῦ 9 τῇ φύσει] τῇ μητρὶ 10 ἄλαις] πλάναις || δαῖς]  
 εὐωχία 11 δῖς] ἐκ δευτέρου 13 μῶν] ἄρα 16 ὄναιο] ἀπόλαυε

οὕτω μὲν ὁ Σάτυρος ὀρέγει μοι τὴν ἐπιστολήν. ἐγὼ δὲ  
 γνωρίσας τὰ γράμματα καὶ θρήνου πλησθεῖς, δάκρυον ἀνη-  
 κόντιζον ἀπ' ὠπῶν· οὐ μικροῦ ἐφλέγετό μου ἡ καρδία, καὶ  
 ἔτ' ἠπίσται συνελαυνομένη ἐπὶ τῷ ἀναμιμνήσκεσθαι τῶν  
 5 συμβάντων μοι τῷ τότε<sup>58</sup> λυπηρῶν. εἴτ' ὠχρία καινῆ συμφορᾶ  
 συσχεθεῖς· ἐνεχαράττετο τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ῥησεῖδια τοιάδε· “οἶδας  
 μὲν ὅσα διὰ σὲ πέπονθα ἢ ἀθλία· διὰ σὲ τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίαν  
 κατέλιπον, αἶ, ὡς συσχεθεῖσα πάθει ἐρωτικῷ· διὰ σὲ φίλτρον  
 οὐκ ἐνεδειξάμην ἄστοργος φανεῖσα τῇ φύσει· κατέσχον με διὰ  
 10 σὲ ὑπ' ἄλαις συνεχεῖς πόνοι· διὰ σέ, δέσποτα, ναβάγια πέ-  
 πονθα βαρβάρων γεγонуῖα ληστῶν· καὶ τέθηκα δῖς σοι  
 ἀκέραιον ἤδη τὸ φίλτρον φυλάττουσα καὶ ἄλλα μυρία  
 ὑπέστην δεινά. διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα πέπονθε μῶν ἢ ἀθλία Λευ-

<sup>58</sup> We opted for the form τῷ τότε, since it occurs in various Byzantine texts (cf. *TLG*).

κίππη, ἵνα σὺ μιγῆς ἑτέρα γυναικὶ κ' ἐγὼ δ' ἑτέρῳ σύζυγος  
 15 ἔσομαι;  
 ὄναιο λοιπόν, Κλειτοφῶν, καινῶν γάμων·  
 ἔρρωσο καὶ γίνωσκε παρθένον μένειν  
 τὴν πρὶν ποθεινὴν, νῦν δέ σοι μισητέαν.”

And so Satyrus handed me the letter and I, as I recognized the handwriting and was filled with sorrow, had tears darting from my eyes; my heart was much inflamed and it still disbelieved as it was forced to remember the sad events once experienced; he (= Clitophon)<sup>59</sup> then turned pale, constrained by an extraordinary misfortune; the following declaration was inscribed in the letter: “You know how much I, wretched, have suffered because of you. Because of you I left my home, alas, as if constrained by erotic passion; because of you I did not display my affection but appeared heartless to nature; because of you continuous troubles held me fast under roamings; because of you, my lord, I suffered shipwrecks [and] became [the property] of barbarian pirates; and [because of you] I died twice, keeping my affection for you pure, and resisted thousands of other terrible things. Was this why the wretched Leucippe suffered these things, so that you can mingle with another woman and I be the wife of another man? So enjoy, Clitophon, your new marriage! Be well and know that she has remained a virgin, [the girl] who was once desired, but [is] now hated by you.”

Comparison with the original shows that the letter itself has been shortened, while some of the feelings attributed to its reader, Clitophon, have been moved from the paragraph originally following the letter<sup>60</sup> to an introductory section describing the emotions of the intradiegetic reader (lines 2–5). Some keywords from the original text remain, as does the primary message of the letter: ‘I have suffered for you and even died twice, and now you’re marrying someone else—good

<sup>59</sup> It is unclear whether this alteration to third person was a deliberate error meant for the students to correct.

<sup>60</sup> 5.19.1: τούτοις ἐντυχὼν πάντα ἐγινόμεν ὁμοῦ· ἀνεφλεγόμεν, ὠχρίων, ἐθαύμαζον, ἠπίστουν, ἔχαιρον, ἠχθόμεν.

luck!’ The additions above some words of the main text do not seem to correct against the Tatian text, but rather to offer alternative forms.<sup>61</sup> The source is, however, easily identifiable because of the names included in the passage (Satyrus, Clitophon, Leucippe). In spite of the changes, knowledge of the original passage would probably help the student to detect the text’s ‘mistakes’, for instance the seemingly playful ἐταίρα γυναικί (“a courtesan”) for ἐτέρω γυναικί (“another woman”).<sup>62</sup>

In contrast to the first *schedos*, which is transmitted anonymously, the second (fol. 204<sup>v</sup>–205<sup>v</sup>) is attributed to George of Myrrha, who was headmaster of the School of the Forty Martyrs in the mid-twelfth century. He is the author of at least nine *schede*, on both religious and secular topics; some of them even refer to contemporary events, such as a fire that broke out in the Church of the Forty Martyrs.<sup>63</sup> In addition to his schedographical output, George is also the author of two preserved poems.<sup>64</sup> The *schedos* in question recounts the story of the lion and the gnat, a fable told in the second book of *Leucippe and Clitophon* (2.22). The tiny gnat challenges a big lion, driving him crazy with his buzzing and stinging. Bragging about his triumph the gnat is, however, caught in a spider’s web and has to regret his arrogance.

The text of this *schedos* is much more challenging than that of the anonymous author. Like other *schede* of the headmaster

<sup>61</sup> Note, however, τέθηκα δίζ (sup. lin. ἐκ δευτέρου) and cf. Tatius 5.18.4: τέθηκα ἤδη δεύτερον.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Tatius 5.18.4: ἵνα σὺ ὁ γέγονας ἄλλη γυναικί, καὶ ἐγὼ τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ γένωμαι.

<sup>63</sup> I. D. Polemis, “Γεώργιος μαίστωρ Ἀγιοτεσσαρακοντίτης,” *Hellenika* 46 (1996) 301–306; for a list of his schedographic production see E. Ch. Nesseris, *Η παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα* II (diss. Ioannina 2014) 124–125.

<sup>64</sup> R. Browning, “Il codice Marciano gr. XI.31 e la schedografia bizantina,” in *Miscellanea Marciana di studi bessarionei* (Padua 1976) 21–34, here 28–30 (repr. *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education* [London 1977], no. XVI).

George of Myrrha, it is a very complex antistoichic text, making understanding difficult for both the Byzantine student and the modern reader. Although we propose some solutions, some parts of the text remain unresolved and perplexing.

τοῦ παλαιοῦ κυροῦ Γεωργίου τοῦ Μύρων  
 204<sup>v</sup> [ἐ]νωτίσασθε ὧ παρόντες καὶ τήμερον μῦθον ἀπὸ κώνωπος  
 καὶ λέοντος· κώνωψ γὰρ πρὸς λέοντα ἔφησεν, ἀλαζών, οὕτως·  
 εἶτα κάμου βασιλεύειν οἶει ὡς τῶν ἄλλων ζώων, δυνατώτα-  
 5 τον ὦν, θηρίων; ἀλλ' οὔτ' ἐμοῦ κρείττων εἶδη; οὔτ' ἀλκιμώ-  
 5 τατος εἶ, δηίδι· ἐπεὶ εἴπερ κοσμεῖ, φράσον τίς ἴς σε; τῷ δι'  
 ἀμυχῶν τῶν παρευρημένων ξαίνειν. ἴδει, καὶ δι' ὀδόντων  
 δήκειν, σάρκας, σὺν οὐδενί, τῷ διῖεναι δι' ὀδῶν, τῶν σῶν;  
 ταῦτα δ' οὐ ποιεῖ καὶ μαχόμενον γύναιον; ποίῳ δὲ μεγέθει ἢ  
 κάλλει ὠραίῳ; στέρνον πλατὺ ὅμοι παχεῖς νῶτοι διὰ χλευ-  
 10 ασμῶν, μᾶλλον· καὶ πολλὴ περὶ τὸν ἀχένα κόμη τὴν κατό-  
 πιν δ' αἰσχύνην οὐχ ὀρῶν εἶ, ἐμοὶ μέγεθος ἀήρ ῥᾶον ἤκοντι,  
 205<sup>r</sup> πτήσει. ὅλος· κάλλος δ' αἰ τῶν λειμῶ[νω]ν || αἴμοι γε, οἶον  
 ἐσθής, συνηρεφεῖς κόμαι ταύτας γὰρ ὅτε παρήπται ἐνεῖμαι,  
 πτήσις. τόνδ' ἐμόν, ἀνδρικὸν τόνον καὶ γελοῖον ἂν ἦ κατα-  
 15 λέγειν ὄργανον γὰρ πᾶς εἰμὶ μετ' ἡχῶν παραταττόμενον  
 μαχησμῶν, σάλπιγξ δέ μοι καὶ βέλος τὸ στόμα· ὥστε εἰμὶ καὶ  
 ἀυλητῆς καὶ τοξότης· τοξεύει γὰρ μου διαέριον τὸ πτερόν,  
 ὡσεὶ δ' ἰῶ τις, δίγμα, ἐπιών, ἐπάγω· ὁ δὲ καταδηχθεὶς ἐξα-  
 πίνης, γέγωνε· καὶ ἄδιφον ἢ γεγόν' αἰτεῖ χωρίων δεδουκῶς. οὐ-  
 20 δένα τόπον καταλελοιπῶς· ἐγὼ δὲ παρῶν οὐ πάρεμι· ὁμοῦ δ'  
 εἶκω καὶ μένω καὶ περιίπταμαι τῷ πτίλῳ τὸν βροτὸν ὀρῶν δὲ  
 ὀρχούμενον ἐπ' εἶδει αὐτὸν πύων γελῶ· ἀλλὰ τί δεῖ λόγων·  
 ἀρξώμεθα μαχησμῶν· καὶ ἅμα λέγων ἐμπίπτει τῷ λέοντι· καὶ  
 κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμπεδῶ· καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλῳ, οἱ ψιλὸν εἰδῶν· περι-  
 25 ἰπτάμενος ἅμα καὶ τῷ βόμβῳ καταυλῶν· ὁ δὲ λέων ἡγρι-  
 αίνετο καὶ ἐστρέφη δὲ πάντη καὶ τὸν ἀέρα περιέχασκεν· ὁ δὲ  
 δὲ τῷ ὠργίσθαι παιδιὰν ἐτίθει, ἐκεῖνον· καὶ ὡσπερ πα-  
 λαιστῆς δι' ὀδόντων λεοντείων διῖών, μετ' ὀδῶν τῶν ὦν ἐθάς  
 ἀπέρρει· μέσην αὐτὴν τὴν γένυν κλειομένην διαπτάς· οἱ δὲ  
 30 τοῦ θηρὸς ὀδόντες κενοὶ τῆς θήρας περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκροτάλιζον·  
 σκιαμαχῶν δὲ ὁ λέων ἴδικε πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν ἤδη  
 καὶ παρειμένος ἔστη τῷ ὠργίσθαι· ὁ δὲ κώνωψ περιίπτάμενος

τὴν κόμην ἐκείνου μέλος ἠλάλαζεν ἐπινίκιον· μακροτέραν δὲ  
 τὴν πτῆσιν ὑπὸ περιττῆς ἀπειροκαλίας ποιῶν, ἔλαθεν ἀράχ-  
 35 νης νήμασιν ἐμπεσῶν· κάκεινὴν οὐ λήθει τῷ ἐμπλακῆναι· ||  
 205<sup>v</sup> ὡς δ' ἐδεῖτο ἀραχνίῳ νήματι καὶ φυγεῖν οὐκ εἶχεν, ἀλύων  
 εἶπεν. ὦ τῆς μανίας· προῦκαλούμην ἔγωγε ἐπὶ μαχησμὸν  
 μάχης μὲν, ὃς ἥκιστα σθένει μοχθεῖν εἶα μαι, λῖν, ὅτι δεῖ με  
 40 πυκνὸς αἰ(?) χιτῶν,  
 ὡς ἀδρανῆ σὺν εὐχερίᾳ ἀράχνης.

Suprascripts: 5 εἶ] ὑπάρχει || δηίδι] μάχην 6 ἀμυχῶν] τῶν ὀνούχων ||  
 ἴδει] καὶ κόπῳ 7 δήκειν] καὶ δάκνειν || ὀδῶν] τῶν 9 στέρνον] ὦ ||  
 νῶτοι] ὦ 11 μέγεθος] τῆς 13 ἐσθῆς] καὶ ἱμάτιον 15 παραταττό-  
 μενον] καὶ ὀπλιζόμενον 17 διαέριον] καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀέρα 18 τις] καὶ  
 βέλει ἄνθρωπος || ἐπιῶν] καὶ ὑπαισέλθων || δέ] ἄνθρωπος 18–19  
 ἐξαπίνης] καὶ ἐξαίφνης γέγωνε καὶ ἐβόησε 19 καὶ ἄδιφον] καὶ  
 ἀψηλάφητον || γεγον' ] καὶ ὅπου καὶ ὑπάρχον καὶ ζητεῖ || χωρίων]  
 τινῶν || δεδουκῶς] ὁ ἄνθρωπος 21 εἶκω] καὶ ὑποχωρῶ 21–22 δὲ  
 ὀρχούμενον] τὸν ἄνθρωπον 22 ἐπ' εἶδει] τῆ θεωρίᾳ || αὐτὸν πύων]  
 καὶ τῶν ἐλκῶν 23 μαχησμῶν] τίνων 24 ψιλὸν] τόπον καὶ τὴν καὶ  
 γυμνὸν || εἰδῶν] καὶ τῶν θεωριῶν 26 δι] ἤγουν ὁ κώνωψ 27 ἐκείνον]  
 ἤγουν δὴ τὸν λέοντα 28 μετ' ὀδῶν] καὶ τραγωδιῶν || ἐθαῆ] καὶ  
 σύνηθες 31 ἴδικε] καὶ ἐκοπία 34 ἀπειροκαλίας] μωρίας 36  
 ἐδεῖτο] καὶ ἐδεσμεῖτο || ἀλύων] καὶ ἀδημονῶν 38 ἥκιστα] καὶ  
 οὐδαμῶς || λῖν] καὶ καταλέλειμμα καὶ λέοντος || ὅτι δεῖ] καὶ δεσμεῖ  
 39 χιτῶν] καὶ ἱμάτιον

τοῦ παλαιοῦ κυροῦ Γεωργίου τοῦ Μύρων  
 ἐνωτίσασθε, ὦ παρόντες, καὶ τήμερον μῦθον ἀπὸ κώνωπος  
 καὶ λέοντος. κώνωψ γὰρ πρὸς λέοντα ἔφησεν ἀλαζῶν οὕτως·  
 “εἶτα κάμοῦ βασιλεύειν οἶει ὡς τῶν ἄλλων ζώων δυνατώτα-  
 5 τον ὦν θηρίον; ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἐμοῦ κρείττων εἶδει οὐτ' ἀλκιμώ-  
 τατος εἶ δηίδει· ἐπεὶ εἶπερ κοσμεῖ,<sup>65</sup> φράσον τίς ἴς σε; τὸ δι'  
 ἀμυχῶν τῶν παρευρημένων ξαίνειν ἴδει καὶ δι' ὀδόντων  
 δήκειν σάρκας, σὺν οὐδενὶ τῷ διῖεναι δι' ὀδόντων σῶν;  
 ταῦτα δ' οὐ ποιεῖ καὶ μαχόμενον γύναιον; ποίῳ δὲ μεγέθει ἢ  
 κάλλει ὠραίῳ; στέρνον πλατύ, ὦμοι παχεῖς, νῶτοι διὰ χλευ-

<sup>65</sup> It is tempting to think that εἶπερ κοσμεῖ could be decoded by the Byzantine student as ὑπερκοσμεῖ.

10 ασμὸν μᾶλλον καὶ πολλή περὶ τὸν ἀυχένα κόμη· τὴν κατό-  
 πιν δ' αἰσχύνην οὐχ ὀρών εἶ; ἐμοὶ μέγεθος ἀήρ ῥᾶον ἤκοντι  
 πτήσει ὄλος, κάλλος δ' αἰ τῶν λειμώ[νω]ν ἔμοιγε, οἶον  
 ἐσθῆς συνηρεφεῖς κόμαι· ταύτας γὰρ ὅτε παρήπται ἐνεῖμαι  
 15 πτήσις. τὸν δ' ἐμὸν ἀνδρικόν τόνον καὶ γελοῖον ἂν ἦ κατα-  
 λέγειν· ὄργανον γὰρ πᾶς εἰμὶ μετ' ἡχῶν παραταττόμενον  
 μαχησμῶν, σάλπιγξ δέ μοι καὶ βέλος τὸ στόμα. ὥστε εἰμὶ καὶ  
 ἀυλητῆς καὶ τοξότης· τοξεύει γὰρ μου διαέριον τὸ πτερόν,  
 ὡσεὶ δ' ἰφ τις δῆγμα ἐπιὼν ἐπάγω· ὁ δὲ καταδηχθεὶς ἐξα-  
 20 πίνης γέγωνε καὶ ἄδιφον ἦ γεγον' αἰτεῖ χωρίον δεδοικώς· οὐ-  
 δένα τόπον καταλελοιπώς. ἐγὼ δὲ παρῶν οὐ πάριμι. ὁμοῦ δ'  
 ἦκω καὶ μένω, καὶ περιίπταμαι τῷ πτίλῳ τὸν βροτὸν ὀρών δὲ  
 ὀρχούμενον ἐπ' εἶδει αὐτὸν πύων γελῶ. ἀλλὰ τί δεῖ λόγων;  
 ἀρξώμεθα μαχησμῶν.” καὶ ἅμα λέγων ἐπίπτει τῷ λέοντι καὶ  
 25 κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμπεηδᾶ καὶ εἶ τι ἄλλο οἱ ψιλὸν ἰδῶν, περι-  
 ἰπτάμενος ἅμα καὶ τῷ βόμβῳ καταυλῶν. ὁ δὲ λέων ἡγρι-  
 αίνετο καὶ ἐστρέφη δὲ πάντη καὶ τὸν ἀέρα περιέχασκεν· ὁδὶ  
 δὲ τὸ ὠργίσθαι παιδιὰν ἐτίθει ἐκείνον καὶ ὡσπερ πα-  
 λαιστῆς δι' ὀδόντων λεοντείων διῶν, μετ' ὠδῶν τῶν ὦν ἐθάς  
 ἀπέρρει μέσην αὐτὴν τὴν γένυν κλειομένην διαπτάς· οἱ δὲ  
 30 τοῦ θηρὸς ὀδόντες κενοὶ τῆς θήρας περὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκροτάλιζον.  
 σκιαμαχῶν δὲ ὁ λέων ἤδηκε<sup>66</sup> πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν ἤδη  
 καὶ παρειμένος ἔστη τῷ ὠργίσθαι. ὁ δὲ κώνωψ περιίπτάμενος  
 τὴν κόμην ἐκείνου μέλος ἠλάλαζεν ἐπινίκιον. μακροτέραν δὲ  
 τὴν πτήσιν ὑπὸ περιττῆς ἀπειροκαλίας ποιῶν ἔλαθεν ἀράχ-  
 35 νης νήμασιν ἐμπεσῶν, κάκείνην οὐ λήθει τὸ ἐμπλακῆναι.  
 ὡς δ' ἐδεῖτο ἀραχνίῳ νήματι καὶ φυγεῖν οὐκ εἶχεν, ἀλύων  
 εἶπεν “ὦ τῆς μανίας· προῦκαλούμην ἔγωγε ἐπὶ μαχησμὸν  
 μάχης μέν, ὃς ἥκιστα σθένει μοχθεῖν εἶαμαι<sup>67</sup> λῖν, ὅτι δεῖ με  
 40 ὡς ἀδρανῆς ἦν εὐχερίᾳ ἀράχνης.”

<sup>66</sup> We have substituted the form ἤδηκε for ἴδικε, but we are not convinced by this emendation.

<sup>67</sup> Perhaps an alternation of “εἶαμαι” into “εἶα με” would fit better to the content of the text.

By the old kyr George of Myrrha

You who are present today, listen to the fable of the gnat and the lion. The gnat said to the lion, bragging, as follows: “So you think you can rule over me too, as over the other animals, being the strongest of beasts, but neither do you look more powerful than me, nor are you necessarily stronger in battle. Tell me what strength adorns you. By scratching in violent heat with your hidden claws and biting flesh with your teeth, nothing gets past your jaws? Does not also a fighting woman do this, so with what size and beauty are you adorned? A broad chest [and] firm shoulders but with a back that is rather mocked and a thick mane around your neck. Cannot you see that your rear is a disgrace? To me belongs rather the entire range of the atmosphere; my beauty [is] that of the meadows; the thick manes [of the meadows] are like clothing [for me]. I put on these when I take a break from flying. It would be amusing to describe my courage at length. For I am entirely an instrument with sounds prepared for the battle: my mouth is both a war trumpet and a missile, so I am both flute-player and archer; for my wing shoots through the air, like an arrow I cause a bite when I land. He, in turn, is suddenly hit and cries aloud, and his wound is not touchable, he is looking for the spot of the bite but cannot find it. I go away and stay at once, and with my wings I fly around the man, and I laugh watching him jumping around because of the wounds. But what’s the point of talking? Let’s start the battle!”

And as he said it he fell upon the lion, attacking his eyes and whatever other [part] of the face he saw bare, at the same time flying around and piping his buzzing. The lion was enraged and whirled around and snapped at the air; but he [the gnat] treated his anger as a game and like a wrestler flew through the jaws of the lion, he went away with the usual odes; passing through the very jaws as they were closing. The beast’s teeth clattered down into each other, devoid of any prey. The shadow-boxing lion already snapped at the air with his teeth and stood there, exhausted with his rage. The gnat, flying around his mane, was singing a victory ode. As he was flying in wider circles due to his utmost lack of taste, he accidentally fell into a spider’s web—and she did not fail to notice his ensnaring. As should be the case with a spider’s web there was no escape and troubled he said: “Oh what madness! I challenged the lion to a battle and I left him ex-

hausted and distressed because of my strength, and the tunic tied me thickly because I was ignorant of the danger of the spider.”

As with the first text, most of the interlinear glosses offer synonyms. However, there are cases in which the notes explain rather the generic meaning of a word (e.g. γέγωνε] καὶ ἐβόησε). Although the *shedos* stays very close to the original text, the schedographer deviates at some points from it by adding some lines that are difficult to understand and decode.<sup>68</sup> Perhaps these deviations could be explained by the fact that the teachers were dictating the *schede* to their students from memory.

It should be noted that the fable of the lion and the gnat is known from the collections of fables attributed to Aesop, where it appears in a much shorter version.<sup>69</sup> However, the version that we find in the *shedos* is so close to the Tatian passage that it must be assumed that George of Myrrha used the novelistic version as the basis of his exercise. That said, we cannot claim with any certainty that the author had at his disposal the novel in its entirety; he may have used a collection of excerpts.<sup>70</sup> Be

<sup>68</sup> For example, the line σὺν οὐδενὶ τῷ διῆναι δι' ὀδόντων σῶν is not to be found in the Tatian text. On the other hand, the author makes some Tatian lines much longer in his work: for instance, ὁ δὲ καταδηχθεὶς ἐξαπίνης γέγωνε καὶ ἄδιφον ἦ γεγον' αἰτεῖ χωρίον δεδουκῶς· οὐδένα τόπον καταλελοιπῶς.

<sup>69</sup> Hausrath no. 276 (= Halm 234, Chambry 189). Vilborg assumed that the origin of the fable was Tatian; “from our romance they have found their way into the fable collections”: E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon: A Commentary* (Göteborg 1962) 54. Such a process is not unlikely, but seems impossible to prove.

<sup>70</sup> To our knowledge, no such collection of ancient novel excerpts has come down to us. One may note, however, the transmission of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*, which survives in manuscript excerpts, short quotations in the *Suda*, and the summary offered by Photios, along with the excerpts that have survived in various gnomologia (see e.g. those included in Colonna's edition of Heliodorus). Moreover, the novel by Manasses survives only in excerpts, which indicates that ancient novels too might have been excerpted, even if no such collections have been preserved.



that as it may, the use of Tatius' version still indicates that the novel held a central position as a model for imitation and adaptation in the twelfth century.

The choice of passages to paraphrase adheres to the educational focus of the period: a letter and a fable, both types of discourse central to the progymnasmatic tradition and present in the schedographic culture of the twelfth century.<sup>71</sup> Letters were frequently inserted into novels, ancient and Byzantine, and the letter by Leucippe has a counterpart in the twelfth-century *Hysmine and Hysminias*.<sup>72</sup> The choice of these two passages from the novel by Tatius accordingly makes sense in the twelfth-century context of learning grammar and composition. Moreover, the presence of *Leucippe and Clitophon* in schedography indicates that at least one novel was used for practical educational purposes, not only recommended in theoretical treatises. With these circumstances in mind, let us turn to the Komnenian novels to discuss their possible links to twelfth-century Constantinopolitan educational contexts.

*From Eros to Lady Grammar:*

*the Komnenian novels in twelfth-century education*

Referring to Prodhomos' *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* 8.520 ("never wet my blade on my teachers"), Elizabeth Jeffreys suggested that this novel had a link to a classroom setting: "There are some hints of classroom humour, suggesting that some of the set-pieces may have begun life as 'fair copies' of school exercises."<sup>73</sup> In fact, there is such a progymnasmatic work in the poetic corpus of Theodore Prodhomos that could have been

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Agapitos, *JÖB* 64 (2014) 5.

<sup>72</sup> *Hysmine and Hysminias* 9.8.4, on which see Nilsson, *Erotic Pathos* 66. On letters in the Komnenian novels see R. Harder, "Die Funktion der Briefe im byzantinischen Roman des 12. Jahrhunderts," in M. Picone and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption* (Basel 1997) 231–244. For a recent study of the letters in *Leucippe and Clitophon* see I. Repath, "Yours truly? Letters in Achilles Tatius," in O. Hodkinson et al. (eds.), *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden 2012) 237–262.

<sup>73</sup> Jeffreys, *Four Byzantine Novels* 15.

used for writing an episode in his novel. In a hexametric ethopoeia, most probably written for an educational setting, a corpse narrates how its ship was wrecked during a storm, its hands were eaten by fishes, and then it was tossed up by the sea.<sup>74</sup> It is likely that this hexametric ethopoeia was used by Prodromos as a basis for the construction of the ethopoetic passage 6.480–491 in *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*. As in the hexametric ethopoeia, Dosikles, in a crescendo of sorrowfulness, laments the putative death of his beloved Rhodanthe after a turbulent storm wrecked their ship. He envisages that her corpse was torn apart by fishes and thrown out dead by the waves.

In addition to this link between *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* and an educational setting, a certain monk and grammatikos Ioannikios, contemporary with Prodromos and presumably one of his close associates, praised Prodromos for his novel in a *schedos*:<sup>75</sup>

τίς ἐπὶ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ συγγραφέντι βιβλίῳ οὐ δὴ Δοσικλέος  
[= οὐ δίδωσι κλέος] καὶ δοξασμῶν [= δοξασμὸν] καὶ αἴνων  
[= αἴνων] εἶδει ἐπέρι [= ἤδη ἐπαίρει] καὶ ὕμνων [= ὕμνον]  
νέμει;

Here Ioannikios plays with the name of the male protagonist of Prodromos' novel by using δὴ Δοσικλέος for δίδωσι κλέος. The passage suggests that the students knew Prodromos' novel, since its decoding presupposes the knowledge of this work. Prodromos admittedly holds a particular position not only in the twelfth century, but also among the four Komnenian novelists. Not only was he an imitator of the ancient Greek novel, but his own novel was also subject to imitation: Eugenianos was a student of Prodromos and wrote his novel in admiring imita-

<sup>74</sup> N. Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos: The Neglected Poems and Epigrams (Edition, Commentary and Translation)* (diss. Vienna 2014) 407–412.

<sup>75</sup> The *schedos* is partly published in Vassis, *BZ* 86/87 (1993/94) 7 n.27. For a brief discussion see Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos* 84–85.

tion of *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*.<sup>76</sup> This is another, if more implicit, indication that novels mattered in educational/intellectual settings. Even Eugenianos' *Drosilla and Charikles* could have been used at some point in an educational setting in the mid-twelfth century. Among Eugenianos' numerous works is a letter addressed to a certain Grammatike, preserved exclusively on fol. 80<sup>v</sup> of *Laur.Plut.* 31.2. According to the letter, Grammatike copied and learned the entire novel by heart:<sup>77</sup>

ἦτησας, ᾧ χαρίεσσα, στίχους ἡμετέρους ἐρωτικούς τριπλῶ  
μέτρῳ μεμετριεσμένους, δῶρον ἡμέτερον· ἔχεις γάρ οὐ μόνον τὸ  
καλλίμορφον ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ τὸ φιλόλογον ἐν τῇ  
ψυχῇ καὶ φιλόμετρον, ἧτις καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ Δροσίλλῃ καὶ Χαρικλεῖ  
συντεθειμένην ἐννεάλογον ἔμμετρον [...], παραταῦτα καὶ ἀπο-  
στοματίζεις, ὅποτε καὶ βούλοιο [...]

You asked, o lovely lady, for my erotic verses, which are counted in triple meter, as a gift; for you have not only a beautifully shaped body, but also a soul that is a lover of literature and poetry—although *Drosilla and Charikles* has been composed in nine chapters in verse [...], you recite it by heart, whenever you want [...]

At the outset of the letter, Eugenianos thus stresses Grammatike's love of literature and metrical form. It is highly likely that the letter does not reflect a real story, but is fictional. If so, it is hardly a coincidence that Eugenianos chose to name the recipient of his fictional letter Grammatike (Grammar). In other words, if Grammatike's love is interpreted allegorically (as love for the unique stylistic and grammar qualities of Eugenianos' novel), it could mean that his novel may have been used for educational purposes as well. In doing so, the author would have broadened the target audience to achieve a wider dissemination of his work.

It should also be underlined that the strong presence of pro-

<sup>76</sup> This is indicated by a heading preceding the text in one of the MSS. of *Drosilla and Charicles*; see F. Conca, *Niketas Eugenianos. De Drosillae et Chariclis Amoribus* (Amsterdam 1990) 8–9 and 30.

<sup>77</sup> I. F. Boissonade, *Nicetae Eugeniani narrationem amatoriam* (Paris 1819) II 7.

gymnastic discourses (most notably ekphrasis and ethopoeia) would make parts of the Komnenian novels suitable for students in their learning process, just as the Tatian novel was useful because of passages such as the ones paraphrased in the *schede* discussed above.<sup>78</sup> Moreover, since most authors of the period had begun their career as teachers, and later on continued to teach and tutor imperial and aristocratic students in parallel with a career in state or church administration (or simply as writers on commission), it seems highly likely that they were reusing some of their material in different contexts. For instance, the preserved works of both Constantine Manasses and Theodore Prodromos show patterns of recycling that may be representative of Komnenian practices at large. Such a procedure was not only economical for a writer on command, but also a means of asserting an individual style that would be enhanced by the repetition of neologisms and particularly successful lines. All four Komnenian novels were written in a similar style, so they may have been composed under similar circumstances: used, in part, in a school setting and then ‘published’ and (in some cases) dedicated to imperial patrons.

To conclude, it can certainly be argued that the novels played a more important role in the twelfth century than has usually been assumed. First, the ancient novels were read and imitated, both in school settings (witnessed by the schedographic exercises) and among court writers and intellectuals (witnessed by the Komnenian novels and other texts of the twelfth century). Moreover, the novel by Tatius was just as appreciated as a stylistic model as that by Heliodorus, if not more. Second, the Komnenian novels too, or at least the one composed by Prodromos, were known by students and may have been used in class both before and after their ‘publi-

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Agapitos, in *Studies in Heliodorus* 145. Note also P. Roilos, “*Amphoteroglossia*: The Role of Rhetoric in the Medieval Greek Learned Novel,” in P. A. Agapitos and D. R. Reinsch (eds.), *Der Roman im Byzanz der Komnenenzeit* (Wiesbaden 2000) 109–126.

cation'. This explains why novelistic discourse was so pervasive in much literature written in the Komnenian period, since authors were confronted with novelistic texts as part of their education. "Brimming with grace and flowers," the novels were useful for aspiring authors while they also, at the same time, challenged the Byzantine fascination for signs and semiotics. To "reap every flower of the *logoi*" thus meant to recycle as well as decode, a central concern of Byzantine literature.<sup>79</sup>

*July, 2017*

Uppsala University  
Uppsala, Sweden  
and University of Oslo  
Oslo, Norway  
Ingela.Nilsson@lingfil.uu.se  
University of Vienna  
Vienna, Austria  
Nikolaos.Zagklas@univie.ac.at

<sup>79</sup> This article was written as part of the research projects "Texte et récit à Byzance" (Uppsala Univ., 2015–17, funded by the Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences) and "Byzantine Poetry in the 'Long' Twelfth Century (1081–1204): Texts and Contexts" (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 2016–19, funded by the Austrian Research Fund, FWF P 28959–G25). We would like thank Carolina Cupane, Eleni Kaltsogianni, Krystina Kubina, Dimitrios Skrekas, and Stephen Trzaskoma for reading drafts of the article and the editions and offering suggestions for improvement. We are also grateful to the anonymous peer reviewer, Kent Rigsby, and the editorial team of *GRBS* for useful remarks.