

John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners: a Byzantine teacher on schedography, everyday language and writerly disposition

Defining the relation between learned and vernacular literature still remains an important issue concerning the overall study of Byzantine literature. Since the middle of the nineteenth century these two linguistic and literary areas were more or less viewed as being separate entities catering to the needs and expressing the ideologies of different strata of Byzantine society, high (written and Byzantine) in the case of learned literature and low (oral and Neohellenic) in the case of vernacular literature.¹ This division had a great impact on the study of late Byzantine and early Modern Greek literature, especially in the way in which the socio-cultural environment of these two literatures was perceived and how the master narratives for their respective histories were gradually created up to the middle of the twentieth century.² Though much work has been done in editing and interpreting learned and vernacular texts, and even though voices have been raised against the division of these two domains,³ the overall impression from publications of the last twenty years is that most Byzantinists prefer to deal with learned texts, leaving the vernacular material to Neohellenists, while the latter on the whole avoid to study in depth material before the fifteenth century.⁴

The research for the present paper was conducted in June-July 2012 at the Institut für Byzantinistik (Universität München) and in September 2016 at the Institut für Altertumskunde (Universität Köln) with fellowships from the Alexander-von-Humboldt Stiftung (Bonn). I am grateful to the Humboldt Stiftung for its continuing financial support, as well as to Albrecht Berger and René Nünlist, who acted as my hosts in Munich and Cologne. The paper was finished with a fellowship from the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy (University of Ghent) in October 2016. I am grateful to the Faculty for its financial support and to Kristoffel Demoen as my host in Ghent. My thanks extend to Carla Castelli, Yakir Paz, Aglae Pizzone and Nikos Zagklas for providing me with their own studies (some before their publication) or difficult to find bibliographical items, to Eric Cullhed for reading through a first draft of my translations, and to Maria Tomadaki for discussing the paper with me and offering me information on the manuscripts of Tzetzes' *Theogony*. Finally, thanks are due to the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek for providing me with digital images of codd. Vind. phil gr. 118 and 321. All translations are my own.

¹ P. A. Agapitos, *Karl Krumbacher and the History of Byzantine Literature*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 108, 2015, pp. 1-52.

² P. A. Agapitos, *Dangerous Literary Liaisons? Byzantium and Neohellenism*, «Byzantina» 37, 2017 (forthcoming).

³ See, for example, E. Trapp, *Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis?*, «Dumbarton Oaks Papers» 47, 1993, pp. 114-129; C. Cupane, *Wie volkstümlich ist die byzantinische Volksliteratur?*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 96, 2003, pp. 577-599.

⁴ For some examples see P. A. Agapitos, *Genre, Structure and Poetics in the Byzantine Vernacu-*

In a recent paper, I attempted to show how problematic this approach is, while I proposed that the joint study of learned and vernacular texts would be productive on an analytical microlevel, as well as on a synthetic macrolevel.⁵ As a case study, I chose the type of grammatical exercise known as *schedos* and the practice of schedography in the twelfth century, exactly the period in which it was believed that the separation of learned and vernacular language and literature was finalized. In a further paper, I looked more closely at the way in which *schede* were taught in school and read by various recipients,⁶ while in another three papers I examined in more detail the opinions of Anna Komnene, Eustathios of Thessalonike and Theodore Prodromos about schedography as a practice and the use of everyday language in literary texts.⁷ What, in my opinion, became apparent from these studies is that (i) everyday language was used in schools for teaching Greek, (ii) various authors and other players in Constantinople's network of education had differing opinions about schedography, and (iii) the *schedos* became part of a new performative literary genre (the "prose-*schedos*-verse" triptych) from about the Thirties of the twelfth century and until at least the end of Manuel Komnenos' reign. Not only was a new genre created out of schoolroom practice, but this practice also generated the composition of court poems in the vernacular, such as the surviving poems of the so-called Ptochoprodromic corpus.

The present paper is the last in this series and focuses on a fourth writer and teacher of the Komnenian era, the polymath and polygraph John Tzetzes (ca. 1110-after 1166).⁸ Despite the appearance of important editions of a number of his

lar Romances of Love, «Symbolae Osloenses» 79, 2004, pp. 7-101: 7-8. One should also note the almost complete absence of vernacular literature from the relevant chapters of the *Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies* (2008).

⁵ P. A. Agapitos, *Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: Redefining a Scientific Paradigm in the History of Byzantine Literature*, «Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik» 64, 2014, pp. 1-22. For a further overview of education in the Middle Byzantine era see A. Markopoulos, *Teachers and Textbooks in Byzantium: Ninth to Eleventh Centuries*, in S. Steckel, N. Gaul, M. Grünbart (eds.), *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West (c. 1000-1200)*, Berlin-Münster 2014, pp. 3-15. On schedography in Southern Italy see now L. Silvano, *Schedografia bizantina in Terra d'Otranto: appunti su testi e contesti didattici*, in A. Capone (ed.), *Circolazione di testi e scambi culturali in Terra d'Otranto tra Tardoantico e Medioevo*, Vatican City 2015, pp. 121-167 with an edition of various *schede* and a full list of items from the schedographic collection of Vat. Barb. gr. 102.

⁶ P. A. Agapitos, *Learning to Read and Write a Schedos: The Verse Dictionary of Par. gr. 400*, in S. Efthymiadis, Ch. Messis, P. Odorico, I. D. Polemis (eds.), *Vers une poétique de Byzance: Hommage à Vassilis Katsaros*, Paris 2015, pp. 11-24.

⁷ P. A. Agapitos, *Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse*, «Νέα Ρώμη» 10, 2013, pp. 89-107; *Literary Haute Cuisine and its Dangers: Eustathios of Thessalonike on Schedography and Everyday Language*, «Dumbarton Oaks Papers» 69, 2015, pp. 225-241; *New Genres in the Twelfth Century: The Schedourgia of Theodore Prodromos*, «Medioevo Greco» 15, 2015, pp. 1-41.

⁸ For his life and works see the essential study by C. Wendel, *Tzetzes Johannes*, in *RE*, 7A, 1948, coll. 1959-2010. On the approximate date of Tzetzes' death see now E. Cullhed, *Diving for Pearls and Tzetzes' Death*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 108, 2015, pp. 53-62, in critical response

works offering a solid basis for scholarly research, there still remain poorly edited or even unedited texts of his in need of critical editions.⁹ Hellenists have for the most part been interested in Tzetzes as a “classical philologist”, viewing his works more as repositories of lost ancient Greek material rather than as textual products of the twelfth century with a concrete socio-cultural and literary life of their own.¹⁰ At the same time, Tzetzes has not received any deeper literary interpretive attention from Byzantinists. A few studies have dealt with specific themes of his *œuvre*,¹¹

to N. Agiotis, *Tzetzes on Psellos Revisited*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 106, 2013, pp. 1-8. In order not to burden the notes of the present paper, I offer here a list of Tzetzes’ works most often used together with their editions and abbreviations:

- Ep.* P. A. M. Leone (ed.), Ioannis Tzetzae *Epistulae*, Leipzig 1972.
- Hist. / Chil.* P. A. M. Leone (ed.), Ioannis Tzetzae *Historiae*, 2nd edition, Galatina 2007 (1st edition, Naples 1968).
- Iambi* P. A. M. Leone (ed.), Ioannis Tzetzae *Iambi*, «Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neolencici» 16-17, 1969-1970, pp. 127-156.
- CarmIl.* P. A. M. Leone (ed.), Ioannis Tzetzae *Carmina Iliaca*, Catania 1995.
- AllegIl.* J. Fr. Boissonade (ed.), Tzetzae *Allegoriae Iliadis accedunt Pselli Allegoriae*, Paris 1851 (repr. Hildesheim 1967); English translation with facing Greek text by A. Goldwyn, D. Kokkini, *John Tzetzes: Allegories of the Iliad*, Cambridge, MA 2015.
- AllegOd.* H. Hunger (ed.), *Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 1-12*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 49, 1956, pp. 249-310; *Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 13-24*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 48, 1955, pp. 4-48.
- Theog.* I. Bekker (ed.), *Die Theogonie des Johannes Tzetzes aus der bibliotheca Casanatensis*, «Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin aus dem Jahr 1840: Philosophische und Historische Klasse», Berlin 1842, pp. 147-169 (repr. in I. Bekker, *Opuscula academica Berolinensia: Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Byzantinistik und Romanischen Philologie, 1826-1871. Band 1: Aus den Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1826-1847*, Leipzig 1974, pp. 443-465).
- Sch. Ar. Plut.* L. Massa Positano (ed.), *Johannis Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem. Fasciculus I continens Prolegomena et Commentarium in Plutum*, Groningen 1960. [M-P]
- Sch. Ar. Nub.* D. Holwerda (ed.), *Johannis Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem. Fasciculus II continens Commentarium in Nubes*, Groningen 1960. [Ho]
- Sch. Ar. Ran.* W. J. W. Koster (ed.), *Johannis Tzetzae Commentarii in Aristophanem. Fasciculus III continens Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves, argumentum Equitum*, Groningen 1962. [Ko]

⁹ For a recent overview of Tzetzes’ life and works see I. Ch. Nesseris, *Η παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12ο αιώνα*, PhD thesis, University of Ioannina, I-II, Ioannina 2014: I, pp. 158-197 and II, pp. 515-540 (exhaustive catalogue of his works with full bibliography). For briefer overviews see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I-II, Munich 1978, II, pp. 59-63 and I. Grigoriadis, *Ιωάννης Τζέτζης: Ἐπιστολαί. Εἰσαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens 2001, pp. 27-32 (with good bibliography).

¹⁰ For two recent publications of this type see O. Primavesi, *Lecteurs antiques et byzantines d’Empédocle: de Zenon à Tzézès*, «Cahiers de Philologie» 20, 2002, pp. 183-204 or D. Canavero, *Enea e Andromaca in Epiro*, «Acme» 55, 2002, pp. 151-164.

¹¹ For example, Grigoriadis, *Ιωάννης Τζέτζης*, cit., pp. 9-25 offered an analysis of Tzetzes’ humor.

his relation to Hellenism,¹² his social network, his relation with his students, or his “beggarly” character as a “poet on commission”.¹³ Only very recently studies have focused on a more sustained, theoretically informed, literary analysis of some of Tzetzes’ works.¹⁴ One central difficulty in approaching Tzetzes as an author is the fact that most of his lengthier surviving works have been (or appear to have been) written for didactic purposes, thus giving the impression that they do not offer the necessary basis for literary interpretation. However, the question whether didactic texts are literature is a modern and not a medieval problem.¹⁵ Another major difficulty in studying Tzetzes is the extreme and quite particular presence of his own Self in his texts, to the point that the vast majority of his writings appears to be driven by an “autographic syndrome”.

The textual image of this phenomenon – Tzetzes’ egocentric, idiosyncratic and contentious character – has been mostly interpreted as a purely personal trait of his.¹⁶ However, it is not possible to establish a direct – biographic, psychological or intellectual – one-to-one relationship between texts and their authors. This, obviously, does not mean that a number of Byzantine writers – particularly so from the

¹² A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 301-307, has proposed to read Tzetzes as an exponent of “Rhomaian” Hellenism in the twelfth century; see also his *Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium*, in C. Barber, D. Jenkins (eds.), *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, Leiden 2009, pp. 1-43: 26-32, with a rather superficial treatment of Tzetzes and his commentaries.

¹³ See M. Grünbart, *Prosopographische Beiträge zum Briefcorpus des Ioannes Tzetzes*, «Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik» 46, 1996, pp. 175-226; *Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend – oder wie meistert man seinen Alltag?*, in L. M. Hoffmann, A. Monchizadeh (eds.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie*, Mainz 2005, pp. 413-426; *Paideia Connects: The Interaction between Teachers and Pupils in Twelfth-Century Byzantium*, in Steckel, Gaul, Grünbart (eds.), *Networks of Learning*, cit., pp. 17-31: 27-29; N. Gaul, *Rising Elites and Institutionalization – Ethos/Mores – “Debts” and Drafts: Three Concluding Steps Towards Comparing Networks of Learning in Byzantium and the “Latin” West*, *ibid.*, pp. 235-280: 266-268; A. Rhoby, *Ioannes Tzetzes als Auftragsdichter*, «Graeco-Latina Brunensia» 15, 2010, pp. 155-170.

¹⁴ See E. Cullhed, *The Blind Bard and «I»: Homeric Biography and Authorial Personas in the Twelfth Century*, «Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies» 38, 2014, pp. 49-67: 58-67, and the forthcoming papers by A. Pizzone, *Self-Authorization and Strategies of Autography in John Tzetzes’ Historiae*, «Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies» 57, 2017 and *The Historiae of John Tzetzes: A Byzantine “Book of Memory”?*, «Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies» 42, 2018.

¹⁵ In particular for poetry see M. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Didactic Poetry and the Question of Poeticity*, in P. Odorico, P. A. Agapitos, M. Hinterberger (eds.), «Doux remède...»: *Poésie et Poétique à Byzance*, Paris 2009, pp. 37-46; see also E. M. Jeffreys, *Why Produce Verse in Twelfth-Century Constantinople?*, *ibid.*, pp. 219-228.

¹⁶ Indicatively, see Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., col. 1965; Kaldellis, *Classical Scholarship*, cit., p. 26 («comically annoying personality»); Nesseris, *Παιδεία*, cit., I, p. 158. For a more balanced approach see Grünbart, *Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend*, cit., p. 413. For a sympathetic approach by a Classicist to Tzetzes in his commentaries see F. Budelmann, *Classical Commentary in Byzantium: John Tzetzes on Ancient Greek Literature*, in R. K. Gibson, Ch. S. Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden 2002, pp. 141-169, though the socio-economic aspects of his *persona* are not discussed.

late tenth century onwards – did not have a sense of being “authors” and did not express such a sense quite clearly in their writings.¹⁷ Yet their authorial identities were also shaped by their social, cultural, religious and economic environment and the resulting manifold codes of interaction with their real or intended listeners and/or readers.

In the highly competitive environment of the capital, where the correct exegesis of standard school texts (such as Homer, Euripides, Aristophanes, Hermogenes and Aphthonios) was of paramount importance for promoting a specific teacher’s superiority over his colleagues, criticism of a potential competitor’s work was a crucial weapon in eliminating him from receiving a coveted position or a lucrative commission.¹⁸ Criticism by others is one of the reasons why Tzetzes kept a watchful eye over his own work, lest it should be appropriated by some other teacher.¹⁹ This happened, for example, when a certain Pelagonites, Tzetzes’ colleague at the Pantokrator Monastery, appropriated his commentary to the *progymnasmata* of Aphthonios. Tzetzes accused Pelagonites of plagiarism and succeeded in convincing the abbot to relieve the adversary of his teaching duties.²⁰ Within such a context, to accuse a competitor of philological ignorance or of using wrong Greek was instrumental in discrediting this person’s standing as a qualified teacher. Eustathios, for example, in his lectures discreetly criticized Tzetzes’ products of Homeric philology and corrected his errors,²¹ while Tzetzes in his commentaries

¹⁷ For theoretically well-equipped discussions of this matter in Byzantine Studies see S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*, Cambridge 2013, along with A. Pizzzone, *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: A View from Within*, in A. Pizzzone (ed.), *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions and Identities*, Boston-Berlin 2014, pp. 3-18, and M. Mullett, *In Search of the Monastic Author: Story-Telling, Anonymity and Innovation in the 12th Century*, *ibid.*, pp. 171-198.

¹⁸ On this literary competitiveness, which reflected a very specific need for social and financial success, see the pioneering study of A. Garzya, *Literarische und rhetorische Polemiken der Komnenenzeit* [1973], in *Storia e interpretazione di testi bizantini. Saggi e ricerche*, London 1974, nr. VII. Two textual witnesses of such polemics in the twelfth century are a still unedited text by Nikolaos Kataphloron about blatant plagiarism by competitors (see M. Loukaki, *Τυμβωρύχοι και σκυλευτές νεκρών: Οι απόψεις του Νικολάου Καταφλώρον για τη ρητορική και τους ρήτορες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη του 12ου αιώνα*, «Byzantina Symmeikta» 14, 2001, pp. 143-166) and an anonymous vituperation against writers who compose monodies (edited with translation and commentary by A. Sideras, *Eine byzantinische Invektive gegen die Verfasser von Grabreden*, Vienna 2002).

¹⁹ See Pizzzone, *Self-authorization*, *cit.*, part 2.

²⁰ *Epp.* 78-79. For another case of blatant plagiarism, where a teacher stole Tzetzes’ commentary to Lycophron, tried to pass it as his own and was exposed by a pupil see *ep.* 42; see also a grotesque episode of supposed plagiarism described by Tzetzes in Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 897a (Rec. II), 951-955 Ko (on the latter passage see Gaul, *Rising Elites*, *cit.*, pp. 266-268). Recension II represents an expanded and revised version of Tzetzes’ Aristophanic commentaries. It is most fully preserved in the famous Ambr. C 222 inf., once dated to the late 13th-early 14th century. However, C. M. Mazzucchi, *Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore*, «Aevum» 77, 2003, pp. 263-275 and 78, 2004, pp. 411-437, has convincingly shown that the Ambrosianus was copied out in the late 12th century, commissioned and read by a pupil of Tzetzes.

²¹ D. Holwerda, *De Tzetza in Eustathii reprehensiones incurrenti*, «Mnemosyne» 13, 1960, pp.

also criticized, though not discreetly, other teachers on their metrical or grammatical inadequacies.²² The detection and publicizing of such “wrong” usages exemplifies the professional risks to which teachers could be exposed if they did not have a powerful social network to support them and good diplomatic skills to counter such an exposure, as Theodore Prodromos had successfully done.²³ Tzetzes often represents himself as the target of such criticism, offering us valuable insights into the control mechanisms within a professional peer group such as the capital’s grammarians.²⁴ The fight for securing a new patron or keeping an old one is what comes out most strongly in Tzetzes’ appeals as documented in his letters.²⁵

In comparing John Tzetzes and Eustathios of Thessalonike, we can say that the two men stand at a substantial distance within the social, cultural and educational spectrum of Komnenian Constantinople. In contrast to Eustathios, Tzetzes never occupied any high rank in the capital’s “school system”, nor any rank in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Despite Tzetzes’ vast textual production (he himself speaks of τῶν ἐξήκοντα συγγεγραμμένων μοι βιβλίων, «the sixty books written by me»²⁶), only two brief prose texts of public oratory survive from his pen, this again in contrast to Eustathios’ grand orations and sermons.²⁷ Moreover, Tzetzes’ philological works, such as his commentaries on the Aristophanic triad, Lycophron’s *Alexandra* or on the *Iliad*,²⁸ differ greatly in style, structure and perspective from Eustathios’ *Parekbolai* on Homer or the exegesis on the iambic Pentecostal canon.²⁹ Eustathios

323-326, and now E. Cullhed, *Eustathios of Thessalonike: Parekbolai on Homer’s Odyssey 1-2. Proekdosis*, Uppsala 2014, pp. *21-*24.

²² H. Hunger, *Zur Interpretation polemischer Stellen im Aristophanes-Kommentar des Johannes Tzetzes*, in *Κοιμωδοτραγήματα. Festschrift W. J. W. Koster*, Amsterdam 1967, pp. 59-64.

²³ See Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., *passim*, and N. Zagklas, *Theodore Prodromos: The Neglected Poems and Epigrams. Edition, Translation and Commentary*. PhD thesis, University of Vienna, Vienna 2014, pp. 58-87.

²⁴ On the role of *phthonos* («envy») as an emotion and a driving force in this specific context of teacher rivalry see M. Hinterberger, *Phthonos: Mißgunst, Neid und Eifersucht in der byzantinischen Literatur*, Wiesbaden 2013, pp. 168-171.

²⁵ Indicatively, see *Epp.* 56 (to the *sebastokratorissa* Eirene), 57 (to Megalonas, representative of Empress Eirene), 89 (to the sons of Theodore Kamateros) and 74 (to Joseph, abbot of Pantokrator Monastery).

²⁶ See the similar phrased passages in Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 843a (Rec. II), 936, 13-19 Ko and Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 897a (Rec. II), 954, 15-955, 4 Ko. The «sixty books» also make an appearance in *Hist.* 369, *Chil.* XI 103.

²⁷ A speech of gratitude addressed to the Patriarch John IX Agapetos (1111-1134) and a consolatory speech addressed to an anonymous. Both texts were written before 1134; see B. L. Konstantopoulos, *Inedita Tzetziana: Δύο ανέκδοτοι λόγοι του Ιωάννου Τζέτζη*, «Hellenika» 33, 1981, pp. 178-184. That Tzetzes was absolutely capable of writing lively and artful prose can be seen from his letters, one of the most interesting epistolographic collections of Byzantine literature.

²⁸ Only the commentary to Book 1 was ever completed; see now M. Papatomopoulos (ed.), *Ἐξήγησις Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα*, Athens 2007.

²⁹ On the latter see now P. Cesaretti, S. Ronchey (eds.), *Eustathii Thessalonicensis In canonem iambicum Pentecostalem*, Berlin 2014.

and Tzetzes represent two different types of teachers within the capital's society, the former being an "upper-class" and high-profile *maistor*, the latter being a "middle-class" *grammatikos* with a restricted public profile.³⁰ Tzetzes certainly gave no cause to be attacked for political reasons, as had been the case with high-level controversies over "correct" education at other times in Byzantium.³¹ Thus, some of Tzetzes' eccentricities, which prove to be devices of high literary artistry, are related to his middle-class social standing and his failed efforts to achieve a higher educational status in Komnenian Constantinople.³²

Given these differences between Tzetzes, Prodrornos and Eustathios, and given the amount of material Tzetzes has to offer, it will be quite instructive to examine in detail his opinions about schedography and everyday language, because this will enable us to see in what ways the social position of a teacher might influence his view on language instruction and literary writing. Furthermore, by looking into the way Tzetzes combines in one specific work the question of appropriate language use with a writer's *oikonomia*, we shall be able to clarify some debated issues in the study of Komnenian literature. Such an examination will further our understanding of the variegated picture of Komnenian textual production in respect to the assumed division between learned and vernacular Greek language and literature.

The schedographic labyrinths of ignorant scum

The practice of schedography is firmly attested since the first decades of the eleventh century.³³ The reading and writing of this new type of grammatical exercise (σχέδος, «sketch», «improvisation») quickly developed into an important element of the education system. A *schedos* was written for advanced pupils and

³⁰ In comparison to Eustathios or Theodore Prodrornos the number of high-standing persons as addressees of his works is restricted, while the relationship of these people to Tzetzes was in most cases not long-lasting; see Grünbart, *Prosopographische Beiträge*, cit., *passim*, and Rhoby, *Ioannes Tzetzes*, cit., *passim*.

³¹ One such case was the clash between Leon Choiosphaktes and Arethas of Caesarea in the early tenth century; see P. Magdalino, *In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choiosphaktes and Constantine Manasses*, in H. Maguire (ed.), *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, Washington, DC 1997, pp. 141-165: 146-161, and I. Vassis (ed.), *Leon Magistros Choiosphaktes, Chiliostichos Theologia*, Berlin 2002, pp. 7-10. Another case was the controversy between Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites in the early fourteenth century; see I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polemique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos: La vie intellectuelle et politique à Byzance sous les premiers Paléologues*, Brussels 1962, pp. 21-174, and Hinterberger, *Phthonos*, cit., pp. 323-325.

³² See P. A. Agapitos, "Middle-Class" *Ideology of Education and Language, and the "Bookish" Identity of John Tzetzes*, in J. Stouraitis (ed.), *Ideologies and Identities in the Medieval Byzantine World*, Boston-Berlin 2017 (forthcoming).

³³ Agapitos, *Anna Komnene*, cit., pp. 98-102. To the references on schedography there one should add a piece of information provided by Psellos. In addressing his former fellow student Romanos, he remembers how both of them, while young (ca. 1130), diligently studied correct spelling (ὀρθογραφία) by writing out *schede*: οὗτοι φύσει τε ὄντες δεξιὸι καὶ σπουδῆ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν χρησίμων γεγραφότες σχεδῶν, ὧν ποτε καὶ αὐτὸς σχεδογραφῶν ἔτυχον (*Ep.* 16: E.

served two main aims: it drilled them in the complexities of Greek spelling, grammar and syntax, while it also helped them to understand the *progymnasmata*. These two aims were achieved through the puzzling form in which the grammarian presented the *schedos*. The text, punctuated in an erratic manner, was filled with strange words and phrases giving no meaning. The pupils had to decode this «riddle» (γρίφος or νόημα) and to rewrite it correctly. The puzzles were based on similarities of sound, called ἀντίστοιχα («correspondences»). For example, we will find phrases playing with similarly sounding nominal and verbal forms³⁴ or wrongly written phrases that need to be acoustically decoded.³⁵ Most *schede* were in prose (usually up to twenty lines in length), but there survives a fair number of *schede* in iambic twelve-syllable verse. By the middle of the twelfth century a particular type of *schedos* had become fashionable, in which an antistoichic prose section is concluded by a short non-antistoichic poem, often addressed to a recipient. This particular “diptych” type was in all probability an invention of Theodore Prodromos, who elevated the *schedos* to a new genre, offering it to aristocratic patrons as entertainment. It is this specific, wholly literary activity that Anna Komnene and Eustathios criticized as a form of deviation from the true aim of proper education.³⁶

Similar to Eustathios,³⁷ Tzetzes viewed schedography as a labyrinth created by its practitioners, mostly teachers like himself.³⁸ For example, he wrote a letter to his friend and colleague John Ismeniotos in order to praise him about his literary skills which Tzetzes only recently had discovered. Tzetzes notes to his addressee that «I knew you to be a most exact model and scientific master of general education».³⁹ As Tzetzes notes in the *Histories*, the vast verse commentary to his own letter collection composed around 1155-1160 and commonly referred to as *Chiliades*,⁴⁰ by

Kurtz, F. Drexel [eds.], Michaelis Pselli *Scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita. Volumen alterum: Epistulae*, Milan 1941, p. 20, 5-8).

³⁴ From an unedited *schedos* of Stylianos in the Vat. Pal. gr. 92, f. 194^v: εἰ δείσεις, θεόν, ὦ παῖ, καὶ περὶ λόγων εἰδήσεις ἰδίσεις, ἠδήσεις σαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἔχθρὸν δήσεις; see C. Gallavotti, *Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodromo*, «Bollettino dei Classici» s. III, 4, 1983, pp. 3-35: 27 n. 23.

³⁵ From a *schedos* of Constantine Manasses transmitted in the Vat. Pal. gr. 92, f. 235^r: (a) καὶ ἐκίσσησεν ἰφ τε instead of καὶ αἰκίσεις ἐνίστε, and (b) ἐνώκεε τε ῥωσθεῖς instead of ἐνῶ καὶ ἕτερός τις; see I. D. Polemis, *Fünf unedierte Texte des Konstantinos Manasses*, «Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici» 33, 1996, pp. 279-292: 283.

³⁶ For a detailed discussion of the above see my studies in n. 7 with full documentation and bibliography.

³⁷ Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 227-230.

³⁸ Very few and brief are the remarks on Tzetzes and schedography; see Gaul, *Rising Elites*, cit., pp. 273-279 on schedography in general with a reference to Tzetzes, and Nesseris, *Παιδεία*, cit., I, pp. 166-167 on Tzetzes and schedography.

³⁹ *Ep.* 77, 114, 4-5: ὑπογραμμὸν γὰρ σε καὶ ἐπιστημονάρχην τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ἐγίνωσκον ἀκριβέστατον.

⁴⁰ The *Histories* are quoted by the ordinal number of each *historia* and the thousand-verse numeration introduced by Theodor Kiessling in 1826. On the *Histories* as a larger-scale project of Tzetzes see the studies by Aglae Pizzone referred to above in n. 14.

«general education» in this passage he meant only «grammar».⁴¹ He then goes on to explain what exactly the subject was by which he knew the skills of Ismeniotes:⁴²

καὶ γὰρ εἰ καὶ κολοκύνταις κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν ἐλήμων, ὅμως οὐκ εἶω οὕτως ἂν ἀβλεπεῖν με, ἀλλὰ παρεβιάζοντο τρανῶς ὄραν καὶ ἀκούειν αἱ μεγαλοφυεῖς τῶν παρὰ σοῦ πλακεισῶν σχεδουργικῶν λαβυρίνθων πλοκαὶ καὶ αἱ ἐξαγώνιοι ἄμιλλαι· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν οὕτω τῶν ἀνηκούστων καὶ ἀμαυρῶν μελισταγεῖς τῶν λόγων ἐκρέουσαι ἴγγας. οὕτω μὲν, οὕτω τῆς ἐγκυκλίου παιδείας ὑπογραμμὸν σε ἤδειν τὸν ἀκριβέστατον.

And even if pumpkins were damaging my eyes, according to the Comic,⁴³ yet still I would not be as incapable of seeing, since the ingenious intertwinings and the non-athletic competitions of the schedourgic labyrinths you have intertwined would powerfully force me to see and listen. For your intertwinings were not utterly unknown and obscure, pouring forth the honeydripping charms of your words. Thus, then, thus I knew you to be the most exact model of general education.

Explaining in the *Histories* his own phrase *σχεδουργικῶν λαβυρίνθων πλοκαί*, Tzetzes expounds the story of Daedalus and the construction of the Labyrinth for King Minos.⁴⁴ The story of the Labyrinth gives Tzetzes the opportunity to make the following comment about schedourgic «riddles» (*νοήματα*):⁴⁵

565 Τοιοῦτος ὁ Λαβύρινθος ἦν ὁ παρὰ τὴν Κρήτην,
φρούριον πολυέλικτον, κοχλοειδὲς τὴν θέσιν.
Ἐγὼ δὲ τροπικώτερον δεινότητι ῥητόρων
τὰ σχεδουργῶν νοήματα νῦν λαβυρίνθους ἔφην.

565 Such was the Labyrinth that was situated on Crete,
a fortress with many twisted coils, snail-shaped as to its arrangement.
But I, more allegorically by means of rhetorical force,
called now the riddles of schedographers «labyrinths».

The extravagant epistolographic compliment payed to Ismeniotes about his ingenious composition of labyrinthine yet charming *schede* and its explanation in the *Histories*, are the only positive statements about schedography Tzetzes made in the totality of his surviving works. In its choice of specific words the phrasing in the passage quoted from *Ep.* 77 is fairly similar to a passage about the schedographic

⁴¹ *Hist.* 377, *Chil.* XI 527-528: νῦν δέ γε τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐγκύκλιον παιδεῖαν | εἶπον, κατὰ κατάχρησιν, οὐ λόγῳ δὲ κυρίῳ.

⁴² *Ep.* 77, 114,3-11.

⁴³ *Ar. Nub.* 327 νῦν γέ τοι ἤδη καθορᾶς αὐτάς, εἰ μὴ λημᾶς κολοκύνταις (Socrates speaking to Strepsiades about seeing the Clouds descending from Mount Parnes and the latter not seeing them clearly). On the Aristophanic verse and its meaning see *Hist.* 378, *Chil.* XI 529-542 along with Sch. *Ar. Nub.* 323a, 460, 18-19 Ho: καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης· εἰ μὴ κολοκύνταις, φησί, λημᾶς καὶ μεγάλως ἀμβλυοπεῖς ἰσομεγέθεις ἔχων τὰς λήμας, δικῶ ἤδη ταύτας ὄρᾶς.

⁴⁴ *Hist.* 379, *Chil.* XI 542-568.

⁴⁵ *Hist.* 379, *Chil.* XI 565-568.

practice of Theodore Prodromos in the monody written by his pupil Niketas Eugenianos⁴⁶ and a passage on the schedographic practice of Patriarch Michael in an encomiastic oration written by Eustathios.⁴⁷ All three passages accentuate the performative aspects of the *schedos*, making it quite clear that Tzetzes knew very well what he was writing about.

All other remarks of Tzetzes about schedography and its practitioners are decisively negative. This massive criticism of «the art of the grammatical sketch» (ἡ τέχνη τοῦ σχέδου), as Anna Komnene called it,⁴⁸ focuses on two major issues. The first concerns the ignorance of schedographers, be it in basic matters of spelling, grammar and metrics or in more complex subjects of general education, such as rhetoric and astronomy. A most telling example of this criticism comes from a note by Tzetzes (but copied out in the late thirteenth century), to be found on the left margin of cod. A of Herodotus, the famous Laur. 70, 3 (early 10th cent.), f. 5^v.⁴⁹ Commenting on Her. I 23 (Ἄριονα τὸν Μηθουμναῖον), Tzetzes remarks to the future reader of the codex:⁵⁰

Ἄριονα γίνωσκε μικρόν μοι γράφειν
ἰωνικῶς τε καὶ κατ' Ἀτθίδος λόγους·
ληρεῖν λόγους ἕα δὲ πρωξιμοπλόκους.

Know that Ἄριονα is to be written with an *omicron*,
both in Ionic and according to Attic diction;
but let the teacher-intertwined speeches tell fooleries.

The concern of Tzetzes about the correct spelling of third-declension proper names ending in -ων is also to be found in the *Histories*. On account of a reference to Arion in the verse epistle he addressed to the teacher Lachanas Zabareiotēs,⁵¹ Tzetzes includes a whole exegetical note on Arion and his story with reference to Herodotus.⁵² In an added scholion to the heading of this history, Tzetzes points to the correct spelling of Arion by quoting an ancient verse inscription preserved in Aelian's *On the Nature of Animals*. He then remarks addressing his future pupils:⁵³

⁴⁶ L. Petit, *Monodie de Nicéas Eugénianos sur Théodore Prodrome*, «Vizantijskij Vremennik» 9, 1902, pp. 446-463: 461-462; see Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., pp. 20-22.

⁴⁷ *OrMin.* 7, ed. P. Wirth, Eustathii Thessalonicensis *Opera minora*, Berlin 2000, pp. 100-140: 131, 23-30; see Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 232-233.

⁴⁸ *Alexiad* XV 7, 9; D. R. Reinsch, A. Kambylis (eds.), *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, Berlin 2001, p. 485, 18.

⁴⁹ On the complex make-up of the present codex see M. J. Luzzatto, *Note inedite di Giovanni Tzetzes e restauro di antichi codici alla fine del XII secolo: Il problema del Laur. 70, 3 di Erodoto*, in G. Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti tra riflessione e dibattito*, I-III, Florence 2000: II, pp. 633-654 and III, pp. 323-330 (plates).

⁵⁰ Luzzatto, *Note inedite*, cit., p. 643.

⁵¹ *Chil.* IV 479.

⁵² *Hist.* 17, *Chil.* I 396-417 (Περὶ Ἄριονος).

⁵³ *Sch. Chil.* I 396; 533, 3-5 Leone.

ὁ ἐπίγραμμα καὶ σημείωσαι, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτοῦ γινώσκεις, ὅτι Ἄριονος τὸ ὀ μικρὸν δεῖ γράφειν, ὡς τὸ Πανδίωνος, Ἰξίωνος καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ βούβαλοι σχεδεκδῶται μέγα.

Of this epigram take note, so that you might know from it, that in Ἄριονος the ὀ should be written as *omicron*, like Πανδίωνος, Ἰξίωνος and the same, and not *omega* like the buffalo sketch-publishers write.

In the marginal note of the Laurentianus quoted above the πρῶξιμοι are the school teachers who «intertwine» *schede*,⁵⁴ only that, in the opinion of Tzetzes, the teachings of such people tell nonsense. Tzetzes' scholion to *Hist.* 17 makes it clear that he has the schedographers in mind. He calls them «publishers of sketches» (a word created by him)⁵⁵ and characterizes them as «buffaloes».⁵⁶ As we shall have the opportunity to see further below, this word is one of his favorite abuses for characterizing ignorant teachers, including himself in two cases.⁵⁷

The ignorance of schedographers in matters of spelling, especially of epic and archaic vocabulary, is expressed most clearly in another scholion. Tzetzes wrote a highly intricate letter to his former pupil Alexios, congratulating him on his appointment as *kokkiarios*, a tax official.⁵⁸ The letter opens with a verse from Hesiod (*Op.* 486 ἦμος κόκκυξ κοκκῶζει δρυὸς ἐν πετάλοισι), in which Tzetzes introduces a wordplay with the verb κοκκῶζειν and its homophone κοκκίζειν. Both verbs are brought into relation with Alexios' new office, the name of which is firmly pointed out to the readers by its inclusion in the letter's heading.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ E.g., like the *proximos* Stylianos in poems 9-10 of Christopher Mitylenaios: M. De Groote (ed.), *Christophori Mitylenaii Versuum variorum collectio Cryptensis*, Turnhout 2012, pp. 10-11.

⁵⁵ However, the verb σχεδεκδῶται is attested in his contemporary Gregory of Corinth (see *LBG s.v.*).

⁵⁶ On the meaning of the word as «foolish person» see Kriaras, IV, p. 160, *s.v.* βούβαλος; see also Ph. Koukoules, *Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου τὰ λαογραφικά*, I-II, Athens 1950: II, p. 184 with references to Tzetzes, but also to *Ptochopr.* II (version H), 68-73 (ed. H. Eideneier, *Πτωχοπρόδρομος. Κριτική έκδοση*, Herakleion 2012, p. 168 in the critical apparatus).

⁵⁷ Tzetzes quotes in *Ep.* 1, 4, 7-13 a few iambs of his written when he was young. In a later scholion to the letters he applies this abusive characterization to himself concerning his wrong use of dichronic vowels in these verses (158, 14-159, 7): οὕτως ἔχεται μὲν τοῦτο καὶ κανόνος· τὸ δὲ πλεόν ὅτι τότε καὶ διχρόνοις κατεχρώμην, ὡς οἱ βούβαλοι («Thus does this phenomenon also have a rule; furthermore, that then I misused dichronic vowels just like buffaloes do»). In the *Histories* he also quotes a few of his own youthful iambs (*Hist.* 66, *Chil.* III 61-67) and makes a similar comment (541-542 Leone): στίχοι ἐμοί· ὅτε ταῦτα ἔγραφον ἔτι κατεχρώμην τοῖς διχρόνοις ὡς οἱ βούβαλοι («My verses: when I wrote these lines, I still misused dichronic vowels just like buffaloes do»).

⁵⁸ On this office, the meaning of the recondite wordplay and the aim of *Ep.* 31 see now the excellent analysis by P. Katsoni, *Ο Ἰωάννης Τζέτζης καὶ ὁ κοκκιάριος: Πληροφορίες για τὸ φορολογικὸ σύστημα καὶ τὴ λειτουργία του στὴν ἐπιστολογραφία τῆς ὑστερης βυζαντινῆς περιόδου*, in T. G. Kollias, K. G. Pitsakis (eds.), *Aureus: Τόμος αφιερωμένος στον καθηγητὴ Ευάγγελο Χρυσό*, Athens 2014, pp. 311-328: 318-324. For a first, not quite successful attempt to solve the puzzle of *kokkiarios* see Grünbart, *Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend*, cit., p. 417 n. 19.

⁵⁹ *Ep.* 31, 46, 13-17.

Τῷ ἀνεπιῶ τῷ πρωτοβεστιαρίου κυρῶ Ἀλεξίῳ γενομένῳ κοκκιαρίῳ
 «Ἥμος κόκκυξ κοκκύζη δρυὸς ἐν πετάλοισι» (κατὰ τὸν Ἀσκραῖον ἐκεῖνον Ἡσίο-
 δον κοκκίζειν, ἀλλ' οὐ κοκκύζειν), ἐξηλθες δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πανευγενέστατός μοι
 δεσπότης.

To master Alexios, nephew of the protovestiaros, when appointed *kokkiarios*
 «When the cuckoo tweets his cuckoo-song in the leaves of the oak» (according to
 the Ascraean Hesiod *kokkizein* [«sprinkle with light rain»] and not *kokkyzein* [«pro-
 duce the cuckoo-sound»], you also came forth, my most noble lord.

Hesiod used κοκκύζειν, but Tzetzes suggests that he actually meant κοκκίζειν. Now, this verb – a colloquial word – means «sprinkle something with flour or dust»,⁶⁰ but Tzetzes (with an eye on the verses following the Hesiodic quotation, i.e. *Op.* 488 τῆμος Ζεὺς ὕοι τρίτῳ ἡματι μηδ' ἀπολήγοι) reinterprets the verb to mean «raining lightly». He thus suggests that just as the cuckoo starts singing at the end of winter, signalling the arrival of spring when light rain falls,⁶¹ so does Alexios go forth on his duties at the beginning of spring. It would have been obvious to the informed readers of the letter that the wordplay κοκκύζειν/κοκκίζειν is a typical schedographic riddle involving the use of everyday language. We see here that Tzetzes knew very well how schedography functioned and, moreover, used colloquial discourse in setting up his deceitful riddle, just like Theodore Prodromos and other teachers did. In an iambic scholion to ἡμος in *Ep.* 31 about the accentuation of this archaic adverb, Tzetzes notes to his reader:⁶²

- ἡμος] 5 ἡμος γράφων δάσυνε καὶ ψίλου δ' ἅμα,
 ὡς τῆμος, ἡμος ἐκκοπὲν δασὺ θέλει·
 τροχαϊκὸν τελοῦν δὲ τὴν ψιλὴν φέρει·
 οὕτω δασυψίλου μέν, ὡς Τζέτζης λέγει,
 σοὶ τεχνικὸν δοὺς ἀκριβέστατον λόγον·
- 10 τοὺς πανσόφους ἔα δὲ τοὺς σχεδεργάτας·
 ἴσασιν οὐδὲν ὦν δοκοῦσιν εἰδέναί·
 φέρουσι τὴν κλησιν δὲ τῆς τέχνης μάτην·
 τοὺς τεχνικοὺς γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίστανται λόγους.
- 5 Should you write *hēmos* [«when»], place both an asper and a lenis, as in *tēmos* [«then»], while *hēmos* when shortened needs an asper, but when beginning a trochaic it carries the lenis. Thus, place an “asperolenis”, as Tzetzes says, granting to yourself a most exact technical diction, but let the all-wise sketch-workmen go their way: They know nothing of what they think they know. In vain do they bear the appellation of the art,⁶³ for they are ignorant of technical discourses.

⁶⁰ See Katsoni, *Ιωάννης Τζέτζης*, cit., p. 321 n. 42 for the relevant references.

⁶¹ On this interpretation of the relevant Hesiodic verses see *Hist.* 163, *Chil.* VIII 41-43.

⁶² Sch. ad *Ep.* 31, 166, 5-13.

⁶³ That is, being called *technikoi*, another term for *grammatikoi*.

The criticism against schedographers concerns again their ignorance in matters of spelling, but here they are ironically called «all-wise sketch-workmen», a low-class version of *shedekdotai*. These people are wrongly called *technikoi*, whereas they are completely ignorant of the «discursive arts» (λογικαὶ τέχναι). It is interesting to note how Tzetzes disparages schedographers by degrading them intellectually and socially, while using quite aptly a schedographic riddle to enhance a letter to a former pupil. Similar in content to the previous scholia are some of Tzetzes' remarks in his commentaries on Aristophanes. For example, in the commentary on the *Frogs*, he attacks vehemently schedographers for having misunderstood the elision ταύτ' ἔστι, thinking that they hear ταύτη ἔστιν,⁶⁴ exactly the kind of schedographic “error” also pointed out by Eustathios.⁶⁵ Of the same type is the schedographic error criticized in relation to another verse of the *Frogs*:⁶⁶

αὐλητρίς ἦδ' ἔνδον ἐστὶ: ἦδε ἔνδον ἐστὶν καὶ αὐλητρίς. τοῖς σχεδεκδόταις καὶ λυμεῶσι τεχνῶν λογικῶν μὴ δοίης «ἦδη» καὶ αὐτίκα, ὡς τὰ μακρὰ οὐκ ἐκθλίβεσθαι μετὰ μυρίων παραδειγμάτων πολλακίς ἔδειξα.

αὐλητρίς ἦδ' ἔνδον ἐστὶ: «This here fluit-girl is inside». Do not grant immediately ἦδη («already») to the sketch-publishers and corruptors of the discursive arts, since I have many times shown with myriads of examples that long vowels are not elided.

The schedographers understand the elided demonstrative ἦδε as the adverbial ἦδη. Tzetzes again uses «sketch-publishers» but adds here the “moral” characterization «corruptors of the discursive arts» (λυμεῶνες τεχνῶν λογικῶν).⁶⁷ Thus, the practitioners of schedography are placed in an area demarcated by error as a form of sin. This moral imagery takes on stronger contours in a scholion to Aristophanes' *Wealth*. Tzetzes, in dealing once again with the correct spelling of a word (δύο as a numeral and δύω as the dual of the ordinal adjective in Attic), makes the following note to his pupils:⁶⁸

μή τις δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀκροατῶν, ὡς τὰ νέα σοφὰ τοῦ βίου καθάρματα, ὡς δυϊκὸν γράφεσθαι μέγα τολμήσοι εἰπεῖν. ἔατε τὰ θατεριστῶν τοῖς θατερισταῖς, ἐπιστημονικοῖς δὲ κανόσιν οἱ ἡμέτεροι χρώμενοι λέγετε: πᾶσα λέξις ἐν μιᾷ φωνῇ τὰ τρία γένη σημαίνουσα ἄκλιτος ἐστίν.

May none of my own pupils loudly dare say that it [*sc.* δύο] is to be written as a dual,

⁶⁴ Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 1160a (Rec. II), 1038-1039 Ko.

⁶⁵ For example, the phrase τάχ' ἡμύσειε in *Iliad* 2, 373 is misunderstood by schedographers as τάχει μύσειε (Eust. *Commll.* 241, 33-36); see Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., p. 230.

⁶⁶ Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 513-514 (Rec. I), 839-840 Ko. Recension I represents an earlier stage of Tzetzes' commentary and is mostly prerserved in Vat. Urb. 141 (14th cent.), but also in Par. Suppl. gr. 655 (14th cent.).

⁶⁷ Possibly a reminiscence of λωβηται τέχνης in *Ran.* 93 (referring to young upstart tragedians), a verse Tzetzes had commented on; see Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 93, 730, 1-2 Ko (λωβηται τέχνης: διαφορεῖς καὶ ἀφανισταὶ τῶν τεχνῶν: λέγει δὲ τῆς τραγωδίας καὶ κωμικῆς). On Tzetzes' use of *Ran.* 92-93 see also further below n. 244.

⁶⁸ Sch. Ar. *Plut.* 508, 123, 22-124, 2 M-P.

like the young wise scum of our present times do. Leave the matters of differentialists (*tbateristai*)⁶⁹ to the differentialists, but you, my own pupils, by using scientific rules proclaim this: «Every word indicating in one form all three genders is undeclinable».

Here the schedographers have become «the scum» of Tzetzes' own times. The word *κάθαρμα* belongs to the ritual sphere («refuse of a sacrifice»). In the ancient scholia to Aristophanes' *Wealth*, *Frogs* and *Knights* the word is treated as synonymous to *φαρμακός*, the person sacrificed or executed as an atonement for others.⁷⁰ Tzetzes obviously uses *katharma* in this particular sense of «outcast», thus a person of criminal background and low social status, in modern terms a «scum». Not only did Tzetzes comment extensively on two relevant Aristophanic passages,⁷¹ but he also included three exegetical notes of the word in the *Histories*.⁷² He was so fascinated by this Hellenic sacrificial tradition that he used it quite extravagantly in a satirical letter addressed to his own slave Demetrios Gobinos.⁷³ For Tzetzes the characteristic traits of the *katharma* are his ugliness, meanness and low social standing.⁷⁴ It is within this semantic frame that he applies *katharma* to the average schedographer, who is indirectly but decisively branded as a deformed, despicable and base creature.⁷⁵ Thus, the *schedourgos* becomes the perfect inimical Other – a grotesque inversion of a good-looking, decent and noble *grammatikos*.⁷⁶ Given this socio-textual attitude, Tzetzes allows himself to openly mock schedography and its

⁶⁹ That is, «the ones who have a different opinion». The word is a creation of Tzetzes (see *LBG s.v.*).

⁷⁰ Equation of *κάθαρμα* with *φαρμακός* in Sch. Ar. *Pl.* 454 and Sch. Ar. *Eq.* 1133; for appearances of these two words in Aristophanes see *Plut.* 454 (γρῦζειν δὲ καὶ τολμᾶτον ὃ καθάρματε), *Eq.* 1405, *Ran.* 733. For a recent discussion of the *pharmakos* ritual in ancient Greek culture see T. M. Compton, *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior and Hero in Graeco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*, Cambridge, MA 2006, pp. 7-22 (with substantial bibliography).

⁷¹ Sch. Ar. *Plut.* 454b, 114, 4-17 M-P and *Ran.* 733a, 891.7-892.4 Kō; see Koster's extensive note to 733a with full reference to the ancient scholia.

⁷² *Hist.* 23, *Chil.* V 728-763 (Τὶ τὸ κάθαρμα); *Hist.* 239, *Chil.* VIII 902-912 (Τίνα τὰ καθάρματα); *Hist.* 481, *Chil.* XIII 333-337 (Περὶ καθάρματος τοῦ καὶ φαρμακοῦ). See also *Hist.* 201, *Chil.* VIII 428-434 (on Aristophanes in the *Frogs* mocking the *katharmata*, here explained as *μωρόσοφοι*, «foolish-wise»).

⁷³ *Ep.* 104, 151, 9-23. On this letter and its Aristophanic intertexts see Agapitos, «Middle-Class» *Ideology*, cit.

⁷⁴ See *Hist.* 23, *Chil.* V 731 (τῶν πάντων ἀμορφότερον, «of all citizens the most deformed») and Sch. *Ep.* 104, 174, 9-11: *κάθαρμα*] *δυσειδέστατον ἀνθρώπιον ἔθνον ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς ὑπὲρ πάσης πόλεως, καὶ τοῦτο φαρμακός καὶ κάθαρμα ἐκαλεῖτο* («*Katharma*») During disasters they sacrificed a most ugly and mean fellow for the good of all the city, and this person was called *pharmakos* and *katharmas*).

⁷⁵ See, for example, the vicious description of the «wise scum» (*σοφὰ καθάρματα*) in *Hist.* 143, *Chil.* VII 496-510.

⁷⁶ Tzetzes describes himself as being similar to Palamedes and Cato the Elder, namely, tall, strong of neck, symmetrically long-nosed and long-faced, quick-witted, modest, thin, blue-eyed, with golden skin and blondish curly hair, though like Cato the Younger, he had a hot and irrita-

practitioners. Thus, following a detailed analysis of a difficult passage in the opening lines of *Wealth*, he notes in his usual satiric iambs:⁷⁷

παίξειν χρεῶν γὰρ καὶ γελᾶν γενειάδας
σχεδεκδοτούντων καὶ στυγούντων τὰς βίβλους.

For it is right to ridicule and mock the beards
of those who publish sketches and loathe all books.

Here we find a further element in the construction of the schedographic Other, since the «sketch-publishers» do not read books, in fact, they detest them. As Tzetzes puts it: «What a sort of scum, supposedly philosophizing, repulsive abortions, utterly inane, uncouth as to their art, having read ten or maybe twelve books». ⁷⁸ Therefore, it is the moral right of the excellent teacher to ridicule in public his ignorant colleagues. This right to ridicule extends even to women, as we can glean from another of Tzetzes' satirical iambic poems:⁷⁹

Στίχοι του Τζέτζου κατὰ γυναικὸς σχεδογραφοῦσης
Ἄντι μὲν ἴστοῦ τὸν τόμον ἐν χερσὶ φέρεις,
τὸν κάλαμον δ' αὖ ἀντὶ κερκίδος, γύναι·
Ἐρμῆ λατρεύεις καὶ θύεις Καλλιόπῃ
5 ἐν δευτέρῳ τιθεῖσα τὴν Ἀφροδίτην.
Τί χρῆμα σὺ δρᾷς; Ἄπορῶ μὰ τὰς βίβλους;
ἄτρακτον ἀφέλισσε,⁸⁰ μηρῦου κρόκην,
ἡλακάτην μέτελθε καὶ μίτους πλέκε.
Λόγοι δὲ καὶ μάθησις ἀνδράσι πρέπει.
10 «Μέλλει γὰρ ἀνὴρ, μὴ γυνὴ βουλευέτω»
ὁ καλὸς Αἰσχύλος σὲ πειθέτω λέγων.

Verses by Tzetzes against a woman writing out sketches
Instead of a web you hold a volume in your hands,
and also a pen instead of a shuttle, woman.
You serve Hermes and you sacrifice to Calliope,
5 giving second place to Aphrodite.
What are you actually doing? By my books, I am astonished!
Unroll the spindle, weave the woof onto the warp,⁸¹
attend to the distaff, plait the thread.
Literature and education befit men.

ble temperament; see *Hist.* 70, *Chil.* III 173-191 and *AllegII.* proleg. 724-739 (transl. Goldwyn-Kokkini, cit., pp. 54-57).

⁷⁷ Sch. Ar. *Plut.* 9, 9-10 M-P.

⁷⁸ *Hist.* 143, *Chil.* VII 498-500: καὶ οἶα δὲ καθάρματα, φιλοσοφοῦντα δῆθεν, | ἐκτρώματα, ἀνούστατα, σφυρήλατα τὴν τέχνην, | δέκα μόνον ἢ δώδεκα βιβλία ἀναγνόντα.

⁷⁹ S. G. Mercati, *Giambi di Giovanni Tzetze contro una donna schedografa* [1951], in *Collectanea Byzantina*, ed. A. Acconcia Longo, I, Bari 1970, pp. 553-556: 556.

⁸⁰ The verb ἀφέλισσω is a creation of Tzetzes; see *Hist.* 258, *Chil.* IX 138 and 140.

⁸¹ Hes. *Op.* 538 στήμονι δ' ἐν παύρῳ πολλὴν κρόκα μηρύσασθαι («and you should weave thick woof on thin warp»).

- 10 «Man should attend to deliberating, let not woman think»;
let good Aeschylus, who speaks thus, convince you.

This is a rather particular specimen of Tzetzes' anti-schedographic utterances. The poem criticizes a woman who, in her studies, concentrates on Hermes (*qua* rhetoric) and Calliope (*qua* epic poetry).⁸² However, according to Tzetzes, this was improper for a woman, since she had to attend to Aphrodite (*qua* marriage and motherhood) and to practice weaving, while literature and learning was an activity appropriate only for men, an axiom supported by a weighty verse of Aeschylus.⁸³ It should be noted that only the heading of the poem refers to schedography, while in the actual text *schede* are not mentioned, however, this is not an unusual practice with Tzetzes.⁸⁴ The terminology describing weaving comes exclusively from the Homeric and Hesiodic poems, making the image of female duties appear textually as very archaic. It has been suggested that the brief poem could be a *schedos*, written for teaching pupils the vocabulary of weaving.⁸⁵ For one thing, we have no information that Tzetzes ever wrote *schede* intended for circulation, as his «sketch-publishing» colleagues did. Furthermore, there is no grammatical indication in the poem that the text needs to be decoded as if it were some kind of riddle.⁸⁶ At the same time, the image of the woman studying and writing out a *schedos* reflects very much the reading practices of educated patronesses of the Komnenian aristocracy, such as Anna Komnene,⁸⁷ Eirene Doukaina⁸⁸ and the *sebastokratorissa* Eirene

⁸² Hermes as λόγιος Ἑρμῆς was seen as the patron of rhetoric, while Calliope, first among the Muses (Hes. *Theog.* 79), was equated with epic (or sometimes lyric) poetry. Irrespective of the ancient mythological and religious issues involved, Tzetzes viewed them so; see *Hist.* 89, *Chil.* VI 917-926 (about the Muses and Hermes as *ephoroi* of poetry and rhetoric respectively), *Hist.* 36, *Chil.* II 386 (Ὀμήρου Καλλιόπη) and *Hist.* 429, *Chil.* XII 585-591 (Hermes as being the interpreter [*hermeneus*] of languages and literature). Tzetzes in his letters often combines the two in addressing some learned recipients, for example, *Ep.* 71, 101, 5-6 (ὦ τῶν Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν τροφίμων τὸ σεμνολόγημα) or *Ep.* 94, 136, 7-8 (κλάδε Μουσῶν καὶ Ἑρμοῦ).

⁸³ Aesch. *Sept.* 200 μέλει γὰρ ἀνδρὶ, μὴ γυνὴ βουλευέτω. On the education and activities of women in the 10th-12th centuries see K. Nikolaou, *Η γυναικία στη μέση βυζαντινή εποχή: Κοινωνικά πρότυπα και καθημερινός βίος στα αγιολογικά κείμενα*, Athens 2005, pp. 185-213.

⁸⁴ See the satirical poem edited from Par. gr. 2925 (15th cent.) by S. Pétridès, *Vers inédits de Jean Tzetzes*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 12, 1903, pp. 568-570: 569, where the information given in the heading is not found in the text. The poem, with some variants and a different heading (Στίχοι κατὰ διαβολέων τινῶν διασυρόντων αὐτὸν καίπερ ἐγγωνιῶντα), is also transmitted in the Vind. phil. gr. 321 (13th cent.), f. 43^r, along with an unedited shorter poem on the same topic (Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτεροι στίχοι πρὸς αὐτούς). I am currently preparing an edition of both poems.

⁸⁵ Mercati, *Giambi*, cit., p. 555 and, more recently, F. Ciccolella, *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance*, Leiden-Boston 2008, pp. 114-115.

⁸⁶ See contrastively the long iambic poem placed at the end of the *Histories* (*Iambi*, pp. 134-144), which is written as if it were a *schedos* accompanied by extensive scholia (*Iambi*, pp. 147-151).

⁸⁷ She worked hard with the complexities of schedography as she herself admits in the *Alexiad*; see Agapitos, *Anna Komnene*, cit., pp. 93-96.

⁸⁸ She was the addressee of at least one of Prodromos' literary *schede*; see Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., p. 18 (with reference to the relevant editions).

Komnene.⁸⁹ In this sense, I would see the poem more as a public and misogynist expression against schedography, not unsimilar to some other satirical poems of Tzetzes.⁹⁰

The other major issue of Tzetzes against schedography is its use of everyday language. We shall look at some specific passages where he expresses his opinions about schedography in relation to *ιδιωτικὴ γλωττα* as Anna Komnene called it,⁹¹ keeping in mind the broader negative framework within which he was writing. For example, while commenting on *mainis*, a word indicating in Aristophanes the smelt (a small surface fish),⁹² he remarks:⁹³

τίς τῆς μαινίδος: ἡ μαινὶς εἶδος ἐστὶν ἰχθύος ὅμοιον ταῖς πλατεῖαις σμαρίσιν, οὐ μέντοι αὐτὴ ἡ σμαρίς, ὡς οἱ τοῖς σχέδεσι βαρβαρούμενοι τοῦτο νομίζουσιν.

τίς τῆς μαινίδος: The smelt is a fish similar to the broad picarels, however not the picarel itself, as those barbarized by schedography believe this to be.

Tzetzes points out that schedography «barbarizes» pupils instead of educating them. This “barbarization” is reflected in the use of an Attic word (σμαρίς, Modern Greek μαρίδα) to cover in a colloquial manner all kinds of small surface fish. The notion of a wrong “vernacularization” of Greek due to schedographic practice is a phenomenon that Eustathios had also singled out as an example of the bad influence of schedography on pupils.⁹⁴ This “vernacularization” through schedography is also a prominent element in Tzetzes’ critical remarks. For example, while criticizing a boorish addressee in one of his letters, Tzetzes made a recondite word-play on Thessalian cities and Thessalonike.⁹⁵ In the *Histories* he refers to this word-play, and then writes:⁹⁶

705 Καὶ γὰρ ἐβαρβαρώθησαν οἱ πλείους σχεδουργίαις,
βίβλους ἀναγινώσκοντες τῶν παλαιῶν οὐδόλως,
ὡς τόπους, χώρας, πράγματα γινώσκειν σαφεστάτως,
καὶ θησαυροὺς ἀρύεσθαι, λόγους σοφῶν παντοίων,
τῶν ἀμαθῶν καπήλων δε πλοκῇ λαβυρινθῶδει
μόνη τὸν νοῦν προσέχοντες καὶ κεκατηλευμένη.

For most of them have been barbarized by schedourgy,

⁸⁹ She also was the addressee of one of Prodromos’ literary *schede*; see Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., pp. 9-12.

⁹⁰ Tzetzes’ misogynist attitude has not been properly studied; for a very first attempt see T. Braccini, *Mitografia e miturgia femminile a Bisanzio: il caso di Giovanni Tzetze*, «I Quaderni del Ramo d’Oro on-line» 3, 2010, pp. 88-105.

⁹¹ *Alexiad* II 4, 9 (65, 98-99 Reinsch-Kambylis).

⁹² *Ar. Ran.* 984-985: τίς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπεδήδοκεν | τῆς μαινίδος; («Who bit off the head of the smelt?»).

⁹³ *Sch. Ar. Ran.* 984-985, 985, 6-11 Ko.

⁹⁴ See Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 233-238.

⁹⁵ *Ep.* 60, 89, 8-9 and 90, 5-7.

⁹⁶ *Hist.* 280, *Chil.* IX 703-708.

- 705 not reading any of the books of ancient writers,
in order to know most clearly about places, lands and affairs,
and to draw in treasures, namely, the discourses of various wise men;
instead, they turn their minds only to the labyrinthine
and vulgar complexity of ignorant tavern-keepers.

On the one hand, pupils pay attention only to this «labyrinthine complexity», which is a product sold in taverns.⁹⁷ Moreover, pupils are not reading ancient books in order to be properly educated, and we have already seen that Tzetzes viewed schedographers as people who hate books and have read just a few of them. On the other hand, schedographers are presented as «ignorant tavern-keepers». The image of tavern-keeper characterizing a teacher possibly suggests that the use of everyday language is involved in this venal form of teaching. In *Historia* 399 Tzetzes explains at length the calculations of the astronomer Meton; at some point he introduces the following digression:⁹⁸

- Τὰ δ' ἀμαθῆ καθάρματα τὰ ληροσχεδοπλόκα,
ἄπερ κατεβαρβάρωσαν τὴν τέχνην τῶν γραμμάτων,
225 ταῖς βίβλοις μὴ προσέχοντες, ἐν αἷς παντοῖος ὄλβος,
ὡς νέκταρ δὲ σιτούμενοι κοπρίας τὰς δυσόσμου
(ἀγγέλων γὰρ οὐ θέλουσιν ἄρτον φαγεῖν οἱ χοῖροι)
τῷ γράφειν τὰ ληρήματα καὶ χαίρειν φλυαρίαις.
Ἡμέραις κάθηται ταῖς νῦν γλυκύς τε καὶ εἰδοῖς⁹⁹ μοι.
230 Πρὸς ἴμπρω ἀπεδήμησας, τζουτζούτζου δ' οὐ παρεῖη,
ὑπ' ἔντε' ἄνδρες μοι ἐχθροὶ ζῶντες εἰσίν, ὦ φίλοι,
ὁ δ' ἵπνος καὶ ὁ κάπνος τε· καὶ ἄλλας ληρωδίας.
Τὰ δ' ἀμαθῆ καθάρματα ταῦτα, τὰ κοπροφάγα,
ἐρωτηθέντα τοῖς αὐτοῖς φοιτῶσι παιδαρίοις,
235 τίνες τοῦ Μέτωνος εἰσίν ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ ἄλλα,
μισοῦντες τὰς διφθόγγους τε πάσας καὶ τὰς τριφθόγγους
καὶ τὰς διχρόνους σὺν αὐταῖς καὶ τοὺς κανόνας πάντας
καὶ πάντων τῶν βιβλίων δε πάσας τὰς ἀναγνώσεις,
ὅπερ ἢ βάρβαρος ψυχὴ τούτοις ἀνατυπώσει,
240 τοῖς μεираκίοις λέγουσι· «Ταῦτα δ' ἠπατημένα».¹⁰⁰
Τὰ τῶν βαρβάρων γράφουσι λογύδρια ταῖς βίβλοις,
ταύτας ποιοῦντες ἐν αὐτοῖς Ἀυγείου κοπρεῶνας,

⁹⁷ The extravagant medium perfect participle *κεκαπηλευμένος* implies the selling of merchandise and its distribution in a tavern, while it might even imply some sort of forgery; see *LBG s.v. καπηλεύομαι*.

⁹⁸ *Hist.* 399, *Chil.* XII 223-246.

⁹⁹ The mss. read *εἰδοῖς*, but the *editio princeps* of 1564 corrected the incomprehensible word to *ἠδύς*, accepted by all editors. However, given that the riddles in the next lines are also transmitted in their “erroneous” form by all mss. (except for the 16th-century O which corrects everything), *εἰδοῖς* should be retained in the text as the necessary signal that the readers are embarking on an encoded *schedos*.

¹⁰⁰ I have changed the punctuation in this verse, turning its second half into direct speech.

- ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ τραγόπωλον τοῦ τόμου τὸ βιβλίον.
 Οὔτω περὶ τοῦ Μέτωνος καὶ περὶ ἄλλων πόσων.
 245 Καὶ ἐκ σοφῶν μὲν γίνονται συγχύσεις, πλὴν βραχεῖαι,
 ἐκ δὲ βαρβάρων βόρβοροι πληροῦντες δυσοσμίας.
- And the ignorant scum, these composers of foolish sketches,
 who have utterly barbarized the art of letters,
 225 not paying attention to books wherein lies manifold wealth,
 while feeding on foul-smelling dung as if it were nectar,
 (for pigs do not want to eat the bread of angels!)
 by writing fooleries and delighting in nonsense.
 For these here days he [*sc.* a grammarian] rests so sweet and pleasant to me;
 230 «You have migrated to Imbro, no cock [?] is near by,
 the five men are living enemies to me, my friends,
 so is dinner, sleep and smoke», and other such fooleries.
 And these ignorant scum, these dung-eaters,
 when asked by the children studying with them,
 235 what are the yearly cycles of Meton and other such matters,
 hating all diphthongs and triphthongs
 and along with them the dichronic vowels and all rules of grammar,
 as well as hating the reading of any book,
 whenever their barbarous soul represents these matters for them,
 240 they say to the youths: «These are all mistaken».
 The youths write the little texts of these barbarians in their books,
 turning them among themselves into the dung-filled stables of Augeias,
 just like the young billy goat did to the book of the administrative cadaster.¹⁰¹
 So much, then, about Meton and about how many others.
 245 Certainly, confusions might also occur from wise men, yet they are brief,
 but from barbarians occur latrines filling everything with stench.

The digression is structured in three parts: (i) an opening section introducing the butt of Tzetzes' verbal missiles (XII 223-228); (ii) a middle section which gives the impression of being a spontaneous insertion (XII 229-232), (iii) a concluding section presenting the main point of the abusive passage (XII 233-246). The opening and concluding sections connect to each other through the use of an almost identical verse (XII 223 ~ XII 233), while both sections end with an escalating abuse developed around fecal imagery. In the first section, the «ignorant scum» are represented as pigs eating excrements and refusing to dine on the Psalmist's «bread of

¹⁰¹ The word τόμος can function as synonymous to πρακτικά, the administrative cadaster. Tzetzes in *Chil.* XI 243 is possibly alluding to a story he narrates in *Ep.* 47, asking from his friend John Ismeniotēs to protect a young man (a relative of Tzetzes) from the possible misgivings of the provincial governor. The reason is that this young man, described in the letter as τὸ παιδάριον ἀκριβῶς τὸ μωρόσοφον ἐκεῖνο καὶ δοκησίσοφον, had been foolish enough to write an iambic poem at the end of the cadaster. For the image of a male goat used as an abuse see the poem edited by Pétridēs, *Vers ineditis*, cit., p. 569, v. 18 (τοῦτ' ἄρ' αἰνῶν τῶν τραγίσκοις τῶν νέοις), where the phrase resembles the τραγόπωλον here; see also Tzetzes' scholion to *Hist.* 20, *Chil.* I 559; 534, addressed to his scribe (ὁ τοῦ τράγου παῖς).

angels». ¹⁰² Thus, schedographers have not only been pushed into the margins of society as *katharmata*, they have also been placed in the world of filthy beasts. In the concluding section, the «dung-eating ignorant scum» distort the truths of ancient wisdom because they hate reading books, thus pronouncing them as mistaken to their pupils. The misguided youths copy the «little stories» (λογύδρια) of these barbarians in their books. ¹⁰³ They thus turn the books into excrement depositories of Augean (*qua* mythical) proportions, since only «latrines» full of stench can be produced by barbaric teachers. ¹⁰⁴ In Tzetzes' view, then, the appropriate socio-cultural locus for schedographers is outside educated society and on the dung-heaps of a pigsty. The images, phrasing and subject of the first and third sections of this passage have already appeared in an earlier exegetical note of the *Histories*, ¹⁰⁵ where Tzetzes digresses for a moment from his main topic and attacks «the thrice-accursed among ignorant brutes» (τρισεξάγιστα τῶν ἀμαθῶν κνωδάλων). These people teach as *technikoi* but are, in fact, envious pigs wishing to eat dung effortlessly (ἀπόνως κόπρον θέλουσι) rather than make «an effort, so to speak, to eat the bread of angels» (μετὰ πόνων, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἄρτον φαγεῖν ἀγγέλων). In this passage the pig-like teachers have been placed in the mythical pigsty of Circe, while Tzetzes as the excellent teacher is equated with Odysseus holding the *moly* of Hermes. It becomes obvious from the above that Tzetzes had developed a set of thought patterns with which he attacked his peer group: ritual terminology from Hellenic cult, social and spatial antithesis of bad and good in a “dualist” worldview, fecal and animal imagery for the adversary, angelic and thaumaturgic imagery for himself. Both passages, being digressions from the main subject of the text, are built through these patterns that give meaning and structure to the writer's improvised thoughts. ¹⁰⁶

The inserted second section of the passage from *Historia* 399 offers to the readers of the *Histories* exactly the kind of malodorous fooleries that schedographers produce and on which young pupils prefer to dine. Sandwiched between a series of

¹⁰² Ps. 77, 25: ἄρτον ἀγγέλων ἔφαγεν ἄνθρωπος, ἐπισιτισμὸν ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοῖς εἰς πλησμονήν.

¹⁰³ This is probably a reference to *schede*. The rare word λογύδριον (possibly synonymous to λογίδιον, «little fable» in Ar. *Vesp.* 64) plays with the small size of the *schedos*, a characteristic which Prodrornos turned into a poetological term defining his literary “sketches”; see Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., p. 12.

¹⁰⁴ The word βόρβορος has a number of meanings («mire», «filth», «sewer») which Tzetzes fully employs. To these he adds the meaning «latrine», as he himself explains in a scholion at the very end of the *Histories* (p. 569).

¹⁰⁵ *Hist.* 306, *Chil.* X 64-78.

¹⁰⁶ Another person who is criticized through a similarly fecal and animal imagery for his lack of education and professionalism is the scribe responsible for preparing a clean copy of Tzetzes' complex edition of his *Histories*, as is witnessed by a substantial number of abusive scholia found in the margins of the manuscripts. See, for example, the scholion to the heading of *Hist.* 19, *Chil.* I 476; 534, the scholion at the end of *Hist.* 23, *Chil.* V 201; 549-550 or the scholion to *Hist.* 399, *Chil.* XII 226; 565. For the identification of this scribe with a certain Dionysios from the Peloponnese who inscribed himself in the *Histories* see E. Trapp, *Tzetzes und sein Schreiber Dionysios*, «Diptycha» 2, 1980-1981, pp. 18-22.

schedourgic riddles (εἰδοῖς should be understood as ἡδύς, ὑπ' ἔντε' ἄνδρες as οἱ πέντε ἄνδρες, δ' ἵπνος as δεῖπνος and ἵπνος as ὕπνος), we find strange words coming from everyday language: ἵμπρω, τζουτζούτζου and κάπνος.¹⁰⁷ Given the preceding analysis, it should not come as a surprise that Tzetzes shows himself fully competent in producing antistoichic puzzles, or in using everyday language.¹⁰⁸ In fact, these verses are not unsimilar to Prodrimos' "mixed" *schede*. But here everyday language is part of Tzetzes' parodistic strategy. Some eighty verses earlier in the same *Historia*, Tzetzes relaxedly shifted to colloquial discourse within his learned idiom, when talking about when Hesiod supposedly lived:¹⁰⁹

Ἡσίοδος ὁ πρότερος κατὰ τινὰς Ὁμήρου,
κατὰ τινὰς δ' ἰσόχρονος, ὕστερος καθ' ἑτέρου,
κατὰ ἡμᾶς τὸν Τζέτζην δε, τὰς τζόχας μου τὰς μίας,
160 ὀλίγον ὕστεροῦτζικὸς χρόνοις τετρακοσίοις,
οὐ γράφει βιβλίον ἀστρικήν, ἧς τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ οἶδα,
ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ βιβλίου δε τὰ ἔπη κεῖνται ταῦτα;
Hesiod, who to some was earlier than Homer,
to some he was his contemporary and to others he was later,
but according to me Tzetzes – oh by my very own little pair of felt shoes –
160 he was just itsy bitsy later by about four hundred years;
so, does not Hesiod write an astronomic book whose beginning
I do not know,
while in the middle of the book are these verses to be found?

Tzetzes humorously swears by his felt shoes and uses a temporal predicative attribute with a demotic diminutive suffix contrasting ironically to the long period of four hundred years separating Homer and Hesiod.¹¹⁰ Through this device he asserts in a grotesque manner his superiority over his rivals. Therefore, within the broader combative strategy against his competitors, Tzetzes employed everyday language to degrade them even further.

It is unfortunate that a probably extended piece by Tzetzes of this type of humorous degradation has not survived. It concluded the vituperative letter Tzetzes addressed to his colleague and rival Lachanas,¹¹¹ where, having reached the end of

¹⁰⁷ Probably ἵμπρω reflects a regional version of ἱμβρω (is it possible that the mss. read ἱμπρο as an accusative?), while τζουτζούτζου could be nominative of a feminine noun (cfr. Modern Greek τσουτσούνα meaning «penis») or genitive of a masculine noun τζουτζούτζος (maybe from the Italian dialectal *ciuccio*, «donkey», «dumb person»). Κάπνος is καπνός with a shift of the accent.

¹⁰⁸ These are techniques that Eustathios also referred to or even used but from a different perspective; see Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 230-233.

¹⁰⁹ *Hist.* 399, *Chil.* XII 157-162.

¹¹⁰ The adjective ὕστεροῦτζικὸς is formed in analogy to ὀλιγούτσικος that is well attested in 12th-century texts such as the *Ptochoprodromika* and the *Spaneas*; see Kriaras, XII, p. 233 s.v. ὀλιγούτσικος.

¹¹¹ *Chil.* IV 471-779; 142-151. On the function of this "epistle" within the *Histories* see Pizzone, *The Historiai*, cit., Part 3.

a long series of «astringent reproaches», he announces that «he will chase away the gloom with jokes».¹¹² In a scholion to this verse, Tzetzes informs his readers that these jokes were not copied from the author's dossier into the manuscript prepared for publication because they were «thrown off, simple, of a colloquial and vulgar muse; whoever wants to read these as well, let him ask for them elsewhere».¹¹³ The phrasing of the first part of this statement indicates, in my opinion, that these jokes were written in political verse and everyday language, while the second part insinuates that these verses circulated privately. If Aglae Pizzone's suggestion is correct, that the verse epistle to Lachanas is a piece of didactic poetry (real or fictional is of little importance) to be read together with the author's autographic commentary (see here n. 111), then a sustained verse composition of vernacular and coarse *asteismata* had no place in the publication of the *Histories*.¹¹⁴ It is no coincidence that the often coarse Ptochoprodromic poems were addressed to the highest members of the reigning family. Whereas Prodromos had succeeded through his social network to remove colloquial discourse from the classroom and to elevate it to imperial heights,¹¹⁵ Tzetzes was not willing or failed to do so. We recognize, therefore, in this and in some of the previous passages from his letters and the *Histories* an ambivalent relation of Tzetzes to everyday language and its literary use, something we do not find in Anna or Eustathios, both of whom relegated colloquial discourse to the classroom or to some very specific uses within «the noble Attic diction».

Tzetzes' device of inserted abusive digression and linguistic/stylistic variety reaches its climax towards the end of the *Histories* and is related to a painful incident late in his life, when he lost some kind of appointment as «orator» (ῥήτωρ) to an unnamed protégé of *sebastos* Andronikos Kamateros, second cousin of Emperor Manuel and prefect (ἑπαρχος) of Constantinople at the time when the *Histories* were being written.¹¹⁶ This rival had publicly criticized Tzetzes' presentation of a

¹¹² *Chil.* IV 776-779: Ἀλλὰ ταυτὶ μὲν εἶπον σοι, δεόντως ὄνειδίζων, | καὶ παραινῶν τὰ πρέποντα, τὸν τύφον καταστέλλον, | ἐν λόγοις ἴσως στυπτικοῖς, ἀλλὰ λυσιτελοῦσι. | Νῦν δὲ τοῖς ἀστεΐσμασι τὸ σκυθρωπὸν ἐλάσσω. On *asteisma* as a word attested in the 11th-12th cent. see *LBG s.v.*

¹¹³ Sch. *Chil.* V 779, 548, 2-6: τὰ ἀστεΐσματα ἐν μόνῳ ἐγράφη τῷ πρωτογράφῳ χάρτη· ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ μεταγραφῆσι τῆδε οὐκ ἐτέθησαν ὡς ἐρριμμένα καὶ εὐτελεῖ (codd.: ἀτελεῖ Dübner Leone) καὶ ἰδιώτιδος μουσῆς καὶ ἀγοραίας· ὃς δ' ἂν ἐθέλοι καὶ ταῦτα ζητεῖτω ἐτέρωθεν. The correction of Dübner (1836), accepted by Leone, is mistaken since Tzetzes' point concerns the simple, cheap character of his product, not its imperfection. I take the participle ἐρριμμένα to mean «thrown off» in the sense of «improvised» (see further below on the heading of the *Theogony* and the meaning of the adjective ἀθωρόν). Finally, for ἀγοραῖος in the sense of «vulgar» see Ar. *Pax* 750 (σκάμμασιν οὐκ ἀγοραῖος).

¹¹⁴ Scurrilous poetic vituperation in the learned idiom could very well be published as Tzetzes' *Iambs* at the end of the *Histories* or some of his freestanding satirical poems show.

¹¹⁵ Agapitos, *New Genres*, cit., pp. 25-37.

¹¹⁶ Andronikos Kamateros held the office of city prefect between ca. 1157 and some time before 1166, when he is attested as «grand captain of the palace guard» (μέγας δρουγγάριος τῆς βίγλας), a high judiciary office in the 12th cent. (see A. Kazhdan, *ODB*, I, p. 663). On Ka-

specific Hermogenean rule as insufficient and erroneous, thus convincing Kamateros to appoint him as *rhetor* and not Tzetzes.¹¹⁷ This is how the deeply insulted teacher presented the incident in *Historia* 369¹¹⁸ and the iambic poem concluding the *Histories* as a whole.¹¹⁹ This unnamed rhetor was not the only protégé of Kamateros with whom Tzetzes conducted a public exchange of critical vituperation. Two further persons were the imperial secretaries George Skylitzes and Gregory who, having criticized Tzetzes' techniques of versification, were attacked by him in a virulently fecal iambic poem.¹²⁰ The abusive attack of Tzetzes against Gregory reached such a point, that he then was forced to ask Andronikos Kamateros and his brother Theodore to speak on his behalf to Gregory and offer his apologies.¹²¹ The passion with which Tzetzes hurled his criticism shows how precarious

materos see now A. Bucossi (ed.), Andronicus Camaterus, *Sacrum Armamentarium. Pars Prima*, Turnhout 2014, pp. XIX-XXIV.

¹¹⁷ Tzetzes' commentary on Hermogenes has not survived complete; for edited excerpts see J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum oxoniensium*, I-IV, Oxonii 1835-1837 (repr. Amsterdam 1963): IV, pp. 1-138. For a fuller discussion see Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., coll. 1989-1991.

¹¹⁸ *Hist.* 369, *Chil.* XI 223-254, where he also makes reference to his lost verse treatise *Logismoi*, where he criticizes various passages of ancient authors, among which also sections of the Hermogenean corpus; on this work see Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., col. 2004.

¹¹⁹ The *Histories* end with three poems (iambic, hexametric, iambic); on the devices employed by Tzetzes for the conclusion of the *Histories* see Pizzone, *Self-authorization*, cit. The heading of the third poem is Στίχοι ιαμβικοί τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀμαθοῦς καὶ ἀρρητορευτοῦ [*sc.* Τζέτζου], ὥσπερ φασὶν οἱ θειάζοντες, οἷα ῥήτορας οἴους Ἡρόδοτος λέγει βαρβαρωδεστέρους ἐθνέων ἀπάντων (Leone, *Iambi*, cit., pp. 145-146); for the reference to the *rhetor* incident in the poem see *Iambi* III 331-336.

¹²⁰ This is the already mentioned iambic poem edited by Pétridés, *Vers inédits* (see above n. 84). George Skylitzes rose to become a *protokouropalates* and governor of Serdica in Bulgaria; he was also a writer of various types of liturgical poetry (see A. Kazhdan, *ODB*, III, pp. 1913-1914). Crucial for his connection with Andronikos Kamateros are a laudatory poem on Kamateros' *Sacred Arsenal* (see A. Bucossi, *George Skylitzes' Dedicatory Verses for the Sacred Arsenal by Andronikos Kamateros and the Codex Marcianus Graecus 524*, «Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik» 59, 2009, pp. 37-50) and a series of six poems for icons and other sacred objects commissioned by Kamateros, preserved anonymously in Marc. gr. 524 (on the identification of Skylitzes as their author see A. Rhoby, *Zur Identifizierung von bekannten Autoren im Codex Marcianus Graecus 524*, «Medioevo Greco» 10, 2010, pp. 167-204: 179-189).

¹²¹ *Ep.* 89, 129-130. Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., col. 1964-1965 erroneously identified this Gregory with the unnamed rhetor in the *Histories* and the *Iambi*. The subject of the critique (theory of rhetoric in the one case, poetic technique in the other) and the framework in which this was conducted are entirely different. However, M. Bachmann and F. Dölger, *Die Rede des μέγας δρογγάριος Gregorios Antiochos auf den Sebastokrator Konstantinos Angelos*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 40, 1940, pp. 353-405: 360 n. 2, suggested that the «imperial secretary Gregory» of Tzetzes could be identified with the well-known official and rhetor Gregory Antiochos, on whom see J. Darrouzès, *Notice sur Grégoire Antiochos (1160-1196): I. Son œuvre. II. Son carrière. III. La fondation du monastère Saint Basile*, «Revue des Études Byzantines» 20, 1962, pp. 61-92. This proposal has been viewed as unverifiable by M. Loukaki, *Grégoire Antiochos: Éloge du Patriarche Basile Kamateros*, Paris 1996, p. 12 n. 76. Yet the fact that Skylitzes is mentioned togeth-

his situation was and how little equipped he was with the necessary diplomatic skills, thus having to apologize for his impetuous reactions.

Already in *Historia* 278, Tzetzes vented his outrage against the unjust and insulting decision of his former patron by presenting himself in the following self-sneering manner:¹²²

ὦ Τζέτζη, ἀρρητόρευτε Καματηρῶ ἐπάρχω
καὶ πάντων χωρικώτερε τῶν ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντίνου,
παπάδων ἀμαθέστερε κλεπτῶν ἱεροσύλων,
οἱ ῥήτορες αἰθέριοι δοκοῦσι τῷ ἐπάρχω.

Oh Tzetzes, untaught in rhetoric in the eyes of prefect Kamateros
and more boorish than all of Constantinople's citizens,
you, more ignorant than thieving and temple-robbing clerics,
who appear as rhetors ethereal to the prefect.

Crucial in these lines are the words ἀρρητόρευτος, χωρικός, ἀμαθής, παπάς and the phrase ῥήτορες αἰθέριοι since these delineate the educational and social spectrum of Tzetzes' critique: on the one side of the spectrum stands "boorish and ignorant" Tzetzes, on the other side stand the "thievish" clerics as ethereal rhetors.¹²³ About fourteen-hundred verses later, while explaining the Hermogenean corpus in *Historia* 369, Tzetzes inserts the most complex digression concerning Andronikos Kamateros and the rhetor chosen by him:¹²⁴

- 210 Τζέτζης δ' ὁ ἀρρητόρευτος ὁ ἀμαθῆς ἐπάρχω
τῷ πανσεβάστῳ σεβαστῷ Καματηρῶν ἐκ γένους,
ῥήτορα ὃς κήρυξεν ἀνακτορίοις ἐνὶ οἴκοις
Δαιδάλου αἰθέριοιο συνημοσύναισιν ἀρίσταις
πετρομαχασκοπάπουτζον, τζαγγάριον, ξυλοσούβλην,
215 βούβαλον, ὀρχίπαπαν, παγχώρικον, ἐμβασίμαυλον,¹²⁵

er with Gregory by Tzetzes as being closely connected to Kamateros, while Antiochos addressed two letters to Kamateros concerning a salary he was expecting to be paid to him (Darrouzès, *Notice*, pp. 68-69), makes it more than probable that the two Gregories, both of whom had been imperial secretaries in their younger years, are one and the same person, favored and promoted by Kamateros.

¹²² *Hist.* 278, *Cbil.* IX 656-659.

¹²³ Similar is the critique of contemporary teachers and schools in the first of the three poems concluding the *Histories*; see *Iambi* I, 134-144.

¹²⁴ *Hist.* 369, *Cbil.* XI 210-224; see also the end of *Hist.* 369, *Cbil.* XI 346-358.

¹²⁵ All manuscripts transmit ἐμβασίμαυλον. The adjective ἐμβασίμαλλον printed by Leone is an emendation by Theodor Pressel (1851), but the word is his creation. Rather unconvincingly, ἐμβασίμαλλος is explained in the *LBG* as «with woolen shoes», probably because of ἐμβάς («felt shoe») that is used in ancient Greek for poor people (Isocrates). Personally, I view ἐμβασίμαυλος as a construction parallel to ἐμβασίχυτρος («pot-visitor») in the *Batrachomyomachia* 137. The second component (-μαυλος) is related to μαυρίζω («to pander»), μαυλιστής («procurer») and μαυλισταρεῖον («brothel»). These words are all attested in the learned and the vernacular idioms; see *LBG* and Kriaras, *s.v.* μαυρίζω etc.

- ὕρχαν ἠδέ γε λάρκος ἀμόργινον, ἔρμεον εἶδος,
 νυκτερίου εἶδωλον δαίμονος ἔσπερόμορφον.
 Οὐρανὸς οὐ στενάχει δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ γαῖα πελώρη;
 Ὅστυλιγγες δὲ πυρὸς οὐκ ἔφλεγον αἰθερίοιο;
 220 Οὐ πόντος ροῖβδησε¹²⁶ καὶ ἔκλυσεν οἴδμασι γαῖαν,
 βούβαλον εἰσορόων βασιληΐδος ἔνδοθεν ἀυλῆς,
 ἄστεος αἰσχροσύνην πωλευμένον ἡμετέροιο;
 Οὗτος ὁ ἀρρητόρευτος ὁ Τζέτζης, τοῦ ὑπάρχου
 τοῦ ῥήτορα κηρύξαντος τὸν βούβαλον τὸν οἶον [...]
- 210 Tzetzes, untaught in rhetoric, ignorant in the eyes of the city prefect,
 the *protosebastos sebastos* of the Kamaterean clan,
 who did proclaim as a rhetor in the palatial halls
 through the best agreements of ethereal Daedalus,
 a fellow with stone-worn shoes,¹²⁷ a cobbler and skewer of planks,
 215 a buffalo, a bullocks-cleric, utterly boorish, a brothel-visitor,
 a pickle-jar,¹²⁸ a charcoal-basket¹²⁹ made of mallow,¹³⁰ a wicked figure,¹³¹
 a twilight-formed¹³² spectre of a nightly demon.
 Does not heaven sigh, as well as the vast earth?¹³³
 Did not the curls of ethereal fire blaze up?
- 220 Did not the sea gush forth and flood the earth with its swollen waves,
 beholding such a buffalo inside the imperial court,
 wandering about to the digrace of our great city?
 This Tzetzes, untaught in rhetoric, of the city prefect
 the rhetor having pronounced such a buffalo here [...]

We will note that the passage displays the same tripartite structure as the digression in *Historia* 399 (opening section with a first set of abuses, middle section with an abusive digression in a different linguistic idiom, concluding section with further abuses), while the opening and concluding sections are connected through an almost identical verse (XI 210 ~ XI 223). This indicates most clearly how Tzetzes operated with his abusive improvisations, mentally shaped and verbally expressed by recurring patterns of meaning and structure, a fully consciously developed device of

¹²⁶ Lyc. *Alex.* 247 ροῖβησε.

¹²⁷ πετρομαχασκοπάπουτζος is rendered in *LBG* as «der Schuhe mit aufklaffender Stoßkappe hat», which is not what the word implies (πέτρα + «-μαχάσκο-» [?] + παπούτζιν).

¹²⁸ Ar. *Vesp.* 676.

¹²⁹ Ar. *Ach.* 333.

¹³⁰ Ar. *Lys.* 150 and 735. On the various meaning of ἀμόργινος and ἀμοργίς see *Hist.* 430, *Chil.* XII 592-600, along with *Souda* σ 1625 (ἀμόργινος) and 1626 (ἀμοργίς); I 144, 9-14 Adler.

¹³¹ The adjective ἔρμεον is a *hapax* of Tzetzes, probably created to fit the hexameter instead of ἔρμαιον. The meaning of the word in this context of abuses is not quite clear, given that ἔρμαιον (or ἔρμαῖον in later Greek) has to do with an «unexpected piece of luck» or a «chance finding» (see *LSJ s.v.*). However, in the *Souda* ε 3032; II 412, 18-19 Adler we find: ἐρμαῖόν ἐστι τῶν κακοήθων ἅπας ἐπιεικῆς. Therefore, I have tentatively rendered the word here as «wicked».

¹³² *Hapax* of Tzetzes; lemmatized in *LSJ* and imprecisely translated as «dark», «shadowy».

¹³³ Hes. *Theog.* 159 and 173.

rhetorical technique. Moreover, Tzetzes again presents himself as lacking rhetorical education (XI 210 ἀρρητόρευτος), picking up most of the key words from *Historia* 278. In attacking this ethereal rhetor, Tzetzes shifts at XI 212 from his average learned diction into Homeric overdrive, while also shifting from political verse to hexameter.¹³⁴ After only two lines (XI 212-213) he embarks on a direct abuse of his adversary by shifting back to the political verse (XI 214-215). However, the abuses are in the everyday language Tzetzes used to mock the self-complacent schedographer in *Historia* 399. The two verses look as if they have been lifted straight from the Ptochoprodromic poems,¹³⁵ and they make all the more regrettable the decision of Tzetzes not to have his vernacular *asteismata* copied for publication.

Tzetzes introduces at the end of verse XI 215 the epic-looking adjective ἐμβασίμουλος which does not fit the political verse though it does fit the dactylic hexameter.¹³⁶ He then shifts back into Homeric diction at XI 216 for the remainder of his attack. The seven verses are couched in the obscure style of the prophecies given by the oracle at Delphi.¹³⁷ In the vernacular verses the rhetor, who has been proclaimed «through the best agreements of ethereal Daedalus» (XI 213),¹³⁸ has, on the one hand, become an utterly boorish cobbler and skewer of planks, this being a distinctly Ptochoprodromic image,¹³⁹ while, on the other, he is presented as a fool and a boorish, knave-like cleric.¹⁴⁰ To the disgrace of the City (ἄστν = Πόλις), this

¹³⁴ Tzetzes does quote hexametrical passages from ancient texts in the *Histories*, for example, *Hist.* 50, *Chil.* VI 382-403 (quoting *Il.* II 127 and 225-227). In a few instances he introduces his own hexameters into the political verse; see, for example, the end of *Hist.* 23, *Chil.* V 186-201, where V 196-201 are in hexameters, being the weighty *sphragis* of Part II of the *Histories*.

¹³⁵ One might compare, for example, the abuses in *Ptochopr.* I 251-257 (the teacher and his wife); III 207-213 (the cleric teacher); IV 549-557 (the young monk as teacher).

¹³⁶ The word makes the accentuated fifteen-syllable verse longer by two syllables, while the accent is on the prepenultimate – a major rhythmical anomaly. However, the quantitative pattern of the word forms the last two feet of the “heroic” verse (– – – –), just like ἐμβασίχυτρος (*Batrachomyom.* 137).

¹³⁷ For a similar case of a fictive Delphic prophecy composed in hexameters compare Prodromos’ *Rhodanthe and Dosikles* IX 184-233 Markovich; on this passage see P. A. Agapitos, *Writing, Reading and Reciting (in) Byzantine Erotic Fiction*, in B. Mondrain (ed.), *Lire et écrire à Byzance*, Paris 2006, pp. 125-176: 145-146. On the literary aspect of Delphic oracles in hexameters see Plutarch’s dialogue *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾶν ἔμμετρα νῦν τὴν Πυθίαν* (*Moralia* 24; III 25-59 Patton-Pohlenz-Sieveking). For a list of “literary” oracles from Delphi, many of which would have been accessible to Byzantine readers through their inclusion in ancient Greek texts (e.g. Herodotus, Pausanias, Plutarch, Lucian, Heliodorus), see J. E. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley 1978, pp. 355-416 (legendary and fictional responses); for a critical edition of Byzantine collections of Hellenic oracles prophesying Christianity see H. Erbse, *Theosophorum graecorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1995² (without the Sibylline Oracles).

¹³⁸ Note also the appearance of αἰθερίοιο at XI 219.

¹³⁹ Cf. *Ptochopr.* III 145-154 Eideneier.

¹⁴⁰ The sexual element in ὀρχίπαπας («testicle-cleric»), a *hapax* of Tzetzes (see *LBG s.v.*), suggests a person who behaves like a knave or rogue. For the boorish thieving cleric as teacher see *Ptochopr.* III 240-273.

person has invaded the imperial court as a buffalo of epic proportions (XI 221), who, in front of the city prefect, «pronounced such a buffalo» (XI 224), meaning the nonsensical explanation of the Hermogenean passage in question. The animal and sexual imagery employed once again degrades the adversary in social terms and allocates him to the world of vulgar craftsmen and fraudulent priests. The heaping of learned references together with the swift shifts of style and the choice of strange-sounding words create a grotesque humor by whose pungent irony the ethereal rhetor as buffalo is swept away. There is no indication in this passage that the vernacular idiom is seen as another language, though it certainly is used in an abusive way by Tzetzes. In fact, three different modes of poetic expression and two verse forms are brought together to produce a devastating satirical effect. As with a number of passages already discussed, Tzetzes puts on an Aristophanic mask by allowing himself to use his profound knowledge of the Comic's plays in order to mock his buffalo-like rivals, be they ethereal rhetors with their vapid art or outcast schedographers with their nonsensical little texts.¹⁴¹

The blemish examiners and everyday language

The incident concerning the appointment of a rhetor by the city prefect, as well as the incident about the poetic quality of hexameters and iambs by persons closely attached to the Kamateros brothers, give us a good idea of how rivalries between teachers and rhetors were carried out in Komnenian Constantinople. Though the former incident involved the exegesis of Hermogenes, Tzetzes also used colloquial discourse to denigrate his successful adversary. Therefore, it will be instructive for our purpose of examining the relation between learned and vernacular language in the twelfth century to look at another well-documented case of polemical criticism between Tzetzes and one of his rivals. This case concerns the use of everyday language in the context of high poetical exegesis and constitutes a formidable example of the peer-group control mechanisms referred to in the first part of the present paper.

Among the difficult poetic works Tzetzes explained to his pupils, Lycophron's *Alexandra* held a place of pride. Early on in this dramatic monologue, the poet offers a very dense and opaque metaphor: φηγὸν δὲ καὶ δρύκαρπα καὶ γλυκὺν βότρυον | φάλλαι τε καὶ δελφίνες αἵ τ' ἐπ' ἀρσένων | φέρβοντο φῶκαι λέκτρα θουρῶσαι βροτῶν («And on oat and acorn and the sweet grape browsed whales and dolphins and the seals that are desirous of the beds of male mortals»)¹⁴² Tzetzes explained in his commentary the rare word φάλλαι («whales»), used instead of the conventional φάλαιναί, as follows:¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ On the Aristophanic role-playing in Tzetzes see Agapitos, "Middle-class" Identity, cit., pp. 6-10.

¹⁴² Lyc. 83-85. On the *Alexandra* more broadly see the new critical edition by A. Hurst, *Lycophron: Alexandra*, Paris 2008.

¹⁴³ E. Scheer (ed.), *Lycophronis Alexandra. Volumen II scholia continens*, Berlin 1908 (repr.

φάλαινα || ζωύφιόν ἐστὶ ταῖς λυχίναις ἐπιπετόμενον ὃ καὶ πυραυστούμορος καὶ ψυχή καὶ ψώρα καλεῖται. [...] καὶ περὶ μὲν φαλαίνης τοῦ ζωυφίου χερσαίου ὃ καὶ κανδηλοσβέστραν ἰδιωτικῶς φάμεν εἴπομεν.

Phalaina || It is an insect flying around lamps, that is also called *pyraustoumoros*, *psyche* and *psora*. [...] And we spoke about the little land-animal *phalaina*, which we also call colloquially «oil-lamp-extinguisher».

Tzetzēs states that *phalaina* also means «moth» as his periphrastic explanation shows. He then lists three other words by which moths are called: *pyraustoumoros* («dying by fire»),¹⁴⁴ *psyche* («soul»)¹⁴⁵ and *psora* («itch»). At the end of the lemma Tzetzēs makes a concluding remark about *phalaina*, that the moth is generally called (φάμεν) «oil-lamp-extinguisher» in everyday language (ἰδιωτικῶς).¹⁴⁶ For the use of the colloquial *kandelosbestra* in a commentary to Lycophron he was reproached by another teacher. In his commentary to the *Frogs*, Tzetzēs mentions this reproach after he has explained the words *πλακοῦς* and *κόλλαβος* in *Ran.* 507. The lengthy digression is quite revealing about Tzetzēs' use of everyday language for purposes of teaching:¹⁴⁷

πλακοῦντας: μελίπηκτα παντοῖα. κολλάβους: ἐξ ἄρτων, μᾶλλον δ' ἐκ ζύμης ποικίλματα, εἰς θέσιν κολλάβων, πασσαλίσκων κιθάρας, τυπούμενα, οὓς νῦν καλοῦσι σιλιγνίας καὶ σησαμοῦντας, κἄν μιὰρὸς τις ἡμᾶς καὶ τούτου ἔνεκα διασύρει, ὅτι τῆς τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἔνεκα ὠφελείας καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως τὸ πᾶν σαφηνίζομεν, ὡς εἰς τὴν Λυκόφρονος φάλλαιναν· ἐπεξηγησαμένου γάρ μου καὶ εἰπόντος ἐκεῖ· «φάλλαινα μὲν ἐστὶ ζωῦφιον ταῖς λυχίναις ἐπιπετόμενον καὶ σβεννύον αὐτάς, ὃ καὶ ψώρα καὶ ψύχη καὶ πυραυστούμορος λέγεται, ὃ κανδηλοσβέστρα παρ' ἰδιώταις καλεῖται· ἐστὶ δὲ φάλλαινα καὶ ἰχθύς, περὶ ἧς ὁ Λυκόφρων φησίν», ἀλλ', ὡ διασύρων ταῦτα τράγου υἱέ, σεληνιαζόμενε, δαιμονῶν καὶ ἐπίληπτε, ὃ φάλλαιναν εἰπὼν τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ψύχην καὶ ψώραν καὶ πυραυστούμορον, εἶτα ἐπενεγκὼν τὸ «κανδηλοσβέ-

1958), p. 46, 29-30 and 46, 33-47, 1; on this commentary see Wendel, *Tzetzēs*, cit., coll. 1978-1982.

¹⁴⁴ The word *πυραυστούμορος* is attested only in Tzetzēs (*LBG s.v.*). It is probable that he created it from an Aeschylean fragment (288 Radt δέδοικα μῶρον κάρτα πυραύστου μόρον) quoted by Ael. *NatAnim.* XII 8 and explained in the Zenobian proverb epitome (V 79; *CPG* I 151, 9-14 Leutsch-Schneidewin). The Aeschylean word *πυραύστης* («moth singed by candle light») is also found in Eustathios' *CommOd.* 1547, 64-66 and 1848, 37-38 with reference to *πυραύστου μόρος* as a proverb.

¹⁴⁵ For *ψυχή* meaning butterfly or moth see *LSJ s.v.* VI (Aristotle, Theophrast, Plutarch).

¹⁴⁶ The word is lemmatized in *LSJ* as *κανδηλοσβέστης/-σβέστρια* («moth») because of its appearance in the scholia to Nicander (*Ther.* 763a) and Oppian (*Hal.* I 404), authors for whose works Tzetzēs had also written scholia (Wendel, *Tzetzēs*, cit., col. 1982). In *LSJ* the word's literal meaning is understood as «extinguishing candles». However, in Byzantine usage *κανδηλα* primarily refers to the oil-lamp as used in homes or churches (see *Lampe s.v.*). From the attested compound words with *κανδηλο-* as their first component (see the list in *LBG*) it is obvious that a lamp is also inferred here and not a candle.

¹⁴⁷ Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 507a (Rec. I), 835, 1-837, 5 Ko. The scholion is transmitted only in the Urb. gr. 141.

στρα», οὐκ ἀδαημοσύνη τοῦτο καὶ ἀπορία λέξεων εἴρηκα, ἀλλ' ἐφιέμενος σαφῶς γράφειν καὶ ὠφελεῖν καὶ τὴν τυχοῦσαν δύσνονον ἐφερμηγεύων τῶν λέξεων. εἰ δὲ κομπηραῖς, μετεώροις καὶ ξενωτέραις ἐβούλετο κεχρηῆσθαι ταῖς λέξεσι, πάντως οἱ τῆς ὑμῶν κουστωδίας ὁμοῦ συνελθόντες συνιέναι μίαν τῶν τζετζικῶν λέξεων οὐκ ἂν ἐδυνήθησαν· τοῦτο δὲ ποτε καὶ πεπόνθησι τὰ ἀκροκόρυφα ὑμῶν καὶ πρωτόλεια ἐνὶ παιγνιώδει χολῶ ἰάμβω ἐμῶ μηδεμίαν λέξιν νοήσαντες, πεπλασμένας δ' εἶναι ταύτας ὑποτοπάσαντες, ὡς μάρτυς τοῦ λόγου ὁ νῦν δρουγγάριος τοῦτοις συνεθισθεῖς ἐρωτήσει περὶ τῶν λέξεων, αἱ ἦσαν αἶδε·

πίσυγγε, τέμνε τὰς λαιθάργους ἀρβύλας,
ἠρωϊκὴν Μοῦσαν δὲ μὴ κατασχύνης.

ἀλλ' ἔτι πρὸς τὸν ἀλιτήριον καὶ παλαμναίῳ κατάσχετον δαίμονι· τῆς κανδηλοσβέστρας τὸ τί αἰτιᾶ; τὸ «κανδήλαν» ἢ τὸ «σβέστραν»; ἀλλ', οἶομαι, σέ τε καὶ τὴν σὴν κουστωδίαν τοῦτο μόνον διέλαθεν ἀνεγνωκέναι Τεῦκρον τὸν Χαλδαῖον καὶ Βαβυλώνιον καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῳ συντεταγμένην Σφαῖραν τὴν Βάρβαρον, ἐν ἧ περι τῶν παρανατελλόντων ἄστρον ζῳδίοις διδάσκει, τούτων δῆθεν λέγων ἀποτέλεσμα· ἐκεῖσε γάρ φησιν οὕτως· «ἐκ μοῖρας ἡ' μέχρις καὶ κ' ὄλης ὁ φέρων τὰ λῖνα ποιεῖ κανδηλάπτας καὶ λαμπαδαρίους».

ἰδοῦ, τὰ νῦν σοι τῷ σκοτεινῷ τὰς φρένας
κανδήλας εἰσήνεγκα πρὸς τὸ φῶς τοῦ λόγου·
σβεστηρίους δὲ μηχανὰς ὑπερτρέχειν
εὔροις ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς λόγοις Φιλοστράτου
ἔλαιον, οὐ σκώληκας ἐξ Ἰνδῶν λέγει.¹⁴⁸

κἂν κοινὴ πάνυ καὶ βάρβαρος ἦν ἡ λέξις λυσιτελοῦντος ἔνεκα τεθειμένη, οὐκ ἔδει λαθραῖως ἡμῶν καταφλυαρεῖν. «δαιμόνιοι, μαίνεσθε».¹⁴⁹ ἔατε ἡμᾶς ἠρέμους διάγειν τῷ θόλῳ· ὑμεῖς συμμορίας καὶ κουστωδίας συνεπαγόμενοι ἄλλος ἄλλω ὑμῶν ἀντερῖζετε καὶ ἕκαστος ἐκάστου καταληρεῖτε. ἀλλὰ μοι πάλιν τὸν λόγον προσαρμωστέον, ὅθεν ἀπέσπασα.

Plakountas: All sorts of honeyed sweets. *Kollabous*: Ornaments made from bread, or rather from dough, pressed in the position of *kollaboi* (that is, the pegs of the lute),¹⁵⁰ whom we today call *siligniai* («wheat breadloafs»)¹⁵¹ and *sesamountes* («sesame cakes»),¹⁵² even if some abominable person¹⁵³ will disparage me also on account of this, namely that I explain everything for the profit and knowledge of my pupils, as I did in the case of Lycophron's *phallaina*. For as I explained and said in my commentary: «*Phallaina* is a little animal flying around lamps and extinguishing them; it is also called *psora*, *psyche* and *pyraustoumoros*, and which is called «oil-lamp-extinguisher» by common people. *Phallaina* is also a fish, about which Lycophron speaks». But, oh you who disparage these statements, you son of a billy-goat, moonstruck, possessed by a demon and suffering from epilepsy, he who pro-

¹⁴⁸ Phil. *VitApollTyan*. III 1, 2.

¹⁴⁹ *Od*. XVIII 406 (δαιμόνιοι, μαίνεσθε).

¹⁵⁰ Sch. Ar. *Vesp*. 572.

¹⁵¹ The noun *σιλιγνίας* is attested only since the 11th cent. (*LBG s.v.*), though *σιλιγνίτης* and *σιλιγνιν* (← Lat. *siligineum*, «wheat bread») are attested since the 2nd and 6th century respectively (*LSJ s.v.* and *LBG s.v.*).

¹⁵² The noun *σησαμοῦς* is attested since at least the 4th cent. (*LSJ s.v.* and *LBG s.v.*).

¹⁵³ Tzetzets employs again a ritual word, since *μπαρός* initially meant «polluted», «defiled by blood».

nounced *phallaina* to be the same as *psora*, *psyche* and *pyraustoumoros*, and then added the word *kandelosbestra*, I did not say this because of ignorance and lack of words, but aiming to write clearly and to benefit others in interpreting an incidentally difficult word. But if he [*sc.* Tzetzes] wished to use bombastic, elevated and strange words, indeed, the members of your cohort having come all together would be unable to understand even one of the Tzetziian words. For exactly this did your topnotch¹⁵⁴ and pick-of-the-day boys suffer since they did not grasp a single word of just one playful choliambic verse of mine, suspecting these words to have been fabricated, as the present *drungarios*¹⁵⁵ is witness to my story since he acquainted himself with these people asking about the words that were the following:

Shoemaker, cut to pieces the dog-biting hunting-boots,¹⁵⁶
and do not utterly disgrace the heroic Muse.

And again I address myself to the sacrilegious¹⁵⁷ man possessed by a murderous demon: What exactly do you censure in *kandelosbestra*? The component *kandela* or the component *sbestra*? Yet you and your cohort have missed, I think, reading Teucer the Chaldaean and Babylonian and the *Barbaric Sphere* composed by him,¹⁵⁸ in which he instructs us about the stars rising next to the Zodiac signs, purportedly declaring their influence on humans; for therein he speaks thus: «From degree 18 until all of degree 20 he who carries the filaments of Destiny creates candle-lighters and torch-bearers».¹⁵⁹

See now, for you, the one with a benighted mind,
I have introduced lamps towards the light of education;
but in these very stories of Philostratus
you will find an oil, wherein he calls it «worms from India»,
that escapes from fire-extinguishing machines.¹⁶⁰

Even if the word was utterly common and barbaric but quoted because of being useful, you should not speak foolishly and behind my back against me. «Oh you pos-

¹⁵⁴ The noun ἀκροκόρυφον is a *hapax* of Tzetzes (*LBG s.v.*).

¹⁵⁵ Could the *drungarios* here be the predecessor of Kamateros? On the office see above n. 116.

¹⁵⁶ The Tzetziian words of this verse prove to be rare words culled from the relevant lexica such as Hesychios or the *Souda*.

¹⁵⁷ For rendering ἀλιτήριος I use *Souda* α 1257; I, 114, 25-26 Adler (ἀλιτήριος: ἀνόσιος, ὁ ἐνεχόμενος μιάσματι καὶ ἐξημαρτηκῶς εἰς θεούς).

¹⁵⁸ On this little known astronomer and his treatise see W. Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke der Tierkreiszeichen: Der anonyme Traktat De stellis fixis, in quibus gradibus oriuntur signorum. I: Quellenkritische Edition*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1995, pp. 92-93 (with the older bibliography). The various fragments of Teucer have been edited and commented by F. Boll, *Sphaera: Neue griechische Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sternbilder*, Leipzig 1903, pp. 3-72. It is worth pointing out that John Kamateros (see A. Kazhdan, *ODB*, II, p. 1098) used Teucer in his astronomical poem *On the Zodiac*. This reveals a possible connection to Tzetzes via the patronage of the Kamateros clan, especially if John is to be identified with Andronikos' older brother (see Bucossi [ed.], *Andronici Camateri*, cit., p. XXI).

¹⁵⁹ *Kandelaptes* and *lampadarios* are lemmatized in *LSJ Suppl. s.v.* The cryptic phrase «he who carries the filaments of Destiny» is the sign of Hydra, more specifically, the head of the water snake; see Hübner, *Grade*, cit., pp. 118-120.

¹⁶⁰ The fictitious story in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* is about a strange creature living in the waters of the Indian river Hyphasis, that resembles a white worm; when melted down it produces an oil that can light up a fire able to overcome any fire-extinguishing device (σβεστήρια).

sessed ones, you are mad!» Leave me in peace to live in the cupola.¹⁶¹ Gathering gangs and cohorts together, all of you contend against each other and fill each other with nonsense.¹⁶² But let me reattach my discourse back to the point where I broke off.

Having additionally used two colloquial words to explain the rare κόλλαβος, Tzetzes invokes the potential disparagement by some other teacher who would accuse him of explaining everything in the texts he is presenting. He is thus reminded of the episodized about Lycophron's *phallainai*. He first quotes his own scholion in a somewhat modified form, probably from memory. It should be noted that what in the commentary appeared as «which we also call colloquially “oil-lamp-extinguisher”» appears here as «which is called “oil-lamp-extinguisher” by common people», giving the impression that Tzetzes is not one of those who use this word. After abusing his detractor in the manner we have already seen in the first part of the paper, he remarks that he used this colloquial word in order to make his commentary more profitable (i.e. comprehensible) to his pupils and not because he is ignorant or overinterpretive. He then digresses even further by telling of how the cohort of the teacher and his best pupils were not able to understand a funny choliamb he had composed. Finally, he points out that both components of the contested word are in fact well attested since ancient times, and he quotes the obscure astronomer Teucer of Babylon and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. He concludes his digression by presenting himself as a peace-loving person sitting in his allotted place, while his rival and his pupils are a gang of savages tearing each other to pieces. As noted already (see above), Tzetzes' representation of his rivals is shaped by a specific set of negative images that he manipulates most competently. The more one gets acquainted with this portrait gallery of *miaroi*, the more one gets the impression that they are in one way or another reflections of Aristophanes' archvillain, the Paphlagonian slave in the *Knights*. Be that as it may, Tzetzes' arguments for using a colloquial word in interpreting Lycophron are (i) the usefulness for the users of his commentary, and (ii) the fact that the colloquial word's components are already attested in older writings. These, in fact, are the arguments that Eustathios also used, only he expressed them somewhat differently (more coherently one would be tempted to suggest) and not attacking other teachers in a pronouncedly vehement manner.¹⁶³ In fact, Tzetzes did not do something out of the

¹⁶¹ Tzetzes wishes to live peacefully under the cupola (ὁ θόλος). Koster plausibly suggests that this could be a discreet reference to his cell or some other building of the Pantokrator Monastery, where Tzetzes lived and taught. For a similar imagery see an abusive iambic note written by Tzetzes in the margin of the oldest manuscript of Thucydides, the late 9th-century Heid. Pal. gr. 252. The note has been edited by M. J. Luzzatto, *Tzetzes lettore di Tucidide. Note autografe sul Codice Heidelberg Palatino Greco 252*, Bari 1999, pp. 49-50. On these verses see Agapitos, “Middle-Class” Identity, cit., p. 5.

¹⁶² In the poem referred to in the previous note, Tzetzes also speaks about a «wise cohort» (σοφὴ κουστωδία), which disparages him because he does not follow their erring ways.

¹⁶³ See Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., *passim*.

ordinary when he glossed Aristophanes' rare "colloquial" word and Lycophron's rare "epic" word with "classical" synonyms plus an "everyday" word, since this was not an uncommon practice when teaching Greek at school in the twelfth century and later.¹⁶⁴

This particular incident of collegial backstabbing must have caused Tzetzes substantial irritation, for he did write to this teacher a short, cryptically ironic letter:¹⁶⁵

Τινὶ μωμοσκόπῳ.

Σὺ μὲν τὰς ἐμὰς φαλλαίνας ἐμέμψω· σοὺς δὲ σοφοὺς Τηλέφους νενόμικας.

To a blemish examiner.

You reproached my whales, but you thought your wise men to be Telephuses.

The heading of this letter introduces us to the noun μωμοσκόπος, a rare word from the context of sacrificial ritual meaning «a person examining sacrificial victims for blemishes», attested for the first time in Philo and somewhat later in Clemens, both Alexandrian authors.¹⁶⁶ Tzetzes often used it to describe those persons who are ready to find blemishes in his works, in other words, malicious rivals.¹⁶⁷ The word is used once in the sense of «ill-disposed critic» by Eustathios for Homer.¹⁶⁸ Just like *katharma*, *momoskopos* marks through reference to ritual practice an extraordinary negative aspect of Tzetzes' rivals.¹⁶⁹

Obviously, the letter is incomprehensible to anyone who does not know the inci-

¹⁶⁴ Agapitos, *Learning to Read*, cit., pp. 19-20.

¹⁶⁵ *Ep.* 64.

¹⁶⁶ *De agric.* 130; I 320 M (= 76 Poilloux) and *Strom.* IV 117, 4; 250, 13-15 Van den Hoek respectively. The term was a translation by Hellenistic Jews of a cultic term from the ritual of the Jerusalem Temple, and does not reflect Greek sacrificial practices; see Y. Paz, *Examining Blemishes: The μωμοσκόποι and the Jerusalem Temple*, «Studia Philonica», 29, 2017 (forthcoming). For the use of the word and the derivative verb μωμοσκοπέω in early Patristic literature see Lampe s.v. and G. J. M. Bartelink, *Zur Spiritualisierung eines Opferterminus*, «Glotta» 39, 1960, pp. 43-48.

¹⁶⁷ See, for example, *Ep.* 6, 13, 1; *Hist.* 397, *Chil.* XII 3; sch. Ar. *Plut.* 82 (Rec. II), 28, 7 M-P; Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 1137, 1033, 17 Ko; *AllegIl.* proleg. 35; *Theog.* 502.

¹⁶⁸ See *CommOd.* 1387, 19-20: Ὅτι οὐδ' ἐν τῇ Ὀδυσσεΐα ὁ ποιητὴς ὡσπερ οὐδ' ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἐθέλει μωμοσκόπος εἶναι καὶ σιλλὸς ὅτε μὴ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη («Note that in the *Odyssey* the poet, just like in the *Iliad*, does not wish to be a blemish examiner and a lampooner should this not be absolutely necessary»). The noun σίλλος characterizes a type of satirical poem (cfr. Ael. *NatAnim.* III 40 τὸν σίλλον ψόγον λέγουσι μετὰ παιδιᾶς δυσαρέστου); σιλλογραφία is found in Eust. *CommOd.* 1850, 33 and σιλλός in *CommIl.* 204, 22.

¹⁶⁹ For another Tzetziian use of the word see his extravagantly abusive iambic attack against incompetent scribes and ignorant teachers in Sch. Ar. *Plut.* 137, 41, 8-46, 21 M-P (a total of 117 verses), wherein he combines all the negative images we have encountered up to this point in the paper (differentialists, tavern-keepers, barbarians, scum, monstrous and malodorous beasts, demons of darkness, thieves, corruptors of literature, enemies of God), while he also employs a word developed out of everyday language (43, 12 κουτροβιτζιῶς). On κουτρούβιν («round clay pot», but also a type of merchant vessel) see Kriaras, VIII, p. 350 and *LBG* s.v., on κουτροβιτζιῶς («randomly mixed») see *LBG* s.v. (is used only by Tzetzes).

dent. However, the letter reveals that Tzetzes must have retaliated in some way, because the second sentence suggests that the blemish examiner had also made an error out of ignorance. The two sentences are explained in two separate notes in the *Histories*.¹⁷⁰ The first of the two notes follows the basic structure of the scholion to *Ran.* 507. Tzetzes remarks that there are numerous meanings attached to *phallaina*, one of which is «moth». He then goes on to explain:¹⁷¹

- Ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς Λυκόφρονα ἐμοὶ ἐξηγηθεῖσι
καὶ περὶ τοῦτου ἔγραψα τότε τοῦ ζωυλλίου.
955 Ἔστι καὶ ζῶον ἕτερον φάλλαινα κεκλημένον,
φάλλαινα, ψύχη ψώρα τε καὶ πυραυστοῦμορός δε,
ὅπερ φασὶ κοινότερον τινὲς κανδηλοσβέστραν.
Τοῦτο δὲ βουβαλόπαπας τὶς σύρειν¹⁷² οὐκ ἀνῆκε,
πρὸς ὃν τὸ ἐπιστόλιον ἐγράφη μωμοσκόπον.
- In my commentary on Lycophron's poem
I also wrote then about this little animal.
955 For there exists another animal called *phaillana*,
namely *phaillana*, *psyche*, *psora* and also *pyraustoumoros*,
that some people call more commonly «oil-lamp-extinguisher».
But a certain buffalo-cleric did not succeed in disparaging it,
to whom blemish examiner my tiny letter was written.

Tzetzes again quotes his own scholion yet with the variation «that some people call <this animal> more commonly “oil-lamp-extinguisher”». The avoidance of the inclusive plural of the original scholion («we call colloquially») again serves to lessen the generality of the everyday usage implied in the Lycophron commentary. In the second note, he embarks on a full-scale counterattack; it begins as follows:¹⁷³

- 960 Οὗτος ὁ βουβαλόπαπας μωμοσκοπῶν τοιάδε,
ἃ ὠφελείας ἔνεκεν ἐγράφησαν τῶν νέων,
αὐτὸς βαρβάρως ἔγραψεν ὡς δῆθεν κωμωδίαν
εἰς πατριάρχην τὸν Στυπῆν, ἅπερ φλυάρως εἶπε
καὶ τήλεφον ἐγκέφαλον εἰπὼν τοῦ πατριάρχου.
- 960 Now this buffalo-cleric blamingly examining these my writings,
which I had written for the benefit of youths,
himself wrote in a barbarous manner supposedly a satire
to Patriarch Stypes, which things he expressed nonsensically
even calling the patriarch's brain a «Telephus».

Our outraged teacher points out a gross error in a «supposed satire» (ὡς δῆθεν

¹⁷⁰ *Hist.* 298 (Ἡ λέγουσα «τὰς ἐμὰς φάλλαινας», πολλὰ δὲ σημαίνει ἢ φάλλαινα) and 299 (Περὶ τοῦ «σοῦς δὲ σοφοῦς Τηλέφους νενόμικας»), *Chil.* IX 946-959 and 960-980.

¹⁷¹ *Hist.* 298, *Chil.* IX 953-959.

¹⁷² Σύρειν here is synonymous to διασύρειν. We find a similar use in *Allegll.* IX 28.

¹⁷³ *Hist.* 299; *Chil.* IX 960-964.

κωμῳδίαν) that his blemish-examining adversary addressed to Patriarch Leo Stypes (1134-1143). In this satire, most probably composed in iambics, the buffalo-cleric called the patriarch's brain a «Telephus», obviously misunderstanding the Aristophanic verse θένων δι' ὀργῆς, ἐκχέει τὸν Τήλεφον, as quoted in *Chil.* IX 969, where the Comic disparagingly refers to Euripides' play *Telephus*.¹⁷⁴ Tzetzes sarcastically remarks that the patriarch had not composed a Telephus drama, while his adversary proved to be a «barbarian» in thinking that the brain is mainly called «Telephus» by Aristophanes (IX 968-978). The philological barbarism of Tzetzes' adversary¹⁷⁵ does not refer to the inappropriate use of everyday language, but to a scholarly error in understanding Aristophanes.¹⁷⁶

Tzetzes abuses his critic as a βουβαλόπαπας (IX 958, 960, 967), while in his commentary to the *Frogs* he calls the same person «son of a billy-goat» (τράγου υιέ).¹⁷⁷ These abuses parallel the «buffalo» and «bullocks-cleric» we met in *Hist.* 369 (*Chil.* XI 215 βούβαλος, ὀρχίπαπας) and the «young billy-goat» in *Hist.* 399 (*Chil.* XII 243 τραγόπωλον). Thus, the rival has once again been placed in the world of malodorous beasts. As in the commentary to the *Frogs*, Tzetzes in the *Histories* is at pains to explain that he used κανδηλοσβέστρα in a work «written for the benefit of youths» (IX 961). These virulent characterizations are part of a defense mechanism against criticism about the use of colloquial discourse in the commentary of an ancient text. Seen from a different point of view, the incident of the *kandelosbestra* reveals that Tzetzes' commentaries were quite successful. This is proven, on the one hand, by the incidents where some teacher stole one of his books or dossiers,¹⁷⁸ and, on the other hand, by the rich textual history of his commentaries, mostly written around the text¹⁷⁹ but sometimes transmitted independently as running texts.¹⁸⁰ Therefore, Tzetzes exposed his work much more to his peer group than other teachers did. Eustathios again offers us a good counter-example. The transmission of his Homeric *Parekbolai* is in Byzantine times far thinner than Tzetzes' *Iliad* and Aristophanes commentaries,¹⁸¹ since the complexity and size of Eu-

¹⁷⁴ In the critical editions *Frogs* 855 is printed as θενὼν ὑπ' ὀργῆς ἐκχέη τὸν Τήλεφον. Dionysus warns Euripides that the angry Aeschylus might hit the former's temple with one of his immense words and thus spill out his *Telephus*. In Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 855a (Rec. I), 942, 9-10 Ko Tzetzes notes τὸν Τήλεφον] ἐγκέφαλον παρ' ὑπόνοιαν, while in Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 854 (Rec. II), 942, 1-8 Ko he expands the older scholion and clarifies the difference between the literal and the figurative meaning in relation to the wordplay on the title of the Euripidean play.

¹⁷⁵ *Chil.* IX 962 (βαρβάρως ἔγραψεν), 965 (βαβαί τῆς βαρβαρότητος), 967 (βάρβαρα λῆρα γράφω), 978 (βάρβαρε).

¹⁷⁶ This is a different application of the barbarian imagery than the one found in Eustathios; see Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 234-237.

¹⁷⁷ Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 507a, 835, 9 Ko.

¹⁷⁸ See above n. 20.

¹⁷⁹ See, for example, Vat. Urb. gr. 141 or Par. suppl. gr. 655.

¹⁸⁰ See, for example, Ambr. 222 inf.

¹⁸¹ One two-volume edition for the *Iliad* (Laur. 59, 2 and 3, a parchment codex) and two manuscripts for the *Odyssey* (Marc. gr. 460 and Par. gr. 2702, both bombycin codices), all of them from the late 12th century.

stathios' work made it costly to copy and difficult to use, while Tzetzes' scholia were reader-friendly and rather popular exegetical notes, as we can see from Eustathios who knew them.¹⁸²

We saw above (pp. 24-26) that Tzetzes employed the technique of stylistic shifts for humorous purposes, but also within the context of poetry exegesis. He himself reveals that he employed this technique consciously. In one of his most grotesquely funny letters, he complained to Nikephoros Serblias, imperial secretary and member of the Senate, that he had no money to repair a leaking drainpipe above the door of his apartment and that he was in dire need of financial support.¹⁸³ In order to flatter Serblias, Tzetzes made the utterly absurd claim that Nikephoros was a descendent of the Servilii, a noble family of republican Rome (τῶν πρὶν Καίσαρων Σερβιλίων ἀπόγονε). In explaining the learned reference in the *Histories*, Tzetzes wrote:¹⁸⁴

- 295 Σερβήλιος ἦν ὕπατος καὶ Καίσαρ τῶν Ῥωμαίων.
 Μεθόδῳ δὲ δεινότητος ῥητορικῶ τῷ τρόπῳ,
 ἐκ Σερβηλίων τῆς γονῆς λέγω καὶ τὸν Σερβλίαν.
 Ὡς εἶπερ ἄλλος ἤθελε, Σέρβον Ἥλιαν εἶπεν.¹⁸⁵
 Τοῦτο γὰρ ῥήτορος ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀμφοτερογλώσσου,
 300 καὶ πράγμασι καὶ κλήσεσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ὁμοίως
 πρὸς ἔπαινον καὶ ψόγον δε κεχρήσθαι συμφερόντως.
- 295 Servilius was a consul and caesar of the Romans.
 By means of the technique of forcefulness, in a rhetorical way,
 I declared Serblias as being of the family of the Servilii,
 just as someone else might wish to call him a Serbian Elias.
 For this is the talent of a man good in rhetoric and speaking in two ways,
 300 namely, to use situations and names and similar such things
 expediently for praise and for blame.

The pseudo-etymological play on the family name Serblias can, therefore, move to two, quite opposite directions, on the one hand, as a transferral to an ancient Roman (*qua* noble) context for purposes of praise (Σερβλίαις becomes a Σερβήλιος), on the other, as a transferral to a contemporary Serbian (*qua* barbarian) context for purposes of blame (Σερβλίαις becomes a Σέρβος Ἥλιας). While the actual praise “rises” to learned diction since Σερβήλιος is a fully sanctioned Roman name culled from Hellenistic historiography and the lexica,¹⁸⁶ the potential blame “drops” to

¹⁸² See above p. 5 and n. 21.

¹⁸³ *Ep.* 18. On the Serblias family see A. Kazhdan, *ODB*, III, p. 1875.

¹⁸⁴ *Hist.* 132, *Chil.* VII 295-301.

¹⁸⁵ In all manuscripts but one of the *Histories* the Roman name is written with an *eta* (Σερβήλιος), though in some manuscripts the correct spelling Σερβίλιος has been written above the line. It is possible that the “wrong” spelling served Tzetzes’ purpose of an antistoichic play (Σερβίλιος → Σερβήλιος → Σερβ’ Ἥλιας).

¹⁸⁶ E.g. *Souda* σ 243; III, 342, 10-11 Adler.

colloquial diction since Σέρβος is not sanctioned by Atticist practice.¹⁸⁷ Tzetzes adds that this technique is the very hallmark of a good rhetor who is ἀμφοτερόγλωσσος. In my opinion, this adjective – a creation of Tzetzes – means that a rhetor can develop out of one word both a positive and a negative wordplay. This results in two very different meanings that can be used for praise or blame according to a given situation.¹⁸⁸ The combined use of “Attic” Greek and colloquial “Rhomaian” Greek shows that we are not confronted with two languages standing in some inimical relation to each other, but with idioms that are used to express, sometimes simultaneously, different purposes of an author within the same text. When an author takes a defensive stance as to the use of everyday language, this is because someone else has criticized him for this use, as the *kandelosbestra* incident amply indicates. This ambivalent stance is related to the character and social standing of the individual teachers rather than to a general attitude of the teaching establishment.

Such an ambivalence is expressed at length in the epilogue Tzetzes wrote for his own compact version of the *Theogony* (along with a genealogy of the heroes of the Trojan War) composed in political verses.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ The usual Atticist equivalent for the Serbs was Τριβαλλοί, a race mentioned in Herodotus IV 49. See, for example, the comment of Niketas Choniates in his *History* about an expedition of John II Komnenos in 1123: Μικρῷ δὲ ὕστερον καὶ κατὰ τοῦ τῶν Τριβαλλῶν ἔθνους (εἶποι δ' ἄν τις ἕτερος Σέρβων), κακουργούντος καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς συγγέοντος, στρατείαν ἐκήρυξε (16, 15-18 van Dieten).

¹⁸⁸ P. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel*, Washington, DC 2005, pp. 29-30, in analyzing *Historia* 132, suggests that the word means «double-tongued» and relates it to «ambiguity» (διπλόη), a word used by Theodore Prodromos to describe the power of rhetoric against opponents. But Tzetzes speaks of both praise and blame; he does not refer to the capacity of words to mean something else than what is being said and, thus, to appear as deceitful, which is what schedography does within an educational context. This meaning of διπλόη as «deceitful ambiguity» is what Gregory Pardos (2nd quarter of the 12th cent.) explains in his treatise *On the Syntax of Discourse* § 67, when he states that τὰ δὲ (sc. ῥήματα) διπλῆν ἔχοντα τὴν σύνταξιν ἢ καὶ ποικιλωτέραν, ταῦτα νῦν μόνα παραλάβομεν, ὡς χρήσιμα καὶ εἰς τὴν διπλόην τῆς σχεδικῆς πλεκτάνης («only those verbs that have a double or an even more varied syntactical function I have included as being also useful for the deceit of the schedographic meshes»); see D. Donnet, *Le traité Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου de Grégoire de Corinthe: Étude de la tradition manuscrite, édition, traduction et commentaire*, Brussels 1967, p. 207, 409-411. On *amphoteroglossia* in Eustathios see also F. Kolovou, *Die Briefe des Eustathios von Thessalonike*, Munich 2006, pp. 43*-49* with many references.

¹⁸⁹ The main part of the text was edited for the first time by Immanuel Bekker (see above n. 8), based on the Romanus Casanatensis gr. 306 (olim J-II-10), a. 1413 [C]. Eight years later, the text was also edited by P. Matranga, *Anecdota graeca*, I-II, Rome 1850: I, pp. 577-598, from a sofar unidentified Vatican manuscript that breaks off already at 618 in Bekker's edition. The epilogue of the poem in C starts with v. 719, but breaks off at 777, because the scribe refused to continue copying the incomprehensible foreign languages he found in the text: καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ στίχοι ἦσαν διαλέκτων διαφόρων, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ παρέλειψα ταῦτα ὡς ἀνωφελῆ («There were many other verses of various dialects, but I omitted these as being useless»). A similar case of refusal to copy the epilogue is found in the Vind. phil. gr. 321 (late 13th cent.) [W] which also transmits

The poem's heading runs as follows:¹⁹⁰

Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ ποίημα τοῦ Τζέτζου αὐθωρὸν πάντη καὶ ἀμελέτητον διὰ στίχων πολιτικῶν περιέχον πᾶσαν θεογονίαν ἐν βραχεῖ μετὰ προσθήκης καὶ καταλόγου¹⁹¹ τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἴλιον ἀρίστων Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Τρώων.

By John Tzetzes the schoolteacher a poem wholly instantaneous and unstudied in political verses comprising all the genealogy of the gods in a concise form with the addition of a catalogue of the excellent Hellenes and Trojans during the war at Ilion.

The phrase «a poem wholly instantaneous and unstudied» (ποίημα αὐθωρὸν πάντη καὶ ἀμελέτητον),¹⁹² also appears in the heading of the poem against the two imperial secretaries, namely, «verses instantaneous and wholly unstudied» (στίχοι αὐθωροὶ καὶ πάντη ἀμελέτητοι).¹⁹³ In my opinion, the older meaning of the adjective αὐθωρός («immediate, at that very moment»), combined here with ἀμελέτητος («unstudied»), expresses the sense of «improvised», that is, delivered in a sketchy and unprepared manner.¹⁹⁴

the *Theogony* on ff. 43^r-48^v. The scribe broke off at 723 and noted: τὸν ὅλον ἐπίλογον διὰ τὴν πολυλογίαν εἰάσαμεν ἄγραφον («All of the epilogue we left uncopied because of its garrulity»). W is the oldest and best witness of the text, while it is also an important manuscript transmitting, among many other texts, the letters of Euthymios Malakes, various works of Theodore II Laskaris and the letters of Nikephoros Blemmydes; see H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. 1: Codices historici, codices philosophici et philologici*, Vienna 1961, pp. 409-418: 411 on the Tzetzes material. Maria Tomadaki (currently post-doctoral researcher at the Department of Literary Studies, Ghent University) is preparing a critical edition of Tzetzes' *Theogony*. From a first study of the *Theogony* manuscripts in the Vatican, Dr. Tomadaki believes that the most probable candidate for having been the basis of Matranga's edition is Vat. gr. 896 (2nd half of 14th cent.), possibly with the use of Vat. gr. 895 (1st half of 14th cent.); it is the latter manuscript that preserves the dedication to the *sebastokratorissa* (see below n. 196); on the two manuscripts see P. Schreiner, *Codices Vaticani Graeci: Codices 867-932*, Vatican City 1988, pp. 66-72 (895) and 72-76 (896).

¹⁹⁰ Bekker, *Die Theogonie*, cit., p. 147. In a few cases readings from W have been included in the text as they clearly are superior to the text of C.

¹⁹¹ The word καταλόγου is omitted in C but transmitted in W.

¹⁹² See also in the text's prologue at *Theog.* 22-23: ἐγὼ δὲ πάντα σοι σαφῶς ἐπιδρομάδην λέξω, | ἀμελετήτως αὐθωρὸν καὶ κατεστενωμένως («For I shall tell you everything clearly and summarily, in a manner unstudied, improvised and highly condensed»).

¹⁹³ Pétrides, *Vers inédits*, cit., p. 569.

¹⁹⁴ In connection with the embarrassing episode hinted at in the Pétrides poem, Tzetzes makes clear in two letters addressed to the Kamateroi brothers (*Epp.* 89-90), that he improvises good iambs; he uses the phrases ἰάμβους τινὰς ἀπεσχεδίασα and τὰ βράχιστα μοι στιχίδια ἄπερ ἀπεσχεδίασα (129, 8-9 and 130, 18 respectively). It should be noted that αὐθωρὸν as an adverb makes a massive appearance in lemmata to poems of Manuel Philes (ca. 1270-ca. 1335), that functioned as metrical prefaces to the recitation of prose works by older authors; see Th. Antonopoulou, *On the Reception of Homilies and Hagiography in Byzantium: The Recited Metrical Prefaces*, in A. Rhoby, E. Schiffer (eds.), *Imitatio – Aemulatio – Variatio. Akten des internationalen wissenschaftlichen Symposions zur byzantinischen Sprache und Literatur (Wien, 22.-25. Oktober 2008)*, Wien 2010, pp. 57-79: 68-74.

The poem is dedicated to a royal lady, addressed in the prologue as «Well, then, imperial soul, soul loving scholarship, splendid soul, lover of beauty and, above all, lover of literature» and «Well, then, graceful soul, lover of history, lover of literature».¹⁹⁵ This person is the *sebastokratorissa* Eirene, widow of the *sebastokrator* Andronikos († 1142), second-born son of Emperor John II Komnenos.¹⁹⁶ Tzetzes first extolls Eirene's mythical riches and royal will (*Theog.* 10-13) and, then, points to her wish for receiving a list of the gods and the descendance of the heroes, a wish which he will satisfy in a clear and concise manner (22). He concludes his self-praise by suggesting that only she can save him from unjust men and from inhuman poverty by breaking the bonds of his speechlessness through her warm golden medicine that will allow his tongue and brain to function again (35-43).¹⁹⁷ One could compare this prologue with Constantine Manasses' prologue for his *Annalistic Compendium* (Σύνοψις χρονική), a work also commissioned by the *sebastokratorissa*. In the prologue's first part,¹⁹⁸ Manasses employs the same themes and vocabulary as Tzetzes (beautiful lady, friend of learning, rich and generous, wishing for a concise and clear book on ancient history), but without the autographic style of the latter. But, then, Manasses was a well-known public speaker, accomplished writer, schedographer and emissary of the emperor, exactly the kind of person whom Tzetzes could have branded as an «ethereal rhetor».

¹⁹⁵ *Theog.* 1-2 Φέρε, ψυχὴ βασιλίσα, ψυχὴ φιλιστοροῦσα, | ψυχὴ λαμπρά, φιλόκαλε καὶ φιλολογωτάτη and 18 ψυχὴ χαρίεσσα, φιλίστορ, φιλολόγε.

¹⁹⁶ In the Vat. gr. 895, f. 115^v (see above n. 189) we find the lemma Πρόλογος πρὸς τὴν σεβαστοκρατορίσσαν (Matranga, *Anecdota*, cit., II, p. 577). The correct identification of the addressee goes back to G. Hart, *De Tzetzarum nomine vitis scriptis*, «Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie. Supplementband» 12, 1880-1881, pp. 1-75: 38, and is based on *Ep.* 56, wherein Tzetzes complains to the *sebastokratorissa* about the bad treatment of his «exegeses» (78, 2 τὰς γὰρ ἐμὰς ἐξηγήσεις); see Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., col. 1984. On Eirene Komnene see E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, *Who was Eirene the Sevastokratorissa*, «Byzantion» 64, 1994, pp. 40-68, who suggested that Eirene was actually of Norman descent; A. Rhoby, *Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Sebastokratorissa Eirene und zu Autoren in ihrem Umfeld*, «Νέα Ρώμη» 6, 2009, pp. 305-336 and, most recently, E. Jeffreys, *The Sebastokratorissa Eirene as Patron*, in M. Grünbart, M. Mullett, L. Theis (eds.), *Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond*, Vienna 2013, pp. 177-194, with substantial bibliography. The hypothesis that Eirene was Norman has been unanimously accepted in the relevant bibliography, however, there is no actual evidence for this proposal, while the argumentation is solely *e silentio*. We simply do not know the origins of this woman; she could be Byzantine but of a somewhat lower social standing.

¹⁹⁷ The text of the prologue (1-48) in C is in an unsatisfactory state. Given the importance of the prologue for understanding the contract between author and addressee I list here the readings from W so that readers can put them into the text in order to have a better understanding of these verses: 6 θεὸς ὡς C : τὴν ὄντως W | 9 τὸ C : τὶ W | 9a φιλεῖς τοὺς λόγους καὶ ποθεῖς, ἐπεντυφῶσα τούτους W : om. C | 13 βασιλικὸν πρὸς ἄλλοις C : βασιλείον εὐλόγως W | 15 ἐπιτερπέστατον C : ἐριπρεπέστατον W | 30 πάντα C : πάντων W | 37 δεσμῶσαι C : δεσμοῦμαι W | 38 καὶ παντελῶς C : καὶ παντελῶς ἂν ἄφρονος ἐκ τούτων ἐγινόμεν W | 43 τὴν ἐγκέφαλον ἡλιθίαν C : τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἡλιθιᾶν W | 46 πρόσσχες (a silent correction of Bekker) : πρόσσχες W.

¹⁹⁸ *SynChron.* 1-17; ed. O. Lampsidis (ed.), *Constantini Manassis Breviarium chronicum*, I-II, Athens 1996, I, pp. 5-6.

The poem's long epilogue of 137 verses cannot be found as a continuous text in any printed edition and has therefore never been studied as a whole. Only one part of the prologue has become well known, at least among Byzantinists. It is the passage where Tzetzes shows his knowledge of foreign languages, quoting snippets of everyday conversation in Scythian (i.e. Cuman), Persian (i.e. Seljuq), Latin, Alan (i.e. Old Ossetian), Arabic, Russian and Hebrew.¹⁹⁹ Because of the epilogue's importance for the purposes of the present analysis, I will quote the lengthy passage in full, uniting it for the first time on the printed page.²⁰⁰ Tzetzes ends his narrative with the heroes who fought at Thebes. Then, he addresses his patroness:

Οὔτοι, φυτὸν χρυσόπρεμνον, οὔτοι, φυτὸν ὠραῖον,
 720 Ἑλλήνων²⁰¹ ἦσαν οἱ θεοὶ καὶ παῖδες τῶν ἡρώων.
 Ἔχεις τοιγάρ τὸ δάνειον, ἀπέτισα τὸ χρέος,
 ἐν παιγνιάδεσι γραφαῖς συγγράψας τὰ σπουδαῖα·
 καὶ δὴ καλῶς ἐκμάθανε πάντας τοὺς γεγραμμένους.
 Εἰ δέ τις τείνει πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφρόνως μώμου βέλος,
 725 καταμωκώμενος ἡμῶν τοιαῦτα γεγραφότων,
 ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὡς βούλοιτο μώμοις ἐπεντυφάτω,
 ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντως οὐδὲ γρὺ φθεγξάιμεθα πρὸς τοῦτον.
 Σὺ δὲ καλῶς γινώσκουσα τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας,
 καὶ πᾶς ἐχέφρων συνετός, εἰδῶς οἰκονομίαν

¹⁹⁹ This passage (a total of thirty-five verses) was fully edited for the first time from the Vat. Barb. gr. 30 [B] (13th cent.) by Gy. Moravcsik, *Barbarische Sprachreste in der Theogonie des Johannes Tzetzes* [1928-1929], in *Studia byzantina*, Budapest 1967, pp. 283-292. Moravcsik dated B to the 15th century, but on the 13th-century date see V. Capocci, *Codices Barberiniani Graeci. Tomus I: Codices 1-163*, Vatican City 1958, pp. 31-33. The missing final section of the epilogue was published by C. Wendel, *Das unbekanntes Schlußstück der Theogonie des Tzetzes*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 40, 1940, pp. 23-26 (comprising fifty-five verses), also edited from B. The passage with the foreign languages was then reedited from the Vind. phil. gr. 118 [V] (late 14th cent.) by H. Hunger, *Zum Epilog der Theogonie des Johannes Tzetzes*, «Byzantinische Zeitschrift» 46, 1953, pp. 302-307: 304-305. These thirty-five verses were translated into English by A. P. Kazhdan, A. Wharton Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Century*, Berkeley 1985, pp. 259-260 (text nr. 47) on the basis of Hunger's edition. This passage has been discussed by P. A. Agapitos, *Vom Aktualisierungsversuch zum kommunikativen Code: Johannes Tzetzes und der Epilog seiner Theogonie für die Sebastokratorissa Eirene*, in E. Kislinger, A. Külzer (eds.), *Herbert Hunger und die Wiener Schule der Byzantinistik: Rückblick und Ausblick*, Vienna (forthcoming).

²⁰⁰ Hunger, *Zum Epilog*, cit., p. 303, reconstructed the sequence of the epilogue on the basis of the printed editions as follows: vv. 1-47 (719-765 Bekker) + 1-35 (Moravcsik and Hunger) + 1-55 (Wendel). The epilogue will be quoted here as if it were a part of Bekker's edition, thus continuing his verse numeration. For reference purposes the numeration of the individual editions will be printed on the right-hand margin of the text column. I have slightly unified the spelling and punctuation of the older editions. Lines printed in Italics are Tzetzes' interlinear glosses found in all three manuscripts (C, B and V). The last part of the epilogue, as edited by Wendel from B, is also preserved in V which in certain cases transmits better readings. These have been incorporated from Hunger, *Zum Epilog*, cit., p. 307 who offers a collation.

²⁰¹ W transmits ἑλλήνων, while C reads ἑλληνες.

- 730 καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ τρόπους τε, δι' οὓς ἔγραψα τάδε,
 ἐκείνου μέμψοισθε, δοκῶ, τὴν μωμοσκόπον γλῶσσαν,
 ἡμᾶς δ' οὐκ ἄν νομίσητε τῶν φαύλων συγγραφέων,
 μὴ κομπηροῖς συγγράμμασιν ταῦτα συγγραφεμένους.
 Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἴωθα σκοπεῖν καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ τρόπους
 735 καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ πράγματα, καὶ γράφειν τὰ πρεπώδη.
 Καὶ πρὸς σοφοὺς μὲν γεγραφῶς ἄνδρας καὶ πρὸς λογίους
 τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀρμόττομαι τότε κιννύραν γλώττης,
 ἐπάδων πάνυ λιγυρὰς ἐκείνοις ἀρμονίας·
 εἰ δέ ποτε δεήσει με καὶ πρὸς ἀγροίκους γράφειν,
 740 ὥσπερ φησὶν ὁ κωμικός, σκάφην τὴν σκάφην γράφω,²⁰²
 πρὸς ἀλιέας ἄγκιστρον, βούκεντρον βουηλάταις,
 πρὸς οἰνοπράτας οἶνον δὲ γλυκύν καὶ τὸν ὀξίνην.
 Εἰ δ' ἐκτροπῖαν γράψαιμεν οἶνον ἐξεστηκότα
 μελιθεῖ καὶ φάλερνον ἢ σικερίτην πλέον,
 745 κινήσει τότε καθ' ἡμῶν δίκην τῆς παρανοίας,
 ὥσπερ καὶ πᾶς τις ἕτερος τέχνην ἀσκῶν βαναύσων.²⁰³
 Διὰ τοι τοῦτο πανταχοῦ τηρῶν οἰκονομίαν,
 ὡς πρὸς γυναῖκα γεγραφῶς ἔγραψα σαφεστέρας·
 ἐνίστε καὶ παντελῶς ἔγραψα βανασώδη,
 750 ἢ πρὸς γυναῖκας γεγραφῶς κοινὰς ἐξ ἀγραμμάτων,
 ἢ χάριν ἀστεΐσματος καὶ γέλωτος μεγάλου,
 βαίτζας²⁰⁴ καὶ πατήτια γράφων καὶ τὰς κουράς των.
 Πρὸς δὲ τὰς κόρας γεγραφῶς καὶ τοὺς ἀπειροτέρους
 γράφω τὴν χαλκομίαν²⁰⁵ καὶ τὸ καμουτζουλίτζιν,
 755 τοῖς βρεφυλλίοις γεγραφῶς γράφω μαμμὰ τατά τε.
 Καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος οὕτω φησὶ πού γράφων
 «καὶ δὴ ἔλεγον μοι καλοῦ πατρὸς καλὸς υἱός».²⁰⁶

²⁰² Plutarch (*Mor.* 178b; II 1, 20, 14-18 Sieveking) reports it as a saying of King Philip of Macedonia, while it is Lucian in his famous essay *How should history be written* (*Op.* 59, 41: III 312, 8-10 Macleod) who attributes it to «the Comic»: ὡς ὁ κωμικός φησὶν, τὰ σῦκα σῦκα καὶ τὴν σκάφην δὲ σκάφην ὀνομάζων (Aristoph. fr. 901b). Tzetzes refers to this *bon mot* also in *Hist.* 207, *Chil.* VIII 556-562, where it appears in a conflated version with Philip quoting Aristophanes.

²⁰³ Bekker printed βανασσον but this is unmetrical; I prefer correcting it to βανασύων.

²⁰⁴ Bekker prints βαίτζας. On the word («maid servant») see Kriaras, *s.v.* βαγίτσα, where also the form βαίτσα is included.

²⁰⁵ Attested in Aetios of Amida (LSJ), with the accent -μίαν, whilst Bekker prints -μυῖαν, that would not fit the political verse here (penultimate accent before the caesura).

²⁰⁶ Tzetzes is quoting here a *bon mot*, spoken by Socrates, in the Pseudo-Lucianic dialogue *Halcyon or On Metamorphoses* (*Luc. Op.* 72, 1; IV 90, 9-10 Macleod): Κηῦκα τὸν Τραχίνιον τὸν Ἐωσφόρου τοῦ ἀστέρος, καλοῦ πατρὸς καλὸν υἱόν («Ceyx of Trachis, son of the Morning Star, handsome son of a handsome father»). Tzetzes' ascription of the text to Plato stems from the fact the dialogue is included in some of the oldest Plato manuscripts and was considered genuine, despite the fact that Diogenes Laertius III 62 attested that *Halcyon* was falsely ascribed to Plato (see M. D. Macleod [ed.], *Luciani Opera. Tomus IV: Libelli 69-86*, Oxford 1987, p. xii with the relevant bibliography). It is interesting to note that Vat. gr. 1 (ca. 900; cod. O of Plato) and Harl. 5694 (a. 913/4; cod. E of Lucian) were both written by Baanes for Arethas of Caesarea, and both of them include *Halcyon*, with E probably copying O. In connection with Tzet-

| | | |
|------|--|------|
| | Ἄριστοφάνης δέ φησιν πάλιν ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις «σὺ μὲν μοι ἔλεγες μαμμάν, ἐγὼ δ' ἄρτον ἐδίδου· 760 εἰ δὲ κακᾶν μοι ἔλεξας, ἐξήγαγον ἂν ἐξω». ²⁰⁷ Αἰσχίνη Δημοσθένη τε Λυσίαν μάθοιτέ μοι καὶ πάντας ἄλλους τοὺς σοφοὺς, οἱ χρῶνταιί που τοιούτως, ὦνπερ τυγχάνω ζηλωτής, παντὶ προσφόρως γράφων, σοφοῖς μὲν ἅπασι σοφά, σαφῆ δὲ τοῖς ἀσόφοις, 765 καὶ τοῖς βαναύσοις βάνουσα καὶ πᾶσι κατ' ἀξίαν. Καὶ Σκύθην Σκύθαις εὐροῖς με, Λατίνον τοῖς Λατίνοις καὶ πᾶσιν ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν ὡς ἓνα γένους τούτων. | 1 Hu |
| 767a | κόμανον καὶ Σκύθην ἀσπαζόμενος οὕτω προσαγορεύω· καλὴ ἡμέρα σου, αὐθεντρία μου, ²⁰⁸ καλὴ ἡμέρα σου, αὐθέντα μου. | 2a |
| 770 | σαλαμαλέκ ἀλτή < -- > σαλαμαλέκ ἀλτοῦγεπ. | 5 |
| 770a | τούρκοις Τοῖς Πέρσαις πάλιν περσικῶς οὕτω προσαγορεύω· καλὴ ἡμέρα σου, ἀδελφέ, ποῦ ὑπάγεις, πόθεν εἶσαι, φίλε; ἀσὴν χαῖς κουρούπαρζα χαντάζαρ χαραντάση. Τῷ δὲ Λατίνῳ προσφωνῶ κατὰ Λατίνων γλῶσσαν· 775 καλῶς ἦλθες, αὐθέντα μου, καλῶς ἦλθες, ἀδελφέ· βένε βενέστι, δόμινε, βένε βενέστι, φράτερ· πόθεν εἶσαι καὶ ἀπὸ ποίου θέματος ἦλθες; οὐνδε ἐς ἐτ δεκουάλε προβίντζια βενέστι; πῶς, ἀδελφέ, ἦλθες εἰς τοιαύτην τὴν πόλιν; 780 κόμοδο, φράτερ, βενέστι ἰνίσταν τζιβιτάτεμ; πεζός, καβαλλάριος, διὰ θαλάσσης θέλεις ἀργῆσαι; πεδόνε, καβαλλάριους, περμάρε, βίς μοράρε; Τοῖς Ἀλανοῖς προσθῆγγομαι κατὰ τὴν τούτων γλῶσσαν· καλὴ ἡμέρα σου, αὐθέντα μου, ἀρχόντισσα, πόθεν εἶσαι; 785 ταπαγγᾶς μέσφιλι χσινὰ κορθὶ καντά, καὶ τᾶλλα. 785a Ἄν δ' ἔχη Ἀλάνισσα παπᾶν φίλον, ἀκούσαις ταῦτα· οὐκ αἰσχύνεσαι, αὐθεντρία μου, νὰ γαμῆ τὸ μουνίν σου παπᾶς; τὸ φάρνετζ κίντζι μέσφιλι καίτζ φουὰ σαοῦγγε. Τοῖς δ' Ἄραψιν ὡς Ἄραψιν ἀραβικῶς προσλέγω· ποῦ ὑπάγεις, πόθεν εἶσαι, αὐθεντρία μου; αὐθέντα μου, καλὴ ἡμέρα σου. | 5a |
| | | 10 |
| | | 15 |
| | | 20 |
| | | 20a |

zes' attested use of early minuscule codices for his readings of the classics (for example, his use of the Thucydidean Heidelb. Pal. gr. 252 and the Herodotean Laur. 70, 3), one can assume that he might have also read Plato and Lucian from the two Arethan codices or their immediate apographs. On the Thucydidean and Herodotean manuscripts see Luzzatto, *Tzetzēs lettore di Tucidide*, cit., *passim*, and *Note inedite di Giovanni Tzetze*, cit. *passim*.

²⁰⁷ Ar. *Nub.* 1383-1384.

²⁰⁸ The feminine form of αὐθεντής appears three times in the text (769, 786, 789). Moravcsik and Hunger printed the word as αὐθεντρία μου, probably in correspondance to the more usual form αὐθεντρία (Kriaras, III, pp. 339-340). However, both B and V transmit αὐθεντρία μου in 769 and 786, while in 789 B transmits αὐθεντρία μου and V αὐθεντρ without an accent. There can be no doubt that the paroxytonal form connected to the enclitic possessive pronoun reflects Tzetzēs' usage.

- 790 ἄλεμαντόρ μενέντε σιτή μουλὲ σεπάχα. 25
 Πάλιν τοῖς Ῥῶς ὡς ἔχουσιν ἔθος προσαγορεύω·
 ὑγίαινε, ἀδελφέ, ἀδελφίτζα, καλή ἡμέρα σου.
 τὸ σδρᾶ<στε>, βράτε, σέστριτζα, καὶ δόβρα δένη λέγων.
 Τοῖς δ' ἄρ' Ἑβραίοις προσφυῶς ἑβραϊκῶς προσλέγω·
- 795 μεμαγευμένε οἴκε στόμα φάραγμα καταπίνων μυίας τυφλέ, 30
 μεμακωμένε βῆθ φαγή βεελζεβούλ τιμαῖε,
 Ἑβραῖε λίθε, ὁ Κύριος ἦλθεν ἀστραπή εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν σου.
 ἔβερ ἐργάμ μαρὰν ἀθά βεζέκ εἰς τὸ χωθάρ σου.
 Οὕτω τοῖς πᾶσι προσλαλῶ πρόσφορα καὶ πρεπῶδη
- 800 καλλίστης ἔργον ἐγκωκῶς οἰκονομίας τοῦτο. 35
 Ὅστις δὲ παρὰ πρόσωπον ἢ παρὰ τρόπον γράφει 1 We
 ἐκεῖνος οὐ σοφός ἐστι, βάρβαρος δὲ τὸ πλεόν·
 τὸν σχοινοπλόκον τις εἰπών, τις ἰμονιοστρόφον,
 εἴτε πάλιν τὸν τζυκαλᾶν εἰπών τις γρυτοπῶλην,
- 805 καυσέδονα καὶ πυρεργὸν εἰπών τις τὸν χαλκέα, 5
 ἐρέτην²⁰⁹ πάλιν φήσας τις ἀνθρωπον κωπηλάτην,
 λεκυθοπῶλην τις εἰπών τὸν ὄς παλεῖ κυάμους,
 σὺν τούτοις τὸν καμελαυκᾶν καυσοεργόν τις φήσας,²¹⁰
 τὸ καμελαῦκον καῦσιν δέ, γέλων πολλοῖς ὀφλήσει.
- 810 Ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ φασήλιον²¹¹ ἂν δόλιχον καλέσῃ 10
 καὶ λάθυρον τὸ ὄσπριον ἀκεανὸν ἂν λέγῃ,
 πρὸς γραῦν ὀπωροπῶλιν δὲ μωρόσοφος ἂν λέγῃ·
- 812a γραῦ
 «ῶραιοπῶλι, κάβαλλι, πῶς δίδως τὰ ῶραῖα,
- 813a κόμαρα
 τὰς περσικὰς, μιμαίκιλα, φημί, καὶ τοὺς πιτζεύξους,²¹²
- 814a ἀπίδια σῦκα²¹³ τὰ ἀγγιμηῖα²¹⁴
- 815 ὄχνας καὶ κράδας,²¹⁵ κόμαρον καὶ τὰς ὠμομηλίδας;»²¹⁶ 15
 Ἄν λέγῃ τις πρὸς ἄσοφον τοιαύτας ληρωδίας,
 βάρβαρος ὄντως²¹⁷ καὶ θρασύς, παράφρων δὲ τὸ πλεόν.
 Καὶ πρὸς βαρβάρους ἂν πέρ τις βαρβαρικῶς μὴ λέγῃ,
 καὶ τοῦτον τότε βάρβαρον γίνωσκέ μοι τυγχάνειν,
- 820 ὥσπερ φησὶν Ἀνάχαρσις ὁ Σκύθης ἐπιστέλλων· 20
 φησὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστολίῳ·
 «οἱ Σκύθαι βαρβαρίζουσιν ἐν γένει τῶν Ἑλλήνων
 καὶ πάλιν βαρβαρίζουσιν Ἑλληνας ἐν βαρβάροις.»²¹⁸

²⁰⁹ ἐρέστην B We.

²¹⁰ φ..ας B : εἶπας We.

²¹¹ β[.]σέλιον B We.

²¹² πιτζεύρους B We.

²¹³ συφαρ B.

²¹⁴ τὰ ἄγγρια μῆλα V.

²¹⁵ βρ[.]δ[.] B.

²¹⁶ ὠμομολίδας B.

²¹⁷ οὗτως B : οὔτος tempt. We.

²¹⁸ Anach. Epist. 1, ed. R. Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, Paris 1873, p. 102: Ἀνάχαρσις παρ' Ἀθηναίοις σολοικίζει, Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ παρὰ Σκύθαις.

- Ὡστε καλῶς μοι γίνωσκε πᾶς ὁ φρονῶν ἐκ τούτου,
 825 εἰ κατὰ τὸν Ἀνάχαρσιν τὸν πάνσοφον ἐκεῖνον 25
 ἐσμὲν καὶ λογιζόμεθα βάρβαροι τοῖς βαρβάροις,
 ἂν κατὰ γλῶτταν τὴν αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς οὐ προσλαλῶμεν,
 πολλῶ μᾶλλον τυγχάνομεν ἐκ βαρβαρωδεστέρων,
 ὅταν, ἐν οἷς δυνάμεθα πᾶσιν ἀξίως γράφειν,
 830 ἀκαταλλήλως γράφωμεν σοφὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀσόφους. 30
 Καὶ πᾶσι δὲ τὸ πάνσοφον βάρβαρον εἶναι νόει
 βαναύσοις πρὸς ἀσόφοις τε καὶ μέσοις καὶ πανσόφοις,
 ὡς Διονύσιος φησὶ μετὰ τοῦ Φιλοστράτου.
 Ὅ μὲν γὰρ Διονύσιος φησὶ τοιουτοτρόπως·
 835 «θαυμάζω, ἄνδρες, ἔγωγε, πῶς οἱ γονεῖς ἐκείνων 35
 ἀκούοντες ἀνέχονται τοιαύτης φλυαρίας
 καὶ ὡς δοκοῦσι²¹⁹ πρὸς αὐτοὺς βάρβαρα λέγειν τούτους».
- Περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶς φησὶ λεγόντων μωροσόφως
 ταῦτα μὲν Διονύσιος, Φιλόστρατος δὲ λέγει·
 840 «τὸ ἀπειρόκαλον ἐν τῷ ἀττικίζειν βάρβαρον»,²²⁰ 40
 ὥστε καὶ πρὸς σοφοὺς φησὶ βάρβαρον εἶναι τοῦτο.
 Τὴν δὲ σαφήνειαν κοινῶς ἅπαντες ἐπαινοῦσι·
 ὦν ζηλωτῆς ὦν κέχρημαι πᾶσι τῇ σαφηνείᾳ,
 καίτοιγε βίβλων ὦν πηγὴ καὶ λέξεων παντοίων,
 845 ὅτε²²¹ δὲ καὶ σαφέστερα καὶ βάνανσά που γράφω, 45
 ἀπανταχοῦ θηρώμενος τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας,
 οὐ χάριν ἔγραψα καὶ νῦν ἐν λόγοις σαφεστέροις.
 Εἰ δέ τις πέμψει πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν τούτοις μώμου βέλος,
 οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος εἰδῶς τρόπους οἰκονομίας,
 850 ἀλλ' ἢ πάντως μωρόσοφος καὶ τῶν ἐπιφυλλίδων, 50
 οἷον ὁ βίος πέπλησται μεστῶν ἀλαζονείας,
 ὄφρυν καὶ μόνον²²² βάδισμα φερόντων φιλοσόφων,
 πολλακίς δὲ καὶ γένειον καὶ πλεῖον οὐδὲ ἄλλο·
 ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐν γραφαῖς ἐσμὲν κανῶν τοῦ Πολυκλείτου,
 855 πᾶσι τὰ πρεπωδέστατα γράφοντες κατ' ἀξίαν. 55
- These, golden-stemmed plant, these, o plant so beautiful,
 720 were the Hellenic gods and the offsprings of heroes.
 Thus you hold your loan, I paid my debt in full,
 in playful writings have I composed matters important;
 you, now, learn well all those recorded in writing.
 And if someone should senselessly draw against me the arrow of blame,
 725 stridently mocking me for having written such things,
 let him, as he wishes, revel in such reproaches,
 but I will not even reply a syllable to him.
 But you, my lady, knowing well what concerns disposition,
 and every sensible, judicious man, who knows about disposition

²¹⁹ [ὡς ..σι] B We.

²²⁰ Philostr. *VitSophist.* I 16, 4: τὸ γὰρ ἀπειρόκαλον ἐν τῷ ἀττικίζειν βάρβαρον.

²²¹ ὅτε B.

²²² ὄφρυν μόνον καὶ V.

- 730 and about persons and ways of conduct, through which
I wrote these here verses,
shall reproach (so I think!) the blemish-examining tongue of this man,
while you readers will not think of me as being a bad writer,
since I have not written these things in boastful treatises.
For I am accustomed to examine persons and ways of conduct
735 and occasions and situations, in order to write what is appropriate.
Having written to wise men and learned scholars,
I then fit the Attic lyre to my tongue,
singing for them most sweet harmonies.
Yet should I need to write also to uneducated people,
740 as the Comic says, I write the trough a «trough»,
to fishermen I write «fish-hook», «ox-goat» to the cattle-driver,
to winesellers I write the wine as being «sweet» or «sour».
Should I write the soured wine *ektropias* («diverted»),
meliedes («honey-sweet»), *phalernos* («Falernian») or even *sikerites*
(«ciddier»),
745 the wineseller will take me to court for madness,
just like everyone else practicing a handicraft would do.
Therefore, observing everywhere proper disposition,
having written to a woman I wrote more clearly.
Sometimes I even wrote in a completely low manner,²²³
750 either having written to uneducated commoner women,
or for the sake of a joke and a good laugh,
writing «handmaids», «slippers»²²⁴ and «cropping hair».
Having written to unmarried girls and to very ignorant persons,
I write «copper-colored-fly» and «fine chamois leather»,²²⁵
755 while to little babies I write «mommy» and «daddy».
Plato the philosopher writes somewhere
«they were telling me that I am a good-looking son
of a good-looking father».
- Aristophanes again says in the *Clouds*:
«You were telling me “yummy-yummy”, and I gave you bred;
760 but if you told me “caca-caca”, I took you outside».
Educate yourselves then from Aeschines, Demosthenes, Lysias
and all other wise orators who use language in a similar way,
of whom I am an emulator, writing appropriately to everyone,
to all learned men learned things, clear things to the uneducated,
765 common things to commoners and to everyone according to their dignity.

²²³ The adjective *βαναυσώδης* means here «common», «low»; see *LBG s.v.* with references exclusively to high-style authors of the 12th century (e.g. Eustathios and the Choniates brothers).

²²⁴ The meaning of the word is not clear to me. In *LBG s.v.* *πατήτιν* we find «Räucherharz» (εἶδος θυμιάματος) from an alchemical work. The passage here is not quoted, nor is the word lemmatized in Kriaras. I wonder if the word has something to do with the verb *πατῶ*, «to press», «to step», and therefore referring to some kind of shoe.

²²⁵ The noun *καμουτζουλίτζιν* is probably a diminutive of *καμούτζα*, derived from Italian *camozza*, and meaning «chamois leather» (*LBG s.v.*).

- You will find me to be a Scythian among Scythians,
a Latin among Latins,
 and among all other nations being like one of their race.
- 767a *Cuman*
 Thus, addressing a Scythian, I speak to him in the following manner:
 «*Good day to you, my mistress, good day to you, my master*».
- 770 *Turks*
 σαλαμαλέκ ἀλτή ← → σαλαμαλέκ ἀλτοῦγεπ.
- 770a To the Persians in Persian I speak thus:
 «*Good day to you, my brother, where are you going, from where are you, friend?*»
- ἀσάν χαῖς κουρούπαρζα χαντάζαρ χαραντάση.
 The Latin I address according to the Latin language:
- 775 «*Welcome, my lord, welcome, my brother*».
 βένε βενέστι, δόμινε, βένε βενέστι, φράτερ·
 «*From where are you and from what province have you come?*»
 οὐνδε ἔς ἔτ δεκουάλε προβίντζια βενέστι;
 «*In what manner, brother, have you come to this city?*»
- 780 κόμοδο, φράτερ, βενέστι ἰνίσταν τζιβιτάτεμ;
 «*On foot, as a rider, by sea? Do you wish to stay?*»
 πεδόνε, καβαλλάριους, περμάρε, βίς μοράρε;
 To the Alans I speak according to their language:
 «*Good day, my master; my lady, from where are you?*»
- 785 ταπαγχάς μέσφιλι χσινά κορθι καντά, and the rest.
- 785a And if an Alan woman has a priest as a friend, you will hear this,
 «*Are you not ashamed, my mistress, to have a priest fuck your cunt?*»
 namely, φάρνετζ κίντζι μέσφιλι καίτζ φουά σαοῦγγε.
 To the Arabs as being Arabs I speak Arabically:
 «*Where are you going, from where are you, my mistress?*»
Good day, my master».
- 790 ἄλεμαντόρ μεέντε σιτή μουλέ σεπάχα.
 And again to the Russians I speak according to their custom,
 «*Health to you, my brother, little sister; good day to you*».
 namely, σδρά«στε», βράτε, σέστριτζα, and saying δόβρα δένη.
 To the Jews I will suitably speak in Hebrew:
- 795 «*Bewitched house, mouth and throat swallowing flies, blind man*»;
 μεμακωμένε βήθ φαγή βεελζεβούλ τιμαῖε,
 «*Jewish stone, the Lord has come as a lightning upon your head*».
 ἔβερ ἔργαμ μαράν ἀθά βεζέκ upon your χωθάρ.
 In this manner I address to all useful and appropriate words,
- 800 knowing this to be the work of the best disposition.
 Yet he who writes in violation of the person or the way of conduct,
 he is not wise, rather he is a barbarian.
 If someone calls the water-drawer²²⁶ a *himoniostrongphos*
(«water-drawer»),²²⁷

²²⁶ In Sch. Ar. *Ran.* 1322 σχοινοπλόκος is the «water-drawer», but Tzetzes' σχοινοπλόκος could suggest that he understood the word as «rope-maker».

²²⁷ Ar. *Ran.* 1297.

or again if he calls the pot-maker a *grytopoles* («seller of small ware»),²²⁸
 805 if he calls the coppersmith a *kausedon* («pot-burner»)²²⁹
 or a *pyrergos* («fire-worker»),²³⁰
 or again if he names a rowing man an *eretes* («rower»),
 if someone calls him who sells broad-beans a *lekythopoles*
 («seller of pulse-gruel»),²³¹
 and if along with these he calls the hatmaker a *kausoergos*
 («cap-worker»),²³²
 and the hat a *kausis* («cap»),²³³ he will make many people laugh.
 810 Just as if he names *dolichos* («long bean») the black-eyed pea²³⁴
 and if he calls *akeanos* the chickling-pea,
 and if a foolish-wise man should say to an old woman fruitseller:
 812a *Old woman*
 «Ripefruit-seller, aged mare²³⁵ [?], at what price²³⁶ do you offer
 your ripe produce,
 813a *komara*
 peaches, strawberry-tree-fruit (*mimaikila*) and pistaccios (?),²³⁷
 814a *apidia* *syka* *ta agrimela*
 815 pears (*ochmas*),²³⁸ figs (*keradas*),²³⁹ berries [?] and wild little apples?»²⁴⁰
 If someone says such fooleries to an uneducated person,
 he is certainly barbaric and insolent, if not completely mad.
 And if someone does not speak to foreigners in their own foreign manner,
 then know that he proves to be a barbarian,
 820 just as Anacharsis the Scythian says when writing letters;
 for this man writes in his little letter:
 «Scythians speak as foreigners when found among Hellenes,
 and again Hellenes speak as foreigners among the foreigners».²⁴¹
 So then, every sensible person, know well from these things

²²⁸ Sch. Ar. *Pl.* 17.

²²⁹ *Hapax* of Tzetzes.

²³⁰ *Hapax* of Tzetzes.

²³¹ Possibly λεκιθοπώλης; cfr. λέκιθος in Ar. *Lys.* 562.

²³² *Hapax* of Tzetzes.

²³³ Macedonian hat (Theophrast).

²³⁴ Ar. *Pax* 1144 φασιόλος. The φασήλιον (a diminutive of φάσηλος) is the kind of bean (φασιόλος) defined as δόλιχος in Attic Greek.

²³⁵ Κάβαλλις seems to be a *hapax* of Tzetzes; in *LBG* it is rendered as «alte Frau (?)», which of course is what the lemma in 812a offers. But the word, which includes the root of καρβαλλάρης, could be supposed to mean something like «old horse».

²³⁶ A colloquial expression in Ar. *Ach.* 745.

²³⁷ Πιτζεύρους is a *hapax* of Tzetzes. In *LBG s.v.* πιτζακέα the word is rendered as «pistaccio tree», i.e. πιστακέα.

²³⁸ *Od.* VII 120 ὄγχνη.

²³⁹ Ar. *Pax* 627 κράδη («fig-tree»).

²⁴⁰ The word is unattested; ἀμαμηλίς is ancient for μέσπιλον («medlar»).

²⁴¹ One should note here that the “ethnic” names of the original phrase (Athenians – Scythians) have been transferred by Tzetzes to two different and very general categories; these, however, fit more easily a twelfth-century reading of the terms.

- 825 that, if according to Anacharsis (that most wise of men),
we actually are and are thought of as foreigners by foreigners,
lest we should not address them in their own language,
how much more must we be seen as most barbaric
when, in those things where we are capable of writing worthily to all,
830 we write unsuitably wise words to unwise persons.
Do understand that to everyone the most wise diction is barbaric,
to common people and to unwise, to «middle» persons²⁴²
and to the most wise,
as Dionysius remarks along with Philostratus.
For Dionysius²⁴³ speaks in the following words:
835 «I do wonder, men, how the parents of such persons,
listening such phrases tolerate such garrulous nonsense,
thinking that their children speak to them in such a barbaric manner».
About those who speak Attically in a foolish-wise manner
these words says Dionysius, while Philostratus says:
840 «The lack of taste in using the Attic diction is barbaric»,
so that even speaking to wise men like that, he says, is barbaric.
But clarity is commonly praised by everyone;
being a zealous admirer of such wise men, I use in everything clarity,
although I am myself a source of books and manifold words;
845 but when I write more clearly and even commonly,
in all matters seeking after what is appropriate to the disposition
«of my writing»,
on account of which I now wrote in a more clear discourse.
And if someone should send in such matters against me
the arrow of blame,
he is not a man knowing the ways of disposition,
850 but he rather is a foolish-wise person and a poetaster,²⁴⁴
obfuscated people whose life is filled with arrogance,
who bear only the brow and walk of philosophers,
often also the beard, but nothing else beyond that.

²⁴² The phrase τοῖς μέσοις suggests here a social stratification of education, by being both a term for a social group and a term defining a middle (*qua* average) level of education.

²⁴³ Wendel, *Das unbekannte Schlußstück*, cit., p. 25, commentary to v. 34 (= 834) thinks that Dionysius of Halicarnassus is ment here, but the “quotation” could not be found in his surviving works. That Tzetzēs was indeed refering to this Dionysius can be seen (a) from the marginal gloss ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς in V to 834, and (b) from a letter of his where he again combines Philostratus and the «Halicarnassian» (*Ep.* 89, 130, 7-8): ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς τε καὶ ὁ Φιλόστρατος καὶ ὁ λοιπὸς μυριάριθμος ῥητόρων ἔσμός.

²⁴⁴ *Ar. Ran.* 92-93 (ἐπιφυλλίδες ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ στωμύλματα, | χελιδόνων μουσεῖα, λωβηταὶ τέχνης) along with Sch. *Ar.* 92a, 729, 6-8 Ko. The Aristophanic verse is used by Tzetzēs in *Ep.* 1, 1, 5-7 (Πυνθάνομαι ὡς παρὰ σοὶ τινες ἐπιφυλλίδες τε καὶ στωμύλματα γλώτταν ἀχαλινον καθ' ἡμῶν κεκινήκεσαν καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν αὐτοῖς διασέστυται), for which see *Hist.* 1, *Chil.* IV 783. On the meaning of the two words see also *Souda* ε 2758; II, 393, 1-7 Adler (ἐπιφυλλίδες· ἐπὶ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι σοφῶν ἢ ποιητῶν) and *Souda* σ 1154; IV, 438, 24-439, 6 Adler (στωμύλος), also with reference to the Aristophanic verse. I have rendered the word as «poetaster» following the *Suda*.

855 However, in my writings I am the rule of Polycleitus,²⁴⁵
writing to everyone what is most appropriate according to their dignity.

Tzetzes, in his usual technique of reconnecting to previous passages, begins the epilogue by addressing the *sebastokratorissa* with the vegetal imagery he had used in the prologue (719 ~ 14-17). The epilogue itself is clearly divided into three parts. The driving power giving to this long passage the associative flow of its structure and its motoric rhythm is Tzetzes' anxiety of being blamed or even mocked by the blemish examiners for not offering an allegorical exegesis of the *Theogony* in high Attic style (724-733, 848-855), but having used a style appropriate to people of a "middle-level" education (832 μέσοις). As we have seen, it is an anxiety that runs through a number of his works and that spurns him to attack these real or imagined adversaries with an abusive language. Of course, the broader issue behind this anxiety is the success or failure of the teacher to attract high-standing patrons and affluent students.

It is within this context that we have to read the notion of playfulness Tzetzes introduces when composing "light" educative texts in verse.²⁴⁶ For example, at the very beginning of the epilogue to the *Theogony*, he hands over his work to the *sebastokratorissa*, by suggesting that he has repaid his debt, having written in «playful writings» about the important matters concerning the gods and heroes of the Hellenes (721-722). He had already used this phrase earlier in the work, at the point where he had concluded the genealogy of Aeneas with a brief excursus on the beginnings of Rome. He interrupts the narrative and addresses his patroness (494-499):

495 Θέλοις σοι παρελκύσωμεν οὕτω τὸ γένος σύμπαν;
'Αλλ' ἀπρεπές σοι καὶ βαρὺ φανήσεται τελείως.
Σὺ γὰρ τοὺς στρατηγούς ζητεῖς Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Τρώων,
τὰ δ' ἄλλα τὰ περιεργα πόνου καὶ κόπου πλέα
καὶ τοῖς ἀκρωμένοις μὲν, τοῖς γράφουσι δὲ πλέον,
καὶ μᾶλλον παιγνιώδεσι τοῖς στίχοις γεγραφόσι.

495 Do you want me to explain to you thus all of their race?
But that would be inappropriate for you and utterly burdensome.

²⁴⁵ Tzetzes uses the same phrase for his poetry in *Ep.* 89, 130, 1, which he explains in *Hist.* 426, *Chil.* XII 550-551 with reference to *Hist.* 191, *Chil.* VIII 311-316.

²⁴⁶ M. J. Jeffreys, *The Nature and Origin of the Political Verse* [1974], in E. M. Jeffreys, M. J. Jeffreys, *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium*, London 1983, nr. IV, pp. 142-195: 148-157, devoted substantial space to Tzetzes' works composed in the *politikos stichos*. Jeffreys pointed to two features in Tzetzes' works composed in political verse, that are of importance to the present study. These are the presence of the notion of *paignion* («play») and the frequent appearance of the term *oikonomia* («disposition»). Jeffreys' understanding of these features form an essential part of his argument concerning the nature of the *politikos stichos* and the use of vernacular language in Komnenian poetic production and, therefore, their role in the history of Byzantine and Modern Greek literature. As will become apparent from the following analysis, I hold a rather different view about these matters.

For you ask to learn about the commanders of the Hellenes and the Trojans,
and about all other superfluous things filled with toil and fatigue,
for listeners and much more for writers,
and above all for those writing their verses in a playful manner.

Tzetzes claims that a detailed account of Roman royal genealogy would appear as utterly improper and burdensome to Eirene, who has asked to learn specifically about the generals of the Trojan war. All other strange things are full of toil and weariness for listeners and writers alike, especially those who compose in “playful verses”. But why should the specific request be such a wearisome toil for Tzetzes and his playful verses? In the prologue to the *Odyssey Allegories*,²⁴⁷ he states about himself.²⁴⁸

40 εἶτ' οὖν τοῖς πᾶσι ζηλωτῆς καθέστηκεν Ὅμηρου
καὶν τοῖς σαφέσι καὶ ληπτοῖς καὶ παιγνιωδεστέροις
καὶ τοῖς ἀποκαθάρμασι τοῦ λόγου τῆς οἰκίας.

Well, then, he [*sc.* Tzetzes] has become the emulator of Homer
in everything,

40 both in words clear and comprehensible and rather playful,
as well as in the offscourings of the house of discourse.²⁴⁹

In my opinion, these allusive lines suggest that Tzetzes in his allegorical exegesis has been able to emulate Homer in all aspects of the poet’s various styles, thus implying that he himself is the poet’s best interpreter.²⁵⁰ In fact, as Eric Cullhed has recently shown, Tzetzes actually set himself up as a kind of new Homer, the only true successor of the wandering and poor bard.²⁵¹

A number of teachers from the eleventh and twelfth century included the imagery of playfulness in their works, for example, Michael Psellos,²⁵² Niketas of

²⁴⁷ The *Odyssey Allegories* form the second part of Tzetzes’ *Plot Summary of Homer* (ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Ὁμήρου), on which see Wendel, *Tzetzes*, cit., col. 1969. The work was originally dedicated to Manuel Komnenos’ wife Eirene, that is, Bertha von Sulzbach (K. Barzos, *Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*, I-II, Thessaloniki 1984: I, pp. 456-457). However, the writing was broken off at Book 15 of the *Iliad Allegories*, when the empress refused through her middleman, a certain Megalonas, to raise Tzetzes’ wages (see also below n. 262). The work was finally completed after the empress’ death († 1160) with the financial support of Constantine Kotertzes, an old pupil of Tzetzes, as a special preface to Book 16 testifies (Boissonade [ed.], *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*, cit., p. 192; transl. in Goldwyn-Kokkini, cit., p. 289).

²⁴⁸ *AllegOd.* praef. 39-41.

²⁴⁹ Jeffreys, *Nature*, cit., p. 155 renders v. 41 as «in the offscourings of kitchen talk» and suggests that Tzetzes intends to write in this manner.

²⁵⁰ We will find a similar self-representation in Tzetzes’ prefatory statement to the scholia he wrote to accompany his own hexametric summary of the complete Trojan epic material, his *Carmina Iliaca* (Μικρομεγάλη Ἰλιάς) in three books; see Leone, *Carmina Iliaca*, cit., p. 101, 1-10.

²⁵¹ Cullhed, *The Blind Bard*, cit., pp. 58-67.

²⁵² In the epilogue to his *Rhetoric* for Michael Doukas (*Poem. 7*, 541-545 Westerink), the young

Herakleia,²⁵³ or an anonymous author of a verse manual on basic syntax.²⁵⁴ All three texts are composed in political verse. In my opinion, the words παίζω («to play»), παίγιον («play») and παιγνιώδες («playful») point to the “playful ease” with which pupils will learn their material, be it by reading and memorizing grammar and vocabulary, or by listening to and learning mythological subjects. Playfulness is one aspect of a teacher’s marketing device to present rather dry and catalogue-like material as easy, digestible, even pleasant for young pupils or aristocratic ladies. The other aspect of this device is, of course, the use of the accentual *politikos stichos* that could easily accommodate all kinds of longer words, especially standardized technical terms or catch-phrases needed for a teaching aid.²⁵⁵

But let us return to the *Theogony* of Tzetzes. The greater part of the epilogue is devoted to the author’s supposedly customary practice to examine persons, ways of conduct, occasions and situations in order to write what is appropriate (734-735). Thus, he adjusts his language according to the education level of the recipients of his writings. The Attic lyre is appropriate for wise and learned men, everyday language for uneducated craftsmen and merchants, a clearer diction for women (in this case the *sebastokratorissa*), but sometimes he will use an everyday idiom for illiterate women of a low station, or simply for the sake of jest and laughter (736-751). Tzetzes, then, offers some examples of this everyday language (752-755) that are of the same type as the sarcastic colloquial comments we saw him use in the *Histories*. He supports his practice of linguistic adjustment by referring to Plato, Aristophanes and the orators Aeschines, Demosthenes and Lysias (756-763). Moreover, he points out that he writes in a learned manner to the learned, in a clear manner to the uneducated and in a common one to common people, addressing all according to their social standing (764-765).²⁵⁶ In particular, Tzetzes’ refer-

prince is encouraged to learn by «playing through discourse» (παίζων λογικῶς), a situation different than what we find in Tzetzes who himself offers the playful verses.

²⁵³ In his poem on *Subjunctive verbs* 1-3 Niketas writes: Φέρε μικρόν τι παίζω μεν πολιτικοῖς ἐν στίχοις | τῆς νόσου παρηγόρημα καὶ τῆς μικροψυχίας, περὶ ῥημάτων δ’ ἔστωσαν ἀθυποτάκτων οὗτοι (Sp. Lambros, *Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου Περὶ ῥημάτων ἀθυποτάκτων στίχοι πολιτικοί*, «Neos Hellenomnemon» 16, 1922, pp. 191-197: 192).

²⁵⁴ Addressing his potential pupil the author states in the prologue: Τοῦ λόγου σοι τὴν σύνταξιν καὶ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου | συντόμῳ πειραθῆσομαι μεθόδῳ παραδοῦναι, | σπουδὴν παιγνίῳ κεραυνὺς πολιτικοῖς ἐν στίχοις, | ὡς ἔχῃς ταύτην ὄμηρον ἀγάπης διδασκάλου (On *Syntax* 9-12); text edited by J. Fr. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis. Volumen II*, Paris 1830, pp. 340-393.

²⁵⁵ There is another *topos* connected to the notion of play, namely, that the teacher who teaches in a playful manner receives comfort from labouring hard to produce satisfactory manuals. Thus, the manual on syntax is preceded by a dedicatory epigram in twelve-syllable verse underlining the use of “modest play” and “play as comfort”: Πρὸς παῖδα σεμνὸν εὐγενῆ γράφειν θέλω | καὶ σεμνὸν ἀντὶ παιδιᾶς δώσω τρόπον, | ὡς ἂν τὸ σεμνόν, κἂν δοκῇ παίζειι, ἔχῃ | κάμοι δὲ διδάσκοντι παιγνίου τρόπῳ | γένοιτο μικρὸς τῆς μιᾶς νυκτὸς πόνος, | πόνῳ παρηγόρημα τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ | ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν οἱ λόγων ὁμιλία | κούφισμα τυγχάνουσιν τῆς λύπης μέγα (On *Syntax* 1-8 Boissonade); see also Niketas’ opening statement quoted in n. 253.

²⁵⁶ In *Theog.* 765 κατ’ ἀξίαν suggests both «according to merit» in the Attic sense of the phrase

ence to Aristophanes is important because the authority of the Comic vindicates the use of everyday language for serious and humorous purposes, as the vocabulary used in 801-817 manifestly shows.

We have seen so far that Tzetzes uses everyday language over the broad spectrum of his various writings, even if he does take towards it an ambivalent stance. It is negative when he mocks ignorant schedographers and their «little texts», defensive when he is being criticized by the malicious blemish examiners, and positive when he writes satirical verses for his personal enjoyment against his rivals. The epilogue of the *Theogony*, picking up the themes touched upon in its prologue, brings them together in a most forceful “teacherly” style, where Tzetzes expresses his opinion on how a specific authorial key concept functions. It is οἰκονομία. Within the first part of the epilogue (719-765), the word *oikonomia* appears three times (728, 729, 747) and in the same metrical position as the last word of the verse. *Oikonomia* also makes three more appearances in the rest of the epilogue (800, 846, 849), of which the two are again at the end of the verse. There can be no doubt that readers are intended to understand that *oikonomia* is an important concept related to the writer’s choice of an idiom «useful and appropriate» (799 πρόσφορα καὶ πρεπώδη).

The notional framework in which the word is normally used by the Byzantines in theology and canon law is determined by three basic meanings, that of «wise foresight» (synonymous to πρόνοια), of «dispensation» (of God’s grace) and of «concession» (i.e. relaxation of canon law).²⁵⁷ Within this framework, *oikonomia* is without exception exercised by a higher authority. In the epilogue of the *Theogony*, Tzetzes refers to *oikonomia* and its *tropoi* («ways») as something that he as a writer heeds and applies (747, 800, 846), others, however, might or might not know, for example, the patroness and wise men know it (729-730), ignorant critics do not (849-850). Before embarking on the last part of the genealogies in the *Theogony*, Tzetzes interrupts his catalogue-like narrative and addresses the *sebastokratorissa*. We have already quoted the first part of this extended authorial address (see above p. 48) where Tzetzes mentions the inappropriateness of writing in his playful verses about useless matters full of toil and fatigue (494-499). He then remarks:²⁵⁸

- 500 Ναρκᾶν γὰρ εἴωθε ψυχὴ πρᾶγμα ποιούσα μέγα,
 ὅταν ἐν οἴσπερ πέφυκεν ἐπαίνων ἐπαξία,
 μᾶλλον δοκεῖ τι μωμητὸν ποιεῖν τοῖς μωμοσκόποις,
 μὴ πρὸς αὐτὸ προσβλέψασι τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας.
 Καὶ δὴ λοιπὸν τὰ περισσὰ τῆς ἥρωγονίας
 505 ἐάσας γράφειν ἀπρεπῶς συγγράμμασι πιθήκων,

(LSJ *s.v.* ἀξία 3a) but also «according to dignity» in the Byzantine sense; see A. Kazhdan, *ODB*, I, p. 639. In the prologue of the *Theogony*, Tzetzes had used ἀξία in the sense of «dignity», «rank» for the royal patroness (6 καὶ πρὸς ἀξίαν τέθεικε Θεὸς ὡς ὑπερτάτην and 8 τὴν καλλο- νὴν τὴν ἔκκριτον, τὸ γένος, τὴν ἀξίαν).

²⁵⁷ See A. Papadakis, *ODB*, III, pp. 1516-1517.

²⁵⁸ *Theog.* 500-509.

τὰ καιριώτερα σαφῶς ἐν τούτοις διαγράψω·
τὰ δ' ἄλλα δέονται καιροῦ καὶ στίχων τῶν ἡρώων,
καὶ μᾶλλον περισσότερον καὶ γλώσσης εὐθυμούσης.
Καὶ δὴ χωρῶ πρὸς τὸν εἰρμόν, σὺ δὲ καλῶς μοι πρόσσχες.

- 500 For the soul is used to grow numb in accomplishing a great deed,
when in those things in which she shows itself worthy of praise,
it rather seems to the blemish examiners to accomplish
something blameful –
people who have not looked into what is appropriate to disposition.
Well, then, omitting to write inappropriately through
the writings of monkeys
- 505 what is superfluous to the genealogy of heroes,
I shall delineate the more important matters in these my writings;
what remains needs time and the verses of heroes,
and even more so it needs a cheerful tongue.
Well, then, I move on to the sequence of my story, while you be
fully attentive.

The writing about useless matters full of toil and fatigue, therefore, refers to the state of stupor in which the soul sinks when, instead of receiving praise, it is attacked by the blemish examiners who have not discerned the ways of *oikonomia*. And so, Tzetzes tells his patroness that he will leave aside the redundant information of the genealogy of heroes since he does not wish to write improperly in the manner of «monkey writings», because these other matters require «heroic verses» and, even more so, a «cheerful tongue». The whole passage makes clear that the patroness commissioned Tzetzes to prepare for her the genealogy of the Hellenic gods and heroes, but it is he who knows how this is to be done and thus will produce the best possible product, exactly what the blemish examiners do not know nothing about.

In the *Iliad Allegories*, Tzetzes includes at two points similar remarks that make absolutely explicit the distinction as to the roles played by the writer and the patron in the contract of commission. In Book 18, that is after Tzetzes had resumed the writing of the work following the death of Empress Eirene, he notes that his work «was written by means of disposition and by the zeal of the sovereign lady» (οἰκονομία συγγραφέν, σπουδῇ τῆ τῆς ἀνάσσης).²⁵⁹ *Oikonomia* here clearly means the necessary «disposition» a writer has to undertake in matters of language, style, metre, content or structure so as to produce a work that will satisfy the «zeal» of a specific patron. In the prolegomena to the *Plot Summary of Homer* as a whole, Tzetzes makes a statement about the form of his work:²⁶⁰

²⁵⁹ *Allegll.* 18, 660.

²⁶⁰ *Allegll.* proleg. 35-40. Boissonade placed a fullstop after φθόνῳ in 36, separating the main sentence from its secondary clause. But 37-40 must be understood as the imaginary reproach of the *momoskopoi*. Boissonade also corrected in 40 μεταβαλεῖν (all codices) to μεταβάλλειν against the meter. In their translation, Goldwyn-Kokkini, cit., p. 5 have translated the passage following Boissonade's text.

- 35 Ἄλλ' ἀναχαιτιζέσθωσαν αἱ μωμοσκόποι γλώσσαι
 ἐξυλακτεῖν τι καθ' ἡμῶν οἰστρούμεναι τῷ φθόνῳ,
 ὡς γὰρ αἱ πάλαι γράφουσι τὸν Δία μυθουργίαι
 μεταβαλεῖν εἰς μῶρφωμα πιθήκων τοὺς Τιτᾶνας,
 οὕτω κἀγὼ νῦν βούλομαι τρόποις οἰκονομίας
 40 μεταβαλεῖν τοὺς ἥρωας συγγράμμασι πιθήκων.
- 35 But let the blemish-examining tongues be restrained
 from barking out something against me aroused by envy,
 for as the ancient mythographies write that Zeus
 changed the Titans into the shape of monkeys,
 so I now wish by the ways of disposition
 40 to change the heroes though the writings of monkeys.

We see here that the same set of key-words appears as in the second address to the patroness and the epilogue of the *Theogony*, namely, the *momoskopoi*, *oikonomia* and the *syngrammata pithekon*. Having read about Tzetzes' insistence on addressing people of different educational standing appropriately, we realize that the phrase «monkey writings» brands a book written in a diction inappropriate to the topic and the addressee (*Theog.* 505 ἀπρεπῶς). More specifically, in the *Theogony* «monkey writings» refers to over-detailed exegeses of the genealogical material, whereas in the *Iliad Allegories* it refers to what Tzetzes' rivals wrongly perceive as his simpler style of writing. It is not Tzetzes' personal expression of distaste to write in the clear diction of a middle style. Moreover, the images of the author's numbed soul and cheerful tongue obliquely but decisively suggest that Tzetzes would expect a better payment for the treatment of such heroic matter in a heroic verse. In fact, in the prologue to the *Plot Summary*, he made three proposals to offer to the empress a more expensive product, twice a full translation²⁶¹ and finally a detailed summary of each individual book.²⁶²

If Tzetzes, therefore, heeds *oikonomia* or writes by it, whose is the authority from which this «disposition» emanates? In my opinion, it is Tzetzes' own. However, he could not state this directly because such a statement would constitute a case of unveiled novelty, a problematic choice within the broadly conservative frame of Byzantine society.²⁶³ The idea that an author could exercise *oikonomia* over his own work as the ultimate authority controlling the craft of writing had been expressed by Michael Psellos hundred years before Tzetzes. For example, in an essay comparing the novels of Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, Psellos wrote about the former:²⁶⁴

²⁶¹ *AllegIl.* proleg. 46-49 and 489-504.

²⁶² *AllegIl.* proleg. 1207-1214. These attempts precede his later complaints to the middleman of the empress, where he demanded to be paid according to his work as a metaphrast and not just as a scribe or author; see the long letter to Megalonas (*Ep.* 57) and his comments in *Hist.* 264, *Chil.* IX 278-297.

²⁶³ On veiled and unveiled novelty see Agapitos, *Literary Haute Cuisine*, cit., pp. 229-230 with further bibliography.

²⁶⁴ Text and translation by A. R. Dyck, *Michael Psellus: The Essays on Euripides and George of*

The book is organized (ᾠκονόμηται) according to the arts of Isocrates and Demosthenes since the element interrupting the story is seen to be controlled from afar and the element following thereafter is immediately reconnected to the interruption. He who reads *Charikleia* for the first time thinks that most elements are superfluous, but as the story progresses, he comes to admire the author's orderly disposition (τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ συγγεγραφότος θαυμάσεται). The very beginning of the work resembles coiled snakes. Having concealed their head inside their coils, they display the rest of their body; so the book, having chosen the type of plot onset that falls in the middle, elevates its centre to its beginning.

Heliodoros' own «orderly disposition» in matters of structural organization is to be admired, and the simile of the coiled snake makes this admiration more than obvious. Psellos, however, never used *oikonomia* to describe his own literary techniques, even if, in his very own way, he did use a number of other terms that derive from ancient literary criticism.²⁶⁵

The appearance of *oikonomia* in the *Theogony* and the *Iliad Allegories* is, then, a prominent feature of Tzetzes' work in relation between him and his patrons, as Michael Jeffreys pointed out.²⁶⁶ As I have attempted to show above, the *tropoi oikonomias* are an encoded term signalling the authority of Tzetzes over his own work. It should therefore not be assumed that the “educational” texts produced by Tzetzes were written under the exact specifications of their respective patronesses. In fact, the presence of the *politikos stichos* and the *idiotis glossa* in an immensely varied spectrum of educational texts from the eleventh century suggests that it is the teachers who chose to present the material in a different manner. As in the case of most innovations in Byzantine culture, some of these teachers, like the over-sensitive Tzetzes, needed to defend their novel products. The only thing one can infer from the *Theogony* and the *Plot Summary of Homer* is that the patronesses asked for the mythological subject matter to be presented in a comprehensible manner.²⁶⁷ The treatment, however, was left to the teacher.

This relation between patron and writer reflects the standard practice in medieval book commissions. One illuminating example is the prologue Chrétien de Troyes, a slightly younger contemporary of Tzetzes, composed to his famous *Le chevalier de la charette* or *Lancelot* (ca. 1170-1175).²⁶⁸ There Chrétien explicitly

Pisidia and on Heliodoros and Achilles Tatius, Vienna 1986, pp. 90-93; the translation, however, has been here substantially revised. On Psellos' essay see P. A. Agapitos, *Narrative, Rhetoric and «Drama» Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodoros*, in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodoros*, Cambridge 1998, pp. 125-156: 132-137.

²⁶⁵ See Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos*, cit., pp. 88-127.

²⁶⁶ However, Jeffreys, *Nature*, cit. pp. 151-152, proposed that by *oikonomia* Tzetzes made an indirect reference to the compromise between the patron's wishes and the writer's own choices and that, in reality, the patron exercised strict control over all aspects of production. Jeffreys also suggested that the chosen literary form (i.e. political verse and lower-level style) were, in fact, distasteful to Tzetzes.

²⁶⁷ Compare the respective passages at *Theog.* 18-23 and *Allegll.* proleg. 16-34.

²⁶⁸ Ch. Mela (ed.), Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Chevalier de la Charette ou Le Roman de Lancelot*,

states that his patroness, Countess Mary of Champagne (1145-1198) and daughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine, asked him to compose a romance: «Puis que ma dame de Chanpaigne | Vialt que romans a feire anpraigne, | Je l'anprendrai molt volontiers» (1-3).²⁶⁹ He refers to the title of his romance and then adds: «Matiere et san li done et livre | La contesse et il s'antremet | De panser, que gueres n'i met | Fors sa painne et s'antancion» (26-29).²⁷⁰ Chretien's «thought» (*panser*), «effort» (*painne*) and «careful attention» (*antancion*) are the equivalent of Tzetzes' «ways of disposition» (τρόποι οἰκονομίας), the «wish» (*vialt*) of Mary corresponds to the «zeal» (σπουδή) of Eirene, while both patronesses dictate the subject matter.²⁷¹

What Tzetzes, then, defends is adjustment and flexibility as the mark of a good writer and criticizes rigidity as the sign of a foolish-wise person or of a poetaster doning the high-brow comportment of philosophers (*Theog.* 850-851). It is in order to demonstrate how he heeds *oikonomia* that in the second part of the epilogue (766-800) he lets loose his display of knowledge of foreign languages, mingling into the text his rough humor, be it his abuse of Jews or the sexually explicit reproach to an Alan woman who has taken a priest as lover.²⁷²

In the first part of the epilogue (719-765) *oikonomia* is exclusively related to the act of writing,²⁷³ in the second part (766-800) it is exclusively related to speaking,²⁷⁴ while in the third part (801-855) it is related both to writing and speaking,²⁷⁵ though at the very end of the text the act of writing takes over completely (854-855). *Oikonomia* in relation to the act of speaking (799-800) is the point where Tzetzes' use of foreign languages enters the picture. In this sense, the very end of the epilogue to the *Theogony* is quite important in many respects. It suggests to the

Paris 1992; see also D. Poirion (ed.), Chrétien de Troyes, *Oeuvres complètes*, Paris 1994, pp. 505-682 (text and translation) and 1235-1299 (introduction and notes).

²⁶⁹ «Since my lady of Champagne wishes that I commence composing a romance, I shall commence the work most willingly». Translation quoted from W. W. Kibler, C. W. Carroll, *Chrétien de Troyes: Arthurian Romances*, London 1991.

²⁷⁰ «The subject matter and meaning are furnished and given him by the countess, and he devotes to it his thought so as not to add nothing but his effort and careful attention». On these highly debated lines of Chrétien see D. Kelly, *The Art of Medieval French Romance*, Madison, WI 1992, pp. 106-110.

²⁷¹ For further examples from Old French and Middle Persian literature see P. A. Agapitos, *In Rhomanian, Frankish and Persian Lands: Fiction and Fictionality in Byzantium and Beyond*, in P. A. Agapitos, L. B. Mortensen (eds.), *Medieval Narratives between History and Fiction: From the Center to the Periphery of Europe (c. 1100-1400)*, Copenhagen 2012, pp. 235-367: 254-276 and 294-312, where the patrons dictate the subject or point to an older book to be “translated”, but never interfere in matters of form and style.

²⁷² On these abuses see Agapitos, *Aktualisierungsversuch*, cit.

²⁷³ See 722, 723, 725, 730, 732, 733, 735, 736, 739, 740, 743, 748, 749, 750, 753, 754, 755, 763.

²⁷⁴ See 768, 771, 774, 783, 785a, 788, 791, 793, 794, 799.

²⁷⁵ For «writing» see 801, 829, 830, 845, 847; for «speaking» see 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 810, 811, 812, 816, 818, 827. One should note that the two types of discourse are separated within the third part: writing first (801-802), then speaking (803-827) and, lastly, writing again (828-855).

sebastokratorissa Eirene – and vicariously to potential rivals, as well as to other readers – that the author, who «in playfull writings composed matters important» (722), knows well the «ways of (writerly) disposition». Being in his writings the «rule of Polycleitus» personified,²⁷⁶ he writes to everyone what is most appropriate according to their educational standing (848-849 and 854-855). Tzetzes does not look down upon everyday language generally. In the ambivalent stance he has towards it, he accepts it for didactic purposes in lexical exegeses or for ridiculing in an Aristophanic spirit his rivals, but he certainly criticizes the inappropriate use of the *idiotis glossa*, be it when addressing the wrong people or, even worse, when employing it for the purposes of schedography.

John Tzetzes stands apart, or even sets himself consciously apart, from the group of successful teachers and accomplished public orators holding some ecclesiastical or state office. His many and varied comments reveal to us his manifold use of everyday language in school, as well as his knowledge of literary and educational developments between 1130 and 1160. Much more so, his comments disclose to us his socially defined personal tastes. In complaining about the successes of the ignorant scum-like schedographers or the ethereal buffalo-like rhetors, Tzetzes further shows us that his simultaneously aggressive and defensive stance is rather different and of a greater scale and style than the comments of “discreet” teachers such as Michael Italikos, Nikephoros Basilakes and Eustathios of Thessalonike, but it is neither idiosyncratic nor simply comical. Schedography certainly became during the twelfth century an embittered educational and literary battle ground, where teachers acted out their fights for professional recognition and financial security in front of the aristocratic patrons of the empire’s capital. In this context, Tzetzes’ finely developed set of abusive imagery is by itself quite a literary achievement and one of the most tangible results of teaching the classics in Komnenian schools. Tzetzes was very sensitive to the “modernist” change of fashion in education and its harmful role, as he saw it, to “traditional” literary culture. What we cannot infer from Tzetzes is the presumed disjunction of a learned and a vernacular idiom within the Komnenian literary system. The opinions of Anna, Eustathios, Prodrornos and Tzetzes show a substantial variety and nuance in dealing with colloquial discourse and its uses, indicating that Komnenian literary culture was not compactly “elite” nor divided between “learned” and “vernacular” idioms.

The conclusions drawn from the detailed examination of Tzetzes’ opinions about schedography, everyday language and writerly disposition, combined with the analysis of the same issues in three other Komnenian authors, has led us to draw a substantially differentiated, far more complex and very dynamic picture of the literary scene in twelfth-century Constantinople, in which colloquial discourse and its literary uses came to play an important role. This role did not have “popular” origins but was the result of experimentation in the schools and of application in literary products prepared for aristocratic patrons. The separation of learned and ver-

²⁷⁶ A lost treatise titled Κανών («Rule») on the proportions of the human body by the famous bronze sculptor (5th cent. BC); see Tzetzes’ explanation in *Hist.* 191, *Chil.* VIII 311-316.

nacular language in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies since the middle of the nineteenth century led to a distorted presentation of the socio-cultural environment of Komnenian literary production. The scientific paradigm that had created this distortion cannot any longer satisfy the study of Byzantine literature which now has to be based on a far broader spectrum of material data and new theoretical approaches. Thus, the old paradigm of Krumbacher and his epigones needs to be changed, and such a change needs to be reflected in a new literary history of Byzantium.

Panagiotis A. Agapitos *

* Department of Literary Studies, Ghent University, and Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, University of Cyprus.