

Zagklas, Nikolaos

A Byzantine grammar treatise attributed to Theodoros Prodromos

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2011, vol. 16, iss. 1, pp. [77]-86

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/115752>

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

NIKOLAOS ZAGKLAS (UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA)

A BYZANTINE GRAMMAR TREATISE ATTRIBUTED TO THEODOROS PRODROMOS

This paper is a first attempt to examine a relatively unknown Byzantine grammar attributed to the twelfth-century poet Theodoros Prodromos. The paper deals with various aspects of this work like the recent scholarly work, Prodromos' authorship, the manuscript tradition, and its purpose of composition. The main purpose of this article is therefore to highlight the importance of this obscure grammatical work in an attempt to set the ground for a future detailed study.

Key words: Theodoros Prodromos, Grammatical Theory, Greek Manuscripts, Byzantine Education, Patronage

Theodoros Prodromos is recognized as one of the most distinguished and well-known authors not only of the twelfth century, but also of the whole Byzantine era.¹ He is particularly known for his rich poetical work – most of his poems were dedicated to the Comnenian family, Byzantine aristocrats, feasts, and various religious figures such as Saints and Church Fathers. How-

¹ On Prodromos' life, see Papadimitriou, Synodes D. 1905. *Feodor Prodromos*. Odessa: Ekonomičeskaja tipografija, 14 ff; see also Hörandner, Wolfram [ed.]. 1974. *Theodoros Prodromos. Historische Gedichte (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien XI)*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 21–35; see also Kazhdan, Alexander and Franklin, Simon. 1984. „Theodore Prodromos: a reappraisal.“ In Kazhdan, A. *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Cambridge – Paris: Cambridge University Press, 87–114. Thereafter, Bazzani, Marina. 2007. „The Historical Poems of Theodore Prodromos, the Epic-Homeric Revival and the Crisis of Intellectuals in Twelfth Century.“ *Byzantinoslavica*, 65, 211–228, esp. 211–214. D'Am-brosi, Mario [ed.]. 2008. *I Tetrastici Giambici ed Esametrici Sugli Episodi Principali Della Vita di Gregorio Nazianzeno (Testi e Studi Bizantino-Neoellenici XVII)*. Rome: Dipartimento di Filologia Greca e Latina, Sezione Bizantino-Neoellenica, Università di Roma «La Sapienza», 20–29. Migliorini, Tommaso [ed.]. 2010. *Gli Scritti Satirici in Greco Letterario di Teodoro Prodromo: Introduzione, Edizione, Traduzione e Commento*. Diss. University of Pisa, Pisa, XI–XVI.

ever, as one of the most prolific Byzantine authors, his literary production cannot be confined within the boundaries of poetry; besides numerous poems, Prodromos' genuine work includes epistles, discourses, numerous works of philosophical, satirical, theological and grammatical nature, and of course the popular twelfth century erotic novel *Rhodanthe and Dosikles*.²

My current doctoral research at the University of Vienna deals with the study of the hitherto unpublished or inadequately published Prodromos' poetical work.³ Nevertheless, the case of a grammatical treatise written by Prodromos has also attracted my research attention.⁴ In my view, the study of Prodromos' grammar is extremely necessary because it can shed ample light not only on the authorial activity of Prodromos, but also on Prodromos' role in the twelfth-century education. Thus, what I will attempt to offer in the context of this article are some introductory remarks on various aspects of this neglected grammatical work.

I would like to begin by referring to the scholarly work on Prodromos' grammar. The first to have dealt with this grammar is Carolus G. Goettling.⁵ Goettling's *editio princeps* published in 1822 in Leipzig is the only available edition of the text. The edition is also accompanied by a Latin introduction of 16 pages. In the first pages of the introduction Goettling sketches the history of the grammar in the Hellenistic era; Alexandrian grammarians like Dionysius Thrax, Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian are mentioned. Nonetheless, he points out that the Greek grammar also flourished in the Byzantine period and he regards George Choeroboscus and Gregory of Corinth as worthy of their Alexandrian predecessors. Moreover, the introduction includes some rather general and informative, but not necessary well-elaborated remarks about the evolution of the Greek grammar throughout the centuries. On the last page of his introduction the editor refers to the manuscript tradition of the text. He mentions a couple of manuscripts transmitting the text, namely Parisinus gr. 2553 and Parisinus gr. 2555 of the 15th and 16th centuries respectively.⁶ Goettling eliminates the latter because it is nothing else but a mere copy of the earlier codex Parisi-

² For a comprehensive list of Prodromos' genuine works see W. Hörandner (1994: 37–56).

³ Thesis' title: „Studies in the Poetical Work of Theodoros Prodromos: A Critical Edition of Selected Poems with Introduction and Commentary“ (supervisors: Andreas Rhoby, Theodora Antonopoulou and Andreas E. Müller).

⁴ No. 138 of Hörandner's list, see W. Hörandner (1974: 49).

⁵ Goettling, Carolus G. [ed.]. 1822. *Theodosii Alexandrini Grammatica*. Leipzig: Libraria Dykiana.

⁶ *Ibid.* (XVIII).

nus gr. 2553. As will be discussed later, however, the editor totally ignores the existence of other earlier manuscripts, which undoubtedly offer better readings than the later Parisinus gr. 2553.

Furthermore, the length of Prodromos' grammar text in Goettling's edition is a very complicated matter that should be discussed. The printed edition consists of 205 pages. However, the first 79 pages of the edition do not belong to Prodromos' grammar. This part of the edition contains *Orthographical Excerpta*, which in some manuscripts are attributed to Herodian, while in some others to Theodosius of Alexandria.⁷ The text of Prodromos' grammar can be found after these *Orthographical Excerpta* on pages 80–197. It is also noteworthy that pages 198–201 include the spurious work of Theodosius of Alexandria *περὶ τόνου*,⁸ while on pages 202–205 an epitome of Herodian's work *περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας*, transmitted from the codex Parisinus gr. 2603, is to be found.⁹

In the years after Goettling's edition some rather scattered and brief references to Prodromos' grammar appeared in the relevant bibliography. Alfred Hilgard – the editor of the *Κανόνες* of Theodosius of Alexandria – mentions in his introduction that Theodoros Prodromos composed his work based on Theodosius' grammar.¹⁰ Three years later K. Krumbacher wrote: “Von den grammatischen Arbeiten, die dem Prodromos zugeschrieben werden, scheint am besten gesichert ein ziemlich dürftiger Traktat über die Nominal- und Verbalflexion”.¹¹ In 1974 Hörandner published his momentous critical edition of Prodromos' historical poems. In the introduction of the edition Hörandner included a comprehensive list of Prodromos' work. This list comprises, of course, Prodromos' grammar and constitutes a first endeavor to examine the manuscript tradition of the grammar. However, a few years later H. Hunger in his invaluable work *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* does not include Prodromos' grammar in the corresponding chapter, which seems to be a rather bizarre omission. More recently, Ioannis Spatharakis

⁷ On this issue see Hunger, Herbert. 1978. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, II 19.

⁸ Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide of Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 83.

⁹ For a critical edition of *περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας* see Lentz, August [ed.]. 1867 (Reprint Hildesheim 1965). *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae, Praefationem et Herodiani Prosodiam Catholicam Continens*. Leipzig: Teubner, I.

¹⁰ Hilgard, Alfred [ed.]. 1894 (Reprint Hildesheim 1965). *Theodosii Alexandrini Canones (Grammatici Graeci IV)*. Leipzig: Teubner, CXXIX.

¹¹ Krumbacher, Karl. ²1897. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*. Munich: Beck, 758.

published a study of codex Taphou 52 from the library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem.¹² This codex transmits an illuminated version of Prodromos' grammar. Nonetheless, it should be noted that Spatharakis' article focuses rather on the illumination and decoration of the manuscript than on the grammar itself. Thus, all the above-mentioned brief references reveal indeed the absence of a comprehensive work which would deal with several aspects of Prodromos' grammar.

To begin with, one of the most important aspects of the grammatical treatise is the transmission of the text throughout the centuries. As it was mentioned previously, Hörändner offers important information on this basic aspect; he enumerates 38 manuscripts ranging from the 13th to the 19th centuries.¹³ The manuscript Athous Kutl. 152 [3225] (s. XVI) should be, however, eliminated from Hörändner's list; it does not include the grammar in question, but some other grammatical works of minor value attributed to Prodromos.¹⁴ On the other hand, a couple of manuscripts should be added, namely, Yalensis 532¹⁵ and Constantinopolitanus Camariot. 157.¹⁶ Unfortunately, I cannot offer the exact folios of all manuscripts because I have not yet consulted all the manuscripts *in situ* or on microfilms. However, the following is a rather detailed and precise list of the manuscripts.¹⁷

1. Hieros. Patr. 52 (s. XII), fol. 2^r–127^v
2. Atheniensis EBE 1089 (s. XIII), fol. 5^r–57^v
3. Flor. Laurentianus Plut. LV 17 (s. XIII), fol. 2^{1r}–6^{1r}
4. Venet. gr. 491 (s. XIII), fol. 2^r–19^v
5. Constantinopolitanus Camariot. 157 (s. XIV), fol. 9^r–66^v
6. Heidelbergensis Pal. gr. 43 (s. XIV), fol. 1^r–39^r

¹² Spatharakis, Ioannes. 1985. „An Illuminated Greek Grammar Manuscript in Jerusalem. A Contribution to the Study of Comnenian Illuminated Ornament.“ *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 35, 231–44.

¹³ W. Hörändner (1974: 49).

¹⁴ Athous Kutl. 152 [3225] (s. XVI); Lampros, Spyridon P. 1895. *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, I, 287–288. The manuscript includes the no. 184–187 of Hörändner's list.

¹⁵ For a detailed description of the manuscript see Stefec, Rudolf S. 2010. *Das Briefcorpus des Michael Apostoles*. Diss. University of Vienna, Vienna, 444–470.

¹⁶ See Kouroupou, Matoula and Géhin, Paul. 2008. *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat Œcuménique, Les manuscrits du monastère de la Panaghia de Chalki*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, I, 376–388. See also volume II, plates 219–231.

¹⁷ The dates of the codices, which are included within the brackets, derive from published catalogues and related descriptions.

7. Vindobonensis Phil. gr. 105 (s. XIV), fol. 129^r–165^v
8. Heidelbergensis Pal. gr. 146 (s. XIV–XV), fol. 206^r–213^r
9. Atheniensis EBE 1097 (s. XV), fol. 338^r–413^r
10. Athous Iber. 83 [4203] (s. XV), fol. 228^r–251^v
11. Oxon. Barocc. 6 (s. XV), fol. 104^r–264^v
12. Oxon. Barocc. 194 (s. XV), fol. 31^r–48^r
13. Cantabrigensis Trin. R. 9. 15 (2346) (s. XV)
14. Kair. Patr. 27 (a. 1520), fol. 158^r–192^r
15. Flor. Laurentianus Plut. LV 7 (s. XV), fol. 6^v–91^r
16. Flor. Laurentianus LXXXVI 25 (s. XV), fol. 83^v–112^r
17. Londinensis Harley 5641 (s. XV), fol. 1^r–162^r
18. Parisinus gr. 2553 (s. XV), fol. 1^r–53^v
19. Parisinus Suppl. gr. 262 s. (a. 1481), fol. 1^r–56^v
20. Berolinensis Phil. gr. 1612 (s. XV–XVI), fol. 1^r–78^r
21. Parisinus gr. 2561 (s. XV–XVI), fol. 1^r–26^r
22. Vaticanus gr. 16 (s. XV–XVI), fol. 21^r–97^r
23. Alexandrinus 181 (s. XVI), fol. 96^r–127^v
24. Athous Iber. 147 [4267] (s. XVI), fol. 37^r–77^r
25. Alexandrinus 182 (a. 1590), fol. 158^r–191^v
26. Bruxellensis gr. 53 [11371] (s. XVI), fol.?
27. Escorialensis Ψ-IV-23 (s. XVI), fol. 157^r–246^v
28. Oxon. Canonici 13 (s. XVI), fol. 71^r–118^r
29. Parisinus gr. 2555 (s. XVI), fol. 1^r–82^v
30. Parisinus Suppl. gr. 525 (s. XVI), fol. 110^r–171^r
31. Ravenn. Bibl. Classensis 88 (s. XVI), fol. 1^r–155^v
32. Yalensis 532 (s. XVI–XVII), fol. 137^r–160^v
33. Atheniensis EBE 1095 (s. XVII), fol. 1^r–93^v
34. Athous Iber. 95 [4215] (s. XVII), fol. 70^r–173^r
35. Athous Iber. 96 [4216] (s. XVII), fol. 142^r–238^r
36. Athous Laurae I 29 [1113] (s. XVII), fol. 63^r–109^r
37. Athous Iber. 1317 [5437] (s. XVIII), no. 71
38. Athous Iber. 1368 [5488] (s. XVIII), no. 4
39. Metoch. S. Sepulchri 314 (s. XVIII), fol. 1^r–47^v

One thing that should be noted with regard to this list is that a fairly large number of manuscripts, namely nineteen, was produced in the last centuries of Byzantium. Apparently, the flourishing of education in the Palaeologan era stands out for the particular popularity of the grammar over these last three centuries.¹⁸ Yet it is worth mentioning that more than half of the manuscripts

¹⁸ For connection between the manuscript tradition and the flourishing of education in

transmitting the grammar were copied in the post-Byzantine period. More specifically, twenty manuscripts were produced from the 16th century onwards, which is of course an important indicator for the reception of Prodrornos' grammar during that period.¹⁹

In connection with the manuscript tradition of the grammar, it should also be noted that the manuscripts bear different titles. Although the text in most of the manuscripts is entitled *Ἐρωτήματα*, in the codex Vind. Phil. gr. 105 the grammar is preserved under the title *Μέθοδος*,²⁰ while in the title of the following four manuscripts (Alexandrinus 181, Athous Iber. 147, Athous Laurae I 29 and Escorialensis Ψ-IV-23) the grammar is presented as an *ἐξήγησις* of the grammar of Manuel Moschopoulos.²¹

Apart from the manuscript tradition of the text, the authorship and purpose of Prodrornos' grammar are also very important aspects that should be examined. As far as the former question is concerned, Goettling, in the introduction to his edition, already mentions that the text from the 80th page onwards was not composed by the well-known grammarian Theodosius of Alexandria; he explicitly states that another author, based on Theodosius' *Canones*, produced this writing.²² He then continues by saying that the grammar was written by a certain Theodoros; the author, according to Goettling, seems to take his mask off and reveal his name when he writes

the Palaeologan era see Antonopoulou, Theodora. 2003. „The Orthographical Kanons of Nicetas of Heraclea.“ *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 53, 171–185, esp. 184–185.

- ¹⁹ It should be mentioned, however, that it remains unclear why manuscripts of this grammatical work continued to be copied after the fifteenth century. The case of being used either by Western European scholars or as an education tool for Greek disciples during the Ottoman period seems to be the most possible explanation. For a general overview of the education in the Greek schools during the post-Byzantine period see Skarbele-Nikolopoulou, Angelike. 1993. *Τὰ μαθηματάρια τῶν ἐλληνικῶν σχολείων τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας, Διδασκόμενα κείμενα, σχολικά προγράμματα, διδακτικές μέθοδοι, Συμβολή στήν ἱστορία τῆς νεοελληνικῆς παιδείας*. Athens: Syllogos pros diadosin ophelimon biblion.
- ²⁰ See Hunger, Herbert. 1961. *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Codices Historici, Codices Philosophici et Philologici*. Vienna: Georg Prachner Verlag, I, 211.
- ²¹ For a complete list of editions of Moschopoulos' grammatical works see Tusculum-Lexikon, 539. The lifetime of Manuel Moschopoulos is placed between ca. 1265 and 1316 (cf. Tusculum-Lexikon, 537 and *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* II, 1414), i.e. more than one hundred years after Prodrornos' lifetime. Moreover, the manuscripts, which present Prodrornos' grammar as an *exegetis* of *Ἐρωτήματα Γραμματικά*, date from the 16th century onwards. Thus, all the above evidence simply indicate that this title cannot be authentic.
- ²² C. G. Goettling (1822: XVI).

ὡς ἐμοὶ τὸ Θεόδωρος.²³ Goettling eventually goes one step further by identifying him with Theodoros Prodromos.²⁴ Furthermore, he argues that the grammar was probably dedicated either to Manuel Komnenos' wife or his daughters, or even his niece Eudokia Komnene.²⁵

However, it should be mentioned that Goettling's uncertainty regarding Prodromos' authorship is related to his problematic method. Goettling did not consult any other manuscripts except Paris. gr. 2553 of the 15th century and its copy Paris. gr. 2555 of the 16th century; both of them apparently fail to transmit Prodromos' name. On the other hand, there are, however, at least seven manuscripts dating before the fifteenth century, which explicitly testify to Prodromos' authorship. Moreover, the oldest manuscript Hieros. Taphou 52, dated to the twelfth century both by Papadopoulos-Kerameus and Spatharakis,²⁶ also attributes the grammar to Prodromos.²⁷ Having also examined the corresponding catalogues of the 39 manuscripts transmitting the text, I observed that all of them attest the Prodromic authenticity of the grammar with only three exceptions. The two already mentioned Parisini Codices of Goettling's edition bear the name of Theodosius, while on the other hand a manuscript from the Bodleian library (i.e. Oxon. Barocc. 194), that of Theodoros II Laskaris (1221–1258). Of course, the case of Theodoros II should also be excluded since there is only a single manuscript testifying to his authorship. Finally, the following argument should also be mentioned in favor of Prodromos' authorship, namely, that some manuscripts of the grammar also include other genuine Prodromic works. For instance, in codex Heidelb. gr. 43 of the fourteenth century, the grammar is transmitted with some historical poems, numerous other epigrams and the erotic novel

²³ Ibid. (XVI and 113, 12–13).

²⁴ Ibid. (XVII). On the same page Goettling also mentions that he agrees with what Bekker had already written about the text's authorship; see Bekker, Immanuel. 1821. *Anecdota Graeca, Theodosii Canones*. Berlin: Typis et Impensis G. Reimeri, IV, 1137.

²⁵ C. G. Goettling (1822: XVII). For Theodora Comnene see Barzos, Konstantinos. 1984. *Η γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν*. Thessalonica: Kentron Byzantinon Spoudon, II, 346–359.

²⁶ Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios. 1891. *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη: Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς Βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἀγιοτάτου Ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ Καθολικοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων Ἑλληνικῶν Κωδίκων*. St. Petersburg (Reprint Brussels 1963: Culture et Civilisation), I, 129; and I. Spatharakis (1985: 243).

²⁷ According to Spatharakis, this luxuriously illustrated manuscript is an excellent piece of the Comnenian illuminated ornament. Moreover, he argues that the manuscript could have been produced while Prodromos was still alive as a gift to the Sevastokratorissa Eirene; see I. Spatharakis (1985: 243).

Rhodanthe and *Dosikles*.²⁸ It is therefore obvious that there is no reason to dispute the Prodromic authenticity of the grammar.

There is still one essential question that needs to be addressed: What purpose did this grammar serve and why did Prodromos compose this grammatical treatise? The answer is rather complicated since, in my view, the purpose of this grammar was twofold. On the one hand, the title of the grammar in almost all surviving manuscripts bears a dedication. Nearly all of them explicitly state that the grammar is dedicated to the Sevastokratorissa Eirene.²⁹ Eirene as one of the most influential literary patronesses of the twelfth century had created a literature circle of the most distinguished writers and intellectuals including Ioannes Tzetzes, Constantine Manasses, Theodoros Prodromos, Manganeios Prodromos and Iakovos Monachos.³⁰ It is beyond any doubt that the greatest part of Prodromos' work was produced within the prevailing system of patronage;³¹ hence, this is also the case for the composition of the grammar in question. In addition, it should be mentioned that the title is not the only testimony to the aforementioned dedication. A closer look at the text itself offers us numerous explicit references to Eirene, e.g. *φιλολογωτάτη μοι βασιλίδων*,³² *φιλολογωτάτη και βασιλικωτάτη ψυχή*,³³ *ἀρίστη μοι βασιλίδων*,³⁴ *μεγαλεπηβολωτάτη μοι βασιλίδων*,³⁵ *σεβασμία μοι κεφαλή*.³⁶

However, the didactic purpose of the grammar should not be neglected. It is believed that Sevastokratorissa Eirene, who was most probably of Nor-

²⁸ W. Hörandner (1974: 151).

²⁹ On Sevastokratorissa Eirene see K. Barzos (1984: I, 362–378); Jeffreys, Elizabeth and Michael. 1994. „Who was Eirene the Sevastokratorissa?“ *Byzantion*, 64, 40–68; Rhoby, Andreas. 2009. „Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Sevastokratorissa Eirene und zu Autoren in ihrem Umfeld.“ *Nea Rhome*, 6, 305–336.

³⁰ E. and M. Jeffreys (1994: 40–41).

³¹ It is also worth noticing that Prodromos dedicated a poem to Eirene. W. Hörandner (1974: 431–433).

³² C. G. Goettling (1822: 80, 3).

³³ *Ibid.* (91, 2).

³⁴ *Ibid.* (98, 4).

³⁵ *Ibid.* (103, 9).

³⁶ *Ibid.* (124, 32). It is noteworthy that there exist numerous similar references to Eirene, to name but a few examples: *φιλάγαθε βασίλισσα και φιλολογωτάτη* W. Hörandner (1974: 431, XLVI, v. 2); *σὺ δέ, ψυχή και φιλολογωτάτη* Lampsidis, Odysseus [ed.]. 1996. *Constantini Manassis Breviarium Chronicum* (CFHB XXXVI/1). Athens: Akademia Athenon, 5 (line 3); *δέσποινα χριστομίμητε, ψυχή συμπαθεστάτη* Bernardinello, Silvius [ed.]. 1972. *Theodori Prodromi de Manganis*. Padova: Liviana, 29 (I, v. 3).

man descent,³⁷ arrived in Constantinople with scanty or no knowledge of Greek at all.³⁸ Although we do not know the exact date of the grammar's composition, it would not be a venturesome speculation to say that the grammar was written at some point for Eirene in order to be used as a philological tool for learning Greek or, to put it even better, as an appropriate tool for learning Classical Greek. Indeed, the dedication to her of a large number of letters, poems and various other works like Constantine Manasses' *Chronike Synopsis*, which were composed in highbrow style, makes our argument even stronger; as one would expect that Eirene was taught some Classical Greek in order to be able to appreciate the learned works she had sponsored.

On the other hand, some indications for the didactic nature of the grammar emerge from Prodrornos' life and work. As far as the latter is concerned, it should be noted that a part of the manuscript tradition ascribes *Σχέδη τοῦ μύος* to Theodoros Prodrornos,³⁹ while at the same time he is also considered to be the author of a number of other *Schede*,⁴⁰ all of which could have been used as teaching tools.⁴¹ Moreover, it is known that Niketas Eugenianos composed three epitaphs in order to praise Prodrornos.⁴² Apart from the fact that Eugenianos was undoubtedly Prodrornos' disciple,⁴³ in his prose

³⁷ E. and M. Jeffreys (1994: 57); A. Rhoby (2009: 308–312).

³⁸ E. and M. Jeffreys (1994: 51).

³⁹ W. Hörandner (1974: 52); Papadimitriou, John-Th. [ed.]. 1969. „Τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μύος: New Sources and Text.“ [Classical Studies presented to B. E. Perry by his students and colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924–1960]. *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, 58, 210–222; and more recently: Papatomopoulos, Manolis. 1979. „Τοῦ σοφωτάτου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Προδρόμου τὰ σχέδη τοῦ μύος.“ *Παρνασσός*, 21, 377–399.

⁴⁰ Schirò, Giuseppe. 1949. „La schedografia a Bisanzio nei secoli XI–XII e la scuola dei ss. XL Martiri.“ *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, 3, 11–29; W. Hörandner (1974: 62–64); Gallavotti, Carlo. 1983. „Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e suoi precedenti fino Teodoro Prodromo.“ *Bollettino dei Classici*, 4, 3–35, esp. 29–30; and Vassis, Ioannes. 1993–94. „Graeca sunt, non leguntur. Zu den schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodrornos.“ *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 86–87, 1–19.

⁴¹ I. Vassis (1993–94: 13).

⁴² For the text of the prose epitaph see Petit, L. [ed.]. 1902. „Monodie de Nicétas Eugéneianos sur Théodore Prodrome.“ *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 9, 446–463. While for the text of the metrical epitaphs (dodecasyllable and hexameter) see Gallavotti, Carlo [ed.]. 1935. „Novi Laurentiani Codicis Analecta.“ *Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, 4, 203–236, esp. 222–231.

⁴³ W. Hörandner (1974: 27 and 33); see also Kyriakis, Michael J. 1973. „Of professors and disciples in twelfth century Byzantium.“ *Byzantion*, 44, 290–309. I do

epitaph on Prodromos we also read: *γλῶτταν* (sc. of Prodromos) *ἀσόφους σοφίζουσαν*.⁴⁴ In this passage, Eugenianos obviously implies that Prodromos at some point in his life used to be a teacher. Finally, on the basis of a letter of Michael Italikos addressed to Prodromos,⁴⁵ it is also believed that he was probably a *μαῖστωρ τῶν ρητόρων* at the Orphanotropheion of Saint Paul in Constantinople,⁴⁶ which, in the twelfth century, was a branch of the so-called „Patriarchal school“.⁴⁷ Although Hörandner, based on the date of the letter,⁴⁸ has rightly argued that Prodromos could not be a teacher at that time due to his illness,⁴⁹ the case of him being a professional teacher cannot be utterly excluded. Thus, in my view, it would be completely plausible to assume that Prodromos' grammar, which was composed for Sevastokratorissa Eirene in the first place, was also used in a school milieu.

To conclude, there are several aspects of this grammar that have not been examined within this paper like the structure and the subject of Prodromos' grammar, the date of its composition, Prodromos' sources and the drawing of a *stemma codicum*. Nonetheless, what I tried to offer are some preliminary remarks on this neglected twelfth-century grammar and, simultaneously, to stress the necessity to deepen our knowledge not only with regard to Prodromos' grammar, but also to the development of grammatical theory in the course of the Byzantine period.

not agree with Kazhdan' view that Eugenianos was not a disciple but a friend of Prodromos; see Kazhdan, Alexander P. 1967. „Bemerkungen zu Niketas Eugenianos.“ *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, 16, 101–117, esp. 101–102.

44 L. Petit (1902: 452.7–8).

45 For the text of this letter see Browning, Robert [ed.]. 1962. „Unpublished Correspondence between Michael Italicus and Theodore Prodromos.“ *Byzantinobulgarica*, 1, 279–297.

46 S. D. Papadimitriou (1905: 204); Browning, Robert. 1963. „The Patriarchal school at Constantinople in the twelfth century (continuation).“ *Byzantion*, 33, 11–40, esp. 22–23.

47 Browning, Robert. 1962. „The Patriarchal school at Constantinople in the twelfth century.“ *Byzantion*, 32, 167–202, esp. 174–176; R. Browning (1963: 23).

48 The letter dates between 1143 and 1147; see R. Browning (1963: 23).

49 W. Hörandner (1974: 28); according to Hörandner, it is possible that Prodromos was not a teacher but a simple resident in the Orphanotropheion of Saint Paul.