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In 384, the sophist Themistios, close to retirement after a distinguished career in the still young Constantinopolitan court and senate, proclaimed that even though Homer knew only nine Muses, no fewer than twice this number would do justice to the New Rome! His wish was to come true: at the city’s zenith in the twelfth century hundreds of students memorized grammar, puzzled over schedography (riddles consisting of homophone but not homograph syllables) and learnt to extemporize in prose and verse. Scores of rhetors praised God and emperor in lofty words and frequented literary salons in the houses of aristocratic patrons or their friends. They argued theological matters in public debates, and discussed philosophy and astronomy in private circles. On feast days, discussions of medicine, geometry and music filled the courtyards of the city’s ancient churches. Medieval Constantinople’s 30,000 hectares brimmed with learning.

Learning on the Bosporos did not begin with the emperors’ arrival in the fourth century; ancient Byzantium had produced its modest share of poets and orators. It was, however, the imperial pull that made the new capital an attractive place to teach and study, and that allowed Constantinople to rival the ancient, venerable centres of learning at Antioch, Gaza (rhetoric), Athens, Alexandria, Aphrodisias, Apameia (philosophy), Berytus (law) or, indeed, Rome itself. Once the school in Athens closed in 529 and the other cities had fallen out of the imperial sphere in the seventh and eighth centuries, Constantinople remained the empire’s unrivalled learning centre.

In February 357, legislation addressing qualifications of would-be administrators introduced by Constantine’s heir Constantius II (337–61) stipulated, ‘by no means shall any person obtain a place of the first order, unless it is established that he excels in the practice and training of the liberal studies and that he is so polished in the use of letters that words proceed from him without the offence of imperfections’. Further, more
honourable ranks were promised to those ‘worthy of the first place on account of [their] studies and [their] skills in the use of words’. Anyone hoping to enter and climb the bureaucratic ranks was thus expected to possess an education in grammar and basic rhetoric, a ‘universal education’ (enkyklios paideia), and to express himself in the classicizing, or Atticizing, sociolect that first had become popular in the second century during the period of the second sophistic, and remained the bedrock of public discourse in medieval Byzantium. This practice of recruiting and promoting civil servants – or ‘civil savants’, as they have been called – remained in place throughout the Byzantine millennium. The famous Choniates brothers, Michael and Niketas, are a case in point. Sent to Constantinople by their godfather, Niketas, the metropolitan of Chonai, and trained by the foremost rhetorician of the time, Eustathios (later metropolitan of Thessalonike), Michael subsequently pursued a career in the church and became metropolitan of Athens. His younger brother Niketas became a minister at the imperial court, and a celebrated rhetor. Learning was thus a social currency, a means of acquiring distinction, at least for those families affluent enough to send their sons to Constantinople and pay for tuition, or for those lucky enough to find a patron. It facilitated upward social mobility and centre–province cohesion.

Learning was closely intertwined with the emperor’s presence in Constantinople, not only in practical but also in ideological terms. The imperial role in reviving and fostering education became a topos of late Roman and Byzantine imperial ideology (whether accurate or not). Themistios praised Constantius II; George the Monk gave credit to Michael III (842–67) and his mother, Theodora. The Scriptores post Theophanem commended the kaisar Bardas (d. 866), John Skylitzes, Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913/945–59). Michael Psellos praised Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55) while Anna Komnene (1083–c.1153) described her father’s school in the Orphanotropheion. In the thirteenth century George Kyprios hailed George Akropolites, and Nikephoros Choumnos and Nikephoros Gregoras lauded Kyprios, and, through them, Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259–82), the conqueror of Constantinople.

Schools and Teachers

A web of semi-public and private grammar schools blanketed medieval Constantinople. These schools offered universal instruction in the
disciplines roughly corresponding to the medieval trivium (grammar, rhetoric, logic/elementary philosophy). Occasionally they were joined with institutions of primary learning, as was the case with the school near the Holy Apostles. By contrast, the advanced disciplines of the quadrivium, especially arithmetic, geometry and astronomy, were either confined to imperial foundations (when such existed) or left to private initiative.

On the one hand, the famous fourth-century sophist Libanios, who spent two brief stints in Constantinople, reports that competition for teaching posts followed the same rules as in any city of the eastern empire. Public and private teachers taught in public spaces, eager to demonstrate their social connections and attract a large following of students: if a private teacher’s student entourage superseded a salaried colleague’s, he could hope to replace the latter. Lessons seem to have taken place mostly in the imperial Basilica, opposite Hagia Sophia, and the colonnades surrounding its courtyard. On the other hand, imperial presence made a difference. In other cities it fell to the council to appoint teachers. In Constantinople the emperor himself made the appointments. At his second tenure Libanios had to seek Constantius II’s (337–61) permission to be relieved of his duties and return to Antioch. Around the time of his departure, in 355, the emperor promoted one of Libanios’s colleagues, the philosopher Themistios, to the senate: he went on to become praefectus urbi (prefect of the city) and the confidant and porte-parole of four successive Christian emperors. His trajectory epitomizes the career a man of learning could hope to make in the imperial system. The pagan Themistios set the model for later Byzantine literati. His account of Constantius’s foundation of a scriptorium-cum-library in 357 formulated a first vision of Constantinople as a universal centre of learning:

for now is the time to export and traffic from you not, by Zeus, gold, timber, and porphyry-dye . . . but the trading-station which the emperor has established for you just now, the goods from there are virtue and wisdom. And for such merchandise will come to us not from retailers, sailors, and the lowly rubble, but the eminent, those most eager after knowledge, and the bloom of the Greeks; learning (logoi) and education (paideia) are the merchandise.

Only in February 425, did Theodosios II (401–50) regulate Constantinopolitan teaching more firmly and establish an imperial school. The school’s size reflected imperial prestige: with fifteen
magistri (teachers) for Greek, thirteen for Latin, two for law and one for philosophy, it was one of the largest in the empire. However, it is unclear whether all thirty-one posts were always filled. Above all, Theodosios drew a clear distinction between imperially appointed magistri, whose position now became far more secure, and private teachers who were henceforth banned from public venues.

Theodosios relocated instruction from the Basilica to the splendidly refurbished Capitol, but it is unclear how long teaching continued there, and whether the Basilica ever fell completely out of use. The latest appointments at the Capitol are attested under Justinian I (527–65). At the same time the Basilica neighbourhood was busy with book merchants and scribes for hire, and it remained a place of vivid public debate. By the middle Byzantine period teaching was once again, or still, associated with the area around the Basilica. According to an iconophile legend, the iconoclast emperor Leo III (r. 717–41) put an end to learning in Constantinople by burning the ‘universal teacher’ with his twelve disciples in the latter’s palace there.

For the early ninth century, in the absence of other evidence for the functioning of schools, treatises such as John the later (?) metropolitan of Sardis’s commentary on Aphthonios’s Progymnasmata suggest the ongoing teaching of rhetoric. Only in the later ninth and tenth centuries do we get a firmer grasp on schools again. No longer associated with public institutions such as the Basilica or the Capitol, they now were located in or near churches and monasteries. At least three of these schools, those affiliated with the Forty Martyrs, St Theodore ta Sphorakiou and the Theotokos ton Chalkoprateion may have functioned continuously from the sixth century. If so, proximity of the latter two to the Basilica may not be coincidental. Over the following centuries one finds schools operating, in addition to these three, in the precincts of the churches of St Peter, the Theotokos tes Diakonisses, the Holy Apostles and the New Church.

Such grammar schools lasted at least into the later eleventh century, and seem to have provided universal education for future courtiers, bureaucrats and bishops. The schoolmaster was now known as maîstor or, more rarely, magîstor, the Graecized form of the Latin term magister. Although their schools were located in ecclesial and monastic precincts, most maîstors seem to have been laymen; it would thus be misleading to imagine these schools in the same vein as the monastic or cathedral schools that dominated the Latin Middle Ages.

While already in late antiquity the size of a student entourage often proved crucial, by the middle Byzantine period the ‘student vote’
had been formalized: new maïstores were elected by their advanced students and only afterwards received imperial approval. Such was the case with Abraamios-Athanasios, the later founder of the Lavra on Mt Athos, in the early tenth century, or Michael Psellos’s elevation to a chair in ‘philosophy’ in 1047. The emperor could override the system, as Theophilos (827–42) seems to have done when installing Leo the Philosopher as a public teacher at the Forty Martyrs.

Every grammar school seems to have evolved around one maïstor. Only occasional and usually rather short-lived imperial initiatives afforded more than one chair. Shortly after 843, Bardas founded a school that was headed by the very Leo whom Emperor Theophilos had previously appointed to the Forty Martyrs (in between lay a brief stint at the last iconoclast metropolitan of Thessalonike). It had four professors (there is no evidence that these were known as maïstores):

Leo the Philosopher took charge of the philosophical school at the Magnaura, and his disciple Theodore was at the head of the room of geometry; Theodegios that of astronomy, and Kometas that of grammar, which Hellenizes speech. Helping these latter in abundant wise and often attending out of his love of learning, Bardas strengthened the pupils’ natural disposition and caused them to grow plumage and progress forward with appropriate time, as if giving feathers to words.

Similarly, at Constantine VII’s tenth-century foundation (inspired by Bardas’s), four teachers taught the disciplines of philosophy (Constantine, the emperor’s private secretary), rhetoric/grammar (Alexander the ex-metropolitan of Nicaea), geometry (Nikephoros the patrician) and astronomy (the imperial secretary Gregorios). Constantine VII’s teachers were of higher social status than Bardas’s, yet their ranks do not seem to depend on their teaching activities to the same degree as Themistios’s above or Psellos and Xiphilinos’s below.

By contrast, maïstores who taught in the churches and monasteries of Constantinople were assisted by senior students. British Library ms Add. 36749, which preserves the collected letters of an anonymous tenth-century schoolmaster, informs us of these arrangements. Such assistant teachers were afforded a say in the school’s fortunes and probably were in charge of teaching younger students while the master himself, as he informed Nikephoros the chamberlain and imperial clergyman who enquired about his nephew, examined their progress twice weekly via oral exams. By the eleventh century, grammar-schools usually had a deputy master.
Whatever rights of oversight the senate possessed in late antiquity seem to have moved to the patriarch in middle Byzantine times. The anonymous schoolmaster mentions the patriarch’s right to redistribute students across the schools of Constantinople.\(^{41}\) Another two of his letters refer to a patriarchal *artidion* (literally, a small loaf of bread; here an allowance), that had been withheld for six months, and an *eulogia* (gift, stipend) respectively, though their exact purpose remains unclear.\(^ {42}\)

Anonymous depicts himself in fierce competition over students: he accused the maïstor Michael of poaching his students and was subjected to similar accusations by another maïstor, the priest Philaretos.\(^ {43}\) He also complained to the patriarch about a neighbouring schoolmaster, perhaps identical with Michael, who poached his students.\(^ {44}\) By the eleventh century such rivalry among schools and their masters was channelled into schedography contests, as attested in the poems of Christopher Mitylenaios.\(^ {45}\)

Anonymous’s ‘placement record’ defined his value in this market of learning – hence his constant lobbying for his students to obtain a salaried position in the patriarchate or the bureaucracy.\(^ {46}\) Several letters show him addressing the imperial *mystikos* (private secretary): one is a straightforward recommendation for one of his students, while in the other Anonymous ‘threatens’ that his students would plaster the thoroughfares of Constantinople with iambic poems praising the mystikos unless he agreed to meet Anonymous (so that the latter could lobby in person).\(^ {47}\) He expressed regret that the metropolitan of Sardis had chosen not to employ one of these alumni as secretary, and stated that at times he felt that his students were overlooked for appointments.\(^ {48}\) His letters to two court officials, the ‘protospatharios and disciple’, Stephen, or the ‘bestetor and disciple’, Constantine, open the possibility that members of the court hierarchy reckoned among his students. Yet one of his letters to Stephen makes the latter’s father responsible for settling tuition fees, which implies that either Stephen held the senatorial dignity of protospatharios at a relatively young age or, more likely, that his title was added to the heading only at a later stage, when the letters were prepared for circulation.\(^ {49}\)

Placement record and connections mattered as they helped – as in late antiquity – to attract students, on whose fees the anonymous schoolmaster depended for his livelihood (the patriarchal stipend notwithstanding).\(^ {50}\) Intriguingly, fees were not fixed:

> We, brother, have left not only you but almost all of our students to their own conscience, so that everyone display
the befitting kindliness in accordance with what [financial] capacity he might have, but have not forced anybody [to pay a specific amount], and may God grant not to force anyone. While we are of such disposition, the many who show themselves ungrateful to us not for want of means but for their own meanness, shall receive their just reward at their own time.⁵¹

Generally, ad hoc arrangements were possible: in one letter the anonymous schoolmaster implies that one ought not to charge students from one’s hometown. Elsewhere he seems content to offer instruction in exchange for manual service.⁵²

From the mid-eleventh century imperial involvement increased. In 1047, Constantine IX Monomachos appointed the polymath Michael Psellos and his friend, John Xiphilinos, to newly created chairs. He appointed Psellos hypatos (consul) of the philosophers, apparently attaching a second chair to the school at St Peter’s to accommodate that position, and made Xiphilinos nomophylax (guardian of the law), perhaps at his own splendid foundation of St George at Mangana.⁵³ The nomophylax received an annual salary of four pounds of gold and a silk garment; as well as a ceremonial staff and senatorial rank.⁵⁴ This arrangement may have applied to the hypatos, too:⁵⁵ if so Psellos and Xiphilinos were the first literati to achieve senatorial rank as a direct result of their learning and teaching activity since Themistios in the fourth century. As with previous imperial appointments, the nomophylax taught publicly without collecting fees. He was allowed, however, to accept donations from any student ‘hailing from a privileged household’.⁵⁶

The arrival of the Komnenoi fundamentally transformed the system. By 1107, Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) and his patriarch, Nicholas III Grammatikos, created a number of didaskaleia (teaching positions)⁵⁷ which seem to have formed, certainly later in the century, a college of twelve and a clear hierarchy.⁵⁸ These didaskaloi (teachers) should be understood as public orators instructing the faithful rather than ‘teachers’.⁵⁹ During his visit to Constantinople in 1136, Anselm bishop of Havelberg (d. 1158) testified that these twelve teachers were dispersed to churches across the city.⁶⁰ They were all deacons or priests, and the three highest-ranking salaried members of the patriarchal diaconate at Hagia Sophia. These were the didaskaloi of the Psalter, of the Apostles and of the Gospels, joined by the master of rhetors as fourth in rank, an office held by prominent rhetoricians such as Theophylaktos,
the later archbishop of Ohrid, or Eustathios, the later metropolitan of Thessalonike.\footnote{61}

By this time the maïstores seem to have disappeared or rather been transformed into didaskaloï. Perhaps in consequence private schoolmasters – known as grammatikoi – become more visible: the notorious John Tzetzes is an example.\footnote{62} (Private teaching was by no means unprecedented, as seen above: it existed in late antique Constantinople, and Leo the Philosopher allegedly taught in his run-down lodgings before being appointed to the school at the church of the Forty Martyrs.)

After 1261, Michael VIII Palaiologos initially hastened to restore teaching to the city that had once again become the empire’s capital. In keeping with the general early Palaiologan imitation of Komnenian precedent, he breathed new life into Alexios I’s foundation, in the Orphanotropheion, and ordered his chief minister, the megas logothetes George Akropolites, to offer instruction in rhetoric.\footnote{63} Yet any efforts to maintain public education petered out during the long rule of Palaiologos’s son, Andronikos II (1282–1328). On the one hand, the seeds planted by his father blossomed and Andronikos presided over a court of learning and rhetorical display.\footnote{64} Gentlemen scholars such as George Kyprios and Maximos Planoudes were given lodging in the imperial Christ Akataleptos monastery, where they presided over a learned circle rather than a formal school.\footnote{65} On the other hand, the emperor’s coffers were empty. The last mention of teachers receiving imperial salaries comes in a letter of Theodore Hyrtakenos, a grammatikos who, though well connected, appears to have been unsuccessful in his own campaign for an imperial stipend.\footnote{66}

\section*{After School}

Those who had completed their education were ready to enter the job market. In the tenth century personal networks were all-important: we saw the anonymous schoolmaster lobby directly with various members of the bureaucracy or bishops. As had Bardas, Constantine VII spent much time with the students in his palace school:

The emperor showed particular interest in and care for the students, whom he invited almost every day to dine with him, whom he supported with stipends and with whom he conversed in a most friendly manner. A short time elapsed and, with the emperor’s help and prudence, these important
arts and sciences were restored; thus choosing among the students, he appointed them judges, notaries, and metropolitan bishops. In this way, he adorned and enriched the polity of the Romans with wisdom.\textsuperscript{67}

The passage shows how closely learning and empire had become intertwined. Contact with the powerful motivated students. At the same time the emperor could foster personal bonds, possibly over years, and ultimately choose those he trusted.

From the eleventh century onward, while personal connections continued to matter, an ostensibly meritocratic system of examinations emerged which, by the twelfth century, seems to have operated in two tiers. On the lower level, students were quizzed in schedography. Every summer\textsuperscript{68} they gathered in the palace where they were examined by a learned courtier. Tellingly, this happened in the presence of the emperor:

The occasion had arrived, at which boys come together in order to wrestle with each other, whom grammar, that has given birth to them and has made them suckle the breast of schedographic forethought, sends to the palace in order to wrestle over \textit{logoi} before the emperor as judge of the contest and gymnasiarch. And on that occasion, the emperor appointed [Nikephoros] Komnenos to examine the children: and the children in their oral boxing match watched the latter’s tongue, as it was the examiner of their prowess (with words). What wisdom he brought to this task! How sweet were his words! What a labyrinth of baits he put into words: as beautiful as the surface of his examination, as graceful was its deeper layer, too; and the bait on the surface was attractive and the hidden fish-hook strong. Once a youngster beguiled by the apparent [layer of the exercise] opened his mouth, the trap immediately ensnared him.\textsuperscript{69}

School-leaving examinations, on the other hand, became tied into veritable ‘theatres of state’. They coincided with a major annual court event, the encomium on the emperor performed by the master of rhetors on Epiphany (6 January). Psellos’s students accompanied him while he delivered his encomium in praise of Constantine IX Monomachos.\textsuperscript{70} While we do not know whether his disciples performed after their master on this occasion, Theophylaktos of Ohrid, in his oration to Alexios Komnenos in 1088, hints that his did. Towards
the very end he turned to his disciples saying, ‘I have passed on to you the secrets of the trade, in order that the tapestry may be more perfect and varied’, 71 a phrase suggesting that they added their shorter praises to his long one. Similarly, Nicholas Mesarites indicates that his brother John performed after the master of rhetors under whom he had studied, and was subsequently offered a post in the bureaucracy. 72

In the late Byzantine period such formalized displays were replaced with more informal interviews, such as in the case of young Gregory Palamas, the future champion of hesychasm, who was examined by Andronikos II’s chief minister, Theodore Metochites. After interrogating young Palamas, Metochites was so impressed,

that he could not restrain himself and could not conceal his wonder, but turning to the emperor he said, full of marvel: ‘Even Aristotle himself, I believe, if he had been seated here in our presence listening to this young man, would have bestowed more than moderate praise on him . . . ’ Therefore the emperor took, as it were, pride in the noble young man, and was full of joy and imagined great things for the youth, and formed plans on that behalf. 73

Such an interview is probably also what Theodore Hyrtakenos had in mind when he said that young Alexios Apokaukos, his former student, ‘went to the imperial court only to become known by the emperors, even then with a dignified and solemn appearance’. 74

Many of those appointed kept up their scholarly pursuits while in public life. The protospatharios and protasekretis Photios, before his elevation to the patriarchate, taught his own ‘choir’ of students, who were eagerly awaiting his return from the palace. 75 Theodore Metochites, Andronikos II’s chief minister in the early fourteenth century, found time for his learned passions in candlelight as his days were busy with running the state. It was in such figures then that education turned into scholarship. 76
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