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Chrysoloras’ *Erotemata*,
and the evolution of grammatical descriptions

ABSTRACT

This article is an analysis of the categorisation of Greek nominals in Greek grammatical theory, and in particular the advances made by late 14th century Byzantine scholars. The analysis concerns the process by which the *canones* of Theodosius Alexandrinus, the 56 inflectional categories described in the 4th century CE, came to be condensed into a mere ten, in the grammar *Erotemata* by Manuel Chrysoloras (1355–1415), and considers Chrysoloras’ achievement as part of the larger scholarly context in Constantinople at the end of 14th century.

1. Introduction

In 1397 the Byzantine aristocrat and scholar Manuel Chrysoloras (1355–1415) took up a teaching position in Florence, on the invitation of the Chancellor of Florence, Coluccio Salutati. This event serves as the starting point for the revival of teaching of Greek in the West after centuries of division, and was part of a general resurgence of classical Greek and Latin learning that gave rise to the term Renaissance itself.1 For this reason, Chrysoloras is often attributed with the honour of bringing back Greek to the west.2

This article is the result of an individual undertaking within the collegial research venture *The Old and the New Rome. The reunion of Greek and Roman cultures during the Early Renaissance*, lead by Dr. Anna Holst Blennow and Dr. Mikael Johansson, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The content has also been presented as part of the working group *Long-term histories of grammatical traditions*, administered by Dr. Philomen Probert, Wolfson College, Oxford. Participants at the seminars and workshops of these two research endeavours have contributed to the content of the article, in particular Dr. Probert. Also, Dr. Eric Cullhed, at Uppsala University, has offered much valuable additions as well as corrections. The author also thanks two anonymous reviewers for many important corrections. All remaining mistakes remain the fault of the author alone.

1) See e.g. Reynolds/Wilson (2013: 148).
2) Plenty has been written regarding Chrysoloras and his life and works. The primary work on Chrysoloras’ life remains Cennelli (1941), recently updated by Thorn-Wikert (2006). Chry-
Chrysoloras was a renowned scholar and much appreciated teacher, but the lasting glory of his name is very much tied to his grammar, the *Erotetamata*, written as part of his teaching activities, and which went on to become the most popular Greek grammar in fifteenth-century Italy. The fame of the grammar commenced with the abridged Latin version used by one of Chrysoloras’ students, Guarino Veronese, when he himself began teaching Greek. It was however not only that the book was available in a Latin translation that made the text more accessible to its Western readers, but more so the fact that the grammar represented a break with the earlier didactic template in the shape of a completely new type of description of the nominal system. Up until Chrysoloras’ *Erotetamata*, the didactic matrix for the teaching of Greek were the 56 nominal *canones* described by Theodosius Alexandrinus in the 4th century. Chrysoloras simplified these to a mere ten categories, a much more manageable number, which also came to lay the foundation for modern descriptions of the language.

The following analysis is an attempt to offer a succinct evaluation of Chrysoloras’ work revising the description of the Greek language. In the form of a summary overview, the article offers an introduction to the nominal description featured in the Theodosian *canones*, as well as within the Roman *ars grammatica*, developments which lead up to the changes in the Byzantine scholarly climate of the late 14th century. As is well known, great innovations are rarely made in a vacuum, and although new discoveries may well appear, to the later viewer, the result of individual labour, they are often interconnected within a larger web of revelations. It will be shown that Chrysoloras was not the only scholar working at a revitalisation of the description of Greek grammar at the end of the 14th century, although his work has been far more influential than that of any of his contemporaries.

2. The Description of Nominals in Early Greek Grammar

The earliest history of Greek grammar remains somewhat difficult to penetrate, since many of the early works are preserved only in fragments or in later adaptations. Because of this there is a tendency to study these various texts not as elements from separate grammars but as *one* Grammar (see e.g. Pinborg 1975; Matthaios 1999: 14). Greek grammatical thinking in the early period
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There is no further systematisation in the *Tēkhnē*, but the book adheres to the standard practice of Hellenistic grammarians, in treating the linguistic material under study principally for the purpose of teaching it, i.e. making it approachable for students who needed to memorise as much as required for their own particular purposes, rather than achieving a linguistically oriented analysis.

2.2 Theodosius and the Canones

Dionysius' *Tēkhnē* remained the standard reference book for many later grammarians. In the 4th century CE another grammarian working in Alexandria, Theodosius Alexandrinus, initiated the path towards increasing crystallisation in the linguistic description of the language. Theodosius' large work "Introductory Rules to the Inflection of Nouns and Verbs" (Κανόνες εισαγωγικοί περί κατάστασις ονομάτων κατά σημάτων) was written as a complete handbook of Greek grammar, featuring lists of various inflections found in the Greek language.

When it comes to the verbs, Theodosius' Canones more or less copies the *Tēkhnē*, although with greater detail. Thrax describes the verbs in terms of thirteen different syzygias, meaning subsets of verbs having similar paradigms: six barytone classes, three classes with circumflexed verbs, and four classes of verbs ending in -mi, with different kinds of accentuation (Kemp 1986: 355–356). In the Canones, Theodosius lists all possible verbal tense forms, including duals, first and second aorists and futures, in all voices and moods, participial forms and so on, sometimes overstepping the boundary between forms in frequent use and those not.

In a similarly detailed way Theodosius set about analysing the nominal system in the form of canones, long lists of words and their inflection, and this is where his description, just like all early descriptions of the Greek nominals, goes all awry, since it focuses on every discriminating detail rather than striving for a comprehensive overview.

The masculine canones begin with words ending in sigma, in the order: -άς, -ής, -ης, -ες, -ες, -ες, -ες, -ες, -άς. The canones are also distinguished on the basis of number of syllables, the placement of the accent (oxytone vs. barytone), the genitive stem, and so on, so that the total number of categories of words ending in *s*igma adds up to 18. After this, and similarly distinguished, come words ending in -ι (masc. can. 19–26), in -έ (masc. can. 27–31), -ψ (masc. can. 32–34), and lastly -ψ (masc. can. 35). All considered the total sum of inflectional categories that Theodosius distinguishes for the Greek language is 56: 35 masculine, 12 feminine and 9 neuter canones. All of the word articles contain the complete inflection, with all cases, in the singular, dual and plural forms of the cited words.

The primary function of the Canones is the same as that of the *Tēkhnē*, to simply record the inflection of Greek, and the material is presented without adhering to any coherent principle. The nominal inflection is sometimes summarised through what could be described as the inflectional stem (e.g. masc. can. 1), sometimes through the ending in the genitive singular (e.g. masc. can. 2):  

**Canon 1:**
- Singular: Αίας “Ajax”, Αίαντος
- Disyllabic nominals that end in -ΑΣ preceded by a vowel, are accented on a non-final vowel, and have a long final syllable, are inflected through the -ΝΤ, e.g. θείας, θαναταίος
- Thēs, thēantos, hēsai, thēantos, aías, alántos ...

**Canon 2:**
- Singular: ο ΚΟΧΛΙΑΣ “snail”, τον κοχλίου
- Words of more than two syllables that end in -ΑΣ preceded by a vowel, are simplified and are accented on a non-final vowel, have their genitive in -ΟΥ, e.g. Papión, hēmerión, aiónetos ...

In this division one can discern a certain amount of embryonic understanding of the Greek stems, in that Theodosius always mentions the o-stem ending -ον in the canones that make their genitive in this way, e.g. in masc. can. 2 ὁ κοχλίας “snail”, which are said to “have their genitive in -ΟΥ” (ἐκ ΟΥ ἔχει τὴν γενικὴν). With the remaining canones, however, there is far from the same level of distinction. Theodosius sometimes gives the inflectional stem, as with masc. can. 1 Αίας “Ajax”, which inflects “through the -ΝΤ”, but sometimes the stem in combination with the ending, as with masc. can. 3 Λάρισας.

---

9) Theodosius' commentator Georgius Choerobossus (c. 750–825) comments that not all verbal forms put forward by Theodosius are "found in actual use" (Robins 1993: 111).

10) The concept of canones (κανόνες “ruler; rule; tool for making straight lines”) may have been introduced by Aelius Herodianus (fl. 2nd century CE), son of Apollonius Dyscolus. Herodianus wrote a number of treatises on inflectional phenomena, such as Peri onomádon (“On nouns”), and Peri klísoi onomádon (“On the inflection of nouns”); see Pagani (2013).
λάχηγος “Laches”, where Theodosius writes that these words “have their genitive in -TOS” (εἰς ΤΟΣ ἑξῆς τὴν γενετὴν (Hilgard 1894: 5.21–6.1), and so on.14 There is no complete understanding of the differentiation between stems and endings,15 and Theodosius also does not distinguish between the different sets of endings, but adheres only to the order of the nominative singular. This means that among the masculine canones, the o-stem genitive singular -ου ending is found in masc. can. 2 ὁ κουλίας, κουλίου “snail”, masc. can. 4 Χρύσος, Χρύσου “Chryses” — both masculine a-stems — and masc. can. 14 ο παπαίος, παπαίου “voyage”,16 and among the neuter categories in can. 4 τὸ ζυλόν, ζυλου “firewood”).

In other words, although complete in terms of detail and inflectional forms, the aim of the Canones is far from a comprehensive, scientific analysis of the nominal categories.

3. Varro and the Roman Ars grammatica

The Roman ars grammatica began properly with Varro (116–27 BCE), a younger contemporary of Dionysius Thrax. To some extent Varro continued the Greek line of considering grammar as a mainly literary device, and translated the definition of grammar presented in the Tekhne almost word-for-word into Latin:

Grammar is knowledge of what in general is said by poets, historians, and orators.17

In his description of the inflection of the Latin language, Varro translated the Greek label κλησις as declinatio, used in a general sense of “inflection” (LL 8.3), but he also went one step further and identified five nominal declinatio-, meaning subclasses of nouns with similar inflections. The starting point in this analysis was the ending in the ablative singular:

14 In other canones Theodosius combines what is in fact different stems and remarks only on changing vowel quality in the inflection, such as with masc. can. 20, oxytone nominals ending in ην, which either “inflect through -ε-” (if there is a -ι- in the nominative, ο τιμημίν “thr?doman”), or “in -η-” (if there is no -ι- in the nominative, ο αλλήν “getter”) (Hilgard 1894: 18 8–10).
15 On the problem of distinguishing between different sets of stems, such as nasal stems and stems that inflect in -ν-, and for example masc. can. 24, “masculine barytone words ending in -ον”, see Elst (2011).
16 This is a collection of nominals with contracted nominatives, including παπαίος, with genitive singular παπαίοντος or παπαίος, and χρυσός, with genitive singular χρυσοῦ or χρυσος (Hilgard 1894: 14).
17 Ars grammatica ... scientia est <eorum> quae a poetas historicos oratoribusque dicuntur ex parte maior (Varro frag. 91, fr. 234 Funaioli, translation of GG 1.1.5 2–3). Translation by Robinson (1996: 4).
4. The Byzantine development

The teaching of Greek to non-Greek speakers was a product of the Hellenistic period, and remained an important task for centuries to come, although to a large extent this consisted more of the teaching of helleinmos, “proper Greek” as the language was attested in the Homeric texts, rather than ordinary, spoken Greek. Grammarians continued to write grammatical treatises that analysed and explained the Greek language, and these Lehrbücher mostly copied the Tekhne for the verbs and the Canones for the nominals, with very little modification. The advances made within the Roman ars grammatica, culminating in the Institutiones by Priscian, were not observed within the Greek scholarly community. In part this was due to the historical divisions between the cultural centres, but to some extent this may also be caused by the marked differences between the languages, the result of very different phonological changes, such as the loss in Greek of intervocalic sigma and -y-, with subsequent contraction (e.g. Sihler 1995: 80-83). The canones were well adapted for the teaching of Homeric Greek, the primary aim of Greek teaching to foreigners. For this reason, Greek grammarians remained stubbornly faithful to the Theodosian order for centuries to follow.

The canones were certainly not without critique. Roger Bacon, in his 13th-century Greek grammar, questions the sense in treating all of the canones separately and suggests a reduction based on differences in the endings, as is done in the teaching of Latin — sicuit fit apud nos (Nolan/Hirsch 1902: 146-147). Bacon in fact outlined a Greek nominal grammar with three declinations, in much the modern sense, stressing the fact that the main goal with the grammar was for it to be useful to “Latin” (Nolan/Hirsch 1902: xxvi). Bacon’s ideas were however mostly lost to his contemporaries; his grammar was never widely distributed, and it remained unpublished until 1902.

In view of the absence of textual evidence stating the contrary, it seems that in the Byzantine East, the scholarly categorisation of Greek nouns did not even consider advancing beyond the canones of Theodosius until the 14th century.

---

25) Omnia nomina, quibus Latina utitur eloquentia, quinque declinationibus flectuntur, quae ordinem acceptaverant ab ordine vocalium formantium genetivos. prima igitur declinatio est, cuius generativus sin de diphthongon desinit, ut hic poetae huius poetae; secunda, cuius in i produc- tum ... finitur casus, ut hic doctus huius docet ... (Inst. de nomine et pronomine et verbo, CPL 1550, Dekker 1995: 443.3).

meaning nouns that contain the same number of syllables in the nominative and in the inflected forms, and imparisyllabic nouns, meaning nouns whose inflected forms do not have the same number of syllables as in the nominative:

There are nouns that inflect in a parasisyllabic manner, such as Aínætæs, Aínætou, and such that inflect in an imparisyllabic manner, such as Aías, Aíantas. The one may thus be called parasisyllabic inflection, the other imparisyllabic.21

In the subsequent sections the Greek nominals are sorted into different inflectional groups, labelled klísis, according to their morphology in the oblique cases in relation to the ending in the nominative singular. At first come five categories can be said to have "regular" inflection,28 and then another five categories featuring nouns that in other dialects have imparisyllabic genitive singular, but in Attic Greek undergo contraction:29

1st klísis: masculine parasisyllabic nouns ending in -ας or -ης (genitive in -οι), e.g. Χρύσης, Χρύσου "Chryses";
2nd klísis: feminine parasisyllabic nouns ending in -ατι or -ητι (genitive in -ατοι or -ητοι), e.g. Μοῦσα, Μούσης "Muse";
3rd klísis: masculine and feminine parasisyllabic nouns endings in -οις, and neuter ending in -ον (genitive in -οντι, e.g. Ἄλκης, Ἄλκου "Alcides");
4th klísis: masc. and fem. parasisyllabic nouns ending in -ος, neuter in -ον (genitive in -οντι, e.g. masculine ὁ λόγος, λόγου "word", fem. η έδος, έδουν "road", and neuter τὸ έδον, "firewood");30
5th klísis: imparisyllabic nouns (genitive in -οι), such as Αίας, Αίαντος "Ajax";
6th klísis: masc. and fem. in -ης, neuter in -ες, -ος (genitive in -ησοι/-ουσοι/-ουκοι);
7th klísis: fem. in -ες, neuter in -η (genitive in -εοι/-ευοι/-εουκοι).33

Chrysoloras thus manages a crystallised overview of the inflections, with a simplification of the number of Greek nominal categories from 56 in the canones of Theodosius to a mere ten, of which five can be considered dialectal exceptions. To a large extent the sample words remain those of Theodosius' canones, and the internal listing of the words remains focused on the endings in the nominative singular, although in a somewhat different order: Theodosius lists the masculine canones in the order -ις, -ης, -ος and -οι; Chrysoloras has -ις, -ης, -ος, -ες and -οι. Also, instead of listing each word as a separate canon, in Chrysoloras' Erotemata the sample inflections are given as unnumbered sections, each klísis featuring three or more sample words.37

By way of introduction to each klísis, Chrysoloras gives a brief summary of the complete inflection, citing the morphology of the oblique cases in the singular, and sometimes also in the plural, in the same order as in Theodosius; the genitive, dative, accusative and vocative. Then follows the enumeration of the complete inflection of the sample words.38

Chrysoloras' achievement consists of two related and interconnected insights that are both required to represent the linguistic material following a format that allows for the type of simplification offered in the Erotemata. These are, on the one hand, the understanding of the internal organisation of the Greek nominals in terms of parasisyllabic and imparisyllabic nominals, and on the other a structured simplification in the analysis inspired by the Roman grammatical tradition and the Latin five declinationes. None of these two are in any way particular to the work of Chrysoloras.

27) Τῶν ὀνόματιν τὰ μὲν κλίνοντα ἑποτυλλάβες, οἷον Αἰνέας, Αἰνεία, τὰ δὲ πεντετυλλάβες, οἷον Αἰας, Αϊαντος. Ως τοῦ θελεῖν γὰρ μὲν κλίνης ἑποτυλλάβος, η δὲ πεντετυλλάβος (Rollo 2012: 253, cf. Chrysoloras 1512: 8).
29) Chrysoloras numbers these additional klíseis from one to five, just as with the five other klíseis; see Rollo (2012: 258–260), cf. Chrysoloras (1512: 24–31). In order to distinguish the latter group from the earlier set, the second list is here referred to as the 6th to 10th klíseis, in accordance with Robins (1993: 244).
30) The category is reflected by Theodosius' neuter can. 4 only, as the canones do not feature masc. and fem. en of this inflectional type.
31) This is basically an enumeration of the remaining canones from Theodosius not considered in the preceding klíseis, all three genders combined.
32) E.g. Δημοσθένης "Demothénēs", with genitive forms Δημοσθένεος and Δημοσθένεος (Att.) (Theodosius' masc. can. 5) and τὸ τείχος "wall", τείχους and τείχως (Att.) (Theodosius' neut. can. 8).
33) E.g. ὁ ϑρῆς "snake", with genitive forms ϑρῆος (Koin.), ϑρῆος (Ion.), ϑρῆος (Att.) (Theodosius' masc. can. 8).
34) E.g. ὁ βασιλέας "king", with genitive forms βασιλεός (Koin.), βασιλεύς (Ion.), βασιλέως (Att.) (Theodosius' masc. can. 10).
35) E.g. η αἰδός "shame; sense of shame", with genitive forms αἰδόος and αἰδοῦς (Att.) (Theodosius' fem. can. 12).
36) E.g. τὸ κρέας "meat", with genitive forms κρέατος (Koin.), κρέατος (Ion.), κρέας (Att.) (Theodosius' neut. can. 7).
37) In the 1512 edition, the 5th klísis comprises as many as 38 sample words (Chrysoloras 1512: 12–19); in the edition by Rollo, this category comprises in total 81 sample words (2012: 254–257).
38) This practice differs somewhat from edition to edition. In Rollo's summary edition, Chrysoloras' 5th klísis is cited with the sample words only in the nominative and genitive singular (2012: 253–257), similar to the 1516 edition. In the expanded 1512 edition, some of the chosen sample words in the klísis are cited in both the singular and plural, others only in the singular cases.
4.2. New Grammatical Descriptions of Greek

Chrysoloras' sorting of the Greek nominals into ten *klíseis*, based on a division between parasyllabic (ισοσύλλαξ) and imparasyllabic (περισύλλαξ) nouns, is in effect the division between vowel stem paradigms (the first through to the fourth of Chrysoloras' *klíseis*; in modern terminology the 1st and 2nd Greek declensions) and consonant and semivocalic stem paradigms (Chrysoloras' fifth *klísis*; in modern terminology the 3rd Greek declension).

That some Greek nominals inflect in a parasyllabic manner was in no way a new realisation, and there are references to this effect in the *Canones*,39 as well as in a few even earlier works.40 It was however not until well into the Byzantine era before this line of thinking was followed up upon in terms of the categorisation of the Greek nominals.

Among the first to put this idea into concise form appears to have been the Byzantine grammarian Nilus Diasorenus (dates uncertain; 14th century ?). There is not much known about him and his work, apart from that he originated from the island of Rhodes, and that he wrote an *Erotemata*. Few fragments remain of the book, but what there is suggests a work of eremetic structure, and the material of the *Tēkhnē* in combination with the *canones*, although not all of them.41 In a comment at the beginning of this book Diasorenus also suggests that all Greek nouns, irrespective of gender, can be divided into two groups, parasyllabic and imparasyllabic:

> Know that many *canones* are of the male gender, of which there are two principal kinds, *Aias* and *kochlias*, for *Aias* has an imparasyllabic genitive, but *kochlias* a parasyllabic one.42

The phrasing at the beginning of Chrysoloras' section on the nominal inflection was thus not entirely new, and neither was Chrysoloras the only one to adhere to this idea. There are two other extant early grammars making use of this distinction, although none made the same mark on the scholarly community as Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*.

39 Theodosius defines some words as γενεια ἴσοσύλλαξια “having parasyllabic genitives”, thus masc. can. 4 ο Χρύσης “Chrysēs”, fem. can. 1 η Μούσα “Muse”, and neuter can. 4 το Ἑλέος “firewood” (Hilgard 1894: 6, 23, and 34, respectively).

40 Pseudo-Arcadius makes comments to this effect at the beginning of Book 3 of his epitome of Herodian's *Peri katholikês prosodías* (“On prosody in general”), and see also Sch. II. 17. 23b Erbsc (Erbe 1960).

41 Hilgard (1894: iii). Among the masculine *canones*, Diasorenus omits masc. can. 6 Ηερακλῆς “Heraclēs”, masc. can. 17-24 (e.g. can. 17 Μενέλαιος “Menelaios”), and masc. can. 35 Κύκλωπος “Cykloop” (Hilgard 1894: iii).

42 Γίνεσθαι δὲ πολλοὶ κανόνες εἰσιν ἄρτοκλην κόρου, ἀρ ὅν εἰσιν οἱ κόρωντες δύο, ὁ Αίας καὶ ὁ κόροις τοῦ μὲν Λάόντος ἡ γενεια περισύλλαξε, τοῦ δὲ κοριάς ἴσοσύλλαξε (Nil. fol.22r; Hilgard 1894: liv).

Caleca thus combines all nominals taking the ending -οιν, whereas Chrysoloras distinguishes between masculine a-stems (Chrysoloras’ 1st *klísis*) and o-stems (Chrysoloras’ 4th *klísis*). On the other hand, Caleca differentiates between feminine a-stems with genitive singulars in -ης and -οιν; these are combined into one *klísis* by Chrysoloras (Chrysoloras’ 2nd *klísis*).

For Caleca the primary form is the uncontracted form, i.e. το τεῖχος is imparasyllabic, genitive τεῖχεος, dative τεῖξει (Bernardinello 1971/72: 214). This means that the words in Chrysoloras’ five “additional” *klíseis*, with con-
tracted Attic genitive singulars, are considered as imparisyllabic and thus fit into Caleca’s 1st category.

4.2.2 Pseudo-Moschopoulos

A third early interpretation of the ideas of Nilus Diasorensis is found in a 15th century MS at Tübingen (Hilgard 1894: liv–lv). This MS presents a system of five declensions, and the primary sorting principle appears that of the morphology of the genitive singular in the uncontracted (Koine) forms:

1st klísis: genitive in -oc (imparisyllabic), e.g. Αίας, Αίαντος “Ajax”;
2nd klísis: genitive in -ow (parisyllabic), e.g. ὁ κυρίας, κυρίαν “snail”; Χρυ-στός, Χρυσόν “Chryses”; τὸ ἐλαίον, ἐλαίου “fire-wood”; Μενέλαος (Μενέλαιος), Μενέλαιον “Menelaus”;
3rd klísis: genitive in -esc, -esc (imparisyllabic), e.g. Δήμοσθένης, Δήμοσθέ-νεος “Demosthenes”; ὁ βασιλέας, βασιλέας (Koin.) “king”; η σι-δώς, σίδος “shame”; Σατύρος, Σατύρον “Satyr”;
4th klísis: genitive in -ioc, -ioc (imparisyllabic), e.g. ο όφις, όφιος (Koin.) “snake”; η πίτως, πίτως “pine”; τὸ γόνυ, του γόνου “knee”;
5th klísis: genitive in -ης, -ης (parisyllabic), e.g. Μούσα, Μουσάς “Muse”; ἡ ῥητή, ῥητή “horn”; ἡ σφαίρα, σφαῖρας “ball”.

An inscription attributes this work to the grammarian Manuel Moschopoulos (end 13th / early 14th century). Moschopoulos was a student of Maximus Planudes (c. 1260–c. 1305), and was probably his successor at Constantinople, where he lived and taught all his life. Scholars however agree that the attribution is false (cf. Rollo 2012: 99); Moschopolis did write an Erotemata grammaticalia, a highly valued book that was copied numerous times (see Rollo 2012: 91), and which was published in Italy in 1493 (Pertusi 1962: 328). However, this book does not feature any changes to the canones of Theodosius.44 The Tübingen MS is therefore better referred to as “Pseudo-Moschopolis”, and although of interest in terms of the history of the linguistic analysis of Greek there is little to be said regarding its place in the larger scholarly context of the time.

5. Changing times

Chrysoloras and Caleca, as well as Pseudo-Moschopolis, all suggested new ways of presenting the inflection of the Greek nominals based on an understanding of the possible division of all Greek nominals into two principal

44 Botley (2010: 5). This is particularly evident in terms of the section on the nominal (Hilgard 1894: xxxix–xliv); for a summary of the differences between the Tübingen MS and the Erotemata by Moschopolis, see Pertusi (1962: 337).

groups, parasisyllabic and imparisyllabic. This lead, more or less automatically, to the further analysis of the Greek nominals considering the morphology of the oblique cases, and consequently a disruption to the inherited order of the canones, given that all imparisyllabic nominals share the same set of endings.

Although the three grammars considered in the preceding differ somewhat internally, all feature an essentially similar pattern, with five inflectional groups labelled πρώτη καλώς “first klísis”, δεύτερα καλώς “second klísis”, and so on.45 This was evidently inspired by the principles of the Roman Ars grammatica, in an order fixed from the 4th century onwards, although the use of klísis for “inflectional group”, rather than the original “inflection”, was not entirely new to Greek grammarians.46

Before determining the precise nature of the Latin inspiration involved in the revision of the Theodosian canones in the grammars of Chrysoloras and Caleca, it is worth considering the ways in which the two books are related.47 On the one hand, one might consider the fact that Caleca’s grammar appears to have been completed first, as early as 1396 (see section 4.2.1). Caleca could thus be regarded as the connecting point between earlier grammars and what was to come, see e.g. Signes Codoñer (2016: 193). If so, one assumes that Caleca took the first step whereafter Chrysoloras completed this work with a more detailed revision; if Chrysoloras had been previously unaware of Caleca’s work, he might have encountered the grammar in Salutati’s library in Florence.

On the other hand, the two scholars were close friends at Constantinople, and Caleca apparently viewed Chrysoloras as “un grande maestro” (Pertusi 1962: 340). Chrysoloras’ grammar is the more refined and detailed one, and represents the more groundbreaking work, but Caleca’s grammar features individual solutions and considerations and does not merely reflect the relationship

45 The system with the label klísis in combination with a number system is found in Chrysoloras and in Pseudo-Moschopoulos (Hilgard 1894: liv-lv). The author of this article admits to not having had the possibility to consult MSS of Caleca’s grammar, but hazards to assume that the same label is used also there, based on Pertusi (1962: 339) and Bernardinello (1971/72: 214) who both refer to Caleca’s system as consisting of “declinazioni”.

46 The Alexandrian scholar Aristarchus (c. 220–c. 143 BCE) from Samothrace may have used the label klísis to indicate something similar to the concept of “declusion” (see e.g. Matthaios 1999: 289), and a few other early grammarians may also have applied the label in a similar way, for example Aristophanes (Pagani 2013). Also, the Roman grammarian Dositheus Magister, in his 4th century partly bilingual Ars Grammatica, used the label klísis to render Lat. declinatio when explaining the Latin declensions (cf. Keil 1871: 23).

47 This question appears not to have been previously considered, and it is noticeable that for example Pertusi only very briefly touches upon the relationship between Chrysoloras and Caleca (1962: 338). Bernardinello (1971/72) does not examine the proximity between the two grammars at all. Caleca’s grammar remains unedited, and this work will need to be completed before a thorough analysis of the book can be achieved.
of a student to his master (Pertusi 1962: 338). A feasible explanation is that Chrysoloras began working on his new grammar while still in Constantinople, and he presumably communicated these ideas to his friend Caleca, who then proceeded to write a linguistic treatise to be used in his own teaching. Chrysoloras then finalized his own grammar only after his arrival to Florence. To what extent the two scholars actively collaborated in their respective labour to revitalise the description of the Greek language will remain uncertain, but they both evidently began with Diasorenus’ summary comment, although with somewhat different end result.

Various suggestions have been put forward to explain the Latin influence on these Byzantine grammars, in the system with five regular inflectional groups (and, in the case of Chrysoloras, five additional groups explaining the forms in the dialects). The Greeks had been teaching their language to foreigners for several centuries, but there was perhaps something about the Italian aristocrats in the late 14th century that prompted a new way of viewing the Greek language. These students would have acquired Latin as a second language, and would have been well acquainted with the regula genitivi as a grammatical principle for the ordering and analysis of linguistic material, but perhaps foremost as a tool for the acquisition of the language.

It is possible that this might have been one aspect in the revitalisation process, although probably not with the hands-on mentality ascribed to it by Pontico Virunio, in his Vita Chrysoforae. This Vita is included in a printed edition of Chrysoloras’ Erotemata from 1509, and Virunio suggests that the format of the new grammar was the result of Chrysoloras working in close connection with his student Guarino Veronese, or alternatively that Guarino himself rewrote sections of the grammar to fit the Latin grammatical system. This places Chrysoloras’ revisionary work rather late in time, and considering the fact that Caleca’s grammar was completed before Chrysoloras left for Florence there must have been some other level of Latin influence on these grammarians. Apart from this fact, there are also several anachronisms featured in this commentary, and scholars agree that this section of the Vita must be “inverosimile”.

Both Chrysoloras and Caleca knew Latin when composing their respective grammars, and Pertusi (1962: 348–349) suggests that the precise Latin template for the ordering of the nominal inflectional groups was taken from the Ianua, an abridged medieval version of the Ars grammatica by Aelius Donatus (Il. mid–4th century CE). The Ianua version of Donatus’ grammar was translated into Greek in 1305 by Maximus Planudes, and was the aid of several Byzantine scholars in the acquisition of Latin. The book may well have been important to other sections of Chrysoloras’ Erotemata, but it was probably not the source for the reduction of the canones into five regular kîleses, since the Ianua exposition of the Latin declensions is much too abbreviated to serve as a template for what we find in the new Greek grammars of the late 14th century. Instead, one might rather look at summaries such as that offered by Charisius or Priscian, where the Latin system is set forth in all its clarity and in as summary a fashion as possible (see note 23). Even though these grammars may not have been translated into Greek as early as the Ianua, the knowledge of the Latin declinations was perhaps never completely “lost” to the Eastern scholars. Priscian, for example, lived and worked at Constantinople, and his work was aimed at primarily Greek-speaking pupils, as is shown by his continuous comparisons between the two languages (Robins 1993: 87). Although Latin became more and more obsolete as a spoken language in the East from the 8th century onwards, it was not completely lost, and for example Planudes, who was evidently adept enough to translate Donatus, appears to have been acquainted also with Priscian’s work to the point where certain passages in Planudes seem like translations of matching excerpts in Priscian (Robins 1993: 210–11).

All this considered, Chrysoloras’ encounter with his Western students may still have had some amount of influence of the final version of the Erotemata, although the explanation goes deeper than the mere encounter. During the sec-

51 Pertusi (1962: 349). Written in the mid–4th century BCE the book remained a widely used schoolbook for the teaching of Latin up until the 16th century (Ising 1970: 13); see further Ciccolletta (2008)
52 The declensions in Donatus’ Ars minor are not distinguished following the regula genitivi but rather a rule of “natural gender”, thus: magister (masculine), musa (feminine), scamnum (neuter), sacerdos (“genus commune”, viz. nouns with masculine and feminine forms) and felix (“genus onnis”, viz. adjectives with one form for all three genders). The fact that Donatus did not adhere to the traditional five paradigm system was explained by his commentator Servius (c. 400) as propter copendium “for the sake of brevity”, see Robins (1993: 116). The e- and u-declinations, not represented by this division, were added in later MS versions, exemplified by species and pructu (Ising 1970: 17–18). This was not always completed in a good enough way, and Beda complained that the Donatus often became “corruptus”, since those who copied the book would insert segments, or sample words, pertaining to their own specific interests (Ising 1970: 22–23, n.11).

---

48 This does not only concern Chrysoloras’ students at Florence, since he received Italian students while still in Constantinople, for example Salutati’s aide Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia (Weiss 1977: 258–259); see also the correspondence between Salutati and Angeli (Salutati 1896: 129–132).
ond half of the 14th century certain Greek intellectuals in Constantinople began to sense a growing alienating sentiment towards the rather unyielding forms of Orthodoxy rising in the city, something which may have favoured an intellectual climate more accepting of the Western views (Hankins 2007). At the same time, men such as Chrysoloras, and possibly also Caleca, consciously began striving to make the acquisition of Greek easier for Western students, something that called for more than the mere teaching of *hellenismos*. This is noticeable in the letter Chrysoloras wrote to Salutati in 1397, where he plays up the need the grasp Greek literature for the sake of a better understanding of Latin. 53 Chrysoloras was one of the scholars who “made it their conscious aim to turn classical Greek into the second learned language of Western Europe”. In a kind of missionary activity spreading Greek culture westwards in order to gain support against the growing tension in the East (Hankins 2007). This in turn met with a growing urge in the West to acquire basic knowledge of the Greek language, and a conviction, felt first in Italy and then through the rest of Europe, that there was a need to incorporate the Greek language and literature into the syllabus of the educated (see Geanakoplos 1962).

These two movements, a Western wish to acquire the Greek language, and an Eastern strive for Western comiseration, coincided in a concious effort among Byzantine grammarians to break free from the inherited doctrine of the *canones* in the search for new ways of describing, and teaching, the ancient Greek tongue.

6. Summary
The revolutionary work done by the late 14th century Byzantine grammarians concerns the simplification of the excessive number of declensional patterns distinguished in the Theodosian *canones* into five regular categories, inspired by the Latin *declinationes*. Comments regarding the potential restructuring of the Greek linguistic material had been made previous to the time of Chrysoloras and Caleca, and the Roman tradition was also known to Byzantine students of Latin, if not continuously then at least from the early 14th century onwards. When it came to the description of the Greek language for the purpose of teaching, scholars all the same continued to write grammars that were structured as repetitive lists following the didactic and mnemonic tradition of Hellenistic and early Byzantine writing. 54 It was only towards the end of the cen-

53 Berti (1998). Note in particular the comment by the anonymous author in the preface to the *editio princeps* of the abridged version of Chrysolora’s *Erotmata*, published in 1471: *hoc episcopum magis ad lattorum utilitatem quam ipseos graecorum necessitatem composuit “he composed this little work more for the use of the Latins than for the need of the Greeks themselves”* (Pertusi 1962: 324; Rollo 2012: 147–148).

54 Bernardinello (1971/72: 218); see also Law (1996).
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and ‘paradigm’, supplemented by ‘climate of opinion’ with respect to Syntactic Structures, while its central hypotheses is (T1) and its framework is Kuhn (1970) [1962]. (p.30)

Whether this quasi-axiomatization of Koerner’s essay clarifies the problem, Koerner’s claim or the history of early generative grammar is hard to say. It sounds more like the comments football fans make on Monday morning on the Sunday game but even more on the match report which was presented on television. They are both presented in a secret language, only understandable to insiders.

Kertész produces a series of theses and solutions, ending after 125 pages in a ‘possible solution to (P): (SP23)’ (p. 122). This model consists of a thesis (T23) and a solution (SP23):

(T23) The history of generative linguistics is a process of plausible argumentation based on the cyclic, prismatic and retrospective re-evaluation of the linguist’s knowledge of grammar.

(SP 23) a. The basic terms of the historiography of generative linguistics are: plausible, retrospective re-evaluation, prismatic and cyclic.

b. The central thesis is (T23)
c. The framework is the historiographical extension of Kertész & Rákosi’s (2012) p-model. (p. 124)

A reader may feel slightly disappointed with this conclusion/solution after having read almost 125 pages of criticism of other scholars. Maybe that is why Kertész adds another 60 pages ending with the answer on the question ‘Why should linguists get out of bed in the morning.’ The answer is not very promising:

Although neither the result of the metahistoriographical evaluation of the approaches we have overviewed nor our own solution to (P), namely (SP23), do in fact suggest an answer that is true with certainty, they seem to assign a high plausibility value to the statement that it may make sense for the linguist to get out of bed in many different ways, but taking part in a daily revolution is not one of them. (p. 185)

This answer is not only rather unsatisfactory, just as the Monday morning comments of football fans, but also makes clear that Kertész’ book is not a bedside book.

Camiel Hamans (Breda)