Specimen

Inhalt / Contents / Sommaire

Aufsätze / Articles

Diskussion / Discussion / Débat

Specimen

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft

Karin Westin Tikkanen

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 Constantinopel 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]

---

[1]   See e.g. Reynolds/Wilson (2013: 148).

[2]   Plenty has been written regarding Chrysoloras and his life and works. The primary work on Chrysolora's life remains Cammelli (1941), recently updated by Thorn-Wikkert (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 *Erotemata*, written as part of his teaching activities, and which went on to become the most popular Greek grammar in fifteenth-century Italy. [3] 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' *Erotemata*, 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 succint evualuation 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.[4] 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

---

soloras' teaching actitivities are documented and discussed in Maisano/Rollo (2002); see in particular Rollo (2002).

[3] The compendium became widely used as a school text. For an enumeration of scholars known to have used Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*, see Botley (2010: 9–11).

[4] A good reminder of this is the story of the more or less simultaneous invention of the telephone, by Graham Bell and Elisha Grey, who both applied for scientific patents for their separate innovations on the same day, February 14 1876; see Hounshell (1981).

was also in large parts the work of philosophy and not considered an independent discipline. To a large extent early Greek grammatical works were focused on creating a metalanguage and method for the study of literary texts (Taylor 1990: 17; Blank 2000: 407), and it was only gradually that grammatical analysis became more linguistically oriented, literary considerations fading into the background (Hovdhaugen 1995: 115).

2.1 Greek grammar up until Dionysius Thrax

The most ancient reflection of the categorisation of the inflection of nouns and verbs within Greek grammar is that of Aristotle, who used the label *ptôsis* "fall" for any form derived from a nominal or a verb.[5] By the time of the Stoic Chrysippus of Soli, in the 3rd century BCE, *ptôsis* had been limited to meaning "case" only, and instead the label *klísis* (from *klínō* "to bend") was used to denote "inflection".[6] Early Greek grammatical thinking was however hampered by a lack of insight into features such as the differences between derivational and inflectional morphology, which made a clear view of the system difficult to reach. This caused a problem for many of the early grammarians striving to explain the linguistic structures, and as a consequence Greek grammars often distinguished the nominal forms into a number of subcategories other than base morphology.[7] This habit was to remain a problem for Greek grammarians for centuries to follow, and surfaces as a problematic element in the *Tékhnē grammatiké*, attributed to the Alexandrian grammarian Dionysius Thrax (c.170–90 BCE).[8] In the *Tékhnē* (§ 12) a noun is defined as a declinable (*ptōtikón*) part of speech, to which is assigned three genders (*génē*), three numbers (*artihmoí*), and five cases (*ptṓseis*). Nouns are further sorted into a total of 24 categories based on their meaning: 1. *proper nouns* (viz. personal names) such as "Homer", "Socrates"; 2. *appellative nouns* such as "man,

---

[5] See Delamarre (1980) and Primavesi (1994).

[6] The term was used for any relevant morphological differences within the nominal and verbal forms in Greek, i.e. *klísis onomáton*, "nominal inflection", meaning accidents that can modify a part of speech bearing case, and *klísis rhēmátōn* for the inflection of the verbs; see further Robins (1993: 115).

[7] According to the 4th century Roman grammarian Charisius, Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257 –80 BCE) enumerated five criteria for the analysis of the nominals: gender, case, ending, number of syllables, and sounds; see Keil (1857: 117). These five were completed by a sixth, either coined by Aristophanes himself or by his pupil Aristarchus, which distinguished between simple and compound nominals; see further Blank (2000: 400–417).

[8] There is a long-standing debate about the authenticity of the surviving *Tékhnē grammatiké* and which sections were actually written by Thrax, but in the long run this *Lehrbuch* of Greek grammar was in any case enormously influential. For a summary of this debate, see e.g. Di Benedetto (2000), Matthaios (2009) and Pagani (2010). Most scholars tend to accept the attribution to Thrax, whereas a minority dispute this and claim that the grammar is the result of much later composition, thus e.g. Law (1990).

horse"; 3. *attached nouns* (viz. adjectives) such as "fast, slow"; 4. *relative nouns* such as "father, son"; and so on (see Kemp 1986: 355–356).

There is no further systematisation in the *Tékhnē*, 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' *Tékhnē* 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 εἰσαγωγικοί περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων καὶ ῥημάτων) 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 *Tékhnē*, although with greater detail. Thrax describes the verbs in terms of thirteen different *syzygíai*, 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.[9]

In a similarly detailed way Theodosius set about analysing the nominal system in the form of *canones*,[10] 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: -ας, -ης, -ις, -εις, -ευς, -υς, -ως, -λς. The *canones* are also distinguished on the basis of number of syllables, the placement of the accent (oxytone vs. bary-

---

[9]   Theodosius' commentator Georgius Choeroboscus (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* (κανών "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 *Perì onomátōn* ("On nouns"), and *Perì klíseōs onomátōn* ("On the inflection of nouns"); see Pagani (2013).

tone, the genitive stem, and so on, so that the total number of categories of words ending in *sigma* adds up to 18.[11] After this, and similarly distinguished, come words ending in -ν (masc. *can*. 19–26), in -ξ (masc. *can*. 27–31), -ϱ (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 *Tékhnē*, to simply record the inflection of Greek, and the material is presented withouth 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: Αἴας "Ajax", Αἴαντος
> 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 -NT-, e.g. *Thóas, Thóantos, Húas, Húantos, Aías, Aíantos ...*[12]

> Canon 2:
> Singular: ὁ κοχλίας "snail", τοῦ κοχλίου
> Words of more than two syllables that end in -ΑΣ preceded by a vowel, are simplicia and are accented on a non-final vowel, have their genitive in -OU, e.g. *Papíou, Hermeíou, Aineíou ...*[13]

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 -ου 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 -OU" (εἰς OΥ ἔχει τὴν γενικήν). 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 Αἴας "Ajax", which inflects "through the -NT-", but sometimes the stem in combination with the ending, as with masc. *can*. 3 Λάχης,

---

[11]   Among these, the contracted paradigms presented by masc. *can*. 6 ὁ Ἡρακλέης "Heracles", masc. *can*. 14 ὁ πλοῦς "voyage", masc. *can*. 17 ὁ Μενέλεως "Menelaus" and masc. *can*. 18 ὁ ἅλς "salt" are considered in particular detail (Hilgard 1894: 8, 14, 16 and 17 respectively).

[12]   Κανὼν α΄. Ἑνικά. Αἴας, Αἴαντος. τὰ εἰς ΑΣ καθαρὸν ὀνόματα δισύλλαβα βαρύτονα μακροκατάληκτα διὰ τοῦ NT κλίνεται, Θόας Θόαντος, Ὕας Ὕαντος, Αἴας, Αἴαντος ... (Hilgard 1894: 3.3–3.5). Unless otherwise specified, translations of ancient texts are by the author of this article.

[13]   Κανὼν β΄. Ἑνικά. ὁ κοχλίας, τοῦ κοχλίου. τὰ εἰς ΑΣ καθαρὸν ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς ἁπλᾶ βαρύτονα εἰς ΟΥ ἔχει τὴν γενικήν, Παπίου Ἑρμείου Αἰνείου ... (Hilgard 1894: 4.17–21).

Λάχητος "Laches", where Theodosius writes that these words "have their genitive in -TOS" (εἰς ΤΟΣ ἔχει τὴν γενικήν) (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 κοχλίας, κοχλίου "snail", masc. *can.* 4 Χρύσης, Χρύσου "Chryses" — both masculine *a*-stems — and masc. *can.* 14 ὁ πλοῦς, τλοῦ "voyage",[16] and among the neuter categories in *can.* 4 τὸ ξύλον, ξύλου "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 *Tékhnē* 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 *klísis* as *declinatio*, used in a general sense of "inflection" (*LL* 8,3), but he also went one step further and identified five nominal *declinationes*, 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 -ήν, which either "inflect through -ε-" (if there is a -μ- in the nominative, ὁ ποιμήν "herdsman"), or "in -η-" (if there is no -μ- in the nominative, ὁ σωλήν "gutter") (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 -ντ-, and for example masc. *can.* 24, "masculine barytone words ending in -ων", see Elst (2011).

16) This is a collection of nominals with contracted nominatives, including πλακόεις, with genitive singular πλακόεντος *or* πκλακοῦς, and χρύσεος, with genitive singular χρυσέου *or* χρυσοῦς (Hilgard 1894: 14).

17) *Ars grammatica ... scientia est <eorum> quae a poetis historicis oratoribusque dicuntur ex parte maiore* (Varro frag. 91, fr. 234 Funaioli, translation of *GG* 1.1 5.2–3). Translation by Robins (1996: 4).

> But if someone does in fact wish to set out from the singular, he will be well advised to start from the sixth case [*sc.* the ablative], which is unique to Latin, for the several different morphemes of this one case will make it easier for him to classify the combinations and permutations of the remaining cases. The endings at issue are: A as in *terra* 'land', or E as in *lance* 'platter', or I as in *levi*[18] 'light', or in O as in *caelo* 'sky', or in U as in *versu* 'line'.[19]

Varro thus distinguished and analysed inflectional categories based on the dissimilarities of one singular ending, and this eventually became the principal guideline in the description of the Latin nominals (Taylor 1995). Pliny referred to it as the *regula Varronis*, and probably also discussed it at length (Taylor 1996: 175), and by the time of the grammarian Charisius, in the 4th century CE, this had become standard practice, although the case used to distinguish between the different inflectional categories was the genitive singular, not the ablative. In his *Ars* Charisius gives the order of the five Latin declensions, from the first through to the fifth, in the order in which they are still enumerated today: *a*-stems (genitive in *-ae*), *o*-stems (genitive in *-i*), the mixed class (genitive in *-is*), followed by *u*-stems (genitive in *-us*) and *e*-stems (genitive in *-ei*).[20]

It remains uncertain whether Charisius was a professional grammarian himself or merely a compiler, and his *Ars* might be better viewed as representative of different currents of thought within Roman grammatical theory.[21] One century later, Priscian (fl. 500) summarized the Latin inflection in his *Institutio de nomine et pronomine et verbo*, and here the description of the Latin nominal system was strictly formalised:[22]

> All nouns, which the Latin language utilises, are inflected in five declensions, which take their order from the order of the vowels forming the genitive. The first declension is that which ends its genitive in the diphthong *-ae*, such as *hic poeta,*

---

18) Other editors, such as Groth, amend this to *clavi*; for comments, see Taylor (1996: 161–162).

19) *Sin ab singulari quis potius proficisci volet, initium acere oportebit ab sexto casu, qui est proprius Latinus: nam eius casuis litterarum discriminibus facilius reliquorum varietate<m> discernere potuerit, quod ei habent exitus aut in A ut hac terra, aut in E ut hac lance, aut in I ut hac clavi, aut in O ut hoc caelo, aut in U ut hoc versu* (*LL* 10,62). Translation by Taylor (1996: 85).

20) According to Charisius there is little agreement as regards the attribution of nominals to the fifth declension, since some sort such items as part of the second declension, with a genitive in *-i*, while others have these nominals in the third declensions, with the dative/ablative plural in *-bus* (31 K., Barwick 1964: 31.22).

21) Kaster (1998: 68, n. 153) takes the dedication of the work to Charisius' own son, in the introduction, as proof of this being the work of an amateur.

22) Several elements of his theoretical approach, for example to morphology, are documented in some of the sources mentioned by Charisius (Hovdhagen 1997: 117).

huius poetae, the second is that which case ends in a prolonged *-i*, such as *hic doctus, huius docti* ...[23]

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 *hellenismos*, "proper Greek" as the language was attested in the Homeric texts, rather than ordinary, spoken Greek.[24] Grammarians continued to write grammatical treatises that analysed and explained the Greek language, and these *Lehrbücher* mostly copied the *Tékhnē* 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 — *sicut 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 "Latins" (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.

---

[23] *Omnia nomina, quibus Latina utitur eloquentia, quinque declinationibus flectuntur, quae ordinem acceperunt ab ordine vocalium formantium genetivos. prima igitur declinatio est, cuius genetivus in ae diphthongon desinit, ut hic poeta huius poetae; secunda, cuius in i productam ... finitur casus, ut hic doctus huius docti ...* (*Inst. de nomine et pronomine et verbo*, CPL 1550, Dekker 1995: 443.3).

[24] See e.g. Morgan (1998: 166–169), and Pontani (2011).

4.1 The *Erotemata* of Manuel Chrysoloras

As outlined in section 1, Manuel Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* constitutes a marked split from the pattern of the *canones*, with a much simpler description of the Greek nominal system. The book, on the whole, embodies the accepted tradition handed down from the *Tékhnē* with little theoretical discussion, although it is much too harsh to describe it as a mere "re-working" of Dionysius Thrax (thus Stevens 1950: 244), since at the same time the book came to drastically revitalise the description of the Greek nominal inflection.

It is a lasting conundrum that the precise date of composition of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* remains uncertain. According to Pertusi (1962: 324–325), Chrysoloras composed his *Erotemata* while still at Constantinople, and Robins (1993: 237) states that the book was "probably written by 1397". It is a fact, however, that all of the oldest MSS of the book are considerably younger than this period, and also that none of the preserved MSS continue what can be considered Chrysoloras' own text, since the book was copied, abridged and amended depending on the scholarly context, as well as the needs of the owner.[25] The compendium used by Guarino was further condensed by an anonymous author and printed as a bilingual *Epitome*, one of the first Greek books to be printed in the West (Venice, c. 1471), and over the following centuries many printed versions of the book were produced, of various lengths, depending on the needs of the owner.[26]

In the following, all quotes from the *Erotemata* are taken from Rollo's edition of what may be considered the original version of Chrysoloras' own text (Rollo 2012). These passages are also compared with the longer, printed version of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* (1512).

In Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*, the Greek nominals are differentiated into 10 categories. As summarized by Chrysoloras in the beginning of the section on the nominals, the elementary dividing criterion is that between parisyllabic nouns,

---

[25] Nuti (2012: 254–255) discerns three different early manuscript traditions: the short, Latin compendium used by Guarino Veronese, possibly composed around 1418; the *Harleian* 6506, a redaction of the grammar but somewhat longer that Guarino's compendium, dating to c. 1410–1415 (this was owned by Sozomenus, Guarino's pupil in Florence); and *Vindob.Suppl.gr.* 75, copied by John Chortasmenos between 1410 and 1416, a long and articulated version. The assumption that Guarino acquired a copy of the book by 1406 (see Ciccolella 2008: 119; Botley 2010: 7) has been proven false by Rollo (2012), see also Nuti (2012: 246).

[26] In the shorter, printed version of the grammar, the section on the nominal inflection may take up no more than 6 medium quarto pages, in a bilingual format, such as Chrysoloras/Veronese (c. 1481: 3–8). There are also editions in which the abbreviated Greek text of the Guarino compendium is printed on its own, without the Latin translation, e.g. Chrysoloras/Veronese (1520). In longer printed versions of the grammar the section on the nominals may require as many as 18 medium octavo pages, thus Chrysoloras (1512: 13–31).

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 parisyllabic manner, such as *Aineías, Aineíou*, and such that inflect in an imparisyllabic manner, such as *Aías, Aíantos*. The one may thus be called parisyllabic inflection, the other imparisyllabic.[27]

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 parisyllabic nouns ending in -ας or -ης (genitive in -ου), e.g. Χρύσης, Χρύσου "Chryses";

2nd *klísis*: feminine parisyllabic nouns ending in -α or -η (genitive in -ας or -ης), e.g. Μοῦσα, Μούσης "Muse";

3rd *klísis*: masculine and feminine parisyllabic nouns endings in -ως, and neuter ending in -ων (genitive in -ω), e.g. ἅλως, ἅλω "threshing-floor";

4th *klísis*: masc. and fem. parisyllabic nouns ending in -ος, neuter in -ον (genitive in -ου), e.g. masc. ὁ λόγος, λόγου "word", fem. ἡ ὁδός, ὁδου "road", and neuter τὸ ξύλον, ξύλου "firewood";[30]

5th *klísis*: imparisyllabic nouns (genitive in -ος), such as Αἴας, Αἴαντος "Ajax";[31]

6th *klísis*: masc. and fem. in -ης, neuter in -ες, -ος (genitive in -ηεος/-ουσος/-ους);[32]

7th *klísis*: fem. in -ις, neuter in -ι (genitive in -ιος/-εος/-εως);[33]

---

27) Τῶν ὀνομάτων τὰ μὲν κλίνονται ἰσοσυλλάβως, οἶον Αἰνείας, Αἰνείου, τὰ δὲ περιττοσυλλάβως, οἶον Αἴας, Αἴαντος. Ὥστε καλείσθω ἡ μὲν κλίσις ἰσοσύλλαβος, ἡ δὲ περιττοσύλλαβος (Rollo 2012: 253, cf. Chrysoloras 1512: 8).

28) Rollo (2012: 253–254), cf. Chrysoloras (1512: 8–19).

29) Chrysoloras numbers these additional *klíseis* from one to five, just as with the five other *klísies*; 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 *klísis*, 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. nouns 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 "Demosthenes", with genitive forms Δημοσθένεος and Δημοσθένους (Att.) (Theodosius' masc. *can*. 5) and τὸ τεῖχος "wall", τείχεος and τείχους (Att.) (Theododosius' neut. *can*. 8).

33) E.g. ὁ ὄφις "snake", with genitive forms ὄφιος (Koin.), ὄφεος (Ion.), ὄφεως (Att.) (Theododosius' masc. *can*. 8).

8th *klísis*: masc. in -εύς (genitive in -εος/-ηος/-εως);[34]

9th *klísis*: fem. in -ώ, -ώς (genitive in -οος/-ους);[35]

10th *klísis*: neuter in -ας, -ρας (genitive in -ατος/-αος/-ως).[36]

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 -ς, -ν, -ξ, -ρ and -ψ; Chrysoloras has -ς, -ξ, -ψ, -ν and -ρ. 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 parisyllabic 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.

---

34) E.g. ὁ βασιλεύς "king", with genitive forms βασιλέος (Koin.), βασιλῆος (Ion.), βασιλέως (Att.) (Theododosius' masc. *can*. 10).

35) E.g. ἡ αἰδώς "shame; sense of shame", with genitive forms αἰδόος and αἰδοῦς (Att.) (Theododosius' fem. *can*. 12).

36) E.g. τὸ κρέας "meat", with genitive forms κρέατος (Koin.), κρέαος (Ion.), κρέως (Att.) (Theododosius' 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 parisyllabic (ἰσοσύλλαβος) and imparisyllabic (περιττοσύλλαβος) 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 parisyllabic 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 erotematic structure, and the material of the *Tékhnē* 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, parisyllabic and imparisyllabic:

> Know that many *canones* are of the male gender, of which there are two principal kinds, *Aías* and *kochlías*, for *Aías* has an imparisyllabic genitive, but *kochlías* a parisyllabic 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 γενικὴ ἰσοσύλλαβοῦσα "having parisyllabic genitives", thus masc. *can.* 4 ὁ Χρύσης "Chryses", fem. *can.* 1 ἡ Μοῦσα "Muse", and neuter *can.* 4 τὸ ξύλον "firewood" (Hilgard 1894: 6, 25, and 34, respectively).

[40] Pseudo-Arcadius makes comments to this effect at the beginning of Book 3 of his epitome of Herodian's *Perì katholikês prosodías* ("On prosody in general"), and see also Sch. *Il.* 17. 23*b* Erbse (Erbse 1960).

[41] Hilgard (1894: lii). Among the masculine *canones*, Diasorenus omits masc. *can.* 6 Ἡρακλέης "Herakles", masc. *can.* 17–24 (e.g. *can.* 17 Μενέλεως "Menelaus"), and masc. *can.* 35 Κύκλωψ "Cyklops" (Hilgard 1894: liii).

[42] Γίνωσκε ὅτι πολλοὶ κανόνες εἰσὶν ἀρσενικοὶ κύριοι, ἀφ᾽ ὧν εἰσιν οἱ κυριώτεροι δύο, ὁ Αἴας καὶ ὁ κοχλίας· τοῦ μὲν Αἴαντος ἡ γενικὴ περιττοσυλλαβεῖ, τοῦ δὲ κοχλίου ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ (Nil. fol.22r; Hilgard 1894: liv).

4.2.1 Manuel Caleca

Manuel Caleca (? –1410) was a Dominican friar of Slavic origins, who for some time was active as a teacher of Greek in Constantinople. He eventually retired to the convent on Mytilene, where he also died (Bernardinello 1971/72: 203).

Caleca also produced an *Erotemata*, the aim of which seems to have been that of a school text, and the grammar can therefore roughly be dated to the period during which he was an active teacher at Constantinopel, meaning 1391–1396 (Pertusi 1962: 339). It also seems certain that the chancellor of Florence, Colluccio Salutati, had acquired Caleca's grammar, and subsequently used it to teach himself Greek at some point between 1396 and 1398.[43]

Like Chrysoloras, Caleca digresses from the inherited structure of his predecessors, offering a more scientific exposition organised by reason, creating a system where the Theodosian *canones* are divided into five inflectional groups, the first sorting principle that of parisyllabic or imparisyllabic inflection, thereafter the ending in the genitive:

1st *klísis*: imparisyllabic masc., fem. and neuter words with genitive in -ος, e.g. Αἴας, Αἴαντος "Ajax"; ἡ τρυγών, τρυγόνος "turtle-dove"; τὸ βῆμα, βήματος "step";

2nd *klísis*: parisyllabic masc. and neuter words with genitive in -ου, e.g. masc. ὁ κοχλίας, κοχλίου "snail"; Χρύσης, Χρύσου "Chryses"; neuter τὸ ξύλον, ξύλου "fire-wood";

3rd *klísis*: parisyllabic fem. words with genitive in -ης, e.g. Μοῦσα, Μοῦσης "Muse"; ἡ τιμή, τιμής "honour";

4th *klísis*: parisyllabic fem. words with genitive in -ας, e.g. ἡ σφαῖρα, σφαίρας "ball";

5th *klísis*: parisyllabic masc. words with genitive in -α, e.g. Μενέλεως, Μενέλεω "Menelaus".

Caleca thus combines all nominals taking the ending -ου, 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 -ας; these are combined into one *klísis* by Chrysoloras (Chrysoloras' 2nd *klísis*).

For Caleca the primary form is the uncontracted form, i.e. τὸ τεῖχος is imparisyllabic, genitive τείχεος, dative τείχεϊ (Bernardinello 1971/72: 214). This means that the words in Chrysoloras' five "additional" *klíseis*, with con-

---

[43] Weiss (1977), Botley (2010: 6). Bernardinello (1971/72: 205) mentions a second suggestion, which he also discredits, that Caleca wrote his grammar during his stay on Chios, meaning in the range of 1403–1404.

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 Diasorenus 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 (Koiné) forms:

1st *klísis*:   genitive in -ος (imparisyllabic), e.g. Αἴας, Αἴαντος "Ajax";

2nd *klísis*:   genitive in -ου (parisyllabic), e.g. ὁ κοχλίας, κοχλίου "snail"; Χρύσης, Χρύσου "Chryses"; τὸ ξύλον, ξύλου "fire-wood"; Μενέλαος (Μενέλεως), Μενέλαου (Μενέλαω) "Menelaus";

3rd *klísis*:   genitive in -εος, -οος (imparisyllabic), e.g. Δημοσθένης, Δημοσθένεος "Demosthenes"; ὁ βασιλεύς, βασιλέος (Koin.) "king"; ἡ αἰδώς, αἰδόος "shame"; Σαπφώ, Σαπφόος "Sapfo";

4th *klísis*:   genitive in -ιος, -υος (imparisyllabic), e.g. ὁ ὄφις, ὄφιος (Koin.) "snake"; ἡ πίτυς, πίτυος "pine"; τὸ γόνυ, τοῦ γόνυος "knee";

5th *klísis*:   genitive in -ης, -ας (parisyllabic), e.g. Μοῦσα, Μούσης "Muse"; ἡ τιμή, τιμής "honour"; ἡ σφαῖρα, σφαίρας "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); Moschopoulos *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-Moschopolous", 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-Moschopoulos, 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 secion on the nominal (Hilgard 1894: xxxix–xliv); for a summary of the differences between the Tübingen MS and the *Erotemata* by Moschopolous, see Pertusi (1962: 337).

groups, parisyllabic 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 κλίσις "first *klísis*", δευτέρα κλίσις "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 Constantinopel, 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 "declension" (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 throrough 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.[48] 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 Chrysolorae*. 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".[49]

---

[48] This does not only concern Chrysoloras' students at Florence, since he received Italian students while still in Contantinopel, 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).

[49] Thus Pertusi (1962: 347); cf. Sabbadini (1896: 10–14). For a detailed analysis and rebuttal of the idea that Guarino had any part in the composition of the *Erotemata* of Chrysoloras, see Rollo (2012: 156–157).

Both Chrysoloras and Caleca knew Latin when composing their respective grammars,[50] 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 (fl. 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.[51] 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 *klíseis*, 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.[52] 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 *decliations* was perhaps never completely "lost" to the Eastern scholars. Priscian, for example, lived and worked at Constantinopel, and his work was aimed at primarily Greek-speaking pupils, as is shown by his continuous comparisons between the two langauges (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 Priscan (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 second

---

[50] Pertusi (1962: 348); Bernardinello (1971/72: 205).

[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: 15); see further Ciccolella (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 omne", 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 conpendium* "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 *fructus* (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).

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 Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*, published in 1471: *hoc opusculum magis ad latinorum utilitatem quam ipsorum 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).

tury that this focus shifted, and Byzantine teachers began to alter the designs of their instruction. This had to do with a changing political climate, in which Eastern scholars became more attentive to the requirement to make learning Greek more accessible to wider numbers of students, many in the West, in order to favour a positive disposition towards the political situation in the East.

The three more or less contemporary grammars mentioned in this article, that of Chrysoloras, Caleca and Pseudo-Moschopolous, represent different solutions to the problem of altered didactic structures. The grammars of Chrysoloras and Caleca were most likely written in the context of teaching at Constantinopel, and it remains to be shown to what extent Caleca acted on his own ideas in the writing of his grammar, or whether he was more prone to copying his "*maestro*". The origin and purpose of the grammar of Pseudo-Moschopolous remain unknown, but the book, together with the two other grammars, shows that the principle of ordering the Greek nominals using the five-declensional model of the Roman tradition was an idea in circulation, which could generate similar but different outcomes depending on the focus and intention of the individual scholar making use of it.

Chrysoloras' work — his grammar as well as his translations of Homer and Plato into Latin, and his other writings — came to have a major influence of the Western appreciation and understanding of Greek. His *Erotemata* was introduced and used in Italian classrooms, and the advent of printing made certain that the book was spread far beyond the boundaries of country as well as student circle. Chrysoloras remains a groundbreaking character in terms of the teaching of Greek in the West, but he was not the only Byzantine scholar of his time working at a revision of the description of the Greek language; he may equally well be portrayed as part of a succession of scholars considering the simplification of the age-old Theodosian matrix.

Karin Westin Tikkanen
Uppsala University
Department of Linguistics and Philology
Box 635
SE–751 26 Uppsala
Sweden
eMail: karin.tikkanen@lingfil.uu.se

References

Auroux, Sylvain / Koerner, E. F. Konrad / Niederehe, Hans-Josef / Versteegh, Kees (eds.)
2000   *History of the Language Sciences / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften / Histoire des sciences du langage*, vol. I. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter,

Barwick, Karl
1964   *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*. Leipzig: Teubner. 2nd ed.

Berti, Ernesto
1998   "Manuele Crisolora, Plutarco, e l'avviamento delle traduzioni umanistiche". *Fontes: Rivista di filologia, iconografia e storia della tradizione classica*. 1: 88–91.

Bernardinello, Silvio
1971/72 "La grammatica di Manuele Caleca". *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*. 8/9: 203–218.

Blank, David
2000   "The Organization of Grammar in Ancient Greece". *Auroux/Koerner/Niederehe/Versteegh* (2000: 400–417).

Blum, Herwig
1969   *Die antike Mnemotechnik*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Botley, Paul
2010   *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica and Classroom Texts*. Philadelphia: American Philological Society.

Cammelli, Giuseppe
1941   *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell' Umanesimo*. Vol. 1: *Manuele Crisolora*. Florence: Vallecchi.

Chrysoloras, Manuel
1512   *Erotemata tou Chrysolora*. Venice: Aldinus.
1516   *Erotemata tou Chrysolora*. Strassbourg: Knoblouch.

Chrysoloras, Manuel / Veronese, Guarino
c.1481 *Erotemata Guarini ex Chrysoloræ libello maiusculo cum interpretatione latina*. Parma: Hieronymus.
c.1520 *Doctissimi viri Guarini Erotemata ex maiusculo Chrysolorae libello in eorum, qui graecarum literarum studiosi sunt, utilitatem excerpta*. Cologne: Cervicornus.

Ciccolella, Federica
2008   *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance*. Leiden: Brill.
2013   "When a Dead Tongue Speaks Again: the revival of Greek studies in the Renaissance". *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors*. Ed. by Machtelt Israëls, Louis A. Waldman. Florence: Villa I Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, 407–412.

Dekker, Eligius
1995   *Clavis Patrum Latinorum qua in Corpus Christianorum edendum optimas quasque scriptorum recensiones a Tertulliano ad Bedam commode recluditcur Eligius Dekkers opera usus qua rem praeparavit et iuvit Aemilius Gaar*. Turnholti: Brepols. 3rd ed.

Delamarre, Alexandre
1980   "La notion de πτῶσις chez Aristote et les Stoïciens". *Concepts et catégories dans la pensée antique*. Ed. by. Pierre Aubenque. Paris: Vrin, 321–345.

Di Benedetto, Vincenzo
2000   "Dionysius Thrax and the *Tékhnē Grammatiké*". Auroux/Koerner/Niederehe/Versteegh (2000: 394–399).

Elst, Valerie Van
2011   "Theodosius and his Byzantine Successors on the Participle: A Didactic Approach". *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Ed. by Stephanos Matthaios, Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 405–428.

Erbse, Hartmut
1960   *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*. München: Beck.

Geanokoplos, Deno J.
1962   *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the dissemination of Greek learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Hankins, James
2007   "Greek Studies in Italy: From Petrarch to Bruni". *Petrarca e il Mondo Greco Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Reggio Calabria, 26–30 Novembre 2001*. Ed. by Michele Feo, Antonio Rollo. Firenze: Le Lettere, 329–339.

Hilgard, Alfredus
1894   *Grammatici graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Vol. 4: Theodosius, Choeroboscus, Sophronius*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Hounshell, David A.
1981   "Two Paths to the Telephone", *Scientific American*, January 1981, 134–141.

Hovdhaugen, Even
1995   "Roman *Ars Grammatica*, including Priscian". *Concise History of the Language Sciences. From the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*. Ed. by E. F. Konrad Koerner, Ronald E. Asher. Oxford, New York: Pergamon, 115–118.

Ising, Erika
1970   *Die Herausbildung der Grammatik der Volkssprachen in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Kaster, Robert A.
1988   *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkley: University of Chicago Press.

Keil, Heinrich
1855   *Grammatici Latini ex recensione Henrici Keilii*. Vol. II: *Prisciani Institutionum Grammaticarum libri I–XII*. Leipzig: Teubner.
1857   *Grammatici Latini ex recensione Henrici Keilii*. Vol. I: *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V. Diomedis Artis grammaticae libri III. Ex Charisii Arte grammatica excerpta*. Leipzig: Teubner.
1871   *Dosithei Ars grammatica*. Halae: Hendel.

Kemp, Alan J.
1986   "The *Tekhnē Grammatikē* of Dionysius Thrax. Translated into English", *Historia Linguistica*. 13(2): 352–353.

Law, Vivien
1990   "Roman Evidence on the Authenticity of the Grammar Attributed to Dionysius Thrax". *History and historiography of linguistics*, vol. 1. Ed. by Hans-Josef Niederehe, Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 89–96.
1996   "The Mnemonic Structure of Ancient Grammatical Doctrine". *Ancient grammar: content and context*. Ed. by Pierre Swiggers, Alfons Wouters. Leuven, Paris: Peeters, 37–52.

Maisano, Riccardo / Rollo, Antonio (eds.)
2002   *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente*. Naples: Istituto universitario orientale.

Matthaios, Stephanos
1999   *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht.
2009   "Aristarch, Dionysious Thrax und die Τέχνη γραμματική. Zur Echtheitsdiskussion des ersten Lehrbuchs über die Grammatik". Ἀντιφίλησις. *Studies in Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture. In Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademietriou*. Ed. by Elenei Karamelengou, Eugenia Makrygianni. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 386–400.

Mergiali-Sahas, Sophia
1998   "Manuel Chrysoloras: an ideal model of a scholar ambassador". *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines*. 3: 1–12.

Morgan, Teresa
1998   *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nolan, Edmond / Hirsch, Samuel A.
1902   *The Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon and a Fragment of His Hebrew Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuti, Erika
2012   "Reconsidering Renaissance Greek Grammars Through the Case of Chrysoloras' Erotemata". *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*. 52: 240–268.

Pagani, Lara
2010   "La Techne grammatike attribuita a Dionisio Trace e la nascita della grammatica nell'antichità greca". *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*. 138: 390–409.
2013   "Declension/Conjugation (*klísis*), Ancient Theories of". *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics Online*. Ed. by Georgios K. Giannakis.

Pertusi, Agostino
1962   "ΕΡΩΤΗΜΑΤΑ. Per la storia e le fonti della prime grammatiche greche a stampa". *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*. 5: 321–351.

Pinborg, Jan
1974   "Antike Grammatiktheorie". *Grundzüge der Literatur- und Sprachwissenschaft*, Vol. II: *Sprachwissenschaft*. Ed. by Volker Sinemus, Heinz Ludwig Arnold. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 91–97.

Pontani, Filippomaria
2011   "Ex Homero grammatica". *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts*. Ed. by Stephanos Matthaios, Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 87–104.

Primavesi, Oliver
1994   "Casus-πτῶσις. Zum aristotelischen Ursprung eines umstrittenen grammatischen Terminus". *Antike und Abendland*. 40: 86–97.

Reynolds, Leighton Durham / Wilson, Nigel Guy
2013   *Scribes and Scholars: a guide to the transmission of Greek and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robins, Robert H.
1993   *The Byzantine Grammarians. Their place in history*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
1996   "The Initial Section of the *Tékhnē grammatikě*". *Ancient grammar: content and context*. Ed. by Pierre Swiggers, Alfons Wouters. Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 3–15.
1997   *A Short History of Linguistics*. 4th ed. New York: Longman.

Rollo, Antonio
2002   "Problemi e prospettive della ricerca su Manuele Crisolora". Maisano/Rollo (2002: 31–85).
2012   *Gli Erotemata tra Crisolora e Guarino*. Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici.

Sabbadini, Remigio
1896   *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese*. Catania: Francesco Galati.

Salutati, Coluccio
1896   *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati a cura di Francesco Novati*. Vol. 3. Roma: Forzani. (Fonti per la storia d'Italia. 17.).

Signes Codoñer, Juan
2016   *La quimera de los gramáticos: historia de la voz media del verbo griego en la*

tradición gramatical desde Apolonio Díscolo hasta Ludolf Küster y Philipp Butt-mann. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Sihler, Andrew L.
1995   *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stevens, Linton C.
1950   "How the French Humanists of the Renaissance Learned Greek". *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. 65(2): 240–248.

Taylor, Daniel J.
1990   "Dionysius Thrax vs Marcus Varro". *Historia Linguistica*. 17(1): 15–27.
1995   "Varro and Early Latin Language Science". *Concise History of the Language Sciences. From the Sumerians to the Cognitivist*. Ed. by E. F. Konrad Koerner, Ronald E. Asher. London: Pergamon, 103–107.
1996   *Varro — De Lingua Latina X: A new critical text and English translation with prolegomena and commentary*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Thorn-Wikkert, Lydia
2006   *Manuel Chrysoloras (ca. 1350–1415): Eine Biographie des byzantinischen Intel-lektuellen vor dem Hintergrund der hellenistischen Studien in der italienischen Renaissance*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Weiss, Roberto
1977   "Iacopo Angeli da Scarperia (c. 1360–1410–11)". *Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays*. Ed. by Roberto Weiss. Padua: Antenore, 255–77.

Wilson, Nigel Guy
1992   *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek studies in the Italian renaissance*. London: Duckworth.

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. he 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)