

Reconsidering Renaissance Greek Grammars through the Case of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*

Erika Nuti

THE HISTORY of modern Western culture was substantially decided in 1397, when Manuel Chrysoloras started teaching Greek to Florentine humanists.¹ In just three years, they would become not only confident with the structures of the ancient Greek language, but also be able to translate intensively the greatest Greek authors into good classical Latin.² Especially in recent decades, many scholars have been investigating this teaching experience from various points of view, including Chrysoloras' life and reasons for teaching,³

¹ On Chrysoloras' life see G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo I Manuele Crisolora* (Florence 1941); on his teaching activity see R. Maisano and A. Rollo (eds.), *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente* (Naples 2002), particularly the papers by A. Rollo, "Problemi e prospettive della ricerca su Manuele Crisolora" 31–85, and J. Hankins, "Chrysoloras and the Greek Studies of Leonardo Bruni" 175–203. See also I. Thomson, "Manuel Chrysoloras and the Early Italian Renaissance," *GRBS* 7(1966) 63–82, and N. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (London 1992).

² For a schematic view of the translations by Chrysoloras' Florentine pupils see R. Weiss, *Medieval and Humanistic Greek* (Padua 1977), esp. 227–254, and Hankins, in *Manuele Crisolora* 183–195. For a general overview on the 15th-century translations and bibliographical information see P. Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe. Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts (1396–1529)* (London 2010) 72–113.

³ See the introduction by E. V. Maltese to M. Crisolora, *Roma parte del Cielo. Confronto tra l'Antica e la Nuova Roma* (Torino 2000); also E. Nuti, "Sal-

his pedagogy, and the outcome of his teaching,⁴ i.e. its success, its effects on his famous pupils, and the extensive albeit slow spread of Greek throughout the West.⁵ The main point of interest decidedly has been Chrysoloras' grammar, *Erotemata*. In 1962 Agostino Pertusi published an article on the development of Greek grammar from late antiquity through the Byzantine period and up to the age of Humanism.⁶ Since then, all have agreed that the success of Chrysoloras' teaching was due to his innovative approach to the theoretical system of Greek grammar, in particular the noun declensions.⁷ Nevertheless, there is still no critical edition of *Erotemata*, despite its great importance in the development of modern Western culture.⁸ Consequently,

vezza delle lettere greche. Ideali e Real Politik negli scritti degli umanisti bizantini," *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 32 (2012) 119–137.

⁴ See in particular F. Ciccolella, *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance* (Leiden/Boston 2008) 97–102, and "Greek Grammars and Elementary Readings in the Italian Renaissance," in O. Pecere and L. Del Corso (eds.), *Libri di scuola e pratiche didattiche dall'Antichità al Rinascimento* (Cassino 2010) 577–605.

⁵ On the success of Chrysoloras' teaching and grammar see Botley, *Learning* 7–12. For an overview of the spread of the Greek studies, D. J. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West* (London 1989) part I; J. Monfasani, "L'insegnamento universitario e la cultura bizantina in Italia nel Quattrocento," in L. Avellini et al. (eds.), *Sapere e/è potere. Discipline, dispute e professioni nell'università medievale e moderna* (Bologna 1990) 43–65; Maisano and Rollo, *Manuele Crisolora*; Ciccolella, *Donati* 97–150.

⁶ A. Pertusi, "Erotemata. Per la storia e le fonti delle prime grammatiche greche a stampa," *IMU* 5 (1962) 321–351.

⁷ See in particular Ch. Förstel, *Les grammaires grecques du XV^e siècle: étude sur les ouvrages de Manuel Chrysoloras, Théodore Gaza et Constantin Lascaris* (Paris 1992) I 148–153; F. Ciccolella, "The Greek Donatus and the Study of Greek in the Renaissance," *IJCT* 12 (2005) 1–24, esp. 6–10.

⁸ Förstel, *Les grammaires* II 3–43, presents a critical edition based on only one manuscript, *Vat. Pal. gr.* 116; convinced that this manuscript contains the most ancient and authoritative of all of the extant copies and considering the complex situation of the textual transmission, he followed Bedier's position and chose the criterion of *codex optimus* or *vetustissimus*. For more on this

scholars lack a text by which to study the original contents of the grammar. This represents a major obstacle in the analysis of *Erotemata*'s chronology and its location as to composition, evolution, and influence.

In this article I will first identify the reasons for this apparent paradox and then urge some guidelines that could be useful for research on *Erotemata*. Finally, I will propose a different approach to the study of Renaissance Greek grammars, starting with the lesson that can be learned from the case of Chrysoloras.

Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* is preserved in more than a hundred manuscripts⁹ and many printed editions,¹⁰ but, so far as we know, there is neither an autograph nor a copy that could be related to any of Chrysoloras' Florentine pupils with any degree of certainty. Furthermore, the text, as it appears in the manuscripts or in print, varies so greatly from one source to another that it really needs to be considered as having many distinct versions. The situation is particularly complicated by the compendium made by Guarino Veronese, the only pupil of Chrysoloras who is known to have taught Greek in the West.¹¹ In this compendium, Guarino probably summarized, integrated, and changed Chrysoloras' original grammar, in order to meet Western students' demand for a simple, essential, yet exhaustive introductory grammar.¹² The compendium was

manuscript, on Förstel's edition, and on the debate about the methodological approach to editing *Erotemata*, see below.

⁹ For a fairly complete list see A. Rollo, *Gli Erotemata tra Crisolora e Guarino* (Messina 1994), ch. 2.

¹⁰ A complete list of Renaissance printed editions is provided by Botley, *Learning* 120–154.

¹¹ For information on him see Wilson, *From Byzantium* 42–47.

¹² Förstel, *Les Grammaires* I 176–179, states that Guarino never abridged a long version of Chrysoloras' work, but instead expanded and rationalized some shorter notes taken in class. Although this hypothesis is intriguing, it has not been taken up by scholars, probably for two main reasons. First, even if, as Förstel demonstrated, Guarino never stated that he made an abridgment from Chrysoloras' manual, most tend to believe the humanist

probably made while Chrysoloras was still alive and, thanks to the success of Guarino's school, it was widely distributed in all humanistic circles, to such an extent that there are many more manuscripts of the compendium than of the long version of *Erotemata*. Furthermore, Guarino's work was printed several times before Chrysoloras' text appeared in print in its so-called original form (though, as we shall see, the term 'original' proves to be quite problematic). The compendium circulated in different versions as well, and many contemporary manuscripts contained variants originating from the contamination between the compendium and Chrysoloras' hypothetical original text.¹³ Given this scenario, every effort to reconstruct the archetype, let alone the original, seems destined to fail.

In 1994 Antonio Rollo attempted to set the manuscript tradition of *Erotemata* in order, but was unable to reconstruct the original text with any degree of certainty.¹⁴ This failure was caused by his purely philological approach to the text, and thus demonstrated the inadequacy of confronting this text solely

tradition, which always spoke of Guarino's work as a compendium. Second, his assumption is based on the antiquity and authority of *Vat.pal.gr.* 116 (P); believing that this manuscript contained *Erotemata* when Guarino bought it in Constantinople in 1406, Förstel could infer that the original text was as short as the one contained in this manuscript, that Guarino integrated it in order to suit Western needs, and that all the longer versions of *Erotemata* were incorrectly considered the original ones because they are all contaminated with other texts. I think that this apparently visionary theory should be taken into consideration. Although its presupposition—the antiquity of P's version—was incorrect (see below), the idea that the original corpus of *Erotemata* should be short is valuable, considering the line of evolution of Chrysoloras' grammars described in the second part of the present article and the meaning of the word *compendium* in Humanism (see n.43).

¹³ The differences in early printed editions of *Erotemata* have recently been studied by F. Ciccolella, "Tra Bisanzio e l'Italia: grammatiche greche e greco-latine in età umanistica," *StudUmanistPiceni* 29 (2009) 397–410.

¹⁴ Rollo, *Gli Erotemata*.

with the methods of classical philology.¹⁵ Nonetheless, Rollo's work is valuable for several reasons:¹⁶ not only did he make a *recensio* of all the manuscripts containing a grammar which can be linked to Chrysoloras' model text, but he also prepared a detailed philological *collatio* of part of them. Moreover, he identified three main lines in the tradition—the long one, the Guarinian one, and the contaminated one—dividing each into subcategories. Though Rollo's conclusions may be questionable,¹⁷ his analysis reveals some important points. First of all, as Rollo himself noted several times, the great textual variety must have to do with the nature of *Erotemata* and its use in schools: the very fact that it was a manual opened it up to modifications by teachers and scholars in accordance with their own needs. In other words, Rollo's study revealed and confirmed the great dynamism of grammatical texts in the 15th century. Second, he was the first to shed light on the fact that the *editio princeps* of the full text (Florence 1496) is a contaminated text. Third, his *recensio* provide us with data to confirm the suspicion that in the

¹⁵ On the deficiencies and obstacles of classical philology concerning the transmission of manuals and popular texts and on the necessity of adapting Lachmann method to the textual tradition of all kinds of texts, see G. Orlandi, "Perché non possiamo non dirci lachmanniani," *Filologia mediolatina* 2 (1995) 1–42, and P. O. Kristeller, "The Lachmann Method: Merits and Limitations," *Texts* 1 (1981) 11–20.

¹⁶ Förstel, *Les Grammaires* I, had already mentioned the majority of Rollo's assumptions in general terms, personally checking a few cases. Rollo's great contribution was to verify them in the tradition with an in-depth, albeit partial, *collatio*.

¹⁷ Because of his strictly philological approach, Rollo failed to take into account the context, audience, and specific purposes of each copy of *Erotemata*. Nor did he discuss the contents of every copy in relation to the other texts (anthologies or grammatical treatises) which in the manuscripts often accompany Chrysoloras' grammar. When the context is overlooked, any statement on the contents of *Erotemata* becomes questionable, as it does not take into account the underlying factors that influenced them. See V. Fera and S. Rizzo, "La filologia umanistica tra filologia classica e filologia romanza," in A. Ferrari (ed.), *Filologia classica e filologia romanza: esperienze ecdotiche a confronto* (Spoleto 1998) 33–65.

15th century the compendium and the short versions were much more widespread, while at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries the long versions prevailed, thanks to the Aldine edition (1512).¹⁸ In addition, his research demon-

¹⁸ To give an idea of the difference in length between short and long versions, mention should be made of the Aldine edition, which contains both Chrysoloras' long version and Guarino's compendium (*Erōtēmata tou Chrysolōra. Peri anōmalōn rhēmātōn. Peri schematismou tōn chronōn ek tōn Chalkondylou. To tetarton tou Gazēs, peri syntaxeōs. Peri enklitikōn. Gnōmai monostichoi ek diaphorōn poiētōn. Dionusiou periegesis*. Venetiis in aedibus Aldii 1512). There, in a small-format book, *Erotemata* (in the form of a contaminated and expanded text) occupies ff. 3–115 and the Guarinian official compendium (a reprint of the Guarinian compendia printed in the Quattrocento) covers 316–409, but the text of the Guarinian compendium is full of lists of conjugations, so as to occupy much more space on the page. The following are examples from my own research on some copies of *Erotemata* preserved at the Vatican Library in Rome and the Estense Library in Modena:

• *Vat. Barb. gr.* 33 (mm. 183 x 131) contains a fine 15th-century parchment copy of the long version of *Erotemata*, which corresponds to the Aldine ed. with minor abridgments in the final part (for more information see the well-constructed catalogue by V. Capocci [Città del Vaticano 1958]): it occupies ff. 1–73 with twenty-three lines per page written in a fine, minute script (but only half of the page is written in Greek, the other half containing the Latin translation). *Vat. Chisan. gr.* 21 contains a short version of *Erotemata* (more or less the Guarinian compendium), ff. 1–38, in a layout very similar to the Barberini copy; 186 x 136 mm. with twenty lines per page. Finally, *Vat. Pal. gr.* 144 contains a redaction considered by Rollo to be not too far from the original one, halfway between the Guarinian compendium and the long version printed in Florence in 1496 and in Venice by Aldus in 1512: the text of *Erotemata*, copied in the mid 15th century (watermark: *ciseaux* 72 in D. and J. Harlfinger, *Wasserzeichen aus griechischen Handschriften* [Berlin 1974–1980]), occupies ff. 1–55 in a layout that closely resembles the Barberini and Chigi copies.

• *Vat. Regin. gr.* 163 is a fine copy of *Erotemata* in its long version with inter-linear translation, corresponding perfectly to the Aldine ed. and copied by George Hermonimos in the second half of the 15th century (see E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600* [Vienna 1981–1997: henceforth *RGK*] III.A no. 102): in a small-format manuscript, the text occupies ff. 1–171 with 11 lines per page. *Mutin. gr.* α.F 9.11 (= *gr.* 251) contains the Guarinian compendium, abridged in the verb section; a small-format manuscript (mm. 80 x 140) with text occupying ff. 1–

strated that there was a simultaneous circulation of various longer and shorter versions of Chrysoloras' grammar. Lastly, Rollo discovered that the actual date and place of composition of *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116, which until then had been reputed to preserve the most ancient and authoritative version, had to be revised.

Before proposing new methodological approaches to these issues in research on Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*, it would be useful to provide further information about *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116 (P). Rollo's study has not reached a wide audience and even today many scholars are convinced of the antiquity of P.¹⁹

The general opinion on the antiquity of this manuscript surfaced in 1962, when Agostino Pertusi (reading all too philologically a piece of information in Sabbadini)²⁰ stated that P was the most ancient extant copy of *Erotemata* because Guarino had bought P in Constantinople in 1406. Pertusi probably did not examine the manuscript directly and even failed to consult Stevenson's catalogue, for he said that the *Erotemata* was to be found at the end of the manuscript, when in fact it is at the beginning (ff. 1–21^r) and is followed by three comedies of Aristophanes (*Plutus*, *Clouds*, *Frogs*). This is very important because Guarino's note with the date and place of purchase is

71 with 15 lines per page, copied by Demetrios Sguropulos in the first half of the 15th century (*RGK* I.A no. 101). Finally, *Vat.gr.* 2338, copied by Constantine Lascaris, contains a copy very similar to *Vat.Pal.gr.* 144, but more abridged in the final section: the text occupies ff. 1–51 in a medium-format (on this copy see below).

¹⁹ This belief is repeated in the most recent publications on *Erotemata*, e.g. Ciccolella, *Donati* 119, and Botley, *Learning* 7.

²⁰ R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Veronese* (Catania 1896) 11–12: “la presenza di Guarino nella capitale greca è attestata da due documenti: l'uno la sottoscrizione autografa a un codice di Aristofane e degli *Erotemata* del Crisolora.” It is clear that Pertusi imagined much more than what Sabbadini had actually written: “la grammatica del Crisolora fu in possesso abbastanza presto anche di Guarino. Un codice di Aristofane da lui comprato a Costantinopoli nel 1406 reca alla fine gli *Erotemata* del maestro bizantino” (*IMU* 5 [1962] 324–325).

written on the manuscript's last folio;²¹ if it had appeared immediately after the copy of *Erotemata*, it would be clear that the manuscript purchased by Guarino already contained Chrysoloras' text. But in fact the *subscriptio* follows Aristophanes' comedies and refers only to that part of the manuscript. Therefore, if Pertusi had examined the manuscript, he would have inferred that it did not necessarily contain *Erotemata* when Guarino purchased it in Constantinople in 1406.²²

A codicological and palaeographical analysis shows that the manuscript can be divided into three sections:²³

²¹ 141^v: "Aristophaneos (sic) liber mei Guarini emptus Const(antinopoli) anno ab incarnatione Domini MCCCCVI die p^o Martii."

²² The main reason for these misunderstandings was most likely the incorrect description of the manuscript in Stevenson's catalogue (H. Stevenson, *Codices manuscriptorum Palatini graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae* [Città del Vaticano 1885] 55). Stevenson stated that the copyist Alexius had written the invocation to God on f. 101, that he copied ff. 1–101, and that Guarino's subscription was at the end of the manuscript (f. 141^v). Instead, Alexius' invocation is located at f. 141, immediately before Guarino's note. There is no possibility that the order of the folios was different when Stevenson compiled his catalogue, because Alexius' invocation and Guarino's note are written on the same page and Alexius copied all the comedies, including *Frogs* (ff. 101–140). Stevenson probably believed that Alexius, who signed the manuscript at the end, was the copyist of the entire manuscript, but he made a mistake when transcribing the number of the folia in the catalogue (writing 101 instead of 141 for the folium of Alexius' invocation). This minor mistake led to Sabbadini's false supposition: reading the catalogue, he believed that Alexius had written ff. 1–101 (i.e. *Erotemata*, Aristophanes' life, the introduction to the comedies, and *Plutus* and *Clouds*) and that another hand soon after Alexius had copied *Frogs* (Sabbadini read that Guarino's note was located at the end of the manuscript and *Erotemata* could not have been written before 1390s). Thus, Pertusi's misinterpretation of Sabbadini's passage has furthered the misunderstandings.

²³ This division is made by *RGK* III as well, stating that ff. 25–140 were copied by Alexius (III.A and C no. 16) and ff. 23–24 by Theodore Gaza (III.A no. 211), but as to ff. 1–21 merely mentioning that they had been falsely attributed to Manuel Achilleios (III.A no. 187e). This information is very important, for it represents a correction of widely accepted data. However, scholars have failed to take it into consideration because of extensive

A. ff. 1–21: *Erotemata*

B. ff. 23–24: Aristophanes' *bios* and introductions to the first comedy, *Plutus*, with a list of the characters.

C. ff. 25–141: Aristophanes' *Plutus*, *Clouds*, *Frogs*, with scholia, general notes and glosses in Greek and Latin.

These three sections have very distinct features:

A. PAPER: uniform in all of this section, light yellow, thick and smoothed down, clearly visible structure, watermarks unidentified in repertoria. Original quire NUMERATION in Arabic numerals (ff. 1^r, 9^r, 17^r), centered in the bottom margin. LAYOUT: 26 lines per page. Black INK for the main text, somewhat faded red ink for headings and capital letters. SCRIPT: conventional, with many elements from traditional τὼν Ὀδηγῶν style, mainly squared and tending toward bilinearism and characterized by a search for harmony, clarity, and equilibrium. NOTEWORTHY LETTERS: *delta* with a small body and a large, curved leg inclined to the left; heart-shaped *beta*; large *theta*; *phi* with a curl over the circle; large *lambda* with a short, inclined leg; traditional *nu* with a short leg.

B. PAPER: thick and porous, light yellow, watermarks and paper structure not visible. LAYOUT: 24 lines per page. Light brown INK for the main text, somewhat faded red ink for headings and capital letters. SCRIPT: attributed to Theodore Gaza (identification in *RGK* III.A no. 211; plates in I.C no. 128 from a manuscript dated around 1420–1427, and in P. Eleuteri and P. Canart, *Scritture greche nell' Umanesimo italiano* [Milan 1991] no. 1).

C. PAPER: rough, brown-yellow, with different types of very basic

confusion in the presentation of the data. *RGK* III gives no references to indicate where this new hypothetical division has been discussed (e.g. Rollo, *Gli Erotemata*), and, more importantly, does not provide any example of the hand that copied ff. 1–21. Furthermore, inspection of Vogel and Gardthausen's catalogue in which *RGK* claims to have found the mistake (M. Vogel and V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* [Leipzig 1909]) shows that there was no mistake at all. First, Vogel and Gardthausen state (p.14) that Alexius wrote *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116 in the 14th century and that this manuscript contains a copy of Aristophanes with scholia, without any mention of *Erotemata*. Second, Emanuel Achilleius, the copyist to whom *RGK* III referred when speaking of Vogel and Gardthausen's alleged mistake, is in fact mentioned in Vogel and Gardthausen as the copyist of *Vat.Pal.gr.* 125 in 1559, and not of *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116.

watermarks composed of simple groups of circles, squares, and letters, similar to Briquet 3514–16 (Italy, first half of the 14th century), the prevalent one being very similar to Briquet 3191 (Holland, 1359) and Harlfinger, *Cercles* 13 (found in a manuscript written in Thessaloniki by Cabasilas in 1343).²⁴ Original quire NUMERATION in Greek every eight folia, written in the central bottom margin in red or brown ink; missing many of the original numbers, which were cut away during the restoration process. LAYOUT: varied. Dark brown INK for the main text, light brown or red for the scholia and other notes in Greek, black or brown for the notes and glosses in Latin, depending on the hand. SCRIPT in the main text and the scholia: a scholarly script of the first half of the 14th century adopted by the otherwise unknown Alexius; cursive, with an effort to separate the letters and avoid excessive disequilibrium, but with some elements remaining from the so-called *Fettaugenmode*; overall rough, heavy, untidy, and rather unharmonious in appearance.

To sum up, a careful examination of both codicological and palaeographical data shows that these three sections were copied by different hands in different contexts and periods. Analysis of the paper indicates that section C was copied around the mid-14th century²⁵ and was later intensively studied in the West, as is shown by the many notes and glosses made by Western teachers and students on the Aristophanes texts. Conversely, the paper, layout, numeration, and ink in sections A and B indicate that they were copied at two different times and most likely in the West, although the watermarks of these two sections have not been found or identified in the repertoria. The contents show that section B is a reconstruction of the first two folios of Aristophanes' comedies, which probably had been lost or damaged. It should be noted that Gaza tried to reproduce the codicological and palaeographical features of Aristophanes' other prefatory sections. Consequently, Gaza's

²⁴ C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes* (Paris 1907); Harlfinger, *Wasserzeichen*.

²⁵ Alexius' hand resembles some hands of Triclinius' circle. On that circle, its copyists, and its handwritten products see D. Bianconi, *Tessalonica nell'età dei Paleologi* (Paris 2005) 91–182.

was an attempt at philological restoration. Analysis of the writing in section C confirms the codicological data and also suggests some hypotheses regarding the context in which it was produced; a similar analysis also confirms that sections A and B were composed at different locations. Moreover, it reveals that B was copied by Theodore Gaza, the well-known Byzantine scholar, teacher of Greek in Mantua (1443–1445) and Ferrara (1446–1449), and later counselor to the Pope and translator for the Roman humanist circle.²⁶ He probably wrote these two folios while teaching in Ferrara, where Guarino, the original owner of the manuscript, taught as well, both at the university and in his own humanist boarding school.²⁷

As for A, the section in which we are now mainly interested, codicological and palaeographical data indicate that it was added after Guarino's purchase, but the place and the date remain an open issue. Rollo seems to be convinced that it was written by a Byzantine copyist in the East and later added to the manuscript containing Aristophanes by Guarino himself, in order to create a teaching miscellany using two manuscripts to which he was particularly attached. I believe it may have been

²⁶ On Gaza's teaching in Vittorino da Feltre's boarding school in Mantua see N. Wilson, *From Byzantium* 34–35. On his teaching at the University of Ferrara see J. Monfasani, "L'insegnamento di Teodoro Gaza a Ferrara," in M. Bertozzi (ed.), *Alla corte degli Estensi: filosofia, arte e cultura a Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI* (Ferrara 1994) 5–17. Monfasani demonstrates that Theodore Gaza taught Greek to finance his own studies on Aristotelian physics and medicine at Italian universities. For a full overview of his life and his political and cultural activities see D. Geanakoplos, "Theodore Gaza, a Byzantine Scholar of the Palaeologan 'Renaissance' in the Early Italian Renaissance," *Constantinople* 68–90.

²⁷ In Ferrara, Guarino was the personal tutor of Leonello d'Este between 1430 and 1435, then a well-paid communal teacher, and finally humanities professor at the University of Ferrara from its opening (January 18, 1442) until his death in 1460. In the meantime, he headed one of the earliest humanist boarding schools, which he had founded and where he also taught both Latin and Greek. For further data on his teaching see P. Grendler, *Schooling in Renaissance Italy. Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600* (Baltimore 1989) 126–129, and Wilson, *From Byzantium* 42–47.

copied later in the West, and most likely in Mantua or Ferrara, where Guarino, Vittorino da Feltre, and Theodore Gaza had contact with one another while teaching Latin and Greek.²⁸ Not only Guarino, but probably Gaza as well taught Greek through Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* in Ferrara, and it is likely that they both lectured on Aristophanes.²⁹ Moreover, in the first half of the Quattrocento other manuscripts contain short versions of *Erotemata* together with anthologies of Attic comedy and tragedy, as we shall see. Therefore, it is likely that *Erotemata* was added to Aristophanes' manuscript in this early humanist Western circle to create a teaching miscellany. Further evidence may be given by a careful comparison between A's hand and the writings of Vittorino's and Gaza's pupils, because at first sight, in the general aspects and in the noteworthy letters, A's hand shows a strong similarity to some of them, especially Giovanni Tortelli.³⁰ This is, of course, only a suggestion, but one which I hope will be considered by expert palaeographers;

²⁸ Vittorino da Feltre (1378–1446) had been taught Greek by Guarino in Venice in 1414 before establishing his own boarding school in Mantua, where Theodore Gaza studied Latin and taught Greek between 1440 and 1445. Gaza then moved to Ferrara, where he certainly had the opportunity to meet Guarino and many of his pupils. On Vittorino's own education and boarding school see Grendler, *Schooling* 129–130; Wilson, *From Byzantium* 34–41; and M. Cortesi, "Libri di lettura e libri di grammatica alla scuola di Vittorino da Feltre," in *Libri di scuola* 607–635.

²⁹ On the use of Aristophanes in the humanist schools of Greek see Botley, *Learning* 88–91, and M. A. Pincelli, *Andrea Brenta, In principio lectionis Aristophanis praeludia. La prolusione al corso su Aristofane* (Rome 1993) 7–29.

³⁰ Tortelli studied in Vittorino's school, but before Gaza had begun teaching there. Later he became the first librarian of the Vatican Library and in Rome had many contacts with Gaza, who was the official translator of Pope Niccolò V's humanist circle. On Tortelli's life, scholarly activity, and writing see M. Reggiosi, "Nuove ricerche intorno a Giovanni Tortelli," *IMU* 9 (1966) 123–189; M. D. Rinaldi, "Fortuna e diffusione del *De Orthographia* di Giovanni Tortelli," *IMU* 16 (1973) 227–262; M. Cortesi, "Il *Vocabularium* greco di Giovanni Tortelli," *IMU* 22 (1979) 445–483; Eleuteri and Canart, *Scritture greche* 184–186.

a clear understanding not only of A's hand, but also of the Latin hands who made glosses in section C would better reveal the history of this manuscript within Byzantine and Western scholarly circles.

Thus, the copy of *Erotemata* was added to the rest of the manuscript after Guarino's purchase, and the place and time of this addition cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. Furthermore, P contains not a long version of Chrysoloras' grammar, but a short one, even more essential than Guarino's compendium and in some ways linked to it. Rollo believes that P's version of *Erotemata* was the first version of Guarino's compendium, because here the text is more basic and primitive than in all the other compendia. Moreover, he thinks that section A was copied in the East from a text created by Guarino under Chrysoloras' supervision; consequently, in Rollo's opinion, P is the only compendium that can be directly linked to Chrysoloras' teaching. This means that P should still be considered an authoritative copy, but only to study the process of composition and spread of the Guarinian compendium, not as the basis for a critical edition of Chrysoloras' original grammar.³¹ Contrary to Rollo's opinion, I believe that section A was copied many years after Guarino's purchase; in my view, the text of *Erotemata* was so brief because it was actually a summary from the Guarinian compendium. In any case, the *Erotemata* transmitted by P cannot be dated 1406; this grammar is very similar to the Guarinian compendium, and, so far as we know, that compendium was published around 1418, when some other dated manuscripts of *Erotemata* were circulating.³² Thus there is no evidence that P is the most ancient copy of *Erotemata* or that it is directly related to Chrysoloras' teaching. This means that the only copy of *Erotemata* that has been considered

³¹ See n.12 above on Förstel's critical edition.

³² For example, *Vindob. Suppl. gr.* 75, copied by John Chortasmenos in 1416 (long version), or *Harleian.* 6506, a personal version, arranged and copied between 1415 and 1417 by Sozomenus, one of Guarino's Florentine pupils.

authoritative is in fact very questionable. As a result, there is really no version of *Erotemata* that can rise above the others and serve as the basis for a critical edition of Chrysoloras' grammar.

This means that a change in methodology is fundamental. A more correct approach would be to focus on the most significant copies of *Erotemata* (e.g. the most ancient copy for each kind of version), editing and studying their contents according to where and why they were produced.³³ A study of individual copies could then pave the way for two lines of research. One

³³ Förstel, *Les grammaires* I 180: "chaque témoin des *Erotemata* devient une source potentielle pour l'histoire de l'enseignement du grec au XV^e et peut-être au XVI^e siècle ... Il serait en effet nécessaire de pouvoir rattacher chaque manuscrit à l'environnement particulier dont il est issu." Unfortunately, Förstel did not develop these assumptions. Instead, Ciccolella, *Donati* 158–172, 198–208, and 229–260, provided an example of this method, based on the contextualization of each manuscript, for another widely distributed manual of elementary Greek; there she did not renounce the effort to make a critical edition, but she based it on a solid contextualization that provides the means to better understand the text and to make progress in the understanding of the Western revival of Greek, its leading figures, its instruments, and its features. In "Codicum lectionem servavi. Riflessioni sull'edizione di alcuni testi grammaticali di età umanistica," in E. Bona et al. (eds.), *Vestigia notitiae. Scritti in memoria di Michelangelo Giusta* (Alessandria 2012) 265–281, she discusses her choices in editing a grammatical text. She makes a good compromise between the old-fashioned methods of classical philology and the extreme position of the New Philology, developing an approach that Förstel had imagined but not carried out. I believe that the creation of digital archives of manuscripts and early printed editions can help in work on *Erotemata*, but they will always remain tools. Scholars can use them to find information, but will then have to make an interpretation, be it philological or historical; see L. Leonardi, "Filologia elettronica tra conservazione e ricostruzione," in *Digital Philology and Medieval Texts* (2006: www.infotext.unisi.it/upload/DIGIMED06/book/leonardi.pdf). On the textual transmission of the late antique novels and technical texts, Mario De Nonno stated that it is fundamental to realize synoptic editions; or, in the case of *excerpta* and epitomes, editing the line of each textual tradition can be very useful to understand better the history of the text and its circulation and functions: "Testi greci e latini in movimento: Riflessi nella tradizione manoscritta e nella prassi editoriale," in *Filologia classica e filologia romanza* 221–239.

would involve studying Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* through comparative methodology to gain a better understanding of the contents. The results would center on Chrysoloras as a historical figure and on the various possible audiences intended for his grammar. This form of research would thus shed light on the reasons behind Chrysoloras' teaching and innovative approach and their relation to grammatical tradition, as well as on more specific aspects of his pedagogy. Another field of study would focus on comparing the extant copies of this grammar and the data contained in the manuscripts and printed editions of many other Renaissance Greek grammars, in order to draw some conclusions regarding the dynamics of textual transmission both of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* and other Renaissance Greek grammars. Indeed, the case of Chrysoloras may help us create some methodological guidelines for research on other Greek grammars of the Renaissance and clarify some dynamics of grammatical texts in the humanist cultural environment.

In what follows I discuss the latter line of research, in order to give an idea of what results can be achieved by this approach. As already mentioned, several versions of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* were circulating at the same time, and every version was related to a specific cultural environment; in other words, every version was made to respond to the specific demands of one or more students in a particular school and at a particular stage of their training in Greek. The years 1410–1420 saw the initial stage of the manuscript tradition of *Erotemata*. Three versions of *Erotemata* are extant from that period:

Harleian. 6506, dated between 1415 and 1417, was owned by Sozomenus, Guarino's pupil in Florence ca. 1410–1415 and teacher of Greek in the following decade; the manuscript contains a short redaction, but longer than the Guarinian compendium and only partially similar.³⁴

³⁴ On the contents and structure of this version of *Erotemata* see S. Zamponi, "Un ignoto compendio sozomeniano degli 'Erotemata' di Manuele Crisolora," *Rinascimento* 18 (1978) 251–270, at 256, 263–267. For a brief description of the manuscript with plates see A. C. de la Mare, *The Handwriting*

Vindob. Suppl. gr. 75, copied by John Chortasmenos in the East between 1410 and 1416, contains a long and articulated version on ff. 61^v–94^r.³⁵

Guarino's compendium, published around 1418,³⁶ is preserved by several manuscripts copied in the first half of the Quattrocento. Their length is usually between 30 and 40 folios in the medium-format manuscripts.³⁷

Even if all these manuscripts originated from Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* and were produced in the same years, they contain three different texts, and their differences are understandable only when related to their owners' needs and cultural environment.

of *Italian Humanists I* (Oxford 1973) 91–103. The manuscript, a parchment palimpsest, contains only *Erotemata*; the text occupies 31 folios with 15 lines per page.

³⁵ For discussion of the contents of this MS. see H. Hunger, "Johannes Chortasmenos, ein byzantinischer Intellektueller der späten Palaiologenzeit," *WS* 70 (1957) 153–163, and on its chronology *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370–ca. 1430–37): Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften* (Vienna 1969) 54–63; for a general overview see P. Canart and G. Prato, "Les recueils organisés par Jean Chortasménos et le problème de ses autographes," in H. Hunger and O. Kresten (eds.), *Studien zum Patriarchatsregister von Konstantinopel I* (Vienna 1981) 115–178. The MS. is an ample miscellany: the text of *Erotemata* was copied by one of Chortasmenos' assistants, occupying all of the page (173 x 97 mm.) in 26 lines, and the title was written by Chortasmenos himself. For a description with full bibliography see H. Hunger and C. Hannick (eds.), *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek IV Supplementum Graecum* (Vienna 1994) 124–130.

³⁶ As Ciccolella, in *Libri di scuola* 584–585 n.18, inferred from a careful reading of R. Sabbadini, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese III* (Venice 1919) 76–77, Guarino probably made two adaptations from Chrysoloras' grammar: first he may have made a short abridgement when urged by Francesco Barbaro in 1418, and later he may have expanded it for his classes. It is difficult to say what the features of each one were; the many copies of the Guarinian compendium are often dissimilar due to the needs of the different contexts, so we have actually far more than just two versions.

³⁷ E.g. *Roma, Bibl. Nazion. Centr.*, *Graecus* 17; *Canonicon. Class. gr.* 26; *Vindob. Suppl. gr.* 117.

Sozomenus' manuscript is the personal copy of a good student of Greek who, starting from the lessons of elementary Greek with Guarino and from a version of Chrysoloras' original *Erotemata* to which he possibly had access, created a systematic manual that was easy to use and exhaustive for an elementary knowledge of the language.³⁸

Chortasmenos' *Vindob. Suppl. gr.* 75 was probably copied in the East, and its complexity can be explained in two ways. The first and more likely explanation is that it was a copy for a secondary school teacher of grammar and rhetoric. In this case, a long version of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* would have been more useful than other traditional grammars, such as Moschopoulos', because Chrysoloras had created an easier system; but in order to be acceptable in the Byzantine mindset, Chrysoloras' text had to be as long as the other traditional grammars and include every exception or detail. This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the contents of the first part of the manuscript. It is an ample miscellany and, in the first half, contains comments and prolegomena to Aristotle's writings on rhetoric and logic, as well as some mathematical treatises; thus it has all the features of a scholarly copy for personal study and teaching at the higher levels in a small elite circle, perhaps also attended by some Western scholars.³⁹ Alternatively, the manuscript could

³⁸ The final part of this text proves helpful in understanding the intent of its redactor. After the verb section, it presents short sections on pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, conjugations, and paradigms of irregular verbs which are very similar to those in the Guarinian compendium. In this way, it provides a complete morphological overview of all eight parts of speech, though without too many theoretical details. Zamponi, *Rinascimento* 18 (1978) 251–270, pointed out that Sozomenus made a second adaptation, *Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare*, C.74. For more on this see below.

³⁹ The presence of a copy of *Erotemata* in Constantinople in 1416 is important in the debate regarding the place and date of Chrysoloras' composition, whether it was written in the East or the West, and whether it was written before or after his arrival in Florence. Without addressing this controversial issue now, it should nonetheless be mentioned that in Constantinople Chrysoloras taught students from the West (e.g. Guarino

be a copy that Chortasmenos made for his library in memory of his dear friend Chrysoloras; indeed, the manuscript contains some writings linked to Chortasmenos' own life and personal connections (a proluision for the return of the emperor, an epitaph, and an elegy for two friends, and some chronicles on the miracles of the Virgin Mary in Constantinople against the Turks).⁴⁰ Furthermore, Rollo considered the version of *Erotemata* contained in this manuscript to be very similar to the one in *Vat.Pal.gr.* 144.⁴¹ The version of *Erotemata* preserved by these two manuscripts represents a line of tradition linked to the copy of *Erotemata* made by the Byzantine scholar Constantine Lascaris in *Vat.gr.* 2338, though the latter has specific features due to the context of production.⁴² If we consider that both Lascaris and Chortasmenos taught advanced-level classes

Veronese) and East after his departure from Italy, and that Chortasmenos was one of his dearest friends and colleagues in scholarly and political pursuits. Consequently, there would be no reason to exclude the presence of the text in Constantinople since 1406/7 when Guarino was studying there, even if the text had been created in Florence for Western students. In my opinion, the place of composition of *Erotemata* cannot be identified with the place where we know the oldest extant manuscripts were copied, but can be determined by a careful analysis of the relationships between the contents and the needs of the two hypothetical audiences, the Western and the Byzantine. On the debate about place and date of composition of the work see Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini* 83; Pertusi, *IMU* 5 (1962) 339–340; Förstel, *Les grammairres* I 68–70; Rollo, in *Manuele Crisolora* 77; Ciccolella, *Donati* 119.

⁴⁰ The double use of this manuscript was discussed by Hunger, *WS* 70 (1957) 153–163, and *Johannes Chortasmenos* 54 (“Der Codex Suppl. gr. 75 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, der zum größten Teil ein Autographon des Chortasmenos darstellt, wurde zweifellos von unserem Autor selbst als eine Art Hausbuch zum privaten Gebrauch, aber auch zur Weitergabe an spätere Generationen angelegt”).

⁴¹ Rollo, *Gli Erotemata*, and *Problemi e prospettive* 77–79.

⁴² Rollo, *Gli Erotemata*, seems to consider Lascaris' Vatican copy to be partially independent of the line of tradition represented by Chortasmenos' text. I think we should speak in terms of different contexts of production of those versions instead of distinct lines of tradition. On Lascaris' texts of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* see below.

of Greek (though in different contexts) and copied texts for their libraries, friends, and pupils, often choosing old and very good redactions, the copy now in Vienna may be very similar to the original texts, with necessary adaptations required by the Byzantine context and the specific purposes of each copy.

The compendium by Guarino originated from his studies under Chrysoloras and his teaching Western students; moreover, his compendium had to be clear and easy, because it was addressed to Western teachers of elementary Greek and to Western students who wanted to learn by themselves. Consequently, we can imagine that Guarino made some revisions, deleting repetitions and long theoretical passages which were suitable only for a more advanced level.⁴³

⁴³ Given the impossibility of establishing the original version of Chrysoloras' grammar, there is no way of knowing just what Guarino removed or whether he removed anything (see n.12 above). In any case, as Guarino's text was called a compendium by his contemporaries, we can trust them for the fact that he made some abridgments. Nonetheless, it is also true that the words 'summary', 'compendium', and '*epitomé*' were often used at that time to indicate that the grammar was simple and summarized the eight parts of speech. Such is the case, for example, with Constantine Lascaris' grammar, which was entitled *Summary of the Eight Parts of Speech* because its author created a short manual after studying the complete tradition (see T. Martínez Manzano, *Constantino Láscaris: semblanza de un humanista bizantino* [Madrid 1998] 137–158). Guarino probably reduced the sections devoted to the rules of prosody and orthography, considering them of little use to the Western beginner, who needed to read the language rather than write perfect classical Greek. Instead, it can be readily established that he expanded the section on contract verbs, as can be inferred from the tradition. Whereas both Moschopulos and the long redactions of Chrysoloras' grammar list only the present tense for those verbs, because in the other tenses they behave like baritones, all printed versions of Guarino's compendium, as well as the contaminated version, also list the other tenses for these classes of verbs, because it was not easy for a non-Greek speaking student to understand their inflection—it is certainly no coincidence that Lascaris, Gaza, and the other writers of Greek grammars for Western students followed the same pattern as Guarino in the verb section (see Förstel, *Les grammaires* I 153–159). Instead, the Guarinian compendia of the first half of the Quattrocento, like *Mutin.gr.* K. 7.19 or *Mutin.gr.* α. F. 9.21, contain only the

But as already mentioned, the Guarinian compendium also circulated in copies whose contents differ in contexts and audience. For instance, *Laurent.Plut.* 59.33 contains 44 folios of *Erotemata* and 20 folios of sixty-one Aesopic fables. It is attributed to one of Uberto Decembrio's sons, Angelo, who studied in Ferrara under Guarino and Gaza and then went on to teach Greek. A recent study by Ciccolella shows that it is probably a copy made by one of Angelo's pupils based on the notes taken in class. She demonstrates that this grammar is "the result of a process of contamination between Guarino's edition of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* and a treatment of Greek grammar by Decembrio," and it is "one of the many 'experimental textbooks' created to teach Greek in the fifteenth century."⁴⁴ The fact that the grammar is found together with the Aesopic anthology makes clear that the author of this compendium needed an elementary grammar.

Another example, *Mutin.gr.* K. 7.19 (= *Campori App.* 81), is a fine parchment copy of a short version of Guarino's compendium⁴⁵ made by Constantine Lascaris, who taught Greek in Milan (1458–1465) and Messina (1466–1502).⁴⁶ To judge from

present tense for contract verbs; the change probably had to do with the passage from the first half of the Quattrocento to the second (see below). Therefore, we cannot know with any degree of certainty whether Guarino's original compendium already contained this expansion.

⁴⁴ F. Ciccolella, "When a Dead Tongue Speaks Again: The Revival of Greek Studies in the Renaissance," in M. Israels and L. A. Waldman (eds.), *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors* (forthcoming).

⁴⁵ Unlike the Guarinian compendium of the Aldine edition, this copy lacks the short notes at the end of the second and fourth declensions, the preliminary questions on persons and verb moods, the examples for future and perfect tenses of each of the baritone conjugations, and the chapter on patronymics and comparatives; moreover, it illustrates only the present for contract and athematic verbs.

⁴⁶ On Lascaris' life and teaching activity see J. M. Fernández Pomar, "La colección de Uceda y los manuscritos griegos de Constantino Láscaris," *Emerita* 34 (1966) 211–288, esp. 213–221; Martínez Manzano, *Constantino* 1–29; Förstel, *Les grammaires* I 85–99.

the script, this elegant copy may belong to Lascaris' Milanese period and was probably produced for one of his pupils as a pocket-sized compendium on the eight parts of speech.⁴⁷ It is likely that, during his early period of private teaching in Milan and before creating his own manual,⁴⁸ Lascaris chose Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* as a basic reference manual for his pupils⁴⁹ because its theoretical innovation in the noun system was the key to success with Western students. Additionally, Lascaris himself produced another copy of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* when he was in Messina (probably in the early period, to judge from the writing and codicological aspects).⁵⁰ It is the above-mentioned *Vat.gr.* 2338, whose text is similar to Chortasmenos' and

⁴⁷ The copy does not have any subscription or date, but palaeographical and codicological characteristics would locate it in Milan. On Lascaris' autographs and writing see Fernández Pomar, *Emerita* 34 (1966) 231–237, and Martínez Manzano, *Constantino* 77–81, for the features of Lascaris' writing in the different periods of his career and various aspects of his manuscripts. These studies demonstrate that all of Lascaris' precious autographs belong to the Milanese period. Moreover, in the books he produced in Milan Lascaris' writing has some peculiar features, described by Martínez Manzano (80): “la escritura del bizantino se hace mayor (en especial o, v y e adquieren un tamaño llamativo), más clara y algo más inclinada a la derecha. El trazo es más firme—la pluma utilizada es también más gruesa—y las letras más angulosas y menos abigarradas.” For samples of Lascaris' Milanese writing see Martínez Manzano plates 4–8.

⁴⁸ This manuscript seems to represent a preparatory stage in the creation of Lascaris' own grammar, as there is no mention either of Chrysoloras or *Erotemata* in the title; instead, Lascaris adopts the title that he gave to his own grammar, *The Summary of the Eight Parts of Speech* (*princeps ed.* Milan 1476, ISTC il00065000). For further information on Lascaris' *Summary* see Martínez Manzano, *Constantino* 137–141, and Förstel, *Les grammaires*.

⁴⁹ It is likely that this copy was owned by the famous humanist Giorgio Valla, Lascaris' Milanese pupil and later teacher of Greek, whose collection of Greek texts is preserved almost intact in the library of Modena.

⁵⁰ The copy has the peculiar features of the manuscripts copied by Lascaris in the first decades of his stay in Messina: it is written in black ink without any illumination, and the writing is very angular yet still clear and quite calligraphic. For samples of Lascaris' copies in Messina see Martínez Manzano, *Constantino* plates 2–3 and 9–11.

probably close to the original: its contents suggest that Lascaris probably made personal adaptations (both abridgments and expansions)⁵¹ to a quite long version of *Erotemata*⁵² based on his own manual and his teaching experience,⁵³ in order to offer a good intermediate-level manual to some of his pupils or to the Messinese library.

A third example, *Jena, Thuring.Univ., Provisoria* O. 25, was copied by the well-known Byzantine scholar Demetrios Chalcondylas during his first teaching experience in Padua, which began in 1463.⁵⁴ It contains a fairly short version, longer than the one in *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116, but shorter than the normal Guarinian compendium. This represents another personal attempt to create a good and simple manual for Chalcondylas' class of elementary Greek by cutting, integrating, and changing different versions of *Erotemata* which he had the opportunity to consult. The anthology of readings that follows *Erotemata* in this manuscript confirms that it was intended to be the manual of Chalcondylas' elementary Greek class: Aesop (ff. 37–80^v), the *Batracomyomachia* (84–92), and Theodoretus' *De spiritu* (94–99). The manuscript also includes a list of paradigms of irregular verbs (32–35), a list of cardinal numbers (36), and an anonymous compendium, *De verborum affectionibus* (93); these three

⁵¹ This copy lacks long notes in the verb section but lists all tenses for contract and athematic verbs; moreover, the sections on nouns and pronouns avoid rules on prosody that were not useful in the West in the early stages of learning, but insist on a schematic approach and on the importance of giving rules for noun contractions.

⁵² It is probably the version represented by the above-mentioned copies of Chortasmenos and by *Vat.Pal.gr.* 144.

⁵³ For example, the material in the section dedicated to the imparisyllabic nouns contains a schematic list of all the possible endings of nouns of his fifth declension, resembling the logic and contents of the list made by Lascaris in his own manual.

⁵⁴ On Chalcondylas' teaching experience in Padua see D. J. Geanakoplos, "The Discourse of Demetrius Chalcondyles on the Inauguration of Greek Studies at the University of Padua in 1463," *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974) 118–144.

texts were typical appendices to introductory Greek grammars. It is thus a complete course for studies in elementary Greek. Like Lascaris, Chalcondylas started teaching from Chrysoloras' text, but he then adapted and changed it deeply, ultimately creating his own manual.⁵⁵

In spite of the extensive variations of *Erotemata* in different cultural environments, it is possible to glimpse a line of evolution during the Quattrocento. This evolution can be divided into two parts. In the early and mid-15th century, teachers focused on creating short versions. Greek studies were at their beginning and students were in need of very simple manuals for the elementary study of Greek; they needed to be able to read and understand classical authors, but they were not yet concerned with stylistic features. Early humanists were interested in Greek texts only because they were tools for better understanding Latin literature and history, a pattern traced by Petrarch and later followed by Bruni.⁵⁶ Therefore, during this period grammars were not supposed to be difficult or complex.

In fact, in the manuscripts of the first half of the Quattrocento, short versions abound, even when *Erotemata* follows or precedes old Palaeologan copies of Attic comedy and tragedy, which were used in Western classes of intermediate and advanced Greek:⁵⁷ in other words, the short versions of *Erotemata*

⁵⁵ Chalcondylas' *Erotemata* was published in Milan in 1493 (ISTC ic00419860). See P. Botley, *Learning* 34–36.

⁵⁶ On this topic see R. Weiss, "Petarca e il mondo greco," in *Medieval and Humanistic Greek* 166–192; J. Hankins, "Greek Studies in Italy: from Petrarch to Bruni," *Quaderni Petrarqueschi* 12 (2002) 329–339.

⁵⁷ Such is the case not only with *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116 but also with *Vat.Pal.gr.* 324, which contains a 15th-century copy of Aristophanes' *Plutus*, *Clouds*, and *Frogs* on ff. 1–98 and an abridged copy of the Guarinian compendium that is similar to P. Moreover, *Vat.Pal.gr.* 144, which we have seen is quite a long version, after *Erotemata* contains a late-14th-century copy of Euripides' three canonical tragedies. Consequently, if easy redactions are followed by those texts that were read at upper intermediate level as well as more complex redactions, we can believe that also the short redactions were used at upper intermediate levels in the West in the mid-15th century.

were considered suitable for advanced students as well and represented the reference text *par excellence*. Both before and after the spread of Guarino's compendium, many other—often anonymous—attempts at simplification were made. Mention has already been made of the two versions by Sozomenus, the anonymous text preserved by *Laurent.Plut.* 59.33 containing a commented short version of *Erotemata*, Chalcondylas' and Lascaris' abridged and contaminated versions, and the very short redaction contained in *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116. Another example is *Pistoia, Archivio Capitolare*, C. 74 (ff. 34), copied around 1425 and owned by Sozomenus, which represents an evolution on his first attempt (the above-mentioned *Harleian.* 6506) to create a short, simple, and complete manual for elementary Greek with a well-organized and rational presentation.⁵⁸ It is likely that in Florence, in the first half of the Quattrocento, Sozomenus' short and contaminated redaction, which originated from Guarino's school, Chrysoloras' text, and Sozomenus' own teaching experience in the 1420s and 1430s, had a fairly broad circulation. Furthermore, *Mutin.gr.* α.F. 9.11 (= *gr.* 251), copied by Demetrios Sguropulos, a well-known copyist for Bessarion and Filelfo in the first half of the 15th century, preserved a copy close to *Vat.Pal.gr.* 116, which we have seen is a short redaction of Guarino's text. This means that at the middle of the Quattrocento summaries were highly preferred at the elementary level. Moreover, a survey of printed editions of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* shows that, before Lorenzo de Alopa's 1496 printing, the first six editions were all short versions, linked more or less to the Guarinian compendium.⁵⁹ The Guarinian compendium was very successful, and almost all teachers and students began their Greek lessons using this reference text (e.g. Pietro da Montagnana, Constantine Lascaris, Demetrios Chalcondylas, John Reuchlin).

⁵⁸ See Zamponi, *Rinascimento* 18 (1978) 251–270.

⁵⁹ See Ciccolella, *StudUmanistPiceni* 29 (2009) 397–410.

Towards the end of the 15th century, however, this changed. Two examples deserve mention. First, *Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana* 23 contains a very long version of *Erotemata* (ca. 100 folios), with many details and additions, an interlinear Latin translation, a list of irregular verbs, and an anthology of first readings, including some of Theocritus's *Idyllia*.⁶⁰ It represents that hypertrophic expansion that was practiced on Chrysoloras' text in order to create an exhaustive and complete introduction to Greek grammar. The use of Latin, the readings assembled in the anthology,⁶¹ and the pedagogical layout show that the manuscript was conceived as a complete course in Greek. Second, *Mulin.* α.S. 9.15 (= *gr.* 252), was copied by Franciscus Bovius in Ferrara; it contains *Erotemata* (ff. 2–104), copied in 1526, followed by some Greek prayers (105–109), a Latin commentary on the Guarinian compendium (110–155), and sixty-one Aesopic fables (156–180), copied in 1525. It is a typical textbook addressed to beginners in Greek, as clearly shown not only by the format and layout of the manuscript⁶² and the biography of the author,⁶³ but also by the contents of both the grammar and the Aesopic anthology. It represents an effort to create an exhaustive introductory grammar, for it in-

⁶⁰ Ciccolella, in *Libri di scuola* 595, mentions this MS. to show the evolution of Chrysoloras' grammar from short to long versions at the end of the 15th century.

⁶¹ Theocritus' *Idyllia* were often read in intermediate classes of Greek in the second half of the 15th century (e.g. Andronicus Callistus and Angelo Poliziano taught Greek from them); in 1480 they were part of Bonaccorso's program of printing all the material that was suitable for elementary studies of Greek, before the Aldine anthology of Greek poetry of 1496. On this topic see Botley, *Learning* 103, and "Learning Greek in Western Europe 1476–1516," in C. Holmes and J. Waring (eds.), *Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond* (Leiden 2002) 199–223.

⁶² Mm. 150 x 215, 20 lines per page, interlinear translation, use of colors for paragraphs and capital letters, legible writing.

⁶³ Franciscus Bernardinus Bovius was an impoverished aristocratic grammarian and writer of Greek poems for the court of Ferrara: see G. Ballistreri, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* XIII (Rome 1971) 550.

cludes all the parts of speech in the most schematic and complete way by contaminating Guarino and Lascaris. Bovius made an interlinear Latin translation; after introducing verb morphology, he inserted the second book of Lascaris' grammar on verb syntax, abridging it in the form of a verb lexicon. Both these manuscripts were school texts just like many Quattrocento manuscripts containing short versions, but they offered long and contaminated versions for the sake of clarity and to give pupils the opportunity to use a single manual to achieve competence in reading and translating the Greek language.

Furthermore, in this period the printed editions of Chrysoloras' grammar are the main evidence for the new needs and trends. In 1496, in Florence, a long version of *Erotemata* was printed. At that time, it was considered to be the original one. After this edition, while the Guarinian compendium was reprinted alone only twice (1501 and 1509) before the conventional end of the Renaissance (1529), the long version of *Erotemata* was reprinted a dozen times all across Europe.⁶⁴ However, these long texts incorporated authentic Byzantine material into the framework of Chrysoloras' grammar, in order to fill in the gaps which late Quattrocento students and their teachers felt in their grammars, as Ciccolella has pointed out very well and convincingly demonstrated.⁶⁵ By the end of the 15th century, humanists were studying Greek in its own right and not as a sort of *ancilla* of Latin studies. Presses were preparing editions of all the most important works in Greek literature, while Western teachers were reading Homer, Thucydides, and Sophocles in all the most prominent universities and humanist schools of Italy and, a few years later, in other parts of Europe as well. Thus teachers and students needed long, exhaustive, and detailed grammars which, in addition to some preliminary

⁶⁴ For a complete list of printed editions and their context see Botley, *Learning* 10–12 and Appendix I.

⁶⁵ Ciccolella, in *Libri di scuola* 589–597, focuses on the different solutions adopted by teachers in the section on prepositions.

notions, would provide all the tools necessary to understand stylistic features, correct mistakes in manuscripts, edit classical and Byzantine works, and fully appreciate Greek poetry.

The line of evolution of Chrysoloras' grammar is the line of all Greek grammars in the Renaissance, as the list of printed editions of Greek grammars clearly demonstrates.⁶⁶ Constantine Lascaris, one of the most prominent figures of the Greek revival in the second half of the Quattrocento, describes this process in the introduction to his extensive grammar. He begins by stating a principle that, in my opinion, should be followed when approaching Renaissance grammars: "In the same way that the doctors can indicate medicines only after considering the situation, the pain, and the infected organ, good grammarians can organize their topics by considering the present situation as well as their students" (932D). He then reconstructs the history of Greek grammars from late antiquity to the late Byzantine period, describing the revival of Greek studies in Italy. He states that "the best learning was taught by different kind of summaries" and that he "always taught by summaries," too, but, at the end of the 15th century, students preferred "long works and disdained the summaries" (936A–B).⁶⁷ It is no coincidence that Lascaris first wrote an essential elementary grammar (the *Summary*) and then created a complete grammar for advanced studies,⁶⁸ adding two books on syntax and style. Nor is it a coincidence that Gaza's grammar in four books was highly successful all across Europe in the first half of the 16th century.⁶⁹ Finally, it is no coincidence that after

⁶⁶ See Botley, *Learning* 119–154.

⁶⁷ Translated from Lascaris' introduction in his autograph: *Madrid, Royal National Library* 4689; the full text with Latin translation is at *PG* 161.931–936. For a description of the manuscript see D. De Andrés, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional* (Madrid 1987) 247–249.

⁶⁸ For an overview and description of Lascaris' grammatical works see Martínez Manzano, *Constantino* 133–163. On the fate and circulation of his grammars see Botley, *Learning* 26–31.

⁶⁹ See Botley, *Learning* 18–25.

Manutius' edition of *Erotemata* in 1512, Chrysoloras' grammar circulated with other supplementary texts (viz. Chalcondylas' treatise on irregular verbs and Gaza's fourth book on syntax) which filled in the gaps of Chrysoloras' elementary grammar. In fact, in the 16th century students and teachers preferred long grammars even at the elementary level: the contamination improved the most famous grammars and created complete yet simple manuals of morphology and syntax. As a result, although both the printed and handwritten versions shared the intent to create long and exhaustive manuals, we see that in the printed versions complex and exhaustive grammars allowed established and stable texts, while in the manuscripts there are many textual variations. Teachers made different choices in the contamination, and even if their strategies were similar because they followed the trends of their own decades, the results always varied, because each copy was adapted to the needs of students and teachers in very specific contexts.

In conclusion, the complex textual situation surrounding Chrysoloras' grammar and the history of its changes and spread invite a reflection on the sort of method needed to approach the corpus of Renaissance Greek grammars. We should take into account the evolution of Greek studies during the Renaissance, from elementary to advanced levels, together with the humanists' change of perspective, from looking at Greek as a tool to considering it worthy in and for itself. We should also consider that the great textual variety and dynamism of grammars and school texts are related to the demands and needs of each scholar, teacher, or student at a particular time and in a specific cultural environment. Starting from these considerations, it is to be hoped that future studies on Renaissance Greek grammars will focus on individual copies rather than attempt to reconstruct abstract original texts. After constructing these solid foundations, some works of synthesis and editions can be attempted. But in the meantime, this 'construction work' could yield important results. One may discover that many anonymous grammars are based on well-known texts with deletions, expansions, and adaptations from materials of

different origin, and that they can provide fundamental contributions to understanding the most important issues related to the revival of Greek studies in the West.⁷⁰

October, 2012

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università degli Studi di Torino
10124 Torino, Italy
erika.nuti@gmail.com

⁷⁰ This article is based on a paper presented at the 2011 Byzantine Studies Conference (DePaul University, Chicago). I would like to thank the audience, who warmly expressed their appreciation, encouraging me to pursue further research and develop this article. In particular I am grateful to Professors Claudia Rapp, Elizabeth Fisher, and Alice-Mary Talbot for their questions and comments, as their insight helped me determine what to include in this article. Moreover, I would like to express all my gratitude to Professor Enrico Maltese, who suggested studying this topic for my M.A. thesis, and thereafter kindly supported my further research. I am extremely grateful to Professor Federica Ciccolella, who read the paper several times, giving me not only valuable comments and suggestions, but especially providing intellectual and moral support with invaluable patience. Finally, let me express my gratitude to Daniele Bianconi, who gave me precious starting indications by twice checking the codicological and palaeographical features of *Val.Pal.gr.* 116, and to Professor Frank Coulson, who read this article and carefully pointed out imprecisions and gave positive comments in aid of publication.