A Slavish Art?
Language and Grammar
in Late Byzantine
Education and Society

RUTH WEBB

One of the most distinctive characteristics of the culture of the Byzantine élite is the continued use throughout the existence of the empire of the classical Attic language for formal expression. The mastery of this language required years of schooling, and the sheer quantity of published and unpublished grammatical treatises, commentaries and lexica – many composed by the most eminent Byzantine scholars – is proof enough of its cultural importance. In what follows I will discuss the evidence for the ways in which the classical language was taught in Byzantine schools in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, concentrating on the commentary to Philostratos by Manuel Moschopoulos.[1] An understanding of teaching methods and the ways in which classical texts were presented to pupils has much to contribute to our appreciation of Byzantine texts and the cultural context in which they were composed. There is no shortage of sources on which to base such a study. Some picture of the organization of education and the curriculum, albeit a sketchy one, is given by the autobiographies, hagiography and correspondence of the period.[2] The commentaries on classical Greek authors by Palaeologan scholars and teachers such as Maximos Planudes, Manuel Moschopoulos, Thomas Magister and Demetrios Triklinios show which texts were read and how they were presented to students. Here, the interest of modern scholars in the transmission of classical texts has provided valuable information about the working methods and interests of Byzantine scholars.[3] The case of Manuel Moschopoulos illustrates the extent to which our knowledge of the lives and works of Byzantine scholars is dependent upon such studies. For in dismantling the Moschopoulean Sophocles recension which Alexander Turyn had constructed in the 1940s, Dawe has transformed Moschopoulos from skilful editor to mere compiler.[4] One consequence of this classical perspective, however, has been a

concentration on the texts which are included in the modern canon of the classics, such as Homer, Hesiod, the tragedians and Aristophanes. But while these authors played an important part in the elementary stages of the Byzantine curriculum they were by no means the only ones to be read in schools. Most importantly, they were read for precise and limited reasons, for their linguistic rather than aesthetic value, as will be illustrated below. The familiar classical texts thus take on a different complexion when seen through the lens of Byzantine scholarship. The resulting difficulty found by modern scholars in classifying and evaluating this aspect, among others, of Byzantine culture can be seen in the debates surrounding the application of the terms 'renaissance' and 'humanist' to Byzantium. In particular, the last centuries of Byzantium have been described as the 'Palaeologan Renaissance' and its scholars termed 'humanists', on the basis of their intense activity in the field of classical scholarship.[5] But it is precisely the nature of this philological output that has caused others to claim that it is inappropriate to speak of a 'renaissance' in this period, since Byzantine scholarship shows none of the required characteristics, such as originality.[6] But before any answer can be given to the question of whether there was or was not a 'Palaeologan Renaissance' it is necesary to place the existing examples of classical scholarship in their context and to consider commentaries on ancient authors alongside other Byzantine works on language and grammar, within the context of the curriculum as a whole.

The Organization of Education and the Curriculum

The published letters of late Byzantine scholars such as Theodore Hyrtakenos and Maximos Planudes give some information on the organization of education[7]. Hyrtakenos informs us of his unceasing quest for a state pension, suggesting that state support for education was available but took the form of subsidies for individuals.[8] One of Planudes' letters to the uncle of Manuel Moschopoulos gives the important information that Manuel acted as an assistant teacher in Planudes' school while continuing his own studies.[9]

For the place of language teaching in the educational system we have the evidence of autobiographies and saints' lives.[10] The picture they give is consistent with that for the other periods of Byzantium.[11] Education was based around the mastery of language. Pupils progressed from learning to read and write syllables and then words, to the mastery of grammar, involving agreement between words in the phrase,[12] and then to the structuring of rhetorical compositions and logical argumentation in the study of rhetoric. Although some form of elementary teaching

seems to have been quite widely available, boys frequently had to move to larger towns to continue their studies. It is reasonable to suppose that many must have gone no further than learning to read and write, or mastering the most basic rules of classical grammar.[13] One method of paying for an education is recorded in the life of the fourteenth century Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, who is said to have worked as a cook in the house of Thomas Magister in Thessalonike in return for his schooling.[14] In his autobiography Nikephoros Blemmydes gives an idea of the time-scale involved (although he modestly admits that he was an exceptional pupil). Starting in Prusa at the age of eight in about 1205 he spent four years learning grammar,[15] then moved to Nicaea to study poetry, rhetoric and elementary logic.[16] His study of the poets is described as being of the books of Homer and the other poets (ὁμηρικαὶ βίβλοι καὶ λοιπαὶ ποιητικαί). After this his studies of rhetoric were based on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonios, the treatises of Hermogenes and logic: Aristotle and Porphyry described as φωνὰς καὶ κατηγορίας καὶ περὶ ἑρμηνείας. The passage, like much of Blemmydes' text, is difficult to interpret but suggests that he was aged sixteen either when he had completed this phase of his education or when he began his studies in logic.

Far more detail is provided by the autobiography of George of Cyprus, who later became Patriarch of Constantinople. It contains an account of his early education on the island of Cyprus under Latin rule and precisely because of the difficulty he encountered in obtaining a Greek secular education it is the most informative and lively of our sources. He lived at home while he went to the school of the *grammatistes*, the teacher of reading and writing (perhaps of elementary grammar as well), in his home village. As he proved to have an aptitude for study he was then sent to Nicosia, where the Greek educational provision was apparently very poor. At this point in his narrative George remarks drily that although the old men claimed that this decline in educational standards was due to sixty years of Latin rule, when pressed they were unable to name a single illustrious figure from the earlier period.[17] After a failed attempt to study grammar and logic in Latin schools, George gave up and returned to his family and a life of hunting. But, driven by his desire for education, he left his home secretly one night and made his way to Nicaea, against the wishes of his family, where to his intense disappointment he found only poetry and grammar were being taught, not the rhetoricians whom he had hoped to study.[18] George associates the ancient poets with the tedium of grammar, giving an almost comic touch of pathos to his experiences in Nicaea: he had braved the fierce seas, abandoned his family all for declensions of nouns and

irregular verbs and ridiculous stories of battles fought over Helen and the dispute between Oedipus' sons.[19]

These accounts show how unstable the educational provision could be outside the capital, whether this was Constantinople or Nicaea, and how dependent on the availibility and abilities of individual teachers. From George's account it is clear that many less talented or less wealthy students must have confined their schooling to what was available in their village or regional centre, simply learning reading or the rudiments of writing. Only the wealthiest, or the most determined, could think of learning to write in accordance with the rules of grammar and rhetoric.[20]

Although I am here concerned with grammar and the associated study of the poets, it is important to bear in mind the later stages of the curriculum. The Byzantine educational system evolved differently from that of the Medieval West in that rhetoric retained much of the importance it had enjoyed in later antiquity. Although rhetoric continued to play an important role in the western curriculum it no longer had a place in society comparable to that of Byzantine rhetoric.[21]

For however detached from reality the products of Byzantine rhetoricians may seem, both church and state continued to require the composition and performance of speeches, so that the study of rhetoric in schools continued to have a practical, political end. In the West the divorce of theory from practice led to a separation in teaching between invention – the art of analysing and ordering subject matter – and the eloquent presentation of that subject matter, between meaning and language. In this way, dialectic – the study of logic – which was originally part of the art of eloquence, became an independent subject of study.[22] Within Byzantine culture, rhetoric remained an integrated system, combining invention and eloquence. Although the nature of Byzantine rhetorical training lies outside the scope of this article it is important to bear in mind this part of the curriculum. For the existence of this later stage as a goal, whether realized or not by the individual student, determined the orientation of grammatical studies. Students were trained to master the classical language for their own use, not just to be able to read and appreciate the great works of the past. Thus the reading of the poets as part of grammar was a functional exercise, not primarily (if at all) an exercise in aesthetic appreciation. But before discussing this in more detail I would like to ask some questions about how grammar was taught in schools.

The sources are in agreement that grammar, together with the reading of poetical texts, was the basis of the curriculum as it had been in antiquity and as is also the case in the accounts of education in the saints' lives of the iconoclast period

surveyed by Ann Moffatt.[23]   But they give no hint as to what exactly this teaching consisted in. There is no way of telling from these references alone whether the term 'grammar' meant exactly the same as it had done in antiquity, or in earlier periods of the Byzantine Empire, or whether the same term 'grammar' in fact stood for a continually evolving educational reality. An anonymous dialogue on the curriculum preserved in a manuscript of the Palaeologan period seems to support the view that Byzantine teaching methods remained largely unchanged for centuries. The questioner asks his interlocutor what the principal texts are for grammar, rhetoric and philosophy. In grammar this is the treatise by Dionysios Thrax, the *Canons* of Theodosios and their 'exegetes' who include Herodian, the ninth-century grammarian George Choiroboskos and the far less well known Oros of whose work only fragments survive.[24]   Dionysios Thrax's treatise seems to have been memorised and recited by students. His work forms the basis of the *Erotemata* composed by Manuel Moschopoulos in which Dionysios' statements are recast in question and answer form. Moschopoulos' *Erotemata* are the earliest example of a genre of Greek grammatical text which was to become popular in Renaissance Italy with the simplified versions by Manuel Chrysoloras and others.[25]   But the question and answer format must reflect a much older practice of testing students orally on their knowledge of grammar, as described by the tenth-century schoolmaster.[26]   However, the analysis of parts of speech given by Dionysios Thrax and the lists of paradigms of nouns and verbs which make up Theodosios' *Canons* were hardly sufficient in themselves for a full and active mastery of classical Greek.[27]

More information on teaching practices can be gleaned from the commentaries and glosses to classical texts and from collections of specifically Byzantine pedagogical material such as schedography, detailed grammatical commentaries on specially composed phrases or quotations from classical, biblical or liturgical texts.[28]   This latter practice was familiar to Anna Comnena who criticized the enthusiasm of her contemporaries, claiming that it distracted them from reading the texts.[29]   Several important collections of schedography survive from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the collection of schedography published under Moschopoulos' name illustrates the nature of this exercise in the Late Byzantine period.[30]   Here, short texts a few lines in length are followed by pages of commentary addressing every aspect of each word. The case, morphology, spelling, etymology, accentuation and dialect are discussed at length and illustrated by references to the language of classical and patristic authors. Moschopoulos'

first example is a prayer for Christ's blessing on the students and their work beginning Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. These five words alone give rise to discussions of the vocative, of the etymology of Θεός, explained as deriving from the verb θεῖν because the ancient planets 'are always running', and an analysis of the personal pronoun ἡμῶν as well as to a general treatise on all personal pronouns.[31] Another feature of the schedographic analysis is the lists of words beginning with syllables which were written differently but sounded the same in Byzantine pronunciation.[32] The beginning of the prayer cited above gives rise to lists of words beginning κυ and κοι; χρι, χρη and χρει; ημ, ιμ and ειμ.[33] Although the principal aim of these word lists is to teach correct spelling, they also explain, where necessary, the meaning of the words listed by the inclusion of synonyms or antonyms or by quotation from classical authors and conjugate irregular or contracted verbs. The lists thus teach orthography in the widest sense while increasing the students' command of vocabulary. Throughout, the quotations from classical authors are juxtaposed with liturgical language. In another example the phrase, ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Θεοτόκου, is followed by, among other things, a lengthy discussion of prepositions, including examples from Aristophanes.[34]

It is difficult to see quite how this system functioned in the classroom. Most probably the boys were expected to learn the commentary, or its main elements, by heart. An intriguing clue is given, for an earlier period, by references in eleventh-century texts to schedographic competitions between schools in Constantinople.[35] One can only try to imagine how these might have functioned, but it was perhaps the students' ability to improvise the most elaborate commentaries which was judged. If so, this exercise would have demanded an astonishing command of a range of classical texts and grammatical knowledge. However, in the case of ready-made collections of schedography such as that described above, the teaching method probably relied on memorization and recitation of an existing text. Some evidence of this practice is given in the schedographic sections of Moschopoulos' unpublished commentary to the *Eikones* of the Elder Philostratos.[36] This commentary, which will be discussed in more detail below, incorporates several long lists of words presenting spelling difficulties, very similar to those found in Moschopoulos' schedography.[37] In a few cases the list is presented as an answer to a question: 'which words are written with "ω"[as opposed to "o"]?' probably reflecting classroom practice.[38]

Schedography was clearly developed by Byzantine teachers to supplement the grammatical textbooks and to illustrate precepts by example. A scholium by

Tzetzes to Hesiod, *Works and Days* 1.285 suggests that in the twelfth century schedography followed the reading of poets.[39] By the late Byzantine period it was beginning to influence the ways in which ancient texts were presented to students in their studies of grammar, as was the case with Moschopoulos' commentary to the *Eikones*. Philostratos is an unusual author to find at this stage of the curriculum. Although the accounts of education speak of reading 'the books of the poets' as part of grammatical studies, Philostratos is a prose author and one with a thoroughly idiosyncratic style. While he does not use complicated periodic sentences which might pose problems for a beginner, his elliptical brevity, his habit of breaking off in mid-sentence and of employing uncanonical constructions such as the nominative absolute to imitate the inconsequentiality of conversation, all make him a unusual choice for the schoolroom.[40] At first sight, therefore, Philostratos does not seem to be an obvious candidate for the grammar curriculum: in fact Psellos had specifically advised against boys reading him until they had been thoroughly imbued with the noble periodic sentence structure of Demosthenes and the other Attic orators, who would not have been read until the next stage of the curriculum, that of rhetoric.[41]

The *Eikones*, however, had two obvious advantages for the teacher. One is the wealth of recherché vocabulary involved in Philostratos' descriptions of scenes based on epic and tragedy, taking place on land and at sea and involving battles, sieges and hunts. The second is the far more mundane fact that the text is neatly divided into short chapters. This latter point, dictated by the practical demands of the classroom, was clearly important. The *Eikones* with the Moschopoulean commentary is usually found in fourteenth century manuscripts as part of a teaching collection, named 'Scholastic Anthology' by Gallavotti,[42] which also includes extracts from the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius, Aelian's *Natural History*, both of which are divided into short passages of a few lines in simple prose, and selected epigrams from the *Planudean Anthology*. All have a similar style of commentary.[43] Although the manuscript tradition of this collection is fluid – not all the manuscripts contain all the texts mentioned above – the texts and commentaries form a whole and comments to one author are frequently complemented by comments to another part of the anthology.

The commentary to Philostratos has been mainly discussed in terms of authorship. Although it is unattributed in the manuscripts, the title of a lexicon of Attic words based on this and other Moschopoulean commentaries refers to Moschopoulos as the author of scholia to Philostratos. It has been suggested that

parts of the commentary can be attributed to Maximos Planudes,[44] but it is far more likely that the whole of the anthology as we have it is put together by Moschopoulos, possibly, since he is known to have been Planudes' teaching assistant, developing methods first used by his teacher.[45] The Scholastic Anthology is an important source of information on the teaching methods developed in the school of Planudes and Moschopoulos and then more widely diffused throughout the fourteenth century, as the number of extant manuscripts from this period shows.   The Anthology illustrates the preoccupations of teachers of grammar at this period and the attitude to the classical language which was instilled into the educated élite of the fourteenth century.   With its novel selection of reading material it also represents a phenomenon which is supposed by many modern critics not to have existed – innovation in Byzantine teaching methods.

Part of the innovation seems to have been the inclusion within the commentary of long passages which are closely related to the exercise of schedography. These are the lists of words beginning with syllables which sound the same but are spelt differently – just as were found in Moschopoulos' *Peri Schedon*. They are far more than just lists, however, as they include quotations from the classical poets, and occasionally from the Psalms, to illustrate the use of a word. They also relate words to their opposites or to synonyms or mention variations found in the literary dialects of ancient Greece. Throughout there is a constant cross-reference, ensuring that each word is firmly anchored within a complex and multi-dimensional linguistic system. In the first word list, for example, which groups words beginning with υ and οι, the Attic ὕαλος (glass) is contrasted with its *koine* form ὕελος – a distinction which derives from the second-century Atticizing lexicon of Moeris; then comes ὑγίεια (health) and its derivatives including an explanation of how the adjective ὑγιεινός can mean both 'health-giving' and 'healthy'; further down the use of ὕμνος by poets to mean any song, not just one addressed to God is mentioned; the less common word ὕνις (ploughshare) is also given, with its genitive to show its declension; this part of the list also contains a quotation from Sappho to illustrate the Aeolic ὕσδος (= ὄζος branch) explained as resulting from the transformation of ο into υ and of ζ into σδ; finally the list returns to its starting point, ὑψηλός (high) which is contrasted with χαμηλός (low) and the latter word is illustrated by quotation from the Greek Anthology.

This method of working outwards from one word in the text to relate it to the wider context of the classical language is evident too in the shorter comments to the *Eikones* which are found in the margins of the manuscripts. In many cases these

do nothing to elucidate Philostratos' text, sometimes even obscuring his meaning, but they do illustrate how to use a word correctly in different contexts. For example, in a difficult passage Philostratos' unusual use of the verb περιβάλλω to describe how armed men are 'placed around' battlements in one scene gives rise to a discussion of the different ways in which the verb can be used, with examples.[46] Nowhere is the meaning of the phrase elucidated. In other cases a comment may define the meaning of the word in question, but this proves simply to be a starting point for a discussion of related terms, often illustrated with quotations from other classical authors: Homer, Aristophanes or the tragedians.

The manuscripts themselves give no clues as to how such commented texts might have been used in the classroom, nor is much known about the availability of books in Byzantine schools. One twelfth-century representation of a schoolroom, in the Madrid Skylitzes, shows boys looking at books on a table.[47] Some suggestions may however be found in the detailed accounts left by Italian humanists of how they were taught Greek by Byzantine émigrés. One student of Varino Favorino Camerte – who had studied with Politian, who in turn had been a student of the Greek Andronikos Kallistos – described his Greek classes in a letter. First his teacher gave a literal translation of the text. The teacher then worked out the inflexion of the verbs and nouns, if these presented any difficulties, and also dealt with etymology and other figures. After this he would go through the reading again, testing the students. Finally, one student would be asked to explain the passage again at the end of the lesson.[48] It is possible to draw a tentative relationship between the procedures described here and the levels of commentary found in the manuscripts used in Greek schools. For example, it may have been during a first reading that the teacher used the brief interlinear glosses found in commented copies of classical texts and which provide alternatives to difficult words or constructions sometimes amounting to a paraphrase of the original text.[49] The longer marginal comments which develop points of morphology, syntax, accentuation or meaning might then have been used as the basis for a more detailed analysis, all of which was to be remembered by the students. There is no obvious equivalent in Camerte's practice to the schedographic word-lists found in the Scholastic Anthology, and indeed the Renaissance manuscripts tend to omit this part of the commentary, but they may have been recited and then committed to memory after the study of each chapter had been completed. One further difference between the Italian and Byzantine schools was, of course, the language used for explanations. A speech by Michael Apostolis, recommending his own services to

his Italian audience, suggests that all teaching of Greek in Italy was in Latin, even when the teacher himself was Greek, a practice which, he claims, could only impart a superficial knowledge and not the personal experience (ἐμπειρία) of the language which was part of the definition of grammar according to Dionysios Thrax.[50] Apostolis clearly considered that the language used in Greek schools for comment and explanation was essentially the same as that being taught. One might also conclude from his remarks that he perceived a sharp distinction in pedagogical function between the Greek interlinear glosses, which both clarified grammatical difficulties and extended the students' range of linguistic experience, and the type of Latin translations given by Camerte which, in his terms, merely rendered the meaning accessible.

To return to the Scholastic Anthology, it is clear that such commentaries did not aim primarily to help pupils understand or appreciate the text in question but rather used it as a starting point for general prescriptions about language. Words were of interest to the teacher only in so far as they could be located within a wider linguistic network or continuum. That is to say that the aim of this and other commentaries in the Scholastic Anthology is to ensure that the pupils learn how to use the language in their own compositions – the reading of ancient texts is entirely subordinated to the aims of rhetoric. Very similar points could be made about the commentaries of Moschopoulos and Planudes to, for example, Sophocles.[51] While there is a little more evidence of interest in the narrative content of the tragedians – some scholia summarize the story or even draw a moral point from the plot – on the whole, the comments are of a similar nature, concentrating on what is typical, and therefore re-usable, in the author's language.

It takes a major adjustment of literary perspective to accept that the very texts which are now considered to represent the height of the fifth-century Athenian achievement – the tragedies of Sophocles or Euripides – appear in this context to have been little more than repositories of lexical and syntactical paradigms. But from this point of view the Byzantine commentaries to the poets can be seen to perform a limited task with perfect coherence. Indeed this treatment of ancient literature is implicit in the work of Dionysios Thrax who defines grammar as 'experience of what is generally said by poets and writers'.[52]   Analysis of individual style is not part of grammar. This is why Moschopoulos can concentrate on what is typical of Attic Greek in Philostratos' language, and can spend so much time relating it to other author's usages without mentioning any of his idiosyncrasies. Clearer still are the Byzantine commentators' discussions of Dionysios

Thrax's statement that the sixth and finest part of grammar is κρίσις literally 'the judgement of poems'.[53]   They point out specifically that this should not be interpreted to mean that the grammarian should exercise any aesthetic judgements on the work in question, rather, they should concern themselves with linguistic issues, such as questions of authenticity.[54]   The scope of Byzantine treatments of classical authors was thus clearly defined.

Grammar, therefore, including the reading of poets, was oriented towards the production of texts. This partly explains why there is no Byzantine equivalent – except in the case of Homer, where the tradition goes back to antiquity[55] – to the full scale allegorizing and moralizing of classical authors found in the Western middle ages, notably with the *Ovide moralisé*. Evidently there was no need for ancient poets to be made relevant to medieval Greek society by Christian interpretation, since their relevance lay first and foremost in their role as linguistic paradigms.[56]

The close study of Moschopoulos' commentary to the works in the Scholastic Anthology and other commentaries used in the elementary stages of education provides valuable evidence for the background to Byzantine texts and for our understanding of the Attic language as used and perceived by the Byzantine élite. They show how the individual words which Byzantine schoolboys met in their reading were constantly related to other terms, as synonyms or opposites, making the student aware of shades of meaning and thus building up a wide and precise vocabulary which was essential for rhetorical composition. This is clearly stated by Joseph Rhakendytes a learned monk of the fourteenth century and correspondent of Nikephoros Gregoras, Nikephoros Choumnos and Theodore Metochites, who composed an epitome of rhetoric as part of a larger encyclopedia.[57] He insists on the need to master a wide vocabulary, making full use of the riches of the Greek language and thus avoiding the error of *tautologia*. For Joseph, 'tautology' does not mean repeating the substance of what has been said, but rather repeating the same word or phrase in a speech instead of finding a synonym or inventing a periphrasis.[58]   What appears to many modern critics to be needless repetition and redundancy was evidently, for Joseph and his contemporaries, the mark of good rhetorical style for which they were trained from the very beginning of their studies. Joseph does not elaborate on this point, but it is possible to glimpse some of its implications from the pedagogical works described above. Through their constant cross-references, quotations and subtle distinctions between words these works give us some idea of the precise connotations and associations which different

terms might have held for the Byzantine audience and of the rich textures which could be woven by the skilled rhetorician.

A further aspect of the richness of literary Greek which becomes evident from the Moschopoulean commentary to the Scholastic Anthology is the existence of several levels of language: the literary dialects, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, Attic – the language of high-style prose – and *koine*.[59] These give a further dimension to the interrelationships of words described above, for not only did the students have to learn to distinguish between near synonyms, they also had to recognise the literary register of a given word. In places Moschopoulos draws attention to items of 'poetic' vocabulary – i.e. words most commonly used by Pindar or Theokritos – or defines particular forms as Homeric or *koine*. This latter category is difficult to define as it includes both words used by Aristotle and Byzantine terms of Latin origin such as καβαλλάριος and ὄρδινος, so that one suspects that any term which does not fall into any particular category may be classified as *koine*. [60] In general however, Moschopoulos' classifications of dialect or register are precise and, unlike those of some other commentaries, reasonably accurate.[61] Once again, these categories are best understood from the point of view of rhetoric. They serve to teach the student which words to use in which contexts so that, when used by the teacher of grammar, terms such as 'Attic' or 'Aeolic' refer to registers of literary language rather than to historical phenomena. Thus even the comments on the formation of dialect forms, such as the analysis of Aeolic cited above, can be seen as prescriptive. This is certainly how they were seen by Theodore Metochites, who composed verse in pseudo-Homeric language of his own construction. From the historical point of view his attempts are full of 'monstrous forms', as Robert Browning has pointed out.[62] But historical accuracy is unlikely to have been Metochites' main concern: he wished rather to give his verse a grandiose Homeric flavour and felt at liberty to coin sub-Homeric forms on the basis of analogy. This is just one example of how the type of teaching represented by these scholia can be seen reflected in the high-style literary production of the fourteenth century. Further analysis of the prose language used by authors of this period with reference to the categories and registers of language described in these teaching texts may well shed light on the linguistic expectations of both author and audience.

There is no external evidence for the precise stage at which the Scholastic Anthology was used in schools.[63] However, it does seem likely that this collection of short extracts of prose and verse – Philostratos, Marcus Aurelius, Aelian and the epigrams – was designed to be an intermediate stage between grammar and the

reading of full-scale poetic texts.[64]   It does suggest that more and more help was needed by students on the earlier stages of the curriculum. But although the end of grammatical studies remained constant – active command of language – the means used to achieve it were ever evolving in accordance with student needs.

Grammar and Byzantine Culture

The value of grammar was not confined to the classroom. To the Byzantine élite a mastery of the classical language and an awareness of the correct registers to be used were essential. The fifteenth-century satire, Mazaris' *Journey to Hades*, mentions a character growing rich from the composition of decrees and *chrysobulls* – an occupation which would demand linguistic and rhetorical skill – as well as mocking another for a grossly inappropriate use of language in the phrase ἢ μέλλεις γενεῖν λογοθέτας.[65] The intricacies of most of Mazaris' references to contemporary figures at court are lost on us, but the humour of this phrase surely lies in the contrast between the vernacular language and the august position of logothete.

That the qualities which were perceived to be imparted by this highly literary and linguistic education were part of the Byzantine elite's self-definition vis-à-vis the West, is suggested by Nikephoros Gregoras' dialogue *Florentios*, composed around 1337.[66] In this text, the author portrays himself in the persona of Nikagoras who is shown discomforting the bumptious Xenophanes, a caricature of the Calabrian monk, Barlaam. Barlaam/Xenophanes is presented by Gregoras as being entirely Latin in culture, so that the debate between the two characters focuses in places on the cultural differences perceived by Gregoras between East and West.

Nikagoras' challenges to Xenophanes in their cross-cultural battle of wits follow the development of the Byzantine curriculum and he begins by proposing that they should start with the basics, as teachers of letters do with their students.[67] But Xenophanes arrogantly rejects Nikagoras' suggestion that they start with grammar, saying that grammar is a slavish art (τέχνη ἀνδραποδώδης καὶ δούλη) and useless to a philosopher like himself,[68] thus giving Nikagoras the opportunity to point out that, without grammar, the works of Plato and Aristotle would be unknown. Grammar, he says, arms the tongue and makes it 'masculine' for speaking and for writing,[69] a phrase which shows the importance of this training in grammar and rhetoric within the values of the Byzantine elite as a preparation for life in the mainly male, public domain. Similar sentiments are expressed by

Demetrios Cydones in his highly allusive account of his own education. Expressing his gratitude to his parents for having sent him to a teacher and his own eagerness when a boy to acquire knowledge of letters (λόγοι) as a 'fitting possession for a free man'.[70]

Xenophanes' claim that grammar is a 'slavish art' is therefore to be seen as a deliberate subversion of Byzantine values. In contrast to the manly and eloquent Nikagoras the character of Xenophanes in Gregoras' dialogue is depicted in a caricature of western scholasticism, as being capable only of forming syllogisms, the subject of dialectic, and being arrogantly dismissive of both grammar and rhetoric. (Nikagoras is able to undermine the Latin's reliance on logical demonstration by pointing out that a syllogism is only as true as its basic premiss.)[71] Naturally, Gregoras depicts the difference between East and West in absolute terms which do not correspond to contemporary realities – Latin grammarians were just as keen as their eastern counterparts to promote their subject as the foundation of all learning. But the dialogue shows that, in the eyes of Gregoras at least, an active command of eloquence was what distinguished Byzantine culture from that of the West and that, within the Byzantine context as he depicts it, such eloquence was a necessary skill for public life.[72] Gregoras' depiction of western culture as such is naturally to be read with caution, particularly given the polemical and satirical nature of the *Florentios*. The value of his sketch lies in the evidence it provides for his own evaluation of the ideals which characterised Byzantine civilisation.

The attitude of Greek intellectuals towards the West was by no means uniformly dismissive and, in the grammatical works of this period, there is some evidence to suggest that contact between the two cultures may have had some influence, or effect, in the domain of linguistic theory. In particular, two works on syntax from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries show what seems to be a new approach to the analysis of classical Greek: these are the *Dialogue on Grammar* and *Treatise on Syntax* by Maximos Planudes[73] and the *Treatise on Syntax* by Ioannes Glykys, a pupil of George of Cyprus, correspondent of Planudes and later Patriarch of Constantinople.[74] Glykys confines himself to a novel treatment of the grammatical cases of Greek whereas Planudes, in his two works, also provides explanations of tenses and other parts of speech. Both authors share in common a desire to provide general explanations of linguistic phenomena which transcended their individual manifestations in language. It has even been suggested by some modern linguists that Planudes' *Treatise on Syntax* anticipated by

several centuries the localist theory of case, according to which the grammatical cases express both concrete spatial relations between entities and abstract grammatical relations.[75] This suggestion has met with opposition, both on the grounds that Planudes' analysis was not original and that the passage in question – a discussion of interrrogative adverbs of place – does not amount to a localist case theory.[76] However, in the context of late Byzantine education the important point is not so much the question of whether or not Planudes was the first to devise such a theory, but rather that he was clearly attempting to find ways to illustrate and explain the underlying principles of grammar which appear to differ from the approaches of his immediate predecessors.

Glykys' work on syntax is devoted to a thorough examination of the cases and their uses. Language for Glykys is God given, not man-made, and the relations between words mirror the relations between things and people in the world.[77] Each of the cases has a range of meaning specific to it: the dative, for example, expresses giving and shared efforts and is therefore morally the best and first case.[78] To break these divinely created rules of syntax therefore constitutes far more than just a grammatical fault and is akin to blasphemy. Philostratos' idiosyncratic syntax, in particular his use of the nominative absolute, thus makes him a target for harsh criticism in Glykys' work.[79] It is quite possible that it was precisely the fact that Philostratos was being used to teach grammar at this period that prompted Glykys to focus on such a relatively minor author.

Neither Planudes nor Glykys make any great claims for their theories, both present their work as pedagogical methods. Glykys' treatise is written as a letter to a young man.[80] Planudes' *Dialogue* is between the teacher, Palaitimos, and the young Neophron, depicted as a youth who has just completed his basic study of grammar and is now ready for a slightly more theoretical approach to the subject. The same author's *Treatise* seems to presuppose a similar audience. All three texts were widely diffused in the fourteenth century. It is clear that the needs of their pupils led them to formulate what has been described in the case of Glykys as the most original thinking on language since antiquity.[81] It may well be that the ever widening gap between spoken and literary Greek led the more conscientious and imaginative teachers to invent such new approaches. The end, however, remained the same. Their enquiries into language are expressed in elegant Attic prose.[82] The final end of Byzantine grammar never ceased to be the practical one of eloquence. The minute inquiries into syntax and semantics found in the grammatical treatises and commentaries were intended to provide the basis for a training in rhetorical

composition, in which attention was turned to the larger elements of composition: figures and the development of arguments.[83]

In their search for philosophical principles underlying language Planudes and Glykys were following a similar path to their Western contemporaries, the Speculative Grammarians, although they never reach the heights of abstraction found in the work of the latter. For the Speculative Grammarians moved away from the study and imitation of the classical Latin *auctores*, preferring to use invented and often nonsensical Latin phrases to illustrate linguistic structures, in contrast to the practical, text-based approach of Planudes and Glykys.[84] It is however possible that there was some direct influence – Planudes knew Latin and translated several works of Latin literature and philosophy into Greek for the first time. It is also likely that, after the Latin domination, it was more difficult for Byzantine intellectuals to maintain the indifference to the Latin language shown by the vast majority of their predecessors and that this may have prompted such considerations of general principles of grammar. If so, this would explain two somewhat puzzling phenomena. One is the existence of an unpublished Greek translation of Donatus' *Ars minor* attributed to Planudes himself.[85] In this translation, everything, including the examples, is translated into Greek (nouns in the ablative are represented by ἀπό with the genitive) so that, used by itself, it could not have been of much help to anyone hoping to learn Latin. It may of course simply have been used as a key to the Latin text and in one fifteenth-century copy, made by Michael Souliardos in MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, grec 2594, it is written on the versos only, facing blank pages on which, presumably, the Latin was to have been added.[86] But the translation may well have been made, or subsequently used, to provide an idea of the grammatical principles of Latin for comparison with Greek, suggesting the same interest in the principles of grammar as are to be found in Planudes' and Glykys' works on syntax.

A comparable approach to Latin is to be found in George of Cyprus' autobiography. He describes how, having exhausted the educational resources of the Greek schools in Nicosia, he went instead to a Latin school hoping to pick up the elements of grammar. What is intriguing is the explanation he gives for his failure which he attributes to his inability to understand the language in which his teachers taught, not to the fact that the grammar he was studying was that of the Latin language. George seems to have believed that the study of Latin grammar could have compensated for his lack of a Greek grammatical education. Like Planudes and Glykys, George seems to take it for granted that grammatical structures tran-

scended the individual language.

Conclusion

A close look at the teaching of grammar in Byzantine schools reveals educational methods which were constantly evolving in response to the practical needs of students. The educational system as a whole, with its emphasis on the acquisition of linguistic skills, had developed to satisfy the needs of the Byzantine state and it remained relevant to these needs throughout the Empire.[87] Although the relative literary values enshrined by this system – the privileging of rhetoric over poetry for example – often seem perverse to modern scholars,[88] they reflected the importance of the art of eloquence in Byzantine culture. In turn, the importance of rhetoric at the highest levels of society ensured that the curriculum remained largely the same in structure, if not in detail, as it had been in antiquity. The interests served by this curriculum were, naturally, those of the élite and the number of those who enjoyed access to the full curriculum was small.[89] However, as suggested above, the earlier stages of the curriculum were far more easily available and could on their own ensure a type of functional literacy which must often have sufficed.[90] Above all, it is against the background of the educational system as a whole that the grammatical and philological works of the Palaeologan period should be evaluated. The approving label, 'Palaeologan Renaissance', which has been given to this period, precisely because of the attention paid by its scholars to classical texts, has led to some unhelpful comparisons with the culture of Renaissance Italy. Needless to say, Byzantine scholarship is found to be no match for Renaissance humanism. In comparison with the originality and the thorough assimilation of antique forms which are seen to characterize the Italian Renaissance, Byzantine scholarship appears derivative and limited in its aims and has thus been reclassified as a 'revival' or 'rediscovery'.[91] Alternative terms to describe the distinctively Byzantine strain of classical scholarship are indeed necessary. But in these instances both 'rediscovery' and 'revival' are proposed as second best, as appropriate labels for a phenomenon which, in Ševčenko's words, 'failed to turn into a renaissance'.[92] However, the value of this comparison for our understanding of cultural history must depend on the definition of the terms involved. Unfortunately, the terms 'renaissance' and 'humanism' are notoriously difficult to define. A commonly accepted definition of 'renaissance' is set out by Alexander Kazhdan in the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* . In support of his argument that the Byzantines never achieved a true renaissance, Kazhdan states that 'a genuine

renaissance "divinizes" man in his practical activity and in his practical goals, whereas Byz. did not go far beyond the traditional perception of man as a pawn in the hands of God or Fate'.[93] This definition of 'renaissance' is closely associated with the commonly accepted interpretation of 'humanism' as a philosophy of man.

However, these definitions of 'Renaissance' and of humanism are relatively recent in date. The free-thinking and even agnostic connotations of the word 'humanism' can be traced back only as far as the nineteenth century and are quite alien to the interests and beliefs of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century scholars and intellectuals now known as 'humanists'.[94] The Italian word 'umanista' was originally university slang for a teacher or student of the *studia humanitatis*, i.e. grammar, poetry, rhetoric, history and moral philosophy.[95] Moreover, the people now known as humanists seem to have referred to themselves as *oratores* or *rhetorici*.[96] The aim of the education they professed was the revival of ancient eloquence – the art of communication being the human art *par excellence* – through the imitation of classical authors.[97] In this respect, the ideals of Italian humanism are surprisingly similar to those of the Byzantine education system described above.

It might therefore seem reasonable to accept the use of the term 'humanist', in the strict and historical sense of the word, to describe late Byzantine culture and education. By underlining the parallels between the literary culture of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy and that of Byzantium such descriptions might encourage the re-evaluation of both cultures. They may also help to expose the realities which underlay both the humanists' claims to be innovators and Byzantine claims to be preserving tradition, which have too often been taken at face value. However, while comparisons between Byzantium and the medieval or post-medieval West can be illuminating, one may question how useful it is to borrow terms from the historiography of one culture or period to apply to another, particularly when they are as broad and imprecise in their range of meaning and implication as 'renaissance' and 'humanism' tend to be. Moreover, the fact that the borrowing has been in one direction, applying terms used primarily to describe post-medieval European phenomena to Byzantium, is both unfortunate and revealing. The very strangeness of a reverse borrowing such as 'Italian Palaeologanism' shows the extent to which ideals and values attributed, often incorrectly, to post-medieval European culture are considered normative for all periods.

Studied in context, the products of Byzantine scholarship and pedagogy have much to tell us about the values and codes of their society and can provide some

clues to the reception of ancient and Byzantine texts. Only when Byzantine culture has been studied, as far as possible, on its own terms can meaningful comparisons be made.

NOTES

1   On the potential importance of this and other related commentaries for our understanding of late Byzantine culture see A. Garzya, 'Sur la production philologique au début du XIVe siècle à Byzance', in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (Bucharest 1971) 84-8.

2   C. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries* (Nicosia 1982), although concentrating on the more advanced parts of the curriculum, provides valuable information.

3   See, for example, J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952).

4   A. Turyn, 'The Sophocles recension of Manuel Moschopoulos', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 80 (1949) 94-173; R.D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* I (Leiden 1973) 43-54. I am grateful to Michael Reeve for this reference.

5   See for example, S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge 1970); J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos: homme d'état et humaniste byzantin* (Paris 1959); H. Hunger, 'Theodoros Metochites als Vorläufer des Humanismus in Byzanz', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 45 (1952) 4-19; M. Gigante, 'Per l'interpretazione di Teodoro Metochites quale umanista bizantino' in *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina* (Naples 1981) 199-216 (= *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 14 (1967) 11-25).

6   D.M. Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire* (London 1979) 50: 'A real renaissance of learning would have required some originality in the use of the material. But in this the latterday Byzantines were curiously deficient. They excelled in learned commentaries and paraphrases of the classics. They laboured to some purpose in the pedantic vineyard of textual emendation: and their scribes undoubtedly preserved for posterity many texts which would otherwise have been lost.'

7   None of these collections of letters, however, is as informative as the tenth-century correspondence of the anonymous schoolmaster in R. Browning and B. Laourdas, 'Τὸ κείμενον τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ κώδικος ΒΜ 36749', 'Επετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 27 (1957) 151-212.

8   See A. Karpozilos, 'The correspondence of Theodoros Hyrtakenos', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 40 (1990), 275-294.

9   Maximos Planudes, *Epistulae*, ed. M. Treu, (Breslau 1886) See also Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium* 103-8.

10 On saints' lives see M. Alexiou, 'Saints and society in the late Byzantine empire', A. Laiou-Thomadakis, ed., *Charanis Studies* (New Brunswick 1980) 84-114.

11 For earlier periods see the discussions of P. Lemerle, *Le Premier Humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971), and A. Moffatt, 'Schooling in the iconoclast centuries', in A. Bryer and J. Herrin, eds. *Iconoclasm* (Birmingham 1977) 85-92.

12 On the focus of ancient and Byzantine syntactical studies on the word rather than the phrase see D. Donnet, 'La place de la syntaxe dans les traités de grammaire grecque, des origines au XIIe siècle', *Antiquité Classique* 36 (1967) 22-48.

13 See below on George of Cyprus.

14 See G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota* (Vatican City 1931) 248-9.

15 Blemmydes, *Autobiographia sive curriculum vitae*, ed. J. Munitiz (Turnhout 1984) I.3.

16 Ibid., II.7 and I.4.

17 George of Cyprus, *Autobiography*, in W. Lameere, *La Tradition manuscrite de la correspondence de Grégoire de Chypre* (Brussels 1937) 177.

18 Lameere was so surprised by George's scorn for the poets that he translated ποιητική as 'la rhétorique', importing twentieth-century literary values into a fourteenth-century text. Ibid., 182.

19 Ibid.

20 Nevertheless, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the ability to read and write to some extent was fairly widespread. See R. Browning, 'Literacy in the Byzantine world', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 4 (1978) 39-54. On George of Cyprus and on the language of his fellow Cypriot, Leontios Machairas, who wrote in a form reflecting the vernacular rather than the Atticizing prose of mainstream Byzantine culture see R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge 1983, 81 and 75.

21 For this view of the role of rhetoric in the West, see R. Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1991) 38-41, and for a different view see the forthcoming volume by J.O. Ward in the series *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental* (Turnhout).

22 Ibid., 92.

23 Moffatt, 'Schooling in the Iconoclast Centuries'.

24 M. Treu, 'Ein byzantinisches Schulgespräch', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 2 (1893) 97. Treu dates the dialogue to the second half of the eleventh century on the basis of the importance of legal studies in the curriculum described but without any further justification, as noted by P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Paris 1977)

25 See A. Pertusi, ''Ερωτήματα: Per la storia e le fonti delle prime grammatiche greche a stampa', *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 5 (1962) 321-51.

26 See R. Browning, 'The Correspondence of a Tenth-century Byzantine Scholar', *Byzantion* 24 (1954) 435. The letter in question indicates clearly that the student was expected to learn grammatical texts by heart. In contrast, N.G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, London (1992) 9-10 suggests that the form of Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* does not reflect any such practice and that this text was used as a reference work by its Italian readers.

27 On Theodosios, his commentators and their place in the Byzantine grammatical tradition, see R.H. Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: their Place in History* (Berlin 1993) 31-2 and 111-23.

28 See Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians* 127-48 on schedography, with some useful examples.

29 Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, XV.7. See also R. Anastasi, 'Ancora su Anna Comnena e la schedographia', *Studi di filologia bizantina* 3 (Catania 1985) 77-95. For a fuller discussion of schedography and related exercises with bibliography see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* 2 (Munich 1978) 22-9.

30 Moschopoulos, *Peri Schedon* (Paris 1545). On the relation of this to other collections of schedography see C. Gallavotti, 'Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodromo', *Bollettino dei classici* 4 (1983) 3-35.

31 Moschopoulos, *Peri schedon* 11-12.

32 On Byzantine spelling problems see R. Browning, 'Itacism', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 2 (New York 1991) 1021.

33 Moschopoulos, *Peri schedon* 3-17.

34 Ibid., 23.

35 P. Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantine* (Paris 1977) 229-39.

36 For a transcription of this commentary see R. Webb, 'The Transmission of the *Eikones* of Philostratos', Ph.D. thesis, (Warburg Institute, University of London 1992) 215-48.

37 See J. Keaney, 'Moschopoulea', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 64 (1971) 303-21.

38 Webb, 'The Transmission of the *Eikones* of Philostratos' 247.

39 See T. Gaisford, *Poetae minores graeci* 3: Τυχὸν γάρ τις ἐθέλει γραμματικὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπικτήσασθαι καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως αὐτῆς γίνεται μέτοχος. ἀλλὰ πρότερον αὐτὸν ἐκδίδωσι τοῖς στοιχειώδεσι γράμμασιν. εἶτα ταῖς συλλαβαῖς, καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ παιδείᾳ ἔπειτα τῇ Διονυσίου βίβλῳ προσέχων, καὶ τοῖς Θεοδοσίου κανόσι καὶ ποιηταῖς· εἶτα σχεδογραφίας ἀπάρχεται. καὶ πολλὰ πολλοῖς μογήσας τοῖς χρόνοις, μόγις τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπικτᾶται.

40 Philostratos' idiosyncrasies were noted by Photios, who remarked on Philostratos' departure from the rules of grammar, but was prepared to accept his authority – saying that as he was obviously an educated man he must have known what he was doing (*Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, 1 (Paris 1959) 28).

41 Michael Psellos, *Peri charakteron suggrammaton tinon*, in *De operatione daemonum*, ed. J.F. Boissonade (Nuremberg 1838) 48-52.

42 C. Gallavotti, 'Planudea II', *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione delle Edizione nazionale dei classici* 8 (1960) 13.

43 The commentary to the epigrams has been published in A. Luppino, 'Scholia Graeca inedita in Anthologiae epigrammata selecta', *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana* n.s. 9 (1959-60) 25-62; that to Aelian in L. Marcheselli Loukas, 'Note schedographiche inedite del Marc. gr. Z487 = 883', *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8-9 (1971-2) 241-60.

44 This argument was first put forward by S. Lindstam, 'Die Philostratoskommentare und die Moschopoulos-Sylloga', *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, 31 (1925) 173-84 but his conjectures were based on the study of an unrepresentative manuscript. A more refined version of Lindstam's argument is put forward by Keaney, 'Moschopoulea'.

45 For full discussion see Webb, 'The Transmission of the *Eikones* of Philostratos' 116-40.

46 Philostratos, *Eikones*, I.4: περιβάλλων τοῖς τείχεσιν ἄνδρας ὡπλισμένους. The comment reads: περιβάλλω τινά, ἤγουν περιπλέκομαι. καὶ περιβάλλω τί τινι, ἤγουν περιτίθημι. καὶ περιβάλλει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν νεφέλαις, ἤγουν ἐνδύει.

47 See H. Hunger, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz: die byzantinische Buchkultur* (Munich 1989) 85, fig. 33. See also M. Mullett 'Writing in Early Medieval Byzantium' in R. McKitterick, ed., *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge 1990) 171. N.G. Wilson, 'Books and Readers in Byzantium' in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Dumbarton Oaks 1975) 8, speculates that pupils may have sold books to each other. However, the manuscripts of the Scholastic Anthology show none of the annotations one might expect to result from use by students. I am also grateful to the anonymous reader for the observation that accounts of schoolboys returning home at the end of the day do not mention books.

48 A. Grafton and L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986) 115.

49 It should be noted, however, that interlinear glosses are not necessarily simpler terms than the words in the text and seem to have functioned also to widen students' vocabulary.

50 Michael Apostolis, *Lettres inédits*, ed. H. Noiret (Paris 1889) 150-2. On Dionysius Thrax see below.

51 Some of these have been published in *Scholia Byzantina in Sophoclis Oedipum Tyrannum*, ed. O. Longo (Padua 1971) 1-164.

52 Dionysios Thrax, *Techne Grammatike*, ed. G.B. Pecorella (Bologna 1962) 31: γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων.

53 Ibid.: ἕκτον κρίσις ποιημάτων, ὃ δὲ κάλλιστόν ἐστι πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ.

54 Ibid., p. 71. See, for example, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, ed. A. Hilgard (Leipzig 1901) (= *Grammatici graeci*, 3) 471-2.54

55 See R. Lamberton and J. Keaney, eds., *Homer's Ancient Readers: the Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's*

Earliest Exegetes (Princeton 1992).

56 It should be noted, however, that the paraphrase of the *Odyssey* by Manuel Gabalas, which was probably not intended as a school text, omits some episodes involving pagan gods and the pagan underworld. See R. Browning, 'A Fourteenth-century Prose Version of the *Odyssey*', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1993) 27-36.

57 Only the section on rhetoric has been published, in *Rhetores graeci*, ed. C. Walz, 3 (Stuttgart 1834) 467-569.

58 Ibid., p. 529. Joseph defines ταυτολογία as τὸ πολλάκις τιθέναι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τὴν αὐτὴν λέξιν.

59 The long comment on the Doric dialect which accompanies the extracts from the *Planudean Anthology* has been published in A. Luppino, *Scholia graeca inedita* 38. It also appears in the selection of poetry in MS Florence, Laurenziana, Plut. XXXII.16 copied partly by Planudes. See C. Gallavotti, 'Planudea', *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dei classici* 7 (1959) 30 and 'Planudea V', *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione dei classici* 4 (1953) 39.

60 On Eustathios' use of the term *koine* see Hedberg, *Eustathios als Attizist* (Uppsala 1935), 201.

61 See G. Böhlig, 'Das Verhältnis von Volksprache und Reinsprache im griechischen Mittelalter', in *Aus der Byzantinistischen Arbeit der DDR* 1 (Berlin 1951) 1-13.

62 Quoted from R. Browning, 'The Language of Byzantine Literature' in S. Vryonis, ed., *The "Past" in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture* (Malibu 1978) 125.

63 In the manuscripts it is frequently found with grammatical treatises by Moschopoulos and Planudes.

64 For an account of how the number of texts in the curriculum tended to diminish over the centuries see A. Dain, 'A propos de l'étude des poètes anciens à Byzance' in *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (Florence 1956) 195-201. However, the very existence of a new collection of texts like the Scholastic Anthology does something to counter the impression of irredeemable decline given by Dain.

65 Mazaris, *Journey to Hades* ed. and trans. J.N. Barry, M.J. Share et al. (Buffalo 1975) (= *Arethusa Monographs* 5) 12 and 10. The inappropriate phrase is aptly translated 'You sure gonna be a secretary of state'.

66 Nikephoros Gregoras, *Florentios*, ed. P.L.M. Leone (Naples 1975).

67 Ibid., ll. 789-91.

68 Ibid., ll. 794-7.

69 Ibid., ll. 801-2: αὕτη γὰρ ὁπλίζει τὴν γλῶτταν καὶ ἄρρενα πρὸς τὸ λέγειν καὶ γράφειν ποιεῖ.

70 Kydones, Speech to John V Palaeologos, in *Correspondance*, ed. R.J. Loenertz, 1 (Vatican City 1956) 11, ll. 6-8: οὕτω τῶν λόγων εἰχόμην ὥστ' οὐδὲν ἦν ὅπερ ἀντὶ τούτων ἐβουλήθην ἄν μοι γενέσθαι, ἱκανὸν ἀνδρὶ νομίσας ἐλευθέρῳ τὸ κτῆμα. See F. Kianka, 'Demetrius Cydones' (diss. Fordham 1981), 30.

71 Gregoras, *Florentios* ll. 926-1025.

72 For some further comparison of education in East and West see S. Ebbesen, 'Western and Byzantine Approaches to Logic' (forthcoming) although Ebbesen's depiction of the study of logic in Byzantium is unnecessarily bleak. I am grateful to Katerina Ierodiakonou for this reference and for discussion of this point.

73 *Anecdota graeca*, ed. Bachmann 2 (Leipzig 1828) 3-101 and 105-66.

74 Ioannes Glykys, *Opus de vera syntaxeos ratione*, ed. A. Jahn (Bern 1849).

75 L. Hjelmslev, *La catégorie des cas: étude de grammaire générale = Acta Jutlandica* 7, 1 (1935) 13, an opinion supported by R.H. Robins, who suggests that Planudes' originality of thought also extended to the Greek tense system: Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians*, 201-33; 'Text and textual interpretation in ancient Greek linguistics', *Semiotica* 70 (1988) 331-44; 'Ex Oriente Lux: A Contribution of the Byzantine Grammarians' in S. Auroux, *Matériaux pour une histoire des théories linguistiques* (Lille 1984) 217-25; 'The Case Theory of Maximus Planudes' in L. Heilmann, ed., *Proceedings of the 11th*

International Congress of Linguists (Bologna 1974) 107-10.

76 See D. Blank, 'Apollonios and Maximus on the Order and Meaning of the Oblique Cases' in D.J. Taylor, ed., *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (Amsterdam 1987) 67-83. A.-M. Chanet, 'Maxime Planude, localiste?', *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 7.1 (1985) (= J. Lallot, ed., *Études sur les grammairiens grecs*) 127-48 gives a detailed discussion and French translation of the passage.

77 I. Glykys, *Opus de vera syntaxeos ratione* 2. For an analysis and translation of selected passages of Glykys' work see Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians* 173-200.

78 Ibid., 27.

79 Ibid., 53-4.

80 Ibid., 3.

81 E. Egger, *Apollonios Dyscole: essai sur l'histoire des théories grammaticales* (Paris 1854) 265.

82 Egger, ibid., notes, with apparent surprise, that Glykys is able to express clear ideas in eloquent language.

83 T. Conley, 'Byzantine Teaching on Figures and Tropes', *Rhetorica* 4 (1986) 335-74, esp. 349-55.

84 See R.H. Robins, *A Short History of Linguistics* (London 1990) 99, and *The Byzantine Grammarians* 39.

85 See C. Wendel, 'Planudes', Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 20 (Stuttgart 1950) col. 2242.

86 The manuscript also contains Planudes' translation of Cato's *Sententiae*, copied on versos only, and several Byzantine grammatical texts.

87 See G. Dagron, 'Aux origines de la civilisation byzantine: langue de culture et langue d'état', *Revue Historique* 241 (1969) 23-56. On the ideological importance of Hellenism in late Byzantium see P. Magdalino, 'Hellenism and Nationalism in Byzantium' in J. Burke and S. Gauntlett, eds, *Neohellenism* (Canberra 1992) 1-29.

88 See, for example, the comments of I. Ševčenko, 'The Palaeologan Renaissance' in W. Treadgold, ed., *Renaissances Before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Stanford 1984) 146.

89 See I. Ševčenko, 'Society and Intellectual Life in the Fourteenth Century', *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des études byzantines* 1 (Bucarest 1974) 69-92.

90 On the wide variations in ability to write shown in signatures see H. Hunger, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz* 76-85.

91 See, for example, Nicol, *The End of the Byzantine Empire* 50. The term 'revival' is suggested by Ševčenko, 'The Palaeologan Renaissance', 144-71.

92 Ibid., 170.

93 A. Kazhdan, 'Renaissance' in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 3 (New York 1991) 1784.

94 See C. Trinkaus, *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism* (Michigan 1983) 3-4. See V.R. Giustiniani, 'Homo, Humanus and the Meanings of Humanism', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (1985), 167-95 for an analysis of the development of the term and its range of meaning in different languages.

95 A. Campana, 'The origin of the word "Humanist"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946) 60-73.

96 M. Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition 1350-1450* (Oxford 1986) 1-2.

97 See Trinkaus, *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism* 52-87 for humanism as defined in the inaugural orations of Bartolommeo della Fonte. The surviving evidence for the teaching methods of humanists such as Guarino Veronese shows that Renaissance humanism was by no means immune from philological pedantry. See Grafton and Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities* 1-28.