

The *Grammatical Introduction* by Nikolaos Sofianos: manuscripts, date, and linguistic models

Marc D. Lauxtermann

Exeter College, Oxford

marc.lauxtermann@exeter.ox.ac.uk

This article deals with the first grammar of vernacular Greek, Nikolaos Sofianos' Grammatical Introduction, and discusses its two manuscripts; it also offers a date for the grammar (after 1545; left unfinished in 1550) and identifies Theodoros Gazis as the principal linguistic model.

Keywords: Sofianos; vernacular Greek; grammatical tradition

Manuscripts

The grammar of Nikolaos Sofianos has come down to us in two manuscripts: Par. gr. 2592, an autograph,¹ and Vat. Ottob. gr. 173, fol. 1^r-30^r, copied by Ioannis Mavromatis in Rome between 1548 and 1553.² The latter manuscript has corrections, in both the margins and the main text, on fol. 5^v, 7^v, 24^r, 28^r, 29^v and 30^r: these corrections are in the hand of Sofianos.³

1 For Sofianos' handwriting see P. Canart, 'Notes sur l'écriture de Nicolas Sophianos', in M. Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs e la commedia dei tre tiranni di A. Ricchi* (Naples 1966) 45–7. While Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, 20–1, flatly denies that Par. gr. 2592 is an autograph, Canart is more cautious: he is inclined to attribute the handwriting to Sofianos. However, for E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*, II (Vienna 1989) 163, the attribution is beyond doubt, and having compared Par. gr. 2592 with a number of manuscripts copied by Sofianos, I concur: it is undoubtedly an autograph.

2 Not fol. 1–50, as incorrectly stated in Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, 20, as well as in all subsequent publications dealing with Sofianos' grammar. For the scribe and the date and place of production, see A. Cataldi Palau, 'Il copista Ioannes Mauromates', in G. Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito*, I (Florence 2000) 335–99, especially 375.

3 Cataldi Palau, 'Il copista Ioannes Mauromates', 398, incorrectly attributes these marginal notes to Arnoldus Arlenius Peraxylus, a Dutch humanist, but the handwriting is clearly that of a Greek and if one compares for example the note on fol. 5^v with the corresponding text on fol. 9^r of the Paris manuscript, there can be no doubt that the annotator is Sofianos himself.

The Paris manuscript contains only Sofianos' grammar: after a folio left blank, it shows the coat of arms of Cardinal Jean de Lorraine on fol. 1^r,⁴ followed by a dedicatory letter addressed to this prelate on fol. 1^r-2^v, the grammar on fol. 3^r-37^r, and an address to the readers on fol. 37^r-39^r.⁵ Vat. Ottob. gr. 173 is a composite manuscript that consists of various codicological units, dating from different periods. The first of these is in the hand of Mavromatis: after a folio left blank, it offers on fol. 1^r-30^r Sofianos' grammar without the coat of arms and the dedicatory letter and without the address to the readers at the end. Like Sofianos' autograph, it originally formed a manuscript on its own. It has a quire numbering in the lower margin and notes to the binder indicating where quires begin and end: (1) fol. 1-7 plus the blank folio at the beginning; (2) fol. 8-15; (3) fol. 16-23; and (4) fol. 24-30 plus a folio now missing from the manuscript.⁶

Émile Legrand published the text on the basis of the Paris manuscript, first in 1870 and then again in 1874, in what was supposed to be a revised edition.⁷ Though the second edition does offer quite a number of corrections, it also has some mistakes that cannot be found in the first: not only typographical mistakes, but also annoying omissions, e.g. 'τὰ περισπώμενα ῥήματα ἔρχοντ' ἀπὸ τὴν <τρίτην> συζυγίαν τῶν βαρυτόνων' (leaving it unclear from which conjugation exactly) or, perhaps even worse, 'κατομωτικά: <ναί μά, εἰς τόν, στόν / καταφατικά:> ναί, ἔτζη, ναίσκε, εἴτις, οὔτως' (conflating two adverbial categories and thus presenting the examples of καταφατικά under the heading 'κατομωτικά').⁸ The 1977 reprint by Papadopoulos is based on Legrand's second edition and, to add insult to injury, has additional mistakes of its own: e.g. the 2nd person plural of the imperfect ἐγράφατε instead of ἐγράφετε (the ending in -ατε is extremely rare in the early modern period).⁹ It also makes a mess of

4 The coat of arms is not reproduced in the two editions by Legrand (see below, n. 7). For Jean de Lorraine's coat of arms, see 'Armorial de la Maison de Lorraine' at fr.wikipedia.org.

5 There is a discrepancy of 1 between the folio numbering of P in Legrand's 1874 edition (see n. 7) and the current foliation of the manuscript: e.g. fol. 22 in Legrand is actually fol. 21. This is because the manuscript received its folio numbering in 1885, 11 years after Legrand's edition.

6 The manuscript also has an alternative folio numbering in the lower margin: 62-91, which indicates that Mavromatis' copy, before being bound together with other grammatical texts in what was to become Vat. Ottob. gr. 173, formed part of another manuscript.

7 E. Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης νῦν τὸ πρῶτον κατὰ τὸ ἐν Παρισίοις χειρόγραφον ἐκδοθεῖσα* (Paris and Athens 1870) and *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire du Grec vulgaire et traduction en Grec vulgaire du traité de Plutarque Sur l'éducation des enfants* (Paris and Athens 1874).

8 Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 48 and 82. The angled brackets indicate omissions from the 1874 edition. The slash / indicates a change of line in the 1870 edition.

9 Th. Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης* (Athens 1977) 221. For the ending -ατε see D. Holton, G. Horrocks, M. Janssen, T. Lendari, I. Manolossou and N. Toufexis, *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* (Cambridge 2019) [henceforth *Cambridge Grammar*] 1538-9 and n. 50.

Sofianos' Latin and Legrand's French.¹⁰ There is an unpublished diplomatic edition of the Paris manuscript by Marc Vernant, which I have not seen.¹¹ The good news for those without access to Vernant's edition is that the manuscript is accessible online – and so too is the other manuscript, the one in Rome.¹²

For reasons beyond his control,¹³ Legrand was unable to compare the Vatican manuscript (V) with the one in Paris (P), which is a pity because there are significant differences between the two. Some of these differences are due to obvious scribal errors. Take the first person plural of the imperfect of oxytone verbs in -έω and in -άω: ἐκρατοῦμαν καὶ ἐκρατούσαμεν V, ἐκρατοῦμαν P (P omits information);¹⁴ ἐγελοῦμαν V, ἐγελοῦμεν P¹⁵ (Sofianos does not use the ending -μεν for the oxytone verbs anywhere else: see, for example, ἄμποτε νὰ γελοῦμαν P).¹⁶ Other mistakes in P include the omission of a whole adverbial category: ποσότητος ἀορίστου καὶ ποιότητος: ὀπωσδήποτε, ὀσαδήποτε, ὡς ἔτυχε, σὰν ἔτυχε V,¹⁷ and the addition of final /n/ in the accusative of ἄλουποῦ: τὴν ἄλουποῦν P, τὴν ἄλουποῦ V.¹⁸ That this final /n/ is a mistake is clear from Sofianos' own words: 'τὰ δὲ θηλυκὰ τελειώνουν εἰς ου ἢ εἰς ω μέγα καὶ κάνουν (...) τὴν αἰτιατικὴν καὶ τὴν κλητικὴν ὡσὰν καὶ τὴν εὐθεῖαν', 'The feminine nouns end in -ου and -ω, (...) and their accusative and vocative are identical to the nominative'.¹⁹ There are also scribal errors in V, such as the plural of what he calls the second aorist of κρατῶ: εἶχα κρατεῖ, εἶχες, εἶχε· εἶχαμεν κρατήσει, εἶχετε, εἶχασι καὶ εἶχαν κρατήσει V versus εἶχα κρατεῖ, εἶχες, εἶχε· εἶχαμεν κρατεῖ, εἶχετε, εἶχασι καὶ εἶχαν P.²⁰

In general, V tends to be a little more formal than P: e.g. τοὺς Αἴαντας V, τοὺς Αἴανταις (Αἴαντες) P,²¹ ἄμποτε νὰ ἡμεθα (γραμμένοι) V, ἄμποτε νὰ ἡμεσθα P,²² and κρατούμεθα V,

10 I counted no fewer than 14 serious spelling errors in two pages of Latin: Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματικὴ*, 201–2.

11 M. Vernant, *La Grammaire de Nicolas Sophianos: transcription diplomatique du manuscrit gr. 2592 de la Bibliothèque nationale et établissement du texte* (Mémoire de DEA, INALCO, Paris 1990). This thesis is unpublished but available in the library of INALCO.

12 Par. gr. 2592 at gallica.bnf.fr. Vat. Ottob. gr. 173 at digi.vatlib.it. Both manuscripts are also accessible via pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr.

13 In the introduction to his first edition, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 20, Legrand complains that the Vatican Library had not been cooperative: 'Nous nous sommes, à deux reprises différentes, adressé à Rome pour obtenir une copie de ce manuscrit; nous avons même offert de payer d'avance: eh bien! nous avons perdu notre temps et nos timbres-poste; on ne nous a pas même fait l'honneur d'une lettre de refus'.

14 P: fol. 22^r; V: fol. 16^r.

15 P: fol. 23^v-24^r; V: fol. 17^v.

16 P: fol. 24^v.

17 V: fol. 29^r. This adverbial category is placed between κλητικά and ὑφαιρέσεως: see the Appendix.

18 P: fol. 8^v; V: fol. 5^v.

19 In his first edition, Legrand (*Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 35) registers the problem; in the second he does not. Incidentally, the accusative ending in -όν is as common as the one in -ού in Sofianos' time: see *Cambridge Grammar*, 572–3.

20 V: fol. 16^v; P: fol. 22^v.

21 P: fol. 9^v; V: fol. 6^r.

22 P: fol. 21^r; V: fol. 15^r.

κρατούμεσθα P,²³ but not always: see, for instance, νὰ κρατειόμεσθε V versus νὰ κρατούμεσθεν P.²⁴

The scribe of the Vatican manuscript, Ioannis Mavromatis, occasionally makes deliberate changes to Sofianos' grammar. In his discussion of derivation in the verbal system, Sofianos gives as example σπείρω, σπέρνω; Mavromatis changes this to δέρω, δέρνω, presumably because the nasal addition in δέρω, δέρνω is not accompanied by a change in the verb stem, which it is in the case of σπείρω, σπέρνω.²⁵ In other words, he is trying to improve on Sofianos. The same happens in the treatment of the verb εἶμαι where Sofianos offers first the subjunctive and then the optative. Mavromatis indicates in the margin that it should be the other way around, and indeed elsewhere in the grammar, optative is always discussed before subjunctive.²⁶ There is one isolated instance in which Mavromatis adds information to the grammar: in the list of tenses, he adds <ὁ> μετ' ὀλίγων μέλλων, 'future perfect', a category which, though rare, is mentioned in the grammatical tradition.²⁷ Whereas the ancient, the Byzantine and the humanist grammarians restrict their discussion to the passive future perfect (e.g. τετύπομαι),²⁸ Mavromatis offers an active form: γράψει θέλω which, however, does not mean 'I shall have written', but 'I shall write' (the 'correct' form would have been θέλω ἔχειν γραμμένα/γραμμένον).²⁹

The major difference between P and V is to be found at the beginning and the very end of Sofianos' grammar. P includes the dedicatory letter to Cardinal de Lorraine headed by a sketch of the cardinal's coat of arms, whereas V does not.³⁰ P has an eloquent defence of the vernacular and its use for educational purposes on the last pages of the manuscript, while V does not.³¹ As the dedicatory letter may not have been of great interest to people other than the dedicatee, its omission in V is understandable. But the only logical explanation for the omission of Sofianos' passionate plea, which certainly must have reverberated with Mavromatis as well as his fellow Greeks and the humanists he was working for, is that it did not yet exist

23 P: fol. 25^r; V: fol. 18^v.

24 P: fol. 26^v; V: fol. 19^v. Cf. ἐὰν κρατειόμεσθε, both in P (fol. 26^r) and V (fol. 19^v).

25 For σπείρω > σπέρνω, see P, fol. 12^v; for δέρω > δέρνω, see V, fol. 8^v.

26 For εἶμαι, subjunctive and optative, see P, fol. 28^{r-v}; for Mavromatis' correction, see V, fol. 22^v. Legrand in his second edition (*Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 71) conflates the subjunctive and the imperative of εἶμαι; for the correct text see the first edition: *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 66.

27 For Mavromatis' addition, see V, fol. 10^r. That this does not go back to Sofianos but has been added by Mavromatis is clear because it is a one-off: Sofianos is very systematic and if he had introduced the future perfect, he would have used the term at least ten times.

28 See for example the grammar of Theodore Prodromos: K. Götting, *Theodosii Alexandrini grammatica* (Leipzig 1822) 148–9 and 162.

29 For the future perfect in medieval and early modern Greek see *Cambridge Grammar*, 1843–8.

30 For the text see Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 25–26; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 33–4; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 201–2.

31 For the text see Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 78–80; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 84–6; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 252–4.

when he copied the text. In other words, V is a copy of an earlier version of Sofianos' grammar and P is a later version.

In fact, the Paris manuscript looks very much like a printer's copy: why else the dedicatory letter, why else the coat of arms? As I shall explain in the next section, it never made its way to the printer because the dedicatee had meanwhile died. P ends abruptly. It is clear from the last sentence of the manuscript that more was to follow: 'It is time to move on from the preface and get on with the work.' But whatever Sofianos may have had in mind, it did not materialize (see section on 'linguistic models' below). In other words, P is not only a later version than V; it is also the final version.

Once we understand that V represents an earlier stage in what was to become Sofianos' *Grammatical Introduction*, other differences between P and V become easier to understand. The main divergences in the grammar itself are related to subheadings and examples. In general, V tends to offer more subheadings than P. Take the introduction to verb morphology (περὶ ῥήματος): while P has no further subheadings, V identifies each subcategory with a rubric: περὶ ἐγκλίσεων, περὶ διαθέσεων, <περὶ εἰδῶν> (which the scribe forgot to add in red ink), περὶ σχημάτων, περὶ ἀριθμῶν, περὶ προσώπων and περὶ χρόνων.³² Sofianos appears to have decided against adding too many rubrics because they might distract from what really is important (just as a text littered with italics and bold may be straining on the eye).

P and V quite regularly add or omit examples. Take for instance the category of appellatives or common nouns (προσηγορικόν). P lists the following words as examples: ἄνθρωπος, βόιδι, ἄλογον, κόρακας, σπίτι, μαχαίρι; but V has ἄνθρωπος, βόιδι, ἄλογον, γάτα, κόρακας.³³ Sofianos initially seems to have assumed that the category of common nouns consists of living entities, and hence did not include words such as σπίτι and μαχαίρι – a view he later changed. It is more difficult to explain why the cat had to go, and not the ox, the horse or the raven.

Whereas P offers a neatly written text (because it was meant to be used by the printer), V has a number of crossed-out passages on fol. 20^v, 22^r and 25^r. Looking at these deletions, it is clear that the scribe, Ioannis Mavromatis, had access to loose sheets, each consisting of ca. 15 lines.³⁴ This may very well have been a copy of Sofianos' own pre-final version.

32 V: fol. 8^v. As for <περὶ εἰδῶν>, the scribe also forgot to rubricate the first letter of the relevant section: <E>ἴδη δύο, etc.

33 P: fol. 11^r; V: fol. 7^v.

34 The crossed-out passages on fol. 20^v and 22^r consist of 15 and 14 lines respectively. The number of lines between these two passages in P is 49 (= ca. 3 pages). The crossed-out passage on fol. 25^r repeats the beginning of fol. 24^r: the text between the beginning of fol. 24^r and fol. 25^r consists of 40 lines in P, which together with the 4 lines crossed out gives us a total of 44 (= ca. 3 pages).

Date

There is some dispute about the date of Sofianos' *Grammatical Introduction* in the secondary literature,³⁵ though without good reason because the dedicatory letter leaves no doubt that Sofianos approached Cardinal de Lorraine in the hope of securing funding for his grammar when both men were in Rome.³⁶ As he writes in his dedication, 'nemo igitur in tam frequenti Urbe mihi occurrit, cui tu non videreris preferendus' ('I cannot think of a better [patron] in this so populous City than you').³⁷ Sofianos moved regularly between Venice and Rome,³⁸ but we know that the cardinal was in Rome in 1549–50 for the election of a new pope.³⁹ Surely, this must be the time when Sofianos and the cardinal met in person and discussed the prospects of publishing the grammar. This would also explain why the grammar never made it to the printing press, though the dedicatory letter and the coat of arms strongly suggest that Sofianos expected it to be printed. The reason is sadly straightforward. Cardinal de Lorraine died on his way back home from Rome (18 May 1550): there was no financial backer, no money forthcoming, and there would be no edition.

1550 is the year in which Sofianos stopped working on the grammar. But now that we know that there were at least two versions, it is clear that the grammar may have been in the making for some time before that date. One may gauge the development of Sofianos' linguistic awareness by looking at his literary output: his copy of the *Chronicle of Tocco* (date unknown, but probably copied at a relatively young age);⁴⁰ the Greek dialogues in Ricchi's *I tre tiranni* (1533);⁴¹ the translation of Ps. Plutarch's

35 Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, 30, Papadopoulos, *Νικόλαου Σοφιανού Γραμματική*, 157–8, A. Morales Ortiz, 'Notas sobre Nicolás Sofianós y su traducción al griego vulgar del tratado *De liberis educandis* de Pseudo-Plutarco', *Myrtia* 20 (2005) 191–206, at 202, P. Ziogas, 'Μία κίνηση πνευματικής αναγεννήσεως τοῦ ὑπόδουλου Ἑλληνισμοῦ κατὰ τον 16ο αἰώνα (1540–1550), μέρος Β': Τὸ πρόγραμμα τοῦ Νικόλαου Σοφιανοῦ', *Ἑλληνικά* 27 (1974) 268–303, at 272, n. 2, and others connect it with Sofianos' translation of Ps. Plutarch's *Περὶ παιδων ἀγωγῆς* into vernacular Greek, which came out in 1545 (2 January 1544 *more veneto*). In contrast, Ch. N. Meletiadis, *Αναγεννησιακές τάσεις στη νεοελληνική λογοσύνη: Νικόλαος Σοφιανός* (Thessaloniki 2006) 124–37, for rather tenuous reasons, dates Sofianos' grammar to the year 1536.

36 For a biography of the cardinal see A. Collignon, *Le mécénat du cardinal Jean de Lorraine (1498–1550)* (Paris-Nancy 1910), who mentions Sofianos on pp. 52–3 and 145–7.

37 See Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 34. The 'Urbs' is not Venice as Meletiadis, *Αναγεννησιακές τάσεις*, 126, thinks: as far as we know, Cardinal de Lorraine never visited Venice.

38 By far the most comprehensive and commonsensical overview of Sofianos' life and works is E. Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy: Printers and Publishers for the Greek World* (Venice 1994) 460–72.

39 See Collignon, *Le mécénat du cardinal*, 27.

40 See G. Schirò, *Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia di anonimo* (Rome 1975), 159–61 (which summarizes an earlier publication by the same author: 'Un apografo della Cronaca dei Tocco prodotto da Nicola Sofianòs', *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 7 (1969) 209–19).

41 There are two editions: Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, and C. Luciani, *Agostino Ricchi – Nicola Sofianòs: I tre tiranni (secondo la redazione del cod. lucchese 1375)* (Manziana and Rome, 2012). References are to Luciani's edition.

Περὶ παιδῶν ἀγωγῆς (*Paidagogos*, 1545);⁴² and the grammar.⁴³ I have looked at the following features of noun morphology: masc. nom. pl., e.g. αὐθένταις (αὐθέντες) vs αὐθένται; masc. acc. pl., e.g. ἄνδραις (ἄνδρες) vs ἄνδρας; fem. nom. pl., e.g. οἱ ἡμέραις (ἡμέρες) vs αἱ ἡμέραι; fem. acc. pl., e.g. ταῖς ἡμέραις (τὰς ἡμέρες) vs τὰς ἡμέρας; fem. nom./acc. pl., e.g. οἱ/ταῖς πόλεις vs αἱ/τὰς πόλεις; extended genitive forms of τοῦτος, e.g. τουτουνοῦ versus τούτου.

In his manuscript copy of the *Chronicle of Tocco*, Sofianos is still very conservative. He changes στρατιῶτες to στρατιώτας, ἄρχοντες to ἄρχοντας; οἱ καμακίς οἱ τόσες to αἱ τόσαι καμακίαι; τέντες to τέντας, πολλές to πολλές.⁴⁴ Things are not much better in 1533 when Sofianos was asked to contribute to Ricchi's Italian comedy *I tre tiranni* with some dialogues in Greek. Apart from 53 ταῖς καλοσύναις ὄλαις, 67 δεκάξ' ἡμέραις ἀπερνοῦν, and 111 διὰ ταῖς χάραις ταῖς πολλαῖς, we find 114 αἱ ἀκτίνες του, 148 αἱ ἀρεταί του αἱ πολλαί, 183 αἱ χάριτές του αἱ πολλαί καὶ αἱ εὐεργησίαι, 209 μὲ χάριτας, 220 τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς, 232 αἱ πράξεις του and 239 τὰς πράξεις.⁴⁵ We also have 120 πρίγκιπας, αὐθέντας ἄλλους, 131 αὐθένται καὶ δεσπότηι and 191 μεγάλους ἀνδριάντας.

Though the Greek of the *Paidagogos*, Sofianos' translation of Ps. Plutarch, is closer to the vernacular than the dialogues in *I tre tiranni*, it still retains a plethora of archaic forms: e.g. 104.19 κλέπται, 104.20 συκοφάνται, 101.9 ὑπηρέτας, 101.29-30 πολλοὺς πατέρας (cf. 103.15-16 τοὺς ... πατέρες), 103.25 κόλακας ... ξενοφωμίτας, 119.14 μοιχεῖται, 119.25 αἱ ἡδοναί, 99.13 αἱ μητέρες τους, 95.20 τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετὰς, 103.5 χιλίας δραχμὰς, 103.20 τὰς ἡδονὰς, 116.22-23 τὰς ἐορτὰς, 97.11 αἱ παραίνεσεις, 100.27 αἱ τάζεις, 99.23 τὰς βρῦσεις, 101.27 καλὰς παραίνεσεις καὶ συμβουλὰς and 119.14 τούτων.

None of these forms can be found in Sofianos' grammar, with only one exception in the whole text: 84.5 τοὺς κανόνας, a technical term referring to the rules of grammar.⁴⁶ The following forms are indicative of Sofianos' Greek in the grammar: 39.6 οἱ προφήταις, 39.8 τοὺς προφήταις, 43.15 τοὺς Αἴανταις, 37.4 προσωδίαίς, 76.5 μετοχαῖς, 85.9 οἱ ἐπιστήμαις, 37.9 ἔς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς, 76.12 ὄλαις ταῖς μετοχαῖς, 86.1 ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιστήμαις, 46.24 ἐγκλισες, 47.3 διάθεσες, 80.9 πρόθεσες, 44.4-5 εἰς ταῖς ἐνικαῖς πτώσες and 85.5-6 τῆς γραμματικῆς τουτηνῆς.

42 Edited along with the grammar in Legrand's second edition: Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 87–123; reprinted in Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ Γραμματικῆ*, 255–91. References are to Legrand's edition.

43 References are to Legrand's second edition.

44 Schirò, *Cronaca dei Tocco*, 159. Schirò incorrectly reads κάμακες; it should be καμακίς = καμακίς; see E. Kriaras, *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικῆς ἐλληνικῆς δημόδου γραμματείας, 1100–1669*, vol. 7 (Thessaloniki 1980) 305, s.v. κάμακες.

45 Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, 33–4 points out that the opening scenes in which Filokratis talks to the servant and the mistress of the house (vv. 31–84) make use of more colloquial Greek than the rest. This is true to a certain extent, but the Greek is still rather formal: 33 οὐκ οἶδα, 45 ἀνάμεινον, 75 ὡς ὄραξ and 79 τίς εἶ;

46 Sofianos also uses obsolete endings in his description of the pronouns: 77.8–9 (περὶ ἀντωνυμίας) πρωτότυποι, κτητικά, δεικτικά, ἐπιταγματικά καὶ σύνθετοι, and the prepositions: 80.9 and 11 (πρόθεσες) μονοσύλλαβοι ... δισύλλαβοι.

As time went by, Sofianos grew more accepting of the vernacular: while he ‘corrected’ the language of the *Chronicle of Tocco* and used an archaizing literary idiom in *I tre tiranni*, in the *Paidagogos* his Greek became closer to the spoken tongue though it still retained a great number of obsolete endings. But it is only in the grammar that he fully embraced the beauty of vernacular Greek. It is for this reason that it is highly unlikely that he was already working on the grammar before 1545 (the date of the *Paidagogos*). In fact, it makes more sense to think that work on the grammar had begun not long before Sofianos approached Cardinal de Lorraine in Rome in 1549–50. Further evidence for this is that the earlier version of Sofianos’ grammar that we find in the Vatican manuscript was copied during Mavromatis’ stay in Rome in 1548–53.⁴⁷ It may have been one of the first manuscripts Mavromatis copied while in Rome: say, in 1548 or 1549.

Linguistic models

Apart from the date, another hotly debated issue is the question which grammatical models Sofianos used for the composition of his grammar.⁴⁸ The answer is in the title, which is emphatically *not* ‘Γραμματική τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης’ as Sofianos’ grammar is usually called. We owe this idiotic title to Legrand (idiotic because Sofianos does not refer to his compatriots as Ἕλληνες, nor does he use the pedantic genitive ending in -ης). The heading in the Paris manuscript is ‘Γραμματικῆς εἰσαγωγῆς βιβλίον πρῶτον’, ‘First book of the Grammatical Introduction’, which is exactly the same title as that of the grammar of Theodoros Gazis,⁴⁹ a highly influential text in humanist circles, widely used by scholars of Greek, published and translated on more than one occasion in the sixteenth century.⁵⁰ One of these editions with facing translation is by Erasmus of Rotterdam, who rendered the title of the first book of Gazis as ‘Primus liber grammaticae institutionis’.⁵¹ The Latin word *institutio* is παιδαγωγία in classical Greek.⁵² The alternative title given to Sofianos’ grammar in the

47 See Cataldi Palau, ‘Il copista Ioannes Mauromates’, 375.

48 See G. N. Ilioudis, ‘Η γραμματική του Κωνσταντίνου Λασκάρεως πρότυπο της γραμματικής του Νικολάου Σοφιανού’, *Ελληνικά* 40 (1989) 413–7; E. Karantzola, ‘Γραμματική της κοινῆς των Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης: Η διαχείριση της γραμματικῆς παράδοσης’, *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 66 (1998) 58–63; G. Katsouda, ‘Η σχέση της γραμματικῆς του Νικολάου Σοφιανού με τις γραμματικῆς του Κωνσταντίνου Λασκάρεως και του Διονυσίου Θράκα’, *Ελληνικά* 52 (2002) 129–37; K. Stoppie, ‘Sophianos on participles and relative pronouns: Between tradition and modernity’, *Ελληνικά* 57 (2007) 319–34; K. Stoppie, ‘The treatment of the adverb in the first grammar of Modern Greek’, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 17 (2007) 59–74.

49 See P. Mackridge, *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766–1976* (Oxford 2009) 68, n. 121 (who owes this information to David Holton).

50 For humanist editions and translations of Gazis’ grammar see P. Botley, *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts* (Philadelphia 2010) 14–25.

51 For Erasmus’ translation (1516), see Botley, *Learning Greek*, 137 (no. 77).

52 See e.g. H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, III (Paris 1572) 11: ‘Παιδαγωγία, ἢ, Institutio puerilis’.

Vatican manuscript, ‘Γραμματικῆς παιδαγωγίας βιβλίον πρῶτον’, is therefore a reborrowing; it is a Greek translation of the Latin of Erasmus.

Though it is beyond doubt that Sofianos borrowed his title, *Grammatical Introduction*, from Theodoros Gazis, it does not mean that his grammar is solely modelled on that of Gazis; in fact, it is not difficult to find parallels with other grammars, particularly that of Dionysius Thrax. Furthermore, grammarians tend to reuse and recycle the work of their predecessors: it is because of all this rehashing that what Gazis says may very well be found elsewhere as well.⁵³ So even when Gazis and Sofianos are saying the same thing, Gazis is not necessarily the source Sofianos had in mind when he wrote his *Grammatical Introduction*.

A good example is the section on adverbs in Sofianos’ grammar (for which see the Appendix on p. 136).⁵⁴ He distinguishes forty adverbial categories,⁵⁵ most of which can also be found in Gazis; but if we look at the precise order of these categories, it is not difficult to see that the first 19 have the same sequential order as Dionysius Thrax and Chrysoloras.⁵⁶ One of these two is his model here. However, if we look at numbers 20 to 35, they are in the sequential order in which they are treated in the first two books of Gazis: this is the second source used. Numbers 23, 37–38 and 40 derive from Laskaris: a third source used by Sofianos.⁵⁷ Sofianos adds two adverbial categories of his own: (15) ἀποδιωκτικά and (25) εὐφραντικά. The ἀποδιωκτικά are the opposite of the preceding category, (14) παρακελεύσεως: it is σίττο, ἔξω, φύγε versus νά, ἄμε, ἔλα. The category of the εὐφραντικά, however, is a real innovation. It comprises exclamations of delight, such as εἶχι and εἶχιτα (spelled by Korais as ὕχι/ὕχιτα and by others as ἴχι/ἴχιτα),⁵⁸ things people say when something smells good or is otherwise very agreeable.

In order to establish patterns of influence, one needs to distinguish new from old. Take for instance the verb system in Gazis and Sofianos. Whereas Laskaris and earlier

53 As rightly observed by Karantzola, ‘Γραμματικῆ’, 60.

54 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 75–7; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 80–3; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ Γραμματικῆ*, 248–51.

55 Stoppie, ‘The treatment of the adverb’, 64–5, has only 38 categories, firstly because she uses Legrand’s second edition, which omits no. 27, and secondly because the Paris manuscript used by Legrand for his edition does not offer no. 37.

56 For an excellent overview of adverbial categories in ancient, Byzantine and early modern grammars, see G. Uhlig, *Appendix Artis Dionysii Thracis* (Leipzig 1881) 2–11.

57 Stoppie, ‘The treatment of the adverb’, 67–8, fails to register that these adverbial categories are found in Laskaris because she uses the 1476 edition and not the expanded 1495 edition (reprinted on numerous occasions in the sixteenth century).

58 See A. Korais, *Ἄτακτα*, IV (Paris 1832) 187. His source is A. da Somavera, *Tesoro della lingua greca-volgare ed italiana* (Paris 1709) 147, s.v. ἴχι and ἴχιτας. ἴχι is attested in *Λόγος παρηγορητικὸς περὶ Δυστυχίας καὶ Εὐτυχίας*, line. 472; ἴχιτας in Chortatsis, *Πανόρια*, 2.143 and 5.343. In letter 27.23 of Joseph Bryennios read with the ms. ἴχιτα ὅτι ἐλυτρόθηκα, not ὄχετο ὁ. ἐ. as in the edition: N. V. Tomadakis, ‘Ἐκ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἐπιστολογραφίας’, *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 46 (1983–86) 350. For its use in modern dialects, see K. Minas, *Μελέτες νεοελληνικῆς διαλεκτολογίας* (Athens 2004) 189–90.

grammarians have thirteen conjugations, Gazis reduces these to just five: four barytone conjugations and one conjugation in -μι, and the contracted verbs are presented as variants within the third conjugation of the barytone verbs.⁵⁹ Sofianos does exactly the same. He has the same four barytone categories as Gazis, omits the fifth one because there are no verbs in -μι in vernacular Greek, and explicitly states that the contracted verbs fall under the third conjugation of the barytones.⁶⁰

Another example is the tense system in Sofianos. He distinguishes eight tenses: present (γράφω) – imperfect (ἔγραφα) – first future (θέλω γράψει) – first aorist (ἔγραψα) – perfect (γραμμέρον ἔχω) – pluperfect (γραμμέρον εἶχα and εἶχα γράψει) – second aorist (εἶχα γράφει) – second future (θέλω γράφει), and then the same again, but for the passive voice.⁶¹ Since all eight categories can be found in any ancient or Byzantine grammar, the source is not necessarily the grammar of Theodoros Gazis. But what clinches it is the fact that while the grammatical tradition in general puts middle forms either under the passive voice (e.g. ἐτυνάμην) or the active voice (e.g. τέτυπα), Gazis separates the three voices and offers for each of these voices exactly the same eight tenses as we find in Sofianos, and in exactly the same order.⁶² As vernacular Greek has only two voices, active and passive, the only thing Sofianos had to do was to skip the middle voice altogether. That Gazis is the model here becomes clear when we look at the other humanist grammar, that of Konstantinos Laskaris. Laskaris distinguishes ten tenses for the active voice: present, imperfect, perfect, middle perfect, pluperfect, middle pluperfect, first aorist, second aorist, first future and second future.⁶³ The number of tenses and the order in which Laskaris presents these tenses is radically different from what we find in Gazis and Sofianos.

The metalanguage has not changed.⁶⁴ Just as Sofianos mentions the dative and illustrates this with an example in the genitive, or just as he offers ἄμποτε νά plus past tenses or subjunctive as legitimate forms of the optative, for no other reason than that ancient grammars happen to have morphological categories called dative and optative,⁶⁵ so too does Sofianos use the terms ‘second aorist’ and ‘second future’ as if they correspond to linguistic realities of the vernacular. Thus we find εἶχα γραφῆ and

59 See Botley, *Learning Greek*, 17.

60 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 40–2; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 47–8; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 215–6.

61 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 42; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 48–9; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 216–7.

62 *Theodori Gazae introductionis grammaticae libri quattuor* (Basel 1538), 29–31. See J. Signes Codoñer, ‘The definition of the middle voice in Ancient and Byzantine grammars’, in M. Hinterberger (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Turnhout 2014) 72–95, at 78–9.

63 *Constantinus Lascaris: Greek Grammar. Milan, Dionysius Paravinus for Demetrius of Crete, 30 January 1476. Facsimile edition* (Amsterdam 1966) [30].

64 This may lead to some terminological confusion, though not to the degree that Stoppie, ‘Sophianos on participles and relative pronouns’, assumes.

65 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 29 and 48–9; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 36 and 55; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 204 and 223.

θέλω γραφή as the second aorist and second future of γράφομαι respectively,⁶⁶ whereas the former is in fact a pluperfect and the latter a variant form of θέλω γραφή ('first future' in Sofianos).⁶⁷ The problem is inherited from previous grammarians. Whereas second aorists (e.g. ἔμαθον, ἔγνων) and second futures (e.g. φανῶ, νομιῶ) form a fairly restricted group in Ancient Greek, ancient and Byzantine grammarians assume that each verb, apart from the regular forms, should also have irregular ones, even if these are not attested: so the second aorist of τύπτω becomes ἔτυπον, and the second future, τυπῶ – neither of them attested anywhere.⁶⁸ Sofianos continues in the same vein.

In the Paris manuscript the *Grammatical Introduction* is followed by a text in which Sofianos explains to his readers why the vernacular should be used at all levels of instruction. Widely seen as an epilogue, it is in fact a preface, as its last sentence unambiguously indicates: 'Καιρὸς λοιπὸν εἶναι νάφήσομεν τὰ προοίμια καὶ νά πιάσομεν τὸ ἔργον', 'It is therefore time to move on from the *preface* and get on with the work'.⁶⁹ But a preface to what exactly? Here Sofianos' linguistic model once again provides the answer. Gazis' grammar is arranged in four books of increasing difficulty. The first book offers basic information on the declensions of the nouns, the conjugations of the verb, and the other parts of speech. The second book covers the same material and in the same order, but in much greater detail. The third book deals with orthography and accentuation; the fourth book, with syntax. The first book is for beginners, the second for more advanced students who need to learn the linguistic terminology and how to apply the grammatical rules. Book 2 begins as follows: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πάλιν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἀρξάμενοι λέγομεν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, 'Hereafter let us start again from the beginning and discuss the same (topics) [as in book 1]'.⁷⁰ Sofianos' preface opens as follows: 'Ῥυτὰ δὲ πάλιν ἄς ἀρχίσωμεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς νάξετάσομεν μετ' ἀκριβείας, καὶ καταλεπτῶς ἄς ξεκαθαρίσωμεν κατὰ τάξιν ἕνα ἕνα μὲ τοὺς κανόνας τοὺς τεχνολογικοὺς καὶ τοὺς σχηματισμοὺς, 'Let us now start again from the beginning and thoroughly examine (the material) and let us clarify the grammatical rules and formations in detail and in an orderly manner, one by one'.⁷¹

66 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 43; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 49; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 217.

67 Karantzola, 'Γραμματική', 60–1, H. Tonnet, *Histoire du grec moderne: la formation d'une langue* (Paris 2003), 176, and I. Manolessou, 'Μεσαιωνική γραμματική και μεσαιωνικές γραμματικές', in G. K. Mavromatis and N. Agiotis (eds), *Πρώμη νεοελληνική δημόδης γραμματεία* (Irakleio 2012), 293–311, at 303, assume that the distinction in Sofianos' grammar between the first and the second future of the active voice, θέλω γράψει and θέλω γράφει, testifies to a nascent awareness of verbal aspect; but if that were the case, one would expect the second future of the passive voice to be θέλω γράφεσται (for the form, see *Cambridge Grammar*, 1783).

68 See for example the *Canones* of Theodosios the Grammarian: ed. A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, IV.1 (Leipzig 1894) 52 and 53.

69 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 80; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 86; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 254.

70 *Theodori Gazae introductionis grammaticae*, 85.

71 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 78; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 84; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφianoῦ Γραμματική*, 252.

A few lines further down Sofianos explains his didactic method: 'εἰς ὀλίγον καιρὸν θέλει μάθῃ νὰ κλίνει τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου καὶ θέλει ξεύρει νὰ κανονίζει καὶ νὰ τεχνολογᾷ καὶ τᾶλλα ὡσὰν εἶναι γραμμένα: λέγω, νὰ γράφει ὀρθὰ καὶ νὰ συντάσσει τὰ λόγια του μετέχνην γραμματικὴν κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν συνήθειαν', '[the student] will quickly learn to decline the parts of speech and will know the rules and the grammatical concepts and everything else as it is here written: I mean, he will learn orthography and syntax as it applies to the vernacular according to the art of grammar'.⁷² That is to say, the student will first learn the basics of morphology (book 1 in Gazis) and will then develop the linguistic theory (Gazis 2) and then learn everything else, namely orthography (Gazis 3) and syntax (Gazis 4). Note that the words τᾶλλα ὡσὰν εἶναι γραμμένα (everything else *as it is here written*), though not factually true, indicate that Sofianos at the time of writing was certain that his grammar would contain books on orthography and syntax.

In the dedicatory letter, Sofianos informs his potential sponsor, Cardinal de Lorraine, that the grammar will comprise three books: (1) parts of speech including noun and verb morphology; (2) orthography; and (3) syntax. If funding is available, he may even compile a dictionary. While the first of these three books is ready, the other two are still in the making.⁷³

This first book is the grammar as we know it, but without the prefatory material at the very end. Sofianos' original plan appears to have been to use Gazis' books 1 and 3–4 as his model (= Sofianos' books 1–3). But then at some stage, after he had presented his book to Cardinal de Lorraine, he came to regret his decision and thought of adding his vernacular version of the second book of Gazis, full of technical information and hard on linguistics. But as he had not yet given up on his idea of three books (morphology, orthography and syntax), Sofianos decided to incorporate Gazis' book 2 into his own first book as a kind of appendix, which is why there is no formal separation between the end of morphology (= Gazis 1) and the beginning of the preface to linguistics (= Gazis 2).

Sofianos never completed his project. He did not write an appendix to his book 1 (1b = Gazis 2), nor did he compose books 2 and 3 (Gazis 3 and 4) as he had promised.⁷⁴ The reason of course is that with Cardinal de Lorraine dead, it was clear to Sofianos that money would not be forthcoming, and he stopped working on the project. In its unfinished state, the Paris manuscript bears witness to the moment

72 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 79; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 84; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ Γραμματική*, 252. The word καιρὸν is omitted in the two editions of Legrand.

73 See Legrand, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ τοῦ Κερκυραίου*, 26; Legrand, *Nicolas Sophianos: Grammaire*, 34; Papadopoulos, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ Γραμματική*, 202.

74 Contrary to what A. Moustoxydis, 'Νικόλαος Σοφιανός', *Ἑλληνομνήμων* 4 (1843) 249, states, Marc. gr. 492, fol. 223^r, does not contain Sofianos' book on syntax. The ms. dates from the mid 15th c., the 'syntax' (one page only) deals with Ancient Greek, and its author is a different Sofianos. See Vitti, *Nicola Sofianòs*, 20 and Stoppie, 'Sophianos on participles and relative pronouns', 321.

Sofianos abandoned his plans. Both manuscripts together (P and V) allow us to understand how Sofianos' ideas developed and what the edition-that-never-was would have looked like, had Sofianos been more fortunate. Suffice it to say that Sofianos' *Grammatical Introduction* deserves a new scholarly edition, based on both manuscripts.⁷⁵

Appendix: Adverbial categories in six grammars (the numbers refer to the order in which they are treated)⁷⁶

<i>Sofianos</i>	<i>Dion. Thrax</i>	<i>Chrysoloras</i>	<i>Gazis</i>	<i>Chalkondylis</i>	<i>Laskaris</i>
1	χρονικά	1	1	1	1
2	μεσότητος	2–3	3 and 5	3	3
3	ποσότητος	4–5	4	4	4
4	τοπικά	6	6	2	2
5	εὐχῆς	7	7	26	–
6	σχετλιαστικά	8	8	27	37
7	ἀρνητικά	9	10	18	29
8	θαυμαστικά	13	9	28	38
9	ἀπαγορευτικά	11	–	19	30
10	ὁμοιώσεως	12	11	9	10
11	εἰκασμοῦ	14	12	20	31
12	τάξεως	15	13	8	9
13	ἀθροίσεως	16	14	5	5
14	παρακελεύσεως	17	15	31 (II.1)	6
15	ἀποδιωκτικά	–	–	–	–
16	συγκρίσεως	18	16	11	12
17	ἐρωτήσεως	19	17	21	32
18	ἐπιτάσεως	20	18	12	23
19	βεβαιώσεως	24	19	14	25
20	διαφρέσεως	–	–	6	7
21	ἐξαφρέσεως	–	–	7	8
22	ἀποστάσεως	–	–	10	11
23	διαστάσεως	–	–	–	20
24	ἀνέσεως	–	–	13	24
25	εὐφραντικά	–	–	–	–
26	κατομωτικά	23	21	15	27
27	καταφατικά	10	–	16	26
28	ἀπομωτικόν	22	22	17	28
29	δείξεως	–	–	22	33
30	διασαφητικά	–	–	24	35
31	ἐκπλήξεως	–	–	29	39
32	θειαςμοῦ	26	23	30	40
33	διακωλυτικόν	–	–	33 (II.3)	–
34	κρύψεως	–	–	34 (II.4)	–
35	ἐμφαντικά	–	–	35 (II.5)	–
36	κλητικά	–	–	23	34
37	ποσότητος ἀορίστου καὶ ποιότητος	–	–	–	14
38	ὑφαιρέσεως	–	–	–	15
39	θετικά	25	20	25	36
40	ἐθνικά	–	–	–	18

75 Marjolijne C. Janssen and I are currently preparing a critical edition, with introduction and linguistic commentary.

76 This appendix, apart from Sofianos, is based on Uhlig, *Appendix Artis Dionysii Thracis*, 2–11.