

REVIVING ANCIENT GREEK: NEW METHODS AND HISTORICAL CONTEXTS IN CLASSICAL STUDIES

REAVIVANDO EL GRIEGO ANTIGUO: NUEVOS MÉTODOS Y CONTEXTOS HISTÓRICOS EN LOS ESTUDIOS CLÁSICOS

Gonzalo Jerez Sánchez¹ & Unai Iriarte²

Enviado: 28/04/2024 · Aceptado: 03/06/2024
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5944/etfii.37.2024.41263>

Abstract

The study of ancient Greek has faced significant challenges, from its perceived lack of practicality to the apparent obsolescence of Classical Philology. The teaching of Greek has evolved due to historical and political developments in countries where it was taught. Currently, the value of ancient Greek in educational curricula is under debate, threatening its future. Despite its limited contemporary applications, ancient Greek remains essential for scholars of Classical Philology, history, and Eastern European studies. We propose exploring alternative methods to approach the language, such as those by Moschopoulos, utilizing texts of various categories and purposes, and reflecting on historical teaching methods. By moving away from current positivist stances, we can revitalize the study of this language and offer new perspectives.

Keywords

Classics; Ancient Greek; History; Greek language; education; pedagogy; cultural heritage; Classical Reception.

-
1. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. C. e.: gonzalo@edlit.auth.gr. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0087-515X>
 2. Harvard University. C. e.: uiriarate@fas.harvard.edu. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3166-5887>

Este trabajo se inserta dentro del proyecto «Ancient Greece in Modern times» dirigido por el Dr. Unai Iriarte Asarta en el Real Colegio Complutense en la Universidad de Harvard. También se encuentra dentro de los proyectos «Democracia antigua en el discurso y en la construcción de la república moderna» (PID2020-112558GB-I00), financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación del Gobierno de España y «Manuscritos griegos en España y su contexto europeo (III): Estudios históricos, filológicos y crítico-textuales» (PID2019-105733GB-I00), financiado por el Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación de España.

Resumen

El estudio del griego antiguo ha enfrentado desafíos significativos, desde la percepción de su falta de practicidad hasta la aparente obsolescencia de la filología clásica. La enseñanza del griego ha evolucionado debido a desarrollos históricos y políticos en los países donde se enseñaba. Actualmente, el valor del griego antiguo en los planes de estudio está en debate, lo que amenaza su futuro. A pesar de sus limitadas aplicaciones contemporáneas, el griego antiguo sigue siendo esencial para estudiosos de la filología clásica, la historia y los estudios de Europa del Este. Proponemos explorar métodos alternativos para abordar el idioma, como el de Moscópulo, utilizando textos de diversas categorías y propósitos, y reflexionando sobre los métodos históricos de enseñanza. Al alejarnos de las posturas positivistas actuales, podemos revitalizar el estudio de esta lengua y ofrecer nuevas perspectivas.

Palabras clave

Estudios clásicos, griego antiguo, historia, lengua griega, educación, pedagogía, patrimonio cultural, recepción clásica.

.....

1. INTRODUCTION

Ancient Greek has been a non-negotiable part of the school curriculum in Western Europe since the 16th century. Previously, education had developed within a Latin-speaking curriculum that emerged in the Late Roman Empire, where Greek had lost its dominance.³ Although Ancient Greek initially played a fundamental role in education, alongside Latin, the importance of the language waned, while that of the latter grew. As a consequence, Greek gradually vanished from the curriculum in primary and secondary education.⁴ Thus, while it is fully represented in specialist subjects in higher education, the language inconsistently survives in the secondary education curriculum. Nevertheless, even today vestiges of Ancient Greek remain in secondary education syllabi.

The factors of this reduction in Ancient Greek coursework at secondary schools in Western Europe have been debated for decades. This situation can be approached in two ways. Firstly, it can be analysed from two distinct perspectives: those who defend its elimination and those in favour of its preservation. Secondly, the case can be addressed in terms of the teaching of Ancient Greek in Greece versus the teaching of Greek in Western Europe (in the broad sense of the term, *i.e.* the West).

2. STRUCTURAL PROBLEM

2.1. ON THE LACK OF SOCIAL UTILITY

We shall first examine the problem from the educational perspective. In general, secondary education is generally recognized as a formative learning phase intended to produce citizens capable of making autonomous decisions in a democratic and pluralistic society. Whereas in practice, it is presented more as a preparation for higher education or vocational education and training. On these grounds, from a theoretical point of view Ancient Greek can be considered wholly unnecessary. Learning the language serves no interest to students unless they wish to study

3. For the period of transition and decline of Greek in imperial education, *vid.* Dickey, Eleanor: «Greek teaching in Republican Rome: how exactly did they do it?», in Rico, Christophe and Pedicone, Jason (eds.): *Transmitting a Heritage: The Teaching of Ancient Languages from Antiquity to the 21st Century*, Jerusalem, Polis Institute Press, 2022, pp. 3-21. For the exceptional status of Greek in Western education immediately before the Renaissance, see the detailed treatment in Wilson, Nigel Guy: *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Bloomsbury, 2017, pp. 1-38.

4. Echoes of this critical situation can be seen in secondary education, for example, in the Anglophone world (Ryan, Cressida: «Perspectives on Classics», *Bulletin of CUCD*, 51 (2022), pp. 1-35.), Italia (De Toni, Alberto Felice: «In-attualità del liceo classico, il processo», in *Cislsuola.it*: <https://www.cislsuola.it/uploads/media/In-Attualita.pdf>; accessed 31/5/2024) or, even, Spain, where an association has been necessary to defend the presence of these subjects: <https://escuelaconclasicos.org/> (accessed 31/5/2024). Given the gradual abandonment of this subject, voices like those of Nuccio Ordine or Carlos Martínez Aguirre have risen. Their essays are widely translated and read (not only by teachers of this subject). *Vid.* Ordine, Nuccio: *L'utilità dell'inutile*, Milano, Bompiani, 2013 and Martínez Aguirre, Carlos: *La extraña odisea*, Madrid, Círculo Rojo, 2013.

Classical Philology or a discipline in which knowledge of Greek may be useful. Moreover, secondary school pupils continuing with vocational education and training almost certainly do not need to know Ancient Greek.

Indeed, if we take as an example enrolment in the Classical Philology degree at the University of Seville in the 2020-2021 academic year, bearing in mind that Seville is one of the most well-attended universities⁵ in one of Europe's most populous countries, the numbers speak in favour of the opposition, which supports abolishing Ancient Greek from the curriculum. The figures reveal a total of 42 students enrolled in the first year and 9 graduating at that university from those who started the degree course in 2017.⁶ By way of comparison, the number of students enrolled in the Business Administration and Management degree at the same university in 2020 stood at 468, with 119 of those who started the course in 2017 graduating.⁷ This data exemplifies the exclusivity of classical studies today.⁸

2.2. THE PURPORTED OBSOLESCENCE OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

On top of a select enrolment, Classical Philology is starting to disappear as a separate discipline and is showing signs of being absorbed into the field of cultural studies. Under this approach, the aim is to apply the ideological premises employed in modern literary criticism to classical literature. Thus, Classical Philology would have presumably fulfilled its historical purpose: the objectives of the subdisciplines that serve it, and that it in turn serves, have been met. As indicated by Boeckh in his programmatic writings,⁹ and as stated below by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, the purpose of Classical Philology must be the following fully-fledge programme and no other:

«The nature of classical scholarship is defined by its subject-matter: Graeco-Roman civilisation in its essence and in every facet of its existence. This civilisation is a unity and the task of scholarship is to bring that dead world to life by the power of science: to recreate the poet's song, the thought of the philosopher and the lawgiver, the sanctity of the temple and the feelings of believers and unbelievers, the bustling life of the market and port, the physical appearance of land and sea, mankind

5. In the 2021-2022 academic year, around 50,000 students were enrolled on degree courses at the University of Seville. (cf. <https://www.us.es/laUS/la-us-en-cifras/anuario-estadistico> [in Spanish], accessed 28/12/2023).

6. Over the past five years, the student drop-out rate has exceeded 50%, the only exception being the 2019-2020 academic year, when it was 48%. In this regard, see «Resultados del título» at <https://www.us.es/estudiar/que-estudiar/oferta-de-grados/grado-en-filologia-clasica> [in Spanish] (accessed 28/12/2023).

7. The number of graduates has been calculated based on the drop-out rates. Note that these figures are always slightly nuanced as they include students from previous academic years. For more information, see <https://www.us.es/estudiar/que-estudiar/oferta-de-grados/grado-en-administracion-y-direccion-de-empresas> [in Spanish] (accessed 28/12/2023).

8. We can cite a proportionally similar case that we have been able to consult, the University of Oxford. According to the university itself, the average number of students admitted to the Classics degree (N.B. Classical Philology does not nominally exist at Oxford) for the years 2021-2023 is 103 students, as can be seen in: <https://www.ox.ac.uk/admissions/undergraduate/courses/course-listing/classics> (accessed 31/5/2024)

9. Boeckh, August: *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1877, pp. 1-34.

at work and play. In this as in every department of knowledge a feeling of wonder in the presence of something we do not understand is the starting-point, the goal was pure, beatific contemplation of something we have come to understand in all its truth and beauty. Because the life we strive to fathom is a single whole, our science too is a single whole. Its division into the separate disciplines of language and literature, archeology, ancient history, epigraphy, numismatics and, latterly, papyrology can be justified only as a concession to the limitations of human capacity and must not be allowed to stifle awareness of the whole, even in the specialist.»¹⁰

We can take as an example the case of one of these separate disciplines: Greek Epigraphy. It grew as an academic field under the auspices of the long-standing institution to which Wilamowitz-Moellendorff belonged, the Berlin Academy of Sciences. Today, with the exception of those *Inscriptiones Graecae* projects yet to be concluded, the task set out by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has been completed:¹¹ the publication of a faithful edition of the Greek inscriptions intended to serve as input for other disciplines, e.g. linguistics, so as to explain the historical origins of Greek, or History, to epigraphically document the processes that concern the subject.

Once Classical Philology has completed its task, cultural studies will take up the cause. Therefore, when viewed in the strictest sense, the goal of publishing faithful editions of the canon of Classical authors, along with the corresponding translations and studies, would apparently have been fulfilled. According to this reductionist perspective, the work of Classical Philology would have been completed with publication of the canonical authors, leaving Cultural Studies to take over the study of these materials. In other words, once we have access to the canonical Western authors, Cultural Studies attempts to analyse the literature through the lens of post-modern critical theory. However, although Cultural Studies can indeed yield results when applied to modern literature, Classical literature is based on materials of a different nature. Certainly, if, as González Maestro¹² suggests, we consider literature in the material sense, namely the objective field of reality in which an author gives literary materials and forms a physical, psychological and logical substance, post-modern criticism of classical studies, the second argument, advocating for the elimination of Ancient Greek from curricula, becomes meaningless. Indeed, in the school and university contexts, the materials students work with are translations, not the classical texts themselves. This is known to those who have attended History and Classical Philology lessons, where the materials studied range from texts (translated with the help of school dictionaries and existing translations or, in the best case scenario, bilingual editions) to literature, and where it is actually the translations of the works that

10. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich: *History of Classical Scholarship*, tr. Alan Harris, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982 [1921], 1.

11. Indeed, after completing its initial task, Greek Epigraphy seems to have evolved towards Digital Humanities projects, diverging from completing the existing *corpora*. Among the most notable projects are the Packard Humanities Institute project (<https://epigraphy.packhum.org/>; accessed 31/5/2024) and the digital edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae* (<http://telota.bbaw.de/ig/>; accessed 31/5/2024).

12. González Maestro, Jesús: *Crítica de la razón literaria*, Vigo, Editorial Academia del Hispanismo, 2017, p. 129.

are studied. At the same time, it warrants mention that the materials of Ancient Greek literature are far from reliable. Furthermore, we must consider the fact that most of the manuscripts, from which our modern critical editions originate, date from the first millennium after Christ. In other words, there is a gap of almost 1500 years between the authors of the works and the materials on which the critical editions are based. For each text, there tend to be between 5 and, in the best cases, 200 manuscripts from which, following the method established by textual criticism, a critical text is produced.¹³ This critical text then provides the material for the translations that the literary critic would work on today. Meanwhile, new texts continue to be discovered in papyri, palimpsests, inscriptions and manuscripts that were either poorly catalogued or inadequately interpreted. As this situation indicates, the material that comprises the base of the work is highly unreliable. Firstly, scholars work on translations of texts that are far from trustworthy. In addition to the fact that these materials do not constitute reliable sources, manuscripts and papyruses that improve the existing editions continue to appear. Given the above, the post-modern literary critic who tackles Ancient Greek literature with no knowledge of the Greek language is not conducting the literary criticism that they claim and, indisputably in good faith, believe they are conducting. Rather they are carrying out literary criticism of translations that are products of their own culture.

3. ANCIENT GREEK IN EUROPE FROM RENAISSANCE HUMANISM TO THE PRESENT DAY

We can parse the method of teaching of Ancient Greek into two broad groups characterised by religious and, to a large extent, political difference. The first group comprises those Western countries with a Catholic or Protestant tradition, while the second includes the Eastern European countries with a largely orthodox Christian tradition.

13. Vid. Wilson, Nigel Guy and Reynolds Leighton Durham: *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1968, for the history of textual tradition. Additionally, a database of available manuscripts with various types of cross-referencing searches can be consulted in *Pinakes*: <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/> (accessed 31/5/2024). The methodology of textual criticism is outlined in Pasquali, Giorgio: *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1934, Maas, Paul: *Textkritik*. Teubner, Leipzig, 1960; West, Martin Litchfield: *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1973, and more recently, Conte, Gian Biagio: *Ope ingenii: Experiences of Textual Criticism*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2013 and Canfora, Luciano: *Lezioni di filologia Classica*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2023.

3.1. GREEK IN WESTERN EUROPE FROM RENAISSANCE CURRICULA TO THE PRESENT DAY

In Western Europe, the teaching of Ancient Greek has always gone hand-in-hand with the teaching of Latin.¹⁴ The strength of this all but indissoluble union has been and remains such that most textbooks implicitly require a knowledge of Latin in order to learn Greek. Right from the earliest Greek primers produced during the Renaissance, the language has been taught through the *lingua franca* of Europe and its culture, Latin. Thus, ever since these early manuals¹⁵ the model has been to begin by explaining Greek pronunciation (in general, contemporary or modern pronunciation)¹⁶ then to examine several Christian prayers (*Our Father*, *Hail Mary*, etc.) in translation, presented either in interlinear form or after the text, and, following that, to read — always in bilingual editions with Latin — Aesop's fables and Cato's distichs, followed by the writings of historians, poets and philosophers.¹⁷ In addition to these materials, which are the ones we have in greatest number, the first teachers of Greek in the 15th and 16th centuries brought to western Europe the materials with which they also taught Ancient Greek after the fall of Constantinople. These materials, which are today forgotten and studied by few specialists uninterested in their didactic value, comprised the schedographical collections (*vid. infra*) that we will examine below. Suffice it to mention for now that they were short texts either written *ad hoc* or extracted from an author's works and adapted to the learner's level, supported by interlinear annotations and a brief grammatical commentary. From the manuscript catalogues we can say without doubt that this type of material was used by several generations of Hellenists in the West. These resources, however, fell into disuse for two reasons.

14. The most extensive overview of Greek in the West during the Renaissance is provided by Ciccolella, Federica: *Donati Graeci. Learning Greek in the Renaissance*, Leiden, Brill, 2007 in her now classic monograph. Specifically, *vid. Ciccolella, Federica, op. cit.* pp. 146-149, which presents the case of teacher Michael Apostolis and clearly demonstrates that the direct method (*vid. Jones William Henry Samuel: Via nova or the application of the direct method to Latin and Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1915 and Miraglia, Luigi: *Nova via: latine doceo: guida per gli'insegnanti*, Montella, Vivarium Novum, 2009) was not used for Greek. This contrasts with the current belief that in Renaissance times Greek and Latin were taught via the direct method which, stated briefly, consists of teaching exclusively in the language being learnt. As Ciccolella proves, Greek teachers were required to master the vehicular language of the day, Latin. She concludes by saying, with regard to the Greek teacher: «Apostolis rejected the teaching of Greek as a dead language, but apparently no other option was available» (Ciccolella, Federica, *op. cit.* p. 149).

15. For the case of the primers produced in Spain, *vid. Sánchez Lasso de la Vega, José: «Notas sobre los 'alfabetarios griegos' en España»*, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica*, 14 (1978), pp. 9-82. Although the didactic material is the same as that produced in other European countries, as the Spanish scholar bitterly states, «Spain is different».

16. On the pronunciation of Greek in school settings, *vid. Carbonell Martínez, Santiago: Cuando las ovejas griegas balan: historia de la pronunciación erasmiana en Grecia y en la tradición escolar hispana*, Castellón, Universitat Jaume I, 2021 for the Spanish case, Sidney Allen, William: *Vox Graeca: The Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968, pp. 125-133 for its English counterpart and the monograph by Drerup, Engelbert: *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart*, Paderborn, F. Schoeningh, 1930-1932 for an overview.

17. On the standard Renaissance curriculum, see the anthological volume by Kallendorf, Craig: *Humanist Educational Treatises*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2002. A contemporary critique of this curriculum can be seen in the speech (still untranslated into a modern language) by Dutchman Haloinus, Georgius: *De restauratione linguae Latinae libri III*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1978 [1533].

The first is the loss of the Greek teachers exiled after the fall of Constantinople (compounded by the loss of their western disciples), while the second is the development of historical and comparative linguistics, after which Greeks would no longer have the monopoly on the teaching of Greek in the West. Thus, the teaching of Ancient Greek gradually abandoned the Christian and moralising content in favour of the historical description of the Greek language. What at the dawn of the Renaissance began as a practical booklet featuring the sounds of the language and reading exercises of increasing difficulty but with familiar content, from the Enlightenment onwards and, above all, with the emergence of positivism, was broached from a scientific standpoint.

Indeed, as it can be seen in manuals dating from the 19th century to the present day,¹⁸ students of Greek are expected to be expert linguists from day one. Simply to be able to read a Greek text, and before they can understand the simplest phrase, the student would have to know the entire phonetic system of Ancient Greek, something that is impossible even for a specialist in the phonetic history of Ancient Greek. Greek learners from Cicero's time or earlier, and through to the Renaissance, never had to consider these philological problems and could start learning Greek directly.¹⁹ In addition to this philological approach, which is impossible to avoid today given its tradition and deep roots in the West, the progression in difficulty is non-existent. Meaning, for Greek learners under the Western tradition there is not much difference in difficulty between two authors because the learner has not been gradually introduced to the language in a way that would allow them to perceive these nuances.

In light of this situation, in the early 20th century a new approach to teaching classical languages emerged. Originating in the United Kingdom, this method was undoubtedly hindered by the two World Wars that claimed the lives of no small number of the teachers who supported it.²⁰ At the end of the 20th century, the manual published by Hans H. Oerberg in 1955 to aid the learning of Latin was revived and, since then, a community of Latin speakers has even developed,²¹ proving those English pioneers to have been right. Given all the above, it is easily understandable why the analogy of the formula for success in classical languages, which consists of Latin + Natural Method = Success (proven), Greek + Natural

18. In the absence of an exhaustive review of ancient Greek methods, the most important textbooks of the last centuries can be consulted at the following link: <https://subsidiavivariumnovum.it/risorse-didattiche/per-la-pratica-didattica/libri-scolastici> (accessed 31/5/2024). As it can be seen, even in the most active methods there is no lack of linguistic disquisitions.

19. It is difficult to find a manual that does not open with a treatise on historical linguistics and phonetics.

20. Vid. Stray, Christopher: *The living word: W.H.D. Rouse and the crisis of classics in Edwardian England*, London, Bristol Classical Press, 1992 focused on the driving force behind that movement, the teacher W.H.D. Rouse.

21. Vid. Engelsing, Eduardo Marcant: *Latin as lingua franca non-native speakers legitimately participating in a community of practice*, (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis), Universidad de Cádiz, 2010 and Avitus, Aulus Gratius: «Spoken Latin: Learning, Teaching, Lecturing and Research», *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 19.37 (2018), pp. 46-52.

Method = X, where X = success, is doomed to fail²² because, as we have seen, Latin and Greek are not comparable terms. Other solutions can be found in an academically mapped but previously unexploited realm, as Cicero says:

«sed meos amicos in quibus est studium in Graeciam mitto id est ad Graecos ire iubeo ut ex fontibus potius hauriant quam rivulos consecretur.» (*Academica* I:8)²³

3.2. A LOOK AT THE GREEK SCHOOL IN EASTERN EUROPE UNDER THE PALAIOLOGOS DYNASTY

Today, in the Eastern European group and, specifically, in Greece, there is no difference in how Greek is taught and learned. This European cultural homogenisation occurred after the Greek War of Independence and the creation of the modern Greek state. From that point on (since c. 1820) the Greek elites have strived to resemble the rest of Europe. Thus, even though traditional forms of political organisation and idiosyncratic educational institutions pre-existed, and despite the sporadic opposition of intellectuals in a personal capacity, it was considered preferable to abandon the old ways and fully embrace European uses and customs, and to do so without much criticism. For this reason, what follows does not apply in present-day Greece, but to Greece up to approximately 200 years ago.²⁴

It is worth recalling here the words of Kaldellis²⁵:

«When we look at our classical libraries (the Loeb, OCT, or Teubner collections) we are in fact looking at a Byzantine classical library.»

22. Every so often, new attempts to achieve something similar to the Oerberg method are published, but none seem to yield similar results: *Reading Greek* (JACT: *Reading Greek: text and vocabulary*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007), *Athenaze* (Balme, Maurice, Lawall, Gilbert and Morwood, James: *Athenaze, Book I: An Introduction to Ancient Greek*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990 [2015]), *Lingua Graeca* (Castellanos, José Carlos: *Lingua Graeca Antiqua Complexu Rerum. La lengua griega antigua por contexto*, Madrid, Áurea Clásicos Editorial, 2023), *Logos* (Carbonell Martínez, Santiago: *Lingua Graeca*, Granada, Editorial Cultura Clásica, 2023.). It is worth remembering a method that is often overlooked, that of Zuntz, Günther: *Griechischer Lehrgang I-III*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983 (English version: Zuntz, Günther: *Greek. A course in classical and post-classical Greek grammar from original texts*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) that applies advances in language teaching without leaving behind the philological rigor required for a classical language.

23. *But my friends who possess an interest in this study I send to Greece, that is, I bid them go to the Greeks, so that they may draw from the fountain-heads rather than seek out mere rivulets* (Trans. Loeb-Rackham 1933).

24. With the gradual exclusion of *katharevousa* or the formal register from Greek public discourse (*vid.* an overview of this issue in Horrocks, Geoffrey: *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*, London, Blackwell 2010, pp. 438-470), the use of a *sui generis* bilingualism (two registers: one formal and one colloquial, highly differentiated, with different grammars and vocabularies), which was the advantage of Byzantine education over the West in Greek language instruction, was lost. As of today, in Greece, there are elderly individuals who learned Ancient Greek following that path with textbooks such as the manual of Zukis, Georgios: *Αναγνωστικόν τῆς Αρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens, *Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Σχολικών Βιβλίων*, 1964. However, as we say, in Greece, that advantage which existed in other times is no longer available. Regarding education in Greece up to the foundation of the modern Greek State, Skarveli-Nikolopoulou, Aggeliki: *Μαθηματάρια τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν σχολείων κατὰ τὴν τουρκοκρατία: Διδασκόμενα κείμενα, σχολικὰ προγράμματα, διδακτικὲς μέθοδοι: Συμβολὴ στὴν ἱστορία τῆς νεοελληνικῆς παιδείας*. Athens, Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων, 1993 remains essential.

25. Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniossoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, p. 2.

These words relate to the above idea of a fracture that exists between classical culture and what is materially available to us, a product of a culture labelled 'Byzantine' since the 16th century, which the Enlightenment sought an equivalent to the Western Middle Ages to hold responsible for obscurantism. Before delving into the subject, a few terms should be clarified. Indeed, talking about Byzantium and the persons referred to under this term, would be as discordant as calling a Venezuelan a Parisian.²⁶ The Byzantines were simply inhabitants of the Roman Empire that had its capital in Constantinople. The so-called Eastern Roman Empire varied in size over time, its territory hosting numerous nationalities united by a single legislation (Roman, and from a certain period onwards expressed in Greek)²⁷ and a common culture (Greek). On this chessboard, Christianity eventually exerted a powerful influence, albeit pervaded by constant tensions.²⁸ Thus, if we talk about the Byzantines in the 6th century under Justinian, we will be talking about Syrians, Greeks, Spaniards, Italians, etc., while if we talk about the Byzantines in the 15th century the scope reduces to just the Greeks of the Peloponnese, Trebizond, Constantinople, Thessalonica and the other cities that continued to hold out. Likewise, while we refer to the Greeks or Hellenes, the ethnonym «Hellene» has enjoyed both periods of prestige and depreciation throughout Byzantine history. Kaldellis (2008: 184-186) identifies up to 5 meanings²⁹ for Ἕλλην before the 11th century, namely: 1. geographical meaning; 2. historical meaning: an ancient people such as the pharaonic Egyptians or the Babylonians who, coincidentally, also spoke Greek; 3. pagans: both ancient and contemporary (heretics and followers of other religions); 4. Ἕλλην ἀνὴρ, speakers of Greek regardless of their religion, origin, etc.; 5. Παιδεία, Hellene in the cultural sense expressed by Isocrates in the famous panegyric.

Nevertheless, irrespective of the empire's internal problems, our interest here lies in identifying what people, who were capable of composing Greek literature, can contribute to us.³⁰ Indeed, Ancient Greek was the indispensable medium

26. The terms «Byzantium», «Byzantine», etc., have become so widespread in studies that they seem more appropriate than the term «medieval», a concept that is even starting to be discussed in relation to the Middle Ages of Western Europe. For Byzantium, in any case, the term «medieval» lacks validity and is not used among scholars, although it is true that Greek universities host chairs and studies of Medieval Greek Philology in an attempt to imitate the medievalist chairs of their Western European counterparts.

27. On the transition from Roman to Byzantine law, *vid.* Τρωιάνος, Σπύρος: «Ἡ μετάβαση ἀπὸ τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸ στὸ βυζαντινὸ δίκαιο», *Τὰ Ἱστορικά*, 3.6 (1986), pp. 267-281, *id.*: Οἱ πηγές τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ δικαίου. Athens, Σάκκουλας, 2011, pp. 170-213 and Chitwood, Zachary: *Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2017.

28. These tensions were open from the start of Christianity (*vid.* Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm: *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961) all the way to the case of Plethon in the 15th century (Woodhouse, Christopher Montage: *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986, and, more recently, Siniosoglou, Nikitas: *Radical Platonism in Byzantium. Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011).

29. See Runciman, Steven: *The last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970, pp. 14-15.

30. As a counterpoint to the claimed lack of literary merit present in 19th-century criticism, and even up to the 21st century (see Fryde, Edmund: *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261 - c. 1360)*, Leiden, Brill, 2000, p. 9), a critical overview of cultured Byzantine literature still useful today is the manual produced by Hunger, Herbert: *Die hochsprachliche*

that all educated persons, to paraphrase Fryde,³¹ were expected to master in an education intended to train future functionaries of the Byzantine administration, within both the Church and the State. These figures would have thus gained the skills necessary to exercise the art of written and spoken rhetoric.³² A potential functionary was thereby separated from the general population by language, meaning that, especially in the Komnenian era, language was not an issue of national identity but one of class.³³ Said language was none other than Ancient Greek. But what kind of Greek is the question without a clear answer and, in academic practice, the elephant in the room that nobody wants to acknowledge. It is worth quoting, once more, the words of Kaldellis³⁴:

«The linguistic basis of Komnenian Hellenism, what I am calling the third Sophistic of Greek literature, has scarcely been studied. We do not know exactly what the standards of linguistic purity were, or whether any precise standards were accepted by the entire sophistic community.»³⁵

The idea of this third Sophistic remains to be explored. This third linguistic Renaissance (the first would be the original Sophistic and the second the Sophistic of the Imperial era) arises, like the rest, as a consequence of the political situation. After the Fourth Crusade (1202-1204)³⁶ and the reconquest of Constantinople (1262) a new awareness emerged, against the backdrop of the Komnenian Renaissance (1081-1085),³⁷ in opposition to the Western invader. This reached its peak under the Palaiologos dynasty (1261-1453), when the widespread opinion that people of

profane Literatur der Byzantiner, München, Beck, 1978 (translation into modern Greek, Hunger, Herbert: *Ἡλόγια κοσμική λογοτεχνία τῶν Βυζαντινῶν*, Athens, MIET, 1987-1994).

31. Fryde, Edmund, *op. cit.* pp. 8-9.

32. In the social context, above all, of the Byzantine θέατρον *vid.* the testimony of Chortasmenos preserved in a letter found in the autographed manuscript *Vind. Suppl. Gr.* 075, ff. 192r-v, as well as the relevant studies by Marciniak, Przemysław: «Byzantine Theatron: A Place of Performance?», in Grünbart, Michael (ed.): *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter = Rhetorical Culture in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Berlin - New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 277-285; Toth, Ida: «Rhetorical Theatron in Late Byzantium: The Example of Palaiologan Imperial Orations», in Grünbart, Michael (ed.): *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter = Rhetorical Culture in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 429-448 and Gaul, Niels: *Thomas Magistros und die spät-byzantinische Sophistik: Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten in der frühen Palaiologenzeit*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011, pp. 17-120; 2018. However, consider Kaldellis's caution (Kaldellis, Anthony: *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 239) «perhaps they spoke Koine Greek on a daily basis more often than is realized. We just do not know how Anna - a hugely conceited woman - spoke in informal settings». The opinion of Wilson, Nigel Guy: *Scholars of Byzantium*, London, Duckworth, 1983, p. 5, according to which the Attic dialect (but to which Attic does the great English philologist refer? The Attic of Aristophanes, of Plato, of the orators? Or the epigraphic Attic studied by Threatte, Leslie: *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, Berlin-New York, de Gruyter, 1980-1996?) was the habitual language of the Palaiologos court, is completely inaccurate and misleading. Given the vagueness of the «Koine» label, Kaldellis' opinion seems more plausible.

33. Cf. Kaldellis, Anthony, *ibidem* p. 226.

34. Kaldellis, Anthony, *ibidem* p. 238,

35. As Kaldellis, Anthony, *ibidem* p. 238 points out, the study by Ševčenko, Ihor: «Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose», *JÖB*, 31 (1981), pp. 289-312 remains the only available reference in this regard.

36. It is worth recalling here the words of Runciman, Steven: *A History of the Crusades. Volume III, The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1954, p. 130, for whom «[t]here was never a greater crime against humanity than the Fourth Crusade».

37. We can also speak of another Renaissance under the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty (9th-10th centuries).

intellect are incapable of practicalities appeared to be verified.³⁸ Indeed, between 1259 and 1453 around 150 intellectuals³⁹ left their imprint on Byzantine literature. This is by no means an inconsiderable number if we take into account that, at the time, authorship was not given great importance, and that many Byzantine works survive without attribution of authorship. This plethora of intellectuals thus appears to have emerged from an educational system that produced tangible results in the form of these Byzantine literary works.⁴⁰

Let us now look at some of the elements that constituted this successful didactic practice. At the time, the goal of mastering Ancient Greek could only be achieved by becoming proficient in using an abundant vocabulary and correct grammar.⁴¹ This could only be acquired by reading and memorising selected passages of Greek literature. Exactly how this reading and memorising took place remains unclear if we are not accustomed to Byzantine book culture,⁴² which we will examine in the paragraph below. Up to the age of 16, pupils followed a course of grammar taught by a private tutor.⁴³ This teaching would be based on first reading and memorising a selection of ancient literary texts⁴⁴ and then would lead to acquisition of a knowledge of what was considered to be the habitual use of Ancient Greek.⁴⁵ The preeminent dialect at the time was Attic, although other dialects, such as the Sicilian Doric of Theocritus, could later be included. Next, Homer, and very probably Hesiod, the two most archaic poets, would be studied. If the pupil were to continue education beyond the age of 16, they would spend one or two years studying rhetoric.⁴⁶ At about the age of 17 or 18, the pupil would complete higher

38. Runciman, Steven: *The last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 3.

39. Ševčenko, Ihor, *op. cit.* and Kazhdan, Alexander: *Authors and texts in Byzantium*. Hampshire, Aldershot, 1993 *apud* Fryde, Edmund, *op. cit.* p. 169.

40. Two histories of Byzantine intellectual life have recently appeared, a general one coordinated by Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017 and another focusing on the Palaiologos dynasty — the final centuries of the Byzantine Empire and a time of intellectual splendour paired with political decadence — coordinated by Kotzabassi, Sofía (ed.): *A Companion to the Intellectual Life of the Palaeologan Period*, Leiden, Brill, 2022.

41. Fryde, Edmund, *op. cit.* pp. 8-9.

42. Cf. Pérez Martín, Inmaculada: «Byzantine books», in Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 37-46 and Dendrinou, Charalambos and Giarenis Ilias (eds.): *Bibliophilos. Books and Learning in the Byzantine World*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2021.

43. Runciman, Steven: *The last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 27. From several didactics manuscripts that survive it is likely that this basic and intermediate education took place in the tutor's home. See, for example, the exercise where a teacher, fed up with his pupils, threatens never to teach them again. *Vid.* Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo: «Ἐν μωρῆς παιδίων: schedae ineditae ex ms. Vat. Pal. Gr. 92 (Pars prior)», *Philologia Classica*, 18.1, 2023, p. 96: καὶ τῶν ἐμῶν οἰκίσκων ἀπωστῖσω (and I will expel [you] from my home).

44. Always in the original version, cf. Runciman, Steven, *ibidem* p. 16. It is nonetheless true that summaries in archaic Greek proliferated that were not read as translations used to access the paraphrased work, but as independent works in themselves.

45. Any learner of Ancient Greek will notice the improbability of a «normal» Ancient Greek when there seem to be more exceptions than rules.

46. We concur with Fryde, Edmund, *ibidem* pp. 167-168 with regard to the reign of the Palaiologos dynasty, which we consider the era of greatest intellectual splendour. The classic works of Koukoulés, Fedon: *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός*. Athens, Εκδόσεις του Γαλλικού Ινστιτούτου Αθηνῶν, 1948-1957 and Kriarás, Emmanouil: «Ἡ παιδεία στὸ Βυζάντιο: ἀνθρωπιστικὲς τάσεις. Καλογηρικό πνεῦμα», *Παίδεια* 5 (1951), pp. 261-268, pp. 335-343 on this subject are in the process of being replaced by the companions produced by Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas, *op. cit.* and Kotzabassi,

education. If they wished to pursue further learning, they had the option to study philosophy. It was more common, however, to study law (in order to prosper as a functionary), or perhaps theology (a discipline reserved⁴⁷ for the clergy).⁴⁸

Only two pedagogical techniques survived⁴⁹ the fall of Constantinople and remained in use until the 19th century: questions and answers and *schedographia*, of which the greatest and most successful exponent was Manuel Moschopoulos.⁵⁰ The first technique's origins in Greek culture can be traced back to the dialogues of Plato. The approach continues in modern times, with catechisms still in use.⁵¹ *Schedographia* seems to have emerged in the 10th century as a response to one of the political and cultural crises mentioned above. But, what does it consist of? Formulating questions and answers and memorising passages were not enough, so teachers at the time devised short texts with interlinear scholia accompanied by explanations — nearly always in archaic Greek, rarely in everyday Greek, called ψυχαγωγία — with a brief grammatical commentary below called a ἐπιμερισμός or *partitio* in the Latin tradition. The texts were short enough to be easily memorised and the grammatical commentary (which was not always included) focused on a few words from the text. Moreover, if the text in question were literary (regardless of origin, whether sacred or profane), the *partitiones* would have been complete.

Let us now imagine we are Greeks or Hellenists required to teach a course in Greek in the 15th or 16th century. What materials could we use? The most reasonable answer would be to use the material that is both yielding results and in vogue: Moschopoulos.⁵² We could start with explanations of orthography and

Sofia, *op. cit.* which coordinate an analogous volume on Byzantine education and which are well-positioned given the materials that have been published over the last 50 years: for the most recent bibliography on the Byzantine school, *vid.* Tsiouras, Stylianos: *Αγωγή και Εκπαίδευση. Σπουδή στην κανονική και πατερική γραμματεία*, Thessaloniki, ΑΠΘ, 2017.

47. Council in Trullo, can. 65.

48. Other options could be Medicine, Philosophy or Mathematics. In the first two disciplines the Byzantines specifically stood out (for Medicine, *vid.* Fryde, Edmund, *ibidem* p. 91 and the Brill companion, Touwaide, Alain (ed.): *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, Leiden, Brill, 2019; for Philosophy, Golitsis, Pantelis: «Η φιλοσοφική πρόσληψη της βυζαντινής φιλοσοφίας», *ICON, Journal on Byzantine Philosophy*, 1.1 (2021), pp. 9-22 and *idem*: «Είναι η φιλοσοφία στο Βυζάντιο αντιβυζαντινή», *Δευκαλίω*, 28.2 (2011), pp. 50-74), while in Mathematics there were no notable achievements (*vid.* Fryde *ibidem*, pp. 88-90 and the Brill companion, Acerbi, Fabio: «Logistic, Arithmetic, Harmonic Theory, Geometry, Metrology, Optics and Mechanics», in Touwaide, Alain (eds.): *A Companion to Byzantine Science*. Leiden, Brill, 2019, pp. 105-159), probably because of the poor alphabetical notation of numbers.

49. *Vid.* Skarveli-Nikolopoulou, Aggeliki: *Μαθηματικά των Ελληνικών...*

50. On Moschopoulos we have studies on concrete aspects (*vid.* bibliography in Fryde, Edmund, *op. cit.* and Pontani, Filippomaria: «Constantinople after Planudes: Moschopoulos, Grammar, Lexicography», in Montanari, Franco (ed.): *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden, Brill, 2020, pp. 490-493), but apart from some biographical notes, we do not have a whole monograph (*vid.* Hunger, Herbert: «Moschopoulos», in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Band 6, München, Artemis, 1998, p. 585 and Fatouros, Georgios: «Moschopoulos, Manuel», in Bautz, Traugott (ed.): *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Nordhausen, Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1999; more extensively in Fryde, Edmund, *ibidem* pp. 295-299 and, recently in Pontani, Filippomaria, *op. cit.*). This Byzantine scholar, a disciple of Planudes, lived between the 13th and 14th centuries. He made important contributions in Philology, Grammar and Mathematics. His works were fundamental for the following generation of teachers of Greek in Italy.

51. *Vid.* Efthymiadis, Stephanos: «Question and Answers», in Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 47-62.

52. For the grammar (more than 250 manuscripts: *vid.* Rollo, Antonio: «Osservazioni sulla tradizione degli «Erotemata» di Manuele Moscopulo», in Martínez Manzano, Teresa and Hernández Muñoz, Felipe Gonzalo (eds.): *Del manuscrito antiguo a la edición crítica de textos griegos: homenaje a la prof^a Elsa García Novo*, Madrid, Dykinson, 2019,

general grammar (1) and nominal (2) and verbal (3) morphology. We would then need some prepositional syntax (4). And we could not ignore dialectal notes (5). However, as we have experienced as learners of Greek, this would not be enough to start reading the work of authors: perhaps we could use those short texts that are so popular (6). With all this under our belts we are now ready to start reading real literature.

(1) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, ff. 1r-1v

Περὶ προσωδίας

Τί ἐστι προσωδία; ποῖα τάσις ἐγγραμμάτου φωνῆς ὑγιοῦς κατὰ τὸ ἀπαγγελτικὸν τῆς λέξεως ἐκφερομένη μετὰ τινος τῶν συνεζευγμένων περὶ μίαν συλλαβὴν. ἦτοι κατὰ συνήθειαν διαλέκτου ὁμολογουμένη, ἦτοι κατὰ τὸν ἀναλογητικὸν ὄρον καὶ λόγον.

Πόθεν προσωδία; παρὰ τὴν πρὸς πρόθεσιν καὶ τὸ ὦδή. τὸ δὲ ὦδή, παρὰ τὸ ἀοιδίη. ὅπερ ἐστὶ ποιητικὸν κατὰ κράσιν τοῦ α καὶ ο εἰς ὦ μέγα μένοντος. καὶ τοῦ ι προσγεγραμμένου, τὸ δὲ ἀοιδίη παρὰ τὸ ἀειδῶ τὸ ἐμμελῶς λέγω. καὶ τοῦτο ποιητικόν. λέγεται δὲ παρὰ τοῖς κοινοῖς ἄδω. τὸ πρὸς μικρόν. πᾶσα πρόθεσις βραχυκαταληκτεῖ. πλήν τῆς εἰς καὶ ἐξ· αἴτινες καὶ ἐς καὶ ἐκ λέγονται. τὸ σω μέγα. τὰ παρὰ τὴν ὦδὴν γινόμενα ἅπαντα διὰ τοῦ ὦ μεγάλου γράφεται· οἷον ὕμνωδία τραγωδία ψαλμῶδία καὶ εἴ τι ὅμοιον. τὰ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὄδον, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ. οἷον εἴσοδος πάροδος. τὸ δι ἰῶτα. τίνα διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα παροξύτονα θηλυκά, διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα γράφεται. ταῦτα· κοιλία καρδία σωτηρία προσωδία καὶ ἕτερα. τίνα διὰ τῆς ε καὶ ι διφθόγγου. ταῦτα· χρεία μνεῖα ὑγεία σιτοδεία. σιτοδεία δὲ ἰῶτα. | (f. 1v) τὸ δι βραχύ. καὶ τὸ α μακρόν. τὰ διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα παροξύτονα θηλυκά διὰ τοῦ ι γραφόμενα ἐκτείνει μὲν τὸ α, συστέλλει δὲ τὸ ι.

Πόσαι προσωδίαί; δέκα· ὀξεῖα βραχεῖα περισπωμένη μακρὰ βραχεῖα δασεῖα ψιλὴ ἀπόστροφος ὑφὲν καὶ ὑποδιαστολή.

Εἰς πόσα διαιροῦνται αἱ δέκα προσωδίαί; εἰς τέσσαρα· εἰς τόνος, εἰς χρόνος, εἰς πνεύματα καὶ εἰς πάθη.

(2.1) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, ff. 13r-v

ἀρχὴ σὺν ἀγίῳ θεῶ τῶν ἀρσενικῶν κανόνων.

Αἴας, ποίου μέρους λόγου ἐστίν; ὀνόματος. ποίου γένους; ἀρσενικοῦ. ποίου εἶδους; παραγώγου. ποίου εἶδους τῶν παραγῶγων ῥηματικοῦ; ποίου σχήματος; ἀπλοῦ. ποίου ἀριθμοῦ; ἐνικοῦ. ποίας πτώσεως; ὀρθῆς καὶ εὐθείας τῶν ἐνικῶν. ὁ

pp. 281-300) and dialectal part (more than 60 manuscripts), we will use the *Med. Plut.* 56.28 manuscript and the *Par. Graec.* 2629 for syntax, both from the 16th century. For the *schedographia* (more than 140 manuscripts, but only the editions of Stephanus, Robertus: *Manuelis Moschopuli de ratione examinandae orationis libellus*. Paris, Stephanus, 1545, von Kurzböck, Joseph: *Τοῦ σοφωτάτου, καὶ λογιωτάτου Μανουήλου τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου, περὶ σχεδῶν. Ἦτοι Γραμματικὴ, ἐν σχήματι τεχνολογικῶ κτλ*, Wien, Kurzböck, 1773 and Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo: *Moschopuli de examinanda oratione libellus*, Madrid, Librería Áurea, 2022 with exercises: *vid.* Nousia, Fevronia: «The Transmission and Reception of Manuel Moschopoulos' Schedography in the West», in Ciccolella, Federica and Silvano, Luigi (eds.): *Teachers, Students, and Schools of Greek in the Renaissance*, Leiden, Brill, 2017, pp. 1-25), we will use the text as in Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo, *op. cit.*

Αἴας πόσα μέρη λόγου εἰσί; δύο· ὁ ἄρθρον, αἴας ὄνομα. ὁ Αἴας, ὁ κανὼν οὐκ ἔχει. αἰ ἄρχαι καὶ τὰ θέματα κανόνας οὐκ ἔχουσιν. ἐπὶ τίνων λέγονται αἰ ἄρχαι; καὶ ἐπὶ τίνων τὰ θέματα; ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ὀνομάτων αἰ ἄρχαι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ῥημάτων τὰ θέματα. ὁ Αἴας, ποίου τόπου τῆς ὀξείας; τῆς παραληγούσης. πῶς λέγεται (in marg. γρ<άφε> καλεῖται) τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς παραληγούσης ἔχον | (13ν) τὴν ὀξεῖαν παροξύτονον καὶ βαρύτονον. πόθεν γίνεται; το ὁ τὸ ἄρθρον ἐκ τοῦ τος ἀρσενικοῦ δωρικοῦ ὅπερ ἀποβολῆ τοῦ τ γίνεται ὅς καὶ ἴνα μὴ συμπίεση τῷ ὑποτακτικῷ ἄρθρω τῷ ὅς ἀποβολῆ τοῦ σ καὶ τοῦ σφοδροῦ τόνου γίνεται ὁ. τὸ ὁ, ποίου τῶν ἄρθρων; προτακτικοῦ καὶ ὑποτακτικοῦ. προτακτικοῦ διόρισον· καὶ ἔστι προτακτικὸν μὲν ὁ, ὑποτακτικὸν δὲ ὅς. τί διαφέρει τὰ προτακτικὰ τῶν ὑποτακτικῶν; διαφέρει ὅτι τὰ μὲν προτακτικὰ ἢ πνεύματα ἢ τόνους ἐπιδέχονται. τὰ δὲ ὑποτακτικὰ καὶ πνεύματα καὶ τόνους. ὁ Αἴας, τὸ ὁ μικρόν (...)

(2.2) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, ff. 78ν-79r

ἀρχὴ σὺν θεῷ ἀγίω τῶν ἀρσενικῶν κανόνων
κανὼν α'

ἡ ὀρθὴ καὶ εὐθεῖα τῶν ἐνικῶν·	ὁ Αἴας
ἡ γενικὴ τῶν ἐνικῶν·	τοῦ Αἴαντος
ἡ δοτικὴ τῶν ἐνικῶν·	τῷ Αἴαντι
ἡ αἰτιατικὴ τῶν ἐνικῶν·	τὸν Αἴαντα
ἡ κλητικὴ τῶν ἐνικῶν·	ὦ Αἴαν
καὶ ἀπτικῶς·	ὦ Αἴας
ἡ εὐθεῖα καὶ αἰτιατικὴ τῶν δυϊκῶν·	τῷ Αἴαντε
ἡ γενικὴ τῶν πληθυντικῶν·	τῶν Αἴαντων
ἡ δοτικὴ τῶν πληθυντικῶν·	τοῖς Αἴασιν
ἡ αἰτιατικὴ τῶν πληθυντικῶν·	τούς Αἴαντας
ἡ κλητικὴ τῶν πληθυντικῶν·	ὦ Αἴαντες

Παράδειγμα: ὁ Θόας, τοῦ Θόαντος, τῷ Θόαντι, τὸν Θόαντα, ὦ Θόαν

κανὼν β'

ἐνικά	δυϊκά	πληθυντικά
ὁ κοχλίας	τῷ κοχλία	οἱ κοχλίας
τοῦ κοχλίου	τοῖν κοχλίαςιν	τῶν κοχλίων
τῷ κοχλία	τοῖν κοχλίαςιν	τοῖς κοχλίας
τὸν κοχλίαν	τῷ κοχλία	τούς κοχλίας
ὦ κοχλία καὶ	ὦ κοχλία	ὦ κοχλίας

Παράδειγμα κανόνος β'· ὁ Αἰνείας, τοῦ Αἰνείου, τῷ Αἰνεία, τὸν Αἰνείαν, ὦ Αἰνεία

(3.1) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, ff. 49v-50r

ῥῆμα ὀριστικὸν ἐνεργητικὸν ἀπλοῦν πρωτότυπον συζυγίας πρώτης τῶν βαρυτόνων. ὀριστικὰ ἐνεργητικὰ ἐνεστῶς.

τύπτω ποίου μέρους λόγου ἐστίν; ῥήματος. ποίας ἐγκλίσεως; ὀριστικῆς. ὀριστικὴ πόθεν γίνεται; ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀρίζομαι τὸ ἄρχομαι, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ γράφεται, πλὴν τοῦ ὀρίζομαι τὸ ἀποφαίνομαι. τὸ ο μικρόν. τὰ | (f. 50r) ὠδίνω, ὠρύομαι, ὠθῶ καὶ ὠθῶ, ὃ μετὰ τῆς ἀπὸ προθέσεως παθητικῶς γράφεται. ἀπωθοῦμαι, ὠφελῶ, ὠχρίῶ τὸ λειποψυχῶ, ὠστίζεται πλῆθος. ἐπὶ τι σπεῦδον καὶ ὑπ> ἀλλήλων ὠθούμενον, ὠνούμαι, τὸ ἀγοράζω, ὠραῖζω, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄ δασεῖαν. τὸ ο πρὸ τοῦ ῥ ψιλοῦται, ὄρεῦς ὁ ἡμίονος. ὄρέγω τὸ ἐκτείνω, ὄρέγομαι τὸ ἐπιθυμῶ. Ὀρέστης, ὄνομα κύριον. καὶ ὄρος, οὐδετέρως. ὄρος δὲ ἀρσενικῆς δασύνεται, ἀφ' οὗ ὀρίζομαι καὶ ὀρισμὸς καὶ ὀριστικόν. τὸ ρι, ἰῶτα. τινὰ διὰ τοῦ -ίζω ῥήματα καὶ ἐνεργητικῶς γραφόμενα καὶ παθητικῶς διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα γράφεται. ταῦτα, ἀγωνίζομαι, βαδίζω καὶ ἕτερα. τὸ δανεῖζω μόνον δίφθογγος καὶ τὸ χρήζω διὰ τοῦ η. τύπτω ποίας διαθέσεως; ἐνεργητικῆς. ἐνεργητικὴ πόθεν γίνεται; ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεργῶ (...)

(3.2) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, f. 85v

ῥῆμα ὀριστικὸν ἐνεργητικόν· ἀπλοῦν πρωτότυπον· συζυγίας πρώτης τῶν βαρυτόνων.

ἐνεστῶς

τύπτω, τύπτεις, τύπτει, τύπτeton
τύπτeton, τύπτομεν, τύπτετε, τύπτοσσι

παρατατικός

ἔτυπτον, ἔτυπτες, ἔτυπτε
ἐτύπτετον, ἐτυπέτην, ἐτύπτομεν
ἐτύπτετε, ἔτυπτον

παρακείμενος

τέτυφα, τέτυφας, τέτυφε
τετύφατον, τετύφατον, τετύφαμεν
τετύφατε, τετύφασι

μέσος παρακείμενος

τέτυπα, τέτυπας, τέτυπε
τετύπατον, τετύπατον, τετύπαμεν
τετύπατε, τετύπασιν

(4) *Par. Graec.* 2629, f. 32v

Τῶν ὀνομάτων τινὰ μὲν δηλοῦσι πάθος, τινὰ δὲ ἐνέργειαν, οἷον ποιητῆς καὶ ποιητός. τῶν δὲ δηλούντων πάθος τὰ μὲν ἔχουσι τὸ πάθος ἐνεργεῖα, τὰ δὲ δυνάμει. ἐνεργεῖα μὲν, οἷον γνωστός ὁ ἐγνωσμένος. δυνάμει δέ, οἷον θνητός. τρωτός ὁ δυνάμενος τρωθῆναι καὶ θανεῖν. τὸ συγκριτικὸν οὐ δύναται ποτε λέγεσθαι χωρὶς ἐκείνου μεθ' οὗ συγκρίνεται. πρὸς ἓν γὰρ ἀφορᾷ ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἄδηλον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν εἰ μὴ περιλαμβάνεται τῷ λόγῳ. ἐπὶ δὲ θου λέγεται κυρίως συγκριτικὰ μόνα, μὴ περιλαμβανομένων τινῶν εἰς σύγκρισιν, οἷον τὸ κρείττον. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἑνός τινός ἐστι κρείττον ἀλλὰ πάντων. τὸ δὲ ὑπερθετικὸν λέγεται χωρὶς ἐκείνων μεθ' ὧν ἔχει τὴν ὑπέρθεσιν. ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀφορᾷ πρὸς ἓν ἀλλὰ πάντα, οἷον κάλλιστος καὶ ῥῆμα οὐδέποτε λέγεται χωρὶς ὀνόματος δηλοῦν ἔννοιαν, εἰ μὴ ἐξαιρέτος ἐνέργεια εἴη, οἷον ἀστράπτει, βροντᾷ. προκατειλημμένος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ λογισμὸς τίς ἐστὶν ἀστράπτων· καὶ οὐ ζητεῖ τοῦτον καὶ πάλιν τὰ ἄλλα μὲν τοῦ λόγου οὐ δύναται ἀπαρτίζειν λόγον χωρὶς ῥήματος. (...)

(5) *Med. Plut.* 56.28, ff. 113-v

περὶ τῶν διαλέκτων ιδιότητος. τῶν διαλέκτων ὄρα. ἰδοῦ σοι καὶ τὰς διαλέκτους ἐγγεγίρω, νέων μοι πάντων φιλολογώτατε. περὶ ὧν ὅτε Φιλόπονος Ἰωάννης ἐπόνθησε καὶ Τρύφων ὁ γραμματικὸς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, οἷς ἰκανὴ περὶ τὰ βιβλία διατριβὴ καὶ ἀσκήσις γέγονεν. οὐπω δέ τις μέχρι καὶ τήμερον τὸ πᾶν ἐκάστης τῶν διαλέκτων ἐγνώρισε. καὶ μὴ νομίσης ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν ταῦτα οἴεσθαι τι μέγα περὶ αὐτῶν. ἡ γὰρ γλῶσσα κατὰ Λυσιάν τὸν ῥήτορα, νοῦν οὔτε πολὺν οὔτε μικρὸν ἔχει. ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ὧ μὲν πολὺ, πολὺς, ὧ δὲ μικρὸν, μικρός. οὐκ οὐκον περιαιτολογοῦντες τῶν ἀνδρῶν περὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος κατηγορήσομεν ἀλλὰ φίλων ὄντων προτιμῶντες αὐτῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὥσπου καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλοσοφώτατος ἔφησεν, αὐτοὶ τοίνυν ἀττικῆς μὲν φράσεως κανόνα τὸν κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνην προθέμενοι, καὶ Θεουκιδίδη τὸν συγγραφέα καὶ ῥήτορα. Ἰάδος δὲ Ἰπποκράτην τὸν Ἴωνα. καὶ Ἀλικαρνασσέα Ἡρόδοτον. Δωριδος δὲ τὸν Ταραντῖνον Ἀρχύταν, καὶ Θεόκριτον τὸν τὰ βουκολικὰ συγγραψάμενον. καὶ τῆς Αἰολίδος Ἀλκαῖον. ἴσως ἂν περὶ τῶν διαλέκτων ἰκανῶς διαλάβοιμεν. εἰ δέ τι καὶ ἡμῖν κατὰ λήθην παραλειφθήσεται, οὐ τῆς ἴσης τοῦτο κατηγορίας ἄξιον παρὰ τοῖς εὐγνώμοσι. τοῖς μὲν γάρ, τὰ πλείω παρείθησαν. ἡμῖν δέ, ὀλίγα τυχὸν οὐκ εἰρήσεται. | (113v) Διάλεκτός ἐστιν ἰδίωμα γλώττης. Ἰὰς ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ Ἰωνος υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Κρεοῦσης τῆς Ἐρεχθέως θυγατρὸς, ἣ ἔγραψεν Ὀμηρος. Ἀτθίς δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀτθίδος, τῆς Κραναοῦ θυγατρὸς, ἣ ἔγραψεν Ἀριστοφάνης. Δωρίς ἀπὸ Δώρου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος, ἣ ἔγραψεν ὁ Θεόκριτος. Αἰολίς ἀπὸ Αἰόλου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος, ἣ ἔγραψεν ὁ Θεόκριτος. Αἰολίς ἀπὸ Αἰόλου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος ἣ ἔγραψεν Ἀλκαῖος. Κοινὴ δὲ ἦ πάντες χρώμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πίνδαρος ταύτη ἐχρήσατο. Διάλεκτος ἡ Ἀτθίς: λῆρον ληρεῖς, ἀττικὴ ἡ φράσις, καὶ τὸ σχῆμα, ὡς τὸ μανίαν μαινῆ. ἔστι γὰρ τῆς ἀττικῆς ἰδίωμα φράσεως τὸ εἰπόντα πρᾶγμα ἐπαγαγεῖν ῥῆμα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος προαγόμενον, ὡς τὸ ὑβριν ὑβρίζεις καὶ φυγὴν φεύγεις. (...)

(6) Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo: *Moschopuli...*, pp. 1-2⁵³

Σχέδος

ἄνευ σποράς ἀξιούμενος
 Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀσπύρωσ εὐδοκίῃσας
 γεννηθῆναι τῆς τὸν θεὸν τεκούσης
 τεχθῆναι ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας θεοτόκου καὶ
 τῆς πάντοτε παρθένου οὔσης τῆ βοηθεία
 ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ταῖς πρεσβείαις αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ
 χρυσοστόμου, δεινοῦ λέγειν
 χρυσορρήμονος Ἰωάννου φώτισον τὸν νοῦν τοῦ νέου τοῦ νῦν
 ἀρχήν
 ἀρξαμένου τοῦ σχεδογραφεῖν, καὶ τὴν καταρχὴν
 εὐνόησον, συμπαραστάει
 εὐλόγησον τοῦ σχεδους.

Ἐπιμερισμός

Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. πόσα μέρη τοῦ λόγου εἰσί; τρία· Κύριε, Ἰησοῦ, Χριστέ, θεός, ὄνομα. ὁ, ἄρθρον. ἡμῶν, ἀντωνυμία. τὰ γὰρ δύο ὀνόματα ἢ καὶ πολλὰ εἰς ἓν συνάγονται ὄνομα καὶ ἓν εἰσι μέρος λόγου. ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ῥήματα εἰς ἓν συνάγονται τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ ἓν εἰσι μέρος λόγου. καὶ αἱ πολλὰ ἀντωνυμῖαι εἰς ἓν, τὴν ἀντωνυμίαν. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος.

Κύριε. ποίας πτώσεως; κλητικῆς τῶν ἐνικῶν. ἢ εὐθεῖα ὁ κύριος. πόθεν γίνεταί; παρὰ τὸ κύρος, ὃ γίνεταί ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρόω, κυρῶ, τὸ βεβαιῶ καὶ τάπτω, ἦγουν τὸ βέβαιον καὶ στεργόμενον. κύριος γάρ ἐστιν, ὃς ἄρχει ἐκόντων τῶν ὑπηκόων. πόσα σημαίνει τὸ κύρος; δύο, τὸ βέβαιον καὶ τὴν στεργομένην ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπηκόων καὶ κλίνεται τοῦ κύρεος καὶ κύρους, ὡς τείχεος καὶ τείχους. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Κῦρος ἀρσενικῶς ὄνομα κύριον. τὸ κυ ψιλόν. τέσσαρές εἰσιν ἀκολουθία τῶν ἀντιστοίχων. ἢ διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ ἢ ἀντίκειται ἢ διὰ τῆς αἰ διφθόγγου. ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα ἢ ἀντίκειται ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἦτα ἢ διὰ τῆς ε καὶ ἰῶτα διφθόγγου. καὶ ἢ διὰ τοῦ υ ψιλοῦ (...)

4. CONCLUSIONS

The teaching of Greek has undergone significant changes, in part due to the historical and political circumstances of the European countries that institutionalized its study. One of the most frequently recurring debates today concerns

53. Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo, *op. cit.*, edition of Moschopoulos' schedography provides, along with the original moschopulean *schedē*, exercises conceived anew.

the rightful place of Greek in the school curriculum. In our opinion, Greek is on course to be eliminated from teaching syllabi, and will plausibly disappear in the foreseeable future. This position does not stem from an unfounded animosity towards one of Europe's most important languages, but from a dearth of present-day applications. Despite this seeming accusation, we acknowledge that Greek is of capital importance to scholars of Classical Philology, History — particularly Ancient History — and Greek, as well as to those who study the regions of Eastern Europe, where the sources present Greek, the language of the Byzantine administration. For this reason, in these cases it is worth reflecting on the method by which Greek has been learnt since Antiquity. The way in which Cicero learned Greek, for example, is very different from the ways in which Classical Philologists are being trained today. Thus, our examination concludes that, apart from everything that we have yet to uncover, the method employed by Moschopoulos, which includes texts of diverse categories and purposes, offers us a fruitful alternative that could bring us closer to the goal of both acquiring Greek, and lending meaning to its continued study. In short, only by distancing ourselves from the current positivist positions will we be able to 'revive' the learning of this 'dead' language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acerbi, Fabio: «Logistic, Arithmetic, Harmonic Theory, Geometry, Metrology, Optics and Mechanics», in Touwaide, Alain (eds.): *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, Leiden, Brill, 2019, pp. 105-159.
- Avitus, Aulus Gratius: «Spoken Latin: Learning, Teaching, Lecturing and Research», *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 19.37 (2018), pp. 46-52.
- Balme, Maurice, Lawall, Gilbert and Morwood, James: *Athenaze, Book I: An Introduction to Ancient Greek*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990 [2015].
- Boeckh, August: *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1877.
- Canfora, Luciano: *Lezioni di filologia Classica*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2023.
- Carbonell Martínez, Santiago: *Cuando las ovejas griegas balan: historia de la pronunciación erasmiana en Grecia y en la tradición escolar hispana*, Castellón, Universitat Jaume I, 2021.
- Carbonell Martínez, Santiago: *Logos. Lingua Graeca*, Granada, Editorial Cultura Clásica, 2023.
- Castellanos, José Carlos: *Lingua Graeca Antiqua Complexu Rerum. La lengua griega antigua por contexto*, Madrid, Áurea Clásicos Editorial, 2023.
- Chitwood, Zachary: *Byzantine Legal Culture and the Roman Legal Tradition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Ciccolella, Federica: *Donati Graeci. Learning Greek in the Renaissance*, Leiden, Brill, 2007.
- Conte, Gian Biagio: *Ope ingenii: Experiences of Textual Criticism*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2013.
- De Toni, Alberto Felice: «In-attualità del liceo classico, il proceso», in Cislscuola.it: <https://www.cislscuola.it/uploads/media/In-Attualita.pdf>
- Dendrinis, Charalambos and Giarenis Ilias (eds.): *Bibliophilos. Books and Learning in the Byzantine World*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2021.
- Dickey, Eleanor: «Greek teaching in Republican Rome: how exactly did they do it?», in Rico, Christophe and Pedicone, Jason (eds.): *Transmitting a Heritage: The Teaching of Ancient Languages from Antiquity to the 21st Century*. Jerusalem, Polis Institute Press, 2022, pp. 3-21.
- Drerup, Engelbert: *Die Schulaussprache des Griechischen von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart*, Paderborn, F. Schoeningh, 1930-1932.
- Efthymiadis, Stephanos: «Question and Answers», in Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 47-62.
- Engelsing, Eduardo Marcant: *Latin as lingua franca non-native speakers legitimately participating in a community of practice*, (Tesis doctoral inédita), Universidad de Cádiz, 2010.
- Fatouros, Georgios: «Moschopoulos, Manuel», in Bautz, Traugott (ed.): *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, Nordhausen, Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1999.
- Fryde, Edmund: *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261 - c. 1360)*, Leiden, Brill, 2000.
- Gaul, Niels: «Performative Reading in the Late Byzantine Theatron», in Shawcross, Teresa and Toth, Ida (eds.): *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and Beyond*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 215-234.
- Gaul, Niels: *Thomas Magistros und die spätbyzantinische Sophistik: Studien zum Humanismus urbaner Eliten in der frühen Palaiologenzeit*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Golitsis, Pantelis: «Η φιλοσοφική πρόσληψη της βυζαντινής φιλοσοφίας», *ICON, Journal on Byzantine Philosophy*, 1.1 (2021), pp. 9-22.

- Golitsis, Pantelis: «Είναι η φιλοσοφία στο Βυζάντιο αντιβυζαντινή», *Δευκαλίων*, 28.2 (2011), pp. 50-74.
- González Maestro, Jesús: *Crítica de la razón literaria*, Vigo, Editorial Academia del Hispanismo, 2017.
- Haloïnus, Georgius: *De restauratione linguae Latinae libri III*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1978 [1533].
- Horrocks, Geoffrey: *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*, London, Blackwell 2010.
- Hunger, Herbert: «Moschopoulos», in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*. Band 6, München, Artemis, 1998, p. 585.
- Hunger, Herbert: *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, München, Beck, 1978.
- Hunger, Herbert: *Ἡ λόγια κοσμική λογοτεχνία τῶν Βυζαντινῶν*, Athens, MIET, 1987-1994.
- JACT: *Reading Greek: text and vocabulary*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Jaeger, Werner Wilhelm: *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961.
- Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo: «Ὡ μωρῆς παιδίον: schedae ineditae ex ms. Vat. Pal. Gr. 92 (Pars prior)», *Philologia Classica*, 18.1 (2023), pp. 80-98.
- Jerez Sánchez, Gonzalo: *Moschopuli de examinanda oratione libellus*, Madrid, Librería Áurea, 2022.
- Jones William Henry Samuel: *Via nova or the application of the direct method to Latin and Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (eds.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Kaldellis, Anthony: *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kallendorf, Craig: *Humanist Educational Treatises*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Kazhdan, Alexander: *Authors and texts in Byzantium*, Hampshire, Aldershot, 1993.
- Kotzabassi, Sofia (ed.): *A Companion to the Intellectual Life of the Palaeologan Period*, Leiden, Brill, 2022.
- Koukoulés, Fedon: *Βυζαντινῶν βίος και πολιτισμός*, Athens, Εκδόσεις του Γαλλικού Ινστιτούτου Αθηνών, 1948-1957.
- Kriarás, Emmanouíl: «Ἡ παιδεία στὸ Βυζάντιο: ἀνθρωπιστικὲς τάσεις. Καλογηρικὸ πνεῦμα», *Παιδεία* 5 (1951), pp. 261-268, pp. 335-343.
- Maas, Paul: *Textkritik*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1960.
- Marciniak, Przemysław: «Byzantine Theatron: A Place of Performance?», in Grünbart, Michael (ed.): *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter = Rhetorical Culture in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Berlin - New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 277-285.
- Martínez Aguirre, Carlos: *La extraña odisea*, Madrid, Círculo Rojo, 2013.
- Martínez Manzano, Teresa and Hernández Muñoz, Felipe Gonzalo (eds.): *Del manuscrito antiguo a la edición crítica de textos griegos: homenaje a la prof^a Elsa García Novo*, Madrid, Dykinson, 2019.
- Miraglia, Luigi: *Nova via: latine doceo: guida per gl'insegnanti*, Montella, Vivarium Novum, 2009.
- Nousia, Fevronia: «The Transmission and Reception of Manuel Moschopoulos' Schedography in the West», in Ciccolella, Federica and Silvano, Luigi (eds.): *Teachers, Students, and Schools of Greek in the Renaissance*, Leiden, Brill, 2017, pp. 1-25.
- Ordine, Nuccio: *L'utilità dell'inutile*, Milano, Bompiani, 2013.
- Pasquali, Giorgio: *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1934.

- Pérez Martín, Inmaculada: «Byzantine books», in Kaldellis, Anthony and Siniosoglou, Nikitas (ed.): *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 37-46.
- Pontani, Filippomaria: «Constantinople after Planudes: Moschopolus, Grammar, Lexicography», in Montanari, Franco (ed.): *History of Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden, Brill, 2020, pp. 490-493.
- Rackham, Harris: *Cicero: On the Nature of the Gods / Academica*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Rollo, Antonio: «Osservazioni sulla tradizione degli «Erotemata» di Manuele Moscopulo», in Martínez Manzano, Teresa and Hernández Muñoz, Felipe Gonzalo (eds.): *Del manuscrito antiguo a la edición crítica de textos griegos: homenaje a la prof^a Elsa García Novo*, Madrid, Dykinson, pp. 281-300.
- Runciman, Steven: *A History of the Crusades. Volume III, The Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- Runciman, Steven: *The last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Ryan, Cressida: «Perspectives on Classics», *Bulletin of CUCD*, 51 (2022), pp. 1-35.
- Sánchez Lasso de la Vega, José: «Notas sobre los «alfabetarios griegos» en España», *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica*, 14 (1978), pp. 9-82.
- Ševčenko, Ihor: «Levels of Style in Byzantine Prose», *JÖB*, 31 (1981), pp. 289-312.
- Sidney Allen, William: *Vox Graeca: The Pronunciation of Classical Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Siniosoglou, Nikitas: *Radical Platonism in Byzantium. Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Skarveli-Nikolopoulou, Aggeliki: *Μαθηματάρια τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν σχολείων κατὰ τὴν τουρκοκρατία: Διδασκόμενα κείμενα, σχολικὰ προγράμματα, διδακτικὲς μέθοδοι: Συμβολὴ στὴν ἱστορία τῆς νεοελληνικῆς παιδείας*, Athens, Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων, 1993.
- Stephanus, Robertus: *Manuelis Moschopuli de ratione examinandae orationis libellus*, Paris, Stephanus, 1545.
- Stray, Christopher: *The living word: W.H.D. Rouse and the crisis of classics in Edwardian England*, London, Bristol Classical Press, 1992.
- Threatte, Leslie: *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. Berlin-New York, de Gruyter, 1980-1996.
- Toth, Ida: «Rhetorical Theatron in Late Byzantium: The Example of Palaiologan Imperial Orations», in Grünbart, Michael (ed.): *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter = Rhetorical Culture in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Berlin-New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 429-448.
- Touwaide, Alain (ed.): *A Companion to Byzantine Science*, Leiden, Brill, 2019.
- Τρωιάνος, Σπύρος: «Ἡ μετάβαση ἀπὸ τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸ στὸ βυζαντινὸ δίκαιο», *Τὰ Ἱστορικά*, 3,6 (1986), pp. 267-281.
- Τρωιάνος, Σπύρος: *Οἱ πηγὲς τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ δικαίου*, Athens, Σάκκουλας, 2011.
- Tsipouras, Stylianos: *Αγωγή και Εκπαίδευση. Σπουδὴ στὴν κανονικὴ και πατερικὴ γραμματεία*, Thessaloniki, ΑΠΘ, 2017.
- von Kurzböck, Joseph: *Τοῦ σοφωτάτου, καὶ λογιωτάτου Μανουήλου τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου, περὶ σχεδῶν. Ἦτοι Γραμματικὴ, ἐν σχήματι τεχνολογικῶ κτλ*, Wien, Kurzböck, 1773.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich: *History of Classical Scholarship*, tr. Alan Harris, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982 [1921].

- West, Martin Litchfield: *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1973.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy and Reynolds Leighton Durham: *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy: *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy: *Scholars of Byzantium*, London, Duckworth, 1983.
- Woodhouse, Christopher Montage: *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Zukis, Georgios: *Ἀναγνωστικὸν τῆς Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens, Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Σχολικῶν Βιβλίων, 1964.
- Zuntz, Günther: *Griechischer Lehrgang I-III*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1983.
- Zuntz, Günther: *Greek. A course in classical and post-classical Greek grammar from original texts*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

