Suggested Topics

This conference has a protagonist: the medieval **textbooks for the teaching of Greek**. These sources are studied from the point of view of

palaeography,

philology, and aspects concerning the Digital Humanities (DH),

historical (socio)linguistics (HSL).

While presenting specific case studies, our papers should contribute to creating a coherent intellectual journey. **Medieval Greek is the key word and a unifying factor of our conference**: we regard Medieval Greek from educational, cultural, linguistic, and hermeneutical points of view.

Suggested Topics

Papers primarily focusing on **paleographical** aspects should discuss one or more of the following points:

a) The definition of textbooks for the teaching of (high-register) Medieval Greek. This label encompasses different kinds of works:

a1) The teaching of Atticized Greek—including all its cultural significance—was constantly part of the Byzantine education. In the Eastern Roman Empire, the programme of studies remained *grosso modo* constant throughout the centuries. Nonetheless, according to their specific didactical needs, generations of scholars and teachers produced various kinds of textbooks, some of which became very popular and *remained in use for generations*. I say "various kinds", because not only grammar books, but also specific Lexica (or Dictionaries) of "Attic" words; encyclopedic and anthological collections of texts;[1] collections of model phrases and sentences to be used as syntactic models for composition; linguistic and syntactic commentaries on the Greek classics, whose language (the Attic Greek, indeed) was to be imitated; etc. should all go under the label of "textbooks for the study of 'Atticized' Greek". All these works had taught medieval authors how to write, and audiences how to read and to demand that poetical forms and conventions be respected, and can still teach us what the Byzantines considered to be Atticized Greek.

b) The teaching of Atticized Greek:

b1) Teaching Atticized Greek entails illustrating its *peculiar linguistic features*, and the *pragmatic functions* implied in its use.

c) Evidence of whether textbooks were really used, and if so, how, where, and for how long.

d) The peculiar characteristics of textbooks, such as:

d1) Common characteristics, if any.

d2) What medieval readers needed to know in order to use them properly.

Papers primarily focusing on **philological** aspects should discuss one or more of the following points:

a) How to present the *cultural content* of textbooks to contemporary readers.

b) How to effectively edit textbooks, without overwhelming modern readers with information.

c) Dreams of an editor (I wish I could…), and the potential of the Digital Humanities. E.g.:

c1) Problems which the DH may solve.

c2) Reports on ongoing editorial projects that involve the DH.

---

[1] A characteristic of "Atticized" Greek is the constant use of quotations, allusions to, and imitations of themes from the literary heritage, which constitutes the socio-cultural framework, to which the medieval users of Greek would refer. Encyclopedic and anthological works aimed to collect texts to this purpose.

d) The kind(s) of information that textbooks contain, such as:

> d1) The mobility of knowledge
>
> d2) Traces left by users over time that help us….

Papers primarily focusing on **historical sociolinguistic** aspects should discuss one or more of the following points:

a) The definition of HSL:

> a1) Historical sociolinguistics (HSL) is a discipline that combines linguistic, social, historical, and philological sciences, and suggests that a language cannot be studied without its social dimension. Similarly, the study of a language in its social dimension is nothing else than the study of the communication which takes place between members of an (extinct) speech community by the means of written texts.
>
> a2) Historical sociolinguistic studies on Medieval Greek consist of linguistic descriptions and interpretations of texts written in this language, privileging the speech community's perspective.

b) The data issue (Labov 1972; 1994; Joseph 2011; Janda and Joseph 2003):

> b1) Textbooks contain linguistic descriptions of Medieval Greek, which formed the linguistic perception of the Byzantines.

c) Atticized Greek as an object of studies for HSL:

> c1) Atticized Greek was a sociolect, but *sui generis*: one was not born a user of Atticized Greek, but became one. This is why, more than inborn and inherited causes, it was people's dedication to studies and personal motivations (such as love for the inherited culture, the willingness to make a career, to succeed in those sectors of society where the use of Atticized Greek was necessary, etc.) that affected their use of Atticized Greek the most.
>
> c2) An appropriate form of linguistic training was based on comments on canonic lectures of model texts, on standard grammar and rhetoric books. The educational system of that time was aimed at teaching not only the linguistic features of Atticized Greek, but also the "meaning" linked to the use of this register, and the framework of cultural competencies indispensable for correctly understanding the texts.
>
> c3) One should avoid looking for the "social" as a direct factor of linguistic variation and change in high-register Medieval Greek, because *a priori* no social factor directly determined the use of this register. I stress *directly*, because social factors rather played a decisive role in determining who could access education, and the places where Atticized Greek was actively used.
>
> c4) The social circumstances under which Atticized Greek was used.

d) How can we study the social role played by Atticized Greek in, and its impact on, Medieval Greek society?

e) Textbooks as one of the factors of linguistic variation and change toward Atticized Greek:

> e1) The linguistic features pertaining to Atticized Greek were certainly affected by the other varieties (including the spoken) of Medieval Greek.
>
> e2) Atticized Greek is not monolithic: when referring to it, one should always specify time and place.
>
> e3) Atticized Greek is an artificial register of Medieval Greek, which users of that time learned at schools by means of textbooks. Hence, textbooks and their linguistic descriptions affected the way the Byzantines used Atticized Greek.

f) How can we measure the impact of education on authors' linguistic choices?

Suggested Topics and Abstracts

g) Textbooks and Historical sociolinguistic poetics:

g1) Byzantine authors could use several "signs" to communicate, such as levels of style, regionalisms, idiolects, sociolects—all appearing in the orthography, syntax, etc. Similarly, the switching from high-register Greek to low-register or vernacular Greek (i.e. code-/style-switching) and the mixing of literary genres can also be considered "signs".

g2) If we use Byzantine linguistic descriptions (preserved in textbooks) we can look at linguistic phenomena (such as style switching) from the speech community's perspective. Since linguistic phenomena have communicative functions, and our linguistic categories may diverge from the Byzantine categories, textbooks help us avoid anachronistic linguistic descriptions and hence textual interpretations.

h) Textbooks and intertextuality:

h1) Intertextuality is a cognitive model of perception and interpretation, an attitude of readers toward texts.

h2) Intertextuality and hermeneutics are mutually interdependent: in Byzantine texts, quotations and allusions, for instance, are "signs", used to signify and convey messages. They suggest to readers several interpretative associations. For the communication to succeed, both authors and audiences must react to intertextuality in a similar way.

h2) In Atticized Greek texts, intertextuality worked in two directions. It functioned both as a tool for authors to convey meaning, and as a cognitive attitude used by readers to interpret texts. This means that texts were both conceived and understood in an intertextual dimension. On top of this, authors and addressees shared the same educational path, which included reading certain texts that were, in turn, later quoted, making up the intertextual structure of high-register Medieval Greek texts.

h3) Medieval textbooks for the teaching of high-register Greek (particularly comments on Greek classics) could help us understand how audiences of that time read and interpreted those texts, which in turn formed the intertextual structure of high-register Medieval Greek texts.

i) The Digital Humanities:

i1) How can the DH help philologists edit their texts effectively? And what does "effectively" mean?

i2) How can the DH help linguistics handle and quantitatively analyze the data extracted from medieval textbooks?

Abstracts

The Editing of Textbooks and the Study of Medieval Greek Literature: When Philology affects Hermeneutics.

Andrea Massimo Cuomo (Discussant: Stefan Büttner)

By discussing some examples taken from my forthcoming critical edition of the "Moschopulean" scholia on Sophocles' *Electra*, I will primarily address the questions pertaining to historical sociolinguistics and the points outlined in the suggested topics, here above.

I will particularly focus on the following Moschopulean manuscripts of Sophocles:

D = Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, II. F. 9 (early 14th cent.);

N = Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, N 166 sup. (early 14th cent.);

Xr = Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Phil. gr. 161 (copied in 1412).

Overall, my paper stresses the links between the editing of medieval textbooks, the studying of Medieval Greek, and the way we interpret Medieval Greek texts.

My paper is designed to serve as a general introduction to our workshop.

Reflecting on the meaning of editing scholia: historicized textual criticism as applied to the old scholia to Sophocles

Georgios Xenis (Discussant: Paolo Scattolin)

The paper deals with the medieval corpus of the old scholia to Sophocles, and considers issues related to the critical edition of this corpus. It falls into three sections: (i) the tradition and textual history of the scholiastic corpus. (ii) Potential goals which an editor of the corpus might set for his edition; the preferable goal and how it can be achieved.

Transforming scholia: Moschopoulos, Planudes, Chrysoloras

Filippomaria Pontani (Discussant: Christian Gastgeber)

After a brief statement concerning the importance of the cultural context in assessing the manuscript tradition of the Byzantine exegetical material to ancient poetry, we shall focus on some examples of the use and re-use of scholia in the framework of Palaeologan scholarship.

First, we shall examine a grammatical scholium to Euripides' *Orestes* tentatively ascribed to Planudes, albeit embedded in a Moschopulean context, and its fate in texts of different kinds (annotations to Moschopoulos' grammatical treatises; a mysterious, unpublished lexicon), with clearly different goals: this will lend us the opportunity to hint at some circumstances in which the same piece of scholarship is transmitted in different exegetical *corpora*.

Secondly, we shall give some examples of the *Nachleben* of Moschopoulos' commentary to *Iliad* A-B 483: one 15th-century manuscript where it has not been recognised as such; another humanistic manuscript where it has been supplemented through a series of additions (scholia, epimerisms etc.), including some very peculiar ones; and a lexicographical work which has digested its scholia in various entries. Here, again, we face a multiplicity of layers between high-brow Homeric scholarship and a more down-to-earth didactic or lexicographic purpose.

Finally, we shall briefly explore the grammatical scholia penned by Manuel Chrysoloras on his copy of the *Odyssey*, and consider the criteria for the scholar's selection as well as their relationship with his *Erotemata*. Chrysoloras was at the same time a philologist and a teacher, and the interference between these two aspects is itself interesting.

Manuscripts that will be mentioned include: Neap. II.F.9; Marc. gr. X.3; Par. gr. 2938; Bodl. Barocc. 162; Vind. phil. gr. 56; Harl. 5674.

Editions cited will include: D. Mastronarde (schol. Eur., California, forthcoming); Schaefer (Greg. Cor., Leipzig 1811); J. Cavarzeran (schol. Eur. Hipp., Berlin 2016); A. Pertusi (schol. Hes., Milan 1955); L. Bachmann (Moschop. in Hom., Rostock 1835); H. Erbse (schol. Hom. Il., Berlin 1969-77); M. van der Valk (Eust. in Il., 1971-87); F. Pontani (schol. Od., Rome 2007-2015); V. Favorinus (lexicon, Rome 1523); F. Ritschl (Thom. Mag., Halle 1832); A. Rollo (Chrysol., Messina 2012). Also S. Biasin (diss. Venice 2017); G. Dalicco (diss. Venice 2017).

The transmission and reception of Dionysius Periegetes in the Palaiologan first century

Inmaculada Pérez Martín (Discussant: Ernst Gamillscheg)

Dionysius Periegetes' *Description of the Known World* was the schoolbook that offered to the Byzantines a Roman compendium of the oikoumene's geography. It is preserved in more than one hundred testimonies which gather the Periegesis with some expected companions such as Cleomedes and Aratus (the basics of the astronomical wisdom) or Hesiod, who provided a cosmogony that supplemented the Homeric geography of Dionysius, but also Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides or Pindar.

In the Palaiologan period and especially in its first century, Dionysius' poem was often copied along with Eustathios of Thessalonike's commentary, ancient scholia, and a paraphrasis that facilitated access to Dionysius' linguistic choices and completed the geographical information. As it happens with other school texts, after 1261 the copies of the *Periegesis* proliferated, allowing us to understand more precisely the ways Byzantine students acquired some geographical notions. Although Byzantine geography or cosmology is equated nowadays with texts such as Kosmas Indikopleustes' *Christian topography,* the real worldview Byzantines acquired at school was provided by these scholia and paraphrasis of Dionysius' *Description.*

Teaching ancient Greek in Late Byzantium: Manuel Moschopoulos' Schedography and his scholia to Homer's *Iliad* and Hesiod's *Works and Days*

Fevronia Nousia (Discussant: Ilias Nesseris)

Manuel Moschopoulos is renowned for his grammatical manuals *Erōtēmata Grammatika* and his *Peri schedōn*. His philological works comprise commentaries on the most important poets taught in the Byzantine school, among which Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Theocritus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Philostratus.

The paper investigates the relationship between Moschopoulos' schedography on the one hand and his scholia-paraphrase to Homer's *Iliad* A-B 493 and his commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days* on the other in an attempt to identify similarities and differences in method and approach. Since 11 out of the 22 schede of the Moschopoulean schedography come from the *Iliad* (mainly Book I), the question is raised whether Moschopoulos composed these schede on the basis of his commentary on the *Iliad* after having composed its paraphrase, or whether he simply applied the schedographic methods (paraphrase, *epimerism*, *technology*) to his commentary on the *Iliad* and *Works and Days*.

The paper closes with an evaluation of the register of Greek Moschopoulos used in his schedography taking into account schedography's place in the Byzantine curriculum.

Bad data? Reflections on a fundamental question of historical sociolinguistics

Stephan Elspaß (Discussant: Andrea Cuomo)

Historical sociolinguistics has developed into a vibrant field of research in historical linguistics in the new millennium. It has shifted the focus to the 'social' in the histories of languages, and it has enriched the study of historical linguistics by accounting for 'external' factors in the description and explanation of historical language variation and language change. Crucially, the (re)discovery of new (old) data, the advances in corpus linguistics and greater efforts to conduct comparative studies have sparked off a whole range of exciting research activities and new projects in the last two decades. Their findings help us to reconstruct historical language use and the social factors that had an effect on its variation and change, thus contributing to an understanding of language as a socio-cultural phenomenon. In effect, such findings sometimes cast a different light on traditional narratives of language histories and encourage alternative interpretations.

In the first part of my talk, I will try to map the field by giving a brief account of main topics and projects in present-day historical sociolinguistics. In the second part, the focus will be on the data problem. Are historical data really "bad data" (Labov 1994: 11)? What are the basic prerequisites for data to meet the requirements of historical-sociolinguistic analyses? Are there any specific problems that arise in the analysis of literary texts? In the final part, I will try to address specific questions pertaining to historical-sociolinguistic analyses of medieval text sources such as Medieval Greek, which are at the center of the Vienna conference.

A database of high level and low level lexical correspondences in late Byzantine texts

Martin Hinterberger (Discussant: Stefano Valente)

In this paper I intend to present the preliminary results of a research project on lexical correspondences between high level and low level texts. In the framework of this research project (funded by the Leventis Foundation and the University of Cyprus) data are collected from various texts which exist both in a high level and a low level version and are stored in a data base. My presentation will focus on Nicetas Choniates' History (completed during the 1st decade of the 13th century) and its metaphrasis (dating to the mid-14th century). In comparison to this process of simplification two versions of the Life of Maximos Kausokalybes will be examined, namely Makarios Makres' high level text which aimed to improve stylistically the older Life by Theophanes (both texts date to the end of the 14th/beginning of the 15th century).

Homer and Archaic Poetry as Models:
Theodore Metochites and the epic/pre-classical tradition

Staffan Wahlgren (Discussant: Nikos Zagklas)

Statesman and scholar Theodore Metochites (1270-1332) was a most prolific writer, active in a number of genres, such as essay- and letter-writing, oratory, and poetry. Although there has been a recent upsurge in interest in Metochites, as well as in some of his contemporaries, little scholarship so far deals with his language, which, in most respects, and as it manifests itself in the majority of his works, seems typical of its time and context: a conventional language, with in-group features reinforced by the constant interaction of a limited number of group members with each other. Different, however, is the language Metochites employs in his poetry. In this paper I will examine some of the typical traits of Metochites' poetic diction, in order to demonstrate how he has appropriated models such as Homer, and what pragmatic limits there are to this appropriation.

Suggested Topics and Abstracts

Did Triclinius lie? Pindar's fifth Olympian Ode in the manuscripts containing the commentary by Moscopulus: metric layout and interlinear glosses

Francesco G. Giannachi (Discussant: Krystina Kubina)

This contribution explores the manuscript tradition of Moscopulus' commentary on Pindar, focusing on the colometry of Pindar's fifth Olympian Ode, as handed down by the codices veteres and the manuscripts of Moscopulus and Triclinius. The interlinear glosses, written by Moscopulus and then reused by Triclinius in his edition, have been studied to shed further light on the cultural dynamics in place between the scholars of the Palaeologan period and to investigate the didactic practices of each school.

A digital approach to scholarly editing: *Excerpta Constantiniana*

Dariya Rafiyenko (Discussant: Charlotte Roueché)

Introduction: The philological research is now equipped with methods and tools that help overcoming the disadvantages and limitations of the printed medium: digital editions outperform their printed counterparts in a number of ways. First of all, digitalization provides for effective means to store diverse information. As the cyberspace is flexible and versatile, it allows to represent the information in a much more varied way than a printed edition. Depending on the type of the information stored, different aspects of the text can be represented by a digital edition such as the genesis, variation, cultural context, intertextuality, and other aspects. Furthermore, digitalization and the use of internet allows for active collaboration in the editorial process and opens up perspectives for crowdsourcing in the broadest sense. Digital texts can also be linked to relevant collections of other digitized texts in various ways. Last but not least, digital texts have a much wider range of application than a printed book in the research. For instance, digital editions make large-scale corpus studies possible as they allow for automated search.

The aforementioned advantages provided by the digital edition become even more important in cases of a more complex textual tradition. For instance, when dealing with texts that contain metatextual information[2] such as scholia or other marginal notes that are notoriously difficult to represent in a printed edition. The same applies to texts with linguistic instability, with the *open* or *fluid* tradition.

In this paper, I will argue for advantages of digital editing on the basis of the digital edition of *Excerpta Constantiniana historica* (EC) as a showcase. EC – a Byzantine encyclopaedia written in Ancient Greek in Constantinople in the tenth century – was designed as a large-scale encyclopaedia with multiple volumes. We possess two original manuscripts of EC – each for one of the volumes of EC. These distinguish themselves by a remarkable *mise-en-page*: in order to enhance navigation through the text several hundred notes and pictograms were placed on the margins of the manuscript by the scribers.

The digital edition of EC: At present, a digital edition of the entire work is being made; one section of the *Excerpta* comprising 24 pages (about 9 000 words) of the original manuscript *Vaticanus graecus* 73 has been edited. The *mise-en-page* of the manuscript was pivotal for the development of the concept of this digital edition. The largest challenge here is a faithful reproduction of the notes and pictograms on the margins that are important for the understanding and interpretation of the text. A *pluralistic* approach to the text was taken as the basis. The goal was to ensure the presentation of the text in multiple *views,* i.e. displaying different perspectives, most important of which were the

---

[2] For the definition of *metatextuality* as the totality of all kinds of commentaries see Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*. Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. XVIII-XIV.

document-focused and the *text-focused* perspectives. In doing so three main views were chosen: (i) a digital reconstruction of the manuscript (*the topographical view*), (ii) a diplomatic transcription (*the document-focused view*), and (iii) a normalized, historical-critical version of the text (*the text-focused view*).

Goals of the talk: In this paper, the model of the edition will be presented and it will show how the text was prepared and annotated. Furthermore, I will illustrate how a number of the research questions that have been discussed in the literature may be addressed with the help of the digital edition more efficiently and what kind of new research questions may be raised. Furthermore, the paper aims at fostering and promoting the exchange of ideas on how to edit EC and other texts with a more complicated tradition. More specifically, I will bring the following questions into the discussion: What are the features that the editors and scholars working with Byzantine texts would like to see in a digital edition? What kind of knowledge is needed in order to create a digital edition (TEI, databases, linking). Finally, I will argue that all standards necessary to work with digital editions already exist and all we need is to elaborate on them in order to adapt them for our needs.