SOPHIANOS ON PARTICIPLES AND RELATIVE PRONOUNS:
BETWEEN TRADITION AND MODERNITY

Traces of the Greek vernacular are found in popular literature from about the 11th century on, but the first grammar of modern Greek appeared only in the 16th century. During the Middle Ages, very few European vernaculars were considered worthy of grammatical description, since they did not obtain a status equal to Latin or ancient Greek. Byzantine grammarians were only interested in describing ancient Greek, which was the key to ancient literature and the model for their own Atticizing language. By the 16th century, however, a new cultural movement in Europe had set in, which also inspired certain Greeks to promote the popular language for literature and as an object of grammatical description.

The first witness for this Greek movement was Nikolaos Sophianos,[1] a scholar born on the island of Kerkyra around 1500. We know that Sophianos spent the major part of his active life in Italy, but many details of his biography remain uncertain. According to some modern scholars he studied at the Greek gymnasium of Rome, founded by Pope Leo X in 1514, but decisive evidence for this hypothesis has not yet been offered. We only know for sure that he worked in Rome and Venice. Papadopoulos[2] divides the

---

This is an updated version of a paper which I presented at the International Conference *European Scholarsip. History, Methodololgy and Beyond*, organised in Nicosia (March 2002) by Prof. I. Taifacos of the University of Cyprus. The original text will be published in the acts of the conference.

1. See for more details on the intellectual renaissance of the 16th century and Sophianos' contributions, Δημ. Γ. Πανδής, «Ο Νικόλαος Σοφιανός και η πρώτη γλωσσοεκπαιδευτική αναγέννηση του νέου ελληνισμού», *Επιθεώρηση τέχνης* 110 (1964) 132-149; 111-112 (1964) 323-349 and Π. Χ. Ζιώγας, «Μιὰ κίνηση πνευματικῆς ἀναγεννήσεως τοῦ ὑποδούλου ἑλληνισμοῦ κατὰ τὸν 16ο αἰῶνα (1540-1550)», *Ἑλληνικά* 27 (1974) 50-78 and 268-303. Recent publications on Sophianos's life and work are: Χ. Κλαίρης, «Νικολάου Σοφιανού του Κερκυραίου γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων γλώσσης», *Η καθ' ημάς ανατολή* 1 (1993) 113-121 and J. Irmscher, «Nikolaos Sophianos, der erste Grammatiker neugriechischen, unter Einfluss der Italischen Volkssprache», in M. Tavoni e.a. (edd.), *Italia ed Europa nella linguistica del Rinascimento: confronti e relazioni, Atti del Convegno internazionale Ferrara, Palazo Paradiso 20-24 marzo 1991*, Volume II: *L'Italia e l'Europa non romanza. Le lingue orientali*, Ferrara 1996, pp. 199-206.

2. Θ. Παπαδόπουλος, *Νικολάου Σοφιανοῦ Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης*, Athina 1977, p. 137.

scholar's activities into those in favour of Italian and European culture, on the one hand, and those in favour of Greek culture, on the other hand. His work as a scribe and later as an editor and printer in Venice was very important for European humanism.[3] He went, for example, to Greece in 1543 to buy and copy manuscripts for Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, the ambassador of Charles V in Venice.

Testimonies of Sophianos' interest in the Greek vernacular and its speakers are a dialogue composed in modern Greek for the Italian comedy *I Tre Tiranni* of Agostino Ricchi,[4] his grammar of modern Greek, entitled *Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης*, and his translation of the *Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς*, a work wrongly ascribed to Plutarch. This translation, entitled *Παιδαγωγός*, is the oldest known printed translation from ancient into modern Greek. Sophianos intended to produce a whole series of translations but he probably did not achieve his goal. Also his plans to make a lexicon of modern Greek seem to have remained without result. Sophianos is furthermore known for his map of Greece and a collection of ancient Greek place names, together with their modern Greek and Italian equivalents.[5] Some 15 years after writing his grammar, he worked for a year in Padova revising and annotating an edition of the *Syntax* of Apollonios Dyskolos.[6]

Sophianos' Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης

Let us now turn to Sophianos' *Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης* (*Grammar of the Greek vernacular*). Of this work only the first book, entitled *Γραμματικῆς εἰσαγωγῆς βιβλίον πρῶτον* (*Introduction to grammar, first book*), has been preserved. This grammatical work has been dated some time before 1550 on the basis of the fact that the Cardinal of Lorraine to whom it was dedicated, died in that year. It has been preserved in two manuscripts, one in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (*Parisinus gr.* 2592) and one in the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (*Ottobonianus gr.* 173, ff. 1-50). The only editions of Sophianos' grammar and translation were

---

3. See for more details on Sophianos as a printer and publisher: E. Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy. Printers and Publishers for the Greek World*, Venice 1994, pp. 460-472.

4. M. Vitti, *Nicola Sofianós e la commedia dei Tre Tiranni di A. Ricchi*, Napoli 1966.

5. The map of Sophianos and its impact on later cartography have recently been studied by G. Tolias, «*Totius Graecia* [sic]: Nicolaos Sophianos's map of Greece and the Transformation of Hellenism», *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 19 (2001) 1-22.

6. J. Lallot – K. Stoppie, «Nicolas Sophianos», in *Corpus de textes linguistiques fondamentaux*, notice 1115 <http://ctlf.ens-lsh.fr».

published by the French scholar Legrand and date from 1870 and 1874.[7] In 1977 Papadopoulos published a photostatic reprint of Legrand's edition of 1874 and added a long introduction, which provides much historical and biographical information. In 1990 Vernant made a diplomatic transcription of the Paris manuscript but his work has not been edited yet.[8]

The dedication and the epilogue of Sophianos' work make clear what his objectives were. He wanted to teach the common language of the Greek people, which he did not consider inferior to the language of the ancients. To do so he announces a work divided into three parts: the first on the parts of speech, the second on orthography and the third on syntax.[9]

Since only the first book has been preserved, it remains unclear whether Sophianos managed to finish the whole. In Moustoxydis[10] and more recently in Papadopoulos[11] we read that a codex of the famous library in Venice (*Theup. Graec. Bibl. D. Marci cd. 492*) probably contains Sophianos' syntax. According to the catalogue of Mioni,[12] however, this codex already dates from the 15th century. Without having seen the codex *in situ*, we think we can add one more argument against the hypothesis of Moustoxydis, when we take a closer look at the lines of the folium printed by Mioni:[13]

VI. Sophianus, De syntaxi (f. 223), Τοῦ κυρίου Σοφιανοῦ περὶ συντάξεως, inc. Εὐθεῖα μετοχικὴ εἰς πρῶτον πρόσωπον λεγομένη, expl. Τῷ<ι> προσώπῳ<ι> συντάσσεται πρώτῳ<ι> ἢ τρίτῳ<ι>, εἰ δὲ τρῖτον πρώτῳ<ι> καὶ δευτέρῳ<ι>.

The morphological form for the dative in the closing line mentioned by Mioni was already out of use in the vernacular of Sophianos' time, as can be seen in his paragraph on the cases of the noun:

Πτῶσες πέντε· εὐθεῖα, ὁ ἄνθρωπος· γενική, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· *δοτική, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*· αἰτιατική, τὸν ἄνθρωπον· κλητική, ὦ ἄνθρωπε (Sophianos, p. 36 Legrand).

---

7. É. Legrand, *Grammaire du grec vulgaire et traduction en grec vulgaire du traité de Plutarque sur l'éducation des enfants*, Paris [1]1870, [2]1874.

8. M. Vernant, *La grammaire de Nicolas Sophianos. Transcription diplomatique du manuscrit gr. 2592 de la Bibliothèque nationale et établissement du texte*, mémoire de DEA soutenu à l'INALCO, Paris 1990.

9. *Hunc tractatum in tres partes divisi. Prima, nomina et verba cum reliquis particulis ostendo; secunda, ago de orthographia; tertia vero, de constructione* (Sophianos, p. 34 Legrand).

10. Α. Μουστοξύδης, «Νικόλαος Σοφιανός», Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ Σύμμικτα Ἑλληνικὰ 4 (1843) 249.

11. Παπαδόπουλος, op.cit., p. 159.

12. E. Mioni, *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum. Codices Graeci manuscripti*, II. Thesaurus antiquus, codices 300-625, Roma 1985, p. 300.

13. Op.cit., II, p. 302.

The vernacular described by Sophianos has been described by Horrocks[14] as «considerably removed from that of standard written Greek, but also quite conservative in comparison with developments on display in the vernacular literature of the 14th and 15th centuries».[15] But more conservative than his form of modern Greek are the structure, categories, definitions, terminology and exemplification used by Sophianos for the description of the parts of speech. In a short presentation of Sophianos' grammar Lallot[16] points at the influence exercised by the Greek grammars of the Renaissance (by Chrysoloras, Gaza and Laskaris), which continue the tradition that goes back to the *Τέχνη Γραμματική* (2nd-1st cent. B.C.) of Dionysios Thrax (*G.G.* I 1, 1-101).[17]

This tendency to hold on to tradition is certainly not surprising, since one observes the same phenomenon when studying the Latin grammars in Antiquity or the first grammars of other vernaculars. Even when the described language did not possess all the traditional categories, grammarians did not leave them out, but filled the gaps with the morphological form or construction that had taken over the function of the original category. A very clear example for this is the fact that until the end of Antiquity Latin grammarians kept the *modus optativus* as they had found it in the Greek grammars (as εὐκτικὴ ἔγκλισις), although this mood obviously does not exist in Latin.[18] They retained, however, this class and applied it to the structure «*ut* or *utinam* plus subjunctive».[19]

When describing 16th-century vernacular Greek, Sophianos had to face the same conflict between his object of study and the grammatical tradition as his Latin colleagues centuries before. We can observe that on many points he has chosen the same solution, preserving categories that vernacular Greek

---

14. G. Horrocks, *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*, London - New York 1997, p. 303.

15. See for more details on the language described by Sophianos: H. Tonnet, *Histoire du grec moderne. La formation d'une langue*, Paris 2003, pp. 171-178.

16. Lallot, op.cit., pp. 32-34.

17. *G.G.* I 1 = *Grammatici Graeci*, pars prima, volumen primum: G. Uhlig, *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*. Lipsiae 1883· *G.G.* II 1 = *Grammatici Graeci*, pars secunda: *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*, volumen primum, fasc. prior: *Scripta minora a R. Schneidero edita*, Lipsiae 1878· *G.G.* II 2 = *Grammatici Graeci*, pars secunda: *Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt*, volumen alterum: G. Uhlig, *De constructione libri quattuor*, Lipsiae 1910.

18. See M. Pugliarello, «I grammatici latini e la sintassi: "coniunctivus modus"», *Studi e Ricerche* 7 (1991) 75-77.

19. As, for example, in Charisius' ars grammatica for the second conjugation: *optativa instantis et inperfecti ut exercerem, perfecti utinam exercuerim, plusquamperfecti ut exercuissem, futuri utinam exerceam* (217. 20-22 Barwick). The passages of Charisius are taken from the following edition: C. Barwick, *Charisius, ars grammatica, libri V.* addenda et corrigenda collegit et adiecit F. Kühnert, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1997.

had already abandoned. In some cases he just replaced these morphological forms with the constructions or forms that had taken over their function. Under the category «infinitive or ἀπαρέμφατο», for example, he has put the periphrasis «νά plus subjunctive»,[20] and he calls a form like τοῦ genitive (γενική) and dative (δοτική).[21]

A direct model for Sophianos' description of contemporary Greek morphology was the traditional grammar of ancient Greek composed by the 15th-century scholar Konstantinos Laskaris,[22] as pointed out by Ilioudis.[23] The latter scholar concludes that the resemblances between both grammars are so numerous and of such a kind that we can accept that Sophianos followed, and on many points even translated Laskaris' short description of the eight parts of speech (Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ὀκτὼ τοῦ λόγου μερῶν). Recently Katsouda[24] compared these grammars with a third one, the grammar attributed to Dionysios Thrax. She focuses on the resemblances with regard to the general structure of the grammars, the definitions and composition of the chapters, the terminology, examples and the paradigms. After discussing the resemblances she comes to the changes Sophianos has made to adapt his material to the spoken language of his time. She concludes that not only the grammar of Laskaris but also that of Dionysios Thrax was among Sophianos' models. In our recent article about Sophianos' chapter on the adverb,[25] we conclude that our grammaria certainly used more sources than Dionysios Thrax and Laskaris to describe this part of speech.

We would like to focus here not on the resemblances, but on the way Sophianos tried to deal with some discrepancies between the traditional grammaticography and the contemporary language which he wants to describe. Of high relevance in this context are his chapter on the participle

---

20. Under the heading ἀπαρέμφατα ἐνεργητικά (active infinitives), for example, we find for the present (ἐνεστώς) νὰ γράφω, νὰ γράφεις etc., for the past (παρακείμενος) νἄχω γραμμένον, νἄχεις etc. and for the first future (μέλλων πρῶτος) νὰ γράψω, νὰ γράψεις etc. (Sophianos, p. 56 Legrand).

21. In the chapter on the article we find for the masculine singular: Ἡ εὐθεῖα, ὁ· ἡ γενικὴ καὶ δοτική, τοῦ, ἡ αἰτιατική, τόν (Sophianos, p. 37 Legrand).

22. I quote Laskaris from the manuscript pubished by Fraenkel: K. Laskaris, *Greek Grammar.* Milan, Dionysius Paravisinus for Demetrius of Crete 30 january 1476, with an introduction of J. J. Fraenkel, Amsterdam 1966.

23. Γ. Ν. Ηλιούδης, «Η γραμματική του Κωνσταντίνου Λασκάρεως πρότυπο της γραμματικής του Νικολάου Σοφιανού», *Ελληνικά* 40 (1989) 413-417.

24. Γ. Κατσούδα, «Η σχέση της γραμματικής του Νικόλαου Σοφιανού με τις γραμμα-τικές του Κωνσταντίνου Λασκάρεως και του Διονυσίου Θρακός», *Ελληνικά* 52 (2002) 129-137.

25. K. Stoppie, «The treatment of the Adverb in the First Grammar of Modern Greek», in A. Kärnä – S. Matthaios, «Das "Adverb" in der Grammatikographie», *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 17 (Münster 2007).

and his treatment of those words that we now call relative pronouns. Like Katsouda we will compare Sophianos with Dionysios Thrax and Laskaris. For the relative pronouns we will also confront his grammar with the classification in the grammar of Triandaphyllidis,[26] the standard work of modern Greek grammaticography.

Sophianos on participles

Sophianos' chapter on the participle or μετοχή begins with a traditional definition and list of «accidences»:

Η ΜΕΤΟΧΗ ἔναι μέρος λόγου ὅπου κλίνεται, καὶ λέγεται μετοχὴ διότι μετέχει τὰ ἰδιώματα τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τοῦ ῥήματος· καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τὸ ὄνομα μετέχει γένος καὶ πτῶσιν, ἀπὸ δὲ τὸ ῥῆμα, διάθεσιν, χρόνον καὶ συζυγίαν.[27] Καὶ

---

26. I used for this paper the *Concise Modern Greek Grammar*, the English translation by John B. Burke (Thessaloniki 1997) of Triandaphyllidis' *Μικρή Νεοελληνική Γραμματική*. This is a shorter version of his *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική τῆς Δημοτικῆς* (*Grammar of Modern Demotic Greek*), which was originally published in 1941 and is until today considered to be the most complete grammar of modern Greek.

27. In spite of the singular (συζυγία and not συζυγίαι), the meaning of the term must be here «conjugation classes». In his definition of the verb (§ 13, *G.G.* I 1, 46. 5-47. 2) Dionysios Thrax mentions the συζυγίαι as one of the accidences of this part of speech (cf. *infra*). In the *Περὶ συζυγίας* chapter (§ 14) of his *Τέχνη* Dionysios defines (the singular) συζυγία as ἀκόλουθος ῥημάτων κλίσις («the regular inflection of verbs») (*G.G.* I 1, 53. 6), but – in the same way as in § 13 – he refers with the plural συζυγίαι to the different conjugation classes. See e.g. εἰσὶ δὲ συζυγίαι βαρυτόνων μὲν ῥημάτων ἕξ. «There are six conjugation classes of barytone verbs» (ibid., 53. 6- 54.1). The only parallel for Sophianos' (singular) συζυγία with this (collective) meaning is the passage in Laskaris' grammar quoted further on.

In the following sentence Sophianos (unexpectedly) uses ἔγκλισις as an alternative for συζυγία. In Dionysios' *Τέχνη* and in Byzantine grammaticography, as well as in Laskaris, ἔγκλισις primarily indicates the grammatical mood (indicative, subjunctive, optative, etc.). Cf. W. Kürschner, «Modus zwischen Verb und Satz», in J. Meibauer (ed.), *Satzmodus zwischen Grammatik und Pragmatik, Referate anlässlich der 8. Jahrestagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft,* Heidelberg 1986, Tübingen 1987, pp. 114-124.

In several sources, however, the (more rare, but original) meaning «inflection» / «inflected form» is still obvious. See e.g. *Schol. Dion. Thrax* 518. 17-18: τῷ ῥήματι συνάπτουσι τὴν μετοχήν, ἔγλισιν αὐτὴν ῥήματος καλοῦντες. «(The Stoics) group the participle together with the verb and call it an "inflected form" of the verb». Also, Apollonios Dyskolos occasionally uses ἔγκλισις with the meaning «inflection», (for the verb: «conjugation»). Cf. e.g. *Synt.* III 149 (*G.G.* II 2, 396. 2-4): ἡ παθητικὴ ἔγκλισις and ἡ ἐνεργητικὴ ἔγκλισις («the passive and the active conjugation»). Ἔγκλισις apparently is just a synonym here of κλίσις (cf. J. Lallot, *Apollonius Dyscole. De la construction (syntaxe)*, Volume II: *Notes et index*, Paris 1997, p. 244, note 352).

In Apollonios' definition of the adverb, the plural ἐγκλίσεις indicates the (sum of the) inflected forms. Ἔστιν οὖν ἐπίρρημα μὲν λέξις ἄκλιτος, κατηγοροῦσα τῶν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐγκλίσεων καθόλου ἢ μερικῶς, ὧν ἄνευ οὐ κατακλείσει διάνοιαν (*G.G.* II 1, 119. 5-6). «An adverb is an indeclinable part of speech saying something about the verbs, in all their forms or part of them, without which (verbs) it cannot make the sense complete» (translation of I. Sluiter, *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought,*

γίνονται μετοχαῖς εἰς ὅλους τοὺς χρόνους τῶν ῥημάτων, κεἰς πᾶσαν ἔγκλισιν καὶ διάθεσιν (Sophianos, p. 76 Legrand).

«The participle is an inflected part of speech and it is called participle because it shares characteristics with the noun and the verb. With the first it shares gender and case and with the latter diathesis, tense and conjugation class(es). We have participles for each tense, each conjugation class and each diathesis».

This paragraph reminds us of the corresponding passages in the grammars of Dionysios Thrax and Laskaris. Dionysios Thrax describes the participle as follows:

Μετοχή ἐστι λέξις μετέχουσα τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰδιότητος. Παρέπεται δὲ αὐτῇ ταὐτὰ ἃ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ τῷ ῥήματι δίχα προσώπων τε καὶ ἐγκλίσεων (Dionysios Thrax, *G.G.* I 1, 60. 2-4).

«A participle is a word which participates in the proper nature of the verbs and in that of the nouns. It has the same accidences as the noun and the verb, except for persons and moods».[28]

The «accidences» of the participle are gender (γένος), species (εἶδος), figure (σχῆμα), number (ἀριθμός), case (πτῶσις), diathesis (διάθεσις), tense (χρόνος) and conjugation class (συζυγία) since we find the following lists for the noun and the verb, respectively:

Παρέπεται δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι πέντε· γένη, εἴδη, σχήματα, ἀριθμοί, πτώσεις (Dionysios Thrax, *G.G.* I 1, 24. 6-7).

«There are five accidences of the noun: genders, species, figures, numbers, cases».

Παρέπεται δὲ τῷ ῥήματι ὀκτώ, ἐγκλίσεις, διαθέσεις, εἴδη, σχήματα, ἀριθμοί, πρόσωπα, χρόνοι, συζυγίαι (Dionysios Thrax, *G.G.* I 1, 46. 5-47. 2).

«There are eight accidences of the verb: moods, diatheses, species, figures, numbers, persons, tenses, conjugation classes».

Laskaris added to the definition of Dionysios Thrax the observation that the participle is declinable, but he lists exactly the same accidences:

Amsterdam 1990, p. 73). See also Simplicius, *In Arist. Cat.* 43a 37: πτώσεις γὰρ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ οὐ μόνον τὰς πέντε ταύτας τὰς νῦν λεγομένας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς παρακειμένας ἐγκλίσεις, ὁποίους ἂν ἔχωσι σχηματισμούς. «The old philosophers used the term "cases" (πτώσεις) not only for the five cases of the nouns, which are called so today, but also for the available (morphological) variations (of the verb), in as far as they are reflected in morphology». In the same way as with συζυγίαν Sophianos uses ἔγκλισιν as a collective singular and with the same meaning («conjugation class(es)»).

28. Throughout this paper I use the (forthcoming) English translation of the *Τέχνη Γραμματική* by P. Swiggers and A. Wouters.

Μετοχὴ ἐστὶ μέρος λόγου κλιτὸν τῆς ἰδιότητος τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τοῦ ῥήματος μετέχον· παρέπονται δὲ αὐτῇ ὀκτώ· γένος εἶδος σχῆμα ἀριθμὸς πτῶσις χρόνος διάθεσις καὶ συζυγία (my transcript of the photostatic version of the text in *Constantinus Lascaris, Greek Grammar. Milan, Dionysius Paravisinus for Demetrius of Crete, 30 january 1476* [Amsterdam, 1966]).

«The participle is a declinable part of speech which participates in the proper nature of the noun and in that of the verb. There are eight accidences of the participle: gender, species, figure, number, case, tense, diathesis and conjugation class(es)».

Sophianos, however, has left out some of these accidences, namely species (εἶδος), figure (σχῆμα) and number (ἀριθμός).

After these traditional opening lines Sophianos provides some interesting observations which make the definition and list of accidences more curious than seems at first sight.

Firstly, he remarks that the ancient participle has been replaced by a relative clause:

[…] καὶ πρόσεχε ὅτι ἡ μετοχὴ ἐπενοήθη διὰ βραχυλογίαν καὶ καλλωπισμὸν τοῦ λόγου καὶ ὄχι ὅτι νᾶν' ἀναγκαία, διότι ἂν εἰπῇς «ἐπολέμησα καὶ ἐνίκησα», ὡραιότερον καὶ συντομώτερον ἔναι νὰ εἰπῇς «πολεμῶντας ἐνίκησα». Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ κοινὴ γλῶσσα ἡ ἐδική μας, μὴ γυρεύοντας εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἄλλους καλλωπισμούς, φυσικὰ ὅλαις ταῖς μετοχαῖς τῶν παλαίων Ἑλλήνων, ταῖς διαλύουν μὲ τὸ ῥιστικὸν ῥῆμα τοῦ χρόνου ὅποὔθελεν ἔχει ἡ μετοχὴ καὶ μὲ τὸ ὅπου, ὁποῖον ἔναι ἢ ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν, ἢ ὄνομα ἀναφορικὸν ἄκλιτον, τόποῖον λαμβάνεται εἰς κάθε γένος καὶ χρόνον καὶ πρόσωπον· ὥστε τὴν μετοχὴν τούτην «ὁ γράφων» τὴν διαλύεις ἔτζη «ὅπου γράφει»· καὶ τὸ «γράψας», «ὅπὄγραψε»· καὶ τὸ «γράψων», «ὅπου θέλει γράφει»· ὁμοίως καὶ ταῖς θηλυκαῖς καὶ ταῖς οὐδετέραις· καὶ τὸ «γράφοντες», «ὅπου γράφομεν» ἢ «ὅπου γράφετε» ἢ «ὅπου γράφουν» λέγομεν· ὁμοίως καὶ τἄλλα (Sophianos, p. 76 Legrand).

«Be aware that the participle was invented to put things in a shorter and more embellished way and not because it was necessary, for if you say "ἐπολέμησα καὶ ἐνίκησα" («I went to war and won») it is more beautiful and shorter to say "πολεμῶντας ἐνίκησα". That's why our common speech, as it doesn't look for ornaments in that respect, decomposes all participles in ancient Greek and replaces them by an indicative of the same tense and ὅπου, a postpositive *arthron* or an indeclinable anaphoric noun, that fits every gender, tense and person. Thus, you decompose the participle "ὁ γράφων" as follows "ὅπου γράφει"; "γράψας" becomes "ὅπὄγραψε" and "γράψων" "ὅπου θέλει γράφει"; the same for the feminine and neuter; and for the participle "γράφοντες" we say "ὅπου γράφομεν" or "ὅπου γράφετε" or "ὅπου γράφουν"; and so on».

At this point we could think that the traditional list of accidences has been changed to fit the new form of the contemporary, though unusual, participles as πολεμῶντας.

But the second paragraph creates even more confusion, as Sophianos, describing the morphology of the participle, contradicts here some of the elements in the opening lines:

> Καὶ πρόσεχε ὅτι πολλάκις εἰς ὅλους τοὺς ἐνεργητικοὺς χρόνους καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ γένη, μία καὶ μόνον δουλεύει μετοχὴ ἄκλιτος· γράφοντας, κρατῶντας, γελῶντας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ (Sophianos, p. 76 Legrand).

> «Be aware too that there is often only one non-inflected participle for all tenses of the active, all persons and genders: γράφοντας, κρατῶντας, γελῶντας, and so on».

The active participle is neither inflected nor does it indicate gender (γένος), case (πτῶσις) or tense (χρόνος). It is only affected by diathesis, namely active, and by conjugation classes, namely συζυγίαι βαρυτόνων versus συζυγίαι περισπωμένων (the accent depends on which conjugation class the verb belongs to, as for example γράφοντας versus κρατῶντας). Curiously Sophianos mentions here, maybe taking Dionyios Thrax as his model, the absence of the accidence πρόσωπα («persons»), where we expect him to stress the absence of the ἀριθμοί («numbers»).

In the last paragraph of this chapter he makes a special case for the participles of the passive:

> Εἰς δὲ τὰ παθητικὰ ἐκράτησε μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡ μετοχὴ τοῦ παρακειμένου, καὶ κλίνεται κεἰς τὰ τρία γένη· «ὁ γραμμένος» λέγομεν, καὶ «ἡ γραμμένη» καὶ «τὸ γραμμένον»· τοὺς λοιποὺς χρόνους διαλύομέν τους καθώσπερ καὶ τοὺς ἐνεργητικούς· ὅπου γράφεται, ὅπου θέλει γραφθῆ ὅπόγράφθη· ὁμοίως καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς (Sophianos, p. 76 Legrand).

> «For the passive verbs only the perfect participle survived until today with different forms for the three genders: "ὁ γραμμένος" we say, and "ἡ γραμμένη" and "τὸ γραμμένον". For the other tenses we decompose the passive participles like the active: ὅπου γράφεται, ὅπου θέλει γραφθῆ ὅπόγράφθη. The others are replaced in the same way».

Unlike the active participle, the passive perfect participle fits Sophianos' definition and accidences. Here, though, the absence of the ἀριθμοί («numbers») is striking.

When we look at this chapter as a whole we can say that Sophianos did not manage to adapt the traditional definition and accidences to the vernacular of his times: the only accidences of his list that characterise *all* participles are διάθεσις and συζυγία. Only the passive perfect participles indicate γένος («gender»), πτώση («case») and χρόνος («tense»), while, supposing that he has left out deliberately the ἀριθμοί («numbers»), this is only

valid for the active participles. And we still ignore his motives to suppress the accidences εἴδη («species») and σχήματα («figures»).

Confronting this chapter with the vernacular Greek of his translation of pseudo-Plutarch's *Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς* we have to conclude that his grammar was neither prescriptive nor an exhaustive description of contemporary Greek. We only have to read a few lines to find an active participle and even a plural form, λέγοντες (p. 96, § 2 Legrand). The same can be said about the infinitive. As I have indicated above, under the category «infinitive» he gives personal forms, but in his translation he simply uses classical infinitives, such as εἰπεῖν (ἤθελα) and γνωρίσειν (ἤθελες) (p. 97, § 4 Legrand). Apparently, Sophianos did not care – or he failed – to account for all levels or variations of common speech. The language described is certainly less conservative than his own.

Sophianos on (our) relative pronouns

Let us now look at the treatment of the Greek relative pronouns in Sophianos' grammar in comparison to ancient theories and the present-day grammar of modern Greek:

	definite relative pronoun	*indefinite relative pronoun*
Dionysios Thrax	ὅς, ἥ, ὅ = ὑποτακτικὸν ἄρθρον = ὑποτασσόμενον ἄρθρον	ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον = ἀόριστον ὄνομα
Sophianos	ὅπου = ὑποτακτικὸν ἄρθρον = ἀναφορικὸν ὄνομα = ἀντωνυμία πρωτότυπος	
	ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον ὁ ὁποῖος, ἡ ὁποία, τὸ ὁποῖον = ? ? ? ?	ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον = ἀόριστον ὄνομα
Triandaphyllidis	που ο οποίος, η οποία, το οποίο = αναφορική αντωνυμία	όποιος, όποια, όποιο = αναφορική αντωνυμία

In ancient and Byzantine grammaticography the class of words that we now call definite relative pronoun, ὅς, ἥ, ὅ, was considered a subcategory of the ἄρθρον. According to the traditional definition, going back to Dionysios Thrax, the ἄρθρον is a declinable part of speech that can be placed before or after the declined noun:

Ἄρθρον ἐστὶ μέρος λόγου πτωτικόν, προτασσόμενον καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῆς κλίσεως τῶν ὀνομάτων. Καὶ ἔστι προτακτικὸν μὲν ὁ, ὑποτακτικὸν δὲ ὅς (Dionysios Thrax, *G.G.* I 1, 61. 2-4).

«An article is a part of speech with case-inflections, which precedes or follows the inflection of the nouns. There is the prepositive ὁ ["the"], and the postpositive ὅς ["that, which"]».

The «preposed» article is our definite article, and the postposed is our definite relative pronoun. The indefinite relative pronoun ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον, on the other hand, is found in Dionysios' chapter on the noun under the category «ἀόριστον ὄνομα indefinite noun» (cf. *infra*). In Sophianos' vernacular the ancient definite and indefinite relative pronouns are replaced respectively by the indeclinable ὅπου and the declinable ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον, which as a definite relative pronoun is sometimes preceded by the article. These are in turn the equivalents of the modern Greek ἀναφορικὲς ἀντωνυμίες or relative pronouns, as we find them for example in the grammar of Triandaphyllidis:[29] the definite relative pronouns που and ο οποίος, η οποία, το οποίο, on the one hand, and the indefinite ὅποιος, ὅποια, ὅποιο. It is clear that Sophianos' relative pronouns are already those of present-day Greek. In this context, it is most interesting to study the way Sophianos has integrated the modern relative pronouns into the grammatical framework available to him.

(1) In his chapter on ἄρθρον Sophianos has left out the postposed ἄρθρον that we find in the work of his (ancient and Byzantine) predecessors. The ἄρθρον is defined as a declinable part of speech that is always put before a noun:

Ἄρθρον ἔναι μέρος λόγου ὅπου κλίνεται· βάνεται δὲ πάντοτε ᾽ς ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῶν ὀνομάτων (Sophianos, p. 37 Legrand)

«The article is a declinable part of speech. It is always put before nouns».

It seems that in this context, we can – perhaps for the first time in the history of Greek grammar[30] – fully equate the term a[rqron with the modern term

---

29. M. A. Triandaphyllidis, *Concise Modern Greek Grammar*, Translated by John B. Burke, Thessaloniki 1997, pp. 172-173.

30. From Aristarchos (3rd cent. B.C.) on the term ἄρθρον was used to indicate both the article (ἄρθρον προτακτικόν) and the relative pronoun (ἄρθρον προτακτικόν). For a short history of this part of speech, see L. Melazzo, «Articolo e pronome relativo nel primo libro della sintassi di Apollonio Discolo», in L. Formigari – F. Lo Piparo (edd.), *Prospettive di storia della linguistica: lingua, linguaggio, comunicazione sociale*, Roma 1988, pp. 66-67 and S. Matthaios,

«article». The «postposed» ἄρθρον, however, turns up again further on in his grammar (cf. *infra*).

(2) At the end of Sophianos' chapter on the noun we find a class of nouns called ὑποπεπτωκότα εἴδη, a term that we can translate as «species falling under [a class]» (pp. 45-46 Legrand). This passage goes back to an interesting passage in the grammar of Dionysios Thrax (*G.G.* I 1, 32. 2-33. 1), where at the end of the chapter on the noun we find a list of species added to those already described. Since this list does not fit well in Dionysios' text, it has been considered a later addition and as such it is an important element in the discussion about the authenticity of the transmitted *Τέχνη*.[31] Dionysios Thrax introduced these species by the phrase ὑποπέπτωκε δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι ταῦτα, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ εἴδη προσαγορεύεται, translated: «under the noun are subsumed the following [classes] which themselves are also called "species"». In the course of history this passage led to the creation of a group of species called ὑποπεπτωκότα εἴδη, a label that obviously is meaningless. This misinterpretation is not due to Sophianos because we already find it in the grammar of Laskaris (Περὶ τῶν ὑποπεπτωκότων εἰδῶν τῷ ὀνόματι), but it is another example of the grammarian's wish to stick to the tradition in spite of the problems it causes.

Just as in the grammars of Dionysios Thrax and Laskaris, we find in Sophianos' problematic list of nominal species, the relative ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον under the category «ἀόριστον ὄνομα or indefinite noun»:

Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre, Göttingen 1999, pp. 432-436.

In fact, Diogenes Laertius (VII 58) assigns to Diogenes of Babylon (2nd cent. B.C.) a definition which already excludes the relative pronoun: ἄρθρον ἐστὶ στοιχεῖον λόγου πτωτικὸν διορίζον τὰ γένη τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς οἷον ὁ, ἡ, τό, οἱ, αἱ, τά. «An article is a declinable part of speech which distinguishes the genders and numbers of the nouns». But this definition does not seem to represent correctly the Stoic views on this μέρος λόγου. Cf. R. T. Schmidt, *Die Grammatik der Stoiker*, Einführung, Übersetzung und Bearbeitung von Karlheinz Hülser, mit einer kommentierter Bibliographie zur stoischen Sprachwissenschaft (Dialektik) von Urs Egli, Braunschweig, Wiesbaden 1979, pp. 62- 66.

31. The *Τέχνη* (*G.G.* I 1, 25. 6-7) mentions 7 εἴδη for the παράγωγα or «derived nouns» which are immediately afterwards discussed and illustrated in more detail (ibid., 25. 8- 30. 4). After having defined also the accidences of number and case (*ibid.*, 30. 5 - 32. 1), the transmitted text somewhat unexpectedly continues: ὑποπέπτωκε δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι ταῦτα ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ εἴδη προσαγορεύεται and lists another 24 species of nouns. The passage has been attributed by V. Di Benedetto («Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita *(continuazione e fine)*», *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, ser. 2, 28 (1959) 100-101) to an ignorant compiler in late Antiquity who placed at the end of the chapter everything he was not able to include in an organic way into the preceding sections.

Ἕν. ἀόριστον. τίς, τινός, τινά. Πλ. τινές, τινῶν, τινάς· τί, τινός, τί· τινά, τινῶν, τινά. Κάποιος, κάποια, κάποιον· *ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον· ὁπόσος, ὁπόση, ὁπόσον·* τέτοιος, τέτοια, τέτοιον (Sophianos, p. 45 Legrand).

The terminology used makes clear that we have here only the indefinite relative pronoun ὁποῖος, ὁποία, ὁποῖον and not its definite homonym. But Sophianos does not entirely follow the tradition on this point, since he adds indefinite pronouns to a category that in the grammar of Dionysios Thrax only contained indefinite relative pronouns:

> Ἀόριστον δέ ἐστι τὸ τῷ ἐρωτηματικῷ ἐναντίως λεγόμενον, οἷον ὅστις *ὁ π ο ῖ ο ς* ὁπόσος ὁπηλίκος (Dionysios Thrax, *G.G.* I 1, 39. 3-4).

> «An indefinite [noun] is that which is used [with a sense] opposite to [that of] the interrogative [noun], e.g., ὅστις ["whoever, whatever"], ὁποῖος ["whatever kind of"], ὁπόσος ["however great"]».

In the next category, namely the ἀναφορικὸν ὄνομα or anaphoric noun, Sophianos places ὅπου together with two other relative pronouns:

> Ἀναφορικόν, οἷος, οἵα, οἷον· ὅσος, ὅση, ὅσον· ὅπου (Sophianos, p. 45 Legrand).

This can be considered an improvement with respect to Dionysios Thrax' grammar, which classifies in this category of nouns only the demonstrative pronouns τοιοῦτος τοσοῦτος τηλικοῦτος:[32]

> Ἀναφορικὸν δέ ἐστιν, ὃ καὶ ὁμοιωματικὸν καὶ δεικτικὸν καὶ ἀνταποδοτικὸν καλεῖται,[33] τὸ ὁμοίωσιν σημαῖνον, οἷον τοιοῦτος τοσοῦτος τηλικοῦτος (*G.G.* I 1, 40. 1-3).

> «An anaphoric [noun], which is also called similative, demonstrative and correlative [noun], is that which signifies a likeness, e.g., τοιοῦτος ["such"], τοσοῦτος ["as/so great"], τηλικοῦτος ["as/so old"]».

(3) We now return to the chapter on the participle (cf. *supra*) and more precisely to the first paragraph, where Sophianos indicates that ancient Greek participles are usually replaced with a periphrastic construction involving

---

32. Some late epitomes of Dionysios' *Τέχνη* include here also the relatives οἷος and ὅσος (cf. *G.G.* I 1, 40, *apparatus*).

33. From the fact that the *Τέχνη* provides here several terms for the same group of pronouns, Di Benedetto («Dionisio Trace», 104) concluded that the passage (in the same way as a large part of the transmitted *Τέχνη*) must be ascribed to a compiler of late Antiquity. According to A. Wouters («The Grammatical Papyri and the Technê Grammatikê of Dionysius Thrax», in: V. Law - I. Sluiter (edd.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technê Grammatikê*, Munster 1995, pp. 99-106), on the other hand, it could point to an as yet immature approach of the correlative pronouns.

ὅπου. Here he defines the word ὅπου as a postposed (ὑποτακτικόν) ἄρθρον or an indeclinable anaphoric noun (ἄκλιτον ἀναφορικὸν ὄνομα), which can be used for all genders, tenses and persons. Although Sophianos in his definition of ὅπου also uses ὁποῖον and τόποῖον (cf. *supra*), he does not classify these definite relative pronouns. Nowhere in his grammatical description of vernacular Greek he mentions the alternatives for ὅπου. But Sophianos' definition of the relative pronoun ὅπου is problematic since it gives rise to several internal contradictions.

Firstly, his definition of ὅπου as an ἄρθρον does not correspond to his own definition of this part of speech, which clearly states that an ἄρθρον is always placed before the noun. While his chapter on the ἄρθρον could mean a step forward in the history of linguistics, this paragraph annihilates it by presupposing the traditional definition of the ἄρθρον.

Also the second identification of ὅπου is problematic, since his definition of this so-called anaphoric noun contains various elements that do not fit his own definition of a noun. This anaphoric noun is not declinable, while the noun is; there is no distinction in gender, while the noun is characterized by three genders.

(4) Finally, we come to the chapter on the pronoun (pp. 77-80 Legrand). In modern Greek terminology Sophianos' ὅπου should be labelled ἀναφορικὴ ἀντωνυμία («relative pronoun»). Sophianos does not use the term ἀναφορικὲς ἀντωνυμίες,[34] but, surprisingly, he gives the relative pronoun ὅπου as a «primary» (i.e. personal) pronoun (πρωτότυπος ἀντωνυμία) of the third person singular and plural, together with ἐκεῖνος:

Εἴδη τῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν εἶναι πέντε· πρωτότυποι, κτητικαί, δεικτικαί, ἐπιταγματικαὶ καὶ σύνθετοι, καὶ κλίνετ' ἡ πρωτότυπος ἔτζη. [...]
Τοῦ τρίτου προσώπου.

ἡ εὐθεῖα τῶν ἐνικῶν	ὅπου· ἐκεῖνος, ἐκείνη, ἐκεῖνο.
ἡ γενικὴ καὶ δοτική	του, της, του.
ἡ αἰτιατική	τον, την, το.
ἡ εὐθεῖα τῶν πληθυντικῶν	ὅπου· ἐκεῖνοι, ἐκείναις, ἐκεῖνα.
ἡ γενικὴ καὶ δοτική	τους.
ἡ αἰτιατική	τους, ταις, τα

(Sophianos, pp. 77-78 Legrand).

This classification raises problems. It is rather improbable that ὅπου here introduces («such as») an example since this usage is not found elsewhere in Sophianos' grammar. An alternative explanation is to see ὅπου as an adverb,

---

34. The term ἀναφορικός (*versus* δεικτικός) was already used by Apollonios Dyskolos for pronouns (to indicate their semantico-syntactic function). See e.g. *G.G.* II 1, 9. 17.

meaning something like «where we use ἐκεῖνος instead of ὅς)». Still, no
decisive argument can be put forward against the idea that Sophianos has
introduced the relative pronoun ὅπου into the chapter on the pronouns.
Either he realized that the word ὅπου replaces a noun, as the definition of
the pronoun says, but he did not take the step to create a separate and
appropriate class for the relative pronouns, or – more probably – he misin-
terpreted one of his models, Laskaris. In the latter's grammar we find in the
category πρωτότυπος ἀντωνυμία the personal pronoun ὃς οὗ οἷ ἕ. It is not
improbable that Sophianos did identify this ὅς not as the archaic personal
pronoun, but as the (isomorphic) relative pronoun, which he then replaced
by ὅπου.

We have to conclude that Sophianos' treatment of the relative pronouns is
not very successful. A first failure is the fact that he only comments on the
relative pronoun ὅπου and forgets about its alternatives. Secondly, he seems
on the one hand very modern in adapting the traditional definition of
ἄρθρον, but on the other hand he does not succeed in developing his new
insights consequently. Thirdly, we can say that his grammar is not coherent:
between different chapters there are contradictions. In spite of these
problems, however, we have to admit that he does achieve an important
progress in presenting ὅπου also in the chapter on the pronouns. Several
elements of a correct understanding of the class of the relative pronouns are
already present in Sophianos' grammar, but the traditional framework for
language description seems to have impeded him to work things out clearly.

Concluding remarks

Without having commented on all the interesting aspects of Sophianos'
description of vernacular Greek we can formulate a cautious conclusion.
Sophianos' grammar not only is an important testimony of the promotion of
popular Greek in the 16th century, it also constitutes a milestone in the
history of Greek grammaticography. Sophianos tried to stimulate this
promotion of modern Greek by providing an introduction to its grammar.
His task, however, was complicated by the object of description, on the one
hand, and by the means for him available, on the other.

His object of description caused him problems because a standard modern
Greek language did not yet exist. It is clear that he does not describe *the*
vernacular, but only some elements of different usages. In his chapter on the
participle, where he does not manage to put things clearly, he obviously
struggles with such language variations. A study of a larger corpus of 16th-

century texts could help us to better understand the complex linguistic situation Sophianos was confronted with.

The (traditional) classification system and the grammatical metalanguage which he used for describing contemporary Greek, made his task even harder. Sophianos had to fit a modern language into a linguistic framework which already at the end of the pre-Christian era had been developed for the description of ancient Greek and which had been taken over as such by the Byzantine grammarians. But instead of only stressing the fact that he continued a long tradition, we also have to appreciate the steps forward he made. Sophianos did not just copy Laskaris' grammar, as Ilioudis suggests, but he also suggested some improvements. A detailed analysis of the whole grammar should allow us to clarify Sophianos' exact position in the history of Greek grammaticography.

KU Leuven   KAREN STOPPIE