

schöneres Haar.) Das ist ihre gesamte Schönheitspflege³⁸), aber sie ist harmlos, denn sie schmücken sich nicht, um zu verführen oder verführt zu werden, sondern arrangieren ihr Haar so, daß sie in den Augen ihrer Feinde beim Beginn der Schlacht erschreckender und größer aussehen“.

München

Allan A. Lund

AN UNNOTICED LATE LATIN GRAMMAR: THE *ARS MINOR* OF SCAURUS?

For a millenium and a half Donatus's name has been equated with grammar; yet, as Karl Barwick remarked in 1922, "die Leistung des Don(atu)s wird ... überschätzt, weil man nicht weiß ... , daß seine ars nichts anderes ist als eines der vielen einander sehr ähnlichen Schulbücher, von denen sie zufällig im späteren Altertum und Mittelalter die Schulgrammatik schlechthin geworden ist"¹). The mutual resemblance of most of the surviving Late Latin grammars is what strikes the casual observer most strongly. If he stops to look more closely, however, he will find that what he took for common family traits are in many cases no more than superficial similarities. It is remarkably difficult to discern a clear network of relationships within the extant corpus. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify some broad groupings: the Donatus commentaries, for example, or the elementary grammars studied by Barwick. Both of these groups are, as it were, genetic, in that their

38) Cf. ThLL IV 1464, 64sq. Man beachte bes. das folgende Beispiel: Paul. Fest. p.63 M. *capilli cum aliqua cura compositi*; Ov. ars am. 3,14f.; Sen. nat. 1,11,17.

Korrekturzusatz: Man gewinnt bei genauerer Betrachtung des Abschnitts den Eindruck, daß Tacitus ironisch auf die Frisuren römischer Principes anspielt (cf. *principes et ornatiorem habent*); denn einerseits war die Schreckensfrisur von Caligula bekannt, andererseits hatte der selbst kahlköpfige Domitian ein Buch *de cura capillorum* verfaßt (cf. Suet. Dom. 18,2).

1) Remmius Palaemon und die römische ars grammatica, Philologus Suppl. 15 (Leipzig 1922), p. 11.

membership is confined to those texts which are thought to be descended from a common parent or to contain a significant amount of shared material. But how much does the generously-conceived treatise of Diomedes, some 320 pages long, have in common with another member of Barwick's *Schulgrammatik* group, the eleven-page *Ars minor*? A typological classification is more likely to be helpful here than a purely genetic one. Surprisingly, relatively few Late Latin grammars are directly comparable with Donatus's two works, in scale or structure or both: the grammars attributed to Asper and Palaemon, both of disputed authenticity; the *Ars Dosithei*; and Augustine's *Ars breuiata*²). In these circumstances, it is of particular interest to note that one of the codices Keil used most heavily in preparing the *Grammatici Latini*³) contains a grammar which is typologically close to the *Ars maior*, and on a similar scale, but is not based upon it: in other words, one of the "einander sehr ähnliche Schulbücher" to which Barwick refers. Although it has a claim to authorship by one of the most famous teachers of Antiquity, it has never been printed, nor even recognised for what it is, a complete, self-contained ancient grammar. It is preserved in a grammatical miscellany copied in the first third of the ninth century at Freising: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6281⁴), folios 52r to 62v. Its scribe gave it no

2) On the authenticity of this work, and on that of the other grammar ascribed to Augustine, see V. Law, St Augustine's *De grammatica*: Lost or found?, *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984) 155–183; U. Pizzani, *Gli scritti grammaticali attribuiti a S. Augustino*, *Augustinianum* 25 (1985) 361–383.

3) *Grammatici latini ex recensione Heinrici Keilii* (Leipzig 1857–80, repr. Hildesheim 1961, 1981) hereafter referred to as GL. A supplement to the GL, Hermann Hagen's *Anecdota Helvetica* (Leipzig 1870, included in the reprint as GL VIII), contains medieval texts edited from manuscripts in Switzerland. A new series, *Collana di grammatici latini*, designed ultimately to supersede the GL, is in progress under Dr A. Puccioni Della Casa, Genoa. Keil used this manuscript for editions of the following texts: pseudo-Augustine, *Regulae*; pseudo-Sergius, *Explanationes in Donatum I*; Servius, *De finalibus*; Sergius, *De littera*; Maximus Victorinus, *De ratione metrorum*; Phocas, *Ars de nomine et verbo*.

4) On this manuscript see Bernhard Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit I: Die bayerischen Diözesen* (Wiesbaden 1974), p. 117, and the descriptions by C. Jeudy, *L'Institutio de nomine, pronomine et verbo* de Priscien: manuscrits et commentaires médiévaux, *Revue d'histoire des textes* 2 (1972) 73–144, esp. p. 107 f.; *L'Ars de nomine et verbo* de Phocas: manuscrits et commentaires médiévaux, *Viator* 5 (1974) 61–156, esp. p. 107 f. An eleventh-century Tegernsee manuscript, Clm 18181, is an apograph of this codex (see C. E. Eder, *Die Schule des Klosters Tegernsee im frühen Mittelalter im Spiegel der Tegernseer Handschriften, Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige* 83 [1972] 6–155, esp. p. 87), and so

title and no *explicit* from which the reader might identify it as an independent work. Consequently, for over a century it has been misidentified as a continuation of the text which precedes it, part of the *Explanationes* attributed to Sergius. The confusion seems to have originated with Keil, whose description⁵) of the texts which overlap on f. 52r is uncharacteristically inaccurate:

“f. 27 *Incipit expositum sergii de octo partibus orationis. Oratio dicitur* – f. 52 *proferuntur*: Sergii explanationes in Donatum 487,22–518,29. || f. 52 *De littera. Littera dicta est* – f. 62* *de interiectione et siqua sunt similia: excerpta ex Donati arte maiore et Sergii in eam explanationibus.*”

The very last word on f. 52r is indeed *proferuntur*; but it is preceded, not by the words which come before in the *Explanationes*, *ab irato* (GL IV 518,29, to which Keil refers), but by the words *uocales sunt quae per se*; and it is followed, on f. 52v, not by the heading *De littera*, but by the rest of the sentence of which it is part: *et per se syllabam faciunt*. Keil's reported *incipit*, ‘*De littera. Littera dicta est*’, is not to be found on f. 52, recto or verso⁶). However, the conjunction of *explicit* and *incipit* recorded by Keil does occur on f. 49v: ... *ab irato proferuntur. DE LITTERA; Littera dicta est*... What Keil failed to recognise was that the text which followed, on folios 49v to 52r, was simply a complete, if rather careless, copy of one further chapter of [*Sergii*] *Explanationes I* (GL IV 518,31–522,12), lightly disguised by the dropping of the longer quotations from Classical authors⁷). It concludes on f. 52r with the final words of this chapter as edited by Keil himself: *sed ubicumque adspiratio est uocalis est*⁸). Following immediately in the same line is a new chapter heading, *DE ARTE*. This does not introduce the next chapters of the *Explanationes*, which deal with syllables and metrical feet. Instead, it heralds an independent work which lacks an identifying title. For this reason, it seems, the grammar on ff. 52r–62v has escaped the notice of

contains a copy of the text with which we shall be concerned; but since it offers no new information, it will not be considered further. I wish to thank the staff of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek for their assistance during my visits and for their help in making available microfilms of these manuscripts.

5) GL IV p. XLIV note. G. Thomas' description, in *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis I 3* (Munich 1873), 84, is based on Keil's.

6) The chapter heading *De litteris. Littera est elimentum uocis articulatae* occurs on f. 52r, five lines above *proferuntur*.

7) The following passages are omitted: GL IV 519, 5–10 (*unde Vergilius – dicta est*); 520,1 (*ne – plantas*); 520,3–7 (*item in bucolicis – magistra Graecia*).

8) Cf. GL IV 522,12: *sed ubicumque aspiratio est, et uocalis est*.

text-hunters since the Renaissance, and is still awaiting its *editio princeps*⁹).

That this work (henceforth referred to as M) is not simply a collection of excerpts, whether from Sergius or from any other grammarian, is clear from its structure and compass. It contains chapters on *ars*, *uox*, *litterae*, *syllabae*, *dictio*, *locutio* (*definitio*, *oratio*), *nomen*, *pronomen*, *uerbum*, *participium*, *aduerbium*, *praepositio*, *coniunctio* and *interiectio*, thus conforming to the traditional pattern of the Late Latin school grammar¹⁰). Such works normally placed a series of chapters on *uox*, *litterae*, *syllabae* and related topics before the discussion of the individual parts of speech. (A third section, on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*, was sometimes added.) The scale of works constructed on this model varied considerably, from the seven pages of the *Ars Aspri*, through the thirty-five of Donatus' *Ars maior*¹¹), to the expansive ramblings of the fifth-century commentators. M falls toward the shorter end of this range, being approximately one-and-a-half times the length of the *Ars minor* (eleven pages) but slightly shorter than the central section of the *Ars maior* (nineteen pages). Although brief, it is perfectly self-contained: its definitions and occasional more relaxed paragraphs of exposition follow on logically and there are no obvious breaks of the sort which characterise a

9) I have an edition in preparation. – One modern reader of the manuscript did recognise this text as an independent work: on f. 52r, in the margin opposite the heading *DE UOCE*, is a note 'videtur esse auct. anon. Comment. in Donati ed. scdam.', and a further note on f. 61r compares the definition of the adverb found there to Donatus's (via a page reference to Putsch).

10) On the Roman school grammar see Karl Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische ars grammatica* (note 1 above), and, on its structure, Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: Étude sur l' Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe-IXe siècle) et édition critique* (Paris 1981), esp. pp. 58–74. In what follows the term 'school grammar' will be restricted to those works which, like Donatus's two grammars, are relatively brief, possess a coherent structure, and, in their chapters on the parts of speech, deal systematically with the *accidentia*. This definition includes, apart from the *Ars minor* and the *Ars maior*, the grammars attributed to Asper and Dositheus, Augustine's *Ars breuiata*, the surviving fragment of the grammar of Marius Victorinus, and the fragments of Cominianus's grammar preserved by Charisius. It excludes rambling compilations like the grammars of Charisius, Diomedes and Sacerdos, works devoted largely to metrics like those of Audax and Victorinus, commentaries on Donatus, and works deliberately structured in a different way, like the grammars of Priscian, Phocas, Eutyches, and collections of *Regulae* like those attributed to Augustine and Palaemon.

11) I have here used Keil's edition for comparability; normally, however, references to Donatus's two grammars will be to Holtz's edition (note 10 above) with references to Keil's (GL IV) in parentheses.

series of excerpts. In any case, this is an original work: its doctrine, although mostly of a conventional type and presented in a conventional manner, is independent of that of any other extant text. Let us now consider the evidence so far available for its authorship and dating.

Authorship

Given that the ninth-century scribe did not know the name of the author of the text he was copying, and that a ninth-century attribution would in any case be of doubtful reliability, we must turn to other late antique grammars for help in its identification. One, the *Explanationes in artem Donati* attributed to Sergius¹², contains numerous borrowings from this work. Compare the following passages:

<i>Explanationes</i>	<i>Clm 6281</i>
IV 486, 9f. <i>Scaurus uero hinc coepit, 'ars est cuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione suscepta'.</i>	f. 52r <i>DE ARTE. Ars est uniuscuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione [perditionem] percepta.</i>
IV 535, 5f. <i>unde Scaurus 'initium, a quo sumitur incrementum'.</i>	f. 52r <i>initium, a quo sumitur incrementum.</i>
IV 560,19–28 <i>Scaurus hoc ordine posuit coniunctiones copulatiuas, et at atque immo ast ac; disiunc-</i>	f. 62v <i>Copulatiuae sunt hae, et at atque quin immo ast ac; disiunctiuae, aut ue uel ne nec</i>

12) GL IV 486–565. The authorship of this work, ascribed by Keil to Sergius largely to avoid confusion with the commentary of Servius (cf. GL IV p. LIII f.), is problematical, as is its relationship to the other works attributed to Sergius/Seruius. The fact that the borrowings from the grammar in Clm 6281 are limited to the introduction to Book I (GL IV 486,4–487,16) only, and Book II (GL IV 534,15–562,25) of the *Explanationes* – I have found no trace of the doctrine of this grammar in the body of Book I – suggests that the introduction printed with Book I may in fact have been meant to accompany Book II. The manuscript Keil took as the basis of his edition, St Paul in Carinthia, Stiftsbibliothek 2/1 (*olim* 24), offers a heavily reworked and interpolated text; a new edition of the Sergian commentaries, based on the other family of manuscripts, might reveal very different relationships.

tiuas sic, aut ue uel nec neque. Expletiuas Scaurus sic posuit, quidem equidem quoque autem tamen porro; causales, si etsi etiam-si tam tametsi siquidem quando quandoquidem quin quinetiam sinetiam siue seu sin nam namque ni nisi nisisi enim etenim sed praeterea quamobrem praesertim quam quamuis proinde saltem uidelicet item itemque ceterum alioquin propterea sane. Scaurus rationales sic posuit, ergo igitur ita itaque enimuero quia qua quapropter quippe quoniam quoniamquidem ideo idcirco scilicet quatenus.

IV 562,1–16 *Scaurus praepositiones accusatiui casus sic posuit, per apud aduersus uls ad usque pone supra contra cis citra ultra subtus prope iuxta circum ab ante secundum praeter propter intra circa extra post inter erga clam trans penes, ut per hominem, apud grammaticum, aduersus leges, uls prouinciam, ad amicum, usque Romam, pone fores, supra regem, contra ius, cis Galliam, citra sedem, ultra familiam, subtus iugum, prope finem, iuxta montem, circum portum, ob iniuriam, ante aedem, secundum mare, praeter spem, propter aquam, intra annum, circa rationem, extra hortum, post annum, inter domos, erga rem publicam, trans fluiuium, secus portum, clam uxorem.*

neque; expletiuae, quidem equidem quoque autem tamen porro; causales, si etsi etiam etiamsi sed sitamen siquidem quando quandoquidem quin quinetiam sinetiam siue seu sin nam namque nisi nisisi enim etenim sed praeterea quamobrem praesertim quamquam quamuis proinde saltem uidelicet ita itaque ceterum alioquin praeterea sane; rationales, ergo igitur ita itaque enim enimuero quia quapropter quippe quoniam quoniamquidem ideo idcirco scilicet quatenus.

f. 62r *Accusatiui casus sunt hae: per apud aduersus cis ad usque penes supra contra citra ultra subtus prope iuxta circum ab ante secundum praeter propter infra intra circa extra post intra erga secus clam trans, ut per hominem, apud grammaticum, aduersus leges, cis prouinciam, ad amicum, usque Romam, penes fores, supra legem, contra ius, cis Galliam, citra sedem, ultra familias, subtus iugum, prope finem, iuxta montem, circum portum, ob iniuriam, ante aedes, secundum mare, trans flumen, praeter spem, propter aquam, infra annum, intra locum, circa rationem, extra hostem, post annum, inter domos, erga rem, secus portum, clam uxorem, trans montem, penes amicum.*

Ablatiui casus sunt hae, a ab abs de e ex pro prae cum sine tenus coram palam, ut a solo, ab urbe, de domo, e uilla, ex ordine, pro iure, prae uirtute, cum socio, sine fine, tenus crure, coram patre, palam filio.

Ablatiui casus sunt hae: a ab abs de e ex pro pre cum sine tenus coram palam, ut a solo, ab urbe, absque pudore, de domo, e portu, ex ordine, pro iure, pre uirtute, con socio, sine fide, tenus cruce, coram patre, palam filio.

In autem et sub et subter utrique pariter casui seruiunt, cum in loco [rem] significare uelimus, ablatiuo; cum in locum, accusatiuo, ut in foro sum et in forum eo, [ut] sub tecto sum et sub tectum fugio.

In autem et sub et subter utrique pariter casui seruiunt: cum in loco rem significare uolumus, ablatiuo, cum ad locum, accusatiuo, ut in foro sum et in forum eo, sub tecto sum et sub tectum fugio.

The lefthand column includes all the passages attributed in the *Explanationes* to Scaurus. All of them, as this comparison shows, recur verbatim in M. In addition, several further passages in the *Explanationes* which lack a named source agree closely with M¹³). The author of the *Explanationes*, working in the fifth or earlier part of the sixth century¹⁴), thus knew M, and knew it as the work of one *Scaurus*¹⁵).

13) Passages without attribution which agree verbatim with the grammar in Clm 6281 include the following: GL IV 486,15–487,2; 487,3–10; 487,14–16; 539,36–540,8; 540,11–15; 543,8–21; 543,22–544,6; 544,15–35; 545,1–9; 557,4–15; 560,28–561,2; 561,20–25; 562,19–25.

14) On the dating of the *Explanationes*, a difficult problem exacerbated by the unresolved state of the problems surrounding the Sergian group of commentaries (see note 12 above), see U. Schindel, *Die lateinischen Figurenlehren des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts und Donats Vergilkommentar*, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse*, 3rd series, no. 91 (Göttingen 1975), pp. 34–52. He opts cautiously for a date in the fifth or the sixth century; Holtz, *Donat* p. 340 and p. 428, seems to favour the later fifth century.

15) It could be argued that the compiler of the *Explanationes* had no more information as to the authorship of his source than we have; for embedded in M is a passage from which he might have deduced its author's name. It was a relatively common practice in late Antiquity for grammarians to use their own names as examples: Karl Barwick used the numerous occasions on which the grammarian Pansa did so to trace passages from his lost work borrowed by other *grammatici*. In M the pronoun section begins thus: *Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro ipso (ipsa cod.) posita nomine minus quidem plene (plena ē cod.) idem (eidem cod.) tamen significat. Nam cum debeam dicere 'artem Scaurus scripsit', dico 'artem ille scripsit'*

Several other late Antique grammarians also quote from the lost works of a teacher called Scaurus: Charisius, Diomedes, Audax and Priscian¹⁶). Some of these quotations are explicitly assigned to commentaries on classical texts – Plautus’ *Pseudolus* and Horace’s *Ars poetica* – and several others, although not attributed to named works, clearly come from these or similar commentaries. These passages cannot help us directly in identifying Scaurus’ grammatical doctrine; however, two quotations are said to come from a work on grammar¹⁷), and many of those attributed simply to Scaurus, without being assigned to a particular work, seem from their content also to belong to a grammar rather than a commentary. It is possible that none of the grammarians who quote from Scaurus used his work directly¹⁸); consequently, comparisons between the doctrine from Scaurus’ grammar preserved in these works and that of M are overshadowed by the likelihood of alterations to the wording at various stages in the process of reworking and transmission, and also by the difficulty of defining the extent of the passages borrowed from Scaurus. Tracing Scaurus’ doctrine in Audax without recourse to the circular device of comparison with M is impossible, for Audax gives no indication of which portions of his work are based on Scaurus and which on other sources. In contrast, Charisius and Diomedes do attribute specific grammatical points to Scaurus. Their character differs in

et pro ‘artem Sca(u)rus scripsisti (scripsit cod.)’ dico ‘artem tu scripsisti’. The use of the name *Scaurus* may well betray the author’s identity, or possibly that of his teacher. In any case, the author of the *Explanations*, faced with a work which contained no other identifying feature, could, like us, have used this clue to deduce its authorship. Hence, the testimony of the *Explanations* as to the name of the author of this grammar cannot be accepted *ohne weiteres*. We may safely conclude from the borrowings in the *Explanations* only that the grammar was in circulation before the *Explanations* were composed, in the fifth or earlier part of the sixth century.

16) Quotations attributed by these grammarians to Scaurus were assembled by Hermann Kummrow, *Symbola critica ad grammaticos latinos* (diss. Greifswald 1880), pp. 2–8.

17) Both are found in the grammar of Charisius (ed. C. Barwick, *Flavii Sospatri Charisii Artis grammaticae libri V*, Leipzig 1925, repr. with corrections by F. Kühnert 1964) p. 169,20 and 173,4.

18) Even Audax seems to have used an intermediate source at one or more removes from the original for his *De Scauri et Palladii libris excerpta per interrogationem et responsionem*. The single passage from Scaurus quoted by Priscian, on the quantity of the *i* in *ambitus*, may be discounted because of its anecdotal nature, which suggests that it came from a source similar to that which provided Aulus Gellius with his one story about Scaurus (11,15).

the two works: in Charisius the passages assigned to Scaurus¹⁹) concern particular words or forms – *obiter*, *im* and the declension of *meus* – whereas in Diomedes, Scaurus' contribution is mainly to definitions of grammatical terms. The passages preserved in Diomedes are thus more germane to our purpose than those in Charisius, and more numerous as well. Let us therefore compare them with the corresponding portions of M in order to find out whether the two *Scauri*, the author of M and Diomedes' source, are in reality the same.

Our enquiry immediately meets with a hurdle: three of the definitions attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus lack any parallel in M for the simple reason that M contains no chapters dealing with the relevant subject. Some, but by no means all, Late Latin grammars included a section on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis*. Diomedes' grammar is one such work: a large portion of its second book is given over to the definition and exemplification of the traditional rhetorical tropes and figures. Three of them; *hypozeuxis*, *macrologia* and *tropus* itself, are given alternative definitions²⁰) according to Scaurus:

hypozeuxis est, ut Scaurus ait, figura superiori contraria, ubi diuersa uerba singulis iunguntur (I 444,29 f.);

Scaurus ita (sc. macrologiam) definit, longa descriptione producta sententia (I 449,26 f.);

tropus est, ut ait Scaurus, modus ornatae orationis et dictio translata a propria significatione ad non propriam decoris aut necessitatis aut cultus aut emphaseos gratia (I 456,27–9).

Since the section on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis* was usually placed at the end of the grammar to which it belonged, we might legitimately wonder whether our *codex unicus* has failed to preserve this chapter through an accident at the binders' or some such physical mishap. As we have noticed, the text finishes on f. 62v, the end of a quire, without an *explicit*²¹). Might not the following

19) 271,10–23 (note the similarity between this passage and that in Aulus Gellius, note 18 above); 169,20–25; 173,3–7. The fourth passage attributed by both Keil and Barwick to Scaurus's *Ars grammatica*, Char. 186,16 f., involves a quotation to exemplify a form (*uectigalium*) rather than a discussion of the form, and for this reason is more likely to come from the works of M. Aemilius Scaurus, drawn upon for examples by Charisius elsewhere.

20) Scaurus's definitions of *hypozeuxis* and *macrologia* follow definitions from another source; that of *tropus*, which introduces the like-named section, is followed by one from Quintilian.

21) The absence of an *explicit* on f. 62v is paralleled by the lack of a title on f. 52r: see p. 69 above.

quire, containing the closing chapters of the work, simply have fallen out and got lost? A codicological examination will quickly show that this is not the case. The quires were numbered by a contemporary hand, and none are lacking in our portion of the manuscript (ff. 52r–62v): quire VIII, a quaternion, finishes with f. 58, and quire VIII consists irregularly of a binion (ff. 59–62) added expressly to complete this grammar before the start of a new quire and text²²) on f. 63r. The scribe thus seems to have had no intention of adding any further sections to this grammar: presumably his exemplar contained nothing more. If the grammar ever did include such a chapter, it parted company with the rest at an earlier stage in its transmission. We may conclude, therefore, that the makeup of Clm 6281 gives us no cause to think that a chapter on the *uitia et uirtutes orationis* was ever meant to form a part of this copy of the grammar – but that it may have been lost at an earlier stage in the transmission²³).

The absence of these three definitions from M is therefore not necessarily an insuperable difficulty – but several of the other points of doctrine attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus, although falling within the compass of M, also present problems. Consider this definition of the adverb reported by Diomedes²⁴): *Scaurus ita definit, aduerbium est modus rei dictionis ipsa pronuntiatione definitus, ut recte diligenter optime*. This is an unusual definition, and one which has nothing in common with the standard Late Latin rendering, which stresses the suppletory and modifying functions of the adverb. M provides a typical version²⁵): *Aduerbium est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat aut mutat*. The remarkable definition with which Scaurus is credited by Diomedes fails to appear anywhere in M. Equally problematical is the definition of *oratio* attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus. It bears little resemblance to that in our grammar. Compare the two:

22) This was done several times in this manuscript, which consists entirely of regular quaternia except where shorter quires were necessary for the completion of a text, as at ff. 32–34 (conclusion of Sergius), ff. 95–98 (conclusion of a major section of Phocas), ff. 123–126 (conclusion of last text).

23) Several works belonging to the Roman Schulgrammatik tradition lack a section on this subject: the grammars of Dositheus, Victorinus, Asper, and Donatus's *Ars minor* are cases in point.

24) GL I 403,20f.

25) F. 61r.

Diomedes I 300,19f.

Scaurus sic, oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio.

CIm 6281 f. 53v

Oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia.

Even allowing for the textual corruption in M, the two definitions have no more in common than the word *ordinata*. A third case of this kind occurs in a list of the manifestations of the *septimus casus* given by Diomedes²⁶): *quarto (sc. modo), ut Scaurus retulit, cum Latinum eloquium in quodam uerbo deficit, uelut in illo ὀντος οὐσης ὀντων οὐσῶν*. M does not mention the *septimus casus*.

If these were the only borrowings which Diomedes attributed to Scaurus, we could reasonably conclude that the work known to his source under this name was quite different from that known to the author of the *Explanationes*. However, the problem is complicated by several passages in Diomedes' grammar which indicate otherwise. Let us begin with Diomedes' discussion of *littera*²⁷). After giving a definition taken from another source, he turns to Scaurus: *Scaurus sic eam definit, littera est uocis eius quae scribi potest forma. Elementum est minima uis et indiuisibilis materia uocis articulatae uel uniuscuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resoluitur*. The definition of *littera* found in M is not the same²⁸): *Littera est elimentum uocis articulatae*. However, that of *elementum*, which follows on directly, is identical to the second half of Diomedes' definition: *Elimentum est un(i)uscuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resoluitur*. Here M and Scaurus *apud* Diomedes in part correspond, in part diverge; in any case, this definition of *elementum* was so widespread that little can be built upon its appearance here.

The chapter on the noun offers a more convincing case. The first part of speech, *nomen*, was usually subdivided according to *qualitas* into *nomina propria* and *nomina communia*. According to Diomedes, Scaurus propounded a different division. After setting out the traditional account, Diomedes continues²⁹):

Sed ex hac definitione Scaurus dissentit. Separat enim a nomine appellationem et uocabulum. Et est horum trina definitio talis: nomen est quo deus aut homo propria dumtaxat dis-

26) GL I 317,34–318,22.

27) GL I 421,15 ff.

28) F. 52r.

29) GL I 320,13–19 + 23 f.

criminatione enuntiatur, cum dicitur ille Iuppiter, hic Apollo, item Cato iste, hic Brutus. Appellatio quoque est communis similium rerum enuntiatio specie nominis, ut homo uir femina mancipium leo taurus. . . . Item uocabulum est quo res inanimales uocis significatione specie nominis enuntiamus, ut arbor lapis herba toga et his similia.

This threefold division, summarised by Donatus³⁰), does not figure in M. Instead, we find the standard division of *qualitas nominum* into proper and common. However, M's account of *nomina propria* is much more detailed than is usually the case³¹):

Propria sunt quae proprietates nominum tam deorum quam hominum quam montium quam urbium quam fluminum continent: deorum ut Iuppiter Sol, hominum ut Cato uel Cicero, montium ut Cynthus Olymplus, urbium ut Roma Cartago, fluminum ut Nilus Eridanus, et huiusmodi alia similia.

This uncommonly precise classification of *nomina propria* is a point of contact with the doctrine of Scaurus as reported by Diomedes³²). More telling is the choice of examples in the two passages. Scaurus *apud* Diomedes gives four *nomina propria*: *Iuppiter Apollo Cato Brutus*, which correspond to the first two categories in M, *nomina deorum* and *nomina hominum*. Of these four, three are identical in the two works: *Iuppiter Apollo*³³) *Cato*.

The result of this confrontation of the passages attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus with the grammar in Clm 6281 is ambiguous: one definition (that of *elementum*) is identical in the two, and the discussion of *nomina propria* includes three identical examples. Against these similarities must be set the discrepancies: two completely different definitions (of *oratio* and *aduerbium*), three definitions in Diomedes which correspond to a portion of text lacking – though perhaps only through an accident of transmission – in M, and one point of doctrine in the noun section of Diomedes on a subject not mentioned in M (*septimus casus*). On the basis of this evidence alone it is impossible to define the relationship of

30) 614,4f. (GL IV 373,5): *Nomen unius hominis, appellatio multorum, uocabulum rerum est. A different account of the distinction between appellatio and uocabulum is found in Quintilian, Inst. or. 1, 4, 20: . . . ut esset uocabulum corpus uisu tactuque manifestum, 'domus lectus'; appellatio, cui uel alterum deesset uel utrumque, 'uentus caelum deus uirtus'.*

31) Ff. 53v–54r.

32) Cf. Scaurus *apud* Diomedes: *nomen est quo deus aut homo propria dumtaxat discriminatione enuntiatur.*

33) The Freising scribe's *sol* conceals the original *Apollo*, which was replaced at some stage in the transmission by a gloss misinterpreted as a correction.

Diomedes' source to M. Did he have before him a work very similar to M, but longer and more detailed? Or was the work known to him under the name of Scaurus completely different from M, coincidentally agreeing (perhaps via a common source) in their definitions of *elementum* and their examples of *nomina propria*?

Diomedes names his sources relatively rarely, and with nothing approaching the regularity of Charisius³⁴). This is to be explained partly by his method of composition: he apparently worked with several sources before him at once, selecting and fusing information from two or more in the course of a single sentence³⁵). Some of these sources may themselves have been the outcome of just such a labour of synthesis. As a result, it is often very difficult to trace the origin of any particular portion of Diomedes' text. The task is further complicated by the fact that the surviving version of his grammar underwent what may have been a quite substantial revision at the hands of Adam of Masmünster toward the end of the eighth century³⁶). Nonetheless, numerous passages scattered throughout Diomedes' grammar suggest a closer acquaintance with a work resembling M than the evidence of the sections attributed by name to Scaurus has so far warranted. The definition of *ars* is among them:

Diomedes³⁷)

Ars est rei cuiusque scientia usu uel traditione uel ratione percepta. . . . Ars dicta, quod arto praecepto singula definiat et uelut uias quasdam ostendat; uel ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, unde ueteres artem pro uirtute appella-

Clm 6281 f. 52r

Ars est uniuscuiusque rei scientia usu uel traditione [perditionem] percepta. Ars apo tes aretes dicta est, unde et ueteres artem etiam pro uirtute usurpauerunt. . . . Gramatice apoton gramaton dicta est, unde et

34) But Charisius does so far from consistently: Barwick, Remmius Palaemon p. 63 n. 1, remarks that he never names one of his principal sources, the grammar by his own teacher. Among grammarians of the early Middle Ages, the naming of a source is as likely to indicate that the medieval grammarian has *not* used that work directly as the opposite: see V. Law, Notes on the dating and attribution of anonymous Latin grammars of the early Middle Ages, *Peritia* 1 (1982) 250–67, esp. p. 263 f.

35) Cf. Holtz, *Donat* p. 85.

36) See C. H. Beeson, *The manuscripts of Bede*, *Classical Philology* 42 (1947) 73–87, esp. p. 76; B. Bischoff, *Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen*, in his *Mittelalterliche Studien* 3 (Stuttgart 1981), pp. 149–69, esp. p. 153.

37) GL I 421,4 + 7–9 + 11 f.

bant. . . Nam et grammaticus romani a litteris appellauerunt Latine litterator est appellatus litteraturam, item grammatica litteratura . . . maticum litteratorem.

The first two of these sentences in M are incorporated almost verbatim into Diomedes, while the substance of the second half of the third is closely paraphrased. The two definitions of *ars* exemplify neatly Diomedes' habit of juxtaposing definitions from various sources, a feature which reappears in a slightly different context in the following passage:

<p>Diomedes I 421,28–30 <i>Accidunt unicuique litterae tria, nomen figura potestas. Nomen est quo dicitur uel enuntiatur; figura, cum scripta aspicitur uel notatur; potestas qua ualet. . .</i></p>	<p>Clm 6281 f. 52r <i>Accidunt unicuique litterae nomen potestas figura. Nomen est quod enuntiatur, potestas qua ualet, figura qua notatur.</i></p>
---	--

Diomedes constructed this passage by combining two sources, the second of which agrees closely with M. Other passages in Diomedes and M which show significant textual or doctrinal agreement could be adduced, but we may, on the basis of the passages inspected here, conclude that among Diomedes' sources were a work similar to M and a grammar by Scaurus. If the two were the same work (as the definition of *elementum* and the passage on *nomen*, both of which are attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus and show points of contact with M, might indicate), then it differed significantly from M. In other words, the grammar known under the name of Scaurus to Diomedes may have been similar to that known under the same name to the author of the *Explanationes*, but was certainly not identical to it.

Date

The fifth-to-sixth-century date of the *Explanationes*³⁸⁾ furnishes a rough *terminus ante quem* for M. Our uncertainty as to the nature of the relationship interceding between M and Diomedes's grammar makes it inadvisable to use the much more precise date of the latter³⁹⁾ – the 360's or 370's – as a *terminus* for

38) See note 14 above.

39) On the dating of Diomedes, see Holtz, Donat p. 82 f.

M. We must therefore turn to the internal features of M itself for clues to its dating.

The earlier stages of the development of the Roman school grammar are to a considerable extent conjectural, owing to the fact that no such works of a significantly earlier date than Donatus' two grammars are known to survive. That the genre did exist much earlier can be inferred from several sources. The grammars of Charisius and Sacerdos, both rambling compilations which draw on several sources, make use of lost school grammars. (Charisius is thought to have been a contemporary of Donatus's⁴⁰), and Sacerdos, to have worked some time during the third century⁴¹.) Two fragments from a Latin grammar dating from the beginning of the third century, or perhaps earlier, have been found in Egypt⁴². Its points of contact with other late Antique grammars, including M, suggest that it belonged to an already well established genre, although school grammars earlier than this are lacking. Their existence in the first century is implied by Quintilian's scornful aside⁴³): *intra haec, quae profitentium commentariolis uulgata sunt*. . . ; his own sketch of the grammatical element in the ideal rhetor's education is at once too allusive and too lopsidedly detailed to be very helpful in giving us an impression of the kind of information to be found in the *commentariola*⁴⁴). To pursue the history of the Roman *ars grammatica* further, we must turn to Greek sources. Diogenes Laertius (s. III A. D.) provides an outline of Stoic linguistic doctrine, taken largely from the lost Τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς of Diogenes of Babylon (s. II B. C.), in his *Vitae philosophorum*⁴⁵). If we can assume that, rather than forcing the Stoic's teaching on selected points into the framework fashionable in his own day, he respected the structure as well as the doctrine of the Stoic's grammar, then we can deduce that Diogenes of Babylon's grammar contained chapters on *uox* (φωνή), *dictio* (λέξις),

40) Holtz, Donat p. 427 and p. 82 f.

41) Holtz, Donat p. 427.

42) The most recent discussion and edition of the fragments, together with bibliography, is that of A. Wouters, The grammatical papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the study of the 'Ars grammatica' in antiquity, *Verhandelingen van de koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren* 92 (Brussels 1979), pp. 93–108.

43) Inst. or. 1, 5, 7.

44) In any case, if Quintilian's account was meant as an antidote to the kind of instruction generally available, it can hardly be taken as typical of what it attacked.

45) Ed. H. S. Long (Oxford 1964), vol. 2, VII 55–58.

oratio (λόγος), *litterae* (γράμματα), the *partes orationis* (τοῦ λόγου μέρη), and on each individual part of speech. No Latin grammar conforms exactly to this pattern: *dictio* and *oratio* have universally lost their prominence, sometimes not even represented by so much as a definition; and in almost all, extra elements – *de syllaba*, *de accentibus*, *de pedibus*, *de posituris*, *de uitiis et uirtutibus orationis* – have crept in to upset the original balance⁴⁶). Of all the extant works, M comes closest to this original pattern. Its opening chapter, *de arte* (which may be an addition to the original plan of the τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς, but if so is an early one) is followed by a discussion of *uox*. The elements of *uox* – *litterae* and *syllabae* – are dealt with, the latter at some length, before *dictio*, *locutio*, *definitio* and *oratio* (corresponding broadly to λέξις and λόγος). Atypically, the *partes orationis* are not listed (but the text here is very corrupt)⁴⁷; *oratio* is followed immediately by the first of the chapters on the individual parts of speech, *nomen*. The similarity of the contents of the opening chapters of M to the assumed plan of the Stoic τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς, and the lack of the extraneous material found in all other Late Latin grammars hint that with this work we may be closer to the beginnings of the Roman school grammar than the evidence previously available could permit.

Another striking structural feature in M with a bearing on its date is the order in which the parts of speech are introduced. Donatus popularised the order *nomen pronomen uerbum aduerbium participium coniunctio praepositio interiectio*, and from the end of the fourth century this sequence held sway almost unchallenged. Prior to Donatus – earlier in the fourth century and during the third – another sequence, which kept the four inflecting parts of speech together by placing the participle before the adverb, was current⁴⁸). It is found in Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus, Victorinus, pseudo-Palaemon, and the *Regulae* of pseudo-Augustine⁴⁹), and also in M. In view of the speed with which the order

46) For the details of this process see Holtz, Donat pp.58–74; Barwick, Remmius Palaemon, *passim*.

47) Between the definition of *oratio* and its example, two lines from the discussion of *nomina propria* intrude, presumably the result of a misinterpreted signe de renvoi.

48) See Holtz, Donat pp.64–8, and the literature there cited. Priscian's return, around 500, to the traditional Greek order does not impugn the general validity of this statement.

49) Only one copy of this text, Oxford Bodl. Addit. C. 144 (Italy, s.xi), preserves the original order; the version printed by Keil, based on Clm 6281 and

favoured by Donatus was adopted after the appearance of his grammars, it is reasonable to assume that M is not significantly later than Donatus' *floruit* (s. IV med.).

These structural features hint at an early date, an impression strengthened by the nature of the literary sources drawn upon for examples: Vergil (repeatedly), Plautus, Catullus⁵⁰), and Laberius⁵¹). The opening sentence of Sallust's *Catilina* is quoted without attribution, as are numerous further lines from Vergil. Any or all of these quotations could be derived from an intermediate source, but it should be noted that none comes from an author active later than the end of the first century B. C. Lucan, Statius and Juvenal, who were quoted in profusion by *grammatici* – Servius and his successors – after the 380's, but rarely earlier⁵²), are conspicuously absent. This evidence *ex silentio* is corroborated by the proper names used as examples: *Otho*, *Nero*, *Cato*, *Metellus*, *Catullus*, *Valgius*⁵³), *Messius*, *Sergius*. Some of these names are commonplace; others are found in no other grammar. The latest identifiable figures, Nero and Otho, provide a *terminus post quem* of 68/69 A.D. Internal features thus provide a possible dating range extending between the last third of the first century and the middle of the fourth. A careful study might refine these *termini*; but we may remark that the earlier part of this period encompasses the activity of the one grammarian called Scaurus of whom we have any historical knowledge, Q. Terentius Scarus⁵⁴), active under Hadrian (117–138). To sum up, the internal features of M

the *editio princeps*, follows the normalised sequence found in all other manuscripts. See further V. Law, St Augustine's *De grammatica*: Lost or found? (note 2 above), p. 160.

50) 4,25 f. This line occurs in the same context in Charisius (330,13) and Diomedes (GL I 344,7), and in a different context in Priscian, Inst. gramm. II 484,2.

51) The reference to Laberius couples his name with Varro's: *Sunt quaedam participia quae solui in forma[n]s uerborum non possunt, ut togatus galeatus hastatus. Quae Varro et Lauerius participia esse affirmantes sic dicunt, [ut] tamquam armatus aptatus, quae a uerbis ueniunt, sed cum partem a uerbo talia non habeant, non recte participia dicuntur* (f. 61r). The extant Laberius fragments twice use *togatae*: Epheb. 1,56 f. (Romani Mimi ed. M. Bonaria, Rome 1965, p.49): *idcirco ope nostra dilatatum est dominium togatae gentis*; *ibid.* 2, 58 f.: *licentiam ac libidinem ut tollam petis togatae stirpis*.

52) See P. Wessner, Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 49 (1929) cols. 296–303 and 328–35.

53) Perhaps a reference to the poet and grammarian C. Valgius Rufus, a friend of the poet Horace (Schanz-Hosius § 273).

54) For the historical evidence see Schanz-Hosius § 594.

suggest that this text antedates Donatus, and could have been composed as early as the end of the first century.

The extant school grammars which may antedate Donatus are few: Dositheus, Asper⁵⁵), Cominianus *apud* Charisius. The addition of M to this small group contributes significantly to our understanding of the development of the genre. But in tracing its evolution it is a matter of considerable importance to know whether M preceded Donatus only by a generation or two, so belonging to the general intellectual milieu which produced the works just named, along with the grammars of Sacerdos and Charisius' anonymous teacher; or whether M was extant in its present form well before any other surviving representative of the genre.

The existence of the school grammar around 200 A. D. has been inferred from the discovery of two papyrus fragments (mentioned above) from a Latin grammar apparently of this type, although on a larger scale than M⁵⁶), which have been dated "to the last decades of the second or to the first decades of the third century A. D."⁵⁷). One of the two fragments, P. Lit. Lond. 184,

55) The grammar attributed to Asper (GL V 547–54) deserves a fresh inspection. Its doctrine, although concisely expressed, often departs from that customary in the fourth and fifth centuries, and might turn out to be significantly earlier, in core at least, than Donatus.

56) How much longer was it? P. Mich. 7429 contains a discussion of several individual diphthongs, a fact which implies a treatment of *litterae* on a scale comparable to that of Sergius's *De littera* or the extensive discussions of Diomedes and Charisius. It is hard to see how this passage could fit into the brief discussion characteristic of the school grammar as represented by Donatus's *Ars maior*, Marius Victorinus, Audax or Asper. P. Lit. Lond. 184, from the same text, which seems to correspond more closely in content to the typical school grammar, might equally well come from a longer grammar, one of the type which prefaces its discussion of the individual parts of speech with an analysis of the name and function of all eight: cf. Servius, Comm. in artem Donati IV 405,12–406,20; Servius [Sergius], Comm. in Donatum IV 428,8–31; [Sergius], *Explanationes* I, GL IV 487,23–489,19; Sergius (pseudo-Cassiodorus), MPL 70,1219; Pompeius V 134,4–136,35. All these works are commentaries on Donatus, yet there is nothing in the *Ars maior* itself – apart from the list of the names of the parts of speech – which would obviously prompt such an excursus.

57) Wouters, *The grammatical papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (see note 42 above) p. 96. This dating rests on the assumption that the grammar was the later of the two texts to be copied onto this bit of twice-used papyrus, and hence that the military lists (dated to A. D. 163–172) which occupy the recto preceded it. If, on the other hand, the opposite is the case, and the discarded grammar was reused for the lists, then the grammar must antedate A. D. 163. Most authorities incline toward the former view: for references to dissenting voices see Wouters, *op. cit.* p. 96 and n. 20.

contains a portion of text comparable with M, containing definitions of *dictio* and *oratio*, an enumeration of the parts of speech, and an etymologizing definition of the first of them, *nomen*. The definition of *dictio* agrees exactly with that found in M: *dictio est uox figuram habens significantium uocum*⁵⁸). The closest parallel to this definition previously known was the here extremely corrupt and lacunose text of Marius Victorinus⁵⁹). Many of these definitions were in general circulation, quoted by teacher after teacher long after the text in which they had first appeared had been forgotten. That of *dictio* found in M, the papyrus fragment, and Marius Victorinus failed to establish itself; indeed, few later grammarians bothered to define this term at all⁶⁰).

Equally striking is the similarity (in sense rather than in wording) between the etymology and explanation of *nomen* found in this fragment and that given by Sergius in the first book of the *Explanationes*⁶¹). Compare:

P. Lit. Lond. 184
Nomen est uelut notamen, quo unamquamque rem uocabulo notantes cognoscimus; est enim uelut nota quaedam rei, nam cum dico quidlibet, etiam si praesentem non inueneris uocabuli huius materiam, tamen, audita hac nominis nota, protinus species rei inhaeret animo.

[Sergii] Expl. GL IV 488, 3.9–12
Nomen dictum quasi notamen: notas enim rerum tenet. . . si enim non uideam scamnum aut cathedram, sed tantum audiam, necesse est ut eius rei notitia ad animum ueniat. Ergo ideo nomen dixere, quod rem notam faciat, quod unam quamque speciem in notitiam deducat.

58) Wouters reads *dictio o[ris] vox*. The reading *oris* is not supported by either Marius Victorinus or M, whereas *est* is corroborated by M.

59) *Elementum est uniuscuiusque rei initium, a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resoluitur. Dictio (est) figura significantium uocum. Oratio est dictio significans uel compositio dictionum significantium consummans unam sententiam* (GL VI 4,26–5,3). Italo Mariotti (Marii Victorini Ars grammatica [Florence 1967]) reads *elementum est uniuscuiusque rei initium, dictio figura significantium uocum aut initium a quo sumit incrementum et in quod resoluitur (oratio)* (2,8); but since *initium a quo sumitur incrementum* etc. is elsewhere universally equated with *elementum*, not with *dictio*, I prefer Keil's emendation.

60) Of those who do, Charisius (14,26 f.), Dositheus (GL VII 388,17 f.) and Diomedes (GL I 436,11 f.) have a different definition: *dictio est ex syllabis finita cum significatione certa locutio, ut est dico facio*. Diomedes (GL I 436,10 f.) has an additional one resembling that of *elementum*: *dictio est uox articulata cum aliqua significatione ex qua instruitur oratio et in quam resoluitur*.

61) A similar account is found in Pompeius (GL V 96, 22–27); Servius (GL IV 405, 12) and Sergius (pseudo-Cassiodorus) (MPL 90, 1220B) offer brief definitions based on the same idea.

Both wording and drift of these two passages correspond, not so closely as to suggest dependence of either upon the other, but implying an ultimate common source. The rest of the text of P. Lit. Lond. 184 parallels the more discursive treatment of the same subjects in the *Explanationes*. Both use the traditional etymology of *oratio*, *quasi oris ratio*, and both refer to scholarly disagreement over the number of its *partes*. An enumeration of the *partes orationis* precedes an etymological explanation of their names (*nunc uideamus, quare sic appellatae sunt ipsae partes orationis*⁶²)) in both texts; P. Lit. Lond. 184 breaks off after the end of that of the noun. We may safely infer that the grammar contained in P. Lit. Lond. 184 was based on a source quite similar to that used in this part of the *Explanationes*. Now, as we have seen, the opening of Expl. I, as well as much of Expl. II, is based on M; and M contains a definition (of *dictio*) which is also found in P. Lit. Lond. 184⁶³). The relationship of the three texts is complicated, but it is clear that they are linked in some way, probably via a common source, which must antedate the papyrus.

Chronologically, there is nothing inherent in M or in its relation to other late Antique grammars which excludes the authorship of the *grammaticus* Q. Terentius Scaurus. Difficulties arise from the apparently contradictory nature of some, but by no means all, of the doctrine attributed to this Scaurus by Diomedes, and that of M. Nonetheless, Diomedes and the other late Antique grammarians thought to have used the work of Q. Terentius Scaurus – Charisius, Audax and Maximus Victorinus – do incorporate passages which bear a strong resemblance to M. To account for both the similarities and the disagreements between the doctrine of M and the reported teaching of Scaurus, we may choose between two hypotheses. According to the first, M would be an epitome of Q. Terentius Scaurus' original, much longer, grammar, prepared some time between that work's composition, in the first third of the second century, and approximately the middle of the fourth century. Against this possibility it could be argued that although a similar origin has been proposed for a number of the starker of the products of the *grammatici*⁶⁴), it has yet to be de-

62) GL IV 487, 33 f.

63) *Dictio* is not defined in the *Explanationes*; the *dictionum genera* are enumerated somewhat earlier (GL IV 487, 16 f.) in a section of text which is rather corrupt.

64) Notably the grammar attributed to Palaemon (GL V 533–47) and the *Ars breuiata* attributed to St Augustine. I have argued against this hypothesis in the case of the latter work in St Augustine's *De grammatica* (n. 2 above).

monstrated for any particular case. Here, too, the discrepancies in the definitions, which one might expect an epitomizer to retain unaltered, lessen the likelihood of M's being a straightforward later abbreviation. An alternative possibility is that Q. Terentius Scaurus himself wrote two grammars, a longer and a shorter one. It was by no means uncommon for Roman *grammatici* to compose two complementary treatises, one in several books and fairly long and detailed, the other a single-book digest for school use, incorporating some of the doctrine of the more advanced work, although often differing greatly in presentation. Donatus' *Ars minor* and *Ars maior* are the best known examples of the type; but Priscian's *Institutio de nomine et pronomine et verbo* reflects in much briefer compass the concern with inflectional morphology which characterises the *Institutiones grammaticae*. Varro's *De lingua latina* may have been complemented by the much shorter exposition in the book on grammar which is thought to have formed one of his lost *Disciplinarum libri*⁶⁵). We know from a chance reference in Charisius⁶⁶) to Scaurus' *Artis grammaticae libri* that Scaurus' work on grammar occupied more than one book: a work on a large scale is implied in any case by the nature of the passages attributed to him by Charisius and Diomedes. It is possible that he, like Varro, Donatus and Priscian, composed a pair of grammars. Of the two, the work known to Diomedes (and perhaps also to the authors of the grammar of the London papyrus and of the corresponding portion of *Explanationes I*) was the more advanced. Probably quite lengthy, like Diomedes' own grammar, it offered a detailed exposition of doctrine which, if the passage on *nomen*, *appellatio* and *uocabulum* quoted by Diomedes is typical, may have departed radically from the standard lore of the fourth- and fifth-century classroom. While the definitions in the shorter work of, for example, the parts of speech conform in general to those found throughout the Late Latin tradition, those in the larger grammar displayed an originality not to be encountered again until the thirteenth century. The shorter version, M, was probably intended for the schoolroom. To judge from its less adventurous treatment of *qualitas nominum* and generally more conventional definitions, its author kept a careful eye on the pedagogical accept-

65) See Jean Collart, *Varron grammairien latin* (Paris 1954), pp. 21–4 and the literature there cited.

66) 173,4 f.

ability of his work⁶⁷) – a textbook, a reformulation of traditional doctrine, rather than a scholarly treatise. The shorter grammar retains a certain amount of material from the more detailed work, as the comparison with Diomedes has shown, but, like others of its type, it tends to favour the conventional at the expense of the controversial. The fragments of the longer work preserved in Diomedes and Charisius are generally regarded as all that remains of the grammar by Q. Terentius Scaurus. If we accept the authenticity of these fragments – and no one has so far questioned it – and also the relatedness of the fragments and M, we accept also that M preserves the teaching of Q. Terentius Scaurus, whether directly or in the form of an epitome⁶⁸).

In either case, this grammar offers new and stimulating possibilities for research. Any addition to the slim corpus of Latin grammars antedating Donatus is welcome, and cannot but contribute significantly to our largely inferential knowledge of the development of the Latin school grammar prior to the lifetime of its most famous exponent. If the internal evidence of M can be relied upon – certainty will have to await the publication of an edition with commentary – then it antedates the earliest complete school grammar extant by two centuries and the earliest papyrus fragment by one. The origin of the Roman school grammar could then be pushed back into the first century of our era, lending credence to the oft voiced suggestion that the first book of Varro's lost *Disciplinarum libri* "présentait déjà le plan et la forme d'un manuel bref... une sorte de prestigieux relais entre un prototype hellénistique de forme squelettique et ses résumés grammaticaux d'époque tardive"⁶⁹). The *commentariola profitentium* mentioned by Quintilian probably bore a very close resemblance to M, and thus also to the school grammars of the third and fourth centuries – further evidence of the remarkable conservatism of Roman elementary instruction. If – and confirmation of this too is dependent upon the results of more detailed study – the work is to be attributed to the renowned *grammaticus* Q. Terentius Scaurus, we

67) His success is proved, not only by its heavy use by the author of the *Explanationes*, but by the very fact of its survival. The more adventurous treatise seems not to have outlived the Empire.

68) Cf. Holtz, Donat p. 101 n. 28: "Rien dans la doctrine de Scaurus ici désigné, ni dans les citations que l'on trouve chez l'auteur des *Expl.* ne semble être indigne de Terentius Scaurus, grammairien du IIe siècle."

69) Holtz, Donat p. 78 f., who voices some scepticism with regard to this view.

gain not only some extra snippets of his doctrine, but also the interesting knowledge that even so original a thinker as he was prepared to dilute his doctrine to join the *turba profitentium* – a fact which might make us take more seriously the claim to authenticity of the school grammars attributed to those other eminent teachers of Antiquity, Augustine, Asper and Remmius Palaemon.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge

Vivien Law

PINDARICA

The melancholy tone of the eighth Isthmian has often been attributed to Pindar's personal regrets about the medizing of his native city in the national struggle against the invading Persians. Recently, a reaction against this 'personal' explanation has set in, and it has been suggested that Pindar's gloomy language in this ode is inspired by sympathy with his patrons. It is possible, especially in the shadow cast by the myth of mortal Achilles, that the victor's cousin Nicocles, mentioned in the poem, was dead, perhaps even as a casualty in the fighting¹).

A telling phrase which might have helped in this debate seems to have been overlooked. Pindar reflects, in the course of the second strophe (vv. 14 ff.), on man's treacherous life and troubles, which yet may be cured with the help of freedom. 'It is right for *good hope* to be a man's concern; it is right for one nurtured in seven-gated Thebes to offer the fine essence of the Graces to Aegina ...' (vv. 15a–16a Sn.-M.). But *ἀγαθὴ ἐλπίς* here is a well-known term of Greek religion. Many examples of this and similar phrases are adduced by F. Cumont²). 'Good hope' is the assurance afforded by a life well lived that all will be well in the world to come. Cumont traces this consolation to the Eleusinian mysteries. If this is correct, one can see why this ode after all offers some relief. 'The house of Persephone' (v. 55) is not wholly closed.

1) E. Thummer, Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte II, Heidelberg 1969, p. 126; cf. A. Köhnken, Gods and Descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's Eighth Isthmian Ode, BICS 22 (1975), pp. 25–36. A recent general discussion of the ode is offered by J. Pörtulas, *Lectura de Píndaro*, Barcelona 1977, pp. 21 ff.

2) Lux Perpetua, Paris 1949, pp. 401 ff.