

KAREN STOPPIE

THE ROLE OF THE GREEK  
IN CHARISIUS' *ARS GRAMMATICA* \*

1. INTRODUCTION

From the extensive production of grammatical manuals in the Roman world, a series of *artes* has been preserved, ranging from the 2nd century A.D. (Scaurus) to the 6th century A.D. (Priscian). Most of these *artes* have been included in the famous corpus *Grammatici Latini* by Keil and some have been re-edited in the 20th century. Of Charisius' manual, for example, a new edition was produced by Barwick in 1925 (add. et corr. Kühnert 1964; repr. 1997).

In this corpus of Latin grammars, three manuals of the 4th century A.D. merit special attention because of the large amount of Greek which is included,<sup>1</sup> viz. the *artes* of Diomedes, Charisius and Dositheus. After the interest which these manuals received from philologists in the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, there has been a period of (relative) neglect. In the past few years, however, the *artes* of Diomedes and Dositheus have been studied again and in much detail. In 2001, Dammer published an extensive monograph on Diomedes, and in 2005, Bonnet presented a new

---

M.A. Karen STOPPIE – doctoral student at the Centre for the Historiography of Linguistics at the KU Leuven; address for correspondence: Blijde Inkomststraat 21/6, BE 3000 Leuven, Belgium; e-mail: Karen.Stoppie@arts.kuleuven.be

\* This article is the written form of a paper given at the *XVIth International Colloquium of the "Studienkreis Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft"* (4-7 March 2004). I thank Dr. T. Fögen for his remarks. I owe much gratitude to Prof. A. Wouters who offered me the opportunity to study Charisius.

<sup>1</sup> Other manuals with a strong Greek component date from the 5th (*Anonymus Bobiensis*) and the 6th century A.D. (the handbooks of Priscian and his student Eutyches).

commented edition of the Latin-Greek grammar by Dositheus. Both scholars have paid attention to the specific purpose of the Greek included in these Latin manuals. Dammer (2001: 56-58) concludes that Diomedes wrote for a Greek-speaking audience, while Bonnet specifies that Dositheus aimed at training students with a good command of Greek and a least a basic knowledge of Latin, in the metalanguage to speak scientifically about the Latin language.<sup>2</sup>

The first statement about Charisius' implied readership dates already from 1907. In a brief article entitled "Von der Tendenz und ursprünglichen Gestalt der Grammatik des Charisius" Tolkiehn (1907: 1021) concluded that Charisius wrote for Greeks. The same view is found more recently in the works of Dionisotti (1982, 1984) and Schmidt (1989). In her article "Latin grammar for Greeks and Goths" Dionisotti (1984: 204) mentions Charisius' *Ars* as one of the Latin grammars written for Greeks, to teach them Latin as a foreign language. Schmidt (1989: 126 and 133) shares the idea that Charisius wrote his grammar for a public in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. Many scholars, however, situate Charisius in a Greek context, namely in Constantinople, but do not say a word about his audience. Rochette, for example, in his book *Le latin dans le monde grec* (1997) just mentions Charisius, together with Priscian, as a renowned professor of Latin in Constantinople, and Baratin in the *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques* (1998) does not even record the large amount of Greek in Charisius.<sup>3</sup> A new impulse to study the Greek in Charisius was given by Schenkeveld at a colloquium held in Lyon in 2002.<sup>4</sup> In his paper

<sup>2</sup> Bonnet (2005: XIV): "apprendre à des étudiants déjà versés dans les lettres grecques le discours technique sur la langue latine, et non leur enseigner le latin, qu'ils maîtrisent assez pour se dispenser de passer en revue déclinaisons et conjugaisons".

<sup>3</sup> While Charisius' grammar is said to be "écrite [...] pour un public qui a le grec comme langue maternelle" in the Diomedes-entry by Desbordes (1998: 45), Baratin only mentions the importance of the Eastern capital in Charisius' biography (1998: 42-43).

<sup>4</sup> The colloquium "Bilinguisme et terminologie grammaticale gréco-latine" was organised by the *Wetenschappelijke Onderzoeksgemeenschap (FWO) Geschiedenis en Historiografie van de Westerse Taalkunde* ("Research Network History and Historiography of Western Linguistics") and the *Seminarium Historiographiae Linguisticae* (Faculteit der Letteren, KU Leuven), on the one hand, and the *Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen* (Institut Courby) of the Université Lumière Lyon 2 and the École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, on the other hand. The proceedings, edited by Louis Basset, Frédérique Biville, Bernard Colombat, Pierre Swiggers and Alfons Wouters, will appear soon in the *Orbis Supplementa* series. They will contain the paper by Dirk M. Schenkeveld.

“Charisius and Diomedes in Constantinople: writing a Latin grammar for Greek readership” Schenkeveld briefly sketched the different ways in which Diomedes and Charisius use the Greek language and stressed that ‘much more research should be done in this field’. Our current research constitutes a response to this exhortation.

A study of all the Greek elements in Charisius’ manual will not only allow to review the earlier statements on his implied readership, but also to determine the grammarian’s knowledge of Greek, Latin and both grammatical traditions. In this contribution we want to present a general classification of how Greek is used in Charisius’ manual and also to illustrate what these Greek elements can learn us about the grammarian and his audience. But first of all we will give a short introduction to the grammarian and his work.

## 2. CHARISIUS: THE GRAMMARIAN AND HIS WORK

On Charisius’ life very few details are known. It is generally assumed that he worked in the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, where knowledge of the Latin language was an essential condition for career prospects in the Roman army and administration.

According to Smith (1989: 125-126) some place names found in Charisius are related to the grammarian’s life: one of them, Skythopolis (p. 45.16-17 Barwick), located on the borders of the river Jordan, would have been his birthplace. But Uría Varela (forthcoming *a*) has shown that these place names can also go back to Charisius’ sources.

The compliment at the address of the emperor Julianus found in Charisius’ manual (p. 54.5 Barwick) suggests that it was written in 362 A.D. (Schmidt 1989: 126).

In his preface, Charisius addresses his son whom he wants to understand to what extent Latin is ruled by *natura*, *analogia*, *ratio*, *consuetudo* and *auctoritas*, all criteria for correct Latin (Siebenborn 1976; Fögen 1998; Schenkeveld 2004: 4). Different interpretations of this preface have been listed by Schenkeveld (2004: 4-5): either the manual was meant for his son’s teacher as a “livre de maître”, as Holtz (1981: 85) calls this *Ars*, or Charisius (together with his son) addressed Greeks who wanted to learn Latin.

Charisius’ *Ars grammatica* is a compilation based on an earlier compilation, probably the (now lost) *Ars* of Cominianus (*fl.* about 330 A.D.). To

the latter *Ars* he added material taken from other authors such as Julius Romanus (between 250 and 320 A.D.). At times Charisius clearly indicates which work he used; for some fragments modern scholars have been able to identify the original author, but other sources remain anonymous. The *Quellenforschung* of Charisius has already received a lot of attention, but here we just mention Barwick's work *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica* from 1922. In this study Barwick ascribes much — probably too much — material to Palaemon, the first-century author of the first *Ars grammatica* (now lost). Some scholars, such as Baratin (1998), call Charisius a mere compiler. But he was more than that. As Schenkeveld (2004: 12-14) has already pointed out, he was also an editor, who inserted several cross-references in his work. In spite of Charisius' efforts to make one grammar out of his material, internal contradictions can easily be found (cf. *infra* for an example). The same *Quellenforschung* also focuses on the relationship between Charisius, Diomedes and Dositheus. The majority of scholars now accept that Diomedes depends on Charisius,<sup>5</sup> and Bonnet (2005: XV-XVI) concludes that Dositheus used the same source as Charisius.

The edition by Barwick (1925) brought to light a grammar quite different from the one printed in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (1857)<sup>6</sup>. Barwick's innovations are based on his new insights in the text transmission and in the interdependence of Charisius and other grammatical and lexicographical works.

The value of N (*codex Neapolitanus* IV A 8, *olim Bobiensis*, 7th or 8th century A.D.), the main manuscript of Keil's edition, was put into another perspective by Barwick. To correct the damaged readings of N, he used the readings of a manuscript which is now lost, the so-called *codex deperditus* or *codex Dousae*,<sup>7</sup> which Keil before him considered unreliable. This *codex* did

---

<sup>5</sup> *Versus* Mazhuga (1998), who defends a different chronological setting of Diomedes and Charisius respectively.

<sup>6</sup> A new edition has been announced by Taifacos (1999: 95-96).

<sup>7</sup> This manuscript is lost, but its content has been reconstituted by Barwick using the work of scholars for whom the manuscript was still available. Keil had already mentioned the existence of the *codex deperditus* in his preface (1857: XXIV *sqq.*), but he did not use its variant readings. The manuscript is called after one of its former possessors, Fr. Dousa. The best source for the existence of the *codex* is one exemplar of the *editio princeps* of Charisius' *Ars* (in 1532 by Giovanni Pierio Cimino), now in the University Library of Heidelberg, in which the scholar Cauchius has written in the margins variant readings of the *codex deperditus*. Cf. Schenkeveld (2004: 133-140) for more details on the lost manuscript and on Cauchius.

not contain the whole grammar but, for the preserved parts<sup>8</sup>, offered much more Greek than the extant manuscripts do.

Barwick's second main intervention was the edition of what he believes to be the original fifth book, of which Schmidt (1989: 126) says that one can speak of "Ansätzen zu einer komparativen Syntax". In the edition by Keil, we only find the first chapter on idioms, but Barwick attributed more of the material found in N to Charisius. Some scholars, among them Holtz and Dionisotti, have made objections to Barwick's reconstruction of the fifth book. Holtz (1978: 230) is convinced that the already weak thesis of Barwick about the last chapters of book V has been demolished by Brugnoli (1955).

According to Dionisotti (1982: 120) there is no proof that Beda (673-735) used for his *Orthographia* the work of Charisius and therefore he is of no use for reconstructing the content of Charisius' book V.

A third pillar of Barwick's edition were texts which he believed to depend either directly on Charisius or on his source. These indirect sources are not only other grammars such as Diomedes' *Ars*, but also different types of material such as the Greek-Latin glossary of Pseudo-Cyrillus (perhaps from the 6th century A.D., wrongly ascribed to the fifth-century patriarch of Alexandria). Barwick (1924: 341-349) was convinced that the author of this bilingual glossary had at his disposal a version of Charisius' grammar with more Greek glosses than the manuscripts available to modern editors. He therefore integrated a good amount of Pseudo-Cyrillus' glosses into Charisius' text.<sup>9</sup>

### 3. THE LAYERS OF CHARISIUS' *ARS GRAMMATICA*

One can distinguish different layers in Charisius' work.

The first layer contains the three components of what Law calls the *Schulgrammatik*.<sup>10</sup> At the beginning of the first book and in the first chapters

<sup>8</sup> The *codex deperditus* contained only the chapters on the parts of speech: I 10-15, I 17-19, II et III.

<sup>9</sup> It is not very clear how much was taken from this source because in the *apparatus criticus* we find "Ps. Cyr. Passim" at the beginning of a chapter, as for example on p. 43. More detailed information, however, can be found in Barwick (1924: 341-349).

<sup>10</sup> For Law's distinction between the *Schulgrammatik* type (a well organised manual providing a conceptual framework to analyse Latin literature) and the *regulae* type (dealing mainly with Latin morphology), cf. Law (1986; 1997: 54-55 and 2003: 65-80 and 83-85). De Nonno

of the second book, Charisius treats some basic concepts: Book 1 contains the definition of *grammatica* (now lost), and of *vox*, chapters on the *litterae*, *syllabae* and on the *communes syllabae*, as well as a paragraph on *dictio*. Book 2 provides the definition of the terms *definitio*, *genus*, *species* and *oratio*; these chapters are immediately followed by a systematic description of the eight parts of speech and in the fourth book the *vitia et virtutes* are dealt with. This third part of the traditional layer has no counterpart in the Greek grammar, but was probably introduced into the standard grammatical manual by the Romans.<sup>11</sup>

The second layer consists of practice-oriented chapters, some of which remind us of what Law has called the *regulae* grammar, a type of grammar developed for teaching morphology. In the first book, Charisius presents observations on the nominal inflection, in some chapters of the second book and in the whole third book he deals with the verbs and their conjugation classes and at the end of the fourth book he discusses aspects of metre (most of this part has unfortunately been lost).

This combination of material from the *Schulgrammatik* and the *regulae* grammar is not unique to Charisius. Other manuals with material of both types are the *Ars grammatica* of Diomedes (4th century A.D.), pseudo-Probus' *Instituta artium* (4th century A.D.) and Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae* (6th century A.D.). Law (1997: 58) draws attention to the benefits of such a combination of materials for a non native speaker of Latin.

The third layer, finally, is the fifth book, which contains a range of chapters on Latin idioms: *De idiomatibus*, *De differentiis*, *De Latinitate* and so on.

#### 4. THE ROLE OF THE GREEK IN CHARISIUS' *ARS GRAMMATICA*

Greek is not included in all parts of Charisius' grammar to the same extent. Some chapters have almost no Greek, while others are completely bilingual. An example of a chapter with almost no Greek is I 19: *De formis casualibus* ("On inflection types"). The grammarian here uses the Latin terminology *forma senaria*, *quinaria* and so on, to indicate classes of nouns with six, five, etc. case forms respectively. The only Greek loanword in this chapter is

---

(1999: 633) and after him also Schenkeveld (2004: 15) use the term *ars grammatica* for Law's *Schulgrammatik*.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Law (2003: 68). See Holtz (1979) and Baratin & Desbordes (1986) for further comments on the origin of the "third part" of the *ars grammatica*.

*monoptota* (p. 192.9 Barwick), here used with its original meaning “nouns with only one form for all cases” (cf. *infra*). This is all the more striking when we compare it to Donatus’ paragraph on the inflection types (*formae casuales*). This grammarian lists only the Greek terminology, going from *monoptota* to *hexaptota* (Holtz 1981: 625).

An example of a completely bilingual chapter is the one entitled *Idiomata nominativa quae per genera efferuntur* (V 6), which contains lists of Latin nouns that have a different gender in Greek.

Not only the frequency but also the function of the Greek differs from place to place. One can distinguish

- (1) Greek grammatical terminology,
- (2) Greek expressions,
- (3) Greek quotations,
- (4) Greek etymologies,
- (5) bilingual references to Latin literature,
- (6) bilingual examples,
- (7) passages where explicit knowledge of the Greek grammaticography is transmitted and
- (8) passages where the Latin language is taught by referring to the corresponding Greek.

Latin grammar cannot be studied in isolation from the Greek tradition. The Roman *ars* was originally modelled on the Greek τέχνη γραμματική, as can be seen most clearly in its similar structure and classification system. In her article “La fonction du grec chez les grammairiens latins”, Desbordes (1988) suggests that the first descriptions of Latin were made by Greeks with references to the Greek language and that some of these descriptions were even written in Greek. But gradually, — so she accepts — the grammatical texts became purely Latin until the “réinjection massive” of Greek elements by Priscian (1988: 17-18). From this point of view we can reformulate our main question: is the Greek in Charisius’ *Ars* all indebted to the fact that Latin grammars are modelled on the Greek tradition, or can we speak in this case of a conscious input of Greek?

Let me provide some examples of the categories mentioned above.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> I do not distinguish between the Greek transliterated in the Latin alphabet and the Greek in the original alphabet. See Holtz (forthcoming) on the appearance of Greek grammatical terminology in the *artes* preserved in a manuscript of the 5th century (Napoli Biblioteca Nazionale lat. 2 — before *Vindobonensis* 16). Charisius, Diomedes and the Anonymous Bobiensis, he observes, “se

#### 4.1. Greek grammatical terminology

The terminology in Latin grammar is very much indebted to the Greek tradition (see, e.g., Nicolas 1996, Fögen 2000 and 2002; each with further literature). The Romans certainly created many grammatical terms of their own, sometimes *ab ovo*, sometimes by translating literally the Greek term, the so-called calques. For many phenomena, however, they just kept the Greek terms.<sup>13</sup> Thus, we have to distinguish in Charisius' work between, on the one hand, Greek terms or calques of Greek terms that are common in Latin grammar, and, on the other hand, Greek terms for which a Roman grammarian normally uses a Latin equivalent. The first kind of Greek terminology does not reveal anything about the native language of Charisius or about his implied audience, but only about the origin of Roman grammar.

A good example of common Greek terminology is the word *euphonia*. In Charisius' manual it occurs twice (p. 14.24-25 and 227.18 Barwick). In the *Index grammaticus* of Lomanto and Marinone (1990) there is a total of 106 entries. For this word Bécaries Botas (1985: 199) gives three Latin equivalents, namely *sonoritas*, *suavitas* and *vocalitas*, but these were not very frequently used.<sup>14</sup> From all the data we can conclude that the occurrence of the Greek word *euphonia* cannot give rise to any speculation about a bilingual author or audience.

A striking example of the opposite, viz. the use of a Greek word really rare in Latin grammar, is found in the chapter *De differentiis* in the fifth book:

---

conformaient aux traditions de la pédagogie latine en reprenant sans la remettre en cause la terminologie grecque latinisée qu'ils trouvaient dans leurs sources. Si d'aventure il leur arrive de mentionner une catégorie grammaticale en grec sans la translittérer, c'est ordinairement en l'accompagnant d'une traduction latine qui ne s'est pas encore pleinement imposée." (Holtz [forthcoming]: 7-8).

<sup>13</sup> Holtz (forthcoming) calls these categories "terminologie traduite" and "terminologie d'emprunt".

<sup>14</sup> In the *Index grammaticus* (Lomanto & Marinone 1990) we have 2 entries for *sonoritas*, 19 for *suavitas* and 7 for *vocalitas*. The most frequent of these equivalents, *suavitas*, is the less appropriate translation. In two instances a grammarian suggests to translate the Greek term. Quintilian (1st century A.D.) proposes to use the Latin term *vocalitas* as equivalent for *euphonia* (*Inst. orat.* 1.5.4: "velut vocalitas, quae εὐφωνία dicitur"; see Fögen 2000: 204 f.) but the only grammarian who really does so is Dositheus (75, 42.12-13 Bonnet). In the other passages the term *vocalitas* is used for characterizing a vocal or semivocal ('open sound'). It was not until the 6th century A.D. that another suggestion came up. At that time Priscian judged that one could use *sonoritas* instead of *euphonia* (*GL* 2.9.16: "euphonia[m] [...] quam nos sonoritatem possumus dicere", and *GL* 3.463.19).



Praeverbium et adverbium. praeverbium est euphonon: adverbium et vitiosum et fictum est, tamen in usum est receptum.

(p. 396.1-3 Barwick)

In contrast with the noun *euphonia*, the adjective *euphonon* only occurs here in Latin grammar. The fact that Bécars Botas (1985: 199) does not give a Latin equivalent for the adjective is significant.

Another example is found in the following paragraph of the chapter on analogy:

Belidis Cinna in Propemptico Pollionis [...],  
 'nec tamen donorum ingenteis mirabere acervos  
 innumerabilibus congestos undique saeculis,  
 iam inde a Belidis natalique urbis ab anno  
 Cecropis atque alta Tyriorum ab origine Cadmi'  
 patronymice dixit Belidis, ut urbis. At vero Maro (*Aen.* 2.82) 'Belidae Palaemedis' ait.

(p. 158.6-12 Barwick)

Here Charisius, or probably his source Romanus, makes an observation on the form *Belidis* found in a poem of Cinna. The Latin form *Belidis* and the interpretation by Charisius have puzzled modern scholars,<sup>15</sup> but what is interesting in this context, is the expression *patronymice dixit*. The Greek adjective *πατρωνυμικός* is found more than once in Latin grammar, but here we have a unique 'translation' into Latin of the expression *πατρωνυμικῶς λέγειν* ('to use as a patronymic') used by Greek grammarians such as the 2nd century A.D. Herodian (e.g., *GG* III, I, 1, 66.21; II, 1, 862.32).

So far we have mentioned examples of the use of Greek grammatical terminology instead of the Latin equivalent. Sometimes the Greek term is the more common in Latin manuals, but in some cases Charisius uses the Greek term while the other grammarians prefer the Latin equivalent.

Another way of introducing Greek terminology into Latin grammar is to juxtapose the Greek and Latin terms. This was done in different ways. Sometimes the word is imbedded in the Latin phrases; sometimes it is not. To illustrate this category, we shall have a look at an example where the Greek term is rather loosely connected with the rest of the sentence:

<sup>15</sup> In Courtney's commentary on this fragment, we read that "Charisius has misunderstood the quotation; *Belidis* is ablative plural of *Belides*, not genitive singular" (Courtney 1993: 214). Uría Varela (forthcoming b), however, denies that Charisius made such a big mistake. He proposes to emend the text and to read 'ut Atridis' instead of 'ut urbis'.

Sunt quaedam verba quae inchoativa appellantur, ἀρκτικά, quaeque rem modo inchoatam et futuram significant, velut [...].

(p. 329.23-25 Barwick)

Because of the weak integration of the Greek term in the syntactic construction, it is impossible to know whether the Greek word has been inserted either by Charisius' source or himself or by a later scribe. In our example, we find the Greek ἀρκτικά added to *verba inchoativa*, a class of verbs that by means of their morphology express the beginning of an act. As this class of verbs has not been distinguished by the Greek grammarians, we only find ἀρκτικός with the meaning 'at the beginning of' or 'originative'. Charisius here uses an existing term not with one of its usual significations, but as a calque of the Latin *inchoativa*.

#### 4.2. Greek expressions

Close to the use of Greek grammatical terminology is what we have called Greek expressions. Under this category we classify passages where the author uses in a Latin sentence Greek that is not exclusively related to grammar. Some of the words found in Charisius' *Ars* are καταχρηστικῶς (p. 213. 19-20 Barwick), εἰρωνικῶς (p. 295.16 Barwick) and καθολικῶς (p. 234.29 Barwick), but this kind of words can also be found in other Latin literature.<sup>16</sup>

#### 4.3. Greek quotations

The number of Greek quotations in Charisius' *Ars* is very small and their content is diverse. Our example is taken from a lexicographical list of interjections found in the second book:

'Vita deum immortalium' Cato senex; ubi Statilius Maximus 'ἐκφώνησις' inquit 'ἀρχαϊκή, ὡς ὃ πόποι'.

(p. 313. 1-3 Barwick)

This quotation is not taken from a grammar, but from the collection of rare Latin words in Cato and Cicero made by Statilius Maximus (2nd century A.D.). This collection had "to serve the rhetorician of the second century" (Zetzel 1974: 109).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Adams (2003: 323-329) for comparable expressions in the letters of Cicero.

#### 4.4. *Greek etymologies*

Since Latin was, for a long time, considered a dialect of Greek (Fögen 2000: 49-51, with earlier literature), etymologies which derive Latin words from Greek origins were not uncommon in Latin literature. In Charisius' *Ars* we find etymologies of some technical terms and etymologies to explain the variant spellings of a certain Latin word. Examples of these types are respectively the Greek etymology for the originally Greek term *syllaba* found in a definition of *syllaba*:

Syllabae dicuntur a Graecis παρά τὸ συλλαμβάνειν τὰ γράμματα, Latine vel conexiones vel conceptiones, quod litteras concipiunt atque conectunt [...].

(p. 8. 10-13 Barwick)

and the etymology given to explain the alternative spelling of the word *scida* ('sheet of paper') found in chapter I, 15:

Scida charta sine adspiratione a scindendo dicta est: sed alii eam cum adspiratione schidam ex Graeco ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίζειν dictam putant.

(p. 134. 9-11 Barwick)

#### 4.5. *Bilingual references to Latin literature*

Of this category we have found rather few examples. They all seem to appear in chapters that go back to Iulius Romanus. The following one, for example, is found in Romanus' chapter on analogy:

Hebem Caecilius in Ὑποβολιμαίῳ [...], 'subito res reddent hebem'.

(p. 168.15-16 Barwick)

Greek titles are common in Latin literature. The title in our example is that of a play by the comedian Caecilius (2nd century B.C.). For Roman tragedies and comedies that were adaptations of Greek plays, the Greek title was often kept (Henriksson 1956: 99-100 and 109). The syntax in this Latin phrase is unusual. The Latin *in* is followed by a dative, the Greek case corresponding to the Latin ablative as an expression of location, which shows that the author is able to correctly equate Latin *in* + ablative and Greek ἐν + dative.

#### 4.6. *Bilingual examples*

The vast number of bilingual examples in Charisius' work — more than 1900 word pairs — deserve much interest. They are concentrated in the first book and more specifically in the practice-oriented chapters on the noun, and in the fifth book, in lists on idioms and gender. They are on the contrary totally absent from the fourth book and very rare in the 'traditional' chapters.

We focus on these bilingual examples in the form they have been printed by Barwick, but we take into account the fact that much of this lexical material has been reinserted in the Charisius text by Barwick who used sources which are supposed to depend on Charisius, such as the bilingual glossary of pseudo-Cyrillus already mentioned.

We find Latin examples that do not perfectly illustrate the given grammatical rule, Latin and Greek *hapaces* and Greek translations that do not cover (exactly) the meaning of the Latin example. In some cases the bilingual glossaries of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (vols. 2 and 3)<sup>17</sup> can help to elucidate the mistake in Charisius. The following examples illustrate the problems one can encounter when using Charisius' word pairs.

In a list of *feminina semper pluralia* occurs the Latin *nares*, followed by the Greek ῥίϋν (p. 36.5-6 Barwick). This is the plural of *naris* "nostril", a word that, as we learn from Lewis and Short (1975: 1186), is found in the singular only in poetry and in post-classical prose. It is usually found in the plural, meaning 'nose'. On this basis, we can conclude that the word should not be placed in Charisius' list of "words *always* used in the plural". This classification is for that matter also contradicted by another passage in Charisius' *Ars*, where we read:

Naris singulariter, haec naris dicimus, ut Aemilius Macer [...].

(p. 136.23 Barwick)

But by adding in his list of *semper pluralia* the Greek translation ῥίϋν (a late 2nd century A.D. nom. form of ῥίϋς), meaning 'nose', the grammarian probably wants to indicate that the plural form *nares* refers to the nose, and not to the two nostrils. So, the Greek added here has a didactic function.

<sup>17</sup> We do not want to determine the relation between Charisius and the glossators, as was done by Hoffmann (1907) and others after him but to find out how common a certain word pair was or, in some instances, to propose another reading.

In the following example, on the contrary, the Greek is problematic. In the chapter on the prepositions at the end of the second book, there is a list of seven compound verbs, all accompanied by a dubious translation.<sup>18</sup> The first item on this list is:

di diducere διασπάζεσθαι [...].

(p. 300.1-4 Barwick)

The word *diducere* ('to draw apart') is followed by the Greek διασπάζεσθαι, an otherwise unknown compound of ἀσπάζεσθαι meaning 'welcome kindly'. A possible emendation could be διασπᾶν, if we take *diducere* in its military meaning 'to separate the forces'.

#### 4.7. *Passages where detailed knowledge of the Greek grammaticography is transmitted*

Some passages suggest that Charisius or one of his sources was very familiar with the Greek grammatical tradition.

When one investigates, for example, his use of the (originally) Greek terms *monoptoton* ('one form for all cases') and *aptoton* ('without cases'), it becomes clear that Charisius, in contrast to his predecessors, turned back to the Greek tradition. From the time of Plinius and Valerius Probus (1st century A.D.) onwards, Latin grammarians, Donatus included, mention *monoptoton* with the meaning 'used in only one case' and *aptoton* with the meaning 'which has only one form in all the cases' (for further details, see Mazhuga [forthcoming]). Charisius, by contrast, uses both metaterms with the content they have in the Greek tradition (e.g., p. 41.1-3 and 10-13 Barwick).

#### 4.8. *Passages where the Latin language is taught by referring to the corresponding Greek*

For several grammatical rules Charisius requires from his student knowledge of the Greek language. For example, when he is taught the formation of the genitive singular with the following rule:

<sup>18</sup> Note that all of the Greek in this list was inserted by Barwick from testimonies of the *codex deperditus*. Cf. notes 7 and 8.

Tunc enim nos s litteram genetivo adicere debemus, cum illi σίγμα eidem genetivo adiciunt, et cum illis similiter detrahere, velut τοῦ πατρός patris, τῆς μητρός matris; porro τοῦ κάπρου capri, τοῦ ἀγροῦ agri.

(p. 104.25-29 Barwick)

We must add a -s to the genitive when they [i.e. the Greeks] add a sigma to the same genitive, and we must leave it out, when they do, for example *tou patros* and *patris*, *tès mètros* and *matris*; in turn, *tou kaprou* and *capri*, *tou agrou* and *agri*.

The grammarian links the presence of the ending -s not to the declension pattern of the Latin noun, but to the morphology of its Greek equivalent.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this article I have proposed a categorisation of the Greek element in Charisius' grammar. An analysis of the Greek elements based on these categories will in our opinion allow a clear picture of Charisius' linguistic background, of the didactic characteristics of his grammar, and last but not least, of his implied readership.

## REFERENCES

### EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES:

- Barwick, Karl (1925): *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii artis grammaticae libri V*, Leipzig [revised edition by Friedmar Kühnert, 1964; repr. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1997].
- Bonnet, Guillaume (2005): *Dosithée. Grammaire latine*, Paris.
- Courtney, Edward (1993): *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
- Goetz, Georg (ed.) (1888-1923): *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum* (7 vols., vol. 2 with Gottholdus Gundermann and vol. 7 with Wilhelm Heraeus), Leipzig. [Repr. 1965, Amsterdam].
- Putschen, Helias (1605): *Grammaticae latinae auctores antiqui*, Hanoviae.
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (2004): *A Rhetorical Grammar. C. Iulius Romanus, Introduction to the Liber de Adverbio*, Leiden & Boston.
- G.G.* = *Grammatici Graeci*, 1867-1901, Leipzig.
- G.L.* = *Grammatici Latini ex recensione H. Keilii*, 1855-1880, Leipzig.

### SECONDARY LITERATURE:

- Adams, James Noel (2003): *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.

- Baratin, Marc (1998): Charisius, in: Bernard Colombat & Elisabeth Lazcano (eds.), *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques* (Histoire Épistémologie Langage, Hors-série 2), Paris, 42-43.
- Baratin, Marc & Françoise Desbordes (1986): La "troisième partie" de l'ars grammatica, in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 13, 215-240.
- Barwick, Karl (1922): *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica*, Hildesheim & New York.
- Barwick, Karl (1924): Zur Geschichte und Rekonstruktion des Charisius-Textes, in: *Hermes* 59, 322-429.
- Bécares Botas, Vicente (1985): *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega*, Salamanca.
- Brugnoli, Giorgio (1955): *Studi sulle Differentiae verborum*, Roma.
- Dammer, Raphael (2001): *Diomedes grammaticus*, Trier.
- De Nonno, Mario (1999): Le citazioni dei grammatici, in: Guglielmo Cavallo, Paolo Fedeli & Andrea Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*. Vol. III: *La ricezione del testo*, Roma, 597-646.
- Desbordes, Françoise (1988): La fonction du grec chez les grammairiens latins, in: Irène Rosier (ed.), *L'héritage des grammairiens latins de l'antiquité aux lumières. Actes du colloque de Chantilly, 2-4 septembre 1987*, Leuven & Paris, 15-26.
- Desbordes, Françoise (1998): Diomède, in: Bernard Colombat & Elisabeth Lazcano (eds.), *Corpus représentatif des grammaires et des traditions linguistiques* (Histoire Épistémologie Langage, Hors-série 2), Paris, 43-45.
- Dionisotti, Carlotta (1982): On Bede, grammars and Greek, in: *Revue Bénédictine* 92, 111-141.
- Dionisotti, Carlotta (1984): Latin grammar for Greeks and Goths, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 74, 202-208.
- Fögen, Thorsten (1998): Bezüge zwischen antiker und moderner Sprachnormentheorie, in: *Listy filologické* 121, 199-219.
- Fögen, Thorsten (2000): "*Patrii sermonis egestas*": Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache. Ein Beitrag zum Sprachbewußtsein in der römischen Antike, München & Leipzig.
- Fögen, Thorsten (2002): Der Umgang mit griechischen Termini in lateinischen Fachtexten: Versuch einer Systematisierung, in: Bogdan Kovtyk, Gerhard Meiser & Hans-Joachim Solms (eds.), *Geschichte der Übersetzung. Beiträge zur neuzeitlichen, mittelalterlichen und antiken Übersetzungsgeschichte*, Berlin, 259-276.
- Henriksson, Karl-Erik (1956): *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur*, Helsinki.
- Hoffmann, Maximilian (1907): *De ratione quae inter glossas graecolatinas et grammaticorum Latinorum scripta intercedat*, Diss. Jena.
- Holtz, Louis (1978): Sur les traces de Charisius, in: Jean Collart (ed.), *Varron: grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Paris, 225-233.
- Holtz, Louis (1979): Grammairiens et rhéteurs romains en concurrence pour l'enseignement des figures de rhétorique, in: Raymond Chevallier (ed.), *Colloque sur la rhétorique*, Paris, 207-220.
- Holtz, Louis (1981): *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical. Étude sur l'ars Donati et sa diffusion*, Paris.
- Holtz, Louis (forthcoming): Transcription et déformations de la terminologie grammaticale

- grecque dans la tradition manuscrite latine, in: Louis Basset, Frédérique Biville, Bernard Colombat, Pierre Swiggers & Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Bilinguisme et terminologie grammaticale gréco-latine*, Leuven & Paris.
- Law, Vivien (1986): Late Latin grammarians in the Early Middle Ages: A typological history, in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 13, 191-206.
- Law, Vivien (1997): *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, London & New York.
- Law, Vivien (2003): *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600*, Cambridge.
- Lewis, Charlton T. & Charles Short (1975): *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
- Lomanto, Valeria & Nino Marinone (1990): *Index grammaticus. An Index to Latin Grammar Texts* (3 vols.), Hildesheim, Zürich & New York.
- Mazhuga, Vladimir (1998): Quand vivait et travaillait le grammairien Diomède?, in: *Hyperboreus* 4, 139-165. [Original in Russian, summary in French].
- Mazhuga, Vladimir (forthcoming): Aptota an monoptota?, in: Louis Basset, Frédérique Biville, Bernard Colombat, Pierre Swiggers & Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Bilinguisme et terminologie grammaticale gréco-latine*, Leuven & Paris.
- Nicolas, Christian (1996): *Utraque lingua. Le calque sémantique: domaine gréco-latin*, Louvain & Paris.
- Rochette, Bruno (1997): *Le latin dans le monde grec: recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain*, Bruxelles.
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (forthcoming): Charisius and Diomedes in Constantinople: Writing a Latin grammar for Greek readership, in: Louis Basset, Frédérique Biville, Bernard Colombat, Pierre Swiggers & Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Bilinguisme et terminologie grammaticale gréco-latine*, Leuven & Paris.
- Schmidt, Peter Lebrecht (1989): Grammatik und Rhetorik, in: Reinhart Herzog (ed.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Vol. 5: Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, München, 101-158.
- Siebenborn, Elmar (1976): *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*, Amsterdam.
- Taifacos, Ioannis (1999): *Arbeitsvorhaben*, in: *Gnomon* 71, 95-96.
- Tolkiehn, Johannes (1907): Von der Tendenz und ursprünglichen Gestalt der Grammatik des Charisius, in: *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 24, 1020-1022.
- Uría Varela, Javier (forthcoming a): What can we learn from Place-names in Charisius' *Ars Grammatica*?, in: I. Taifacos (ed.), *The Origins of European Scholarship*.
- Uría Varela, Javier (forthcoming b): Charisius (*ars grammatica* p. 158.6-12 Barwick): On Cinna, fr. 1 Blänsdorf, in: *Mnemosyne*.
- Zetzel, James E.G. (1974): Statilius Maximus and Ciceronian studies in the Antonine Age, in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 21, 107-123.



ROLA JĘZYKA GRECKIEGO W *ARS GRAMMATICA* CHARYZJUSZA

## Streszczenie

W łacińskim podręczniku Charyzjusza (Flavius Sosipater Charisius), gramatyka z IV wieku, spotykamy wiele elementów języka greckiego. W niniejszym artykule przedstawiamy ogólną klasyfikację sposobów użycia greki przez Charyzjusza, a także pokazujemy, co owe greckie elementy mogą nam powiedzieć o tym gramatyku (o jego znajomości greki, łaciny i tradycji gramatycznych obu tych języków) oraz o jego potencjalnych czytelnikach.

Elementy greki dzielimy na następujące kategorie:

- (1) grecka terminologia gramatyczna;
- (2) wyrażenia greckie;
- (3) cytaty greckie;
- (4) etymologie greckie;
- (5) dwujęzyczne odwołania do literatury łacińskiej;
- (6) przykłady dwujęzyczne;
- (7) fragmenty, w których przekazywana jest dokładna znajomość gramatyki greckiej, oraz
- (8) fragmenty, gdzie język łaciński jest nauczany przez odwoływanie się do odpowiednich elementów języka greckiego.

*Z angielskiego przełożył Tadeusz Kartowicz*

**Słowa kluczowe:** gramatyka łacińska, Diomedes, Charyzjusz (Charisius), Dositheus, potencjalni czytelnicy Charyzjusza, kompilacja, *Quellenforschung*, Cominianus, Julius Romanus, Barwick, Beda, Pseudo-Cyrillus, *Schulgrammatik*, gramatyka regułkowa (*Regulae*), Pseudo-Probos, Priscian, greka w gramatyce łacińskiej, bilingwalizm, τέχνη γραμματική.

**Key words:** Latin grammar, Diomedes, Charisius, Dositheus, Charisius' implied audience, compilation, *Quellenforschung*, Cominianus, Julius Romanus, Barwick, Beda, Pseudo-Cyrillus, *Schulgrammatik*, *Regulae* grammar, Pseudo-Probos, Priscian, Greek in a Latin grammar, bilingualism, τέχνη γραμματική.