TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND SOURCE STUDY
IN ANCIENT LATIN GRAMMAR:
CHARISIUS *ARS GRAMMATICA* 46.5 BARWICK;
EXCERPTA BOBIENSIA, GRAMMATICI LATINI 1.547.35 KEIL

JAVIER URÍA VARELA

I N THIS PAPER (1) an attempt is made to defend, against the conjectures of the most recent editions, the transmitted text of two passages (**A** and **B** below) from two different Latin grammatical works: Charisius' *Ars grammatica* and the so-called Anonymus Bobiensis or *Excerpta Bobiensia* (hereafter cited as Anon., and in quotations as *Exc. Bob.*).[1] That defense leads (2) to re-examination of another passage from Charisius, closely connected with the first two. Finally (3), the explanation of the content of these passages reveals two formulations of a rule for classifying the nouns in *-es,* and this is followed by an inquiry into the origin and tradition of both formulations.

As an introduction, it is enough to say that, thanks particularly to the fundamental work of K. Barwick on the tradition of Latin grammatical *artes,*[2] it is generally accepted that both Charisius' work and the Anon.[3] go back to a common source (named by Barwick "Gewährsmann der Charisius-Gruppe"), on which also Dositheus and Diomedes depend; but Dositheus and the Anon. would have used a "Mittelquelle," which might have been an abridged recension of the common source.[4]

1. These editions are, respectively: K. Barwick, *Charisii "artis grammaticae" libri V* (Leipzig, 1925), rev. F. Kühner (Leipzig, 1964); H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* 1 (Leipzig, 1857), 533–65. The latter, which is in fact based on the previous edition (and *princeps*) by J. V. Eichenfeld and S. L. Endlicher, *Analecta grammatica maximam partem anecdota* (Vienna, 1837), has recently been improved by M. De Nonno, *La grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis (GL 1 533–565 Keil)* (Rome, 1982). This edition I shall of course take into account as well; my quotations, however, will be from Keil's edition, with references to De Nonno's only where necessary.

2. K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische ars grammatica* (Leipzig, 1922).

3. Keil himself, having initially edited this text as *Excerpta Bobiensia* together with Charisius' *Ars grammatica* (regarding *Exc. Bob.* as entirely dependent upon Charisius' *Gramm.*), retracts later (in his Praefatio of *Gramm. Lat.* 7, at 369) and recognizes the independent nature of the *Excerpta Bobiensia* (cf. De Nonno, at xvi).

4. I am following the summary of Barwick's statements made by De Nonno, at xvii. Cf. also the graph at 203 in A. C. Dionisotti, "Latin Grammar for Greeks and Goths," *JRS* 74 (1984): 202–8. More recently, P. L. Schmidt has suggested that the "Gewährsmann der Charisius-Gruppe" is to be identified with Cominianus, very probably Charisius' teacher (*Restauration et renouveau: La Littérature latine de 284 à 374 après J.-C.,* vol. 5 of *Nouvelle histoire de la littérature latine,* ed. R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt; French edition, under the direction of G. Nauroy [Turnhout, 1993], §523.1, Bibl. 2 [hereafter, *Restauration et renouveau*]).

1

First, I present the texts as we are led to believe they are transmitted in the manuscripts (on the evidence of the critical apparatus of the most recent editions):[5]

A   si vero adiecta fuerit littera, confundit declinationem et in is genetivum facit, ut ambages περίοδος ambagis, clades συμφορά cladis . . . (Charisius *Gramm.* 46.5)

but if a letter is added, it mixes its declension and forms the genitive in *-is,* like *ambages* περίοδος *ambagis, clades* συμφορά *cladis . . .*

5 fuerit littera *codd.:* non fuerit i littera *Barwick, conferens Exc. Bob. 547.36 Keil*

B   sin autem adiecta fuerit littera, in is facit genetivum et fit tertiae declinationis, velut nubes nubis, caedes caedis. (*Exc. Bob.* 547.36)

but, if a letter is added, it forms the genitive in *-is* and becomes of the third declension, like *nubes nubis, caedes caedis*

36 fuerit littera in is *codd.:* non fuerit littera i in is *Keil,* nis *pro* inis *in codd. falso legens, ut videtur*[6]

Certainly, the transmitted text at first sight *appears* not to make sense in the context, particularly in the Anon. (**B**). It deals with the classification of nouns in *-es,* and those from the fifth declension have been presented as a first group:

huius tamen quintae declinationis nomina quae ante es productam et puram habent i litteram . . . (*Exc. Bob.* 547.31)

the nouns from this fifth declension which have an *i* before pure, long *-es . . .*

Indeed, after this first part of the statement, we would then expect to be told about nouns that *do not have* an *i* before *-es;* and that being so, "but if an *i* is not added" is apparently the logical concomitant to the preceding "that have an *i*."

With regard to Barwick's emendation of Charisius' text (**A**),[7] it is based, as he himself points out via his critical apparatus, on the Anon. (**B**); but the preceding context in Charisius is different:

Omnia nomina quae in es terminantur genetivum faciunt in i, si tamen pura fuerit syllaba, ut acies παράταξις aciei, almities almitiei . . . (Charisius *Gramm.* 45.19 Barwick)

All the nouns that end in *-es* form the genitive in *i,* if the syllable is pure, like *acies* παράταξις *aciei, almities almitiei . . .*

In this case, the first group of nouns in *-es* is made up of those whose syllable (the *-es* syllable, evidently) is *pura;* and this is probably the key concept for

---

5. I have not myself collated the manuscripts as De Nonno and Barwick did for the Anon. and Charisius respectively. I provide a critical apparatus of my own, showing the conjectures of the canonical editions. A very literal translation is added.

6. The same text is presented by De Nonno, who, unlike Keil, puts the *i* into angular brackets ⟨*i*⟩. It must be said that De Nonno personally collated the manuscript from Bobbio, whereas Keil relied on the previous edition by Eichenfeld-Endlicher. From De Nonno's critical apparatus we know that ⟨*non*⟩ is a conjecture by Eichenfeld-Endlicher and that the ⟨*i*⟩ was introduced by Keil.

7. It is only fair to point out that here the previous edition by Keil maintains the text in the manuscripts.

understanding the text. For Charisius, here, a *pure* syllable is one that has
no consonant before the vowel that is the center of the syllable, that is, a
syllable with no syllabic margin before the nucleus. This concept is corrob-
orated in several other grammatical passages.[8] To put it another way, Cha-
risius is defining a "pure" syllable in passage **A** without reference to the
presence of the letter "i" at all.

It is true that different passages from Charisius, also referring to the
nouns in *-es,* could easily lead one to jump to the conclusion that the *adiecta
littera* in passages **A** and **B** here is none other than the *i* preceding the final
syllable of the nouns in *-es pura:*

> Es litteris productis elata, si quidem i habuerint ante es syllabam, genetivum faciunt per
> i . . . (Charisius *Gramm.* 87.2 Barwick) quae autem i ante es productam non habent,
> haec genetivum faciunt per is . . . (87.19)

> Those that end in long *es,* if they have an *i* before the syllable *es,* form the genitive with
> *i.* . . . (87.2) Those that do not have an *i* before long *es,* form the genitive with
> *is.* . . . (87.19)

> Es producta finita nomina genetivo diei aciei luxuriei faciei facient, excepto quies: quam-
> quam enim et hoc ante es i litteram habeat, tamen quietis facit. . . . (Charisius *Gramm.*
> 163.3 Barwick)

> Nouns that end in long *es* use the form *diei aciei luxuriei faciei* in the genitive, with the
> exception of *quies,* because, although it also has an *i* before *es,* it uses the form
> *quietis . . .*

If one does jump to the conclusion that the *adiecta littera* in passages **A** and
B above is the preceding *i,* one is obliged to take the *si/sin* clause in each of
those passages as transmitted in the manuscripts to refer to nouns that do
have final *-es pura,* whereas the respective contexts suggest that it should
refer to those that do not (like *ambages, clades, nubes, caedes*).

This assumption, then, about what is behind *adiecta littera* seems to have
caused in passage **B**, first, the conjecture ⟨*non*⟩ by Eichenfeld-Endlicher,[9]
and then, the conjecture ⟨*i*⟩ *in is* by Keil, which is based on his paleograph-
ical tinkering with a misreading of the manuscript.[10] Finally, Barwick, who

---

8. *Fragmenta Bobiensia, Gramm. Lat.* 7.541.2: "omnis nominativus es correpta terminatus, sive pura sive
aliqua consonante anteposita et iuncta"; cf. the equivalent use of the adverb *pure* in Charisius *Gramm.* 147.33:
"quaecumque nomina us pure proferuntur, velut strenuus necessarius et similia" (*stre-nu-us*). Probus re-
fers in succession to *as pura* (*Gramm. Lat.* 4.17.35), e.g., Λυσίας, Αἰνείας; *es pura* (ibid. 18.11), e.g., *species,
dies; is pura* (ibid. 18.24), e.g., *Lais, Thais; os pura* (ibid. 18.31), e.g., *os;* and *us pura* (ibid. 19.4), e.g., *Vergi-
lius, Terentius, arduus, carduus.* It is worthwhile to explain that the use of *pura* as an adjective with (*syllaba*) *as,
es, is, os, us,* and so on, is, in Latin grammatical texts, more relevant than it might seem to a modern reader. In
fact, we find uses of *as es . . . syllaba* that refer to "syllables containing *as, es,*" but not necessarily "pure"; here
is a selection of examples from Charisius in which some of the words referred to are in parentheses: 49.5: *is
syllabam* (*assis, bovis, dentis*); 52.14: *or syllabam* (*venator, gladiator, tutor*); 53.25: *us syllabam* (*descensus,
coitus*); 57.21: *is syllabam* (*salutaris, agilis*); 65.8: *a syllabam* (*arma, castra, exta*), etc. In short, *es syllaba* may
point both to "syllable *es*" and "syllable with *es,*" whereas *es syllaba pura* points unambiguously to "syllable
es," i.e., cases where *es* alone constitutes the whole syllable.

9. We can assume that their interpretation was "if *that* letter is not added," and this shows to what extent
they identified the *i* with the *adiecta littera.*

10. So sure must Keil have been that *nis* ought to be read as *in is* that he did not even print *i* as a conjec-
ture, ⟨*i*⟩, in the way that De Nonno did later.

probably also took into account the two other Charisian passages,[11] accepts both conjectures in his text of Charisius in passage **A**. The resulting texts are:

> **B**   huius tamen quintae declinationis nomina quae ante es productam et puram habent
> i litteram, haec omnia et feminina sunt et correpta, velut dies materies luxuries. . . .
> (*Exc. Bob.* 547.31 Keil) sin autem adiecta ⟨non⟩ fuerit littera i, in is facit genetivum
> et fit tertiae declinationis, velut nubes nubis, caedes caedis. (547.36 Keil)
>
> The nouns of the fifth declension that have before long, pure -*es* the letter *i*, are all
> feminine and short, like *dies, materies, luxuries.* . . . (547.31) but if the letter *i* is
> not added, the genitive is formed in -*is* and becomes of the third declension, like
> *nubes nubis, caedes caedis.* (547.36)
>
> **A**   Omnia nomina quae in es terminantur genetivum faciunt in i, si tamen pura fuerit
> syllaba, ut acies παράταξις aciei, almities almitiei. . . . (Charisius *Gramm.* 45.19
> Barwick) si vero adiecta ⟨non⟩ fuerit ⟨i⟩ littera, confundit declinationem et in is
> genetivum facit, ut ambages περίοδος ambagis, clades συμφορά cladis. . . . (46.5)
>
> All the nouns ending in -*es* form the genitive in *i*, if the syllable is pure, like *acies*
> παράταξις *aciei, almities almitiei* . . . (45.19) but if the letter *i* is not added, it
> mixes its declension and forms the genitive in -*is*, like *ambages* περίοδος *ambagis,*
> *clades* συμφορά *cladis* . . . (46.5)

There are, however, reasons to reject these conjectures, even if they apparently make perfect sense in the text. Firstly, the paleographically possible reading of Anon. by Keil in passage **B** (*in is* for *nis*)[12] has the disadvantage of giving rise to an unusual word-order: in grammatical texts the order *X littera* is greatly preferred to the order *littera X*.[13] That is probably why Barwick in his edition changed the order shown in the text of passage **B** upon which he relied for his conjecture.

Secondly, I think that *adiecta,* in contexts like the one at issue, does not denote "placed before," but "added to," in the sense of "becoming a part of."[14] By this I mean that the addition takes place within something, either the word, the syntagma, or, as is the case here, the syllable (so also in the

11. Charisius *Gramm.* 87.2 and 87.19 as well as *Exc. Bob.* 547.31 and 547.36 are cited as "Parallelen" for Charisius *Gramm.* 45.19 by Barwick in his 1922 source study, *Remmius Palaemon* (n. 2 above), 136.

12. The age of the manuscript implies *scriptio continua* (cf. B. Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography* [Cambridge, 1990], 173), well observed in a reproduction of a part of the *codex* in *Codices Latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century,* ed. E. A. Lowe, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1938), p. 37, n. 397a. This means that, from a paleographical point of view, it would be possible to divide *litterainis* as *littera i nis* by interpreting *nis* as *in is* (there is, in fact, the inverse miswriting, i.e., *in is* for *nis,* in the manuscript N for Charisius *Gramm.* 128.16 Barwick).

13. I am using X for any letter. In just the first six pages of Charisius, the sequence *X littera* appears 23 times, whereas *littera X* does not appear at all. In Quintilian, among 40 examples, 37 are *X littera* and only 3 *littera X;* moreover, in these 3 instances (1.4.11; 1.6.23; 1.7.16) there seems to be a reason for the alteration of the order: to avoid the *concursus vocalium* that Quintilian condemns in 9.4.33: "Tum vocalium concursus: quod cum accidit hiat et intersistit et quasi laborat oratio. Pessime longae, quae easdem inter se litteras committunt, sonabunt"; the usual order would have implied the sequences *atqui i, genitivō ō* and *ultimā ē* in the above-mentioned passages. Another interesting ratio is provided by Velius Longus with 90 cases of *X littera* and 9 of *littera X;* in Festus, we have 22 and 0.

14. Cf. *TLL* 1.669.70–670.13, esp. 82–84: ". . . ex praepositionem, si verbum sequeretur specto, adiecta secundae syllabae s littera, si pecto, remota scriberemus" (Quint. 1.7.4); "nominativo singulari s litteram adiciebant, ut facerent genetivum" (Charisius *Gramm.* 137.2), "accusativum autem pluralem facies, si ablativo singulari adieceris s litteram, ut ab hoc Scauro hos Scauros" (190.18), "Nomina quae ablativo casu numero singulari u littera finiuntur masculino et feminino genere adiecta s littera faciunt nominativum et

passage quoted from Quintilian [n. 14], where the opposition *adiecta/ remota* is significant). Moreover, it does not make much sense to take *non adiecta* to refer to the absence in front of a syllable of an element previously regarded as an integral part of the syllable when it is present.

But the main reason for rejecting all these conjectures is that they are unnecessary, because the transmitted text makes perfect sense in both passage **A** and passage **B**. Both are dealing with the nouns in *-es*.

Charisius (**A**) distinguishes two types: i) those forming the genitive in *i*, that is, those that have a syllable *-es pura* (with no preceding consonant): *a-ci-es aciei, al-mi-ti-es almitiei;* ii) the nouns that do not have a syllable *-es pura* because a letter is added to it (*si vero adiecta fuerit littera*) in the role of prevocalic margin, and that form the genitive in *-is: am-ba-ges am-bagis, cla-des cladis*. Two kinds of exception to this classificatory rule[15] are pointed out:

1. Nouns that, not having syllable *-es pura*, nonetheless form the genitive in *-i: spes spei, res rei,* and *fides fidei* (46.19)
2. Nouns that, having syllable *-es pura*, form the genitive in *-is: lues luis, strues struis*

To these *plebes* is added (46.22) as a word with double genitive and double nominative, and so is *fames* (47.1) as a word with double genitive:[16] their genitive in *-i* (*plebi, famei*) would make them exceptions like *spes, res, fides*.[17]

As for the Anon. (**B**), the most logical explanation of the transmitted text is that the author is conflating two sources: one that uses the perhaps more widespread formulation of the rule for nouns in *-es* and appears in the above-quoted texts from Charisius *Ars Grammatica* 87.2 and 163.3 Barwick, that is, *(non) habere i (litteram) ante es (syllabam)* (from now on, called "formulation **with** *i*"), and one that uses the formulation appearing at Charisius 46.5 (= passage **A**), that is, *syllaba es pura / adiecta littera (syllabae)* (from now on, called "formulation **without** *i*").[18] The mistake of the successive editors of both passages **A** and **B** arose precisely from their not having noticed the existence of two different formulations; by emendations they distorted the formulation **without** *i* into a mere second member

---

accusativum et vocativum pluralem . . ." (190.32). Cf. also Consentius *Gramm. Lat.* 5.391.33 "diximus per adiectionem litterae syllabae temporis accentus aspirationis fieri barbarismum. per adiectionem litterae sic fit, ut siquis dicat coperit pro operit, gruit pro ruit, tottum pro toto, cottidie pro cotidie, quandius pro quandiu; syllabae, ut si dicas tutrusit pro trusit . . ."

15. The passage is from Book 1 of Charisius' *Ars grammatica* and it belongs to chap. 14, *De nominativis ad regulam redactis.*

16. A different group is made up of the nouns increasing by a syllable, like *ales alitis, aries arietis,* because these are not covered by the rule in question. For this group, see section 2 below.

17. The text as presented by Barwick, though unnecessarily corrected, makes sense both for the rule and for the exceptions. In this case, *spes, res,* and *fides* would be nouns to which a letter *i* is not added (*si vero adiecta ⟨non⟩ fuerit ⟨i⟩ littera*) and yet form the genitive in *-i* and not in *-is* as the rule requires. And *lues, strues* would be nouns with syllable *es pura* that do not form the genitive in *-i,* but in *-is.*

18. This hypothesis is in accord with Barwick's reasoning in *Remmius Palaemon* about Charisius chap. 14 and the corresponding text in the Anon.: "Diese Bruchstücke haben aber die exc. Bob. nicht wie Char. als ein selbständiges Ganze überliefert, sondern sie *mit den Bruchstücken des anderen Kapitels kontaminiert*" (p. 14, my italics). See further Barwick, op. cit., 134–37.

of the formulation **with** *i*.[19] But the greatest corruption was to be in Bar-
wick's edition of Charisius (**A**), where, by conjecture, a formulation **with** *i*
is introduced as the second member of a formulation **without** *i*.

2

The proposed reinstatement of the readings of the manuscripts in passages
A and **B** (see p. 62) and the outlined explanation invite critical analysis of
another passage in Barwick's edition:

> *sunt etiam quae adaugentur syllaba,* licet praecedens pura sit necne, *i pura, ut abies*
> ἐλάτη *abietis, aries* κριός *arietis, non pura, ut ales* πτηνός *alitis* [alis], antistes ζάκορος
> antistitis . . . (Charisius *Gramm.* 47.2 Barwick)[20]

> Also some of them take an increment of a syllable, no matter whether the preceding
> one is pure or not, pure *i*, like *abies* ἐλάτη *abietis, aries* κριός *arietis,* not pure, like *ales*
> πτηνός *alitis [alis], antistes* ζάκορος *antistitis . . .*

> **2** * adaugent syllabam (*corr. K.*) licet **n 3** nec ne * abies abietis aries arietis ales alietis
> (alitis *corr.* ω) **n**

One can see from the critical apparatus that **n**'s evidence, on which Barwick
is relying for his reconstruction, is rather exiguous. In fact, Keil, more cau-
tious, had only dared to print the following text:

> *sunt item alia quae in genetivo* adaugentur syllaba, licet praecedens pura sit necne, *ve-*
> *lut* abies abietis, aries arietis, ales alitis [alis], antistes antistitis . . . (Charisius *Gramm.*
> 1.40.11 Keil)

> There are others that take an increment of a syllable in the genitive, no matter whether
> the preceding one is pure or not, like *abies abietis, aries arietis, ales alitis [alis], anti-*
> *stes antistitis . . .*

Barwick's reconstruction (*pura . . . non pura*) appears to be logical accord-
ing to the content of the passage,[21] but it is in my opinion mistaken at least
in one point: the *i,* which is again intrusive. Indeed, as one can easily infer
from the preceding explanations, on the one hand, the adjective *pura* does
not fit the letter *i,* given that it refers to syllables; and on the other hand, in
the examples that follow, not even the syllable containing *i* is *pura.* In my
view, the "preceding" syllable in the passage is that in the genitive, because
it is the genitive that takes an increment.[22] According to this, the pure syl-

---

19. That would have already happened, in my view, in the *editio princeps,* whose text (*si autem ⟨non⟩*
adiecta fuerit littera), although with no *i,* implies its presence from contrast with the preceding context, i.e.,
"but if (that) letter is not added." And De Nonno, though he realized that the *i* was not in the manuscript, still
maintained that ⟨*i*⟩ was a conjecture required for the sense.

20. Fragments in italics are those marked by Barwick to point out they are not legible in the main codex
N and that they are restored, if no other indication is given in the critical apparatus, following the manuscript
n (cf. p. xxv of his Praefatio).

21. Here the classification of the nouns in *-es* is completed; now Charisius is dealing with the imparisyl-
labic nouns of the third declension.

22. It is not possible to assume that the preceding syllable is the one in the nominative, because then
we would have syllabic structures as inconsistent as *a-* (*abies, aries, ales*), *an-* (*antistes*), *caes-* (*caespes*),
co- (*cocles*), etc. One can compare Charisius *Gramm.* 43.2: "Omnia nomina quae in en terminantur in nomi-
nativo casu, ea in genitivo efferuntur per nis mutata praecedente syllaba in i. . . ." where it is clear that it is
the preceding syllable in the genitive that is the one referred to (Charisius is dealing with nouns like *termen*
terminis).

lable would be made up of an *e* and not of an *i: a-bi-e-tis, a-ri-e-tis*.[23] But the *e*, a paleographically easy alternative for *i*, does not fit the *non pura* cases, where the syllable at issue has mostly an *i: a-li-tis* and so on.

Yet another contradiction in the text edited by Barwick casts doubt upon the inclusion of *pura* and *non pura*. Among the examples for *non pura*, *paries* (*pa-ri-e-tis*) and *quies* (*qui-e-tis*) appear, though they are examples that we would expect to find joined with *abies* and *aries*, examples for *pura*. Therefore, I think that, as the manuscript **n** suggests, the examples succeeded each other simply **in alphabetical order**, with no distinction of *pura* and *non pura*, and that it was just by chance that the first words (*abies* and *aries*) were examples of *non pura*. Moreover, an alphabetical list not taking into account the opposition *pura / non pura* fits perfectly with the immediately preceding context: . . . *adaugentur syllaba,*[24] *licet praecedens pura sit necne,* that is, "it does not matter whether the syllable is pure or not";[25] introducing a distinction *pura / non pura* would indeed contravene the stated rule.

I am able to offer only a negative critique of this passage, since I am not in a position to fill the gaps in the manuscript. It seems to me, however, to have been adequately demonstrated that the *i* should not be in the text. (Barwick no doubt had it in mind after including it as a conjecture in the preceding page [46.5 = passage **A**].) It is not likely, either, that the grammarian made a mistake in assigning the examples. Therefore, while I cannot myself emend to produce a more secure text, I prefer to reject Barwick's conjectures and to go back to the less risky text in Keil.

3

One could argue, against all that has been stated, that the modifications proposed in section 1, even though they explain the text of the manuscripts, are of no great consequence, since, in the final analysis, we are simply dealing with two different ways of stating a single rule. But this is precisely the point. By accepting the conjectures by Barwick and Keil-De Nonno (for Charisius and the Anon. respectively), one is erasing from those texts the formulation **without** *i*, which, in its turn, would lead to erroneous results in any eventual source study.[26] Indeed, one of the most obscure aspects of the

23. Proposing a syllabification *ab-ie-tis,* which makes no sense in the context, is not a solution either, because then the *i,* being consonantal, would function as syllabic margin and would not merit the adjective *pura.*

24. I think it is even possible to introduce a change in the punctuation of the text here, as follows: "sunt etiam quae adaugentur, syllaba licet praecedens pura sit necne." This seems, however, to have the disadvantage that the conjunction *licet* usually appears, in later Latin, in the initial position of the subordinate clause (cf. *TLL* 7.2.1364.4); but exceptions are found, especially where there is, as is the case here, a predicative relationship: cf. Apul. *De dog. Plat.* 1.18: . . . *obsequente licet et pacata cupidine;* Hegesippus 1.12.1 p.17.10: *victor licet . . . ;* in the classical period cf. Tib. 2.4.45: *centum licet annos vixerit;* Mart. 5.39.8 *Croeso divitior licet fuissem.* The change in the text does not, however, affect the sense, since *pura* refers in either version to *syllaba,* a word that, following Barwick's punctuation, is to be understood as the referent of *praecedens.*

25. In my opinion, the clause introduced by *licet* refers to the whole of the preceding formulation: it is as if the grammarian were saying: "there are, apart from those, other nouns that take an increment in the genitive, but in these cases it is no longer relevant whether the syllable is pure or it is not."

26. As pointed out above, Barwick himself (*Remmius Palaemon,* 136) cites Charisius *Gramm.* 87.2 and 87.19; *Exc. Bob.* 547.31–40 as "Parallelen" for Charisius *Gramm.* 45.19–47.2.

history of Latin grammar is that of the relationships that the texts gathered in Keil's volumes have with each other and with the previous tradition. This is not the place to deal with such a complex problem,[27] but clearly the reliability of what is said on this matter depends to a great extent on the reliability of the texts compared.

I think it possible to deduce from the distribution in grammatical texts of the two formulations distinguished above a different origin for each of them, either different sources or different passages of the same source. The formulation **with** *i* is already found in a passage ascribable to Julius Romanus (Charisius *Gramm.* 163.3)[28] and that seems in itself to indicate that the complete rule is stated in another passage of the same work (or of its source).[29] This fits well with the idea that we have of the structure of the lost work by that author.[30]

It does not seem unlikely, then, that the formulations **with** *i* in Charisius and the Anon. (i.e., Charisius *Gramm.* 87.2–11 and 87.19–25; *Exc. Bob.* 547.31–39 [see quotations pp. 63 and 62 above]) could depend on this hypothetical other place in Julius Romanus' work (or its source[31]). In fact, we can define a typology that is common to the formulation **with** *i* in Romanus, Charisius and the Anon., based on these features:

1. Explicit reference to the long nature of *-es: es litteris productis* (Charisius), *es producta* (Romanus in Charisius), *es productam* (*Exc. Bob.*)[32]
2. Reference to *quies*[33] as an exception and to the regular behavior of the compound *requies*
3. Quotation of Virgil *Aen.* 4.433

---

27. Cf. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon*, passim.

28. Among the passages that are supposed to be taken more or less literally by Charisius from this author is chap. 17 of Book 1 (149.21–187.6 Barwick), starting: *De analogia, ut ait Romanus*. Cf. A. Della Casa, "Giulio Romano nella storia della grammatica latina," in *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, ed. J. Collart (Paris, 1978), 217–24, at 220.

29. The rule seems to be introduced within the alphabetically ordered item *Es producta* only as an explanation of the exceptional character of *quies;* in other words, the content of Charisius *Gramm.* 163.4 (". . . excepto quies: quamquam enim et hoc ante es i litteram habeat, tamen quietis facit") seems to imply a previous reference to the fact that nouns with *i* before *es* form the genitive in *i*. Another fact pointing to a fuller statement of the rule somewhere else is that *res, spes, fides* are quoted as exceptions (163.8: *exceptis etiam rei spei fidei*), when they are not, in fact, exceptions to the stated rule (163.3: "Es producta finita nomina genetivo diei aciei luxuriei faciei facient"), but, as we already know, to the rule saying that nouns not having *i* before *es* form the genitive in *is*. I would go even further: the mention of the exceptions *res, spes, fides* is not comprehensible except as an implicit reference to that rule.

30. Cf. Schanz-Hosius 3.1 (§603): "Die Methode bei den einzelnen Materien war die, daß Romanus zuerst die allgemeinen Lehren vortrug, dann alphabetisch das Wortmaterial mit den Belegstellen vorführte." There is another passage of Charisius pointing out the structure of the work: 150.3: ". . . contenti paucis, quae exempli gratia Gaius Iulius Romanus sub eodem titulo exposuit. . . ."

31. In this case, there is no explicit attribution (*nominatim*) to Julius Romanus, as is sometimes the case.

32. There is, moreover, an important coincidence in the examples: *diei aciei luxuriei faciei* (Julius Romanus in Charisius [hereafter cited as Roman. Char.] 163.3), *acies dies luxuries* (Charisius *Gramm.* 87.4), *dies materies luxuries* (*Exc. Bob.* 547.32). One even feels inclined to emend the text in Roman. Char., suppressing *faciei* (i.e., . . . *diei aciei luxuriei [faciei] facient*), not only because the *facient* that follows could have caused the introduction of *faciei*, but especially because later in the text the same Romanus, referring to *quies*, uses the examples *dies, acies, luxuries* (Roman. Char. 179.24; cf. the quotation in the following footnote).

33. This word is also dealt with by Romanus in Charisius (179.23): "Quies quietis facit, cum es ⟨producta⟩ finita nomina genetivum ei soleant terminare, ut dies acies luxuries. . . ."

Moreover, in Charisius and the Anon. we can read the same formulation of the rule (*si . . . i habuerint ante es . . .* [Charisius]; *quae ante es . . . habent i litteram . . .* [*Exc. Bob.*]) as that which in Romanus appears only, as has been pointed out, to explain the unique status of *quies* (*quamquam . . . ante es i litteram habeat*). Charisius, however, is the only author who offers a complete version of the formulation **with** *i* (87.2–11 and 87.19–25; see p. 63 above), referring, as he does, to the nouns' **not having** an *i* before long *es;* the Anon., because of the above-mentioned contamination, replaces this second member of the formulation **with** *i* with the second member of the formulation **without** *i*.

The formulation **without** *i,* present in chapter 14 of Charisius' Book 1 (45.19) and as a second part of the formulation **with** *i* in the Anon. (547.36), is characterized by the use of the syllabic structure as a classificatory criterion: it distinguishes those nouns having a syllable *pura* (*si . . . pura fuerit syllaba*) from the nouns that add a consonant to the syllable (*si . . . adiecta fuerit littera*). To these another group is added: those that take an increment of one syllable (47.2: *sunt etiam quae adaugentur syllaba*). Unlike the formulation **with** *i,* attention is not paid to the quantity of *-es.*

The comparison of Charisius and the Anon., where possible (i.e., in the second part of the rule, because that is the only one appearing in the Anon.), seems to imply a common source. Certainly, the texts share the following features:

1. The way of stating the second part of the rule: *si vero adiecta fuerit littera; sin autem adiecta fuerit littera*
2. The exceptions for the second member and the way of presenting them: *corrumpuntur haec tria, spes . . . res . . . fides . . .* (Charisius *Gramm.* 46.18); *corrumpuntur autem haec tria, spes res fides . . .* (*Exc. Bob.* 547.37)
3. The reference to *fames:* "de fame ambigitur. quidam enim famis, quidam famei dixerunt genetivo" (Charisius *Gramm.* 47.1); "de fame ambigitur. quidam enim haec fames huius famis, quidam huius famei ut fidei declinaverunt" (*Exc. Bob.* 547.38)

As an argument *ex silentio* it is relevant, in the formulation **without** *i,* that no special status is given to the word *quies,* so important as an exception in the formulation **with** *i,* and here simply relegated to the group of the imparisyllabic words. An explanation is not difficult to outline: the singularity of *quies* is that it is the only word with long *-es*[34] that forms the genitive in *-etis,* and this makes no sense in a formulation where the quantity is not taken into account.

On the other hand, it is very interesting that the Anon. does not include as exceptions *lues* and *strues,* which do appear, as pointed out above, in

---

34. It is worth noting that *abies, aries,* and *paries* are nouns in long *-es* only partially, since their genitive is in short *e*. However, it seems that *paries* was also referred to by Pliny, in his *De dubio sermone,* within the item *quies,* according to Probus, *Gramm. Lat.* 4.89.1–10 ("Item quaeritur, haec quies . . . Item in hac supra dicta forma quaeritur a Plinio Secundo, paries . . . "). Perhaps the fact that Julius Romanus did not mention *paries* in his turn caused *quies* to be maintained as the only exception in Charisius' group.

Charisius (46.20). These words are exceptions to the first part of the rule,[35] which does not appear in the Anon. This is, in my opinion, a piece of information that may allow us to perceive the *modus operandi* either of the Anon. or of that "Mittelquelle" pointed out by Barwick. For on this particular point, the resultant synthesis, although contaminating two sources or distinct parts in the same source, is coherent.

But we can go even further in our search for remarks on the nouns in *-es* in the history of Latin grammar. It is likely that, already before Quintilian, some grammarian (his teacher Palaemon?) had dealt with them, pointing out their flexional variety, to judge from the remark of Quintilian himself about the singularity of the genitive *Cereris* (Quint. 1.6.14): "Item, cum es litteris finita per varios exeant genetivos, numquam tamen eadem ris syllaba terminatos, 'Ceres' cogat dici 'Cereris'?" But even more interesting is the fact that from Probus' *Instituta artium* (4.89.1, quoted in n. 34 above)[36] we can deduce that there was in Pliny's *De dubio sermone* an entry for the word *quies,* which perhaps appeared in Julius Romanus and which, finally, could have found its reflection in Charisius' formulation with *i,* where this word, as we have seen, played an important role as an exception. The ascription of the origin of the formulation with *i* to Pliny is supported by several factors: a general one is the importance of Pliny as a source of the Charisius group, proved by A. Mazzarino;[37] a more specific one is the ascription of the item *poematorum* (Roman. Char. 179.12) to Pliny,[38] given that it directly precedes the item *quies* in Charisius. To these arguments, I would add the presence of the phraseology of the formulation with *i* in several grammatical passages from Pliny: specifically the use of *ante "A" "B" habere,*[39] which appears at least seven times in the preserved fragments of Pliny's *De dubio sermone.*[40]

The formulation without *i,* that is, the one using the concept of *syllaba pura,* should very probably be placed within a "Palaemonian" context. Barwick points out that Charisius' chapter 14, which he owes to the "Gewährsmann" (= Cominianus), is closely relying on chapter 10, reputedly by

---

35. That is, for . . . *genetivum faciunt in i, si tamen pura fuerit syllaba* (Charisius *Gramm.* 45.20); indeed, *lues* and *strues* do have syllable *es pura,* but they make the genitive in *-is,* not in *-i.*

36. On the problems concerning the authorship of this work, edited by Keil, cf. *Restauration et renouveau* (n. 4 above), §522.4.

37. A. Mazzarino, "Una nuova pagina di Plinio il Vecchio," *Maia* 1 (1948): 200–222 and 2 (1949): 43–53.

38. Also by Mazzarino (*Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta aetatis Caesareae* [Turin, 1955], 223).

39. A and B stand for any letter or letter-sequence.

40. Mazzarino, "Una nuova pagina" (n. 37 above), 208, had pointed to *habere* among the Plinian expressions used to refer to the end of a word, but he quoted only one of the seven fragments of Pliny's *De dubio sermone* that I provide here: ". . . haec genetivo plurali ante um i litteram habere debent" (Charisius *Gramm.* 173.23); ". . . ut canes, quando genetivus pluralis horum canum ante um i non habet" (ibid. 174.22); "nomina semper pluralia, si ante novisimam a litteram i habebunt . . ." (ibid. 181.32); "si autem ante a i non habebunt . . ." (ibid. 182.1); "Lucius Aemilius et cetera nomina quae ante u habent i duplici i genetivo singulari finiri debent . . ." (ibid. 98.17); "ea enim nomina quae i ante a habent, ut cetaria, in bus necesse est desinant" (ibid. 160.5); ". . . et quando aliquam habet ante se in eadem syllaba consonantem . . ." (Prisc. *Gramm. Lat.* 2.29.11). Anyway, this seems to have been a rather common phraseology, e.g., (Charisius on the second declension) "item quae ante us syllabam i habent sic declinantur geminata i in genetivo . . ." (Charisius *Gramm.* 21.11); "quae ante um habent i similiter declinantur geminata i in genetivo . . ." (ibid. 21.17).

Remmius Palaemon.[41] From this we cannot determine whether the formulation is due to Palaemon or to Cominianus himself, but the consideration of another passage will help us to do so. In Charisius *Gramm.* 147.32 the adverb *pure* is used in the very same sense as that of one of this article's key concepts, *syllaba pura*;[42] the portion of text where that use appears has been ascribed to Palaemon on the basis of its terminology and introductory phrase.[43] Finally, it is not irrelevant to say that our key concept *syllaba pura* happens to appear also in the *Catholica Probi* (texts in n. 8 above), which is said to be an "altered version" of Book 2 of Plotius Sacerdos' *Ars grammatica*;[44] in his turn, Sacerdos was the teacher of (and source for) Cominianus.

In spite of the remaining uncertainties, it seems to me worthwhile to have highlighted the distinction of the two traditions for the classification of the nouns in *-es* that appear in the "florilège"[45] that is Charisius' *Ars grammatica*. That distinction had been totally obscured by the conjectures made in Barwick's canonical edition.[46]

University of Zaragoza

---

41. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon,* 14: "die Darstellung [of chapter 14] sich ursprünglich vielfach eng an die Palaemonische des 10. Kapitels anlehnte." See further pp. 134–36.

42. Charisius *Gramm.* 147.32: "non minus autem excipimus ex comparationibus quaecumque nomina us pure proferuntur, velut strenuus necessarius et similia."

43. Cf. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon,* 113 on the "Palaemonian" use of *velut* (instead of *ut*) and *ordo* (instead of *declinatio*). The introductory phrase is Charisius *Gramm.* 146.29 (*Aliis ita placuit definire*), where *definire* has been recognized as the verb used by Cominianus to introduce other grammarians' points of view, mostly Palaemon's: cf. Barwick, op. cit., 64–66 and *Restauration et renouveau,* §523.1, Bibl. 3 (*fragmenta*). It is noteworthy that the alternative formulation appears at 145.13 ("sed ex his quae ante us e aut i habent comparationes fieri non possunt. neque enim ab idoneo idoneor fieri potest . . ."), before the phrase with *definire,* consequently considered a fragment of Cominianus (see *Restauration et renouveau*), and again in a Palaemonian context on 242.6 ("sed ex his quae e ante us habent et i ante us comparationes fieri non possunt. neque enim ab idoneo idoneor fieri potest . . ."), which, in my opinion, must be seen as a portion coming from a different source, for the paragraph itself makes very little sense inserted in a place in which the endings of the *adverbia qualitatis et quantitatis* are dealt with.

44. Cf. J. Tolkiehn, *Cominianus: Beiträge zur römischen Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1910), 158; *Restauration et renouveau,* §522.3. Sacerdos himself uses *pura* several times in the same sense: e.g., Sacerdos *Gramm. Lat.* 6.471.2, 474.27.

45. L. Holtz, "Sur les traces de Charisius," in *Varron,* ed. Collart (n. 28 above), 225–33, at 225.

46. The preparation by I. G. Taifacos of a new edition of Charisius must be warmly welcomed (see the "Nachricht" in *Gnomon* 71 [1999]: 95–96).