

TEXTUAL AND LINGUISTIC NOTES ON THE *HERMENEUMATA CELTIS* AND THE *CORPUS* *GLOSSARIORUM*

The following notes are meant as a small contribution to the interpretation of the important late-antique bilingual school text virtually discovered by Carlotta Dionisotti, which has come to be known as *Hermeneumata Celtis* (ÖNB, *Supplementum Graecum* 43) and is notable, alongside the other colloquial texts printed in Goetz's *Corpus glossariorum*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1892), for preserving a great number of everyday terms and phrases, of which we would otherwise be ignorant. Dionisotti's acumen and accuracy in editing this text for the first time in 1982 left almost no room for improvement, but in the intervening years new research tools, especially in Greek lexicography, have become available, and some small progress seems possible. In addition, I draw on my own research on the glossary attached to the Vienna *Colloquium*, which I plan to edit with a commentary in the near future. In presenting the following extracts, *Vind.* designates *Colloquium Vindobonense*. Unlike Dionisotti, I generally normalize the spelling and morphology of the Greek in the extracts, except when the exact interpretation of a word is the point at issue.¹

Vind. 4: The MS *ἵνα ὀρθριοῦμεν* / *ut manicemus* ('[time for us] to rise and go [to school]') is interpreted by Dionisotti as a case of *ἵνα* with a contracted future *ὀρθριοῦμεν*. She observed rightly that the spelling with simple omicron for contracted -ου- is attested in Hellenistic and Imperial papyri.² The use of future forms in final clauses is sometimes on record, for example in the NT, but the translators of *Hermeneumata* materials, including the *Celtis Colloquium*, seem to avoid that (in *Vind.* cf. 12 *προερχέτω* / *procedat*; 55 *καταβῶμεν* / *descendamus*; the only ambiguous case is 28 *ἵνα δυνήσομεν* / *ut possimus*, which might represent a subjunctive with the usual confusion of omicron and omega). However, the palaeographic confusion of sigma and omicron is a well-attested feature in the transmission of Western medieval bilingual glossaries, and goes back

¹ For an edition of the *Colloquium* and detailed information about what is known of the discovery of the MS by the German Humanist Conrad Celtis see A.C. Dionisotti, 'From Ausonius' schooldays? A school-book and its relatives', *JRS* 72 (1982), 83–125. Partial editions of the glossary are: J. Kramer, 'Die Ämterliste aus dem Wiener Celtis-Glossar', in B. Palme (ed.), *Wiener Papyri, als Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Hermann Harrauer* (Wien, 2001), 249–65; J. Kramer, 'Lateinisches-Griechisches Glossar: Celtis' Abschrift aus einem Papyruskodex', in J.M.S. Cowey and B. Kramer (edd.), *Paramone. Editionen und Aufsätze von Mitgliedern des Heidelberger Instituts für Papyrologie zwischen 1982 und 2004* (Leipzig, 2004), 43–62; P. Gatti, 'Nomi di pesci negli *Hermeneumata Celtis*', *ALMA* 64 (2006), 105–21. I have put forward some other proposals and corrections on the text of these *Colloquia* in 'Il latino dei *Colloquia scholica*', in F. Bellandi, R. Ferri (edd.), *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano* (Amsterdam, 2008), 111–77.

² Cf. F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, v. 1: *Phonology* (Milano, 1976), 212.

to the similarity of the two letters in Greek uncial script. So perhaps *ορθριομεν* is at least just as likely to be a haplography for an aorist conjunctive *ὀρθρίσωμεν* with the confusion between long and short [ο] (also a common one).

Vind. 37: λαμβάνουσι τόπον, παραίνεσιν, ἀμφισβήτησιν ... πρόφασιν τοῦ Ἰλιακοῦ πολέμου, πρόφασιν τῆς ἀναγορεύσεως / *accipiunt locum, suasoriam, controuersiam ... causas Troici belli, materiam recitationis*. The extract comes from the interesting school scene, at the point when the older pupils are assigned some work from the teacher, which they take to their places and ponder on: so ‘they take a passage, a *suasoria*, a *controuersia* ... the causes of the Trojan war, the matter for reading out’. The final item, however, *πρόφασιν*, is a repetition of the previous, and does not match the Latin well (‘motive, cause, purpose’ or ‘preface’). A ‘preface’, Lt. *praefatio*, is acceptable for a mature declaimer who goes over the main points with the audience before plunging into his chosen theme (as in the famous passage in Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.31),³ but this is not appropriate in the context, because *recitatio* can only be ‘reading aloud’ an assigned passage. The students learn to read out a text from one of the classic school authors with proper pauses, sense and intonation, and doubtless with an appropriate *actio* – demanding enough as an exercise if the text is continuous and without punctuation. This cannot be a translator’s mistake, and I suggest changing *πρόφασιν* to *ὑπόθεσιν*,⁴ meaning the actual text to read from, rather than one to elaborate upon extemporaneously.

Vind. 47: πρόσθεθες θερμαντήρα καὶ πλείονας χύτρας / *adpone cusciniā et plures ollas*. Dionisotti interpreted the unparalleled *cusciniā* as an eccentric spelling of *culina* (also found as *coquina*, *quoquina*, *coxilina*), meaning ‘portable stove’. However, the two passages mentioned by Courtney at Juv. 3.250 *sequitur sua quemque culina* are satirical caricatures, and there is no proof that the standard term for ‘stove’ in Latin was *culina*. In fact the MS reading seems to me to be *cuscumam*, for *cu(c)cumam*, ‘kettle’, usually *θερμόφορον* in *CGL* (= *θερμαντήρ*), but also found in the hitherto unpublished glossary at *tit.* 27.63 (*περὶ ἀργυρείων*), f. 36v, *θερμοφύλαξ*, and *tit.* 24.112 (*περὶ ἐνδομενίας*), f. 35v, *χαλκίον*, all meaning the same thing. The extract thus means ‘put on the kettle and several pots’.

Vind. 52: ἡταραυλου ολιγον / *laridi quippiam*, ‘some salted meat’. In fact, on inspection, the MS reading is *ταρυλου* (Celtis blotted out the alpha) or possibly even *ταρυχου*, because lambda and chi are very similar in Celtis’ own Greek hand. In the hitherto unpublished glossary, at *tit.* 34.50 (*περὶ βρωμάτων*), we read *laridum ταριχηρόν*, which seems to confirm *ταρίχου ὀλίγον* as the correct reading here.

Vind. 58: ἀλλαξιμαρ / *delatorium*. The section lists various rooms and facilities in a bath establishment, but many Greek and Latin words occurring here are not on record. Dionisotti reads *ἀλλάξιμαρ* followed by a colon mark, usually employed here to mark a punctuation break, or an abbreviated word. On inspection I would preferably read ‘*ἀλλαξιμαρι*’, and take this as one of the numerous

³ *Nam memini iuuenis admodum inter Pomponium ac Senecam etiam praefationibus esse tractatum an ‘gradus eliminat’ in tragoedia dici oportuisset.*

⁴ In the glossary, at *tit.* 20.82 (*περὶ γραμματοδιδασκαλείου*) f. 34v, we read *materia παράφρασις*, but this, though attractive palaeographically, does not seem to yield the required sense.

cases in which rebinding has cut out part of a word, especially in the margins. Whichever the case, the MS reading seems to stand for *-άριον*, hitherto only known to mean ‘change of clothes’ (LSJ and Suppl.; J. Kramer [ed.], *Glossaria bilingua altera* [München–Leipzig, 2001], 96). However, thanks to advances in Greek lexicographical tools, chiefly the electronic *TLG* and the (still in progress) Vienna *Lexikon der Byzantinischen Gräzität*, we now know that the word occurs in Ps-Kodinos, *De officiis* p. 172.7 (first half of the XIV century according to its most recent editor, Jean Verpeaux [Paris, 1966]), where the word is equalled to the Latinism *βεστιάριον*, ‘vestry’ (*LBG Umkleidekammer*).⁵ The Latin *delatorium* presumably means the same, ‘a place where one takes off and deposits one’s clothes’, or ‘cubbyhole’, as suggested by Dionisotti.

Vind. 61: *extergite me, caput et humeros* should be altered to *extergite mi caput et humeros*, to make it match the Greek *ἐξμάξατέ μου τὴν κεφαλὴν, <τοὺς> ὤμους*: cf. the similar passage at *CGL* 3.217.31–3 (*Monac.*) *κατάμαξόν μου κεφαλὴν καὶ πόδας, terge mihi caput et pedes*. In the Greek, the genitive may perhaps be genuine, rather than a mistake for the expected dative, since the genitive progressively ousts the dative in koine Greek. In Ferri (n. 1), 155 I suggested reading *extergite me caput* etc., on the analogy of the Greek double accusative, but I think now the dative is preferable. The other example of reflexive usage or ‘Greek’ double accusative I discuss there, *CGL* 3.287.23–4 *ὑποδησάτω μέ τις τὰ λώρια. δός ἐνδύσω με* / *calciet me aliquis gallicas. da uestiam me* (‘let someone shoe me my Gallic shoes; give me something to put on’), a punctuation I would adopt in preference on Goetz’s *calciet me aliquis. gallicas da. uestiam me* (τὰ λωρία δός. ἐνδύσωμαι), 657, I can now better support by comparison with *Vulg. Act.* 12.8 *ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου* / *praecingere et calcia te gallicas tuas*. For the use of the bare subjunctive after *dare* cf. *CGL* 3.284.39 *δός ἀναγνώ* / *da legam*; Plaut. *Stich.* 757 *date bibat tibicini*.

Vind. 66: *quis sic facit dominus quomodo tu?*. In fact, the MS reading seems to me to be *domine* (abbreviated: *dne*), slightly preferable in a document where words are rarely in hyperbaton. The abbreviated nominative *dn(us)* occurs later at 71, and looks very different. The reading carries no definite clues to the identity of the speaker (an outraged wife, as suggested by Dionisotti, or a pedagogue). The standard term for third-person descriptions of people of free birth in these *Colloquia* is *pater familias* / *οἰκοδεσπότης* (cf. *Vind.* 10 *ut decet ... filium familias, hominem ingenuum*; *CGL* 3.110 *controuersiam facere non est bonum libero homini*

⁵ ὁπνίκα γοῦν δεήσει τὸν βασιλέα καβαλλικεῦσαι, φέρει τὰ ὑποδήματα παιδόπουλον τοῦ βεστιάριον ἐντός, οὕτω κοινῶς ὀνομαζομένου ἀλλαξιμαρίου, ‘when the king needs to mount on horse, a servant takes his shoes to the vestry, commonly called the *allaximarion*’. The parallel, however, raises the question of the date and reliability of the Greek translation, which is, as Dionisotti observed, derivative and often not idiomatic. Although the Greek of the glossary is certainly ancient, some later Greek forms may have made their way into it. In the *colloquium*, Greek forms such as 71 *προηλθισιν* / *praecesserunt*, 77 *ἤλθουσιν* / *uenerunt* and above all 75, 77 *σταθῆται* (also with the spelling *-τε*) / *sistitur* have no parallels even in the Greek of papyri and may indeed be very late vulgarisms. A.N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar, chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (London, 1897), 996¹¹⁸ quotes *σταθῶ* as a medieval back-formation from the perfect *ἔστηκα*. In my forthcoming contribution ‘*Hermeneumata Celtis*: the genesis and the sources of a bilingual glossary’, in R. Ferri (ed.), *The Latin of Roman Lexicographers* (in press), I argue that *HC* is a combination of various sources, including at least one Atticist monolingual lexicon, possibly of Byzantine date.

et patri familias).

Vind. 73: ἑκατόνταρχοι τοῦ χαλκοῦ προστίμων / centuriones e caminis pretium. 'The centurions [come round to raise] the tribute on copper', *sc. exigunt*. The MS reading *e caminis* makes no sense with the Greek τοῦ χαλκοῦ. Dionisotti suggested altering the Greek to χαλκείου, meaning 'copper furnace' to match *caminus* 'smelting-furnace', and A. Giardina conjectured *e camisiis*, for 'wrought-iron mail'.⁶ The best solution seems to me to read *eraminis* for *aeraminis*, which clearly suits τοῦ χαλκοῦ best. If accepted, this yields an important clue to the date of Celtis' *exemplar*, thought by Kramer to be a late-antique papyrus codex.⁷ In fact, the palaeography of this mistake, confusion *r/c*, weakens the thesis that the Sponheim MS transcribed by Celtis (n. 1) was part of an extensive sixth-century papyrus codex written in uncial script (the 'BR' type), of which the only extant fragments are the so-called Walraff and Helmstadt fragments.⁸ Confusion *c/r* is compatible with a late-antique hand, for example half-uncial script, as well as with medieval minuscule script, but certainly not with the script of the *Fragmenta Walraffianum* and *Helmstadtense*.⁹ Moreover, the markedly itacistic character of the Greek in *Supplementum Graecum* 43 is a long way from the moderate itacism of the above-mentioned late-antique glossaries, where for example extensive confusion of *u/v/ou* is absent. None of this is very revealing about the nature of the Greek script, but it does seem to weaken the late-antique chronology offered by Kramer. It is at least equally likely that Celtis' *exemplar* was a Carolingian MS no different from other *Hermeneumata* MSS, e.g. Montepessulanus H 306 and Harleianus 5642, though one in which a native speaker or someone acquainted with the current pronunciation of Greek left a trace through dictation or transcription.

CGL 3.108.27–30: uide ne quam consuetudinem facias / ὅρα μήτινα ἀναστροφὴν ποιήσεις. Latin lexicography ignores the meaning of *consuetudinem facio* which is required here, that is 'make conversation', or, more colloquially 'hang about' (the addressee is a young pupil who receives admonition from his father or from a tutor, 'mind you don't hang about with people', presumably on the way to school).¹⁰ *Consuetudo*, obviously, is well known for 'common language', and as a sociolinguistic term, but this further colloquial expression has eluded notice so far. However, one parallel has come out in *Acta apostolorum apocrypha, actus Petri cum Simone* 32 (Lipsius): ἐλθὲ καὶ παρέδρενε / ueni et fac consuetudinem 'come and make companionship with us'.¹¹ The Latin version is uncertain in date; Lipsius ascribed it to the fifth century.

⁶ 'L'impero e il tributo (gli *Hermeneumata* di Sponheim e altri testi)', *RFIC* 113 (1985), 309–27, esp. 320.

⁷ Kramer (n. 1, 2004), 43–7.

⁸ For editions with commentary of these fragments see J. Kramer, *ZPE* 39 (1980), 161–79 and *ZPE* 40 (1980), 229–43.

⁹ Other errors in the Latin of the *Celtis Hermeneumata* suggestive of minuscule rather than capital or uncial hands are: 56 'colla' for *tolle*; 61 'inuestite' for *ite, uestite*; 67 'accidit' for *accedit*. I give a much fuller list of Latin errors pointing to faulty transcription from minuscule script in my forthcoming contribution (see above, n. 5).

¹⁰ *TLL* s.v. 560.40 lists the passage under the subentry for 'friendship, familiarity', but the phrase seems to presuppose an acquired phraseological meaning.

¹¹ Some comment is offered by M.C. Baldwin, *Whose Acts of Peter? Text and Historical Context of the Actus Vercellenses* (Tübingen, 2002), 268 n. 240, who remarks on the difference between the Greek παρέδρενε and the Latin *consuetudinem fac*.

CGL 3.111.43–4 (Harleianus): εσπαζόμενσε τριτημερα / *salutabam te die tertio*. Goetz, 641 wrote ἡσπαζόμην σε τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ / *salutabam te die tertio*. The third volume of *CGL* came out in 1892; only one year earlier, Kenyon had published Herodas,¹² where the adverbial form τριθημέρα was found (3.24), which is how the passage should be written now. Interestingly, Claude Saumaise's unpublished collation from what he called *colloquia scholastica* in *Par. Lat.* 7683, noticed by A.C. Dionisotti,¹³ amongst other things transmits the form *diestertium* (f. 41r, *salutabam te diestertium* ἡσπαζομένην σε τριτήμερα). *Diestertium* strikes one as close to the adverbial *nudius tertius*, for *nunc dies tertius est*, found from early Latin down to the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate (cf. *Vetus Latina*, Exod. 4.10 (Codex Lugdunensis) *non sum dignus ante hesternam uel nudutertiam diem*, for which another MS has *ante ... dustertianum diem*; Vulg. Acts 10.30 *a nudius quartana die usque in hanc horam orans eram*). *Diestertium*, with its lack of agreement, may have been corrupt in Salmasius' MS, but it may well conceal an original 'vulgar' time adverbial, perhaps something along the lines of **diustertius*. Lastly, I shall just mention that the form *nustertius* 'two days ago' occurs in *Hermeneumata Ensidlensia*, *CGL* 3.296 (comment in G. Loewe, *Prodromus corporis glossariorum Latinorum*, Leipzig, 1876, 206).

CGL 3.110.39–40: ψευδεται οειπονσοι / *mentitur quid tibi dixit* (Harleianus). Goetz, 640, wrote ψεύδεται ὁ εἰπέν σοι, *mentitur quod tibi dixit*. However, on the basis of the MS reading, it seems equally possible to write ψεύδεται ὁ εἰπών σοι, *mentitur qui tibi dixit*, 'he who told you, lied' (previously, the Latin was: *audiui omnia apud alumnum tuum*, 'I heard it all [i.e. that he skipped school] at your teacher's' or 'from your teacher'. The passage has been transmitted also in a Prague papyrus, edited by Kramer and included in *Glossaria bilinguia altera*, vol. 2 (2001), 83–9. The Latin here was not preserved, but the Greek reads οκοιειπ[, which Kramer supplements εἰπ[εν. There are supporting parallels for ὁ εἰπών even with this word order, with the personal pronoun inserted between the article and the participle: cf. Io. Chrys. *In Genes.* 53.315 ὁ σοι παρασχὼν τὴν τοσαύτην δαψίλειαν; Ephraem Syr. *Sermones paraenetic* 47.47 οὐ πᾶς ὁ μοι λέγων, Κύριε Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

CGL 3.213.45: *idu ostiarios / ecce ostiarius* (Monacen.)] Both Krumbacher¹⁴ and Goetz (ibid. p. 649) sidelined the MS evidence and wrote standard Greek θυρωρός (*ἰδὸν ὁ θυρωρός / ecce ostiarius*). We now know that the Latin loan-word δστιάριος was in use as early as the fourth century A.D., and there is no reason not to retain it here.

Università di Pisa

ROLANDO FERRI
r.ferri@flcl.unipi.it

¹² F.G. Kenyon, *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1891).

¹³ A.C. Dionisotti, 'From Stephanus to Du Cange: glossary stories' *RHT* 14–15 (1984–5), 303–36, esp. 328–9 and n. 3.

¹⁴ K. Krumbacher, 'Colloquium Pseudodositheanum Monacense', in *Ars. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, W. von Christ zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Schülern* (München, 1891), 307–64.