

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLII

HELSINKI 2008

INDEX

LUIGI ARATA	<i>Impieghi del λιβυστικόν nella medicina greca antica Una possibile identificazione della pianta</i>	9
DAVID J. BUTTERFIELD	<i>Supplementa Lucretiana</i>	17
VIRGINIA L. CAMPBELL	<i>Stopping to Smell the Roses: Garden Tombs in Roman Italy</i>	31
MAURIZIO COLOMBO	<i>I soprannomi trionfali di Costantino: una revisione critica della cronologia corrente</i>	45
RAMÓN GUTIÉRREZ GONZÁLEZ	<i>A Note on Juvenal 11,156: pupillares testiculi</i>	65
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Julia Kallitekno and Gaius Caesar at Euromus</i>	69
PETER KRUSCHWITZ	<i>CIL VIII 19 Revisited</i>	77
CHRISTIAN LAES	<i>Learning from Silence: Disabled Children in Roman Antiquity</i>	85
TUOMO LANKILA	<i>Proclus' Art of Referring with a Scale of Epithet</i>	123
AVGI-ANNA MAGGEL	<i>The Invention of a Deceptive Dialogue: Reconsidering the False-Merchant scene in Sophocles' Philoctetes</i>	135
ANNA REINIKKA	<i>On the Attribution of a Latin Schoolgrammar Transmitted in MS Clm 6281</i>	147
RONALD T. RIDLEY	<i>Gaetano de Sanctis and the Missing Storia dei Romani</i>	159
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Some Observations on the Use of the Pronoun hic haec hoc in Latin Inscriptions</i>	181
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>The So-Called Division of the Roman Empire in AD 39 Notes on a Persistent Theme in Modern Historiography</i>	199
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXLIV–CCLI</i>	215

JAANA VAAHTERA	<i>On Grammatical Gender in Ancient Linguistics – The Order of Genders</i>	247
DAVID WOODS	<i>Tiberius, Tacfarinas, and the Jews</i>	267
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	285
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	343
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	347
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	355

ON THE ATTRIBUTION OF A LATIN SCHOOLGRAMMAR TRANSMITTED IN MS CLM 6281*

ANNA REINIKKA

In this article I will examine the attribution of an unpublished Late Antique grammar, known today as *Ars Scauri*. The text was first identified as an independent *ars grammatica* in 1987 by Vivien Law, who argued for the attribution of this grammar to a 2nd century AD grammarian, Q. Terentius Scaurus.¹ Her argument has, surprisingly enough, not received a lot of attention, and the attribution to Scaurus has not been questioned. As the text contains some doctrinal aspects which speak against this attribution and as Law failed to consider these in her article, I feel that the matter of the attribution of this text deserves another look. Also, when writing her 1987 article, Vivien Law regarded Dionysius Thrax's *Tekhne Grammatike* as authentic.² The *Tekhne*, which was long regarded as the first treatise on grammar in the Western tradition, is increasingly considered as inauthentic, a fact which obviously has an impact on the attribution of this unpublished grammar, since the beginnings of Latin schoolgrammar, too, have to be reconsidered. The untimely death of

* A talk on this topic was given at the eleventh international conference on the history of the language sciences (ICHoLS XI) in Potsdam on 1.9.2008. The author has received support for this research from the Finnish Academy (project number 1210927) and the Finnish Cultural Foundation.

¹ V. Law, "An Unnoticed Late Latin Grammar: The *Ars Minor* of Scaurus?", *RhM* 131 (1987) 67–89.

² This obviously had implications on her attribution of the text. Later she came to regard the *Tekhne* as inauthentic (except for the beginning of the text); see e.g. V. Law, "Roman Evidence on the Authenticity of the Grammar Attributed to Dionysius Thrax", in H. J. Niederehe – K. Koerner (eds.), *History and Historiography of Linguistics* I, Amsterdam – Philadelphia 1990, 89–96 and V. Law, "The *Technè* and Grammar in the Roman World", in V. Law & I. Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the *Technè Grammatikè**, Münster 1995, 111–119.

Vivien Law prevented her from finishing the edition of this grammar she had in preparation.³

In her 1987 article Law identified a previously unknown grammar in a 9th century manuscript from Freising (CIm 6281) and attributed it to a 2nd century AD grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus.⁴ This text had escaped the notice of scholars, as it contains no title or *explicit*, and was taken to be a continuation of the preceding work, *Explanationes in artem Donati* by Sergius. Heinrich Keil's inaccurate description of the manuscript⁵ seems to have contributed to this view, which was repeated in many later descriptions of the manuscript.⁶ Due to this misunderstanding,⁷ the nature of the text was also misinterpreted (see n. 5). Rather than a series of excerpts, it is a complete, independent *ars grammatica* approximately one-and-a-half times the length of Donatus' *Ars minor*. Following Law's practice, the unedited text will be referred to as M throughout this article.⁸ In this article I will argue that the author of this unpublished grammar is not the 2nd century AD grammarian, Q. Terentius Scaurus, as Law suggested.

I shall now consider the main arguments Law presents in favour of her attribution. Firstly, there are four passages attributed to a Scaurus in Sergius' *Explanationes in artem Donati*,⁹ which recur verbatim in M.¹⁰ Several other

³ See Law (above n. 1) 70 n. 9.

⁴ Later we find a somewhat different view; compare, for example Law 1990 (above n. 2) 92: "Varro's solution reemerges (whether consciously or coincidentally) in a grammar of the second or third century AD ascribed to a grammarian called Scaurus (though whether he was identical with the renowned Q. Terentius Scaurus is open to question [Law 1987])."

⁵ "f. 27 *Incipit expositum sergii de octo partibus orationis. Oratio dicitur - f. 52 proferuntur: Sergii explanationes in Donatum 487,22–518,29. f. 52 De littera. Littera dicta est - f. 62* de interiectione et siqua sunt similia: excerpta ex Donati arte maiore et Sergii in eam explanationibus."*

H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* (henceforth *GL*) 4, xlv. However, the sequence of the abovementioned *explicit* and *incipit* does not occur on f. 52r but on f. 49v. The folios 49v–52r contain a copy of one further chapter of the *Explanationes* (*GL* 4, 518,31–522,12). This chapter concludes on f. 52r with the words *sed ubicumque adspiratio est uocalis est*. The unpublished grammar begins immediately after these words with the chapter heading *DE ARTE*. See Law (above n. 1) 69.

⁶ E.g. G. Thomas, *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis I 3*, Monachii 1873.

⁷ For a detailed description, see Law (above n. 1) 68–71.

⁸ I am preparing a scholarly edition of M as a part of my doctoral thesis under the supervision of docent Anneli Luhtala of the University of Helsinki.

⁹ *GL* 4, 486, 9–10; 535, 5–6; 560, 19–28; 562, 1–16.

¹⁰ For a detailed comparison, see Law (above n. 1) 71–73.

passages in the *Explanationes*, for which the source is not named, also agree almost word for word with M.¹¹ Thus it appears that at the time *Explanationes in artem Donati* was compiled, i.e. at some stage in the late 5th or the 6th century, this text was in circulation and was known (at least to the author of the *Explanationes*) as the work of (one) Scaurus. Secondly, in the text itself there is a tantalizing example that could, according to Law,¹² hint at the author of the work. The section on the pronoun begins with the standard definition: *Pronomen est pars orationis, quae pro ipso posita nomine minus quidem plene idem tamen significat*, but what follows is not recorded in any other grammar: *Nam cum debeam dicere 'artem Scaurus scripsit' dico 'artem ille scripsit' et pro 'artem Scaurus scripsisti' dico 'artem tu scripsisti'*.¹³ This example could reveal the author's identity, Law suggests. She also considers the possibility that this example could be the reason Sergius attributed the text to Scaurus. So according to Law, "Sergius' attribution cannot be accepted *ohne weiteres*".¹⁴

Law then considers some of the other passages attributed to Scaurus in the corpus of Latin grammatical texts. She disregards passages which obviously derive from commentaries on literary texts and concentrates on those which seem to contain some of Scaurus' grammatical doctrine.¹⁵ Such passages quoted in the grammar of Charisius primarily concern particular words or wordforms and have no counterparts in M,¹⁶ while those quoted in the *ars grammatica* of Diomedes are more valuable to us, as they contain, for example, definitions of grammatical terms. Three of the passages attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus concern the *vitia et virtutes orationis*,¹⁷ which are not discussed in M at all,¹⁸ and are thus of no use in trying to establish links between Scaurus' doctrine and M.

¹¹ See Law (above n. 1) 73 n. 13.

¹² Law (above n. 1) 73.

¹³ Law (above n. 1) 73 n. 15.

¹⁴ Law (above n. 1) 74 n. 15.

¹⁵ See Law (above n. 1) 74. The one passage attributed to Scaurus in Priscian's *Institutiones* (GL 2, 547,10) was not considered by Law in her discussion because of its anecdotal nature, and although Audax's work is titled *Audacis excerpta de Scauro et Palladio*, he never mentions sources for particular passages in the text, thus preventing us from identifying the grammatical doctrine attributable to Scaurus.

¹⁶ Law (above n. 1) 75.

¹⁷ See GL 1, 444,29f.; 449,26f.; 456,27–29, which contain Scaurus' definitions of *hypozeugis*, *macrologia* and *tropus*, respectively.

¹⁸ See Law (above n. 1) 75–76 for a discussion whether or not M originally contained a book on *vitia et virtutes orationis*.

The definitions of *adverbium* and *oratio* which Diomedes attributes to Scaurus offer us the possibility to compare Scaurus' doctrine with M. The definition of *oratio* presents problems for Law's thesis, a fact which she acknowledges,¹⁹ it being highly unlikely, even allowing for textual corruption, that the following two definitions would have the same source. The definition found in M reads: *oratio est significantibus uocibus secundum rationem ordinata sententia*,²⁰ while Diomedes quotes Scaurus' definition as: *Scaurus sic, oratio est ore missa et per dictiones ordinata pronuntiatio*.²¹ The comparison between the definitions of the adverb produces similar results. The definition found in M closely resembles the definitions contained in many Late Antique grammars: *adverbium est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat aut mutat*.²² The definition reported by Diomedes has nothing in common with the one found in M: *Scaurus ita definit, aduerbium est modus rei dictionis ipsa pronuntiatione definitus, ut recte diligenter optime*.²³

This, in my view, would strongly suggest that Scaurus *apud* Diomedes, generally assumed to be the 2nd century AD grammarian, Q. Terentius Scaurus, and the author of M are not identical. It is only in the 3rd century AD that definitions of parts of speech in Latin grammatical texts can definitely be seen to take the form of "*x est pars orationis*" (x is a part of speech), that is, the form of the philosopher's substantial definition.²⁴ The definitions that have been preserved from the preceding centuries, including those attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes, do not conform to this type, which became the standard method in Late Antique grammars. I will quote examples of the leisurely defining practices of the 1st century AD grammarian, Remmius Palaemon, to whom the following definitions have been attributed by Charisius: *interiectiones sunt quae*

¹⁹ Law (above n. 1) 76–7.

²⁰ Law (above n. 1) 77.

²¹ *GL* 1, 300,19f.

²² See for example the definition used by Donatus, 640, 2–3: *Aduerbium est pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque inplet, ut iam faciam uel non faciam*. (Donatus = L. Holtz (ed.), *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical, étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion [IVe – IXe siècle] et édition critique*, Paris 1981.)

²³ *GL* 1, 403,20–21.

²⁴ A. Luhtala, "On Definitions in Ancient Grammar", in P. Swiggers – A. Wouters (eds.), *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, Leuven 2002, 257–285, esp. 273.

*nihil docibile habent, significant tamen adfectum animi,*²⁵ and *praepositiones sunt dictae ex eo quod praeponantur tam casibus quam verbis,*²⁶ and *coniunctionum quaedam sunt principales, aliae subsequentes, aliae mediae;*²⁷ the last one amounts to a division rather than a definition. Etymological definitions seem to have played a prominent part in grammatical exegesis from the beginning, and they continued to be used alongside the substantial definitions in Late Antiquity.²⁸

After examining the abovementioned passages, which cannot be reconciled with the content of M,²⁹ Law turns to the passages in Diomedes' *ars* in which she finds similarities to M. Law compares, for example, the definition of the noun and its subdivisions; the usual division in Late Antique grammars was into proper and common nouns (*nomina propria, nomina appellativa*, here *proprie communiterve*):³⁰

*nomen quid est? nomen est pars orationis cum casu sine tempore rem corporalem aut incorporalem proprie communiterve significans, proprie, ut Roma Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs flumen.*³¹

Immediately after this standard definition Diomedes presents an alternative definition with a different division, which he attributes to Scaurus:

*sed ex hac definitione Scaurus dissentit. separat enim a nomine appellationem et uocabulum. et est horum trina definitio talis: nomen est quo deus aut homo propria dumtaxat discriminatione enuntiatur, cum dicitur ille Iuppiter, hic Apollo, item Cato iste, hic Brutus. appellatio quoque est communis similium rerum enuntiatio specie nominis, ut homo uir femina mancipium leo taurus. ... item uocabulum est quo res inanimales uocis significatione specie nominis enuntiamus, ut arbor lapis herba toga et his similia.*³²

²⁵ Charisius = C. Barwick (ed.), *Charisii artis grammaticae libri V*, Lipsiae 1964², 311, 10–11.

²⁶ Char. 299, 14–16.

²⁷ Char. 290, 12–13.

²⁸ For a discussion on the defining practices of Latin grammarians, see Luhtala (above n. 24) 271f.

²⁹ These include also a passage attributed by Diomedes to Scaurus on the *septimus casus* (*GL* 1, 318, 14f.). The *septimus casus* is not touched on at all in M.

³⁰ Instead of this division, the early writers use terminology similar to Scaurus *apud* Diomedes; compare for example Varro *ling.* 8,40; 8,41 and Quint. *inst.* 1, 4, 19f.

³¹ *GL* 1, 320, 11–13.

³² *GL* 1, 320, 13–24.

This division appears also in a truncated form in Donatus,³³ but not in M, which contains only the usual division into *nomina propria* and *nomina appellativa*:

Qualitas nominum bipertita est, aut enim propria sunt nomina aut appellatiua. propria sunt quae proprietates nominum tam deorum quam hominum quam montium quam urbium quam fluminum continent; deorum, ut Iuppiter, Sol, hominum, ut Cato uel Cicero, montium, ut Cynthus, Olymplus, urbium, ut Roma, Cartago, fluminum, ut Nilus, Eridanus et huiuscemodi alia similia. (ff.53v–54r).

Law finds this account of *nomina propria* "much more detailed than is usually the case",³⁴ and seeks to establish a link between the two because some of the examples are found both in M and in Diomedes (*Iuppiter, Apollo*,³⁵ *Cato*). However, this link seems rather tenuous, and the differences between the two passages are more striking than the similarities. Most importantly, there is no trace in M of the threefold division of nouns attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes. Indeed, the terms *appellatio* and *vocabulum* never appear in M at all; only the standard term *nomen* is used. The two discussions have also very different aims: while Scaurus *apud* Diomedes argues for a distinction between three nominal parts of speech (*nomen* = proper names of gods and men, *appellatio* = common nouns signifying animate things, *vocabulum* = common nouns signifying inanimate things), the author of M merely lists diverse types of proper names as examples of this subtype of noun. That some of the words used as examples happen to be identical is not, in my opinion, sufficient evidence of a dependence between these two passages.

The distinction between *appellatio* and *vocabulum*, as presented by Scaurus in Diomedes' *ars*, that is, the distinction between animate and inanimate things, seems to have been an important one in the earlier Latin grammatical tradition, and it does not appear in M, in which the distinction

³³ *Nomen unius hominis, appellatio multorum, uocabulum rerum est. Sed modo nomina generaliter dicimus (Don. 614, 4–5).*

³⁴ Law (above n. 1) 78. There are, however, similar passages in other grammarians' works, some of which even contain some of the same examples (*Iuppiter, Cicero*); see e.g. Dositheus (J. Tolkiehn (ed.), *Dosithei Ars Grammatica*, Lipsiae 1913) 27,8–12; Anonymus Bobiensis (M. De Nonno (ed.), *La Grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis*, Roma 1982) 1,14–2,4; Diomedes (*GL* 1) 320,30–321,2; Probus (*GL* 4) 51,26–29.

³⁵ I agree with Law (above n. 1) 78 n. 33, who suggests that "*sol* conceals the original *Apollo*, which was replaced at some stage in the transmission by a gloss misinterpreted as a correction."

between corporeality and incorporeality is stressed instead.³⁶ This, in my view, would also suggest that the doctrine reported by Diomedes and that contained in M come not only from different grammarians, but also from different eras.

In addition to the definition of the noun, Law takes a look at Diomedes' treatment of *littera* in M. The definition of *littera* is different in the two passages,³⁷ but the following definition of *elementum* coincides partially. Law herself admits that "this definition of *elementum* was so widespread that little can be built upon its appearance here".³⁸ Even if the origin for the definition of *elementum* were Scaurus' *ars grammatica*, M is not exceptional in repeating it; at least Dositheus, Charisius, Probus and Audax repeat it without attributing it to any grammarian.³⁹ Further passages in Diomedes' work, for which he does not name a source, such as the definition of *ars*,⁴⁰ correspond partially with M. But the passages are not unique to Diomedes and M, and as the source for these passages is not named, it is difficult to prove that it was Scaurus' grammar (without the circular device of comparison with M).

We are thus left with material attributed to Scaurus that is reconcilable with M (mostly in the *Explanationes* of Sergius) and material that is not (in e.g. Diomedes' and Charisius' works). Regarding these passages, Law comes to the conclusion that: "the grammar known under the name of Scaurus to Diomedes may have been similar to that known under the same name to the author of the *Explanationes*, but was certainly not identical to it."⁴¹ We also have a mention

³⁶ See e.g. Luhtala (above n. 24) 261: "Indeed, evidence suggests that the semantic distinction important in the early *ars grammatica* was that between animate and inanimate things rather than (in)corporeality. It is along these lines that Scaurus maintained a distinction between the three nominal parts of speech, *nomen*, *appellatio* and *vocabulum* in the early 2nd century. ... Additional evidence indicating that the early Latin grammarians distinguished between *nomen* and *vocabulum* on the basis of (in)animateness is provided by Cledonius: *apud veteres haec erat discretio inter nomina et vocabula: nominibus res animales appellabantur, vocabulis res inanimales* (G.L. V, 35. 1–3)."

³⁷ Diomedes attributes the following definition to Scaurus: *Scaurus sic eam definit, littera est uocis eius quae scribi potest forma. Elementum est minima uis et indivisibilis materia uocis articulatae uel uniuscuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resolvitur* (GL 1, 421,15f.). The chapter titled *de litteris* in M begins with the definition: *Littera est elementum uocis articulatae. Elementum est uniuscuiusque rei initium a quo sumitur incrementum et in quod resolvitur* (Law [above n. 1] 77).

³⁸ Law (above n. 1) 77.

³⁹ See e.g. Charisius (4,10–12); Probus (GL 4, 48,33–34); Audax (GL 7, 321,14–16; Dositheus (11,7–9).

⁴⁰ For a comparison, see Law (above n. 1) 79–80.

⁴¹ Law (above n. 1) 80.

in Charisius' grammar of Scaurus' *books* on grammar,⁴² which speaks against M being the *ars grammatica* of Scaurus referred to here, which, judging by the contents of the quotations in Charisius, was much more detailed. Law offers two solutions to this problem: either M was a later epitome of Q. Terentius Scaurus' second century AD *ars grammatica*, which spanned several books, or Q. Terentius Scaurus wrote two grammars: a detailed one, containing more innovative doctrine, for scholarly use, and M, a shorter, more conventional treatise for use in the schoolroom.⁴³ Law herself prefers the latter solution. Thus M would reflect Q. Terentius Scaurus' grammatical doctrine, and any discrepancies with the passages attributed to Scaurus in Diomedes and Charisius would be due to the different nature of these two works.⁴⁴ Law argues that Scaurus could have easily produced two works different in scope and content, as Donatus and Priscian, for example, did later on.⁴⁵

A comparison of Donatus' two grammars shows that *Ars maior* contains a great amount of material which does not appear in the shorter work, but it is equally clear that Donatus consistently uses similar terminology and definitions in both texts.⁴⁶ Scaurus, if he indeed was the author of M as well as the grammar known to Diomedes and Charisius, as Law suggested, does not use grammatical terminology consistently; the definitions of *adverbium*, *nomen* and

⁴² ... *inquit Scaurus artis grammaticae libris...* (Char. 173, 4–5).

⁴³ Law (above n. 1) 86–88.

⁴⁴ "Of the two, the work known to Diomedes ... was more advanced. Probably quite lengthy ... it offered a detailed exposition of doctrine which, if the passage on *nomen*, *appellatio* and *uocabulum* quoted by Diomedes is typical, may have departed radically from the standard lore of the fourth- and fifth-century classroom. While the definitions in the shorter work of, for example, the parts of speech conform in general to those found throughout the Late Latin tradition, those in the larger grammar displayed an originality not to be encountered again until the thirteenth century. The shorter version, M, was probably intended for the schoolroom. ... The shorter grammar retains a certain amount of material from the more detailed work, as the comparison with Diomedes has shown, but, like others of its type, it tends to favour the conventional at the expense of the controversial" (Law [above n. 1] 87–88).

⁴⁵ Varro is also mentioned by Law (above n. 1) 87–88 in this context with reference to *De lingua Latina* and the first book of the lost *Disciplinarum libri*.

⁴⁶ Only the definition of the interjection is different in the two works. The status of the interjection as a part of speech was not as strong as that of the other parts of speech, and consequently there was more variation in its definition: "Most variety is shown in the definition of the interjection, as every author seems to have preferred to formulate his own version of a somewhat standard content. The Greek tradition provided no model for this definition, as the interjection was not regarded as a part of speech in Greek grammar" (Luhtala [above n. 24] 279).

oratio, for instance, reported in M and Diomedes' grammar differ vastly from each other. The division of the nominal parts of speech attributed to Scaurus by Diomedes into *nomen*, *appellatio* and *vocabulum* is especially interesting. The terms *appellatio* and *vocabulum* (or the threefold distinction) do not appear in M, as mentioned above, but another text attributed to Q. Terentius Scaurus, *De orthographia*, contains passages in which the terms *vocabulum* and *appellatio* are used.⁴⁷

In addition to the discrepancy of terminology used in M and Scaurus *apud* Diomedes, there exists the further problem of dating the material. Scaurus' grammatical doctrine seems to belong to an earlier tradition of Latin grammar; his defining practices are idiosyncratic, and he puts emphasis on the concept of (in)animateness rather than (in)corporeality in connection with the noun.⁴⁸ No trace of this can be found in M, where the definitions of parts of speech resemble closely the so-called standard definitions used by grammarians from the 3rd – 4th century AD onwards, all of them taking the form of "x is a part of speech". The definition of the noun found in M⁴⁹ differs greatly from the one reported by Diomedes (see above p. 151) and contains a distinction between concrete objects and abstract things which, according to Luhtala,⁵⁰ "was introduced into the definition of the noun quite late, in the late 3rd or early 4th century".

In the face of these discrepancies, the few similarities (the definition of *elementum*, for example) seem insufficient evidence to convince us that these two texts would share the same origin. Are we thus faced with two different grammarians writing in two different centuries? The 2nd century grammarian Q. Terentius Scaurus is the one quoted by Charisius, Diomedes and Priscian. Sergius, on the other hand, quotes another, later grammarian, known to him also as 'Scaurus', whose work is identifiable with M. This seems to me the most plausible hypothesis.

When did the later 'Scaurus' write his grammar? Based on the types of definitions he uses, the earliest possible dating for M is the 3rd century AD,

⁴⁷ See for example *GL* 7, 30,10–14 and *GL* 7, 32,21–33, 2.

⁴⁸ Luhtala (above n. 24) 261.

⁴⁹ *Nomen est pars orationis significans rem corporalem aut incorporalem proprie communiterue, proprie, ut Roma Tiberis, communiter, ut urbs flumen.* f. 53v.

⁵⁰ Luhtala (above n. 24) 260.

when standard definitions first appear in Latin grammatical texts.⁵¹ Law gives us a *terminus ante quem* of 5th to 6th century (the date of the *Explanationes*). While discussing the date of M, before coming to the conclusion that M is the work of Q. Terentius Scaurus, Law examines various internal features of the text. In her discussion, Law brings up the order in which the parts of speech are treated: after Donatus "popularised the order *nomen pronomen uerbum aduerbium participium coniunctio praepositio interiectio* ... this sequence held sway almost unchallenged."⁵² A different sequence which kept the four inflecting parts of speech together is found in e.g. Charisius, Diomedes, Dositheus and M. Thus Law argues that M cannot be significantly later than Donatus.⁵³ She then turns to examine the literary quotations appearing in M, which mostly consist of passages from Vergil. Catullus is quoted once, as is Sallust, and Plautus and Laberius are mentioned in passing. These are all authors active before the end of the 1st century BC. Authors, such as Lucan, Statius and Juvenal, who were often quoted by grammarians after the 380s, but rarely earlier, are missing from M.⁵⁴

M appears thus to have been written in the period ranging more or less from the 3rd century to the middle of the fourth century. But do we have enough evidence to call its author 'Scaurus'? There is no title to M nor any mention of its author in either of the manuscripts in which it is preserved.⁵⁵ The example in which the name 'Scaurus' comes up twice (see above p.149) is intriguing, all the more so as it coincides with the late 5th to 6th century attribution of Sergius. On this matter Law states that "it was a relatively common practice in Late Antiquity for grammarians to use their own names as examples" and refers to Karl Barwick using this method to trace passages from the grammarian Pansa in later grammarians' works.⁵⁶ However, it seems that this practice has not been studied in detail. The grammarian Priscian, who does use his own name as an

⁵¹ Apollonius Dyscolus definitely used substantial definitions in his grammar in the 2nd century AD. According to Luhtala (above n. 24) 280–283, the standard definition of the noun in the Latin tradition, as signifying concrete bodies and abstract things, represents a simplification of the Apollonian definition. See also V. Di Benedetto, "Dionisio il Trace e la *Technè* a lui attribuita, II", *ASNP* 28 (1959) 96–114.

⁵² Law (above n. 1) 82.

⁵³ Law (above n. 1) 82–83.

⁵⁴ Law (above n. 1) 83.

⁵⁵ The only other manuscript containing M is Clm 18181, which as a direct copy of Clm 6281 contains no new information, see Law (above n. 1) 68 n. 4.

⁵⁶ Law (above n. 1) 73 n. 15.

example in his texts, usually uses it in connection with first person pronouns or verbs etc, for example: ... *exceptis illis uerbis, quae sunt substantiae uel uocandi, ut Priscianus sum, Priscianus uocor, Priscianus nominor, Priscianus nuncupor*.⁵⁷ In M, however, only second and third person pronouns are used in connection with the name Scaurus. One might think that also one's teacher's name or a famous grammarian's name could also be used as an example. I am therefore not confident in basing any attribution solely on this evidence.

The attribution by Sergius, the author of the *Explanationes in artem Donati*, is, in my view, inconclusive. As also suggested by Law (see above p. 149), Sergius might have based his attribution on the abovementioned example, and thus might not have had any more information than we do. In addition, no trace of Sergius' attribution can be found in either of the extant manuscripts (see n. 55). Based on the evidence examined in this article, M does not seem to be the *Ars minor* of the 2nd century AD grammarian, Q. Terentius Scaurus. Instead, we seem to be dealing with a work written sometime between the 3rd century AD and the mid 4th century AD. The nature of the evidence pointing towards a grammarian called 'Scaurus' as a possible author is, in my opinion, far from conclusive. So it might be wise, at this stage, to refrain from attributing the text to a later, otherwise unknown 'Scaurus'. A famous name could easily enough be attached to an anonymous grammar at some stage of the transmission, all the more so when a suitable candidate could be found within the text itself. Even if we are left with 'merely' another anonymous *ars grammatica*, its relatively early date alone makes it an interesting addition to the corpus of Latin grammatical writings.

University of Helsinki

⁵⁷ *GL* 2, 448,22–24.