

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXX

HELSINKI 1996 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

ROLF WESTMAN	<i>History of Classical Scholarship in Finland: A Bibliography</i>	7
PATRICK BRUUN	<i>Two Facets of Ancient Monetary Economy: Celtic Imitations and Roman Rigid Formality</i>	21
ANNE HELTTULA	<i>Truffles in Ancient Greece and Rome</i>	33
MAARIT KAIMIO	<i>How to Enjoy a Greek Novel: Chariton Guiding his Audience</i>	49
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>New Poems on Stone</i>	75
KALLE KORHONEN	<i>On the Composition of the Hermeneumata Language Manuals</i>	101
MARTTI LEIWO	<i>Language Attitude and Patriotism. Cases from Greek History</i>	121
JARI PAKKANEN	<i>The Height and Reconstructions of the Interior Corinthian Columns in Greek Classical Buildings</i>	139
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Observations on Some Names of Sailors Serving in the Fleets at Misenum and Ravenna</i>	167
RAIJA SARASTI-WILENIUS	<i>Do tibi me totam. Latin Wedding Poetry in Finland</i>	187
MARY SIANI-DAVIES	<i>Gaius Rabirius Postumus: A Roman Financier and Caesar's Political Ally</i>	207
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta Epigraphica CLXIV-CLXVI</i>	241
RAIJA VAINIO	<i>A Reading in Consentius Reconsidered. A Case of Palatalization</i>	247
ROLF WESTMAN	<i>Possible One-verse Additions before Eur. Supplices 263</i>	257
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	261
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	313
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	317

# ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE *HERMENEUMATA* LANGUAGE MANUALS\*

KALLE KORHONEN

## 1. Introduction

The bilingual Greek-Latin language teaching material, known as *Hermeneumata* or *Interpretamenta Pseudodositheana*, is a peculiar chapter in the history of ancient erudition. Published in the third volume of the *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum* (= CGL) in 1892, they have received little attention in the scientific literature of this century.<sup>1</sup> Still, they give us plenty of information about language learning and teaching in antiquity, about ancient everyday life, and about the study of Greek in the Medieval West.<sup>2</sup> In this article, my aim is to discuss some central problems of this material: why do the texts seem to have two target groups; what do the three books mentioned

---

\* I am grateful to Carlotta Dionisotti, Maarit Kaimio, Kaspar Kolk, Martti Leiwo, Roger Wright and many other friends and colleagues for comments and help.

<sup>1</sup> For the essential discussion see: G. Goetz, CGL III (1892) vii-xxxi, xxxiv-xxxvi; Id., CGL I (1923) 12-23, 284; A.C. Dionisotti, "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives", JRS 72 (1982) 83-125 [= Dionisotti, Schoolbook], especially 86-94. The article contains the edition of a previously unknown *Hermeneumata* text. – For an overview, see H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*<sup>7</sup> (= Marrou, *Histoire*) II (1975) 59 and 193-94 note 20; J. Début, "Les *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. Une méthode d'apprentissage des langues pour grands débutants", *Koinonia* 8 (1984) 61-85; A.C. Dionisotti, in: *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>3</sup> (1996) 690. I will call the material simply *Hermeneumata* because there is no reason to connect them with the grammarian Dositheus, see H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* VII (1880) 369 ff. and G. Flammini, "Prolegomeni alla recensio plenior degli 'Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana'", GIF 42 (1990) 3-43 (= Flammini, *Prolegomeni*), esp. 3-5.

<sup>2</sup> On the last subject, see especially B. Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* II (1967) 260-61; A.C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe", in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages* (ed. by M. W. Herren) (1988) 1-56 (= Dionisotti, *Grammars & Dictionaries*), esp. 26-31, and B.M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts* (1988).

in the prefaces contain; and finally, problems of the dating and the original context of the collections.

I will restate briefly the basic facts of the *Hermeneumata*. More or less complete collections have survived in ca. 50 Western manuscripts and early printed books. The material contains the following bilingual parts:

- a) words, mostly verbs, in alphabetical order (Greek-Latin)
- b) noun lists arranged by topic (κεφάλαια – *capitula*) (Greek-Latin)
- c) texts for language practice.

In the collections, the most characteristic parts of the text material often have the title Περὶ καθημερινῆς ὁμιλίας or συναναστροφῆς – *De sermone cotidiano* or *de conversatione cotidiana*. These texts have not survived elsewhere, and they may contain the description of a single day from dawn to dusk. The whole description consists of scenes: morning, school (and possibly lunch), official and social routines, bathing, dinner and the preparations for night. The texts are traditionally called *colloquia*, and I will use this plural term in this article, even though it has some disadvantages. In some versions other texts are included, such as fables of Aesop, rudiments of Roman law, mythology etc.

The editor of the CGL, G. Goetz, suggested that the parts originally formed a language teaching material in 12 books, and that one surviving version (*Hermeneumata Leidensia*) was close to the original.<sup>3</sup> The first proposition has been convincingly refuted, because 1) it is unlikely that all the 12 texts put together by Goetz belonged to the same collection, 2) the mention of 12 books, which appears only once, is clearly an addition by a later systematizer, and 3) the informative, though somewhat chaotic, prefaces of the texts emphasize that the collection is in three books.<sup>4</sup> Because of the consular date of the year 207 in his "original" version, Goetz believed that the manual was created at this time, and imitated by various schoolmasters throughout the remainder of antiquity.<sup>5</sup> The description of the 207 version as being the original one has been strongly criticized by A.C. Dionisotti.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> G. Goetz, CGL I (1923) 17-19 following on the lines of H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* VII (1880) 374, note.

<sup>4</sup> Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 90 (supported by Flammini, *Prolegomeni* 42 n. 83). The number of books: see CGL III 7,70-8,15; 30,21-42; 119,24-26; 120,5-6; 166,10-19; 283,15-16; 289,22. About the four-book collections see below, n. 41 p. 110.

<sup>5</sup> G. Goetz, *RE* VII (1912) 1438; CGL I (1923) 17-19. He uses the term *enchiridion*.

<sup>6</sup> Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 86-92.

The *Hermeneumata*, in their current form, are not a single manual. On the basis of the manuscript tradition, the versions can be grouped as follows. Their contents are also listed (ABC = alphabetical glossary, cap. = *capitula* glossary, coll. = *colloquia*, texts = other texts). I also list the conventional abbreviations of the versions.

**B** = *Hermeneumata Bruxellensia* (CGL III 393-98, 398-421)

ABC, cap.

**C** = *Hermeneumata Celtis* (Dionisotti, Schoolbook 97-106 + Wien, ÖNB Suppl. gr. 43, ff. 18 - 45v)

cap., coll.

**E** = *Hermeneumata Einsidlensia* (CGL III 221-79)

cap., coll.

**H** = *Hygini Hermeneumata* (CGL III 72-94)

ABC, cap.

**L** = *Hermeneumata Leidensia* (CGL III 1-72 [coll. 637-38]; 94-108)

ABC, cap., coll., texts

**M** = *Hermeneumata Monacensia* (CGL III 117-220 [coll. 644-54])<sup>7</sup>

ABC, cap., coll.

**Mp** = *Hermeneumata Montepessulana* (281-343 [coll. 654-59]; 487-506; 506-31)

ABC, cap., coll.

**S** = *Hermeneumata Stephani* (CGL III 345-90, 438-74, 474-87);

ABC, cap., 2 coll. (S<sub>1</sub> = coll. I, 376-79,<sup>8</sup> S<sub>2</sub> = coll. II, 379-84)

**V** = *Hermeneumata Vaticana* (CGL III 421-38).

cap.

The textual history of the different versions is quite complicated,<sup>9</sup> e. g., the relations between *Hermeneumata Leidensia*, *Hygini H.*, and *H. Stephani* are

---

<sup>7</sup> M and E are so close to each other that they clearly have a common origin. E, in which the Greek text is written in the Greek alphabet, is not based on M, which has only the Latin alphabet. See Goetz, CGL III, xxii. The M and E colloquia will be quoted together.

<sup>8</sup> The beginning of the S<sub>1</sub> *colloquia* is similar to the one in L, but S<sub>1</sub> continues after L finishes. I will cite these *colloquia* together.

<sup>9</sup> It has been studied by K. Krumbacher (*De codicibus quibus Interpretamenta Pseudodositheana nobis tradita sunt*, Diss. Munich 1883 and RhM 39 [1884] 348-58), G. Goetz [see n. 1], and A.C. Dionisotti (Schoolbook 86-90; "From Stephanus to Du Cange: Glossary Stories", RHT 14-15 [1984-85] 303-36 [= Dionisotti, Glossary Stories]; *Grammars & Dictionaries* 26-31). As to the L version, see also Flammini, *Prolegomeni* 9-43. For a list of the versions and manuscripts see Dionisotti, Schoolbook 87 and *Grammars & Dictionaries* 27-28.

extremely difficult. The position of the *Colloquium Harleianum* (CGL III 108-116 = 638-44), which belongs to the *Hermeneumata* material on the basis of its title and contents, is unclear. I will cite it separately as *Coll. Harl.*<sup>10</sup> I would also point out that the order of the three basic elements is variable in the manuscripts. Two papyrus fragments of *colloquia* have survived, P. Prag. II 118 (5th c.),<sup>11</sup> and P. Berol. inv. 10582 (5th or 6th c.).<sup>12</sup> The first one contains fragments of the Coll. Harl. (6; 8-9 = 109,73-110,2; 110,29-42); the second has two *colloquia* which do not directly belong to any of the manuscript versions, but have some similarities with Mp.<sup>13</sup>

Before proceeding, some points must be made about the language of the *Hermeneumata*. The language in the *colloquia* is very close to spoken language.<sup>14</sup> There is no tendency to teach "correct" forms of language in the manner of grammarians.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, the syntax and vocabulary, especially in the Greek part, show a strong interference of the other language.<sup>16</sup> "Spoken language" always has a certain context, but in this case finding out when and where this kind of language was taught is extremely difficult because first one should make a clear distinction between the features of spoken language and those produced by interference.<sup>17</sup> Another problem is that since all the surviving manuscripts are western, the Greek

---

<sup>10</sup> The L, H, M, and Mp colloquia, edited by Goetz in CGL III 637-59, will be quoted by his chapters, all the other parts of CGL III with page and line numbers, and C colloquium by the chapter numbers given by Dionisotti. The letters (except C) thus always refer to the version in CGL III; the single manuscripts will be indicated when quoted exclusively.

<sup>11</sup> Ed. pr. J. Kramer, in: *Papyri Graecae Wessely-Pragenses II* (1995) 3-5.

<sup>12</sup> W. Schubart, *Klio* 13 (1913) 27-33; CPL 281; J. Kramer, *Glossaria bilingua in papyris et membranis reperta* (1983) (= Kramer, *Glossaria*) 99-103 n. 15.

<sup>13</sup> The bilingual papyrus PSI VII 848 = CPL 39 contains L 45,42-48 and 46,9-17 (fables of Aesop).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. L. Zgusta, in: *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit* (1980) 124-25.

<sup>15</sup> In fact, the author of the *Appendix Probi* was using *Hermeneumata* noun lists to find unsuitable and incorrectly written words, as C.A. Robson has shown (MA 69 [1963] 37-54). To his examples may be added four words belonging to the category *de cognatione* (Prob. app. gramm. IV 198,35 - 199,1); two or three of them are in M (*nurus* 181,57; *socra* 181,55; *ancula* (?) 181,37). However, the "incorrect" forms in *Appendix Probi* usually deviate much from the forms in the *Hermeneumata* manuscripts printed in CGL.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 92.

<sup>17</sup> There is one approach which could also be used to analyse the texts, namely that of pragmatics (a field of modern linguistics), because we know little about ordinary conversations in antiquity. I am planning a study on the linguistic aspects of the texts.

texts have sometimes suffered badly; in M, the Greek has been written in the Latin alphabet. However, it is important not to date them a priori to Late Antiquity. I will cite both the Greek and the Latin versions without any syntactical emendations (except when the C version is concerned).

## 2. A phrase book as a schoolbook

When looking at the contents of the *Περὶ καθημερινῆς ὁμιλίας* – *De sermone cotidiano* parts,<sup>18</sup> one has the impression that the texts have not originally had a single target group, but two: children and adults. Compare, e.g., the two passages from M: Προῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος σὺν τῷ παιδαγωγῷ καὶ σὺν τῇ τροφῷ ἀσπάσασθαι τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα – *Processi de cubiculo cum paedagogo et cum nutrice salutare patrem et matrem* (M 2), and Κύριε, τί ἐπιτάσσεις; Μήτι ἔχεις χρήματα εὐκαιροῦντα; Τί χρεῖαν ἔχεις δανείσασθαι; Εἰ ἔχεις, χρῆσόν μοι πέντε δηνάρια. – *Domine, quid imperasti? Numquid habes pecunia<m> vacua<m>? Quid opus habes mutuari? Si habes, commoda mihi quinque sestertia{s}* (M 5 = 212,46-54), or from C: Λεαίνω καὶ παραγράφω πρὸς τὸν ἐπίγραμμαμον ... καὶ δεικνύω τῷ διδάσκοντί με. Καὶ ἐπαίνησέν με ὅτι καλῶς ἔγραψα. – *Deleo et prae-  
duco ad superpostum ... et ostendo doctori meo. Et laudavit me quod bene scripsi.* (C 27), and Τίς οὕτως ποιεῖ ὡς σύ, ἵνα τοσοῦτον πίης; Τί εἰρήκασι οἱ ἴδοντές σε τοιοῦτον ... Τοῦτο δὲ πρέπει φρόνιμον οἰκοδεσπότην ἰδιοπράγμονα ... ἑαυτὸν εὐθύνειν; – *Quis sic facit dominus quomodo tu, in tantum bibis? Quid dicent qui te viderunt talem ... Ita hoc decet sapientem patrem familias sui negotii ... semet ipsum regere?* (C 66). In the *colloquia*, the protagonist in the morning and at school is a schoolboy.<sup>19</sup> The persons who participate in private and public affairs are adults, which is also the case in the dinner descriptions and in the bathing sequence.<sup>20</sup> Another feature that seems to separate these parts from each other is the manner of narration. In the schoolbook parts, the schoolboy acts as the narrator, he keeps telling what he does as the story proceeds; naturally, there is also some dialogue. In the phrase book there is no such narrator, only dialogue. In fact, the name

<sup>18</sup> For an overview of the contents, see also Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 93-94.

<sup>19</sup> The only morning scene with an adult man is in Mp 4.

<sup>20</sup> The difference in the protagonists has also been noted by Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 93-94, but she prefers to divide the material into scenes.

*colloquia* better suits these sequences.

If we go through the versions one by one, we can distinguish the two types of material and see if all the *colloquia* conform to these rules. The L/S<sub>1</sub> *colloquia* cause problems. L finishes in ch. 8, in which the boy arrives at the baths. S<sub>1</sub> which, as I noted above, is a longer version of the same text, continues with bathing, oaths and dinner (mostly names of foods and types of wine) (378,32 - 379,66), and the age of the protagonist is not clear. The first-person narration continues through the *colloquia*. Anyway, it seems to show some editorial effort (by the publisher Estienne?) to even out the differences between the two distinct parts. Coll. Harl. has both the schoolbook (3-10) and the phrase book elements (11-28). It also has a preface, a dialogue between the boy and his father (1-2). The schoolbook part is followed by a title which well suits a phrase book.<sup>21</sup> Here the problem is that it has, in the school part, mostly dialogue. The only exception is c. 9, in which events of adult life are described, but in third-person narration. Fortunately, the chapters 8 and 9 can be connected with the aid of the papyrus P. Prag. II 118, the last sentence of which supplements the London ms. of Coll. Harl.: ἦρεν γάρ με ὁ πατήρ μου εἰς τὸ [π]ραιτώ[ριον] μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ (ll. 17-20).<sup>22</sup> This short description is clearly a part of the school text, but as I said, Coll. Harl. has mostly dialogue.

The order of M is interesting: the schoolbook sequence (2) is followed in the manuscripts by the two glossaries, and then come the beginning of the same schoolbook sequence (3) and a phrase book part (4-12). This time, the type of narration is first-person and dialogue, respectively.<sup>23</sup> Mp has a preface, a dialogue of a pupil and his teacher (Mp 2) which is followed by a dialogue sequence with adults (3-20). S<sub>2</sub> only has the schoolbook sequence (379-384,29); it begins with: *Lege bene. Hodie quid fecisti?* – Ἀνάγνωθι καλῶς. Σήμερον τί ἐποίησας; (379,68-70), and continues with first-person

---

<sup>21</sup> H 11: Πάλιν ἐρῶ συμμικτὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα. Ἔστιν δὲ ταῦτα ἀσπασμὸς λόγων, ἐπερωτήσεις, λοιδορίαὶ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ. – *Iterum dicam commixta et necessaria. Est autem haec salutatio sermonum, interrogationes, maledicta et alia multa.*

<sup>22</sup> It must be noted that excerpts from Coll. Harl. can also be found in Leiden, UB Voss. lat. 24, Bern, ms. 236 (see Goetz, CGL III xxxi; CGL I 22-23), and in Paris, BN lat. 7683, of which at least the Paris ms. is an independent witness (see Dionisotti, Glossary Stories 329-30).

<sup>23</sup> In M 4, the phrase book sequence begins with some third-person narration, which ends after few lines.



narration. C, which, as Dionisotti says,<sup>24</sup> has been put together from two or more different sources, has both parts (1-46; 47-69); the narration follows the usual manner. The titled sequence 70-77 is like an expanded version of Coll. Harl. 9. The chapters have a didactic tone, and the main character is the father of the person to whom the story is told (C 71). I believe that the sequence belongs to the schoolbook part. The Berlin papyrus shows no traces of a schoolbook part, but has, in the middle, a title *σερμῶ κω[τιδία]-νους – ὄμ[ι]λία καθημερινή* (ll. 42-43). Therefore, it probably is part of a larger phrase book which has contained many *colloquia*.<sup>25</sup>

To conclude, it seems that it is useful to distinguish two different kinds of material in the *colloquia*. I will call these different parts "schoolbook" and "phrase book". The schoolbook parts have to do with the early stages of literary education, and they give us much information about ancient schools. Such narrations may have been used as translation practice. (I hope to analyze the school parts further in another study.) The literary genre of phrase books has not been studied extensively. To use a definition proposed by N. Haastrup, they represent "idealized dialogues that are meant to be used as models for verbal conversation in specific situations".<sup>26</sup> It seems clear that these parts are meant to be an aid in the acquisition of a foreign colloquial language. They would not exist in unilingual form. They also demonstrate in which situations to use the expressions, as the title *Περὶ καθημερινῆς ὀμιλίας – De sermone cotidiano* indicates.

It is, of course, possible to say that even though the protagonist changes, the material may still have been written for children in order to teach them both language and everyday affairs. After all, there are dialogues in grammars, too. It is true that the surviving versions seem to have been used by schoolchildren, as they have been transmitted among grammatical material. But writing bathing and dinner descriptions that are meant to be used at school before the children start with Homer and Vergil does not seem reasonable. What if the material has been written for both adults and children because foreign language acquisition was necessary for both? Should we rather divide the material only into scenes – traces of such a division have survived in C,<sup>27</sup> or into different *colloquia* or *fabulae cottidia-*

<sup>24</sup> Dionisotti, *Schoolbook* 94, 120.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. W. Schubart, *Klio* 13 (1913) 34.

<sup>26</sup> N. Haastrup, in: *Symposium on Lexicography III* (1988) 390.

<sup>27</sup> C, title: *κεφαλα νονη περι καθημερινη<ς> αναστροφης*; C 70: *de lucubris et negotiis*

*nae*?<sup>28</sup> In my opinion, however, the clear differences in the contents of the texts show that the division proposed here is useful.

In CGL I, G. Goetz made an important distinction, when he divided the early bilingual glossaries (*glossaria vetustiora*) in two groups: those based on the studies of the Roman grammarians, and those on the communication of Romans and Greeks. To the first group belong the etymologies (*etyma*), significations and *idiomata*; to the second *hermeneumata*, which, as I said earlier, Goetz saw as a manual created in the third century.<sup>29</sup> He noted that the glossaries are only loosely, if at all, related to the other extant Greek-Latin or Latin-Greek vocabularies. He added that they had been composed using material collected by lexicographers;<sup>30</sup> it is true that the arrangement of the *capitula* titles belongs to the ὀνομαστικόν tradition.<sup>31</sup> I think we can agree with Goetz here and see the *Hermeneumata* mostly as something that does not belong to the grammatical tradition. But what about the school parts? After all, they contain explicit references to the study of grammar, grammatical terms, etc. (M 2; S<sub>2</sub> 381,28 - 382,73; C 18-42). There are also, in the *capitula* glossaries, sections called *de studiis* (L 24-25; S 351; title in H 82,40), *de ludo litterario* (M 198-199 [E 277-278]; Mp 327; S 351-352; C f. 34r-34v) or *de instructione artis grammaticae* (Mp 327-328; S 375-376).<sup>32</sup>

In all, it seems that the *Hermeneumata* contain at least two kinds of originally separate material. The parts must have been put together already in antiquity because most of the extant versions now have both elements, the only exceptions being S<sub>2</sub> *colloquia* and the Berlin papyrus.<sup>33</sup> All the

---

*forensibus*. See Dionisotti, Schoolbook 94.

<sup>28</sup> The discontinuity between the scenes was noticed by K. Krumbacher, in: *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*. W. von Christ zum 60. Geburtstag (1891) 309. He suggested that the different *colloquia* be numbered separately, a principle that Goetz partly followed in CGL III 637-659, although he used names like "Colloquium Leidense" etc.

<sup>29</sup> CGL I 13: *Aut e studiis succreverunt grammaticorum Romanorum, qui ... latina vocabula cum graecis diligenter contulerunt, aut e commercio Romanorum et Graecorum, quod Romanos litteras graecas, Graecos latinas discere coegit*. Cf. op. cit., 13-22, 284.

<sup>30</sup> Goetz, CGL I 22.

<sup>31</sup> C. Wendel, RE XVIII (1939) 515-16. On the *capitula* glossaries, see also I. Schoenemann, *De lexicographis antiquis qui rerum ordinem secuti sunt*, Diss. Hannover 1886.

<sup>32</sup> C also has Περὶ ἀγωγῆς καὶ ἀμφιβάσεως (f. 31v-32r).

<sup>33</sup> The text of the recently published P. Prag. II 118 entirely belongs to the school part as

versions we have were used as schooltexts, which is shown also by the references to *Hermeneumata* in the school scenes.<sup>34</sup> This has granted the survival of the adult material. The distinction *hermeneumata* vs. material based on grammarians' work is useful, but needs to be applied carefully. The prefaces of the texts can tell us more about the original purposes of the different parts.

### 3. The three books and their prefaces

As I stated before, the repeated references to three books in the prefaces make it clear that at one stage this was the form of the material. I think those of the books I and II indicate that three-book collections existed for practical purposes.

The prefaces of the alphabetical glossary (the first book) and the *capitula* glossary (the second book) are quite similar in the different versions, and they all seem to be based on the same model. The preface of the first book, which also is the preface of the whole collection, survives in its original place in the London manuscript BL Harl. 5642,<sup>35</sup> and in two manuscripts of the B group.<sup>36</sup> We have it also in M 1<sup>37</sup> and in Mp 1. In the two

---

defined by me.

<sup>34</sup> M 2: ἐκμανθάνω ἐρμηνεύματα – *edisco interpretamenta*; C 34; compare S<sub>2</sub> 381,59-60: ἔγραψα καθημερινά – *scripsi cotidiana*. There is one rather unknown reference to *hermeneumata* in ancient literature which may be relevant here. Seneca the Elder seems to talk about this kind of material in *contr.* 9,3,14 (cf. 9,3 exc.). He mentions an orator who gave speeches in both Latin and Greek, and when some people complained that he was being paid too little, Q. Haterius Agrippa (cos. suff. 5 BC) said: *numquam magnas mercedes accepisse eos, qui hermeneumata docerent*. This immediately brings to mind the poorly-paid primary teachers. However, the significance of the word *hermeneumata* remains unclear; we are dealing with a very early period, and it may refer to translation practices mentioned by Suetonius (*gramm.* 4).

<sup>35</sup> Goetz prints the preface in CGL III ix. It is not so clear as the prefaces in M and Mp, and has elements not found in B, M, or Mp. The same ms. also contains the Coll. Harl. See K. Krumbacher, *RhM* 39 (1884) 348-50.

<sup>36</sup> They are Leiden, UB Voss. lat. F 26 (the so called *Glossarium Leidense*, CGL III 398-421) and Angers, mss. 477, omitted by Goetz and published by H. Omont, *BECh* 59 (1898) 671-88; the preface: 675. The composition of the Leiden manuscript has been disentangled by Dionisotti, *Glossary Stories* [see n. 9] 305-12. In it, the lines of a *Hermeneumata* collection have been turned from Greek-Latin to Latin-Greek and arranged

last cases, it is no longer the preface of the alphabetical glossary,<sup>38</sup> but the preface of the *colloquia*. I quote the Mp version here:

Ἐπειδὴ ὀρώ πολλοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας Ἑλληνιστὶ διαλέγεσθαι καὶ Ῥωμαῖστὶ μῆτε εὐχερῶς δύνασθαι ... οὐκ ἐφεισάμην τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἵνα ἐν τρισὶν βιβλίοις ἐρμηνευματικοῖς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα συγγράψωμαι.

*Quoniam video multos cupientes Graece disputare et Latine neque facile posse ... non peperi hoc facere ut in tribus libris interpretatoriis omnia verba conscribam.*

The first book will contain the letters from A to Ω. The preface in M (and E) is longer than in the other versions, but the essential contents are the same. Some more information about the contents of book I can be obtained from the prefaces of the second.<sup>39</sup> In them, the author states having given ῥήματα καὶ τούτων ἐκ μέρους ἀναγκαῖα εἰς κλίσιν ῥημάτων – *verba et eorum ex parte necessaria in declinatione verborum* (L, H)<sup>40</sup> in the first book.

According to the prefaces of book II (see n. 39), the author will write in it περὶ πάντων (λοιπῶν Mp) πραγμάτων καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια αὐτῶν – *de omnibus rebus et capitula eorum* (M, cf. Mp and L 30,55 - 31,2). Some of these prefaces also contain a table of contents of the *capitula* (H 82; M 166-167 [E 235-236]; C 18r-18v [p. 92-93 Dionisotti]). In the prefaces of books

---

alphabetically. The list of words belonging to the preface can be found in op. cit. 307.

<sup>37</sup> E has basically the same preface (223 - 224,39), but the order of the books has been modified in it.

<sup>38</sup> M has an addition which joins the preface to the colloquium (the last ten lines in M 1 = 120,17-37). In the other versions, the alphabetical glossary begins with some introductory lines (L 3,26-29: ἀποδώσω οὖν τὰ λοιπὰ κατὰ στοιχείον; Mp 337,7,9: Ἄρξασθε ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς, cfr. H 72,1, M 122,60-61).

<sup>39</sup> L 7,65 - 8,19 and, strangely, 30,55 - 31,2 (preface of the "third" book), cf. also 47,58 - 48,7; H 81 - 82,7; M 166,10-29; Mp 289,21-43; fragments in *Glossarium Leidense*: 402,81, 405,76-78, 407,42, 408,44-45, 415,64-65, 418,6 (cf. Dionisotti, *Glossary Stories* [see n. 9] 307 n. 6).

<sup>40</sup> The ῥήματα – *verba* really seem to mean here "verbs", as the glossaries mainly contain verbs in their different forms. The not so numerous words from other parts of speech have only one form. The *verba quae pertinent ad artem grammaticam* in the confused preface of the ms. Harl. 5642 (CGL III ix) is not consistent with the contents of the ABC glossaries in general, but seems to be an addition, cf. also the contents of the same ms. as listed in CGL III ix.

I and II, the authors do not specify for whom the bilingual word-lists have been written; the words used are ἄνθρωποι – *homines* (L 8,7-10 [book II]: οὕτως εὐκόλως τῆς ὁμιλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐχρησία ἔσται – *uti facilius sermoni hominum proderit*, cf. H), or πολλοί – *multi* (M + E, Mp, book I). This means, in my opinion, that the original target group has been adults rather than children. It is remarkable that the languages mentioned in these prefaces are always both Greek and Latin; the alphabetical and *capitula* glossaries have been far more useful for Greeks who have wanted to use Latin.

Could it then be that in an "original" form, a *Hermeneumata* collection would have contained three books with an alphabetical glossary in the first, and the *capitula* glossary divided into the two last books? After all, the prefaces use the expression "all the words", so where do the texts come in? Such is the arrangement of the three books in the fragmentary B version. In this group of manuscripts we have *explicit*s in the middle of a *capitula* glossary.<sup>41</sup> Otherwise, they always come in the end.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, it seems that in a typical version book II was sufficient for the *capitula* glossary.<sup>43</sup> An alternative solution would be that book III contained an alphabetical Latin-Greek glossary, in which case the three-book collection would really have been useful to the students of both languages, as the prefaces promise. But then we should have to conclude that these dictionaries would have disappeared without leaving a trace in the surviving manuscripts, which seems unlikely to me.

At this point, it seems safe to suppose that the three-book collections to which the prefaces refer had texts in the mysterious third book. But what

---

<sup>41</sup> Dionisotti, *Glossary Stories* 307 n. 1. Book III in *Glossarium Leidense* 409,72; three books in the *capitula* glossary of the Angers ms. 477 published by H. Omont, *BECh* 59 (1898), 679, 682, 685. B 395,63-65 may indicate two glossaries arranged in four books. However, one ms. of the B group also had the *S*<sub>1</sub> *colloquia*, see Dionisotti, *op. cit.* 315. – The four-book *Hermeneumata Vaticana* is the product of a later reworking (on it, see I. David, in: *Commentationes philologiae Ienenses* 5 [1894] 199-202; L. Traube, *ByzZ* 3 [1894] 604-06; G. Baesecke, *Der Vocabularius Sti. Galli in der angelsächsischen Mission* [1933] 80-81; B. Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* II [1967] 267).

<sup>42</sup> Book I: L 7,61-63; H 81,50; M 166,9; book II: M 210,43 (possibly also the sign with an uncertain meaning in Mp 337 after line 6, see Goetz in *app. crit.*).

<sup>43</sup> The extent of the glossaries in the manuscripts does not help us to solve the question, as the longest glossaries in CGL III are in M, both a little more than 40 CGL pages long (122,62 - 166,8 and 166,30 - 210,43). The prose parts are in no way as extensive.

texts? Can we connect the extant prefaces of book III with those of books I and II? The only preface of book III that mentions the preceding books is the one in L (30,14 - 31,23). It is a strange mixture. Its first part seems to be written for a single person, possibly an adult – because the children of the student are mentioned – who "loves to speak Latin".<sup>44</sup> The contents are defined only as "something with which to practise". Then follows a fragment of the preface of book II (30,55 - 31,2).<sup>45</sup> It seems that the author has at first thought to list here the titles of the texts to follow, and used an expression from the preface of book II. However, we here have only the prologue of the text *Hadriani sententiae* (31,3-23). It is completely uncertain whether the first part belongs to the series of the first two prefaces or to the collection that follows.

In the preface of the *colloquia* in M (M 1 = 120,17-39, cfr. E 224,18-39), the author specifies the purpose of the book: ἐπειδὴ νηπίοις παισὶν ἀρχομένοις παιδεύεσθαι ἀναγκαῖον ἡδύρον ἀκρόασιν ἐρμηνευμάτων ὁμιλίας καθημερινῆς – *quoniam parvulis pueris incipienti<bu>s erudiri necessarium videbam auditionem interpretamentorum sermonis cottidiani*. This will help children to learn to speak Latin and Greek. In Mp, the preface of the *colloquia* (Mp 2) is a teacher-pupil dialogue; Latin seems to be the more foreign language. Coll. Harl. has been used by Greek-speaking schoolchildren (1; 3-4). These prefaces, both of which follow the preface which actually belongs to the first book, clearly reflect the school use of the material.

The prose parts in the other *Hermeneumata* versions have neither prefaces nor book III incipits (in spite of the book II explicits), only the title Περὶ ὁμιλίας καθημερινῆς – *De sermone cotidiano*, or something similar.<sup>46</sup> This is even mentioned in the table of contents of M *capitula*

---

<sup>44</sup> I need to cite it at length: (in the two books) συνέγραψα πάντα τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἡδυνήθην τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐρμηνείᾳ, ὅσα ἀναγκαῖα ὑπολαμβάνω καὶ ὅλως ὅσα ὠφελεῖ ἀνθρώποις φιληταῖς τῆς λαλίας ῥωμαϊκῆς. Οὐκ ἐδίστασα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ προσθεῖναι, ἵνα ἔχῃς ὅπως ἑαυτὸν γυμνάσῃς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐτυχῶς τέκνοις σοῖς καταλίπῃς μνημόσυνον καὶ ὑπόδειγμα φιλοπονιῶν σῶν – *conscripsi omnia verba, quae potui nostra interpretatione, quae necessaria arbitror et omnino quae prosunt omnibus amatoribus loquellae Latinae. Non dubitavi et in hoc libro adicere, ut habeas, ubi te ipsum exerceas, sed et feliciter liberis tuis relinquantur memoria et exemplum studiorum tuorum* (30,23-48). This is the only place in the prefaces in which only Latin is mentioned.

<sup>45</sup> It is very similar to M 166,24-27 and Mp 289,32-36.

<sup>46</sup> L, title = 69,41-43; Coll. Harl., title = 108,1-2; M, title p. 647 = 210,44-45; S<sub>1</sub> 376,47;

(167,24), where it comes last, and C,<sup>47</sup> where it is in the middle of the index (it may well have been book III even if it is in the table of contents of book II). At this point we can conclude that book III has in some *Hermeneumata* versions begun simply with the title. It is better to discuss the L version separately. It also takes us to more general problems of context.

#### 4. Problems of dating and context

The L version has an intriguing consular dating which has been used to date all the *Hermeneumata*.<sup>48</sup> In all, L contains, after the preface that starts book III (see above), a collection of bilingual texts with abundant prefaces in some of them (31,3 - 69,38): *Hadriani sententiae et epistulae*, fables of Aesop, the so called *Dositheanum fragmentum de manumissione*,<sup>49</sup> *Hygini Genealogia*, and an *Iliad* paraphrase. The L *colloquia* which, as I mentioned before, are a shorter version of S<sub>1</sub>, follow abruptly after the last of these texts, the *Iliad* paraphrase, which lacks the beginning and the end. We find no traces of a collection of texts of this kind in groups B, C, and M. As I said, Goetz considered the L version original; Dionisotti alternatively suggested that it would be "a late gathering of originally separate material of this kind"; according to her, the dating in the Hyginus preface may have come from the colophon or title of an original work by Hyginus.<sup>50</sup> *Hadriani sententiae* survive in S without the preface (387-390); a more complete version of *Hygini Genealogia* has also been combined with the glossaries of the *Hygini Hermeneumata* (H 72-94), as the excerpts in some manuscripts show.<sup>51</sup>

---

C, title p. 97.

<sup>47</sup> C f. 18r; see Dionisotti, Schoolbook 93 and pl. III.

<sup>48</sup> I cite the date as printed in CGL III 56,30-34: Μαξιμω · και · απρω / ὑπατοις / προ · γ̄ · ἰδων · σεπτῆβριων / ὑγινου · γενε · αλογιαν / πασιν · γνωστην · μετεγραφα – *Maximo · etapro / consulibus / tertio id septēber / yginigenealogiam / omnibus notam descripsi*. Note that μετέγραψα (cod. μετεγραφα) – *descripsi* here means "I copied", Dionisotti, Schoolbook 89. The absolute dative in the Greek is a common phenomenon in the consular dates of documents and indicates a translation from Latin. The only consuls that match are those of 207, Annius Maximus and Septimius Aper.

<sup>49</sup> The beginning of a Roman law primer of the same type as Gaius' *Institutiones*.

<sup>50</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 90.

<sup>51</sup> See Dionisotti, Glossary Stories 327-30. These *Hermeneumata* also had the Coll.

The first problem here is that these five texts may well have existed in 207. The two datable texts in the collection, the Law fragment and *Hadriani sententiae* have both been dated – by their contents, not the consular dating – to the late 2nd century.<sup>52</sup> The dating of the other texts is more difficult. Babrius wrote, at the latest, in the 2nd century, as P. Oxy. 1249 shows.<sup>53</sup> The other fables of Aesop and the *Genealogia* of Hyginus are almost undatable.<sup>54</sup> Nor is it easy to date the translations.

But let us turn to the prefaces of these texts.<sup>55</sup> According to Dionisotti,<sup>56</sup> the similarities in them are due to the formulaic nature of such prefaces. In my opinion, they rather seem to form a coherent whole. All the prefaces of the first three texts – leaving aside the first book III preface discussed earlier – emphasize that they help learning both Latin and Greek; the languages are always mentioned in this order.<sup>57</sup> Another interesting feature of the prefaces are the references to three-book material. A piece of the preface of book II comes up in a surprising place (47,58 - 48,7, preface of the law primer). As Dionisotti has noted,<sup>58</sup> the Hyginus preface also has a reference to book II (*capitula* glossary): the author says that in the book that follows there will be many translated stories about gods and goddesses, whereas in

---

Harl. The Hyginus seems to have had no preface (op. cit. 330).

<sup>52</sup> The law primer: see A.M. Honoré, RIDA, 3<sup>e</sup> sér. 12 (1965) 306-11, 323; H.L.W. Nelson, Überlieferung, Aufbau und Stil von Gai Institutiones (1981) 368-70. *Hadriani sententiae*: A.A. Schiller, in: Atti del secondo Congresso internazionale della Società italiana di storia del Diritto II (1971) 720-24 (note that the linguistic analysis of the text announced by Schiller was never fully accomplished, cf. P. Stein, in Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller (1986) xvii); on the text, see also F. Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (1977) 532.

<sup>53</sup> See also M.J. Luzzatto & A. La Penna (ed.), Babrii mythiambi Aesopei (1986) x-xi.

<sup>54</sup> In my opinion, this Hyginus fragment should have been treated more thoroughly in the new Teubner edition by P.K. Marshall (Hygini Fabulae, 1993); the text is not even published in it, cf. Marshall, op. cit., p. x. For a more valid evaluation of the fragment, see L.D. Reynolds, in: Texts and Transmission (1983) 190. On the fables, see M. Nøjgaard, La fable antique II (1967) 398-403.

<sup>55</sup> The prefaces: *Hadriani sententiae*: 31,3-23; fables: 38,30 - 41,5 (and 94,1 - 95,39 from a Paris mss. with some differences); the law primer: 47,58 - 48,45 (the first 8 lines seem to come from the preface of book II); *Hygini Genealogia*: 56,27 - 57,42. See also Dionisotti, Schoolbook 89 and Flammini, Prolegomeni 14, 18, 21-26.

<sup>56</sup> Schoolbook 90.

<sup>57</sup> L 31,20-21; 38,52-53; 48,19-24.

<sup>58</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 89.



book II he has only listed their names (56,35-43).<sup>59</sup> He also says that pictures illustrate them (56,47-50), as in the preface of Aesop (L 39,55). If the dating of the collection to 207 is correct, it would mean that the three-book form existed already, say, in the 2nd century. In any case, the three-book collections seem to antedate the prefaces of the L version.<sup>60</sup> But in the L version, the phrasebook proper would have disappeared.

There is another common feature which separates these prefaces from those of books I and II: the prefaces of Aesop, the law fragment and Hyginus mention γραμμάτων τέχνη, τέχνη γραμματική or γραμματικοί (38,43; 48,8-10, 56,51-52), and translations from Greek to Latin and vice versa (48,16-24). It is clear that we are dealing with grammarian's teaching. Now, what languages can be studied with the help of these texts? The version in the most important Leiden manuscript really seems to be suited for bilingual education: the *Hadriani sententiae* and the fragment of the primer of Roman law are suited for the study of Latin, but it would be natural to study Greek with the fables and the mythological texts. Dionisotti saw the whole *Hermeneumata* material as a largely western phenomenon, suited for the simultaneous education of both languages,<sup>61</sup> and it is an incontestable fact that Latin was studied by very few, if any children in Greek grammarians' schools in this period.<sup>62</sup> The school scenes in the *colloquia* are a similar case: Greek children learning Latin at school would be an oddity before Late Antiquity. If this collection of texts existed in bilingual form already in 207, the material would have had to belong to the Western school.

However, the utility of the "law" texts is a problem. Would Latin-speaking children study Greek with the help of such texts? We should explain this by saying that their purpose has been to teach how to translate laws and other legal documents into Greek, which was a normal practice in governing the eastern parts of the Empire.<sup>63</sup> But the material seems ideal for the eastern schools of Late Antiquity, where such jurisprudential texts, also

---

<sup>59</sup> The words ἐξεπλέξαμεν – *explicuimus* (actually "unfolded") must here mean "list", because the author emphasizes the distinction between book II and the one he is writing, in which ἱστορίαι – *historiae* or ἐξηγήσεις – *enarrationes* can be found.

<sup>60</sup> This was also the view of A.A. Schiller, op. cit. in n. 52, 719.

<sup>61</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 91; see also ead., Grammars & Dictionaries 29.

<sup>62</sup> See, e.g., A. Bataille, in: *Recherches de Papyrologie* IV (1967) 162-68; H. Maehler, in *Actes du XV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Papyrologie* II (1979) 18-19.

<sup>63</sup> J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (1979) 75-80, 109-10.

Gaius, who is fairly contemporary with the law primer in L,<sup>64</sup> were studied intensively, to judge from the papyri.<sup>65</sup> Instead, the study of a foreign language with the aid of bilingual Hyginus or fables seems natural for both Roman and Greek children. In my opinion, it is possible that the collection of texts has been compiled, translated and the prefaces written about a century later than 207. Thus, we still have no *terminus ante quem* for the three-book collections.

In the glossaries, elements datable to the Late Antiquity are few.<sup>66</sup> S<sub>1</sub>, the continuation of the L *colloquia*, has no criteria for dating. As to the official or military terminology in L, the two glossaries (27,36 - 28,8 and 28,9-23) contain only words that were already in use in the first century AD. This is the case in the other versions as well: in the single *capitula* glossaries with the title περὶ ἀρχόντων – *de magistratibus* or similar (L 28,9-23; M 182,22-60; E 275-276; Mp 297,33 - 298,15; S 362; C f. 30v-31v), the bulk of official terminology always belongs to the early imperial period; late antique terms are very rare. Constantinian terminology is lacking in the glossaries.<sup>67</sup>

In addition, we know that Greek-speaking persons were using bilingual *capitula* glossaries already in the 2nd century to study Latin, as the papyri show. P. Oxy. 2660 (1st / 2nd century) lists vegetables and fishes with a heading between the lists.<sup>68</sup> The order in the *Hermeneumata* is the same. P. Oxy. 3315 (1st / 2nd c.) contains signs of the zodiac followed by names of winds with their heading.<sup>69</sup> In this case, the order of the words is

---

<sup>64</sup> See H.L.W. Nelson, op. cit. in n. 52, 364-70.

<sup>65</sup> See R.A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*<sup>2</sup> (1965) nos. 2953-2993.

<sup>66</sup> *Dux* – ἡγεμόν at 27,39 is a general term, cf. H.J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (1974) 146; *mulomedicus* in another glossary (25,56) seems a late word, but it is probably a gloss which has come to the text at a later stage. A certain later addition is *salomonis* at 9,38, probably a reference to Salomo III, abbot of St. Gall (fl. ca. 900), compare *Glossarium Salomonis*. The problem here is that words are hard to date, and when glossaries are copied, words can be changed.

<sup>67</sup> E.g. *comes* appears only once in CGL III, namely in the alphabetical dictionary of M, at 159,38; it is translated by συνοδοίτοπος.

<sup>68</sup> It has been republished by Kramer, *Glossaria* 63-64 no. 6. Parts of the same two glossaries are also in the later P. Oxy. 2660a (3rd cen.; Kramer, *Glossaria* 67 no. 7). All the papyrus datings used here are by the editors. My thanks are due to Jaakko Frösén for help in evaluating the correctness of the datings.

<sup>69</sup> Kramer, *Glossaria* 69 no. 8.

not the same in any of the *Hermeneumata* versions. I also mention P. Mich. inv. 2458 (2nd / 3rd c.) with the end of a list of gods, the beginning of another with goddesses, and the heading of the second list in between.<sup>70</sup> It is like a fragment from the beginning of a *capitula* glossary. Fragments of single *capitula* glossaries have survived in P. Laur. inv. III/418 (late 2nd c.),<sup>71</sup> and P. Lund 5 (2nd c.).<sup>72</sup> In all of these five papyri, the Latin part has been written with Greek letters. It has long since been noted that these papyri do not seem to belong to the school sphere, if this means "children's school", but have instead been written by skilled writers. Thus they are considered as predecessors of the topical dictionaries of the modern travellers' vocabularies, written for adults.<sup>73</sup> This matter needs further study, as it is difficult to say who would have needed such vocabularies. Even if the word order is in no case so similar between the papyri and *Hermeneumata* that we could say that a papyrus belongs to a certain version,<sup>74</sup> it is certain that one source material of the *Hermeneumata* were glossaries similar to these. We do not know if these glossaries belonged to or were copied from the three-book collections.

The prose parts in the other *Hermeneumata* versions have elements that cannot be earlier than the 3rd century, but their use may have continued for some time. The expression *domini mei imperatores* in Coll. Harl. 9 and the name *Aurelius* (Coll. Harl. 19) date the full Coll. Harl. to the third or fourth century.<sup>75</sup> In M, the key term is *praeses provinciae* (διέπων τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, M 4), which dates the text to probably the late 3rd century or

---

<sup>70</sup> N.E. Priest, ZPE 27 (1977) 193-200; Kramer, Glossaria 79-81 no. 12.

<sup>71</sup> R. Pintaudi, ZPE 27 (1977) 115-117; J. Rea, ZPE 29 (1978) 240; Kramer, Glossaria 61-62 no. 5.

<sup>72</sup> Also published by Kramer, Glossaria 71 no. 9. A later *capitula* glossary fragment is in P. Vindob. L 150 (5th c.; J. Kramer, Tyche 5, 1990, 37-39).

<sup>73</sup> W. Brashear, in: Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology (1981) 33-34; Kramer, Glossaria 10. See also A. Bataille, op. cit. in n. 62, 161-69; J. Kramer, in: Atti del XVII Congresso internazionale di papirologia (1984) III 1379-80, 1384.

<sup>74</sup> The nearest affinities are provided by the late P. Vindob. L 150 mentioned in n. 72. But glossaries, when copied, tend to change much more than prose texts (essential points about the transmission of glossaries have been made by A.C. Dionisotti, in the new volume *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen âge* (1996) 205-25).

<sup>75</sup> See K.J. Neumann, RE V (1905) 1305-09; G. Lugli, in: Dizionario epigrafico delle antichità romane II.3 (1922) 1954-55. On Coll. Harl. 9, see above, p. 106.

later.<sup>76</sup> However, in the passage M 5 cited above (p. 105), in the Latin version *sestertii* are mentioned (M 5 = 212,54 = E 228,50), but not in the Greek. The use of *sestertii* ceased in the Diocletianic period;<sup>77</sup> here the Greek term has been changed to correspond to reality, but not the Latin one. The prices elsewhere in the *colloquia* do not help us much; but at least Constantinian *solidi* are not used as currency. It is clear that money terms and official terminology may have been updated in language manuals that were meant for the study of everyday language. The context of the *colloquia* in Mp is Rome; it is harder to date because it has no official terminology. The *balneum Tigillinum* (Mp 14) gives it a *terminus a quo*, the Neronian period.<sup>78</sup> C, on the other hand, has more clues for dating; Dionisotti dates it to the late 3rd or more probably 4th century.<sup>79</sup> Dionisotti has plausibly suggested that we have one testimony of such manuals in the literature, Ausonius' partly preserved poem *Ephemeris, id est totius diei negotium*.<sup>80</sup> This indicates that the *colloquia* were used in the 4th-century West; Ausonius may have used them at school. The original capitula glossaries and the texts show no certain signs of Christianity,<sup>81</sup> but the phrase book material was still in use in 5th-6th century Egypt, as the two papyri mentioned above (p. 104) show. Together, these instances bear witness to a long period of use of the *Hermeneumata* material.

The traditional interpretation has been that the *Hermeneumata* were created for Greeks who wanted to learn Latin; later, they were also used by Romans to learn Greek.<sup>82</sup> The scholars have been puzzled by the fact that the prefaces seldom speak of only one language, and normally both the languages are named. As a consequence, it has also been proposed that they

---

<sup>76</sup> See W. Enßlin, RE Suppl. VIII (1956) 602.

<sup>77</sup> K. Regling, RE IIA (1923) 1882.

<sup>78</sup> The name probably refers to Ofonius Tigellinus (PIR<sup>2</sup> O 91); the *balneum* is attested in other sources, too, see E. Rodríguez Almeida, in: *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae I* (a cura di E. M. Steinby) (1993) 165.

<sup>79</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 122-23; see also A. Giardina, RFIC 113 (1985) 316-20. The most clearly datable part in the C text is, however, the schoolbook sequence C 70-77 (see above, p. 107).

<sup>80</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 123-25. Cf. R.P.H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius* (1991) 246.

<sup>81</sup> Dionisotti, Schoolbook 91.

<sup>82</sup> Goetz, CGL I (1923) 18; J. Tolkieln, RE XII (1925) 2468; Marrou, *Histoire* (see n. 1) II 59, n. 20 p. 194.

were designed for the needs of both groups.<sup>83</sup> Dionisotti's criticism against the first theory is justified. I think that the problem needs to be clarified further, but I consider possible that the authors of the phrase book and glossary material really would have had in mind the speakers of both languages.

## 5. Conclusions

I propose that the *Hermeneumata* we have in the manuscripts have been put together from two different kinds of material: 1) everyday conversations and vocabularies for practical use by adults; 2) school texts more adapted for translation practice. I think this is the only way to explain the differences in the characters and in the manner of narration. The distinction between the glossaries based on the studies of grammarians and on the needs of everyday communication is useful, but the *Hermeneumata* we have now contain both types of material. The prefaces of the alphabetical and *capitula* glossaries we have seem to belong to the practical material. The context of this material, which has already been known from the papyri, needs to be studied further.

I have also discussed the problematic Leiden collection. In my opinion, the prefaces of the bilingual texts form a coherent whole. They indicate that the compiler of the bilingual version has used an existing three-book *Hermeneumata* collection. It would seem that the collection belongs to the study of Latin as a foreign language in Late Antiquity. However, the rest of the *Hermeneumata* material shows signs of a long period of use. It is also probable that the compilers of the three-book *Hermeneumata* collections had in mind both the learners of Greek and the learners of Latin.

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>83</sup> J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (1979) 203-04; see also Marrou, *Histoire* II n. 20 p. 194. It is improbable that they would have been written for an audience that knew neither Greek nor Latin.