



*DICCIONARIO
GRIEGO-ESPAÑOL*



VI d.C.

Glossaria (*Gloss.*)

Dionisotti, A.C., «From Ausonius scholdays, a schoolbook and its relatives», *JRS* 72, 1982, 97 pp.83-125 (*Gloss. ... D.*).

Dionisotti 1982.pdf

FROM AUSONIUS' SCHOOLDAYS ? A SCHOOLBOOK AND ITS RELATIVES*

By A. C. DIONISOTTI

Plates I-III

I

Conrad Celtes at Sponheim

Some time ago, pursuing humanistic Greek dictionaries, I was leafing through the volume of plates from Vienna MSS published by Josef Bick in 1920, when my eye was caught by a plate from a Latin-Greek dictionary, arranged not alphabetically but by topics. Bick and the catalogue informed me that there was a subscription at the end, written in beginner's Greek and then crossed out (Plate I): 'And so ends, with God's help, the dictionary of Cicero, written out by me, Conrad Celtes, Poet, in the monastery of Sponheim, in the year of Our Lord 1495 on the seventh day of October, while Johannes Trithemius was Abbot. Praise be to God in heaven most glorious.' On the first page of the volume, Celtes had written a table of contents: *Continetur in hoc libello: 1 Grammatica greca brevissima, contracta ex diversis autoribus per C.C. 2 Colloquia et conversaciones grece, quas vulgo apud Latinos Latinum ideoma dicunt (?) cum vocabulario per C.C. inventas. 3 Vocabularium rerum admirandum grecum, nuper a Conrado Celte in Hercinia silva apud druidas inventum.* On the same page, Celtes had written instructions to a well-known publisher: *Aldus meus* is to add a short preface addressed to all the youngsters of Europe who want to learn Greek, and is assured that it will be a fine and very useful little book. Various additions are needed in the Grammar; but Aldus needs no telling, let him emend it all as necessary; and have accents added, for in Celtes' exemplar, and in all Greek books in France and Germany, there were none.¹

In fact the volume is a composite one, bound together by Celtes when he thought of publication. The grammar, which occupies c. 1-11, was copied for him by an assistant in 1500, and is, as he says, a concoction by him from the humanistic ones currently available. The colloquies and the dictionary, on the other hand, had not been compiled but merely copied by him, some five years earlier at Sponheim. And it has long since been noticed,² though not so far as I know by any classicist, that these two items are not humanistic compositions, but akin to what are known as *Hermeneumata Ps. Dositheana*, bilingual school-books commonly dated to the third century A.D., various other versions of which were published by Goetz in Volume III of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*.³ Celtes in fact had added a further instruction to Aldus at the beginning of the colloquies (Plate II, bottom): that a title should be composed for these two books, *quos credo propter antiquitatem a Cicerone conscriptos sua manu*. Aldus was not impressed; we have his letter of rejection: *... Institutiones Graecas et dictionarium remittimus, quia multa iam impressa habentur, quibus erudiantur qui Graecas litteras discere concupiscunt.* But he adds: *illud rogo te, humanissime Celtes, ut librorum Graecorum, quos apud druidas esse scribis, des ad me nomina.*⁴ Celtes had

* This is a first edition, for me and for the text: it would not have got even this far without generous help and encouragement, especially from Mary Beard, Prof. E. Courtney, Michael Crawford, Mark Hassall, Prof. K. Hopkins, Prof. H. Maehler, Prof. A. D. Momigliano and Michael Reeve. My best thanks to them all. I am also grateful to the members of the Classical Seminar at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, who heard part of this as a paper and made useful comments, to the British Academy for a grant enabling me to study the MS in Vienna, and to Prof. H. Buschhausen and Prof. O. Mazal of Vienna for their kind help.

¹ 'Fiat et preponetur per Aldum meum brevis epistola ad adolescentes studiosos lingue grece per Europam; et erit libellus speciosus et multis utilissimus. Preponetur etiam elementa alphabeton, abbreviatur et potestates litterarum ... Sapientia pauca: non habet magistrum Aldi mei Minerva. Ergo emendentur emendanda, radantur radenda ...

Et accentus addantur, quia in exemplari, et aliis grecis codicibus quoscumque in Germania et Gallia reperi, appositos non vidi, sed nudas dictiones.' J. Bick, *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen HSS*, no. 44, Plate 42. H. Hunger, *Katalog d. gr. HSS d. Österr. Nationalbibliothek, Supplementum Graecum* (1957), no. 43. D. Wuttke in *Silvae: Festschr. E. Zinn* (1970), 298-303, gives history and description of the MS, but follows Bick in supposing that the colloquium is incomplete.

² A. A. Renouard, *Annales de l'imprimerie des Aldes* (1825), III, 278-9.

³ Leipzig, 1892; referred to hereafter simply by page and line, without prefixing 'CGL III'. I generally quote only the Latin of bilingual texts, for convenience, not implying that the Latin is more authentic than the Greek.

⁴ H. Rupprich, *Der Briefwechsel des Konrad Celtis* (1934), ep. 315, dated 3.9.1504.

no doubt told him of the remarkable collection of Greek works assembled by Trithemius, soon, alas, to be dispersed; and Aldus was not one to neglect such leads, not even from such a rum character as this Celtes, whose Greek was three parts enthusiasm to one part knowledge, who could credit Cicero with stuff like *Hermeneumata*, and yet was too much a classical purist to call a monk a monk.⁵

Well, there I might have left this, as a nice little non-event in the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of ancient glossaries, variously revealing, in its small way, of classical studies North and South of the Alps in that critical period. True, inspection of Bick's plate showed that this must be a much fuller version of the *Hermeneumata* than any of those published, including numerous words, both Latin and Greek, unknown to Goetz's index; and some unknown to our dictionaries too. The overlap with the other versions was enough to prove that this one had an early base, but, before one could accept a lot of novelties into the classical languages, more, I felt, was needed than just Conrad Celtes having a palaeographical fit. Might not the novelties be due to a humanistic reworking? Not by Celtes, certainly; he was barely up to copying the text, and anyway there is no need to doubt his good faith;⁶ but he might have been wrong in thinking the book was old, or not noticed later interpolations in it.

I now think that the cumulative evidence disposes of these doubts, but at the time it was just one item on the plate which intrigued me enough to continue; the word *marmorea*, glossed Πάρινα. Now this does occur in Goetz's index, and just once; this being also our only evidence hitherto for the word Πάρινα. The source is a fragment of an alphabetical Greek-Latin glossary, surviving on a sixth-century leaf of papyrus now in Cologne. Not a papyrus dug up in Egypt, however, but one probably written in Byzantium, and related to others which we first hear of in the seventeenth century, in Helmstadt.⁷ Lose that leaf, and the gloss would have joined the list of Celtes' dubious novelties.

Perhaps Celtes' exemplar warrants a little pursuit after all. Ciceronian autographs apart, how old was it, and where could it have come from? Trithemius doubtless got most of his Greek MSS from Italy, but he also scoured the monastic libraries of Germany. So far as I know, no ancient bilingual glossary was transmitted in Byzantium, thence to be imported into Italy in the Renaissance: all extant ones survived in the West, and, with few exceptions, North of the Alps. A partial catalogue of Trithemius' Greek books survives,⁸ apparently by him, and includes what must be Celtes' exemplar: no. 18 *Codex arcualis formae scriptus, qui continet Graecum vocabularium cum Latino supposito M. Tullii Ciceronis ad filium suum, secundum materias in varios titulos partitum li. 1*. The catalogue gives no ages, but it regularly gives the size (*arcualis* means quarto), and it distinguishes between MSS and printed books. There are seventeen MSS, and in every case *except* this one we are told what it is written on: *codex scriptus in papyro* or *in pergamento*. The catalogue only survives in an edition of 1605; perhaps it is just bad luck that this detail dropped out in this one case.⁹ But anyway it confirms that the ascription of the work to Cicero was there in the exemplar, and I think the ascription may be of some antiquity.¹⁰ Trithemius owned another book which perhaps came from the same source, no. 24 *Codex mediocris formae scriptus in pergamento non satis erudito caractere, qui continet Grammaticam Dositheii brevem li. 1, varium quoque vocabularium li. 1*. Dositheus' grammar survives only in three St. Gall MSS of the tenth century, all also containing parts of *Hermeneumata*, none identifiable with this one. Bobbio also had Dositheus, and among the finds there in 1493 was a 'Liber

⁵ Druids replace monks, just as in *Hercinia Silva* replaces Sponheim, not an indifferent matter when the Ciceronian controversy was in full swing. Admittedly Celtes seems to have believed that these monks were direct descendants of the Druids, cf. the vivid account in his *De situ et moribus Norimbergae* (C. Celtis, *Opuscula*, ed. K. Adel (1966), 70-1).

⁶ Note that his proposed title-page squares with his colophon written some ten years earlier, and that he prudently omits the Cicero ascription. Suspicions that he planned to forge six books of Ovid's *Fasti* are misplaced: *cui bono*? When major new texts were still surfacing (e.g. Tacitus' *Annals*) false reports were easily believed, and probably worth a few pence

to the presbyter from Ulm who passed this one to Celtes.

⁷ CGL II, 561-3; new ed. by J. Kramer in ZPE 38 (1980), 229-43.

⁸ P. Lehmann, *Merkwürdigkeiten des Abtes Joh. Trithemius* (SBBay.Akad.d.Wiss.) (1961).

⁹ Was it conceivably written on papyrus? Humanists had great difficulty knowing what to call that when they met it, cf. Ch. Perrat in *Bibl. Ec. Chartes* 109 (1951), 173-92. I hope the *app. crit.* may enable a palaeographer to determine what script and date the errors imply; cf. also n. 51.

¹⁰ See n. 21.

persimilis L. Polluci de vocabulis rerum, sed hoc amplius: uno labore et una opera graecis et latinis pariter consulitur. nostrae dictiones in prima parte paginae collocatae sunt, ex diverso respondent graeca vocabula. primus liber periit, quem forsan recuperabimus; ab inquisitione non desistimus'.¹¹ Both Bobbio books seem to have disappeared without further trace, and the latter is suggestively like Celtes' exemplar: ¹² did someone by any chance walk off with them from Milan to Sponheim?

The Corpus Glossariorum

At any rate, there seems to be at least a good chance that what Celtes copied at Sponheim is a *bona fide* version of the Hermeneumata, as respectable as those surviving in ninth- and tenth-century MSS, even if his copy is the only extant witness. But an unpublished text, especially an endless glossary, is not like Mt. Everest; you do not have to climb it just because it is there. What can such a text tell us, and what can we do with it? These are not easy questions to answer, because clearly the aims of those who have studied such texts in the past can no longer be our aims; this would be true in any field, but it poses more of a problem in this one, because you do not edit glossaries every other decade, or even study them. Once the job is done, it is reckoned to stay done, even if the principles on which it was based were quite specific to its period, and the resulting material very hard, or risky, to use for any different purposes.

George Goetz, who devoted *non levissimam partem vitae suae* to this thankless study, was well aware of the problem, and did set out to solve it. In a rather moving epilogue to a study of Scaliger's work on glossaries, he sizes up the distance between Scaliger's day and his own, and defends the decision to create not a *Corpus Glossarum*, the aim around 1600, but a *Corpus Glossariorum*.¹³ The decision is surely still a valid one, even though we might justify it rather differently: a *Corpus Glossarum* creates a static construct of a language, beyond time, a general Resurrection of Dead Glosses from wherever, each called to account on its own merits; a glossary, on the other hand, is compiled at a particular time and place, and with specific aims; so, as a totality, it can define for us a particular linguistic and cultural horizon. We can ask it questions not only about single words, but about whole categories and the boundaries of its coverage, not only about what it has, but also what it has not. In this way it can be a rich document to set beside other evidence for its period, literary, epigraphical or material.

But in fact the *Corpus Glossariorum* is nowhere near being usable in this way by ordinary mortals.¹⁴ Why not? Partly because the enterprise required a control of MS resources which in this field we barely have even now; one can only admire the energy and determination of Loewe, Goetz and Gundermann in their searches round Europe, but even before the last volume was out, brief descriptions of MSS which emerged too late to be used filled 15 pages, and would now take many more. Of course the same is true for, say, Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, but for glossaries the relationship between MS and text is a far more delicate one.¹⁵ How do you decide whether you have two glossaries, A and B, or two variant copies A and B of the same glossary? It is not easy, because I think attitudes to such texts vary greatly from one period to another. Hazzarding a guess, I would say that in the Carolingian period dictionaries are compiled as very personal tools: excerpts, additions, conflations are the order of the day; identical copies of a dictionary are rather exceptional. By about the eleventh century a different concept seems to take hold: dictionaries get compiled by named authors, often with a preface, for publication, and

¹¹ M. Ferrari, 'Le Scoperte a Bobbio nel 1493', *IMU* 13 (1970), 140-1. But her identification of it p. 163 with Neap. IV A 11 cannot be right. O. von Gebhardt in *Centralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen* 5 (1888), 119-24, was on the right lines. The description was sent by J. Questenberg to Joh. von Dalberg, d. 1503, patron of Trithemius.

¹² In being Latin-Greek, not vice versa, and in revealing that it had lost its first book, see p. 91 below. Admittedly, there is no sign of ascription to Cicero.

¹³ *Berichte über d. Verhandlungen d. Sächs. Gesellschaft d. Wiss.* (1888), 231-4, cf. *CGL* I, 276-7. Of course the indices, *CGL* VI, VII, are in effect a *Corpus Glossarum*.

¹⁴ To my knowledge only L. Robert has done so, cf. *Hellenica* XI-XII (1960), p. 1, n. 4, XIII (1965), index s.v. *Glossaires*.

¹⁵ Though minor grammatical texts and ancient commentaries can be very like glossaries in this respect.

then tend to be copied verbatim, like literary texts.¹⁶ They are no less derivative in content than their informal predecessors, but they present themselves quite differently. This can be illustrated in the case of the *Hermeneumata*, in that the only version of these to have a twelfth-century diffusion, the *Monacensia*, is also the only one that can boast a medieval diffusion of what are unmistakably copies, not variants, of the text. Now, as regards this problem, Goetz undoubtedly went to intolerable extremes, often printing as separate entities what are, by any criteria, merely different copies of the same text, so that one has to make one's own edition of it;¹⁷ and conversely, though one can understand the impatience, he omitted quite distinct versions, with the excuse that they overlap with others or are not interesting enough, thus removing essential stepping-stones in the history of the glossaries.¹⁸

What is still more of a pity and a drawback for the *Hermeneumata* is that, while publishing the different versions separately, Goetz did not, in his all too brief discussion of them,¹⁹ inquire into their individual nature and origin, as he was quite uniquely qualified to do; instead, not surprisingly perhaps, he tried to fit all the versions into a single family tree, the Jesse of which was the work of an early third-century schoolmaster; and while admitting that major features of the texts do not square with this, he did not think to question whether the genealogical model is at all appropriate for explaining the diffusion of texts of this kind. Inevitably, his conclusions have had a much wider influence than the texts themselves; and those who have had occasion to use the *Hermeneumata*, and they are more than one might think, have mostly assumed them as fact, in spite of running into fresh problems as a result.

In short, *CGL* is not at all comparable to the other monumental *Corpora* of its time: it had virtually no tradition behind it, and it leaves us with the material in a much more raw and provisional state than we are used to in the classical field. So I fear that one could not just feed a new text into it; to make any sense of it, one would have to take a deep breath, write a new programme, and re-sift the lot; a hard job for a more dwarfish generation, even though Goetz's indices are a splendid pair of giant's shoulders. I would just add that Lindsay and his school provide no salvation. For their attack on Goetz, and rival enterprise, *Glossaria Latina*, however valuable in detail, were, I think, based on entirely reactionary principles, virtually reverting to the sixteenth century. They call for editions, not transcripts, of glossaries, which is fair enough; but what they assume an edition must be, is a sifting of the pure, classical, and especially literary, gold, from the vulgar, banal or semi-medieval dross that infests the surviving copies.²⁰ Not surprisingly, the only bilingual glossary they undertook was Ps. Philoxenus, whose Latin half is related to the literary and antiquarian tradition of Latin lexicography, Festus and the like. As for the *Hermeneumata*, give or take a few bird-names, they could be ignored.

II

Hermeneumata: vital statistics

What then are these *Hermeneumata*, and what have they to offer that might justify a fairly vast amount of spadework to sort them out? They are, as I said, bilingual school-books, and they consist of one or more of four different elements. First, an alphabetical dictionary, whose main business was probably verbs, but which can be expanded to become quite general. Secondly, a dictionary by topics, which I shall call capitula—word-lists under headings like *de avibus* or *de magistratibus*. Thirdly, and most characteristic, colloquia—little scenes from everyday life in dramatized form, as used today in modern

¹⁶ e.g. Papias, Hugutio, Osbern of Gloucester, Johannes Balbus, etc.

¹⁷ So 31. 24-38. 29 = 387. 10-390. 33 (*Hadriani Sententiae*); 38. 30-47. 57 = 94. 1-102. 7 (*Aesop*); 49. 19-56. 27 = 102. 8-108. 4 (*Gaius*); 69. 41-71. 77 = 376. 48-378. 31 (*Colloquium*); 119. 1-122. 61 + 210. 44-220 = 223. 1-235. 7 (*Colloquium*); 393-8 nearly all reappears within 347-76. Some of these were critically edited by E. Böcking, *Dosithei Magistri interpretamentorum liber tertius* (1832).

¹⁸ See the asterisked items in the table p. 87.

¹⁹ *CGL* I 17-23.

²⁰ W. M. Lindsay in *CPh* 13 (1918), 1, 'the apographs in Goetz's *CGL* will be replaced by editions of the glossaries, and Goetz's *Thesaurus Glossarum* [i.e. *CGL* VI and VII] will become the mere *apparatus criticus* of a small *Dictionary of Glosses*, a dictionary which will be owned and freely used by every teacher of Latin'.

language courses and the Cambridge Latin Course. And finally, one may have some texts for reading practice, such as some Aesop fables, extracts from a mythological handbook, or gnomic texts. A table will best clarify what survives and where:

	<i>Alph.</i>	<i>Cap.</i>	<i>Coll.</i>	<i>Texts</i>
LEIDENSIA (L) (<i>CGL</i> III, 3-72)				
Voss. gr. Q. 7. (s.x ¹ , ?Cologne)	h/l	L	L	L
Sang. 902 } (s.x, St. Gall)	—	(L)	—	(L)
clm. 601 }				
Harl. 5642 (s.ix/x, ?St. Gall)	*h	(L)	H	(L)
AMPLONIANA (A) (72-94)				
Amplon. 2. 10 (s.ix ¹ , Austrasia)	a	(A)	—	—
*Paris. lat. 7683 (Salmasius) (cf. pp. xi-xii)	[a]	[A]	[H]	[L]
BRUXELLENSIA (B) (393-421)				
Voss. lat. F. 26 (s.viii, Amiens)	vo			
*Angers 477 (A.D. 897, St. Pol, Brittany)	(vo)/*b	B	—	—
Brux. 1828-30 (s.x, English)	*b	B	—	—
*Cambr. U.L. Add. 3166 (s.x ex./xi ¹ , N.E. France)		(B)		
*Heidelb. Salem. 9. 39 (s.xii)		B		
Stephanus' MS (<i>CGL</i> III, 347-379)	?	B±	L	?
STEPHANUS (S) (<i>Glossaria Duo</i> , 1573: 347-390)	?	S	LS	LS
Paris. lat. 6503 (s.ix, Tours?) (94-108)				(L)
MONTEPESSULANA (Mp) (283-343)				
Montp. H 306 (s.ix, ?Laon)	mp	Mp	Mp	—
MONACENSIA (M) (119-220)				
*Admont 3 (s.xii, Austrian) to 211.53	m	M	M	—
*clm. 27317 (s.xv ex., Augsburg) to 211.53				
clm. 13002 (1158, Kleinprüfung)				
clm. 22201 (1165, Bavaria)				
*S. Crucis Austriae 17 (s.xii)				
*Zwettl. 1 (s.xiii) from 126. 35				
*Neap. II D 35 (s.xv/xvi, Italian)				
*Mon. gr. 323 (s.xvi, Ebersberg) parts				
EINSIDLENSIA (E) (223-279)	lost	E	M	—
*Flor. Ashb. 1439 (c.1460, Florence, M. Ficino)				
Eins. 19 (1503, S. Rhineland, M. Theodoricus)				
Paris. gr. 3049 (s.xv ex., G. Hermonymus)				
*Vindob. suppl. gr. 84 (ante 1497, G. Hermonymus)				
*Selest. 343 (1504, Stuttgart, J. Cuno)				
ed. B. Rhenanus, Basil. 1516				
*Paris. lat. 7683, Salmasius collation.				
*Neap. II D 35 (s.xv/xvi, Italian) Coll. + Cap. 1-6				
*CELTES (C)				
Vindob. suppl. gr. 43	lost	C	C	—

Note: () = fragmentary; * = not used/published by Goetz; [] = excerpts

There are, you see, eight different redactions. The six surviving alphabetical glossaries are all different one from another, and vary from around 200 words to over 3,000. In one case, the Brussels redaction, we can watch the process of expansion. This redaction once existed with prefaces, an alphabetical glossary almost exclusively of verbs, capitula, and possibly a colloquium. Of this, all that survives is the alphabetical glossary (b), and a selection of the capitula. But by the eighth century, a new alphabetical glossary was compiled (vo), systematically adding to the original one words and phrases from the other parts. As a result, from an old one of c. 300 words we have a new one of c. 1,800, and can also reconstruct some of the lost bits.²¹ But I do not think the other alphabetical glossaries can be related to each other in this way.

Turning to the capitula, we do find that the redactions group themselves a bit: L and A have almost identical chapter headings, M and E have significant overlaps, and altogether the headings suggest a fair amount in common; 12 are shared by all the redactions, 14

²¹ Though this has not been done. The extracts are still layered, so that for each letter we find the sequence: preface, b, preface, capitula, each in

turn. The original seems to have been ascribed to Cicero, cf. 401.18.

more if we except the fragmentary B. But this still leaves 49 headings which crop up either in single redactions or in changing groups of them.²² Worse happens if we examine the actual contents under each heading; we then find that L and A are far from identical, and that the groupings so fluctuate that one despairs of finding any rhyme or reason. There is also a problem of criteria, of how to evaluate both the overlaps and the divergences between the versions. Interpolation and omission are not applicable concepts, since this kind of text can be expanded or excerpted equally plausibly. And a nucleus of lemmata that all the versions share may tell us very little: sit five people down to write a list of what is in the sky, and they may well all include sun, moon, stars, without consulting a volume of Ur-Hermeneumata. In practice, of course, deciding just what 'anyone' would include, what overlaps are non-significant, can be very difficult, especially if we do not know when or where 'anyone' lived.²³ It may be that more work will reveal some decisive evidence: for the moment I can see no way of deriving any version of these capitula from any of the others extant.

If you now consider the colloquia, you will see that these are by way of being a movable feast. The Montpellier version and Celtes', each attested in only one MS, have their own colloquium with their glossaries. But the Leiden colloquium appears not only with the Leiden capitula, but also with different ones in two of Stephanus' MSS. A quite different colloquium, H, is found with the Leiden capitula in one MS and with the Amplonian ones in another. And the M colloquium also attaches itself to the E capitula. Moreover, though I have tabulated them neatly in the third column, their actual position in the MSS varies greatly.²⁴

Less can be said about the texts, which are much more sparse. Basically they are attested in two sources, with the Leiden capitula and in Stephanus' MSS, in what context there we cannot tell. But a fuller text of Hyginus was attached to the Amplonian capitula in Salmasius' MS, and a stray bit of it is mixed into the Montpellier capitula. A bit of the Aesop has turned up on a papyrus of the third to fourth century, presumably Egyptian, from what kind of book we do not know. The other redactions show no signs of ever having had any texts.²⁵

Magistellus nescioquis

If all this is true, you may wonder, if the alphabetical glossaries are all different from one another, and no set of capitula is derivable from any other, while the colloquia play musical chairs, and even the texts bob about the place, why has anyone ever tried to put all these versions in one tree and derive them from a single source? Partly, I fear, because the assumptions with which a study began are not easily abandoned in the light of new evidence; it is always tempting to pummel the new evidence into fitting the assumptions. From the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, the Hermeneumata were ascribed to Dositheus, simply because in Sangall. 902, one of the first MSS to be discovered, they are with Dositheus' grammar. Stephanus' MSS, and the Leiden one which soon came to light, were anonymous, so offered no resistance, although all but two of the texts published by Stephanus were quite different. But Mp, M, B, and most of E were not known till the

²² This is a provisional count: many capitula are concealed because they have lost their headings, e.g. 374. 67, where a cap. *de cognatione* is tacked on to *de moribus*.

²³ Some control may be provided by the similar, but presumably unrelated, ancient Middle Eastern glossaries, cf. J. Goody, *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (1977), 93-9.

²⁴ In particular, a colloquium can present itself as one of the capitula: so in M (167. 24), in the C table of contents (see n. 41 below), and probably in one of Stephanus' MSS, where it was *circa medium*.

²⁵ The single texts have provoked more discussion than any other part of the Hermeneumata, though without fresh inquiry into these as a whole. They are: 1. Hadriani Sententiae (L, S): G. Goetz, *Index Scholarum hib.* (Jena, 1892-3), A. Schiller, in *Atti del 2° Congr. Internaz. della Soc. ital. di Storia*

del Diritto (1971), 11, 717-27; 2. Aesop (L. Paris. 6503, PSI 848): M. Nøjgaard, *La Fable Antique* (1967), 11, 398 ff.; 3. Tract on Manumission, ?Gaius (L. Paris. 6503): A. M. Honoré, *Rev. Internat. des Droits de l'Ant.* 12 (1965), 301-23, H. L. W. Nelson, *Überlieferung, Aufbau und Stil von Gai Inst.* (1981), 360-8; 4. Hyginus (L, Mp, Salmas.—the last unpublished): D. A. van Krevelen, *Philologus* 110 (1966), 315-18; 5. *Iliad* epitome (L): O. Jahn, *Griechische Bilderchroniken* (1873), 89 ff.; 6. & 7. Niciarius and Carphilides (S): B. Perry, *Secundus the Silent Philosopher* (1964), 5-6; 8. *Responsa Sapientum* (S): R. Merkelbach, *Die Quellen des gr. Alexanderromans* (1977), 72 ff., 156 ff.; 9. *Praecepta Delphica* (S): Dittenberger, *Sylloge* 111 (1920), no. 1268, *RE Suppl.* vii (1940), s.v. *Sosiades*. Cf. also n. 17, and on nos. 6-9, p. 91 below.

end of the last century, the latter two just too late for Krumbacher's pioneering study,²⁶ which thereby became obsolete almost immediately; except in establishing that Dositheus is irrelevant, since his connection was limited to one version, and not all MSS of that.

But he and Goetz then in effect replaced Dositheus with a *magistellus nescioquis*, who in spite of this dismissive title compiled the impressive Leiden corpus of glossaries and texts, from which the other versions were said rather than shown to descend. There is also, however, a more concrete reason for this search for an author: most of the versions have prefaces to one or more of their parts, and these prefaces are strikingly similar one to another, and seem to present us with one individual, setting out the aims of an individual work, even though what follows is different in each case. Before considering this curious phenomenon in general, we should look briefly at the whole string of prefaces which punctuate the Leiden corpus, and which are the *magistellus'* main *raison d'être*.

There is no general preface, for the MS begins with a rag-bag of adverbs followed by a simple statement (3. 26-8), *reddam ergo cetera per litteras*, introducing the alphabetical glossary; this is a conflated affair, beginning with Latin-Greek and just verbs (3. 29-4. 25), then switching to Greek-Latin and miscellaneous material. At the end of this we are informed, *impletum est primum interpretamen* (7. 61-3). There follows a preface referring back to a *primus liber* containing verb conjugations, and announcing a *secundus liber*; here there seems to be a lacuna, and we plunge straight into the first of the capitula. At the end of these we have another preface (30. 14-48) referring back to the previous two books, and announcing further material, now addressed to an individual, who will use it for practice and preserve it as a monument of his studies for his children. Tacked on to this (30. 49-31. 2) is the debris of a preface for capitula,²⁷ wandered from somewhere, but the *Hadriani Sententiae* follow with a rather mangled little introduction. More prefaces introduce the Aesop, the tract on manumission recently ascribed to Gaius, and the Hyginus. The Aesop (38. 30-40. 5) is introduced as finishing a work begun, and points out the value of the work for learning Latin and Greek and for moral education, with also a reference to pictures. The Gaius (47. 58-48. 44) begins with some advertisement, and seems to distinguish between this book and others preceding, which were composed *artis grammaticae gratia*. The author stresses the difficulty of translating *multa varia* from Latin into Greek or vice versa, but then the text goes into gibberish till 48. 39, where it announces a text relevant to the *forum* and the *curia*, as promised—not that we have had any such promise.

But it is the Hyginus preface (56. 27-57. 4) which has been the basis of all discussion of the Hermeneumata as a whole and which is regularly invoked by those pursuing the independent transmission of any of the texts. For after saying that he will give us similar *verba* as promised, the writer suddenly has a fit of chronological accuracy and gives us a date: 'In the consulship of Maximus and Aper (A.D. 207) on the 11th of September I μετέγραψα/*transcripsi* Hyginus' Genealogy which is known to all.' This is such a nice thing to have that people have been understandably loth to ask any questions about it. Why is it here? In all other respects this preface is very like the others; there is a reference back to the capitula, and to pictures as in the Aesop.²⁸ Editors of Hyginus take μετέγραψα to mean 'translate', i.e. into Greek, and ignore the Latin text here, as a later, barbaric retroversion. But this makes nonsense of the following sentence, and runs counter to the consistent usage of (μετα)γράφω as opposed to ἐρμηνεύω in these prefaces.²⁹ The date in fact sticks out like a sore thumb, and if it were not so useful would probably have been square-bracketed as an interpolation. Might it not have been a title or colophon of the Hyginus used by the redactor, transferred *en bloc*? At any rate, I would stress the oddity of it, and suggest caution before pegging all the Hermeneumata to it.

Originally there was no doubt also a preface to the *Iliad* summary which follows, but a large lacuna (60. 20/21) has done for half of Hyginus and the first part of the *Iliad*

²⁶ C. Krumbacher, *De codicibus quibus interpretamenta Pseudodositheana nobis tradita sunt* (1883).

²⁷ cf. M (166. 20-9), Mp (280. 30-7).

²⁸ 'Sicut autem promisi similia verba reddam. Maximo et Apro consulibus tertio id. septembr. ygini genealogiam omnibus notam descripsi, in qua [?] erunt plures historiae interpretatae (ἐρμηνευμέναι) in hoc libro. deorum enim et dearum nomina in

secundo [sc. in the capitula] explicui, sed in hoc erunt eorum enarrationes, licet non omnes, eorum tamen quorum interim possum.'

²⁹ In all the prefaces μετα/ἀνα/συγ-γράφω = *describo, conscribo*, as opposed to (δ)ερμηνεύω = *interpretari* = translate, cf. e.g. 48. 3-7. (Note that Goetz's indices do not cover the prefaces, texts or colloquia.)

summary. What follows (69. 39) is not a preface but a simple statement: *Incipit hermeneumata idest libri XII de conversatione cotidiana*, followed by the Leiden colloquium, only half surviving here. Why book(s) XII? Goetz made an ingenious suggestion,³⁰ which tidies things up so attractively that it has been universally accepted as fact: if the two glossaries are books 1 and 2, as they clearly are, then the texts which follow add up to 7, and the colloquium makes 8. Now Stephanus had a MS containing the *Hadriani Sententiae* and the Leiden colloquium, and there is good external evidence that Paris. 6503 with Aesop and Gaius is a surviving bit of that MS. But Stephanus also publishes four gnomic texts, not otherwise preserved: put those four into the lacuna between Hyginus and *Iliad* summary, and the colloquium becomes 12. This is so neat as to be almost irresistible, and greatly reinforces the idea of an original, individual compilation. But, though feeling a spoil-sport, I would observe that Stephanus clearly did not have the Hyginus, or the *Iliad* summary, or for that matter the Leiden glossaries; he tells us that the Leiden colloquium was at the *beginning* of one of his MSS, and *circa medium* of another;³¹ we can prove that at least one of his MSS had quite different book-divisions, *within* the capitula; and his four gnomic texts form a very distinctive group as against the others; there is no evidence or even likelihood that they were in the same MS; on the contrary, some evidence that they were with the S colloquium which he also publishes. In short, I do not think one can use Stephanus to reconstruct the Leiden MS; there are too many discrepancies. And apart from that, why do we get a book-number, if it is one,³² but no preface, with the colloquium, and wordy prefaces, but no book-numbers, to the texts? Also, similar as the prefaces are in tone, they seem, as I hope my summary has shown, far from coherent as a series within one work.

However, the general problem remains: why is it that the prefaces, both in the Leiden version and elsewhere, are so similar in style and tone? Do they in fact imply a specific original compilation, whether or not of A.D. 207, from which the others derive, albeit with drastic revision of content? I think that if we stop thinking of these things as literary compositions, and consider what is implied by their being scholastic handbooks, a different explanation can at least be suggested. Time and again, if one picks up school commentaries on classical authors from Servius to the Renaissance, one finds that the writer begins: Before I begin my commentary, I think I should consider 3/4/5 points: the identity of the author, his purpose, the title of the work, the genre to which it belongs, its value to us, the department of studies in which it fits, etc. Such prefaces often appear to be individual, but the language is highly formulaic, and we know that their authors, widely scattered in time and space, were not following a specific model, but a deeply rooted school tradition, with which they themselves grew up. The same formulae could be applied whatever the particular text and commentary that followed. Now for the classical period, our evidence for schoolbooks is of course pretty thin. Much of it has survived on scraps of papyrus, the live context of which, whether it is a bit of private homework or part of a formal lesson, is often not known, especially for the bilingual examples. The most detailed descriptions of what young children actually did at school are in fact provided by the *Hermeneumata*, in some of the colloquia, and these handbooks are in fact referred to in them. I think they were probably dictated, a bit at a time, one hopes, and this may be why we get the recurrent *nunc ergo incipiam scribere* and the like.³³ The two glossaries were a regular feature, other parts might be added at will. As for the Leiden corpus, I suspect we should turn the theory upside down: not a grand archetype, but rather a late (and remarkable) gathering of originally separate material of this kind.

Hermeneumata: General Character

Leaving aside this tangle of arguments about different versions and their parts, let us stand back a moment and look at the *Hermeneumata* as a whole. We note first that they are thoroughly pagan. The exceptions are so localized and immediately identifiable that

³⁰ CGL I, 18 (cf. III, xvi).

³¹ CGL III, xiv-xv.

³² It could equally have been no. 12 in a series of capitula, cf. n. 24.

³³ 30. 49, 31. 23, 39. 49, 48. 45, 57. 41, 120. 17, 166. 28; and note 122. 56-61, 337. 7/9.

they do prove the rule. So there is a whole redaction of the capitula which I have not mentioned, appropriately called the Vaticana,³⁴ where the material is crudely and energetically reorganized according to the book of Genesis, and to make up for the sharp reduction in the number of *deorum nomina* the Holy Trinity is equipped with forty-nine epithets. This does seem to have been an individual venture. Apart from this, three Christian chapters are tacked on to the end of the Einsiedeln version, their origin unexplored, but tacked on is the word, for they are not in the table of contents. The Vossianus glossary (vo) fell into the hands of a keen student of Augustine on Psalm 118, but where we can check with the Angers MS the items are missing, so again an individual import postdating the archetype. And similarly, one of the Aesop MSS rather feebly turns plural gods into singular and boots out a reference to Minerva. But that is about all the showing that Christianity makes, as against which there are substantial positively pagan chapters, not only on the gods, but *de aedibus sacris*, *de sacrificiis*, *de diebus festis*, and pagan priesthoods under *de magistratibus*. In the colloquia too there are various references to gods and temples, and at most one dubious hint of Christianity.³⁵

A second general characteristic, reiterated in the prefaces, is that all this material is designed to teach language, the living language, that is, the vocabulary of everyday life, not literary language. Time and again, rare words and forms in the glossaries have been confirmed by inscriptions and documentary papyri. Even the texts, while they provide some cultural baggage, are not couched in anything like literary prose, and I think this is true irrespective of problems of transmission. The highest literary level in the Hermeneumata is a couple of Babrius fables included in the Aesop.

Moreover, most of the prefaces, and originally perhaps all, talk about learning both Greek and Latin.³⁶ The implications of this have been largely ignored: for what context could a handbook purport to teach both languages? Did compilers envisage distribution all round the Mediterranean? This seems anachronistic and implausible. In fact I see no reason for supposing that these handbooks originated or were used for Greeks learning Latin in the East, as is everywhere stated. All our evidence suggests that Greeks who learnt Latin generally took it up later, as a second language: the simultaneous teaching of the two languages, as implied by the Hermeneumata, was characteristic of the West. Of course, it would often be Greek teachers in the West who compiled them, so it is not surprising that many of their components are of Eastern origin. This is especially true of the gnostic texts published by Stephanus. The *Praecepta Delphica* are already found inscribed in a gymnasium in Cyzicus around 300 B.C.: clearly ancient schoolmasters were not addicted to syllabus reform. Similarly, the gnostic sayings here ascribed to Niciarius and Carphilides, both otherwise unknown, overlap with the clever sayings of the philosopher Secundus, which were to have a vast diffusion in East and West; but Cicero already knew of this kind of thing as a school exercise.³⁷ Of even further Eastern origin are the riddles which Alexander put to the Gymnosophists, here presented anonymously as *Responsa Sapientum*. And even the idea of a dictionary by topics seems to travel from East to West, beginning in cuneiform and fetching up, I suppose, in Seville. But the question is not where these texts originate, but when and where they became bilingual, and when they came West: for our MSS are Western. So far as I know, the only sure *terminus ante quem* is the late seventh century, when a version of the capitula became the basis for a Latin-Anglo-Saxon dictionary, perhaps thanks to Theodore of Tarsus or Hadrian at Canterbury.³⁸ Was this then a recent import? I think it is more likely that successive generations of Greek teachers had been bringing these materials west, and that it was in the West that they became bilingual. This would at least explain how Carolingian scholars were able to lay their hands on so many different versions, while not one Greek MS, and only one papyrus, indicates their existence in the East.³⁹

³⁴ 421-38; edited by I. David (*Comm. Philol. Ienenses* v) (1894).

³⁶ H (109. 3-6) 'gratias confiteor maximas apud deum', but cf. n. 46.

³⁷ The exceptions are 30. 35 (*et graecae* omitted? cf. 31. 20-1), 109. 16, 32 (H), 283. 41 (interpolation? cf. 28-9), 421. 11-15 (Vat.).

³⁷ cf. *Top.* 32, *adulescentia* = *flos aetatis*, *senectus* = *occasum vitae* as *definitiones*.

³⁸ G. Baesecke, *Der Vocabularius Sti. Galli* (1933).

³⁹ P. Berlin inv. 10,582, s.v-vi, Greek-Latin-Coptic colloquium related to Mp. See W. Schubart in *Klio* 13 (1913), 27-38; G. Esau in *Philol.* 73 (1914/16), 157-8. A number of bilingual Aesop fragments have also survived.

If this problem is clarified, it becomes easier to tackle the problem which has tended to be confused with it, whether the Greek or the Latin half is more 'genuine'. This has particularly exercised discussions of the texts, further bedevilled by the idea of an original compiler: if instead we have a number of handbooks made for bilingual teaching in the West, it is not odd that originally Greek and originally Latin material should sit side by side, and that, by the time they reached our medieval MSS, the text of each language should show contamination by the other. As the teaching of Greek in the West disappeared, it was natural for the Latin text to become an increasingly literal crib: the *Hermeneumata* were no longer bilingual handbooks for children, but a rare aid for solitary adults interested in Greek. The process can be illustrated wherever we have more than one MS of the same text, e.g. ἀπό Μουσῶν is *a musis* in one MS and *a musarum* in another. In this situation, the linguistic evidence, of Grecisms in the Latin and vice versa, though interesting in itself, cannot be the basis for larger conclusions about the origin and use of the handbooks as a whole.⁴⁰ Above all, no discussion of the texts will be conclusive without an analysis of the glossaries, which may give us many clues to date and place. But here all the work remains to be done.

Vocabularium Rerum Admirandum

Returning at last to Celtes' find, the new *Hermeneumata* consist, as we saw, of a colloquium and a large glossary by topics, that is, capitula. Originally, however, there was an alphabetical glossary preceding them, and the glossary by topics was Book II. For at the top of c. 18 where the capitula begin we read (Plate III): τέλος του καταστοιχειου εικωσι και τεσσαρων γραμματων εισιν ονοματα XI CCCIX. ευτυχως αρχεται βιβλειον δευτερον. In fact τέλος is crossed out and αρχη written above it, but this is a later, mindless emendation by Celtes, not thinking or understanding beyond the fact that for him things were beginning rather than finishing here. A glossary of 11,309 words is massive: even if we halve the number for lemmata, it is still nearly twice as long as the longest parallel one surviving. There is no need to doubt it, however, for this is equally true of the capitula, and the reason, I suspect, is that two or more glossaries have been conflated. Below the title we have a brief preface (identical to that in M although the glossary is quite different), and a table of contents. This differs substantially in both content and order from what is actually in the MS, perhaps another sign of conflation. I integrate the two in the following table, which will also give an idea of the glossary's range: ⁴¹

CELTES CAPITULA

Order in Table of Contents (18r)		Order in Table of Contents (18r)	
18v	1 (de diis immortalibus + deorum nomina) 1, 2	30v	15 de potentia . . . et magistratibus 19, 20
	2 deorum nomina 3	31v	16 de negotiatione 37
19	3 de caelo (with intro.) 4	32	17 <u>de mercibus</u> 38
20	4 de signis caelestibus 5	32v	18 de militia 39
	5 de XII signis 8	34	20 de spectaculis 36
20v	6 de septem stellis 9		de ludo litterario 35
	7 de aedibus sacris 6	34v	21 de institutione 34
21	8 de diebus festis 7	35	22 <u>de arte musica</u>
	9 de spectaculis 36		23 <u>de mensuris</u>
21v	10 de membris humanis 10		24 de suppellectile 24
22v	11 de natura humana 11	36	25 de ferramentis 41
23v	12 de moribus 12		26 de aureis 28
29v	13 de cognatione 14	36v	27 de argenteis 29
30	14 de artificibus 40		28 de aereis 30

⁴⁰ So the criteria elaborated by A. Bataille, *Recherches de Papyrologie* 4 (1967), 161-9 (and cf. J. Bouffartigues, in S. Said *et al.*, *Études de Littérature Ancienne* (1979), 81-95) seem to me inapplicable to transmitted bilingual texts, though useful for located original documents.

⁴¹ Chapter headings underlined do not occur elsewhere (though some of their contents do, of course). Note that a colloquium is listed as no. 13 of the capitula, cf. n. 24.

37	29	de fictilibus	32	43v	45	de serpentibus	53
	30	de scorteis	33		46	de medicina	54
	31	de vestimentis	25	44v	47	de navigatione	55
37v	32	de coloribus		45	48	de ventis	56
	33	de linteamine	26				
38	33	de victu quotidiano	42				
38v	34	de escis	43				
	35	de potionibus	49				
39	36	de opere pistorio					
	37	de oleribus	47				
39v	38	de avibus	45				
	39	de piscibus	46				
40	40	de divitiis	27				
40v	41	de agris	21				
41v	42	de arboribus	52				
42v	43	de gregibus	51				
43	44	de bestiis	50				

In Table of Contents, but not in the MS :

13	de quotidiana conversatione
15	de aedificiis
16	de habitatione
17	de civitate
18	de oppido
22	de frugibus
23	de reditu
31	de ferreis
44	de carne
48	de secunda mensa

III

Ab exordio lucis usque ad vesperum

Now let us turn to the new colloquium,⁴² and see what it has to offer. Its title is *περί καθημερινῆς ἀναστροφῆς*, or *de conversatione cotidiana*, as it is translated in the Table of Contents. And in fact, though I have called these texts 'colloquia' as everyone has since Beatus Rhenanus, they are nowhere so described in the MSS,⁴³ and it is something of a misnomer: they do not purport to be dialogues, like Erasmus'; they are exercises in the vocabulary and idiom of everyday life, including dialogue, of course, but only as a component, not as their overall form. First person narrative dominates in scenes where the hero is a child, other scenes are depicted mainly through instructions to mute slaves, who fetch and carry, get food and clothes, dry one, dress one, reminding us of how much the ancient daily routine could consist of telling others what to do rather than doing it oneself. Moreover, in our text and elsewhere, the narrative sometimes degenerates into, or has not yet developed out of, a simple list of words relevant to the scene, demonstrating the close connection in aim between the colloquia and the glossaries that accompany them.⁴⁴ For the history of the handbooks it will be useful to see how far, within each redaction, the overlapping vocabulary is identical for both languages. Substantial differences are likely to mean separate origin, even if, once joined to a glossary, a colloquium could be expanded from it, and vice versa.

Apart from the mixture of dialogue, monologue and narrative, did the colloquia aim to present a coherent account, *ab exordio lucis usque ad vesperum*? Only our text and L⁴⁵ explicitly claim this, but consider the distribution of scenes: ⁴⁶

	C	M/E	Mp	L	S
Getting up	1	1	1	1	1
School	2	2		2	2
Business/Social		3	2	(5)*	
Lunch	3	4	(3)	(3)	
Preparing dinner	4		4		
Baths	5	5	5	4	
Dinner		6	6	6*	
Bedtime	6	7	7		

⁴² I refer to it by the section numbers.

⁴³ They are also called *de sermone cotidiano*, *de fabulis cotidianis*, *περί ὁμιλίας καθημερινῆς*. Mp and S have no title.

⁴⁴ e.g. 23-6, 57-8; L (379. 8-66); half-way stage 49-54, Mp (652-3).

⁴⁵ In Stephanus' MS (376. 47-9).

⁴⁶ Numbers = order of scenes, brackets = brief reference only, * = only in Stephanus' MS. I have excluded H, as it is clearly a patchwork, cf. 640. 11, 643. 25.

S may never have had more than it does, whereas L has clearly lost its ending. In Mp it is an adult who gets up, so he does not go to school. C has no business/social scene, but compensates by spilling over into the next day with an elaborate scene in the forum (71-7). In spite of much variation in content and emphasis, the basic shape is clear. This does not mean, however, that the account is continuous, or the same characters to be assumed throughout: the little boy in C who gets up and goes to school (3-45) can hardly be the *pater familias* who gets a sermon for coming home drunk at night (65-9). And a number of inconsistencies between the scenes are best explained by accepting that they are not meant to be a single drama.⁴⁷

In fact, there may be traces in C (though nowhere else) of an explicit division into scenes: at 70 *de lucubris et negotiis forensibus* seems to be a heading for the forum scene, while an incoherent passage (29) between two separate school scenes may conceal another heading like *de latinis studiis et graecis*, which would suit what follows. It is tempting to connect these with the reference to 'nine chapters' in the title: if we count the prologue, and assume a dinner scene lost, or count the two school scenes separately, nine would fit.⁴⁸ But irrespective of this, I think that the colloquium, like the dictionary, conflates two different sources. The boy gets up twice (3-5, 6-9), second time round acquiring a slave, a brother, and much more detail; he sallies forth and greets his friends in town, then returns home to say good morning to his parents before going to school—hardly sensible. There are the two different school scenes; and another incoherent passage (46) may be the remains of a different lunch scene. But transitional phrases which make little or no sense in context (6 *Tunc ergo*, 17 *Deinde . . . patris*, 28-9, 47 *Age ergo*, 70-1) suggest that at some point a superficial effort was made to weld the thing together into a continuous story.

The Text and the Greek

What principles should one adopt in editing a text of this kind? For the other colloquia, Goetz and his predecessors thoroughly overhauled the orthography, and hence often the morphology, and sometimes the syntax, of both the Latin and the Greek, to fit acceptable classical norms.⁴⁹ This makes for easy reading, but is otherwise hard to justify. Those classical norms, convenient but questionable at the best of times, are quite irrelevant to a subliterate text of the late Empire: there is no reason to suppose that our text was ever written according to them, any more than that it is written in Ciceronian periods. A simple transcript, on the other hand, appropriate for a school exercise preserved on a papyrus or wax tablet, is unsatisfactory for a transmitted text: even if our archetype was written by a schoolboy, we must still try to recover it, identifying and eliminating subsequent corruptions as far as possible. In principle, this holds good equally for the Latin and the Greek, but in practice the two are in quite different cases and for two different reasons.

Firstly, transmission. The original orthography and morphology of the Latin are largely lost; for Celtes' exemplar had 16 *habe . . . habete* (for *ave*), 21 *scamellum*, 50 *oba* (for *ova*), 57 *labracrum* (for *lavacrum*), 75 *necat* (for *negat*): it is unlikely to have had no more such. They are exceptions, where Celtes corrected *after* copying, proving the rule, that he generally corrected *currente calamo*,⁵⁰ imposing his own orthography, and more classical forms where he knew them. This is no surprise. Celtes' world was not Politian's; it would not have crossed his mind to make a diplomatic transcript. For the Greek, however, I think he did more or less that, willy-nilly, not knowing the language enough to do otherwise; his corrections here are equally revealing in the opposite sense.⁵¹ But granted that for the Greek we have a near-transcript of a much older manuscript, the critical problem remains: Greek transmitted in the West is especially liable to miscopying; even common words

⁴⁷ So, with reference to M, Krumbacher in *Festschr. W. von Christ* (1891), 309 (this edition of M is the best of any colloquium).

⁴⁸ The barbarous 'νοη' was doubtless in Celtes' exemplar, but may just have interpreted a numeral in the original title. It is also possible that the colloquium was once no. 9 in the capitula.

⁴⁹ 637-59; cf. xxxiv-vi.

⁵⁰ A few original spellings and corruptions survive uncorrected, e.g. 19 *habe*, 52 *allium*, 56 *colla*.

⁵¹ He normally puts an accent on καί, and see app. crit. on e.g. 5 λεῖπα, 16 χερε, 37, 39; he generally does not delete the original, as he does correcting the Latin, and it may be that there were Greek corrections in the exemplar. A few corruptions look like the result of incorporated interlinear variants: 17 επανενημι, 45 μηετρι, 52 χειρουδιου, 761 μυμρους (μ/η).

can be monstrously misdivided and letters strangely confused.⁵² Worse can happen if the scribe knows some Greek, for then either half of the text may be deliberately mauled to make it correspond *ad verbum* with the other; so, for instance, the Greek article does not have much life expectancy in a bilingual transmission. But identifying this kind of fault, and deciding what to do with it, is a much less tractable problem than that of miscopying, and cannot be disentangled from the second factor differentiating the Latin from the Greek text, namely the nature of the Greek version.⁵³

That it is a version, a crib which never existed independently of the Latin, is clear enough. The translator faithfully renders each part of speech with its equivalent, rarely letting fly with e.g. 27 τῷ διδασκόντι με for *doctori meo*.⁵⁴ Faced with idiomatic expressions, he often produces calques, e.g. 13, 15 *procedo in publicum* προερχομαι εἰς δημόσιον, 17 *insularium* νησοφιλακᾶ, 67 *infamiam maximam tibi cumulasti* διωχῆμαι μεγίστον σοι ἐπλήροσας. It does not follow, however, that he was a Greekless illiterate to whom any and every kind of mistake can be ascribed. Not till the fifteenth century did literal translation cease to be respectable, for all the protests of the enlightened few. Can we draw a rough identikit of this translator's linguistic level, to distinguish his version, however odd, from later distortions, and perhaps also date him? For though there can be little doubt that this colloquium, like the others, was bilingual from the start, it cannot be taken for granted, given the total dependence of the Greek in this case, that the Greek we have is the original. The colloquium might have lost its Greek half and acquired a new one later. At two points the Greek translates corruptions in the Latin text,⁵⁵ and while this does not prove that the version as a whole is later,⁵⁶ it warns us to keep an open mind.

The mass of non-literary Greek which has emerged on papyri since Goetz's day has vastly extended our grammatical and lexical map of the language, and does give some guide to what might be possible, albeit a regionally remote and peculiar one. It is evidence which I am not competent to evaluate, but which is now just codified enough to tempt an amateur effort, which I hope may provoke experts to lend their aid.⁵⁷

What kind of Greek, then, does this version present? It is unmistakably ancient, not burgeoning medieval, Greek,⁵⁸ not only in vocabulary (44 bread is ἄρτος, to take the most obvious case), which could derive from a glossary, but also in grammar, which could not. For it is not classical grammar, as transmitted in ancient text-books. There is a range of *-mi* verbs and strong aorists, but their inflection is uncertain, and competitors are in evidence.⁵⁹ Middle verbs can slip into active forms.⁶⁰ Augments come and go.⁶¹ An aorist imperative ending can hitch itself to a present stem.⁶² Optatives

⁵² e.g. 47 ποιη κονδυνον, 66 ουλετωτε, 72 κνετθῦ. There are recurrent confusions of α/δ, λ/δ, ιτ/τι/π, ν/ρ and a whole series of κ for c (12, 39, 42, 46, 47, 63, 70). Final sigma is always lunate, the only regular ligature is στ, σπ and εσ occur occasionally, υι once; abbreviations only occur at 17 πρὸς = πατρός, 35 φονίδα, 37 π' = περί, 70 δυναμί, 71 κς = κυριος, 35, 73 γραμάτων, 74 φ = προς. At 58 and 59 there is an abbreviation ρ: which I do not understand. Where a word recurs at short intervals it is often abbreviated with a colon, or left untranslated. Some of this may be due to Celtes. The Latin text also sometimes had no or false word divisions, cf. 62.

⁵³ So in fact use of the article is odd in translations even when we have the original document, cf. Meuwese, op. cit., next note, 127.

⁵⁴ Similarly 39 *pro posse* = κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, cf. app. crit. and 70; 66 *qui te viderunt* = οἱ ἰδόντες σε. Gerundives (74, 75) are rendered with pf. part. For the technique, see Bouffartignes, op. cit. in n. 40; H. Marti, *Übersetzer der Augustinzeit* (1974); S. Lundström, *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen* (1955); I. Müller-Rohlfen, *Die lat. Raven-natische Übersetzung der Hippokratishen Aphorismen* (1980). For Greek translations from Latin see V. Reichmann, *Römische Literatur in gr. Übersetzung* (Philologus Suppl. 24) (1943), A. P. M. Meuwese, *De rerum gestarum Divi Augusti versione Graeca* (1920); E. G. Domingo, *Latinismos en la Koine* (1979) (based on bilingual inscriptions, but with general bibliography).

⁵⁵ 17 *amicos*, 75 *crescit*; possibly also 67 *accidit*.

⁵⁶ e.g. George Hermonymus, copying E in Paris. gr. 3049, misread (232. 50) *adice amiculum* as *aduce avunculum*, and so altered ἐπίδοξ ἐπικάρσιον to εἰσαγε τὸν θεόν. Such alterations, of course, imply some knowledge of Greek.

⁵⁷ F. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byz. Periods* I (1976); II (1981) [= G., vol. and p.]; B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri* (1973) [= M §]; L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* (1945) [= P. and p.]; F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (1975) [= BDR §].

⁵⁸ Contrast the *Folium Parisinum* (CGL II, 563), newly edited by J. Kramer in *Proc. XVI Internat. Congr. of Papyrology* (1981), 55–71. > (CGL II, 563).

⁵⁹ So beside δοσ, δοθηται, διδοσθαι, διδοσθαι, ἀπεδοκα we find διδεται = *datur*, επιδιδει = *porrigit*, επιδιδειν = *ad-ferre*, αποδιδουσιν = *reddunt* (cf. G. II, 382–4); beside σπιμι = *eo* (and imperatives), also σπιουσι = *eunt*, επανειμι = *regredior* (cf. n. 51), επανιετι = *regreditur* (cf. M §120, BDR §99); beside ανεστην = *surrexi*, also ανιστασθα = *surrexi*, ανιστασθαι = *surge*; σταθηναι = *sisti*, σταθηται = *sistitur*; 26 δικυσον, διζον; ηλθον regularly, but 62 ελθατω (G. II, 341), 71 προηλθειν, 77 ηλθουσιν; ενεγχε but κατενεγκασθαι (cf. M §317). Note also 47 εαρισον, 48 στρωνησον, 53 ρενεσον.

⁶⁰ e.g. 10, 59 ητησαμην = *poposci*, 43 αιτω = *posco* (and cf. 14); -ερχομαι regularly, but 73 εισερχουσιν; 69 αναπαυσασθαι, 71 αναπαυσον; 67, 73 δυνατε (= -αι), but 28 δυνασομεν; at 9 ενδυσ με is probably influenced by the Latin, cf. 43. In general, see G. II, 325–7, M §316.

⁶¹ cf. G. II, 223–54, M §§231–64; but augments are much more frequently omitted here than in the papyri.

⁶² 3 υποδενον, 25 παραγραφον, 47 επιτασσον, ? 56 επερον; aorist imperatives so outnumber present ones that the transference is not surprising. The opposite phenomenon (= on aorist stem) is found in papyri (M §684).

are of course quite out. Purpose is expressed exclusively by *ἵνα*, which can be followed by a future as well as a subjunctive.⁶³ Latin perfects are normally and naturally rendered by aorists, but perfects make a few random appearances.⁶⁴ Possessive adjectives are on the retreat in favour of possessive pronouns.⁶⁵ Most of this is paralleled in the language of the New Testament and the non-literary papyri, and must have been a living language for the translator; it could not have been reconstructed from books.

The papyri also support most of the orthographical features of the text, which I think is perhaps long enough to warrant using quantitative criteria to distinguish scribal error. For instance, interchanges of *ε*/ι, *ε*/αι, *ο*/ω are commonplace in the papyri and occur by the dozen in this text; but the fully itacistic ones of *ε*/υ and *η*/οι are rare in the papyri, and here occur just twice each⁶⁶—careless imports of a later scribe, then, rather than carefully preserved oddities of the original? Admittedly the frequency of interchanges in the text does not exactly mirror that in the papyri, and clearly Greek in the West could be subject to very different influences, which for lack of evidence we can hardly guess at.⁶⁷ Such influences may also have worked on vocabulary and idiom, so it is possible that some of the calques were not *ad hoc* creations, but in use among Greek speakers in the West, as tends to happen in the language of an immigrant community, or wherever a foreign language is dominant.⁶⁸ Still, there are limits, and the text itself suggests some. For instance, the translator is normally correct in his use of prepositions; so when we find *ἐκ* and *μετά* misbehaving with a dative in odd cases, it may well be a later scribe who got hypnotized by the Latin.⁶⁹ Likewise, since we have a perfectly decent genitive absolute at 40, the illiterate rendering at 45 is surely a corruption, and we can see the process happening in the schizophrenic *καθήμενω μου* = *sedente me* (22).⁷⁰

All in all, I see no reason to doubt that the Greek version is roughly contemporary with the Latin text. Its vocabulary suggests a direct knowledge of a living language, not a concoction from glossaries, at any rate not from any extant one. Was the translator a Greek or a Latin speaker? Given the nature of literal translation, it is not easy to tell. Some misinterpretations of Latin morphology suggest rather a Greek.⁷¹ Certainly, if it was he, rather than some later joker, who took Lucan for an adjective and translated him *φωτισιον* (38), he was short on Latin culture.

In the text which follows I have silently standardized the Latin orthography, as this is not the place to explore the spelling habits of Conrad Celtes. Where I have emended, the MS reading is of course recorded in the apparatus. For the Greek, I decided to try and restore the original version, emending if I can where I think it is reasonable to suspect subsequent error, on the lines explained above. But in this case all deviations from the MS are recorded apart from mis-divisions of words, which are only recorded if relevant to other corruption. It was no doubt a rash decision, and the result does look pretty odd; it might have looked less so if I had added accents, breathings and iota subscripts (there are none in the MS), but I can think of no good reason for doing so: unlike Celtes, I do not hope that this text will help the youngsters of Europe to learn Greek, but that it may interest as a document, as the product of an ancient school. It may be that the document has suffered much more in transmission than I allow for, that the standard of Greek in a Western school in the late empire was much higher than this. Certainly, this edition can be no more than a holding operation, and there will be many cases where I have judged wrongly: so, *lector discretissime, veniam te precor*.

⁶³ 3 ὀρθοῖμεν, 28 δυνήσομεν (cf. 68), and 47 ἐξησώ, M §540-3.

⁶⁴ 45 πεποκα, 68 τεθοριβημε, 66 ειρηκασι = *dicent*, but there are other non-matching tenses.

⁶⁵ Not as much as in *koin* generally (BDR §285), probably because of Latin influence, cf. Meuwese, op. cit. (n. 54), 127; Domingo, op. cit., ibid., pp. 192 ff. At 39 and 73 ιδιον replaces the possessive (BDR §286). The possessive is omitted with κυριος (12, 62; but cf. 44, 71).

⁶⁶ 67 καταίχειν, 77 λείπεινοι; 14 εξηρημενη = -οι; 67 τοιαιτοις = -ης. Cf. G. I, 272-3, 265-6.

⁶⁷ e.g. interchanges of υ/οι, η/υ and η/ει are less frequent here than in the papyri, υ/υ much more frequent (or scribal error?). Recurrent peculiarities include: -γενωσκω, γενεται, λειπα; 14 θεος, 51 θερμος, 50 ασπαργος, 72 πολιτικός, all accusative plural; 37 κωμηδιον, 38 κωμεδιος; 50, 52 απωρα, Latin influence? cf. 4 γραβατου, 51 βουλβου.

⁶⁸ e.g. 42 αργεiai = *feriae*, well attested in the Roman period.

⁶⁹ It remains possible that the translator was inconsistent, so I have left these cases, *dubitanter*; cf. 21 επανω, 39 εγγυς, 77 απερ, all with acc.

⁷⁰ Some further linguistic oddities, for which any evidence would be most welcome: nom. for voc. without article (cf. BDR §147) at 3, 6 (cf. 70); 17 τροφον, 52 πλερον accus.; 44 γαλας, 72 κριθεντος genit.; 17 απασιν, 67, 76 μεγα indecl.? 74 ποιας relative. Various non-words are discussed in the notes, but much remains to do.

⁷¹ 45 reverti (taken as imper.?), 74 custodis (as dat. plur.?), 76 cui (as interrog.). Two Greek words are often given for one Latin one, in some cases apparently pairing *vox propria* with etymological calque, e.g. 35 καλεισματα, ονοματα = *vocabula*; in one case (57) the *vox propria* seems to have spawned a Latin calque, *devestitorium*. Moreover, as Prof. Maehler points out to me, a Latin speaker would probably have learnt to spell Greek more by the rule-book. There are any number of inappropriate renderings, but these could be due to ignorance of either language.

TEXT

Note

Celtes first wrote the title and the Latin text, in black ink; then the Greek, and additions and corrections to the Latin, in bright red. Occasionally, he was inspired to add German glosses: 58 Riben 60 bitten, Schinbein 70 νικκεν (etymological fancy, based on corrupt νικεταα?). There are no paragraphs, virtually no punctuation, sparse and random capital letters.

Square brackets in the text indicate doublet glosses (cf. n. 71), not deletions. The beginnings of sections are marked by a capital letter. The *apparatus* does not aim to provide a diplomatic transcript: I give the MS reading where I have emended the Greek in any way, the Latin in substance; otherwise I only note features which may be evidence for Celtes' exemplar; so, for instance, not cases where Celtes left out some words on first copying the Latin, and added them on noticing the omissions while copying the Greek.

121 εκ καταστιχιου του κικερωνος κεφαλα νονη περι καθημερινη<c> αναστροφης

Preface

- ① Αναστροφη, τριβη καθημερινη, οφειλει δοθιναι απασιν τοις παισιν και
 Conversatio, usus cotidianus, debet dari omnibus pueris et
 κοραις, επιδη αναγκεα ειχειν τοις μεικροις και μειζοσιν,
 puellis, quoniam necessaria sunt minoribus et maioribus,
- 2 δια την αρχαιαν συνηθειαν και επιστημην. Ουτως αρχομαι
 propter antiquam consuetudinem et disciplinam. Sic incipiam
 γραφειν, απ' αρχης του ορθου μεχρι του εσπερου.
 scribere, ab exordio lucis usque ad vesperum.

Gloss ... D.
 ↑
 1-77

Getting up

- 3 Τροφος, τροφευς, ενδυςον με και υποδεον· καιρος εστιν, ωρα εστιν,
 Nutrix, nutritor, vesti me et calcia; tempus est, hora est,
- 4 προ ορθου ινα ορθριωμεν προς εχολην. Πρωι οτε ηρξαμην γρηγορην,
 ante lucem ut manicemus ad scholam. Mane cum coepi vigilare,
 (και πρωι εγρηγορησα) ηγερθην, ανεστην εκ του υπνου και εκ του γραβατου,
 (et mane vigilavi), surrexi, surrexi de somno et a grabato,
- 5 εκ της κλινης. Τουτο πρωτον ποιω, (πρωτον εποιησα) απεθηκα ενκυμετρα,
 de lecto. Hoc primum facio, (primum feci): deposui dormitoria,
 και λαβον λινουδιον, επικαρσιον, επωμιον, σπενδονην, χειτωνα, και
 et sumpsi linteum, amictulum, pallium, fasciam, tunicam, et
 τα λειπα ενδυματα.
 reliqua indumenta.
- 6 Τοτε ουν εξυπνισα εμον παιδα, ειπον αυτω, Εγειρον, παις, ορα ει ηδη
 Tunc ergo excitavi meum puerum, dixi illi: Surge, puer, vide si iam
 λαμπει· ανυξον την θυραν και την θυριδα. και κεινος ουτως εποιησεν.
 lucet: aperi ostium et fenestram. at ille ita fecit.
- 7 Τοτε αυτω ειπον, Δος χρημετα, επιδος υποδηματα, διπλωσων ειματια
 Tunc ei dixi: Da res, porrige calciamenta, plica vestimenta
- 8 καθερωτερα και αποθεσ καθημερινα χωρις. Δος επικαρσιον και
 mundiora et repona cotidiana separatim. Da amictulum et
- 9 παλλειον. λαβε. ελαβον και τα λειπα. Ειτα καταβενω εκ τη κλεινη,
 pallium. accipe. accepi et reliqua. Deinde descendo de lecto,
 περιζωνημαι, επωμιον περιτιθημι ττραχηλη, ενδυο με, (ενδυσα με)
 praecingor, pallium circumdo collo, vestio me, (vestivi me)

- 10 ὡς πρέπει, (ὡς ἐπρεπεν) υἱὸν ὑποδεσποτὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐγενὴν. Οὕτως
ut decet, (ut decuit) filium familias hominem ingenuum. Sic
ἡτῆρα μὴν ὑποδηματὰ, ἀναξυρία, πειλία, κημεϊδᾶς. ὑποδενόμε, ὑποδεθὴν.
porosci caligas, bracas, udones, ocreas. calcior, calciatus sum.
- 11 Διδετε μοι ὕδωρ πρὸς ὄψην, νιπτῶ [πλυνῶ]. ὅτε ἐνὺψα, τὸ στόμα κλυζο,
Datur mihi aqua ad faciem, lavo [lavo]. cum lavi, os colluo,
ὅτε (ἐκλυσά), ἐγμασσω ὠμολινῶ καθάρῳ, ἐξεμαξά. δός ἡ πεντάλακον ἐγμαγιον.
(cum)collui, extergo linteo mundo, extersi. da sabanum extersorium;
- 12 ἐγμαξον, ἐξεμαξίν. Ἐνεγκε ὕδωρ καθήρον τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐμοὶ ἀδελφῷ,
exterge, exterseram. Affer aquam mundam tuo domino, meo fratri,
- 12V ἵνα καὶ/οὗτος μετὰ μου (ἢ μετὰ ἡμῖν) προέρχεται εἰς δημοσίον, πρὸς σχολήν.
ut et /ille mecum (aut nobiscum) procedat in publicum, ad scholam.
- 13 Καὶ οὕτως ἐφῆξεν ἐκέλευσα δο [διδόσθαι] ἡμῖν (ὑμῖν, ἐκείνοις, ἐμοί)
Et sic ordine iussi dari thnari nobis (vobis, illis, mihi)
χειτῶνα (χειτῶνας) καὶ λινουδὴν (καὶ λινουδίου), λευκὴν φαينوλήν, βίρρον.
tunicam (tunicas) et lineam (et lineas), albam paenulam, cucullum.
- 14 Οὕτως ἐξηρτημένος (οὕτως ἐξηρτημένη) προσκοινησάμεν (προσκοινησά) θεός
Sic aptatus (sic aptati) adoravimus (adoravi) deos
πάντας, καὶ ἡτῆρα μὴν (καὶ ἡτῆρα μὴν) καλὴν ἐκβάσιν καὶ ἐπιτεύξιν
omnes, et petivi (et petivimus) bonum processum et eventum
ολῆς τῆς ἡμέρας.
diei totius.
- 15 Ἐνθεν ἡτέρον προέρχομαι ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου εἰς δημοσίον, εἰς ἀκροατήριον,
Hinc postea procedo de domo in publicum, in auditorium,
εἰς γεφυράν, εἰς κώμην, εἰς ἀγοράν, σὺν τῷ ἐμῷ παιδεῖω καμπτροφορῷ, ἢ
in pontem, in vicum, in forum, cum meo puero capsario, aut
- 16 παιδαγωγῷ ἢ συμμάθητι. Εἰ τις γνωστός ἢ φίλος συνήντισεν μοι,
paedagogo, aut condiscipulo. Si quis notus aut amicus occurrit mihi,
ἀσπασάμην αὐτὸν τῷ αὐτοῦ ὀνοματί. ἀντάσπαζετε με τῷ ἐμῷ ὀνοματί,
saluto eum nomine suo. resalutat me nomine meo,
(ἀσπασμός, ἡσπάζαμην, ἀσπάσας). κυρίε, χερε, χερεται· εὐ σοὶ ἔστο.
(salutatio, salutavi, saluta). ave, domine, avete; bene tibi sit.
- 17 Εἰτα ἐπανεῖμι εἰς οἰκίαν τοῦ πατρὸς. ἀπὶ μὲν ἀσπασάσθαι γονεῖς, πατέρα
Deinde regredior ad domum patris. eo salutare parentes, patrem
καὶ μητέρα καὶ πατέρα καὶ μῆμα, ἀδελφὸν καὶ ἀδελφὴν καὶ πάντας συγγενεῖς,
et matrem et avum et aviam, fratrem et sororem et omnes cognatos,
θίον καὶ φίλους, τροφὸν καὶ τροφόν, πρεσβυτέρην τῆς οἰκίας,
avunculum et famicos, nutricem et nutritorem, maiorem domus,
πάντας συνέλευθους, θυροῦρον, οἰκιακόν, γειτῶνας, ἀπασὶν φίλους,
omnes collibertos, ostiarium, domesticum, vicinos, omnes amicos,
ἐνοικητήν, νησοφίλακα, εὐνουχόν.
incolam, insularium, eunuchum.

At School

- 18 Ἀπὶ μὲν ἐξω πρὸς ἀκροατήριον ψηφιστοῦ, σημιογράφου, Ἑλλήνων, Ῥωμαίων,
Eo foras ad auditorium calculatoris, notarii, Graeci, Latini,
- 19 ῥητορὸς. Εἰσελθὼν εἰς σχολήν, καὶ εἶπον, Χαίρε, διδασκῶλη,
oratoris. Intravi in scholam, et dixi: Ave, magister, ave

- 20 καθηγητα. και κεινος με αντησπασατο. Διδωσιν μοι αναλογιον και κελευει
praeceptor. et ille me resalutat. Dat mihi manuale et iubet
με αναγινωσκειν παρ'αυτω σελιδας πεντε και ανεγνωκα ακριβως
me legere apud se paginas quinque; et legi certe
- 13r 21 και επισημος. τοτε αλλω εδοκα. Υστερον επανερχομαι προς υποκοφιστην./
et nobiliter. tunc alio dedi. Postea redeo ad subdoctorem./
ασπασομαι αυτον και συμμαθητας, και κεινοι εμε αντησπασαντο. τοτε
saluto illum et condiscipulos, et illi me resalutaverunt. tunc
εκαθισα τω τοπω μου (το εμου τοπω), επανο βαθρον η διφρον η
sedi in loco meo (meo loco), super scamnum aut sellam aut
- 22 βαθμον η υποποδιον η καθεδραν. Καθημενω μου επιδιδει ο παις μου
gradum aut scamellum aut cathedram. Sedente me porrigit puer meus
καμπτροφορος πινακιδας και θηκην γραφίων, παραγραφον, δελτον
scriniarius pugillares et thecam graphiorum, praeductale, tabulam
και θερμους.
et lupinos.
- 23 ταποκαстанνο, δακτυλιζω, ψηφιζω, αριθμω, αριθμω, αναριθμω, * αποαριθμω,
deduco, dūco, computo, numero, numerabo, denumero, dinumero,
διπλασιαζω, μεριζω, μερη, πυγμα, [ζητημα], ζητω, χρηςις, [τρειβη], ψηφιζομαι
multiplico, partior, partes, quaestio, quaero, usus, [usus], calculor
[ψηφιζω], αναγεωσκω, στοιχους, ονομα, ονοματα.
[calculor], lego, versus, nomen, nomina.
- 24 Σημιογραφος, σημια, χαρακτηρ, λημψης, επιλημψις, επιγραμмон,
Notarius, notae, nota, summa, acceptio, superpositum,
- 25 υπογραμμον, εκτιθεμενον, κεντεμα, διαδοχον, διαδοχος. Επαναγνωσις, αναγορευσις,
praescriptum, expositum, punctum, exceptum, exceptor; Relectio, recitatio,
[επαναγνωσις], κλιςις, κλιςμοι, [κλιςματα], υπομνημα, υπομνηματα,
[recitatio], declinatio, declinationes, [declinationes] commentarium, commentaria,
ποιηται, πραξις, πραξεις, βιβλιον, βιβλια, ικνυουσραι, παραγραφον, παραγραφον,
auctores, actio, actiones, liber, libri, ιcackae, praeductum, praeduc,
- 26 Κεντησον, προσεχε, διδαξον, δικνυσον, διξον, προθεσ, συναγε, ενπαξον,
Interpunge, attende, doce, monstra, ostende, propone, admove, impinge,
αξον, [αγε], απολογισον, απολογια, γραφιον, αναδος, παραδος, γραφον, εξαλειψον.
adduc, excusa, excusatio, stilus, dicta, trade, scribe, dele.
- 27 Λιαινω [εξαλειφω] και παραγραφω προς τον επιγραμμον, και γραφω, και
Deleo [deleo] et praeduco ad superpostum, et scribo, et
δικνυω τω διδασκοντι με. και επηνησεν με οτι καλως εγραψα.
ostendo doctori meo. et laudavit me quod bene scripsi.
- 28 επαναγεωσκω τη εγραψα κατα διαστολην. Αναγορευω. ανηγορευκα
relego quod scripsi ad distinctum. Recito. recitavi
προτερος σου. ψευδη. ου ψευδομαι. εαν αληθος λεγεις, ειπεν μοι ο εμος
prior te. mentiris. non mentior. si verum dicis, dixit mihi meus
αγομεν εις οικον, ινα δυνησομεν υπαγειν προς ελλινα [ελληνικον] και
paedagogus, eamus domum, ut possimus ire ad Graecum et
- 13v 29 προς/ρωμαιικον [ρωμαιον]. Ειτα εις παλεστραν απολυομεθα, προς ρωμια
ad /grammaticum. Deinde ad ceroma dimittimur, ad Latina
παιδια και ελληνικα.
studia et ad Graeca.

- 30 Εισήλθον εἰς σκολὴν ἑλλινος καὶ εἰς ἀκροατήριον ῥωμαίου. ἐγμάθω
 Intravimus scholam Graeci et auditorium grammatici. edisco
 τὰ γράπτα μου. εἰ ἐτύμος εἰμι, εὐθὺς ἀποδοίδοι· εἰ δὲ μὴ, πάλιν
 scripta mea. si paratus sum, statim reddo; sin autem, iterum
 ἀναγινώσκω.
 lego.
- 31 προανα/ ἐπανα/ ἐπανεγνώκα, προανα/ προαναγνώκαμεν, προαναγνώκαται, ἐπανεγνώκαμεν,
 Praelego, relego, relegi, praelegi, praelegimus, praelegistis, relegimus,
 ἐπανεγνώκαται, ἀναγορεύω, ἀναγορεύκα, ἀποδοίδοι, ἀπεδώκα, πρᾶσσω, ἐπράξα, λαμβάνω.
 relegistis, recito, recitavi, reddo, reddidi, ago, egi, accipio.
- 32 Ἐλάβον ἀναγνώσιν, στοίχους, λέξεις. ἐξηγεῖτε μοι ἀγνοστον
 Accepi lectionem, versus, glossulas. explanatur mihi ignotus
- 33 βιβλίον ἢ ἀγνοστη ἀναγνώσις. Ἐξηγησίς παραδίδοτε. λαμβάνω τοπον, καὶ
 liber aut ignota lectio. Expositio traditur. accipio locum, et
 ἄλλοι μετ' ἐμοῦ σιμερινόν [ἀπωχρονισμόν], οἱ λυποὶ ἀποφροντίζουσιν
 alii mecum extemporalem [extemporalem], ceteri accuratum
- 34 [ἐπιμελιτάτον] ἀποδίδουσι. Οἱ μικροὶ ἐρμινεύματα καὶ συλλαβὰς,
 [accuratum] reddunt. Minores interpretamenta et syllabas,
 τοῦ ῥήματος κλισίαν, τέχνην ἀπασιν, διαλεκτὸν διηγούνται παρὰ
 sermonis declinationem, artem omnem, sermonem exercent apud
- 35 ὑποσοφιστὴν· Πτῶσις ὀνομάτων, γένη ὀνομάτων, ἀριθμούς, σκημάτια,
 subdoctorem: Casus nominum, genera nominum, numeros, figuras,
 [καταλείματα] ὀνόματα κατὰ στυχίον, γράμματα, φωνενδὰ καὶ ἡμιφωνα καὶ
 [vocabula] vocabula per litteras, litteras, vocales et semivocales et
 ἀφωνα· διαμερίζουσι, σιστελλοῦσι, ἐπαρῶσιν.
 mutas; dividunt, suspendunt, elevant.
- 36 Εἴτα ἀπαντὰ διέρχοντε, τὰ δὲ κεφαλαιὰ ὀνομάτων,
 Deinde universa pertranseunt, sed et capitula nominum,
- 37 μέρη λόγου τὰ ὀκτώ. οὕτως γένηται ἡ εὐγεία. Ἀπιοῦσι προτοσχοιοὶ
 partes orationis octo. sic fit silentium. Eunt priores
 πρὸς διδάσκαλον, ἀναγενοσκούσιν ἀναγνώσιν περὶ Ἐλῖαδος, ἄλλην περὶ
 ad magistrum, legunt lectionem de Iliade, aliam de
 Ὀδυσσεύς. λαμβανοῦσι τοπον, παρενεσίαν, ἀμφισβητήσιν, ἱστορίαν,
 Odysseia. accipiunt locum, suasoriam, controversiam, historiam,
 κωμῆδιαν, δράγματα, ἀπασιν φιλοπονίαν/ῥηθωρίαν, προφασίν τοῦ Ἑλλιακοῦ
 comoediam, narrationes, omnem industriam/orationis, causas Troici
 πολέμου, προφασίν τῆς ἀναγορεύσεως, ἀναδοσίαν
 belli, materiam recitationis, redictiones;
- 38 Πράξεις τοῦ Κικερωνοῦ, Οὐεργιλίου, Φωτιδίου, Διο
 Actiones Tullianas, Maronem, Persium, Lucanum, Statium, duo
 μάχη, τρεῖς κωμείας,
 bella, Terentium, Sallustium, tres comoedias, Theocritum, Thucydidem,
- 39 καὶ τοὺς κυνικοὺς. Τότε
 Demosthenem, Hippocraten, Xenophontem et Cynicos. Tunc
 ἐπανέρχεται ἕκαστος, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τοπῷ καθέουσιν. ἕκαστος ἀναγινώσκει
 revertitur quisque, in suo loco considunt. quisque legit
 ἀναγνώσιν αὐτῷ δεδειγμένην· ἄλλος γράφει, ἐθοποιεῖ εἰς τάξιν
 lectionem sibi subtraditam; alter scribit, alter meditatur. in ordinem

αναγορευουσιν ἑκάστος κατὰ τὴν δινάμιν· ἡ τῆς καλῶς ἀνεγορευεῖν, ἐπενεῖτε,
 recitant quisque pro posse; si quis bene recitavit, laudatur,
 εἰ τῆς κακῶς, δερετέ. γεινέτε ἀπολυσις· ἀπολυοματὰ ἐγγυε τὴν ὥραν
 si quis male, coeretur. Fit dimissio: dimittimur circiter horam
 ἐβδομην.
 septimam.

- 40 Κελευοντος καθηγητου ανιστανται οι μικροτατοι προς και ημεις
 Iubente praeceptore surgunt minores ad syllabas, et nos
 ἀνεγορευκαμεν αμιλλαν και στοιχουσ αποδιδουσιν
 recitamus dictatum et versus ad subdoctorem; reddunt nomina
- 41 και ερμινευματα, γραφουσιν Δευτερα ταξης επαναγενωσκει. και
 et interpretamenta, scribunt lectionem. Secunda classis relegit. et
 εγω εν τη πρωτη, ως εκαθισαμεν, διερχομαι (διελθε, διηλθον)
 ego in prima, ut sedimus, pertranseo (pertransi, pertransivi)
- 42 το υπομνημα μου, και λεξης και τεχνην. Φωνηθεις εξελθον εξω. απελυεεν
 commentarium meum, et lexeis et artem. Clamatus exivi foras. dimisit
 ημας καθηγητης, και εδωκεν αργειας εις αυριον. εκαστος επανιετε οικoi.
 nos praeceptor, et dedit ferias in crastinum. quisque regreditur domi.

Lunch

- 43 Ειςερχομε οικον του πατρος, εγδιωμε ειματια, αισθησιν καθηρωθερον,
 Intro domum patris, exuo vestimenta, habitum mundiozem,
 ενδυομε καθημερινον. αιτω η ερωτω η αυτος λαμβανω υδωρ προς χειρας.
 induo cotidianum. posco aut rogo aut ipse sumo aquam ad manus.
- 44 Επιδη πεινω, λεγω τω μου παιδει, Θεσ τραπεσαν, επιτραπαισαν και
 Quoniam esurio, dico meo puero: Pone mensam et mantele,
 χειρωμακτρον και απιθι/προς την κυριαν σου, ενεγκε αρτον και προσφαγιον
 14v mappam; et vade /ad tuam dominam, et adfer panem et pulmentarium et
- 45 ποσιν οινου, ζυθου, αρτιτου, αβρυνθιου, γαλας. Ειπε τη εμη μηετρι οτι
 potionem vini, cervisiae, conditi, absinthii, lactis. Dic meae matri quod
 παλιν εχω επανειθι εις οικον του διδας(καλου). δια τουτο ουν σπευδε
 iterum habeo reverti ad domum magistri. ideo ergo festina
 ημειν επιδιδειν αριστον. ηριστησα αρκετως και πεποκα. τεπανασυνλεκτα
 nobis adferre prandium. prandi sufficienter et bibi. remota
 τραπεσα ανιστασσα. ηγροθην προς διφθερας, προς πινακιδας.
 mensa surrexi. surrexi ad instrumenta, ad codices.
- 46 Εφη μοι ο εμος πεδαγογος, Οψε ηριστικας. τι πασχεις σημερον; ουδεν
 Ait mihi meus papas: Sero prandisti. quid pateris hodie? nihil
 εγευσαμεν. η μη τη νηετης λουη, επιδη οφειλιμον εστην, επιδη
 gustavi. aut numquid ieiunus lavis, quoniam utile est, eoque
 ενωροτερον ανιστασις; ουτως πιστευω γενυτω. αγε ουν αγομεν οικoi
 temperius surgis? sic credo, sic fiat. age ergo eamus domum,
 και γαρ πεινω.
 etenim esurio.

Preparations for Dinner

- 47 Επιτασσον τω συνδουλω εχησω γευμα απο βαλανιου. προσθεσ θερμαντηρα
 Iniunge tuo conservo habeam gustare a balneo. adpone cusciniā
 και πλειονας κυτρας, ποιησον διπνον, θεσ ανθρακας εν τω κυτωνει· αρισον
 et plures ollas, fac cenam, pone carbones in mansionem; scopa

- 48 την οικίαν, ενεγκαι ιδωρ. Καλιφον βαθρον, στρωνησον την κληνιν, συνθεσ hospitium, adfer aquam. Cooperi scamnum, sterne lectum, compone
- 49 στιβαδιον και αναστροματα εκτεινον, θεσ καθεροτερον. Ανυξον ταμειον, stibadium et stragula extende, pone mundiorem. Aperi cellarium, διενεγκε οινοφορα, και οινον, ελεον και γαριδιον, χειτινην. profer vasa vinaria, et vinum, oleum et liquamen, cervisiam.
- 50 Προς αρτιματα πιπεριν, οπος, κυμεινον, αρτιματα, αλας, κρομια Ad condimenta piper, laser, cyminum, mixta condimenta, sales, cepam και σκορδον, κραμβια και πρασσα, σευτλια και μολοχας, ωα ασπαραγος et allium, caules et porros, betas et malvas, ova et asparagos,
- 15r 51 καρια λοβια. Κοκκυμηλα απια, απορα /θερμος, κιναρας βουλβους, nuces et faselia. Pruna et pira, poma et/lupinos, cardos et bulbos, ραφανους βουνιαδας, τροξιμα ταριχον, οριζαν χονδρον, πεισιν, radices et napos, acetaria et salsum, oryzam et tisanam, alicam et pisum,
- 52 κυαμον' Οξος ακρατον, ιχθυας κολοκυντας, χειριδιου τιποτε fabam solidam. Acetum et merum, pisces et cucurbitas, porcinae aliquid δελφακειου ταριχοκρεαν, †ταραυλου ολιγον, οψωνιον, απωρα, et porcellinae et carnem salsam, laridi quippiam, obsonium et parva poma, †κραμβιασθαλασσο, πλερον σταμνιον και αλλον α(ρτιτου). caules marinos, urceum plenum absinthii, et alium conditi.
- 53 Προενεγκε αμβικας φειαλην (αμβιξ [ποτηριον]), λαμπαδοφορον, κοσμησον Profer calices et phialam (calix), ceriolarem, orna ρενεσον ανθους εις τρικλινιον, θεσ ανθρακας και θυμιαματα, delphicam, sparge flores in triclinio, pone carbones et thymiamata,
- 54 παντα ετυμα εχε. Ειπε τω συνδουλω[†] γευσιμους βρωσεις ποιησαντω, omnia parata habe. Dic tuo conservo sapidos cibos faciat, επιδη εχω διπνουντας ανδρας μεγαλους ερωτεσειν και αποδη(μους). quoniam habeo cenatores viros magnos rogare et peregrinos.

At the Baths

- 55 Εγκπλεξον σε ταχυτερον ειν' ενορωτερον λουωμεν. κατενεγκατε τα χρηματα Explica te celerius ut temperius lavemur. deferte res εις βαλαν(ιον) και αλαξιμα, αρατε τα κανδαλια ταλαρια υποδηματα. ad balneum mutatoria, tollite soleas et caligulas et calciamenta. θεσ επιμελος, και προλαβε τοπον ευκαιρον, ινα ηδεως καταβωμεν. pone diligenter, et occupa locum opportunum, ut suaviter descendamus.
- 56 Κακως ακουεται ει ου ακολουθειτε. συ προαγε εις τουνπροσθε συν Male auditis si non sequemini. tu antecede in priore cum ελαιοφωρω. τι βραδυνει; βραδεως ποιης, βραδυς ει. επαρον τα χρηματα oleario. quid moraris? tarde facis, tardus es. tolle res και βαλαναια. et balnearia.
- 57 Βαλανιον, λουτρον, εισηλυσις, βασιλικη, βαθρα, θρονοι, βαθρα, αποδυτηρεον, Balneum, lavacrum, introitus, basilica, podiola, sedilia, scamna, devestitorium, αποθετηριον, νηρα, εμβατη, αφιδρωτη(ριον), †προτιδρον, depositorium, recentaria, solium, assa, prima cella,
- 15v 58 αλλαξιμα: /Οψιμαγιον, αναβολανην, λινουδην, σημιωτη, δελματικον, λειτη ωθονη, delatorium./Faciale, anabolare, linea, clavata, dalmatica, pura lintea, κεφαλοδεσμος, κριδεμνον, καθοπτρον, κτηνην, κονχη. capitlar, pericranon, speculum, pectine, concha.

- 59 Εἰς ἡλθον εἰς ἀλειπτ(η)ριον, ἠτῆσαμην ληκυτον. δοσ ἐλῖον, ἀλῖψον με
Intravi in unctoria, proposci gutum. da oleum, unge me, et
συντρεῖψον ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐντεν ἦκαρ. ἀγῶμεν ἐσῶ, κατὰβῶμεν.
confrica totum corpus hinc et inde. eamus intro, descendamus.
- 60 Ἡδὴ ἰδρῶσα πανή. εἰς ἐνβατήν ἀγῶμεν. ἀποχορεῖτε, βυθῦσαι θέλω. βάλε
Iam sudavi valde. eamus ad solium. recedite, urinari volo. mitte
ἰδῶρ ἐκ ἡκολιφιστερος. ἀναβα. ἀγῶμεν ἐξῶ πρὸς τὴν κολυμβήτρον,
aquam de fistula. descende. eamus foras ad natatoriam,
- 61 πρὸς εὐρίππον, ἵνα πεμψῶ κολυμβῆσαι [νηχεῖν]. Δοσ ξυστράν, ἀποξησον
ad euripum, immittam natare [natare]. Da strigilem, destringe
με. δοσ σαβανά, ἐξμαξατέ μου τὴν κεφαλὴν, ὠμούς, στήθος γαστέρα,
me. da sabana, extergite me, caput et humeros, pectus et ventrem,
χεῖρας πλευρά, νῶτον μῆρους, γόνατα σκέλη, ποδὰς πτερνα
manus et latera, dorsum et femora, genua et crura, pedes et calcanea,
- 62 κατὰδυμάτα. Ὑπάγετε, ἐνδισαῖται ὑμᾶς καθάρως καλῶς. δοσ εἰματῖα ἵνα
pelmata. Ite, vestite vos munde et bene. da vestimenta ut
ἐνδύσω με. ἐνείλειςον τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐνδύσον αὐτόν· μετὰ μου ἐλθάτω.
vestiam me. involve tuum dominum et vesti illum; mecum veniat.
- 63 Εὐ λελούσασθαι, εὐ σοὶ ἐστο, εὐ ὑμᾶς ἐστο. εὐ ἴλουτεπα εὐ
Salvos lotos, bene tibi sit, bene vobis sit. bene lavate, salvus
λελεύτας, εὐ λουθεῖ εὐ λου καλὸς ἐλούσεν. ὑγιένε, κυρίε, εὐ σοὶ ἐστῶ.
lotus, bene lava, bene lava, salvum lotum. vale, domine, bene tibi sit.
- 64 Συλλεξόν τὰ χρήματα τὰ λιπα ἀναγκαῖα. ἀκολουθήσον ἡμᾶς, ἀκολουθήσον
Collige res et reliqua necessaria. sequere nos, sequere
ἀγῶμεν οἶκον. καλὸν βαλάνιον, θε(ρμῶ)ς λουεῖ, εὐκρατῶς. χάρις αἰσμαι
me eamus domi. bonum balneum, calide lavat, temperate. gratias ago
τῷ βαλάνει./
16r balneatori./

After the Party—Bedtime

- 65 Θέλω αὐτῷ < > ὥς ἀσφαλίσῃτε. σβέσατε λαμπέρας τὴν < > χάραν
Volo illi quomodo ita faciatis. extinguite luminaria et focum
- 66 ἐπιμελῶς καλύψατε. ἀπῖτε κοιμαῖται. Τῆς οὕτως ποιεῖ ὥς
diligenter cooperite. ite pausat. Quis sic facit dominus quomodo
σύ, ἵνα τοσοῦτον πίης; τί εἰρηκάσι οἱ ἰδόντες σε τοιοῦτον, ὅτι
tu, intantum bibis? quid dicent qui te viderunt talem, quod
οὐδέποτε ἐξῶ ἐδειπνήσας ὥς ἀπληστῶς; τοῦτω δὲ πρέπει φρονιμον
numquam cenasti foris tam aviditer? ita hoc decet sapientem
οἰκοδεσποτὴν ἰδιοπραγμόνα, ὃς ἄλλον συμβουλεύει, ἑατὸν εὐθύθειν;
patrem familias sui negotii, qui aliis consilia dat, semet ipsum regere?
- 67 Οὐ δύνατε ἀσχυμονεστέρᾳ οὔτε αἰσχροτέρῳ συμβῆνε ἢ ἐχθὲς ἐπράξας.
Non potest turpius nec ignominiosius evenire quam heri gessisti.
ἐμε δὲ λείαν καταίσχυνει. τί λεγούσιν ἄλλοι ἐν τῇ σῇ ἀπορία; διςφημίαν
me certe valde pudet. quid dicunt alii in absentia tua? infamiam
μεγίστην σοὶ ἐπληροῦσας. συνέβη πρὸς ταῦτα μέγα ἀποσσημιῶς < > ἐκ
maximam tibi cumulasti. accidit ad haec grandis denotatio de
τοιαυτοῖς ἀκρασίαις. δεομαι σοὶ μὴ ὑπερὸν τοιοῦτῳ ποιήσης.
tali intemperantia. rogo te ne postea tale facias.

- 68 Ἀλλὰ νῦν μὴ τῇ ἐξερασε θέλεις; καὶ θαυμάζω θ' ἐπαθες.
 Sed modo numquid vomere vis? et miror quae passus es.
 οὐκ οἶδα τι λέξω, οὕτως γὰρ τεθοριβήμε ἵνα λόγον μὴδενῇ
 nescio quid dicam, ita enim perturbatus sum ut rationem nulli
- 69 δινῶ (< >). Κλείσατε, παῖδες, τὰς θύρας καὶ τὰς θυρίδας, ἐπιθετέ
 possim reddere. Claudite, pueri, ostia et fenestras, imponite
 τοὺς μοχλοὺς, παραθετέ σταμνίον. ἀπίτε, ἀναπαύσασθαι.
 seras, adponite necessarium. ite, pausate.

In the Forum

- 70 Περὶ ἀγριππῶν καὶ τὸν κατ' ἀγορὰν πραγμάτων. ἀγριππία, ἀγριππῶ,
 De lucubris et negotiis forensibus. lucubrum, lucubro,
 ἀγριππῶ, ἀγριππῶσατε, ἀγριππῶσιν. ἑσπερον, ὄψις, σκοτίνον, σκοτωδές,
 lucubrabo, lucubrate, lucubramus. vesper, sero, obscurum, tenebrosum,
 μέσον νύκτος ἀλεκτοροφονία, ἀλεκτοροκοκκυ, ὕπνος· νύστασιν, ἐκεκμηθῇ,
 media nox, pulli cantum, gallicinium, somnus; dormito, edormivi,
 ἀντεργηγῶρη, ἀλεκτορ ἐκκοκκυσεῖν.
 revigilavi, pullus cantavit.
- 16v εἰρήνη, παῖ, ἀνίστασιν ταχύτερον ἢ ταταγριππῶσα καὶ ἐκβασι/
 leva te, puer, surge celerius et lucubra bono eventu/
 κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς εἰδῆς (ἕως) ἐμοῦ. οὕτως ἴφρανατε ἐν τῇ αἰ ἀγορῇ (εἰ)
 iuxta posse scientiae meae. sic ἴφραbitis in recitatione tua
 εἰς αὐρίον.
 in crastinum.
- 71 Ἀναπαύσιν ὀλίγον ἐν ᾧ προέρχεται ὁ κύριος μου, σου, εἰς ἀγορὰν
 Requiesce modice dum procedit dominus meus, pater tuus, ad forum
 (ἀγορὰ) ὀρθρον, ἀγήμερα, ὅς πανοι ὀρθρεῖ, ἐπιδὴ ἐπαρχός,
 (forum) ante lucem, albescente die, qui satis manicat, quoniam praefectus,
 ὑπατικός, λογίος καὶ ἡγεμῶν ἐπιτροπός προηλθῇσιν.
 praeses et rationalis et dux et procurator praecesserunt.
- 72 Ἀκούεις τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ κυρίως κράζοντα τοὺς πρωτοπολεῖτας καὶ πολιτικούς.
 Audis vocem praekonis citantem decuriones et cives.
 ἕκαστος διοικεῖ ταύτου μερί· ἐπαρχός ἐσθῆτα ἱερατάλην, ὑπατικός
 quisquis exigit suas partes: praefectus vestem muneralem, praeses
 ἵππους ἱδοκίμειαν, χρῖσιν καὶ ἀργυρὸν μορφήν, ὁ ἡγεμῶν νεολεκτοὺς, λογίος
 equos probabiles, auri et argenti speciem, dux tirones, rationalis
 κτήματα ἀπὸ προτίμου χορτοῦ καὶ κριθέντος ἐπιτροπός
 pecunias de pretio faeni et hordei et - - - -, procurator
- 73 αἰτόν βρεγμά, ἐκατονταρχοὶ τοῦ χαλκοῦ προτίμου. Γενετέ ὥρα τρίτη.
 triticum et bracem, centuriones e caminis pretium. Fit hora tertia.
 εἰσερχοῦσιν παρακλητὴ δικολογοί, σχολαστικοί, φωνισθέντοι εἰς ἀπορείτον
 ingrediuntur advocati, causidici, scholastici, evocati in secretarium
 τοῦ ἰδίου κρείτου. πράξουσιν πλείστα αἰτία, ἕκαστος ὥς δινάτε
 iudicis sui. agunt plures causas, quisque ut potest
- 74 κατὰ τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων ἐμπειρίαν. Εἰσὶν καὶ προφασεῖς ἐν τῇ
 secundum literarum facundiam. Sunt et causae in
 τῶν χρόνων διορῶσαι, ποίας σήμερον πιστεύω διοριζέμενας. ἐκτοτε οὖν
 temporum finem, quas hodie credo terminandas. exinde
 καταβῆναι ὑπατικός πρὸς τὸ βῆμα φυλαξείν καθημένος. στρωνιέτε βῆμα,
 descendit praeses ad tribunal custodis sessurus. sternitur tribunal,

καταβαίνει ο κριτής βῆμα, και οὕτως τη φωνῇ του κυρικός κελεύει
 conscendit iudex tribunal, et sic voce praeconis iubet

- 75 σταθῆναι προσοπουσ. Ενοχος σταθῆται λίστης, ἐξετάσεται κατὰ
 sisti personas. Reus sistitur latro, interrogatur secundum
 τὴν ποιησιν· βαζανίζετε, βαζανηστής κρούει ἑατὼ τὸ στήθος †στρεβετε,
 merita; torquetur, quaestionarius pulsatur, ei pectus vexatur,
 συστελλετε, †αὐξάνει, μαστιγείτε †αποξύλας, τέρετε, διερχετε τάξην
 suspenditur, †crescit, flagellatur fustibus, vapulat, pertransit ordinem
 171 τῶν βασανισμάτων, και ἐτι /ἀρνεῖ. κολασμένος· ὠλίτῳ κολασῇ, ἀπαγείτε
 tormentorum, et adhuc/negat. puniendus est: perit poena, ducitur
 ἐπὶ ξίφος.
 ad gladium.
- 76 Εἴτα ἄλλος σταθῆτε, ἀναιτίος, τὴν παρῆστιν μέγα δικολογία, και
 Deinde alter sistitur, innocens, cui adest grande patrocinium, et
 ἄνδρες δεδιδάγμενοι παρίσιν αὐτῷ. οὗτος δὲ σχῆσι ἐγβασιν· ἀπολιετε.
 viri disertis adsunt illi. hic etenim habebit eventum: absolvitur.
- 77 Μαρτυρὲς καλῶς ἡλθουσιν ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ αἰτίᾳ, ἀτερ ἰβριν λελυμένοι εἰσιν.
 Testes bene venerunt in sua causa, sine iniuria absoluti sunt.
 αὕτη ἡ αἰτία εἶχεν πολυτέλῃν ἀπολογίαν, και πιστὴν τῆς ἀληθείας μετὰ
 haec causa habuit idoneam defensionem, et fidem veritatis apud
 πρᾶξεις ἀπεθῆκεν εἰς ἑκάστος.
 acta deposuit unus quisque.

τέλος ἐν τῷ μονοστερίῳ σπᾶνεμ.

APPARATUS

Title νονή] ἐννεα *p.c.*

3 ἐνδύσων] ἐναγών σχολήν] στολήν *cf.* 12, 19

5 primum facio] primo *f. hoc a.c.* λείπα]-οι- *s.l.*

6 ostium] os tuum *a.c.* θύραν] θύρα

7 ὑποδημάτα] ἐπυδημάτα *cf.* 10, 55

8 λαβέ] λαβεί

9 περιζώνημαι] -μει ἐπώμιον] ἐπώαιον collo] collum *a.c.*

10 ὑκοδεσποτήν] -ποιήν *cf.* 66 ἀναξυρία] -ξυνία ὑποδεθῆν] -διοθῆν

11 κλυζο *erasum hic, post* ὅτε *additum* (cum)] *lacuna indicatur, sed nil additum*
 ἐγμαγίον] -ματίον ἐξμαξίν] *cf.* 61, n. 61

12 ὕδωρ] ὕδωσ σχολήν] κλολήν

15 ἀκροατήριον] ἀκροτήριον *cf.* 18, 30 in auditorium] de auditorio *a.c.* εἰς ἀγοράν]
 εἰς ἱσαγοράν

16 ὀνοματὶ] νοματὶ κυρίε χερε] κ. χερουο, *corr. Celtes in mg.* ave... avete] habe...
 habete *a.c.* coi] cō

17 eo] eos ἀσπασασθαι] ἀσπασθαι θυρουρον] θυρουρον

18 Graeci] Cracci *a.c.* Ρωμαίου] ρωμαίος

19 ave^{1,2}] habe

20 manuale] -lem κελεύει] -εἰς

21 ὑστερον] ουτερον κεινοι] κεινός ὑποποδιον] -διο scamellum] scab- *s.l.*

22 καμπτροφορός] καμπρο-

23 διπλάσια[ζω] διπλάζιαςω versus] *bis scriptum*

27 λισινω] λιδινω

28 ἀναγορευω] -τορευω

30 ἀκροατήριον] ἀκρατ-

32 ἐξηγεῖτε μοι] ἐξηγετε μου ἀναγνώσις] -ης *a.c.*

- 33 παραδιδετε] παραδιτε
 34 exercent] exerunt *ut vid.* υποκοφιστη] υποφιση
 36 τα οκτω] τω οσχω silentium] si legunt *a.c.*
 37 προτοσχολοι] πρωτ- *s.l.* αμφισβητησιν] αμφισηνητησιν προφασιν] -εις *s.l.*
 38 Hippocraten] hyppocraten
 39 εκαστος^{1, 2, 3}] εκαστος τοπω] τοπου αναγορευουσιν] ανογορευσιν την δυναμιν
 τη δυναξιμιν η] ει *s.l.*
 42 φωνηθεις] -θεσ αυριον] κυριον εκαστος] εκτατος
 43 ερωτω] ερετω rogo] cogo *a.c.*
 44 τραπεσαν] -παιζαν *s.l.*
 45 επανειθι] επανθειθι *a.c.* πινακιδας] πινκιδας
 46 νηκτης] νηκτης
 47 εχησω γ.] εχης ωγευμα ποιησον διπνον] ποιη κονδυον θεσ ανθρακας] θεκαν
 θρακος *cf.* 53 αρισον] -αν
 48 κληνιν] -σιν *a.c.* stibadium] stifiadium *ut vid.* καθεροτερον] καθετοτερον
 50 ονα] οβα *a.c.*
 51 κιναρας] κριν- τροξιμα] προξ- ταριχον] αρχιον οριζαν] οριζαμεν oryzam]
 okysam tisanam ryzanam alicam et pisum] alica metrisum *a.c.*
 52 χειριδιου] χειριουδιου δελφακειου] αλφακειον πλερον σταμνιον] πλεροντα μνιον
 alium] allium
 53 λαμπαδοφορον] λαμπαρο- κοσμησον] -σω ρενεσον ανθ.] ρενεσω νανθ. triclinio]
 -ino habe] habet
 54 ειπε] επιε διπνουνας] διτινουνας
 55 ενωρωτερον] ενερω- υποδηματα] -δυματα καταβωμεν] καθεβωμεν *cf.* 59
 56 τουνπροσθε] τουντιροσθε ελαιοφωρω] ελαιο- βραδυεις] βραλυ- βραδυς]
 βαδυσ επαρον] επερον (*vel* = επαιρον? *cf.* n. 62) tolle] colla
 57 lavacrum] labracrum *a.c.* αφιδρωτη] αφαρωτη
 58 αναβολανην] ανο- pericranon] peri-
 59 gutum] sutum *a.c.* ungue me] unguentum συντρειψον] -ψω καταβωμεν] -με
 60 αποχορευτε] -χορευτε
 61 αποξησον] -σω da²] de *a.c.* νωτον] νωπον μηρους] μυμρους ποδας]
 ποδος πτερνα] περνα
 62 ite vestite] investite *a.c.* καθαρως] -ριως ut vestiam] ut tu es iam *a.c.* et
 vesti illum] et tu est ullum *a.c.*
 63 εστο¹] ετισο καλος ελουσεν] καλο κελουσεν εστω] ειτω
 64 τα λιπα] αλιτια
 65 lacunam indicavit Celtes λαμπερας] λαμπεγας cooperite] custodite *a.c.*
 66 της] τη intantum] leg. ut tantum? ουδεποτε] ουλετωτε εξω] εξως
 οικοδεσποτην] -ποιην
 67 ασχυμονεστερα] εσχ- αικροτερον] ακρο- δε] λε καταιςχυνει] -ςχεινει τοιουτω]
 το ουτω
 68 τεθοριβημε] τεθοριβηνημε δινησω] δινηω
 69 θυριδας] θριδας μοχλους] μορχλους adponite] appontem *a.c.* necessarium]
 -rio *a.c.* ite] *bis scriptum*
 70 αγριπνων] γριπνω κατ' αγοραν] καταρα νικτος] νικτας αλεκτοροφονια]
 -τοραφονα αλλετοροκοκκυ] αλλετορα- νυσταςω] νιεκταςω ταχυτερον]
 ταχτερον posse] possum εμου] ενιου ση αγορευ(ε)ει] σιναγορευει
 71 προερχεται] -χεται επιτροπος] επιπρονος
 72 διοικει] διοκει (*fort.* διυκει *leg.*) ταυτου μερι] ταυτο ημερι χορτου] λορτου
 et - -] sic χαλκου] λαλκου προστιμον] προσσιμο
 73 φωνισθεντοι] φωνισοεντοι απορειτον] -ρεπον κρειτου] κνεπθυ εκαστος] εκαστε
 προφασεις] -φασιν *a.c.*
 74 βημα¹] βηματα τη] τω
 75 κρουει] κρευει ει] et *a.c.* στηθος] ση- negat] necat *a.c.* κολαση] κολειση
 76 σταθητε] στατιτε *a.c.* παρεστιν] παρστιν ανδρες] αναρες σχησι] εχησι
 77 αυτου] αυτω λελυμενοι] λελειμενοι
Colophon εν τω] εις τον *a.c.*

COMMENTARY

This is far from being an exhaustive commentary. Much work remains to be done on the language, for which a proper study of the glossary is needed. Meanwhile, I have tried to give an idea of the extent to which this colloquium diverges from the published glossaries: \neq TGL means 'this equivalent not in *Thesaurus Glossarum Latinarum*', i.e. CGL VI, VII, the indices; 'not TGL' means the word(s) do not occur there at all. For other linguistic evidence, I have generally not searched beyond the standard lexica: ** means that the word is not attested in these, * that it is not attested in the required sense; it may well be that the specialized indices to epigraphical and papyrological documents will eliminate some of these. For the subject-matter too there is obviously a great deal more that could be done; I hope experts in the various fields will contribute, in print or privately.

At the beginning of each section I have indicated the parallel sections in other colloquia (with sigla for the various redactions as in the table on p. 87, and references to CGL III, which are not then repeated in individual notes). I quote these texts as edited by Goetz, though much work remains to be done there too. I have also indicated the capitula containing words most relevant to each section; references for the various redactions of these can be found by looking up the heading in TGL. Other abbreviations:

n. = footnote + number

'note on' with section no. = cross-reference within the commentary

Ausonius without reference means the *Ephemeris*, quoted below p. 124

André = J. André, *L'Alimentation et la cuisine à Rome* (1961)

B. + page = H. Blümner, *Die Römischen Privataltertümer* (1911)

Bonner + page = S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (1977)

Jones, *LRE* + page = A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (1964)

C. *Juv.* + ref. = E. Courtney, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* (1980)

For the orthography and grammar of the Greek version, and the abbreviations used, see nn. 57-71.

For the title see p. 93 and n. 48.

Preface

- 1 Cf. M (647.3) 'sermo, conversatio, usus cottidianus, debet dari omnibus pueris, minoribus et maioribus, quoniam necessaria sunt'. But (645.1) 'nunc ergo incipiam scribere: quoniam parvulis pueris incipientibus erudiri necessarium videbam auditionem interpretamentorum sermonis cottidiani, per quem facilius Latine et Graece loqui instruantur, idcirco paucis de sermone cottidiano conscripsi, quae subiecta sunt'. Disagreement, apparently, about the proper age-group for such exercises—varying with time and place?

puellis: pleasing inclusion, unique in the colloquia, but S cap. *de ludo litt.* (352.9, 13, 14) lists *discipulae*, *puellae*, *virgines*, and Aus., *Protr. ad nep.* 33-4 seems to imply a coeducational school. A Paula would of course be taught at home with suitable *sociae* (Jer., *ep.* 107.4.3): social status, rather than sex, probably determined whether a child learnt at home or at school. In general, see Bonner 135-6; also the sarcophagi in Marrou, *MOYCIKOC ANHP* (1938), nos. 1, 8, 11, 13 (scenes which do not imply private tuition, as they symbolize rather than represent schooldays).

propter . . . disciplinam: this justification only here; I know of no external evidence for the use of colloquia.

- 2 *sic . . . scribere*: see p. 90 and n. 33.

ab exordio . . . vesperum: cf. L (376.46) 'incipiamus scribere totius diei conversationem'. S 'hodie quid fecisti?' Ausonius, *Ephemeris*, *id est totius diei negotium*.

BIBLIOTEC

Getting up

Cf. L (637.1-2), S (379.71-380.59), H (638.1), M/E (645.2, cf. 647.3, lacunose), Mp (655.4). Capp. *de vestimentis*.

The scene is far from coherent, and probably a conflation (see p. 94). In M the sequence is: get up, shoes, wash (thus far also S, Mp), dress, greet family, go out. Specific features of M recur here (see on 5 *dormitoria*, 9 *praecingor*, *pallium circumdo collo*). In S there must be a lacuna—the boy goes out well shod and thoroughly washed, but naked, most unfortunate it being a cold day (see on 10); but even so, specific features of that too recur here (see on 6 *aperi ostium*, 9 *ut decet*, 10 *ocreas*, 11 *os colluo*, 13 *cucullum*, 14, 15-16). The conflation seems to be less tidy than that in the school scenes.

- 3 In all the colloquia the child has someone to help him get up, except in H, where the father tells his son: 'vesti te, calcia te, <terge> faciem'.

nutrix, nutritor: cf. 17; the *nutritor* not elsewhere in the colloquia, but in capp. *de cognatione*; cf. SHA, *Alex. Sev.* 18.13. 'nutrix ei Olympias data est . . . nutritor Philippus provenit casu unus ex rusticis'; *CIL* VI, *Index Verborum*, s.v. (25 instances); Jer., *ep.* 107.13.

ante lucem: early rising is de rigueur in the colloquia, cf. 70; M 'ante lucem vigilavi de somno', L 'dies, sol ortus est . . . iam lucet, aurora, ante lucem mane surgo', S 'surrexi mane expergefactus'. And school began early, H 'manica ergo ante omnia in scholam inlucescere caelo', *C. Juv.* 7.222, 14.190, though the *ludi scelerate magister* of Mart. 9.68 overdid it, 'nondum cristati rupere silentia galli: murmure iam saevo verberibusque tonas'.

manicemus: cf. 71 and H quoted above (\neq otherwise TGL). Aug., *Quaest. in Hept. iud.* 9.32 (CC 33.5, p. 356) 'quod Latini quidam habent *maturabis*, quidam vero *manicabis*, Graecus habet quod dici posset non uno verbo *diluculo surges* (viz. ὁρθρίει) . . . *manicabis* autem Latinum verbum esse mihi non occurrit'. But it occurs elsewhere in the Vetus Latina, and survives in the Vulgate at Luke 21.38 'omnis populus manicabat ad eum', often with motion implied as here. ὁρθριόμεν = ὁρθριούμεν, cf. G. I 212; see n. 63.

- 4 *grabato*: \neq TGL, where = κλῆπτους. For forms G. I 66, and n. 67.

de lecto: cf. 15 *de domo*, 37 *de Iliade*, 60 *de fistula*. In all the colloquia *de* is beginning to take over from *ab*, *ex*, and simple ablative.

- 5 *dormitoria*: elsewhere in the glossaries, but in the colloquia only M, where the boy first puts on shoes and washes, then 'extersi; deposui dormitoria(m), accepi tunicam ad corpus'. Specific night-clothes are implied, but the terms seem not to occur outside TGL, and altogether it is not clear what, if anything, the Romans wore in bed. Varro says 'praeterea quod in lecto togas ante habebant; ante enim olim toga fuit commune vestimentum et diurnum et nocturnum et muliebre et virile' (*de vita pop. Rom.* I fr. 44 Riposati, who (p. 160) takes the toga to have been used as a blanket, forcing the Latin here; Arnob. 2.68 is specific and different). Anyway that was an antique habit. Martial, being 'nec Curius nec Numa nec Tatus' complains to his wife (11.104) 'fascia te tunicaeque obscuraque pallia celant: at mihi nulla satis nuda puella iacet', which rather implies that night-clothes as such were not then current, but retaining (a little) underwear probably was. For Isidore night-clothes are *camisiae* (19.22.29), cf. on 13.

lintheum: \neq TGL, where it means a towel, but the Greek is attested = linen shirt, cf. 13 *lineam* and Aus. 'lintheum da sindonem'.

amictulum: in literary sources a general term for anything worn over underwear (and so not listed in *Edict. Diocl.*), but in TGL regularly = ἐπικάρσιον, attested = 'a striped garment'; its use here (cf. 8) and at Coll. Mp (657.13) suggests a more specific garment.

pallium: ≠ TGL (cf. 8, 9). The Greek word is found in Patristic texts, = cape.

fasciam: ≠ TGL and inappropriate. For a boy one would expect *fascias* = socks, rather than sing., = bra or girdle, but cf. 9 *praecingor*.

- 6 *tunc ergo*: cf. p. 94. S 'vocavi puerum, iussi aperire fenestram. aperuit cito'.

ἐγείρον: cf. 70; ἐγείρει is normal in intrans. use (BDR §33.6), see n. 62.

ἀνυξον: cf. 49, G. I 198.

iam lucet: ≠ TGL, cf. L 'iam lucet' = ἤδη φωτίζει.

- 7 *res*: CGL II 173.41 *res πράγμα καὶ πράγματα καὶ ἰμάτια*—the last added from a colloquium?

plica: to prepare them for wearing? cf. Aus. 'da quicquid est amictui, quod iam parasti, ut prodeam', and contrast Martial in retirement (12.18.1) 'ignota est toga, sed datur petenti rupta proxima vestis e cathedra'.

mundiora: so *munda* in capp. *de vest.*; not so much 'cleaner' as 'finer', cf. Aus. 'habitum forensem da, puer'.

cotidiana: for private, indoor, as opp. to public, outdoor use (Cic., *ad Q. fr.* 1.1.37 'in hac privata cotidianaque vita', Quint. 12.9.21 'in rebus cotidianis ac domesticis'). The boy changes into them when he gets home, 43.

- 9 *praecingor*: cf. Ulp., in *Dig.* 34.2.23.1, 'vestimentorum sunt omnia... quae induendi, praecingendi, amiciendi causa parata sunt'. Probably of underwear, a girdle or belly-band, cf. M 'praecinxī me' (after one tunic and before a *palla* and another tunic), Mp 'da subarmale: cinge me. da togam: operi me. da paenulam'.

pallium... *collo*: M 'feci circa collum pallam' (= ἀναβόλαιον cf. 58), perhaps the original reading here, since the pallium was not wrapped round the neck.

ut decet: S 'sic enim decet puerum ingenuum', there concluding the scene, as one would expect.

filium familias: ≠ TGL where = ὑπεξούσιος, while οἰκοδεσπότης = 'pater familias'. Not a bad compromise for the context.

- 10 cf. 55; L 'da mihi calciamenta et udones et bracas; iam calciatus sum'. S 'poposci calciamenta et ocreas, erat enim frigus. calciatus ergo...'. M 'accepi pedules, caligas; calciavi me'. How many of these might be worn at once is not clear: Ulp., in *Dig.* 34.2.25.4. 'fasciae cruales pedulesque et impilia vestis loco sunt, quia partem corporis vestiunt; alia causa est udonum, quia usum calciamentorum praestant', yet *udo* = πῖλος, ἐμπίλιον elsewhere TGL. For *ocreae* as leggings rather than armour cf. Pallad. 1.42.4., SHA, *Alex. Sev.* 18.40.5 'donavit et ocreas et bracas et calciamenta inter vestimenta militaria' (i.e. they were not previously part of the clothing issue? In first-century pay-records (Fink, op. cit., ad 72, nos. 68–9) soldiers get *caligae* and *fasciae*, and *vestimenta* more rarely). Perhaps the terms *bracae* and *ocreae* replaced *tibialia* and *feminalia* (Suet., *Aug.* 82), cf. Jer., *ep.* 64.10 'περικεῖλη, a nostris feminalia vel bracae usque ad genua pertinentes', so that trousers proper were distinguished as *bracae Gallicae* (SHA, *Aurel.* 26.34.2.).

**ἀναξυρία: TGL = ἀναξυρίδες, but for the form cf. πινάκιον, θύριον, κεφάλιον κτλ.

- 11 Aus. 'da rore fontano abluam manus et os et lumina'.

os colluo: S 'os clausi τὸ στόμα ἐκλείω', nonsense surely; I think Stephanus found the text corrupt and mis-emended. His boy also brushes teeth and gums, spits, and blows his nose. In L there is soap, in M combing and hair-conditioner.

sabanum: ≠ TGL where = σαβαν(ι)ον *saepiss.* cf. 61. I do not know what to make of πενταλαcon. ἐκμαγεῖον is well attested, and TGL = terg/tersorium.

- 13 *thēnai*: half of δοθῆναι, invading from above; clearly so in Celtes' exemplar.

lineam: ≠ and not as garment TGL, but cf. Jer., *ep.* 64.11.2 'volo pro legentis facilitate abuti sermone vulgato: solent militares habere lineas, quas camisas vocant', and often SHA. Cf. on 5.

albam paenulam: a woollen coat sewn up in front (see, exhaustively, F. Kolb in *Röm. Mitt.* 80 (1973), 73–116; 86 for white ones, *gausapinae*). Cf. M ‘indui me superariam (sc. tunicam) albam; supra induo paenulam’. It could not be worn over the *toga*, so Mp (cited on 9 *praecingor*) is giving alternatives.

cucullum: ≠ TGL, but cf. S ‘et in proscholio deposui birrum’. An alternative to the *paenula* (which could also be hooded), C. *Juv.* 8.145.

- 14 *aptatus*: ≠ TGL, and inappropriate?

adoravimus . . . totius: no parallel for this in the other colloquia, but S ‘paratus ergo in omnia processu bono auspicio’ may be a bowdlerized vestige. The evidence cited for morning prayer in Roman paganism is not compelling: Hor., *Carm.* 4.5.37–40 looks like polar expression, cf. Ov., *Fasti* 2. 631–8; *sat.* 2.3.281–4 caricatures the superstitious man; Sen., *ep.* 95.47, following mention of Jews, probably refers to Isis-worship, as does Apul. 11.20, 23, 27; this leaves Alexander Severus (SHA 18.29) who prayed first thing in his amazing Lararium provided he was in a state of grace. Julian seems to have instituted ὥρων τε ῥητῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν τεταγμένων εὐχαῖς (Sozom., *H.E.* 5.16.2.) on the model of Christian ones. See further, West on Hesiod, *Op.* 338.

- 15–16 cf. S ‘processi bono auspicio sequente me paedagogo recte per porticum quae ducebat ad scholam. sicubi mihi noti occurrerunt salutavi eos, et illi me resalutarunt.’; Aus. ‘dicendum amicis est have valeque, quod fit mutuum.’; M ‘eo salutare omnes amicos’. H has a special section of greetings (640.11).

capsario, paedagogo: they accompany the boy to school (cf. 22, 28) and generally cf. Suet., *Nero* 36.2. ‘quosdam (sc. damnatorum liberos) cum paedagogis et capsariis uno prandio necatos.’

- 17 cf. M ‘processi de cubiculo cum paedagogo et cum nutrice salutare patrem et matrem; ambos salutavi et osculatus sum. et sic descendi de domo’. The colloquia offer no parallel for the roll-call here, but cf. capp. *de cognatione*.

†*amicos*: presumably *amitam* or *amitas*, bowdlerized out when *t* was read as *c*.

maiolem domus: not TGL, but attested for private households from the fourth century (*TLL* s.v. *magnus* 132.33).

κυνελευθερους: corruption or calque? cf. L 6.33.

eunuchum: nowhere else in the Hermen., but ‘considered essential in all really high-class households’ (Jones, *LRE* 851).

At School

See p. 120. L (637.3–8), H (638.1–8 + 10), M (646), S (380.60–384.29). Capp. *de studiis, de ludo litterario, de institutione artis grammaticae*.

For teaching-methods see P. Beudel, *Qua ratione Graeci liberos docuerint* (1911) (papyri etc.); C. Degenhardt, *De veterum grammaticorum scholis* (1909) (evidence from ancient scholia).

- 18 cf. H ‘vade primum apud Latinum, apud scriptorem, apud grammaticum, apud oratorem’. *calculator* and *notarius* do not appear in other colloquia, but are in capp. and cf. *Edict. Diocl.* 7.

auditorium: used interchangeably with *schola* in this colloquium (19, 30), as generally till Cassiodorus, after whom it disappears in this sense; both terms in capp., but only *schola* in other coll.

Graeci, Latini: grammatici (cf. 29, 30) to be understood or supplied; these cannot be missing from the list, while an *orator* for both languages would be remarkable in the provinces outside the imperial household. Thus no Greek *orator* in Ausonius’ *Professores*, while the *grammaticus graecus* Urbicus (22) is celebrated as practising the three styles of oratory (v. 16–24).

- 19 Greetings are de rigueur, in M with a kiss.
- 20 *manuale*: *manualem*, sc. librum (= ἐγχειρίδιον) would fit the following phrase, but is absent from the Hermeneumata; whereas *manuale* = ἀναλόγιον appears in capp. and H 'porrige mihi, puer, manuale, cito ergo porrige librum, revolve, lege cum voce, aperi os', so should probably be read here. It is a lectern, cf. Mart. 14.84 with heading *Manuale* 'ne toga barbatos faciat vel paenula libros, haec abies chartis tempora longa dabit'. Full discussion with pictures in T. Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* (1907), 175-81.
iubet . . . alio dedi: M 'iubet me legere. iussus alio dedi'.
- 21 *redeo*: for the sense 'go away', not 'return' = ἐπανερχομαι, see Löfstedt, *Komm. zur Peregr. Aetherae* (1911), 274-5.
subdoctorem: the Greek recurs C *de ludo* but is otherwise unattested. TGL = ὑποδιδάσκαλος. For the job see Bonner 133, and more fully L. Grasberger, *Erziehung u. Unterricht im klass. Alterthum* (1875), II 143 ff.
L 'ave, magister, avete, condiscipuli . . . locum mihi date meum' (cf. also S 381.20-3, 56-7), 'scamnum, scamellum, sella. densa te, illuc accedite; meus locus est, ego (prae)occupavi'.
gradum: not elsewhere in a school context. There is no suggestion of outside classrooms in the colloquia, and in S it is upstairs.
scamellum: cf. Isid. 20.11.8, and TGL for forms.
cathedram: more likely the teacher's, but cf. the rich boys in the Neumagen relief illustrated Bonner 56.
- 22/27 cf. M 'porrexit mihi puer meus scriniarius tabulas, thecam graphiariam, praeductorium. loco meo sedens deleo, praeduco ad praescriptum. ut scripsi ostendo magistro; emendavit, induxit'.
scriniarius: = *capsarius* only attested in M, above.
praeductale: for forms cf. TGL. A ruler or writing guide (cf. 27). It has been associated with the engraved tablets recommended by Quintilian (1.1.27), but it is the child who *praeducit* in the colloquia, and L cap. lists the object under *de ferro*. See Grasberger 310.
tabulam: probably the abacus here; C. *Juv.* 9.40 ('ponatur calculus, adsint cum tabula pueri, numera sestertia quinque . . .').
lupinos: also in C *de ludo*, but nowhere else in a school context. Presumably they were used for sums, as *calculi*, cf. Plaut., *Poen.* 597 and Hor., *ep.* 1.7.23 where they are toy-money.
- 23 *deduco*: t.t. = subtract (TLL s.v. 281). ≠ TGL, and ἀποκαθιστάνω not attested in this sense, though ἀποκαταστατικός is a (rather advanced) math. t.t.
duco: as math. t.t. TLL s.v. 2155-6; not so the Greek, and ≠ TGL.
partior: see M. Glück, *Priscians Partitiones* (1967), 170-9.
- 24 *superpositum, praescriptum*: both in different capp. *de ludo*, perhaps synonyms = a suitable dictum written up by the master for copying, cf. Sen., *ep.* 94.9, 51; Grasberger 223.
exceptum: = *dictatum*, cf. TLL s.v. 1253.37. The Greek seems unattested in this sense.
- 25 *auctores*: same equivalent S (381.73).
†*cackae*: *capsae*, probably, but the Greek is beyond me; cf. Grasberger 232.
- 27 *praeduco*: cf. M above, and L 'praeducere nescio. tu mihi praeduc, quomodo scis'.
ad distinctum: L 'et alii in ordine reddunt ad distinctum'; S 'ad numerum et distinctum et casulam (*sic*) cum aspiratione ubi oportebat'.

28 cf. M 'et tu, inquit, dicta mihi. dixi ei: Redde primo; et dixit mihi: Non vidisti cum redderem prior te? et dixi: Mentiris, non reddidisti. Non mentior. Si verum dicis, dicto'. Our text is far from coherent. Perhaps it was originally: 'recita. recitavi. . . Si verum dicis, <recito>' or '<dicto>. dixit mihi . . .'.
si verum dicis: neither this nor the following sentence make narrative sense, see p. 94. *Dimittimur* implies after school, and is appropriate for *ceroma* but not for *ad latina studia* . . . which may be the debris of a heading.

29-30 *grammaticum* . . . *grammatici*: it seems unlikely that *Latinus* has dropped out twice: only in the West could *the* grammaticus be the Latin one.

ceroma: ≠ TGL. In M it is associated with the bath scene (q.v.) and it is listed Mp cap. *de civitate*. Cf. C. *Juv.* 3.68.

30 *εγμαθω: TGL = μελετῶ, ἐκμανθάνω; possibly a corruption.

31 *praelego*: normally of the teacher, though the Greek can also = to read beforehand.

32 *lectionem*: cf. Degenhardt 8-24.

versus: most likely gnomic ones, *monosticha* cf. e.g. Beudel 18. L 'versus postea coepi legere'; S 'alii ergo nomina, alii versus recitaverunt, ut soliti sunt'.

glossulas: cf. the *Glossulae multifariae idem significantes* preserved with Charisius.

ignotus liber: presumably unseen reading; cf. S 'deinde ab oculo citatim ignotum et quod rare legitur'.

33 *locum*: of a text, or perhaps a theme for composition.

extemporalem . . . *accuratum*: not elsewhere in colloquia or capp.; ≠ TGL and non-existent or inappropriate, ἀποχρονισμον and επιμελιττον probably calques.

34 *minores*: classes also in M, and in S with educationist's justification.

interpretamenta: i.e. books like this. Cf. M 'edisco interpretamenta'. It implies bilingual teaching.

syllabas: cf. Dion. Hal., *de comp. verb.* 25 τότε ἀρχόμεθα γράφειν τε καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν, κατὰ συλλαβὴν καὶ βραδέως τὸ πρῶτον. Beudel 13: word-lists with syllables divided.

artem: sc. *grammaticam*; cf. M 'interrogatus artificia (= τέχνην) respondi: ad quem, dixit? quae pars orationis? declinavi genera nominum, partivi versum'; and cf. S (382.53-73).

35 *figuras*: not rhetorical, in this context, but grammatical or metrical, cf. Priscian (*Gramm. Lat.* ed. Keil III) 464.34 'quot accidunt nomini? quinque: qualitas sive species, genus, numerus, figura, casus sive declinatio'. 462.8 (on *Arma*) 'cuius est figurae? simplicis. fac ab eo compositum: armiger . . .'. 460.23 'quot figurarum est heroicus versus? triginta et duarum . . .'.
dividunt . . . *elevant*: pronouncing words with proper scansion and accent, cf. TLL s.v. *divido* 1609.77, s.v. *elevo* 362.24, Quint. 1.1.8, 11.3.35-6.

36 *sic fit silentium*: 'so then . . .' after they *universa pertranseunt*, which was doubtless done in chorus.

37 *priores*: ≠ TGL; in M *maiores*.

locum: cf. on 33.

suasoriam, controversiam: cf. Aus., *Prof.* 2 (Tiberius Victor Minervius Orator) 15-16 'seu libeat fictas ludorum evolvere lites, ancipitem palmam Quintilianus habet'. Jer., *Comm. ad Gal.* 1.2, 'aliquoties cum adolescentulus Romae controversias declamarem, et ad vera certamina fictis me litibus exercerer, currebam ad tribunalia iudicum'.

historiam: recurs in C cap., not otherwise in Herm.; C. *Juv.* 6.450, 7.231.

comoediam: children's sarcophagi often show them reading with tragic and comic masks hanging on the wall (cf. Marrou, op. cit. on 1, nos. 3, 4, 12. Tragedy is significantly missing here.

narrationes: ≠ TGL, where it occurs capp. = διήγημα, ἐξήγησις. Cf. Beudel 58.

****redictiones**: ≠ TGL, and unattested in relevant sense. School jargon?

38 For the authors, including Homer above, cf. p. 121.

****φωτιδιον**: !; derivatives of φῶς proliferate in *koine*.

duo bella: displaced, and belonging with Sallust? Cf. Suda II. 506 (a reference I owe to Prof. Nisbet) Ζηρόβιος . . . ἔγραψεν . . . Μετάφρασιν Ἑλληνικῶς τῶν Ἱστοριῶν Σαλουστίου τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ καὶ τῶν καλουμένων αὐτοῦ Βελῶν. But see below p. 122. If the text is sound, Caesar might seem an obvious candidate, but I know of no evidence for his *bella* as a school text (for Quintilian he is an orator), and the early MSS do not combine BG and BC.

tres comoedias: perhaps Menander, a school author for Ausonius (and cf. F. Stahl, *De Ausonianis studiis poetarum Graecorum* (1886)—the only dramatist certainly known to him); Sidonius Apollinaris still had a copy of the *Epitrepontes* (ep. 4.12.1). For triads, cf. A. Blanchard in *Proc. XVI Internat. Congr. of Papyrology* (1981), 21-30; *pap. Bodmer* for Menander, apparently.

Theocritum: possibly known to Ausonius, cf. *Epist.* 14.33 with Theoc. 1.56 and Gow ad loc., Stahl 20.

Thucydidem: in the same epistle, Ausonius assures a prospective visitor that he will find Ὀκτῶ Θουκυδίδου as well as ἑννεα Ἡροδότου in his library, perhaps specific enough to be true.

Hippocraten: there is a little evidence for medical teaching in schools (cf. M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (1971), 111) and many Hippocratic works were translated in the fifth and sixth centuries. His inclusion here remains very odd. Just possibly his later fame caused a scribe to substitute him for Isocrates (cf. Aus., *Epist.* 17.13).

Xenophontem: perhaps the *Cyropaedia*, referred to Schol. Bob. ad Cic., *pro Planc.* 68, but there is scant evidence for direct knowledge of him in the West, see K. Münscher, *Philologus* Suppl. 13 (1920), 95 ff.

Cynicos: Diogenes was a popular hero in *chriae* (Bonner 176, 257).

39 *meditatur*: ≠ TGL and oddly interpretative; for *ethopoeia* as a school exercise see Beudel 60 ff.

si quis bene . . . coercetur: cf. Libanius (ed. Foerster) VIII (1915) 84-5 for a more sinister picture.

horam septimam: rather late for lunch, but not unheard of, cf. B. 382 n. 6.

40 cf. M (following on the passage cited on 28) 'inter haec iussu magistri surgunt pusilli ad subductum, et syllabas praebuit eis unus de maioribus, alii ad subdoctorem ordine reddunt, nomina scribunt, versus scripserunt, et ego in prima classe dictatum excepi. deinde ut sedimus pertranseo commentaria, linguas, artem. clamatus ad lectionem audio expositiones, sensus, personas . . . ut haec egimus, dimisit ad prandium'.

42 *ferius in crastinum*: presumably 'holiday till tomorrow', though in the next scene the boy says he must return to school after lunch, as elsewhere in the colloquia. Cf. the cross teacher in H 'occasiones quaeris agere et nescis quod feriae pueros indoctos faciunt'.

Lunch

L (638.7) 'iam didici quod acceperam. rogavi, ut me dimitteret domum ad prandium, et ille me dimisit. ego illi bene valere dixi, resalutavit me. postquam pranderam, reversus reddidi(?)'; H (640.10) 'hodie autem vade et prande, et a prandio citius veni'; M (646-7) 'ut haec egimus, dimisit ad prandium. dimissus venio domi. muto (sc. clothes?), accipio panem candidum, olivas, caseum, caricas, nuces. bibo aquam frigidam. pransus revertor iterum in scholam'. Adults may have a more elaborate meal with guests, cf. M (650.7-9), Ausonius; see B.382.

43 cf. 7; *habitus* ≠ TGL, but both words common in the imperial period.

44 L (378.73) 'mensa anteponatur . . . mappam, mantile adlatum est nobis'.

**ἐπιτραπέζιον: perhaps ἐπιτραπέζιον as TGL (*LSJ* not in this sense). Apparently table-cloths are first certainly attested in SHA (B. 390).

cervisiae: cf. 49, ≠ TGL; common in Gaul, as Julian the Apostate complains (*A.P.* 9.368), cf. Plin., *NH* 22.164, Athen. 152c; a drinking-bottle found in Paris says 'ospita reple lagona cervesa' (*CIL* XIII. 10,018.7, cf. 10,012.7). See André 179-80.

conditi: spiced wine, cf. André 169-70, B.203; frequent as noun, e.g. on wine-bottles.

absinthii: a specific variety of *conditum* (André 168), not very suitable for lunch. Gaul was famous for absinth, especially Saintonge, see Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule* v, 260.

45 *habeo reverti*: the construction app. first in Tertullian (*TLL* s.v. *habeo* 2454.53), cf. n. 71.

**ἑπανακύλετα: either misunderstanding the Latin as a nominative, or corrupted to an 'ablative' cf. p. 96. Compounds with ἐπάνω, like the prep. itself, proliferate in *koinē*, as do verbal adj. in -τος (cf. 30, and P. 43-4), but I suspect the word as well as the case is corrupt here.

ηγροθην: cf. 4; conflation of ἡγέρθην and ἡγρόμην (poet. and never in N.T., BDR §78)?

instrumenta: TGL = γράμματεῖον, a special sense not given in *TLL*.

46 This passage is unparalleled in the colloquia, does not cohere with what precedes and follows, and is in itself obscure. The last sentence (*age ergo . . .*) may be a stop-gap, superficially leading into the next scene.

papas: C. *Juv.* 6.633; *gustavi* can mean to have lunch or a snack (cf. 47), but opposed to *prandisti* suggests that here as in *Juv.* the *papas* acts as a *praegustator*, odd though it seems in this homely context.

Preparations for Dinner

At this point the boy disappears (perhaps resurfacing at 70-1), and is replaced by a *pater familias*, cf. M (647.3-4). The scene is not quite consistent: in spite of the elaborate preparations, and the *cenatores viros magnos et peregrinos* who are expected, the meal is more of a supper *chez soi* (cf. Mp 659.20) than a dinner for guests. There is plenty of hors-d'œuvres or *gustatio*, including fish and charcuterie (cf. B.398) but no main meat or poultry course, while fruit, nuts and *lupini* belong with *secunda mensa* (Mart. 10.48.18 'saturis mitia poma dabo . . .'). This is just like the *cenula* to which Martial invites Toranius (5.78) 'si tristi domicenio laboras, Torani, potes esurire mecum . . .', as opposed to the three-course party with *stibadium* of 10.48, and the dinner-parties in M (652-3) and Mp (658.17-18). Preparations before the baths occur also in Mp (656.11-13), and those in M (650.9) were perhaps for dinner rather than lunch in spite of *prandere* (cf. below). The

capitula include various food sections covering the vocabulary, for which see also André, index.

- 47 *a balneo*: the sequence is so standard that a dinner invitation could include bath, Mart. 11.52 'cenabis belle, Iuli Cerialis, apud me . . . octavam poteris servare; lavabimur una: scis quam sint Stephani balnea iuncta mihi. prima tibi dabitur ventri lactuca movendo utilis, et porris fila resecta suis . . .' and M (after instructions for cooking) 'vade ad Gaium et dic illi: Veni, inde lavemus . . . nondum venit? vade, dic illi: sero nos facis prandere'; L (37-9) 'bene lava, bene cena'. One could also pick up a *gustatio* on the way home from the baths M (652) 'sequimini ad domum et emite nobis a balneo minutalia et lupinos et fabas acetatas'.

cf. Mp 'excutite culcitam, ponite pulvinum, operite stragula et opertoria, ducite scopam, spargite aquam, sternite triclinium, adferte calices et argentum'.

cusciniam: ≠ TGL; presumably a portable stove, cf. C. Juv. 3.249-50, though here merely taken into a room (which?) rather than outside. I have preserved the spelling (unattested apparently) since the word varies so much anyway.

κντρacc: cf. G. I 94.

carbones: M 'ligna sicca, carbones, prunam, securim, vasa, catina, caccabum, ollam, craticulam . . .', clearly in the kitchen there.

mansionem: = room, as the Greek, common from the fourth century (≠ TGL, where the more classical *cubiculum*); but here perhaps rather = fireplace, or grate of the *cuscinia*?

scopa: ≠ TGL, where cαρόω = *commundo*, *verro*; *scopo* from the fourth century. **cαρίζω or **cαρέω or scribal corruption?

hospitium: = dining-room, Petr. 77.4; ≠ TGL.

- 48 *stibadium*: ≠ TGL; still known to Sid. Apoll., ep. 1.11.14, 2.2.11.

mundiorem: sc. *mappam*, or a noun missing, or corrupt for *mundiora*?

cf. M 'affer clavem, aperi loculum et eice clavem cellarii; profer quae necessaria sunt . . .'. 21010700

cervisiam: cf. 44; *cειτινη, cf. CGL II 119.26 curmen (Celtic word) ζύθος από cίτου.

- 52 **ταριχοκρεαν: normally κρέως ταριχηρός; for forms of κρέως, not including this compromise, G. II 68.

laridi: = λάρδος TGL.

caules marinos: so Marcell., med. 21.5, = *brassica marina*, sea-cole, κραμβή θαλασσία. The translator seems to think that such terms should be rendered with a compound in Greek.

absinthii: cf. on 44.

- 53 *ceriolarem*: ≠ TGL, but both words attested = candelabra in documentary sources, note CIL VI 30972, where a priestess provides *delficam cum laribus et ceriolaris*.

delficam: Procop. BV 1.21 Δέλφικα τὸν τρίποδα καλοῦσι 'Ρωμαῖοι. Used as a side-table for ornaments (*orna*), cf. Mart. 12.66.7 'argenteum atque aurum non simplex Delphica portat'; perhaps the candelabra go on it, here, and in CIL cited above with statuettes of the *lares*.

flores . . . thymiamata: these refinements absent from the other colloquia, though in Mp the man calls on an *unguentarius* before bathing (657.15) 'da mihi tus et unguentum quod sufficit hodie ad homines viginti — sed de bono'.

- 54 *sapidos*: ≠ TGL; **γευσιμους, cf. P. 27-8.

faciat: read *faciant* ('them' in the kitchen)? Loss of *n* and final *v* seems more likely than intrusion of *v*.

At the Baths

M (651.10), Mp (657.16), and brief references in L (378.22-39) and H (642-4, 21, 22, 25, 28). A few glosses in capp. *de civitate*.

M is much the fullest account, including choice between public or private baths, lavatory, danger from clothes-thieves, sport, payment to the *balneator*, and a snack afterwards. But all three scenes have the basic sequence: oiling, sweat-bath, hot bath, cold swim, strigil, drying and dressing, good wishes. Cf. B.433-5 (partly based on M and Mp), and *Alterc. Hadr. et Epict.* (ed. L. W. Daly and W. Suchier, (1939), 105): 'Quid est homo? Balneo similis: prima cella tepidaria unctaria, infans natus perungetur; secunda cella sudatoria, pueritia est; tertia cella assa, †perferentia iuventus; quarta cella, appropriat senectus frigidaria . . .'. For bath-buildings see D. Krencker, *Die Trierer Kaiserthermen* (1929).

- 55 *diligenter*: M 'compone vestimenta, cooperi, serva bene, ne addormias propter fures'.

locum: almost a t.t., cf. Mp 'ego autem usquedum locum invenitis (in the *balneum Tigellinum*) unguentarium salutabo'.

descendamus: cf. 59; regularly of bathing, cf. *TLL descensio* B2 'metonymice, i.q. balneum'.

- 56 *in priore*: sc. cella; M 'introeamus in cellam primam tepidariam'.

- 57-8 This list has no parallel in the colloquia or the published capitula, and is full of novelties; but all the colloquia would have such passages if we did not have relevant capitula.

introitus: ≠ TGL, where -um = εἰσόδιον = entrance-fee. This probably means the entrance-hall, found in most baths.

basilica: a covered form of palaestra (Krencker 186, 274-7, 327) mainly found N. of the Alps: Sidonius had one as an adjunct to his *piscina* (*epist.* 2.2.8) and *CIL* XII 4342, VII 287, VII 445. A number have been identified, cf. D. Atkinson, *Report on Excavations at Wroxeter* (1942), 338-9, B. Cunliffe, *Fishbourne* (1971), 172-3.

***podiola*.

***devestitorium*, *depositorium* . . . **delatorium*: of the Greek equivalents, only ἀποδυτήριον is attested (= *spoliarium* TGL) and normally used in Latin as well. *devest.* may be a calque on it, and ἀποθετήριον on *depositorium*; this and the *delatorium* presumably refer to cubby-holes or the facilities provided by the *capsarius*, who would look after one's things for a fee.

recentaria: TGL = νεαροφόρος, cooler for drinking-water?

assa: sc. cella, dry-heat *sudatorium*.

prima cella: cf. 56. In M = πρῶτον οἶκον; προτιδρον unattested, but cf. ὑδρεῖον.

- 58 ***οψιμαγιον*: ≠ TGL, where *faciale* = προσόψιον, προκοψίδιον.

***anabolare*: TGL *anaboladium*; ἀναβόλαιον (to be read here?) = *palla* (cf. 9) etc.

linea: cf. 13.

clavata: ≠ TGL, but cf. *clavatura* σημείωσις.

dalmatica: a tunic with long wide sleeves, somewhat *négligé*, apparently popularized by Commodus.

pericranon: unattested as Latin word; in *koine* = cap; TGL = *cervicale*.

concha: C. *Juv.* 6.304, 419; context here favours 'scent-vessel' rather than 'basin'.

- 59 *unctoria*: so Plin., *ep.* 2.17.11; TGL only *unguentarium*. Mp 'da mihi oleum. unge me'. *confrica* not TGL.
- 60 M 'veni ad sudatorium. sudas ? sudo, lassus sum'. Mp 'iam sudasti ? sudavi'.
urinari: jump in, rather than a head-dive, for which the solium would normally be too small.
fistula: TGL = *ωλήν, φυσητήρ*, both of which may lie behind this creation, cf. n. 52
 την κολυμβητρον: both masc. and feminine forms are attested, so the compromise may be original.
- 61 cf. capitula *de membris humanis*.
pelmata: not known as a Latin word; TGL *calcanea* = *πέλματα*; ***καταδυματα*, gloss created by Greek doublet ?
- 63 The acrobatics of *λούω* in this section seem beyond sorting out, cf. M (217.45) 'calose lusu bene labasti calos sueste bene tibi sit'. For the formulae cf. M. Haupt, *Opuscula* II 448, and the strigil with *καλως ελουσε* found at Caerleon and illustrated by G. C. Boon, *The Antiquaries Journal* 60 (1980), 333-7.
 Mp (287.29) *καλως ελουσου, κυριε saluum lotum, domñ*.
- 64 *lavat*: cf. B. Meyer, *Proc. XVI Internat. Congress of Papyrology* (1981), 211.
 ***χαρισσομαι*: TGL *χαρίζομαι* = *gratifico*, and *gratias ago* = *εὐχαριστῶ, χάριτας ὁμολογῶ*.

After the Party—Bedtime

- This scene is without parallel in the colloquia, where a good but not riotous dinner is followed by brisk arrangements for bedtime: M (654.12) 'puer, veni, collige haec, omnia suis locis reponere. diligenter sterne lectum. Stravimus. Et ideo durum est ? Excussimus et pulvinum commolluimus. Quoniam autem pigriter fecistis quae necessaria sunt, nemo foris pernoctet aut ineptiat. si alicuius vocem audio, non ei parco. recipite vos, dormite, et in galli cantu excitate me, ut excurram'. Mp (659.2) 'quot horae sunt noctis ? Iam tres. Pone pelvem et matellam (et urceum). puerum mihi clama ad pedes, aut magis de mulieribus unam clama. tolle lucernam, dormire volo, ut mane vigilem'. Here instead the hero returns home to a scolding for disgraceful drunken behaviour. Who gives it is not clear, perhaps his wife. At the top of the page Celtes wrote *ου τι λειον*, perhaps as a relevant moral.
- 65 There is no knowing the extent of the lacuna: a whole dinner scene may be lost.
αφραλισητε: a *koine* word, mostly med. (always TGL = *munio*, tutor, etc.), but the act. is attested. Presumably it refers to shutting up the house, so read *tuta* for *ita* ?
pausatum: ≠ TGL (cf. 69); = sleep *Reg. Bened.* and Christian inscriptions.
- 66 *sui negotii*: the gloss recurs in the capitula, and seems valid for both languages.
- 67 *turpius, ignominiosius*: the glosses may be reversed, cf. TGL. For the compar. cf. G. II 145 ff.
cumulasti: ≠ TGL, where = *ωπεύω* more appropriately.
accidit: *accedit* ? If so, the Greek again translates a corruption.
denotatio: from the second century; the Greek is a calque in this sense; TGL = *ἀτιμία*.
- 68 *vomere*: ≠ TGL. More acceptable in ancient manners cf. *C. Juv.* 6.425.
- 69 *necessarium*: ≠ TGL; euphemism for chamber-pot, cf. Mp cited above.

In the Forum

See below, p. 122. Capp. *de magistratibus, de legibus*, and Mp *de negotiis forensibus*. Michael Crawford promptly and generously came to my rescue in this section, solving many problems. He is of course not responsible for errors and inadequacies in these notes.

- 70 *negotiis forensibus*: = Mp cap. heading (336.29).

*αλλεκτοροκοκκυ: sophisticated for a calque—possible compound?

leva te . . . crastinum: apparently the father exhorting his son to *patrissare*, cf. Sen., *dial.* 1.2.5. (patres) 'excitari iubent liberos ad studia obeunda mature, feriatis quoque diebus non patiuntur esse otiosos'.

iuxta posse: cf. 39 *pro posse*, with same Greek.

- 71 *αυγημερα: αύγή = dawn in *koine*, and TGL *ante lucem* = πρὶν αύγῆς.

manicat: cf. 4.

praefectus: in this sequence presumably the *praefectus praetorio*, suggesting a major provincial centre, e.g. Trier, which would also fit with *dux* (see below: my thanks to Fergus Millar for drawing my attention to this point). This need not mean that the colloquium was composed there, as it may include all known officials, like all known clothes, etc.; but the list does imply a provincial horizon.

praeses: ≠ TGL (and cf. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (1974), 169–71); ὑποτικός regularly = *consularis*, which began to replace *praeses* under Constantine; and in any case, in this non-official context, either would be acceptable as = 'provincial governor', cf. *RE* Suppl. VIII (1956), 598–614, *Dig.* 1. 18.

rationalis: sc. *rei summae*, responsible for money-taxes, mints and mines (Jones, *LRE* 376, 411 ff.). On a par with provincial governors under Diocletian, they declined in importance in the later fourth century. TGL = λογικός, συλλογιστικός, καθολικός (so Mason), but neither λόγιος nor λογικός is otherwise attested in this sense, probably calques.

dux: introduced by Diocletian in many frontier areas (Jones, *LRE* 373) to take over military affairs like recruiting (*tirones* below) from the provincial governor.

procurator: sc. *rei privatae* (Jones, *LRE* 413), responsible for collecting rents in kind from imperial estates, so presumably the *triticum et bracem* below.

- 72 πρωτοπολειτας: see F. Viattoni, *Studia Papyrologica* 16 (1977), 23–9.

*vestem *muneralem*: not TGL, the Greek a derivative of ἀπαιτέω? For the tax, see Jones, *LRE* 434; Youtie, *ZPE* 38 (1980), 289–91. The *praefectus* could be responsible for appointing *susceptores vestium* (*CTh.* 12.6.4, A.D. 365) from among the prominent citizens; later (*CTh.* 12.6.31, A.D. 412) it became the job of the governor's staff.

**probabiles*: at Dura in A.D. 251 horses are *probati* by *praefectus, consul, procurator* or *dux* (R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (1971), no. 83), but nothing like δοκιμειν is found as its equivalent.

auri . . . speciem: this must be Constantine's *collatio lustralis* = *chrysargyron* (Jones, *LRE* 431–2, 871–2; abolished A.D. 498). The overall symmetry of the list of taxes and the officials in 71 above, and historical fact, both suggest that *rationalis* (sc. *rei summae*) should be supplied here to collect it.

dux: see above.

rationalis: possibly he has wandered from above, displacing someone else; or perhaps the *magister rei privatae* is meant, who came to be called *rationalis* from Constantine on (Jones, *LRE* 376, 412), so that the *pecunias* (≠ TGL) would be commuted rents?

pretium: cf. also below; προετίμω not TGL, but cf. *LSJ* s.v., 2.

faeni et hordei: both normally much required by the army, see Fink 247 and index.
bracem: ≠ TGL (where *braces sunt unde fit cervisia*, and = malt in Anglo-Saxon glossaries). Otherwise the word only occurs at Plin., *NH* 18.62, 'Galliae quoque suum genus farris dedere, quod illi bracem vocant, apud nos scandalam, nitidissimi grani'. Cf. N. Jasny, *The Wheats of Classical Antiquity* (1944), 134 ff. The Greek term only occurs = an infusion, prompted here by false sound-connection? The gloss recurs in Celtes cap. *de mercibus*.

centuriones: among *officiales* (CTh. 1.16.7) rather than military.

caminis: ≠ TGL and not matching. Historical and textual facts are hard to reconcile here. The Greek would nicely refer to the *collatio aeris*, a levy on owners of copper and iron mining districts (Jones, *LRE* 838-9), whereas there is no evidence for a tax on smelting, as implied by *caminus*. On the other hand, the Greek is in general derivative and more corrupt, and χαλκείου (= *aeris officina* TGL) is a much more obvious emendation than to suppose that *caminis* wrongly glossed, and then displaced, *aere*, after the text was translated, which would be a unique case.

73 *hora tertia*: the normal time, cf. Mart. 4.8.2. How long did Roman time-reckoning survive? (cf. 39).

scholastici: first attested = legal adviser in letters of A.D. 323 (H. Cotton, *Documentary Letters of Recommendation in Latin* (1981), 40 ff.), then CTh. 8.10.2 (A.D. 344), both implying established usage. Cf. A. Klaus, 'Ο ΣΧΟΛΑΣΤΙΚΟΣ (1965). Nowhere else in the Hermeneumata.

**φωνιθεντοι: neither the word (cf. 42), nor, unsurprisingly, the form is attested. It is not clear whether *evocati* qualifies the preceding nouns, or means a separate category of legal advisers (cf. C. *Juv.* 16.10), or others, e.g. witnesses, summoned.

secretarium: Mp cap. (336.42) = δικαστήριον. In this sense, 'private court' as opp. to *pro tribunali*, it occurs first in Lactantius (though for the Greek, cf. Philostr., *Apoll.* 4.44.2, ἀπόρητον δικαστήριον); it was current in the fourth century (CTh. index), but then lost this sense, to mean just 'trial, case'; so already CTh. 2.4.7 (A.D. 409).

iudicis sui: this and 74 below seem to imply that *iudex* ≠ *praeses*, so perhaps *iudices pedanei* (CTh. 1.16.8, cf. *RE* IX 2470), appointed by the *praeses* to handle minor cases, and acting under his supervision in the next section.

74 *finem*: within a year from the charge, CTh. 9.36 (A.D. 385, 409). **διορουνει cf. LSJ διορία.

praeses: Ulp., in *Dig.* 1.18.3, 'congruit bono et gravi praesidi curare, ut pacata atque quieta provincia sit quam regit. quod non difficile obtinebit, si sollicitè agat, ut malis hominibus provincia careat, eosque conquirat: nam et sacrilegos, latrones, plagiarios, fures conquirere debet et prout quisque deliquerit in eum animadvertere, receptoresque eorum coercere, sine quibus latro diutius latere non potest'.

custodis: sc. *provinciae, civitatis*, or what?

προκοποους: for the masc. cf. G. II 43.

75 *quaestionarius*: attested from the fourth century; ≠ TGL. For torture, see Jones, *LRE* 519-20; a sequel to *interrogatio*, *Cod.Iust.* 9.41.8.

vexatur: ≠ TGL, στρέφεται? στρεβλοῦται?

suspenditur: cf. 35; the Greek here quite inappropriate.

ordinem: I know of no evidence for a specific sequence of tortures, legal texts are rather shy of details on this topic. One may be implied in a cryptic extract of Callistratus (*Dig.* 48.19.7), but that anyway refers to punishment rather than examination. Cf. P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (1970), 137.

negat . . . gladium: a far cry from Constantine's instruction (*CTh.* 9.40.1) that capital punishment should only be administered on confession, or on testimony of such unanimity 'ut vix ipse ea quae commiserit negare sufficiat', but anyway it was a poor look-out for those of the wrong class, cf. Ulpian (*Dig.* 48.19.8, specifying *gladius* as the only acceptable method of execution) 'nec ea quidem poena damnari quem oportet, ut verberibus necetur vel virgis interematur, nec tormentis: quamvis plerique dum torquentur deficere solent'. This *latro* is relatively fortunate to get decapitated; the likes of him would commonly, though not necessarily, suffer worse forms of capital punishment, cf. Garnsey 124 (though at 157 n. he translates *ad gladium* 'to mortal combat', without explanation).

76 *patrocinium*: ≠ TGL and probably inappropriate. For the growth of the institution Jones, *LRE* 773-81; I. Hahn, *Klio* 50 (1968), 261-76.

diserti: ≠ TGL.

77 *bene venerunt*: cf. Mp cited p. 122.

sine iniuria: witnesses could of course be tortured in serious cases if they were not of the exempted class.

idoneam: ≠ TGL and curious: the sense 'expensive' is perhaps unintentionally realistic.

IV

The school scenes

The light which the colloquia throw on ancient education has always been their main claim to fame, and justly. They do this in two ways: as being themselves an instrument of teaching, and as providing, in the relevant scenes, the liveliest description we have of what went on in an ancient school. Both aspects would be better studied if the texts were properly edited, and placed and dated on internal evidence, without preconceptions. Meanwhile, the new colloquium is variously interesting in this connection. As I mentioned above, we can distinguish two different school scenes, rather clumsily put together. The first (19-28) is simply a *schola*, where on arrival the boy reads to a *magister*, then proceeds to a *subdoctor* who supervises his writing-exercise, and arithmetic is also mentioned. The scene is very like that in M/E, including the squabble as to who recited first (28, cf. 646). At 30, after a confused transition, we enter a *schola graeci et auditorium grammatici*. Here the work includes unseen reading, commentary, extempore and prepared reading or composition. A class of *minores* work at grammar and vocabulary with a *subdoctor*, and it is nice to see that *interpretamenta*, *vocabula per litteras*, and *capitula nominum*, our Hermeneumata in fact, are in full use. Meanwhile the *priores* do more advanced work with the *magister*, reading from an impressive list of authors, and practising *omnem industriam orationis*, which includes declamations. When each child has performed and received due praise or punishment, (39) *fit dimissio: dimittimur circiter horam septimam*. But suddenly (40) we find ourselves back with the *minores*, now subdivided into two classes, both working on language, until they too are dismissed (42). Why should the poor youngsters be kept longer in school? Perhaps they are not. For 30-9 form a complete and coherent school scene, with a few parallels in S, but largely quite new; whereas 40-2 resume the close relationship with M/E just where the first school scene had left off at 28. So I think we have a conflation, the second school scene sandwiched inside the first.

Besides deriving from different sources, the two scenes clearly present different types of school. The first is a *ludus litterarius* or elementary school, concentrating on the three R's. Even this teaching is of course grammatical: grammars begin *de littera*, *de syllaba*, etc., and that was also how you learnt to read and write. But the typical teaching of the *grammaticus*, the *enarratio* of texts, does not figure here; the emphasis is on reading and writing as skills. Recently it has been argued, convincingly, that there was no universal, sharp distinction between Roman primary and secondary education, no regular progression from a *grammatistes* to a *grammaticus*: children could go straight to a *grammaticus* at

about the age of seven, either having learnt the rudiments at home, or to be taught them in the school, most likely by an assistant teacher.⁷² This does not mean, however, that no *ludi magistri* existed, some no doubt poaching on the territory of the *grammaticus*, just as he did on theirs or on that of the *orator* at the other end. The professions certainly remained distinct. The Edict of Diocletian⁷³ specifies monthly fees per *puer* for *magister litterarum*, *calculator* and *notarius*, and per *discipulus* for *librarius*, *grammaticus*, *geometra* and *orator*. Only *grammatici* and *oratores* share the privileges of *medici*, although Julian in 362 required that all *magistri studiorum doctoresque* be publicly licensed to teach.⁷⁴ How far these different teachers ran separate establishments would no doubt vary greatly, depending on the size and wealth of the town, and the ambitions and resources of the individual teacher.⁷⁵

At any rate, the second school in our colloquium overlaps with the first, inasmuch as the *subdoctor* teaches basic grammar and vocabulary, but there is no reference to writing-practice or arithmetic. On the other hand, the *magister* here teaches not only the poets and historians, but oratory as well; so perhaps a school where children could enter as soon as they could read and write a bit, and where they could then complete their education, if their parents were not rich or ambitious enough to send them to an *orator*, who might not exist in a small or middling town. I would guess that this kind of school was quite common in the later empire; at any rate, the idea of a *quadriga auctorum* including Cicero's speeches rather implies it.

The list of authors read (37–8) is a welcome peculiarity of this colloquium, though not without its problems and surprises. The only, and slight, parallel for it is in S, where a heavily moralized digest of the Trojan legend is followed by (384. 11): *in his dum exercemur et aliis variis et pertinentibus, advenit hora. sumptis ergo pugillaribus scripsi de oratione Demosthenis, dictante praeceptore, quod sufficebat, et hora permittebat. distinxi ut oportebat recitantes primum, et ipse recitavi solus*. There seems to be a lacuna before the Trojan summary (382. 73/4), so we do not know if this was a more advanced class than that engaged in basic grammar immediately before. Anyway, it is a limited, purely Greek, programme, even if we add the four following gnostic texts, which probably belong with it. In our scene Homer gets pride of place, as was only normal. So Paulinus of Pella complains (*Euch.* 72):

nec sero, exacto primi mox tempore lustrī,
dogmata Socratus et bellica plasmata Homeri
erroresque legens cognoscere cogor Ulixīs,
protinus ad libros etiam transire Maronis
vix bene comperto iubeor sermone latino . . .

which there is no reason to doubt, even though Paulinus plainly presents himself as a mirror-image of Augustine (who had problems with Greek).⁷⁶ So too Ausonius, sketching out the reading for his homonymous grandson about to enter the school of the *grammaticus* (*Protr. ad Nep.* 45):

perlege, quodcumque est memorabile, prima monebo:
conditor Iliados et amabilis orsa Menandri
evolvenda tibi: tu flexu et acumine vocis
innumeros numeros doctis accentibus effer
adfectusque impone legens. distinctio sensum
auget et ignavis dant intervalla vigorem.

⁷² cf. A. D. Booth in *Florilegium* 1 (1979), 1–14 (also Beudel, op. cit., p. 110, 29–30). Booth's parallel thesis (*TAPA* 109 (1979), 11–19), that *ludi magistri* mainly taught slaves, would at best be proved for upper-crust Rome in the first century A.D.

⁷³ 7. 66–71.
⁷⁴ *Cod. Iust.* 10. 53(52), 6, 7, 11. Cf. P. J. Parsons in A. E. Hanson (ed.), *Collectanea Papyrologica in honor of H. C. Youtie* (1976), II, 441–6.

⁷⁵ cf. e.g. *CIL* XIV, 472 (Ostia, A.D. 144) where a *praeceptor*, not apparently a mathematician, commemorates a prodigious *calculator* who had been his *verna*.

⁷⁶ *Conf.* 1, 13 'tenere cogebar Aeneae nesciocuius errores, oblitus errorum meorum . . .', 14 'credo etiam graecis pueris Vergilius ita sit, cum eum discere coguntur, ut ego illum [sc. Homerum]'. Paulinus' *dogmata Socratus* are presumably gnostic verses, though 92–9 suggest that besides Augustine he had in mind Sulp. Sev., *Vita Martini* 1. 3 'aut quid posteritas emolumenti tulit legendo Hectorem pugnantiem aut Socraten philosophantiem', representing not a school curriculum, but pagan culture in general. In Aus., *Prof.* 27. 5 *dogma Platonium* is set beside oratory and medicine as a higher study.

Neither passage need imply that the whole of Homer was read: more likely selected passages were learnt for recitation, as in our colloquium (note the emphasis in Ausonius, lines 47-50), while context was provided by the widely popular Homeric summaries, presumably referred to here in *causas Troici belli*. Of the other authors, Cicero, Virgil, Sallust and Terence are only what we would expect; Persius and Lucan are among the authors on whom there were school commentaries when Jerome was a child, although Lucan only begins to be quoted by grammarians shortly before. For Statius, it has been argued⁷⁷ that he did not enter the school curriculum till the end of the fourth century, after Juvenal, who is absent here; but the evidence is thin either way. What are *duo bella*? Initially I thought they might refer to Sallust, and *tres comoedias* to Terence, assuming dislocation in the text. But all the evidence suggests that the *Histories* remained in the curriculum alongside *Catiline* and *Jugurtha*, and nothing suggests a selection from Terence. Perhaps then *tres comoedias* begins the Greek list (perhaps Menander, compare Ausonius). At a pinch, *duo bella* might describe Lucan and Statius, but it would then be the only such descriptive phrase in the list. A separate item perhaps seems more likely. And the Greek list seems remarkable alike for the absence of tragedy, and the presence of Hippocrates.⁷⁸ Ausonius' Greek list is nostalgically vague (*ibid.* 52):

quando oblita mihi tot carmina totque per aevum
conexa historiae, soccos aulaeque regum
et melicos lyricosque modos profando novabis
obductosque seni facies puerascere sensus ?

while for Latin he cites Horace's *Odes*, Virgil, Terence and Sallust's *Catiline* and *Histories*. Evidently for him Silver Latin was at least not representative of school reading. But his exclusion of oratory must be deliberate, and not surprising in Bordeaux, with its wealth of *oratores*.

In the Forum

Another novelty of this colloquium is the Forum scene at the end. It divides into three parts: 71-2 a procession of dignitaries each demanding the taxes due to them; 73 legal cases dealt with privately in the *secretarium*; 74-7 two public trials. In M/E (647-8) there is a private suit, *res pecuniaria*, tried by *magistratus ex subscriptione praesidis provinciae* (?); witnesses are gathered and 100 denarii borrowed from a *nummularius* to pay the lawyers; both sides have their say and the narrator wins. In Mp too (656.10) there is a law-case, but very summary: *iudex venit. acta res est et vicimus. quoniam ergo bono pede convenisti in rem meam, possumus hodie una prandere, rogo, veni*. Otherwise our scene is without parallel. The first section poses a number of problems. The dignitaries apparently appear in hierarchical order, but when they are again listed with their appropriate levies, the *rationalis* and *dux* change places, and centurions appear in addition, demanding *e caminis pretium*. In any case, this simultaneous exaction of levies by different officials seems to be unrecorded, and such exalted personages are not likely to be doing the actual collecting. Does the scene represent a ceremonial handing over of taxes already collected? Or a formal announcement of what taxes will be due? Is there any evidence for such public occasions?

The brief central section in the *secretarium* is mainly of interest for the date of the text (see below). The two public trials in the last section are clearly exemplary: one is a *latro*, guilty of course, though he denies the charge through a horrible and apparently standard series of tortures; he is duly executed. The other, *cui adest grande patrocinium et viri disertis adsunt illi*, is so innocent that we are not even told what he is accused of, but he is acquitted, and his witnesses *sine iniuria absoluti sunt*, evidently not to be taken for granted. This might well encourage school-children to acquire *literarum facundiam*, and the picture is no doubt realistic enough.

⁷⁷ P. Wessner in *Phil. Wochenschr.* 49 (1929), 296-303, 328-35.

⁷⁸ For detail see notes ad loc.

It is no surprise, *a priori*, that the two aspects of Roman government to impinge on the everyday world of the colloquium should be taxation and the administration of justice. A nice parallel, though, is provided in the tirade of the renegade Roman citizen encountered or invented by Priscus, for whom just these two aspects of Roman misrule were enough to make one prefer to be a Hun.⁷⁹

Clues to Date and Place

We cannot decide where and when the surviving redactions of the Hermeneumata were compiled until all parts of them have been studied, especially the glossaries. But it is worth considering, what place and date we might give our colloquium, supposing for instance it had survived on its own and without analogues.

Clearly the Roman Empire, in terms of ordinary urban living, is still going strong. In the afternoon we visit public baths which have a full range of facilities. A large household assumes not only slaves, but specifically a *capsarius* (15) to accompany a boy to school, and a *paedagogus* (28) who apparently also acts as *praegustator* (46), and a eunuch (17). Food is served on tables which are brought in and taken away again, and at dinner one reclines on draped couches forming a *stibadium* (48) with a scattering of flowers and perfumes for that special touch. Central government is represented by officials who announce taxes and levies to the assembled *decuriones et cives* in the forum (72), where also a *iudex* sitting on a *tribunal* conducts public trials, of which records are kept (74-7). There is no hint of Christianity; on the contrary, the boy prays to *deos omnes* (14).

A more precise date is obviously difficult; everyday living is not prone to sudden changes resulting in *termini ante* and *post*, and even as regards public life, the text is not an official document bound to be accurate in all its details. A number of features, linguistic and other, point to the late third or more probably fourth century, notably 73 *secretarium*, which seems not to have been used in this sense either earlier or later. I can see no contrary indications, but perhaps those more learned will.

Even everyday living might be datable if it could be located in a specific place, but unfortunately this colloquium does not refer to any places by name.⁸⁰ That we are in the West is clear, if only from the gloss *grammaticus* = ῥωμαῖος (29, 30). Besides the fact already mentioned, that it is only in the West that young children commonly studied both languages simultaneously, it seems doubtful that Silver Latin poetry would have figured much in the Eastern curriculum before or outside Priscian's Constantinople, or that tragedy would have been absent in an Eastern list of Greek reading. Admittedly the Greek list is differently remarkable for a Western school, but we must remember how little such evidence we have: we would hardly have expected new Anacreon on a floor in Autun.⁸¹ Can one say more precisely where in the West? The last scene implies a provincial centre rather than Rome. And a number of features suggest a cool climate: probably a boy would not wear *bracas*, *udones*, *ocreas* as well as *caligas* all at once,⁸² but it seems that some kind of leggings was normal, as also a *paenula* or a *cucullus* for going out; and *carbones* are acceptable in the dining room (47, 54). Spiced wine, especially with absinth (44, 52) and charcuterie (52), though typical of Gaul, were widely exported, but two further items do suggest that we are well north of the Alps: beer may be drunk at lunch or dinner (44, 49), and one of the grains taxed is *braces* (72), specific to Gaul. I would not claim that this amounts to proof, but in the absence of any contrary indications, Gaul does seem a good bet.

It would perhaps anyway seem a likely context for the kind of bilingual teaching which the colloquium represents. Even apart from Ausonius, we have so much more evidence for Greek teaching in Gaul than for anywhere else in the West, that it can hardly be mere accident.⁸³ It is Ausonius, however, who gives us the fullest picture of education in fourth-

⁷⁹ *Hist. Graeci Minores*, ed. L. Dindorf (1870), 1 306-7; my thanks to Keith Hopkins for pointing it out to me.

⁸⁰ Contrast Mp, apparently set in Rome (656. 8, 657. 14).

⁸¹ H. Stern—M. Blanchard Lemée, *Recueil Général*

des Mosaïques de la Gaule 11 2 (*Gallia Suppl.* x) (1975), no. 213.

⁸² Throughout this and the other colloquia there are alternatives of both vocabulary and syntax, in tune with its being a linguistic exercise.

⁸³ cf. H. Bannert in *WS* 90 (1977), 87-91.

century Gaul, and I would like to stop with him for a moment, if only to justify my title. Ausonius not only tells us explicitly about teachers and teaching, his poetry has exceptionally close links with scholastic culture. I do not mean so much the game poems, the *Cento* or the *Technopaegnia*, *jeux d'esprit* of a man of letters rather than real school exercises; but I mean such poems as the *Eclogae* on the days of the week, the months, the signs of the zodiac, or those reworking the sayings of the seven sages: poems where scholastic content is elevated to a more polished style. I do not know if the sources of the *Ephemeris* or *Totius Diei Negotium* have been investigated or with what result; whether, that is, there is earlier evidence for a series of scenes from an ordinary day as the framework for some poems.⁸⁴ At any rate, there is quite a suggestive likeness between parts of the *Ephemeris* and the humble colloquium:

PARECBASIS

Puer, eia, surge et calceos et linteam da sindonem. da, quidquid est, amictui quod iam parasti, ut prodeam.	nec liba crusti mellei foculumque vivi caespitis vanis relinquo altaribus.
5 da rore fontano abluam manus et os et lumina. pateatque fac sacrarium nullo paratu extrinsecus. pia verba, vota innoxia	15 deus precandus est mihi ac filius summi dei, maiestas unius modi, sociata sacro spiritu. et ecce iam vota ordior
10 rei divinae copia est. nec tus cremandum postulo	20 et cogitatio numinis praesentiam sentit pavens — pavetne quicquam spes, fides?

Well, you may say, we all get up and get dressed. But we do not all necessarily write about it in little scenes like this, and this is my main point. Ausonius, like the boy, prays; unlike the boy, he is Christian, but it is notable that he points this out at length, before giving us a suitably elaborate prayer (*Ephem.* 3). Why such explicit contrast? After praying, he puts on outdoor clothes and goes out to exchange greetings with friends, and invites some to lunch (cf. 14–16, 54):

EGRESSIO

Satis precum datum deo. quamvis satis numquam (a) reis fiat precatu numinis. habitum forensem da, puer.	valeque, quod fit mutuum. quod cum per horas quattuor inclinat ad meridiem,
5 dicendum amicis est have	9 monendus est iam Sosias.

LOCVS INVITATIONIS

Tempus vocandis namque amicis appetit.
ne vos vel illi demoremur prandium,
propere per aedes curre vicinas, puer.

⁸⁴ Martial 4. 8 is a cameo, using the daily routine as frame for one epigram. Otherwise, the theme occurs, not surprisingly, in biography, satire and letters, usually coloured by a moral or philosophical point (e.g. Hor., *Sat.* 1, 6, 111 ff.; Pliny, *ep.* 3. 1, 3. 5. 8–15, 9. 36 with 9. 40 as rather lame pendant), taken to idiosyncratic extremes in Sen., *ep.* 83, but detectable even in a real letter like Cic., *ad fam.* 9. 20. 3. (I am grateful to Professor Nisbet for

references on this point.) Ausonius' poem seems to me more like the colloquia than like any of these in scale, form and stance. Admittedly, Ch.-M. Ternes, in R. Chevallier (ed.), *AION: le temps chez les Romains* (1976), 239–52, reads the poem as an 'itinéraire spirituel', 'témoignage poignant d'une conversion', etc.; if Ausonius intended that, he was a hopeless poet.

LOCVS ORDINANDI COQVI

Sosia, prandendum est. quartam iam totus in horam	156
sol calet : ad quintam flectitur umbra notam.	(V)
an vegeto madeant condita opsonia gustu	
(fallere namque solent), experiundo proba.	
5 concute ferventes palmis volventibus ollas,	
tinge celer digitos iure calente tuos,	
vibranti lambat quos umida lingua recursu.	
.....	

At this point there is a lacuna, and although a note in the only MS says that what is missing is the end of this poem and the beginning of the next, this does not square with the title *Totius Diei Negotium*; for the next poem is the last, and Ausonius is in bed having terrible dreams, which he begs to leave him in peace till morning (*Ephem.* 7. 36–9). So though we do not know what Ausonius did between lunch and bed-time,⁸⁵ enough remains, I think, to suggest that the poem may be a literary reworking of the school colloquia of his day, too lowly otherwise for recognition in the exclusive world of Latin literature.

King's College London

⁸⁵ Peiper (ed. Leipzig 1886) inserted the poem
In *Notarium* between 6 and 7, saying (p. xvii) 'nemo

non bene factum concedet'; maybe, but we still
miss dinner, and probably baths.