
The works known as the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana are school texts in dialogue form designed for teaching language: Greek to Latin speakers, Latin to Greek speakers. They consist of simple conversational phrases relating to topics from daily life that can be easily memorized and put to use. These often start with a dialogue concerning a day at school and move on to bathing, dining, quarreling, collecting a debt, and the like. The colloquies are written in two columns, with Greek on the left, Latin to the right. Collectively they give the impression that they were intended for Greek speakers living in Italy who needed to learn or improve their Latin. However, they can be read in both directions, so that a Latin reader can learn Greek by reading from the right column to the left, as the dialogues invariably translate each other. It is often hard to tell whether the authors of the individual versions were Greek or Latin speakers, since non-idiomatic renderings can be found in both columns.

The Hermeneumata are called Pseudodositheana because of the attachment of the dialogues to fragments of the Greek-Latin grammar of Dositheus that survived in Carolingian copies. However, we know nothing about the authors of the Hermeneumata, and may suppose that the different versions were composed at different times before the end of antiquity. They seem to have been addressed to users who still lived in a predominantly pagan environment, as there are no unambiguous references to Christianity, whereas the portions of the colloquies dealing with worship point exclusively to pagan gods. The presence of slaves, including pedagogues, is also a notable feature, as many of the dialogues involve discourse with slaves, or tell one how to give them orders for particular tasks.

Although the works have been known since the Renaissance, and were later edited by Georg Goetz in volume 3 of the ‘Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum’, they have never been made fully accessible in a user-friendly edition until now. Eleanor Dickey has given us all we could possibly wish for in order to read, understand, and make use of these texts for further research in her two-volume edition published by Cambridge University Press (2012, 2015). (Those seeking complete information about these works should refer to her introduction in the first volume.) The texts edited include: (volume 1) Colloquia Monacensia, Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani; (volume 2) Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and fragments.

The volume under review contains individual introductions to each of the colloquia followed by the text and full apparatus criticus, an excellent English translation, then a full commentary. There is an appendix containing papyrus fragments of colloquia followed by an exhaustive bibliography and separate indices for Greek and Latin words. The separate introductions provide studies of the scholarship for each, the text tradition, linguistic features specific to each colloquy, and sources. Where possible, stemmata are provided.

While there can be no doubt that the Hermeneumata were compiled for ancient users (demonstrated beyond a doubt by the papyrus fragments), their transmission in the Carolingian period played a critical role in spreading a lim-
ited knowledge of Greek to western medieval scribes and scholars. Their presence in continental libraries helps to explain why medieval scribes transliterating Greek words into Latin so frequently employed the so-called ‘Byzantine spellings’. The vowel shifts in Greek that were well underway in imperial times were mostly complete by the fifth century C.E., resulting in the transliteration of classical οι as e and ηι, η, and υ as i, while the ancient diphthongs ου and ευ were transliterated as af and ef. Importantly, the Hermeneumata were mined for their lexica, which were often re-ordered in alphabetical glossaries. The potential role of the Hermeneumata as models for Medieval Latin colloquies remains to be fully explored, but the task should now be much easier. Dickey was doubtless right to reject the suggestion that additions in the Harleianum were inspired by Anglo-Saxon examples (p. 15). However, the reverse is worthy of consideration. One already sees traces of the Hermeneumata in sections of the seventh-century (Irish) Hisperica Farnia.

In the comments that follow I shall concern myself with linguistic matters, as these are the easiest aspect of the work to focus on – at least for a reviewer who has not spent half a lifetime labouring over these texts. On the whole, there is very little to criticize, and a great deal to praise. Dickey’s commentaries take account of stages of development in the Greek and Latin languages from their classical beginnings through changes in late antiquity to the forms they take in medieval manuscripts. Particularly laudable is the attention that she gives to Modern Greek and to the Romance languages for Latin. The English translations are almost always accurate and give the flavour of the discourses through colloquial expressions. Since reviewers are tasked with pointing out the weaknesses as well as the strengths of works under review, I append a short list of minor criticisms:

**Harleianum**

p. 19, 1e: *apud* for place to which is rare in Classical Latin; a note would have been helpful.

p. 19, 1g: *ita . . . nisi* for *tam . . . quam* needs a comment; here the construction translates the Greek.

p. 20, 1h: *re molestatur*: The use of the present for future perfect in conditional sentences probably reflects everyday speech.

p. 22, 6b: *re *aqu*: There is nothing suspicious about the Greek adverb in context. The father says that he wants to go ‘at the same time’ or ‘together with’ (his son) to see how well his son does his exercises, as explained in what follows. The problem is with the Latin translation. Neither *noviter* (‘newly’, ‘recently’) nor the proposed *obiter* (see commentary) conveys this meaning.

p. 25, 11b: *re λόγων/sermonum*: The genitive case of these nouns is not explained, and not completely helped by the insertion of [‘portion of’] in the translation. Is it possible that a word was missing in the Greek?

p. 26, 12c: Dickey’s text reads *uacat mihi*. H and F read *uaca*, and J (a late antique papyrus fragment) is missing at this point. Final t in the third person singular of verbs was already in the process of disappearing in the Late Latin period; see Väänänen, ‘*Introduction au latin vulgaire*’ 130 (p. 68). Perhaps it would be better to print *uaca*<t>. Dickey, ‘Commentary’, p. 63, states only that ‘Goetz’s emendation to the impersonal *uacat* must be right’.

p. 27, 15a: *re στήκεις*: I did not find the cross-reference. Dickey does well to correct Goetz’s classicizing *ἐστήκας* to *στήκεις*, which is an attested late form (LSJ). It is worth noting, however, that H’s *στεγας*, which preserves the ancient aorist ending, shows epsilon

p. 27, 15b: The Latin is in domum translating the Greek εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. A note for the Latin construction (which obviously follows the Greek) is needed here (compare Montepessulanum 20a cansus domum).

p. 27, 15c: Greek Διὰ τί (compare Modern Greek γιατί) and Latin qua re here are repeated elsewhere in the Harleianum (cf. 18c). Although the simple classical τί appears elsewhere (e.g. 15a), I did not find the expected equivalent cur in this colloquy; qua re and quid take its place. Perhaps the explanation is that cur had already passed out of daily use; cur has no derivatives in Romance.

p. 28, 16c re Maledicis me: While the accusative occurs in Old and Late Latin, classical usage strongly favours the dative of persons as recipient. A reference to ‘ThLL’ would have helped here: examples with the accusative come from Petronius («in partibus sermonis vulgariis) and the Itala.

p. 28, 16d: The phrase ista fac followed by ipsis may conceal an obscenity.

p. 31, 20b: Perhaps it is worth noting that all the words for food and wine are classical, given the opportunities for ‘modern’ intrusions.

p. 31, 20c re κολλήγιον/collegium: I wonder if the reference is to a club or society of students, which is exclusive. Note that an objector argues that the diners will want to include some ordinary people so that they can relax.

p. 36, 26d re prandidi for prandi: For more examples of reduplication of verbs not re-duplicated in Classical Latin, see Stotz, ‘Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters’ viii.116.6 (vol. 4, pp. 201–2).

Montepessulanum

p. 95, 1a: Disputare as a general word meaning ‘to speak’, as here ‘to speak Latin’, is odd and requires comment. One would expect loqui, or perhaps conloqui, to match the Greek διαλέγεσθαι.

p. 95, 1d: A rare oversight: The Greek is όγαθή τύπη, the Latin bona fortuna. Given that the Greek is dative, the Latin must be ablative. The translation should be ‘by good fortune’ rather than ‘good fortune’.

p. 96, 2e: It is very doubtful (see ‘commentary’, p. 115) that the Latin double negative qui nescis nihil is intended to be complimentary, with the negatives cancelling each other. Not only do they follow the Greek, where more than one negative can be reinforcing, but double negation is also a common feature of Vulgar Latin and the Romance languages. For early and late Latin examples see Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, ‘Lateinische Grammatik’, vol. 2, pp. 834–5.

p. 100, 9b: The address to Aphrodite (which Dickey identifies as an hexameter) is obviously an interruption of the discourse and should be bracketed. It is the sort of thing that might have been imported from a margin.

p. 100, 11c: quae opus est translating τὰ χρεῖα ὀντὸς is non-latinate; one expects either quibus opus est or quae necessaria sunt.

p. 101, 13b: duco me may be attested (see ‘commentary’ ad loc.), but it looks very much like an attempt just to render the middle voice of πορεύομαι.

p. 103, 16b–c: It is interesting that the usual terms associated with Roman bathing (calidarium, frigidarium) are missing here, replaced in Latin by solium (‘bath tub’) and piscinan (‘pool’), while in Greek we find ἐμβάτη (?) and δεξαμενήν (‘tank’ or ‘cistern’). Had the classical terms fallen out of use by late antiquity?

p. 100, 16c: Here it is tempting to take νηρόν with δεξαμενήν («the cool tanks») and adjust the punctuation. However, that would leave καλῆ in the next line without its noun. I am not sure that Dickey’s translation ‘We had a good cold plunge’ solves the problem.
Celtis
p. 170, 19: κεῖνος for ἑκεῖνος would benefit from a note, as it probably owes more to popular usage than classical Ionic (LSJ).

p. 179, 46a: The paedagogus (papas in the Latin) asks: quid pateris hodie (‘What’s the matter with you today?’). Someone replies: έδεν εὐευούμην (Latin Nihil gustavi). Surely, the respondent here is the narrator (the pupil). The meaning must be ‘I didn’t eat anything’, for gustare in that sense see 47a: Iniunge tuo conservo habeam gustare a balneo.

Dickey gets all this right in her lengthy note, p. 46a, but it is hard to see the point of including the preceding discussion regarding the expectation that pedagogues would taste their charges’ food for the possibility of poisoning.

Despite these minor criticisms, one can only admire Eleanor Dickey’s achievement. The edition is a huge advance over previous attempts to edit this material, and a major contribution to classical philology. The Cambridge University Press must also be congratulated for giving readers a beautiful and carefully edited volume.
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