sichtspunkten entfaltete 'objektivistische' Lesart, die die Betonung der Subjektivität des Selbst erst mit Descartes beginnen läßt, zwei gegenwändige Gesichtspunkte genannt. Es scheint mir einerseits offenkundig, bei Augustinus, etwa in den Confessiones, eine deutliche Wende zur Subjektivität feststellen zu können. Augustinus steht nicht für sich, sondern verarbeitet viele Motive der hellenistischen und spätantiken Philosophie. Zum anderen beginnt mit Descartes (entgegen seiner Selbstpropaganda) nicht etwas völlig Neues. Wer die Tradition des Augustinus im Mittelalter berücksichtigt, könnte unter Umständen Schwierigkeiten haben, herauszufinden, was denn, von neuen mathematisch-naturphilosophischen Ideen und deren Folgeproblemen abgesehen, Descartes an substantiell Neuem gebracht hat. Die im philosophischen Bildungsprogramm immer noch übliche Ausblendung der Philosophie der christlichen Spätantike und des Mittelalters hat Folgen für die Sicht der Dinge.


Erlangen

Maximilian Forschner


The Donati Graeci of Federica Ciccolella’s title are four different Greek translations of the Latin Ianua, a medieval compilation based on Donatus’ Ars minor and Priscianus’ Institutiones. Ianua is a ‘parsing’ grammar, in which all parts of speech are analyzed, in question-and-answer patterns, according to their ‘accidents’. Recent research has shown that Ianua was composed in the twelfth century as a convenient tool for the teaching of Latin; sometime in the fourteenth century or later (see infra), one or more MSS of Ianua were brought East and were translated into Greek to assist Byzantine speakers in need of the basics of Latin. Ciccolella (henceforward: C.) is not the first to have engaged in study of this topic, and she credits the important work of W. O. Schmitt, a scholar active in the former German Democratic Republic in the 1960s and 1970s. Schmitt’s doctoral thesis, defended at the Humboldt-Universität in 1966, ‘Maximos Planudes, der lateinische Pseudo-Donatus (Ianua) und seine Übersetzung ins Griechische’, included an edition of Donatus Graecus (which C. also calls Pylê, although this actual translation of Ianua does not figure explicitly as a title in the MSS). Yet, Schmitt’s thesis was never published, and Ciccolella’s book will therefore be the only tool generally available to scholars interested in this topic. Moreover, Ciccolella has added five more MSS to Schmitt’s original six, and C.’s discovery has produced a significant step forward in the history of this interesting text, leading her to identify three different versions of Pylê, which she names b, c, and d, which, C. argues, served as Greek grammars for Westerners, mostly in Italy,
competing for a while with the various sets of *Erotemata* circulating in manuscript and then in print in the second half of the fifteenth century.

C.’s initial two chapters summarize previous research concerning the study of Latin and Greek grammar from the end of antiquity to the Renaissance. Chapter one (‘The Latin Donatus’, 1–73) is primarily an analysis of *Ars minor* and *Ianua*. Chapter two (‘The Greek curriculum’, 75–149) surveys the teaching of Greek in Rome from the Republic to Late Antiquity, the Greek grammatical curriculum in Byzantium, and, finally, the teaching of Greek in the Renaissance. Even if this section of C.’s work is not the fruit of original research, the two initial chapters are a formidable summa of the subject, which will be of great help to students of Greek and Roman grammar, and in particular to students of the survival of Greek in the West.

There is enormous background reading here, and it was probably inevitable to commit minor oversights. P. 42: it may be true that the study of syntax was reserved for more advanced students in antiquity, but there is, to my knowing, no positive evidence for this from antiquity. P. 56: it is not true that bilingual onomastica evolved into alphabetical dictionaries; presumably bilingual onomastica remained what they were, for example in *Hermeneumata* compilations. Whereas onomastica are collections of everyday or technical words, alphabetical glossaries include mostly learned vocabulary culled from authors’ glosses and *Graeca collecta*. P. 87: P. Fouad 1.5 is a Vergilian bilingual and does not contain *Hadraum sententiae*. In the same page, the statement that in antiquity ‘dictionaries, lexica, grammatical works... had been conceived for native speakers, not for foreigners striving to acquire the basis of the language’ is incorrect, without further qualifications, because bilingual dictionaries were obviously used by non-native speakers of either language, and likewise many of the Latin grammars containing Greek translations (e.g. *Anonymus Bobiensis*, Dositheus’ *Ars*, possibly even Charisius) certainly had a Greek readership in mind, though they would hardly have been useful in the hands of absolute beginners of any age group. P. 90: C. appears to be the first to identify the earliest attempt to produce a *Donatus graecus* in the fragment of a bilingual parsing grammar in a ninth-century MS, *BNF*, Par. Lat. 528, ff 134v–135r. Although too early to be based on *Ianua*, the fragment is almost identical to what C. calls *Pylê a*. P. 91 C.’s analysis of the other, Carolingian Greek grammar, *ONB*, Cod. 114 ought to mention that large sections of the same grammar occur in several MSS, listed in Dionisotti, *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks* (1988), 21–4.

Chapter three (‘Donati graeci’, 151–228) and four (‘Donati graeci in their context’, 229–260) are the core of the book. Mentions of *Donati graeci* occur in some medieval Latin documents: the earliest of them is the library catalogue of Christ Church, Canterbury (ca. 1170), listing a *Donatus graecus* among the library’s holdings. C. argues however that even *Pylê a*, the earliest extant version of *Ianua*, post-dates the twelfth century. C. convincingly deconstructs (237–44) with strong linguistic arguments (such as the vernacular element present in *Pylê a*) the earlier ascription of the work to Maximus Planudes, a high-profile Byzantine intellectual particularly celebrated for his Latin translations of various literary works.

Of the four redactions identified by C., *Pylê a* is by far the most interesting, because it transmits the only extant grammar for Greek speakers attempting to learn Latin. We know that Greeks were interested in the study of Latin from early on, but no systematic grammar has survived antiquity, with the only partial exception of some bilingual glossaries, such as the alphabetical dictionary with grammatical notes in *P. Sorb. inv. 2069*, on which see now Dickey and Ferri,
ZPE, 175 (2010). Pylê a is a word-for-word translation of an unidentified Ianua-source. The MSS transmitting Pylê a seem all to derive from the same archetype, although one of them, R, may have used a further Latin source accounting for some 'interpolations' (172–80). Pylê a, although entirely in Greek, is a description of Latin (only two MSS have interlinear or partial Latin translations). Therefore, for example, the language described in Pylê has five declensions, identified by their genitive endings (ἐκτεταμένον 'long i', κυριεύμενον 'short i', ὁς κυριεύμενον 'long us', εἰς κυριεύμενον 'bi-syllabic ei'), but items for each declension chart are only provided by Greek words. Therefore the third declension includes πατήρ and ἔργον, neither of which has a genitive ending in -is.

No extant MS of Pylê is earlier than the fifteenth century, and almost all were written in Italy. The three which can be located outside Italy point to Crete, and thus C. puts forward the convincing suggestion that Pylê a was conceived for local officials trying to learn Latin in Crete under Venitian rule (244–56).

The edition of these grammatical texts, their interpretation and linguistic analysis, and the final select textual-critical commentary, are beyond doubt a lasting achievement of this book. I will only mention in passing a minor drawback of the edition of Pylê a. Here, C. prints a facing Latin text which she defines as «Ur-Ianua a» (xxiii). This, to the present reader, is an unhelpful definition, especially when «Ur-Ianua a» is being referred to in support of C.’s emendations in the Greek text. C. uses the following Latin siglum: «D = Donatus latinus, consensus quorundam codicum et editionum»; she then lists sigla for interlinear/marginal Latin in MSS G and Q, four further Ianua-MSS of different periods (H, J, S, U) and p, an incunable of Ianua published in 1492. To pass over the disturbing reference to «certain/some manuscripts and editions» (what are they? are they different from the other sigla?), the Latin apparatus has only readings from D, G, Q, which leaves one very confused, especially when the Latin or the Greek yield a non-sensical text, e. g. at p. 381 l. 160 (de pronominis), quasi sunt pronomina de quibus nulla dubitatio est where the Greek reads πτώϲιϲ declinatio, certainly corrupt, since ‘doubt’ is correct, or at p. 391 l. 19 (de coniunctione) subcontinuatio est quae causam continuatiois ostendit cum rebus essentia (for rerum). At 274 l. 103 the rule for the ending of vocatives in proper names in -ius is oddly phrased in the Greek (και ἰστέον ὅτι κύριον ὁνόμα λήγον εἰς οὐς [in fact, only true for -ιους] ἐφείλει πλεονάϲαι τὸ τούτου θετικόν μίαν συλλαβήν, ‘and we have to remember that proper names ending in us must exceed their positive by one syllable’[?]) but C.’s conjectural κλητικόν, based on the Latin ‘Ur-text’ reading nomen proprium desinens in us debet superare sum nociationum una syllaba, while factually true, fails to account for the fact that, without exceptions, the word for vocative is feminine in Greek, κλητική (πτώϲιϲ). It would have been much more acceptable to base her Ianua Latin text on the MSS and printed editions she claims to know, and to place the text on a provisional perhaps, but at least traceable source.
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