judicieusement parallèle fait par DD entre S. et Paulin de Nole permet aussi d’envisager la même démarche de complétude littéraire chez les deux poètes (comme chez Prudence): louer Dieu par toutes les possibilités esthétiques héritées du monde classique, aussi bien dans des pièces lyriques (les *Hymnes* pour S., les poèmes en l’honneur de Félix pour Paulin) que des œuvres à dominante épique (comme la *Laus Johannis* de Paulin et le *CP*), démarche que S. poussera jusqu’à son aboutissement par la version prosaïque de l’*OP*.

Genève
Nicole Hecquet-Noti


It is no surprise that more than 150 years have elapsed since the first and last critical edition of Priscian’s *Ars Grammatica*. This vast text, preserved (whole or in parts) in more than five hundred manuscripts, is the most complex as well as the longest ancient Latin grammar. Written in the early sixth century in Constantinople, it occupies nearly a thousand large pages in Martin Hertz’s edition of 1855–59; Theodorus, the scribe (and pupil of Priscian) who left his name and precise dates at several points in the text, took three months to copy Book 17, 100 pages in Hertz; in other parts of the work he seems to have progressed more rapidly, but still, the first 17 books appear to have taken him eight months (from October 1, 526 to May 30, 527) to write. Hertz, a pupil of Lachmann, was an excellent editor, and it is just as well: no single scholar now is likely to try to repeat his work.

The sheer exhausting size of Priscian’s work is both daunting and, as the editors of this commented translation of Book 17 point out, characteristic of the age. They rightly compare the encyclopedism of the contemporary *Ethnika* of Stephanus of Byzantium and the *Digest*. Within the tradition of Latin grammatical writing, moreover, Priscian’s work stands out not merely because of its bulk, but because Priscian alone of the Latin grammarians drew extensively on the work of the great Greek grammarians of the second century, Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian. And while the traditional shape of the Latin *ars grammatica* concentrated on the parts of speech (with or without paradigms, depending on audience), Priscian followed his Greek models in paying close attention, in Books 17 and

18, to syntax, something that apparently had not been done in Latin since the (lost) second half of Varro’s *De lingua latina*, if even then.

The volume under review is a translation, with extensive annotations and a facing text, of Book 17, the first half of the syntax. It was undertaken by the Groupe *Ars Grammatica*, nine scholars in France under the leadership of Marc Baratin and including some other very distinguished scholars of Latin grammar, grammarians, and manuscripts. According to the preface, this volume is presented as a pilot project, the ultimate purpose of which is to provide critical translations of important works of Latin grammarians; as they point out, while some Greek grammatical texts have been translated into modern languages, there is very little comparable for Latin.

Although the absence of translations of Latin grammarians has been in part alleviated by the valuable anthology edited by Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar & Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475* (Oxford, 2009), which even includes some excerpts from Priscian Book 17, the complete translation and thorough annotation offered by Baratin’s team is extremely welcome. The great strength of the present volume (as indeed of the Copeland-Sluiter volume) is that the authors take Priscian seriously as a theorist of language and grammar and attempt to explain his arguments in some detail. The introduction offers a close analysis of the relationship of Priscian’s text to that of Apollonius Dyscolus. It includes not only a careful account of Priscian’s argument in Book 17, but explanations of Priscian’s methods of analysis; of his terminology; of his choices of *exempla*. The editors also include detailed indices of terminology (both Latin/Greek and French) and an analytical list of the *exempla ficta* (grammatical illustrations that are not quotations from literary texts). Within the translation, they have supplied headings to assist the reader in following Priscian’s often obscure train of thought, and many of their annotations link Book 17 to the other books of the *Ars*. Their careful reading has led to improvements in the paragraphing of Hertz’s text, and even to restoring to Priscian’s work, usually called *Institutiones grammaticae*, its proper title of *Ars*. In general, this volume is one of the most serious attempts to explain in detail a work of ancient grammatical scholarship: in the work of Baratin and his colleagues, Priscian’s difficult argument (and Latin) make a great deal more sense than they have made before.

On the large scale of argument and interpretation, indeed, this volume is outstanding; at the same time, however, in subsidiary matters, particularly in questions of presentation and editorial technique, it occasionally falters. The text itself is an accurate reproduction of Hertz with very few typographical errors and some real improvements – the introduction of subheadings and better paragraphing and punctuation – and very few other changes, all of which are identified in the annotation; there is no apparatus criticus. The Latin text is (in the manner of the Loeb series rather than the Budé) on the left, the translation on the right. But the presentation is also very cumbersome: within the translation, every one of Priscian’s quotations is repeated, in Latin, followed by the French translation and the source citation in brackets. The notes to the Latin text (marked by lower-case letters) point out parallels and sources, but are also the only place...
where textual variants in the quotations are identified, often far too briefly, while
textual discussion of variants in the Latin text are in the notes to the French
translation. If one is interested, for instance, in exploring Priscian’s quotation
(143.17) ‘sic Iuppiter ille monebat’, one must first find the source (Aen. 7.110) in
the facing translation, then return to the footnote to the Latin text which points
out the variant (ille: ipse) and cites the authorities for each from Geymonat’s
dition. But only by looking at Geymonat’s apparatus does one discover that ille
is the reading not only of Priscian, but of every indirect source for the verse, not
just Priscian, but DS and Ti. Donatus as well. Given the overriding interest of
Baratin and his colleagues in Priscian’s argument rather than his place in the
Latin tradition, that is understandable; but for those who approach the text from
another direction, it is less than helpful. The same lack of concern is evident in
the testimonia: while the editors are assiduous and very helpful in giving parallels
to Apollonius Dyscolus (often discussing the similarities and differences in their
introduction and notes), the references to the Latin tradition are sometimes mis-
leading: at 142.22, on Priscian’s quotation of Aen. 6.691 ‘hic uir, hic est, tibi quem
promitti saepius audis’, the note cites no fewer than eleven parallels from the
Latin grammatical tradition. But Priscian is using the line to demonstrate deictic
hic, while all the parallels are interested only in the variation of quantity in the
two appearances of hic. They are simply not relevant here.
The notes to the translation also have problems. As noted above, the annota-
tions to the French include the textual notes to the Latin; again, one must go
back and forth between text and translation and both sets of notes to get a clear
picture of the evidence. Within the textual notes, moreover, there are some pecu-
liarities and errors: at 108.19–20, for example, in restoring to the text, probably
rightly, two phrases bracketed by Hertz, the editors comment that he did so
«sans aucune raison paléographique» (p. 65, notes 5 and 6). That is perfectly true,
but irrelevant: palaeography has no role in identifying intrusive glosses. At
138.19–20, they follow Hertz in bracketing ‘Vergilius . . . accipi’, but in describ-
ing this sentence as «une interpolation ou une seconde rédaction» they fail to
note that it is in fact missing from the major manuscripts, and at 143.1 they
wrongly include the words ‘ut iste tuus filius et hanc aspice prolem’ omitted by
Hertz, saying that he rejected them; in fact, they are found in very few witnesses
and the last four words only in one manuscript. Three lines later they do not
indicate that Hertz had bracketed ‘ad . . . demonstrationem’; he may have been
wrong, but his deletion is not unreasonable and should be reported. At 124.13–
14, on the other hand, their text is a distinct improvement on Hertz’s (substitut-
ing ‘doceo et doceor’ for ‘doceris et doceo’).
Furthermore, while the notes to the translation are a mine of important infor-
mation about Priscian’s language and meaning, the editors fail entirely to cite or
to make use of Samantha Schad’s outstanding Lexicon of Latin Grammatical
Terminology (Pisa, 2007), which is in many cases much clearer and more careful
than these notes in elucidating Priscian’s terminology. Thus, in their note on
inclinatus as a translation of enklitikos at 141.10, the editors supply much less
information than Schad on inclinatus and on rectus (4). And while both they
and Schad explain Priscian’s language in relationship to that of Apollonius, only
the latter allows one to see it in relationship to the rest of the Latin grammatical tradition.

These comments are not meant to diminish the very real and substantial contributions of this volume: it will be an essential tool for anyone working in this field, and it is marked throughout by great learning and good sense. But the editors emphasize rather single-mindedly the development of the theory of syntax and the relationship of Priscian to Apollonius Dyscolus. That is, indeed, an important contribution, and it is quite explicitly what the editors intended. At the same time, however, if this is a pilot project, one can hope that subsequent volumes will pay slightly more attention, perhaps in the manner of the ‘Collectanea Grammatica Latina’ series now being published by Weidmann under the general editorship of Giuseppe Morelli and Mario de Nonno, to the presentation of the text and translation; to the problems of the text itself; and to its place in the tradition of Roman, as well as Greek, grammatical scholarship. That would improve on what is already an excellent beginning.
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