

CHARISIUS' *DE VERBO* (*ARS GRAMMATICA* II. 8):
TWO CASE STUDIES IN *QUELLENFORSCHUNG**

Introduction

Historians of the Roman grammatical tradition are very familiar with the chapter in the *Ars Grammatica* of Charisius that furnishes a unique account of three different classifications of verbal voices (Char. 210. 3–215. 17 B).¹ In this chapter Charisius describes a four-fold classification (active, passive, common, neuter), a six-fold classification (the previous four plus a deponent and *supina*), and a three-fold classification (active, passive, stative), and in a final paragraph elaborates on the five-fold classification. Karl Barwick has clearly failed in attributing the content of that last paragraph to Remmius Palaemon (1st c. AD),² and no other classification quoted by Charisius has been attributed to the known grammarians of Roman antiquity. We shall discuss the primary sources of the ideas on voice which Charisius relates to us, and the intermediate sources he has immediately exploited. In this paper the system of voices will be considered as a set of different relations between the form and the meaning of verbs in respect to the state of performance (Gr. ἐνέργεια) or experience (Gr. πάθος). Several Greek and Latin texts as well

* The author is very indebted to Prof. Daniel J. Taylor (Lawrence University) and Dr S. O'Sullivan (Queen's University of Belfast), who kindly read through the text and made many helpful suggestions. He thanks equally Prof. R. Maltby (University of Leeds) for important suggestions. Remaining faults of expression are, however, to be imputed to the author.

¹ The following editions are referred by the sigla only:

B – Flavius Sospiter Charisius, *Artis grammaticae libri V*, ed. C. Barwick, addenda et corrigenda coll. et adiecit F. Kühnert (Lipsiae 1964, ed. stereotypa 1997);

GG – A. Hilgard, R. Schneider, G. Uhlig (ed.), *Grammatici Graeci* (Lipsiae 1878–1910);

GL – Heinrich Keil et alii (ed.), *Grammatici Latini* (Lipsiae 1855–1880);

Sch. – *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam*, rec. A. Hilgard, GG I, 3 (Lipsiae 1901);

Us.–R. – H. Usener, L. Radermacher (edd.), *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant* (Stuttgartiae 1904–1929, ed. stereotypa 1965).

² K. Barwick, *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica*, *Philologus*, Supplementband 15. 2 (Leipzig 1922) 23. Cf. a more recent essay of reconstructing the grammatical work of Palaemon: G. Pennisi, “Ad grammaticos”, *Helikon* 1 (1961) 496–511, see also E. Hovdhaugen, “Genera verborum quot sunt? Observations on the Roman Grammatical Tradition”, *Historiographia linguistica* XIII 2/3 (1986) 307–321, esp. 311.

as a lost chapter of the grammatical work of Pliny the Elder (23/24–79 AD) will be treated as the probable sources where the material of Charisius originated.

The Greek Connection

Greek and Roman grammatical doctrine is rich in multiple classifications of verbal voices, but Latin classifications usually differ from the Greek ones. Charisius' first classification of verbal voices, however, corresponds rather well to the description of verbal voices that can be seen in the commentary of Stephanos to the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax (*Sch.* 245. 26–246. 6). Like Charisius' predecessor, the Greek commentator distinguishes four kinds of voices: active (ἡ ἐνέργεια), passive (τὸ πάθος), middle (ἡ μεσότης), and neuter (οὐδέτερα διάθεσις). At the outset he pays particular attention to the middle voice. The Greek grammarians habitually used terms like μεσότης for verbs whose meaning did not correspond to their form, as well as for all verbal forms that did not clearly express the idea of performance or experience. Stephanos applies the term μεσότης exclusively to verbal forms with reflexive or medial signification,³ which the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c. 280–207 BC) had once distinguished in his classification of verbal voices and for which he used a special term, namely, ἀντιπεπονθότα (Diog. Laert. *Vit.* VII. 64. 10). In the Latin classification which Charisius has reproduced, the third category is called *commune* (Char. 210. 19–22 B). In the same way as the Greeks dealt with medial forms, so the author of this Latin classification has assembled here the morphologically passive verb forms which could semantically render either performance or experience when designating different acts.

The fourth type of verbal voice comprises intransitive verbs both in the Greek commentary and in the Latin classification in question. Stephanos treats the fourth type of verbal voice (οὐδέτερα διάθεσις) immediately after he provides some additional remarks on the active and passive voices. It is noteworthy that the same type of verbs, οὐδέτερα κατηγορήματα, had been treated by Chrysippus just after the active and passive voices. According to the 3rd c. AD doxographer Diogenes

³ *Sch.* 245. 31–33: ...τρίτην τὴν μεσότητα κατηριθμήσατο, ἥτις ἑκατέραν τὴν διάθεσιν δηλοῖ τῆ φωνῆ· ἡ γὰρ τοῦ “ἐγραψάμην” φωνῆ δύναται σημαίνειν καὶ πάθος καὶ ἐνέργειαν. At the end of the paragraph, the same type of verbal voice (μέση διάθεσις) is treated once more as a medium: Μέση δὲ ἡ πῆ μὲν ἐνέργειαν πῆ δὲ πάθος δηλοῦσα· τὸ γὰρ “ἐποίησάμην” δηλοῖ, ὅτι ἐμαυτῷ ἐποίησά τι, τὸ δὲ “ἐποιήθη”, ὅτι δι’ ἐμοῦ ἐποιήθη (246. 5–6).

Laetius, Chrysippus used forms of active infinitives to exemplify his idea of neuter or intransitive verbs.⁴ In the Greek commentary this category of verbal voice is represented by the personal forms of intransitive verbs with active and passive endings.⁵ In the corresponding Latin classification the class of intransitive verbs (*neutrum*) is not only exemplified exclusively by verbs having active voice endings (*sedeo*, *ambulo*), but it is also expressly said that this class can not have passive endings (Char. 210. 29–32 B). In the next paragraph, however, which deals with some additions to the initial classification and with its modification, it is said that *neutra verba* do sometimes get the ending of the passive voice: *in neutris verbis vel aliquot partibus r littera admittitur* (Char. 211. 20 f. B). So to that extent the two texts agree that intransitive verbs may manifest either active or passive endings.

Further observations substantiate the conclusion to which those above point, namely, that Charisius' predecessor and Dionysius Thrax's Byzantine commentator had drawn their ideas from the same source, and also suggest that this source dates to the 1st c. BC. At the beginning of Stephanos' commentary the special term διοίκησις is used for explaining the semantics of verbal voices.⁶ When giving a general definition of the verb at the beginning of the chapter where it deals with verbal voices, Charisius has used the exact Latin counterpart of this Greek notion, namely, *administratio*.⁷ He was obviously following here his Latin predecessor, who had calqued the term from his Greek source.

From at least the late 1st c. AD we find witnesses to the “administrative” tradition: both Quintilian (c. 35–c. 96 AD) and Probus of Beirut, who was active on the threshold of the 2nd c. AD, describe the activity of the speaker with the verb *administrare* or the adjective *administrativus*, and Greek sources do the same with the verb διοικέω or the participles derived from it, and especially with the substantive διοίκησις. Quintilian identifies the most useful component of the rhetorical art with the two synonymous adjectives *activa* and *administrativa* (Quint. *Inst. orat.* II. 18. 5). In the *De coniunctione temporum*,

⁴ Diog. Laer. *Vit.* VII. 64. 6–10: ὀρθὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ συντασσόμενα μιᾷ τῶν πλαγίων πτώσεων πρὸς κατηγορήματος γένεσιν, οἷον “ἀκούει”, “ὀρᾷ”, “διαλέγεται”. ὑπτία δ' ἐστὶ τὰ συντασσόμενα τῷ παθητικῷ μορίῳ, οἷον “ἀκούομαι”, “ὀρώμαι”. οὐδέτερα δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μηδέτερος ἔχοντα, οἷον “φρονεῖν”, “περιπατεῖν”.

⁵ Sch. 246. 3–5: οὐδέτερα δὲ ἢ μήτε ἐνέργειαν μήτε πάθος σημαίνουσα, οἷον “ζῶ”, “πλουτῶ”, “δύναμαι”, “βούλομαι”.

⁶ Sch. 245. 26–28: Διάθεσις ἐστὶ δίαίτα ψυχῆς καὶ διοίκησις· καὶ ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ γὰρ διαθεῖναι τὸ οἰκονομῆσαι καὶ διοικῆσαι.

⁷ Char. 209. 24–25: *Verbum est pars orationis administrationem rei significans...*

which Diomedes has reproduced, Probus of Beirut addresses the usage of tense and mood in compound sentences.⁸ Considering himself an innovator, Probus credits the rules that he establishes in this domain with regulating all of literary language. It is the verb *administro* that he employs to express the idea of organizing a good language: *quibus temporibus... universa nobis administratur oratio* (Diom. *GL I*. 388. 17–18).⁹

We note in passing that Charisius, while defining tense in the chapter on verbal voices and employing materials most likely borrowed from Probus, applies the adjective *administrativus* to describe what was done or was to be done: *Tempus est diurnitatis spatium aut ipsius spatii intervallum aut rei administrativae mora* (Char. 214. 7–9 B).

One remains uncertain as to the date of Greek witnesses on specialized uses of the substantive διοίκησις and the verb διοικέω (with its derivatives) in the domains of grammar and rhetoric, but such witnesses do exist. For instance, the *Rhetoric* attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus contains a section entitled Περὶ ἐσχηματισμένων that treats the figurative style, which allows the speaker to express additional information or even contrary ideas under the guise of simple, positive sentences.¹⁰ According to the observations of Malcolm Heath, this part of the treatise dates to the early second century AD,¹¹ but the tradition attested there is certainly older. Διοίκησις is employed by the author in nearly the same sense as σχῆμα; in other words, it deals with an image created in the speech. The author uses expressions like διοικήσεως σχῆμα and σχῆμα διοικούμενον (Us.–R. VI. 345. 9–12).¹² He also uses expressions with the word λόγος: τῶν λόγων τὴν διοίκησιν (*ibid.*, 339. 24) or διοίκησις ἐν τῷ λόγῳ (344. 3–4)–διοίκησις in the latter

⁸ Cf. Serv. (Auctus), *In Verg. Aen.* VII. 421; Diom. *Ars gram.*, *GL I*. 388. 10 sqq.; M. Baratin, *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome* (Paris 1989) 186 ff.

⁹ Charisius has repeated the same passage, cf. Char. 347. 11–12 B. At the beginning of the chapter on the verb, Diomedes seems to reproduce the formulars that Aemilius Caper (second half of the 2nd c. AD) had set starting from the ideas of Probus and using his terminology: *Vis igitur huius (i. e. verbi) temporibus et personis administratur* (*GL I* 334. 4–5); *personae in verbo sunt tres, per quas universus administrabitur sermo* (*ibid.*, 334. 20).

¹⁰ *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae volgo ferebatur “Ars Rhetorica”*, Us.–R. VI. 253 sqq.

¹¹ M. Heath, “Pseudo-Dionysius *Art of Rhetoric* 8–11: figured speech, declamation and criticism”, *AJPh* 124 (2003) 81–105; cf. G. A. Kennedy, “Some Recent Controversies in the Study of Later Greek Rhetoric”, *AJPh* 124 (2003) 299–300.

¹² See also Us.–R. VI. 299. 9–10: Ὁρᾶς καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῆς διοικήσεως, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐπιφερόμενον τῷ ἔργῳ, τὸ ‘σχῆμα’.

expression is opposed to the real mind of the speaker.¹³ The same idea of a skilled organization of speech, especially for contradicting a rival, is also evidenced in the expression διοίκησις τεχνική (330. 23–24).¹⁴ It is obvious that this particular aspect of rhetorical speech was considered as including an active intercourse with one or more opponents. The rhetor could prevent an attack by his opponent, for instance, while allegedly addressing another person.¹⁵ He can also pursue a different aim by simulating agreement with a previous speaker.¹⁶ Pseudo-Dionysius, as we refer to this author, treats διοίκησις, along with expression and invention (πλάσις) or interpretation (ἐρμηνεία) as a major rhetorical technique.¹⁷

The principal features of διοίκησις made it appropriate for arguing in juridical processes, especially in what Pseudo-Dionysius terms *forensic rhetoric* (δικανικὸς λόγος).¹⁸ It is almost certainly the case that διοίκησις was used at the start as a special term of rhetoric in precisely this domain; the idea of an interaction of speaking persons was inherent in the notion of διοίκησις as applied to forms of rhetoric. So when Quintilian applied the Latin term *administrativa* to the forensic part of rhetoric, he must have been following some Greek predecessor(s) who had used the verb διοικέω and its participles as well as the substantive διοίκησις in this special sense. Likewise, the Byzantine commentator on Dionysius Thrax's grammar was clearly under the influence of a Greek rhetorical treatise or treatises where the term διοίκησις was frequently used when he applied this term to the system of verbal voices.

Quintilian and our commentator could well have used the same source(s) as a model when the former applied the Latin term *administrativus* to forensic rhetoric and the latter applied the term διοίκησις

¹³ Us.–R. VI. 344. 3–4: Μία μὲν αὕτη διοίκησις ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, δευτέρα δὲ ἐκείνη ᾧ μὲν βούλονται πολεμεῖν κτλ. See Heath (n. 11) 87.

¹⁴ Cf. Πάθους οὖν προβολὴ κλοπὴ γίνεται διοικήσεως τεχνικῆς. Τοιοῦτο μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ τὰ ἐναντία λέγειν οἷς βούλεται (Us.–R. VI. 330. 23–25).

¹⁵ Us.–R. VI. 336. 11–15: Τὸ δὲ ἐν διοικήσει προσώπων ὑπαλλαγὴν, ὅτε διὰ τῶν πρὸς ἑτέροισ ἐτέροισ <τις διαλέγεται> καὶ ἔχει τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἐν τῷ μὴ οἷς ἐπιπλήττει αὐτοῖς διαλέγεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀκουόντων αὐτῶν ἑτέροισ ταῦτα λέγειν, ἃ τούτοις προσήκει; *ibid.*, 340. 6–8: τὸ ἀσφαλὲς τοῦ μὴ προσκρούειν τῇ ὑπαλλαγῇ τοῦ προσώπου ἐνδιοικούμενον.

¹⁶ Cf. Heath (n. 11) 83.

¹⁷ Us.–R. VI. 369. 5–7: τὰ μέτρα τῶν προομιῶν εὐρίσκομεν κατὰ τὰς διοικήσεις καὶ τὰς πλάσεις καὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν.

¹⁸ Us.–R. VI. 299. 9–14: Ὅρας καὶ τὸ ἔργον τῆς διοικήσεως, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐπιφερόμενον τῷ ἔργῳ, τὸ 'σχῆμα'. ὁ αὐτὸς τοίνυν Δημοσθένης ἐν μὲν τῷ περὶ τῆς πρεσβείας, <ἴνα> ἀπὸ δικανικοῦ λόγου ἀρξώμεθα, ἄλλα προτείνων ἄλλα κατασκευάζει, δι' ὅλου τοῦ βυβλίου διοικούμενος διοίκησιν τινα τοιαύτην.

to the verbal voices. It therefore seems suitable to attempt to reconstruct somewhat this source. We may start with the commentator's paragraph that immediately precedes the one on verbal voice, noting first that the ideas set forth therein as well as its terminology certainly date to the time before Apollonius Dyscolus had composed his fundamental work entitled *Περὶ συντάξεως* (second third of the 2nd c. AD). The personal forms of verbs, especially those in the indicative mood, are treated here as essential to their semantic value. All modal forms, except the infinitive, are considered as expressions of inner attitudes on the part of the speaking persons, whereas the whole utterance is conceived as a kind of real action. Moreover, the subjunctive is treated principally as an expression of doubt (ἡ ψυχὴ διστάζουσα) or, in other words, also as a speech act.¹⁹ The infinitive is called a noun indicating a general kind of action, and, significantly, it is put in the last place.

The same account of verbal voices is reproduced literally, except for some unimportant omissions, in a paragraph of *Scholia Marciana* referred to Heliodoros (*Sch.* 399. 30–400. 1). Unlike our primary commentator, however, this second commentator felt compelled to object to those who had considered the infinitive as a primary form and who had therefore placed it before the indicative.²⁰ He obviously takes his arguments from the Stoic heritage, where a concrete action and an acting person were of main concern.²¹ It is noteworthy that when discussing the arrangement of verbal modes, the commentator uses the same verb,

¹⁹ *Sch.* 245. 3–9: "Ἐγκλισις δὲ ἐστὶ <σχῆμα φωνῆς ποιᾶν κίνησιν τῆς> ψυχῆς ἀναφαίνον ἐπὶ τι τρεπομένης· προσκλίνεται δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἢ ὡς ὀριζομένη τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς δρώμενα, ὡς ὅταν εἴπῃ "τύπτω", ἢ ὡς προστάττουσα, ὡς ὅταν εἴπῃ "τύπτε", ἢ ὡς εὐχομένη, ὡς ὅταν εἴπῃ "τύπτοιμι", ἢ ὡς διστάζουσα, ὡς ὅταν εἴπῃ "ἐὰν τύπτω", ἢ ὡς οὐδὲν τούτων δηλοῦσα, μόνον δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πράγματος προβαλλομένη, ὡς ὅταν εἴπῃ "τύπτειν".

²⁰ *Ibid.* 400. 5–10: Τινὲς δὲ τῆς ὀριστικῆς βούλονται προτάττειν τὴν ἀπαρέμφατον. Πρὸς οὓς φαμεν: πᾶν πρᾶγμα διὰ προσώπου ὀράται: ἄξιον οὖν τὸ πρόσωπον προτάττεσθαι, ἔπεςθαι δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὅτι καὶ πρῶτον τὸ πρόσωπον γνωρίζεται, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα διὰ τοῦ προσώπου ἐστὶ γνωριζόμενον. Δευτέρα δὲ ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος. One observes here the ambiguity of the term "πρᾶγμα", which was proper to the late Stoics. This word could indicate as well a concrete action, where personal verbal forms were used, as a general idea of a kind of action, which was expressed in the infinitive. The commentary in question is repeated also in *Scholia Londinensia* (*ibid.*, 558. 21–30)

²¹ Cf. Diog. Laert. *Vit.* VII. 60: "Ὅρος δὲ ἐστὶν, ὡς φησὶν Ἀντίπατρος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ ὄρων, λόγος κατ' ἀνάλυσιν ἀπαρτιζόντως ἐκφερόμενος, ἢ ὡς Χρῦσιππος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ὄρων, <ἰδίου> ἀπόδοσις. ὑπογραφή δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος τυπωδῶς εἰσάγων εἰς τὰ πρᾶγματα, ἢ ὅρος ἀπλοῦστερον τὴν τοῦ ὄρου δύναμιν προσενηνεγμένος.

προτάπτειν, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses when speaking about approximately the same topic (*De comp.* 26. 11–16 Us.–R.):

Ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἤξιουν τὰ μὲν ὀνοματικά **προτάπτειν** τῶν ἐπιθέτων, τὰ δὲ προσηγορικά τῶν ὀνοματικῶν, τὰς δ' ἀντονομασίας τῶν προσηγορικῶν, **ἐν τε τοῖς ῥήμασι φυλάπτειν, ἵνα τὰ ὀρθὰ τῶν ἐγκλινομένων ἡγήται καὶ τὰ παρεμφατικά τῶν ἀπαρεμφάτων**, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα πολλά.

And still further, I thought it right to put my nouns before my adjectives, common before proper nouns, and pronouns before common nouns; and with verbs, to take care that the indicative should precede the other moods, and finite verbs infinitives, and so on.²²

Dionysius had earlier referred to “two treatises which Chrysippus has left us, entitled *On the Classification of the Parts of Speech* (Περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν, *De comp.* 22. 12–13 Us.–R.), and briefly described these as treatises on logic. Now, after giving an account of an older arrangement of parts of speech and their principal forms, Dionysius declares that this arrangement was proposed by the logicians and is useless for his proper doctrine. The Chrysippian origin of the arrangement in question is attested by, among other things, the fact that pronouns precede common nouns.²³ As is well known, the founders of the Stoic language theory considered at least the demonstrative pronoun as immediately indicating a true being. The mention of the adjectives, however, makes us date the classification that Dionysius has reproduced to a later period.

We can sum up our observations now. The first classification of verbal voices that Charisius has treated in the special chapter on the verb in his grammar is very close to the classification attributed to Stephanus in the scholia on the *Techne* of Dionysius Thrax. In addition to the similar order in which the verbal voices are set forth, the Greek notion of δι-οίκησις and its related lexemes as used in the commentary in relation to the system of verbal voices corresponds exactly with the Latin notion of *administratio* and its adjective *administrativus* as used in the chapter of Charisius. All these terms seem to be drawn from common or closely

²² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The critical essays*, with an English transl. by S. Usher II (Cambridge, Mass.–London 1985) 52.

²³ Cf. D. M. D. Schenkeveld, “Linguistic Theories in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus”, *Glotta* 61 (1983) 72–73, 86–89. Cf. also a new study on the topic: C. C. de Jonge, *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature* (Leyden 2008), with which we could not become acquainted.

related sources where Stoic ideas predominated. The strong Stoic tradition is also attested in the commentary of Stephanus both by the classification of verbal voices and by its account of verbal modes. The sources in question are to be dated to a time somewhat earlier than the *floruit* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (late 1st c. BC).

The Roman Nexus

The Roman author of the first classification of verbal voices in the *Ars* of Charisius would therefore have been active in the early 1st c. AD, and, accordingly, it was very likely to have been Remmius Palaemon who further developed the initial classification of the verbal voices that we have examined. The class of verbal forms called *genus commune* was morphologically distinguished by the exclusive use of passive voice endings. Alongside this class there was now constituted a new one, a fairly large and imposing category of *deponentia* ‘deponents’, which were morphologically identical to those of the *genus commune* but distinguished from them by virtue of their exclusively active meanings (Char. 211. 4 sqq. B). This class had probably been conceived initially as a subdivision of the *genus commune*, because it united passive form and active meaning and was consequently deprived of a passive meaning. Quintilian had used no special term in his account of deponents: ... *in natura verborum est et quae facimus patiendi modo saepe dicere, ut ‘arbitror, suspicor’* (Quint. *Inst. orat.* IX. 3. 7). So perhaps the special term *deponens* came into use somewhat later. At the very start Charisius used, however, another term for the class of deponents, namely *simplex*, which clearly contrasted with *commune verbum*. But the term *simplex* was not specific enough and must soon have fallen into disuse.²⁴

The *genus neuter* was morphologically distinguished by a predominant, if not exclusive, use of the active endings. Moreover, some verbs of this morphological type had a passive meaning. The latter verbs were consciously opposed to the deponents and proved somewhat difficult to classify, as Charisius attests: *item e contrario quod forma agendi significat patientiam, ut ‘venero, vapulo, ardeo, flagro’, quae verba in neutrorum specie quidam posuerunt, alii supina dixerunt* (Char. 211. 15–18 B). The same opposition was also affirmed by Quintilian (*Inst. orat.* IX. 3. 7).

²⁴ One can hardly agree with the opinion of R. Lamacchia on meaning of the term *simplex* in the Charisius’ paragraph: R. Lamacchia, “Per la storia del termine *deponente*”, *SIFC*, n. s. 33 (1961) 192–194.

Although detailed enough, the expanded classification of verbal voices could not embrace all the particular relations between form and meaning in respect of performance and experience. It is noteworthy that Pliny the Elder was clearly annoyed by the vanity of his contemporary Remmius Palaemon, about whom he said: [sc. *vanitas*] ... *quae nota mire in illo fuit* (*NH* XIV. 50),²⁵ and was in all probability rather sceptical about Palaemon's elaborate theoretical constructions. In any case Pompeius Maurus, who was active in Roman Africa at the end of the 5th c. AD,²⁶ informs us that Pliny, perhaps following Varro (*LL* X. 33), reduced the verbal voices to two principal species, i. e., active and passive (*agentis et patientis* – Pomp. *GL* V. 228. 2–4). The aim of Pliny surely had not been to abolish every subdivision in the domain of verbal voices, but in contrast to the sophisticated classification of Palaemon, he had set a fundamental principle in approaching the verbal voices and at the same time had presented a much more flexible description of the verbal forms. Moreover, again according to Pompeius, Pliny distinguished active and passive verbs not only in the proper sense but also in a figurative sense: *abusive* (*GL* V. 227. 31). One can speak of the active and passive in a proper sense when it deals with an action between two persons, but one can speak of the active and passive in a figurative sense only when it concerns a single person.²⁷ The adverb *abusive* is a key term, and Pliny a key figure, in such discussions.

The lost grammatical work of Pliny the Elder entitled *De dubio sermone* can be partially reconstructed from later citations and accounts, e. g., the testimony of Pompeius quoted above.²⁸ We propose to supplement the existing *testimonia* with two others, which until now have not been linked to the work of Pliny. Pompeius surely knew Pliny's

²⁵ Cf. J. Kolendo, "Éléments courants et exceptionnels de la carrière d'un affranchi. Le grammairien Q. Remmius Palaemon", *Index, quaderni camerti di studi romanistici* 13 (1985) 177–187.

²⁶ Cf. R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of the Language: the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley etc. 1988) 139–168.

²⁷ Pomp. *In Artem Donati*, *GL* V. 227. 25–31: (...) *Hoc est quod dixit Plinius Secundus: dicit "activum est quod alio patiente nos facimus, passivum est quod alio faciente nos patimur" ... Ista sunt proprie activa et passiva, quae versantur inter duas personas. Ista proprie; illa vero, ubi una persona utrumque agit, non videntur proprie dicta esse, sed abusive.*

²⁸ H. F. Neumann, *De Plinii "Dubii sermonis" libris Charisii et Prisciani fontibus* (Kiliae 1881); F. Schlitte, *De Plinii studiis grammaticis*, Programm, Gymnasium zu Nordhausen (Nordhausen 1883); *Librorum "Dubii sermonis" VIII reliquiae*, collegit et illustravit J. W. Beck (Lipsiae 1896); A. della Casa, *Il "dubius sermo" di Plinio* (Genova 1969).

De dubio sermone, but in the chapter on the verbal voices he had mostly used other sources. Moreover, his testimony on the Plinian ideas in question are to be considered more as a remark than as a real account, but he did praise Pliny's grammatical doctrine as that of an eminent man: *praeceptum tanti viri* (GL V. 144. 31). For an authentic account of Pliny the Elder's views on grammatical issues we need to look again at Charisius' chapter on the verb even though the text does not specifically cite Pliny. We also need to note that Charisius has surely not drawn his material immediately from the *De dubio sermone*, but rather from an account by Flavius Caper (second half of the 2nd c. AD).²⁹ Essential arguments in favor of the latter assumption are to be seen in our study on the doctrine of verbal moods by Roman grammarians.³⁰

The salient paragraph of the Charisian *Ars* begins with the statement that other grammarians posit the existence of only three verbal voices altogether: *Aliis placuit omnium omnino verborum genera esse tria* (Char. 211. 25–26 B). The dative plural *aliis* could include Charisius' predecessor as well as, of course, many others. As we shall see, Valerius Probus could be meant along with Pliny. Together with the usual voices *activum* and *passivum*, a particular genus called *habitivum*, 'stative', is presented as the third one. The discrepancy between Pompeius' assertion that Pliny had enumerated only two principal voices and the three-fold classification here in Charisius prevented scholars from associating this paragraph in Charisius with the testimony of Pompeius, as we now propose to do.

It seems that Charisius' primary source did not apply the term *genus* to the third kind of verbal forms in the classification under examination. Charisius himself perhaps had generalized the use of the term *genus* when speaking of those ideas originally proclaimed by Pliny. It can also be the case that the term *genus* had not been used at all by Charisius' source. When turning to the description of the third *genus*, Charisius begins to speak simply of (*verba*) *habitiva* (212. 1–3 B). It is also noteworthy that this novel class of verbs has nothing to do with the Greek middle voice (μεσότης), nor can it be placed into the Latin *neutrum genus*. With no regard to the morphology, the illustrative series of verbs points completely to the idea of coming into a state of being: *nascitur*,

²⁹ Cf. G. Keil, *De Flavio Capro grammatico*, Diss. Phil. Hal. 10 (Halis Saxonum 1889) 251; A. Hoeltermann, *De Flavio Capro grammatico*, Diss. Inauguralis (Bonnae 1913) 4–5; F. Rutella, "Chi fu Flavio Capro", *Studi e ricerche dell'Istituto di Latino* 1 (Genova 1977) 143–159.

³⁰ V. I. Mazhuga, "Über die Bezeichnung des Indikativs bei den römischen Grammatikern des 1. und 2. Jhs. n. Chr." (paper read at the 11th International Conference on the History of Language Sciences, to appear).

crescit, oritur. In the Latin grammatical tradition, one finds this series nowhere else. So it is highly doubtful that the *verba habitiva* had been put by the prime source of Charisius in the same range as the major, traditional verbal voice classes of actives and passives.

Then Charisius goes more thoroughly over the species of verbs designating performance and experience, i. e., *activa* and *passiva* (*verba*), but without ever using the term *genus*. Considering once more only the meaning of the verbs without any regard to their morphology, he begins discussing each of these two large classes when speaking about intransitive verbs; afterwards he treats transitives. Among the intransitive passives, he distinguishes a species that concerns an experience 'by virtue of nature': *quae natura pati quid significat* (Char. 212. 8 B). In the *Naturalis Historia* by Pliny the Elder, one finds similar expressions as well as the verbs *nascitur* and *crescit*, which had exemplified *verba habitiva* in the Charisian paragraph.³¹ This similarity also supports the attribution of that paragraph to Pliny the Elder. The transitive passives are represented as signifying an experience which comes from the outside: *cum illi qui patitur accidere quid significatur* (Char. 212. 11–12). This general notion of something coming from the outside recurs repeatedly in such discussions.

The next paragraph deals with verbs belonging to the *genus commune*, and yet more with the impersonals and their modifications, as well as with deponents, which are presented without special designation as *verba activa passivorum figura enuntiata* (Char. 212. 13–213. 15). Charisius concludes by turning anew to the topic of *habitiva* (213. 16–28). Now, however, this class of verbs is represented with examples that indicate a perception or a sensation: *cernit, videt, aspicit, or videtur, amatur, diligitur*. The idea of an image helps us to put together the several different series of *habitiva* cited by Charisius. In one case it deals with the arising or the appearance of an image, in another case with perceiving or feeling an image. The adjective *habitivus*, as well as the Latin substantive *habitus*, are related to the Greek ἕξις or the Greek Stoic ἑκτόν, which designate the dynamic image of a being.³² A casual use of philosophical notions such as we see here distinguishes Pliny the Elders' approach to grammatical matters.

³¹ Cf. *NH* I (XIX) = ed. L. Jan–C. Mayhoff, I (Lipsiae 1906) 59. 11: *quoto quaeque die nascantur seminum natura*; *NH*. XVII. 95 = ed. L. Jan–C. Mayhoff, III (Lipsiae 1892) 32. 26: *quod natura fit*; *NH* XVI. 125 = ed. L. Jan, C. Mayhoff, III. 92. 3: *Quaedam autem natura tarde crescunt*.

³² Cf. *Simpl. In Arist. Cat.* 237. 25–238. 32 ed. C. Kalbfleisch (*CAG* VIII); K. Hülser, *Die Fragmente zur Dialektik der Stoiker* III (Stuttgart–Bad Canstatt 1987) 894–897 (Nr. 761).

Even more evidence for the authorship of the paragraph comes from another idea expressed therein. We are told that one feature of (*verba*) *habitiva* is to refer as *activa*, and another as *passiva*, but only, however, in a figurative sense (καταχρηστικῶς),³³ for some sensations (*videtur, amatur, diligitur*) can be related to a person who is actually absent. The Greek adverb καταχρηστικῶς perfectly corresponds with the Latin adverb *abusive*, which Pliny, according to Pompeius, had used in his judgement on the active and passive senses of intransitive verbs. As we already know from Pompeius, Pliny had defined intransitive verbs as reflecting a situation where no other person was present. The opinion about the passive *habitiva* that we find in the account by Charisius corresponds very well with the idea of intransitive verbs that Pompeius attributes to Pliny the Elder.

As we stated above, it is highly probable that Charisius got his knowledge of the Plinian doctrine on verbal voices through the intermediary of Caper. Nevertheless, his account of this doctrine seems to be close enough to the original. We can now present another witness to the same doctrine, namely, Consentius, a grammarian of the first half of the 5th c. AD.³⁴ Consentius had also exploited an intermediary, who was, however, much closer chronologically to Pliny, namely, Probus of Beirut,³⁵ for he cites Probus and refers to him as a most learned man: *sicut Probus vir doctissimus adnotat* (GL V. 366. 19).

First, in the supposedly joint account by Probus and Consentius, the verbs in the category termed *habitus* are treated separately from the verbs that can be qualified in respect of performance or experience. The definition of *verbum* says that the verb is a part of speech designating either a deed or a state: *Verbum est pars orationis factum aliquid habitumve significans* (GL V. 365. 29). The term *factum* can be related to the Greek πράγμα, whereas *habitus* refers to the Greek Stoic ἔκτόν.

Second, the verbs in the category of *factum* are said to represent either performance or experience: *Factum quod significatur agentis aut patientis vim continet* (*ibid.*, 365. 30–366. 1). Instead of a general notion of voice, for instance, *genus*, one sees here an indication of the inner disposition (*vis*) of acting or undergoing an action. The verbs of active meaning, as well as the verbs of passive meaning, are further

³³ On the Greek words by Pliny see: G. E. Manzoni, “Arcaismi e grecismi nella lingua della ‘Naturalis historia’”, in P. V. Cova et al. (ed.), *Studi sulla lingua di Plinio il Vecchio* (Milano 1986) 186–192.

³⁴ See the recent study on Consentius: T. Fögen, “Der Grammatiker Consentius”, *Glotta* 74 (1997/1998) 164–192.

³⁵ On Probus as source of Consentius see Hoeltermann (n. 29) 10.

divided into transitive and intransitive ones. The philosophical origin of these expressions is beyond any doubt, and, as we noted above, their casual introduction into a text is a distinctly Plinian characteristic.

Third, when speaking of the agent, Consentius uses the participle *administrans* as a counterpart to *patiens*. As we have seen above, Probus used the verb *administro*, but this verb had not been used by Pliny. Another word, however, namely, *extrinsecus* is not only proper to Pliny, but the very use of this adverb by Pliny seems to be particular.³⁶ We are told of the intransitive verbs of active meaning that they do not require imagining a passive counterpart from the outside: *Quaedam vero talia sunt, ut nullum patientem extrinsecus necesse sit intellegi, ut cum dicimus 'sedeo' et 'ambulo' (ibid., 366. 6–8)*. The adverb *extrinsecus* appears twice in the next sentence too, where it deals with verbs of passive meaning. It is said there that some passives show an agent, whereas others call no person to mind from the outside.³⁷ As we remember, Pompeius attributed a similar distinction to Pliny the Elder. That similar way of thinking is attested also in the paragraph of Charisius on the (*verba*) *habitiva*, where it deals with imagining an absent person. The verbs assembled under the category of *habitus* here essentially differ from the *habitiva verba* that Charisius had adduced, for Consentius deals with verbs of active form which signify a specific state: *habitus quidam tantum modo demonstratur, ut est 'sto' 'sapio' 'vivo'*.

We can now conclude this second case study in *Quellenforschung*. Pliny the Elder's doctrine on verbal voices is a primary source not only for Charisius' account of verbal *genera* but also for that of Consentius, and, furthermore, the account of Charisius is closer to the original.

Vladimir I. Mazhuga

St-Petersburg Institute for History, Russian Academy of Sciences

В латинской грамматике Харизия (третья четверть IV в. н. э.) в начале большого раздела, посвященного глаголу, помещена глава о глагольных залогах.

³⁶ See the remark of Palladius on how Pliny had treated the possessive pronouns: *Nunc etiam monemus, quod Plinius Secundus pronomina possessiva et per quandam mixturam sic putavit declinanda, id est intrinsecus et extrinsecus (GL V. 137. 11–13)*

³⁷ Cons. *Ars de nomine et verbo, GL V. 366. 8–11: Similiter quoque ea quae patientiam habent interdum eius modi sunt, ut agentem extrinsecus demonstrent, sicuti est 'secor' 'pulsor' 'vapulo'; quaedam autem eius modi sunt, ut patientia quae significatur nullam agentis personam trahat extrinsecus, ut est 'esurio' 'algeo'*.

Есть основания полагать, что Харизий использовал в этой главе материал, собранный Флавием Капром у своих предшественников, трудившихся с конца I в. н. э. до середины II в. н. э. Установление источников Харизия, а вместе с тем и Капра, и составляет задачу статьи. В главе о глагольном залоге представлены четыре классификации: четырехчленная, шестичленная, трехчленная и пятичленная. В статье делается попытка установить источники четырехчленной и трехчленной классификаций.

Следует отметить, что в целом учение римских грамматиков о глагольном залоге заметно отличается от известных греческих опытов описания глагольных залогов. В частности, римские грамматика применяли понятия “рода” (*genus*) для обозначения категории залога – ничего подобного мы не находим у греческих грамматиков. Однако можно указать на греческий аналог первой и, несомненно, древнейшей из представленных Харизием классификаций, а именно четырехчленной. Сходную классификацию мы находим в приписываемой Стефану византийской глоссе к *Грамматике* Дионисия Фракийца (*Grammatici Graeci* I, 2, 245, 26–246, 6). Этой глоссе исследователями не было уделено до сих пор должного внимания. Она представляет редкий пример позднейшего развития доктрины Хрисиппа (ок. 280–207 г. до н. э.) о глагольном залоге. Лишним свидетельством того, что глосса и первая классификация Харизия могли иметь общий источник, является, в частности, то, что автор глоссы применил к глагольным залогам понятие $\delta\iota\omicron\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ и родственный ему глагол $\delta\iota\omicron\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, а в определении глагола, которым у Харизия предваряется глава о залогах, применен латинский аналог греческого глагола *administro*. В статье показано, что латинские грамматика и теоретики риторики I–II вв. н. э. широко применяли этот глагол и образованные от него причастия в отношении речевой деятельности и, в частности, форм залогов. На основе сопоставления глоссы с характеристикой частей речи в сочинении Дионисия Галикарнасского “О соединении слов” (*De comp.* 26. 11–16 Us.–R.), как и с некоторыми другими глоссами к “Грамматике” Дионисия Фракийца (*GG* I, 2, 399, 30–400, 1; 558, 21–30), делается вывод о том, что источник, из которого могли черпать свой материал автор первой из представленных у Харизия классификаций латинских залогов и автор названной греческой глоссы, следует датировать временем, предшествующим деятельности Дионисия Галикарнасского, т. е. ранее последней трети I в. до н. э.

Далее характеризуется источник, условно говоря, трехчастной классификации глагольных залогов. Сопоставление со свидетельством грамматика Помпея (вторая пол. V в. н. э.) о двучленной классификации Плиния Старшего (23/24–79 гг. н. э.), как и со сходным материалом Консенция (первая половина V в. н. э.), позволяет утверждать, что трехчленная, как и двучленная, классификации у трех названных грамматиков восходят к утраченному грамматическому сочинению Плиния Старшего *De dubio sermone*, причем Харизий наиболее точно передал содержание этого сочинения, хотя порою и нарушал – возможно, вслед за Капром – строгую последовательность мысли самого Плиния.