

of the name that Suet. uses when he refers to the man elsewhere in the work (2.2 *Pompeius Lenaeus*), and which he surely would have used had he compiled a formal index.

Yet even if the lists are not Suet.'s work, they are probably ancient: a date before Jer. *Chron.* should be implied if the name M'. Otacilius Pitholaus is correctly restored at 27.1 (see n. ad loc., Kaster, *STS* 124). They certainly provide valuable evidence for the names of the teachers, both in the lost final segment (see Fragments nn.) and occasionally elsewhere (9.1, 10.1, 17.1, 27.1, 28.1 nn., cf. Kaster, *STS* 80 n. 85).

I-3: THE RECEPTION OF GRAMMAR AT ROME

These first chaps. trace the gradual incorporation of *grammatica* in Roman culture; with the parallel discussion of rhetoric at 25.1-3, they form the only known attempt to account for the reception of the two disciplines central to the education of the Roman upper classes under the Empire. Similar discussions of poetry, oratory, history, and philosophy probably introduced the other segments of the *DVI*.¹ The format, pairing discussion of the *τέχνη/ars* with discussion of the *τεχνίται/artifices*, may have descended to Suet. (through Varro) from Aristotle.² The relation of Suet.'s discussion to any such ancestry, however, is at best greatly attenuated, and merely formal: it would be difficult to imagine a less 'Aristotelian' account than the one here provided.

The account's general outlines are clear. Between the time when *grammatica* was unknown in a Rome still 'uncultured and devoted to warfare' (1.1), and the time when it was cultivated enthusiastically both in Rome and in the provinces (3.4-6), three distinct historical moments stand out.

¹Traces only for the *De poetis*, though their character is controversial: with the material printed as fr. 2-3, pp. 4 ff. Reiff. (= Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.1-f. + Diom. *GL* i. 482 ff.), contrast Rostagni 6 ff. (= Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.1 ff.) and id., *Mélanges Marouzeau* (1948), 509 ff. (vs. Paratore, *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'De poetis' di Suetonio* (1946), 21).

²See esp. Dahlmann, *SV* 7 ff., and id. in Varro (Fondation Hardt, 1963), 1 ff. Dahlmann must here and there strain to make Suet. fit the presumed pattern: note esp. that any conception of the *τέλος* of *grammatica* is entirely absent from the present chaps.—necessarily, since any concern with its *ποιός* is also lacking.

1. The undistinguished first stirrings (*initium* . . . *mediocre*), when the earliest teachers—the 'half-Greek' poets Livius Andronicus and Ennius—anticipated the practices of later (true) *grammatici* in using Greek and Latin poetic texts for their instruction but were themselves not scholars in the discipline: a time that merely hints at real *grammatica*, in the late 3rd and early 2nd cents.

2. The first introduction of *grammatica* truly so called 'at just about the time of Ennius' death' (2.1 n.), when the visiting Pergamene scholar Crates served as a model for Rome's inhabitants, some of whom, in partial imitation of that model, set about making the poetry of Naevius, Ennius, and Lucilius better known to their fellows: a time of limited cultivation of *grammatica*, from the 160s down to the end of the century.

3. The decisive contribution of two Roman knights, L. Aelius and his son-in-law Ser. Clodius, who set *grammatica* on a firm and orderly footing and enhanced it 'in every respect' (see 3.1 n.): the time of the discipline's real establishment, at the end of the 2nd cent. and the start of the 1st.

These three moments thus amount to three separate 'beginnings' of *grammatica*, which can be described as merely apparent (1), partial (2), and true and complete (3). In surveying these beginnings Suet. traverses just over a century, though the chronology is for the most part implied rather than stated and includes some notably awkward patches (see nn., esp. 2.2 n.). Some of the account's particulars are very likely correct (e.g. 1.3, denying technical works of *grammatica* to the poet Ennius), others are very likely incorrect, or at least oversimplified and overstated (e.g. 2.1-2, on the significance of Crates' visit), while still others are merely curious (e.g. 3.1, equating Ser. Clodius' scholarly achievement with that of his father-in-law). Much of seeming importance, like the character of Crates' and Aelius' scholarship, is left entirely vague, even as attention is paid to odd trivialities like Ser. Clodius' gout. Most consequentially, Suet.'s sweep through this century of cultural history appears to be based on a mere handful of isolated data.

His conception of Aelius' stature Suet. almost certainly owed to Cicero and Varro, but most other items are things he happened to discover in gathering material for his lives of the early poets

and of the *grammatici* themselves. Suet.'s method of piecing these data together and of drawing inferences from them is considered in the nn. below. Here a major formal feature of his exposition can be noted. His treatment of the first two stages (1.2–2.2) consists of a unified, carefully articulated argument, each step of which is explicitly marked: thus 'initium . . . mediocre extitit, *siquidem* antiquissimi doctorum . . . *nilhil amplius quam* . . .'; '*nam quod nonnulli . . . iure arguit* . . .'; '*primus igitur* . . . hactenus *tamen* . . .'. It is this argument's cumulative burden to show that apparent early manifestations of *grammatica* in fact fell short, in one way or another, of a fully realized cultivation of the discipline. The final stage, by contrast, is asserted baldly, as a simple fact ('instruxerunt auxeruntque ab omni parte grammaticam . . .'), with no continuative word linking this assertion to what precedes. With this statement the story of *grammatica* at Rome in effect begins again—or rather, truly begins. The juxtaposition of the unified, negative argument in 1.2–2.2 with the distinct, positive assertion in 3.1 suggests that Suet. was trying to square one basic datum that he took as established fact—the crucial role of L. Aelius—with a few other data he had found that seemed to hint at an earlier cultivation of *grammatica*. The first segment places the problematic items in a coherent (though not necessarily correct) relation to one another and to Aelius as well.

The result overall is clearly something other than 'a *bios* of the art itself'.³ Rather, to adjust the metaphor, these chaps. sketch the adoption of a child into whose ancestry and character no close inquiry is made. Nothing is said about the origin of *grammatica* as a discipline, about its nature, aims, parts, methods, and principles. From these opening remarks it would be impossible to learn what *grammatica* was, or what the *grammatici* did. Suet. is concerned exclusively with the external history of the discipline as it came to be naturalized at Rome. That concern, with the concomitant lack of concern for the discipline's Greek origins, accounts for one of the sketch's most conspicuous features, its Romanocentrism, which distinguishes it from the far more historically ambitious remarks on the Greek background of oratory with which Cicero introduces his survey of Roman orators (*Brut.* 26–52). It may be that 'Greece, once captured, captured her wild conqueror and

³ So recently Vijjamaa, *ANRW* II 33.5 (1991), 3844.

brought the arts to rustic Latium' (Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156 f.), but Greece, *capta* or otherwise, plays a distinctly secondary role in Suet.'s account (see *Introd.* xlv). The true realization of *grammatica* at Rome was (Suet. says) the work of Aelius and his son-in-law Clodius, and it is their work that stands as the watershed event in the discipline's reception (3.4 'posthac magis ac magis . . .').

Precisely how and why events took this course Suet. does not say, and his silence gives to the account the contingent character that is its other most salient trait. The account is contingent, not only in the sense that sheer accident (Crates' encounter with a sewer-hole) determines one of its stages, but in the more fundamental sense that it lacks any principle of historical causation and explanation. As Suet. tells the story, there is no evident reason why *grammatica* could not have been established earlier at Rome, or why Aelius and Clodius did what they did when they did it, or why 'from that point on, both the esteem in which the skill was held and the attention devoted to it became ever greater'. That, apparently, is just the way things happened, according to the data at Suet.'s disposal and the pattern that he thought they formed. The unifying element that does exist in the pattern is found, not in the character or history of *grammatica* as a discipline, but in the social place of *grammatica* at Rome, as its progressive incorporation in the city's culture—from first intimations (1.2), to partial imitation (2.2), to full establishment (3.1), to enthusiastic cultivation (3.4)—is matched by the progressively higher social standing of its practitioners—from *semigraeci* (1.2), to *nostri* (2.2), to *equites Romani* (3.1), to *clarissimi viri* (= senators: 3.4). It is the social dimension of this introductory account that most clearly consists with the subsequent sketches of the *grammatici* themselves, in which Suet. is concerned less with the details of the individuals' scholarship than with their role as *professores*—teachers offering their expertise in public (cf. 4.7 n.)—and with their social standing, their *mores*, and their social relations.

It is worth affirming, finally, that this account is Suet.'s own, since the consequences of Leo's contention to the contrary are still felt. Noting that the detail about Clodius' gout is certainly traceable to Varro, while Varro is not named among the *auctores* of grammar, Leo concluded that Varro himself composed cc. 1–3, which were

then 'copied out' by Suet.⁴ This conclusion was one of Leo's less happy leaps. It is mistaken, first, in supposing that Varro is absent from the account: though Suet. does not *name* Varro with Aelius and Clodius as one of the true founders of *grammatica*, he surely *alludes* to Varro, correctly, as one of the *clarissimi viri* who cultivated *grammatica* in the generation or two following Aelius (3.4 n.). Second, Suet. explicitly marks as his own judgement (*ut opinamur*) the evaluation of Crates' visit at 2.1. Since Suet. also presents this judgement as following logically (*igitur*) from the argument concerning grammar's *initium* just preceding (1.2-3), and since this judgement in turn is the premise for the rest of c. 2, the argument in cc. 1-2 as a whole must by implication be Suet.'s own (see above and nn. ad locc.). Further, as already noted, many of the details adduced in cc. 1-3 are items that Suet. must have come upon when collecting his data for the *DVI* as a whole, and the manner in which these details are pieced together is identical to Suet.'s method in the rest of the text. More telling still, this introduction has its precise counterpart in 25.1-3: the similarities of thought and structure guarantee that both segments were written by the same man, and it will become evident that Varro cannot have written the latter. Finally, the diction of cc. 1-3 includes one important term of the grammarian's art (*praelegere*) that was not used in Varro's time at all, and several other usages unknown to republican Latin.⁵ In short, though there may well be more than one Varronian raisin in the pudding of cc. 1-3 (see esp. 3.1 n.), it cannot reasonably be doubted that the confection is Suet.'s own.

I.1 grammatica: Engl. 'grammar' is a convenient, not an adequate, translation of Gk. ἡ γραμματικὴ (τέχνη) = Lat. (*ars*)

⁴ *PP*² 30 n. 1. Leo was followed by Funaioli, who presented all of cc. 1-3 as a 'fragment' of Varro (*GRF* i. 327 ff.), save for three brief passages that he regarded as Suetonian supplements: 1.3 'nam quod . . . ferantur', 2.2 'quas legisse . . . praedicant', 3.5 'quem . . . dicit'; he did not notice that the first 'supplement' is integral to the argument of cc. 1-2 as a whole, and that the second is integral to the list of Crates' 'imitators' at 2.2, see nn. ad locc.

⁵ On *praelegere* see 1.2 n.; cf. e.g. *adnotare* at 1.2, *repudiare* (of divorce) and *praemortuus* at 3.3; and note 3.6 'nonnulli . . . docuerunt, maxime in Gallia togata, inter quos . . .', a characteristically Suetonian structure (cf. Kaster, *STS* 62). For other non-Varronian touches see also, more tentatively: 1.2 n., the possibility that Suet. followed the 'late' chronology of Livius Andronicus; 2.1 n., on Crates' association with Attalus (vs. Eumenes); 2.2 n., the detail concerning Lampadio perhaps derived from Santra.

grammatica (-ce): the Latin usage is first attested at *Ad Herenn.* 4.12.17 (mid-to-late 80s BCE, though the manner of ref. suggests a usage already familiar). In developing beyond its literal meaning as 'the skill concerned with letters/writing' (e.g. Pl. *Crat.* 431E, *Soph.* 253A; cf. 4.1-3 n.), the term came to denote the methodical study and teaching of language and 'letters' in the sense of literature, esp. poetry. For Suet. and his contemporaries, *grammatica* entailed 'recte loquendi scientia et poetarum enarratio', in Quintilian's compendious definition (1.4.2); on the 'parts' of *grammatica*, see 24.2 n. Where *γραμματική/grammatica* modifies *τέχνη/ars* in the sense 'handbook', the phrase denotes a systematic survey of the language, its constituent elements and attributes. On the background and emergence of the discipline, as the last of the liberal arts elaborated in Hellenistic Greece, see *RE* vii. 1780 ff. (Gudeman), Pfeiffer 171 ff., 252 ff., Pinborg, *CTL* 13 (1975), 69 ff., Bonner, *EAR* 47 ff., Booth, *Hermes*, 106 (1978), 117 ff., Hovdhaugen, *Foundations of Western Linguistics* (1982), Rawson 117 ff., 267 ff., Taylor (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (1987), 1 ff., Geymonat, *SLRA* iii. 117 ff.

in honore: this stage did not commence until the *gratia et cura artis*, and so the *pretia* . . . *grammaticorum* . . . *mercedesque*, increased following the work of L. Aelius and Ser. Clodius: 3.4 f.

rudī . . . vacante: the explanatory phrases blend two topoi: the general depiction of humankind's rude state before the discovery of *artes* (e.g. Cic. *Inu.* 1.2, Hor. *AP* 391 ff., Quint. 9.4.4, Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.1), and the specific depiction of early Rome as a community of rough and ready citizen-soldiers before the influx of wealth and alien *mores* from foreign conquests gave scope to leisure and moral decay (e.g. Cato *ORF* fr. 163, Polyb. 31.25.3-8., L. Calpurnius Piso fr. 38 (*HRR* i. 137), Sall. *Cat.* 7-10, Diod. Sic. 37.3.1-5, Livy 39.6.7-9.). Suet.'s unsentimental characterization lacks the moralizing usually found in other instances of the latter commonplace. The next sentence probably implies that the *rudis ac bellicosa civitas* began to be transformed at the end of the 3rd cent. BCE and beginning of the 2nd: see esp. 1.2 *Livium* n., and cf. 2.1 'inter secundum ac tertium Punicum bellum', dating the second stage of Suet.'s survey; note also Porc. Lic. fr. 1 (*FLP* 83) 'Poenico bello secundo Musa . . . / intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram.'

1.2 initium . . . extitit: Suet. here begins what will be the regular pattern for presenting his data and the conclusion inferred therefrom: the conclusion stands first, in the form of some generalizing statement ('initium . . . extitit'), followed by the evidence on which it is based. The relation between evidence and inference is sometimes clearly marked (as here, by *siquidem*: cf. e.g. 11.3, 30.4 nn.), sometimes obscured (see e.g. 3.4 n.). The clause 'initium . . . extitit' marks the first of three 'beginnings' that Suet. eventually describes: see 2.1, 3.1, and on these stages 1-3 n. above. The present stage is 'undistinguished' because its representatives lacked the scope and expertise of *grammatici* truly so called (see below).

antiquissimi doctorum: Suet. ignores (or is unaware of) Sp. Carvilius, freedman of the cos. of 234, who first opened a 'school of letters' at Rome and charged a fee (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 59, cf. *GRF* i. 3). As a mere *γραμματοδιδάκαλος*, or teacher of 'elementary' letters, Carvilius would have seemed to Suet. even less a representative of true *grammatica* than Livius Andronicus and Ennius. *ludi litterarum* at Rome are also mentioned, probably anachronistically, at Liv. 3.44.6 = Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 11.28.3 (450 BCE), Liv. 6.25.9 (382 BCE); cf. also the Faliscan *magister litterarum* at Liv. 5.27 = Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 13.1f. (394 BC). Both context and Suet.'s usage elsewhere show that *doctorum* must be the gen. pl. of *doctor* (3.6, 25.3, *Jul.* 42.1), not of *doctus*/ 'scholar' (only in the verse of Ticiada quoted at 11.2).

et poetae et semigraeci: i.e. they were neither essentially *grammatici* nor fully *Romani*: *semigraeci* (not derogatory here) stresses that we are not yet at the stage where such cultural concerns engage the Romans themselves (cf. 2.1 *nostris*, 3.1 *equus Romanus*, 25.1 *apud nos*), and anticipates and explains Livius' and Ennius' 'interpretation' of Greek texts (n.), just as *poetae* anticipates and explains their exposition of their own verse. Both men were treated by Suet. in the *De poetis*: see Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 1830 = 187 BCE (Livius), s.a. 1777 = 240 BCE, 1849 = 168 BCE (Ennius).

Livium: Livius Andronicus, the first dramatic poet of Rome and the translator of the *Odyssey* in Saturnian verse, was said to have been brought as a slave from his native city, the ancient Greek settlement of Tarentum (Accius ap. Cic. *Brut.* 72; Livius' Tarentine origin can probably be accepted independently of Accius'

chronology, which it may have encouraged). Two different chronologies were known to Cicero: a 'late' chronology established by the poet Accius, acc. to whom Livius fell captive at Tarentum in 209 and first produced a play at Rome for the Ludi Iuventutis of 197 (*Brut.* 72 f.; the latter date is certainly mistaken); and an 'early' chronology, established by Atticus (relying on Varr. *De poetis*, acc. to whom Livius first produced a play in 240 (Cic. *ibid.*, cf. *Sen.* 50, *TD* 1.3, and for Varro, Gell. 17.21.42 f., with Dahlmann, *SV* 28 ff., 43 ff.). The 'early' chronology is probably correct. For a survey of the controversy see Mette, *Lustrum*, 9 (1964), 41 ff.; more recently (for the 'late' chronology) Marconi, *MAL* 12 (1966), 125 ff., with Mattingly, *Gnomon*, 43 (1971), 680 ff., and (for the 'early' chronology) Suerbaum 1 ff., 297 ff., Waszink, *ANRW* I 2 (1972), 873 f., Verrusio, *Livio Andronico* (1977), 9 ff., and Gruen, *Studies*, 80 ff.

In his own *vita* of Livius Suet. certainly referred conspicuously to, and may well have followed, the 'late' or 'Accian' chronology. So much is suggested *prima facie* by the late placement of Livius' *floruit* under the year 187 in Jer. *Chron.*, based on Suet.; the suggestion is corroborated by the content of Jer.'s excerpt, 'qui ob ingenii meritum a Livio Salinatore, cuius liberos erudiebat, libertate donatus est.' The language is Suetonian (with the formula 'ob ingenii meritum . . . libertate donatus est' cf. 13.1 n.), and the Livius Salinator intended here must be M. Livius Salinator, cos. II 207, whom Accius linked with the production of Livius' 'first' play (Cic. *Brut.* 73), and in whose second consulship Livius was publicly honoured for composing (or reviving) an expiatory hymn to meet a crisis in the Second Punic War (Liv. 27.37.7 ff., Fest. 446 L.). Suet. can hardly have had in mind the M. Livius Salinator attested as *Xvir sac. fac.* at the time of the Ludi Saeculares in 236 (*MRR* i. 223: commonly identified as Livius' *patronus* on the 'early' chronology, this man is either the father of the cos., or the cos. at an earlier stage in his career). Jer.'s excerpt shows that Suet. also mentioned Livius' teaching in his life of the poet; there is no other evidence for Livius as teacher. On the degree to which Livius infused his verse with elements of Hellenistic learning, as a poet-scholar in the Alexandrian mould, see recently Sheets, *AJP* 102 (1981), 58 ff. (qualified by Kearns, *AJP* 111 (1990), 40 ff.), Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (1995), 43 ff., with further refs.

As the present context shows, however, Hellenistic learning was not a trait that Suet. took to characterize Livius' teaching, cf. below.

Ennium: Q. Ennius was born in 239 BCE (Varro ap. Gell. 17.21.43, based on a statement of the poet; cf. Cic. *Brut.* 72, *Sen.* 14, *TD* 1.3), and died at the age of 70, acc. to Cic. *Brut.* 78 (perhaps rather a *term. a. q. non*, see Münzer, *Hermes*, 40 (1905), 66); acc. to Jerome's excerpt from Suet.'s *vita* he died *septuagenario maior* in 168 (*Chron.* s.a. 1849). A native of the Messapic town of Rudiae, he was not merely *semigraecus* but trilingual in Greek, Latin, and Oscan (Gell. 17.17.1). Suet. may have followed Nepos in thinking that he was introduced to Rome from Sardinia in 204 by Cato, 'quaestor . . . ex Africa decedens' (Nep. *Cato* 1.4 with *MRR* i. 310 n. 4 on the date, cf. Jer. s.a. 1777 = 240 BCE 'a Catone quaestore Romam translatus': generally accepted, but see Badian in *Ennius* Fondation Hardt (1972), 155 ff.). Ennius accompanied M. Fulvius Nobilior to Aetolia in 189 and celebrated him in verse (*Ann.* 15, *Ambracia*). A free *peregrinus*, he became a citizen, probably through his connection with Nobilior (cf. Cic. *Brut.* 79, attributing enfranchisement to M. Nobilior's son Quintus in 184, which must be mistaken in either the date or the person, prob. the latter: see Badian 183 f.). He owned a house on the Aventine (Jer. *ibid.*, cf. Cic. *De or.* 2.276, *Acad.* 2.51, with Badian 163 ff.); his statue was allegedly placed at the family tomb of another aristocratic connection, P. Scipio Africanus (so, cautiously, Cic. *Arch.* 22, Liv. 38.56.4, leading to the story that Ennius was buried in the tomb, Jer. s.a. 1849 = 168 BCE 'sepultusque in Scipionis monumento via Appia intra primum ab urbe miliarium': on the sources, Suerbaum 210 ff., Skutsch 2 n. 7; the topographical detail at the end of Jer.'s excerpt is typically Suetonian). As the 'inventor' of the Latin hexameter and a poet deeply familiar with both classical and Hellenistic Greek literature, Ennius justifiably presented himself as *dicti studiosus* (= φιλόλογος: *Ann.* 209, with Skutsch ad loc.). That his works embraced technical grammar is none the less very doubtful, see below. On his cultural achievement and social relations in Rome, see Suerbaum 43 ff., Jocelyn, *ANRW* I 2 (1972), 987 ff., Badian 151 ff., Wülfing, *ibid.* 253 ff., Della Corte, *FLOV*² 42 ff., Skutsch 1 ff., Gruen, *Studies*, 106 ff., Goldberg, *TAPA* 119 (1989), 247 ff., id., *Epic in Republican Rome* (1995), 110 ff. The only other ref. to his teaching occurs in an

unreliable 4th-cent. source, Anon. *De vir. ill.* 47.1 'Marcus Porcius Cato . . . in praetura [= 198 BCE] Sardiniam subegit, ubi ab Ennio Graecis litteris institutus' (if, as usually supposed, the report is not authentic, the source has probably garbled Nep. *Cato* 1.4, which mentions both Cato's praetorship—in fact set in Sardinia (*MRR* i. 330)—and his importation of Ennius from Sardinia while quaestor).

utraque lingua: anticipated by *semigraeci* (n.) and answered in turn by *Graecos* . . . *Latine* below. Bilingual teaching is among the traits that distinguish Livius and Ennius from both the *grammatici* and the *rhetores* treated in the body of the work. Absent explicit indication to the contrary, all those after Livius and Ennius are understood to be *grammatici Latini* solely and *rhetores Latini* solely. Though the bilingual learning of Antonius Gniphio, Ateius Philologus, and Iulius Hyginus is remarked, and though others would certainly have been bilingual in virtue of their origin (e.g. Pompeius Andronicus, *natione Syrus*), only one teacher—the rhetor Sex. Clodius, *e Sicilia*—is said to have taught both languages (29.1 n.).

domi forisque: lit. 'at home and out of doors': hence either 'privately and publicly' (*domi* e.g. *Aug.* 61.1, *Tib.* 61.4, *Ner.* 10.2; *foris*, *Aug.* 99.1, cf. *Ner.* 36.1), or 'at home and abroad [i.e. away from Rome]' (*Claud.* 22, cf. *Jul.* 9.3, *Cal.* 3.2, with *TLL* vi. 1042.35 ff.), acc. to the context. The former sense is probably intended here, since Suet. is concerned with the *initium grammaticae* at Rome, and so presumably with Livius and Ennius as the *antiquissimi doctores* at Rome (not at Tarentum, Rudiae, or elsewhere: sim. Della Corte 72). Whether the source(s) to which Suet. alludes (*adnotatum est*) provided more detail for *domi* or *foris* cannot be known. For *foris* something like the school 'opened' by Sp. Carvilius may have been meant (1.2 *antiquissimi doctores* n.). With regard to *domi*, note that Suet. knew of Ennius' household on the Aventine (Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 1777 = 240 BCE) and reported that Livius earned his freedom by teaching Livius Salinator's children (*ibid.* s.a. 1830 = 187 BCE): he probably understood the teaching of each man *domi* in those terms, the one as a free man teaching in his own *domus*, the other as a slave teaching in his master's. On later conditions at Rome, when a teacher could meet

his pupils either in a private *domus* (his own or another's) or in more public places, see 7.2, 18.2 nn.

adnotatum est: an early correction of the (probably) archetypal error *adnotum*, preferable in sense to *sat notum* (Lachmann) or *ad (Della Corte). Both active and passive constructions—*aliquis adnotat (-tavit)/adnotatur (-tatum est)* + acc.—inf.—are common in post-Augustan prose, where they are often used in learned compilations to denote an item 'remarked' in a written source (e.g. Plin. *HN* 2.185, 211, 28.27, 29.77, Gell. 6.9.11 f., Solin. 1.75, 26.10). The present construction (which = a true perfect, '[has been noted/remarked and so] is on record') thus serves the purpose for which Suet. more often employs a personal form of *tradere*.*

nihil amplius quam: a favourite idiom of Suet., used adverbially to mean 'merely' or 'only', such that its literal force as a structure of comparison is not felt (see esp. *Cal.* 44.2, *Ner.* 39.3, *Vesp.* 20; cf. *Aug.* 7.1, *Tib.* 32.2, *Claud.* 16.1, *Gal.* 19.1, *Tit.* 9.1). Here the adverbial expression modifies both verbs of the compound predicate, 'they merely . . . *interpretabantur* or . . . *praelegebant*' (the idiom is misunderstood by Della Corte 8, 'non commentavano altro che testi di letteratura greca', cf. 72, 'L'unica attività critica di questi due poeti era rivolta a greco', with next n.; correctly Rolfe, ' . . . did no more than interpret the Greeks or give readings . . .'). The phrase is the hinge of Suet.'s argument, insofar as it suggests the chief justification for the judgement expressed in the adj. *mediocri* above. In using verse as the basis of their teaching, Livius and Ennius adumbrated the later practice of true *grammatici*—but they did no more than that; for as the next clause implies ('*nam quod . . .*'), their activity lacked the dimension of systematic or technical learning characteristic of the discipline in its mature state—a dimension, acc. to Suet., unknown at Rome before the visit of Crates and not truly developed at Rome before the turn of the 1st cent.

Graecos interpretabantur: the first of the two predicates describing the procedures of Livius and Ennius as teachers. *Graecos* presumably means *Graecos poetas*, implied by the teachers' own standing as *poetae* and their concern with poetry in the next predicate. The meaning of *interpretabantur* is controversial. Like its mod. cognates, Lat. *interpretari* denotes the action of an in-

termediary (*interpres*) who undertakes to clarify the meaning of a phenomenon for others, in any number of different contexts (see Fuhrmann in *Sympotica Franz Wieacker* (1970), 80 ff.). Discussion of the present passage has largely been concerned to show that *interpretabantur* must = either 'explain'/'provide exegesis of' (as a form of 'attività critica') or 'translate' (for refs., Dahlmann, *SV* 7 n. 1, Suerbaum 349 ff., with e.g. Mariotti, *Livio Andronico* (1952), 21, Sheets, *AJP* 102 (1981), 62). At stake, it is supposed, is our view of the pair's standing, as either (scholarly) 'exegetes' or (mere) 'translators': those who stress the poets' cultural sophistication prefer the former view (with appeal esp. to 4.1 *poetarum interpretes*); those who stress Suet.'s modest estimate of the *initium grammaticae* prefer the latter.

In this context, however, such a distinction seems artificial and misleading. The sequence of thought, from *semigraeci* to *utraque lingua . . . docuisse* to *Graecos . . . aut . . . Latine*, shows that this predicate is concerned with the two men's teaching of Greek, just as the following predicate is concerned with their teaching of Latin. Prima facie, then, *interpretabantur* should mean, not that the two merely presented their pupils with 'translations', but that they attempted to 'explain' the Greek *qua* Greek. At the same time, however, Suet.'s conception of the circumstances at Rome, wherein these *semigraeci* were teaching a citizenry just emerging from a rude and warlike condition, should imply that their teaching necessarily included a large amount of glossing or 'translation'. Accordingly, *interpretabantur* should connote neither 'explanation'/'exegesis' alone nor 'translation' alone, but some combination of the two that cannot be more precisely defined. Only a more general rendering—'clarified the meaning' vel sim.—suits the implications of the context and of Suet.'s conception of the circumstances.

It must be stressed, however, that Suet.'s conception need not be correct or the context reliable. It is at least questionable that Suet. knew very much about the actual practices of Livius and Ennius. It is rather more likely that he was projecting the practices of his own times—as he certainly projected the terminology of his own times (next n.)—on to the scrappy data he had gathered about the earliest period; and it is more likely still that he was inferring what Livius and Ennius 'must have' done in the circumstances as he conceived them, not simply reporting what they did. It would

be imprudent to base any estimate of Livius' and Ennius' culture on Suet.'s use of the terms *interpretari* and *praelegere* (the scepticism of Fraenkel, *RE* Suppl. v. 601, is justified). Note too that nothing in this passage demands the conclusion that Livius composed (or even used) his *Odussia* as a school-text (rightly e.g. Waszink, *ANRW* I 2 (1972), 874).

si quid . . . praelegebant: in the grammatical teaching known to Suet., *praelegere* (-*lectio*) was the common term for a gramm.'s presentation of a text to his pupils; the term is not found in this sense before Martial (1.35.2, 8.3.15) and Quintilian (1.5.11, 1.8.8, 13). *praelegere* denotes, most basically, the gramm.'s reading of a poetic text in front of his pupils, as a model of correct pronunciation, expression, and prosody in advance of the pupils' own reading. By only a slight extension, *praelegere* could virtually mean 'lecture (on)', embracing the comments on linguistic usage vel sim. that a teacher offered in his line-by-line *enarratio poetarum*: on the procedure, see esp. Bonner, *EAR* 225 ff. Since Suet. is treating a period before the advent of true *grammatica*, he presumably conceived of Livius' and Ennius' activity as little more than 'exemplary reading', with a minimum of technical comment. There is in any case little reason to suppose that their teaching much resembled the *praelectio* known to Suet. 300 years later.

1.3 nam: marking the last stage of Suet.'s introductory argument, the causal particle responds specifically to *nilhil amplius quam*, explaining and justifying the use of that limiting adverb (n.), which in turn explains and justifies the judgement initially stated, *mediocre*. The contention that *nam* introduces is thus crucial to the argument as a whole: if Suet. (or L. Cotta) is mistaken when he denies the technical *libri* to Ennius, the error must undermine both the preceding judgement on the *initium grammaticae* and the following conclusion about the significance of Crates' visit (2.1 n.).

nonnulli tradunt: *tradere* with pers. subj. (whether indefinite or named) is Suet.'s favoured way of citing a written source: see 5.2, 7.1, 10.2, 11.1, 13.2, 20.2, 21.4, 25.3, and e.g. *Vit. Ter.* 27.7, 32.8 f., 14 f. Reiff., *Vit. Hor.* 44.3 f. R., *Jul.* 52.2, *Aug.* 27.2, *Tib.* 5, *Cal.* 25.1, *Claud.* 44.2, *Ner.* 54, *Galb.* 20.1, *Oth.* 7.1, *Vit.* 1.1, *Vesp.* 1.2 (but not at all in the thinly documented lives of Titus and Domitian); cf. also 3.4 *tradantur*, 15.3 *traditur*.

duos libros . . . editos: although Ennius presented himself as *dicti studiosus* (*Ann.* 209 Sk.) and was an innovator in Latin metre and even (reportedly) Latin orthography (Fest. 347 L. 'nulla tunc geminabatur littera in scribendo. quam consuetudinem Ennius mutavisse fertur, ut *pote Graecus Graeco more usus* . . .', cf. *GRF* i. 4), he is quite unlikely to have written the *libri* ascribed to him (differently e.g. Della Corte, *FLOV*² 44 n. 7). A work treating letters and syllables *together* points toward the phonological theories of the Stoics, acc. to whom a written letter was the representation of an irreducible unit of sound in human speech (or 'element': στοιχείον/*elementum*), and a syllable was a distinct 'gathering' of these phonetic representations (see esp. Diog. Laert. 7.55-7, and Frede in Rist (ed.), *The Stoics* (1978), 42 ff., Ax, *Laut, Stimme, Sprache* (1986), 138 ff.). This is the doctrine underlying Varro (?) fr. 237, 'grammaticae initia ab elementis surgunt, elementa figurantur in litteras, litterae in syllabas coguntur, syllabis comprehenditur dictio, dictiones coguntur in partes orationis . . .' (*GRF* i. 267, cf. fr. 49, 239-43, *ibid.* 206, 286 f.); and the same doctrine underlies the regular inclusion of introductory sections on *litterae* and *syllabae* (after *vox*, and before the *partes orationis*) in the extant grammatical handbooks (Barwick, *RP* 43 ff., 229 f., Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch* (1960), 152 ff., Holtz 58 ff.; cf. Robins, *TPhS* (1957), 84 ff., and Ax 223 ff., on the sections περί στοιχείων and on συλλαβῶν in the τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax). Though composition of a work *de litteris syllabisque* would not in principle require the prior codification of *grammatica* in such a handbook, it surely presupposes a kind of methodical study of language that is scarcely credible for Rome (even for a *semigraecus* at Rome) in the first three decades of the 2nd cent. BCE on the chronology of Hellenistic grammar see esp. Pinborg, *CTL* 13 (1975), 103 ff.). It is accordingly not surprising that a work *de syllabis* is otherwise unattested before Varro's younger contemporary Sinius Capito (*GRF* i. 459). It is probably not fortuitous that a work *de metris* here keeps company with a work *de litteris syllabisque*, since methodical discussion of metre should proceed from an understanding of the phonetic value of *litterae* and *syllabae* (cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1456B, and note e.g. the section *de pedibus* following the sections *de littera* and *de syllaba* in Don. *Ars mai.* 607.5 ff. Holtz); again, no other work *de metris* is attested before Cornelius Epicadus, writing (prob.) in the second quarter

of the 1st cent. (see 12.1 n.). The treatises here noted in all likelihood date to the 1st cent. BCE, when formal and systematic grammatical study was already established at Rome.

L. Cotta: if the text is sound, this is more likely to be L. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 65, cens. 64) than the other candidate commonly favoured, L. Aurunculeius Cotta, a legate of Caesar in Gaul said to have written a work *Περὶ τῆς Ρωμαίων πολιτείας* (Athen. 6. 273B). The man cited simply as 'L. Cotta' should be the relatively well-known consular, to whom Suet. and others regularly refer by that name, not the relatively obscure lieutenant of Caesar, whom Suet. elsewhere calls 'Aurunculeius' (*Jul.* 25.2); see further Kaster, *STS* 38 ff. L. Aurelius Cotta is not otherwise known as a learned authority: note, however, that the Cotta cited here evidently knew the 'later Ennius' as the author of a work on augury (the subj. *ferantur* implies that the clause was part of Cotta's contention, wherever Suet. found it); and an interest in augural lore would not be alien to L. Aurelius Cotta, who was *XVvir sac. fac.* by 44 (*Jul.* 79.3, cf. *Cic. Div.* 2.110 with *MRR* ii. 333). If the text be thought corrupt, Della Corte's *C. Cotta* offers a plausible correction (*RFIC* 20 (1942), 137, cf. edn. 73): this is C. Aurelius Cotta (cos. 75), an older brother of Lucius, one of the most distinguished orators of his age (*Cic. Brut.* 183, 201–5, cf. *De or.* 1.25 ff.), with a known connection to the scholar L. Aelius (*Brut.* 205, cf. 3.2 n.). As a pontifex (*MRR* ii. 23, 113), Gaius too could have had an interest in books on augury. The *term. a. q.* for the *posterior Ennius* would then be 74 BCE (C. Cotta died late 74 or early 73: *Cic. Pis.* 62, *Ascon.* 14 C., cf. *MRR* ii. 113).

posterioris Enni . . . ferantur: since there is no reason to doubt the existence of these *volumina*, and no plausible ground for ascribing them to the poet Ennius, the existence of a *posterior Ennius* should not be problematic *per se*: his work could be dated to the first half of the 1st cent. BCE (before 54, if L. Cotta is L. Aurunculeius Cotta; the *term.* could be slightly later if L. Aurelius Cotta is meant, but a generation earlier if Della Corte's *C. Cotta* is correct, see above). This dating would suit both the grammatical *libri* at issue here (cf. above) and the books *de augurali disciplina*, a subject much discussed in the last generation of the Republic (cf. Linderski, *PP* 36 (1982), 12 ff., id., *ANRW* II 16.3 (1986), 2241 ff., Momigliano, *CP* 79 (1984), 199 ff.): note esp. the books

on *auguralis disciplina* and *auspicia* of C. Claudius Marcellus pr. 80 (*Cic. Leg.* 2.32), L. Iulius Caesar cos. 64 (*Macrob.* 1.16.29, *Prisc. GL* ii. 270.5, 380.3), Ap. Claudius Pulcher cos. 54, M. Valerius Messalla, and Veranius (*GRF* i. 426 ff.), a work on *augurium privatum* by Nigidius Figulus (*Gell.* 7.6.10), the third book of Varro *Ant. rer. div.* devoted to augurs (*Augustine Civ. D.* 6.3), and *Cic. Leg.* 2.21, 30 ff., *Div.* 1.25 ff., 2.70 ff., *De auguriis* (lost).

Traces of this *posterior Ennius* are possibly found in two difficult texts. The first is *Anecdota Parisina* = *GL* vii. 534.4–6, 'his solis [sc. notis] in adnotationibus Ennii, Lucilii [Bergk: hennii lucii cod.] et historicorum usi sunt τ varrōs hennius haelius aequae τ et postremo Probus . . .' (on *Anecd. Paris.*, the use of *notae*, and Probus, see 24.1.2 nn.). Numerous emendations have been attempted for the names here placed between daggers—e.g. *Var-gunteius Laelius Archelaus* (cf. 2.2) Bergk, *Vargunteius Leneaeus Aelius aequae* Della Corte, *Varro Servius* (= Ser. Clodius, cf. 3.1) *Aelius aequae* Bonner—all based on doubtful premises: it may be preferable simply to read *Varro, S. Ennius, Aelius aequae* ('se vogliamo distinguere soltanto e non emendare': Timpanaro, *Contrib. di filol. e di stor. della ling. lat.* (1978), 83 n. 1, after Funaioli, *GRF* i. 101 f.; 'S.' was the usual abbr. for 'Spurius' into the 1st cent. BCE, see Salomies, *Die röm. Vornamen* (1987), 149). The notice of S. Ennius, as a scholar evidently distinct from the poet, would then consist with the transmitted text of *Fest.* 482 L., 'TOPPER significare ait Artorius "cito", "fortasse", "celeriter", "tem<e>re" . . . "fortasse": sic Accius in *Io*, "topper, ut fit, patris te eicit iras". Ennius vero sic [sc. ait]: "topper" "fortasse" valet in Enni et Pacui scriptis; apud Ennium est . . .', where the *MS' iras Ennius* is most simply corrected to 'ira. S. Ennius', again referring to a scholar distinct from the poet (see Funaioli, *ibid.* and 457, arguing correctly against K. O. Müller's *Sinnus*, printed by Lindsay). These two possible instances of the name 'S. Ennius' perhaps offer 'due coincidenze che difficilmente possono attribuirsi a mero caso' (Timpanaro *ibid.*); alternatively, it may be preferable to restore the scholar's name simply as *Ennius* in both places (treating the corrupt *Varros* and *iras* as mere errors of anticipation before *Ennius*). Certainty is obviously unattainable. Yet even if neither text were taken to attest an authority named Ennius, his existence could not properly be denied merely on the ground that Suet. is our only witness: Suet. is our sole witness

for a good number of the persons he cites or discusses (see e.g. 3.6, 5.1, 8.1, 19.1 nn.), just as Varro is our sole witness for the scholar named (perhaps appropriately, in this connection) Vergilius (*LL* 7.39).

2.1 primus . . . opinamur: the emphatic placement of *primus* underscores the original conclusion that Suet. draws from the evidence at his disposal. The conclusion is presented as following logically (*igitur*) from the preceding argument: the first stirrings of grammar at Rome were undistinguished, for the reasons previously given ('siquidem antiquissimi doctores . . . nihil amplius quam . . . nam . . .'); therefore the visit of the Pergamene scholar provides the earliest evidence for true *studium grammaticae* at Rome. *ut opinamur* marks the conclusion as Suet.'s own (cf. 1-3 n.), with the verb he commonly uses to denote a supposition or inference that he himself is offering (*Aug.* 47 'ut opinor') or that he has found others offering (e.g. 27.2 'ut Cornelius Nepos opinatur', *Jul.* 30.2, introducing a doxography, 86.1 f. 'sunt qui putent . . . alii e diverso opinentur'). Suet. more often refers to himself in the 1st pers. sing., but for 1st pers. pl. cf. 4.7 and 14.2 (also *Tib.* 70.3, *Cal.* 8.2, *Claud.* 35.1). On the implied date of Crates' visit see below. Suet. ignores, or is unaware of, evidence for Greek *γραμματικοί* at Rome before Crates: cf. Plut. *Aem.* 6.9 *γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ ῥήτορες* . . . 'Ελλήνες (before Paullus' second consulship in 168; cf. *ibid.* 33.6, *διδάσκαλοι* displayed in the triumphal procession of 167).

Crates . . . aequalis: a native of Cilician Mallos active in Pergamum, eclectic 'critic' (*κριτικός*)—as he preferred to be called—vs. mere *γραμματικός*: Sext. *Emp. Adv. math.* 1.79) influenced by Stoicism, Crates is here synchronized with his great Alexandrian rival, Aristarchus: *sim. Suda* K 2342 (iii. 182 Adler) *σύγχρονος Ἀριστάρχου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλόμητρος* (180-145 BCE), cf. *ibid.* A 3892 (i. 351), Strab. 13.1.55 (609C), Gell. 2.25.4, 14.6.3, and John Lyd. *De mens.* 1.28 (below). His interests included the criticism and interpretation of Homer and other poets (probably in monographic form, not 'editions'), cosmology and allegory, and the principles of language. In Varro's influential account (*LL* 8-10) of the controversy between the 'anomalists', who stressed the irregularity of common usage as the dominant trait of language, and the 'analogists', who stressed the

regularity of grammatical forms, Crates is aligned with the former, Aristarchus with the latter (note esp. the attack on Crates at *LL* 9.1; on Varro's account, Fehling, *Glotta* 35 (1956), 214 ff., 36 (1957), 48 ff.). Fragments, testimonia, and discussion in *RE* xi. 1634 ff. (Kroll), Mette, *Sphairiopoia* (1936), *id.*, *Paraterexis* (1952), *id.*, *Lustrum*, 26 (1984), 95 ff., Pfeiffer, 235 ff., Asmis, *Phoenix*, 46 (1991), 138 ff., Porter in Lamberton-Keeney (eds.), *Homer's Ancient Readers* (1992), 67 ff. For Crates' only other attested link with Rome, see John Lyd. *De mens.* 1.28: in the rivalry between Pergamum and Alexandria, Crates supposedly advised King Attalus to curry favour with Rome by sending finely prepared sheepskins as writing material (i.e. *Pergamena membra* = 'parchment'), just as Aristarchus advised Ptolemy to send papyrus. Lydus prob. draws on Suet., whose works he knew and who took up the topic of writing materials in his *De libris* (cf. *Isid. Etym.* 6.11 = fr. 103, p. 132 Reiff., Schmidt, *ANRW* II 33.5 (1991), 3814 f.); in Varro's version of the story the Pergamene king is Eumenes, not Attalus. Neither Crates nor Aristarchus is mentioned as the story appears in Plin. *HN* 13.70 = Varro fr. 297, *GRF* i. 313; on these tales see Johnson, *CSCA* 3 (1970), 115 ff. How much Suet. knew of Crates, beyond his fame (cf. 11.3 n.), is not clear: the present passage speaks of him only as a lecturer and in the most general terms.

missus . . . Enni mortem: temporal *sub* + acc. correlates nearly simultaneous actions: beyond the idiom *sub idem tempus* (6 times in *Caes.*), the phrase in Suet. can mean either 'immediately before' (25.3 'sub ipsum civile bellum', *sim. Jul.* 56.5, *Aug.* 16.1, *Tib.* 6.1, 35.2, *Cal.* 17.1, *Galb.* 1, *Dom.* 17) or 'immediately after' (*Tib.* 17.1), depending on the context. In this context, where we do not know exactly when Suet. thought the embassy occurred ('inter secundum ac tertium Punicum bellum'—202-149 BCE—is not helpful) or exactly when he believed Ennius died, a less exact translation must suffice. In any case, the statement almost certainly errs in the ref. to the king or to Ennius' death. Attalus II of Pergamum succeeded his elder brother Eumenes II in 159 or 158, whereas Suet. evidently believed that Ennius was 'over 70 when he died (1.2 n.)—probably some time after 169, that is, but presumably not a decade or more after; attempts to explain (or deny) the error are lucidly surveyed by Garbarino 357 ff. In

all likelihood, either Suet. wrongly synchronized two distinct events—Ennius' death and an embassy sent by Attalus—in his eagerness to cap the argument he was developing, which presumed Ennius' ignorance of true *grammatica*; or he misread an account of an embassy that Eumenes sent and Attalus led. In the latter case, the most probable candidate is the embassy of early 167, sent to congratulate the senate for the victory at Pydna and to seek support against the Galatians (Polyb. 30.1–3, Livy 45.13.12, 45.19–20.3); this could well have been 'sub ipsam Enni mortem', as Suet. conceived it. In either case, 167 can safely be taken as a *term. a. q. non*; after his accession Attalus sent an embassy to Rome in 156/5 (Polyb. 33.1). Crates appears to be linked with Attalus also at Plut. *Mor.* 1095D; and Suet. may have linked the two in the tale of Attalus' gift of parchment to Rome (above).

cum regione Palati . . . crus fregisset: the clause is one of very few precise and circumstantial touches in these opening chaps. Running SW from the Forum, the Cloaca Maxima drained the Velabrum, between the Palatine and Capitoline hills, before passing through the Forum Boarium and emptying into the Tiber (Platner–Ashby 126 f., Nash i. 258 ff., Richardson 91 f.). *cloacae foramen* alludes to the 'manholes' in the vaulting that covered the original open stream; some of these still exist, most notably the *Bocca della Verità*.

acroasis: the term can denote any sort of verbal display before an audience: as an orator's *ἀκροάσις* would be a 'declamation' (cf. Sen. *Contr.* 4 pr. 2), or a poet's a 'recitation' (cf. *Bull. ép.* 1966, 189, p. 372), a gramm.'s would be a 'lecture' or some similar display of his expertise (note Gell. 16.6.1 f., a gramm. giving a public reading of *Aen.* 7 and inviting questions from his listeners); cf. Polyb. 32.2.5 *γραμματικὸς τῶν τὰς ἀκροάσεις ποιουμένων*, describing the *κριτικός* Isocrates (31.33.5) sent by Demetrius of Athens to Rome in 159 (as the context makes plain, however, Isocrates gave no *ἀκροάσεις* at Rome). On *ἀκροάσεις* see also *Bull. ép.* 1958, 347, p. 281. Crates' *plurimas acroasis* were formal, public occasions, in that respect distinct from his 'frequent discussions', which were informal and private.

subinde: 'constantly' or 'repeatedly', the sense in which Suet. regularly uses the word in *Caes.* (22 times); here rather otiose

after *plurimas*, and virtually synonymous with *assidue*, the adverb increases the hyperbole of the passage.

nostris: after two *semigraeci* and a native of Cilicia, Suet. comes at last to men of Rome: cf. Cic. *Brut.* 52 'sed de Graecis hactenus . . . veniamus ad nostros.' Since Suet. is concerned with the introduction of *grammatica* to Rome in general terms, as a discipline (not, specifically, as a profession), it should not be assumed that all the men subsequently mentioned were professional teachers: L. Aelius and Ser. Clodius, at 3.1, clearly were not; in the present passage only the description of Archelaus and Philocomus implies *per se* that they were. Note also that—like Livius and Ennius—one or more of these men may not in fact have been *nostris* by origin (see nn. on Lampadio, Archelaus, and Philocomus): if so, Suet. either did not care or, more likely, did not know (on the controversy over this point, Christes 6 n. 3).

2.2 hactenus tamen imitati: the limiting adv. *hactenus* corresponds to *nilhil amplius quam* above (1.2 n.), as Suet. continues his argument concerning the narrow compass of pre-Aelian *grammatica*: both *nilhil amplius quam* and *hactenus* stand in contrast to 3.1 *ab omni parte* (cf. 1–3 n.). Given Suet.'s utter vagueness about Crates' scholarship, we cannot know in just what respect he believed *nostris* fell short of 'complete' imitation (if he had anything specific in mind at all): the thrust of his argument implies that the deficit lay in the area of technical (written) scholarship (sim. Della Corte 73).

ut carmina . . . nota facerent: i.e. the Romans' limited 'imitation' of Crates, as Suet. conceived it, involved some exercise of critical judgement (*probassent*), some sort of careful 'review' of poetic texts (*diligentius retractarent*: see below), and above all the communication of poetic texts on a broad front ('carmina . . . etiam ceteris nota facerent'): note esp. the parallel between Crates' *ἀκροάσεις* and Vargunteius' recitation of Ennius' epic 'in magna frequentia', between Crates' private discussions and the reading of Lucilius' satires 'apud Archelaum . . . apud . . . Philocomum'.

This *ut*-clause serves as a generalizing bridge in the structure of Suet.'s argument, correlating the datum just adduced (Crates' visit) with the data about to be listed: the clause contains nothing that Suet. could not have extrapolated from the following details, collected when he was researching the lives of the poets and the

grammatici themselves; as regularly, the general statement precedes the specific evidence on which it is based (cf. next n.). This typically Suetonian manner of proceeding (cf. Introd. §2) is consistent with the common suggestion, surely correct, that Suet. overgeneralizes and exaggerates the importance of Crates' visit (Della Corte 73, cf. e.g. *GRF* i, p. xi, Zetzel 10, Reynolds-Wilson 20). Indeed, the question legitimately arises whether his evidence justified Suet.'s speaking of 'imitation' here at all. (1) The first of his specific exx.—Lampadio's division of the *Punicum bellum*—is the only one that necessarily implies some form of *written* scholarship, and as the example of 'imitation' purportedly closest in time to Crates' visit, it should most directly bear his stamp: yet so far from 'imitating' any of Crates' known scholarship (cf. esp. Pfeiffer 238 f.), it most closely resembles the division of the Homeric poems ascribed to Aristarchus—and could as well have been inspired by the *Annals* of Ennius as by any Greek model (n. ad loc.). (2) The only persons listed whose activity can be dated independently of this passage are Archelaus and Philocomus, who can hardly have read Lucilius' satires with Cato and Linaeus before the 80s (11.1, 15.1 nn.), 70–80 years after Crates' visit: the suggestion that they were necessarily dependent on the model of Crates, either directly or indirectly, is bizarre on its face, esp. since their activity not only would have followed the decisive contribution of L. Aelius (as Suet. presents it) but also would have postdated the teaching of the first two *grammatici* treated in the body of the work (Sevius Nicanor, Aurelius Opillus). More generally, (3) Suet. ignores, or is unaware of, the evidence for Greek γράμμαται at Rome before Crates (2.1 *primus* . . . *opinatur* n.), and esp. the 'great flock' of scholars who flooded into Rome from Greece and changed the face of Roman culture in the second half of the 2nd cent. (Polyb. 31.24.6 f., cf. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (1984), 250 ff., id., *Studies* 158 ff., Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme* (1988), 517 ff., 566 ff.); cf. also 3.5 n., on Lutatius Daphnis. In short, nothing discourages the conclusion that Suet. was reasoning loosely—*post Crateta, ergo propter Crateta*—in piecing together his data, which were too sparse, and perhaps not closely enough considered, to support his argument.

Furthermore, we do not know what grounds Suet. had for dating Lampadio and Vargunteius, the latter following the former

at some undefined interval (*postea*) in the second half of the 2nd cent.; he may merely have assumed that they could be so dated, given the dates of the poets concerned, and accordingly placed them in a chronological order corresponding to the chronological order of the poets. Uncertainty on this point makes it more difficult to define the relation between the 'imitators' in Suet.'s list and the two categories of poets he mentions, dead friends or any other poets who passed muster (*si quorum aliorum* of course represents a general category—'whoever else', 'any other persons whatever'—and cannot be confined to the meaning 'amici ancora viventi', *pace* Della Corte, *FLOV*² 34 and n. 11, comm. 75). The first category should be relevant at least to Archelaus and Philocomus, since Lucilius is called their *familiaris* and since Suet. knew (or should have known) from his lives of Cato and Linaeus that their reading occurred after Lucilius' death. The second, more general category should be relevant at least to Lampadio: on the chronology implied by the present passage and Suet.'s life of Naevius (cf. Jer. *Chron.* s.a. 1816 = 201 BCE) he could have restructured Naevius' poem no sooner than 35–45 years after the poet's death, and was therefore unlikely to be Naevius' *amicus*. The discussion above, however, may suggest that Suet. did not engage in nice chronological reckoning when he composed this passage: he may, therefore, have believed that *each* poet was a dead friend of the corresponding person in the list; in that case, the second category would be merely a flourish of further generalization. On the consequences of the uncertainty see the nn. on Lampadio and Vargunteius below.

retractare: the verb denotes a 'review', often (though not always) accompanied by 'revision': cf. *Aug.* 34.1 'leges retractavit et quasdam ex integro sanxit . . .', where the context shows that Augustus revised some of the laws while reviewing them (see *OLD* s.v. B.6). Here the nature of the 'review' is left vague, seemingly glossed only by the following gerunds, *legendo commentandoque*; but in formulating this generalized description Suet. prob. was thinking specifically of Lampadio, whose review of Naevius' poem in fact issued in a revision, at least of its format.

ut C. Octavius . . . praedican: the specific activities of these men, as Suet. knew them, were simply: 'C. Octavius Lampadio Naevi *Punicum bellum* uno volumine et continenti scriptura expositum divisit in septem libros', 'Q. Vargunteius *Annales* Enni

certis diebus in magna frequentia pronuntiabat', 'Laelius Ar-
chelaus Vettiusque Philocomus saturas Lucili, familiaris sui, apud
se cum Pompeio Lenaeo et Valerio Catone legerunt (ut hi prae-
dicant)' (in the third instance Suet.'s sources for the activity
were also participants in the activity, and so their names too are
prominent). But since Suet. based the foregoing generalization on
these activities and then listed them as evidence for it, the main
verbs implied in each *ut*-clause must be understood from that
generalization ('ut . . . Lampadio Naevi *Punicum bellum* [diligentius
retractavit ac notum fecit] . . .; ut . . . Vargunteius *Annales* Enni
[d. r. ac n. f.] . . .; ut Laelius . . . Vettiusque . . . Lucili saturas
. . . [d. r. ac n. f.] . . .'). The names of the 'imitators' and the
authors and works concerned are set in the foreground, as though
exemplifying some homogeneous phenomenon, while the specific
information about each 'imitator' is subordinated in the parallel
relative clauses ('. . . quod . . . libros; . . . quos . . . pronuntiabat;
. . . quas . . . praedicant').

C. Octavius . . . septem libros: the *tria nomina* only here; other
refs. to 'Lampadio', below (see also Teuffel⁶ i. 257 f.; Sch.-Hos.
i. 231 f.; *RE* xvii. 1850 f. (Kroll); *GRF* i. 21 f.). *Λαμπάδιων* (as
though formed from *Λαμπάς*) does not occur as an ordinary
personal name in classical or Hellenistic Greece (vs. *Λαμπάδιος*/
-δία, cf. neut. dim. *Λαμπάδιον*). This fact, combined with Plautus'
use of 'Lampadio' as a slave-name in *Cist.*, is commonly taken to
show that Lampadio was a freedman, who adopted as his *cognomen*
the slave-name imposed by his master (summary at Christes 7 f.;
a *Λαμπάδιων ἱερεὺς* is attested much later (s. III CE), *Bull. ép.*
1970, 399). If the inference is correct, no sure conclusion can be
drawn about his place of origin; his use of the *tria nomina* would
not conflict with the date implied here, c. mid-2nd cent. BCE,
though this pattern of libertine nomenclature does not predominate
until later (see 5.1 n.). Despite the rarity of the name and Lam-
padio's interest in Naevius, it is probably a coincidence that
Naevius wrote a *fabula palliata* entitled *Lampadio* (*SRPF*² ii. 16,
cf. Cèbe on Varr. *Men.* fr. 8).

With the present passage cf. Non. 250 L. 'Santra *De verborum
antiquitate* III: "quod volumen unum nos lecitavimus, et postea
invenimus septifariam divisum". The statement presumably con-
cerns the same poem of Naevius and the same seven-book division

by Lampadio: if Nonius (who cited the clauses only for the use
of *septifariam*) omitted a ref. to Lampadio following *divisum*, as
he omitted the poem's title before *quod*, Santra could have been
Suet.'s immediate source here, as he was elsewhere (Introd. xxvi,
14.4 n.). Suet. would then have had no idea of Lampadio's exact
date, unless Santra went on to provide that information as well.
The remark by Santra, a contemporary of Varro, in any event
provides a rough *term. a. q.* for Lampadio's intervention.

continenti scriptura means that Naevius' poem was composed as
a continuous whole contained in a single papyrus roll (*volumen*):
cf. the statement in some Homeric scholia that the *παλωδιαί*/
'songs' (what we term 'books') of Homer were once written
continuously (*κατὰ συνάφειαν*), distinguished one from the next
only by a *coronis*—a condition in fact found in some Ptolemaic
papyri (Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie homérique* (1960), 42).
That the phrase refers also to the absence of word-divisions
(introduced by Lampadio too?) is suggested, less certainly, by
Suerbaum, *ZPE* 92 (1992), 158 ff. If Naevius' poem was composed
without book-divisions, it resembled Livius Andronicus' version of
the *Odyssey* (cf. Fraenkel, *RE* Suppl. vi. 637 f.). With Lampadio's
action compare the division of *Il.* and *Od.* into 24 books ascribed
to Aristarchus (cf. Pfeiffer 116)—though Lampadio need have
been inspired by no one Greek scholar, esp. if his work followed
Ennius' *Annales*, which provided the Roman model of an epic
composed in discrete books.

Two other refs. to Lampadio show that his name carried a
certain cachet in the mid-2nd cent. CE, but they add no reliable
information concerning his work. (1) Gell. 18.5.11: to support an
argument concerning the text of Enn. *Ann.* 236 f., the rhetor
Antonius Iulianus cites a 'librum summae atque reverendae vetu-
statis, quem fere constabat Lampadionis manu emendatum', which
he claims to have rented (*conduxi*) 'pretio . . . multo unius versus
inspiciendi gratia' (on the meaning of *emendatum*, see 24.2 n.).
(2) Fronto, *ad M. Caes.* 1.7.4: delighted that Marcus Aurelius
has copied out one of his speeches, Fronto exclaims 'quid tale
M. Porcio aut Quinto Ennio . . . usuvenerit? quorum libri pretiosiores
habentur et summam gloriam retinent, si sunt Lampadionis aut
Staberii [cf. c. 13] . . . manu scripta e<xem>pla . . .', listing some
MSS of famous authors supposedly copied by various noted
authorities; from the Gellian passage it is commonly inferred that

the MS of Ennius was Lampadio's, Staberius' that of Cato, though this is not certain. The authenticity of the MSS cited in both passages is doubtful: beyond the hedging phrase *quem fere constabat* at Gell. 18.5.11, note that Gellius undercuts the showy appeal to the 'precious' MS' authority by remarking (ibid. 12) that the very arguments made by Iulianus could be found in *peruulgatis commentariis*; on the MSS cited by Fronto, see the refs. at 6.1 n., where the full list is quoted.

postea Q. Vargunteius . . . pronuntiabat: Q. Vargunteius (Teuffel⁶ i. 258; Sch.-Hos. i. 231 f.; *RE* viiiA. 379 f. (Dihle)) is otherwise unknown: attempts to restore the *nomen* in the *Anecdoton Parisinum* (see 1.3 n.) are palaeographically implausible and based on an assumption—that Vargunteius produced a 'critical edition' of the *Annales*—not supported by the present passage (see below). The date implied here is some time in the second half of the 2nd cent.; the *nomen* is first attested for the *monetalis* M. Vargunteius of 130 BCE (*RRC* i. 62 f., 283), thereafter in mid-1st cent. (*MRR* ii. 497, iii. 215; Jul. Obseq. 61; *MRR* ii. 227, 232; beyond Rome, the name is attested in Sabine territory and Latium, *CIL* ix. 4935, x. 5662, 5870, xiv. 2157, 2214). *pronuntiabat* means that Vargunteius recited the epic, as a kind of display-piece (cf. 2.1 *acroasis* n.): for *pronuntiare* of verse-recitation, see *Jul.* 49.4, *Aug.* 53.1, 98.4, *Cal.* 54.1, *Vit. Ter.* 31.7 f. Reiff., *Vit. Luc.* 147 Rost. Nothing in the clause implies that Vargunteius supplemented the recitations with scholarly exegesis vel sim., while *certis diebus* implies that he did not give his recitations *qua* teacher, insofar as the phrase connotes occasions specially appointed, not the daily routine of a *magister*; *magna frequentia* points in the same direction. Since the generalizing description of Crates' 'imitators', above, is itself merely Suet.'s interpretation of this and the surrounding data, that description does not provide further information about Vargunteius' activity and so cannot be taken to show that he also served as an 'editor' or 'commentator'.

Laelius Archelaus Vettiusque Philocomus: see Teuffel⁶ i. 278, Sch.-Hos. i. 159, *RE* xii. 414 (Wessner), ibid. viiiA. 1851 ff. (Strzelecki: unreliable), *GRF* i. 50 f., Christes 8 ff. The two are not otherwise securely attested. Laelius Archelaus may be 'Q. Laelius, ex principibus grammaticis', author of a work *De vitis virtutibusque poematorum* cited by Iulius Romanus ap. Charis.

179.18–20 B. (*principibus* is prob. not used temporally, *pace* Wessner, but the others cited under the same lemma—Varro, Cicero, Accius—suggest that this Laelius was of republican date). Lucilius criticized the speech of a certain Vettius as redolent of Praeneste (Quint. 1.5.56 = fr. 1322 M.).

Both their *cognomina* suggest that they were freedmen: see Christes 7, with refs.; and Solin, *GPR* i. 29, 177 (no certainly freeborn Archelaus at Rome before s. 1 CE; cf. also a libertine Archelaus at *Suppl. Ital.* i. 184), ibid. 162 (4 Philocomi besides Vettius, 3 libertine, 1 a freedman's son; cf. also a libertine Philocomus at *CIL* ii. 3931, a slave at *AE* 1988, 1146). If so, it is not clear whether they were given the names by their owners (as *vernae* or after enslavement) or were already so named when enslaved (J. D. Morgan remarks *per litt.* that 'in the Hellenistic period . . . the name *Φιλόκομος* is almost unique to Cyrenaica, the homeland of Callimachus'—perhaps significant, in view of the 'neoteric' tendencies of Vettius' pupil Valerius Cato).

Archelaus and Philocomus must have been at least a generation younger than their friend Lucilius (b. probably 180, d. 102), since they could not have read his satires with Lenaeus and Cato before the 80s (11.1, 15.1 nn.).

apud: this could connote informal reading 'at the home of' a friend, in the manner of a salon (e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 207 'cum essem apud Aelium adulescens eumque audire perstudiose solem': cf. 3.1 n.); more likely here, a student's reading of a text with his teacher, as often: 24.2 'legerat . . . libellos apud grammatistam', cf. 26.1 'studiosissimus quisque apud eum [sc. Plotium Gallum] exerceretur' (quoting Cicero), *Tit.* 2 'apud eosdem magistros institutus'. Suet.'s phrasing does not imply any form of published scholarship or 'critical editions', still less that Archelaus and Philocomus represented 'rival schools' of Lucilian scholarship, as sometimes suggested.

praedictant: used of any strong assertion meant for public consumption (cf. 23.2 n.), here prob. connoting 'boast', since it would be a point of pride to have read the poetry with the poet's *familiares*. Cato and Lenaeus claimed Philocomus and Archelaus as their respective teachers in writings that Suet. knew and used: thus the

implication of the context and of the present tense, cf. 16.1, 28.1 nn.; for the claims' possible contexts see 11.1, 15.2 nn.

3.1 instruxerunt ... grammaticam: after his account of the first fitful stirrings of *grammatica* at Rome, Suet. arrives at a fact that he believes can be asserted without argument, qualification, or corroborative data: Aelius and Clodius set *grammatica* on a sound and orderly footing and enhanced it, 'in every respect'; they thereby became the 'founders' and *auctores* of a discipline worthy of the name (Leofranc Holford-Strevens suggests comparison with Pomponius' history of jurisprudence at *Dig.* 1.2.2.35 ff., esp. *ibid.* 39 'post hos fuerunt Publius Mucius et Brutus et Manilius, qui fundaverunt ius civile'). The absence of an inferential particle or other continuative word has the effect of making Aelius' and Clodius' activity distinct from the phenomena just described: the story of *grammatica Romanae* in effect begins again, *de novo*, with these two men (in the introductory cc. 1-4 a continuative word is comparably absent—of course—at 1.1 *grammatica Romanae*, and then again only at 4.1 *appellatio grammaticorum* and 4.4 *veteres grammatici*, each introducing a topic and stage of exposition distinct from the preceding; see also Kaster, *STS* 109). The present phenomenon is further distinguished as the work of Romans of status, not Greeks or half-Greeks, and as completely achieved: *ab omni parte* stands in contrast to the limiting adv.'s *nilhil amplius quam* and *hactenus* above (nn.). The basis or source of the assertion is not revealed (cf. next n.), and the assertion itself is left entirely vague: *ab omni parte* is broadly generalizing and, taken strictly, hyperbolic; Suet. may mean no more than that Aelius and Clodius (unlike the men already mentioned) actually produced scholarly writings. They are omitted from the catalogue of *professores* properly so called (cc. 5-24): as *equites Romani*, the two would have been gentlemen-scholars who shared their learning with social equals and superiors, not professionals who taught for a fee.

L. Aelius Lanuvinius: a native of Lanuvium, a *municipium* on the *via Appia* c. 30 km. SE of Rome, birthplace also of the comic poet Luscius, the actor Q. Roscius, and the mimographer D. Laberius (cf. Wiseman, *RS* 291). Prob. born c.150: he was the dedicatee of Coelius Antipater's history of the Second Punic War (*Ad Herenn.* 4.12.18, Cic. *Or.* 230), completed some time after

121 (Peter, *HRR* i, p. ccxii, Sumner, *Orators* 56 f.), when Aelius was presumably already a mature person of some note; but he was still active at least as late as 90 (*Brut.* 207). All other datable refs. to him belong to the year 100 or later; his connection with Varro (b. 116) cannot antedate the 90s, and *LL* 6.59 implies that he was a *senex* when Varro knew him; Cic. *Acad.* 1.8 seemingly implies that Varro's *Menippean Satires* (80-67 BCE) were composed 'post L. Aelii nostri occasum'. Aelius' *floruit* (c.110?-85?) would therefore have coincided roughly with the teaching of the first two gramm. in Suet.'s catalogue, Sevius Nicanor and Aurelius Opilius (cc. 5-6).

Both Cicero (*Brut.* 207) and Varro (*ibid.* 205) knew and learned from him; Varro refers to him as his friend (*Ant. rer. div.* fr. 89 Card.=Gell. 1.18.2, cf. Cic. *Acad.* 1.8) and bases a linguistic observation on a recollection of Aelius' own usage (*LL* 6.59, cf. the formula *Aelius dicebat* at *LL* 5.66, 101, 6.7; on Varro's debt to Aelius see recently Lehmann, *MEFR* 97 (1985), 515 ff.). Aelius thus can rightly be called the 'teacher' of Cicero and Varro (cf. *magister Varronis*, at Gell. 16.8.2, Charis. 106.8 B.), not as a professional paid for his instruction, but as a noted man of letters at whose feet young *studiosi* sat: compare the description of Aelius' connection Coelius Antipater, of senatorial family and *iuris peritus*, as both *magister* and *familiaris* of the orator L. Crassus (*Brut.* 102, *De or.* 2.54). Cicero and Varro both praise his learning highly: *Brut.* 205 'eruditissimus et Graecis litteris et Latinis, antiquitatis nostrae et in inventis rebus [= cultural 'discoveries'] et in actis [= historical 'facts'] scriptorumque veterum litterate peritus'; *LL* 7.2 'hominis in primo in litteris Latinis exercitati', *Ant. rer. div.* fr. 89 (=Gell. 1.18.2) 'litteris ornatissimus memoria nostra'. If any element of Suet.'s introductory chaps. is owed to Varro, it is surely the high valuation placed on Aelius' scholarship; nor should the influence of Cicero's judgement in *Brut.* 205-7, which Suet. certainly knew (cf. 3.2 *quod ... solebat* n.), be underestimated.

Aelius' interests ranged widely over Roman antiquities, literature, and archaic language: beyond *Brut.* 205, quoted above, note *De or.* 1.193 *Aeliana studia*, with ref. to *ius civile*, *pontificum libri*, the XII Tables (cf. *Top.* 10, *Leg.* 2.59); the words put in Varro's mouth at *Acad.* 1.8 suggest that much of Aelius' learning dled with him ('quae autem nemo adhuc docuerat nec erat unde studiosi scire possent, ea quantum potui ... feci ut essent nota

Suetonius' 'I of 'gramma and are fast name moth more produ Roman cul For the earl literall ind repository a literay life understandi relations, a freedmen a of Suetoni accompanie appear in el most thoru elucidate N and places i historical co

Robert A. the Univers

C. SVETONI TRANQVILLI DE GRAMMATICIS ET RHETORIBVS

[GRAMMATICI

Aelius Praeconius
Sevius Nicanor
Aurelius Opilius

5 M. Antonius Gniphio

M. Pompilius Andronicus
L. Orbilius
L. Ateius Philologus

P. Valerius Cato

10 Cornelius Epicadus

Curtius Nicia

Laeneus

Q. Caecilius

M. Verrius Flaccus

15 L. Crassicius

Scribonius Aphrodisius

C. Iulius Phriginus

C. Melissus

M. Pomponius Marcellus

20 Q. Remmius Palaemon

Val. Probus

ITEM RHETORES

Plotius Gallus

L. Voltacilius Pilutus

25 M. Epidius

Sex. Clodius

C. Albucius Silus

L. Caestius Pius

M. Portius Latro

30 Q. Curtius Rufus

L. Valerius Primanus

Verg. Flavius

L. Statius Vrsulus

P. Clodius Quirinalis

35 M. Antonius Liberalis

Sex. Iulius Gabinianus

M. Fabius Quintilianus

Iul. Tiro]

C. Suetonii Tranquilli De Grammaticis (Antiquis add. B) Et Rhetoribus ω (sic et Decembr., om. C., add. Liber): Suetonius Tranquillus De Grammaticis Liber Primus M, C. Suetonii Tranquilli Historici De Grammaticis Pro(h)emium C4 (Libri Primi add. C)
indices hab. X GI BVL MCA (indicem rhetorum post c. 24 ponunt C4): om. cett.
(indices vere Suetonios esse valde dubium est: ut in archetypo, sic fere nomina hic scribuntur) 1 om. X, Grammatici Celebres β (cebres B, illustres L)
3 Servius α 4 Aurel. W, Aurel. V 5 grifo X, grapho α
6 M. om. M Pomilius X 8 L. om. M 9 et. L. staberius add. O
10 Staberius heros t hiero add. M, L. Taberius add. C 11 om. ID
12 om. Δ 13 Quintus X 14 Valerius B 16 afro- X
17 phry- M'Δ, phy- O, fri- L 18 M. VL 20 re- W, ye- O, the- Y
21 M. add. B Val. WV, Val. I: Valerius OGBLY 22 item om. LM
rhetores clari β (clari om. L) 23 L. add. BM 24 plut' X, pilatus L
28 cestius OBLΔ, caelestius I 29 Porcius OC 31 Valer. W, Val. I
32 Verg. XIV, Vergi G, Vero B: Virgilius L, Vergilius γ 33 Vrsilus γ
34 clod' W 36 Iul. WI 37 Flabius V, Flavius M
38 Iul. W, Iul. IV: Iulius OGBLY Tiro WIBVΔ: Tyro OGLC, prio M

C. SVETONIUS TRANQUILLUS 'ON TEACHERS OF GRAMMAR AND RHETORIC'

[GRAMMARIANS

Aelius Praeconius
Sevius Nicanor
Aurelius Opilius

5 M. Antonius Gniphio

M. Pompilius Andronicus
L. Orbilius
L. Ateius Philologus

P. Valerius Cato

10 Cornelius Epicadus

Curtius Nicia

Laeneus

Q. Caecilius

M. Verrius Flaccus

15 L. Crassicius

Scribonius Aphrodisius

C. Iulius Phriginus

Melissus

M. Pomponius Marcellus

20 Q. Remmius Palaemon

Val. Probus

RHETORICIANS

Plotius Gallus
L. Voltacilius Pilutus

25 M. Epidius

Sex. Clodius
C. Albucius Silus
L. Caestius Pius

M. Portius Latro

30 Q. Curtius Rufus

L. Valerius Primanus

Verg. Flavius

L. Statius Vrsulus

P. Clodius Quirinalis

35 M. Antonius Liberalis

Sex. Iulius Gabinianus

M. Fabius Quintilianus

Iul. Tiro]

1 (1) Grammatica Romanae ne in usu quidem olim, nedum in honore ullo erat, rudi scilicet ac bellicosa etiamtum civitate necdum magnopere liberalibus disciplinis vacante. (2) initium quoque eius mediocre extitit, siquidem antiquissimi doctorum, qui idem et poetae et semigraeci erant—Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est—nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur aut si quid ipsi Latine composuissent praelegebant. (3) nam quod nonnulli tradunt duos libros—de litteris syllabisque, item de metris—ab eodem Ennio editos, iure arguit L. Cotta non poetae sed posterioris Enni esse, cuius etiam de augurali disciplina volumina ferantur.

2 (1) Primus igitur, quantum opinamur, studium grammaticae in urbem intulit Crates Mallotes, Aristarchi aequalis: qui missus ad senatum ab Attalo rege inter secundum ac tertium Punicum bellum sub ipsam Enni mortem, cum regione Palati prolapsus in cloacae foramen crus fregisset, per omne legationis simul et valetudinis tempus plurimas acroasis subinde fecit assidueque disseruit ac nostris exemplo fuit ad imitandum. (2) hactenus tamen imitati, ut carmina parum adhuc divulgata vel defunctorum amicorum vel si quorum aliorum probassent diligentius tractarent ac legendo commentandoque etiam ceteris nota facerent: ut C. Octavius Lampadio Naevi *Punicum bellum*, quod uno lumine et continenti scriptura expositum divisit in septem libros; ut postea Q. Vargunteius *Annales* Enni, quos certis diebus in magna frequentia pronuntiabat; ut Laelius Archelaus Vettiusque Philocomus Lucili saturas familiaris sui, quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius LENAEO, apud Philocomum Valerius CATO praedicant.

3 (1) Instruxerunt auxeruntque ab omni parte grammaticam L. Aelius Lanuvinus generque Aeli Ser. Clodius, uterque eques Romanus multique ac varii et in doctrina et in re publica usus.

- 1 (1) nec in *BH*, testatur *Decembr.* (2) qui idem *Lachmann* (teste *Reiff.*, qui iidem *iam Steph.*): quidem ω , quidam N^1G (-dem NG^1) utranque linguam a ad(an)-notatum aB: adnotum *XIV*, notum *L'*(ex at notum)U (3) C. Cotta *Della Corte*, fort. recte augurali X: augurali Y
2 (2) etiam] et β (ut B) Vettiusque *Oudendorp*: Vettius Q. O, Vectiusque W, vectus Q. Y (rectius Q. B)
3 (1) generque X: gener. Q. Y

1 (1) The study of language and literature (or 'grammar') was once not even known at Rome, much less respected, since the community, being then uncultured and devoted to warfare, did not yet have much free time for liberal learning. (2) The first stages of this study, too, were undistinguished, inasmuch as the earliest teachers, who were at the same time poets and half Greek—I mean Livius and Ennius, who are on record as having taught both languages privately and publicly—merely clarified the meaning of Greek authors or gave exemplary readings from their own Latin compositions. (3) For whereas some relate that Ennius published two books—on letters and syllables and on metres, respectively—Lucius Cotta rightly contends that these are the works not of the poet but of a later Ennius whose books on augural lore are also in circulation.

2 (1) In my view, therefore, the first person to introduce the study of grammar to the city was Crates of Mallos, a contemporary of Aristarchus. Sent to the senate by King Attalus between the Second and Third Punic Wars, at just about the time of Ennius' death, Crates fell down and broke his leg in a sewer-hole in the neighborhood of the Palatine and spent the whole time of the embassy and of his recuperation constantly giving a host of lectures and holding frequent discussions, thereby providing an example for our countrymen to imitate. (2) Still, they imitated him only to the extent that they carefully reviewed poems that had as yet not been widely circulated—the works of dead friends, or of any others they approved—and by reading and commenting on them made them known to the rest of the population as well. So Gaius Octavius Lampadio did in the case of Naevius' *Punic War*, which he divided into seven books (it had previously been set out as a continuous text in a single book-roll); so Quintus Vargunteius later did in the case of Ennius' *Annals*, which he used to recite before a large audience on specific days; and so Laelius Archelaus and Vettius Philocomus did in the case of their friend Lucilius' satires, which Pompeius LENAEO and Valerius CATO boast that they read with Archelaus and Philocomus, respectively.

3 (1) Order and enrichment were brought to every aspect of grammar by Lucius Aelius of Lanuvium and his son-in-law Servius Clodius, both of them Roman knights of extensive and varied

correction.⁶² Nor (finally) should any reader doubt or forget how frequently good corrections are needed. Though the text of the archetype can be reconstructed, with certainty or a high degree of probability, for nearly all of the *DGR*, it is plain that the archetype was a very poor witness indeed.⁶³ In scores of places the words that Suetonius wrote are reclaimed (if they can be reclaimed at all) only by conjecture.

⁶² See *ibid.* 34 n. 59. Beyond *MHθ* two other γ MSS (US) are very occasionally worth citing, esp. at 29.2 (a quotation of Cic. *Phil.* 2.42 f. that was wretchedly corrupt in ω); similarly helpful here and there are two β MSS, L (which contains a number of good conjectures by Pontano) and D (which uniquely remedies some of ω 's flaws at 14.2, a quotation of Cic. *Fam.* 9.10.1). The 11 other MSS (*conspectus siglorum*, ad fin.) give no cause for citation at all. I report *OWNGBVHL* from my own collations; for the other MSS I have relied on the reports of Robinson and Brugnoli.

⁶³ In this regard it makes no difference whether one equates ω with the Hersfeldensis itself or with a 15th-cent. apograph: see Robinson's warning, . . . ne nimiam bonitatem libro Hersfeldensi attribuiamus' (diss. 60), with Kaster, *STS* 35 ff.

SIGLA

ω archetypon codicum XY

X hyparchetypon codicum OW

O Vat. Ottob. lat. 1455

O¹ codex eadem manu correctus

O^m lectio eadem manu in margine notata $\left\{ W^1, W^m, W^2, \text{etc.} \right.$

O² codex altera manu correctus

W Vindob. lat. s. n. 2960 (olim 711) (an. 1466)

Y hyparchetypon codicum $\beta\Gamma$

β hyparchetypon codicum BV

B Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 151

V Vat. lat. 1862

T hyparchetypon codicum $\alpha\gamma$

α hyparchetypon codicum NG

N Neap. IV. C. 21

G Guelf. Gud. lat. 93

γ hyparchetypon codicum M ζ

M Marc. Lat. XIV. I. (4266) (an. 1464)

ζ hyparchetypon codicum H θ

H Lond. Harl. 2639 (ante an. 1465 script., fort. 1462:

J. Delz, *IMU* 11 (1968), 311 ff.)

θ hyparchetypon codicum C Δ Q

C Berol. lat. 8° 197

Δ Vat. lat. 4498

Q Berol. lat. 2° 28 (an. 1477)

codices *OWBVNG* separatim laudantur. de codicibus e γ (fonte pravissimo) fluentibus, nisi viam ad codicem Γ consensu suo monstrant aut singuli (ut nonnumquam fit) coniecturam bonam aliudve auxilium praebent, siletur (de his rebus vide Kaster, *STS* 1 ff.).

alii sunt qui aliquid boni hic illic praestant:

de codice β derivati, L Leid. Periz. Q. 21 (an. 1460)

D Haun. Gl. Kgl. S. 1629 4°

de codice γ derivati,

U Vat. Urb. lat. 1194
(post an. 1482 script.)

S Neap. IV. B. 4. bis

ceteri non sunt digni qui laudentur:

de codice α derivati, *I* Vat. lat. 1518 (gemellus codicis *G*)
Vat. Ottob. lat. 1434 (apographon
codicis *I*)

Vat. Ottob. lat. 3015

de codice γ derivati, *K* Ambros. H. 29 sup. (gemellus
codicis *M*)

P Paris. lat. 7773 (apographon
codicis *H*)

F Laurent. plut. (Gadd.) 89. inf. 8.1
(apographon codicis *C*)

T Vat. lat. 7190

E Vat. Borg. lat. 413

Univ. Notre Dame 58

Colker ms. 11

Bibl. Riccard. 3595

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Suetonius' biographical sketches of 'grammar' and rhetoric are fairly brief; yet in name another text of significant more productive resource Roman cultural history. For the early history of literature indispensable, a repository as well for the literary life more generally, understanding of Roman relations, and even for freedmen and slaves. That of Suetonius' rich and accompanied by the first appear in eighty years. The most thorough and detailed elucidates Suetonius' and places the stories in historical context.

Robert A. Kaster is the University of Chicago

C. SUETONIUS TRANQUILLUS

De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus

EDITED WITH A TRANSLATION,
INTRODUCTION, AND COMMENTARY
BY

ROBERT A. KASTER



CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD
1995