Publication ethics and malpractice statement

Storie e Linguaggi, founded by Franco Cardini and Paolo Trovato, is a peer reviewed semestral journal committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics. In order to provide readers with articles of highest quality we state the following principles of Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement.

Authors ensure that they have written original articles. In addition they ensure that the manuscript has not been issued elsewhere. Authors are also responsible for language editing of the submitted article. Authors confirm that the submitted works represent their authors' contributions and have not been copied or plagiarized in whole or in part from other works without clearly citing. Any work or words of other authors, contributors, or sources (including online sites) are appropriately credited and referenced. All authors disclose financial or other conflict of interest that might influence the results or interpretation of their manuscript (financial support for the project should be disclosed). Authors agree to the license agreement before submitting the article.

The editors ensure a fair double-blind peer-review of the submitted papers for publication. The editors strive to prevent any potential conflict of interests between the author and editorial and review personnel. The editors also ensure that all the information related to submitted manuscripts is kept as confidential before publishing.

The editors coordinates the editorial board for reviewing the works to be published in *Storie e Linguaggi*. The reviewers, members of the scientific committee, include experts in the field of higher education, university lecturers and researchers. Each is assigned papers to review that are consistent with their specific expertise.

Reviewers check all papers in a double-blind peer review process. The reviewers also check for plagiarism and research fabrication (making up research data) and falsification (manipulation of existing research data, tables, or images). In accordance with the code of conduct, the reviewers report any cases of suspected plagiarism or duplicate publishing.

Reviewers evaluate manuscripts based on content without regard to ethnic origin, gender, sexual orientation, citizenship, religious belief or political philosophy of the authors. They ensure that all the information related to submitted manuscripts is kept as confidential and must report to the editors if they are aware of copyright infringement and plagiarism on the author's side. They must evaluate the submitted works objectively as well as present clearly their opinions on the works in a clear way in the review form. A reviewer who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript notify the editors and excuses himself from the review process.

Sommario

A new database of the Latin grammarians. Linguistic and philological criteria of the digital markup*

Elena Spangenberg Yanes

Università di Roma La Sapienza

elena.spangenbergyanes@uniroma1.it

Abstract

The paper presents a new database of both critical editions of ancient Latin grammatical works and descriptions of medieval manuscripts of Latin grammarians. The database uses the content creation system *Cadmus* developed in 2020 by Daniele Fusi, that enables a more flexible and complex digital markup than TEI. The former part of the article describes the structure of the database and the underlying criteria of linguistic and philological analysis, setting this research project in the current scholarly debate about digital critical editing. The latter part of the article presents some case-studies that illustrate the textual critical and linguistic markup applied to Latin grammatical texts through *Cadmus*.

1. Introduction

In classical philology, traditionally less productive than other philologies in the digital humanities,[1] scholarly interest has increased in recent years in the opportunity provided by digital media for expanding the range of

---

1 Monella 2018, pp. 141-150.

the materials that a textual critic can record during the preparation of a critical edition but that do not fit in the *textus constitutus* and the critical apparatus:

> At present perhaps the most important contribution of electronic data recording to classical editing is the ability to transcend the limits of traditional book format […]. Exploiting the potential of electronic recording and dissemination of data may call for more collaborative effort on the part of the classicists […]. Textual criticism's hopes for a healthy future depend in part on becoming more closely integrated with the disciplines to which it is connected by its nature and aims: on one hand with a set of historical disciplines – palaeography, history of the book, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* understood as a subdivision of the study of reception – and with literary criticism and analysis on the other.[2]

The realisation of such opportunities is the objective of three on-going research projects comprehending textual-critical and linguistic studies about the ancient and late-antique Latin grammarians as well as the realisation of a digital infrastructure which contains both the critical texts of the grammatical works re-edited after Keil's collection and the catalogue of the Latin grammatical manuscripts until the 10th century:[3]

1. *Thesaurus dubii sermonis (ThDS): Digital Critical Collection of Ancient Latin Linguistics (1st century BC - 8th century CE)*, funded through an A. von Humboldt Stiftung fellowship for advanced re-

---

2   Tarrant 2016, pp. 153-156. See also Monella 2018, pp. 150-153; Malaspina 2019, pp. 47-51; Monella 2019; Fischer 2019, pp. 215-216; Id. 2020, p. 427.

3   The homepage of the editor's interface is http://151.100.184.12/#/home (the login is restricted to the project's collaborators; the interface for the visualisation of the database, including the search tools, is currently under construction and will be open access). About the opportunity of creating digital *corpora* of critical texts in order to encourage systematic analyses and cross searches see Fischer 2017, pp. 266 and 284-287. The digital texts of the Latin grammarians currently available online lack the critical apparatus and allow only for simple textual searches (De Gruyter's *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina*, Brepol's *Library of Latin Texts*) or, in addition to these ones, divide just the text into sections and subsections that reproduce the titles of the books and chapters in the printed editions (*Corpus Corporum* of the University of Zürich, http://www.mlat.uzh.ch/MLS/xanfang.php?corpus=13&lang=0; *digilibLT* of the University of the Piemonte Orientale, https://digiliblt.uniupo.it/).

searchers (2020-2021) at the Thesaurus linguae Latinae (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften), granted to myself, and a research fund of Sapienza University of Rome (2019-2021), directed by Michela Rosellini. *ThDS* is the digital repository of the passages (both fragments and parts of works transmitted in full) of the Latin grammarians dealing with the *dubius sermo*. The collection, which includes only texts with critical apparatus, can be consulted through both authors and lemmata or linguistic concepts.

2. *The Transmission of Ancient Linguistics: Texts and Contexts of the Roman Grammatical Studies*, funded by the Italian Ministry for University and Research (PRIN 2020-2022) and directed by Mario De Nonno (University of Roma Tre) with the participation of the Universities of Pisa, Rome Sapienza, and Verona. It involves the preparation of new critical editions of grammatical texts, which will be published in Olms-Weidmann's series *Collectanea Grammatica Latina*, the digitisation of all the critical editions of Latin grammarians appeared after Heinrich Keil's 19th-century *corpus*, and the online catalogue of the Latin grammatical manuscripts until the 10th century.

3. *Priscian's Ars Grammatica in the European Scriptoria: A Millennium of Latin and Greek Scholarship* (*PAGES*), ERC Advanced Grant (2021-2025), directed by Michela Rosellini (Rome Sapienza). The project aims at the complete new critical edition of Priscian's *Ars grammatica* as well as at a series of studies about the sources, the manuscript tradition, and the early medieval and humanistic reception of this work.[4] All the outputs of the project will be accessible in the same open access database contributed also by the projects *ThDS* and PRIN.

The texts to be published in the database are critically edited according to the Lachmannian genealogical method.[5] The digital editions will include, along with the critical text and the connected apparatuses (critical apparatus and *apparatus fontium et locorum classicorum*), also a series

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

4   See https://web.uniroma1.it/pages.

5   About the reasons of this choice see, among others, Orlandi 1995; Reeve 2011; Trovato 2014, pp. 179-219; Rosellini 2017, pp. 103-109 and 112-116; Malaspina 2019, pp. 36-39; Guillaumin 2020. In this perspective the editions included in the database of the Latin grammarians are not «comprehensively digital editions» in the sense described by Monella 2018, p. 142, i. e. «based (1) on a complete digital transcription of all primary sources and (2) on an automated collation of those transcriptions».

of additional materials about the history of the tradition of the texts (transcriptions), their interpretation (translation, linguistic markup), and documentation (bibliography):[6] therefore, although these editions draw on printed critical texts, they correspond to Sahle's definition of digital edition: «A digital edition cannot be given in print without a significant loss of content and functionality».[7]

To render the digital infrastructure, the three aforementioned projects use the content creation system *Cadmus*,[8] recently developed by Daniele Fusi with the aim of fulfilling the need of scholars in the humanities for building up complex digital databases without dealing directly with TEI XML's limitations and less user-friendly aspects:

> In the traditional content creation process of Scholarly Digital Editions, a "text-centric" perspective is often responsible of the persistence of a "book paradigm" in its digital reincarnation. At least when producing content, we essentially deal with a text which flows from paper to a digital document with annotations (XML) […]. Here, the tree structure laid on the text bears the whole data universe. […] Yet, in some cases, especially with the outgrow of data provided by new types of analysis (e.g. morphological, syntactical or metrical tagging), and/or when handling very complex documents (e.g. inscriptions or

----

6   The already edited works to be included in the database are *Ars Ambian.*, *Ars Bob.*, Arus., Ps. Aug. *reg.*, Bass., Bass. *frg.*, Ps. Bass. *app.*, *De verb. ad Sev.*, *Fin. Metr.*, Fortun., *Frg. Bob. nom.* (ed. Mariotti), *Frg. Bob. nom.* (ed. Passalacqua), Macr. *verb.*, Mall. Theod., Mar. Victorin. *ars*, *Nom. Dub.*, Ps. Palaem. *reg.*; Pomp. III, Prisc. *ars* XVIII.2, *fig. num.*, *inst.*, *metr. Ter.*, *part.*, *rhet.*, Ps. Prisc. *acc.*, Ps. Prob. *app.*, *cath.*, *nom.*, *Rat. Metr.*, Rufin. *metr. Ter.*, *num. or.*, Sacerd., Scaur. *orth.*, Ps. Scaur. *ars*, Serv. *centim.*, Ter. Maur., Vel. *orth.* The editions in preparation regard *Ad Basil.*, *Ars Bern.*, Ps. Caper *orth.*, Consent. *ars*, Mart. Cap. *metr.*, *Orth. Bern.*, Phoc., Pomp. I-II, Prisc. *ars* I-XVIII.1. Further editions of the remaining grammatical works will be planned at a later stage. The complete digital *corpus* will correspond to approximately 5,000 pages of printed text.

7   Sahle 2016, p. 27. Cf. Fischer 2017, p. 279: «the purpose of a corpus lies in its capacity to provide a large number of homogeneously edited texts, not only to ensure a high degree of usability but also to guarantee its feasibility and long-term maintainability. Therefore in principle these editions can be digitized editions».

8   In the field of classical philology *Cadmus* is being adopted also by the databases *Musisque deoque* and *Catullus online* as well as by the project *Purism in Antiquity: Theories of Language in Greek Atticist Lexica and their Legacy* (*PURA*), ERC Consolidator Grant (2021-2025), directed by Olga Tribulato (University of Venice Ca' Foscari): see respectively https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_mqdq; https://github.com/vedph/co_catutil; https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_pura.

complex literary traditions), this may not be the most efficient para-
digm for creating content. In such scenarios a paradigm shift might
be beneficial. Here, TEI might be the final outcome of a more articu-
lated production flow, rather than its starting point. Thinking textual,
meta-textual or non-textual content beyond the technological and
mental markup constraints allows freeing scholars from a number
of practical issues […], letting them focus on their logical rather than
physical models.[9]

In TEI XML, which at the moment represents the standard for digital
databases in the humanities, all annotations (i.e. all information about
a given object) must be referred to a unique base text and anchored in
a unique hierarchy. Subsequently the digital structure is scarcely flex-
ible: the alteration of a single detail in the text or in the annotations can
compel to modify the entire XML document. Furthermore, TEI XML
requires the presentation of objects of different nature within the same
hierarchy: for example, the text and its tradition (i.e. the critical appa-
ratus), or its sources (i. e. the *apparatus fontium et locorum classicorum*).
In this system, it is often difficult to manage the large amount of complex
data, especially given the prohibition against overlap, namely the impos-
sibility to anchor multiple annotations on textual segments that overlap
partially.

Cadmus is a modular solution alternative to the simple "horizontal"
TEI XML markup; however, its databases can be exported in XML for-
mat.[10] It allows the description of objects of any kind – texts, words,
manuscripts, archeological findings, or anything else – and does not
have a predefined structure or markup language: its architecture can be
adapted to the specific needs of every project, for which it is possible to
define an appropriate model without limits in the variety and the overlap
of data and annotations. In order to work with *Cadmus*, users are not
required to install software on their computer or work directly with
XML code, since they can simply work online through a browser in a
human-readable interface. More users can intervene simultaneously on
different aspects (i.e. parts, see below) of the same item, eventually with

---

9   https://fusisoft.net/cadmus/. For a more complete presentation of *Cadmus*, including a
     demo-version of the editor's interface, see https://fusisoft.it/apps/cadmus-show/#/home.

10   See https://github.com/vedph/event_materials/blob/master/2020-03-25_fusi_seminar/
     fusi-cadmus.pdf.

different authorisation levels. *Cadmus*' general code as well as that of the specific *Cadmus*-based projects are available open source on the *GitHub* platform.[11] *Cadmus*' architecture is articulated in three levels:

1. *Items*: empty "containers", which can represent objects of any kind (e.g. in a textual database, an item can be a paragraph of one of the works included in the database; in a catalogue of manuscripts or archeological findings, an item can be the descriptive report on a single manuscript or funding).
2. *Parts*: the various kinds of data that build up every item and can consist in text (*parts*), metatext (*layers*), or extratext (*parts*). Every *part/layer* contains a series of properties and eventually also of classes, namely elementary models of a given kind of data that contain properties in their turn. Properties can consist in strings of free text or can be selected from lists (*thesauri*) of predefined values. The *thesauri* are very important for the indexing and, consequently, for the search of data by the users of the platform. They can consist in both simple or ramified lists (*hierarchical thesauri*); their conceptual classification is called taxonomy. Every project defines its own *thesauri* according to its needs.
3. *Fragments*: every annotation of data in a part or layer is called fragment. An item consists of the entirety of the fragments of the various parts and layers in its model.

2. Applying *Cadmus* to the Latin grammatical works

For the database contributed to by the three aforementioned projects about the Latin grammarians it has been defined a *Cadmus* model that comprehends items of different nature (texts and manuscripts), represented by several parts (text and extratext) and layers (metatext).[12] The items consisting of descriptive reports on manuscripts include only extratext parts according to the following scheme:[13]

---

11 https://github.com/vedph; specifically about the database of the Latin grammarians see https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_tgr.

12 The models can be consulted at https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_tgr_doc/blob/master/models.md.

13 This scheme is based on Petrucci's 2001 model of the description of manuscripts; additionally, it absorbs some aspects of a former project of catalogue of Latin grammatical *codices* of the University of Cassino as well as of the *Cadmus* based project *Petrarch's ITINERA: Italian Trecento Intellectual Network and European Renaissance*

– Ms. Signature
– Historical date
– Ms. Place
– Ms. Contents
– Ms. Units (*sc.* codicological description)
– Ms. Scripts
– Ms. Formal features (*sc.* orthographic and phonetic peculiarities)
– Ms. Ornamentation
– Ms. History
– Generic bibliography (including also the links to the available online digital reproductions of the manuscripts)

As far as textual items are concerned, the objective is «un'edizione in *open source* che, dietro una *facies* convenzionale, comprenda come ipertesto molti materiali che in formato librario non possono trovare adeguato spazio (glosse al testo in diverse lingue e *marginalia* vari, gli inserti greci introdotti nelle edizioni a stampa in sostituzione delle parti greche mancanti, e forse anche tutti gli altri materiali ricavati dalle collazioni, dunque la documentazione completa del materiale vagliato)».[14] With this aim, we developed in *Cadmus* a structure that enables the reconstruction of a critical text on the basis of the genealogical method and, at the same time, that provides documentation more expansive than what is required to demonstrate the stemmatic relationships among the witnesses in the critical apparatus. Thus it responds to Fischer's *desideratum*: «while broadening the agenda and embarking on truly

----

Advent, funded by the Italian Ministry for University and Research (PRIN 2020-2022) and directed by Natascia Tonelli (University of Siena) with the participation of the Universities of Roma Tre, Napoli "Federico II", Perugia per Stranieri (https://github. com/vedph/cadmus_itinera). Both the PAGES and the TAL projects contribute to the catalogue of the Latin grammatical *codices*, respectively for the witnesses of Priscian's works and for those of the remaining grammarians. About the criteria of the *census* of the manuscripts see Degni-Peri 2000; De Paolis 2009; Id. 2013, pp. 23-25. The provisional list of the witnesses to be included in the catalogue, drawn up by De Paolis 2013, pp. 25-49, comprehends 637 items.

14   Rosellini 2017, p. 113 n. 3. Cf. the concept of "archive-edition" proposed by Chiesa 2016, p. 225: «un'edizione critica, con le necessarie selezioni e indicazioni gerarchiche, in cui però non si rinuncia alla presentazione di tutto il materiale noto, mettendolo a disposizione degli studiosi. […] Un'edizione-archivio non è evidentemente indirizzata allo studio del solo punto di partenza, ma dell'intera tradizione».

digital edition projects, classical philologists must not give up on the idea of a critical text and the ideal of some uniform editorial format for authoritative, critical text editions»:[15]

a. Parts of text:
   – Base-text
   – Bibliography
   – Translation
   – Available witnesses (the list of the witnesses available for each portion of text represented by an item)
b. Layers of metatext:
   – Apparatus (*sc. criticus*)
   – Quotations (*sc. apparatus fontium et locorum classicorum*)
   – Transcriptions (with four different roles: glosses; humanistic interpolations; paleographical transcriptions; paratext)[16]
   – Linguistic tags

In this paper I will deal in particular with the Quotations, Linguistic tags, and Transcriptions layers. I leave aside the presentation of the Apparatus layer because it does not introduce substantial innovations in respect to the traditional apparatus of printed editions, except for the possibility to make cross searches within it.

3. The markup of the literary quotations

The model that we designed in *Cadmus* for the digital markup of the literary citations transmitted by the Latin grammarians is the following one: what is included in round brackets indicates for each point whether

---

15   Fischer 2019, p. 207. Cf. Fischer 2017, p. 265: «the number of digital-facsimiles of manuscripts and early printed books and the quantity of document-oriented transcriptions available online is growing continually, and with it the need for critically examined and edited texts increases»; Monella 2019, p. 63. Therefore there is not necessarily a dichotomy between the fact that «The added value that a digital edition can provide only becomes worth the effort of a comprehensive digitization of the sources in the framework of a "plural" concept of text and language» and «the concept of (1) *one* authoritative text and (2) *one* pure language» (Monella 2018, p. 151). About the use of more layers and of markup to provide in a digital critical edition more data than in a printed one, but nevertheless in a hierarchical or "digested" way, cf. Fischer 2017, pp. 278-280; Id. 2019, pp. 210-211.

16   This layer is used only in the items produced by the *PAGES* project.

it is a property, represented by a string of text, that can be selected from a *thesaurus*, or a class containing in its turn a series of properties or further classes; the properties marked with an asterisk are obligatory; the properties and classes followed by square brackets [] are arrays, that is, they may contain a series of values rather than a single one:

– quotations (VarQuotation[]): quotations with variants:
  • tag (string, thesaurus)
  • authority* (string, thesaurus): the authority type (grammatical / linguistic)
  • work* (string, hierarchical thesaurus): author and work
  • location* (string): location in the work (book, chapter etc.)
  • parallels (QuotationParallel[]): further occurrences of the same quotation in other grammatical works:
    o tag (string, thesaurus)
    o work* (string, hierarchical thesaurus): author and work
    o location* (string): location in the work (book, chapter etc.)
  • variants (QuotationVariant[]): variant readings:
    o lemma* (string)
    o type* (string, thesaurus)
    o value* (string)
    o witnesses (AnnotatedValue[]):
      ◊ value* (string)
      ◊ note (string)
    o authors (LocAnnotatedValue[]):
      ◊ tag (string): any optional classification for the author (e.g. ancient vs modern)
      ◊ value* (string, optional hierarchical thesaurus)
      ◊ location (string)
      ◊ note (string)

In the Quotations layer, in order to encode the literary and grammatical sources of our grammarians, we use a *thesaurus* of authors and works,[17] which draws on the *Index* of the *ThlL* for the Latin texts, on the abbreviations of *LSJ* for the Greek ones (with modifications). The *thesaurus* consists, of course, of only a selection of the *ThlL*'s *Index*, with

----

17 https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_tgr_api/blob/master/CadmusTgrApi/wwwroot/seed-profile.json ll. 1069-10877.

a few modifications as far as grammatical works are concerned. Another option would be to cite according to the digital *Perseus Catalog*;[18] however, although such tool has been developed by two distinguished institutions, namely Tufts University and Leipzig University, it does not conform to the standard for the citations of Latin texts, and it lacks several rare or late antique authors, including especially various grammarians. Similar to a printed *apparatus locorum classicorum*, we mark citations for which there is no certain identification in the preserved literary works but only some terms of comparison with the property *tag* with value *cf.*

Just as in the earlier version of the *ThDS*, conceived in XML TEI, we also use the digital tools in *Cadmus* to resolve the problem of the individuation of the limits of the citations, especially from prose texts, within ancient works – a problem that affects the editors of fragmentary texts in particular.[19] In the case of citations in direct speech, the encoding fragment of the Quotations layer that contains the indication of the provenance of the citation is applied to the entire citation, including its introducing expression. For instance, in Arus. 5, 9-10 Abundat illa re. *Cicero pro Cluentio: 'mulier abundat audacia'*, the metadata «Cic. *Cluent.* 184» is linked to the textual segment *Cicero ~ audacia*. We also include in the segment encoded as a citation the introducing expressions (in the example, *Cicero pro Cluentio*) because it is useful to index them in order to analyse the *Zitierweise* of different grammarians. In the case of citations in reported speech as well as of mentions of the name of an author that are not followed by a citation, the fragment of metadata is applied only to the name of the author and/or the title of the work mentioned by the grammarian. For instance, in *Nom. Dub.* B6 Barones *dicendum, sicut Cicero ad Pansam*, the metadata «Cic. epist. frg. 5, 4» is connected to the words *Cicero ad Pansam*. The same criteria are applied in the encoding of citations in the Linguistic tags layer. Therefore, in Arus. 5, 9-10 the linguistic tags are linked to both the lemma Abundat illa re and the segment *Cicero ~ audacia*; in *Nom. Dub.* B6 to the lemma Barones and the mention *Cicero ad Pansam*.

Adapting again the earlier version of the *ThDS*,[20] the model of the *Quotations layer* in *Cadmus* can distinguish, through a specific tag, the

---

18   https://catalog.perseus.org/. For the works included in both the *ThlL*'s *Index* and the *Perseus Catalog* it would be still possible to define correspondences between the two lists and to produce subsequently citations according to both systems.

19   Rosellini-Spangenberg Yanes 2019, p. 276.

20   *Ibidem.*

literary sources cited by the grammarians in order to document a linguistic phenomenon, from the grammatical sources cited as theoretical references. The two types of sources are marked through the property *authority* with the values of *linguistic* and *grammatical* respectively. In view of such distinction, the simple mentions of *veteres* or *antiqui* (*et sim.*) are also encoded as citations; indeed, although they are generic, they nevertheless represent references to some kind of authority, sometimes a linguistic one, other times a grammatical one.

The class *parallels* is used to register further occurrences of a given literary example, in connection with the same linguistic phenomenon, in other ancient grammatical or lexicographical texts. Through the class *variants* we encode, in the text of the passages cited by the grammarians, the variant readings attested by the direct tradition (*witnesses*) of the cited works (if they have one) or by other sources of indirect tradition (*authors*). The same class can also encode the conjectures of modern scholars (once again through the sub-class *authors*).

4. Criteria of the linguistic markup

The *Linguistic tags layer* contains the lexicographic and linguistic markup and is conceived as a kind of linguistic "running commentary" on the *corpus* of the Latin grammarians.

– forms (LingTaggedForm[]):
  • lemmata (string[]): optional normalized text forms
  • dubious (boolean): *Thesaurus Dubii Sermonis*
  • note (string)
  • tags (AnnotatedTag[]):
    o value* (string, hierarchical thesaurus)
    o notes (TaggedNote[]):
      ◊ tag* (string)
      ◊ note* (string)

The linguistic metadata apply only to the forms and phenomena dealt with by the grammarians; they classify the reasons for which a grammarian mentions a given form or linguistic category. The class *form* individuates the specific letter, word, syntagm, or larger linguistic phenomenon taken into account by the grammarian. If *form* consists of a single word, it will also contain the property *lemma*, namely a string of free text where the user registers the corresponding lemmatised form in the *ThlL* for Latin words

(and in the *OLD* for entries not yet available in the *ThlL*), in *LSJ* for Greek words (and in the *LBG* for the forms of late Greek not registered by *LSJ*). When *form* consists, instead, of an entire linguistic category (*e.g.* Char. 83, 17 *'As' terminata nomina casu nominativo*), our annotation will not contain the property *lemma*. Homograph lemmata are distinguished, in the property *lemma* as well as in the reference lexica, with a numeral written after the lemma and a comma (*e.g. ThlL s. v. 1. dico* [Gudeman], V.1 963, 28 and *ThlL s. v. 2. dico* [Lommatzsch], V.1 967, 15 will be indicated respectively as *dico, 1* and *dico, 2*). We decided not to make reference to the online Latin lexicon of the ERC project *Lila* (*Linking Latin*, https://lila-erc.eu/query/), which currently appears to be a promising digital experiment but whose linguistic and lexicographical depth is insufficient for our project.

To each *form* we apply tags, for which we established a double system of taxonomy (*ancient tags* and *modern tags*),[21] developed from the model of markup in TEI XML that we had defined in an earlier version of the *ThDS* project.[22] The model takes into account, through a double series of tags, both the ancient grammatical theory and modern historical linguistics. Indeed, only through a double set of linguistic markup it is possible to achieve an efficient indexing for the needs of every specialist – experts either in philology or history of linguistics or historical linguistics – and a surplus hermeneutical value given by the use of the digital medium. Such indexing fosters a better understanding of the ancient and late antique grammatical terminology and theory, it makes connections between different definitions of the same phenomenon or form given by different grammarians, it refines our understanding of the connection between the use of multiple sources and the diversity of terminology and theoretical approaches among the various parts of the same grammatical work (*e.g.* Priscian describes the same form in different ways in the books about syntax and in those about morphology), and it recognizes the individual contributions of individual grammarians in the theoretical reflection about a specific linguistic phenomenon.

The *ancient tags* reproduce the concepts and, as far as possible, the terminology of ancient grammar; we identify them both through the survey of Latin grammatical works and with the aid of Morelli's *Nomenclator metricus Graecus et Latinus* (2006) as well as of Schad's *Lexicon of Latin*

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

21   https://github.com/vedph/cadmus_tgr_api/blob/master/CadmusTgrApi/wwwroot/ seed-profile.json ll. 10878-15331. See also http://www.fusisoft.it/xfer/ling-tags.mp4.

22   Rosellini-Spangenberg Yanes 2019, pp. 272-290.

Grammatical Terminology (2007). The *modern tags* adopt, instead, the conceptual schemes of modern linguistics, in particular, those of historical linguistics. For historical phonetics and morphology as well as for syntax, the taxonomy of our project draws on Leumann (1977) and Hofmann – Szantyr (1965); however, for syntax we also rely on Pinkster (2015; 2021). In the field of metrics, our references are Questa (2007) for dramatic metres, Boldrini (1992) for dactylic metres, and Boldrini together with Rosellini (1997) for lyrical metres. The *ancient tags* are in Latin and may encompass a series of synonyms (*e. g. coniunctivus / subiunctivus*; *imperativus / mandativus*; *gerundium / gerundivum / supinum / participiale*).

The taxonomy of the *ancient tags* reproduces mostly, in its internal structure, the typical structure of the *artes grammaticae*, that is, two initial sections *de littera* (that we combined with *de orthographia*) and *de syllaba*, a section *de pedibus / metris*, and eight sections about the various parts of the speech for the exposition of morphology. Additionally, our taxonomy includes a section *de partibus orationis*, which can be used to encode the ancient discussions about the identity of the part of the speech of a given form (*e. g. supra* can be both an adverb and a preposition, as Priscian observes in *ars GL* III 83, 25-27). Within each one of these macro-sections there is an additional element, which presents the *accidentia* (i. e. features) of each part of the speech according to Latin grammarians: for instance, *de nomine*: *genera*: *commune*; *dubium*; *epicoenum / promiscuum*; *femininum*; *masculinum*; *neutrum*.[23]

Finally, the last section of the *thesaurus* of *ancient tags* concerns details *de constructione*, that is, about syntax. The tags included here result mostly from the survey of books 17-18 of the *Ars Prisciani*. There are fewer branches than for other categories of *ancient tags* due to an intrinsic feature of the ancient Latin works about syntax. Indeed, they are less schematic than those about prosody, morphology, and metrics, because they represent a relatively "new" field of Latin grammatical reflection, little developed with the exception of Priscian, who draws on Greek models, namely Apollonius Dyscolus and an Atticistic syntactical lexicon.[24]

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

23   Here and in the following examples the sign / separates equivalent definitions of the same category. The colon separates, instead, subsequent hierarchical levels of the taxonomy. The semicolon separates multiple tags of the same level.

24   See Baratin 1989, pp. 367-376; Rosellini 2010; Ead. 2012; Ferri 2014; Ucciardello 2014; Valente 2014; Spangenberg Yanes 2017a, pp. xliii-liii and lxi-lxvi; Ead. 2017b, pp. 59-76; Ead. 2019.

The *modern tags* cover the various fields of the study of the language (phonetics, metrics, morphology, orthography, prosody, semantics, syntax); furthermore, they include some additional ticks to be put against ancient observations of textual criticism (i.e. when grammarians record variant readings in the tradition of the literary works they cite, *e. g.* Prisc. *ars GL* II 256, 16-20 *apud Horatium duplicem invenio scripturam et 'fastos' et 'fastus' in III carminum: 'per memores genus omne fastos', et 'fastus' in aliis codicibus*),[25] sociolinguistics (for the occurrences of the concepts of *rusticitas*, *urbanitas* etc.), and historical linguistics (for the references to *antiqui, antiquissimi, veteres, vetustissimi*, and similar categories). Whereas the *ancient tags* concerning morphology follow the ancient subdivisions for the *partes orationis*, in the *modern tags* for *morphology*, the linguistic features shared by multiple parts of the speech are unified in order to avoid cumbersome repetitions. So, for instance, the tags *number*: *singular*; *dual*; *plural* can be used for adjectives, nouns, pronouns, and verbs. In particular, *morphology*: *inflectional type* contains the tags concerning both nominal and verbal stems, which are distinguished through a further subdivision of the *thesaurus* (*nominal*; *verbal*, containing the tags that identify the specific stem-vowels and consonants for nouns and verbs respectively). Other tags apply only to one part of the speech, like *mood: imperative*; *indicative*; *subjunctive*, which apply only to verbs.

The double linguistic taxonomy serves to avoid interpretative errors and losses of information, which would inevitably occur if one adopted a single system of tags (following either ancient or modern linguistic concepts). It enables also a double historical perspective:

1. history of linguistics, reconstruction of the ensemble of concepts and technical terms developed by the ancients;
2. history of the language, analysis of the linguistic documentation gathered by the ancients and useful to reconstruct the diachronic development as well as the diastratic varieties of the Latin language from the point of view of modern linguistics.

Indeed, differences between ancient theory and modern scholarship occur at all levels of the study of the language. The most obvious examples regard the identification of the parts of speech themselves: the par-

----

25   See De Nonno 1998, p. 37.

ticiple represents a unique part of speech according to ancient schemes, whereas it is a verb (more precisely, a verbal adjective) according to modern linguistics; on the other hand, the adjective is for us a different part of speech from the noun, but for ancient Latin grammarians, it is merely a subcategory (*species*) of the noun.

> In expositions *de nomine* some grammarians consider the instrumental ablative as "seventh case", distinguished from the ablative of origin/separation.[26] From a morphological point of view they are of course a unique form. On the contrary, ancient grammarians describe the remaining forms of locative of -*ā*- and -*ŏ*- stems as genitives or datives expressing position in space (this definition survived for a long time in modern school teaching of Latin).[27] The *species nominum* and *verborum* of ancient Latin grammar correspond rather to suffixes (mostly denominative and deverbative ones) in terms of modern linguistics.
>
> In the domain of verbal morphology a well-known example of substantive difference between ancient and modern theory is the one of the future perfect / future subjunctive.[28] Furthermore, some authors, trying to bring the exposition of Latin grammar nearer to the one of Greek, distinguish an *optativus* and a *subiunctivus* mood: however, from a morphological point of view they are the same thing.[29] Other Latin grammarians consider the *impersonale* a mood.[30] Gerundive is often described as a passive future participle (*e.g.* Don. *min.* 597, 18-598, 1; Char. 210, 14-17; Prisc. *ars GL* II 567, 4-6) – such a definition is by the way more appropriate from the point of view of historical morphology than the one widespread in modern grammatical terminology.[31]

In the *modern tags* we distinguish *orthography* from *phonetics*, whereas in the *ancient tags* we group together in the category *De littera / De orthographia* all the annotations concerning these two fields. With the same category merge phonetic-orthographic observations included both in the chapters *de littera* of the *artes grammatical* and in selfstanding treatises

---

26   Murru 1980; Schad 2007, p. 358.

27   See Traina-Bernardi Perini,1998, pp. 201-205.

28   Rosellini 2008; Ead. 2009.

29   Jeep 1893, pp. 216-226.

30   Ivi, pp. 229-234.

31   Hofmann-Szantyr 1965, pp. 368-370.

de orthographia. For instance, the graphic representation of long vowels as diphthongs and the writing *gg* and *gc* for /ng/ and /nk/ pertain properly to orthography but Priscian puts them without distinction together with many notions of phonetics in the chapter *De littera* of book 1 (*GL* II 30, 12-21; 37, 9-11). At least for some phenomenes the difference between the two aspects is however clear to Priscian himself: this is the case of *ars GL* II 6, 24-7, 7 *Hoc ergo interest inter elementa et litteras, quod elementa proprie dicuntur ipsae pronuntiationes, notae autem earum litterae. Abusive tamen et elementa pro litteris et litterae pro elementis vocantur. Cum enim dicimus non posse constare in eadem syllaba 'r' ante 'p', non de litteris dicimus, sed de pronuntiatione earum: nam quantum ad scripturam possunt coniungi, non tamen etiam enuntiari, nisi postposita 'r'*. Here the grammarian distinguishes *litterae* and *elementa* with regard to the nexus *-rp-*: these two letters cannot be pronounced together (i. e. they cannot stay in the same syllable), but of course they can be written one after the other.

The tags exclusively encode – in both ancient and modern terms – the linguistic features of a given *form* observed by the grammarian author of the base-text and not other features. For example, the noun *cardo* is sometimes mentioned with regard to the length of the final *-o* (Char. 79, 7): in these cases we apply to *cardo* the ancient tag *De littera / De orthographia*: *vocalis*: *brevis / correpta* and the modern one *phonetics*: *vocalism*: *vowel length*. Other times *cardo* is mentioned with regard to its gender (Phoc. *GL* V 413, 24; Ps. Caper *orth. GL* VII 101, 13; *dub. GL* VII 108, 13; Non. p. 202, 15-19 = III C47; Prisc. *ars GL* II 145, 23; 169, 9; 349, 26-27): in these passages we apply to it the ancient tags *De nomine*: *genera*: *dubium* and/or *femininum* and/or *masculinum*, and the modern ones *morphology*: *gender*: *masculine*; *feminine*. Finally, when *cardo* is cited for its declension (Sacerd. 2, 1, 33 ≈ Ps. Prob. *cath.* 1, 33) the ancient tag is *De nomine*: *declinationes*: *III*, the modern one is *morphology*: *inflectional type*: *nominal*: *n*: *-ĭn-*.

If from a passage concerning the prosody of *cardo* appears incidentally also the gender of this noun, but the grammarian does not remark it, we do not markup it in the database. On the contrary, one can select for every *form*, in both sets of tags, more than one tag if the grammarian registers at the same time more features of the same linguistic form. For instance, again *cardo* is cited twice for both its uncertain gender and the *-n-* stem (Prisc. *ars GL* II 206, 10-13; *Nom. Dub.* C47): in these cases we pick up from the *ancient tags* both *De nomine*: *genera*: *dubium* + *femininum* +

masculinum and *De nomine*: *declinationes*: *III*, from the *modern tags* both *morphology*: *gender*: *masculine* + *feminine* and *morphology*: *inflectional type*: *nominal*: *n*: *-ĭn-*. Just as in the passages just discussed, when the grammarians qualify a linguistic feature, such as nominal gender, as uncertain, we select multiple options together in the markup, like both feminine and masculine.

In addition to the property *lemma* and the linguistic tags, the class *form* can also contain the property *Thesaurus dubii sermonis* (a simple tick): it serves the purpose of marking the passages and lemmata that can be traced back to the erudite tradition about linguistic uncertainty and should be included in the *Thesaurus dubii sermonis* (see above, pp. 2-3).[32]

5. Paleographical transcriptions of single witnesses, paratext, glosses, and interpolations

Four further layers of markup, sharing the same *Cadmus* model but with different roles, are used in the database of the Latin grammarians only for the *Ars Prisciani*, that is the specific object of the ERC project *PAGES* (see above, p. 3; p. 8 n. 16). These layers are designed for the paleographical transcriptions of single witnesses, of paratext, of early medieval glosses, and of Humanistic interpolations. They allow Priscian's digital critical editors to publish and markup a series of additional materials, that cast light on the history of the tradition of the *Ars* but cannot find place in a printed edition. The use of several separate layers to encode this kind of information enables to make it available to readers without making the critical apparatus layer heavier through the insertion of data irrelevant for documenting stemmatic relationships and ecdotic choices.

It is commonly stated in studies of digital philology that the critical apparatus of printed editions is selective in order to stay within the physical constraints of the printed page;[33] this kind of observations is, in my view,

----

32   Consequently we register in this way mostly passages of works dealing with the *dubius sermo*. Nevertheless, for the reasons explained in Rosellini-Spangenberg Yanes 2019, pp. 270-272 and 278-282, the *ThDS* does not comprehend only the "nominative" fragments of the authors of works *de dubio sermone*, *de dubiis generibus* etc., but in general all the passages concerning linguistic uncertainties in the *corpus* of the preserved Latin grammatical texts; therefore it is likely that the *ThDS* will collect also material originating more generally from expositions *de Latinitate*.

33   *E. g.* Monella 2018, p. 150: «Due to space constraints, the print *apparatus* tends to select "substantial" readings»; see also Andrews 2013, pp. 64-65; Monella 2019, pp. 64-65.

implicitly bounded with the idea of a digital critical apparatus that can be increased *ad libitum*. This is what happens indeed in TEI XML, where variant readings and conjecture of any kind, although they are usually accompanied by an attribute @*type* specifying their nature,[34] are encoded within the base-text through the elements <app> and <rdg>.

More properly, however, it is not the critical apparatus but the printed edition as a whole that, due to lack of space, leaves aside orthographic variants and singular readings. The latter, indeed, even when more space is occasionally available, find their place in appendixes and not in the apparatus.[35] Rather than for physical constraints, the apparatus has long been selective due to the methodological need to organize information into a hierarchy. From this point of view *Cadmus*' modular structure, unlike TEI XML, makes it possible to keep information of different nature and importance (significative variants, singular readings, orthographic variants) in separate "containers", without extending indiscriminately the range of readings to be recorded in the digital critical apparatus (see also below, pp. 28-30).

Cadmus' model and the use of *thesauri* in it allow it to index the metadata recorded in the *Transcriptions layer* (as well as in the other *layers* of the model) and to cross-search them.[36]

– transcriptions (Interpolation[]):
  • type* (string, thesaurus)
  • role* (string, thesaurus)
  • tag (string, thesaurus)
  • languages* (string[], thesaurus)
  • value* (string)
  • groupId (string)
  • note (string)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

34   As it has been proposed by Malaspina 2019, p. 49; Monella 2020, pp. 140-141.

35   Cf. Mariotti 1961, p. 220: «gli editori di testi classici, preoccupati soprattutto e giustamente di ricostruire il testo dei loro autori, spesso trascurano i diversi fini per cui altri potrebbero profittare delle loro ricerche su certe tradizioni manoscritte. Non di rado essi debbono esplorare un materiale ampio e difficilmente accessibile, cioè fare un lavoro che non è agevole ripetere. Quando possono, dovrebbero fornire – in prefazione, in appendice, in lavori particolari – un'informazione almeno orientativa su quanto per il loro intento di editori hanno lasciato in ombra o messo da parte».

36   An earlier version of the model for the paleographical transcriptions of single witnesses and glosses, in TEI XML, is presented in Monella 2020.

- sources (ReadingSource[])
  - witness* (string, thesaurus)
  - handId (string)
- quotations (VarQuotation[])

In the digital edition of the *Ars Prisciani*, the first *Transcriptions layer* serves the purpose of recording – separately from the critical apparatus, which collects only significative readings and conjectures – the paleographical transcriptions of single witnesses for "priviledged" parts of text, namely all the Greek parts of text and the citations of Latin fragmentary works. The former are useful to the linguistic and paleographical study of the transmission of the *Graeca* in Latin texts in early medieval West. The latter are made available to the scientific community, in particular to textual scholars expert in fragmentary literature.[37]

The second *layer* is dedicated to the interlinear and marginal glosses in the early medieval witnesses of the *Ars*: in the first instance our digital collection includes only the Latin glosses regarding Priscian's *Graeca*, but the same model can be applied also to the analysis and publication of glosses in whatever language (*e. g.* Breton, Old High German) concerning also the Latin parts of the *Ars*.

The third *layer* contains the transcriptions of the paratext in Priscian's manuscripts: *incipit* and *explicit* phrases, titles of books and sub-sections of books, and above all the subscriptions put at the end of some books of the *Ars* by Flavius Theodorus, Priscian's pupil and scribe of the first copy of the *Ars*.[38]

Lastly, the fourth *layer* is designed for the transcriptions of the interpolations of Greek citations to be found in 15th-16th-century printed editions of the *Ars*, in which such interpolations compensated for the omission of the *Graeca* in contemporary manuscripts.[39]

The choice to publish individual transcriptions for only specific parts of text and/or particular kinds of witnesses is certainly constrained by the fact that the objectives of the research project have to be realistic as far as duration of the project itself and availability of scientific personnel are concerned. But it responds also to the precise decision to provide readers with reasoned and hierachized ones rather than with "plain"

---

37   Following the model of the transcriptions *in usum editorum* by Rosellini 2014.

38   See Ballaira 1989, pp. 57-73; De Nonno 2009, pp. 271-273.

39   See Baldi 2014; Rosellini 2015, pp. cxxxiii-cxxxvi.

ones.[40] Therefore the four *Transcriptions layers* serve the purpose of documenting and analysing various aspects of the tradition of the *Ars Prisciani* that previous studies have identified as the most noteworthy and peculiar to the domain of the medieval and humanistic traditions of Latin texts.

6. Examples

In this paragraph I discuss some examples of the application of the *Cadmus* model designed for the database of the three ongoing research projects about Latin grammarians that I described above (pp. 2-3). I present some illustrative passages, useful for demonstrating the main fields of linguistics practiced by ancient grammarians as well as the digital markup in the various layers described above and the underlying linguistic and philological analysis. For each passage I reproduce *exempli gratia* the digital markup of only one linguistic form and one literary citation, even if more forms or citations are introduced and/or discussed in the passage.

6.1 Quotations layer: the various ways the grammarians cite Varro

Scaur. *orth*. 6, 5, 2 (p. 29, 11-14) cites Varro as a source of linguistic doctrine (*authority type*: *grammatical*) and reports his thought indirectly, without a quotation in direct speech; therefore we apply the tag *quotation* only to the name *Varro*. Thus we avoid the problem of the individuation of the boundaries of Varro's fragment of indirect tradition.

On the contrary, in *Nom. Dub.* P26 Varro is mentioned as linguistic authority, attesting the use of the plural masculine *porri* (instead of the neuter *porrum*). In this case the citation is in direct speech and its boundaries are clearly recognizable. Consequently, the tag *quotation* is applied to the entire textual segment of the citation, including also the indication of its provenance, which consists here of the author name alone.

---

40   Cf. Fischer 2017, pp. 280-281: «Instead of accumulating textual evidence and transcriptions of witnesses, they [*sc.* i *corpora* digitali di edizioni critiche] should focus on critical value, i. e. critical annotation, deep mark-up and the establishment of some kind of representative text version with a canonical work structure. This does not mean that transcriptions and facsimiles etc. should not be included; they should in some way. It is just a matter of prioritizing when creating a digital corpus».

Scaur. *orth.* 6, 5, 2 (p. 29, 11-14)	*Quotations layer*

Negat <u>Varro</u> etiam 'Gracco' aspirandum, quoniam a 'gerendo' sit cognominatus: matrem enim eius qui primus Graccus sit dictus duodecim mensibus utero ‹eum› gessisse.	quotation:
	– authority type: grammatical
	– work: Varro *ling.*
	– location: *frg.* 80
	– parallels:
	    • work: Char.
	    • location: 103, 8-13

Nom. Dub. P26	*Quotations layer*

Porrum gen. ni., sed <u>Varro: 'ponuntur tenuis</u>[41] <u>porri'</u>.	quotation:
	– authority type: linguistic
	– work: Varro *Men.*
	– location: 580
	– parallels:
	    • tag: *cf.*
	    • work: Lucil.
	    • location: 1370

6.2 Linguistic tags layer: the *Persi*-type genitives

Various grammarians deal with the genitive *Persi*, which they mention always in connection with Sall. *hist. frg.* 1, 8 and often together with other genitives in *-i* of Greek names whose nominative singular ends in *-es* (e. g. *Achilli, Ulixi, Oronti*). They give three different interpretations for this kind of form:[42] some grammarians describe them simply as genitives in *-i*;[43] others consider them as datives of the third declension used instead of the corresponding genitives;[44] others again classify them as the results of the apocope of the final *-s* in the genitives in *-is* of the

---

41   Sc. *tenues*. On the orthography of *De nominibus dubiis* see Spangenberg Yanes 2020, pp. LXXVIII-XCI.

42   It is unclear which one of the following options is referred to by Serv. *Aen.* 1, 220 Oronti *pro 'Orontis', ut 'inmitis Achilli'*. [[*Vitavit* ὁμοιοτέλευτον]].

43   *Ars Bob.* 12, 12-15; 16, 5-6; Char. 48, 5-8; 86, 14-19; Ps. Prob. *inst. GL* IV 95, 13-17; *Explan. in Don. GL* IV 537, 4-6; Prisc. *ars GL* II 185, 3~6. The genitive in *-i* is qualified as "archaism" by in Serv. auct. *Aen.* 2, 7 '*Ulixi' autem vetus genetivus est, ut 'atque inmitis Achilli'*; 3, 87 inmitis Achilli *veteres 'Achillis' declinabant*.

44   Sacerd. 2, 1, 86; Ps. Prob. *cath.* 1, 80; 1, 86; 28, 15-20; Prisc. *ars GL* II 246, 16-247, 9; *GL* III 188, 15-19.

third declension.[45] In terms of historical linguistics such forms should result, according to Leumann,[46] from the monophthongation and contraction of the genitives in *-ēī* of an original Latin inflection of these Greek nouns (with nominative in -ης or -εύς) as stems in *-ē-*. However Leumann himself (*ibid.*) lists the ending *-i* of the singular genitive of these names also in their alternative inflection scheme that follows the third declension.

If we marked up digitally this kind of genitive in *-i* only in the terms of the ancient grammarians, we would disperse the passages of different grammarians regarding the same type of linguistic forms across three categories (*De littera / De orthographia*; *De nomine*; *De constructione*). If we also apply to these passages tags based on the interpretation of the genitive *Persi* according to modern linguistics, which apply to all occurrences of this form in the *corpus* of the Latin grammarians, the different passages will be conveniently connected. However, the digital markup in modern terms would not be sufficient alone. Indeed, if we gave up the markup in ancient terms, we would lose the opportunity to reconstruct, in a complete way, the ensemble of the ancient theories about some phonetic-prosodic (apocope) or syntactical (exchange of cases) phenomena. Therefore it is necessary to encode the expositions of the genitives *Persi* and *Achilli* (*et sim.*) through the *ancient tags* according to the interpretation given by each grammarian and through the *modern tags* according to the modern consideration of such forms, namely as singular genitives of the *-ē-* stems. In the following table I include only the passages where Sall. *hist. frg.* 1, 8 is cited; for the other passages about the same kind of genitive, see above, nn. 42-45.

---

45   Don. *mai.* 661, 9; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 30; 8, 383, where Asper is indicated as the source of this theory; Pomp. *GL* V 297, 6-12; Consent. *barb.* 5, 9-10.

46   Leumann 1977, p. 458.

Sacerd. 2, 1, 86 (≈ Ps. Prob. *cath*. 1, 86)[47]	*Linguistic tags layer*

'Ses': hac syllaba nomina finita Graeca sunt: indifferenter quoque declinantur, et primae sunt declinationis 'sae' <facientia genetivo> et tertiae 'sis', ut 'Cambyses Cambysae' vel 'Cambysis, <u>Perses Persae' vel 'Persis</u>'. Nam quod <u>Sallustius ‹ait› 'ad bellum Persi Macedonicum'</u>, non declinationem mutavit, sed antiqua usus est consuetudine, dativum posuit pro genetivo, ut Cicero: 'filiumque Verri' pro 'Verris', et Vergilius: 'inmitis Achilli' pro 'Achillis'.	– form:
	– lemma: *Perses*, 2
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus
	  • De nomine: declinationes: I + III
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: $\bar{a}$ + $\breve{\imath}$
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • language concerned: Latin
	***
	– lemma: *Perses*, 2
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus + dativus
	  • De nomine: declinationes: III
	  • De constructione: variatio: per accidentia: diversi casus
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: $\bar{e}$
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • history of language
	  • language concerned: Latin

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ps. Prob. *cath*. 1, 80	*Linguistic tags layer*

Omnia igitur tertiae sunt declinationis, quoniam 'is' faciunt genetivo. Inveni et genetivo 'Chremi', sed antiqua est ratio declinationis dativo uti pro genetivo: 'infelicis Ulixi' pro 'Ulixis'; 'Achilli' pro 'Achillis'; '<u>ad bellum Persi Macedonicum</u>' pro 'Persis'.	form:
	– lemma: *Perses*, 2
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus + dativus
	  • De nomine: declinationes: III
	  • De constructione: variatio: per accidentia: diversi casus
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: $\bar{e}$
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • history of language
	  • language concerned: Latin

Ars Bob. 16, 5-6	*Linguistic tags layer*

Terentius 'Chremi' declinavit, ut <u>Sallustius 'Persi'</u>: 'etiam puerum inde abiens conveni Chremi'.	form:
	– lemma: *Perses, 2*
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: $\bar{e}$
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • history of language
	  • language concerned: Latin

Char. 86, 14-19	*Linguistic tags layer*

Inveniuntur autem apud veteres quae sine ratione genetivum faciunt per 'i', ut <u>apud Sallustium in prima historia: 'bellum Persi Macedonicum'</u>. Item apud Vergilium: 'atque inmitis Achilli', et alio loco: 'pellacis Ulixi'.	form:
	– lemma: *Perses, 2*
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus
	  • De nomine: declinationes: III

	– modern tags:
	• morphology: case: genitive
	• morphology: inflectional type: nominal: *ē*
	• morphology: number: singular
	• history of language
	• language concerned: Latin

Serv. *Aen.* 1, 30	*Linguistic tags layer*

Achilli propter ὁμοιοτέλευτον detraxit 's' litteram, quae plerumque pro sibilo habetur non solum necessitatis, sed etiam euphoniae causa, [[nam alibi ipse ait 'nec equis adspirat Achillis'.]] Ut <u>Sallustius: 'a principio urbis ad bellum Persi Macedonicum'</u>. Detrahitur autem tertiae declinationis genetivo.	form:
	– lemma: *Perses, 2*
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De littera / De orthographia: detractio
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus
	  • De nomine: declinationes: III
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: *ē*
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • language concerned: Latin

Serv. *Aen.* 8, 383	*Linguistic tags layer*

'Neri' autem pro 'Nerei': omnia enim quae in 'eus' exeunt hodie apud maiores in 'es' exibant, ut 'Nereus Neres, Tydeus Tydes', et genetivum in 'is' mittebant: 'Tydis, Neris'. Sed quia plerumque 's' [[supra]] in Latinitate detrahitur, remanebat 'is'. Hinc est 'filia Nerei', 'inmitis Achilli', item <u>in Sallustio: 'ad bellum Persi Macedonicum'</u>. Sic Asper.	form:
	– lemma: *Perses, 2*
	– Thesaurus dubii sermonis
	– ancient tags:
	  • De littera / De orthographia: detractio
	  • De nomine: casus: genetivus
	– modern tags:
	  • morphology: case: genitive
	  • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: *ē*
	  • morphology: number: singular
	  • language concerned: Latin

Prisc. *ars GL* III 187, 13~188, 19[48]	*Linguistic tags layer*
Diversi quoque casus vel casus pro casibus figurate tam a nostris quam a Graecis saepissime ponuntur […]. <u>Idem historiarum I: 'nam a primordio urbis ad bellum Persi Macedonicum'</u>, pro 'Persis'. Vergilius in I Aeneidis: 'Troas, relliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli', pro 'Achillis'.	form: – lemma: *Perses, 2* – Thesaurus dubii sermonis – ancient tags: • De constructione: variatio: per accidentia: diversi casus / casus pro casibus – modern tags: • morphology: case: genitive • morphology: inflectional type: nominal: *ē* • morphology: number: singular • language concerned: Latin

6.3. Linguistic tags layer: ancient metricologists and annotated tags

For metrics alone, the *thesaurus* of the linguistic tags also includes some values to which free remarks (*note*) can be added. This is meant to make it easier to deal with the ancient terminological (and in part also conceptual) variety. It also allows the different names given by ancient metricologists for the various *species* of each type of verse to be recorded (*e. g.*, in the two passages of Servius' *Centimeter* reported below, the dactylic hexameter is defined respectively as *heroicum* and *bucolicum*), and the same is true for the metrical schemes (sequences of long and short syllables) described by them. At the same time, the free adnotation field makes is possible to associate ancient definitions with the modern definition of each metre (*e. g.*, in the case of the two passages cited below, even if Servius mentions two different *species* of *hexametrum dactylicum*, namely *heroicum* and *bucolicum*, the modern name of the verse is *dactylic hexameter* in both cases). The users of the database will consequently be able to search for the definitions (encoded through the *ancient tags*) applied across centuries to a given verse or metre (to be identified through the *modern tags* with the name widespread in modern scholarship).

Serv. *centim.* 25, 7-9	*Linguistic tags layer*

De heroico. Heroicum constat hexametro catalectico, ut est hoc: 'vulnera bella tubae numero donantur Homeri'.	form:
	– ancient tags:
	  • De pedibus / De metris: catalexis: catalectica
	  • De pedibus / De metris: genus: dactylicum
	  • De pedibus / De metris: numerus metrorum / pedum: hexametrum
	  • De pedibus / De metris: schema / figura:
	    ○ note: –uu, –uu, –uu, – –, –uu, – –
	  • De pedibus / De metris: species
	    ▪ note: heroicum
	– modern tags:
	  • metrics: catalexis
	  • metrics: type
	    ▪ note: dactylic hexameter
	  • language concerned: Latin

Serv. *centim.* 26, 1-3	*Linguistic tags layer*

De bucolico. Bucolicum constat hexametro catalectico, ita ut quartus dactylus partem determinet orationis, ut est hoc: 'rustica silvestres resonat bene fistula cantus'.	form:
	– ancient tags:
	  • De pedibus / De metris: caesurae / incisiones / sectiones: bucolice tome / βουκολική
	  • De pedibus / De metris: catalexis: catalectica
	  • De pedibus / De metris: genus: dactylicum
	  • De pedibus / De metris: numerus metrorum vel pedum: hexametrum
	  • De pedibus / De metris: schema / figura
	    ○ note: –uu, – –, –uu, –uu, | –uu, – –
	  • De pedibus / De metris: species
	    ○ note: bucolicum
	– modern tags:
	  • metrics: catalexis
	  • metrics: diaeresis
	  • metrics: type
	    ○ note: dactylic hexameter
	  • language concerned: Latin

6.4 Transcriptions layer: medieval and humanistic *Graeca Prisciani*

The *Transcriptions layer*, as stated above (pp. 17-20), serves to register the singular readings of one or more witnesses – in the case of the *PAGES* project only for 'priviledged' portions of text, whose transcriptions are useful to the study of the medieval and humanistic transmission of the *Graeca Prisciani*. In the two passages cited below the words marked up in the *Transcriptions layer* with role *paleographical transcription* are underlined; the one encoded in the *Transcriptions layer* with role *Humanistic interpolation* or *gloss* are spaced. For each type of *Transcription layer* I provide here, *exempli gratia*, only the readings of one witness.

Prisc. *ars GL* II 239, 17-240, 4	*Transcriptions layers*

Virgilius tamen auctoritate poetica 'o Palla' protulit in XI: 'salve aeternum mihi, maxime Palla'. In eodem: 'quin ego non alio digner te funere, Palla', in hoc quoque Graecorum poetas secutus. Homerus in Μ´ ῥαψῳδία: 'Πουλυδάμα, σὺ μὲν οὐκέτι μοι φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις', 'Πουλυδάμα' dixit pro 'Πουλυδάμαν'. <u>Menander quoque in Dardano</u>: 'Δρία παῖ, δειπνοποιεῖσθαι τί δεῖ;', 'παῖ Δρία' dixit pro 'Δρίαν'.	transcriptions:
	– type: replacement
	– role: paleographical transcription
	– languages: Latin
	– languages: Ancient Greek
	– value: *menander quoque in dardano* ΑΡΙΑ ΠΑΙ ΛΙΠεΟΠΟΥεΙΘΙΑ ΤΙ ΔεΙ
	– sources:
	  • witness: *S*
	***
	transcriptions:
	– type: replacement
	– role: paleographical transcription
	– languages: Latin
	– languages: Ancient Greek
	– value: *menandar quoque in dardano* ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΙΠΝΟΙC ΙCΤΑΙ ΘΙ ΔεΥ
	– note: *post corr.*
	– sources:
	  • witness: *S*
	***
	transcriptions:
	– type: note
	– role: gloss
	– tag: interlinear
	– language: Latin
	– value: *disciplina somnis scito quid oportet*
	– note: *corrector*
	– sources:
	  • witness: *S*

In the manuscript *S* (Par. lat. 7506, second third of the 9th century, eastern France) a contemporary corrector altered the first-hand text of Menander's citation: he proposed a different separation of the words and tried to translate it into Latin in the space between the lines. This intervention by a *semidoctus* scribe may not have any value for the *constitutio textus* of the *Ars Prisciani*, but it is of the highest interest for the study of the (partial) knowledge of Greek vocabulary and morphology in Carolingian West.[49]

In order to clarify the difference between the transcription layer and the critical apparatus layer, which contains, instead, only significative variants and conjectures, in the following example I also include the metadata of the *Apparatus layer* (central column, corresponding to the words with double underlining in Priscian's text).

The two Greek citations which accompany this passage (Eur. *Hipp.* 907-908; Men. *Epitr.* 515-516) are almost completely omitted in the *editio princeps* of the *Ars* (Venezia, 1470, ISTC ip00960000), except the name *Euripides* (written in Latin in the manuscripts). In the edition printed in Milan in 1476 (ISTC ip00963000) they are replaced by a citation of Euripides' *Hecuba* (954-955): it attests as well the adverb ἀρτίως, one of the two dealt with by Priscian, and must have been suggested to the curator of this edition by the presence of Euripides' name in the defective passage.

With regard to the critical apparatus and the *layer* of the paleographical transcriptions, which I reproduced here only as far as Menander's citation is concerned, the unique reading of Priscian's manuscript registered by Rosellini (2015) in the apparatus is the itacistic error εΙCΙmaiΙ for εἴσειμι, already present in the archetype *α*. As the transcription of the entire citation from the manuscript *O* (Par. lat. 7499, third quarter of the 9th century, Corbie) in the *Transcriptions layer* shows, this witness bears several unique errors: they are neither useful to the reconstruction of Priscian's text nor to the demonstration of the *stemma*, but they offer an interesting testimony of the graphic and phonetic distortions that Greek parts of text within Latin works underwent over the medieval transmission.

---

49   Spangenberg Yanes 2017c, in particular p. 42.

Prisc. *ars* 18 p. 12, 12-16 Rosellini	Apparatus layer	Transcriptions layer

'Ἄρτιος' καὶ 'ἄρτι' et praeteritum paulo ante et praesens significat apud illos. Euripides ἐν Ἱππολύτῳ στεφανηφόρῳ· 'ἦν ἄρτιος ἔλαιπον, ἡ φάος τόδε / οὔτω χρόνον παλαιὸν εἰσεδέρκετο'. <u>Μένανδρος ἐν ἐπιτρέπουσιν· 'εἴσειμι πρὸς ἐκείνην λέγεις ἄρτι γὰρ νοῦ'</u>.	entries:
	– type: replacement
	– value: εΙCΙΜΙ
	– witnesses
	  • value: α
	* * *
	entries:
	– type: replacement
	– value: ἐκεῖνον
	– authors:
	  • value: *Men. (pap. Cair.)*
		transcriptions:
		– type: replacement
		– role: paleographical trascription
		– languages: Ancient Greek
		– value: ΜεΝΑΝΔΡοC εΝ εΠΙΤΡεΠΙΟΥCΙΝ εΙCΙΜΙ ΠΡΟC εΚεΙΝΗΝ ΛεΤεΙC ΑΡΤΙ ΓΑΡ ΝΟω
		– sources:
		  • witness: O
		transcriptions:
		– type: replacement
		– role: Humanistic interpolation
		– languages: Ancient Greek
		– value: ἐκάβη δάκριω σ ετοροον πολιν τε την ςὴν την τ αρτιοσ θάνουσον εκγονον σεθεν
		– sources
		  • witness: Mediolani 1476
		– quotations:
		  • authority: linguistic
		  • work: Eur. *Hec.*
		  • location: 954-955
		  • variants:
		    ▪ lemma: δάκριω
		    ▪ type: replacement
		    ▪ value: δακρύω
		  • variants:
		    ▪ lemma: τε την ςὴν τ
		    ▪ type: replacement
		    ▪ value: τε σὴν τήν τ'
		  • variants:
		    ▪ lemma: θάνουσον
		    ▪ type: replacement
		    ▪ value: θανοῦσαν

Bibliography

Andrews 2013 = Tara L. Andrews, *The Third Way: Philology and Critical Edition in the Digital Age*, «Variants», 10 (2013), pp. 61-76.

Baldi 2014 = Davide Baldi, *Le editiones di Prisciano e i Graeca. Considerazioni preliminari*, in Martorelli 2014, pp. 393-419.

Ballaira 1989 = Guglielmo Ballaira, *Prisciano e i suoi amici*, Torino, Giappichelli, 1989.

Baratin 1989 = Marc Baratin, *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome*, Paris, Les Éditions de Minuit, 1989.

Baratin *et al.* 2009 = *Priscien. Transmission et refondation de la grammaire de l'Antiquité aux modernes*, éd. par Marc Baratin, Bernard Colombat, Louis Holtz, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.

Berti 2019 = *Digital Classical Philology*, edited by Monica Berti, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2019.

Boldrini 1992 = Sandro Boldrini, *La prosodia e la metrica dei Romani*, Roma, Carocci, 1992.

Chiesa 2016 = Paolo Chiesa, *Venticinque lezioni di filologia mediolatina*, Firenze, SISMEL, 2016.

Degni-Peri 2000 = Paola Degni, Alessandra Peri, *Per un catalogo dei codici grammaticali altomedievali*, in *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Erice, 16-23 october 1997, as the 11th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records*, edited by Mario De Nonno, Paolo De Paolis, Louis Holtz, Cassino, Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2000, II, pp. 719-745.

De Nonno 1998 = Mario De Nonno, *Grammatici latini*, in *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, dir. Scevola Mariotti, Roma, Treccani, 1998, III, pp. 31-39.

De Nonno 2009 = Mario De Nonno, *Ars Prisciani Caesariensis: problemi di tipologia e di composizione*, in Baratin *et al.* 2009, pp. 249-278.

De Paolis 2009 = Paolo De Paolis, *Per un catalogo delle opere e dei manoscritti grammaticali tardoantichi e altomedievali*, in Baratin *et al.* 2009, pp. 653-668.

De Paolis 2013 = Paolo De Paolis, *Il progetto di catalogazione dei codici grammaticali latini e la tradizione delle opere ortografiche latine*, in *Libri e testi. Lavori in corso a Cassino. Atti del Seminario internazionale, Cassino, 30-31 gennaio 2012*, a cura di Roberta Casavecchia, Paolo De Paolis, Marilena Maniaci, Giulia Orofino, Cassino, Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio meridionale, 2013, pp. 13-49.

Ferri 2014 = Rolando Ferri, *Alcuni aspetti della metodologia e delle fonti del glossario priscianeo*, in Martorelli 2014, pp. 85-113.

Fischer 2017 = Franz Fischer, *Digital Corpora and Scholarly Editions of Latin Texts: Features and Requirements of Textual Criticism*, «Speculum», 92 (2017), pp. 265-287.

Fischer 2019 = Franz Fischer, *Digital Classical Philology and the Critical Apparatus*, in Berti 2019, pp. 203-219.

Fischer 2020 = Franz Fischer, *Representing the Critical Text*, in Roelli 2020, pp. 405-427.

Guillaumin 2020 = Jean-Baptiste Guillaumin, *Criticism of Digital Methods*, in Roelli 2020, pp. 339-356.

Hofmann-Szantyr = Johann Baptist Hofmann, Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München, Beck, 1965.

Jeep 1983 = Ludwig Jeep, *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den Lateinischen Grammatikern*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1893.

Leumann 1977 = Manu Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München, Beck, 1977.

Malaspina 2019 = Ermanno Malaspina, *Il futuro dell'edizione critica (cioè lachmanniana), più o meno digitale. Riflessioni (in)attuali*, «Storie e linguaggi», 5/1 (2019), pp. 36-60.

Mariotti 1961 = Scevola Mariotti, *Cronologia di congetture e congetture superflue*, in Id., *Scritti medievali e umanistici*, Roma, Storia e letteratura, 1976, pp. 220-230 [già in *Studi e problemi di critica testuale (Convegno di Studi di Filologia italiana 1960)*, Bologna, Commissione per i testi di lingua, pp. 359-368].

Martorelli 2014 = *Greco antico nell'Occidente carolingio. Frammenti di testi attici nell'Ars di Prisciano*, a cura di Luca Martorelli, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, Olms, 2014.

McGann 2013 = Jerome McGann, *Coda. Why Digital Textual Scholarship Matters; or, Philology in a New Key*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Textual Scholarship*, edited by Neil Fraistat, Julia Flanders, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 274-288.

Monella 2018 = Paolo Monella, *Why Are There No Comprehensively Digital Scholarly Editions of Classical Texts?*, in *Digital Philology: New Thoughts on Old Questions*, edited by Adele Cipolla, Padova, libreriauniversitaria.it, 2018, pp. 141-159.

Monella 2019 = Paolo Monella, *L'edizione critica digitale: la critica del testo nella storia della tradizione*, «Storie e linguaggi», 5/1 (2019), pp. 61-82.

Monella 2020 = Paolo Monella, *A Digital Critical Edition Model for Priscian: Glosses, Graeca, Quotations*, «Analecta Romana Instituti Danici», 44 (2020), pp. 135-149.

Morelli 2006 = Giuseppe Morelli, *Nomenclator metricus Graecus et Latinus*, I: *A-Δ*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, Olms, 2006.

Murru 1980 = Furio Murru, *À propos du septimus casus*, «Eos», 68 (1980), pp. 151-154.

Orlandi 1995 = Giovanni Orlandi, *Perché non possiamo non dirci lachmanniani*, in Id., *Scritti di filologia mediolatina*, Firenze, SISMEL, 2007, pp. 95-130 [già «Filologia mediolatina», 2 (1995), pp. 1-42].

Petrucci 2001 = Armando Petrucci, *La descrizione del manoscritto*, Roma, Carocci, 2001.

Pinkster 2015 = Harm Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, I: *The Simple Clause*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.

Pinkster 2021 = Harm Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, II: *The Complex Sentence and Discourse*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2021.

Questa 2007 = Cesare Questa, *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio*, Urbino, Quattroventi, 2007.

Reeve 2011 = Michael D. Reeve, *Editing Classical Texts with a Computer: Hyginus' Astronomica*, in Id., *Manuscripts and Methods. Essays on Editing and Transmission*, Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2011, pp. 361-393.

Roelli 2020 = *Handbook of Stemmatology*, edited by Philipp Roelli, Berlin-Munich-Boston, De Gruyter, 2020.

Rosellini 1997 = Michela Rosellini, *Metri lirici*, in *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, dir. Scevola Mariotti, Roma, Treccani, II, pp. 912-919.

Rosellini 2008 = Michela Rosellini, *Varrone, Palemone, Prisciano: effetti di un insegnamento grammaticale sulla pratica della lingua*, in *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano. Atti del Convengo (Pisa, 5-6 dicembre 2006)*, edited by Franco Bellandi, Rolando Ferri, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 2008, pp. 189-198.

Rosellini 2009 = Michela Rosellini, *Prisciano e il futuro del congiuntivo*, «Philologus», 153 (2009), pp. 300-309.

Rosellini 2010 = Michela Rosellini, *Le costruzioni verbali nel libro XVIII di Prisciano*, «MD», 65 (2010), pp. 69-94.

Rosellini 2012 = Michela Rosellini, *Exempla utriusque doctrinae: analisi del testo e individuazione di criteri editoriali per il lessico sintattico greco-latino del l. XVIII di Prisciano (GL III 278, 13-377, 18)*, in *Le strade della filologia. Per Scevola Mariotti*, a cura di Leopoldo Gamberale *et al.*, Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2012, pp. 195-211.

Rosellini 2014 = Michela Rosellini, *Frammenti di autori attici negli Idiomata di Prisciano: trascrizioni di manoscritti altomedievali in usum editorum*, in Martorelli 2014, pp. 517-595.

Rosellini 2015 = Michela Rosellini, *Prisciani Caesariensis Ars. Liber XVIII. Pars altera*, 1: *Introduzione, testo critico e indici*, a cura di Michela Rosellini, Hildesheim, Olms-Weidmann, 2015.

Rosellini 2017 = Michela Rosellini, *Paucorum in usum? Travagli di un editore critico nell'epoca della post-verità*, «MD», 79 (2017), pp. 101-118.

Rosellini-Spangenberg Yanes 2019 = Michela Rosellini, Elena Spangenberg Yanes, *Per un Thesaurus dubii sermonis digitale*, «Rationes Rerum», 14 (2019), pp. 259-290.

Sahle 2016 = Patrick Sahle, *What is a Scholarly Digital Edition (SDE)?*, in *Digital Scholarly Editing: Theory, Practice and Future Perspectives*, edited by Matthew Driscoll, Elena Pierazzo, Cambridge, Open Book Publishers, 2016, pp. 19-39.

Schad 2007 = Samantha Schad, *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*, Roma-Pisa, Serra, 2007.

Spangenberg Yanes 2017a = *Prisciani Caesariensis Ars. Liber XVIII. Pars altera*, 2: *Commento*, a cura di Elena Spangenberg Yanes, Hildesheim, Olms-Weidmann, 2017.

Spangenberg Yanes 2017b = Elena Spangenberg Yanes, *Il lessico sintattico di Prisciano e la tradizione degli idiomata casuum*, in *Atti del III Seminario Nazionale per dottorandi e dottori di ricerca in studi latini. Roma, 20 novembre 2015 - Università degli Studi "La Sapienza"*, a cura di Paolo De Paolis, Elisa Romano, Palermo, Palumbo, 2017, pp. 59-87.

Spangenberg Yanes 2017c = Elena Spangenberg Yanes, *Correzioni e glosse al greco nei codici carolingi dell'Ars Prisciani*, «RPL», 40 (2017), pp. 5-63.

Spangenberg Yanes 2019 = Elena Spangenberg Yanes, *Materiali lessicografici greci e latini nell'Ars di Prisciano*, in *Pratiche didattiche tra centro e periferia nel Mediterraneo tardoantico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studio, Roma, 13-15 maggio 2015*, a cura di Gianfranco Agosti, Daniele Bianconi, Spoleto, CISAM, 2019, pp. 217-249.

Spangenberg Yanes 2020 = *De nominibus dubiis cuius generis sint*, Introduzione, testo critico e commento, a cura di Elena Spangenberg Yanes, Hildesheim, Olms-Weidmann, 2020.

Tarrant 2016 = Richard Tarrant, *Texts, Editors, and Readers. Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Traina-Bernardi Perini 1998 = Alfonso Traina, Giorgio Bernardi Perini, *Propedeutica al latino universitario*, Bologna, Pàtron, 1998.

Trovato 2014 = Paolo Trovato, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lachmann's Method*, Padova, libreriauniversitaria.it, 2014.

Ucciardello 2014 = Giuseppe Ucciardello, *Il lessico sintattico-atticista fonte di Prisciano e la tradizione lessicografica bizantina*, in Martorelli 2014, pp. 33-60.

Valente 2014 = Stefano Valente, *La fonte sintattico-atticista di Prisciano e la lessicografia greca*, in Martorelli 2014, pp. 61-81.

A JOURNAL OF THE HUMANITIES

9 788833 595252

€ 35,00