

THE SUBSCRIPTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPTS OF LIVY AND FRONTO AND THE MEANING OF *EMENDATIO*

J. E. G. ZETZEL

Schon die Abschreibung irgend eines Schriftstellertextes ist eine kleine historische Tatsache, all das, was dieser und jeder folgende Schreiber von Eigenem absichtlich oder unbewusst hinzutut, seine Fehler und Verbesserungen, seine Randbemerkungen bis herab zum einfachsten Avis au lecteur, dem Zeichen für *nota* und *require* oder der weisenden Hand—all diese kurzen, fast stummen Winke und Zeichen können als geschichtliche Zeugnisse gedeutet werden.

[Ludwig Traube]

At various times in the late fourth and early fifth centuries A.D., three Roman aristocrats, Tascius Victorianus, Nicomachus Dexter, and Nicomachus Flavianus, occupied their leisure hours in correcting the text of the first decade of Livy's History.¹ The precise circumstances of their critical undertaking, its extent, and its effect on the text of Livy are uncertain, and will remain so. The copy or copies of Livy that they used do not survive; aside from a tantalizing letter of Symmachus,² the only significant evidence lies in the subscriptions attesting their efforts, subscriptions now found in a number of medieval manuscripts that are copies, at whatever remove, of the codices that they corrected. These subscriptions are well known; they are perhaps the most famous documents of their kind. And yet their significance has eluded precise definition. What, exactly, were these noblemen trying to do? To what extent did they succeed? And what is the importance of their work to the modern reader or editor of Livy? How, finally, are we to understand the meaning of *emendau*i in this or other texts? Not all of these questions can be answered satisfactorily, but it is the intention of this paper to suggest some possible answers by examining the work of the subscribers and of the slightly later corrector of the

This is the second in a projected series of articles on the subscriptions; the first was "*Emendau*i ad *Tironem*," *HSCP* 77 (1973): 225–43. Much of the research for this project was carried out when I was a member of the Society of Fellows at Harvard University; the inspection of manuscripts was done in 1976 with the support of a Grant-in-Aid from the American Council of Learned Societies. I am grateful to both of these organizations for their support, and to the Bodleian Library, the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, and the Biblioteca Capitolare at Verona for their aid. I would also like to thank R. M. Ogilvie for microfilms of E and U, my colleagues A. T. Grafton and T. J. Luce, and the anonymous referees of *CP* for their criticisms and suggestions.

1. I am not concerned here with the prosopographical problems; on the subscribers, see O. Jahn, "Ueber die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischen Classiker," *Ber. sächs. Ges. der Wiss. zu Leipzig*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3 (1851): 335–42; H. Bloch, "The Pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century," in *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, ed. A. D. Momigliano (Oxford, 1963), pp. 215–16, with additional references.

2. *Epist.* 9. 13: "Munus totius Liuiani operis, quod spopondi, etiam nunc diligentia emendationis moratur." The letter is presumably dated to 401; see O. Seeck (ed.), *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt* (Berlin, 1883), p. cciv; Bloch, "Pagan Revival," p. 216.

[© 1980 by The University of Chicago]
0009-837X/80/7501-0003-\$01.37

palimpsest of Fronto. It is to be hoped that a clearer understanding of what a late antique *emendator* did, and did not do, will emerge from this discussion.

I. THE SUBSCRIPTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPTS OF LIVY

As anyone who has used the editions of the first decade of Livy by Conway and Walters knows, there are a great many manuscripts involved. Thanks to Ogilvie's work, however, their relationship has become much clearer, and the apparatus criticus more comprehensible.³ For the subscriptions, moreover, not even all of Ogilvie's manuscripts are relevant, since some of them contain no subscriptions at all.⁴ In the text of the subscriptions presented here, the following manuscripts are cited:

- M Mediceus Laurentianus lxiii 19
- H Harleianus 2672
- D Laurentianus S. Marci 326
- A Harleianus 2493
- P Parisinus Lat. 5725
- O Oxoniensis Auct. T i 24 (= S.C. 20631)
- E Einsiedlensis 348

Of these manuscripts, MHPOE are cited whenever they contain subscriptions; a full description of the colophons in each is given in the appendix. D and A, less valuable representatives of the family of H, are cited only for Books 8 and 9, where H is not extant.⁵ I have collated the subscriptions in MPH and O from the manuscripts themselves and from photographs in my possession; for E, I have used a microfilm (supplied to me by Professor Ogilvie) containing the subscription to Book 4 and Chatelain's plate of that to Book 5; for D and A, I have relied on Walters and Conway's apparatus.⁶

There are three different men named in the subscriptions, and there are five different forms of subscription which I have distinguished. Subscription 1, that of Victorianus, is found at the ends of Books 1–9; after Books 3 and 4, it is preceded by subscription 2a; after 5 by 2b; after 6 by 3a; and after

3. On the relationship of the manuscripts, see R. M. Ogilvie, "The Manuscript Tradition of Livy's First Decade," *CQ* 7 (1957): 68–81, and the preface to his Oxford text (1974), with the remarks of J. Briscoe, review of *Titi Livi "Ab urbe condita" libri I–V* ed. by R. M. Ogilvie, *JRS* 67 (1977): 239–41.

4. Of the major manuscripts only T (B.N. Lat. 5726) and U (Upsaliensis C 908) contain no subscriptions; F (B.N. Lat. 5724) and B (Bamberg MS Class 34) contain only those to Book 1. The omission of subscriptions is not stemmatically significant; see n. 8.

5. RLDA are not descended from H and should have independent value. In no significant reading (in the subscriptions) does any of them disagree with H except to add errors. Note, however, that in subscription 2b after Book 5, where HDL read *dexterum* for *dexter* *u*, A reads only *dexter*. In subscription 3a after Book 6, LDA agree with M in reading *praefecit*. On their relationship, see Ogilvie, "Manuscript Tradition," pp. 69–72. Ogilvie does not report RLDA in his text; see the criticisms of Briscoe, review of Ogilvie, pp. 239–40.

6. E. Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins* (Paris, 1884–1900), pl. CXI; C. F. Walters and R. S. Conway (eds.), *Titi Livi "Ab urbe condita" VI–X* (Oxford, 1919). Chatelain gives one plate each of subscriptions in MHERDL; a plate of O may be found in R. W. Hunt et al., *The Survival of Ancient Literature* (Oxford, 1975), pl. X(a).

7 and 8 by 3b. I give the text of each of these forms separately, with an apparatus (primarily negative) omitting minor variations of abbreviation or orthography. Subscript Arabic numerals are used to indicate book numbers, and suprascript "a" to indicate readings before correction. Cases where an entire subscription is in a corrector's hand are not identified in the apparatus, but will be found in the appendix.⁷

The witnesses of subscription 1 are: M (Books 1, 4–9), H (2–7), D (8, 9), A (8), E (4, 5), O (5), P (1, 4). The subscription reads,

- (1) Victorianus \overline{uc} emendabam domnis Symmachis.

Victorinus M₆^a \overline{uc} om. P₁P₄H₅E₅O₅: u \overline{o} M₁: u \overline{ic} M₇ *dominis* P₁H₂P₄: *domni* M₈ *simachus*
H₇: *gymmachis* M₁

There are two forms of the second subscription, although the longer form alone is frequently cited. The shorter form is found after Books 3 and 4. Witnesses of subscription 2a: M (4), H (3, 4), E (4), P (4); witnesses of subscription 2b: M (5), H (5), E (5), O (5). The subscriptions read,

- (2a) Nicomachus Dexter \overline{uc} emendaui.

nikomachus E₄

- (2b) Nicomachus Dexter \overline{uc} emendaui ad exemplum parentis mei Clementiani.

Dexter \overline{uc}] *dexterum* H₅E₅O₅ *glementiani* O₅

The third subscription is normally printed as a single text, but the evidence of the manuscripts shows that we should distinguish two different versions. The shorter one is found only after Book 6, the longer after Books 7 and 8. Witnesses of subscription 3a: M (6), H (6); witnesses of subscription 3b: M (7, 8), H (7). The subscriptions read,

- (3a) Nicomachus Flavianus \overline{uc} iii praefectus urbis emendaui.

flavianus om. M₆ *prefeci* M₆: *praefecit* H₆ *urbis* M₅

- (3b) Emendaui Nicomachus Flavianus \overline{uc} ter praef. urbis apud Hennam.

nico M₈ *lauian* M₇ \overline{uc} om. M₇H₇: u \overline{e} M₈ *prēf* H₇ *Hennam*] *ter* M₈

While H does not survive for the end of Book 8, it is significant that D and A, which do and which normally contain the same text as H, preserve only subscription 1 here, and not 3b. We will return to this feature of the H family shortly.

The first questions that must be raised with regard to these subscriptions concern their stemmatic relationship, and it should be evident that any solution is extremely hypothetical. All subscriptions are more liable than most texts to fluctuate in their attestations: a scribe may omit them—and indeed omit the entire colophon—or add them where they are not attested in his primary exemplar.⁸ But even so, the statement that these subscrip-

7. The subscriptions in P after Book 4 and H after Book 7 are by contemporary correctors; those in M and P after Book 1 are additions by the first hand. Note also that the corrector's subscription in H after Book 7 is garbled; see the appendix for details.

8. A. E. Housman (ed.), *Lucani "Bellii civilis" libri decem* (Cambridge, 1926), pp. xiii–xviii, memorably discussed the wanderings of the subscriptions to Juvenal and Lucan; on the dislocation of the subscription to Persius, see W. V. Clausen, "Sabinus' MS of Persius," *Hermes* 91 (1963): 252–56. Iulius Celsus' subscription to Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* also wandered from the α class of manuscripts, where it belongs, into two of the β class.

tions are attested in all or most of the medieval manuscripts of Livy leaves much to be desired. Of our five major witnesses, M has subscriptions to Books 1 and 4–9, H to 2–7, P to 1 and 4, O to 5, and E to 4 and 5. Some of this is the result of mutilation of the manuscripts themselves: thus, since H ends six words before the end of Book 8, we could not expect it to contain any later subscriptions, and E contains the ends of two books only, 4 and 5. E, it is to be observed, is thus the only manuscript to contain subscriptions to all books where it is extant.

As for indicative errors in the text, they are few and offer little help in establishing a stemma. The most important is in subscription 2b after Book 5, where HEO agree in the error *dexterum*. The same three manuscripts omit *uc* after the same book in subscription 1, and it is of interest that the same omission occurs in P after Books 1 and 4, the only subscriptions contained in that manuscript. A basic division can thus be drawn between M on the one hand and HEO(P) on the other. This is in accord with Ogilvie's stemma, by which M is the major representative of the hyparchetype μ , which represents one of the two branches of the medieval tradition, while PEO, witnesses of a reconstructed π , and H(DA), witnesses of a reconstructed λ , are the two subdivisions of the other branch.⁹ These are not the only manuscripts important for reconstructing the text of Livy, but they are the major manuscripts containing subscriptions.

While the variants in the subscriptions themselves confirm only the basic division between M and the other manuscripts, the variation in their attestation goes somewhat further and suggests, although it cannot prove, some modifications in Ogilvie's stemma. In the first place, there is the marked weakness of attestation in PEO, the manuscripts of the π group. As was noted earlier, E is the only manuscript with subscriptions to all of the books for which it is extant, but as that is only Books 4 and 5, little can be said about it. In P itself, the subscription to Book 4 is added by a corrector, and the subscription to Book 1, although written by the first hand, is crammed into the end of a line, clearly as an afterthought or an addition from another source. O, also, contains only the subscription to Book 5, and Upsaliensis C 908 [U], one of the best witnesses to the group, contains none at all. Given that O is descended from an exemplar that had been corrected against a member of the λ group, and that the corrector of P shows textual affinities with both μ and λ , it is likely that the hyparchetype π itself did not contain any subscriptions at all.¹⁰

The absence of subscriptions in π could be ascribed to two causes: either that they were never present, and that π is not a descendant of the "Nicomachean" text [N], or that the subscriptions were not copied into π from N. The latter hypothesis is clearly more plausible, because the relationship of the manuscripts in the text of Livy shows the indisputable existence of a common ancestor and also the closer relationship of π to λ than to μ . For the relationship between μ and λ , however, the subscriptions provide slightly better evidence. Both subscriptions 1 and 3b are found after Book

9. This is highly abbreviated; for details, see Ogilvie, "Manuscript Tradition," *passim*.

10. On λ readings in O, see Ogilvie, "Manuscript Tradition," pp. 79–81; on P², *ibid.*, pp. 77–79.

7 in μ and λ , but after Book 8 μ contains both subscriptions while λ has only subscription 1.¹¹ In this case, the normal vagaries of the transmission are not to blame; when subscriptions are added or omitted, they are regularly added or omitted in their entirety. Thus the fact that subscription 3b is missing after Book 8 in λ suggests—although definitive proof is impossible—that it was never there. The logical inference from this is that λ descends from a copy of N made before the completion of Flavianus' work and that μ alone represents the latest stage of his work to survive.

This hypothesis is not without difficulties, and I offer it primarily as evidence that Ogilvie's stemma is not quite as secure as we might wish.¹² To demonstrate this relationship of the manuscripts, it would be necessary to show that there are a greater number of textual differences in Book 8 between μ and λ than elsewhere; this would be the case if Book 8 had undergone one more stage of correction in μ than in λ . To the best of my knowledge, that is not the case, but so many explanations are possible that it seems fruitless to pursue the subject here. What is important, however, is that μ is the only family in which all the subscriptions are firmly attested in their fullest extent, and thus that M, as the only full representative of μ , is likely to provide the most accurate witness to the subscribers' work. That this is true in details other than the subscriptions themselves will be shown shortly.

II. THE WORK OF THE SUBSCRIBERS

The constitution of a critical text of the Livy subscriptions is the least demanding problem that they pose. It is much harder to determine what Victorianus and the Nicomachi meant by their simple *emendavi*. The basic meaning of *emendatio* is clear: it is the removal of *menda*, flaws in the text. But the word can be used of anything from the correction of an author's rough draft to the proofreading of a copy against its exemplar; it may include both of what we would describe as *recensio* and *emendatio*: the process of judging among attested readings or the invention of a better one.¹³ The word itself is no help in that regard. Moreover, if we simply take it as the rough equivalent of the English "edit," we are no better off, since "edition" in English has an equally broad semantic range.¹⁴ In fact, it will be shown that an ancient *emendator* did not feel limited to the correction of the text; he might add notes, and he could either correct the text or simply supply a variant reading.

11. The fact that the subscriptions to Book 7 in H are added by a corrector is irrelevant; those in LDA are perfectly regular and do not share any of M's peculiar errors.

12. For other doubts, see Briscoe, review of Ogilvie, pp. 239–41.

13. The basic ancient definition of *emendatio* is Varro's (frag. 236 Funaioli = Diomedes 426. 21 Keil): "emendatio est reorrectio errorum qui per scripturam dictionemue fiunt." Here it is simply one of the four branches of grammar, *lectio*, *enarratio*, *emendatio*, and *iudicium*, and means, presumably, the correction of the text one is studying. But Ps.-Horace *Serm.* 1. 10. 2–3* ("qui male factos / emendare parat uersus") certainly means the improvement of Lucilius' rough verses, and the sense in which Quintilian uses it in his chapter on the subject (10. 4) is that of revising one's own works.

14. On the error of speaking of ancient "editions," see B. A. van Groningen, "ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ," *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963): 1–17.

Modern attempts to define the act of *emendatio* in the Nicomachean Livy (or elsewhere) have been remarkably unsuccessful. One procedure has been to praise the text of M (or a reconstructed N) by comparison with the Verona palimpsest (V).¹⁵ That does indeed show that the text of the medieval manuscripts is generally better than that of the ancient one, but it does not clarify the problem: it could mean that the Nicomachi had carefully improved the text—if we could assume that their exemplar looked like the Veronensis—or it could mean that the Veronensis is an unusually poor copy of Livy, or that the exemplar of the Nicomachi was unusually good. The comparison leaves us where we started: that N is better than V. No further conclusion is justified. It is equally common to refer to the work of Victorianus and the Nicomachi as a "recension" or an "edition."¹⁶ The second of these terms is almost meaningless, the first imports a totally anachronistic concept: recension, in its accepted meaning, signifies the collection and assessment of all available evidence for the reconstruction of a text and implies the use of the stemmatic method and all of the apparatus of Lachmannite textual criticism.¹⁷ It is hard to imagine—and few if any since Housman's strictures on Paul of Constantinople in 1926 have done so¹⁸—that the Nicomachi did anything of the sort. The only way to decide what the *emendatio* meant is to examine the internal evidence of the manuscripts, primarily M, to see what traces of the *emendatio* remain. The evidence can be divided into three categories: the physical placement of the subscriptions, the variant readings in M, and the marginalia that appear to be of late antique origin.

In the first place, the arrangement of the subscriptions and titles in the manuscripts is highly suggestive. A complete colophon in these manuscripts contains three elements: (1) the author's name and the title of the work, *Titi Liui ab Vrbe Condita* ("title"); (2) the explicit and incipit of the books in question, for example, *Explicit Liber I Incipit Liber II* ("explicit"); (3) one or more subscriptions. Not all these elements appear after each book. The subscriptions are most frequently not there; at times the subscription is present but the title and explicit are omitted, as in M after Book 1 and in H after Books 2 and 7 (the latter subscription is added by the corrector). Where title and explicit are both present, however, they form a single grammatical sentence, as does each subscription. When title, explicit, and subscription 1 alone are present, as after Books 1, 2, 9 (and 8 in DA), the subscription may either precede or follow the other two elements. After Books 3–8, however, when two subscriptions are present, then sections of the colophon have a fixed order that breaks the grammatical construction of titles and explicit, and after Books 7 and 8 of subscription 3b as well.

15. Thus Bloch, "Pagan Revival," p. 216.

16. Bloch, "Pagan Revival," p. 216; L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*² (Oxford, 1974), p. 37 ("recension"); Ogilvie, "Manuscript Tradition," p. 77 ("edition").

17. P. Maas, *Textual Criticism*, trans. B. Flower (Oxford, 1958), p. 1, defines *recensio* as "to establish what *must* or *may* be regarded as transmitted." On modern misuse of the word, see Clausen, "Sabinus' MS," p. 252.

18. *Lucani "Bellii ciuiliis" libri decem*, pp. xiii–xviii.

After Books 3–6, each colophon begins *Titi Liui*; that is followed by either subscription 2 (after Books 3–5) or 3a (after Book 6), then by *ab Vrbe Condita*, then by subscription 1, and finally by the appropriate explicit. After Books 7 and 8, a slightly different order is found: these begin with *emendauī Nicomachus Flauianus*, then *Titi Liui*, the remainder of subscription 3b, and the rest of the colophon as after Books 3–6. In either case, the placement of the subscriptions destroys grammatical continuity. What has happened is clear: the subscribers found the book titles already present when they wrote their subscriptions, and they added them in the remaining space. This is clearest after Books 7 and 8, where even the subscriptions are made unintelligible by being divided. In the original copy, the colophon after Book 7 must have looked like this:

emendauī Nicomachus Flauianus
TITI LIVI
uc ter praef. urbis apud Hennam
AB VRBE CONDITA
Victorianus uc emendabam domnis Symmachis
EXPLICIT LIBER VII INCIPIT LIBER VIII.

The fact that this arrangement must have been created by the subscribers themselves was recognized almost two hundred years ago.¹⁹ It is clear that it cannot be the result of later interpolation of the subscriptions into manuscripts, since it is present in all families, and one could not expect scribes independently to copy this ungrammatical form. But if the subscriptions were written between the lines of the titles and explicit, it is evident that the subscribers did their *emendatio* on a preexistent complete text; they made their corrections and annotations between the lines of, and in the margins of, a manuscript of Livy without intending to write or supervise the writing of any subsequent “edition.” It is this last fact that shows how radically different *emendatio* is from the modern activities to which it is compared: if a modern scholar uses a copy of a text for the same purpose, his ultimate goal is the creation of a new text which will embody, in the text or apparatus, the results of his investigations. He does not consider it the finished product and sign his name to the simple collation. Victorianus and the Nicomachi did; their copy is signed as the indication of a completed work: *emendauī*. Thus, to speak of the work of the subscribers as an edition is ill-conceived. There was no Nicomachean text; there are only Nicomachean additions and corrections to an existing text. And while the result, if copied by an intelligent scribe, might ultimately embody their ideas, it was not a part of their basic purpose.

19. By F. Arevalo in his edition of Prudentius (1788–89): “At correctores illi antiqui inter lineas codicis suam subscriptionem inserebant” (2: 843–44). G. B. de Rossi, “Iscrizione onoraria di Nicomaco Flaviano,” *Annali dell’Ist. di Corresp. Arch.*, n.s. 6 (1849): 321 (note), agreed and suggested that the subscriptions were in cursive while the titles were in capitals. There is a clear parallel to this arrangement in the Medicean Virgil in which the subscription and poem of Turcius Rufius Apronianus Asterius are written between the titles of the *Eclogues* (photograph most readily accessible in Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*², pl. IX). I am not yet sure whether the subscription and scholia of that manuscript are autograph or were copied from an earlier manuscript. I hope to deal with that problem elsewhere.

As for the second type of evidence, the variant readings embedded in the text, it has long been recognized that all the medieval manuscripts contain doublets in the text, pairs of words of which only one can have been in Livy's original.²⁰ This feature is not unique to Livy: every ancient text has some of them, and their origin is to be found in the introduction of alternate readings by correctors, which were then added to the text by subsequent scribes. It is not possible, normally, to date such doublets; some of them are clearly ancient, others clearly medieval: correction was a normal stage in the production of manuscripts at all periods. But the Medicean Livy, which as we have seen is the best representative of the Nicomachean Livy, in six passages has more than the mere doublet: it uses words that show that the variants were the result of collation, not what we would call emendation. In five of them the variant is introduced by the abbreviation *ia*, often mistakenly expanded to *iam* or *idem*, but actually meaning, as Heraeus showed, *in alio*. In the sixth, *alibi* is used for the same purpose. I cite all six passages:²¹

3. 26. 9 . . . rogitanque "satin salue?" togam . . . proferre uxorem . . . iubet.
satin salue VP*: *sat iam satisne salua essent omnia in saluem* M: *satisne salua essent omnia* P^oHOU
4. 13. 6 collega additur ei Agrippa Menenius cui Lanato erat cognomen.
Menenius λπ: *Mallius* V: *iamaniliusenenius* M
6. 13. 3 ad se quisque peruenturam caedem cernebat.
cernebat λπ: *credebat* Vorm.: *credebat alibi cernebat* Vorm.²M
10. 5. 13 . . . et Cilnio genere cum plebe in gratiam reducto . . .
cilnio Gruter: *licinio* λπ: *licinio iacilnio* M
10. 19. 21 his quoque mox fusis a uictoribus castra oppugnabantur.
a uictoribus π: *ausiatoribus* λ: *ausiatoribus iam pugnatoribus* M
10. 37. 15 sed fanum tantum, id est locus templo effatus, fuerat.
effatus π: *effatus* λ: *ia sacratus effatus* M.

Since the Medicean Livy is at least at two and possibly three removes from the copy of the Nicomachi, it is not easy to say whether these variants appeared in the same form in the original as in the descendant. It is, however, clear that these variants do belong to a late antique stage of the transmission, not to a medieval one. In the first place, the fact that the abbreviation *ia* was so misunderstood suggests that these variants do not derive from the immediate exemplar of M; in the second place, it is also evident that several of them do not otherwise form a part of the medieval tradition:

20. On the doublets in general, see W. Heraeus, "Ueber einige Variantenzeichen," *Palaeographia Latina* 4 (1925): 6 (note); Ogilvie, *Livy I-V*, pp. vii-viii; idem, "Manuscript Tradition," pp. 68-69 and 75-77, with additional references.

21. These passages were first collected and the abbreviation explained by Heraeus, "Variantenzeichen," pp. 5-6; they are also cited by Ogilvie, "Manuscript Tradition," p. 76. Heraeus summarized his findings in "Ein Textproblem in einem Zwölftafelgesetz," *RhM* 82 (1933): 315-24. I cite these passages from the Oxford text, with the exception of 10. 19. 21, where the OCT reads *iam a uictoribus*, but I have abbreviated the apparatus using Ogilvie's group sigla. It should also be noted that in this passage P's original reading was *a uiatoribus*, corrected to *a uictoribus*. See also Briscoe's discussion of the manuscript evidence for 3. 26. 9 (review of Ogilvie, p. 240).

thus *Manilius* at 4. 13. 6, *Cilnio* at 10. 5. 13. Neither of these is likely to be the result of a mere scribal error: they are proper names, and thus cannot be taken as the creation of either the poor eyesight or the imagination of a Carolingian scribe.²² Finally, the fact that some of these variants are reflected in other branches of the tradition at an early stage may suggest that they belong in their common ancestor, the Nicomachean text.

Since we have here six variant readings stemming from the Nicomachean Livy, it would be valuable to be able to say which was the base reading and which the variant, and in some fashion to characterize both their manuscripts and their methods on this basis. It is not, however, possible to be very definite. Base reading and variant have at all times fluctuated, and their alternation in successive generations of the ninth-century Lucan manuscripts impresses the need for caution.²³ In one case, however, at 3. 26. 9, it is possible to get an impression of how the process worked. Here it is clear that the base manuscript must have read *satin salue* (or *saluem*). The corrector added above, or in the margin if a line of the text ended with *sat-*, in *alio satisne salua essent omnia*. M, or an intermediary, inserted this into the text in the middle of the word *satin*.

This process of collation is familiar not only from medieval manuscripts but from the practice of late antique scholiasts as well, who frequently note the existence of a variant with similar vague phrases.²⁴ These six meager examples must surely be but a small portion surviving from the original labor. The significant facts are two: that the correctors did consult what must have been a manuscript other than the exemplar from which their copy of the text was taken, and that they did, at least on occasion, give some indication (*in alio*) that they had done so. The normal technique of correcting a manuscript in late antiquity, so far as one can tell from surviving examples, did not involve the identification of the source of a variant, nor did it normally entail anything more than the simple proof-reading of a manuscript against its exemplar. Late antique manuscripts do not, as a rule, contain *variants* at all: they have only corrections by addition

22. It should also be pointed out that *in alio* is not common even in the ninth century; the usual Carolingian method of introducing a variant is *uel* (†); *legitur et* is not infrequent. Lupus of Ferrières' use of *-A* is distinctive, and the use of *aliter* or *in altero* was enough for L. Traube (*Textgeschichte der "Regula Benedicti"*¹² [Munich, 1910], p. 123) to identify some manuscripts as Lupus'. He was wrong, but the use of such signs should not be exaggerated even for the ninth century.

23. I cite five examples from the collation of Z² in H. C. Gotoff, *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 114–36: 2. 181 *exectaue* Z²A: *exsectaue* MZA²BR rel.; 3. 263 *pelago* Z²A: *pelagi* rel.; 3. 433 *uidet* Z²A: *uidit* A²BR rel.; 4. 296 *fastigia* Z²A cett.: *fastidia* MZA²BR(?); 6. 226 *e* Z²AQGUVPEWJAY: *et* MZA²BRY. In each of these cases, as in others, the corrector of the descendant (A) has returned to a reading of the ancestor (Z) that had been altered by the corrector (Z²).

24. In Servius, the best preserved of the ancient commentaries, there are over three hundred variant readings (the list in J. Mountford and J. Schultz, *Index rerum et nominum in scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati tractatorum* [Ithaca, 1930], s.v. *lectio varia*, is incomplete); a small percentage are attached to the name of an earlier scholar, while most are introduced by *legitur et* or *alii* (*quidam*, *multi*) *legunt*. Specific references to manuscripts are rare. In less well-preserved or later commentaries, the proportion of variants introduced by *legitur et* increases markedly.

or expunction. That the emenders of the first decade of Livy did more places them in a different class from most correctors.²⁵

Even if the correctors of the Nicomachean Livy did more than the usual in improving their manuscript—and that is the reason for the proud declaration of the subscriptions themselves—we should not place them on a par with modern editors. For one thing, the practice of full collation is a relatively recent discovery.²⁶ And although we cannot tell how many hundreds of passages they actually corrected, in some at least they chose not to exercise their judgment, but simply introduced the variant without expressing an opinion. From such a small sample it is hard to tell what type of textual problem received which type of attention. But all six of the passages cited are substantive variants, places where either reading (except for the corrupt *ausiatoribus* at 10. 19. 21) could make sense. What is more, the very formula *in alio* assumes that the base reading in these passages was left unchanged; even if they thought the variant might be better, no such value judgment was expressed. True, it is possible that in some cases a substantive variant was actually substituted for the base text; we could not tell that from the state of our evidence. The significant fact, however, remains: *emendatio*, in so far as it included variants of collation, was not the same as emendation in the modern sense. It is the apparatus without the text, the variants presented without a choice. Just as the placement of the subscriptions themselves implies, these variants, too, show that the modern equivalent

25. I do not believe that it has been noticed how rare variants introduced by *in alio* (or even *legitur et* or *uel*) are in ancient manuscripts. In the twenty-one late antique corrected codices that I have examined (which are, however, primarily Christian texts) I have found no clear example of any of them. The normal technique was to cross out or expunge if necessary, and add what was needed either between the lines, in the margin, or, using a *signe de renvoi*, elsewhere on the page. I have found only two apparent exceptions to this. (1) The Verona Virgil at *Aen.* 2. 632, where Geymonat reports that the corrector, not the scholiast, added *legitur et deo* ("I codici G e V di Virgilio," *Mem. Ist. Lomb.* 29 [1966]: 373). My own inspection suggests that *deo* alone is the work of the corrector, while *legitur et* is in the hand of the scholiast; the two parts of the note are in different script, and there is a gap between them. In his edition of Virgil Geymonat reports no true variants (that is, using an introductory word or phrase like *uel*) in the hand of a corrector anywhere in the text of Virgil. The other curious note in V, *γρ. cernere* at *Aen.* 12. 709, is in the hand of the scholiast and is, to the best of my knowledge, the only use of *γράφειν* in Latin scholia. It is also perhaps indicative of the difference between ancient and ninth-century correctors that the ancient portions of Vat. Lat. 3225 (F) of Virgil contain no true variants, while there are two readings introduced by *uel* on *Aen.* 4. 116—in the one small section added by a Carolingian hand. (2) Ambros. D 36 sup. (now S. P. II 67) of Prudentius, where Lowe's plate (*Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 3:331) of fol. 28^r shows *uel insignia* over *ingentia*. Not only is the hand apparently somewhat later, but it is the only correction of this type in the manuscript.

The manuscripts that I have inspected are the following: Lyon, Bibl. Mun. 452 (Hilarius), 478 (Augustine), 483 (Origen), 607 (Augustine); Milan Ambros. C 77 sup. (Severianus), D 36 sup. (Prudentius); Oxford Bodleian Auct. T ii 26 (Hieronymus); Paris, B.N. Lat. 152 (Hilarius), 2235 (Hieronymus), 5730 (Livy), 8084 (Prudentius), 10592 (Cyprian), 12214 (Augustine), 13367 (Augustine); Verona Bibl. Cap. II (2) (*Kings*, etc.), XIII (11) (Hilarius), XVII (15) (Hieronymus), XXVIII (26) (Augustine), XXXVII (35) (Clemens), XXXVIII (36) (Sulpicius Severus, etc.), XL (38) (Virgil). These manuscripts were selected, in part, because the description in *CLA* indicated that there might be scholarly activity in them.

26. Collation in the modern sense of the word was the discovery of the Renaissance and was not common until the nineteenth century; see now A. T. Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance," *JWI* 38 (1975): 155–81, with additional references; idem, review of *The Classical Text* by E. J. Kenney, *JRS* 67 (1977): 175–76.

for what the subscribers did is not an edition, but the collection of raw material for an edition.

The final feature of M that may reflect the work of the subscribers is the presence of annotations.²⁷ Originally, all of them must have been in the margins; some are now preserved embedded in the text, while in one section of the manuscript (8. 14–24) the scribe, at this point Leo Diaconus, seems to have copied them from his exemplar with some fidelity.²⁸ As with the doublets, the internal evidence of M does not permit accurate dating of most of the notes; but the vocabulary seems to point to a late antique date,²⁹ and one annotation in particular, in the margin of M at 8. 15. 7, is quite significant for chronology. The annotator speaks of the burial alive of the Vestal Minucia, and after paraphrasing Livy he adds,³⁰

miror autem, cum defossam indicat, omisisse illum ex libris Sibillinis hoc esse praeceptum, ut legisse me in ipsis apud Flegontem temporis istius uersibus recolo.

The reference to Phlegon permits a fairly precise dating; there are few allusions to him in Latin: Jacoby cites only the *Historia Augusta* and St. Jerome.³¹ If one accepts a date in the 390s for the HA, then an allusion to Phlegon by the Nicomachi or Victorianus would be contemporary. And it should not be forgotten that a taste for Phlegon, while scarcely indicative of exquisite literary judgment, fits in with the known interests of the subscribers: Tascius Victorianus was involved with the copying of the elder Flavianus' translation of Philostratus' *Life* of the miraculous Apollonius of Tyana,³² and interest in religious cult and ritual was widespread among the Roman aristocracy at this time.³³ Thus, it is extremely likely that this note, and presumably others as well, are a product of the same *emendatio* as the subscriptions and textual variants.

The citation of Phlegon is far more learned than any of the other notes in M; several are simple marginal titles or summaries, and a few excerpts and

27. See L. Voit, "Marginalnoten zur 1. Dekade des Livius," *Philologus* 91 (1936): 308–22.

28. Voit, "Marginalnoten," pp. 309–15, gives the text of the twenty-one marginal notes at 8. 14–24 in Leo's hand; Walters and Conway, *Livy VI–X*, pp. vii–viii, give notes included in the text of Livy 6–10; Conway and Walters, *Livy I–V*, include some of the notes on Books 1–5 in their apparatus. See also G. Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio (Laur. 63, 19) al Livio del Petrarca (B.M. Harl. 2493)," *IMU* 2 (1959): 110–11.

29. See Voit, "Marginalnoten," pp. 315–20, for details.

30. Voit, "Marginalnoten," pp. 310–11; Billanovich, "Dal Livio di Raterio," p. 111. I have also examined this note myself. The text is corrected in numerous details.

31. *FGrHist* 257 T 2, 5; F 35, respectively *HA Severus* 20. 1, *Hadr.* 16. 1, and *Quadr. Tyr.* 7. 6; and F 16 and 246, respectively *Chron.* AAbr. 2047 and *Q. Hebr.* I, *Gen.* 10. 2. On the suspicious nature of the HA passages, see R. Syme, *Ammianus* and the "Historia Augusta" (Oxford, 1968), p. 60; idem, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 18–19. See also P. Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources*, trans. H. Wedeck (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 78, n. 146.

32. Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* 8. 3. 1: "Apollonii Pythagorici uitam, non ut Nicomachus senior e Philostrati, sed ut Tascius Victorianus e Nicomachi schedio exscripsit, quia iusseras, misi." On this passage, see Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers*, pp. 16, 258. What Victorianus did is puzzling; Jahn "Ueber die Subscriptionen," p. 338, sensibly suspended judgment. *Schedium* has numerous meanings, and is often confused with *scheda* and *scida*; I think that all Victorianus did was to copy out for public circulation the unfinished draft of Nicomachus' translation.

33. Bloch, "Pagan Revival," p. 201–6, provides a good introduction to the peculiarities of pagan worship at this time.

abbreviated sentences that the annotator wished to recall. Most of them concern facts of historical or antiquarian interest. What is significant is that these notes are not a commentary, nor would they be of interest to anyone but the writer himself. They are private reminders of passages that the annotator wished to recall.

There can be no doubt that the reconstruction of the *emendatio* of the text of Livy performed by the Nicomachi and Victorianus is hazardous and must be tentative in the extreme; it is far easier to say what it was not than what it was. Our evidence, because it is separated by several copies and removes from the original manuscript, is too slight to permit clear and definite conclusions. And yet, all three of the features of the later manuscripts that we have discussed point in the same direction: that the intention of the subscribers was not philological in the modern sense. They had a different aim. They corrected a single copy of Livy; it was not designed to be the basis for wider circulation. Variant readings were introduced from an independent copy—a clear improvement on the ordinary methods of the day—but the variations seem to be indications of doubt rather than of improvement. They added notes to this copy; but the notes are not in any sense a commentary; they are designed exclusively for personal reference, and cater to the interests of the writer, not a prospective reader. In sum, we may characterize their work as personal. It was a labor of private interest and intention, not a formal work of scholarship. But in order to fill out the details of this portrait of the subscribers, we cannot examine the Medicean Livy in a vacuum; it was not the only corrected manuscript of its age, and one ancient manuscript in particular, the Bobbio palimpsest of Fronto, can supply much to confirm our inferences from the tradition of Livy.

III. THE PALIMPSEST OF FRONTO

If we were to be able to understand completely the work of Victorianus and the Nicomachi, we would need to possess not the descendants of their copy of Livy, but the copy itself, with their autograph corrections; ideally, we would also have the copies of Livy from which they worked, such as the *exemplum* referred to in subscription 2b. Only then could we see which new readings were conjectures, and which the result of collation; which were corrections, and which merely variant readings. The evidence of the Medicean Livy is a poor substitute for this; it gives us the ability to ask the questions, but not to be sure of the answers.

Among the relatively few ancient manuscripts that survive, very few have subscriptions, and few of those show signs of collation. One manuscript, however, does contain all the features that we have ascribed to the Nicomachean Livy: autograph subscriptions, variants of collation introduced by *in alio* or other similar phrases, and marginalia.³⁴ The manuscript in ques-

34. The only other classical text that may have an autograph subscription is the Medicean Virgil (see n. 19), but the textual errors in it make me suspect it is a copy. Other unsubscribed manuscripts would repay scrutiny. One striking difference between the manuscripts of Livy and Fronto and the slightly later Vatican Hilary (Basilicanus D. 182), which is dated in the subscription on fol. 288^v to 509/10, is that where the secular texts have *emendauit*, the Christian critic uses

tion, the Bobbio palimpsest of Fronto (Vat. Lat. 5750 + Ambros. E 147 sup.), is slightly later than the Nicomachean Livy; it was written in the second half of the fifth century and corrected and subscribed by one Caecilius shortly thereafter, probably around A.D. 500. Unfortunately, it was erased, rearranged, and recopied with the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon in about A.D. 700.³⁵ As a result it is extremely hard to read, and quite fragmentary. The existence of Van den Hout's careful edition, however, based on the investigations of E. Hauler, provides sufficient evidence for examining the methods of the subscriber. I have not examined the manuscript myself; all of my information derives from Van den Hout's edition. There are seven different forms of subscription extant in the manuscript:³⁶ (1) after *Ad M. Caesarem* 3: *Caecilius s[ae]pe [r]ogatus legi emendau;* (2) after *Ad M. Caesarem* 4, *De eloquentia*, *De orationibus*, *Ad Antoninum Pium*, *Ad amicos* 1 and 2, *Principia historiae*, *De bello Parthico*, and *Arion: legi emendau qui supra*; (3) after *Ad M. Caesarem* 5: *emendau;* (4) after *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 2: *recognoui;* (5) after *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 3 and *De nepote amisso: legi emendau;* (6) after *De feriis Alsiansibus: legi;* and (7) in the untitled collection of letters (*Additamentum*), page 233 VdH, and at the end of the same collection, page 239 VdH: *felic(i)ter*. Subscriptions appear at the end of every book (where the end of the book is extant in the manuscript) except *Ad Verum* 1. The absence of a subscription seems not to reflect any more difference in method than do the different forms of subscription: there are three corrections in the three extant pages of *Ad Verum* 1, which is no less than in other books in the latter part of the text. The use of *feliciter* alone may be significant; the letters where it appears are primarily in Greek, and there are no corrections by Caecilius in them.

When we turn from the subscriptions to the actual work of the subscriber, it is clear that the evidence is much more abundant and the problems of interpretation rather more complex than was the case with the Nicomachean Livy. There are hundreds of corrections in the manuscript, executed in various ways: erasure, expunction, or the addition of readings interlinearly. These tend to become less frequent in the course of the text: in *Ad M. Caesarem* 3, for instance, there are 110 corrections in sixteen pages, an average of slightly more than one every four lines; in *De bello Parthico*, near the end of the text, there are only four in five pages, or one in every

contuli (except on fol. 228^r, at the end of *De trin.* 10), and that he not only signs the ends of books, but the ends of quires as well; they are visible in the facsimile on foll. 65^v and 73^v. It should be noted that Lowe's description of the corrector's notes (*CLA*, 1:1) is untrustworthy. From the manuscripts that I have examined, there seems to be a shift in the sixth century from signing books to signing quires; the change is significant for the mentality of the corrector and marks a transition from the corrector as reader of the text to the corrector as functionary in a scriptorium.

35. For all details about the manuscript, see the preface to M. van den Hout (ed.), *M. Cornelii Frontonis "Epistulae"* (Leyden, 1954). A description of the work of Caecilius (m²) is on pp. xl-xliii.

36. The subscription naming Caecilius is no longer legible; a copy of Mai's drawing of it is in Jahn, "Ueber die Subscriptionen," pl. VII, no. 5, and in Van den Hout, *Fronto*, after p. 262. L. Havet, "Le reviseur du MS de Fronto," *Rev. phil.* 10 (1886): 189, suggested *Caecilius pr. pr. togatus*, which is even less convincing than Mai's unsatisfactory supplement. On the problems of the manuscript, see the summary of E. Champlin, "The Chronology of Fronto," *JRS* 64 (1974): 136, with additional references.

twenty-five lines. The second type of work by Caecilius is the addition of what we will call variants, that is, alternative readings introduced by collation, with the use of a phrase like *in alio*.³⁷ These readings may be interlinear or marginal, but the base reading is not deleted. The third element is the addition of marginalia (other than variants). These too are of varying frequency, and it is significant that they do not necessarily appear in the same concentrations as the corrections. In *De bello Parthico*, where there are only four corrections, there are twelve marginal notes. One further complication of these notes is that some of them, like the variants, are introduced by *in alio*.

What one would like to know about the purely textual notes is precisely what the opposition between correction and variant signifies. One possibility is that the difference is one of source: that is, that the corrections result from conjecture, and the variants from collation. It is not, however, as simple as that. All *in alio* variants are obviously the result of collation: that is the meaning of *in alio*. But it is equally clear that at least some of the corrections also arose from consulting another manuscript. Thus, at *Ad M. Caesarem* 1. 6. 4, a whole line that the scribe had omitted because of homoeoteleuton is added without any indication of source; other similar additions occur at *Ad M. Caesarem* 3. 13. 1 and *Ad Verum* 2. 1. 18. To imagine that these were conjectural would be absurd. On a smaller scale, there are quite a few corrections or additions of individual words that seem to be beyond the possible range of conjecture, such as *sanas* (*Ad am.* 1. 10. 1) or *ex Baecola* (*Ad M. Caes.* 1. 7. 4).³⁸

The second possible distinction is one of intention rather than source: that those readings of Caecilius that involve correction are ones that he preferred, while those introduced by *in alio* are rejected, in the manner of a modern apparatus. It is harder to disprove that idea, because we cannot tell whether Caecilius thought the variants were better or worse, while we know that he preferred the corrections. But here too, I believe, we have one class that is defined—the corrections—and one that is not—the variants—just as in the matter of source indications it is the variants that are defined and the corrections that are not. The only strong argument against the idea that Caecilius meant the variants to be rejected is that some of them are so obviously correct that we would have to have an extremely low opinion of Caecilius to think that he would not prefer them. Thus at *Ad M. Caesarem* 4. 4. 1, Marcus, according to the first hand, wrote *pelliculam . . . quam in pacem suum flamen . . . imponit*. For *pacem* Caecilius noted in the margin *alibi: in apicem*, which makes sense. At *Ad M. Caesarem* 5. 74. 1, the manuscript has Fronto saying *iudicia prohibent, quae . . . dies totos exhibent*. This too is nonsense, and for *exhibent* Caecilius wrote *i(n) a(lio): eximent* in the

37. Examples of *alibi* at *Ad M. Caes.* 2. 8. 3, 4. 4. 1; *in aliis* at 1. 9. 3, *Ad Ant. Imp.* 3. 10. 2 (discussed below); *ex alio* at *De orat.* 15 (see n. 45).

38. So also, probably, *eloquentia* at *Ad M. Caes.* 1. 5. 6, *caluētur* at *Ad am.* 1. 10. 1. *Sanas* is discussed by S. Timpanaro, review of *M. Cornelii Frontonis "Epistulae"* by M. van den Hout, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Lettere storia e filosofia, ser. 2, 24 (1955): 277–78. Timpanaro justly criticized Van den Hout for his excessive conservatism and refusal to admit readings of the second hand into the text.

margin. A third example is at *Arion* 1, where the scribe made the psychological error of writing *sociis* . . . *per nauem citharam dispersis*. Caecilius wrote over *citharam*: *i.a. ceteram*; again, it is a clear and obvious correction.

Perhaps the best way to understand the distinction between the two categories of readings is to examine those passages where there is one of each type. There are only three such passages in the entire manuscript where two readings are given by Caecilius, one of them with an indication of source.³⁹ At *Ad M. Caesarem* 2. 8. 1, Marcus wrote,

nam διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν fere dies transimus: idem theatrum, idem odeum, idem desiderium tuum.

Odeum here is Caecilius' interlinear correction of the first hand's *odium*. But in the margin he also wrote *i(n) a(lio): otium*, which I suspect is correct. At *Ad M. Caesarem* 3. 16. 2, Fronto wrote,

neque deerat Socrati profecto grauitas aut uis, quantum cynicus Diogenes uolgo saueiebat.

Here *quantum* is the correction of the first hand's *quatum* (there is a similar correction at 4. 1. 1); in the margin he has added *i(n) a(lio): quantam*. Finally, at *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 3. 10. 2, we find,

memini me excerpisse ex Ciceronis epistulis ea dumtaxat, quibus inesset aliqua de eloquentia . . . disputatio.

What is printed here as *ex* is again a correction; the first hand had written *exoe*. But in the margin Caecilius also noted *de in aliis*. The procedure, clearly, is the same in all of these cases: the correction was made first, and is the least possible alteration; all of these could be conjectural. After that, he noted a slightly less obvious correction imported by collation from another copy.

It is impossible to prove that the corrections in these three passages are conjectural; some of Caecilius' corrections are so poor that one's estimate of his abilities in this respect is not high. At *Ad Verum* 2. 1. 19, for instance, he altered *ualeat* to *baleat*, and the confusion of *b* and *v* troubled him elsewhere.⁴⁰ But it is significant that two of the three base readings in these passages are *uoces nihili*, which any careful reader would recognize as nonsense and try to correct with or without manuscript support.⁴¹ Magnitude, in fact, seems to be one way to distinguish between corrections and variants. Of the 105 legible corrections in *Ad M. Caesarem* 3 (five of the 110 are no longer comprehensible), fully twenty are purely orthographic, another seventeen are corrections of nonsense, and two more are deletions

39. There are also several passages where there are two corrections, neither having any indication of source, e.g., *Ad M. Caes.* 1. 6. 1, where *eligere* is corrected first to *siligere*, then to *sibi praelegere*. At *Ad am.* 1. 10. 1 (discussed in n. 38 and on p. 51) *bonis* is corrected first to *bonas*, then to *sanas*.

40. Thus at *Ad M. Caes.* 4. 3. 4, where Fronto distinguishes between the meanings of *lauere* and *lauare*, the first hand has *labere* for *lauere*, and the second hand changed it to *labare*, making a minor error much worse.

41. Caecilius did not correct all of the nonsense in his text; e.g., the salutation of *Ad M. Caes.* 4. 12 reads *caescaesari*, which is not altered.

of dittographies. Only four corrections are additions of more than a single word, and only eight involve changes of a whole word, or even of more than two letters within a word.⁴² The vast majority of the corrections consists of the removal of minor scribal errors; most of them a modern critic could make with little reflection. None of the variants, however, is a correction of nonsense; few of them are concerned with orthography, and the majority involve real variants. These are at times changes of a single letter, as in two of the above examples, but they extend to one of fourteen lines of text (*Ad M. Caes.* 1. 9. 3). One reason for this difference of scope is presumably that most of the trivial corrections were made first; thus in collation it was unnecessary to do it again. On the other hand, it may be that readings from the same sources as the collation variants were, if trivial enough, incorporated as corrections.⁴³ But that too is an indication that the major difference between the two is a matter of scale, not intention.

One other factor, finally, deserves attention, and that is the distribution of the two classes. Corrections appear throughout the manuscript, except in the Greek letters (but Greek phrases in the Latin letters were occasionally corrected).⁴⁴ Variants, however, do not: there are none reported for *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 1, 2, or 4, *Ad Verum* 1, *Ad Antoninum Pium*, *Principia historiae*, *Laudes fumi et negligentiae*, *De bello Parthico*, *De feriis Alsensibus*, or *De nepote amisso*. There is one only in *Ad M. Caesarem* 5, *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 3, and *Ad Verum* 2. On the other hand, there are several in *Arion*, the last Latin work in the book, and in one passage of *De orationibus*, a corrupt quotation of Ennius, there are seven such variants in five lines (*De orat.* 15).⁴⁵ The inference from this is clear: the corrections follow the normal pattern of decreasing frequency as the text progresses; the collations appear with uneven frequency, reflect the interests of Caecilius, and involve primarily substantive readings. A tentative solution to the problem is that the corrections are the first proofreading of the manuscript, possibly the fruits of reading it against its own exemplar. The collations are the result of consulting other sources, whose value Caecilius could not know; they are marked as noteworthy, but not necessarily to be believed.⁴⁶

Taking the variants as the collection of information rather than the exercise of judgment on it helps to comprehend some rather peculiar facts

42. Thus (giving in each case first the base reading, then the correction) *Ad M. Caes.* 3. 2. 1 *que: pro*; 3. 2. 2 *conprobabis: probabis*; 3. 3. 2 *debere: praebere*; 3. 6 *uel: id (incert.)*; 3. 8. 1 *futurum: fictum* or *factum*; 3. 13. 1 *ac: et*; 3. 13. 1 *uia ludiosa: res ludicrosa*; 3. 13. 1 *plane: praeterea*.

43. One should not forget, however, the obvious corrections that were not incorporated into the text; see p. 52.

44. There are corrections of Greek phrases at, e.g., *Ad M. Caes.* 1. 4. 1, 1. 4. 2, 1. 4. 6, 1. 5. 3, 3. 8. 2.

45. It is to be noted that the corrections at *De orat.* 15 are the only ones introduced by *ex alio*. The whole passage is hopelessly confused, and I have not tried to explain it here.

46. Servius again (see n. 24) provides a useful control: of the approximately 320 textual variants in the commentary, less than a third are explicitly accepted or rejected. In all other late antique commentaries, the percentage is even smaller. In only three of seventy passages of Terence does "Donatus" offer his own opinion in favor of one of the readings; Porphyrio in only one of thirteen passages of Horace.

involving not only the textual variants but the other marginalia as well. One such problem occurs at *Ad M. Caesarem* 1. 7. 2. Here the first hand, followed by Van den Hout, reads,

idem euenit floribus et coronis: alia dignitate sunt, quom a coronariis ueneunt, alia quom a sacerdotibus porriguntur.

The second hand added two marginal notes. The first reads *in alio habet: insunt*, giving an inferior variant for *sunt*. The second gives a different form of the whole sentence:

in alio sic habet: alia dignitate sunt in Portunio, cum a coronariis ueniunt, alia cum a sacerdotibus in templo porriguntur.

In the first of these, he gives a variant for one word, in the second there are numerous changes; yet they are offered as parallel. They are simply a collection of material for study, not a digested analysis of readings.

In the last example, it was at least clear that both notes came from another source (in fact, probably two other sources) and that both were textual. Determining the purpose of marginalia, however, is often difficult, particularly where no introductory phrase is employed. Thus at *Ad M. Caesarem* 4. 6. 2, Marcus wrote to Fronto:

deinde cum matercula mea supra torum sedente multum garriui.

Here too there are two marginal notes. One is a simple variant, *i(n) a(lio): matercella*. The other is less clear: he simply wrote *cum matercella multum garraui*. It is quite possible that this note is simply intended to draw attention to a phrase that he wished to remember; there are many such notes in the manuscript. If that is the case, and Caecilius wrote it rather than copied it, then he has clearly taken his variant *matercella* into account. But what then of *garraui*? On the other hand, he may mean it as a variant of collation, without indication of source. In that case, not only *matercella* but also *garraui* must be taken to be readings from another manuscript. In the same way, there are corrections or variants implicit in marginalia at *Ad M. Caesarem* 4. 12. 2, *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 1. 2. 6, 1. 5. 2, and elsewhere. A particularly striking example occurs at *De bello Parthico* 8. The text reads,

post Cannensem cladem Poenus imperator anulorum aureorum quos caesis equitibus Romanis Poeni detraxerunt, tres modios cumulos misit Carthaginem.

The margin summarizes differently,

tres modos anulorum cumulos Hannibal caesorum equitum Romanorum apud Thrasymenum Karthaginem misit.

It is clear that this note rearranges the text; it is a note, not a variant version. But what of *Thrasymenum*? Is it what he found in the margins of another text, or is it a simple psychological error, substituting one battle for the other? Caecilius' methods, his source, his intentions are all unclear to a modern reader of the manuscript. We must assume that the distinctions

that matter to us—between comment and variant, between conjecture and collation—were not significant to him. It was the accumulation of material, from whatever source, that mattered.

The copious marginalia of Caecilius are extremely helpful for gaining an understanding of the mentality of a late antique corrector. Some of them, but not all by any means, derive from other manuscripts, as the use of *in alio* and the presence of variants suggest. But the fact that they do not appear in the same concentrations as either corrections or variants implies that many of them were his own reflections; his notes are thus in some ways reminiscent of the scholia of the Bembin Terence.⁴⁷ Thus, at *De orationibus* 7, next to Fronto's brilliant analysis of the opening lines of the *Pharsalia*, Caecilius wrote *uituperat Lucanum*; at *Ad M. Caesarem* 1. 13. 4, we find the note *laus Ciceronis* next to an appropriate passage. These are obviously passages that Caecilius admired and wanted to find again; his intention is even clearer at *Ad M. Caesarem* 1. 3. 5, where he remarked, *mirus locus de amore rationabili et fortuito*. Like the annotator of the text of Livy, Caecilius also excerpted notable words and phrases, often summarizing or rearranging. At *Ad M. Caesarem* 4. 3. 2, for instance, Fronto wrote,

quam ob rem rari admodum ueterum scriptorum in eum laborem studiumque et periculum uerba industriosius quaerendi sese commisere. oratorum post homines natos unus omnium M. Porcius eiusque frequens sectator C. Sallustius. . . .

Caecilius, in the margin, wrote,

Porcius Cato unus omnium uerbis quaerendis se commisit eiusque frequens sectator Gaius Sallustius.

Some of Caecilius' observations are grammatical; in several places he notes odd genders or forms of words, and occasionally goes further. At *Ad Antoninum Imperatorem* 2. 1. 1, where Fronto employed *margarita* as a neuter plural, Caecilius observed,

hoc margaritum et haec margarita genere neutro et genere feminino haec margarita et heae (*sic*) margaritae, ut Cicero de Signis [2 *Verr.* 4. 1] "nullam gemmam aut margaritam."

The gender of *margarita* was a standard grammatical problem;⁴⁸ the quotation of Cicero is found both in Servius (ad *Aen.* 1. 655) and in Nonius Marcellus (213M). Caecilius may have taken this note from another copy of Fronto, or composed it himself on the basis of a grammatical handbook. But just as in dealing with the variants we should not consider the problem of intention, so with the annotations in terms of their sources: they should be as unimportant to us as they were to him; the only significant fact is that he chose to include them.

47. On the personal character of the scholia in the Bembin Terence (and other ancient marginalia), see my "On the History of Latin Scholia," *HSCP* 79 (1975): 335–54.

48. Cf. Charisius 72. 9, 138. 6 Barwick; Priscian, 2:143. 14 Keil; Caper, 7:110. 12 Keil. The quotation of Cic. 2 *Verr.* 4. 1 and the question of the gender of *margarita* are also found in Lactantius Placidus' note on Stat. *Theb.* 6. 63.

IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "EMENDATIO"

The work of Caecilius in his copy of Fronto does not, finally, lend itself to easy characterization; his comments and variants reflect his personal interests. The readers of Livy were primarily interested in historical and antiquarian detail, the reader of Fronto in grammar and rhetoric; that is only to be expected from the nature of the texts which they studied. But how, then, are we to define *emendatio*? It included, of course, the superficial removal of errors by correction against another copy or, in simple matters, by conjecture.⁴⁹ But beyond that almost anything could be included. Variant readings were added, where it suited the *emendator*; they were neither accepted nor rejected, but considered as material worthy of note. We have no reason to believe that Caecilius or any other corrector felt that only one reading in any passage was true: more than one was transmitted, and all were worthy of thought.⁵⁰ In the same manner, notes and excerpts from other manuscripts were written in the margins, but it was not important to distinguish variants from summaries, or original notes from those drawn from other sources. The value for Caecilius was in the content, not the source; in the pursuit of his own intellectual interests, not in the creation of a critical text.

It may seem pointless to insist on the difference between *emendatio* and modern critical technique; as we have been reminded recently, it is nearly two hundred years since Wolf proclaimed the difference between Aristarchus and Richard Bentley.⁵¹ But critics at that time rejected Wolf's assertion;⁵² and, while the modern scholars who refer to ancient "editions" and "recensions" would not, if pressed, maintain that ancient critics were really like Lachmann, the very use of such words leads us to make implicit assump-

49. That is essentially Jahn's definition, "Ueber die Subscriptionen," p. 367: "Das Wort *emendare* wird nicht nur in jenem eminenten Sinn vom Kritiker gebraucht, sondern auch in den bescheidneren des Verbesserns von Schreibfehlern—wie wir jetzt Corrigieren von Druckfehlern sagen. . . ." See also the remarks of E. J. Kenney (ed.), *Lucretius "De rerum natura" III* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 7–8.

50. It is a striking fact that the attitude toward textual variants of the ancient scholiasts is not unlike that of Symmachus to religion (*Rel.* 3. 8): "uno itinere non potest perueniri ad tam grande secretum." Aside from the fact that in the vast majority of cases no decision is made between variants, Servius in a number of passages suggests that the choice of reading is irrelevant, e.g., ad *Aen.* 8. 692: "CONCVRRERE MONTIBVS ALTOS alii 'altis' legunt, unum tamen est." See also his notes on *Aen.* 1. 518 and 6. 84, *G.* 4. 45, and *DS* on *Aen.* 1. 552. I suspect that the acceptance of two readings is derived, through Christian sources, from Biblical criticism going back to the early stages of the Hebrew Bible and reflected in the Massoretic tradition by the *kethib-qere* readings; on this phenomenon, see S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960): 148; idem, "The Old Testament Text," *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1970), p. 28. The attitude implied by Servius' notes is certainly similar to that of Augustine with regard to the double truth of the Hebrew and Greek versions of the Old Testament; cf. *Civ. Dei* 18. 44: "utraque auctoritate utendum putavi, quoniam utraque uera atque diuina est." This passage is cited and discussed by H. Marti, *Uebersetzer der Augustin-Zeit* (Munich, 1974), pp. 133, 311.

51. Grafton, review of Kenney, p. 176, citing F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena ad Homerum*³ (Halle, 1884), p. 179.

52. K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis* (Königsberg, 1833), p. 316 (= 3rd ed. [Leipzig, 1882], pp. 344–45), cited this passage of Wolf and rejected it. F. W. Schneidewin, in dealing with the subscriptions in his edition of Martial (1842), was on Lehrs' side, although he admitted that there was as yet no adequate evidence to assess the methods of ancient critics of Latin texts (1: cx).

tions about their methods. We tend to judge the work of a Nicomachus by its result, not by its aims; the fact that the copy that had undergone *emendatio* was used as the basis for subsequent copies whose text was probably better (from our point of view) than what had existed before, and that those copies have preserved the text for us, is completely irrelevant to an assessment of the intention of the *emendatio*. For what Caecilius or the Nicomachi did was not addressed to posterity or even to contemporary readers. It is the result of private study, and for private use; it is the collection of material for thought, not the public presentation of any considered judgment. The subscribers made an effort to supply for themselves texts that they could read of works that they wanted to read. They took the trouble to search out other manuscripts and note down what interested them. They thought about the meaning of the text and wondered at its virtues or deficiencies. But they were not critics or scholars, and were not trying to be. The value for us of the work of a Caecilius should not reside in admiring his judgment or his presentation of evidence, but in the preservation of material that would otherwise have been lost, and for the chance to glimpse an ancient mind at work. It is not skill or science that is so striking and admirable about the work of the subscribers, but the care and love that went into their study. It is the effort, not the result, that is remarkable: "the journey not the arrival matters."

APPENDIX: THE COLOPHONS OF THE MAJOR MANUSCRIPTS

"Full colophon" indicates the presence of title, explicit and incipit, and subscriptions as explained on page 43; "a" and "b" indicate the left and right columns of the page, where relevant.

Mediceus Laurentianus lxxiii 19 (M). Book 1 ends on 24^vb; twelve lines were left blank at the foot of the column, but the first hand has added subscription 1 in minuscule, awkwardly: despite the abundant space, he has tried to fit it into a single line and failed. As a result, *-machis* is written over *gym-* (sic). There are no titles or explicit/incipit. Book 2 ends on 50^ra; titles and explicit/incipit are in capitals, with a blank line between the lines of the titles. There is no subscription. Book 3 ends on 77^vb; fourteen lines are left blank. There is no colophon. Book 4 ends on 98^ra; *Titi Liui* and subscription 2a are written in capitals on two lines separated by blank lines; *Ab urbe cond.* and subscription 1 are on the last two lines of the column; explicit and incipit, separated by blank lines, are at the top of b. Book 5 ends at the foot of 118^vb; *Titi Liui* in capitals occupies the first line of 119^ra; the subscriptions, separated by *Ab urbe condi.*, are written in continuous minuscule in the next four and one-half lines, followed by a blank, explicit, blank, incipit, and *feliciter* on successive lines. Book 6 ends on 138^vb; the full colophon (without incipit) is in capitals on alternate lines at the foot of the column and the first eight lines of 138^ra. Book 7 ends on 156^ra; the full colophon in capitals occupies the last two lines of a and the first five of b. Book 8 ends on 172^va; the full colophon in capitals occupies six lines; the first, third, fifth, and sixth are rubricated, as is the first word

of Book 9; the sixth line is larger and more ornate than the others. Book 9 ends on 192^vb; the full colophon in capitals begins in the same line as the end of the text; it occupies five and one-half lines, the remainder of that containing the subscription being left blank.

Harleianus 2672 (*H*). Book 1 ends on 26^v; three lines are blank before the beginning of Book 2. There is no colophon. Book 2 ends on 51^r. Subscription 1 follows continuously after the text in the same hand and script; nearly two blank lines follow. There are no titles or explicit/incipit. Book 3 is missing the end; 80^v concludes with *exemplo* (3. 72. 2); 81^r begins with the full colophon in capitals on the first three lines of the page. Book 4 ends on 108^v; ten lines are blank at the foot. 109^r begins with the full colophon in capitals on the first three lines. Book 5 ends on 133^r. The full colophon in capitals fills three and one-half lines; the last half is blank. Book 6 ends on 150^v. The full colophon in capitals follows the end of the text immediately, in the middle of a line; it occupies three and one-half lines. Book 7 ends on 168^v. The first hand left five and one-fourth lines blank before the beginning of Book 8 and the subscriptions without the rest of the colophon were added by a smaller contemporary hand in the remainder of the line on which the text ended, and in the full line below. The text of the subscription is confused, and is not reported accurately in the Oxford text. It reads as follows:

L dabam domnis

simachus emendaui Nicomachus flauianus ter p̄ref urbis apud hennā Victorian; ūc em̄

The absence of titles suggests that the full colophon was not in the corrector's exemplar, but was added by a corrector. This person could not fit it into one line, so he wrote *L dabam domnis simachus* above (cf. *M*, Book 1); the corrector of *H* took *L dabam* as the beginning of the subscription and, as he could not fit the first three words into one line—*domnis* ends at the normal right margin—he redivided the lines, creating the garbled version given here. *H* ends six words before the end of Book 8, in the middle of 188^v.

Parisinus Lat. 5725 (*P*). Book 1 ends on 21^r; titles and explicit in capitals occupy one line, and the next line has the incipit in capitals followed by subscription 1 in small minuscule by the first hand. Book 2 ends on 42^r; two lines are left blank, in which a shaky hand has added an incipit. There is no other colophon. Book 3 ends at the foot of 66^r; two and one-half lines are blank. The first line of 66^v has an incipit in capitals (probably the same hand as the text). There is no other colophon. Book 4 ends on 84^r. Title and explicit/incipit are in capitals on one line; the corrector's hand has added in small minuscule, one over the other, subscriptions 1 and 2a in the space left at the end of the line. Book 5 ends on 101^v and Book 6 on 115^v; in each case the same hand as at the end of Book 2 has added *Titi Liui* and explicit on the same line as the end of the text, and the incipit on the next line. Book 7 ends on 129^r, Book 8 on 142^r, and Book 9 on 157^v; in each case a corrector's hand has added the full title and explicit following the end of the text, and the incipit on the next line.

Einsiedlensis 348 (*E*). Book 4 ends on page 38b; the full colophon in

capitals begins in the same line as the end of the text and fills four more lines. Book 5 ends on line 36 of page 76a, and the incipit of Book 6 is at the top of column b. The remainder of the colophon is found at the foot of both columns (which normally contain thirty-eight lines) in capitals and in the same hand as the text. This suggests that the format of E's exemplar was identical to that of E and that the subscription in that manuscript was added by a corrector. That, however, is extremely speculative, and there are no irregularities in the subscription to Book 4.

Oxoniensis Auct. T i 24 (O). Book 1 ends on 21^v; titles and explicit/incipit in capitals on a single line. Book 2 ends on 39^v; explicit, *Titi Liuii*, and incipit in capitals occupy the same line as the end of the text. Book 3 ends at the foot of 57^v; the same line contains the explicit in capitals. There are three blank lines at the foot of the page, and the first line of 58^r contains *Titi Liuii* and the incipit in capitals. Book 4 ends on 67^r; the explicit in capitals occupies the end of the same line, and the next line contains *Titi Liuii* and the incipit in capitals. Book 5 ends on 83^v; the full colophon, including subscriptions, occupies four lines. It should be noted that the *-tis* of *parentis* is added above by the same hand and that the first letter of *Glementiani* is a *G*, not *C* as is usually reported. Book 6 ends on 104^r; explicit/incipit in capitals occupy the end of the same line. The next book, whose initial letter has not been added, begins on the next line. Book 7 ends on 124^r; explicit/incipit in mixed capital and minuscule occupy a line to themselves. The end of Book 8 is missing; at the end of Book 9 on 169^v there is a line left blank but no colophon.

Princeton University