

THE ANNOTATIONS OF M. VALERIVS PROBUS (II)*

When Mommsen saw foll. 28^r line i–29^r line 6 of cod. Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7530, an eighth-century grammatical miscellany from Monte Cassino, he realised immediately the importance of their contents.⁵⁶ He wrote to Bergk about his discovery on 2 November 1844 and Bergk published the material early the next year as being an epitome of a treatise on signs applied to literary texts by Probus and earlier Latin grammarians.⁵⁷ There had long been known⁵⁸ Diogenes Laertius' account of the $\chi\acute{\iota}$ and other signs placed in the margins of texts of Plato's dialogues,⁵⁹ Hephaestion's account of the colometrical παράγραφος, κορωνίς, διπλή and ἀστερίσκος placed in texts of lyric and dramatic poetry,⁶⁰ the chapter *de notis sententiarum* in Isidore's *Origines*,⁶¹ the names of various treatises *περὶ σημείων* mentioned in the *Suda*,⁶² the references to *σημεῖα* in Eustathius' commentary on Homer⁶³ and in the marginal

* The first part of this article appeared in *CQ* 34 (1984), 464–72.

⁵⁶ L. Quicherat had mistaken them for Isid. *Orig.* 1.21 (*de notis sententiarum*). See *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 1 (1839/40), 52. They had, however, been recognised and used by R. P. Tassin and C. F. Toustain, *Nouveau traité de diplomatique* (Paris, 1757), iii. 483–7 (cf. Villoison, op. cit. [n. 44], proleg. xxii).

⁵⁷ 'Anecdoton Parisinum', *Zeitschr. f. d. Alt.* 3 (1845), 81–131 (see Mommsen's *Gesammelte Schriften* VII [Berlin, 1909], 217–18 and Bergk's *Kleine philologische Schriften* I [Halle, 1884], 580–612). The material is printed by F. Osann, *Anecdoton Romanum de notis ueterum criticis, inprimis Aristarchi Homerici et Iliade Heliconia* (Giessen, 1851), 327–34, A. Reifferscheid, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli... Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1860), 137–41, A. Nauck, *Lexicon Vindobonense* (Leningrad, 1867), 278–82, W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I (Oxford–Leipzig, 1875), xlvii–xlix, H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* VII (Leipzig, 1880), 533–6, H. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta* I (Leipzig, 1907), 54–6 (omitting the *notae simplices*). For Mommsen's pride in his 'discovery' and Jahn's congratulations see T. Mommsen and O. Jahn, *Briefwechsel 1842–1868*, ed. L. Wickert (Frankfurt, 1962), 13–15. Some of the material has turned up again in a ninth-century manuscript from Benevento, cod. Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 1086 (see C. Morelli, *Rendiconti della Reale Accad. dei Lincei, Cl. Sc. Mor. Stor. e Filol.* 5th ser., 19 [1910], 287–328). The two manuscripts drew upon a common source (see L. Holtz, *Stud. Med.* 3rd ser., 16 [1975], 142–5, H. D. Jocelyn, *CQ* n.s. 30 [1980], 394–6).

⁵⁸ I. Casaubon gathered most, if not all, of the material available in his time (*Notae ad Diogenis Laertii libros de uitis, dictis, et decretis principum philosophorum* [Morsee, 1583], 119–22). This was supplemented by B. de Montfaucon, *Palaeographia Graeca* (Paris, 1708), 186–90, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt* 1 (Paris, 1714), 38–42, Tassin and Toustain, loc. cit. (n. 56), Villoison, op. cit. (n. 44), proleg. xiii–xxii, A. Gräfenhan, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie im Alterthum* II (Bonn, 1844), 92–9.

⁵⁹ 3.65–6 (probably from the *Bíoi* of Antigonos of Carystus). The Greek text of Diogenes' *Φιλοσόφων βίων καὶ δογμάτων συναγωγή* was printed at Basle in 1533. Related in some way to Diogenes' account are those in cod. Cava dei Tirreni, Arch. S. Trin. 3, fol. 255 (A. Reifferscheid, *RhM* 23 [1868], 131–2) and a second-century A.D. Florence papyrus (V. Bartoletti, *Mélanges E. Tisserant* 1 [Vatican City, 1964 (*Studi e Testi*, 231), 25–30]).

⁶⁰ Pp. 73–6 Consbruch. The *Ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ μέτρων* and attached essays were printed at Florence in 1526. Demetrius Triclinius had known and used Hephaestion's work at the beginning of the fourteenth century (see J. Irigoin, *Les scholies métriques de Pindare* [Paris, 1958], 93–105).

⁶¹ I. 21. The *Origines* was printed at Augsburg in 1472 ('Etymologiae').

⁶² II 102.32, IV 581.21 Adler. The work ('Suidas') was printed at Venice in 1499.

⁶³ Pp. 136.13, 599.33, 957.16, 1015.23, 1610.46, 1627.59, 1921.55 of the edition brought out at Rome in 1542 and 1550.

scholia to Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes in Byzantine manuscripts,⁶⁴ Cicero's allusions to the *ὀβελός* and the *διπλή*,⁶⁵ scattered reports of the signs with which Origen equipped Greek versions of the Old Testament⁶⁶ and Jerome's adaptation of Origen's system,⁶⁷ and Cassiodorus' account of his own method of noting orthodox and heterodox opinions in ecclesiastical writings.⁶⁸ The use made by G. Schoppe (Scioppius) of a scholium on Virgil, *Aen.* 1.21 in order to back a comparison of Probus with Aristarchus⁶⁹ lay unnoticed. More recently there had been found in Servius' note on *Aen.* 10.444 a reference to Probus' use of the *alogus*;⁷⁰ in a codex of St Mark's Library in Venice, gr. 454,⁷¹ a whole text of the *Iliad* equipped with *ὀβελοί*, *ἀστερίσκοι*, *διπλαῖ* and *ἀντισίγματα* and accompanied by scholia deriving from Didymus' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως* and from Aristonicus' *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος σημείων* and a fragment of a Byzantine rewriting of the preface of the latter work;⁷² and in another Venetian codex, gr. 483, fol. 46^v, two lists of signs (*τοῖς παρ' Ὀμήρῳ στίχοις παρακειμένα*) accompanied by explanations.⁷³ The year 1841 saw the publication from cod. London, B.L. Harley 5693, fol. 2^r, of a brief essay *περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀριστάρχου σημείων παρατιθεμένων*

⁶⁴ Cf. schol. Hes. *Op.* 207–12, 276b, 649a, *Theog.* 117, 573, Pind. *Ol.* 2.48 f., 10.78 f., *Pyth.* 3.18a, 4.305, 318a, 431, 507, Aesch. *Prom.* 9, *Sept.* 79, *Choeph.* 534, Soph. *Ai.* 962, *Ant.* 735, 741, 1176, *Trach.* 402, *O.C.* 25, 43, 237, 375, 1494, 1740, *Phil.* 201, 417, Eurip. *Hec.* 3, 4, 29, 323, *Orest.* 81, 599, *Hipp.* 93, 1192, *Med.* 33, 1346, *Andr.* 603, 873, 930, *Rhes.* 41, 239, 716, Aristoph. *Av.* 76, 107, 204, 302, 1309, 1372, *Equ.* 721, *Lys.* 499, 702, *Nub.* 518, 562, 766, 815, 925, 962, 1178, *Pac.* 775, 990, *Plut.* 3, 863, *Ran.* 35, 153, 557, 575, *Thesm.* 924, *Vesp.* 1172, 1282, 1480. Scholia to Aristophanes were printed in 1498 (Venice), to Pindar in 1515 (Rome), to Sophocles in 1518 (Rome), to Euripides in 1534 (Venice), to Aeschylus in 1552 (Venice). Colometrical remarks by Triclinius frequently got mixed with ancient material in these editions. Scholia to Hesiod were printed in 1537 (Venice). The Homeric scholia printed in 1517 (Rome) were those long attributed to 'Didymus'; on the history of knowledge of more erudite sets see Villoison, op. cit. (n. 44), proleg. xiv n. 1. There was also knowledge of the use of *σημεῖα* on Demosthenes (Schol. ix 587.25–6 Dindorf; 'Ulpian' was printed in 1503 [at Venice]) and on Hippocrates (Galen, xv 110 [= *CMG* v 9, 1, 58], xvi 800 [= *CMG* v 9, 2, 154]; the commentaries on Hipococrates were printed in 1525 [at Venice]), perhaps also of their use on Thucydides (schol. 3.84.1; 'σχόλια παλαιά' were printed in 1526 [at Florence]).

⁶⁵ *Att.* 8.2.4, *Fam.* 9.10.1. Cf. *Pis.* 73, *Fam.* 3.11.5, 9.16.4.

⁶⁶ Orig. *Comm. Matth.* 15.14 (*Origines Werke. Zehnter Band. Origines Matthäuserklärung*, hrsg. E. Klostermann [Leipzig, 1935], 388), Epiphanius, *De mens.* 2–3, 7–8, 17 (P. de Lagarde, *Symmicta* II [Göttingen, 1880], 153–70; J. E. Dean, *Epiphanius' treatise on weight and measures. The Syriac version* [Chicago, 1935], 16–34), Jerome, *Praef. interpr. Pent.* in *Bibl. Sacr. ed. Bened.* 1 64, *Iob* ix 69–70, *Paralip.* in *Patrol. Lat.* xxviii 1393, *Epist.* 57.11, 106.7, 112.19, Augustin. *Ciu.* 18.43.

⁶⁷ Jerome, *Praef. interpr. Psalm* x 3–4, *Salom.* xi 6, *Dan.* in *Patrol. Lat.* xxviii 1359 A, *Epist.* 112.19, Augustin. ap. Jerome, *Epist.* 104.3 (= *Epist.* 71.3).

⁶⁸ *Inst.* 1.1.8, 1.9.3. See also *Inst.* 1 praef. 9, 1.26.

⁶⁹ Schoppe found in his 'schedae Fuldanae' et 'hinc...parcas' in *Probi adpuncti sunt*. See his *De arte critica commentariolus* (Nuremberg, 1597), sig. B7. Daniel's reading, et 'hinc...parcas' adiuncta sunt, held sway until Bergk made his study of cod. Kassel, Staatsbibl. MS. Poet. fol. 6 ('Servii Casselani part. III', Progr. Marburg. 1844, 4).

⁷⁰ See above, n. 35.

⁷¹ See above, n. 44.

⁷² On this passage (fol. 8r [foll. 7 and 9 are missing]) see C. G. Cobet, *Mnemosyne* 2, 1 (1873), 26–34, W. Dindorf, op. cit. (n. 57), 1–2, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* IV (Oxford–Leipzig, 1878), 394–5, L. Friedländer, *Ind. Lect. Königsberg* (1876), 4, A. Ludwig, op. cit. (n. 25), 61–4, H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* I (Berlin, 1969), lxiv–lxvi.

⁷³ See Villoison, op. cit. (n. 44), proleg. xl. The material was published in the same year by J. P. Siebenkees in *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst*, Drittes Stück (Göttingen, 1788), 71–2. It is reprinted in Osann, op. cit. (n. 57), 5–8, Reifferscheid, op. cit., 143–4, Nauck, op. cit., 274–6, Dindorf, op. cit., xlv–xlv. Cod. Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Auct. T IV 9 (Gaisford's 'codex Saibantianus') is a copy of the Venice manuscript.

τῷ Ὀμήρῳ.⁷⁴ In 1852 F. Osann was to publish from cod. Rome, Bibl. Naz. Vittore Emmanuele gr. 6, fol. 3, two lists (headed τὰ παρατιθέμενα τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς στίχοις Ἀριστάρχεια σημεία) closely related to those in cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 483.⁷⁵ The treatise *de emendatione et notis ueterum librorum* which the Abbey of St Columban at Bobbio had possessed in 1461⁷⁶ remained lost, but short essays on signs continued to turn up in hitherto unexplored medieval miscellanies.⁷⁷ Part of a letter about four signs used in an edition of Aratus' *Φαινόμενα* was found in cod. Florence, Bibl. Laur. 87.10, fol. 183^v.⁷⁸ Bergk's publication stimulated a search for cases of the use of critical and colometrical signs preserved in Greek⁷⁹ and Latin⁸⁰ manuscripts, a search which continues.

⁷⁴ Prefixed to a fifteenth-century text of the *Iliad* (in a hand of the next century). See J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca* III (Oxford, 1841), 293. The material in question is reprinted in Osann, op. cit. (n. 57), 8, Reifferscheid, op. cit., 144, Nauck, op. cit., 277, Dindorf, op. cit., xlv.

⁷⁵ Prefixed to an elementary commentary on the *Iliad* copied in South Italy between 905 and 915. For the material in question see Osann, op. cit., 3–5, Reifferscheid, op. cit., 141–3, Nauck, op. cit., 271–3, Dindorf, op. cit., xlii–xliv, V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie* II² (Leipzig, 1913), 411–12, and plate xvi opposite p. 74 of R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1954). On the relationship between this material and that offered by cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 483 see W. Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie homérique* (Paris–Brussels, 1960), 244–8.

⁷⁶ Item 102 of the inventory. See A. Peyron, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationum pro Scauro, pro Tullio et in Clodium fragmenta inedita...idem praefatus est de Bibliotheca Bobiensis, cuius inuentorium edidit* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1824), 23–30.

⁷⁷ For the essay *περὶ τῶν ἐμφορομένων σημείων* in cod. Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. LIX 38 (15th cent.), fol. 428^v, see C. Wachsmuth, *RhM* 18 (1863), 180–1; for the essay *περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν κειμένων ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἑξαπλῶν Ὠριγένους μεταγραφαῖσι βιβλίοις* in cod. Mt Athos, Mon. Vatopedi 507 (12th cent.) and cod. Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat. 2200 (Columnensis 39) (8th–9th cent.) see D. Serruys, *Mél. d'Arch. et d'Hist.* 22 (1902), 189–93, F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi* (Münster, 1907), 248–9; for the essay *de notis antiquorum* in cod. Cava dei Tirreni, Archivio dell'Abbazia di SS. Trinità 3 (11th cent.), fol. 255^r, see A. Reifferscheid, *RhM* 23 (1868), 127–33; for the annotated list of signs in cod. Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. Lat. 14429, fol. 122^{r–v} (10th cent. from S. Emmeram) see H. Kettner, 'Kritische Bemerkungen zu Varro und lateinischen Glossaren', *Progr. d. Klosterschule Rossleben 1868*, 33–5, P. Weber, *Quaestionum Suetonianarum capita duo* (Diss. Halle, 1903), 8–13. Traube (see n. 81) mentions similar material in cod. Boulogne-sur-mer 44.

⁷⁸ See E. Maass, *Hermes* 19 (1884), 108–9. Cf. *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (Berlin, 1898), 140–1.

⁷⁹ On manuscripts of Homer see T. W. Allen, *PBSR* 5 (1910), 31–3, *Homer, The Origins* (n. 25), 314 n. 1, *Homeri Ilias* I (n. 52), 196–9, P. Collart, *RPh* 3,7 (1933), 39–40, 3,13 (1939), 306; of iambic and lyric poetry R. L. Fowler, *ZPE* 33 (1979), 24–8. On copies of the fifth column of Origen's *Hexapla* see B. M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* (New York–Oxford, 1981), 38. On Greek manuscripts generally see Devreesse, op. cit. (n. 75), 74–5, 87, 113–14, 133–4, 169, E. G. Turner, op. cit. (n. 25), 146–52 (= *Greek Papyri*, 112–18).

⁸⁰ Various signs are visible in the margins of a fifty-century Virgil (cod. Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. xxxix.1 = *CLA* III 296; see O. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena critica ad P. Vergili Maronis opera maiora* [Leipzig, 1866], 158–63), a fifth- to sixth-century Gaius (*P. Soc. Ital.* 1182 = *CLA* III 292), a fifth- to sixth-century Juvenal (*JEA* 21 [1935], 199–207 = *CLA* Suppl. 1710) and a sixth-century Hilarius (cod. Vienna, Oest. Nationalbibl. MS 2160 = *CLA* x 1507). Where medieval and renaissance manuscripts are concerned, see on cod. Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. Lat. 816a (Lucretius: fifteenth century Italy) T. Bergk, *NJbb* 83 (1861), 317–20 (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* I [n. 57], 248–52), H. Sauppe, *Progr. Göttingen* (1864), 11–14 (= *Ausgewählte Schriften* [Berlin, 1896], 433–6); on cod. Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Pal. lat. 1615 (Plautus: eleventh century South Germany), F. Schoell, *T. Macci Plauti Truculentus* (Leipzig, 1881), xxxv–vi, W. M. Lindsay, op. cit. (n. 4), 82–3. M. D. Reeve informs me, however, that Sauppe was wrong to accept the presence of the χι in C.L.M. 816a; what Bergk saw belongs to the annotator's abbreviation of *ὥποιον*. On various codices preserving Jerome's signs see A. Rahlfs, 'Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters', *Septuaginta-Studien*, 2. Heft (Göttingen, 1907), 124–34.

Mommsen thought that what he had found in cod. Paris, B.N. lat. 7530, foll. 28^r line 1–29^r line 6, was the source of the chapter *de notis sententiarum* in Isidore's *Origines*, a chapter copied out elsewhere in the codex, at foll. 154^v col. 2. 1–155^v col. 2.11.⁸¹ Bergk preferred to postulate a common source for the two accounts, namely the one-volume work by Suetonius listed by the *Suda* as *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων*.⁸² Suetonius' material, Bergk argued, would have flowed into the account of the Paris codex, first through an epitome labelled DE NOTIS PROBIANIS and then through a number of careless copies of this epitome; the flow was nevertheless a direct one and enriched by no Christian tributary. Isidore's *Origines*, on the other hand, according to Bergk, would have got material from the DE NOTIS PROBIANIS through a work compiled in the third century, a time when, in Bergk's view, signs were no longer used in Latin manuscripts; the data on the Christian *lemniscus* et al. accumulated later. This theory has been rejected outright by a few scholars⁸³ but accepted with varying modifications by the majority.⁸⁴ Modification seems to me not to have gone far enough.

The structure of the account of grammar given in the first book of Isidore's *Origines* requires to be considered more closely. This account depends for the most part upon a commentary on Donatus' *Ars grammatica*, very probably a larger version than the one we possess of the commentary by Pompeius.⁸⁵ Now while the average Latin grammatical handbook of late antiquity had a section on *positurae*, that is places where there was some sort of pause in pronunciation, and sometimes mentioned the marks of punctuation which could be used to indicate these pauses,⁸⁶ it had no room for the signs used in philological criticism. Such criticism had rarely if ever touched the curriculum of literary instruction in the average school. It is no accident that few of the ancient books of which anything survives are equipped with critical signs.⁸⁷

⁸¹ The chapter also occurs in the Cava miscellany (n. 77), foll. 247^v–248^v. For its separate transmission see L. Traube, 'Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti', *Abh. d. Hist. Cl. d. Kön. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss.* 21, 3 (1898), 725 (= ed. 2, *Abh. d. Kön. Bayer. Ak. d. Wiss., Philos.-philol. und hist. Kl.* 25, 2 [1910], 121).

⁸² IV 581.21. The same title is attributed elsewhere in the *Suda* to a Diogenes or Diogenianus (II 102.32).

⁸³ Cf. J. Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), 10 (arguing that the source of the Paris essay was composed before Probus edited Terence), G. Brugnoli, *Atti Acc. Naz. Lincei* 8, 6 (1955), 1–16 (= *Studi Suetoniani* [Lecce, 1968], 156–8), N. Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 4), 114 n. 23 (= *Stud.* 193 n. 33), G. Pascucci, op. cit. (n. 4), 27 (drawing attention to the conflict between the list of authors given by the Paris essay and the picture of Probus' interests painted in Suetonius' *De grammaticis*).

⁸⁴ Cf. A. Reifferscheid, op. cit. (n. 57), 419–20 (arguing that the *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων* was part of the *De uiris illustribus* and included material on shorthand and cryptography), O. Ribbeck, op. cit. (n. 80), 150, J. Steup, op. cit. (n. 9), 52–3, F. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* 2 (n. 3), 32, A. Macé, op. cit. (n. 12), 265–7, L. Traube, 'Die Geschichte der tironischen Noten bei Suetonius und Isidorus', *Arch. f. Stenogr.* 53 (1901), 191–208 (= *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* III [Munich, 1920], 254–73), P. Weber, op. cit. (n. 77), 3–24, A. Gudeman, *Grundriss* (n. 43), 105 n. 1, 'Krit. Zeich.' (n. 52), 1917, P. Wessner, *Bursians Jahresber.* 188 (1921), 80, G. Funaioli, *RE* II 4.1 (1931), 630–2, s.v. 'Suetonius', R. Hanslik, *RE* II 8.1 (1955), 198, s.v. 'Valerius Probus', A. Grisart, *Helikon* 2 (1962), 390 n. 49, R. W. Müller, op. cit. (n. 41), 62, L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, op. cit. (n. 4), 20, C. O. Brink, op. cit. (n. 4), 36–7, C. Questa, *RFIC* 102 (1974), 186, J. E. G. Zetzel, op. cit. (n. 4), 15, J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique* I (Paris, 1959), 74–80, does not name Suetonius. J. N. Hillgarth, 'The Position of Isidorian Studies: a critical review of the literature since 1935', *Isidoriana* (León, 1961), 33 and n. 62, expresses himself obscurely.

⁸⁵ Cf. J. Fontaine, op. cit. (n. 84), 192–4, L. Holtz, *RPh* 45 (1971), 81–3.

⁸⁶ Cf. Donat. *Gramm. Lat.* IV 372.15–23, Cledonius, *Gramm. Lat.* V 34.1–9, Diomedes, *Gramm. Lat.* I 437.10–439.9.

⁸⁷ In 1931 T. W. Allen counted five papyrus texts of Homer out of a hundred with signs (*Homeri Ilias* I [n. 52], 198). In 1977 P. Oxy. 3224 with its signs (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. XLV, 51–2) stood against 53 other ancient copies of the same set of Hesiod's works lacking

Isidore's DE NOTIS SENTENTIARVM, which follows his DE POSITVRIS, must be an interloper from another source. The next five items, DE NOTIS VVLGARIBVS, DE NOTIS IVRIDICIS, DE NOTIS MILITARIBVS, DE NOTIS LITTERARVM and DE NOTIS DIGITORVM are even more out of place in an account of school grammar. On the other hand they hang together quite closely with each other and with the DE NOTIS SENTENTIARVM.⁸⁸ What Isidore did, I should suggest, was to extract material from a single treatise devoted to semiotics in general rather than from one like Suetonius' *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων*, which would have treated the particular signs used by critical grammarians.⁸⁹ Where he got his Christian material from must remain obscure.⁹⁰

The material about critical signs in the Paris codex would come, at least in part, from one of the sources of my hypothetical treatise on semiotics.⁹¹ Despite the corruptions and confusions now present, this material reveals the hand of at least one writer going back to the late first or early second century.⁹² Bergk, however, seems to me to have erred in supposing that in foll. 28–9 of the Paris codex we have to do with one single original source. This area of the codex has two headings in uncial letters: NOTAE XXI QVAE VERSIBVS APPONI CONSERVNT and NOTAE SIMPLICES. Bergk saw that what appears as the fourteenth of the NOTAE SIMPLICES, namely *F. de notis probianis*, was a corruption of a book or section title: FINIT DE NOTIS PROBIANIS.⁹³ He put this together with the sentence following the first of the two lists of signs – *his solis in adnotationibus † hennii lucii † et historicorum usi sunt † uarrus hennius haelius aquae † et postremo Probus, qui illas in Virgilio et Horatio et Lucretio apposuit, ut Homero Aristarchus* – and concluded that DE NOTIS PROBIANIS was the title of everything we have, in other words an epitome of Suetonius' *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων*. He did not look carefully enough at the second list.⁹⁴ That it does not appear in Isidore's DE NOTIS SENTENTIARVM makes no moment. Two items however, namely — (*praepositum sine consequente*) and — (consequens sine praeposito), occur in the first list with different functions (— obelus . . . *quotiens improbarent uersus quasi aut malos aut non Homericos* and — obelus cum puncto *ad ea de quibus dubitabatur tolli debeant necne*). The functions of another pair of items, H⌘ (*recte positus et pugnanti contrarius*) and — (repugnans), appear to be the same as those of a pair in the first list, ⌘ (asteriscus . . . *Aristarchus autem ad eos qui in hoc puta loco positi erant, cum aliis scilicet*

signs. E. A. Lowe remarks (*Codices Latini Antiquiores. Suppl.* [Oxford, 1971], 13 [on no. 1710]), on the small number of signs to be found in Latin manuscripts. On the tendency of Origen's signs to disappear in the course of the Greek biblical tradition see B. M. Metzger, loc. cit. (n. 79).

⁸⁸ At 1.5.4 *positurae* and *notae* appear as two of the thirty divisions of grammar.

⁸⁹ At *Adu. Hieron.* 2.40 Rufinus refers to the military theta (~ Isidore, *Orig.* 1.24) in a discussion of Origen's use of critical signs; this could indicate that the treatise used by Isidore was known to Rufinus.

⁹⁰ It is badly muddled. What Epiphanius (n. 66) and the essay published by Serruys (n. 77) call the ὑπολημνίσκος, Isidore calls an *antigraphus cum puncto* (*Orig.* 1.21.6).

⁹¹ The use of the same text of Virgil, *Aen.* 10.88–90, to illustrate the *auersa obelismene* (referring back to 10.25–9, 55–62) puts this beyond doubt.

⁹² Probus is treated throughout as a recent rather than an 'ancient' grammarian. See further below, nn. 133, 140.

⁹³ EXPLICIT is normal in cod. Paris, B.N. lat. 7530 and other South Italian manuscripts, but for FINIT see fol. 145^r. FINIT is said to be characteristic of Irish and Spanish manuscripts (W. M. Lindsay, *Palaeografia Latina* II [Oxford, 1923], 5–10, iv [1925], 83–4; but see E. A. Lowe, *CQ* 22 [1928], 60 [= *Palaeographical Papers 1907–1965* I (Oxford, 1972), 272], R. P. Oliver, *TAPhA* 82 [1951], 239 n. 8).

⁹⁴ At *NJbb* 83 (1861), 320 n. 10 (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* I 252 n. 10) he declared the *notae simplices* to be later than the other twenty-one but did not go into the matter in any detail.

non recte ponerentur) and ✱ — (*asteriscus cum obelo . . . utebatur autem ea in his uersibus qui non suo loco positi erant*). The functions of > (*bis dictum*), ∩ (*alienus uersus*), Θ (*superuacuos*) and ⇒ (*alienus et superuacuos*) overlap with those of — (*obelus . . . Aristarchus, quotiens inprobarent uersus quos aut malos aut non Homericos, obelo potissimum notandos existimarent*), ∩ (*antisigma ponebatur ad eos uersus quorum ordo permutandus erat*) and ∩̇ (*antisigma cum puncto ponebatur, cum eiusdem sensus duplices essent et dubitaretur qui potius legendi*). The function of M (*malum metrum aut aprepes*) overlaps with that of ∩̇ (*ancora inferior ad humilium uel inconuenientius quid enuntiatur*). The lists have undergone a great deal of corruption, especially the signs themselves,⁹⁵ but there is no way in which a coherent system of annotation attributable to one scholar can be extracted from the two lists. They must be of quite different origins.⁹⁶

The second list has itself a deal of coherence. A system is visible which could have been applied to texts of the one general sort by one scholar. Items like F (*metaphrasis latina*) and Φ (*metaphrasis graeca*) indicate that these were Latin texts but not simple translations of Greek works like the old Republican tragedies and comedies. The first list on the other hand does not turn out to be at all coherent. Two, perhaps three, sections of different origin can be distinguished.⁹⁷

Of the twelve/thirteen signs relating to the content of narrative verses or groups of verses, signs which all appear in Isid. *Orig.* 1.21, eight, the — *obelus*, the ✱ *asteriscus*, the ✱ — *asteriscus cum obelo*, the > *diple aperistiktos*, the >̇ *diple periestigmene*, the ∩ *antisigma*, the ∩̇ *antisigma cum puncto*, and the ✱ *ceraunium*, are found in Greek lists of the signs allegedly used by Aristarchus.⁹⁸ The Homeric scholia stemming from Aristonicus' treatise on Aristarchus' signs and from Didymus' *Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως* do not mention an ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον⁹⁹ or a κεραυνιον.¹⁰⁰ This may simply mean that neither sign appeared very often in the

⁹⁵ On the first list see below. Where the second list is concerned, the lack of correspondence in the symbols —/H✱ and the repetition of — later in the list strongly suggest corruption. Φ ∩ Φ ∩̇ *graeca metaphrasis et bis dictum et repugnans*. Φ P *graeca metaphrasis et repugnans* ought to have some correspondence with > *bis dictum* and with — *repugnans*. It is hard to believe that M denoted both *malum metrum* and *aprepes* (see below, n. 156).

⁹⁶ Cf. L. Holtz, *Stud. Med.* 16 (1975), 114 n. 75.

⁹⁷ Weber, op. cit. (n. 77), 19–24, discerned three sections, one concerned with the signs used by Aristarchus and Probus, one concerned with the punctuation of lyric and scenic texts, and one concerned with the 'uerborum sensus' (p. 21) or 'iudicium' (p. 22). Only the first, in his view, went back to Suetonius.

⁹⁸ Nine signs are credited to Aristarchus in our sources. Most modern accounts reduce the number to six. See Villoison, op. cit. (n. 44), *Proleg.* xiii–xxii, M. Sengebusch, 'Homeric dissertation prior' in W. Dindorf, *Homeri Ilias*⁴ (Leipzig, 1861), 25–7, Ludwig, op. cit. (n. 25), i, 19–22, F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit* i (Leipzig, 1891), 454 n. 105, L. Cohen, *RE* 2.1 (1895), 865–7, s.v. 'Aristarchos', Allen, *Homeri Ilias* i (n. 52), 197–9, J. A. Davison, 'The Transmission of the Text', in A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings, *A Companion to Homer* (London, 1962), 215–33 (224), Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 25), 218, P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), i, 464, ii, 672 n. 164.

⁹⁹ This is the term used in the second list in cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 483 and the first list in cod. Rome, Bibl. Naz. Vitt. Emm. gr. 6.

¹⁰⁰ The absurdity of the Latin explanation — *ponitur quotiens multi uersus inprobantur, ne per singulos obelentur* (for series of ὀβελοὶ see cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 454, foll. 19^r, 19^v, 26^v, 28^r, 29^v etc.) — and the elusiveness of that in the first Rome list — *δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ πολλὰς ζητήσεις πρὸς ταῖς προειρημέναις* — suggest that somewhere in their ancestry lay a confession of ignorance. For Aristophanes' use of the sign (to indicate τὸ εὐτελές) see schol. Hom. *Od.* 18.282; for its use in an edition of Plato's *Dialogues* (πρὸς τὴν ἀγωγὴν τῆς φιλοσοφίας) Diog. Laert. 3.66. Lehrs, loc. cit. (n. 98), and others deny the κεραυνιον to Aristarchus.

Aristarchean ἐκδόσεις. The Aristonicus scholia twice, however, refer to verses marked with ἀντισίγματα and neighbouring verses of similar sense and doubtful authenticity marked with στιγμαί.¹⁰¹ The explanations of the *antisigma* and the *antisigma cum puncto* offered in the Paris list and by Isidore – *antisigma ponebatur ad eos uersus quorum ordo permutandus erat... antisigma cum puncto ponebatur cum eiusdem sensus uersus duplices essent et dubitaretur, qui potius legendi* – are clearly a muddle, affected to some extent by those correctly given for the *asteriscus* and the *asteriscus cum obelo*. The same muddle appears in the first of the two sets of explanations in cod. Rome, Bibl. Naz. Vittore Emmanuele gr. 6, fol. 3 – Ὁ τὸ δὲ ἀντίσιγμα καθ' ἑαυτὸ πρὸς τοὺς ἐνηλλαγμένους τόπους καὶ ἀπάδοντας. Ὁ τὸ δὲ ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον παρατίθεται, ὅταν ταυτολογῇ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν δεύτερον λέγῃ.¹⁰² Between this muddle and the true situation as implied by the Aristonicus scholia lie a statement in the second of the Rome sets of explanations – Ὁ τῷ δὲ ἀντίσιγμα καὶ τῇ στιγμῇ, ὅταν δύο ὡσι διάνοιαι τὸ αὐτὸ σημαίνουσαι, τοῦ ποιητοῦ γεγραφότος ἀμφοτέρας, ὅπως τὴν ἑτέραν ἔληται. τῷ δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ αἱ δύο εὐρέθησαν οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔχουσαι – and one in the list in cod. London, B.L. Harl. 5693, fol. 2^r – τὸ δὲ ἀντίσιγμα καὶ αἱ δύο στιγμαί, ὅταν κατὰ τὸ ἐξῆς δις ᾗ τὸ αὐτὸ νόημα κείμενον. καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ προτέρου τίθεται τὸ ἀντίσιγμα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου αἱ δύο στιγμαί. No agreement has established itself among modern scholars about the precise way in which Aristarchus used the ἀντίσιγμα and the στιγμή/στιγμαί,¹⁰³ and I should plead here only that the evidence offered by the Paris list and others be treated as a whole and the individual items regarded with the greatest suspicion. If, however, I am right in thinking that the doctrine on the *antisigma cum puncto*/ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον in the Paris list and the first Rome list is mistaken, it would be reasonable to hypothesise a common Greek source for these two lists.¹⁰⁴ The references to the practice of Latin grammarians in the Paris list would be a secondary addition.

The other four/five signs relating to the content of verses, — simplex ductus (~ — paragraphus... — positura [Isidore]), ˆ coronis, < auersa obelismene, and — obelus cum puncto (~ obelus superne adpunctus [Isidore]),¹⁰⁵ are not found at all in Greek accounts of Aristarchus. The item < auersa obelismene † in ore † ponitur quae ad aliquid respiciunt, ut 'nosne tibi fluxas Frygiae' has a striking correspondence with one in the list of *notae simplices*, namely > alienus et superuacuius. It may be an intruder from this list. The remaining items could all be entirely to do with Greek texts.

Isidore's — paragraphus ponitur ad separandas res a rebus, quae in conexu concurrunt, quemadmodum in Catalogo loca a locis et regiones a regionibus, in Agone praemia a praemiis, certamina a diuersis certaminibus separantur. — positura est

¹⁰¹ Schol. A Hom. *Il.* 2.192, 203; 8.535–7. Cf. Ammonius ap. Nemesio ap. schol. A Hom. *Il.* 10.397–9 (verses repeating 10.310–12). For Aristophanes' use of the σίγμα and the ἀντίσιγμα see schol. Hom. *Od.* 5.247–8, schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 153.

¹⁰² Cf. the function given to the ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον in Diogenes Laertius' account of an edition of Plato's *Dialogues* (πρὸς τὰς διττὰς χρήσεις καὶ μεταθέσεις τῶν γραφῶν).

¹⁰³ See Wolf, op. cit. (n. 24), CCLVII n. 43 (= ed. 2, 158 n. 43), Lēhrs, op. cit. (n. 25), 362 (= ed. 3, 340–1), G. G. Pluygers, 'De carminum Homericorum ueterumque in ea scholiorum... retractanda editione', Progr. Leyden, 1847, 3. Sengebusch, op. cit. (n. 97), 25. Ludwig, op. cit. (n. 25), i, 20, 22, 209, 318, ii, 139, Susemihl, loc. cit. (n. 98), Gudeman, 'Krit. Zeich.' (n. 52), 1923–4, G. Jachmann, *Nachr. d. Ak. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil-hist. Kl.*, 223 n. 1 (= *Textgeschichtliche Studien*, ed. C. Gnlika [Königstein/Ts, 1982], 882 n. 1), K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin–New York, 1977), 260–3.

¹⁰⁴ One would talk more accurately of a common source to the source of the Paris list and Isidore on the one hand (see above), and the source of the Rome and Venice lists (see Lameere, op. cit. [n. 75], 42–3, 244–8) on the other.

¹⁰⁵ What Isidore reports makes it clear that — obelus adpunctus in the actual list is corrupt.

figura paragrapho contraria et ideo sic formata, quia sicut ille principia notat, ita ista fines a principiis separat shows the parallel item in the Paris codex — \neg *simplex ductus inter uersus ponebatur ad separandas res a rebus quae inconexa currebant, quemadmodum* <in> *Catalogo, cum loca a locis aut <regiones a> regionibus, et in Agone, <cum> praemia a praemiis, certamina a diuersis certaminibus separantur* — to be defective. The ultimate source of the two accounts must be a Greek description of a text of *Iliad* 2.484–877 (the *κατάλογος νεῶν*) and 23.257–897 (the *ἄθλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ*).¹⁰⁶ The original Latin adapter transliterated the term *παράγραφος* as he seems to have done all the other technical terms of the Greek treatise. Those who passed on his adaptation introduced Latinisms (like *simplex ductus*) and omitted various important matters of substance.

The item \neg *coronis in fine libri posita inuenitur* need be no secondary addition. A sign called the *κορωνίς* was frequently used at the ends of book-units of non-dramatic poetry in rolls of the Imperial period,¹⁰⁷ in particular after each of the twenty-four units into which Aristarchus was believed to have divided both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.¹⁰⁸ The second of the Rome sets of explanations contains a statement about the use of the *κορωνίς* to mark off the pre-Aristarchean *ῥαψωδίαί*.¹⁰⁹ Accordingly I should suggest that the ultimate source listed the *κορωνίς* and provided a history of it of the kind which is now to be read in the Paris list in regard to the *ὀβελός* and other signs.

The item \neg *obelus cum puncto ad ea de quibus dubitatur, tolli debeant necne* is related in some way to \neg *antisigma cum puncto ponebatur cum eiusdem sensus uersus duplices essent et dubitaretur qui potius legendi* and to the Greek material on the *ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον* and the *στιγμαί*.¹¹⁰ It is not impossible that, in order to express doubt, Aristarchus used different signs according to whether or not the verse in question occurred elsewhere.

Four signs clustering in the middle of the Paris list, the \rhd *diple obelismene* (\rhd *diple ὀβολισμένη* [Isidore]), the \neg *obelus cum auersa* (\neg *auersa ὀβολισμένη* [Isidore]), the \rhd *diple superne obelata* (*obolata*), and the \rhd *recta et auersa superne obelatae* (\rhd *diple recta et aduersa* (?) *superne obolata* [Isidore]),¹¹¹ have clearly related shapes and functions.¹¹² They pertain to changes in dramatic scripts of metrical patterns,¹¹³ of scene, of time or of persons required on the stage or in the orchestra. What is alleged here has obviously some connection with Hephaestion's account of the marginal signs in the Alexandrian editions of lyric and dramatic poetry, i.e. of a *κορωνίς*, a *παράγραφος*, an *ἀστερίσκος*, an *ἔσω νενεκυία διπλή* and an *ἔξω βλέπουσα διπλή*,¹¹⁴ and the account given in the extant scholia to the comedies of

¹⁰⁶ It is to be observed that Virgil's imitations of these two episodes come in the reverse order (books 7, 5).

¹⁰⁷ See Meleager, *A.P.* 12.257, Martial 10.1.1, P. London, B. M. Inv. 136 (A.D. i). G. M. Stephen, *Scriptorium* 13 (1959), 3–14, Lameere, op. cit. (n. 75), 190–224.

¹⁰⁸ See [Plut.] *Vit. Hom.* 2.4, p. 25.22–5 Wilamowitz, Eustath. *Comm. Hom. II.* 1 proem. p. 5.29–36 ed. Rom.

¹⁰⁹ The statement also occurs in the Venice material (with *ἡδῶντο* instead of the correct *ἦνοντο*). For discussion see H. Diels, *SB Berlin Ak. Wiss.* (1894), 357 n. 3, Lameere, op. cit. (n. 75), 42–53, Erbse, *Gymnasium* 69 (1962), 76, S. West, op. cit. (n. 52), 18–24.

¹¹⁰ See above, nn. 101–3.

¹¹¹ The four signs come 13th–16th in the sequence of explanations given by the Paris codex (15th, 16th, 18th, 19th in the Isidorean sequence), and 10th, 14th, 15th, 16th in the preceding list.

¹¹² One might suppose that at some stage the tradition lost a \rhd *auersa superne obelata*.

¹¹³ Isidore makes clear the function that the source attributed to \rhd \rhd (\rhd \rhd ... *ponitur finita loco suo monade, significatque similem sequentem quoque esse*). See also Caesius Bassus, *Gramm. Lat.* vi 266.18–267.2.

¹¹⁴ Pp. 73.12–76.16.

Aristophanes of the signs used by Heliodorus in his edition of these comedies, i.e. of a *κορωνίς*, a *ἀπλῇ*, a single *διπλῇ*, two *διπλαῖ*, and a *διπλῇ καὶ κορωνίς*.¹¹⁵ Abbreviation and corruption affect all three accounts and no general conclusion can be drawn from the differences between them.¹¹⁶ It is noteworthy, however, that the Latin account gives to two of its signs ($\text{—}\angle$ *obelus cum auersa* and $\text{—}\angle$ *diple superne obelata*) functions which make sense only in terms of fifth-century B.C. Attic drama. No Roman dramatist ever employed strophic responsion in the lyric areas of a script¹¹⁷ or demanded a change of scene within a script.¹¹⁸ The Latin account may therefore be considered to derive without Latin additions from one which attempted to describe marginally annotated Greek texts.

The functions of the last five signs of the Paris list¹¹⁹ are described in terms which could apply to both Greek and Latin writings. Three of them have Greek names,¹²⁰ two of them Latin ones. The *alogus* (\sim ἡ ἄλογος [γραμμαί]) is elsewhere associated once with Aristarchus' second *ἐκδόσις* of the *Iliad*,¹²¹ once with a pre-Didymus text of a Lesbian lyric poet, probably Alcaeus,¹²² and once with a text of an Aristophanic comedy.¹²³ Servius reports Probus as having placed it against a passage of anomalous syntax.¹²⁴ No use is reported of the P *chi et ro* (\sim *crisimon* [Isidore]), the P *fi et ro*,

¹¹⁵ On Heliodorus see C. Thiemann, *ΗΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΕΙΟΣ ΚΩΛΟΜΕΤΡΙΑ* (Diss. Halle, 1868), 21–43, *Heliodori colometriae aristophaneae quantum superest una cum reliquis scholiis in Aristophanem metricis* (Halle, 1869 [pp. 95–136 on the signs]), O. Hense, *Heliodorische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1870), 35–72, *RE* 8.1 (1912), 28–40 (32), M. Consbruch, 'De ueterum *περί ποιήματος* doctrina', *Bresl. Phil. Abhandl.* v, 3 (Breslau, 1890), 52–67, C. Conradt, 'Ueber die Semeiotik des Heliodoros', *NJbb* 151 (1895), 273–7, W. G. Rutherford, op. cit. (n. 50), 88–92, J. W. White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (London, 1912), 384–421, D. Holwerda, 'De Heliodori commentario metrico in Aristophanen', *Mnemosyne* 4, 17 (1964), 113–39, 4, 20 (1967), 247–72 (247–8, 254–6, 263), Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 25), 189. A somewhat simpler set of colometrical signs is described in the old scholia to Pindar (see Irigoin, op. cit. [n. 60], 49–52).

¹¹⁶ Despite the differing names for the sign, there are striking similarities between the Latin note $\text{—}\angle$ *diple superne obelata ponitur ad condicionem locorum uel temporum uel personarum mutata* and Greek accounts of the scenic *κορωνίς*, most particularly with one in the Byzantine treatise on tragedy published from cod. Oxford, Bodl. Libr. Barocci 131, fol. 415, by R. Browning, *ΓΕΡΑΣ. Studies presented to George Thomson* (Prague, 1963), 67–81 (§ 10) ἡ δὲ κορωνίς μέρους ἐστὶ σημεῖον, ὅταν οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ἐξεληθόντες τῆς σκηνῆς μόνον τὸν χορὸν καταλείπουσι, καὶ ἐπεισέλθωσι πάλιν, ὅπότεν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἔστιν ἀλλάξειν, καὶ τόπον καὶ χορὸν, καὶ ὅλον τὸν μῦθον, ἀρχῇ δὲ ἐπισοδίου ἢ τελευτῇ. It may be that a desire to keep this sign distinct from the narrative *coronis* (*¶ coronis tantum in fine libri posita inuenitur*) caused a compiler of the Latin list to seek a new name. The use of *obelus* rather than **paragraphus* may also evidence a desire to harmonise.

¹¹⁷ This point is made by Gudeman, 'Krit. Zeich.' (n. 52), 1926.

¹¹⁸ See Aesch. *Eum.* 234, 488, P. Oxy. 20.2257 (on the *Αἴτην* and the *Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταί* of Aeschylus), Soph. *Ai.* 815, Aristoph. *Ach.* 394, *Equ.* 722 (the *δύο διπλαῖ* mentioned in schol. EF³ have often been thought to indicate the change of scene), *Ran.* 180, *Thesm.* 277 (P.S.I. 1194 [A.D. ii] has a *κορωνίς* in the margin). For avoidance of scene change by the Latin dramatists see H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1967), 165, *Entretiens Fond. Hardt* 17 (1972), 57.

¹¹⁹ Isidore also puts these signs last, and in their company the *coronis*.

¹²⁰ The term *crux* (see Asconius ap. Philarg. *Virg. Buc.* 3.105) may have been used by some Latin writers to denote the *alogos*.

¹²¹ Schol. A Hom. *Il.* 16.613... ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἄλογος αὐτῷ παρέκειτο (from Didymus). Lehrs, op. cit. (n. 25), 362 (= ed. 3, 341), changed *alogos* here to *ὀβελός*; cf. Ludwig, op. cit. (n. 25), 19 n. 20, 21 n. 23.

¹²² See P. Oxy. 15.1788, add. P. Oxy. 21, p. 142 (= ad Alcaeus F 3 b. 40^c, p. 167 L–P).

¹²³ Heliodorus ap. schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1283e expresses bewilderment about *τόποι ἐπτα* ἔχοντες *στιγμὰς καὶ ἀλόγους*.

¹²⁴ *Virg. Aen.* 10.444.

the ↑ *ancora superior*, or the ↓ *ancora inferior* in relation to pagan literature.¹²⁵ Both Isidore and the author of the material in the Paris codex write as if the five signs in question had to do with literary texts. They could be distinguished from their companions as having to do with particular elements of the ‘verses’¹²⁶ to which they were attached rather than to the verses as wholes. It is noteworthy, however, that in the first century B.C. commentary on *Iliad* II partially preserved in P. London, B.L. Pap. 2055 (P. Oxy. 8.1086), a commentary in which the ὀβελός and the διπλή often precede lemmata explained according to the formula τὸ σημεῖον πρὸς τοῦτο ὅτι, the sign ⚭ appears a number of times in the margin.¹²⁷ Cassiodorus’ commentary on the *Psalms* is equipped with a system of marginal signs indicating the subject matter of particular notes.¹²⁸ I should suggest therefore that all five of our signs originally had to do with commentaries rather than with literary texts. In any case they form a group quite distinct from the other two which have been described.

What we now read in cod. Paris, B.N. lat. 7530, foll. 28^r–29^r and Isid. *Orig.* 1.21 thus can hardly have lurking under the manifold corruptions a carefully and knowledgeably composed account of how Probus and his predecessors equipped Latin texts with marginal signs. It is clear that most of the discussion of the first twelve/thirteen signs is taken from a Greek account of the signs used by Aristarchus in editing Homer, that the discussion of the next four signs relates entirely to Greek scenic texts and that the final five signs stand apart. Someone would have put three originally distinct accounts together and translated them into Latin. The sentence *his solis in adnotationibus* † hennii lucii † *et historicorum usi sunt* † uarrus hennius haelius aequae † *et postremo Probus, qui illas in Virgilio et Horatio et Lucretio apposuit, ut Homero Aristarchus* would have been tacked on to the translation at a later stage;¹²⁹ likewise *item Probus et antiqui nostri* to the explanation of the *asteriscus*;¹³⁰ likewise *item Probus et antiqui nostri* to the discussion of the *asteriscus cum obelo*; likewise *similiter in nostris auctoribus Probus* to the discussion of the *diple aperistiktos*; likewise † in his † *et nostri ea usi sunt* to the discussion of the *diple periestigmene*;¹³¹ likewise *sic et apud nostros* to the discussion of the *antisigma cum puncto*.¹³² The discussion of the *auersa obelismene* with its reference to Virg. *Aen.* 10.88 may be a late interloper. To attempt to construct a history of Latin philology with material like this is foolish. All that can be said is that the author of the additions lived some time after the first century A.D.,¹³³ and that he or his source knew of texts of Virgil, Horace and Lucretius annotated by Probus and texts of earlier authors¹³⁴ annotated by earlier

¹²⁵ Cassiodorus used a ‘chresimon’ to mark orthodox opinions in biblical commentaries which he read (see *Inst.* 1.9.3); an ‘achresimon’/‘achriston’ to mark the unorthodox (1.1.8, 1.9.3).

¹²⁶ The material relates to *historici* as well as to poets. For the use of signs in the margins of prose writers see above, n. 64.

¹²⁷ Cf. P. Oxy. 13 (1919). 1611.56, where ⚭ marks the beginning of a quotation of Acusilaus in a grammatical treatise.

¹²⁸ ⚭ indicates ‘dogmata ualde necessaria’; see *Corpus Christianorum* ser. lat. XCVII (Turnhout, 1958), 2. Cf. above, n. 125.

¹²⁹ Cf. the way in which the names of Crates and Aristarchus are added to the discussion of the περιεστιγμένη διπλή in the second Venice list (~ the second Rome list).

¹³⁰ Not sensibly, since two distinct Greek uses had been described.

¹³¹ Not sensibly, since the use of the sign to mark disagreement with Zenodotos had been described. Cf. Gudeman, ‘Krit Zeich.’ (n. 52), 1920.

¹³² A discussion which we have shown, above, to muddle the Greek facts.

¹³³ Probus is certainly made the last in a line of sign-using Latin grammarians, but neither the distance between him and the others nor that between him and the person responsible for the statements about Latin practice is made clear.

¹³⁴ Bergk rightly recognised Ennius and Lucilius. L. Mueller was wrong to change *historicorum* to *scaenicorum* (*NJbb* 87 [1863], 176); see Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I (Berlin, 1913), 359 n. 1. Aristarchus is now known to have written an ὑπόμνημα on Herodotus I (P. Amherst

grammarians.¹³⁵ We cannot deduce that texts of Virgil, Horace and Lucretius were the only ones he knew or that at the time of writing these were the only texts that Probus had annotated.¹³⁶ We cannot attribute to Probus all the *notae XXI quae uersibus apponi consuerunt*¹³⁷ or use what is said about the *diple obelismene*, the *obelus cum auersa*, the *diple superne obelata* and the *recta et auersa superne obelata* in reconstructing the history of the text of any Latin scenic poet.¹³⁸ It is interesting that whereas Suetonius in writing the history of grammatical study at Rome represented Probus as a man eccentrically interested in older writers ousted from the ordinary school syllabus¹³⁹ my hypothetical maker of additions made him the first to treat critically the new classics.¹⁴⁰ The contradiction is apparent rather than real. Nevertheless the difference of emphasis suggests quite strongly that behind the Paris list and Isid. *Orig.* 1.21 lies someone other than Suetonius.

Consideration of the first Paris list has not contributed very much to our understanding of what Probus was up to, except to destroy some of the apparent evidence. A little more can be got from the second list. To judge by the title DE NOTIS PROBIANIS it could be an epitome of a section of Suetonius' *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις σημείων*; more likely, however, it abbreviates a work devoted to discussion of the way Probus annotated his texts, a work similar to a number of Greek works about Aristarchus put out in the course of the first century A.D., for example Philoxenus' *Περὶ σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι*¹⁴¹ or Aristonicus' *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος σημείων* or *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ὀδυσσεύς σημείων* or *Περὶ τῶν σημείων τῶν ἐν τῇ Θεογονίᾳ Ἡσίοδου*¹⁴² or Seleucus' *Κατὰ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου σημείων*.¹⁴³ From the existence of such a work it would follow that the Probian *Aeneid* was in format and

2.12 [London, 1901]), although that does not necessarily mean that he was also responsible for an *ἐκδοσις* of the text. Schol. Thuc. 3.84.1 shows that there existed annotated texts of the other classical Greek historian.

¹³⁵ The presence of Aelius (Stilo) may be accepted, although Bergk preferred Laelius (Archelaus). All else is in doubt. For conjectures and discussion see F. Della Corte, *La filologia latina dalle origini a Varrone* (Turin, 1937), 74 n. 3, S. F. Bonner, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 358–9, S. Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome, 1978), 84–5, Zetzel, op. cit. (n. 4), 15–17.

¹³⁶ As Aistermann did, op. cit. (n. 4), 10.

¹³⁷ As Bergk did, op. cit. (n. 57), 85 (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* 1 585), Ribbeck, op. cit. (n. 80), 150, Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*² (n. 4), 32 n. 2.

¹³⁸ As C. Questa does, *RCCM* 7 (1965), 925 n. 19, *QUCC* 1 (1966), 20, *Due cantica delle Bacchides* (Rome, 1967), 70 n. 19, *RFIC* 102 (1974), 179, 186, 188, in *La critica testuale greco-latina oggi. metodi e problemi* ed. E. Flores (Rome, 1981), 160.

¹³⁹ *Gramm.* 24.2–3. See part I.

¹⁴⁰ Just when the *auctores* studied by Varro, Cicero and Caesar were replaced in the schools of the capital is not at all clear from our evidence. It was no ordinary school in which Q. Caecilius Epirota lectured on Virgil and *alii poetae noui* (Sueton. *Gramm.* 16.3). Virgil, Lucretius and Horace would have been in a sense *antiqui* by the time they were commonly read in preference to Ennius and Lucilius. The first clear sign of Virgil's classical status is in anecdotes like those about Caligula (Sueton. *Cal.* 34.2) and Remmius Palaemon (Sueton. *Gramm.* 23.4). Persius' detailed knowledge of Horace's poetry and the story told in his biography (51–3) that he read Lucilius only after leaving the school of Remmius Palaemon provide the earliest evidence for the rise of Horace and the fall of Lucilius. Tacitus separated Lucretius from Virgil and Horace, putting him with Lucilius, Sisenna, Varro and Calvus (*Dial.* [a work with a mid-seventies dramatic setting] 23.2). On the other hand, Seneca, no lover of the poets of the old Republican syllabus (see *Dial.* 5.37.5, *Epist.* 58.5, Gell. 12.2.1–8), cited Lucretius quite often. Quintilian cited him twice and mentioned him with respect as the next best hexameter poet after Virgil (*Inst.* 10.1.87; 12.11.27).

¹⁴¹ *Suda* iv 729.6.

¹⁴² *Suda* i 356.31–2.

¹⁴³ P. Oxy. 2.221, col. xv.16–17 (Ammonius on Hom. *Il.* 21.290 [= *Schol. Il.* v 107 Erbse]).

purpose very much like one of the Aristarchean ἐκδόσεις of the *Iliad*, i.e. that it was a single text marked by Probus for his own purposes, that the marginal symbolism was not meant to instruct a large public, that to think of a Probian text as at all like a Byzantine text of the *Iliad* equipped with lengthy marginal scholia is quite anachronistic. Probus' fame survived his death and grew.¹⁴⁴ Some libraries had texts which were thought, whether rightly or wrongly,¹⁴⁵ to have been annotated by him. What the symbolic annotations meant was not clear and scholars set out to interpret them. Probus' actual writings, unlike those of Aristarchus, were exiguous¹⁴⁶ and, not surprisingly, the content of the list under consideration is a little out of harmony with other reports.¹⁴⁷ At any rate it cannot be seriously argued¹⁴⁸ that the annotations made by Probus had no effect at all on the transmission of the texts he studied.

If the second list and its explanations are trustworthy, two deductions about Probus' mode of operation can be made: he used a much more varied panoply of signs than Aristarchus had done;¹⁴⁹ his signs were as much concerned with the area of κρίσις as with that of διόρθωσις.¹⁵⁰ Suetonius' *exemplaria... emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curauit, soli huic nec ulli praeterea grammaticae parti deditus* would thus be exposed as a distortion of the facts. The texts which Probus is reported to have been the first at Rome to treat in the Alexandrian fashion, namely the texts of Lucretius, Virgil and Horace, could not have suffered anything like the amount of corruption that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had suffered by the time Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus got to work on them. They did not exist in a vast number of manuscripts gathered from a wide geographical area. We ought not therefore to be surprised if Probus' mode of operation should prove to be not exactly identical with Aristarchus'. It is wrong, however, to argue that the signs of the second list indicate a rhetorical rather than a grammatical method of criticism.¹⁵¹ Certainly, the two arts of grammar and rhetoric did affect each other. And more so at Rome than in Greek communities.¹⁵² We have to guess, it is true, about the precise nature of the functions attributed to the so-called *notae simplices*, but do not need to look outside the grammatical tradition. The items — *repugnans* and H✕ *recte positus et pugnanti contrarius* clearly have to do with the interpolation of an original text.¹⁵³ > *bis dictum* and Θ *superuacuu*s could as well criticise the verbal style of the original as suggest interpolation.¹⁵⁴ ⊃ *alienus uersus* could accuse a scribe of interpolation or the original

¹⁴⁴ Even if Gellius' stories about Probus are fictitious (see nn. 5–7) they attest a considerable reputation for him in the second century. Schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9.369 suggests that C. Sulpicius Apollinaris thought his opinions worth citing.

¹⁴⁵ On the dubious authenticity of some of the literary manuscripts referred to by Gellius and others see G. P. Goold, *HSCPh* 74 (1970), 160–2, Zetzler, *HSCPh* 77 (1973), 235–43, L. A. Holford-Strevens, *LCM* 7, 5 (1982), 67.

¹⁴⁶ With Sueton. *Gramm.* 24.5 contrast *Suda* 1 351, 24–5 (s.v. 3892 'Αρίσταρχος).

¹⁴⁷ See part III.

¹⁴⁸ As Scivoletto and Büchner (above n. 4) seem to argue.

¹⁴⁹ See above, n. 98.

¹⁵⁰ How much Aristarchus was concerned with purely aesthetic judgements is unclear. The Paris list mentions verses marked with the obelus *ipsius Homeri proprios sed non eo dignos* (for the notion of Homer occasionally slipping see Lucil, 344–7, Hor. *Ars* 359–60, [Longin.], *Subl.* 9.14, 33.4, 36.2).

¹⁵¹ Cf. Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), 11–13 (arguing that the *notae simplices* had to do with rhetorical exercises), Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 4), 114–15 (= *Studi*, 194–6).

¹⁵² Cf. Sueton. *Gramm.* 4.6–10.

¹⁵³ Cf. for the phraseology schol. A Hom. *Il.* 20.269–72 μάχεται δὲ σαφῶς τοῖς γνησίοις, schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9.369 *adnotant... contrarium illi esse 'sepsit se... habenas'* (7.600).

¹⁵⁴ For *δισσολογία* as a reason for deletion see schol. A Hom. *Il.* 1.474. For the topic of *περισσότης* see Ammonius, Hom. *Il.* 21.290 (P. Oxy. 2.221, col. xv.25–6), schol. T Hom. *Il.* 1.189–93, schol. A *Il.* 1.295 et al., Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 1.21 *hi duo si eximantur nihilominus sensus*

author of plagiarism.¹⁵⁵ *M malum metrum aut aprepes* is similarly ambiguous.¹⁵⁶ *Π contra historiam*, — *praepositum sine consequente*, — *consequens sine praeposito*, *F metafrasis Latina*, *Φ metafrasis Graeca*, *Φ F metafrasis Graeca et Latina* cannot be associated at all with *διόρθωσις*. The source, however, of a poet's subject matter,¹⁵⁷ his arrangement of it,¹⁵⁸ and his particular imitations of predecessors¹⁵⁹ were all topics of interest among the great Alexandrian grammarians. It is also noteworthy that, whereas the rhetoricians and those affected by their ways used the literature of the past as a source of models for emulation, Probus is represented by the *De notis Probianis* as a critic interested above all in the detection of faults. However much his emphases and methods diverged in detail, he clearly stood in a direct line of descent from Aristarchus. He was no ordinary *grammaticus* and it is likely enough that his 'editions', besides provoking the curiosity of those interested in semiotics, would have enjoyed some prestige with those who thought critical problems important in the study of literature.

(Part III will follow.)

University of Manchester

H. D. JOCELYN

integer erit, 4.418 *Probus sane sic adnotauit 'si hunc uersum omitteret melius fecisset'*, 8.627 *et quibusdam uidetur hunc uersum omitti potuisse*, 8.731 *hunc uersum notant critici quasi superfluo et humiliter additum*. The symbol Θ is elsewhere associated with different topics: Sidon. *Carm.* 9.334–5 (talking of his cousin Probus as a critic of bad verse) *isti qui ualeat exoratori dstrictum bonus applicare theta*; Auson. *Epigr.* 87.12. The Cava essay *de notis antiquorum* (see above, n. 77), lists a *theta* in *amputandis*.

¹⁵⁵ For the ἀλλότριος στίχος see schol. A Hom. *Il.* 1.365. On literary κλοπή see Theopompus ap. Athen. 11.508c–d (*FGRH* 115 F 259). Porph. ap. Euseb. *Praep. eu.* 10.3, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 6.2, Diog. Laert. 2.97, 3.57, Vitruv. 7 *praef.* 4–7, Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 45–6. The topic is not always easily separable from that of *μετάφρασις* (see below, n. 159). The sign ➤, if correctly explained (*alienus et superuacuis*), could have had to do only with interpolation.

¹⁵⁶ It seems likely that Probus used two signs to mark two quite different phenomena and that our list has suffered corruption. For metrical criticism in commentaries see Sisenna ap. Rufin. *Gramm. Lat.* vi 561.8–10 (on Plaut. *Aul.* iv 9 according to Hermann) *haec scaena anapaestico metro est. sed concisa sunt, ut non intellegas*, Serv. Virg. *Buc.* 2.50 *non stat uersus* (cf. *Georg.* 2.82, *Aen.* 3.535 [citing Donatus], 4.132, 5.299, 10.129, 11.243), *Aen.* 2.778 *hic uersus caret scansione*, 3.336 *contra metrum* (cf. 3.636, 4.22, 10.778), 5.481 *pessimus uersus*, 12.144 *animaduertendum autem uersum hunc sine caesura esse*. For criticism of τὸ ἀπρεπές and the like see comm. anon. P. Oxy. 8.1086, col. ii.63–73 (on Aristarchus' athetesis of *Il.* 2.791–5), schol. A Hom. *Il.* 1.29–31, 3.423, 4.345–6, 14.1, 24.130–2, schol. Hom. *Od.* 6.244, Cornutus ap. schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 5.488, Probus ap. Donat. Ter. *Phorm.* 1005, Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 2.592, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 8.731.

¹⁵⁷ For the explanation of *Π (contra historiam)* cf. schol. Pind. *Ol.* 4.31 b *παρ' ἱστορίαν (Pyth.* 7.9b, schol. Soph. *Trach.* 633, *Phil.* 425, 445, schol. Eurip. *Androm.* 107, 224, 616, *Rhes.* 508). The phrase *παρ' ἱστορίαν* got into common parlance (see Cic. *Att.* 13.10.1 and A. E. Housman, *CR* 15 [1901], 155 [= *Class. Pap.* ii 536–7]). For the duty of the *grammaticus* to comment on *historia* see Cic. *De orat.* 1.187, Quintil. *Inst.* 1.8.18. 'History' included the events and persons of the heroic period. For concern about Virgil's departures from the common tradition see Hyginus ap. Gell. 10.16, Macrobi. *Sat.* 5.17.5, 5.22.9 (*Probus notat*), Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 1.267, 474, 8.493.

¹⁵⁸ The explanations of — (*praepositum sine consequente*) and — (consequens sine praeposito) are not entirely clear. For the general topic see schol. A Hom. *Il.* 7.443, 20.269–72, 24.614–17, Hor. *Ars* 41–3, Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 2.668, 7.601, 8.40, 9.365, 10.157, 331 (Donatus), 12.120, 124, 357.

¹⁵⁹ For the topic of dependence on a previous author see, where Greek literature is concerned, Glaucus in hyp. Aesch. *Pers.* (on the beginning of the Aeschylean tragedy and that of one by Phrynichus), schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.507 (τὸ χι ὅτι ἐκ τῶν 'Hσιόδου Ἔργων εἰληπται), Theon. *Progymn.* in *Rhet. Gr.* ii 62.22–63.30). On passages of Virgil dependent on Greek literature see Macrobi. *Sat.* 5 passim, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 1.94 et al. For dependence on older Latin authors see Macrobi. *Sat.* 6.1–2, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 1.44 et al. For dependence on both Greek and Latin predecessors see Macrobi. *Sat.* 6.3, Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 6.625. The topic was considered important both in *διόρθωσις* (cf. Gell. 1.21) and in *κρίσις* (cf. Gell. 17.10, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 8.625).