

### THE ANNOTATIONS OF M. VALERIVS PROBUS, III: SOME VIRGILIAN SCHOLIA\*

Most of the commentaries on Greek authors which circulated in the towns of Egypt during the late Ptolemaic and early Imperial periods ignored the critical and colometrical problems which had engaged the attention of the great Alexandrian grammarians. A few, however, based themselves on texts equipped with signs, included the signs in their lemmata and offered explanations.<sup>160</sup> Such commentaries must be the source of the scattered references to signs in the older marginal scholia in Byzantine manuscripts of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar and the Attic dramatists. The only Byzantine manuscript to transmit a pagan text still equipped with a large number and a variety of signs, namely cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 454, is also the only one to transmit scholia with lemmata retaining prefixed signs. Just as texts and scholium-lemmata lost their signs in the course of transmission,<sup>161</sup> so too did references to signs within scholia<sup>162</sup> either disappear or become garbled. At best, a statement about the reasons for affixing a sign would turn into one about the content or style of the verse in question. The few mentions made of the great Alexandrians give no cause for thinking that we ever have a verbatim quotation of an *ὑπόμνημα* written by one of them in order to explain his own signs. Time and again it is demonstrable that an explanation of a sign's presence against a particular verse goes back to some writer like Aristonicus.<sup>163</sup>

What survives of the ancient discussion of Latin literature is exiguous in comparison with the Greek material. Its intellectual level tends to be much lower. Where the three authors allegedly 'annotated' by Probus<sup>164</sup> are concerned, we have no commentary at all on Lucretius,<sup>165</sup> while those on Horace show little interest in either *διόρθωσις* or *κρίσις* and rarely name earlier students.<sup>166</sup> The material attaching to Virgil's poems,

\* For the other two parts of this article see *CQ* 34 (1984), 464–72, 35 (1985), 149–61.

<sup>160</sup> See P. London, *Brit. Libr. Pap. 2055* (commentary on Hom. *Il.* 2.751–827 from first century B.C., published by A. S. Hunt, *P. Oxy.* 8 (1911), no. 1086; = Erbse, *Schol. Il.* 1.164–74), P. Cairo, *Journal no. 60566* (commentary on Hom. *Il.* 6.236, 252–85 from second century A.D.; published by W. G. Waddell, *Mélanges Maspero* (Cairo, 1934–7 [Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire, *Mémoire* 67]), ii. 148–51; = Erbse, *Schol. Il.* ii. 124–8), P. Vienna, *Oest. Nationalbibl. G. 29780* (commentary on Aristoph. *Pax* 410–15, 457–66 from fifth century A.D., first published by H. Gerstinger, *Mitteil. aus d. Papyrussamml. der Nationalbibl. i. Wien* [Vienna, 1932], i. 167, identified by M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 45 [1982], 64–9).

<sup>161</sup> Very few traces of ancient symbols survive in medieval manuscripts; see above, nn. 79–80. For the signs in the lemmata to the scholia in the Venice manuscript see Dindorf, *op. cit.* (n. 57), pp. xx–xxiii.

<sup>162</sup> Noteworthy in P. London, *Brit. Libr. Pap. 2055* are the formulae *διεπλή ὅτι* (col. ii. 55), *τὸ σημείον πρὸς . . . ὅτι* (coll. i. 28, ii. 47, iii. 98), *ἀθετεῖ τούτους ὁ δεῖνα ὅτι* (col. ii. 63).

<sup>163</sup> On the prehistory of the references to signs in extant scholia see the works cited in nn. 98, 115, H. Schrader, *De notatione critica a ueteribus grammaticis in poetis scaenicis adhibita* (Diss. Bonn, 1864), K. Lehrs, *Die Pindarscholien* (Leipzig, 1873), pp. 104–11, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, 'De Rhesi scholiis disputatiuncula', *Ind. scholl. Greifswald*, 1877–8, 10–12 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Berlin, 1935], i. 9–13), A. Roemer, 'Die Notation der alexandrinischen Philologen bei griechischen Dramatikern', *Abh. bayer. Ak. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 19 (1892), 627–82 (661–5), H. T. Deas, 'The Scholia Vetera to Pindar', *HSCPh* 42 (1931), 1–78 (3–4, 30, 72–6), J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), pp. 51, 64, 104.

<sup>164</sup> *Gramm. Lat.* vii. 534.5–6.

<sup>165</sup> Jerome knew of a commentary on the *De rerum natura* (*Adu. Rufin.* 1.16).

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Brink, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 40.

however, is extensive and sometimes erudite. One purely exegetical piece is attributed to Probus himself,<sup>167</sup> while four other sets of scholia report opinions of Probus in all areas of grammatical study, including those of διόρθωσις and κρίσις. Donatus' commentary on Terence, an author probably little read in Probus' day<sup>168</sup> but a fully established classic by the fourth century, cites opinions of Probus on punctuation and a number of other matters. Two signs are reported as having been placed by Probus in a text of the *Aeneid*: *puncta* at 1.21–2 and an *alogus* at 10.444. The *In Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum* and the fourth- and fifth-century commentaries which cite Probus as an authority look as if they were composed for the kind of class-room teaching which Suetonius censured Probus for neglecting.<sup>169</sup> The latter present Probus for the most part as a conventional teacher of grammar: textual variants which he allegedly preferred are introduced with the formula *Probus legit*,<sup>170</sup> colon and period divisions with *Probus distinguit*,<sup>171</sup> queries with *Probus quaerit*,<sup>172</sup> opinions with *Probus dicit* and the like.<sup>173</sup> Other formulae, e.g. *Probus notat*<sup>174</sup> and *Probus adnotavit*,<sup>175</sup> make the record of Probus' teaching a written rather than an oral one.<sup>176</sup> Modern students have accordingly often held that Probus wrote line by line commentaries of the fourth- and fifth-century type and that these commentaries formed the source of all the material relating to Terence and Virgil which is extant.<sup>177</sup>

It should now be clear that Probus' interests were rather wider than Suetonius

<sup>167</sup> See above, n. 33.

<sup>168</sup> Seneca's one citation of Terence (*Haut.* 77 at *Epist.* 95.53) may be at second hand (see H. D. Jocelyn, *Antichthon* 7 [1973], 42–4). The same philosophical theme is handled at Persius 5.161–9 as at Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.259–71; significantly, Horace refers to Terence's *Eunuchus* and Persius to the Menandrian original.

<sup>169</sup> *Gramm.* 24.4.

<sup>170</sup> See Serv. *Aen.* 7.773, 8.406, Serv. Dan. *Georg.* 1.277, *Aen.* 1.44. Cf. Serv. *Aen.* 1.441 (*secundum Probum*), 10.539 (*Probus dicit legendum*). The same formula is applied to Donatus at Serv. *Aen.* 12.365, *Buc.* 3.38. Behind it lie injunctions like *lege* (Donat. Ter. *Andr.* 167–8, Serv. Dan. *Georg.* 3.187) and *legendum est* (Serv. *Aen.* 1.2 et al.).

<sup>171</sup> See Donat. Ter. *Andr.* 720, *Eun.* 46. Cf. Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 10.173 (*Probus subdistingui uult*). For the underlying classroom injunction see Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1.133 (*distingue*), 5.404 (*hic distinguendum*), 8.381 (*subdistingue*). The correlative *iunctim legere* (Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 9.219) suggests that the commentators had in mind oral delivery rather than punctuation as such.

<sup>172</sup> See Donat. Ter. *Andr.* 875, *Phorm.* 372, 1005, Serv. *Aen.* 6.473, 782, 10.18, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.83. Cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.177 (*Probus... et Donatus de hoc loco requirendum... dixerunt*). For the direct putting of a query cf. Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 4.696.

<sup>173</sup> See Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 12.174, Philarg. *Georg.* 1.224. For *Probus ait* see Serv. *Aen.* 3.3, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1.1, 4.359, 9.811, Philarg. *Georg.* 1.403, 4.134. For *Probus... inquit* see Donat. Ter. *Phorm.* 155. The same formula is applied regularly by Servius to Urbanus (*Aen.* 5.493) and to Donatus (*Aen.* 6.230).

<sup>174</sup> See Macrobius *Sat.* 5.22.9. For the classroom injunction *nota* see Serv. *Aen.* 2.288; for *notandum* Serv. *Aen.* 1.147 et al.

<sup>175</sup> See schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9.369, Donat. Ter. *Phorm.* 49. For the injunction *adnotandum* see Donat. Ter. *Eun.* 971, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 11.211, *Georg.* 3.351, schol. Ver. Virg. *Buc.* 3.30, *Aen.* 9.402 (Asper), 10.63, 10.564, Porph. Hor. *Carm.* 2.11.16–17 et al.

<sup>176</sup> Pressed literally, *Probus notat* and *Probus adnotavit* suggest the note-taking student. *Probus putat* (schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 2.173, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 10.303), *Probus uult* (Serv. *Buc.* 6.76, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 10.173, 11.830), *Probo displicet* (Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 2.173), *secundum Probum* (Serv. *Aen.* 1.441, 10.33), *sic Probus* (Donat. Ter. *Hec.* 2), *Probus tradit* (Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 10.182) are of course completely ambiguous.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Jahn, op. cit. (n. 8), pp. cxl-cl (admitting, however, that the *In Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum* had suffered abbreviation and addition). At op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 207–8, Zetzl seems to derive Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1.21–2 from a line by line commentary composed by Probus; at *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 10 (1981), 20, he distinguishes a little more clearly between the work of Probus and 'variorum' commentaries like that of Donatus.

allowed, but nothing discredits the concluding two sentences of the latter's account: *nimis pauca et exigua de quibusdam minutis quaestiunculis edidit, reliquit autem non mediocrem siluam observationum sermonis antiqui*. This would seem of itself to rule out the existence of genuine line by line commentaries of the sort which Donatus and Servius were to write.<sup>178</sup>

The very dubious company of the statements on Terence and Virgil attributed to Probus is also noteworthy. The commentary on Juvenal quoted by G. Valla<sup>179</sup> could not have been our grammarian's work.<sup>180</sup> Almost as certainly bogus was the one from which the biography of Persius purported to come.<sup>181</sup> Likewise four works on the morphology of Latin which have been transmitted under Probus' name. Here it is not a question of medieval error. One of the morphological works already circulated in northern Italy in the fifth century as having been composed by Probus. Another did so in the next century in Constantinople.<sup>182</sup> That there is a problem with all four works is obvious. The hypothesis of one or more grammarians following M. Valerius Probus with the same cognomen has commended itself to many modern students.<sup>183</sup> Others have argued for the presence in each suspect work of genuinely Probian material overlaid by a long process of redaction.<sup>184</sup> Such solutions exaggerate the conserving power of

<sup>178</sup> Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), p. i, attempted to soften the implications of Suetonius' account by conjecturing *uius* for *nimis*.

<sup>179</sup> *In Iuuenalis Satyras commentarii* (Venice, 1486). On Valla and 'Probus' see W. S. Anderson, *Traditio* 21 (1965), 383–424, A. Bartalucci, *SIFC* 45 (1973), 233–57. The source of Valla's knowledge can now be taken back with some plausibility as far as ninth-century Brescia (on the basis of the hexameter poem appended to a commentary on Terence on fol. 144<sup>r</sup> of cod. Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. lat. 14420; see G. Billanovich, *IMU* 17 [1974], 43–60, 22 [1979], 367–95). Cod. Vatican City, Bibl. Apostol. Urbin. lat. 661, fol. 62<sup>r</sup>, has 'Probus' applied in a contemporary (eleventh century) hand to a set of Carolingian scholia (see E. M. Sanford ap. P. O. Kristeller, *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum* [Washington, 1960], i. 184).

<sup>180</sup> Cf. A. Poliziano, *Miscellaneorum centuria prima* (Florence, 1489), cap. xxxiii.

<sup>181</sup> See above, n. 34. For continuing doubts about the Probian origin of the biography see R. Scarcia, *RCCM* 6 (1964), 298–302, D. M. Robathan and F. E. Cranz, *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum* (Washington, 1967), iii. 204.

<sup>182</sup> G. Parrasio printed at Milan in 1504 the material in foll. 76<sup>r</sup>–95<sup>v</sup> (lacking a title) of what is now cod. Naples, Bibl. Naz. Lat. 2 as the 'Probi grammatici Instituta Artium' and at Vicenza in 1509 the material in foll. 95<sup>v</sup>–111<sup>v</sup> (titled, fol. 95<sup>v</sup>, DE CATHOLICIS PROBI; fol. 111<sup>v</sup>, ARS PROBI... CATHOLICA) of the same codex as the 'Probi Catholica'. On the fifth-century origin of the folia see CLA iii. 397a. W. Freund, *NJbb* 5 (1832), 90–5, showed that the first work could not be the one cited in the second as 'Instituta artium'. A. Mai printed in Rome in 1833 (*Classicorum Auctorum e Vaticanis Codicibus Editorum Tomus V*, pp. xxxiv–xli, 153–328) the untitled material in the sixth-century Vatican codex, Urb. lat. 1154 (CLA i. 117). J. von Eichenfeld and S. Endlicher, *Analecta Grammatica maximam partem anecdota* (Vienna, 1837), pp. xi–xii, pointed out the existence of the same material in a Vienna codex (now Naples, Bibl. Naz. lat. 1, foll. 17–49, lacking a title [CLA iii. 388, written in the seventh or eighth century at Bobbio]) and in two Paris codices (Bibl. Nat. lat. 7494, foll. 124–218, titled TRACTATVS PROBI GRAMMATICI [written in the ninth century]; 7519, titled *Probi Grammatici de octo orationis partibus* [written in the fifteenth century]). L. Lersch, *Zeitschr. f. d. Alt.* n.s. 1 (1843), 633, proved that Priscian knew this work as the *Instituta artium* of Probus. Von Eichenfeld and Endlicher printed from foll. 8–10 of the same Vienna codex a fourth lot of material titled VALERII PROBI DE NOMINE and from foll. 49–52 a fifth lot which lacks a title but which coincides in part with the DIFFERENTIAE PROBI VALERII of cod. Montpellier 306, fol. 68. The latter they called an 'appendix ad Probi Artem Minorem'.

<sup>183</sup> See the works cited in n. 39 and Steup, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 138–201. The notion is enshrined in the *Realencyclopädie* (23.1 [1957], 59–64, s.v. 'Probus. 26').

<sup>184</sup> H. Keil published the four works in the fourth volume of his *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig, 1864) under the name of Probus. For Keil's views on the process of redaction see the preface to this volume, p. xxx, and 'De M. Valerio Probo grammatico' in *Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschelii collecta, fasc. prior* (Leipzig, 1864), 91–100. There has

tradition, neglect the magic encircling the name of Probus in late antiquity and undervalue the carelessness and dishonesty of the bookmakers and booksellers of this period. Insufficient attention has been paid to the fact that from the very same north Italian centre survive remnants of two grammatical codices: one carried at least two books of the *Ars grammatica* of Sacerdos (CLA iii. 398); the other carried, among other items, the content of the second of these two books and attributed it to Probus (CLA iii. 397a).<sup>185</sup> This was no local muddle. The same or similar material was known to the Roman grammarian Servius and to the Constantinopolitans Cledonius and Priscian as coming from a work by Probus.<sup>186</sup>

Probus' name could have been attached in the same baseless way to Terentian and Virgilian commentaries as it was to elementary works on morphology. The proper attitude for the modern student is one of suspicion. Many, indeed, have denied to Probus everything in the *In Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum*.<sup>187</sup> Suspicion has attached to all the statements credited to Probus in the other extant commentaries with the exception of those which relate to *διόρθωσις*. I should like to suggest that there is no reason to exempt even this material from a general suspicion. Each item must be scrutinised with the utmost care. At all events much of what the extant commentators assert about Probus has passed through several stages. In the case, for example, of schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9. 369 – *IBANT alio loco ostendit illos a Turno missos. hoc loco adnotant Probus et Sulpicius contrarium illi esse 'sepit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas'* – something written by Sulpicius was perhaps known at first hand to the author but pretty certainly nothing by Probus.<sup>188</sup>

There are three items which deserve more credit than the rest, Servius Dan. *Aen.* 1.21–2, Servius *Aen.* 6 praef. and Servius *Aen.* 10.444. These relate to the appearance

not been a great deal of discussion of the problem since Keil's day; see, apart from Steup's book, J. W. Beck, *De M. Valerio Probo Berytio quaestiones nouae* (Groningen, 1886), O. Fröhde, 'Valeri Probi de nomine libellum Plinii Secundi doctrinam continere demonstratur', *NJbb Suppl.* 19 (1893), 159–203, L. Jeep, *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen* (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 73–82, M. Ihm, *RhM* 52 (1897), 633, P. Wessner, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 113 (1903), 166–9, K. Barwick, *Hermes* 54 (1919), 409–22, R. Helm, *RE* 23.1 (1957), 59–64, s.v. 'Probus. 26', C. A. Robson, *MA* 69 (1963), 37–54, A. Della Casa, 'La "Grammatica" di Valerio Probo', in *Argentea Aetas: in memoriam E. V. Marmorale* (Genoa, 1973 [Istituto di Filol. Class. e Med. dell'Univ. di Genova]), 139–60.

<sup>185</sup> On the make-up of cod. Naples, Bibl. Naz. lat. 2 see M. De Nonno, *La grammatica dell'Anonymus Bobiensis* (Rome, 1982), pp. xvii–xxviii.

<sup>186</sup> With Servius' notes on *Aen.* 1.194, 2.15 compare *Gramm. Lat.* iv. 36. 25–8, 16.35–17.2. Cledonius, *Gramm. Lat.* v. 45.17–19 (*Probus in arte quam de regulis scripsit*) seems to relate to *Gramm. Lat.* iv. 17.4–5; Priscian, *Gramm. Lat.* ii. 218.22–3 (*Probus in libro qui est de catholicis nominum*) to *Gramm. Lat.* iv. 28.23–4.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. Riese, op. cit. (n. 42), p. 28, Kübler, op. cit. (n. 43), p. 30, G. Thilo, *NJbb* 149 (1894), 289–304, 421–32, E. Norden, *RhM* 61 (1906), 171–7 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Berlin, 1964]), pp. 443–8; for the view that the *commentariolum* has a Probian core see Jahn, op. cit. (n. 8), p. cxli, Ribbeck, op. cit. (n. 80), pp. 163–4, G. Körtge, 'In Suetonii de uiris illustribus libros inquisitionum capita tria', *Diss. philol. Hal.* 14.3 (1900), 187–284 (235–8), P. Wessner, *BPhW* 20 (1900), 878, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 113 (1903), 201–4, F. Marx, *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1904), i. lxxii–lxxv, Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 72–80. The issue has been left to one side for many years; cf., most recently, L. Lehnus, 'Verso una nuova edizione del commento Virgiliano attribuito a Probo. La *Vita Vergilii*' in *Scripta Philologica* (Milan, 1982), iii. 179–211.

<sup>188</sup> Serv. *Aen.* 6.177 (*Probus tamen et Donatus...dixerunt*), 7.543 (*Probus, Asper, Donatus dicunt*), 8.406 (*Probus uero et Carminius...legunt*) point in the same direction; likewise Serv. *Aen.* 6 praef. (*licet...Probus et alii...reliquerint*), 6.473 (*quaerit et Probus et alii*), 7.773 (*alii...legunt, ut Probus*), Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1.44 (*Probus et 'tempore' legit...qui 'tempore' legunt...*), 11.830 (*alii...legunt. Probus...*). Probus' was a famous name which Servius and the compiler of the additions tended to pick out of lists of older students.

of a copy of the poem which was thought to have passed through Probus' hands.<sup>189</sup> The extant Latin commentators show little interest in manuscripts as such. Where they do refer to them it is rarely in specific terms.<sup>190</sup> A powerful pressure operated against singularities. It is instructive in this regard to compare the note in our *commentum Donati* on Ter. *Andr.* 536 – *et 'paucis' et 'pauca' legitur* – with Priscian, *Gramm. Lat.* iii. 320.10–12 – *'pauca'... sic enim habent antiqui codices teste Donato commentatore eius*<sup>191</sup> – or Servius' note on *Aen.* 5.871 – *...sciendum sane Tuccam et Varium hunc finem quinti esse uoluisse; nam a Vergilio duos uersus sequentes huic iuncti fuerunt. unde in non nullis antiquis codicibus sexti initium est 'obuertunt pelago proras, tum dente tenaci'* – with that found by J. J. H. Savage in cod. Vatican City, Bibl. Apost., Reg. lat. 1625, fol. 69 – *...sane sciendum hunc finem quinti Tuccam et Varium (uarum) esse uoluerunt: nam a Vergilio (uirgilio) duo uersus sequentes huic iuncti fuerunt, unde sexti (sextum) initium est 'obuerterunt pelago proras'. sic enim <in> Cornelian[is] et in Ebrii (ebrii) inuenies* –.<sup>192</sup> The notes on *Aeneid* 1.21–2, the beginning of book 6, and 10.444 must be archaeological survivors from a time when students of the poem had a stronger interest in the manuscripts carrying it, in *διόρθωσις* and in *κρίσις* than the one as a rule evinced by Servius.

The plain sense of Serv. *Dan. Aen.* 1.21–2 *'hinc... parcas' in Probi adpuncti sunt* is that in a manuscript associated with Probus *puncta* stood in the margin against the two verses. All the other ancient manuscripts about which we know anything carried the verses. Whether Probus knew of manuscripts without them we cannot tell. The substance of the verses is much the same as that of the preceding two verses. There

<sup>189</sup> This is not necessarily so (despite Jahn, op. cit. [n. 8], p. cxl) in the case of Donat. Ter. *Andr.* 720, *Eun.* 46, *Ad.* 323.

<sup>190</sup> I note in the Ps. Acro scholia to Horace: *Serm.* 1.6.95 *'parentum' inuenio*; 1.8.19 *in aliis 'uexant' lego*; 2.3.126 *in aliis 'inplexum'*; *Epist.* 1.7.69 *in alio 'praeuidisset' legitur*; in the *commentum Donati* on Terence: *Andr.* 236 *in aliis 'factu aut inceptu' fuit*; 599 *in aliis 'idem' scriptum est*; 978 *ut in plurimis exemplaribus bonis non inferantur*; *Eun.* 312 *in quibusdam omnino non legitur*; *Ad.* 511 *hi sex uersus in quibusdam non feruntur*; 601 *uersus... quos multa exemplaria non habent*; 706 *hic uersus in quibusdam non inuenitur*; *Hec.* 665 *in ueteribus codicibus sic est*; in the Berne scholia to Virgil: *Georg.* 4.26 *in Ebrii 'coice'*; 77 *in Ebrii 'nactae', non 'nactae'*; 87 *in Cornelianii 'quiescent', non 'quiescent'*; 120 *'intyba' in Ebrii, 'intuba' in Cornelianii*; 131 *in Ebrii 'seram'*; 169 *in Ebrii 'feruit'*; 175 *'forcipe' in Ebrii et 'forfice' in Cornelianii*; 545 *in Ebrii 'Orphi'*; 564 *in Ebrii 'Parthinope'*; in Servius' commentary: *Aen.* 5.871 *in non nullis antiquis codicibus... est*; 6 praef. *licet primos duos uersus Probus et alii in quinti reliquerint fine*; 7.543 *difficile in exemplaribus inuenitur*; 7.568 *quamquam antiqui codices habeant... antiqui codices... habent*; 9.607 *in aliis*; 10.444 *...huic loco Probus alogum posuerit*; in the scholia added to this commentary: *Buc.* 7.64 *in Ebrii*; 7.65 *in Vari et in Ebrii*; *Georg.* 1.12 *antiquissimi libri 'fudit aquam' habuerunt... in Corn. 'equum', in authentico 'aquam', ipsius manu 'equum' (cf. Georg. 1.6 emendauit ipse; 1.64 induxit et reposuit; 1.66 ipsius manu adiectum; 1.67 ipsius manu adiecti sunt deletis duobus; 2.224 emendauit ipse; 4.141 ipsius autem manu duplex fuit scriptura; Aen. 3.204 hi uersus circumducti inuenti dicuntur et extra paginam in mundo; 3.226 sed sane hic uersus qui circumductus est talis auditur); *Aen.* 1.21 *in Probi adpuncti sunt*, 2.37 *antiqua tamen exemplaria 'ue' habere inueniuntur*; 2.775 *et hic uersus in plerisque dicitur non fuisse*; 3.153 *hic uersus in multis non inuenitur*; 4.348 *sane quidam in nouis et emendatis libris pro 'detinet' 'demeret' inuentum adserunt*; 5.871 *<in> Cornelian[is] et in Ebrii inuenies* (see n. 192); 9.36 *in omnibus bonis... inuentum*; 11.142 *multa... exemplaria... habuerunt*.*

<sup>191</sup> Priscian does not state his source at iii. 162.11–163. 3 – *...sed melius in quibusdam codicibus sine m pharetra ablatius inuenitur... sed melius hic quoque in quibusdam inuenitur 'quod scelus... aut Calydona merente'... sed inuenitur etiam 'iustitiaene prius mirer'...* –, but it must have been some commentary rather fuller and more specific than Servius' (contrast with Priscian Servius' notes on *Aen.* 1.323, 7.307, 11.126).

<sup>192</sup> *HSCPh* 43 (1932), 109. To judge by the commentary based on his lectures (published in 1487), Pomponius Laetus had read this manuscript. For other examples of the obliteration of singularities in the scholiastic tradition see S. Timpanaro, *Stud. Urb. Ser. B* 31 (1957), 166–7 (= [with additions] op. cit. [n. 135], pp. 448–50).

is nowhere else in the poem where they could plausibly go. An ancient critic had three avenues open to him: he could have declared them bad writing on Virgil's part; he could have marked them as a certain interpolation; he could have merely indicated a degree of personal unease. Of the signs in the first Paris list the *obelus* and the *obelus cum puncto* were usable; of those in the second list the  $\mathfrak{D}$ , the  $\Theta$ , and the  $\Rightarrow$ . The language of the Danieline scholium, however, applies strictly to none of the five. If Ribbeck was right in thinking that it applied to the *obelus cum puncto*<sup>193</sup> we should have to suppose some error in the tradition behind it.<sup>194</sup> I suggest a different hypothesis, at least equally probable, that the second Paris list is defective in yet another respect,<sup>195</sup> that, in addition to the  $\Rightarrow$  for the *uersus alienus et superuacuius*, it once contained a symbol for the verse which Probus suspected but was not prepared to expel outright, a symbol describable as one or more *puncta*.<sup>196</sup>

All extant manuscripts end the fifth book of the *Aeneid* with two verses of lament for Palinurus and begin the sixth with *sic fatur lacrimans*. A roughly similar juncture occurs between books 12 and 13 of the *Odyssey*:  $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\phi\alpha\tau$ ... According to Servius it was Varius and Tucca who arranged things so, Virgil himself having begun the sixth book with *obuertunt pelago proras*.<sup>197</sup> Servius also claimed that several ancient manuscripts<sup>198</sup> preserved the original Virgilian arrangement. The words used by Servius in his next note (on book 6 as a whole) – *sane sciendum, licet primos duos uersus Probus et alii in quinti reliquerint fine, prudenter ad initium sexti esse translatos* – can only imply that the manuscript of the *Aeneid* worked on by Probus was one of these and that Probus did not challenge its arrangements (e.g. by placing a new *coronis* after 6.2).<sup>199</sup> We thus have a Probus who believed he had evidence permitting him to get behind the imperially authorised edition of the *Aeneid*, who chose to annotate an *exemplar* not directly descended from this edition.<sup>200</sup> Servius is too far in time and spirit from the first century and too much given to rewriting the tradition in terms of the fifth century for us to press very hard the implications of any of his statements, even one as unusual as that at 6 *praef.* Nevertheless no account of the early stages of transmission of the *Aeneid* ought to discount it.<sup>201</sup>

<sup>193</sup> Op. cit. (n. 80), p. 152. Cf. Riese, op. cit. (n. 42), p. 4 n., Gudeman, 'Krit. Zeich.' (n. 52), 1926.

<sup>194</sup> On second thoughts Riese, *NJbb* 93 (1866), 467 n. 3, 472, 871, suggested the *antisigma cum puncto*. Aistermann's notion (op. cit. [n. 4], p. 65) that it was a question of the *asteriscus* increases the difficulty. Steup, op. cit. (n. 9), pp. 86–90, argued for a radical rewriting: *in Probi his duobus uersibus obeli appuncti sunt*.

<sup>195</sup> See Part II 161 n. 156.

<sup>196</sup> On the Greek  $\sigma\tau\iota\gamma\mu\acute{\eta}$  see above, n. 101.

<sup>197</sup> *Aen.* 5.871.

<sup>198</sup> Nothing should be deduced from Servius' use of the term *codex* (rather than *liber* or *exemplar*). He could have been translating something from an old commentary into terms readily comprehensible in the fifth century.

<sup>199</sup> For the *coronis* in non-dramatic poetry see Part II 156. The formula *reliquit aliquis* is normally used in relation to the original author's autograph (cf. Hyginus ap. Gell. 1.21.1, 'Probus' ap. Gell. 1.15.18, Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 7.464, 12.120, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 6.289).

<sup>200</sup> For the belief, backed by what looked like hard manuscript evidence, that Varius and Tucca did not publish verbatim the material left by Virgil see Nisus ap. Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 42, Servius, *Aen.* 1 *praef.*, 7. 464, 12.120 (citing Caper and Hyginus), Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 2.566, 6.289.

<sup>201</sup> Both Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*<sup>2</sup> (n. 4), pp. 42–3, and Büchner, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 394 (cf. *RE* II 8.2 [1958], 1469–70), have Probus rejecting texts of the sort cited by Seneca at *Epist.* 94.28 in favour of the one issued by Varius and Tucca. G. P. Goold, *HSCPh* 74 (1968), 125, extracts from Servius' two notes the notion that the division between books 5 and 6 made by Varius was what Virgil intended and that Probus conjectured a different arrangement (cf. Zetzel, op. cit. [n. 4], pp. 52, 272 n. 19).

*Aen.* 10.444 was not a verse which could have been expelled or transposed. Its syntax, however, was such as to be capable of stimulating either criticism of the poet's Latinity or suspicion of scribal error.<sup>202</sup> Servius' report of the *alogus* was so singular that corruption overtook the whole scholium. Our grammarian, or his source, thought that the function of the sign was to mark an abnormality of syntax.<sup>203</sup> The ancestor of the first Paris list of *notae* and Isidore, *Orig.* 1.21 defined the sign as a marker of *mendae*. Whether the faults of the poet or those of scribes were meant, we cannot tell.<sup>204</sup> Nothing like the *alogus* (T or †) nor any symbol with an arguably equivalent function occurs in the second Paris list. I suggest that originally one did (excessive abnormality of syntax would cohere with the kinds of faults allegedly marked by the 'notae simplices') and that, like the *punctum*, it disappeared.

Since the three items just discussed show that examination of an actual Probian text of the *Aeneid* occurred at some point in the tradition behind the extant commentaries, we may treat statements introduced by the formula *Probus legit* as possibly dependent on such examination. Whether, however, *tempore* at *Aen.* 1.44, *umbrae* at 1.441, *Phoebigenam* at 7.773, *infusum* at 8.406, *aeger* at 9.814, *albis* at 10.539, *relinquunt* at 11.830, and *floros* at 12.605 occurred in the text chosen by Probus as his base (like the book division at 6.2) or were corrections made to that text on the basis of collation with others or were pure conjectures, entered and marked as such, we cannot tell. Servius' whole use of *legere* would indicate that for him *Probus legit* meant that Probus 'read' the variant in question in a manuscript and commended it in some way.<sup>205</sup> What was said and meant in Servius' source is yet another unanswerable question.<sup>206</sup> In any case attempts to compare Probus' text of Virgil as a whole with any of those which survive or to assess the methods of textual criticism which Probus followed are vain. We know the 'readings' we do know because majority opinion in late antiquity 'read' the passages in question differently. We know absolutely nothing about Probus' views on the hundreds of other passages where there were problems even for persons uninterested in or positively hostile to problems.

I come now to the statements attributed to Probus giving reasons for the affixing of a sign or for the choice of a 'reading'. If, as I have argued, Probus did not write line by line commentaries, if he did not even accompany his marginal *notae* with brief explanations, if interested scholars felt obliged to write treatises *De notis Probianis*

<sup>202</sup> For the distinction see Varr. *Ling.* 9.106 *Plauti aut librarii mendum si est*, Ascon. p. 60. 7–8 Stangl *inducor magis librariorum hoc loco esse mendam quam ut Ciceronem parum proprio uerbo usum esse credam*.

<sup>203</sup> For *satis licenter* cf. the notes on *Aen.* 5.326, 8.268, *Georg.* 3.443; for reports of criticism by Probus of Virgil's latinity cf. those on *Aen.* 2.173, 3.83, 4.359, 9.811 (referring to 5.432). Since Burman (op. cit. [n. 8], vol. iii. 534) recognised the reference to an *alogus* and suggested that the scholium be read either as... *ut Probus huic loco corrupto alogum apposuerit* or... *ut Probus hoc loco corrupto alogum posuerit*, some have kept the reference to corruption (cf. Bergk, op. cit. [n. 57], 110 [= *Kl. phil. Schr.* i. 581], Ribbeck, op. cit. [n. 80], pp. 151–2, Steup, op. cit. [n. 9] p. 85). G. Thilo (Leipzig, 1884) rightly got rid of it (*ut huic loco Probus alogum adposuerit*); likewise Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), p. xiii.

<sup>204</sup> The first Paris list has Aristarchus and others marking with the obelus 'bad' verses as well as non-Homeric verses (*Gramm. Lat.* vii. 534.13–16).

<sup>205</sup> See above, n. 19.

<sup>206</sup> It is doubtless true that *nunc magis est* at *Aen.* 10.481 results from conjecture (cf. Timpanaro, op. cit. [n. 135], p. 184 n. 50), but Servius' *legitur et 'nunc magis est'* can hardly mean "'nunc magis est" is also conjectured'. Likewise *audiam* at Ter. *Andr.* 592 and *paucis* at *Hec.* 58 may be conjectures based on the original Greek (cf. Wessner, *Aemilius Asper* [n. 3], p. 28), but Donatus' *legitur et* and *quidam legunt* refer merely to what has been seen in manuscripts.

along the lines of Aristonicus' *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰλιάδος σημείων*, where, it may be asked, did such statements come from? Scholars have made much of the three Danieline scholia: *Aen.* 1.21–2 *et 'hinc populum late regem belloque superbum uenturum excidio Libyae sic uoluere parcas' in Probi adpuncti sunt et adnotatum* (Schoppe:<sup>207</sup> *adnotandum*): *'hi duo si eximantur (examinantur C), nihilo minus sensus integer erit. sed Vergilius amat aliud agens exire in laudes populi Romani'*;<sup>208</sup> 4.418 *Probus sane sic adnotauit: 'si hunc uersum (Commelin: uerbum) omitteret, melius fecisset'*; 12.605 *antiqua lectio 'floros' habuit... Probus sic adnotauit: 'neotericum erat "flauos" (Daniel: fluuium) ergo bene "floros" (Daniel: flores), nam sequitur "et roseas laniata genas". Accius (Daniel: acciui) in Bacchis (Commelin: bacchidibus)... in iisdem... Pacuuius Antiopa...'*<sup>209</sup> They are impressed, even when they do not say so, by the use of the verb *adnotare*, a verb used by Suetonius in his account of Probus at *Gramm.* 24.3. It is to be observed that the syntagm *exemplar adnotare*<sup>210</sup> is quite different from the one shared by the three scholia. Much more relevant to these is the use of *aliquis adnotauit* as a stylistic variant of *aliquis ait* and the like in the Danieline scholia and in other bodies of ancient grammatical comment: I should cite only Donat. *Ter. Phorm.* 88 *legitur et 'illico' et annotatur: 'ex abundanti additum, ut apud ueteres multa sunt'*, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Aen.* 9.346 *Cornutus 'nocte' legit et adnotauit: 'utrum "nocte" pro morte an cum multa nox esset?'*, 10.673 *Asper 'quosne' legit et adnotauit: "'ne" pro "ue", quasi expletiua particula.*<sup>211</sup> The Danieline scholia on *Aen.* 1.21–2, 4.418 and 12.605 cohere with those on 2.173 (*Probo sane displicet...*), 4.359 (*Probus enim ait...*), 9.811 (*Probus ait...*), 10.182 (*Probus...tradit*), 10.303 (*Probus...putat*), 11.554 (*Probus...*), 11.566 (*Probus...*), 11.830 (*Probus...uult...*), 12.174 (*Probus...dicit*). One could derive them all, with the exception of one, from some now-lost commentary falsely attributed to Probus.<sup>212</sup> That on 1.21–2 stands quite apart.<sup>213</sup> Here it is plainly implied that a text of the *Aeneid* handled by Probus has been examined<sup>214</sup> and that this text contained in its margin both a sign and an explanation of the sign. We thus have a difficulty for the view of Probus' activity urged in the rest of this paper, a difficulty of the kind posed for students of the activity of the great Alexandrians by scholia containing both a reference to a sign and an explanation of the presence of the sign. It is not an insuperable difficulty. I should suggest that it was not Probus who composed the jejune note in favour of the *puncta*

<sup>207</sup> See op. cit. (n. 69). *Adnotandum* cannot stand; the gerund is regularly constructed either with an accusative and infinitive (Ascon. p. 58, 27, Serv. Dan. Virg. *Georg.* 3.351, Porph. Hor. *Carm.* 2.11.16–17, 4.5.18, *Serm.* 1.3.1) or with a clause introduced by *quod* (Donat. *Ter. Eun.* 971, schol. Ver. Virg. *Buc.* 3.30, *Aen.* 10.564, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 11.211, Porph. Hor. *Epod.* 2.54, *Serm.* 2.1.17, 2.3.187, 2.3.316; at Porph. Hor. *Serm.* 1.10.18 *quod* is easily supplied).

<sup>208</sup> It is impossible to tell with certainty whether *sed Vergilius amat aliud agens exire in laudes populi Romani* is meant to belong to Probus' note or to be a criticism thereof.

<sup>209</sup> Cf. Donat. *Phorm.* 49 *hoc annotauit Probus*, schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9.369 *adnotant Probus et Sulpicius*.

<sup>210</sup> See above, n. 42 (especially the discussion of Steup).

<sup>211</sup> Servius seems not to use *adnotare* at all.

<sup>212</sup> Zetzel, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 48–9, 207–8, makes the scholium wholly dependent on a commentary by Probus which prefixed the lemmata with signs. In 'postilla' to his original article (n. 4; see *Studi di letteratura latina imperiale*, pp. 214–21) Scivoletto argues that the author of the statement in the scholium (Donatus) based it on a schedule of *notae* with brief explanations illustrated from the *Aeneid* by Probus himself.

<sup>213</sup> Cf., however, schol. Ver. Virg. *Aen.* 9.373 *Prob. hic posuit aptissimum hoc exemplum ex Horatio: 'nocte sublustri nihil astra praeter uidit et undas'*.

<sup>214</sup> See above, pp. 470–1, on *'hinc...parcas' in Probi adpuncti sunt*.



placed against *Aen.* 1.21–2 but some later owner of the manuscript which Probus had marked.<sup>215</sup>

The tradition of ancient Virgilian scholarship thus points in the same direction as the two lists of signs preserved in cod. Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7530. What Probus did caught not only the attention of contemporaries. The texts he worked on survived for some time, and attempts to decipher the meaning of the signs he inserted in their margins were made. Something of a myth developed about him and his opinions. It is clear that Leo made too much of the myth. On the other hand there are items in our record which cannot be dismissed in the cavalier way of certain recent students. Between the autograph manuscripts of Terence, Lucretius, Virgil and Horace, if not of Plautus, Sallust and Persius, and those which survive is dimly perceptible the activity of a scholar who thought well of his own powers of judgement and who impressed posterity. Unfortunately a large emphasis has to be placed on the adverb 'dimly'.

*University of Manchester*

H. D. JOCELYN

<sup>215</sup> *Et adnotatum* could be regarded as co-ordinate with the earlier *et 'late regem' ... et 'hinc'* rather than as linked closely with *adpuncti sunt*. Not, however, I think plausibly. Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 212), p. 220 n. 74, defends the transmitted *adnotandum* as coming from Donatus.