

THE ANNOTATIONS OF M. VALERIUS PROBUS¹

In the period between Constantine's reunification of the Empire in 324 and the deposition of Romulus Augustulus in 476 M. Valerius Probus enjoyed a large reputation as master of all areas of the *ars grammatica*. The commentary on Terence attributed to Donatus and the commentary of Servius on Virgil cite him more often than they do any other ancient authority.² His fame persisted through the Dark Ages. Eugenius of Toledo set him with Varius and Tucca against Aristarchus, the greatest of the Alexandrian students of Homer.³ Modern writers on the history of Roman scholarship have estimated in widely different ways his quality as a textual critic, the level of his reputation during the century after his death and the influence which his activities had on the transmission of the Latin classics.⁴ That he 'annotated' at least

¹ I am grateful to C. O. Brink for some critical comments on a draft of this paper. Much of it was written during a visit to the Fondation Hardt in Vandoeuvres in August 1981 under the exchange agreement between the British Academy and the Fonds National Suisse de la Recherche Scientifique.

² The commentary on Terence ascribed to Donatus names Probus nine times, Asper three. Servius' commentary on Virgil names Donatus, probably his principal direct source, forty-seven times; Probus comes next with eighteen mentions, followed by Asper with fifteen. The Danieline additions have seventeen mentions of Probus, six of Celsus, five of Cornutus, four of Asper.

³ See the preface which he wrote to his 'edition' of Dracontius, vv. 20–5 (*MGH* auct. ant. xiv, pp. 27, 29).

⁴ Still fundamental are F. Leo's discussions: *Plautinische Forschungen: zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie* (Berlin, 1895), pp. 21–45 (= [with supplements] ed. 2, 1912, pp. 23–48); *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig, 1901), pp. 18–19, 139; review of W. M. Lindsay's *The Ancient Editions of Plautus*, *GGA* (1904), 358–74; review of Keller and Holder's edition of Horace and of Keller's edition of the pseudacronian scholia, *GGA* (1904), 849–56 (= *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, II [Rome, 1960], 159–67). For general approval of Leo's view of the transmission of the archaic and classical authors see F. Vollmer, 'Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz', *Philologus* Suppl. 10. 2 (1905), 261–322 (267, 285 n. 47), E. Höhne, *Die Geschichte des Sallusttextes im Altertum* (Diss. Munich, 1927), pp. 14–38, A. Rostagni, *RFIC* 62 (1934), 1–26, 67 (1939), 113–35 (= *Scritti minori* II 2 [Turin, 1956], 351–75, 121–47), Suetonio 'De Poetis' e *biografi minori* (Turin, 1944), pp. 167–8, R. Hanslik, *RE* II 8. 1 (1955), 198–208, s.v. 'M. Valerius Probus', F. Brunhölzl, *Hermes* 90 (1962), 102. For modification see O. Seyffert, 'Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der Komödien des Plautus', *BPhW* 16 (1896), 252–5, 283–8, P. Wessner, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 113 (1903), 133–6, 143, 139 (1908), 102, 152–3, 188 (1921), 78–88, *Aemilius Asper* (Halle, 1905), pp. 9–12, 19–23, in W. Kroll and F. Skutsch, *W. S. Teuffels Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, ed. 6, II (Leipzig–Berlin, 1910), pp. 256–63, *BPhW* 33 (1913), 139–47, 49 (1929), 434–45, 51 (1931), 1449–59, *Gnomon* 3 (1927), 339–47, *RE* II 4. 1 (1931), 741–2, s.v. 'Sulpicius Apollinaris', J. Aistermann, *De M. Valerio Probo Berytio capita IV* (Bonn, 1910), pp. 9–15, 33–57, A. Klotz, *BPhW* 43 (1923), 261, G. Jachmann, *Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum* (Basle, 1924), pp. 72–91, R. Zimmermann, *Der Sallusttext im Altertum* (Munich, 1929), pp. 48–50, G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence, 1934; ed. 2, 1952), pp. 339–48, 357–9, 370–3, 378–9, E. Paratore, *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'De poetis' di Suetonio* (Turin, 1946), pp. 90–101 (= ed. 2, with supplements, Bari, 1950, pp. 81–126), G. D'Anna, *Le idee letterarie di Suetonio* (Florence, 1954; ed. 2, 1967), pp. 157–70, C. Questa, *RFIC* 102 (1974), 177–9. For outright rejection (anticipated to some extent by W. M. Lindsay, *The Ancient Editions of Plautus* [Oxford, 1904], pp. 104–18, 142–50, *Bursians Jahresberichte* 130 [1906], 128–33, O. Keller, *RhM* 61 [1906], 80–81) see N. Scivoletto, 'La "filologia" di Valerio Probo di Berito', *GIF* 12 (1959), 97–124 (=, with supplements, *Studi di letteratura latina imperiale* [Naples, 1963], pp. 155–213), K. Büchner in H. Hunger et al., *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, I (Zürich, 1961), pp. 329–30, 335–9, 377, 379–80, 388, 391, 392–6, E. J. Kenney, *CR* n.s. 12 (1962), 225, L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford, 1968) pp. 25–6 (= ed. 2, 1974, pp. 25–7), P. L. Schmidt, *Der kleine Pauly* 4 (1972), 1147–8, s.v. 'Probus', G. Pascucci, 'Valerio Probo e i ueteres', in *Grammatici*

some of these in the manner of an Aristarchus is not in dispute, but everything about the nature of his 'annotation' is. This paper will treat afresh a famous statement about Probus in Suetonius' *De grammaticis* (24. 3), two lists of *notae* associated with Probus' name in a late eighth-century manuscript from Monte Cassino, cod. Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7530 (*CLA* v 569), two references to such *notae* which have been detected in Virgilian scholia (Serv. *Aen.* 10. 444 and Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 1. 21) and a number of statements in these scholia which appear to give Probus' reasons for affixing *notae*. The results of my study are largely negative but may help to control general discussion of the history of a number of Latin texts.

I have set to one side several items in the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius which J. Aistermann treated as 'fragments'⁵ and which still figure prominently in discussion of Probus: 1. 15. 18, 3. 1. 5–6, 6. 7. 3–5, 9. 9. 12–17, 13. 21. 1–9. These are all accounts of statements purportedly made by Probus' acquaintances in private conversation. Where 3. 1. 5–6 is concerned, doubt is thrown by the hearer on the truth of the statement. All five could be entirely fictional. Gellius wrote in a tradition affected by the dialogues of Plato and Xenophon. The rules of the tradition did not demand even the degree of veracity expected in the minutes of a modern academic committee meeting.⁶ None of the items in question should be treated on the same level as, for example, the references to books purportedly written by Probus at 4. 7,⁷ 6. 9. 11–12, 15. 30. 5 and 17. 9. 5.

I. SUETONIUS, *GRAMM.* 24. 3

hos (sc. antiquos) cum diligentius repetere atque alios deinceps cognoscere cuperet, quamvis omnes contemni magisque obprobrio legentibus quam gloriae et fructui esse animaduertet, nihilo minus in proposito mansit multaque exemplaria contracta emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curavit, soli huic nec ulli praeterea grammaticae parti deditus

Serious analysis of the twenty-fourth chapter of Suetonius' *De grammaticis* began with the prolegomena to O. Jahn's edition of Persius' *Satires*, a work dedicated to K. Lachmann.⁸ A sentence on p. cxl, 'Probum potissimam curam in recensendis et edendis scriptoribus posuisse Suetonius narrat', has dominated for well over a century, either directly or indirectly, the whole debate concerning Probus and what he was about. Many have written about the 'editions' of Probus, occasionally assimilating them in one way or another to those of Lachmann himself, more frequently to the ἐκδόσεις of Aristarchus. It has been objected that Suetonius makes no reference to the comparison of different *exemplaria* of the one text,⁹ that he does not describe *latini d'età imperiale* (Genoa, [Università di Genova, Fac. d. Lett., Ist. d. Filol. Class. e Med.], 1976) pp. 17–40 (= *Scritti Scelti* [Florence, 1983], 399–422), E. Courtney, *BICS* 28 (1981), 24–6, J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York, 1981), pp. 41–54, 73–4, 237–8. The best measured recent discussion is C. O. Brink's: *Horace on Poetry. The 'Ars Poetica'* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 35–8.

⁵ Op. cit. (n. 3), pp. vi (1, 2), vii (4), xix (55), xxiii (66).

⁶ Cf. Cic. *Fam.* 9. 8. 1 (...nosti morem dialogorum), Athen. 5. 215c–221a, 11. 505e–506a, Diog. Laert. 3. 35–6, Macrobi. *Sat.* 1. 1. 5–6. On fiction in the *Noctes Atticae* see L. A. Holford-Strevens, *LCM* 7. 5 (1982), 65–8. ⁷ Discussed by C. Questa, *RFIC* 102 (1974), 178–9.

⁸ *Auli Persii Flacci Satirarum liber* (Leipzig, 1843). Some of the references to Probus scattered in extant literature had been collected by P. Burman, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera cum integris et emendationibus commentariis Seruii, Philargyrii, Pierii*, 1 (Amsterdam, 1746), praef.

⁹ Both Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 4), 100 (= *Stud.* p. 162) and Büchner, op. cit. (n. 4), 336–7, make much of this. It troubled nineteenth-century students. J. Steup, *De Probis grammaticis* (Jena, 1871), pp. 18–19, conjectured *multosque ad exemplaria contracta emendare*, H. Usener, *SB Bayer. Ak. Philos. philol. u. hist. Kl.* 1892, Heft iv, 605, n. 1 (= *Kleine Schriften* II [Berlin–Leipzig, 1913], 282 n. 49), *multaque exemplarium copia contracta emendare*.

Probus as writing out texts in his own hand,¹⁰ that he does not talk of *editiones*.¹¹ Any warning against analogies, especially modern ones, can only be salutary, but the weight of negative linguistic considerations in enquiries of this kind ought not to be exaggerated.

Suetonius was not a professional *grammaticus* of the type which his essay described.¹² He neither presided over a library nor held classes in grammar. He did not always use professional vocabulary in relating the activities of professionals. He wrote with great brevity. He clearly valued other areas of the grammatical art more highly than the one to which Probus seemed to him to have devoted most attention, and he regarded the person of Probus with some hostility. The absence of any reference to the recension of manuscripts in his account of Probus may simply reflect a lack of concern for the exact narration of technical details in an area of activity he thought trivial.¹³ It is perhaps more significant that he did not bring against Probus the stock ancient charge against grammarians interested in the correction of texts, namely that of wilfully corrupting with conjectures the genuine *paradosis*.¹⁴

It is true that the *ἐκδόσεις* of Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus were regularly referred to by the Greek counterparts of Suetonius as though they had been executed in the hands of the grammarians themselves,¹⁵ and that there existed texts believed by book collectors to have been written by C. Octavius Lampadio, L. Aelius Stilo and other famous Latin grammarians.¹⁶ Nevertheless the failure of Suetonius to talk about the handwriting of Probus is without significance. He did not do so in the *De grammaticis* about Lampadio or about Stilo either. Furthermore, while it was the custom of Greek commentators to indicate variants with formulae like *γράφει/ἔγραφε ὁ δεῖνα*,¹⁷ Latin commentators used formulae of the type of *legit aliquis*,¹⁸ thinking in terms of class-room lecturing rather than of book production.¹⁹ Thus even had

¹⁰ Cf. Büchner, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 336, 339.

¹¹ Cf. Scivoleto, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 106–107 (= *Stud.* pp. 178–80).

¹² Despite *Suda* iv 581. 18, s.v. *Τράγκυλλος*, and Plin. *Epist.* 1. 24. 4 (misinterpreted by A. Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* [Paris, 1900], pp. 51–3, and G. D'Anna, *op. cit.* [n. 4], pp. 73–86 [75, 85]), it must be said that Suetonius would have classed himself with Varro, Cornutus, Pliny the Elder, and Asconius, all of whom he put elsewhere among the *uiri illustres*.

¹³ There is no precise reference to collation at *Dom.* 20 (...*quamquam bibliothecas incendio absumptas impensissime reparare curasset, exemplaribus undique petitis missisque Alexandream qui describerent emendarentque*), but it is quite certainly implied.

¹⁴ Cf. Strabo 12. 3. 20–3, pp. 550–2 Casaubon, Lucian, *Ver. Hist.* 2. 20, Galen, 15. 22, 24 Kühn (= *CMG* v 9, 1, pp. 13, 15 Mewaldt), 358–60, 16. 485, 17A. 795, 18B. 631, 19. 83, Athen. 5. 180e, Diog. Laert. 9. 113.

¹⁵ Cf. Athen. 1. 12e, 5. 188f, 11. 498 f.

¹⁶ See Front. p. 15. 13–21 van den Hout.

¹⁷ See schol. Pind. *Ol.* 2. 140 a ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος “πόσιος” γράφει. Cf. schol. *Nem.* 10. 114 a ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος ἀγιοῖ γράφειν “ἡμενον”, schol. T Hom. *Il.* 15. 24 ἀμείνων δὲ ἡ Ἀριστάρχου γραφή, schol. A *Il.* 16. 252 διχῶς γράφεται.

¹⁸ See Serv. Dan. Virg. *Georg.* 1. 277 *Probus* “*Orchus*” *legit*. Cf. Fest. p. 392. 27 Lindsay (probably transmitting material from a commentary of the first century B.C.) *Plautus* ‘*quia tibi suaso infecisti propudiosa pallulam*’. *quidam autem legunt* ‘*insuaso*’, Porph. Hor. *Carm.* 2. 6. 24 *legitur et* ‘*uatis Horati*’, Donat. Ter. *Andr.* 205. 1...*uera ergo lectio est* ‘*neque tu haud dicas*’, *quod plurimi non intellegunt*, (cum) ‘*hoc dicas*’ *legunt*, Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 6. 37 *sane sciendum* ‘*poscit*’ *lectionem esse meliorem*, *Georg.* 1. 218 *duplex lectio est*...

¹⁹ For *legere* of the *grammaticus* in the classroom see Sueton. *Gramm.* 2. 3–4, 11. 2 (citing an earlier poet, probably Bibaculus), 24. 3–4, Gell. 9. 9. 12, 16. 6. 3. *legit aliquis* sometimes has reference merely to punctuation (e.g. Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 6. 123, 8. 409, 9. 37), word division (Serv. *Aen.* 10. 471), or assignation of speaker (Donat. Ter. *Eun.* 312). *Legendum est* (Serv. *Aen.* 2. 348, 4. 132) states what the pupil must do. *legi, legimus, legitur, lectum est* can refer to the instructor’s knowledge of the substance of the poem in hand (Serv. *Aen.* 3. 68) or of some other work (Serv. *Aen.* 3. 57, Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3. 133, 4. 698).

Suetonius been writing more discursively, he would have had no cause to give a precise account of the relationship between Probus and the manuscripts which concerned him.

Editio very probably did function in the language of first-century Latin grammarians as *ἔκδοσις* did among their Greek peers,²⁰ but it may have had a somewhat technical flavour rendering it unsuitable for the style of Suetonius' work. The verb *edere* is nowhere recorded in relation to the philological handling of a text transmitted through many stages. It served Suetonius himself to denote the issuing of a work to the general public for the first time, whether by the author or by some sort of heir.²¹ We may wonder if we will about the equivalent the Latin of the grammarians had for the special use of *ἐκδιδόναι* in Greek,²² but Suetonius' failure to talk specifically of philological 'editing' is as unsurprising at *Gramm.* 24. 3–5 as it is at 2. 4 (on Lampadio). The end-products of Probus' work would have seemed comparable with the famous Alexandrian *ἐκδόσεις*. What else indeed was there with which to compare an *exemplar emendatum distinctum adnotatum* associated with the name of the leading *grammaticus* of his day?

To say that Probus 'edited' texts in the manner of Aristarchus does not get us as far as a superficial observer of the debate about Probus and his activities might imagine. Even among the generation of *γραμματικοί* who followed Aristarchus there was controversy about the nature of the great man's textual work.²³ In modern times, since Wolf reformulated the question,²⁴ the relationship of the term *ἔκδοσις* to other terms which occur in our record, like *διόρθωσις*, *σημείωσις* and *ὑπόμνημα*, has been hotly disputed. Some would make discursive commentary (*ὑπομνήματα*) an essential part of an *ἔκδοσις*, others would restrict this term to the base text, the textual variants adduced and the *σημεία* added to the margins.²⁵ It is of course not disputed that Aristarchus made use of the vast number of different texts which the Ptolemies had gathered together. No one however has been able to find any tangible evidence about the criteria he used in choosing his base text. Nor is there any agreement about the extent to which he supplemented manuscript evidence with conjecture.

Suetonius' words in *Gramm.* 24. 3, *multaque exemplaria contracta emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curauit*, clearly apply to copies of works no longer studied in

²⁰ Cf. Quintil. *Inst.* 5. 11. 40 (*Homeri uersu, qui tamen ipse non in omni editione reperitur*).

²¹ Cf. *Gramm.* 1. 3 *libros... de metris ab eodem Ennio editos*, 3. 3 *librum... nondum editum*, 9. 2 *librum... editum*, 18. 2 *commentario Zmyrni edito*, 25. 7 *plerique autem oratorum etiam declamationes ediderunt*, 25. 9 *controuersiae... conlectae editaeque*. A synonym, *uulgare*, is used at 8. 3.

²² Cf. Ammonius ap. schol. T Hom. *Il.* 19. 365–8 *περὶ τῆς ἐπεκδοθείσης διορθώσεως*, schol. Arat. p. 140. 17–18 *Μαασ οὐδέπω τῆς διορθώσεως ταύτης ἐκδεδομένης*. It may indeed be doubted whether it is proper to talk about a special use of *ἐκδιδόναι*.

²³ Cf. schol. A Hom. *Il.* 10. 397–9.

²⁴ *Prolegomena ad Homerum siue de operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma uariisque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi* (Halle Sax. 1795), pp. clxiv–cclxxvi (= ed. 2, Berlin, 1876, pp. 106–169).

²⁵ Cf. K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis* (Königsberg, 1833), pp. 29–31 (= ed. 2, Leipzig, 1865, pp. 25–6 = ed. 3, 1882, pp. 26–7), A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, I (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 18–19, II (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 431–3, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides: Herakles*, I (Berlin, 1889), p. 138, T. W. Allen, *Homer: the Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 307–9, G. Pasquali, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 216, G. Zuntz, *ZDMG* 101 (1951), 187, 192–3, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 3, H. Erbse, 'Ueber Aristarchs Iliasausgaben', *Hermes* 87 (1959), 275–303, in H. Hunger et al., op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 223–5, E. G. Turner, *Chron. d'Ég.* 37 (1962), 146–7 (= *Greek Papyri* [Oxford, 1968], pp. 112–13, 184 n. 28), B. A. van Groningen, *Mnemosyne* 4. 16 (1963), 1–17, *Traité d'histoire et de critique des textes grecs* (Amsterdam, 1963), pp. 34–5, R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 71–2, 94, 110, 215–17.

Roman schools in Probus' time. We know from another source that some of these had received philological treatment in the late second and early first centuries B.C.²⁶ It may be that Probus' *exemplaria* were philological 'editions' or descendants thereof and that he 're-edited' them without reference to other manuscript evidence, although, as I have argued, Suetonius' discourse leaves this question quite open. We also, however, know from the same source that Probus 'edited' works that were studied in the schools of his time, namely the poems of Horace, Lucretius and Virgil.²⁷ Doubtless these were the first philological 'editions' of the new classics. The extant fourth- and fifth-century commentaries on Virgil record a number of Probian 'readings' at variance with the current vulgate.²⁸ However we assess the quality of Probus' judgements, what he did was of considerable historical importance. It did not seem so to Suetonius, at least in the context of a general account of Roman professional grammarians. His failure to mention the 'editions' of Horace, Lucretius and Virgil is of a piece with his neglect of this aspect of grammar when discussing the practitioners of the Republican period. Certainly, where Horace, Lucretius and Virgil are concerned, we can deduce nothing about Probus' use or non-use of manuscripts from what Suetonius tells us of his 'editing' of the *antiqui*.

Jahn took Suetonius' verb *emendare* to refer to the correction of transcriptional errors, *distinguere* to the placing of marks of punctuation, and *adnotare* to the addition of discursive notes, notes which he declared to be the source of the statements attributed to Probus in Donatus' commentary on Terence,²⁹ Servius' commentary on Virgil,³⁰ the Danieline additions to this commentary³¹ (particularly those at *Aen.* 4. 418 and 12. 605 introduced by *Probus sic adnotauit*) and the marginal scholia in cod. Verona, Bibl. Cap. xl (38),³² of the *Valerii Probi in Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum*,³³ and of the *Vita Auli Persi Flacci de commentario Probi Valerii sublata*.³⁴ He knew of Burman's restoration of a reference to Probus' use of the *alogus* at Serv. Virg. *Aen.* 10. 444³⁵ but did not appreciate its wider significance. If he had thought about the question of where Probus put his alleged discursive notes, he would have imagined them in the margins and the interspaces of the *exemplaria* rather than in separate volumes. On linguistic grounds no serious challenge to Jahn's interpretations

²⁶ See Anon. *Gramm. Lat.* vii 534. 4–6 *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*. On the discovery of this material, its source and the corrupt proper names see part II.

²⁷ The three poets are frequently cited in Seneca's philosophical letters and treatises while those whom they read at school are either ignored or abused (cf. *Dial.* 5. 37. 5, *Epist.* 58. 5, ap. Gell. 12. 2. 3–11). For the coupling of Virgil and Horace as classics see Petron. 118. 5, Anon. *Laus Pisonis*, 230–45.

²⁸ See Part III.

²⁹ Printed in Rome in 1472.

³⁰ Printed in Florence in 1471.

³¹ Printed in Paris in 1600 (P. Daniel, *Pub. Virgilii Maronis... et in ea Mauri Seruii Honorati Grammatici... commentarii*).

³² Printed in Milan in 1818 (A. Mai, *Virgilii Maronis interpretes ueteres*; cf. *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus vii* [Rome, 1835], pp. 247–320).

³³ Printed in Venice in 1507 (from a manuscript removed from Bobbio by G. Merula in 1493).

³⁴ Attributed to Cornutus in some codices and in editions of the time of C. von Barth, who declared it to be from Suetonius' *De uiris illustribus* (*Aduersariorum commentariorum libri sexaginta antiquitatis tam gentilis quam Christianae illustratae* [Frankfurt, 1624], xi 27). Jahn, op. cit. (n. 8), p. cxxxvi, pointed out that various older codices attributed it to Probus. On the exegetical material attached to Persius see, most recently, J. E. G. Zetzel, 'On the History of Latin Scholia, II', *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 10 (1981), 19–31.

³⁵ In the edition of 1746 (see above, n. 8).

was possible even though the first clear examples of *distinguere* in the sense of 'punctuate'³⁶ and of *adnotare* in that of 'equip with discursive notes'³⁷ occur quite late in recorded Latin. *Emendare* was used at all periods of making changes of substance or style to an original text, but there could be no question of this use here, where the verb clearly has to do with the correction of transcriptional error. It had moreover already become apparent from the run of Suetonius' sentence – *multaque exemplaria contracta emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curavit, soli huic nec ulli praeterea grammaticae parti deditus* – that what he had in mind with *distinguere* and *adnotare* related closely to purely grammatical *emendatio*/διόρθωσις.³⁸ And yet it was also apparent that only a small number of the statements recorded by Donatus and Servius concerned the establishment of the text; most had to do with general exegesis or with the ordinary rules of Latin morphology and syntax. Furthermore, the *Vita Auli Persi Flacci* was what it claimed to be and the *In Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum* contained nothing about textual problems. In any case Suetonius' account of what M. Valerius Probus had published or left behind – *nimis pauca et exigua de quibusdam minutis quaestiunculis edidit. reliquit autem non mediocrem siluam obseruationum sermonis antiqui* (24. 5) – had no room for large-scale commentaries. There were accordingly supporters for the view that two or more grammarians with the name Probus had left material behind them.³⁹

New information about marginal symbols (*notae*) used by a Probus came to light in 1845. The publisher of this information, T. Bergk,⁴⁰ interpreted Suetonius' *adnotare* so that it referred to the affixing to a text both of marginal symbols and of discursive notes explaining the symbols. T. Mommsen was to restrict the reference simply to marginal symbols.⁴¹ A few succeeding scholars have taken Mommsen's view⁴² but most have taken Bergk's.⁴³ The linguistic evidence we possess cannot of itself settle

³⁶ See Diomedes, *Gramm. Lat.* i 437. 14–19 (*distinctio*).

³⁷ See Prob. Virg. *Buc.* 6. 31, p. 337. 25 Hagen. For *nota*, 'discursive note', the lexicon of Forcellini offers nothing before *Dig.* 49. 17. 10 (*Pomponius libro singulari regularum ex nota Marcelli...*).

³⁸ For the μέρη/partes of grammar see Dionysius Thr. *Gramm. Graec.* I i, pp. 5–6 Uhlig, Sext. Emp. *Math.* 1. 91, 248–53, Varro ap. Diomed. *Gramm. Lat.* i. 426. 12–31 (fr. 236 Funaioli), Quintil. *Inst.* 1. 4. 2–3, 1. 5. 1, 1. 9. 1.

³⁹ The theory seems to have gone back to H. Estienne (Stephanus), *De criticis ueteribus graecis et latinis...dissertatio* (Paris, 1587), pp. 247–9. Cf. L. Schopen, *De Terentio et Donato eius interprete dissertatio critica* (Diss. Bonn, 1821), p. 30, F. Lindemann, *Corpus grammaticorum Latinorum ueterum*, I (Leipzig, 1831), praef., W. H. D. Suringar, *Historia critica scholiastarum Latinorum*, II (Leyden, 1834), pp. 8–31, F. Osann, 'Probus der Grammatiker', *Beiträge zur griechischen und römischen Literaturgeschichte*, II (Kassel–Leipzig, 1839), pp. 166–280, L. Lersch, *Zeitschr. f. d. Alt.* 7 (1840), 109–18, n.s. 1 (1843), 625–31, 633–5.

⁴⁰ See the work cited in part II, n. 57, 119 (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* I 601).

⁴¹ See *Ber. ü. d. Verh. d. kön. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. z. Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Cl.* 5 (1853), 130 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, VII [Berlin, 1909], 209–210).

⁴² Cf. Steup, op. cit. (n. 9), pp. 25–34, B. Kübler, *De M. Valerii Probi Beryti commentariis Vergilianis* (Diss. Berlin, 1881), p. 2, A. Gudeman, *Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 105, Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 4), 102–105 (= *Stud.* pp. 165–78), A. Grisart, *Helikon* 2 (1962), 384 n. 21, Reynolds and Wilson, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 25–6, B. Inzerillo, *Athenaeum* 3 (1915), 31–40, J. Andrieu, *REL* 28 (1950), 488, Scivoletto, op. cit. (n. 4), 102–105 (withdrawn, apparently, at *Stud.* pp. 165–78), and Grisart, op. cit., 406–408, attempt to find other senses in *distinguere*; see, however, Steup, op. cit., pp. 20–4, and R. W. Müller, *Rhetorische und syntaktische Interpunktion* (Diss. Tübingen, 1964), pp. 55–60.

⁴³ Cf. Jahn himself, *Ber. ü. d. Verh. d. kön. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. z. Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Cl.* 3 (1851), 366–7, A. Riese, *De commentario Vergiliano qui M. Valerii Probi dicitur* (Diss. Bonn, 1862), pp. 3–10, O. Ribbeck, *NJbb* 87 (1863), 351, Leo, *Pl. Forsch.*² (see n. 4), p. 29, Aistermann, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 14, Pasquali, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 344, Hanslik, op. cit. (n. 4), 198, Büchner, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 336–7, Brink, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 37, Courtney, op. cit. (n. 4), 24.

the issue. It is nevertheless at least suggestive. The syntagm *adnotare quod...* should be put entirely to one side. Only *exemplar aliquod adnotare* and *scriptorem aliquem adnotare* (~ *adnotatio scriptoris alicuius*) are relevant. The latter is to be found in the opening sentence of the material published by Bergk – *his solis in adnotationibus Ennii Lucilii* (Bergk: *hennii lucii*) *et historicorum usi sunt...*, a sentence best interpreted as having to do with texts of the authors named and with the twenty-one *notae* listed. It is difficult not to put this sentence together with Suetonius' *exemplaria... emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curauit*. Extra-linguistic considerations tell even more strongly in favour of Mommsen's view.

When Bergk formed his interpretation of *exemplaria... emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curauit* he would have imagined the lay-out of an Alexandrian *ἔκδοσις* of the *Iliad* as not dissimilar to that of cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 474, the tenth-century manuscript whose contents J. B. C. d'Ansse de Villosion had published in 1788.⁴⁴ This manuscript carried a text with symbols set against suspect verses, variants written near suspect words, and scholia, many of them critical in content, arranged around the columns of verse.⁴⁵ The publication in 1863 of pap. Louvre, catal. xiv. 60, no. 3320, nouv. no. 71, – part of a first-century A.D. roll carrying the first book of Alcman's *μέλη* accompanied by brief marginal scholia⁴⁶ – encouraged scholars to continue to think of the great Alexandrians as writing their *ὑπομνήματα* against the actual texts.⁴⁷ As papyrus finds mounted it became clear that such texts were the exception and that their scholia were brief, and necessarily brief because of the physical nature of the roll.⁴⁸ At the same time fragments of rolls carrying nothing but *ὑπομνήματα*, on works of both prose and poetry, began to accumulate.⁴⁹ By now it seems to be agreed that the Alexandrians themselves wrote their *ὑπομνήματα* in separate rolls.⁵⁰ Some scholars hold that Aristarchus put nothing except his *σημεία* against a text, others allow him brief explanatory notes as well. Heavily influential upon the latter must be the Bergkian interpretation of *exemplaria... emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curauit*.⁵¹

⁴⁴ 'Ομήρου Ἰλιάς σὺν τοῖς Σχολίοις: *Homeri Ilias ad ueteris codicis Veneti fidem recensita. Scholia in eam antiquissima Ex eodem Codice aliisque... cum Asteriscis, Obeliscis, aliisque Signis criticis* (Venice, 1788).

⁴⁵ See the facsimile (*codices graeci et latini photographice depicti duce Scatone de Vries, tom. VI. Homeri Ilias cum scholiis, codex Venetus A, Marcianus 454 phototypice editus. Praefatus est Dominicus Comparetti* (Leyden, 1901).

⁴⁶ See E. Egger, *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et de philologie* (Paris, 1863), pp. 159–75. Cf. *Notices et extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, xviii. 2 (Paris, 1865), 416–20 (and Pl. L).

⁴⁷ Cf. Wilamowitz, op. cit. (n. 25), pp. 165–8, F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, II (Leipzig, 1892), p. 201.

⁴⁸ Cf. P. Oxy. 3 (1903). 445 (Homer, *Il.*: ii cent.); 5 (1908). 841 (Pindar: ii cent.); 9 (1912). 1174 (Sophocles: ii cent.).

⁴⁹ See E. G. Turner, op. cit. (n. 25), 146–52 (= *Greek Papyri*, pp. 112–24); also the supplementary notes on pp. 205–206 of the 1980 paperback edition of *Greek Papyri*.

⁵⁰ See H. Diels and W. Schubart, *Didymos: Kommentar zu Demosthenes* (Berlin, 1904 [Berliner Klassikertexte, I]), pp. xxvii–xxix, W. G. Rutherford, *A Chapter in the History of Annotation* (London, 1905), pp. 22–3, J. W. White, *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes* (Boston–London, 1914), pp. liii–lviii, G. Zuntz, *Byzantion* 14 (1939), 545–605 (= *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri* [Berlin, 1975], pp. 61–121), *An Enquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 272–6. Wilamowitz changed his mind in old age; see the 'Geschichte der Philologie' in A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. 3, I i (Leipzig–Berlin, 1921), 76; cf. Pasquali, op. cit. (n. 4), p. 344, Zetzel, op. cit. (n. 4), pp. 42–5.

⁵¹ Zuntz, op. cit. (n. 50), 552 (= *Die Aristophanes-Scholien*, p. 68) treats Sueton. *Gramm.* 24. 3 as an apparent difficulty for his view of the Alexandrian *ἐκδόσεις* and emphasises how brief and sketchy Probus' marginal annotations must have been.

It needs to be emphasised how much this interpretation depends on a superseded view of the lay-out of an Alexandrian *ἔκδοσις*.

The view taken of the purpose of the Alexandrian system of *σημεῖα* must also affect interpretation of *exemplaria*... *emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curavit*. Those who insist upon a necessary link between *σημεῖα* and formally written *ὑπομνήματα*⁵² are perhaps unconsciously affected by the layout of cod. Venice, Bibl. Marc. gr. 474 and that of pap. Louvre, catal. xiv. 60, no. 3320, nouv. no. 71 and by Isidore's statement at *Orig.* 1. 21. 28: *fiunt et aliae notulae librorum pro agnoscendis his quae per extremitates paginarum exponuntur, ut, ubi lector in liminare huiusmodi signum inuenerit, ad textum recurrens eiusdem sermonis uel uersiculi sciat esse expositionem, cuius similem superiacentem notam inuenerit*.

The combination in the Venice codex is not, however, the direct descendant of Aristarchus' *ἔκδοσις* but the result of a meeting of several streams of post-Aristarchan grammatical tradition. The system of linking scholia with text used in the Louvre roll has no detailed similarities with any of the Alexandrian sets of signs. Isidore's statement relates quite explicitly to what are now called 'signes de renvoi'. Such signs may have been related in physical shape to those described earlier by Isidore, but their function was entirely different. A number of positive considerations can be urged against any idea that an Alexandrian *σημεῖον* always pointed to an *ὑπόμνημα*. Both Zenodotus and Aristophanes are reported to have employed *σημεῖα* but neither is credited with *ὑπομνήματα*.⁵³ To judge by the extent of the ancient dispute about Aristarchus' reasons for affixing some of his *σημεῖα* and the number of general treatises written concerning them,⁵⁴ it is unlikely that he always stated reasons or that when he did the *σημεῖα* helped the uninitiated to find them. The system was perhaps designed to function on its own for the benefit of himself and his immediate co-workers and pupils rather than as part of a wider system incorporating discursive commentary.

Two sets of *notae* seem to be attributed to Probus in the material published by Bergk in 1845. The second of these sets formed, as I shall argue, a system which attempted to symbolise explanations as well as descisions. Probus would thus have had no need to write discursive notes either in the margins of an *exemplar* or in a separate volume. We may therefore gloss Suetonius' *adnotare* with *notis compungere*, a phrase used by Seneca in connection with the *σημεῖα* of Aristarchus,⁵⁵ and look with great suspicion upon the *Vita Auli Persi Flacci*, the *In Buccolica et Georgica commentariolum* and all the statements attributed to Probus in the Terentian and Virgilian scholia, including those which relate to *διόρθωσις*.

Much of the argument which has raged about what Suetonius thought Probus was up to springs from a tendency to consider the nouns *ἔκδοσις*, *editio* and 'edition' (~ 'Ausgabe') interchangeable and from the wide semantic range of the verb 'edit' (~ 'herausgeben'). Some writers forget that *ἔκδοσις* covered both texts imported to Alexandria from other Greek cities and texts produced by scholars at Alexandria. Others confuse the work of a modern scholar upon a text and that of the printer and publisher who diffuse the results of his work. With *multaque exemplaria contracta emendare ac distinguere et adnotare curavit*, whatever exact sense we give to *adnotare*,

⁵² See A. Gudeman, *RE* 11. 2 (1922), 1916–27 (1916), s.v. 'Kritische Zeichen', Allen, *Homeri Ilias. Tomus I Prolegomena* (Oxford, 1931), p. 198, Turner, op. cit. (n. 25), 148–52 (= *Greek Papyri* pp. 113–18, 184), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1971), p. 17, S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne–Opladen, 1967), p. 133.

⁵³ Cf. R. Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 25), p. 115, n. 4.

⁵⁴ See above n. 23, part II n. 62.

⁵⁵ *Epist.* 88. 39.

Suetonius was describing the sort of scholarly work which is often today called 'editing' or is at least included in the process of 'editing'. Suetonius' language did not, however, imply any sort of deliberate and formal publication by means of multiple copies or even any intention that this should happen. There is no contradiction at all with what he says later: *nimis pauca et exigua de quibusdam minutis quaestiunculis edidit*.

The view that Suetonius did not refer to 'editions' of a modern kind can cohere with practically any view of the relative importance of Probus in the transmission of the Latin classics. The questions are how freely available the *exemplaria emendata distincta adnotata* were and how authoritative Probus' decisions, if knowledge of them was available, were thought to be. No analysis of Sueton. *Gramm.* 24. 3 can offer answers to such questions.

(Parts II and III will follow.)

University of Manchester

H. D. JOCELYN