

THE SOURCES OF THE *APPENDIX PROBI*—A NEW APPROACH

PRELIMINARY NOTE

The publication of Professor J. G. F. Powell's new edition of the *Appendix Probi* in the same issue of the *Classical Quarterly* as this article will enable readers to assess the arguments presented here in the perspective of a full and reliable text. My thanks are due to Professor Powell for his courtesy in giving me advance access to his readings, which I have been able to take into account in presenting the results of my own investigations. We have, however, worked independently, and he is in no way responsible for the views I express, nor I of his.¹

THE TEXT, ITS NATURE, MS, NAME AND SIGNIFICANCE

The text discussed in this article is a list of 227 corrections to 'vulgar' forms of Latin words—*speculum non speclum, vetulus non veclus*, etc. It owes its name, *Appendix Probi*, to the fact that, in the MS (Naples Lat.1—previously Vindobonensis 17²), it is appended, together with four other short grammatical texts, to a grammatical work, the *Instituta Artium* (published with the appendices in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (GL) 4.47–204), attributed to a certain Probus.³ Strictly speaking, the name of the text should be, and occasionally still is—for example by Pierre Flobert, whose contribution is discussed below—applied collectively to the five appended texts (of which the subject of this article is the third). But, because of the particular value attached to the list of corrected vulgarisms as attestations of developments in the variety of post-classical Latin often called 'Vulgar Latin', it is usually taken, when standing alone, to refer to that text. The four other short texts are sometimes also referred to as appendices to Probus, reference in their case being specified by a number—'the first appendix', 'the second . . .', etc.⁴

¹ I also wish to express my particular gratitude to Professor J. N. Adams of All Souls College, Oxford, for invaluable bibliographical indications and advice; and to Mr. P. G. McC. Brown of Trinity College, Oxford, for helpful criticisms of earlier drafts. Neither of these scholars is in any way responsible for the views expressed in this article.

² Dated by E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: Italy, Ancora-Novara*, vol. 3, nos. 388–90 (Oxford, 1938), to the seventh or eighth century. A text of the *Instituta* without any appendages has also survived in an earlier MS, *Vatic. Urbin. Lat.* 1154, in *ibid.* vol. 1, no. 117 (Oxford, 1934), dated by Lowe to the late fifth century.

³ No attempt will be made here to enter upon the controversial questions of the justification of this attribution, and the identity of 'Probus'. In order, however, to avoid confusing those new to this subject, it must be pointed out that the statement in the late W. D. Elcock's widely read book, *The Romance Languages* (London, 1960), and repeated (p. 40) in the 1975 edition, revised by J. N. Green, that the author of the *Instituta Artium*, to which our text is appended, was the celebrated first-century A.D. grammarian, Marcus Valerius Probus of Berytus, is, as a reference in the *Instituta* to the fourth-century A.D. baths of Diocletian shows, erroneous. The slip stating that the *Appendix* MS is 'now kept at Vienna' also seems to have escaped the vigilance of the reviser; it is kept at Naples, to which place, according to Lowe (n. 2), it was returned from Vienna in 1919.

⁴ A brief account of these texts is given in my article, 'The second Appendix to Probus', *CQ* 56.1 (2006), 257–78, at 257–9.

The *Appendix Probi*, as we shall continue to call it here, has probably been more widely referred to, and quoted from, by Late Latinists and Romance philologists than any other 'Vulgar Latin text'—a popularity doubtless favoured by its convenient brevity and the fact that all its entries ostensibly attest vulgarisms, whereas other such texts present only a smattering of them. An adequate discussion of the wide range of questions raised by this much-studied text is obviously beyond the scope of a single article. An attempt to do them justice is made in a book-length study on which I am at present engaged (henceforth referred to provisionally, and I hope not too portentously, as 'the Study'). It has, however, been represented to me by colleagues acquainted with my views on sources that they are sufficiently novel, and their implications for *Appendix* studies sufficiently important to be brought to the attention of fellow scholars without further delay. This the present article attempts to do. The case in support of those views will inevitably suffer from compression to article proportions, but I hope sufficient evidence and argument will have been retained to carry conviction. I have also tried, in response to a suggestion from the anonymous reviewer, to ensure that compression is not achieved at the expense of explanations helpful to the non-specialist reader.

TWO PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Two matters affecting the text as a whole require discussion before we enter upon details.

(a) *Condition of the MS, state of the text*

For a clear and comprehensive account of the single *Appendix* MS, readers should consult Professor Powell's article. It will be seen that he found the text, with the exception of the damaged area of items 147–60, 'largely legible'. One may add that, where there is illegibility, but affecting only part of an entry, the completion of the entry can, in some cases, be conjectured with a high degree of probability. For example, the *auctoritas non autoritas* of entry 155 makes [*auctor non*] *autor* highly likely in the preceding entry. But Professor Powell's edition has the great merit—as compared with his predecessors—of reproducing what he was able to read (on personal inspection of the MS in Naples) without modification or addition, leaving the justification of all such 'restorations' to the responsibility of their proponents.

The text is undoubtedly a copy: it shows clear signs of corruption, such as repetition of entries (*catulus non catellus*, 50 and 51), identity of vulgar form and correction (*gyrus non gyrus*, 28), *constabilitus non constabilitus* (202), or non-correspondence between them (*cannelam non canianus*, 18), *homfagium non monofagium*, 47), probably attributable—although here Professor Powell takes a different view—at least in part, to scribal miscopying. Such clear evidence of corruption undermines confidence in the reliability of the MS readings in general, a feature that has to be taken into account when demands of contextual coherence, an important clue, as I shall argue, to the identification of sources, clash with manuscript readings. And, there is a further complication: we shall see reasons for thinking that not all deviations from a suspected original are to be attributed to scribes; some appear to result from misunderstandings of his sources by the grammarian-compiler, or attempts by him to bring vulgarisms encountered in the sources into line with types familiar to him from personal observation or from his reading of other grammarians—a procedure that, in the absence of an established term, I venture to call

‘grammaticization’ (not to be confused with the linguistic term ‘grammaticalization’). A probable example is entry 125, *tereбра non teleбра :n:*, where the original vulgarism, *tenebra*, ‘darkness’, vouched for by the source (meanings of Greek *ZOPHOS*, discussed below), was interpreted by the grammarian as a vulgar variant of *tereбра*, ‘awl’; another is entry 45, *pancarpus non parcarpus* (also discussed below), where the grammarian, again mistaking the identity of the source words, this time of Greek origin, has concocted a correction-of-vulgarism entry by condemning *parcarpus*, a form that did not appear in the source but was discussed by the grammarians (see Baehrens, p. 72 [full reference below, Section b])

(b) *Notes on some frequently cited reference works*

As well as such familiar works as the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL), (the *CIL*), and Keil’s *Grammatici Latini* (GL), I have frequently cited G. Goetz’s corpus of bilingual (Graeco-Latin) glossaries, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (CGL) (1888–1901). The glossaries with which we are principally concerned here—published in volume 3 (1892) of the *Corpus*—were compilations designed to help Greek and Latin speakers learn one another’s language. They are commonly referred to as *Hermeneumata* (a Greek word meaning ‘interpretations’ or ‘translations’, the Latin equivalent being *interpretamenta*). Typically they consist of three parts: (1) an alphabetical word-list, mainly of verbs; (2) classified vocabularies (nouns grouped by topic), which are of chief concern to us here; in these two parts the equivalents in the two languages are placed side by side in columns; and (3) continuous texts for language practice, usually consisting of dialogues set in everyday situations, the Greek and Latin versions appearing on alternate lines; to these, short reading extracts—fables, scraps of mythology and the like—are sometimes added. Most of the oldest of the MSS in which they have come down to us date from the ninth and tenth centuries, but some are later, one important one, the Einsidlensia, being as late as the fifteenth or sixteenth century.⁵ The names by which they are referred to—Ampliona, Monacensia, Montepessulana, Leidensia, etc.—derive from their places of origin. The usefulness of the *Corpus* is greatly enhanced by the volumes entitled *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum*, which serve as a Latin index to the glossaries; they are referred to in this article as ‘the Goetz index’. A further index, compiled by W. Heraeus, listing alphabetically the Greek words appearing in the glosses with cross references to the relevant Latin entry words in the main index, was added to the *Corpus* in 1903. For brevity’s sake, where evidence of attestation, not source, is all that is relevant to the purposes of an argument, my quotations from the Goetz index in this article do not usually include references to specific glossaries.

⁵ The *Hermeneumata* have been the subject of important studies, particularly A. C. Dionisotti’s articles, ‘From Ausonius’ schooldays? A schoolbook and its relatives’, *JRS* 72 (1982), 83–125, and ‘Greek grammars and dictionaries in Carolingian Europe’, in S. A. Brown (ed.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks* (London, 1988), 1–55, especially 26–31, where MS dates are also given. See also the introduction to J. Kramer, *Glossaria Bilingua Altera* (Munich-Leipzig, 2001), where he sets Graeco-Latin *idiomata* and *hermeneumata* in the context of other such lists arising from the contacts between Greeks or Romans and ‘barbarian’ languages and cultures. The most comprehensive study of these and related matters is J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

Another type of compilation of importance for our investigation—being in fact the source of a number of *Appendix* entries—is the onomasticon.⁶ Its purpose, like that of dictionaries and classified vocabularies, was to present the lexicon, the wordstock, of Greek and Latin. It differs most obviously from dictionaries by not arranging its words alphabetically, but, like classified vocabularies, by subjects or topics. It differs from the vocabularies, which consist of bare lists, by presenting its words in the form of a connected and systematic account of the special vocabularies or terminologies of particular subjects. Thus, for example, instead of a ‘parts of the body’ list of the type still found in present-day classified vocabularies, an onomasticon presents, in an orderly and discursive way, a compendium of terms applied to the head, trunk and limbs, relating them to their functions. The close affinities between classified vocabularies and onomasticons are, however, obvious, and compilers of each may well have drawn on the other—a matter on which further research may throw light. In this article I have for simplicity of presentation treated them as distinct sources. One further important difference is that, unlike the humbler classified vocabulary, the onomasticon encroaches at times on fields covered by specialist or technical treatises, such as those by Aristotle in Greek—quoted below as the ultimate source of one series of entries—and Varro and the elder Pliny in Latin, the difference being the predominant emphasis of the onomasticon on the linguistic and rhetorical rather than what we would call the ‘scientific’ aspect of the matters covered. No such sharp distinction was, however, general in the ancient world, and a Latin work of Bishop Isidore of Seville (560–636), his *Origines* or *Etymologiae*, came to be treated in the Middle Ages as an encyclopaedia of ancient knowledge. Our surviving Greek exemplar is the *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux, a Greek rhetorician, who wrote under, and for, the Emperor Commodus (A.D. 180–92). (Edition and index: E. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, vols. 1–3 [Leipzig, 1900–37]).

I would not mention modern standard dictionaries, familiar to all classicists, were it not to explain a departure I sometimes make in this article from the usual practice of referring to most recent works in their most recent editions. I occasionally quote the older Latin Dictionary of Lewis and Short (L&Sh) instead of the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD), where I find the definitions of the former more briefly or clearly match a point being made; and I sometimes prefer the editions of Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon (L&Sc) prior to the H. S. Jones’ revision and its supplement. A particular advantage of the older editions for the discussion of contacts between the two classical languages, with which we will be concerned here, is that they frequently quote Latin equivalents of Greek words, a practice abandoned in the new revisions. This enables equivalences between the languages to be pointed out without any possible suggestion of capricious selectivity—a clear example is the *SKAPHOS/alueus*⁷ equivalence claimed below in the discussion of the Parts of the Ear series. A similar advantage is obviously presented by the Graeco-Latin dictionaries. This explains my frequent citation of the revised edition (1831–65) of the magnificent

⁶ In modern use the word *onomasticon* has two different senses: the first refers to alphabetical lists of proper names; the second—the one in which the word is used in this article—refers to collections of words grouped by subjects, and accompanied by explanations of their meanings and use.

⁷ Since the subjects discussed in the present article will be of interest not only to classicists but also to Romance philologists, some of whom may have only a sketchy knowledge of Greek, words cited in that language are transliterated in italic capitals, followed in brackets, wherever seems appropriate, by the originals in Greek script.

Thesaurus Graecae Linguae (TGL) originated by Henri Etienne, where often a Latin rendering coincides with an *Appendix* entry. The TGL also sometimes includes matter which lexicographical purists would probably reject as suspected fantasies or figments of grammarians and scholiasts. But the departed linguistic world with which we are here concerned is peopled by precisely such figures, the kindred of the lexical glosser and grammarian (whose role in the creation of the *Appendix* will figure prominently in this article), and of the compilers of the bilingual glossaries. In the investigation pursued here we need to keep our minds open to every available insight into that shadowy world.

SOME PREVIOUS VIEWS—ULLMANN, BAEHRENS, JARECKI, FLOBERT

If the 'new approach' is to be seen in perspective, a brief account must be given of some previous views on sources. They have moved between two extremes: first, in a view once widely held, seeing them as oral, drawn from 'the gushing spring of the living language' ('aus der sprudelden Quelle der lebendigen Sprache', as W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* [Halle an der Saale, 1922; Tübingen, 1967] graphically expresses it—admittedly applying it to only a part of the entries); second, as largely or wholly written (C. A. Robson, whose views are discussed below, would have said wholly). Most scholars seem, however, to have taken an intermediate view, as will emerge from our discussion below. An example is Karl Ullmann ('Die Appendix Probi', *Romanische Forschungen* [1892], 145–226), who, while conceding that some entries were probably added by the compiler as corrections to regional and rustic vulgarisms in his own speech, of which he had become aware as a student in Rome—Ullmann sees him as of Campanian peasant origins—believed that most derived from the doctrines of other grammarians propounded to him in the lessons he attended at a grammar school known as the 'Caput Africae' (mentioned in entry 134),⁸ differing in that respect from the opinion, later tentatively expressed by Baehrens (p. 3), that he might have been a teacher there. Ullmann's examples of parallels in types of vulgarism represented and in the judgments of grammatical correctness between the *Appendix* and the writings of the Roman grammarians are so numerous and so striking that they place beyond doubt the affinity between the *Appendix* and that grammatical tradition. But, although, as explained below, several groups of entries are undoubtedly of specifically grammatical origin, it does not follow, as Ullmann appears to have thought, that the bulk of the remaining *Appendix* vulgarisms must also have been. What the affinities certainly show is that the *Appendix* compiler was steeped in traditional grammatical lore. Indeed, there are indications, as noted above, that he sometimes modified source material to make it fit into a familiar grammatical mould, 'grammaticizing' it. But a distinction has to be made between such influences and the material upon which they operated. In this article the word 'sources' generally refers, as I think is usual, to the origins of that material, the words embodying the vulgarisms, and, apart from the words of specifically grammatical origin discussed below, not to the doctrines by which they were judged incorrect—matters extensively discussed in the linguistic commentary chapter of the Study.

⁸ The existence of this school as an establishment for training young slaves for service in the imperial administration is attested in inscriptions, e.g. *CIL* 6.8983, 8984, 8985.

The contributions of Casimir Jarecki, 'Sur l'Appendix Probi III, son lieu d'origine et son auteur', *Eos* 30 (1927), 1–25, and Pierre Flobert, 'La date de l'Appendix Probi', in *Filologia e Forme letterarie, Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte* (Urbino, 1987), 299–320 —the latter writing later than Robson (still to be considered) but discussed here because of the coincidence of a number of his views with Jarecki's—are largely directed to extracting from the text indications of the origins, occupation, and even personality, of the compiler. Flobert openly avows his *ad hominem* approach (pp. 309–10): 'C'est en effet un phénomène rare qu'un pâle compilateur, au moyen de simples listes de mots, révèle autant de choses sur lui-même: on attendait un grammairien, on découvre un homme.' Both these scholars see him as an African grammarian, who migrated to Rome—Flobert thinks he was probably a refugee from the Vandals—where he became a teacher at the Caput Africae school. On this point they agree with Baehrens, as against Ullmann, who had thought of him as a pupil there. As to sources of the *Appendix* vulgarisms, Jarecki believes that they proceed from personal didactic experience: 'la liste des fautes, contenue dans l'Appendix, ne se laisse expliquer que par l'habitude d'un maître de faire des corrections continues' (p. 16). He even believes (p. 23) that he catches in some of them—*deses* (101) and *reses* (102), both meaning 'idle, lazy'; and *uapulo*, 'I am flogged'—echoes of his pedagogue's classroom exasperations. The possibility that they were included in this grammatical work purely for their grammatical interest does not seem to have appealed to Jarecki, intent, as he was, on extracting from it personal information about the compiler.⁹

Flobert's views on sources specifically of 'our' *Appendix Probi*—as noted above, he uses the term differently, applying it collectively to the five appended texts—are not easy to isolate. For, being convinced that all five, together with the *Instituta Artium* itself, the *Catholica* and possibly several other texts attributed to 'Probus' form a corpus of related texts, he is primarily concerned with the sources shared by them all (p. 309).¹⁰ But those that appear to relate specifically to our text are: (1) some parts of the 'corpus' of related 'Probus' material, specifically the *Instituta Artium*;¹¹ (2) three early bilingual glosses, of the *Hermeneumata* type: *coclia* (AP 66), *ANSARES* (129, 164), and *PASSARES* (163);¹² and (3) (p. 311) a few words from Martial: *brattea* (AP

⁹ The first two are part of a group of entries, most of which favour the *-es* over the *-is* termination, and are, as we shall see, unquestionably of grammatical origin. Both appear together, twice, in the fourth-century grammarian Charisius (C. Barwick [ed.], *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V* [Leipzig, 1964], 29.10 and 168.13), and, perhaps more strikingly, *reses* also appears in Charisius (47.15) in company with nine of the other *Appendix -es* examples. *Vapulo*, appearing, incidentally, much later in the *Appendix* text, also has an obvious grammatical justification for inclusion, as one of the few Latin verbs active in form but passive in meaning ('I am beaten'), and as such is discussed twice by Charisius (211.16, and 213.12) and by Priscian (*GL* 2.377.15 and 3.269.27).

¹⁰ The evidence presented by Flobert of relationship between members of his supposed corpus provides the essential basis for further consideration of this important question.

¹¹ A number of its vulgarisms, as first pointed out by J. Steup (*De Probis Grammaticis* [Jena, 1871] coincide with nine *Appendix* entries—*aus* (29), *milex* (30), *sober* (MS *suber*, 31), *figel* (32), *mascel* (33), *barbar* (36)—the bunching of these entries is possibly significant; *tetrus* (138), *pleps* (181), *lapsus* (205); to which may be added *Adon* (213) as the form recommended by both the *Instituta* and the *Appendix*, and two others, *ecus* (37) and *cocus* (38), noticed by Ullmann (p. 151), who also points out the implied rejection of *acrum* (41) and *paupera* (42). Counting them all we arrive at a total of fourteen complete or partial coincidences. It is not at all certain, however, that the *Instituta* was the source of all these coinciding items. Different explanations of the presence of *aus*, *figel*, *mascel*, and *cocus* are offered in the present article, and others are discussed in the Study.

¹² Capitals are used here to indicate that these Latin words were written in Greek script—a not uncommon practice in bilingual glosses.

65), *cochlea* (66), *cocleare* (67), *pegma* (85); and possibly, *draucus* (153) from another epigram.¹³

An obvious initial objection to the supposed Martial source is that a literary text would not supply the grammarian with vulgarisms but with classical forms. But, of course, incorrect forms might appear in quotations from a literary text—as in the quotation from Varro discussed below. And, again, correct forms might remind a grammarian of vulgar variants he had encountered elsewhere—a possible explanation of the origin of a few of the *Appendix* entries, also mentioned in note 25 below. So the use of Martial cannot be automatically ruled out. But there are, as we shall see, other more likely explanations of the origin of the words in the first Martial passage. Moreover, the case for it as the source is not as strong as might first appear (involving as it does four words in a single short poem). For their order of occurrence is different—*pegma*, which appears first of the four in Martial, appears last, and widely separated from the others, in the *Appendix*. Moreover, although three of the words, *brattea*, *coclea* and *cocleare* are ‘bunched’ in the *Appendix* (65, 66, 67), the apparently persuasive occurrence of both the latter words in both texts is offset by their being closely related forms, which leaves open an alternative explanation of their occurring together, such as that provided below, where I propose an entirely different account of the sources of all four words. Much stronger is the case for the second Martial source—although Flobert mentions it as a mere possibility—where the rare words, *opobalsamum* and *draucus*, appear in close proximity in both Martial and the *Appendix* (151, 153); the difficulty here is that in neither Martial nor the *Appendix* are the MS readings certain—Powell reads only a fragment of entry 151.

ROBSON'S VIEWS

C. A. Robson's article, ‘L'Appendix Probi et la philologie latine’, *Le Moyen Age* 69 (1963), 37–54, postulating a much later date of compilation than any previously thought likely—the seventh instead of the third or fourth century—had a considerable initial impact on scholarly opinion, but did not convince such a formidable authority as G. Rohlfs (*Sermo vulgaris Latinus* (Tübingen, 1969), 16), nor, as we shall see, Pierre Flobert. In particular his argument (p. 53) that the *Appendix* must be late because it embodied material from bilingual glossaries, whose manuscripts (as published by Goetz) were all of late date, is invalidated by the existence of similar compilations of much earlier date, as promptly pointed out by Sabatini.¹⁴ But, even deprived of that support, the question of date of compilation remains open, as does Robson's associated claim that the compiler was a monk in the monastery of Bobbio in north-western Italy (founded by the Irish missionary Columbanus at the beginning of the seventh century), where the surviving copy of the text was probably made. Those matters are fully discussed in the Study. Here we are concerned only with Robson's views on sources. These he saw as entirely written, and of three kinds: (1) the classified vocabularies in the bilingual glossaries (some account of which was

¹³ This supposed Martial source had already been cited by Robson (p. 54), who gives the full Martial references (8.33.3, 6, 24, 25), and includes *opobalsamum* (AP 151—not mentioned by Flobert), which, if Martial is the source, is inseparable from *draucus* (153; cf. Martial 11.8.1, *Lassa quod hesterni spirans opobalsamum drauci*, a line whose readings and interpretation have given rise to controversy). Perhaps Flobert noticed these parallels independently; he makes no acknowledgement.

¹⁴ F. Sabatini, ‘Tra latino tardo e origini romanze, I: *Appendix Probi* è l'opera di un irlandese di Bobbio’, in *Studi ling. ital.* 4 (1963–4), 140–3.

given above in Section (b) of the preliminary matters); (2) some possible fruits of the compiler's reading, such as a description of the city of Rome, and travel itineraries, which, Robson thought (p. 52), might account for scattered references in the text to aqueducts, columns, buildings, a supposed statue of Marsyas, and the like; and (3) a few verses in Virgil and Martial—those which Flobert was later to quote—apparently consulted by the compiler to verify 'correct' forms of certain words. The second and third of these postulations of sources are based on loose conjecture—with one possible exception, the Martial verse discussed above; but they would in any case account for only a few entries.

Robson's one sustainable identification of an *Appendix* source is the bilingual classified vocabularies. Flobert (p. 318) denies him priority in this, pointing out that W. Heraeus, in his linguistic commentary,¹⁵ had long since drawn attention to parallels between the vocabularies and the *Appendix*. But there is an essential difference between the mere citing of parallels and their attribution to borrowing, and neither Heraeus nor, as far as I can see, any other scholar previous to Robson, had specifically claimed the use of the vocabularies by the compiler as a source. What is paradoxical about the situation is that, although Robson's claim was both original and, I believe, correct, none of the examples he cites in support of it are, with one exception, persuasive. For if certain *Appendix* words were encountered in association in a glossary, one would surely expect to find the borrowed words occurring correspondingly in fairly close proximity in the *Appendix* text. As it is, even allowing for some disruption of an original order,¹⁶ whether as a result of intervention by the compiler, or by copyists' negligence, the words for which Robson claims a glossarial source are, with that one exception, so widely dispersed in the text that it is difficult to accept that they necessarily had a common source.

The exception is the three bird names, *passar*, 'sparrow' (163), *ansar*, 'goose' (164) and *hirundo*, 'swallow' (165), which, appearing in the birds lists in two classified vocabularies cited by Robson, also occur in close proximity in the *Appendix*. Robson did in fact quote (p. 42) one other such group of words—relating to Natural Phenomena (about to be discussed), which would have provided a much more persuasive example of the use of the glossaries by the compiler of the *Appendix* than those he presents. But, incomprehensibly, he chose not to use it for that purpose, merely quoting the apparently substantival use (only late attested) of one of the words, *coruscus*, as part of his argument for a late date of compilation. Nevertheless, in spite of his failure to build a convincing case for the use of the glossaries by the compiler, his contention was, as the evidence about to be presented will show, undoubtedly right.

Where he fell short in presenting his case was in not citing three groups of *Appendix* entries, in addition to his birds, which display clear affinities between their members—two of which had been pointed out by Ullmann—similar to those found in the classified vocabularies. The first, mentioned above, is the Natural Phenomena—more

¹⁵ 'Die Appendix Probi', *Archiv. f. lat. Lex. u. Gramm.* 11 (1899), 301–31 and 451–2.

¹⁶ Traces of what appeared to be an original ordering of the material, subsequently disrupted ('Spuren gestörten Zusammenhangs') were commented on by Ullmann in his *Appendix Probi* article (p. 166), and by Foerster (*Wiener Studien* 14 [1892], 314); although neither thought reconstitution possible. Robson too saw (p. 45) traces in the text of subject groupings presented 'sans beaucoup d'ordre'. It will be seen below that I also believe that the order of source material was disrupted in the course of compilation, mainly through mixing of different sources but also by additions made by the compiler. But neither of those processes would account for the wide dispersal of Robson's supposed source material.

precisely Destructive Natural Phenomena. It has four members: *terraemotium*, 'earthquake' (159), *noxius*, 'destructive' (160), *coruscus*, 'flashing' (161), and *tonitru*, 'thunder' (162). Between these and the vocabularies there is a clear link: for example, the similar cluster in the *Einsidlensia* (CGL 3.245): *coruscatio* and *fulgur* 5, *tonitrus* 7, *fulmen* 9, *terrae motus* 13.¹⁷ The subject of the second group is Female Family and Relationship terms. These are the entries: *obstetrix*, 'midwife' (166), *nouerca*, 'step-mother' (168), *nurus*, 'daughter-in-law' (169), *socrus*, 'mother-in-law' (170), *neptis*, 'grand-daughter' (171).¹⁸ In this case too there are several similar groups in the glossaries: *socrus*, *nurus*, *nouerca* and *obstetrix* occur in close proximity in the *Einsidlensia* (CGL 3.253), and *neptis* on the following page; all except *obstetrix* also appear in the *Montepessulana* (CGL 3.303–4).¹⁹ Ullmann, in discussing the arrangement of the *Appendix* material (p. 166) had cited, although he made no mention of possible glossarial origins, both the natural phenomena ('Naturerscheinungen') and the Female Relationship terms ('weibliche Verwandtschaftsnamen'). He appears not to have noticed a third series, concerned with the City and its Trades:²⁰ *figulus*, 'potter' (32), probably *macellum*, 'butcher's shop' (MS *mascel*) (33), *lanius*, 'butcher' (34); and, this time after a separation resulting from intrusion by members of another series—a feature discussed below: *coqus*, *coquens*, *coqui*, 'cook' (38–40); cf. *macellum*, *lanius* and *carcer*, 'prison' (*Einsidlensia* [CGL 3.267.60–1]); *macellum*, *lanio* (MS *lanium*) (*Montepessulana* [CGL 3.306.23–4]), and *figulus*, *macellarius*, *lanius* (CGL 3.308.7.10–11); and *cocus* appears with *lanius* in a trades list in the *Leidensia* (CGL 3.25.48–9). Yet another series, or group of series, consisting of medical and botanical words, also mentioned by Robson, probably derives from basically similar Graeco-Latin vocabulary lists. But, being more dispersed and the identity of its members less certain than the three just mentioned, it is not discussed here. Clinching the connection between the *Appendix* list and the *Hermeneumata* glosses, is the occurrence of the Greek word itself in entry 190, *ermeneumata non erminomata*.

¹⁷ *Noxius* (160) is missing and may have been a subsequent addition to this *Appendix* group; but its association with destructive natural forces appears also in Seneca (*Q Nat.* 66) *De terrae motu adversus tonitrum et minas caeli . . . remedia sunt. . . Hoc malum [earthquakes] patet ineuitabile, auidum, publice noxium*. The gist of the passage is that, while one can take shelter from the destructive effects of thunderstorms, there is no escaping the general devastation caused by earthquakes.

¹⁸ *Anus*, 'old woman' (172) does not seem to belong here semantically; but it does belong grammatically with *nurus* and *socrus* as a fourth-declension feminine (cf. *Phocae Ars* 2, *GL* 5.420.14–16, where the three are quoted together). So it may have come into the *Appendix* text as what we can call a 'passenger entry'—one added to source material by association of ideas with one or more of its members.

¹⁹ A further indication of the *Hermeneumata* origin is the appearance in entry 167, between *obstetrix* and *nouerca*, of the word *capitulum*, which is the term used in the *Hermeneumata* to identify subject sections of the classified vocabularies. See Dionisotti (n. 5), 86–8.

²⁰ In the *hermeneumata* there is overlap between the two topics: 'shops', for example, which, as buildings, belong more appropriately in sections dealing with the City, appear in Trade lists together with their proprietors, 'butcher's shop' (*macellum*) with 'butcher' (*lanius*), as they do in the *Appendix* (cf. the consecutive entries in the *Montepessulana* (CGL 3.306.23–4), where *carcer*, 'prison', another City word, also appears in entry 26.) Whether the *calida non calda* of entry 53 derives from an *aquae caldae* referring to *Thermae*, 'public baths', as in the glossaries, is doubtful. It is widely separated in the *Appendix* from the other City entries.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AFFINITIES BETWEEN NEIGHBOURING
ENTRIES AS A CLUE TO SOURCES—A SECOND VARIETY,
GRAMMATICAL AFFINITY

Now, the feature that pointed to the classified vocabularies as an *Appendix* source was, as we have seen, affinities of meaning between entries—kinds of birds, natural phenomena, female relatives, city trades. Further investigation will show that the existence of such affinities is, in fact, a distinctive feature of this text—a key feature, whose value as a clue to sources has been hitherto neglected. For, although it was sufficiently striking to catch the attention not only of Robson but of several of his predecessors, in particular Foerster and Ullmann (see note 16 above), neither he nor they explored its full potentiality. So far it has enabled us to identify with reasonable certainty the source of twenty *Appendix* entries—three birds, four phenomena, five relatives and five city-trades (plus three accretions, the two *coc-* variants and the *anus* entry brought in by association with the *-us* feminines)—and we shall see later that there is good reason to believe that a considerably larger number of similar semantic affinities, present in the source material, have been obscured in the process of transmission, leaving, however, sufficient traces to enable us to reconstruct the probable sources—which, as we shall see were mainly onomasiological and lexical. But first let us look at a second type of clue to the identification of sources, grammatical affinities—the relation of adjacent entries to a specific grammatical subject or category.

Although the presence in the text of groups displaying this feature, starting with the syncope (those showing dropping of a vowel in the unstressed penultimate syllable)—*speculum non spechum* (3), *masculus non masclus* (4), etc.—has long been recognized, their possible value as a clue to identification of sources has, again, been neglected. Not even Ullmann and Flobert, who most strongly affirmed the grammatical nature of *Appendix* sources—the former as underlying the greater part of the entries, the latter (p. 309) as characterizing the sources common to a corpus of grammatical writings, which, he believed, included our text—do not appear to have regarded the grammatically related groups as having any special significance. One can only conjecture the reason for this neglect. Perhaps the fact that all 227 entries are, as providing corrections to non-standard forms, in a broad sense, ‘grammatical’, made it seem unnecessary to make a distinction between the majority of successions of entries, which relate to various grammatical features, deriving, as we are seeing, from a variety of sources, and three groups that relate to a single particular feature or part of speech.²¹ It may also be that the conviction that the *Appendix* vulgarisms listed were the fruit of the compiler’s personal observations, their selection for inclusion in his list being influenced, according to some scholars, by his desire to vaunt his origins and proclaim his professional pride—resulted in the grammatically based groupings being viewed as merely a secondary result of sporadic attempts on his part to bring

²¹ There are in fact some other juxtapositions of shared grammatical features scattered throughout the text; but, if we do not count flexion variants, such as the three *coq-/coc-* entries (38–40), only one (the three *vyr-/vir-* words [120–2]) relates to more than two entries. Moreover, nearly all the pairs are concerned with common types of spelling mistakes—*eal-ia*, *-eusl-ius*, *-euml-ium*, *-ily*, the exceptions being the syncope *calidalcalda*, and *frigidalfrigda* (53–4), and their occurrence together is clearly as semantic opposites, both relating to water. In fact, as we shall see, the juxtaposition of a number of other entries sharing formal features is coincidental, their source being semantically, not grammatically, related material.

some sort of order into his material. The idea that the groupings might be attributable not to him but to his sources does not seem to have been seriously considered.

The first of the three groups consists of the nine entries (3–11)—*speculum non specum*, *masculus non masclus*, *uetulus non ueclus*, *uitulus non uiclus*, *uernaculus non uernaclus*, *articulus non artichus*, *baculus non uachus*, *angulus non anglus*, *iugulus non iuglus*—whose shared grammatical feature, referred to above, is syncope. The other two groups are: the twenty-two entries (88–109), most of which express a preference for the termination *-es* to *-is*: *uepres non uepris*, *fames non famis*, etc.; and a group of eleven (216–26)—*necne non necnec*, *passim non passi*, *numquit non mimquit*, *numquam non numqua*, *nouiscum non noscum*, *uobiscum non uoscum*, *necioubi non nescioubi*, *pridem non pride*, *olim non (oli)*, *adhuc non aduc*, *idem non ide*—whose members are all ‘particles’ (adverbs—the *idem* of entry 226, probably being a miscopy for *item*—and conjunctions).²² Both these latter groups present some apparently anomalous features, but their grammatical, rather than semantic, affinity is clear.

Now, the specifically grammatical nature of these groups points strongly to their source also being grammatical. The only alternative explanation would be that the compiler decided to select from a motley collection of vulgarisms those that illustrated particular grammatical features and assemble them in groups. But for two of the groups this seems inherently unlikely—would the compiler have bothered to group forms belonging to such a minor part of speech as ‘particles’? And would randomly gathered material have just happened to include as many as twenty examples of vulgar *-is* instead of *-es*? But there are also specific reasons for thinking that the grammatical character of the latter group went back to the source. The first is the occurrence of similar groupings in the grammarians’ treatment of *-es* words. Ten of the *Appendix* words: *ales* (88), *facies* (89), *cautes* (90), *plebes* (*Appendix*, *pleues*) (91), *nubes* (96), *suboles* (97), *lues* (100), *reses* (102) (a word which, as noted above, is linked with *deses* (101) in other Charisius passages, and may well have appeared with it in the source), *fames* (104), and *clades* (105), all appear on pages 45–7 of Charisius (Barwick). Charisius also lists together (p. 33) *fames* (104), *tabes* (93) and *supellex* (94) as *semper singularia* (‘words found only in the singular’), and cites (p. 35) *aedes* (107) as a word with different meanings in singular and plural. This concern with singularity and plurality probably also explain the inclusion of *uepres* (103) (cf. Charisius, 35.4. Diomedes, *GL* 1.327.32, and the *De Dubiis Nominibus*, *GL* 5.592.19–20, *singularem non recipit*, and of Syrtes (106), sometimes regarded as a *plurale tantum* (Priscian, discussing it and *Alpes*, regards the singular of both as poetic (*GL* 2.328.13–15)); and Baehrens cites (p. 113) evidence of similar tendencies to regard *proles* and *suboles* as *semper singularia*. To these examples of points of specific grammatical interest illustrated by the *Appendix* words in this group, one should perhaps add the extended-stem words: *ales*—*alitis* (Charisius, p. 47) and *reses* (102) (and *deses*, 101) the latter singled out by grammarians (for example, Charisius, 29.10) for their genitives in *-dis* rather than *-tis* etc. Perhaps decisive as indicating the specific grammatical origin of this group is the inclusion of the non-*-es* example *supellex*, which shares, as noted, a grammatical characteristic with two of them.²³ To these

²² The inclusion of the prepositional phrases, *nouiscum* and *uobiscum* (220–1), with the adverbs is in line with the practice of Charisius (244.21). It does not, of course, follow that specifically Charisius was used; the Roman grammarians borrowed freely from one another and wrote within a generally uniform tradition.

²³ The impression that emerges from a comparison of the *Appendix* list with the treatment of words in *-es* in the grammarians, who were, as we have seen, concerned with such matters as

evidences of grammatical origin one may add the striking fact that no traces of an original semantic affinity are visible in precisely these two sequences.

The one series of the three about which there is less certainty is the syncopes. Here there is no strong grammatical parallel—surprisingly the Roman grammarians do not seem to have listed examples of this phenomenon, although it is briefly referred to in the *Instituta* (GL 4.119.10–12: *item sunt nomina quae u litteram omitant, ut puta seculum et seclum, et cetera talia* ('There are also nouns which omit the letter u, for example seculum and seclum and other such'). It should, however, be noted that the *Instituta* is not concerned here with phonetics but with spellings, as the context clearly shows. Moreover, there are in this series some hints of possible semantic affinities with other entries in the vicinity: *maschus* (4) with *mascel* (33), *uechus* (5), 'old' with *aus* (29) 'grandfather', *uichus* (6) 'bull-calf' with *iuuencus* (35) 'bullock'. So in this case it is possible that someone—a copyist?—added to a smaller list of examples of this very visible grammatical feature, further examples, originally found in nearby positions in the text, where they belonged to semantically based series. It should, however, be noted that, if there were such a displacement and grouping of syncopes, it did not extend to the text as a whole: there are a dozen or so other examples of syncope (listed by Baehrens, pp. 14 and 16) scattered throughout the text.

If accepted, the identification of this second source might account for the presence of as many as a further forty-two entries—depending on whether we counted all nine examples of syncope as of grammatical origin—and it must remain a matter for surprise that it was not made much earlier.

Before leaving this matter of grammatical sources, two final points need to be made. The first is that, while the probable integration of *Syrtes* seriously weakens the argument for the African origin of the text, the now certain integration of the *deses* and *reses* entries in a grammatical series completely disposes of Jarecki's autobiographical explanation of the presence of these two entries. The second is to call attention once again to the decisive role played by grouping, or bunching, in the text in the identification of the grammatical sources. It will prove to be an equally essential adjunct in the identification of sources revealed by semantic affinities, to which we now return.

RATIONALE OF THE NEW APPROACH: THE TWO TYPES OF SEMANTIC AFFINITY; THE IMPORTANCE OF SEMANTIC ASYMMETRY BETWEEN LANGUAGES

Given the demonstrated value of those affinities in identifying the entries of classified vocabulary origin, it was natural to hope for similar success with other groups of entries. But they have proved more recalcitrant. Indeed, the potential of that line of enquiry might have appeared exhausted—unless one were to suppose that

semper singularia, pluralia tantum, difference in meaning between singular and plural, differences in extended-stem flection (e.g. Charisius [29], membership of third or fifth declension, and the like, is that the *Appendix* grammarian misunderstood the nature of his source material, reducing its diversities to a simple *-es/-is* opposition. It even seems possible that he was confused by the practice of citing the genitive as a criterion of declension membership *-is* indicating the third, *-(i)ei* the fifth and accompanying the *-es/ -(i)es* nominative distinction, e.g. Charisius (45–6). The reduction of grammatically interesting complexities to jejune simplicities is reminiscent of what occurred with the *Second Appendix*, as described in my *CQ* article (see references in n. 4 above). The possible significance of this reductionism and 'dumbing down' for the date of compilation of the *Appendix Probi* is discussed in the Study.

some affinities, existing in the sources, have been obscured in course of transmission—a possibility, that, as mentioned in note 16, had occurred to Ullmann, Foerster and Robson. In my own early scrutiny of the text, the entries that struck me as most suggestive of such vestiges of an original order were *Marsyas* (17) *pecten* (21) (taken in the sense of ‘plectrum’), *cithara* (23) ‘lyre’ and *museum* (26) ‘seat of the Muses’, which all have musical associations—for Marsyas was the name of the pipe-playing satyr who competed with Apollo, virtuoso of the lyre, the Muses acting as judges. But the four ‘musical’ words are spread over ten entries and separated by words with meanings like ‘aqueduct’, ‘column’, ‘crest’ and ‘ant’, which have no apparent connection with music. (Indeed, some commentators have, because of the presence of statues of the satyr in several towns, including Rome, seen in the Marsyas entry a possible clue to the place of origin of the text.) But the sense of an elusive context persisted. Another grouping of associated meanings was the two adjacent entries *caligo* (124), ‘murk’, ‘gloom’, and *tenebra* (125) (if we accept the scribe’s marginal correction), ‘darkness’. But the preceding entry, *occasio* (123), ‘opportunity’, seemed quite unrelated in meaning. Yet another was the juxtaposition of *solea* (80), ‘sandal’, or ‘sole’, and *calceus* (81), ‘shoe’, and, although separated by several entries, between *lancea* (72) ‘spear’ (sometimes one with a thong attached for throwing), and *flagellum* (77) ‘javelin thong’, which is preceded by *ansa* (76) ‘loop’ (in a shoelace), looking as if it might provide some kind of link between the footwear and weaponry group.²⁴ And other such groupings offered no more than hints of semantic affinity—nothing at all comparable to the clear affinities of the classified vocabulary series; no sufficiently solid basis for the postulation of a source. Something further seemed to be required to build elusive hints into fully established semantically related series. I believe that I did eventually succeed in identifying that missing something, but before relating how that was done, it will be well—in response to the anonymous reviewer’s plea for more consideration to be given to non-specialist readers—to clarify the notion of semantic affinity, using familiar modern-language examples.

The basic distinction to be made is between two types of such affinity—topical, and lexical. The first, where the affinity consists in relationship to a common topic or theme—natural phenomena, trades, female kindred, and the like—we have already seen in operation in discussing the classified vocabularies. The second type, lexical affinity, not so far discussed, is between various meanings of particular words. To take an English example: the meanings ‘machine for lifting heavy objects’ and ‘wading bird of the Gruidae family’ are related to one another as meanings of the word ‘crane’. Since we shall shortly have to take into account a second language to Latin—Greek, it is also of particular importance to note that, although these two lexical meanings are also shared by single words in some other languages, for example French ‘grue’, it is not safe to assume that such linkages will always be found as one moves from language to language. For example, of the two meanings of English *bulb*—‘underground part of some plants, corm’, and ‘glass device emitting electric light’—only the latter is shared by French ‘ampoule’ (‘electric bulb’), which itself also has another meaning, ‘blister’, unmatched by English *bulb*. So one has always to bear in mind, as one moves from language to language, that the range of meanings of a given word might prove to be language-specific; in any particular case semantic symmetry with

²⁴ These examples are given to illustrate semblances of linked meanings as they might initially strike a careful reader of the text. Not all the interpretations are confirmed as most probable by subsequent investigation.

another language might exist, but we cannot safely assume that it will. Failure to recognize this elementary linguistic fact is a common cause of mistranslations, and we shall see examples of them as we pursue our investigation of *Appendix* sources. With the glossarial classified vocabularies, which, being from the outset bilingual study adjuncts, listed the Latin and Greek words side by side under a topic heading that confirmed context, there was little possibility of mistranslation—unless, ignorant of, or ignoring, the context, a copyist or a busybody grammarian intervened. That is why the affinities in sequences of this type have mostly been preserved in easily recognizable form. But if originally monolingual material came to be translated without regard to context, errors could occur which might, partially or totally, obscure affinities.

It may save much abstract discussion if a simple concocted example is given. Suppose we were confronted with three successive items, *thread*, *switch* and *blister* in an English list; they would probably appear to present no semantic link. But then suppose a suspicion arose that the list might have been translated from French, and it also occurred to us that *switch* might point to electrical fittings as the 'topic' of the original list; we might then guess that *thread* and *blister* were mistranslations (in the electrical context) of 'fil (électrique)', and 'ampoule' and correct them to *wire* and (*light*) *bulb*. With the topic identified and the semantic affinities recognized, we would also be able to reconstruct with reasonable confidence the original of *switch* as 'commutateur'. And, having identified the nature of the list, we might identify its probable source as an extract from an electrical supplies catalogue or part of an explanation of the workings of electric lights. From our imaginary case we can also see how semantic asymmetry between the original and the translation, while disguising original affinities, may perform the valuable service of identifying the language of the original—as in this case *blister* pointed to French not, say Spanish, where 'bombilla' could not have been so rendered. In the case of the *Appendix*, similar particularities will be found in numerous cases to identify the source language as Greek.

This simple example—which I hope that those familiar with these linguistic matters will not think too elementary—should make clear the principles and *modus operandi* of my new approach to the investigation of *Appendix* sources. It only needs the finishing touch of concocted vulgarisms, which we will further suppose to have reached a grammarian and been corrected by him, to complete a 'series' parallel to those discussed below. Let us suppose the 'text' to be something like: 'thread not thred, switch not swich, blister not blisster'. We should also note that, if there had not been what he regarded as mistakes in any of the three words, it would probably not have appeared in a grammarian's list.²⁵

The reasons for associating Greek with the genesis of the *Appendix* are not far to seek. First is the bilingual nature, Greek as well as Latin, of the identified classified vocabularies source—a feature which, strangely enough, is given no prominence by the commentators, even Robson, who, although he quotes Greek in his lists, has his attention rigidly fixed on the Latin equivalents. Moreover, one has only to glance through the *Appendix* text to be struck, as several commentators have been, by

²⁵ There are, however, a few *Appendix* entries, discussed in the Study, where there is reason to suspect that the compiler, reminded by a form in his source, itself perfectly correct, of a vulgar variant seen elsewhere, added the pair to his list of corrected vulgarisms. An example is *pancarpus non pancarpus* (45), where it is probable that *pancarpus* (a conflation of *PAN* and *KARPOS*, see *Aristotle's classification of animals* below) appeared in the source; on the *pancarp-* variant see Baehrens, p. 72.

the large number of words of Greek origin. The text begins with three of them, *porphireticum marmor* and *tolonium*, and ends with another, *amfora*, and it presents such striking features as the purely Greek run of four successive entries (44–7), in which appear five words of Greek origin, *brauium*, *pancarpus*, *theofilus*, *homfagium*, *monofagium*.

There is even one sequence that offers a specific link between a Latin word and its Greek equivalent:

..... autor (154)
auctoritas non autoritas (155)
ipse..... (156)

For the Greek equivalent of *ipse*, ‘self’, is *AUTOS*, which, short of an unlikely coincidence, must surely be linked in some way with the *aut-* forms, *autor* and *autoritas*, possibly in an explanation (incidentally false) of their etymology—which may have been influenced by the genuine relation between *AUTOS* and *AUTHENTES*, *AUTHENTIA*, Greek ‘semantic equivalents’ of *auctor* and *auctoritas*. Armed with this new insight, let us re-scrutinize two of the three sequences in which we found hints of semantic affinities, starting with ‘murk’ and ‘darkness’, and leaving the ‘musical’ series for later consideration,

Murk and darkness (ZOPHOS)

occasio non occansio (123)
caligo non calligo (124)
tebra non telebra:n: (125)

We have mentioned above the obvious relationship between the meanings, ‘murk, gloom’ and ‘darkness’ of the Latin words *caligo* and *tenebra* of the second and third entries, and the apparent lack of any affinity with the ‘occasion, opportunity’ meaning, of the first entry. But *occasio* is very similar in shape to another Latin word, *occasus* ‘sunset’, ‘western quarter’, which has a sufficiently strong association with (the coming of) darkness to prompt enquiry whether there might not be some Greek word involved whose semantic range covered all three meanings. And, sure enough, we not only find that range of meanings recognized for the word *ZOPHOS* (*Ζόφος*) by the modern lexicons (e.g. L&Sc: ‘gloom, darkness . . . , the dark quarter, i.e. the west’) but are lucky enough to find it attested in an older authority, the fifth-century lexicon of Hesychius (Editions: K. Latte, *A-O* [1953–66]; P. A. Hansen, *P-S* [2005], Schmidt [1958–68]): ‘*ZOPHOS*: *SKOTOS* (‘darkness’), *OMIKHLE* (‘murk’), *DUSME* (‘the quarter of sunset’) (*Ζόφος*: *σκότος* *δμίχλη* *δύσμη*)’

This series offers a perfect illustration of the way in which incomplete semantic associations between Latin entries in the *Appendix* reflect more complete associations between Greek words of which they must be deemed translations, or, more precisely, translation glosses. It also calls for a number of further observations.

The first concerns the discrepancy between the MS reading, *occasio*, and the word, *occasus*, required to match one of the meanings of the key Greek word. Such a discrepancy would not surprise us in view of the corrupt nature of the MS, mentioned above. But, as it happens, in this particular case we may not even be obliged to suppose corruption. For *occasus* in the sense of *occasio* is found several times in Ennius: for example, *aut occasus ubi tempus audere repressit* (‘opportunity or time’) (*Annales* 8.255). Oddities of this sort were precisely the kind of thing that interested

the Latin grammarians and glossographers—the *occasioloccasus* confusion is in fact cited by Festus (*Occasus . . . quo vocabulo Ennius pro occasione est usus . . .*) (W. M. Lindsay, *Glossaria Latina* 4 [Paris, 1930], 295). So it may well have attracted a marginal comment, *item occansio*, or the like, on the *occasus* of the original translation gloss, which resulted in the inclusion by a copyist of *occansio* in the *Appendix* entry. If so this would be our first example of the incorporation in the text of a marginal ‘learned comment’—a phenomenon discussed below.

The second observation concerns the failure of the vulgar form *telebra* in the first entry, to match *SKOTOS* ‘darkness’ of the Greek original. Here, basing ourselves on the force of context, we would have had to conjecture a corruption of *tenebra* to *telebra*, buttressing our argument by citing the Goetz index, where a vulgar *tenebra* variant of *terebra* is attested s.v. *terebra*, and more abundantly s.v. *furfuraculum*, further supported by the survival of ten variants of *terebra* in certain Italian dialects, as reported by W. Meyer-Lübke (*Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (REW)* [Heidelberg, 1935]). That conjecture, so strongly supported, would probably have sufficed to carry conviction, but, as it happens, and as we have seen, we do not need such support since a corrector (or the copyist himself on reading through) has noticed the erroneous *telebra* and added a correcting -n- in the margin of the MS. So, with the entry restored to *terebra non tenebra*, we have an apparently perfectly justified *Appendix* correction of a genuine vulgarism. But that is not quite the end of the story: for we should note, as mentioned above, that the compiler clearly mistook the identity of the *tenebra* vulgarism, taking it for a variant of the word for ‘gimlet’, instead of ‘darkness’ (confirmed by the context and the parallel Hesychius entry), which he should have corrected to the *plurale tantum* form *tenebrae*. So here we have a clear example of an entry in the *Appendix* resulting from a mistaken interpretation by the compiler of his source material. It is not exactly a ‘grammaticization’ since it does not distort the source form by forcing it into a familiar mould—interpretation of *tenebra* as a vulgarism for *terebra* is as legitimate as is *tenebra* for *tenebrae*—but it does remind us to beware of automatically attributing distortions of source material to the copyist, without considering the possibility of a mistaken identification of an error by the compiler.

The third observation on this series must be a comment on the good fortune by which its elucidation is lent decisive conviction by the chance survival of a Greek text that so perfectly matches it. It would be too much to expect similar luck in other cases, although in fact there is one further series, the ‘Parts of the Ear’, discussed below, where a strikingly similar Greek passage has come down to us. In that case, although the series has been seriously disrupted, the order of occurrence of all items in the probable original has, as we shall see, been miraculously preserved. Need it be said that the specific Greek texts in which close matching with the conjectured words behind *Appendix* entries is found were not necessarily those used by the *Appendix* glossator? One cannot, for example, conclude that he must have found the words of the *ZOPHOS* series in Hesychius. The Greek lexicographers and onomasticians, like their modern counterparts, drew heavily on their predecessors, and it is quite possible that a similar entry in an earlier work was the source. We certainly could not safely use Hesychius’s fifth-century dates to establish a terminus post quem for the *Appendix*.

Before leaving this series, an observation must be made which applies to all series of Greek origin discussed in this article. It is that at least two stages and two distinct persons were clearly involved in the genesis of the *Appendix* list. At the first stage, the meanings of the Greek words were rendered in Latin by a translator; at the second,

corrections to the translator's vulgarisms were added by the grammarian. There will be further discussion of the characteristics of these two persons below.

ANKYLE

The second series with elusive affinities mentioned above was the one in which it seemed that loops might provide a link between shoes and javelins. Investigation of Greek words with suitable semantic spread throws up *ANKYLE* as the best match. These are its members, the square brackets indicating intruders from two other series discussed later.

lancea non lancia (72)
 [fauilla non failla (73)]
 [orbis non orbs (74)]
 [formosus non formunsus (75)]
 ansa non asa (76)
 flagellum non fragellum (77)
 calatus non galatus (78)
 digitus non dicitus (79)
 solea non solia (80)
 calceus non calcius (81)
 [iecur non iocur (82)]
 [auris non oricla (83)]
 [camera non cammara (84)]
 pegma non peuma (85)

Two preliminary remarks: (1) It will be seen that, although three of the seven items listed, *lancea non lancia* (72), *solea non solia* (80), and *calceus non calcius* (81), share a 'grammatical' feature, *-eal-ia*, or *-eul-iu*, it is of the banal type discussed in note 21 above, and although providing the substance of the corrections, it can hardly be the basis for their grouping in the text, which is, as we shall see, semantic affinity. (2) Since dictionaries are going to be quoted, a point of clarification needs to be made—and it is one to be borne in mind when considering other series as well. Although the words *digitus*, *solea*, and *calceus* all figure in one or other of the dictionary entries quoted below, none of them render meanings of the entry word in the way that *lancea*, 'javelin' or *ansa*, 'loop' do. They only appear in explanations of its meanings, just as, to take an English example, although *thimble* does not mean 'finger', we would expect the latter word to appear in dictionary definitions of thimble, as, for example, it does in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* entry, where the definition includes the phrase 'worn to protect the finger'. The inclusion of the three words in the *ANKYLE* series is, in fact, one of the indications that its source was lexical.

To come to the evidence of the dictionaries: the L&Sc *ANKYLE* entry (the relevant *Appendix* words are inserted in brackets) reads: 'the sense of a cup (*calathus*)²⁶ the thong of a javelin (*flagellum*) . . . the javelin itself (*lancea*) . . . a sandal thong (*solea* and *ansa*)'. The *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (*TGL*) entry (omitting much of what is

²⁶ So rendered in pre-ninth editions of L&Sc, but subsequently amended to 'wrongly explained as cup'. But, according to Athenaeus (11.182d), the name *ANKYLE* came to be applied to a cup (*KYLIX*) used in a wine-tossing game, the *cottabus*, from the fact that the wine was thrown with a bent arm (one of the basic meanings of *ANKYLE*, and its related form *ANKALE*). We also find *ANKYLE* included in a lists of names of cups in Pollux (6.95): τὰ δὲ τούτων εἶδη κύλικα, κυλίσκη, φιάλη, ἀγκύλην (*ANKYLE*), λεπαστήν, κυμβίον .'. So the older L&Sc interpretation would seem to be vindicated.

already covered in the quotation from L&Sc), uses, with reference to the loops in straps or thongs, the phrase *quibus videlicet digiti inseri possunt* ('into which the fingers can be inserted') (*digitus*), and also specifically mentions sandal (or shoe) thongs, *lora in calceis* (*calceus*), and *solearum amentum* (*solea* again). So the entire group of the *Appendix* words listed (down to entry 81), or, in one case, a synonym (*lancea* is not itself cited), appear in these dictionary entries under one Greek word. Which leaves only the last member of the series, *pegma non peuma* (85) to be discussed. Although separated from the other members by three entries, the evidence for their membership of another series is, as we shall see later, very strong. So the separation is not by three separate insertions but only one group; it is an example of the disturbance of an original order, mentioned above.

This *pegma non peuma* entry is probably the result of a series of confusions and interactions, which are not easy to expound, and the task would not have been attempted in this shortened presentation were it not for the considerable linguistic interest they present. Let us begin with *pegma*, the grammarian's correction to *peuma*. *Pegma* was a well-established Greek loanword in Latin. Its Greek form, *PEGMA* (πέγμα) was a derivative of the verb *PEGNYMI*, which had a range of meanings, centring on the notions of fixing together, making fast, compacting, solidifying. In Latin the loanword was in both literary and popular use. In the literary language, it developed a specialized, technical meaning, presumably derived from the 'fixing-together' notion, and was used to designate structures, especially those employed in putting on shows in the theatre and circus, roughly corresponding to what we call 'staging' and 'stage machinery'. In popular Latin, however, it seems, to judge by the Romance derivatives (see Meyer-Lübke, *REW*), to have been the 'compacting', 'solidifying' meanings, relating to things 'coagulated' or 'congealed' that prevailed. So the first point of linguistic interest presented by *pegma* is that of a Greek loanword whose semantic development diverged sharply in literary and popular usage. But, as we have noted, neither the literary nor the popular meanings appear to relate to our *ANKYLE* series.

There was, however, another Greek word, *PELMA* (πέλαμα), whose 'sole of a shoe' (L&Sc) meaning, would exactly match the *solea* ('sole') and *calceus* ('shoe') of our series. But, it may be objected, how is the gap between *PELMA* and the *pegmal/peuma* of our *Appendix* entry to be bridged? Phonetically there is no problem. For the *pegma* loanword developed, as the Romance forms show, two vulgar variants, *peuma* and *pelma*—the first through vocalization of the [g] before [m] (V. Väänänen, *Introduction au Latin vulgaire* [Paris, 1967], § 124), the second by false regression to [l], as explained in the note.²⁷ So, short of supposing an unlikely coincidence, we have reason to accept

²⁷ A more familiar example of this phenomenon to Romance philologists is another Greek loanword *sagma* from *SAGMA*, 'burden', 'load', which developed a vulgar variant, *sauma* (parallel to *peuma*), derivatives of which survive in several Romance languages. But vocalization to [u] before [m] was not confined to [g]; it also affected [l], which vocalized before other consonants as well and was a commoner phenomenon. There was, however, some resistance to such vulgar forms, and attempts were made to correct them. But since this vulgar [u] had developed from two different consonants, [g] and [l], in different words, these attempts sometimes resulted in the wrong consonant being 'restored', the commoner [l] ousting an original [g] in both *sauma*, leading to *salma*, and *peuma* to *pelma*. The latter false regression is in fact the one most widely attested in the Romance languages. Meyer-Lübke, *REW*, s.v. *pegma* cites: Romanian *pielma*, 'meal, flour' (see also the *Dictionarul Limbii Române [serie nouă]*, [Bucharest, 1974] for the now current *pielm* form, and the revealing false etymological comment, comparing Mod. Greek *PELMA*, which, incidentally, continues to mean 'sole' both of foot and shoe). Surselvan, Ladin and Lombard,

a *PELMA*, appearing in a Greek lexicographer's account of the meanings of *ANKYLE*, as the probable source of both the *solea* and *calceus* entries and, because of its form, of the *pegma non peuma* entry as well. We can be reasonably sure of that result, but just how it came about we can only conjecture. One possible 'scenario' is that what reached the grammarian was the translator's glosses entered upon a copy of the Greek lexical entry, and that, as well as picking up for correction the *solia* and *calcius* vulgarisms, he, having some, albeit scant, Greek, thought he recognized in *PELMA*, a vulgar variant of the familiar *pegma* loanword, and made it the basis of another correction, *pegma non peuma*, preferring to cite as the vulgarism not *pelma* but the older variant in *u*, which was also possibly more familiar to him. The alternative possibility, that *PELMA* was sufficiently current as a loanword to have itself developed in Latin a *peuma* variant, is unlikely. Its only attestation in Latin is in the so-called *Hermeneumata Celtis*.²⁸ On the other hand, since that text, like the material from which, in part, the *Appendix* list emerged, was bilingual in character, it is possible that the word had some currency in the language of bilingual clerks.

All the series so far discussed are clearly based on lexical affinity. Let us now introduce one whose affinity is 'topical'. Its immediate source may, in fact, have been an onomasticon. Similar classifications, characteristic of the borderland between lexicology and science occupied by such compositions, occur in Pollux, although this particular one is not found in the abridged version of his *Onomasticon* that has come down to us. In any event, there can be little doubt that the ultimate source was Aristotle's classification of animals by their eating habits. This identification enables us, as will be seen, to make sense of what initially appears a farrago of unrelated entries, the third of which is obviously corrupt, and the second linguistically difficult to account for. We shall see that all three entries were probably the result of the compiler's inability to understand the nature and import of the Greek material as it reached him, compounded by his attempts to assimilate it to familiar vulgarisms. While falling short of offering the assurance we would have if a fully corresponding Greek text had come down to us, enough has survived to enable us to reconstruct the main lines of the original with a reasonable degree of certainty.

ARISTOTLE'S CLASSIFICATION OF ANIMALS BY THEIR EATING HABITS

pancarpus non parcarpus (45)
theofilus non izofilus (46)
homfagium non monofagium (47)

Aristotle divided the animals into several categories: the omnivorous (*PAMPHAGA* or *PAN-PHAGA*), the fruit eaters (*KARPO-PHAGA*), those particular about their food (*IDIO-TROPHA*), and the meat eaters (*SARKO-PHAGA*), or (*OMO-*

pelma, 'honeycomb', Andalusian *pelma*, and a derivative, *pelmazo*, in Spanish. [He might have added the *pelma* form itself, which is also still current in non-Andalusian Spanish in the sense of 'tiresome person', 'bore'. A meaning, 'compacted lump', akin to that of the Greek etymon *PEGMA*, also persists in Spanish.] The *peuma* and the *pelma* variants doubtless coexisted for a time. In the case of *salmalsauma* both variants have survived in the Romance languages. To quote only a few of the Meyer-Lübke examples: persisting *sauma* forms underlie Provençal *sauma* and French *somme* (as in *bête de somme*), while Catalan and Spanish *salma* exemplify the second type of variant; and in Italian *soma* and *salma* attest the continuing coexistence of both types.

²⁸ Published by Dionisotti (n. 5), see esp. 103 and 117.

PHAGA), literally ‘raw eaters’.²⁹ We see that these terms all consist of two roots. The first indicates the nature of the food *PAN*- (‘everything’), *KARPO*- (‘fruit’) *IDIO*- (‘particular’), *OMO*- (‘raw’); the second is *-PHAG*- (‘eat’) in all cases but one, *IDIO-TROPHA*, where the second element relates to nourishment. Let us set them down again in comparison with the *Appendix* entries: *PAN*-/*pan*-; *KARPO*-/*carpus* (45); *IDIO*-/*lizo*- (46);³⁰ *OMO*-/*lhom*- (47). The second root *-PHAG*- appears only (but twice) in the (*hom*)*phagium* and (*mono*)*phagium* of the final entry (47).

The unmistakable lineaments of the source words can still be discerned in the *Appendix* entries, but we see that the material has undergone considerable corruption. Attempts to trace its course will inevitably involve conjecture, but some parts of the process are reasonably clear. *PA*- and *KARP*- have been combined to form the word *pancarpus*. (It is not unlikely that the lexical glosser, seeking to economize space for his marginal or interlinear gloss, wrote only *pan*- and *carp*-*ophaga*, which would have facilitated the mistaken recognition of *pancarpus*.) In entry 46, *izofilus* must surely, in this context, be a gloss on an *IDIOPHILOS*, meaning ‘fond of particular (foods)’. Although the lexicons do not attest that compound—Aristotle used *IDIO-TROPHOS*—the Greek language very readily coined and admitted new compounds, and similar *PHILO*-compounds (both as first and as second component) relating to food are attested: for example, *PHILOTRAPEZOS* (‘loving the table’), *PHILO-BOROS* (‘fond of eating’); *PHILOPSOS* (‘fond of dainties’), *OPSOPHILOS* (ditto), and, *GASTROTROPHILOS* (‘devoted to the stomach’) —Pollux fills half a page with *PHILO*- examples (6.166–8). The ‘correcting’ *theofilus*, looks like a despairing effort on the part of the grammarian to make some sort of sense of *izofilus*, and contorted attempts such as Baehrens’s (pp. 47–8) to contrive a sound change that would account for the relationship between the two words are probably a waste of philological ingenuity. In the last entry of the series, *homfagium non monofagium* (47), which preserves the *PHAG*- element, the missing *OM*- of the list of eating preferences also survives, but in the correcting, not corrected, position. The entry presents a feature, the correction of one lexical item by another, that is alien to *Appendix* practice, which is to correct variant forms of the same word. There is only one other such case, *cannelam non canianus* (18); and in that case too (discussed below) the probable explanation is that a copyist ran the rejected forms of two entries together. In the present instance *homfagium* was probably the original corrected form, corresponding to a lost *omophagia* (possibly *omofagia* since *theofilus*, not *theophilus* is

²⁹ The several relevant Aristotle passages include: *Hist. An.* (488a14–15): καὶ τὰ μὲν σαρκοφάγα (*SARKOPHAGA*), τὰ δὲ καρποφάγα (*KARPOPHAGA*), τὰ δὲ παμφάγα (*PAMPHAGA*), τὰ δὲ ἰδιότροφα (*IDIO-TROPHA*)—where, it will be seen, all the Greek words, except *OMOPHAGA*, corresponding to the *Appendix* entries appear; *Pol.* (1256a25): Διὰ τὸ τὰ μὲν ζωοφάγα (*ZOOPHAGA*), τὰ δὲ καρποφάγα (*KARPOPHAGA*), τὰ δὲ παμφάγα (*PAMPHAGA*), αὐτῶν εἶναι. The *OMOPHAGA* ‘raw eaters’ are mentioned in *Hist. An.* (608b25) and *Part. an.* (694a1).

³⁰ The phonological implications of hesitations between (-)di- and (-)z- in the spelling of Greek words in Late Latin do not concern us here. All that we need to note is that the Greek letter zeta (Ζ, ζ), usually transliterated by *z*, is sometimes represented by *di*, e.g. βαπτίζεν (*BAPTIZEIN*) by *baptidiare* (e.g. *Aetheriae Peregrinatio* 45.1, 46.1, 46.6), and, conversely, δι (*DI*) by *z*, as in *zabolus* (*diabolus*), and in our *izofilus* (for *idiofilus*). The practice was occasionally extended to Latin words, as in *azutoribus* (*adiutoribus*) (cited by D. Norberg, *Manuel pratique de latin médiéval* [Paris, 1968], 22).

entered in the correcting position in entry 46), and *monofagium* the surviving part of another entry, corrected by *monofagia* or *monophagia*.³¹

AN EXEMPLARY CASE OF MISTRANSLATION

So far no example has been given of the obscuring of original affinities by the mistranslation of Greek source material mentioned in the section on the rationale of the new approach. So let us consider the adjoining entries *balteus non baltius* (132) ('belt') *fax non facla* (133) ('little torch'), where there is no suggestion at all of affinity between the meanings of the Latin words, but semantic affinity at once emerges if we suppose them to be translations of the commonest meanings 'belt' and 'little torch' of the Greek words *TELAMON* (τελαμών) and *LAMPADION* (λαμπάδιον). For these share a secondary meaning, 'bandage' or 'surgical dressing' (L&Sc). Here renderings that respected the medical context implied by their consecutive occurrence were required, but the translator, ignoring, or ignorant of, the context, simply glossed the Greek words with translations of their commonest meanings.

But what was the precise nature of the Greek source? Was it a passage in an onomasticon dealing with medical matters, which would make their affinity topical? Or do the two words convey the meanings of a single Greek word, which would make it lexical? Let us see whether their context in the *Appendix* will help in answering those questions. A first inspection suggests that, primarily, the neighbouring entries are concerned with tablets, so we will label the series as:

Tablets—and bandages?

These are the relevant entries:

grus non gruis (128)
anser non ansar (129)
tabula non tabla (130)
puella non poella (131)
balteus non baltius (132)
fax non facla (133)
uico capitis africae non uico caput africae (134)
uico tabuli proconsulis non uico tabulu proconsulis (135)

The entries that, as explained below, probably arise directly from glosses on Greek Tablet words (although this is not immediately obvious in the first and third of them) are: *anser non ansar*; *tabula non tabla*; *puella non poella* (129–31); and, integrated in an apparent street name, the *tabulu* of entry 135. Entry 134 does not itself contain a

³¹ (a) The inclusion of this word marks a further departure from Aristotle, where it is not attested. In the *Septuagint* (*Maccabees* 4 [1.27, and 2.7]) it is linked first to *PANTOPHAGIA* (in the sense of 'eating everything [within sight]', and *LAIMARGIA*, 'voracious greed'), and then to *GASTRIMARGOS*, another 'gluttonous' word. Its accretion to the Aristotelian words looks like a 'learned comment'—citation of a further example of a compound in *PHAG*. It implies some knowledge of Greek and may have been made by the translation glosser. (b) The *-ium* termination probably arose from a mistaken interpretation of *-ia* as a Latin neuter plural termination, from which a matching singular was formed. In support of this explanation Baehrens (126) cites Cassian (*Inst.* 4.22), who clearly interpreted two *-phagia* words, *omophagia* and *xerophagia* as plurals—*nec . . . cura inter eos . . . coctionis impenditur, quippe qui maxime xerophagiis uel omophagiis utuntur* ('among them no concern is given to cooking, for they mainly consume dry or raw food'). *Xerophagia* is also cited as a plural in a gloss on this passage, *herbae quae comeduntur incoctae* (*Goetz index*).

Tablet word, but it is probably an offshoot of one: for, as mentioned above, the Vicus Capitis Africae was the site of a famous school, a *DIDASKALEION*—the word used in the Suda to render another Greek word, *GRAMMATEION*, whose commoner meaning was ‘writing tablet’. So a gloss in the source on *GRAMMATEION*, taken in the ‘grammar school’ sense, mentioning the site of one of the most celebrated of such institutions, would account for the presence of that street-name in this context. For the entry looks very much like a ‘learned comment’, which, picked up by the grammarian, who, regarding the non-inflected street-name as a vulgarism, included it in his list.³²

The other key Greek words for Tablets (and planks) are: *PINAX* or *SANIS*. *PINAX* is rendered by L&Sc as ‘a board or plank . . . a drawing or writing tablet’, and by the TGL as ‘tabula, asser’ (‘beam’). *Tabula* and *asser* are again the words used by the TGL to define our second Greek word, *SANIS*, which is explained by L&Sc in similar terms to *PINAX*. So these two words are ‘plank’ as well as ‘tablet’ words. *GRAMMATEION*, however, is not a ‘plank’, only a ‘tablet’ word. The Latin glosses on these Greek words in the Goetz index confirm this distribution of meanings: for example, under *tabula* we find *SANIS*, *PINAX* (and derivatives), and *GRAMMATEION*; under *pugillaris* (‘writing tablet’) (where *tabula* and the very suggestive form *puellaris* also figure) we find *PINAKIDES* and *PINAKIDION*; and under *asser* *SANIS* (and the byform *assares*). This configuration of forms and meanings makes it likely that the correction *anser* in the *anser non ansar* entry is itself a mistake—this time most likely a copyist’s—and that the entry originally read *asser non ansar* (or *assar*): a mistake possibly induced by the presence of a bird name in the preceding entry (*grus/gruis*). As to the *ansar/asser* confusion, the assimilation of [n] to following [s] is one of the most widely attested sound changes in Popular Latin, and both itself and the corresponding hypercorrection, -ns- for -s-, figure in the *Appendix*: for example, *ansa non asa* (76), and *hercules non herculens* (19); while the -ar for -er termination is attested for both *asser* (*assares*) and *anser* (*ansar*) in the glossaries.

So much for the first two Tablet words, *asser* and *tabula* (129 and 130). The third, *pugillar(is)eles* which probably lies behind the immediately following entry, *puella non poella*, is so heavily disguised that its existence might never have been suspected if it had not been for the attestation of a similar deformation, *puellaris* for *pugillaris*, in the gloss cited above (see the Goetz index, s.v. *pugillaris*). The confusion between *pugill-* and *puell-* doubtless results from the fall of intervocalic [g], a sporadic phenomenon in late spoken Latin, commonest before a back vowel, but also occurring before front vowels, for example, *viginti* to *vinti*, *quadraginta* to *quarenta*, *fugire* to *fuir* etc. (See Baehrens, p. 87, and Väänänen, § 108.) The *ile* and *ulo* confusions are well known to students of late and Popular Latin and are discussed in the Study. We can only guess just how our MS reading was arrived at. Perhaps a form *poellaris* glossing one of the Greek ‘writing tablet’ words was mistaken for a vulgar variant of *puellaris*, ‘girlish’, by the grammarian, who omitted the adjectival suffix as calling for no correction, and thus arrived at *puella non poella*. The fourth Tablet word, *tabulu*, embedded in the *uico tabuli proconsolis non uico tabulu proconsulis* entry (135), is of the ‘plank’ persuasion, probably being a gloss on *IKRION* (cited in L&Sc in the plural form *IKRIA*), which designates planking, for example on the decks or sides of ships or on platforms (see

³² The *Caput Africae* is the only one of the four street-names (134–7) elsewhere attested as such, and, in the Study, I question the authenticity of the other three and offer an alternative explanation of their origin.

the L&Sc entry). As to the *tabulu* form, it is clearly a vulgarism for *tabulum* (cf. *triclinium non triclínu* and *passim non passi* (143 and 217)). It is attested in the glossaries (see the Goetz index, s.v. *tabulum*, where it is twice quoted as glossed by *IKRION*).

Now, all these Tablet words could have derived independently from an onomasticon, in which case their adjunction to the two Bandage words, *baltius* glossing *TELAMON*, and *facla* *LAMPADION*, would be purely fortuitous. But there is one further neighbouring entry whose possible derivation form a Greek Bandage word must be mentioned, *gruis* (128), ('crane'). For the Greek name for that bird is *GERANOS*, which has a derivative, *GERANIS*, meaning 'surgical bandage' (L&Sc). If that explanation of the presence of the *gruis* entry were accepted, the fact that there were now three Bandage entries intertwined with their neighbours would increase the likelihood of a link between the two groups. And there is, as it happens, a Greek word, *PITTAKION*, which, like its Latin derivative, *pittacium*, combines the Tablet and Bandage meanings and could provide that link. But intertwining does not, as we have seen, necessarily imply relationship, and this appears to be a case where we cannot certainly exclude either Greek source—onomasticon or lexicon. These questions and a possibly complex relationship with three of the supposed street-names are discussed in the Study.

THREE SHORT SERIES

Two of the most interesting of the identified series covered in this abridged presentation remain to be discussed; but they are lengthy, and, before embarking on them, let us group three of the shortest and consider them here. All are probably of lexical origin.

(a) *Serpentine eyes*

The first is *draco non dracco* (110) and *oculus non oclus* (111). The juxtaposition of the words meaning 'snake' and 'eye', apparently fortuitous as far as Latin is concerned, can be accounted for not only by the similarity of form between the Greek words *DRAKON* ('snake') and *DRAKOS* ('eye'), respectively glossed *draco* and *oculus* by the *TGL*, but also by their common derivation from the root, *DERK/DRAK/DORK*, as exemplified in the verb *DERKOMAI*, 'look at, see'. (The L&Sc entries support the common etymology of the two Greek words.) We note that this time the affinity is between shared roots. A possible source of entries might have been a Greek etymological note.³³

(b) *Wild boars*

The second, *teter non tetrus* (138), and *aper non aprus* (139), is concerned with the wildness of the wild boar. The entries appear to derive from a gloss on Greek *KAPROS*, or *SYAGROS*, 'wild boar'. For *aper* (*aprus*) is 'boar' and *taeter*, which in classical Latin meant 'foul', 'offensive', was used by the early authors in the sense of *ferus*, 'wild'. Cf. Isid. *Orig.* 10.270: *Tetrum enim veteres pro fero dixerunt, ut*

³³ See R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), who quotes s.v. *draco*, Paul. Fest. 67 *dracones dicti ἀπὸ τοῦ δέρκεσθαι, quod est uidere. Clarissimam enim dicuntur habere colubrae aciem . . .* ('*Dracones* (snakes) are so called from Greek verb *DERKESTHAI*, which means "see". For serpents are said to have very sharp sight . . .').

Ennius . . . 'tetros elephantos'. And 12.1.27: *Aper a feritate vocatus, ablata F littera et subrogata P. Unde et apud Graecos σάγρος (SYAGROS), id est ferus, dicitur.* ('The boar (*aper*) is so called from its wildness (*feritas*), with change of P for F. Whence it is called SYAGROS (AGROS equals *ferus*) in Greek.' The SYAGROS reference may well go back to a lexicon; for in Hesychius we read: 'KAPROS [the Greek equivalent of *aper*]: σάγρος (SYAGROS), ὅς ἄγριος (HYS AGRIOS)'; (HYS means 'pig' and AGRIOS 'wild'). The appearance of the archaism here suggests a 'learned comment' gloss subsequently incorporated in the text, in a similar way to the *occasio/occasus* gloss in the Murk and Darkness series.

(c) *Sloughed snakeskins (GERAS)*

This is a shortened version of the discussion in the Study of a series consisting of possibly as many as seven members. Here only the first three are considered:

exequae non execiae (27)

gyrus non gyrys (28)

auus non aus (29)

These three entries present a particularly interesting conflict between the MS readings of the first two and suggestions of underlying affinities linking all three.

Let us begin with *auus*, 'grandfather', the Greek for which is *PAPPOS*. But *PAPPOS* has another meaning, 'fluff' or 'down', a synonym for which is *GEREION*, a derivate of *GERAS*, 'old age'—a word which, it will be argued, probably originally figured in the obviously corrupt *gyrus non gyrys* of the preceding entry. And *GERAS* too has a second meaning, 'sloughed snakeskin'—both meanings recorded by L&Sc—a Latin equivalent for which is *exuuiæ*, very similar to the *execiae* of the first of the three entries—a very suggestive collocation, especially when we find that those two words, *exuuiæ* and *ex(s)equiae*, are frequently listed together in the Latin grammarians.

The Latin and Greek authorities for these statements make interesting reading in themselves. Our Latin authority is again Isidore. He explains the association between old age and sloughed snakeskin as follows (*Orig.* 12.4.46): *Serpentes . . . diu vivere dicuntur, adeo ut, deposita vetere tunica, senectutem deponere atque in iuventutem redire perhibeantur.* ('Snakes are reputed to live long, so much so that, when they have shed their old skin, they are said to shed old age and return to youth.') And he goes on (12.4.47) to account for the use of *exuuiæ* (whose basic meaning is 'discarded or stripped off clothes') in the 'sloughed snakeskin' meaning: *Tunicæ serpentium exuuiæ nuncupantur, eo quod his, quando senescunt, sese exuunt, quibus exutis, in iuventam redeunt.* ('The skins of snakes are called *exuuiæ*, because, when they grow old, they put them off [like old clothes], and return to youth.' (Cf. also Virgil's splendid line evoking the snake's emergence from its winter torpor: (*coluber*) *nunc positis novus exuuiis, nitidusque iuuenta* ('the snake, now new, its old coat shed, and bright with youth', *Aen.* 2.473)). The two meanings of Greek *GERAS*, it will be noted, are paralleled in Latin *senectus*, whose secondary meaning was probably a semantic calque on the Greek word.³⁴

³⁴ The Greek authority is Hesychius: γήρεια· τὰ τῆς ἀκάνθης ἐξανθήματα ἅπερ ἔνιοι πάππους λέγουσι 'GEREIA [the pl. of *GEREION*]: the efflorescence of the thistle [i.e. thistle down], which some call *PAPPOI* [plural of *PAPPOS*]' And πάππος· ἀκανθα ἐπὶ γηράσῃ καὶ ἀποξηρανθῇ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἐκριπίζηται, καὶ τόπον ἐκ τόπου μεταβάλλῃ· Σημαίνει δὲ καὶ

As to the two discrepancies between these interpretations and the MS readings: the obviously corrupt *gyrus non gyrus* presumably derived from a gloss on *GERAS*, should accordingly be emended to read *gyrus non gyras*—an understandable correction since *gyrus* was a well established loanword, whereas no corresponding loanward from *GERAS* seems to have established itself in Latin. The *gyras* form is, however, attested in glosses, as is *gifas*, probably a scribal distortion of an original *giras* (see the Goetz index, s.v. *Tunica serpentis*). Both these misspellings are easily accounted for. The post-classical merging in a single phoneme, /i/, of three vowel phonemes of classical Greek, represented by the letters eta (Ε) (*H,η*), upsilon (Υ) (*Y,υ*) and iota (Ι) (*I,ι*), resulted in spelling confusions. Our *GERAS* (*γῆρας*) might, accordingly, have also been spelt *γυρας* or *γίρας* and transliterated in Latin as *geras*, *gyras* or *giras*. As to the missing *exuuiæ*: there is support from the *TLL* for possible semantic confusion between the two words *exuuiæ* and *ex(s)equiæ*. But a more likely explanation of the presence of the latter lies in the strong association, mentioned above, that must have existed between the two words in the mind of any student of Latin grammar, such as our compiler. For they figure together in grammarians' lists as standard examples of feminine *pluralia tantum*.³⁵ Moreover, in Phocas (*GL* 5.428.8), where the words also appear in close succession, an *exubiae* variant with *b* for *v* appears in two MSS. So the close grammatical association between the words may have prompted our grammarian to add to his original entry *exuuiæ non exubiae*, an *exequiæ non execiæ* grammatical 'passenger', perhaps directly inspired by a specific linking of the two words in some grammarian in the way illustrated by 'Albinus' (*GL* 7.300.26): *Exuuiæ per v, excubiae per b scribantur; exsequiæ per q scribendum est*—which implies rejection of *exubiae* and *ex(s)ec(u)iæ* vulgarisms. Cf. also Cassiodorus (*Ex Papiriano*: *GL* 7.158.15–17), *Reliciæ et relicui per c scribebantur . . . at nunc reliquiae et exequiæ per q scribuntur*, this time directly confirming the existence of an *execiæ* form as condemned in our text. So if the two entries, the primary and its passenger, were originally made in the *Appendix*, thus:

exuuiæ non exubiae
exequiæ non execiæ

a mistaken omission of the first by the copyist would have resulted in the reading of our MS—with the ironical consequence that, cuckoo-like, the 'passenger' would have ousted the primary word from the nest.

And the probable source? A dictionary, arranged alphabetically like Hesychius' (where *GERAS* and *GEREION* appear separated by only one entry) seems most likely.

From this brief excursion into the innocent world of pre-Darwinian 'nature study', we must turn to a daunting succession of three series. They are interesting both in themselves, and by the way in which they are linked.

But first we need to survey the progress made.

πατριJ > μητριJ πατΕρα κα-τ-ν ἱπῆ τό γενε-τ- tr-cwsin. '*PAPPOS*: thistle; when it grows old and desiccated and is borne off by the winds and tossed about from place to place. It also means . . . a father's or mother's father. Also a growth of hairs under the chin.' (The possible relevance of the latter meaning to the wider *GERAS* series, is discussed in the Study). (Cf. also Pollux 2.80; Photius 379.75; and Eustathius 1353.57 and 1496.53).

³⁵ For instance, in Charisius (35.18–19), where they occur together in immediate succession: *exuuiæ . . . exsequiæ*, shortly followed by *excubia*; and in Bede (*GL* 7.271.28): *Exuuiæ, exequiæ, excubiae . . . tantum pluralia*.

A PAUSE TO TAKE STOCK

From what we have seen of the Greek-based sequences of entries so far investigated we realize how fortunate we are that sufficient traces of the underlying Greek words have survived to enable them to be identified with reasonable certainty. This is in spite of the fact that their origins have sometimes been obscured by mistranslation—the most striking examples so far being the ‘belt’ and ‘little lamp’ renderings of words that, in context, meant ‘bandages’; that their identity has been misunderstood by the grammarian (who, for example, thought that *tenebra* was a vulgarism of *terebra* ‘awl’, and *peuma* a mistake for *pegma*); or disguised by miscopying—*gyrus* for *gyras*; or, in a number of cases, made more difficult to detect by disturbance of their original sequence. Moreover, there probably have been omissions, for example, when the translator’s gloss was not regarded as a vulgarism by the grammarian. So we cannot assume that all the Greek words in a given source were translated into Latin or that all the translations contained vulgar features that prompted the grammarian to include them in his list. The conclusion must be that some at least of the survivals are probably fragmentary.

Beyond all these factors there is another that complicates our task—signs of intervention by some person other than the translator and the grammarian, as so far conceived. The interventions appear to have been learned or semi-learned in character, prompting the label ‘learned comment’, first applied above to the *occasio/occasus* archaism mentioned in discussing the *ZOPHOS* series. Further examples were the linking of *draco* and *oculus* through the meaning of the verb *DERKOMAI* in the Serpentine Eyes series; the addition of an exemplifying reference to a famous school, this time mistakenly prompted by a word, *GRAMMATEION*, which in the original context meant ‘writing tablet’; the use of the archaic *teter* for ‘wild’ in the Wild Boars series. Then there was the suspected etymological explanation of the *autoritas* and *autor* forms as derived from Greek *AUTOS*. And we shall shortly see what is probably the most striking example of all: fragments of a sentence from Varro quoted to illustrate a particular use of the word *cochlia*.

Returning now to the next series to be discussed—in fact a group of three related series—we note that they provide a clear example of the necessity to take the philological factor into account. For, although the first series is quite certainly of onomastic origin, what ties the three together is relationship not to a particular topic or field but to a word, the Greek word *KOKHLIAS*, its related Greek terms, and its Latin equivalent *cochlea*. Hence the heading I give to the group.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON *KOKHLIAS* AND RELATED FORMS

The linked series may begin as early as entry 58, *umbilicus non imbilicus* and they certainly extend to entry 86, *cluaca non clu* . . . (omitting the eight already assigned to the *ANKYLE* series). The members of each series will be set out and discussed separately, beginning with the third, which may have given rise to the other two.

(a) *Parts of the ear*

cochlea nan coclia (66)
 alueus non albeus (70)
 iecur non iocur (82)
 auris non oricla (83)
 camera non cammara (84)
 cluaca non clu.... (86)

This time it will be convenient to begin by looking at the source, a Greek passage closely similar to that found in the *Onomasticon* of Pollux, mentioned above.³⁶

The following is a translation of the relevant parts of the passage (*Onomasticon* 2.85–6). The Greek words linked to the *Appendix* are transliterated and their *Appendix* renderings added in brackets: ‘The outer periphery of the ears [is called] the *KOKHLIAS* (*coclia*), the inner the *SKAPHOS* (*albeus*) and . . . the lower part the *LOBOS* (*oricla*) . . . and the part round the hole the *KAMARA* (*cammara*). . . .’³⁷

The relation of *coclia*, ‘spiral shell’, to *KOKHLIAS* is obvious and requires no further comment at this stage. As to *albeus*, L&Sc (older editions) tell us that *SKAPHOS*, as well as designating one of the cavities of the external ear, was generally applied to ‘any deep vessel’ and, specifically, to ‘the hull of a ship, Lat. *alueus*’. *LOBOS*, is, as L&Sc point out, not only applied to the lobe of the ear (*auricula* is the Latin form used specifically in that sense) but also to the lobe of the liver, and, generally, the liver itself, thus accounting for both the *oricla* and *iecurliocur* entries. The last Greek word in the series, *KAMARA*, is again represented by two *Appendix* entries, *camera non cammara* and *cluaca non clu* . . . (cf. L&Sc, s.v. *KAMARA*, ‘vaulted sewer’). Here, with the *albeus* ‘deep vessel’, *iocur*, ‘liver’ and *cluaca*, ‘sewer’, we note a further example of the translator’s failure to render the meaning of the Greek words relevantly to the context. If, as from the technical nature of the Greek passage might have seemed possible, his purpose had been to assemble material for a bilingual glossary of anatomical terms, his glosses would have been quite useless.

So here we have a second example—the first was the *ZOPHOS* entries—of a series of *Appendix* entries with matching Greek equivalents, whose conjecture is confirmed by attestation. In it we see confirmation of the two operations distinguished above. The first was obviously the adding of Latin translation—doubtless, as was the usual practice, in the margin or between the lines of the Greek text. In the second, the correcting by the grammarian of the translator’s vulgarisms, we again see clear evidence of a separate hand: not only in the obvious fact that this man would not have perpetrated the vulgarisms he reproves but also in his rejection of the lexical glosser’s (for once perfectly legitimate) use of the diminutive *oricla* to translate *LOBOS*, correcting it not to *auricula* but to *auris*, an intervention which once again exemplifies his proneness to assimilate his material to familiar types of vulgarism.³⁸

³⁶ As in the case of the Hesychius entry and the *ZOPHOS* series, the close correspondence between the Pollux passage and this *Appendix* series does not necessarily mean that the Pollux text, as we have it, was that used by the Latin lexical glosser. Pollux, like other compilers, ancient and modern, drew on earlier compilations, and his own may readily have been similarly used by successors or extracts made from it for particular purposes. In fact the version we have is itself recognized as an abridgement (cf. *OCD*, 3rd edn. s.v. *Pollux* (K.Latte [ed., inc. index], *Pollucis Onomasticon* [Leipzig, 1900–37]). But, adhering to the evidence we have, we shall, for simplicity, refer to it as ‘the Pollux passage’.

³⁷ I do not attempt to bring the ancient consistently into line with modern anatomical terminology. The rest of the passage, not represented in the *Appendix* but included here as possibly relevant in the wider context, goes on: ‘The entire circuit of the ear [is called] the *HELIX* and the part below it the *KONKHE*.’ This is the original Greek passage, with the transliterations of the key words again added in brackets: τῶν γε μὴν ὠτῶν ἡ μὲν ἑξῶθεν περιβολὴ κοχλίας (*KOKHLIAS*), ἡ δὲ ἐνδοθεν σκάφος (*SKAPHOS*), . . . τὸ δὲ κάτω λοβός (*LOBOS*), . . . τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὸ τρύπημα μέρος καμάρα (*KAMARA*). ἡ δὲ πᾶσα περιαγωγὴ τοῦ ὠτὸς ἐλιξ (*HELIX*), καὶ τὸ ὑπ’ αὐτῇ κόγχη (*KONKHE*).

³⁸ The wide currency of the diminutive *auricula* for the ear as a whole is confirmed by such Romance forms as Fr. *oreille*, Sp. *oreja*, and Romanian *ureche*. It is in this sense that modern commentators have taken this entry, as did the grammarian.

A final observation is on the application to this case of the procedure, generally followed throughout this investigation, of following up clues given by Greek polyseme. That procedure had in fact enabled me to identify *LOBOS* as probably underlying *iocur* and *oricla*, and *KAMARA cammara* and *cluaca* before I noticed their occurrence together in a surviving text. But, although I had also noticed the specifically auricular associations of *LOBOS-oricla* and *KAMARA-cammara* and possibly *KOKHLIAS-coclia*, the wide separation of the latter from the other entries, and its linkage with its immediate neighbours (described below under the Shells series) made those associations appear just one of the possibilities to be further explored. The *aluueslalbeus* entry, on the other hand, viewed in isolation, suggested no auricular connection at all. It was the Pollux passage that, by drawing attention to the auricular meaning of *SKAPHOS*, whose Latin (non-auricular) equivalent was the *albeus* of the *Appendix*, and, by confirming the correctness of the *LOBOS* and *KAMARA* auricular conjectures based on Greek polyseme, clinched matters. It also made it seem likely that, in spite of its separation from the other members, *coclia* as well belonged to that series.

(b) *Shells*

Purple-productive

Although of Greek origin, this series presents the unusual feature of incorporating a purely Latin quotation gloss on the word *coclia*, the striking 'learned comment' referred to above. The wide separation in the *Appendix* text of the *coclia* entry from the other Parts of the Ear, except the *albeus* of *SKAPHOS* origin (from which it is only separated by three intrusive entries concerned with variants on the *-ar* termination, *cochl-earel-iarium*, *pal-earl-iarium*, and *primipil-arisl-arius*), has already been commented on. The larger gap is accounted for by several entries of *SPEIRA* origin—closely related to the Shells—and the long *ANKYLE* series.

The only link between this series and the Parts of the Ear is the presence in both of the word *KOCHLIAS/cochlea*, which we have seen as a term for a spiral convolution of the outer ear, but which, in its basic 'shell' sense, was also used to refer to a marine snail. This linkage through a word is a major reason for adding to the sources characterized by lexical and topical semantic affinities a further category—those characterized by philological comment. The interest that its appearance in the two series reflects in the different fields of reference of a word goes beyond what is normally found in dictionary entries, and even the admittedly more discursive passages in onomasticons.

In this series we have *KOKHLIAS* appearing in its primary 'shell' meaning—its use as a term for part of the ear is clearly secondary—and the context shows that its reference is specifically to the sea-snail, the murex, from which purple dye was extracted. Its Greek synonym in this latter meaning was *PORPHYRA* (our 'purple'), the relevant parts of the L&Sc definition of which read as follows: 'the purple-fish . . . the purple dye obtained from it . . . the stripe . . . of a garment . . . the Lat. latus clauus . . .'. The forms reflecting *PORPHYRA* meanings in this series show as occurred in the *ZOPHOS*, *PHAG* and *GERAS* series, discrepancies between MS readings and those required by a contextually based interpretation of the passage. But this time the glossaries provide independent evidence of vulgar contamination and confusion between the postulated words and those figuring in the MS.

These are the probable members of the series:

umbilicus non imbilicus (58)
 (turma non torma (59))
 (celebs non celeps (60))
 ostium non osteum (61)
 flauus non flaus (62)
 cauea non cauia (63)
 senatus non sinatus (64)
 brattea non brattia (65)
 cochlea non coclia (66)
 cocleare non cocliarium (67)

Let us begin with the purple component. The *latus clauus*, referred to in the L&Sc definition was, of course, the distinctive broad purple stripe on a Roman toga, worn by members of the senatorial order, which immediately recalls the *senatus* entry of our series. These purple and senatorial connotations of the *latus clauus* are confirmed by the *TLL*, which glosses it as *pupurata vestis* ('purpled garment') and *ornatus imprimis tunicae senatorum* ('adornment especially of the garb of senators'). But—and here comes the first of the discrepancies mentioned above—our MS, instead of *clauus* ('stripe'), reads *flauus* ('reddish-yellow'), a word closely similar in form, which, given the context, looks like a probable copyist's mistake. But it may not even be necessary to make that supposition. For there is evidence of contamination between the two words: the Goetz index reports (5.599.64) the gloss *genus uestis* ('type of garment') to *flauus*, and *flauus* appears again in 5.612.35 glossing *toga* (itself glossed elsewhere as *SYNKLETIKON PHOREMA*, 'senatorial dress', *vestis senatoria* . . . *vestis superior quae senatu induitur*). There is no doubt either about contamination between the other mismatching word, *brattea* ('a thin plate of metal') of entry 65, and yet another 'purple' word, *blattea*, derived from *blatta*, glossed several times *genus purpurae* in Goetz, and equated in a gloss quoted in Goetz (2.30.40) with *θρόμβος αἵματος τῶν κογχυλίων* (*THROMBOS HAIMATOS TON KONKHYLION*, 'clotted blood of shellfish'). For, again in Goetz (4.594.15) *brattea* is glossed not only *tenuis auri lamina* ('thin plate of gold') but also, and continuing the same quotation, *sive purpura* ('or purple').

So there can be little doubt that the entries *flauus non flaus* and *brattea non brattia* belong, with their *senatus* and *cochlea* neighbours, to the purple series. But what of *ostium* and *cauea*? Here we come to the second component of the series, a purely Latin linguistic comment embodying a quotation; for the words are not members of the Greek-based group but offshoots of the Latin rendering, *coclia*, of one of its members, *KOKHLIAS*. The quotation, in which the two words appear in company with *coclia*, is from the first-century B.C. Latin author Varro, famous both as a grammarian and as a writer on farming. Discussing suitable doors for aviaries or fowl-houses, he says (*De Re Rustica* 3.5.3) —the *Appendix* words are underlined: *ostium ornithonem habere oportet humile et angustum et potissimum eius generis quod cocliam appellant, ut solet esse in cauea in qua tauri pugnant* ('A fowl-house should have a low, narrow door, preferably of the [revolving or spiral] type they call a *coclia*, as commonly used in enclosures for fighting bulls').³⁹ The occurrence of three words

³⁹ The use of *cochlea* with reference to spiral motion or progression—a use whose beginnings can be seen in its Greek etymon *KOKHLIAS*, cf. the references to Strabo and Procopius passages in L&Sc—is well attested in late Latin; as, for example, in *Aetheriae Peregrinatio* 3.1: *non eos (sc. montes) subis . . . per girum, ut dicimus in cocleas, sed totem ad directum* ('You don't go up these mountains in a roundabout way, snailshell fashion, as we call it, but in a straight line'). (See E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* [Uppsala, 1911; Darmstadt, 1962]). 85.)

from Varro's sentence in close proximity in the *Appendix* makes it very probable that that sentence was their source, particularly when one considers that there is no general semantic affinity between 'shell', on the one hand, and 'door' and 'cage', on the other; and, within the *Appendix* context, no other way of accounting for their proximity. So here we have an example of a phenomenon noted in several other *Appendix* entries: secondary, and specifically Latin, intervention operating upon Latin words glossing Greek source material—in the present case by quotation from a passage in a Latin text to illustrate a meaning of one of such words. To have a convenient label, we might call the practice 'parasitical quotation'. It is a form of 'learned comment'. As to the forms of the Latin words as represented in the *Appendix* text, we can see that the 'vulgarism' *cochia* in fact occurred in the Varro passage as it has come down to us, but whether the *osteum* and *cauia* forms were in the Varro MS used by the glosser we do not know.

Nothing has so far been said about the *umbilicus non imbilicus* entry, which is separated by a small gap from the rest, but probably belongs with them. Like the words in the Varro quotation, it probably relates to the spirality of shells. As Forcellini puts it: *umbilici dicuntur marinae cochleae quarum testa rotunda et contorta similitudinem habet cum umbilico hominis* ('*Umbilici* is the name applied to sea-snails whose round, convoluted shell resembles the human navel'). (Cf. also L&Sh s.v. *umbilicus*: 'a kind of sea-snail'.)⁴⁰

Spirally Convoluted

This characteristic spirality of the shells of gastropod molluscs, to which the *murex* belongs, probably provides the link to the next series to be considered. The most likely keyword is *SPEIRA*. Its basic sense (akin to that of *KOKHLIAS* of which, like *PORPHYRA*, it seems to be an offshoot) is given by L&Sc as 'anything twisted or wound'. It is from *SPEIRA* that our English word, *spiral* ultimately derives, as does—interestingly enough because of the association between this series and its *cochlea* neighbour—the technical term *spire* in the sense of 'the upper part of a spiral shell' (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*).

These are its probable members:

glouus non glomus (71)
 (lancea non lancia (72))
 fauilla non failla (73)

⁴⁰ This interpretation of *umbilicus* is rejected by the *OLD*, which takes it to refer to pebbles. The passage on which interpretation turns (Cic. *De or.* 2.6.22) refers to the emblematic friends, Scipio Africanus and Laelius, in relaxed mood, picking up *conchae* and *umbilici* on a beach, and is not specific enough to rule out either meaning. Presumably the reason why the editors of the *OLD* rejected the shell interpretation was that they took *conchae* in the generic sense of 'seashells', which made it necessary to conclude that the *umbilici* must be something different, such as pebbles. But, without entering into the complexities of marine-shell terminology, the possibility must also be considered of taking *conchae* in the sense of one particular kind of shell, the bivalve mollusc (see the *OLD*, s.v. *concha* 'a mollusc . . . the shell of a mollusc'), familiar even to non-conchologists from the Shell Oil logo and Botticelli's *Birth of Venus*—a flat, often ribbed, double shell, not at all resembling the human navel; and *umbilici* as referring to another kind (the univalve gastropod, seen in land and marine snails, which is circular and convoluted in shape, and looking extremely like one—indeed the term *euomphalus* is used of one extinct variety. See also Pliny *HN* 9.102, who comments on the extraordinary variety of shapes assumed by seashells. So Forcellini may have been right. In any case, the link with shells in the *Appendix* context is strong and might dispose the editors of the *OLD* to reconsider their interpretation of *umbilici* in the Scipio and Laelius passage too.

orbis non orbs (74)

formosus non formunsus (75)

(The bracketed entry belongs, as we have seen, to the *ANKYLE* series.)

One of the entries, *glouus non glomus*, in the military sense of 'a troop, band' (see L&Sh s.v. *globus*) probably glosses a military meaning of *SPEIRA*: 'a body of men-at-arms' (L&Sc), a sense perhaps made explicit in the original Greek material by the inclusion of some word such as *LOKHOS*. And, given the signs of considerable upheaval in this part of the text, it is possible that, in spite of its separation from the rest of the series, entry 59, *turma non torma* ('a troop, squadron . . . throng, band, body', L&Sh), was also a gloss on that meaning of *SPEIRA*.

The link between the last two entries of the series, *orbis non orbs* and *formosus non formunsus*, which have no apparent affinity in Latin, is again established through Greek. For another meaning of *SPEIRA* is 'a twisted rope or cord' (L&Sc.), or, in the *TGL* phrase, *funis nauticus in orbem convolutus*. Now, there is a Greek word for 'rope', *KALOS*, which, to the translation glosser, seems to have proved confusingly similar to the Greek word for 'beautiful'—which he accordingly glossed with Latin *formosus*.⁴¹

The entry, *fauilla non failla*, which does not seem to relate to the neighbouring words—*fauilla* means 'ashes'—may be a 'stray'. But it is also possible that the MS entry is a copyist's mistake for *sauilla non sailla*—confusion of *s* and *f* is a notorious cause of copyist's errors—which would make it a member of the *SPEIRA* series. For one of the meanings of that word, particularly found with its *SPIRA* variant, was 'a cheesecake'—a meaning also attached to the loanword *spira* in Latin; and the purely Latin word for a cheesecake was *sauillum*, perhaps cited here in the plural.

A word is perhaps required about the three successive, apparently intrusive, entries separating the Shell from the *SPEIRA* series, *cocleare non cocliarium, palearium non paliarium, primipilaris non primipilarius* (67–9) which, as noted above, share a common feature—terminations in *-ar-*. Whether they have any semantic connection with either of the two series seems doubtful. On the face of it, it looks as if the *cochia* entry inspired a 'learned comment' on the variant forms of *cochlear*—*cochleare* and *cochlearium*, perhaps also the adjectival form, *cochlearis* (see the dictionaries), which in its turn brought in the similar uncertainties about *palear*, *palearium* and *palearis* and *primipilaris* and *primipilarius*, both of which variants appear to be well attested. A case could, indeed, be made out for including them in the series of grammatical origin; but, because the *cochleare* entry is clearly related to its predecessor in the list, *cochlea*, and because there just might be some semantic factor involved—the colour

⁴¹ In Attic Greek the noun *κάλως* ('rope'), ending in omega sigma, is distinguished from the adjective (*καλός*) 'beautiful', which ends in omicron sigma. In Roman and Byzantine times, however, the 'interchange of *ω* and *ο* occurs very frequently in all phonetic combinations', F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* [Milan, 1976], 275, who also cites (p. 277) the specific *καλός/κάλως* example. The different accentuation of the word for 'rope' may well have not been represented in the original Greek lexical gloss—omission of accents was very common in glossarial material. And the mistake would have been even more easily made if the Greek gloss was in Roman letters—again a common glossarial practice. (The reverse practice of writing Latin words in Greek script was commented on in n. 12 above.) What seems to have happened in the present case is that the Latin lexical glosser, having rendered the 'coiled rope' meaning by *orbs*, and ignorant of the fact that *KALOS* as an adjective was a quite distinct word, added for good measure a second gloss, *formunsus*, 'beautiful' (subsequently 'corrected' by the grammarian to *formosus*)—an interesting case of a translator's non-contextual rendering enabling us to identify which word (there are several other 'rope' words in Greek) represented that meaning in the original.

of a cock's wattles (*palea*), might suggest a link with the purple words, and, the military connotations of *primipilaris* with the military formations, *glouus* and possibly *turma* covered by one of the *SPEIRA* meanings, the three entries have not been counted in the statistics of entries derived from grammatical writings (see p. 712 above).

In conclusion, we must once again rejoice in the happy chance that sufficient traces of the Pollux passage have survived to enable us, in spite of the dispersal and obfuscations of some of the translation glosses, to establish its identity. That identification enables us to follow with reasonable assurance the transformations undergone by a specific body of original material, as well, of course, as providing, together with the Hesychius *ZOPHOS* series, very strong evidence for Greek origins of some of the vulgarisms incorporated in the *Appendix* list.

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

This brings us to the last of the series of Greek origin to be discussed in this shortened account. Unfortunately, it appears, like several others we have discussed, to be intertwined with entries of a possibly different character. These probably derive from the Greek noun *SIPHON*, which is not a musical term, although, confusingly, it has a basic semantic affinity with some of the musical words. Another complication is that one of the entries deriving from a primarily musical word is the famous crux in *Appendix* studies, *cannelam non canianus* (18). Full discussion of the crux would be disproportionately lengthy here, but, in view of the context created by identification of some of the musical entries, and the exceptionally strong interest in the crux, it seemed appropriate to include a brief account of a possible solution.

These are the members of this series selected for discussion here; the *SIPHON* words are bracketed:

(uacua non uagua [14])
 (uacui non uaqui [15])
 cultellum non cuntellum (16)
 marsias non marsuas (17)
 cannelam non canianus (18)
 (hercules non herculens [19])
 (columna non colomna [20])
 pecten non pectinis (21)
 (aquaeductus non aquiductus [22])
 cithara non ci .. ra (23)
 crista non crysta (24)
 (formica non furmica [25])
 musium non museum (26)

The musical associations of several of the entries—Marsyas (17), *cithara* (23), *museum* (26), mentioned earlier in this article—are immediately evident, provided one remembers the contest between Marsyas and Apollo, although exactly what form the Greek glossed with *museum* took is not certain. That others were also linked with music only become clear in the light of further investigation.

Let us begin with entry 21, *pecten non pectinis* (21). The fact that *pecten*, whose commonest meaning is 'comb', also means 'plectrum' (a device for plucking stringed instruments) was mentioned above in the initial discussion of suggestive semantic affinities between adjoining entries. That, however, on further scrutiny, is not the most likely reason for its presence in what we shall soon see is an extensive musical context.

For another perspective is opened up by the *pecten* entry in the Goetz index, which cites for the nominative singular not only the *pectinis* form, as in the *Appendix* entry, but also another vulgar form, *pectis*. Now *pectis* is how the Greek word *πηκτίς* (*PEKTIS*), would have been written in Latin letters. (As previously mentioned, Greek words are often found so written, particularly in glossarial material, and indeed precisely this word *PEKTIS* is cited in Latin dress under *fistula* ['musical pipe'] in the Goetz index, only in this case spelt *pictis* [the *i* instead of *e* representing the later Greek pronunciation of the vowel represented by the letter eta [*H, η*], more commonly transliterated by *e*, especially in classical Latin].) And the *PEKTIS* was no mere auxiliary device like a plectrum but a musical instrument in its own right—it seems to have been used mainly for a stringed instrument, but occasionally for a wind instrument such as a pipe (see L&Sc). Isidore in fact quotes it (*Orig.* 3.22.3) in Latin dress (in the plural form, *pectides*) in a list of musical instruments. So, given the context, it seems likely that the grammarian, ever on the lookout for vulgarisms, and indifferent to contexts, mistook the translator's *pectis* gloss on *PEKTIS* for a vulgar *pecten* variant, and that either he or a copyist substituted for it the commoner variant *pectinis*. But is there any reason, other than general context, to prefer the Greek musical to the Latin *capillo*-cosmetic identification? There is, and a powerful one. For *PEKTIS* not only designated a musical instrument but also, according to the Suda, 'a knife',⁴² which would account for the presence, otherwise unaccountable for in a musical context, of the *cultellum* ('knife') entry—a further example of the now familiar failure of the translator to render the Greek words contextually. It also further illustrates how the rendering of a contextually irrelevant secondary meaning of a Greek word can confirm the correctness of a conjecture, here making it virtually certain that *PEKTIS* underlay the *pectinis* of the text.⁴³

Another candidate for admission to the musical series is *crista* (24), 'crest'. This, in the context, probably renders the Greek word *πήληξ* (*PELEX*), which means both 'a stringed instrument' and 'crest of a helmet' (L⪼ cf. also Pollux 4.61: *πήληξ . . . οὐ μόνον ὁ τῆς περικεφαλῆας λόφος ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄργανόν τι ψαλτήριον* [*PELEX* not only the crest of the helmet but also a stringed instrument]). An alternative possibility would bring in a pipe word, *AULOS*, 'a wind-instrument, usually rendered by 'flute' (L&Sc) but meaning also 'cone of the helmet to which the plume was fixed' (ibid.), which would in addition, perhaps in the form *HYDRELOS AULOS* 'water organ or pipe' (cf. Pollux 4.70)—account for entry 22, 'aqueduct'. (It is interesting to note that Latin *fistula* also combines a musical meaning with the meaning 'water-pipe'.) But, as we shall see, the claims of another Greek word, *SIPHON*, to account for 'aqueduct' (L&Sc) are probably stronger.

⁴² A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon*, pt 4 (Leipzig, 1935), 124, no. 1502: *πηκτίς . . . πανδούρα, μάχαιρα κρεωκόπος* ('*PEKTIS* . . . *PANDOURA*, a knife for cutting meat'). And p. 19, no. 181: *πανδούρα, μάχαιρα κρεωκόπος, ἡ πηκτίς* ('*PANDOURA*: a knife for cutting meat, the *PEKTIS*'). It will be seen that *PEKTIS* and *PANDOURA* were regarded as synonyms, both combining the meanings 'musical instrument' and 'butcher's knife'.

⁴³ *Pecten* -inis is a somewhat anomalous formation in Latin: it is one of only a few masculines in -en (the vast majority are neuter), and various attempts seem to have been made to reshape it analogically. Those attested in the glossaries (v. Goetz index, s.v. *pecten*) are: *pectina* which shows it treated as a neuter with the plural in singular function like *folia*, the forerunner of the Romance word for 'leaf'—a complicated solution; *pectis* -inis, perhaps on the model of *sanguis*, one of only a couple of nouns of that shape, but at least in common use; and *pectinis* -inis, which brings it into line with many parisyllabic masculines. This latter nominative form may, therefore, have been the vulgar variant most familiar to the grammarian, who preferred it to *pectis*; but he may have written *pecten non pectis*, which was 'corrected' to *pecten non pectinis* by a copyist.

All the Greek words of the core group are concerned with musical instruments: *KITHARA*, *PEKTIS*, *PELEX* with strings; *SYRINX*, to be discussed below, with pipes—in which category we should probably also again mention *PEKTIS* since it seems, according to Hesychius to have also been used, as L&Sc confirm, in that sense—and add *MARSYAS* as the champion of that type of instrument. Since the semantic affinities are obviously ‘topical’, the most likely source would be an onomasticon. Disappointingly, there appears to be no matching passage in Pollux’s discussion, in Book 4, of music and its instruments. But he does divide them into wind, stringed (and percussion), mentions Marsyas (4.78), and, as we have seen, comments on the two different meanings of *PELEX* which are reflected in the *Appendix*.

The remaining entry in this part of the text that probably has musical links, is the obviously and notoriously corrupt *cannelam non canianus* (18), no proposed emendation to which has found general acceptance. In fact Baehrens, after listing various of them, remarks, with understandable resignation (p.127): ‘But here no certainty is attainable’ (‘Aber zu Sicherheit gelangen wir hier nicht’). That was doubtless a just assessment of the situation as it then appeared, but, with a probable context—musical instruments—now established, yet another Greek musical term, *SYRINX*, may hold the key. For in addition to its ‘pan-pipe’ meaning, *SYRINX* was also used to refer to a roll (the technical term is ‘quill’) of cassia (L&Sc), a spice akin to canella—although the modern variety of the latter is of New World origin, another variety was known to antiquity—and to cinnamon (Cf. Isid. *Orig.* 17.8.12). Now, this secondary meaning suggests the conjecture of two original *Appendix* corrections to glosses on *SYRINX*: *cannula non cannella* (we know the *Appendix* preference for *-ul-* over *-ell-* diminutives), and *cinnamum non cinnamus*, which, we would have to suppose, were miscopied and conflated by the copyists to produce a single entry, the MS reading (as happened in the case of *homfagium non monofagium*, 47) —the vulgar forms alone being retained and *cinnamus* distorted to the palaeographically similar *canianus*. (The suggestion, then unsupported by context, that the two spices, canella and cinnamon, might be involved was in fact made by W. Foerster, *Romanische Forschungen* 7 [1891], 229, and *Wiener Studien* 14 [1892], 295, but seems subsequently to have dropped out of sight.) Full discussion of these matters is left for separate publication.

Looking back now over the eight entries of Greek musical origin, we note that: two contain the Greek word itself, *PEKTIS*, disguised as *pectinis*, and *KITHARA*, represented by its loanword forms; two—possibly three, if we count the conjectured *canella*—embody glosses on non-musical meanings of the Greek words—*cuntellum* on the secondary ‘knife’ meaning of *PEKTIS* again, and *crista* on what may be the primary meaning of *PELEX*.

Let us now turn to the intertwined *SIPHON* series. The Greek word *SIPHON*, whose basic sense is ‘tube’ or ‘pipe’, has two special meanings which would account for two further entries in this series: the first, ‘water-spout’ (the meteorological phenomenon; L&Sc) for entry 20, *columna*, which is the corresponding Latin meteorological term; the second, attested by Hesychius, ‘an antlike type of little creature’ (εἶδος θηρίου μυρμηκοειδές) for entry 25, *formica*, ‘ant’. Moreover, there is a Greek adjective, *SIPHNOS*, meaning, according to Hesychius, ‘empty’ (*KENOS*), suggestively similar to *SIPHON* in both form and meaning—pipes, and tubes, being notoriously empty, or, as we would say, ‘hollow’—which could account for the two *uacuius* entries (14 and 15; cf. *CGL* 2.347.40: ‘uacuum κενόν’ [*KENON*]). In fact, in the light of these affinities, we probably should consider the *SIPHON* series as not merely juxtaposed, but semantically related, to the musical terms, specifically, of course, the pipes. This

affinity is also strikingly evident with *SYRINX*, both covering a range of meanings linked by the notion of hollow passages. The situation is comparable to one we analysed in discussing the Shells series, where a secondary set of glosses relating to purple seems to depend on a partial synonym of *KOKHLIAS*, the word *PORPHYRA*.

There remains one other entry in the sequence still not accounted for, *Hercules non Herculeus*. The most likely explanation for its presence—ignoring the loose mythological connections between Hercules and music—is that it is secondary to *columna* taken by the grammarian in its architectural meaning, ‘pillar’, and is an example of a ‘passenger entry’, of which we have seen others—one brought in by a banal association of ideas—this time ‘pillar’ triggering ‘Hercules’. The *-ens/-es* confusion, one of the commonest in Latin orthography, would have been part of any grammarian’s stock-in-trade, and any word ending in *-es* could trigger a ‘grammaticizing’ *-es* not *-ens* comment.

Finally, the possibility should be mentioned that there are other members of the instrument series, which would extend it, with exclusion of the syncopes, from the first to the twenty-sixth entry. But their discussion would require more space than is available in this abridged presentation.⁴⁴

Before leaving this series, we must again note the signs of interest in something more than the listing of terms: the possibly etymological comment on *SIPHON*; and the ‘learned’ reference to the Marsyas myth that ‘explained’ the twofold division of instruments—wind and stringed. These may simply derive from the digressive style sometimes found in onomasticons—as in the digression on Hercules and the discovery of the purple dye in Pollux (1.45ff.)—or be examples of interventions by the putative ‘philologist’. Such signs of additions and modifications may offer clues to the nature of the material from which the grammarian-compiler drew his vulgarisms, and they deserve further investigation.

CONCLUSION

With the shortened presentation of the investigation into sources thus completed, it only remains to venture some concluding observations. These must, proportionately to the article, be brief, and—in view of the major implications of the findings for the reassessment of the text—tentative and provisional. First, with regard to coverage: the new approach has made it possible to identify probable sources for well over half of the fully legible entries: roughly 124 of 227 (not all of which are legible)—a much larger number than any previously proposed. Of the 124, 42 (if we include all the syncopes) were found to be of Latin grammatical origin; 82 of ultimate Greek origin—20 glosses on Greek words in classified vocabularies, as attested in the *hermeneumata*, and 62 translation glosses on Greek words, mainly occurring in onomasticons or lexicons. I have reserved for presentation in the Study a number of further identifications that I hope will be considered probable—and, now that the potentialities of the ‘new approach’ have been demonstrated, the number may well be

⁴⁴ For example, the question arises whether the *Porphyreticum* of the first *Appendix* entry may not be a distortion (by someone who knew the phrase *porphyreticum marmor* from Suet. *Ner.* 50) of an original *PHORETRON portitorium* (or *portorium*) gloss on *NAULON* (or *NAULOS*), whose meanings, deriving from originally distinct words, cover both ‘a stringed instrument’ and ‘port dues’. For another term for the dues was *vectura*, a word linked in glosses with *PHORETRON*, *NAULON* and *teloneum* (cf. *telonium non teloneum* in the second *Appendix* entry). Another is the possibility that *calcostegis* and *septidonium* (entries 12 and 13, after the syncopes) are the debris of an original reference to the seven-stringed lyre, mentioned in a quotation from the *Alcestis* of Euripides—to judge by Pollux, quotation from literary texts was a common practice in onomasticons.

increased by suggestions from younger and keener minds. But it is probably too much to expect that sufficient traces will have survived of the sources of all remaining entries—we have seen how precarious some of the survivals were, and it is always possible that some entries were adventitious.

Among the features of the sources identified, one of the most striking is their surprising variety, both those of Greek origin—classified vocabularies as attested in the *hermeneumata*, onomastic disquisitions, and entries in Greek lexicons; and, of Latin origin, the three specifically grammatical series, and most of what I have called ‘learned comments’, the most striking example of which is the quotation from Varro illustrating a particular use of the word *cochlea*. These comments too are themselves of considerable interest both humanly, reflecting individual quirks of mind, and philologically. For some appear to point to grammatical or philological work on the material carried out independently of, and previously to, the compiler’s corrections—a feature, which may throw further light on the ‘prehistory’ of our text. Of historical interest also is the evidence, particularly in the *-es non -is* series, of failures to understand the complexities of source material and of its simplification and banalization in a way analogous to what seems to have occurred in the second of the five appendices to Probus, as I have argued in my *CQ* article referred to in note 4.

In the interpretation of lists as distinct from continuous texts a great disadvantage is the absence of context. So those created by the recognition of related series of entries have not only proved invaluable in the present investigation but should continue to be a useful tool in future work on the text. Here it has made it possible to identify additional members of related groups, to detect and sometimes rectify copyists’ errors, and, by discrediting some supposed linguistic evidence, to avoid the waste of ingenuity on its interpretation, as with the *theofiluslizofilus* entry. Similarly, by providing an alternative and more convincing explanation of the presence of certain words, it throws grave doubt on the autobiographical interpretation of such entries as *deses*, *reses*, and the supposed geographical significance of Syrtis, and Marsyas.

But perhaps the most fundamental point on which the assessment of the *Appendix* is affected by this new identification of sources concerns its status, whether as an attestation of spoken or of written vulgarisms. At one time the former was probably the prevailing view. But the sources here identified are exclusively written, not perhaps absolutely excluding oral influences—after all a person who reads may also listen—but severely limiting their scope. It is no longer possible to see the *Appendix* as a vessel replenished from the ‘gushing spring of the living language’, as Baehrens, styled it, or as ‘notes on current errors of speech’, as L. R. Palmer, more soberly put it (*The Latin Language* [London, 1954], 154). That does not, of course, mean that the text has lost its value as evidence of changes in pronunciation, since vulgar spellings often reflect vulgar pronunciations. But recognition of its nature and affinities places the text where it truly belongs: not merely, in what Robson called the context of ‘la philologie latine’, but in the broader context of Graeco-Latin philology.

Not all *Appendix* problems linked to sources have been solved. In fact, new problems arise from the identifications made, in particular just how such diverse material, from which the vulgarisms were culled, came to be assembled. One possible explanation has been hinted at above. But, as often happens when new insights are presented, the further lines of enquiry thus opened up may stimulate fresh research, from which more complete understanding of this still enigmatic text may be achieved.

Trinity College, Oxford

F. J. BARNETT
fjbarnett@xtra.co.nz