

XXVII.—“New Fragments” of Latin Authors in
Perotti's *Cornucopiae*

REVILO P. OLIVER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Niccolò Perotti's *Cornucopiae* contains a large number of quotations from classical authors, some of which are not otherwise attested. Perotti's unblemished reputation and the accuracy of his work as a lexicographer render it unlikely that he fabricated these “new fragments.” A study of his quotations from Persius, Sallust, Ennius, and Plautus suggests that he drew upon a work which may tentatively be described as “Nonius auctus” and perhaps upon another grammatical treatise now lost.

Unfortunately it is true that, as Professor Ullman observed in an address to the American Philological Association two years ago, the probability of any new discovery which would increase the amount of classical Latin literature available to the modern world is very slight. The sources which so sensationally augmented our store of Greek literature during the past century are now nearing exhaustion, and never made more than incidental contributions to the extant body of Latin writings. While we may and should indulge the pious hope that the sands of Egypt or the tufa of Herculaneum may yet hold in reserve a miracle, we must rely for any augmentation of Latin literature, however slight, on a more careful reworking of the materials now available, and imitate those miners who, by a more patient refinement, extract a scanty yield of ore from the slag-heaps left by their predecessors. In these circumstances we are, I believe, justified in expending a very considerable amount of time and effort on the reëxamination of the otherwise otiose productions of the early scholars of the Renaissance who may have had access to materials now lost.

I

In the last third of the fifteenth century Niccolò Perotti, a Humanist who was more of a scholar than a *littérateur* and hence was overshadowed by such vigorous and polemically brilliant contemporaries as Poggio and Valla, compiled a ponderous lexicographic commentary on Martial to which he gave the name *Cornucopiae*

seu Latinae linguae commentarii.¹ Perotti documented his definitions of Latin words with brief but numerous quotations from the major Latin writers; embedded in this mass of some twelve thousand quotations are a few which are not otherwise attested. If genuine, these quotations, hitherto unstudied and virtually unnoticed, are new fragments of Latin literature which will make some contribution to a better knowledge of the authors from whose lost works they presumably come, and a very considerable contribution to our knowledge of the history of the Latin language by offering instances of the literary use of such words as *austrare* and *strigium* which are now known only from the glossaries, and by providing instances of the use in the time of Plautus of words which otherwise do not appear in literature before the Ciceronian age or even later.

In saying that these fragments have been thus far virtually unnoticed, I am guilty of a slight exaggeration. One fragment of Petronius attested only by the *Cornucopiae* has found its way into the standard editions of that writer,² and two more, with equal claims to authenticity, were recently excavated from the same source by Anthony Rini.³ One fragment of Lucilius was admittedly taken

¹ Although the arrangement of a lexicon in the form of a commentary on Martial was perhaps the most unhappy idea ever to be conceived in the history of lexicography, and although Perotti completed only the first half of the *Cornucopiae*, leaving at his death an unfinished second part which subsequently disappeared, his work enjoyed considerable popularity until more conveniently arranged dictionaries became available, and it was printed many times. The "very rare" *editio princeps* of 1479, cited by A. Pinetti and E. E. Odazio in *Archivio storico Lombardo*, 3.5 (1896) 372, is probably a fiction; cf. Giovanni Mercati, *Per la cronologia della vita e degli scritti di Niccolò Perotti* (Roma, 1925) 126, note 2. The first printing was almost certainly that edited by Lodovicus Odaxius, Venetiis, 1489 (= Hain No. 12697). Other editions known to me are: Venetiis, 1490 (= Hain No. 12698); Venetiis, 1490 (= Hain 12699); Venetiis, 1492; Venetiis, 1494 (= Hain 12701); Venetiis, 1494 (= Hain 12702); Parisiis, 1496; Venetiis, 1496; Mediolani, 1498; Venetiis, 1499; Parisiis, 1500; Venetiis, 1501; Parisiis, 1505; Argentinae, 1506; Mediolani, 1507; Venetiis, 1508 (v. *Zeitschrift für Bucherfreunde*, 10 [1906-7] 483); Venetiis, 1513; Venetiis, 1517; Basileae, 1521; Thusculani, 1522; Basileae, 1526; Venetiis, 1527; Basileae, 1532; Basileae, 1536. The edition of 1526 is, perhaps, the one most generally available in American libraries and I have accordingly made it the basis of reference in this article. The statement on the title page, that the *commentarii* are "denuò ad veteris codicis et scriptorum, unde illos deprompserat, fidem diligentissimè recogniti" is a publisher's "blurb." The first claim, though improbable, may be true; the second refers to the "Annotationes seu castigationes" of Michael Bentinus which follow the unnumbered page bearing the printer's mark which follows col. 1346. Bentinus, as he explains in his introductory note, was too cautious a scholar to tamper with the text of the *Cornucopiae* itself.

² Fragment 18 in the editions of Buecheler-Heraeus and of Ernout.

³ *Petronius in Italy* (New York, 1937) 18. Rini believes (*ibid.* 17) that Perotti, who quotes passages from portions of Petronius which were first published in 1565,

from the *Cornucopiae* by Franciscus Dousa, whose hint remained unnoticed until E.-F. Corpet, who prepared an edition of Lucilius for the Panckoucke series with a diligence not commonly found in such hybrid works, evidently searched the *Cornucopiae* and found nine more fragments otherwise unknown.⁴ Corpet's additions were, however, expunged from the collection of Lucilian fragments by Lucian Mueller, who believed, on stylistic grounds, that the nine fragments were the work of some other Latin poet and had been mistakenly attributed to Lucilius by Perotti.⁵ And although Marx, when he produced the standard critical edition of Lucilius, described Mueller as "propter audaciam criticus parum felix,"⁶ he did not reopen the question.

The *Cornucopiae* is also the unrecognized source of some fragments which have found their way into collections divorced from Perotti's name. The provenience of one of the fragments of Apuleius⁷ is said to be J. Scheffer's *De militia navali*, but there can be no doubt but that Scheffer took it, as he might have taken a score of others, from Perotti's dictionary. Some fragments of Plautus which puzzled the conscientious Forcellini⁸ are ultimately

"was acquainted with a fuller text of Petronius than that which was published by Puteolanus in the *editio princeps*." Rini naturally ignores the possibility that Perotti was merely quoting from a collection of extracts — a possibility which does not force itself on one's attention until one notices the number of authors from whom Perotti quotes "new fragments." It is highly improbable that Perotti used a manuscript of the *Satyricon libri*. In the whole *Cornucopiae* there are only seven quotations from Petronius: the three mentioned above and four which agree *verbatim et literalim* with what are known as the *Excerpta Vulgaria*. The agreement is particularly noteworthy in the quotation from 16.3, where Perotti has the *cur* and *sacram* of the *Excerpta* instead of the *cuius* and *sacrum* of the more complete manuscripts of Petronius.

⁴ Fragments 203–211 in Corpet's *Satires de C. Lucilius* (Paris, 1845).

⁵ *C. Lucili Saturarum reliquiae* (Lipsiae, 1872) xxiii f.: "Quae in *cornu copiae* Perottino leguntur exempla Luciliana non aliunde cognita, ea praeter unum a poeta aliena esse persuasum habeo . . . reliqua errore Perotti Lucilio tributa existimo, et maxime ea quae iambicis sive trochaicis videntur adstricta numeris." For reasons which will be noted below, defective verse structure which might be the result of omissions cannot be used as an argument against the authenticity of the Perottine fragments; but Perotti, who was no poet, shows himself in his few verses so inept a metrician in dealing with any form less common than the elegiac distich that a good iambic or trochaic structure may be considered almost conclusive proof that he did not write the line.

⁶ *Lucilii Carminum reliquiae* (Lipsiae, 1904–5) 1, cxv.

⁷ No. 20 in the fragments as edited by B. E. Perry in the *Index Apuleianus* of Oldfather, Canter and Perry (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, 3) 1934.

⁸ E.g. Forcellini, s.v. "connato," remarks, "Afferunt multi ex Plauto, sed nos invenire non potuimus"; the ultimate source is Perotti's quotation from Plautus,

derived from the same source. Quotations in Perotti are also often the unacknowledged source of statements made by later scholars and lexicographers,⁹ and it is probable that exploration of Perotti's book and investigation of his credibility would be justified even if it led to no result more noteworthy than that of laying a few philological ghosts.

What has thus far been taken from the *Cornucopiae* is only a minute fraction of the total that might be taken from it; three lines of Petronius are but a trifle when compared to almost two hundred fragments, with equal claims to authenticity, of other writers, such as Plautus and Apuleius. A complete collection of all the fragments to be found in Perotti seems to me, therefore, to be highly necessary, so that, if they are genuine, we may profit from a very small, but yet significant, addition to the extant body of ancient Latin literature, and if they are spurious, we may free ourselves from the reproach of having neglected a possible source of information. It is for this reason that I have, perhaps rashly, elected to ignore Housman's memorable admonition, apropos of Barth's *Adversaria*, that "to read three thousand tall columns of close print by a third-rate scholar is no proper occupation for mortals,"¹⁰ and have undertaken to extract and verify every quotation from every author cited by Perotti in his bizarre lexicon.

The present time is, perhaps, a particularly favorable one for such an enterprise, since the great wave of scepticism which accompanied the hypercritical scholarship so brilliantly manifested in Wolf's *Prolegomena* is now a receding tide on the shores of scholarship. We have not only restored Homer as an individual to the

printed as Fragment No. 13 below. Forcellini quotes Fragment No. 34 s.v. "compressiuncula" in his comment, "Plures lexicographi huic voci auctoritatem adstruunt ex his Plauti verbis . . . quae nos in Plauto nondum vidimus." Cf. s.vv. "quiesco," "praemiosus."

⁹ For example, in Kirsch's *Cornucopiae linguae Latinae et Germanicae* (Ratisbonae et Viennae, 1749), the word *strīgium* is defined as "ein wüster und schlechter Mantel, wie sonst die Spanier getragen," and is said to be used by "Plaut."; the information came, no doubt indirectly, from Perotti's *Cornucopiae*, as may be seen from the sixteenth of the "new fragments" of Plautus printed at the end of this article. Perotti is also the source of a number of "fragmenta dubia" of ancient writers now supposed to be attested only by later writers — e.g. the Plautine lines which Bothius collected from Pontano's commentary on Macrobius, and which are given as "versus valde dubiosi" in Winter's collection of the fragments of Plautus, p. 81, were almost certainly taken by Pontano from Perotti.

¹⁰ M. Manilii Astronomicōn liber primus, recensuit et enarravit A. E. Housman (Londinii, 1903) xv.

history of literature, we have not only come almost unanimously to regard as genuine such works as the *Epistolae ad Caesarem* which bear the name of Sallust,¹¹ but we have repeatedly witnessed the vindication of early scholars who were, until a few years ago, thought to have been conclusively convicted of forgery. We now know, for example, that there is a considerable probability that Paulus Merula acted in good faith when he published the spurious fragments of Ennius.¹² Caelius Rhodiginus, who was long adjudged guilty of having forged the *De orthographia* of Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius, has been fully exonerated by Salomon Reinach, who has shown that Caelius possessed a manuscript now lost which not only differed greatly from the incomplete and sadly interpolated transcription published by Mai and by Osann, but probably was an honest compilation which included information derived from respectably ancient sources.¹³ The certainty that Carlo Sigonio forged the pseudo-Ciceronian *Consolatio* was demolished when B. L. Ullman published the text of a work by Sicco Polenton which made it clear that this *Consolatio* was known almost a century before Sigonio was born.¹⁴ We have even come to reconsider the possi-

¹¹ B. L. Ullman, "Trends in Greek and Latin Studies," *Studies in Philology*, 42 (1945) 405.

¹² P. I. Blok, "De fragmentis Ennians a Paulo Merula editis," *Mnemosyne*, N.S. 28 (1900) 1-12. But the twin horsemen of the scholar's apocalypse, imposture and suspicion, will roam the world forever, and it is only a small irony that we have recently had a very plausible hypothesis that Ennius himself was a forger; see Léon Herrmann, "Ennius et les livres de Numa," *Latomus* 5 (1946) 87-90.

¹³ Salomon Reinach, "Le tombeau d'Ovide," *RPh* 30 (1906) 275-285. It is interesting to note that Caelius in his *Antiquarum lectionum commentarii* (Venetiis, 1516) quotes, without indicating its provenience, a fragment of Plautus which Reinach believes to be genuine and to have been taken from the authentic and now lost copy of Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius which Caelius had in his possession. The same Plautine fragment is quoted by Perotti and is printed as Fragment No. 9 below. It is entirely possible that Caelius derived this fragment from the *Cornucopiae*; on the other hand, it is quite possible that Perotti may have used some form of the work *De orthographia* of Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius. The possibility would become a probability if we drew from Reinach's discussion the not implausible inference that the two slight grammatical works *De nota aspirationis* and *De diphthongis* attributed to "Apuleius Minor," which Perotti indubitably knew and used, may really be chapters detached from the work of Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius, but I have not thus far found any evidence to confirm such an inference.

¹⁴ Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII, edited by B. L. Ullman (Rome, 1928) xxxvii. See also the articles by Salomon Reinach in *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1930, p. 94, and *RA* 33 (1931) 121-133, and the notice of these by F. G. Lo Bianco, "Sigonio vindicato," *Historia* 6 (1932) 308 f.

bility that the *Consolatio* may, after all, be the work of Cicero.¹⁵ The atmosphere has indeed changed since the age in which the publication of the *Cena Trimalchonis* evoked from half the scholars of Europe demonstrations that the fragment could not possibly be the work of Petronius.¹⁶ While it remains true that it is safer to err on the side of suspicion than on the side of credulity, and that we must exercise the greatest caution in accepting fragments for whose authenticity we have no greater warrant than the unsupported testimony of a Renaissance scholar, we are, perhaps, in a position to approach such questions with less prejudice than our predecessors, who seemed sometimes disposed to regard every writer of the fifteenth century as subject to a kind of Code Napoléon by whose terms he was guilty unless his innocence could be proved beyond peradventure of doubt.¹⁷

Without abandoning an attitude of legitimate *méfiance*, we may observe that we find in the *Cornucopiae* none of the obvious signs of falsification by which forgers habitually denounce themselves. Perotti makes no display of abstruse erudition and recondite references. The tinsel glitter of citations such as "Callimorphus Pisaeis," "Lupus Anilius in Helene," and "Terenti Varronis Bellum Punicum," with which the authors of "Fulgentii Expositio sermonum antiquorum" and the extant version of "Caecili Minutiani Apulei De orthographia" bedizen their meretricious compilations, is emphatically absent from the *Cornucopiae*. Authors otherwise unknown make no appearance in these pages, in which only the standard Latin writers are cited, and Perotti almost never gives the title of any work from which he quotes. He betrays no consciousness that there is anything unusual about any of the passages that he produces in support of his definitions of words, and hence never advertises his erudition as more extensive than that of his contemporaries. The great majority of his quotations are genuine

¹⁵ So far as I know, the investigation announced by B. L. Ullman in the article cited in note 11 above has not yet been completed.

¹⁶ A conspectus of the controversy is given by Rini, *op. cit.* (above, note 3) 59-82.

¹⁷ The high tide of scepticism, if we exclude the follies of Jean Le Clerc, is probably marked by a demonstration that the works of Tacitus are a Humanistic forgery; see P. Hochart, *De l'authenticité des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite* (Paris, 1890). This sensational hypothesis won little support; but is it, after all, more absurd than some of the attacks on the historicity of Tacitus which still receive serious consideration? Cf. Eugène Bacha, *Le génie de Tacite* (Bruxelles et Paris, 1906) 100: "*Les Annales . . . sont l'œuvre d'un poète de génie qui a créé des fictions décevantes en pleine conscience de son imposture.*"

and come from the standard authors, and it would be entirely possible for a man well trained in Latin literature to read the *Cornucopiae* from cover to cover without suspecting that he had read anything not to be found in the standard editions of the Latin authors. Many of the quotations are familiar to every reader, and for the rest, who but a specialist would feel that he could call to mind and recognize every line of Plautus or of Lucilius or of Apuleius? The other great motive for forgery is equally absent. Perotti is interested in providing illustrations of the meaning and use of Latin words; he seldom proposes a definition which could arouse much dissent among his contemporaries, and when he does, his views do not depend for their primary support on the otherwise unattested quotations.¹⁸ These new fragments, therefore, cannot have been fabricated by Perotti for purposes of either display or controversy. The "new fragments" form so small a fraction of the total mass of quotation that they could all be excised without impairing Perotti's definitions or even sensibly diminishing the mere bulk of his book. His *bona fides* is not, therefore, impugned by a general examination of his work as a whole.

II

Perotti himself bears an unblemished reputation as a scholar of integrity. The scion of a gentle, but not noble, family of Guelphic sympathies, he was born at Fano towards the end of 1429.¹⁹ He studied under one of the most celebrated teachers of the age, Vittorino da Feltre, and perhaps also under Guarino da Verona. The fortunes of his family, never brilliant, were naturally impaired by the civil strife which was almost as fashionable in Fano as elsewhere in Italy, and Niccolò naturally gravitated toward Rome, where he entered the service of Cardinal Bessarion, made the acquaintance of Valla, and formed a firm friendship with Giovanni

¹⁸ The only exceptions which I have noticed are two quotations from Cicero which, indeed, serve no special function in the *Cornucopiae*, but which had been used by Perotti in an earlier controversy on the meaning of the word *felis*. These form part of a special problem which I intend to treat separately.

¹⁹ Many of the details of Perotti's life are still obscure, and discussion of them would obviously be foreign to the purposes of the present paper. For a fuller account of some phases of Perotti's life, see the work of Giovanni Mercati cited in note 1 above, and the introduction to my forthcoming critical edition, *Enchiridion Epicteti a Nicolao Perotto Latine redditum, Urbanae Illinorum, 1948*.

Tortelli.²⁰ When he was twenty he attracted the favorable attention of Nicholas v with a translation of Plutarch's *De invidia et odio* and of a homily on the same subject by St. Basil. He was encouraged to translate five books of Polybius, and his performance of an arduous task, though sadly inadequate when judged by the standards of modern scholarly translation,²¹ so pleased the genial and enlightened pontiff of that golden age that he gave to the young translator a purse of five hundred ducats — a reward exactly equal to that presented to Valla for his version of Thucydides. Scholarship was honored in that remote age of noble enthusiasms: Perotti was invited to enter the church. He became an ecclesiastic in 1456, and two years after taking orders he was Archbishop of Sipontino. Perotti's was not a creative mind; his original compositions are almost negligible,²² and his major work consists of translations and compilations. His most popular work was his *Rudimenta grammatices*, which, as Voigt remarks, "muß als erste Schulgrammatik der neueren Zeit gelten";²³ completed in 1468, it was first printed in 1473, passed through at least fifty editions in the next ten years, and had not lost its popularity a century later.²⁴ Perotti's primary interest was lexicographic, and his contemporaries remembered him as "diligentissimus vocabulorum perscrutator: si quod undecunque incognitum audiisset, neque dormire, neque rerum aliquid gerere solebat, priusquam id investigasset."²⁵ The date at which he began compilation of the *Cornucopiae* cannot

²⁰ The author of the well-known *Commentaria grammatica de orthographia dictionum e Graecis tractarum*, and the man to whom Valla dedicated his celebrated *Libri elegantiarum*.

²¹ For severe strictures on Perotti's fidelity as a translator, see the introduction to Casaubon's edition of Polybius (1609) and Peter Huet's *De interpretatione libri II* (Hagae Comitum, 1682) 220. These generalizations from isolated infidelities must not be taken too seriously. The edition of the *Enchiridion* mentioned in note 19 will contain an apparatus showing the results of a word for word collation of Perotti's translation with the Greek text.

²² Much of the original work attributed to him by Voigt and others is merely a kind of myth generated by the inaccuracies of the bibliographers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An article on this subject will appear during the coming year.

²³ *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, 3. Auflage (Berlin, 1893) 2.377.

²⁴ Although I have made no effort to compile a complete bibliography, I have a record of one hundred and two editions that appeared between 1473 and 1579. These do not include pirated works which reproduced the contents of Perotti's grammar without mentioning his name.

²⁵ Raphaëlis Volterrani *Commentariorum Vrbanoorum octo et triginti libri* (Basileae, 1559) 491 f.

satisfactorily be determined; it may have been 1473, for in that year he said that he had in press an edition of Martial accompanied by a commentary of his own.²⁶ The edition now extant contains only the text.²⁷ One of the several hypotheses by which this discrepancy may be explained is that Perotti for some reason withdrew his commentary as inadequate and began the horrendous process of expansion whereby the commentary was to be converted into a complete dictionary of the Latin language. Whenever the work was begun, it became the chief concern of his life after he resigned the last of his series of papal governorships in 1477 and retired to the somewhat luxurious seclusion of a villa which he had built near Sassoferrato and named Curifugia. The first half of the *Cornucopiae*, which is all that now remains, was completed in July, 1478.²⁸ He worked diligently on the second half, but the work was still incomplete when he died suddenly and prematurely on the fifteenth of December, 1480. His nephew, on whom he had concentrated his affections and whom he had made his heir, seems principally to have devoted himself to spending the inheritance.²⁹ Perotti's books and manuscripts, certainly including collections of his minor works and probably including at least one ancient manuscript of unique value, seem to have been speedily dispersed and to have disappeared leaving no trace.³⁰ The manuscript of the unfinished

²⁶ In a letter to Pomponius Laetus first published by Remigio Sabbadini, *Studi italiani* 11 (1903) 337 ff.

²⁷ Romae, 1473. The volume bears no editor's name, but the emendations render it certain that the work is Perotti's; see Mercati, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 93 f., and Remigio Sabbadini, *Classici e umanisti* (Firenze, 1933) 61. Sabbadini's view that the autograph manuscript, Vat. Lat. 6848, contains all the annotations that Perotti had made to the text of Martial at this time seems to me an entirely gratuitous assumption. Perotti undoubtedly owned several manuscripts of Martial; there is even another extant autographic copy, Vat. Lat. 6835.

²⁸ For the date, see Mercati, *op. cit.* 120. A few corrections were made after that date.

²⁹ Unless, of course, he really did bring out in 1479 the "very rare" edition of the *Cornucopiae* mentioned in note 1 above. I have found no trace of such an edition or of any other writer who claims to have seen it. In 1484, the Pope knew of no such edition when he made efforts to procure the printing of Perotti's work; see Mercati, *op. cit.* 126, note 2.

³⁰ The ancient manuscript to which I refer is the Phaedrus mentioned below. Perotti's own copy of his translation of the *Enchiridion*, a luxurious manuscript adorned with his arms, probably remained in his library until his death. It is now in the small communal library of San Daniele del Friuli. How it got there is unknown. Various manuscripts which Perotti copied or owned at one time are still extant (e.g. the Martials in the Vatican Library mentioned in note 27 above), but he probably sold or gave them away during his lifetime. What happened to the well-furnished library

second part of the *Cornucopiae* had evidently gone to the scrap-bin before the first printed edition was brought out by Lodovicus Odaxius in 1489.³¹

In an age in which invective was the means of attaining those ends now achieved by academic intrigue, and in which the lusty scholarship of the Humanists sought expression in verbal tournaments of appalling ferocity, Perotti was not so spiritless as not to enter the lists and break a pen or two for the honour of Philologia and the dishonour of his rivals. As a friend of Valla, he matched insults with Poggio and, it must be admitted, was sadly beaten by that veteran gladiator. As an ally of Bessarion, he launched a furious diatribe against George of Trebizond, who had been guilty of insufficient veneration for Plato, and Perotti would no doubt have felt that his labours had been crowned with adequate laurels: could he have heard a modern scholar's comment on his work: "contumeliosa verba nescio an plura excogitari possint."³² When Domenico Calderini and Perotti met in Rome it became obvious that the Eternal City was too small to encompass two men who could lecture publicly on the text of Martial, and each soon fancied himself in the rôle of Jove defending with verbal thunderbolts his Olympus from impious assault. Some of these imperishable triumphs of loedorography are now lost; what survives is sufficient, if it be believed at all — even if discounted like a Russian rouble — to ruin forever the reputations of all concerned. Those who are familiar with the conventions of Humanistic invective will not be surprised to learn that Perotti was a bastard, a paederast, a pathic, an adulterer, and a thief, but will be impressed by his enemies' silence on the score of really serious misconduct, i.e. forgery. The best that they seem to have been able to contrive is the clearly preposterous story that his translation of Polybius was only a copy

of his villa after his death is a mystery. Some of Perotti's works, such as his biography of Bessarion, the *Epistulae Romanae*, and the *Epistulae Perusinae*, are lost; since these works were sources of pride to him, there must have been copies of them in the library of "Curifugia."

³¹ See Odaxius' preface to this edition in which he stated that he made inquiry concerning the second part of the *Cornucopiae* and learned only that Perotti had not finished it although he worked on it "continuis vigiliis et lucubrationibus" until he died. The inquiries must have been made of the heirs, and it is only reasonable to assume that Odaxius would have included in his edition the completed portions of the second part had he been able to obtain them.

³² J. C. Hacke, *Disputatio literaria inauguralis qua Bessarionis aetas, vita, merita, scripta exponuntur* (Harlemi, 1840) 77.

of an ancient translation which he had found and subsequently destroyed.³³ In their mutual recriminations Calderini and Perotti, of course, accused one another of corrupting the texts of Martial and Pliny with grotesque emendations that could be tolerated only by an ignorance so abysmal that it would bring a blush of shame to a rustic — or a despairing silence to A. E. Housman! But emendations are another matter; and we may at least have the assurance that Perotti, if guilty of any fabrication of spurious material, was able to hide his misconduct from observers who doubtless asked of their God no greater boon than an opportunity to detect him in some misdeed.

Perotti's reputation, which survived the maledicency of the age in which the Humanists so cheerfully broke the vials of wrath on one another's heads, has not been impaired by subsequent scholarship. It is, to be sure, now clear that he was guilty of the innocent mystification of writing the preface to the *Cornucopiae* under his nephew's name, but many a scholar has felt that his praises may not be sung if he himself does not provide a suitable tune, and Perotti had, in addition to this dubious modesty, two more worthy motives: he evidently wished to answer criticism which emanated from a few unscholarly contemporaries who held the pragmatistic opinion that an archbishop should devote his time to souls rather than to books, and there can be no doubt but that he wished to introduce to favorable notice the nephew of whom he was so fond. So far as I know, the only grounds on which we can today question the integrity of Perotti's work is an *obiter dictum* by two modern scholars who represent Perotti as maintaining close relations with one of the most notorious forgers of the Renaissance. Although this charge is not accompanied by any suggestion that Perotti participated in, or was duped by, the forgeries of Giovanni Nanni, the possibility that he kept such company should be alarming to anyone about to embark on a quest for "new fragments" in the *Cornucopiae*, and must therefore be noticed here.

About 1474³⁴ Perotti put into circulation under the title *Epitome*

³³ Poggio's slander was really a compliment and it is interesting to notice that it was so reported by Paolo Giovio in his *Elogia* (Basileae, 1577) 32. The charge was not a particularly remarkable manifestation of *livor edax*; a few years later, Politian was accused of having found and appropriated an ancient translation of Herodian.

³⁴ I assign so late a date to the *Epitome* because Perotti in the prefatory letter (1) addresses a citizen of Viterbo as "concivis" — an expression that would be possible only after he became governor of Viterbo in 1464, and could have been used even after Perotti left his difficult post in 1469 — and (2) refers to a collection of his own letters.

fabellarum a collection of fables taken from Avianus and Phaedrus accompanied by some of his own efforts in verse, which he, perhaps truthfully, described as *juvenilia*. The collection, which has survived in two manuscripts that were discovered in the early part of the nineteenth century, was primarily intended for the use of the nephew to whom it is dedicated, but it is preceded by an introductory letter to a Titus Mannus Veltrius³⁵ to whom "immortales gratias" are offered "quod post epistolas nostras, quas tanto studio collegisti, versiculos etiam nostros collegeris." Now Titus Mannus is not otherwise known; he may have been one of the now forgotten multitude of ambitious young scholars of the fifteenth century whose careers were, for one reason or another, cut short before they could emerge from obscurity; he may have been some citizen of Viterbo whose affectations as an amateur scholar led him to collect the writings of the former governor of the city; he may be merely one of the thousand men of that age whose names have survived only because they owned a certain codex or received a letter from a man of distinction. His obscurity, however, makes it impossible categorically to refute the suspicion voiced by the two scholars who in a footnote remark, apropos of the *Epitome*, "la dedica è al viterbese Tito Manno (o Marino) Veltrio, che ci pare non esser altri che Tito Annio (Giovanni Nanni), il celebre falsificatore di testi antichi, del quale sarebbe stato storpiato il nome ne' codici."³⁶

The earliest collection of Perotti's letters of which we have any notice was the *Epistulae Romanae*; these letters are now lost, but we are told in the preface to the *Cornucopiae* that they were devoted to exposure of the unfathomable ignorance of a "vilissimus paedagogulus" who can be no other than Calderini; the letters must therefore have been written during Perotti's quarrel with Calderini in 1472-74. Had any of Perotti's earlier letters been collected as models of epistolary style, the collection would surely have been mentioned by Perotti's secretary, Maturantius, in the fulsomely encomiastic oration on his patron's achievements which he delivered in December, 1475; the oration was published in Vermiglioli's *Memorie di Jacopo Antiquarij* (Perugia, 1813) 303 ff.

³⁵ The *Epitome* was first published from the Neapolitan manuscript: Codex Perottinus MS., digestus et editus a Cataldo Iannello, Neapoli, 1809 [= 1811]. In this edition the superscription to the prefatory letter reads: "Nicolaus Perottus, Pontifex Sipontinus, Tito Marino Veltrio Viterbiensi concivi suo S.P.D." Mai, in his edition of the Vatican manuscript (*Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus III* (Romae, 1831) 280), not only gives *Manno* as the reading of the Vatican manuscript, but reports that an inspection of the evanid writing of the Neapolitan manuscript (much damaged in this and other places by moisture) indicates that it has the same reading. My photostats confirm both of Mai's statements.

³⁶ F. Gabotto ed A. Badini Confalonieri, *Vita di Giorgio Merula* (Alessandria, 1893) 86, note 3. The authors do not develop their suggestion, or even give a reason for it.

The following considerations may be urged against a supposition which is based, at best, on a rather remote similarity of names. (1) The assumption that the name "Mannus" is a copyist's error for "Annius" is at best highly precarious, for the two extant manuscripts agree in their reading, and completely collapses if we accept the unanimous opinion that one of the manuscripts is an autograph.³⁷ (2) There is no evidence that Giovanni Nanni ever used the name Veltrius. (3) So far as I know, there is no evidence that he adopted the name "Titus." Born Giovanni Nanni, he Latinized his name to Iohannes Annus, and it is in this form that it appears, for example, on his celebrated forgery.³⁸ (4) Early in his life Nanni, who was born in 1432, became a Dominican friar in the convent of Santa Maria di Gradi and distinguished himself for both his knowledge of Oriental languages and the profundity of his theological learning. Had he been the person addressed by Perotti, simple courtesy would have required mention of his ecclesiastical status, and Perotti would almost certainly have made some complimentary allusion to his reputation for erudition. (5) Whatever the relationship between Perotti and Nanni,³⁹ it need, I think, give us no concern here, for Nanni as a forger was a specialist.⁴⁰ When he began his fabrications is uncertain, but the fact that, according to the subscription in the first edition, he completed his commentary on them at Rome in 1498 suggests that the whole enterprise belongs

³⁷ See the editions of Phaedrus by D. Bassi (Augustae Taurinorum, s.a. [1918] vii), J. P. Postgate (Oxonii, s.a. [1921] vi), and A. Brenot (Paris, 1924, xi), and, above all, Mercati's *Per la cronologia* (see note 1 above) 105. The judgment of Mercati, who has examined virtually every known specimen of Perotti's writing, should be conclusive.

³⁸ The only variation in the spelling of the name that I have noticed is the genitive form *Nannis* which appears in the colophon of some editions of this writer's *Glossa super Apocalypsin* which, however, have *Anni* in the title.

³⁹ I do not mean to deny that the two men knew each other; it is highly probable that they met either while Perotti was governor in Viterbo or at the home of Cardinal Bessarion, who appears to have used Nanni's services as a preacher to promote his own favorite project, a crusade for the recovery of Constantinople. I merely point out that there is no indication of any intimacy between them.

⁴⁰ That Nanni was a dupe rather than a forger has frequently been claimed; cf. the short article in the *Enciclopedia italiana* by I[nnocenzo] T[aurisano], s.v. "Annio": "Che l'A. volesse ingannare è da escludersi; forse fu sorpresa la sua buona fede." But the fact remains that Nanni's commentary, entitled "Cronographia Etrusca digesta," appears to be the framework about which the whole imposture was built, and, what is more conclusive, the fabrications are clearly the work of someone who knew both Hebrew and Chaldee, and who possessed precisely the kind of recondite Oriental learning for which Nanni was celebrated.

to a period subsequent to the death of Perotti in 1480. Whatever the date at which they were produced, a careful reading of the forgeries suffices to show that Nanni's motive cannot have been merely a desire to impose on the credulity of his contemporaries by simulating the work of ancient writers. On the contrary, it is evident from his "Fragmenta Catonis" that he made no effort to imitate the style of Cato,⁴¹ and his "Q. Fabius Pictor De aureo saeculo," which is apparently intended to represent a *Latin* original, is equally inept. The forger was clearly interested, not in stylistically plausible imitations of ancient writers, but in the ideas which his carefully arranged mosaic of fabrications was intended to suggest. His primary purpose was to advance an elaborately Euhemeristic interpretation of ancient religion. Taking as his basis the *Origo gentis Romanae*, the remains of Manetho, and Biblical narrative, he wove together from these and other sources an extraordinary tissue of spurious annals whose general tenor may, perhaps, be best suggested by the fact that Noah, who is described as an astrologer who was able to read from the stars the imminence of a deluge, is identified with Bacchus, Chaos (father of the gods), and Janus (the deified first colonist of Italy); by wives who are identified with Vesta, Pandora, and Terra, he became the father of such oddly assorted offspring as Sem, Cham, Chronos, Prometheus, and Thetis. The rôle of the Hebrews in history is minimized or even denied by implication. Whether the strange Dominican friar intended that his subversion of the Old Testament should be extended to a faith based on the New is a question which, however startling and intrinsically important, need not detain us here. It will have sufficed to have shown that there is reason to believe that Nanni, even had he had the opportunity, would have had neither the capacity nor the inclination to deceive Perotti by producing a literary forgery which might have become a source of the "new fragments" which we find in the *Cornucopiae*.

Against these suspicions we must make the point that it is now an established fact that Perotti possessed at least one ancient manu-

⁴¹ The only attempt at verisimilitude, a denunciation of the Greeks, will serve as a specimen of the style: "Graeci tam impudenti iactantia iam effunduntur ut, quoniam his dudum nemo responderit, ideo libere a se ortam Italiam et eandem spuriam simul et spurcam atque novitiam nullo certo auctore aut ratione sed per solam insaniam fabulentur. Quamobrem nunc ut ceteris Latinis viam faciam . . . scribere instituo. Italiae splendidissima origo fuit . . . Coepit enim aureo saeculo sub principibus diis Iano, Cameae, Saturno . . ."

script which was the unique text of part of the work of an ancient author and which was subsequently lost. Some thirty of the fables of Phaedrus, now known as the "Appendix Perottina," are preserved only in the transcriptions made by Perotti for the edification of his nephew in the *Epitome fabellarum* to which we have already referred. When these were first published, forgery was, of course, suspected, and the Appendix was the subject of a controversy which need not be rehearsed here, since, in the opinion of all the modern editors of Phaedrus, the question is closed and the authenticity of the fables attested only by Perotti's compilation is so well established "ut nemo iam eat infitias a Phaedro eas esse profectas."⁴² Perotti himself therefore provides proof that there is nothing inherently implausible in a tentative assumption that he *may* have had access to other manuscripts now lost. And when we remember that a poem which was in all probability identical with the *Carmen de bello Actiaco*, now known only from the papyrus fragments found at Herculaneum, was not only extant in the year 1466 but had somehow been attributed to Vergil,⁴³ an enthusiastic imagination could easily persuade itself that almost any treasure of antiquity might, like the Phaedrus, have found a last home in Perotti's library. In comparison with such expectations, however, the "new fragments" to be found in the *Cornucopiae* will seem an exceedingly meager harvest.

III

It is not my purpose here to attempt to examine, much less to defend, the authenticity of the "new fragments," but rather to make a preliminary investigation into the probable nature of the sources from which Perotti may have derived them. I shall, therefore, attempt to describe briefly Perotti's method of citation, and then examine his quotations from five authors.

While, from the standpoint of convenience, there is doubtless a touch of madness in Perotti's lexicographic method, it is not one for which no justification could be alleged. The plan is simple enough. Perotti goes through the text of Martial word by word, and defines in turn not only the particular word in Martial but the root word from which it is (in his opinion) formed, gives the basic

⁴² J. P. Postgate in his edition of Phaedrus, page v.

⁴³ It seems that there can be no doubt about the facts; see Remigio Sabbadini, *Studi italiani* 5 (1897) 373.

meaning of that word, discusses its secondary meanings, lists and defines its derivatives, and frequently adds a notice of such synonyms and antonyms as occur to his mind. A complete article, covering his treatment of an entire family of words, would be too long for quotation here; the general form of the individual entries may be seen from the context given for each of the new fragments printed in the appendix, below.

Perotti's procedure in quoting reminds one of some of the elementary dictionaries in use in the schools today. The quotations are brief, intended to do no more than illustrate clearly the meaning of the word, and are introduced only by the author's name, which is usually abbreviated (but without system, so that such ambiguous abbreviations as "Pl." and "Lu." occur frequently). The title of the work from which the quotation is drawn is almost never given, and, of course, there is no indication of the immediate source which Perotti used. It is this which makes the isolation of the new material and even the verification of the normal quotations a task of some difficulty. The only approach is through *indices verborum*, where these are available, and the *Thesaurus*, when the quotation contains a not too common word that falls in the early part of the alphabetic sequence. On the whole, however, Perotti worked with an accuracy remarkable in a man of his era. It is possible to verify hundreds of his quotations without finding a significant departure from the established text or the manuscript readings reported in modern critical editions — for, needless to say, since we cannot demand of Perotti accuracy greater than conformity to the text as he knew it, and since it would be almost impossible now to identify the manuscripts which he used, we must consider a quotation accurate if it conforms to the readings of any known manuscript. Many other quotations, when compared to the readings reported in the modern editions, show only such discrepancies as might have found their way into some of the *deteriores* — the late manuscripts which, for most of the Latin authors, have not been fully collated and are not reported in the critical editions. In such instances we must remain in doubt whether the error is Perotti's or was already present in his source.

There are, however, certain systematic deviations to be observed in Perotti's method of quoting. First, most of his supporting quotations are introduced merely by the author's name in the nominative or an abbreviation thereof, and these are presumably

direct quotations. Occasionally an opinion or phrase is reported in indirect discourse, in which, of course, we expect only a summary. But Perotti uses, occasionally, a third device, which may at first sight seem slightly anomalous; this is the use of *inquit* in a passage which is not a strictly exact quotation, but rather an adaptation which stands halfway between indirect discourse and direct quotation. His method of quotation is, perhaps, best illustrated by the following example. As I shall do in all similar cases, I supply quotation marks about Perotti's quotations which have been verified against the standard text, give within diplae the exact references, and use brackets and diplae to indicate what must be excised from, or added to, Perotti's version to bring it into harmony with the standard text.

Sagire enim veteres acute sentire dicebant. Cic. <*De div.* 1.65> "Sagire enim sentire acute est, ex quo sagae anus, quia multa scire volunt, et sagaces dicti canes. Is igitur qui ante sagit quam oblata res est dicitur praesagire, id est futura ante sentire." Hinc manifeste ostenditur error Acronis, qui sagam mulierem scribit incantatricem dici atque maleficam, ab eo quod satis agat.⁴⁴ Melius Fest. saga, inquit, mulier est perita sacrorum et vir sapiens.⁴⁵ Et Nonius <23.1>: "Sagae <mulieres> dicuntur feminae ad libidinem virorum indagatrices, unde et sagaces canes dicuntur ferarum vel animalium quaesitores."

Noteworthy and typical are the complete accuracy of the quotation from Cicero, the two degrees of paraphrase shown by indirect discourse and the peculiar use of *inquit*, and finally the omission of an unessential word in the quotation from Nonius.

The second characteristic of Perotti's method of quotation may fairly be described as the result of a desire to conserve space. There are many instances in which he quotes a fragment which he has obviously and necessarily derived from one of the grammarians, but instead of reproducing the whole quotation, Perotti quotes only the minimum number of words necessary for his purpose. There are numerous instances in which a fragment of two or three lines is given by Nonius or by Gellius from which Perotti quotes only the three or four words pertinent to his immediate purpose.

⁴⁴ Pseud-Acron. In *Hor. Carm.* I.27.21: "QVAE SAGA THESSALIS: Incantatrix et malefica dicta ab eo, quod satis agat."

⁴⁵ Paul. ex Fest. 471 M.: "Saga quoque dicitur mulier perita sacrorum, et vir sapiens." Cf. Fest. 426 L.: "<Saga quoque dicitur> mulier perita sacrorum, et sagus > sapiens."

His purpose, obviously, is not to compile quotations, but to support definitions as concisely as possible. He tends, therefore, to omit from quotations unessential words, and conversely to interpolate in the text explanatory glosses which he considers necessary. Since he does not have at his disposal marks of suspension, brackets, and the other devices of modern typography, he is occasionally guilty of seeming infidelities of the types illustrated in the two following quotations from Gellius (5.21.4 and 19.9.8, quoted by Perotti in columns 644 and 645 respectively):

Aderat <, cum ille hoc dicit,> reprehensor audaculus verborum.
Cedere equidem <inquit> vobis debui, ut in tali asotia [id est, luxu, prodigalitate] atque nequitia artium nos⁴⁶ vinceretis.

Very occasionally Perotti goes so far as to condense a quotation by changing indirect discourse to direct. He quotes (605), for example, a passage from Gellius (1.8.4) in which Gellius quotes in indirect discourse from Sotion. Perotti, who was interested only in illustrating the meaning of *adagium*, suppressed the indirect discourse, which, had it been reproduced, would have entailed explanation of who Sotion was. Perotti's quotation therefore compares with the text as follows:

Hinc <ait> natum [est] <esse illud> frequens apud Graecos
adagium: οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐς Κόρινθον ἔσθ' ὁ πλοῦς.

Such then are the major types of systematic inaccuracy in Perotti's method of citation — inaccuracies which, for the most part, seem to be the result of a desire for concision, rather than carelessness. For the purpose of the present study, the most important of these systematic errors is his omission of words considered irrelevant; this tendency prevents us, at this stage of the investigation, from using metrical tests on any of the fragments of verse that we shall hereinafter consider.

IV

PHAEDRUS

Since it is absolutely certain that Perotti once had in his possession a manuscript of Phaedrus more complete than any now extant and took from it the unquestionably genuine fables which he alone has preserved, we quite naturally might hope to find in

⁴⁶ The common reading of the *deteriores* and early editions. Hosius, following manuscript Z, prints "†arcinnum" and suggests *Aristippum* or *Apicium*.

his *Cornucopiae* fragments of the other fables which were probably contained in the lost manuscript. In the *Cornucopiae* there are no quotations from Phaedrus. This disappointing silence, however, like that of the famous dog in Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's story, may not be without significance. While it is possible that Perotti excluded Phaedrus from the compilation because he regarded him as a writer of little or no authority,⁴⁷ it is more probable that the omission is to be explained by his method of working. He simply did not use a manuscript which he must have had at hand.⁴⁸ And while it may be taken for granted that Perotti was unaware of the unique value of the manuscript of Phaedrus that he had used, his failure to cite Phaedrus at all is unmistakable evidence that he was not primarily interested in displaying a vast erudition by citing from as many authors as possible. It follows, furthermore, that the *Cornucopiae* is probably not an accumulation of notes on all subjects made over a long period of time, but rather a systematic compilation made for a specific purpose, and necessarily involving, therefore, recourse to a limited number of sources.

V

PERSIUS

For an estimate of Perotti's fidelity as a compiler, Persius is a particularly convenient touchstone, since his extant works are of relatively small bulk and since we have no reason to suppose that Persius ever published anything more than the text that has come down to us. If, in other words, Perotti were to offer us any "new fragments" of Persius, our suspicions would justly be aroused and, in the circumstances, the gravamen of proof would fall clearly on anyone who argued against an imposture. But there are no "new fragments" of Persius. If we exclude a phrase of three words which Perotti by a lapse of memory attributes to Persius instead of Juvenal, every quotation which he attributes to Persius is found in our present text.

Perotti's fifty-three quotations from Persius are generally in agreement with modern editions, although he does have the un-

⁴⁷ It is not probable that Perotti discriminated so nicely between the worth of classical and post-classical Latinity. Late writers are quoted infrequently, but without apology, e.g. Claudian (18), Solinus (7), Martianus Capella (4), Boëthius (3).

⁴⁸ I.e. if not the manuscript of Phaedrus, at least a copy of his own collection, the *Epitome fabellarum*.

metrical transposition of *est* to the end of the line in 1.1, found in some of the inferior manuscripts, and, in the last line of the prologue, the unmetrical *melos* that replaced *nectar* in most of the inferior manuscripts.⁴⁹ He presents only one reading that is otherwise unreported: *Latio* for *Italo* in 1.129.

The small number of quotations from Persius plus the fact that Perotti's readings are not all found in any single manuscript reported in the editions, strongly suggests that his source was not Persius directly, but some compilation in which he found his excerpts ready for use. It is difficult to believe that had he himself excerpted the text of Persius he would not have found a greater number of peculiar locutions to notice in his work.

In only one instance do we find a textual variation which seems to indicate clearly a secondary source. In his quotation of 3.84, Perotti has "E nihilo nihil, in nihilum" — a combination of readings found only in the verse as quoted by Isidore (1.35.17, where, however, *ex* stands in place of *e*). This, however, is the only quotation from Persius that Perotti has in common with Isidore. It would seem hazardous, therefore, to conclude that the correspondence is more than fortuitous.

So far as I have been able to determine from consultation of the *indices scriptorum* in the standard editions of the grammatical writers whom Perotti is likely to have used, and of the extraordinarily complete collection of *testimonia* in Consoli's edition of Persius,⁵⁰ the greatest number of quotations from Persius that Perotti has in common with a possible secondary source is thirteen. The work in question is the *Thesaurus novus Latinitatis*, first published by Angelo Mai in the eighth volume of his *Classici auctores*, which is now generally believed to have been compiled, partly from sources now lost, by the English monk Osbernus of Gloucester. While seven of the thirteen quotations show no textual peculiarities, since Perotti, Osbern, and the manuscripts of Persius present the same readings, the six others cannot have been taken by Perotti from Osbern. For example, in *Choliamb.* 6-7, Perotti has the normal reading *ipse*, which Osbern alone corrupts to *ego*. In 3.100,

⁴⁹ Including the Urbana manuscript. To avoid an unnecessary proliferation of footnotes, I have given in Note 53 below a complete list of all of Perotti's quotations from Persius.

⁵⁰ A. Persii Flacci Saturarum liber, recensuit, adnotatione critica instruxit, testimonia usque ad saeculum XV addidit Santi Consoli. Editio maior. Romae, 1914.

Perotti has "calidumque triental" (the first word unanimously attested by the manuscripts, the second, an intrusive gloss in two of the *deteriores*) whereas Osbern has "validumque trientem" (the first word a reading peculiar to him, the second the accepted text). In 2.47 Perotti has "in flamma," the reading of two of the older manuscripts, which is preferred by some editors, while Osbern has "in flammis," the reading of most of the other manuscripts. Since Perotti reproduces none of Osbern's peculiarities, it seems best to conclude that the relation between Perotti and Osbern is, if anything, one resulting from a common source.

Perotti has six quotations from Persius in common with the commentaries of Servius, whose work he can be shown, on the basis of his quotations from other authors, to have used in his compilation.⁵¹ In one quotation Perotti gives the text of Persius without a corruption that appears in Servius; in the remaining five both Perotti and Servius agree so closely with the transmitted text of Persius that no positive deductions can be drawn. Perotti has two quotations in common with Quintilian — again there are no textual peculiarities to help us — and one in common with Priscian. Six other possible secondary sources with whom he has a single quotation in common are listed in the terminal note to this section. There remain twenty-four quotations which are not found in any secondary source known to me. It is possible, of course, that Perotti may have taken them from one of the almost innumerable *florilegia*⁵² or have gone directly to a manuscript of Persius. The only alternative hypothesis, it would seem, is that he used some secondary source now lost.

The net result of our examination of the quotations from Persius is a considerable assurance that Perotti is a reliable witness, and a slight suggestion that he *may* have used some compilation not now available.⁵³

⁵¹ Perotti definitely knew the commentary in the "auctus" version. I make, therefore, no attempt to distinguish between "Servius" and "Servius Danielis."

⁵² At one time I thought that he might have used the *Deflorationes Persii* contained in a Humanistic collection, Vat. Reg. 1428, described by Carl Wotke and Carl Hosius, *RhM* 43 (1888) 498 ff. But although some readings in this MS agree with those of Perotti — particularly the unmetrical displacement of *est* in 1.1 — it does not contain more than half the lines quoted by Perotti, and presents some important variations in text.

⁵³ I here list the passages in Persius quoted by Perotti; following in parentheses are possible secondary sources; the number following the colon is that of the column of the *Cornucopiae* in which the quotation occurs. *Choliamb.* 1 (Osbern. 132 Mai;

VI

ENNIUS

I propose next to examine Perotti's quotations from Ennius. Since it cannot be supposed that a manuscript of Ennius survived to the fifteenth century, all the sources will necessarily be secondary, and since very few of the fragments of Ennius are preserved by more than one source, these sources can be identified with certainty. Quotations which cannot be identified must either be fabrications or come from a secondary source now unknown.

Perotti does not quote frequently from Ennius. From the total of ninety-one quotations which he attributes to that poet, we must deduct ten which belong to other writers. One quotation must be restored to each of the following: Caecilius, Pacuvius, Laevius, Naevius, Furius, Hemina, Marullus, Varro, Neleus, and an anonymous tragedian. For four of the mistaken attributions Perotti is not entirely to blame, for the error was either present in his sources or suggested by the juxtaposition of an anonymous quotation to one assigned to Ennius, but the remaining six mistakes are evidently Perotti's — a serious margin of inaccuracy.⁵⁴

Of the remaining eighty-one quotations, five are "new fragments" and will be reproduced in the appendix to this paper. The remaining seventy-six⁵⁵ may be assigned to their sources as

Lact. Plac. *In Th.* 4.62; Rufin. *In Met. Ter.* 6.560 Keil):409, 507 & 943. 5-6:228 & 288. 6-7(not Osb. 462):173. 9:967. 14:400. — 1.1:626. 4-5(Osb. 7):779. 9(Quint. 9.3.9):175. 16(Osb. 374):253. 26-7(Quint. 9.3.42):175. 32(Hieron. *Ep.* 22.13):92. 51:375. 54(Serv. G. 3.199):961. 56-7(Osb. 412):64. 58:652. 58-9(Guarini *Epist.* 2):841. 69-71:332. 97(Serv. *Aen.* 11.553):662. 129:427. — 2.10(Serv. *Aen.* 6.187):626. 10-12:301. 11:626. 11-12:698. 32-4:403. 47(Osb. 279):720. 48-9(not Osb. 390):28. 51(Serv. *Aen.* 2.546):326. 69-70:842. — 3.1-2:179. 3-4:600. 9(Lact. Plac. *In Th.* 4.45; Eutych. *De verb.* 5.471 K.):156. 25(Osb. 526):938. 48-9(Osb. 533):224. 49-50:224. 50(not Osb. 402):137 & 301. 84(Isid. 1.35.17):734. 100-1(not Osb. 162):888. — 4.12(not Osb. 608):789. 29(not Osb. 521):301. — 5.13:489. 45-6(Serv. *Aen.* 1.476):318. 53:175. 53-4:307. 102(Iohannis Saresberiensis *Pol.* 7, prolog.):947. 106(Prisc. 8, p. 405 Keil):912. 126:855. 147(Porph. *In serm.* 2.3.143):251. 147-8:1023. — 6.77:117.

⁵⁴ Mistakes of this kind are often very difficult to correct, since modern editions and indices give no help. I am not at all confident that some of the "new fragments" which I produce in this paper may not be merely mistaken attributions, and I solicit the assistance of any reader who may recognize any of them.

⁵⁵ I list the quotations from Ennius according to the edition of Vahlen, using line numbers for the *Annales*, and fragment number for the other works. *Annales* 10(Prisc. 7.401):679. 14(Varr. *L.L.* 5.60):734. 69(Paul. 355):570. 73(Non. 134):814. 98(Paul. 426):180. 101(Paul. 476):309. 103(Diomed. 2.447; Charis. 4.282 Keil):654. 113(Prisc. 6.250):666. 117(Non. 120):767. 130(Paul. 188):86. 132(Prisc. 13.3):308.

follows: Nonius, 32; Paulus, 16; Gellius, 7; Varro, 7; Cicero, 5; Priscian, 4; Servius, 2; Macrobius, 2; Charisius or Diomedes, 1. In one of the quotations from Paulus (p. 439 Lindsay) Perotti reads *supernia* for *superbia*, evidently trying to bring the quotation into harmony with the lemma, and in another quotation he replaces an interjected *sûltis* with *quaeso*; in all the other quotations, with the exception of the six taken from Nonius which I shall discuss below, his version either corresponds exactly to that of his source or shows variations too slight to be worthy of discussion.

Twenty-six of Perotti's quotations of Ennius which he must have derived from Nonius satisfactorily correspond to the text. The remaining six, however, deserve some notice. Three may be merely emendations by Perotti: In a quotation taken from Nonius (p. 120.2 Mercerus ap. Lindsay) he has the necessary object, *te*, which modern editors have had to supply; in a quotation taken from the same source (514.3), he has *nos feramus* where the manuscripts read *vos fueratis*, which modern editors emend to *feratis*; in a third, (183.15), he has *correpta* for the *concepta* which is emended to *consaepta*. He gives a fourth quotation (504.32) twice, once correctly, and once with *madet terra* instead of *terra sudat* (*sanguine*). This may be a mere blunder; if not, it would suggest that his manuscript of Nonius had a gloss on *sudat*. Two other quotations, however, present curious problems. Perotti's version of *Annales* 537 (Vahlen) must come from Nonius, since Perotti has the reading *ascendit* instead of the correct *accedit* which appears in the quotation of the same passage by Gellius, yet Perotti has also the initial *atque* which appears only in Gellius. We are, therefore, forced to

152(Macrob. *Sat.* 1.4.17):467. 156(Paul. 284):292 & 863. 158(Gell. 1.22.14):177. 195(Cic. *Off.* 1.12.38):521. 195-6(*ibid.*):460. 197-8(*ibid.*):60. 218-9(Paul. 476):309. 221(Non. 158 & Fest. 324):840. 253(Non. 116):606. 265(Varr. *L.L.* 5.182):232. 271-3(Gell. 20.10.1):469. 286(Paul. 439):803. 291(Non. 246):298. 309(Serv. *Aen.* 6.515):1017. 312-3(Non. 110):1004. 324(Non. 95):472. 362(Non. 149):215. 370(Macrob. *Sat.* 6.1.23):86. 421(Varr. *L.L.* 6.82):186. 430(Paul. 433):532. 446(Serv. *G.* 4.188):984. 450-1(Non. 134):713. 452(Non. 134):713. 453(Non. 63):510. 504(Paul. 453):977. 532(Paul. 510):184. 537(Non. 530 & Gell. 10.29.2):433. 538(Non. 134):794. 541(Varr. *L.L.* 7.7):12. 584(Paul. 87):821. 588(Paul. 5):149. 589(Paul. 353):867. — *Achil.* 2(Non. 147):800. 4(Non. 277):968. 6(Gell. 4.17):9. 7(Non. 129):445. 10(Paul. 314):45. — *Andromach.* 8(Non. 76):604. 12(Varr. *L.L.* 7.6):12. — *Andromed.* 2(Non. 20):621. 3(Non. 169):832. 6(Non. 183):616. — *Chres.* 3(Non. 144):986. — *Hect.* 13(Non. 504):440 & 816. 19(Non. 399):759. — *Hecub.* 3(Varr. *L.L.* 7.6):12. 4(Non. 474):195. — *Iph.* 9(Gell. 19.10.5):98. — *Med.* 15(Non. 84):67. 17(Varr. *L.L.* 7.9):12. — *Melan.* 5(Gell. 5.11.11):119(*bis*). 6(Non. 170):124. — *Nem.* 1(Non. 183):350. — *Phoen.* 3(Gell. 6.17.10):464. 8(Non. 514):278. — *Tel.* 1(Non. 172):569. 2(Paul. 129):984. — *Thyest.* 2(Non. 255):449. 13(Non. 97):310. — *Epigr.* 2(Cic. *Tusc.* 1.49.117):280 & 919. — Not in Vahlen (Prisc. 15.71):191.

conclude either that Perotti obtained his version by collating Nonius with Gellius, or that he had a manuscript of Nonius from which the initial *atque* had not been lost. Even more curious is *Annales* 221: Nonius has "suos divis sacrificare puellōs"; Festus has "†penisolitīs vos sacrificare puellōs"; and Perotti, although he seems not to have known Festus except through the epitome of Paulus, which does not preserve the *vos* in this passage, reads: "divis vos solvi vestros sacrare puellōs." Rather than a conflation of two sources, this appears to be yet another corruption of the original (variously restored by modern editors) from which the quotations in both Paulus and Festus must be derived. This again suggests a manuscript tradition of Nonius different from that known to modern editors. And finally, the third of the new fragments printed below comes, as the context printed with it indicates, in a passage in which Perotti echoes Nonius's definition of *congenerare*, and quotes a version of a line from Accius which is preserved only by Nonius (84.30). Perotti has probably omitted three words deliberately to economize space, but in place of the corrupt †*atgrafo*, he reads *hunc enim*, which recalls Mueller's emendation, *hanc*. Then follows the "new fragment" from Ennius, which looks suspiciously like a mere echo of the line from Accius. We cannot, of course, be absolutely certain that the two quotations came from the same source, but the fact that both are given excludes, I think, what we should otherwise consider the natural explanation, that the line attributed to Ennius is merely another version of the line from Accius, and that Ennius's name is associated with it by some slip of pen or memory. Perotti undoubtedly thinks that he is giving two separate quotations, and, unless we assume that he simply fabricated the second of the two, it seems likely that he found both in the same source. This would imply that his manuscript of Nonius either had at this point a gloss which gave the quotation from Ennius, or a fuller text, including that quotation, the loss of which, by homoeoteleuton, might have caused the corruption of the existing text.

On the other hand, a recension of Nonius does not seem a probable source for the first of the "new fragments." As will be seen from the context printed with it, this fragment is the second of two passages quoted by Perotti to illustrate his definition of *homoeoptoton* — a definition which evidently is not reproduced from either Diomedes or Charisius, the grammarians who have preserved

the passage from Ennius which Perotti uses as his first illustration. And although Perotti's definition seems to allude to the *Auctor ad Herennium* (4.12.18), Perotti does not quote the anonymous verbal jingle which is the only illustration provided in that work. He may, therefore, have taken both his definition and his examples from a rhetorical work now lost. Of the five "new fragments," this one seems to me most likely to be genuine, for it shows more imagination than I should expect from a grammarian who was trying to concoct an example of internal rhyme. The rhythm and assonance seem suited to a scene of confusion and tumult: is the subject Polyphemus in his fury after he has been blinded?

Of the remaining new fragments, the second, which seemed to me so familiar that at first I thought it came from Lucretius, might have come from a Vergilian commentary or almost any other source. The fifth, the isolated word *poëtificus*, was evidently associated in Perotti's mind with the opening lines of Persius's *choliambi* and could, perhaps, have come from a gloss on them. The phrase which forms the fourth fragment may have been suggested by Paulus's probably erroneous statement that there was an adjective *pulchralis*, a variant of *pulcher*. However, I should not expect *ludus* to occur first to a mind seeking something to describe as beautiful, and it is barely possible that the phrase is a genuine fragment which, isolated from its context, was the source of Paulus's error, he having misunderstood the verb form *ludis* as a noun, and so assumed that *pulchralibus* was an adjective rather than the ablative of a rare noun.

Perotti's quotations from Ennius, then, make it clear that he must have excerpted for the *Cornucopiae* Paulus's epitome of Festus and the *De compendiosa doctrina* of Nonius, either in the form which we now have or a hypothetical fuller version which we may, for convenience, term "Nonius auctus." It is probable, also, that he used Varro, Cicero, and Gellius directly. While it is probable that he used Priscian, Servius, and Macrobius, the possibility of a common source cannot be excluded, since these grammarians may have known Ennius only through secondary sources.

VII

SALLUST

I next describe Perotti's quotations from Sallust, primarily as a means of classifying his use of his sources, but incidentally because

we find here a suspiciously high percentage of "new fragments" — thirty-three out of a total of one hundred and thirty-seven quotations.

Of the one hundred and four quotations which I have traced, three are erroneously attributed to Sallust: one fragment which Nonius specifically ascribes to Sisenna, an historical passage from Gellius which Nonius quotes as the work of an unnamed *auctoritas*, and a line from the pseudo-Ciceronian *In Sallustium*.⁵⁶ Perotti's unquestionably genuine quotations come from the Sallustian works as follows: *Bellum Catilinae*, 36; *Iugurtha*, 36; *In Ciceronem*, 1; *Historiae*, 28.⁵⁷ It will be convenient to consider these in reverse order.

There is no indication that Perotti knew the collection of Sallustian *Orationes*. His quotations from the *Historiae* must, therefore, come from secondary sources, and these appear to have been the following: Nonius, 19; Servius, 6; Priscian, 2; Gellius, 1. All the

⁵⁶ Again I remind the reader of the possibility that some of the new fragments are mistaken attributions which I have failed to recognize. See also note 61 below.

⁵⁷ The following is a summary of Perotti's quotations. After some hesitation, I have decided to list the fragments of the *Historiae* according to Dietsch's edition for the convenience of those who may wish to use the indispensable, although regrettably inaccurate, *index verborum* in that work. *Cat.* 1.1(Arus. 7.508 K.):122. 1.1(Non. 212):753. 2.9(Non. 309):275. 5.1(Non. 351):532. 5.1:518. 5.4(Gell. 1.15.18):81. 5.4(Non. 439; Serv. *Aen.* 1.516):16. 6.1(Non. 249; Serv. *Aen.* 7.48):293. 7.4(Non. 453):813. 7.5(Gell. 8.12.9):34. 7.6(Non. 442):110. 8.5(Non. 322):336. 9.2(Non. 398; Serv. *Aen.* 1.632):277. 11.3(Gell. 3.1):273. 11.8(Prisc. 16.99):503. 15.5(Non. 289):204. 15.5(Non. 181):305. 15.5(Serv. *Aen.* 2.55):704. 20.12:422. 23.1(Non. 310):275. 23.1(Non. 341):311. 23.3(Gell. 6.17.8):464. 25.3:759. 33.3(Non. 390):645. 44.4:284. 52.13(Non. 317):472. 52.29(Serv. *G.* 3.456):277. 52.32:922. 53.3:106. 56.3(Non. 554):693. 56.5(Prisc. 17.184):699. 57.4(Prisc. 3.343):179. 58.17(Non. 242):644. 59.3(Serv. *Aen.* 2.157):440. — *Iug.* 1.1(Serv. *Aen.* 4.415):41. 2.4(Non. 58):989. 5.3:263. 8.1(Non. 407):733. 10.1(Non. 110):41. 14.22:115. 15.5 Non. 306):37. 16.1(Non. 366):713. 17.3:689. 17.6:816. 20.5:428. 24.2:428. 31.15(Non. 208):275. 35.4:1025. 35.10:352. 44.5(Don. *In Ter. Eun.* 939):22. 46.1(Non. 325):463. 46.7(Non. 553):279. 48.1(Non. 257):334. 48.1(Non. 335):67. 56.5(Non. 293):302. 57.4(Non. 553):674. 60.7(Claud. Donat. *In Aen.* 2.442):147. 70.2(Gell. 1.22.15):427. 71.4(Non. 396):180. 85.33(Non. 322):658. 85.47:605. 86.2(Gell. 16.10.6):505. 89.7:939. 90.1:168. 95.4(Non. 424):70. 97.3(Gell. 9.14.26):21 & 911. 103.3:812. 103.7:685. 106.3(Non. 425):25. 106.3(Serv. *Buc.* 2.17):480 — *In Cic.* 3.5 & 4.7:474. — *Hist.* 1.8(Non. 92):306. 26(Serv. *Buc.* 2.67):859. 43(Non. 257):334. 53(Serv. *Aen.* 1.576):647. 59(Serv. *Aen.* 1.380):438. 74(Non. 531):428. 86(Non. 212):607. 88(Non. 276):742. 96(Prisc. 8.436):600. — 2.17(Non. 538):217. 23.3(Non. 286):625. 29(Non. 172):523. 66(Non. 534):568. — 3.1(Non. 314):443. 8(Non. 534):569. 11(Non. 535):569. 26(Non. 138):931. 68(Non. 116):810 & 534. 70(Non. 539):216. 78(Prisc. 10.506; Non. 4):904. — 4.18(Serv. *Aen.* 3.400):938. 25(Gell. 1.15.12):81. 31(Non. 186):204. 40(Non. 366):692. 59(Non. 535):570. — *Lib. incert.* 15(Serv. *Aen.* 5.524):494. 49(Serv. *Aen.* 2.157):440.

quotations show satisfactory conformity to the established text with the following exceptions. One fragment preserved by Servius (*Ad Aen.* 3.400) reads: "Omnis Italia coacta in angustias finditur in duo promontoria, Bruttium et Sallentinum"; Perotti has *scinditur*, which is generally regarded as an unnecessary emendation by Kritz, and the astonishing variant *Pachynum*, which could be defended only on the supposition that Sallust considered Sicily as a part of Italy. The four quotations taken from Nonius which show significant variations from the text are all passages in which the manuscript readings require some emendation. I again employ brackets and diplae to indicate what must be excised from and added to Perotti's quotation to bring it into conformity with the unemended readings of the manuscripts.

Hist. 3.68 (Dietsch)/84 (Maurenbrecher): "Diversa, uti solet rebus perditis, [consilia] capess[unt] <ivit>, namque alii, fiducia gnaritatis locorum, occultam fugam sparsi, [alii] globis eruptionem temptavere."

Perotti's *capessunt* has been proposed, though not generally accepted, as an emendation; in place of his *alii*, modern editors supply *pars*.

Hist. 3.1/46: "<namque eis praeter solita vitiosis magistratibus,> [coepit] <cum> per omnem provinciam <infecunditate bienni proximi> grave pretium fructibus esse."

Editors delete the *e* in the second word and emend the last to *esset*.

Hist. 3.11/4.2: "<eum atque Metrophanens senatus> magna industria perquireba[n]t [eum] <cum> per tot scaphas, quas ad ostia <cum paucis fides> [percontatum] <percunctatur> miserant."

The editors emend to *Metrophanen*, *fidis*, and usually *percunctatum*, but Perotti's reading, *percontatum*, reappears in Maurenbrecher's text, evidently as an emendation made by that editor.

Hist. 2.66/1.25: "primo indicit <forte> per noctem <in> lenunculo piscand[um] <is>."

Editors delete *primo*, and emend to *incidit*, *lenunculum*, and *piscantis*.

These variations may, in whole or in part, represent emendations by Perotti himself; if not, they represent a text tradition of Nonius quite different from any reported in modern editions.

Perotti's quotation from the *In Ciceronem* consists of the beginning of a sentence in one section of that work combined with

the end of a sentence in the following section. This suggests either quotation from memory or the use of a secondary source which I cannot identify.

The most significant quotations are those which come from the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Iugurtha*. Of these seventy-two quotations, nineteen differ significantly from the established text of Sallust, but we should not carelessly conclude that Perotti was careless. For twelve of these quotations Perotti gives a version which contains the same departures from the established text that are found in the quotations of these passages by the grammatical writers, as follows: Nonius, 3; Servius, 3; Gellius, 4; Priscian, 1; Claudius Donatus, 1. In two other instances, Perotti's version, while it agrees with neither Sallust nor Nonius, is best explained as the result of a corruption in Nonius: In *Cat.* 56.3 Perotti has *quosque* instead of the correct *quemque*; some manuscripts of Nonius have the impossible reading *quaeque*. In *Iug.* 8.1, Perotti has "novi atque [ig]nobiles" — a corruption more likely to have occurred in Nonius, where the phrase is isolated from its context, than in a manuscript of Sallust, where the context would make it clear that two different classes of men are being described. The remaining significant errors in Perotti's text seem also more likely to have occurred in isolated citations than in a context, even though no secondary source for these can now be suggested: e.g. *maxime* for *Massivae* in *Iug.* 35.4; *cito* for *mature* in *Iug.* 35.10 (a correction made from the Livian *Periochae*, 64); *habebat* for *quaerebant* in *Iug.* 89.7.

When we find that Perotti so frequently agrees with secondary sources against the text of Sallust, we naturally raise the question whether he excerpted Sallust for the *Cornucopiae* at all. He could have derived all but sixteen of the remaining quotations from the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Iugurtha* from known secondary sources, as follows: Nonius, 24; Nonius or Servius, 3; Servius, 2; Gellius, 4; Priscian, 2; Arusianus, 1; Aelius Donatus, 1. For the remaining sixteen quotations, is it likely that he, who never significantly agrees with the text of Sallust when this differs from that of the secondary sources, went directly to Sallust for these? Or is it more likely that he obtained these quotations from another secondary source, which I cannot now identify? There is one detail which may be significant. The quotation which we have assigned to Arusianus, we assign to him because Nonius, who also quotes

the passage (371.11), does not have the last two words of the quotation as given by Perotti, although these are really indispensable to the sense of the quotation. Can there have been a form of Nonius in which the quotation was more fully given? If so, that form could also have contained additional and desirable words in the quotation from *Cat.* 5.1, and so have been Perotti's source. Such tenuous speculations could, of course, be extended — what, indeed, could one *not* fit into a hypothetical "Nonius auctus"?

When one exercises one's imagination on the subject of what might have been in a recension of Nonius different from that now known, it is particularly easy to drop the reins. To quote the latest editor:

Our MSS. of Nonius come, all of them, from one archetype, an archetype written apparently in minuscule script, and therefore of no great antiquity. If it did not abound in transpositions, insertions, and omissions, it would be strangely unlike the other MSS. of its time . . . Nonius' work was the Latin Dictionary of many a monastic library; and a studious abbot would have no scruple in adding in the margin or at the end of a chapter some word which he found in another part of the work.⁵⁸

Only what he found in another part of the book? Is not the *De compendiosa doctrina*, in the form in which we have it, a work which almost cries for expansion and completion? And might not such expansion have taken place at a time when the *Historiae* of Sallust and other works now wholly or partly lost were available to some studious reader? On the other hand, the archetype of our present manuscripts obviously suffered at least the transposition of one leaf and a number of patent omissions. Every user of the work will have remarked the relatively large number of instances in which the *lemmata* have no supporting quotations or the quotations support *lemmata* which have disappeared from the extant manuscripts. While it is possible that Nonius may have been a grossly careless compiler, it seems on the whole more likely that such discrepancies are the result of the loss of lines or parts of lines in the transmission of the text. May there not also have been omissions of a less obvious kind? Given the multiple obscurities in the history of the text tradition of Nonius, there is nothing inherently implausible in the supposition that there was a "Nonius auctus."

⁵⁸ W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901) 6.

The new fragments of Sallust, except two which I have relegated to a footnote as probable misquotations,⁵⁹ are given in the appendix to this article. Unfortunately they provide little evidence for a further determination of Perotti's sources, and none of a kind that is not more clearly exhibited by the quotations from Plautus, which I shall next consider. I content myself with observing that almost all of them could be placed under existing lemmata in Nonius, that some of them, as shown in the contexts, occur in juxtaposition to quotations which Perotti did obtain from Nonius, and that two of them (Nos. 6 and 10) illustrate definitions which in our text of Nonius (262.31 and 429.21) are not supported by any quotation.

VIII

PLAUTUS

Plautus was evidently one of the authorities to whom Perotti appealed by preference, and only Vergil, Cicero, and the elder Pliny are cited more frequently in the *Cornucopiae*. The quotations from Plautus are too numerous, and involve too many questions of detail, to be analyzed here, where I wish primarily to call attention to the quotations which cast some light on Perotti's sources. It seems clear, however — if I may generalize from material which I cannot exhibit here *in extenso* — that for Plautus, as for Sallust, Perotti depended heavily, if not exclusively, on secondary sources. Of a group of 428 quotations, it can be shown that 114, either because they are fragments not elsewhere preserved or because they show distinctive textual peculiarities, must have come from secondary sources, as follows: Nonius, 79; Paulus, 25; others (Servius, Gellius, Priscian, etc.), 10. Another 173 quotations, although they exhibit no textual peculiarities which would enable us to say that they either did or did not come directly from Plautine manuscripts, may have come from these same sources, *viz*: Nonius, 147; Paulus, 10; others, 16. Eight more of Perotti's quotations are found in Nonius, but the variations in text are too great to be explained by anything short of a text tradition of Nonius different from that which we know. Nine other quotations appear in Nonius, but Perotti has a few more words. There re-

⁵⁹ *Corn.* 13: "seque nobisque dignum est." Cf. *Iug.* 21.4: "ita seque illisque dignum esse." — *Corn.* 293: "arma deponere, praesidia de locis deducere." Cf. Sisen. 4.97 (ex Non. 289.14): "ab armis recedere, praesidia de locis deducere."

main, therefore, only 124 quotations — approximately 29 per cent of the total — for which no necessary or probable secondary source can be shown. These are distributed among the various plays in approximately the same proportions as those from secondary sources, so that, if we assume that Perotti used any of the plays of Plautus directly, we shall have to assume that he excerpted all of them; and on this assumption it would be difficult to account for his demonstrable dependence on secondary sources in almost *all* the cases where there are textual criteria, and for the extraordinary coincidence that so many quotations in which there are no textual peculiarities should appear both in Perotti and the secondary sources.

That Perotti took any particular pains to collate different texts of the same quotation may be doubted. The only clear instance of possible conflation that I have noticed is the surviving fragment of Plautus's *Agroecus*,⁶⁰ which is preserved both by Paulus (610, who has *clunes infractus fero*) and by Nonius (196, who has *clunes desertos gero*). Perotti (336), like most modern editors, combines the two versions to read *infractus gero*. On the other hand, Perotti seems to quote *Casina* 443 from three different sources without being aware of the discrepancies. Once (390) he takes the line from Nonius (145): "Retroversum caedam; imitabor nepam." Once (931) he transcribes Paulus (165), with the omission of the initial word: "<Recessim> dabo me ad parietem; imitabor nepam." And once (71) he has the normal reading, "Recessim cedam ad parietem." This last reading might have come either directly from a manuscript of Plautus, or, if the editors are correct in believing that the *retroversum* of Nonius is an intrusive gloss, from a less corrupt text of the *De compendiosa doctrina*.

Of the new fragments⁶¹ I give a selection, not of those which seem

⁶⁰ I cite the fragments of Plautus from the collection by Franciscus Winter, *Plauti fabularum deperditorum fragmenta* (Bonnae, 1885).

⁶¹ I believe all of these to be new, but I have used a rather strict standard in estimating the possibility that a fragment may be merely a misquotation. I should, for example, have included Perotti's quotation (315): "Sine iuxta aram sedeam, et dabo meliora consilia," had I not, more by chance than system, noticed that the quotation occurs in Servius, *ad Aen.* 9.4. Modern editors (e.g. Winter, 19) regard this as a misquotation of *Mostellaria* 1094 and 1104: "ego interim hanc aram occupabo . . . Tum consilia firmiora sunt de divinis locis"; and it therefore is not to be found in the indices. By the standards which I have used, the similarity is not great enough to be conclusive, and would not, therefore, exclude the line, if it were attested by Perotti only, from a place among the "new fragments."

most plausible, but of those which seem to contribute to a study of Perotti's sources.

I give first fifteen fragments which seem to me to come from some lexicographic work which has no apparent connection with the form of Nonius known to us. I call attention to the rare words *austrare*, *glareola*, and *connare*, of which only the first, so far as I have been able to discover, appears in the published glossaries. I should, perhaps, add that No. 9 was regarded as a genuine fragment of Plautus by Salomon Reinach, who believed that it was preserved only in the *Antiquarum lectionum commentarii* of Caelius Rhodiginus.⁶² It will also be observed that Perotti or his source misunderstood fragment No. 3 on the basis of the quotation from Terence which I have noted under it; in the fragment, *vices*, of course, means "adventures," and not, as Perotti supposes, "battles." This is perhaps some assurance that the fragment is not an *ad hoc* forgery.

I next include two fragments (Nos. 16 and 17) which also cannot be connected with Nonius, and are interesting because Perotti is following a source which for a space paralleled, if it was not identical with, that followed by Isidore of Seville, who also produces on the subject of foreign clothing an otherwise unattested quotation from Plautus that has been accepted as genuine by the editors. This quotation Perotti does not reproduce, but he gives us in exchange the two new fragments of Plautus. If, as seems likely, Isidore for the first part⁶³ of his discussion of exotic garb followed some author who used quotations from Plautus to document his descriptions, Perotti's quotations may come from this source or a derivative of it that is either lost or has escaped my search.⁶⁴

⁶² "Le tombeau d'Ovide," *RPh* 30 (1906) 284. Cf. note 13 above.

⁶³ Isidore evidently changed sources shortly after he completed the passage which I have cited under fragment 16, for he later describes *mastrucae* as a German garb, thus contradicting the earlier statement I have quoted.

⁶⁴ If, as is generally believed, Isidore's major source was, directly or indirectly, the treatise *De genere vestium* by Suetonius, it is, of course, possible that material was at some time taken from Suetonius to supplement the chapter "De genere vestimentorum" in Nonius. It should be noted, however, that such a procedure should have drawn attention to the discrepancies between some definitions in Nonius and the corresponding definitions in Suetonius, who would, presumably, have been cited by name; since Perotti shows no awareness of such conflict of authorities, it seems safe to infer that his source was not our hypothetical "Nonius auctus." It is interesting that a fragment of Suetonius' treatise (167 Reifferscheid) is preserved by the late author of the Vatican Glossary (*CGL* 5.215.4).

I next give a series of fragments (Nos. 18 to 34) which seem clearly to fit the text of Nonius. The first two of these, as appears from the passages from Nonius placed under them, fit what may be lacunae in Nonius, whose quotations do not support his lemmata. In the first instance, our text of Nonius, after defining *exterebrare* in terms which Perotti echoes, gives no example of the use of that verb, but merely an illustration of the use of the noun *terebra*. In the second, Nonius's lemma leads us to expect an illustration of the use of the noun *proventus*, but we are given only an example of *provenire*.

If we turn from these to No. 25, we approach evidence that is more than conjecture. In this fragment, as appears from the context given with it and the annexed passage from Nonius, Perotti begins by defining a meaning of *locare* in the same terms as Nonius, gives a new fragment of Plautus which is precisely the kind of illustration that we should expect to find in Nonius but do not find in our present text, and then gives the quotation illustrating the adjective *illocabilis*, which in our text of Nonius immediately follows the definition of *locare*. This relationship, it seems to me, makes it highly probable that Perotti was following a single source — in other words, a "Nonius auctus." We need not go on to ask whether the carelessness shown by the discrepancy between the lemma and the quotation in our present text of Nonius was that of the compiler or of some scribe who intervened between him and the archetype from which all our manuscripts descend. Perotti's manuscript must have belonged to a tradition in which the carelessness had been either avoided or repaired.

Equally clear, I think, is the evidence provided by the context to fragment No. 30. Here Perotti first takes from Nonius a quotation to illustrate *percrepare*, and next echoes Nonius's definition of one of the meanings of *crepare* ("queri vel dolere"). In Nonius this meaning is supported by two quotations, the second of which Perotti now quotes, after which he gives us the new fragment, and then closes his discussion of the word with the quotation which stands first in our text of Nonius — and any possibility of coincidence is eliminated by the fact that Perotti reproduces the corruption *mollitiem* (for *militiam*) which appears in our manuscripts of Nonius. It is highly improbable that Perotti would have taken the quotation from Plautus from another source and placed it be-

tween his two borrowings from Nonius. Whether or not the passage is genuine — and those who wish so to regard it may interpret the parallel passage from Sidonius, which I have placed under the fragment, as a paraphrase of Plautus — it is, I think, a fairly sure indication that Perotti possessed a work which we may describe as “Nonius auctus.”

Some evidence concerning the nature of this work is contained in fragments 28 and 29, in both of which Perotti produces quotations from Plautus which so closely parallel quotations from other writers in our extant text of Nonius that we cannot suppose them to be separate. Both of the quotations in our Nonius are corrupt and require surgical care from the editors; it may be that the corruption is the result of the fusion of what were two successive quotations in the original. On the other hand, fragment 28 will suggest an alternative explanation. The quotation from Lucilius printed below it has been variously mended by the editors, principally on the assumption that the fragment deals with Agamemnon who (on the basis of *Iliad* 1.31) is supposed to have sworn that Chryseis would not return a virgin to her father. Lindsay's suggested reading of the line is, “*primum Chrysi cum negat signatam gnatam reddere.*” However, a satirist is as likely to have parodied as to have followed the tradition of Homer, and whatever Lucilius may have written, it is significant that in one of the manuscripts of Nonius the last word in the line appears as *redire*. Is it not possible, therefore, that our hypothetical tradition of Nonius may have had some such reading as *Chrysi cum negat se signatam redire*? If so, what Perotti gives us as a fragment from Plautus was an interpretative gloss on that line.

I now offer a series of eleven fragments which suggest to me that Perotti used another source — a grammatical treatise comparable, perhaps, to Priscian. Fragments 35–38 occur in an article illustrating so simple a point of Latin grammar as the use of interrogative adjectives. Such a point would hardly have been treated in a lexicographic work, and it seems likely that Perotti is following a single source, since, had he compiled his examples himself, he need not have looked far in the standard writers. It will be noticed that there are five quotations from Plautus, only one of which comes from an extant play. I have included in the context a sufficient number of corrected quotations from other authors to suggest that

the grammarian, whoever he may have been, was not distinguished for meticulous accuracy. Fragments 39–42, which illustrate such matters as the ablative with *interest* and the declension of *ficus*, probably come from the same source, and Fragments 43–45, although less markedly associated with questions of elementary grammar, seem to belong here rather than with the earlier groups of fragments. There is, by the way, nothing inherently implausible in the hypothesis that Perotti, who at the age of eighteen made from a *vetustissimus codex* that is now lost one of the two extant copies of the surviving fragments of the otherwise unknown grammatical work of “Apuleius minor,”⁶⁵ may have had in his possession some work by one of the many minor grammarians who are now only shadows lost in the midnight of history.

Fragment 46 is the only instance I have thus far found of a “new fragment” which may fit a palimpsest text. Unfortunately, continuity between Perotti’s quotation and the mutilated text of the *Cistellaria* is far from clear or even convincing. It is, of course, greatly to be hoped that further investigation will discover a coincidence between some of Perotti’s quotations and a palimpsest text or other work not available during the Revival of Learning; but if we have correctly postulated the use of at least three sources, even such a striking confirmation would not constitute a guarantee of all the “new fragments,” for these, it seems to me, can be neither accepted nor rejected *en masse*.

IX

VERGIL

In conclusion we may remark that the 2,315 quotations from Vergil provide some slight additional evidence concerning Perotti’s methods.⁶⁶ A quite high degree of accuracy is indicated by the

⁶⁵ Cod. Vat. Urbin. 1180; cf. note 13 above. The two little tractates are conceded to be the work of some grammarian who lived after the barbarian invasions; even Madvig, in his polemic against Osann, the first editor, described them as “exiles sed non mendaces libelli” (*Opuscula academica* [Hauniae, 1834] 1.24). Incidentally I do not know whether it is more than a curious coincidence that the names of the two Latin writers of romance should have become attached to late grammatical writings. The short work entitled “Petronius Arbiter De antiquis dictionibus” was edited by Charles Beck in the *Memoirs of the American Academy*, N.S. 8 (1860) 1–26.

⁶⁶ The following is a concise analysis of Perotti’s quotations from Vergil. The notation “variants” indicates quotations which contain significant readings for which I find no precedent in the reported manuscripts or secondary sources.

fact that 2,284 of these quotations correspond to the text of Vergil (including minor works attributed to him), and of these only sixteen contain significant variant readings for which I can find no precedent either in the reported manuscripts⁶⁷ or in the secondary sources. It is significant that not even in his quotations from Vergil, whose three major works he presumably excerpted himself, is Perotti independent of Nonius, whose few peculiar readings he reproduces, and Servius, who occasionally reports, with some neutral remark such as "alii legunt," variant readings which Perotti seems almost invariably to have preferred to the text which Servius regarded as standard.

VERGIL		
Aeneid	1,515	
Aeneid (variants)	10	
Georgics	524	
Georgics (variants)	6	
Eclogues	217	
	<hr/>	
Total, major works		2,272
Copa	3	
Moretum	1	
	<hr/>	
Total, Appendix Vergiliana		4
Priapea	6	
Anth. Lat. 256	1	
Anth. Lat. 646	1	
	<hr/>	
Total, Pseudo-Vergiliana		8
Perotti's paraphrases		7
Conflated quotations		5
		<hr/>
Total, Vergil		2,296
NOT FROM VERGIL		
Lucan	8	
Ovid	4	
Statius	3	
Lucretius	1	
Donatus (prose)	1	
Unidentified (see note 68)	2	
	<hr/>	
Total, erroneous attributions		19
		<hr/>
Grand total		2,315

It may be of interest to indicate the portions of the major works from which the largest and smallest number of quotations are taken: *Aeneid*, Book I, 349; Book XII, 46. *Georgics*, Book III, 147; Book IV, 114. *Eclogues*, 3, 46; 4, 9.

⁶⁷ Including early editions.

Some of the sixteen variant readings already mentioned may indicate nothing more than that Perotti sometimes quoted a favorite author from a not infallible memory. Occasional reliance on memory is more clearly indicated by seven passages which are paraphrases rather than direct quotations, and five quotations which seem to be conflations of two or more passages rather than variant readings. Perotti's quotation, "vocabere tu quoque votis," for example, is most easily explained as the product of an imperfect recollection which blended two genuine and similar phrases, "vocabitur hic quoque votis" (*Aen.* 1.290) and "damnabis tu quoque votis" (*Buc.* 5.80). I have assumed that the line, "quandoquidem Ausonios non fas contingere portus," is compounded by a labile memory of two parts Vergil (*Aen.* 10.105 f. and 9.98) and one part Ovid (*Met.* 13.708). Although the comparative rarity of such *lapsus memoriae* is somewhat reassuring, the fact that they occur at all imposes a further caution in the consideration of each "new fragment."

Perotti gives only two quotations from Vergil which I have been unable to identify.⁶⁸ Both are patently imitated from familiar Vergilian lines, and probably belong to some late poet whom I failed to recognize.

APPENDIX: "NEW FRAGMENTS"

ENNIVS

1. (*Corn.* 654) Homoeoptoton, quod a nostris dicitur similiter cadens, cum diversae dictiones in similes exeunt casus. Ennius <*Ann.* 103 V.>: "Maerentes, flentes, lacrymantes, [et] <ac> miserantes." Idem:

neque currentem neque se cognoscit euntem
tollentemque manus saxumque immane moventem.

Cf. Diomed. 1.447.17 K.; Charis. 4.282 (Barwick); *Auct. ad Heren.* 4.12.18.

2. (*Corn.* 351) A Troia Tros derivatur . . . et Troianus . . . et Troicus . . . item Troiugena. Ennius:

Troiugenas bello claros.

Cf. Lucret. 1.465; vet. poët. ap. Liv. 25.12.5; Cat. 64.356.

⁶⁸ *Corn.* 457: Vbera cui dederint Gaetula in valle leaenae. (Cf. *Aen.* 4.367: Hyrcanaeque admôrunt ubera tigres.) *Corn.* 962: Mors hominum facilis dulcique simillima somno. (Cf. *Aen.* 6.522: dulcis et alta quies placidaque simillima morti; Cic. *Cat. M.* 81: videtis nihil esse morti tam simile quam somnum.)

3. (*Corn.* 328) Congenero, quod est associo, adiungo. Accius <580 Rib. ex Non. 84.30>: “<Quaeve †atgrafo> [hunc enim] tibi congenerat <gentium aut generum> affinitas,” et Ennius:

quem mihi congenerat affinitas.

Cf. Non. *loc. cit.*

4. (*Corn.* 1000) A pulcher fit pulchre . . . et pulchralis, pro pulchro. Enn.:

pulchralibus ludis.

et pulchritas pro pulchritudine. Caec. <54 Rib. ex Non. 155.18>: “Di boni, quid illud est pulchritatis?”

Cf. Paul. 281 L.: pulchralibus pro pulchris. Fest. 280 L.: pulchralibus atque †cupidus.

5. (*Corn.* 753) Poëtificus, quo usus est Ennius qui caballinum fontem

poëtificum

nominavit.

Cf. Pers. *Choliamb.* 1.

SALLUSTIUS

1. (*Corn.* 406) Convenio, quod proprie est congregor, coëo. Virg. <*Aen.* 1.361>: “Conveniunt, quibus aut odium crudele tyranni / aut metus acer erat.” Sallustius:

postquam unum in locum omnes convenere.

Cf. *Cat.* 6.2: Hi postquam in una moenia convenere.

2. (*Corn.* 517) Aliquando tamen bellum pro proelio ponitur. Sallustius:

in eo bello trecenti milites desiderati.

Cf. *Cat. Orig.* 1.27 (ex Non. 64): igitur tertio pedatu bellum nobis facere. — Cf. *Caes. B.G.* 7.51.4: eo die milites sunt paulo minus dcc desiderati.

3. (*Corn.* 518) Bonus quandoque pro magno accipitur, et bene pro valde. Sal.:

bona pars militum inde discesserat.

Cf. *Hor. S.* 1.1.161: Bona pars hominum decepta cupidine falso.

4. (*Corn.* 568) Onerariam Hippius Tyrius invenit, quae a gestandis oneribus dicta est, et ob id tarda, quemadmodum actuaria navicula celeritate praestans est, ita appellata quod facile agi possit. Sallust.:

his actuariae naves circiter triginta, decem onerariae erant.

Onerariam navim etiam corbitam nominant. Plaut. <*Poen.* 507 ex Non. 533.13>: "Tardiores quam corbitae sunt in tranquillo mari."

Cf. Caes. *B.C.* 1.34.2; *ibid.* 3.102.5; Sisenna, *Hist.* 3.39 Peter (ex Non. 536.3): quibus occisis acturias ad viginti naves, item complures onerarias incendunt.

5. (*Corn.* 599) Sterno . . . hinc prosternere fit, quod aliquando est in terram deicere . . . aliquando vincere, profligare, extinguere. Sallustius:

prostratisque militibus fugae se dedit.

Cf. *Bell. Af.* 23.2: subito eruptione facta, prostratos perterritosque Pompeianos in mare navesque passim compulerunt.

6. (*Corn.* 600) Consterno . . . quando vero est primae coniugationis, pro deicere duntaxat accipitur. Sallustius:

qua victoria elati hostes, nostri territi atque animis consternati, discessere.

Idem <*Hist.* 1.96 D. ex Prisc. 7.436 K.>: "Equi sine rectoribus exterriti aut saucii consternantur."

Cf. Caes. *B.G.* 7.70: sic sunt animo consternati homines. Nep. *Paus.* 2: qua victoria elatus, plurima miscere coepit et maiora concupiscere.

7. (*Corn.* 707) Per metaphoram tamen iacere aliquando accipitur pro eo quod est esse, extare. Virg. <*Georg.* 3.354>: "Sed iacet aggeribus niveis informis et alto / terra gelu." Sall.:

in medio campus iacet aquis undique scatens.

8. (*Corn.* 713) Quoad dicimus pro quousque. Sall.:

dummodo putetis vos tutos esse, quoad reliqua multitudo advenerit.

9. (*Corn.* 625) Remitto . . . Ab hoc remisse adverbium deducitur, quod modo humiliter significat, Sal.:

pauca timide remissequelocutus, abscessit

modo laete et veluti remisso, hoc est relaxato, animo.

10. (*Corn.* 836) Conscius . . . a quo fit conscientia, quae similiter de pluribus, modo de uno dicitur; de pluribus, Sall.:

tum scelerum suorum in primisque conspirationis conscientia solliciti, quo se verterent non videbant.

Cf. Sall. *Hist.* 2.87.D6 = II, x, 6 (e palimpsesto): cupere pacem sed conscientia noxarum metuere. *Ibid.* 1.77.7: homines omnium ordinum corruptissimi . . . scelerum conscientia exagitati.

11. (*Corn.* 302) Invado quoque proprie aggredior significat. Sall.: priusquam hosteis invaderet.

Cf. *Iug.* 51.3: signo dato hostis invadit.

12. (*Corn.* 721) Altum etiam vocamus profundiore[m] maris partem et a terris remotiore[m]. Sal.:

et piscatoria scapha in altum navigat.

Cf. *Iust.* 2.13.9: ubi cum solutum pontem hibernis tempestatibus offendisset, piscatoria scapha trepidus traiecit.

13. (*Corn.* 86) Neque enim verum est quod Servius <*Aen.* 9.6> affirmat, nemo idem significare quod nullus homo, nam si ita esset, non adiungeretur homo, ut saepe fit. Cicero <*Tusc.* 1.99>: "Vtrum autem sit melius, dii immortales sciunt, hominem quidem scire arbitror neminem." Sallustius:

quo nemo vir melior nec praestantior.

14. (*Corn.* 280) Per metaphoram effundere capitur pro emittere. Vir. <*Georg.* 3.104>: "Ruuntque effusi carcere currus." Item prosternere, profligare. Sal.:

effuso ac profligato peditatu paulatim retrocedere coeperunt.

15. (*Corn.* 278) Fundere . . . nonnunquam pro profligare. Sall.: bis fusos milites.

Cf. *Sall. Hist.* 1.961: scelestissimi hostes fusi.

16. (*Corn.* 292) Prodo, quod interdum est defero . . . nonnunquam trado. Sallu.:

ante quam arcem proderet hostibus.

17. (*Corn.* 879) Praevaleo, quod est antecello, et quasi in maiori pretio sum, aliquando etiam potentior sum. Plin. <?> Vtraeque in precio sunt, sed tamen praevalent margaritae. Sal.:

verum hostes tandem robore ac viribus praevaluerunt.

18. (*Corn.* 276) A plico . . . etiam circumplector. Sall.: cum montem undique circumplexus obsideret.

Cf. *Caes. B.G.* 7.83.2: erat . . . collis quem . . . circumplecti non potuerant nostri.

19. (*Corn.* 284) Circundo, circuo. Sall.:

circundatos militibus saltus mox occupavit.

Cf. *Sall. Hist.* 1.72: occupatusque collis editissimus apud Ilerdam et eum multa opera circumdata.

20. (*Corn.* 8) Traiicio, quod interdum est transporto. Sallustius:
iam omnem exercitum traiecerat.

Cf. *Caes. B.C.* 1.40: legiones quattuor equitatumque omnem transiecit.

21. (*Corn.* 626) Committere . . . quandoque initio, inchoo. Sall.:
quibus dictis mox proelium commisere.

Virg. <*Aen.* 5.113>: "Et tuba commissos medio canit aggere ludos."

Cf. *Sisen. Hist.* 3.26 (ex Non. 491.27): postquam sonu signorum proelium magno cum clamore virorum commissum est.

22. (*Corn.* 692) A pateo patesco, quod est aperior, patens fio; interdum etiam pro pateo accipitur. Pli.: Quinque ostiis patescit in mare. Sall.:

hinc late patescentibus campis exercitum tuto emittit.

Cf. *Liv.* 22.4.2: via interest perangusta . . . deinde paulo latior patescit campus.

23. (*Corn.* 151) Ab arma autem derivatur armo verbum, quod est armis instruo. Sall.:

armati fores obsidebant.

Virg. <*Aen.* 8.397>: "Tu[nc]<m> quoque fas nobis [Graios] <Teucros> armare fuisset."

Cf. *Sall. Hist.* 3.64: quo armati constitissent.

24. (*Corn.* 759) Desperati, qui nullam amplius salutis spem habent. Vnde vetus illud proverbium, non esse cum desperatis decertandum. Hinc et desperatio dicta. Sall.:

ne forte desperatione adducti vitae mortem praeferrent.

25. (*Corn.* 295) Subtendo, decipiendi gratia subdo aliquid aut machinor. Sall.:

dum subtendit insidias militi.

26. (*Corn.* 150) Congressus pro pugna accipitur. Sall.:
multi in eo congressu perierunt.

Cf. *Sall. Jug.* 59.3: ni pedites . . . magnam cladem in congressu facerent. *Caes. B.C.* 1.46.4: nostri in primo congressu circiter LXX ceciderunt.

27. (*Corn.* 868) Proruo, cum impetu feror . . . Irruo, eiusdem fere significationis. Sall.:

cum forte in eum irruerent, facile repulsi sunt.

28. (*Corn.* 216) Paludati dicuntur qui vel imperatoriam chlamydem vel alia eius ornamenta gestant. Cic. <*Ep. ad Caes. iun.*, 2.9 ex Non. 539.4>: "Antonius [g]<d>emens ante lucem paludatus." Sall.:

cum paludatus incederet, inire quamprimum proelium cogitavit.

29. (*Corn.* 29) Praefero . . . item antefero, quod et ipsum a fero compositum est. Sall.:

postquam hi, qui signa praeferebant, intellecto discrimine constitere.

Vnde "praefericulum" dictum <Paul. 293> "vas aëneum sine ansa patens <sumum>, veluti pelvis" quod praeferre in sacrificiis solebant.

Cf. Gell. 16.19.10: tum illum ibi pernicie intellecta . . . pecuniam dedisse . . .

30. (*Corn.* 108) Adverbia propere et properatim et properiter et, quo plerique utuntur, properanter. Sall.:

tum propere consul educit exercitum.

Caecil. <167 ex Non. 155.5>: "properatim in tenebris istuc confectum est opus."

Cf. Quadrigar. *Ann.* 2.35 (ex Non. 155.1): eo consules propere exercitum reducunt.

31. (*Corn.* 104) Consurgo, simul surgo. Sall.:

consurrexere omnes simulque in eum impetum fecerunt.

Cf. Caes. *B.C.* 3.37.5: subito illi ex insidiis consurrexerunt, sed nostri fortiter impetum eorum tulerunt.

PLAUTVS

1-2. (*Corn.* 324) A quaero fit quaerito, quod proprie de his dicitur qui quotidie inquirendo vix victum inveniunt. Teren. <*And.* 75>: "Lana ac tela victum quaeritans." Plau.:

quae inops et sordida quaeritando alit familiam.

Quaeritando, inquit, hoc est ostiatim victu quaerendo, quod mendaci faciunt, a quo rogatores etiam sunt dicti. Plau.:

ut rogator ostiatim petam panem.

Cf. Plaut. fab. incert. 59 Winter (e Serv. *Aen.* 3.539): paupera est haec mulier. Plaut. *Pseud.* 274: si familiam alere possim misericordia. — Cf. Mart. 4.30.13.

3. (*Corn.* 372) Praeterea a vi vices dictae, quod nomen veteres pro pugnīs usurpabant. Plautus:

vices eius memorat, et cicatrices denudat.

Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 482: neque pugnās narrat neque cicatrices suas ostentat. Varr. *L.L.* 9.112: suam inscientiam denudat.

4. (*Corn.* 373) Verno, quod est pullulo. Martialis <2.61.1>: "[D]<c>um tibi vernarent tenera lanugine malae," hoc est pullularent

et pilos emittere inciperent. Interdum per metaphoram pro cano accipitur. Plautus:

dum aviculae vernant,

quippe verno tempore omnia laetari videntur.

Cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.8: avis vernat. Apul. *Met.* 11.7: ut canorae etiam aviculae prolectatae verno vapore concentus suaves adsonarent. *CGL* 4.190.47: vernat, laetatur.

5. (*Corn.* 340) Ab austro australis dicitur . . . et austro verbum, quod est humecto. Plaut.:

austrati ad ignem sedent.

Cf. Osbern. *Thes. nov. Lat.* 41: auster . . . inde . . . et austrare ·i· humectare. *CGL* 4.209.28: austrare, humidum facere. *CGL* 2.27.32; 5.7.35; 5.442.16; 5.492.22.

6. (*Corn.* 458) Glarea vero minutissimos lapillos significat, qui in fluviorum ripis vel maris littoribus reperiuntur . . . a glarea glareola. Plau.:

glareolam manu effundens.

7. (*Corn.* 442) A turba fit turbella diminutivum. Plautus:

hanc mihi ancilla turbellam fecit.

Cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 1057: tantas turbellas facio. *Pseud.* 109: scis . . . quo pacto et quantas soleam turbellas dare.

8. (*Corn.* 520) A bellus fit belle adverbium, et aliud diminutivum bellulus, cuius adverbium est bellule. Plaut.:

nam nurus bellule se habebat.

Cf. Paul. 32: bellule apud Plautum diminutivum adverbium est a bene, quod facit belle et bellule. Apul. *Met.* 5.31: quod aetatem portat bellule, puer semper tibi videtur.

9. (*Corn.* 105) Radius dicitur virga philosophorum qua geometrae lineas indicant . . . et instrumentum est quo raduntur mensurae, quod alio nomine dicitur hostorium. Plau.:

Dii deaeque omnes tantam nobis laetitiam
tot gaudia sine radio cumuletis.

Cf. Forcellini s.v. "radius"; Salomon Reinach, *RPh* 30 (1906) 284.

10. (*Corn.* 375) Animadverto, quod est considero, intueor, et requirit accusativum sine praepositione. Plau.:

animadverto hominem subalbidum, tremulum.

Cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 143: nisi animum advortetis omnes. *Curc.* 160: anus tremula. *Men.* 854: barbatum tremulum Tithonum.

11. (*Corn.* 404) Animadverto . . . aliquando significat . . . punio, verbero, iram exerceo; nec eius duntaxat, qui in alterum ordinariam habet potestatem (ut Valla sensit), sed cuiuscunque. Plautus:

is, cum in herum animadvertisset gravior,

hoc est, iram convertisset, ideoque accusativum exigit cum praepositione in.

12-13. (*Corn.* 200-1) Nare . . . a quo fit frequentativum natrare . . . Connato, simul nato . . . Conno, simul nato, a quo connatio dicitur, sicut a connato connatio. Plaut.:

connationis nostrae conscius,

hoc est quod eandem adiremus mulierem. Idem:

connatat nobiscum,

hoc est, rivalis est.

14. (*Corn.* 270) Carnifex . . . ab hoc fit carnificinus.na.num, hoc est saevus et carnifice dignus. Cic. <*Pro Sest.* 65.135>: "Carnificina est ista <et> crudelitas." Carnificina etiam locus est publicus in quo, iussu magistratus, homines occiduntur. Plautus:

quid si desperatis rebus carnificinam petat.

Suetonius de Tyberio <*Tib.* 62.27>: "Carnificinae eius ostenditur locus . . . inesset." Est etiam carnificina officium ipsum carnificis. Plautus <*Cap.* 132>: "Vel carnificinam hunc facere possum perpeti."

15. (*Corn.* 961) Horror interdum tremorem significat. Plaut.:

quis hic horror est? quid pavitas?

16-17. (*Corn.* 208) Vestimenta . . . aliquando, quo a barbaris sumpta sint, barbara habent nomina, ut quae a Parthis sumpta sunt, sarabella dicuntur fluxae vestes et sinuosae; quae a Germanis, renones, vestes pelliceae quibus in castris utuntur; quae ab Hispanis, strigia. Plautus:

nudus est. iurat se triobolo strigium

oppignorasse.

quae a Sardis, mastrucaae. Idem:

mastrucatus et plenus pulvere.

Cf. *Poen.* 1310: tu . . . hallex viri . . . manstruca, halagora! *CGL* 5.631.42: strigium, genus vestimenti (cf. *ibid.* 515.55 & 610.11). *Ibid.* 5.464.58: mastruga, vestimentum ex pelle (cf. *ibid.* 4.114.43).

Cf. *Isid. Etym.* 19.23.1: Quibusdam autem nationibus sua cuique propria vestis est, ut Parthis sarabarae, Gallis linnae, Germanis renones, Hispanis stringes, Sardis mastrucaae. Sarabarae sunt fluxa ac sinuosa vestimenta . . . Linnae saga quadra et mollia sunt, de quibus Plautus <fab. incert. 78>: "Linna coopertus est tetrino Gallia."

18. (*Corn.* 228) Terebra . . . instrumentum ad perforandum a terendo dictum, a quo fit verbum terebro, quod est terendo perforo, et exterebro, quod est extorqueo et scrutor. Plau.:

exterebra prorsus et excute.

Cf. *Per.* 237: numquam hercle istuc exterebrabis. Non. 63.1: EXTEREBRARE est vi aliquid extorquere et scrutari aut curiosius quaerere. Plautus in *Astraba*, cum in curiosum iocaretur: "terebrā tu quidem pertundis."

19. (*Corn.* 406) Veteres tamen non solum bonarum rerum, sed etiam malarum proventum dici voluere. Plau.:

calamitatum et miseriarum tot proventus.

Cf. Non. 521.1: PROVENTVM etiam malarum rerum dici veteres voluerunt. Lucilius lib. XXVI: "denique adeo male me accipiunt decimae et proveniunt male."

20. (*Corn.* 763) Degulo verbum, quod est gulae trado. Plau.:

postquam degulato patrimonio pauper est factus.

21. (*Corn.* 332) Ponere proprie collocare est . . . interdum pro apponere. Martial. <3.45.5>: "Nolo mihi ponas rhombum mullumve bilibrem." Idem <2.37.1>: "Quicquid ponitur, hinc et inde verris." Plautus:

vafre facit, ponit vini plusculum, cras ei ut reponam
large ac liberaliter.

Cf. Sen. rhet. *Cont.* 2.1.35: tum Syriacus vafre fecit et belle respondit. Cic. *De or.* 2.24: plusculum negotii. Plaut. *Pers.* 37: mihi des nummos . . . quos continuo tibi reponam. Ps.-Plaut. *suppl. ad Bacch.* I.i.21: licet plusculum iacturae facere.

22. (*Corn.* 369) Semiviri dicuntur eunuchi, item molles atque effeminati; et evirati modo eunuchati, hoc est quibus amputata sunt virilia, modo lascivi, perditī, atque effeminati. Varro <275 ex Non. 46.12>: "<Spatula> eviravit omnes venerivaga pueros." Plau.:

adolescens eviratus ac mollis.

Cf. *Gloss.* 'Abstrusa' 12: eviratus, effeminatus <quia> effeminatorum nulla virilitas.

23. (*Corn.* 451) Infumo, sicco ad fumum . . . Plaut.:

atque hillas infumatas et sumen.

Hillas, hoc est farta intestina tenuissima; veteres enim hillas intestina tenuiora dixerunt, unde Bovillae oppidum vocitatum . . . quod eo vulnerata bos sua trahens intestina devenerit. Laberius <21 ex Non. 122.10>: "Neve aliter hunc p[ra]edicabis. Quomodo, video adulescenti nostro caedis hilla[s] <m>."

Cf. Non. 122.5: HILLAS intestina veteres dixerunt; unde Bohillae, oppidum in Italia, quod eo bos intestina vulnere trahens advenerit. Laberius: "lavite item hillam. cocus si lumbum adussit, flagris caeditur." Idem Catulario: "neve aliter [e.q.s.] . . ."

Cf. Hor. S. 2.4.60, et schol. *ad loc.*

24. (*Corn.* 334) Componere . . . pro fingo. Plautus:
 quas iste fabellas composuit.

Cf. Non. 257.30 sqq.

25. (*Corn.* 312) Loco . . . saepe etiam pro marito do. Plau.:
 filiam eius pupillam locavit.

A quo illocabilis dicitur quae tradi viro non potest. Plau. <*Aul.* 191 ex Non. 340.27>: "Virginem habeo grandem, dote cassam atque illocabilem."

Cf. *Aul.* 228: si filiam locassim meam tibi. Non. 340.25: LOCARE, marito dare. Plautus in *Aulularia*: "Virginem habeo [*e.q.s.*] . . ."

26. (*Corn.* 360) Catulire, verbum quod est gestire et coitum maris appetere. Plautus:

cum meam uxorem vidi catulientem.

Laberius <56 ex Non. 90.30> "catulientem lupam" scripsit coitus appetentem. Hinc catulio dicitur cum canes maritari quaerunt, quo tempore terra aperitur, ut Varro <*R.R.* 2.9.11> testatur. Plinius (*N.H.* 16.94): "Catulionem rustici vocant gestiente natura semina accipere . . ."

27. (*Corn.* 527-8) Signo, quod modo significat ostendo Plautus:
 hic meretricem deperit. signat tamen se eam
 non amare.

modo scribo, unde et subsignare subscribere dicimus, modo imprimo. Vergilius <*G.* 3.171 ex Non. 405.10>: "Et summo vestigia pulvere signent."

Cf. Non. *loc. cit.*

28. (*Corn.* 529) Signatam veteres virginem dixere, quasi insignem virginitate. Plau.:

negat se puellam domum signatam reversuram.

Cf. Non. 171.2: SIGNATAM virginem vetustas voluit dicere. Lucilius lib. XXIX: "primam † crisisum negat signatam † redere."

29. (*Corn.* 448) Item ab hoc solo solidum dicitur, quod modo significat continuum ac iuge. Plautus:

decem annos solidos erravit puer.

Cf. Non. 405.21: SOLIDVM, continuum, iuge. Varro *Sesquevulx*: "navibus duodecim † dum profectum decem annos solidos errasse."

30. (*Corn.* 449) A crepo deducitur . . . percrepo. Lucil. <621 Marx ex Non. 255.11>: "Percrepa pugnam Pompili, facta[m] Corneli cane." Aliquando tamen per metaphoram capitur pro conqueror vel

doleo. Idem <Lucret. 2.1168 ex Non. 255.19>: "Et crepat antiquum genus ut pietate repletum." Plau.:

qui crepat defunctum patrem.

Hor. <Carm. 1.18.5 ex Non. 255.17>: "Quis post vina gravem molliem aut pauperiem crepat?"

Cf. Sidon. *Carm.* 2.358: incertum crepat ille patrem, cum serva sit illi certa parens.

31. (*Corn.* 77) Incilare vero veteres dicebant increpare vel improbare. Accius <458 ex Non. 125.1>: "qui <non> me <spernens,> incilan[t]<s> probris, sermone indecoran[t]<s>." Plau.:

melius est tamen ita vivere ne quis nostra
incilet facta.

Cf. Acc. 41 (ex Non. 125.4): †matre meo† iure factum incilas.

32. (*Corn.* 932) Connitor, quod est simul nitor. Plautus:

conixique eam eripuerunt a praedonibus.

Nixurire vero usurpabant veteres pro eo quod est niti velle. Nig<idius Comm. gram. 40 ex Non. 144.19>: "Nixurit, qui niti vult et in conatu saepius aliqua re perpellitur."

Cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 29: si quidem conisus esses. Liv. 33.5.7: tres iuvenes conixi arborem unam evelebant.

33-34. (*Corn.* 1001) Comprimo, modo cohibeo, compesco. Plau.:

ne saevi, obsecro, comprime iracundiam.

Modo, vitio. Mart. <4.66.12-3>: "Villica vel duri compressa est nupta coloni / incaluit quoties saucia vena mero." Vnde compressus pro coitu accipitur. Plau. <*Truc.* 497-8 ex Non. 457.22>: "Nunc ad amicam decimo [die] <mense> Athenas <Atticas> viso, quam gravidam hic reliqui <meo> compressu [meo], quid ea agat." Compressio etiam in eadem significatione accipitur, a quo fit diminutivum compressiuncula. Idem:

dulces amantium compressiunculae.

Cf. Plaut. *Truc.* 262: comprime, sis, iram. Ter. *And.* 868: ah, ne saevi tanto opere! Plaut. *Pseud.* 66: compressiones artae amantum comparum. *Ibid.* 68: papillarum horridularum oppressiunculae.

35-38. (*Corn.* 317) QVAE GENS. Interrogantis est; qui enim quae, quod, vel aliquid, aliquando interrogative ponuntur . . . Apuleius: quinam hic novus est hospes . . . Plaut.:

quod facinus admisi tantum?

Idem <*Mil.* 669>: "Quid ad illas arteis opt[es]<†issi>, si optio [ad]-<e> veniat tibi?" Aliquando indefinite. Plin.: tum mihi nescio quod in aurem insusurravit . . . Plaut.:

nec mihi quod facinus conscirem inveni.

. . . Nonnunquam quis ponitur pro aliquis. Cic. <*Pro Sest.* 31>: "[Si] <ne> quis <forte> vestrum [est qui forte] miretur." Plaut.:

si quem servorum domi habes.

Nam qui pro aliquis in nominativo casu raro praeterquam apud vetustissimos invenitur. Cicero <*De inv.* 1.22>: "Si <. . .> quae [sunt] in <stent> [hac re] difficultates <proferemus>." Etenim in singulari non quae, sed qua pro aliqua dicimus. Martialis <5.19.1>: "Si qua fides veri, praeferrī, maxime Caesar, temporibus possunt saecula nulla tuis." Plautus:

si quod post hoc verbum fecero.

Virg. <*Aen.* 4.383>: "Spero equidem mediis, si quid pia numina possunt, / supplicia hausurum scopulis."

Cf. *Men.* 712: quid tandem admisi in me? *Stich.* 397: sat servorum habeo domi. *Mil.* 1252: si quid fecero.

39. (*Corn.* 323) Quamlibet et quantumlibet et quamvis, eiusdem plane significationis. Plau.:

impudica mulier quamlibet magnum facinus
audet.

40. (*Corn.* 267) Facere . . . pro coire. Martialis <1.46.1>: "Cum dicis 'propero, fac, si facis,' Hedyle, languet." Plaut.:

mavult ancillae facere quam liberae,

hoc est, mavult cum ancilla coire quam cum libera.

Cf. *Asin.* 184: volt placere sese amicae, volt mihi, volt pedisequae, volt famulis, volt etiam ancillis.

41. (*Corn.* 47) Dicimus enim mea interest, hoc est mea in re . . . Interdumque separatim ponuntur . . . Plautus <*Pseud.* 253>: "Si <n> tuam est quippiam in rem," hoc est, si tua interest. Idem:

utrum veniat necne, nihil in re est mea.

42. (*Corn.* 980) Quod ficus quartae declinationis sit quando fructum significat, manifestum est. De arbore, Cicero <*De or.* 2.278>: "Vxorem suam suspendisse se de ficu." De fructu, Plautus:

ficus nobis attulit duricorias praecoces.

Cf. Macrobius *Sat.* 3.20.1: Cloatius . . . sic enim diversas ficos diligentiae suae more dinumerat: Africa, albula, . . . cucurbitiva, duricoria, Herculanea . . .

43. (*Corn.* 337) Colimus nos, colimus faciem, colimus orationem, id est excolimus atque ornamus. Plau.:

quin tu te colis ante quam ex eas domum?

Cf. Ov. *A.A.* 3.225: tu quoque dum coleris.

44. (*Corn.* 321) Est autem quiesco aliquando dormio, aliquando sto, non moveor, aliquando curis vaco, quod si addatur accusativus est quiescere facio. Plautus:

quiesce tumultum hunc, qui est ante ostium.

Cf. *Serv. Buc.* 8.4: quiesco enim duplicem habet significationem, at aliter dico "quiesco ego," aliter "quiesco servum," id est quiescere facio.

45. (*Corn.* 898) Sitis proprie est bibendi appetitus, a quo fit sitio verbum; ponitur tamen pro nimia aviditate cuiuscunque rei. Plautus:

cupio te amplecti, neque aliter sitim iamdiu
conceptam sedare possum.

Iustinus <1.8.13>: "'Satia te,' inquit, 'sanguine, quem sitisti, cuiusque insatiabilis semper fuisti.'"

Cf. *Ov. Remed.* 246-7: inferet arma tibi saeva rebellis Amor: . . . avidus sitiensque redibis. *Ibid.* 533: explenda est sitis ista tibi, qua perditus ardes.

46. (*Corn.* 9) Iniicio, intro iacio. Plautus:

ante quam haec in domum iniicias.

Cf. *Cist.* 340-1: * * * * * niçiaş, malum aufer. Bonum mihi opus est.