

XX.—The First Medicean MS of Tacitus and the Titulature of Ancient Books

REVILO P. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

I

It is generally agreed that the First Medicean manuscript of Tacitus, the unique source of the text of the first six books of the work that we call *Annales*, was copied in the Ninth Century from a manuscript in minuscules which had been copied from a manuscript in rustic capitals.¹ It appears, however, that one bit of evidence

¹ See the prefaces of Rostagno and Lenchantin De Gubernatis, the introduction to Fuchs' *apparatus criticus*, and the works therein cited. To reduce the number and bulk of my footnotes, I here list all works which I have occasion to cite more than once (so that the abbreviation *op. cit.* will invariably be a reference to this note) and certain other works, including my sources of information concerning the papyri and codices which I mention in this article. In footnotes the dates of papyri and codices, when expressed in terms of centuries of the Christian era, are indicated by Roman numerals within parentheses.

TACITVS

Codex Laurentianus Mediceus 68 phototypice editus; praefatus est Henricus Rostagno (Lugduni Batavorum 1902).

Libri ab excessu Divi Augusti I–VI; Maximus Lenchantin De Gubernatis recensuit (Romae 1940).

Annalium ab excessu Divi Augusti quae supersunt; edidit Harald Fuchs (Frauenfeldae [1946–49]).

PAPYRI

The Herculean papyri have been consulted principally in the Neapolitan collections: *Herculaneensium voluminum quae supersunt* (1793–1855), *Collectio altera* (1862–76), and *Collectio tertia*, I (Milano 1914); the Oxonian rolls in *Herculaneensium voluminum pars prima* (Oxonii 1824) and *secunda* (1825); also *Fragmenta Herculaneensia*, edited by Walter Scott (Oxford 1885). Other collections of papyri are cited by the sigla in current use. Certain papyri are best known by their contents, and I have accordingly so designated them, as follows:

Callimachus: *Διηγῆσεις δι' ποιητῶν δι' Καλλίμαχον*, a cura di M. Norsa e G. Vitelli (Firenze 1934).

Carmen de bello Actiaco: Poëmatīs Latīni rell. ex vol. Herculaneēsi evulgatas edidit Ioannes Ferrara (Papiae 1908). (Good facsimiles, including some not published elsewhere, but the editor's conclusions concerning the composition of the poem are too fantastic to require comment.)

Didymus: *Kommentar zu Demosthenes*, ed. H. Diels, W. Schubart (Berlin 1904).

Eudoxus: *Ars astronomica* qualis in charta Aegyptiaca superest denuo edita a Friderico Blass (Kiliae 1887).

Herodas: *Facsimile of Papyrus CXXXV in the British Museum* (London 1892).

which both confirms the latter conclusion and provides a means of assigning an approximate date to the hyparchetype has hitherto been overlooked. I refer to the curious and consistent error in the titlature of the First Medicean which shows that the scribe who produced this manuscript, presumably misled by his exemplar,

Hierocles: *Ethische Elementarlehre*, ed. H. von Arnim (Berlin 1906).

Hyperides: "Περὶ δὲ λόγῳ Β", edited by the Rev. Churchill Babington (Cambridge 1853). *Orationes sex*, edidit Christianus Jensen (Lipsiae 1917).

Isocrates: *Papyrus Massiliensis*, ed. H. Keil, *Hermes* 19 (1884) 596-643.

Livy (epitome): *POxy.* 668. *T. Livi Periochae*; edidit Otto Rossbach (Lipsiae 1910).

Menander (Codex Cairensis): *Reliquiae in papyris et membranis servatae*; edidit Christianus Jensen (Berolini 1929). *Quae supersunt*; tertium edidit Alfredus Koerte (Lipsiae 1938).

Nonnus: ed. W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Epische und elegische Fragmente* (Berlin 1907).

Sosylus: ed. U. Wilcken, *Hermes* 41 (1906) 103-141.

Theocritus: *Two Theocritus Papyri*, ed. A. S. Hunt and J. Johnson (London 1930).

CODICES

Cicero, palimpsest of *De republica*: ed. Albert W. Van Buren, *Supplementary Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome*, II (New York 1908) 84-262. *De republica*; recognovit K. Ziegler (Lipsiae 1915).

—, palimpsest of *In Verrem: Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum tomus II*, curante Angelo Maio (Romae 1828).

—, Turin and Ambrosian palimpsests of orations: *Orationum Pro Scauro, Pro Tullio, et In Clodium fragmenta inedita*, composuit Amedeus Peyron (Stuttgardiae 1824).

Dioscurides: *Codex Aniciae Iulianae* phototypice editus, moderante Josepho de Karabacek (Lugduni Batavorum 1906).

Fronto (both palimpsests): *Epistulae*; recensuit S. A. Naber (Lipsiae 1867).

Homer: *Iliadis pictae Ambrosiana* phototypice edita curā Ant. M. Ceriani et Ach. Ratti (Mediolani 1905).

Livy, Vatican palimpsest: *Historiarum libri XCI fragmentum ἀνέκδοτον* descriptum a Vito M. Giovenazzio, Paullo Iac. Bruns (Romae 1773).

—, *Ab Vrbe condita lib. III-VI* quae supersunt in codice rescripto Veronensi; edidit Th. Mommsen (Berolini 1868).

—, Puteanus: H. Omont, *Histoire romaine de Tite-Live*, reproduction réduite du manuscrit en onciale, Latin 5730 (Paris 1907).

—, *Codex Vindobonensis Lat. 15* phototypice editus; praefatus est Carolus Wessely (Lugduni Batavorum 1907).

Lucan, Neapolitan palimpsest: ed. D. Detlefsen, *Philologus* 13 (1858) 313-357; 26 (1867) 173-184. Ed. Josef Bick, *Wiener Palimpseste* (= *SBWien* 159 [1908] No. 7), 3-27.

—, Vatican palimpsest: ed. D. Detlefsen, *Philologus* 15 (1860) 526-538; cf. C. M. Francken, "De Lucani rescripto Romano," *Mnemosyne*, N.S. 22 (1894) 46-54.

Plautus: *Codex Palatinus C* phototypice editus; praefatus est C. Zangemeister (Lugduni Batavorum 1900).

Prudentius: ed. J. Bergman, *CSEL* 61 (1926).

Scholia Bobiensia: ed. Paulus Hildebrandt (Lipsiae 1907).

Seneca, *De vita patris: M. Tulli Ciceronis orationum Pro M. Fonteio et Pro C. Rabirio fragmenta*, edidit B. G. Niebuhr (Romae 1820).

mistook the title of Tacitus' work for a part of the text. I here quote *literatim* all titles and subscriptions in the manuscript which are the work of the original scribe.² His normal hand, a pre-Carolingian script which he is changing to Carolingian minuscule, is here represented by the normal font of type; the scribe also employs on occasion (a) small plain majuscules, a Ninth-Century derivative of rustic capitals, here represented by SMALL CAPITALS, (b) a more

Servius et al.: *Codex Bernensis 363* phototypice editus; praefatus est Hermannus Hagen (Lugduni Batavorum 1897).

Terence, Bembinus: *Comoediae*; edidit Franciscus Umpfenbach (Berolini 1870); cf. R. Krauer, "Zum Bembinus des Terenz," *WS* 20 (1898) 252-276.

—, *Codex Ambrosianus H.75 inf.* phototypice editus; praefatus est E. Bethe (Lugduni Batavorum 1903).

Virgil, *schedae Fulvianae: Fragmenta et picturae Vergiliana codicis Vatic. 3225* phototypice expressa [ed. F. Ehrle] (Romae 1899).

—, *Codicis Vergiliani qui Augusteus appellatur reliquiae* quam simillime expressae; praefatus est Remigius Sabbadini (Augustae Taurinorum 1926).

—, Veronese palimpsest: O. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena critica ad P. Vergili Maronis opera maiora* (Lipsiae 1866). *Opera*, recensuit Otto Ribbeck (Lipsiae 1859-62).

—, Sangallensis: *ibidem*.

—, *Codex Vergilianus qui Palatinus appellatur* quam simillime expressus; praefatus est Remigius Sabbadini (Parisiis 1929).

—, *Picturae, ornamenta, complura scripturae specimina codicis Vaticani 3867 qui Codex Vergilii Romanus audit* phototypice expressa [ed. F. Ehrle] (Romae 1902).

—, *Vergili Medicei simillimum* [praefatus est Henricus Rostagno] (Romae 1931).

—, Bernensis 184: Ribbeck, *op. cit. supra*.

STUDIES

G. Andresen, *De codicibus Mediceis Annalium Taciti* (Berlin 1892).

Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* (Berlin 1882).

A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford 1918).

V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie: I. Das Buchwesen im Altertum und im byzantinischen Mittelalter*, 2. Auf. (Leipzig 1911).

F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 2d ed. (Oxford 1951).

E. A. Lowe, "Some Facts About our Oldest Latin Manuscripts," *CQ* 19 (1925) 197-208; 22 (1928) 43-62. (Cited as "Facts.")

—, *Codices Latini antiquiores*, Vols. I-V (Oxford 1934-50).

J. Mallon, "Quel est le plus ancien exemple connu d'un manuscrit latin en forme de codex?" *Emerita* 17 (1949) 1-8.

R. P. Robinson, *The Germania of Tacitus*, a Critical Edition (Middletown, Connecticut 1935).

W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* (Berlin 1921).

B. L. Ullman, *Ancient Writing and Its Influence* (New York 1932).

C. Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des Vorderen Orients* (Halle 1949).

² I therefore omit (a) the words P. CORNELII written in tiny capitals at the extreme upper edge of f. 2^r by a hand which is "procul dubio recentior" (Rostagno, p. vii; cf. W. Studemund, *Hermes* 8 [1874] 232 f.); to this a Humanistic hand added TACITI; (b) the insertion on f. 61^v which I mention below.

ornamental form of these letters with decorative shading and some uncial elements, but not taller than the normal line of writing, here represented by FULL CAPITALS, and (c) much larger and heavier capitals of essentially rustic form which I have distinguished by the use of boldface type.

2^r]

ABEXCESSV DIVI AVG·VRBEM ROMAM APRINCIPIO RE
GES HABVERE·LIBERTATEM ETCONSVLATVM·L·brutus
Instituit·dictaturae adtempus sumebantur· *e.q.s.*

31^v]

FINIT P[RO]CORNELI[O]· LIB· I·
INCI PIT LIBER · II·

Ab excessu diui augusti·sisennastatilio tauro·L·libone
cōs mota orientis regna; prouinciaeq; romanae; *e.q.s.*

61^v]

FINIT LIBER · II·
INCIPIT LIBER · III· FELICITER

62^r]

Ab excessu diui augusti·Nihil intermissa nauigati
one hiberni maris agrippina corcyram insulā *e.q.s.*

89^r]

·P·CORNELI LIBER · III· FINIT
INCIPIT LIBER · IIII:—

ABEXCESSV DIVI AVGVSTI·
·G·asino·c·antistio·cōs·nonustiberio annus erat *e.q.s.*

115^v]

FINIT LIBER IIII·
INCI PIT LIBER · V·

Ab excessu diui augusti·rubellio & fufio·cōs·quo
rum utriq; geminus cognom̄tum erat·iulia *e.q.s.*

It will be seen at once that the scribe certainly did not understand that *Ab excessu Divi Augusti* was the title of the work that he was copying, for he has everywhere treated it as an integral part of a text which he evidently made no effort to construe. Even at the beginning of Book IV, where these words appear on a separate line, they are so definitely related to the text, not to the title, that our first impulse is to assume that they owe their isolation to

the caprice of a scribe who began to write the first line of the book in capitals and then desisted, although it is equally possible that he intended this half line to reproduce some peculiarity that he found in his exemplar at this point but not elsewhere. Certainly, if he then had any vague perception that the words did not precisely fit into the context of the first sentence, he forgot his suspicions by the time that he reached Book V.

This curious error must, it seems to me, be explained in the same way that we should explain a dislocation or other major error in the text itself, that is, by seeking an explanation in the history of the text tradition so far as we can reconstruct it. Our problem, then, is to find the position in that tradition at which a mistake of this sort might have been made naturally and, as it were, innocently.

It will, I think, be conceded that such an error could have occurred naturally only in the process of copying from an exemplar in which the subscriptions were: (a) written in the same hand and style as the text, and (b) not so clearly worded as to preclude the possibility of misunderstanding.

Since students of the text are agreed that numerous errors in transcription show that a manuscript in Insular minuscules intervened between our codex and the hyparchetype in rustic capitals,³ and since in the construction of hypotheses it is well to remember the barbarous but sound dictum of the Scholastics, *entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*, the first condition that we have posited almost automatically leads us to the inference that the error was made in transcription from the hyparchetype in rustic capitals, since manuscripts in that hand have subscriptions that are invariably in the same style, and often in the same size, of letter

³ So far as I know, the editors have found in the text no definite trace of a possible intermediary in uncials or antecedent in cursive majuscules, but, with all respect to them, we must add that the text of the major works of Tacitus has never been subjected to the profound scrutiny and subtle palaeographic analysis which the late Rodney P. Robinson applied to the minor works in the prolegomenon to his brilliant critical edition of the *Germania*. If the antecedents of the First Medicean were the same as those of the Ninth-Century manuscript of the minor works, the archetype was in Raetian, not Insular, script, and had been copied from a codex in uncials which had two columns on a page with an average of thirteen letters per line, which was probably itself a copy of a manuscript in cursive majuscules of the late Second or early Third Century. The essentials of the argument which I here present could, *mutatis mutandis*, be adapted to such a lineage: colophons of what I shall call the "first stage" would naturally accompany the cursive majuscules, and the uncial transcript could have been similar to the palimpsest of Fronto cited on page 257 below. This would, however, destroy the basis for the argument which I present in § III of this article.

as the text.⁴ And furthermore, since the likelihood of the error increases with every increase of similarity between title and text, and reaches its maximum in a situation in which the words AB EXCESSV DIVI AVGVSTI written in the normal hand of the text would occupy one or two lines of the same width as a normal line of text, there is some presumption that the hyparchetype came from the early period in which prose texts were normally written in comparatively large letters and very narrow columns. The most familiar example of such columnar arrangement, perhaps, is the famous palimpsest of Cicero's *De republica*, now assigned to the Fourth or Fifth Century, in which the lines contain from ten to thirteen letters. An even more apposite example is the Ambrosian palimpsest of the *Pro Scauro* and other Ciceronian orations, which cannot be later than the Fifth Century, in which the narrow columns have an average of twelve rustic capitals in each line. Such columns were so commonly used for prose texts in the early codices, whether written in rustic capitals or in uncials, that it has recently been argued with great cogency that in Latin the term *literae unciales* does not refer at all to the peculiar shape of the characters which we call uncials, but rather to this columnar arrangement of texts in which a single capital or uncial letter was *uncialis* because it occupied one-twelfth of a standard line.⁵ In such a manuscript AB EXCESSV DIVI AVGVSTI could have occupied two full lines not conspicuously different in length from a normal line of text. It is true, however, that lines tended to become longer during the Fifth Century,⁶ for the Turin palimpsest of the *Pro Scauro* etc. averages

⁴ The alternative, of course, is to assume an intermediary similar to the Bernensis 363 (saec. X) containing Servius et al. in which subscriptions are crowded into the sprawling lines of a slovenly text, but, aside from the obvious methodological objection to such an assumption, we must remember that Tacitus was very seldom copied. E. A. Lowe, "The Unique Manuscript of Tacitus' Histories," *Casinensia* (Montecassino 1929) I, 257-272, has found indications that the Second Medicean was copied in the Eleventh Century directly from a rustic-capital manuscript of the Fifth Century or earlier. This would mean that this part of Tacitus was transcribed but once in about ten centuries, but it now appears that we may expect evidence to show that there was a transcription other than the Second Medicean; see C. W. Mendell and S. A. Ives, "Ryck's Manuscript of Tacitus," *AJP* 72 (1951) 337-345. Cf. below, note 88.

⁵ William H. P. Hatch, "The Origin and Meaning of the Term 'Uncial,'" *CP* 30 (1935) 247-254.

⁶ Lines were also longer in what we may call the "pre-uncial" period. A luxurious roll of Sallust in rustic capitals of probably the Second Century (*PRyl.* 473) has 18-22 letters per line. It may, of course, be assumed that the "uncial" line was standard only in work of calligraphic pretensions, and that cheaper manuscripts, even if written in narrow columns, had smaller letters and hence more letters per line.

eighteen capitals to the line, and the oldest codices of Livy all show longer lines: the Veronese palimpsest averages eighteen letters per line, the Puteanus has 14-21, and the smaller hand of the Vindobonensis produces lines of 25-29 letters. Since the condition that we have postulated requires lines of either 10-12 or 20-24 letters in the hyparchetype, we cannot infer from it a date for that hyparchetype more precise than that implicit in the original inference that it was written in rustic capitals. We must, therefore, turn to the second point in our hypothesis.

This second point, it will be recalled, was that the hyparchetype cannot have had colophons which were couched in the standard formulaic style. This is the more important point of the two, for unless we wish to impute an active and almost malevolent perversity to the scribe, we cannot suppose that he could have failed to recognize the title of his text, whatever the script in which it was written, had the exemplar before him contained formulaic subscriptions of the kind that we find, for example, in the three ancient manuscripts of Livy that we have just mentioned. A typical subscription in the Puteanus is

TITI· LIUII
ABURBE CONDITA
LIBER XXU
EXPLIC INCIPIT
LIBER XXUI
FELICITER

The Vindobonensis has equally clear colophons, e.g.,

TITI LIUI
ABURBECONDITA
LIB·XLIH EXPLICIT
INC·LIB· XLIH
FELICITER

The Veronese palimpsest has exactly the same formula minus *feliciter*, and most of our early manuscripts of other authors employ comparable formulae, which make misunderstanding impossible for even the dullest wit and most negligent eye.

It follows, therefore, that the hyparchetype of the Medicean manuscript must have had titles of a quite different form. They must have contained uniformly the words *Ab excessu Divi Augusti*

and the number of the book, but they may have contained nothing more. In fact, if we examine the colophons in the Medicean manuscript closely, we find conclusive internal evidence that they cannot have come from the hyparchetype. First of all, *feliciter* is an obvious intrusion, an addition made by a scribe who felt that the colophon should be "regularized," but did not recognize the title in the words before which he placed it. Another intrusion is the name of the author; that it formed no part of the titulature in the hyparchetype may be inferred from three indications: (a) the scribe of the Medicean apparently found it in only two colophons, (b) it is incomplete, since it omits *Taciti*,⁷ and (c) a colophon containing the author's name would have placed the title of the work immediately after that name and before the word *liber*, as in the colophons from Livy that I have quoted above. We can even see how the author's name was inserted in the colophons as part of a process of regularization which, as a matter of fact, went on even after our Medicean manuscript was completed, for on f. 61^v a distinctly later hand, ignored in my transcription above, has added P. CORNELY to the first line of the subscription. It is highly probable that analogous additions had been made to the minuscule exemplar that our scribe had before him, for in the first colophon, as may be seen from the spacing and the clear traces of the letters which he erased, he first wrote PRO CORNELIO, and this error strongly suggests that in his exemplar the name had been inserted in the colophon in a small minuscule hand in which an initial *p* might resemble a compendium for *pro*. And finally, the words *incipit* and *finit* may be no older than *feliciter*, for the presence of the relatively unusual substitute for *explicit* in a manuscript is usually taken to be an indication of Insular origin or influence and of a date not earlier than the Eighth Century; and although the generalization must be qualified by such numerous exceptions that the form *finit* is not in itself a reliable mark of date or origin,⁸ the preponderance of that

⁷ Tacitus' cognomen, necessary to distinguish him clearly from Nepos and the other literary Cornelli, is used by almost all of the few ancient writers who refer to him. The *testimonia* are most conveniently collected by C. Pascal in an appendix to Annibaldi's edition of the *Agricola* (Augustae Taurinorum [1917]). On Cassiodorus' reference to Tacitus as *quidam Cornelius*, see E. Cornelius, *Quomodo Tacitus . . . in hominum memoria versatus sit usque ad renascentes literas . . .* (Wetzlar 1888).

⁸ See W. M. Lindsay's notes in *Palaeographia Latina* 2 (1923) 5-10; 4 (1925) 83 f. To the list of exceptions there given, add, as manuscripts which have both *finit* and *explicit*, the Fifth-Century manuscript in quarter-uncials described by Lowe, *Codices*, §397a; cf. §331. Note also that the form *finitus* appears regularly in the subscriptions

form in Insular manuscripts is such that when we find it in a manuscript which has on other grounds been shown to be a copy made from an exemplar in Insular script, we may recognize a probability that the *finis* is the work of the Insular scribe.

Our problem, then, is to determine whether titles of the very simple type that we have posited for the hyparchetype of our manuscript are to be regarded as a scribal eccentricity, to which no date could be assigned, or as representative of a style that was normal in some stage in the evolution of the Latin book, and can thus be situated within more or less precise chronological limits.

Since there appears to be no separate study of the development of the colophon, which, indeed, is generally ignored in discussions of the date and filiation of manuscripts,⁹ and since the form of titlature is only incidentally mentioned in the standard works on the *Buchwesen* of antiquity,¹⁰ we are obliged to trace for ourselves an *ébauche* of the history of titlature in ancient books.¹¹ The following survey, which does not pretend to be exhaustive and is limited to the elements pertinent to the problem presented by our Tacitean manuscript, is based on an examination of the principal published collections of papyri and inspection of early codices available in facsimile or diplomatic editions. I have restricted the inquiry to purely literary works, excluding all private or official documents as irrelevant, and all magical or religious books as possibly misleading, since there is definite evidence that in some details, at least, Christian books differed in format from works of pagan literature in the early centuries of the present era.¹² I have, finally, excluded a considerable amount of material so fragmentary or ambiguous that it could serve only for conjectures, not conclusions.

of one of the most venerable codices, the Bembine Terence, which may belong to the Fourth Century. See also Lowe, "Facts," 60.

⁹ I refer, of course, to the formal subscriptions themselves, not to the frequently-found notes which record the name of a scribe or reviser of the text. The only instance of the use of the form of a colophon as a criterion of date known to me is Remigio Sabbadini's article, "Il codice Vaticano Palatino 1631," *Historia* 4 (1927) 57-67, in which he refers to it as "un indizio al quale nessuno ha badato." He makes no attempt, however, to construct a history of colophonic form.

¹⁰ Birt, Gardthausen, Schubart, Kenyon, and Wendel, all cited in note 1.

¹¹ That is, the entries made on the books themselves. The possible variation in the form of titles cited by ancient authors is quite another question, on which see L. W. Daly, "The Entitulature of Pre-Ciceronian Writings," *Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather* (Urbana, Illinois 1943) 20-38.

¹² Kenyon, *op. cit.* 96-111.

II

We possess no evidence for the form of titulature in Latin books earlier than the great vellum codices in rustic capitals, for the exiguous fragments of earlier texts do not include, so far as I know, a single example of a title or subscription. Our inquiry, therefore, will necessarily be dependent on the hypothesis that the form of the Latin book was the same as that of the Greek book. This hypothesis is, indeed, one that is taken for granted in all references to the subject known to me, appears reasonable *per se*, and can be supported by a wide variety of considerations ranging from Suetonius's generally accepted statement that systematic editing and propagation of literary texts began at Rome in 169 B.C. under the influence of Crates Mallotes,¹³ to the obvious dependence of Latin literature on Greek models. Before proceeding on this hypothesis, however, we must note that it is more precarious than might at first sight be supposed. We do know that in one important respect Latin books in the Augustan Age and the First Century differed markedly from Greek books. The surviving specimens of Latin books of this period are pathetically meager and mutilated — for practical purposes they are a fragment of a papyrus roll of 21–14 B.C. which contained the second book of the *Secunda actio in Verrem*,¹⁴ the remains of the *Carmen de bello Actiaco* found in Herculaneum,¹⁵ and the historical fragment *De bellis Macedonicis* which is also the earliest vestige of a vellum codex (c. 100 A.D.)¹⁶ — but these by the unanimity of their testimony¹⁷ suffice to show that Latin literary texts were written with careful and elaborate punctuation: words were separated by spaces containing *interpuncta*, clauses set off by two forms of *virgulae* corresponding roughly to our comma and semicolon, sentences terminated by a stronger mark of punctuation, and long vowels distinguished by *apices* and *I-longae* wherever necessary to facilitate comprehension of the text. This procedure

¹³ *De gram. et rhet.* 2.

¹⁴ *Pland.* 90.

¹⁵ Whose testimony is supported by the fact that *interpuncta* can be discerned on the virtually illegible fragments of another roll, thought to have contained an oratorical work, found at the same time; see Lowe, *Codices*, §387.

¹⁶ *POxy.* 30; for the date, see Mallon, *op. cit.* Mr. C. H. Roberts kindly informs me (27 Feb. 1952) that Mallon's dating of this fragment has been confirmed by E. A. Lowe.

¹⁷ Supported, of course, by the good Latin inscriptions and carefully written documents (e.g., *PSI* 1183 of 45–54 A.D.) of the same period.

offers, of course, a strong contrast to Greek literary texts which uniformly show only the *scriptura continua*¹⁸ and the virtual absence of accents and punctuation that make them at first sight so discouraging to the modern eye. In this period, then, Latin clearly had standards of its own¹⁹ which we could wish it had never abandoned. It was evidently during the Second Century that there took place in Latin *Buchwesen* one of the most astonishing cultural regressions of ancient history. Within that century *interpuncta* and regular punctuation disappear, *apices* become rare and sporadic, and lines become solid blocks of *scriptura continua*.²⁰ For this amazing and deplorable regression one can conjecture no reason other than an inept desire to imitate even the worst characteristic of Greek books.²¹ From this consideration we may draw the somewhat reassuring inference that while, so far as we know, the colophons of Latin books in the Augustan Age may have differed distinctly in form from those used in Greek books, the probability of an independent Latin tradition greatly decreases in the Second Century and may be assumed to vanish in the Third. In other words, it is probable that copies of Tacitus made in the Second and

¹⁸ The exceptions are negligible; I recall only one, *PRyl.* 486 (late I), which was said to be without precedent at the time of its publication.

¹⁹ That *interpuncta* were thought to be virtually an element of the Latin alphabet may be seen from *PSI* 743 (I/II), a curious fragment in which a Greek text has been transliterated in Latin characters, and the words accordingly separated by *interpuncta*.

²⁰ *Interpuncta* survive in the fragment *De Servio Tullio* (*POxy.* 2088) of the Second Century. A good specimen of the new style is *PRyl.* 473, a relatively luxurious book which was reused for accounts in the Third Century, and is therefore assumed to have been produced in the Second; it has solid lines, no punctuation at all, and only occasional *apices*. Even in a grammatical treatise, *PMich.* 429 (II/III; cf. Lowe, *Codices*, §212), in which one might suppose clarity to have been particularly desirable, punctuation disappears except where it is necessary to distinguish a vowel or diphthong under discussion from the surrounding text. Of course, some sporadic punctuation is to be found in later manuscripts, but, so far as I know, no attempt was ever made to abandon the *scriptura continua* or to return to the fine lucidity of Augustan standards.

²¹ Such is the effect of the change, but a real explanation would have to go much deeper into the obscure mutations of taste that are the real arcanum of history. B. L. Ullman, *op. cit.* 211, has pointed out that *scriptura continua* is a deliberate style: "the reason for it apparently was the feeling that spaces at uneven intervals marred the beauty of the line." Note that in some of our rustic-capital manuscripts there are occasional *interpuncta* which seem to be the work of the original scribe, but these are invariably so inserted that the regular spacing of the letters in the solid line is not disturbed. After Ullman's work, the relation of palaeography to cultural history cannot be doubted, and styles of writing must be considered as much an index of cultural mutation as styles of architecture. One wonders whether the return to *scriptura continua* in Latin books could be related to the marked alteration in artistic taste that is associated with the reign of Hadrian.

Third Centuries had *scriptura continua* and colophons of the type known to us from the Greek papyri.

The title of an ancient *volumen* was normally given in at least two, possibly in three, places. Presumably there was always an external title which could be read without unrolling the *volumen*; in some cases the title was written at the beginning of the roll; and almost invariably it was stated in a colophon at the end.

In the Pre-Alexandrian period, as Wendel plausibly infers,²² titles were simply written on the outside of the roll, and a few specimens²³ survive to show that this obviously convenient notation was sometimes used in later times, although it is to be noted that the extant specimens indicate that the title in this position was added by a later hand, perhaps that of the owner, and did not form part of the book when it left the hands of the professional copyist. The normal external indication of title seems to have been the parchment label, *sillybos* or *sittybon*, attached to the roll, of which only three specimens have survived.²⁴ There is some reason to believe that these labels were added by the owner of the roll, rather than the original scribe.²⁵ For our purposes, however, the essential point is that these titles, whether written on the back of the roll or on labels, appear invariably to have been of the simplest possible form, stating merely the author's name and the title of the work, thus:²⁶

ΒΑΚΧΤΑΙΔΟΥ
ΔΙΟΤΡΑΜΒΟΙ

Whether the roll itself normally bore a title in the strict sense of the word, i.e., preceding the text, is still uncertain. The categorical statement that it did not is based on insufficient evidence,²⁷

²² *Op. cit.* 24 f.

²³ Sosylus (Ptolemaic), Eudoxus (193–165 B.C.), *PRyl.* 19 (II).

²⁴ *POxy.* 301 (I/II), 1091 (II); *PAntinoöp.* 21 (III).

²⁵ The *sillybos* of *POxy.* 1091 is considerably later than the text. Cf. Cic. *Ad Att.* 4.4a.1, 5.3, 8.2, where Atticus' workmen add *sittybae* to the books in Cicero's library. On the different forms of the word that designates these labels, see Wendel, *op. cit.* 107, where it is shown that two roots are involved.

²⁶ *POxy.* 1091 (II); the same form in all the examples cited above, including the papyrus of Eudoxus, in which the title is written vertically. In quoting examples of titulature, I have not thought it worth while to reproduce the decorative marks or flourishes which sometimes accompany them, or to indicate mutilated letters or slight restorations where the reading is certain.

²⁷ Kenyon, *op. cit.* 60 f., apparently repeating the conclusion drawn in his *Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1899) 22: "It was usual to leave a blank column at the

for the circumstance that the outer part of a papyrus roll was particularly exposed to damage of every kind has left us very few specimens of the commencement of a *volumen*,²⁸ and since these give conflicting indications, we must be uncertain whether the inclusion or the omission of the title was "normal" — and our uncertainty is but complicated by the possibility that there may have been a change of fashion in the Second Century. The clear evidence of a few papyri in which the text is preceded only by a blank column,²⁹ and a notable *volumen* in which the initial column, originally blank, was provided with a title by a later and informal hand,³⁰ must be balanced against the clear evidence of three examples earlier than the Fourth Century of titles apparently produced by the scribe at the beginning of his labors,³¹ and the doubtful evidence of two single sheets of papyrus which seem to have the format of small books, and in which the first column is devoted to a title that is repeated in a subscription at the end of the text.³² If this evidence³³ is inadequate to show whether or not the normal *volumen* began with a title-column, it does show that the title, when present, consisted of the simplest possible wording: the author's name, the title of the work, and, if the work contained more than one book, the number of the book, thus:³⁴

ἹΕΡΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ
ΗΘΙΚΗΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ

beginning of a roll, as is found in the papyri of Aristotle and Herodas and in the Harris Homer; but in none of these cases is the title written on it." The first of these examples proves nothing whatsoever, for the papyrus text of the *Respublica Atheniensium* is a *Privatabschrift* presumably made from a mutilated exemplar, since the scribe begins his transcription in the middle of a sentence. The blank column at the beginning of the papyrus of Herodas was apparently cut from the roll before the photographs reproduced in the published facsimile were made.

²⁸ So far as I know, no one of the rolls found in the famous discovery at Herculaneum has thus far exhibited the beginning of a text, much less anything that might have preceded the text. All the extant titles, I understand, are really subscriptions, although the fragments containing them are sometimes placed first in the reproductions (e.g., *Herculaneum volumen pars secunda*, p. 46). On the condition of the outer layers of the rolls, see Scott, *op. cit.* p. 1; Birt, *op. cit.* 128.

²⁹ See above, note 27.

³⁰ Hyperides (I).

³¹ Hierocles (II), *PHarris* 123 (III), *POxy.* 568 (III).

³² *POxy.* 2084 (III), 1015 (middle or late III).

³³ I have excluded a number of Homeric titles because it is not clear, at least on the evidence available to me, that they come from the beginning of a roll; a roll normally contained more than one book of Homer (cf. note 43).

³⁴ Hierocles and *PHarris* 123. Note that the name of the most celebrated of all authors is usually omitted.

or

ΟΔΤΣΣΕΙΑΣ

Α·

Since the terminal portion of a roll occupied the most protected position, a comparatively large number of specimens has been preserved, and there can be no doubt but that, although there are rare exceptions,³⁵ every roll normally ended with a subscription. Numerous examples are found in the Herculanæan papyri, in which the subscription regularly occupies the last column of a roll, although it occasionally appears beneath the last words of the text.³⁶ These subscriptions have a fixed and simple form, e.g.,³⁷

ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ
ΠΕΡΙΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ
Δ

These subscriptions are frequently followed by stichometric notations, and occasionally by statements concerning the length of the roll, but the form of the essential subscription does not vary. That this was a standard and fixed form throughout the ancient world is shown by the numerous subscriptions of the Egyptian papyri, all of which follow the same pattern.³⁸ When appended to books of mixed contents, such as a collection of biographies or a commentary on more than one oration, the subscription included a subtitle or brief statement of contents, thus:³⁹

ΣΑΤΤΡΟΥ
ΒΙΩΝΑΝΑΓΡΑΦΗΣ
Σ
ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ
ΣΟΦΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΟΥ

³⁵ Notably Hyperides (I); cf. *POxy.* 1790 (II).

³⁶ On the position of the subscriptions, see W. Crönert, "Die Ueberlieferung des *Index academicorum*," *Hermes* 38 (1903) 401 f., where a number of good examples are given.

³⁷ Scott, *op. cit.*, app. p. xli; *Collectio tertia*, I, p. 57.

³⁸ *PLond.* 132 (I), *POxy.* 1082 (II), *PSI* 1194 (II), *POxy.* 1231 (II), 2076 (II), 1810 (II), 1805 (late II), 1367 (late II), *PSI* 1188 (II/III), *POxy.* 843 (c. 200), 698 (early III), 1232 (early III), 404 (c. 225-265), *PLond.* 77 (III), *PAmh.* 12 (III), *POxy.* 1399 (middle or late III). The name of Homer is omitted in *PSI* 1188 and *POxy.* 445, that of Sappho in *POxy.* 1231, and, astonishingly, that of Demosthenes in *POxy.* 1810.

³⁹ *POxy.* 1176 (II); the same form in Didymus (II).

The only example known to me of a departure from this pattern of rigid economy is a curious and elaborate sheet which must originally have been the end of a calligraphic masterpiece containing two books of the *Iliad*. The subscription, which coyly calls itself a *coronis*, is of the standard form, but it continues with a recital of the calligrapher's name, and some feeble attempts at heavy-handed humor: ΙΑΙΑΔΟΣ || [B] || 'Εγὼ κορωνίς εἰμι || γραμμάτων φύλαξ. || Καλλίνος μ' ἐξέγρα||ψε δεξιά χειρί, καὶ τὸ || ν Ἀ. ἂν τινί με χρὴ || σης, ἕτερον ἀντι||λάμβανε· ἐὰν δέ με || ἀλείφης, διαβαλῶ || σ' Εὐριπίδῃ. ἄπεχε!⁴⁰ The wretched taste exhibited leads one to hope that such things were rare, but this isolated specimen is valuable to us as evidence that even the most elaborate colophon did not in its statement of the title depart from the laconic simplicity of the standard subscription.

One further characteristic of the papyrus roll remains to be noted. Since the length of the *liber* of most works of literature was determined by the number of papyrus sheets that could conveniently be assembled into a *volumen*, a *liber* was seldom divided between two rolls,⁴¹ and conversely, it was seldom necessary to indicate within a *volumen* a division between *libri*.⁴² Books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, however, are so short that the average *volumen* contained two books.⁴³ In such rolls it appears to have been usual to indicate the division between books by a simple notation of the book-number at the end, and to begin the following book without title or further notice.⁴⁴ There are some indications that occasionally the converse procedure may have been followed,

⁴⁰ *PLond.* 136 (I or earlier). The original is in an "artificial square hand of epigraphic type." The only real uncertainty in reading is the numbers of the books, as I have indicated in the modernized transcription given above.

⁴¹ A good instance of such division, doubtless made for the convenience of readers who found long rolls difficult to handle, may be seen in the Herculanean papyri (*ap. Scott, op. cit.* p. 75), among which we have two rolls that are partly duplicates. No. 1425 originally contained the whole of the fifth book and has a normal subscription; No. 1538 comes from an "edition" in which the *liber* was divided into two *volumina*, and has the subscription ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΣ || ΠΕΡΙΠΟΙΗΜΑΤΩΝ || ΤΟΤ Ε || ΤΩΝΕΙΣΔΤΟ || ΤΟ Β. On the relationship between *volumen* and *liber* in general, which does not here concern us directly, see particularly Wendel, *op. cit.* 46-59.

⁴² Very long *volumina* were occasionally produced. *PAntinoöp.* 21 (III) seems to come from an unprecedented monstrosity that contained the whole of Pindar.

⁴³ Kenyon cogently argues (*op. cit.* 17) that this means that the division into books antedates the Alexandrian Age; cf. Wendel, *op. cit.* 57. Three books of the *Odyssey* were sometimes included in a single *volumen*.

⁴⁴ *PLond.* 128 (First Century B.C.); cf. *PSI* 1188 (II/III). *PHib.* 22 (not later than First Century B.C.) is an example of a presumably unusual form in which neither title nor subscription appears at the division between books.

i.e., the subscription replaced by an ornamental mark in the margin (*coronis*), and the designation of the new book placed at the beginning of its text.⁴⁵ As the name of Homer was seldom placed on copies of his works, we must look to other divisions within a roll for evidence concerning the treatment of what we may call internal titles. When more than one oration was incorporated in a single roll, the usual procedure appears to have been that of placing a subscription at the end of an oration, and beginning the following oration without a title.⁴⁶ There are inconclusive indications of a variant procedure in which titles were written at the beginning of an oration and the end was marked only by a *coronis* in the margin.⁴⁷ The important point, however, is that in these entries, whether titles or subscriptions, it was never thought necessary to add the author's name, so that all of our examples have the form

ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΕΡ
ΛΥΚΟΦΡΟΝΟΣ

Even a good-sized roll would contain no more than three orations of moderate length, so that it was natural to treat these as the equivalent of short *libri*. When shorter units, each complete in itself but forming part of a definite series, were contained in a roll, our evidence shows a uniform procedure: the title is written on a separate line indented from the margin at the beginning of the unit, and the end of the unit is indicated only by the title of the following unit. We find this procedure followed in rolls containing a series of mimes, biographies, or poems, and also in commentaries and epitomes, in which the units naturally correspond to the divisions of the work on which they are based.⁴⁸ In the latter case, the title might, of course, consist of no more than a numeral (e.g., Δ) designating the book of the original commented or abstracted. We may add that smaller units which did not have distinct titles, such as short poems and chapters or sections of prose works,⁴⁹

⁴⁵ The Parisian papyrus mentioned by Wendel, *op. cit.* 26 (I/II); *PSI* 139 (II/III). Cf. *PHarris* 120 (II). Even-numbered books of the *Iliad* normally formed the second half of a roll.

⁴⁶ Hyperides (I), *PLond.* 139 (II), *PSI* 1205 (II), *POxy.* 1606 (III). All are clear examples; in the Hyperides a much later hand has added titles also.

⁴⁷ *PLond.* 134 (I), *POxy.* 1366 (late III).

⁴⁸ Herodas (I/II), *POxy.* 2064 (II), *POxy.* 1800 (II/III). Diegeseis of Callimachus (I), Didymus (II), Oxyr. Epitome of Livy (III?).

⁴⁹ On the question whether sectional divisions were recognized in the transmission of texts, see Roberti Friderici *De librorum antiquorum capitum divisione atque summariis* (Marpurgi 1911).

were separated only by a mark between lines or in the margin, a *paragraphos*, *diple obelismene*, or *coronis*.

This fairly extensive survey of ancient practice has been necessary to show that the papyrus roll appears invariably to have borne a title which, whether placed at the beginning or the end of the roll, had the simplest possible form, limited to the minimal marks of identification (author's name and title of work), and that titles within the roll were even more laconic, omitting even the author's name. Contrary to what we might expect on *a priori* grounds or infer from the use of more elaborate titulature in other literatures,⁵⁰ the uniform evidence of the extant papyri enforces the conclusion that more formulaic styles of titulature do not appear before the period in which the codex supplanted the *volumen* as the normal form of book.

When the codex first made its appearance as a new form of book for literary works about the beginning of the Second Century, its most remarkable feature was that which excited the admiration of Martial,⁵¹ its compactness. A much greater amount of written text — the whole of Homer, for example, or Virgil⁵² — could now

⁵⁰ On the use of formulaic subscriptions in Egyptian texts, see Wendel, *op. cit.* 13 f. As a comparison of possible interest, showing a presumably independent development of the formulaic style in a literature transmitted in books radically different in material and assemblage (palm-leaf sheets strung together on cords, which must, of course, be untied before the sheets can be separated for reading), I note that Sanskrit manuscripts usually begin with *śrīh* (an exclamation of good omen, approximately the equivalent of *feliciter*), which is then repeated as an honorific prefix to the author's name (= *illustris* or *divus*), to which other honorifics are, on occasion, added. Colophons have the author's name and the title of the work enclosed in *ili . . . samāptah*, so that the basic formula may be rendered as *sic ab illustri scriptore conditum opus perfectum est*. Internal colophons are similar, but subdivisions of a work, such as books or the acts of a play, are usually given titles of their own. In internal titles *atha* is the counterpart of *incipit*, e.g., *atha vighrahaḥ*, literally *Nunc bellum* (i.e., *liber de bello*). The foregoing are merely casual observations made in the course of quite limited experience with Sanskrit texts, and it will be understood that I do not pretend to have made a study of their titulature or its development.

⁵¹ Best commented by Mallon, *op. cit.*

⁵² Mart. 14.184 and 186. I am aware that the exact significance of Martial's verses has, at least since the time of Birt, been contested, but I confess that I have never been able to persuade myself that Martial did not mean what he said, and so, with Mallon, *op. cit.*, I believe that when Martial says that his codex *cepit immensum Maronem*, he means that it contains the text of at least the major works of Virgil. If the codices of which he speaks were "extracts or epitomes," the epigrams become pointless, for there is nothing wonderful about the fact that an epitome is shorter than the original. And, having swallowed the Virgilian gnat, I shall not strain at the Livian camel, and I am quite prepared to believe that "pellibus exiguis artatur Livius ingens" (14.190) refers to a complete Livy contained, no doubt, in several codices, which are

be combined within a single physical unit. One immediate consequence of this innovation, of course, was that the *liber* became a purely literary division in the codex, and no longer corresponded in size to the physical book. A *liber* of Livy, for example, now had about the same relation to the codex that contained it that a mime of Herodas had to the papyrus roll in which it was included. And since there is reason to believe that the codex regularly began with a *pagina liminaris*, or title-page,⁵³ a copyist transcribing the work of a given author into a codex from a series of rolls had his choice of two procedures: he could regard his codex as either the equivalent of an enormously long *volumen*, or as a mechanical combination of rolls. On the first assumption, the title of a *liber* would become an internal division and would have the form of an internal title in

properly described as *exigui* in comparison with the bulk of the 142 *volumina* which they replace. (In the Medicean Virgil the space on a page is used rather lavishly, yet my rough calculations indicate that the codex occupies from one-eighth to one-fifteenth of the volume of space that would be occupied by the same text on *volumina* packed tightly together.) I am unmoved by Kenyon's argument (*op. cit.* 93-95) that "a Christmas present of a complete Livy . . . is a *reductio ad absurdum*." Why? It would, to be sure, be a fairly expensive gift, but certainly less expensive than such "Christmas presents" as a good cook (220), a skillful confectioner (222), an expert shorthand writer (208), a Spanish girl as accomplished as the one described in 203, or a whole troop of actors (214). As for Birt's argument (*op. cit.* 71-87) that the *volumina* in Martial's epigrams are the more lavish gifts, it is a perverse exercise of great learning, and based essentially on an appalling anachronism. When Birt assumes that copies of a relatively unpopular work of literature became "eine Antiquität und Rarität" and hence expensive, he is really thinking of *printed* books, which do tend to become expensive when new copies are no longer available from the publishers, but *only* because the cost of setting up the type and placing it on the press is prohibitive for a purchaser who wants but one or two copies. In ancient times, although we may well believe that the *bibliopolae* operated with considerable efficiency, each copy of a text was necessarily a single copy, and the only economy that could have been effected when books were issued in large editions depended on the fact that the scribes would copy a little more rapidly as they became familiar with the text; it is hard to imagine that the saving thus effected could have exceeded ten to fifteen per cent of the total cost of the book. It follows, therefore, that for all practical purposes a copy of the rarest book in Rome, provided only that a copy was somewhere available to the scribe, could not have been much more expensive than a copy of the most widely-sold work of comparable size.

⁵³ Wendel, *op. cit.* 27; Schubart, *op. cit.* 139. The papyrus codex of Theocritus from Antinoë had a title-page which, like most of the early title-pages, did not survive. Very fine codices may have had several pages preceding the text. The beautifully illustrated codex of Dioscurides (late V) has a whole series of frontispieces, a "bastard title," and an index preceding the title, which occupies two facing pages (f. 10^v-11^r); this reminds one that Martial's codex of Virgil (14.186) had a frontispiece (*prima tabella*) bearing a portrait of the author.

a roll, i.e., a simple notation without the author's name and perhaps consisting of nothing more than the number of the book; on the alternative assumption, the title or subscription of the roll would naturally be preserved in full.

Contrary to what we should perhaps expect *a priori*, the available evidence indicates that the earliest codices were produced on the assumption that they were units comparable to a roll, and that only later did the treatment of the codex as a combination of rolls become standard, supplanting the earlier method in the Fourth Century. It does not appear that there was any difference in this respect between the papyrus codex and the vellum codex, and the former, although normally smaller than the latter,⁵⁴ certainly cannot be regarded as a transitional stage, since, so far as we know, the codex, like Minerva, had no infancy: when it first appears in literary history,⁵⁵ its substance is vellum and its size comparable to even the largest extant codices.

Although the examples of titulature which we possess are relatively few,⁵⁶ they suffice to illustrate at least the simplicity of the early style. The Ambrosian *Iliad* of the Third Century evidently indicated the transition from Book I to Book II by a simple $\overline{\text{A}}$. Another Homer, from the same or a slightly later period,⁵⁷ divides books by combining the simplest possible internal subscription and title:

$$\overline{\text{X}}$$

$$\overline{\Psi}$$

This is in principle the same form as that found in two codices in which the division between works of different title was marked by

⁵⁴ So that an *Iliad* written in a fairly large hand might occupy six papyrus volumes (PSI 1298, V/VI).

⁵⁵ Note 52.

⁵⁶ The papyri are, of course, fragmentary, and so are some of the best-known early codices. The famous *codex Augusteus*, whose square capitals are illustrated in so many high-school editions of Virgil, does not now include either the beginning or the end of any book, and so, of course, exhibits neither title nor colophon. Since a part of the manuscript now lost was known to Mabillon, I have looked through the *De re diplomatica* in the hope that some information on titles in the Augusteus might be given, but I found nothing. The Neapolitan palimpsest of Lucan, famous for the sheer beauty of its rustic capitals, does not contain the beginning or end of a book.

⁵⁷ PRyl. 53 (late III).

writing the title of the piece that is terminated above the title of the piece that follows it, thus:⁵⁸

ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΣ·
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣΕΙΡΗΝΗΣ·

We have, furthermore, the evidence of two of the oldest extant Latin codices. What may be the most ancient of all, the *schedae Fulvianae* of Virgil written in the "old type of Rustic capital,"⁵⁹ completely dispenses with both titles and subscriptions, indicating the division between books by nothing more than an ornamental line, the equivalent of the marginal *coronis* in a papyrus roll. Here the feeling that in the codex a *liber* is merely a literary unit is carried to its logical extreme, and both internal titles and subscriptions are abandoned as otiose since they no longer serve any useful purpose, for the reader who wishes to turn to a particular book will guide himself by a new and far more convenient device, the "running title," which was written at the top of each folio in this, as in many (but not all) of the very old codices.⁶⁰ The *schedae Fulvianae*, which may belong to the latter part of the Third Century, are certainly earlier than the handsome Palatine Virgil, now assigned to the Fourth, which does not go to the logical extreme of abolishing internal titles, possibly because its "running titles" have been virtually reduced to symbols.⁶¹ In this manuscript the end of a book is indicated only by a simple subscription in the same size of rustic capitals as the text, thus:

AENEIDOS· LIB· I

⁵⁸ *POxy.* 1096 (IV); precisely the same arrangement in *PRyl.* 489 (III/IV). *PAmh.* 24 (IV) has only the title of the following work.

⁵⁹ Lowe, *Codices*, §11.

⁶⁰ As specimens of the "running title," which does not, so far as I can see, directly concern us here *except* as a possible source of information for scribes engaged in regularizing colophons, I give the following, using the vertical bar to distinguish between left and right pages: Neapolitan palimpsest (IV): LVCANI || LIB· VI. Ambrosian palimpsest of orations (IV): PRO || SCAURO. Bembinus of Terence (IV/V): ·PHORMIO· || ·TER· Ambrosian palimpsest (IV/V): DE REP· || LIB· II. Mediceus (V): AENEIDOS || LIB· VI. Vindobonensis (late V): TITI LIUI || LIB· XLII. A particularly suggestive example may be found in the Turin palimpsest of Ciceronian orations (IV), in which the "running title," normally PRO || TVLLIO, appears in the form PRO TVLLIO at the top of the page on which the oration begins; there is no other title, but unfortunately we cannot use this as evidence for the form of titulature which I am here discussing, because we cannot be certain that the preceding page did not have a colophon. On the frequency with which "running titles" are found in the oldest codices, see Lowe, "Facts," 206, 59; on their presence in the *schedae Fulvianae*, *ibid.* 199.

⁶¹ For example, Γ || Ī and Α· || Ī̄.

The next book begins on the verso of the following leaf with a title in slightly smaller letters, but of the same style, thus:

AENEIDOS LIB· II

This, in comparison with the style that was, perhaps, coming into vogue even at the time the Palatinus was written, is simple enough, but we can, I think, discern vestiges of even more Spartan concision in two other Virgilian manuscripts of venerable antiquity. When in the Fourth Century the scribe of the fragmentary Sangallensis in square capitals wrote on a separate sheet BVCOLICA EXPLICIT || INCIPIT GEORGICA LIBER I,⁶² he must have been trying to produce a "regular" subscription. It is clear, I think, that the older manuscript (Third Century?) from which he was copying must have had only GEORGICA as the general title of all four following books — and nothing else. It was the scribe of the Sangallensis who added *Liber I*, but forgot that his addition required a syntactical change to *Georgicōn*. Exactly the same type of archaic titlature must have been in the archetype of the Fifth-Century Romanus, which at this point does have BVCOLICA EXPLIC· || INCIPIT GEORGICA. This codex, which is almost entire, enables us to observe the editorial revision in process at the end of books. Terminating his first book the scribe writes GEORGICA || LIB· ·I· EXPLIC INCIP || LIB· ·II·, obviously importing *Georgica* from the general title which stood at the beginning of Book I in his exemplar, but by the end of the second book he has learned to write *Georgicon*. At the end of the first Aeneid he forgets one element of his editorial expansion, and writes LIBER· I· EXPLIC· || FELICITER· INCIPIT || LIBER· II·, but in later books he remembers to add *Aeneidos*. The only explanation of this obvious scribal ingERENCE, it seems to me, is that the archetypes of the Sangallensis and Romanus had an older form of internal titlature, similar to that of the Ambrosian Homer, and marked the division between books only by a numeral, with or without *Liber*. Whether the number was recorded at the end of a book, at the beginning, or in both places, can no longer be determined, although the use of a general title such as *Georgica* prefixed to the whole work would logically call for the notation *Lib. II* or *II* as a

⁶² The Sangallensis and the Romanus have the author's name at the beginning of the colophon, but this, like *incipit* and *explicit*, is, in my opinion, the mark of a later style, which I discuss below.

title prefixed to the second book, and would not call for any subscription at the end of the first.

We are therefore justified, I think, in positing on the basis of the evidence thus far examined two distinct stages in the development of the colophons of Latin codices, the first in which a general title is placed at the beginning of a work and the division between books indicated only by numerals (with or without *Lib.*) or a decorative line, and a second and presumably later stage, represented by the Palatinus, in which the general title is abandoned and the name of the work included in the colophon and/or title of each book to give such readings as GEORGICON LIB· II. Traces of this second stage are also to be found in later manuscripts in which the colophons have been retouched, but incompletely edited. The Vatican palimpsest of the *In Verrem*, in rustic capitals of the Fourth or Fifth Century, has two colophons: IN C·VERREM <I> || EXPLICIT FELICITER, and IN C·VERREM III· || INCIPIT LIB· IIII· || FELICITER, which suggest that even the abbreviation *Lib.* is to be counted among the editorial additions, and that the archetype had only the simple form IN C·VERREM III, either as a title or as a subscription. Similar vestiges of early colophons may be found in the uncial palimpsest of Fronto, written in the second half of the Fifth Century, which is particularly instructive since the variety of subscriptions preserved shows a corresponding variety of editorial patching,⁶³ and the palimpsest of the *De republica*, in which the title of Book II, which is the work of the original scribe, does not contain Cicero's name,⁶⁴ while the name is given in the colophon of that book, which is the work of the second hand. Some traces of this and other early styles of colophon survive, of course, in much later manuscripts, where they are generally recognized only when they are accompanied by blunders of the kind we found in the Sangallensis and Romanus.⁶⁵

⁶³ Note particularly that the scribe copied the simple subscription AD M. CAESAREM LIB· III, but then, in adding *explicit* and *incipit*, also inserted *epistularum* between the two, where, of course, it cannot logically stand. At the end of Book IV he has been somewhat more successful, but now he adds the author's name and illogically separates it from *epistularum*. Compare the subscription to Book I, where I suspect that the confused report by Mai, of which Naber complains *ad loc.*, refers to some correction of the confused colophon, in which the scribe inserted his *epistularum* twice, but forgot to write the rest of the title.

⁶⁴ See Ziegler *ad loc.*

⁶⁵ E.g., in the Ambrosian Terence (IX/X) and the Palatine Plautus (X/XI) we find such remarkable catachresis as *Incipit Prologus Adelphoe* and *Incipit Pseudolus*

The third stage in the evolution of the colophon corresponds to the assumption that the codex is merely a mechanical combination of rolls. The colophon or title or both reproduce, therefore, the standard subscription found at the end of the papyrus roll, i.e., include the name of the author as well as the title of the work. The earliest example known to me is a papyrus codex of Philo Judaeus which evidently comes from the last part of the Third Century,⁶⁶ and this style was common in the Fourth Century, if we may judge from the papyrus Codex Cairensis in which Menander's name appears in the title of the *Eros*, which was certainly not the first play in the volume, and the palimpsest fragment in rustic capitals which has the subscription Μ·FRONTONIS || GRATIAR·ACTIO || IN SENATV || PRO CARTHAGINIENSIB·. A few survivals of this style may also be found in the uncial palimpsest of Fronto that we have already mentioned.⁶⁷

We should recognize as a fourth stage, logically though not; perhaps, chronologically distinct, that in which subscriptions and titles of the third style are united to form a single colophon of the type⁶⁸

ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΤ·ΑΙΤΙΩΝΔ
ΚΑΛΛΙΜΑΧΟΤ·ΙΑΜΒΟΙ

This form, logical enough when it occurs in the middle of a page, prepares the way for the standard form of the later manuscripts in which the subscription placed at the end of a book illogically includes the title of the book whose text may begin on the following page. It is possible that this position of the colophon and the

Prologus; obviously the archetypes or hyparchetypes, like the Bembinus of Terence (IV/V), indicated the subdivision by nothing more than a simple PROLOGVS. One of the best Carolingian codices of Vergil, Bernensis 184 (IX), preserves the ineptitude of some early "expander" of colophons (who perhaps found only abbreviated "running titles" in his exemplar) in the form *Aeneidorum liber II*, etc. In Greek codices there appears to have been less tampering with colophons, and the Tenth-Century Parisinus of Demosthenes preserves subscriptions complete with stichometric notations that must have been transmitted intact from papyrus *volumina*.

⁶⁶ PSI 1207. One of the tractates begins with the title ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΕΡΙΤΩΝ κ. τ. λ. at the top of page 281. Page 280 contains the termination of another tractate by Philo, but unfortunately we do not know whether or not the entire codex was devoted to the works of this author. If not, the inclusion of the author's name is less remarkable, and it may be that what we call the third stage had its origin in the production of codices that contained the works of more than one author.

⁶⁷ In the minor works, *Arion*, *De nepote amisso*, etc.

⁶⁸ POxy. 1011 (third quarter of IV).

fusion of subscription and title into a single entry may have in part determined the formulaic additions to the colophon made in the fifth stage.

This final stage in the evolution of the colophon is that in which further clarity is sought by the addition of formal statements that the given books end and begin at the point marked by the colophon. The earliest example of this formulaic wording known to me is a papyrus which is assigned to the very end of the Third or first part of the Fourth Century, and which is not a literary work in the strict sense of that term. It bears the title⁶⁹

Φ[(*nomen auctoris*)

ΤΟΔΕΤΤΕΡΟΝΤΗΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΩΝΗΠΑΚΤΙΚ[ὧν σημεί-
ΩΝ ΕΝΤΕΤΘΕΝΑΡΧΕΤΑΙ

The end of this sub-literary composition, more noteworthy for superstition than for stylistic grace, is lost, but we may assume that ἐντεῦθεν ἀρχεται was echoed by a corresponding phrase at the conclusion, comparable, perhaps, to the subscription found in a somewhat later papyrus codex: ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΧΕΙ ΙΑΙΑΔΟΣ ᾤ. ⁷⁰ The use of an active verb having the book as its subject is noteworthy,⁷¹ since it corresponds so closely to the Latin *incipit* and *explicit*. The latter verb, whether it owes its origin to an almost incredibly common misunderstanding of the abbreviation *explic(itus est)*⁷² as Lindsay supposes,⁷³ or is, as Birt more plausibly suggests,⁷⁴ an in-

⁶⁹ *PAmh.* 14.

⁷⁰ *PLond.* 126 (IV/V).

⁷¹ The papyrus codex of Nonnus (VII) has elaborate subscriptions which begin ΤΕΛΟΣΤΟΤ ΙΑ . . . ΑΡΧΗΤΟΤ ΙΕ κ. τ. λ., but I cannot remember having seen a comparable use of nouns in Latin manuscripts.

⁷² As a matter of fact, the earliest use of the verb in this sense known to me occurs at the end of a papyrus codex (*PRyl.* 472, late III or early IV) which contained a set of otherwise unknown liturgical texts that may have had no specific title, and here the verb-form *explicitus* takes the place of a colophon. This form, however, is very seldom found in manuscripts, unless *EXPLICIT* or *EXPLIC* are to be taken as abbreviations of it.

⁷³ W. M. Lindsay, *Palaeographia Latina*, 2 (1923) 21.

⁷⁴ Birt, *op. cit.* 20. Cf. A. Ernout et A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique* (Paris 1951) s.v. The verb may well have been in use in the book-trade long before it appeared on manuscripts, and comparable, perhaps, to the heteroclit formations which have a similarly limited use today, e.g., "to correct a *revise*." The purists naturally objected to it — a vestige of their doctrine is to be found in Hagen's *Supplementum* to Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (Lipsiae 1870) 79: "'explicit' nullo modo dici quit, nisi consuetudo patrona sit; auctoritas enim et ratio regulae deficit" — and are probably responsible for the use of *finis*, *finitus*, and possibly even *explicitus*.

transitive verb formed from *explicāre*, may have been introduced into the colophons of codices as a reference to papyrus rolls, and may originally have meant that the book "unrolls itself" at the designated point, but it is equally possible that it was at the time that it came into use merely a somewhat specialized synonym of *finire* in the intransitive sense of that verb,⁷⁵ and had no connotation of a process of unrolling. It appears in codices of the Fourth Century, the oldest specimen, perhaps, being the Sangallensis of Virgil that we have quoted above, or possibly a lavish papyrus codex of the same period.⁷⁶ With the addition of *feliciter*, which may have its origin in superstition,⁷⁷ the evolution of the colophon is complete, and we have the standard pattern, familiar to us from its use in so many manuscripts of a later period, and evidently the normal style of the Fifth Century. The examples are innumerable, but we may terminate our study with one taken from the Medicean Virgil which can definitely be assigned to a period but little earlier than 494 A.D.

P̄ VERGILI MARONIS
GEORGICON LIB. III EXPLICIT
INCIPIT LIB. IIII FELICITER

III

If the foregoing attempt to trace the development of titulature in early books is valid, and if our initial deductions concerning the origin of the systematic error found in the First Medicean manuscript are correct, we can now assign the hyparchetype to a definite place in an evolutionary sequence. Although the first line of the Medicean could have come from a general title, such as was characteristic of what we have called the first stage of evolution, the colophons definitely indicate that the hyparchetype marked the division into books by internal titles (or, alternatively, subscrip-

⁷⁵ The date of the information contained in the glossaries is, of course, a vexed question, but note that Placidus (*Glossaria Latina*, IV) E.55 adopts this view: "*Explicit* ad librum refertur; *explicuit* autem et *explicavit* ad hominem, ut si dicamus 'explicit liber,' 'explicuit homo opus suum.'"

⁷⁶ *PAntinoöp.* 29 (IV).

⁷⁷ The meaning probably is that more clearly expressed in the subscription to *PRyl.* 58 (V/VI) in which the colophon proper is followed by Εὐτυχῶς τῷ γράψαντι καὶ λαμβάνοντι καὶ ἀναγνώσκοντι.

tions) which had the form

LIB· II
AB EXCESSV
DIVI AVGVSTI

or, possibly,

II
AB EXCESSV DIVI AVGVSTI

and thus misled the unwary scribe of the Insular archetype. The use of such titles or subscriptions places the hyparchetype in our second stage, of which the Palatine Virgil is a probably terminal representative. If the notations in the hyparchetype were titles, each book may have begun with a new column or page; if they were subscriptions, the codex was more economical of space and began the text of a new book immediately after the subscription. I see no way of determining which of these two arrangements was used.

It may, however, be possible to draw from the form of titulature yet another inference concerning the hyparchetype, although the use of one hypothetical reconstruction to generate a second is a hazardous operation in which the chance of error increases not arithmetically, but geometrically. We shall be dealing, at best, with speculations concerning degrees of probability.

It will have been observed that the titulature which we have posited in the hyparchetype places the title of the work after the number of the book. This is distinctly unusual. In both Greek and Latin the normal arrangement, shown in all the examples of comparable titulature that I have quoted or mentioned above, places the number of the part after the title of the whole. The only early example that I can call to mind of the arrangement that we have necessarily assumed for our hyparchetype is found in the palimpsest of Fronto: IN(*cipit*)· LIB· V || EPISTVLARVM || AD M· CAESAREM || ET INVICEM. This is the manuscript that we have already mentioned for the remarkable inconsistencies resulting from scribal "regularization" of colophons,⁷⁸ and the colophon we have just quoted probably shows nothing more than that the scribe did not think of supplying the title until after he had copied the book number from his exemplar. We have, therefore, no probative exceptions to the general rule that in ancient books the title of the

⁷⁸ Cf. the colophons cited in note 63.

whole work invariably preceded the number of the subdivision, and that titles followed book-numbers only when they were subtitles which referred not to the whole work, but to a part thereof. Of the latter usage in Greek we have already cited two examples⁷⁹; in Latin the oldest examples known to me are the two Sixth-Century manuscripts of Prudentius, which place after the book-number a title that is applicable only to the book in question, e.g., INCIPIT LIB. TERTI||VS PSYCHOMA||CHIA.⁸⁰ The most familiar subtitles of this type are those found in the Verrine orations (e.g., *Actionis secundae lib. I, De praetura urbana*), which, although they appear in relatively late manuscripts, must have been introduced into one branch of the tradition as early as the Fourth Century.⁸¹

The rule which we have formulated is merely a generalization from observed practice. It corresponds to no syntactic or stylistic necessity, for Latin writers, when they have occasion to cite a numbered book in their text, quite frequently use the form *in prima Historiarum* or *in primo Historiarum*. Since there is no linguistic reason why the same order of words should not have been used in a formal title or subscription, we cannot exclude the possibility that the titulature in our hyparchetype merely represented an editorial eccentricity, a departure from the normal style. The uniformity of ancient practice, however, will lend some degree of probability to an hypothesis based on the premise that the hyparchetype was not an abnormality, but, like all the comparable early manuscripts now extant, conformed to the rule that we formulated above. The corollary of this premise, of course, is that in the hyparchetype the words *Ab excessu Divi Augusti* must have been regarded as a subtitle, i.e., the title of a part, rather than the whole, of the series of numbered books contained in the codex. This, it seems to me, can be explained in only one way.

The great majority of scholars who have concerned themselves with the composition of the Tacitean works holds in essential agreement a view which, although not without its difficulties,⁸² appears

⁷⁹ Note 39; the papyrus of Didymus has ΔΙΑΤΜΟΤ || ΠΕΡΙΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΣ || ΚΗ || ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΚΩΝ Γ.

⁸⁰ Quoted from the uncial manuscript; the manuscript in rustic capitals has this form in the "running titles." On the dates, see Lowe, *Codices*, §§ 331, 571a.

⁸¹ The subtitles were known to Nonius Marcellus and Arusianus; see A. Klotz's edition of the *Verrinae* (1923) pp. iv-viii.

⁸² The dissenting views which are based on a supposed hexadic or triadic arrangement of books appear to me to be illusory, but I do not see a cogent answer to the

to be the most reasonable and economical explanation of the rather scanty evidence. Tacitus, after completing the *Historiae* in fourteen books, wrote sixteen books *Ab excessu Divi Augusti*, but did not complete the prolegomenary and supplemental works which he had projected. The result, therefore, was two historical works which were subsequently combined, possibly by the author but more probably by a later editor,⁸³ into a single sequence of thirty books numbered consecutively. The existence of such a consolidated edition is implied in Jerome's oft-quoted reference⁸⁴ to the *triginta volumina* (= *libri*) of the Tacitean "vitae Caesarum," and confirmed by the subscriptions in the Second Medicean manuscript, in which we clearly have the remains of a consolidated edition. At the end of the second book of *Historiae*, for example, the colophon reads: Cornelij tacitj. || Liber octauus decim; expljcit. || Incipit nonus decimus. This numbering is certainly taken from the mutilated archetype from which the Second Medicean was copied, and may therefore be presumed to be ancient.⁸⁵

What title was given to this consolidated edition? It seems unlikely that either *Historiae* or *Ab excessu Divi Augusti* could have been used to designate the combination of the two works,⁸⁶ and it is, I think, entirely possible that the one ancient reference which gives a title to the combined work is correct in giving that title as

objection that Book XVI of the *Annales*, even if the longest of the Tacitean books, could not have carried the story of the Julio-Claudian line to its conclusion; see particularly Philippe Fabia, "Sur . . . les livres XVI, XVII, XVIII des *Annales*," *REA* 34 (1932) 139-158. But the dissenters' assumption that the numbering of the books in the Second Medicean MS can be dismissed as a copyist's error is much too cavalier. No one can inspect that manuscript without being convinced that the book numbers are those which were found in an ancient manuscript which contained both the *Annales* and the *Historiae*, and numbered the books in sequence. A large part of this codex was lost before the Second Medicean (or its archetype, if there was an intermediary manuscript; cf. notes 4 and 88) was copied; if the scribe changed the book numbers, the colophons which now designate the end of Books XVIII, XIX, and XX would be numbered VI, VII, VIII or XVI, XVII, XVIII. The argument that the *Annales* consisted of eighteen books implies that the last two books were lost in antiquity before the two works were combined, and (since a rough calculation will show that fourteen books were required for the *Historiae*, which were certainly completed) before the time of Jerome. This is possible, but improbable. After all, we do not know that Tacitus lived to complete the *Annales*; see Carolus Bretschneider, *Quo ordine ediderit Tacitus singulas Annalium partes* (Argentorati 1905) 69-75.

⁸³ When the two works were first combined in a codex?

⁸⁴ *Com. ad Zach.* 3, 14 (= Migne, 25, 1522).

⁸⁵ Cf. note 82.

⁸⁶ Tertullian (*Apol.* 16; *Ad nat.* 11) cites the *Historiae* by book numbers.

Historia Augusta.⁸⁷ But whether this title was used or the simple notation of the Second Medicean, *Taciti libri*, was deemed sufficient, it is clear that the consolidated edition would in ancient times have had to include in the later portion, at least, a double numbering for the convenience of the reader. The only clear ancient parallel known to me is that of Books 109–116 of the *Ab urbe condita*, which must have borne double numbers in the codices from which the extant *periochae* were made, as may be seen from their titles, e.g., *Ex libro CVIII qui est Civilis belli primus*. If an analogous form of notation was used in the combined edition of the major works of Tacitus, a colophon in the second part of the work would, in its simplest form, have read: LIBER XVIII·HISTORIARVM II. In the first part of the work, however, a title or subscription could quite logically have had the form LIB· II·AB EXCESSV DIVI AVGVSTI, since it would have been quite unnecessary to repeat the numeral II after the subtitle. This is precisely the form that we have posited for the hyparchetype of the First Medicean. It appears probable, therefore, that this manuscript was a codex comparable to the ancestor of the Second Medicean,⁸⁸ in which the two major works of Tacitus had been consolidated to form a single series of consecutively-numbered books. The First Medicean has preserved the subtitles which were probably also present in the ancestor of the Second Medicean, but discarded by some copyist, just as the scribes of some manuscripts of the Livian *periochae* discarded the subtitles of Books 109–116.

IV

Hypotheses are but hypotheses, and a poor substitute for unavailable facts. However, if the inferences we have drawn from our examination of the colophons are acceptable, we may provisionally conclude that the rustic-capital hyparchetype of the

⁸⁷ Flav. Vop. *Tac.* 10.3. Whatever opinion one may hold concerning the date and motives of Vopiscus, he must have been familiar with the works of Tacitus. We may note that one group of the manuscripts classified by C. W. Mendell, "Manuscripts of Tacitus XI–XXI," *YCS* 6 (1939) 41–70 is consistent in exhibiting titles which designate the work as *Historia Augusta*; these manuscripts are usually supposed to be derivatives of the Second Medicean, and it is therefore assumed that the title was supplied from Vopiscus.

⁸⁸ Not, however, the same codex if there was no intermediary between the Second Medicean and its ancestor in rustic capitals; cf. above, note 4. Perhaps, however, the existence of an intermediary may be inferred from the fact that the archetype of the Second Medicean had pages of approximately the same size as the pages of our extant First Medicean; see Henri Quentin, *Essais de critique textuelle* (Paris 1929) 176 f.

First Medicean manuscript of Tacitus was a codex which originally contained both of the major works of Tacitus, that it was at least as old as the Fourth-Century Palatinus of Virgil, and that there is a definite suggestion that it belonged to the Third Century, the period in which the simple form of titlature appears to have been most common. It may, indeed, have been produced during the brief reign of the Emperor Tacitus (†276), perhaps in obedience to his decree, which, designed to save the work of his illustrious homonym from oblivion — *ne lectorum incuriā deperiret*,⁸⁹ may thus have effectively preserved for us a part of what is, assuredly, one of the noblest productions of the human mind.

⁸⁹ Flav. Vop. *Tac.* 10.3. The historicity of this statement is attacked by E. Hohl, "Über den Ursprung der *Historia Augusta*," *Hermes* 55 (1920) 300 f., with what seems to me to be quite gratuitous scepticism.