Classical Quarterly 61.2 731–743 (2011) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838811000012

THAT NOTORIOUS *CANNELAM NON CANIANUS* ENTRY IN THE *APPENDIX PROBI*

About the seriously corrupt state of entry 18, *cannelam non canianus*, in the *Appendix Probi* there can be no question. Not only is the recommended word *cannelam* unattested, at least as here spelt, but, unlike all other nouns and adjectives throughout the text, which are quoted in the nominative, it bears the accusative *–m* termination. And the rejected word, *canianus*, is likewise unattested, even as a vulgarism. Moreover, whereas all the other entries – with one exception, *homfagium non monofagium* (47), discussed later in this article – discriminate between variant forms of the same word (*vetulus non veclus* [5], *pecten non pectinis* [21], etc.), the discrimination in this entry is between what appear to be quite distinct words, whose very identity has to be conjectured. So, if we are to make any sense of the entry, emendation is certainly called for; and a number of attempts to find a suitable remedy have in fact been made.[1]

I do not intend – with one exception made for reasons explained below – to discuss any of them. Suffice it to say that none seems to have won general acceptance; and none (with, as far as I know, that one exception) is even comparatively recent, suggesting that scholars have come to fight shy of what appeared to be an intractable crux. Indeed, discouragement seems to have set in early. Already in 1892, Wendelin Foerster in his *Wiener Studien* article, after citing various suggestions, expressed despair of a 'certain' – presumably meaning 'fully convincing'— remedy for an entry that, as it stood, he justly regarded as 'sinnlos' ('meaningless'). The phrase he used, 'etwas Sicheres ist nicht zu finden', was echoed almost verbatim thirty years later by Baehrens, 'zu Sicherheit gelangen wir hier nicht' ('no certainty is attainable here').[2] And, when one looks over these unsuccessful attempts, the reason for their failure to achieve acceptance is clear: none of them meets all of three obvious requirements: (1) that the proposed reading(s) should match the general *Appendix* pattern by discriminating not between different words but between variant forms of single words; (2) that the reading(s) should be in line with the compiler's standards of linguistic 'correctness' (deducible from other entries); and (3) that the corruption(s) to the MS reading should be palaeographically credible. Failure to meet the first two requirements is also evident in the one exception mentioned above, C.A. Robson's proposal[3] to read *cannelam non canianus* as *canicla(m) non caninus*. The reason why it does, nevertheless, have to be discussed here, at least briefly, is that, by an uncharacteristic misjudgement, the distinguished Finnish scholar Veikko Väänänen incorporated it in the text of the *Appendix* included in the anthology annexed to his generally admirable *Introduction*

[1] Several are mentioned by W. Foerster, 'Die *Appendix Probi*', *WS* 14 (1892), 278–322 at 295–6; the entry is also discussed by K. Ullmann, 'Die *Appendix Probi*', *Romanische Forschungen* 7 (1892), 145–226 at 177, and by W.A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen* Appendix Probi (Halle, 1922), 127, who mentions several further possibilities.

[2] Baehrens (n. 1), 127.

[3] C.A. Robson, 'L'*Appendix Probi* et la philologie latine', *Le Moyen Age* (1963), 37–54.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

au latin vulgaire (Paris, 1963, 1981), thus bringing it to the notice of the numerous readers of his book and conferring upon it an air of scholarly respectability beyond its merits.[4] It is true that Robson's *caniclam non caninus* might, at first glance, have appeared a promising suggestion, at least palaeographically: for, if we set aside that awkward final *m* as an intrusion, the *–nic–* of *canicla(m)* could credibly have been miscopied as the *–nne–* of *cannelam* (the difference between *–ni–* and *–nn–* is mainly a matter of counting minims [downward strokes of the pen], a recognized cause of miscopyings,[5] and *–c–* and *–e–* are of similar shape); as to *caninus*, it only differs from *canianus* in one letter. But the objections to the reading should have been obvious: the proposed entry (against requirements 1 and 2) would not only concern two different words but recommend a syncopated form contrary to the grammarian compiler's repeated rejection of such (e.g. in entries 3 to 11 [*speculum non speclum*, etc.]) – a *canicla* in the rejected position would, in that respect, have been credible but a recommended *canicla* never. And if, to meet that objection, one were to replace Robson's *canicla* with *canicula*, the credibility of the corruption to MS *cannela(m)* – its one attractive point – would be lost. So, on those grounds alone, Robson's conjecture must be judged unacceptable.[6]

What can, nevertheless, be said for his proposition is that he does attempt – although unconvincingly – to relate the entry to others of similar meaning, and thus create a context for it. For contextual support often clinches the case for a particular emendation where several other possibilities might, otherwise, have appeared open. And it is not as if the *Appendix*, though a bare list, were completely devoid of sequences of related entries: morphologically, in, for example, the succession of syncopated forms, *speculum non speclum*, and so forth, referred to above, and the *–es non –is* series (entries 88 to 109), in either of which a corrupt entry might stand out by departure from the pattern and be brought into line with it by a matching emendation; and semantically, such as the female kinship terms – *noverca* ('stepmother'), *nurus* ('daughter-in-law'), *socrus* ('mother-in-law'), *neptis* ('granddaughter'), and *anus* ('old lady' 168–72). However, in the sequence of entries in

[4] It is possible that Väänänen was mistakenly influenced in his acceptance of Robson's emendation by the latter's citation in his article (n. 3), 46, from the Graeco-Latin index to entries in Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* compiled by Heraeus at the end of the nineteenth century. For there, glossing the Greek word KYNARION, *canicula* and *caninus* appear side by side, just as they do in Robson's emendation, which Väänänen may have construed as offering striking glossarial support for the emendation. In fact, they offer no such support. There is not, as far as I can see, a single example of the appearance together of the two words anywhere in the glossaries; and all that Heraeus's index tells us is that they share a meaning with one another and the Greek word, as could, if need be, have been discovered from any modern dictionary.

[5] Listed, for example in L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1991[3]), 223.

[6] It is, nevertheless, only fair to the memory of the late Alan Robson to point out that he was not guilty of the gross error of scholarship with which, by a regrettable slip, he was charged by the usually scrupulous scholar, P. Flobert, 'La date de l'*Appendix Probi*', *Filologie e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte IV* (Urbino, 1987), 229–320; a charge echoed by M. Mancini, '*Appendice Probi*: correzioni ortografiche o correzioni linguistiche', in F. Lo Monaco-Piera Molinelli (ed.), *L''Appendix Probi': nuove prospettive di ricerca* (Florence, 2007), 65–94, at 76–7. For Flobert (317) interprets Robson as having argued that the *Appendix* corrections were to the Vetus Latina texts erased from the Bobbio MS to make way for it. In fact, Robson makes no such absurd claim. His only reference to the erased texts (p. 39) is by way of repeating, as background to his discussion of the *Appendix*, the history of the physical MS, separately established and familiar to all specialists – matters that, admittedly, would have been less confusingly dealt with at the outset of his article.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which our no. 18 occurs, neither of those types of context, nor indeed any other, appeared to exist. It was, in fact, the realization – borne in on me during the investigations reported in my sources article[7] – that there is after all an underlying semantic relationship between the entries in that sequence that has encouraged me to propose two emendations, which I hope will be found not only to meet all three requirements set out above but also to fit precisely into that context.[8]

Since all previous attempts to combine two such widely differing forms as *cannela(m)* and *canianus* in an emended single entry have failed, we must turn to the alternative possibility: that the two words were originally parts of two distinct entries, subsequently 'merged' into one by a copyist. That was, in fact, the conclusion that Karl Ullmann arrived at in 1892:[9] entry 18, he says, 'seems to combine the defective [i.e. censured] components of two distinct comments' ('scheint die fehlerhaften Bestandteile zweier verschiedenen Bemerkungen zu vereinigen').[10] Unfortunately, there is a further complication: it is dubious whether either of the two surviving components of the original entries, *cannelam* and *canianus*, even as rejects, can be safely regarded as faithfully transmitted. Both, as they stand, look less like vulgarisms, the subject with which the compiler of the *Appendix* was concerned, than copyist's corruptions, with which he clearly was not. The corrupt state of the first is obvious because of that accusative *–m*, and of the second likely, because no such vulgarism as *canianus* is known. So we are obliged, like those who were trying to reconstruct a single entry, to begin by looking for words of similar shape that could credibly have been distorted into the present forms.

One might have expected that, for *cannelam*, by far the most likely candidate would have been the word most closely resembling it – *cannella* ('cinnamon').[11] But, strangely enough, its claims do not seem to have been considered by anyone except Wendelin Foerster,[12] whose choice may have been influenced by the fact that, in German, a similar word, *Kaneel*, is a recognized alternative to *Zimt* as the name for cinnamon. And even he, as we shall see, appears to have finally decided not to press them. His contribution is discussed below. No doubt a major reason why other students of the text hesitated to recognize *cannella* behind the obviously corrupt *cannelam* was the apparent unlikelihood of such a clearly vulgar word being recommended by such a purist as the grammarian-compiler of the *Appendix*. That *–ella* suffix alone, one might think, would have been enough to exclude it;[13] in

[7] F.J. Barnett, 'The sources of the *Appendix Probi* – a new approach', *CQ* 57 (2007), 701–36.

[8] I first drew attention to the previously unnoticed context at Barnett (n. 7), 734, very briefly mentioning the proposed emendations based on it, which are more fully presented here. I return to this matter of context below.

[9] Ullmann (n. 1), 177.

[10] Incidentally, that is very probably what also occurred in the only other *Appendix* entry where different words (again both clearly censured components since neither could conceivably have been recommended by a grammarian), not different forms of a single word, are also presented – *homfagium non monofagium*. It is discussed below.

[11] The precise identity of the spice, whether cinnamon or its cousin cassia, is a question bedevilled by terminological confusion. It is discussed in the Supplementary Note appended to this article.

[12] W. Foerster, 'Beitrag zur Textkritik der *Appendix Probi*' ('Contribution to the textual criticism of the *Appendix Probi*'), *Romanische Forschungen* 7 (1892), 227–30.

[13] The vogue of the *–ellus* and *–ella* diminutive suffixes as vulgar alternatives to established *–ulus* and *–ula* forms is widely discussed in the literature; a particularly clear and concise account is given in Helmut Schmeck's revision of Karl Vossler's *Einführung ins Vulgärlatein* (Munich, no date), §§ 202–4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fact, parallel forms are specifically condemned in entries 50 and 51 (*catulus non catellus* and *catula non catella* – the latter as read by Stefano Asperti).[14] That vulgar feature, reinforced by other factors to be mentioned below, may explain the long delay of *cannella* in achieving admission to the written register. But, as far as the *Appendix* is concerned, those obstacles could be overcome by supposing, as Foerster did, that *cannella* had originally occupied not the recommended but the rejected position in a subsequently corrupted entry – a supposition supported, as we have seen, by Ullmann's interpretation of both of the words behind MS *cannelam* and *canianus* as the rejected components of two originally separate entries. However, what was probably for many scholars an even greater obstacle to recognizing *cannella* behind *cannelam* was the perceived necessity – so long as it was thought that both it and *canianus* belonged in a single entry – for any modifications made to the MS reading(s) to be such as to make one of the words appear a more credible correction to the other; for the change of *cannelam* to *cannella* would neither have brought it closer to *canianus* nor – it was presumably, although mistakenly, thought – have suggested any matching change in the latter. That objection, too, immediately falls away if the two corrupt words are assigned to different entries, leaving us free to consider on its own merits the case for making that identification. And it is a strong case: for it rests not only on the close similarity in spelling between *cannella* and MS *cannelam* but, and above all, as we shall see below, on a secondary meaning, 'cinnamon', of the source word of one of the entries that form the context to which our entry 18 belongs – a meaning that, against all probability of coincidence, it shares with *cannella*.

Thus, assured of the high probability of the identity of *cannella* as the rejected form of one of the two original entries, and knowing not just on general grounds but specifically from entry 51, *catula non catella*, the grammarian-compiler's preference for the older *–ula* suffix, we are at once enabled by its matching shape to identify *cannula* as the highly probable missing recommended form in one of the original entries and to complete the entry as *cannula non cannella*. That we owe to the shape of *cannella*. But its meaning, 'cinnamon', proves equally helpful, suggesting another probable identification, that of the still missing recommended form of the second original entry, corresponding to the rejected *canianus* of the MS. For, possessed through *cannella* of the 'cinnamon' meaning, we now have little difficulty in recognizing in the corrupt *canianus* the word *cinnamus*, a vulgar variant of the name of that spice, whose corresponding recommended form might have been *cinnamomum* or *cinnamum*, but more probably the latter (which is also respectably attested) as closer in shape to *cinnamus*. Nor do we have any difficulty in seeing how the supposed corruption probably came about: the first *a* of *canianus* could have come from the adjoining *cannela(m)* of the MS entry, and the misreading of *–nn–* as *–ni–* and *–m–* as *–n–* would be one more case of the familiar copyist's error of miscounting minims. *Cinnamus* would, moreover, have been well qualified for rejection by the grammarian. It seems to have been a vulgar variant of *cinnamum*, and is attested only in the third-century grammarian and compiler Gaius Julius Solinus (*Coll*. 33) and in a gloss (Lindsay, *Gloss. Lat.* 3, 189.36).

So, thanks to the survival of *cannella* (still detectable under the *cannelam* corruption), we find ourselves in the happy position of being able to propose as

[14] S. Asperti, 'Il testo dell' *Appendix Probi* III' in Lo Monaco-Piera Molinelli (n. 6), 41–66, at 47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the two original entries probably lying behind entry 18: *cannula non cannella* and *cinnamum non cinnamus*.

This is not the place for a linguistic commentary, but we may briefly note that, while *cannula* itself is rarely attested, it does at least appear in the second-century *Metamorphoses* (4.6, p.145) of Apuleius and the fifth-century *De Nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* of Martianus Capella (2, § 224) – in the eyes of our grammarian it must have had the decisive advantage over *cannella* of its respectable *–ula* termination. As to *cinnamum* and *cinnamus*, hesitations between neuter and masculine flexions in the nominative singular of second-declension nouns at a time when the neuter gender was declining into vestigial survival would also have been a familiar topic to him.[15]

We can now return briefly to Foerster's contribution,[16] which offers some similarities to mine – although mine was in fact arrived at independently. He begins (p. 229) by proposing *cannella* as the correction to MS *cannelam* and *cinnamomus* to *canianus*, then interprets the marginal dots in the MS as signalling a word-order mistake, arriving at *cinnamomum non cannella*, as his final reconstruction of the original entry – in itself a credible grammarian's preference of the classical word *cinnamomum* to its vulgar synonym *cannella*, but, it will be noted, postulating two distinct words. He returns to the topic in his longer *Wiener Studien* article, (which presents the full *Appendix* text, accompanied by comments),[17] this time more explicitly describing *cannella* as a 'Romance word' meaning 'cinnamon' and as a diminutive of *canna*, but then, reporting a recent implied criticism by Sittl, appears to have lost faith in his proposed emendation.[18]

About the history of the word *cannella* before its emergence into the full light of attestation we can only conjecture, but some points are reasonably certain. It was obviously the tubular, pipe-shaped 'quills' of cinnamon bark – prone like that of its close relative cassia to curl into reed-like rolls as they dry – that led to the use for them of the term 'reedlets', 'cane sticklets', no doubt initially as a slang alternative to *cinnamomum* or *cinnamum*. This feature is in fact mentioned by Isidore of Seville (*c*. 560–636), in his *Etymologiae* (17.8.10), where he gives *canna*, 'reed', as the etymon of the first component of *cinnamomum*, explaining that the spice is so called because its bark is round and thin like a reed ('*Cinnamomum dictum quod cortex eius in modum cannae sit rotundus et gracilis*'). The success of *cannella* as a rival to the traditional terms is understandable. It had an articulatory advantage with its simple, purely lingual pattern of *nn* and *ll* over the confusing switch from lingual *n*s to labial *m*s, especially in the *cinnamomum* variant but

[15] Its importance in the history of Romance morphology makes it a standard topic in the manuals, such as Bourciez's *Eléments de linguistique romane*, e.g. §§ 96 and 218 in the fifth edition (Paris, 1967). It is also touched on in my article, 'The second Appendix to Probus', *CQ* 56 (2006), 257–78, at 273–6.

[16] Foerster (n. 12).

[17] Foerster (n. 1), 295–6.

[18] Readers will see that Foerster's emendations have in common with those I propose not only the identification of *cannelam* as a distortion of *cannella* but also that of *canianus* as a distortion of another word for cinnamon. There is, however, an immediate objection of detail to his proposal: the supposed corruption of *cinnamomus* to *canianus* is, palaeographically, barely credible, and of *cinnamomum* not at all. (The gap between my own suggestion of *cinnamus* and *canianus* is much narrower.) But in any case, his final emendation with its two distinct words, not variants of a single word, is, on that ground alone, no more acceptable than Robson's.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also in *cinnamum*;[19] and its graphic quality, more directly evoking the reed-stick shape of the quills, may also have helped. With those advantages, enhanced by the colloquial ring of its vulgar *–ella* termination, *cannella* would doubtless have come readily to the tongues of dealers and their clients. But, however favoured the form may have been in trade circles, it appears, like other technical and specialized terms, to have taken time to win entry into the written register of Latin. Moreover, as a slang alternative to an established term, it would have been particularly disadvantaged in that respect, since its meaning could always be expressed by falling back on its formal synonym. Another factor, this time a historical one, that may also have delayed its attestation was a probable decline in the availability of spices, and an accompanying decline in the frequency of references to them owing to the disruption of trade with the East following the collapse of Roman order. So it is perhaps significant that it is precisely in the twelfth century, with the revival in the spice trade consequent upon resumed contacts with the East through the Crusades, that we have the first attestations of our *cannella* (whose variant forms, incidentally, demonstrate that the word was not a fresh creation). The earliest is dated 1157: '*pro pipere et cumino et canell' et amandis ad opus regine Pipe*'.[20] From then on the attestations are abundant.[21] In these we note, as in the 1157 example, that *cannella* is accompanied by pepper and cumin and nuts (almonds), and by the names of other condiments, such as ginger and liquorice, which make it quite clear that *cannella* is being mentioned as a food condiment. This marks, surprisingly to us, a new departure since in antiquity cinnamon, apart from medicinal use and – *quelle horreur*! – as a sweetener of wine, appears to have been primarily valued for its scented odour when burned. The full emergence of the word in twelfth-century Latin was accompanied by the first vernacular attestations. It appears in the *Chanson de geste, Aliscans*:[22] 'sa 'tenre bouce k'est douce con canele' ('her soft mouth that is sweet as cinnamon'); and the *Roman d'Alexandre* (ibid. 36,1, 2.): 'Moult fu biaus li vregiers et gente la praele: / moult souef i flairoient regalice et canele' ('Very lovely was the orchard and fair the meadow, very sweetly scented of liquorice and cinnamon'). These attestations reflect what are clearly not learned but already conventional vernacular images and evocations, and the word forms are semi-learned, retaining the non-palatalized initial consonant but simplifying the double *n* and *l* consonants – features characteristic of semi-learned borrowings. As time went on, regional variants of the word were adopted in accordance with the prevailing sound patterns of each vernacular. In Italian, for example, where double consonants are common, it retains, or regains, its *cannella* shape; in Spanish, where they are regularly simplified, it is reduced to *canela*; in French it eventually adapts to French orthographical practice as *cannelle* – and in all these languages and in numerous others, it is the ordinary (indeed in some the only available) name for the spice cinnamon. Where the old names still survive in those languages, it is usually only in Linnaean botanical terminology or as archaisms. The great exception to this eclipse of the old forms is English,

[19] The challenge to articulatory nimbleness in coping with a mixture of *m*s and *n*s is well illustrated by the jocular English tongue-twister: 'Are you aluminiuming those pans, my man?' 'No, I'm copper-bottomin' 'em, mum.'

[20] R.F. Latham, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London, 1981).

[21] For further attestations see, in addition to Latham, C. du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (with D.P. Carpenter's supplement) (Niort, 1883).

[22] K. Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, 19.152.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in which a further learned variant, *cinnamon*, holds its ground[23] – perhaps partly because in English *canella*, so spelt, has acquired a new meaning. (These matters are discussed in the Supplementary Note.)

We must now return to the question of the context of entry 18, to investigate the possibility of support for the proposed emendation, to read *cannella* for MS *cannelam*. As far as the surrounding Latin words are concerned, no grammatical or semantic affinity with spices is immediately apparent, but one of the striking features of the *Appendix Probi* text is the presence of a number of sequences of entries that appear to consist of corrections to translation glosses on clusters of semantically interrelated Greek words.[24] The topic of our present context (running from entry 16 to entry 26) is, as we shall see, music (particularly musical instruments), which, it will be argued, points to the presence in the Greek source of a word (identified below) that owes its place in the list to its musical meaning but has a second meaning relating to a spice, thus providing what is surely decisive contextual support for our conjectured emendations. These are the 'musical' entries concerned: *cultellum non cuntellum* (16), *marsias non marsuas* (17), *cannelam non canianus* (18), *pecten non pectinis* (21), *aquaeductus non aquiductus* (22), *cithara non citera* (Asperti) (23), *crista non crysta* (24), *formica non furmica* (25), *musiuum non museum* (26). As explained below, there may also be a link with four others: *uacua non uaqua* (14), *uacui non uaqui* (15), *hercules non herculens* (19), and *columna non colomna* (20). In only one of the main group of entries, no. 23, which actually names a musical instrument (the *cithara*, 'lyre'), is the presence of the musical theme immediately evident. Two others do, however, have strong musical associations: entry 17 with its mention of Marsyas and entry 26 with its *museum*, a word derived from *musae*, the Muses; for Marsyas was the satyr who competed as champion of the flute, with Apollo, the champion of the lyre (*cithara*) – wind against strings – before a panel of the Muses, from whose name, as a substantivized adjective, the very word for music derives ('*Et dicta musica per derivationem a Musis*', Isid. *Etym*. 3.15.1). There are, however, five other entries – *cultellum non cuntellum* (16), 'knife'; *pecten non pectinis* (21), 'comb'; *crista non crysta* (24), 'crest'; *aquaeductus non aquiductus* (22), 'water conduit'; and *cannula non cannella* (our emended *cannelam non canianus* of the MS) (18), together with its companion *cinnamum non cinnamus* (the references being to the closely related spices cassia and cinnamon) – all of which render non-musical meanings of Greek words that are, as we shall see, also names of musical instruments.

[23] Evidence for the early insular preference for the old name is provided by Chaucer's 'swete Alisoun … my swete cinamome' ('Miller's tale', 511–12).

[24] The feature is discussed more fully in Barnett (n. 7). Briefly: Greek words often cover a wide range of meanings, facing the translator from that language with a sometimes formidable task of deciding which is the most appropriate to render in the context – which in *Appendix* terms is usually a topic shared by a sequence of entries, such as music and its instruments in the sequence we are discussing. The complication is that in the *Appendix* text we not infrequently find that the glosser has rendered what may well be a meaning of a Greek source word more familiar to him but that is at variance with the context concerned. In such cases, the Latin mistranslations in themselves offer little or no clues to the original context, thus masking the identity of the word or even its existence – which is probably why this feature passed unnoticed for so long. On the positive side, the resulting anomalies, may, like errors of transmission, as pointed out in the conclusion of this article, actually help us to reconstruct original features of the text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

What, places the identity of the first instrument, the PEKTIS, beyond doubt as the word underlying an *Appendix* entry in this sequence is its unexpected secondary meaning, 'knife' (LSJ and *Suda*), which accounts for the *cultellum non cuntellum* of entry 16.[25] PEKTIS seems to have been used as the name for a stringed as well as a wind instrument – it is attested in both meanings (LSJ); but of crucial interest to us is that, as a wind instrument, it is attested as specifically referring to the pan-pipe (LSJ), a more specific term for which is SYRINX (*σῦριγξ*), of which more below. The identity of the second instrument, the PELEX (*πήληξ*) is similarly revealed by an equally unmusical rendering, the *crista* of entry 24, 'crest of a helmet', but its musical meaning is assured by Pollux (*Onomasticon* 4.61), who tells us that PELEX designates 'not only the crest of a helmet but also a stringed musical instrument', tentatively identified by the LSJ *Rev. Supp*. as 'a crested harp'. Of most interest to us, however, is that link with the SYRINX (*σῦριγξ*), the pan-pipe. For, just as the presence of the musical instruments the PELEX and the PEKTIS was betrayed by the entries 24 *crista*, and 16 *cuntellum*, rendering known non-musical secondary meanings of those Greek words, so is that of the SYRINX by the *cannella* of our entry 18, rendering its non-musical secondary meaning 'quill of cassia' (a spice akin to cinnamon).[26] The link between the two meanings, the musical and the condimental, was doubtless the similarity in shape of the long, rounded, musical pipe, and of the rolled sticklets of the spice, commented on by Isidore, as quoted above.

This brings us to an extremely important point in our argument. It will be seen that in all three cases the links between the musical and non-musical (in fact, highly unmusical) meanings are extremely unusual – what on the face of it have 'crests of helmets', 'knives' and 'spices' got to do with music? But the very oddness of these linkages – these words PELEX, PEKTIS and SYRINX may well be the only words in the whole Greek lexicon that combine a musical with those particular non-musical meanings – points to certain important conclusions. First we have, against all likelihood of coincidence, confirmation of the correctness of our identification in this musical context of the Greek words PELEX, PEKTIS and SYRINX as those glossed by the *crista*, *cultellum* and *cannellam* entries. More generally, and even more importantly, this identification and the procedure by which it was established also provide powerful support for the hypothesis canvassed in this and my sources article that glosses on Greek words were one of the sources of the *Appendix* entries.

As to the possibly related entries mentioned above, 'pipe' words have prosaic as well as musical associations in Greek as well as English, which might explain the presence of several other entries; one of the attested meanings, 'service-pipe'(LSJ), of the Greek SIPHON (its presence perhaps linked by overlaps of meaning with SYRINX), would match the *aquiductus* of entry 22, while its etymological mean-

[25] In fact, the word itself probably appears in distorted form in the *pecten non pectinis* entry (no. 21) of the text, where the original form of the gloss would probably have been *pectis*, a mere transliteration of the Greek PEKTIS (*πέκτις*) like our 'balalaika' transliteration of the Russian балалайка. But, if *pectis* figured among the original glosses, it was not to maintain its position, being mistaken by the grammarian-compiler for one of the vulgar variants of *pecten*, 'comb' – *pectis* is in fact so attested (see the index to Goetz's *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, s.v. *pecten*). Whether it was he or the copyist who replaced it with the commoner *pectinis* variant to produce the *pecten non pectinis* of entry 21 we do not know.

[26] See both LSJ, with attestations, and the Supplementary Note below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ing, preserved in the adjectival form SIPHNOS, might account for the 'empty' (i.e. 'hollow') words *uaqua* and *uaqui* in entries 14 and 15. And yet another meaning of SIPHON, 'waterspout' (*OLD*), might match the *columna* of entry 18. Even that does not end the semantic versatility of SIPHON; for Hesychius tells us that it also denotes an 'ant-like kind of small creature' (εἶδος θηρίου μυρμηκοειδές), which might account for the *formica*, 'ant', of entry 25. Those possibilities remain to be explored elsewhere, however; they are marginal to our main purpose here, which was to find confirmation of the *cannella* emendation.

The case for the proposed emendations – to read for *cannelam non canianus*:

cannula non canella
cinnamum non cinnamus

was already strong. They meet all three requirements set out above: they replace discrimination between separate words by discrimination between different forms of single words; they conform to the grammarian-compiler's standards of correctness; and – leaving open the origin of that final *m* – their corruption to the MS readings is, palaeographically, entirely credible. Now underpinned by context, they will, I hope, carry full conviction.

Such is the positive case for the emendations. So stated, it does, however, leave undiscussed the process of corruption to *cannelam non canianus* of the original entries, which, if set out horizontally, as most of the entries are in the Bobbio MS, thus:

cannula n canella
cinnamum n cinnamus

would seem very difficult to explain. For why should the recommended forms of the two entries have been omitted and the rejected forms, *cannella* and *cinnamus* (miscopied to *cannelam* and *canianus*), have been rearranged in a single line? We have to consider the possibility that, at an earlier stage, the entries were set out differently – not horizontally but vertically[27] – with the preferred forms written above the rejected ones, the first pair thus:

cannula	or (with the negative differently placed)	*cannula n*
n cannella		*cannella*

beside which the second pair, consisting of *cinnamus*, a secondary gloss inspired either by the affinity to, or identity with, *cannella* of cinnamon spice,[28] together with its *cinnamum* correction, would have found its appropriate place, thus:

cannula n	*cinnamum n*	or	*cannula*	*cinnamum*
cannella	*cinnamus.*		*n cannella*	*n cinnamus*.

This arrangement would bring the two words *cannella* and *cinnamus* into juxtaposition as found in our MS entry, making them ripe for the miscopying of *cannella*

[27] I take this opportunity to acknowledge the contribution of my wife, Elizabeth Barnett, who, in discussions of various possible arrangements of the text, emphasized the advantages of supposing an originally vertical arrangement.

[28] See the Supplementary Note.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as *cannelam* and *cinnamus* as *canianus.* The subsequent omission of the entire first line by the copyist would be much easier to account for than the omission of the left-hand half of two horizontal entries. In the copying of texts such omissions of whole lines are not infrequent, only requiring a single inadvertence.[29]

What still persists, as it has with all other attempted emendations, is the intractable problem of precisely how *cannella* came to be miscopied as *cannelam* with its single *l* and its intrusive terminal *m*. All it seems safe to say is that the corruptions probably occurred during the switch from vertical to horizontal alignment. It is, however, a striking fact that the words destined to be omitted by the copyist both present the eventually peccant features of the MS reading – *cannula* the single *l* and *cinnamum* the final *m* – although the latter might have resulted from misinterpretation of a following *n* negative, possibly induced by a switch of the two possible placings of the particle, as shown in the above schemas.

It will be seen that, while the vertical positioning of the entries does provide a credible reason for the omission of the 'correcting' words in the two original entries, it immediately raises a new question: whether that arrangement would have been acceptable to scribes. Fortunately, we have an example of its acceptability from this very text. It begins, as it happens, at entry 20, only one entry away from our entry 18, thus:[30]

columna
n colomna (20)
pecten
n pectinis (21)
aquaeductus
n aquiductus (22)
cithara
n citera (23), etc. down to entry 28.

Although, in this particular case, there was a special reason for adopting the vertical order – to fit the entries into the reduced space at the bottom right-hand corner of a page – the example does show that the vertical order was an acceptable option for a scribe to choose. As to the placing of a second such entry beside the first: in addition to the general reason for thinking that this may well have occurred in a number of other cases throughout the text, there are compelling reasons for thinking it must, as we shall see, have also occurred in one other case closely similar to that with which we are concerned.

As regards the point about secondary entries inspired by primary ones, there are a considerable number of related pairs in the *Appendix*, similar to the one just mentioned – a striking feature of the text, already commented on at length by Ullmann.[31] There are about a score of them scattered throughout the text, beginning – to confine ourselves to immediately obvious examples – as early as entries 14 and 15, *uacua non uaqua* and *uacui non uaqui*, and extending to entries 220 and 221, *nobiscum non noscum* and *uobiscum non uoscum*. The linkage, as grammatical parallels, is both obvious and otiose; but others, like the pair adjoining our entry 18, spring from a looser association of ideas. Here the *columna* entry,

[29] Reynolds and Wilson (n. 5), 226.
[30] The layout of the MS entries at this point can be conveniently inspected in Foerster's transcription (n. 1), 282.
[31] Ullmann (n. 1), 165–6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as I have argued elsewhere,[32] clearly belongs through its Greek source to the series constituted by several of its neighbours, but the *Hercules* entry does not. It appears to have come into the text linked by association of ideas to *columna* through the familiar name *Herculis Columnae* (Pillars of Hercules) for the twin rocks guarding the entrance to the Mediterranean. All these and many other similar examples look very much like subsequent additions to an existing list – the sort of thing a busybody reader running his eye down it might be tempted to pen in, choosing as the obvious place to do so the space beside the original entries, and following in this case too the vertical order that occupied less lateral room.

None of the items so brought into horizontal alignment were, of course, intended as corrections the one of the other – *cannella* could never have been meant by any grammarian worth even a grain of grammatical salt to be a correction to *cinnamus* – but they clearly risked being interpreted as such by a scribe mechanically reproducing what he had before him, resulting in the nonsensical *cannelam non canianus* of our manuscript. One is naturally reluctant to speak harshly of our scribe, a member in the broad sense of our own guild, but it appears that, when the challenge eventually came of turning vertically arranged corrections into horizontal ones as we now find them, it proved too much for him on a number of occasions.[33] Gaston Paris has a poor opinion of the copyist's abilities: 'To judge by the numerous mistakes, the copyist did not understand what he was transcribing' ('On juge … par les nombreuses fautes … que le copiste ne comprenait pas ce qu'il transcrivait').[34] As far as our entry 18 is concerned, Foerster[35] goes further: he believes that 'neither the scribe nor the grammarian (*Correktor*) understood anything of it [i.e. the specific source material]' ('weder der Screiber noch der Correktor etwas davon verstanden hat'). Personally, I would go even further. I believe that, in a number of hitherto unsuspected instances, certain peculiarities, particularly contextual, give reason for suspecting that this kind of failure on the part of one, the other, or both of them has occurred, which, coupled with misguided attempts to make some sort of sense of what had come down to them, usually by assimilating it to some known vulgarism, presents scholars with a formidable task in attempting to reconstruct the original material. Whether the subsequent omission of the first line of the reconstituted original entries by our copyist was purely inadvertent or whether it was deliberate – if it looked to him as if his predecessor had erroneously entered two corrections of very similar nature – we cannot say. It is paralleled in the case we are about to discuss.

This is entry 47, *homfagium non monofagium*, which, like *cannelam non canianus*, presents two quite different words. It belongs to a series of three entries 45–7: *pancarpus non parcarpus* (*parcompus* [Asperti]), *theofilus non izofilus*, *homfagium non monofagium*. These very probably derive ultimately from Aristotle's well-known classification of animals by their eating habits:[36] PAN-PHAGOS/A ('eating

[32] Barnett (n. 7), 734–5.

[33] Like the sad case of the little clerk in Gogol's *The Overcoat*, who was happy with straight copying but gave up when asked to incorporate modifications and begged to be given 'something just to copy'.

[34] G. Paris, 'L'*Appendix Probi*', in *Mélanges Rénier: recueil de travaux publiés par l'Ecole pratique des hautes études* (Paris, 1887), 302.

[35] Foerster (n. 12), 206.

[36] Barnett (n. 7), 719–22. In a full elucidation of this series, it would be necessary to go into a number of points (most of which are covered in my sources article), such as the omission of the –PHAG– component from entry 45, and the probable modification of Aristotle's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

everything', 'omnivorous'), KARPO-PHAGOS/A ('fruit-eating') – the first components of these two have been run together by the copyist to give MS *pancarpus* (entry 45); IDIOTROPHOS/A ('eating particular things') – mangled into the *izofilos* of *Appendix* entry 46; and OMOPHAGOS/A ('carnivorous', literally 'eating raw [meat]') – similarly into the *homfagium* of entry 47, and MONOPHAGOS/A into *monofagium*. The parallelism between *cannelam non canianus* and *homfagium non monofagium* is obvious both with regard to their discrimination between what are different words and the necessity to suppose an original vertical arrangement of the correcting and corrected forms, leading in both entries to misinterpretation of those laterally aligned as a correction one of the other, something like this:

omofagia (??) *n monofagia* (??)
homfagium n monofagium

So the supposition of an original arrangement of the corrections that is at least partly vertical finds both general support from the presence of numerous entries that look very much like subsequent additions made to an original list – a process that would have been facilitated by vertical arrangement of the material – and specific support from a strikingly parallel case to our *cannelam non canianus*, viz. *homfagium non monofagium*, which, like it, can only be explained, as far as I can see, on the lines set out above. Further investigation of the possibility of an originally vertical arrangement of the corrections, possibly throughout much if not all of the list, might help to account for the considerable number of other peculiarities of the entries that await explanation.

Thus I conclude this presentation of the emendations to the *cannelam non canianus* entry, 'notorious' for so long perplexing students of the *Appendix*. More generally, I hope that this investigation will have thrown further light on the nature and origins of this text, including the extent of mechanical faults in the transmission of the material but also of failure on the part of the compiler(s) to understand the original nature of the material. This exercise may also serve to remind us of the potential fruitfulness of errors in transmission and semantic anomalies in providing clues to previously unsuspected original features of a text, most strikingly in this case a different arrangement – vertical rather than horizontal – of at least part of the entries.

Trinity College, Oxford F.J. BARNETT
fjbarnett@xtra.co.nz

adjectives qualifying the animals into a series of abstract nouns ending in –IA referring to their dietary customs, from which, as Baehrens (n. 1) suggests (126), by a mistaken interpretation of the –IA termination as a neuter plural, a supposed Latin singular in *–ium* was formed. The non-Aristotelian *monofagium*, which, according to the lexicons might refer either to the supposedly greedy practice of eating alone or to monastic one-meal-a-day austerity, looks like a 'grammarian's' addition to the *–fagium* series. Its attachment to the *homfagium* 'correction' is one more case of a copying error.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON SPICES

The purpose of this note is to clarify, a little more fully than would have been appropriate in a footnote within the body of the article, two possibly confusing points about spices. The first concerns the two widely used spices cassia and cinnamon. Although derived from distinct plants – cassia from the *Cinnamomum cassia*, cinnamon from the *Cinnamomum zeylanicum* (Sri Lankan) – they are very closely similar, not only in flavour and medicinal and culinary properties but also in the shape – rolls or 'quills'– in which they are marketed. It was, as explained above, the latter feature that gave rise to the originally slang term *cannella*, 'little cane stick', which, as we have seen, was eventually to become the standard name for cinnamon in a number of modern languages. Now, if we were quite sure that that meaning had already become firmly attached to *cannella* at the time of compilation of the *Appendix*, the secondary specifically cinnamon gloss, *cinnamus*, conjectured for MS *canianus* would be directly vindicated. It might be objected, however, that there is no certainty that that attachment had been made by then. And indeed, in the Galen passage (*De Antidotis* [ed. C.G. Kühn *Opera* 14], pp. 69 following) the spice to which SYRINX links the name for a musical instrument is not cinnamon but cassia. So it may not be superfluous to point out here that there is, in any case, no logical need to assume identity of the spice designated by *cannnella* to account for the secondary 'cinnamon' gloss. The similarity of cassia and cinnamon was such that mere association of ideas would suffice to account for it, similarly to the Hercules gloss prompted by *columna* ('pillar'). Of this affinity there is abundant testimony. From ancient times, to mention only the main authorities, in Pliny and Isidore in Latin and Galen in Greek, the two spices are discussed together, the authors being at pains to draw a distinction between them. Indeed the cheaper cassia was frequently added to, or even substituted for, the expensive cinnamon – a practice already discussed by Galen – and to this day it is apparently entirely legal for ground cassia to be sold as 'cinnamon spice'.

The second possible source of confusion is that there is yet another aromatic spice, canella (so spelt), which, although botanically unrelated to either cassia or cinnamon, is sometimes known as 'wild cinnamon'. It was, apparently, discovered in Central America and the Caribbean islands by the Spaniards, who, wrongly believing it to be a species of cinnamon (for which, as we have seen, their term was 'canela'), brought it under that name to Europe, where, in English, it has assumed the form 'canella'. The desire to sidestep confusion of that spice with true cinnamon may, as mentioned in the article, have encouraged avoidance in English of the *cannella*-type forms (so common on the Continent) for the latter, and the persistence in current use of the old term 'cinnamon' in both the United Kingdom and the United States.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838811000012 Published online by Cambridge University Press