Classical Quarterly 57.2 687–700 (2007) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000638

A NEW TEXT OF THE *APPENDIX PROBI*

I. THE NEED FOR A NEW EDITION

What Latin and Romance linguists know as 'the *Appendix Probi*' is the third of five short compilations transmitted in a single manuscript, Neap. ex Vindob. Lat. 1 (formerly Vindob. Lat. 17), believed to have been written in the seventh or eighth century at Bobbio. These compilations are appended to a text of the grammatical treatise entitled *Instituta Artium* attributed to a 'Probus' but clearly not by the famous first-century A.D. grammarian Valerius Probus.[1] The third *Appendix* consists, as is well known, of a list of 227 items, each of the form '*a non b*' where *a* is a correction and *b* an error or 'vulgarism' (the latter word should be signalled as potentially very misleading). The text, edited for the first time in 1837 by J. von Eichenfeld and S. Endlicher,[2] is reproduced again and again in anthologies of 'Vulgar Latin',[3] and the philological importance accorded to it would seem to entitle it to careful consideration from a textual point of view, though the last full philological commentary devoted to it was that of Baehrens in 1922.[4]

Given that our text of the *Appendix* relies on a single manuscript, the first desideratum is an accurate transcription. No such transcription has hitherto been available, and existing printed texts of the *Appendix*—of which the least misleading, that of W. Foerster,[5] is now around a hundred years old and not readily accessible—vary considerably in their readings, so much so as to give rise to significant doubts as to what is manuscript evidence and what is conjecture. One's first suspicion might be that we are dealing with a scarcely legible manuscript and that, consequently, the editorial variations represented different guesses as to what might be there on the parchment. That this is in fact incorrect, except in the case of a few items, will be seen below. Mostly the editorial interventions are changes to perfectly clear manuscript readings, and the further question arises to what extent this kind of intervention is justifiable: the answer to this question depends on one's view of the nature of the text,

[1] The use of the baths of Diocletian as an example provides a clear *terminus post quem* of A.D. 305. See in general esp. P. Flobert, 'La date de l'*Appendix Probi*', in Anon. (ed.) *Filologia e forme letterarie: studi offerti a Francesco della Corte* (Urbino, 1987), 4.299–320, with bibliography. On the second of the five appendices see F. J. Barnett, 'The Second Appendix to Probus', *CQ* 56 (2006), 257–78; on the Fourth Appendix see the edition of F. Stok, *Appendix Probi IV*, Univ. degli Studi di Salerno, Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 18 (Naples, 1997). The relationship of the five Appendices to the *Instituta artium*, with which they share some material, has been much discussed. K. Barwick, *Hermes* 54 (1919), 409–22, at 421, suggests not implausibly that the third Appendix may be 'ein Rest aus dem *Instituta artium* 119.16 [Keil] citirten orthographischen Traktat'.

[2] *Analecta Grammatica* (Vienna, 1837), 437–51.

[3] E.g. W. Foerster and E. Koschwitz, *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch, zum gebrauch bei Vorlesungen und Seminarübungen* (Heilbronn, 1884; rev. edn. Leipzig, 1911), 225–32 [column numbers]; G. Rohlfs, *Sermo vulgaris Latinus* (Tübingen, 1969), 16–17; V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (Paris, 1981), 200–3, 216–18.

[4] W. A. Baehrens, *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur Vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (Halle, 1922; repr. Groningen, 1967).

[5] In Foerster-Koschwitz (n. 3), based on work already published in 1892 (W. Foerster, 'Die Appendix Probi', *WS* 14 [1892], 278–322).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and accordingly I provide a brief discussion of this question below (Section III). In the first place, however, it was clear from an early stage that only a re-examination of the manuscript itself would provide a secure basis for further study. This I carried out, for my own purposes,[6] at Naples in September 2000. The stimulus to publish it now has come from Mr. Frank Barnett, whose new and ingenious interpretation of the *Appendix* is published elsewhere in this issue of *CQ*. I am grateful to him for providing me with an advance copy of his article, and he has used my readings of the manuscript, but we have otherwise worked independently and I do not necessarily agree with his views, nor he with mine.

II. THE MANUSCRIPT

The text of the *Appendix* occupies the end of fol. 50*r* and, laid out in four columns, most of fol. 50*v* of the manuscript (the end of col. 4 is occupied, after a gap, by the first three items of the Fourth Appendix). The manuscript is a palimpsest, in fact a re-used Biblical manuscript, so efficiently erased that the parchment is very thin and the writing on one side of the page is often visible through it on the other side. On the facing pages 50*v* and 51*r* of the manuscript, there was at some stage, perhaps quite early in the manuscript's history, a spillage of water or some other liquid, causing the ink to run. The volume was closed before the water had dried, leaving an irregular patch on each page, one the mirror image of the other. At the centre of these patches the ink has nearly disappeared, while at the edges it has collected, causing in places what Foerster[7] referred to as 'ein grosser, trostloser schwarzer Fleck', obscuring almost entirely what lay under it. This damage has also caused a certain amount of mirror-image transfer of writing from the one page to the other: this in addition to the *Spiegelschrift* showing through from the other side of the parchment. Foerster assessed the situation thus: 'ein grosser Teil des textes ist durch Nässe und Abklatsch (Spiegelschrift) fast oder ganz unleserlich'. In fact this is an overstatement. The worst area of damage covers items 147–60, fourteen items out of 227; otherwise the text is still largely legible in the manuscript itself (less so in the photograph published by Foerster,[8] or in the microfilm provided by the Naples Library).

Only two items appear completely illegible because of the water damage: 87 (normally printed as *festuca*) and 150 (normally printed as *dysentericus*). The readings current in editions derive from the nineteenth-century editors. Foerster claimed to have read *fistuca* in no. 87, except that the *ca* was illegible. On 150 Foerster comments 'erstes Wort unleserlich; an 2. Stelle glaubte ich *disinteric's* erraten zu konnen'. This is cautious enough, though Foerster's photograph reveals no more than is now visible in the current state of the MS. Only the application of more advanced technology might help with these items. In a few cases I could read only two or three letters, especially items 152 (traditionally *mensa* or *tensa*—the variations between editions here reflect the item's illegibility as well as the editors' fondness for guesswork), 157 (traditionally *linteum*) and 158, on which Foerster had already admitted defeat. Foerster stated that 148 was illegible, but I was able to confirm Endlicher's earlier reading of the right-hand side of this item as *ariex*. This last was not, therefore, a case of deterioration of

[6] I was working at the time on an article re-assessing the importance of the *Appendix* as evidence for the history of spoken Latin. This work had to be laid aside owing to other commitments, but I hope at some point to return to it.

[7] In Foerster-Koschwitz (n. 3), 229–30, on item 148.

[8] Foerster (n. 5, 1892); the photograph is appended at the end of the *WS* volume.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the manuscript, but of Foerster working from the photograph (where the item is indeed illegible) rather than the original.

In a number of items, the left-hand side (the correction) is preserved, but we are left in the dark as to what the error on the right-hand side may have been. Of this kind are 86 *cluaca*, 88 *ales*, 95 *apes* (plural, presumably), 117 *tinea* (double-underlined in the MS, for an as yet unfathomed reason), 166 *obstetrix*, 174 *riuus*, 175 *imago*. In some other items the reverse is the case: the error is preserved, but the recommended form has disappeared completely or partially and the traditional editorial readings must be regarded with caution. These include 147 *menetris* or *meneris*, and 164 probably *ansar* (in that case a duplicate of 129). Although the correct form of 147 may well have been *meretrix*, we are not entitled to restore it in the text since we do not know what the *Appendix* compiler thought was the correct form—it may not have been the same as the familiar classical form.

The manuscript contains a number of marginal marks and comments, which are often omitted in published texts of the *Appendix*. These I have reproduced in detail. Two of the items have written against them, very clearly (though not certainly in the same hand as the main text), the words *utrumque dicitur*.[9] One of these is 53 *calida non calda*. As for the other one, it is not clear whether the comment is supposed to apply to the item on its left or the one on its right. The item to the left is 94, *suppellex* [sic]; the rejected form is apparently *superlex* with the *er* abbreviated. The item to the right is 149, which, though the editors transcribe it confidently as *persica non pessica*, I could not read with any confidence; the left-hand side was completely obscure, while the first letter of the right-hand side seemed to be a *b* rather than a *p*. At a few points there are notes in shorthand. These have been interpreted by L. Schiaparelli[10] and are as follows: 94 *utrumque*, 211 and 214 *dicitur*, 189 *utrumque a pinna dicitur*, 204 *locus est musarum*.

The other marginal marks (combinations of dots, strokes and letters) are difficult to interpret, except for the fact that some of the items so marked are in some way problematic. For example, 28 *gyrus non gyrus* is marked with two sets of three dots. There clearly is a problem here, because (in the manuscript—not in all editions) the left-hand and right-hand forms are exactly the same, with the sole difference that the letter *g* is written differently. Some have thought that these sets of dots, in some contexts, were supposed to effect a correction, for example, the deletion of a letter, but it is not easy to see how this would apply in all cases.

There are other items as well as 28 *gyrus* in which the left-hand and right-hand forms are the same: 137 *uico strobili* and 202 *constabilitus*. These items are important

[9] Not too much should perhaps be made of this in the debate as to whether the *Appendix* aims to correct pronunciation or spelling (see below); one can presume from the grammarians' use of the word elsewhere that *dicitur* does not apply narrowly to pronunciation (they would in that case use *sonare* or *proferre* or *pronuntiare*) but more generally to linguistic usage; for their prescriptive use of *dicere* see R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1988), 182 and n. 37. In the case of *calida* and *calda*, it is unproblematically true that both forms are found in correct Latin; one could choose between the two forms only if one knew the stylistic register and/or context in which they occurred (the syncopated form being expected esp. where the meaning is 'hot water'). How *utrumque dicitur* could apply to 94 or 149 is difficult to see, especially in view of the difficulty of reading item 149. The shorthand note on 189 *utrumque a pinna dicitur* refers clearly not to usage at all, but to etymology.

[10] *Bollettino della accademia italiana di stenografia* 4 (1928), 407. I am most grateful to Professor D. Ganz for informing me about this article.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evidence for the hypothesis that what we have in our manuscript is not an original compilation but a copy of a lost exemplar.[11] Evidently, in copying a list of corrections, this is a very easy form of 'perseveration error',[12] while it is less easy (albeit not impossible) for one writing such a list for the first time. In one further item, 55 *uinea*, the same problem exists, but the item has been corrected so that the error reads *uinia*. In the case of *gyrus* and *constabilitus*, however, it is now impossible to do more than guess at what the original error might have been, and there is no merit in such guesswork from an editorial point of view. Thus, for example, Buecheler's conjecture *stabilitus non istabilitus*, which turns the item into a condemnation of the prothetic vowel, must remain in the realm of speculation.

III. THE NATURE OF THE TEXT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR EDITORIAL METHOD

In all, the exercise of re-collating the manuscript may perhaps appear slightly to have reduced our knowledge of the text of the *Appendix*; but in scholarship the extirpation of spurious knowledge is as important as the acquisition of the genuine sort. Where the writing was legible at all, it seemed to me usually quite distinct, and it emerged that most of the textual problems had been caused not by palaeographic obscurity, but by editorial interference. Even Foerster's edition was not free of problems in this respect: for example in item 35 the condemned form clearly reads *iunenclus*, but Foerster prints the emendation *iuuenclus* in the text, banishing the manuscript reading to the apparatus.

What can have been the reason for this kind of behaviour on the part of editors? Different kinds of change could, of course, be made for different reasons. For example, C. A. Robson[13] (followed by Väänänen) changed 176 from the traditional *pavor* (in fact not fully legible in the MS) to *pavo*, on the assumption that abstract nouns were out of place in the *Appendix* (but this seems mistaken: for example, what of 123 *occasio*?). However, the main assumption underlying the traditional editorial approach to the *Appendix* can be easily uncovered. It is that the items on the right-hand side of the *Appendix* are, in all cases, a more or less close phonetic representation of a variety of spoken Latin,[14] conventionally called 'Vulgar Latin', which is supposed to underlie some, most or all modern Romance idioms. On this assumption, a purely graphic slip (such as *n* for *u* in *iunenclus*) cannot be allowed to remain. The right-hand side of the *Appendix*, in its presumed original form, could only be allowed to contain forms which corresponded with the editors' preconceptions of 'Vulgar

[11] Other features of the text have been taken by editors to point in this direction, notably the instances where the left-hand and right-hand forms seem to be lexically distinct (which e.g. Foerster [n. 8] regarded as conflations of two different items); but as will be seen below, these may have a different explanation. An interesting, though not exact, parallel case is to be found in Pompeius 286.7–9 and 14–16 Keil, a context dealing unambiguously with pronunciation, where we are recommended to pronounce 'Titius' with a sibilant sound, i.e. [titsius], rather than 'Titius' as spelt: the two forms being written exactly the same. Most likely the original text would have used an unusual spelling to illustrate the point of pronunciation, and that was then normalized in copying. Kaster (n. 9), 157 suggests alternatively that the mistake was due to Pompeius' amanuensis, but this seems to me less likely.

[12] It is a type of problem I encountered from time to time when proofreading the *Classical Review*, where some of the misprints listed by reviewers inevitably got 'corrected' in the process of transmission, so that authors appeared to be criticized for spelling things right.

[13] 'L'Appendix Probi et la philologie latine', *Le Moyen Âge* 69 (1963), 37–54.

[14] Thus esp. Baehrens (n. 2), 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latin'. It was their aim to reconstruct this supposedly original form of the list and even, perhaps, to make it yet more attractively vulgar than it already was. Yet in fact we have no guarantee before we start that the condemned forms in the *Appendix* will turn out to fit this category. Naturally, the idea that the compiler of the *Appendix* was a conservative exponent of classical Latin speech, fighting a crusade against the slipshod pronunciations whose descendants were destined (despite his—or her—best efforts) to become standard in the Romance languages, is a seductive one, and has become enshrined in standard treatises on the history of Latin and Romance.[15] It doubtless gives a peculiar pleasure, when approaching the *Appendix* for the first time, to fancy that one sees living Romance words emerging from the dry husks of school Latin. But it is a mistake to assume that the erroneous forms cited in the *Appendix* give us unmediated access to the spoken Latin of any particular period, and in fact there are many features in the text of the *Appendix* which do not fit at all comfortably with that hypothesis.

The compilation of lists of errors and their corrections[16] belongs to a well-attested late antique and early medieval tradition within the wider area of Latin grammatical studies, of which there are several other examples to be found within the covers of Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, spanning a wide chronological range: for example, the treatises *De Orthographia* by Flavius Caper (dated to the second century A.D.), Agroecius (fifth century) and the Venerable Bede. Those treatises are generally more discursive than the *Appendix*, which reduces everything to the bare bones; yet they contain some entries which are exactly of the same form as *Appendix* items. In fact, the *Appendix* is not just a mysterious *additamentum* to a grammatical text but a grammatical text in its own right, concerned like other such texts largely with the establishment and perpetuation of written norms.[17] More specifically, it is concerned with *orthographia*, that is, with the correction of written errors (not just in what we call 'orthography', but also in morphology and lexicon[18]). Latin grammarians do, of course, discuss pronunciation from time to time, but it is not usually their main concern, and when they do discuss it, they tend to go out of their way to make the fact explicit.

Obviously, a good proportion of orthographical errors are phonetic in origin,[19] and this explanation accounts satisfactorily for many of the errors documented in the *Appendix*, for example, the many examples of syncope, confusion of final *–is* and *–es*, and so on. But such a diagnosis will not fit all the items. Perhaps the clinching example is 218 *numquit non mimquit*, where there is no doubt about the manuscript reading. It is implausible to suppose that this is anything other than a simple scribal

[15] E.g. L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London, 1954; 3rd edn. 1961), 154–62.

[16] See J. Collart, ' "Ne dites pas . . . mais dites . . ." (Quelques remarques sur la grammaire des fautes chez les Latins)', *REL* 50 (1972), 232–46. On Bede and his sources see A. C. Dionisotti, 'On Bede, grammars, and Greek', *Revue Bénédictine* 92 (1982), 111–41.

[17] So correctly W. Elcock, *The Romance Languages* (London, 1960), 29–34.

[18] Morphology, e.g. 57 *tersus non tertus*; lexicon, e.g. 83 *auris non oricla*.

[19] And there is the further issue whether a phonetic error represents standard or non-standard pronunciation, an issue on which traditional Vulgar Latin studies have often been confused. A form like *veclus* must clearly have started out as a 'slipshod' pronunciation, but the occurrence of that written form in the *Appendix* leaves entirely open the question of its degree of prevalence in different registers of the spoken language at the time of writing. To take an English parallel, in a word such as 'culture', the pronunciation [-tʃə] for the suffix *–ture* would have been regarded as slipshod in the nineteenth or early twentieth century, when the standard pronunciation was [-tjuə]; but it is entirely standard now, though the change has not so far been reflected in spelling. The whole issue as regards the *Appendix* requires extensive reconsideration.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

error, the sequence of letters *nu* being copied as *mi*. Now of course in theory it may be a scribal error by the copyist of our manuscript rather than by the compiler; in that case, of course, we cannot guess what the original condemned form might have been. But leaving that possibility aside, and assuming that the condemned form is indeed *mimquit*, there can be only one plausible explanation for it: the issue must be one not of linguistic usage but of textual correction.[20]

Further support for this view can be derived from the fact that while most of the pairs of forms in the *Appendix* are undeniably different spellings or forms of the same words, a few of them consist to all appearances of two different words: 71 *glouus* (= *globus*) *non glomus,* 165 *hirundo non harundo*, 203 *sirena non serena*, 211 *rabidus non rabiosus*; the notoriously opaque 18 *cannelam non canianus*; and, now clearly enough revealed by my own collation, 74 *orbis non urbs*.[21] It may well be that at least some of these were words commonly confused with one another, and the usual way of resolving such problems would have been by means of what ancient grammarians called a *differentia*; the Fourth Appendix indeed consists of a collection of these, and they occur from time to time in the treatises *de orthographia*. Agroecius, GLK 7.122.18 has one regarding *hirundo* and *harundo*: *harundo canna est ab ariditate dicta, hirundo avis quae tignis adhaeret*. But under what circumstances can one say simply *hirundo non harundo* that is, 'swallow, not reed'? Surely only if one has a context where *hirundo* is appropriate and *harundo* is not, that is, only if one is correcting a text, or at the very least a list of words where there is some semantic principle of organization (e.g. a list of birds' names).[22]

That textual corrections underlie the *Appendix* is suggested by other features as well. First, many of the items belong to specialized semantic areas, such as the Roman landmarks in 12, 13, 17 and 134, and the North African ethnics in 48–9:[23] the selection of these is difficult to explain on the hypothesis that the Appendix is a list of

[20] Less decisive, but still indicative, are those items which relate to the distinction (largely graphic by any possible date for the *Appendix*, one would have thought) between *ps* and *bs* (60, 181, 184, 205), between *qu* and *cu* (14–15, 37–40), between single and double consonants (49, 112, 124, 182, 199) or between *i* and *y* in the words *crista, vir, virgo* and *virga* (24, 120, 121, 122): on this last point, Priscian, *Part. XII Vers. Aen. I* 24–5 = GLK 3 (= vol. 2 of the Priscian edition) 465, 14–27, indicates clearly that the sound of *y* represented the current standard pronunciation of those words.

[21] To this list could be added 67 *cocleare non cocliarium*: one of the *differentiae* in the Fourth Appendix distinguishes these as different words (*cocliarium [? -us]* a vendor of snails, *cocleare* a spoon); perhaps 55 *uinea non uinia* (distinguished apparently by Cornutus ap. Cassiodor. GLK 7.150.18); 26 and 204 *musiuum / musium / museum* ('mosaic' vs. 'temple of the Muses', the latter attested by the shorthand annotation on item 204); 47 *homfagium non monofagium*: the left-hand form probably conceals Greek *ὀμφάκιον*, verjuice, rather than *ὠμοφάγιον* 'meat eaten raw' (cited by LSJ only from a Milesian inscription of the third century B.C.) or *ὠμοφαγία*; in either case it does not seem at all plausible that *monofagium* (? = 'eating alone') could be a mere mispronunciation.

[22] Or, conceivably, if one were so ignorant of classical Latin that one did not know that the word *harundo* 'reed' existed, but knew the form only as a mistake for *hirundo*. But could this explanation apply to *orbis non urbs*?

[23] Discussion has centred particularly on 134 *uico capitis Africae*; for the Caput Africae as a well-known item of Roman topography see E. M. Steinby, *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* (Rome, 1993), 1.235. An inscription, *CIL* 6.8983–4, mentions a *paedagogus a caput* [sic] *Africae*; G. Paris, *Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études* (1887), 301–9, fancied that he had found the author of the *Appendix* in this unsuspecting pedagogue, and the idea was taken up with enthusiasm by other scholars such as Baehrens, C. Jarecki (*Eos* 30 [1927], 1–25) and even Flobert (n. 1), who dismisses Robson's (n. 13) view of the *Appendix*'s origins as 'mythistoire' and yet swallows this spectacular example of historical romancing.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

common errors of speech, but extremely easy if we are dealing with corrections to a text or texts dealing with those places.[24] Second, as observed by Foerster, some of the items are in cases other than the nominative singular, a fact which is difficult to explain unless they occurred in those inflected forms in the source text.[25] Third, some items are duplicated, clearly an easy mistake in compiling any list but easiest of all to explain if the error in question occurred twice in a text.[26]

Fourth, there is the sheer disorder of the collection. Sometimes, clearly, a principle of linguistic selection is at work, as in items 3–11 and 88–109 (except 94) and some smaller clutches of items linked by some linguistic or semantic similarity. But there is a lack of an overall ordering principle. Either this is a random selection, or else it is a set of corrections listed in the order in which they occurred in the course of the grammarian's reading of his source text or texts,[27] amplified in places by the addition of further examples of similar kinds of error. Similar disorderly features are observable in some of the other surviving treatises entitled *De Orthographia*, especially that which goes under the name of Flavius Caper; and probably for the same reasons.

A further conclusion follows, which has not always been explicitly pointed out: we cannot date the *Appendix* merely by relying on the occurrence of particular lexical items within it. One might for example point to 183 *parentalia* as evidence for a pre-Christian origin; but this shows only that the text from which that item was drawn must have dated from the pagan period. Similarly, 69 *primipilaris* must come from a text produced at a time when the Roman army still approximated to its classical form; but the morphological error (*-arius*) corrected in the *Appendix* could have been made at any time from the first century A.D. to the twenty-first. Such items therefore do not necessarily make for an early dating, while the evidence of textual corruption in our manuscript indicates that the arguments of Robson[28] for a late dating (contemporary with the manuscript itself) are equally flawed: as shown above (pp. 689–90), it is likely that our seventh- or eighth-century A.D. manuscript text is not the original compilation but a copy of it, at least at one remove and possibly more.

It might seem easier to date those of the errors that arise from phonetic changes in spoken Latin. This project is, however, fraught with difficulty. Clearly, a scribal error that depends on a phonetic change cannot happen until the change has happened; but (as I hope to demonstrate elsewhere) most of the relevant phonetic changes are now attested in non-standard texts of the early imperial period, that is to say from the first or early second century A.D., and the few that are not require more comprehensive investigation before their chronology can be established (the imagination of Romance scholars has, of course, been caught by such items as 112 *acqua* and 179 *sifilus*). In any case, any argument on this point runs a risk of circularity, since one scholar may use certain linguistic features to date the *Appendix*, while another will then use the date thus established for the *Appendix* to date the linguistic features.

[24] Robson (n. 13), very much to his credit, suggested that the compiler of the *Appendix* was acquainted with a Roman itinerary among other texts, but did not go so far as to suggest that this section of the *Appendix* might be a list of corrections to a text of such an itinerary.

[25] The pairs of items 14–15, 38 and 40 present the same words in different cases; add the names of streets in the ablative in 134–7, the ablative *tonitru* in 162, and the plural or genitive (*h*)*ostiae* in 207.

[26] Pairs of duplicated items: 4 and 33; 26 and 204; 50 and 51; 59 and 145; 60 and 184; 129 and 164.

[27] A notable parallel is provided by the Reichenau glossaries, in which items are listed in the order in which they occur in the relevant biblical texts.

[28] Cited n. 13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Clearly a major interest of the *Appendix* compiler was the transcription of Greek words into Latin, which may be suggestive as to its date and milieu. Some of these items provide a further pointer to the view that we are in the world of textual criticism and that the issue is orthography, not primarily pronunciation. In particular, the Greek word at issue in item 46 *theofilus non izofilus* has been subjected to gross corruption: a nonsense-word like *izofilus* can only be the result of faulty transcription, and cannot tell us anything about contemporary spoken language. (Whether the original condemned form has been further corrupted in manuscript transmission must, of course, remain unclear.)

The prehistory of the *Appendix* must, then, fall into several stages. We must envisage the parent texts or word lists, from which the items in the *Appendix* ultimately derive, undergoing a sufficiently long process of copying, by scribes not too well versed in classical Latin spelling, to suffer corruptions of the kind which the *Appendix* sets out to correct; then undergoing correction by a person of greater competence in standard Latin. These corrections must have been of interest from the point of view of *orthographia*, at any rate sufficiently so to be thought worth preserving in a list divorced from their original context or contexts. The list itself was then copied along with the pseudo-Probus text. The dating of any of these stages must be largely a matter of conjecture; but the formation of the *Appendix* itself can be neither as early as the texts from which its items derive, nor as late as the manuscript we now have. We can best characterize it as a late antique or early medieval grammatical compilation, like so many others that are found in the pages of the *Grammatici Latini* or the *Corpus Glossariorum*.

Scholars are gradually becoming more aware[29] that it is inappropriate to apply classical canons of text editing to many of these compilations. Partly this is because they often turn up in more than one manuscript version (not the case with this text, though it is true of its companion the Fourth Appendix) and it is not possible to establish an 'original' text; partly because they reflect the ideas of Latin usage that were current at the time of writing or copying, not the classical canons which scholars would normally apply. While a classical literary text might for the most part be treated (to use a convenient item of computer-speak) as 'read only', and an original version can therefore be established, a grammatical text like the *Appendix* could be altered or added to by different users over time, so that it might end up containing material originating at very different periods; what we have is only the latest stage of the compilation. It follows—though of course one may still, if one wishes, speculate about the earlier stages of transmission—that no modern editor is in a position to produce a reconstructed original version of a text like this one, and certainly not one in which a sharp line can be drawn between textual corruption and linguistic vulgarism. The aim of Baehrens and others to purge the text of its textual corruptions, in order to reveal this collection of 'vulgarisms' in all its purity and authenticity, is doomed to failure. All one can do as a starting point for further linguistic study is to reproduce as closely as possible what one sees in the manuscript; and this is what I have done here. It follows also that no attempt need be made to document every editorial conjecture, since all are equally the result of mere guesswork and sometimes made for very dubious reasons. I have added only as much critical annotation as is absolutely necessary to give a full picture of the text as it now is in the manuscript,

[29] On this point I am much indebted to discussions with Carlotta Dionisotti. See also my review of P. Gatti (ed.), *Synonyma Ciceronis: la raccolta accusat, lacescit* (Trento, 1994) in *CR* 46 (1996), 296–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and in cases where the manuscript could not be read, to indicate the earlier editors' identifications of the lexical items in question.

IV. THE TEXT

The 227 items are numbered in sequence. 1^1 means the left-hand or recommended form; 1^2 means the right-hand or condemned form. Abbreviations and other marks are reproduced as far as possible. Letters about which there is doubt are printed in italics; dots representing illegible letters are enclosed in square brackets to distinguish them from the scribal marks or annotations.

(fol. 50*r*) 1 Porphireticum marm'r ñ purpuretic' marmur
2 tolonium ñ toloneum
3 specul'm ñ speclum
4 mascul's ñ masclus
5 u&ulus ñ uiclus — 5^2 *corr.* ueclus
6 uitulus ñ uiclus
7 uernac'lus ñ uernaclus
8 articul's ñ articlus
9 baculus ñ uaclus ·:
10 angulus ñ anglus
11 iugulus ñ iuglus
12 calcostegis ñ calcosteis
13 serpizoni'm ñ serpidonium — *corr.* septizoni'm ñ septidonium
14 uacua ñ uaqua
15 uacui ñ ua[.]qui
16 cultell'm ñ cuntellum
17 marsias ñ marsuas
18 ·: cannelam ñ canianus
19 hercules ñ herculens
20 columna ñ colomna
21 pecten ñ pectinis
22 aquaeductus ñ aquiductus
23 cithara ñ ci[..]ra
24 crista ñ crysta
25 formica ñ furmica
26 musiuum ñ museum
27 exequae ñ execiae
28 Gyrus :· ñ gyrus ·:

(fol. 50*v*, col. 1)
29 auus ñ aus
30 miles ñ milex
31 sob*rius* ñ suber
32 figul^{u}s ñ figel
33 masculus ñ mascel

28 *The two forms differ only in the shape of the letter G*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

34 lanius ñ laneo
35 iuuencus ñ iunenclus
36 barbarus ñ barbar
37 equs ñ ecus
38 coqus ñ cocus
39 coquens ñ cocens
40 coqui ñ coci
41 acre ñ acrum
42 pau̲ mulier ñ pau̲*pa* mulī
43 carcer ñ car*car*
44 :· brauium ñ brabium
45 ·:· pancarpus ñ parcarpus
46 theofilus ñ izofilus
47 homfagium ñ monofagium
48 byzacenus ñ byzacinus
49 capsesis ñ capsessis
50 catulus ñ catellus
51 catulus ñ *c*[..]*e*ll*us*
52 :· doleu*m* ñ doli*um*
53 calida ñ calda — utrumque dr. (*in left margin*)
54 frigida ñ fri*G*da
55 uinea ñ uinea — 55^{2} *corr.* uinia
56 tristis ñ tristus
57 tersus ñ tertus
58 umbili*cus* ñ imbilicus
59 turma ñ torma
60 celebs ñ celeps
61 ostium ñ osteum
62 flauus ñ flaus
63 cauea ñ cauia
64 senatus ñ sinatus
65 brattea ñ brattia ·:
66 cochlea ñ coclia
67 cocleare ñ cocliarium
68 palearium ñ paliarium
69 primipilaris ñ primipilarius
70 alueus ñ albeus
71 glouus ñ glomus ·:
72 lancea ñ lancia
73 fauilla ñ failla
74 ·:· orbis ñ uurbs ·: — 74^{2} *corr.* urbs
75 formosus ñ formunsus

50^{1} l *has a line through it*
52^{1} *last letter may be* m *or* s *or one corrected to the other, difficult to see which is the original and which the correction*
54 G *could be* g *or* ci
74^{2} *corr.* urbs *perhaps further corrected to* orbs

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

76 ansa ñ asa
77 :· flagellum ñ fragell'm ·: — 77^2 *dot above* r
78 ·|:· calatus ñ galatus ·|·: — 78^1 *vertical stroke above* u
79 digitus ñ diG*i*tus
80 solea ñ solia
81 ·:· calceus ñ calcius
82 iecur ñ iocur
83 auris ñ oricla
84 camera ñ camm'ra
85 pegma ñ peuma

(fol. 50*v*, col. 2)
86 cluaca ñ clu[…]
87 [……]
88 ales ñ *al*[..]
89 facies ñ *faces*
90 cautes ñ cauti*s*
91 pleues ñ ple[..]s
92 uates ñ *uatis*
93 tabes ñ *tauis*
94 suppellex ñ suplex — utrumque dr.
95 apes ñ […..]
96 nubes ñ nub*is*
97 suboles ñ *subolis*
98 uulp*es ñ uulpis*
99 palum*bes ñ palumbus*
100 lues ñ luis
101 deses ñ desis
102 *reses ñ resis*
103 *uepres ñ uepris*
104 fames *ñ famis*
105 clades *ñ cladis*
106 syrtes ñ *syrt*is
107 aedes *ñ ae*dis
108 sedes ñ sedis
109 proles ñ prolis
110 draco ñ dracco
111 oculus ñ *oclus*
112 aqua ñ acqua

79^2 Gi *could be* ci *or* g; *in the latter case the only difference would be in the shape of the* g, *cf. 28*
87 *entirely illegible;* festuca non fistuca *edd.*
90 ti *ligature is clear;* 90^2 *looks misleadingly like* cladis *on Foerster's photograph*
94 *this note may go with 149, the corresponding item in the column to the right;* utrumque *also added in shorthand*
95^2 *entirely illegible*
96^2 *could be* nubs

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

113 alium ñ aleum
114 lilium ñ lileum
115 Glis ñ […]*ris*
116 delirus ñ del*erus*
117 tinea ñ [.....]
118 :· exter ñ extraneus ·:
119 ·:· clamis ñ clamus
120 uir ñ uyr
121 uirgo ñ uyrgo
122 uirga ñ uyrga
123 occasio ñ occansio
124 caligo ñ calligo
125 terebra ñ telebra :n:
126 effiminatus ñ imfimenatus
127 botruus ñ butro
128 grus ñ gruis
129 anser ñ ansar
130 tabula ñ tabla
131 puella ñ polla — 131[2] *corr. to* poella *with* e *added sup. lin.*
132 balteus ñ baltius
133 fax ñ facla
134 uico capitis africae + ñ uico caput africae
135 uico tabuli proconsolis ñ uico tabulu proconsulis
136 uico castrorum ñ uicocastrae
137 uico strobili ñ uico strobili ·:
138 teter ñ tetrus
139 aper ñ aprus ·:
140 amycdala ñ amiddola

(fol. 50*v* col. 3)
141 fassolus ñ fassiol's — 141[1] *corr.* fasseolus
142 stabulum ñ stablum
143 triclinium ñ triclinu
144 dimidius ñ demidius
145 t*ur*ma ñ t[..]ma
146 *pus*innus ñ pisinnus .a — 146[1] *corr.* -ll- *sup. lin.*
147 […….] ñ mene*r*is .i
148 [……] ñ *ariex*
149 […….] ñ *b..sica*

117[2] *illegible*
135[1] *could be* uico tabul proconsolis *with correction to* tabuli
137 *another* ·: *over* s *of* strobili
139 *another* ·: *over* p *of* aprus
141 .p. *added above line*
147[1] *illegible;* 147[2] *could be* menetris
148[1] *illegible;* 148[2] ariex *barely visible*
149 persica non pessica *edd.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

150 [……]
151 *o*[……..] *ñ* [.]*babals*[…]
152 *n*[……..]*a*
153 *raucus ñ* draucus
154 [……..] *aut*or
155 *auctoritas ñ autoritas*
156 ip*se* [……..]
157 [……]um
158 [……]*ra* ·:
159 [……]*s ñ terrimoti*um
160 *nox*[……..]*eus*
161 coruscus ñ scoriscus
162 *tonitru* ñ tonotru
163 passer ñ passar
164 [……..]*ansar*
165 *hirundo ñ harundo*
166 obst*etrix* ñ […….]
167 capitulum ñ capiclum
168 nouerca ñ nouarca
169 nurus ñ nura
170 socrus ñ socra
171 neptis ñ nepticla
172 anus ñ *anu*cla
173 tundeo ñ *detundo*
174 ri*uu*s ñ […..]
175 imago ñ […..]
176 pa[…] ñ paor
177 coluber ñ colober
178 adipes ñ alipes
179 sibilus ñ sifilus
180 ·:· frustrum ñ frustum
181 plebs ñ pleps
182 garrulus ñ garulus
183 parentalia ñ parantalia
184 celebs ñ celips — 184[2] *corr.* e *sup. lin. i.e.* celeps
185 poples ñ poplex
186 locuples ñ locuplex
187 robigo ñ rubigo
188 ·:· plasta ñ blasta
189 bipennis ñ bipinnis — utrumque a pinna dicitur (*in shorthand)*

---

150 *illegible;* dysentericus non disintericus *edd.*
151[1] opobalsamum *edd.*
152 mensa *or* tensa *edd.*
157 linteum *edd.*
158[2] ametra *Endlicher*
160 noxius *edd.*
169[2] *could be* nora

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press

190 ermeneumata ñ erminomata
191 tymum ñ tumum
192 strofa ñ stropa .a·:·
193 bitumen ñ butumen
194 mergus ñ mergulus
195 myrta ñ murta

(fol. 50*v*, col. 4)
196 zizo*bus* ñ zizipus
197 iuni*pi*rus ñ zini*perus* — 197[1] *corr.* e *sup. lin. i.e.* iune*pi*rus
198 tolerauilis ñ *tolerabi*lis
199 basilica ñ bassilica
200 tribula ñ tribla
201 uiridis ñ uirdis
202 .t constabilitus ñ constabilitus
203 sirena ñ serena
204 musium û musiuum ñ museum — locus est musarum (*in shorthand*)
205 labsus ñ lapsus
206 *ori*legium ñ orologium
207 *osti*ae ñ hostiae
208 februarius ñ febrarius
209 gratu ñ cracli — 209[2] *corr.* glatri
210 allec ñ allex
211 rabid's ñ rabios's — dicitur (*in shorthand*)
212 tintinacul'm ñ tintinabul'm ·:
213 adon ñ adonius
214 grundio ñ grunnio — dicitur (*in shorthand*)
215 uapulo ñ baplo
216 necne ñ necnec
217 passim ñ passi
218 numquit ñ mimquit
219 numquam ñ numqua
220 nouiscum ñ noscum
221 u*obiscu*m ñ uoscum
222 *nescioubi ñ nescioc*ube
223 *pridem ñ prid*e
224 olim ñ […]
225 *adh*uc ñ aduc
226 idem ñ ide
227 *am*fora ñ amfora

---

192 *another* ·:· *over* stropa
196[1] *very unclear*
227[2] f *perhaps corrected to* p

Royal Holloway, University of London J. G. F. POWELL
j.powell@rhul.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000638 Published online by Cambridge University Press