

## THE METHODS OF NONIUS MARCELLUS' SOURCES 26, 27 AND 28<sup>1</sup>

### I. THE PROBLEM

In 1901, W.M. Lindsay presented the results of a thoroughgoing analysis of the methods and sources employed by Nonius Marcellus in compiling his 'dictionary', the *De compendiosa doctrina*.<sup>2</sup> He reached significant conclusions about some 41 sources employed by Nonius, about the regular order in which those sources were consulted and about the implications of those methods, under specific circumstances, for editing and arranging fragments of Republican literature and drama.<sup>3</sup> (The last-named result is the principle that has since acquired the name of 'Lindsay's Law.'). Among those 41 sources were works of Republican literature as well as grammatical and lexicographical works of diverse character, to which Lindsay gave the general name 'glossaries.'

The greatest gains from Lindsay's analysis were realized in connection with the complete literary and dramatic texts excerpted by Nonius himself, since the quotations of those works therefore gave a glimpse of their texts in Nonius' day, and since some objective evidence for the editor of fragmentary texts emerged in the instances where Lindsay's Law applies.<sup>4</sup> In the *saeculum* since Lindsay's analysis appeared, studies have investigated the quality of Nonius' source texts and their evidence for the state of the transmission of those works; the second-hand cita-

<sup>1</sup> Citations of Nonius Marcellus, given with Mercier's page numbers, are taken from W.M. Lindsay's Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1903); all references are to the initial line of a lemma. Fragments of Republican drama are cited from the third edition of O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1897–8), sometimes with references to more recent editions of individual authors. This paper will be followed in a subsequent issue of this journal by a series of notes and conjectures proceeding from its conclusions, under the title 'Some fragments of Republican drama from Nonius Marcellus' sources 26, 27 and 28', to which I here occasionally refer as 'Some fragments'. I am grateful to the Journal's referee and its editor for helpful suggestions on these papers. This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

<sup>2</sup> W.M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901). References to earlier studies of Nonius' methods can be had from H.D. Jocelyn, *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 43–4.

<sup>3</sup> Subsequent corrections of Lindsay's description of Nonius' methods have not altered its basic claims; see W. Strzelecki, 'Ein Beitrag zur Quellenbenutzung des Nonius', in J. Irmscher et al., *Aus der altertumswissenschaftlichen Arbeit Volkspolens* (Berlin, 1959), 81–90, at 81–2; and most notably D.C. White, 'The method of composition and sources of Nonius Marcellus', *Studi Noniani* 8 (1980), 111–211.

<sup>4</sup> W.M. Lindsay, 'De fragmentis scriptorum apud Nonium seruat', *RhM* 57 (1902), 196–204 identified the instances in which the principle applies. Attempts to expand Lindsay's list of literary works that Nonius excerpted himself (see e.g. L. Rychlewska, 'De Nonii comoediarum Naeuianarum notitia', *Eos* 57 [1967–8], 203–10; E. Cadoni, 'Citazioni "doppie" e "multiple" da Titinio in Nonio', *Studi Noniani* 13 [1990], 87–120; T. Guardì, 'Afranio in Nonio', *Pan* 13 [1995], 17–37) have not proven convincing.

tions of individual authors have also attracted considerable scrutiny.<sup>5</sup> Less attention, however, has been paid to the glossarial sources in their own right, in order to assess what the material drawn from those works might reveal about them.<sup>6</sup> Lindsay offered some tentative observations about the glossaries,<sup>7</sup> but many questions still remain unanswered or unasked.

Given that a significant proportion of Nonius' quotations came to him from these glossarial sources, a more secure understanding of their individual habits and methods would provide much useful information for students of Republican literature and of lexicography in antiquity. Gathering the quotations that Nonius owes to those sources would make it possible to trace some patterns in those citations and thereby to recover information about the methods of the earlier lexicographers. Just as it has proven useful to the student of Republican literature to know the regular manner in which Verrius Flaccus quoted his examples, so too would similar benefits accrue from comparable information about Nonius' scholarly sources.<sup>8</sup>

My aim in this paper is to expand Lindsay's observations about three closely connected glossarial sources, which we now identify as sources 26, 27 and 28 and which seem to have come from the hand of the same scrupulous lexicographer. Source 26 was a large glossarial work that does not show alphabetical arrangement (called by Lindsay 'Gloss. iii'); sources 27 and 28 were lists of verbs and adverbs, respectively, arranged in strict alphabetical order ('Alph. Verb' and 'Alph. Adverb'). Lindsay's description of those sources remains a useful introduction to the works of republican literature quoted in them:

The close connexion of 'Gloss. iii', 'Alph. Verb.' and 'Alph. Adverb.' is seen in the similarity of their citations. Both the dramas and the Epic of Ennius are cited, the latter with statement of the number of the book, e.g. *Ennius Annal. IX*. Caecilius is widely used (especially the *Hyp. Rastr.*, *Fall.*, *Asot.*), the name of the play being always mentioned. Laeberius is less, and Livius Andronicus more used than in 'Gloss. v.' While 'Gloss. v' draws only from the plays of Naevius, [the] three cognate sources cite both his plays and his *Bellum Poenicum* (with mention of the number of the book). They use freely both Pomponius and Novius, of which authors there is scarcely a mention in 'Gloss. v.' The quotations from Suetius' *Pulli* seem to be peculiar to them.<sup>9</sup>

Although Lindsay was fairly accurate in identifying the works of Republican literature that were quoted in these sources, a number of details in his description will require some modification. Furthermore, he omitted any discussion of the actual methods of the individual who compiled sources 26, 27 and 28, whom, for

<sup>5</sup> A full bibliography can be had from G. Barabino and R. Mazzacane, 'Bibliografia Noniana', in F. Bertini (ed.), *Prolegomena Noniana I* (Genoa, 2000), 7–77, at 17–27, with the *aggiornamento* in F. Bertini (ed.), *Prolegomena Noniana II* (Genoa, 2003), 149–52, at 150–1.

<sup>6</sup> The exception is the first glossarial source ('Gloss. i') and its debated connection to the scripts of Titinius, for which contrast Lindsay (n. 2), 7 and 105–6, with Cadoni (n. 4). Studies of this source nevertheless still fall short of a full analysis of its contents and methods. In this paper and in 'Some fragments' I shall occasionally offer some preliminary observations about the methods of other glossaries.

<sup>7</sup> See Lindsay (n. 2), 104–6.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. W. Strzelecki, *Quaestiones Verrianae* (Warsaw, 1932), esp. 81–92, and L. Rychlewska, 'De Verriana hexametros afferendi ratione', *Eos* 43 (1948–9), 186–97. For a similar analysis of the methods of Macrobius's sources, see H.D. Jocelyn, 'Ancient scholarship and Virgil's use of Republican Latin poetry', *CQ* 14 (1964), 280–95, esp. 289–93 and *CQ* 15 (1965), 126–44.

<sup>9</sup> Lindsay (n. 2), 104–5 n. h.

the sake of brevity, I shall call 'Anon.'<sup>10</sup> For when he spoke of the 'similarity of their citations', he was alluding solely to the range of works of Republican literature quoted, and not to the form in which Anon. gave his quotations. That methodological question is the main concern of this paper.

In the sections that follow I first define the corpus of material that Nonius took from Anon. before turning, in § III, to the earlier lexicographer's methods. I aim to show that Anon. behaved in a thoroughly predictable way when excerpting quotations of poetry, for he seems never to have quoted less than a single complete metrical unit; in longer quotations he sometimes gave partial verses, but only if joined to complete metrical units, and he seems not to have set down quotations that both began and ended with partial verses.<sup>11</sup> Even in the unemended, and woefully transmitted, text of Nonius, almost 80 per cent of Anon.'s quotations adhere to these principles. Misattributions offered by Lindsay and subsequent students of the dictionary, errors in the order of lemmata in the tradition and corruptions of the fragments themselves have inflated the apparent number of exceptions; in § IV, I reconsider several problems and patterns in these exceptions, for which reasonable explanations present themselves. That section involves some detailed but essential inquiries into individual lemmata and passages, since eliminating the apparent exceptions will show more clearly that Anon.'s method of quoting Republican verse was felt to be a rule, rather than simply a strong preference.

## II. THE CORPUS OF QUOTATIONS TAKEN FROM ANON.

In his analysis of Nonius' methods, founded upon detailed lists of quotations in the *De compendiosa doctrina*, Lindsay assigned a significant portion of Nonius' quotations to one or another of the 41 sources. Two major gaps were left in that study, the first of which Lindsay himself bridged a few years later with an analysis of the added quotations in Books 2–4.<sup>12</sup> In 1954 Ludwika Rychlewska closed the other major gap by examining all the quotations occurring in Books

<sup>10</sup> For a number of reasons – many of which emerge only in the details (recorded in notes in this paper and in 'Some fragments') concerning similarities of methods, citations and sources that are shared across these three works but are not reflected in Nonius' other sources – it seems preferable to treat Anon. as one individual who composed three related works. I offer some further reflections on the question of the authorship of these works at the end of this paper.

<sup>11</sup> I have relied on the assumption that Nonius normally took over his quotations unchanged from Anon. Nonius' mechanical style of transcription, which is evident in his deference to his source texts in assigning quotations either to 'M. Tullius' or to 'Cicero', or in recording or omitting the title of Lucilius' *Saturae*, makes this a reasonable assumption. Less obvious than the competing forms of Cicero's name, but ultimately no less compelling, is the point that the material Nonius transcribed from his glossarial sources is so internally consistent, but so distinct from one source to the next, that the repertoire and methods of those individual sources can be identified even though they are no longer extant. There is admittedly some circularity in this last point, but such an explanation is more economical than the assumption that Nonius capriciously, but with unflinching regularity, changed his methods of excerption (and the material he took from those sources) from one glossary to another.

<sup>12</sup> The analysis and lists are presented in Lindsay (n. 2); W.M. Lindsay, 'De citationibus apud Nonium Marcellum', *Philologus* 64 (1905), 438–64. Strzelecki's re-analysis of Book 3 attributed a few more quotations than Lindsay did to Nonius' use of lists 26, 27 and 28 (since Lindsay declined to commit himself to attributions of several groups of quotations in Book 3), but most are too insecure for the present argument. For Strzelecki's claims about Book 3 and an important refutation see W. Strzelecki, 'Zur Entstehung der *Compendiosa Doctrina* des Nonius', *Eos* 34

11–19.<sup>13</sup> In gathering the material that Nonius took from Anon., I have relied, for the sake of transparency, upon the lists of Nonius' quotations given by Lindsay and Rychlewska. Although Lindsay did not assign a number of quotations to a particular source, I have not here supplemented or expanded his analyses. Similarly excluded are a number of quotations that Lindsay assigned to other lists, which could plausibly be admitted to the corpus.<sup>14</sup> Readers wishing to test the arguments of this paper may therefore assume that I have followed those attributions in assembling the initial corpus of Anon.'s quotations.

The resulting preliminary corpus consists of 534 quotations of pre-Varronian drama, satire and epic poetry.<sup>15</sup> 21 of these quotations are too corrupt or otherwise problematic to be relied upon, and are excluded from further consideration.<sup>16</sup> Since a number of quotations whose attribution to Anon. is difficult, dubious, or wrong will be set aside in § IV, I shall reserve further comment about the works of Republican literature excerpted by Anon. for the final section of this paper. From the remaining 513 quotations I shall aim to demonstrate the consistency of this lexicographer's methods. In a few cases I shall argue that Anon. himself was not responsible for the apparent irregularities in those methods that are suggested by some quotations which Lindsay and Rychlewska assigned to these sources; the irregular quotations probably derive instead from different sources.

### III. ANON.'S METHOD OF QUOTING REPUBLICAN VERSE

Ancient lexicographers were given to quoting their sources in units either of sense or of metre.<sup>17</sup> The former method produces generally intelligible fragments whose metre can nevertheless remain unclear. The method of quoting complete units of metre, of which Verrius Flaccus is the most famous practitioner, gives sure guidance on the metrical setting of a fragment but occasionally leaves the sense of the resulting text obscure. I propose that the latter method provides part of the foundation of Anon.'s quotations, which reveal a persistent habit of citing never

(1932–3), 113–29; id., 'Nonius Marcellus', *RE* 17 (1936), 882–97; id., *De Flavio Capro Nonii Auctore* (Cracow, 1936); and White (n. 3).

<sup>13</sup> L. Rychlewska, 'Quaestiones Nonianae: De librorum XI–XX compositione et fontibus', *Tragica II* (Wrocław, 1954), 117–41. Lindsay had not ventured to identify the sources of the 'added' or 'secondary' quotations in these later books.

<sup>14</sup> The remarks of Strzelecki (n. 3), 81–2 about problems in Lindsay's analysis are important. Several studies re-examining Lindsay's analysis in individual books have identified errors or misattributions of quotations. For a recent survey, see A.L. Llorente Pinto, 'La "Compendiosa Doctrina" de Nonio Marcelo', *Helmantica* 181 (2009), 15–72.

<sup>15</sup> I have excluded from consideration the quotations of Varro's *Menippeans*, owing to the particular difficulties of determining whether those quotations are properly from Anon. or from one of the later glossaries, in which the works of Varro predominate. The metrical quotations are in any case few in number, and seem generally to support the argument made here.

<sup>16</sup> Nonius p. 3.13 (Caecilius 140a); 12.21 (Caecilius 115); 29.22 (Ter. *An.* 59); 39.14 (Ter. *An.* 8 and *An.* 15); 75.21 (Caecilius 40 and Pomponius 67); 147.10 (Pomponius 6); 147.18 (Enn. *trag.* 7); 153.22 (Titinius 17); 159.38 (Accius 285); 183.1 (Enn. *praet.* 4); 200.13 (Naev. *com.* 115); 297.16 (Enn. *trag.* 241); 334.38 (Accius 605); 415.28 (Novius 52); 462.31 (Naev. *com.* 32–34); 474.22 (Pomponius 85); 475.32 (Pacuvius 217); 511.27 (Caecilius 51); 515.24 (Novius 24).

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Rychlewska (n. 8), 186; Jocelyn (n. 8), 289; J.T. Welsh, 'The grammarian C. Iulius Romanus and the *fabula togata*', *HSPH* 105 (2010), 255–85, at 274–5.

less than a complete metrical unit. That method is visible in sequences of lemmata such as that at p. 170.4–15, taken from sources 27 and 28:<sup>18</sup>

SORDET, sordidata est. Accius Aegistho (23):  
*cui manus materno sordet sparsa sanguine.*<sup>19</sup> (ia<sup>6</sup>)

SVBLABRARE, cibum intra labra mittere. Nouius Decuma (13):  
*iam ego illi subiens sublabrabo esui illud sinciput.* (tr<sup>7</sup>)

SVBLIMARE, extollere. Ennius Medea (234):  
*sol qui candentem in caelo sublimat facem.* (ia<sup>6</sup>)

SVPERSTITENT, saluent. Ennius Melanippa (249–50):  
*regnumque nostrum ut sospitent, superstitentque*<sup>20</sup> (v<sup>r</sup>)

SAEPTVOSE, obscure. Pacuuius Antiopa (5–6):  
*ita saeptuose dictio abs te datur,  
 quod coniectura sapiens aegre contulit.*<sup>21</sup> (ia<sup>6</sup>)

SEMPITERNE. Pacuuius Medo (234):  
*populoque ut faustum sempiterne sospitent.* (ia<sup>6</sup>)

Anon.'s habit seems to have been to quote not less than a complete metrical unit, as in the case of the six fragments just presented. In this respect his method matches that of Verrius Flaccus.

Sometimes, however, Anon. gave a verse with its continuation, so that partial verses can occur, but only when they are given as part of a quotation that is longer than one verse. The method allows for quotations of, for example, one and a half verses or two and a half verses, but never of just half a verse. The shape of these quotations implies that Anon. embraced a hybrid manner of quotation that gave consideration to the completeness of both metre and sense. Examples occur in the entries for *FRAGESCERE* (p. 111.1) and *FACVL* (p. 111.21):

FRAGESCERE, frangi. Accius Aegistho (25–6):  
 < × – × – × > *neque fera hominum pectora  
 fragescunt, donec uim persensere imperi.*<sup>22</sup> (ia<sup>6</sup>)

<sup>18</sup> Lindsay's suspicion (at Lindsay [n. 2], 55 nn. *f* and *g*) that this sequence came from Anon. was confirmed by Strzelecki (n. 3).

<sup>19</sup> *sparsa ed. 1526* : sparso ω.

<sup>20</sup> W. Strzelecki, 'Meletematon tragicorum specimen', *Eos* 42 (1947), 24–49, at 26–9, recognized the *uersus reizianus*, but other scansions are possible, for which see H.D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1969), 384.

<sup>21</sup> I give the manuscript reading, scanning with hiatus after *dictio*, with P. Schierl, *Die Tragödien des Pacuuius* (Berlin, 2006), 107, rather than Ribbeck's *dictio<ne>*; on either text, Anon. quotes a complete metrical unit.

<sup>22</sup> *persensere imperi Hermann* : *persenserim* (-rint *H*) *imperii* ω : *imperii persenserint Bothe*. I retain, with Lindsay, Hermann's palaeographically simpler conjecture, without complete confidence.

idem Eurysace (337–8):

*numquam erit tam inmanis, cum <non> mea opera extinctum sciat,* (tr<sup>7</sup>)  
*quin fragescat.*<sup>23</sup>

FACVL pro faciliter; huic contrarium est DIFFICVL. Lucilius lib. VI (258–9 Marx):

< - ∞ - ∞ - > *peccare inpune rati sunt* (da<sup>6</sup>)  
*posse et nobilitate facul propellere iniquos.*

Pacuius Teucro (322–3):

*nos illum interea praeficiendo propitiaturos facul* (ia<sup>8</sup>)  
*remur.*<sup>24</sup>

This feature of Anon.'s methods can be illustrated from the quotation of Accius' *Aegisthus*. A lexicographer who quoted units of sense without regard for metre would probably have given only *neque fera hominum pectora | fragescunt*. A lexicographer who quoted units of metre without regard for sense, on the other hand, would have given only *fragescunt, donec uim persensere imperi* or, if so inspired, would also have quoted the entirety of verse 25. Anon.'s methods produce quotations that respect the completeness of both sense and metre, so that in the fragment of the *Aegisthus* the sense is clear, owing to the inclusion of *neque fera hominum pectora*, while the metre also remains transparent, since the fragment ends with a complete senarius.<sup>25</sup> Comparable arguments can be made about the inclusion of *peccare inpune rati sunt* in Lucilius 258–9 and of *remur* in Pacuvius 322–3.

Given the tendency in Republican verse for units of sense and metre to coincide, one may ask whether Anon.'s apparent respect for metre is merely an incidental result of his excerpting complete units of sense. Such an explanation seems not to withstand scrutiny, even though Anon.'s own extended quotations, of the type illustrated from *FRAGESCERE* and *FACVL*, have concealed many examples of what might otherwise have seemed to be complete verses whose sense is somehow deficient. Nevertheless, some examples of metrically complete quotations that include extraneous words are still to be found, as in the case of *quid ita? :: quia enim repuerascis, fugitas personas, pater* (Novius 2, at p. 165.26) or that of *aut me occide, illinc si usquam prouigeam gradum* (Pacuvius 341, at p. 154.2).<sup>26</sup> A lexicographer concerned to illustrate sense alone would probably have omitted the underlined words. These quotations support the description of Anon. as a lexicographer who took account both of metre and of sense; neither of those concerns would seem to be an accident of the other.

<sup>23</sup> <non> *Bothe*. It is, however, possible that the quotation of Accius 337–8 is really an added quotation from the 'Accius i' (5) list, which Nonius seems not to have used in the F-section of Book 2 for primary quotations; he could therefore have gone 'back' (in the order of sources) to that list for added quotations.

<sup>24</sup> praeficiendo] proliciendo *Ribbeck* : perliciendo *Bothe*.

<sup>25</sup> Anon.'s quotations that run for longer than one verse frequently begin from a clearly marked sense boundary; cf. Nonius p. 89.5 (Pacuvius 23–4), p. 90.4 (Accius 542–3), p. 111.1 (Accius 25–6, quoted above), p. 111.7 (Enn. *trag.* 142–3), etc.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Nonius p. 153.33 (*fateor*, Accius 294), 512.1 (*non negat*, Caecilius 43) and the discussion at 'Some fragments', § 4. Students of Afranius have long doubted the transmitted readings *adest* (Afranius 6, at p. 76.15) and *uidet* (Afranius 91, at p. 89.5) but the metrical method of citation would account for both. Certainty is just beyond reach for p. 75.21 (*perii*, Pomponius 67), 75.25 (*age age*, Accius 304), 76.1 (*quid fit*, Enn. *trag.* 68), 98.4 (*quid istuc est*, Titinius 102), 126.33 (*namque huc id uenio*, Accius 124), 127.22 (*nullus sum*, Caecilius 46), and others.

The examples given so far have emphasized iambo-trochaic verse, but the same habits are also evident in Anon.'s quotations of dramatic cantica, of dactylic hexameters, and even of Saturnians:

- p. 97.29 DELECTARE, inlicere, adtrahere. Ennius Thyeste (303 Jocelyn):  
*set me Apollo ipse delectat ductat Delphicus.* (cr<sup>2</sup> tr<sup>4</sup>)
- p. 98.20 DIV pro die: unde et INTERDIV dicitur ... Plautus Mercatore (*immo Cas.* 823):  
*noctuae et diu ut uiro subdola sis.* (an<sup>4</sup>)
- p. 474.35 OPINO, pro opinor. Plautus Bacchidibus (12):  
*Praenestinum opino esse: ita erat gloriosus.*<sup>27</sup> (ba<sup>4</sup>)
- p. 111.39 FORTVNATIM, prospere. Ennius Annali lib. I (102–3 Skutsch):  
*quod mihi rei que fidei regno uobisque, Quiritis,*  
*se fortunatim feliciter ac bene uortat.* (da<sup>6</sup>)
- p. 176.6 SINGVLATIM et SINGILLATIM, a singulis. ... Lucilius lib. XIX (563 Marx):  
*sic singillatim nostrum unusquisque mouetur.* (da<sup>6</sup>)
- p. 76.3 ATROX, crudum. Naeuius Belli Poenici lib. IV (fr. 33 Strzelecki):  
*simul atrocia porricerent exta ministratores.* (Sat.)
- p. 90.24 CONCINNARE, conficere uel colligere. Naeuius Belli Poenici lib. IV (fr. 32 Strzelecki):  
*transit Melita*  
*Romanus exercitus, insulam integram urit*  
*populatur, uastat, rem hostium concinnat.*<sup>28</sup> (Sat.)

These examples have brought together evidence for Anon.'s methods of excerpting poetry. His own quotations of Republican verse consist of, or begin or end with, a complete metrical unit. It appears that Anon. did not give a quotation in a form that would leave its metre obscured, but he also gave some attention to providing complete (or very nearly so) units of sense.

It remains to determine whether this tendency was a rule, or simply a preference. Of the 513 quotations on which this analysis is founded, 408, or about 79.5 per cent, are given in the manuscripts in a form that respects the methods just described. Some 105 quotations, or about 20.5 per cent, seem on first inspection to violate that pattern. Taken in isolation the latter number perhaps seems substantial enough to show that Anon.'s tendency to quote complete metrical units was simply a strong preference. Two factors argue against that conclusion. First, of the 408 quotations just mentioned, 91 consist of a complete verse or verses joined to a partial verse, of the type illustrated above from the lemmata *FRAGESCERE* and *FACVL*. 89 of those 91 quotations begin or end with a complete metrical unit; in only two problematic instances does the transmitted text of a fragment begin and end

<sup>27</sup> Although the fragment derives from the lacunose beginning of *Bacch.*, its metrical completeness is corroborated by the overlapping bacchiac tetrameters quoted at Priscian, *Gramm.* II 575.

<sup>28</sup> I give both fragments of Naeuius' poem with the metrical setting of W. Strzelecki, *Belli Punici carminis quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1964), rather than with Lindsay. Alternative versions of each are possible, but in all instances Anon.'s methods would be maintained.

with incomplete metrical units.<sup>29</sup> Beginning or ending a quotation with a complete metrical unit establishes, with considerable clarity, its metre; that habit suggests that the lexicographer considered that information to be of importance to a reader of such quotations. Quoting partial, incomplete verses would leave that information quite obscure. Second, the tabulation just given offers the extreme case: it takes no heed of alternative analyses of the quotations that Lindsay attributed to Anon., or of emendations of Nonius' text. Both are of some significance. In the next section I consider a number of factors that artificially inflate the number of exceptions and therefore have obscured Anon.'s consistent methods. Accounting for these factors reduces the number of violations of this rule to fewer than 30 of the 513 quotations.

#### IV. EXCEPTIONS

In this section I aim to reassign or otherwise explain a number of problematic quotations that violate the rule that I proposed to have governed Anon.'s quotations. I examine in the subsections below: (A) probable misattributions offered by Lindsay, where the quotation in fact derives from a different source; (B) a case of large-scale transposition in Nonius' text that has caused a sequence of lemmata to be assigned, wrongly, to Anon.; (C) tralatitious quotations that apparently came in from the margins of Nonius' copy of Anon.; and (D) probable errors of transmission that have obscured the shape of Anon.'s quotations. With these detailed arguments I hope to demonstrate that the greatest portion of the exceptions to Anon.'s methods are merely illusory.

##### (A) *Misattributions in Lindsay's analysis*

Nonius' characteristic methods of constructing entries by accumulating quotations from his diverse sources created a work that frequently gives the impression of chaos. Lindsay himself was rather tolerant of the chaos, convinced as he was that the tradition was marred by small- and large-scale transpositions. That conviction is right in principle, but it also led him sometimes to tolerate peculiarities that superficially supported his claims, but for which alternative and often more plausible explanations are available.<sup>30</sup>

At the boundaries of sequences of lemmata, Lindsay sometimes attributed a lemma to Anon. that properly belongs to an adjacent or neighbouring list:

(1) Nonius' entry for *SAEPIVNT* (p. 41.1) begins: *SAEPIVNT significat tenent, inpediunt; dictum a saepibus, quae obiectae iter cludent; unde et CIRCVMSEPTVM dicitur*. Lindsay wondered whether this lemma and its quotation of Afranius' *Mateterae* derived from a note on *saepe* found in list 28.<sup>31</sup> It is unlikely that a scholar as careful as Anon. would have produced so barbarous a note, or that Nonius would have been the one to rescue him, by

<sup>29</sup> The two exceptions are not particularly compelling, and can be brought to order with minor interventions. See 'Some fragments', § 9.

<sup>30</sup> Any such analysis is bound to introduce explanations for which alternatives are possible or even more plausible. Here I aim only to demonstrate, through some characteristic problems, that Lindsay's views ought to be regarded only as a starting point.

<sup>31</sup> Lindsay (n. 2), 14 n. *m*.



eliminating mention of *saepe*, from such a blunder. A more plausible explanation would make the entry come from a marginal note in the ‘Cicero v’ (29) list, attached to Cicero, *De officiis* 2.39 (*nullis praesidiis saepti multis adficiuntur iniuriis*). Lindsay was perhaps unwilling to admit this explanation since the next entry (*STIGMATIAS*, p. 41.5) is illustrated with a quotation of *De officiis* 2.25. That order of entries is contrary to the one expected by Lindsay’s analysis. That two entries are out of their correct order seems more credible than the idea about *saepe*.<sup>32</sup>

(2) Under *APSENTE NOBIS* (p. 76.15), the incomplete quotation of Plautus, *Amphitruo* 400, which illustrates *PRAESENTE*, has been moved forward from its proper position in the ‘Plautus ii’ (30) list in order to pair it with Anon.’s examples illustrating *APSENTE NOBIS*. In the quotations Nonius took from Anon. to illustrate *PRAESENTE* (p. 154.13) this verse of Plautus is not given.

(3) The lemma *PARCVIT* (p. 153.20) illustrates the rarer form of the perfect tense, in the place of the customary form *pepercit*. Lindsay attributed this entry to Anon., since it could form the opening of the sequence of alphabetically arranged verbs, which runs *PARCVIT*, *PERBITERE*, *PIGRARE*, *PROVIGERE*, *PVELLASCERE*. Lindsay thought that Naevian drama was quoted in Anon., but he was on this point probably mistaken; only a few quotations from Naevian scripts could be attributed to Anon., and in each instance those attributions are suspicious.<sup>33</sup> It is therefore not entirely plausible to treat this quotation as coming from Anon. It is speculative but nevertheless attractive to suggest that the Naevian quotation comes from a marginal note in the ‘Lucilius ii’ (25) list, which provided the preceding entry *PERMITIES*.

(4) At p. 165.16, the entry ‘*REDANTRVARE*, *redire*’ is illustrated with incomplete quotations of Lucilius 320 Marx and Pacuvius 104–5. Lindsay marked this entry as the opening of a sequence taken from list 27. These quotations are given in fuller form, in the same order, by Festus (p. 334.19 Lindsay s.v. *REDANTRVARE*). Nonius’ preceding lemma (*REPEDARE*, p. 165.12) is illustrated with Lucilius 677 Marx, which quotation opens *rediisse ac repedasse*. The Festan material has therefore probably come to Nonius from a marginal annotation, entered into the ‘Lucilius ii’ list at that point, rather than from list 27; to that transmission would be owed Nonius’ banal *Graecos* at p. 165.19 for what Festus preserves as *Graios*.

Similarly, a number of problematic quotations within lemmata are perhaps best described as added quotations drawn from other lists, rather than as deriving from Anon.:

(1) At p. 72.22 s.v. *ASSVLATIM*, quotations of Plautus, *Captivi* 832 (a complete trochaic septenarius) and of Sueius’ *Pulli* (characteristic of Anon.) are followed by a problematic quotation of Plautus, *Menaechmi* 859. Entries deriving from Anon. generally are arranged so that quotations from the same author are grouped together. The few instances where such author clusters are interrupted generally look to have been combined from different sources by Nonius.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Some evidence for the disruption of the order of entries here is provided by the position of *VERNILITER* (p. 42.19), which seems to derive from list 27; see ‘Some fragments’, § 17.

<sup>33</sup> The most plausible quotation of Naevian drama that has been assigned to Anon. occurs at p. 200.13 s.v. *COLLVS*. Elsewhere, only p. 462.31 s.v. *MVLTAIRE* is possibly, but not plausibly, assigned to Anon. A few quotations of Naevian comedy are excluded in the next subsection. By contrast, Anon. gives thirteen quotations of Naevius’ *Bellum Poenicum*, an imbalance which appears significant, and probably should be taken to indicate that Anon. did not have access to, or for some reason now unknowable chose not to use copies of any Naevian scripts.

<sup>34</sup> In the entry for *TETINERIT* (p. 178.7), Anon.’s quotation from Pacuvius’ *Medus* has been supplemented by Nonius with quotations from perhaps the ‘Accius i’ (5) and from the ‘Pacuvius’ (12) volumes. The separation of the Pacuvian quotations reveals the process. Cf. p. 104.7 s.v. *EXPALPARE*, discussed in subsection C, below.

(2) In several instances it is difficult to determine whether quotations have come from Anon. or from 'Gloss. iv' or 'Gloss. v'.<sup>35</sup> At p. 78.30 s.v. *BLATERARE*, two metrically complete quotations of Afranius are followed by a partial quotation of Caecilius' *Hymnis*, which script is otherwise cited by Nonius only from 'Gloss. v'; that source gave quotations in units of sense, rather than of metre.<sup>36</sup> Similarly dubious are the incomplete quotations at p. 104.21 (Pomponius 42, Laberius 11–2), 126.33 (Pacuvius 111), 132.29 (Accius 513), 270.5 (Caecilius 227), and 401.14 (Plaut. *Merc.* 204), all of which were attributed by Lindsay to the works of Anon.<sup>37</sup>

My analysis of these lemmata represents minor divergences from Lindsay's analysis or more agnostic treatments of quotations that seem to derive from Nonius' glossaries. The first group of exceptions is more significant than the second, in that it demonstrates how Lindsay occasionally ignored a plausible interpretation in favour of one that directly supported his theory about Nonius' methods. There are many such instances elsewhere in Lindsay's analysis, but they do not materially alter his claims. For the present purposes, however, these modifications permit the removal of these aberrant quotations from Anon.

(B) *A Transposition in the P-section of Book 2 and 'Gloss. iii'*

The most difficult material attributed to Anon. is the sequence at the opening of the P-section of Book 2 (pp. 148.25 s.v. *PAENVLARIVM*–151.10 s.v. *PASCEOLVS*), which Lindsay with some hesitation assigned to 'Gloss. iii'.<sup>38</sup> Of the 23 relevant quotations in that sequence, 13 consist of less than a complete metrical unit. Both the texts that are quoted and the manner in which the quotations are given differ substantially from other groups of quotations taken from Anon.; most significant is the complete absence of the Republican tragedians, who otherwise account for about 40 per cent of the corpus of Anon.'s quotations. Those differences are themselves sufficient to cast some doubt on Lindsay's attribution, doubts which only increase on closer examination of the P-section as a whole.

The P-section of Book 2 also presents a striking and isolated irregularity in the order in which Nonius used his sources. In it there occur primary quotations attributed by Lindsay to the following lists (the numbers in parentheses refer to Lindsay's list of sources):

<sup>35</sup> The former, containing principally Varronian quotations, predominantly affects quotations excluded from this study. 'Gloss. v', which drew on a wider range of sources, is a more significant source of ambiguity for the quotations of Republican drama.

<sup>36</sup> All 45 relevant quotations (28 in verse, 17 prose) in Book 1 that are taken from the 'Gloss. v' (38A and 38B) list consist of complete, albeit sometimes scanty, units of sense. Of the 28 verse quotations, 18 consist of at least one complete verse against 10 that are metrically incomplete. In view of the tendency in Republican scenic verse for units of sense and metre to coincide, this distribution strongly suggests that 'Gloss. v' quoted by sense, and not by metre.

<sup>37</sup> In some cases it would also be possible to argue that the quotation derives from Anon. and to propose a new metrical arrangement of it. At p. 104.21, Pomponius 42 could be treated as a catalectic bacchiac trimeter (ba<sup>3</sup>; Laberius 11, not so easily rescued, is perhaps best attributed to 'Gloss. v'). At p. 132.29, is Accius 513 (where the inclusion of *et* is characteristic of Anon.'s methods) an iambic monometer with a cretic colon (ia<sup>2</sup> cr<sup>2</sup>; cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 99 and *Rud.* 206a), or, at p. 270.5, is Caecilius 227 a catalectic trochaic dimeter (tr<sup>4</sup>)?

<sup>38</sup> For a comparable sequence, cf. the S-section of Book 2, which Lindsay assigned to 'Gloss. i'; Strzelecki (n. 3) showed that Nonius had in this instance used his lists in reverse order.

- (?)Gloss. iii (26)
- B { Plautus ii (30)  
 Varro ii (31)  
 Gellius (32)  
*PROXIMI* [= Gellius, *NA* 10.24]  
*PROPERATIM* [= Gellius, *NA* 12.15]
- A { *PERMITIES* Gellius [so Lindsay]; or Lucilius ii (25), Book 29?  
*PARCVIT* Alph. Verb [Lindsay]; or Lucilius ii (25) [cf. A.3, above]  
 Alph. Verb (27)  
 Alph. Adverb (28)  
 Cicero v (29)  
 Gloss. i (1)  
 – Plautus i (2); Lucretius (3); Accius i (5); Accius ii (8); Lucilius i (9); Pacuvius (12); (?)Gloss. ii (14); Afranius (19) –  
 Lucilius ii (25)  
*PETIGO* Lucilius ii (Book 30)  
*PORRIGO* Lucilius ii (Book 30)  
*PROFLIGARE* [~ Gellius, *NA* 15.5; so Lindsay, but cf. n. 42 below]  
 – Varro iii (33); Cicero vi (34); Sisenna (36); Cicero vii (37); (?)Gloss. iv (35B); Cicero viii (39); Varro iv (40); Varro v (41)

Two problems stand out in this sequence of the lists and in the individual quotations mentioned. First, Nonius' lists are used in a predictable order, except that lists 30–31–32 (collectively marked as group 'B') precede lists 27–28–29 (group 'A'). A related difficulty occurs in the two entries *PERMITIES* and *PARCVIT*, which, as I have argued in the previous subsection, look to be orphans from the 'Lucilius ii' list. Groups A and B, with or without the alleged 'Gloss. iii' entries, are out of place, well before their expected position after the second 'Lucilius ii' (25) sequence (*PETIGO*, *PORRIGO*) and before the 'Varro iii' (33) entries. This order of sources would not necessarily be problematic by itself, for a number of comparable irregularities occur in the manuscripts that are not obviously the result of errors of transmission.<sup>39</sup>

A second problem, however, demonstrates that these entries have been misplaced through an error of transmission. In the list given above I have singled out seven specific entries, originally perhaps from the 'Lucilius ii' and 'Gellius' lists, that show signs of disturbance. Lindsay elsewhere called such disturbances the 'ragged ends'<sup>40</sup> that result from an error of transposition. In the P-section the 'ragged ends' are these:

(1) at p. 153.9–20, two lemmata (*PROXIMI*, *PROPERATIM*) taken from Gellius (list 32) are followed by one or two lemmata (*PERMITIES*<sup>41</sup> and perhaps *PARCVIT*) taken from the 'Lucilius ii' list (25);

<sup>39</sup> See e.g. Lindsay's (n. 2), 20–1 and 37–8, analysis of the beginnings of Books 6 and 2A.

<sup>40</sup> Lindsay (n. 2), 91–2.

<sup>41</sup> In the entry for *PERMITIES*, Plaut. *Asin.* 133 (from the 'Plautus ii' (30) list) occurs as an added quotation appended to the 'Lucilius ii' (25) list. That the 'Plautus ii' list is used for an added quotation further supports the claim that these entries have been transposed from their proper place. If Nonius had composed these entries in the sequence they are given in the manuscripts, the entry *PERMITIES* ought to occur in the 'Plautus ii' sequence printed at pp. 151–2, with *Asin.* 133 as the primary quotation, and not in the 'Lucilius ii' sequence.

(2) at p. 160.18–23, two lemmata (*PETIGO*, *PORRIGO*) from the ‘Lucilius ii’ list are followed by a discussion of *PROFLIGARE* from the Gellius list with its marginalia.<sup>42</sup>

Such disjunctions in the order of sources of sequential lemmata are a strong indication of a transposition in the text. These two ‘ragged ends’ (at the transition from list 32 to list 25, and again from list 25 to list 32) are the most striking. Less flagrant but still noticeable disjunctions occur at the outer boundaries of the combined group B-A indicated above, in the alleged transition from ‘Gloss. iii’ (list 26) to ‘Plautus ii’ (30) and from ‘Cicero v’ (29) to ‘Gloss. i’ (1).

These problems, I propose, are to be resolved by transposing groups B and A to their proper position. Order would be restored on the hypothesis that perhaps two leaves had become detached from a manuscript, and were inserted for safe keeping near the beginning of the P-section, but in the incorrect order, so that a hypothetically numbered sequence 1r1v2r2v was put back into the manuscript in the order 2r2v1r1v.<sup>43</sup> On this hypothesis, leaf 1 will have contained group A above, and leaf 2 group B.<sup>44</sup> Those leaves originally stood after the entry for *PORRIGO* (p. 160.21), which gives itself away as the proper position for their content: the quotations of Book 30 of Lucilius will have preceded those of Book 29, as is usual in this list, and Nonius will have used his lists in regular order (25–32), continuing onwards with the entry for *PROFLIGARE*, which belongs to the Gellius list and occurs in its expected sequence (*PROPERATIM*, from Gell. *NA* 12.15, coming before *PROFLIGARE*, Gell. *NA* 15.5). This explanation restores order to Nonius’ use of his sources and eliminates the ‘ragged ends’ identified above.

Lindsay himself seems to have recognized these problems, but he declined to give voice to the solution.<sup>45</sup> I cannot explain his reticence but it seems just possible that this explanation was ignored because he could not square it with his understanding of the archetype of our text of Nonius. This transposition affects four Mercier pages divided precisely into two-page units. Lindsay himself knew that an average leaf of the immediate archetype of our manuscripts of Nonius contained three Mercier pages, not two or four. Given that disparity, it would be difficult to assign this transposition to the immediate archetype. Instead, it would have occurred earlier,<sup>46</sup> and probably in a copy where each leaf held the equivalent of two Mercier pages.

<sup>42</sup> The quotation of Cic. *Tusc.* 5.15 (*profligata iam et paene ad exitum deducta quaestio est*) given in that entry does not itself occur in Gell. *NA* 15.5, as we have it, but it was almost certainly entered into the margin there or inserted by Nonius himself into the lemma. Cf. Gellius’ etymology of *profligo* (15.5.2): *nam cum ab adfligendo et ad perniciem interitumque deducendo inclinatam id tractumque sit ...* Nonius or another reader will have spotted the similarity and augmented Gellius with more Ciceronian material. Since Nonius’ use of Gellius is comparable to his use of the ‘glossaries’, this example ought also to be kept in mind in the next subsection.

<sup>43</sup> For an alternative codicological explanation of a comparable problem of transposition in Book 6 see Lindsay (n. 2), 92 n. y.

<sup>44</sup> More precisely, leaf 1 contained, inclusively, the entries from *PERMITIES* to *PRAEFRACTVM* (pp. 153.14–155.13), while leaf 2 contained *PIEM* to *PROPERATIM* (pp. 151.15–153.12).

<sup>45</sup> I draw this conclusion from Lindsay (n. 2), 53 n. s, 54. n. u and 92 with nn. x and y.

<sup>46</sup> This conclusion is supported by the presence of the important corrections of *F*<sup>3</sup> throughout the transposed passage at pp. 151–5 (see J.W. Brown, ‘The corrections in the Florence ms. of Nonius’, *CR* 9 (1895), 396–403, 447–54), which suggests that the source of those corrections already presented this passage in its transposed location. By contrast, *F*<sup>3</sup> includes no corrections throughout the more famous transposed passage at pp. 406–9 (appearing in the manuscripts at p. 3.13), merely indicating corruption at the beginning and end of that passage with two

Removing that material to its proper position also eliminates a signal difficulty in the opening sequence of entries, for Lindsay's attribution of those entries to 'Gloss. iii' is no longer necessary. The transposed leaves interrupted the original order of entries, where *PISCULENTVM* and *PASCEOLVS* (p. 151.6–14, inclusively) were followed by *PVLCRITAS* and *PROLETARII* (p. 155.18–23, inclusively). Examining together what Lindsay marked as two separate glossarial sequences (pp. 148.25–151.14 and pp. 155.18–157.22) demonstrates that it is correct to remove the intervening passages and thereby to reunite the two sequences as a cohesive unit. The P-section opened with several entries, jumbled together, that were drawn from more than one glossarial source.<sup>47</sup> There are a number of aberrant features occurring on both sides of the transposed passages that can only be explained with the hypothesis that the two sequences form a more coherent unit than Lindsay's analysis suggests. Firstly, there occur quotations drawn from Accius' *Pragmaticon libri* (p. 150.11 *bis*, and p. 156.3), a work which is quoted nowhere else in the *De compendiosa doctrina*; Naevian comedy is also prominent in each glossarial sequence, and is quoted far more often than it is elsewhere in Nonius' dictionary. Secondly, a number of discursive (and sometimes banal) explanations are given in this material, which focus especially on comparably formed words; such remarks are not found within the transposed passages, nor are they equally prominent elsewhere in Nonius.<sup>48</sup> Certain of these lemmata display an enthusiasm for the stylistic *abundantia* of Republican Latin far surpassing what is displayed elsewhere.<sup>49</sup> The coherent style of these two sequences leaves little doubt that Nonius set them down as a single unit, composed of entries drawn from several glossaries, and that the original sequence has since been interrupted by a large-scale transposition.<sup>50</sup>

This lengthy discussion of a transposed passage in the P-section of Book 2 has been necessary in order to exclude a series of lemmata that Lindsay assigned, with hesitation but nevertheless wrongly, to 'Gloss. iii.' Excluding that material removes considerable obscurity from Anon.'s methods, since the sequence presents a number

asterisks (J.H. Onions, *Nonius Marcellus: De Compendiosa Doctrina I–III* [Oxford, 1895], xi; W.M. Lindsay, 'The lost "codex optimus" of Nonius Marcellus', *CR* 10 [1896], 16–18, at 16).

<sup>47</sup> The characteristic texts and methods of the first, third and fifth glossaries are in evidence, but it would be hazardous to attempt to sort the entries here. Certain points suggest that Anon. was not the sole source of these entries: at p. 149.17, the title *Matertera* in the singular attributed to Afranius matches the singular form given at p. 392.15 (from 'Gloss. i'), while Anon. excerpted a copy of the script that bore the title *Materterae*. The quotations of Naevian drama and of Cato's *Origines*, both absent from Anon.'s repertoire, are best assigned to 'Gloss. v.'

<sup>48</sup> Such as, for example, at p. 155.23, in the entry for the imperatives *PROSPICA* and *DESPICA*, which concludes *potest ergo PROSPICVS et DESPICVS dici*; cf. further the remarks in entries at p. 149.5, 149.18 *bis*, 150.33, 155.30 and 155.33.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the definitions at pp. 150.11 and 155.23.

<sup>50</sup> I hesitate to press the peculiarity of this material further, but it is worth noting that a number of entries with explanatory digressions are illustrated with works of Republican literature not otherwise quoted in Nonius. Furthermore, these peculiarities fall in the longest section in Book 2, at 26 Teubner pages (the next-longest section in Book 2, the C-section, is 21 Teubner pages, and has been expanded by more extensive use of 'Gloss. i' and by a number of words beginning *con-*; the other sections are between five and fifteen Teubner pages). One might therefore maintain that Nonius made use of a source related to the letter *P* that was not used elsewhere. On the other hand it is an as yet unexplained but noteworthy peculiarity of 'Gloss. v' that the lemmata drawn from it in Book 1 begin disproportionately with the letter *P*; see, most conveniently, Lindsay (n. 2), 16–17. What significance, if any, this has alongside the fact that the Pomponius (6) and 'Varro i' (15) volumes contained works whose titles began with the letter *P* is not known.

of irregularities that can scarcely be reconciled with the habits of the author of 'Gloss. iii.' On this analysis, the P-section of Book 2 begins with a jumble of entries that have been taken from several glossarial sources, neither expressly nor exclusively from Anon., without clear order.

(C) *Tralatitious quotations in the margins of Anon.*

In his analysis of Nonius' sources, Lindsay recognized that the lexicographer was using copies of literary texts that had been annotated with citations from other texts. In composing his dictionary, Nonius took over many marginal jottings along with the quotations of the main text, as an easy and useful way of expanding his work. Such marginalia are easy to recognize now, being revealed when, for example, a primary quotation of Naevius interrupts a sequence of primary quotations taken from a Plautus list.<sup>51</sup> While this hypothesis of annotation in the literary texts restored much order to Lindsay's theory about Nonius' methods, the question of marginal notes was not significant in the analysis of the glossarial sources, where it is more difficult to separate a 'main' text from a marginal note. But Lindsay's silence on annotations in the glossaries is still troubling, for it is not particularly credible that Nonius' texts of literary works should have been marked up extensively, whereas the more utilitarian lexicographical texts stayed pristine.

In the particular case of Anon.'s works, where a clear idea of their author's methods has started to emerge, it seems possible to extend Lindsay's ideas about marginal annotations to the glossaries themselves, and in particular to determine that Nonius' copy of Anon.'s works had been annotated by one or more readers who were not their author, and whose methods and sources therefore sometimes clashed with those of the author. In the case of a lexicographical work, however, it is not as simple as separating Naevius from Plautus; rather, the sifting is necessarily more tentative, depending largely on what we can reconstruct of the lexicographer's interests, sources and methods, and on what material seems inconsistent with those factors.

Several quotations have come into Nonius' dictionary, alongside material deriving from Anon., that quite plainly violate the earlier lexicographer's methods. The lemma *EXPALPARE* (p. 104.7), occurring in a sequence (*EXPETVNT*, *EXPALPARE*, *EXPERGO*, *EXTRABVNT*) taken from list 27, illustrates how Nonius used that list and what may reasonably be identified as its annotations:

*EXPALPARE*, *elicere*. Plautus *Poenulo* (357):  
*quid faciam? :: exora, blandire, expalpa ...*

Pomponius *Collegio* (32):  
*siquid expalpare possim ab illo ...*

Plautus *Vidularia* (fr. xvi):  
*nunc seruus argentum a patre expalpabitur.*

Here one must read the quotations against Nonius' guidance, in order to understand how this entry came together. The quotation of the *Vidularia* is obviously a complete iambic senarius, and probably illustrated, in Nonius' source, the rare

<sup>51</sup> Clear examples are identified and explained at Lindsay (n. 2), 11 nn. o, p, q and r.

use of *expalpari* as a deponent verb.<sup>52</sup> It is preceded by two metrically incomplete quotations where *expalpare* is given in the active form; these quotations have guided the structure of Nonius' lemma, which focusses, as befits Book 2, on the sense rather than the form of *expalpare*. The quotation of Pomponius' *Collegium* (a script never otherwise quoted by Nonius) has probably been introduced into the margin of the copy of Anon.'s list, as a counterpart to the *Vidularia* quotation (*siquid expalpare possim ab illo* being comparable in syntax to *nunc seruius argentum a patre expalpabitur*). The quotation of the *Poenulus* is less easy to justify. It has the look of a note introduced simply to explain the meaning of the word through synonyms. Neither of these metrically incomplete quotations harmonizes with the original purpose for which the quotation of the *Vidularia* was evidently adduced, which Nonius subsequently obscured.<sup>53</sup>

A similar example can be found in another quotation of the *Poenulus*; that script is quoted five other times in material taken from Anon.: four are complete metrical units, and the fifth is the quotation of *Poen.* 449 at p. 126.29:

INFELICENT. Caecilius Nauclero (114):

*ut te di omnes infelicent cum male monita memoria!*

Plautus Poenulo (449):

*di illum infelicent omnes! . . .*

As in the case of the note on *expalpare*, here what was presumably a marginal annotation in the copy of Anon.'s list was transferred by Nonius into his burgeoning dictionary along with the metrically complete quotation of Caecilius. Exceptional quotations such as these are fairly easy to spot: at p. 40.1, the tiny snippet of Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus Rastraria* (89), *rabere se ait*, has probably come from a marginal note added by a reader of Anon.<sup>54</sup>

In some instances the form of a title or even the identity of the work that is quoted can show that such quotations are not original to Anon.'s work. At p. 178.14 s.v. *TETVLIT*, a quotation attributed to Caecilius' *Hypobolimaesus* (75) is appended to a metrically complete quotation of Accius' *Andromeda* (116). Anon. always gives the quotations of the *Hypobolimaesus Rastraria* with the full two-word title.<sup>55</sup> In the only other quotation from the script known to us by the alternative titles *Hypobolimaesus siue Subdituios*, Anon. quotes a complete metrical unit against the title *Subdituios*.<sup>56</sup> There is good reason, therefore, for suspecting either that there is a lacuna in the Nonian text (*Hypobolimaeso* <*Rastraria*: × - > *aerumnam* ...) or, if there is no lacuna, that Caecilius' *aerumnam pariter tetulisti meam* came to Nonius as a marginal annotation in the copy of Anon., added by someone who knew the script as the *Hypobolimaesus* rather than, as did Anon., as the *Subdituios*.

<sup>52</sup> The same verse is quoted, from the 'Plautus i' list, at p. 476.22 s.v. *EXPALPABITVR*, where Nonius, guided by sense rather than metre, omitted *nunc*.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also n. 25, above, on interrupted clusters of quotations from the same author.

<sup>54</sup> Anon. quotes the *Hypobolimaesus Rastraria*, with the complete title, six times; the other five are complete verses. A similar case of a banal marginal annotation is found at p. 127.13 (from Ennius' *Alcmeo*, not quoted elsewhere in Nonius).

<sup>55</sup> pp. 16.13, 89.14, 147.6, 176.6, 505.29.

<sup>56</sup> p. 514.31. Lindsay's index omits this quotation; at p. 204.26 the quotation attributed to the *Subdituios* descends from Gell. *NA* 15.9.

Furthermore, the quotations from certain dramatic scripts are so frequently irregular as to suggest that Anon. did not excerpt the works himself. These scripts would instead have been pillaged by a later reader who marked up the margins of Anon.'s works with extracts from them. It is clear that Anon. made use of a script of Livius Andronicus' *Aegisthus*; from his use of it Nonius preserves ten quotations, nine of which certainly and the tenth probably<sup>57</sup> were given in keeping with Anon.'s methods. The quotations of the same dramatist's *Tereus*, however, are strikingly fewer and more erratic: of four total quotations, two are metrically incomplete.<sup>58</sup> Similarly, from Anon. descend 24 quotations of Novius, most of which are given with laudable respect for metre; but the two quotations of Novius' *Dapatici* are metrically incomplete, and are introduced to illustrate a similar point (*dicebo* and *uiuebo* standing as alternative future-tense forms for *dicam* and *uiuam*). It is usually possible to argue, from such distributions, that Anon. himself did not excerpt a script, and that those metrically incomplete quotations were perhaps the handiwork of a collaborating reader of Anon., rather than of Anon. himself.<sup>59</sup> Nonius, with mechanical regularity, transcribed everything that looked useful.

(D) *Errors in the transmitted text*

No account has yet been taken of the simple but significant fact that the transmitted text of fragments preserved by Nonius is bad, having been corrupted by omissions, transpositions and errors.<sup>60</sup> The unemended paradosis presents a high proportion of quotations given in keeping with Anon.'s hypothesized method, which itself lends credence to that claim. Since Anon. seems to have avoided ever setting down less than a complete metrical unit, and since Nonius regularly took over the material in his copy of Anon. without alteration, it is plausible that some of the remaining exceptions are simply illusory, the result of facile scribal error which has corrupted otherwise normal quotations.

A number of attractive conjectures known to or adopted by Ribbeck demonstrate how readily some of these remaining apparent exceptions can be brought to order. For example, in Nonius' text of Pomponius 129 (p. 40.24), < × > *hoc sciunt omnes, quantum est qui cossim cacant*, a complete senarius is restored with Guietus' transposition *sciunt hoc*. In Nonius' text of Caecilius 223 (p. 118.9), *per mysteria hic inhoneste grauidauit probro*, a fragment which Lindsay had to set as two incomplete iambic lines, Bothe's palaeographically simple supplement *per*

<sup>57</sup> For a conjecture on the tenth fragment that restores Anon.'s methods, see 'Some fragments', § 9.

<sup>58</sup> The evidence is considerably less clear for the single quotations of Livius' *Hermiona*, *Aiix* and *Equus Troianus*, all of which are metrically complete but by their paucity could be tralatitious. For the comparative frequency of quotation from a script as a factor in distinguishing first-hand excerpts from tralatitious quotations, cf. Welsh (n. 17), 263, 266–9.

<sup>59</sup> Some further examples: the quotations of Pomponius' scripts bearing a title naming or referring to the *bucco* are frequently incomplete (*Bucco Adoptatus*, two of three quotations incomplete; *Bucco Auctoratus*, one incomplete quotation); by contrast, the two quotations recorded against the title *Auctoratus* are metrically complete. Five of twelve quotations of Pacuvius' *Chryses* are metrically incomplete. Afranius' *Omen* (two quotations, both incomplete; cf. 'Some fragments', § 16) and Caecilius' *Asotus* (five quotations, three incomplete) present similar cases. In some instances one may prefer to attribute a quotation to a later glossary, especially 'Gloss. v'.

<sup>60</sup> F. Bertini, 'Errori nella tradizione manoscritta della *Compendiosa doctrina*', *Studi Noniani* 1 (1967), 9–66, remains fundamental.



*mysteria hic inhoneste* <*honestam*> *gravidauit probro* restores a complete trochaic septenarius. I count nineteen further fragments where certain or highly probable conjectures adopted or reported by Ribbeck would restore metrically complete quotations, in keeping with Anon.'s apparent methods.<sup>61</sup>

## V. THE ANONYMOUS LEXICOGRAPHER

The exceptions discussed in § IV would eliminate or otherwise justify some 77 of the 105 quotations that violate Anon.'s apparent habit of not quoting less than a single complete metrical unit. In a paper in a subsequent issue of this journal I shall offer several suggestions and conjectures that would reduce the number of exceptions still further. Depending on how many of those conjectures one accepts, the remaining exceptions will amount to between three and five per cent of the corpus, many of which would yield to somewhat more speculative explanations.<sup>62</sup> It now seems, however, beyond reasonable doubt that when Anon. himself excerpted a work of Republican poetry, he gave quotations in a form that gave clear indication of their metre, while also taking into account the intelligibility of the resulting text. How much of the original Anon. quoted was guided in part by the completeness of sense of the resulting quotation, but if a unit of sense did not begin or end with a complete metrical unit, he extended the quotation to cover at least one complete verse.

The implications of the lexicographer's methods may be demonstrated fully from an example, which we may examine in its original context. At p. 508.7 s.v. *REPERIBITVR*, Anon. gives a quotation of Plautus, *Epidicus* 151 to illustrate the form *reperibitur* as an alternative to *reperietur*. The fuller passage in the Plautine script reveals the factors that Anon. seems generally to have taken into consideration (*Epid.* 150–3; Anon.'s quotation is identified in bold script):

ST. nunc places, nunc ego te laudo. EP. patiar ego istuc quod lubet.  
**ST. quid illa fiet fidicina igitur?** EP. **aliqua res reperibitur,**  
 aliqua ope exsoluam, extricabor aliqua. ST. plenus consili's.  
 noui ego te. EP. est Euboicus miles locuples, multo auro potens ...

<sup>61</sup> Ennius 6 (*int<ere>a* Klussmann); Ennius 104, quoted twice from Anon. (*pro<uo>rsus* Ribbeck; the conjecture has never been much in favour but the archaism merits consideration, particularly in light of the verbal effects at which the Plautine verse preserved at Varro, *Ling.* 7.81 [*ut transuersus, non prouersus cedit quasi cancer solet*] aimed); Accius 24 (*dedecet* Buecheler); Accius, *praet.* 9 (*ignau<au>it* Buecheler); Caecilius 121 (*sepultus [sum]* Ribbeck); Caecilius 124–5 (*perd<u>o* Bothe); Caecilius 196 (*quod] quom* Ribbeck : *quae* Bothe); Turpilius 3 (*ducere uxorem audio* Bothe); Afranius 7 (*femina <una>* Lachmann); Atta 3 (*meretricie and lupantur* Ribbeck, after Buecheler); Atta 8–9 (*[ut]* Ribbeck); Pomponius 30 (*suam <uir> quisque* Ribbeck); Pomponius 86 (*insipui partem* Munk); Pomponius 108 (*si stud <nim>ium* Lachmann); Pomponius 168 (*Syris <is> quidem* Buecheler : *Syris <qui> quidem* L. Müller); Novius 55–6 (*tam repente <tam> iucundum* Bothe); Novius 81/2 (*<cum> congemit* Quicherat); Laberius 56 (*una <cum> exoleto* Quicherat).

<sup>62</sup> For example, at p. 90.20, the quotation of Laberius 2 should be scanned, with Bothe, as a cretic dimeter (if the quotation was excerpted by Anon. himself) or as part of a longer cretic verse (if it is tralaticious; it is in any case not the beginning of a trochaic verse). However Laberius is quoted perhaps just four times (or fewer) by Nonius from Anon., in forms that obscure the precise origin of those quotations.

Anon. quoted the entirety of verse 151 in order to show the metre of the quotation; Stratippocles' *fiet* incidentally supports the point that *reperibitur* is a future-tense form, but that corroboration seems not to have been Anon.'s primary reason for quoting Stratippocles' words. Had Anon.'s goal in this instance been to illustrate one of the shades of meanings of *reperire* rather than the morphological peculiarity, the quotation would certainly have been extended to include verse 152. Anon. would not, however, have quoted Epidicus' words at 151–2 in isolation, since they give no complete verse; for this hypothetical purpose the quotation would have been 151–2a or 151b–2; in the latter instance, Anon. would not have given the rest of Stratippocles' words (*noui ego te*, 153), which would give incomplete metrical units at the beginning and end of the quotation. By contrast, when Nonius, who generally pays attention to sense without regard for metre, himself excerpted a copy of the *Ēpidicus* to illustrate the sense of the root word *tricae*, he gave only the words *aliqua ope exsoluam, extricabor aliqua*.<sup>63</sup>

The habits of Anon. that have emerged in this paper suggest that Nonius was relying on the works of a scrupulous lexicographer who had access to and excerpted a substantial collection of works of Republican drama and literature. That individual took into account both meaning and metre when determining how much of the original text to quote. Quite absent from the material set down by Anon. are the kind of howlers that are sometimes introduced when a lexicographer quotes units of metre with no regard for the sense of the resulting quotation, such as Nonius' amusing and much-derided *infantem fugiens media inter proelia belli* (Verg. *Aen.* 11.541, at p. 437.14). Indeed, Anon. has so often given quotations with a word marking a sense boundary, such as *nam, et, atque, ut, neque* and the like, that we may reasonably trust that we have been given a complete clause, if not always a complete sentence.

From the detailed investigations of Anon.'s methods I turn finally to the inter-related questions about Anon.'s sources, his authorship of these three works, and the context in which he worked. First, Lindsay's tentative suggestions about Anon.'s collection of Republican literature require some minor modifications, most prompted by a clearer understanding of Anon.'s methods and by the ability to exclude the material surveyed in § IV of this paper. This study has set to the side the quotations of the annalists, among whom Cassius Hemina and Quadrigarius are prominent, and the quotations of Varro's Menippeans and antiquarian works, which are a little less commonly cited. Among the verse quotations Republican tragedy is the main focus (190 quotations, about 40 per cent of the reduced corpus that results from this study), just surpassing the material taken from the *palliata* and the *togata* (148 quotations, principally from Caecilius, Afranius and Plautus). There are, furthermore, some 80 quotations from the *Atellana*. The quotations of Laberius and other later dramatists, and of hexameter poetry, are considerably more meagre than Lindsay's preliminary description suggested. Quotations of Lucilius are also scarce.<sup>64</sup> Ennian tragedy is preferred to the *Annales* (and the *Saturae* and the

<sup>63</sup> Nonius p. 8.11, from the 'Plautus i' (2) list.

<sup>64</sup> Lucilius presents a special case, since the 'Lucilius ii' (25) list was used in sequence with the works of Anon. and since the manner of citation – always *Lucilius lib.* with book number and without *Satyrarum* – is identical in the 'Lucilius ii' list and in Anon. Just twelve quotations of Lucilius have been attributed to Anon. with any certainty, all occurring in Books 3–19; two further quotations, from Books 27 and 30, may with some plausibility be attributed to Anon. Given such a distribution and the adjacency of these lists, there is a good chance that further

comedies), but the opposite treatment is seen in the quotations of Naevius, whose epic is cited while his dramatic scripts are not to be found.

Lindsay described lists 26, 27 and 28 as deriving from ‘cognate sources’, hesitating slightly over whether the lists derived from three separate works or from three parts of a single work. This paper has been framed on the assumption that Nonius’ sources in this instance were three interrelated works written by the same author, whose characteristic and unusual methods subtend them all. Such an assumption cannot be proven, and its correctness can only be established in terms of probabilities. The details that build up this case of probability cannot be reassembled here, but it is worth briefly reviewing some significant evidence and patterns that set these three lists apart from Nonius’ other sources as a unified group. These are the material deriving from the opinions of Nigidius Figulus, found in all three sources but not in comparable concentrations elsewhere;<sup>65</sup> the peculiar method of quotation here identified, which is not employed systematically in any of Nonius’ other lists nor in other grammatical and lexicographical sources, where quotations are regularly given in units either of sense or of metre; and the particular constellations of texts employed to produce these lists, in terms of the typical individual texts included, with rare gems such as Sueius’ *Pulli* or Santra’s tragedy, and of the surprising absences such as Cato’s *Origines* or the whole of Naevian drama. More specific details, such as the form of a title attached to a particular script where variants are known, on numerous occasions reinforce this view of a single author.

But whereas the characteristics of what seem, with all probability, to have been the works of one author emerge even from Nonius’ excerpts of them, the identity and date of that author cannot be established with any precision beyond the *termini post quem* established by Anon.’s quotations of Varro, Cicero, Santra and Nigidius Figulus.<sup>66</sup> The most prominent literary texts in Anon.’s repertoire are characteristic of the canon of *ueteres* employed by Latin grammarians and lexicographers from Verrius Flaccus to Priscian, and overlap considerably with the contents of Nonius’ own library. For all that we may say about the sources and methods of this lexicographer, it is not yet possible to be more precise about his identity or the period in which he worked.

*University of Toronto*

JARRETT T. WELSH  
jarrett.welsh@utoronto.ca

quotations belonging to Anon. have been assigned to ‘Lucilius ii’ in error. Closer scrutiny of the ‘Lucilius ii’ material would be worthwhile. There is a similar problem with some of the Ciceronian material that Lindsay assigned to lists 26, 27 and 28, which is sometimes rather to be attributed to the ‘Cicero v’ (29) list.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. J.T. Welsh, ‘No rest for the weary: Titinius 27 Ribbeck<sup>3</sup>, *Mnemosyne* (forthcoming), n. 11.

<sup>66</sup> The sole quotation that complicates this picture is the fragment preserved at Nonius p. 144.21 and attributed to Pomponius Secundus (1–2), but there are reasons to doubt that the fragment is rightly attributed to the Neronian tragedian; for discussion see ‘Some fragments’, § 18.