THE SECOND APPENDIX TO PROBUS

The celebrated list of Latin vulgarisms that has come to be called the *Appendix Probi* is in fact, as is widely known, only one—the third—of five short texts appended in MS Naples Lat. I to the putative Probus text, the *Instituta artium*. Strictly speaking, the term 'appendix' should no doubt be applied to the five texts collectively, but here, as seems to be common practice, it will be used to refer to each of them individually. The second appendix consists of three parts, whose apparently disparate nature has led some scholars to count them separately, arriving at a total of seven appendices in all. Five is, however, the number customarily recognized, and the closer scrutiny of the three parts of the second appendix undertaken in the present article will show reasons for thinking that they do in fact all belong together. In order to avoid any confusion that might arise from the five- and seven-fold counts, the five are referred to here as *Ap1*, *2*, *3*, *4*, and *5*, and the three parts of the second appendix as *Ap2(a)*, *2(b)*, and *2(c)*.

Although the attention of scholars has, understandably, been directed primarily to *Ap3*, the *Appendix Probi* as it will no doubt continue to be called, the other four appendices have not been entirely neglected, although, with the exception of *Ap4*, the attention they have received has been less for any intrinsic interest than for their possible bearing on the main text. For it has been thought by some scholars that if all five appendices, or even some as long as they included *Ap3*, could be shown to be the work of a single compiler, any evidence with chronological, geographical, or even biographical implications discoverable anywhere in the larger corpus of material thus made available could be applied to that important text. This approach has been most systematically explored by the distinguished Latinist Pierre Flobert.[1] In support of his view that all the appendices, together with the *Instituta artium*—and possibly some other texts as well—formed part of a Probian corpus, he comprehensively reviews the evidence for affinities between the texts in the supposed corpus and its bearing on the *Appendix Probi,* particularly, as the title of his article indicates, its date. This latter is partly in refutation of C. A. Robson's controversial postulation of a seventh-century dating.[2] Although presented in a much more scholarly fashion, the lines of argument used by Flobert and the conclusions he reached coincide in part with those of the Polish scholar Casimir Jarecki in an article published as long ago as 1927.[3] But Jarecki only drew on *Ap3* and the *Instituta*, not, as far as I can see—he is not always easy to follow—on the other appendices. Jarecki's arguments and conclusions were lent a perhaps over-ready ear by the Brazilian scholar Serafim da Silva Neto, who echoes them in his book.[4]

One might have expected that investigations into the possible relations between the five texts would have been accompanied by serious attempts to clarify the nature and

---

[1] P. Flobert, 'La date de l'*Appendix Probi*', in *Filologia e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte* 4 (Urbino, 1987), 299–320.

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

[3] C. Jarecki, 'Sur l'Appendix [Probi] III, son lieu d'origine et son auteur', *EOS* 30 (1927), 1–25.

[4] S. da Silva Neto, *Fontes do latim vulgar: o appendix Probi* (Rio de Janeiro, 1938; 1956³), especially pp. 34–5 and 40–1.

presumed purpose of each of them. In fact, however, both matters appear generally to have been considered self-evident, and they have from the earliest studies been dispatched in a few brief phrases. Wendelin Foerster,[5] for example, followed by W. A. Baehrens,[6] merely states (p. 278) that our *Ap3* is the most important part, for linguistic history, of the *Appendix* (meaning the entire group of short texts); and Karl Ullmann[7] refers (p. 146) to our *Ap1*, *2*, and *5* as 'compilations [*Zusammenstellungen*] of grammatically related words'—lists of *pluralia tantum*, masculine nouns, and the like. Fabio Stok, the author of a scholarly study of the fourth appendix, a *differentiae* (a list of words to be distinguished in meaning),[8] is more specific (pp. 13–14) in his characterization of the five appendices: the first is a list of nouns classified by gender and by ablative and nominative terminations; the three parts of the second are: (i) a list of constructions classified by cases; (ii) a list of nouns classified by length of the penultimate; (iii) a brief list of masculine nouns; the third is the famous list of corrections (the *Appendix Probi*); the fourth a list of *differentiae*; the fifth a list of deponent and 'common' verbs. Flobert in a similar enumeration (p. 305), has more to say about our *Ap2(a)* and (*b*), recognizing the former as an *idiomata*—an important point—and noting, with understandable surprise, the inclusion in the latter of blocked-syllable words in the examples of both long and short penultimates—also a significant observation, as we shall see. The third part he cursorily identifies as 'quelques noms masculins'.

   The broader questions of relations between the five texts and between them and the *Instituta*, and their possible bearing on the *Appendix Probi,* lie beyond the scope of the present article, and their detailed consideration is left to my forthcoming edition and study of that text. But before leaving those questions entirely, mention must be made of two further publications, which, although not primarily concerned with *appendix* issues, draw attention to a hitherto unnoticed grammatical work, the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*, containing material closely similar to our *Ap2(a)*, not only in the wording of the examples and their order of occurrence, but even in the use of the *Ap2(a)* term *locutio* (admittedly in the plural and only once, in the discussion of the genitive).[9] The work in question, an eighth-century commentary on the *Ars minor* of the celebrated fourth-century grammarian Aelius Donatus, was first brought to notice by the late Bernhard Bischoff in an article of 1958,[10] in which he gave the work the title by which it is now known, *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* (the name of the dedicatee). The full text together with an introduction and linguistic comments has been subsequently published as *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum*, *Expositio Latinitatis* under the joint authorship of Bischoff and Bengt Löfstedt.[11] In the meantime, Vivien Law's

---

   [5] 'Die Appendix Probi', *Wiener Studien* 14 (1892), 278–322.
   [6] *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi* (Halle, 1922; repr. 1967).
   [7] 'Die Appendix Probi', *Romanische Forschungen* 7 (1892), 145–326.
   [8] *Appendix Probi IV* a cura di Fabio Stok, Quaderni di Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 18, Università degli Studi di Salerno (Naples, 1997).
   [9] The use of *Ap2(a)* by the author of the *Cuimnanum* is not, however, beyond question; the alternative possibility of a common source is supported by coincidences of wording with another 'Donatus text', the [*Sergii*] *Explanationum in Donatum libri* (*GL* 4.486–565), specifically p. 556, where several examples—*misereor puerorum, pudet facti* . . . —coincide with the legible part of *Ap2(a)* as presented in *GL* (p. 196), and *piget inertem, iubeo Chremitem, calumnior* with the only partially legible items, believed to have been preserved in the *Cuimnanum*. On the Donatus text see L. Holtz's edition (Paris, 1981).
   [10] 'Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 33 (1958), 5–50.
   [11] Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 133D (Turnhout, 1992).

book, the second of the publications referred to, had appeared.[12] Although she is
chiefly concerned with the broader question implied by her title, Law makes several
references to *appendix* matters, of which one is of particular interest because of its
possible bearing on Flobert's thesis of the interrelationship of Probian material.
From the separate attestation of the *Anonymus* text, with its striking similarities to the
first part of the second appendix, taken together with that of the Montpellier
differentiae, part of which is closely similar to part of the fourth, she concludes (p. 27)
that the appendices 'seem to have circulated independently of one another and of the
works of Probus'. And in support of that view she might have also cited the fifth
appendix, the one dealing with deponents and 'common' verbs, the last part of which
corresponds closely to a passage (*GL* 5.56, mainly lines 25–30), in the fifth-century
grammarian Cledonius, whose *Ars* survives in a sixth- or seventh-century manuscript.
But this, as stated above, is not the place to go into those questions in detail. There are
many matters to be taken into account when assessing the possible relationships,
including the notoriously interpolated state of the Cledonius text. All that needs to be
said here is that the *Anonymus* text enables us to hazard a completion of the only
partially legible list of examples illustrating use of the accusative case in *Ap2(a)*, as
indicated below.

Returning, then, to the main theme of this article, and leaving aside *Ap4*, ably
discussed by Stok, and, for the present, the celebrated and much-discussed *Ap3*, it
must suffice here to note that, of the remaining three appendices, the first and last
have each their points of interest: *Ap1*, dealing with noun declensions, because the
similar arrangement of the material and the inclusion of certain common examples
suggest some link with the *Instituta artium*; *Ap5*, dealing with deponent and 'common'
verbs, because of the chronological and other problems raised by its textual coinci-
dences with the grammarian Cledonius' treatment of that subject referred to above.
But it is *Ap2*, the subject of the present article, that is probably the most interesting of
the three, both in its relation to other grammatical writings and in its own right.

Here discussion is based throughout on the edition at 4.196–7 of Keil's *Grammatici
Latini*. The text of *Ap2(a)* is too long to be reproduced in full, but the excerpts and
notes on its structure presented below should make it easy to follow the discussion
and assess the arguments; the full text of *Ap2(b)* is quoted in the course of the dis-
cussion, and that of *Ap2(c)* is presented at the beginning of the section devoted to it.

APPENDIX 2(a)

The structure of this part is very simple: the formula *Locutio cum . . .* introduces, in
turn, examples of the use of the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, and
ablative cases. Here, as samples, are abridged excerpts from the first two sections—
the dots indicate my omissions, not gaps in the text:

Locutio cum nominativo casu, non ambigit quem ad modum proferatur, ut puta Cicero dixit . . .
et cetera talia.
Locutio cum genetivo casu haec convenire reperitur: similis illius, avidus honoris, . . . misereor
puerorum, pudet facti, piget operis, taedet laboris, paenitet sceleris, particeps rerum, . . . memini
illius, . . . prudens rerum, . . . impleor Bacchi, auxilii eget, dives opum, fessi rerum, potens
tempestatum.

---

[12] *The Insular Latin Grammarians* (Woodbridge, 1982).

This will be an appropriate place to present, with all due caution, as a further sample of the text, the section on the accusative, as tentatively restored from the Bischoff and Löfstedt edition of the *Anonymus* (pp. 134–5); the *Anonymus* words are italicized:

obliuiscor *uos*, *fugio illum*, *euado periculum*, penitet *amicum*, *piget inertem*, iubeo *Cremitem*, calumnior illos (*Anon. calumpnior malos*), sortior *uxorem*.

None of the remaining five entries (the *GL* editor speaks of a total of thirteen) is recorded by him as even partially legible in the *appendix* manuscript. The presumably matching entries in the *Anonymus* are: *miror malos, deleo stomachum, memini haec, decet bonos, portior illam rem* [*et reliqua*].

Thus presented, the subject-matter of *Ap2(a)* appears to be of a simple mono-lingual descriptive type, one still familiar to modern students of Latin grammar—lists of verbs and adjectives that 'take' the genitive, or ablative, and so on—which presumably explains why this list has not been thought worthy of particular comment. But comparison with other similar, but more explicitly worded, lists in the Latin grammarians makes it clear that their approach to such matters was not always so narrowly focused. They viewed case usage—and some other grammatical topics—in the light of a norm, the norm of Greek, from which Latin usage was thought occasionally to deviate, and saw it as their task to draw attention to such deviations. In other words, their approach was not purely monolingually descriptive but bilingually comparative. That explains why the compiler of our list found so little to say about the nominative and vocative cases, where Latin and Greek usage are in close accord. Hence also the name *idiomata* ('individualities', 'peculiarities') applied to points of difference observed between the Greek and Latin languages. Of three com-parable lists of *idiomata* that have come down to us, two, the *De idiomatibus* section of the fifth book of Charisius (379–86)[13] and the *De consensu verborum cum casibus* section of Diomedes (*GL* 1.310–20) refer expressly and repeatedly to Greek, and the third, the anonymous *De idiomatibus casuum* (*GL* 4.566–72), cites the Greek equivalents of all its Latin examples. Charisius (379, 3–5) defines *idiomata* as *Idiomata . . . nostri sermonis . . . sunt omnia quae pro nostro more efferimus et non secundum Graecos* ('all those things we express in our own accustomed way and not in conformity with the Greeks'). A further passage in Charisius (380.21–7), closely matched by one in Diomedes (311.3–9),[14] states more explicitly the perceived relation-ship between the two languages:

Cum ab omni sermone Graeco Latina loquella pendere videatur, quaedam inveniuntur dicta . . . praeter consuetudinem Graecorum, quae *idiomata* appellantur. . . . Nam invenimus quae Graeci per genetivum casum dicunt, haec per dativum usurpata, ut *parco tibi*.

While Latin usage seems to be generally dependent on Greek, some locutions are found . . . contrary to Greek usage, which are called *idiomata*. . . . For we find that things that the Greeks convey by the genitive are expressed [by us] in the dative, for example, *parco tibi* ['I spare you'].

We note that, although Charisius and Diomedes refer to the Greek use of the genitive contrasting with the Latin dative, they do not, as their texts have come down to us, actually quote the Greek equivalent, φείδομαί σου, which is, however, given in the *De idiomatibus casuum* (*GL* 4.566.23). This omission leaves an awkward

---

[13] All Charisius references are to the edition of K. Barwick (Leipzig, 1964²).
[14] On the relationship between Charisius and Diomedes see R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language*: *The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988), 270–2.

impression of curtailment, of incompleteness, and it seems extremely likely that Greek equivalents were originally included by the two grammarians. In particular, it is hardly credible that they should have omitted them from their introductory formulation of the contrasts with Latin; it is not as if they generally eschewed Greek words—many accompany Latin examples in other parts of their works. The subsequent complete omission, presumably by copyists, of the Greek equivalents suggests a changed view of the purpose to be served by the material, not just a need to save space, which could have been achieved by reducing their number. It may be that the need for practical guidance in Latin case usage in its own right was now thought to have a stronger claim than academic-seeming comparisons with Greek or the provision of study aids for Greek students, which one would expect to have occurred at some period later than the fourth century. Whatever the explanation, the omission of the Greek equivalents, unaccompanied as it is by corresponding adjustments to the exposition, which continues to be couched in bilingual terms, has left the texts, viewed as free-standing compositions, in an unsatisfactory intermediate state.

Ap2(a), on the other hand, being a bare list of examples without any reference to comparison with Greek, does not suffer that disadvantage. It can be read as a purely monolingual descriptive presentation, and indeed seems to have been so read by modern scholars cursorily surveying the five short appendices. Even the perceptive Pierre Flobert, who does refer to it (p. 305) as an *idiomata* list, defines it purely monolingually—'c'est-à-dire une énumération des constructions typiques à l'aide des différents cas'—and does not comment on the bilingual implications of the term *idiomata*.

Without entering upon a detailed discussion of the relationships between the other three *idiomata* mentioned, we may note that there are differences in the extent to which their examples coincide with those of *Ap2(a)*. For instance, the following precise equivalences with *Ap2(a)* occurring in Diomedes are not matched in Charisius: (under the genitive) *memor bonorum, obliviscor iniuriae, misereor puerorum, neglegens amicorum, peritus rerum* (D. *huius rei*), *dubius itineris, cupidus honoris, securus amorum*; (under the dative) *maledico hosti, mando tibi, pareo legibus*; (under the ablative) *abstineo cibo* (D. *abstineo me cibo*). Although the overall differences between *Ap2(a)* and Diomedes are too great to suggest common authorship or that one was the source of the other, such specific similarities make it very likely that they drew on common source material. And, given the unlikelihood that the avowedly bilingual slant of the section in Diomedes was something subsequently imposed on that material, its originally bilingual character seems beyond reasonable doubt.

As an illustration of how Greek equivalents originally included could be later omitted we may compare our Charisius text with the *De idiomatibus casuum*. Although the frequent resort in the examples in both texts to non-distinctive *tibi* to signal the dative provides no firm basis for affinity, there are some striking parallels between the ablative examples, such as *careo amicis, queror tibi de illo, onero servum lignis, tempero me vino, glorior dignitate, utor divitiis*. In all cases the *De idiomatibus* includes Greek equivalents, Charisius does not. This too strongly suggests that Greek equivalents were originally included in Charisius as well. In their *Idiomata generum* lists, where Charisius also provides the Greek equivalents, the texts of the two works are virtually identical.

The view of certain features of the Latin language as 'particularities' or 'peculiar-ities' is, as we have seen, based on a persuasion, real or feigned, that the obvious similarities between Greek and Latin must be the reflection of a linguistic dependence

of Latin upon its culturally more prestigious neighbour, and that any differences must be considered Latin deviations. This presentation of Latin as subordinate to, and implicitly derivative from, Greek no doubt had the advantage of making its study more palatable to fastidious Greeks, reluctant to recognize the claim to serious attention of another language, a 'barbarian' language with, however, it would seem, competing pretensions. This point is well brought out by Johannes Kramer in his *Glossaria bilingua altera*.[15] He cites (p. 12) Philoxenus, who treated Latin as a Greek dialect, a (deviant) variety (*Abart*) of Aeolic. But of more direct relevance here is that this subservient approach is one of the indications that such material as the *idiomata* was primarily intended as a study aid for Greeks learning Latin.

Generally speaking, then, the *idiomata* features of Latin are those identified by the grammarians, not by monolingual descriptive, but by bilingual comparative criteria, their defining characteristic being non-conformity with Greek. The *idiomata* so far considered relate to case usage, the technical term being *idiomata casuum*. Another such category, relating to nouns of identical meaning in the two languages but differing in gender, was the *idiomata generum*. It is represented in Charisius (450–63), the anonymous *De idiomatibus* (*GL* 4.573–84), and the so-called *Ex Charisii arte grammatica excerpta* (*GL* 1.551–4), now generally known as the *Anonymus Bobiensis*.[16] As we shall see below, it probably contributed material used in the third part of the second appendix.[17]

So the first part of the second appendix is no mere list of Latin examples of case usage, as it seems to have been generally viewed. Like the corresponding parts of Charisius and Diomedes, it derives from a Greek–Latin comparative forerunner, which has been shorn of its equivalent Greek examples.

There is no discussion of *idiomata casuum*, or indeed of Latin case governance considered monolingually, in the *Instituta artium*. There are, however, some *Instituta* stylistic mannerisms also appearing in *Ap2*(*a*), which are adduced by Flobert in support of community of compilation of the appendices and that text: *ut puta*, introducing examples, the periphrasis *reperitur/reperiuntur* followed by an infinitive, and the phrase *et cetera talia* at the end of an enumeration. That argument cannot be dismissed, but its force is greatly reduced by the fact that none of these features is peculiar to the *Instituta*; they are widely used in good Latinity, as the dictionaries confirm—*ut puta* is in fact so current that it is sometimes written as a single word, *utputa.* Grammars in which similar matters have to be frequently discussed are a genre particularly prone to lazy formulaic repetitions, and it would not be surprising if a copyist, bemused by the endless repetitions of the *Instituta*, carried over some of its phrases when he proceeded to copy the appendices. Stylistic mannerisms that might suffice to identify the author of a literary work are much less reliable when applied to grammatical writings. On balance the evidence is not, in itself, strong enough to support the conclusion of community of compilation.

---

[15] Archiv für Papyrusforschung u. Verwandte Gebiete, Beiheft 8 (Munich and Leipzig, 2001).

[16] Re-edited by Mario de Nonno (Rome, 1982).

[17] On the two types of *idiomata*, see A. C. Dionisotti, 'Greek grammars and dictionaries in Carolingian Europe', in S. A. Brown (ed.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks* (London, 1988), 1–55, and the introduction to Kramer's *Glossaria bilingua altera*, cited above, in which he sets Greek–Latin *idiomata* and *hermeneumata* in the context of other such lists arising from the contacts between Greeks or Romans and 'barbarian' languages and cultures.

APPENDIX 2(*b*)

The subject of the first of the two lists in *Ap2(b)* is stated by the introductory words to be *Nomina cum accentu producto* ('nouns with long accent'), of the second *Nomina cum accentu correpto* ('nouns with short accent'). This terminology is a little odd since it is vowels and syllables, not accents, that have length. However, since the length of the penultimate determines the place of the accent in Latin words of three or more syllables, we must assume that this is a shorthand way of saying 'nouns with long penultimates' (and accordingly accented on that syllable), and 'nouns with short penultimates' (and accordingly accented on the antepultimate)—in fact Flobert (p. 305), simply renders 'à pénultième longue . . . à pénultième brève'. We shall see later that there is reason to qualify that assumption, but it is generally supported by the conformity of most of the examples to those prescriptions, and specifically by the fact that most of the words introducing the second list—*Castoris, Hectoris, rhetoris, Mnestoris, Actoris*—are found in several grammarians precisely as examples of penultimate short *o* in the oblique cases of nouns in *-or* of Greek origin, *quae apud Graecos corripiuntur* ('which the Greeks shorten').[18] The contrasting accentuation between Latin and Greek *-or/-oris* nouns must in fact have been a thorn in the flesh of the analogists, at least since the time of Varro, who points out (*Ling*. 8.38) that their approach would entail pronouncing the oblique cases of words of Greek origin with long penultimates like Latin words of the same shape (*secundum illorum rationem debemus secundis syllabis longis Hectorem Nestorem: est enim ut quaestor . . . Nestor, quaestorem . . . Nestorem*).

So far, then, the lists appear to be what they proclaim themselves. But, on closer scrutiny, a number of odd features appear: for example, the fact (also noted with surprise by Flobert, p. 305) that some words with blocked penultimate, that is, one long 'by position', for example, Cloanthus and tyrannus, figure not only in the first list—where they meet the specification but hardly needed to be included since, unlike open syllables whose length depends on the perhaps unknown length of their vowel, blocked syllables are always long and can be recognized by anyone capable of dividing Latin words into syllables, *Clo-an'-thus, ty-ran'-nus*—but also, against the defining principle, in the second list: *Aurun'ci, palan'ges*, and *Garaman'tas*. Moreover, six of the words included in the first list, *Cec'ropis* (whether interpreted as the genitive of *Cecrops* or the nominative of *Cec'ropis* (-*idis*), a female descendant of *Cecrops*), *Pene'leus, Pasi'phae, Phle'gethon, Alca'noris*, and *Age'noris*, again contrary to the principle of the list, have short penultimate syllables; and in the second list *Laudami'a* (more correctly *Lao-*) is included although its penultimate is long. And then there are two disyllabic words which do not belong in either list since, in Latin, all disyllables are accented on the first syllable irrespective of length: *Triton* in the first list, and *barcent* (?) in the second. The latter is obviously corrupt, and, neither of the readings discussed in the footnote being certain, the word will not be taken into account in this discussion.[19]

---

[18] See Charisius (52 and 108), Phocas (*GL* 5.416, 423), and the so-called *Ex Charisii arte grammatica excerpta* (now *Anonymus Bobiensis*) (*GL* 1.543.33), in the last of which *Castor* occurs side by side with *Hector*. The *Mnestor* of our text may be a miscopy of the usually cited *Nestor*, perhaps induced by a following *Theomnestor* in the original, as in Charisius 108: *Hectoris . . . Nestoris . . . Theomnestoris . . .* ; or it may be a crossing with *Mentor* (Phocas, *GL* 5.423).

[19] MS *barcent* may be a miscopy for *Barcen*, the name of Sichaeus' nurse, Barce, appearing with Greek accusative *-n* (also cited as an example of that flexion in the *Instituta*, *GL* 4.95.23), as it does in *Aen*. 4.632: *Tum breviter Barcen nutricem affata Sichaei*. But that correction is not at all

One of these apparent anomalies should probably be discounted: *Aurunci* was most likely included with *Actoris* (in reminiscence of the Virgilian phrase *Actoris Aurunci spolium, Aen.* 12.94), to make it clear that the genitive with short *o* of the Greek name *Actor* was meant, not of the Latin common noun *actor* (*-o'ris*) with long *o*. And, if we admit the possibility of miscopies—and a number of manuscript readings are in fact corrected in the *GL* edition of the appendices—it is possible that several others might be discountable. In particular *Alcanoris* and *Agenoris*, occurring at or near the end of the first list, could easily have been displaced from the beginning of the second list, where they logically belong, since they, like *Castoris*, *Hectoris*, and so on exemplify short *-o-* genitives. We also note that *Cecropis* is only a conjectured correction for MS *cecrop*, and could with equal justification be expanded to *Cecropia* (see below); and it is not unlikely that one of the disyllabic words, *Triton*, should be corrected to *Tritonis*, bringing it into line with the other trisyllabic genitives used to illustrate penultimate vowel length, such as the *Hec'toris* group and *pae'licis*. But it is difficult to see how credible emendation could remedy the other anomalies mentioned. So, short of supposing gross error on the part of the grammarian, we are obliged to consider the possibility that the words listed might have been chosen with some purpose in mind other than merely to exemplify accentuation related to length or shortness of the penultimate—neither of which they consistently do.

The clue to that other purpose may lie in what is one of the most striking features of the lists—the preponderance of names (many from mythology and literature), the majority of which are of Greek origin.[20] Why such a strong preference for names—thirty out of the forty-two completely legible words? What advantage could they offer over common nouns as examples of accentuation? If we are thinking in purely Latin terms, no apparent advantage whatsoever. But for anyone wishing to compare Greek and Latin accentuation they would have had the great advantage of facilitating one-to-one comparisons since, unlike most common nouns, they appear in very similar shape in both languages. And that advantage, it will be noted, is not confined to Latin words of Greek origin, since many Latin names had established Greek equivalents, for example *Camillus*/$Κάμιλλος$, and so had 'barbarian' names like *Garamantas*/$Γαράμαντες$.

So here we have a possible alternative purpose of the lists: comparison of Greek and Latin accentuation patterns. It would not immediately account for the anomalies noted above, but it would open the way to so doing, as will later become clear. In the meantime we must deal with a possible objection. Is the convenience of names as a basis for comparison, and their preponderance in the lists, sufficient to justify that comparative interpretation of their purpose? Might not the preponderance merely reflect the compiler's predilection for Virgil? *Actoris Aurunci* and *Barcen* (if that is how the latter should be read) are almost certainly Virgilian reminiscences, and in fact most of the names are found in that poet. So we need a 'control'; and, as it happens, we have one—the roughly dozen common nouns in the lists. For, although Greek and Latin common nouns offer a one-to-one match much less frequently than names, some are sufficiently similar in shape to provide a basis for comparison. The result of a count is conclusive, showing an overwhelming preponderance of matches. Of the

certain—the original might equally well have been *Barceni*—the *-inus* and *-enus* suffixes could be confused: cf. *Byzacenus non Byzacinus* (48) in *Ap3*, the *Appendix Probi* (cf. also Baehrens [n. 6], 122–3).

[20] On the problems associated with the treatment of Greek names in Latin, as well as many other topics relevant to contacts between the two languages, see J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), on the present point 370ff.

twelve common nouns and one adjective, no fewer than nine meet the comparability criterion. Here is the list (with the Latin accents marked to indicate the differences so revealed): *tyran'nus*/τύραννος, *graba'tum*/κράβατον, *lebe'ta*/λέβητα,[21] *crate'ra*/ κρατῆρα, *rhe'toris*/ῥήτορος, *bara'trum*/βάραθρον, *palan'ges*/φάλαγγες, *pae'licis*/ παλλακίς, and *umbili'cus*/ὀμφαλός. (The latter pair, although less closely similar than the others, are probably close enough to have been regarded as acceptable for the purpose of comparison.) Of the three words that do not have a matching Greek form, one, the adjective *praesagus*, although not appearing in the feminine, is so closely linked in meaning with the immediately preceding *Sibylla* that it is difficult not to conclude that that affinity must, in some way, have led to its inclusion. But the inclusion of the remaining two, *delubrum* and *arbuta* 'fruit of the strawberry tree' remains unexplained. Neither has a Greek equivalent of similar shape, and *delubrum* can hardly have been included as an example of the ambiguous length of syllables in which a short vowel is followed by a plosive preceding *r*—a phenomenon that has no relevant parallel in Greek—since the long *u* in the penultimate of that word resolves any ambiguity. But we can say that, with the exception of those three words, all the examples in the two lists resemble their Greek equivalents sufficiently closely to facilitate accentual comparison between the languages, and that that function and not merely the provision of examples of Latin accentuation is very probably the real purpose of the lists. We shall see later that, although that formulation is essentially correct, it probably requires minor modification.

But before we further explore these matters, it will be convenient to present for reference a conspectus of all the Greek and Latin pairs in the order in which the Latin words appear in the text:

Heliodo'rus/Ἡλιόδωρος, Theodo'rus/Θεόδωρος, Polydo'rus/Πολύδωρος, Cloan'thus (a Trojan)/Κλόανθος, tyran'nus/τύραννος, graba'tum/κράβατον, lebe'ta/λέβητα,[21] (delu'brum), crate'ra/κρατῆρα, umbili'cus/ὀμφαλός, Seres'tus (a Trojan)/Σέρεστος*, Sarpe'don/Σαρπηδών, Ado'nis/Ἄδωνις, Olym'pus/Ὄλυμος, Cec'ropis/Κεκροπίς, Pene'leus/Πηνέλεως, Pasi'phae/ Πασιφάη, Casybus (not yet identified, and the length of the penultimate vowel unknown), Phle'gethon/Φλεγέθων, Sibyl'la/Σίβυλλα, (praesa'gus), Camil'la/Κάμιλλα, Anthe'a/Ἄνθεια, Camil'lus/Κάμιλλος, Trito'nis/Τρίτωνος, Alca'noris/Ἀλκάνορος, Gulus'sa (a son of Massinissa of Numidia)/Γύλυσσα, Age'noris/Ἀγήνορος, ending the first list. In the second list: Cas'toris/Κάστορος, Hec'toris/Ἕκτορος, rhe'toris/ῥήτορος, Mnes'toris (?)/ Μνήστορος (?), Ac'toris Aurun'ci/Ἄκτορος Αὐρύγκου, Laodami'a/Λαοδάμεια, barat'rum/βάραθρον, (MS barcent), palan'ges/φάλαγγες, Pro'chyta/Προχύτη, pae'licis/παλλακίδος, Garaman'tas/ Γαράμαντες, and finally (ar'buta).[22]

The probable, but as yet unverified, Greek equivalent of one polysyllabic Trojan name has been asterisked. As explained above, in view of the uncertainties arising

---

[21] *Lebe'ta* is a vulgar by-form (see K. E. Georges, *Lexikon der lateinischen Wortformen* [Leipzig, 1890], s.v., who also cites *Ap1* [*GL* 4.194.7] and Placidus 31.3 Goetz) of the classical Greek loanword *le'bes*/*lebe'tis* (from λέβης/λέβητος), also discussed below. *Lebeta* is an example of the formation of a Latin first-declension noun on the accusative singular of a third declension Greek noun, here λέβητα. In some cases the new formation became the classical form, e.g. *cratera* from κρατῆρα, following next but one in the *Ap2(b)* list. Does the proximity of the two similarly formed words reflect a category grouping by the compiler?

[22] It is possible that the *ca be*, read between *Laudamia* and *baratrum*, in *GL* should be completed to *Calybe* (cf. *Aen.* 7.419: *Fit Calybe, Iunonis anus templique sacerdos*), the Greek equivalent of which is Καλύβη, contrasting in accent, as it will be seen the majority of the words listed do, with Latin *Ca'lybe* (cf. the *calibe* in *Ap1* [*GL* 4.194.29] where it is accompanied by six other Greek women's names). The common noun καλύβη 'hut' or 'shack' does not appear to have a matching Latin form.

from MS *barcent*, the form is bracketed, and possible corrections are not included in this discussion. The three Latin words without Greek equivalents of similar shape—*delubrum*, *praesagus*, and *arbuta*—are also bracketed.

This is not the place for a detailed comparative account of Greek and Latin accentuation, for which, however, the lists would provide very pertinent examples. But it may be useful to recall briefly the main principles governing accentuation in the two languages and draw attention to some of the most important contrasts illustrated in the lists.[23]

Obviously, if the principles were identical, there would be no need for comparative lists, but the above conspectus, where only a few of the pairs listed have coinciding accents, reflects the fact that they were very different. The two languages agreed in not admitting accent to be placed earlier than the antepenultimate, but in virtually nothing else. The decisive factor in accent placement in Latin polysyllables was, as noted above, simply the length of the penultimate ('position' [free or blocked] counting as well as 'nature' [vowel length]); but in Greek the length of the penultimate was irrelevant to placement—although not to the type of accent (circumflex or acute) if one did fall on that syllable. In Greek there was no such generally decisive factor, although a long final syllable had the important effect of precluding antepenultimate accentuation: that is, it confined accent to one or other of the last two syllables. (On the 'law of limitation' and restricted exceptions to it, see Probert, paras. 64, 113, and 123.) One consequence of this rule was movement of the accent from the antepenultimate to the penultimate when inflection resulted in a short final being replaced by a long one, for example Πολύδωρος but Πολυδώρου. That was an effect unknown to Latin, where movement of accent could only result when addition of a syllable through flexion brought a long syllable into penultimate position, as in *ac'tor acto'ris* (as compared with *Ac'tor*, *Ac'toris*). There was also a tendency in Greek, but only a tendency, for the accent to be placed as early in the word (but no further forward than the antepenultimate) as final vowel length permitted, especially in proper names.[24] Another major difference between the two languages was that, whereas in Latin the final syllable was never accented, in Greek final accent was quite frequent. Such were the Greek general 'rules', and they were not sufficiently rigorous or comprehensive to enable a foreigner to predict by a single criterion, as was the case with Latin, which syllable in a word not previously encountered would bear the accent. He could improve his chances of being right by observation of further specific indications, such as that certain terminations, for example -εύς, were regularly accented, but some 'irregular' accentuations inherited from the Indo-European past made for many exceptions both to general rules and to specific observations.

Coming to illustrations of accentual contrasts between the two languages: as is foreseeable from the brief outline of principles, the commonest contrast is that occurring when the Latin word has a long and therefore accented penultimate but the Greek equivalent, in the absence of a long final, and in accordance with the tendency towards early accentuation, is accented on the antepenultimate; and perhaps it is significant that that major contrast is illustrated by the first three items of the first list: *Heliodo'rus*, *Theodo'rus*, and *Polydo'rus* in Latin, but Ἡλιόδωρος, Θεόδωρος, and Πολύδωρος in Greek. Other examples are Σίβυλλα/*Sibyl'la*, Ἄνθεια/*Anthe'a*,

---

[23] An extensive and lucid account of Greek accentuation, citing ancient authorities and incorporating material based on recent research, is provided by P. Probert, *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol, 2003).

[24] On 'recessive' accent, see Probert, paras. 69 and 222.

the Roman names *Camil'la*/Κάμιλλα and *Camil'lus*/Κάμιλλος, Ἄδωνις/*Ado'nis*, Ὄλυμπος/*Olym'pus*, Λαοδάμεια/*Laodami'a*, and the African name Γαράμαντες/ *Garaman'tas*; to which we may now venture to add, corresponding to our conjectured *Trito'nis*, the Greek genitive, Τρίτωνος; and the common nouns: τύραννος/*tyran'nus*, κράβατον/*graba'tum*. The contrast resulting from the restrictive effect of a long Greek final is illustrated by *Pasiphae*, which, by Latin rule, must be accented on the antepen- ultimate, *Pa-si'-pha-e*, because the penultimate vowel is short, while for Πασιφάη the length of the penultimate is irrelevant but the long final confines the accent to one of the last two syllables in this case, for traditional reasons, the antepenultimate; similarly Φλεγέθων/*Phle'gethon*, and Προχύτη/*Pro'chyta*. There are also several examples of Greek words with traditionally accented terminations, such as ὀμφαλός/ *umbili'cus,* and Σαρπηδών/*Sarpe'don*.

The interplay of accentual differences between the two languages is well illustrated by two of the pairs. The first, κρατῆρα/*crate'ra* in which a Latin first-declension noun, derived from the accusative of a Greek third-declension noun, κρατήρ, coincides in penultimate accentuation with the Greek word, but for entirely different reasons: *crate'ra* by virtue of the long-penultimate rule; κρατῆρα in consequence of the accented final syllable of the nominative (κρατήρ) being brought into penultimate position by the addition of a further (flexional) syllable, but, except for the type of accent, uninfluenced by penultimate length. On the other hand, in *lebe'ta*, similarly, as noted above, from a Greek accusative (λέβητα), while the accent again automatically moves to the long penultimate in Latin (but see below), this time no coincidence results because the Greek word, being initially accented in the nominative (λέβης) and the added flexion not being long, retains initial accent in the accusative.

To sum up: the fact that the lists in *Ap2*(*b*) consist almost entirely of Latin words that have Greek equivalents of very similar shape leaves little room for doubt that the words were selected to provide examples of contrasting accentuations in the two languages. This they do admirably, illustrating a variety of situations, including, as we have seen, all the most important contrasts.

But, that being so, what are we to make of the absence of any explicit indication of that comparative function in the text, including the introductory formulae—*Nomina cum accentu producto . . . cum accentu correpto*—which gives the lists a self-contained, purely monolingual, appearance? The probable answer is that Greek equivalents originally accompanied the Latin words, on the same lines as in our conspectus, making the comparative function quite clear, and that, since the penultimate syllable was the crucial point of the Latin system, it was natural for the compiler to group the material in relation to it. The subsequent omission of the Greek is paralleled, as we have seen in our discussion of *Ap2*(*a*), in some of the *idiomata*, and was no doubt the consequence of such lists being considered equally suitable for monolingual descriptive purposes. But what might have been acceptable when the Greek was there to guide interpretation of the material was no longer sufficient when the Latin was left to stand alone since, as we have seen, considered in purely Latin terms, not all the examples fit the descriptions.

How are we to account for the latter anomaly? One possible explanation would be to argue that a copyist, not fully understanding the principles illustrated by the lists, added or misplaced the non-matching items. Such explanations cannot be wholly ruled out. As we shall see when discussing *Ap2*(*c*), in addition to the omission of Greek equivalents, there is evidence of secondary interference with original material that changed its character; but although, as pointed out above, it seems quite possible

that a copyist separated *Alcanoris* and *Agenoris* from the first items of the second list, probably by misplacing the introductory formula of the latter, it is more difficult to admit such gross corruption as the misplacement of the four words *Cecropis*, *Peneleus*,[25] *Pasiphae*, and *Phlegethon* in the first list, and of *Laodamia*, *Garamantas*, and *palanges* in the second.

There is, fortunately, an alternative explanation, which questions the soundness of our own initial assumption: that the Greek words quoted, once spelt with Latin letters, were all to be accented in accordance with Latin rules. In fact the accentuation of Greek words in Latin presented special problems recognized and discussed by the grammarians. For example, Dositheus, in the *De accentibus* section of his *Ars Grammatica* (*GL* 7.379), comments on the final accentuation of some Greek words, which is not normally admissible in Latin:

Graeca nomina, si iisdem litteris proferentur, Graecos accentus habebunt. Nam et cum dicimus *Thyias*, *Nais*, acutum habebit posterior accentum [Θυιάς, Ναΐς] et cum Themisto Calypso, ultimam circumflecti videmus [Θεμιστώ, Καλυψώ] quod utrumque Latinus sermo non patitur.[26]

(Greek nouns, if pronounced with the same letters [sounds], will have Greek accents. Thus when we say *Thyias*, *Nais*, the second (syllable) will receive an acute accent, and when *Themisto*, *Calypso*, we will find that the final (vowel) is circumflexed—neither of which [accentuations] is tolerated in Latin speech.')

Donatus also, after noting other factors that may modify the rules, goes on to say (*GL* 4.371.27): *Sane verba Graeca Graecis accentibus efferimus* ('We pronounce Greek words with Greek accents'). And in the *Servii commentarius in Donatum* (*GL* 4.426–7) there is an extensive account of Latin and Greek accentuation, a special principle being laid down for the pronunciation of Greek loanwords:

Graeca verba tunc Graecis accentibus proferimus, cum Graeca fuerit declinatio. *Hos Arcades* quoniam Latina declinatio est, prior syllaba habebit accentum, id est tertia a fine; quando autem dicimus *hos Arcadas*, media, quoniam declinatio Graeca est.

(We pronounce Greek words with Greek accents when their declension is Greek. *Hos Arcades*, since the declension is Latin, we shall accent on the first syllable, i.e. the third from the end; but, when we say *hos Arcadas*, on the middle syllable since the declension is Greek.)

But perhaps the most instructive account with the fullest examples is that found in the *Explanationes in Donatum* of 'Sergius' (*GL* 4.526–8). Like Servius, he makes a distinction between forms retaining Greek flexion, such as the Greek accusative singular in -*a* in *Aen.* 6.202 *liquidumque per aera lapsae*, where he favours *ae'ra*, following ἀέρα, against the Latin short-penultimate rule, and those which have adopted Latin flexion, such as the genitive *aeris* of the same word. In that event he leaves the matter open, the ear to be the judge—*dum modo auribus eo serviamus* (528.1)—whether, in accordance with the Latin short-penultimate rule, *a'eris*, for

---

[25] It is not certain that *Peneleus* is misplaced. If the compiler regarded the termination as consisting of a single syllable -*eus*, as indicated in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* by the loops marking synizesis in Greek words of that termination, to which Πηνέλεως appears to have been assimilated, he may have counted *Peneleus* as penultimately stressed. In the genitive, however, as in *Aen.* 2.425 *Penelei dextra . . .*, it appears with antepenultimate accent.

[26] The *Ars grammatica* of Dositheus (re-edited by J. Tolkiehn [Leipzig, 1913]), an example of a bilingual grammar, makes frequent comparisons with Greek on particular points and is accompanied by a Greek translation. It seems to have been intended, at least primarily, for Greek students of Latin.

example, should be so pronounced or *ae'ris* following ἀέρος. Another of his examples concerns a word from our list, *lebeta*, commented on above in our discussion of the penultimately stressed words, where we noted its contrasting accentuation with its Greek progenitor λέβητα, the predominance of the Latin rule being assured by the fully Latinized form of the neologism. Here (*GL* 4.527.2–4), however, 'Sergius', concerned with the classical third-declension loanword *lebes/lebetis*, and citing Virgil's *Dodonaeosque lebetas* (*Aen.* 3.466), recommends, in accordance with the Greek flexion/Greek accentuation principle, antepenultimate stressing, *le'betas*, of the accusative plural, in spite of the long penultimate syllable, which offers an instructive contrast with the treatment of its vulgar variant *lebe'ta*, commented on above.

But 'Sergius' also reminds his readers favouring Graecizing pronunciations to make sure they observe the Greek rules: for example, that change of case flexion which brings a long vowel into final position moves the Greek accent from the antepenultimate to the penultimate, as we have noted above. He tells them that to pronounce *Eu'andrum ty'rannum*, in the Greek fashion, is admissible (*absurdum non est ita enuntiare*), following the accentuation of Εὔανδρον τύραννον, but that it is a blunder to pronounce *Eu'andri ty'ranni*, which offends against not only the Latin penultimate rule but also the Greek long-final rule restricting accent to the last two syllables, which requires Εὐάνδρου τυράννου.

So it is clear that the general principles governing Latin accentuation, as initially propounded above, should not be regarded as absolute when applied to Greek words. The situation probably offers some analogy to the treatment of French words in English, where the degree of acceptance of a word, fully, partially, or not at all, absorbed into English, is often a matter of personal judgement and even taste, as well, of course, as education. Such words as *envelope*, *impasse*, and *minuet* (actually *menuet* in French) are differently pronounced by different people—the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* offers 'Gallic' alternatives for the first two, and the third can be heard as [mɪnjueɪ] from those airing their acquaintance with French.

As to education, there is an anecdote told by Quintilian (12.10.57), to which Professor J. N. Adams has drawn my attention,[27] that aptly illustrates differences that can occur in the pronunciation of Greek names in Latin. Quintilian is urging court advocates to adapt their style of speech to different types of witnesses. He gives the example of a lawyer who, faced with denial by an uneducated witness of acquaintance with a certain Amphion, shrewdly repeated the name 'shortening the second syllable' (consequently moving the accent to the first syllable), whereupon the rustic replied he knew the man very well. If we assume that in his repetition the lawyer would have used the referring nominative, the anecdote is a good illustration of the clash between Greek and Latin principles of accentuation: in Greek the name Ἀμφίων could not be stressed on the antepenultimate because of the long vowel in the final; in Latin it could, provided the penultimate was short. And it is interesting to note that that is the feature mentioned by Quintilian, who, citing only the accusative form of the original question, where there is coincidence of accentuation in Greek and Latin, does not have occasion to mention the movement of the accent at all. The probable reason for the rustic's error is also interesting. The *i* in the termination of this Greek name is long, a quantity retained in the educated Latin rendering of it, such as the lawyer's. But the Latin situation is quite different: there in all common nouns, such as *conditio*, and personal names of similar shape, such as *Pollio* (and even some Greek, such as

<hr/>

[27] I am also indebted to him for, among other things, invaluable bibliographical guidance.

Phocion), the *i* is short, and the rustic accustomed to hearing the name mispronounced *à la latine*—*Am'-phi-on*—failed to recognize it in the lawyer's *Am-phi'-on*.[28]

So there appears to have been considerable linguistic *malaise* and uncertainty resulting from the clash of the two systems of accentuation discussed above, which—ironically, but humanly enough—is reflected in a mistake on 'Sergius's' own part. He condemns (528) the antepenultimate stressing of the Greek names *Cassandra* and *Sibylla*, as being in breach of the Latin long-penultimate rule, and rightly points out that antepenultimately stressed *Cassandra* is also in breach of the Greek long-final-vowel rule; but he makes the mistake of thinking the same applies to *Sibylla*, citing a supposed Σιβύλλα form, whereas the final vowel this time is short, and Σίβυλλα is the correct Greek accentuation.

This evidence of variations in the accentuation of Greek words in Latin throws new light on the problem of the apparently misplaced items in the two lists in *Ap2(b)*. For it opens up the possibility that the compiler placed the words, not inadvertently but deliberately, in what we, assessing them in purely Latin terms, regarded as mistaken positions in the two lists; that he was in fact recommending *Passipha'e* and *Phlege'thon* and so on in the list of the penultimately stressed words and *Laoda'mia* and *Gara'mantas* in the antepenultimate list, in line with the Greek accentuations Πασιφάη, Φλεγέθων, Λαοδάμεια, and Γαράμαντες. *Cecropis* would not fit in with this explanation, but that reading is, as noted above, conjectural. If we, equally legitimately, corrected MS *cecrop* to *Cecropi'a* (in line with Greek Κεκροπία, as opposed to the Latin-rule *Cecro'pia*), it would fit the context of penultimate-stressed words, thus further reducing the number of supposed errors.

Consistently, the same principle should apply to the common nouns, so that *palanges* might have been initially stressed in line with φάλαγγες, although for some reason it comes less easy to accept a Greek pronunciation for a common noun than for a name. That such Graecizing pronunciations of common nouns did, however, implant themselves is shown by the Romance derivatives of some Greek words cited below. Perhaps the clash of accents may also account for the inclusion of *tyrannus* in the first list, which, although correct, seemed, because of its blocked penultimate, otiose. It may have been included as an example of a word in which the Latin rule should prevail over the Greek (τύραννος), the latter judgement applying also to *lebe'ta* (in the compiler's view, against that of people like 'Sergius'). In fact, as noted at the outset of the discussion, the Latin rule is, as we would expect, similarly given precedence over the Greek in the majority of cases, and the *le'beta* alternative would not have called for special mention here if it had not been for 'Sergius's' dissenting judgement. It would appear that there was room for disagreement about individual words among those admitting Graecizing pronunciations.

Supporting this explanation of the 'errors' is the consequence that, apart from the movement of *Alcanoris* and *Agenoris* from the end of the first list to the beginning of the second list—which is, on its own merits, a very probable correction—the only change it requires to the text as presented in *GL* is the emendation of MS *cecrop* to *Cecropia* instead of to *Cecropis*. Once that is done, *all* the supposed errors that had

---

[28] This is the passage: 'Sermo ipse qui facillime iudicem doceat aptandus; nec id mirum sit, cum testium personis aliqua mutentur. Prudenter enim qui, cum interrogasset rusticum testem an Amphionem nosset, negante eo detraxit adspirationem breviavitque secundam eius nominis syllabam, et ille eum sic optime norat.' It will be noted that another 'rustic' feature, not relevant to our context, the absence of aspiration, reflected in the spelling *Ampio(n)*—attested in a number of inscriptions (*CIL* 2.6119, 5.6025, etc.)—is also mentioned.

perplexed us when considering the text as purely monolingual are—with the possible
exception of *Peneleus*—accounted for.

So far, in explaining the apparent anomalies in the *Ap2(b)* lists as due to clashes
between Greek and Latin accentuation patterns we have quoted only the evidence of
the grammarians, which might imply a divorce between scholastic and common
practice. But the link with practical life is well brought out by the Quintilian anecdote
quoted above, and the relevance of variant stressings of Greek words to the
development of Spoken Latin and the Romance languages has long been recognized.
It is, for example, discussed by V. Väänänen in his *Introduction au latin vulgaire*,[29]
where he remarks on the distinction between the treatment of earlier borrowings
such as *epi'stula* (ἐπιστολή), *ca'mera* (καμάρα), and *tale'ntum* (τάλαντον), which
were adapted to Latin accentuation, and later borrowings, particularly technical and
ecclesiastical, where the accentuation follows the foreign pattern. Examples include
i'dolon (εἴδωλον) (whence It. Sp. *ídolo*, O.Fr. *idele*, *idle*), *(h)e'remus* (the ἔρημος
variant) (It. *èremo*, *ermo*, Sp. *yermo*, O.Fr. *erm*). Sometimes the Latinizing and
Graecizing forms both survived: *buty'rum* (It. *butirro*), and *bu'tyrum* (Fr. *beurre*)
(βούτυρον); and *encau'stum* (It. *inchio´stro*) with *en'caustum* (ἔγκαυστον) (O.Fr.
enque).

Dag Norberg adds a specific explanation for the different accentuations of such
loanwords in the earlier and later periods[30]—the disappearance of quantitative
rhythm based on a clear-cut opposition of long and short vowels, a change which
deprived the penultimate syllable of its governing role.

A l'époque de Cicéron, un Romain ne pouvait pas, en parlant sa langue maternelle, préserver
l'accentuation grecque des mots φιλοσοφία et ἀκαδήμεια. Cela aurait été contre le génie de la
langue latine que de placer l'accent sur une pénultième brève ou de ne pas accentuer une
pénultième longue. Cicéron disait donc *philoso'phia* et *academi'a*. Mais après l'effacement des
quantités vocaliques qui s'est produit aussi dans la langue grecque, les Latins pouvaient adopter
l'accentuation étrangère *philosophi'a* et *acade'mia*. Dans le latin parlé de la fin de l'Antiquité, il y
avait donc deux manières d'accentuer les mots grecs.

It is the situation of uncertainty resulting from the clash of those two *manières
d'accentuer* that we find illustrated and ruled upon in *Ap2(b)* and the passages from
the grammarians quoted above. And we see that it is also reflected in Late Latin and
Romance.[31] That specifically linguistic situation had as background a changing
political, administrative, and cultural situation—the movement from a western,
Roman- and Latin-dominated world to one at first counterpoised and then out-
weighed by the Constantinopolitan and Greek East—which, giving impetus and
urgency to the achievement of wider bilingual competence, stimulated interest in
comparative linguistic studies, not purely academic but practical, some of the mani-
festations of which are seen in this second appendix, and in the bilingual glossaries.

To sum up: here too, as in the case of *Ap2(a)*, we have a text which, in the sense that
it compares linguistic differences between Latin and Greek, is an *idiomata*; but it is of
a novel sort, since it compares not cases or genders but accents. Symmetrically with
the *idiomata casuum* and *generum*, we might coin for it, if it does not already exist, a
Latin term, *idiomata accentuum*. We also note another difference from such lists:

[29] (Paris, 1967²), 32–3.
[30] In his *Manuel pratique de latin médiéval* (Paris, 1968), 19–20.
[31] It is interesting to note that, while the *Ap2(b)* words *Theo'dorus* and *ty'rannus* figure among
the examples quoted by Norberg from late rhythmic verse, in neither case is that Graecizing
accent the one recommended by our text—an eloquent illustration of the fluidity of the situation.

while they deal essentially with particularities—these Latin verbs or adjectives are examples of those 'taking' such-and-such a case (a different one from Greek); these Latin nouns are of such-and-such a gender, as distinct from their Greek equivalents—*Ap2(b)* operates within a framework of general principles, grouping its examples of accentuation ostensibly by the determinant length of the penultimate syllable. Where, as in a number of instances, it is the place of the Greek accent that is decisive, it can be said to be prescriptive rather than purely descriptive—this is how this particular Greek word should be pronounced in Latin—in a way loosely comparable to such modern works as, in English, the guides to pronunciation and usage of Fowler, Gowers, and Partridge, which, as well as establishing general principles, also rule on particular cases.

There are also, as we shall see, indications in the third part of this appendix of an attempt to relate a bare list of masculine nouns, such as we find in the *idiomata generum*, to something more general: gender-related categories, semantic and flexional, a feature that probably points to an augmentation and reworking of the original material. The evidence of reworking in the second part is slighter, relating to the few items (noted above) that do not fit into the general schema.

As in the case of *Ap2(a)*, there is no parallel in the *Instituta artium* to this second part of the second appendix, although this time a (presumably monolingual) treatment of metric and accentual matters is several times promised in a similar way to the promised treatment of other topics such as orthography: *hoc in metris vel in structuris competenter tractabimus* ('this we shall duly deal with in the [section on] metres or structures', *GL* 4.100.1–2); *cum ad metra ipsa venerimus* ('when we come to the metres', 60.29); *in accentibus competenter tractabimus* ('we shall duly deal with in the [section on] accents', 145.2), and so on. But none of these promises is fulfilled. On their basis some scholars have sought to identify the missing sections of the *Instituta* in some of the appendices, particularly the orthography in the *Appendix Probi*. But most seem to have recognized the very different nature of that text; and *Ap2(b)* exemplifies differences between Greek and Latin accentuation and does not at all deal with the various features of Latin flexional stress the discussion of which is promised in the *Instituta*.

As to affinities with the other appendices, we note the occurrence in *Ap2(b)* of one word, possibly two, found also among the examples in *Ap1*: both cite the name *Calybe* (spelt *Calibe*), if we can safely count it—it is only partially legible in *Ap2(b)*; and the vulgar form *lebeta* 'a copper or bronze vessel'; but the features exemplified are quite different: in *Ap1* masculines in -*a*, in *Ap2(b)* accentuation contrasting with a Greek progenitor.

APPENDIX 2(c)

The following is the full text. For the reasons given below, some of the words are picked out in capitals or bold:

Nomina generis masculini: URCIOLUS, **cinis**, SEXTARIUS, Tiberis, CONGIUS, ORCUS, QUAR͜ARIUS, dens, **nodus**, **articulus, nervus, venter**, PES, CUBITUS, UTER, MODIUM, **grex, fons**, st....., commentarius, **cucumis**, **acinus**, **vomer, ligo, vepres**, umerus.[32]

---

[32] *Quar͜arius* in our discussion is read as *quartarius*. The partially legible 'st....' entry of the manuscript might represent *stirps*, whose gender is the subject of grammatical comment, e.g. in the so-called *Valerii Probi de nomine excerpta* (*GL* 4.210.23–6): *Stirpem Vergilius et masculino et*

An essential feature of the list to be registered from the outset is that it consists of two main components. The first, being semantically based, is immediately recognizable. It consists of units of measurement (capitalized above): both measure terms proper—*congius*, *sextarius*, *quartarius*, and *modius*—and measures derived, as happens in so many languages, from popular approximations based, for length, on parts of the body—the foot, *pes*, and the forearm, *cubitus*—and, for content, on commonly used vessels or containers—the jug, *urceolus*, the jar, *urceus* (MS *orcus*),[33] and *uter* the leather 'bottle' or wineskin—some of which were incorporated into the official measure system.

The homogeneity of the measures words is confirmed by their grouping in the text. They are presented in two 'runs': *urciolus*, (*cinis*), *sextarius*, (*Tiberis*), *congius*, *orc(i)us*, *quartarius*, followed by *dens* and four *idiomata*; and then *pes*, *cubitus*, *uter*, *modium*.

Latin grammarians seem to have felt it necessary to affirm the masculine gender of measures words, thus eminently qualifying them for inclusion in a select list of masculine nouns. For example, *modius*, *sextarius*, and *congius* in unbroken sequence figure with *culleus* in a masculine list in Caper's *Orthographia* (*GL* 7.101.12ff.) quoted below, and *congius* is again specified as a masculine (*congius hic*), in Caper's *De verbis dubiis* (*GL* 7 109.2). Similarly, Placidus (5.10.3 Goetz), when rejecting the spelling of *culleus* with one *l*, does not miss the opportunity to affirm its masculine gender: <u>*Culleus genere masculino, geminato l dicitur*</u>. This insistence seems to be a reaction against a strong tendency in popular usage to treat the measure words as neuters, of which there is much evidence—starting with the neuter form *modium* appearing in the *Ap2(c)* list itself; for the copyist to write a word with the specifically neuter *-um* termination in a list labelled 'masculines', the neuter form must have seemed so 'natural' to him as to come inadvertently to his pen. Then there is the distinction made in the *De dubiis nominibus* (*GL* 5.574.12) between *cubitus* 'elbow' and *cubitum* 'measure of length'. In fact *cubitum* was used in both senses, but again we see evidence of a strong popular association of measures with the neuter. The strength of the neuter association is also illustrated by the preponderance of *-um* forms in the glosses. Thus, in the Goetz index we find no *congius* or *quartarius*, only *congium* and *quartarium*; *sextarium* appears more often than *sextarius*, and, in the relevant sense, *culleum* vies with *culleus*.

The second component, picked out above in bold, consists of words differing in

---

feminino genere dixit: masculino cum radices arborum significare vult . . . feminino cum ad progeniem refert . . .   Stirps would qualify as an *idiomata* word since it has some Greek non-masculine equivalents—ῥίζα (or ῥιζόφυτον) for its primary meaning, and γένος or γέννημα or γεννέα for its derived meaning, It is not counted in the statistics of categories.

[33] Variant forms in *o-* of both *urceus* and its diminutive were in frequent use (see the Goetz index—the index volumes entitled *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum* [Leipzig, 1899–1901], to G. Goetz's monumental *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* [Leipzig, 1888–1923]; see also Georges [n. 21], s.vv.). *Orcus*, 'the underworld', has no claim to inclusion in the list, being neither a word of uncertain gender nor one with regular non-masculine Greek equivalents to qualify it as an *idioma generum*. So, given the context, it seems highly probable that MS *orcus* is a miscopy for *orceus* or *orcius*, by-forms of *urceus* or *urcius* (*-ce-* and *-ci-* are also frequently attested variants in this family of words)—a conjecture supported by the position of the word in the list, between the measure terms *congius* and *quartarius*. It is also possible that the scribe was influenced by the word *orca*, defined by Isidore (*Orig.* 20.6.5) as an 'amphorae species', and seen by him as the word from which *urceus* and *urceolus* were derived (*cuius minore vocabulo* <u>*urceus*</u> *diminutivo* <u>*urceolus*</u> *est*). The whole of *Origines* 20.6, *De vasis vinariis et aquariis*, provides an instructive background to our discussion.

gender from their Greek equivalents. Their affinity being 'grammatical', not semantic, is not so readily recognizable as that of the measures. Indeed, their identity might have gone undetected if the originally *idiomata casuum* and '*accentuum*' character of the material underlying *Ap2*(*a*) and (*b*), as now established, had not prompted enquiry whether this third segment might not also derive, at least partially, from similar material. The obvious place in which to look for parallel examples to those in our text was in the *idiomata generum* lists of the Latin grammarians. And, sure enough, they proved to contain no fewer than twelve of the words in our list—*cinis*, *nodus*, *articulus*, *nervus*, *venter*, *grex*, *fons*, *cucumis*, *acinus*, *vomer*, *ligo*, and *vepres*—almost half the total number. A possible thirteenth, *commentarius*, which contrasts in gender with its glossarial Greek rendering, ὑπόμνημα (n.), is not so attested and, like the uncertain *st*(*irps*), cannot be safely included in the *idiomata* count.

Eleven of the parallels to our words are found both in the *Idiomata nominativa quae per genera efferuntur* of Charisius (pp. 450–63), and in the anonymous *De idiomatibus generum* (*GL* 4.573–84), and the twelfth, *cucumis*, in the *Ex Charisii arte grammatica excerpta* (*GL* 1.553.18) twice referred to above and now called the *Anonymus Bobiensis*. A complicating factor, as far as *cucumis* is concerned, is that the *Excerpta* lists it with the Latin feminines (with Greek neuter equivalents), an aberration for which a possible explanation is offered below in the discussion of -*is*/-*eris* as distinct from -*is*/-*is* words. These are the twelve *idiomata* words with their Greek equivalents:

cinis (τέφρα, f.), *nodus* (ἄμμα, n., γόνυ, n.), *articulus* (ἄρθρον, n.), *nervus* (νεῦρον, n.), *venter* (κοιλία, f.), *grex* (ἀγέλη, f.), *fons* (πηγή, f.), *cucumis* (σικύδιον [MS σικυδιν] n.), *acinus* (γίγαρτον, n.), *vomer* (ὕνις, f.), *ligo* (ἀμμοδίκελλα, f [Charisius], ἄμμη δίκελλα ἤτοι λίστρον f., n. [the *GL* text]), *vepres* (ἄκανθαι, f.).

With the main components of the text thus identified, what is probably the most important feature of *Ap2*(*c*) in relation to the second appendix as a whole has been established—the use here too, as in the first two parts, of originally bilingual, 'idiomatic', material. It is true that this time a second type of material, the measures, has also been used, and four 'oddments'—*Tiberis*, *dens*, *commentarius*, and *umerus*—added. There is, however, nothing surprising about such additions since the monolingual use to which the bilingual material has been put—the provision of examples of noteworthy masculine Latin nouns—is so wide in its scope as to cover many types. Here the compiler has chosen measures, and, as we shall see, he was also probably influenced in his choice of words from the *idiomata* by the linkage between flexion and gender. That he was not alone in taking that factor into account when selecting his examples, and in recognizing measures as a category meriting inclusion in a list of masculines, is well illustrated by the following passage in Caper's *Orthographia* (*GL* 7.101.12ff.):

Hic culleus, hic pluteus, puteus, cuneus, laqueus, postis, margo, veper vel vepres masculina sunt. Hic cardo, hic axis, modius, sextarius, hic congius, hic corbis, hic gladius, sanguis, venter, aqualiculus, hic vectis, hic flos, ros, pons.

Here too one notes not only the presence of measure words—*modius, sextarius*, and *congius*—all found in our list, but also evidence of strong interest in morphological features: the first five words ending in -*eus*; the group of three monosyllables closing the list—monosyllables could be masculine or feminine, hence the need to specify (cf. the lists in Charisius, p. 49), which may explain the presence of *dens* in our list; and the presence, in addition to five -*is* words, of *vepres* and *venter*, as in our list, which

are relevant to the flexional, and consequently, gender, uncertainties of nouns with genitives in -(*e*)*ris*. In fact no fewer than six of the words—all but one are *idiomata*—present flexional features with gender associations—*cinis*, *Tiberis*, *venter*, *cucumis*, *vomer*, and *vepres*—all with -(*e*)*ris* genitive singulars corresponding to -*is* or -*er* nominatives: *cinis/cineris*, *cucumis/cucumeris*, *vomis* (variant of *vomer*)/*vomeris*, and two others, *venter/ventris* and *uter/utris*, the related -*er/-ris* pattern—and indeed *vepres* with its occasional *veper/vepris* variant (as in the Caper excerpt) or *vepris/ vepris* singular (which in usage is uncommon). *Tiberis*, of course, differs from the rest in that, strictly, it belongs to the -*is/-is class*, the -*er*- being part of the stem, but it is easy to understand its being included as illustrating a further complexity of words of the shape under consideration. All the others appear in the gender discussions of Latin grammarians (e.g. Charisius 48–9, 112, and the *Probi Catholica*, *GL* 4.24.30–3), reflecting considerable uncertainties concerning both form and gender. For while the -*is/-eris* pattern is exclusively, and the alternative -*er/-eris* pattern preponderantly, masculine, some of these nouns were given alternative -*is* genitives bringing them into line with -*is/-is* nouns, a pattern shared by masculines and feminines but preponderantly feminine. Hence, probably, the treatment of *cucumis* as a feminine in the *Ex Charisii arte grammatica excerpta* (*GL* 1.553.18) mentioned above in our discussion of membership of the word in the *idiomata*, and in one manuscript of Caper's *De verbis dubiis* (*GL* 7.107.14), *cucumis haec non cucumer*, where the rejection of the -*er* form clearly reflects the link between that form and the masculine gender. The most systematic discussion of these matters is in Priscian (*GL* 2.159.16, and 161.21), who, incidentally, cites one of our 'oddments' in the form *Tibris*. Moreover—and this is a point against any semantic interpretation, as 'georgic', of the latter part of the *idiomata* words in our list, which, probably by chance, consists of names of plants and agricultural implements—*cucumis* is linked specifically to *vomer* (by-form *vomis*) in discussion of these confusingly related flexions, for example in Placidus, *Cucumis generis masculini; huius cucumeris. Sed et cucumer dicitur, nihilominus huius cucumeris faciens, ut vomis et vomer* (5.9.15 Goetz).[34]

So it is possible that interest in the complex interrelationship of flexion and gender in words of this shape influenced the person who chose the original list of *idiomata* words. And it may be that *Tiberis*, as hinted above, was an addition, made by association of ideas, to the *idiomata* words: it has the particular interest of presenting, by the accident of its -*er*- stem, with a consequent *Tiberis* nominative, an apparent divergence from the -*is/-eris* nominative/genitive pattern.

One final point to be emphasized about *Ap2*(*c*) is its difference in composition and presentation from the other two parts. Although complex in that they cover various aspects of their particular topics—the use of the different cases in verbal and adjectival governance, the various types of noun structure and origin that affect placement of accents—they show a less clearly marked distinction between the components in their make-up, the basis of which remains predominantly bilingual. And, in their adaptation to monolingual presentation, they show no signs of major transformations. Of course, in the transition to a monolingual account of case usage, in particular, with its separate categories and multiple exemplifications, there must always have been a temptation to add to the examples of a given case, some of monolingual interest in themselves, in which there was partial or even complete

---

[34] On the other hand, the tendency to group related terms may account for the semantically related succession of *dens*, *nodus*, *articulus*, *nervus*, and *venter*, all of which, except the first, are of *idiomata generum* origin.

coincidence with Greek usage—there are several suspect instances in *Ap2(a)*, but similar dubious examples also occur in the Charisius and Diomedes lists, reflecting no doubt the uncertain division between bilingual and monolingual treatment of such features. And it is also possible that one or two such additions were made to *Ap2(b)*, although, particularly there, faults of copying and the integration of marginal or interlinear glosses into the text may also have occurred, which could, for example, account, in spite of the adjustment from feminine to masculine, for the presence of *praesagus* next to *Sibylla*. But the major signs of modification are to be found in *Ap2(c)*. It contains not just isolated words that look like suspect monolingual additions, but, as a quite distinct second component, a semantically related group of words, the measures, which is certainly not bilingual in origin. It also shows signs of having undergone rearrangement in the light of other criteria: semantic (the grouping of anatomical terms) and morphological (the link between flexion and gender). Those features, not inherent in *idiomata*—which are exclusively concerned with contrasts between Greek and Latin—point to a quite different, purely monolingual, interest in the various features associated with Latin gender as such, accompanying the change from bilingual comparison to monolingual description and analysis.

This more clearly mixed character of the third part may also provide evidence of the stage at which the three lists lost their bilingual character. For it could be argued that, since all three bear, as their common feature, traces of that character, they must have been brought together at a time when it was still evident. But the measures can only have been added when the list of masculines was no longer recognized as bilingually based, and was simply regarded monolingually. Now, if that addition had been made at the stage in which the lists as we have them were compiled, the new additions would surely have been kept together, not partially separated as they now are. Similar conclusions, although with less force, could be drawn from the partially mixed character of the first two parts as well. So, since all three parts belong together, it is unlikely that any of the three parts was reduced to monolingual status by the compiler of the second appendix.

There being no matching general list of masculines in the *Instituta artium*, where references to gender relate to specific flexions, it can now be stated that the subject-matter of no part of *Ap2* is paralleled in that text. In fact the only feature shared with it is the presence in *Ap2(a)* of the *tics* of style, noted by Flobert and discussed above, where it was argued that they do not suffice to establish community of composition. On the contrary, the distinctness of the second appendix from both the *Instituta artium* and the other appendices is strikingly illustrated by the fact that it alone is not represented in Flobert's list of shared features (p. 308).

In fact, apart from one word, *lebeta* (two if we include *Calibe*), occurring in both *Ap1* and *Ap2(b)*, the only part of *Ap2* that presents any shared material with other texts of potential interest is the third, where, it will have been noted, some examples of masculines are paralleled in Caper, the so-called *Valerii Probi de nomine excerpta* (*GL* 4.207ff.), and the *De dubiis nominibus* (cited above), which might be regarded as consistent with Flobert's postulation of a corpus of related material to which the *Instituta* and the short appendices belong, and for which there is some evidence in the other appendices. But in this case the evidence is very tenuous. In fact, the utterly different character of the second appendix, with its bilingual affiliations, rather makes against his hypothesis of a 'cohésion' between *all* those texts.

The second appendix as a whole differs in one essential respect from all but one of the other appendices. There is nothing about the first (Latin noun declensions), the

fourth (distinctions in meaning between Latin words), or fifth (Latin deponents and 'common' verbs) that suggests bilingual sources. The third, the *Appendix Probi*, is a very special case. It is not unitary in composition, and, as I argue in my forthcoming study, part of its material originally consisted of Latin translation glosses on Greek words, which furnished a considerable number of the vulgarisms it corrects. In thus incorporating material in which Latin was initially linked to Greek, and which subsequently assumed a monolingual Latin guise, it has some affinity with the second appendix. Both, in different degrees, drew on material for the use of Latin-speaking students of Greek, or Greek of Latin—which way round being a question open to discussion, but with current learned opinion inclining in analogous cases to the latter interpretation; and both have survived as purely Latin guides to Latin grammar or usage—which has hitherto been assumed to have been their form from the beginning. But there is an important difference between the two texts: however debased and trivialized, the basic functions of the three parts of the second appendix have remained essentially unchanged—guidance on case usage, on the accentuation of certain nouns, on genders to be noted—only the explicit comparison with Greek having been lost. In the *Appendix Probi*, however, the shift from bilingual to monolingual presentation has been accompanied by a complete change of function—from lexical to 'grammatical'. The retained Latin translation glosses—those presenting vulgar features—have not only, as in *Ap2*, lost their Greek equivalents, whose meanings they rendered, but have been furnished by the grammarian-compiler with something new that transforms their function—corresponding 'correct' forms, in whose favour they are to be rejected. In most cases the only trace left of their original lexical function has to be sought in certain groupings in the text, groupings whose members have no discernible Latin semantic affinity, but whose lost Greek equivalents do.

As to the subsequent diffusion of the second appendix, the evidence of the *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum* makes it, as we have seen, probable (not certain: the gaps in the appendix text and the possible use of a common source preclude absolute certainty) that the first part at least was known in Britain by the eighth century. Whether the manuscript so used also contained the other two parts we do not know. There is, of course, no reason why the availability of all three should have precluded the use of only one of them—one that had relevance to a particular task in hand, in this case the commentary on Donatus, section case governance of verbs. As pointed out in our discussion of *Ap2(a)*, its probable separate attestation, together with that of part of the fourth appendix (the *differentiae*) in the Montpellier manuscript, and of the fifth (deponents and 'common' verbs) in Cledonius, might be interpreted as evidence of the separate compilation of the various appendices—against Flobert's conviction. But that is by no means certain: separate attestation does not necessarily imply separate compilation.

This investigation has shown that the original nature and purpose of the three parts of the second appendix—comparisons between grammatical features of Greek and Latin—are common to all of them, supporting the view that they were transmitted as a body of related material (and, incidentally, confirming the count of five, not seven, appendices to Probus). The most interesting characteristic of their transmission is the changes made in their presentation, from bilingual comparison to monolingual description. By the omission of the Greek equivalents the first part, an *idiomata casuum*, was transformed into a *de consensu verborum cum casibus*; the second, an '*idiomata accentuum*', into a list of apparently arbitrarily chosen Latin nouns with

long and short penultimates; the third, an *idiomata generum*, into a brief, equally arbitrary, list of Latin masculines, whose original identity was further obscured by monolingual accretions. In every case the change was from the linguistically significant to the grammatically banal. Examples that had been chosen as offering a contrast with Greek had no unifying characteristic when standing alone in Latin—'quelques noms masculins', as Flobert characterizes the third list. The least seriously impaired was the first, since a monolingual presentation of examples of case usage has its own independent utility. But the second and third, neither with any evident criterion of selection or pretension, in its absence, to adequacy, have been utterly trivialized. It is no doubt this rudimentary status that explains the scant attention hitherto paid to the second appendix. But, in addition to the inherent interest of its rehabilitated evidence of comparative activity, particularly in the second part, its present debased form and the way in which it was arrived at can be viewed as an instructive example of the reduction of comparatively sophisticated material to a more elementary level, characteristic of an age of decline in scholarship, if not intellectual culture.

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