

# Approaches to the Writing of Greek in Late Antique Latin Texts

*Aaron Pelttari*

**L**ATIN AUTHORS frequently insert Greek words into their texts, in a practice known as code-switching.<sup>1</sup> When a Latin author switches to Greek, he may either change alphabets or engage also in character-switching, in which one language is written with letters borrowed from another.<sup>2</sup> J. N. Adams has detailed a number of cases of character-switching in documentary sources. Did literary authors also engage in character-switching? Did Latin authors write Greek in Roman characters? Although Republican and early Imperial authors presumably did engage in character switching, there is as yet no way to approach the question: the manuscripts present conflicting evidence, and there is reason to think that late antique

<sup>1</sup>J. N. Adams has defined code-switching as a “switch from one language into another within one person’s utterance or piece of writing,” *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge 2003) 19. Code-switching is distinct from borrowing, though individual cases may always be questioned; for, while code-switching involves foreign words or phrases, loan words are borrowed from another language and integrated into the receiving idiom (Adams 25–27). For a brief recent overview of bilingualism in the ancient world see F. Biville, “Situations et documents bilingues dans le monde gréco-romain,” in F. Biville et al. (eds.), *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie* (Lyon 2008) 35–53.

<sup>2</sup> Adams, *Bilingualism* 71–76, discusses orthographic interference and coins the term ‘character-switching’, along with the synonym ‘alphabet-switching’. Character-switching in Roman contexts had already been documented by, among others, G. Purnelle, “Les phrases grecques translittérées dans les inscriptions latines,” in *Serta Leodiensia Secunda* (Liège 1992) 299–404, and “Les inscriptions latines translittérées en caractères grecs,” in *XI Congr. Inter. Epigr.* (Rome 1999) 825–834.

scribes influenced the tradition.<sup>3</sup> For late antiquity, extant codices provide evidence that both single words and short phrases of Greek were written sometimes in Greek and sometimes in Latin characters. However, modern editors—and in some cases medieval scribes—have frequently resolved cases of character-switching, in order to give their texts linguistic consistency. That is, they have hyper-corrected their texts, in order to write Greek only in Greek characters.

Does it matter whether we write Greek words in Latin letters or in Greek? There are four reasons that it does. (1) Editors generally attempt to restore the *ipsisima verba* of their author; the concern they evince in their critical apparatuses demonstrates that many editors would also like to restore their authors' *ipsisimae litterae*. (2) Not all audiences could or can decipher Greek characters; printing a word in Greek assumes a certain level of audience. (3) Beyond any considerations of the author's education, the script in which a word is written necessarily affects the ways in which that word works within its context. (4) At least some late antique authors played with the similarities (and differences) between the Latin and Greek alphabets. Thus, in two of his poems (16 and 19), Optatianus Porphyrius composed acrostics in which the individual letters

<sup>3</sup> For Plautus, Michael Fontaine has drawn attention to the fact that the Palatine tradition gives Greek words in Latin script while the Ambrosianus gives them in Greek characters: "A Lost Example of Code Switching: *unum somnum* (Plautus, *Amphitruo* 697)," *RhM* 148 (2005) 404–406. For Cicero, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, in his commentary to *Ad Familiares* 64.1 (= 3.1.1), quotes R. Y. Tyrrell's observation that "A good case could be made for the theory that in the original archetype all the Greek words were written in Roman characters" ("Remarks on *Tucker's Emendations in Cicero's Epistles*," *Hermathena* 15 [1909] 440). Apart from the question of character-switching, Adams provides an exemplary study of code-switching in Cicero's letters (*Bilingualism* 308–347). Dionigi Vottero attempts to answer the question of alphabet-switching in Seneca's philosophical works, "La grafia dei termini d'origine greca nelle opere filosofiche di Seneca," *AttiTor* 108 (1974) 311–339; but his survey is limited by an inattention to the manuscripts and by *a priori* assumptions as to how Greek was written.

function as Latin in one direction and Greek in the other. Further, Ausonius wrote a bilingual poem in which he purposefully confused the two languages and their alphabets.<sup>4</sup>

1. *Greek in late antique codices*

So far as I know, only one study uses extant codices to address the question of how Greek was written within Latin texts:<sup>5</sup> L. Holtz surveyed the use of Greek in grammatical treatises and commentaries, basing his study on what remains from late antiquity. He found that technical terms like *epicoenon* and *antiptosis* were transliterated in grammatical treatises, while citations and some “isolated” words were written in Greek letters. In commentaries, however, grammarians usually, but not always, wrote Greek in Greek characters.<sup>6</sup> Given Holtz’s findings, it is worth asking how Greek was written in non-grammatical texts.

Augustine had recourse to Greek in his writings. Though his knowledge of Greek was limited especially at the beginning of his career, he had studied Greek as a child and so always had at least a rudimentary knowledge of the language.<sup>7</sup> Despite his passing knowledge of Greek, Augustine seems to have pre-

<sup>4</sup> *Epist.* 6 ed. Green (1991). Thus, the letters of *ennea* (line 14) could be read as either Latin or Greek, provided that the poem was written in an uncial script.

<sup>5</sup> D. Feissel however has published a fascinating paper on the writing of Greek in Latin characters in official Greek texts in the sixth century: “Écrire grec en alphabet latin: le cas des documents protobyzantins,” in *Bilinguisme* 213–230.

<sup>6</sup> L. Holtz, “Transcription et déformations de la terminologie grammaticale grecque dans la tradition manuscrite latine,” in L. Basset et al. (eds.), *Bilinguisme et terminologie grammaticale gréco-latine* (Leuven 2007) 37–56, at 42–43, 46–49.

<sup>7</sup> The fundamental study of Augustine’s Greek is P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en occident*<sup>2</sup> (Paris 1948) 137–209.

ferred to write Greek in Latin characters.<sup>8</sup> Two manuscripts of Augustine's works, the one contemporary and the other probably contemporary with the author, present more than forty examples of Greek words written in Latin script. *Petrograd. Q. v. I.3* was assigned by W. M. Green to the fifth or possibly even the end of the fourth century and tentatively to Augustine's own scriptorium.<sup>9</sup> Excluding common loan words, two Greek words and one Greek title appear in this manuscript; the scribe wrote Greek words only in Latin characters:

*De div. quaest. ad Simp. 2.1.1: aut per demonstrationem in extasi, quod<sup>10</sup> Latini nonnulli pavorem interpretantur.*

*Contra Epist. Fund. 10: cata iohannē.*<sup>11</sup>

*Contra Epist. Fund. 29: informem quamdam materiem ... confusum nescio quid atque omnino expers omni qualitate, unde illud quidam doctores Graeci apaeon vocant.*

In the first case, Mutzenbecher (CC 44 [1970]) printed *extasi* in Latin script, but in the other two Zycha (CSEL 25 [1891]) 'emended' the texts to *κατὰ Ἰωάννην* and *ἄποιον*. Though *-ae-* was not the most correct transcription of *-oi-*, it was common enough;<sup>12</sup> and there is no reason to reject the transliteration on that or any other grounds.

<sup>8</sup> It is likely that Augustine's preference was influenced by his intended audience's ignorance of Greek, but character-switching does not always follow easily prescribed guidelines. Therefore, a reliable estimation of the relation between character-switching and the intended audience's level of education must await a fuller survey of character-switching in Latin texts.

<sup>9</sup> On this codex see Green's introduction to his edition of *De Doctrina Christiana* (CSEL 80 [1963]) viii–ix, xiii–xvi.

<sup>10</sup> In such contexts, Greek words are normally treated as neuter regardless of their gender, either in Greek or when treated as loan words in Latin.

<sup>11</sup> It is unclear whether the final letter was meant to be *m* or *n*. At the ends of lines, this manuscript abbreviates each with only a horizontal line above the text: E. A. Lowe, "Some Facts About our Oldest Latin Manuscripts," *CQ* 19 (1925) 197–208, at 202.

<sup>12</sup> On the various writings of *-oi-*, see F. Biville, *Les emprunts du latin au grec: Approche phonétique* II (Paris 1995) 335. The spelling could easily be explained

The evidence of *Petrograd. Q. v. I.3* is confirmed by *Verona Bib. Capit. XXVIII (V)*, which Lowe dates to the first half of the fifth-century (*CLA IV* 491). This codex contains Books 11–16 of *De civitate Dei*, in which there occur one Greek title and thirty-one individual Greek words.<sup>13</sup> In every case, the scribe wrote his Greek in the same Latin uncials as the rest of the text. Because the editors cite this manuscript only when the scribe clearly misspelled such words, I provide here a full account of **V**'s presentation of his Greek. The relevant context, quoted from Dombart and Kalb's edition and not directly from **V**, shows that each word is actually Greek and not treated as a loan word.

11.23: *In libris enim, quos appellat [sc. Origenes] Peri archon, id est De principiis.*

11.34: *pituítam, quod graece phlegma dicitur.*

12.2: *sicut enim ab eo, quod est sapere, vocatur sapientia, sic ab eo, quod est esse, vocatur essentia, novo quidem nomine, quo usi veteres non sunt Latini sermonis auctores, sed iam nostris temporibus usitato, ne deesset etiam linguae nostrae, quod Graeci appellant usian.*

13.24: *Sive autem formavit sive finxit quis dicere voluerit, quod Graece dicitur eplasen, ad rem nihil interest.*

13.24: *Semper autem iste Spiritus in Scripturis sanctis Graeco vocabulo pneuma dicitur.*

13.24: *non ait Graecus pneuma, quod solet dici Spiritus Sanctus, sed pnoen, quod nomen in creatura quam in Creatore frequentius legitur; unde nonnulli etiam Latini propter differentiam hoc vocabulum non spiritum, sed flatum appellare maluerunt.*

---

by the author's dictation of his work. For the suggestion that such aural confusions be attributed to the processes of dictation see R. Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia* (Oxford 2010) 65 n.1.

<sup>13</sup> This list excludes *antitheta* (11.18), *centron* (13.17), and *pygm<a>eos* (16.8), which the editors have treated as loan words but which could easily be regarded as Greek considering their context or, in the case of *centron*, their spelling. In every instance cited below except one (16.21), Dombart and Kalb (BT 1981) printed these words in Greek script.

13.24: *Quod itaque Graece pnoe<sup>14</sup> dicitur, nostri aliquando flatum, aliquando spiritum, aliquando inspirationem vel aspirationem, quando etiam Dei dicitur, interpretati sunt; pneuma vero numquam nisi spiritum.*

13.24: *quantum ad Graecos adinet, non pnoen videmus scriptum esse, sed pneuma; quantum autem ad Latinos, non flatum, sed spiritum.*

13.24: *si Graecus non pnoen, sicut ibi legitur, sed pneuma posuisset ... pneuma.*

13.24: *non Graecus pneuma sed pnoen dixerit.*

13.24: *in Graeco non dixit pneuma, sed pnoen.*

14.8: *Quas enim Graeci appellant euphatias,<sup>15</sup> Latine autem Cicero constantias nominavit.*

14.8: *et illas tres esse constantias, has autem quattuor perturbationes secundum Ciceronem, secundum autem plurimos passiones. Graece autem illae tres, sicut dixi, appellantur euphatiae; istae autem quattuor pathae.<sup>16</sup>*

14.9: *aphatia graece dicitur, quae si Latine posset impassibilitas diceretur ... apathia ... apathia ... apathia.*

15.5: *exemplo et, ut Graeci appellant, archeotypo.*

15.23: *Qui enim graece dicitur angelos, quod nomen latina declinatione angelus perhibetur, Latina lingua nuntius interpretatur.*

16.4: *Quod non intellegentes nonnulli ambiguo Graeco falsi sunt, ut non interpretarentur contra Dominum, sed ante Dominum; enantion<sup>17</sup> quippe et contra et ante significat.*

16.21: *quam Graeci vocant yperbolen.<sup>18</sup>*

16.26: *sciat aeternum a nostris interpretari, quod Graeci appellant aeonion, quod a saeculo derivatum est; aeon quippe graece saeculum nuncupatur ...*

<sup>14</sup> Dombart and Kalb note that the first hand (along with two other manuscripts) gives here *pnoen* in the accusative rather than *pnoe* in the nominative. It looks to me like the original scribe has put a mark through the terminal *n*, in order to delete it; but it is not clear.

<sup>15</sup> Confusion between aspirated and unaspirated consonants is common. And this is a deluxe manuscript written by a careless scribe.

<sup>16</sup> On this writing of *eta* see Biville, *Les emprunts* 324–333.

<sup>17</sup> The final *n* is written above the line.

<sup>18</sup> In this passage Dombart and Kalb print *hyperbolen* in Latin letters.

*aeonion* autem quod dicitur, aut non habet finem aut usque in huius saeculi tenditur finem.

16.37: *sine fictione ... quod est Graece aplastos.*<sup>19</sup>

Thus in the two earliest manuscripts of Augustine's writings, Greek is never written in Greek characters. If in these texts Augustine's contemporaries—and possibly his own scribe—wrote Greek in Latin characters, there is no reason for a modern scholarly edition not to do the same.

Editors have printed many of these words in Greek, because Augustine clearly intended that they be understood as Greek. For example, in 12.2 he draws attention to the difference between Latin and Greek: what the Romans call *essentia*, the Greeks call *usia*. At 13.23 he cites *eplasen*, the conjugated form of the verb rather than the infinitive. And at 15.23 he gives both the Latin declension of and a Latin translation for *angelos*. Augustine was not using these Greek words as loan words, i.e. foreign words already incorporated into his own language. Rather, he wrote Greek in Latin script. I emphasize this point because even Holtz has drawn too sharp a distinction between the characters used for loan words and the ones supposedly used for actual Greek.<sup>20</sup> Though a technical term, *hyperbole* was a perfectly acceptable loan word in Latin; in calling it the figure *quam Graeci vocant yperbolen*, Augustine shows that in this context he is thinking of the word as Greek. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that he would have made a clear and consistent distinction between loan words and foreign words, or between the alphabet to be used with either category. Even in spoken English, a common word like *burrito* may be made foreign in pronunciation. And even in modern publishing there is no fixed practice as regards foreign words, although individual editors and publications do have their own rules. In a given context, a word may be italicized or not, depending upon any number of factors. Thus, in *De la grammatologie* (1967),

<sup>19</sup> The first *a* is written above the line.

<sup>20</sup> Holtz, in *Bilinguisme et terminologie* 44.

Jacques Derrida glosses “l’histoire et le savoir” as “*istoria et epistēmē*” (20); he speaks of “la question du *γράφειν*” (157); and he mentions “la question de l’essence,” which is then glossed as “‘*ti esti*’” (31). If neither spoken language nor modern publishers disambiguate loan words and foreign words in consistent ways, we should not force Latin authors to write Greek only in Greek script. If it would be too confusing to write such Greek words in Latin characters, editors could employ some convention, such as an italic font, in order to disambiguate Greek from Latin.

A complete study would now provide a full survey of the remaining late antique Latin codices that contain Greek words and phrases.<sup>21</sup> But two closely related questions may be considered here in a preliminary way. Why has Greek been erroneously restored where Latin authors wrote their Greek in Latin characters? And how should we use the evidence, provided by medieval manuscripts, as to how Greek was written in late antiquity?

## 2. *Greek in medieval manuscripts*

Editors and scholars have internalized the narrative according to which bungling scribes could neither understand nor transcribe the Greek in their exemplars: faced with unfamiliar Greek uncials, scribes either gave up completely or produced gibberish.<sup>22</sup> Examples to support this view are common

<sup>21</sup> Lowe, *CQ* 19 (1925) 198–203, provides a helpful list of forty-seven of our oldest manuscripts, and there is a slightly different list in E. A. Lowe and E. K. Rand, *A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1922) 16–19.

<sup>22</sup> For example, M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 26–27: “Copyists grasp at indications that they are writing the required language even if they cannot quite follow its meaning, and it is not often that they abandon all pretence of articulacy ... It happens most surely when a Latin copyist who does not know Greek suddenly finds himself faced with a Greek phrase or quotation: then he is reduced to imitating the shapes of unknown letters, and gibberish soon results.” Cf. L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris 1911) 186 §786: “Les mots écrits



enough. Several of the scribes who copied Macrobius' *Saturnalia* omit the parts written in Greek.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the Greek in Latin manuscripts is riddled with visual and phonetic corruptions. The standard narrative, therefore, accounts for a great number of cases and has enabled some brilliant emendations. For example, at Mart. *Spect.* 21.8, the *textus receptus* gave the nonsensical *ita pictoria*, which A. E. Housman corrected to *παρ' ιστορίαν*.<sup>24</sup>

Although some medieval scribes did not know any Greek, there were also scribes who knew enough Greek to meddle with their text.<sup>25</sup> The preface to Ausonius' *Protrepticus ad nepotem* has the phrase *instar protreptici*; the 14<sup>th</sup>-century **P** gives the second word in Greek capitals (*instar ΠΟΤΡΕΠΤΙΚΙ*).<sup>26</sup> No one has suggested that **P** alone preserves the authentic script. At Macrobius' *In Somnium Scipionis* 1.6.56, *Bruxellensis* 10146 (early tenth century) is caught *in flagrante delicto* transliterating *amphikyrtos* as AMPHYKYPTOC: the Latin letters *p* and *h* were read as though they represented *rho* and *eta*, rather than *phi*. Further, a series of Prudentius' manuscripts include a note on the meter of his *Epilogus*, in the *incipit* to that poem. Thompson records in his apparatus that one manuscript from the branch of the

---

en caractères grecs sont peu à peu remplacés par des transcriptions en caractères latins." Havet, however, does suggest that some works might always have written their Greek in Latin characters; for example, he suggests that Plautus did not use Greek letters (186 §787).

<sup>23</sup> J. Willis, *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Saturnalia*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1994) ix.

<sup>24</sup> A. E. Housman, "Two Epigrams of Martial," *CR* 15 (1901) 154–155. The passage is discussed by R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1969) 46–47. It is a personal pleasure to recall how much I owe to Prof. Renehan's generous teaching.

<sup>25</sup> Or sometimes they did not know enough but still tried: in his apparatus to Macrobius' *Sat.* 7.4.25 Willis notes that "podagrae Graecis litteris scribere temptat **N**, sane infelicitur." If **N**'s Greek had been a little more felicitous, would *ποδάγρας* be the accepted form?

<sup>26</sup> For the manuscripts of Ausonius and their sigla I have used R. P. H. Green's OCT.

tradition known to him as Γ and three from Θ give the meter as *trocheum et trimetrum endecasyllabum* (with minor variations); a single manuscript (U), also descended from Θ, gives this portion of the note as *trochaicum trimetrum* ΕΝΔΕΧΑΚΥΛΛΑΒΟΝ.<sup>27</sup> U was written in the final third of the ninth century. Though the Latin Middle Ages saw a decline in the knowledge of Greek, individual scribes were often interested in Greek and did not need to know much in order to transcribe the words in front of them into Greek script.<sup>28</sup>

With the rediscovery of Greek in the Renaissance, Greek words in Latin script began to fare even worse. Thus, the manuscripts to Serv. *In Aen.* 3.73 read (with a few trivial variants): *ut autem Delos primo Ortygia diceretur, factum est a coturnice, quae Graece ortyx vocatur.*<sup>29</sup> *Delos autem quia diu latuit et post apparuit—nam delon Graeci ‘manifestum’ dicunt.* In 1600, Pierre Daniel printed ὄρτυξ and δῆλον; the Harvard editors followed his lead.<sup>30</sup>

When a word is found in Greek script in a manuscript or early printed edition, it may well reflect the arbitrary choice of

<sup>27</sup> A similar meddling is found in *Sangallensis* 866, a twelfth-century manuscript of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: R. J. Tarrant (OCT p.481) reports that the *explicit* to Book 15 gives the title of Ovid’s work as ΜΕΤΑΜΟΡΦΩΣΗΩΝ.

<sup>28</sup> On the uses of Greek in the Middle Ages see W. Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages* (Washington 1988), and B. M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1988). For the interest of scribes in Greek, cf. the *De civitate Dei* from Verona, in which a Carolingian scribe has noted many of the Greek words by copying them neatly in the margin; on the ability of scribes to transliterate Latin, Berschin also discusses a couple of cases (from the sixth and eighth-ninth century) of scribes writing Latin in Greek script: “Griechisches in der Domschule von Verona,” in G. Cavallo et al. (eds.), *Scrittura, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio I* (Spoleto 1991) 221–234, at 228–229 (repr. W. Berschin, *Mittelalterliche Studien* [Heidelberg 2005]).

<sup>29</sup> *Serv. Dan.* has here *dicatur* in place of *vocatur*.

<sup>30</sup> Thilo and Hagen, however, also report that *Lipsiensis Bibl. Publ. rep.* 1 (4) n. 36 wrote ΟΡΤΥΞ in place of *ortyx*. The question is whether it is more likely that a single manuscript preserved the original text or that a single copyist transcribed the word into Greek capitals.

a scribe or printer, rather than the text found in their exemplar. The transmission, therefore, of Greek in Latin texts is more complex than has usually been allowed.<sup>31</sup> While some scribes were unable to recognize or (correctly) transcribe the Greek in front of them, other scribes and scholars decided to restore the Greek which they thought belonged in their text.

### 3. *Greek in modern editions of Latin authors*

As I have started to suggest, we should reconsider the Greek that appears (either in Latin or in Greek characters) in the manuscripts of late antique authors, late antiquity being the earliest period for which there is contemporary evidence to confirm the practices of literary authors.<sup>32</sup> To suggest how such reconsideration could proceed, I will discuss a series of passages with Greek in them from the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius and from Ausonius' poetry.

Macrobius knew Greek rather well.<sup>33</sup> In the *Saturnalia*, he quite often quoted Greek words, titles, and phrases, as well as longer passages of prose and poetry. Longer passages are always in Greek script, and the manuscripts are riddled with trivial errors. Phrases are normally in Greek script (I consider below what I think to be one exception). But Macrobius' practice does not seem to be consistent when it comes to titles and individual words. While many titles are in Greek, R. Kaster has recently drawn attention to the fact that the best evidence leads one to conclude that Macrobius wrote some of

<sup>31</sup> Sebastiano Timpanaro however has pointed out, in his emendation of *καλω* to *calo* at Macrob. *Sat.* 1.15.10, that scribes sometimes mistakenly transliterate from Latin to Greek characters (*Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* [Rome 1978] 540–544). As Timpanaro notes, P. K. Marshall also discussed several relevant passages from Gellius, in “Gelliana Graeca,” *CQ* 10 (1960) 179–180.

<sup>32</sup> I do not know of any study of the evidence from documentary texts that has addressed this question for earlier periods. A full of study of the manuscripts of, say, Cicero's letters could also yield interesting results.

<sup>33</sup> See Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques* 3–36.

his Greek titles in Latin script.<sup>34</sup> For individual words, *Sat.* 1.12.8 mentions *spuma, quam Graeci afron vocant*. Although the manuscripts are united (with the exception of **T**'s more correct *aphron*), Willis and Kaster print ἀφρόν. The evidence presented above makes it clear that such an intervention is arbitrary at best. In a similar phrase at 1.19.17, the codices present *genituram ... quae genesis appellatur*. Jan and Willis print γένεσις. Kaster restores the reading of the manuscripts, but on the grounds that *genesis* was a loan word already common in Latin texts: “Jan ... had no warrant to introduce Greek characters for the archetype’s *genesis*: Greek usage or practice is not being discussed, and by Macrobius’ time *genesis* has long since been naturalized as a *vox propria* for ‘horoscope’ (*TLL* 6,2:1802.74–1803.32), which is the topic here.”<sup>35</sup> Thus, Kaster reinforces the distinction between genuinely Greek words (which would naturally be written in Greek script) and Latinized forms of Greek. I hope to have shown that genuinely Greek words were also written in Latin.

*Sat.* 1.17.47 presents a much more difficult case. I give Willis’ text and the relevant portions of his apparatus:

*Apollo Χρυσόκομας cognominatur a fulgore radiorum quos vocant comas aureas solis, unde et Ἀκερσικόμης, quod numquam radii possunt a fonte lucis avelli; item Ἀργυρότοξος, quod enascens per summum orbis ambitum velut arcus quidam figuratur alba et argentea specie, ex quo arcu radii in modum emicant sagittarum.*

χρυσόκομας] vulg., *chrisocomas* **NDPTMF**, *chrysocomas* **BVZR**, *chirsocomas* **A**  
 Ἀκερσικόμης] om. **T**, **ΑΚΕΡΤΙΚΟΜΗC** **M**, **ΑΚΕΡCΙΚΟΜΕC** **B**, a greca **A**  
 Ἀργυρότοξος] vulg., *argirotoxus* **NDPTVR**, *agyrothochus* **M**, *argyrotoxus* **BZF**, *agyrotoxus* **A**.

<sup>34</sup> Kaster, *Studies* 58.

<sup>35</sup> Kaster, *Studies* 58–59.

As Kaster has noted, Willis' "vulg." means one or more of the scholars who edited the *Saturnalia* before him.<sup>36</sup> In this case, it means at least Jan and Eyssenhardt. The archetype clearly had *Ἀκερσικόμης*, as well as *chrisocomas* and *argirotouxus*. Is it possible that Macrobius wrote two of these names in Latin and one in Greek? I think it unlikely, though such inconsistency is not impossible. Though not nearly as drastic, the fifth-century palimpsest of Fronto's *Epistulae* has the word *schemata* at *Ad Anton. Imp.* 1.2.6; but, in an exactly parallel phrase at 3.1.1, it gives *σχήματα*.<sup>37</sup> But I do not know of any other case of an author who was so inconsistent as to switch, within a single sentence, between transcribing a series of names into Latin letters and leaving them in their Greek form. Since it is still more likely, in any given case, that a single scribe would transliterate from Greek to Latin, the editors are right to print *Χρυσοκόμης* and *Ἀργυρότοξος* in Greek, though it is just possible that the corruption went the other way and that Macrobius actually wrote *Acersicomes*. In any case, the transmitted text should not always be retained.

I have here addressed three individual passages from a long and complicated text, and there will certainly be doubts about one reading or another. But Book 4 of the *Saturnalia* is more straightforward. Only the middle of the book survives, an explanation of the rhetoric in Vergil's *Aeneid*. The discussion takes up twenty-two pages in Willis' Teubner edition. For this book, Macrobius used as his sources two different rhetorical treatises.<sup>38</sup> In those twenty-two pages, a number of rhetorical

<sup>36</sup> Kaster, *Studies* 4.

<sup>37</sup> Not to mention that *παράλειψιν* appears in the sentence after *schemata* in 1.2.6. Holtz, in *Bilinguisme et terminologie* 48, drew attention to similar inconsistencies in the transmitted text of Donatus' commentary to Terence's *Andria*.

<sup>38</sup> As Kaster pointed out in his Loeb edition, the one ends and the other begins at 4.5.1. On the difficulties of editing a text that compiles earlier

terms are introduced which editors have transliterated into Greek against the evidence of the manuscripts. Since Holtz has shown that rhetorical terms in technical treatises are usually transliterated, we will reconsider them now. I provide below a list of words that have been printed in Greek, along with a few others that have been regarded as loan words (whether helpfully or not), and the one Greek quotation in this section of text. I give Willis' text (with which Kaster's Loeb agrees in each case) and (where helpful) his apparatus.

4.1.4: *inter pathe*.<sup>39</sup>

4.2.1: *oportet enim ut oratio pathetica aut ad indignationem aut ad misericordiam dirigatur, quae a Graecis οἶκτος καὶ δείνωσις appellatur.*] δείνωσις vulg., om. **T**, ΔΕΙΝΩΣΕΙC cett.

4.2.4: *initium ab ecphonesi*] *initium ab ecphonesi* om. **T**, *ecfonesi* **R**, *haec phonesi* **A**.<sup>40</sup>

4.2.4: *deinde sequitur hyperbole*] *iperbole* **P**, *hiperbole* **T**.

4.2.4: *deinde ironia*] *yronia* **R**, *hyronia* **A**.

4.5.1: *huius species sunt tres: exemplum, parabola, imago; Graece παράδειγμα, παραβολή, εἰκόν.]* Graeca om. **T**, post *para* in *παραβολή* om. **R**, ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΡΜΑ **N**, ΠΑΡΑΔΙΓΜΑ **P**.

4.5.11: *sed prior forma οἶκτον praestat, haec δείνωσιν]* οἶκτον vulg., om. **T**, *oecton* cett., δείνωσιν vulg., *dinostin* **N**, *diuosin* **T**, *dinosin* cett.

4.6.5: ὡς εἰ ἅπασα  
Ἰλιος ὄφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ' ἄκρης.]

material (e.g. was a particular change made by the compiler or in transmission?) see Kaster, *Studies* 65–84.

<sup>39</sup> Book 4 is specifically concerned with the raising of *pathos*, and so the term naturally occurs throughout. In most places, it is almost certainly to be regarded as a loan word. But the neuter plural used here is less common in Latin texts; and the archetype seems to have had *pathos* in Greek at 5.13.17, though two of the manuscripts there transliterated the original Greek into Latin.

<sup>40</sup> Willis' apparatus is a negative apparatus, so the remaining manuscripts transmit *ecphonesi*. **T** regularly omits Greek.

Graeca om. **TRFA**, ΑΠΙΑC **P**, ΙΜΟC **NP**, ΟΦΡΙΟΕCCA **NP**, CΜΗΧΟΙΤΟ **NP**.<sup>41</sup>

4.6.9: *oratores homoeopathian vocant quotiens de similitudine passionis pathos nascitur.*

4.6.11: *facit apud oratores pathos etiam addubitatio quam Graeci ἀπόρησιν vocant] ἀπόρησιν vulg., aporesin codd.*

4.6.15: *hyperbole, id est nimietas] hiperbole NPT, yperbole A.*

4.6.17: *exclamatio, quae apud Graecos ἐκφώνησις dicitur] ἐκφώνησις vulg., et fonesis NT, ecfonesis cett.*

4.6.20: *ἀποσιώπησις, quod est taciturnitas] aposiopesis codd.*

4.6.23: *nascitur pathos et de repetitione, quam Graeci ἐπαναφορὰν vocant] ἐπαναφορὰν vulg., epanophoran N, epanaphoram T, epanaphoran cett.*

4.6.24: *ἐπιτίμησις, quae est obiurgatio] ἐπιτίμησις vulg., epithimesis T, epitimensis F, epitimesis cett.*

In Book 4, the archetype wrote its Greek words in Latin letters, with exceptions only at 4.2.1, 4.5.1, and 4.6.5. The exceptions are two passages in which three Greek words are found together and one in which Macrobius quoted a line and a half of Homer. Because the archetype always has single Greek words in Latin letters, and also in one case (4.5.11) a pair of Greek rhetorical terms in Latin, it would appear that Macrobius' normal practice in this book was to write single Greek rhetorical terms in Latin letters, even when he did not regard them as loan words. And, if Macrobius often wrote such terms in Roman letters, it may be right to think of at least *ecphonesi* (4.2.4) and *hyperbole* (4.2.4, 4.6.15) as Greek terms rather than loan words. Further, in the three passages where the archetype did contain Greek, ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΡΜΑ of **N** (4.5.1) and ΙΜΟC of **N** and **P** (4.6.5) are common uncial confusions. While every argument from silence is hazardous at best, it is worth noting that the manuscripts do not betray any trace of confusion from uncial Greek elsewhere in Book 4. The archetype wrote most

<sup>41</sup> Kaster, *Studies* 76–77, defended σμήχοιτο against Willis' σμύχοιτο.

of these rhetorical terms in Latin, and we know that Macrobius' contemporaries wrote such terms in Latin. Rather than postulate some process by which nearly all the rhetorical terms in Book 4 of the *Saturnalia* could have been transliterated into Latin letters, I would presume that Macrobius himself wrote these terms in Latin script.

The poet Ausonius had frequent recourse to Greek.<sup>42</sup> In his commentary to and edition of Ausonius, R. P. H. Green pays careful attention to Ausonius' use of Greek, and B. Rochette has recently written a judicious study of code-switching in Ausonius.<sup>43</sup> Despite the attention of both scholars, their work is limited by *a priori* principles about how Greek is written. Thus, Rochette says that actual Greek, as opposed to loan words, should be written in Greek letters.<sup>44</sup> I discuss here only those words which both Green and Rochette would print in Greek, against the evidence of the manuscripts. I give Green's text (Oxford 1991) and as much of his apparatus as necessary.

*Epigr.* 86 is a crude joke on the sexual habits of the grammarian Eunus:

*Eune, quod uxoris gravidae putria inguina lambis,  
festinas γλώσσας non natis tradere natis.  
γλώσσας]* Green, *glossas* codd.

Green explains his decision: "the Latin word, given by the manuscripts, does not mean 'tongue'; the Greek is suitably ambiguous. Greek words occur frequently in the *Epigrams* and other works of A., and tend to be garbled or simplified in transmission." Rochette (187) explains that "le mot grec renforce la

<sup>42</sup> See R. P. H. Green, "Greek in Late Roman Gaul: the Evidence of Ausonius," in E. M. Craik (ed.), *Owls to Athens: Essays Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford 1990) 311–319.

<sup>43</sup> B. Rochette, "Code-switching chez Ausone," in R. Bedon and M. Polfer (eds.), *Etre romain: hommages in memoriam Charles Marie Terres* (Remshalden 2007) 175–195.

<sup>44</sup> Rochette, *Etre romain* 177. But Rochette's actual practice is more nuanced than his statement of principles.



*vis comica* de cette épigramme.” Both scholars assume that the word is essentially either Greek or Latin and that the spelling would be consistent in either case. I hope to have shown that Greek words could be written in Latin letters; and I doubt any reader who knew Greek would have had trouble divining the secondary meaning of *glossa* in this epigram, even if it were written in Latin.

Another epigram on the same grammarian makes the same joke (*Epigr.* 85):

Λαῖς Ἔρωσ et Ἴτρος, Χείρων et Ἐρωσ, Ἴτρος alter  
*nomina si scribas, prima elementa adime,*  
*ut facias verbum, quod tu facis, Eune magister.*  
*dicere me Latium non decet opprobrium.*

Graecis litteris Ludg., Latinis codd.; *eros* **CMT** (bis), *heros* **K** (bis);  
*itys* **C**, *itis* **KT**, *ytis* **M**; *chiron* **CK**, *chyron* **M**, *chyrom* **T**; *ytis alter* **C**, et  
*itis (itys M) alter* **KMT**.

Again, the objection to the transmitted text is that Ausonius' reader would have had to reconstruct λείχει from the Latin letters *l-e-i-c-e-i*. *leicei*, I submit, would have been perfectly comprehensible.<sup>45</sup> Indeed, a fifth-century Arian text explains the IXΘΥC symbol as follows: *I iota, hoc est Iesus; X, chi, id est Cristos; Θ, theta, theu; Υ, <ypsilon y>ios; C, symma, soter; quod latine explanatur Iesus Cristus dei filius salvator.*<sup>46</sup> In this text, the word IXΘΥC and the individual Greek letters are all written in Greek characters; but the underlying words are given only in Latin transliteration. Thus, the reader was forced to move between these different registers. An elaborate joke would be just the place for Ausonius to make use of his own reader's ability to

<sup>45</sup> That *chi* was a decipherable transliteration of *c* is demonstrated by a *defixio* from Hadrumetum (*ILS* 8757), a Latin curse written in Greek letters in which *chi* regularly replaces Latin *c*. On this *defixio* see Adams, *Bilingualism* 44–47.

<sup>46</sup> *Contra Paganos* 7.5, ed. R. Gryson (*CC* 87.1 [1982]). Lowe dates the manuscript preserving this text to the 5<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> century (*CLA* IV 504). The passage was quoted by Berschin, in *Scrittura* 224–225.

switch between Latin and Greek. Moreover, in the Ausonius manuscripts, the various spellings are just the normal result of scribal transmission. In all likelihood, therefore, Ausonius wrote *Lais Eros et Itys, Chiron et Eros, Itys alter*. This was the text of the archetype, and there is no convincing reason to alter it.

Next, *Professores* 21.26 celebrates two grammarians who are *callentes mythoplasmata et historiam*, according to the manuscripts. Scaliger conjectured *mython plasmata* in place of the unlikely compound, and Prete (BT 1978) followed him. Green, however, wrote *μύθους, πλάσματα*. According to Green, following Colson, Ausonius has in mind the threefold division of narrative, between stories that are fantastic, possible, and factual.<sup>47</sup> But Scaliger's conjecture is easier paleographically. And more importantly, the binary division between *mython plasmata* and *historia* suits this poem, which celebrates two grammarians in complementary terms. And binary divisions between true and false are common in the literary criticism of antiquity; further, Servius distinguishes precisely between the fabulous and the historical (*ad Aen.* 1.235):

*et sciendum est, inter fabulam et argumentum, hoc est historiam, hoc interesse, quod fabula est dicta res contra naturam, sive facta sive non facta, ut de Pasiphae, historia est quicquid secundum naturam dicitur, sive factum sive non factum, ut de Phaedra.*

In short, *mython plasmata* is a simpler correction and makes more sense in context. H. de la Ville de Mirmont transliterated to *μύθων πλάσματα*; it is at least as likely that Ausonius wrote the phrase in Latin letters.

The preface to Ausonius' *Cento Nuptialis* affords an example of a technical term glossed by its Greek equivalent. The archetype

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.2: *et quia narrationum, excepta qua in causis utimur, tris accipimus species, fabulam, quae versatur in tragoediis atque carminibus non a veritate modo sed etiam a forma veritatis remota, argumentum, quod falsum sed vero simile comoediae fingunt, historiam, in qua est gestae rei expositio, grammaticis autem poeticas dedimus: apud rhetorem initium sit historica, tanto robustior quanto verior.* Colson and Green also cite Sext. *Emp. Adv.gram.* 263–264.

had *simile ut dicas ludicro, quod Graeci stomachion vocavere*.<sup>48</sup> Green prints *στομάχιον*. He notes that this word's only appearance in a Greek text is in a short treatise by Archimedes (II 416 Heiberg); it also appears in Latin form as the title of Ennodius' *Carm.* 2.133 (Hartel). Again, the word is definitely Greek; but the manuscripts would tell us that Ausonius wrote it in Latin letters. As if to emphasize the arbitrary nature of such choices, *Ἀὐτομέδων* (a common enough name in Latin poetry) appears in Greek letters in the most reliable manuscripts of Auson. *Epist.* 8.10.<sup>49</sup> Though Ausonius turns later in this letter to continuous Greek, there is no clear reason for Greek here. Surprisingly, Green was the first editor to follow the manuscripts in printing the name in Greek letters, though he is surely right to do so.

Further, in his *De Herediolo*, Ausonius introduces a familiar adage (19–20):

*quamquam difficile est se noscere: γνῶθι σεαυτόν*  
*quam prope legimus tam cito negligimus.*

In the sixteenth century Jacopo Sannazaro “corrected” the text to *γνῶθι σεαυτόν*; the single manuscript had *gnoti seauton*. This Delphic advice was well known in the West and in late antiquity.<sup>50</sup> The phrase is found in Greek letters in the manuscripts of Juv. 11.27 (which is quoted in Greek letters in Macr. *In Somn.* 1.9.2) and at Auson. *Ludus* 53 and 138.<sup>51</sup> However, the phrase is also found in Latin letters in the manuscripts of both

<sup>48</sup> This is the reading of *C* and *T*; *K* has *ostomachion*; *L* has *estomachion*.

<sup>49</sup> In his apparatus Prete cites some less reliable witnesses in which the word appears as *autumedon*. On **Z**, the branch of the tradition which contains this letter, see M. D. Reeve, “The Tilianus of Ausonius,” *RhM* 121 (1978) 350–366.

<sup>50</sup> P. Courcell, *Connais-toi toi-même* I (Paris 1974) 113–163, 181–229.

<sup>51</sup> The Greek in Ausonius' *Ludus* is transmitted in Greek characters only by **H**; but in line 203 **V** gives *γίγνωσκε καιρόν* as *dinosce caeron*. Since *d* is a simple confusion for *gamma*, there is some reason to think that the archetype of the *Ludus* had Greek throughout.

Nonius Marcellus' *De compendiosa doctrina* 169.15 (= Varro *Sat. Men.* 199 Astbury)<sup>52</sup> and Macr. *Sat.* 1.6.6. Since this phrase was well known and since it was comprehensible in Latin characters (as made abundantly clear by the Greek titles that Macrobius transliterated into Latin script), I would suggest that Ausonius wrote *gnothi seauton*. The editors have also altered the texts of Nonius and Macrobius, but each passage lends support to the others.

In conclusion, late antique Latin authors were more willing to write Greek in Latin characters than has been generally acknowledged. One (admittedly very partial) explanation for the writing of Greek in Latin characters is the similarity of many ancient Greek and Latin scripts. While the difference between Greek and Latin scripts became more pronounced throughout the Middle Ages, in antiquity the two systems were at points quite similar.<sup>53</sup> Holtz has drawn attention to the similarity of the Greek and Latin uncials in the fifth-century *Codex Bezae*, which presents portions of the New Testament in Greek on one page and Latin on the other; in particular, he notes that *zizania* looks exactly the same on either side of the page.<sup>54</sup> In some cases, Ausonius and Macrobius simply could not choose whether to write in Latin or Greek. The letters were the same. In other cases, they probably did not even think about it. And there is no reason to assume that they were

<sup>52</sup> Whether Varro wrote the phrase in Greek is of course a different question.

<sup>53</sup> Adams, *Bilingualism*, notes the occasional interference of one script upon the other in papyri (74–75), as well as the presence of bi-literate scribes (541–543). This phenomenon was surveyed by B. Rochette, “Écrire en deux langues. Remarques sur le mixage des écritures grecque et latine d’après les papyrus littéraires bilingues d’auteurs classiques,” *Scriptorium* 53 (1999) 325–334.

<sup>54</sup> L. Holtz, “L’écriture latine du Codex de Bèze,” in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994* (Leiden 1996) 14–55, at 18.

consistent in the ways we would like.<sup>55</sup> Other explanations, beyond the scope of this paper, could address the state of Greek learning in the West, the educational contexts that supported such learning, or the separability between a word and its written representation.<sup>56</sup> The positive results of this study, however, are several: (1) Two contemporary manuscripts suggest that the Greek words in three of Augustine's texts were originally written in Latin letters. Therefore, (2) a strict distinction between Greek loan words (to be written in Latin letters) and still-Greek words supposed to have been written in Greek letters is untenable. (3) During the Middle Ages, some Latin scribes transliterated the Greek words in Latin letters from their exemplars into Greek letters. Points (1) and (3) raise obvious questions: How do the other surviving late antique codices—not to mention papyri—present the Greek that they contain? And how frequently did medieval scribes transliterate from Latin into Greek letters, as opposed to from Greek into Latin? L. Holtz began to answer the first question, but only for grammatical texts and without presenting his results systematically. I have offered systematic results for two of Augustine's codices. A full study of surviving Latin codices is a *desideratum*. To answer the second question, it will be necessary to survey a statistically representative sample of known exemplars and their apographs. But, unless the cases presented here prove to

<sup>55</sup> At least some authors were more consistent when it came to the declension of Greek nouns, as Donatus prescribed: *meminerimus autem Graeca nomina ad Graecam formam melius declinari, etsi illa nonnulli ad Latinos casus conantur inflectere* (*Ars maior* p.70 Schönberger; quoted by Holtz, in *Bilinguisme et terminologie* 39). As regards the question of alphabet, I doubt it will ever be possible to reach the kind of clear results attained by Housman in his "Greek Nouns in Latin Poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal," *Journal of Philology* 31 (1910) 236–266.

<sup>56</sup> Thus, a glossary of Greek words written completely in Latin script and preserved on papyrus was clearly used in an educational context of some sort: J. Kramer, *Glossaria Bilingua in papyris et membranis reperta* (Bonn 1983) 89–95.

be completely abnormal, editors, when deciding whether to print a certain word in Greek or Latin letters, will have to pay more regard to the evidence of their manuscripts.<sup>57</sup>

*June, 2011*

Department of Classics  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
adp38@cornell.edu

<sup>57</sup> I am glad to recall the debts I have accumulated in writing this paper, which began from a presentation at the Marco Manuscript Workshop at the University of Tennessee in Feb. 2010. A partial version was also read at the Cornell Medieval Studies Student Colloquium in Feb. 2011. Bart Huelsenbeck provided helpful feedback on a written draft; Mike Fontaine encouraged my work at a key stage; and the anonymous readers for *GRBS* improved the paper in many ways. Robert Kaster kindly answered several questions via e-mail. And the Townsend Fund of the Cornell Classics Department purchased for me a reproduction of *Verona Bib. Capit.* XXVIII.