ANCIENT LITERATURE: AN INTRODUCTION

Grant Parker, University of the Witwatersrand

Among 20th-century classicists reacting against an overriding concern with *Realien*, so important to the scholarship of earlier generations, one topic which has suffered relative neglect is that of the physical being of ancient literature.[1] Yet it need hardly be stressed how important this topic is as background information to the study of classical literature. How did the Greeks and Romans record their literary works, and how did they "publish" them? What was the ancient notion of a collection of poetry? And was there an equivalent for our notion of a "second edition"? These are but some of the questions which may pertinently be asked.

So with a view more to utility than originality I offer a survey of the more important recent critical writing on the subject, which I hope will serve also as a *vade mecum* outlining the basic details of the ancient book, as well as the processes by which it was circulated. The first part (sections I to III) surveys the physical being of Greek and Latin literature, concentrating on its materials and then format, and the second half is concerned with its dissemination.

I

To begin by putting the topic into perspective, we must evaluate the importance of writing relative to other vehicles for literature. The importance to Greek and Latin literature of the spoken word cannot be over-emphasised.[2] In fact it would not be extravagant to claim that all literature in ancient Rome was written to be listened to (Kenney 1982:3). The *recitatio*, the Roman manifestation of this trend, can be regarded as a development of the *symposium* and public performances of the Greeks (Sherwin-White 1966:115). An epigram of Martial implies that recitation is synonymous with being a poet:

> nil recitas et uis, Mamerce, poeta uideri.
>   quidquid uis esto, dummodo nil recites.
>
> (2.88)

> "Mamercus, you recite nothing and still wish to be considered a poet. Be whatever you like, as long as you don't recite anything."

Literary patronage was most important to the *recitatio*; unless sponsored, the author himself had to meet the considerable cost of providing the venue or seating (Favez *OCD* 1970:910). In an age which did not know commercial printing, this became the main form of initial circulation, as it provided the cheapest and quickest means of making a work known to the largest available educated audience (Sherwin-White 1966:115). The invention of the practice is attributed by Seneca the Elder to Asinius Pollio, who in Augustus' time invited guests to readings of his own work (*Controu. 4 praef.* 2; cf. Isid. *Orig.* 6.52). Undoubtedly, though,

---

[1] Useful surveys have been produced by Kenney (1982), Roberts and Skeat (1983), Starr (1990b) and in Afrikaans by Kruger (1977). My paper differs in being wider-ranging in its scope and more introductory in its character.

[2] Birt (1882:2) is indicative of a different emphasis evidenced in earlier scholars. See most recently Harris (1989, esp. 3-42) for a survey of literacy in the ancient world.

there are earlier vestiges of the practice. Our most complete evidence for the mechanics of the *recitatio* occurs at Pliny *Ep.* 1.13, to Sosius Senecio, particularly at paras 3-4. Pliny the Younger, Martial and Juvenal frequently complain about the excessive number of *recitationes* in their time. This can be taken to signify that the *recitatio* had become firmly established as a vehicle for literature by the 1st century AD.[3]

From a purely literary point of view it should be borne in mind that the *recitatio* often played an important part in the very composition of the poem. The Roman poets never completely lost the improvising ability of their archaic Greek predecessors. Lucilius, Virgil, Horace and Ausonius[4] all appear to have composed their poems by dictation (Quinn 1982:85-86).

Recent scholars have tended to stress the importance of oral presentation as a vehicle for poetry, and consequently it is necessary to restore the balance by underlining the particular value of writing. A poem committed to paper can be accurately preserved and transmitted, by someone other than its author; reading can replace performance and the poem can gain its own identity independent of its performer and author. Writing also permits revision of the poem in a series of drafts, as well as detailed study and criticism of the text by others (Quinn 1982:88).

At several points Martial shows an awareness of the physical length of his poems. For example, at 10.59 he complains that poems of his which take up an entire column (*pagina*) are glossed over by the reader who is satisfied by the short poem:

> Consumpta est uno si lemmate pagina, transis,
> et breuiora tibi, non meliora, placent.
>
> (1-2)

> "If an epigram fills up a whole page you pass it over; briefer poems
> rather than better ones please you."

On a different occasion, however, he points out to one Cosconus that his poems are not long by comparison with those of others. Albinovanus Pedo and Domitius Marsus are cited as poets whose individual poems often stretch into two columns. The verb *tractat* ("drag") suggests that these poets are long-winded: "Marsi doctique Pedonis/ saepe duplex unum pagina tractat opus" (2.77.5-6). Significantly, Martial speaks of the physical rather than temporal length of the poems. One may conclude that, at least in the case of individual poems, Martial expected his readers to be aware of the physical appearance of his work.

II

The most important writing materials used by the Romans were wooden tablets, papyrus and parchment[5]. Discussion of these materials will be prefaced with comments on the sources for our knowledge of them. We have a fair number of Greek books extant from classical antiquity, most of them dating from the 1st to 3rd centuries AD. However, little Latin literature has survived in the form of papyri (Kenney 1982:3). One reason for this is that the principal source of papyri is Egypt, where Greek was of more interest than Latin literature (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174). References in existing Greek works to the physical appearance of literature are sparse, and Latin literature before the 1st century AD does not

---

3   E.g. Juvenal *Sat.* 1.1-6, 3.9; Pliny *Ep.* 8.21; 5.17; 6.15. Ancient references to the *recitatio* have been collected by Mayor (1853:38-39). Starr (1990a) has shown the seriousness the younger Pliny invested in recitations.

4   Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.9-10; Suet. *Vita Virg.* 90-94, 132-139; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.92; Auson. *Ephem.* 7.

5   The words "parchment" and "vellum" are here used interchangeably.

have much more to offer.[6] Martial, Pliny the Younger and Juvenal make some occasional references to the outward form of literature. One of the few direct literary sources, Pliny the Elder's *HN* 13.11-12, is fraught with obvious inaccuracies (see postscript).

Thus far this discussion has concerned itself with literary sources on the physical appearance of literature; the archaeological evidence should also be explored. An important discovery of papyrus codices of mainly Christian literature was made in Egypt in the late 1920's, and the resulting collection of manuscripts became known as the Chester Beatty Papyri, after their discoverer (Kenyon 1951:98-101; Kleberg 1967:75). The five main areas from which surviving examples of Roman writing tablets come are Southern Italy (particularly Pompeii and Herculaneum, preserved by the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in AD 79), Dacia (mostly AD 131-167), North Africa (45 tablets from the 5th century AD), Egypt (a great variety from the first to fourth centuries AD) and Switzerland (particularly from Vindonissa, a legionary fortress with tablets dating to the mid-first century AD) (Bowman and Thomas 1983:33-34). The discovery in 1973 of a number of writing tablets at Vindolanda (modern Chesterholm) has added substantially to our evidence of Roman writing materials, and necessitated reconsideration of earlier assumptions about the material and form of ancient writing tablets.

One of the most important basic writing materials for the Romans was papyrus, the manufacture of which was taken *mutatis mutandis* from the Greeks (Kenney 1982:15). In antiquity the main source of the papyrus plant, the *Cyperus Papyrus*, was the Nile delta of Egypt; but the plant has completely died out in Egypt by now (Skeat 1969:55). The method by which the papyrus roll was made is described by Skeat (1969:55), and Turner (1968:3 and 1977:44). Some points which bear recounting here are as follows. Whereas the medieval scroll was written from top to bottom along the length, ancient scrolls were written in a series of independent columns (*paginae*) running perpendicular to the length (Turner 1968:5). The papyrus sheet comprised two strips made from the fibres of the papyrus plant, superimposed at right angles to one another. Traditionally these two sides have been distinguished as "recto" (the side with horizontal fibres, more carefully finished in order to receive the writing) and "verso" (the rougher side comprising vertical fibres, seldom used for writing) (Schubart 1921:11, 129; Skeat 1969:56). These terms when applied to Greek and Latin papyri should be used only of rolls, rather than of individual sheets. The manufacturer's and retailer's unit was the roll or *charta* (Turner 1968:3-4).

Papyrus sheets were smoothed with pumice after being joined together, and a criterion for the quality of the paper was the extent to which it had been smoothed (Cerny 1952:6; Skeat 1969:55). Thus when Horace describes a book of his poetry as "Sosiorum pumice mundus" (*Epist* 1.20.2) he intends the polished appearance of the book to express also the polish of the poems contained in it. The poem as a whole is addressed to a now complete volume of poetry as if it were a pretty slave-boy absconding in order to make a living out of its looks, a comparison that brings out the winsomeness of the book (Macleod 1979:23-24).

Occasionally both sides of the papyrus were used, resulting in "opistograph" manuscripts. References to manuscripts of this type can be found at Juvenal 1.6 ("scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?") and Martial 8.62:

> Scribit in auersa Picens epigrammata charta,
> et dolet auerso quod facit illa deo.

> "Picens writes epigrams on the back of the papyrus, and is sad that
> the god turns *his* back on the poems."

This form was, however, the exception rather than the rule (Courtney 1980:85).

---

6   On the paucity of evidence see Kleberg (1967:67) and Roberts and Skeat (1983:3-4).

116

Papyrus had a number of uses other than for writing, and this gave rise to a literary topos concerning the fate of a book. Cheap papyrus was used for wrapping purchases (Lewis 1974:46, 95). Thus Catullus could predict that Volusius' *Annals* "laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas" (95.8), and Statius can say of Grypus' worm-eaten book:

> quales aut Libycis madent oliuis
> aut tus Niliacum piperue seruant
> aut Byzantiacos cocunt lacertos.
>
> $\qquad$ (*Silu*. 4.9.11-13)

> "... like the paper that drips with Libyan olives, or wraps incense
> from the Nile, or pepper, or cooks tunny-fish from Byzantium" (tr.
> Coleman 1988:49).

In keeping with this commonplace, bad literature is threatened with olives, spices, perfumes and fish, among other things - all of which reflects the versatility of papyrus (Parsons 1968:287-288; Coleman 1988:227-228 with further references).

The parchment notebook, expressed by the Latin *membranae*, appears to be a Roman invention. Skeat (1969:61-63) and Turner (1968:9) have recounted the manner in which parchment and vellum are produced, through the process of "tawing". There is no literary or archaeological evidence for it from the Greek east (Roberts 1970:53). The earliest unambiguous reference to the publication of literature on parchment codices occurs at Martial 1.2. Here the poet suggests that the main advantage of this is that of portability; a traveller can take one with him on a journey:

> Qui tecum cupis esse meos ubicumque libellos
> $\quad$ et comites longae quaeris habere uiae,
> hos eme, quos artat breuibus membrana tabellis:
> $\quad$ scrinia da magnis, me manus una capit.
>
> $\qquad$ (1.2.1-4)

> "You who are keen to have my books with you everywhere, and
> want to have them as companions for a long journey, buy these ones,
> which parchment confines within small leaves. Provide cylinders for
> great authors: one hand can hold me" (Howell 1980:31).

Lightness, convenience, durability and ease of reference are all factors likely to have weighed heavily in the favour of the parchment codex. Unlike a papyrus roll, a codex could lie open on a reader's desk and could be read using one hand only. Partly because it was possible to write on both sides, a papyrus codex could contain four or five times the content of a roll (Turner 1968:8). In addition, a major advantage of parchment over papyrus was the clarity of writing on the former (cf. Persius 3.10 and Isidore *Orig.* 6.11.4) (Paoli 1963:177). A major factor favouring the codex in a Christian context was that all four Gospels could be bound together into one book, whereas this was not possible with the papyrus roll (Metzger 1964:6).[7] In evaluating the comparative advantages of parchment and papyrus as writing materials, Roberts and Skeat (1983:7-9) have noted that the outstanding advantage of the former was that of availability: "whereas production of papyrus was limited to Egypt, parchment could be produced wherever the skins of suitable animals were available in sufficient quantity" (1983:8). However the difficulties involved in processing this durable material delayed its widespread use. Our lack of evidence on the subject makes it impossible

---

[7]   On the use of the codex by the Christians see Roberts and Skeat (1983:38-66).

to speak of cost as a factor in comparing the two materials (Skeat 1982; Roberts and Skeat 1983:7).

Martial's *Apophoreta* include a number of books mentioned as being in codex form:

> 14.184 *Homerus in pugillaribus membranis*
> Ilias et Priami regnis inimicus Vlixes
>   multiplici pariter condita pelle latent.

> "Homer in vellum notebooks: the *Iliad* and the story of Ulysses, enemy of Priam's kingdom, both lie stored in many-folded parchment."

One may compare also 14.188 *Cicero in membranis*, 14.190 *Titus Liuius in membranis*, and 14.192 *Ouidi Metamorphosis in membranis*.

Martial's emphasis on the advantages of the codex makes it clear that this type of presentation was an innovation in his time (Howell 1980:105). Scholars are divided as to whether the poems 14.183-195 refer to complete works or to epitomes and anthologies. It is likely that Martial here refers to complete works; the epigrams would be pointless if they indicated epitomes, as there is nothing remarkable about the brevity of these. It is not impossible that the Romans had some system of miniature script. Such gifts would be expensive, but not out of keeping with presents of a good cook, an accomplished Spanish girl or an entire troop of actors (14.220, 203, 214) (Oliver 1951:248-249; Roberts and Skeat 1983:25-27; *pace* Kenyon 1951:94). Given the advantages of parchment over papyrus as outlined above, it remains to be asked why parchment took so long to supersede papyrus as the standard writing material. Skeat (1969:67) has suggested that this failure can be attributed to the conservative outlook of the Graeco-Roman reading public. More likely factors, perhaps, are those of availability and price of suitable hide - which in all probability militated against the use of parchment for a considerable time (Paoli 1963:178).

The Romans continued to use various materials other than the standard papyrus, and later parchment. Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.3.31) says that students used tablets for their lecture-notes; discoveries of tablets have corroborated the view that they were used for "subliterary" purposes (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:175). Among his *Apophoreta* Martial lists tablets made of citrus-wood (14.3) and ivory (14.5). We hear also of Vitellian tablets, which from their context appear to be small tablets (probably named after their maker) used for billets-doux (cf. 2.6.2):

> 14.7 *Vitelliani*
> Nondum legerit hos licet puella,
> nouit quid cupiant Vitelliani.

> "Vitellian tablets: Though the girl has not yet read these tablets, she well knows what they're after."

Whereas the Egyptians used a slender rush (*Juncus maritimus*) in the manner of a fine brush, the Romans followed the Greeks in using instead a thicker stem (*Phragmites aegyptiaca*) with its end cut to a point to form a nib (*harundo*: Martial 1.4.10; 9.12.3). Occasionally a metal substitute was used (Skeat 1969:60). Pens were usually kept in bundles (e.g. *Fasces calamorum* Martial 14.38; cf. Paoli 1963:180). The Egyptians invented and used a form of ink made from carbon, mixed with gum (which gave it adhesion) and water. The inert composition implied by this meant that the ink was not subject to fading and could survive an extremely long time. The metallic-based ink invented later had, in the long term, the extreme disadvantage that it ate through the material on which it was written (Skeat 1969:61).

118

The roll was the natural way of storing lengths of papyrus. Folding subjected the cell of the papyrus fibres to excessive pressure, and in time cracks developed at the folds. Rolling, on the other hand, exerted little pressure on the cells and hence the papyrus could preserve its flexibility for a long period (Cerny 1952:10). Wound round a roller with one or two bosses (*umbilici*) on the end, the roll could easily be stored in a bookseller's pigeon-hole or case (*capsa*) (Coleman 1988:225).

The codex originated from the multi-leaved writing tablets used by both Greeks and Romans at various times. These were rectangular wooden boards, held together on one side by strings or leather thongs passing through holes. They were slightly hollowed out, and the resulting cavities filled with a layer of wax. Writing took place when a stylus was used to incise the wax. Wooden tablets of another type were those made smooth in order to accept writing in ink. These two categories have been called "stylus tablets" and "leaf tablets" respectively (Bowman and Thomas 1983:36). Tablets were an ideal vehicle for rough notes and memoranda, especially because deletion and alteration were easily effected by using the flat end of a reversed stylus (Skeat 1969:65). For example, the tablets found at Vindolanda contain information on military payment and supplied (Birley 1977:154). The format of the wooden writing tablet paved the way for the parchment codex, once vellum became widely enough available (Kenyon 1951:93; Skeat 1969:66).

There is disagreement among scholars over the relationship between the switch from papyrus to parchment on the one hand, and that from roll to codex on the other. The traditionally held view was that the replacement of papyrus by vellum, and of roll by codex went hand-in-hand; consequently the papyrus codex was regarded as a "transitional species" (Kenyon 1951:87). More recently Kenney (1982:25) has written that the replacement of the roll happened at much the same time as that of papyrus, though the two did not coincide completely. Against this Roberts (1954:183) and Turner (1968:8) have stressed that there is no essential connection between format and material. To quote Roberts and Skeat (1983:10): "the transition from papyrus to parchment was of an entirely different character from, and quite unconnected with, the transition from roll to codex". The papyrus codex is a phenomenon well attested by modern archaeology[8] and also by ancient sources, e.g. Ulpian *Digest* 32.52 *praef.* There is enough evidence of this nature for us to regard the papyrus codex as a significant form, which did for some time co-exist with the parchment codex (Roberts 1954:183).[9] It is certainly clear, however, that as a format the codex offered the major advantage of relatively easy handling; it has also been suggested that the codex offered a cost-advantage as great as 26% over the papyrus roll (Skeat 1982:172-75).

The change from roll to codex was connected with the eventual triumph of Christianity in the Roman Empire. Also, it is possible that Gentile Christians encouraged the use of codices in order to distinguish the New Testament scriptures from the Old Testament scrolls (Metzger 1964:6). The ascendancy of the codex had two drastic consequences for Roman literature: (1) the increased durability of the codex gave works of literature a greater chance of survival over the centuries; (2) only certain texts were chosen for transcription into the codex form, and the choice was made unmethodically. This led to the loss of a great many works which might otherwise have been preserved (Kenney 1982:26). In the 4th century classical literature was rewritten on vellum on a large scale (Pinner 1948:21).

New evidence from Vindolanda has revealed tablets with a "concertina"-format, neither of the roll nor the codex variety (see Bowman and Thomas 1983:39). It was at first thought that this

---

[8]   Classified by Turner (1977:20-31).

[9]   On the papyrus codex see further Maunde Thompson (1912:27) and Kenyon (1951:95-112).

unknown form could represent some transitional stage between roll and codex (Birley 1977:154). However, Bowman and Thomas have revised their earlier ideas concerning this format (1983:40, 42). It appears that this rather unusual form found at Vindolanda should be regarded as another variety of writing tablets in its own right, rather than being in any way a forerunner of the codex.

The surprisingly high proportion of leaf tablets found at Vindolanda has raised doubts about what was previously a widely current notion: that the stylus tablet was the commonest writing material other than papyrus and skin. It is quite possible that leaf tablets were a much more common medium for ephemeral documents such as letters and accounts. Though they could not be re-used in the way that papyrus and parchment were, these leaf tablets had the advantage of being cheaper, more dispensable and easier to use (Bowman and Thomas 1975:471; 1985:44).

It is certainly likely that the length of papyrus rolls had an effect on the length and divisions of classical literary works, but it is not clear how direct this influence was. Certainly, by the first century AD the production of books must have reached a certain standard if it could provide papyrus rolls large enough to contain long works of poetry, such as books of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. Van Sickle (1980:29) has suggested that the "material and manufacture of the papyrus roll were not so restrictive of its content, still less prescriptive, as might have been expected", and that the length of an individual book was determined by criteria that were internal to each genre. This is speculative and implausible (cf. Kenyon 1951:40); it is impossible to gain clarity on such issues because or our lack of technical and quantitative information on the writing materials of the time. Furthermore, the matter is complicated by the question of the implications of genre differences in classical literature.[10]

<div align="center">IV</div>

If there is little evidence concerning ancient writing materials, we know even less about the dissemination of literature. Whereas surviving fragments of Greek literature far outnumber those of Latin, Latin literature is much richer than Greek in references to books and the book trade (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174). Before the time of Cicero our knowledge is largely speculative; for his own time Cicero's correspondence with his friend and "publisher" Atticus is a major source of information. In the century that followed, Martial's poems contribute substantially to our knowledge of the subject. The early history of the book trade is also shrouded in mystery. The first Athenian references to the circulation and collection of books date to the 5th century BC (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:173). It is very likely that the book trade at this time functioned on a small scale.

It has been noted above that oral presentation is an important theme in any study of the dissemination of classical literature. It has also become apparent that "publication" in the modern sense of the word is inappropriate in a Roman or Greek context. Nowhere is this more true than in the occasional poetry of Martial and Statius; so many other factors come into play in their circulation. Thus Starr's general comment (1987:213) is especially true of these two writers: "Romans circulated texts in a series of widening concentric circles determined primarily by friendship, which might ... be influenced by literary interests, and by the forces of social status that regulated friendship." An important study on these lines had been produced by Peter White (1974). Suffice it here to summarise the main arguments, evidence and conclusions of White's paper.

The books of Statius' *Siluae* and Martial's *Epigrams* as we have them represent no more than the final and least significant means by which poems were presented to patrons. The books, as

---

10   Skeat (1982) has argued that the standard length of the papyrus roll was 20 sheets.

<div align="center">120</div>

they were finally published, would not have been an effective vehicle for conveying complimentary verse, for three reasons: firstly, the honour coming the way of the dedicatee of any poem would be diluted by the poem's being placed among other poems addressed to other people, and often the book as a whole would be dedicated to another person; secondly, the time-lag between composition for a specific occasion and eventual publication weakens the force the poem would otherwise have; thirdly, in many poems by Martial the dedicatee is not identified, and such references implicit in poems would be recognised at the time only if the poem were given separately and directly (White 1974:40).

White uses evidence from the *Siluae* and *Epigrams* to show that these poems were communicated primarily through three means: impromptu performance, recitation and private brochure. Given that occational poems were delivered in social situations dictated by *amicitia* relationships, extemporaneous production inevitably became their hallmark. Statius, for one, emphasised the speed with which the poems were produced (cf. *Silu.* 1 *praef.* 13-15; Martial 9.89; Williams 1978:267). This was essential when poems were composed for *cenae* and visits to the country estates of rich *amici*. The *recitatio*, which has been described earlier in this paper, is much referred to in the poems of Martial and Statius (e.g. Mart. 1.3.7-8; 12 *praef.* 9-10; Stat. *Silu.* 5.2.162-163) and also by Juvenal (7.82-86) and Pliny (*Ep.* 6.15; 4.27). For a poet who relied on the spin-offs of patronage these occasions were an important showcase. It is also very possible, in the case of Martial and Statius, that copies of poems written were sent privately and informally to their dedicatees before being given any broader exposure. When poems were too short to merit this procedure they were collected into small groups, or sometimes excerpts were taken from larger works. The word *libellus* should be understood in these terms, as being private, brief, pre-publication manuscripts (White 1974:42-45).

V

The mechanics of copying have long elicited controversy among scholars. Birt (1882:351-353 and 1913:309-310) wrote that copying took place by means of simultaneous dictation to a number of scribes; Schubart (1921:157) acknowledged that several of the extant errors in manuscripts are more likely to have arisen from errors of reading. In an influential paper Skeat (1956:179-208) showed that both methods of copying were used by the Romans, depending on the circumstances (such as the number of copies required) (cf. also Skeat 1969:57-58). The fact that we know some of Atticus' slaves to have had Greek names - Dionysius (*Att.* 4.8a.1), Pharnaces and Antaeus (*Att.* 13.44.3) - suggests that at least some of them were Greek (Kleberg 1967:24). This difference of language could account for at least some of the mistakes in the copying of Latin texts (Pinner 1948:31-32; cf. Marshall 1976:254). Quite apart from the practical demands of his work, a copyist could be exposed even to political danger. Suetonius (*Dom.* 10) says that Domitian executed the copyists (slaves) of Hermogenes of Tarsus, who was himself assassinated for certain allusions in an historical work.

The importance of *amicitia* is clearly a motif in the above account of the circulation of poetry. A well-documented *amicitia* relationship centred on the production of written material was that of Atticus and Cicero. Titus Pomponius Atticus (110-32 BC) helped Cicero get his work copied by lending Cicero his slaves as copyists; as Cicero's many *Epistulae ad Atticum* and their replies show, Atticus was also Cicero's literary adviser, political ally, and himself a writer (see Sommer 1926; Feger 1956:517-520; Shackleton Bailey 1965:3-59 at 13; Phillips 1986).

As a wealthy citizen Atticus had at his disposal several slaves and freedmen who could and did act as copyists and proofreaders: "namque in ea (sc. familia) erant pueri litteratissimi,

121

anagnostae optimi et plurimi librarii" (Nepos *Att.* 13.3; cf. Cicero *Att.* 4.8a.2, 13.44.3). The impression to be gained from the letters is certainly that Atticus provided this assistance to Cicero as a favour, rather than for commercial gain (*pace* Finley 1973:52); and hence it is misleading to describe Atticus as a "publisher" (Kenney 1982:20). To quote Horsfall (1989:12): "Atticus did employ copyists ... but there is not a word in Nepos about a publishing business because it did not exist". He goes on to point out that there is no evidence that Atticus' activities in the literary sphere were for financial gain, and that they should be viewed in terms of *amicitia* relationships (1989:89 on Nepos *Att.* 13.3; cf. Phillips 1986:236-237). The chances are that Atticus was simply one of many cultured men to fit this description; it is probable that many well-off Romans had one or more of their slaves trained as a clerk, for use as a copyists when the need arose.

Though again it must be conceded that a lack of evidence has imposed severe contraints on our insights, a certain development does appear to emerge. In keeping with the *amicitia* system Atticus helped Cicero, but for later generations bookselling was more of a commercial venture[11]. Horace mentions the Sosii as his booksellers at *Ars P.* 345 and *Epist.* 1.20.2, briefly in both cases. In the former, Horace contrasts the wealth gained by the bookseller with the fame won for the author; "hic meret aera liber Sosiis; hic et mare transit/ et longum noto scriptori prorogat aeuum" (345-346). The commentator Porphyrio describes them as the "bibliopolae celeberrimi" of their time (*ad Hor. Ars P.* 345 and *ad Hor. Epist.* 1.20.2: Brink 1971:358).

Martial makes several references to his booksellers. In 1.2 he advises on where his books can be bought: "libertum docti Lucensis quaere Secundum/ limina post Pacis Palladiumque forum" (7-8). Both 1.117 and 4.72 are addressed to people who ask the poet for copies of his poems, who are told that they should buy copies at a bookshop (of Atrectus and Tryphon respectively). In both poems Martial ends by agreeing with the addressee to the effect that the poems are not worth buying. In one he gives a description of the whereabouts of a bookshop:

> Argi nempe soles subire Letum:
> contra Caesaris est forum taberna
> scriptis postibus hinc et inde totis,
> omnis ut cito perlegas poetas.
> illinc me pete. Nec roges Atrectum -
> hoc nomen dominus gerit tabernae - :
> de primo dabit alteroue nido
> rasum pumice purpuraque cultum
> denaris tibi quinque Martialem.
>
> <div align="center">(1.117.9-17)</div>

> "Presumably you're in the habit of going up the Argiletum: opposite
> the Forum Caesaris there is a shop, whose door-posts are completely
> covered on both sides with advertisements, so that you can quickly
> run through all the poets. Get one from there. And you needn't ask
> Atrectus - that's the name of the owner of the shop - he'll give you,
> from the top pigeon-hole, or the next one down, a Martial all shaved
> with pumice and dressed up in purple, for five denarii (Howell
> 1980:89)."

Martial implies that his poems sell so well that the bookseller will of necessity keep a copy easily to hand (Howell 1980:351). Tryphon is mentioned as a "publisher" (*bybliopola*) of

---

[11] To quote Starr (1987:221): "the booktrade was merely an ancillary system of circulation beside the private channels that probably supplied the vast majority of literary texts."

Martial (*Epigr.* 4.72; 13.3.4) and the same is implied with regard to Quintilian (*Ep. ad Tryph.*). Dorus is mentioned by Seneca (*Ben.* 7.6.1) as a bookseller stocking copies of Cicero and Livy (Carcopino 1956:215).

On several occasions Martial speaks of his poems as being read throughout the world: "Hic est quem legis ille, quem requiris,/ toto notus in orbe Martialis/ argutis epigrammaton libellis" (1.1.1-3); "quod orbe cantor et legor toto/... umbilicis quod decorus et cedro/ spargor per omnes Roma quas tenet gentes" (8.61.3-5); "totoque legetur in orbe" (6.64.25). Sometimes Martial makes this claim to emphasise the contradiction between his widespread fame and his unfavourable financial position:

> Sum fateor, semperque fui, Callistrate, pauper
>   sed non obscurus, nec male notus eques,
> sed toto legor orbe frequens et dicitur "Hic est,"
>   quodque cinis paucis hoc mihi uita dedit.
> <div align="right">(5.13.1-4; cf. 11.3)</div>

> "I am, I confess, and always have been poor, Callistratus, but yet I
> am no obscure or unknown equestrian; I am much read throughout
> the whole world, and people say of me, 'It's he!'. Life has given to
> me what death has given to few."

The claim to universal readership is particularly Ovidian (cf. *Trist.* 4.10.128), and as a literary topos it can be traced back to Alcman (148 Page) and Theognis (237-254) (Kleberg 1967:44-45; Kay 1985:63). Martial's claim is however backed up by evidence suggesting that his work was available to some extent outside Rome. By the time of Martial and Pliny literature was widely disseminated in the Western empire, but it is unknown by what means (Sherwin-White 1966:490; Kenney 1982:20). Presumably Romans abroad on civic or military duty would have with them favourite works brought from home, in the absence of *recitationes*, or they may have reproduced literature for sale. Pliny is apparently surprised to find a bookshop at the major provincial centre of Lyons (9.11.2), and Aulus Gellius mentions that he found some Greek works for sale at Brundisium (9.4.1; cf. Best 1968/69:210-211 and Marshall 1976:253 n.6). Other authors indicate that there was a considerable trade in old and rare books, and that forgery was not unknown in this field: Pliny *HN* 13.83.86, Quintilian 9.4.39 (cf. Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174).[12] The story told by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 18.4) of a visit to the bookshop in Vicus Sandaliarius ("shoemaker's street"), where a braggart was defeated in argument with Sulpicius Apollinaris, suggests that bookstores served a function in literary life beyond their basic function (Holford-Strevens 1988:61).

It is uncertain whether a poet such as Martial could make any material benefit from the sale of his works. The general tone and content of Martial's references to the sale of books suggests that he had nothing to gain. At 13.3 Martial says that a *libellus* will cost the addressee four sesterces, but that if it cost two the bookseller Tryphon would still make a profit. He makes a passing reference to his own poverty later in the poem (line 6). Van der Valk (1957:2-3) assumes that the poet himself profited from the sale; it is possible that a bookseller might pay a poet for the right to be the first to copy his work (Howell 1980:2), but it is much less likely that he "afterwards got a certain amount in proportion to the books which had been sold" (Van der Valk 1957:2 n.6). In all probability the benefits for the poet were the less directly obvious, in keeping with the *amicitia* system.

---

[12] It has been suggested, however, that Rome itself had only a small trade in used books: see Starr (1990b).

The surviving information about the price of books in Rome is extremely limited. A de luxe edition of Martial Book 1 cost 20 sesterces (1.117.17 "denaris quinque"); a copy of Book 13, which is half the length, cost 4 sesterces, with more than half that figure representing a profit for Tryphon (13.3.2). Statius (*Silu.* 4.9.9) speaks of a *libellus* of his work costing 2.5 sesterces, which suggests materials of good quality. Presumably de luxe materials would merit the use of specialist copyists (Coleman 1988:226; cf. Howell 1980:351-352). These figures imply that books in their standard form were cheap, if it is borne in mind that in this period a loaf of bread cost one or two *asses*, is 1/4 to 1/2 HS, though shortages inflated prices from time to time (Duncan-Jones 1974:244).

Inevitably, textual errors resulted from copying by hand. As suggested above, the standard of education on the part of the copyist was in all likelihood a factor in the accuracy of the manuscript produced. Of errors in his own works Cicero complains "ita mendose et scribuntur et ueneunt" (*Q.Fr.* 3.5.6). Martial is careful to protect himself from blame:

> Si qua uidebuntur chartis tibi, lector, in istis
>   siue obscura nimis siue latina parum,
> non meus est error: nocuit librarius illis
>   dum properat uersus adnumerare tibi.

<div align="center">(2.8.1-4)</div>

> "(bis) Reader, if anything in those books seems to you to be excessively obscure or in poor style, the fault is not mine: the copyist did the damage as he hastened to prepare the poems for you."

Naturally the speed at which the copyist works (*properat*) goes some way towards determining the number of errors perpetrated. That highly trained copyists were worth a great deal of money we can conclude from Seneca the Younger (*Ep.* 27.6-8) and Horace (*Epist.* 2.2.5-8) (Marshall 1976:254). The more up-market booksellers had special correctors (*anagnostae*) to check texts before they were made available (Kleberg 1967:32). Martial checked a certain number of presentation copies himself (*Epigr.* 7.11; 7.17.7).

The concept of a "second edition" presents certain inevitable problems when considered in a Roman context. Again, it is easy to be misled by modern notions of an "edition". Horace *Ars P.* 389-390 suggests that there is some finality to the act of "publishing" (by which is meant the last of the four stages of publication as outlined above): "delere licebit/ quod non edideris, nescit uox missa reuerti" (*pace* Quinn 1982:89). In the context Horace is encouraging the poet to exercise care in his every utterance, and it is unlikely that this extract bears much weight as evidence for the circumstances of publishing.

Cicero is an important source for our understanding of the ancient edition. We know that while Atticus was having copies made of Cicero's *Academica*, Cicero himself was in the process of revising the work extensively; the letter dedicating the second edition to Varro survives as *Fam.* 9.8. Evidently, Cicero was too late to stop the reproduction of the earlier version, as this has survived in part. The *Academica* are thus a rare example of a work which has survived from antiquity (in part at least) in more than one edition (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:23, 194; see Emonds 1941:265-274, *pace* Phillips 1986:233). Another possible case of different "editions" occurs at Martial 10.48.23: "de prasino conuiua meus uenetoque loquatur". It is possible that the first edition of the book included the name of a charioteer (*Scrutus*) here but that in the version published after the poet's death the name, no longer topical, was replaced by the team to which the charioteer belonged (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:194).[13]

---

[13] Second editions of ancient literary works have been surveyed by Emonds (1941).

We know that Ovid's *Amores*, published originally in five books, perhaps as early as 20 BC, was later circulated in a revised edition of three books. The latter edition probably took place shortly before Ovid wrote the *Ars Amatoria*. Only the later edition is extant; this is made clear by the epigram which heads the book. Despite the dogged efforts of several critics, it is impossible to ascertain with any clarity the difference between the two editions; the nature and extent of the changes effected by Ovid will remain an area of speculation (Cameron 1968:322; cf. McKeown 1987:74-89).

From this it emerges that, in the case of Ovid's *Amores*, the second edition has survived, whereas in the case of Cicero's *Academica* we have parts of both versions. This is purely historical accident. The overwhelming impression is that once a work was reproduced for circulation, there was no effective means of correcting or recalling it, and therefore a second edition would not necessarily supersede the first (Kenney 1982:11).

VI

The public library, so important a factor in the literary life of the Hellenistic world after the 3rd century BC, was not a reality at Rome until the 1st century AD. For Roman libraries the great model was the Museum at Alexandria, established and run by the Ptolemies, which became a thriving cultural centre. The library at Alexandria, part of the Museum complex, gained legendary status; scholars in large number edited and copied texts to an extent never known before. Heading the institution were some of the foremost literary figures of the time, including Apollonius Rhodius, Eratosthenes and Aristophanes. The crucial contribution to literature made by the Museum was that of standardising texts; a number of other developments facilitated reading, such as the standardising of the literary alphabet, improvements to the punctuation system and the invention of a system of accentuation (see Reynolds and Wilson 1968:5-15; Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:173).

In the case of Rome a distinction must be drawn between public libraries on the one hand, and on the other hand the private libraries of bibliophiles such as Cicero.[14] The library excavated among the ruins of Herculaneum in 1750 is an example of one such private library, and the chances are that this particular one (consisting almost entirely of the Epicurean writings of Philodemus and others) belonged to Calpurnius Piso (Nisbet 1961:186-188). In the 1st century BC Lucullus had a large (private) library at Tusculum, which he made freely available. A chance reference in the preface to Martial's ninth book shows us that a private libraries sometimes contained decorations, in this case a canvas painting: Martial says that his *amicus* Stertinius Avitus "imaginem meam ponere in bibliotheca sua uoluit" (9 *praef.*, prose lines 3-4).

Julius Caesar was the first to plan a large public library at Rome, using the help of Marcus Varro to collect and classify the books (Suet *Div. Iul.* 44; cf. Dziatzko *RE* 1897:417); this intention was not realised until 39 BC when Asinius Pollio built a public library at the Atrium Libertatis. Augustus' establishing of public libraries in the Temple of Apollo (28 BC) and in the Campus Martius were important further developments (Reynolds and Wilson 1968:22-23). Both of these were linked to temples, and comprised separate Greek and Latin libraries with a hall or reading room where conversation was possible (Aulus Gellius 13.19-20; Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:608). By the middle of the 4th century AD there were 28 public libraries in Rome (Kleberg 1967:47; Platthy 1968:3).[15]

---

14   On private libraries see especially Rawson (1985:39-40) with reference to late Republican times.

15   On libraries at Rome see Saglio (*Dar.-Sag.* 1873:707-708), Platner and Ashby (1929:84-85), Dziatzko (*RE* 1897:405-423), Kenyon and Roberts (*OCD* 1970:607-608), Rawson (1985:39-42) and Starr (1987:216).

In this discussion various aspects of the ancient book and its circulation have been raised. In any such study a pervasive danger is that of anachronism; the modern connotations attached to such words as "publish", "edition" and even "book" are misleading when applied to the ancient world. We have seen how papyrus was eventually replaced by parchment, and how the roll gave way to the codex as a format. It appears, though, that these two changes were unrelated. As regards the dissemination of literature, sociological themes are clearly of prime importance. The support of patrons was a *sine quo non* of the *recitatio* and the copying of works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Best, Edward E. 1968/69. "Martial's readers in the Roman world." *Classical Journal* 64, 208-212.

Birley, Robin 1977. *Vindolanda: a Roman frontier post on Hadrian's Wall.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Birt, Theodor 1882. *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhaltniss zur Litteratur.* Berlin: Hertz.

Birt, Theodor 1913. *Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriss des antiken Buchwesens.* Munich: Beck (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 1.3).

Bowman, A.K. 1975. "The Vindolanda writing tablets and their significance: an interim report." *Historia* 24, 467-472.

Bowman, A.K. and Thomas, J.D. 1983. *Vindolanda the Latin writing tablets.* London: Society for Roman Studies (*Britannia* Monograph 4).

Bowman, A.K. and Thomas, J.D. 1986. "Vindolanda 1985: the new writing tablets." *Journal of Roman Studies* 76, 120-123.

Brink, C.O. (comm.) 1971. *Horace on Poetry: the* Ars Poetica. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, Alan 1968. "The first edition of Ovid's *Amores.*" *Classical Quarterly* 18, 320-333.

Carcopino, Jerome 1956. *Daily Life in ancient Rome.* (tr. E.O. Lorimer). Harmondsworth: Penguin (2nd ed.).

Cerny, J. 1952. *Papers and books in ancient Egypt.* London: University Press (inaugural lecture).

Coleman, K.M. (comm.) 1988. *Statius* Siluae 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Courtney, E. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal.* London: Athlone.

Duncan-Jones, Richard 1974. *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dziatzko, K. 1897. "Bibliotheken." *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Pauly-Wissowa) 3.1, 405-423.

Emonds, Hilarius 1941. *Zweite Auflage im Altertum.* Leipzig: Harrassowitz (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 14).

Favez, C. 1970. "Recitatio." *Oxford Classical Dictionary* 910 (2nd ed.).

Feger, R. 1956. "T. Pomponius Atticus." *Real-Encyclopadie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft* Suppl. 8, 503-526.

Finley, Moses I. 1973. *The Ancient Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holford-Strevens, Leofranc 1988. *Aulus Gellius*. London: Duckworth.

Horsfall, Nicholas (comm.) 1989. *Cornelius Nepos: a selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howell, Peter 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London: Athlone.

Kay, N.M. 1985. *Martial Book 11: a Commentary*. London: Duckworth.

Kenney, E.J. 1982. "Books and readers in the ancient world." *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 2, 3-32.

Kenyon, F.G. 1951. *Books and readers in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2nd ed.).

Kenyon, F.G. and Roberts, C H 1970. "Books, Greek and Latin." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 172-175 (2nd ed.).

Kleberg, Tönnes 1967. *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (tr. R. Zundken). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kruger, G. van W. 1977. *Rondom die antieke Griekse Boek*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch Press.

Lewis, Naphthali 1974. *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKeown, J.C. (comm.) 1987. *Ovid*: Amores 1. Liverpool: Cairns.

Macleod, C.W. 1979. "The poetry of ethics: Horace *Epist*. 1." *Journal of Roman Studies* 69, 16-27.

Marshall, Anthony J. 1976. "Library sources and creative writing at Rome." *Phoenix* 30, 252-264.

Maunde Thompson, E. 1912. *An Introduction to Roman Palaeography*. London: Kegan Paul.

Mayor, J.E.B. (comm.) 1853. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*. London: Macmillan.

Metzger, B.M. 1964. *The Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nisbet, R.G.M. (comm.) 1961. *Cicero*: In Pisonem. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oliver, Revilo P. 1951. "The first Medicean MS of Tacitus and the titulature of ancient books." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 82, 232-261.

Paoli, Ugo Enrico 1963. *Rome, its people, life and customs* (tr. R.D. Macnaghten). London: Longmans.

Parsons, P.J. 1968. "Papyrologica Mediolanensia II: XAPTAPIA." *Parola del Passato* 23, 287-290.

Phillips, John J. 1986. "Atticus and the publication of Cicero's works." *Classical World* 79, 227-237.

Platner, Samuel Ball and Ashby, Thomas 1929. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Platthy, J. 1968. *Sources on the earliest Greek libraries*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Quinn, Kenneth 1982. "The poet and his audience in the Augustan Age." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.30.1, 75-180.

Reynolds, L.D. and Wilson, N.G. 1968. *Scribes and Scholars: a guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press (2nd ed.).

Roberts, C.H. 1970. Books in the Graeco-Roman world and in the New Testament, in: Ackroyd, P.A. van Evans, C.F. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, C.H. and Skeat, T.C. 1983. *The Birth of the Codex.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saglio, E. 1873. Bibliotheca. *Dictionnaire des Antiquitées Grecques et Romaines* (Daremberg-Saglio), 707-709.

Schubart, W. 1921. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern.* Berlin: Staatliche Museen.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (comm.) 1965. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sherwin-White, A.N. 1966. *A Commentary on the Letters of Pliny.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skeat, T.C. 1956. The use of *dictatio* in ancient book production. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 38, 179-208.

Skeat, T.C. 1969. Early Christian book-production: papyri and manuscripts, in: Lampe, G.W.H. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skeat, T.C. 1982. "The length of the standard papyrus roll and the cost-advantage of the codex." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 45, 169-175.

Sommer, Richard 1926. "T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Cicero's Werken." *Hermes* 61, 389-422.

Starr, Raymond J. 1987. "The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world." *Classical World* 37, 213-223.

Starr, Raymond J. 1990a. "Pliny the Younger on private recitations and C. Titius on irresponsible judges." *Latomus* 49, 464-473.

Starr, Raymond J. 1990b. "The used-book trade in the Roman world." *Phoenix* 44, 148-157.

Turner, E.G. 1968. *Greek Papyri: an Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Turner, Eric 1977. *The Typology of the early Codex.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Van der Valk, H.L.M. 1980. "On the edition of books in antiquity." *Vigiliae Christianae* 11, 1-10.

White, Peter 1974. "The presentation and dedication of the *Siluae* and *Epigrams*." *Journal of Roman Studies* 64, 265-300.

Williams, Gordon 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the early Empire.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

APPENDIX: GLOSSARY OF TERMS CONCERNING THE ANCIENT BOOK

Bibliopola

(Otherwise *bybliopola*) "bookseller", derives from the Greek βιβλιοπώλης. The term is used of Tryphon (Mart. 4.72.2; 13.3.4; 14.194.2); see also Hor. *Ars.P.* 345; Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.6; 9.11.2; *CIL* 6.9218 (*TLL* 2.1955.32-51; Birt 1882:353).

Bibliotheca

Otherwise *bybliotheca*, from the Greek βιβλιοθήκη. A library, by which is meant either a collection of books or the building or room containing them - the distinction is not always clear; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 13.77.3 "Dionysius, seruus meus, qui meam bibliothecen multorum nummorum tractauit"; Mart 7.17.1 "ruris bibliotheca delicati" (*TLL* 2.1955.52-1957.16). The word came to indicate particularly the public libraries of Rome once these came into being: e.g. Plin. *HN* 7.115 "bibliotheca, quae prima in orbe ab Asinio Pollione ex manubus publicata Romae est" (*TLL* 2.1957.17-1958.74).

Capsa

A cylindrical case for holding papyrus rolls, and occasionally used also to refer to a receptacle for other things. Used in the former context at Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.63; *Epist.* 2.1.268; Pliny *HN* 8.107; 16.229; Stat. *Silu.* 4.9.21; Juv. 10.117; cf. Porphyrio *ad Hor. Epist.* 2.1.113 "scrinia capsas dicit ... in quibus scripta omnia reponantur".

Charta

(Or *carta*) is the Latinised form of the Greek χάρτης, which was used of the paper manufactured from papyrus e.g. "cartae regiae nouae bibli" (Cat. 22.6; cf. Nisbet 1978:96-97); Pliny *HN* 13.74; 37.103; Juv. 13.116. When indicating quantity the word implied a roll rather than a sheet of papyrus (Turner 1968:4; Lewis 1974:70-77). *Charta* quickly took on the generic connotations of meaning "paper" (Lewis 1974:77). Eventually the word became synonymous with *scriptum* or *liber*: e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 40 "chartae ... quae illam pristinam seueritatem continebant obsoleuerunt"; Mart. 2.8.1 "Si qua uidebuntur tibi, lector, in istis/ siue obscura nimis siue latina parum" (*TLL* 3.998.46-999.54).

Codex

Or *caudex*, originally meant the trunk of stem of a tree (Virg. *Geo.* 2.30; Pliny *HN* 13.56; Gellius 5.3.3), and was sometimes used of the post onto which criminals were fastened (Plaut. *Poen.* 1153; Prop. 4.7.44). It took on the technical meaning of a "book" formed from wooden tablets or (later) other materials (*TLL* 3.1404.10-1406.52). Often the term referred to official records (Suet. *Aug.* 101.1, Sen. *Dial.* 10.13.4) or account-books (Cic. *Q.Rosc.* 1.5, *Ver.* 1.92, Juv. 7.110) (*TLL* 3.1406.53-1407.22).

Cornu

This word (= "horn") is occasionally used of books, in which context it means "the ends of the *umbilicus* or stick around which rolls of papyrus were wound" (*OLD* s.v. 7d); "projecting knobs" (Kenyon 1951:61). Used in the plural in this context [Tib.] 3.1.13 "atque inter geminas pingantur cornua frontes"; Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.8; Mart. 11.107.1 "explicitum nobis usque ad cornua librum". The word came to have this special sense "quod uolumen explicitum simile sit aciei cornibus" (*TLL* 4.26-30; cf. Birt 1913:331-332).

Edere

In essence this word means to "bring forth" (offspring) or to produce or render services. The specific meaning applicable here is "to publish" (writings), used esp. of an author or bookseller; e.g. Mart. 4.33.3 "Edent heredes ... mea carmina" (*TLL* 5.2.88.15-89.18; *L-S* s.v. 2B; *OLD* s.v. 9).

Editio

Like *edere*, with which it is linked, this noun came to have a special sense with regard to books (= "publishing"), and it is in this sense that the word has been taken into modern English usage. See e.g. Stat. *Silu.* 4*pr*.17 "de editione Thebaidos meae"; "an editione sint digni" Plin. *Ep.* 3.15.1 (cf. *TLL* 5.2.79.59-80.34; *OLD* s.v. 4).

Index

Literally, that which points or indicates, referring sometimes to the forefinger or an informer. In its metaphorical sense it is often used in connection with the ancient book and inscriptions. Firstly, the term is used to indicate a small leaf of papyrus (*schedula*) attached to a roll supplying title and author. Thus Vitr. 7*pr*.10 "ego non alienis indicibus mutatis (sc. ut plagiarius) interposito nomine meo id profero corpus", and Mart. 3.2.11 "cocco rubeat superbus index"; cf. also Cic. *De Or.* 2.14.61, Ov. *Pont.* 1.1.5, Liv. 38.56 "index orationis habet P. Scipionis nomen M. Naeuii habet", and Birt (1882:223, 328). Secondly, it sometimes means a summary or epitome of the work it heads: "summa argumenti, epitome uberioris scripturae", as in Pliny *HN* 30.4 "Hermippus ... uersus Zoroastris indicibus ... uoluminum eius positis explanauit"; Suet. *Aug.* 101.4 "indicem rerum a se gestarum"; Gaius *Inst.* 3.54 "hactenus omnia iura quasi per indicem tetigisse satis est". The third sense, linked to the first, is that of a catalogue, e.g. Sen. *Dial.* 9.9.4 "bybliothecas, quarum dominus uix tota uita indices perlegit"; Gell. 3.3.1 "indicibus fabularum Plautinarum", cf. Quint. 10.1.57 (*TLL* 7.1A.1140.13-1144.10; *L-S* s.v.). Martial and Statius do not use this word in connection with literature, but it might have been used to indicate the Statian prefaces with their "inventory" aspect.

The word parallels the Greek σίλλυβος, which means a parchment label appended to the outside of a book: Cic. *Att.* 4.4a.1 "[librariolis] imperes ut sumant membranulum ex qua indices fiant, quos uos Graeci, ut opinor, σιλλύβους appellatis, cf. ib. 4.5.3 (Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. II).

Libellus

Diminutive of *liber* (see below). It could be used of a small work written for publication, a volume or a book: e.g. Plin. *Ep.* 9.6.1 "inter pugillares ac libellos" and Juv. 1.86 "nostri farrago libelli". When Martial uses *libellus* in this context, i.e. as a synonym for *liber*, it usually has apologetic overtones: e.g. Mart. 5.2.5-6 "lasciuos lege quattuor libellos:/ quintus cum domino liber iocatur" (cf. Sage 1919:68 and Coleman 1988:226). In poetry the substitution of *libellus* for *liber* was sometimes motivated *metri gratia* (Tanner 1984:3039). Otherwuse *libellus* was used of a single poem: e.g. Stat. *Silu.* 1*pr.*2, 16, 27, 2*pr.*15; 3*pr.*2, 11, 23 (White 1974:45; Coleman 1988:226), cf. Cic. *Arch.* 25, Prop. 1.11.19 (*TLL* 7.1268.70-1269.4). The word could also represent a notebook or register, or official communication or documentation (*a libellis*). See also *TLL* 7.1262.51-1270.74.

Liber

Apart from its senses as a proper noun and an adjective, this was one of the standard words for "book". In this context the word originally indicated the inner bark of a tree: Curt 8.9.15 "libri arborum teneri haud secus quam chartae litterarum notas capiunt"; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.554 and Stat. *Theb.* 1.584 (*TLL* 7.2.1271.12-1272.28). It is uncertain, and impossible to determine, whether this is because *liber* was used as the equivalent for the Greek λεπος because it already indicated a now lost type of "book" written on bark, or because bark was the native substance most closely resembling papyrus (Kenney 1982:15). In the event, *liber* came to designate a book written for publication, a volume or roll: Cic. *Att.* 2.6.1 "libris me delecto'; cf. Sen. *Controu.* 1.3.11; Juv. 3.41; Tac. *Ann.* 3.58. On a number of occasions the word is used of a single volume from a long work: Cic. *Q.Fr.* 3.5.1 "sermo ... in nouem ... libros distributus"; Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.86 "de libro Enni annali sexto". Statius refers to his second book of *Siluae* as "liber meus" (2*pr.*4). Special connotations of *liber* applied to sacred books containing prophecies consulted at times of prodigies (cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.72; Liv. 3.10.7), and to any lengthy document such as recordbooks or ledgers (Cic. *Verr.* 3.167; Sen. *Ben.* 7.10.5; Juv. 9.84) (*TLL* 7.2.1272.29-1280.12; *OLD* s.v. 4).

Librarius

Used of both (1) a scribe, copyist or secretary of (2) a bookseller (*OLD* s.v. 3). Cicero's letters to Atticus mention *librarii* in the first sense on a number of occasions: e.g. Cic. *Att.* 4.16.1 "epistula librarii manu est"; *Att.* 12.14.3 "quem librum ad te mittam si descripserint librarii". See also e.g. Mart. 2.1.5 "quod haec una peragit librarius hora" and *CIL* 1.594.1.3.14; Liv. 38.55.8 (*TLL* 6.2.1347.14-51). A different meaning of the word is that of a bookseller or a dealer in books: e.g. Cat. 14.17-18 "ad librariorum/ curram scrinia"; Sen. *Ben.* 7.36.1 "libros dicimus esse Ciceronis: eosdem Dorus librarius suos uocat" (*TLL* 6.2.1352-61). The diminutive *librariolus* is also found: Cic. *Att.* 15.7; 4.4a.1 (*TLL* 6.2.1346.76-84).

Membrana

The term for the skin of sheep and goats used for the preparation of writing materials, particularly parchment: e.g. Cat. 22.7; Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.2 "Sic raro scribis, ut toto non quater anno/ membranam poscas"; Plin. *HN* 13.70; Mart. 14.186 (*TLL* 8.630.50-631.32).

Pagina

Corresponding to the Greek σελίς, is applied to the column of writing, which at times could be so wide as to extend over two or three sheets (Turner 1968:5). Later, the term was used of complete sheets of writing. Thus Isidore (*Orig.* 6.14.6), writing at a time when the parchment codex had become the norm: "partes libri paginae dicuntur, eo quod sibi inuicem compingantur".

Pugillares

A set of writing tablets, small enough to be held in the hand: e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 15.6; Plin. *HN* 16.68; Mart. 14.7 "Pugillares membranei"; Plin. *Ep.* 1.22.11 "libellos et pugillares"; 7.9.16 "pugillares resumis"; 9.36.6 (*OLD* s.v.). *Pugillalarius* was used as a noun of agent, meaning a maker of or dealer in small writing tablets (*CIL* 6.9841).

Titulus

Originally used of a flat piece of wood, or other material inscribed with a notice supplying information, often identification. A frequent use in this regard was as a tablet or inscription describing a person's career; cf. Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.265 "nocturnis titulos imponimus actis", also *Rem. Am.* 302; Tib. 2.4.54; Prop. 4.5.51. The specific use of this term in the context of Roman literature was as a heading for a book or chapter, e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.7; *Pont.* 1.1.17; Plin. *HN* pr.26; Mart. 13.3.7 "addita per titulos sua nomina rebus habebis" (*OLD* s.v.). This was often in the form of a piece of papyrus or vellum projecting from the roll as it lay on a shelf (Kenyon and Roberts *OCD* 1970:174).

The work *lemma* (a subject for consideration, = λῆμμα) is used by Martial as a synonym for *titulus*: "lemmata si quaeris cur sint adscripta docebo:/ ut, si malueris, lemmata sola legas" (see *L-S* s.v. 2b). In this context it refers to the titles of the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*.

Umbilicus

Originally indicates the navel or umbilical cord of humans or animals. In time it acquired meanings as applied to objects resembling the navel in position or shape cf. ὀμφαλός. This protrusion was the boss at the end of the roller around which the papyrus was wound (*OLD* s.v.), rather than the roller itself (*pace* Birt 1913:329-30). The expression "usque ad umbilicum" (or "umbilicos") thus came to mean reaching the end of a roll, and it is used with that connotation at Hor. *Epod.* 14.8 and Mart. 4.89.2 ("iam peruenimus usque ad umbilicos"). They served as handles when the rolls were stored in a bookseller's pigeon-hole or a *capsa*. "Coffee-table" editions, those intended primarily for display, often boasted two bosses: Stat. *Silu.* 4.9.8 "binis decoratus umbilicus"; Mart. 3.2.9 "pictis luxurieris umbilicis" (Coleman 1988:225-226).

Volumen

Deriving from *uoluere*, this word essentially means anything rolled. It soon came to take on the specialised meaning of a roll of papyrus forming a book or part of a book, and later even a book of any form: Ulp. *Dig.* 32.52 "librorum appellatione continentur omnia uolumina, siue in charta siue in membrana sint siue in quauis alia materia". It was used also in very different contexts to designate a twist, wreath or fold. In its most common use, however, the word

132

indicates a papyrus roll: e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 122 "in hac turba nouorum uoluminum"; Cic. *Q.Fr.* 1.2.8 "uolumina selectarum epistularum"; Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.26 "pontificum libros, annosa uolumina uatum"; Mart. 7.63.1 "numquam moritura uolumina" (*OLD* s.v.; Birt 1882:14-16). This became a specifically Roman word for a book, there being no Greek analogue for it (Kenney 1982:15).

Postscript: When this article was in proof stage Dr. William A. Johnson kindly alerted me to a forthcoming article of his, entitled "Pliny the Elder and standardised roll heights in the manufacture of papyrus", *Classical Philology* 88, 1993. In addition, a third edition (updated and enlarged) of *Scribes and Scholars* by Reynolds and Wilson has appeared.