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The book studied consists of thirty unrelated chapters covering natural, ethical, and dialectical philosophy, Roman history, Latin phonology, lexicography, literary criticism, and various other matters. The thesis is primarily intended as a Sachkomentar elucidating the things discussed or mentioned in the chapters; but it also considers points of text or Latin usage, and especially of Gellian Latinity.

The commentary takes the form of a running annotation on each chapter, with introductory notes and excursus wherever they seemed desirable. It is assumed the reader has to hand the editions by Hertz (ed. maior), Hosius, and Marshall; information given by them (e.g. on the provenance of citations) is in general not repeated. The text followed is Marshall's, save as otherwise stated; questions of text settled by Hertz or his predecessors are normally omitted, being adequately covered in his apparatus.

A commentary of this nature on an author of this nature can hardly have a unifying theme to be abstracted and summarized: it must inevitably consist of individual discussions, some longer than others. Among the longer discussions may be noted those on ancient wind-roses, and the peculiarity of that described by Favorinus (Gell. 2.22, introductory note); the history of Roman attempts to curb the luxury of the table (2.24 excursus); the use of the adjective cuius (2.29.15), which is shown to have been regular in Early Latin as a predicate, but rarely used as an attribute save in legal language. It is also shown (2.3.5n) that Gellius's references to allegedly autograph
Vergils are of no value to the critic save as attesting ancient variants. In passing, an attempt is made to explain an anachronism in Claudius Quadrigarius (Gell. 2.2.12-13n).

The most important textual discussion is that in the excursus to 2.23, where the fragments of Menander and Caecilius cited in that chapter are treated in detail and several new suggestions made about them. In Gellius himself a few proposals are made, mostly of deletion; at 2.1.2, for instance, Socrates is expelled from the text.

Although the excursus to 2.17 is devoted to the demolition of Holsius's argument that the chapter was derived from Probus, not much attention is bestowed on Quellenforschung; this is due to scepticism concerning the assumptions on which that operation has been conducted. Attacks on these assumptions will be found in the prolegomena (pp. 23-32); in the course of this discussion it is concluded that of the various anecdotes Gellius tells about his friends and teachers, some are true, some are composed around their writings, and some are utterly fictitious.

These prolegomena are not a full-scale introduction, but confine themselves to certain points such as Gellius's name (for which the evidence is set out in detail, pp. 3-7) and the date of the Attic Nights' publication (which is set c. 179 A.D., pp. 8-12). The claim that the Nights are meant to be morally useful is examined and largely dismissed (pp. 13-22); although the archaistic movement is not discussed in detail, passages from Gellius and Fronto apparently running counter to it are shown to be warnings against untimeliness and ostentation (pp. 33-36). There is a brief account of the manuscripts in which Book 2 is found (pp. 36-39), and a review of the principal editions, commentaries, and translations (pp. 40-44).
PROLEGOMENA

This is not intended to be a general account of Gellius, the 
Hoctes Atticæ, and their social and cultural background; for good 
recent treatments see Fischer’s introduction to Ropescu’s Romanian 
translation (Bucharest, 1965) and Marache “La Critique littéraire de 
langue latine et le développement du goût archaisant au IIe siècle 
de notre ère”, and the introduction to the same scholar’s Jude édition. For studies in Gellius’s language the reader is referred to 
Marache “A lots nouveaux et lots archaïques chez Fronton et Aulus-Celle”; to Knapp “Archaism in Aulus Gellius” (Fringer Studies 126-171); and to 
the useful summary in Hornsby’s introduction (pp. xxxii-lxv). A good 
bibliography to Gellian studies will be found in Gamberale “La 
traduzione in Gellio” (pp. 211-8), a work in itself of considerable value 
and great detail. The purpose of these prolegomena is to consider a 
few points of general interest with regard to Gellius.

Name

The name Aulus Gellius is attested directly by Servius on Vergil 
(c. 5.738 “hanc autem plene exsequuntur et Cicero in Auguralibus” 
(fr. 2 Baiter) “et Aulus Gellius in libris Noctium Atticarum” (3.2), 
and by DE on Georg. 1.260 “Aulus Gellius: mature ueluti celeriter

1. Western attitudes to such works from Communist countries in strange 
tongues tend to be τον Νασαφθδ του του τε αγαθον του; to which 
the only answer is “ερχεσαι και τοε”. Fischer’s introduction is, for 
its size, the best general treatment of the lights and their 

2. This formula implies no opinion on the provenance of this, or indeed 
of either recension. See J.P.G. and Horvat and Billing (1928), 341 (1929). uly 317.180,(Bitter, 
3. See also Münz-Horsch “Geschichte der römischen Litteratur” (ed. 3), 558 and 581; 
4

dicimus" (cf. 10.11.1). (The additional note in fifteenth-century manuscripts at iun. 7.740, citing Gell. 6.20.1 all but word for word with the remark "alii idem a Virgilio in Georgias factum memorant, ut etiam abulo Gellio traditur" I leave out of account pending proof of its antiquity).

The author of the Historia Augusta, masquerading under the name "Claudius Vopiscus" declares at the beginning of his life of Trobus; "Certum est quod Sallustius Crispus quodque Cato et Gellius historici sententiae modo in litteras rotulaverunt, omnes omnium virtutes tantas esse quantas uideri eas voluerint eorum ingenia qui uniusuisuisque facta descripserint". As Hertz saw, (vol. 2. p. VI), the author is thinking of Cato fr. 83 Peter ap. Gell. 3. 7. 19; I suspect that he wanted us to think that "Gellius" was Cn. Gellius, but his reason for giving the name was that he had taken his Cato-reference from the Attic Nights, whose author, therefore, he knew as Gellius and not as Gellius.

It is possible, indeed, that we have a much earlier testimony to our man; one in fact from his own lifetime. Pronto writes to Claudius Julianus (proconsul of Asia under Antoninus Pius, probably in 166; "Claudius" no. 134) "Ion agnou ista mea ab Gellio pessime quaeri: credideris admonisse se edere" (ad amicos 1. 19) which I take to mean

2. Gell. 3. 10. 16 states that that is what some grammarians thought. Cf. Syme op. cit. 168.18.
3. But the citation comes from Jerome's prologue to the Vita S. Hilariou.s (sig. PL 23. 29a), cf. Syme op. cit. 81; or by some other indirect route (Janson's Latin Prose Prefaces 2. 150).
"I didn't realize Gellius was very badly wanting my stuff; you'd have thought (sc. from the fuss he's making) he'd told me he was publishing it". It would be very pleasant to think that Gellius was pestering Fronto for some notes on rare old words to work into a chapter of the Noctes Atticae; but as Marshall reminds us (C.Q.R. 56.143) for all we know this Gellius might be Arrian's addressee in Gellius, or someone we know nothing of at all. I still incline to believe it is our man; but the doubt is too great for us to argue anything about the Noctes or their author from this letter.

We have seen that Servius and "Vopiscus" gave the nomen Gellius; but we find at about the same time the form "Agellius", a nomen borne at least by one Agellius Redditus (CIL 6.1056.b.2.33; 205 A.D.) cf. Schulze "Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Eigennamen" 440. So, according to the seventh-century codex unicus (Taurinensis regii tabularii 1 b vi 26), he is designated by Lactantius in his Epitome institutionum divinarum (24.5 Brandt = 29 Pfaff, Vigne): "Huius (sc. Chrysippi) sententiam interpretatus est Agellius in libris Noctium Atticarum, sic dicens" (there follows Gell.7.1.1-6; from "quibus" to "propter quem" our only source for §1).

It may be objected that one manuscript at one place is insufficient evidence to determine the form used by Lactantius; but there can be no such doubt about St. Augustine, who has Agellius twice at quaestiones in Heptateuchum 1.30 (on Genesis 15.12) and five times at Civ. Dei

1. Cf. Charisius GLX 1.206.1 = 267.6 Barwick: "Haele pro ualde Fronto ad Antinum unicum lib. II: 'Hale me, larce, praeest riae uitae mece paenitet'.
2. Corrected by J. Davis to "que... propter", which is obviously right.
3. Both passages relate to Gell.19.1.
4. Cf. the Novatian bishop Apelles in 383 AD (SocratesHist.Erat. 5.19.272-283, 274.6)
The manuscripts, according to Ligne\textsuperscript{1}, have Agellius throughout, though editors have printed A.Gellius; yet what is decisive here is the fact of repetition: no-one would speak of "A.Gellius" five times within a single passage, but "...Gellius" the first time and "Gellius" the other four.

Priscian, too, has Agellius at GLA 2.240.6, 2.259.23, 2.355.20\textsuperscript{2} (in the first two places the ninth-century corrector of R is reported by Hertz ad locc. as restoring A.Gellius); at 2.135.14-5 he cites as parallel formations "seruus serui Seruius, seruiis Seruilius, agellus age Hi Agellius, silua Siluius."

Larache (p. LVIII) cites testimonia to "Gellius" from Charisius, Caper, and Marius Victorinus, without apparently noticing that they have nothing to do with the N\textsubscript{4}, but come from Cn. Gellius the annalist. A long list of pre-Renaissance references from Gregory of Tours\textsuperscript{3} onwards to "Aulus Gellius" (e.g. Vincent de Beauvais, Petrarch, Boccaccio) and "Agellius" (e.g. John of Salisbury, Petrus Cantor, Radulphus de Diceto,\textsuperscript{6}) will be found in Hertz's preface (2.XXII-LXVII).

---

1. The Brepols edition (Corp.Christ.47) does not seem to bear him out in Civ.Jei; but it is not the LS readings but the repetition that is decisive.
2. Citing respectively Book 8 (fr. cap. inc. p.1414; and the title (or praef.)).
3. Preface to Vita patrum (p. 662.20 Arndt-Arusch = PL 71.1009-10), cf. Hertz 2.XXII. Of the five ninth- and tenth-century LS\textsubscript{5} used by Arusch at this point, one (Cod.Bruessel.766.71, sec.c) has "A.Gellius", the others "Agellius", in whose favour a presumption is created by the following quoque.
4. Policraticus 5.12 (1.338.15 Webb = PL 71.527b); 7.3 five times (2.295.23 sqq.Webb = PL 199.641), from Civ.Jei.9.4. Ligne prints Aulus Gellius throughout, but the LS\textsubscript{5} have Agellius (cf. Webb 1.xxxiv).
5. Who ascribes a precis of Val.Max.7.2.ext.14 to "Agellius" (Verbum abbreviatum. 138 = PL 205.16bc). Pascal (Atene e Roma 11.1908.20-22) sees in this a fragment of Geil.3 (translation of "locos quosdam Platonicos") on the strength of Plato Com.fr.22 Kock; this is perverse.
6. See section on "Gellius's Date", p. 8.
7. Add the unidentified verse fragment "ut dudos Agellius inquit" (Hertz 2. XII n.\textsuperscript{**}).
The manuscripts of the ticones present both versions of the name; the subscriptions in V to books 1-6 have "Aulli Gellii", the inscription in P has "Aulli Gellii"; for the manuscripts of books 9-20 the reader is referred to Curtius' apparatus.

If Fronto was referring to our author when he wrote to Claudius Julianus, his name was "Aullus Gellius" and there's an end on it. But if he was not, we have two traditions both extant in the fourth century between which we must choose. That either could in itself be a corruption of the other is demonstrated by the Gellian MSS at two places within one chapter: "maccii titi" for "maccii Titi" (3.5.9) vs. "Iaelius" for "Laelius" (3.5.12). But "Aullus Gellius" gives us not only a much commoner nomen, but a praenomen to boot; in the absence of a cognomen this is highly desirable. We may therefore with reasonable confidence stay faithful to this form.

---

1. Hertz 2.LVI; Lamarche expands to "Aulii Gellii" (p.XLV).
2. The poet is "Maccius Plautus" not in his MSS, but in all printed editions before Ritschl (q.v. "De Plauti poetae nominibus", F-Hm Plautus und Tereant 1.eq. Whether Maccius itself is correct is not the point; but see Fraenkel elementi 29 n., 401.
3. The same error at Cicero de oratore 1.265.
4. And with one attested for the MSS Gellia byull 1073 = 6.8269, a.1057.6.98, (6.103537), 0.38417, 8.21203, 11.1911, 11.7090.
for the Nocks' publication
GELLIUS'S DATE

The first attempt to date the Attic Nights was made by Radulphus de Diceto (d.1203?), who in his Abbreviationes Chronicorum and his de uiris illustribus made "Agellius" write in 119 A.D., because that was the first year of Hadrian, four times mentioned in the Nights. All manuscripts of the abbr.Chron. save B make additional mention of "Agellius" under the year 118; one manuscript of de uiris illustribus, namely R, reads "Agellius scribit anno CLIX", which several scholars took seriously till its true value was exposed by G. Gunemann in his article "Trogus und Gellius bei Radulphus de Diceto".

We have seen that of contemporary references to Gellius there is only the one dubious instance of Fronto ad amicos 1.19; but Larache (pp.IX-XII, cf. Critique 331-2) claims to have established a terminus ante quem of 158, when Apuleius delivered his Apologia, where he cites as writers of love-poetry "apud nos uero Aedituus et Tercius et Catulus, isti quoque cum aliis innumeris", which Larache rightly takes as borrowed from Gellius (cf. NA 19.2.10). This, however, does not prove that Apuleius had read the finished product with preface, index of contents, and twenty books; why should he not have met Gellius when he was in Rome, and seen an early draft? In the same speech (13.2),

1. 3.14.5, 11.15.3, 15.22.1, 16.13.4 - all as divus Hadrianus!
3. Catullus in the Tianshe-episode of the "Faeries and Thetis" (64.51-264) several times imitates Lucretius; but the two clients of Catullus must have compared notes. It is worth recording that Spenser The Faerie Queene 1.7.32, i.e. 11, are obviously the sources, not imitations, of Marlowe Tamburlaine the Great, Part 2, 3.3.119-124, 3.3.13-18 respectively; yet Part 2 of Tamburlaine the Great was published in 1593, The Faerie Queene not till 1596.
"ne ego necesse habeam contra sententiam Teopolemi Enniani piuribus
philosophari" may come from Gell.5.15.9, but the only reason for
supposing the source to be Gellius rather than Cicero (Tusc.2.1; rep.1.30)
is the adjective "Ennianus", which is no reason.

On the other hand, Apuleius says "etemim admonenius es mihi, non docendus". Gellius in his preface (§17) asks his readers to take
his sketchier remarks as "non docendi magis quam admonendis gratia". It
may be pointed out that Apuleius uses the verb admonere to mean
"remind", while the Cellian phrase is rightly rendered by Larache
"moins pour exposer que pour avertir"; but that does not preclude borrowing. If it was borrowed, the most natural inference is that
Apuleius read the preface in a complete edition of Gellius. Yet coincidence
can surely not be ruled out; before accepting Larache's theory we
should examine the internal evidence.

At 7.6.12 we are told; "Adulescens ego Romae, cum etiam tumult
ad grammaticos itarena, audii Apollinaris Sulpicius, quem inprimis
secfabar, ... Erucius Clarus praefectus urbi dicere ...". Erucius Clarus
was praefectus urbi from some time after 138 to 146, when he died in
office between 1 and 15 March.1 At the time of this conversation,
Gellius had not yet graduated from toga virilis, for it was having done so
that he set about finding "magistros...explorationes" (16.1.1), and
heard Apollinaris reflation the soi-disant expert on Sallust.2 It would

1. See P.Marchall"The Date of Aulus Gellius", 55.5(1963)14-3-2.
2. Larache rightly remarks (p.IX n.4):"La rencontre prend l'allure...d'un événement, d'une révélation et peut se comparer à la rencontre de Néosthène et de Callistrate (3.13), de Socrate et L.ton ou Théon". It may have occurred before Erucius became praefectus urbi, though hardly long before. Ert. Alzi, Comm.42(1970)681, strangely thinks this passage proves he was praefectus urbi at the time; it does not, but in fact he very probably...
be reasonable to assume that in 7.6.12 Gellius was between sixteen and twenty years old; given that the dramatic date is between 138 and 146, this gives the outside limits for Gellius's date of birth as 118 and 130; and consequently in 158 he was between twenty-eight and forty.

In the praefatio (§1), Gellius claims to have written "ut liberis quoque meis partae istiusmodi remissiones essent, quando animus eorum interstitione aliqua negotiorum data laxari indulgerique potuisse". The natural interpretation of these words, particularly of negotiorum, is that these liberi are embarking, or already embarked, on their careers.¹ Let the eldest be eighteen; then if the praefatio was written in 158, Gellius was at most twenty-two at his firstborn's birth. Of another man this would be credible; but for Gellius this entails the child's being born two years after the conversation of 7.6.12, when presumably he was studying rhetoric under Castricius and Julianus. After these studies he passed on to philosophy, it being as a philosophy-student that he went to Greece.² It is not impossible that by then he was a married man and a father; but it is hardly a welcome hypothesis.³ Gellius, cuiusmodi homest, is likelier not to have married till his late twenties; if so we may suppose that at the time of the praefatio he was about fifty.

1. Contrast the introduction to the Saturnalia, a work professedly intended for the education of Macrobius's son Eustathius (for whose name, identity, and age, see Cameron JR 56.1966.30) Note that liberis in §1 may refer only to one child (§2.13), though there are younger children in §23.
2. "hōs cum apud magistros Athenis esserat" 1.2.1; chief of these was Paurus, re familiari procurandoque cultu librorum" (praef. 23). These responsibilities and his legal duties came first, leaving scholarship for his spare time (11.3.1); he could hardly have left them for a year in Greece.
But, it may be objected, Gellius's memory may have played him false. If the conversation reported at 7.6.12 in fact took place not when Gracius Clarus was praefectus urbi, but (for instance), in 128, Gellius would be thirty-two when his son was born, late enough even for him. There is, however, another line of argument that suggests a date of publication about 180 A.D., by implication supporting the chronological accuracy of 7.6.12.

Gellius regularly speaks of his friends and teachers in terms most appropriate to the dead: "Favorinus...solitus dicere est" (2.5), "Antonius Iulianus rhetor perquam fuit honesti atque amoeni ingenii" (1.4.1), "Apollinaris ut mos eius in reprehendo fuit" (13.20.5), cf. "Sulpicius Apollinaris in quaelam epistula scriptum reliquit" (15.5.3):

"Tulius Paulus...herediolum tenue possidebat" (19.7.1) "Annianus...in fundo suo quern in agro Falisco possidebat" (20.8.1). Surely these people, if they were still alive, had not dropped out of his life? Clearly these are ἀπομνημονεύματα of the dead.

Among those so described is Herodes Atticus: 19.12.1 "Herodes Atticum, consularem ulum, Athenis disserentem anniui Graeca oratione, in qua fere omnes memoriae nostrae universos gravitate atque copia et elegantia uocum longe praestitit". Surely Herodes was dead when this was written; yet he did not die till 177 A.D. at the earliest: cf. 1.

---

1. This has nothing to do with truth or falsehood; a genuine reminiscence may be misdated by a slip of memory, a fiction may respect chronology in all regards.

2. Graeca oratione of course = ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ διαλέκτων. cf. 1.2.6, 12.1.24.

The relevance of this passage was first noticed by Castorina (Giornale italiano filologia 3.195O.137 sqq.)
The one person to whom such language is not applied is Fronto, who was certainly still alive in 175, since he speaks of "numnum... de exor." Commodi" (Hornussen Hermes 8.1074.216). May it not be, then, that the Noctes Atticae were published just before Fronto's death, in 179 or thereabouts? If so, Gellius will have been fifty or a little older, with children old enough to have negotia.

But this hypothesis entails explaining away the evidence from Apuleius: assuming that when in Rome he had become friends with Gellius, and been shown his scrinia. The apparent echo of the preface presents a difficulty, for the preface was surely written last; but it may be a coincidence. I should therefore prefer to date the Attic Rights to just before the death of N. Aurelius, say to 179 A.D.

---

1. I am not impressed by the claim that he published the NA before P. Grernus Proteus committed suicide in 165, because he does not mention the fact in 12.11. Why should he? Did he even know? Or did he mention it in 8.3?
Gellius's aim is clearly stated in his preface: his work shall
amuse (§1) and instruct (§12); unlike other compilations that bore
the reader without giving him anything "quod sit aut voluptati legere
aut cultui legisse aut usui dominisse" (§11), the Attic Lights shall
provide "quae aut ingens prompta expeditaque ad honestae eruditionis
cupiditate utilisque artium contemplationem celeri facilique compendio
ducerent, aut homines aliis iam uitae negotiis occupatos a turpi certe
acrestique rerum atque uerborum impertitia indicarent" (§12). Gellius's
motto has always been πολυμαθής νομος ου διδάσκει (ib.); if he has
included various difficult points from grammar, dialectic, and geometry,
together with augural and pontifical law, it is because a liberally
educated man is under an at least social obligation to know them:
"sed primitias quasdam et quasi libamenta ingenuarum artium dedimus,
quae uirum ciuiliter cruditas neque audisse unquam neque attigisse,
si non inutilis, at quatenus certe indecorum est" (§13). Readers are
asked to consider whether the trifles they learn from his book "eius
seminis generisque sint ex quo facile adolescent aut ingens hominum
vegeta, aut memoriam administratio, aut oratio selectior, aut
sermo incorruptior, aut delectatio in otio atque in luco liberalior"
(§16); while where his discussion seems elementary, he begs of them
"ut non docendi magis quam admonendi gratia scripta existimetur et
quasi demonstratio uestigiorum contenti perseverantur ea post, si
libebit, vel libris reputis uel magistris".

In summary, then, he was writing a compendium of polite scholarship,
containing things that, at a time when men of learning were publicly
honoured and were accepted in the best society, should for preference improve his readers' minds or at least preserve them from a socially embarrassing ignorance. It is in the latter spirit that at 9.4.5 he justifies the repetition of marvellous tales he affects to despise as being intended "ut qui eos lectitabit, is ne ruais omnino et anoxos inter istiusmodi rerum auditiones reporiatur". Learned, if often trivial, discussions were the stuff of table-talk (7.13, 10.2, 10.13); note especially 10.2.6 "quaerobatur autem res huiusce modi: aut sententiae poetae ueteris lepide obscura: non anxie, aut historiae antiquioris requisitio, aut decreti cuiuispian ex philosophia perperam imulgatig purgatio, aut captionis sophistiae solutio, aut inopinati rariorisque verbi indagatio, aut tempus idem in uerbo perspicuo obscurissimum."

The slogan πολυμαθης λοις ου διδακις is alluded to at 14.6.6. In that chapter, Gallius tells us that a friend of his gave him a book of miscellaneous information, which however he returned with the words εναος ου ταυτης της πολυμαθης: "Nam meae Noctes, quas instructum ornatumque isti, de uno maxime illo uersu ueneri quaerunt, quem Socrates prae omnibus semper rebus sibi esse cordi dicebat: "οτι ηοι νεπεροντι κακον τηγαθον τε τετυκταλ". This verse (2392) was used in philosophical writings to indicate the supremacy of θυμοφ. 3.

1. Cf. Larache Critique 264-6, Fischer : "I observe that W. Lohrs (de Aristarchi studiis Homeri, ed. 1839, p. 104) and W. Stein (Hermes ed. 3, p. 231) make the same points, which I suspect were interpolated by someone who did not understand that lepide obscure meant propter obscuritatem lepide.

2. Νον anxie is hardly in the spirit of the passage at large (cf. obscurissimum). I suspect it was interpolated by someone who did not understand that lepide obscure meant propter obscuritatem lepide.

3. Use of the verse is ascribed to Socrates by Demetrius of Byzantium (12 no. 37; Diog. Laert. 2.21) and by Ausonius (fr. 3, p. 41 Hense-Stobaeus 6.31.126); so did "many", though Diocles ascribed it to Diogenes the Dog (12.10.105). The chapter is similar in tendency to Senea 2.108, with which it shares the problem of Ulysses' wanderings; could it not come from a diatribe, perhaps by Ausonius whom Gallius cites four times? If so, the book will be a Gallien invention; in any case it is certainly not the πεντοεικα τοπος of Favorinus.
But we should examine this chapter in more detail.

In §§3-4 Gellius rehearses at length the contents of his friend’s book; first in indirect question, but when he comes to a list of ancient place-names he uses indirect statement, so that the information is passed on to us. But the matters discussed are exclusively Greek, and therefore would have more quickly bored the Roman reader than similar problems in things Latin. Most of them indeed are Homeric; which gives point to Gellius’s words “de uno maxime illo uersu Homerii quae sunt”. But it is quite clear from §6 that Gellius has the aim τον διδασκέων; this being here conceived in ethical terms, but in the preface intellectually.

There is in this the genesis of a contradiction; but there is no reason to suppose that Gellius was aware of it. He is a man of considerable common sense, but no philosophical profundity and decidedly deficient in self-awareness. Both these wants are demonstrated by 17.20.4-7, where having related how Taurus taxed him with being a ῥητο-ρεῖς who had come to Athens "eloquentiae unius extundendae gratia", and bade him disregard the stylistic excellence of a passage from Plato and concentrate upon its meaning, he blithely continues that these words actually impelled him to reproduce in a Latin translation the elegance of the Greek. What better proof could there be that Taurus was right, and Gellius did not realize it?

That Gellius did not perceive any ultimate conflict between ethical and intellectual benefit is suggested also by a comparison of 1.9.10 "Est etiam inquit (sc. Taurus) 'pro Iuppiter ! qui Platonicum legere postulet non utiae ornandae, sed linguae orationis commodae gratia, For the authenticity of this story see p.28."
nec ut modestior fiat sed ut lepidior" and 9.4.12 "temuit nos non idoneae scripturae (sc. of \( \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\sigma\omicron\omega\gamma\omicron\omicron\delta\\omicron\upsilon\omicron\) taudium nihil ad ornandum iuuvandumque usum uitae pertinentis". Taurus is thinking of ethical improvement, Gellius finds no cultural value in these stories: yet he uses ornat in both places.

If philosophy is to be studied, it should be ethical and political: "quae uirtutum omnium disciplina est, quaeque in publicis simul et privatis officiis excellit ciuitatesque et rempublicae, si nihil prohibeat, constanter fortiter et perite adinistrat" (10.22.24). There speaks the true Roman: yet Gellius knows only too well the fatal fascination of dialectic (16.6.16-17). But indeed philosophy is not something to be studied in depth (5.15.9, 5.16.5); Gellius tells without comment how Demosthenes deserted philosophy for rhetoric (3.13).

Gellius's professions are inconsistent: it is more than probable that this reflects contradictions in his value-system. It was during his lifetime that Fronto and Rusticus battled for the soul of Marcus Aurelius: had their pupil been Gellius he would long have perceived no conflict, but had a choice been forced upon him he would have chosen Fronto.

Of course human conduct was important: Cato's ideal had been "uir bonus dicendi peritus", and so had Cicero's and Quintilian's; not would Gellius have disagreed. To speak of an "humanisme gellien"

1. The immediate context in both places is one of physics; but Gellius speaks generally. Very few Romans after all, would have disagreed with Cicero's opinion: "philosophiae quidem praecipua noscenda, uiuendum autem esse ciuiliiter" (Lactantius, Inst. div. 5.4.17).
2. Naturally they conceived of this ideal in different ways; but that is not the point.
(Marache Critique 251-66) is misleading if it implies that Gellius had any ideas or ideals in these regards that had not long been commonplace. He was a competent, if not outstanding, dialectician, but had no deeper understanding of philosophical ideas. Nor was he an idealist: his excuse for citing the marvellous tales he disbelieves and despises (9.4.5) cited above is that of a man prepared to take the world as he finds it. As Fischer points out (p.115), those for whom he wrote were under no obligation to believe this rubbish, but they had to know it. Gellius tolerates the situation.

Indeed, it is quite clear that Gellius shared the taste, however low, for tales of marvels; cf. Marache (p.115): "Cette horreur théorique des miracula s'accompagne d'une curiosité intense pour les histoires de ce genre, et Aulu-Gelle cherche chaque fois tous les prétextes, pour départir, à l'égard du présent récit, de la méfiance qu'il affiche en général". In particular, the expressions of disgust that besprinkle 10.12.1-8 can only be described as "protesting too much". The game is given away by 6-7: "His portentis atque praestigiis a Flinio Secundo scriptis non dignum esse cognomen Democriti puto; uel illud quale est, quod ...". Nor it is very easy to believe in the pretensions of 64 "Item aliud quod hercle an ponerem dubitau, ita est deridiculae uanitatis - nisi incirco plane posui, quod oportuit nos dicere quid de istiusmodi admirationum fallaci inlecebra sentiremus, qua

1. In all studies of a man's ideas, the question should be asked: who would have disagreed? For similar reasons I lay no emphasis on Gellius's contempt for hypocrites and charlatans.
2. As we shall see at loc., in 2.8 he fails to see the real flaw in Epicurus KA2.
4. "Omul de lungă căruia i se adresa Gellius"; more comfortably translated into French than English "l'homme du ... qui s'adressait Aulu-Gelle".
plerumque capiuntur et ad perniciem elabuntur ingenia maxima sollertia, enque potissimum quae discendi cupidiora sunt". Harache (p. ...) sees this as self-revelation; it is, but I should suspect unconscious. It also bears an uncomfortable resemblance to a Sunday-newspaperman justifying his salacious stories by saying that they are news and an awful warning; but again I do not suspect hypocrisy, rather self-deception.

For is Gellius's rejection of minute knowledge at all convincing, in view of its prevalence in the attic Nights. Of course most trifles could be justified on social grounds: "ne rudis olimino et anginos inter istiusmodi rerum auditiones reperiatur". The *Omphalé Zηηήρατα of l. 63-4, such as "cuiusmodi fuisse Homerus dicat in Vlixis domo ἀιρήν", are arguably no less interesting than the nature of the *στρέω in 8135(Gell. 17. 3).

At 4. 1. 5 Favorinus spurns the morphological lore of the "quis quam grammaticae rei dition"; what do the gender and declension of *penus matter? Far more important to determine what *penus is. Gellius approves: "Sic Favorinus sermones id genus communes a rebus paruis et frigidis abducebat ad ea quae magis utile esset audire ac discere," (§19). One might point out that Favorinus is but changing pedantries, from grammar to dialectic and law; but in any case who ever delighted more in details of morphology than malicious Gellius?

It may be noted that the sentence just quoted continues: "non allata extrinsecus, non per ostentationem, sed indidiv. nata acceptaque". In other words, Favorinus did not drag in his learning κατα ιστορίαν and for ostentation, but made it emerge naturally from the discussion. By contrast, the humiliated *grammaticus was a show-off: "ostentabat..."
scholica quaedam nugalia de generibus et casibus uocabulorum
disserens cum arduis superciliiis uocisque et uultus grauitate
composita tamquam interpres et arbiter Sibyllae oraculorum" (§1).
It should seem that Gellius is chiefly concerned with social behaviour:
learning should be worn with grace. This is a form of "humanisme
gellien"; but indicating no more than that he too was home du monde.

One may compare Harache (Critique 255):
"Favorinus s'est fait un idéal humain de l'homme bien élevé. Étant
lui-même un type assez parfait d'homme bien élevé, il montre une
horreur profonde pour toute affectation" (cf. e.g. 14.17.19)...
"Chaque fois qu'il fait un discours brillant, mulu-Gelle prend grand
soin de nous avertir qu'il n'y a mis aucun désir d'ostentation. Or
il n'insiste tant sur ce point que par fidélité à la pensée de son
maître. Cortes Favorinus s'est fait illusion lui-même et nous ne
jugeons pas que sa pratique soit en parfait accord avec sa théorie."
Pour la politesse, au contraire, dont il avait fait un véritable
règle de conduite, son exemple était le meilleur enseignement."

This is a fair statement, provided we bear in mind the question
"who would have disagreed?". But it is in a not dissimilar spirit
that Gellius sets out to show, by the elegance of his style, and the
inventiveness of his mise en scène, that he is a man of culture as well
of learning.

But as we have seen, at that time social cultivation demanded at
least superficial interest and knowledge in matters literary and
learned. These are Gellius's chief concerns; and the relative

1. As the Cuia says of him: "philosophos metas, ποιητικὴ βιομορφή ἐπι-
θεομενος. Cf. Gell. 14.1.2 "exercitavit et ostentabat, multa insigni argumento seque
judiciaque attingere, nec non bene dicere". My word "chaque" is in parenthesis.
importance he attaches to literary and ethical values is best illustrated by 12.2. In §1 he contrasts the views of those who judge of Seneca "ut de scriptore minime utili cuius libros adtingere nullum pretium operae sit" on account of his stylistic shortcomings, with theirs who admit these shortcomings but admire his content. Gellius feels no need to make a general judgement on him, but concentrates on certain remarks of his on Ennius, Cicero, and Vergil (§2); these he cites with increasing distaste ("insulsissimo"§6, "homo nugator"§8, "inepti et insubidi hominis"§11). He then passes judgement: "Dignus sane Seneca videatur lectione ac studio adolescuium, qui honorem coloremque ueteris orationis Soterici lectoribus comparatur quasi minime scilicet gratiae et rectis iuss contemptisque" (§12). Admittedly Seneca has his moments (§13), such as "quid enim refert quantum habeas? multo ilium plus est quod non habes"; but (§14) young minds derive less benefit from what is well said than harm from what is very ill said; particularly when there is more of the latter, including advice "in re ancipiti". What matters is not that after all Gellius is passing a general judgement on Seneca, but that he regards pith maxims of ethics as outweighed by false criteria of literary appreciation.1

This does not of course mean that Gellius himself was not a man of high moral standards: his character shines out from his works. "Man sieht daraus nur zu deutlich" (says Weiss on p. VII of his introduction) "seine Bescheidenheit, Ehrlichkeit, Rechtssinn, Gewissenhaftigkeit, seinen Gifer für Jugend, seine Liebe zu den Wissenschaften, sein unaufhörliches redliches Streben, seinen Geschmack zu bilden und sich

1. We should not read overmuch significance into Gellius's concern for young minds; much is heard in our own day about books allegedly unsuitable for young persons and likely to be read by them from people with no particular interest in education. It is more important to note, they are concerned with moral 'corruption', Gellius with literar. Gellius need have had no great interest in education save as a father. (Proä § 27)
unter den sittlichen Einflusse und unter Anführung geistig
hervorragender Lehrer durch wissenschaftlichen Unterricht Anführung
zu verschaffen. As this summary suggests, ethical and intellectual
values are intertwined; but although it is probable that Gellius was
not fully aware of the fact, his intellectual interests overrode his
ethical interests as his curiosity in matters marvellous overrode both.

Even Marache, who at all times stresses Gellian concern for ηοριανή,
and relates his fashionable interest in archaic Latin to the always
traditional, but for Gellius in Marache's eyes deeply and intensely
felt admiration for early Roman courage, honesty, and simplicity,
nevertheless admits (p.227) that "l'érudition l'intéresse plus que
la morale".

Like a good Roman Gellius believed in the importance of morality
and more generally of that which was utile: but his literary and
scholarly interests went beyond these bounds. Fortunately he was not
aware of this; the point was in any case obscured by the importance
of erudition as a topic of polite conversation. Almost anything could
thus be described as utile, or found a purpose; Gellius even makes a
list of weapons and boats named in Early Latin histories "nequid
aliarum ineptiarum uacanten stupentemque animum occuparet". After all,
the early French grammarians justified their most arbitrary rulings in
the name of "la raison"; even so for a Roman the useless had to be
utile.

1. Because otherwise we should not have had the loces...tticae.
2. lienius, of course is used here as ηοριανή; often is; implying a contrast
    between Gellius's list and ineptiae. Thus Lucretius 1.116 "an pecudes
    alias dicitnitus insinuet se"; cf.Tll.1.1625.75sqq.
3. Horace's"omne tulit puncta qui discuit utile dulci"(Ep.1.6.343)

1. Because otherwise we should not have had the loces...tticae.
2. lienius, of course is used here as ηοριανή; often is; implying a contrast
    between Gellius's list and ineptiae. Thus Lucretius 1.116 "an pecudes
    alias dicitnitus insinuet se"; cf.Tll.1.1625.75sqq.
3. Horace's"omne tulit puncta qui discuit utile dulci"(Ep.1.6.343)

with the attitude of Varro (1.340; Gell.1.26.5; 7.7.5): readings in
the table should be such"quae sit diuturna et dulciaetet".
For Varro and Gellius what is erudita is eo...so of use in life.
But there are more things to life, even to the life of the mind, than philosophy and self-awareness. A keen eye for detail is far more useful to the scholar, and this Cellius clearly had. Rather than worry that he who calls others pedants should be a pedant himself, we should ask ourselves of what use the botanist is who cannot see the trees for the wood.
SOME NOTES ON SOURCE-CRITICISM AND

GELLIUS'S ANECDOTES

Although the juristic extracts in the MA had been studied by
H.E. Dirksen in 1851, the first major work of Gellian quellenforschung
was an article by L. Mercklin "Die Citiermethode und quellenbenützung
des Gellius in den Notices Atticae", Fleckeisen Supp. 3 (1857–60) 635–709,
cited throughout this commentary as Citiermethode. It is an invaluable
study of Gellius's working-methods even where one does not accept its
conclusions, and establishes beyond doubt:

that a source cited for a particular detail is often the source
for much more of the chapter concerned, or even the whole of it;

that many of Gellius's supporting citations are in fact taken
over from his source;

that a work cited by title and book number is likelier to have
been quoted directly than one whose author only is given.

From then on this study grew apace, to culminate in Hosius's attempt
on pp. XXII-LVII of his edition to trace back well-nigh every chapter,
even those in book 8, to its source.

Hosius's results and methods were sceptically reviewed by G.
Wissowa, Gött. gel. Anz. 1907. 734 sqq; this scepticism is continued by
Hornsby (pp. xxii–xxxii) and Karache (pp. XXVI–XXXI). The present
discussion is intended to do no more than warn the reader against
certain of Hosius's and his predecessors' assumptions.

Most important of these is that Gellius was all but invariably
dependent for his information on secondary sources. When in 15.3

1. Abh. der Berliner Akad. Wissenschaften 1951. 29 sqq = Hinterlassene
Schriften 21 sqq.
2. For bibliography see Hosius p. xxi.
Gellius expressly claims to have read Cicero's *Crator* and Nigidius Figulus's *comentarji*, Hosius refuses to believe him on the grounds that the Cicero-passage is quoted by Velius Longus *GLK* 7.60.7 (p.XLIX); on 2.17 he tells us "non suo periculo Ciceronem Gellius aggredi ausus est" (p.XVII), preferring instead on evidence that is no evidence to find the source in Probus.  

In 1.18 Gellius suspects Varro of committing the selfsame error with which he had taxed Stilus, namely excogitating Latin etymologies for words borrowed from Greek; not only does he specify the book of Varro's concerned ("in XIV rerum divinarum libro") but he even knows where the two passages occurred in it (§§3-4). Gellius relates the Latin *fur* to the classical Greek *φήσας*; hardly a difficult feat. Yet Hosius (p.XIV) declares "Gellium ipsum Varronis errorem detexisse ut putem, a me impetrare nequeo", without in any way justifying this implicit allegation of stupidity, he suggests a juristic source on account of Paulus *ad dictum* (3.47.2.1.pr., cf. Justinian *Inst.* 1.1.2) "furtum a furuo id est nigro dixtum Labeo ait, qual ciam et obscuro fiat et plerumque nocte; uel a fraude ut Sabinus ait; uel a iuro do at auferendo; uel a Graeco sermone, qui φήσας appellat fures, immo et Graeci το τη φέρεν φήσας dixerunt". But this is hardly enough to prove that Gellius did not derive the etymology from a grammarian, from the contemporary *Gemeingut*, or from his own brain; still less that the juristic or other source also mentioned Varro.

1. See Excursus to 2.17.

2. *cf.* 15.30.7 Agah Fleckeisen *Supp.* 24, p.184. 1.18 lema has *litterarum* wrongly (cf. "filium" 15.7.1 *m.x.*, but "nepote" rightly ib.§.)
This brings us to another fault in Hosius's method: the insistence on attributing every chapter to a single source. Extreme cases are 1.3 and 1.11, which he ascribes in toto to the philosophical writings of Favorinus, Cicero-quotations and all, remarking that Favorinus is made to quote Cicero in 13.25 and 18.7. The latter parallel is unfortunate: the Cicero-quotations come not from Favorinus but from Gellius himself. But Favorinus wrote in Greek; how then can he have cited Cicero? We must recognize that the composition of \( \text{La} \) is adequately represented neither by the fundamentalist model in which Gellius finds out every reference for himself and pieces his notes together, nor by the model in which he simply copies out long extracts from Favorinus or Probus or some other such source, but that each model applies to certain parts.

A third assumption, possibly unjustified and certainly misapplied, is that Gellius names all authors he draws on at least once: Hosius \( \text{p.XIX} \) "\( \text{utquam vero fit, certa nusquam probari potest Gellius sua} \) mutuatum esse ex scriptore non ab ipso se vel identidem nominato". Let this be so: we must remember, first that Gellius may well have drawn on several of the works named in \( \text{praef. 6-10} \) of whose contents in general we know next to nothing, secondly that authors may have been named in book 8 or even in missing chapters of book 20. It must not be forgotten that the fragment of book 8 preserved by Priscian \( \text{CIL2. 246.6} \)

1. Indeed, on 11.1 Hosius admits (p.XLIV) "\( \text{Hoc caput totum in Gellii officina conflatum uidetur}. \)

2. Hosius does not, however, extend this principle to unnamed works by named authors: p.XIX.
Hence, even if Hesiod is right, we still cannot be sure that a fixed particular author can be ruled out as a source for Gellius.
"Historia ex libris Heraclidae Pontici incunda moratu et miranda" is the only reference to Heraclides Ponticus that has come down to us in Gellius; what other names may not be lost? Nor indeed is Hosius's rule at all certain: it is naturally hard to prove that Gellius quoted from an author he does not name; but that is certainly not to say he did not.

Evidence that neither this assumption nor that of the single source is justified comes from a chapter long thought to demonstrate the opposite, namely 9.4, where ever since Mercklin (Citermci~hode 64,0 sqq) scholars have assumed that all the material purportedly derived from "Aristeas Proconnesius et Isigonus Micaeensis et Ctesias et Onesicritus et Philostephanus et Hegesias" (§3) in fact came from the seventh book of Pliny's Natural History, cited in 97 and again (for matter undoubtedly from it) in §13-16. The exception is Nettleship ("Lectures and Essays" 257), who postulated a common source; "hence" says Hosius (22,4). Bolton, however, has now demonstrated ("Aristeas of Proconnesus" 27-31) that Gellius and Pliny both used the same Greek prose source, a work of Πανίνης Σιλακης composed c503 c. and otherwise unknown to us. The decisive argument is the contrast "uestiri frondium lamgine" (Pliny NH 7.25) and "auium ritu plumantibus" (Gell. 9.4.10) - perhaps Ρετός had crept into Pliny's copy for Πετός. This reads like a lemma (cf. those to 1.8, 5.9, 6.5 al: cf. 2.29, 1.12, 15.19 al.); nor can I see where it could have occurred in book 5. I should surmise that it is in fact the otherwise unrecorded lemma to a c.8.16; since Priscian cites it for the genitive Heraclidae, we may suppose that the text proper did not employ this case; cf. 1.2. lemma "in libris sodiaiss" vs. §1 "amplius, 5.9 lemma "sumpta ex Herodoti libris" vs. §4 "Heredotus in historis". I presume that this lemma was lost as Bk 8 itself was in the ancestor of the centiares, and even more in VP.
This raises the whole problem of Gellius's anecdote. Gellius claims to have found aristers and the others mouldering in a bookseller's at Brundisium. We certainly cannot believe every word of this; the Aristopenae are unlikely to have still been extant. (Bolton, p. 27), and we have seen that he used a Greek prose source. Did he find it "Arbitu arcto retneto" and selling dirt "eoop at Brundisium. It is highly probable that this was indeed his experience with some book or other; but no one can prove (or disprove) that the book in question was his source for this chapter.

At 1.9.5 Gellius states "et arctor et an. Insecunda et a "junio insec scriptum sine V littera. Offerdi enim in bibliotheca Petrensi librum uerae uetustatis Livii Andronicii qui inscriptus est "Oe/uea " (i.e. "secessi") "in quo erat versus primus cum loco uerbo sine V littera: uirum muti Canone insecue uersum." It is generally supposed that in this chapter Gellius is following Velius Longus and possibly Verrius Fl. conc. (mosium LV with 6.2); but what of the manuscript at Patras? There are several chapters in which Gellius claims to have stumbled on interesting book libraries or elsewhere (cf. 2.3.5 r.); to suppose that all these references come from his sources is perverse, nor need disbelief in some of these manuscripts' age and authenticity comport disbelief in their existence. But as regards this particular case, why should Gellius claim to have found it at Patras? Surely because that is where he found it. There is no difficulty in believing that in a city where there was a Roman colony there was a manuscript of Livius Andronicus, which Gellius discovered on his travels; but if the 13 were fictitious, it is strange that Gellius should have chosen Patras to bestow it on.

1. Although he speaks of "libri" (413.6.7.13.24.14.8.1), there will have been only one Greek source.
3. Why Alice is it a home at all? The "Etruscan" Ciceros of 1.3.1.16 have none.
About another story I have no doubts at all. At 17.20.4 Gellius states that Taurus called him a ἐνακόλουθος who had come to Athens for eloquence alone. What man would make up such a story about himself? Gellius here, as people often do, repeats a charge made against himself without realizing it is true; it is beyond belief that he should have invented it. Indeed, I see no reason not to accept the entire chapter; the class was studying Plato's Symposium; Taurus bade his wayward pupil perpend not form but content; the incorrigible Gellius is merely stimulated to make a Latin translation.

It has long been noted that Gellius rarely quotes from his friends' and teachers' writings (but cf. 10.12.5-10, 15.5.5-4) but often cites their spoken word. This is normally taken to be conventional, Gellius in fact having drawn on their books: no doubt, in general. But certain doubts remain: the first of which is trivial, that sometimes he may actually have heard what he later copied from his written text. Thus at 9.3.3 he claims to have heard Favorinus deliver a sententia that we also find closing an extract from his writings at Stobaeus 4.132 W-F (fr. 104 Barigazzi): how can we be sure he was not present? Likewise he asserts he was in the audience when Favorinus attacked the astrologers (1.1.1,34). Either statement may be false, but it is unlikely that Gellius was never present on such occasions: not only was Favorinus his beloved teacher, he was also a most fashionable declamator whom one would not want to miss.

1. Despite Gudeman Arch. Oxy. 45(1925) 1217.
2. Halfway-house is 13.3.3, where Gellius claims to have been present when Apollinaris wrote his reply to Erucius Clarus.
which suggests both "conducted in the spirit of love" but also and "is not..."
One may also wonder whether such passages as 1.5 and 2.5.8 "so-and-so used to say" are at all implausible; do we not remember teachers who had favorite remarks? They may not always have been written down.

Did Favorinus or Taurus never say anything memorable?

From the opposite pole comes Mette's attack ("Lectures and Essays" p. 256): "But the reader soon becomes convinced that these notes are mere personae introduced to give an attractive setting to the extracts quoted under them". In general, other readers have not been so convinced; one may, however, note that at 1.5.12 Geilius himself states that Antonius Julianus's remarks were also found "in perulgatis commentaris". There is also considerable room for doubt over dialogue-chapters: in 2.26, for instance, Favorinus champions the Greek colour-words, in front of the Latin; what better schema could there be for such a discussion than to oppose the great philhellen e and the foremost living latinist?

In the lemma to 4.1 Geilius describes the contents of that chapter as "Serio quidam Favorini philosophi cum grammatico iactantior factus in Socraticum modum"; virtually an admission of fictitiousness. Indeed, one can hardly believe in the many scenes with grammarians ridicules, although such people must have existed: there was a market for learning, and there is no reason to suppose that those who sought to exploit it, particularly those with no other recommendations, were any more reticent in self-advertisement than ancient cooks and doctors.

1. This has nothing to do with "le primat de la morale" (Larache ... 1 loc; it means that Favorinus exposed the grammarians' ignorance by questions in a spirit of _elevia_ (cf. 4.4); cf. 1.5.1.

2. In 13.31-13 the disc.acidad grammaticaster declares "talia ego gratis non doceo". Unlike the Platonist, Blazeus (Re. 337d), he was running for cover but this does not affect the passage's evidential value. It is possible that 12.30.2 are 17.11 are genuine citations in the Aristotelian style.

3. For boastful doctors see M. nanaer.
which would appear to record Gellius's first experience of Culpicinius Apollinaris, one may wonder whether "inrisit inlusitque genere illo facetissimae dissimulationis qua Socrates ad sophistas utebatur" is not a warning that this is a fiction modelled on the Iatonic dialogues.

A further complication is introduced by those passages more Favorinus is made to speak of things Latin. I do not count incidental remarks, such as 1.1.11, obviously inserted by Gellius himself (cf. here Varro ap.Gell.3.32.2): I mean those in which Favorinus deals extensively or exclusively with Latin matters. For as Barigazzi says (Gnomon 42.1970.622) "non è da credere che egli abbia lasciato opere scritte in latino né che abbia trattato in greco cose specialmente latine"; or as Kehnching has it (p.55) "Die Lemmata, in denen Favorinus nicht nur beiläufig von lateinischen Dingen redet, können kaum aus Favorins Werken stammen, vielmehr werden Notizien zugrunde liegen, die Gellius zur Zeit seines Zusammenseins mit Favorinus gemacht hat". In fact we have two possibilities to reckon with: that these things were genuinely said by Favorinus, or that they do not come from him at all. If they do not, why are they ascribed to him?

In 17.10 Favorinus compares a passage in Vergil to what he takes as being its original in Pindar; this when Gellius has come from Rome to visit him in his villa at Antium, during the summer. I fail to see why this should not be true; on the other hand it is always possible that Gellius found the criticism somewhere else and put it in his mouth. But why Favorinus? Perhaps simply because he was the most beloved of all his teachers. I am rather more doubtful of 15.25, where Favorinus discusses the meaning of "marubiae", and digresses upon tautology.
The examples in the digression are from both languages; but the Greek ones are confined to Homer and the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. This play is cited by Gellius at praef. 20-1, 1.13.19, 12.5.6, and here 13.25.7; the citations are always incidental, and their absence would not harm the overall sense. Since there are only two other references to Aristophanes throughout the Attic Nights (15.20.7, 19.13.3) it is hard to escape the conclusion that Gellius's references to it come from personal reading and excerpting, and were inserted by him into material derived from other sources. That leaves Homer, an author whom Gellius and his sources cite countless times; we are left with the conclusion that Favorinus is a lay-figure, and the chapter concocted by Gellius, with aid perhaps from Probus or Verrius Flaccus (Hosius p.XVIII).  

The Gellian Favorinus also shows a good knowledge of Roman law (4.1, 14.2, 20.1), but in the first of these chapters Gellius finds a divergent opinion (§§ 20sqq), and in the last Favorinus is confuted by Sex. Caecilius. We have seen that 4.1 is fictitious, and no doubt the other two are; but it is probable that we are justified in deducing from them that Favorinus was a fairly good amateur but not expert jurist.

Indeed, it is perhaps a more useful exercise to approach these anecdotes as evidence for their subjects' interests, habits, and external circumstances: Pronto's gout (2.26.1, 15.10.1) being confirmed by l. Caesar ap. Front. sup. 1.2.1, we may readily accept the description of Herodes Atticus's villa (1.2.2), or Apollinaris's gentleness in reproof (13.20.5). In general, I accept that the opinions expressed do

---

1. Note that § 14 is taken from the excerpts underlying 6.3.14.
substantially represent those held by the speakers, and that at least
chronology is respected; but since I regard it as certain that we
have some genuine reminiscences and some total fictions, I can do no
more than follow Barigazzi (Gnomon 42, 1970, 682): "Occorre quindi di vola
di volta in volta, non affidarsi a criteri di carattere generale", with
the proviso that in order to judge one must have evidence.

I also regard it as certain that where Gellius does give us his
teachers' views, or copies from another source, he often adds remarks
of his own: 1 we have seen this at 11.1.11, and should surely also see
it in 12.1.20; for a more extended example see the introductory note
to 2.22. Indeed, nothing could be further from the truth than the picture
of Gellius as the slavish adherent of one authority at a time. Though
no deep thinker, he is an intelligent man with an eye for detail; he
was well-read and comminued with the learned. Any source-analysis that
neglects these facts is bound to go wildly wrong: or as Wissowa has it
(Cött, celi, 1907, 740): "Was bei Leuten von Schlag der Nonius, Macrobius,
Isidorus an Platze ist, ist es nicht bei einem Schriftsteller, der auf
rühmlichem Gebiete zur guten Philologie etwa in denselben Verhältnisse
steht, wie Athenaeus auf dem griechischen".

1. These may be corroborative examples of personal opinions: at
9.9.4-11 and in 12.27 for instance, Gellius may well have taken
the parallel passages from a commentary and then made his own
judgement on the quality of Virgil's imitation.
It will not be necessary to rehearse here the literary creed of Pronto: its emphasis on the carefully chosen and startling word (e.g. Caes. 4.3: de eloquentia 1.4, 2.2-3); not new-fangled ("nec id quidem absurdum est" de orat. 18), but quite possibly taken from an early Latin author. Hence Pronto's excerpting of Cicero's letters (e.g. Anton. 3.10.2) and Marcus's of sixty books (ap. Front. ep. 2.5.2); and so we find Gellius filleting Quadrarius in 17.2 and Laevius in 19.7. It should not, however, be forgotten that both writers warn at times against excessive realization of their teachings.

Except in epieicis, oratory has the practical purpose of persuading or at least informing, and must therefore be comprehensible. At 11.7 we find Gellius mocking the ἀφυμαθῆς ("repentina et quasi tumultuaria doctrina praeditus") who gravely informed a no doubt shocked praefectus urbi: "hie eques Romanus apudian edit et flocces bibit", and the ἀπειρόκαλος who denounced his opponent in court as a "bouinator" (§7). In neither case had anyone else the slightest idea what was meant. Likewise Pronto to J. Caesar (ep. 3.1) "Denique idea tua, quom in senatu uel in contione populi dicendum fuit, nullo uerbo remotiore usus es, nulla figura obscura aut insolenti; ut qui scias eloquentiam Caesaris tubae similis esse debere, non tibiarem, in quibus minus est soni, plus difficultatis."


1. For this attitude cf. Horace ep. 3.45-58 (protesting against it), Quintilian 1.5.71-2 (moderate), Jaeckel Vindex ad Gell. 11.11.2. Gellius, however, admires Sallust's innovations, as Probus did (1.15.18), though many did not (1.15.1). Of course both Pronto and Gellius do use new words; cf. Marache mots passifs, esp. pp. 14, 16, 104-6.
But there are other factors operating in both passages. Pronto is thinking especially of Caesar's eloquence; the heir presumptive must not betray his dignitas by showing off his schooling. In Gellius, too, the untimely archaists are attacked for their ostentation: "Est ad id uitium plerumque serae eruditionis quam Gracci oπυμφθαλυ appellant, ut quod manquam didiceris diu ignoraueris can id scire aliquando coeperis, magni facias quo in loco cuncte et quacunque in re dicere" (11.7.3).

Better known, perhaps, is 1.10, where Favorinus retorts to an "alulescentis uerborum cupidissimo et plerques uoces minus priscas et ignotas in cotidianis communibusque sermonibus exprimenti" (§1) that one should use contemporary language comprehensible to one's interlocutor; and in §4 cites Caesar's precept "ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens uerbum". In fact Caesar, who laid down this rule in his first book de analo gia, will have been warning against the use of artificially-created analogical forms (cf. Gell. 2.25, introductory note); it was in this spirit that Gellius's friend insisted on saying "qui es cit"; preferring usage to grammatical authority: "neque se tam insinuare locaturum ut absone inauditaque dicaret" (7.15.5). Favorinus, however, applies it to ostentations and excessive archaizing "in cotidianis communibusque sermonibus". Aκαιρία is not the least among offences.

We have already seen (in the notes on Gellius's aims and values) that ostentation was frowned on, above all by Favorinus; we should however recognize that the social code forbidding it was yet more tolerant than we should be, as was inevitable when learned discussions...
formed an integral part of polite conversation. That Marcus writes
to Pronto in an account of the day's doings "Fauces fumi - potius
quam dicerem "gargarissae", nam est apud Louium, credo et alibi"
(epp.4.6.1) may be explained as the pupil's demonstrating his prowess
to the teacher; but Favorinus himself, the enemy of ostentation,
is made at Gell.5.11.12, having asserted a mean in female looks
between great beauty and great ugliness, to continue "qualis a quinto
Ennio in Helanippa perquam elegantia vocabulo 'stata' dicitur". This
is not to be wondered at in an age when a busy man of affairs not
interested in verbal pedantry can use "pluria" quite unselfconsciously
because he was a constant reader of old texts (Gell.5.11.1-3) and can
then justify that usage by citing the authority of ancient writers (ib.
§6) and Sinnius Capito (§§ 9-13)2.

But all the same there were limits, albeit subjective, as there
had always been and still were (19.7.13) on the use of poetic words
in prose; archaism, and indeed the rare word in general, must be
kept within bounds; particularly in conversation and practical
oratory, or on other business or state. Pronto praises Verus's
military despatches (epp.Ver.2.1.5: "Numquod uerbum insolens aut
intempestivum?" ); these were certainly no place for verbal ostentation.

1 Whether or not Favorinus said this is not the point; Ceiğius did not
think it incongruous to put these words in the mouth of a man he
represented as disapproving of ostentation. It is worth noting here
that Favorinus was an Atticist, but not a strict one (Galen 1.41 .Khn;
Barigazzi pp.29 sqq).
2 It is no answer to say that Celiigius was inventing the entire conversa-
tion; his invention shows what was possible. At how many other times and
places could a man of affairs figure in such a fiction?
3 For the praise given Vergil at 5.12.13 see introductory note to 1.6.
But in all genres moderation must apply: as Gellius rules at 11.7.1-2
"Verbis uti aut nimis obsoletis exculcatisque aut insolentibus
nouitatisque durae et inlepidae par esse delicti... uietur. Sed molestius
equidem culpatisque esse arbitror uerba noua incognita inandita dicere
quae inuolgata et sordentia; noua autem uideri dico etiam ea quae sunt
imusitata et desita, etsi sunt uetustata".

1. F. Seneca _contr._ 4. pr. 9 "ne urbis calcatis et obsoletis uteretur";
"obsoletus"= "trite", not "obsolete" (cf. also Gell. 17.2.12.)
MANUSCRIPTS

For a statement of the MSS in which the Noctes Atticae are preserved, I refer the reader to Marshall (pp. v-xix) and Hertz (vol. 2, pp. XIII-XVII, XLVIII-CV). I confine myself here to a brief account of the witnesses on which the text of book 2 is based.

A (Codex rescriptus Vaticanus Palatinus 24); a palimpsest in which four books of the Latin Bible are written on pages plundered from various classical texts; leaves 80-1/6 are mostly taken from a fourth-century Gellius in rustic capitals, which in all probability contained the twenty books entire. Twenty-four fragments survive, from the lemmata and books 1-4; they are listed by Marshall (pp. v-vi), and include twelve from book 2. All Greek is omitted, appropriate spaces being left; the Latin text is better than any other witness's. Thus at 2.6.5 it and it alone gives mupsatur; not only the other MSS, but the twofold indirect tradition through Deutero-Servius and Macrobius,...
have the trivialized raptatur. ...it confirms Aldobrandus’s conjecture prodigiosae; for other examples see Hertz 2. LXXVI. Of course it has its errors (Hertz 2. LXXXVII sq); thus at 2.7.13 it gives deprrehensionis where the later MSS have the correct reprehensionis, but overall it is our best witness.

In general, however, we must chiefly rely on three mediaeval MSS that form a family among themselves (Hertz 2. LXXXIX-XXXII) and unrelated to A (Marshall, p. ix and n. 5); since Hertz these have been designated V, P, and R.

V (Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3452, the first part): a thirteenth-century MS containing books 1-7 (each book preceded by its lemmata), but omitting the praefatio. It everywhere reproduces the Greek, in capitals, often with much corruption (cf. #).

P (Codex Parisinus Bibliothecae Nationalis Latinus 5765, the "codex Regius" of Gronovius): a twelfth-century MS containing the praefatio and books 1-7 down to "ictus solis" 7.4.3; as in V, each book is preceded by its lemmata; everything between "rege" 1.19.lemma and ΔΕΝΙΣΕΝ (sic) 1.2.11 is omitted, half a column being left blank with "dees." in the margin.

It preserves all the Greek (again in capitals) up to 2.22.25, but from 2.23 onwards omits all continuous passages of it (save for the first few letters), leaving spaces; individual Greek words in the Latin text continue to be transcribed. It also contains Caesar de bello Gallico.

R (Codex Leidensis Gronovianus 21; the "codex Rottendorfianus" of Gronovius); a twelfth-century MS copied by several hands, containing the praefatio and books 1-6 down to "amariores" 6.20.6, but no lemmata. It omits all pass-

---

1. For the minor 13th-century MS of books 9-20 bound in with it v. Hertz 2. LXVI sq., X. XVI.
2. In books 9-20 the same title is bestowed on the 13th-century Cod. Paris. Bibli. Nat. Lat. 8664, now known as Q.
3. So Marshall auctore Sir Roger Honors, who inspected it in person; formerly assigned to the thirteenth century.
4. To whom it was made available by its owner Bernhard Rottendorff. For a full description see J. Geel "Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui inde ab anno 1741 bibliothecae Lugduno-Bataeae accesserunt" p. 136-7, no. 44; among the other texts contained in this MS is Cicero de fritibus (cf. supra p. V-VII).
sages wholly or mainly in Greek (though not individual words), and also omits 3.10.\S 3-9 and \S 12-17; it indulges in wilful variation (Bohaim p. VII).

Each of these MSS in turn preserves readings corrupted in the other two: thus V alone has "Pomplux" 2.18.8, "adlocrscit" 2.22.29, "nequid" 2.29.20; P alone "disccnmbatur" 2.2.9, "primorle aspectu" 2.7.6, "non" 2.7.22, "Postumo" 2.16.3, "Thedon" 2.18.1,3, "alia qua" 2.22.19, "ex aduersum" 2.22.22; R alone "si additur" 2.7.22, "quedam" 2.12.2, "adnitenata" 2.12.5, "quix" 2.22.2, "ar" 2.22.30. On the other hand each has its peculiar errors: V alone has "pausum" 2.6.2, "pompylus" 2.22.8, "aut" 2.22.20, "enim" 2.29.20; P alone "latrasse" 2.22.27, "populiata" 2.29.3, "dolens" 2.9.3, "cessoris" 2.10.1, "ablatus" 2.24.9; R alone "quas(qui)" 2.23.15, "famem" 2.23.21, "rariter" 2.25.8. In all these places the other two MSS have the correct reading.

The fifteenth-century MSS combining the two halves of the tradition are our only source for the lemmata to book 8; there is little evidence, however, that they owe their improvements on the other codices to tradition rather than emendation. Good readings are occasionally preserved in the MSS of a florilegium culled from Celleius and Valerius Maximus; at 1.13.7, for instance, they give "Postumiana" and "Manliana" uncorrupted. The indirect tradition in Nonius Deuteroc-Servius, Macrobius, and others, will be discussed as the need arises; its relevance varies with the fidelity of transcription.

1. Though at 2.9.3 the first hand of R interpolates "animi" after "dolentis".
2. At 2.27.5 prodicendo is closer to the true prodicendo than the prodicendo of VPR; cf. 2.4. Mention should also be made of the now-lost Codex Basilidianus (B), cited in several 16th-century editions (Marshall vii), notably Carrio, who alleged it came from the 12th century; it contained both halves, but not book 8. Before the discovery of A (which stops short at "molestiam quod" 1.3.7), it was our only source for 1.2.13-1.3.8 "et"; it is of no importance in book 2. For the recteiores see also Hertz 248W.
4. Cf. 2.6.4 "splendoribusque" VPR, which admirably illustrates the kinship of VPR. At 1.1.7, incidentally, R has "postumiana."
published by the famous German printers Conrad Sweynheym and Arnold Pannartz. In the same year they published Caesar and Lucan, also praised by Virgil. See Seneca's "A History of Classical Literature." 2.17.

Joannes Andreae (Giovanni Andrea de' Bizzati).
A full account of previous editions will be found in Hertz (vol. 2, pp. CVI-CXXXVI), and a shorter in Marache (pp. LVIII-LXXII). The editio princeps was that of Joannes Andreas, bishop of Aleria (Rome, 11 April 1469); the first critical edition was Ludovicus Carrio's, published in Paris by Henricus Stephanus in 1585. The text prepared "docti hominis cura" and published by Lodewijk Elsevier at Amsterdam in 1651 was edited by Johannes Fredericus Gronovius; it was largely followed in the Leiden edition of 1666, with copious notes by Antonius Thysius and Jacobus Diselius. Meanwhile, Gronovius had discovered the MSS P ("Regius") and R ("Rottendorfianus"); at his death in 1671 he left notes extending as far as 9.15.5 and other emendations beyond that point. This Nachlaß was published by his son Jacobus in 1687, at Leiden. All these editions, however, are surpassed by that of 1806 (also at Leiden), in which Jacobus added to his father's work notes of his own, and others from Carrio, Lambecius, and Thysius—Diselius, with readings from two MSS collated by Gaspar Schoppius. No remotely comparable commentary on the Attic Nights has since appeared.

The basis of all modern scholarship in Gellius, however, is the second edition by Martin Hertz, published at Berlin in 1883 (vol. 1, containing books 1-9) and 1885 (vol. 2, containing Hertz's preface and books 10-20). Hertz was the first scholar to conduct a scientific investigation of the MSS to make proper use of V or any use of A; despite errors, neither his account of the

1. Begun by Thysius (d. 1665); completed by Diselius, who annotated bk 13-20.
2. His first (a Teubner text of 1853), based on his collations but with no apparatus and deliberately over-conservative, is of interest only as provoking attacks by R. Klotz ("Quaestiones Gellianae", Leipzig 1857) and Haddig ("Adversaria critica" 2,583-613), answered by Hertz in "Vindiciae Gellianae" (Greifswald 1858 = opusc. Gell. 1-41) and "Vindiciae Gellianae altera" (Fleckeisen Supp. 7, 1873: 1-91; also published separately, Leipzig 1873). Errors in his apparatus, caused by failing eyesight, were corrected in Fleckeisen Supp. 21 (1894) 1-44. His account of the MSS is modified in several respects by Marshall (pp. v-viXIX).
3. This is not said in disparagement of Gronovius's search for good MSS (cf. Hertz 2. CXXVI, CXXXVI).
tradition nor his apparatus has yet been superseded, and subsequent editions have departed little from his text. His very long preface (ppl.2, pp.III-IV) treats of the manuscripts and their relationship, ancient and mediaeval references to Gellius and borrowings from the Attic Nights and the history of Gellian scholarship from the editio princeps in 1469 down to himself; when no work of his is named "Hertz" will indicate this edition.

In 1903 Carl Rosius published a Teubner edition, which was admirably reviewed by Georg Wissowa in *Ittinische gelehrte anzeige*, 169(1907), 727-740. It presented a revision of Hertz's text, not without conjectures of Rosius's own; the apparatus is greatly reduced. Most of the preface (pp.XVI-LIX) is devoted to quellenforschung; for an estimate of this section see Wissowa l.c.734sqq and our own notes on the subject. More useful are the parallel passages cited at the foot of almost every page, even though here verbal imitations by Ammianus and plagiarizings by Ronius and Macrobius are strewn among genuinely parallel citations, on which however no quellenforschung has been exercised (cf. Wissowa 733); it will readily appear how indebted is this commentary to these collections. He also states the precise source of all quotations.

The French scholar René Marache, author of two important books on Gellius1, is currently at work on a classic edition of him; his preface and the text and translation of books 1-4 were published in 1967. It is an expressly conservative edition2 (p.LXII), but Marache shows more

1. Critique littéraire and notes; see Bibliography.
2. Though at l.c.2, he does not know Lörsteit's vindication of the καραδοσύς "Si sine uxore possemus" (Syntactica 2.2.75)
respect than other modern editors for the recensiones, even accepting such obvious interpolations as "falsi et audaces" 2.1.2 and "restituere" 2.19.1. The edition was reviewed by Barigazzi (Gnomon 42.1970. 600-6), who points out grave deficiencies in its handling of Greek; other editions of Gellius, however, also offend in this regard. It must be said that Marache is very careless in matters of detail. More important textually is P.K. Marshall's C.C. 1. of 1960, based on a new study of the manuscripts: in particular he restores to critical use the codex Franequeranus (9th century A.D.) of books 9-20, which belongs to neither of the two families (γ and δ) into which the other manuscripts are divided; but rarely in fact does it provide a better reading. The improvements in his text are indeed largely due to emendation and interpretation, not to recension. Like Hosius, he gives a very brief apparatus, and refers all citations to their sources.

As has been noted, the notes by the Gronovii and others in the edition of 1706 are still unsurpassed as a full and continuous commentary on Aulus Gellius. Hertz attempted one, but had to give it up; Hosius provides not a commentary but materials for a commentary. More recently, the Rumanian version by J. Popescu (Bucharest 1965) is accompanied by notes from the pen of I. Fischer, who also contributes an excellent introduction. Many of the notes are somewhat elementary, but others are most useful; yet neither they nor Marache's notes even approach the Gronovian commentary for scale and scope. Weiss (v. i. 112) has some good notes; other translators few.

1. At 2.23.20, Hertz, Hosius, Marache and Marshall, all give two hiatus impossible not only for Menander but also for Gellius's idea of Menander; at 2.2.3.9, 12 only Hertz knows how to accent διστάτων "tolerable" at 1.3.27 none of them knows how to accent τούτο "this". Hertz saw 2. Marache's "rapide collation" led him to set it in γ (p. 136). Hertz had 3. Too brief at times; cf. 2.27.5, and p. 44 at bottom. 4. Notably Thysius and Cigellius, to whom some note of the unattributed annotations.

...

Inscribed under the auspices of the Fundación E. Roat Vizcaya.
There are three commentaries on portions of the HA: by far the best is Paul Raider's on the praefatio in Lusse belge 31(1927) 189-216. H. I. Hornsby's commentary on the praefatio and book 1 (Dublin 1935) is handy but uncritical; pp. xxxi-lxv of her introduction provide a useful if derivative account of Gellius's Latin. The commentary on book 15 by W. Murch (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N.C., 1965) rarely solves any problems.

Several translations have appeared since the late eighteenth century, when the Attic Nights were done into French (by ... l'abbé de Vertuill, Paris 1776), Russian (by the Archimandrite Manasij, Moscow 1787), and English (by the Rev. W. Beloe, London 1795). A very good but free German translation (printed by Hertz, 2.500 M.) was made by Fritz Weiss (Leipzig 1875-6). More recently, J. C. Rolfe competently rendered Gellius into English for the Loeb Library (1927-6). A Catalan version in the Escriptors Catalans series, by Cebrià Montserrat, did not progress beyond two volumes (Books 1-5; Barcelona 1930-4); it had no merit. David Popescu's Romanian version (Bucharest 1965), though overshadowed by Fischler's contributions and given over much to smoothing down the difficulties, is on the whole sound; but the translation I have made most use of is that in Marache's edition, on the whole both accurate and elegant. Errors noted in these translations are not to be taken as typifying them.

The critically worthless Delphin edition by J. Proust, S.J. (Paris 1651), includes an index verborum that despite its many deficiencies has still not been supplanted. It was reproduced in J. Valpy's variorum Gellius (London 1824) with little change save in the method.
of citation: whereas Proust referred to page and line of his edition, Valpy refers to book, chapter, and paragraph. The index is several times inaccurate and regularly incomplete; it sometimes fails to distinguish homographs (e.g. iacere and iacere) and never separates words used by Gellius from words cited; it is, however, all we have.

1. These paragraphs, however, do not correspond to those introduced by P.J. Longolius (loc. cit., 1741), and adopted by all modern editors. (cf. Hertz 2.CXXX).

(See p. 42 n. 3). At 17.3.9 Marshall cites "quaii cum" from F without mentioning that it had been conjectured by Scheffers in 1630 (and "sed qui quae" by Stephanus in 1585); neither in his apparatus nor at QQ 15 (n.4), 160 does he remark that epiqulalvesdai 16.7.4 had been correctly interpreted by Stephanus. At 16.6.2 his treatment of Gellius 181-8 Marx (182-3 Frankel) ignores Housman's edition. — 1.1907.14.50. Nor on 1.2434 does he cite Frankel KGB 2.442-3.
**PHILOLOGICAL SYMBOLS**

*paridaiz*-
form philologically reconstructed

*Ke** *ei** *t* *o* *k* *o* *s*
non-existent form (symbol used e.g. in G. Y. Shevlov

> becomes

< comes from

[    ] enclose phonetic transcription

/ / / enclose phonemic transcription

The phonetic symbols used are those of the International Phonetic Association; the pronunciation indicated is that argued for in
W. S. Allen "Vox Latina" (Cambridge 1965). Note especially that the
Latin /a/ is assumed to have possessed the same sound as its Italian
representative, an open unrounded central vowel transcribed [A],
not the front vowel [a] or the back vowel [a]; that u after
g or q before e or i is marked [y] like the y in French lui; that
short /i/ otherwise open [i], is marked as closed [i], before the
velar nasal [ŋ]; see Allen pp. 50, 17, 73 respectively.
In general, references to ancient authors follow standard forms, and
to the editions commonly used; for fragments these are generally
those listed by marshall (pp.xxii-xxix). Exceptions, and other points
of clarification, are listed below.

Alcaeus and Sappho are cited according to Lobel and Page(1P).

Apuleius is cited as in the "Index Apuleianus" of Oldfather, Canter,
and Perry(Middletown,Conn., 1934): by book, chapter, and line of
Teubner text from beginning of chapter.

Charisius is cited according to Keil(GL) and to Barwick.

Deutero-Servius (Servius auctus, Danielis, plenus) is abbreviated DS.

The Digest is abbreviated D.

Die is used by itself for Cassius Dio.

Ennius is cited in the tragic fragments according to Ribbeck(ed.3)
and to Jocelyn; in the annales and minor works according to Vahlen(ed.2).

Favorinus is cited according to Burigazzi, and where available Lensching.

Festus and Pauli Epitome (P.J.) are cited according to Lindsay.

Fronto is cited by book, letter or fragment, and paragraph, according to
van den Hout.

Greek comic fragments are cited according to Kock, save those from
Menander, q.v.: tragic fragments according to Nauck(ed.2), save those
from Sophocles (according to Pearson).

Hippocrates is cited according to Littre.

The Historia Augusta is cited as HA: the individual "authors" are ignore.

Homer is cited by book-letter: A1 = Homer Iliad 1.1, $^\gamma$296 = Homer
Odyssey 23. 296.

Lucilius is cited according to Marx and to Krenkel(Leiden 1970).
Lenander is cited:

- in *Aspis* and *Samia* according to Austin (Berlin 1969-70);
- in *Dis magnation* according to E.W. Handley, "Lenander and Plautus: a Study in Comparison" (London 1968);
- in *Sicyonius* according to Kassell (Berlin 1965);

Nonius is cited according to Lindsay.

Pliny means the elder Pliny unless the context makes clear otherwise.

Roman scenic cited according to Ribbeck (ch. 3).

Seneca means the younger Seneca unless the context makes clear otherwise.

It should be noted that since both Hosius and Marshall indicate the source of all citations made by Gellius, I have not (save where I follow a newer edition) thought it necessary in general to do so.
This bibliography includes the more important books cited in or used for the commentary, and those cited by author's name alone; editions of and commentaries on classical texts are in general omitted. It also lists all works cited by initial letters.

**AJP**
American Journal of Philology, Baltimore, d, 1860.

**ALL**

**Allen, W.A.**

**André, J.**
- Études sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine, Paris 1940.

**Attin, E.**

**Axelson, S.**
Unpoetische Wörter, Lund 1945.

**Balsdon, J.P.V.J.**
Life and leisure in ancient Rome, Bodley Head 1969.

**Barigazzi, A.**

**Baumeister, A.**

**Bennett, C.I.**

**Blumberg, H.**
Bemerkungen zu Geil. 2.26, in Philologische Abhandlungen Hertz gewidmet, Berlin 1885.

**Boisacq, P.**
Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, ed. 3, Heidelberg 1950.

**Bolton, J.C.P.**
Aristeas of Proconnesus, Oxford 1962.

**Brock, A.H.**
Studies in Fronto and his Age, Cambridge 1911.

**Broughton, A.R.B.**
Magistrates of the Roman Republic, New York, 1951-2, supplement 196. Title abbreviated MRP.

**Brune, C.G.**
Fontes Juris Romani Antiqui, ed. 7 (revised by O. Gradewitz), Tübingen 1909.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.I.</td>
<td>Cambridge Ancient History, Cambridge 1933-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIL</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin 1963-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Phi.</td>
<td>Classical Philology, Chicago, Ill., 1915-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Classical Quarterly, London, 1907-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Classical Review, London 1907-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denniston, J.D.</td>
<td>Greek Prose Style, Oxford 1952.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernout-Meillet</td>
<td>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, ed. 4, Paris 1959; sometimes cited as E.-M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faider, F.</td>
<td>Lilli Galli noctium Atticarum praefatio, in musee belge 31 (1927) 189-216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Gr...</td>
<td>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, ed. F. Jacoby, Berlin 1821-58, ed. 2, Leiden 1957-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fischer, I. Introduction and notes to Julius Gellius,opération...tr.P.Popescu), Bucharest 1965.


Gorice, Oxford 1957.

II. Zeit. = kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Rome, 1901.

Lesezproben = Lesezproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos, Rome 1950.
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It will be obvious to all students of Gellius this commentary owes to the generous and to Herz, together with Mosius's parallels; and to standard works such as RE, T.L., and L.J. This I say at the outset once for all time.

I wish to express my gratitude for the criticism and encouragement bestowed on me by my supervisors, Professors Sir A.E. Thomson and R.C.L. Misbet, and for their help and advice; also to Professor J.H.L. Lloyd-Jones for reading and improving my discussion of the Menander-fragments in Gellius 2.23. Thanks are also due to Mr. J.G. Green for his constant encouragement and for the advice specified at p.327 n.3; to Mr. P.K. Marshall for correspondence exchanged on matters Gellian; to M. M.W. Wood and Professor E. Lautzberg, who as my examiners made many valuable suggestions constructive of the present work, and to Mr. P.J. Parsons for his benevolent advice and to many too numerous to mention, including those friends of mine who listened to my Gellian expositions with such or even genuine interest and understanding.

To the staff of the Bibliotheca Library, for enquiring after strange articles,
En route for agathon's, Socrates stopped to consider whether wisdom, like water, flowed from the full vessel to the empty, taking up his stance in the porch next door; this was quite a habit of his (Plato 174d-175d, esp. 175c. où νοῦν Χρόνιον ὃς εἰσέλθῃ διατήρησθαι). Alcibiades alleges (ib. 220c-d) that on the Poteidæan campaign, Socrates once stood from dawn to dawn wrestling with a problem: the single incident, as in many anecdotes, was magnified into a habit and reinterpreted as an ascetic exercise, no doubt long before Favorinus. This does not mean that people no longer read the Symposium (we know Gellius did, 17.20.1): not all those who nowadays speak of three Wise Men or even three kings have not read Matthew 2.1.

1 ad fortuitas patientiae uices: the genitive denotes the sphere within which "the chance vicissitudes patientia may be applied to, within the scope of patientia." But we should consider deleting patientiae.

1-2 id quoque...dicitur: after Socrates dicitur, Socrates is neither necessary nor elegant, and should be deleted.

2 The rhetorical elaborations will be noted: "pertinaci statu perennis atque pernox"; the variatio "a summo lucis ortu ad solem alterum orientem"; the asyndetic dicolon with common prefix "inconius immobils". This last is itself the first element of a tricolon.

It should be remembered that Plato was not even born when this campaign took place, which leaves plenty of time for a legend to develop before he heard it. Would Socrates, who was not universally admired (cf. 220b. οὗ ἦν στρατηγὸς οὗ ἦν στρατηγὸς ἦν κατηφοροῦντος φημῆσθαι), have been left undisturbed?

None of the repetitions listed by Räcke (cf. 37-8) is remotely like this one.
"i.i. / isdem in uestigiis / et ore atque oculis eundem in locum
directis", which in turn is the culmen of a triadic crescendo
"pertinaci...pernox / a summo ... orientem / inconiuens ... directis";
all this being at last followed by the climactic explanation
"cogitabundus ... a corpore", which suggests a new division into
two shorter elements followed by two longer. And the entire structure
is an expansion of the simple colon "stare solitus dicitur" tucked
away at the beginning (another argument, incidentally, for not
cumbering it with an unnecessary Socrates). Naturally we should
punctuate before, not after, inconiuens | | perdius atque pernox: pernox
is shown from Vergil onwards, but perdius is first found here and
in Apuleius: (Lett.5.5.5 "et perdia et perinox nec inter amplexus
coniugales desinis cruciatum" for the construction of desinis
see Gell.2.12.3n), 9.5.19 "at ego misera pernox et perdia ( . Schulze;
per diem codd.) lanificio neruos meos contorqueo".1 It is not used
except in conjunction with pernox, which tells against Cudendorp's
conjecture perdio at Apul. Florida 10.1.

a summo lucis ortu ad solen alterum orientem: cf.3.2.4:"a sole occeps
ad solen iterum occidentem"; ib.§5 "a sole enin exorta ad exortum
eiwsdem incipientem".2 Typically Gellian variatio, of which the
best example is 17.10.7 "pari crassamento eiusdemque longitunninis".
Likewise 2.7.3-5 "omnia quae pater imperat parentum...in quibusdam

1. For the otiose possessive adjective cf. note on §4; so Gell.15.2.4
"caputque et os sum...masquam aciem suam flectens".
2. In all three places Gellius moves from the completion of one sunrise
(set) to the beginning of the next; but in 3.2, where the topic is
how various peoples reckoned the day, this is obviously nonsense.
No doubt the idea, clumsily expressed, is "till just before the
corresponding moment."
parendum, quibusdam non obsequendum...nil necessum esse patri obsequi et parere" (that the last of these could have been expressed with the gerundive is shown by § 8 "numquam est igitur patri parendum quae imperat"); and the change in verbal mood at l. 1.2 "disciplinam istam Chaldaeorum tantae uetustatis non esse quantae uideri uolunt, neque eos principes eius auctoresque esse quos ipsi ferant". Even more striking is his use of the device throughout a chapter, expressing its topic in ever-different fashion. (Ed. Fraenkel, kleine Beiträge 2.336), and indeed in the structure of the octes as a whole: 

Faiserlin Citiernmetode 705. Or. also 2.29.7. tore atque oculis: for this standard expression see Öllfin ua f. red. Schriften 268.

cogitabundus: for adjectives in -bundus see Enilio Pianezzola "Gli aggettivi verbali in -bundus" (Florence 1965); for their use by Gellius see Faisere hotz 185-8, Pianezzola l.c. 214-221. Fourteen such words (including tremibundi 2.29.8, cr. ad loc.) occur in the at sixteen places; of these nine (occurring in ten places) are new. Apuleius uses them far more freely, fronto not at all. Gellius discusses them at ll.15. "Tamen quodam secession mentis atque animi facto a corpore: as if in an mode.

3 The sophist and philosopher Favorinus of Strelate appears in the octes atticae as Gellius's beloved friend and teacher, who enraptured his pupils with his eloquence (16.3.1), whom Gellius went from Rome to Antium to visit (16.10.1), who when a pupil of his became a father called on him "et puerperam usum et patri gratulatum"(12...2), and bore so tolerantly the rudeness of Donitius Insanus(l. 7.4). It is as unreservedly favourable a picture as Polemon's" is unrelievably

hostile; as in quiet answer to the slanders of sexual incontinence, the Gellian Favorinus tells us that a woman neither very beautiful nor very ugly will be neither υποτελής καταπολέμων, and describes her appearance as "uxoria"\(^1\) (5.1.6sqq.).

We cannot here discuss the overall life and work of Favorinus, the quarrel with Polemon, the tensions at Hadrian's court, the relegation to Chios; for these the reader is referred to the introductions and testimonia in Lienscing's and Burigazzi's editions. But it is worth noting that he was Herodas Atticus's teacher (Philostratus vita soph. 1.48), and that Pronto in his laudes neglectentiae ἔγραψε περὶ τῆς ἐμφάνειας like those handled by Favorinus (Gell. 17.12) refers to him with the words "de Favornini nostri pigmentis" (63). Our concern here must be with Favorinus as portrayed by Gellius.

Favorinus the philosopher was basically an adherent of the later Academy: \(^2\) A.140 sqq.; Gell. 20.4.9, 20. Socrates was a favourite subject (Barigazzi 1-76); it is significant that in his attack on astrology he asks why human events do not repeat themselves like planetary configurations, producing "Socratae simi et Antisthenae et Platonis multi" (Gell. 14.1.25). But he greatly admired Aristotle and the Peripatos (Plutarch mor. 734f ), and is made in dialogues to quote Democritus (Plutarch i.e.) and Epictetus (Gell. 17.19)\(^4\).

...although he wrote ten books on the μορφή τῶν ἄρωμάτων (Gell. 11.5.5, Philost. i.37, Dio. 63.7); or, in general (1.70-67), he was not a

---

1. See the works of P. A. L. MacRae and R. E. C. H. dollar (Philostratus vita soph. 1.32) yet he was "sine testiculis: itus", and
2. This cannot come from his writings; what Greek work would it render?
3. He wrote a work Ἐνεικτικύατον για τοῦ Ἴπποκράτους αὐτοῦ τῆς τεκνικῆς γενεσίας,
4. When he matched with Plutarch's slave Onesimus in a dialogue λέγει (Galen. i.111.)
Fyrrhonian: for a hostile account of his epistemology see

The author of a παραγωγή (παραγωγή was naturally a polymath:
it is not surprising to find him discoursing on the winds (Gell. 2.22)
or writing about Archytas and his artificial pigeon (1.12.9-10), even
quoting the physician Erasistratus (1.3.3). He is also an
authority on Θεοκτίστης (e.g. 2.15-6, 9.3.3, 12.1, 17.19); he was not
a rigorist, declaring (Gell. 1.3.27) that

Indeed, Gellius tells us that as a novice iudex, in a suit
where the plaintiff brought no evidence in his support but was by
common repute an upright man, while the defendant was a noted
scoundrel, unwilling to pronounce in the defendant's favour he
adjourned the court and went to Favorinus for guidance "quae in
eo tempore Romae plurimum sectabar" (1.2.11). Favorinus answers
like a jurist, not like a philosopher; as indeed a Roman asking for
advice de officio iudicis (cf. 2.12.13, 17, 20) would expect.

Indeed Favorinus is elsewhere represented as an amateur if not expert
jurist (4.1.20.1) but what matters here is that Gellius represents
himself as going to Favorinus for advice.

But, says the Suda, Favorinus was φιλοσοφίας μετοχας ἔκτος ἃτροπον ὑπέρ,
This latter propensity being even more
marked in Gellius, it is not surprising that most of his
appearances concern matters literary or linguistic. Thus in 17.10 he

---

1 For the accentuation see Chandler §§30-9: editors wrongly give
2 Cf. Barigazzi p.74 "La società gia' necessaria e l'acceita come"; we
have seen (Elocogmena, Notes on Gellius's Mius and Values) that
Gellius is similarly tolerant of what intellectually he despises,
namely stories of miracula.
3 Admittedly Gellius says (7.11) "Hoc quidem mihi tum favorins ut uirum
philosophum decuit susseat", but the material is juristic and not
philosophical. cf. esides §26, it contrasts Favorinus's theoretically correct
comparis Vergil *Aen. 3. 570-577* and Pindar *Pyth. 1. 21-6; in 2. 5 he contrasts Plato and Lysias; at 1. 21. 4-5 he approves a reading of Hyginus's in Vergil and supports it out of Lucretius; at 3. 5. 6 he declares a verse from the *heruliaria* enough to prove its Plautine authorship; at 9. 13. 5-6 he is as much affected by Quadrigarius's description of how Assanius acquired his commission of Torquatus as if he were watching the actual combat.

Examining the material attributed to him from another standpoint, we find that in only ten out of the thirty-four chapters he appears in does Favorinus deal exclusively with things Latin; of the other twenty-four, 19. 3 affords no linguistic clue, but otherwise the language, *pont de départ*, or (at least in part) the subject matter of the discussion is Greek. This accords well with his own proclaimed preference for Greek: *οὐδὲ χιλιάδες ρώμες ἔνετο καὶ τῶν γυμνάσιων καὶ τῶν σχολής τῶν Ἐλευθέρων ἐγγευμένος* 1; his writings were, it should seem, exclusively in Greek. His Latin studies are modestly underestimated by him at 13. 25. 4 and politely over-praised by Sex. Caecilius at 20. 1. 20; he has at his disposal such recherché expressions as "stata( forma)" at 5. 11. 12 and "adfecto anno" at 31. 16. 17; he can cite jurists and the Twelve Tables (1. 1, 14. 2, 20. 1). But in 13. 7 he is not certain whether *δημοτικόν* can rightly be called "contiones", and when Domitius's book fails to satisfy him turns to Gellius for examples; while in 6. 2 Favorinus tells Gellius of ten words used in the *coiνή* that are not attic (such being the implication of "adulterina et barbarā", cf. 5. 20. 3-7), and Gellius tells Favorinus

1. (io Chrys.) 37 = fr. 95 Parigazzi, 625. This Hellenism is not surprising in one born within the Cultural ambiance of Cassilia. Etymically he was a Celt (fr. 95. 27) not a colonist.
of ten words in current Latin use that are not found in the ueteores. These two chapters are all the more significant in that nowhere else throughout the Noces Atticae is Gellius represented as teaching his teachers: Favorinus is not an expert in Latin as he is on Greek. It may also be noted that his criticisms in 20.1 of certain Decennial provisions stem partly from ignorance, partly from a Hellenic lack of sympathy with early Roman harshness.

All this points in the same direction as his championing of the Greek colour-words in 2.26, and Fronto's corroboration: Favorinus (like Hadrian) paid more attention to Greek than to Latin.

Mention having been made of Gellius 3.2, we may note that Favorinus was an Atticist, but not a strict one (Galen. 1.41 a.; Barigazzi pp.29sqq). At 1.10 he is made to denounce the ostentatious use of archaism in Latin conversation2 with this we may compare Gellius's remark about his learning (4.1.19) "Sic Favorinus sermones id genus consumpsit a rebus paruis et frigidis abducit ad ea quae magis utile esset audire ac discere, non allata extrinsecus, non per ostentationem, sed indidem nata acceptaque". At 2.22, 25-6 Favorinus urges to discuss the Ετυμολογία and Πρόσεγγισις so as not to monopolize the conversation with an ἀκρόασις Κριτικής. Despite being a sophist, Favorinus clearly believed that there were limits on the display of one's knowledge, particularly in social intercourse; cf. Prolegomena, 1.

1. That is to say, what Sex. Caecilius (or Gellius) regards as ignorance.
2. This does not mean that he was not an archaist: we have seen quoting Old Latin. In 14.2 he reproduces the doctrine of Gellius (16.3), on which the jurists dispense on the basis of his archaism (Pomponius lib.7 sqq. exch. 11.1.2.48). Pomponius was contemporary with Gellius; professional jurists were not affected by the ideas prevailing among dilettanti (cf. Gell. 16.10.7). For the antiquarian nature of Gellius's legal studies see Fischer IX.
"Notes on Gellius's Aims and Values" and "The Limits of "Orchaisus":

M. Racine Critique 251 sqq. 1

de fortitudo eius ut pleraque disscrens: this does not read very smoothly, and we have no other example of pleraque as a pure adverb (though cf. plerumque, πολλά). Very attractive is Marshall's insertion of <Graeca> before ut: he compares i.2.6 "Herodes Graeca uti plurimum ei nos ruit oratione utens". The sense of course is perfect, and Graeca will be an internal accusative rather than a pure adverb.

Poll: fr. 97 Barigazzi.

4-5 Socrates's asceticism was not intended as mortification of the flesh 2 but for the maintenance of health and fitness: Xenophon

memorabilia 1.2.1 ού τον Ἴριδονίμον καὶ ταυτατά Πάντων Εὐδημίαν ἔλισσε διὰ τοῦτο, διὰ τὴς ἄριστης καὶ μακρυμνίας πάντων πόλεων καὶ τελικῶν τάτων, ἐντὸς εἰς τὸ χρόνον συναίνειν πεπαίδευμασ αὐτὸ ὧτε τὸν πάντα πυκνὰ κειμήνης πάντων ὃν καὶ ἔχειν ἠρχόμενον… ηὔνομα μὲν καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὗτος εἰς ὑμᾶς ἠκούει οὓς ἐπειράμονος οὖν ἰδοῦνε τοῦ μὲν ὑμᾶς ὑπερβαίνειν ἐπετρέπειν ἐπεδομάσθε, τὸ δὲ ἐκ ὑδατος ἡ φυλή δέξατο τάξιν ἑυκαρπος ἐπιστέφειν τοιοῦτος ἀληθεῖς.

3.12, 3.7.9. Even the comic poets recognized his toughness:

Aristophanes Clouds 417 sqq., Meipsias fr. 9 Kock. In course of time exaggeration and romance enveloped all such data: where we find at

Biogenes Caertius 2.25 οὕτως τοὺς τὴν τῆς διατύμη τινος μετα πολλάνων ἀθανάτιον μακροχρόνως ἔχων ἤδη ἀφιμάν μέλαν. Lucian Var. 13.27 οἷς το ἐνθρονίαν ἐγένοι.
Thus do hagiographers write for hagiolaters.

uitae sœæ: for the otium possessive see Todr "Position of Possessive and Demonstrative Adjectives" (Philadelphia, 1926), pp. 11-14.

5 internoxius: rare, and classical only with bellum, but cf. the Fronto-passage cited below.

obnoxius: cf. I. 14.5 "obnoxium quippe et obiectam falsis existimationibus". Obnoxius, formed by apostasis from ob noxam, is discussed in Early 6.17; it is common in late Latin, Sallust, and Tacitus, being also found in Bratus ep. 1.17.6, the Augustan poets, Livy, Seneca and the elder Pliny, but never in Cicero or Caesar. The modern English obnoxiosis (obnoxious for "unpleasant") derives from a confusion with noxius, first attested in Fronto ep. 3.1 Obes. I. 3 "invidia perniciosam inter homines malum maximeque int nescium, sibi alisque pariter obnoxium". 1

---

1. The English word is cited in the Oxford English Dictionary, with the sense "harmful" four times from 1612 to 1683; from such contexts as Donne, Pseudo-martyr 353 (1610) "The Doctrines of the Heys ... and all the ceremonies, which were the most obnoxious matters" developed the modern sense, first attested in 1675. It is also found in the seventeenth century with the sense "culpable"; cf. Cell. 6.17.3 "noxae, id est culpae suae, conscium". Amandrey in 1604 defined "obnoxious, subject to danger, faultie"; subject to exactly reproduces the ob).
1. The Platonic philosopher Taurus, whose Jerome sets in
his "Gesta spir.

145 . . . is often cited by Gellius; especially as an expounder
of Plato (1.9.10; 7.10.1; 7.13.10-11; 7.14.5; 17.20), but not
exclusively so. In 13.10.3 he is called "Calvisius Taurus", but
of sig. 2.568 Δυσκοί έδωκαν Λ. καλβννων Ταύρο κατεστινείον ψιλοσφή Νάτυμον.
Thilostratus (vit. soph. 2.14) makes him a Tyrian and teacher of
Herodes Atticus.

praeses: a term used from Trajan's time of provincial governors;
at first mainly for senators, but gradually also for equestrian
procurators (Macer I de officio praesidis = 5.1.15.1; -flamn Les
Procurateurs (aestres sous le Haut-Empire romain 112sqq). In
literary use we find praesides provinciarum spoken of by Pliny (Pan. 70.1) and Suetonius (uto 7.1), and "Aoesiae praeses" from Trajan's
pen (Plin 32.14.4); in second-century inscriptions, however,praeses is usually found in honorific ("praesës optímus" and the like)
rather than titular contexts, the first example with the genitive
of the province being at CIL 3.205 (198 . . .). With provinciae
it is found at ILS 9.117, with provinciarum the plural is used
at CIL 12.594. About 250 A.D. praeses became the standard term for
all governors; after Diocletian's and Constantine's reforms it
designated an equestrian governor, as opposed to senatorial consulares
and correctores.

Crete: Crete and Cyrene formed one province under a governor.
2 sectatoribus: cf. 2.41.3, 1.5.3, 1.9.11, 3.1.5, 8.15.5, 12.2.1, 13.5.2, 13.1.1, 14.10.3, 19.5.1; sectari 7.6.12, 13.16.3, 13.25.2, 14.2.11, 20.6.1; it should be noted that secta is related not to seco but to sequor (cf. sectare sequi), sector.

3 or 3.1 or 3.2; "just", "modo"; found in Plautus, Terence, and Cicero's letters to Atticus (also 2 Verr. 4.61). No doubt a Republican colloquialism.

5 dum aliae prouebantur apposita est: instead of promuntur.

Such imperfects are common from Sallust and Livy onwards: 1.3.2.375-6 (§210.4).

7 absque praecidicio: the juristic sine praeidicio (Marcellus VII digestorum ap. J. 25.3.1.11; Ulpian §1 ad edictum = J. 20.8.5.1, &c) survives in the "without prejudice" of English law.

For the history of absque see J. Pronm, Jmil 6 (1889), 197-212.

In Early Latin it occurs only in the formula absque (illo) foret/esset "were it not for (So-and-so)", always governing a pronoun (me, te, eo, hoc, hac, are found): e.g. Plautus Bacchides 412 "nam absque te esset ego illum haberem rectum ad ingenium bonum." This accords with its etymology: for -que "if", Vedic ca, see Wackernagel Ki.Schr. 257-261.

Between Terence and the archaists it is presented as a preposition with the ablative five times in manuscripts:

Cic. Att. 1.19.1, where it is a corruption of aliquo (cf. Shackleton-Bailey ad loc.);

Ps.-Sall. in Cic. 3 "absque carnificis nomine", which is an incomprehensible garble;

Mly the Slier (fr. 23.6 Beck) ap. Charis. Ck. 1.124.29 (= 155.3

1. Plaut. Tim. 832 "nam absque foret te" with a different word-order in anapaests.
2. Cf. the earlier English use of "and" (now normally written "an")
Barwick): "exceptis nonosyllabais cetera -n finita nomina seu
uocabula absque communibus ("except adjectives") genetion
plurali quamquam ante -un I non recipiunt.", where "absque
communibus" would seem an interpolation.

Lucan 6.152, an uncontestedly spurious verse;

Quintilian 7.2.44 "an etiamsi non ratione ductus est,
inpetu raptus sit et absque sententia", where the needless "et
absque sententia" was deleted by Jordan.

We then find that in the archaistic usual absque is used as a
preposition meaning "but for" (Gell.2.26.20, fronto e...Caes 5.43.1;
the same meaning but a different construction) "save for" Gell.
l.13.19.4; or simply "without" as here. It is extremely common
in Church Latin, and survives in Lombard asca "except"(Meyer-Boke
No.47).

8 alius: loosely used for alterum, unless Taurus's chair is being
thought of as well. dixi boni: for this admiratory interjection
see Kraenkel, Horace 441.

9 interquiescere: properly "have a rest" (Cato ag.cult.15.2),
"fall silent for a while" (Cic Brutus 91); used metaphorically by
Seneca and the Plinies. The image of resting is continued by
continere, used metaphorically by Cicero (cf.t.4.320-31). Cf.
also *interesse* (Cic ros.10).

10 priuata actio: Rhet. Hor. 1.22 "in prior actiones praetoriae

1. Once the feeling, for the idiom had been lost, the verb would seem
unnecessary.
exceptiones sunt et causa cadit qui eigit, nisi hactenus, et in publicis quaestionibus..." 12-13. This event, from 213 B.C., is recorded by Livy (24.44.9-10) "His procuratis ex decreto pontificum, profectioni consules Sempronius in Lucanos, in Apuliam Fabius, pater filio legatus ad Suessulan in castra venit; cui cum Apulian filius pro preredetur lictoresque uerecundia maestatis eius taciti anteirent, praeter unicum fasces equo praefectus senex, ut consul animadvertere proxima lictores iussit et is ut descendere ex equo inclamauit, tum demum desilens 'experiri' inquit 'uolui, fili, satinscire te esse!', whence Val. ex. 2.2.4: cf. Plutarch Fabius 24, Moralia 196a. As we know from Livy (Plutarch has no idea of the context, and in the latter passage seems to put the incident at Rome), the elder Fabius was not proconsul but a legate, as in 292 Q.Fabius Maximus Rullianus was to his son Q.Fabius Maximus Gorges, in whose triumph he proudly rode. Although the office of proconsul had existed since 326 B.C. 1, and although in that very year of 213 Q.Claudius marcellus and R.Ca. Cornelli Scipiones were all proconsuls, and the consul Ti.Sempronius Gracchus was to have his imperium prorogued in 212, it was not yet regular for a consul to serve the next year pro consule.

1. When Q.Publilius philo (cos.11.327 B.C.) served pro consule and triumphed (Livy 23.12; 26.7) according to Dion. Hal. 6.15 Q.Fabius Vibalianus fought at the Cremera, according to Livy 3.4.10 Quintius served in 464; these reports must be rejected, cf. Ogilvie on Livy 3.4.10.
But a generation before Claudius a proconsul had brought about a disaster by not yielding to a consul. In 105 B.C. the consul Gnaeus Manlius begged the previous year's consul, currently pro cons, Q. Servilius Caepio, in the light of the legate Scævulus's capture by the Cimbri, to join forces with him; Caepio would not co-operate, and insulted the enemy envoys for dealing with the consul and not with him. The result was total rout at Arausio on 6 October. It is quite possible that in the ensuing arguments the history-books were ransacked (and if necessary rewritten), in the usual manner, to provide suitable precedents; and that Claudius's version derives from a supporter of the consul's, who wanted to prove by precedent that Caepio should have done as bidden. Indeed the alleged maius imperium of a consul, despite Cicero Phil. 4.9 "omnes enim in consulis iure et imperio debent esse provinciae", was rather shaky in actual practice; cf. Syms, Roman Revolution 162n.

None of this will have passed through Ceiius's head; but we should remark that he often cites Claudius and never mentions Livy, this preference being based not on historical merit but on style; cf. Marache, Critique littéraire 233 sqq.

I ignore the $h(\zeta)$ of Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan languages, which is voiced $[b]$. It is treated like any other consonant.
The Latin, like the Greek, was weakly articulated; this is obvious from the uncertainty of its use and from its prosodical irrelevance. In rustic and vulgar Latin it was often dropped, or hypercorrectly added; but urbanity was not always certain which usage to adopt. The grammarians knew only one reliable test, Sabine $f = \text{Latin } h$; yet arena (Sabine *irasena*, Varro *LL 7.27*) did not ultimately prevail over arena. Etymology was a will-o’-the-wisp: ortus for hortus might be derived from orior (Varro ap. Charis. *GLK* 1.32.7 = 103.7 Barwick), humor for uxor from huma (Varro *LL* 5.24).

The voiceless plosives $p$ $t$ $k$ were properly unaspirated but in the late Republic came in certain words to receive aspiration in educated mouths. Cicero records at Orator 160 how he long held out against this usage, but had in the end to concede on pulcher Cethegus triumphus Cartago, while standing firm on Orciuius Iato

Oto Saeocio sepulcrum corona lacrims: cf. Quintilian 1.5.20.

1. In the quantitative verse of Arabic and Persian $h$ makes position like any other consonant. In Spanish verse, which is syllabic, $h$ from Latin $f$, or of Germanic or Arabian origin, prevented synaloepha till it ceased to be pronounced during the 10th century; cf. French $h$ aspiré, whose consonantal effect has survived its phonetic abolition (it was still pronounced among the educated in the 17th century). In early Germanic alliterative verse, $h$ is treated like any other consonant; but in Middle English, where the sound had become weaker, it is often ignored in alliteration.

2. One might deduce from such spellings as SURREXU *CLAANO* (*CLL* 1.626; note the implied nominative *Corintum*) or such loan-forms as *burrus* <*perfectus*, *barbus* <*fætus* (cf. English *gay* < French *gay*), that these consonants were slightly aspirated in Latin (*Allen, *Vox Latina*" 12-3) It is possible that the absence of phonemic opposition between aspirated and unaspirated did permit a slight facultative aspiration; but it was not noticeable to Greek ears (it consistently in transcription) nor comparable with that of an *arrius*. We may note that $\phi$ also appears as $v$: *Φίλπος > philippes* and $\phi$ *ballaena*.

3. Contrast Quintilian 12.10.57: prudenter enim qui cum int rogresset rusticum testem an Amphionem nosset, replete eo, detraexit aspirationem breuiantique sub nomine syllabam, et ille cum sic optime norat. See *Hofschweizer Kleine Schriften* 425 sqq.
It is noteworthy that several of these words are *cognomina* (cf. *Gracchus*); probably the aspiration served to make the name sound more *distingue*. Such considerations were certainly in *Cn. Marius*’s mind (Catullus 84); he also added hyper-correct aspirations before vowels.

The correct use of aspiration was a requisite for urbane diction: *Rutilius Flaccus* 39 Swendod ap. Gell.13.6.3 "Rusticus fit sermo si adspires perperan". This held good even (or especially) when the aspirate was no longer in ordinary use (*Augustine Confessions*).

For spelling-conventions regarding *H* between two vowel-letters see *Suetonius* and *Vehemens* § 3.

The letter-name (pronounced ) is followed by *littera*, with which the concord (*illam*) is made; this is Gellius’s normal practice.

Occasionally, however, he uses letter-names by themselves, and when he does so gives them neuter concords: "*scripsit*" 7.14.2, cf. 11.17.7, 5.21.8, 9.14.3, 11.5.2, "per ino ".

For the *siue* clause cf. 7.7.1 "Caiae Taracine siue illa Rufetia est"; similarly *Terentianus Maurus* GLK 6.331.213 "H littera siue est nota quae spirat anhylum". Varro denied that *H* was a letter, reducing it to a mere mark of aspiration;¹ we are not told his reasons, but from those given by other grammarians they seem to have been that the aspirate was a modification of the vowel rather than an independent sound, and that it was not marked by a separate letter

¹. *Sercius* GLK 5.519.11; *Cassiodorus* 7.152.16; *Friscian* 9.13.10. Cf. *Onomastica de . . . Terenti Varronis libris grammaticis* (1864) 93ff. For arguments see *Pseudo "Fratus"* (no. 4.222.4; *Terentianus Maurus* 6.331.213; *Velius Longus* (despite his own opinion) 7.52.3.
in the (standard) Greek alphabet. The former statement is indeed phonetically accurate, but one would like some reassurance that it was a genuine observation, rather than a deduction from the Greek orthography. (This last, of course, was purely accidental: an aspirating dialect adopted the otherwise superior alphabet of a psilotic one.) Scaurus (Gk. 7.23.3 sqq), Longus (7.52.3), and "Probus" (4.50.15) maintain it is a letter: it was in old Attic, and is written like a letter among letters.

The trivial dispute was eventually resolved in a perversely ingenious way: Vergil's *terga fatigamus hasta* (6.610) having been taken to show lengthening before ℣, Christian poets sometimes treated it as a full consonant, after both vowels and consonants. When ℣ was so treated, it was called a letter; when otherwise, as a mark of aspiration.

H litteram ... inserebant eam ueteres nostri: cf. 3.10.5 "Dies deinde dillos, quibus alcyones hienne anni in aqua sidulantur, eos quoque septem esse dicit"; 17.2.11 "Graece quoque *Dei voc eis pese* uitum in non est". So Cato *grat.fr.206* Malcovati (Gell. 4.2.26)

---

1. The phoneme /h/ is "a kind of breathy modification of the following vowel" (Allen, *Vox Latina* 43) "strong, voiceless onset of the vowel in question" (Gimson, *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English* 186 quoted by Allen: *Vox Graeca* 52n); "just breath ... shaped by the vowel which follows" (J. W. Thistell *German Pronunciation and Phonology* 114; a work containing much of general phonetic interest.)

2. *Mar.Vict.* Gk. 6.229.14; Cledonius 5.2-8, *fr.Bob.* 7.539.8 - The invalidity of the argument from Vergil 6.610 was recognized by Bede, 7.230.23 sqq, who compares *aug.10.68*: he supports the usage, more suo, by citations from Christian poets. In his famous hymn *Pange lingua* *Machonici Aristotelis* writes:

```
er medullam /kret indepastis unde tecerat
so vegetable /kret indepastis unde tecerat

esse necessas /kret indepastis unde tecerat
hic accidat sed necessas /kret indepastis unde tecerat
```

(1.2.3, 17, 19)
"illi unie petitur, ei potius credendum esse"; for other parallels see Hertz "vidicisae Gellianae alterae" 63-70; Hache 43-4; see also 2.20.4, "de multis solisque defectionibus ... in eis qui causa reperienda".

It is true that in general aspiration was less and less used in Latin as time went on; but Gellius's statement is an over-simplification. Quintilian 1.5.20-1 "cuius (sc.aspirationis) quidem ratio mutata cum temoriibus est: parcissime ea ueteres usi etiam in uocalibus, cum aestus ircoque ritebant; diu deinde seraturne in consonantibus aspirarent, ut in uocibus et in triumplis; erupit breui tempore minus usus, ut chorona chenturiones praechones etiam nunc in inscriptionibus manant; quae de ro Catulli mobile epigramma est. (21) Inde durat ad nos usque uelmonter et componemore et mihi; nam nache quoque pro pe apud antiquos trapoediarum praecipue scriptores \[uteribus libris iminimus\]. Apart from the errors in the last sentence (cf. the note on uelmonter 83) this is a valuable account. Cicero's statement (Orator 160) that he knew "ita maiores locutos esse ut nasquam nisi in uocali aspiratione uterentur".

inserebant ea ex ueteres nostri piecisque uocibus uerborum firmandis reborandisque: "les anciens, chez nous, l'inséraient pour soutenir et renforcer la sonorité de beaucoup de mots" (Marache). The dative gerundive of purpose may be compared with nuctus costellaria 288 "purpura aetati occultandaest", Sallust "historiae 3.3"aurenbrecher "perundae pecuniae genitus"; the construction is eased by the dative-taking verb inserebant. Plerisque of course is used here

1 Add Holf "Latinsche Untersprach. 499, pp. 103-5."
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in its later Latin sense of "many", as often in Gellius; cf.
Servius GLX 4-422.34 "H a pierisque adspirationis f;ota, a
plerisque consonans habetur".
Euphonic and. psychological explanations were easy to propound
when philological science was ill-developed, arid ai'ter all are
sometimes correct,

'fhe present one contains this much or truth:

tn at energetic speec:;, at least as reflected in interjections, tends
towards aspiration,
besides j'arre.'

Ml

(

^™*V

•.

ijarre.1
/

So "hey.1 " heus . fevov. besides e3 c<. Spanish
,
——— »

"giddy-up", and possibly haue : even if this really

is from the Hioenician, Plautus's auo (Jroenulus 924, al) neglects the
[tj of '^:-^ "uiuite". - jjouis the _ious (the Holy liomar, niiuperor
j-udhuwig I, d.840) is supposed to have said as he lay dying "huz,
^l *•*•*•
/
huz" (Old High German MZ "out")^?^^:: "1'he Romance uari^-uages"
&*r ut

(liondon,196o) 33'^Ju_t_so^u^s__earumi esset uiridior ue^et^iorque:
with a comparative, instead of quo , is found at 1.3.10 "nee ut

modestior fiat, sed ut lepidior" , 1.11.1 "ut moderatiores modulatioresque fierent"; ci'.vJicero 2 Verr. 4-64-

-''or uiridior "livelier"

(cf. I. 26. 17, .. 13- 21- 13) see V^rpjil AE b. 304 "sed cruda deo uiridisque
senectus", Seneca Oedipus 297 -o "si foret uiridis -ahi/calidusque
sanguis, pectore exciperem deu._:" (cf .Sophocles Trachiniae 1055

^y^^y oty^ )studio et exemplu liriruae Atticae :

Ju st athdu s ( 13 ^7 - 10 , o n

contrasting Epic cf^ and AtticokSgo
as saying V^f*^' 1 t^f *i) v^bw* «'

27 ),

quotes -i.elius Jionysius

'/Tr'feoi. Or. Lent z rhilolo/qis

Greek show the aspirate
</
extcnaed to words that should not take it: --jtic has 0£»$ "boundary"

Suppl. 1. 7^3fi'-

-I-;- aspirating aialecta of


(Horae), but Heraclean ὀκτώ "eight", and so on. Buck, Greek Dialects 556c. Some words such as ἠπισ and ὑνος, unaspirated in Attic, took an aspirate in the ἱέρα: W. Schulze, Ν. Schr. 517.

2 ἤχους: on the contrary it was ἤχος as everywhere else. Gellius has a garbled version of the etymology given by Ἀσταθίους:

γίνεται ἡ ἀρχή τοῦ ἐκκέων καὶ ὑνέω, ὥστε δὴ ἡ ἀρχή ἐκκέων μὲ ν ἐκκέων μὲ ν

with the aspirate lost before ἀ; but Ἀσταθίους never suggests that the Athenians (or anyone else) ever said ἤχος, which indeed he implicitly denies by citing τοῦ ἄνθρωπος ἀρχής ἀρχής ἀρχής ἀρχής from Aristophanes (fr. 525).

Prof. odd: A. Skutsch's ἱερεῖν palaeographically easy (the παρέδοσις being a transliteration); but there is no evidence the aspirate in this word was thought to be an Attic peculiarity. It certainly was not: I.G. 5.1.213 (Laconia, 5th century B.C.)

Εὐρ. Κέρ. Βίους: though it is absent in compounds (Κερίκες καὶ)

Etymologically one would have expected ἐπίτηδες from I. εὐκήδες.

Hertz (Opuscula Gelliana 52.), after listing various conjectures, proposes "ζ' pron(omen)"; that is the pronoun ζ', meaning "she", etymologically identical with Gothic si, O.N.G. si > German sie, but regarded by the ancients as the nominative of ζ' οὐ οὐ, used by Sophocles, fr. 471 Pearson, and wrongly conjectured at ζ. 410. He cites Apollonius Dyscolus 70c καὶ ἀλήθειας παρὰ Ποδινος ἀυτοῦς; ζ' δὲ ἂν ἠμφατίκος ἄμφατίκος; some grammarians give the word as ζ' (Lentz's Herodian, 2.550.14, cf. Endendt-Genthe "Lexicon Sophocleum" s.v.). Gellius's source would then have read ζ' in Sophocles and

1 926.15 (on ζ. 2116), cf. 437.14 (on Δ.), 1734.42 (on μ. 251).
in Homer. This is ingenious but no more; conjecture is made the harder by the near-certainty that whatever Cellius wrote he was wrong anyway.

3. lachrymus: cf. Cicero Orator 160. CIL I 21222.2 and ART-6.2.1616-1617, ANORAVE AD LACHRYMIS (i.e. "a.m.plere quest lacrimis"), anticipating the mediaeval spelling.

sepulchrum: CIL I 21107 SEPWIB. Cicero i.c. states that he had to concede on pulcher, but that educated usage still permitted sepulcrum; and although Varro declared for pulcher, this distinction long maintained itself: Caper GIL 7.93.2 "pulchrum cum h scribendum, sepulcrum sine h." (Charisius GIL 1,73.19 = 93.3 Barwick) "Pulcrum Varro adspirari negat, ne duabus consonantibus media intercederet aspiratio, quod minime rectum antiquis uidebatur; unde et sepulcrum hodieque manet, quod sit seorsum a pulchro propter recusationem coloris". Servius on Vergil Georgics 3.223 "tria enim tantum habebant nomina (sc. maiores) in quibus ilitteram sequeretur aspiratio: sepulchrum orclus pulcher; e quibus pulcher tantum hodie recipit aspirationem" (At the note on incohere).

ahenum: CIL I 255.26 (106 B.C.) ....; consistently aheneus in our LSS of Cato's de agri cultura; Servius on Vergil Aen. 213 "huic aemus nomini maiore aspiracionem dabant, nam ahena dicebant"; so in Umbrian, ahenes "ahenis". Etymologically the adjective is i.e. ayenesnos from *ayes- (whence by s.ncope asea); with a different suffix ayessinosvestan "metallic", etc.

ahen (orn) eburn "ahenis". (The form aheneus is a recharacterization after ferreus aureus argenteus.) And separating vowels in matu
is found in the other Italic languages: Umbrian ocren pihær
"arcis piandaæ", st a h u "sto": Oscan pil-ih-ii' "i̯ri̯o", st a h i n t "stant" vs. st a i t "stat". This may be purely
graphic (cf. French envahir, German ebern - v.s'); but it is
quite possible that a [j] sound was sometimes pronounced, as can
happen e.g. in French: P. Fassy Les Sons du Francais s. 205. See too
Sommer p. 192; ... Devine "The Latin Thematic Genitive Singular"

us-hemens: the pronunciation the is metrically attested at
Cicero brutae 53; Catullus 50. 21; Lucretius 2. 1024, Horace Epistles
2. 2. 120; us-hæmens not till Marcus Caesar writes to Pronto (B.P.
...Caes.. 3. 7. 2) "nos istic uhementer aestuauus - habes en
hendi. quellabum ingenium". This evidence, however, is not
as convincing as it might be: the word is so unpoetics (Axelson
Unpoetische Worte 60) as to be confined, as far as verse is concer-
ned, to the comic poets and a few hexameter-writers. Since even if
the original form were us-hemens it must have been colloquially
pronounced the the fact that no comic passage requires the
one scansion or the other is of small significance; while in the
hexameter-writers (save those already named) it occurs in only two
metrical formulae: uhementi- - ending a line (trattius, five
times; Statius Silvae 1...83) and - vv - uhemens beginning one
(Juvenal 9. 11, 11.34, 15.196). It will be seen that each of these
authors has only one formula: nothing can be deduced about
pronunciation. Cellius treats the as the original form; so does
Quintilian (1. 5. 21), who however implies the same of co. 

1 Cf. Cicero's to his Gель 6. 54, Att. 7. 21
and Scaurus volK 7.19.1 sqq and Velius Longus 7.65.14 sqq
also prefer intus and re-wondere, the latter pronunciation on the
grounds that the prima positio is "prendo"; both authors present
these doctrines in Varronian contexts.1

We are left, therefore, to etymologize for ourselves. The
contraction u whites > u pientes is easy to explain (cf. latitude); but
whence comes u whites ? W. Schulze (Ks. Schm. 1475n) suggested a
derivation *uehemenes- from *weh- (ueho); as if "plein d'en ortement".
This was anticipated in antiquity: Scaurus i.e. tells us "quidam
putant adiciendam (sc. aspirationem) quoniam non aliud putant
esse quam alterius ferri†, cum huic uerbo sine dubitatione
aspiretur". The words alterius ferri are corrupt, but the last
clause shows that some form of ueho lies underneath.

On the other hand, the derivation u e + mens is attractive; how
then did the spelling with ehe arise ? In Umbrian as written in
the Latin alphabet a long vowel may be represented by the corresponding
letter doubled about an H (Buck, "Anm. über die Umbrian" 26).
This graphy is found in Latin with the cognomen uhala "armpit"
(Cicero Orator 153; the cos. of 427 B.C. is sometimes called
Axilla, see Broughton 1892 ad loc.); that a trisyllabic spelling-
pronunciation later came into use is shown by Diomedes volK 1.424.1
"A uocalis per se facit syllabas et breues et longas,
iterque conexa cum aliis tam praeposita quam velia filiensaque,
ut uhala". This could have happened with uehemenes; but one must
then ask why other words with ue do not show this development.

---
1In Scaurus the passage comes between two ot. expressly taken from
Varrro, in Velius the next sentence derives (hortus from orior;
as we have seen this is Varronian.
2See too Mar. Vinc. CIL 7.1219 = I. 64 Mariotti, with his note(p217).
3 Cf. volK 5.1-10, 6.5.6 longe quod est re usque in uehemenes.
The explanation could be a popular association with *ueho*.

We must therefore choose between an unclear etymology and a straightforward sound-change \( \overline{\text{ueho}} \rightarrow \overline{\text{uehens}} \) on the one hand and on the other a simple etymology and a complicated - not sound-change, but extraneously motivated modification \( \overline{\text{uehens}} \rightarrow \overline{\text{uehens}} \). Metre and the ancient grammarians both appear to favour the latter hypothesis, but the former can be otherwise explained and the latter can be wrong.

As a postscript, be it noted that Quintilian (1.5.21), who regarded as intrusive the [\( h \)] of *uehens*, * UEFAHEMARE*, and *UHI*, claims to have found *meho* in ancient texts, especially of tragedy. Since *meho* and *nihil* are often written where metre requires *ni* and *nil*, it is possible that a spelling *mehe* was developed; that a disyllabic pronunciation was ever used we are not required to believe. Ribbeck once wanted to read it in *Tacitus*, *Fr. A3*; but it is better to read *ei* for *et*:

"Quid, quod - ei mihi! -
piget paternum nomen, maternum pudet
prorari?"

**incohare** Herta: *incohere* RV *incoare* 1. Since the words cited show, in order, aspirated consonant, intervocalic aspiration, initial aspirate, Hertz's correction is necessary to maintain the sequence.

All three spellings are found in MSS and inscriptions: *MCOAVI* in the copy of Augustus's Res Gestae (420) set up at Antiochiae risidiae (Yalvac), but *NCOAVI* in the Ankara copy; *INCOARTIS* CBL

1. At 5.21.4 Hertz prints *incohatusque* with the note "*incohatusque FR*" leaving us to deduce that \( V \) reads "*incohatusque*" at 12.1.17 he prints *incohaturum* with no note: at 11.1.17 *incoch tus* with *incoatis* cited *FR*. *
6.31034.7 (102 A.D.); InCIL 6.23397, INCNIT 6.23476
PERFECT: CIL 10.1690.8, 1691.9; also INSTVIA CIL 11.4127.4
(Narnia, 218 A.D.), whence Old Provencal enar (ML 4359 b).

According to Diomedes GLA 1.365.16, Julius Modestus favoured
inchoo, Verrius Flaccus and Suetonius inchoo. Servius on Vergil
Georg. 3.223 makes inchoo the earlier form: "reboant resultant,
repeuant; est antem Graecum uerbum, nam apud Latinos m\[\[muerum
est quod ante 0 finalem 0 habeat excepto inchoo, quod taken maiores
alter scriebant, aspirationem interponentes uocales, et
dicebant inchoo. Tria enim tantum habebant nomina in quibus 0
litteram sequeretur aspiratio, sepuchrum orchus pulcher, e quibus
pulcher tantum hodie recipit aspirationem" (cf. on sepuchrum above).

Compare "Probus" 1.382.7 "-ho primae est, -haui facit: neque post 0
litteram H Latina uerba regit exceptis nominibus tribus quae supra
possui pulcher Orchus lurcho, neque 0 littera ante 0 litteram in
Latinorum uerborum prima persona referitur (he goes on to explain
that reboo is Greek).

Terentius Scarrus 7.12.5sqq quotes the opinion that inchoo
should be written "quoniam a Chao dictum sit, quod fuerit initium
rerum" (cf. F.A. 95.4) Verrius Flaccus, however, derived inchoare
from cophum: "cohae enis apud ueteres mandum significat" (Diomedes Lo.)
a misinterpretation of ennui's metaphor (1.11.545) "uix soluam comple
cohum terroribus caeli". According to Varro L.A. 5.15 "sub inco
medio causam quod bura extrema addita oppilatur uocatur cohun a caue
(bura or buris being "pars aratri posterior decemurata", Nonius
113.3). The etymology from causos will be correct: cf. Greek

\[The garble in F.A. 34, 264 "cohae iorum quo teno buris cum inco
colligatur a cohribendo dictum" need not here detain u.\]
The H in cohun, incohare will be parallel to that in ahemus; but rustic speech may be responsible for the form incohare.

helluari: P.L. 99,10 "heluo dictus inmoderate bona sua consume
ab eluendo, qui aspiretur ut auditas magis expopretur; fit enim uox incitatione." Cassiodorus GLK 7,201,8 "E enim sequente plerumque gravior enimantatur ('is aspirated'), ut heluus heluo helucus helops et quidquid ab unicuoque eorum fit". We do not know the etymology; Gellius probably derived it from eluo as Festus did.

honora honusta: these forms may have been made on the supposed derivation (Varro L.L.5,73) "honos ab onere: itaque honestum dicitur quod oneratum, et dictum 'onis est honos, qui sustinet rem publicam'" (qui here = siquis.) Etymologically the aspirate is adventitious, cf. Sanskrit anas- "cart". Orthographia Jansiedlensis GLK Supp.298,21 "honos si de honore cum H, omis si de onere sine H; onustus onerosus similiter sine H"; by then both honos and omis sounded [onos].

4 istius: very often used in Gellius for hic (cf. Spanish este)
cf. 2.7,9 "neque istan...neque autemilla 4.1,9 "ista quae dixi".

But the original use is occasionally found: 15,31,10 "librum istum tibi totum legas."

1. "chele" in Scap. 2,74 supposed incohare to be a morphological parallel to incohare anfangen from the root of Oscan khaud "capiat, fange". This is a less economical hypothesis.

5 quonia: for quoniam introducing an additional note ("while we are on the subject") cf. 3.16.22, 5.6, 9.9.12 (Neubauer p.35).
5 Fidius Optatum: we do not know who he was, nor indeed whether this be his right name: if so these are both cognomina. Alternatively, he might have been Fidius Optatus; for the gens Fidia cf. Asconius 55C: Accusarunt C. Fidius, C. Asponius Cn.f. Seius ... (the defendant was L. Saepeius L.f., Milo's chief gangster, accused under the lex alia de ui), and from Spain CIL 2.834, 835, 2153. Hertz tentatively suggested the grammaticus's nomen was Caelius, since Pronto Epp. ad amicos 1.9 is addressed to Caelius Optatus; but this is Pronto the consul commending Sardius Saturninus to his attention. Unlike his sons ("doctissimos iuvenes" l.c.), Sardius Saturninus is not stated here or elsewhere to have had any scholarly pretensions (he is addressed or mentioned in 1.10, 1.22, and 1.25); nor is Caelius Optatus, who at CIL 6.2736 (Lambaesis) is described as F. CAELIUS OPTATUS LEG. (he is also named in CIL 6.17953 (Lena'a, 166A.D.) Even were it palaeographically plausible, the suggestion cannot stand. librum ... mirandae uetustatis existimatur in Sigillariis uiginti aureis, quern ipsius Verrii fuisset

expositori: cf. 5.4.1 "apud Sigillaria forte in librarium ... ibi expositae erant Fabii annales, bonae atque sincerae uetustatis libri, quos uenditor sine mentis esse contendebat"; no doubt we have here similar sales-talk underlying "quem ... credebatur". For other references to CIL 1.33 see 4.16.2; 9.14.1.6; 13.5.11; 1.9.5; for allegedly autograph Verrii cf. 5.14.7, 13.21.b.

Shopkeepers can lie, or be deceived by the previous owner; we
can do nothing but check the readings themselves. To take the others first, at 9.14.7 Gellius is inclined to believe those who claim to produce from a Vergil autograph "libra dies solumque pares ubi recerit horas" at Georg. 1.208; but why, instead of the normal everyday genitive dìi or die should Vergil use dies, not only archaic but producing a needless signatism with soìni?

At 13.21.4 Probus cites urbis at Georg. 1.25 from a copy "manus ipsius correctum", but urbes at με 3.106. Probus may have taken trouble over authenticating his manuscript, but the most we can say is that these are indeed the better readings on euphonic grounds, as Probus says: "urbìsne invisisere" rhymes internally, "centum urbes habitant magnas" would sound less opulent with the narrower vowel. This I fully accept; but it does not prove the manuscript was corrected by Vergil. A similar (to my ear equally justified) variation is cited in 110-11 for με 10.350-1 with no reference to special ...; even if it does come from Probus and his ... it proves nothing.

Any doubts we may have about these MSS are reinforced by 1.21.2 sqq, where Julius Hyginus claims to have found anaror at Vergil Georg. 2.247 "in libro qui fuerit ex dono atque familia Vergilii". The vulgate text in Gellius's day, as in our MSS, was "et sapor indicium faciet manifestus et ora tristia temptantia sensu torquebit anaror".

There is nothing wrong with that: the objection (Gell. §3) that "ipse sapor sensus sit" can be made only by those who have forgotten indic 1.246 "it mare proruptum et pelago primit arua sonanti" (cf.

1.600 Memorini, § 6.1.47, who cites "et or ... anaror" as inspired by Lucilus 1.401 "vele tecum ora sapor".)
eg Aen.9.2. uolus alti uenis et caeco carpitur igni
Housman on Manilius 1.535). This line also illustrates a characteristic
Vergilian schema present in [i.e., 1.246-7]; of one subject are
predicated two verbs, linked by "and", the second modified by an
adjectively qualified ablative. Amaror, by contrast, whether
we read sensus or sensu - both equally otiose - makes a hideous
change of subject; nor is its Lucretian provenance any guarantee
against its having been interpolated by someone familiar with Vergil's
habit of imitating Lucretius. It follows that either the MS did
not come from Vergil's house and household or interpolations were
already being made under that very roof. We are certainly not
relieved by any such assertions from the duty of exercising our
critical faculties. 1

As regards [allemus] it is clear that the ancient Vergilian vulgate
was 2.155 without the H, as in our manuscripts, but that occasionally
抄ists added the H either in the text (Gell. §6; cf. above as the lemma
to the Romanus-scholion at this same line Georg. 1.296) or as a
correction (Gell. §5; cf. the Medicæan corrector at [i.e., 1.449]). Unless
we choose to believe that Probus or some other ancient editor went
through the text methodically falsifying Vergil's spelling, we may
assume that he wrote the word without H, and that the claim made for
Optatus's MS "ipsius Vergili fuisse" is of relevance not to its text
but to its price.

1. Cf. 1.7.1 "in libro spectatae fidei Tironiana cura atque disciplina
facta", 13.21.16 "in uno atque in altero antiquissimae fidei libro
Tironiano"; their readings do not commend themselves to editors
("hanc sibi rem praesidio tuturum" 2 Verr. 5.167, "in manifesto peccatu"
ib. 1.194).


3. Send again a Morning 3.496, 4.473, 6.41, ib. 1.101. - I am glad to find myself in
agreement with G. P. Gold (American Historical Review 74. 167, 161) who
states that this relates to an article on sea-marks with G. P. Gold (Neues Jahrbuch für Germanistische Philologie 74. 167, 161) who
states that this relates to an article on sea-marks with G. P. Gold (Neues Jahrbuch für Germanistische Philologie 74. 167, 161).
Siillatiis: cf. 5.4.1; dishes were even sold there (v. 32. 102.1), even an "essedum argenteum sumptuose fabricatum" (Suet, Claud. 1.4); the market was held in the porticus Argonautarum, later in that of Trajan's thermae (Schol, Juv. v. 154). For the feast and the clay sigilla see Macr, Sat. 1.19.24, 1.11.46-50; Sen, ep. 12.3; RE 2 (A.3.) 2270.

niginti aureis: 500 denarii (vio 55.12.4; Lucian, Pseudologista 30). Papyrus was expensive (see Raenkel, Horace 20 with v. 5, and the literature there cited), but there is no more comparison between this and normal book-prices than between the sums fetched by First Folios and those paid for ordinary printed works. A de luxe edition of Martial bk 1 might be expected to sell for 5 denarii (Marti, 1.117-15), and a cheap one for 6-10 sestertii (1.66.4); the small bk 13 would sell at 4 sestertii, though even at two the bookseller would make a profit (13.3.1-4). Obviously the price asked and paid depended on the assumption that the manuscript was a Vergil autograph.

uestibulum...aena: Vergil, Aen. 2.469-70. In the Gellian 1.33 aena, guaranteed by the context, is corrupted to ahena. The same reading is reported by Hertz ad loc. for the 1.33 of Macrobius, Sat. 5.12.2 (a passage quite independent of Gellius), where Jan prints ahena, Wysenhardt and Wilis aena, all without mentioning the codices.

6 aut foliis undam trepidi desquamat aeni; in fact Vergil wrote (Georg. 1.295-6)

aut dulcis musti Volcano accogit umorem
et foliis undam trepidi desquamat aeni.

1. At Statius Silv. 1.6.7-9 the raw materials for a de luxe libellus come to ten asses; this is a joke (cf. Vollmer and a. ad loc.), not appreciated by Friedländer, Sitten-geschichte Romae, ed. 9.2.222. - Nor is the even more outrageous price in Lucian's fantasy relevant.
The scholion in R¹ gives *aheni* twice: "*aheni: uas in quo coquitur uimum. et trepidum dicit quia quod bullit quasi tremere uidetur. aheni: ex aere facti". It will be seen that this scholion implies the reading "*trepid" given by Gellius, *Schol. Enee. ad loc.* (Fleckelsen loc. cit., Brevis expositio *ad loc.*), the second hand of P,¹ and the ninth-century MSS; this reading is obviously right, and explained by the scholion in R. The first hand of P, and the second hand in R, give *trepidii*; (cf. *trepidius ... menis* from the first hand of R). If these be not mere errors, they are trivializations: the cauldron is warm, leaves tremble.

¹. Throughout this note P and R refer to the MSS of Virgil usually so designated.
Since such charges as were heard by a jury-court or quaestio could be brought by other persons than the party aggrieved, it could happen that after the initial postulatio there came forward more than one would-be accuser. Which of them should prosecute was decided by diuinatio: the quaestio of the appropriate jury-court sat with an unsworn panel of iudices (who might or might not later serve on the trial-jury), while the disputants made speeches extolling their own claims and belittling their rivals; there were no witnesses or exhibits. The panel, after hearing the speeches, voted all together to decide who should be accorded the nominis delatio, that is appointed prosecutor; if a rejected claimant or other person unacceptable to this prosecutor asked to be a subscriptor, the panel voted on his request.

The three known diuinaciones took place in 70 B.C., when Verres was accused of repetundae; in 54 B.C., when the same charge was brought against Gabinus (Cicero, F.3.1.15, 3.2.1); in 52 B.C., when Milo was accused of ambitus (Asconius 39.5-10). Quintilian (3.10.3) speaks of diuinaciones as still being held, occasionally between informers disputing the reward; Gellius too has the present, which he is not the man to have blindly copied from his sources. But at

1. It is a hearing to accord the nominis delatio already postulated, Cic.A. Caec.4. Unsworn panel and hearing sine testibus et sine tabulis, as—Isa.99,1-5 Baiter. Qaestor presiding, Cic.A.F.3.1.15 with 3.2.1, and Asconius 39.5-10. In the speech against Caecilius the president (presumable, i.e.) is ignored. Different composition of panel and trial-jury, Cic.2 Verr.1.15; ibid, the panel refused Caecilius permission to subscribe, c'. the Moratones of Cap.51. Diuinatio of hearing first, F.3.1.1, of speech Ps-Isa.99.1; the speech against Caecilius is cited by Gellius as de constitendo aequatore, 7.9.7; 13.25.9. But for diuinatio used of the speech of contio (Gell.18.7) and Sicur (Christophorus Wagen 776, with MacDowell's note of Gell.3.13.5).
least under the empire other procedures existed: Ulpian VIII disputationum (D.46.5.2.9), writing of the lex Julia de adulteriis controversis, states: "Sed et quotiens alii qui post maritum et patron accusare possunt ad accusandum prosiliunt, lege expressum est ut is cuius de ea re notio est de iusto accusatore constituat"; certain other such questions of precedence were not so regulated (D.46.5.2.8, 45.5.4.2), By Justinian's time the diuinatio, like the quaestio, had been long since given up: a passage from Ulpian II de officio consulis was blatantly wrenched from its original context and made to read (D.46.2.16) "si quaeres existant qui eum in publicis iudiciis accusare uolunt, iudex Ulpian wrote consul; lenel eligere debet eum qui accuset, causa scilicet cognita aestimatis accusatorum personis uel de dignitate uel ex eo quod interest uel aetate uel alia iusta de causa". The same criteria by and large as Cicero suggests in the speech against Caecilius, but a different procedure.

Neither Cicero's speech against Caecilius nor the various other references to this procedure contain any suggestion that the gods were asked to manifest their will; it therefore seems that the name diuinatio implies no more than human guesswork, as stated in Gavius Bassus's explanation as itself explained by Gellius; cf. Pseudissoconius 99.4-6 "alii, quod res agatur sine testibus et sine tabulis, et his remotis argumentis sola sequantur et quasi diuinent".1

1. quinam potissimum ... corruitatur: cf. Cic. Caec. 10 "si certamen inter
aliquos sit cui potissimum delatio detur". Note that Gellius often uses quisnam in indirect questions, as in §§ 5 and 6 below,

3. Gaius Bassus is cited "in commentariis suis" (3.19.1, 3.10.3); "liber de origine uerborum et uocabulorum" (3.19.1); "in libris quos de origine uocabulorum scripsit" (5.7.1); "de origine uocabulorum septimo" (11.7.4). Always he is cited for *et* for the *ratio* (2.4.4; 3.12.3) of an expression, a causal formula being regular in his explanations: 2.4.3, 3.19.2 & 3, 5.7.2 in direct citations, 3.10.4, 11.17.4 in paraphrases. See Hercklin *Sittermethode* 65-6; the *commentarii* and the *libri de origine uocabulorum* are no doubt identical.

4. * Nimis... imperfecta*: in spoken Latin adver of degree often headed the sentence, or at least were separated from the adjective or adverb modified: Mößelt "Syntactica" 2.3.7, Hisbet *ad* Cic. *Pis. 17* *Nimis* in Gellius often means no more than *ulade*, as in Early Latin and colloquial usage; cf. Augustine *enarratio in Psalms* 116.4 (PL 37.1509: *Serm. Christ, 40.167A*. *Sed aliter... Latina lingua sic abutitur ut nimis pro eo quod est ulade et positum inueniamus in litteris sacris et penamus in sermonibus nostris*; Wölflin *Auserwählte Schriften* 145-6, Hornann "lateinische Umgangssprache" 143, 192 (n. on 72.17), 202 (n. on 133.9).

5. Note the indicatives in *oratio obliqua*; for the quirks of Gellian usage in this respect see 2.2.5n.

*didicit*: a regular verb for the apprehension of a case, cf. e.g.

*didicistis* Cicero *2 Verr. 1.11; 2.6p; 3.198; 4.30*. *Docere* is correspondingly used e.g. *ib. 1.125-6, 5.4; 5.16*, etc. In England
the solicitor instructs the barrister; in Rome the orator
instructs the jury. Cr. Lysias 31.3 ἡ δὲ προσεκτίκη ἀνθρώπων
διδάσκων ἐν τούτῳ ἀκοδωμικρὰς ἔγχρων; Antiphon 5. e, b, etc.

6 cf. Pseudasconius 99.1 "diuinatio dicitur haec oratio quia non
de fato quaeritur (haec conjectura) sed de futurō, quae est
diuinatio, uter debeat accusare." Like the explanation in this
paragraph, that is an attempt to relate this use of diuinatio
with the word's other meaning.

1. Zumpt compares Rhet. Hierem. 1.18 "conjecturalis (sc. constitutio)
est cum de facto controversia est".
...as we find it. Quint. 12. 14 14...
CHAPTER 5

For comparison in ancient ethical, literary, and other writers, see I. Focke, Hermes 58 (1923) 327-368. In literary criticism the method may be used simply to bring out each writer's peculiar qualities (τὸν ἵσιον ἐκλύετον χαρὰν γὰρ Dion. Hal., Isaeus 13), or to determine relative merit, or for other purposes: Focke 342.

It may be noted that Quintilian disclaimed any intention of comparing Demosthenes and Cicero (io. 1.105 "cum praeertim non sit in propositi ut eum demostheni comparrem hoc tempore"), then contrasts their styles: ı. 106 "in eloquendo aliqua diversitas: densior hic, ille copiosior etc". A full-scale 6γνέους demanded rather more.

How far Favorinus went towards a 6γνέους of Lysias and Plato we do not know: he may have written at length, he may have made this single observation οβίτερ, nor do we know whether he was influenced by Caecilius of Calpacte, who ἐν τοίς ἐνδε λυσίου συγγεγράφαν ἀπεδόθηκε εἰ πάντες λυσίας ἱκετής Πλάτωνος ἀπεφαρέσθαι (ἀφικόμενον ἖ς γὰρ ἀναπότετον καὶ καθαρόν τὸν ρητορὸν προφητεύει κοιλοθήκη διηγηματίην τοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος ἤπαινος). (PseudoLonginus 32.8: see Oenloch, Caeciliii Calpactini fragmenta, nos. 150-152b, and for Caecilius's judgment on Lysias cf. Photius, Bibliotheca 469b13). Caecilius seems to have intended avenging the critique in Plato's Phaedrus: indeed ἀναρχηγήτων... συλλαγή τοῦ πρεσβύτου τοῦ Πλάτωνος may well be an answer to Phaedrus 235ε λυσίας τοῦ παῦσας ἐμπαρτήκης. It is quite possible that Caecilius provided the point as support for Favorinus; but even so there is no reason to suppose this criticism is not Favorinus's own. It is quite compatible with his academic allegiance: less so with Caecilius's loathing of Plato (ἐμᾶς ἵνα ἀγαθοφορεῖν τὸν Ἐυρυτόνον).
Although Gellius often represent his teachers as saying what he probably found in their books, there is no particular reason to doubt that this observation was indeed frequently on Favorinus's lips. That is not to say it did not occur in his writings; Barigazzi (test. 25) tentatively assigns it to the "Ἀριστοτέλεια", which certainly did discuss Plato's dialogues (frr. 45, 47); he identifies the ἔρει πλάσσει with the ἔρει ἵδα, quite plausibly (r. 179-1), which would seem to rule that out as the source. On the other hand, does not the balance of praise lie here rather with tyrannus than with Plato? It is better to say straight out we do not know where it comes from.

Barigazzi prints this chapter not as a fragment but as a testimonium (no. 25).

There are other chapters in which Gellius contrasts various authors' styles: notably 10.5, where passages are compared with admirable judgement from Cato, C. Gracchus, and Cicero, denouncing atrocities by Roman magistrates and promagistrates. The anecdote of Accius and Paucius in 13.2 is composed around a comparison; at 1.24 a ranking-list of Roman comic poets is cited from Volcacius Sedigitus. Most of the comparisons, however, are between Roman writers and their Greek originals; Gellius makes them in the form of judgments on the accuracy, but also on the elegance, of translations. Indeed, the translation of Greek into Latin was a subject that fascinated him; cf. the introductory note to 2.23: Gamberale passim.

lemma signateque Falster, designate cod. by dittography. "precisely, clearly"; uniting the two nuances seen separately at 2.6.6 "a ueteribus qui proprie atque signate locuti sunt" and Tertullian

Cf. Quintilian 8.2.9 "proprie dictum id est quo nihil inueniri possit significavius"
resurr. carn. 13 "Quid expressius atque signatius in hanc causam aut cui alii rei tale documentum?" Barigazzi (Gnomon 42. 1970.686) needlessly suggests consignatius; indeed we do find the word in Cellius with the same meaning as in this passage at 1.15.12

"Eupolilis quoque versus de id genus hominibus consignatissimae factus est: διδυμόν μας ἵππος ἠδοματότατος ἐγένετο", and in a slightly different sense at 1.25.8 "Graeci autem significantius consignatissimae cessationem istam pugnae pactician ἐυσκέρμων dixerunt", but there is nothing wrong with signateque.

Si. n. c.: cf. For this type of criticism Quintilian 10.1.106 "illii (sc. Xenostheni) nihil detrahi potest, huic (sc. Cicoroni) nihil amici".

commodatissimae: the adjective commodatus is known from Pliny (iii 22.33) and Quintilian 10.1.17), being then used by Apuleius; for the adverb cf. Pronto de orat. 18 "uerbum aliquod adquiras non fictum a te (nam id quidem absurdum est), sed usurpatum concinnius aut congruentius aut commodatius".

1. Tertullian is referring to the phoenix as evidence for resurrection; he continues by citing Psalm 91 (92 Heb.) 13 "et floreat" enim inquit "uel phoenix!". But this is a mistranslation of LXX δεκάλος ἐξ φοῖνικος ὄρυγγας, which in fact means "the righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree" (hebrew נְטֵה כָּנֹי הַפּוֹרָא); Vul. "justus ut palma florebit". The second half-verse, be it noted, declares that "he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon" (LXX less aptly נְטֵה נְכָר נְדַב "וט נְכָר לְבָנֹא פָּרָא")
Vergil, who is nowhere so far as we know named by Pronto or his correspondents, plays an important part in the *Hoctes Atticae*. He is frequently cited as an authority on Latin usage, and called "poeta uerborum diligentissimus" (2.20.11), "multae antiquitatis hominem sine ostentationis odio peritum" (5.12.13) "elegantissimus poeta" (20.54. cf. 17.10.6). He is defended against Hyginus's criticisms in 1.21 (by a change of text; but cf. 2.3.5n), 5.8 (where Hyginus recognized the construction of *men* 7.107, but prosaically denounced the zeugma; Gellius's explanation is false), 7.6; at 10.16, however, his criticisms are let stand, as are *rrobus*’s at 9.9.12-17 and Favorinus’s at 17.1.6-19. At 1.22.14 Gellius criticizes Vergil’s use of "supersit" at *Georg.* 3.10, at 13.27.3 he calls *men* 3.119 "ventre crudelissimos et quodam quasi ferumine inmissa fucation"; but both these criticisms are coupled with praise for other verses, and it is quite clear that Vergil’s errors are regarded as minor blemishes in comparison to his overall merits. Despite Hadrian’s well-known tastes (..., Hadr. ib. 4), 2 Vergil’s continued popularity is attested by Gell. 20.10.2, where a grammarian is made to say "siquid igitur ex Vergilio Plato Eunio quaerere habes, quaeras licet".

Ainnaeus Cornutus was born at Leptis, and became a notable

1."studio"Cornelissen, cf. 5.35, 5.21.1; rightly unless"sine ostentationis odio"means"ita ut non propter ostentationem odiosus fuerit"(cf. Hortz ad loc.) I accept "studio".

2.Hadrian’s influence should not be exaggerated. His main interest was Greek; he preferred Antimachus to Homer (Dio 69.6.6), and the professors at his court were only too anxious to win his disfavour for talents greater than his own (Dio 69.5.3sqq; Ammianus, Aen.

3.Suda sv. *Karvneus*; interpolator at Step. yz s.v. *feci* (1b. s.v. *feci*, a similar interpolation makes him a thecrite; there is unfortunately a lacuna between *Nepos* and *Nepos*.)
teacher of rhetoric and philosophy at Rome; among his pupils was the poet Persius, for whose legacy to him see *uía fersi* 35 sqq. Nero made him his literary collaborator, which led to *relegatio in insulam*:

Sio. 62. 29. He wrote a commentary on Virgil (Charisius CIC. 1. 127. 20 = 162. 10 Barwick), a treatise "de enuntiatione uel orthographia" (Cassiodorus 7. 147. 3, cf. ib. 22-154. 11); and another "de figuris sententiarum" (Gell. 9. 10. 5), in which he was guilty of a dirty-minded cavil over *Aen*. 8. 406, and is roundly denounced by Gellius. He was also guilty of an embarrassing error in failing to recognize that *Aen*. 4. 704-5 came from Euripides *Alcestis* 73-6 (Macrobius *Saturnalia* 5. 19. 2-5). Other remarks of his are preserved by Servius, DS, and Schol. *Gem.*: note especially that at *Aen*. 9. 675

"portam quae ducis imperio commissa recludunt".

he interpreted "commissa" as "clausa", rightly as I should have thought. His allegorizing *παραδεισάων* is still extant.

1 haud sane indocti neque ignobiles: at 9. 10. 5 Cornutus is "homo sane pleraque alia non indoctus neque imprudens". Gellius often precedes criticism by a compliment, normally in litotes form (3. 16. 11; 13. 23. 12; 13. 29. 2; 14. 6. 1; 15. 9. 3; 16. 2. 1; 17. 5. 3; 15. 5. 2; 1. 11. 1), but not always (6. 17. 1; 11. 15. 3). This respectful attitude is not necessarily sincere: the grammarian "non sane ignobilis" of 13. 9. 3 turns out to be "semindoctus" (§ 6) and "nulli rei" (§ 11; for the phrase *nulli rei* cf. 9. 2. 6, 13. 3. 3). But he is polite in talking to such people (6. 17. 4), as are Favorinus (4. 1. 11; less so § 4), Pronto (13. 29. 3),

1. "reprehensio spurca et odiosa inquinavit" Gell. 9. 1. 1. "leuca; insuissa nitis et odiosa scrutatione uiolata est" ib. § 8.

2. With "homo minus minus" (Persius) (3. 16. 11) Cic. "consec. 45" *civ. hominum minus plus* (§ 6) "quicken Caesaris, virum optum et hominem sequutur".
and spoliarius (13.10.5); Probus by contrast did not suffer fools gladly (13.21.5). For the form of the expression: litotes is not the

head of a

grudging and ironic figure in Latin and Greek it is an

angry Gallius, stating his authority, at 20.11.1, says "P. Livi liber est non incuriosus factus", and at 18.9.4 describes Velius Longus, whom he agrees with (45), as "non homini indolens". To the Homeric examples cited in §11 we may add

at random: Thucydides Hist. 1, Homeric 1.4.14, 20.11.2; see H. Fleckeisen, Register (1895) 123-35; ibid. "Die lateinische Umgangssprache" p. 147; J. Hubbell on Horace 1.7. The same spirit infuses such euphemisms as om paullum for quidam and those discussed on 48-50.

Sallust Hist. 2.42

incuriosus: pass. 1, 7.6, 12.1.4, 20.11.1; cf. Livy 3.3.4, 29.5.8, 45.11. (381)


2-7 The passages are: 2.6.75-7, Georg. 4.4.1, Ann. 10.3.14.

§ 2 detestatio: detestatio emptionisque; for detestatio cf. 2.7.13, 12.1.9

6.16.6, 10.3.1/ of detestor 2.6.14, 7.16.5.13; the verb is associated with execrator at 7.16.5 "sae nsin deprecor a utullo dicitur quasi detestor vel execraptor vel damous vel gnomon" and at Livy 5.11.15.

Seneca Epist. 51.66. Detestatio may seem awkward after detestatio, but is attested by amicitia and Macrobius (cf. Hertz ad loc.); Gallius's point to detestations (first attested in Tertullian), which is far too feeble; ad Lucius's deprecation (ad loc. 2.590-90; s. cir. 16.40, 45, Dem. 7.9.3)

Pliny Nh. 20.17 is not inappropriate, but would involve supposing an

early interpolation from detestatio, 1.3.16, 3.37. Yet no earlier than this.

Unfortunately, a does not resume till 2.28.

- Morphologically: univo: detesto :upo : rapecio : ra-pto; for the sense, Salmasius

compares οὐ μεδί προσφέρω. This verb (absent from comedy and the more colloquial portions of Petronius) is an Republican Latin always used of deprecations, heavy blows or such like harms. Cf. 2.6.16, 3.6, 4.20. Unfortunately, a does not resume till 2.28.

1 "Demodo usurans" p. 782-9. (But see Ernout-Meillet s.v.)
Lucretius 1.503, 2.59; Catullus 61.80; Caesar bell. 61.14.

This meaning remained with the verb in Augustan and Silver Latin: Propertius 2.20.29 "tum meuel tragicae uexetis aringes" (the image as in Vergil Aen. 1.471sqq) 2.20.37-8; Horace Carm. 4.9.19, 4.13.23; Liv. 2.2.7; Ovid Tristia 2.517-8; Seneca Ex. 1003-90; Lucan 5.375-6; Tacitus Ann. 10.1 and 11.1, 11.140.7; Silius, Pun. 2.11.23, 10.5.6; Apuleius Met. 7.2.10. While if a parallel in Vergil himself be sought, there is Aen. 6.615 "aut bello audacis populi uexatus et armis".

By any criteria, however, some uexationes must be greater than others; and by the common flux of language the word's lower limit of extension was reduced so that it covered rather weaker disturbances than it had before: thus Ovid Amores 2.19.15

sic ubi uexarat tepidusque refouerat ignes

Statius Theb. 5.612

lascium et prono uexantem gramina cursu

Juvenal 1.2

uexatus totiens rauci Thesside Codri.

Indeed, this weakened use of uexare is regular in Juvenal: e.g. 1.126 "noli uexare: quiescit", 13.133 "uexare oculos uomer coacto"; this last is a minor physical irritation comparable to those in §6. It is probable that by Corintus's time this was the normal meaning of uexare, the traditional use seeming incongruous to the unphilological, similar as Milton's minimum use of "annoy" (Samson agonistes 577-8): Wilt thou then serve the Philistines with that strength Which was expressly given thee to annoy them?

Samson was a fighter, not a fly.
On Cicero l Verr.12 "quae iste per triennial uexuit ac peruidit", Pseu?Aquinius remarks "nimium uexuit ingentis calamitatis aistum significavit; nam et supra"("In saec 7) sic ait: 'populatae uexatae euersae provinciae' et Varrilius 'candida succincta latrantibus inguina monstris Dulichias uexasse <rates>".

But Servius on Sue.6.76 comments: "uexasse rates autem per tapnos in dictum est, nam non uexuit sed euertit" (This of course is not true.) "quod Probus uult hac ratione defendere, dicens uexasse uenire ab eo quo id uelbe uecto uexo, ut uexasse sit portasse" (whence Isidore Orig.1.20.260) "et sine dubio pro arbitrio suo euertisse". OS continues: "uexasse est enim uis quaedam alieni arbitrii, non enim sui potens est qui uexitur. bene orco inclinatum uerbum est; nam qui pertur et reptatur et huc atque illuc distrahitur uexari propio licitur.

Cato in oratione de achaesis: 'Cumque Hannibal terram Italian laceraret atque uexaret'. Cicero in Verrinis 'sed ut a barbaris praedomibus uexata esset', item (2 Verr.4.104) 'di allati,fora uexata, direptae2 urbes reperiuntur'"

It is clear that OS's material comes ultimately from Gellius; probably through Donatus, who will have added the last citation. The etymology from uelbe is common to Probus and Gellius, but differently formulated; it would be rash to assume that Gellius could not have found it for himself, or at least perceived the semantic function of intensives.

1. Cf. notes on AEAE.118, 2.402.
5 procul dubio: "certainly, without a doubt" not "doubtless, sans doute, probably". The expression occurs thirteen times in Gellius (including dubio procul 2.29.15). It is first attested in Lucretius (dubio procul 1.812), than at Livy 39.12.10; procul with the ablative is first found at Ennius trag. 220 Ribbeck, in prose first at Livy 2.13.6 "et procul ripa Tiberis". Outside this idiom it occurs in Gellius only at 17.1.1 "factis procul, uerbis tenus"; procul a 2.12.2, 12.3, 12.10, 25.12, 26.19. It is first found at Ennius trag. 220 Ribbeck, in prose first at Livy 2.13.6 "et procul ripa Tiberis". Outside this idiom it occurs in Gellius only at 17.1.1 "factis procul, uerbis tenus"; procul a 2.12.2, 12.3, 12.10, 25.12, 26.19. So A and Macrobius Sat. 7.8, for uastiorest the other Gellian MSS have inclinatum est, under the influence of procul dubio inclinatum est below. Hosius suspect the first procul dubio of having infiltrated from this passage; there is however nothing wrong with it, and without it the final colon is a trifle abrupt. 

Rapsatur...; raptatur Macrobius Sat. 7.8, JS sec. 6.78, and the mediaeval MSS of Gellius. The verb rapsare is found at B.Afr. 73, CIL 6.152715 (the so-called laudatio Turiae, 5-2 B.C.); cf. Hertz. *Vind.* Gell. alt. 19. A choice rarity, parallel in formation to uexare and (as G. thinks) taxare: for this etymology cf. Festus 490.12 sqq.; it is hard to see the semantic connection, and the alternative derivation from *τοιχαστι* (as campire < ἴμπατος) .deserves consideration. On the other hand, a terminus that is neither aspratilis nor porpodolatus is said to be taxatus, as if "given a touch" of the adze. 1

5-6 pressius crebrisque... fusius larensique... greulis mult... e: such pairings are typical of Gellius.

6 sigmate: cf. 1.5, Iouari n.

7 quando: adversative, cf. 10.11.4, 12.15.15, 15.30.2, 19... 6; Hertz

in casual and temporal clauses it takes the indicative: e.g. obi. in eo tempo, the classical preposition with such phrases is frequent in Gallus, cf. Knapp u. 25 (1894) 11n.1; an early Latin usage (cf. now Cujanā 1.2.71), reinforced no doubt by contemporary speech.

-18 inaudati. Just as "nouphélis" and "inutilis" often imply βλέπων and mortis, as εύζημον does not belong to those "che viscer senza infi ni senna loco", and as οὐκ εἶναι in Euripides often stands for πέριφορα, so inaudatus euphemistically connotes exsecratio. It seems strange that Cornutus did not appreciate this; yet commenting on Herodotus 8.13 καὶ τὸ τέλος ὑπέτειλε τὸν δικαίον (Pseudo-Longinus καὶ ὑποτελέσθε 3.1; Russell compares v 392-4). For indeed in Gallus very comfortable, offering two explanations: the one correct, but overlaid by attempts at literal justification; the other absurd.

9 ne in quiquam Early Latin (. e.g. Plut. Gellina 1008, Ter. Hecyr. 67), then Suetonius Tiberius 12.2, Caligula 3.1; cf. also nihil quinquam (v. 3, pl. lat. sec. 146, Ter. Hecyr. 400, then Gall. 1.3.3 cl.). Holm-Laëcrity 602.

affictis Macrobius, affictis cod.2. Gall. affictus is properly "wound up", "bent to death"; men "affictus moribus" is a "wound wreck". It is the contrary of moribus integris.

Rem. 292: Jacobus Gronovius cites the Greek proverb (e. "Zeno"

5.33) οὐδὲ ἐκανάνθαις τινι ἐν πεπεραται. Thus in Cicero comes χαρακτικόν ἠξετάζω καὶ μὴν τοῦ τυχόν τελεῖν 23. The verb of δακρύων εἰς τοὺς περίπτον ἡ τελειώματα διαλέγει καὶ ἐφεξῆς γιὰ (for Athenian wakes cf. Cicero de legibus 2.37); "um mentiun f t habebatur". 

κόλασι καὶ μπορώς άγρι μάλα ἕκαστον κρίνει: cum Bell. 
κόλασι γαρ καὶ μπορώς ἀγριότατον εἶναι: Macrobius. 
κόλασι του καὶ μπορώς άγρι μετακόπων εἶναι: Stobæus 3.4.24, 
"of those drowned in the shipwreck of Enneus after Athenius, the Sun."

The text seems to be a mixture of Latin and Greek, discussing various Latin phrases and their meanings, particularly in the context of literary works and historical usage.
Naturally they vary in intensity (Stevens, p. 674). While such
outliers do occur, they might occur, it is true, that
we should not see in the same case the same order as we should see in
the same case the same order as
"Diogenes" 7.81, and (sometimes with slight variations) in other patakeographies.

The variants γάρ, πάλαι ἄριστον /τοι ἑκταογράφον reflect no more than different extemporizations to complete the hexameter by different authors; it is otherwise with the fool and the gardener.

The sequence of thought in 9 is "no-one is such a moral wreck as never to say or do something praiseworthy; whence the proverb "even a — often speaks very much to the point". We should expect to replace the dash by some such word as "scoundrel" (resuming effictis moribus); instead we have a choice between a fool and a gardener, the fool being independently attested for this proverb.

I say "a fool"; but we must remember that "μωρός is a strongly condemnatory word denoting culpable lack of intelligence" (Barrett on Euripides Hippolytus 644). Lack of intelligence was regarded by the Greeks as highly reprehensible, and words such as μωρός αδρων ἁρσόν overlap into what we should categorize as moral censure. Such connotations would make the Macrobian verse seem more in place.

What then of gardeners? If they were proverbial for wickedness or folly, we might expect to hear more of it, from Gellius or another. And why should they be liable to such a reputation?

The observation that "a fool may learn a wise man wit" is as old as human experience, yet worthy of note precisely because in the normal course of events a fool speaks folly. The verse σολλάκης γάρ κοί μωρός δούλει πάλαι λαφρῶν θαλεν, would not be out of place in Hesiod; that given by

---

1. "Diogenes" 7.29 ends the verse κατά μωρόν θετόν (from Homer).
2. We should not adduce the specifically Eupiridean use of sexual intercourse.
3. The context excludes allusion to the wisdom of humble folk (e.g. Cæcilius 266 R: "sepe est etiam sub palliolo sodido sapientia").
4. As the shepherd says in the ballad of "King John and the Rabbits of Canterbury".
5. μωρόν γάρ πάρος ἄριστον, Eurip. 349-350 compares with 32.6 καὶ γέας μωρός παρειλαῖο; but this renders "καὶ νάμσις ναμσίς γελάβατε", The námbal is an impious fool, who says in his heart such námbal as "enéléthi", God does not exist (Ps. 14:1, 53.2, 4.10.4). The Biblical Greek μωρός is μωρός in Hebrew, meaning
Ceilius's MSS resembles not an antiquissimus versus but a comic parody; perhaps from Antiphanes's κηνοψής.

But if so, either Gellius quoted it and some reader put the orthodox version in the margin, or Gellius wrote what Macrobius gives and someone added the parody. Neither hypothesis is without difficulty; Hertz more attractively suggests that καινοψής (κηνοποίης) has developed from a ditto graphical καιναψής, the (now unmeterical) γράφ then falling out. But in no case can I accept the MSS reading. inculpitus: ἀφίκατον. First used by Ovid (met. 2.583, 9.671-2), then occasionally in the second century and frequently in later writers. Gellius himself uses it at 6.22.4 "non omnino inculpatum neque indesiderum sempiternitatem et expertise."

14.2.5"uine esse bonum notaeque fidei et utae inculpatisissimae." 12 Cf. Gellius 2.9; Cic.de off. 3.118 "dicunt enim (sc. Epicurei) voluptatem magnitudinem doloris detractione finiri"; This is Κόρες Usener; cf. Cicero de fin. 1.37 with Madvig's note, Gell. 9.4.2 "Epictetus voluptatem summum bonum esse ponit, sed tamen its definit; ἐνδόταν ἐν βουλεσος κηνοψής". This "catastematic" pleasure (cf. Diog. Laert. 10.136 = fr. 2 Usener) is just as great as any active (κατακεφαλήν) pleasure, cf. Cicero de fin. 1.38 "quisquis enim sentit quamadmodum sit affectus, sum necesses est aut in voluptate esse aut in dolore. Omnis autem priusione doloris putat Epicurus terminari summam voluptatem, ut postea variari voluptas distinguat.

possit, augeri amplificarique non possit"; Plutarch mor. 1088 καὶ τέρας κανέν τέλος τινα ἵνα των καὶ ἄθορθως ἀπορεσθαι καὶ τρελαινθίκην ὡς οἱ φίλοις ἢ δει τοῦ Κολωνίων το ἀθροισθαι ὀθοδοσίας ὑπὲρ χαῖρεται καὶ ἀπελθήναι ἀκαθαρσίας καθορίσαντες τινας ὡς ἀναγκασθοῦν τρισδευτὸν δικαίων ἔτη ἐν τῷ μὴ τοιοῦτος γεγονότις διελθοῦς.

14 κατακεφαλήν φειδεῖα κατ' amores ἐφαρμος: cf. 5.12.10 "ex una tantum parte...quae priusiones est, quam Graeci ὑπερτητὰ ἐπεισεν dicunt"; ss. 1.26.11

1. Cobet, Anemosyne 6 (ser. 2). 16/3. 111, sugg. that Gellius wrote to; this is unnecess. 2. Yet another notice, and η ὁμοίως. To boot: the sense is "inexcusably idle."
"principorem ... quae sic oportet dicere".

1-18 Gellius's alternative explanation is that since in local parlance
ludo = nomo, "inlaevatus" = "non nominatus"; cf. Uricus. In saeculum =
2.23 pr., "non nominato coe" Tertull. 15.11. (Petersicus p. 347.9
Michelemanus), H. Frutus 6.2. Jacobus Gronovius cites Antonius
Liberalis 13.3 ne tertig. tibi Modigyc yTerroniis cometo piainos
espertos; unde quod est, quo ometro omni rapta, usus de
esse saeculo peramiscendo,
but not the far more important dictor eaeonto xovos kai idiou oino tropodem
(2.260, 597, 519); cf. also duovmpas. (It is not here profitable to
distinguish between subjective renance and objective ill-...)

16 auctor lumine 
17 komonius IX saeculum = 2.19.1.6.5 "si illi
iter accurato, uti demum auctorem saecludere poteris si tunc fuerit
fusus cui aquirare seminatum uniuersis"; rescript to Severus Alexander to
Hilarianus (3 April 222; ed. 54.17) "auctor lumino si euit...res est".s
so too in key contexts: Cic. Frut. 3.63, 3.187, Brutus 44; Gellius 3.16.6
"airstotelem auctorem lumine". A similar meaning is found at Plautus
Captiui 426 "id ut scias, Ioue supremum testem ludo, Hicic". Turebus
(adversari. 2.11) cites Pseudo-quintillian deol. 269 (p. 98.28sqq Ritter)
"si ab uniuersis tamen ad singulos vocatur, et tunc num testem dabo;
illum quidem neque ego laudo, sed ipsa uiti. eius, ipsa seelena, factum
hus rei auctoritatem"; but why should we not paraphrase καὶ ἐκπερνὸν γελᾶν
ἐκαίνω, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἁμαρτάνον ἀνέδω, ἢ ἀνατροπῆς το δήλον?

- Be it noted that auctorem nomino (Cicero pro Caecina 79, Client 186)
is not found in the jurists.

18 nomen...nominit et; cf. tr. Lic. inc. 97 Ribbeck "meum nominans nomen",
Plautus 4.2.260, Terence Phormio 739. For this figure and the related
 nominatur nomine Argo see Jocelyn on En. trag. 211.2 (203-9).
Valerius Maximus c. 14, ext. 5 “illa uero gloria sacralege; inuentus est enim qui Dianae Ephesiae templum incendere uellet, ut opere pulcherrimo consumpto nomen eius per totam terrarum orboriam disceretur; quem quidem mentis fuorem soleo impositus detexit. Ac bene consuluerant Ephesii decreto facto memoria taeterrimi hominis abolenisse, nisi Theopompi magnum facundiae ingenium cum suis historiis comprehendisset”. Strabo 14.1.2 (640), "

Cf. Solinus 40.2, "Elian Var. Hist. 6.40; Herodotus' ghost would be gratified to know that his name has even reached the cinema. The crime is said to have been committed on the day Alexander the Great was born (Plutarch Alexander 3.3).

communi condito Asiae; anachronism. The κοινωνία Ασίας was an institution of Roman times, probably established by Augustus. In the time of Lysimachus there had been set up an ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΦΕΣΩΝ but if the fire did belong to 356 B.C. Ephesus still lay in the satrapy of Yauna. Valerius has "Ephesii", correctly.

utile...ne: appropriate in laws, decrees, and the like (cf. Hache 17), but common anyway in Gellius (Gorges 52).

qui templum Dianae Ephesiae incenderat; the locative Ephesiae seems to go with templum (τον Εφεσων ρεν) rather than incenderat; so Petronius 111.1 "matrona quaedam Ephesiae notae est pudicitiae" (cf. Fraenkel Loseproben 174). Macrobius has the trivialized Ephesiae (Sat. 6.7.16).

ullo in tempore; cf. 57.

19-25 Squillus (Brutius trag. 263 Ribbeck = 276 Jocelyn) and its derivatives are antonymic to lat. nitidus hilaris, and words related to them;
conveying such ideas as "rough" "scaly" "dirt-encrusted" "dirty" "uncared-for" "unkempt" "in mourning". The sense of "roughness" is clear at Lucretius 2.424-5

"at centro quaecumque molest. atque aspera constat, non aliquo sine materiase squalore repertast." (cf. 2.469-70)

The perhaps justified association with squama is well established by Gellius for Accius and Vergil; for the latter cf. Georg. 4.12 "picti squalentia terga lacerti", in. 92-4 "alter erit maculis auro squalentibus armatus...et rutilis clarus squamis", where it is squamis whose sense is twisted to fit Squalentibus: bees mammis or lea1.

21 locis aliquot; cf. locis plurisque 2.23, and in the singular alio loco § 22, 3.14.10, 6.17.3. Normally, however, Gellius uses in with the ablative of locus, e.g. 2.26.13, 2.30.10, 6.24.5. See Knapp Tap. 25 (1894) 11, where 6.20.5 is wrongly listed as lacking in.

22 inculcatum: reading guaranteed by Monius 725.24, D. on Vergil 1.10.314, Macrobius St.6.7.19. The normal construction is inculco rem rei, but see TLL 7.1.1880.16-η for inculco re re Cicer. Att. 16.5.1 "δέκλειον ipsum crebris locis inculcatur"; P.F.45.20 "culcita quod tenendo inculcatur appellata".

---

1. auro and rutilus are chromatically identical, cf.n. on aureum 2.36.5 (\\textit{auro}).
2. "exotized", cf. Reid ap. Salays on Dr. tor 59.
The problem of the limits rightly observed in filial respect was broached by Aristotle, E.N. 1164b22: ἀπο τὰ ἀληθεία καὶ τὰ τυμπάνα ὁ οἶκος πάντα τῷ πατὶ ἔχειν καὶ πείθομαι σὺν κόμματι ἤκοτοι. Στιθεὶς, διὰ γὰρ δὲ κατηγορεῖτο ἐν πολεμικῷ καὶ ἁρμό- 4

A commonsense answer is given, 1165a4: ὅτι ὅπου ὁ παῖς ἀφετέρους ἀδελφοὺς ἀποφεύγεται, οὐδὲ τῷ αὐτῷ πάντα ἐπιθύμει οὐδὲ τῷ Διί πάντα, οὐκ ἀφείλεν. οὐδὲ ἐπιθυμίης ἤκοτοι καὶ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἐπιθυμίης καὶ εὐσεβείας ἐκάστοις οὐκ ὁμοιοί καὶ τὰ ἐρμοστομα ἐννενήμερον ὁμοιοῦσεσ σε.21sqq; no doubt similar principles would apply to obedience. Cf. 1148a34, on excessive devotion to one's father.

It is related that Hisonius was asked by a young man who wished to study philosophy but whose father forbade it, whether one must always obey one's parents (Hisonius fr.13 hense = Stobaeus L. 25.51). He replied that one must define obedience, which could best be done by examining disobedience. Would a sick son be disobedient in not complying with the orders of a medically ignorant father? or if the father were ill and wanted food or wine at the wrong time, would the son be disobedient for not giving it him? Hisonius thinks not; much less a son who refused to commit an immorality enjoined by his father. Since disobedience is ὀνείδος στὶς στηθέωσ but abstention from wrong-doing is οὐκ ὀνείδος ἀλλ' ἐκάστρον. it is not disobedience not to do an evil action commanded by one's father, one's sovereign, or even one's master, ἀλλ' ἐκάστοις ἀποτελεῖσθαι καὶ καθές καὶ εὐσεβέστατος έρμοστομόν ἐστὶν ἐπαρακατοφόρως. The obedient (ἐυσεβής man, by contrast, is
Indeed, Iasónius believes that a man who does what is right and good for him obeys his parents even without their orders, because all parents wish their children well, and therefore want them to do ὑπ' ἀληθείας ἀλληλοίων ἀληθείας ἀλληλοίων. Obedience to parents in a specific instance therefore depends on the virtuousness of the action. The young man, therefore, need not fear he will be disobeying his father in studying philosophy; let not his father be the cause for him or doing wrong ἢ ἐκείνην ἐπὶ δυνάμεως ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας. Surely he knows already he need not obey ὑπ' ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας if his father in his ignorance told him to play the lyre or write his letters wrongly, or having no skill in steersmanship bade him misguide the rudder. Therefore he should not listen to his ignorant father on the subject of philosophy, but himself should teach him better.

J. C. van Geytenbeek (tr. L. Hijmans, "Iasónius and Greek Diatribe", Assen 1963, p. 69ff) notes the difference between Gellius, who argues in standard Stoic terms, and Iasónius, who redefines obedience. Elsewhere Gellius quotes both Iasónius and Hierocles the Stoic (for whom see §13n.); but the matter was no doubt dealt with in a hundred Stoic text-books, any dozen of which our author may have read.²

The ethical term "right" (καθεῖον, honestum) is ambiguous, being now prescriptive, now permissive. An adherent of parental authority might maintain that a father's orders, superfluous when the action

². C. Agesilaus apo-Kautarch Loralia 534e. A. Rosius(V.XVI) compares "Iasónii ep. §75" (i.e. pseudo-Iasónius ep. 1.5, 139 Hense); but the only passage with any bearing on the point is ("would you not wish your children, ἢ ἐὰν δέντα ἀλληλοίων δέντα ἀληθείας ἀληθείας ἀληθείας;\) This is not close enough to Gell. §13 for it to be worth quoting.
ordered was prescriptively right (that is, it was positively one's duty) and certainly to be disregarded when it was wrong, were to be followed when without them it would be permissible either to do or not to do it. This is Cellius's position without its Stoic clothes; it is also the attitude taken by Hierocles the Neoplatonist, Simplicius, and Clement of Alexandria (van Geytenbeek, 94-5).

We may observe that though in 1.13 Cellius discusses the problem whether one should disobey an order to serve him who gave it better than one would by obeying it, the two chapters show no other common feature.

Lemma: quaesitum question = "an" introducing a simple indirect question is very common in philosophical contexts: see 2.23.21n.

2 Graeci nostriisque qui de officiis scripsissent: cf. 1.13.1, or general citations see mercklin, 657-8.

3 The view that one should always obey one's parents was the common man's opinion, and even philosophers will repeat it when they are not considering the matter closely. That even a wrongful command should be obeyed is virtually declared in a passage of unargued uplift by "Perict... one the female Pythagorean" (Stobaeus 4.25.50): αἰτίης δὲ οὲν ἐνομονούμεν καὶ τραβήγματι (παρεκτής?) tantum non parentibus); in soberer mood one might claim that wrongful commands evinced madness, but the context is hardly one of tightly-reasoned thought. omnia ... parendum; τοῦτα χελετένα; cf. Statius, 4.660 "non adeo parebimus omnia matri".

4 in quibusdam parendum, quibusdam non obsequendum: the twelfth-century
of their frequent appearance in the adiaphora-sceous, e.g.
Ps. Quod. and 271 (p. 100 Ritter) "For the company makes there are
abominations and it is not to know his question, an whole ancient at
great fames quickened part insisted of the adiaphora for a
general list of examples."
ffprilegium MS T inserts *in* before the second *quibusdam*. This is probably accidental, but as accepted by Hosiass; yet surely *quibusdam non obsequendam* is parallel in construction to "omnibus patris iussis obsequendum" in the leaue. §§S seem with libri; here we have it between "in quibusdam praeconio" and "quibusdam no":

5 We do not know how propounded this opinion; but the argument in

§7, *simpliciste* to a degree, recalls not only a playful Socrates puncturing a catchphrase, but also the dialectical catches of Gellius 10.2. Aristotie, as we have seen, cites this question as a standing *anecdn*, and in the Socratic terms of argument from the *re* *vax*

it is probable that filial obedience was a traditional topic for argument and paradox in the academy. But such discussions will have soon become common; and the argument in a the *re* *vax* reappears in Lusonius.

6 primor aspectu. *Primor*, conflated from *primus* and *prior*, is in strict usage "the first half/part of", (e.g. Cic. Cael. 28, vnc. 6. 113) and so at Gellius 1.1.3 "Haec Varro in primore libro scripsit" as opposed to §4 "in posteriorem eiusdem libri parte" (the book is the fourteenth *rerum aequitatis*), 6.12.1 "ultra brachia et usque in primores manus ac prope in digitos", 10.1.3 "in primori pueritia", In this last passage "prima" could have been used; from such context there developed a loosw sense, first in Varro R.R. 2.2.14 "imribus primoribus" and then in Silver Latin generally. This is a mannerism in Gellius: with our present passage compare 2.12.10.

"speciem habens primorum iniquae inimicisque legis", 2.12.18 "interstiti sunt inter primores [omg]", 10.1.9 "primoribus litteris" 1, 1.5.2

1 Of the first(four) letters of the ordinal, L. T., to be read *tertium* or *tertio* according to taste. Contrast Cic.2 Ver. 2.14 "Pudetis primas litteras integras?" (the Var of *V.R.UL* altered from *V.RIAL*).
"parted domus primorem" for primor domum or parted domus priorem.

7 non quia imperat: an example of the relatively rare indicative of irrelevant fact, cf. 9.3.5, Cicero pro Milario 78 "non quia debeo amitis ... sed quia nominas saepe cum currit". At 7.11 "non quia tu ill etiam facis, sed quoniam ita sese ... sed quoniam ... uolubilitas habet" we find the indicative used after non quia in a rejected reason contrary to fact; so Lucretius 2.3, Propertius 1.11.7, Horace Satires 2.2.39-50, Ovid Ex Ponto 4.1.5, Tacitus A.13.1, 15.60.


9 argutia: so 9.14.26, 10.1.12, and nowhere else in Latin. For the number, argutia in the singular is not found before Apuleius Met. 1.1.3, Fronto additamentum epistularum 7.2 (p. 34.2 v. 114) and Gellius 1.15.1.1., 3.16, 11.2.1; for the sense, argutia(e) is used in an unfavourable context at 1.4.7, 3.4.6, 10.22.24, 12.1.1, of quibbles or of verbiage; favourably at 1.1.13., 7.13.2, 17.12.1, 20.5.2, of wit in the eighteenth-century sense, and 17.6.4 of wit in the modern sense.

fruola: cf. 3.11.1em, 15.30.1, 16.11.1, 16.1.12. This adjective, implied in the Plautine title Fruiolari, is first recorded at Rhet. 4.1.16, then not found again till Silver Latin: Phaedrus 3.4.8, 5.7.1, Pliny III 7.156, and several times in Seneca; it is also used by Quintilian, Suetonius, Fronto, Gellius, and Apuleius. It is frequent in fourth-century Latin, occurring in ecclesiastical writers and the historia augusta; at this time the adverb fruole appears. If it was originally a popular word, it is surprising we do not find it in comedy.
Gellius always uses the word in its strict sense, of murder or suicide, not (as Suetonius and Seneca do) of death in general.

12 media igitur sententia optima atque tutissima: τότεν μὲν ἐρείσθα said Theophrastus (335), long before Aristotle. Tutissima may represent ἀποκλιςία in his source; more likely it is his own expansion, under the influence, conscious or unconscious, of Ovid met. 2.137.

Hierocles the Stoic (Stobaeus l.25.33, p.643.12 W.-.) καὶ ρέντος καὶ τούτου τοιμάστεναι [sc. of poenas], ὥσπερ ἤ δὴ πολλὰ φιλεῖς γενόμενα πρὸς τοὺς πελίκους καὶ ἵνα τιμηθήσῃ τῇ γένεσι, ἐπανωθῆτοι μὲν ἄρα οἱ μετ' ἐκπλήξεσιν ἡ Δίκη, καθήκοντες ἀρχαῖοι πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλάττους ὂν τῶν πολέμων ἡ ἡκούσαντες, ἄρα ἐς μετὰ παρακλήσεως, καὶ οὗ ἔ ὄ λα ὀμολογήτων διαφόριστα ἡ ὁμολογία τῇ μέρες λαβοῦται καὶ ἁντιτιθέμενος μὲν ἐπέστησεν. Ἀναγείρα τὰς τῆλικος καὶ μᾶλλον ἡ ἐκτενεῖς νοθείας ὁμολογίας δὲ μετὰ παρακλήσεως καὶ πρὸς φιλοτέχνας ἐνεκτίθεται τῶν αὐτῶν ἔτην

Obedience to unjust commands would be a crucial case; it is not specifically discussed by Hierocles.

detestationes: cf. 3.3n.

sensim: "gently"; cf.13.4.3 "sensim ac comiter". The word occurs several times in Gellius, meaning "quietly" (1.11.13, 17.6.7), "slightly" (3.26.8) "peacefully" (5.11.11 "sensim atque placide"), and "gradually" (12.1.22 "sensim atque paulatim", 15.5.3 "sensim atque in diem").

quoi: for potius quem. See Nolhann-Szantyr: 593a; common in Early, Silver, and Late Latin; indulged in by the mannerists of the archaizing age, more than once, in Caesar ep. Front. opp. 15.1 "indulgen se

1. So in the παράδοσις at 12.5.11; I regard it however as a moralizing interpolation.
quam oratorem uolt laudari". But indeed with uolo this usage occurs at Cicero inv. 2.5, Livy 3.60.11, 25.29.6, so in Greek η for μηδεν η, with But indeed with uolo this usage occurs at Cicero inv. 2.5, Livy 3.60.11, 25.29.6, with Bosio, Cf. also Nepos 14 (Oiatanes) 8.1 "Statuit congradi quam cum tanti copis profugere aut tam diu unloco sedere"; Salvat Cat. 3.5 "beneficiis quam metu imperium agitabant" (where later most MSS insert magis). 1.111.62. 91

15 "aut honesta sunt aut turpia"; as the text stands this is precisely the error whence the view to be refuted is derived. Barache rightly adus "aut neque honesta neque turpia", cf. §22, and 1.8.12, where the δισευ θερεονις stated to be of the form "aut malum est uoluptas aut bonum aut neque bona neque malum est".

18 At 12.5.4 Taurus is asked the reason "cur dolor at Stoicos indifferentes esse dicitur, non malum"; in his explanation comes the sentence (§7) "Reliqua omnia, quae in medio forent ac neque honesta essent neque turpia, neque bona esse neque mala decreta est". (This Stoic dogma seems to have considerably interested Gellius: at 10.1 he stages a discussion on the related question, whether virtue was a sufficient condition of happiness). Cf. to the citation from Ep. 87, 1.2.9 and 88, 1.9.8. Our form is derived from 168.7.

19 uxor eaduere: Paulus V ad editum (p. 23.13) "filio familias dissentiente sponsalia nonine eius fieri non possunt"; a daughter might object only on the grounds that her father's choice was of low character, Ulpian de sponsalibus (2.23.1.12). On the other hand neither son nor daughter might marry without paternal consent, Paulus XXV ad editum (2.25.2.2). The position in the late republic seems to have been the same: Watson, The Law of Persons in the later Roman Republic, pp. 41-7. In practice of course, a father might respect his daughter's reluctance (Cic. nat. 5.4.1) and arrange a marriage for his son (Cic. de oratore 1.239); his command would bear
all his auctoritas, and it would be unusual indeed for the son to defy him. Indeed, it is clear from the praetorian edict (Lenel, *Ecictum Perpetuum* 59–60) of a widow who ought to be mourning her husb and it would be unusual indeed for the son to defy him. / the praetorian edict (Lenel, *Ecictum Perpetuum* 59–60)

of a widow who ought to be mourning her husb and it would be unusual indeed for the son to defy him. / the praetorian edict (Lenel, *Ecictum Perpetuum* 59–60)

... in matrimoniun colloquiuert: eamue sciens uxorem duxit non iussu eius in cuius potestate esset: et qui eum quem in potestate haberit ...

... in matrimoniun colloquiuert: eamue sciens uxorem duxit non iussu eius in cuius potestate esset: et qui eum quem in potestate haberit ...

... in matrimoniun colloquiuert: eamue sciens uxorem duxit non iussu eius in cuius potestate esset: et qui eum quem in potestate haberit ...

even though the son had the right to refuse, the praetor even in this case would not encourage him to exercise it. - At Athens the father had no power either to command his son's marriage or to forbid it, but was υπερτητος or his daughter to give or withhold her hand.

20 sed enim: some thirty-six times in Gellius (Hache p.16), cf. Cato ap. Gell. c.3.16, Fronto *epi. Ver.* 2.1.20. A strong adversative, introducing a proposition that outweighs what precedes; cf. Greek οὐδέρ οὗ

(benniston 100sqq); For sed enim after a negative (Cato 1.c) cf. Denniston 107.

propudiosam: Plautus *Stichus* 334, Truculentus 271, Apuleius *Apol.* 75.4 int. 9.27.12; the occurrence in Fronto (p. 62 Habel = *epi. Ver.* 4.3.1-2 v. 4.8.) alleged by Knapp (*Drispy/er Studies* 160) is a hallucination.

20 Admittedly it happened before the conspiracy of 63 B.C., but Cicero toyed with the idea of defending Catiline in an extortion-charge despite his manifest guilt; in his speech for Scaurus he imagines himself defending L. Tubulus; and in April 59 he was hoping for a rapprochement with Modius. Naturally Gellius could not penetrate the fog of propaganda nor understand the Republic, but to quote Cicero, *de officiis* 2.51 "nece tamen ut hoc (sc. accusing an innocent man) fugiendum est, item"

1. It may also be pointed out that giving evidence against Clodius was a gross breach of turpia on Cicero's part; cf. Stockton"Cicero: A Political Biography" IX-1.
est habendam religioni nocetem aliquando, modo ne nefarum
impliumque, defensiere: uolt hoc multitudine, patitur consuetudo, fert
etiam humanitas. judicis est semper in causis ureum sequi, patroni
nonnumquam ueri siliile, etiam si minus sit uerum defensiere; quod
scribere, praesertim cum de philosophia scriberem, non uerum nisi
idem placet "prauiissimo Stoico: Panaetio". In other words,
Panaetius had done his usual job of trimming Stoic doctrines to suit
those members of the Roman ruling classes who felt in need of a
philosophy to justify what their ancestors had cheerfully done without
one. Cicero, writing philosophy, has to make concessions to sentimental
priggery; in real life one defended the nefarious and impious without
turning a hair - insomuch as such expressions meant more than "qui a me
De republica none dissentiant". Cicero spoke readily enough for
P. Sulla, but defending Gabinius was a humiliation.2

The subject is also discussed by Quintilian, 12.1.33-45, who
having argued that knowing how a bad man is defended is the best
preparation for refuting such defences (cf. the Platonic δειδεινον ἐφορέ),
maintains that as for hoodwinking the juror, even the strictest Stoics
(§38) - for he is giving not his own opinion, "sei eorum quos prauiissimos
sapientiae magistros aetas uetus credidit" (§36) - admit that lying is
among the things "quae non tant factis quam causis eorum uel honesta
vel turpia: one promises a sick child what one will not give, one lies
to save one's country. Therefore there are circumstances in which one

1. Similar saving clause at de amicitia 1.61 "modo ne suam turpitudine
2. For Gabinius see Misbet, pp 160ff, his edition of Cicero's In Iugis.
Synec Roman Revolution 66-7. For the trial of P. Sulla, Gell 155-8, Sallust Cat. 17.3
may defend the guilty: not perhaps so much one's father, brother, or friend, as such, as one who plotted against a tyrant (§40), or if the criminal may be made a good citizen (§42), or should he be an indispensable general (§43: one remembers the fifth Verrine) – and here the story of Rufinus is quoted, cf. Sallius ... we observe that Quintillian is even eager than Cicero; we may also observe that neither uses the arguments we ourselves should use: that it is not for the barrister to anticipate the jury's verdict; that any man has the right for his case to be put as strongly and convincingly as possible, against which case it is for the prosecution, if it can, to prove his guilt. Cicero never suggests that Verres ought not to have been defended; but no more does he suggest that Sex. Roscius had a right to counsel.

Tubulo: Lucostilius Tubulus, praetor in 142 BC (Cic. Att. 12.5b), was so openly corrupt as president of the quaestio inter sicarios that next year the tribune r. Scaevola took the matter to the concilium plebis: "uellentne de ea re quaeri?". They did, and the senate assigned investigations to the consul Cn. Caepio: Tubulus did not even answer his summons, but sped into exile, "erat enim res aperta" (Cicero, de finibus 2.54; for the procedures involved see Halvig ad loc., also Lommsen Römisches Strafrecht 197n2, 203n1, 633n4). According to Asconius (p. 236) that was not the end of the matter: "t. Tubulus praetorius fuit etate patrum Ciceronis" (inaccurate, cf. sup.); "is propter multa flagitia et de exsilio arcessitus esset ut in carcere necaretur, uenenum bibit"; see Lommsen op. cit. 71n1, 197n2, Enzer Hermes 47.167n. We do not know the politics of these events, if any; Astin, Scipio Aemilianus 125n1.
If Tubulus really was a proverbial villain, it is surprising he is never mentioned in the Verrines; in fact the first we hear of him is in the Scauriana of 54 B.C. (fr. k): "Si mehercule, indices, pro Tubulo dicere, quae una ex omni memoria sceleratissima et audacissima fuisset acceptius, tamen non tinerem, venenum hospiti aut conuiuae si dicere meret eunici ab illo datum cui acue heros neque iratus fuisset". Minzer, in VIII 2515, suggests that Cicero learned of Tubulus when reading up Lucilius for the Orator: he is not mentioned in that work, but cf. 1.63 "Quid de sacrilegio, quid de impiis periurisque diceamus? Tubulus si Lucius uaquam, si Lupus aut Corbo aut Neptuni filius ut ait Lucilius (1312 Marx = 1328 Krenkel), putaret esse deos, tam periurus aut tam inpurus esset?" In any case he obtained fuller details from Atticus (ep. 12.5b is dated 12 June 45 B.C.) for the Finibus, whence the story of the bribes ob re indicanda; reference is made again at 1.77 and 5.62 "cui Tubuli nomen odio non est? quis Aristides non mortuum diliigit?" But he nowhere tells us of poisonings and perjuries; and if Livy knew anything about this Tubulus, it is not recorded in the periocha of bk 53 or in any of the Livy-dependent authors. Nor does his allegedly so infamous name sully the pages of Valerius Maximus, though Catiline appears on five occasions and Clodius on six. (Verres, however, is not in Valerius either.) It should seem that long-dead criminals lose something of their individuality: one suspects that wicked deeds were ascribed to Tubulus because he was a wicked man (at Comment. 9 Catiline...
is accused of incest with his sister by confusion with Clodius) and that Gellius was chiefly concerned with showing off his learning.

Indeed, to the names of Catiline and Clodius, villains of the Ciceronian age, the obvious third to be added is Verres; so Seneca, controversiae 17.4 "Traestis Ciceroni quod propinqui Catilinae, quod amici Verris, quod <clientes Clodii praestiterunt" (Kiesling's supplement is certain, cf. 13.13). Juvenal 2.26-7 has these three and a fourth (whom Cicero of course supported) from that period: "si fur displiceat Verri, homicida Ilioni, /Clodius accusat ioechos, Catilina Cethegam". If there were an erasure in the text, so that we could not read the second name, we should certainly have supplied Verres;

but Gellius substitutes the recherché example as he might the recherché word.


1. See Henderson JRS 40 (1950-10; surely "educatus in sororiis stupris" (for the text cf. Watt ad loc.) can have no other implication. On this work in general see Henderson l.c., 111, misbet JRS 51 (1961) 85-7. Dinsmoor's reply (CS 13 n.s. (1963) 285-91, answers some, but not in my opinion all, of their arguments. It should, furthermore, be stated that I, 11, written by an elder brother and a consular, cannot be used to justify the composition of co... by a younger brother not yet standing for praetor. Besides, Marcus was not happy with Quintus' administration of his province, which was antagonistic the businessmen (cf. Stockton 50); the last person in the world to teach Marcus tact was surely Quintus.
This chapter and the following one make in both form and content a single whole; e.g. 2.9.1 "in eodem libro idem Plutarchus eundem Epicurum reprehendit". A similar relation holds between 5.10 and 11 (5.11.1 "rotatorion illam de quo dixi modo ἀντιγράφων"), 9.13 and 14 (9.14.1 "quod autem supra scriptum est"), 13.15 and 15 ("idem Messala in eodem libro") 3.16 and 17, 7.1 and 2, are connected by the lemmata; while other pairs of chapters (e.g. 10.4 and 5, 11.7 and 8) have the same source but no formal connection; so too the three chapters 13.4, 5, and 6. See Pericleis, Cicero, et al., 664 ff.

The process of misrepresentation that made Epicurus the model of an atheist, a debauchee, or at best a gourmet, was considerably advanced by Cicero and Plutarch. Sometimes doctrine is mis-stated (Cic. de fin. 2.96 "sin autem ad animam, falsum est, quod negas anima illam esse gaudium quod non referatur ad corpus"; contrast Lucretius 3.145-6); often his disregard for Aristotelian forms of logic is cast in his teeth. Thus at de fin. 2.26 Cicero translates ΚΑ. 28 and sneers: "primum divisit ineleganter: quo enim genera quae erant hic tria. Noc est non dividere sed frangerre. Qui haec didicerunt quae ille contemnit sic solent: Duo genera cupiditatum, naturales et inanes, naturalium duo, necessariae et non necessariae"; unfortunately, the Epistle to Menoeceus reads (Diog. Laert. 10.127) ἀναλογίστεον δὲ ὡς τῶν ἐνδύματων αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς φυσικοὺς καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν λόγους ἀλληλοι. αὐτὸν εἰς φυσικὸν μήρον.

1. Cf. 5.15 and 16, both from some collection of φυσικὰ δύταρα and linked by the line from Annius cited at 5.15.9 and alluded to ("de quo supra scripsimus") at 5.16.5.
Gellius is free from this malicious tendency: although he cites Taurus's fondness for Hierocles's abusive barb (3.6.8), he himself knows how Epicurus defined θεός (9.5.2. θεός εί τόν κόσμον ἀπώτερον) and both there and elsewhere (5.15.8, 5.16.3) cites him objectively when listing philosophers' opinions on some matter. Although Gellius has a great respect for Plutarch ("homo in disciplinis graui auctoritate" 1.11.11) and often cites him, here he does not accept his criticisms, regarding them as cautious. As we shall see, however, in 2.8 neither Plutarch nor he perceives the real flaw in logic, in 2.9 he does not know enough Greek to understand just why Epicurus was right and Plutarch wrong.

The ὁμογένεια μεταφρασις of Plutarch (cited again at 1.11.11) are preserved only in fragments; see Bernardakis, vol. VII, p. 100-1. They must not be confused with the spurious ἀπείρησθαι βίου καὶ τῆς πολεμίσσας ἀποκρις.

We are therefore unable to check Gellius's reports with the original; this is especially regrettable in c. 7.

Plutarch's criticism of Κρίτα Δύσα 2, if correctly reported, is trifling and superficial, and rightly dismissed by Gellius. Cicero cavils similarly, de fin. 2.100 "Nam quod ita positum est, quod dissolutum sit, id esse sinit sensu, id eius modo est ut non satis plane dicat quid sit dissolutum. Sed tamen intellego quid uelit".

They noticed a far graver fault discussed by Alexander or Apollonius on Aristotle Topica 100a25. Aristotle defines a syllogism as

Φως ἐν ἔκλειψιν πάντων ἑτέρων ἀ τῶν κατέχον ἢ ἀκούσα καθήκε (cf. Gellius 15.26); Alexander expounds the last three words as follows:

1. Always from the book; but Taurus (1.26.4) calls him "Plutarchus nostro" and tells a story about him that he may have learnt in social intercourse.

2. First cited in this connection by Aurelius (var. lect. 11.18)
"For are those arguments syllogisms that have appended, not the conclusion proper to the premises, but another proposition, whether consequent upon it or contingent: it does not follow from the premises. For example, if one were to take the premises that pleasure is natural and that what is natural is to be chosen, and conclude that pleasure was a good: this last is not demonstrated from the premises, even if it is a necessary consequence of the conclusion to be drawn from them. Similar is Epicurus's assertion about death: from the premises, which state that 'what has been broken up has no feeling' 'what has no feeling is nothing to us', it does not follow that 'death is nothing to us'. Death is not 'what has been broken up' but the breaking up; the man who has granted that what has been broken up has no feeling, has not granted that the breaking up takes place without being felt: to the animate being, breaking up, that is to say dying, is not unfelt. Consequently, dying and not being dead are something to us, even if dying is not always so. 'Death', therefore, is ambiguous, referring either to the state or to the process. The state of death may not perhaps be anything to us, but the process is; and that is what we fear".
As Alexander points out, ὁ νεκρὸς ὁ γιανόρος: it may refer to either the state or the process. If by ὁ νεκρὸς Epicurus means ὁ γιανόρος, being dead, τὴν τεθνηκε, he is saying that once we are dead there is nothing left to feel any regrets. "Niligitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum, quandoquidem natura animi mortalis habetur"; the dead man does not say to himself αἰών τεθνηκα. εἰ τάδε μοι κάλλιν ὁ βίος γιανότο. One should therefore not project one's consciousness to the time beyond one's death (as for instance the man in Lucretius 3.376 sqq). On the other hand, if Epicurus means ὁ γιανόροος, the argument is invalid; but had Epicurus perceive a distinction missed by Cicero, Plutarch, and Gellius? and do men really fear the process of dying, or are they worried by the thought they will be dead? The first question may safely be answered in the negative; it is probable that the process of dying is the more fearful, but let each man ask himself.

Plutarch's limits as a logician are plainly revealed by his supplying ὁ νεκρὸς ψυχῆς καὶ ἔσμεντος διάδωσι. At Ποραίλα 1103d, 1105a (from ὅτι οὐδὲ δὴ ἐστιν ἡ δεόν κατ' ἑπίκουρον) he maintains that disbelief in afterlife actually increases the fear of death.

Lemma: quod...facta sit: in the main clauses of his lemmata Gellius uses indifferently the accusative and infinitive (1.7 "in hisce uerbis neque mendum esse neque uitium...errareque istos..."); so 2.13, 2.20, 2.28) quod with the subjunctive (so 2.9 "quod...insectatus sit", 1.15) and quod with the indicative (1.3 "quod...cepit, quodque est...") cf. 2.14 "quod...dicit", 2.16 "quod...reprehensus est", 1.18 "...
fuit, quodque... servierunt". The last is decidedly the commonest, occurring in 58 lemmata; the accusative and infinitive being found in 40, quod with the subjunctive in 15. (I do not include uses in subordinate clauses). For qui-clauses replacing acc. + infinitive in Gellius see also 2.10.2n.

synlogismi: so the word is spelt in A, whose testimony begins with (cu)iusmodi in § 6. Neither Greeks nor Romans were consistent in marking or not marking assimilations; there is, however, no doubt that they were regularly made in speech. For Gellian orthography cf. προδηγήσει 10.10.8 (not to be edited as προδηγήσει; cf. W. Schulze "Orthographica", part 1.)

praepostere: not specifically by putting the conclusion first (cf. § 6), but more generally "perverse". - Note the congeries of synonyms linked by atque, as often in Gellius, imitating Cato; cf. Cato oriat. f r. 163 talcovati (Gell. 6.3.2, 13.25.14) "scio solere plerisque nominibus rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis animam excellere atque superbia atque ferociam augescere atque cresceru"; ...Cea sar ap. front. esp. 2.14.1 "nun uni hic et orcio me dedicavi atque addomi atque delegavi. Hoc etiam ipsum 'atque' unde putas? ex ipso furore". A. Fraenkel suggests that Cato's predilection for atque was in part motivated by rhythmical considerations (iese groben 130). In the extant fragments of Cornelia's letters to C. Gracchus, atque occurs eight times in all, and five times joins synonyms (Fraenkel ib. 162, Cugusi "Epistolographi Latini minores" 1.2.66).

in disciplinis: statt "in the text-books" cf. "in artibus" Serv. on
Disciplina in various senses is a favourite word with Gellius; here it stands in variety with in docendo (§9), cf. §6 "tamquam in sociis philosophorum."

$\delta$ Θάνατος ... $\zeta$ μας : Bussner rightly added after $\zeta$ μας the conclusion $\delta \, \sigma \nu$ δάνατος (better $\delta$ Θάνατος καλώ) οἵδεν κείμενον $\zeta$ μας.

Gellius is here antithetically working out the syllogism: would he omit the conclusion? Note that he refers to its displacement at §8; otherwise, he will not have given it in its proper place.

6 cuius: oh honest: "being the man he was" (Rolfe). Fischel (p.151) strangely rimes in this clause a concession to conventional disdain of Epicurus; it in fact simply records the objective fact that Epicurus had no respect for the forms and measure of Aristotelian syllogistic, or indeed for other disciplines: Epicure ans $\tau$ή διαλεκτική $\varepsilon$ παρέδωκεν σύναθα τον θεον (Diog.-sert. l5.31); πασείν δὲ παντικαραγ $\phi$εντεν τινάτον ἔδρασις (ib. 5).

7 finius: definitions. Quintilian 5.1.54 "ex tantur ergo argumenta ex finitione seu fane (nam utroque modo traditur);" at 7.3.15-25 Quintilian uses finitio five times and finis twice.\[\text{\textit{VIR: there will have been a variant reading prosum besides prosus which latter Hertz rightly restores. For the forms and uses of this word in Gellius see Rolfe C.Rui. 17(1922)100-6.}}\]

6 conclusiones VIR conjunctionem \textit{s}. In favour of the latter is \textit{s}'s general superiority and the cantilena "lectio difficilior potior"; but I can find neither justification nor parallel for conjunction $\sigma\nu \tau \varepsilon \kappa \rho \alpha \rho$; its regular meaning in dialectic is $\sigma \nu \nu \gamma \alpha$ (sic:\ Lucasius \textit{1}. That is "the sort of man": cf. "I am not the \textit{b}. = non ego is \textit{qui} + \textit{v}.}
* Yet, too, it's clear in terminology the peaceful in point of view of present [let 2.3 - 2.378], and the complex is a hard to explain as its wonder is easy
91, 5 t.12, 15, 16, cf. Columella 2·2.3) I therefore follow Sosius in reading conclusionem.

9 One might well object that Plato lived and taught before Aristotle had codified the ordo.
Plutarch's criticism is directed against Κ.Δ.3 ὡς τὸ μεγέθως τῶν ὁρῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθῶς διεξάγοντος. ὡς τὸ μεγέθως τῶν ὁρῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθῶς διεξάγοντος, ὡς τὸ μέτρον ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθῶς διεξάγοντος σεισμὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθῶς διεξάγοντος. This is rightly rendered by Errighetti: "il limite in rambanza dei piaceri è la detrazione di ogni dolore. È dovunque è piacere, e per tutto il tempo che persiste non c'è né dolore fisico né spirituale né ambeue"; the construction of the participles being that of Sophocles, Philoctetes 875-6. Thuc.cludes 1.36 et seq. Epicurus himself ὡς ὁ θεονίζει τὸ ἀληθὲν συνεχόμεν ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέτρον ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀρετῆς, τὸ μέτρον ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς κατ' ἀρετήν ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς συγκαλέων. This abstract participle is not common after the fifth century (Thenniston, Greek prose Style 36-7); Plutarch (unlike Cicero and Gelius, 6.6.12n) took ὡς ὁ ἄλλον as "that which is in pain".

The word he claims Epicurus should have used is ὡς ἀληθείνω μέτρον ὁράλατα λογο, καὶ πέρας κοινῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐν τῷ πλῆθος τῶν ἀληθείων διαχείρεσθαι παρὰ Πηθέρι, ὡς ὡς ἀληθείας πρὸς τοῦ Πηθέρι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀληθείως τὸ ἀληθείνω σεισμὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς κατ' ἀρετῆς, ὡς ὡς ἀληθείως τοῦ πλῆθος τῶν ἀληθείων ἀληθείως τὸ ἀληθείνω σεισμὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς κατ' ἀρετῆς.

One might object in turn that ὡς ἀληθείνω should strictly mean "that which causes pain"; now pain can survive the removal of the stimulus.

---

1.36 [at Sophocles Οιόδησμη (misinterpreted by LSC)]}

Ἐν Ινικὸν ἐδεῖ οὐκ ἑαυτὸν ἀληθείνω, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῶν ἑαυτὸν ἐδεῖ οὐκ ἑαυτὸν ἀληθείνω, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ θεῶν ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτό

not to be bemoaned or grieved for, but wondered at.
One would defend the usage by citing from this passage and elsewhere τὸ ἐπὶ in the sense of "pleasure"; but when one blames another for loose expression, one must avoid it oneself. Gellius, however, does not challenge Plutarch on the linguistic points; we may suppose he was not fully informed about them. Instead he accuses Plutarch of captious pedantry. Compare Epiphanius de haeresibus 70b ἑσύμπτωμες τοῖν δὲ ἔσημερος εἴδος ὅς ἀφέσσων καὶ ἐλθέγονε θυμέρον (cf. 11.11); Constitutiones Apostolorum 3.5 ὑπαρχόν ἀπὸ πᾶσας ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ῥημάτων, μὴ ἔκδηλος μὴ ἐρευγέσος μὴ προβαλλόμενος μὴ πολὺ ἑάυτην μὴ κατάλειψος μὴ ἔσημερος μὴ διεσοφάλως καὶ ἐσοφάλως (there is nothing in the Syriac version corresponding to μὴ πολύλαθος; μὴ πολὺ ἑάυτην but the general tenor of these vices suggests that ἔσημερος = "captious") Dr. Ἐγγόθης "quibbler" in Philo the Jew: 3.1.19, 249.1.23.10 Chalmers. A different sense for the verb, of seeking out choice expressions, is Socrates, Hist. 6.22(34.27) καὶ πολλὰ μὲν ἀκριβῶς βιβλία γέρεγκται λείψῃρα δὲν αὐτοῖς καὶ ποιημάδως ἰδιωμένην γένος. So ἐν εὐεργεθάρι Thucydides 5.98a, 14.149.4. For further examples see the Gadonii. 5 non modo non sectatur epigraphus sed etiam insciatur; a blatant use of a figure found also at 1.1.10 "tantum ceterum omnibus in ipsius quoque inscriptionis lami cendentis, quantum cessimus in cura atque elegantia scribendorum"; 2.23.22 "non patu Ciuccilium sequi debuisse quod assequi nequitat"; c.s. (with change, not addition, of prefix) 3.29 "cum discernendi magis discuptandiique discrimini quam cum discernendi sententia atque fiducia"; 3.24 "qua erat procul dubio opinones suae professio, non Ronensiunm culpae confessio"; 17.5.13 "si id per aliquam circumstantiam fieret, non per ipsam perpetuae benignitatis constantian".
The word *fauisae*, outside this passage and its epitome at Sulpicius 1.26.1, is found only in *Paul.-Fest.* and the glossaries. P.A. has two explanations: "fauisae: locum sic appellabant in quo erat aqua inclusa circa templo; sunt aucta qui putant fauisas esse in Capitolio cellis cisternisque similis ubi reponi erant solita ea quae in templo uetustae erant facta" (76.16); in the absence of corroborating evidence, and taking note that even the learned Ser. Sulpicius Rufus had no idea what *fauisae* were, we had best assume that P.A.'s first explanation is due to a false inference from statements about *cisternae*, and that the word *fauisae* was applied to the Capitoline lumber-rooms and nothing else. These were an Etruscan feature; their name seems to represent the root of *touea* and the Etruscan suffix found in *carisa* and *mantis*.

1 Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51 B.C.) is cited seven times by Gellius, sometimes perhaps directly (A. 3. 2, A. 4, 7. 12), but not here, where directly or indirectly Gellius is using Varro's *epistolicae questiones.*

uir bene litteratus: we have observed Gellius's taste for such compliments (2. 6. 11.), but here there is a special point: the word was so out-of-the-way that not even the learned jurist knew it.

2 quod...ixisset: here the quod-clause, replacing the accusative and infinitive, follows one acc. + inf. (as at 1. 11. 2) and precedes another (cf. 15. 7. lemma vs. 15. 71); but Gellius needs no such motivation for the construction. The subjunctive here is due to dependence on *in*

---

1. The word *fauisae*, outside this passage and its epitome at Sulpicius 1.26.1, is found only in *Paul.-Fest.* and the glossaries. P.A. has two explanations: "fauisae: locum sic appellabant in quo erat aqua inclusa circa templo; sunt aucta qui putant fauisas esse in Capitolio cellis cisternisque similis ubi reponi erant solita ea quae in templo uetustae erant facta" (76.16); in the absence of corroborating evidence, and taking note that even the learned Ser. Sulpicius Rufus had no idea what *fauisae* were, we had best assume that P.A.'s first explanation is due to a false inference from statements about *cisternae*, and that the word *fauisae* was applied to the Capitoline lumber-rooms and nothing else. These were an Etruscan feature; their name seems to represent the root of *touea* and the Etruscan suffix found in *carisa* and *mantis*.

1 Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cos. 51 B.C.) is cited seven times by Gellius, sometimes perhaps directly (A. 3. 2, A. 4, 7. 12), but not here, where directly or indirectly Gellius is using Varro's *epistolicae questiones.*

uir bene litteratus: we have observed Gellius's taste for such compliments (2. 6. 11.), but here there is a special point: the word was so out-of-the-way that not even the learned jurist knew it.

2 quod...ixisset: here the quod-clause, replacing the accusative and infinitive, follows one acc. + inf. (as at 1. 11. 2) and precedes another (cf. 15. 7. lemma vs. 15. 71); but Gellius needs no such motivation for the construction. The subjunctive here is due to dependence on *in*

---

2. For the change [low]*7[AW]* cf. *touea* and *fauoe*, *noue* and *caneo*.
memoria sibi esse"; elsewhere Geilinus has both subjunctive (10.27. lemma "quod...fuerint", 14.6.4 where indirect questions precede) and indicative (10.27.1"quod...fuit", cf.2.13.10n. 6.9. lemma 11.1.6, 11.17.7)
See Gorges p.51, and for use in the main clauses of lemmata, 2.6. lemma n.

quod...impedissent: Catulus wished to cut into the hillside about the temple, thus lowering the Forecourt (area Capitolina) and raising the height of the stylobate (suggestus) - which would involve increasing the number of steps - to achieve a better proportion with the increased height\(^2\) of the temple floor to pediment (fasciculum);
but found his excavations running into the fauisae, of whose existence he had doubtless been till then unaware.

3 Valerius Soranus: see Sicinorius Hermes 41 (1909) 50ff. Soranus is not an integral cognomen, but "from Sora"; cf. L. caiumius Bononiensis. A mediocre orator cut a good s. leuar (Gic.de or.3.43, Brutus 169); he acquired the citizenship (being a Latin) by the lex Iulia of 50 B.C., and was tribune of the plebs in 22; but having revealed the secret name of Rome\(^3\) he fled to Sicily, and was executed by the propraetor Pompey, on the Senate's orders but by treachery.\(^4\)

2. Cf. Valerius Maximus 2.4.11 "ueteris Capitolii humilia tecta".
3. This seems to have been for (i.e. Romul backwards:: \\

(\textit{he has supplied }\textit{must} to parallel \textit{must} \textit{use} \textit{beaut} \textit{beaut} \textit{beaut} \textit{beaut} . This is not the same mumbo-jumbo as Capito's story (\textit{JS} 3.1.273; Jcestus 328.13, Solinus 1.1.), that Rome\((\textit{Solv})\) was Evander's Hellenization of an earlier Valen tia, \textit{Valerius} also named the tutelar deity: \textit{Sacr. Sac.} 3.9.3sq.
4. we need not worry about his triumphic sanctity: he could always be held to have forfeited it by leaving Rome. Besides, this was a heinous offence and Rome was fighting for her life.
* The reader's ill-will, since quo...appellatum probably persisted in this...citating...in 2. Valerius or 2. Suetonius; but in...tend toward cases, where the subordinate clauses in...Aesopian...tend to fast but the repetend...had not...him to emphasize the point. getting...Early Latin writers...will tend to use the indicative...the subjunctive.
appellaresmus: I have expected appellamus, but cf. 2.18.3.
Contrariwise we frequently find the indicative where the subjunctive would be more appropriate: Hertz vind. Gell. alt. 25-6, n. 56; e.g. 1.12.6
"idque dixisse ait Hypsicrates quemiam grammaticum, cuius libri sane nobilis sunt super his 'quaes a Graecis accepta sunt'.
flauias: a fragment of Valerius's imagination (apart from anything else, the stem of illo is not -i/3-, but -il-)
4 aditui; but aditumosque 6.1.6. At 12.10.1-2 he rules firmly
"Aedituus uerbum latinum est et uetus, ea forma dictum qua fimis et legibus. Sel pro eo a plerisque nunco aedituus dicitur nova et commentaria usurpatione quasi a tuendis aedibus appellatus"; his authority (§ 4) is Varro 2.1.2. At uR.1.2 Varro writes "ad aeditumos, ut dicere dominabitur a patribus nostris; ut corrigamur a recentibus urbanis, ad aedituos"; cf. 15.1.26.2, 1.69.2; 15.7.12, 3.61. Although Gellius uses at 5.11.17 a form (harenarum) that at 15.5.16 he declares to be unattested in good authors, if he wrote aeditum he here deserted both his principles and his source. Aedituus should therefore be considered: the corruption is attested at 15.10.6 for Cicero 2 Verr. 1.96; it occurs too at lexius 105.15 as against Gell. 12.10.7, cf. also Leo on Plautus *Curculio* 204. From Livy onwards we definitely find aedituus; but the uetus poeta (15.2.10) Valerius aedituus already bore it as a cognomen, Lucretius has aedituentes, and Varro as we have seen attests aedituus.

2. Admitting his immediate source may now have been Varro; but one might expect Gellius to have restored a form that both he and Varro preferred.
CHAPTER II

The remarkable prowess of Sicinius (or rather Siccius, cf. § ...)
is related by Dion. Ant. 1. 30-7, Val. Max. 3. 2. 24, Pliny NH 7. 101-2
113. 9 Helm; cf. Suetianus Marcellinus 25. 13, 27. 10. 16. There is very
little variation in the story, for which Valerius and Julgentius cite
Varro as the source.

Dionysius tells us that the consul T. Romilius* sent Siccius, a
leading plebeian agitator, on a mission as to his death; but Siccius
survived by his wits, was elected tribune, and secured Romilius's
conviction (for this last cf. Pliny NH 7. 102); he was then murdered
by the decemvirs. This murder is also recounted by Livy at 3. 43, who
makes no other mention of him: he is silent on his valour and also
on his tribunate, though he does present him as an agitator:
"petulantiam decemviralem tribunorum creandorum secessionisque
mentiones edulius militum sermonibus occubuit serentem." Finally
Homeras 7. 18 makes the decemvir murder Λομιόν τον Σέκινον,
άμον ο τον Ενδράν φαί ἀν τον πρώτον τον δόρον πηθάρησαντον

Pliny follows his account of Siccius by treating of L. Annius
Capitoilinus (NH 7. 103) and L. Sergius Silus (ib. 104-6), both men of
much valour. The latter, nuced, pr. 107 B.C. and Catiline's great-
grandfather, not only was brave in battle, but when he lost his right
hand made himself an iron one. Not even injuries in both hands and
both feet abated his courage: "ceteri proecto victores nominum fuero,

1. Julgentius garbles it, but it clearly is the same story that he garbles.
2. 452/1 B.C. = 455 B.C. (Varro) = 453 B.C. (Dionysius); that is the year
before Tarpeius and Sterneius.
Sergius uicit etiam fortunam" (Pliny NH 7.106). Festus, intending Siccius, speaks of "L.Ser^io Dento". It is possible that Siccius was at least built up, if not actually invented, as a plebeian counterpart to the patrician Sergius, particularly if the source of our accounts be Sicinius Macer (§4n). See A.Letz Hlio 33.173-9; Ogilvie on Livy 3.13; and the literature cited by the.

1 Sicinius: so Solinus and Ammianus; Dionysius, Livy, Valerius, Pliny, and Zonaras, all have Siccius, and Fulgentius has Sitius; Festus, as we have seen, has Sergius. Sicinius is the commoner name, and the gens Sicinia provided seven officers of the plebs that we know of, including two in the three years after the First Secession and one in 44. Besides these, the tr.pl. of 47/0 is Siccius in Livy but Sicinius in Diodorus Siculus; the cos. of 47 is Sicinius in Livy and Festus, Siccius in Dionysius and Cassiodorus (cf. RE under these years). — see p. 128.9 (compare n. r. Sicinius 2 and n. r. Sitius 2). The details of these awards are constant (with a few trifling exceptions, noted below) in all accounts1 which argue a relatively recent common source; for the possibility that this was Sicinius Macer see §4n. For Roman decorations see Gellius 5.6 with the passages cited by Hosius; RE s.vv. Corona, Dona militaris; G. R. Watson "The Roman Soldier" I 107. The imperial practice of relating rewards more to rank than the actual feat of arms is not to be projected into either the real or the imaginary fifth century B.C.

coronis...auris: according to L. Fiso (Pliny NH 33.38) a gold crown was first awarded to a soldier by Postumius at Lake Regillus; in Livy the first soldier to receive one was T. Manlius (afterwards Forquatus) I. Fulgentius's confusions are here ignored.
in 357 B.C., for his famous feat in single combat. No doubt the mural and other special crowns developed out of plain gold crowns, which came to be awarded to equecati, or where a special crown was not appropriate. obsidionale: given to the relieving commander by those he has relieved, and made of grass crowning in the place besieged (Gell. 4.4.9), the most honourable of all (Pliny NH 22.9). Indeed Pliny found records of only eight such awards: 1 of these, Siccius's is the only one whose circumstances are unknown.

muralium: gold, with imitation turrets, for first scaling the enemy wall (Gell. 5.6.10.)

ciucis: made of oak-leaves, awarded by a fellow citizen whose life one had saved in battle. (Gell. 5.6.11-15). Last known to have been awarded under Claudius: Watson l.c. llo. cf. Cicero Planc. 72.

torquibus...amillis: general tokens of the commander's esteem with no fixed tariff for award; under the empire these were apart from phalae the only decorations open to ranks below centurion.

amillis plus centum sexaginta: other sources give him 160 exactly.

hastis...phaleris: according to Polybius (6.39.3) τη μὲν τρείς τοιούτα καθημενον γαλλικον δεσπότην, τοι τε καταλάβοντα αυτοκράτορι τη μὲν τοξοφόρα φήδα τη δε δεδομένη, & τη δε παιδοφόρον. The distinction between φήδα and φάλαξ is peculiar to this passage, probably relating to a difference in shape.

For the hasta pura (δόρατος 2.6.2) & Sonar. 7.21.5) see leibig(abhandlum en

1. To Siccius, P. Secius has the elder. Calpurnius Flamma (liv 7's name. 22.6.11 - cf. epiocha 17 - for the leader in 258 B.C. of the Forlorn hope described in gr. 3.7. Fabius Maximus Cunctator, the younger Scipio (cf. Appian M. c. 103.40. -990) C. Retrius Atinas (in the Illyrian war under Scipio: the only centurion to win it), Sulla, and Octavian (13 Sept.) 30 B.C. the young Cicero being consul. Pliny displays a noble concept for the last two awards.

2. For this word see Holder Allzeitscher Sprachschatz s. v. "gaison".
It is most economical to suppose that Sicinius was from time to time corrupted to Sicinius, as it was in the Plinian exemplar use by Solinus; and that the Sicii, like certain other gentes, had (or were represented by tradition as having) a patrician branch (whence the cos. of 467) and a plebeian (whence the tribunes of 454 and 449).

For Dionysius: in either case the three-hundredth year of the city.

in annalibus: possibly Sicinius Macer's, c.f. § An. Gellius, however, was probably using a collection of examples.

plus quan credi debeat strenuorum fuisse: only in Plautus (M. 446, 'rin.1056) does strenuus make a synthetic comparative; but the adverb one would expect in the analytic form is magis. But plus is so used by Plautus (aul.420, Cas.670) Horace (Aen.1.3.52), and Valerius Maximus (5.4.3); yet in all those places, as here, plus may perhaps be in part taken with the verb. This, however, does not apply to its use in Tertullian, Irenaeus, the Ital, and other late Latin. (Cf. Tiberianus 1.15, Pl. 3.265 Horrens: "has per umbrae omnis ales plus canora quam lutes"; there is no equivalent of Gellius's fuisse) no distinction in use between plus and magis has survived into Romance: the French for magis magisque is "de plus en plus", the Spanish for plus centum is "más de ciento".

G. Wolfflin ausgewählte Schriften 149sqq.

For the notion "plus quam credi debeat strenuorum" the modern English colloquial would use the even more wittily nonsensical "so tough it isn't true". Gellius is reviving the faded hyperbole of incredibilis, which even the sober Caesar could use (LG 1.15.1); the reversion to oratio recta

1. apart from the fossilized magis "but" (French jamais, Italian: ma, etc.) and (non)... (iam)magis "never" (French jamais, Italian mai, etc.)
in §2 "phaleris item donatus est quinquiens uiciensque" tells against a literal interpretation of the words as expressing disbeliever. So 3.17.7 cf. 3.8.8, 
lemon "pratiis rite non capientibus". [see also Tat s.v. oeo "sensu debilitato ferei, qu. posse uel licere" Th. 5.100-6 sqq; usually in a negative or as here virtually negative context.

Achillenn Romanum: a common pattern of phrase; normally however used for purposes of insult, cf. Nisbet on Cic. is.20 "barbarus Epicurus", but here laudatory. We may compare Propertius 4.1.64 "Vulbria Romani patria Gallinachi", and such expressions as "the English Cicero" in the eighteenth century. We have here another instance of the Romans urge to show that they could equal or surpass the Greeks; Cato's comparison of Macedicius and King Leonidas is in a not dissimilar spirit (17.63 Peter: Gell.3.7.15)

quinquies uioresque: the use of -que with compound numerals is very rare but cf. Martial 14.192.2 "carmina mononis quinquies decemque gerit". (I take Manilius 1.452 "qu e re decem trisque inceninit" as uai i te dea

[ma te rea avah avah souca] Vedice by contrast allows "na ca navat

ca" for "ninety-nine"(acc.); such constructions seem regular in Avestan ("navata navatama").

3 spolia multiiuga: spolia is corrupted in V-R to populi. multiiugus
(cited as a word at II.14.4) is used strictly by Livy(28.4.15 "multiiugus si uelit et equis"), cf. Gell.14.C.11; in the sense of "multiple" at Gell. 1.2.7; meaning "many together" by Fronto, alluding to Cato's

The word occurs seven times in Apuleius, four times in the singular, e.g., Florida 10.95 "duplumigitur uolos vociam subeo, inuo exeru multilio"m : lat. 21.5.7 "nomici multilio totus enteritur orbis." At Florida 15.79 multilio means no more than miles; "tot tamquam multillu" is "culcibus discipulorum toti orbe haustatis." Cf. the description of English manifold into a synonym for many.

2. I use this formula for simplicity's sake: Varro had Rome founded in 753 B.C., Dionysius in 751 B.C. (to the Decemviri the relative chronologies tally.

3. This is Livy's date (2.11.3), whose amount of the battle, polyvexia, is followed by Polybius (v.2.13.1).


Here it means simply "many": 1 according to Pliny Siccius won thirty-four spoils (figure confirmed by Solinus), according to Valerius thirty-six; both give nine eight in single combat. Dionysius (10.37.3) is incomplete but divergent:...κατεχες ἐνέκαμηκαν ἐντεινον εἱσσον καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν ἐνδοκεφαλοφορὸν ἐνυόυος ἐξοράζεις ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἐκείνης. Anthene., clementine 22 A.D. (1894), 369, fills the lacuna thus: <2>ἐφέον πελένοι</2> but we should not suppose a substantial variation for the sake of homoeoteleuton.

4. According to Dionysius (10.38.4), the consulate of I.2o. iilius (A.D. 299) 2 fell in our hero's fortieth year of active service and the thirtieth from his first command, in the consulate of C. Aquilus and C. Siccius (A.D. 267). Obviously he is using round numbers; but if we assume that he served ten years before his first command, he will have enlisted in A.D. 257 ("A. Sempronio stratino Minucio Augurino coss"). Between then and A.D. 299 Dionysius, our fullest source, gives eleven triumphs (AEC 17.8; cf. Degrassi Inscr. It. 13.1-536-7), of which two fell in the same year A.D. 295.

AEC argues that Licinius Iacer dated the triumph of "Auctumius Regillensis dictator de Latinis" to A.D. 295, and that since Siccius cannot have participated in both triumphs of A.D. 295, and since his nine triumphs were obviously found by counting the number of triumphs celebrated over the period Lacer is the source.

1. The word occurs seven times in Apuleius, four times in the singular, e.g., Florida 10.95 "duplumigitur uolos vociam subeo, inuo ex eru multilio: lat. 21.5.7 "nomici multilio totus enteritur orbis." At Florida 15.79 multilio means no more than miles; "tot tamquam multillu" is "culcibus discipulorum toti orbe haustatis." Cf. the description of English manifold into a synonym for many.

2. I use this formula for simplicity's sake: Varro had Rome founded in 753 B.C., Dionysius in 751 B.C. (to the Decemviri the relative chronologies tally.

3. This is Livy's date (2.11.3), whose amount of the battle, polyvexia, is followed by Polybius (v.2.13.1).
In fact another argument could be advanced: the nine require inclusion of Servilius Priscus's triumph in AUC 259; of this Dionysius tells us (6.33.2-3) that Servilius's colleague App. Claudius denounced his sympathy towards the plebs (this is the year before the First Secession) καὶ ἐπεεἴρισεν τὴν βουλὴν πὴν δοῦαι τῷ σωτῆρι Θεόδωρο. Servilius then summoned a contio in the Campus Martius, declared that his right to a triumph stemmed from his own deeds, and celebrated one 

Servilius then summoned a contio in the Campus Martius, declared that his right to a triumph stemmed from his own deeds, and celebrated one διὸ τοῦ δήμου παρακριβές προεξερχόμενος; Dionysius concludes ἐν δὲ τούτῳ φθόνον μὲν ἐτερίσθην παρὰ τῶν κατηγοροῦντας, δέκρεια δέ εἰσερχόμενος ἐπεφέρθη τῷ δήμῳ.

The analyst, therefore, must - on the assumption that he did not make Siccius follow both consuls in AUC 295, - have either dated Postumius's triumph to AUC 258 and ignored Servilius's (as all our other sources do, including Fast. Cap.), or dated Postumius's triumph to AUC 255 and accepted Servilius's triumph as legitimate. In which case did Biber the battle of Lake Regillus to AUC 255, bearing in mind that as a populares he is likely to have accepted the triumph of AUC 259, we may incline ourselves towards regarding him as the source of this story about the great plebeian warrior.
Lemma speciem habens priorum: 2.7.6n.

1. axibus lineis: Plutarch Solon 35.1 
απεριφέροντας εἰς ἴδινυν ἄρονας ἐν 
κάλλιστοις περέΨουσι στρεφώντας. The authorities disagree 
irreconcilably on the shape, substance, and purpose, of κύρεις and 
ἁφόρας; one wonders how consistent the Athenians were. See Stephanus-

Hist. Soc. 91 (1953-7), 1sqq; H. mant, History of the Athenian Constitution
by C. E. D. Ehrhardt 24-5, 3v; Aristotle has κύρεις at Ath. Pol. 7.3, but is said to have written 
in five books τῶν Σόλωνος ἄρονων (see Rose Aristotelis
Fragm. p.16, 140).

Aristoteles: in Ath. Pol. 5 δειν ὅ ἐν 
των μεν πολίως στρατιωτικῶν 
των δὲ πολίων κυρείων διὸ ἦν ἤδη 
ἡμᾶς κυριαρχεῖτα δὴ τοις, νόμον ἐργαζόμενο 
νομον ἐργαζόμενο 

<...>

Similarly Plutarch Solon 20.1; allusions at Cic. de Fin. 10.1.2; Plutarch
Moralia 550c, 823f, 665d. But Solon made no such law. Shortly after the
Thirty had been expelled, one Thimon, having been selected by the lot for 
the council, was accused at a δοκουμένη before the sitting Council 
precisely for not taking part in the civil war of 404-3; his accuser 
anticipated a possible defence as follows (Lysias 31.27): ἡνὸς διὰ τοῦ 
δυνατον ἔχειν ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἄδικοις οὐκ ἔσται ἄν 
παρακατέβασθαι ἐν ζητεῖν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, νόμος ἐν ἑαυτῷ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ διακρίνεται, ἶνα 
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄδικων ἀδικήσῃ τις. 

οὐδὲ ἀδικώς οὐκ ἔσται ἀδικήσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἐν 
ῥήματι ἐν ἄδικων οὐκ ἔσται ἀδικήσῃ, ἢ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἕκαστο ἐν 

Our law, then, was invented afterwards, probably very soon afterwards;
it is admirably expressed in the same speech (57)

footnote: 1. Solon's alleged reason (Cic. Sex. Ross. 70, Diog. Laert. 1.59) for not 
prohibiting parricide...
Despite the oaths — they were a constant source of danger to the State (if one believed the accuser) or harassment by συμοποντάκα (if one believed the accused); see (in opposite tendencies) lysias 25 and 26, and indeed several other speeches from the corpus. 2 The same thing had happened after the previous restoration of democracy: Pseud-lysias 20 passim, aristophanes progs 71 sqq, lysias 25-25. Some histories exaggerate the speed of reconciliation; the atmosphere was perhaps not entirely unlike that in liberated Paris.

si ob discordiam dissensionemque, Ar: aristotle's simple Greek is transformed into an ampullose Latinity, obviously aimed at reproducing the verbosity of Roman laws, but not entirely succeeding. Laws pile up near-synonyms in asyndeton or linked by -que in order to cover all possibilities (e.g. lex acilia 3 "ablatum captum coactum conciliatum auersum siet"); Gellius joins synonyms with -que or atque for rhetorical effect, in his usual manner (cf. 13.25.11-23). This is Gellius's own work (Gamberale 101, 1.75 against Milanovitz "aristoteles und Athen" 296 n.1); but it is quite likely that Gellius found the reference to aristotle in Favorinus (cf.5), who admired him (Plut. mor. 734f).

1 Hell. 2.4.3; aristotle th. rol. 39.6; lysias 13, 66; 13, 13, etc. (contrast 13.23 with 26, 16); flor. 17, 98 (ii. in italico); con. 112, 2, c. 7.
2 The trial of socrates was similarly motivated; and the old emotions were (albeit in vain) appealed to by min 382 (lysias 26).
tut...in eo tempore: cf. Asellio ap. Gell. 2.13.5; Hache 14. Such pleonasm are common in Gellius as in early Latin and Lucretius; no doubt the archaism is here intended to convey the solemnity of a law (Gamberale i.e., alterutrae partis sese adiunxerit: the MSS have alterutra parte, which Carrio corrected (cf. Charisius Ann. 1.159.2 = 202.13 Barwick "asteus alterutrae alterutrae") Hertz (vind. Gell. alt. 6) toyed with retaining parte as a dative; such forms from i-stems are epigraphic but not literary, unlike those from consonant-stems (note i.297-301).

Note that for variety's sake Gellius uses here the native, but in ad with the accusative; adiungo with the dative is classical, but adiungo never always takes an in Cicero (for the dative cf. Ver. 9.1.1), Florus 1.10.1)

a communi malo ciuitatis: malo del Favign. Although Gellius is rhetorically expanding his original, references to the common ill are more appropriate to an ethical commentary than to the actual law; the sumptaein sumptaein sumptaein sumptaein that Hertz (vind. Gell. alt. 3) cites from Plutarch Solon 20.1, p. 624a, are indeed from commentary.

The latter passage, indeed, enjoins the statesman (not to join either party, but) to mediate; the former is worth quoting in full: τῶν δ' ἄλλων αὐτῶν νόμων ἱδίως μὲν ράκτιτα καὶ παράδοσις δὲ μελέτην ἔπιτημον εὑρίσκει τὸν ἐν στόχῳ τόλμησις μετέφερα μερίδος γενόμενον. Μοιρασθείσα δ' ἐν τούτῳ κατάς μηδὲν ὑποκλίσεις ἐπικεφαλής κατὰ τὸ ποιήσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑποβολῆς τοῖς πάνταις ἱλαρώτατοι τὸ ἕκτον καὶ δικαιοτέρα πρακτικὴ προσβήμενον συμπάθειάν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν µαλλον ἣ προφέρεται καθιστάσα τὰ τῶν κρατούσιν.

First the law, then the commentary: even there besides Hertz's...
Moreover, makes a clearer-cut contrast with "solitarius separatusque ... sec. sserit"; and the interpolation is easily explained. It is certainly what Collius ought to have written, and in my opinion what he wrote.

"... and the "civitas"..."

Gullius (or his source) misunderstands it as implying exile, which from Solon's time was no longer entailed at Athens by *

For *domo patria* (five times in Cicero's speeches) and *patria carere* see TLL 3.155.3sqq; for the rhetoric of these clauses of Livy 5.30.6

"... exsules extorres populum Romanae ab solo patrio et diis Penatibus in hostium urbe agerent".

extorres: ex- privative (or exlex; exanais; exos et exsanguis; aetius 3.72; or aevbeunos, aens;) + V terra (for the o-prase or se2-/ tripudium); for the i-stem of exanais.

---

1. Which removes Vogel's objection (Mellekisen III 1875.569) that there is no koulo\(\) in a civil war.
2. For *commune* = *\(\) koulo\(\) see TLL 3.1977.51sqq. - In mediaeval Florence the idea "res publica" was expressed not as republ\(\)a (a Renaissance Latinism), but as commune. [41937a]
3. Harrison The Law of Athens [47]; see *eschines* 1.11-; or *cyiax* 6.24, * aesthenes* 21.5, 92, 1, and more in *Andocide* 1.73-6.
2 Solonis singulari sapientia praedicti: cf. 11.7 "Alcyades autem rex terrae Libyae, more atque luxi barbarico praeditus"; 12.6.5 "Romulus quoque regius et Pulius Flaccus, nobili genere amplissimo honoribus ac summo loco in ciuitate praeditus"; at 1.2.1, 6.12.4, 9.4.13, 13.1.6 praeditus is attached not to the proper noun but to an appositive uir. In general, Gellius is as strict as Cicero in using appositive uir (40 times) and homo (21 times); apart from the instances with praeditus I have noted direct attachment only at 2.20.5 "Scipionem omnium aetatis suae purissimae locutum", 12.20.16 "Sallustius quoque proprietatu in uerbis retinentissimis consuetudinibus concessit", and 17.21.3 "Incipimusigitur a Solone claro" ἀπὸ κόρσεθ' αὑν ἐκ ἅνων ἐκ ἑκάστους ἑδονός, where if anything were supplied it would be not uir but illio. 1 As regards praeditus, however, Cicero himself often attaches it directly, e.g. Phil. 15.25 "si ... praestantissimus ciuem, si ... Scipionem, clarissimum uirum maiorumque suorum simillimum"; Lebrton "Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron.43. temuit nos ... admiratio: "spes tenet", "studium tenet", are regular expressions; but here one senses in the back round the Homeric ὅππος δὲ ἔχει ἑρωικῶς. Cf. Livy 44.19.1 "hostis primum admiratio cepit quinam sibi repentissimis clamar uellet". See also, however, 10.12 "temuit nos non mononeae scripturae taedium."; fere: 2 "uirc ne repirc fte obildis tenitent".

1 One can hardly count 2.25.1 "erontonea consuelarem"; consularis is virtually a noun in such contexts, and is normally so treated by Cicero (Lebrton 56). This is not invalidated by occasional a positions in Cicero, nor by Gell. 2.1.1 "Herodem atticiun, consular uirum ingenioque eloquio et Graeca uocabula colorem" (where uirum is de Francis by ingenioque ... colorum). 10.12.1 "Herodem atticum, consularium uirum".
in principio: cf. Vulg. Gen. i. 1, John i. 1; and so below § 4. In classical Latin we should have principio. Cicero, for instance, distinguished principio, in principio, and a principio as follows: principio is relative to that which follows in time, logic, or importance, in principio is relative to the entire structure, a principio looks back from a later point. Thus for the difference between principio and in principio, see de oratore i. 209 "il faciam quod in principio fieri in omnibus disputationibus oratorum censeo, ut quid illud sit de quo disseretur explanetur", the definition coming at the beginning of the discussion of which it is a part, but i.e., 210 "nau si forte quaeror et quae esset ars imperatoria, constitutum putarem principio quae esset imperator; qui cum esset constitutus administror quidam beli gera mi, tum aequitatem de exercitu...", where the definition is set off against subsequent elaborations; the two expressions could not change places.

(For a principio see Att. 7... 2 "ac uellem: a principio te audisse adiscissime censeo", Brut. 157 "eixerat... a principio ut de re publica sileremus" or.ell. 23.7). Cellius, therefore, is yielding to the ever-rising tide of prepositions, as at 2.1.9 "ad filium dicitur", 1.2.6 "de calamidade damni".

requirens VFR requirentes rec. The enunciation seems obvious, and the corruption easy: an assimilation to the preceding singular aspiratio. It is, however, just possible that a mannerist could make an astonishment itself seek information: another mannerist, after all, makes opinions themselves seem (medianus 30.7.11 "ut opinions a stimant").

3 ad des. mental. solutione: cf. reference H 305 "vander telian desinit"; i.e., also ad an. Fina 5.4 "haud scio an qui dicit abuisse se aemitian cu.
eo désinere”; Geil. 15.7.2 "disciplina tabilis canem bi desita est", Il. 31.5 "obpugnatione desita”; and frequently in P. uius.

introspexerant... dicebant: obviously right, against the singular in AV.

res prorsa... se sic habent: idiom requires habet. Il. 6.3.2449.68

confuses this set usage with qualified plurals such as dic. alt. i. 19.4 "urbanae autem res se sic habent".

4 Obviously, this has nothing to do with the law's real motivation, which we have seen in lysis 31 and which Gellius caught perhaps without fully realizing it in his "solitarius separatusque a communi ciuitatis secesserit"; the democratic collectivist's rejection of the oθελημα (who after all tended to be an oligarch in disguise). The more democratic an Athenian's opinions, the more he exalted παντοκρατορισμός and oδυνη over the interests of the individual, for thus was democracy best protected against an Alcibiades or a Critias. Anyone, however, voicing any unusual sentiments expressed here would have been taken for a supporter of the Thirty. Naturally in Solon's day they would have had no relevance: if by the boni one understands the παντοκρατορισμός the rich, noble, and mighty, they would already be involved in the στάδιοι, and were hardly disposed to wish their adversaries base or noble "sanatos magis ... qual. perditos"; if men of good will like Solon himself, how many were there maioris auctoritatis? and what if they all took the same side? In fact we have an armchair philosophizing that justifies the measure in terms of the ideology, or rather propaganda, propounded by Roman republican boni: had such a law ever existed, or been alleged to have existed, at Rome, these are the arguments we should expect to find in Cicero and Livy.
Hindu: Accius 117 "Mosque ut severum diumacos leto offeres"; cr.

Lachmann on Lucretius 5.679.

seorsum: so 2.23.27, 3.3.6, 10.15.26, 10.20.5, 20.5.6.

5 sunt: more logical would be sint (since we do not know that there are any such), but Gellius displays a sublime indifference in such matters:

11.1.2 "disciplinas istam Chaldaeam tantae auctoritatis non esse quantae uideri volunt, neque eos principes eius movebant esse quae ipsi ferant",

in concordia adnitemus: for animor transitive cf. Livy 5.25.5, 22.5.5, Pliny ep x.1.1, Pronto ed V fl. 2.7.4.

animos. Even if this meant simply "mentis" and not (as the connection with lites would suggest) "iras", one would expect animos; cf. Wackernagel Vorl. Üb. Syntax 2.13-14. But, as is well known, anima tended to displace animus: at each instance we must enquire whether this has happened in the author's Latin or his manuscripts. The latter surely at Sallust uv.2.8 "nan uti genus minimum compositum ex corpore et anima est, ita res suntae studiaque omnia nostra corporis alia, alia animi naturalem secuntur"; but the reminine is also found in the 1.33 at Eu.2.2, Cat.2.6. The basic distinction is between the life-force (anima = spiritus) and consciousness (animum = mens): "sapimus animo, fruimur anima" (Hor.2.9.68); it needed little violation of ordinary usage for Lucretius to render τοῦ αὐτοῦ by animus, τοῦ αὐτοῦ by anima (he uses either term for the conjunct whole, the ζυγον). Immortality should be attributed to the animus but the reminine term is found at Pliny xiii.7.100, Tacitus xi.16.19, Gellius 2.13.2 (where see note); it is not therefore surprising to find anima for animum at Seneca ben.4.37.1, and editors
have the unpleasant responsibility of deciding when they shall allow such usages to begin. Certainly by Gellius's day *anima* had extended its meaning; note especially 3.1.5 "Sallustium...corpus et anima dixisse, quae duae res hominem demonstrant; nuncque noso ex anima et corpore est", where *animum* is quoted from Cat.1.3, but Gellius's own word is *anima*. Therefore if here *animas* means simply "mentis" it should certainly be accepted; but in conjunction with *lites* one might expect rather *animos* "iras": *anima* yielded to *anima* only in its primary sense. *lites animasque corum in flamment aut oii studio aut luci*: Seyffert (Berliner philologische Hochschriften 4.1881.174) thought to find in these words a scenic septenarius; but no scenic poet ever could have used *odii*, nor would have used *odi*, as genitive of *odium*; cf. Sachmann on *Lucretius* 5.10.6. There is no point in reconstructing "*lites animosque* (u.B.) eorum in flamment aut odio aut studio luci"; we surely have an accidental septenarius as at 3.i.15 "quibus ineilla lori consilium est, septimo demum die"; cf. 2.29. Introductory n.

1. So Prouto de nepote *aniss*o 2.5 passim (cf. 2.1. "animarumque conciliabula": the ghosts of popular and poetic mythology are *animae*, but the immortal spirits that the Stoics people the skies with are strictly *animi*).
For liber or one child, cf. Servius on Virgil Aeneid 10.532; Schaalz Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen 35 (N.F. 15,) 1891, p.121; Landgraf on Cicero Sex. Rosc. 96; J. v. Allgemeine historische Forschungen 115 sqq; Distel Syntaktica 1.39; Funck All. 7 (1922) 73 sqq "as heißt 'die Kinder'?

The usage is not uncommon in early and classical Latin. Plautus Amulius 735-7

_...qui ego erga te conuerui, adulescens, tali quanomai ena faceris meque moe'que paritu? Liberos? :: deus impulsa nihi fuit, is me ad illiam inexit._

Compare ib.23; Asin.67, 932 (cf.16); Truc.634; Terence Hecyra 212

_qui illum decrevunt dignum suos qui liberor committerent_ (the reference is to one daughter); Andria 691, 112.151; Pacuvius 32. R; (Accius 4217); Cicero Sex. Rosc. 96 (cf.9.2), 2 Verr.3.161, Imp.34.g.33 (cf. Plutarch Rom. 24) In Cat. 1.4 (cf. Vell. Pat. 2.6.6) Phil. 1.2 (cf.1.31, 2.90). Ser. Sulpuci ap. Cic. Fam. 4.5.3 "natura est tibi credo pro tua dignitate ex hac inuentute gerner deligere cuius rici liberis tuos (sc. Tulliam) te tuto committere putares" (cf. Ter. Hec. 212), 1 Cassius (ib. 12.13.2) "sunt tibi, i. Tullii, liberis propinque dini quae te et merito tibi carissimi": by this time (13 June 43 B.C.) Julia was dead, so liber or refers only to young females. See also Livy 3.49.2, 3.50.5,6; Vell. Pat. 3.50.3 (cf. Cic. Phil. 1.2); Tac. 1.42.

The use of liber or instead of filius or filia of a single child generally implies that the child is thought of as offspring, as related to his parents, rather than as an individual. Particularly instructive is Livy 3.50.6: Virginia, who was an only child (3.45.9), is first filia: ("sibi uitan filiae sua cariorc. fuisse"), then liber or ("morte a.m.i.ti

_It will be seen that liber or did not refer to a child's whole offspring. Cfr. In Cat. 1.4 (cited above). V. ib. 15, Vell. Pat. 2.7._
melius ratum quam contumelia liberos"). In the former clause Verginius
thinks of her as a very dear person; in the latter as his offspring,
concerning whom a general principle is enunciated. And so, it is often
misleading to say that liberi refers to one child; rather does it refer
to offspring in relation to parents, the particular offspring happening to
consist of one.

The singular liber pens is first found in the declamations of pseudo-
Quintilian (cf. Heins Hortgen L.700); it is late, rare, and artificial. It
remains, therefore, to ask why liber was used of issue whether one or
manyfold.

Despite Andri's attempt to separate liber from liber etliber (which itself probably comes from the root *leudh- "iron", cf. liber
Pater, and German leute, Russian ljudi "people"), it should seem that
liberi are the free members of the familia; the wife being singled out
as coniunx (as we say "wife and family", though the wife is part of the
family), and freedmen, despite their legal status, not having the same
standing in practice. Thus liber came to be used of the children,
but in relation to their parents rather than as themselves; hence such
expressions as auctus liberis, coniunx liberique, domus coniunx liberi,
which are used even when there is only one child: Plautus Arpa 364,
Terence Andria 691, Cicero Sex. Res. 96 (cf. Landgraf).

One may compare the use of manes for a single ghost (Ver. aep. 0.119)
or deuov (ib. 6.743); but these concepts are of much later date than the
collective di manes. Nor are such generalized uses as parentes of a single

1. That a wife n magna counted as a daughter has no bearing on the question.
parent or $\textit{maides}$ of a single child precisely parallel; these are genuine plurals of words that exist in the singular, whereas $\textit{liberi}$ has come to be a collective noun with plural form.

2 $\textit{complurium}$: "plurium" and "complurium" are the only forms ever used; which is probably why Sinnius Capito (Gell. 5.21.10) ruled that $\textit{pluria}$ was the only correct form. (cf $\textit{complurium}$, Gell. 18.6.2) But since $\textit{plura}$ had been in use since Plautus's time and $\textit{complura}$ was in classical use, Julius modestus (Gell. ap. Charis. 61.125.4 = 159.9 Darwicx) ruled "$\textit{complura} \textit{et complurium} \textit{esse diœcutam}". This was simply an analogist excess.

\textit{mine quoque:} cf. $\textit{nuper}$ 2.23.4, 1.3.1, 13.31.1, 19.31.2, 17.21.1, 2

\textit{suppining 3.3.3; hodie 3.16.13; Hercklin Citiernmethode 690. In none of these places does Gellius put his argument in another's mouth; at 11.3.1 he describes his present busy life; at 15.31.2 and 17.21.1 he speaks of people who have "recently" made fools of themselves. Here he cites an author whom, according to Hercklin (cf. next note) he did not come across till shortly before the Attic Nights were published. It is possible that the use of these expressions is not entirely arbitrary.

$\textit{semporii asellonis}$: For his conception of historiography see 5.18.8-9.

R. Till, "Jürzburger Jahrbücher" 330sqq. Hercklin remarks (Citiernmethode 702.) that all Gellius's (six) citations from him are provided with

1. $\text{Lysias 1.4}$ $\text{Eulexos}$ $\text{ποτα εἰσεῖθε}$ $\text{τοις καὶνίς τοῖς βοάδις}$ $\text{γλυκεῖν}$ $\text{εἰς εὐεργετούς}$ $\text{μα}$ $\text{πατίσον γίγνεται}$. For these and other such plurals see \textit{distedt} Syntactic 1.27sqq.

2. $\text{Nuper}$ of course is a vague word: Cicero uses it in 70 B.C. (in Caec. 67) of an event in 104 B.C. (the trial of .. Silanus; cf. .. ecnonus 89).

3. at 14.1.20 Favorinus claims to have read Gelliusuber $\text{nuperine}$; the tale is fictitious, cf. "Notes on \textit{Biellenforchem}" 31.
book references and except for this chapter are added at the end of discussions; one should note, however, that at 13.3.6 Cellius claims the point de part for his discussion of "necessitas" and "necessitudo" to have been finding "necessitudo" used of necessity in Sempronius Asellio. Hercklin suggests that Cellius did not discover his till shortly before the *Notitia Atticae* were published, adding that the *Notitia* of Asellio in 63 suggests that he had but recently made his acquaintance, and therefore felt compelled to tell the reader who he was - in other words, that is, not even the educated archaeists that Cellius was writing for could be expected to have heard of him.

5 *orare coepit*, &c.: after polling in the tribunicii elections had been adjourned (Appian BC 1.14.62); Gracchus feared not death, but conviction and exile. See *Caesar* "Scipio Aemilianus" 218, and his excellent reconstruction of the fatal events. Dio (frg. 82.8) makes this appear a part of the election campaign; Flutarch (*Hi.Gracch.* 13.5) sets it even earlier, before the annexation of Perusia.

liberosque suos; eum quaque virile secus ... habebat: but surely this means the same as "quorum eum quem, &c."; Cellius was wrong to see in this passage an example of *liberi* with single reference. It should seem that Gracchus had other children at the time; *Caesar* 319-321, *Dio* 166-7. The later historians are of no value on this point, but the growth of the story is amusing: Appian has correctly ἐν ὄργα τὴν οὖν ὀπάσαν. Flutarch tells us that *οὐκ ἔμειν αὐτογαρφάραν ἐπείγον τοῦ διδομο τοῦ κακοῦ παῖδον* ἀπεκτείναςκαὶ τὰς μητέρας δὲ αὐτὸς ἐπιμελείας ἔτην, while Dio adds Cornelia to the procession: *καὶ ἔπερσαν εὐθὺς παλάκας οὐσῶν τὸν τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸ παιδία τοῦ ἔτεν ζητέων.* We have seen a similar "Παλάκας" at 2.3.
Steti is historically the perfect corresponding to the presents *sto* and *sisto*, and in the form *stiti* maintains its position in compound verbs. In the simple verb, however, the two presents having become semantically distinct, *steti* attached itself exclusively to *sto*; when in certain legal expressions a perfect was required for *sisto*, one was backformed on the analogy *resisto: restiti :: sisto; stiti*. In Imperial Latin this form fell out of use: Digest 34, 5, 13, 2 (Julianus de ambiguitatibus) "si Stichum et protem non sisteris".

One of these phrases is *uadimonium cistere*, to keep bail: outside the passage from Jato here cited the perfect occurs Reapos 25 (Anonius 2.4 "ut nullum ilia (sc. ilia) stiterit uadimonium sine attico"; in many ADD we find the interpolation praestiterit. The other is *sisteres aliquem*, to procure someone in court: the perfect is found in a legal context only at 34, 5, 13, 2 above, but cf. Cicero ad fam. letter (written by Cicero in his own and his son's names to Tiro) "in hoc omnem illi sietian si exhibueris teque nobis incolument /sisteris n, praestiteris /.../ omnia a te habebo"; in view of *sisteres* reported here from Jato's manuscripts and *praestiterit* in Reapos's, Victorius's *sisteris* may be regarded as certain.

Since, however, *steti* has often been wrongly written by editors for *steti*, we shall list here the uses of *sto* and *sisto* in this legal context. 1 It is notorious that *uadimonium* has been systematically eliminated from the Digest in favour of *cautio judicio sisti* and similar expressions; but for the moment we need not distinguish

1. (exacty taken from Roby, "Introduction to Justinian's Digest", c. VII, p. xxxvii.)
interpolated and uninterpolated texts.

To produce a person in court is *sister* aliqua; thus 2.11.10.2; 2.11.11; 2.11.14, and for the perfect see above.

To appear in court: *se sister* (2.11.2.3, 2.11.4. pr.; for the perfect see above); or *sisti* (2.11.3. pr.; 2.11.3.1; 2.11.3.2; 2.11.11), in the perfect status esse (2.15.3; 2.11.11; 2.11.14); or *stare* (2.11.11 ad fin.; cf. Horace Sat. 1.9.38; Gellius 4.20.7), in the perfect stetisse (2.11.4; 2.11.3; 2.11.2.1; 2.11.11 twice; 2.11.4.3; 2.11.6; 2.11.11 twice; already in Cicero, pro quaestio 25 "F. Quinotius non stetisse et stetisse se", Att. 15.19.1). In these passages stetisse is sometimes interpolated by editors.

To promise for someone's appearance is *promittere aliqua sisti* (2.11.7; 2.11.8. pr.; 2.11.11; so Cicero, pro quaestio 67 "ut Alcimus promittat Naucio sisti (quinotium)").

To promise for one's own appearance is *promittere se sisti* (2.11.2.3; 2.11.6; 2.11.9; so Gaius, Inst. 1.184 "udimonium ei faciendum est, id est ut promittat se curto die sisti").

It will be seen that these expressions are perfectly classical, although often substituted in the Digest for those with *udimonium*. Thus 2.11.2.3 "cum facias esset ipso tempore promissionis sistendi" with a *rei gerendi* construction; this is from Ulpian LXIXV ad ejictam, which will have had *udimonii sistendi*. From the same work comes 2.11.4.4 "in promissione deserta iudicio sistendi causa facta" for "in udimonio deserto". As a result of these interpolations we find *sisto* used intransitively in some Digest-passages for *"appear", e.g. 2.11.220.4 "se per quem factum erit quominus quis in iudicio sistat" for "udimonium."
sistat"; so 2.10.1.1; 2.10.2; 2.10.3.pr.; 2.11.0.

contra Tiberium exulae; fr 202 Halvovati. Who this Tiberius was, whether he was Ti. Senigronius Longus (a rival of Cato's for the censorship in 134), and when this speech was delivered, we have no information; this passage is our only source for it.

2 falsa et audax emendatores E scripto et per libros "stetisse" fecerunt; Hertz is no doubt on the right lines with "falsa et audax emendatio libros vulgaris inuasit: sic istud quae uerbum sincerissimum corrupserunt importuni: emendator et scriptor &c".

quoniam sisteretur ... non staretur: one would expect the present indicative, but cf. 2.10.3.n.
L't

.Lemma ae tat i senecjbae : so 3.4.lem: "ante aetatem senectam". The
expression occurs several times in Plautus; see also *notus* on Lucretius
3.772, where however the reference to Sallust should be deleted
(Schulzbrecher on *hist.* 2.47.2).

*atque ibi*: so the lemmata to 1.7, 1.6, 3.20, 1.6.7, *et ibi * 
*ibidem* 5.6,  *atque ibidem* 8.14; *(atque) in ibi* see 2.20. lemma n.

1-2 For Roman marks of deference to age see major on Juvenal 13.55;
especially Cicero *de senectute* 63 "haec enim ipsa sunt honorabilia quae
uidentur levia atque communia: salutari adjeti decessi adsurgi deduci
reduci consuelt: quae et apud nos et in aliis civitatibus ut quaeque
optime morata est, ita diligentissime observantur"; Ovid *Fasti* 5.65-70;
Valerius Maximus 2.1.7. In 21 A.D. Domitius Corbulon complained to the
Senate that *Sulla* had omitted to rise for him (*Tacitus* 2.31);
Seneca includes this point in things to be taught a child (*de ira* 2.21.8).

2 in antiquitatis: *cf.* 5.13.3; see Herodtis *Critiermethode* 657-6.

*Lacedaemonis*: the Spartans were renowned for respecting old age, as
Lysander appreciated (*Cicero de sen. 63, Plutarch Loralia 795*).

According to Herodotus 2.50 they were the only Greeks to make way for
their elders and give up their seats as the Egyptians did;¹ this is an
exaggeration, but though the idea one should do so was widespread, only
the Spartans could be relied on to put it into practice (*Cicero de sen.
63-4, Plutarch Loralia 235c-d; cf. *ristophanes* lueb. 993, Xenophon *Bk. 2.3.16, Cyrop. B.7.10, aristotle *Eth. 1165a2c*). - Naturally the idea of
a direct derivation is of the same order as the tale that *Lycurgrus's
constitution came from Crete.

1. And among other peoples the Jews (*Leviticus* 19.32, *Job* 22.8).
3 haberent: the παράδοσις is habent (Kv, habentem P), of which not the mood (or Hertz vimiC. Gell. alt. 25-6, 58) but the sense is impossible. At 15.22.6 "circa quae perisset ad se rouerti et, ut prius consuerat, quod opus esset ut facto praedicere", the  family has a similarly impossible est.

According to Cicero (de rep. 2.55) in the first year of the Republic P. Valerius rubicola conceded the victors to his new colleague Sp. Lucretius as to the older man; on this story Plutarch (rubicola 10.4) comments: καὶ τῶν ῥήματος ἐπὶ ἑπτά τὸ πρόσπερτον ἀλ. ἑκτὸν ὥσ τοι γενέσθαι ψυχονομον. As Hollis & Saw (staatsrecht 120.3), the largely unrecorded consulate of Sp. Lucretius, who is said to have died after a few days in office (Livy 2.8.4), was invented as a precedent for conceding the first fasces to the older consul. In his account of AUC 261 (491 BC = 493-2 on the Varroonian system), Dionysius of Halicarnassus makes the consuls Postumius Cornelianus and Sp. Cassius, having entered office on 1 September, call a special meeting of the Senate to deal with the Secession (6.45ff); after Aemilius Lepidus had spoken, τὸ πρόσπερτον τῶν δύστιν ἐνδιδαξὼν τὸν ἡμῖν ἥκει (6.57.2). But in the later Republic we find that the candidate who first obtains a majority, and therefore prior nominatur, is called consul prior; thus Cicero, who was returned after the ninety-seventh century had declared, while J. Antonius and Catiline were still battling it out, was consul prior and had the fasces in January. He was elected suo anno, "quod nono punci consules in hac citiate facti sunt" (2 leg. aug. 3), and will therefore have been younger than his undistinguished colleague.

It may be that a younger man might, of grace, concede first fasces to a more reverend colleague, but if so we might have expected to hear of occasions when the younger man refused to do so and a public issue developed; and what should be the criteria? Those given by Gellius in §6 would not have served in B.C.275 to decide between A. Curius Lentatus (already cos.in 290, now praetor; the elder, but a novus homo) and A. Cornelius Lentulus Catulus, patrician and nobilis; nor in 100 between Curius cos.XI and A. Valerius Flaccus. Nor do the Fasti show any deference to age - nor indeed to nobility, previous tenure, or even the alphabet - in ordering the names.

Some interesting conclusions can be drawn from section 56 of the Sex.Palacitana (CIL 2.151; Bruns L.97); "is qui ea committit habebat, uti quisque curiae cuius plura quae alii suffragia habuerit, ita priorer ceteris et pro ea curia factum creatusque esse remaniato, dono is numerus ad quern creari oportebat expleitus sit. Qua in curia tuleram suffragia duo proresae habuerint, maritu quoque maritorum numero erit caelibi liberos non habenti qui marito numero non erit, habente liberos non habenti, plures liberos habentes pauciores habenti praeferto priorumque notiato, ita ut bin. liberi post inveniendum aut singuli puberes ansius uiri iuris potentes ansiae pro singulis sospitibus nominatur. Si duo proresae tulentur suffragia habebant et eiusdem conditionis erant, nonima cures in sortem collit, et uti quaeque nonen sorti ductum erit, ita eum priorum alis remaniato". Under this law (or between 84 and 84 B.C.), the successful candidates are returned in the first instance in descending order of votes received; if that fails the more prolific father is given priority; that failing, the married man; as

The same rules to be followed when two or more candidates carry the same number of curiae (ib. 57.60-5).
a last resort the elder is not preferred, but the question is
resolved by lot. Whereas Imperial Rome had first sham comitia
and then none, at Salona as under the Republic the elections were
genuine; but if the Romans had been strongly committed to age as a
criterion for priority, they could have interposed it in the lex
Basilitana between husbandhood and lucum. It is after all, noteworthy
that the provisions in that law and the lex Julia concerning children
and marriage are identical.

kap. VII could; kapiut is frequent in official usage, T. 3.3.6ff; as in
haceo kalendae harumpasso; cf. the abbreviations..."calumniae causa"
(Lex Rubria 1.9); a "calumniator" (Cicero Sex. Nesc. 57) which are not to
be expanded as kalumniæ causa, kalumniator, any more than C and C...

as Caius or Quaeus. So too saturnaliciunum (c. strense) c. Gen. 4-1 recto
fasciae sumendi; there are three possible constructions in the genitive,
rem gerendi, rerum gerendam, rerum gerendi. Cælius uses all three:
"recipienda instituitione discipulos" 1.3.1, cf. this passage and 4.10.1;
"libera alendorum" 13.1.7, cf. 20.10.9 "uerborum fingendi et nouandi"
1.15.1, cf. 5.10.5, 1.3.2 all three are also found in the singular:
"ius consulendi senatum" 1.7.5, but "ius... senatus habendi" ib. 8,
imponendi poenae" 7.1.1. Note too the variation at 5.10.5 "eloquentiae
discendae causarumque orandi cupiens fuit".

1. It should be mentioned that Ulpian ad legem Julia et Papian
(1.1.14) states "proconsules non amplius quem sex fascibus utatur".
This may be confirmation that the lex Julia did treat of the fasciae.
2. At 3.1.1 "emunque esse honumam gendidi summa fines", honumam
may go directly with fines.
5 This does not mean that bastards counted as offspring; they were "sine patre filii" (Gaius Inst. 1.64), related only to their mothers. Where a man is preferred to the widower or divorced who has not remarried (cf. 87a), on grounds of age (cf. 86b, 102), and is not exempt by subsequent marriage.

maritus aut qui i: numero maritorum. I. x. lal. *maritus quiu. maritorum numero erit*. Hardy ("Roman Laws and Charters", p. 104, n. 20), citing Ulpian reg. 16.1 to show that the age for containing a marriage laid down by the lex *quae lex liberos exigit* Papia Poppaea was for a man from twenty-five to sixty, states that a man *maritorum numero* would be a widower whose wife had died after his sixtieth birthday (or a soldier, but this would hardly apply to consuls).

7 Caelebs, unlike English "bachelor", is not restricted to the man who has never married: Sejnea Medea 697-8 *si satis est tibi / caelebs Jason*;

Phaedra 1215-6 "caelebs et orbis* funebres una face ut concremarem proles et thalami rocos?"


2. For the legal consequences of this relation see Sanders 129, 327, and the juristic texts there cited. Cf. F. Hoyer "Der römische Konkubinat", pp. 5-7: "Alle nicht in *legitimae nuptiae* Geboren werden gleich behandelt (Celsius *XXIX digestorum* = 9.1.5.19 *cum legitimae nuptiae factae sint, patrem liberi sequuntur; ulgo quaesitus mater sequitur*). Sie gelten alle als waterlos, wenn auch ihr Vater bekannt ist (Paulus IV ad editum = 9.2.4.5 *pater uero is est quem nuptiae demonstrat*); Syne, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 104 (1900) 323-7. (Syne suggests that the status of bastards as "sine patre filii" and the absence of legitimation by subsequent marriage are contributory reasons why we hear so little of bastards in the Roman aristocracy. It should, however, be noted that at English law a bastard is "nullius filius"; nor was legitimation by subsequent marriage admitted till 1926.)

3. Likewise the *orbis* may have lost his children or never had any.
Postumus is to post what ultimus is to uis, and etymologically is synonymous with postremus: it is in this sense that Virgil used the word at Æ. 763. But it came to be specialized in the meaning of a child born after its father's death,\(^1\) that is to say the one certainly last, and as such a child's praenomen: Plautus Ammianus 162-4

post medián ætatem quod hera luctu uxore domus,
si eam senex anum praenatae fortuito recerit,
quid dubitas quin sit paratum nomen puero postumus?

Varro 1.2.60 "qui nane natus diceretur, ut is uius esset, qui luci
Lucius, qui post Patris mortem postumus"\(^2\) It early then developed into a cognomen (thus in C. Rabirius Postumus), but unlike Agrippa, which from a praenomen (Agrippa, Lucius Lanatus) became exclusively a cognomen, is still used as a praenomen in imperial times: ÆS 947 "Post...missius C.
Sæius tr. mil. q. aed. p. p. legatus i.l. Iaesaris Aupræ [ ] Fumenti
dandi ex S.C." Virgil, however, exercised his poet's right to use the word in its etymological meaning; and was so understood by Ausonius

Ep. 12.85-7 (p. 242 Peiper):

Vt quondam in Albæ mortibus
Supremus Senex satus
Silvius Juliis discit.

\(^1\) Or, in legal usage, after its father had made his last will.
\(^2\) No doubt the usage was assisted by the ordinal praenomina such as Quintus, (like which it generated a gentile name Postumius), though these originally referred to the month of birth: Petersen TAPA 93 (1962) 547-55. Unlike them and unlike Hanius and Lucius, Postumus as a praenomen retained its proper implication - no notice should be taken of the story that a postumus with a surviving grandfather was called Quiter (P.P. 27.17; auctor de praenomina p.501.11 in Kern's Teubner ed.of Valerius Maximus) it is a cognomen of Oppius (Censor

RE 18.1.6892).
In the mannerist period, however, we find *postumus* used in various senses: "last" (*Ptolemaeus* met.6.30.20), "too late" (ib.1.5.6; *apoll. 36.5*), "a ghost" (*Livy* 1.14.7) and with a genitive "postumae
cladis illius" (cities) founded after (the Flood) *Tertullian* *apoll. 30*.

As regards Silvius, the story stated by Servius *ad loc.* to come from *Catullus* is that a widowed and pregnant Lavinia fled from her stepson Ascanius and bore him in Tyrrhus's cottage: "cuius (sc. Ascanii) Lavinia
timens insilias, grauida confugit ad silias et latuit in casa pastoria
tyrrhui - ad quod aillumens eit "Tyrrhusque pater, cui regia parent/arenta";
(*Livy* 7.405-6) - et illic enima est Silvius... Sed cum Ascanius Magrarut
imilia, neuocait nouercan et ei concessit laurolaunium., sibi uero
Alban constituit; qui quoniam sine liberis perit, Silvius (qui et *Aeneas*
Ascanii filius, dictus est) suum relinquit imperium." cf. *Dion. Hal. 1.7 o. 175*, *Festus* 490.7, Jerome on the year of Abraham 661, *Izetzes* on *Lycofrohn* 132.2

In Augustan times this unedifying story found itself bowdlerized. *Vergil*
reinterprets "Silvius Postumus" to create a sylvan idyll; *Livy* (1.3.6)
has "Silvius deinde regnat Ascanii filius, casa quodam in siluis editus".

The family history of the *Aeneidae* is very variously related: see
C. *Trieber*, *Aeneas* 1394, p.124ff.; *Kraer* on Ovid *Fasti* 1.39. Whereas the
normal genealogy is *Aeneas - Silvius (Postumus) - Silvius Aeneas -
Silvius Latinus*, the *elision* of Silvius Aeneas (old 1.21, p.1.9, 3)

1. *Museus's* source was *Diodorus Siculus*; cf. *Diodorus* 7.5.8 from the
Armenian *Museus*, which appears to state that Silvius was Aeneas's
son by Oliva, first wife of *Rumelius*. Karst, however, emends the
Armenian text to give the Catoian story: *e griechischen christlichen
schriftsteller her ersten drei Jahrhunderte* *Museus*, vol. 5. (Leipzig
1911) 134, 397-5. In any case, Ascanius's plot is there.

2. *Izetzes* adds, listing the Alban kings, *re* *Aescanianum tetrarchum* 2
*Aescanianum* *trachon* *Aescanianum* *tetrarchum* *Aescanianum* *tetrarchum* *Aescanianum* *tetrarchum*... *The tetrarch* are *Livy*. *Tzetzes* account derives from *Dio* (L.y.24.8.270.10)
makes him son of Aeneas and Lavinia,\(^1\) while ovid (Fasti 1.12 sqq, oct. 14.609) makes (post.) Silvius son of Aeneas and father of Silvius Latirus. 3 praenomen ei postumo fuit: of the two alternative constructions with "nomen est" (cf. Gell. 13.29.1), Ceiùius prefers, at least with o-stems, the attraction to the dative, which is the earlier (Hoffmann-Saranbr 90-1 L. 420.1, eger 4.434, Bennett 2.108, 165, Landgraf on Cicero Sen. Rosc. 17, p. 46). His usage may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-stems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arescuae 9.4.15</td>
<td>Sepaisia 1.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellae 13.6.3</td>
<td>Ruga 4.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-stems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postumus 2.10.3</td>
<td>Macroclus 5.13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesari and Saberio 3.7.21</td>
<td>Superbus 17.11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollio 9.13.2</td>
<td>Cr. Protes 12.11.2, treus 13.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtius 11.11.2</td>
<td>Cellius accepts such nouns into the Latin second decension; 7.40.9 &quot;in proctheo&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molosso 17.21.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insano 1.7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other ascensions the only examples are the Greek names ας 2.14.8 (but who would ever have said qui quid?) and Alco = 'Αλκώ (Alce would have been impossible, Alcon apparently unwelcome\(^2\)); naturally Greek names still in Greek letters cannot be put in the dative (5.9.5 "nomen illi fuit 'Εκ'τες", not 'Εκ'τες').

\(^1\) Cf. 'procreores rerum mythicarum latinorum, e. i. (Celle 1434) "Aeneas de Creusa iun. (sc. gemit) qui et Ascanius; quo interfecit ipse post ueniens in Italia de Lavinia, filia Latini desponsata Turno, gemit Silvius hancam" (quoted by Frieser).

\(^2\) Despite Servius Antonius (153.4.5), Laetus 115.556, Pacuvius (4038), Accius (3868) cf. Pl. ianem 2.209.1 sqq. and even Iesus, gentiliano 1.5.63. Charisius pr. Pers. "Caypsoneas" (i. 65.7.8 sqq. Barwick); whereas Servius and Acrobius use Aulonis sc. Cora itus ian. eu, had used Aulus in the genitive (Char. 1.117.20 = 162.10 Barwick); Vergil has A. accido, and no other case-terms; but cf. 'Mavrov i.e. Io.1.4".
5 Caesellius Vinex is dated by Keil to the Etrurianic era (EBK 7.13); at any rate he must have written early enough for Sulpicius and Scaurus to write about his errors (3.16.8, 11.15.3; indeed he had many enemies who were not always fair: 6.2.2). He is cited seven times by Gellius, who once vindicates him from attack (11.15), once supports him with as evidence (11.14.6), but generally finds him in error: at 3.16.6 he misinterprets orta, in 6.2 he condemns an outrageous howler ("quem creditit esse meum cor.") in 18.11 he is a malistine. On all those occasions so far listed he is praised by a litotes (cf. 2.6.11n); compare 20.2 "quid istuc sit quo sitiices cantat homo in emae veritatis scire sese negat" (Gellius gives the answer Aepito's conjectura). Here alone his name is unadorned.

6 idoneum: virtually "reputable"; the word is also used by Gellius for stylistic models, 5.20.4 "apud Graecorum idoneos", 11.26.5 "apud scriptores idoneum", 11.6.3 (apud idoneos moderis scriptores), 11.26.5 "apud Sulpicius idoneum". Indeed, we do not know even of any disreputable authority for the Vergilian account, which is surely his own invention. (And is it not like him to reinterpret Postumus according to its etymology?) That Aepito finds a different way out of the unwelcome vulgate suggests that neither is following a Julian tradition.

(It is unnecessary to suppose that Vergil needed either persuasion or compulsion to twist the hitherto accepted story into a form more favourable to the imperial ancestors; but Gellius can hardly be expected to have understood the reason for the change, and is therefore puzzled by the απέπευεν).

8 Apollo Sulpicius: "quem primis sectabar" 7.6.12. Often cited, nearly always with high praise casting no little light; only at
* So far all, unless on Sept. 524: Exposition Deo. shine.

what beholds the place is made plain by Deo. re.
12.13.21 and 15.13.4 is he controverted, and there most respectfully.
here, however, Gellius, worried though he is that Caesellius's interpretation is καὶ τοῦτο, cannot swallow the equivalence of
longaeaeus and immortalis (which probably rested on the principle of
subalternation: all includes some, so everlasting includes 10.834 (καὶ τοῦτο),
9 ad filium dicit: a mark that the case-system is breaking down.
Sall. 4.2, 11.5.4; cf. 2.28.7n (inapp T.PA 3.7); tertullian
'AI nations''13.10 "alter ad alterum dicobat εἰς τὴν μνήμην''
this usage is very common in the Vulgate, where everyday usage is
reinforced by Greek καὶ and Hebrew el-
indigetem: whatever this term meant, it was certainly applied to
Aeneas, who is ABIGI6.2 RESR 10.8348 cf. Solinus 2.15,
Luppiter ignis Iivy 1.2.6, rightly 3.5.
10 sane: "very" in Gellius is normally "sane" or "admodum," though
other works like per and perquam are also found; never the Ciceronian
vulgo, and plano only once (11.11.6). See Schröllin "Jusgerulite
Schriften" 135 (and more generally 133-49); Torres 36sqq.

---

1. See Heide "Kölsche Religionsgeschichte" (Munich 1960) 43.
2. ABIGI6.3 may be compared to the reverse spellings pneumoniae
thensesaurus 177,35-46.

---
The affections of ing- conf- etc., may be considered under the general head of the phoneme-sequence /Vnr/ (vowel + nasal + fricative), whose development appears to have been as follows:

(1) In non-initial syllables short /a/ was narrowed to /e/; hence amans but luscensus.

(2) Quantitative distinctions were annulled. This happened before other consonants, long vowels being shortened, so that uidentis is [ui'dɛntis] as gentantis is [re'gentis]; that it followed the vowel-reduction is shown by the contrast amantis / talenim. It cannot, however, be shown that these groups with a fricative went through a separate stage with a shortened vowel; at all events quantitative distinctions were annulled, but this may have happened as a part of stage (3).

(3) The nasal element was realized as a nasalization of the vowel, which if short was compensatorily lengthened. That is to say, the phonemic group /Vnr/ was phonetically realized as [V:]. uimens and legens were phonetically still /w-.ns/ /leg-ns/, but phonetically [u'i:n:s] ['i:ɡɛ:ɡs].

(4) The nasal element was liable to be dropped altogether: [w:i:n:s] might thus mean δέξις or δφωρ, ['leɡ:s] ἀναγνώσει or ἀναγνώσκω. Thus the THURAT at CIL 12 4, CIL 501 10.12 560, I.c. 6 6.1973 (and Breton isern from in'mena; by influence of the labia, Welsh ufern) and of course 003.; or. Velius longus 7-7.1 "Cicero qui foresia et legalsia et hortensia sine littera dicebat”; Acerobius Sat. 3.2.8 "Varro diuinaram quinto ait aras primas asas dictas. quod necesse esset a sacrificantibus eas teneri, ansis autem teneri uasa quis dubitat?"
which depends on pronouncing ansa (Lithuanian ąsa establishes the as organic) without the įmm. One may adduce also the variants uiceninus/uicesimus, uiciens/uicies, and reverse spellings like formonsus and thesaurus. In the accusative plural of all declensions, where the /i/ is morphologically isolated and other plural cases end in es or us, the nasalless form is standard.

(5) Sometimes the nasal seems to have been restored after the long vowel, as [ ] before [ ] or įmm [ ] before [ ], especially when morphological factors tended to support it; as in the prefixed forms discussed by Cicero, who seems to imply [i:n'sa: us] [i:,'Te:li:ks] [korn's:a:wi:] [korn'te:vi:]. A distinction was probably made in careful speech between [laksas] laxas kalapas (pronounced like laxas kalas) and [laksans] laxans kalan, the one being influenced by laxis, the other by laxantis. Moreover, the /N/ was sometimes heard in words like anser and genus, or why were they so spelt? But we must remember that nasalization may have continued as an alternative manner of preserving the /N/.

(6) Romance development and external borrowings show a general loss of /N/ before a fricative: mense gives French moine, Spanish and Portuguese mésa, Gothic mes, Welsh mwy, all from [im'esa]. But in the very groups discussed by Cicero and Gellius, the original pronunciation [i: ] was often analogically restores: im'ans, classically [i:'i:ns] or [i::s] or [i:ma:ns], becoming [i'ans] whence Old French emes, Old Provençal ensas, or: the plerumque modifying the rule that im- etc have long vowels at Simek's Gm 1.409.2 (= Don. us 4.309.29) and servus .442.40.
It may be noted that the lengthening of vowels before \textipa{nx} not may be explained by the development of /\textipa{nx}/; see Alios \textit{Vox Latina} 66-7, whose account I modify in one particular. If we use [\textipa{t}] for a voiceless dental ([\textipa{t}] or [\textipa{s}]), the process is \[\textipa{v}. \textipa{x}\textipa{t}] > [\textipa{v}]: [\textipa{x}]: [\textipa{v}].\]

\textit{Inactus} \textit{mimus}; but since between sonant and dental [\textipa{t}] was often lost (cf. \textipa{ars} for \textipa{arx} T. 2.735.61, \textipa{ars} for \textipa{arx}, text from \textit{Virgil} the reverse spelling \textit{Conclivus} in the \textit{ax acilia}, we in the frequently used ordinal and praenomen [\textipa{q}-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t}] became [\textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t}].\]

\textit{Quintus}. A similar development may account for \textipa{quincenae}:

\[\textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t} > \textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t} > \textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t} > \textipa{o}ld \textit{Latin} \textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t} > \textipa{c}.

\textit{Classical} [\textipa{q}:-\textipa{n}:-\textipa{t}], the spirant [\textipa{v}] falling out between two nasal elements.

1. \textit{verbis aut vocabulis}: a \textit{vocabulary} is an appellative. Stoic grammar, possibly in the person of \textit{Chrysippus}, distinguished the \textit{peposiopia} from the \textit{vocabulary}, and Varro rendered these \textit{vocabulary} and \textit{nomen} respectively. \textit{Rhet.} 1.40.80 "sequitur de nominibus quae different a vocabulis ideo quod sunt finita ac significant res proprias, ut \textit{Caris Helena}, quod vocabula sunt infinita ac res communis significant, ut \textit{uir mulier}.

Similarly Varro \textit{Rhet.} 1.40 "Aristotelin duas partis orationis esse dicit vocabula et uerba, ut \textit{homo} et \textit{equus}, et \textit{adit} et\textit{currit}"; of course Aristotle spoke of \textit{eulax} and \textit{eupax}, e.g. \textit{Rhet.} 1404 b 26 \textit{vocum \textit{eulax} vel \textit{eupax} nec \textit{eulax} nec \textit{eupax}}. 2 \textit{Seneca} \textit{ep.} 5.6.7, complaining of its inadequate representative \textit{quod est} "cogor uerba pro vocabulo ponere"; \textit{Gellius} 4.1.10 "quoniam ciuibus Romanis \textit{latine}


2. At \textit{Rhet.} 1.45 Varro distinguishes \textit{provocabula} like \textit{quis quae} (\textipa{ris} not \textipa{r}is) from \textit{prononina} like \textit{nec haec}; I can find no other references to \textit{provocabula} or \textit{peposiopia}.
It should, however, be noted that *vocabulum* can be non-technically used of proper names: Cic. _de or._ 1.2 "Chaldaei non ex artis sed ex *vocabulo nominati*"; (cf. Gellius 2.22.19n) Tacitus, _orig._ suus, substitutes it for *nomen* in set expressions: _Ann._ 12.66 "delitteratur artifex talium *vocabulum* locusta", _Ann._ 13.12 "cui *vocabulum* Acte fuit". *Nomen* or *appellatives* is of course very common.

Aristarchus proposed to treat the *vocabulum* as a species of *ὄνομα*, and this view prevailed: Dion. _Thr._ 636b ἡ προσωπικὴ δὲ τῆς ὄνομας ταῦτα, ἐν ᾗ ἡ προσωπικὴ διὰ μόνον προσωπικὴν ἐπιθέσιον... ἐπεστευλόντα δὲ ἦσστι τὸν καθ' ὄνομαν ὀμαῖνον ὀν ἀπεδράντω ἴκεος.

Later Latin grammarians used *appellatio* or *appellatio nomen*; *quintilian* (1.14.20) treats with a distinction between *vocabulum* of things seen or touched and *appellatio* of other things, but in § 21, as is wont, dismisses the question: "vocabulum an appellatio dicunt... or et subiciencia minor necne, quia purui refert, liberum opinaturis relinqu quo.

Cicero, who throughout _Orator* avoids naming letters: 160 "aspiratio",

*ut iota litterae* tollas et _B_ plenissimae *litterae* (the archaic-rustic). (and not _litteram_ in _V_3 _exunctio_ s detrahant). _Att._ orator 3.46

"nisi aliqua litterae sequuntur* quae in *uerbis constituít et contruit secum: "ea_(the prefix) _"prima sunt"* which is a reminiscence of this chapter (cf. the reference to *copertus* in Sallust immediately following.)
Allen Vox Latina 53-5) he calls a Latin letter by its Greek name.

At Lucilius 379 Marx = 369 Arntz. I read "S nostrum [e.1] sem. et am cu quod dicimur: sigma". Martial 8.93.4 uses iota of the numeral character. By contrast, when he names to letters as written shapes, Cicero names them in the normal way: 2 Verr. 2.147, de or. 4.200, div. 1.23.

in "sapiente atque felix": again Gellius follows Cicero; for the syntax of words quoted as words see Lepoton 65sqq. The ablative of nominal, not adjectival form: Chiriusus GLA 1.47.6 = 5.1.26 Barwick: Priscian GLA 4.35-15, 347.18; Heue 2.59, 95, 118. Both sapient from sapient "wise man" and felix from the cognomen felix are well attested; the ablative of *Gelius Sapientis* is not attested, but no doubt was *Gelio Sapiente*; felix from felix substantival is not attested, but cf. procace Seneca const. 5.5, pertinace 1.3, de ira 3.8.4.

2 haec Gellius, eae Cicero. Attempts to late the weakening of hic into an antecedential particle like is are complicated both by the difficulty in certain instances of determining whether hic still retains its deictic force (cf. §3n), and by the frequent as confusion of it(s)/hi(s) and eae/haec of 6.3, 2692-26, 2732-34. Cicero admits it in verse (Aratea 235 "uerum haec quae semper certo voluuntur in orbe") but not in prose; but Gellius has e.a."his...accipiant unde ea nos accipimus" (quer.10), "ab his scilicet artibus quas iamo accipere atque meditari incessauerant" (1.9.6), et sic passim.

quaer excur sit: dicent iuunare: Cicero wrote "quaere aut sita se dicent iuuare", suppositional motivation for phonetic development forms the theme of Orator 153-161.

3 in his vocius de quibus Cicero locutus est: w.: hic be taken as
deictic ("these" Rolfi, "aceste" opescu) or antecedential ("(duels" montserrat,"les" larache); only a necromancer could inform us.

As in fact, of course, the basic form of the prefix is con-; cf. § 68.

"ea litera quaet prima est in urbe"Recit": Gallius continues with the Cicero-Pel minimum turn of phrase: cf. § 11, 1.17...

Whereas the alternation con-/con- was phonetically motivated and arose within Latin, pro- and prō- are both inherited from the parent language; save in Lithuanian, the reflexes of prō- are far commoner outside Italic. But in Latin the independent form (preposition and adverb) is inevitably prō; but even in prefixation pro- is normal.

The allocation of pro- and prō- seems arbitrary: prōnari but pro-ari, prōundo but prōero prōnico. Wackernagel (Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer 258) detected in prō- the specific meaning "fort"; it has however been encroached on by prō-.

Where the prefix adds another generation, we find prōnepos (Ovid met. 42.606) proneptis (Persius 6.53) but prōnemus (Ovid her. 17.208) prōceter (ib.3.74)2; these are the only words for which there is agreement.

Attention: one would however instinctively read prōceter (Seneca, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny) and prōhateru (ib.3.10.17, 38.10.10.1b) with the long vowel; and it may be that prōnepos and proneptis were necessarily influenced by the corrected vowel of prōnus.

1 Latin has no short open non-enclitic monosyllables: just as we ṯ (cf. Slavonic tv) not *ṯu (Doric τω) and ἅ (Gothic ne, Gothe, Slavonic ne) so prō (Lithuanian prō), not prō (Czech pro 'for!)

2 By contrast, in Sanskrit we have consistently (from prō-) proṣṭau, vātāu, pronepos "pranas", prāpan ("pranās", prāparātās "prāparātās", "patrānas magmin"; by contrast in Balto-Slavonic "ur-" is expressed by *prū- (Lithuanian prūtis prōtis), prūdān ("prūdān", prūprātās "prūprātās", "prūtis magmin"; in Balto-Slavonic "ur-" is expressed by *prū- (Lithuanian prūtis prōtis), prūdān ("prūdān", prūprātās "prūprātās", "prūtis magmin") and all other senses by *prū- (Lithuanian "ur-", Russian prūtis "urgethen", Lithuanian prūtis "vogelfather", Russian prūtis "urgeth; sian prōtis prophet").
In a few words we find variation: thus _uteri_ Enn. trac. 293; 
Plautus _lenaecidi_ 643; _procuratus_ (from _propiciscor_) Plautus _minuendus_ 149; _propriet Catullus_ 64.202; _profuso_ "to the spenatnri" (the same 
word as _profusus_ "poured forth") appendix Sententiaria 230 Ribeck.

propago noun and verb have usually _pro_-, but Vergil, besides the clause 

\[\text{propago} \text{ noun and verb have usually _pro_, but Vergil, besides the clause} \]

\[\text{propago} \text{ at _AE. _570 (or Lucr. 1.42, 1.997; Ovid Met. 2.38; 
Stat. H. 5.278, 327, Silv. 2.1.85, 2.3.39, 1.481), has _propaginis_ G. 2.26, 
propagé tib. 2.63; he may or may not have been anticipated by Licinius 
ap. Cel. 18.9.13, where the text is uncertain. In the verum._trág._inc. 
inc. 103 Ribeck has _propé_-, and Lucrétius varies: _propagant_ 1.200, 
2.997 _propagant_ 1.20, 2.173 (all final), but _propagare_ 1.195 and the 
striking contrast 

\[\text{5.650 ut propagando possint procudere saecla} \]

\[\text{5.656 nec potuisse propagando procudere prole...} \]

Lest it be thought that all these variations are encroachments of 

\[\text{Lest it be thought that all these variations are encroachments of} \]

_pro- upon _pro_, Lucrétius has _propert Aquae propellat_ (1.194, 1.1026; 
contrast _propellat_ 6.1028); _procurare_ has _pro_ (Plautusשלחus 2.0, 
Horace _Epist._ 5.2, Vergil _Aen_ 9.163, _Silius_ 6.529), but is given the 

\[\text{short vowel by Tibullus 1.5.15, Ovid _Fasti_ 5.3.3 (but _procurari_ 1.5.67"ipse 
procurator nume quaeque multa procurat" is spurious.) However the} \]

\[\text{opposition _proterus_ (Plautus Terence Pacuvius) / classical _proterus_} \]

\[\text{may well be explained by the form _proterus_ indicated by the} \]

\[\text{procurat for _procurare_ 6.12, Pacuvius 1.6.66, 1.444.30; _octurnix_ or 
_cocturnix_ (Plautus _sl._ 666, Capit. 1.1003, Lucr. 1.641) vs. _cótumix_} \]

\[\text{(Ovid _Ares_ 2.0.27, Juvenal 12.57).} \]

\[\text{At _Acan_ 7.159 the variant _propriet_ for _propriet_ was read by} \]

\[\text{At _Acan_ 7.159 the variant _propriet_ for _propriet_ was read by} \]

\[\text{and Oudenaard, and seems sort of mention by leforsan; but_and} \]

\[\text{and_and are often confused in JS: cf. Linner's apparatus at Horace Ser.} \]

\[\text{9.1.70.} \]
By contrast, the normal tendency from pro to prō is reflected in proloqui (cf. próloqui) < próloquos, próloquia Lucilius. 198 Marx = 195 Brünkel < próloquos, próloquia Lucilius 198 early próloquum but classical próloquum.

Which words then have prō? An ancient stratum of words the Romans will not have recognized as compounds: procôla, proœlēus, proœgius, and a sub-group with zero- radix roots proverb, probus, proœs, prómonim, prótenim (Hranianus 107), show the same extension as diutinus (skrīt aŭtēbana-) with the root of tenus, or prótinus.

Here are also a number of patent compounds: proœpus proœptus, and several whose second element begins with f- proœpra proœtari proœstus proœdicisci proœriteri proœgere proœlus proœtus prœœdus (but prœœro fœliche). None of these words has a second consonant between the f and the following vowel; Gellius expressly attests proœiā, conœtens, manus: próœx = 324J. Indeed, as far as we can tell all compounds of pro- and a word beginning with two consonants have prō except probus and proœbus, which were no longer felt as compounds: thus prō-fuō and prō-teāo, (Lucuvius 68R prō-creant).

Finally, there is no evidence that neologisms were ever given the short vowel, but the long is attested e.g. for probot (Lucertius 6.477). Except for a few vacillations, compounds with prō constitute an unexpanding class within the Latin vocabulary.

1. procôla from *kel- "strike", or percello; proœerus or properus; proœgius hypostatized from proœgiuo; probus (cf. probus Gell. 5.2, 198; Hertz viam Gell. al. 260, or. prōrog. "uitio uerto", probus of Sanscrit gā "superior, mighty", from gā - "be": procôa from "a" - "far", or welsh pelu and with wi. Hā Epic ἰοκ, Sappho 6. 29... Note that the b of probus and probus represents medial not initial, i.e. *bi, demonstrating that they were already felt as simplicia in the pre-Latin period.
7 "con" particula: cf. 1.19.3 "re"particula, 6.7.7 "an" particula (cf. i.1.85
16.5 "ne" particula; Cornutus 'Epideyrh' 13 τοις επικριτικοις μορίου
14.1.47 το άλλα άνευ ταύτα μέρες λόγου άλλα μορίου. 'Επειδή γαρ τοις εξωτερικοίς μερε
και εσοχοι μέρες ζώδες, μέρη δε τοις κεφαλαιοίς ούν οφειλείτο Αμφιπολος
χρησιον διανοειδες ίδιες, τινα τε θέλων διαγνωσθηκαι κατά τις διακινήσεις καθώς τινα
μοριου τοις λόγου μέρης ή τω μόριαν καθισ. 86.9 το ΑΕ (in Χερσονήσῳ)

In i.3 and 17.13 particula used or whole words, as μοριον is by

Apoloionus Dyscolus; cf. Priscian GM 5.127.2-3, Servius GM Sup. 150.2.

J. Collart (Rev. 6.1.1965.36 sqq) speculates that Gellius derived his
evident interest in syntax from contact with Apollonius's school;
the possibility cannot be ruled out.

7 tectorous cooperius: so cell. h. 17.6 "sicut Sallustius 'tectorous' inquit 'copertius'"; cf. Sall. 29.23 "Plautius atque tectorous cooperius".

Carratius: this form is already in Plautus and Cato, whereas the present-
and perfect-stems are first found in Lucretius (coperuisse 5.342,
coperitus 6.49), but are very rare until the Italici Cooperius would
see to have been a reinforcement of cooperutus, and then been
taken as the past participle of a verb cooperiex: for the transition of.

Cicero 2 Verr. 1.119 "quæ iste collega nisi habuisset, rapiabus
cooperius esset in foro" (Cicero has cooperius turice and no other form).

The contraction is attested metrical in Lucretius, and
orthographically in O. 20277 (295 . . .) cooperius, and MSS forms such
as cooperimento (Gavius Bassus a. Cell. 5.7.2) cooperiex: Bovinus 671.15 (v.
Lachmann on Lucretius 2.1061, ed. s.v.). (Consentius GM 5.367.56,
391.34, calls coperit for cooperiex a barbarism; he may have in mind the

1. Use, e. . at ivy 5. . . 5 (cooperiretura), Cornelia 5.3.6 (cooperiex)
ripy 5. . . 17.24 (cooperiex).
2. This is intended as a diplomatic spelling, and must not be taken to
Greek diacrisis. At Mar. 5.342 the MSS give cooperiex (- ά-); at 
1.1063 cooleris ex. e. is. cooleris (cf. 2.1061) = COE 1.1063.
forms with \( \text{co-} \) in the carminian. Evidence is thin, since comic metres give no \( \text{co-} \) and the word prosaic (Housman's \textit{Lucan}, xxii); but there is no evidence save here for \( \text{co-} \). It is the contracted form we should expect to find: save in \textit{courtaus}, where the stress falls on the second \( g \), there is no evidence for the sequence \( [\text{q}^2] \) in any Latin word; by contrast \textit{cooptare} takes \textit{coopta} (\textit{Ovid} \textit{Fasti}, x. 180, 45 B.C.), \textit{COPTA} (\textit{Ovid} \textit{Fasti}, i. B.C.; 5.4921, 26 \( \ldots \)), with \( v. \) for \textit{copatus} (10.5914) or \textit{coptati} (10.5916), \textit{coptari} is attested by the MSS at 
\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Like vowels are readier to contract than unlike: how then shall
\begin{quote}
\textit{coeminin coepeset coepit} \textit{coepitabamus} give \textit{coerinin coepeset coepit} \textit{coepitabamus} and \textit{copaeio coopratus coopratus coopratus coopratus} not be pronounced \textit{copaeio coopratus coopratus coopratus}?
\end{quote}

But phonetic rule may be broken at the behest of spelling: the
\begin{quote}
t of Latin is often should always be silent as in \textit{soften fasten castle}
\textit{thist} thistle \textit{christen bustic listen whistle}, being dropped between a intrusive and a sonant, but nowadays \( [\text{w} \text{th}] \) (instead of \( [\text{w} \text{ch}] \)) is quite common. A similar hypercorrection \( [\text{copertus}] \) is implied by Geilius, who finds it necessary to cite authority for \textit{copertus} but not for \textit{copiatat} or \textit{copexus}.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{O colitat} / \textit{Hiligratus A33. Hertz, ad loc. and in \textit{Dechicier} 85. 56,}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{cites parallels for such} \( \ldots \) \textit{forms; some may be due}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{L. t. \textit{etna} 407 the true reading is} \textit{coitur: coritur C., defended by}
\textit{Sunhans, is morphologically unexceptionable but semantically impossible.}
\end{quote}
to scribal error, but cf. C. I. 5.11255 &c (C.II 3.1591.111)
Although colligo is found eight times in ed.
Legent, no. 303 (p. 423-) in view of aliquo five times and non nova six times it cannot be used to support the reading in Gellius.

Conexus: so collabium sentenii (< septor-nei) noneni: the basic form of the prefix is of course not con- but con- . Whereas in inherited formations con remains, a final latin m, being weak, is differently treated: in word-stems it combines with a following [] to give [ ] (hence the alleged reason for not saying conocus: Sic. rator 154, of Velius Longus and 7.70.16), in internal composition it disappears before [], lengthening the vowel. (Conomen and inomania are not exceptions, nonen being reinterpreted as gnomen1) Hence conexus as sentenii: and probably also conocus conitor. 2 Only here and at C.II Sup. CXXXI.15 is this pronunciation mentioned by an ancient author; cf.

Excursus, 173.

9 In his quad postuli: namely coeperius colicatus conexus, as against Cicero's conoeit concepi; this proves that Gellius did not drop the N in these latter.

3 Formerly they said coeo like circueo and unlike ineo, the Romans thought of the prefix as con-. Gellius's explanation, compensatory lengthening, fits coepetus conexus but not coeperius, nor coeo.

11 Coeo: for ex. c.s. incorruptus acvit. 2.4.61, Cicero 60 6.1006, conect
Varro R.I.1.41.2, conacat ib. 65, and the error C. 2.4.12 = cotito
2. These words, however, may well have developed from concre in the same way as quin: if so immutor will be analogical, there being no Latin words beginning -e vowel save the dubious immo.
The contraction does not take place if the a is in a closed syllable (e.g., 'in eo quod est' 'ego' vs. 'in eo quod est senatus domus'), though the [a] of the a is colloquially reduced to [v]: Flautus, lost. 829 coogmena; nor again in the a is long, where again [a] > [v]: INquam = incobata

But with a short a in an open syllable there is no evidence for contraction not taking place; at 'in eo quod est' for instance, there is no proof that we should read 'coacervatus' as [\textsuperscript{[a] e.} A:to:] rather than [ko:er: A:to:].

'in eo...quod est...ego': a frequent formula in Gellius to supply the warrant of the definite article, e.g., 1.6.1 "ab eo quod est senatus domus fluctus", 5.11.15 "ab eo autem quod est cupiditas", 9.1.4 "ab eo quod est hic dies...ab eo quod est haec fames", ib 18 "ab eo quod est luxuries". Cicero would have said "a sentu", or where the nominative was specifically required "a cupiditas" (cf. "in optumus" Orator 161: Lebreton 66n.1); here he would have said "in(uero)cero". But the in quod est formula was used by Jeremi, Sall. (Gell. 7.25.8) in "a quod est caseas" and Velius Longus (Gell. 7.61.10) in eo quod est appello.

Cf. e.g., Charisius GL. 1.111.9 = 140.15 Barwick's "ex eo quod est repens", Di saties Can. 1.393.11 "pro eo quod est..." Cassiod. 7.203.20 "ex eo quod est specto".

So too the Romance forms, e.g., Italian guarligare, Caper Can. 7.91.16 "coactus non coactus dicendum, absconoi non absconsi" is arguing against analogical formations: coactus gave rise to "coctare". Old French coctier "worry"; the preterite of Italian nascere is nasceo; more regularly, coactare (used by Lucretius) gave "quactare". Logudorese (battare) battare "crush" (Bec. "bke no. 1999").

2. In an etymology, he would have said "a cogendo" (Lebreton 501), cf. lasuris Sabinius ap. Gell. 4.6.9 "uerbo (sc. religioso) a relinquendo dicta, tamquam caerimonia e causo". At 3.4. Gellius writes "parsus enim quaerere ab arca memoriae ab iocendo, sed ab eo quod est..." DEM "coactus non coactus dicendum"; Cicero would have said ab eo damnem (cf. "ex eo...mercum" Orator 154) "at damnam". 
in eo... quod est cogo... non enim salua id \( \delta\varepsilon\nu \alpha\varepsilon \gamma \tau \iota \) dicitur a uerbo quod est "cogo": it is not like Gellius to repeat himself so crassly (cf. M. Fraenkel \textit{M. Beitz} x. 333-6): we should therefore consider deletion of "a uerbo quod est cogo" as a gloss on: "salua id \( \delta\varepsilon\nu \alpha\varepsilon \gamma \tau \iota \) ".

An objection would be the abruptness of "non enim... dicitur".

\( \delta\varepsilon\nu \alpha\varepsilon \gamma \tau \iota \): Greek dative used as Latin ablative; cf. 2. 25. 1ff.

\textbf{EXCURSUS ON SOURCES}

At 15. 3. 1 Gellius states "Legium librum ... Ciceronis qui inscriptus est Crator"; in § 2-3 he discusses and then quotes the discussion of the prefixal morpheme \( \mu \nu \)- in § 156 of that work, the paragraph immediately preceding that quoted at § 2. 17. 2. It might not be thought too difficult to take him at his word as Kretschmer does (\textit{De Gellii fontibus} p. 59); but Hosius (p. XVII, XXI) insists that even these chapters are secondhand.

In the former place, indeed, discussing the present chapter, he delivers himself of the startling remark "non suo periculo Ciceronem Gellius a rei ausus est". He then proceeds to argue in favour of Probus as the source, first citing as the closest or all the grammarians to Gellius in this chapter the author "de utribus syllabis", conjectured to be Probus by Parrhasius, \textit{Cat.} 253. 20, 254. 4, 262. 9. We may ignore the fact that the work is not by Probus: it will be sufficient to quote the three passages in full.
Po-Probus G.K. 4.255.20 "con et in praepositiones loquellares" cum fuerint iterum per compositionem loquellis in inherent, ambae minus naturae sunt hoc generis; si in F uel S litteras consonantes occiderint naturaliter producuntur ut 'inferretque deos Latios' (Verg. Aen. 1.6)

et 'insignem p(ictate)' (ib. 1.10) "item 'considunt tectis'" (ib. 10.5)

et 'munc unius acerbum conficit' (ib. 11.823-4) "et si ceteris consonantibus excipiuntur, positione longae fient nec produci in praepositione possunt sine ulterior barbarismi". No reference to Cicero; different examples, filleted from Vergil.

Po-Probus G.K. 4.255.4 "pro praeposition cum causalis fuerit semper producitur, ut

nobis ad belli auxilium pro nomine tanto (Verg. Aen. 8.472)
at cum loquellaris fuerit variae positor; alibi enim longa, alibi breuis inuenitur. Est operae pretium edocere quando breuis debeat, quando longa constitui; si hanc praecedentem syllabam secuta fuerit altera syllaba naturae longae, necessario prior corripitur ut in Lucretio

omnia ueridico ornatam ex ore profudit (6.6)
at cum positione syllaba longa fuerit consecuta, frequenter producitur in uerbis live participiis ut

procurrant Laurentium; hinc densi rursus inuandant (Verg. Aen. 12.280)
alibi autem breuis, alibi longe est in nominibus; breuis in hoc, ut

ni faciat, maria in terras caelumque profundum (ib. 1.58)

1. By Cassiodorus's time such were the normal spellings (G.K. 7.155.4-7, cf. supp. 175.7-17). To restore the single -l- might be to correct the author.
2. As no doubt in produco profici and the like.
It should now be perfectly obvious that Gellius and pseudo-Probus have nothing whatever to do with each other. Now let us consider Hosius's reasons for ascribing anything in either author to the real Probos.

"Ex Probus hauserunt Diomedes (cir. Keil pr. LIII) et Priscianus, praecipue in capite de perfecto: habes Gellium §2" (i.e. Cic. or. 159) concinnetem cum Diomede 409.2; 433.15; 411 cum Prisciano I" (= GLK 2) "461.14 (de coegi)" † thus Hosius, p. XXVIII. Once again, let us consult our texts.

Diomedes GLK 1.409.2 "ex quibus in et con praepositiones si ita compositae fuerint ut eas statius aut F littera consequitur, plerumque producuntur ut 'insula' 'insula' 'consilium' 'confessio'".

No Cicero; different examples; plerumque revealing later vacillation.
Diomedes GLK 1.433.15 *con quoque praeposito complexa F vel S subiunctas litteras producta O pronuntiabitur; F ut 'confido' 'confiro' 'confestim' 'confertus', eodem modo S ut 'consensio' 'consenduo' (consono) 'consisto' 'consult'; et utrue edam aliam litteras praeposita. corripitur ut 'continuo' 'conduco' 'conuoco' 'conuerto' 'conuoco' 'comprehendo' 'congrego'. No Cic. ro; different examples; *continuo suggesting late sens.

Priscian GLK 2.461.11 *o correpta modo manet eadem ut 'doceo' 'docui' 'condidi', modo producitur ut 'muo moei' 'fudeo fusi' 'fodi'. 0 producita in quibusdun manet yt 'oro orai' 'dono donavi', in aliis corripitur ut 'pomo posui' 'cogo coegi'. No reference to the prefix or the loss of N.

Whatever Probus may or may not have had to do with these passages, it should be quite obvious that they have nothing at all to do with Gellius. Indeed, no other grammarian shows any knowledge of the Ciceronian passage (only one of his examples recurs even once; infelix "Probus" GLK 4.149.34); no other grammarian notices the correlation between corrected pro- and a following F; no other grammarian cites copertus or coligatus; for conatus the only parallel is Sergianus GLK suppr.CXVII.15 "co dichrona est, ut coecuro coneceto", which do not advance our quellenforschung. True, Priscian, in minutenly parsing every word in the first line from each book of the Aeneid, pointing out that "surgens" (Aen. 11. 1) is a compound with both

---

1. No-one would the Vergilian conficit of *Probus 4.252.2. or the
   conficit of Servius 4.445.32 as reflecting Cicero's conficit.
2. *ut even Servius, who gives "profectus prof: profatus prof:nus
   profatus prof:amus provincus pro:amus pronepos et cetera" (GLK 4.450.2.).
elements "corrupted", includes "coco coegi" among various compounds
cited as having "whole" or "corrupt" elements with the words (GLK
3.508.34) "coco coegi in presenti ex dibus corruptis est, in
praeterito perfecto ex corrupto et integro"; it requires the eye of
faith to discern a common source for this and Gellius 2.17.11, but I
can find no other reference to the verbs being compound.

Hesius also remarks that in 4.17 "quod caput ad proum vel
Sulpiciunm "pollin rem revocarunt" (cf.p. XXXIII; again no other
extent treatment of its subject bears any resemblance to it), the
prefixes cor- and pro- are discussed and the same Sallustian "faenoribus
copertus" is adduced. But since the subject of 2.17 is the behaviour
of certain prefixes and the subject of 4.17 is the compounds of iscio,
the former argument bears little weight; the chapters start as it were
from opposite ends and meet. As for the citation from Sallust,
at 4.17.6 Gallius remarks: "Sed neque ob neque sub praepositio
produendi habet naturam, neque item cor nisi cum eam litterae
esequitur quae in verbis constituit vel confecit secundum eam prima
sunt, vel cum eliditur ex ea littera, sicut Sallustian "faenoribus"
inquit 'copertus". This, however, would appear to be a Gallian
self-quotation inserted into the main discussion; note especially
the Ciceronian but otherwise un-Gallian periphrasis "litterae quae...
prime sunt" for "S vel F litterae". It is therefore of no
source-critical value.

It should by now be obvious that Gallius 2.17 is in almost every

1.Cf.p.161 and n.1. - I attach no significance to the replacement,
whether deliberate or by lapse of memory, of consueuit by constituit;
it may be noted that neither is cited elsewhere in this connection.
way unique among treatments of its subject-matter. This means either
that it is Gelius's own unaided or at but unaided work, or that its
source has left no other traces. The former is the more economical
hypothesis; is it in itself possible?

I fail to see why not. It is inconceivable that Gelius did
not read Cicero; having read this passage he tested its assertions
about diphthong, found them correct (as was natural, the contrary
pronunciations sounding strange), and asked himself why this should
be so. Was it to do with the nature of o and e? He noticed that the
production-rule did not apply to o; he must find some other
explanation. Was o ever pronounced long in other contexts? There
were examples of o; but these had no l. He made no further progress
but published his investigations. Is there any observation that was
beyond his wit to make? I do not think so; nor is there any
inherent improbability in this keen philologist's being stimulated
to such investigation.

It may be objected that nowhere in this chapter does Gelius
name the works from which his citations come. Those from Cato and
Sallust may well come from a secondary source; but that source need
not have afforded him more; it may indeed lie behind 67-11, but it
is a long step from that to suppose it was the source of anything more.
The argument from the non-mention of Orator is the less compelling in
view of 15.3.1; particularly since the passage cited here comes in
Cicero a few lines after that cited in 15.3.

Since the latter place is expressly cited from "Cicero in Orator"
by Velius Longus (GUL 7.60.6) Josius suggests (p.244) that 15.3 is borrowed from him. This is quite unnecessary; why should we not believe Gellius? It may however be that Gellius was referred to Cicero by Velius; even so there is no reason why he should not have used the Augustan matter (15.3.4) himself, and (from whatever source) the Homeric citations of §8. But whether or not he was impelled by Velius, he read Orator and noted both passages, or took down a longer extract and quoted it.
This chapter is repeated, almost but not quite word for word, in Macrobius. It is certainly not the source of Lactantius: and differs in certain respects from all other accounts of these matters that have survived.

I do not discuss by Plato, but his youthful charms are obvious from (Socrates) : (Socrates) : (Socrates).

This story was already current in the third century B.C. when nicronymous of Rhodes attacked an as a slave in his . (Diog. Laert. 2.105); it may also lie behind Cicero No. 1.93 (Epicurus).

1. According to Plotinus, no slave was ever a philosopher. Of the (sic), no doubt we should restore Phaedon; , we assumed, ; , and , . It was cheaply, but why should have said more than he was asked: for his alleged sale see Harsteid, (247) 295-300. Since Favorinus is known to have treated of it (Diog. Laert. 3.19), he is perhaps unlikely to be the source of this chapter.

2. Sixth century . . . . The Suda, s.v. , agrees with him all but verbatim.

3. In the index of names following the passage, which is printed at the end as in the recensions.
"Phaedon: Socratic turpissime vult aixerit".

Gellius adduces (in §9, by contrasting Diogenes, as a free man enslaved, with those who precede him in the chapter) that Phaedon was born a slave; so, it should seem does Lactantius. According to Diogenes Laertius, however, Φαίδων Ἰάτρος τινὸς ἐποίησαν αὐτὸν δοῦλον ἦν (2.105, cf. 2.31 d', τί Χρηστώνον οὖν); Hesychius of Alethiass cheerfully has him captured #regionus συνεδριάζω. We do know that in 400 B.C. Sparta captured certain outlying cities of Elis (Diogenes Laertius 1.17, 1.34) but before we rush to house Phaedon in one of these we should consider the legends that Plato and Diogenes were sold into slavery. It should seem that the ancient philosophers were no more restrained in the invention of discrepant stories than the comic poets and the orators.

Elidensis: the normal form is eli-ns, ELID<ΣΗΛΕΟΣ. The Latin suffix -ensis is often used with Greek place-names (Atheniensis) particularly in early Latin (Eocelenensis, etc. inc. 323 a. Sic. q. 2.1) but in the classical period suffered competition from the transliterated Greek ΕΛΗΝΟΣ. In Silver Latin it reasserts itself. Thus Crotonites Cic. inv. 2.1, 2.27, Val. Max. 9.12. ext. 9; Crotoniensis O. H. 3.72, 37.14, Gellius 15.10. Iceni, §1 (Livy has both). Similarly Cicero and Varro have Citiæns, Gellius Cctienses (Gell. 17.21. 30); Pliny has both; cf. IL 1.18 (onomastic) s.v. Citius.

disciplinarum: cf. 1.9.12 "simul atque a ἱπποκρηστηρια in cohors etiam disciplinarum recepti erant". [L]ucullus et Alcibiades in quinquennione ...missus, Gell. 13.5.2 "omnis eius sectatorum conors". Cf. Seneca ep. 22.11 "tota conors Stoicorum". More generally, a man's

*Plautus has Alēus (Elean ΦΑΙΕΙΟΠ > ΦΑΙΕΙΟΠ, cf. MA for on). For the correction cf. Chisch < XTROS (Casan. c. 18, p. 699)
"set", whether friends, flatterers, clients, or disciples are his cohors; a sense developed from the use of the word for a provincial governor's retinue (cic. 2. ver.. 36 et saepe). 1. 2. 3. 9. 9. 3.
per fuit familiaris: c. 3. 6. 1."per hercule rem mirandum", 1. 2. 1 "per hercule antiquum" etc. "Per enim inquit 'inconsequens'" 13. 2. "per inquit 'magister optum, exoptatus'. "per" was often separated from its subject in colloquial Latin: in comedy, in Cicero's letters, and again in late authors, whence Old French per next the verb: Contient syntactica 2. 4. 3.
2-eius...ius...ius...eius: imitating Old Latin narrative, and everyday speech. Thus Cato a. Gell. 3. 7. 13 "eius sustulere isque cornaluit"; ...iso a. Gell. 7. 9. 2 "iul. Flavius...isque...eiusque, &c" C. Cracchus ap. 3. 5 "is in lectica Lerebatur. ei quia bucoiius de piebe Venusina amenit" (note Gellius's omission in § 6 "nilil proiecto abest speculato assiduus"). For the same style see 16. 1. 3. 7.;
Indeed, examples abound of is used in this artless manner, 4. 2. 2.
2-eius. a. Gell. 3. 5. 1. 12. etc. etc.; Hache 3. 9. 13. 18. 5.
2-eius n. Gell. i. librum...i. i. i. eius: translated by Rolfe and Popescu as if it were "eius...libro deit"; but dare is being treated like dedicare (c. dic. de in Macrobius's paraphrase). (cfr. arache "considera à soli nos...""). Likewise at Vergil: en 3. 12 "dare classibus aus ros", dare..."
could be (for the sense) replaced by quitter. Semantically, and perhaps etymologically, so represents is as well as is.

de immortalitate animae: Cicero would have said animae; 1 M. 3 "haec quae animae immortalitate disceruntur" comes from Savoniaus, not from Cicero, but animae is used by Pliny (NH 7.138), Tacitus (A 16.19) and is regular in Bertullian and later writers. Cf. 1.12 on; Mackernagel H. 2.13.

sermonessque eius: according to Diogenes Laertius 2.105 Rhaedon wrote a Συνθήκη and a Συμφωνία; other dialogues were disputed: Νίκις, a Μηδίας ascribed by some to Menander, Socrates, others to Polyaeus, Ἄνθρωπως, Προφαστας, and Πνευματικόν also attributed to Menander. The Suda adds Συμφωνίας, Αγαθέους, and Κερτίδεας. For discussion and reconstruction see . . . von Fritz, RE s.v. Rhaedon, 1926-1939 sqq.

7 sailing: Diogenes Laertius 6.99 Μενηρίας, καὶ ὁδοὺς κυκλίδος, ῥὸς ἐν Φοίνιξ, Γόρκιος ὡς φρενί Μακρίνης ἐν Ἡμίνοις. Διονυσίδος ἐκ ἡλίων ἐν τῷ δεοντηρ στόμω εἰναὶ καὶ βάσων μεταβιβασκόντα . More cynical than κυκλίδος,

he made enough money to become a Theban citizen, and indeed a wealthy financier; but when he was ruined by his enemies he hanged himself for grief.

cuius libris: Varro in sputis seminatus est: Cic.-Ac. 1.8 (Varro loquitur: "in illis uteribus nostris, quae necipiam inquitati, non interpretatiqua, quata hilaritate conspersius". In Gellius semilior orfen means no more than interpreter (Gamberale La tradizione in Gellio)

1. Lucretius 3.612 "quod si immortalis nostra forét mens"; the question is, are we conscious after death? Since for Lucretius the animas are anima from a single whole (cf. 3.126-4: "if I say the anima is mortal understand this to apply also to the animus"), he can use natura animae in this connection acti gratia referring to the entire ψυχ.

2. Note haec where Cicero would have said eq; cf. Gel. 24.2.
quas alii cynicus, ipse appellat Henippeas: c. 5. i. 31.1 "quas partim
cynicus, alii Henippeas appellant".

*Pompeius: Diod. Saec. 7.36"* (*see note 4)*

**Dioscurides:** "Pitungia* (*see note 4)*

**Persaeus: Diod. Saec. 7.36** "Argyros Icypas xlyion hēs hēs. "

Persaeus, *Dioscurides* Kition, ἤοι ἄνω γαίας οἰκείων ὑπόδειγμα ἑκατέρου ἐν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀγώνων ἀπόδειξιν τε καὶ θρῆσθαι ἐν τούτῳ καὶ διάλεγον. "

According to Athenaeus (vii. 241), Bion Borysthenites, seeing on a bronze of him

the inscription *Pertinus Zephyros Kition*, joked that the last word

should have been οὐκ ἔχει φήμης ἡμείς γενοῦσα τοι 2άνους

καὶ Μερκύριος ὁ Μερκύριος ἤσσε εὐθεῖα ἐν γιὸς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀγώνων ἀπὸ

Σωτῆρα ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρης ἐν τοῖς Διδάκταις.

**Quintus:** for the construction see 2.1-3n.

*Diogenes:* we have the evidence of Epicurus's will (*Diod. Saec. 10.21)*

**Diogenes Saec. 10.3**

9 *Diogenes* being a first-class subject for anecdotes, it is not

surprising to find the "sale into slavery" motif attached to him.

Both Henippeus and Kubulus wrote works entitled *Diogenes πρὸς σήμερον* (*Diogenes Saec. 29, 30): these fictions were then taken for

fact. Apart from Callius, our sources are Philo the Jew (*note 6)*

121-4 = *3.4.14 sqq* Com. Westland: *Diogenes fr. 268 mallach*;

Diog. La st. 6.25-70, 74; Stobaeus 3.1.52; *Suda s.v. Κλεόντας* (*note 8)*.

*Diogenes* was captured by pirates commanded by one Scirpalus and

sold in Crete (*note 74)*, or alternatively was being sold in Corinth.
(Stobaeus); asked what he could do he answered "Govern men". "Fine wares I've got" laughed the auctioneer "if anyone wants to buy a master"; but Menippus says that Diogenes himself bade him cry a master for sale. Prevented from sitting down, "it doesn't matter" he quipped "after all, fish are sold as they lie". Then "isn't it odd now when we buy pots and plates we ring them to see if they're sound, but we're quite content to buy a man on his looks?" Seeing (says Philo) one whose very looks proclaimed him a passive homosexual, he called out "Buy me: you need a man"; and the wretched creature slunk away. But the parallel story is that he caught sight of a rich Corinthian ne'er-do-well (Judah), or a Corinthian with a fine border to his cloak called Xeniaides (O. 1. 74) and said "Sell me to him; he needs a master"; and when Xeniaides bought him, the irrepressible philosopher warned him "You'll have to obey me": it made no difference that he was a slave, for a doctor or a helmsman would have to be obeyed even if he were a slave. But Xeniaides did obey him, giving him charge of his children and his whole household; and was so pleased with the results that he went around saying ὠραῖος δάσκαλον ἐστὶν τῷ

πάντων μοι ἐξοικοδομεῖν. (O. I. 6. 74).

1. Stobaeus 3. 3. 52: δηούσας παθομένως ἐν καρδίᾳ ζηροτέρεον τοῦ πέρων τρέφεσθαι

ἀπείχοις ἐντὸς ἀστικῶς καὶ ὀσπάττον ὑμένας ἐξεπείρασθαι καὶ συν τός θεός

πελαθοῦν κύριον.

2. Diog. Let. 6. 29: καὶ ἂν τὸν κόσμον καταλάβει ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῷ θεώ καὶ συν τῷ ἐγκόσμῳ ὀφείλει καὶ τῷ τῆς πρός ὑμᾶς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἡμῖν ἀνήλθει. Θαυμάζειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ διακόπτειν ἐν τῷ ἐκείνῳ καρδιώματα εἰς διόνυσον δὲ

κομίζει ὅσοι ἔρευναι.

3. Diog. Let. 6. 30: ὁ δὲ τὸν Χενιάδα τῷ παρετέθη τὸν δὲν πάθεσθαι αἰτεῖν ἐν

καὶ ἀργὸν ἐν τῷ μὴτ ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῷ ἔκρης αὐτῷ καὶ δούλως εἰς δούλως ἐν παράστη

καὶ δοῦλοι εἰς τῇ παραστήσειν εἰς δούλους ἐν παραστήσειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.
It will be seen that Gellius, whether on his own account or following some Roman source, has introduced a purely Latin play on words, adding the epithet "free" to the noun "men" in Diogenes's reply and leading thereby to his charge over Xenia's children: "hominibus libris imperare" - "accipe liberos neos quibus imperes".

For a similar Romanization cf. 5.4.12, where Euathlus says to Protagoras that he could have avoided liability to pay him after winning his suit "si verba non ipseFacere atque alto paterno uterum". In Athens one had to speak oneself, even if Lysias or Herodotus had written one's speech, and even if one had a suaveor.

9 equid artificii nouisset percontatus: so Jacobus Bronovius (in his note) Hosius, Carache, and Marshall, following Macrobius in equid (et qui VR) but not in adding est after percontatus: Macrobius is given to smoothing down the style, or his rewriting of §2-3. We should punctuate with a comma after percontatus, which is as usual active in sense: despite arbitrata 1.13.2, frustratus 5.16.6, and the discussion in 15.15, to take it as passive would disrupt sentence-rhythm, which requires the na or pause before noui: "quem can exere tuelet / Equideos copiosis / equid artifici nouisset percontatus, / noui inquit Diogenes / 'hominibus libris imperare'". - At 1.5.11 "quere" inquit 'ea potius quae a grammatico quaerenda sunt; na de omnibus opiliones percontantur!" I should read with Macrobius percontutor (Sat. 6.5.3), more appropriate after quaere, "percontor".

1. All these except Carache have a comma before percontatus to mark off the preceding indirect question. Such punctuation not only violates the original syntax, but is at least for the English reader a positive obstacle to comprehension. Carache is here and elsewhere far more independent than Marshall in his punctuation.

2. Morrison ("The Law of Rome," 2.156 k 2.134) points out that this may not have been required by law; but even if not, it was a strong aid of imitation. Apparent but not invariable, such a pause usually leaves a very slight impression, unless long, with at least a dot at the end.
occurs some fifteen times in Gellius, always as a deponent.

decreatus: so 1.7.2 decreatur 3.7.12 decreantur (wrongly ascribed to Cato by LIM S.V.), 6 esse decreatos, 2.5.15 esse decreatau 10.5.5
decreatus 1.20.6 decre Guam, 20.10.4 decriatus. In all authors before Gellius, in Cicero and the elder Pliny as well as in comedy, the only form of the verb ever found is the first person singular present indicative decretor; since this is not particularly rare, the absence of all other forms can hardly be due to chance. One must conclude that before the Augustan period, or even before Gellius, the verb was defective; most likely it was obsolete in Gellius's day, who was therefore not restrained by usages from treating it as an ordinary verb. (cf. the false form rescire in 2.19).

10 quod is nunc est servus, as we see in 2.1.2a.

debuerit: the sentence might be paraphrased "causa notoria reconsit, scribi non debuit", sc. cum haec componeremus, so e. 2.2.12 "non esse ab re usum est ut scriberet". Macrobius varies the expression: "quae ut possit inter obliterata nesciri."

At the end of this chapter the early editors added Macrobius Sat. 1.1.45 "cuis etiam de se scripti duo versus feruntur, ex quibus latent et intellegas, non omni modo dis ex sos esse qui in hac uita cum aerumneram varietas luctantur, sed esse arcanas causes ad quas pance cut potuit perenire curiositas:

Σαυλος Επιπετετις γενόμενος και εγκινότει περισσος
και παράγεις Ιερος και φυλος Θανατως.

Salmastus was the first to perceive that this was not derived from

1. Eius Epiteti et Gell.
2. Omnes omnes currio sine causa.
3. H.7.676, where it is marked 5ηλων; cf. John Chrysostom. 12.111.
Tullius, who indeed was probably incapable of reading such
significance into the verse, and was certainly incapable of using
exous as a passive 1. Nor is the passage in keeping with the general
terseness of the chapter.

1. Not so found before the fourth century; till then always active
as at Gell. 1. 2. 1.
CHAPTER 19

There was no such verb as *rescire*: the present tenses were built from the "inceptive" stem (*rescisco*, *resciscere*), the perfect *rescui* being the basis for Gellius's back-formation. For compound verbs with inceptive presents see Dilke Ch 17 n.s. (1967) 400ff; esp. p. 401 "most inchoative verbs derived from verb stems are compounded with prepositions. Where these prepositional prefixes have a non-local force, their function is the same as that of the *re*- infix, to convey an 'aspect' in the verb. The result tends to be that the corresponding non-inchoative preverb forms do not exist, at least in the classical period." See too Sittl, *now* 1 (1984), 465-532; V. Niclaie Studii Classici 7 (1965), 137-44. It should also be noted that other compounds of *sci-* have originally an inceptive present (Dilke 402, Sittl 477); but the Augustan poets back-formed *recit* presents: Horace *Exiut*. 1.1.61 "mi conscire sibi" (*μνησθείς ἔστω μου ἰδέαν*) *adscire* in Verg. AE. 12.38 and thence in Tacitus four times.

*Rescisco* is a common verb in early Latin, rare in the late Republic and hardly used afterwards. Plautus has it twenty-eight times; Terence thirty-three, nearly always of fathers, wives, and others one wishes to deceive. But Caesar, for whom the word implying the discovery of that which one is not intended to find out might have been expected to be most congenial, uses *rescisco* only once (e.g. 29.1); elsewhere

---

1. Dilke's spelling, in accordance with Latin (cf. 2.3.3n) rather than English.
2. *adscisco*, *descisco*, *adescisco*, *descisco*, are all from the same *sci-* as *scio*: for the idea of "deciding" *piebi scitum, pieba scitum*, and *γνωριμία* *scio* may be compared with *recognize a face*, *portenmihi conscisco* is "I decide on the place," *portenmihi conscisco* is "I commit suicide," with *descisco* "cease" cf. *τοιγνωκός* "despair."
he has *composco, certior fio, and forms of mutius and mutio. The verb is used once in the non-Aesarian writings (E.nis. 8.2) and only once in Cicero (on. 3. 31); it is also used by Scaevus (I. 2. 1. 2) and twice by Met. 2. 4. 29, 4. 2. 7, and Scaevus *Jul*., 17. 1.

Reisco is properly "I get to know"; re- is not only intensive, but suggests the idea of opening or uncovering (discovering) as in *recludo* retego reneo. Reisco is nearly always used of discovering a plot or learning bad news, the information coming unsought save at *Marius mercator* 720, where honus, getting evasive answers to her questions about the 'other woman', gruffly declares "I'll find out all the same", resciscant talia.

Celius (14) states the verb is used "super is rebus quae aut consilio consilio latusrim aut contra spec. opinionem usu eunram". Although such news may in principle be either good or bad (Ter. Am. 868-9) or *Hec. 860-6 of the the* tetes, it is nearly always bad news that one rescisit, but there are a few exceptions. At Ter. *Hec. 208* Sostrata says to Scaevus

"meque abs te immorito esse accusatum postmodus rescisces"

- inpintum inspexit tunc certam, (Celius 82), but for the better;
likewise ib. 475, 790. The unexpected is not always very prominent;
but the post-Terantian uses all comply with the Gellian specifications save for orate Eust. 2. 1. 226-8

*... our speram in ventura: ut simul fugae
carnina rescieris nos flanger, conquis utro
morsas at egere ustes et scribere cogas.*

But then Horace would not count for Gellius as among those "qui
which supplied (resist) and indicated a lacuna between it and substitute; it should reject substitute for accept the coming supplying.
diligenter locuti sunt"; cf. 2.20.4n, 2.27.2n, and contrast Carneades.

2.17.1 with Gellius 4.9.5, 5.17.1. Cf. also 13.6.4

Donatus makes a number of attempts at interpreting the verb, which like Gellius he gives a non-existent present unless guided by the lemma:

on 

265 "resciscere autem est uix reperire quod quis de industria quae rerat celatum"

519 "scius manifesta, rescisuus occulta" (rescicerit in the lemma)

868 "resciscunt quae pertinet. et resciscunt quae nescit, scius quae neglegunt. et resciscimus ex alio, scius etiam per nostra opinacionem".

All this is far inferior to Gellius's treatment, which suggests that Gellius is not entirely dependent on some traditional Terence-commentary; on the other hand we cannot safely posit complete independence.

I neque ut rescribere reprehendere substituire dictus: for substituere the later RS have the obviously interpolated retinere. After relegere Hertz something on the lines of "in quibus pro duabus pridem litteris posticus 'inimicam' uel 'iterum'; for re- we can (substitute) "back" or "again".

ivide: common in Plautus and other early writers: used five times each by Cicero and Lucretius, twice by Varro, and once each by Flavius (37.74) and Suetonius (Aug. 24.2); frequent in Cælius, Appuleius, and later authors (cf. Fronto ep. 1.1.2).

6 naelius in "Tri nallo"; see 36-8 Ribbeck. For the title of Varro's
satire. Τείφόλλας ἤτει 2εεωτός. Juvenal 6, 11. 20. Aristophanes wrote a Τείφόλλας; for the idea behind the name of Birds 1256 στόματι τείφόλλον. In friar 83 Nicerius have Πριπε in v. 6 but Ἐρωμάς in v. 9; cf. Coe 2. 200 6, 2. 201 22 /Tre alius Περίκρος. "Τείφόλλας" is another form of the same word: P. 6 (N. l.) 2401.

si unquam: "sic unquam" (Ribbeck, bergk) makes the metre and is probably right. The form is not attested, but must have existed; cf. sicubi.

extemplo illa te duce ubi non despons: as Gronovius established, this means "in pistrinum", where he would be dazzled to prevent his eating any of the grain. Greek sources speak of a "nauclera" (Aristophanes fr. 302) or καρποπτερὸν (in fr. 301), a circular mitter around the neck, cutting off the mouth from the hands. Similar devices could be fitted to oxen; this was forbidden to the Jews (Deut. 25 4). At Plautus Asin. 30 sq. Libanus bids his master spit away but once the cargo was on the move there is no decepere his ill-omen mention of the pistrinum. There is nothing wrong with the text of this line (see Haltsch "Rheinisches and Romanisches" 138 n); the scanion is

"extempli id te duce ubi non despons".

7 sibi per fallacios uerba dare esse: among the choice expressions noted by Gellius from book 1 of Quadrigarius's annales is "uerba dedit" or a wordless deception: "Solum qua aestimator descendent atque uerba Gallis dedit" (fr. 4. Peter ap.SELL. 17. 2. 24). Verba dare "decease" is rare in the highest genres of literature, being no doubt somewhat colloquial, but is found throughout Latin, being particularly common in Plautus and Cæsi, but occurring also in

1. tripallis P, priapeus 65: there can be no doubt of the true reading.
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Jerence, Lucilius, Cicero (inv. 2.28, rhi. 15.33, att. 15.6) Nepos, Propertius, Horace (ser. 1.22) Scaevola, Persius, Seneca, etronius, Martial, and Sronto (ep. 4.3.1 "in uerbis uero eligendis conlocandisque ilico dilucet nec uerba dare diuitus potest quin se ipse indicet uerborum ignarus esse"). No words need be spoken or otherwise uttered: with Claudius fr. 4 compare Petronius 75.8
"nos occasionem op ortunissimam nacti aganemnon uerba dedimus raetinque tam plane quam ex incendio furius". See IVL 5.1675.1sqq. Note that in later Latin the expression is sometimes used literally: first at uvid ex iponto 4.0.34-6 "Naso suis opibus, carmine gratius erit...am pro concessa uerba salutem damnus" then Val. Fl. 7.251 "talia uerba dabat". An historical notes 78-8 see p.191.
2 The context of this passage is none other than the aftermath of Cannae: see Coelius and Cato 1. Cell. I. 26, 6-7; livy 22.51.2-4.
Mahunbal promised, should he be sent ahead with the cavalry, that Hamihal should dine on the Capitol in four days' time; adding in livy "cum equite ut prius uenisset quam uenturus sciant praecellent". Hannibal, however, insisted on thinking it over, whereupon Laharbal claimed "unceram scis Hannibal, victoria uti nescis"; and indeed, says livy, "nora eius diei satis creditur sancti missae urbi atque imperio". The element of sur rice insisted on by Laharbal was gone, as our present passage states. How did the Romans find out? And how does Cato know what passed between Hannibal and Laharbal?

1. "Barea" according to Plutarch (Fab. 17); acc. according to Silius (1.0.375sq). 2. diecquinti Cato, Coelius; die quinto livy; Кв. Сал. Кв. Plutarch. Translators do not always remember the difference in latin. Cf. Silius 1.376 "eta quinta dies non orbe tuisset"; the coming of being the first. 3. The pronoun to be supplied is of course me, not te.
Certainly not from his war memoirs! The story reappears in Valerius Maximus (1.5.15), Plutarch (Cato 17), Florus (1.22.8), Ammianus 19.3.6, Zonaras 9.4.6, keeping generations of declaimers in voice; but is not found in Polybius, although he does say that the Carthaginians had great hopes of marching on the city and taking it (3.11.4). Nor is it mentioned by Polybius.

dictator...magister equitum: c. Sato fr. 65 (ap. bel. 10.9.7)

"Liturg dictator... arthagiiensium magister equitum sumit."

7-8 mm. displaced from p. 190. Claudius Quinctius fr. 16, 19 Peter

7 This fragment relates to the belied discovery of the plot hatched in br. 15 (Cell. 6.11.7); see Livy 8.27. (The Ligurians sought to detach the Lucani from Rome by suborning a well-born, young profligate Lucanius (Claudius fr. 15) or several such (Livy 66) to simulate ill-treatment by the Romans; the deceived populace renewed its Samnite allegiance. The suspicious Samnites demanded hostages; whom given,

dilucere dein dea brevi coepit, postquam criminum falsorum sectores sed amissa
areatuirum commigratere, deae pretiose nihil ultra quam, " sed amissa"

8 This apparently relates to the Senate's rejection of the Pacta-Quintia in 326 B.C. After the surrender the consuls told C. Pontius, the Samnite commander, that no treaty could be struck say; by the people and in the proper ceremony: "itaque, non ut velgo credunt Claudiusque etiam scribit foedere p.x Claudius sed per sponsionem factum est" (Livy 9.5.2). The hostages were in fact an earnest of the treaty's ratification; Claudius however will have included the gift of them among its terms.

"et proper necessarium foederis dilatio nem obsides etiam sescenti equites imperati, qui opit lucernet si pacto non statuer" (Livy 9.5.5)
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Chapter 20

Vivier: Varro's "utrum eius piscibus denn hebeat an ranis" (RR 3.9.3) is reported by Columella (3.6.1.) as "utrum eius piscibus an ranis frequens habeat uiuaria", and cf. Acerbius Sat. 16.10 "nec Optatus praefectus classis, sciens scarum et Italicius litoribus ignotum ut ne moterem eius piscum habeas, increibilem scarorum multitudinem uuiariis nauibus vocat inter Ostian et Caesarii litus in mare sparsit". Cfr... a piscinas § 7.
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L. vivier: since one would hardly keep dead ones, uuiare is added as the for uuiarie. The *fere* included wild swine and roe deer (Varro RR 3.3.8) and Columella 9... "fere pecudes ut capreoli uamaeque nec minus oryças utruamque genera et aperorum".
Some owners went further: C. Fulvius Lippinus besides deer also kept wild sheep (Varro Re 3.1.1); Q. Hortensius kept up what he called a tachotrophium (ib.3.13.2) Besides game, the park would also contain escropli, beehives, and casks for keeping dormice (ib.3.12.2). See also non soli §2; Layard "espai sur les classes animales" 68 sq.

leporaria: this is the regular term in Varro; cf. Columella 8.1.4

ἀγοροεφεία (but the Latin name is given as μινωιας), OEB 2.357.64 "ἀγοροεφείαι leporaria"; Old Italian leporaiolo (meyer-Lübke 4987). The institution not being Greek, ἀγοροεφεία will have been an Italic formation. That the term was given a wider meaning is no surprise: in a cloak-room may be stores hats, cases, and umbrellas, while a cupboard may hold books, cat-food or skeletons.

Note too that ἀγοροεφεία at Columella 8.1.4 must include both

χινοβοινεία (Varro Re 3.10.1) and νησοβοινεία. (Varro Re 3.11.1, Columella 5.1.1).

2 Villaticae pastiones: Varro's actual words are eius disciplinae.

A modern scholar would have cited Varro in the form "eius disciplinae (sc.villaticae pastiones)" but the ancients were less concerned with verbal exactitude than with stylistic elegance. (Cr.15.3.5. "super eadem particularia scripta 'naec' inquit 'praeposito'"; the reference is Cic. Orator 158 "quae praepositio" &c." For other variations see nt. to §3,8; yet Geelius is in general very precise with his quotations.)

The Roman farmer had kept up aviaries, fishponds, and hare-warrens, long before the advent of Oriental luxury. Varro discourses at length on the contrast between the old simplicity and the new
extravagance (RR 3.3.6.10, cr.3.4.7.2); connumella, with the industrius paterfamilias in mind¹, amplifies Varro’s lament on the fashion for marine fish-ponds (c.18.1-5), though resigned to their discussion (ib.6). For these writers’ attitudes to game-pasts see non soli ornithonas dico omnium alitum: implying for ἐννευ its classical sense of amnis, Hellenistic ὑπὲρευ, cr. Varro RR 3.3.6-7: originally the Romans kept only poultry and pigeons, in what they called amnaria; now they keep other birds and speak of ornithones. Contrast Sall. c.1.3 “in uilia est quod appellant Graeci ὑπὲρακαης καὶ ἀρεπτερευς” henhouses and dovecotes, (the original amnaria, in fact); F.1xy.9.1207 (probably of 175-6 H.J.), a lease to convert ὑπὸ ἱχνους ἐπὶ ἀρεπσμον ἑπικιν, the rent consisting, among other things of ἐπιευθυμαν ἀποδονευς ἀποδόναι ἑπὶ ἑπικιν the rent consisting, διατερω ἐν ἅλων ἐγκτενον. Here we have the Hellenistic ἑνευς καὶ ἀρεπσμον gallina, in fifth-century Attic (v) ἐπιευθυμαν (Arístophanes Clouds ὅς ὅσqq; Urátius tr.108 lock, etc.). For a discussion of ἑνευς and ἀρεπσμον see Athenaeus 373a-374d. soli: cr. 3.3.6 “sic in secunda partì ac leporario pater tuos, axi, prasterguam lepuscolum e uenatone uidit nunquam: neque enim erat magnum id saeptum, quod nunc u. habeat unites apros ac capreas complura iugera maceriis concundunt”, i.e.3.4.1 “Appius ’sequitur’ inquit ’actus secund generis, adiecticious ad uillian’ solet esse ac nomine antico a parte quam leporarium a pellatum: nam neque solum lepores in eo inclinatur silua ut οἶλος in iugero apelli ant in obus, sed etiam cerui aut capreae iuguribus multis”. Since he continues with...

¹). 2.5, in a denunciation of cock-fighting.
the even greater extravagances of Lippinus and A. Pompeius, deer are for him quite a moderate indulgence; Columella, high on a century further removed from the antique virtue, allows the ancients more than hares: 9 praer. "siquidem mos antiquus lupusculis capreolisque ac subus feris iuxta uillam plerumque subjicte dominicis habitationibus ponebat uinaria"; the very roe deer and wild swine, in fact, that Varro contrasts with the ancients' hares. addicta: corrupted in Gelius's LSS to aequiricia. With addicta uillae compare RR 3.12.1 "addicticius ad uillam". For the form of the participle of ib.3.7.4 "sub ordines singulos tabulae fictae ut sint bipalmes", ib. §7 "duabus urgis uiscatis aedictis in terra", ib.3.9.7 "aut exscripta aut addicta firmiter". So too Lucretius 3.5-4

te sequor, o uraiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc ficta pedus pono pressis uestigia plantis.

Diomedes OMK 1.377.11 "figor ambiique declinatur aqua uelae tempore perfecto; reperimus enim fictus et fixus: Scaurus de uita sua 'sagittis' inquit 'comictis'; Varro ad Ciceronea tertio (ib. 3, fr.3 G-3) 'fixum', et Ciceron Academicorum tertio (Incellus 27) 'stabile fixum ratum esse debeat'. Fixus is the only form in Plautus, is used twice by Lucretius (3.549, 5.1205), and is standard throughout the classical period and afterwards; fictus is not attested again till Gregory or Tours, but survived into Romance (Italian fitto besides fisso; Meyer-Milke 3280). The etymologically regular form would be fictus, but as in many other 'supine stems' the original (.) morpheme was displaced by (.) originally from the dental stem.
Urdu (from classical Persian) پڑھا "mīrār-pākh"
multi forns: Varro wrote "fuerunt multi;..." but the original passage is
a "paradox." Forward: "nor in rancid muli., Athen.
4 parede/jous : from an Iranian, aridai/-, ("walled around", as if
τετράδιον; Avestan pairi.d a - "enclosure" (v - 0. - 3.16); in
the sense of "walled park" first found in the Elamitic borrowing
bar-te-ta (466 B.C.), reflecting Old Persian aridai/-, which
probably underlies the corrupt p readable in an inscription of
Artaxerxes II; see Benveniste Journal asiatique 242(sér.3), 1954, p.309
Kent Old Persian p.195. The Median form will have had z for Iranian z,
Old Persian đ; the Greek form will have come from pari aze -
vel sim. It is first known in Greek from Xenophon, who uses it
of the Persian nobles' walled parks for keeping game (exeil.,.15)
or cultivating trees (equal.1,.10); but at excon.4.13 there is no
Persian reference, and very soon φειδίαριος is the regular Greek
word for "orchard"; it was used at LXX Genesis 2.8sqq. to render
the Hebrew gan "walled garden". The Christian use derives from
Luke 23.43 σμήνον μετ' έμοι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.
quaes leporaria Varro dicit: omitted by Hertz, I think rightly.
Gellius gives the Greek name in passing; some reader adds a gloss
from § 1 and produces a clumsy sentence.
5 Scipione...locutus: for the directly attached participle see
2.14.2.
roboration: the term is nowhere else found. As rosarium besides
1. Via Middle Persian /aræz come Hebrew päræz (of the Persian kin's
park, Genesis 2.8; or an orchard, Ecclesiastes 2-5,Armenian päræz
(western baræz)"garden", modern Persian /aræz "vegetable garden";
so too Arabic fir ã a plural form, "pleasure-garden".
2. The theological implications of this text lie outside our scope:
but whereas the Leak Syriac version renders the last three
words "ba aræz", the Old Syriac has "a anna gæden" "the
garden Eden". Note too the development of Arabic janna, "garden,"
Paradise".
rosetum "rose-garden", so roborarium could in itself perfectly well mean "grove of oaks" like roboretum (Ov. Fast. 4.3, 2.1.13; 2.5.1.7; cf. Spanish rodedo, Italian rovereto); that such a grove might be found on private property is shown by Varro RR 1.10.6 (where the term used is jubatum, but robur is rarely used of an actual tree outside Pliny NH 16. The conjunction with piscina; possibly favours the interpretation put on the passage here; if so the derivation "a tabulis roboreis quibus saepa essent" will be parallel to English "pale" from Taurus; or English parrock, and (via the French) parc, from Old English pearrocc, used at OED 5.352.38 to render clatrum. It should, however, be recognized that in all probability Gellius's authorities had no more evidence than we have for determining the word's meaning.

1. tabulis
2. roboreis...plenisque: cf. Columella 1.12.3 "si lapidis et operae uilitas suadeat, haud dubie cemenitis et calce formatus circumdaturaurus; sin aliter, crudo laterae ac luto constructus; ubi uero neutrum pati famulorum conductit, ratio postulat maccerris includi; sic enim appellatur genus clatrorum, idque fabricatur ex robore querceo uel sibereo".

6. What is this Fifth Oration against Asellus? We know that in 140 B.C. 1. Claudius Asellus tr.p.l., an inimicus of Scipio's, imposed a fine on him, but we do not know what for (cf. Justin Scipio Aelianus 175-6), nor do we know that this speech was the same as that quaelta ad 3 populo (Gell. 6.11.9). A iudicium populi had to be over in one day;

1. Chiefly known from its use for that small part (now in Dublin) of medieval Ireland where the King ofarm's writ ran.
2. For stone, brick, and earth walls (maceriae) see Varro RR 1.11.11. cf. id. 3.12.3.
3. "At populum" in the lemma, however, make this not unlikely.
it is therefore surprising to find scholars supposing that Scipio
delivered five speeches during it. In fact, neither the speeches
against Catiline nor those against antony were all delivered on the
same occasion; why should those against isellus? Both the particular
dispute and the general quarrel must have been conducted at several
times and places.

ubi uidisset...aiebat...uillam: commonly mistranslated,¹ as if ubi
uidisset meant in Republican Latin (as it might in Livy) ubi uicerat,
and aiebat meant iubebat, which it cannot at any time. Everything
from ubi to statuere, and from unde to uillam, is an oratio obliqua
depending on aiebat: "He said that wherever" (rather than "whenever")
he saw the best-kept land and the best-kept farmhouses, it was
there, at the highest point, that he set up the surveying-rod, &c".

The oratio recta will have been "ubi uidit...in his regionibus...
statuit" rather than "ubi uadi...in his regionibus,statuo": it is
hardly something to boast of (though we cannot be dogmatic, having
no idea of context).

loco urum reco: locorum mut E, locorum urum reco,
loco urum the earlier editors. The correction is palmary, though
for some reason Hopescu rejects it: "spunca et s...ale zimuri",
leaving locum urum. Hertz (vino belait) preferred locum urum,
taking urumus to be the sound on which a gramma stood; but it is a far
more general word, cf. 1.330; 158 sqq.

---

¹ Hopescu "Unde veaca ogoare mai bine cultivate și case mai fructuose,
în acele laturi, în locul celui mai nalt spunea ș. să "ale zimuri."
[walls] or next note] karacoe takes ubi as temporal and issues the
true force of the superlatives: "Quand il voyait les champs bien
cultivés, les domaines tels bien soignés, il faisait placer la perche
d'arpentage dans les parages, sur une hauteur".

2 In fact V renders loco urum, statuere as "loco urum est statuere".
corrigere: Ammig proposed corrigere, which makes for better sense and should be accepted. This ravager of the environment, whoever he was, drove roads straight through people's property; corrigere "straighten" would make him dependent on the roads already being there, but not straight.

7 piscibus uiuis coercentur clausa cod: what things are ? how are the clauses connected? what is clausa doing? the Italian stops: <qua> scibus and Jacobus Gronovius's pisces quibus for piscibus uiuis leave uiuis hanging in the air; but the latter is superior to the former in that it is more natural for fish to be said coereri than for ponds. For these reasons I accept J.P.Gronovius's coercentis instead of coercentur, which abolishes all three difficulties at a stroke. Gronovius also omitted uiuis; his son is not certain whether this was deliberate, but points out that uiuis is quite unnecessary: who would ever suppose that piscinae were kept for dead fish? It will not do to cite §1 "ferae uiuae" as a parallel: in §1 uiuae is necessary as the τετυμον of uiuaria (cf. n. ad loc.), but since there is no reference in Gellius to uiuaria "fishpond" uiuis has no point here, and may have been interpolated from §1. Marshall reads piscibus uiuis coerit nisi and attributes all three words to Gronovius, wrongly.

piscinas: so always in Republican Latin. In the first century A.D. however, fishponds are also called uiuaria, and piscina is used of pools in general (cf. Columell. 1.4.4 "nantium uo u rum quae stagnis piscinisque lactantur"), especially for swimming-pools (cf. French piscine). Insofar as uiuarium and piscina are distinguished when

1. Unless there be an implied contrast in "so atque proprio nocine"; but this is hardly an argument for retaining uiuis.
referring to fishponds, uinariaium seems to be the pond as fish-holder's basin or the piece of water: cf. esp. Columella 8.17.4
"sin autem locus ubi uinariaium constituere censemus pari libra cantu aequor maris est, in pondus nonum aereiatur piscina". If one were to put into Silver Latin Dionorus Siculus 11.25 hisdxeicnedo de oii', Akerantinos en kolhydradon poluveli epi peirwpou exousan etadion epia, to de bades xpadon aipin. Eis de xaiydrwn epiponkeyoum kolhydradon en xaiydrwv edaimi xynoagelleton blyvnto podtous paraxhdouon xpyiws esx teofon kai iapodagwn.
it is kolhydradon (used for "pool" at e.g. MCG 1 21.5.17) that would be rendered piscina, while xynoagelleton would be

\[ a \] apiaria: first used in Columella 4...4, 9.5.1; cf. Plin. NH 18.338
"in hunc (sc. eorum) apiaria et uineae Italiae Galliarumque spectare decent".

\[ a \] apia: so Livy and Columella, who however also have the apium of Cicero and other writers (neue-Stegener 1.395sqq); Virgil has neither for... Apis has no known congener; on the strength of apia, and the constancy of hanc ape (not tapia), hae ape (not iapi), hae apia (not tapia), it is regarded as a consonant-stem with the same extension in the nominative singular as canis mensis iuvenis; apium is perhaps due to the analogy of putas.

nominem ferme quae incorrupte locuti sunt: for the omission of eorum, cf. 3.1.13 "ex feminando...et male et corpori, qui neque sese neque alium current nisi pecuniam", 7.14.4 "aut iacturan dignitatis, in quem peccatum est"; cf. 3.1.1, 5.11.25, 5.12.20.

9 Varro's actual words (TB 3.1.42) are "meilttonas ita faccere oportet,
quos alii melitrophia appellant, eandem rem quidam melitrophia a".

There is no other example of mellarium1 or meilidrophiou melitisiov
is used at Columella 4.1.4 and in the obscure passage 6.1 1
14.25-6, translated from a text already corrupt, but not in the same
way corrupt as Jerome's original, which seems to have been the same
as the masoretic text.

melissoiias: Marshall prints melissonas, noting that Varro
uses Latin letters and that immediately below Celliis according to the
SS has "melissonas"; for the change in script he compares IApyξ in
com. for "Iapyx" at 2.22.2. Celliis is highly capricious in this
matter, but Marshall is probably right here. Note that Varro wrote
"helittonas" not "melissonas".

qua quidam melicaria appellat: Varro did not attract the gender of
the relative, but Celliis has just written (§ 4) "uiuaria
autem quae nunc uul'us dicit, quos aopaiexiov Graeci appellant".

1. Though the beekeeper is called mellarius at Ep 3.16.17, 30; Columella
(3.1.3) has metalius.
CHAPTER 21

legem sine "constellation", as eter; cinerarius 1,465 "stellis ostendere sidera certis", and Housman ad loc.

vocabuli: cr 2.23.14n.

1 ab Aegina, in Piraeum: where both the whence and the whither are given, the ablative of a town or island may even classically take a preposition: BS 1,470, cr. Gern. Scipio's ap. Cil.. 13, 4.5.4 "ab Aegina segregamus uenus" and 2.12.1 "ab Apidauro Piraeum", Gel. 4.1.1. "a Cassiopra Brundisium", in Piraeum, so Cic. Att. 7.1.1. at att. 7.9., he had written "in Piraeus" = \( \text{in Piraeus} \); Atticus, objecting, he admits he should have used the Latin Piraeum rather than the Greek Piraeue, but defends the preposition on two counts: first, that deines are not towns, second, that Terence had used the preposition \(^2\) (Att. 7.5.10). Since Early Latin limits the preposition with place-names outside Italy (Bennett 2.235, 376, 307; Hofmann-Sanz, 49, 102, 190; BS 1,477; Wackernagel, 1 Toral.. 24-25), and since Terence's e Sunio (v. 5.) is countered by the locative \( \text{in Piraeus} \) (v. 519), Atticus need not have been convinced; no doubt he held that if one said Ostia one should also say Piraeum, as Gern. Scipio ues (v. 4, 1-1).

vocabuli: such distributives from comparatives are common in Early Latin (Plautus, Terence, Jato; c. celebresre, Rhet. cr. 3.24;

---

...Inscriptions, comedy, and the orators, regularly use \( \text{in Piraeus} \) \( \text{ex Piraeis} \) \( \text{hein Piraeo} \); the locative \( \text{in Piraeus} \) occurs in Xenophon, but \( \text{in Piraeo} \) is a hyper-stichoism of Alciplan's (4.19.17, 21; Schepers), while \text{Piraei} is cited in early editions of Diocles and Scott from chloeostatus 15, 15, Iarvis (Vit. Ap. Tyraen. 1.17) is a past-ord, chloeostatus having es de in Piraeo as Piraeo. (Piraeo is kamp for Piraeo.)

2 He cites M. 159 with "in Piraeus" for "in Piraeo".
Lorenz on Plautus recn. 207-9; minuscules and minuscula
occur sporadically in Cicero's letters, Varro, Vitruvius, and the
early Flavi. This formulation is revived by Fronto and Gellius;
Krahe Lotts 91; 254-5. Conclusus is common in Gellius; or. also
graniusculus 1.11., *ididiusculus* 3.13., minspulcs 4.11.6, and
concussus 17.2.15, noctiusculus 7.11.1.
2 Note the semi-poetic "evocative" style; compare 1.2.2, and the more
extended passage 2.23.3-16. Compare, too, the very different shipboard-
scene at 17.4.1-4.

liquid serenum: it is rare in Latin for qualitative adverbs to
modify adjectives; but to the examples in 3.1.254 a., Laberius 1.6R
"submissa placide clariloquens oratio". The effect here is poetic.
Gellius has similar uses at 9.1-6, 13.3.1, 19.12.9, and most
important of all, the "profession of faith" (Wicher p. 226 n. 2) at
19.2.6 "sententia poetae actores deplie obscura non anxie". ( I
suspect "non anxie"; see Prolegomena "Notes on Gellius's Annals and
Values": 1.
lucentia sidera considerabanes: considero stands to sidus as
contenedor to templum; to the etymological figure he adds the poetic
unusual.
3 Graecas res erudit; or 1.12.9 "amacia; tiamiaque... eruditus".
In classical Latin erudic takes the construction al~sgeni\aliqua re;
the double accusative is found in Silver epic (Val. 1.1.50, Stat.
Teob.1.502). But with the passive, the retained accusative (instead
of the ablative) is post-classical; even with docet, first occurring
...

...A more classical way of expressing the notion is to prefix sub-
to the positive (which may take the diminutive: subamericanica Cic. att-
4.5.14, subarmutulii Gell. 13.3.1).
At Assumio 930, Calvo invited for the handwriting of the Et Habet Aemus perpenditum. For Calvo L. Miller prepared Calvo, in 1805 the state is had under real problems's takings.
at Salust. Hist. 1. 147 Iaur. "doctus militiam", cf. 1. 296; for its use with 
emissus (also found in Cerrallian) cf. Cor. epigr. 55
"docta eruita omnes artes".

"Apasai": cf. "Charles's Wain" "il Gran carro". This is to be understood, not of what we should regard as the entire constellation of Ursa maior, but of the seven principal stars, also known in English as the Plough. We read in Homer that Hephaestus wrought on Uchilles' shield (Σ 4. 5-9)

Then Odysseus sailed from Cytheria, no sleep fell on his eyelids (Ε 272-5

At a later date the Greeks learned from the Phoenicians to identify the Lesser Bear, called Phoinix by Eratosthenes (Cat. 2); thus Aratus says of the celestial north pole (Phaen. 16-7).

He also tells us that Greek sailors still sailed by Ursa minor, though the Phoenicians used the more accurate Ursa maior, and is our first source for the names Ελιων and Κοββοεα (36-17).

It will be realized that the ancients had no pole-star; even in Ptolomy's (that is Celsius's) day, Κ Ursa Minoris was some 12° from

1. These four are the only constellations to have their own Latin names: Νιλοειδες Verriliae, Ψαλδες Squilae (cf. Cels. 1. 9)

2. The four previously mentioned constellations and Boötes were the only ones known to the Greeks till the fourth century B.C. (Bolton "Arist. of Proconnesus" 1. 150), see for the Tōbria, Kohn, Jorsch 1. 135. 184
the pole, and even in Homer's *Draco* had long since passed it by.

nor were α and β Ursae Majoris yet pointers.

*quid* Α Perseus, *quid* Β Ω, et *quae* Μαjor et *quae* minor coud; but

Bootes is not mentioned in what follows, and *Α* Perseus cannot be supplied

across "*quid* Β Ω, a*" to bestow meaning on *quae* *Major* and *quae* *Minor*. These two

factors taken in conjunction recommend Hertz's deletion of "*quid* Β Ω, a*".

*quae* *Major*; or *quae* *Minor* 2.4.1 a.

cur ita appellata: from the shape (which has not changed significantly

between Homer's day and ours), η 5 ζ Ursae Majoris being regarded as

the shaft, δ ζ θ γ as the body. 2

*quam in partem... moueretur*: it has of course an apparent motion

clockwise round the pole, starting from the east.

*quambrum* Homerus, &c. Aristotle (poet. 1461 c 21) took δ ζ to mean "the

most notable" (τὸ η 5 ζ Ω Μαjor ρόδος); Strabo (5 1, p. 3) took *Machai*

and *Α* Perseus to mean the entire circumpolar region of the sky; even

wilder suggestions are recorded by Lucas on *Aristotel* l.c. and by

Strabo. But in fact Homer's statement "implies, not that the poem

veritably ignored the unnumbered stars revolving within the circle

traced out round the pole by the seven of the Plough, but that they

remained a nameless crowd, unassociated with any terrestrial object,

and therefore attracting no popular observation!" (Agnes Clarke,

"Familiar Scenes in Homer" p. 42). We may add that Ursa Major has been

1. *Bootes* is not irrelevant to a discussion of the rustic imagery in

these names (cf. Varro LL 7.74); but this could be a motive for

interpolation. The point is that he does not fit into this discussion.

2. These four are known in Arabic as *Α* Ζ *Α* *Λ* *Ω* *Ω* *Λ* *Ω* *Ω* "the aster, whence the

modern Latin Feretrum Majus.

3. 1. LSJ s.v. *λόφος* ... II.4; similarly Latin solus. Bostgard, Skrifter

uteliva av kungliga humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 25 (1932) 165.
These seers (Sansk. sg. ṛṣi-) mentioned in the Rgvedas are identified in the Brahmanas with the seers of the Plough and said originally to have been bearers (wat ṛkṣa-). They are also identified (Sukhasene-Brahmanas 14.5.2.6 Mahabharata 12-12) with the composers of the Vedas. (Maddorn) "A History of Sanskrit Literature" [reprinted, Delhi 1871] pp. 90-1; Monier-Williams "Sanskrit-English Dictionary" s.v. ṛṣi.)
slipping steadily southward in the sky since Homer's day, so that not all of it is now circumpolar to the observer in Greece.

cum et qaelian alia: Luce past prints the LS text and renders "alors qu'il y a d'autres constellations qui ne se couchent pas"; I should accept this translation but supplement (after alia) e. <sidera non occident> 1. Gronovius preferred to read that for cum, "and then some other things", which is rather readable.

4 opici: etymologically = ὀπικόω "uscaus", cf. 2.25.3n, but used in Latin, and in Greek a Philoquius (A.P.5.15.7); cf.Otto p.256, and ad fronto ep., 1.1.1, ..Caesar lib.2.2.2; Cujas lib.2.3.6. The Oscans, like the Suebii, the men of Gothia, the Swabians, and the Kabeler, were supposed to be stupid, cf. Arist.Ctint.de nat..s.. 74.

Septentriones: the plural is the older form (first found at Plautus amh..73) and means "the seven plough-oxen"; 2 Gronovius tr.. "triones hic moderato rusticus", Varro 4.7.74 "triones ehi et boes appellantu a buiscis etiam manu, maxima cuxx amat terran"; for the formation cf. the Sanskrit name for the Plough, Sapt.."7." "the Seven Risus".

Cicero's thesis is therefore quite justified (nat..s..6) "quas noscri soliti Septentrionem triones".

In course or time, however, triones being restricted to specialist use, the word was no longer understood as adjective + noun but as the plural of Septentriones. This form occurs twice in Cicero:

1. Non occident Carrio: Hosius added astra, a word Sellius does not use.
2. The image is unparalleled; but that does not mean the etymology is false. G.Szemer'yi (11.achtung. "richtige s..Sprach..wissenschaft", Innsbruck 1962, 188-9) derives the name from the root *ster "star" *septemberio *septentrio *septentriones *septentrio, an unproductive sequence.
3. E.g. Diabetes (Ct..2.20.8) "Triones, f. week", "insulin" (add. by Tyrius).
once of the north wind, 'Azeaeclas (Atq. 9.3.2) once of a single Bear (h. 2.111 "minores autem septentriones") 2. At (Caesar) by 1. 6 "Septentriones" alternates with "Septentriones" §7; the three paragraphs are riddled with e.-Caesarian variatio, cf. Hering rhinocerus 1.50 (1956) 67-9; Serres Septenses 98 (1970) 16-9. But in Augustan Latin and subsequently Septentrio is regular (e.g. it occurs eleven times in Livy, the plural never); even being split by thesis, first at Vergil Georj. 3. 3. 1 "talis Hyperboreo Septe-
subiecta -trioni". 3

5 prolixius: so 1.2.10, 12.14, 13.89.3, cr.5.1.2 "prolix proliouseque"; and for the adjective 3.10.11 "uastiora prolixioraque fuerunt corpora", 6.12.1 "tuncis...prolixis".

6 ad litteras...deinoret: another example of d + acc. for a classical native, cr.2.16.9n., Knaps 1.22.25 (1894) 7.

7 Supposing an inorganic extension was an easy way out; cf. Cicero Topica 36 (cited 1.1.4n) "...sed cum eius postillum uis quaeritur et uerbum ipsum notatur; in quo Servius noster, ut quiser, nihil putat esse notandum nisi post, et -limium illia productionem esse uerbi uult, ut in finitum magnum seditum non plu - secus tumum (i.e. thymanum) quam in medipilio julium: scoeuola autem P. F. Iunctum putat esse uerbum, ut sit ... ac et post et limen, etc". See also the discussion on -bunius in 1.1.15; an "inanis...productio" or κεραυγή according to some §6 though not apollinaris (§8).

1 "Septentriones uenti" (an...ap...Cic. Att. 9.6.3) may be a true plural, ‘Azeaeclas’ cr. 2.22.15n.
2 Contrast Varro ap. Gell. 3.1.2 "septentriones maiores et minores". A
3 Tiones ma. be poetically used for "the bears", e.g. Vergil Aeneid 1.744 "genimoseque friones". See in general = Connel de Stellarius apellations et religiones Romana 50 sqq.
Quinquatrus: originally celebrated on 19 March, by Varro's time from the nineteenth to the twenty-third; sacred to Minerva;¹ a school holiday; of Etruscan origin K. 4. "Ne dic Erasimus, ed² 2.48.

The name exists in the forms quinquatrus -iūnum, quinquatres -iūnum., quinquatricularis; the etymology at schol. Juv. 13. 155 "aut quod intra quinque atria fit" suggests that the a was long; the syllable is never short in the poets.

Varro (³ 6.14) and Festus (305.22) inform us that the name signifies not a five-day festival, but one held post idem Iunius; the Tusculan: atrarius, seratus, Septemtrarius and the Faliscan Decimtrarius all fell so many days after the Ides. The names are formed from the cardinals (1.3) and the element atr, probably Etruscan; no doubt they are half-assimilated loans.

Stilicho: Stilicho Stilichonimus, an equest from Lavinium, c.155-170 B.C.; friend and teacher of Varro (cf. Cic. ³ 16.8; Varro a. 47. 5. 18 etc.; Quint. A. 59; Geil. Ic. 2); for his part in this etymology see next note. In 100 B.C. he accompanied Metellus Numidicus on his voluntary exile to Rhodes,³ where Pfeiffer suggests he may have met Dionysius Thrax ("History of Classical Scholarship", 266).

VARRO: having at 1. 7. 73 cited Simonius Frang.

1. 'Trios e festival on 13 June, though on the actual Ides and not the fifth day following, was called "quinquatrus minusculae".
2. But cf. Wackenagel, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 22 (1923/4) 215-9, who connects it with ater: he takes "ales at r" to have been originally a day of waning moon, then used of posttrialexus, from which it's religious nature it came to be used of all ill-fated days (cf. Geil. 5. 17); quinquatrus would thus be "five days" (including the Ides) of waning moon. This explanation raises more problems than it solves.
3. See in general C. ³ 169. 265-7, Suet.Aug. 3. he wrote speeches for nobles including C. Sotta's uncooperative but unsuccessful "pro se lege varia" (cf. Dion. C. 1. 37. 167) Cicero thought them "loius orationes" for himself. Stilicho had pretensions to Stoicism, but

*Original text: 208*
209

177. loc. 165-167, Varro states in §74 "nas septem stellas Graeci ut Homerus uocant Aρες et propinquum eius signum Ῥώμη
nostri eas septem[ elias] tresiones et Teumon et prop eae acem;
triones enim et boves appellantur a bubulcis etiam mundo, maxime cum
arant terram; et quis ut dicti 'ualentes glebarii' \(^1\) qui facile
proscinuant glebas, sic omnes qui terram arabant e terra terriones,
unde triones ut dicemus a detrito"; in §75 he adds "possunt
triones dicti VII quod ita sitae stellae ut terrae recenti triones"
(cf. Gell. §10). Closer to our passage is Festus (bk. 36 2) "septem
stellae appel... (…) bus iunctis quo trioes... /a pellent qui
... (t)…/ quasi terriones.../ quod in astrum Graeci.../ partem
quantam... Simius "superat..."/ et physici eam si.../ c. [ten...]
temp.../ alium quod ita sunt.../ ut terrae proxime... 'triones'
R. Schröter\(^2\) rightly concludes that Varro had discussed this
question in an earlier work (antiquitates? de vita p. ?), which
 cited Alciatus for the first etymology and the physici for the
second; this work will have been used by Titius Flaccus, who will
probably have been Gellius's source. I owe both this reference
and that to Szecréyi (p. 206 n. 2) to Fischer's commentary.

Rustico [... ] uocabulo: "cetero" was explained by Damstedt,

Alensoyne (? 6er? ). I 444 as coming from a marginal gloss "s. e ter'
(cf. next n.). Gronovius suggested cetera or c. e qui, "otherwise (than
when referring to the Ploug)" but in this sentence it ought to mean

\(^1\) An unidentified, presumably dramatic fragment: e.g. "terra
ualentes proscinduit glebarii".


2. Or better "c."? I have not found the etymology than the explanation.
"otherwise than when referring to oxen", which is absurd.

terrones: in fact trio is related to tero, cf. 263 on Verr. 1.7.44
(whence Isidore 6th-7th, 12.1.3).

9 positio: 12 times in Lucretius, then Prop. 6.5.32, Gell. 1.7.13, 1.9.4,
1.14.15. Sallust has positus (ist.ln.2.1 n); cf. idem sargo; Caelio pr.cf.
2.39, 43, Gell. 1.2.2, 1.17.8, 10.4.1; positio is not found before Columella,

10 cf. p. 209. Any three points not in a straight line form a triangle; all
Vermo succeeds in arguing, is that no star in the Plough line on a straight
line with the two stars nearest, even if he means that there are seven
triangles formed by neighbouring stars, this must be so provided no three
stars are so placed that two of them are each nearer to the other two than
to a fourth. - It goes without saying that the etymology is false, but it
is of interest in that it seems to imply the pronunciation τεηεαια for
τεηεαια. From Hypereuclides onwards such pronunciations had been growing
common. 1

ternae stellae proximate quaeque. The plural was unavoidable, but at p. 10.9
there is a clear breach of the classical rule: "periculique et vetae
climates
fortunaeque omnia quae
[Childe's appollont, or missimos quaque
fieri acfirmat septenariost]." 2

11 cf. his dabus rationibus... quod posterior est; instead of "qua
posterior...". Compare the frequent res quod, e.g. Gell. 4.12.1

"plurina rebus quae dixit quaque fecit"; see Bailey's Lucretius,

1 pl. to Aristoxenus fr. 168 Kock; § 1 sth. c. 75; class tr. Purtan "pronunci-
ation of βοιτεια βέκτ" 110; Allen "Vox Græca" 2-3. such spellings as
οδιοι for οδιοι are frequent in papyri; regular in e.g. that of
Heronius' Sicynius (copied at the end of the 3rd century B.C.),
2 addimt V, recce om.P (Ko.BL its § - entire). Such sentence in this
passage has its own verb of saying.
3 "in auch stilistisch für c. recht instructiver Satz" (Hartz v. id. Gell. l 1.7.1;
vol.1, pp. 94-5; hence on Cic. 2.3; Petrus Faber on Cic. Mucilus c.14 (§ 43); Keil on Varro R 1. 41; Ernout Syntaxe L p. 142 1. 3f. also Cic. leg. 2.26 "bene uero quod sens fieras Virtus rudes consecratur manu, ut illa qui habeant (habent autem omnes boni) deos ipsos in animis suis colocatos patent" (ut Paris, mea compositio).

Inuenimus enim nobis illum: "as we looked into it", i.e. into the matter. Certainly not "that constellation" (Rolle), "constelation" (Popescu), "la constellation" (Karche); sidus (§ 9) is too far away. Naturally they did look up at the Plough, but cellius leaves that to be implied by "forma esse triquetra uidementur".

Uiderentur: sc. the seven stars under discussion. There is a slight awkwardness; but uiderentur, Groenewits's conjecture 2 would produce a greater, one would require <sidus > uidementur, or possibly forma <uideris>.

Proposibilia: so 2.22.22, 4...3, and often.

1. The reverse construction also occurs: Plantus Hercator 337 "satin quia quid est quam ran agere occupi", Lucretius 4. 365 "id quo providet, illius res constat imago"; Gel. 1 1. 2. 14. "si uixx forte la sciut de qua re apud eum litigatur".

2. Hertz's report that it is read by R is contradicted by Marshall and implicitly by Karche.
The main ancient sources for wind-names are:

Aristotle 363a2-3.6, p. 363a2-3; Aristotle 363a2-3.6, p. 363a2-3

Theophrastus fr. 5 "De uctatis";

Timaeus ap. Athenaeum 2.7 (cf. ib. John of Damascus de ortu vir 2.26);

A. Aristot. deuq. Theor. p. 373; cf. Rose;

The wind-tower of Arrianus Cynhathes at Athens (CIG 518, Dammeister 2115; cf. ib. 1.6.6,)

Strabo 1.29 (citing Posidonius);

Vitruvius 1.6;

Ps.-Aristot. de mundo 394b19-20;

Seneca 3.10.17

Pliny 2.119 sqq.; 1.333 sqq.

Suetonius fr. 351 Reiterscheid (1516)

See further Hosius on this chapter, Homotan, Homilius 1.593. For modern discussions, apart from commentaries on individual authors, see A. Rehn "Ueber die Windrosen" (1816) 99-106; M. Nielsen Classica et Mediaevalia 7(1945),1-145. It will be soon apparent how truly Gellius complains (§ 2) that there is agreement "neque de appellationibus eorum neque de numero".

The fundamental cause of difficulty is that whereas in the Germanic languages the bearings are primary and the winds are named after them (thus south wind is secondary to south) in both Greek and Latin the wind-names are largely independent of direction; indeed is often expressed in terms of the wind. It is contingently,

not analytically, true that ἔνδος Νότον and ἔνδος Μεσόπολεις express the same direction.

In time, attempts were made to schematize the winds, that is to redact independent and often locally restricted names into a rose. These, however, did not affect the ordinary man, who went on identifying winds by their qualities or their geographical provenance (Ἑλλησποντιας &c) rather than by their astronomical direction; nor the poets, for whom that is always good enough which was good enough for Homer.¹ In general, wind-roses were a luxury of scholars and philosophers, who appear to have had little practical experience of the subject, and were not perhaps incapable of gratuitous variation.

The original four winds of Homer, βορέας Ἑσπές Νότος Ζέφυρος were by the fifth century B.C. supplemented by four others to produce an eightfold classification; in what might be called its proto-καυνη form it ran Ἀνατολίας N, Βορέας NE, Ἀνατολίος E, Ἑσπές SE, Νότος S, Ῥηχή S, Ζέφυρος W, Ἀνατολίας NW; at Athens, however, local usage differed from this schema in respect of the three names Βορέας or Βορέας N, Καυκάς NE, Ζέφυρος N.

The next development came from Aristotle, who drew up a twelve-point rose and then looked for winds to equip it with. The twelve points were: N, 334° E (halfway between its neighbours), N 66° E (summer sunrise), E, S 66° E (winter sunrise), S 334° E, S, S 334° W, S 66° W (winter sunset), W, 66° W (summer sunset), and N 334° W. On the 3-point compass the nearest equivalents would be N, NE by N

¹ Tannianus 4.53 sqq. taken literally, implies a 12 wind system with 2.4. To realize on the astrolabe 2.31 (date 191) & be it so shipmen reason alike parties in xxx j.
(that is $33^\circ$E), ENE (that is $67^\circ$E), E, SSE, SE by S, S, SW by S, 
SW, W, NW, and NW by N; I shall use these names throughout the 
commentary.

But having devised twelve points, Aristotle could not find 
twelve winds. Blowing due north he set 'Ἀπρωπός', which under the 
influence of Attic usage he also called Βορέας, at NE by N 
(a name used in Caunus, Ps-Ar.973 a), at NE another Attic wind 
Καῦκας. Due S was 'Ἀπρωπός', ESE Eυρως; but 
for the SE by S wind he could find only the local wind Φοινικός 
(so called by ὁ πρῶτος τόν ἱστόν ἱκέτων, 36423). Due E of course was Νότος 
but for SE by S he could find no wind at all. WSW Λέος, W 
Σέφυρος; the NW wind he gave the alternative names 'Ἀπρωπός' 
(the most general, to judge by our sources), 'Ολυμπίας (Δομοιος, 
rs-Ar.973b 21, Fliny Hh 17.232; Lesbian Ps-Ar.1b.1) and Εὐρως 
(Attic; also Segarian according to Ps-Ar.973bl9); the NW by N wind 
he called Ορακίας.

This system was modified by Timosthenes, admiral to Ptolemy 
Philadelphus; in particular the missing winds are supplied by the 
extraction of similars from πιαρία tautum used in different senses 
by Aristotle. He also reallocated the name Βορέας to the NE by N 
wind, and gave the NW wind the name Πτέρος that sets off the 
discussion in this chapter. His system was as follows:N 'Ἀπρωπός 
NE by N Βορέας, NE E Καῦκας, E 'Ἀπρωπός', ESE Ευρως 
SE by S Ευρωνός (cf.Gell.8lm.), S Νότος, SW by S Λευκόνος 
(cf.Gell.8lm.), WSW Λέος, W Σέφυρος, NW Πτέρος, NW by N 
Ορακίας ('called Κέφως by the ἱερούς', that is by the Celts - 
I according to the transmitted text equivalent of Ορακίας = 
Ορακίας ; displacement is to be suspected.
Gauls - who live NW by N of Rhodes; cf. J. s.v. 'Timosthenes,' 1315). This twelve-wind system became standard, alongside the eight-wind, although with several variations in names: for Εὐδόνονος at NW by S we find Oéðónoños (θερμος ἡθος) and Φῶνος (Pliny); for the SW by S wind, called Λευκόνονος by Timosthenes, a frequent name is Λιβόνονος (E.-n. de mundi, Pliny, cf. austroafricans in Suetonius), while de mundio records in addition Λιβόνονος.

But this system was not without its rivals. The pre-Socratic Thrapeces and dealt and there were only two principal winds, Βόρεας and Νότος; westerlies, being cold, were a species of northerly, easterlies, being warm, a species of southerly. Basing themselves on this classification, and two Homeric passages

Βορέας καὶ Ζήφυρος, τῷ τε Θαλκυθένθητος (15)

Εὐς ὑπὸ τής Ζήφυρος νέφοι στριφέσθησαν

Aργοκέλτο Νότῳ δεδέκτης Ἀδαίτην πάρειν (Π 305-6)
certain persons concocted a ridiculous six-fold wind-rose of Βορέας N, Εὐθέας, 'Αργοκέλτος ESE, Νότος S, 'Αργοκέλτος WSW, Ζήφυρος WNW.¹ That these names could be so violently reinterpreted is yet more evidence that the relation of a wind to its astronomical direction was for the Greeks an artificial, bookish enterprise.

Local wind-names survived, though liable for general service:

Παλκους for instance, is used by Timosthenes and in the lemma of ἄνθρωπως ὲθος instead of 'Αργοκέλτος. The persistence of this usage is shown by the wind-tower erected by Aristonicus of Cysikos, whose eight faces bear the names and likeness of Βόρεας due.

¹ See S. rabo 29; cf. Aristotle meteor. 585a12, post. 562a4; Rehm p. 29.

The Homeric passages certainly not imply this absurd system; Thrace lies both north and west of Troy/Hisarlik, while 'Αργοκέλτος is a. epithet; cf. West on Hesiod chironomy 37.

² Oéðónoños app. Λευκόνονος (Rehm 981).
The Romans had wind-names of their own: *aquilo* E (cf. note § 9), *nocturnus* S, *auster* S, *maricus* S., *rauonius* W, *carpus* NW; the octet was completed by *septem* E(Es) used of the *mea* wind and *subsolana* of the one E wind, these terms being no doubt modelled on *'Aqurias* and *'Aqurias* (classification into eight winds, it may be noted, survived into the Middle Ages and beyond in Italy). In the first century AD *nocturnus* was displaced by *eurus*: Sen. *IQ* 5.1.4.

Roman accounts of the wind-rose show certain common features: even in the eight-wind system, the intermediate winds are related to the points of sunrise and sunset; the account of the major winds is followed by discussion of local winds (Vitruvius is here an exception, giving instead his personal twenty-four-wind monster-system). One might see in this the imitation of an earlier treatise, which from Seneca *IQ* 5.1.3 would seem to be Varro's; but the various accounts are still sufficiently different to necessitate the supposition of additional sources.

The twelve-wind system was adopted by Varro, and is described by Seneca and Pliny, who have however no Latin names for *Kaikias E2ponotos* *Neukarotos* *Opelcias*. Pliny indeed achieves some remarkable audacity: he describes first (*IQ* 2.44) the eight-wind system, but instead of setting *aquilo* = *Boreas* S.E in conformity with his treatment of the other intermediate winds, he puts it between *septentrio* and the summer sunrise, which would seem to imply NE by R.

---

its position on the twelve-wind system. Then (§ 130) he tells us
"muro soior ratio quattuor his intericerat...itemque Caecian media
(s. regiones) inter aquilum et exortum aquincoctiales ab ortu
solstitiali" (which taken literally would put aquilo at 43°)!
"Phoenica media regione inter ortus brumalem et meridian...sec
...tis: alii quippe aces nomine etiam adinter aequinoctium et
Caecian" (here reverting to the Aristotelian system, though at
meteor. 363b31 'Akeron put not Boreou is used) "et inter aequino-
ctum aequinoctium" (not realizing that Φοίνιξ and Ευρένοτος
are the same).

The next development in Roman usage was the Suetonian
nomenc-
clature for the twelve-wind system: septentrio., aquilo NE by N,
ultunum N, subsolianus S, eurus SSE, euroauster SE by S, auuster S,
aulstrafrisor SW by S, auricu SW, furonius W, caurus NW, cirrus
NW b. N. It will be seen that eurus has been naturalized, and
ultturnus revived with a new meaning (S.E instead of SE or SSE);
that Eupérotos and Leipóvotos have been translated; and that the mistral
(cirrus "le cors") has been conscripted as the Latin Θρακικάs
even though later in the same Es. 151 it is a local wind again
(Or. § 20n). For this system cr. 18. 1. 1308, 2579, 454 Riese.

Our present chapter describes the eight-wind system in terms of
sunrise- and -set-points, alludes briefly to the four- and twelve-
wind systems, and then discusses local winds and the etesians. All
this is standard, but there are certain peculiarities:

(a) The truly Latin wind-names are classically and correctly
applied: in particular ulturnus is the ESE wind. The only

T. E. B. of Thompson CR. 32. 6. S 2 (Greek 32. 5) 3, 11 Wall Pl. 3b, aquilo 49° V 30° E, Caesars. Nov. 28.
individuality is the form "septentrionarius" (instead of "septentrion" or "septentrio") for the due N wind. The Latinized eurus, however, is applied to the due E wind, and ἑσπερίοις elsewhere the SE by S wind and hence alien to the eight-wind system, is equated with volturnus as designating the SSW wind.

(b) In §2 the western winds are opposed to the easterly not ἐαυτὸς ἄσπρος but ἐν κόσμῳ: caurus - auruio; favorinus - eurus; Africus - volturnus. The first and third of these pairs lie on secants parallel to the axis of the second.

(c) In §22 ἠλέκτρων is equated with caurus because it blows opposite eurus; in other words opposition is diametric, and eurus is the ESE wind, contrary to (a) and (b) above.

(d) The exposition from §3 to §26 is put in the mouth of Favorinus, but in §26, wondering whether something stated by Favorinus may not be correct, he uses first-person verbs: dixi... dixerim.

As we have seen, variation and mundane are constantly present in ancient discussions of the winds. But before applying this result to our present problems, let us note that whereas Favorinus, among Romans and therefore speaking Latin, can reasonably be represented as citing Latin names and quoting Roman poets, he cannot have done so in a book written in Greek. If then Genius is following (say) the ναυτολόγος τεσσερά, he must have added the Latin names and the references to Vergil, Horace, and the old Latin lyric poem of §2, from elsewhere. One is under no obligation to say that he took the names from Aenèas, who is cited in §31; but Aenèas

1 At the opposite ends of parallel secants: cf. Houssman, Manilius 2, p. xvii.
is certainly not responsible for the citations of Vergil and prose.

at the identity of Latin sources is less important than the plausible hypothesis that Gellius used other authorities besides Favorinus. Could it not be that Favorinus gave the eight-wind system, in Greek, with Εὐρός = ἀντίλαμβανον at line 1 and Εὐριόνος at line 2? Gellius will then have followed him, but since eurus had long since been Latinized used it as a Latin name, feeling, perhaps, that subula ens, being a sailors' word, was beneath the dignity of his style.2

The same hypothesis accounts also for the problem of § 22. Favorinus will have given the μετα τὸν ἀντίλαμβανον opposition that Aristotle thought it necessary to reject (363b18 sqq., cf. § 12n); but another source will have stated that Καλπίκη blew opposite eurus, using these terms in their more normal meanings. Gellius will have displayed less than his normal periscopic in not noticing the discrepancies.

The remarks about 'etesiae et prodromi' in § 5 are commonplace, as Gellius himself says (§ 30 "scutatus opiniones saecularis"); it is probable that they occurred in Favorinus as well as in others, but Gellius will not have regarded them as specifically his. It was the easier for him to forget when writing § 30 (which at least bears the appearance of a Nachtrag) that he had ascribed them to Favorinus.

This chapter is cited by Varrius as test. 27; Apuleius gives a precis of §§ 5–9 at de mundi 13–14, with an ascription to

1. Popular usage no doubt preserved this use of Εὐρός, cf. Aristotle 364b.5 Εὐρόι λίβα καὶ Καλπίκης, ὧν Εὐριόνος οἰκὸς καὶ θεῶν καὶ ἀντίλαμβανον, καὶ ἀντίλαμβανον. Gellius 5.55ff. also sets eurus due to "col. alton"; paradise lost 1.45–4).

2. Ventus posuit 23.2 comes from Vergil, even if Vergil did not use nautical usage: see n al. loc.
Favorinus that proves nothing; Nonius 72 L gives the same etymologies as Gellius for Iris, Nothus and Boreas, but is otherwise independent; his Nothus comes "ab oriente... nemo..."

1 Or 3. 11.1 "Aquat cenae Favorini philosophi cum ascubitum fuerat coptusque erat apponi cum, servus assistens sensae eius lophobia inseptatam aut Graecum quia litterarum aut nosoratium"; for readings at table see Gell. 1. 100, and note especially Varro Sat. 340 at Gell. 22. 5, 13. 11. 7. Other learned dinners occur at 7. 1, 9. 4, 15. 2, 17. 5, 16. 13, 19. 9, 20. 9; they are standard in literature from Plato to Plutarch and Xenaeus and then to Acrobius (for whose setting cf. Gell. 13. 2). For etiquette at them see Varro ap. Gell. 13. 11.

Favorinus and Melicii postae; Gellius very rarely mentions the Greek lyric poets. At the banquet, we are told, "Avaro... pleraque et Sapphica..." were sung; Gellius being especially dedicated by some purported "versiculis lepidissis..." (19. 9). At 20. 7. 2. Sappho, Bacchylides, and Pindar, are cited among other authorities for the size of Heroids brood; this is no doubt a brief notice lifted entire from some handbook. The other two citations are explicitly second-hand: Pindar Pyth. 1. 21-5 at 17. 10. 2 from Favorinus, Alcaeus 347 at 17. 10. 1 from Plutarch and other writers. For Latin lyric see below, 32.

Melicii: normally a purely musical term in Latin, but cf. Cicero opt. 1. 7, Pliny NH 7. 5. See Malmros History of Classical Scholarship, 158-3. The original term meleniós was retained by the Greek...
theorists, out in context, such as "references to editions or texts and lists of the 'makers'" * fuece* was introduced, possibly by Aristophanes or Byzantium. In Latin, *fuece* is regular, even in theoretical writers, from the Augustan period onwards (Cic.Orat. 1.3 has "qui fuece a Graecis nominatur")

2 Legebatur ergo ibi tune in carmine latino: from the context this must be a "vetus carmen melici poetae", and therefore not *Horace carm. 1.3.4* or *3.27.20; neither in time nor in temperament was *Horace vetus.* One thinks of Laevius, but why does Gellius not have the poet? Possibly because he had found only an anonymous fragment in an anthology; possibly because he had omitted at the time he came across *laevius* to make a proper note.

*Laevius* quem, quaestus, *que est quis:* to be so punctuated. To put the comma before *quis* is to sacrifice a Latin sentence at the altar of German grammar.

tan in frquentium vocabuli: it is not of course uncommon in the technical literature, but that does not count. In general literary use it occurs as a wind-name outside the Latin poets here cited, in *Horace* (v.sup.), at *Vergil* Aenid 6.710 (cf.23), Lucan 6.335, *Valerius maximi* 3.11; I have not found it in Greek.

3 *fabulans est:* the verb *fabulus* "loquer" is common in early Latin, particularly in *Caesar,* who has it fifty six times; it is unused in the later Republic, but reappears with the implication of untruth (which it lacks in Early Latin) at *Livy* 43.39.15 "quae senatus *Horace* is cited below, in §25, but only for the *Heb.* *atubulus* Fronto had a certain fondness for him (cf. *Princ. 2.5.3*), which Marcus did not share (ib.2.5.3; *Fronto's post decisa negotia* *Princ. hist. 15* is probably borrowed from *Horace* e. *W.* 7.59.)
decreuit potius quam quae Ser. Calba Fabulatur audi = quas Fabulas narrat. (This much is clear, despite the corruptness of the text.)

The sense of *fabulae* is also found at Pliny, *H.N.* 29, 3 "ictur fulmine resuapiunt fabulata" (sc. aedae medicae; this sense, rendering *μεταλαυετέν* recurrs in later Latin); at Quintilian, *Inst.* 3, 13 and Tacitus, *Ann.* 29, *cfr.* is used of undignified orators with a chatty style of speaking, and at Martial, *3, 6*, 6 *cfr.* is applied to a bore.

But at *64*, 4 Martial uses it in the old manner of ordinary conversation, without pejorative nuance; and so does Suetonius (*N.G. 74, 5*; *Cal. 22, 6, *Domit. 1, 4*). These authors presage the word's use by *Pol. *Florus, *Fronto*, and *Gellius*, and also by later writers like adjectival *cuius*, it remained part of the living language in Iberia, whence Spanish hablar and Portuguese falar "speak." See *Inst. Lat. Syntax. 2, 3, 8*; Lebek "Verba Prisca": 4.

4 septentriones: *cfr.* 2, 24, 4.

5 *solutia*: *cfr.* 2, 24, 4.

Gellius stands by the classical usage in which *solutia* means not "solstice", as in Silver Latin, but only "the same solstice". The Romans seem to have seen the solstitial point of Cancer as the goal the sun spent all year making for, and stopped when he had reached; that of Capricorn, by contrast, he "rugs up" round at. Whereas Aratus *Phaen. 4, 9* "*κυκλοφορεῖν υπερβολά*" becomes Cicero *Arat. 264* in quo consistens convertit curriculun So-,

*Phaen.* 186 "*κυκλοφορεῖν υπερβολά*" *Helioc.* gives *latea* 60-1 quae ca. perpetuo vestiunt muliebem litan,

brama flectens contortae tunc est circa.

If Cicero had conceived of *brama* as a solstice, he could have said
"sistens contorquet", parallel to "consistens convertit" in 264; but as it is he saw it only as the turning-point, whence the tautologous "sustentis contorquet". For this conception cf. Varro 6.7 "Alter lotus solis est minime, quod monturus a bruma et solstitio. \[sol\]

Dieta bruma quod punctus maximus tunc dies est; solstitium quo die sistere indecet quo ad nos versus proximus est\] (text.corr.Pengel) cf. Amilius 4.162-4.

Cancer ad aequor et aequino point set, \[sol\]

When Phoebus solis reuocatus 

altem ambiit, curiosus articulum aequino undet retinet mosaque retinet.

Pliny HN 16.264 (of the summer solstice) "magus hic adn cardo, marmare consulat". Neither author speaks so of the winter solstice; it was from the Greeks that the Romans learnt to put the two solstices on the same footing, but their own conception attached far more importance to that in summer. -\[sol\]... a-recedent of quae is solstitium implanta solstitialis; its gender and number are taken from the predicate (de)prex (em)

7 eurus: used as a Latin word by Vitruvius 1.6.5 "inter solarii et australia ab oriente hiberno eurus") and fully naturalized by Seneca's time (in 5.10.4). Its etymology is unclear.\[\overline{\text{1.3}}\] The noun admits both 'his' (so Polybius) and 'ews' (so Mitharch).

8 \[\text{Asynhronity so 162.1306, aphlogiates Catullus 26.3, Seneca HN 5.15.4, Greek sources, however, have \text{Asynhrony even in Attic (Ca. 516, cf. Phrynichus fr. 249 de borries), cf. Aistathius 83.3 (on A 197), 1562.33 (on 5.265). T. L. has \text{Aphlogites (CII 2.119, 3.337); so apparently Suetonius (fr. 19-R.}}\]

2 aquilo: I take this to be the "eagle-wind" and volturnus the "vulture-wind"; cf. Nielsen 77, 2, who hold these terms to be of augural origin: the augur faces east, the eagle comes from the north, the vulture from the south. Nöhr. (Re 3.1.721) independently supposed that aquilo was originally conceived of as an easterly, not a northerly: "Nach nationalen Erwartungen war der aquilo, gerade wie der volturnus, ursprünglich vielleicht ein Seitenwind des Ostwinds und wurde erst später mit dem griechischen Boreas (Nordnordost1) identifiziert".

Aquilo has been independently derived from aquilus, and volturnus from Volturn. "Monte Vulture" in Aquilia (cf. Livy 22.46.9 cited ibid. 1.10); but the coincidence of bird- and wind-names tells against these theories. Nor is aquilo a dark wind; at all events Böeas

widermen als could become clarus aquilo, cf. Seneca N.Q 5.4.2

"in Italian auster latellit (sc. nubes), aquilo in Africam liccit".

It may be noted that the Aquileia marble sets aquilo at N by 1.

Böeas: in Attic the due north wind, elsewhere the north-easter

( and so in Xenophon, Nielsen 29 sqq) or in the twelve-wind system the

2 Reference from Kitzel: Hermes 1885.62-4. "Bülow's indefatigable search for and (unfortunately to me)
It by wind. Its etymological meaning is probably "mountain-wind", or Russian gor' (<L. *gōra* "mountain", and Livy 45.29.1-6, where gor'ons is set in northern Illyricum; this is still called the Bópas range, on the border between Greece and Yugoslavia, highest peak Kaimanjaklav (2528m). Boreas is thought of as coming from the notoriously mountainous Thrace, or else from the Pindaric Bópas; his consort is QeiiThelca "mountain-stormer". For the derivation of Italian Tramontana; also Rumanian Ajuntean"west" in Curm's translation of the Odyssey, cited by Fischer on 317, 371.

It should be noted that although Bòpas is certainly used in Attic, Aristophanes and Synecidous have Bòpas; also that from this word comes the Italian gora, used for the 1st wind of Calabria, (also found in Serbo-Croat).

10 ugturmum: cf. ...on aquilo §9. The name is used by theregius 5.7; Varro *Sen.5.1.4, Livy 22.43.1; cf. id. 22.46.9 "uquiturum regionis (sc. Tricuriae) incolae vocant", Columella 5.5.15 "eurus quae incolae (sc. Basilicae) uquiturum appellant", 11.2.65 "eurum quae quidam uquiturum appellant". These passages suggest that it dropped out of uraline usage; and Seneca too regards it as obsolete. Yet later it is used in: al. 2.117, 124, 126; 4.2.6; 10.335-9. As we have seen, butonius used it of the 1st wind. For other uses of Volturmu see now the these of the Romans (Cambridge 1979) 102-3.

*Eúpóromos* : the singular *Eúpóromos* was first used by Dionysianes; it was not known to Aristotle, who would have used it instead of the local wind *Fóinikios* for the 3rd by 3 points. But at meteor.509b.0-4:

"But the wind is more normally *slovene bluja* (or 'blura', possibly influenced in *blura* by *bora*)."
Aristotle, referring to his diagram, says "δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Δ Ἕσπος:

Εὔβροτος γὰρ ἐκ ἀνωτέρου θεοῦ, μὲν Μ. ἔτη παλαιᾶς

Εὐφραίνως, ἤ περὶ τοῦ Νοτανοῦ. Ἡ τοῖς ἴσος πολλᾶς

Here, Εὐφραίνως is not the plural of Εὐφραῖνος, nor is it exactly equivalent to Εὐφραῖνος καὶ Νοτανοῦ; it is rather "winds of the Εὔβροτος-Νοτανοῦ range", with a group identity that supersedes their individualities. Timotheus, however, wrested from it the singular Εὐφραῖνος as from Λεγόν τότε ἐρωτήσας he wrested the singular Λεγόντος, and interpreted it as "a Νοτανοῦ with Εὔβροτος qualities," a formation parallel to our own "north-east" and the like; on this model was created the later Λεγόντος "SW by S wind." Favorinus, having backed Ἕσπος to due S, backs Εὐφραῖνος to SSE.

12. This paragraph was understood by Aquileius (de reg. 13) to mean that carrus was diametrically opposite to aquilo and arterius to uolturnus: "tertius arterius Λυ θεοῦ uolturno reflat" (cf. Ps.-Valer i. c. 406 Ætan, a Renaissance forgery). Indeed, it is the obvious interpretation; but of course factually untrue. The points from which each pair below are opposed καράς ὧσπερ ή τετελεσθείσας; carrus and aquilo, likewise arterius and uolturnus, meet each other at an angle of 143°. This is, I think, within the scope of aduersae flamma. It should be noted that Aristotle thought it worth his while to point out as a possible error precisely this καράς ὧσπερ ή τετελεσθείσας opposition: 363b16

---

1. Or. 423, Π 765, μ 320.
2. At Aristotle, see 411 το το καραντοβουκτεονος are no doubt στο Μ 731 οτι τος θεος τον ἐπιστήμην καὶ το Μ 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
3. πλευδεραίος τὸν ἐπιστήμην πολλαῖς, but of course Π 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
4. Of the plain 1 + B Ædavardyta compound, the first examples are πλευδεραίος and Π 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
5. The first examples are πλευδεραίος and Π 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
6. Paul 2 Corinthians 1-25, etc. 363b16 (Persius o.5).

7. It is a common formation in modern Greek: 326. Schulze 1.854.
8. 523n: Ædavardyta and the Vulgate have τὰς καράς χαμας τον (Marc 1.33) "ranz nach neugriechischerweise" as Π 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
9. Of the plain 1 + B Ædavardyta compound, the first examples are πλευδεραίος and Π 777 from πολλην ουκ ἀλλοιῳ, but one corporate mass, not two; ib. 731 πλευδεραίος of course, ἔτει Τ. 677 would be conceived as a single blessing: 
10. Or. 120 (4) πλευδεραίος.
Before Gellius it is found only in poetry, from Ovid onwards.

Corpus: cf. corpus 53; in both places the AS3 have chang. Indeed, the forms chorus and corpus are frequent in manuscripts, and their antiquity is demonstrated by pos 27.12 κατὰ Λίπα κατὰ Χωρόν 1. (The forms with -o- are well established; cf. Vitruvius i.35 "corpus, quas partes usque corpus"; at i.11.13 they are fancifully differentiated in the twenty-four-wind system.) So IG I.356 LANYE CHORUS.

Etymologically the word is related to Lithuanian šūčiūrė "north, šiaurės "bitterly cold" from L.E. šōure-, cf. Russian север < *šēveros; the aspiration will have been vulgar (cf. Gell. 2.3). In the Germanic languages it takes on multiple senses: Gothic sufra windis = faeyardn

2. νέμον (line 4.37), cf. seur "storm", English "shower".

Seneca considered acutum < acu-are) ἀερέσιν : Seneca disagreed.

(...) solstitial occidentes corum uscit, qui aequa gressa Argestes

deicitur; nisi non videtur, quis cui violentauss est et in una... partem

ruram, Argestes ferre moneis et canentes communi quos redeuntibus

(Act 5.1.5). ἀερέσιν can hardly be called "mollis": it is χαλάσσις χαλάσσις

(Aristotle 36.1.22), δοτεραῖος (36.230) and indeed it is

ἀκεφηλία and ἀερέσιν that more than any other winds mollis

eι καὶ ἐνέργων πρέπουσιν (36.233aqq); as for "ta...redeuntibus"

ultramarine comments (cf. v.11 al.): "des uns" (sic: euntes) somptuoses

1. The Vulgate SS have here chorus, the Clementine edition corum...
dans le sens de vent; les autres (sc. redoucrites) "louvoient et courrent
des voiles" (tack and beat up to windward); he adds "Il semble que
à quelqu'un aurait à généraliser cette observation. Pline, aural de
la ruote secouée à milieu, sait évidemment mieux ce qui est vrai:
'isdem ventis in contrarium navigatur, proiectus pedibus, ut nocte
plerisque adversa vela concurrant' (NH 2.128)."

'Άργηστής : The adjective ἀργηστής is accented ox-tone, but
the wil-name, that is the proper name, is paroxytone, Ἀργάς
at Λ 306 we should read Ἀργαστός Νότοῖο (cf. Justinius Ν.5.1) out
Ἀργάς at Πολιωνίου Ρηθίου ... Ἀργάς (v. Thückel ad loc.); see Λ
166.26, and chreotidian t. 6.14 Lentz: τὰ θὰ τὸ ΕΣΤΙΝ μὴ ὁντα
καθετικά βραύνων, τὸ μὲν κυδόνησι πέποτο ἀργηστής ἐξισθενώ
ἐξ ζύγων ὑπὸ θυγάτης οὐκόροις βραύνων, chandler 550.
Hertz has the correct accent, his successors not.
The name 'Ἀργάς ultimely passed into popular Latin in the
historical form άργετς (island origin: 13.11.1).

faramus: etymology obscure. From it come Famaesch fayurn (Sursilvan),
ľuon, ῥαυνά (Latin), καρέτα (i.e. caro) > įmu. that this
wind is a southery does not imply the etymology; cf. the
prehistoric shift of guster. (for such shifts in another language-

m. B. Brasselet bothy "Die Bezeichnungen für nautische Richtungen in
den finno-ugrischen Sprachen", Univ. of Indiana 1967, pr. 236-6, 213).

Ζέφυρος : Seneca 4. 5. 5 "southeastalis occidens faramum
mittit, quem Senecum esse aeternat tibi et magnum Graecum aesciunt loqui".

uarior: regularly used of the S. wind even in later Latin: "Urosius
1.4.56 "loesia ab oriente nactus ostia Æmonii, ab esto
Thracian, a nombe Macedonian, ab úrico duumbian, ab occisum istriae,
a circio Pharnonion, a septentrione Dannahium”; Italian africo, Spanish and Portuguese forego. But in Biblical Latin it is sometimes used of the south: so in the Itaia to render Ν'ψ and Θαιαθ (cre. Ἰάναν); cf. Augustine Civ. Dei 1.3. Jerome on Obadiah (“Ammia”).

**Ν'ψ**: The etymology given seems to be correct, from the root of Ἀβής. The word was, however, popularly associated with Λήψη; hence in the Greek of Egypt it was used for “west”. It is so used in the papyri, and in Ptolemy’s Tetrabiblos (but not in his Geography); in LXX at 2 Sam. 32.30, 35.24, and in the Coptic’s translation of Psalm 6.5.

Elsewhere in LXX, however, it is used for “south”, and so too in the Stoic wind-system given in St. Irenaeus 9.1.26. Phil (as Plutarch 10.5.5b) 

but in modern Greek Νήβας is the south-west wind, cf. Libyan (cos.): liv'p.

adversus volutur: see 1.1. 2.5.1.24 “quei arauros ead recissent”; v.4.74 “uoluit racere contra haec aeris” Cic. Quinct. 1 “contra nos aebrae facient”; Tertullian adv. Marc. 1.22 “qui hoc quoque argumentum adversus se racere non uudit”. “not against” is the best English rendering.

14 meridiale: also at Tertullian de anima 25.7. The usual adjective is meridianum (Cicero, Varro, etc.); meridionalis (French midi), forced after septennialis, is used by Prisco (Prisc. Hist. 9) and


2. Even at 2 Petr. 1.28...
Ps.-Rufinus in his translation of Josephus (Ad 2.2),

*austr*: the exact congener of old horse *austr* (masc., gen. sing. *austrs*)

"east"†; the root is that of *aurora* *austrs* etc. The shift in sense is striking: Walde-Pfannmann s.v. cites a suggestion by Überhuber that the Romans re-orientated the axis of Italy; the article is said to have been published in the "Festschrift der 57. Phil(ologie ?)

Versammlung, Salzburg 1929, 126"; which the Bollean Library has not been able to exhume.

**Notes**: For once the etymology ("wet wind") seems substantially correct, cf. Boisacq and Frisk s.v.


The verb *umexato* is used by Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Columella, the elder Pliny, and Silius, cf. *umexato* Gel. 17.11.1.

*septentrionarius*: the usual form is the simple noun: anon. ap. Cic. 9.6.3 "ex ea die fuerer septentriones uenti" (which may be a true plural = *AΣΤΕΡΙΣΚΑΙ*, cf. *linit* pH 2.12-), "septentrio" Cic. 10.9.2, etc. (cf. Gel. 2.21.4n); even in *P* leiuius's imitation of this passage, de munro 13. "et is septentrio nabet cognomentum".

---

1. Contrast *austria* = Österreich with *australia* < *austr*.
2. This may be regarded as primarily literal, relating to the snow; calves.
3. affective because colloquial.
16 for the four-wind system cf. Vitruvius 1.6.4, Pliny HN 2.113;

Seneca AG 5.17.

Homer uses all his four wind-names twice in the great storm off Phaceae.

inter primores duos: presumably .. and S, being the two cardinal winds other than E and W, which are separately mentioned. This is far too artificial: after "tertios quattuor" "secundi quattuor" we want simply *primores* (sc*quattuor*). I therefore delete duos.

Seneca AG 5.17.5 "qua. sunt quorundam locorum proprii, qui non transmittunt sed in proximam percutant. Non est illis a latere universi mundi impetus: ataxius Apulia... in statu Calabria Iapyx, Aetna, Sciron, Samphylia...", 3 Gaulia... "...est si simulatos uelim persequi; nulla enim... propemodum regio est quae non habeat aliquem... Sibini ex se nascentem et circa se cadentem"; Pliny HN 2.120 "sunt etiam quidam peculiare quibusque gentibus ueniunt, et Atheniensi Sciron, paulo ab Algesa de hemis... religioce... ignosci; non ultra certum procedentes tractant; alibi elation iadem Olymiam vocatur. 4 Constutum omnibus his nominatum Argetis interlegit. Saecian aliqui uocant Nelespondian, 5 et eos un alii aliter. Item in

1. There is no reason whatever to assume reference to the Arasyalkan stem.
2. Marache: "entre les vents primitifs". To read "quattuor" for "anus" would give an indecent repetition.
3. 3. *teo* vulg 973a5-6 (s. *theo* 973b16 Fl. Fl.); 7 *theo* vulg 973a19
4. From Aristotile 304b19 Kàvados, 304b20 *theocras*... he... was also used for...
Marbonensi provincia claramissim us intenta est circius...('it reaches Ostia, but does not blow in Vien a'); Tuetonius fr.151 b: "quocam autem Tréquillius proprie locus certis cenellat nonnimibus, quo ex numerio sunt in Syria Thracis, Carpasus in Sicilia, in Francia Thracis, in Attica Sciron, in Gallia circius, in Hispacia Suconensis. Sunt praeterea quidam immemorabilcs ex triumfinibus aut stagnis aut fontibus nominati". The truth of this statement is amply demonstrated by l6.-ristotle §73; it will also be noted how local winds have been made general.

In suis quiscue regionibus: "quisque" = "quibusque", assimilated in case to suis by the common construction.

Vocalis: here of course used of proper names; cf.2.17.1; 2.1.17.


20 ostri namque Galli: "the Gauls of whom I (Favorinus) are one", in the provincia Marbonensis. 1 Namque is first postponed at Catullus 66.63, then Varro ap. Geil.3.10.2, and in Livy.

circium: see §6 s.v. and Holder Alt.-c Litt.scr. Sprachschatz s.v.

In Greek we find Κέρκυς in Timosthenes; Κερκύς is given by l5.-r 973b20 as Italiote and Siceliotc for Κέρκυς (since it comes

1. Favorinus was a Celt:(Dio. Chrys.)37 = Fr.95. Larigazzi,§27; Geil.2.1.3n.
between ὀρμάλας and ἔφισσαν the passage was perhaps first attached to ὰλοκοτίας). At Theophrastus ἀκέραστος ἔδρα ἦν ὀρμάλας, ὧν ἔφισσαν καλότειχος, ὧν ἦτο Ἐυμεδαίος Ἀρείας.

Salmisius corrected the last word to κεριὰν. In Latin we find cercius attested for Spain by Cato (92 B.C., in.), and circius at Sallustius l. 6.10; otherwise circius. A Celtic form is cited by Holder; in view of its use in western Greek for the NW wind one might propose a Greek etymology from κλέας (by-forms κλεάς, κλεάους), making it the "hawk-wind", cf. ἀκρογίας κέλαρες. It survives in modern Romance as cers in the French of Languedoc, cierzo (which must come from cercius as attested for the area by Cato) in the Spanish of the Ebro valley, and cerş in Catalan.

It refers in the Provincia to the violent northerly winds of the mistral and tramontana type. Strabo says of this wind (132):

"circus vocatur ἀπὸ τοῦ πεδίου τοῦ (the Rhone valley) τὸ μεσαρρόβερος ἡμίπαθες. Ἀκέραστος ἔδρα ἦν καὶ βιοκάπως. ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ κυνόπτωμα τῶν ἄτον ἐνίων, καταφθάνον δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὥς ἄν ἔκμενον καὶ ἀτρομπότως ἐκτὸς."

Seneca Ν.B. 5.17.5 "Galliae circus (sic. infestat), cui ad viricia quassanti tamen incolae gratias agunt, tanquam salubritatem caeli sui lebant ei; dius usque Augustus templum illi, cum in Gallia moratitur, et uoluit et recit". Pliny H. 2.121 "itid in Narbonensi provincia clarissimus uentorum est circus nec ullo omnium videntia inferior, Ústian picturique secto ligustico mari perferens; idem non modo in reliquis partibus caeli ignorant est, sed et Vieniam quidem eiusdem provinciae urbe attingens, pauci ante ilibus luci solici

1. Varying between NW and NE from place to place.
2. Josephus Ν.B. 4.22) gives this name to a violent wind off Coppa."
occurs: tantus ille uentorua coercius".

Suetonius (Fr. 151 R), though retaining circius in his list of local winds, identifies it with θρακιας as the βω wet wind; Orosius uses it for the ΚΝ, or 5.342.72.

a turbine opinor eius ac uertigine: i.e. from circus and related words.

21 ex ιαπυιας... laivi: for the text see Hertz verre-cell. 40 sqq. 1 ιαπυια is Apulia-Calabria (modern Puglia; mediaeval and modern Calabria = bruttii or ager bruttius); ιαπυια = Capo Santa Maria di Leuco (not ιαπυις). was used of the ΚΝ wind by Timosthenes, or. 373bl. (as Leuna), ras.de mando 394b26, IG 14.15...

23 The references are to Vergil Aen. 5.709-10

illam inter caedes palentem morte futura
recerat ignipotentis uallis et Iapyge ferri

and 11.677-8

procularnytus armis
ignotis et equo uenator Iapyge furtur.

no doubt Iapyge furtur in the latter was generated by Iapyge ferri in the former.

ecum: or. 2.2.10 anticus 1.9.12, secus 18.12, secundur 4.17.6, 10.22.1; 17.21.43, loc. 20.6.2; Knapp Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler 142.

24 κακιας: the Attic term for the north-east wind: Aristophanes Knights 430-7

On the tower of Andronicus Cyrrhestes he is represented holding a winnowing-fan whence he pours forth hailstones (Saumeister 211). The

1. It should appear from his apparatus that Cosius's oae is a misprint; Hertz's oae is clearly right.
The etymology is unclear: it is certainly not, as some have suggested, from Greek *Kaikos* which would give not *Kaikios* but *Kaikioi.*

The root of Latin *caecus* (of which there are no other traces in Greek) is also proposed; but it is clear from Gothic *haihins,* Old Irish *caech* "one-eyed," Sanskrit *kecar-"squint-eye"" that its primary meaning is "deficient in the eyes". One can hardly expect *Kaikios* to pass through the semantic changes as *caecus* and to disappear with no other relic of its existence. — Yet another erroneous stationing of a wind at Platarch: *Euenos* (Caecian in se trahere nubes)

As for attracting the clouds: *Aristotle 364b12* δὲ *Kaikias ouk a theoros.* τὸ ἄνεφρον [κακ. 263 ν] εἰσακούσῃ ὅθεν αἰτεῖ τὸ κακούμ.* Plutarch *deferentia* de ventis 37 ὅ ἐν ἐν Κακίας οὖν ἐφάπτω ἄγεται τὸ νέφος καθαρὸν αἰτεῖ τὸ κακούμ. Περὶ ἑκάστου οὖσαν παραγγελίαν ἔφαντο τὸ *Kaikias népho.*

39 ἂν τιν ὁ πρὸς τὴν *Caecian* ἄγεται τὸ νέφος καθαρὸν αἰτεῖ τὸ κακούμ. Ἐπικράτει τοῖς πλέον ἔφαντον ἄγεται τὸ νέφος. το ὡς ὅ γάρ αὐτῇ τῇ ἐνέφρον ἐντείθεν ὅ ἐνεφάνετα.

cf. (ar) *probl 240a1* ἤθικα. *Florus hist 2.126* "narrant et in Ponto Caecian in se trahere nubes". For a modern explanation see *Nielsen 34* "lorsque le vent du nord-est souffle près de la terre, c'est souvent un vent contraire qui souffle dans les couches les plus élevées de l'atmosphère".

*Uerum istum proverbialem factum ait: apart from the citations above*

cf. *Plutarch mor 823b* ἔκαλεν ἐφ' οὐδὲν ὁτὲ *Caecian népho*. 
The paroemiographic collections give it with the explanation:

και των ἐξεπιραμένων κατωτέρων κακίας ("Diogenian" 4.66; "Apostolius" 7.6 ad loc. ἐκακιά; the scholia on Aristophanes Nights 437 have κακιά ἐφ᾽ ἀετῶν ἐκείνων ὅσον κακίας νέφος

cf. Faillari in E. Deschamps, no. 431). This last form is likelier to come from a comedy; ὑπότητος in the sense of νέφος could not be used in a comic trimeter save in quotation from, or parody of, another genre. (Or indeed is νέφος common in this style; but cf. Menander fr. 1104.)

If here read Ἐλκωνεφεπαττόν ὡσκαίκιας νέφος which by itself we should correct by inserting ὅ after ὅσ; it is common for ὅ to be lost after ὅσ. This was indeed done by Hertz onwards; editors have read Ἵγετοτῇ to bring the citation into line with Aristotle. Ancient quotation being what it is, however, this is not certainly correct. It may be noted that Aristotle, Probl. 243a34, Gellius, the paroemiographers, and the scholia on Aristophanes, all have νέφος, but Theophrastus and Plutarch νέφη.

I suspect that Averinus gave the line in the form Ἐλκων ἐφ᾽ ἀετῶν ὅσον κακίας νέφος.

25 commenticii: "with specially created names". For commenticius "coined ad hoc" of Cicero fin. 5.30 "nomibus...parti nouis et commenticiis"; the same terms are in 3.52 called "factis...nomibus et nouis".

suae quisque regionis: this time quisque is nom. sin. nasc.

stabulus: Horace, Pers. 1.5.77-8.
incipit ex illo montes Apulia notos
ostentare nisi quos torment atabulus, c.

*Eratosthenos* 17.232 "quaedam temporum causae aut locorum non proprie
dicantur orbi, quoniae proximae necant, s.ae tabes cum imasit arborun
aut ureui uel itatus ab huius regionis proprius, ut est in Apulia
atabulus, in Duboea olimpia", or. Sen. 10 5.17.5 (§19n). It is the
sciuroco. *Quintilian* cites it as a local word to be avoided for its
obscurity (c. 2.13).

**Etesiae et proprii**: The Mediterranean summer trade-winds, the
*περικομα* being those that blew between the summer solstic
and the nelianal rising of *Sirius*, the *Ergylion* being those after
the latter. The phenomenon is first mentioned by *Hesiod* *Works and
Days* 663 sqq; the name *Ergylion* is first found at *Herodotus* 2.20;
the *περικομα* first appear at *Aristotle* 36b24. The *Ergylion*
blow from mid-morning to noon and from evening to nightfall
(Theophrastus de *ventis* 12; *Eratosthenos* NH 2.127). For details of direction
and date of blowing, which vary from source to source, see *Rehm* 
s. 1.713 sqq; *Schuster* RE 23.1.9c. As an example of the confusion that
abounds in ancient astronomy, *Seneca* NC 5.10.4. *says of the etesiae:
"a solstitio illis initium est, utraque orum Camiciiae non valent".

*Ex alia atque alia parte caeli*: see RE s. v. *Etesiai* 6.713 sqq, *Sannias
Hlim.exerc.* 299 (ed. 2). *Incler* on *Meteor.* 1.562; *Wiels* abh. der
k.-skad. der Wissenschnten en Berlin 1985, no. 3, 1.11. Different
parts of the world have different trade-winds: *Aristotle* 345a5 o.d'
*Ergylion* περικομα 2015 ἐν ὑπὲρ δύσκολοις οἰκουμενα ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαιομὲν ὡς
*Oriëntis* καὶ Ἀσβεστoς καὶ Ζεύς, *Ergylion* βοις ἑὰν ἀφίκονται
ξένοι, τῷ Ἀχαἰoμὲν
*Eratosthenos* NH 2.127 "in hispania et Asia ab oriente stabat est eorum, in

*At this point Ross deletes the interpolating O δ. τῆς Ἀσβεστος
Ζέφυρος ὀδίων, (or. *Istrabo* 26) δευτερομερῶν τῶν ἀφίκονται
συντελεῖσθαι ἀν τοῖς ἄνω, (from *Alexandros* of *Aphrodisias* 115.27).
ronto ab aquilone, reliquis in partibus a meridie"; cf. Beaujeu (p. 237-8) "hinc confinii sous ce nom tous les vents de l'ouest, depuis la brise de l'Est espagnole, dont parle Strabon (144), d'après Rosionius, jusqu'au **aqua**". Le *aqua* mentionnée par Roy (I.36.6; 5.5.3). Comme vent d'O venant de l'O en E, on ne connaît guère que celui qui arrive par la côte méditerranéenne du Ront jusque sur la mer de Narbonne; d'où sans doute le nom d'`heliespontias d'où au subsolans (i) ou au cacciar (r-e), quant aux "autres régions", on ne voit guère que l'Italie qui reçoit en été une brise régulière du S-E.

27 in eo quo dixi sequere: for the preposition see 2.12.7n, for the attracted relative. 2.26.7n.

23 Cirrus will have been the form used in Canti, and the Languedoc French *gier* is consistent with this form, but Spanish *cierzo*, used of a contrary, *astra*-like north-to-north easterly wind in the Ebro valley can come only from *cercius*. Cato went out to Spain as consul in 195 and crushed a serious rebellion in both provinces; in the tradition of ancient historiography he gives some account of the country, where we shall find that he is in *Catalonia*, where the wind is called *cercus*.

29 Ferrareae argentiliminae qui cherriesae: Spain is a country very rich in minerals. The main deposit of iron ore north of the Ebro is in Vizcaya, but it is also found in various parts of Catalonia. Silver is found at several places in the *Tarragona* area; for exploitation of these resources we may adduce the silver coinage of

1. See Nielsen 39.
Osca (Oescal) mentioned by Livy (34.21.7), no doubt following Cato. Other ancient references to these minerals are set further south; Livy(34.21.7), having just narrated the defeat of insurgents about Berga (41°55′N, 1°41′E; now in Barcelona province) continues "pauata provincia magna unaque instauravit ex ferrariis argentariisque, quibus tuae institutis locupletior idies provincia ruit", but this could refer to mines anywhere in Hispania Citerior, including the silver-mines by Huna Carthago and the iron ore of Sila除; or it may simply come from our present passage of Cato.

mons ex sale nero magnum: the famous salt-mountain 2 km east of Jardona, 1 eighty metres high and containing some three hundred million cubic metres of salt in a high degree of purity; it has various natural caves, some of easy access, with beautiful salt stalactites, (Source: *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-american* vol.11, 1876, Bilbao 1911).

buccan in lat: one sees here the transition from bucca "cheek" as in

inflare / suscille buccas (Plautus *Stich. 767*, Horace *Ser. 1.12.1; Plautus *Ebur. 724*, Varro *Sat. 474*, Martial 3.17.4) to vulgar bucca "mouth." (e.g. Varro *Sat. 6.203*, Petronius *43.3*, Martial 4.41.4, etc; cf. the proverb "quaest in buccas uenit" Cic.*att. 1.44.12.4 etc; cf.*

Otto Sprick "Phil. der Römer" 1.55, Weiman 13.266)

armaturum hominem, illastrum operatum percussit: no doubt written from bitter experience, not merely local tradition. Strabo (1.52) says of the mistral: a *metaphor* magni vel. siue vicior vel ferocius

1. 41°55′N, 1°41′E, 25 km SW by S of Berga, Barcelona province.
Theocharus de urbis 11.48 ἀπὸ τῆς περιήγησεν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς περιήγησεν ἡ Νότος ἀνατολικῶς καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνατολικῷ ἐξ θερμών, νύφων τινῶν ταῖς ἥμεραις ὕπονοιν μὲν ἐγκληματικῶς ἐξεπέμβατον τετράτην ἡ Νότος ἀνατολικῶς καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνατολικῷ ἐξ θερμών, νύφων τινῶν ταῖς ἥμεραις ὕπονοιν μὲν ἐγκληματικῶς ἐξεπέμβατον 

Secondo sole: "with the sun behind them". Sambasius III. 6. 299 (ed. 2) explains that the sun or northerlies begin when the sun is north ("quo tempore sol descendit ex septentrionali circulo"); in winter, when the sun is coming back from the south the Λευκόνοτος begin. This is surely right, even though Nigglius would thus be ignoring the sun's right ascension (for the sun in Cancer and Leo is not strictly behind a north-easterly). It is, however, conceivable that Gellius was wrong in taking this phrase to indicate direction; if so, Swoboda's interpretation is best: "cum soli iis opportunus est", i.e. is furthest north resp. south on its annual course. But although Gellius does not appear to his best advantage in this chapter, he did know the Higgian context.

We may note here another strange Higgian use of secundus:

1. Aleximenes extracted the singular Λευκόνοτος for the SWIFT, wind; cf. Aristobulus ap. Strabo 29; cf. m. 975bd. See Nielsen 43, who however wrongly denied that in the last-mentioned place is the SWIFT wind, and rightly accepts that it is in his diagram on 5b.
Fr. 113 Swetea "cur alli pisces squama secunda, scipenser adversa est?" From Pliny ill. 66 and Plutarch mor. 979b-c we learn that the sturgeon's scales overlap towards the head (i.e., each scale overlaps on to the one in front) so that the motion relative to the fish of the displaced water (as opposed to the tide, with which it swims) would tend to push them up, whereas other fish have scales overlapping tailwards, so that the pressure of the water (and also the tide, since they swim against it) serves to hold them down. Hence *secunda squama* is "with scales (collective singular in Latin) following (so the water)".

---

considerandum; Gellius employs *considero* some thirty times.

*igitur;* according to Miller, p. 48, *igitur* occurs 115 times in *Gellius:* once (v. 5.7) in first place, 11 times in third, and the remaining 103 times in second. *Itaque* occurs 37 times (always in first place), *ergo* 25 times, *idcirco* 39. For other authors see TLL 9.2.76a-1, cf. Fraenkel Kl. Beit. 2.134; Gellius’s classicism stands in sharp contrast to the practice of Fronto, out of whose 96 *igitur* 33 are initial and who never uses *itaque.* Cicero has *igitur* 23.4 times, but in first place only 34 times; *itaque* some 1300 times, always initially.

---

1 See D. marcy Thompson "Glossary of Greek Fishes" pp. 7-8 e.v. φίλος. Naturally this statement about its scales is false.
CHAPTER 23

As has been said on 2.5, Gellius treats the imitation by a Latin author of a passage in Greek as being a process or translation, even if of free translation (9.9.1sqq). His citations from Probus (9.9.12-17) and Favorinus (17.1) show that theirs was a similar approach, though in the particular instances they display considerably less intelligence than Gellius does when making his own comparisons.

Stimulated to translate Plato by Taurus's praise of his style (17.4.7sqq, cf.8-8), and displaying a lively interest in finding Latin renderings of words, phrases, and passages, Gellius is well aware of the difficulties; the limits of Latin— and especially, he means with conventional modesty, his own Latin (10.22.3, 11.16, 14.1.24, 14.1.32), the frequent impossibility of literal translation (9.9.1-11).

The entire topic is discussed by Leopoldo Camerale: La traduzione in Gellio (Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Roma 1969).

In 9.9.4-6, comparing Theocritus 5.68-9 and Vergil, Gellius finds the "et inquit ad saecula et se cupit ante uideri" to be actually "iucurnius lepiliumque" than οὐχ η

...νται, revealing a taste for vitality that is, however, as this chapter shows us, tempered with refinement. In §§ 7-11 (Theoc.3.3-5; Verg. Euc.9.23-5) he recognizes the impossibility of

1. It is one thing to say that Gellius found the Greek originals in a commentary, another to assume that he found the critical judgment there as well. The manner in which Probus is introduced at 9.9.12 suggests an attempt to matter independently compiled for Probus and Favorinus see Camerale 14-6, 14.7-155,见 also Austin ως, 3 ως, 8.1.41-47. H.

2. Gellius was certainly one of those who read Plato "non uitae ornandi sed linguarum orationisque comenlaria gratia" whom Taurus denounces at 1.9.10, though unlike Taurus (17.29.4) he may not have realized the fact. Pronto deplored the fact that in philosophy there is "nil illae Graecae in nostran linguam uertendum" (de eloq. 4.4)

rendering: το μαλον πεφιλμένε, "ueba herbale non translaticia, sed cuiusdam nativae dulcetinis" but notes that Vergil has turned Theocritus's ἐνθές into a cæper, which according to Varro means the castrated beast (this is not entirely true, cf. Gamberale iii, 25).

We see that Gellius does attach importance to accuracy of detail, but that he also has a genuine aesthetic appreciation of poetry that can withstand mere errors of detail; but recognition of this fact should not be impaired by our refusal to see these changes of detail as errors.

These qualities are confirmed by ii. 4, where he compares nēpides Hecuba 293-5 and Annius tran. 165-7 Ribbeck = 172-4 Jocelyn; he judges that "nos uersus Q. Annius, cum eam tragoediam uertaret, non sano incommodae aemulatus est" but also remarks that immobiles and opulenti are not equivalent to ἀδικοῖ ἄνερτες and ἀποκολύτερες at 13. 27 the criticism is purely aesthetic: Vergil geo. 437 is said to be the equal in charm of Parthenius 11. 30 Martini, but neo. 3. 119 suffers in comparison with Ἀ 728, on account of its prettified Hellenistic style. He is right.

In the present chapter, Gellius compares certain passages from Menander's Ἐκλεις with the corresponding passages in Caecilius's Ἐκλεις. His only other citation from Menander is also from this playwright, concerning gestation-periods (3. 11. 3); he adds that Caecilius inserted
a reference to eight-month pregnancies absent from the original. It would be strange if Gellius had never read Menander for himself; it would be even stranger if he hit on two Menander-citations in independent sources, that happened to come from the same play. It is far more reasonable to suppose that Gellius did read Menander's Νεκταρίων to compare the adaptation and the original, as an Englishman might read Plautus's Ἐναεχμίον to compare it with Shakespeare's The Comedy of Errors, or a Frenchman read Ἀρχικρόν and Αὐλολαρία to compare them with Molière's Amphitryon and Leavare.

That does not mean that Gellius knew only this one play of Menander's; he does not quote him elsewhere because in the Νεκταρίων he rarely considers drama from a literary standpoint. His other citations from Cæcilius, like most of those from Plautus, are made to illustrate points of Latin usage; he will therefore have had no cause to cite the originals.

As regards the substance of the criticisms, it will be clear that Gellius is considering the plays not as theatrical productions, nor as documents of literary history, but as poems: this is neither unexpected nor illegitimate. As Leo remarks (Geschichte der """"nischen Literatur 1.222) """"Gellius, dem Zeitgeschmack entsprechend ein Verfechter sowohl der altlateinischen wie der attischen Dichtung und Sprache ist, befindet sich hier in einem Gleichgewicht der Befindungen und urteilt ohne Σοφία, richtig, wenn man wie er nur die """"nstlerischen Gesichtspunkt ins Auge faßt, aber ihm entgehen gewisse

1. Cicero too speaks of reading the dramatists (f10.4; acer. 4) (for the supposed contradiction between the two passages see Davila on f10.4). It will not be necessary to note here the classical and Shakespearean scholars whose approach has been the same.
It will be noted that the adaptation is on Plautine lines: the curtailing of fine reflections, the boisterous humour, the high-flown \textit{parasangri} , the military metaphors (\textit{....}, \textit{....}), the conversion of an iambic monologue into a comedy, beginning with a \textit{sententia}. In discussing Plautus's adaptation-method, \textit{...} Raenkel brings out the fact "\textit{...}'' in \textit{Bios}, il quotidiano e tiglio, proprio di che nelle sue sottili differenze. \textit{...} non ha mai cessato d'attirare i poeti attici, sembra irrelante e privo d'interesse. La miglior caratterizzazione di questo stato di cose l'ha data.

1. See Leo Der Monolog im Drama, \textit{...} in \textit{...} diiss. zitiitungen (1912, 903, 451, \textit{...}, \textit{...}) S. Raenkel \textit{...}

2. It need hardly be said that nothing in Raenkel's book is dependent on Gellius's assertion; on the contrary, it is the book that demonstrates the general accuracy of Gellius. Gaberline, who suspects that Gellius knew no other play from the New Comedy and may be quoting a typical passage at that, warns us not to over-value this chapter as evidence for the Roman poets' practice (\textit{...}, \textit{...}). He seems to be writing as if we knew nothing about the subject save what we are told here. As for his hypothesis that Gellius knew only the one \textit{...}, can it seriously be considered that having discovered and enjoyed "\textit{...}'' he would feel no desire to read more of this author? 

\textit{...} \textit{rule(42-3)} finds a contrast between the structures of 2.23 and 9.9 that leads him to suppose that the generalization 2.23.1-3 is based on nothing but these comparisons: in 9.9 there are several examples, here only one. But in 9.9.1-3 Gellius states that good translations have often to be free, and then cites two examples from the \\textit{...} in reality one bipartite example. He then changes tack, and cites Probus's criticism of an allegedly bad translation without discussing alterity. In later chapters Plautianus's general statements are followed by examples from but one source. Gellius does not prove his point by illustrative examples because the point does not need proof.
1 lect. tars: cf. praef 1,19; 1,20; 1,7.16; 3,5.1; 3,15.9; 9.10; 14.15.5, 19.6.16, 20.1.;
2 lepide quoque et uenuste: cf. 2,25.2 "lepide atque incundae", 5.7: "lepide mi hercules et scite" (lepide alone 5.7. lemma; the adjective is used at 1.23.8, 1.25.3, 1.7.4, etc.; aditus is extremely common in the comic poets: adjective and adverb together occur some two hundred times in Plautus.
3 sed enim: so hertz corrected enim cold. cf. 2,7.201,1; oppido: so 15.7., 15.3.4, 16.7.1, 17.12.1; Livy 3.25.3, 3.2.47.2; Vitruvius 1.4.7, 7.praec.14, 8.3.11, 9.2.; Simple oppido is found in Early Latin, and occasionally in classical writers (cf. 3.gn.1.1,4, 3.gn.1.1,4; fin.3.33; Livy 4.2.26.15 cr.Gell.15.5.9); Quintilian remarks : oppido quamquam usi sunt paulum tempore nostro superiores, uereor ut ian nos ferat quisquai...". See Wolfflin "Jugoschicte Schriften" 14.
4 facetia: cf. 1,1. Lecte. To the English reader facetia is a "faux ami": it implies not schoolboyishness but urbanitas; not always even humour.
5-3 merely a contentious observation, one would have thought; hence it is illustrated rather than proved. It is a common experience, which I have had, for instance, when reading in Dante stories I had previously read in Chaucer.
4-6 for Alexander's Μξωκον see cforte, irr 333-347; for Caecilius's Μαχιομ, Ribeck, Caecilius 142-149. It lies outside the scope of this commentary to consider in detail the plays' probable plot; but it should seem (cf. Ribeck's and Note's notes preceding the first fragment) that probate and her husband (whom I shall call ) are the...
parents of the young man who has got the poor man's daughter with child.
and that the poor man is the same as A's neighbour (whom I call B)
in fr.334/156-63. Just before B left for town, A's son met B's
daughter at a κεφαλή; neither recognized the other, but in the
usual fashion they made love "properatio in tenebris" (169R), and
now the girl is crying out in labour.2 The faithful slave, whose name
in Xenon is Parmeno, hears her and by an ἐκείχος of (among
other things)gestation-periods (343/164-5; Gel1.3.1.3-4) establishes
the date and circumstances of her impregnation. Meanwhile, Probyle has
been urging her son to marry a certain kinswoman; but the discovery
no doubt made by Parmeno with the help of the κεφαλή 3 that the
young man is the father of B's grandson causes these plans to be
abandoned; the neighbouring houses are united by marriage, and
Parmeno is freed.

4-6 "Super adeo...legere": cf.9.5.4 "Sic itu nup omne aput mensam om
legarentur utraque sibi bucolica Theocriti at Vergili". If not
3 ἐκείχοσ certainly ἐκα ἐκ γόνινο
4 nequaquam: used seven times by Gellius, nequaquam twenty-six times:
Küller p.20.
6 libitum est: so 1.3.11, 9.4.19, 10.25.1, 13.25.12, 17.14.2,
libitum erat proef.2; libuit only at 1.4.16, 7.1.1. From other such
1. Gellius's language gives us no warrant for this assumption, but
without it we are liable to have a similarity of characters.
2. It is a comic convention that pregnancy is undetectable before
childbirth is imminent.
3. The normal reading of this word is "necklace", but it can also
mean "lock of hair"; see note 1. A young man might give a
girl a lock of his hair, but he is hardly likely to have been
wearing a necklace.
verbs we find picatum est 13.22.1, pertaesum est 12.12.1; the active perfect systems only in the personal pertaesuisset at 12.6. The forms auditus and audita are cited at 15.13.9 as founding ueritum impersonal.

7 a principio statim: "right from the start", "strait ta 't", cf. 2.12.2
quantumque mutare: for the intransitive verb cf. Livy 31.5.10 "mores quicquem populi Romani quantum mutatur uel hic dies argumento erit"
(for the motif cf. Sophocles Ajax 923 ἀποκαθιστάται Vergil Æneid 2.274-5 "quantum mutatus ab illo / Hectoro qui, &c").

Auto intransitive is not attested in early Latin; it is first found in Catullus, Lucretius, and Varro, then in Livy and Tacitus, becoming a mannerism of Pertunianus's. Gellius has it again at 13.3.1, 12.1.9, and discusses it at 15.2.3 ("Varro... mutilant inquit elegantissime pro mutaturum").

8 It should seem that the poor fellow was not in fact conducting an affair with the maid; but he is hen-pecked into selling her all the same.

faciundus: gerunds and gerundives with -und- occur several times in Gellius, e.g. 3.1.9 "quarernutae undique pec. a", 5.2.4 "ioci dicundii", 8.17.1 "non hercle expersandi vel temptandi gratia"; see Knapp Classical Studies in honour of Henry Drisler 13. Lady, but by no means all, are technical expressions rather than Gellian archaisms, "quindecim virtu sacris faciundis" (1.12.3), "liberum quareman gratia".

1.274 sqq; but delete Lucretius 5.528(Q's uidentur is correct) and Seneca loc. circ. 2.38.3 (se is to be understood with mutaturam from se mutaret).

In later Latin mutare often means "spoil, alter" (cf. stent Syntaxica 2.381 sqq); here, however, it is still in itself neutral, the implication in peius coming from the context.
(1.3.2), "iuri dicundo" (13.12.9), "decemarios legibus scribundis" (17.21.15) prove nothing about Gellius's predilections. Similarly "ius testamenti faciundii" (1.12.5) may be paralleled by Scaevola

\[ Y \text{ digestorum} = 2.32.33.17, \text{Sams Inst. 2.113,116.} \]

9 For commentary on this and the other fragments see excursus.

11 praeter uenustatem...nequaquam parem": best rendered "apart from the marked inequality in uni: ion: always used by Gellius as ἐγὼνε never simply as "quidem". (Müller 16)

Thus: we are no longer supposed to be present at the scene described in §§-7.

nescioquina enim inculcavit: enim is Carrio's certain correction of enimica. (Could one wish for a better illustration of how the English (and French) word large has acquired its present meaning?)

See Leo Geschichte d. röm. lit. 225; Braunh. Elementi plautini in Plauto 107,374.

iliud menandri de uitia comitia media supustum in the words of

Aristophanes of Byzantium οὐ με ναί ταῖς βίες ἐκ φαντωμάτων οὐκ ἔσται ἐκρατήσῃτι

16 clam patrem: an archais. In early Latin clam as a preposition governs the accusative, as is guaranteed metrically at Plautus Cas.451, nerc.342. The one apparent Plautine exception, nerc.451, was corrected by Pins (uīrul) for uīro; we may also restore patrem at accius 64R (cf.: clam esse conset alteros" 345R), Saturnius at Ennius Euhemerus 1.3. Cf.: "clancula/patres" Terence Aelipho 52-3. "Clam patrem" is used at Plautus nerc.342, 660; Terence Hezona 396.

The accusative is again found in the Bel. Hist.: "clam praesidia" 3.2, 35.3, "clam nostros" 1.1. But in other authors of the classical

period, on the rare occasions clam appears as a preposition it
accompanies the ablative: "clam troianis" Lucretius 1.476, "clam uobis
Caesar _C.2.32.8, "clam nostibus" bel. 11.4, "clam hoste" Livy
9.1.8. (Cic. 12.2 is corrupt).

The shift is no doubt due to the analog of coram; but it will
surely have been aided by the frequency of "clam me /te /se", which
of course could represent either case. Except for Hec.396 cited above,
the preposition always accompanies me or te in Terence; and the five
instances all told of clam as a preposition in Apuleius, the Vulgate,
and the Digest, all exhibit one of those three pronouns. 1

The earlier grammarians recognize both constructions: Charisius
1.15.17 = ibid. 11 Barwick is perplexed: "te ablativo; clam te est.
Alloquin Plautus in Henaechmis (152) clam uxorem [est]; nisi forte
clam et accusativo et ablativo possit aptari"; but Dionneus Cli.
1.3.9.23 states clearly "clam custodem et custode", and Donatus
1.3.10.22 2 "clam praepositione casibus seruit ambobus" Priscian, however,
makes it an ablativeal preposition only (Cic 3.4.26); so "Sangadi-
ars" Cic. Supp. 3.2.10, Asper ib. 5.2.26; Cm. Einsili. 1. 216.18, and
the old school grammarians. 3

20 a rema dignitate...vacua: for this use of a see 2.30.3...
21 Ad...consideramus. "Ce naturel et cette vérité dans les mots,
examinons si Caecilius y a tendu" Harache. Menander's dictionaire

1. me 4.3.21.3; Vulg. Ge. 21.24; Recum 1.27; te Vulg. Ge. 1.7.13
se Apuleius Apol. 77.18

2. His commentators took him as allowing only the ablative: Servius
Cic. 1.41.25 Pompeius 5.274.31 point out that clam is used with
either case; cf. Rg.-Sergius 4.157.30, Cledonius 5...17.

uitiose cianoelum illos Ferentius melphus."
is absolutely appropriate to character and situation, and has purity of style as well. *Sincerus* "having nothing in it alien to it/that should not be there" is a favourite Gellian word e.g. 1.1.4. "indicia enim uiue et sinceris proprietates"; 13.17 lemma "qui sincerit locuti sunt"; 13.2.7.3 "ecce enim uiletur soneri (sincerus) simplicior et sincerior, Vergilii autem reuter melior et quoda quasi ferme inmisso uocation". At 15.1.4 "Q. Claudii...optimi et sincerissimi scriptoris" means not that he writes *sine ipa et studio*, but that his Latin is pure. Cf. Cic. *Ratus* (of. Jotta, cos. 75) "nihil erat in eius oratione nisi sincerum, nihil nisi sincerum atque salus", and the imagery throughout the paragraph: the use of an *in* a simple indirect question is peculiarly at home in philosophical, juristic, and scholarly contexts, introducing 

According to Vollmer's table at Th. 2.1-2, an is so constructed eighty-three times in Cicero's philosophical writings against fifty-nine all told in his other works; Seneca has it three hundred and one times, Quintilian three hundred and forty-three. It is the normal Gellian particle conscribantnis: round again at 13.25.19; cf. Apuleius met. 7.5.9. It is used several times by Ammianus.

Tragici tumoris: cf. *Aristophanes* *trops* 940 and the frequent *βυνος*; Quintilian 9.1.140, Lardat 4.1.43.8. See Taillard at *Les llposes d'Aristophanes*, g. 798; *Pseudo-Lucian* 3.3, *Psych. ex. etc.*

22 imprata et quaque: and to the list of *im*- pairs at *Victor* 2.

For tumor etc. of bombast in general cf. *Aivy* 45.23.16, Seneca de beneficiis 2.1.6, Petronius Sat. 1.2, Quintilian 8.1.6, 11.10.12, Tacitus dial. 1.4, Pliny ep. 7.12.4, 9.26.5, Call. 1.14.5, 17.1...

It is a calque from *βυνος*.

1. Note however: I get the *littera* *times* (as *nach* for *pepitula*, in *littere plurimi*) in *Ovid*.
Ausgewählte Schriften 262. Note that the prefix is pronounced 
\[ [\text{in'gra:t}(\text{a}) \text{ in'\'A:wa'ri}] \].

Non puto Jaecilius sequi debuisse quodassequirequiret: for
sequi, assequi see 2.3.5n. The prefix has perfectivizing force, as
regularly in Balto-Slavonic and often in Germanic; for the classical
languages see Schwyzer [Gr.6r.267-9 Hornbostel-Zantyr 304, Wack
magel Vorlesungen über Syntax p.156, 2.11]. For "assequi" as a term of
literary criticism ("be as good as one's model") cf. Sic de or. 2.91
le. 1.7, teitn 3, 97, 103sqq: Lobet "Verba frisca" 632n42.
EXCURSUS
FRAGMENTS OF MENANDER AND CAECILIUS

I intend to take the three Menander-fragments together, and then the three Caecilius-fragments; my method will be for each fragment to give the text as I believe it should be, and then discuss it. It should be noted that my texts will aim to reproduce what Menander and Caecilius wrote, rather than what Gellius thought they wrote; but I shall indicate in the commentary where I think Gellius's own text was wrong. I should also warn the reader that much in these texts is highly speculative; but the commentary serving to qualify these audacities, I have decided to persist myself so to present the texts that they may be read and judged as a whole.

Gellius § 9 Menander fr. 333 Körte.

ἐπ' ἀμφότερα ὃν ἕσείκληρος ἢ καλὴν 
μέλλειν καθευσθεὶν κατειρραταὶ μέγα 
καὶ περιβοήτων ἐξανο. ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας 
ἐξέβαλεν τὴν λυκοῦσαν ἢ τὸ ἐβοῦλε 
ἐν αὐτοῦ τῶν πάντων εἰς τὰ κραμβόλησ 
τεθηκόν, ἢ τέχνης ἐλίθη γυνὴ 
δέσποινα, καὶ τὴν ὁμήρην ἐκτρήσας. 
ὅτι ἐν πίθηκοι, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ἑρεμοῦν 
ἐστιν. διαφθόρα τὸ κυρίωτα τὴν 
πολλὰς κακὰς ἀρχήν. ὁμοία κραμβότρην 
ταξιδεύω με καὶ δώδεκα τάδαντα ἐξερεύνων, 
τὴν βίν ἐξουσία πόσεως. εἰτ' ἐστι τὸ 
φρονήμα τὸ ἀποστατοῦν; μὲ τὸν Δία 
tὸν Ὀλυμπὸν καὶ τὴν Ἀθήναν ἀσθαμάτω 
καὶ παιδεύων θεραμενίκηκέν δὲ καὶ ἰὸν 
θάττων ἀπέπερυμεν. ἀπεκα 
τὸ γὰρ ἔν τῷ λέγων:
we are unfortunately reduced in this and the following fragment 334 (§12) to relying on the LS. V; for the scribe of R omits all Greek save isolated words, and the scribe of P gave up copying it when confronted with this rebarbative and incomprehensible expanse. V, however, not understanding a word of it, salliered on, and earns our heart-felt thanks. The fifteenth-century Italian LSS add accents and breathings, and extract individual Greek words from the παιωνευς but without considering either sense or metre; stripped of such frills their text is virtually identical with V's. And what V is capable of is revealed by 3.31.7 where ENGA legoMETRA KYMAGOSANENPEIONPEIOG beloved comes ENGA NQHMEROS TAPONTICCKAYONPEIONPEIOΒΕΛ.

l έκ'αμφότερα instead of the more normal έπ'αμφότερον οὖς
is quite correct, cf. A. Jüster Hermes 12 (1877) 214 n.1, who cites
Libanius Diuiae 3.24, εἰ 620.4 (vol. 8 p. 91 and vol. 9 p. 466
respectively in his Teubner edition). See also L. Gamberale Rivista
di filologia 95 (1907) 162.; Otto 'Sprichwörter der röm. inspir.

κεφαλής : for the legal position of ἐπίκεφαλον
see Harrison 'The law of Athens'. 101, 113, 112ff. If an heiress's husband was poorer than she was, he was liable to end up under her thumb: Aristotle NE ll111al (on the relation between husband and wife) ἐνίοτε δὲ ἀρχέων αὐτοῖς ἐπίκεφαλον οὖσαι

 interstate fr. 582

ι' κ' αλήθεια Ribbeck, Haupt: ironic, as orter. Chr. Jüder entes 50.3
καταθάλασε σὲ ἐν παθολήθη τίς βίον ἰδέα τῆς καλῆς ὑπαρκῶς ἐν ἐπικεφαλε.

for other such ironic adjectives of praise see Justin on ἄριστος.
2 κατείχονατα: minic, cf. thr. sacch.1199, ken. xacq.292, ...

3 περιβόητον : cf. remeironene 2 1-1

5-6 ἢ τεννυνέτος ὁδὴ ἡ γυνὴ δέσποινα ἡμῶν, τεννυνέτοσκελεμεγεννυνεσποινα ἡ

"And that she may be clearly recognized to be my wife-and-sovereign"

("sper si et "name" Popescu); Harmane rephers "et qu'il soit bien !abli que c'est ma femme le tyran", an idiomatic recasting of

the sentence. The collocation γυνὴ δέσποινα is taken from

η 347 ἢ ἡ γυνὴ δέσποινα Ἡγος ἀρουν καὶ ζωῆς, where it is

parallel to τεκνος ἀνδρες, ἀμφιδίκη, γυνίς, and the like; but

here it assimilated to such locutions as ἀνθρωπος ὅρας

(aristophanes biris 169), ἀθανασίον ἄρνην (ib.1559), βασιλῆς ἀκέ

(l. trop.207).

amazanistes 4c, 1-0 lock

η γαρ ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ γυναικα χείρα τα

ἀρδεῖν ἐχει δέσποινα το γυναικ χεις

γς ἐστι δούλος.

Or. menander 876-9, fr. 579.

7 τὴν ὅπιν ἂν ἐκτησατο : for ἐκτησάμην = νεκτηματι =

ἐκών cr. atherlotus 144, 2 ὅτι ἔγορας κατακερματι πως τε καὶ ἰχθες χαμμακία

6.13 ο Ἐν Πελεξηνίδος ὅταν...τεκτονοτέρους κατακερματι ἐξέρχεσα τοις ταϊνωμεν γυνίς

Plato yulos 53 lock

η γαρ ὅσον δόμηκα τοις ὁμον ἐκτησατο

ἐν τοις ὁμον ἀλλ' ἄδικος ἐκτησάμην ἐκών

Timoci 36. 4-4

ταχύφραν στατι αἰμα καὶ γυνα χρωτός,

ὅταν δ' ἤνεκεν πάθη μὴ ἐκτησατο

ὁτοι μετὰ δικαίω τεθρὺλλες πάθοιτως.

Luke 21 4

ψυχὴν κατακερματι τοις ταϊνωμεν ἄδικων

"her owner", cf. xlesias 5.1, 7.12.

7-9 τὴν ὅπιν ἂν ἐκτησατο... ἐστιν : for attractio inersa see

ib. 2.1.13-1.
256

4.24, Hartlaub Proverbs 2.38 Leutsch.

tóúto δῇ to ἀγράμην: for similar expressions in
Menander and elsewhere see Austin on Sáma 11, Headlam on Herondas
2.45; one may note at random Lato Corn. 514e to ἀγράμην δῇ τóúto.
Menander fr. 689 to δῇ ἀγράμην tóúto. Ὡτέτον ἢ βάσην.

for tóúto δῇ cf. men. fr. 443 tóúto δῇ to νῦν ἐθός

for tóúto Plato Soph. 244d, amat. 134a; for δῇ rollybnus 2.46.1

to δῇ ἀγράμην, Demiston 235. Cf. in Menander also aspis 372
to γὰρ ἀγράμην, Lysimachos P.Oxy. 33.2656.302 to tóú Ἡροῦ, Dis

exeoton 26 Handley to tός ἰπομηνίας.

ἡ ἄρα τοῦτο τῆς ποικίλης παπαίνον ἡργάσεως "troubles" is a commonplace

derived from Homer: Ἑ 63-4 νῆσας ἐργάσεως ἀι καθαρὰς ἤπειρας γένων,
cf. Herodotus 5.37 at νῆσας ἐργάσεως ἀι καθαρὰς ἤπειρας. γένων.
Archidamus gave it new life by saying (Thuc. 2.12.3) ἢ ἡ ἱστορία τότε
"Εἰ καὶ μεγάλον καὶ μεγάλον ἔθιν (cf. Aристophanes Ecc. 135, ed. He...)
2.2.23). Menander's adjective comes from Euripides Hippolytus 111

ἀλλά, κανέν ἐργάσεως ἐργαίς Ἔρως; for marriage in this context
see maxandrides 52.3 κακῶν κακῶν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐργάσει τῷ βίῳ. Antiphon.
the Sophist had said of it, (fr. B 49.3, Diels-Kranz 2.357; ἢ ἡ ἱστορία

ἡ ἱστορία, ἢ τὸ νῦν, καὶ κἀκεῖ ἡ ἱστορία καὶ ἡ ἱστορία.

Ἀθηναίοις καταλήμνα : look read ἄδηθόν ἐν εὐκαίριον τόλμην
(<φρονήσεως>). d'abelt ἄδηθόν ἐν εὐκαίριον τόλμην (φρονήσεως) at why

ἐπί;? No emphasis is required; Marcellus remarks ἀδηθόν: avóρ
and we do not feel the pronoun's loss. Now when neither sense nor grammar requires the orthotonic forms ἔμε ἐμοὶ ἐμοί, Alexander employs them only at the beginning (Epit. 317) or end or a line, or else ἀνασκεφάλωσις: see sec. 317, τοιοῦτον ἐν μοι τῶν ἐν μοι τοῦ ἄνθρωπον.

In our present passage none of these conditions applies (there can be no ἀνασκεφάλωσις when sonor's law is violated in the previous line); I therefore tentatively propose something on the lines of ἀδείεις [ἐν] καὶ ἄφθονα τάλαντα (φασάμαι) for ἄγραφον or.

Antiphanes 329 (= Alexis 341) 2, Anaxarchides 52.7. The estate is of course fantastic: cf. Harnack on ὑσσόλος 842-4.

12 ΠΕΝΕΟΡΩΜΗΝΕΝΕΥΩν ἐν ἐγκώμιον πᾶν κα κας ἄφθονος ἄκοψας. oinos and his successes, mistakenly παντεων as παντεων.

13 φεύγαμι lit. "whimpering"; but e.g. Aesop's pāsphs 135 ἀρίστονος. ἀρίστονος λαμαίς. (ταυτίζοντος 3329); Aristaeus 2.12 ἀκώς ἔμοι τῷ πλυσίμοις φιλόκαμος καὶ τῷ πλούσι τῶν μέχρως παραξένοις.

13 ἅπανταν: "able to be borne". Lobock (Parallipomena 478 sqq) established from sundry indications that compound adjectives in -τος are oxytone if used in the potential sense. That is to say, the expected pattern "simple -τος: compound ἐπί -τος" is preserved when the adjectives are mere equivalents of passive participles, but the distinctive potential sense is marked by a distinctive accent-pattern, fixed oxytone. 2 See moreover L'A contumation des langues indo-

15 θεραπευτικήν : εἰσυμενον fr. 31 πανδικράτιον μὲ παντοδεξιοτελείαν καὶ εἰσυμενον: Θεραπευτικήν: Xen. He 1. 3. 12 τοῦτα διὰ τῶν πυρικῶν δίδακτος τοῦ εὐτυχοῦς καὶ θεραπευτικῆς θεάτρου. Menander has also Θεραπευτικήν θεάτρων Θεράπευτικής θεάτρου.

15 postponed: cf. Handley on *Ayscon 10. Common in New Comedy: Denniston 186. 15-1 КАΙ ΟΝΤΟΤΑΙΟΝ ΜΑΝΕΣΧΟΙΣ ΔΟΤΙΚΩ ΣΕΑΤΙΟΜΙΑΝ: obviously this garble refers to the slave-girl's dismissal, but nothing else is certain...

The first fourteen letters are quite clearly καὶ θεσσαλος τάξιον "quicker than it takes to tell"; cf. Alciphron 14. 73. 1 Sch., Aerobianus or Antistich: 3. 13. 3, Bishop James ed. 31 herencer (and adjectively at Heliodorus 1. 15). Alciphron in particular is dearer of

Menandrian phrases. The expression will be adverbial, not adjectival: save for the adverbialized τῇ τάξισι, Menander uses no part of τάξις as an adjective, but has the adverb τάξις τάξεως

Ομορφόν τάξισιν, but τάξιον raises doubts: Θανον occurs some twenty times in the extant texts, τάξιον never. Τάξιον is already found, however, in the treatise de morbis u-erubribus (Corpus Hippocraticum: 8. 12, v. 9. littl. but Θανον 1 ib. p. 1, v. 2), which treatise antedates Aristotle; it is used by Epicurus in the letter to Herodotus (Diogenes Laertius 1. 98); it is the normal

1. The analog of Ionic κεκλήθην μέσον: Attic κερτήν μέσον suggest we should accent Θανον. Some authorities accent Θανον rather than Θανον in honor; cf. Beelen *lexicon Homericum* s.v. θάνατον.
form in Hellenistic Greek. It is, therefore, not inconceivable that Xenander, who at fr. 710 and Hesych. fr. 1. (Örte-Thierfelder 2.2.7) = P. xy.33.2650–104 has ὁ ἄνεμος, should have used τὰχοσ here; yet it could so easily be an interpolation: on the view here taken of the following words, ὁμον ἄνεμος ἐπέφερεν ὁ ἄρσεν could have turned into τὰχοσ ἄνεμος ἐπέφερεν ὁ ἄρσεν long before Geilius.

The next word in the MS is ἀπαγόρεος, which hardly makes sense. Granted that Leineke correctly restored fr. 653 as ἀνεξάρτητα ὁ σώματος ἱππαίρατον, it is surely perverse to say "let a dutiful maid be taken (to market) at once or quicker". The verb required is ἀπαγόρεος, or possibly ἀποφέρω.

On the other hand, the second person singular present imperative active ἀναγείτε may be used to mean ἱππαγαίει (Orse. 976) or ἔφερεροι: ἀναγείτε ἐστὶ ὁ πάραδεκτος (Ub. 392,575), ἂναγείτε κόρακες (Ub.432 Θρ. 406); this meaning attaches to no other part of the verb. Lloyd-Jones suggests to me that ἀναγείτε may underlie the MS garble; on this basis I tentatively propose ὁμον ἄνεμος ἐπέφερεν ὁ ἄρσεν [θάλασσα].

For the remaining letters the most attractive conjecture is τῇ νῆσῃ τῆς Ἱεροῦ (Thierfelder's suggestion, at Örte-Thierfelder 2.2.5; it is better than his other proposal τῇ νῆσῃ τῆς Ἱεροῦ). There are several lines of this nature, which can be used in several circumstances, including helpless resignation. At Aristophanes N. 987 the sex-starved Spartan says of his sufferings ἄφαρτα τῇ νῆσῃ τῆς Ἱεροῦ; at S. 428 Xenander makes the desperate oschion cry out

1. It is, however, avoided by the author of 2 Macabees and condemned by the Atticists.
Different uses of such expressions occur at Aristophanes Eccl. 927.

Menander Dysc. 132, Samia 717, fr. 951.11. These shade off into

τι μακρά δεῖ τηρεῖν; (Antiphanes 33.5) and the usual reluctance

μεταφρασεῖν ἔστιν εἰδόσιν. Cf. in Latin "quid opust uerbis. "quid

ultima" and the like (Hofmann "Lateinische Umgangsprache"1/0).


A. ἔχω δ' ἐπίκλησιν Λάριαν. ὥσις ἔφησά σοι

τοῦτο γάρ; Β. οὐχί. A. κυρίαν τῆς οἰκίας

καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τῶν ἄνδρων αὐτῶν

ἐχόμεν. Β. "Ἀπέλλων ἢς χαλέκων. A. χαλεπώτατον

ἀπαθεί δ' ἐφεξῆ καίνα, οὐκ ἔρωτί μόνε.,

τοῦτο. Καὶ ἔρωτ ἄρα τοῦτον τιμᾶς; Β. προτίμη ἄρα τοῦτον τηρεῖς.

A. εὖ οὖν ὁδε.

vv 1-2 that τορείταρον ὀν is not τοῦτο ἐπετειλαμένον

but τοῦτο γάρ οὐκ ἔστω; was seen by Kaibel, who however ascribed it
to the second speaker (the neighbour), with a question-mark after

σοι... Ἀλλὰ... ones points out to me that we should interpret

the text thus: A. ἔχω δ' ἐπίκλησιν Λάριαν. ὥσις ἔφησά σοι

τοῦτο γάρ; Β. οὐχί. A. κυρίαν ἐργ.

For relaxation γάρ, frequent in comedy, see Handley on ἡκύν 6.0;

Penniston 95-3.

παντωναντεκεῖνεικα V. loco rightly expands παντωναντεκεῖνεικα

for the loss of τάνα cf. the omission of τάνα, preserved by

Stobaeus, at ή. 33.8 (Ge 1: 20), and for the expression, fr. 27.5
at ἈΘΗΝΑΙ. For this and other licensed Eikos see Moorhouse C. 12(ns), 1962.239 sqq; add ἈΘΗΝΑΙ 33-

§ 20 henandor fr. 335 horte

And see Moorhouse G. 12(ns) add 2±£. 33-

Verse 2

Verse 2 ιαίδοτοι εἰθ' Stobaeus; V has the active. Not only is the middle required for the metre: it is the regular fourth-century form (Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, Socrates. Boeotius). First found Eur. Breustes 1083. The active is found at Sophocles ELECTRA 565, Aeschylus HERACLEIDEAE 524, Aristophanes NECROBADIAEAE 61

4 ἀναγκάς Stobaeus, ἈΘΗΝΑΙ V. Those who print μὴ τ' ἀν ἀναγκάς should explain how they justify the hiatus, or ἑκάστοι without 'αν. Gellius cannot possibly have quoted the verse in this form.

Stobaeus, κοινὰ Gellius. Certain; καὶ would not βίον is good here—for "the common fortunes and misfortunes
"ana Stevens on Euripides, Automata" 181
V. *Antipus* (resting ultimately on a reading reported by Thysius) is perfectly good Attic in the sense *oinoe*; the word does not happen to be so far attested in *Aristophanes*, though Handley plausibly conjectures it at *Lyr. 401*.

4 *Apollo* εις Χαλεκόν: for such interruptions cf. *Lexicon 126.13*; *Apollo* εις Ιατρῖκας: Damosenus 2.52; *Apollo* ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀργῇ *εἰκών*; Sosipater 1.24; *Apollo* ἔφεστε γάρ: *Aristophanes* 3.33 εἰς Χαλεκόν. *Apollo* εις Χαλεκόν; but Lloyd-Jones more economically proposes ἔφεστε τῇ αὐτῇ ἀργῇ: εἰς Χαλεκόν (see Austin ad loc. vol. 2: p. 8).

5 *εὖρακ* : the adjective occurs eight times in *Aristophanes*, but only once in a trimeter (*Plutus* 1); it is also found at *Iph. 1.1* in *Hippocrene*, which indeed is a trimeter.

6 *εὐρακ* εἰς Χαλεκόν: cf. *en. 2.6.13* ὡς τὸν ἐν τῇ φέρα τοῦ ἄνθρωπος *τὸν εὐρακ* (so τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῷ πεῖρα τῆς Χαλεκοῦ) of a person of *Diosc. 122* ἐν τῇ *τό πεῖρα* (i.e. *en. 2.6.13*) with Handley's note, and *en. 2.6.13* ὡς τοῦ πεῖρα τῆς *Apollo* εἰς Χαλεκόν ὡς τοῦ *Aristophanes* 3.33 εἰς Χαλεκόν. *Apollo* εἰς Χαλεκόν occurs at *Aristophanes* 3.253 (playing on the sense *imbellis*), 1.14; *Men. 193* κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον εἰς Χαλεκόν *en. 22:5* ap. *Aristophanes*.

7 *εὖρακ* : to be said by Croby's hust... for confirming the other person's remark cf. *Diosc. 1.1* ὡς τοῦ *Pindar*.

8. *εὖρακ* εἰς Χαλεκόν: *A. 2.6.13* ὡς τοῦ *Pindar*.

So it should seem, *εὖρακ*—alone *en. 2.6.13* Handley has *εὖρακ* parenthetically at *Aristophanes*, and in reply to *οἷδα* ἄνθρωπος...
of mankind", but loss of money is after all one of them. Alexander
it, therefore be presumed to have written δοκά: "in other
thing, no wrong, he can patch them up with money". For δοκάς
preceding the one thing set aside, cf. Apollodorus of Carystus
fr.25.3-4: doca

η δοκά μεν γὰρ ὀδελέως χορία
σουκας φέρει, τορπίν δὲ καὶ τὸς ἀρκτίλους

word, however, would seem to be an ancient variant, and was
certainly given by Gellius.

1 ἐπαμφιέεσαι Heinsius, Ἐπαμφιέσται V, ἐπαμφιεσθεῖσα Soden
ἐπαμφιέεστεν occurs in the preceding and antepenultimate Sapphidae fr.1127a2 Posidon (or Alex. Jerom. 5.39.3)

here is no evidence for either ἐπαμφιέεσαι or ἐπαμφιεσθεῖσα till
well into the Christian era: the former occurs in st.basil of
Ossacena's homilies on the Hexahemeron 6.6 (σωματικόν), cf.

ἐπαμφιέεσαι ἐπαμφιέσται Hesychius, ἐπιμελεῖσαι ἐπιμελέστην

Apollonius hex.85; the latter at Aristides 30.16 Bekker, Basil
in R.M. 3 (σωματικόν), cf. ἐπαμφιέεστεν ἐπιμελέστην

Hesychius. Although σωματικός is used by Clearchus of Soli
(2.25 PG 1.314 = homoean 6.x.4.) ἐπαμφιέεσαι is used
by Homer, Aristophanes, Plato and Xenophon; there is therefore little
reason to doubt Heinske's reading. It should seem that Gellius
read ἐπαμφιέεσαι.

8 οἵς ὁμοίως: so Zeilin and Gaisford for οὐ διαιρέω διην.

The omission has since been confirmed by Epitrepontes 577-8

ὅπως ἐκεῖνον ὁδὸν ἐδόκει ἄρα 

οὕτως ἐκεῖνος ταύτην ἐκεῖνον

and Ἱαγ. Didot. 12.24-6 (where note the repetition of ἐκεῖνον).
9. Ἀργαλέων, Ἀλεξανδρ. Ρ.; cf. Ἕπικαλλέον in V for Ἕπικαλλέον ν. 33.1. Grotius's ἐνῖκον is far less natural.

Cobet altered ἐνῖκον into ἐνῖκος; this may be right, but it is not necessary.

Ὑψὸν for ἐνῖκος + gen. occurs e.g. at Ἐπιτρεπόμενος 2

ἥπερ ἐκ τοῦ μεθύκεσθος Ἰηροῦ, and ἥπερ γάρ ἐνός (Ἱηροῦ)

is not a split anapaest. There need not be word-end after ὑψὸν;

cf. Samia

δέ φίλος δὲ χαμάρᾳ σου. τε γάρ ἄλλοι: ἢ θεολογία.

(quoted p. 85, Κρίκλης Π. 64)

and the tragic poets allow it at Porson's Bridge:

Sophocles Π. 736 ὑπερ' εἶπε δὴ τὸ δεῖν ὅτι γάρ τινι δὲ μοι

Π. 115 νίνας λόγους ἐρώσων ἐν γάρ τῷ μαθέι

Euripides Π. 230 ὑπερ' εἰπεὶ δὲ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τοὺς κακοὺς ἐν ἥπερ

Π. 275 ὄρος τόδε αἰσχρὰ ἔτη σὺν ἀνάξιον ἐνός ἀρνή.

There is no parallel to ὑπερ' ἐνός γάρ τινι in Menander

with ὑπερ' (at Π. 725.1 Κρίκλης the particle belongs not to Menander

but to Philoleus), but cf. R. Maurice 678

ὦ τὰ τοιχία πού δὲ πελαγηγέτων κατοικία,

I do not therefore consider ὑπερ' γάρ ἐνός Ἰηροῦ ἔπειρας ὅσον ὅτι

an impossible trimeter for Menander.
§10 This fragment corresponds to Caecilius 142-157 Ribbeck.

1 is denum miser est qui aerumnum suam nequit occulte ferre. 142
2 ita de meusor forma et factis tacit, si tacesset, taken intr incarn. 143
3 quae nisi dotem ut in quae nolitis habet; qui saepius, de me discet. 144
4 qui quadam hastis captus liber seruus salma urbe atque arce. 145
6 dum eius mortem inhio, inter uivos egentuiuo mortuos. 146
5 - quae quidquid lacet eo privat, nam ego esse 147
7 et me classem mea ancilla at consuetum, mi me arguit; 148
8 ita pi.orando orando instando atque obiurgando me obtulit. 149
9 eam uti uendere...; nunc credo inter suas. 150
10 aequalis et cohetas sermonem seriat: 151
11 quis uestrarem tuit integra actacula. 152
12 quae hoc item auro. 153
13 impetravit sui, quae ego anus modo. 154
14 effeci, paletiss ut meum priuarem uiunct. 155
15a haec prunt concilia tote; 156
15b dissillar sermone miser.

Letter: 1-4 trochaic octonarii
6, 7, 8 trochaic septenarii
9 bacchiac tetrameter catalectic
10 iambic senarius
11 cretic tetrameter
12 "Pseudolum tuum"
13 critic dimer + "Pseudolum tuum", cf. Plautes
14 iambic senarius
15 two cretic dimer: - v - XX v

By reading occulte for occitare in v.1 and in v.2 inserting ne
before me, vv. 1-4 can be taken as four trochaic octonarii. In his
second edition Ribbeck ended 142 at nequit, assuming - x - before is;
changed ferre to foris, ending 143 at "facit"; changed "si" to "etsi", added "aeae" after "indicium", ending 144 at "o.-uia", and read sapit for sanet, making 1:5 ("quae nolis...discet") a bacchiac tetrameter.

In his third edition he rejected this perverse arrangement, read "nesciat" for "nequit" ("nescit" rec.) and "foris" for "ferre", making an anapaestic septenarius "is...occulte", and two anapaestic octonarii "foris...indivitum" "quae nisi...discet". But there is no evidence that Caecilius ever used anapaests. For other attempts at restoring sense and metre see the annotations of Lertz and Ribbeck (also Ribbeck's corollarium to ed.2.XXVsqq.)

1 occulte: so I emend occulte. For occulte ferro "I keep secret" cf. Terence Adelphoe 327-8 "a...are oceepit aliam. :: uae miserae mini ! ::/ neque i...occulte ferto, ab lenone ipsus eripuit palm: ("And he doesn't keep it dark; he's snatched her away...").


3 The βασιλεύς having no true Roman counterpart, an uxor notata is substituted. Such is Artemona in Plautus's Asinaria (897), whose last breath is meted by the Caecilian tenemant (161 R.G.269).

4 saeua urbe atec...see E...r...el...p...antini in...autum 223 cf. C.Williams Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry 363 sqq.

One thinks of the urbs Rome and the Capitol; cf. the oath "si sciens tallo, tum me Despiter saeua urbe aroque bonis eiciat ut ego hunc lapidem" (2.5.12, 17, cf.Polybius 3.25.2); Eudor. trag. 71 = 36 "arce et urbe orba sum", lic. div. 2.69 "ad arce aubemenque rotinemians", Horace Car. 3.5.12 "incum multitude et urbe Roma".

4-5 Ribbeck's transposition (concealed by his numeration), gives a better sequence of thought. "I'm my wife's slave. While I'm longing
for her to die I'm a living corpse - my should I want her to live, seeing she takes all my pleasures away from me? She's made me sell the maid....

6 dum eius mortuus inhio: Nonius 606 li, sa, under the lemma "accusativus pro dativo", gives "dum ego eius mortus inhio" (inhio codd.). The ego is certainly not wanted with exist to follow: it would spoil the contrast between "her" desired but unforthcoming death and "my"

living one. Nonian readings not guaranteed by the lema are unreliable (but cf. ibid). Inhio, incidentally, regularly takes the accusative in early Latin (Plautus an. 267, 6c), and also at Virgil 6.2.463, Statius theb. 2.110; the dative is not found till the elder Seneca, cont.

7.7. (22) 11. With this verse cf. Plautus dia. 22.531, 905.

inter unios egoem et inter mortuos: so I transpose "egoemet uiuo mortuos inter unios". Ribbeck read "egoemet inter unios uiuo mortuos", but this would set the diaeresis between inter and uiuo. To be considered also loc. 5. seisen's "egoemet uiuo inter unios mortuos", with a legitimate hiatus. For the idea of Timoloe 35. 4 ofos potu

Siborn pedibus eritatis. Ter. An. 73: "uiuos uidensque perere".

5. the LSS have quae mihi quicquid placet ea prius um me seruatim: Ribbeck saw that the sense required seruata (nulim); Hertz read "quae mihi quicquid placet ea prius, tu um seruata nulim?", but I suspect that u uiue conceals non. Hence I suggest miu o c o e a u. u.; or possibly non e a u. or re. Ser. 2.2.28 "miu a uet" (It is no doubt by accident that I can find no earlier such scansion of non, but several of nam - c u.)

7 ciam se: or fel...
8. For the scene-play and the congeries of Caec. 212 R

15 R

cloaco postulo obsecro or o ploro atque imploro rivan!

10 (152 R) ser. om. o.l. or . latus uerculo 163 "poilluctus uiris
seruos seruus aterrana serat".

11 (153 R) uestrarn: in earli Latin the genitive of nos and uos
is often made up with the extended (originally pronominal) -orum -arum

uostorum uostorum uostorum are all found. As regards spelling, Caecilius is credited with uersaris (244 R) by the MSS of
Cicero Naelius 59, and uersantur (41) aduersum (69) uerbit (116) in
passages cited by honius: we should therefore accept uestram, while
recognising the total unreasolality of it. Evident.

Certain. Ribbeck should not have printed uostaram, on the strength
of nostrarum in certain receptiores, produced by confusion of
str- and str-

15b (157 R) differar Ribbeck, differor oad. After erunt the future is
absolutely necessary.

§13 Caecilius 158-62 Ribbeck.

B. sed tua urosanai uxor quesso est? A. ua, rogas?

B. qui tandem? A. taeat mentionis, quae mihi

ubi domum adveni aisedi, extemplo sauium 160
dat ieiuna anima. ...nil poccat ne saunio:

ut deuosas uolt quorroris potueris.

158 ua Ribbeck, quam oad. For ua, rogas? "you don't need to ask me
that, do you?" i.e. "of course she is" cf. latus uersa 107 "equid
nallecis. :: ua, rogas;" "of course there will".

159 qui tandem?: "how do you mean?" latus uost. 1106 "dedisti uersa.
:: qui tundens... from quae down to anima lod is cited by Nonius 346 L s.v. anima.

160 adsedi Nonius, ac sedi cum Gell. adsedi is obviously right: not only is adsē common for "I sit down", but it is used specifically of sitting down when one gets back down at Var. 124. The simple situs is not attested before negos: ῶν ἐκαθόθησαν (as opposed to ἐκαθήσαν) not till Vergil.


6 o Caecilius 14-172 Bibbech

is desima infelix infortunatust homon,
pauper qui eumcit in egestates liberos 170
quod ut fortuna et res est continuo petet.

nec opulento fatae facile occultat facti.

Our witnesses include the palaeoesth A, which however despairs us after in 170.

169 The ÆS have "is demum est infortunatus homon", which is not iambic and is too short. The former error can be corrected by transposition: "is demum infortunatus est homon" (or rather to avoid the diams, Spengler's "is demum infortunatus homon"); but the latter necessitates supplementation: I do not think it likely that the sentence began in diams-verse; hence my suggestion of infelix immediately preceding infortunatus, and lost by nonocclusion.

Cf. "felix fortunatusque" Sic. de ina 3.37.3; "tunc felix, tunc fortunatus" Calp. Sic. 3.4; "Fortunatius feliciter" Enul. 106; "fortuna et felicitate" Sic. 1.5.7 ("Fortunatus" Schirren, 259, 261.)
169-170 That punctuation should come after *nemo*, not after *peper*,
was first perceived by Ribbeck.

170 in *gestates* *liberos*: the ablative *gestate* would produce an
inferior rhythm, cf. *sine*; early Latin Verse 270 seq. For the
accusative see n-S 1.593-*f*, *narrans*; *zantyr* 2.6-*f*; also *Celi*.1.7.6-15.
(Note that in §19 or that chapter Celsus seems to recognize that
Cicero's use of the accusative at *de nat.* 1.36 33 "in praedonum
pustate potestatis sciatis" is motivated by the *casu*.)

171 *ca* *fortuna* *et res* *ui est* *continuare* *pateat* *Vex*: these words do
not as they stand make metre, but the sense is clear: the state of the
poor man's affairs cannot be concealed. (How precisely this relates
to the wretchedness of having children in poverty is another question;
but doubtless Caecilius was no logician). I therefore suggest
transposing up from after *res* to before *fortuna*, and interpreting *qui*
as *quid* (cf. *Caecilius* 261-*f*), thereby recovering metre.

172 *momento* *factum* *facere* *oculata* *factio*: "Den Reichen lohnt sein
Anhang bald die Abrede zu" (Weiss); for *rana* = *amafia* cf. *e.g.* *ambius*
tra. 10-12 Ribbeck, 30-30; *AESCVS* 52, *Terence* *AELPIS* 263, *Apulius*
162, an 6.207.1.20. The idea is that the rich and powerful man's
*amicis* and *clintes* cover up and suppress evil rumours; *loc* (Geschichte
der römischen Literatur 469) renders pithily if freely: "Das Reichen
Schmach v. *Allen* *Macht und Gunst*". But it must be admitted that the
thought in these verses is somewhat disconnected.
This is one of the two ancient accounts concerning what Cato called *leges cibariae*, the other being given by Macrobius *Saturnalia* 3.17; although the two passages are very similar in outline, each gives much information omitted by the other. The most recent treatment is by Balsdon *Life and leisure in ancient Rome* p.30-40; for a more general discussion of Roman supranumerary laws see Kübler RE s.v. *suppeditium* (p.302-8). Their motivation, however, is barely touched on by these writers; the reader is therefore referred to Daube *Roman law: Linguistic, Social, and Philosophical aspects*, p.117-128, where it is shown that while old-fashioned moralistic sentiments undoubtedly played their part, a prime motive for this as for much other legislation was the relief of poorer or more prudent members of the upper class from the social pressures

1. Macrobat.3.7.12.
2. Only Gellius has Augustus's law and the subsequent edict; only Macrobius the *leges Orphica* and *Dilia*, and Antony's edict. Gellius reports at length the money-limits of the *Sanedia* and *Licinian* laws; Macrobius garbles them, but gives the latter's weight-limits in more detail. Gellius has the terms of Antius's law, but Macrobius gives us his cognate *meae* and an anecdot about him; each has a different *lex Cornelia*. On the other hand both follow this with the *Sanedia*, though only Macrobius explicitly ascribes it to the cons. of 78 B.C.; it dates in fact from 115. Above all, neither mentions Caesar's law of 46.

3. Cato was by no means the only person to think on those lines: Scipio's attitude in his censorship may be cited, cf. Justin *Scho. mel. ii.10*, es. pp.116-9. Of the fables of pauper heroes in the early Republic; Gelzer *Unterricht* 2.1.1-19 (H.3chr. 1.36; English tr. p.22) with n.186.

4. For instance Ap. Quintus (*pr. 54*), cf Varro *RR* 3.1.238c; certainly the genuine poor were not considered. The rise of luxury was accompanied by increasing depression among the proletariat.
towards extravagance imposed by their richer or more reckless fellows. To the arguments adduced by Daube it may be added that in 69 and 11 B.C. we find sumptuary measures combined with an enforced reduction in the price of certain luxuries, which would be sinfully perverse if the overall aim were a return to ancient frugality.

Discussion in detail of these laws is reserved for an excursus; but it may be noted here that the limits laid down rose with each new law. The annual expenditure for ordinary days, if expressed in terms of the denarius, was 1 in 161 B.C. and 50 in 22 B.C. This was not due to inflation; as more and more wealth was extorted Homewards, and greater and greater progress was made in the heliophagetic arts, so the banquet of the wealthy became more and more luxurious. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that none of these laws had any lasting effect: in 22 A.D. Tiberius refused an invitation to initiate measures on the subject, declaring them to be useless. Lucius (3.51-5) appeals to his account of this event a digression on the gradual decline of sumptuary law, that followed the fall of Nero, and its social causes. On the subject of seculium see Frisse under "Sittengeschichte Rom" (cd.9) 2,285-342.

1. Daube cites the parallel of the simple Jewish funeral: we may add that Pope Clement V forbade incontinent of the universities reserving more than 3000 livres tournois on feasts and days for their fellow masters or Doctors. Or too, Synesius's welcome (Rel. 1) for the sumptuary decree of 25 July 54 A.D.: "he adores: he consumes more than the sumptuous magnificence of the other" (ed. 74). Frisse (Rel. 5.4) on the sumptuary legislation of 25 July 34:

2. The price at which corn was sold at the specimen was established at 1 1/3 asses a moneius by C. Asconius; despite numerous additions and reinstatements of the institution, this was still the price in 58 B.C. (Asconius 7.16). It was also the price proposed by Serracinus (Rel. 1.21). For semissibus must be emended as proposed by last, 38. 1-5, to semis (which is corrupted to sensis in the MSS of Asconius). If the price had been 5/6 as a moneius this would be expressed not as "de semissibibus et trislibibis" but as "de hemissibibis"; nor can such an awkward figure ever have been proposed. One as a moneius would have made the people grumble enough, (as in 74 B.C.; Ann. 11. 16); which also makes it clear that 6 1/3 asses a moneius was intended as a fair average price, protecting the people against the vagaries of the market.
2 in Capitulis Atei conciliatis: Ateius Capito and Mnestius Labeo are both cited several times by Gellius. Politically Capito was a strict constitutionalist who even under Augustus recognized only the authority of the ancients (Capito a. Gell. 1.12.2; 1.3.75); in civil law, however, Capito was the conservative, Labeo the innovator (for this see 2.2.47; Fabius et Valerius Messalla consulibus: 161 B.C. The et, however, must be deleted: in the ablativus acti.

principes civitatis quod lucis sagalensibus ... utitarent: the SC will not have defined their status, but simply have run "qui lucus sagalensibus" or the like. The other evidence for these banquets comes from sources:

Lucero de Quinto 45: "Primus h b.ueper sociales; sociitates autem quaestor constitutae sunt, sacris lideis hagae matris acceptis; equilibrar i iter cum sociisibus seis omnino mox in, sa era quaerat feruor aetatis, quia pro re alteme omnia finire in dies finierunt."

Verrius Flaccus ap. Festor. : "Primus Apr. C. Judi. ...

Nagalensia uocabatur, quod ea dea negale appellatur. Nobilitas autititationes centro: solitae sunt frequenter fieri, quod later magna ex libris Sibullinis arcessita locuta uatait ex Phrygia Romae."

Gellius 4.2.11: "Postea quaestio istae ait, quam ob causam patricii sagalensibus autitare solitai sit, plebei serialibus."

It thus appears that Cato, a plebeian and a novus homo, was in his quaestura a foundein of a sagalensia-club, these clubs being
instituted in 204 B.C., the year that the Great Mother's rites were brought to the city (Livy 29.14.14). From the conflicting statements about membership one would naturally suppose that it was normally restricted to the leading nobles, but that in the last resort it depended on the existing members' willingness or unwillingness to have the candidate dine with them. Whatever Cicero's authority for the statement about Sato, he will not have thought it incongruous for him to participate; it is quite possible, after all, that Cicero - or Atticus - had contemporary records that he did. Patricii at Gellius 1.12.11 will be loosely used for nobles: cf. Geizer Nobili Iter r.P.I 4.322. The clubs seen to become obsolete by Verrius's day ("solitiae sunt").

As for the alebeinii (whose archives were kept in the aedes Cereonis) Plautus Ennius speaks of seriulles cenas. It is unlikely that the extension of the ludi seriales from the feriae on 19 April to the eight days 12-19 April has any relevance to the date "pr.Id.Apr." given the aalenensi by Livy 29.14.14, as Eissenborn supposes; it comes from M.T., misread as r.P.id.

mutitarent: cf. 18.2.41, post:praen. The regular word for this institution we may deduce; found nowhere else in Latin. It reminds us that mutuo and mutuus are etymologically related.

centenos uiconosque aeguis: in 161 C. this would be 120 sextantal asses at 1 to the denarius; Mattingly JRS 27(1937).69.

omae olis et fer et uius:na:holera" (ναξαρα), taken stricti., exclude "leguminos" (οτιηεα); Andre l'Aimentation et la cuisine Rome A35 "Le mot legumina à l'abord désigné les plantes alimentaires à

1. I cannot find in classical precedents of solit dus sunt for it occurs only in Livy 23.5.23.45.9. Catt. Ref. 9.2.22, the sense is that of an English perfect: "has/have been used up to now" in contrast with the new situation'. But Ovid has ineunt.
costes, dont on convient les grains, par opposition aux l'usage proprement dits (holer ou oler), dont on mangeait recel en les parties vertes, et non des leuc (fruits).

For lists of holer, see Isidore orig. 17.10-11; of legumin, ib. 17.4. The two are often confounded: Vitruvius 5.9.6, Calus 1.4.1, Suetonius aero 1.6.2, all the same, it is wiser not to press the distinction here: it is hard to imagine that beans had to be paid for out of the 120 asces but beet was unrestricted. No doubt plum is used kat. ἄγενδόκχην cf. Apulianus anol. 20.14 "now reconsecrando et unum et holus et pome et pecunia pretio sacriiui".

θερ: likewise κατ. ἄγενδόκχην. Spelt (as earlier been the only cereal known at Rome (Pliny h. 18.62; Isidore op. c. 55).

libra: centum: modern scholars give the conversion 1 libra = 327.45 g.

Of course the Romans were incapable of such accuracy; their lowest weight was the scripulum, one-twelfth and eighth of an libra, or 1.137 g to four significant figures were we entitled to reckon so precisely. For our present purpose we should say that the limit was about 32.75 k.2

3 centesima seris insumi consecutit: for accusative and infinitive with centesimo cf. fil. 2 a. 345. Catullus 64.2, Lucretius 1.614, Keilman only 345.

4 Luilius poetis: 1.1172 libra = 1192 Krenkel.

5 cum cognit iamb. are: they called iambus, who states (Sat. 3.17.5); "Festina etiam sumptibus modum fecit assibus centus, unde a Lucilio poeta festinotitis euse more centussis moortur".

festis quibusdemit diebus: cf. 511 "circaque lieorum et feriae quibusdem sollemniubu". Die festi stand to frisae as holidays to holy days.

ludi: are not feriae but they are dies festi (i.e. 1.1: the trial is

Note the shift in sense.

2 32.745 kg = 1052.77 oz. Troy to six significant figures.
being put. "diebus festis ludique publicis"). Conversely, feriae may
be anything but cheerful (c.Livy 3.40.7: after thirty-eight days of
earthquakes: "per totidem dies feriae in sollicitudine ac metu facem");
or the public may never have heard of them (c.Varro LL 2.19) on the
Ferrinalis, s.c.ii. 4.4.2 Sext in honour of the goddess Fortuna).

6 aliorum autem dieum in singulas dies: for the repetition of 1.9.8,
5.10.1, ad (at a greater distance) 2.12.1. Hence (p.12) compares
Cato p.138,108.1 "nulli centurium de coaudo".

7 Iuv. deinde Licinia rogata est: since Macrobius (Sat.3.17.7) calls its
mover P.Licinius Crassus Lucretius, he will not have been the con. of 97 B.C.,
who did not possess the cognomen Lucretius, but the con. of 131 B.C., P.Licinius
Crassus Lucretius maxime; the terms of the law favour the earlier dating,
cf.lxxviius p.284 n.1; Voigt, "richtige der kaiserlichen Schriften".

Akademie der Wissenschaften 42 (1902) 250; Kaiser l.c. 300. (perhaps another
may suggest that this gave it more time between satisfied senio obligabitur (cf.413)
Macrobius (sat.3.17.9) gives the terms as "ut habendis omis
nundinis non-nisi cuique in dies singulos trinquantam dument atasses
edundi causa consumere liceret, ceteris uero diebus qui excepti non
essent ne amplius daretur apponere tertium quam camis aridae pondo tria et
salsamentum pondo libra, et quod ex terra uitae arboreae sit (sic codd.)
naturum". The first clause is obviously garbled; the second preserves both
substance and wording in greater measure than Gellius (cf.daretur apponetur).
camis autem AVPl; so too the Juntine. There is no justification for
substituting aridae from Macrobius as the recentiores do; the adversative
particle is required for sentence-continuity. But of course the law did
refer to dried meat (cf.thenaeus 274c with lxxviius p.283;
André 144-5); did Gellius perhaps write "cum autem et camis aridae"?
I do not think so.
jsalsamenti: the term covers both salt meat and salt fish (andré op. cit. 145).

**tamen AVPr;** the Macrobian notum of some recensiores is not wanted.

* Terra uite arbore: for uitis and arboe distinguished cf. Cic. *ID 2,84

"quae procreatio uitis aut arboris": Columella 1,8,20 "num aliqua uitis, num arbor, num fruges absint", 3,1,2 "tertium quidem, quod nec arborem nec fruticem proprie dixerimus, ut est uitis", cf. de arboribus 1,2.

But much of Columella's discussion of trees is in fact devoted to vines (books 3, 4, 5, 7; de arboribus 1, 3-6, 4); when these have been dealt with does he turn to *vitae.* Pliny regards vines as trees; NH 14,9 "uites iure apud priores magnitudine quaque inter arbore

numerauerunt": 14,150 " duo sunt liquores humanis corporibus gratissimi, intus uini, foris olei, arborum e genere ambo praecipui". So did the jurists: Ulpian LXI ad edictum = D. 43,27,1,2 "arboris appellatio etiam uites continetur", LIV ad Sabinum = D. 47,7,3,1 "uitem arboris appellatio continer contineri plerique uetorum existimauent"; Gaius I. leg. II tabb. = D. 47,7,2 "sciendum est autem eos qui arbore, et maxime uites ceciderunt, etiam tamquam latrones puniri". In his *Institutio* (4,11), Gaius tells us that in the old legis actiones the precise wording of the law had to be repeated; "unde cum qui de uitibus succisis ita egisset ut in actione uites nominaret, responsum est rem perdidisse, quia debuisset arbores nominare; eo quod lex XII tabulam ex qua de uitibus succisis actio competeter generaliter de arboribus succisis loqueretur". It is clear that the suit would not have been dismissed on the grounds that vines were not trees; on the other hand, the ordinary Roman no more called a vine a tree than the ordinary Englishman calls a bird an animal.

1. Horace *Carm.* 1,48,1 must not be pressed too far in view of *Alcaeus* 342 LP
Indeed, even in legal writings we find the terms opposed: Lebeo (bk 5 of Juvolenus's epitome = D.18.1.80.pr.), justifying his interpretation of *meminens*, argues "non liter interpretentibus uites et arbores omnes excepte uidebuntur*. Here he uses *arbores* in its ordinary-language acceptation; he is using the word himself, not interpreting it in a statute.

As for the language of the Lex Licinia, we should not expect a Roman legislator to omit a word just because a juristic interpretation of another made it unnecessary, particularly when his provision concerns something as important as wine.

*Lebeo postes* unless he is the Lebeo Melissus who insulted the Roman Cato (friend of Q. Catulus, cons. 102 B.C.) Suetonius (gramm. 3), we do not know his other names and have no other indication of his date. There is certainly no reason to connect fr. 3 Korel "meminens Virmo corde vultat" with the great polymath born in 116 B.C.; nor can so individualistic an innovator in so undocumented a period be confidently dated by his style. We are left with this passage (fr. 23 Korel), which on the face of it would seem to be contemporaneous with the law; but in the absence of a context such appearances are unreliable.

In *Epitopegenik*; cf. Karl-Erik Henriksson "Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur" 23-4; one might render "nunc eum torico".

U *lux liquida heedo redditur*: the previous line being in iambic dimeter, which metre Laevius uses frequently, we must conclude that the first syllable of *liquida* is to be scanned long, as at Lucretius 1.349,
Despite Seneca's ἑτέρη, this is not an inherited form, in ἑταίρεια the nature of res is unaccusative.

The stem in Latin is re-constructed from the accusative ῥῆμ (Vedic ῥ⁄r̥m). This shows parallel simplification of the long antepenult to short of the in ῥην (Hindi ῥ̥एन, Sanskrit ῥ̥ेन), where the stem is ῥ̥ेन (vira, bīra). If however, the above was true, it would be more problematic.
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The cause is a contamination of zero-grade (cr. quor) and grade (cr. quor less quor). There is, after all, little difference in sense between the two participles at Verg. Geog. 442.

Quaest. orib. de usum terrae fluminique aquatilis

and AE. 675

quaes aeternae — querentia fluminis circum

or — quaestia nella 1132 a quaer. 1133 a quaerentia 1136, 176.

10 Lucilius: fr. 120.0 Marx = 1223 Krenkel: cr. fr. 1.53 M = 176.5.

"centenaria cena" (1. 415 "centenariae cena ducabantur in aquae leges"

Aelina non plus centessibus praetere turr enata impenetaeatur"; the ascript of to Lucilius is plausible but not certain).

11 Herodotus 3.165.5 "leges quoque ipseam lussa consentu tacito oblitertantur"; 29. 22-25, where again obliterata occurs in 6.2.4.

surgitibus: an indispensable word for denouncing gluttony: 156.2360.72.

12 Nennius quoted: Gellius does not hate this law; it is treated of apart because it limited not the cost but the range of the menu.

Macrobius, probably misled by the same order in his source, ascribes it to Eusebius, cos. 76. In fact it was used by Scarrus, cos. 145, in his consilium: Pliny NH 15.233, inst. de uiris ill. 79.5. It prohibited dormice, shell-fish, and exotic birds (Pliny 1.45); such a measure would have been ludicrous in 76, but in 145 they were still, we may suppose, new luxuries a sanguine man might have hopes of suppressing.

...it is perhaps worth pointing out that the vulgate text of Nic...453-4 is quite so... anal... is an analogical active created by Lucretius, no less justified than... 680, 2.236, etc. in the artificial verse... 5.69, Sel. 9.1.21; or indirect... (cos. deicr... 5.11.25) iudex... (Nennius 3.47). The noun intactus 1.53 is impossible; cr. Mackernagel Worterb. Syntax 2.28.
15 ne quo: i.e. "ne al quem", cf. Lautus Scichus 155 "uendi illo in cenar
where illo means "to So-un-so's, chez Un t l."; "quo ea pecunia
peruenit" in Claudio's, Sulla's and Caesar's repetundae-laws,
paraphrased by Cicero "iubet lex Julia persequi ab eis ad quo ea
pecunia quaeris exorat qui damnatus sit peruenit" (Rapos. 3-7).
see note on inde eitut 2.29.15 for discussions of such constructions.
14 repotia: defined by Festus 350.14 as "postriuque nuptias ad novum
meruit censatur, quia quasi reficitur potatio", forphullo on Horace
Ser. 2.1.60"repotia dicebat ues post nuptias" (Pseu Acro marion etes).
15 auiine munrui an fieri cesseris nuptias comemant: for arguments
suggesting the edict was made by Augustus see excursus 2.288.
for diernm varias soulenuates: does this mean "throughout the various,
regularly-recurring times of days in the year: (laends, Ides, Nones,
and, or plain profesti," or "throughout the various observances of
days = observed days"? With some hesitation, I prefer the former,
which injects more meaning into diem; if so, the basic rate will
have been raised by 50. According to Festus 38.36 a solennia
is derived from the oscan word for "all" (occ. p. sollo 6 lo ) :
"solennia quod omnium annis praestari iebet".
adusque duo septertia: for this preposition cf. i.1.2 "uimi libidine
adusque imilibria ebrious" It is used in poetry from Catullus i.e.,
1. prose from Tac. 1.1.56, am occurs 112 times in Annianus Marcellinus;
see Thiel. n. m. 7.186.
saltati: conveying a note of despair; luxury has been contained within
no bounds up to now; oh that these may be enough for it! Compare
Vergil. Georg. 1.500-1 "hunc saltati evesco iuuenem succurr er saeclo /
ne prohibete!" and the discussion in cell. 10. 13, espé o" nam cum alia quaedam petita et non impetrata sunt, tum solent ... quasi extrema aliqua petitor quod negari dixeret nebeat, dixerit nec saltem fieri aut dari oportere"
The first law restricting dinners passed at Rome was the Lex Orania of 182 B.C., "quae tuit J. Orchius tribunus plebi de senatus auctoritate" (Macrovius Sat. 3. 17. 2), which limited the number of guests one might invite; if the clause cited from the Pannian law by Athenaeus (i74c) was a simple re-enactment of the Orchan, the limit was three guests not of the household, or five on Lunainae (and no doubt other special days).

Naturally Cato was in due course to be heard complaining that the law was being broken (Macr. ib.), and he opposed a motion for its partial repeal: Festus 220. 15 B "Cato in suasione <ne> de lege Orchiad aerogoratur: 'qui ante ... obsonitauerer, postea cemenis obsonitaure'" If the law contained no other clauses, derogation would presumably be of the limit on festal dinners; the coincidence of cemenis in Cato and as the maximum for festi under the leg Orcha is striking, but we do not know exactly what Cato said, much less what he meant.

In 161 B.C. a senatus consultum enforced on the members of Megalensia-clubs an oath to spend no more than 120 asses (sextantal, at 10 to the denarius) on each dinner, not counting vegetables, cereals, or wine; to serve only native wine; and to use no more than 120 libras of silver. (it will be remembered that the libra is in theory 327.45 g, or about 11.2 oz avoirdupois or about 10 oz Troy.) Later that year a law was passed restricting expenditure to 100 asses on festal dinners, 30 asses ten times a month, and 10 asses otherwise. It also forbade

1. The correction in Festus c.c. is obvious; in fact we also have to correct 222. 1 = "lac una qua legem orchian[dis] suadet". Scho. Ob. Sic. Sest. 130 (1. 11. 17 Stangl) "Cato in leg[e] [ ] Orci [ ]"; for such inexactitudes see below on S. Titius. Likewise Festus 150. 31 B "Cato in s. linc ne lex saebia aerogoratur", but Nonius 755 B "Cato lege saebia".
fattened hen, which provision was re-enacted in all subsequent legis-
lation of this kind, and just as consistently ignored.¹

Athenaeus, however, tells us that the law, besides limiting
invitations² and expenditure³ ἐπίστας δὲ μανήσωτο οἰκονομεῖν
tιλαμάνας δακανένσες τοὺς ἐκκοιτούς ἐπέχωροι καὶ ὧν ἤτεροι ἡμῶν
καὶ διαφόρως ἐγρήγορα (274c). Fifteen Attic talents = 1200
librae, giving in a 365-ia year a daily allowance of 3 librae with
135 librae left over for special days. Probably this is in fact the
Licinian provision; v.ind.; his statement that only Scaevola, Tubero,
and Rutilius, accused the θεομετέρων . . . θερμαῖν, indicates a certain
chronological confusion.

In 43 the lex Didia⁵ was moved, whose main provision was "ut
universa Italia, non sola urbs, leges sanctuaria censeatur" (Proc. Lab. 3.17.5).

¹Pliny HI 14.139; in fact he writes "nequaquam ponenter prae-
serat urbis ("only")guellina, non aliquot, but if none were so the cost-fattening
of 140 would have been still a "criticism" but an open violation. Nor
since this prov. was repeated, would the Lex Didia have
repealed "ex aux orbe connectas amnis" (Pliny HI 223).
2. The Licinian law exceeded the Licinian in severity by also ("stiam")
limiting expenditure (Proc. Lab. 3.17.5).

3. To 2½ denarii = 10 sesterces; based on a misunderstanding of aures,
originally 185 (1937.1.2)

4. An Attic talent = 80 librae, or 1 Attic talent = 10 librae = 13.6.
Cassubia, citing Vitruvius 11.1.7 (where 4.16 tal. = 150,000 librae,
whence 1 tal. = 60 Attic præ = 1000 præ = 120 librae), reduced the
annual limit of 100 librae, i.e. 5 librae a day; too generous.

5. Didius will have been tribune; at that date the tribunate did not
comport automatic enfr. to the Senate (cf. Libellus Athenaeus 41.193)
6; I fail to see why Gabba, ib.43 (1995), 230, thinks that Libellus's
conclusions contradict Loeb's argument for dating the plebeian
contumly between 123 and 122), but the move of a supratory law will
probably have been Scipio's approval at the next censure, and Damiens
was not out to make trouble. If Damiens did become a senator, 1
Didius, 43.3, cos. 98, was not the best of his son, unless Cicero
is using the term "novus homo" loosely at 1.17, (cf. Funge II, for
which cf. Frey. 130.2, Phil. 9.4, Vell. Pat. 2.28.2.)
which would appear to mean that Latins and Italians on Roman soil were subjected to the law, and that their cities were invited to become fundi of it. In addition, the penalties for illicit lusury were extended to the guests; a clause no doubt proposed on a wave of moral earnestness with never a glance cast at practicality.

Lactarius cites a speech by C. Litius, "aer aetatis Lucilianae", in favour of the lex Pannia (Sat. 3.1.14 sqq); presumably a speech against repeal (Cictorius Uuntu uncleaen in Lucilius 264-7; for Litius see Douglas on Cicero Brutus 167). A little later the lex Lucania was moved "a M. Licinius Crasso Diiuiti" (Lact. Sat. 3.17.7) - that is, by Crassus Lucianus, cos. 131 - with so much support in the senate^ as to be decreed in force so soon as it should have been promulgated. It retained the hundred asses (uncial now, but still ten to the denarius) for festivals, but allowed 200 for weddings and 30 for any ordinary day; it also limited the amount of cooked meat and salt preserves permitted on ordinary days to 3 librae and 2 libra respectively, but expressly left unrestricted all foodstuffs of the vegetable kingdom.

There followed in 115 the lex Sevilia, moved by the consul Scaurus forbidding dormice, shell-fish, and exotic birds, which bans were repeated by later censors to no avail (Pllny En 6.223). Soon S.ergusius

1. And certainly not F. Licinius Crassus, cos. 97, who was not called Duess and by whose time 100 asses (25 sestertii, not 40) would have been gradually low a limit on feasts. Indeed, the law must have preceded the retarting of the as in 122 B.C. (Lattinio's plausible date, Linn. Crot. 1937, 3-9). Syndes, ii. 41-58, puts it in 154; Lucianus will in that case have moved the law as praetor. But see Lattinio, JR. 1930, 237, dating it (and the shift to sestertius reckoning) to between 110 and 110 B.C.; perhaps Crassus was tribune c. 14.

2. Ab optimatibus says Lactarius anachronistically. If the law does belong to 131, it will have united the can and anti-Crassian, Lucianus and Scipio; deep as feelings on the agrarian question were, there were other things to think about.
Orata was to declare that the finest-flavoured oysters came from the Lucrine Lake (Pliny III 9.160); no-one obeyed the sumptuary laws save Quintus Scaevola, Gellius Tubero, and P. Rutilius Rufus - and of course theasses.

In 97 (or just possibly 96) a certain I. Juronius, tribune for that year, was moved from the senate by the censors for securing the repeal of a sumptuary law; this may - or may not - be the occasion on which the Lex Licinia was defended by the unknown orator of Gellius 15...

Then in 89, Julius Caesar censors anno urbis comitae XIXAV edixerunt 'nequis uina Graecae uinam vinostram [que] pluris tonis aeris singula quadranta uenderet'; haec enim uerba sunt. Tanta uero Graeco uino gratia erat ut singulae potionis in convictu darentur" (Pliny H. N. 19.95). A quadrantam (as a liquid measure usually called amphora) was 4.196 litres; by enforcing a glut price the censors destroyed the vindex vins as an exclusive luxury.5

---

1. Who first installed oyster-beds, at Baiac, but for profit, not for food; (Pliny H. N. 31)
2. Athenaeus 274 C; but even these three u. eight citizens pursued not frugality but money on the cheap by buying from their slaves and clients.
4. Pliny was the finest wine in Italy: sato uinum, 6.4, Pliny H. N. 14.21, Johannis 5.2.7.
5. According to Varro and Pliny HI 13.17 this price obtained in 250 B.C.; an as bought a denarius (as amphora) of wine, a modius (as quadrantam) of spelt, 30 librae of dried figs, 10 librae of olive oil, or 12 librae of meat; with these prices, whatever their authority, or those of 76 BC when an as bought a modius of wheat or 10 librae of olive oil (ib. 14.16, 15.1). The price of wheat was extremely variable but the fair price at the auctuatio was 63 asses a modius. The censors' price would therefore have been what ordinary wine might have fetched in a very fruitful year. True, in Basitania (Plin. H. N. 54.8-7= Athenaeus 331 b) a metretes, that is 4 amphorae, cost a drachma, which at the rate 2 as = 4 obol (Plin. H. N. 2.15.6) would make an amphora cost 8 asses, but in the subsidium the price of a metretes was often as low as two obols (Plin. H. N. 2.15.1; cf. alban. 2.1 loc. for the problems of conversion), but prices in these provinces were no guide to those in Rome.
They also banned the sale of "unctua exotica" (Pliny NH 15.25); one could curb sumptus either by banning luxuries or by cheapening the.

The same methods were adopted by Sulla as dictator in 82: his legislation included one law restricting dinner-expenditure to 300 sestertii on Kalenia, Ides, and Nones, and other special days, otherwise 30 sestertii; another limiting funeral expenditure (Plutarch: Sulla 35); a third "qua rege ideam pro eo lege etenit mendum ex anno anno

1. In fact Pliny's text reads "Certum est Antiochus regis Asiaque decretis urbium anno D. C. . . . Licinius Crassus... Julianus Cassarea censores edixisse 'neguis unius aeneae unguentum exotica'; sic enim appellauerent". In AD 565 = 189 . . . the years after Magnesia, the censors were T. Aemilius Flamininus, cos. 198, and M. Marcellus, cos. 196. The notices of the two edicts, however, here and at 14.95, are so similar that they suggest a single source, giving both, twice followed by Pliny. We should probably, therefore, at 13.24 posit a 14.95 after decretis, and emend 14.95 to 14.97.

2. The drastic increases are no doubt an attempt to be realistic.

3. The drastic increases are no doubt an attempt to be realistic.

4. Extensively discussed by Jaube l.c.

5. The Lex Urs. (132) forbids a candidate, on pain of 5000 sesterces' fine, from giving dinner to more than nine persons, or letting anyone else give dinner on his behalf.
was prohibited from not dissimilar motives (Ju. 1. c. 126); but like all preceding laws on either subject had no effect.

In 55 B.C. Pompey and Crassus tried their hand; but the contrast between the terms of their law and the tenor of their lives led to their withdrawing their notion - not least under pressure from the luxurious Loutensius (Dio. 39.37.2). Antony, as magister equitum to Caesar,\(^1\) made a sumptuary edict whose terms we do not know; but effective action was left to Caesar, who in 46 not only made but enforced a sumptuary law (Dio 43.25.2, Suetonius div. Au. 43.2).\(^2\) According to Suetonius, he posted guards at the market to confiscate excessive purchases - and bring them to himself - ; and even sent soldiers to snatch from the very dining-hall what had escaped the guards. This last reads like hostile propaganda; but we do know that in 45 Caesar decided to stay in Rome lest the law be broken behind his back (Cic. Att. 13.7), while an augural dinner at the time consisted largely of vegetables, unrestricted by the law, but so deliciously prepared that Cicero ate too many (Cic. Fam. 7.26.2; cf. also ib. 9.15.5, 9.26.3).

But without the praefectus oribus the law subsisted, till in 22 B.C.\(^3\) Augustus introduced one allowing 1000 sestertii for weddings and the next-day party; 300 for holidays, Ides, Nones, and certain other feasts, otherwise 200; even so a later edict established a scale of three hundred to two thousand sestertii.

---

\(^1\) "ab Antonio...qui postea triumvir fuit", Macrobius Sat. 3.17.1.  
\(^2\) He also restricted the use of litters, jewels and pearls (Suetonius div. Au. 43.1).  
\(^3\) Dio 51.2.3. "Dux est suinus ad multas annos catulis, ut se sedes et supplices in ostiis manum leges recte dicere et quasdam ex integro sancti ut sancturiam et de adulteris be".
Gellius (§ 15) our only source for the edict, cannot remember whether it was made by Augustus or Tiberius. Had it been made by the latter, one might expect mention of it in Tacitus; it must of course be anterior to 22 A.D., in which year Casio died, Gellius's authority for it (1. 3. 75) but in that year, Gellius and his fellow aediles complained that the sumptuary laws relating to food and feasts were being broken and that food-prices were continually rising; the senate referred the matter to Tiberius, who after long consideration replied that nothing could be done: "tot a maioribus repetae leges, tot quas diius Augustus tuit, illae oblationes, haec quod flagellriosius est contentu abolitae, secutiorem luna recere" (Tac. a. 5. 54). Tot quas diius Augustus tuit is more compatible with a law and a decree than with one law and nothing else; nor is so disillusioned an observer of human ways as the Emperor Tiberius so likely to have issued such a edict as Augustus, whose death in the law as an instrument of moral change lasted even to 9 A. D. e max with reasonable confidence, therefore, attribute the edict to Augustus.

Whoever made it, it was utterly ineffective; luxury at table grew unabated till the fall of Nero, after which the personality of Vespasian and the virtual disappearance of the nobles, and the rise of frugal men from municipia, coloniae, and even provinciae, brought about its decline (Tac. a. 3. 55). There is no record of any further attempts at government on it. 2

1. It is true that in 16 A.D. a senatus consultum forbade the use of golden vessels for serving food and the wearing of silk by men; but as Tacitus makes clear, this was a senatorial initiative: "prohibita senatus die (after Libo Junius's conviction, quita in multis civitatis dicta a...). Habito consulatu Octavio fronte praetura Romana; decreta, tuncque novae et novae solidi minarandis obis dierent, nec vestes sericae usque ad foedaret" (A 2. 33). Dio has loosely: "terebintos auloniacos et..." (57. 5. 4).

2. But cf. Pliny Jr. 22. 5: "sma differrentia in diebus sumptus coniunxit et ad antieonum recidit." From its context this probably refers to his principe, not to legislation, for Hadrian's frugality cf. Dio. 3. 7. 3. 46(6) διο ουκ εσθη τις ου... This was not the whole truth: Frontone, a far better authority than Dio or "Sparianus," calls him "prudiorum optima optima" (cf. Terentius' distinction 3. 5). At his banquets he ensured that the caterers did not cheat the lower tables: (cf. Tac. 1. 7. 1, for his drinking (11. 3. 3) and invention of a type of called 

3. "..."
The term **aνωμαλία** was applied to language by Chrysippos, who used it to describe the lack of correspondence between things and their names (Varro Δι, 9.1; Reifferscheid, *History of Classical Scholarship* 203). It was reinterpreted by Crates as denying the existence of grammatical rules, such as were maintained by Aristarchus (Varro it.).

The term **aναιολία** was used (not necessarily by Aristophanes himself) of the inflectional principles laid down by Aristarchus of Byzantium: nouns are similar if they share gender, case, ending, number of syllables, and sounds. Aristarchus added a sixth principle: simplex and compound should not be compared.

This dispute took on two forms: one, an abstract discussion of the nature of language; the other, a debate on what forms one should use. Aristarchus maintained that one should use "regular" forms as far as usage permitted (Varro 1.e.); analogist writers make prescriptive judgments. Thus Varro, in bk 9, where he is arguing in favor of analogy (cf. 1.24, 1.7; Gellius 10), lays down laws for the use of *lusus* and *larari* (9.100-7, cf. Gellius 7.x.); Caesar not only formulates other conditions for analogy (fr. 1. Anaioli), but rules that the genitive singular of *dies* should be *die* (fr. 9 = Gellius 11.125), the genitive and dative singular of the fourth declension should end in *-us* and *-u* respectively (fr. 26 = Gellius 14.16.8) and so on.

---

1. Chrysippos Gk Χρυσίππος = Χρυσίππος 149.21 Burwick: Dionysius Gk Διονύσιος 6.276.5; Ἀριστορρ, *Hermian* (Brunner Arch. 1913, 353.6) to μοιων en τοις ἀναλοχος για τον ἕδειν ἐκείνου. (co nom or proper) ἀξιός ἐν ἀναλοχος ἀναλοχος (simplex or compound) ἀκάθαρτος ἐν ἀναλοχος (or the final vowel, ἐν ἀκάθαρτος ἐν ἀναλοχος - ἐκαθαρτος) (number - not quantity - of syllables ἀκάθαρτος singular again at v. 24), κελλία με νεῖκος (v. 16), ἐν ἀκάθαρτος ἐν ἀναλοχος (influence or consone d'appui). See Cukley 65.15 (1919)

2. Use this term in the synchronic sense of the school grammar: ficio-ficilis nicoso-nicote. **dine*-dine** dunsere-dunere are "regular," and the historically correct *fico-ficilis*
But what happens if the "regular" form does not exist? At 3.31, where he is arguing for analogy, Varro declares one should not invent it; but in book 9, where he is arguing for analogy, he maintains that it does exist even if it is not used (§ 77), and if it is invented, poets (especially grammarians) ought to use it (§ 47). In general "itaque populus universalus debet in omnibus verbis uti analogia, et si perpera est consuetus corrigere se ipsam, cum orator non debet uti omnibus uti, quod sine offensione non potest facere, cum poeta transilire lineas impari possit (§ 5, cf. §§ 12, 14, and 16-74), but on the other hand (§ 35) "neque in eo statum in omnibus verbis est sequens; non siqua perpera declinavit uerba consuetudo, ut ea aliter non possint e rTerri sine offensione mutatorum, his rationem uerborum praetermittendam ostendit loquendi ratio". It was in the first book of de analogia that Caesar, analogist that he was, warned the reader to shun the unusual word like a rock (Gell. I. 14).

Analogy thus involves one in inconsistency or else in artificiality. Anomaly respects usage, but by denying that there are rules throws out the baby with the bath-water. But if neither view be taken to extremes, it will be seen that both have their uses in the study of a language; cf. W. stein's History of Classical Scholarship p. 245; "it (so the dispute) should not be so emphasized; for there was always a lively interplay between the opposite camps, which led to a sort of reconciliation in Dionysius' book" (so the ex-1 of Dionysius Thrax). "The most

1 Quare muni non ineunus ut duci uidetur aliud esse latine, aliud grammatico sequi" (Aquilius 1. 1. 27, at the end of a sensible discussion).

2 Cf. Varro L. L. 9. 2 "sed qui in quaedo partim sequi inquit nos consuetudinem, partim sequi, non tam dissipant, quod consuetudinem analogia contradicat, quam inter se quam iei credunt".
remarkable point of contact was this: although Aristophanes' main approach was to deduce a few general rules of inflexion from his discovery of analogous patterns in the declension, he also observed with an open mind the variety of forms in the spoken language, the *sonorina*. It was just this observation of irregularity in which J arteries excelled" (cf. ib. 202-3, and for further literature 202n. 6).

It lies outside the scope of this commentary to trace the history of this quarrel; see e.g. Jolso no. 13 (1919) 24sqq; Morache *Critique littéraire*, passim. We should, however, consider Gellius's own attitude and practice. In his grammatical discussions, he respects neither grammarians' rules nor current usage, but the authority of the *mater*; he is prepared to supplement that authority by grammatical arguments, but those for him are secondary. In 5.21 his *Praena* justifies the form *puricia* by the usage of "L. Cato, q. Claudius, Valerius Antias, Baelius, P. Iulius, ...Varro" (§ 6). Then, however, the "reprehensor adscisculus aerocorvus" (§ 4), objects "tibi habeas auctoritates istas ex jamorum et Aboriginum saeculo repetitas atque huic rationi respondes" (§ 7), the ratio being the analogy of comparatives like *meliora maxora gratiora* (§ 8), he replies by referring him to the *rationes grammaticae* given by Sininius Capito (§ 10-12); adding in refutation of his opponent's ratio that according to Siminius the word was not a comparative. 1 But the main argument is the authority of Cato and the other writers cited; he could do without Siminius, but not without Cato.

In 1.9, exception being taken to Caecilius's expression "frons hic lula", Gellius retorts (§ 4), "limo...potius nos et quam audaces et quam..."
licentes sit usus qui proterve inocteque non uti illi genere
licitus, cum et ratio proportionis, quae analogia appetatur, et
uesterum auctoritates non haec sed haec proterve debere dicta esseant".
He then quotes Cato (§5); his opponent, described as a "semilactus
grammaticus" (§6), retorts "missa...auctoritates facias, quas quidem
ut habeas posse fieri puto, sed rationem dix quam non habes". Gellius
gives him an analogical argument "falsae quidem, sed quam rearguere
falsae esse tu non quas" (§7); the grammaraster cannot, and the
matter is set down; even then Gellius does not refute his faulty
argument. This shows considerable contempt for rules of analogy;
contempt also expressed at 1.5.4, where two grammarians persist in
a heated but entirely theoretical debate on the vocative of adjectives
in -ius.

In 1.7 this contempt is not present: a scribal error is suspected
in a text of Cicero (§3), but the reading futurum for futurem (sc. esse)
is explained as an infinitive §§6,8,13-14 and supported by citations
from C. Gracchus, Claudius Quarrigerius, Valerius antias, Luautus, and
Lautius (§§7, 9-12). In §§16-18 Cicero's 'in praedonum susque
potestatem' is said to be "ratione dicitur carta et proba"; the ratio
is not given, but a parallel is deduced from Luautus, and others are
said to exist in the older writers, and in Greek. The weight of the
argumentation, throughout the chapter, falls on the auctoritates.

Gellius is certainly not an analogist; but he is not strictly
an analogist either: his standard is not the "proterve", the
"homo", that all nouns in -ons -(on)tis are masculine; the counter-
examples would be sons and messis; cf. Ars Bernensis (G.M. Supp. 127.1):
"In ons quot genera inveniantur? hoc est tres: masculina femina
communia. masculina ut hic fons, pentis, nic long, pantis, nic bronis,

s; feminum ut naec, frons, frantis et io sensa, frons frantis
(Gellius specifies -tis in the genitive); communia trium generum, ut est
nic et naec et hic unus".
consuetudo, but Republican, especially early Latin, usage. But those
who go against the consuetudo have to observe certain limits: at
12.13.5, 16, Sulpicius apollinaris recognizes the supremacy of common
usage; in 7.15 a friens of Gellius's prefers quinque with usage to
quinco with analogy - although (6) he produces arguments to justify his
pronunciation.

In his actual usage Gellius adopts archaic, classical, and modern
forms: see e.g. 2.29.7n; he uses for instance the Republican subjunctive
aenat (3...7) and the modern present indicative edid (1...7.3);^1
cr.19.4.7 "edereent...sse". He does not create analogical inflections.
2 quam quidam Latine proportionem uocant: from pro portione
and turbo
Cicero back-formed a noun proportione ἀναλογία as a mathematical
term: ^2 Timaeus 13 "ill optimis aequitutur quae Graece ἀναλογία,
Latine (audendum est enim, quod haec quinta a nobis nautur)
comparatio proportione dici potest", ib. 24 "eam eam proportionem
corporationenque"; note that he feels it necessary to support his
coinage with a synonym. From Timaeus, which was written after comenica
(15.1); but when the latter appeared Varro had made little progress with
3: Cíc. Att. 1.1.3 - Varro took it over, and made or it a grammatical
term, ^3 but used it only once (18.57); elsewhere he has analogia
(though he does use proportione) likewise Quintilian, who has
proportio only at 1...3, 6.

1. Gellius is the first author to use the thematic forms instead of
those with -are. estitare and potitare in the preceding paraphrase show
that eatit and bubit are presents not perfects.
2. Used by Gellius at 1.1.15a, 2.
3. Heiffer denies that the grammatical use of ἀναλογία derived
from the mathematical; I do not see why not. proportione is certainly
mathematical in Latin; modern philologists cheerfully use the
mathematical signs for proportion, e.g. "the change from weak were
were in Middle English to strong were more in the modern language
is due to the analogy bare: bore: wear: more".
Viceroiiia's authorship of this term has, however, despite his claim been denied. Jollart (Warron, gra mairie lat. 146n.7) ascribed it to Caesar on the strength of Rompeius Cdl 5.197.21; but Rompeius is not citing Caesar's actual words. More serious is Priscian GLK 2.555.1, St esse de proportione "non esse positiones regulae a quibus interdum analogia calumniatur" (the point being the passive agent calumniatur, rendered by Priscian aut ipsis). Staberius came to Rome with Publius Syrus and the latter's maternal cousin, the astronomer Manilius, on the same ship (Clny H 35.199), and taught Brutus and Jassius, in addition giving his services free to the sons of those ascribed under Sulla (Suetonius de graam.13). This voyage will have been made in 63 B.C.; even if he was forty at the time, and wrote de proportione after Cicero published Tuscon us, he was no older then than Varro was when he wrote de re rustica (RR 1.1.).

Can we even be certain that Priscian is reproducing the work's original little?

There is no reason to suppose that Staberius anticipated Cicero in coinin' the noun proportio. 4 de perensitavit: if this were strictly used, the frequentative would denote repeated action, the aorist would fix it in a limited and now past stretch of time. In Greek one would use the imperfect: cf.

Cicero Brutus 59 "quandem in Periclit libris scriptit lupolis sessitanisse", lupolis having written καλομεταμφιηται, So Gel.

3.1.1. "pelibus etnatis in curiam" 1.1.1 "Pythagorwn philosophum non esitanisse ex animalibus". On the other hand, at 11.8.2 "Albimus...res Romana orationes (vaccsa scriptitavit)" (contrast again 10.7.1) the verb means little other than scriptit; we cannot therefore be confident that de perensitavit really does imply a long scholarly battle of book.
(Y of Ke 6 on Syr 5301, Z, p. 608)
and counter-book. We do know that Aristarchus answered Crates over one point; see next note. For frequentatives in Gellius see Knapp "The History of the Classical World"; they are very frequently used both with and without their proper meaning.

5.9 Book 6 De lingua latina as we have it does not contain these passages, but cf. 3.66:

"sic item quodiam simile est recto casu surus\(^2\) lupus lepus, rogant quor non dicatur pro portione surus\(\) lepus\(\) lepus; sic respondetur similia non esse quod ea uocemus' surus\(\) lepus\(\) lepus, sic enim respondere uoluit Aristarchus Crates: nam cum scripsisset similia esse Philomedes Herculides Helicertes, dicit non esse similia: in uocando enim cum brevi dici Philomedes [i.e. \(\Phi\,\iota\,\lambda\,\nu\,\omicron\,\gamma\,\delta\,\varepsilon\,\varsigma\)], cum longo Herculide, cum A brevi \(\)Helicerta\) in nec dicunt Aristarchum non intellexisse quod quaereretur se non solvere", that is to say, Aristarchus argued that nouns could not be regarded as similar on the strength of their nominatives if their vocatives were different.

6 With 8.68 cited above cf. Pompeius GLK 5:10.19: Caesar decided that lupus and lepus were not analogous because lupus made lupa in the feminine, but lepus did not make lepi. (cf. Servius Guia 4.435.21). All this comes to the brilliant observation that words that do not reflect alike are not analogous.

Lupus laui: or \(\)lupu laui\); for vrdah"id perfect and extended present cf. Romeo fowli, nono mou, rouco woui. Lenuai is first found in Christian Latin; neue-Jagenser 3:307.

7 cenatus sum: "cenatus" = \(\)deinob \(\)pros is common enough, but the perfect is usually cenau. See, however, Plautus Cunfo 1:6 354 "postquem".

---

1. The translators see no special point in the frequentative: Pollux "defended", opesou "au sec, but", archeo"ont dendi".
2. A very rare word whose diminutive is \(\)cenus" see Netus 364.71.51.21, 33.3.11.
cenati atque avotii, taicos posuit sibi i. manum"; Bef. A. 5.1
"consuma cenatus esset", Sal.Juc. 106.4 "statia milites cenatos esse...
iubet" (to get their dinner over). Cenatus esse, therefore, refers to
one's state after dinner or of having dine, cenasse to the fact of having
dine...

potui sum: "I am drunk" (or at least "under the influence"); potuam
"I drank, have drunk".

"aestuor" tatu et "exturgeo" et "laure", "dstruxi" et "exter"i
et "lau" dicimus: there is no evidence for dstruxor or exturgeo.
C.Gruew. 4. Ge. 10, 33 and
quasi-passive; for laur so used only (Varro's definition, L. 9.10).
The Latin verb for "wash" exists in the present-stem with the
extension (lauare) and with the thematic extension (laure);
in the perfect only laui is used; lautum (lautum) may correspond to
either present-stem, but from lauare is also formed lauatru.

In Early Latin the transitive sense is expressed in the present-
stem tenses by lauere, the intransitive "was (ones)", have a bath" by
lauare; laui and lautum may be used for either. But a different usage,
already found in the song at Flatus poemitus 210sqq, establishes itself
by classical times: the transitive sense is expressed by lauare laui,
the intransitive by lauir laubus sum, lauere drops out of use except in
poetry (where it is chiefly used in the opt. lauit; e.g. in
Vergil, who in all other forms uses lauare, but has always lauit not
lauit). 3

l. 16. 61, "lautare" Ter. 3. 93.
2. Note Curtius' artificial distinction, auctorius uero gentes 'lauere'
dica est (a uten 'lauere' non 'lauere' (ep. paes. 1. 1: 1).
3. Aut; retaet besides present: Ger. 2. 25. 1. u. grace,
however, has lauare (Carm. 3. 11. 2), lauis (Carm. 6. 26).
Varro, in a confused passage, states (as 9.106-7): "puerum nutrix lauat, puer a nutrice lauatur, nos in balneis et lauanus et lauatuir.

Sed consueudo alterum utrum cum satis haeret, in toto corpore potius utitur lauanus, in particibus lauanus, quod licimus lauo manus, sic pedes et cetera. Quare e balneis non recte dicunt laus, laui manus recte.

Sed quoniam in balneis lauror lautas suar..." This appears to mean that the replacement of active by deponent was more usual in the present than in the perfect; the paradigm lauri/lauisset occurs in C. Gracchus fr. 42 Halcovati ap. Gell. 16.3.3 where laus is in an official formula. The Early Latin intransitive forms re-emerge in Suetonius, who has "lausse" (Cajicula 21.2), "lausisset" (Dero 35.5), "lauerit" (Titus c.2), "lauebat" (Domitian 21), "lauaret" (De gramm. 13); in view of this consistent usage "lauaretur" (Cajicula 37.1) should be correcte to laueret, which lives a better coeptas with sorseret and meret. It is possible that Varro's quasi-passive paradigms represent a half-vulgar tendency to treat the perfect as intransitive (cf. reverto reverti and §9n) that did not find favour with Latin writers.

"Graec" (Graeco): in all three the adjectival suffix -(i)ous is present. In Greek the standard form since Antiochus of Syracuse (cf. Aristotle Pol. 1329b19, 1330b242) was "Omičos "Oscan", "Omicg "Oscan country", though Thucydides has used "Omainas acc.pl (6.2.4), Omaina dat.sing (6.1.5), or kι. So Latin opinos "ignorant", Cee. 21.1. that the "Oscan name was we have no idea, but if the people called themselves *Upkeis (*Upkeis) we should have a root op- extended with a k- suffix. In the
Latin for, this suffix appears in a compound form (cf. Germanic -iskan, Slavonic -islú).

Tuscom: Umbrian tuscom acc. sing. neut. (Tab. Lug. 6958,7a/7), but turskum acc. sing. neut. (ib.1b/17); clearly turs-+cas, or: tursōs;
for this last and Egyptian turṣa, see E. 6.730sqq: ἐξωροιδο probably another form of the same root. The native name was Rasi, or:

Θάλεβρα Dion. Hal. ms. R. 1.30. For the direct suffixation of
-ṣs cf. :stricasus vs.Etrumia, (cr.ustus vs.uro), Valiscus vs.Faleri
(cf.almisidus vs.alxerma),Volscus vs. 'Olescu alarmsı vs. Muscuses .

Graecus: from Traius, cr. Messapian grays (whatough n.388, cr. in: k.s.v.)

non minimus "rare": but see Ehrisius Gk. 217.6 = 200.24 Berwick:
"rare Cicero pro raro, ubi idea(s) (Statius) maximus notat Catonem
quoque ilta locunam. s d et lautus in Ruten (995); 'usurar rare
capitur'. It is also rouni at Columella (2.9.5): "nam nisi rare
conseritur name et minatun spicas fecit", where however it means
"thiny", cf. v. 1.169.2 "rare σάρις"(s)

raro: the ending -o is common in temporal adverbs: cito continuo
cr. bro raro repentino subito.

rarenter: so Cælius 3.1.1, 3.15.4, 17.3.0; for its use in Early
Latin see Lorache nos 160. It is formed on the analogy of frequenter;
Cato has "frequentem" ex.c.17.77, "rarenter" in.103; Cicero opposes"raro"
and "frequentem" (de or.3.201,postor 221).

adsentior taken rare omnes: but see Tob s.v.2.355, Hene-Jagener
3.18-20. The active is in use throughout Latin, though Cicero, Livy,
and Seneca, hardly ever use it; adsensä however, is far commoner than
adsentio. Quintilian (13.3.7) and Gellius (13.9.4, 15.12.10) treat the verb as indifferently active or deponent; at 6.3.4 Quintilian repeats Varro's information about Sisenna, but by omitting "in senatu" he misses the point. It is not that adsentio or itself was unheard-of; Sisenna varied the standard formula "adsentior illi". Cic. Rha. 7.27 "quibus de rebus referas, P. Serullio adsentior"; ib. 7.5.3. "illum ipsum qua ais, quia fiet dictum SIC. IV. IV. ? ōuropo, O. P. C. 5.10.2.7 "en surnam, dic...TVrant; DSENrvOR DE. Latina, id est. Romonicio". Sisenna said adsentio, "quasi emesiator seremonis usitatim cum esse uellet" (Cic. Brutus 259, cf. Douglas ad loc.). The fragments of Sisenna's histories preserved by Gellius (9.4.12, 11.5.7, 12.15) and others - see Peter Historicon Romorum relicuiæ 2.76-257 - illustrate his linguistic individuality, which he exercised even in the courts (Cic. Brutus 259-260) and, as we see here, in the senate.

10 in aliis libris: in books 9 and 12, cf. 8.24 "de quibus utriusque generis acclinationibus libris faciam bis turnos, prioris tris de earum declinationum disciplina, posterioris de eius disciplinae propagini ut De prioribus primus erit hic, quae contra similitudinem declinationum dicuntur, secundus quae contra dissimilitudinem, tertius de similitudinem forma; de quibus quae experieris singulis tribus tum de alteris totidem scribere ac ductat incipiam".

pro ávalor'i tua: for the dative of Greek nouns in Greek letters

1. Caper de urbibus dubisi (Cic. 7.107.9) even rules "adsentio quia usus est, hoc adsentior".
2. Voluntary (i.e. ad hoc formation) and natural (i.e. paradigmatic).
treated as an ablative see marshall 2, 10 m.s. (1960), 179.

(For several hundred years, of course, the diphthong αι had been
reduced in pronunciation to α, and ωι to ω, which helped the
construction to develop. Pronto boldly writes "in hac ελκόνε
ευ...cæs.3.6.2). For pro with gerundive of Kules with 157,
Bennett, 1646.

Thus the controversy became a controversia, as became it.
Throughout the notes to this chapter I shall cite as "indigo" J. Menneville, *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*; a far less reliable study of Greek chromatic vocabulary is R. Schulz, *Das Farbennervungs-System der Hellenen*, Leipzig 1914. Useful is W. Platschek, *Z. f. Menneville (1921) 153-62; cf. Goethe *Sämtliche Werke* 39. II. 45 (Stuttgart 1940) cited by Eiss ad loc. This is not the place to make a full investigation of the ancient peoples' colour-vocabulary, much less of their colour-perception, especially since the physiology and psychology of colour-vision are still not properly established. Suffice it to say that the Romans could apply the terms *ruber* *rubor* *rubere* to any red, orange, or yellow.

It should be remembered that the habit of associating various hues under particular general terms is largely conditioned by the objects with which one is familiar. Any modern European with normal vision will find in the spectrum three colours with a longer wavelength than green, namely, yellow, orange, and red; but it is only since the spread of *Citrus aurantium*, (the Seville or bitter orange, Persian *sing*) that we have had an object or a colour constant and distinct enough to impose itself on our consciousness as a third colour independent of red and yellow. By contrast, although we are taught that indigo is the sixth colour of the rainbow, it rarely employs the term in description, since the eye is not much used. For further discussion of colour-words in other cultures see Roger Brown, *Social Psychology* 315-6, and Reason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* 428-30.

1. Known in Europe well before the sweet *Citrus Sinensis* (which in the Middle East is called the "Forty-queen" and sometimes names the colour: *Persian zoro, Arabic *burdut*, *Indian* *burtuq*)
atque inibi: this formula occurs twenty three times in Gellius' letters; cf. -que inibi 1.3 loc., 1.5.1em; for other expressions see 2.15.1em.n. In the main text, inibi is used locally at 17.12.3, temporally at 1.8.3, 3.14.5, 4.3.8 "inibi ut piectereur inuit."

Pavorinus philosophus: Foravorinus as a Hellenist cf. 2.1.3. Although Barigazzi reasonably prints this chapter as t. 28, I am inclined to see in it a pure fiction, owing nothing to either Favorinus or Fronto (whom it is strange to find citing Virgil). See 2.1.3n, and "Notes on Seel & Orschi" and Gellius' Anecdotes." 29.

Frontonem consularem: Fronto was cos.surr. in July and August 143 A.D. (see 2.1.3 Caesar 1.9, c.4 and §4; 2.5.4; 2.9), though Ausonius wonders or affects to wonder "quibus consulibus gesserit consulatum" (grat. pro consulatu 32). For his championing of Latin in this chapter see Garborale 59ssq; Dorothy Brock Studies in Fronto and his Age, c.4. Marcone Pri(e)re. 117. He disapproves of Varro's writing in Greek (epp. Faes. 2.9.2), but wrote in it himself, and had to admit its superior lucidity in philosophical matters; de eloquentia 1.9 "praecis verbis fortasse apertius significabo".

Gellius was not formally a student of Fronto's, but a friend:

15.1 "Adulescentulus tunc, priusquam Athenas concecerem, quando erat a magistris auditionibusque obtonebatur, ad Fronto num Cornelium uisendi gratia pergebam, sermoibusque eius purissimis bonarumque doctrinarum plenis fruebar; nec unquam factum est, quotiens cum uillius loquentesque audierim, quin rectius in uere cultuores doctioresque".

Fronto's influence on his literary taste and style need no discussion here; for the possible mention of Gellius by Fronto (ad amicos 1.1.9)

T.2.3(c).aper.Sat.2.3. on G. Caecinius Messius(105.31 Dec.45.31) "hoc consecutus est seebius ut quaerretur quibus consulibus consul fuerit" (not in Sic.17.7.30).
In that chapter Pronto tells his friends to search out examples in good authors of *quadriga* singular and *harenae* plural: 

\[\text{"ita er o nunc et quando fortis erit otium quae\text{ri}te an quadrigam et harenas dixevit e cohorte illa ductat\text{ax}a\text{t} antiquiores et oratorum aliquis uel poetarum, id est classicus}^2 \text{ alsidiusque}^2 \text{ aliquis scriptor, non proletarius}^2\].

In 13.29 he praises an archaism in *Quadrigarius*; in 19.10 his friend revives and he discusses *praeteremptor*; in 19.13 he asks Apollinaris Sulpicius whether he was right to give up using *namus*, as a "sorilib... uerbum et barbarum"; Apollinaris points out it comes from *v\text{\textat}".

The question is put "ra notico cuiusiam Latino, Prontois familiari" (§4) whether it is used in good Latin of rules and ponies; the grancanarian cites it from Helvius Cinna.

**pedibus aegrum:** cf.19.10.1 "ad frontonem Corneliurn pedes tunc graniter aegrum ir. et uisere". From Pronto's letters it is clear that his health was poor; for his feet cf. I..Caesar (ep.1.2.1)"(fortune does not allow me to visit my Pronto and...) ipsum denique illum pedem quantum sine incommodo fieri possit attracere sensi. in balneo fure, in-. gredienti namu: subicere."

**uisum inquit:** for the accusative supine in Gellius (usually constructed with a direct object, cf.2.29.oh) see Bornsby lviii.§3. For *uisum* ad *aliqueam* ir. cf. 19.8.1 "ad frontonem Corneliurn uisemai gratia pergebam"(contrast 2.1"ad philosophum Taurum Athenas uisendi cogioscendique eius gratia uenerat"), 16.3.1 "ad quendam aegram inceit uisere"; so C. Fiso (Gell.7.15"ad collega. uisisse uisere aegrotum"

1. Used by Vergil, and Augustan and Silver writers generally; also by I..Caesar( Pront.ep.1.6.5) and Gellius himself(16.17, 10.1.7).

See Dadgicke in Pt. Antfa. 745n.
At 18.0.1 there is no verb of motion, "quod ab eae aegrotum non uiseret"; 
Lucilius had said "quem uiserus molueris cum debueris" (Ter. Hayn 339-40), but cf. Lucretius 12.36 "nam quicumque suos fuaretabant 
uiseret ad aegros" (avoided visiting them.) 2.359-60 "reuisit" at stabulum;
5.6.36 "et haece quia signa reuisient" 
2 quod ... forent: cf. 2.1.3. The subjunctive may be due to a literal "
but cf. 4.27. From "Historia de populo Romano deque populo roenico,
quod per ipse propendam uiuere fuerint semuli".

5 quippe qui rufus color ... appetitus est: for this construction
(where qui is the old locative) cf. Planus/Audreas 347 "quippe ego
qui muriestertius meis manibus uiminum..." (qui is here used as the
general word (classically ruber, etc. 75, cf. fén); it is properly
a dull, yellowish red, the colour of onions (Pliny 15.105; fén
etc.), and contrasted with the fuller red ruber by Pliny (4.28.6,
cf. 31.7). But at 15.109 the χοίδας or corn-poppy is said to be
flore rubeo (χοίδας δ' ἔκεν ἐν έχοδείει
Theophrastus 15.9.12.4);
since the flower is bright red, we have already the generalized rufus,
meaning "red". 1 The true rufus, colour, unlike the bright flamus,
was not admired in women's hair, being coupled in the comic poets with
marks of ugliness (cf. 7.31, 400, 12.12.4, Ter. 4.106). 2 Roman
dislike of matt colours is clear from the sinister overtones of
alter luidus lürz: correspond to our "green", but
occasionall. spreads beyond it; 17.

5 cum aliter rubeus ignis, &c: the MSS give four objects here, ignis,
sanguis, on rum, or corum, but six colours: igneus flammaeus sanguineus
Croesus ascraus aureus. (Croconvs added "aliter aurum et tr. "croconu; 
\[\text{\footnotesize [In. 1-12: Aelian Tauriae Inquines we find bears called \textit{mufrum} (152) and \textit{mufras} (1527), but these (7.93) and other (7.93) are the same beasts. (\textit{All \footnotesize [In. 21: It stood here in the Greek is irrelevant; no comic poet would have treated rufus as frights if the audience would have found them attractive.}]}\]
on this reasoning we should add "aliter flama" after "ignis", for the
two colours are not identical, cf. on ignem and flamma.

ex ipsis, do: cum here must be "alaeversativ-konzessiv"(Hofmann-
Szantyr 619), with the indicative of Early Latin(Bennett 1.141).

ignem: "La couleur du feu est un rouge vin, différent du rouge orangé".
de flamma (André 114).

sanguineum is used of scarlet (Iucan 1.125) and Lyrian purple (i.e.crimson;
Val. Placc.2.342); also of the planet Mars (Silius 2.506).

flamma: André 115-6. Tends more towards the yellows: the bride's
flamma is often described as "lux uncta". On the other hand, Valerius
Placcus has (5.360-1) "extremo iam flammea aurice corno /tegmina".

few of the distinctions here drawn are absolute: in particular we are
hampered by having largely to rely on the poets, who are not greatly
concerned with precision in such matters.

sanguineum: the meaning naturally varies with the colour of the
envisaged blood, and 115. Although one generally thinks of it as
bright red, one haematite described as "sanguineo colore"(Piny
nh 37.169) for which Theophrastus (ae lapidibus 37) has ηαματη
αι υμάτας ουόκι δυσφόρος . (In crystalline form, indeed, it often
has a blackish colour; when it is scratched, the scratch-line has the
colour of aried blood.)

crocetin: the classical ηόκος is Crocus sativus, from whose red-
orange stigmas orange and yellow dyes are made. The Greeks associate
its colour with that of gold: cf. Sophocles O3 òγοςγος ηόκος (v.Jebb ad loc.), Æaeropus Tr.14,1-15 Nauck; Theocritus 1.25-31,

1 Among the substances produced are α-crocin(C44 H64 O24), which is yellow, and crocetin(C46 H6O), which is red.
eschylus Agamemnon is not an exception, since the blood is derived from the heart, nor is predicated on the heart.

In the Latin poets' such expressions as "rubens...crocis" (Vergil Aeneid I.216) "poenicei...croci" (Horace Aeneid IV.3.5-6), partly the relic of the ancient Semitic extension of the ruber-verse, partly a reference to the stigmata (v. 3.5-6). They do not indicate that croceus can be taken as "red", any more than "red gold" in the Germanic languages implies that "golden" ever means or has meant "red".

In exception is Vergil Aeneid I.158: "...rubens...croci...". But otherwise the distinction is maintained: Lexicon II.158: "...rubens...croci...". We should therefore regard Vergil I.158 as an exception in the Latin poets' such expressions as "rubens...crocis" (Vergil Aeneid I.216) "poenicei...croci" (Horace Aeneid IV.3.5-6), partly the relic of the ancient Semitic extension of the ruber-verse, partly a reference to the stigmata (v. 3.5-6). They do not indicate that croceus can be taken as "red", any more than "red gold" in the Germanic languages implies that "golden" ever means or has meant "red".
In the fourth century A.D., however, *croceus* may be used even of blood. Bishop Potamianus (d. 357) rhapsodizes on the martyrdom of Isaiah: "mox se ut ad cubile coralis concinnamento nescio sector sollicitus derixisset, fortis fluenta purpurei laxatis unarum lapsibus, ne uenas uernaculatim pollice profanus intenderet, croceus se aratim imber infuisset, ut testa surgite sanguinis uenerima pictura non tre voce, necque miraretur quale esset unde victus erubescere coreretur* (C. T. 141 bai. xi. soberer writer, the so-called Syriam Gallus, versifying the book of Leviticus about the year 5-55, writes (*Corp. script. eccl. sat.* 23, 108, vv. 1-3: *Lev. 17:13*)

acque etiam si forte pecus uernum peremptum laxavit croceus sectis et faucibus unda...
debet terrae tegi, ne sit non coniita fraudi.

*ostrimum:* "ostrum" is the colouring-matter of the *purpurea* (Vitruvius 7.13.1), but more especially of the crimson *purpurea* dye, and such is the use of *ostrum:* Propertius 3.13.7, aurem 102-3.

*aureum:* in Augustan poets gold is *fluens*, less often *aureum*, *palidum*, but as we have seen (2. 19n), at *Carr. 4. 92-4* Vergil takes up "aesculis auro aequalitibus" with "rutilis...squamis". *Rutilis* is used of gold by the Silver poets; as we shall see (§9) there is a certain overlap between *rutilis* and *flamma* in some writers, but at *Carr. 4. 94-17* Lucan has first "fulvo genuinis rami" and then "rutilo curvata metallo". Valerius Flaccus (5.27) writes "aureus effusit campis rubor". Martial makes a "phiala aurea caclata" say (14. 95. 1) "quamvis Callaico rubem generosa metallo". Redness is particularly ascribed to gold in the
Furniss: Pliny viii 30,55 "aurique experimentum in his est, ut similis
colores rubeat ignes catque ; i.e., igne colore riat et ipsum; obassum
uocant" n. s. stine Civ. xi. 2. "nam sicut sub uno igne durilat,
pulsa rumat".

In Greek gold is not characteristically ascribed colour-adjetives;
but the colour-name of ᾱρεσία is covered by ἰνέραιας and δάκρος.

Theonis 445-50, however, declares

εἴσεξας δέ με μαθών ἐν ηζεράαειν ὑμῆρον

ἤρεσιν έμπαθιν ἦσαν, τεῦρανον βραδύν

But in neither language is "red gold" a normal form of speech.1

For the uses of aureus see num. 135-6: it is applied to the sun
(Comm. 22), the stars (Vergil ap. 160), the flames of torches
(Catullus 61.96) and lanterns (Mart. 14.61.1), and a lion's mane
(Martial 53.10). It is used of hair instead of rufus (where in
English one would certainly say "golien"); though this usage is not very
colon.

6 "Rufus" (Carrio, rufus com) enim color et ruber "nihil a vocabulo
rufi" dicuntur; so the S3. armsial accepts δι<νος> σις <żo<ark> from
Heraceus (c. 1.5.1.1). The same is occasionally
in view of the next clause this must mean "rufus and ruber do not
extend beyond the range of rufus" (nor cover all that range), but this
is very harsh talk. Heraceus proposed nūnīm (c. 12.15) for nihil,
which perhaps makes the incompatibility color/vocabulo less awkward; it
produces an old etymological series rubor > rufus > ruber, but that

1. Contrast the cliché "red gold" in German literature. Sir Gawain's
blazon was gules, a pentangle or; the charge is said to be
"ryally with red goldie vpon rese gor" (Sir G. & the greke knight 6.3,
Nowadays, however we think of gold as "characterized by a beautiful
yellow colour" (v. .) in classical Arabic; pl "is occasionally
("yellow", feminine form).
is probably a greater blemish in our eyes than it was to Gellius.

One might however, have expected dicta sunt (cf. p. 158, n. 4, Actum 7. 4, 5, & sic passim: a word has already been derived and is not still being derived.) The balance of probability therefore lies with uingenscantur.

In fact, ruber is the general term in classical Latin, russus is a bright red, though *rugg* in modern Italian the general term rosso; andré 85-1. Ruber represents Indo-European (H-)rhóros, cf. ῥέος; *russus* is a dialect form from ῥόδινος (cf. Urobian roof *rua* (razos), Germanic *ra* & ), the true Latin development being seen in the derivative *rusibus*; russus probably < *rúhos*.

Proprietates: not the *idiotres* or properties of red, but the individual shades. ῥέος is a general term for any colour from the redest orange to yellow; it includes in it *κόκκος* a yellowish colour of wine, and *πυρρός* a redish colour of hair (but also of other things). They can be distinguished: Galen 9.589-600 "\[...\]

(on A 77) δύτης ἐστὶ ἡ ῥόδινη κόκκος... καὶ πυρρά κριότητα... (Phoinix would also do) ... ἑτερα δὲ ῥώδινα διαφοράς ἐστὶ. Ῥωδινοὶ τοῖς ἡλίουσις ἐφ' ἑαυτός τοῖς πυρροίς τοῖς βλεπτοῖς καὶ φωνικοῖς τοῖς κατ' ἔτεν

See too Galen 15.109, and the note on *russus* 59.

For *κόκκος* (rightly restored by Gronovius: *πυρρός* ἐστι)."
we may consult Pseudo-Athen. 15.3.9-10: οὶ τοιούτοι ρώμοι (sc. ὅ τινες 675 ὅποιος ἄνευ κοπηκών και ὄποτε πληκτρικών)

The genuine Galen tells us at 6.35 that white wine can never become ξανθός, only ἱπροκάνθος; on the previous page he has, more loosely, equated κρέος and ξανθός.

ἐρυθρός: was not the same generality as ῥοζ, and can normally be rendered by our "red". We should, however, note Χάδνον Ῥέμφρον 1385 (copper, i.e. "red"; or the American expression "not a red cent"), and λακονίς 130 cit. above on copper: or Sermonis 2.5-12 (3.2-5 ibid.) we find ψεύδειτε ὅποιος ἐμaint recorder το ἄρχειν (i.e. the people) ἵνα θεύουσιν θεόν οὐκ οὖν μετά). On the other hand, at Thaum. aR 3.12.5 it is used of amon-blosso, which is philos: used in epic and lyric (not in tragedy or lyric; also φοινίκες > φοινικόςις (e.g.), or φοινίκες > φοινικοι). The combining-form φοινίκοι is normal Attic φοινίκος. The term covers any red, orange, or brown, but is normally used of bright red or crimson; cf. e.g. usauthius 3.10 (on Αλλα), 1.9.55 (ο Μ201), 1320.31 (ο Ψ717). It is especially associated with blood, e.g. Ψ717 αἴματι φοινικόθεσα Shield of Heracles 194 αἴματι φοινικόθεσα

Erythraea

Etymologically the word represents a confusion of the root γεῖν (as in θείνω, ἐγείρω, ἔρεσσας; hence φοινος, adjective "φοινικός" > φοινίκος 1) and the obscure φοινίκας "Phoenician".

1 Π 159 ποιητής ἐκ τοῦ φοινικοῦ ἀντικρύον φοινίκας. 2 Unless this is derived from the Phoenicians' trade in dyed textiles.
habere: as so or with habere and ἐχω, the sense is "involve".
distantias: here "different kinds", as in later authors: Cassius
Felix 35 (1.71.7 hence; he is writing in 447 A.D.) "seu tamen uestera
decus quattuor distantias sua suis vocantur habere aut ostentatur";
Hr. III. 506.15 Main "quando significat tempus; temporis distantiae
sunt duae, semper et accidens: semper et interitu, noorte; accidens
ut bellum pop. loci distantiae sunt illi, spatium et segetes: spatium
sit, forte prope: segetes ut intra cimitateamuel extra".
uel accentes... temperantes: the participles agree with "σαρόβενα et
ἐμφρόβενα...", the names are the things not being distinguished.
Here striking is "acceptiones... aut accectentes..." in §5, cf. note a lei
accentes: among the colours listed this seems most appropriate to
σαρόβενα and πορίνα; cf. §5, more pomegranate or patheus
are described as implying "exuberantissimi Athenienses...urus".
resistentes: this would most easily apply to σαρόβενα which is a
sort of yellow; cf. §4 "luteus contra rumus color est alienum...".
secta quaelis specie temperantes: for tempero "rix militae" "olerare"
see rankei: Horace 344 1.2. Here the idea is of diluting red y
mixing some other colour; σαρόβενα would on the evidence of
§5 be taken as red and green with or without white or.
other theories of colour-mixture see Plato Phæbus 67c-69a, Aelius de Nisii
Theophrastus de coloribus; Schulz 120-177.
7 ali que... inquit: cf. 1.3.11, 1.10.8, 15.10.1; 1.1.9n;
Knapp Lett 25 (1934) 7.
non inititiu... unus: cf. 1.6.6. Outside Earl, Latin and Livy, this
expression is nearly always negated save in the conc pta ubra of
Gainius in spur. 1.172 (cf. Paulsen, 319-32) "non canninitas causa
ininitias ire", where the negative goes of course with canninitas causa.

prolixior hisiorque: cr. 13.29-5 "longe longeque esse amplius prolixius
rusius" (R).

in his tamen coloribus quibus non misisti denominandis: cr. 1.3.21
"in eo quo dixi libro"; 1.23.16 "ex his quibus dixi uocibus"; 2.22.27;
5.10.5, 11.23.1, 13.43, 11.14.22, 1.7.11, 13.2.15, 19.1.21; all
meaning "cine quos" "the said, what". R. Förster de abstractione
eminenti or relative construction (Berlin, 1.6.3) pp. 11-15 times the construction
virtually limited to this sense, and even then only if the subordinate
verb's grammatical or logical subject is in the first or second
person; he therefore follows at 1.4.x in reading "In oratione ...

Tulli quae (qua VAR) pro Ca. Flancio dixit". At 5.1.1.14 VR give rightly
"in ista quae dixit tropaeedia", the subject of dixit being Favorinus;
who has just mentioned Gainius's red. The haplographic "dixit"
found in R is factually erroneous (but cf. 2.22.36n) but in Gellius
had written it he would have said "in ista quae dixit tropaeedia".

As we have seen, russels is a vivid red, rubeor a general term for
reals, sometimes also oranges, and yellows, though also capable of
meaning "bright red" as opposed to rubus. Rubus is a brown colour or
a fairly dark yellow, flavus similar but lighter; the two terms
overlap about the golden yellows. Rubius is a blackish or brownish red,
p obstruct scarlet, shading towards orange; rubius an intense red or
orange, overlapping with flavus; ancus yellow to orange; spadix is
used of horses and means "bay". These statements will be amplified and
qualified in the ensuing notes. Other terms not discussed by Fronto
include ruficatusus (for which see_INDEX 78-9; normally an intense
and bright red, luridus (dull yellow).

callationes... aut acuentes eun: if we were on our best behaviour
in distinguishing names from things, we should translate "denoting
that it is intensified". But we are quite often not on our best
behaviour; it may be noted that Karache, writing in a language far more
insistent, or pedantic accuracy than either Latin or English, is quite
ready to write "...sont des noms de la couleur rouge, qui, ou bien la
renforcent et l'embrasent pour ainsi dire..."

cientes eun quasi incandescentes: i.e. poenices putulus spaliix (6)
for "quasi incandescentes" or. ignesco "ignae colorae fio". The text,
however, needs correction by inserting et before quasi (Gronovius;
Karache's translation); alternatively we may suppose, with Hertz,
that "quasi incandescentes" is interpolated. Since of the seven names
listed here six are covered by these participial expressions, we should
add after incandescentes something corresponding to utens and parallelism:

uel committantes &6. Mussen's aut incandescentes gives the right idea, but
is too short for the sentence, unless we delete "quasi incandescentes".

on colore unill incandescentes: whence Plautus §11.

onere incandescentes: giving rubiceus §14.

uirenti sensum abo illuminantes: to produce flammus §12. Vires senсим
= "grecis., vireto"; Karache remarks "ou l'âme croissent d'un clair
aux reflets verts". For sensum in Cælius see 2.7.15r.

9 poenices: also poenicos. With short i; adapted from φαοικδσ
with accented l-o-nic, which in eel sometimes replaces it.

Rather less general than the Greek word, it denotes bright red (for
59-60), but in ovid shades off into orange (cf. on croceum §5),
and when applied to horses means "bay", sqauix (with Cælius here
or Servius on Vergil Georg. 3.02).

rutilus: a similar colour to ruinis, but brighter. As applied to hair it
stands to flauus as πυρεος to ʃαυος; but as in Greek
the distinction is not always observed. German hair was redder than
Gallic, and Suetonius tells that Caligula, wearing shift for Germans
to lead in orange, selected the tallest Gauls he could find "comitique
non tantum rutilare et suo literare oman, sed et seriques Germanicicum
adiscere et non sa barbarica ferre" (Caligula 47.1), but Manilius
says more loosely ( .715-6)

flaua per ingentes surgit Germania partus,
Gallia vicina haerit est incesta rubore.

Housman ad loc. cites Galat. 15.16 (Germans are strictly πυρεος
not ʃαυος ; or rutilare in Suetonius, and Strabo 7.230 (Germans
exceeded Gauls in fierceness, size, and ʃαυος ; or flauna in
Manilius), together with other overlaps of flauros and rutilus applied
to hair; and Lucas L.14.1-151

hacc Libycos, pars tam flauros gerit altae crines
ut ... Rutilis Caesar Rheni se it at in arsis
tam rutilas uidesse conies.

For rutilus and flauros overlapping in other contexts see Anæl 07;150.

9-10 squix: cf. ʃαυος "que... colorum nec sicuti uix, poeniceus... uicinus,
Graeci partim φωινικα... uili σπάδινu appellant,qnmonia valiae
tenes ex arbore c.uctu ansulsiu speuix uexitur" (the subject of the
chapter is Sæius's horse, described at ʃ3 as colose poeniceo; "trobus"

1.1 Verro 7.65 "ince etiam miliores ualue ruinius rutilae dictae";
see too Fisett-Hubbard on Horace Carm. 5.4,9.
2. In Cicero's augaeae (322,412) it means little more than clamus, am so
again in late Lat.
3. With the expression equus Seianus cf. Varro L.R.3.2.7 "metuo ne pro
uilia exam in litore Seianas aedis".
admit it we can not meet the lowers.
on Vergil Georg. 3.52 "Siciliam emam Rhetam, quam Gracchi φοίνικα appellan. uocant οπαδικα". We have no Siceliot or even Doric evidence for this word, and no Greek evidence at all for its use as a colour-word, for horses or anything else; the verb- form οπαδίζοντας "having wounded on the back" occurs in Herodotus (5.25). The quantities are established by οπαδίκα Nicander Alg. 522, cf. Vergil Georg. 1.52, Grattius 532.||| uocici: or Servius on Vergil Aeneid 7.769 "secundis Doricos", cited by marsham; bachasm (on Lucretius 5.85) had attacked this usage as a solecism.

In rutilus: mere 132-6 a darkish (but not dull) yellow, shading towards brown; sharing common ground with rumous, cf. eum acet. 9.36 "inque uice... rumus tacet flavescit herenae". It is also the standard Augustan epithet for gold, cf. aureus §51, and below.

Rutilus agulis: Vergil Aeneid 11.75. So in Cicero's harium

munita fulva Louis armauia visa figura

(cita de lexibus i.e.; for the story cf. liv. 1.456).

jaspis: Vergil Aeneid 4.261. There are in fact yellow and brown

Pliny NH 37.118 "et Dissauades... 5.142) speak of the smoke-coloured jassar"

jasper: in N 37.118 smoke may be fulvus (Lucr. 6.468, Dirce 38) and of Pliny NH 37.148 "Fumatum et lucrum... Introducere... candida reducta... in hic generis capris... caprides".2

Galvus: Aeneid 7.628 "fulvusque jaspis plena galeris".

lumus: AE 7.275 etc. See ante 361; not only is fulvus the commonest epithet for gold, but fulvus and aureus, like fulvus are alternate within the same formula.

harmon: at 5.374. 69; andre' 361. Augustus is the standard epithet for aura, but rumous is also found (cf. Ovid Met. 9.36, quoted above).1. That is, Zeno, Stal, as throughout the Verstines.

2. Cfr. Servius on Vergil Aeneid 4.261 "dict etiam Plinius in Naturali Historia multa esse iaspidum genera, in quibus etiam fulvum commemorat" (OS 658) "hac et Didymus et Nicander affirmant") Pliny does not use the word fulvus in his omission
leonc.: 2.722, &c; mar' 360. Again the standard ethit; the same
appears as rutila (Catullus 63.8), flāua (Statius Thea.4.154),
aurea (Martial 1.55.10).

aere ānīno: Annales 454 Vulson. At 13.4.1 it Gellius tells us that in
the eighteenth book of the annals Ennius wrote aere āłíua; if Gellius
wrote āluiā here it will have been trivialized. Syntactically and
rhythmically aere āluiā will have reproduced Ἱέεες πολύς
used in Homer for clouds that confer invisibility; note that Cvid
(Her.3.173) speaks of Juno as aueaque recomplexμve (cf. Virgil
Aeneid 12.791-2).

12 For flāua see māre 128-132. It is similar to flāus but lighter,
overlapping with rutulius (§ 9n, Housman on Catullus 4.716).

Tronēs Ceanus: Vergil Aeneid 5.309 "flāuque caput noctentur aulxāa".

Aesculapius verse 617 ἀε.ο.φς ζχαλας καρφς εἴωθς πέρα

Pindar Olymp. 1.13 στεφανός χρυσᾶς ζχαλας Ναυ.1.17 χυμοπυδν

φάλανσ ελαξινος mił. 152: "Au soleil... le vis-à-vis l'ile de
l'olivier prend des reflets dorés, effet amplifié par l'intensité des
rayons perçant à travers les feuilles"; this is easier, given sunny
countries, than Henry's explanation (Aeneid 5.9) that flāus
refers to the yellow pollen broadcast by the olive when it flowers;
for this, however striking, fails but in the two months of May and June.

1 Gellius cites Ἱέες βαθεῖον (from Homer ῥ ῥ). Both refer to
such lists; the former runs

τίνι δ' ἐν Ἑλλάδι ἐξ Κύπρου ἠποστάθη ἦς ἐκατοτέρω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀριστοτέρου
δῶρον μᾶλλας τε θεοῦ, ἐκδοθέντα δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἑλλήνης
τείς τεν ἐπερα οἰκονόμης δῖος ἔχοντας διος ἐυλαττόμενον οἰος
ἐν Κύπρῳ χαλατίῳ, τεί πρὸ ἡερα τίτα βασιλείᾳ.

"
13 acuAuu i'ulua 331. It implies silt in the river: "Les cours d'eau italiens, au parours montagneux, le torrent torrentiel, à crues brusques, charrent les limons jaunâtres, comme il reste beaucoup des cours d'eau eumènes."

fulvus fulvus: maré 301. Cænus 315 "purus fulvus uolat", Si 1: 325; other colours are also found.

quoting sans incendiatami: cf. Herod. Circes 600, who cites other examples of Cænus's aesthetic or ethical reasons for remembering and rejects them on account of his inability to recall some facts and names (2.24.1, 3.5.1, 12.11.7). As in this were not just now our memories worked!

cedo...quiritinae: Racuvius 14. For some reason, Marshall lets these three trochaic septennarii be printed as prose.

lychnis: Racuvius no doubt wrote lupeis.

14 rubicins: maré 76-80. Use of worn leather (Flatus Stichus 230, Cæsar, cf. 71.31-205), toast (Flatus Casina 310, cf. Isidore Orig. 9.1.4.15) and a drunkard's face (Acusenius Vitellius 17.3).

nigrum: "nctis nigror" was probably used by Cænus, cf. Racuvius 14. Lucilius 299 Marx (cf. his note ad loc.). The noun occurs again at Lucretius 6.39; but Cæsar 2.11.12, cited in the dictionaries, in fact uses nfrctina.

luctus is roughly synonymous with crocus: it may be used of pure yellow but also of the dun or the fieshel. Anc. 151-2. In Catullus 1.194-5: "alba part sacris uelut / luteasque paganar" it appears to denote the very 

1. has "purum coctus"; less plausible than Isidore's "ratoctus et rubefactus".

2. Partenice would seem to be the partenion or leucanthus of Pliny.
red orange or corn-poppy; Ellis suggested a reference to the glauceum (Dioscorides 3.60, Pliny 27.33, cf. Columella 10.163); the colour-contrast would then be as in Cæcilius 66.151, "nullēbat crocina camēdus in tunica", cf. App. Verg. Grief. 9.12 "luteae uioiae minih / lactaeque papauer" (for the luteae uioiae cf. the discussion of Coq. 1. s.v. croceum § 3).

17 πυρινίας quidem color: when used of colour, uviolis can nearly always be rendered "green"; but note Ovid. d.ores 2.10.39 "uirēques britanicos" which is normally described as caeruleus (Caesar B. C. 5. 2, "o nes uero se Britanni autro inpectorato, quos caerule... ehit colorum"; Hirtai 1. 351.1 "caeruleis... vitamis"). Uviolis can occasionally be used of green; thus annus Ann. 566 "per caerulea lactaeque prata"; e. "caeruleus exuandis" Propertius 4.2.12, Prop. 4. It is also used of grey-green in the olive: Lucretius 5.1.71, Ovid ...2.57v, Lanillus 5.260; cf. Juvenal 11.144 "nomine quicenat olivae", Sophocles 407.701 γλαυκός ...φόλλω ἔθέλεις. For γλαυκός... ἔθέλεις see § 111.

The claim that Greek has no more words for green colours than Latin is somewhat rash; but one might object that χλωρός and ὑπάτος can also mean "yellow" or simply "pale" (χλωροτέρες ἐς πολύς / ἄργυρος Ζρηβάη 51.1.22 ΛΕ) and that πόσις and the darker πόσις are derivative. If the blues and the greys are to be included we have πολύς and the derivative 

It may also mean "fresh, lively". cf. 2.3, 1.
a nobis: "by you Greeks", favorably. being culturally a hellen.

13 γλαυκός in Greek covers the range of blues and greys (cf. es. Plato Timæus 53c), but may also mean "bright, shining"; its association with the sea suggests it can include green within its scope, but probably only sea-green, which does not seem to have been associated with other greens. J. Behre and H. Oberg, Indexgre 1962-1964, argue that γλαυκός can never be shown to signify "green", but that our present passage caused glaucus to bear this meaning in later Latin, so that the medical term γλαυκωπα, rendered in Arabic as sura ("blueness"), as in mediaeval Latin aurilaqua (see above). It is certainly found in Latin authors before Gellius or various green colours in the vegetable kingdom: locum 257 "glauco pampino", Vergil Geor. 1.162 "glauces saucies", and 1.405 "harumina glauca"; and quite frequently of olive-leaves. Here, however, there are overlaps with caulis (cf. aequa 1.14, and Vergil Geor. 2.43 "glauca catenae fronde salicata"); more comments (p. 77) "Je te redis que l'or et lais fant dommages à tout, que leurs couleurs correspond a des ombres et du lâthier. L. grec, les semblantes correspondances existent entre τολιος et γλαυκος."

1. Sprak- och litteraturhistoriska studier, Uppsala; the article in question is in English.

2. A not dissimilar range of meaning attaches to exist and Irish glas "blue, green, grey" (related to the Celtic word for wood; holder _łecitische Sprachschats s.v. pl.: st.). Many languages have one word for the blues and greens of the sea, or of field and sky: Chinese 藍 (reding dial "6'0") = Japanese ko: korean phy: "is blue/green". (The character is also read се in Japanese and cheery - c'heorema - on korean, representing the Chinese work, for which s. also Victor von Strassmair, Turms, das chinesisch, "Einführung in die demonstrating 1939, 1934-35"). For Persian and Arabic usage see H.C. All A history of medieval theory 1-4 in J. 11.127, 21nh, 22nd; the Green Zone (ibid. 1, 9, 10), the kulture, are in fact covered with turquoise tiles (as an informed by eye-witnesses that the retiling of 1911 has not affected the colour).
In our present passage, Gellius cites Vergil Georg. 3. 51-2

honesti
spaliex glaucique, color dextremus alius
et ilius.

Despite line 178, this refers quite clearly to the colour not of
eyes but of coat; the horse is a grey. (See also the long
discussion by Verlière on Cætius 503, who renders "pompeii
ocelli", dapple-grey.)

notiores Graecae: in fact glaucus had been used in Latin verse since
Accius 237R and Lucretius 1.719; it is not found in prose before
Columella and the elder Pliny.

imposito Latine: indeed, we do not find cærul(e)us used of horses
save at Ov. Fasti 4. 155-6

bene uinct et uiscis putrumםוכותותתאתר
rēnaque caeruleis in suas portat equus.

But the horses being Pluto's, "caeruleis" means "black"; see André
16. 73 and compare Cic. inuest. Gigantomachia 1. 63

rex ipse silicium
letaque uicitur curru, lucaque tinctos
insitam uicitur equi, trempique uelatu
spissas caeruleis nubes e n rubus offens.

19 cæsia: "having light blue eyes". The adjective may be used
either of the eyes or of their possessor;1 for the former cf. Cic. or. 467
1. 63 "cæsis oculis minerae, caeruleos esse neptuni".2 Such eyes were
not adorned in women: Terence H 3. 100-1. "rubrique illas virgines/
cæsia.

1. Divine or human save Catullus 15. 7 "cæstio leoni(γὰλαυκόον 172,
held, 350, in fact "flashing-eyed")".
2. Neptune's eyes are sea-blue; cf. Hesiod of Oracles 350. Limocius
Felix has the paradoxical "aetus glauces oscalu, minera cæsia"(41.5)
haeus 1. 1. 6 finds no difference: ἦ τοῦτο γὰλαυκος (sc.
ὶ ἀτρόμωτος) ἐν χρυσὸν καὶ ἑπτακοίλης ἐν ἀλβήνης. Whether γὰλαυκος οῖς ἄτρομα
originally meant "blue-eye/ grey-eye" it seems is not the point.
sparso ore, aitnco naso? non possam, pecur. 1 Lucretius's lover is
more robust, likening his lady to Minerva: "caesia 'Fallulium'"
(l. 161).

Lucretius's etymology (fr. 74 Swoboda) is interesting as evidence
that the Romans did not know that caeruleus was derived by dissimil-
ation from caelulius, like musculus, caeruleus like aeneus being
due to recharacterization. Pliny NH 19.24 "uilia super et colore caeli,
stellata" is inconclusive, since Pliny strives for chromatic precision;
unlike his frequent derivative colour-words. On the other hand,
no evidence that the etymology was recognized can be extracted from
"caeli caerulea templa" (Nh. 19.24), "caeli caeruia" (Lucretius
1.105, 80).

20 exsuscitatus: = "uile ciratus"; Seneca contr. 1.2.17, Gell. 1.5.15.
absque te uno: ...2.2.7r.

The quotation from ψ332 is unhappy, the κερ. destroying Favorinus's
reading. The original refers to diemus causing caelulius in the
chariot-race:

21 The citation is amnes 39, 5 Venlen. Friscian 6.II 2.171.11
"etiam hoc sale Em.ius protulit in XIIII annalibus
caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate puls..."
* Or rather as Dr. Houghton says, 'it shallow water the churned-up surface would appear tawny or yellowish, whilst the spray in the sunlit waves by contact have a bluish-green tinge, brown-yellow leaves and clean, fresh water.'
The question "utrum in alerum saliturus fuerit" decides the point in favour of Frisian's sale; Gellius will have been working from a corrupt text. Cieruleum sale will be the spray from the blue salt water, but viewed from above (as from a ship) that water may be mcitor fil.Adam, the bottom shining through. 25 spum.ass...appellant: Gellius, then, anticipated Vanini in punctuating after more in Job; I see no reason why we should not, more naturally, set the stop at the end of the line.
CHAPTER 27

Sallust was a fashionable author in Gellius's day; the straw
metaphor of R.4, who claimed to have penetrated his very blood
and marrow will, if he did not exist, have been a very plausible
fiction: Fronto admires and constantly quotes him; it is high praise
when he tells Caesar that his latest νεόνιον is worthy of
Sallust himself (Caesar 3.12.1). It is possible that the
epistles ad Cassarem senem were forged about this time (Syne
"Sallust" 300-1, 327, 348).

Gellius has a high regard for his style: "elegantia orationis
Sallustiueror quoque flaginab et novam studiis" .15.1,
"Sallustius quoque praeclaram in aerum refinantium" 10.6.18;
and several times cites him as an authority on usage. On the other
hand, so difficult an author (cf. Fronto de orat. 1) one needs
explaining (3.4, 3.1, 1.20, 1.4) and has enemies (1.15.1)
including Pollio (10.2.1), were Gellius is obviously no more able
than Castricius to comprehend the mind of a fanatic, and hence does
not relate the criticisms.

Larsen, however, supposes that Gellius had reservations on
the educational utility of Sallust on account of his sexual mis-
behaviour as reported by Varro ap. Gell. 17.18 ("orumages \'on
nervorum", 575 sqq.). But surely what interested Gellius, as it would
1. His work, explain why, are written in imitation of Sallust's
historical style, quite inappropriate for political pamphlets
(Ad. Braenkel 391-41, (1951).195-7 = K. Seiler 151-7); a forger
at this time would not be so sensible of the point. For an
examination of the letters' language see now W. Lebek "Verba
iusca" (Vandenhoecck Reprecht, [Essingen 1970], 340-2, who finds
several usages difficult to
Sallustian authorship; statistical method, indeed, suggests that ep.2 is too archaic - too
"Sallustian" - to be Sallust's, even apart from the genre-difference.
interest anyone, is the alleged contrast between high-toned principles and dissolute practice; not to mention the humiliating consequences of that practice. Gellius quotes another such bit-bit at 7.1.5, but it makes no difference to his admiration for the elder Scipio: "I. i.

"Scipio, piacit antiquior quanta uirtutum gloria praestiterit, et qua rubet altus unius atque magnificus, et qua sui conscientia subnixus, patrum rebus qua uiritque fecit decennium est".

Why should he then have thought any the worse of Sallust—no one unlike Scipio is being judged as a writer, not as a man—for having allegedly been caught in bed with Kausta? I suspect he felt amusement, not disapproval. As for educational utility, the primacy, in Gellius's estimation, of literary over ethical values is amply demonstrated by 12.2.1-14; see Frodsham, "Notes on Gellius's aims and values", p.20.

Apart from fleeting references to Casarius, most in "Amic. correspondence," 1 Casarius is shown to us only through Gellius, his pupil (1.22.1). In 1.6 he decries "etelius Facundus" for being honest in his speech on marriage; in 2.13 he uncovers a tautology in C. Gracchus; in 13.22 he reproaches senators for wearing slippers. From this testimony Karneh (i.e.) concludes a fanatical right-winger who adorns the only dogs Gracchus and Sallust.

In fact 1.6 is very similar in tone to 1.3, where Gellius

1. Amic. 2.2; opening words of C. P. A. Plutarch 1).
2. Facundus is "Facundus" according to Gellius; but it is hard to believe this is not the classic speech read before the Senate by Anakrates (c. 500 BC). Schäfer, "Die Sitten u. sicht. (Jensoren) 72-3; note how 69).
Gellius certainly dates Facundus in 7.11, 185, 11.6, 1-14, 17.2-7. If, however, this is Facundus, we should note that Sallust fully recognizes his great writer (especially Jug. 4.5.1 "magna et sapiens dirum ruisse coeperit"; Syne 151, 55-6.)
defends Cato's speech pro Requienses against the criticisms of Tiro Tullius: e. 6.17 "'alter inquit 'securum fui ecce, alter rhetor'" sed ut a senatore et consulari et consorci uirum quid optimum esse publicum et ausinhabat sumente, non ut a patrono caesaris pro reis dicente". There is no need to see in either passage more than the normal Roman admiration of antique uprightness.

Castricius in 1. 14 finds Paul with Gracchus's logic; but he is quite right, and his criticisms are couched in the most respectful terms: § 16) "'haec ego inquit 'sensum non ut C. Gracchus audidit vale, sed utiam meliorum mihi! nam si quicquam in tali fortis facultae iuicii us. erroris esse null potest, id non et dicituritas eius excitatur et usitas consumpsit - sed utiam amicitias ..." (not to put some above sense). If that is radius optimae ipsius, what was the unbiased man supposed to do - suppress the matter? Castricius after all was teaching rhetoric: it was not easy to point out faults as well as virtues, and he praises Gracchus in terms that Cælius never uses; who indeed regards him as overrated (12. 3).

As for senators casual, shed, the traditional austerity that inspires Castricius's remarks had never been an optimae preserve. Which was the mere aestivus, varis or sullae?

Thus the pillars of the structure crumble; yet we light prodigia have undermined the foundations. That relevance, even emotional, had Republican faction-rights to the contemporaries of "cairian and Antoninus plus? The historical sentimentality that there was attached to the republic, not to the optimates or the populares.
To unlikely a bias must be justified with far stronger arguments than these.

This content, therefore, to take the criticism in this chapter at face value; it is won, but the error as one that a man of peace and reason is very liable to make. Castricius has failed to empathise in Sertorius's fanaticism.

Demosthenes 13 (as corona). 67.

Mercurie strangely mis-translates "pourvu qu'il y ait le reste de sa vie dans l'honneur et la gloire", as if 
were ; it is of course equivalent to with the rest of his body".

Salustian brevity and fondness for the verb "patre" suggest the further conjecture...

"nobilis peregrina cognita obuenere quanquam ad alios incelebrata" (cf. Tac. 1. 67. 5).

For prime of non-temporal of primam... quin at Cat. 3. 2.

... whether the error occurred before or after

Gellius, he cannot tell. For the omission of "erat" in Augustus 49. 5 "primo dubius...nulli"

Cited by Jonas on Tertullian 3. 401.
dehonestamentum: so *Hut. 1.53. 22 Haur: Lepidus calls Rufidius "ancilla turpis, omnium honorum dehonestamentu". Tacitus alludes to our passage at Hist. 4.13 (for the word cf. Hist. 2.67, A.12.4) for Lepidus's phrase see Annal. 16.7.16, 23.22p.15.2. The word is also used by Seneca (const. 10.3) who also coined honestamentum: e.g. 66.2, cf. Apuleius apl. 4.21, col. 1.265, Ps.-Call. ep. 2.15.2

C. Gracchus has used dehonestamentum (CNP fr 43) of Apuleius apl.

3. 3.

3 "nemo ...ultra naturae humanae omnium est dehonestamentum corporis inactari?" no, it is not. As far as Sertorius is concerned, Plutarch tells us that having lost an eye in the wars: *απειρούντα ἔποιεσαν δὴ θυσίαν* (Sertorius 1.2) Plutarch is here independent of Sallust (November ms 79, Suetonius, Dio, Justin 13.10). (Ant. Sall. vol. 19-20)

There is in the Vatican Library a copy of the 17th Bipontine edition with English AS notes by Dr Charles Williams; in these it is remarked of our passage:

"This is certainly an infinite expression; but it may easily be imagined, that those whose characteristic is an ardent love of glory, can receive satisfaction, and even delight, from the incidental circumstances providing that glory, though occasioned by wounds, loss of limbs, and such like accidents. what is related by Stobaeus 2 of the Persians appears at first sight a remarkable and not to be accounted for species of this propensity in the human mind. It is related that the Persians, when ordered to be beaten severely by the

2. Stobaeus 1.2.25 (P 159 W-H) of *Museus* br. 1.13.3:
3. Principal of Jesus College Oxford, 1858-77, then president of Magd. in 1877-81. Two grandchildren; Edward W. P. C. and M. J. D. W. In life President of the college for music establishment by Mrs. Loder (see note 2.27).
commands of their sovereign, expressed the greatest joy, that they should at all have a place in the remembrance of their master.

Our Saviour also tells his more intimate disciples to rejoice and be exceeding glad, when for his sake they suffer persecution from the world. All of which, when reduced from figurative to common language, seems to mean no more, than that in all possible cases of injury or suffering, the silent but emphatic testimony of a good conscience, and acting from a sense of duty, must communicate a satisfaction not to be diminished by any external impression".

The final rationalization is perhaps more appropriate to Sertorius; but it will be recognized that it is possible for a man to rejoice, however irrationally, over the itself disagreeable cause of a delightful effect. So was it with Sertorius. *notionibus laetitia dicitur exultatio quaedam animi et hominum effervescence eventu rerum expetentiae; one might render εἰρήνη θεοῦ ἐκ ποιῶν ἢπόκρισις ἐπὶ τῶν ψυχῶν χαὶς ἀφανεία ἐνπειρίγεται διὰ μὴ βιωθηθῆναι. We are in Stoic waters: *Diogenes Laertius 7.14. ἡ θεωρία ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτάξεων ἢπόκρισις ἐπὶ ἀφανείας ἐν μέλιπαντι διὰ τῆς ἐπιτάξεως. The equivalences laetitia = ἡ θεωρία, gaudium = ἥπαξ, one of the three εὐδαιμονία or constantiae; ἡ θεωρία ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιτάξεων, one of the four πάθος or perturbationes. Cicero Tusc. 4.13 "nam cum ratione animus moventur placide atque constanter, tum illius gaudium dicitur; cum aitem inaniter et effuse

1. Matthew 5.11-12. "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, even so as they have persecuted me and my apostles, and the prophets, who were before you; Rejoice, and be exceeding glad".
animus exsultat" (cf. "exaltatio quaedam animi" here) "tum illa
laetitia gestiens uel minia dici potest, quam ita definiunt: sine
ratione elationem" (cf. Alexander of Aphrodisias on Aristotle, Iop.
ll.2-21, 1.4.4. S. Sca.1). See also Cic. ib. 5(4.c.vs-anthonius
κατὰ παθήσειν 1.5 (p.12 Keuttner with n.1) and Galen 4.366 f.(un);
Arnim 3.377-4.20, 431-442; Keuttner p.22.

It is probable that Gellius, writing up this criticism, added
this definition from another note, taken from a Stoic source. Gellius
was not a Stoic, but uses Stoic material (cr.2.7), and takes
considerable interest in Stoic doctrines; yet he is closer in
spirit to Herodes Atticus, who can demolish a pseudo-Stoic by citing
Epictetus (1.2) and also argue against the Stoic ἀλήθεια (19.12).
si similis: Neubauer omits this passage (p.43), citing only 9.9.15,
17.5.11.

4 sinceriusque et the unwelcome8 attachment of -que to the first
member is eliminated by Hosius's "sinceriusque simpliciter que";
likewise, at 16.2.1 "indecus esse disputandique (io. atque
rationem non tenere" Hosius suggests "indecus inscripere"; cf.
indocte et inscite" 19.8.12. The two passages, however, may be
taken as supporting each other. Intolerable by contrast, is
"senatusque populusque Romanius" 5.6.10, where the first que
was rightly deleted in the recentiores.

praec: as a causal proposition, used by Cicero, Caesar and Livy,
only in negative or virtually negative contexts, but this rule is

1. Because unusual in Gellius: it is perfectly good Latin;
   cf. 53.5.15.
   Hefenbrink
not known in early Latin; cf. Liguus Andronicus fr. 16 Fermel

icitur damnum Vliri fæx fritx præ purore².

Suetonius, who often anticipates the rhetors in verbal usage², has "cum periclitatur quadrum præ pudore ex continencia repessisset" (24.2.32.5). En reweeks, the early writers always use it as here, with a noun denoting state of mind or feeling; classical Latin neglects this limitation (cf. also Suetonius (24.30.1 "praec tumultu"), producendo as Audobrandus had conjectured in the Justinian edition of 1513; producendo, Vp ed.pr., producendo some recentiores, closer here to the true reading. As such part was threatened, Philip bode

Fortune iux and waste it; a noble image. For producere used of wasting what is not, or was not, one's own. cf. Ollust Hist. 1.55.17 "hisi Vettius Pices et scriba Cornelius illa bona prodogerint"; for ἐποίημα produco profundo in the context of courage see hisber-huther or Ovins Ep. 1.12.38. It is a pity that Hosius, Hermse, and Marshall, suppress the reading now established by no authority had already been conjectured; Hosius and Marshall do not even mention the reading producendo, which is surely not irrelative to assessing these manuscripts' value (cf. p.59 n.2).

but atque concordio: coupled by Cicero (2. Ver. 2.6, 9.101a) and other writers.

collabor.; cf. phils. 1.3.10 "Rerum exterrum sunt ea quae eam aut fortura accidera possessi: senex edificatio limit e potestates glori e omnes aminit et qu e iunius nege sunt et his contri" (cf. ib. 3.14); Ollust Jus. 41.6 "penes eosdem ser rium prœci nes maecist us glori e triumphantique erant".

1. ρ. 297 και τοι ὁ δημοσιος τη ανανήψε και πιλον ἑτος
2. Suetonius editions noted in this commentary; Rome ed. Cerami J. (1928); Rome ed. Cerami J. 2.1.2.89, p. 180, 185, 155. De Virre ed. (2.11.1, 21.4, 19.1, 18.17, 14) jurors (1928.2.25.7 p.297)
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Lemma: quae terra moisset: cf. 2 "ubi terram moisset senserant muntiatum erat." 1 "terra moisset multari solet". The intransitive active is also found with terra at Livy 35.40.7, 40.59.7, Suetonius Caes.

22.2, Tertullian ad loc. 40.2; in all these passages the earthquake appears in its quality of promptum in Roman religion. In view of hastas mortias moisset in the SC of 99 B.C. (Gell., 2.2) we may suppose that the official phraseology used moisset: Elsewhere, however, moisset was employed: Lucretius 667, Ovid Met. 15.344; Seneca by 6.1.1, 6.21.2, c. 27.3 (cf. Plin. 6.20.3) in none of these passages does Roman religion play a part. For moisset moisset in general see Liv. 8.154.9-7c.

non modo his communibus hominum sensibus opinionibus compertus, sed ne inter physiocras quodem philosophias satis constitit: we should read <non> compertum, or else with R. Klaasch incompertum: non modo may anticipate ne...quidem only if there is a common predicate: 1-5 1.61-4. philosophas is here a genuine plural "philosophical systems"; at 1.1.15, 5.5-6, it means "philosophical studies"; so Plato Theaetetus 172c οε ει ταść φιλοσοφίας πολλα δει λεγεγενταres. cf. Trosinian 8.7 "non indici geometrias critica et theologias seniit". his communibus hominum sensibus opinionibus: the opinions of hom-in-one-strat around us, based on their own limited knowledge and understanding"; cf. Aule de Orat... 12 "ab imperitoria intelligentia sensuque diciugatu." The phrase communis sensus is discussed by H.J. Thompson, JR 34 (1920) 21; for the meaning "what all men can perceive by their senses" that we have here cf. Aristotle meta phil.

For Seneca it is a true passive, cf. 64 c. 1 quae terras moisset quid sit quod terrae ab infimo moisset". So too for Lucretius.
17.7.11, imitating Gellius’s language, ascribes this view to Anaxagoras, cf. Gellius 3.15.4, Diogenes Laertius 2.2; but Aristotle (365a19) and Seneca (6.9.1) report differently: Anaxagoras held that earthquakes were caused when the earth was struck from below by aether (so Aristotle) or the fire dart in clashing clouds (so Seneca). The early history of the theory here advanced, that earthquakes are caused by winds entering the earth, can best be read in Seneca: it was propounded by Archelaus (6.12; Sicleis-Anax 60 A 16a); with the refinement that the encircling waters trapped the winds it was accepted by Callisthenes (6.2.4; Sicleis-Anax 12b.15) as explaining the destruction of Helice and Coris in 372 B.C. Aristotle imputes earthquakes to the ἄνευ μακαχος Τον ἐκ βούτακα σταγιάζουσα υδάτα χαλάσαι... etc. and elsewhere; but as an alternative to winds engendered in the earth and other theories, from what geography Gellius (or Statius Theb. 7.10.1) derived his alternatives it is impossible to say. An aquarius... finctuibusque: Thales held that the earth floated on water (Sicleis-Anax 11 A 14,15) and hence explained earthquakes (Sen. 6.6.1; Gellius 3.15.1); this conception is already implied in the semantic
epithets for Poseidon Ἠραῖος θεὸς Ἦρημος ἔρημος (cf. next note; whether a particular ὅποιος was aware of this does not matter).

Democritus held that the earth was full of water, which when swollen by rain burst out (Aristotle 365b1-6), and that winds might cause subterranean storms (Seneca 66.20.4); Epicurus too suggested this as a possible cause (Seneca 66.20.1); so too al-Jasam ibn Bah. 164.

but the Stoics too, according to Aetius 3.15.2, say ἁλειψάσθαι ἐπειδή ἐτη Σωφρονίκην ἔκπληξαν: and Seneca is favourably disposed to the theory ascribing earthquakes to underground waters (Seneca 66.23.4).

Homer has ἐνοσίαρας ἐνοσίαρον, for ἐνοσίαρον see Pindar 322.1.52 καθότου sentimentum ut appellaerunt: cf. (Heraclitus) Ap. harr. 38.

Seneca 66.23.4, Pausanias 7.21.6-11, usteathius 1012.12-14 on O 190sqq

Homer has ἐνοσίαρας ἐνοσίαρον; for ἐνοσίαρον see Pindar 322.1.52 καθότου sentimentum ut appellaerunt: cf. (Heraclitus) Ap. harr. 38.

alae mi...alteriusue se: for the ways of expressing ἐνοσίαρας ἐνοσίαρον in Latin see Neue-Hagener 2.532-5.2 Gellius uses aliusmom at 17.5.14, but here prefers the normal alterius, and the feminine aliae (as at 17.5.5) used by Lucretius (3.916- Ciceron (div.2.30), Capito Aetius (Gel. 1.1.8), Livy (24.27.8), Ulpian (GIL. 34.12.124);

aggenus Vrbicus ap. Rom. 1.7.2.1 Gellius also uses aliae at 5.1.8 and alterae τὰ μέν at 7.7.1; note that alterius 6.21.3 = Ωάτερου. 2 ferias: cf. Livy 35.10.7 Suetonius...?2.2

"observed. Since seculo ut quotiens terra in urbe monisset ferias

ad voca contone praetor indicet"; they were therefore ferias

1. Translator into amo Amo of the alleged Syriac neoplatonist see Bergström ser SE der Hessische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil. hist. inst. 1).

2. Here delete Ammianus 30.5.4 (atius is not) and add P. eisopabolus 29.2 (at six times); ut Pesc. 1.5 re (c). ut οὐ (Adn.)

imperativus (Macr. Sat. 1.1.6)


Tranio, quiesce si sapias :: tu quiesce hand ne modo petere.

Vulg. faciam. 116 "quiescito agere peruerse" (Hebrew 12, the ordinary word for hesitate, cf. LXX παύσοδέε); for a direct noun-object cf. (Seneca) locutus Octaeus 1586 "quam tuas ludes populi "escant". But in all those passages quiesco means "cease," whereas here the meaning is "refrained from"; cf. Horace O. ad juvenes 379-80

ludere qui nescit caesestrius abstinuit armis, incoactusque pilae di u troque quiescit.

falsa religione populam alligarent; cf. ageius (fr.4 paralleu) a. Gel. 4.2 "religiosus is appellabatur qui noluit et superstitionis religionem sese alligauerat". Those passages probably imply the etymology religio religare; cf. Lucrotius 4932, 4.7 "religionum anima solus exsoluerre pego", Cicero 10.6.6 "senvitum religionem obligare". See Major on Cima 2.72; the etymology there asserted from religare should be regarded as a Cicertian αἴτιοσζείδασκα, despite the obscure verse cited in Gel.4.9...

3 si quos si seae: Cato ag. cult. 139 "sei deus sei dea es quom immi sacrum"; the euocatio an Animum Macr. Sat. 5.9.7 (see above nel horace 237-4) "si deus si dea est cui populus ciuitasque Karthaginiensis est in cutela", Cato 1.261 SEI 4.3.4.2 W 2.5.10 ib.4.5.3.1. 17.3.15 DS. Livy 7.26.4 "si diius si diua esset qui sibi prepetes misisset". With these expressions cf. OS on Ver...
2.351 "in Capitolio fuit clipeus consecratus cui inscriptum erat: genio urbis Romae, siue mas siue remiae. Et pontifices ita prorogabantur: Jupiter Optime Maxime, siue quo alio nomine te appellari volueris", showing the relation of our formula to the well-known invocatory hesitations, for which see Hor. op. ostos map a 143-7, translated on Aristophanes a 160. It may be noted that the evocatio cited by Lactariusinus (v. sup.) from Flavius (usually taken to be Furius Philus, cos. 156 B.C.) beginning "si deus si dea est", is followed by another from the same source (Lac. sat. 3. 10) beginning "his pater Veiiouis nanes siue [cos] quo alio nomine fas est nominare".

4 The true explanation of eclipses was found by Anaxarchus (Diels-
Kranz 31 B 42), and repeated by Anaxagoras (I. 59 A 1-9), but there were other theories; cf. e.g. Lucretius 5. 750-70 and his commentators ad loc.

defectionibus: the normal term, loan-translated from ἐνεκτέαστος.

note that ἐκτεινομεν, predicated of the sun, may mean not only ἐ
ἐνεκτέαστον but also ἔσεθος (Lucretius 3. 5. 27) and of the moon, φθόνος (Gell. 20. 8. 5); defectus, used for defectio by Lucretius (5. 751), Vergil (Georg. 2. 478) and in Silver prose, is applied to waning at Cic. de 2. 50 (cf. Meyer ad loc.) and in later Latin of setting (1. L. 2. 282, 38-9)

non minus ... sese exercuerunt: as it stands this must mean "on ne
s'est pas moins efforcé' and refer back to 31; this is impossible,

nor could 'quippe . . . ;ato, etc' be attached to it. Neither Hertz's non

minus <inprospere> nor Karache's mistranslation "ils eurent autant de
de mal" is of any help; the early Romans did not fail in their efforts
to find the cause of eclipses, they made none. Sciopplius cited minis for minus, which produces a very abrupt transition; momsen suggested amplius, which although Gellius does not actually say that the utentes Romani did not exert themselves to find the cause of earthquakes is the best proposal so far. But I do not believe the solution has yet been found. Gellius suggest minine for non minus, but remarks "Gellius' confusion of thought obscure". Gellius reit: cr. 2.3. ... for anacoluthic as.

5-7 Cato may well have known the cause of eclipses quite as well as Junius, who wrote (L. 163)."Nonis In\(\) \(s\) soli luna obstitit et mot"; but being a good Roman and being Cato, he put up a facade of ignorance. Even if he did not, he assumed there was a natural explanation.

5 incerta tenen et incuriosi: note the syntactical variatio. The tenen of course contrasts with "aur in corp. e nis retus multi studii".

6 quotiens amona cara, quotiens...obstiterit: Cato turns his back on trivialities. He, however, should be only too happy to write our economic histories showing what price wheat reached from year to year, while Roman dates of eclipses would be invaluable for our studies of the Republican calendar.

Humm: such dative are discussed at heue-pagener 1.297-301, where however this passage is not mentioned. The standard examples are

-So hullemann, citato in loc. cit. 1.30 (aut. via fasti 6.61) for the name lunonius. I should prefer, however, to take lunone as genitive or _lunone_ of _lunone_ in 3.15-6 "lalamae/martis".
-Even Cicero can, for instance, pretend in the fourth Verrine not to know much about art. The famous verses, Ver. 11.6.647-53, present a traditional Roman attitude; they are not a new insight, but "what art was taught, but never so well executed" (Pope An Essay in Criticism 29).
iure dicuntio, opera faciunio, tres alis argento acre plauio
1 riundo.

at quid: Cic. off. I "non litter usuis est contra naturam aut
egestas aut quid eiusmodi". 1

7 uel scire uel dicere: the latter is probably more to the point
than the former.

1 See the literature cited in Hertz's note; ellipse of alius is in
fact very common.
The fable of the crested lark and her young is also told by
Batrinius (ob; preserved also as Aesop 210 idiom) and Avienius (21); the reader may compare its treatment by La Fontaine (Fables 4.22). On ancient fables see ...gaard la fable antique (Copenhagen 1964, 1967).

There is a striking contrast in style between §§3-16, telling the fable, and §§1-2, 17-20, where Gellius introduces and comments on it; the latter in his normal style, the former in one far simpler, with shorter and less complex sentences, and without the usual plethora of abstract nouns and paired near-synonyms. (Contrast § 1 with any comparable length of the narrative).

In § 20 we are informed that Ennius related this fable in his Saturnia; (Fr. H Vahlen); it is, therefore, surprising that scholars have ascribed the difference in style to imitation of Ennius, and even tried to reconstruct the original verses (e.g. Ribbeck II.10. 7; see Hertz ad loc; Vahlen pp. CXXIII). They have, however, operated on the false premise that Gellius was a slavish imitator.

We have in 12.19 a renarration by Gellius of the Arion-episode from Herodotus, whose style he praises at the outset: "celeri admodum et confibilli oratione uocumque filo toreti et candido". But in this renarration, Herodotus's smooth and easy grace is not even imitated: the beginning is fa la la in its repetition of is (cf. ...5n; nothing could be less like Herodotus2), but amplissim in its pairs and its

1. For the orthography see Cameron 17.5 (1967) 160-1; the translator of Batrinius or the aequ. Avienius, II.392.
2. Conversely, one might expect Ennius to have used this device; but Gellius does not use it here.
istic et uompuribus a mariisque nonnulla fuit"); at the beginning
he spreads himself in flowery rhetoric. We have in fact a declamation
composed in exacto, the same spirit as Procato's ario.

"but" it will be objected "Gellius's treatment of a Greek author
is no evidence for his treatment of a Latin one, least of all of his
admired Ennius". Then let us see how he handles the no less admired
Cato in 3-7. In §3-17 he retells the story of the tribunes militum
and the forlorn hope in his own words; but in §19 he lets Cato
speak for himself. The difference in style is obvious, even though
Gellius writes in a less complicated fashion than usual, and even
though one sometimes fancies to catch Sertorian echoes. Not only
are there certain expressions such as procul audio (§6, cit. to iln)
and agitansur §12, cit. Sert. that certainly cannot have stood
in the original; there is a smoothness about the prose, despite the
many short sentences, that is quite foreign to the author of §19.

We should certainly not expect a verse-author to be more
faithfully followed than a prose-author; and to be sure the prose
presents a number of expressions that cannot be ascribed to Ennius:
e. al. crasino (2), dicto obsequiante (§12). Now indeed does the
passage as a whole read like Latin of the second century B.C.; and
there is no reason to doubt the Gellian paternity of such words as
discalabint (§7) and obsequiiles (§12).

But attempts at reconstruc ting the Ennius original have
concentrated on those word-sequences that with or without a line
rearrangement produce trochaic rhythm: "siquid etsi orae ..." (§6);

1. Vermula (§6) is explicitly stated to be from Cato. Otherwise, however,
on must recognize that archaic expressions in Gellius may not be
direct borrowings from the original text, but rather inventions of its
style. Vitreri, for instance, did not have been used by Cato; but the narrative may have contained some other "fer" with it occur
independently" at 15.2.4."
"ubi redisset, nuntiarent" (i.); "tua illo versu mi rilium" (§11);
"fiet unic apud procul" (§11) — even trochaic verses: "non meturar
neque necessam est, nostis utius aferas" (§9). With the omission
of two conjunctions we can extract three consecutive verses in §7:

et manus iam postulare; // incirco aut crustini,
aut prima dimostrabit, nec amice eas et reges

uglians, opera multa mutuo, messis, macto nodos adjutum.

But who can believe Gellius to be so uncritical a plagiarist as
to take over so long a stretch of Ennius all out unaltered? It
would be far more reasonable to believe that some of these trochaic runs
are accidental, and others deliberately planted to hint at the metre
of the original, but constructed out of Gellius's own words. We must
be wary of pecking at painted fruit.

Certain accidental trochees can be found elsewhere (cf.2.12.4on)
particularly interesting are 3.8 and 3.9, where with slight
alterations perfectly respectable verses can be obtained. Thus with
one transposition, §11 would be

Frrrus rex cu. in terra Italia esset et unum atque alteram
| pugnas prospere pugnasset...

and a little later in the same sentence, one simple contraction yields

...pieraque

Italia ad regum descissat, tum abraciancis quispis:

trochees...

or in 3.7.3

equitali missae ratio siue fortuna rerum,

ut in cuius haec ratio et fortunis omnibus

In §5 a little rearrangement produces

cui cum eo potibus esset, ipsa victum postea
atque desertum interisse exitio attestabili.

1. Or better still prospere pugnas.
this last is the best septenarius of all; yet no-one suspects these chapters to come from a paraphrased poem.  

Lemma apologetic: See I. Jegaard 1.128. Whereas in Greek we meet ἀπολογός, "story" only in Ὀδησσίας ἀπολογός = Odyssey C - μ, in Latin we find Piusius Stichus 539 "apologetic" used of Antipho's story "Vuit alt., quasi ego sum, senex, &c"; Rhet. Her. 1.10 "si defessi erit amiendo, ab aliqua re quae re quae visum semper cessit - ab apologetic, fabula uere similis, imitatione deprecatus..." (where apologetic is presumably less uero, similis; a word, perhaps as opposed to the type of story in Piusius Stichus 539); Sic. Inv. 7.25 "mitia parasce (re) quae uel apologetic uel fabulam uel aliqua tenet inisionem"; Quintilian 6.x.44 "Semeu (i.e. derived from) treatment at some length in apologia quoque et quasius. Interim etiam historiis exponemis gratia consequi solet. Lic. M. 1.11.20 ονοματομορφή et ὑερογράφεις τι ειπε. ἐπειδή et εἰπετο: ἐριττον μαθών μοι καὶ ἱστορίαι μισθοφόρων ἡμῖν ἀληθείας: so the proverb μησιμοί εὐόλχος (Herod. 5.1, or "ZenoBiades"

5.10, and so later sources; but we have an earlier version that he was a Thracian; so ἁγεμόνε, a possibly γαμερον. (For whose date, before the Peloponnesian War, see Lec. Ins. Thuc. 5); cf. Terry's Aesopic 216. According to Herodotus (1.134) he was the fellow-slave of Rhageopis the Thracian, owned by Iason or Samos: the curious may debate whether his Thracian origin be a false deduction from Herodotus, or his Thracian origin (as Terry believes) assumed from his servitude and his similarity to Aristoxen (Vita Aesopi 100). If he was a Thracian, he will per asp have come from the Thracian or Bithynian Thracians (cf. Herodotus 1.20); at all events the Greek tale certainly come from Asia Minor. Cf. Jegaard, 1.432, 444ff. Phaeacius, 3 prol. 2sqq.; ἄπληκτος Re. 614b. Aristotelic 417a13, 445b. Perhaps the word was more freely used in, e.g. Greek; but not every French word in English is used as it is in French.
certainly shows no knowledge of Thracian birth for Iesop.

1. On the nature of fables of Apuleius 1 prol. 3.

duplex intellectuos est: quia uiscum nonet
et quia prudenti uita concilio nonet.

So 2 prol. 1-7; m. Perotti l., 13-14

risisse Iuno ductur Vectiris iocos
quia per callinan de otanit feminas.

Dio Chrysostom 72. 13 ἐδίκει χάριν τινι
(like the Seven Sages) γενόσαν, γαρ οὖν τινι
μεταβολαί οὕτως τεταρτεύειν
καὶ τυχῶν πολλά ἐν τῇ ὁμοίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ ὡς ὡν
μῆλος τοῦ δικτοῦν τοὺς ἀθροίζων καὶ ἐλευθερώναις
ἀπὸ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν. ὡς ἡ μάλινα ἐφεμερίον αὐτῶν, ἐθέρμανεν ἐκι 
καὶ τῶν μῆλων, ἐκείνη τα ταύτα ταῖς τῆς δαίμονος
μορφαὶς προτέρων ἤκοι των.

nobilis Iesopem nostram qui resposo Selenei Apollinis monitus ridicula
obtus est ut legendum firmonet.' Cf. Bentley "or Iesop's fables"
§ 1 (Bouce 2.212-4); Χ/Joarda l. 47.

Despite the raucists' pretensions, however, fables were
chicili, appreciated as light entertainment. Philocleon tells how
direndants try to make the jury laugh1 (crystophanes sages 566-7)
ὅτι δὲ ἡμῖν μῆλοι ἠδύναμον ὃ, ὅ'λα 
ὁ ἄλαστρος ὑδάτως ἡμῖν τῆς ἐρυθής
μῆλος καὶ τὸν δικαίον ἐπερεάζειν.

Later on, his son explains how drunken or bsbehaviour is passed off
in the best circles (ib. 1257ff)

(Not that it works for Philocleon!) Seneca advises nobius not to

1. Frontu's argument appears to have finished with the fable of the
vines and the donkey to countervail its earlier Venice scene; see
E. la Jolla, "The art of the ur. as a form of speech" 10-Cl. 15,
try writing fables till he be over his worst grief, but first to work on more serious subjects (Praen. 3): "non sumus ut usque se producere ut famelias quoque et necoseos logos, intemp d ita

Roma. is in his opus, solita sibi usumstate conestas; difficile est quidem ut d haec hilariosa studia tan uohongenter percurrerius animus tan cito posset accedere. Hoc tamen argumenta habens ian collaborati eius et rectiti sibi, s. notorius a severioribus scriptis ut haec solutiora procedere; in illis enim quannis agrum em. aduan et secum relictantes: suocait rosa rerum quas tractavit austeritas, haec quae remissa fronte commentaria sunt non xeret, nisi caniam sibi ad omni parte constiterit. Itaque aebebis om. seviorum mater. primam exercere, deinde hilarior temperare".

praecipit; cum causa...is normal in earl. lat. (Parr. 1.3: 302) and used by Lucretius (Bailey vol...98), but not in clas. Lat. Gellius has it again at 1.3.24, 1.6.1, 1.6.1.

See mapp TAF. 28 (147) viii, Düger 2.673-90; Bornh.-Saa by C. 62a. 619,624-5.

dictabiles: first in Tac. a.12.67 "induxit dextabili cito uenem "; Ger...1, 1....4, 2.23.12, 3.15.9, 15...3.

2 legi...aeque iucunque: cf.2.23.21.

3 We may note that the fable begins with a general statement about the name and nature of the crested lar. The lex generis normally dispenses with such things; so Babrius 38 begins corporis Λάρυξ ἐξ ἑκάστατα (verse 2 being spurious). It is, however, not unknown for fables to start with a general statement; e.,

1 Hence at mart. 3.20.5, qu'as l. logos may be right to s. am. l.61; but so as. logos (i.e. exporsus is logos), c. 4. 6. 7. 8.
"et hoc incurit e i fastidios... vμετω καί logos in the ISS of Phaedrus 3.proi.57; cf. the Greek use of υελον.
Aesop 340, 341, Chambry e.2 (f. pp. 537-6 e. laior). It must be recognized that neither Tunius nor Cælius was a "professional" fabulist.

"cassita": term found nowhere else, but presumably used by Tunius.

Babrius 38 has κορμαδίας (telling the story of the hare; the word can be of either gender); νερός 21 has no name at all. The κορμαδίας is called Galerita Tunus II. 3.7.2 ("quam in capite habet plumam elongatam"), cf. Pliny NH. 11.121 "praetera purpurei ani quae ab illo (sc. apice) galeria appellata quondam, postea Gallicaca nocasculo etiam legioni nonam aedefat alamies". D. Henry Thompson, Glossary of Greek birds s.v. ΚΩΡΜΑΔΙΑΣ - "A dark: e.g. Haliae (Galerita) Cristata, the commoner species in Southern Europe, which has a more conspicuous crest than the sylvan., argentee. Cristate 617 by κορμαδίαν δυτική ὑπήρχε ὅμοιον καὶ κοτόν εὐκρίνειον καὶ ἄπορον ἔχουσα, ὅ ἐτέρα ἀργελία ἡ ἐπισείρησεν, το μέτεωρα ὑπολογίζοντο τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ ἀνασκάλυπτος ἑλεοφυία, ἐπεὶ ὅρον ὅν τὸ ἔντεκτον ἐδέσσαν".

4 similatur: cf. 3.10.5: "names of the quibus aliquae aenee aequi in aqua similatantur". Pliny and Columella use similare; other writers - that is to say, literary as opposed to technical usage - say either conserere (cf. confesserat 5) or mimera ringere/ sumere/ pomerium are the like. But Pliny uses mimierai transitively, for "enclose".

1. hence Catalan ais, I. salam, Ioiosa, French agratt. Note that the letter V. Iacint was disbanded after the defeat of Cornelius Asmus in Caesar (6. 16), cf. - at son the Roman Soln n. p. 15. 16th
2. This is not a direct citation of Verro's headquaters, but a paraphrase. Homer 219. 9 is derived from Cælius, and therefore has no evidential value to the contrary.
in a nest": in 1.63 "Adiius rursus cornu (sc. scarabaeorum) genus,
quae recte menues pilis amersis pedibus uolutant, genusque in his
contra rigorem membris utens rulosos, retus sui, salutarum".
5 senates: used for geysters, cf. Ovid Fasti 1.673 "nos dans percutuos
teneris sementibus uestus".

In Sabrinus et Avitus there is no explanation of why the lark's
young are still unfeathered. We may presume that Senamus, a no
obious rationalizer, originated the idea that the crops had ripened early;
La Fontaine found a different solution, more in accord with the
tastes of his contemporaries (1.22.16 sqq): "Une pourtant de ces anciennes
Avaient voulu passer la morteé d'un princeps
Sans pour le plaisir des ours printaniers".

ex.vers.: ἀπεικόνισαν.
6 cibus quaestium: the accusative supine with an object is fairly
common in Gellius: e. j.1. "aduitum Curristratium", r.3.7 "socies...
duresam conservatioque pergit", § 44 "seruates ire socios": cf.
Hornsby 1. viii § 45.
7 matutinis: ripened to the point of over-ripeness. Ovid Tristia 1.124
atre ca sic lapes est ut surgere, si non lucis
ematurerit Caesaris ire, quest.
("Matura hacta fuerit et lenita" Aruan., Plin. h. 27.56 "nonnulla
actus candidum (sc. apollinaris herbae genus) rursus si non
ematurerit"; 27.14; "ne ilium quidem duicitur, o uina ramoscum, una
affectusque idem si fructus prius ematuruscat".

ut erasmi; Plancus Hostiliaria sol "hoc die octimi quon amurus
resciuerit"; at Macrobius I 1.3.16 Caecina says "ergo noctu futura,
cum media esse coeperit, auspiciu. Saturnaliorum erat, quibus die
crastini nos anchandis est'; the grammatical oddities "noctu futurum", "Saturnaliorum", and "die crastini", are justified in the next chapter, die crastini being defended in a passage adapted from well. l. 2.1.8. It is of course the locative of dies crastinum; the more normal ablative appears from Livy onwards (crastina die 2.5.9, 3.2.9 et saep; crastina die 3.20.4, 3.40.6), or die crastino (l. Caesar a. front. 4.95.54). Unlike mater nocte, modo modo (Fraenkel H. Zeit. 1.140) it is not Giurinate for crastino see § 9...
dimicabit: cf. 6.1.6 "prinsquam dimicabit". Nowhere else in Latin, though dimiculacere is attested at Gna. 5.190.1. there is no reason for ascribing this word to Ennius: if it is a Gel. θονομάση (or at least a neologism) there is a neat cyclic variation in this chapter in the expressions for "tomorrow" and "at dawn":

"tomorrow" "at dawn"
archaic § 7 die crastini § 7 primo luci
classical § 11 cras § 5 luce oriente
modern § 9 crastino § 7 ubi dimicabit

Compare the triplication "uarian (clas. et misceléan (arch.) et quasi conrusanean (modern)", mer 5, and Faider ad loc.
For other variations in this chapter: § 8 "die...postero", § 13 "alia luce orta"; § 7 "roges", § 11 "orane"; § 6 "ipsa irit cibus pulis quaestium", § 14 "mater in pabulum uolat" § 13 "ais in pastum perfecta est". See 2.1.2.

messe: hanc nobis adiuvant: for the construction of 3.5.5.35, 5.44.22 "adiuma ne' adiuna mihii utranque potest fieri, melius tamen ne: 'adiuma' enim ilium dicimus quam 'ilii', nisi forte uicus 'adu numhii' quasi 'reliqua minoress'<. adu numhii is late (first in
It should, however, be pointed out that in Varro and Petronius, the et could easily be due to dittography (and Varro’s text regularly suffered from the “wires’ inability to comprehend his textual style), and the context is probably safe from initial misconstruction of the et as a coordinate. The first sentence reads ad libitum.

But in Varro and Petronius, the et could easily be due to dittography (and Varro’s text regularly suffered from the “wires’ inability to understand his textual style”), in which it was due to misconstruction of instantanea non penetrativa as coordinate. (Hedrick, 1970, 316; K. Müller, delete et). The first sentence reads ad libitum.

C. ab 75 v. Ciceron. The epigraphically complete, 1st century Varro is

P. 738 Later. 1. 70. 41 ff.
but un exceptionable.

Luc ancios eas et rores: a formalistic analysis would say that eas et was did not a psychological one that eas et rores was equivalent to eas rogatur. Vahlen quotes Lucius Apuleius 32 (emended) "propterca pacem aequam et a vos amores" (as if Lucius amores), 3.201.2. 10.4. Example of apototic et are found in ancis ancis. 9.534 (who cites this passage as being by Manilius; we cannot be so sure) and in his ancis.

8 haec unde ancis, et discessit: cf. *ed. s. et 69.52sqq. *

9 saeculums Philologus 11.12 (1912), 20sqq., 72 et al. on Per. Acth. 9.5.

(p. 201-3). Examples of apototic et are found in ancis ancis. 18.0.1 sons from Varro on ancis: Varro R.R. 2.7.9 "equos matres salirecum adducion posset, cum em capite obvolutum auriga adduxisset et coegisset matres impret. cum descendentium despisset ab oculis, et illa imperti to fict in eam ac adordicus interrecta; Petronius 58.8 (a "vulgar" passage) "cum Incuboni pilum rapuisset, et unesaurum inuenit"; *curtius 1.2.5.22 "qui acerbo ei instarant, et ab arianis equitibus promebantur". *curtius 7.2.4.

"interim cum purum ilium par nes sci pia norius Matibusque querebantur, et adiuvationes ecce rusticus inequae quorum promissum sum frustratur, ductin tem sectionem de mi flagitat". They are protected by *ab. Jac. (CIL 3.946), no.11, or 23s. Oct.165 in: "it quod exit se locas et locavit Socrates 3[10]c ("yatis operas suas", 0.

(20 May 165) "it quod exit se locas et locavit operas suas". 11.16.8.2. The construction is frequent in later Latin; 1 with atque it is found.

1. So too with participles: to the *ed. in CIL 3.946, no.11, the expanded text of *N in the codex Zeax: "equa die alius quotiens quendam operantem sabbato et dimit illi ..." (Greek όποιος ουδὲ κυρίως οὐδὲ διδασκόντων τι διδάσκειν [ιδιϊκα] εταν αποτικα καιοκατοικε)
at Flavius Josephus 217, [Vergil Georg. I. 203 (cf. Gell. i. 23. 4)] Gel.
17. 29. 2. 1. Gellius's use of it here, as or fac amicos eas et magis
above, is probably meant to suggest a homely, familiar touch.

Treitler: Pianezzola (p. 2. 15) argues that the more conventionally
poetic forms in -bunias being un-Gellian, this word is borrowed from
Ennius. The argument is not conclusive, but highly plausible.

9 otioso anno: Terence Andria 542 "amico nunciam otioso esse mecum";
 cf. Phormio 340 "otiosum ab anno", Alex. 535 "quin tu otiosus es;
 ego illum sensum palatrum caloco". 2

crastino: so Plaut. tet. 2. 1. 18 "'quantum' inquit 'labor aderit
crastino'" 6. 3. 4. 17; cf. Cassiodorus Hist. 9. 10. 5. "scitote
ceastina nos collectariororis urbis celebraturum". In later Latin the
idea "tomorrow" is expressed in several ways (e.g. 4 calas 11. 26
"in crastina enim hac hora incipies scribere", itala Cael. 6. 20
"in crastina die"); but in modern Romance the normal expression is
miane (Romanian șine) or a derivative thereof. 3 Tras has survived in
a few places: Leyer-"be Romanisches etymologisches" Terbuch
no. 2. 29.

Tevert: so 17. 1. 5. "Feuere" is regular in early Latin and Lucretius
(cf. lat. s. v.; Deve- agger 3. 265), reappearing in Gellius, Commodius,
and other late authors; it is the ancestor of South Italian cerve,

mian a fierbe (Leyer-Libke 3. 205. 4), Feuere is first attested

1. Statius Theb. 2. 27 is corrupt, Rapinian In responsoria = 3. 44(not 44)
1. 10. 2 interpolated.
2. As of course is still pronounced ess; the meaning esto is an
interpolation.
3. For "miane"tomorrow" see ibid. 8. 27. 7. 444; but delete V. P. Gellum 37. 6
1. 19. 2 where it bears the classically-attested meaning
"tomorrow morio", as the Hebrew original makes clear.
4. likewise no doubt Spanish haver, Portuguese ferver; c. St. vivir,
rt. vivir, forum vivere, French boulier, Provençal boulier, Catalan
polir, the from bulir, used by Vitruvius, C. Ius, Seneca and
Persius.
by Lucilius, who contents it; 356-7 Marx 349-50 Krekel. From Cicero onwards the second conjugation is standard, even at Crimalchio's dinner-table (retro 38.1, 59.2); Quintilian contents the older form "liquis antiquos sciucus feruntre breu media syllaba dicat, deprehendatur utiiose loqui" (1.6.7).

There is, however, one interesting exception: the infinitive regularis appears as feruntre in the voces: Varro Saturn. 86; Propertius 2.32, 2.29.4; Vergil geor. 1.456, gen. 4.4 3, 4.567, 6.677, 9.503; Valerius Flaccus 1.141, 6.398, 7.150; Silius 1.456, 4.660, 5.243; Petronius 125.21.2 In most places the idea is that of "swearing" (cf. Marcius 2.41; no doubt an Ennian formula). On the other hand, feruntre is used as the infinitive by Statur (tbeh. 525, 5.44, 10.468, also in the sense of "swearing") and at Regna 402,405.

sent: cf. Plautus Pulicarius 394.5

sed meus sodalis it can pracaia poscilo.

utire salvum mercatores gaudes.

I listi: contemptuous rather than equivalent to quos communis.

neanu partem: cf. 1.22.3 first attested in classical Latin (Cic. Crat. 46, Cæsar 4.11.8, Livy 5.1.5)

cessatores: first attested in Horio's letters (1.3.5.6, 3.5.7, 4.1.3.17.5).

quin lotius: so 1.17.3, 5. livy 22.4.1.4, 1.19.6.

-----

2. Contrast the present tenses sperat Varro 3.2.65; Vergil Georg. 1.327; Silius 5.672; Terent. Valerius Flaccus 1.300.
cognates analnesque: the moral speaks only of mice, and in Fabrius we pass straight from plora to self-help. this was the older version, but Senius or his source expanded it into a triadic structure. thus at Dio Chrysostom 17.7sqq, the story that the owl warned the birds against the oak with its mistletoe, the story elsewhere to tell of the swallow that she warned the birds against the flax, and the Libyan soil first met at Rescarius fr.139, are combined into the one fable that the owl gave the birds three warnings; they mocked her, ουτως δε άρετήν ἐναμείτας και άνεμοις κοσμώματιν έν τοις δικάς. for the various versions of this fable see Adados accentu 26 (1952), 358, Ferry Taur. 93 (1962), 315sqq.

Jørgaard however, maintains (1.190) that Dio preserves here the older form; that the fable (in the strict sense to which he, but no ancient author, restricts the term) avoids the number three, and that the augustana collection of nesopic fables makes a determined effort to expel it from any stories (originally not fables) in which it occurs. But an unprejudiced examination of the material collected by Adados and Ferry will surely suggest that to apply this principle to Dio 12.7, making it the oldest version, is perverse syste zwang; Dio's conception of fable was less perfect than, or at least different from, Jørgaard's and the augustana-collector's. after all, Dio was not a fabulist; nor was Senius. the triadic structure may be alien to the true spirit of Greek fable; but conversant with the higher branches of literature would hardly realize the fact. Senius, or his source,
will have elaborated on the table he found and who shall say he spoilt
it: neither Avienus nor La Fontaine thought so, for both retain the
triplet
ation.

temper: common in early Latin. Note that unlike the active temori
and ablative (etymologically locative) tenere, this form maintains
qualitative Ablaut: cr. genus / generis (\textit{γέρος} / Epic \textit{γέρας}, Old
Scavonic nebo "sky", cr. \textit{φός}, genitive nebese), facinus /
facinerosus.

12 obsequibles: \textit{άπειρος} \textit{αδέρφος}

dicto oboedient: In Early Latin we occasionally find dicto audiens
fused with oboediens (cr. Livy 5.3.9 "nec plebs nobis dicto audiens
et oboediens sit") to give dicto oboediens: Plautus \textit{Bacch.} 1.3.3,

\textit{Persa} 378, Accius \textit{Hli.}. Calpurnius has the back-formed finite dicto
oboedire, which in Flavious's day would have been as unthinkable as
dicto audire, and must be classed with absque = sine (2.2.7n) as a
pseudarchais. It reappears in Vulc. \textit{esp. ad vivum} 3.1 "subditos esse,
dicto oboedire, ad omne opus bona paratos esse).

13 supersederunt: in the general sense "neglect" "to without" "leave
off" supersedere is used transitively at \textit{Rhet. Her.} 2.26 "non uisa est
(sc. causa) supersedenda", Apuleius \textit{Florida} 1.19, "istis rebus
supersessis". It is constructed with the dative at \textit{Beq.} 41.75.2,
Apuleius \textit{Ap.} 17.34; but the normal construction is with the ablative,
\textit{e.g.} \textit{Rhet. Her.} 2.30 (twice), 2.34; \textit{Cic. Av.} 1.20, 30, 72, 2.17;
\textit{G.} 2.4; \textit{Livy} 7.27.4. We should therefore assume the ablative at
such places as Flavious \textit{Hippidicus} 39 "superset fistic rebus iam",
Caesar \textit{G. 2.} 1 "proedio supersedere", \textit{Cic. De R.} 14.1 "exemplis
supersedeo".
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14. *primo* *luci*: or *cum primo luci* Pl. *Lis.* 525, *Ter. Ad.* 841, *Att. 8*


512. *Jonius* 310. 3 cites "...Julius de officiis lib. III" for *lux*

as a masculine; in §112 of that book the MSS give *cum prima luce*,

but *de veteri* restore *cum primo luci*, or *luci* at *Phil.* 12. 25.

Elsewhere of course Cicero has *cum prima luce* (*prima luce* alone

*Sulla* 52, and sixteen times in *Caesar*); compare also *Varro Sat.* *en.* 512

"hodie si possas quo debeamus populo in foro medio luci claro

decoquere" with *Bell. d.i.* 4. 3. 4 "luci clar. Cassina in medio foro

nefarie intericere uoluitis"; *palam luci* Lex. *Sat.* *Bant.* 17, 24,

but *lucem palam* Cic. *Bec.* 83. *Durout-Vellut* suggest the masculine

gender is probably due to the influence of *dies*.

It will be noted that no example of *primo luci* without *cum* has been

found in the early writers; this is quite probably an accident.

15 *rist manu ducio procul*: this could be the second half of a

septenarius, and *manu procul* is not inconceivable for *Jonius*

(cf. *extra procul* trag. 225 and 226); elsewhere *manus* has *procul dubie*,

but Gellius could be simply suggesting a *neo-saic* original by the

form of his own composition.

15 *cuia res est*: a set phrase, e.g. *Cic.* *Verr.* 3. 16 (paraphrasing a

censorial law), 62; *Bell.* 1. 22. 6; cf. *Cic.* *Verr.* 1. 14. 2 "is cuia res sit,

caium periculum", *Bell.* 1. 13. 7 "cuia res praecipue esset". A

lawyers' phrase of *Republican* date, not found in the immortal jurists;

with Gellius's archaism contrast *Sabinus* ap. *Bell.* 1. 10. 21 (*ius iuris

civilis = D. 4. 2. 5. 3) "qui alienum facens luceri faciendi causa

sustulit, furti obstrin itur sine scilicet cuius sit sine nescit".

The locution *cuius res est* illustrates the predominant use of *cuius* as predicate. In Early Latin, not the genitive of *quid* and *qui*, is regular in this place, whether as interrogative or as relative. Thus the adjective, not the pronoun, is always used in Plautus, and cf. Cato *ag. curt. 139* "si deus si dea es quinam ilium sacrum est" (cf. *C.r 2.3.3*); Lex Antonia de Tertio Sius (vam II 5-9) 2.1/2 "magistratus pr[...]

The first certain example of a predicative genitive from *quis* or *qui* occurs in the *lex agraria* or III 25 (s.I 2505), §9, though the adjective appears in §8 and 10.

8 deique eo agro loco aedificiium eum quoium [is ager locus aedificiium...]

9 neue quis facito quo quoium eum aedificiium possessionem ex legem plebeiam sco [esse]e oportet oportebit.

10 neue facito neque [r quo quis eorum quoium eum aerum locum aedificiium posse [esse]e legem plebeiam scoito esse oportet oportebit.

By the classical period, however, the adjective was all but obsolete even in this use: Catullus *aesib. 1.17* "cuius esse isis" Varro R.24 "accessitus ab aedico cuius procuratio huimus..."
tempus est". Cicero's *cuinu periculum* (2 Verr. 1.42) is motivated by *cuia res* preceding.

In the attributive use, by contrast, *cuius* pronominal, *quaerat*, *quarum*, are at all times normal. The relative adjective is, however, found in legal usage: e.g. *Gelas. Cilicia* (15:2583):§5 "aut *quoius nomen praenarationis causa delatum erit, aut quoium nomen ex h.i. ex reis exemptum erit" (note the variatio);§1 "quoaue in rile sit" §29 "quoiium nomen ex h.i. delatum erit". Cicero summarizes a Syracusan law in the form "quot essent remanenti, tui in hydria coit.arentur; cuium nomen exisset, ut is haberet id sacrorum" (2 Verr. 1.47); since the text of the law was in Greek, it was Cicero's own *Syracuse" that induced him to use the adjective.

With *causa* and *ratia* we find in Early Latin normally *quoinus*, but *quaia* at *Plautus* 265, *Bacc. 548* (the latter of course a highly ornate passage). Otherwise the adjective is very rare; *Plautus* *Poemenius* 535 "quod tu inuits nescias rerum ad domino de quoio cleris* (substantivum *z*); Cicero *pro Varino* (Aziscian G. 2.555.10) "ea caedes si potissimum crimen datur, uter ei cuia res interruit, non ei cuia minus interruit". Elsewhere (Lurena 60, fin. 2.55) Cicero uses *cuius* in such a context (crit. 1.1.2.16); the speech for *V. remin* should on historical grounds be dated to before Cicero's Greek voyage, *Minucius Felix* 1.5.6.

For the interrogative there is the *Plautine formula* *quaia uos?*, found at *Bacc. 979* (qu 2) *Curt. 1.1, 229, Herc. 86* (nescio quoia), *reae. 702, Luc. 229, 332-3; fin. 45. Only *Curt. 229* and *Tri. 45* exhibit *in senarii*, and the former clearly reveals its stiltedness:
Capadoc the pimp asks "quis hic est qui loquitur." but Malimirus the slave "quidam uocem e o audio," such pomposity being a characteristic of the Flautine slav. auct. 364 and pseud. 702 are in very elaborate contexts.

Otherwise adjectival quis? is hardly found: Terence Andria 763 "cedo quion quern hic adposistis dico mihi"; Vergil ge 3.4 "dico mihi, Canoeta, cuin? pecus?" (unless we take cuin? as predicative; in either case the expression was blocked by Juliusius); Priscian Hist 3.133.24 "cuin? cuin? cuin? in omnis species possessorum pertinet, ut si dicam, cuin? est filia haec? recte respondeas mea uel tua uel [sua illius] uel [priscia uel mandria" (again, cuiin? may be taken predicatively).

In sum, "whose" was expressed in Early Latin by the adjective as a predicate, but in attributive position by the pronoun-genitive, the adjective being restricted to legal or bombastic style. By classical time the adjective survived only in a few legal expressions, mainly cuin? rest. At no time were the relative and the interrogative differently treated.

unfe petetur: so 12. 7.6, 21.22 (but "de quo petitur" 6.23) see
Hofmann Zapyr 208 sqq; Dvest Bk. 1.0.17.8 (0.2.7.9),
Syntactica 2.143sqq; Fauthel Horace 4.402.2, Kl. Beii. 2.75 sqq; and
cfr. 42. 10; 2.3.13. The use of locative adverbs instead of preposition and pronoun with personal antecedent is found in early and late Latin, and in legal usage. To the examples cited by these authorities add
Cic. 2 Vorr. 3. 55 "ille autem unde ablata est" opposed to "is qui
1. Contrast modern Spanish, where cuio cuia is freely used in attributive position as a relative, but çuio? ci cuia? is very rare.
peteres debet" (Verres's iniquity has made the farmer pay according
to the decumanus's assessment and then seek a rebate; the prevailing
custom was for the decumanus to sue for the difference). Cf.

\[\text{"tis rōs eis dērēn" ("whose son?", Wackernagel \textit{Vorl.} \textit{ter Syntax} 1.259);}\]

and in classical French "Le \textit{Véritable Amphitryon / est l'Amphitryon où l'on câne" (\textit{etc.} \textit{re} \textit{1702-3})

16 \textit{nīdum migravit}: cf. Livy \textit{Il.} 36.12 "relietaque quae migratur
\textit{difficilia}, Silius \textit{7.131-1} "\textit{mari nuntur Raeteia regna / in Libyan superis}"; so in later Latin, \textit{Ad} 8.93.23sqq.

16 \textit{sanctiores}: the comparative bears little meaning; cf. \textit{7.1.1}

"\textit{Doctrina quaeque ista utilem ac delectabili}, \textit{7.21.1} \textit{"clariorum
\textit{notionem}"; see too Wöllflin \textit{Ausgewählte Schriften} 169. Absolute
comparatives are extremely common in \textit{Gellius}: e.g. \textit{prolixius} 2.11.5,
\textit{dilatoribus} 5.15.2, \textit{atrociore} 7.3; it is often hard to determine
whenever they have any special force.

\textit{ut in nobis tantum ipsius nitatur}: Bentley proposed \textit{uti nobis}. The

main relative is by far the \textit{componer} construction, and is regular in
\textit{Gellius} (\textit{9.1.8, 11.1.33, 11.2.4}). Bentley's emendation should
therefore be accepted, although the prepositional construction is in
itself perfectly good Latin (\textit{e.g.} \textit{Lucrécius} 5.909, \textit{Sic.} \textit{41.19}).

19 \textit{extra nos extraque nostrum animus}: \textit{La becius} compares the

"\textit{Pythagorean" tenet \textit{πρὸς αὐτὸν \πη\νωθείων οἵτως \πως διάφορος \πε\νωθείων
\textit{śrois ĝes ſ}} (\textit{Schenkel \textit{Riener} \textit{Studien} 8, 275, n.30: "\textit{Demophilus"} \textit{1.38, Stobaeus 3. \textit{1.36}}).

\textit{neque pro nostris neque pro nobis: this seems to mean "(we should not
consider them) either as being ours \textit{ś} in our interests", the two
pro's being differently used. If so, formal parallelisms will have
triumphed over semantic co-ordination. Vole (rleekaisen III.572),
followed by hertz, proposed bonus for noxis, comp. rim. 10.4.4 "atque
ibi Stoicus ensebat et uitas beatam hominum uirtute anini sola et
miserae. [Heraclitus] magna malitia sola posse efficem, etiam si cetera bona quae
cor oralia et externalia appellantur uirtuti dessent, malitiae
adesse". But this is not the point: it is not that friends and
relatives are not bona but that we cannot rely on them as we can
on ourselves.

Versibus quadratris: here or trochaic septonarii (cf. -7.45). See
toponitis G. 4.16. The term is also used of iambic septonarii (e.g.
leuconius ib. line 5; Te; v. 393.2273 sqq). Quorum duo postrumpi isti sunt: thus we have an indisputable example of
an epiuodio in a fable of the second century B.C. See
lojaarr 4.48-506 (our present passage being discussed on 5.592), who
establishes that the epiuodio was already an established
advice in the fifth century B.C. (cf. Herodesotus 1.365). This is only
what we should expect; even when telling a fable for a specific purpose
a Greek would be likely to express the point as a rupu, and
when the fable was told for its own sake, addition of this rupu
would preserve the continuity with a plied fable. Besides, if fable
be utile, the moral serves the dialectic end; if it be dulce, both
the sententiousness of the moral and the pretence to derive it from
the story may be humorous.

Aequantum: in rhadrus used of the whole fable: 2.7.11, b.6.2, 4.11.4,
1.17.7, 3.11. Here, however, it is predicative: "this will commence

Rhadrus quadratus qualified by "hippomaceus" is used or Caesius Passa
of the iambic septonarii G. 6.26-17, 2o-6, by paeanus of the
anataphonic metre -..-..-..-..-..-..-... (v. 288.98)
you not to..." we should therefore print a comma (as Hertz
does) after *situm*, not a colon.

"ne quid exspectes amicos quo uete agere possies: cf. line 1. ep. 2.-5

"seu dispicio ne sit parum pruinda sperare ex aliis quam tibi ipse
non praeestes".
CHAPTER 30.

The lacuna after "faciunt" was indicated by Homann: exempli
ratia one might supply "aliter fieri animaduersamst acque in illis
quas eant".

Wind was defined by some as κλονος (Aristotle
Meteorologica 349a20; cf. Seneca, Ep. 5.1; Aristotle's own definition
is κλονος της τοις φελες αυτήσαισθεσ (i.e. 361a30; see
the entire chapter, 359b27-361b14). Gellius's expression, if pressed,
suggests an Aristotelian theory.

2 ventus: probably a nautical expression, cf. Conington on Ver.
Aen. 7.27 "cum venti posuererinoisque repente resedit/\status"; so in
1.1.13 "cum Zephyri posuero", Ovid Met. 7.19 "iam venti posent" cf. Lucan
3.523 "posito borea". In all these passages the sea is mentioned next.
2 concessunt: here only in Latin, and formed upon consensus.

3 a. quinto ... tranquillia: cf. Livy 35.30.4 "erat iter tale quod un
tranquillum at hostili actu a non expersi posset". So Caesar, B.C.
3.3.1 "ab hoste oiosum", Livy 34.4 "cum et oris quieta omnia a
bello essent et domi sanata discordia". With the nouns we find Livy
1.31.5 "nulla tener ab araris quietis", 3.41 "ab externis aravis oitium
ruit"; and the preposition is regular with cesari, quiesser, uaco, and
the like. B.C. 3.2.1.43n.

tranquilla: for this neuter plural see J. Plut. 0.7
in καιρόνια γίνοιτε at ταινίας Seneca, Epistles 19.200 "innoti
incident/tranquilla reingi", Pliny H.N. 9.35 "capiantur (s. tessulares)
multis quiesco cosis, sed maxime euctae in sua pelagii antimeridiani
temore blancto, ominone totius dorso per tranquilla emulantes, etc".
unabundam: Gellius's coinage, taken up by Amiani 17.7.11 "impulsu
crobiore aquis unabundantis".

4-5 Strab. I. N. 128 "austro minores fluctus exaltur quam
equilone, quonia ille internus ex insula spirat, hic subito". The
ancients of course regarded the ortipole as higher than the south.

Caracte (1.1.1) notes "La différence observée doit s'expliquer du
cou que pour les Italiens l'Aquil a souffle de la terre et n'a pas le
temps de donner à la houle une large amplitude".

4 intus: so at Gellius 17.1.13; 1 Apuleius Met. 4.12, 9.34;
Amiani 17.7.13. Classically one saw iunius or ab/ex ins.
tanisper: Plautus eleven times, Terence four, Cicero four (excluding
quotations), Livy three (p.5, 1.3.1, 1.2.5). Never in Caesar,
Tacitus, or customius. At 7.4.1 Gellius links it with quaod, an
innovation.

infimam: so 5.1.2 "ex supernis in infima quam ex infinis in superna";
13.22.5 "plantarum calceis tunc in infima"; 13.10.1 "capite infimo nimis"
Contrast 1.1.2 "ad ventrem intum" 1.5.1 "de pectore intum". The term
infimus (= Sanscrit usūr), Indo-European *usūrs (usūrs) is the only one
used by Plautus and Terence, and is normal in prose till Livy; cp.
Cicero, 1.4.1.4 "ita et esse et forte oricula infima scito conioren
(contrast Catullus 23.2); Caesar 1.4.1.5 "sub infimo colle"; Varro
ap. Cic. 1.1.17.2 "infimam hominam Via". Thus, with the zero-grade of
the suffix -us, is already found in Cato, and from the first century
B.C. is regular in verse; in prose Livy has it nineteen times (and
infimus thirty or so), and then it predominates in Viruvius (111-),
Helius (c. 65-), the younger Seneca, Commodus, the elder Sfiny, and
1. hence Macrobius Sat. 4.7.12.
quintilian. It is, however, very rare in the metaphorical sense, for which infimus is regular ("ex infima plebe" and the like; even in authors who always use imus for the literal meaning: Rhet. herm., Tacitus, the younger Plin., Suetonius, Historia Auguste; similarly Lucretius has imus seventeen times with its literal value, but 1.1035 "ossa aedit terrae proimae ac famuli infimus esset". See L.s.v. imus; Wörstelt, Syntaxion 1.345sqq.

alignantiser: so Plautus, pseudoitus 571, Oeculius 45, Terence, Adelphoe 632, MT 572; Claudius quadrigarius fr. 60; then in Plutus (1.36.11), Gellius (here and at 16.3 lemma), and Apuleius. See Lebek "Verba Priscas" 253.

6 adininiculum: the technical term for supporting a vine or a tree on a stake: Cicero, de fin. 5.39; volumnia 4.96.1, art. 17.2; Pliny, i.m. 14.13; used metaphorically of help by Varro, and by Gellius at 14.1.1 in "adininiciation" praef. 11. In later authors, as Ambrose and Chalcidius, it is used as a deponent and constructed with the active.

7 τονός μείγα κόμα ητειβοινέα εϊων ηβειν this is 295 (remarkably corrupted in V).

8 και Βορεύς άλφενενέρες (μέγα μωρόν) this is 596, cr. 2.22.9.161.

9 ab austris cetera his qui humaniores sunt: "his" would seem to be allative of comparison.

10 ἠδην ἄνω ὄθεντο τοι ἱππον: see 2 596, cited again at 6.2.5 for its (extremely expressive) hiatus of identical vowels.
The marvellous match, of sound to sense in the description of Sisyphus's torment (1593-600) was often noted and imitated in antiquity in the original poet it was no doubt instinctive and unconscious.

Dr Williams (cf. 2.27.30, p.327) aptly compares Vergil, er. 5.1-2

interea medium nomen iam classe tenebat
certus iter, fluctusque atros aquilone secabat.

Aristotelis libros problematorum: 26.27, 29-1024 διό

Nestou περιέχει η στοίχεια τοῦ πεπερασμένου ουδέ

η ταχύτητα του ουδέ ουδέ

problematum: so (1.1.17) 3.6.1; or problematum in Accius, q.

Laelius, Vico, and Varro (Charistus G.K 1.14.29 = 179.12 Barwick and the super glossem of Accius Philologus (Festus 192.2);

in Republican Latin the dat.-abl. form is regularly -natis, whence in Gellius theoraphatis ... 2.6, poenatis 9.14.10.12; 13.1.1; 17.11.4; 1.11.4), problematis 19.5.1. See H 1.34.673.3, 1.345.77.2.

Neue-Wagner 1.30 sqq.; Hertz Varro.

on ...prescr. ...e nato. For the interchange of singular and plural cf. prex. 2: "nami proinie ut ... coperam ... audieram ...

annotabar ... nisi ... reconsiembar ... me ... sumpsram ... ,

facile inde nobis inuenit atque deprecto taret"; 11.6.3 "nasi san

inquit "homo natus natus in latitio; Graecia oratio a nosis alienissima est"; 17.2.2 "uelut hac uerba ex Gellii primo annali quae nonisse potui notari, quonlibet legibus biline proximo superiore";

17.6.11 (referring to Gellius's own interpretation of "serius receptus"

"plura dicere quibus hoc nostrum taeus supersedeo". Cf., at

a certain distance, 12.2.2; between sentences the shift is frequent,

In naturally the wording is in fact Gellius's own, though the same shift may have been present in Nepos (source for the chapter 15) or in Albinus's Greek, which there is no reason to suppose Gellius saw.

2 Where Henry aptly compares Alciphron III scherefs. (Hocabulary, p.93, and aimo; how only not to be described.)
e.g. 1.15.1-3 (plural to singular), 1.6.1 (singular to plural), and repeatedly in the preface. At 1.6.6 "quid enim refer mea eiusque quicua loquor, quo genera 'pennis' dicam aut in quas extremes litteras decline, si nemo in non nimir barbarae fecerim VR", the standard interpretation is Hertz's "si neuter nostrum in nimir barbarae fecerit". That this is linguistically possible is demonstrated by his parallels, but it gives the wrong sense: only "ego" have used the word at all, barbarae or nimir, not "quicua loquor". I should therefore end nemo to modo with Lion, and accept "fecerius" fronte, giving another example of the interchange. 1

praecicerpo: elsewhere used of plucking before the fruit is ripe (Ovid Her. 20.143); figuratively at e.g. Cicero 2 V., 69 "non praecicerpo fructum offici tui".

totaei: but Gellius fails to quote it, apparently through forgetfulness. We may, however, suppose that (no doubt quite early) the end of a roll was lost, as the beginning of one was in books 5 and 7.

1. which, it may be noted, is particularly common in our idiom (cf. Dodds on 3 c.s.c.h. 66).
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