

*sunt unctae, uti etiam libri, a tineis et carie non laeduntur*).<sup>11</sup> The darker colour of cedar-coated papyrus was also aesthetically prized.<sup>12</sup> Modern finds of ancient papyrus attest to the presence of cedar, especially for scrolls containing literary works.<sup>13</sup> In his *TLL* entry for *citrum* (*TLL* 3.1207), faced with the fragment of Varro in question, Stadler suggested that in this case *citrum* perhaps referred to cedar, yet such a usage would be entirely unparalleled. Rather, this is a mistake that should be corrected.

The similarity of sound and semantic field between *cedro* and *citro* would make the corruption an understandable one, especially if the copyist was not knowledgeable about the manufacture and repair of papyrus. Therefore, the fragment of Varro's *De bibliothecis* reading *glutine et citro refecit* (fr. 54 *GRF* Funaioli) should be emended to *glutine et cedro refecit*.

Dartmouth College

THOMAS HENDRICKSON  
 thomas.g.hendrickson@dartmouth.edu  
 doi:10.1017/S000983881400069X

<sup>11</sup> The use of cedar oil to preserve books is often noted, and is an indication of a good quality book: Hor. *Ars P.* 331–2: *speramus carmina fingi | posse linenda cedro*; Porph. on Hor. *Ars P.* 332: *libri enim, qui aut cedro inlinuntur ... a tineis non uexantur*; Schol. Hor. *Ars P.* 332: *cedrus ... <cutius> ligna sunt imputribilia et hac re uermes et serpentes fugantia*; Pers. 1.42: *cedro digna locutus*; Pacian, *Ep.* 2.4.5: *litteras tuas uiuaci cedro perlinam propter cariosas hostes Musarum*; Marcell. *De med.* 12.36: *cedrum, quo libri perunguntur*; Marcell. *De med.* 31.21: *cedria, quo librarii utuntur*.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Ov. *Trist.* 1.1.7: *nec cedro charta notetur*; Ov. *Trist.* 3.1.13: *neque sum cedro flauus*; Ov. *Trist.* 3.1.55: *aspicis exsangui chartam pallere colore*; Mart. *Ep.* 3.2.7: *cedro ... perunctus*; Mart. *Ep.* 5.6.14: *cedro decorata*; Mart. *Ep.* 8.61.4: *decorus et cedro*; Lucian, *Ind.* 16: τὰ βιβλία ... ἀλείφεις τῷ κρόκῳ καὶ τῇ κέδρῳ; Mart. *Cap.* 2.136: *alia ex papyro, quae cedro perlita fuerat*.

<sup>13</sup> E.g. J. Frösén, 'The conservation of ancient papyrus materials', in R. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford, 2009), 79–100, at 83.

## TWO TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN BOOK 7 OF VARRO'S *DE LINGVA LATINA*\*

In this contribution I wish to tackle two corruptions in Book 7 of Varro's *De lingua Latina* that have hitherto gone unnoticed or been corrected inadequately.

The text of this work is anything but straightforward. A large number of manuscripts exist, but there is no reason to doubt that they all go back, directly or indirectly, to an extant codex kept in the Laurentian Library at Florence.<sup>1</sup> This parchment, the Codex Laurentianus LI.10, folios 2–34, commonly abbreviated to F, was written in the Beneventan script in the eleventh century. The scribe of our text is usually accused of carelessness, incompetence, poor eyesight, or a combination of the three; however, while these accusations are undoubtedly well-founded, the process of deterioration must have begun long before his time.

\* I would like to thank Philipp Brandenburg and an anonymous referee for some very helpful comments on this piece.

<sup>1</sup> Thus also L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 430–1.

But now it is time to turn to the passages in question.

7.42: *OLLI VALET DICTVM ILLI*

In 7.42, Varro quotes an Ennian hexameter (Enn. *Ann.* 113 Skutsch) containing the form *olli*, ‘to him’. This old dative requires a gloss, and naturally Varro provides one. In F, it reads as follows:

*Olli ualet dictum illi, ab olla et ollo.*

*Olli*, ‘to him’, stands for the word *illi*, ‘to him’, from *olla*, ‘she’, and *ollus*, ‘he’.

An appositive phrase with *ab* is unproblematic. We can find a parallel in the following example (7.67):

*Id Graecum est, ab eius loci uersura.*

This is Greek, from the bend of this place.

However, the phrase *ualet dictum*, provisionally translated as ‘stands for the word’, is unsatisfactory. Varro has a variety of expressions for ‘word’ – *uerbum*, *uox*, *nomen*, and *uocabulum* – all used with slightly different connotations, but *dictum* is not among them.<sup>2</sup> *Dictum* is attested as a noun in 6.61, yet not as ‘word’ in the linguistic sense, but as ‘witty word/saying’ in mime.<sup>3</sup> Taking *dictum* in our passage as a participle rather than a noun would be equally difficult; we would have to translate *ualet dictum illi* as ‘means (as if) *illi* was said’.

Despite these problems, all editions leave the phrase unaltered.<sup>4</sup> Kent, whose translation is normally helpful and convincing, renders *ualet dictum illi* as ‘is the same as *illi*’, which glosses over the difficulty without solving it. Under these circumstances, it may be better to leave *dictum* aside for the moment and to concentrate on *ualet*. *Valere* is used in four different ways in the *De lingua Latina*:

- (a) as a participle functioning like an adjective; in this usage it means ‘strong’, is not combined with any complements, and is rare (9.11; in 7.74 we are dealing with a quotation);
- (b) as a finite verb with the meaning ‘to have monetary value’; in this usage it does take a complement, but is attested only twice (5.173, 5.174);
- (c) as a finite verb, combined with *idem*, translatable as ‘to have the same meaning’; this occurs three times (6.58, 6.81, 9.87);

<sup>2</sup> For *uerbum* vs. *uox*, see D.J. Taylor, *Declinatio: A Study of the Linguistic Theory of Marcus Terentius Varro* (Amsterdam, 1974), 119–20. *Verbum* is used in 9.53 of nouns; *uox*, in 8.76, of adjectives and adverbs; *nomen*, in 8.5, of all words that can be inflected; and *uocabulum*, in 9.50, of nouns. These four words can be used non-specifically of various word classes, but also more specifically as technical terms, in which case they are no longer interchangeable.

<sup>3</sup> *Hinc* [*sc. ab dicendo*] *appellatum dictum in mimo ac dictiosus*, ‘from this [*sc. dicere* “to speak”] *dictum*, “witty word”, and *dictiosus*, “witty”, were named in mime’.

<sup>4</sup> Among more recent works, see e.g. K.O. Müller, *M. Terenti Varronis De lingua Latina librorum quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1833); L. Spengel and A. Spengel, *M. Terenti Varronis De lingua Latina libri* (Berlin, 1885); G. Götz and F. Schöll, *M. Terenti Varronis De lingua Latina quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1910); R.G. Kent, *Varro: On the Latin Language: with an English Translation* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1938).

- (d) as a finite verb or an infinitive, used for glosses of the type *x ualet y* ‘x means y’; this occurs eight times, as in the following example:

*Creui ualet constitui.* (7.98)

*Creui*, ‘I have decided’, means *constitui*, ‘I have established’.<sup>5</sup>

Only the linguistic meanings (c) and (d) are relevant here, and, although the material is limited, it is telling that they are never combined with a noun meaning ‘word’ or with a participle. What can be done? The Codex Vindobonensis LXIII (fifteenth century, abbreviated to V) and the Codex Basiliensis F.IV.13 (fifteenth or sixteenth century, abbreviated to p) leave out *ualet* altogether, whether through negligence or on purpose. This seems to improve the situation, but unfortunately only at first sight: the normal order for ‘x used to be called y’ in Varro is *x dictum y*, not the other way round, so we should expect *illi dictum olli*.

Thus, it is probably *dictum* rather than *ualet* that needs to be removed from the phrase; *olli ualet illi*, ‘*olli* means *illi*’, is in keeping with Varro’s diction. However, it is hard to see how *dictum* could have intruded into our text, as it is not a gloss. The most elegant solution for 7.42 does not consist of a deletion, but of a transposition of *dictum* and *illi*:

*Olli ualet illi, dictum ab olla et ollo.*

*Olli* means *illi*, said from *olla* and *ollus*.

This transposition restores the proper usage of *ualere* and leads to an appositive phrase with *dictum ab*, for which there are several parallels in Books 5–10.<sup>6</sup>

### 7.53: ‘HE HAD SLIPPERS ON HIS SHEEP’

In 7.53, Varro transmits a verse from Naevius because of two words, *diabathrum* (‘slipper’) and *epicrocum* (‘saffron robe’). In F, the text reads as follows:

Dyabathra in pecudibus habebat, erat amictus epicroco. (Naev. *trag. inc.* 54)

He<sup>7</sup> had slippers on his sheep and was dressed in a saffron robe.

Varro does not gloss these words, presumably because they would be familiar to his readers. While he normally explains the etymological origins of native words, he typically makes less of an effort in the case of loanwords and merely says what languages they come from. As he follows the same procedure here, the copyist would know that he was dealing with Greek words, but, given the mess that he normally makes of anything written in Greek letters,<sup>8</sup> it is a safe assumption that he understood little or no Greek. Thus, since he

<sup>5</sup> The other tokens are in 5.171, 6.60, 6.63, 7.14, 7.69, 7.99 and 9.54.

<sup>6</sup> See 5.159, 5.165, 5.177, 6.11, 7.31, 7.85; the token in 5.129 is ambiguous.

<sup>7</sup> The *epicrocum* was normally a garment for women, but *amictus* is masculine. Non. p. 498 Lindsay informs us that, according to Varro, the *epicrocum* could also be worn by men.

<sup>8</sup> This is particularly obvious in *Ling.* 6.96, where Varro discusses Latin words supposedly taken from Greek. The Greek words in F are partly written in the Latin alphabet, partly in the Greek; capitals and lower-case letters are used almost randomly; various words are mangled to such an extent that it is only the Latin equivalents that allow us to restore the Greek words.

probably did not know that *diabathra* are a type of shoes, he would not realize that one does not put them on sheep. A mistake of this sort was unlikely to persist for too long, and Rholandellus corrected in *pecudibus*, ‘on his sheep’, to in *pedibus*, ‘on his feet’.<sup>9</sup>

With this minor correction in place, the verse has made it into all editions of Varro and Naevius.<sup>10</sup> However, it does not scan. Ribbeck is the only editor who makes his scansion explicit and divides the line, a trochaic septenarius, into feet:

Diaba|thr(a) in pe|dibus ha|bebat | erat a|mictus | epicro|co.

With this scansion, *pedibus* violates the law of Hermann and Lachmann, which states that a disyllabic element (here *-dibus*) may not be formed from a word beginning before the element and ending together with it. Violations of this law are extremely rare and occur mainly at the beginning of a line or after the main caesura, places in which other laws are similarly observed less strictly.<sup>11</sup>

Ribbeck clearly had misgivings about his scansion and as an alternative proposed dividing *pedibus* as *pedi|bus*. While this does not violate the law of Hermann and Lachmann, it now leaves us with *-bus* as a heavy syllable. As parallels he quotes Plaut. *Mostell.* 402 and Titin. *com.* 45, both trochaic septenarii; the former ends in *aedi-bus habitet licet* and the latter in *aedibus absterrui*. In both cases *-bus* counts as a heavy syllable. However, the situation is completely different in these proposed parallels: *-bus* stands in the eleventh position in a trochaic septenarius, which can be treated as a virtual line end, a ‘locus Jacobsohnianus’; not only can we find hiatus quite commonly here, but we can also get a light syllable instead of a heavy one.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, in the Naevian line there are no excuses for letting *pedibus* violate the law of Hermann and Lachmann or for counting its final syllable as heavy.

Previous attempts at emendation have been rather drastic. Bergk suggested deleting *habebat*, regarding it as a gloss.<sup>13</sup> This would yield an iambic senarius, but the syntax would be obscured: *diabathra* cannot depend on *erat amictus*, and understanding *erant* with *diabathra* would lead to a clumsy change of subject. An anonymous scholar quoted by Ribbeck suggests replacing *habebat* with *gerebat*, which would yield a correct septenarius; *habebat* would be a gloss that replaced *gerebat*. While *gerere* can indeed be used of footwear,<sup>14</sup> and while this usage is admittedly rare, *gerere* in general is such a common verb and would be so readily understood here that I find it hard to see why it should have been glossed.

A different solution needs to be found. I propose a simple transposition, after which the line scans as a perfect septenarius:

In pedibus diabathra habebat, erat amictus epicroco.

<sup>9</sup> F. Rholandellus, *M.T. Varronis De lingua Latina* (Venice, 1475).

<sup>10</sup> For Varro, see again the editions in n. 4. For Naevius see e.g. O. Ribbeck, *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta, I: Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1897<sup>3</sup>; same text in earlier editions); E.H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin, Vol. 2: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius* (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1936); E.V. Marmorale, *Naevius poeta: introduzione bibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento* (Florence, 1959); M. Schauer, *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta, I: Livius Andronicus; Naevius; Tragici minores; Fragmenta adespota* (Göttingen, 2012).

<sup>11</sup> For details, see C. Questa, *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio* (Urbino, 2007), 213–44.

<sup>12</sup> Details in *ibid.*, 279–99.

<sup>13</sup> T. Bergk, ‘Kritische Bemerkungen zu den römischen Tragikern’, *Philologus* 33 (1874), 249–313, at 281, conveniently reprinted in T. Bergk, *Kleine philologische Schriften von Theodor Bergk: herausgegeben von Rudolf Peppmüller*, vol. 1: *Zur römischen Literatur* (Halle, 1884).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Catull. 61. 9.

Two mistakes in one sentence is not an unusual count for our scribe. But, despite the plethora of mistakes we find in F, it is on occasion worthwhile to ask why individual errors exist. *Pecudibus* instead of *pedibus* is certainly strange enough to warrant this question, as *pes* is not a rare or unusual word naturally prone to corruption. So what happened?

The genesis of the corruption is quite straightforward. An earlier copyist accidentally transposed the words, yielding *diabathra in pedibus habebat*. The corrector who went through the text afterwards spotted the mistake, marked *diabathra* and *in pedibus*, and wrote *c'* over *pedibus* (or possibly in the margin). *C'* is an abbreviation for *conuerte* ('transpose/change'),<sup>15</sup> but either the scribe of F or someone before him did not understand the meaning of the verse, misread the correction mark as *cu*, and inserted these letters into *pedibus*.

### CONCLUSIONS

My two proposed changes to the transmitted text of Varro's Book 7 of the *De lingua Latina* are transpositions. Errors of word order are more difficult to detect in prose works than in poetry, and so it is perhaps not surprising that one of the emendations concerns a verse quotation from Naevius. However, my emendations are by no means unique; other scholars have successfully emended passages of the *De lingua Latina* through simple transpositions.<sup>16</sup>

Wolfson College, Oxford

WOLFGANG D.C. DE MELO

[wolfgang.demelo@gmail.com](mailto:wolfgang.demelo@gmail.com)

doi:10.1017/S0009838814000019

<sup>15</sup> For this abbreviation and its use in F, see P. Flobert (ed.), *Varron: La langue latine, livre VI. Texte établi, traduit et commenté* (Paris, 1985), 67.

<sup>16</sup> A particularly convincing example of emendation by transposition is H. Dahlmann, 'Zu Varro, *De lingua Latina* VI 12', *RhM* 132 (1989), 307–13.

### CICERO, *LEG.* 1.6: 'PLEASURABLE' ANNALS?\*

quamobrem aggredere, quaesumus, et sume ad hanc rem tempus, quae est a nostris hominibus adhuc aut ignorata aut relicta. nam post annales pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse iucundius, si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennonium uenias, quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet uirium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes?

3 iucundius  $\omega$  : <in> iucundius *Davies* : ieunius *Ursinus* : nudius *Rob. Steph.*

The manuscript reading *iucundius* has had a few defenders, but nearly all editors have chosen to emend, and of the several emendations proposed, the favourite has been Orsini's *ieunius*, adopted recently in Jonathan Powell's Oxford Classical Text, in Andrew Dyck's magisterial commentary, and in the new edition of the fragments of

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. I am grateful to the audience there and to the anonymous reader for *CQ* for helpful comments.