

Greek philosophy,¹⁷ it is even conceivable that Catulus was aware of the Platonic background, such as it is.

Wadham College, Oxford

S.J. HEYWORTH

stephen.heyworth@wadh.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838814000810

¹⁷ NB *De or.* 3.187 *atque haec quidem ab eis philosophis, quos tu maxime diligis, Catule, dicta sunt.*

AN EMENDATION TO A FRAGMENT OF VARRO'S *DE BIBLIOTHECIS* (FR. 54 *GRF* FUNAIOLI)¹

Varro wrote three books *De bibliothecis*, according to a list by Jerome (*Ep.* 33.2 = testimonium 23 *GRF* Funaioli). The work may have had something to do with his commission to build a massive public library for Julius Caesar (Suet. *Iul.* 44.2), though Caesar was assassinated before the library could be built. It may also have some connection to Rome's first public library, which Asinius Pollio added to the Atrium of Liberty in the 30s B.C. Pollio, after all, gave a portrait to Varro alone among living authors (Plin. *HN* 7.115). The known fragments are few.

There are places where Varro is quoted on book-related matters, but without an attribution to his *De bibliothecis*. One example is a note on the history of papyrus in Pliny's *Natural History* (13.69–70). Pliny reported that Varro had written about the origins and history of papyrus and other writing materials (palm leaves, bark, lead, linen, wax). Varro apparently wrote that papyrus was only discovered after Alexander the Great had founded Alexandria, and that parchment was invented at Pergamum in response to a papyrus embargo from Egypt, which had been instituted when the Ptolemies became jealous of the rival library. Such a history of papyrus could easily have fit in the *De bibliothecis*, but it could just as well have fit in some of Varro's voluminous other writings.

It is sometimes supposed that all of Isidore of Seville's *Origines* 6.3, 6.5 and 6.9–14 come from Varro, with Suetonius as an intermediary.² This is certainly possible. Isidore's treatment of books and libraries in his *Origines* included chapters on writing materials (wax at *Orig.* 6.9, papyrus at 6.10, parchment at 6.11, various others at 6.14). But we should keep in mind that the only certain connection between Isidore's Book 6 and Varro's *De bibliothecis* is in subject matter (i.e. books and libraries). The role of Suetonius as intermediary is based on the fact that Isidore cited Suetonius elsewhere, and on the fact that Isidore made use of Suetonius once in regard to a book-related matter.³ Given these tenuous connections, the temptation to use Isidore to reconstruct Varro's *De bibliothecis* should be resisted.

¹ I would like to thank Dylan Sailor, Bruce Gibson and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments and suggestions.

² So P. Schmidt, 'Suetons "Pratum" seit Wessner (1917)', *ANRW* 2.33.5 (1991), 3794–3825, esp. 3806, 3814–15.

³ Isidore cites Suetonius explicitly at *Orig.* 8.7.1, 18.2.3 and 18.6.8. At *Orig.* 6.14.1, Isidore gives a definition of *bibliopola* that is also found in a scholiast (on Hor. *Ars P.* 354), who attributes it to Suetonius.

There are only two securely attested fragments, both preserved in Charisius, who wrote his *Ars grammatica* around A.D. 362.⁴ One simply remarks that in the second book of Varro's *De bibliothecis* he used the form *uectigaliorum* rather than *uectigalium* (fr. 53), and the other that he used the term *gluten* in the phrase 'he fixed it up with glue and citron-wood' (*glutine et citro refecit*,⁵ fr. 54).

The reading is not very satisfactory. The *gluten* suggests that Varro is talking about repairing a scroll.⁶ Yet citron-wood is not known to have been used in the manufacture or repair of book-rolls. The quotation from Varro is cited in two places in Charisius, and the *editio princeps* (1532) emended the first of these to *cinere* (the one at p. 110 Barwick), an emendation that Fabricius used for the second (at p. 167 Barwick) in his edition of 1551.⁷ Presumably they believed Varro was referring to the use of ash in ink. Both Keil and Barwick rejected this emendation, so they must have found the reading *citro* defensible. Seneca (*Tranq.* 9.6) makes reference to citron-wood bookcases (*armaria*), so they may have accepted the reading on the grounds that Varro was writing about repairing bookcases. It is true that *gluten* could be used in wood-working (see *Lucr.* 6.1069–71), but it seems unlikely that citron-wood would be used along with *gluten* as a part of a repair. Citron-wood was an expensive luxury item, often mentioned alongside gold or ivory.⁸ In fact, moralizing rhetoric at times used the combination of citron-wood with gold or ivory to suggest an over-the-top extravagance⁹ – and this is what we see in Seneca. He is not referring to any actual citron-wood bookcases, much less suggesting that these were a common item. To the contrary. He asks (*Tranq.* 9.6): *quid habes cur ignoscas homini armaria <e> citro atque ebore captanti?* 'What indulgence should you show for the kind of man who would try to acquire bookcases made from citron-wood and ivory?' Seneca uses the idea of citron-wood bookcases to categorize a certain kind of individual: the kind who would spend a fortune on the accoutrements of literature but not spend time on literature itself.

A much better reading would be *cedro*. Cedar was most definitely used in book-roll production and repair. Pliny the Elder writes that cedar had fungicidal and pesticidal properties.¹⁰ Papyrus was frequently treated with cedar oil for this reason. As Vitruvius writes (2.9.13): 'When other things, like books, are treated with cedar-oil, they are not damaged by worms and rot' (*ex cedro oleum ... quo reliquae res cum*

⁴ Fragments at Varro, fr. 53 *GRF* Funaioli (= p. 186 Barwick [p. 146 Keil]) and fr. 54 *GRF* Funaioli (= p. 110 Barwick [pp. 87–8 Keil] and p. 167 Barwick [p. 131 Keil]).

⁵ As it appears at p. 167 Barwick, *reficit* at p. 110 Barwick.

⁶ Sheets of papyrus were glued together to form a book-roll. The adhesive used was sometimes described as *gluten* (or a related word) in ancient sources, e.g. *Isid. Orig.* 6.10.2: *carta autem dicta quod carptim papyri tegmen decerptum glutinantur*; SHA, *Quadr. Tyr.* 3.2: *exercitum se alere posse papyro et glutine*; Plin. *HN* 13.81: *inserta mediis glutinamentis taenea*; Plin. *HN* 22.127: *chartae glutinantur*. Slaves and freedmen who worked on book-repair were called *glutinatores* (see *TLL* 6.2.2113 s.v. *glutinator*).

⁷ This is stated in the apparatus criticus in H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1857 [reprinted Hildesheim, 1961]). Barwick does not note the emendation. In the first case, the *editio princeps* also deleted the *reficit*.

⁸ E.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.37: *maximam et pulcherrimam mensam citream*; Plin. *HN* 13.102: *nec aliunde pretiosiora opera*; Apul. *Met.* 2.19.1: *citro et ebore nitentes*.

⁹ E.g. Cato the Elder, fr. 185 *ORF* Malcovati: *expolitae maximo opere citro atque ebore*; Varro, *Rust.* 3.2.4: *nuncubi hic uidet citrum aut aurum?*; Petron. *Sat.* 119.28–9: *citrea mensa ... imitatur uilius aurum*; Plin. *HN* 5.12: *luxuriae, cuius efficacissima uis sentitur atque maxima, cum ebore, citro siluae exquirantur*.

¹⁰ *HN* 16.197: *cedri oleo peruncta materies nec tiniam nec cariem sentit*; *HN* 16.212: *cariem uetus-tatemque non sentiunt ... cedrus ... rimam fissuramque non capit sponte cedrus*.

sunt unctae, uti etiam libri, a tineis et carie non laeduntur).¹¹ The darker colour of cedar-coated papyrus was also aesthetically prized.¹² Modern finds of ancient papyrus attest to the presence of cedar, especially for scrolls containing literary works.¹³ 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

¹¹ 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*.

¹² 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*.

¹³ 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.¹ 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.

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