

- (18) Pliny *Epist.* 7. 20. 7: "ut invicem ardentius diligamus"  
 "That we should love each other still more warmly"  
 (19) Quintilian 9. 4. 129: "homines, manibus invicem apprehensis, gradum firmant."  
 "Men, having linked hands with each other, steady their steps."

In (17)–(19), the reciprocal interpretation of *invicem* ("each other") and not the sequential one ("by turns, alternately") is fully apparent, since it is clear that the action in each sentence is simultaneous for every agent involved.

Schematically, then, I would represent the derivation of this reciprocal complex as follows:

Stage I	<i>se</i>
Stage II	<i>inter se</i>
Stage III	<i>inter se invicem</i>
Stage IV	<i>invicem se</i>
Stage V	<i>invicem</i>

It is important to note that this schematization does not assume a chronological progression and should not be considered a reconstruction. These stages may be best viewed as representing stylistic options rather than a diachronic chain. In other words, there was probably no time at which any of these options would have been ungrammatical once *invicem* came to be used to disambiguate reciprocals and reflexives. This semantic and syntactic development is motivated entirely by the need to distinguish more easily the reciprocal from the reflexive interpretation of sentences like Priscian's "iste et ille se amant," and as such is a dynamic example of Latin's well-known intolerance for ambiguity and lack of clarity. That Priscian recognized this ambiguity as a linguistic problem and attempted to deal with it at all is a credit to his independence and creativity. Those who would berate him as a mere translator of Apollonius would do well to look at the entire *Institutiones*. There is a wealth of valuable insight in it.

PHILIP BALDI

*The Pennsylvania State University*

## TWO RUSTIC NOTES

### 1. VARRO *Rust.* 1. 5. 4 AND THE STRUCTURE OF SCROFA'S DISCOURSE

Scrofa, the principal speaker of the first half of Book 1 of Varro's *De re rustica*, is a lecturer of method: he first outlines his subject and then, at the beginning and conclusion of each part and section, reminds his audience of his progress and of what is to come. His outline (1. 5. 3–4) is as follows (there are four "parts," each of which has two "sections"):<sup>1</sup>

- I. cognitio fundi (discussed in chaps. 6–16)
  - A. quae ad solum pertinent terrae (6–10, 14–15)
  - B. quae ad villas et stabula (11–13)

1. "Parts" and "sections" (and later "subsections") are my terms of convenience. In such outlines (*divisio, dividere*), Varro uses *pars*, *genus*, and *species* loosely, often interchangeably: see M. Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch* (Göttingen, 1960), pp. 72–74. Cf. the first sentence of 1. 5. 4, with Heinrich Keil's convincing emendation, "de his quattuor generalibus partibus singulae minimum in binas dividuntur species" (for "de his quattuor generibus singulae . . ."). References

- II. quae in eo fundo opus sint ac debeant esse culturae causa (17–22)
  - A. de hominibus per quos colendum (17–18)
  - B. de reliquo instrumento (19–22)
- III. quae in eo praedio colendi causa sint facienda (23–26)
  - A. quae ad quamque rem sint praeparanda
  - B. ubi quaeque facienda
- IV. quo quicque tempore in eo fundo fieri conveniat (27–37. 3)
  - A. quae ad solis circumitum annum sint referenda (27–36)
  - B. quae ad lunae menstruum cursum (37. 1–3)

The neatness of this division obviously appealed to Varro, for some of the material turns out not to fit quite so easily. For instance, II is actually handled in a triadic arrangement, *instrumenti genus vocale* (men, 17–18), . . . *semivocale* (beasts, 19–21), . . . *mulum* (equipment, 22); and III is actually dealt with as a whole and in somewhat different terms (23. 1 “... duo considerata, quae et quo quidque loco maxime expediat serere,” what to plant where). Such discrepancies, noted by some scholars, need cause no alarm and should only emphasize for us the importance Varro attached to his four-part, eight-section *divisio*.<sup>2</sup> What is alarming, however, is a complete lapse in the handling of I, where outline and discussion are totally and irreconcilably at odds. Though some scholars have noted this as another minor slip on Varro’s part, no one has regarded it as serious or offered a solution.

At the beginning (6. 1), I A is divided further into four “subsections”: “igitur primum de solo fundi [i.e., I A, ‘quae ad solum pertinent terrae’] videndum haec quattuor, qua sit forma, quo in genere terrae, quantus, quam per se tutus.” Sure enough, each subsection is dealt with in turn—the situation of the land (6. 2–7. 4), types of soil (7. 5–9. 7), measurements of land (10), and types of enclosures (14–15)—all purposefully concluded by the methodical lecturer (at the end of 15): “igitur primum haec, quae dixi, quattuor videnda agricolae, de fundi forma, de terrae natura, de modo agri, de finibus tuendis.” But what, then, is all this we have just heard at length (11–13), in the subsection on measurements, about the villa (its location in relation to winds, sun, and water) and the other farm buildings? Consulting our notes of Scrofa’s initial outline, we see that he appears to have included, under the subsection *de modo agri*, the whole of I B (“quae ad villas et stabula”). Is this unexpected inclusion (or intrusion) a nicety of arrangement, however uncharacteristic of Varro’s procedure elsewhere? Or is it a structural blunder? In any case, since we have had both sections in I as given in the outline, II should follow, and with this expectation we turn again to the text, picking up, after

to Keil are to his edition of Cato and Varro: vol. 1.1: Cato *De agri cultura* (Leipzig, 1882); vol. 1.2: Varro *Res rusticae* (Leipzig, 1884); vol. 2.1: commentary on Cato (Leipzig, 1894); vol. 2.2: commentary on Varro (Leipzig, 1891); vol. 3.1: index to Cato, compiled by R. Krumbiegel (Leipzig, 1897); vol. 3.2: index to Varro, also by Krumbiegel (Leipzig, 1902).

2. So Fuhrmann, *Lehrbuch*, p. 70, on Varro’s general disposition of his subject: “Schon diese Stellen zeigen, dass Varro einer konsequenten systematischen Trennung der Materien grossen Wert beimisst und dass er die erstmal von ihm durchgeführte Dreiteilung der gesamten Landwirtschaft als erheblichen wissenschaftlichen Fortschritt ansieht.” Cf. the elaborate triadic *divisio* of Book 2 (outlined at 2. 1. 12 “ita fiunt omnium partes minimum octaginta et una . . .”). Varro’s use of *minimum* in the first sentence of 1. 5. 4 indicates his awareness that outline and discussion will not agree in every detail.

This note is as much concerned with Varro’s structure (now misunderstood) of Book 1 (Scrofa’s discourse) as with the text of 1. 5. 4 (the source of the misunderstanding); hence its length and detail.

Scrofa's summary (at the end of 15), with chapter 16: "relinquitur altera pars, quae est extra fundum . . ." But as we read, we find nothing of the subject matter of II, nor can we relate what we are being told to the initial outline.<sup>3</sup>

As we reread 16, however, it becomes obvious what we have. This *altera pars* has four subsections (*species*), listed at the outset (16. 1), just as in 6. 1 the four subsections of I A were listed: the safety of the region, accessibility of markets, availability of transportation, influences of neighboring farms. Following the discussion of each of these subsections, Scrofa sums up (17. 1): "de fundi quattuor partibus, quae cum solo haerent, et alteris quattuor, quae extra fundum sunt et ad culturam pertinent, dixi. nunc dicam, agri quibus rebus colantur." Clearly enough, *here* is the conclusion of I and the beginning of II. Here, too, we have a clear statement of I, its two sections, each in turn with its four subsections, from which we may abstract the outline:

- I. cognitio fundi
  - A. quae cum solo haerent (in four subsections)
  - B. quae extra fundum sunt et ad culturam pertinent (in four subsections)

Comparing this with Scrofa's first outline (5. 4), we recognize again that I B is the villain of the piece. Not only did the *villae et stabula* (the I B of the initial outline) cause confusion when we heard about them in the third subsection (11–13) of I A, but here (17.1), when Scrofa sums up the division of I, they have disappeared. And it should be perfectly clear that the subject matter of I B, as given in the revised outline, has valid credentials—first, because the otherwise inexplicable "relinquitur altera pars, quae est extra fundum" (16.1) can only introduce I B; second, because the summary of 17. 1 is guaranteed by the discussion of 16 (whereas the "quae ad villas et stabula" of 5. 4 is not guaranteed by, or embedded in, its context); and third, because we can now see an obvious division of I (A internal considerations || B external considerations).

The only recourse now is emendation, and there is only one form it can take: "quae ad villas et stabula" must be ejected from Scrofa's initial outline at 5. 4, and its place given to some form of the words we have at both 16. 1 and 17. 1:

de his quattuor generalibus partibus singulae minimum in binas dividuntur species, quod habet prima ea quae ad solum pertinent terrae et altera quae extra fundum sunt.<sup>4</sup>

3. This unusual and serious incongruity between outline and discussion has been either ignored, regarded as careless, or explained away. Keil, *Commentarius*, p. 28, simply presents Varro's disposition of material; H. Dahlmann, s.v. "M. Terentius Varro," *RE*, suppl. 6 (1935): 1188, finds perfect order ("Den Dispositionspunkten, die er 5,3 auführt, folgt die Darstellung ganz glatt und klar"); nor is Fuhrmann, *Lehrbuch*, pp. 72–74, in spite of the fact that arrangement is his primary concern, aware of any difficulty. F. Zahlfeldt, *Quaestiones criticae in Varronis "Rerum rusticarum" libros tres* (Berlin, 1881)—unavailable to me—"attributes the discrepancy to Varro's careless form" (so, citing Zahlfeldt, J. Skydsgaard, *Varro the Scholar*, *Analecta Rom. Inst. Danici*, suppl. 4 [Copenhagen, 1968], p. 12, n. 7). Skydsgaard notes that "the discrepancy between the introductory systematization and the actual description has been only superficially discussed in the previous literature" (p. 12, n. 7); on pp. 12–15, he recognizes the difficulty, seems to find such discrepancies characteristic, and concludes only that "Scrofa has decisively broken the general outline given by himself, the breach apparently motivated by the word 'modus,' which gives rise to the train of thought: unit of area→the ideal size of the farmstead→its location generally" (p. 13).

4. The paradox is "... quod habet prima ea quae ad solum pertinent terrae et alterum quae ad villas et stabula." Keil first deleted *alterum*, noting (*Commentarius*, p. 27), "*alterum* inde ab Aldina

"Et quae ad villas et stabula" may have been added, perhaps as a marginal note, by a reader (at any time) to account for what is after all a large and important block of material (11-13, in itself twice as long as the real I B); and this addition may then have been taken as the second *species* (section) and so replaced *quae extra fundum sunt*.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. CATO *Agr.* 1. 7

I give Keil's text, my own apparatus criticus (after Keil), and the Loeb translation of W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash (Cambridge, Mass., 1934):

praedium quod primum siet, si me rogabis, sic dicam: de omnibus agris optimoque loco iugera agri centum: vinea est prima, *si vino bono* vel si vino multo est, secundo loco hortus irriguus, tertio salictum . . .

*post agris, non post dicam, interpunxit Merula et -que del. post loco addidit emitto Merula, si emeris Iucundus (Keil in Commentario suo) si vino bono addidit Ursinus, alia alii ex Varrone De re rustica 1. 7. 9 vel a Florentino Politianus*

If you ask me what is the best kind of farm, I should say: a hundred iugera of land, comprising all sorts of soils, and in a good situation; a vineyard comes first if it produces bountifully wine of a good quality; second, a watered garden; third, an osier-bed . . .

So has this sentence, almost without exception, been printed, punctuated, translated, and understood since the Renaissance; but there are real difficulties of both sense and syntax.

- (1) *De omnibus agris* cannot mean "comprising all sorts of soils,"<sup>6</sup> nor, even if it could, does Cato want to say that here. Cato, as Varro read him,<sup>7</sup> is ranking cash crops: the prospective buyer (to whom this chapter is addressed) will consider whether what the land is suited for will be profitable or not (the well-known "*scito idem agrum quod hominem. . .*" immediately precedes this sentence). What Cato is *not* saying (as should be evident from the simple fact of the list) is that one's sixty-six acres should be producing all sorts of crops (though this is what our texts lead readers and translators to suppose).

---

editione omissum erat," but then had second thoughts: "scribendum erat potius . . . *et altera quae ad villas et stabula.*" In his *editio minor* (Leipzig, 1891), he printed ". . . [et] altera quae ad villas et stabula." G. Goetz, in his edition (Leipzig, 1922), emended to *iterum*. *Altera* should be read (the Parisinus gives *alteram*, with *eam* for *ea*): *prima* and *altera* then stand for *species* (not *pars*), which is why Varro continues *secunda pars* . . . (cf. n. 1).

5. It is, of course, possible to read ". . . quod habet prima ea quae ad solum pertinent terrae et ad villas et stabula, et altera quae extra fundum sunt." (The omission of *quae extra fundum sunt*—and the consequent confusion which finally produced *alterum*—would then be due to a copyist's taking *ad villas et stabula* as the second *species*.) I do not, however, regard this as a likely possibility, because Varro intentionally simplifies and (cf. n. 2 and *minimum in binas species* at 5. 4) even distorts for the sake of clarity, simplicity, and balance of *divisio*; he would thus not have thought it necessary in the initial outline to mention buildings (a mention which would, in fact, distract from the neatness of the internal/external opposition).

6. This is not the *templum de marmore* usage (material). "Comprising all sorts of fields" requires *ex*, as Varro *Rust.* 1. 6. 2 "et *ex* iis tribus quartum," describing a "composite" farm comprising two or three of the basic types of land (*campestre, collinum, montanum*).

7. *Rust.* 1. 7. 9 "Cato quidem . . . gradatim praeponens alium alio agrum meliorem dicit esse in novem discriminibus, quod sit primus ubi vineae possint esse bono vino et multo, secundus ubi hortus irriguus," etc.

The idea of a farm "comprising all sorts of soils" is therefore foreign to this sentence (whether or not such a farm is desirable or possible is not at issue here).

- (2) For the same reason, *optimoque loco* is at least suspect: frequently *locus* does mean "situation" or "site," but is this meaning relevant here?
- (3) There is an awkwardness in the structure of the sentence evident even in translation (e.g., the Loeb translators' semicolon serves only to make an impossible sequence tolerable): what is the relation of *iugera agri centum* to *vinea est prima*? Merula and Iucundus saw the difficulty, but their solutions are noted by only one modern editor, and by him only in his commentary, without comment of any sort.

I suggest: "praedium quod primum siet, si me rogabis, sic dicam de omnibus agris: optimo loco iugera centum vineae, *si vino bono* vel si vino multo est, secundo loco hortus inriguus, tertio salictum . . ." Four points may be made in explanation.

- (1) Merula's punctuation seems necessary and apt:<sup>8</sup> *dicam de omnibus agris* makes sense of *de* and is precisely what Cato must want to say.
- (2) If we place a full stop after *agris*, the *-que* (*optimoque*) is no longer required, and was in fact omitted by Merula. Further considerations guarantee the deletion. P. Theilscher saw that *loco* means not "the situation of the farm," but "place in a ranked list."<sup>9</sup> This should have been an obvious enough possibility: Cato's enumeration continues *secundo loco* . . . *tertio* . . . etc. And, as noted earlier, reference to the farm's situation is not germane to this sentence.
- (3) Cato's norm for a profitable olive grove is 240 *iugera* (10. 1 "quo modo oletum agri iugera CCXL instruere oporteat"), for a vineyard 100 *iugera* (11. 1 "quo modo vineae iugera C instruere oporteat"): these headings suggest, then, a solution to the awkwardness of expression mentioned earlier.
- (4) *Vinea est prima* has the ring of a (Carolingian?) marginal gloss. It contributes to the awkwardness (rendering *iugera* superfluous) and violates the system of enumeration.

It is not difficult to understand the course of the corruption. As soon as *optimo loco* was understood to refer to the situation of the farm (a common meaning, after all, and one that occurs twice just before: 1. 3 *loco salubri* and 1. 5 *loco bono siet*), and as soon as *de omnibus agris* was taken with what follows (again an easy misunderstanding), then *-que* became a necessary addition. A further inevitable consequence of the misunderstanding of *optimo loco* is that the first-place prize would appear unawarded, and a conscientious reader would then have noted in his margin *vinea est prima*, which became established in the text.

DAVID O. ROSS, JR.  
University of Michigan

8. Given by Keil, *Commentarius*, p. 9; R. F. Thomas has kindly checked for me Merula's text in the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1472) at Harvard University.

9. *Des Marcus Cato Belehrung über die Landwirtschaft* (Berlin, 1963), p. 180. His text and translation (" . . . will ich es so sagen: von allen Böden, und an bester Stelle, ist, 100 Morgen [gross], Weinland das erste . . .") seem to ignore this insight.

*Optimo (loco)* is odd and, as far as I know, unparalleled in this meaning, but W. V. Clausen has pointed out to me that "presumably Cato used it (instead of *primo*) in order to avoid confusion, having just written *praedium quod primum siet*."