

**X.—Addenda on Varro, *de Lingua Latina***

ROLAND GRUBB KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the preparation of an edition and translation of *Varro on the Latin Language* (Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols., 1938), I found it necessary to make a number of new emendations in the text, that it might yield an intelligible and translatable meaning. These emendations, with the reasons for them, appeared as an article, "On the Text of Varro, *de Lingua Latina*," in *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 64–82. Since the issuance of the two volumes, a very large part of the stock of the LCL was destroyed by the war-bombings, in London and in Cambridge, and the Varro is now out of print. It is a demonstration of British stamina that the management of the series plans to bring out a reissue of the Varro, including such revisions as I might send in; the reissue is scheduled for 1948. The revisions are not very numerous, nor very extensive; but it seems useful to chronicle them in one place, with some justification of the changes. Holders of the original printing will then be able to identify the changes and insert them as marginalia.

Added bibliography concerning the text (cf. vol. 1, pp. xxxiv–xliii):

- von Blumenthal, A.: *Indog. Forschungen* 53 (1935) 120.  
Dahlmann, A.: *Varronis de Lingua Latina Buch viii*; Berlin, 1940.  
Giffard, A. E.: *Revue de Philologie* 61 (1935) 82–83.  
Hoenigswald, H. M.: *AJPh* 68 (1947) 198–199.  
Klotz, A.: "Die Plautuscitate Varros" (*Philologus* 96 [1943] 18–27); inaccessible to me.  
Leumann, Ernst: *Glotta* 12 (1923) 148.  
Leumann, Manu: *Glotta* 11 (1922) 185–188.  
Oko, J.: *Eos* 38 (1937) 157–168.  
Rose, H. J.: *Folk-Lore* 47 (1936) 396–398.

Critical reviews concerning text or translation:

- Bolling, G. M.: *Language* 14 (1938) 292–300, 15 (1939) 129.  
Collart, Jean: *Revue de Philologie* 65 (1939) 261–263, 66 (1940) 65.  
DeWitt, N. W.: *CW* 32 (1938) 52.  
Ernout, A.: *Bull. Soc. Ling. de Paris* 39.3 (1939) 65–67.  
Fordyce, C. J.: *The Classical Review* 53 (1939) 131.  
Klotz, A.: *Philologische Wochenschrift* 60 (1940) 246–248.

Marouzeau, J.: *Rev. des Études latines* 17 (1939) 200–202.

P[ostgate], J. W.: *Oxford Magazine*, 23 Feb. 1939.

Sturtevant, E. H.: *AJPh* 63 (1942) 361–363.

Whatmough, J.: *CPh* 34 (1939) 379–383, 35 (1940) 82–86.

In addition to these helps I have had personal letters from Alfred C. Andrews, C. L. Durham, J. L. Heller, W. B. McDaniel, A. S. Pease, E. H. Warmington, and probably from others of whom I have lost record.

In listing the revisions, I shall indicate to whom I owe the correction, setting the name in square brackets at the end of the item if it does not come as part of the discussion; a few are my own discoveries, or I can no longer readily identify my informant. Misprints in the first printing were probably due to errors in my own typed copy, rather than to the compositor; for R. and R. Clark of Edinburgh did extraordinarily accurate composition. In referring to passages I give the page, the book and section of the text, and usually the line of page or section; for the Introduction, of course, only the page and line, and for the Indexes the page and column.

Page xxxiii, lines 24–25: For *Philologus*, read *Bursian's Jahresberichte*; a stupid lapse on my part [Marouzeau].

Page xlv, lines 10–11: Change to: “Nos. 21 and 22.”

Page 7, v.5, 6: Change “those that” to “those things that.”

67, v. 69, note c: Add: “cf. H. J. Rose, *Folk-Lore*, xlvii, 396–398.”

75, v. 77; also v. 79, vii.47, ix.28, ix.113: The identification of the fishes and shellfish of the ancients is always troublesome, or worse. My former student, Dr. A. C. Andrews, who had made intensive studies on them, wrote me in 1940 a detailed account of those named by Varro; from this letter, with one slight addition by Andrews after examining D'Arcy W. Thompson's *Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London, 1947) — which also I have consulted — I quote with his permission the following items:

*asellus*: probably the hake, *Gadus merluccius*, rather than the cod, *Gadus mustela*, which was generally called *mustela*.

*umbra*: almost certainly a Scienid and one of the three species, *Sciaena aquila* Cuv., *Umbrina cirrhosa* L., and *Corvina nigra* Cuv. Of these the second is the most probable.

*turdus*: not a sea-carp, but a type of wrasse, probably either *Coricus rostratus* or *Crenilabrus pavo*.

*lupus*: the sea-bass, *Labrax lupus* Cuv.

*peloris*: almost certainly the sunset-shell, *Psammobia vespertina*.

*ungues*: probably the razor-shell, i.e., the genus *Solen*, represented by about four species in the Mediterranean. The Greeks also sometimes called them 'finger-nails'.

*lolligo*: the calamary, *Lolligo vulgaris*, rather than the cuttle-fish, which is *Sepia officinalis*, anciently known as *sepia*.

*saperda* and *silurus*: two classical headaches. When *saperda* referred to a Nile fish, as is usually true, the fish is probably *Tilapia* (*Chromis*) *nilotica* L. Sometimes it denoted a marine fish, then probably either *Chromis castanea* or *Corvina nigra*, or perhaps a type of tunny. When the *silurus* is mentioned as a Nile fish, as is usually true, the identification is most uncertain. Various scholars have suggested an eel-like catfish, *Clarias* (*Silurus*) *anguillaris* or *Clarias lazera*; the electric catfish of the Nile, *Malopterus electricus* Lac.; the shilbe, *Silurus mystus* L.; and the schall, *Silurus schall*. The *silurus* of the Danube is almost certainly the wels or sheatfish, *Silurus glanis* L.

*amia*: not the scomber, i.e. the common mackerel, *Scomber scomber* L., but the bonito, *Pelamys sarda*.

*mustela*: as a marine fish, the cod, *Gadus mustela*; as a lake fish, the burbot, *Lota vulgaris*.

I am not an ichthyologist, nor are most persons. In fact, most persons really know and use a very limited range of fish-names. Relying therefore on Dr. Andrews, and attempting at the same time to reduce the names to reasonable intelligibility, I am making the following changes:

75, v.77: *asellus* 'hake' (not 'cod'); *umbra* 'umbra' (not 'grayling'); *turdus* 'wrasse' (not 'sea-carp'); *lupus* 'sea-bass' (not 'wolf-fish'); *peloris* 'sunset-shell' (not 'mussel').

77, v.79, 6: *lolligo* 'squid' (not 'cuttle-fish').

313, vii.47, 8: bonito (not scomber, for *amian*).

459, ix.28, 9: sea-bass (not pike, for *lupus*).

531, ix.113, 15-19: sea-bass (not wolf-fish, twice, for *lupo*); cod-fish (not lamprey, for *mustelae*); hakes (not codfish, for *asellis*).

I find myself at a loss what change, if any, to make as a translation of *saperda* vii.47; but relying on ancient authorities that it denoted the *κορακίνος* when salted, I have retained "salted perch".

78, 3 (= v.80, line 6): For manuscript *consulciat*, read not *consul fiat* with Laetus, since, as Klotz remarks, this is unmetrical, but *consul cluat*; and in the translation change "become" to "be called". The critical note to *cluat* is to be changed to: "2GS., after an unnamed friend of Scaliger, for *consulciat*."

99, v.103, last line: *Sisymbrium* should be glossed 'mint' rather than 'thyme'. I quote again from Andrews:

*sisymbrium*: a very loose term in ancient times. It sometimes referred to water cress, *Nasturtium officinale*, and sometimes to cultivated mint, *Mentha aquatica*; but I find no evidence that it denoted thyme. Note that the common characteristic is a humid habitat.

100, v.105, note *e*: Change to *Pa <n> nus*, which was my understanding of the *panus* in the text, though I had not made this clear. I still think that it is a fourth declension genitive. I trust that this meets Postgate's objection that *panus* means 'bobbin' and not 'cloth'; also the matter of the case.

101, v.106, note *a*: Delete *hordeum* [Andrews].

103, v.107, 3: Gloss *similixulae* not by 'wheat-softies', but by 'half-softies', and change note *b* to: "Probably for *semi-lixulae* 'half-rings', while *lixulae* are 'rings,' being varieties of *circuli*." This change also is based on Andrews' argument:

Your reading *similixulae* is supported by Walde in his third edition, p. 817; but there is one flaw, the time factor. *Similago* seems to have been the earlier term for 'fine flour', later corrupted to *simila*, so far as I can discover. On the other hand, Varro here implies that these are Sabine equivalents of *circuli*. Festus (16.9 M.) identifies the sacrificial *arculata* with the *circuli*. Since *circuli* meant 'rings' and *arculata* 'arcs' or 'part-rings', possibly *lixulae* meant 'rings' and *semi-lixulae* 'half-rings'. Further arguments are that the religious use of these cakes implies the use of a flour too coarse and primitive in character to be called *simila* and that their shape may have suggested the sun and crescent moon or the full and the crescent moon.

This argument convinces me that *similixulae* is not to be taken as *\*simila-lixulae* with haplology, as taken by Fay, *AJPh* 35.157; but I am still inclined to take *lixulae* as from the root in *ē-lixus* 'boiled', rather than with Walde (*LEW*, all editions, s.v. *lixulae*, after Vaniček), as related to *ob-liquus*. My translations 'softies' and 'half-softies' are of course etymological, and not conventional terms in use for doughnuts or the like.

103, v.108, 10–11: For *quae minus cruda esse poterant decoquebant in olla*, change the translation to "they boiled down in a pot those which they could less easily eat raw." The successive admonitions of Warmington, Fordyce, and Postgate have convinced me that we have here *ēsse* 'to eat' and not *ēsse* 'to be'. More literally, the translation would be either "could eat (when) less raw", or perhaps "could not eat raw", with *minus* as a negative.

105, v.109, 1: For *perventum est*, not “we go on”, but “they came”; they progressed from vegetables and fruits finally to the use of meat, as Bolling points out.

115, v.119, note *a*: Change “Wrong” to “Correct” [Postgate], though the root must be used in a form lacking the final consonant.

121, v.128, note *c*: Change to: “Rather ‘under-seat’, that is, a seat below the tribunal” [DeWitt].

130, v.137, critical note 5: Improve to: “*Mue.*; zanculas *Scaliger*; for phanclas . . .”

138, v.146, critical note 4: Change to: “*Added by Kent, from Plautus, Curc. 474.*” The manuscripts of Varro have merely *Apud Piscarium*; but those of Plautus, whom Varro is here quoting, uniformly have *apud Forum Piscarium*. When in the first printing of my Varro I inserted *Forum* to make Varro’s quotation agree with his source, I attributed the insertion to Goetz and Schoell in their edition of the *De L. L.* Herein I was wrong, as Heller points out; I seem to have made the actual insertion myself. The identification of the Plautine passage is given in the notes of L. Spengel’s edition of 1826, as well as in several subsequent editions. The words *Ubi variae res*, which follow *Piscarium*, were taken by all editors as forming part of the quotation, until A. Spengel in his 1885 edition set a sentence end after *Piscarium*; curiously, no earlier editor had observed that they were not in the Plautine text, nor does anything stand there which could be so paraphrased.

147, 10–11 (= v.155, 16–17): For *appellatus a parte*, change translation to “was called from a part of its use”; this in answer to DeWitt’s criticism.

148, v.158, 4–5: Change capitalization of text to: *Clivus proximus a Flora susus versus Capitolium Vetus*, with the translation, page 149: “The Incline that goes up close by the Temple of Flora is Old Capitol.” To my previous version Fordyce rightly objects that *susus versus* cannot govern *Capitolium*.

151, v.160, 9: Insert “even” between “funeral” and “says”, to represent the *etiam*, previously omitted [Sturtevant].

174, 1 and 175, 1–2 (vi.2): Accepting Whatmough’s argument, I change the gloss on *turdelix* to ‘magpie’, and alter the attached note *e* to the following: “Meaning found in certain S. Italian derivatives; formation, *turdela* + *-ix* as in *cornix*, etc. (Whatmough, *C.P.* xxxiv. 381, xxxv. 84); hardly with Fay, *A.J.P.* xxxv. 245, as ‘spiral entrance for thrushes’, despite *cochiam* in Varro, *De Re*

*Rustica*, iii. 5. 3." Fay's interpretation was in any case a last desperate resort, and I am glad to have something better.

210, vi.39, note *c*: Change to: "That is, does not postulate that they are original elements (*quod* for *quot*)." [DeWitt.]

223, vi.56, 8: Translate *pueris* not by "boys", but by "children", as Whatmough points out.

227, vi.59, 1-5: Bolling properly gives the meaning of these lines as that the avoidance by some elderly men of *novissimum* 'newest', = *extremum* 'last', was (and so alter the translation) "on the ground that this superlative of the word was too new a formation" — *nimum novum verbum quod esset*, as Varro puts it.

243, last line (= vi.76, 9): *Scaenici* should be translated not "play-actors", but "scenic poets" [Bolling].

252, vi.83, note *c*: Replace entire note by the following: "After *ausculto*, seemingly a lacuna, as the transition from hearing to smell is abrupt. *Odor* is not connected with *audio*; *olor*, with the well-known change of *d* to *l*, is not attested elsewhere in Latin literature, but is found in the glosses and survives in the Romance languages." Bolling remarks on the probability of the lacuna, and refers to Spengel<sup>2</sup>, xli note, who recognizes the disordered condition of the text, but fails to deal satisfactorily with it.

259, vi.92, 2: An improvement in the wording of the translation: "this is the summing up of the edict written at the end."

283, vii.14, 13: After 'settle down', insert an additional note: "Wrong etymology."

283, notes, line 2: Delete "which is visible"; a howling lapse on my part, called to my attention by Durham.

290, vii.22, note *b*: Add at end, for clarity, "*fretu*, fourth declension abl." To save space, delete in next line the words "or worse", and "That is".

292, vii.26, 4: Change misprinted *ad* to *ab*.

299, vii.32, 6: Change "singular" to "feminine", which brings out the point properly.

318, vii.55, note *b*: Change entire to: "That is, 'companion, playfellow', from 'fellow-trifler'; see next note." [This despite Bolling.]

327, 3 (= vii.66, 9): Add note *d* to *Axitiosae*: "Cf. M. Leumann, *Glotta*, xi. 185-188; E. Leumann, *Glotta*, xii. 148."

331, vii.74, note *d*: Make an insertion for clarity: "*Trio* is a

derivative of *terere* 'to tread (the grain from the stalks)', *cf.* . . ."  
This is in answer to Bolling's remark *ad loc.*

373, viii.3, 5: For clearness, change "should have" to "have learned".

373, viii.4, 1-2; Change "either through the males or through the clan", to "some through the males, others through the clan". This change results from Whatmough's critique, as do also the next four.

383, 11 (= viii.14, 19): Gloss *cervices* not by 'back of the neck', but by 'muscles of the neck and shoulders'.

395, viii.31, 5: *Vestiti esse honeste* is rather "to be decently clothed", than "to be honourably clothed".

415, viii.56, note *a*: Change "Wrong forms", to "Forms not in use"; this applies to all five words to which the note is attached.

434, viii.79, note *b*: add: "*aucella* and *avicella* do occur in later Latin."

437, viii.83, 1-4: For greater clearness [Fordyce], change to: "Most freedmen set free by a free town get their names from the town; in this matter, those who were slaves of guilds and temples have not observed the rule in the same way."

443, ix.4, note *b*: Change to: "*Qui* is here the instrumental-ablatival adverb." [Whatmough.]

447, ix.9, 6 end: Change misprinted "in" to "is" [Whatmough].

456, ix.25, 5: Change misprinted *sin* to *sic* [Klotz].

465, ix.35, 10: The omitted *aliter* [Sturtevant] should be represented by "in any other way" between "uttered" and "without".

502, ix.81, 7: Correct *aes significat* to *aes adsignificat* [Klotz].

516, ix.95, note *a*: Sturtevant thinks positively that *genus* in this passage means "voice"; but I can find no support for this in the *De L. L.* Change the note to read: "Apparently a *genus* of verbs is a group of verbs which make their forms similarly; it may also be a set of forms having one function, and hence equal to 'mood', *cf.* [ix.] §102. It is not clear whether Varro includes voice under *genus*."

533, 3 (= ix.114, 10): To "offence", attach a note: "That is, will offend the feeling for idiom." [Fordyce.]

550, x.22, note *a*, line 2: Change 'brigands' to 'mercenary soldiers', as gloss for *latrunculi* [Fordyce].

Index, 641, col. 1: insert "cluāt, v. 80". 643, col. 2: Change

first item under D to: "D:R, vi. 4; D:L, vi. 83, *cf.* v. 137 note *b.*" 652, col. 2: Change first item under L to: "L, *v.* G; L:S, v. 138."

There are numerous other points made by the reviewers, which I have not adopted, either because I did not agree with their views, or because the changes involved would have made, in my opinion, only a negligible improvement or no improvement at all. The changes in the Latin text — apart from actual misprints — seem to me to be unnecessary, in view of the well-known roughness of Varro's logic and style. I had planned to discuss here my reasons for not accepting certain of these matters, but have decided that the space had better be used in other ways. Finally, let me say to the reviewers, one and all, that I am very grateful for their careful labors, and trust that they will not be too dissatisfied with the utilization which I have made of their critiques.