The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes On Festvs

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 7 / Issue 02 / April 1913, pp 115 - 119

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800023958, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800023958

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1913). Notes On Festvs. The Classical Quarterly, 7, pp 115-119 doi:10.1017/S0009838800023958

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTES ON FESTVS.

IN the Teubner edition, just published, I had to reduce the *apparatus criticus* to the smallest possible dimensions. All conjectures that were merely probable and not fairly certain had to be excluded. Some of them that are new may find a place here.

There is only one MS. of Festus' epitome of Verrius. It is now at Naples, and is said to have been found in Illyria. Dr. E. A. Loew, the leading authority on Italian script, tells us that it was written at Rome towards the end of the eleventh century. It must have been rescued (in Illyria?) from a fire; for the outer edges of all the pages are burned away, so that the greater part of the outer of the two columns on each page has been lost. The chief task for editors is to fill up by conjecture these gaps in the outer columns. Scaliger won immortal fame in this work, although many of his conjectures merely followed out a suggestion of his predecessor, Augustini. Ursini and Müller were of service in adapting to the conditions of space the stop-gaps of Scaliger, and both of them, chiefly Müller, added excellent conjectures of their own. The conjectural supplements, printed in italics in Müller's edition, have often, especially in German students' dissertations, been treated as if they were actually part of the text. The Hungarian editor, Emil Thewrewk, who first provided satisfactory manuscript material for Paulus' epitome of Festus, in order to prevent this error, took the extreme course of omitting these supplements in his edition; although many of them are made absolutely certain by the words of Paulus. I have taken a middle course between Müller and Thewrewk and have admitted the certain and the probable supplements, leaving blanks elsewhere. The supplements are printed within angular brackets, the merely probable supplements being in italic type.

English scholars will, I hope, turn their attention to Festus, for there is now new material for conjecture. Dr. Loew and Dr. Croenert have re-examined the undecipherable letters in the burnt edges of the Naples MS. and brought us as near certainty as the circumstances allow. And the new advance in Latin Palaeography, led by Traube, has taught us that strict rules must be followed in ascribing abbreviation-symbols to the lost parts of the lines and in dividing the syllables of a word between two lines. These rules are stated in the preface to the new edition.

140 Th. (153 M.) l. 30 Persuasit animo uinum, deus qui multo est maximus. Is this from Plautus' *Aulularia*, after line 737 (in the 'ducats and daughter' Scene)?

LY. Déu' mihi impulsór fuit, is me ád illam inlexit. EVC. quó modo?

*persuasit ánimo uinum, déu' qui multo est máximus.

Whether the missing word at the beginning of the line belonged to Euclio or to Lyconides (e.g. quia) is uncertain. The author of the Greek original is unknown:

οἶνός μ' ἔπεισε, δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατος.

250 Th. (206 M.) l. 25 (a part of Festus preserved only in Renaissance apographs). Since the apograph (*Vat. lat.* 1549), which marks the lacuna *praeruptus* . . . *iam*, marks a lacuna wrongly elsewhere, at 260 Th. (213 M.) l. 2 (where the use of *hodieque* in the sense of *hodie* puzzled the scribe), we may venture to ignore the lacuna here and read *praeruptissima*. The same apograph may be wrong in marking a lacuna at 266 Th. (214 M.) l. 16 between *uidentur* and *quo* (for 'in quo').

274 Th. (218 M.) l. 28 (s.v. Postliminium receptum). *Equi et muli et nauis eadem ratio est postliminium †receptum ist† quae serui*. Editors change *receptum* *is* into *receptionis*. But since antique forms are often found in the passages which Verrius took from jurists, perhaps *receptuis* (cf. Terence's *anuis*, etc.) is right.

292 Th. (233 M.) l. 1. *Possessio est, ut definit Gallus Aelius, usus quidam agri aut aedifici, non ipse fundus aut ager. non enim possessio est . . . rebus quae tangi possunt . . . qui dicit se possidere †his uer† potest dicere. itaque in legitimis actionibus nemo †ex his qui† possessionem suam uocare audet, sed ad interdictum uenit*. Possibly *ex his qui* belongs to the preceding sentence: *possessio est <nisi in> rebus q. t. p.* *Ex his qui dicit se poss. is uere p. d.* *Itaque in leg. act. nemo poss. suam, etc.*

298 Th. (234 M.) l. 15. From a part of Cato's speech, in which he alluded to his having saved Romans from the indignity of flogging, comes a quotation which editors print thus: *si em percussi, saepe incolumis abii; praeterea pro republica, pro scapulis atque aerario multum reipublicae profuit*. The first six words seem to be the utterance of the carnifex, the flogger, and the comma should stand, not after *percussi*, but after *saepe*. 'If I struck a Roman citizen, the law punished me, but if I gave him a round dozen with the lash in my official capacity, I got off scot-free.' This passage cannot be used as evidence that *em* 'eum' was current with Cato (and therefore with Plautus) or even with the lower classes in Cato's time. It is a quotation from the law, i.e. the Twelve Tables, in which *em* was presumably used in the clause which punished assault, just as it was used in the clause which prescribed *antestatio*: *igitur em capito*.

312 Th. (242 M.) l. 28. Dr. Loew has detected the letters *us* before *inprudentialiam*. Perhaps: <Cato> in oratione[m] quam scrib<sit in Q. Thermum de X hominib>us 'inp. praem.'

326 Th. (249 M.) (s.v. *Procincta classis*) l. 24 *anti* Loew. Perhaps: *anti*<qui enim hominum classem> dixerunt, ut nunc quoque <classis nauium coe>tus est. Cf. 281 Th. (225 M.) (s.v. *Procincta classis*) *Vetustius* enim fuit multitudinem hominum, quam nauium, classem appellare.

334 Th. (253 M.) l. 29 *nam quod prodi* Loew. Perhaps: *nam* quod *prodi*<t olim, producit in prae>sens ualet. Cf. 314 Th. s.v. *Prodidisse*.

342 Th. (257 M.) Paulus has a lemma '*Quintana porta*,' for which there seems no room in the Naples MS. of Festus. This MS. has elsewhere omitted lines or words which were present in the lost Monte Cassino MS. of Festus used by Paulus. Probably here a lemma '*Quintanam (-na) portam (-ta)*' has been lost (by homoeoarchon) before the lemma '*Quintanam classem*.'

372 Th. (273 M.) l. 10. *Per*, the intensive particle, was in early Latin an independent adverb, e.g. *per* pol saepe peccas. Therefore *pertaesus*, *pertenax* (Plaut. *Capt.* 289) are not mere compounds like *perquiro*, *pertinens*; vowel-weakening was therefore inappropriate with them. Lucilius twits Scipio with his affected *pertisus*:

Quo facetior uideare, et scire plus quam ceteri,
pertisum hominem, non pertaesum †dicere ferum nam genus†.

Editors who try to emend the second line seem always to forget that Festus' rule in quoting is to complete the line, whether the sense ends at the end of the line or not, e.g. p. 258 Th. (210 M.) (s.v. *Pedum*) At tu sume pedum, quod me cum saepe rogaret; p. 396 Th. (285 M.) (s.v. *Ruri esse*) Ruri se continebat, ibi agrum de nostro patre; p. 430 Th. (301 M.) (s.v. *Sospes*) Maxime Teucrorum ductor, quo sospite numquam. This consideration opens the way to numerous possibilities, of which one may serve as specimen: dice; refer unum genus <Collo et mento>. For old Latin *collus* masc. was replaced by *collum* neut.

378 Th. (274 M.) l. 27 (a line of Pacuvius). Perhaps:

<in saloque>
Pército, rapidó, reciproco, | ángusto citáre retem.

Retis 'a net' and *retia*, a Collective noun of the first declension, are old Latin forms which have been last discussed by a young scholar who gives promise of following in the footsteps of Skutsch, Prof. Jacobsohn of Marburg University (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 33, 2786). Priscian attests *retem* in Plaut. *Rud.* 942, 984 (but cf. 985) and *retiam* in 900. Is it because these nouns in *-is* were originally adjectives that their gender is so variable in old Latin, e.g. *amnis* masc. and fem. (possibly for 'amnis fluuius,' and 'amnis aqua' or the like)? Leo lays too great stress on *pane* in Plaut. *Curc.* 367 (attested as neuter in this line by Nonius and Charisius) in his argument (Plaut. *Forsch.*²,

p. 307) that, in Plautine Latin, -*ē* replaced -*is* in nouns as well as verbs (e.g. *loquere* and *loqueris*): 'Plautus hat 5 mal den Accusativ *panem* und *Pers.* 471 *binos panes* : ist jenes *pane* glaublich?' Not to mention the probability of an unfamiliar form like *pane* being changed, even by ancient scribes, to the more familiar *panem* (in *Curc.* 367 our MSS. offer *panem*; and the Accusative might be defended), why should Plautus write -*e* for -*is* without any metrical necessity? The line would scan perfectly well with the dactyl *panis et* in the first foot of the second hemistich:

Atque aliquid prius opstrudamus, pérnam, sumen, glándium,
haéc sunt uentris stábilimenta, *pánis et* assa búbula.

Clearly this is one of the numerous cases where Plautus selects an unusual form. What the motive of his selection is we can never be sure, we can seldom even venture to guess. Here, it is possible (but only possible) that *pane* (neut.) was a vulgar by-form that suited the tone of the passage (cf. the *uinus mihi in cerebrum abiit* of the boor in Petronius).

420 Th. (297 M.) (s.v. Secus) l. 2. Perhaps: significat enim aperte <aliter; hausecus non> aliter. For Paulus has: Secus aliter, hausecus non aliter. And he can hardly be credited with the introduction of *hausecus*.

422 Th. (297 M.) l. 13. If the line of Plautus (*Pers.* 392) was:

Librórum eccillum habeó plenillum sóracum,

we can account for P's *plenum* and A's *plenum illum*. But the rhythm of the line is not altogether satisfactory. Paulus offers as lemma 'Soracum' (neut.): Soracum est quo ornamenta portantur scenicorum; and Sonnenschein (*Class. Rev.* vi. 400) proposed *eccillud* for *eccillum*. But Paulus makes many mistakes in epitomizing Festus; e.g. 498, 25 Th. ludi, i.e. ludii, of Festus becomes *ludos* in Paulus; 510, 24 Th. (in *Amphitryo*)ne si of Festus becomes *ne si* in Paulus. And he is capable of turning an Acc. masc. into a Nom. neut. (cf. *Class. Rev.* v. 9). Since the termination *us* was in many MSS. expressed (in endings like -*cus*, -*lus*) by the same abbreviation-symbol as was in other MSS. used for -*um*, he may here have misread the *Soracus* of his Festus MS., just as (p. 375 M.) *Vngulus Oscorum lingua anulus* becomes in Paulus *Vngulum Oscorum lingua significat anulum*. In *Poen.* 314 A seems to read *plelli* where P reads *pleni*. But if Plautus used *plellus*, that is no reason why he may not have used along with it *plenillus* (cf. *pauxillum* beside *paullum*).

ibid. l. 23 Dr. Loew substitutes *e* for the *c* of previous editors. Perhaps: ex e<odem uerbo>, ex e<adem stirpe>, or the like.

432 Th. (302 M.) Has the lemma *Sciscito, sententiam dicito* been omitted by the scribe of the Naples MS. before the lemma *Succidanea hostia*, etc.? Paulus has *dico*, but Festus elsewhere (s.v. *Niquis sciuit*): nam sciscito significat sententiam dicito.

454 Th. (314 M.) l. 4. In the Plautus quotation Dr. Loew has elicited *tenen* from the burnt edge of the page. If this passage of the *Friularia* was of the same tenor as *Men.* 87 sqq., a possible supplement would be : agnina tenen <dust> (*scil.* parasitus).

494 Th. (333 M.) (s.u. Scrutillus). Perhaps something of this tenor :

Ventér suillus ? dí b<oni ! si déuolarem> in íllum,
ego me hódie e<xcruciandúm darem, ní sí com>esa fáрте
bíberem ír<neam in promúlsidem scrutílli>.

The last line of the passage was not completed in the quotation.

It has been pointed out above that Festus in his quotations cares more for the completion of the line than of the sense. His normal form is one complete line. So the probability is that Liu. Andr. com. 2 (quoted s.v. Scenam) is an Iambic Senarius, with a dactyl in the first foot and hiatus at the pause in the sense :

Corruít quasi ictus scéna |, haut multó secus.

W. M. LINDSAY.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.

NOTE ON PLAVTVS.

Professor Leo has now recanted his heresy regarding the corrupt text of the *Truculentus* (see *Classical Quarterly*, January, 1913, p. 4, line 10 from bottom).

W. M. LINDSAY.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS.