The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Quintilian's Quotations from the Latin Poets

Charles N. Cole

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 01 / February 2006, pp 47 - 51

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993582, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993582

How to cite this article:

Charles N. Cole (1906). Quintilian's Quotations from the Latin Poets. The Classical Review, 20, pp 47-51 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993582

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

turres, labore maius humano decus,' Stat. Theb. iv 151 'Cyclopus ductas sudoribus arces.' *scopulos* is just the word for the huge polygonal blocks of the Mycenaean masonry.

V 3 264-270.

quae lamenta tuli! ueniam concede,
manes,
fas dixisse, pater: non tu mihi plura
dedisses. 265
felix ille patrem uacuis circumdedit
ulnis
uellet et Elysia quamuis in sede locatum
abripere et Danaas iterum portare per
umbras
temptantem et uiuos molitum in Tartara
gressus
detulit infernae uates longaeua Dianae. 270

Whether 266-70 are punctuated thus, or whether with the old editors a colon is placed at the end of 268, the sentence has no meaning.¹ Aeneas, patrem post amplexus asportare temptantem (et, ut hoc addam, uiuum Tartara ingressum), detulit Sibylla! Everything, from the undefined *ille* of 266 to the serried absurdities of 269 sq., points in one direction: a verse has been lost after 268.

¹ 'Construere: *felix ille* (Aeneas) *patrem uacuis circumdedit ulnis* (vgl. Verg. A. vi 700 ff.) *et, quamuis uellet in El. sede locatum abripere et iterum per Danaas* (vergleichend wie einst in Ilion *per Danaos*) *umbras portare, temptantem* (scil. abripere et portare) *et uiuos gressus in T. molitum detulit Sibylla*' Vollmer.

felix ille patrem uacuis circumdedit ulnis
uellet et, Elysia quamuis in sede locatum,
abripere et Danaas iterum portare per
umbras,
<quem proli uentura suae praenoscere
fata>
temptantem et uiuos molitum in Tartara
gressus
detulit infernae uates longaeua Dianae.

I have borrowed the contents of my verse from iv 3 131 sqq., where the Sibyl says 'me duce praescios Auerni | Aeneas auide futura quaerens | lucos et penetrauit et reliquit.' All is now in order: *felix patrem amplexus est et, si liceret, abripere uellet ille, quem detulit Sibylla*. Another verse, as Dr Postgate has perceived and as Heinsius once conjectured (at Ouid. fast. i 287), is missing between 273 and 274: for example

si Thessalicis Admetus in oris
<coniuge ab infernis potuit gaudere re-
ducta>,
si lux una retro Phylaceida rettulit umbram.

Another again, as Markland detected, has been lost after 129.

Mr G. A. Davies has already brought back the sentence to its proper form by introducing the relative pronoun; but he alters the *temptantem* of 269 into *quem tandem*, removing an apt word and creating a coordination which is not apt, 'tandem et . . . molitum.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

QUINTILIAN'S QUOTATIONS FROM THE LATIN POETS.

THE question of the textual accuracy of the quotations in Quintilian is an important one in such a case as Hor. C. i. 12. 41, where all the MSS. of Horace give *incomptis capillis*, while Quintilian reads *intonsis capillis*. The editors of Horace do not agree in their estimates of the value of this indirect testimony—indirect in the sense that Quintilian's discussion is not concerned with this particular word—but none of them seems to have made a thorough test of the matter. This has been done, however, by Professor Morgan in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. xii, pp. 234 ff., but only with reference to the quotations from Horace. The present paper has been prepared in the belief that a wider range of evidence, obtained in a search for all the dis-

crepancies between Quintilian and the poets from whom he quotes, throws new light upon the question. The references have all been drawn from the index of quotations in Meister's edition of Quintilian, vol. ii, pp. 339 ff. This list, while perhaps not absolutely complete, is at least nearly enough so to serve the present purpose. Authors of whom only fragments remain are not considered.

CATULLUS.

Six references to Catullus are recorded, but two of them are not quotations. One (i. 5. 20) is only an allusion to a poem, without reproduction of any part of it. The other (i. 5. 8) merely mentions the fact that Catullus uses the barbarous word *plexenum*.

A third (xi. 1. 38) is probably to be regarded as a paraphrase rather than a real attempt at quotation. Quintilian says: *Negat se magni facere aliquis poetarum utrum Caesar ater an albus homo sit*. This obviously refers to Catullus's familiar couplet (93):

*Nil nimium studeo, Caesar, tibi velle
placere*

Nec scire utrum sis albus an ater homo.

In such a case the inversion of *albus* and *ater* is not a matter of importance.

The three real quotations follow:

(1). In ix. 4. 141 the quotation of Cat. 29. 1 and 2 agrees exactly with the traditional text.

(2) Cat. 62. 45 reads thus:

dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est.

For this there appears in Quintilian (ix. 3. 16), in a comment upon the use of *dum* in the passage:

dum innupta manet, dum cara suis est.

The text of the quotation differs, it will be observed, from that of the MSS. in giving for *intacta* the metrically equivalent *innupta*. But the text of the MSS. is strongly supported by the reappearance of the word in a parallel verse (56), which is evidently designed to repeat the earlier one as far as the thought will permit:

dum intacta manet, dum inculta senescit.

Innuptus is found in the poem in three places (vv. 6, 12, 36), but the genuineness of *intacta* in the verse under discussion seems never to have been questioned. It should be noted also that Quintilian's object in making the quotation is not affected by the choice of a word for this place.

(3) Cat. 86. 4 reads thus:

Nulla in tam magno est corpore mica salis.

In the quotation of this (vi. 3. 18) the words *tam magno* do not appear, and the order of *in* and *est* is reversed, thus:

Nulla est in corpore mica salis.

HORACE.

Of the twenty-eight citations of Horace recorded by Meister, three (x. 1. 24; 1. 56; 1. 61) are merely references to opinions expressed by Horace, without any semblance of quotation. Two more are duplicates, indicating a single allusion (i. 5. 57) to Horace's use in two places of the barbarous word *petorritum*. Still another (viii. 6. 17) is a

quotation of a line from *Furius Bibaculus*, of which there happens to be a parody in Horace. Of the twenty-two that remain, all but five agree with Horace's MSS., if we may pass over as unimportant such intentional changes, made to suit the context, as *acrem tibiam* (Quint. viii. 2. 9) for *acri tibia* (C. i. 12. 1) and *conrugare nares* (xi. 3. 80) for *conruget naris* (Ep. i. 5. 23). The five cases of discrepancy are these:

(1) C. i. 12. 41. Here all the MSS. of Horace, confirmed by Servius (on *Aen.* xii. 100) and Charisius (i. p. 104 K) give:

Hunc et incomptis Curium capillis.

For this we find in Quintilian, who quotes it to illustrate the figure *adiectio*, seen in the use of *Hunc*, the following (ix. 3. 18):

Hunc et intonsis Curium capillis.

The discrepancy between *incomptis* and *intonsis* is of exactly the same sort as that pointed out in the second quotation from Catullus. It does not affect the point Quintilian is making, and it reminds one of passages (e. g., *Epod.* 15. 9, *intonsos capillos*; C. ii. 15. 11, *intonsi Catonis*) in which the word given in Quintilian's text is actually found in the MSS. of the poet.

(2) In *Sat.* i. 4. 11 all MSS. read:

Cum flueret lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles.

This Quintilian paraphrases thus (x. i. 94): *Ab Horatio dissentio, qui Lucilium fluere lutulentum et esse aliquid quod tollere possis putat*. Here it is evident from the very form of his sentence that Quintilian did not try to quote accurately the whole of the verse; but it is equally apparent that in the last part of it, where the rhythm of the original appears, he was attempting to give its exact words. The fact that it is just here that *possis* is found in place of *velles*, its metrical equivalent, is significant, in view of the similar cases that have been pointed out above.

(3) In *Sat.* ii. 6. 83 we read in Horace:

*neque ille
Sepositi ciceris nec longae invidit avenae.*

This is abridged, but not otherwise changed in Quintilian (ix. 3. 17):

nec ciceris nec longae invidit avenae.

(4) In *Ep.* i. 1. 73 f. the text of Horace reads:

*Olim quod vulpes aegroto cauta leoni
Respondit, referam.*

The quotation of this (v. 11. 20) omits *olim* and replaces *respondit* with *dixit*, thus :

Quod dixit vulpes aegroto cauta leoni.

In this way a verse is produced which is metrically correct, but which cannot possibly be fitted into Horace's text. It seems clear that exact quotation was intended. It is interesting to note also that here, for the first time, the substituted word is not a metrical equivalent of the one it replaces.

(5) The last case is not properly an instance of discrepancy. In *A. P.* 311, where the MSS. give both *sequentur* and *sequuntur*, the text of Quintilian (i. 5. 2) agrees with the majority in reading *sequentur*.

LUCRETIVS.

There are but two citations of Lucretius. One passage is a part of i. 926 (repeated at iv. i), correctly quoted in Quintilian, viii. 6. 45. The other is i. 936 ff. (repeated at iv. 11 ff.), but with *nam* for *sed*. It reads :

*Sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes
Cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula
circum*

Contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore.

In the quotation by Quintilian (iii. 1. 4) *ac* is given for *sed* (but Nonius also, p. 413, gives *ac*), and *contingunt* is represented by *inspirant* (A) or *adspirant* (B), for which the editions usually give *inspergunt*, the conjecture of M. Haupt. No trace of *contingunt* appears in the MSS. of Quintilian. Here again, then, there may have been a case of inadvertent verbal substitution.

OVID.

There are eight references to the extant works of Ovid. Two of the passages are supposed to be indicated in ix. 4. 65, where there is a comment in general terms, without special mention of any author, upon the words *Apenmino* and *armamentis* as the close of a hexameter. Of another (*Rem. Am.* 707 f.) the sense, but not the wording, is to be found in Quintilian, xii. 10. 75. Of the five passages remaining three (i. 5. 43 ; ix. 2. 64 ; 3. 48) accord perfectly with Ovid's MSS. The other two are :

(1) *Met.* i. 502 :

si qua latent, meliora putat.

The text in Quintilian (viii. 3. 47) is :

quaeque latent, meliora putat,

showing again a metrical equivalent for the reading of the original.

NO. CLXXIV. VOL. XX.

(2) *Met.* xiii. 5, 6 :

*agimus, pro Iuppiter, inquit,
Ante rates causam, et mecum confertur
Ulixes ?*

Quintilian's quotation (v. 10. 41) takes this form : *Et Ajax apud Ovidium, ante rates, inquit, agimus causam, et mecum confertur Ulixes ?* This is the version, given by A and B, which is generally adopted by the editors. It omits *pro Iuppiter*, transfers *inquit* from the quotation to the main clause, and reverses the order of *agimus* and *ante rates*. Inferior MSS., however, either reproduce exactly or approximate more closely Ovid's order of words, but all omit *pro Iuppiter*. In such a case there can be no confident decision upon the question of accuracy in the original quotation.

PERSIUS.

Five citations appear in the list. Three of them are real quotations, all in perfect agreement with the traditional text.

SENECA.

The sole reference to Seneca is an exact quotation of *Med.* 453 (ix. 2. 9).

TERENCE.

Of the nine passages cited from Terence only two show any change of text. *Nescibam* (ix. 2. 58) for *nescibam* (*Eun.* 155) is probably due to Quintilian's copyists. The same may be true of the omission (Quint. ix. 3. 18) of *hunc* from the text of *Eun.* 85 :

*Accede ad ignem hunc, iam calesces plus
satis.*

VERGIL.

One hundred and fifty-five references to Vergil are recorded. Nearly all of these are real quotations, and almost all show no discrepancy. There are, however, some interesting cases of divergence from the MSS. of Vergil. Such trivial variations as *haud* for *non*, *et* or *aut* for *ac*, etc. may be passed over without consideration, as well as the cases in which the probability of original disagreement is greatly lessened by failure on the part of the MSS. of one or the other author to agree among themselves. After deducting these there still remain :

(1) In *Ecl.* i. 2 Vergil has

Silvestrem tenui musam meditaris avena,
for which Quintilian's text shows (ix. 4. 85) :

Agrestem tenui musam,

evidently, as Halm suggests, from confusion with *Ecl.* vi. 8 :

Agrestem tenui meditabor harundine musam.

It is possible, of course, that this is the verse which Quintilian is really quoting—he is using *agrestem* to illustrate syllabic quantity—and that the two words are intentionally omitted from it. But it is at least equally likely, in view of what we have seen, that *agrestem* has crept into the place of *silvestrem* in the other verse.

(2) The second instance concerns *Ecl.* iv. 62 f. :

*cui non risere parentes
Nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata
cubili est.*

On this Quintilian says (ix. 3. 8) : *Est figura et in numero vel cum singulari pluralis subiungitur vel ex diverso ; cui non risere parentes, nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est ; ex illis enim qui non risere, hic quem non dignata.* This text, which is given by all the MSS. of Quintilian, agrees exactly, it will be observed, with that of Vergil. But from the context it is perfectly clear that Quintilian himself wrote *qui* for *cui*, and so his editors all have it. The change, a necessary one, involves another discrepancy, of a sort now becoming familiar, between the quotation and the MSS. of the author. It is also the first one to affect vitally the point for which the quotation is made.¹

(3) From *Georg.* i. 431

vento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.

The quotation (v. 9. 15) omits *semper*, without impairing the metrical quality of the line.

(4) In his quotation from *Aen.* i. 48 :

et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat ?

Quintilian (ix. 2. 10) reads, according to all his MSS. except Eckstein's excerpts from Par. 7530, *adoret* for *adorat*. On so small a point the MSS. might, of course, fail to represent Quintilian correctly, and as a matter of fact, the editors follow the excerpts. Still, the MSS. are unusually good just here (cf. Meister, *praef.*), while the excerpts, because of various additions and changes in the text, are open to the suspicion of having been compared in this and the preceding section with the traditional version of the quotations.

¹ For a different view of the significance of this discrepancy cf. Dr. Postgate, *C.R.* xvi. pp. 36 sq.

(5) In *Aen.* ii. 69 we read :

*Heu quae nunc tellus, inquit, quae me
aequora possunt
Accipere ?*

In the quotation (ix. 2. 9) *me* is given for *nunc* in all MSS. except Eckstein's excerpts, which are again followed by the editors.

(6) The most common type of discrepancy appears again in the quotation of *Aen.* ii. 307 f. :

*stupet inscius alto
Accipiens sonitum saxi de vertice pastor.*

In Quintilian's version (viii. 6. 10) we find *sedet* for *stupet*.

(7) Similarly for *Aen.* iii. 436 :

*Praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque
monebo*

we find in the quotation (ii. 13. 8)

Praecipiam ac repetens, etc.

(8) From *Aen.* iii. 620 :

di talem terris avertite pestem

the word *terris* is omitted in the quotation (xi. 3. 70). The fragment remains metrical.

(9) A group of characteristic variations remains. The first is in *Aen.* v. 212, for the closing phrase of which :

pelago decurrit aperto,

the version in Quintilian (vii. 9. 10) is :

caelo decurrit aperto,

which may have been suggested by *Aen.* i. 155 :

caeloque invectus aperto.

(10) The second is in *Aen.* vii. 787 :

*Tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera
flammis,*

where we find *tremens* in the quotation (ix. 3. 15) instead of *fremens*. The change is a very slight, but a very natural one.

(11) Another is found in *Aen.* xi. 384, from which the phrase *tot stragis acervos* becomes (ix. 2. 49) *tot caedis acervos*, perhaps from confusion with *Aen.* x. 245 :

Ingentis Rutulae spectabit caedis acervos,
or *Aen.* xi. 207, which ends with *ingentem caedis acervum*.

(12) The last concerns *Aen.* xi. 406 :

*Vel cum se pavidum contra mea iurgia
fingit,*

the quotation of which (ix. 3. 14) shows *iactat* for *fingit*.

In all the quotations from these eight poets there have come to light some twenty-one cases of discrepancy between Quintilian's text and that of the MSS. of the author concerned. Five of these consist in the omission of a word or two from the quoted verse, accompanied sometimes by transposition of other words in the line, but in most cases leaving the fragment still metrically correct. The other sixteen cases also fall into a single class, that, namely, in which a word or pair of words is replaced by another of similar sense and, with one exception, the same metrical value. Of these cases Catullus, Lucretius, and Ovid furnish one each; Horace has three, Vergil ten. In only one, the *cui risere* passage from Vergil, has the discrepancy any bearing on the purpose for which the passage was quoted. It is an interesting fact, though not an important

one, that four of the cases, including the disputed passage from Horace, are to be found within the compass of three of Meister's pages (vol. ii. pp. 119-121). So many instances of the same sort, occurring in quotations of several authors, are hardly to be accounted for either by variant texts of the author quoted, or by corruption of the MSS. of Quintilian. It seems only fair to conclude that Quintilian himself not infrequently quoted from memory, and that he was, in consequence, especially in unimportant details, rather liable to errors of the kinds that have been pointed out. Too much stress should not, therefore, be laid upon his evidence for the text of the verse in Horace with which we began.

CHARLES N. COLE.

Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.

THE 'TRIBUTUM CAPITIS.'

'THE opinions of modern writers concerning this text,' says Marquardt (*St. V.* 2, p. 201; French Trans. x. p. 249), 'are very divergent.' The following are the chief passages in the ancient writers which concern it.

A.—FOR REPUBLICAN TIMES.

- (1) Cic. *Att.* v. 16. 2, for *Cilicia*:

Audivimus nihil aliud nisi imperata
ἐπι κεφάλια solvere non posse.

- (2) Cic. *Fam.* iii. 8. 5, for *Cilicia*:

Atque hoc tamen te scire volo, me de
isto sumptu legationum aut minuendo
aut remittendo decrevisse nihil nisi
quod principes civitatum a me postu-
lassent, ne in venditionem tributorum
et illam acerbissimam exactionem,
quam tu non ignoras, capitum atque
ostiorum inducerentur sumptus mini-
me necessarij.

- (3) Caes. *B.C.* iii. 32, for *Asia*:

Acerbissime imperatae pecuniae tota
provincia exigebantur . . . In capita
singula servorum ac liberorum tribu-
tum imponebatur; columnaria, osti-
aria, frumentum, milites, arma, remi-
ges, tormenta, vecturae imperabantur;
cujus modo rei nomen reperiri
poterat, hoc satis esse ad cogendas

pecunias videbatur [of Q. Caecilius
Metellus Scipio in 49 B.C.].

- Cf. Appian *Mithrid.* 83, for *Asia*:

ὁ Λεύκολλος . . . τέταρτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς
καρποῖς, τέλη δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς θεράπουσιν καὶ
ταῖς οἰκίαις ὤριζεν.

- (4) Appian, *Lib.* 135, for *Africa*:

ὤρισαν φόρον ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς
σώμασιν, ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ ὁμοίως [of
Scipio and his fellow-commissioners].

- (5) *C.I.G.* 2336 for *Tenos* [date uncer-
tain]:

One Satyrus gave 18500 denarii ἵνα ἐκ
τοῦ τόκου αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν καὶ
γυναικῶν καὶ παιδῶν ἐλευθέρων Τηνίων
κατ' ἔτος διδῶται τὸ ἐπι κεφάλον.

B.—FOR IMPERIAL TIMES.

- (6) Appian *Syr.* 50, for *Syria, Cilicia, Judaea*:

διὰ ταῦτα [viz. the frequent capture of
Jerusalem] ἐστὶν Ἰουδαίοις ἅπασιν ὁ
φόρος τῶν σωμάτων βαρύτερος τῆς
ἄλλης περιουσίας· ἐστὶν δὲ καὶ Σύροις
καὶ Κίλικιν ἐτήσιος, ἑκατοστὴ τοῦ
πῆματος ἐκάστῳ. [Time of Hadrian.]

- (7) Dio Cass. 62. 3, for *Britain*:

Boudicca is made to complain οὐ τῶν
σωμάτων αὐτῶν δασμὸν ἐτήσιον φέρομεν;