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](#)

Some Notes on the Text of Fronto

C. R. Haines

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / January 1915, pp 50 - 54
DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800006182, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800006182

How to cite this article:

C. R. Haines (1915). Some Notes on the Text of Fronto. The Classical Quarterly, 9, pp 50-54
doi:10.1017/S0009838800006182

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

SOME NOTES ON THE TEXT OF FRONTO.

THERE are few ancient texts in a condition so mutilated and unsatisfactory as that of Fronto. Not only was the Codex containing his letters used subsequently for recording the Latin translation of the Acts of the first Council of Chalcedon, and even in one case (*Cod. Vat.* 227) for two writings one over the other, but there are also indications that there was an earlier writing *under* the Fronto text, of which Studemund found traces in *Cod. Ambr.* p. 107 and Hauler on p. 251 of the same. The latter detected the name Hadrian, and supposed that a work of that Emperor might have been transcribed there. However, the Ambrosian MS. has recently been thoroughly cleaned and laboriously examined by Dr. Hauler, whose authoritative edition of Fronto has long been expected. Meanwhile Naber's edition, faulty as it is, holds the field, and the references in the following notes will be to it. The numerals indicate page and line.

P. 17, 2: De funere [quoque ad]damus. Sciat familia quemadmodum lugeat: aliter plangit seruus manumissus, aliter cliens laudat uocatus, aliter amicus legat<o> honoratus.

Instead of *quoque addamus*, which is apparently Naber's improvement of Mai's *mandamus*, the Codex, according to Studemund, has *aliquid dicamus*, which makes excellent sense. This cannot be said of *laudat uocatus*, Mai's guess for the MS. *laudaucatus*, with an *a* written over the second *u*. Vahlen's *adoptatus* is too far from the MS. and Klussmann's *laudicenus*, from its associations, is out of place here. The allusion is to three classes of persons holding different positions under the will of a deceased person. I would therefore suggest *laude auctus*. There will then be the slave who is given his freedom, the client who is remembered with praise, and the friend who is left a legacy. If this be rejected, Robinson Ellis's *laudatum uocatus* is the better reading.

P. 25, 10: Qua die primum beneficio maximi principis ederem spectaculum gratissimum populo maximeque popolare, tempestiuom duxisse gratias agere ut idem dies—.

Though Fronto seems to use *dies* (in the sense of *day*) feminine (Nab. p. 90, 10) as well as masculine (ibid. p. 92, 23), yet he could hardly do both in the same sentence. So we must read *quo die*. The above words are the actual words (*principium ipsum*) of Fronto's edict of thanks to Pius, but thrown

into indirect speech, as *ederem* shows. Otherwise I should have proposed *duxi me*; but in any case *duxisse* requires <me>.

P. 43, 11: Vale, Domine, et uiue, ut ego sim beatus.

Viue seems odd, and Klussmann suggests *iuua*, but *uige* would be much better; compare p. 5, 17, *uigeo*, *ualeo*. Perhaps the same word might be substituted for *uide*, p. 3, 6, where for *et uide* Klussmann suggests *optime* and Schwerczina *egregie*.

P. 44, 7: Read 'sed ut nunc <bene> suades, ita <suade si tal>e umquam.

P. 45, 23: For *te tutum*—*tutatur* read *te autem*—*tutatur*. In spite of *paratis*—*parabat* (p. 45, 23) the tautology seems very unlikely.

P. 49, 2: Plurimum tibi in oratione facienda . . . tum certe quidem cotidie . . . ex Iugurtha.

In the lacunae Eussner supplied <proderit unum dic>tum and *excerpere*. But we find elsewhere (p. 54, 10) *plerumque ad orationem faciendam uersus—adiuuat*. So we can restore our passage thus: 'facienda <adiuuerit uersus>; tum certe quidem cotidie <aliquam sententiam excerpere> ex Iugurtha.'

P. 51, 11: ego potius te caruero—potius quam.

The double *potius* seems hardly tolerable. Read *prosus* for the first.

P. 72, 2: Read 'Sed uter contra morem nostrum <aliena manu>; not as Ehrenthal, *precaria*.

P. 74, 10: Nec ego dum tu theatris, necdum conuiuiis abstinebam.

The *dum* of *necdum* is added by the second hand. Both Naber and Brakman take *tu* to be *tū* (i.e. tum). I would read, 'Nec *equidem* tum theatris, *nedom* conuiuiis abstinebam. But if *abstinebam* be taken in the active sense, as in Cicero and the Comic writers, then perhaps 'nec ego tum <te> theatris.

P. 74, 24: Cum interim numquam tua imago tam dissimilis ad oculos meos in itinere accidit ut non ex ore meo excusserit rictum osculi et somnium.

What sense can be extracted from *et somnium*? Either something has dropped out after *somnium*, which gave the words some such meaning as 'throws me into a reverie about you,' or we must alter *somnium*. Possibly *sauium*, if not too much of a tautology, would do. I have also thought that *et somnium* may hide some adjective in agreement with *rictum*, e.g. *sollemnem*.

P. 78, 12: With the help of the marginal gloss read: 'Differunt affluunt, gestiunt <fastidiunt>, ego uero etiam fastidio.

P. 83, 1: The Codex has *laetasq* <ue>. Naber omits the *que*. Read 'laetas, <eas>que.'

P. 85, 5: Read 'Quae pro me precatus es, scio te <ex animo> precatum.'

P. 85, 16: By referring to Fronto's reply (p. 86, 4), 'Filiae meae iussu tuo osculum tuli,' we can supply the lacuna at the end of this letter as follows: 'Gratiae salutem dic <et fer osculum parvulae tuae Gratiae>.'

P. 98, 6: In quo multa simul laudanda sunt.

The sense requires 'in qua' (sc. oratione).

P. 104, 13: Domine magister.

Surely it is impossible that Fronto's *Dominus* should call him *dominus*, in spite of the common use of this term as a title of respect (p. 188, 11; p. 192, 9). Read therefore *optime*.

P. 108, 7: For *et porro* Klussmann suggests *ecce porro*, *en* being un-*Frontonian*. Would not *quot* be better?

P. 116, 19: Read 'Quod ueniendi ad te adeo <rara est facultas>.'

P. 126, 6: For *Cirtam obsessi* Hauler extracts from the Codex *Cirtas as* <tu o>bsessi. If the *s* of *as* <tu> is not certain, I would suggest *arte* = *arcte*.

P. 142, 14: To the mutilated fragments 'Cum . . . magn . . . arte taceat . . . inquit, ne te rei illis ui . . . uter contemnant, taken from the margin, Brakman adds two important words thus: *cum u . . . appelles Alexander Magnus*. . . With this clue we can refer to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XXXV. 36, § 12, and boldly emend as follows: 'Cum, u <ti ferunt>, Apelles Alexandro Magno <suadebat ut sua de> arte taceat, <Cave>, inquit, ne te peritiores ue <l pueri qui colores ter>unt contemnant.

P. 147, 7: Read 'Sed potius Platonis <eloquentia uti malis>.

P. 163, 18: Fill up the lacunae here thus: 'Quanta <sit ad> me tua <beniuolentia, iampridem> hercule <satis scio, sed hoc iam admiror, noua et digna ingenio tuo, orator> optime,—inuenire te posse.

P. 165, 16: For *desinere* I should prefer *deserere*, as four lines lower down.

P. 166, 7: *Ipsum se*. The duplicated pronoun seems uncalled for, and Klussmann would write *sc.* (= *scilicet*)! Ebert gives *s* <an> *e*. Why not *re*?

P. 173, 1: *Iste mos progressus est ut etiam eos qui . . . disceptarent, non tamen improba res uideretur iudicibus ipsis aut iis, qui consilio adessent, commendare*.

This being ungrammatical, Schopen emends simply enough by giving *nec* for *non* and *commendarent* for *commendare*. But comparing line 6 below we see that there *adhibere* is in apposition to another *mos*, and, if the same construction is followed here, we must either alter *ut* to *ita* and insert <si> before *non tamen*, or add some such words as <fas esset> after *adessent*.

P. 193, 15: Before *cenis* the preposition *in* seems to have dropped out to correspond to *in curia, in spectaculis*.

P. 194, 3, 4: For *functus*, which ruins the rhythm of the sentence unless *fuert* be added, should not *fecerit* be read, as in line 6? *Plenius* can hardly be right, as Fronto himself ridicules its use (P. 196, 8), and *plenior* has already been ejected from p. 92, 10. Read therefore *planius*.

P. 197, 11: *Nec non quis uindemiam maturam ac distillantem propellit?* *Nec non quis prorogat* —?

Mai omits the first *nec non*, which Naber gives presumably as in the Codex. The second *nec non* appears in the MS. as *.ntsa*. Perhaps then *aut sane*.

P. 199, 7: *Iis uero qui parum probe quid a te impetratum uelint* <es>se denego.

Klussmann objects to *esse* and suggests *ipse*. N6vak reads *sedulo nego*. Would not <pos>se do?

P. 211, 7: *Plerique legentium forsan rem de titulo contemnant, nihil serium potuisse fieri de fumo*.

Something seems wanting to introduce the *Oratio Obliqua*, and Mähly wished to insert *autumantes*, and N6vak *existimantes*, before *contemnant*. It is easier to add *enim* between *nihil* and *serium*.

P. 215, 18: <Mallet> de Fauorini nostri pigmentis fuci quisnam appingere<mus>? Licet.

Brakman sees in the Codex before *de Fauorini . . . n . . .*, and reads *uetat num . . . appingere nos?* But the involved order of words seems unaccountable. I would suggest '*<Vide>n <ut> de Fauorini pigmentis fuci quiddam appingere <nos> liceat.*'

P. 218, 10: *Piscibus in caudis est . . . , auibus in pinnis*.

The gap of six letters may be filled with *uirtus*, or possibly *robur*. Four lines lower add <puniendas> after *hostium*.

P. 219, 1-16: With the help of du Rieu and Brakman's new readings of the Codex, and utilizing Heindorf's suggestions and some of Mai's additions, I would read the whole of this mutilated passage as follows:

'Nihil in aetate agunda duri aut acerbi expertus esse dicitur, quin sub manus <cum> cuncta <redegisset> prosus <haberetur omnium regum> beatissimus. <Cui, ut fertur,> rex Amasis Aegyptius sapiens fortuna de nimia consultus scriptis familiaribus litteris suasit ut semet (so Mai, but Brakman says Codex has *semper*) ipsum uoluntario aliquo damno sc<i>ens multaret, eoque dolore <dis inuidis se conciliaret> . . . <Ille autem aureo> habebat <in> anulo manupretio <summo> facie eximia lapidem smaragdum [summo], <quem ante alia omnia sibi pertinentia aestimabat>. Eum Polycrates anulum naue longa in altum prouectus sponte in mare abiecit, unde numquam <posthac> emergeret. Tum—quod sciens sponteque <fecit>—abiectum <lapidem> dolebat. <Sed mox grandem pis>ca<tor piscem retibus> saepe <iactis unum> nactus, indignum duxit ad uenales deferre,

sed dignitati parens regi obtulit. Rex gratum acceptumque habuit s<ibique> apponi iussit; quo <iusso> piscique opera <data> se<rui> contractantes anulum in aluo repertum ad regem gaudentes tulerunt.

P. 220, 9: Read exorsus <felices ha>bent <exitum> interdum <infaustum>.

P. 220, 18: potuere, pracquam nostri exercitus illi sub iugum missi sunt.

For *illi* the Codex has *si* . . . and Brakman conjectures *sane*. But du Rieu seems to have seen the letters *sili*, and I would prefer for the whole sentence, 'potuerunt aequae ac nostri exercitus olim sub iugum missi sunt.'

P. 222, 13: Haec epistula multorum uerborum indigebat. But the Codex has *ingerebat*. If this is kept, we must change *multorum* to *multam uim*.

P. 227, 8: Complete as follows: Intensius ad supremam <diei horam cum tu labores suscepisti et> ad luminis <aduentum protrahes>?

P. 238, 8: After *Arion intrupit* are missing eighteen letters which can be exactly filled with the words *sospes incolumisque*, a combination quite in keeping with Fronto's love of synonyms (see Schwerczina, *Frontoniana*, pp. 151 sqq.).

P. 243, 22: χείλη κρύπτειν. Read ῥάπτειν, comparing Demosth. (1268. 2) ῥραφθαι τὸ χεῖλος. We have a phrase in English, 'to purse the lips.'

P. 243, 29: Read ἐν παντὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ κατὰ παν<τὸς ἀγανακτεῖν> κἀπ<ρ>σδοκήτως προσπείοντος ἀπρεπὲς ἀνδρί, παιδείας πεπειραμένῳ. Χαίρων δὲ ἔγωγε μᾶλλον <ἀν ἄσ>μενῶς μέτρα παρὰ βάλλοισι. Dobson suggested ἀν ἄσμενῶς.

P. 247, 22: I would suggest for this mutilated passage τοῦθ' ὃ <π>εῖσαι <με θ>έλεις, <ὅτι καὶ> ἐμὲ πρέπει εἴπεσθαι.

P. 251, 19: Ἐρρωσο δὲ σύ, τοῦτο καὶ λογιζόμενος ὅτι πλέονα τῶνδε ἑκατὸν αὐτὸς παρέξεις. Mai has [τροφεὶ] δὲ . . . καὶ . . . [λογιζομένῳ] . . . μείζονα τὸν καρπὸν] αὐτὰ παρέξει. du Rieu saw in the Codex τροφεὶ . . . καὶ . . . μενος . . . οναμο . . . δεκαῖον . . . παρεξε. . . . Read τροφεία δὲ <τῶν παίδων> λογιζομένῳ μείζονα τὸν καρπὸν σοὶ νῦν παρέξει.

C. R. HAINES.