

# 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](#)



---

## Von Ponor's *Festus Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt, Cum Pauli Epitome*. Edidit Aemilius Thewrewk De Ponor. Pars I. Buda-Pesth, 1889. 7 Mk. 50.

H. Nettleship

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 09 / November 1890, pp 412 - 413

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191310, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00191310](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191310)

### How to cite this article:

H. Nettleship (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 412-413 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191310

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

the same grief and cannot but work it up again into the subsequent tissue of his poem. I can see nothing improbable in this ; it does not prove poverty of invention, because from its very peculiarity it must be rare ; all we can say against it is that, as an artifice, it is not (at least in the case before us) a very happy one. It marks in my judgment, *the very reverse* of M. Thomas's conclusion. The recurrence of the five lines is *intentional*. It is *meant* to be a link which connects the two parts of one whole ; yet at the same time in such a manner as to suggest that the two parts were not contemporaneous. It is far from impossible that Catullus has directly

imitated some Alexandrian model now lost in this much-discussed repetition.

The above view is expressed more clearly in the new edition of my Commentary. I had hoped to make my point of view on this vexed question more conclusive to Catullian critics generally, and to M. Thomas in particular.

I must not conclude without expressing my deep-felt gratitude for the more than eulogistic manner in which my Catullus has been treated by both editors of a work crowned by the Académie Française.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

#### VON PONOR'S *FESTUS*.

*Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt, Cum Pauli Epitome.*  
Edidit AEMILIUS THEWREWK DE PONOR.  
Pars I. Buda-Pesth, 1889. 7 Mk. 50.

THIS volume is the first instalment of an edition of *Festus* and *Paulus*, on which its author has been working for some years. It contains the bare text, with no *apparatus criticus*, and nothing in the preface to guide the reader as to the character and mutual relations of the manuscripts of Paulus newly collated, or collated for the first time.

For this information the reader must go to an essay by the editor entitled *Festus Studien*, published in the second number of the *Ungarische Revue* for 1882, and a paper in the *Mélanges Græux* (Paris, 1884), p. 659-669, containing an account of the French manuscripts of Paulus. The present writer carefully studied the first of these papers at the time of its appearance.

The editor bases his text of Paulus on eight manuscripts, one at least of which (Vienna 142) was never collated before. The other seven have been thoroughly examined, either by the editor himself or by his friends. They are (1) Munich Clm 14734 : (2) Wolfenbüttel 10 3 : (3) Troyes 2291 : (4) Leyden L, or Vossianus 116 : (5) Leyden T, or Vossianus 37 : (6) Leyden R, or Vossianus 135 : (7) Escorial o III. 31.

For the text of the fragments of *Festus* the Farnese MS. has been collated anew by Abel, who has found attached to Vat. Lat. 3369 the signature of Fulvius Ursinus. Abel has also collated the Vatican MSS. 1549 and 2731 : Vossianus G has been collated by

the editor himself ; and a hitherto unknown copy of the Farnesianus, in the National Library at Paris, has been put into his hands by M. Omont.

All the manuscripts of Paulus are, in Von Ponor's opinion, derived from the same copy of Paulus's original book. The good manuscripts he divides into two classes, no one of the representatives of which was copied from any of the others. The principles upon which he has acted in using them, and the relations of the Paulus manuscripts to the Farnese *Festus*, are clearly expounded in his *Festus Studien*, pp. 10 and 11. His views will justify themselves to any careful student of the text before us.

As might be expected, Von Ponor's text shows a considerable advance upon Müller's of 1839. Interpolations have been expunged : the relative position of a number of glosses has been rectified ; many readings rejected by Müller have been restored ; the orthography has in many instances been corrected ; new readings have been introduced from the MSS. A large number of the emendations of Bugge and Mercklin, published at the end of Simmel's reprint of Müller (1880), have been adopted, and other modern work has been laid under contribution.

The following instances of new readings and improved spellings will give a fair idea of the character of the new text. P. 10, 1 (Müller), *accerris* for *acieris* ; compare *Glossae Latino-Graecae* p. 13, 9, Goetz, *acceres ἀξίρη* ἰεροφάντρον ; 10, 6, *agonos* (= *montes*) for *agones* ; 12, 1, *ammenta* for *amenta* ; 14, 7, *avillus* for *avillas* ; 16, 5, *tuto manent* for *tuta* ; 17, 3, *Teotonos* for *Teutonos* ; 17, 8,

*Amptermi* for *Antermini*; 23, 19, *Iulum* for *Iulium*; 29, 13, *unde ne quis suspicetur* for *unde quis non suspicetur*; 32, 10, *bulimum* for *bulimam*; 34, 2, *blatterare* for *blaterare*; 35, 4, *Bruttaces* for *Bruttates*; 40, 8, *comptum, genus libaminis*, for *conilum*; 40, 9, *et excultu* for *et cultu*; 40, 10, *conflunt* for *confligunt*; 42, 1, *conivoli* for *contuoli*; 42, 6, *valles, vallecule* for *vallis, vallacula*; 46, 11, *caudeae* for *caudecae* (as Scaliger had conjectured); 46, 16, *clacendix* for *calcendix*; 48, 8, *caperratum* for *caperratum*; 50, 1, *cura dicta quasi coreda*, for *quasi cor edat*; 50, 9, *culcitra* for *culticula*; 50, 10, *cumalter* (= *cum altero*) for *cumalter*; 55, 9, *cluras* (= *simias*) for *clunas*; 56, 16, and 64, 17, *commoetaculum* for *commetaculum*; 63, 5, *cingillum* for *cingulum*; 69, 15, *discidere* (*dis, caedere*) for *discedere*; 79, 7, *incudis* (nominative) for *incus*; 81, 12 and 131, 13, *Equirria* for *equivria*; 82, 7, *exim* for *exin*; 88, 4, *favisae* for *favissae*, confirmed by the MSS. of Nonius and Gellius; 92, 21, *fulgere ferire* for *fulcere*; 95, 7, *gizeria* for *gigeria*, with some support from the MSS. of Nonius p. 119; 100, 6, *hariuga* for *harviga*; 103, 8, *heluella* for *helvela*; 105, 11, *iacere pultis* for *pullis*; 111, 5, *circumitu* for *circuitu*; 117, 6, *laetrum, laetrorsum* for *laevum, laevorsum*; 123, 22, *Sisinna* for *Sisenna*; 124, 6, *a mercedem solvendo* for *a mercede solvenda*; 134, 19, *Maesson, Maesone*, for *Moeson*; 143, 10, *millando*, not *mullando*; 149, 32, *equis cretus*, for *ortus*; 162 b 14, *coniugationem* for *conjunctionem* (a conjunction); 167, 7, *iugulandis* for *iuglandis*; 175, 2, *noctiugam* for *noctilugam*; 177, a 6, *subiecta mensae* for *subvecta*; 207, 7, *pitora* for *petora*; 225, 12, *procastria* for *procestria*; 233, a 15, and elsewhere, *quodannis* for *quot annis*, as so often in the MSS. of Vergil; 238 b 1, *planitia* for *planitie*; 244, 12, *pavire* and *terripavium*, for *puvire* and *terripuvium*; 246, b 31, *descriptione centuriarum* for *descriptione*; 253 a 21, *posculenta* for *poculenta*; see my *Contributions to Latin Lexicography* p. 553. 258, b 4 and 259, 3 and 6, *quandoc* for *quando*; 263, 1, *runa proeliata* for *pilata*; 367, 7, *aut permarceret paries* for *permaceret*, confirming Vahlen's conjecture. Many other improvements of the kind might be mentioned, did space permit.

It should be mentioned that the book is disfigured by more misprints than might have been expected. P. 6, 15, *annos* for *annus*; 12, 14, *irfirmare* for *infirmare*; 15, 8 (in the added gloss on *adversus*), *ergo* for *erga*; 20, 4, *ad eadem causa* for *ab...*; 28, 16, *fierit* for

*fieri*; 30, 6, *apellatur* for *appellatur*; 32, 9, *Βυκάκην* for *Βυκάμην*; 41, 9, *ligui* for *ligni*; 44, 11, *paecuti* for *praeacuti*; 67, 11, *dumus* for *domus*; 69, 5, *instituae* for *institutae*; 78, 12, *iu* for *in*; 79, 11, *exhiberunt* for *exhibuerunt*; 99, 20, *aedem* for *eadem*; 114, 16, *proptes* for *propter*; 132, 3, *mensuetum* for *mansuetum*; 133, 22, *agende...verbo* for *agendo...verbo*; 142, 18, *clam pater* for *patre*; 151, 1, *decreta* for *decreto*; 156, 7, *craeiomonias* for *caerimonias*; 259, 7, *ignificat* for *significat*.

I conclude by offering, for what they are worth, a few emendations. P. 2, 14, *agua dicitur a qua iuvamur*. This is too senseless even for Paulus. Perhaps the word *Diuturna* (= *Iuturna*) has dropped out before *dicitur* (*diutur-*); *agua Diuturna dicitur* etc. Or *dicitur* *a* may be a corruption for *Diuturna: aqua Diuturna, a qua iuvamur*. See Servius on *Aen.* 12, 139, where the etymology of *Diuturna* or *Iuturna* from *iuvo* is given. 11, 15, *Affatim dicitur a copia fatendi*. Perhaps *a copia fandi*: Priscian 15, p. 75, Keil, *a fatu affatim*. 21, 13, *Adulare ab accedendo et alluendo*. Perhaps *ululando*: Lucretius 5 1070 (*canes*) *longe alio gannitu vocis adulant*. 34, 2, 3, *blatterare* and *blateae* are surely two glosses, not one. 35, 6, *ex tentoriis et ex pellibus*. Possibly *et ex pellibus* is a gloss, and *tentoriis* from a substantive *tentoriae*, i.e. *tentoriae pelles*. 73, 12, *dilaniare est discindere* etc. *Discidere* and *discidit* are clearly indicated by the MSS. readings (as given by Müller) *decedere, discedit*; compare 117, 18, where we have *discidendo*. 73, 12, *Genium appellabant deum qui vim obtineret rerum omnium genendarum*. I have always thought that the right reading is *genendarum*; Censorinus 3, 1, *hic (genius) sive quod ut genamur curat,.....certe a genendo genius appellatur*. 162, b 10, *Necessarii sunt...qui aut cognati aut aut adfines*, etc. Perhaps *aut agnati aut adfines*. 186, 30, *Hostiae opimae praecipue pingues*. Perhaps *praecipuae, pingues*; *praecipuus* being used in its proper sense of 'first chosen, select': *Aen.* 5, 249, *ipsis praecipuos ductoribus addit honores*. 270, b 15, *redibitur tum id proprie dicitur quod redditum est improbatumque*. The true reading may be *redhibitorium id proprie dicitur* etc.

All students of Latin will gratefully recognize the value of this book, which will be immensely enhanced when the second volume, with a complete *apparatus criticus*, and explanatory preface, makes its appearance.

H. NETTLESHIP.