

# 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](#)



---

## Phaedrus and Quintilian I. 9. 2. A Reply to Professor Postgate

F. H. Colson

The Classical Review / Volume 33 / Issue 3-4 / May 1919, pp 59 - 61

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0001252X, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X0001252X](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0001252X)

### How to cite this article:

F. H. Colson (1919). Phaedrus and Quintilian I. 9. 2. A Reply to Professor Postgate. The Classical Review, 33, pp 59-61 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0001252X

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

of the ancient scholia, which is as good a witness as the Pithoeanus itself; but reason and authority together are no match for that passion of love which is inspired in modern scholars by MSS whose names begin with a P. In my edition of 1905 I made a brief remark on the circumstances and restored *nihil*. The result of my action deserves to be put on record as exemplifying the customs of classical scholarship in the twentieth century. Buecheler, though

placing *nihil* in his text, had exhibited in his apparatus criticus and in his excerpts from the scholia the facts which I have stated, '*nihil* S ω', 'qui nihil expositum'. It was safe to print this evidence so long as nobody took any notice of it; but as soon as I gave it effect by promoting *nihil* to the text, the case was altered. The fetish was in danger, the facts must be suppressed, and Leo in his edition of 1910 suppressed them.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## PHAEDRUS AND QUINTILIAN I. 9. 2.

### A REPLY TO PROFESSOR POSTGATE.

IN the February—March, 1919, number of the *Review*, Professor Postgate writes as follows:

'We can hardly doubt that the poet of *Inst. Or. I. 9. 2* who composed "Aesopi fabellas . . . sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente" and whose "gracilitas" is to be reproduced in the school exercises, was Phaedrus. The Fables then, or rather a selection from them, were a schoolbook at Rome towards the end of the first century A.D.'

With the implied interpretation of the passage in question I entirely disagree. The question whether Phaedrus was used as a school-book at Rome is another matter. On this, too, I differ from the writer, but I speak with less confidence. I may add that the whole of the ninth chapter is important in the history of ancient schools and well worth elucidation.

The whole passage runs thus:

'igitur AESOPI FABELLAS, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant: VERSUS primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari: tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et brevare quaedam et exornare salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur. quod opus, etiam consummatis professoribus (? profectibus) difficile, qui commode tractaverit, cuicumque discendo sufficiet. SENTENTIAE quoque et CHIRIAE et ETHOLOGIAE [ (? aetilogiae) subiectis dictionum rationibus apud grammaticos scribantur, quia initium ex lectione ducunt: quorum omnis similis est ratio, forma diversa.'

This ninth chapter deals with the 'progymnasmata' or forms of exercise in original composition, of which we have full accounts in Hermogenes (with

Priscian's translation), Aphthonius and Theon. All these exercises were, strictly speaking, 'rhetorical,' being preparations for the full dress declamation. But Quintilian complains that through the laches of the 'rhetores' they had fallen into the hands of the 'grammatici,' and his object in this chapter is to suggest a compromise by which the more elementary exercises, and these only, might be retained in the lower school. From the dozen or more in vogue we may say that he selects two as suitable for this purpose. The first is the *μῦθος* or, more exactly, *μῦθος Αἰσώπειος*, for our Greek authorities are careful to say that what we call fables are all known by the name of Aesop, whether they were attributed to Aesop or not. The other is the 'Chria' and its varieties, the *γνώμη* or 'sententia' and the doubtful 'ethology.' All these are evidently little moral essays, founded on some saying or significant action, and it will be convenient to speak of them under the single name of 'Chria.' Another exercise, the *διήγησις*, he only accepts under the limitation 'narratiunculas a poetis celebratas notitiae causa non eloquentiae tractandas puto.' That is, if we come across an allusion to Orpheus in our books, the 'grammaticus' may set the boy to write out the story of Orpheus, in his own words, to see that he knows it, but it should not like the other two be used as a set composition. From this point of view it is reserved for the higher school.

Now I think it is perfectly clear from the words themselves that the injunction that boys should learn to tell or write fables 'sermone puro' or 'gracili' has nothing whatever to do with Phaedrus or any other fabulist, but merely refers to the style required from the pupil. And this is confirmed by the Greek parallels. Hermogenes says that the style in the *μῦθος* must be *περίοδων ἀλλοτρία τῆς γλυκύτητος ἐγγύς*. Theon, who on other grounds puts the *χρεία* before the *μῦθος*, says that in the latter the style must be *ἀπλουστέρα* than in the former. I think Dr. Postgate may have been misled by the 'eandem.' The meaning is, I take it, that the 'fable' composition has two stages—the first oral (what the Germans, I think, call a Vortrag), the second written, but in both cases the same simplicity of style is required.

We have now to note that between the 'Aesop fable' and the 'Chria' Quintilian interpolates another exercise, which is not, strictly speaking, one of the 'progymnasmata.' Take a piece of verse,<sup>1</sup> he says, and (1) write it out in prose order, (2) suggest synonyms, (3) paraphrase, *précis*, or expand it, while retaining the writer's meaning. The directions bear a close resemblance to a question which I have often set as an examiner in Shakespeare in the Cambridge Locals, the formula of which runs thus: 'Put the following passage into modern prose so as to bring out clearly the full meaning.'

When I say that paraphrase was not, 'strictly speaking,' one of the 'progymnasmata,' I mean that, while it does not appear in the detailed accounts, Theon does dwell on it in his prefatory matter, and it was clearly practised in the rhetoric school, though rather as a parallel and auxiliary to the declamation than as a preliminary. Some surprise may be felt that Quintilian, who tells us that it is a difficult job even under the crack rhetoricians<sup>2</sup> (much more under the 'grammaticus'), should advo-

cate it at this early stage. I suspect that he shared the belief which still makes me advocate it. The candidates often make a terrible mess of it, but I hold to it as the best antidote against reading poetry without thought for the exact meaning.

I believe then that the words 'versus . . . permittitur' have nothing to do with the 'fable.' It is true that, as the construction after 'condiscant' runs on, we have to print them in the same sentence, but that is not a real consideration.<sup>3</sup> It is, however, true that nothing which I have said at present argues against the possibility that Phaedrus (and I presume Babrius, for Quintilian has been legislating for Greek studies as well as Latin) were used for paraphrasing. I will deal with that later, but at any rate there is no reason to think that they are *exclusively* meant. It is hardly credible that the exercise should begin and end with the fabulists.

It may indeed be asked why, seeing that the 'fable' and the 'Chria' are both in a way original compositions, while the paraphrase is of a different nature, it is placed between them. The answer is, I think, that Quintilian names the exercises in the order in which he thinks they should be taken up. It is very noteworthy that he grounds his approval of the Chria, etc., on the fact that they 'initium ex lectione ducunt.' In other words he believes in the correlation of studies, and wishes the composition subjects, when possible, to be connected with the literature. The reading in Homer and Virgil might easily supply the periodical 'Chria.' It is true, however, that most of those reported to us come from prose sources which would not enter into class reading in the grammatical school. But I presume a little ingenuity might easily forge a connection between them and the poets read. A very favourite 'Chria' seems to have been 'Isocrates said that the roots of *παιδεία* were bitter, but its fruits sweet.' This might easily be connected with a story of a

<sup>1</sup> 'versus' and 'poetae' of course, because no prose was 'apud grammaticos' at Rome at this time.

<sup>2</sup> So Spalding takes 'consummatis professoribus,' but, as he says, it is harsh; on the other hand, if we take it as dative the statement seems exaggerated. I am much inclined to Sarpe's

'profectibus' = highly advanced pupils, a phrase which has good parallels in Quintilian.

<sup>3</sup> It may be observed that each exercise is introduced by its leading noun, which I have indicated by printing them in capitals.

hero who was chastened by misfortune into wisdom and happiness. Odysseus or Aeneas would do for the purpose. It was perhaps some such reminiscence of his youth which induced the 'Auctor ad Hebraeos' to introduce this very Chria into his twelfth chapter *à propos* of the divine *παιδεία* of the Church.

I imagine then that Quintilian wished the 'Chria,' etc., as a composition exercise, to be taken up when the class, having been trained in literary appreciation on the admirable principles laid down in the seventeenth section of the previous chapter, had arrived at some idea of the 'laudandum in sensibus.' The easiest form of paraphrasing could be started earlier, and the 'Aesopi fabella' was, I suggest, pre-literary. Its groundwork lay in simple children's

stories just above the 'nutricularum fabulae,' and the style was intended to correspond. And the inference I draw from the way in which Quintilian speaks of it, as compared with the other two exercises, is that neither Phaedrus nor Babrius, nor any other poetical fabulist, was used in the schools. This is in itself, no doubt, a speculative argument, but it is confirmed, I think, by two solid facts. If Phaedrus was read, we should have expected some mention, if not of his name, at any rate of his type, in the eighth chapter. And, if the indices are to be trusted, not a single quotation from him is to be found in the whole body of extant 'grammatici' and 'rhetores.' Is this compatible with his use as a school text? It seems to me very doubtful.

F. H. COLSON.

### VIRGIL, *AENEID* 6. 859.

Adspice ut insignis spoliis Marcellus opimis  
ingreditur uictorque uiros supereminet omnes.  
hic rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu  
sistet eques, sternet Poenos Gallumque re-  
bellem,

tertiaque arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.

Marcellus, according to Plutarch, *Marc.* 8. and Propertius, 4. 10, dedicated the *spolia opima*, won from the Gallic chief Viridomarus, to Jupiter Feretrius. Why then does Virgil make him dedicate them to *pater Quirinus*?

The answer is to be found in Festus and Plutarch. Servius saw dimly where the truth lay, as his note shows.

SERVIUS. After a futile attempt to explain *capta Quirino* as *qualia et Quirinus cepit*, *id est Romulus (patri on this view = Ioui)*, he continues 'possumus et, quod est melius, secundum legem Numae hunc locum accipere, qui praecepit prima spolia opima Ioui Feretrio debere suspendi, quod iam Romulus fecerat; secunda Marti, quod Cossus fecit; tertia Quirino, quod fecit Marcellus. Quirinus autem est Mars qui praeest paci et intra ciuitatem colitur: nam belli Mars extra ciuitatem templum habuit. . . . uarie de hoc loco tractant commentatores, Numae legis immemores, cuius facit mentionem et Liuius.'

For this *lex Numae* we must have recourse to Plutarch and Festus, Livy's reference to the law having apparently been made in one of the lost books.

FESTUS, p. 202 Lindsay, 'opima magnifica et ampla, unde spolia quoque quae dux populi Romani duci hostium detraxit: quorum tanta raritas est ut intra annos paulo (*lacuna of nineteen letters*) trina contigerint nomini Romano: una quae Romulus de Acrone; altera quae Cossus Cornelius de Tolumnio; tertia quae Marcellus Ioui Feretrio de Viridomaro fixerunt. M. Varro ait opima spolia esse etiam si manipularis miles detraxerit dummodo duci hostium *sed prima esse quae dux duci neque enim quae a duce capta*<sup>1</sup> non sint ad aedem Iouis Feretri poni: testimonio esse libros pontificum in quibus ait: "pro primis spoliis boue, pro secundis solitaurilibus, pro tertiis agno publice fieri debere: i esse etiam Pompili regis legem opimorum spoliorum talem: 'cuius auspicio classe procincta opima spolia capiuntur, Ioui Feretrio dari oportet, et bouem caedito; qui cepit, CCC dari oportet. secunda spolia in Martis ara in Campo, solitaur-

<sup>1</sup> Words in italics conjecturally supplied by Hertzberg.