

PA25
C68
N74

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
FRONTO AND M. AURELIUS

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN THE HALL OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE
OXFORD, DECEMBER 3, 1903

WITH AN APPENDIX OF EMENDATIONS
OF THE LETTERS

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., HON. LL.D.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN

A

0002240471

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

California
Regional
Facility

This book is DUE on the last
date stamped below

PA25 Ellis-

C68 The correspond-
v.74 ence of Fronto
and M. Aurelius.

PA25

C68

v. 74

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF
FRONTO AND M. AURELIUS

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN THE HALL OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE
OXFORD, DECEMBER 3, 1903

WITH AN APPENDIX OF EMENDATIONS
OF THE LETTERS

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., HON. LL.D.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
AT
LOS ANGELES
LIBRARY

29p

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES LIBRARY

LONDON
HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.
OXFORD: 116 HIGH STREET

1904

PA25

C68

v. 74

FRONTO

AT the beginning of the nineteenth century all that survived of the once famous orator M. Cornelius Fronto was a few short fragments quoted in Charisius, in Servius' Commentary on Vergil, and in the short treatise *de Abstrusis Sermonibus* of Fulgentius Planciades. Yet his greatness as a speaker had been attested not only by the fact of his being selected to train the young Caesars M. Aurelius and L. Verus in rhetoric, but by the united verdict of the Panegyrist Eumenius and the poet Ausonius, the former of whom comparing him with Cicero had pronounced Fronto the second, but not inferior, glory of Roman eloquence, while Ausonius, contrasting his own elevation to the Consulship with Fronto's two months' tenure of the same office, deprecates any rivalry with Fronto's acknowledged eloquence, but prefers his own Emperor Gratianus to Fronto's patron M. Aurelius. It was remembered too that M. Aurelius, in the very first chapter of his *Reflexions*, had ascribed to Fronto his perception of the jealousy, artifice, and insincerity which mark tyrants, as well as the want of natural affection often found in the so-called aristocracy. These were recommendations of no slight kind to that 'great age' in which the French Revolution was still new, and the monarchs of Europe had one after another been dispossessed by Napoleon. Great, therefore, was the curiosity which greeted the announcement in 1815 that an Italian scholar, the now famous Mai, had discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan a palimpsest containing on 282 pages of double columns, 24 lines in each column, part of the correspondence between Fronto and his pupil M. Aurelius. Later, when Mai removed to Rome as librarian of the Vatican, he found there another part of the same palimpsest, containing further letters of

Fronto in 106 pages. Over the original writing had been superscribed a Latin account of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. On the antiquity of the original writing various opinions have been formed; Mai considered it to be very old, indeed not later than the fourth century; Niebuhr referred it to the beginning of the seventh, arguing from the shape of the letters, which are not unlike those of the Pandects in the famous MS. at Florence. Naber assigns it to the beginning of the sixth century, and considers it to approximate most nearly to the Vienna MS. of Livy. This view he conceives to be further supported by the form and character of the Greek letters (the MS. contains several epistles of and to Fronto in Greek) and the absence of accents and marks of aspiration. There are few contractions, q' for *que*, b' for *bus*, IMP. for *imperator*. The facsimile given by Mai at the end of his Milan edition, 1815, has in some cases a large comma written above the line, apparently to divide words from each other, or show when sentences end; but it is hard to speak confidently, as in a short letter of thirty-six words and five sentences, the comma is introduced five times, but in two of the five after words which do not end a sentence, and one which does not even end a clause. The text of Fronto in the MS. was emended at an early period by a person whose name Caecilius was formerly legible at the end of the third book of Epistles, though it has now been obliterated. He has written in the margin sometimes words, sometimes sentences, now transposed and altered, now in imperfect excerpts, now in full. His notes are more numerous towards the end. There are a few various readings. All this is reproduced in Naber's edition of Fronto (1867). After the publication of the Ambrosian part by Mai, it was again edited by Niebuhr, Buttman, and Heindorf conjointly. Mai, on the discovery of the Vatican portion, re-edited the whole in 1823, since which time nothing of much importance was done till 1858¹, when Naber's friend, Du Rieu,

¹ See Du Rieu's *Schedae Vaticanae*, Praef., p. 2, published in 1860.

again examined the MS. very carefully, and rearranged the whole. Instead however of publishing his results himself, he entrusted them to Naber, whose edition of 1867 still remains the only adequate form in which the text of the Letters can be studied. In 1874 Klussmann published his excellent *Emendationes Frontonianae* with an *Epistula Critica* by Studemund, and in 1902 the Dutch scholar Brakman in his *Frontoniana* contributed the results of a new examination of both palimpsests, which must be considered valuable. From a short conversation with Dr. Hauler of Vienna in 1897 I learnt that he was then meditating a new edition.

The literary interest of this correspondence is considerable. It comprises 8 books *ad M. Caesarem et inuicem*, i. e. between Fronto and M. Aurelius, still Caesar, 2 to M. Aurelius as Emperor, 2 *Ad Verum Imperatorem*, to Aurelius' colleague Verus, 1 to Marcus Antoninus *de eloquentia*, 1 to the same *de orationibus*, 1 to Antoninus Pius, 2 *Ad Amicos et inuicem*. Besides these, there are six short and imperfect treatises: (1) *Principia Historiae*, (2) *Laudes Fumi et Pulueris*, (3) *Laudes Negligentiae*, (4) *De Bello Parthico*, (5) *De Feriis Alsiensibus*, (6) *De Nepote Amisso*, (7) *Arion*. There is finally a short book of Greek letters, in which two Latin letters are included. We have thus, numerically, a tolerably large body of remains from which to estimate the literary merits and position of Fronto, among the writers of African Latin the most conspicuous figure that has survived to modern times with the single exception of Apuleius. It is true that nothing remains of his speeches, and it was on his speeches that his chief title to distinction rested. In this respect he is at a disadvantage as compared with another but later writer who happens to be included in the same palimpsest with himself, the famous supporter of Paganism in its last days, the object of the Christian poet Prudentius' attack, the epistolographer and orator Symmachus, of whose oratory at least some fragments survive. This is the more regrettable as Fronto is selected by no less a critic than Macrobius

(*Sat. v. 1*) in the passage where he describes the four styles of oratory, the copious, the concise, the colourless, the florid, as the best type of the colourless or *dry* style (*siccus*), and is contrasted with the younger Pliny and Symmachus, who represented the fourth or florid genus.

M. Cornelius Fronto was born in the Berber town Cirta (modern *Constantine*), it is not known in what year, but perhaps, as Monceaux thinks, in the principate of Nerva or the first years of Trajan. Nor are we informed when he left his native country for Rome, where, seemingly under the training of the philosopher Athenodotus and the rhetorician Dionysius, he gave himself to the study of eloquence and rose under Hadrian (109–138 A.D.) to be the first orator of his time. As such he is mentioned by Dion Cassius among the chief ornaments of Hadrian's reign (lxix. 18). Hadrian himself he never liked and seems to have avoided close contact with him; 'I approached him,' he confesses in a letter to M. Aurelius, p. 25 N., 'as a kind of Mars Gradivus, or Dis Pater, whom I wished to soothe rather than loved.' This was not inconsistent with frequent laudation of Hadrian in the senate; and these orations were, Fronto tells us, in every one's hands.

An Algerian inscription, Renier 2717, gives a list of the offices he held before his appointment to the Consulship: triumvir capitalis, quaestor of the province of Sicily, plebeian aedile, praetor. It was not till the sixth year of Antoninus Pius, 143 A.D., that he was made consul suffectus for the months of July and August. Before this he had been appointed tutor in rhetoric to the young M. Aurelius, and later to L. Verus, the future joint-rulers of the Roman Empire, whom Antoninus Pius had adopted, in conformity with the wish of Hadrian, as the condition of his own succession to the principate (Feb. 25, A. D. 138).

From this time to the end of his life Fronto continued in high favour with the reigning emperors, his reputation increasing steadily with his years. He was offered the pro-consulate of Asia, but declined it on grounds of health. 'I had made every preparation for starting, and had even

arranged with a Mauritanian soldier-friend of tried experience to provide means for hunting out and coercing the banditti. It was my hope by spare diet and drinking water to alleviate, if not keep off, the malady from which I suffer. But an attack supervened of such violence as to convince me that all hope of accepting the post was impossible' (p. 169). He remained at Rome, too confirmed an invalid to be very happy, too much courted and caressed to be quite miserable. Capitolinus tells us (M. Aurel. 2), that M. Aurelius had a statue erected to him, and he was doubtless included in the series of golden effigies which the Emperor placed in his *Lararium* in honour of his various preceptors (ib. 3). Though he affected no state, he was rich; owned villas in different parts of Italy, was proprietor of the famous *horti Maecenatiani* (p. 23), and is introduced by A. Gellius (xix. 10) as surrounded by architects who exhibited to him plans of costly baths, one requiring an outlay of 350,000 sesterces. It is not wonderful therefore that he is mentioned in the inscription above quoted as *patronus* of the African town of Calama, and seems to have been solicited to assume the same function in his native Cirta (p. 200).

In the loss of all Fronto's orations, it will suffice to mention the titles of those by which he gained most applause. The Panegyrist Eumenius (Pan. Constantii XIV), from whom I have cited the words *Fronto Romanae eloquentiae non secundum sed alterum decus*, quotes a passage from the eulogium which he addressed to Antoninus Pius on his successful consummation, though not personally present, of the war in Britain. Another famous display was his invective against Herodes Atticus, his rival in oratory and the instructor of M. Aurelius in Greek, as Fronto in Latin, rhetoric. On this occasion M. Aurelius interceded with Fronto in behalf of Herodes; and the orator seems to have modified the violence of his invective, at the same time that he maintained a stern and dignified attitude towards an undoubted offender. In his speech *de hereditate Matidiae* he supported M. Aurelius and his wife Faustina

against Matidia's legatees. But the crowning effort of his oratory was his speech against Pelops, probably, as Niebuhr suggested, the celebrated physician mentioned by Aelius Aristides and Galen; in this he surpassed himself, as we are expressly told by Apollinaris Sidonius (*Epp.* vii. 10).

Deplorable as is the loss of even one specimen of Fronto's oratory—instructive as it would have been to compare him with his great rival, Cicero, or his senior contemporary, Pliny, particularly where both had to deal with the same materials, the laudation of really great and admirable emperors—we have enough left us in the palimpsest remains discovered by Mai to form an adequate idea not only of the man but of the epoch in which he lived and which was moulded considerably by him. A circumstance there is which heightens or even doubles the attractiveness of Fronto's correspondence. The letters with their replies are addressed to and answered by a youth who became later one of the greatest and certainly one of the best men of the Roman world. When the correspondence with his tutor began, M. Aurelius was quite young, *audax puerulus*, as he calls himself (p. 41), perhaps, as Naber thought, nineteen years old. Such indeed is the tone of these letters between master and pupil as to suggest an even earlier age. They may fairly be said to overflow with affection, and this a reciprocal passion in which the fondness of the master is more than equalled by the ardour of the pupil. It may well be that the feeling of fondness which Fronto would naturally conceive for Marcus as a young boy extended itself to his adolescence and even to his mature youth; in fact he tells us so in one of the first passages of the letters (p. 102). 'Schoolmasters, as we know, have more affection for their pupils while they are still learning the tasks of boyhood and paying their fee. Speaking for myself, the moment I entered upon the work of tending and cultivating your intellect, my hopes anticipated that you would be what you are: I strained the eyes of my affection to reach into this your reign.

Your boyhood was already bright with native excellence, your adolescence still brighter; yet only with the dawning and imperfect light of a day without cloud. Now at last the brilliant orb of your perfect excellence has risen and dispersed its rays over the world; and yet you would recall me to the ancient measure of a love still in its dawn, and would have the dim light of morning shine at midday.' Again (p. 51), 'In receiving the letters you sent me every day, I felt all the pangs of a lover who sees his love hurrying to him along a rugged and perilous road. His joy at meeting again alternates with his alarm at the danger.' Again (p. 74), 'If, when slumber's chain has bound me, to speak with the poet, I see you in my sleep, I never fail to embrace and kiss you; then, according as each sleep varies its scene, I either weep profusely or feel my heart beat with an ineffable joy.' Again (p. 155), 'I confess—and it is a fact that I tell you—that one thing, and one only, can occur to make my love for you halt to any considerable degree—your neglecting oratory.'

On his side Marcus was equally warm (p. 26).

'To my dear Fronto. I give in, you have conquered; all lovers that ever were you have conquered in loving. Take the crown: and besides this let the herald declare openly in front of your tribunal this your victory. *Marcus Cornelius Fronton Consul a la victoire; il reçoit la couronne des grandes luttes d'amour.* For my part, defeated as I am, I am not likely to withdraw from my devotion or prove untrue. Leaving it then to yourself to love me more than man ever loved man, I, who own an inferior power in loving, shall love you more than any human being loves you, nay more than you love yourself. Henceforth Gratia and I are rivals: and yet I feel I shall not be able to go beyond her. For her passion, as Plautus says, is a rain whose large drops have not only drenched her robe, but actually course through her vitals.' Again (p. 56), 'What do you think are my feelings, when I reflect how long it is since I have seen you, and why it is I have not seen you? Possibly indeed I may not see you during the few days

which you are compelled to take for recovering your strength. So as long as you lie by, my own spirits must droop; when with heaven's help you stand on your feet again, my own spirits will resume their composure: at this moment they burn with the intensest longing to see you. Farewell, thou soul of thy own Caesar, thy friend, thy pupil.' And in another letter he even more closely anticipates the language of Shakespeare's Sonnets (p. 4): 'Where my mind has betaken itself, I do not know, except that I know this, it is on its way to that unknown somewhere, you. . . . If you think of any waters as a cure, write and restore to my breast its soul.'

Similar, but perhaps a little less high-flown, is the expression of Fronto's feeling for his younger pupil, Lucius Verus. 'How often,' he writes (p. 136), 'have you supported me in your hands, raised me when I had difficulty in standing up, or almost carried me when bodily weakness made it difficult to move! With what a joyous and benign look did you always greet me: how gladly converse and how long! how unwillingly break off the conversation!'

The infirmities of which Fronto here speaks extended to every part of his body and fill his whole correspondence. He was a perpetual sufferer from gout, and is called 'Fronto the gouty' by Artemidorus (*de Somniis*, iv. 24), and twice described by Gellius (ii. 26, xix. 10) as *pedibus aeger*, and *pedes tunc graviter aeger*. He describes himself as suffering successively in the arm, the elbow, the knee, the neck, the groin, the left foot, the sole, the stomach, the right hand, the chest, the windpipe, the shoulders, the peritoneum (if Klusmann's conjecture is right, p. 72), the eyes. The whole of the fifth book of the correspondence with Aurelius is an alternation of Fronto's varying ailments and Marcus' sympathizing replies: a fact, I believe, without any other example in Greek or Roman literature. But he knew how to turn his pains to good purpose; they excused his attendance at court, and gave him a real plea for absenting himself from visits of ceremony which to a man so much employed as a pleader must too often have been a waste of

time. Nor does it seem that such absences were resented or that they caused any coldness between the Caesar and his master.

As might be expected from the intimacy of their relations, the letters of Fronto and Marcus range over a wide list of subjects and admit us to many different phases of Italian life in the second century A. D. The most prominent place must be given to literature, under which I include oratory and the study of words. At that time Rome was filled with grammarians, and most of them acknowledged a leader in Fronto. The *Attic Nights* of A. Gellius are perhaps the most faithful exhibition of the literary tendencies of the epoch. Gellius introduces us no less than five times to scenes in which Fronto is the central figure. Once it is a discussion with Favorinus on colours and the words which express them (ii. 26); then a defence of Claudius Quadrigarius' *cum multis mortalibus* against a caviller who could feel no difference between this and *cum multis hominibus* (xiii. 29); in a third (xix. 8) the question is asked, Have *harena, triticum, caelum* plurals? has *quadrigae* a singular? and Fronto quotes the Dictator Caesar's *de Analogia* and a passage of Ennius: in a fourth *praeter propter*, alleged to be a low word used by artisans, is defended and shown to be good Latin (xix. 10): in the fifth a grammatical quartett, Gellius, Apollinaris Sulpicius, Festus Postumius, and Fronto, canvass in the vestibule of the Palace the respective claims of *nanus* and *pumilio*; and Fronto's disparaging opinion of *nanus* is shown by Apollinaris to be inconsistent with its being genuine Greek, and by Postumius with its authorization by a poet as learned and famous as Helvius Cinna.

This side of Fronto's activity is well represented in the letters. He has the most pronounced judgements on Roman oratory, and it is clear that with him oratory depended for its success almost wholly on the choice of words. 'Few writers,' he says (p. 62), 'have addressed themselves to the laborious and hazardous study of carefully looking for words. Among orators Cato above all others and his constant

imitator Sallust; among poets Plautus especially, and most especially Ennius with his studious imitator L. Caelius: again, Naeuius, Lucretius, Accius, Caecilius, and Laberius. Reserving these, there are some writers whom you may observe to be choice in special lines; Novius, Pomponius, and their compeers, in words of country life or of jesting and farce: Atta in words used by women, Sisenna in love-scenes, Lucilius in the words appropriate to each profession or business. You may perhaps ask impatiently where I place Cicero, the so-called fount and spring-head of Roman eloquence. I consider him to have used invariably the finest words and to have excelled all other orators in the splendour with which he adorns everything he wished to set off with distinction. I hold him, however, to have been far removed from any minute search for language, either because he was too high-minded or shunned the labour, or felt assured that without any search he would find ready to his hand words which would hardly occur to others with it. And so I believe I have made out—for I have been a careful reader of everything he wrote—that while he has handled all other classes of words with rare fullness and richness, words proper or metaphorical, simple or compound, including those choice, and often quite beautiful dictions which shed a lustre over all his writings—still throughout his speeches any one of those sudden surprises of language which only study, attention, vigilance and extensive memory of old poetry are able to discover, is very rare indeed. By sudden surprises of language I mean what comes upon the hearer or reader unexpectedly and unawares, such that if it is withdrawn and the reader is ordered to search himself for the right word, he will either find none at all or no other as well fitted to indicate the meaning.’

He illustrates what I have here translated by the various uses of *luere* and its compounds. To rinse the mouth is *os colluere*, to scour a pavement is *pelluere*, to wash off sweat *abluere*, to wash out a stain *eluere*, to mix a draught of mulse *diluere*, to rinse the throat *proluere*, to bathe an animal’s hoof *subluere*. To wash a dress is *lauare*, to

drench the cheeks with tears is *lauere*, to scour away dirt that clings is *elauere*, a word affected by Plautus.

A similar characterization of Roman orators and historians is found (p. 113). 'Among poets, as every one knows, Lucilius is a type of the meagre, Albucius of the lifeless style, Lucretius is lofty, Pacuvius neither high nor low, Accius unequal, Ennius various. Again, history has been written by Sallust in a set periodic style, by Pictor roughly, by Antias with sprightliness, by Sisenna tediously, by Cato with words in long teams, by Caelius in single words. Again, in public harangues Cato is fierce, Gracchus noisy, Cicero copious: in judicial speeches Cato is furious, Cicero exultant, Gracchus vehement, Calvus quarrelsome.' Nor must we suppose that Fronto contented himself with merely lauding these antiquated worthies; he got copies to be made of them and dispatched them to his imperial pupil; the *Sota* of Ennius, we learn from Marcus himself, was thus sent off to him written on cleaner paper, in a more attractive volume and finer writing; whether it was read, or if read thought much of, we are not told; but the next sentence informs us that a speech or speeches of Gracchus which Fronto wished also to send, might as well wait, as there was no hurry. It would seem that the great literary epoch of Domitian and Trajan, the epoch of Statius, Juvenal, Martial, Suetonius, Tacitus, Pliny, was too recent in men's memories to give way without a struggle to a new creed which reversed their pretensions and returned by preference to the older, mostly pre-Ciceronian models, now long out of date and only to be revived by an effort. Fronto, however, was too wise to attack these great names; his scoffs are aimed at an earlier generation, the writers of Nero's reign, specially the younger Seneca and Lucan.

This is his verdict on Seneca (p. 156): 'I well know the fellow to be copious and exuberant in philosophic aphorisms (*sententiis*); but I observe that his trotting sentences nowhere hold on at a quick galloping pace, nowhere join issue, nowhere aim at a grandiose effect; he is like Laberius, full of witty sallies, or perhaps I should say witticisms, rather

than of smartly turned dicta. Do you really think you will find weightier judgements, I mean on the same matter, in your Seneca than in Sergius? But then Sergius' sentences are not so well modulated; true; nor so lively in movement; no: nor so resonant: granted. Well, suppose the same breakfast served up to both, one of the two fingering the olives set before him, putting them to his mouth, chewing them in the authorized manner of mastication; the other tossing his olives into the air, opening his mouth to catch them, displaying them when caught at the tip of his lips as a conjurer does with counters. By this he would certainly secure the vivas of boys, and the amusement of the guests; but the one would be taking his meal decorously, the other using his lips to play the harlequin.' The criticism is severe, but has at least elements of truth; even more decidedly damning is what he says of the Neronian affectation of repeating the same idea in many different forms.

'The first vice in that kind of speaking is a very vile one, I mean repeating the same idea a thousand times over in a different dress. As actors dancing in a mantle use the same mantle to express a swan's tail, the hair of Venus, the lash of a Fury; just so this school of writers present the same one sentiment in many forms, air it, change and turn it about, rub up the same one idea continually.

'Has something to be said about Fortune? You shall find there every single aspect of the Goddess: the Fortune of Antium, the Fortune of Praeneste, Fortune looking backwards, even the Fortune of the bath, all alike with wings, wheels, and rudders.

'As an instance I will mention one poetical prelude, by a poet of the same time and the same name: he was himself an Annaeus. At the beginning of his epic he has illustrated in the first seven lines one single idea—*a more than civil war*. Now count up how many varieties he uses to unfold the idea.' Here he proceeds to draw out Lucan's famous proem clause by clause, adding at the end, 'Annaeus, where will you finish? Or if limit and

measure must not be observed, why not add *Et similes lituos*; concluding with *et carmina nota tubarum*? Indeed you may as well go on to coats of mail, helmet-plumes, swords, belts, and the whole equipage of war.' With this Neronian verbiage he rightly contrasts the condensation of Apollonius Rhodius, who in the four hexameters with which his *Argonautica* open

Ἄρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι, οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας
Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἔφημοσύνη Πελλίαι
χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας εὐζυγον ἤλασαν Ἄργώ.

sums up five separate circumstances, the heroes who sailed, the course they took, the king who commanded the voyage, the purpose of the voyage, the ship which carried the Argonauts.

For Sallust Fronto had an undisguised admiration, and is fond of coupling him with Cato, whom Sallust imitated, and as such is called *sectator Catonis* (p. 62). When congratulating Marcus on the success with which he had expressed some *sententia*, he tells him 'it might be put into a work of Sallust's, without any difference or inferiority being noticeable,' and he urges him to perfect his style by reading daily some part of the *Jugurtha* or *Catiline*. It is amusing to find that this admiration was not equally shared by Marcus: he begs off reading Sallust, excusing himself by his undivided devotion to Cato (p. 36). The letter, indeed, in which he says so is only half serious, and it is probable that in his maturer years the great philosopher became equally indifferent to both Sallust and Cato. It was no part of the Stoic training to think much of rhetoric or busy oneself with questions of style: so the Emperor himself confesses in his *Reflexions* (i. 7); and Sallust is nothing if not a stylist. Style indeed is implied in the very adverb by which Fronto describes Sallust, *structe*, i.e. with a studious attention to periodic arrangement. Such aiming at effect, we may believe, however much in unison with his preceptor's teaching, would become less and less acceptable to M. Aurelius as he grew older, more

reflective, and more conscious of the seriousness of his position as master of the world.

Besides the *Jugurtha* and *Catiline* we find Fronto quoting from Sallust's *Histories*, the letters sent by Mithridates to Arsaces asking for aid in war, and the letter of Cn. Pompeius to the Senate (p. 126).

Of Plautus Fronto seems to have been so great an admirer as to satisfy the exacting requirements even of a Ritschl or the eminent band of German critics who have revived the study of his comedies during the past half-century. A well-known passage from the *Mostellaria* we have cited already; from the *Rudens* he quotes *piscatu hamatili et saxatili* (p. 225), from the *Bacchides maculosa maculosioraque quam nutricis pallium*, from the lost *Colax* (p. 33) the lines

Qui data fide firmata fidentem fefellerint
Subdoli subsentatores, regi qui sunt proximi,

Qui aliter regi dictis dicunt, aliter in animo habent: from an unknown passage, perhaps Poen. i. 1. 49 or iii. 3. 43, where however our MSS. give *liberum*, the combination *lubricum locum = uoluptarium*; taking occasion by the way to comment jocularly on the Plautine *facere animo uolup*, which he calls *halving* words, to assure Marcus that he (Marcus) at any rate was beyond any such suspicion, and was far more likely to admit to his society a vulpine than a voluptuous friend (p. 225). Even in a short business letter he can stop to draw an illustration from Plautus. Recommending to Avidius Cassius one Junius Maximus, he writes, 'No Plautine braggart could speak more loftily of his own achievements than Junius of yours; the only difference is that Plautus commends wittily, Junius as the most faithful of attached friends.' In another passage, which it is as difficult for us now, as it must have been for the Romans of that time, to read without a smile, he imagines Marcus in his holiday retreat at Alsium alternately taking a polish from Plautus, sating his spirit with Accius, tranquillizing it with Lucretius, rousing it to a glow with Ennius.

Certainly the days of reaction had set in; Horace, that notable (*memorabilis*) poet whom Fronto once condescends

to quote as endeared to him by his friendship to Maecenas and Maecenas' gardens which he was then occupying (p. 23), is as completely set aside as Pope by Wordsworth, Boileau by Keats, the music of the eighteenth century by Wagner.

But there is a time for everything, and Fronto's was the time when the Romans, tired with the artificiality of their latest literature, turned again to the forgotten writers of the Republic, and in spite of Horace began an organized study of works which had long been laid on the shelf. Plautus and Terence, it is true, could never be old-fashioned; but the revival extended much beyond these, and gave once more a temporary vogue to such works as the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius, the Annals and Tragedies of Ennius, the dramas of Pacuvius, Afranius, Accius, the Satires of Lucilius, and even the prose histories of Quadrigarius, Caelius Antipater, and Sisenna. This new study was greatly assisted by its close connexion with every form of antiquarian research, particularly with the examination of archaic words, archaic forms and inflexions, archaic deviations from the recognized rules of classical construction and prosody. With the study of grammar, the study of rhetoric advanced *pari passu*. Eloquence, according to Fronto, largely consisted in choosing the best language; it is easy to see how this *λεξιθηρία* worked into cognate subjects, and tended to develop lexicography and minute examination of words. As might be expected there were many teachers of rhetoric, many grammarians, many writers on antiquities. Suetonius, who belonged to the beginning of the second century, was both a writer on antiquities and a lexicographer. Under Hadrian Terentius Scaurus, whom Charisius and Diomedes often cite, besides grammatical treatises, wrote a commentary on Plautus; Sulpicius Apollinaris, Arruntius Celsus, A. Gellius were contemporaries of Fronto. One of the greatest of Greek grammarians, Herodian, dedicated a work to M. Aurelius.

In Fronto's letters we are able to trace these tendencies of the age not indistinctly. They abound with peculiar, often archaic words and constructions of words. From

Naber's Index I select the following: *admurmurari*, *con-garrire*, *deliberamentum*, *reuimentum*, *samentum*, *dictabolarium*, *disconcinuus*, *genum* for *genu*, *inluculascere*, *inpliscisci*, *inuiare*, *linitus* for *linteus*, *pedetemptius* comparative of *pedetemptim*, *perfrictriuncula*, *poetare*, *prodormire*, *rogatarius*, *siubenus*, *spernari*, *superuacaneo* adverb, *tolutiloquentia*, *uolentia*, *uoluptatiuus*, *claudere* = *claudicare*, *expergitus* for *experrectus*, *extradicitus* (Plautine), *fuat* and *abfuat* for *sit absit*, *horribiliter* extraordinarily, our 'awfully,' *ipsus* for *ipse*, *modificari* with dat. = *modum facere*, *nullum* nearly = *nihil*, *octauidus* for *octauo idus*, *praeditus* for *praepositus*, *querella* of a bodily complaint, *symbolus* masc. for *symbolum*, *tam* for *tamen*, *tutari* passive: and the following constructions, *alienus* with dative, *animaduertere* with accusative = *punire*, *carere* with accus., *curare* with dative, *fauere* with abl., *gaudere* with acc., *meus* as a vocative, *modestus*, *sanus* followed by a genitive, *perfungi* with accus., *studere* with accus., *decere* with dative. Very peculiar are the constructions of the gerundive, p. 120 *iis rebus laetandis* in the rejoicings for those events, p. 111 *sine mora intercedenda*. An affectation adopted from Cato is the excessive use of *atque* as Marcus tells us himself, p. 36 *uni M. Porcio me dedicauit atque despondi atque delegauit. Hoc etiam ipsum ATQVE unde putas? ex ipso furore.*

I will now attempt to give some idea of the lighter style of the correspondence, much of which has nothing to do with eloquence or literature. The following describes one of Fronto's attacks of ill-health (p. 87): 'I have had a serious choleraic attack, so bad that I lost my voice, hiccuped, sighed to suffocation, had no pulse left, and in the absence of pulsation felt miserable; it ended with my household giving me up for lost. For a considerable time I lost all consciousness; the doctors had no time or opportunity to use even a bath or cold water or food for fomenting or restoring me. All I could do was when evening set in to swallow a very small quantity of crumbs mixed with wine and poured into my throat. In this way

I was completely restored. Afterwards three whole days passed without my recovering my voice. Now, however, by heaven's kind help, I am in the best of health, walk more easily, shout more audibly, to conclude, am proposing, with heaven's help, to take a drive in a carriage to-morrow. If I bear the flint pavement without difficulty, I shall hurry with all possible speed to you. I shall live again when I see you and not before.'

A similar account of his master's health called the following letter from Marcus (p. 92): '*I* be studying, when *you* are in pain? what is more, in pain on my account? Should I not rather vex myself deliberately with every kind of uneasiness? Certainly I should have good reason. Who was it that brought on your pain in the knee, which you write to say became worse last night, if not, I will not say, myself, but your stay at Centumcellae? What then am I to do, when I cannot see you and am tormented by your agonizing condition? Besides, even if I were in the mood for study, the law-courts forbid it, causing as they do the loss of whole days, for so say those who know. Still I have sent you to-day's *sententia*, and a *τόπος* completed three days ago. Yesterday I spent the whole time in travelling: to-day it is a difficult task to get anything done except a *sententia* drawn up after dark. You will say, Do you spend so very long a night in sleeping? Sleep indeed I can, for I naturally require a great deal; but my bedroom is so chilly that I can scarcely put my hand out in the cold. The real thing, however, which had most effect in diverting me from study was that, owing to my overfondness for literature, I gave you some trouble over a passage of Cato, as circumstances prove. Good-bye then to all the Catos and Ciceros and Sallusts, provided only that you are well and that I may see you in strong health, even at the cost of giving up my books. Farewell, my chiefest of joys, my dearest master.'

The same playful tone is to be found in many other letters of the young Emperor. He thus describes a youthful escapade, in which, to use Christian language, the shepherds

were smitten and the sheep scattered, not metaphorically, but literally.

‘As soon as my father had returned home from the vineyards, I mounted my horse as is my custom, started for the road and advanced some little way. Thereupon I found a quantity of sheep standing huddled together on the road, as the loneliness of the place made natural. They had four dogs and two shepherds with them, but nothing besides. Upon this one of the shepherds seeing a number of horsemen said to the other, “Look there at those horsemen; such fellows are like to be great robbers.” Hearing this I put spurs to my horse, and galloped him upon the sheep. They scattered in dismay; straying some here, some there, bleating and beating about in all directions. A shepherd flung his crook upon us, it fell upon the rider behind me. I escaped by flight. In this way fearing to lose his sheep, he lost nothing but his crook. Do you think this an invention? it is a real fact.’

In two other letters to Fronto he describes a day in the country as follows (p. 68):—

‘To-day I studied from three in the morning to eight, arranging meals with care. From eight to nine I put on sandals and had a delightful walk in front of my chamber. After this in boots and my military cloak, for I had received orders to attend in this costume, I went off to pay my respects to my imperial master. We started for a hunt, did prodigies of valour, and are told that some boars were taken; see them we did not. However we climbed a very high cliff, and then returned home in the afternoon. I hastened to my books: pulling off my boots and taking off my clothes, I remained on my sofa for two hours. I read Cato’s speech on the property of Pulchra, and another in which he indicts a tribune. I suppose you will shout to your slave, “Go as quick as you can, fetch me those speeches from the library of Apollo.” It is no good for you to send: the books have already followed me. . . . However after reading through these orations, I did a little writing in a miserable way, only fit to be consigned

to the water or the flames: wretched as anything could be was what I wrote to-day, a school-boy's exercise such as any hunter or vintager might produce (at this moment they are making my chamber ring with their jodels), and quite as tiresome and nauseous as any lawyer's pleadings. What can I mean by saying this? I mean what I say; for my instructor is a true orator. I fancy I have taken a chill; whether because I walked in sandals early in the day or because I wrote without success, I cannot say. At any rate full as I generally am of phlegmatic humour, to-day I find myself a much greater sniveller than usual. I shall therefore steep my head in oil and go to sleep, for I do not intend to replenish my lamp all day with one single drop of oil: so thoroughly worn out am I with riding and sneezing.'

P. 69:—

'I have slept on far into the day on account of a slight chill, which seems now to have subsided. Consequently from five in the morning till nine I spent part of the time in reading extracts from Cato's *Agriculture*, partly in writing, not so badly, I may tell you, as yesterday. After that I wished my father good morning, and then, by sipping water mixed with honey till it reached the gullet and then spitting it out again, rinsed my throat, for I prefer saying *rinsed* to *gargled*, a word, I believe, to be found in Novius and elsewhere. However after attending to my throat I went off to my father and stood by him as he performed sacrifice. Then to our midday meal. What do you think I ate? A mere morsel of bread, whilst others were gormandizing before my very eyes on beans, onions, and sprats full of roe. After this we gave ourselves to grape-picking, covered our bodies with sweat, jodelled, and as some poet says, left a few high hangers as the last remnant of the vintage. At twelve we returned home; I read a little and that to no great purpose. After this I had a long chat with my dear mother seated on a sofa. My talk was to this effect: "What should you think dear Fronto is doing now?" She: "What should *you* think

dear Gratia is about?" I in my turn: "And what should you think our pet, Gratia the younger, is doing?" Whilst we were talking and disputing in this way, which of us was fonder of one or other of you, the gong sounded, i. e. we were informed that my father had passed into the bath. We therefore bathed and dined in the press-room: I do not mean that we bathed in the press-room, but had a bath and then dined, listening with amusement to the rustics' banter. Returning after this, before turning on my side to snore, I wind off my day's task and give in an account of the way I spent it to my dearest preceptor, for whom my love is such that if it were possible to be more fond I should gladly submit to an extra amount of pining.'

From two passages of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix (ix., xxxi.) we know that Fronto was a declared enemy of Christianity. In one of his speeches he accused the Christians on a charge often alleged against them, incest of an unbridled and abominable kind. Fronto's pupil, M. Aurelius, was, as is well known, one of the earliest persecutors of Christianity. We should be glad to be able to indicate anything in the letters which could throw additional light on this common point of belief between the master and his pupil. But the extant remains contain nothing of the kind, and the one passage in the Emperor's *Reflexions* which mentions the Christians (xi. 3) is widely removed from anything like an attack on their morals, and only contrasts slightly the defiant readiness with which the Christian submitted to the extinction or dispersion of his soul with the reflecting and dignified demeanour of the philosopher in the same situation.

APPENDIX

p. 13. Albucius.

Professor Minton Warren, of Harvard, U.S., writes as follows (Proceedings of the American Philological Association, vol. xxv. 1894, p. xliii.):

'Who now is the Albucius who is contrasted with Lucilius? Teuffel (§ 141-3), following M. Hertz, is inclined to identify him with the Epicurean T. Albucius, whom Lucilius ridicules for his Graeco-mania. He may have written, surmises Hertz, a didactic Epicurean poem before Lucretius, which died of its aridity. We have, however, no other evidence that this T. Albucius ever wrote poetry at all. It seems to me much more probable that our Albucius is to be identified with the Abuccius mentioned twice by Varro, R. R. 3. 6. 6. and 3. 2. 17 *item L. Abuccius, ut homo, scitis, adprime doctus, cuius Luciliano caractere sunt libelli*. The early editions have here Albucius, but Keil follows the MSS., and the existence of the name Abuccius is abundantly proved from inscriptions. As Fronto's opinion may ultimately go back to Varro, it seems much more plausible, even if we have to emend to Abuccius, that a poet who was a satirist in the manner of Lucilius is contrasted with him, than to suppose that Albucius wrote an Epicurean poem.'

ib. Meaning of *longinque*.

'Against Teuffel I am inclined to think that *longinque* refers to the language rather than the undue length of Sisenna's history. Compare especially Cic. Brutus, 75. 260 "*ne a C. Rusio quidem accusatore deterreri potuit quominus inusitatis uerbis uteretur*" and "*recte loqui putabat esse inusitate loqui*." Fronto himself opposes p. 64 Naber *remotis et requisitis to uolgaribus et usitatis*, and *longinque* may have been chosen as an adverb to neatly express this. Compare Quintilian, 8. 6. 17 *a longinqua similitudine ductae*.' M. Warren, p. xlv.

ib. *multiugis uerbis*.

'What, finally, is the meaning of *multiugis uerbis* and *singulis*? Some argument might be made for translating these words "with polysyndeton" "with asyndeton". . .

'It is a well-known fact that polysyndeton is frequent in Cato. Compare Elmer, "The Copulative Conjunctions *que, et, atque* in the Inscriptions of the Republic, in Terence and in Cato," p. 37. Especially noteworthy is a passage cited by Gellius, VI. 3, from the oration for the Rhodians which it will be remembered was included in the Origines. *Scio solere plerisque hominibus rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis animum excellere atque superbiam. atque ferociam augescere atque crescere*. Here we have five *atques*. Two connect three synonymous adjectives, one two synonymous verbs, one two synonymous nouns, and one two clauses. We must not imagine that such a piling up of connectives was not noticed by the ancients as

a mark of style. A curious proof that it was noticed is afforded by the correspondence of Fronto. See p. 36. M. Aurelius writes, "*Nam uni M. Porcio me dedicavi atque despondi atque delegavi. Hoc etiam ipsum atque unde putas? ex ipso furore.*" The verbatim fragments of Caelius are very few and very short. None of them show any tendency to polysyndeton, and of 32 verbatim fragments, ten exhibit asyndeton. . . . It will be noted that in the passage already quoted from Cato the polysyndeton is accompanied by an abundant use of synonyms. A writer in the Nation, April 29, 1886, says, "Speaking of the use of synonyms, M. Amiel says (in other language) that it is well one's team of words should be adapted to the subject and the occasion; a writer should sometimes drive at full speed with a single epithet, sometimes with four magnificently, sometimes à la Russe with three, sometimes even with a tandem, perhaps more safely with the usual two, etc."

'In a similar figurative sense, implying the comparison with a team, *multiugis* and *singulis* seem to be used here. Caelius uses the single word, the off-hand stroke; Cato drives in pairs and threes, sometimes with four magnificently. This is the meaning also attached to the word by Peter, Prolegomena, cxxxviii. With this use of *multiugis* we may compare in Fronto, p. 211 *neque uerba multa geminata superuacanea inferciat*. With the use of *singulis*, Fronto, p. 151 *synonymis colligendis, verbis interdum singularibus requirendis*, and a curious parallel with Amiel is furnished by p. 139. The whole passage beginning with *castella uerborum* is too long to quote, "*quae ratio sit uerba geminandi et interdum trigeminandi, non numquam quadriplacia saepe quinquies aut eo amplius superlata ponendi,*" etc. Numerous passages might be cited from Fronto's works where he insists upon the necessity of choosing one's words carefully, and that Caelius was one of the few early writers who did pay attention to seeking for the right word is attested by Fronto, p. 62.' M. Warren, pp. xlv., xlv.

EMENDATIONS OF THE TEXT OF THE LETTERS.

Those marked with an asterisk were published in the first number of the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* in 1868. The rest will appear in vol. xxix (1904) of the same journal.

p. 6. *Ecco nox praeteriit dies hic est ALIERTVLA exactus est.*

Perhaps alter et uel alter, 'a second and even a third.'

p. 10. *Somnus autem Ulixen ne patriam quidem suam diu agnosceret siuit, cuius καὶ κωνὸν ἀποθρώσκοντα νοῆσαι* **Ἡς γαίης θανέειν ἰμείροτο.*

The original (Od. i. 58) has *Ἰέμενος καὶ κ. ἄ. ν.* As Marcus Aurelius has omitted *Ἰέμενος*, there is no construction. It would seem that *νοῆσαι* should be *νοήσας*.

*p. 12. ed. Naber. *Illud vero dictum elegans AVTAVIATVV . . . ΑΙSNEQO*^N
alia omnia quae 'Οδοσσείαν faciunt. Read haut a via tuum quod ais
'neque alia omnia quae 'Οδ. faciunt.' 'This again is a choice
 expression of your own, not borrowed from the streets.'

p. 14. Brakman's conjecture *inauditam*, if he has correctly reported the legible letters of the palimpsest . n...itam,' seems very probable. Klussmann Emend. Fronton. 1874 suggested *antiquam*, less near to the original.

p. 17. aliter plangit seruus manumissus aliter cliens laudaucatus aliter amicus legato honoratus.

The balance of clauses would be preserved by writing *aliter cliens laudatum uocatus* invited to pronounce an eulogium.

*p. 20. Qui orationem spreverit, litteras concupisceat; qui scripta contempserit, scribtoorem reverebitur. ut si simiam aut volpem Appelles pinxerit et bestiae . . . pretium adderet. The space in the palimpsest has A. [v̄CVIĀ. This looks as if it were either APICVLAM. or AVICVLAM. In the latter case he probably had in his mind a story told by Strabo (xiv. 2. 4) not of Apelles, but Protogenes. Protogenes had painted a Satyr leaning against a column on the top of which was a partridge; the people were so much delighted by the partridge that they overlooked the main figure of the picture, the Satyr. [If, as Brakman states, the palimpsest gives BESTIAE . . . REMÆ, this conjecture falls to the ground.]

*p. 21. Omnibus tunc imago patriciis pingebatur insignis. Read *in signis*.

*p. 33. Qui aliter regi dictis dicunt, aliter in animo habent. Read *animos*, like frequentem in forum, p. 191.

*p. 34. Merito ego mi magisterii fraglo. Read *magister te*.

ib. Polemonis tui quem meministi, rogo ne Horatii memineras, qui mihi cum Polione est emortuus.

quem is more probably *quom* or *qum* than *quoniam*. So p. 81 *animo bene fuit qum te balneo et uino libenter usum cognoui*.

p. 46. Postea ubi re proposita ꝑeimaginem scribes,

This I believe to be an error for *ei rei imaginem*, a combination elsewhere affected by Fronto. p. 47 *de quo deus ei rei praeditus facilius exaudiat*. p. 95 *eique ego rei, sei fieri possit, repuerascere opto*.

*p. 54. Haec mecum anxie volutans inueniebam te multum supra aetatem quantus (afterwards corrected to quantum) est, multum supra tempus quo operam his studiis dedisti . . . in eloquentia promovisse. Naber reads *quanta*: perhaps it is better to keep *quantus* and change *est* to *es*, 'much beyond the age to which you have now attained.' [Klussmann conj. *quantula est*, Studemund *qua tu es*.]

*p. 64. Tot exemplis unum atque idem verbum syllabae adque litterae commutatione in varium modum ad censum usurpatur. Read *adcensum, ἀξίωθέρ*.

p. 66. Postquam uehiculum insecendi iter non adeo incommodum ꝑnon fecimus.

This seems to be not *nos fecimus*, but *consecimus*.

p. 80. Modo mihi Victorinus indicat Dominam tuam magis maluisse quam heri.

Naber prints *caluisse* after Schopen. Possibly in Fronto's time *incalere* was used of having a fever: certainly *in* would account for the *m* in *maluisse*.

p. 83. aput censores expostulat.

A little lower, in the letter following,

In hac materia diutius laborandum est ut factum credatur, quam ut irascatur.

The absence of a nominative to *expostulat* and *irascatur* is noticeable, as the second letter (from M. Aurelius) is an answer to the first. But whereas it is quite in accordance with the shortness of legal Latin to supply a nominative to *expostulat*, this is not equally true of *irascatur*. I think Marcus is here following the usage of comedy, which made *irascere* an active, *irasci* a passive verb. Nonius, p. 127, quotes from Pomponius *noli irascere*: then the nominative will be *factum*, as Novák suggests, comparing Gell. vi. (vii.) 2 *delicta non suscensenda*.

ib. Vindemias laetasque quam firmissimo corpore agere te, mi magister, opto.

Perhaps *laetas* quamque *firmissimo corpore*.

ib. Fronto, writing to M. Aurelius, says:

Pro Faustina mane cotidie deos appello: scio enim me pro tua salute optare ac praecari.

Somewhat later, p. 85, Marcus, writing to Fronto, replies:

Quae pro me praecatus es, scio te praecatum.

It seems to follow that in the *former* of the two passages *scio* should be *scis*.

*ib. M. Aurelius to Fronto:

Ego adeo perscripsi, ut mitte aliud quod scribam. Naber changed *ut* to *et*, Orelli to *tu*. Perhaps it is a construction not unlike Thuc. iv. 92 *δείξαι ὅτι ὦν ἐφιενται πρὸς τοὺς μὴ ἀμυνομένους ἐπιόντες κτάσθων*.

*p. 89. Si quo modo integrum redigi, ac pro te tuisque ac liberum tuorum commodis insolutum dependi potest. Mai proposed *in solidum*; *in solutum* would do as well, 'as so much debt discharged.' Sen. Benef. vii. 15 *ei qui uoluntatem bonam in solutum accepit, eo libentius debes quia dimitteris*. Klussmann accepts this view.

*p. 113. Quid si quis postularet ut Phidias ludicra aut Canachus deum simulacra fingeret? aut Calamis Turena, aut Polycletus Etrusca? Perhaps *Turintina*. Polycletus was an Argive.

*p. 114. An cum labore quidem et studio investigare verba elegantia prohibes, eadem vero si ultro, si iniussu atque invocatu meo venerint, ut Menelaum ad epulas quidem recipi iubes? Read *tu idem*.

*p. 122. Ornatio videbar daduchis Eleusinao faces gestantibus. Perhaps *Eleusine*, at Eleusis.

p. 126. breues nec ullam rerum gestarum expeditionem continentes.

This is said of the short letters in Sallust's *Histories*. *Expediitio* seems here to mean 'statement' or 'account': much so Herenn. iv. 68 *habet paucis comprehensa breuitas multarum rerum expeditionem*. Otherwise *expositionem* might be suggested.

p. 140. In primis oratori cauendum, ne quod nouum uerbum ut aes adulterinum percutiat, ut unum et id uerbum uetustate noscatur et nouitate delectet.

Read *unum et id uerum uetustate noscatur*.

p. 144. Places tibi cum facundus: igitur †uerberantem. quid facundia uerberas?

facundiam was long since conjectured; for *uerberantem* Niebuhr's *uerbera te* is accepted by Naber, but does not seem certain. It might be *uerberandum test*.

ib. illud etiam audisse me memini, pleraque sapientes uiros (id inest scitis mentis atque consultis) habere debere quorum interdum usu abstineant.

Nothing is here changed: I only add marks of parenthesis before *id* and after *consultis*, translating 'this is inherent in mental resolves and determinations,' a preliminary clause explaining a statement against which objection might be raised.

*p. 153. Quod si ita haec uerba contra dixisset: quique pene bona patria lacerauerit, inedita obscenitas uerbis appareret. *Inedita*, which has been changed by Naber to *indita*, by C. F. W. Müller to *insita*, by Buttman to *inaudita*, is possibly right. 'The words would bear on their face a coarseness not found in our actual editions.'

p. 160. Ennius: Postquam †constitit fluius qui omnium princeps.

Here the palimpsest is variously reported. Naber gives *const..ti*, Vahlen in his new edition of Ennius *consis...se*, Brakman read *constitit*, adding 'ita euidenter codex.' If this is true, Ennius wrote *constitit is*, and such absence of caesura is quite in the manner of his hexameters.

*p. 166. Res autem istas quas nec [tenere] uolumus, nec [negare] credimus, et, si dii aequi sunt, ueras et congruentes simplicitati nostrae amicitiae semper adsequamur. Perhaps *nec negare e re* (or *a re*) *credimus*,

p. 168. Quamobrem tecum quaeso nequid obsit amicitia nobis †qui nihil profuit.

Naber prints *quae*. I think it should be *quia*. Klussmann conj, *quibus*.

p. 179. Impense istud a te peto. factum enim Aquilae uolo honoris eorum causa qui pro eo studiose laborant.

Naber prints Heindorf's conjecture *fautum*. I doubt the rightness of this word, and believe *factum* to be defensible. 'I wish it to be done in Aquila's behalf as a compliment to those who are using their efforts for

him.' The indeterminateness of the word is natural in the comparatively free language of epistolary correspondence.

*p. 197. Hoc quod uocas interim, quanti sperabit? Si tantisper, paulisper sperabit. Read *quantisper sperabit? si tantisper dum spirat, paulisper sperabit.*

p. 216. uod. nunc diuinæ naturæ proprium est nec fumum manu prehendere nec solem queas.

Quodsi Naber: perhaps *Quodque*. 'Besides, which is a property of the divine nature in the matter before us, it is impossible to grasp either smoke or the sun with the hands.'

ib. nisi delicta facile †intellegas parum clementer †indulgeasque.

Naber gives *facile negligas*, in which *neglegas* appears to me incongruous with *facile*. Surely the meaning is 'unless you put an easy (lenient) construction on faults.' For *indulgeasque* perhaps *indulgeas quoque*. Without a lenient judgment to start with, there can be no real sympathy with (and therefore indulgence to) the offender. The understanding must anticipate the heart.

p. 223. *magiras facere* 'to profess the trade of a cook,' ought, I think, to be *magirias f.*

p. 224. aut Ennio incenderes (sc. te) in horam ist. Musarum propriam quintam.

istius seems the most natural supplement: the hour which properly belongs to his (Ennius') muses, the fifth, in allusion to his praenomen *Quintus*.

*p. 227. Agere de finibus duos claros et nobiles vesperum et Luciferum puta; utrique demonstrationem sui †quisque limitis ostendunt: horum cognitioni interesse postulat somnus, nam se †quisque adfinem esse negotio et adtingi iniuria ait.

On the first *quisque* Naber says: *Codicis lectio non satis certa est; neque est quisque neque quoque neque quaque; alii videant.* Probably it was *quoisque*, the old form of the genitive, as *quois* indicates. The same genitive is obviously required in the second place. Niebuhr conjectured *quoique*, Orelli *quoque*.

*p. 241. ἐκείνου μὲν οὕτω παῖς, ὥσπερ Ἀθηναῖ τοῦ Διός, οὗς δὲ Ἐὐνῖος ὡς τῆς Ἥρας ὁ Ἡφαιστος. Read *υἱωνός*.

*p. 246. Φίλφ δὲ οὐχ ὡς τοῦτον ἐπιδεικνύτων θράσος εὐνοίας, Ἀλληναϊτόντων ὑποδέουσι ἔπεμψα τὸ πρὶν ἐπιτρέψης. Read *οὐχ ὡς τούτων ἐπιδεικνύτων θράσος εὐνοίας ἀλλ' ἀναγγιόντων ὑπὸ δέους, εἰ ἔπεμψα τὸ πρὶν ἐπιτρέψης*, 'but forgive your friend, if I sent them before, not supposing the slaves to exhibit any confident good will on my part, but imagining them to start to their feet for fear of your displeasure.'

*p. 250. Εἰ γοῦν ἀποτιμήσεις γίγνοιτο ἡμῖν Ὑσμῖνο πέμψας τοὺς δύο τούτους παῖδας, μικροτέραν, ἐγὼ δ' ὁ λαβὼν μείζω τὴν οὐσίαν ἀποφανοῦμαι. Naber reads *ὁ μῖν*: *σὺ μὲν ὁ* is perhaps better,

*p. 251. ματευσαιμην δανεικοντας νωητιω χρωμενος. Read Μαιευσαίμην δ' ἂν εἰκόνι ἀνοήτῳ or ἀδιανοήτῳ (Quint. II. 8. 20) χρώμενος. The last word in the sentence which Mai read προσέμην, Du Rieu προσήκων, may be προσηκαίμην. Cf. p. 248 πολλά πολλάκις παρὰ πλείστων πεμπόμενα οὐ προσήκατο.

*p. 258. ἀλλὰ θηρίου δίκην ὑπὸ λύπης εὐθύς ΕΙΟΙΤΟ ἂν καὶ βαίνειν προθυμοῖτο μηδὲν αἰδούμενος. Read σείοιτο, the σ having dropped owing to the σ of εὐθύς.

*p. 259. ἀλλ' οὐδέν γε πλέον ΑΠΟΛΑΤΣΕΙΟΔΕ. Naber reads ἀπόλλυσι, οὐδέ. I suggest ΑΠΟΛΑΤΣΕΙ.

'Ἄλλ' ἔγωγέ σοι ἐπιδείξω, ΠΙΧΟΥΣ πρὸς τὸν Ἴλισδὸν ἅμα ἅμφω βαδίσαμεν. Naber εἰ εὐθύς, better εἰ ἰθύς, which seems to have been confused with ἰχθύς.

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY



University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388

Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

24139

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 224 047 1

