

VARRONIANA

A. *The sub-titles of the Menippeans*

The origin of the sub-titles attached to some of Varro's *saturae Menippeae* was discussed during the second half of the nineteenth century by Mercklin¹), Vahlen²), Riese³) and Havet⁴). Since that time those who have commented on the matter have been content to express their opinion on one side or the other without detailed examination⁵). The problem depends to a large extent on the evidence provided by the so-called '*lex Lindsay*' on Nonius Marcellus, but when Riese put forward what I believe to be the correct explanation of the sub-titles the '*lex Lindsay*' was at an early stage in its development. Thus it appears to me desirable to re-examine the question in the light of work done since 1867 on Varro and on Nonius Marcellus. This will not substantially affect the conclusions drawn by Riese but will serve to place them on a

1) *RbM* 12 (1857) 372-89 and *Pb* 13 (1858) 724-8; the latter is a reply to Vahlen's criticisms of his original discussion.

2) In *M. Terentii Varronis saturarum Menippearum reliquias coniectanea* (Leipzig 1858) 191-217.

3) *Symbola philologorum Bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschelii collecta* (Leipzig 1864-7) 479-88, and more briefly in *M. Terentii Varronis saturarum Menippearum reliquiae* (Leipzig 1865) 43-7.

4) *RPh* 6 (1882) 52-4.

5) E. Norden, *Jahrb. Suppl.* 18 (1892) 276, is fairly non-committal, though he appears to incline to the view that Varro composed them. Most of the others support Riese in supposing them to have been added by a later writer, e.g. L. Riccomagno, *Studio sulle satire Menippee di Marco Terenzio Varrone* (Alba 1931) 42-3; E. Bolisani, *Varrone Menippeo* (Padova 1936) xxviii-ix; F. Della Corte, *Menippearum fragmenta* (Genova 1953) 135 (though earlier he had believed them to be Varronian; see section B of this article); J.-P. Cèbe, *Varron, Satires Ménippées I* (Rome 1972) xiv. However H. Dahlmann, *RE Suppl.* 6. 1268 remains unconvinced (note that Cèbe is incorrect in his statement of Dahlmann's view); the fact that the doyen of Varronian scholars does not accept the conventional opinion is in itself sufficient justification for a fresh examination of the question. K.-E. Henriksson, *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur* (Helsinki 1956) does not commit himself on the origin of the sub-titles in his discussion of them on pp. 24-30.

firmer foundation and, I hope, to convince those who remain doubtful about their validity.

Thirty three of the satires have two titles, of which the second is Greek and consists of *περί* + genitive. These are: – 1) *Aborigines*, *περὶ ἀνθρώπων φύσεως*; 2) *Ἄλλ' οὐ μένει σε*, *περὶ φιλαργυρίας*; 3) *Ἀνθρωπόπολις*, *περὶ γενεθλιακῆς*; 4) *Caprinum proelium*, *περὶ ἡδονῆς*; 5) *Columna Herculis*, *περὶ δόξης*; 6) *Cycnus*, *περὶ ταφῆς*; 7) *Desultorius*, *περὶ τοῦ γράφειν*; 8) *Devicti*, *περὶ φιλονικίας*; 9) *Ἐκατόμβη*, *περὶ θυσιῶν*; 10) *Epitaphiones*, *περὶ τάφων*; 11) *Est modus matulae*, *περὶ μέθης*; 12) *Ἐὔρεν ἡ λοπὰς τὸ πῶμα*, *περὶ γεγαμηγόντων*; 13) *Ἐχὼ σε*, *περὶ τύχης*; 14) *Ἐως πότε*, *περὶ ὠρῶν*; 15) *Flaxtabula*, *περὶ ἐπαρχιῶν*; 16) *Gloria*, *περὶ φθόνου*; 17) *Κοσμοτορῆνη*, *περὶ φθορᾶς κόσμου*; 18) *Marcopolis*, *περὶ ἀρχῆς*; 19) *Mitium muli scabunt*, *περὶ χωρισμοῦ*; 20) *Octogesis*, *περὶ νομισμάτων*; 21) *Papia pappae*, *περὶ ἐγκωμίων*; 22) *Περίπλους*; a satire in two books of which the second bore the sub-title *περὶ φιλοσοφίας*; 23) *Pseudulus Apollo*, *περὶ θεῶν διαγνώσεως*; 24) *Serranus*, *περὶ ἀρχαιρεσιῶν*; 25) *Σκιαμαχία*, *περὶ τύφου*; 26) *Synephebus*, *περὶ ἐμμονῆς*; 27) *Testamentum*, *περὶ διαθηκῶν*; 28) *Tithonus*, *περὶ γήρωος*; 29) *Τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ φακῇ μύρον*, *περὶ εὐκαιρίας*; 30) *Τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ παιδίον*, *περὶ παιδοποιίας*; 31) *Τριодίτης τριπύλιος*, *περὶ ἀρετῆς κτήσεως*; 32) *Τρίφαλλος*, *περὶ ἀρρενότητος*; 33) *Vinalia*, *περὶ ἀφροδισίων*.

In addition to these there come into question four satires, of which the titles have the same form as the sub-titles listed above, viz: – 34) *Περὶ αἰρέσεων*; 35) *Περὶ ἔδεσμάτων*; 36) *Περὶ ἐξαγωγῆς*; 37) *Περὶ κεραυνοῦ*, and two satires whose titles, if they are such, have the appearance of sub-titles translated into Latin, viz: – 38) *De officio mariti*; 39) *De salute*.

Lindsay⁶⁾ has demonstrated that in compiling his dictionary Nonius employed three distinct collections of Varro's Menippeans; he denotes these as *Varro i*, *ii* and *iii*. *Varro ii* comprised some eighteen satires, none of which has a sub-title⁷⁾, while *Varro iii* contained four satires, again without sub-titles⁸⁾. To the collection *Varro i* Lindsay assigns with more or less certainty thirty three satires⁹⁾. All of these except

6) W.M.Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford 1901).

7) *ibid.* 9, 119.

8) *ibid.* 10, 119–20.

9) *ibid.* 8, 117–9. Lindsay has been guilty of a slight inconsistency here; both lists contain thirty two titles, but that on p. 8 omits *Τρίφαλλος*,

one (*Prometheus liber*) either have sub-titles or have titles which have the same form as the sub-titles, e.g. *Περὶ ἐξαγωγῆς*. Thus thirty two of the thirty seven satires with titles or sub-titles of this type are probably to be assigned to this collection. The remaining five are nos. 1, 4, 5, 30 and 35 in the list given above. The latter does not come into question since it is not in any case cited by Nonius. Only a few fr. of the other four satires are preserved by Nonius (five of no. 1; three of no. 4; one of no. 5; four of no. 30) and they do not provide evidence for allocating the satires to the *Varro i* collection; but, in view of the fact that thirty two out of thirty six satires (excluding *Περὶ ἐδεσμάτων*) with titles or sub-titles of this type occur in this collection, it is probable that the remaining four are also to be assigned to it¹⁰) and that it is mere chance that evidence to prove this is lacking. We may conclude therefore that the satires in the *Varro i* collection were fitted out with sub-titles, while those in *Varro ii* and *iii* were not.

There are a number of instances where fr. from the satires in *Varro i* are cited by Nonius without the usual sub-title; in nearly all these cases an explanation is to hand. These passages are: —

p. 551, 7 *Varro Anthropololi* (fr. 40)¹¹). The title is given in Latin characters and the sub-title is missing. These variants are to be explained by the fact that Nonius is here using his *Gloss. v* list, not *Varro i*¹²).

p. 361, 24 *Varro in Caprino Proelio* (fr. 71). The sub-title is omitted; there is no readily apparent reason for this.

p. 466, 29 *Varro Hecatombe* (fr. 94). The title is again in Latin characters and the sub-title is missing. At p. 504, 14, where Nonius is using his *Varro i* source¹³), the same fr. is cited with the title given correctly and in full. This makes it

περὶ ἀρρενότητος, while that on pp. 117–9 omits *Vinalia*, *περὶ ἀφροδισίων*. Combining the two lists produces a total of thirty three titles.

¹⁰) As was suggested by F. Della Corte, 'La poesia di Varrone Reatino ricostituita', *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, Ser. II, Tom. 69, Part. 2 (1939) 50ff. and *Varrone il terzo gran lume romano* (Genova 1954) 373.

¹¹) Nonius is cited by the page and line numbers of Mercier's second edition (1614); for the fragments of the Menippeans I follow the numeration of Bücheler.

¹²) Lindsay, *op. cit.* 34, 117.

¹³) *ibid.* 88.

likely that *Varro i* was not used here; it may well be an interpolation from p. 504¹⁴).

p. 510, 26 and p. 20, 16 *Varro Octogesi* (fr. 342). The sub-title is missing in both citations. That at p. 20 appears to be from the *Varro i* collection¹⁵), while at p. 510 the citation appears in the midst of a *Plautus i* series¹⁶). But at p. 20 all we have is *seque opificio non probiter clepere*, while at p. 510 we find *postquam avida libido rapere ac caedere coepit | seque opificio non probiter clepere*. Thus the latter citation cannot be an interpolation from the former (unless we suppose the former to have been truncated in transmission), and since the former is where one would expect a fr. from a satire of the *Varro i* collection to be it is not likely to be an interpolation from the latter which is not where one would expect to find it. It could be argued that the two citations are independent of each other, the one drawn by Nonius from his *Varro i* collection, the other from a marginal note in his *Plautus i* source, but the absence of the sub-title in both cases would be a curious coincidence. The complexity of the situation makes it unwise to draw any inference from the absence of the sub-title.

p. 545, 1; 8; 18 *Varro Est modus matulae* (fr. 114). The same fr. is cited three times on the same page, each time without sub-title. But at p. 146, 8 this fr. is cited with the title in full. It is clear that nothing certain can be inferred from the situation on p. 545, though it is possible that the citation of the fr. there comes from Nonius' *Gloss. iv* source¹⁷).

p. 104, 28 *Varro seraparecte* (fr. 456). This has been assigned to the satire *Serranus*¹⁸); if so, it lacks the sub-title. Its corruption makes it useless as evidence.

I turn now to consider those places where frr. from the thirty seven satires under discussion are cited by authors other than Nonius, with special reference to the presence or absence of the sub-titles. These are: —

a) *Flaxtabula*. i) Plin. *nat. praef.* 24 mentions the title, but not the sub-title. It would, of course, have been alien to his purpose to give the sub-title, even had he known of it.

14) *ibid.* 118.

15) *ibid.* 83.

16) *ibid.* 29, 118.

17) *ibid.* 119.

18) By Mercklin, *RhM* 12 (1857) 383.

ii) Diom. *gramm.* 1. 375, 27-376, 1: *Varro in praetorina: 'delitae litterae'*. Oehler¹⁹) includes this as a fr. of *Flaxtabula*, arguing on p. 66 that *Praetoriana* (so he reads the title with Putschius) is connected in some way with the sub-title *περὶ ἐπαρχιῶν* = 'de praeturis'. This suggestion does not appear very probable and can hardly be considered to carry much weight as evidence for the existence of the sub-titles outside Nonius.

b) *Octogessis*. Prisc. *gramm.* 2. 209, 11 cites fr. 344 as from *Varro de nomismatis*, which has been generally believed to be a translation of the Greek sub-title *περὶ νομισμάτων*²⁰).

c) *Papia papae*. Dub. *nom. gramm.* 5. 572, 15 has *papae dicendum, sicut Varro in satira*. If this is a reference to the satire *Papia papae*, there was no reason for the author to give the sub-title, even if it were known.

d) *Σκιαμαχία*. Fr. 506 is cited by Gell. 13. 23. 4 as from *M. Varro in satira Menippea, quae inscribitur Σκιαμαχία*, with no reference to a sub-title.

e) *Testamentum*. Gell. 3. 16. 13 cites fr. 543 as *in satira ... M. Varronis ... , quae inscribitur Testamentum*, with no reference to a sub-title.

f) *Τὸ ἐπὶ τῆ φωνῆ μῦρον*. Gell. 13. 29. 5 and Ath. 4. 160c mention the proverb as occurring in Varro's satires; it is not certain that they are referring to the satire of that title, and in any case mention of the sub-title, if it were known, would have been irrelevant.

g) *Τριούτιης τριπόλιος*. Serv. auct. *georg.* 1. 34 cites fr. 560, but gives neither title nor sub-title. It cannot be regarded as completely certain that the fr. belongs to this satire²¹), but in any case the absence of both titles means that the citation is not significant in the present context.

h) *Τρίφαλλος*. Fr. 563 is cited by Char. *gramm.* 1. 80, 12 simply as *in Triphallo*, without the sub-title.

i) *Περὶ αἰρέσεων*. Fr. 402 is cited both by Non. p. 94, 23 and by Prisc. *gramm.* 2. 98, 9; both give only this title.

19) F. Oehler, *M. Terentii Varronis saturarum Menippearum reliquiae* (Quedlinburg 1844).

20) The fr. was first assigned to the satire *Octogessis* by R. Stephanus in his edition of the Menippeans in *Fragmenta poetarum veterum Latinorum, quorum opera non extant* ([Paris] 1564).

21) The suggestion was first made by Vahlen, *Analecta Noniana* (Leipzig 1859) 31 n. 3.

j) *Περὶ ἔδεσμάτων*. Both the fr. of this satire are cited with this title only by Gell. 6. 16 and 15. 19.

k) *Περὶ κεραννοῦ*. Fr. 413 is cited by Macr. *Sat.* 3. 12. 2 as *in ea satira quae inscribitur περὶ κεραννοῦ*.

Finally we should consider the mode in which the two possible Latin titles with *de* are introduced, viz: –

1) Gell. 1. 17. 4: *Varro in satira Menippea quam de officio mariti scripsit*.

2) Serv. auct. *georg.* 2. 336: *Varro autem in satira, quae scribitur de salute*.

From the evidence which has been adduced above we may draw the following conclusions: –

i) It is probable that Varro did make occasional use of Greek titles consisting of *περὶ* + genitive. The four titles of this type which survive are cited by Nonius, Gellius, Priscian and Macrobius. Such titles are, of course, very common in Greek philosophical writing²²).

ii) Nonius' *Varro i* collection probably contained all the satires which he cites with sub-titles. Equally the evidence for the existence of the sub-titles is confined to this collection; where Nonius cites these satires from other sources and where other authors cite them the sub-titles do not appear. The sole exception to this is Priscian's citation of fr. 344 as from *Varro de nomismatis*, which appears to be a translation of *περὶ νομισμάτων*. This is the only evidence which can be adduced in favour of the existence of the sub-titles outside Nonius' *Varro i* collection. Yet this falls short of making it probable, let alone proving, that Varro himself was the author of the sub-titles. If it is accepted that *de nomismatis* is a translation of the sub-title *περὶ νομισμάτων*, then it follows that the text used by Nonius for the *Varro i* collection and that used by Priscian (or his source) for this citation descend from a common original in which the satires were provided with sub-titles. But it by no means follows that the existence of sub-titles in this common original implies their addition by Varro, nor does this interpretation of *de nomismatis* affect the fact that most of those who quote from the Menippeans do not appear to have knowledge of the sub-titles. But it is not necessary to regard *de nomismatis* as a

22) Henriksson, *loc. cit.*, cites examples of works of Greek philosophy bearing titles which are the same as or similar to the sub-titles of the Menippeans.

translation of *περὶ νομισμάτων*. It may be that two entirely separate readers of the satire *Octogessis* have independently indicated its subject in a similar way, the one (be it Varro or a later reader) by *περὶ νομισμάτων*, the other by *de nomismatis*. Some support for the latter view may be found in the next paragraph where it is shown that such indications of subject in Latin do occur occasionally.

iii) *De officio mariti* and *de salute*, which could also be translations of Greek sub-titles²³), must be handled with caution, since Gellius and Servius do not say that they are titles; if their words are taken at their face value, and there appears to be no reason to do otherwise, these are simply indications of the subjects of the satires²⁴).

What, then, are the implications of all this for the question of the origin of the sub-titles? Nonius had access to a collection

23) Attempts have been made to interpret *de officio mariti* as a translation of the sub-title of the satire *Ἐδρεν ἢ λοπάς τὸ πῶμα*. In his three citations from this satire Nonius has the sub-title as *περὶ γεγαμηρότων* (pp. 478, 2 and 526, 15) and *περὶ καθηρότων* (p. 399, 34). Mercklin, *RbM* 12 (1857) 378, combined these to produce *περὶ καθηρότων τῶν γεγαμηρότων*, arguing that *de officio mariti* was a translation of this phrase. He was followed by Vahlen, *Analecta* 28 n. 1, with *περὶ καθηρότως γεγαμηρότων* and by Della Corte with *περὶ τῶν γεγαμηρότων καθηρότων* ('La poesia' 60 and *GLF* 1 [1948] 73) and *περὶ τῶν καθηρότων γεγαμηρότων* (in his edition). Bücheler, *RbM* 14 (1859) 434 n. 13 rightly expressed doubt about the grammar of Mercklin's version, and in any case there are cogent reasons for caution in this matter. Firstly it is surprising that there are no signs in the mss. that anything has fallen out in the three citations of the sub-title. Secondly, and more important, Lindsay, *op. cit.* 107, has pointed out that, while Nonius drew his citations on pp. 478 and 526 from his edition of Varro, it is probable that he took that on p. 399 from a marginal note in his edition of Turpilius. The latter would be more liable to corruption, so it is preferable to regard *καθηρότων* as a variant of *γεγαμηρότων* rather than as evidence of a longer sub-title.

In the case of *de salute* Vahlen, *Coniectanea* 195-7, is persuaded by the similarity of this fr. (*Varro autem in satira quae scribitur de salute ait mundum haud natum esse neque mori*) to fr. 268 (*nec natus est nec morietur, viget veget ut pote plurimum*) to identify the two and to add the sub-title *περὶ σωτηρίας* to the satire *Manius*. The identification of the two frs. appears probable, but it does not follow from this that *de salute* should be regarded as a translation of an original Greek sub-title *περὶ σωτηρίας*.

24) Riese, *art. cit.* 482 n. 6, well cites Gell. 14. 3. 3 to illustrate Gellius' care in the use of the verbs *scribere* and *inscribere* in this context. Broukhusius' emendation of *scribitur* to *inscribitur* in Servius and Vahlen's suggestion (*Coniectanea* 194) that *inscripsit* should be read for *scripsit* in Gellius depend entirely on a *petitio principii*, on the assumption that *de officio mariti* and *de salute* are in fact titles.

of some of the satires of Varro in which the satires were equipped with sub-titles in addition to titles. But other writers who quote from these satires, with the possible exception of Priscian, show no awareness of such sub-titles; it is to be presumed therefore that their texts did not contain the sub-titles. Three possible explanations of this situation are available. First, it may be argued that Varro himself provided the sub-titles and that they have fallen out of all the texts used by grammarians and scholars except that employed by Nonius in his remote corner of Africa. Yet difficulties present themselves. How did the sub-titles disappear so completely from the texts used by authors other than Nonius? Did Varro give sub-titles only to the satires which now have them? If so, why did he restrict their use? If their purpose was to indicate the subject of the satire it would appear somewhat cavalier to add the sub-title *περὶ διαθηκῶν* to the satire *Testamentum* while not giving a sub-title to e.g. *Cras credo, hodie nihil* or *Idem Atti quod Tetti*. Or did every Menippean have its sub-title? If so, why is there no trace of sub-titles for all the other satires?

The second explanation is that of Havet²⁵) who suggests that Varro himself added the sub-titles when he was preparing a complete edition of the satires. He explains the fact that only one of Nonius' three collections has the sub-titles by arguing that the *Varro i* collection derives from this hypothetical complete edition, while *Varro ii* and *iii* (and presumably all the texts used by the other authors who quote from the satires) derive from the original edition(s) which did not have the sub-titles. This does not conflict with the available evidence, but it involves assuming that Varro did produce a definitive edition of his satires, for which there is no evidence, and it is surprising that this edition has left no traces of its existence other than in Nonius' *Varro i* collection.

Thirdly, it may be suggested that Varro did not add the sub-titles, but that they were added later by some reader or scribe of the particular group of satires in Nonius' *Varro i* collection. This appears to be the most satisfactory explanation of the fact that the only evidence for them comes from this collection. The impulse for their addition may have come from the fact that Varro had given three of the satires in this collection titles which consisted simply of *περὶ* + genitive and which

25) See n. 4 above.

did give a clear indication of the subject of the satire – something which many of Varro's titles fail to do. So this unknown reader went mechanically through his collection and added similar indications of subject to the other satires, producing in the process such absurdities as *Testamentum, περὶ διαθηκῶν*²⁶). These sub-titles, whatever their provenance, are, of course, now of inestimable value in view of the fragmentary state of the satires, but it should be noted that of their nature they give a somewhat simplistic view of the subject of the satire and may obscure satire's tendency to digression and to the indirect approach; thus it would be wrong to attempt always to find a direct link between each fragment and the subject of the satire as indicated by the sub-title.

B. *The arrangement of Nonius' 'Varro i' collection*

Della Corte²⁷) has suggested that this collection was arranged alphabetically by the last word in the sub-titles. The evidence for the arrangement of the various collections used by Nonius comes from those passages which contain sequences of quotations from a particular collection. Della Corte cites some of the places where sequences of leading-quotations provide such evidence for *Varro i*. These are: –

26) Vahlen, *Coniectanea* 193, citing F. Ritschl, *Parerga zu Plautus und Terenz* I (Leipzig 1845) 157ff., adduced as a parallel phenomenon the incidence of alternative titles in Latin comedies, while Cèbe, *loc. cit.*, who refers to the comments of J.-M. Jacques, *Ménandre I²: Le Dyscolos* (Paris 1963) 9–10, compares the appearance of similar alternative titles in Greek comedy. A more apposite parallel for an explanatory second title would be the *Apocolocyntosis*, where the explanatory gloss *apothēosis per saturam* has completely ousted the incomprehensible title.

27) 'La poesia' 50–56. A. Klotz, *PhW* 59 (1930) 917–8, comments that Della Corte's view is 'unmöglich'. His reasons are first that the titles are not arranged alphabetically (the point presumably being that one would expect an alphabetical arrangement to concern itself with the titles rather than the sub-titles) and second that the position of *Περὶ πλοῦς* is governed by the initial *φ* of the sub-title of the second book *περὶ φιλοσοφίας*; 'aber der Nebentitel des ersten Buches würde doch nicht in die alphabetische Reihenfolge passen, welchen Stoff man auch dem Buche zuweist'. The latter point is well taken. It should be noted too that there appears to be no parallel for the use of the *final* word of the sub-title to govern the alphabetical arrangement; one would expect the significant word to be that immediately following *περὶ*; cf. L. W. Daly, *Contributions to a history of alphabetization in antiquity and the middle ages* (Bruxelles 1967).

pp. 26-8, where we find the sequence *Paria parae, περι ἐγκωμίων; Flaxtabula, περι ἐπαρχιῶν; Ἐκατόμβη, περι θυσιῶν; Prometheus liber; Περι κεραννοῦ; Est modus matulae, περι μέθης.*

p. 324-5: *Synephebus, περι ἐμμονῆς; Gloria, περι φθόνου.*

p. 458: *Περι ἐξαγωγῆς; Flaxtabula, περι ἐπαρχιῶν.*

p. 478: *Ἐῶρεν ἡ λοπάς τὸ πῶμα, περι γεγαμηκότων; Pseudulus Apollo, περι θεῶν διαγνώσεως; Testamentum, περι διαθηκῶν.*

Two other passages involving leading-quotations are passed over in silence by Della Corte, presumably because there are cogent reasons for doubting the evidence they appear to provide. These are: -

p. 131: *Ἐκατόμβη, περι θυσιῶν; Περιπλους lib. II, περι φιλοσοφίας; Τριφάλλος, περι ἀρρενότητος.* It is very likely that these citations come from the *Varro i* series, but they have been misplaced²⁸) (possibly in the course of the alphabetization of Book II of Nonius); since their original order may not have been retained in the course of their displacement, their present order cannot be regarded as certain evidence against Della Corte's theory.

p. 492: *Sesqueulixes; Devicti, περι φιλονικίας; Meleagri; Prometheus liber.* The satires *Sesqueulixes* and *Meleagri* were in Nonius' *Varro ii* collection; their presence here indicates some confusion in the text and makes doubtful any deduction from the order of the other two satires.

Thus the evidence of the leading-quotations does not conflict with Della Corte's assertion; equally the evidence is so limited that it cannot be said to give strong support to his theory. He admits²⁹) that the satire *Prometheus liber*, which does not have a sub-title, does not fit into his arrangement, but, more important, he appears to have forgotten that evidence for the order of the satires can come not only from the leading-quotations but also from the extra-quotations. And in fact two of the six relevant passages conflict with his view. They are: -

28) Lindsay, *op. cit.*, 48 and note k.

29) 'La poesia' 53-4. In fact the evidence on the position of *Prometheus liber* is sufficient in itself to disprove Della Corte's theory. It stood between *Ἐκατόμβη, περι θυσιῶν* and *Περι κεραννοῦ* (pp. 27-8); before *Tithonus, περι γήρωσ* (p. 199) and after *Cycnus, περι ταφῆς* (p. 497). It follows from this that *Tithonus, περι γήρωσ* came later in *Varro i* than *Ἐκατόμβη, περι θυσιῶν*, and that *Cycnus, περι ταφῆς* came earlier than *Περι κεραννοῦ*, which leaves Della Corte's alphabetical arrangement looking more than a little sorry for itself.

p. 171: *Περίπλους* lib. I; *Octogessis*, *περὶ νομισμάτων*.
 p. 199: *Prometheus liber*; *Tithonus*, *περὶ γήρωος*.
 p. 343: *Ἐχω σε, περὶ τύχης*; *Tithonus*, *περὶ γήρωος*.
 p. 455: *Περίπλους* lib. II, *περὶ φιλοσοφίας*; *Serranus*, *περὶ ἀρχαιρεσιῶν*.
 p. 497: *Cycnus*, *περὶ ταφῆς*; *Prometheus liber*.
 p. 504: *Ἀνθρωπόπολις, περὶ γενεθλιακῆς*; *Ἐκατόμβη, περὶ θυσιῶν*. While it might be argued that the fact that the satire *Περίπλους* consisted of two books, of which only the second bore the sub-title *περὶ φιλοσοφίας*, weakens the evidence of p. 455, the situation on p. 343 is sufficient to disprove Della Corte's hypothesis.

Della Corte also suggests that Varro added the sub-titles to this collection only, in which he gathered those satires which had 'il carattere più filosofico e teoretizzante'³⁰). This attempt to find some sort of unity for the *Varro i* collection is not convincing; the supposed 'carattere' of the collection is so vague as to allow inclusion under it of many of the satires which are not in this collection. In addition there are, as I have shown above, cogent reasons for believing that Varro did not add the sub-titles.

C. *Ecdemeticus*

Fr. 93 of the Menippeans, which consists only of the word *quadriga*, is cited by Gell. 19. 8. 17: *quod unum ergo rarissimum videbatur, invenimus 'quadrigam' numero singulari dictam in libro saturarum M. Varronis, qui inscriptus est Ecdemeticus*.

Gellius' usual method of citing the Menippeans is in the form *in satura quae inscripta est ...* or the like³¹); in 13. 31. 2, where he has *eum librum ex isdem saturis ... qui ... inscriptus est*, and 13. 11. 1: *liber ... M. Varronis ex saturis Menippeis*, the phrase *liber ex saturis* is to be taken as equivalent to *satura*. But here we have *liber saturarum*. Now E. Sprockhoff³²) has shown

30) Bücheler, *RbM* 14 (1859) 420, had commented that the sub-titles are found 'nur in denjenigen Satiren, welche allgemeinere, meist philosophische Gegenstände behandelten'. Note that the reprint of this article in Bücheler's *Kleine Schriften* I (Leipzig 1915) 170 has 'philologische' instead of 'philosophische'.

31) 1. 22. 4; 3. 16. 13; 3. 18. 5; 6. 16. 1; 7. 5. 10; 13. 23. 4; 15. 19. 1.

32) *De libri voluminis βιβλιον sive βιβλίον vocabulorum apud Gellium Ciceronem Athenaeum usurpatione* (Diss. inaug. Marburg 1908) 29-30 (pp. 8-31 are on Gellius' use of *liber*).

that Gellius gives the titles of books in the genitive after *liber* in two ways; either he puts the plural *libri*, as e.g. *Aristoteles in libris Problematon* (I. II. 17) or he uses the singular with the ordinal, as e.g. *in XIV rerum divinarum libro M. Varro ...* (I. 18. 1). Having demonstrated this, Sprockhoff goes on to say: 'Locis I. 22. 19; 12. 13. 21; 15. 7. 3 huic regulae non repugnant, cum his locis genitivus *epistularum* propterea adhibeatur, quod in unoquoque libro plures epistulae conscriptae sunt'. I suggest that, in conformity with Gellius' usage, *liber saturarum* is to be understood in the same way as *liber epistularum*, i.e. the *liber* contained several *saturae*³³). We thus obtain valuable information on the method of publication of the satires; Varro appears to have published a collection of satires written during a period of absence from Italy and to have given this collection the appropriate title *Ecdemeticus*³⁴). It may be asked why, if this is the case, Gellius does not give the title of the individual satire in which the word *quadriga* appeared rather than the title of the collection. I should suggest as a possible explanation that Varro supplied the collection with an introduction in which he used *quadriga* and that Gellius could therefore only cite this word as coming from the *Ecdemeticus*.

University College, Dublin Raymond Astbury

33) It may be worth noting that in the catalogue of Varro's works given by Jerome in his preface to Origen on Genesis there are to be found the entries 'saturarum Menippearum libri CL' and 'saturarum libri IV'. It has been generally supposed that Jerome meant by the first of these 'saturae Menippeae CL'; perhaps the evidence of Varro's *Ecdemeticus* suggests at least the possibility that the numeral is corrupt. That Jerome may have used *liber saturarum Menippearum* as equivalent to *satura Menippea* does not affect my argument about *Ecdemeticus*, since it is based on Gellius' practice in the use of *liber*.

34) On the title see J. Vahlen, 'Ein Varronischer Satirentitel', *RbM* 18 (1863) 319-20.