

VI. *Nepos* 'σχορπιστής' and Philoxenus

JOHN L. HELLER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1. *Nepos* 'luxoriosus'

1.1 Paul. Fest. 163 L.: *Nepotes luxoriosae vitae homines appellati, quod non magis his rei suae familiaris cura est, quam is, quibus pater avusque vivunt.* The last clause defines *nepos* in its ordinary meaning 'grandson' (or 'granddaughter,' cf. Enn. *Ann.* 55 V.: *Ilia dia nepos*), somewhat obscurely limiting the term, however, to those who have a living parent and grandparent. The meaning with which we are concerned, 'spendthrift,' 'wastrel,' or 'prodigal,' is explained as a metaphor applied to *luxuriosi* 'playboys,' because they take no more care of their property than *nepotes* 'grandsons' who are still under their parents' control. The trait common to both groups is irresponsibility. The explanation may or may not be convincing, but the metaphor (if such it is) can be illustrated from numerous passages in Cicero, Horace, and Seneca. Of these, the passages from Horace are most significant and require examination in some detail.

1.2 Discussing the middle courses that lie between the extremes of self-indulgence on the one hand and self-seeking on the other, Horace uses *nepos* to suggest the one extreme and *avarus* the other (*Epist.* 2.2.193 ff.): *Scire volam quantum simplex hilarisque nepoti Discrepet et quantum discordet parcus avaro; Distat enim, spargas tua prodigus (like a nepos) an neque sumptum Invitus facias (as being parcus), neque plura parare labores (like an avarus), Ac potius... Exiguo gratoque fruaris tempore raptim (like one simplex hilarisque).* The middle courses are aspects of the virtue *liberalitas*, one with respect to giving (*parcus*), the other with respect to taking (*simplex hilarisque*). As Porphyrio noted, this is the Peripatetic doctrine of the mean,<sup>1</sup> and the *locus classicus* for this particular virtue is Arist. *EN* 4.1, where the mean is

<sup>1</sup> Porph. *Epist.* 2.2.192: *Redit ad mediocritatem Peripateticorum, et dicit...; cf. Cic. Off.* 1.89: *mediocritatem illam... quae est inter nimium et parum, quae placet*

ἐλευθεριότης and the extremes are ἀνελευθερία and ἀσωτία and all have to do περὶ δόσιν χρημάτων καὶ λῆψιν. Aristotle notes (4.1.4) that ἀσωτία sometimes had a more extended meaning: τοὺς γὰρ ἀκρατεῖς καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανηροὺς ἀσώτους καλοῦμεν. Horace's *nepos*, then, replaces the Greek ἀσώτος for the one who goes to excess in giving, and his *avarus* suggests the αἰσχροκέρδεια which is the common characteristic of those who go to the extreme of taking (*EN* 4.1.40 f.). Cicero's discussion of the same virtue (*Off.* 2.52–90) uses the terms *liberalitas* and *benignitas* for the virtue with respect to giving (*largitio*), *avaritia* for the vice to be avoided (2.64: ut inliberalitatis avaritiaeque absit suspicio), and characterizes those who go to excess in giving as *prodigi* (2.56); cf. Horace's *spargas tua prodigus*.

**1.3** Horace had used this contrast previously (*Epod.* 1.32 ff.): haud paravero Quod aut avarus ut Chremes terra premam, Discinctus aut perdam nepos. In the *Satires*, however, *nepos* recurs several times in Stoic contexts, notably in *Serm.* 2.3.224 f.: Nunc age, luxuriam et Nomentanum arripe mecum: Vincet enim stultos ratio insanire nepotes. Here Horace is compelled to listen to the diatribe of the busybody Damasippus, which he in turn had learned from his former master, the Stoic Stertinius, demonstrating that all but the wise are fools and that every form of folly is madness, in short, that *insanire omnes vos ordine* (81). The first form of folly is *avaritia* (82–160), the second *ambitio* (161–223), the third *luxuria* (224–46), to which *puerilis amor* (247–80) is closely joined, and the last is superstition induced *timore deorum* (281–95). Each form of folly is dramatically illustrated by individuals. Nomentanus, the first *luxuriosus nepos*, immediately on receiving his patrimony, invites to his house all the purveyors of luxuries—piscator, pomarius, auceps, unguentarius . . . cum scurris fartor . . . leno—and makes extravagant bargains, *iuvenis aequus* that he is, with them (226–38). Another is the son of Aesopus, who had sunk a cool million on a precious pearl for his mistress' ear, then caused it to be dissolved in vinegar, doubtless giving her another (239–42). Then come (243–45): Quinti progenies Arri, par nobile fratum, Nequitia et nugis, pravorum et amore gemellum, Lusciniis soliti impenso prandere coemptas.

Peripateticis et recte placet. On Horace's debt to Peripatetic philosophy in general, see J. F. D'Alton, *Horace and his Age* (London 1917) 80–84; also E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957), 330 f., on *prodigus et stultus* in *Epist.* 1.7.20.

**1.4** Nomentanus occurs again in the *Satires* as a *nepos*, in company with the *scurra* "Pantolabus" (1.8.11). The two, though obviously of good birth, are destined to lie in the public burial-ground, doubtless because, as Porphyrio says, bona sua comed-rant. In the first satire of the second book, Horace allows himself to be reproached by Trebatius for having attacked such a pair, quoting the line. Though better subjects for his verse were available, such as Caesar's deeds (2.1.11), Horace would satirize (*tristi laedere versu*) *Pantolabum scurram Nomentanumque nepotem* (2.1.22), thus making enemies of all who would see their own faults in these poor devils. Horace replies that every man has his foibles, and his particular pleasure is to write verse in the manner of Lucilius (29), expressing his opinions freely and without fear of the consequences. He will attack people only in defense, however, when he has been stirred to resentment (45), using the best weapon at his command. In doing so, he follows a law of nature, as a wolf uses his teeth or a bull his horns—or as the *nepos* Scaeva dispatches his too lively old mother, not by any act of violence, but letting poisoned honey do the trick (53 ff.): *Scaevae vivacem crede nepoti Matrem; nil faciet sceleris pia dextera . . . Sed mala tollet anum vitiato melle cicuta*.

**1.5** *Nepos* in the sense '*luxuriosus*' occurs once more in the *Satires*. At *Serm.* 1.4.49 ff., Horace represents a father in a comedy as complaining bitterly of his son's conduct: *quod meretrice nepos insanus amica Filius uxorem grandi cum dote recuset, Ebrius et, magnum quod dedecus, ambulet ante Noctem cum facibus*. Here the word *insanus* lends a Stoic tinge to the thought; and this irresponsible playboy behaves much like Nomentanus in the Stoic diatribe of *Serm.* 2.3—except that in this case the father is still alive.<sup>2</sup> Not surprisingly, Seneca seems to echo these passages. With the last one, compare *Epist.* 95.23: *In rhetorum ac philosophorum scholis solitudo est; at quam celebres culinae sunt, quanta circa nepotum focus iuventus premitur*. In the *De ira* (2.16.3), he distinguishes between the truly *simplices* and those *iracundi* who were falsely praised as being such: *quos quidem non simplices dixerim sed incautos; stultis, luxuriosis nepotibusque hoc nomen inponimus et omnibus vitiis parum*

<sup>2</sup> Porphyrio, alluding to the normal meaning of *nepos*, notes that the juxtaposition of *nepos* and *filius* here creates a *bella obscuritas*. The meaning 'grandson' is also excluded by the context for *nepos* in *Serm.* 2.1.53, above.

callidis. Those who take no pains to conceal their faults are not *simplices*, but *incauti*, irresponsible. Speaking elsewhere (*Ben.* 1.15.3) of moderation and virtue, he uses a derivative of *nepos* to indicate the perversion of *liberalitas*: Cum sit nulla honesta vis animi, etiam si a recta voluntate incepit, nisi quam virtutem modus fecit, veto liberalitatem nepotari.

**1.6** Seneca's doctrine here reflects the Peripatetic mean. Similarly, Horace's Nomentanus also appears at *Serm.* 1.1.102 as an example of the Peripatetic extreme, diametrically opposed to *avarus*, though here he is called a *nebulo*, not *nepos*. At this place Porphyrio identifies Nomentanus: (qui erat) adeo sine respectu calculorum suorum prodigus, ut sestertium septuagies gulae ac libidini impenderit. Earlier scholars had attempted to identify Horace's characters, of course; Porphyrio cites them on Maenius in *Serm.* 1.3.21: Qui de personis Horatianis scripserunt, aiunt Maenium et scurrilitate et nepotatu notissimum Romae fuisse. The quotation puts the derivative *nepotatus* closer to Horace's time than Porphyrio's, and it recurs elsewhere (see below, 1.8). As for the fact, we have Horace's own testimony in a very interesting passage, the last of his which we must consider (*Epist.* 1.15.26 ff.). Here Maenius, who had run through his inheritance in a hurry (26 f.: rebus maternis atque paternis Fortiter absumptis), changes his style (urbanus coepit haberi) and becomes a *scurra vagus* (28), ready to abuse anyone or anything in order to win an invitation to dinner. On occasions when he fails to get anything from the *nequitiae fautoribus et timidis* (33) and is forced to dine at home, his meals, though of the cheapest kind, are still gargantuan (35: tribus ursis quod satis esset). At the same time he talks like the reformer Bestius (36 f.): Scilicet ut ventres lamna candente nepotum Diceret urendos. On the other hand, when his efforts have been successful, he allows that there is some good in fine eating after all (39-41). The delightful irony of having the apparently reformed *luxoriosus* condemn in public the vice of gluttony, to which he is still in secret addicted, is capped by Horace's tactful confession (42-46) that he too is like that; he could praise the simple life when he had to live it, but he was not entirely disinterested in the luxuries of his wealthy friends, like the one to whom he addressed this letter inquiring about the amenities of the coastal resorts (1-25). It should be noted,

however, that the story of Maenius also illustrates a point made by Aristotle (*EN* 4.1.31), that the mean man (ἀνελύθερος) seems to be more reprehensible than the ἄσωτος, since the latter may be reformed (εὐίατος) by increasing age or by poverty and thus turn more toward the middle course, whereas meanness is incurable. Horace must have reflected more than once on Aristotle's chapter.

**1.7** In these passages, whether Peripatetic or Stoic, Horace guarantees the vowel-quantities in *nepōs* 'luxuriosus,' but otherwise makes no very close connection between it and *nepōs* 'filius filii.' In fact on two occasions (*Serm.* 2.1.53, 1.4.49 f.) he seems to exclude a connection, whether deliberately or inadvertently (see above, fn. 2). The word, for him, seems to be almost a technical term of popular philosophy, not so much for those who, on coming into an inheritance, proceed to dissipate it, as for those irresponsible young men who devote themselves to pleasure in general, especially the more extravagant luxuries of eating, drinking, and chasing after women. Cicero's usage is similar, though without the philosophic overtones. In at least one passage he refers to the dissipation of inherited property (*Leg. agr.* 1.2): Videte . . . ut impurus helluo turbet rem publicam, ut a maioribus nostris possessiones relictas disperdat ac dissipet, ut sit non minus in populi Romani patrimonio nepos quam in suo; cf. *ibid.* 2.48: Ut in suis rebus, ita in republica luxuriosus <est> nepos, qui prius silvas vendat quam vineas. Still, the emphasis is on the riotous living of the *nepos* rather than on his family connections. Elsewhere in Cicero the word has a more general application. Like *helluo*, it seems to be one of his favorite terms of invective. Cf. *Quinct.* 40: Quis tam perditus ac profusus nepos non adesa iam sed abundanti etiam pecunia sic dissolutus fuisset? *Verr.* 3.184: nummulis corrogatis de nepotum donis ac de scaenicorum corollariis; *Har. resp.* 59: Quis umquam nepos tam libere est cum scortis quam hic cum sororibus volutatus? and the astonishing list of fourteen terms—a regular haymaker—characterizing Catiline's unsavory associates (*Catil.* 2.7) and including, near the end, quis ganeo, quis nepos, quis adulter. The word in this sense occurs once in the letters (*Att.* 6.2.8: sumptu iam nepos evadit Scaptius), but not in the more dignified philosophic or rhetorical works, and it does not occur in Horace's odes or Seneca's tragedies.

**1.8** Until the next fascicles of the *Thesaurus* make their longed-for appearance, it is hazardous to say that the word does not occur in this sense elsewhere in classical Latin, but if it does I have failed to find it in a reasonably diligent search of lexicons and indices. Some derivatives, however, begin to appear in the Silver Age. Besides Seneca's *nepotor* (above, 1.5), which recurs in Tert. *Apol.* 46.16 (Aristippus in purpura sub magna gravitatis superficie nepotatur),<sup>3</sup> we have *nepotatus*, *nepotalis*, and *nepotatio*. For *nepotatus*, see Plin. *HN* 9.114 (subeunt luxuriae eius nomina et taedia exquisita perduto nepotatu); *ibid.* 14.57 (on extravagant luxuries at the banquets of the rich); Suet. *Calig.* 37.1 (Nepotatus sumptibus omnium prodigorum ingenia superavit); and the phrase cited by Porphyrio (above, 1.6). In all these cases, *luxuria* is the best equivalent for *nepotatus*. *Nepotalis* occurs in Apul. *Met.* 2.2 (dum in luxum nepotalem... ostiatim singula pererro)<sup>4</sup> and Amm. Marc. 31.5.6 (dum in nepotali mensa... vino marcebat et somno). The last word, *nepotatio*, is at present attested only in glosses; see Placidus (*Gloss. Lat.* 4) N 11: Nepa... (cited in full below, 2.6); hinc quoque nepotatio pro luxuria ponitur, qua certae quaeque res consumuntur (= Isid. *Etym.* 10.193; cf. *CGL* 5.507.55); but again the *Thesaurus* may be able to document Placidus' assertion. Derivatives and *nepos* itself are not likely to have been overlooked by Christian moralists in search of distinctive words.

**1.9** One more occurrence of *nepos* itself remains to be considered, but from a very late source, Iohannes Lydus, *De magistratibus populi Romani*. Referring to the period after the Twelve Tables and before the time of Appius Claudius (1.43), he asserts (1.42) that the Romans enacted legislation to control luxury (*ἀσωτία*), and further, that the law was entitled *De nepotibus*: τίτλος δέ, ἥτοι προγραφή, τῷ νόμῳ de nepotibus οἰονεῖ <περὶ ἀσωτῶν. ἐπεὶ δὲ διπλῇ> ἡ σημασία τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου ἐστὶ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις— νέπωτας γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους καὶ τοὺς ἀσώτους ὁμωνύμως καλοῦσιν— ἥρρεσεν ἐμοὶ διὰ βραχέων τὴν διαφορὰν εἰπεῖν.<sup>5</sup> He then launches

<sup>3</sup> Oehler (Leipzig 1853) notes that this translates Tatian's Ἀρίστιππος ἐν πορφυρίδι περιπατῶν ἀξιοπίστως ἡσωτεύσατο.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.51 and Sen. *Epist.* 95.23 (above, 1.5).

<sup>5</sup> Wuensch (Leipzig 1903) reproduces the spelling of the Codex Casseolinus for the Latin words; ordinarily Lydus seems to have transformed them: νέπωτας = *nepoēs*. For the lacuna, see Wuensch's apparatus.

into a long discussion of the etymology of *nepos*, which we shall have to consider below (3.4 ff.). There is no other reference to any such title for a Roman law, and Lydus as an authority on matters of early Roman law commands no respect.<sup>6</sup> He is probably quoting from a comparatively late Roman source referring to one or another of the sumptuary laws designed to check *luxuria* (i.e. *nepotatus*) and *luxuriosi* (i.e. *nepotes*); cf. Gell. 20.1.23 (*Quid tam necessarium existimatum est propulsandae civium luxuriae quam Lex Licinia et Fannia aliaque item leges sumptuariae*) and Macrob. *Sat.* 3.17.4 (citing Serenus Sammonicus on the Lex Fannia): *cum res publica ex luxuria conviviorum maiora quam credi potest detrimenta pateretur, siquidem eo res redierat, ut gula inlecti plerique ingenui pueri pudicitiam et libertatem suam venditarent.* Lydus' lexical information may be compared with a note in *Pompeii Commentum Artis Donati* (GLK 5.146.14): (Homonyma)... *ut si dicas nepos; nepos dicitur et filius filii et prodigus; and an otherwise strange gloss (strange because of the form of the lemma) could have been drawn from a Latin source on a lex de nepotibus; cf. Dub. Plac. (Gloss. Lat. 4) N 3: Nep<ο>tibus luxuriosis (=CGL 5.86.22, 5.121.1).*

**1.10** By way of summary, and in order to exhibit the various meanings, other than '*filius filii*,' which are attributed to the word in the numerous comments of ancient scholiasts and glossators, I present below a table analyzing the contexts in which *nepos* occurs, under three headings. Beginning with the specific vice of squandering one's inherited property—which was the point of the metaphor, if we may believe Paulus—the analysis proceeds to the more general faults associated with riotous living and ends with the completely abandoned conduct implied by Cicero. From each passage cited above I abstract the juxtaposed nouns, adjectives, or actions (expressed as relative clauses) explicitly associated with *nepos*. These constitute the actual meanings of the word. Then, under each group, I distribute the meanings supplied by the commentators and glossaries. It will be observed that there is nothing new in them. Each meaning seen by the commentators is fully justified by one or another of the classical

<sup>6</sup> See Wuensch, praef. xli: *hac in re Lydo fidem nullam esse, quippe qui labente memoria res toto caelo divisas miscuerit, per litteras benigne me monuit Theodorus Mommsen.* See also note 24, below.

contexts—not necessarily, however, by the one on which they happen to be commenting. The analytical arrangement, of course, sometimes requires the separation of items of information which are logically different in our scale of values, even though they come from the same context or the same comment. For example, Cic. *Quinct.* 40 (quis tam perditus ac profusus nepos . . . dissolutus fuisset) has to be placed both under the third group (for *perditus*) and under the second; Pseudacr. *Serm.* 1.8.11 (Nomentanus nepos] prodigus fuit et omnia bona comederat) has to be recorded in two different places under the second group. Cross reference is made in every case to the whole passage as cited in the sections above or to the whole comment, cited by its leading words at the appropriate place in the table. The procedure is mechanical, to be sure, but our object is merely to exhibit the range of meanings so that without prejudice we can determine, if possible, which ideas are central and which peripheral in these contexts.

### 1. Specifically, of spendthrift heirs to property

- Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1.2 (above, 1.7): qui sua disperdit ac dissipat; cf. *ibid.* 2.48 (1.7) *Quinct.* 40 (1.7): qui pecuniam suam adest  
 Hor. *Epod.* 1.34 (1.3): qui sua perdit  
*Serm.* 2.3.226 ff. (1.3): qui patrimonium per luxuriam dissipat  
*Epist.* 1.15.26 (1.6): qui res maternas atque paternas fortiter absumit  
 2.2.195 (1.2): qui sua spargit  
 qui res suas devorat: Schol. Lugd. *Catil.* 2.7 (ed. Stangl)  
 devorator substantiae paternae: Ansil. (*GL* 1) NE 321  
 evorsor rerum parentum: Ansil. NE 323; cf. Abstr. NE 27 (below, 2 b)  
 qui bona sua comederant . . . ; quem nepotem propter prodigam vitam appellavit: Porph. *Serm.* 1.8.11; cf. Pseudacr. *ibid.* (below, 2 b)  
 qui bona parentum per luxuriam consumunt: Plac. (*GL* 4) N 11

### 2. more generally, of irresponsible young men who live luxuriously

- a. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.48 (1.7): qui prius silvas vendit quam vineas  
 Hor. *Epod.* 1.34 (1.3): discinctus; cf. Arist. *EN* 4.1.4 (1.2): ἀκρατὴς καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανηρὸς  
*Serm.* 1.4.51 (1.5): filius ebrius qui cum facibus ante noctem ambulat  
 2.3.225 (1.3): stultus, qui insanit, iuvenis aequus (i.e. prodigus)  
 Sen. *Ira* 2.16.3 (1.5): incautus, stultus, vitii parum callidus  
 (Nomentanus) adeo sine respectu calculorum suorum prodigus ut sester-tium septuagies gulae ac libidini inpenderit: Porph. *Serm.* 1.1.101 = Pseudacr. *ibid.* (tam profusus fuit ut . . . inpenderet); cf. Pseudacr. *Epod.* 1.34 (below, 2 c)



- b. Cic. *Quinct.* 40 (1.7): profusus, dissolutus  
 Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.195 (1.2): prodigus; cf. Arist. *EN* 4.1 *passim* (1.2): ἄσωτος;  
 Cic. *Off.* 2.56 (1.2): prodigus; Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.102 (1.6): nebulo  
 Lyd. *Mag.* 1.42 (1.9): ἄσωτος  
 prodigus fuit et omnia bona comederat...; omnibus suis absumptis:  
 Pseudacr. *Serm.* 1.8.11; cf. Porph. *ibid.* (above, 1)  
 prodigum ac luxuriosum: Porph. *Epod.* 1.34; cf. *Serm.* 1.1.101 (above, 2 a),  
 1.4.49 (below, 2 d)  
 prodigus, eversor: Abstr. (*GL* 3) NE 27 = Abba (*GL* 5) NE 23 (Nepos non  
 purus, prodigus, eversor)  
 et filius filii et prodigus: *Pomp. Comm. Donat.* (*GLK* 5.146.14)  
 καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους καὶ τοὺς ἀσώτους: Lyd. *Mag.* 1.42; cf. AA N 166 (below, 3)  
 cf. nepotatus ἄσωτία: Philox. (*GL* 2) NE 33; Porph. *Serm.* 1.3.21 (above 1.6)  
 cf. nepotor ἀσωτεύομαι: Tert. *Apol.* 46.16 (1.8 and note 3)
- c. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.48 (1.7): luxuriosus; cf. *Verr.* 3.184 (1.7); *Att.* 6.2.8 (1.7)  
 Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.224 (1.3): luxuriosus  
 Sen. *Ira* 2.16.3 (1.5): luxuriosus  
 luxuriosus: Porph. *Serm.* 2.1.22 = Pseudacr. *Serm.* 2.3.224 = *Epist.* 1.15.36;  
 cf. Porph. *ibid.* (below, 3)  
 luxuriosus: Ps. Plac. (*GL* 4) N 13 = Dub. Plac. (*GL* 4) N 3 (Nep<o>tibus  
 luxuriosis)<sup>7</sup>  
 luxuriosae vitae homines: Paul. Fest. 163 L. (1.1)  
 luxuriosum filium: Pseudacr. *Serm.* 1.4.48  
 luxuriosos, insanos: Porph. *Serm.* 2.3.224  
 luxuriosus et pronus ad artes magicas: Pseudacr. *Serm.* 2.1.53  
 luxuriosus, negligens: Pseudacr. *Epod.* 1.34  
 cf. nepotatus, luxuria: Plin. *HN* 9.114, 14.57 (above, 1.8)
- d. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1.2 (1.7): helluo; cf. *Quinct.* 40 (1.7)  
 Hor. *Epist.* 1.15.36 (1.6): cuius venter vorax urendus est  
 Sen. *Epist.* 95.23 (1.5): cuius culinae frequentantur a iuventute  
 vorax atque prodigus: Porph. *Serm.* 1.4.49; cf. Porph. *Serm.* 1.8.11  
 (above, 1); Pseudacr. *ibid.* (above, 2 b); Schol. Lugd. *Catil.* 2.7  
 (above, 1); Ansil. NE 321 (above, 1)  
 popino, ambro: Ansil. (*GL* 1) NE 322
- e. Cic. *Har. resp.* 59 (1.7): qui libere cum scortis volutatur  
 Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.49 (1.5): filius qui meretrice amica insanus uxorem divitem  
 recusat  
 (This aspect of conduct is not mentioned by the glossators, though they  
 did comment on the passage in Horace.)

### 3. as a term of abuse, of men of abandoned character

- Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1.2 (1.7): impurus helluo  
*Quinct.* 40 (1.7): perditus ac profusus, dissolutus  
*Catil.* 2.7 (1.7): ganeo, adulter  
 Hor. *Serm.* 1.8.11 (1.4): scurra = *Serm.* 2.1.22 (1.4); cf. Cic. *Verr.* 3.184 (1.7)  
 2.1.56 (1.4): qui matrem venenat  
 2.3.244 (1.3): qui nequitia et nugis, pravorum amore notatissimus est

<sup>7</sup> Possibly related to the source of Lyd. *Mag.* 1.42; see above, 1.9.

perditus, sceleratus, asotus: AA (GL 5) N 166 (Nepus)  
 perditā femina: AA N 167 (Nep<ō>is feminae perditae feminae)<sup>8</sup>  
 nequam et luxuriosorum: Porph. *Epist.* 1.15.36<sup>9</sup>  
 cf. nepotatus scurrilitas: Porph. *Serm.* 1.3.21 (1.6)  
 perditus nepotatus: Plin. *HN* 9.114 (1.8)

**1.11** It is readily seen that in each group of meanings Cicero comes first and Horace follows regularly. The single adjective that best fits most of the contexts and is supplied in most of the definitions is *luxuriosus* (2 c); thereafter, in descending order, come *prodigus* (2 b), *stultus* (2 a), *vorax* (2 d), and *perditus* (3); but if a relative clause is desired, then something like *qui sua perdit* (1) comes closest to the mark. In sum, *nepos* 'luxuriosus' or 'prodigus' would appear to be a sort of canting or even slang expression, like our *haymaker* or *playboy*, which originated among certain speakers of the Ciceronian period, was taken up enthusiastically by Horace in satiric and philosophic contexts, almost as a technical term, but thereafter fell out of literary fashion, except for Seneca and certain other late and learned echoes. The word enjoyed sufficient currency to beget a number of derivatives, but even these appear to be rather more learned than popular; there is no trace of this meaning in the Romance derivatives. The question remains, was *nepōs* 'luxuriosus' a metaphorical extension of *nepōs* 'filius filii'?

**1.12** Porphyrio's further comment on *Epod.* 1.34 brings us back to Paulus' extract from Festus (above, 1.1), in that it too attempts to explain the usage as a metaphor: *Nepotem autem veteres ut prodigum ac luxuriosum dicebant, quia re vera solutiores delicatiorisque vitae soleant esse qui sub avo nutriantur.* The last clause is certainly a more accurate definition of *nepos* 'grandson' than Paulus' *quibus pater avusque vivunt*, and the explanation seems at least as reasonable as his. Most modern authorities, indeed, accept the explanation in a general way, supposing that *nepōs* 'grandchild' acquired a derogatory meaning 'spoiled child' in the speech of censorious elders, and then that this meaning

<sup>8</sup> This gloss probably reflects an actual occurrence (in the gen. sg.) not yet known to us. The sense may have been abstracted from Cic. *Catil.* 2.7, where the words following *adulter* (see above, 1.7) are: *quae mulier infamis, quis corruptor iuventutis, quis corruptus, quis perditus.* But cf. also Abav. (GL 2) NE 32: *Neptis, nepos femina* = AA N 168.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Mart. 3.69.4 f.: *At mea luxuria pagina nulla vacat. Haec igitur nequam iuvenes facilesque puellae, Haec senior . . . legat.*

was taken up by other people and generalized, at least in certain circles and for a time. Walde compared the German *Mutter-söhnchen*; Ernout, following Niedermann, the French *filz à papa*.<sup>10</sup> Both point to the emotional charge evident in certain earlier contexts of *nepōs* 'grandchild'; Plaut. *Mil.* 1265 (*nepos* sum *Veneris*), echoed mockingly as *Venerium nepotulum* (*ibid.* 1413, 1421); compare also Catullus' ironic *magnanimi Remi nepotes* (58.5). Even if we grant, however, that a meaning 'spoiled child' might have arisen in this way, and further, that a spoiled child might in a few more years become a spendthrift heir, some of the meanings actually attested for *nepōs*, e.g. *luxoriosus*, *vorax*, *perditus*, seem a little extreme if they were in fact metaphorical applications of *nepōs* 'grandchild.' If *nepos* in Cicero is to be understood merely as 'adult spoiled child,' 'playboy,' then his invective falls a little flat.

**1.13** An alternative theory has been put forth by Muller and, with some variations, by Pariente.<sup>11</sup> To expand Muller's brief but suggestive formulation, we may note the existence in Latin of verbal adjectives with the negative prefix *nē-*, side by side with others using *in-*: *īnsciūs*, *īnsciēns*: *nesciūs*, *nesciēns*; *īnfandus*, *īnfāns*: *nefandus*, (Non. 489.14 M.) *nefāns*. The differentiation in meaning, if there is any, is only slight; cf. *īnsānus*: *vesānus*. Muller supposed that there was an early Latin *nepōs*, *nepōtis* corresponding to *impōs*, *impōtis* and to *impotēns*, *-entis*. *Nepōs* would have had the same meaning as *impōs* 'powerless (to control oneself),' a meaning which *impotēns* also has in various familiar contexts. Muller compared Greek ἀκρατής for the meaning 'unrestrained,' 'intemperate'—a meaning illustrated in the passage from the *Nicomachean Ethics* by which we established (1.2) the equivalence of *nepōs* in Horace with ἄσωτος in Aristotle. But Horace regularly treats the second syllable of the word as long. This Muller explained as the result of popular etymology: the form of *\*nepōs* 'powerless to control oneself,' 'intemperate'

<sup>10</sup> Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*<sup>3</sup>, ed. by J. B. Hofmann (Heidelberg 1938–39), 2.162. Ernout & Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>4</sup> (Paris 1959–60) 438. *Nepōs* 'grandchild,' of course, has good Indo-European cognates.

<sup>11</sup> Fr. Muller, *Altitalisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen 1926), s.v. *nepōt-s* 'Enkel'; A. Pariente, "En torna a 'nepos,'" *Emerita* 11 (1943) 60–122. Pariente has an excellent collection of material, and I think most of his conclusions are sound enough, except for his strange argument (69–73) that '*luxoriosus*' in the glosses is a medieval mistake, i.e., that the proper gloss for *nepōs* in these contexts is only '*prodigus*.'

was altered by association with the more familiar word *nepōs* 'grandchild,' just as *πλεύμων*, attested in Homer (cf. Latin *pulmō*), was altered to *πνεύμων* by association (cf. Arist. *Resp.* 476A 9) with *πνεύμα* (see *LSJ*, s.v. *πλεύμων*).

**1.14** Unfortunately, the form *nepōs* 'luxuriosus' is nowhere attested, unless we suppose that Cicero treated the second syllable as short—which is unlikely in view of the contexts in which he seems to associate the word with *nepōs* 'grandson.' Nevertheless this etymology for *nepōs* 'luxuriosus' seems preferable to the usually accepted view that it is a metaphorical extension of *nepōs* 'filius filii,' for the reason that it accounts much better for the extremely unfavorable contexts in Cicero as well as for the philosophic and satiric usages of Horace and Seneca.<sup>11a</sup> The other view, of course, is also possible. In the nature of language, one can never know precisely why a word is given a new application, and when semantic changes are so unpredictable, one can only rule out a proposed etymology when it is phonetically impossible.

## 2. *Nepos* 'σκορπιστής'

**2.1** After discussing what he took to be the metaphorical use of *nepos* 'grandson' in these pejorative contexts, Ernout added, "Toutefois ce glissement de sens, admis par les anciens (P.F.

<sup>11a</sup> A study of the distribution of *impos* and *impotens* confirms this impression. *Impos* occurs five times in Plautus, not at all in Terence or Cicero, rarely in Accius, Laevius, Seneca, and Suetonius. In Plautus, it occurs only in the phrase *impos animi* and is applied twice to reckless or shameless women (*Cas.* 629, *Men.* 110) and three times to young men who are reckless and indiscreet in their love affairs (*Bacch.* 614, *Trin.* 131, *Truc.* 828). Everywhere else the word, used with *consili*, *mentis*, *sui*, etc., is more general in application; for the references, see the *Thesaurus*. *Impotens* occurs not at all in Plautus, three times in Terence, occasionally in Pomponius, Catullus, Horace, Cicero, Livy, and Seneca. In Terence, it occurs with *animi* expressed or implied, and is used once of a shameless *meretrix* (*Heaut.* 227) and twice of a young man in love, reproved for his indiscreet conduct (*Andr.* 879, *Heaut.* 371). Nowhere else does it have this special application, though Cicero uses it as an opprobrious epithet of Antony (*Phil.* 5.24): *impotentem, iracundum, contumeliosum, . . . ebrium*. *Nepos*, however, does have this special application in Cicero, Horace, and Seneca. It looks as if, for the meaning 'irresponsible young man,' *nepos* had indeed replaced the earlier *adulescens impos* (or *impotens*) *animi*. The passage in the *Andria* (879 ff.) is especially significant in connection with Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.49 ff. (above, 1.5), in that here a father storms at his son for preferring his *meretrix* to a wife who would bring him a very large dowry (cf. 101). Though the rest of the passage in Horace (*ebrius* et. . . *cum facibus*) does not fit the situation in Terence, Horace's phrase *meretrix nepos insanus amica* corresponds very closely to *adeo impotenti esse animo, ut. . . hanc habere studeat cum summo probro*, and it was just here that Horace chose to add *filius* to the phrase, thus seemingly excluding the ordinary meaning of *nepos* (cf. above, note 2).

163,6), repose peut-être sur une étymologie populaire. Peut-être y a-t-il eu deux mots différents à l'origine: le texte de Festus, malheureusement lacunaire, semble indiquer la provenance étrusque de *nepōs* 'débauché'; cf. Fest. 162,18 sqq."<sup>12</sup> In other words, he was not thinking of Muller's etymology, but of another which he thought may have stood in Festus. Actually he was thinking of K. O. Müller's restoration of Festus, in a passage which Lindsay has now restored differently and, I think, convincingly. Here we must consider an ancient etymology of *nepos* which is impossible phonetically, but not quite so absurd as Müller thought (in his note on *Nepa* 'scorpius').<sup>13</sup>

## 2.2 The glosses in Paulus (163 L.) are as follows:

Neutiquam pro nullo modo.

Nepotes luxuriosae vitae homines appellati, etc. (above, 1.1).

Nepos compositum ab eo, quod natus post sit patri, quam filius.

Nefasti dies N littera notantur.

Nepa Afrorum lingua sidus, quod cancer appellatur, vel, ut quidam volunt, scorpius. Plautus "Dabo me ad parietem, imitabor nepam."

Nepus non purus.

2.3 The corresponding lines in the mutilated Codex Farnesianus of Festus, beginning with what is clearly the last line of the comment on *Neutiquam*, are as follows (with a few words or parts of words certainly to be restored from Paulus):

p. 162 L.

17 neutiquam  
Tuscis dicitur  
homines a<ppellati

20 sua famil<iaris  
vivunt. quod  
sit, quam fil<ius  
chus interpre<

πόδεσσιν

25 ti dies nōm<

p. 165 M.

7

10

νε->

<Nefas->

15

<sup>12</sup> This reservation first appeared in the third edition (Paris 1951), 776.

<sup>13</sup> In his edition of Festus (Leipzig 1839, repr. 1880), p. 164. Lindsay's Teubner text was published in 1913, his *editio maior* (in *Glossaria Latina*, vol. 4) in 1930. Frequent reference is also made below (section 3) to *GRF* = *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*, ed. H. Funaioli (Leipzig 1907). For further data on Festus, see R. Helm in *RE* 21 (1952) 2316-19 (Pompeius, No. 145).

and below, after the comment on *Nefasti dies*,

32 et aedes sacrari so<                      Nepa Afrorum lingua> 22  
sidus, quod dicitur nostris c<ancer, vel, ut quidam,>  
scorpios. Plautus in <Casina, etc.

**2.4** Our concern is with the first part of the comment (lines 17–18). If *luxuriosae vitae* is read at the end of line 18, Paulus can be followed verbatim to the end of the sentence (line 21), though the disparity in number of letters between lines 19 and 20 should warn us that these are not restorations but merely supplements to suggest the sense. What follows, beginning with *quod*, evidently corresponds to Paulus' second entry (Nepos compositum . . . quam filius), but then Festus had a section (22–24) which Paulus omitted entirely, in which someone was cited on *νεπόδεσσιν* in Apoll. *Arg.* 4.1745, as Müller saw. After the extended comment on *Nefasti dies*, we can follow Paulus again (Nepa Afrorum lingua sidus . . . imitabor nepam), leaving just room at the end of line 35 for Paulus' *Nepus non purus*.

**2.5** For the first part of the comment, Müller had suggested <Nepos luxuriosus a> Tuscis dicitur, <vel nepotes sunt luxuriosae vitae> homines appellati, quod, etc. Lindsay ignored this in his Teubner text, except for a lemma <Nepos>, but evidently Festus must have said something about an Etruscan origin of some word connected with *nepos*, whence Ernout's suspected popular etymology (2.1). The lemma in Paulus, however, is *Nepotes*, and if that stood in Festus, some other word must be the subject of *dicitur*. In his *editio maior* of Festus (p. 282), Lindsay therefore suggested: <Nepotes dicti aut quia scorpius a> Tuscis dicitur <nepa; aut ideo luxuriosae vitae> homines a<ppellati, quod non magis his res> sua famil<iaris curae est quam is quibus pater avusque> vivunt.

**2.6** Lindsay's *editio maior* of Festus was the culmination of his work on the medieval glossaries, in that here he utilized the evidence of glossaries which he thought had in some part been drawn from Festus, especially "Philoxenus" (edited by Laistner in *GL* 2) and "Abolita" (by Lindsay in *GL* 3).<sup>14</sup> In this place he cited no evidence, other than a reference to Paulus for *nepa* in the

<sup>14</sup> This "Philoxenus" is not, of course, the Alexandrian grammarian whom we discuss later (section 3). Lindsay suggested (*ed. maior*, p. 82) that the author (or director) of the compilation was in fact Columbanus; but this pseudepigraphous name for a Latin-Greek glossary testifies to the fame of the grammarian.

meaning 'scorpius.'<sup>15</sup> Yet I think he was entirely right, for there is good evidence that some ancient scholars had associated *nepa* 'scorpius' with *nepotes* 'luxuriosi.' This is in the "Placidus" glossary (GL 4, p. 29 = CGL 5.35.2 = 5.86.20 = 5.121.8) N 11: *Nepa scorpius quae natos consumit nisi eum qui dorso eius inhaeserit; rursus ipse qui servatus fuerit consumit patrem; unde homines qui bona parentum per luxuriam consumunt nepotes dicuntur; hinc quoque nepotatio pro luxuria ponitur, qua certae quaeque res consumuntur; cf. Isid. Etym. 10.193: Nepos dictus a genere quodam scorpionum qui natos suos consumit, excepto eum qui dorso eius insiderit, nam rursus ipse qui servatus fuerit consumit patrem; unde homines qui... consumuntur; cf. CGL 2.263.9: Nepa γήινος σκορπίος ὁ κατεσθίων τὰ ἴδια τέκνα; Schol. Lugd. Catil. 2.7 (= CGL 5.657.33): Nepa dicitur scorpius qui facit filios ducentos, qui omnes se consumunt et unus remanet; propterea qui res suas devorat nepos dicitur.*

2.7 Even if we discount the *ducentos*, the zoological information above is clearly fictitious—*eine Fabel*, as Stier calls it—and even though its substance is also to be found in Pliny and Antigonus Carystius.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the proposed etymology, *nepa*, -ae > *nepōs*, -ōtis, is impossible phonetically. But the passage of Placidus

<sup>15</sup> It is curious that Paulus asserts an African (Punic?) origin for the word, which occurs among *astrologorum signa* in Ennius (*ap. Cic. Rep.* 1.30) and in Cicero's translation of Aratus (*ND* 2.109), whereas Lindsay's restoration (if *Tusci* in the Codex Farnesianus is correct, on which see below, 3.9) gives it an Etruscan origin. But similar contradictions are not uncommon in ancient etymological discussions even of the same word; and Paulus' gloss on *nepa* in Plautus, standing after *Nefasti dies*, was clearly drawn from a grammarian's discussion (*cf. Non.* 145.12 M., where the meaning 'cancer' is rightly deduced from the passage in Plautus), whereas here the discussion of *nepotes* was etymological and largely Stoic: *Nepos quod est NATus POST patri!* The gloss on *Nepa* does not really support Lindsay's restoration, but it cannot be used against it, either.

The one passage known to me in which *nepa* is used of the actual animal is *Cic. Fin.* 5.42: *Quam similitudinem videmus in bestiis, quae primo...; deinde suo quaeque appetitu movetur: serpere anguiculos, nare anaticulas, evolare merulas, cornibus uti videmus boves, nepas aculeis, suam denique cuique naturam esse ad vivendum ducem.* (Here the MSS. of Cicero have *vespas*, but Nonius gives *nepas* in his citation of the passage [145.17 M.].) For the fact, *cf. Plin. HN* 11.87: *Semper (sc. scorpionum) cauda in ictu est nulloque momento meditari cessat, ne quando desit occasioni; ferit et obliquo ictu et inflexo.* It is also curious that one of Horace's uses of *nepos* (*Serm.* 2.1.53; see above, 1.4) follows immediately after his reference to the same Stoic doctrine (52 f.): *Dente lupus, cornu taurus petit; unde, nisi intus Monstratum?*

<sup>16</sup> Stier in *RE* 2.3 (1929) 1802, s.v. "Spinnenthier m. Skorpion." *Cf. Plin. HN* 11.91: *Quidam et ab ipsis (sc. scorpionibus) fetum devorari arbitrantur; unum modo relinqui sollertissimum et qui se ipsius matris clunibus imponendo tutus et a*

deserves more consideration than Müller (see above, 2.1) gave it. Granting that it seems absurd, though no more so than many another ancient etymology, the question must still be asked, why in the world should anyone have thought of a possible connection between *νερα* and *νερος*?

**2.8** The answer will readily occur to anyone who remembers the parable of the Prodigal Son (*Lk.* 15.13): *καὶ ἐκεῖ διεσκόρπισεν τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ζῶν ἁσώτως*. I do not mean to suggest there is any relationship between this etymology and Christian documents; the recurrence of ἁσώτος (see above, 1.2) in this context is probably mere coincidence. The verb *σκορπίζω* and its compounds were common enough in Hellenistic Greek, in the sense 'scatter (things),' 'rout (people).' Compare *Diosc.* 4.134: (*καλλίτριχον*) ἄλωπεκίας δασύνει χοιράδας σκορπίζει; *LXX* 2 *Kgs.* 22.15: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν βέλη καὶ ἐσκόρπισεν αὐτούς;<sup>17</sup> and in the *Magnificat* (*Lk.* 1.51): διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους, which may be compared with *Phil. Leg. alleg.* 2.87: ὁ δ' ἁσκητὴς δάκνεται μόνον ὑφ' ἡδονῆς καὶ σκορπίζεται, οὐ θανατοῦται. Though its documented occurrences are all late, we have Phrynichus' testimony (193 p. 295 R.) that *σκορπίζεται* was an Ionic word used by Hecataeus (*FGrH* 1, F 366) where Attic used *σκεδάννυται*, a fact which is consistent with the spread of the word in Hellenistic but not in classical Greek.

**2.9** Besides this general use, however, the verb was also bracketed with *οὐσία* or  *χρήματα* in the extended meaning 'squander,' 'waste.' Side by side with the parable (above), we may cite *Cat. Cod. Astr.* 2.162.7: τὸν πατρικὸν βίον σκορπίζουσιν—certainly a non-Christian source. Moreover, derivatives were formed from the word in this sense, an agent-noun *σκορπιστής* and an action-noun *σκορπισμός*; cf. *Cat. Cod. Astr.* 8 (4).154.7: ἐσπέριος δὲ (ὁ Ἑρμῆς) οὐ τηρητὴς οὐδὲ φύλαξ <χρημάτων> γενήσεται, ἀλλὰ σκορπιστὴς τῶν ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ κειμένων; *Artem. Onir.* 2.30: θάνατον προαγορεύει καὶ τῆς οὐσίας σκορπισμὸν καὶ διάλυσιν.<sup>18</sup>

cauda et a morsa loco fiat: hunc esse reliquorum ultorem, qui postremo genitores superne conficiat; *Antig. Mirab.* 87.

<sup>17</sup> The verb is obviously denominative from *σκορπίος*, and this passage suggests association with the ballistic engine also called *σκορπίος*. One might compare the connection between *musket* and *mosquito*, but such metaphors we must leave unexplained; see above, 1.14.

<sup>18</sup> *LSJ* cite another instance of *σκορπιστής* in this sense, from *Lyd. Mag.* 1.42, on which see below, 3.5.



**2.10** Given the existence in Hellenistic Greek of the series σκορπίζω 'squander,' σκορπιστής 'wastrel,' and σκορπισμός 'dissipation,' all based on σκορπίος 'scorpion,' and in Latin of the Augustan age the series nepotor, nepos, and nepotatus or nepotatio, corresponding exactly in meaning, we should not be at all surprised if some intelligent Greek, on learning Latin, should have put the two series together, hunted for a Latin word meaning 'scorpion' and, having found nepa, concluded that it was the base for nepos. Allowing for a certain laxness in his phonology, the semantic analogy would have seemed convincing to him: σκορπιστής : σκορπίζω : σκορπίος = nepos : nepotor : nepa.

**2.11** If such a person existed, and I think we can actually name him, he might or might not have felt it necessary to explain why nepa 'scorpius' had any connection with nepotes 'luxuriosi,' 'qui bona parentum per luxuriam consumunt.' He might have thought of the bit of folklore asserted as fact by Antigonus Carystius and thus have made some such statement as is found in Placidus and Isidore about the surviving scorpion qui consumit patrem. I am inclined to think, however, that the semantic analogy with σκορπίος and σκορπιστής would be quite sufficient explanation for him, and that the statement in Placidus is a later addition by someone who did not know Greek well enough to understand the analogy. This impression is supported by the fact that the one other ancient source which asserts a connection between nepa and nepotes (see below, 3.6) has quite a different story about the nature of the beast. The statement which Lindsay has suggested to fill out line 17 of the passage in Festus probably reflects accurately enough, as far as it goes, the view of our Greek scholar: Nepotes dicti quia scorpius a Tuscis dicitur nepa, except that he would also have stated the necessary comparison with Greek. In the next section (3.5-9) I shall try to show that we have other evidence for the original statement, including the equivalence of nepos and σκορπιστής. A Latin version, adapted for the purposes of a dictionary, can be restored in Festus, as follows:

- 17 neutiquam <..... Nepotes dicti quia scorpius a>  
 Tuscis dicitur <nepa, ut apud Graecos luxuriosae vitae>  
 homines a<ppellati σκορπισταί, quod non magis his res>  
 20 sua famil<iaris curae est quam is quibus pater avusque>  
 vivunt. quod <nomen ductum ab eo quod natus post patri>

Lines 18–21 now run to 43–45 letters each, a measure which, though a trifle long, is much more satisfactory than the fluctuating 39–34–45–43 letters posited by Lindsay and Müller.<sup>19</sup> As for Paulus, we can assume that he, like Placidus, failed to understand the Greek analogy, and therefore omitted it while condensing the words in the first part of the statement: *Nepotes luxuriosae vitae homines appellati, quod, etc.* Placidus, on the other hand, substituted a zoological explanation which seemed to fit the nature both of the scorpion and of *nepotes* ‘*luxuriosi*.’

### 3. PHILOXENUS

**3.1** If we had to guess the identity of the Greek scholar who made such remarkable use of semantic analogies between Greek and Latin word-families in sorting out the derivatives (τὰ παράγωγα) from the primitives (τὰ πρωτότυπα) our guess would certainly be Philoxenus, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, γραμματικός· ὃς ἐσοφίστευσεν ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Περὶ μονοσυλλάβων ῥημάτων κτλ. (Suid. Φ 394, ed. Adler). One of his works, unfortunately not listed in the Suda, is cited occasionally in Orion and the *Etymologica* under the title Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου; the fragments are collected by Funaioli, *GRF* 443–46. The period of his teaching in Rome is difficult to fix with precision. Reitzenstein believed that various echoes of Philoxenus’ doctrine could be found in Varro’s *De lingua Latina* and also that Philoxenus was a contemporary of Didymus, who is dated by the Suda to the time of Antony and Cicero and before Augustus. Funaioli, asserting that no sure trace of the work *On the Romans’ Dialect* is to be found in Varro, conservatively placed both scholars at the beginning of the Augustan age, i.e. after the *Grammaticae aetatis Varronianae fragmenta*.<sup>20</sup>

**3.2** Philoxenus is best known for his construction of monosyllabic verbal roots, like the *primigenia* of his otherwise unknown

<sup>19</sup> The lines in the adjoining undamaged column (13) of the Codex Farnesianus range from 34 to 48 letters in length, with the median at 42. (The count is from the printed text. The long lines contain an unusually large number of compendia, the short lines contain extra space left between one entry and the next.)

<sup>20</sup> See Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig 1897) 180, and his *M. Terentius Varro und Johannes Mauropus von Euchaita* (Leipzig 1901) 87; Funaioli, *GRF* (see above, note 13), xx–xxi. Wendel, in *RE* 20 (1941) 194, s.v. “Philoxenus, No. 27,” thinks a date in the first century B.C. is possible; J. Collart (*Varron Grammairien Latin* [Paris 1954] 95) accepts Philoxenus as being contemporary with Varro. A useful summary of Philoxenus’ doctrine is given by Fr. Muller, *De veterum imprimis Romanorum studiis etymologicis* (Utrecht 1910) 73–77; see also Wendel.

contemporary Cosconius (Varro, *LL* 6.36–39), each responsible for a large family of derived words, and each (usually) with multiple meanings, e.g. γῶ, with four meanings: γῶ, τὸ χωρῶ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ γῆ, ἡ πάντας χωροῦσα· γῶ, τὸ γανῶ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ γυνή· γῶ, τὸ λαμβάνω καὶ δέχομαι, ἐξ οὗ καὶ γαστήρ· γῶ, τὸ φωνῶ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ “ἦυσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον Δαναοῖσι γεγωνῶς” (*Il.* 8.227).<sup>21</sup> The meanings, deduced from the derivatives, were multiple; this was quite at variance with the Stoic doctrine of the origin of words φύσει (which they applied primarily to nouns rather than verbs) and could only be explained by the development of language, ἐξ ἱστορίας (cf. Varro, *LL* 8.6). Philoxenus, of course, did not always appeal to his roots; he did not always find a πρωτότυπον in a verb, and he sometimes did accept a Stoic etymology. Similarly, though he knew Tryphon’s theory of παθήματα (cf. Varro, *LL* 5.6), he did not always apply it. What is consistent about his methods is the use of analogy in arranging derivatives as well as inflected forms under a basic word and the care which he took to illustrate each meaning with an example. Relying on analogy, he did not hesitate to postulate a non-existent basic form from its assumed derivatives, and he even dared to contradict the authority of the Aristarchan school on a reading in Homer which was backed by the unanimous tradition of the manuscripts.<sup>22</sup>

**3.3** An excellent illustration of these tendencies is provided by Funaioli’s first fragment (from *Etym. gen.* p. 87 Reitz.; cf. *Etym. magn.* 148.16): ἄρπῶ· ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἄρπάζω· ἐν χρήσει μὲν οὐκ οἶδα <τὸ> πρωτότυπον. τὸ δὲ ἄρπῶ αὐτὸ παράγωγον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρπη παρηγμένον· ἄρπη δὲ ἐστὶν εἶδος ὀρνέου· ἄρπακτικὸν γάρ. ὡς φωνῆ φωνῶ, αὐδῆ αὐδῶ, σιγῆ σιγῶ, οὕτως ἄρπη ἄρπῶ. οὕτω Φιλόξενος περὶ Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου. He has constructed a family of words, ἄρπη > ἄρπῶ > ἄρπάζω > ἄρπακτικός, etc., all related in meaning. Ἄρπῶ is not attested, but he postulates its existence on the analogy φωνῆ: φωνῶ = σιγῆ: σιγῶ = ἄρπη: ἄρπῶ. He is not much concerned with the basic noun ἄρπη, which, as he doubtless knew,

<sup>21</sup> See Reitzenstein, *Gesch. d. gr. Etym.* 345. The words above come from the *Epimerismi psalmodum* of Choeroboscus p. 58.24 G., but the doctrine is known as Philoxenus’ from many similar passages which cite him by name and from the explicit reference to Philoxenus by Orion on γυνή (39.20).

<sup>22</sup> See Reitzenstein, *Varro u. Joh. Maur.* 80–88, 92, especially 84 ff., on a fragment of Herodian in which Philoxenus is censured by Tryphon and Didymus for having read φθισήνωρ in Homer (rather than φθεισ·).

had other meanings (cf. Hesych. A 7404 L.). He explains its existence in Stoic fashion, *φύσει*. What interests him in the first place is the analogy, then the semantic group in Greek, and finally, as Reitzenstein saw, the Latin family for the same meaning: *rapio*, *rapto*, *raptim*, *raptor*, etc.—which he could relate to the Greek forms through the *πάθημα* of metathesis.<sup>23</sup> Metathesis is in fact invoked in Funaioli's sixth fragment (from Orion p. 112.11), in which Philoxenus, observing that Greek *ξξ* and *ἔκτος* correspond to Latin *sex* and *sextus*, inferred that Greek *ξέστης* 'a sixth (of a measure)' must be Latin in origin: διὰ δὲ εὐφωνίαν τὸ σέξτης λέγεται ξέστης μεταθέσει τοῦ ξ. In this brilliant guess he was almost entirely right; the only qualification we should make is that *ξέστης* was modeled on Latin *sextarius* rather than *sextus* (see *LSJ*, s.v.). In this case he derived the Greek word from Latin. In the case of *ἄρπῳ*, he evidently derived Latin *rapio* from Greek. His object in studying the Latin language seems to have been to show that it was only another dialect of Greek. It had families of derivatives constructed on the same principles as Greek word-families, and for the same meanings; the borrowings, if any, were mutual.

**3.4** But—to return to *nepos*—we do not have to guess that it was Philoxenus who related it to *σκορπιστής*. We have the explicit testimony of Lydus, in a passage (*Mag.* 1.42) immediately following his assertion (quoted above, 1.9) that there was a *lex de nepotibus* and that *nepotes* had two meanings in Latin. In the long discussion eagerly offered by Lydus—as if διὰ βραχέων τὴν διαφορὰν εἰπεῖν—Philoxenus' name appears near the beginning, but without citation of a specific work. While we may agree with Funaioli's judgment in printing the first part of the discussion as a fragment (No. 12, p. 446) of Philoxenus which is very likely to have come from his book on the Romans' dialect, it is very difficult to decide just which statements derive from Philoxenus and which are additions made by Lydus himself, either by way of interpretation or, perhaps, drawing from some

<sup>23</sup> See Reitzenstein, *Varro u. Joh. Maur.* 87, and more explicitly in *RE* 6 (1907) 810 s.v. "Etymologika": "Die lateinische Sprache gibt in den vielen griechischen analogen Etymologien nicht mehr den Beweis dafür, dass alle Sprache *φύσει* ist; sie ist vielmehr aus denselben Wurzeln wie die griechische erwachsen: aus dem Worte *ἄρπῳ*, dass nach den Ableitungen zu postulieren ist, erwächst durch *μετάθεσιν* *rapo* und *rapio*." On *rapo*, which Reitzenstein had not noted in 1901, see below, note 45. *Rapio* and its derivatives are regularly glossed by a form of *ἄρπάζω*; see *GGL* 7.

other source.<sup>24</sup> We may also agree that the fantastic folktale about the scorpion's hibernation (lines 10–18 below) was not drawn from Philoxenus, but even the first part, which Funaioli accepted, requires critical examination, and, on the other hand, even after the folktale, comes the statement we are looking for.

### 3.5 Lyd. *Mag.* 1.42:

- Νέπως ὁ νέος παῖς ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς ἐτυμολογίας ὁ ἔγγονος  
λέγεται, ὡς καλῶς ὁ Φιλόξενος εἶπεν. νεβος δὲ καὶ  
ὁ ἄσωτος, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ τροπικῶς. καὶ κατὰ θεωρίαν  
5 ῥωμαῖοι πατρίως νέπαν καλοῦσιν, οἷονεῖ ἅποδα κατὰ  
στέρησιν (τὴν γὰρ νε συλλαβὴν στερητικῶ τρόπῳ λαμβάνουσι ῥωμαῖοι, ὥσπερ Ἕλληνες νήλιπος νήχυτος νήγρετος νήδυμος) ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν συμβαινόντος τῷ  
θηρίῳ.
- 10 ὥρα γὰρ χειμῶνος καὶ αὐτὸς εἰκότως ὁ σκορπίος τῇ γῇ καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ἐρπετῶν ὑπονεκρωθεὶς κείται, μηδὲν ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὴν ἐσθίων. ἥνικα οὖν πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐδώδιμον γῆν ἑαυτῷ δαπανήσῃ, τῶν ἰδίων καθάπτεται πλεκτανῶν καὶ πᾶσας αὐτὰς ἀνεπαισθήτως καταναλίσκει. ἦρος δὲ ἀνακαλοῦντος  
15 αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς φῶς νόμῳ τῆς φύσεως, ἀναποδοῦνται καὶ πρὸς καλαμίνθην τὸ φυτὸν ἐρχόμενος μόνῃ τῇ ἀφῇ τῆς βοτάνης ἀναλαμβάνει τὸ δριμύ καὶ στεγανοῦται, καθάπερ ὀφεις τῇ μαράθῳ ὅθεν καὶ νεπέταν τὴν καλαμίνθην ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν.
- ταύτῃ <τοῦς> σκορπιστὰς νέπωντας ἀποκαλοῦσιν  
20 αὐτοί, οἷα τῶν ἰδίων μελῶν διαφθορεῖς.
- 2 νεβος cod.; v. supra, 1.9, annot. 5 19 σκορπιστὰς  
νέπωντας cod., τοὺς σκορπιστὰς νέπωντας Bekker.

3.6 The only part of this passage which is explicitly assigned to Philoxenus is the first sentence, in which *Νέπως ὁ νέος παῖς* looks suspiciously like a Stoic etymology.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless some of the following statements must also be given to Philoxenus, at least the clause *ὅτι τὸν σκορπίον . . . νέπαν καλοῦσιν* (4–5).

<sup>24</sup> See Klotz in *RE* 13 (1927) 2210–17, s.v. “Lydos, No. 7.” Lydus usually cites only his ultimate source, not the proximate one. He had read much, but (2216) “seine Kenntnisse nicht ohne Irrtümer, Missverständnisse und Flüchtigkeiten anzuwenden weiss, da er offenbar viel aus dem Gedächtnis zitiert.”

<sup>25</sup> Compare Paulus' separate entry (163.9 L.; above 2.2): *Nepos compositum ab eo, quod NAtus POSit patri, quam filius.* A Stoic etymology in Philoxenus would not be surprising; cf. Funaioli, Fgt. 5 (on *μοχλός*) and Reitzenstein, *Varro u. Joh. Maur.* 87. I am inclined to think, however, that the words *ὁ νέος παῖς* are an addition by Lydus, and that Philoxenus gave a different Greek etymology for *νεβος* in the sense *ἔγγονος*; see below, 3.13 and note 28.

Wuensch suggested that τοῖς Ἑλλήσι in line 4 is a cover for Philoxenus and that his discussion extended at least to the beginning of the parenthesis in line 6.<sup>26</sup> Funaioli accepted even more, as far as line 9, as a fragment of Philoxenus. It must be noted, however, that the argument appealing to the privative *ne-* really explains νέπους, -ποδος, not *nepa*, which shows no trace of the stem ποδ-. Νέπους is a Homeric γλῶσσα, occurring only in the phrase φῶκαι νέποδες at *Od.* 4.404, variously interpreted by the grammarians, and also re-used by Hellenistic poets in the sense 'descendant' or 'fish';<sup>27</sup> compare Apollon. *Lex.* (citing Apion) s.v. Νέποδες: ἄποδες, ἢ νηξίποδες, ἢ ἀπόγονοι. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄποδες, ψεῦδος· ἔχουσι γὰρ πόδας αἱ φῶκαι. τὸ δὲ ἀπόγονοι παράκουσμα τῶν νεωτέρων ποιητῶν, and (for νε στερητικόν) *Etyim. magn.* 601.29 (citing Orus): Νέποδες, οἱ ἰχθύες· παρὰ τὴν νε στέρησιν καὶ τοὺς πόδας, οἱ ποδῶν ἐστερημένοι.<sup>28</sup> Lydus, or his immediate source, appears to have confused information bearing on νέπους, which he somehow connected with *nepos*, with Philoxenus' explanation of *nepos* 'ἄσωτος' in terms of *nepa*, and thus to have inferred that it was the scorpion which was ἄπους. This mistaken notion led him—willingly enough, no doubt—to the winsome tale which purports to explain how the scorpion was footless during hibernation and also—by a stroke of virtuosity—how the herb catnip came to be called *nepeta*.<sup>29</sup> This is fantastic indeed, but Philoxenus may well have

<sup>26</sup> Wuensch (praef. xxxvi) rendered the passage: Philoxenus dixit, 'nepos etiam dissolutus, quod et ipsum tropice est accipiendum.' et quantum ad cognoscendam originem (*θεωρίαν*), fortasse Graecis (h. e. Philoxeno) concedendum est, Romanos τὸν σκορπίον nepam vocare, tamquam pedibus privatum.

<sup>27</sup> See *LSJ*, s.v. and, for a fuller but admirably concise statement of the facts, R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, vol. 1 (Oxford 1949), p. 385 on Fgt. 533. The word occurs four times in the fragments of Callimachus, always in the sense 'descendant.'

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *Etyim. Gud.* 405.51; Suid. N 250. Orus (*Etyim. magn.*) continued with: καὶ ὅτε τίθεται ἐπὶ ἀπόδων γενῶν, ἢ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν βρεφῶν τῶν μήπω τοῖς ποσὶ κεκρημένων. Here the words τῶν βρεφῶν may explain Lydus' ὁ νέος παῖς and ἡ μεταφορὰ the clause ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ τροπικῶς. The latter cannot have stood in Philoxenus, for he was explaining *nepos* 'ἄσωτος' not as a figurative extension of *nepos* 'ἐγγονος' but as a separate expression, derived from *nepa*.

<sup>29</sup> I can find no trace of the tale itself, and one would hardly expect to find any, but some of the elements out of which it was concocted can be suggested. (1) Scorpions were said to devour earth (*Plin. HN* 10.198). A dead scorpion could be revived if one smeared it with the juice of hellebore (*Plin. HN* 25.122). (2) Serpents on emerging from hibernation eat young fennel-shoots as an aid to shedding their old skins (*Nic. Ther.* 31–34, cf. 390 ff. and Schol. 391 [ed. Keil, Leipzig 1856]; *Plin. HN* 20.254 and 8.98) and restore their damaged vision by rubbing their eyes with fennel (*Plin.*

said something to initiate the association of *νερός* and *νέπους*, and we shall later have to examine this possibility (below, 3.11). For the present, we exclude everything from *οίονεῖ ἄποδα* in line 5 to *νεπέταν τὴν καλαμίνθην* 'Ρωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν in line 18, and concentrate on what Philoxenus said about *νερά* in connection with *νερός*.

**3.7** The result, if we bracket a few expressions as additions by way of ascription or interpretation by Lydus, is as follows:

Νέπως [ὁ νέος παῖς] ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς ἐτυμολογίας ὁ ἔργονος  
λέγεται [ὡς καλῶς ὁ Φιλόξενος εἶπεν]. Νερός δὲ καὶ  
ὁ ἄσωτος, [ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ τροπικῶς. καὶ κατὰ θεωρίαν  
τάχα τοῖς Ἑλλήσι παραχωρητέον] ὅτι τὸν σκορπίον  
5 οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι πατρίως νέπαν καλοῦσιν. . . ταύτῃ <τοὺς>  
σκορπιστὰς νέπωντας ἀποκαλοῦσιν αὐτοί, ὅτα τῶν ἰδίων  
[μελῶν] διαφθορεῖς.

In the last clause, we need only exclude the one word as an insertion by Lydus. All the rest is consistent with what we know of Philoxenus' methods elsewhere and with the other traces of what we now see was his doctrine on *νερός* 'luxuriosus' as derived from *νερά*.

**3.8** The words *ταύτῃ . . . διαφθορεῖς* could in fact be translated by Placidus' clause (above, 2.6): unde homines qui bona parentum per luxuriam consumunt nepotes dicuntur.<sup>30</sup> In Placidus, the clause follows the folktale about the scorpion *qui consumit patrem*, just as in Lydus it is made to conclude the explanation of *nepotes* by way of a quite different folktale (see above,

HN 8.99; Ael. HA 9.16; Isid. Etym. 17.11.4; see Olck in RE 6 [1909] 2175, s.v. "Fenchel"). (3) *καλαμίνθη* is glossed by Latin *nepeta* in various places: Diosc. 3.35 f. (ed. Wellman); GGL 2.133.30, etc.; and, notably, by Hesychius in a gloss (N 374: Νέπιτα· ἢ καλαμίνθη) which stands next to glosses on *νέποδες* (375) and *νεπόδων* (376); cf. Philox. (GL 2) NE 34 *Nepita, καλαμίνθη*, sandwiched between NE 33 *Nepotatus, ἄσωτία* and 35 *Nepa, σκορπίος*. Philoxenus would not have included *nepeta* in the family based on *νερά*, since there is no semantic connection. The connection in Lydus is pure invention, of a piece with the adaptation of folklore concerning serpents to the "footless" scorpion.

<sup>30</sup> For the rendering of *σκορπιστάς*, compare *Cat. Cod. Astr.* 2.162.7: τὸν πατρικὸν βίον σκορπίζουσιν, and Artem. Onir. 2.30: τῆς οὐσίας σκορπισμὸν καὶ διάλυσιν (both cited above, 2.9). Compare also the contexts for *νερός* in Cicero (*qui sua disperdit*) and Horace (*qui sua spargit*) cited above, 1.10.1, and the last clause of the gloss on *Catil.* 2.7 (above, 2.6): propterea qui res suas devorat nepos dicitur. But in speaking of translations, we should suppose that Philoxenus rendered in Greek the explanations of Roman commentators of his day, rather than the reverse.

2.11). In both cases, the later authors chose to interpret *διαφθορεῖς* in Philoxenus, by which he referred merely to the destruction or dissipation of family property,<sup>31</sup> as meaning the literal consumption or devouring, in the one case of the scorpion's limbs, in the other of the scorpion's parent.<sup>32</sup>

**3.9** In Festus, these same words are represented, if my restoration above (2.11) is correct, by the clause: ut apud Graecos luxuriosae vitae homines appellati *σκορπισταί*. The clause guaranteed by Paulus, quod non magis his res sua familiaris curae est, etc., seems to be an expansion of Philoxenus' *Nepos* δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄσωτος in terms of the normal meaning of *nepos* (*filius filii* = *ἐγγονος*),<sup>33</sup> in the belief, also held by Porphyrio (above, 1.12) and Lydus (see fn. 28), that *nepotes* in the sense '*luxuriosi*' was a metaphorical extension thereof (see 1.1). The opening clause, as restored by Lindsay (2.11), is now seen to correspond to Philoxenus' *ὅτι τὸν σκορπίον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι πατριῶς νέπαν καλοῦσιν*, except for the puzzling *Tuscis* in the Codex Farnesianus (see above, fn. 15). If we suppose that this conceals Festus' *nostris*, then the correspondence will be exact: *Nepotes dicti quia scorpis a nostris dicitur nepa*.

**3.10** The passage as cited by Lydus is consistent with Philoxenus' doctrine on *nepa*, but of course Lydus may not have cited all of it. It is likely, for example, that Philoxenus continued with other members of his semantic analogy. Besides *nepa* to *σκορπίος* and *nepotes* to *σκορπισταί* we might expect a further equation with *nepotor* to *σκορπίζειν* and with *nepotatus* or *nepotatio* to *σκορπισμός*; see above, 2.8–10. Some evidence that Philoxenus actually did continue can perhaps be found in Placidus' gloss on *Nepa* (above, 2.6), which, just after the clause which is so close to Philoxenus' words as to seem a translation, continues with: hinc quoque nepotatio pro luxuria ponitur, qua certae quaeque res consumuntur. This in turn may have some bearing on Lydus' *titulus* for a sumptuary law, *De nepotibus* (*Mag.* 1.42; above, 1.9).

**3.11** A more important question is whether Lydus could have found something in Philoxenus which induced him to connect

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *LSJ* for *διαφθορεῖς* as used with *νόμων* or *ἀνθρώπων* and for *διαφθορά* as used with *πόλεως* or *ὀμμάτων*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *CGL* 2.344.48: *καταφαγᾶς*: *nepa*, *comisator*, *vorax*, *comesor*.

<sup>33</sup> *Nepos* and *ἐγγονος* are frequently equated in glosses, e.g. *CGL* 2.283.19.



*nepos* with νέπους and thus to apply information which really bears on νέπους to the explanation of *nepos* in the sense *luxuriosus* (ἄσωτος); see above, 3.6. In this connection we must observe that Festus' article on *Nepotes*, most of which was drawn from Philoxenus, does not end with the Stoic etymology of *nepos* in its ordinary sense 'filius filii' (quod natus post sit patri, quam filius). Though Paulus neglected them altogether, there are two more lines in the Codex Farnesianus before we come to the next entry, *Nefasti dies*; see above, 2.3. One of them (24 of Lindsay's page 162) begins with the letters ποδεσσιν clearly visible in the facsimile as being written in Greek characters.<sup>34</sup> It would appear that here too we have information bearing on the Homeric gloss νέπους and that the word was cited in the dative plural form νεπόδεσσιν. If so, the quotation must be from the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes (4.1745): τεοῖς νεπόδεσσιν ἐτόλμη—the only place in the Greek literature so far recovered where the word occurs in the dative plural. Müller, following Ursinus, therefore restored the three lines as follows:

sit, quam fil<ius. Quidam, inter quos Aristar->  
chus interpre<s Homeri, Graecum putant, qui τεοῖσι νε->  
πόδεσσιν <ἐτόλμη afferunt ex Apollonio. Nefas->

Of this, Lindsay printed in his Teubner text the Greek words and *Aristarchus interpretes Homeri* as being reasonably certain and in his *editio maior* he accepted the whole sentence, including Müller's unmetrical τεοῖσι. If the first part of the restoration can be allowed to stand, then we would have a Greek etymology for *nepotes* (i.e. as drawn from νέποδες), and if Philoxenus had said something similar, Lydus would have had some grounds for his confusion.

**3.12** It is true that some modern scholars have supposed an etymological connection between *nepos* 'grandson,' which is certainly of Indo-European origin, and the word νέπους, which—whatever its meaning in *Od.* 4.404—was undoubtedly used by Callimachus and other Alexandrian poets in the sense 'descendant,' e.g. Callim. Fgt. 222 Pfeiffer (77 Schneider, from Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 2.9, as corrected by Scaliger), referring to Simonides,

<sup>34</sup> *Codex Festi Farnesianus XLII tabulis expressus*, ed. Thewrewk de Ponor (Budapest 1893), Qu. ix, Col. 14, line 14.

ὁ Κεῖος Ὑλίου νέπους.<sup>35</sup> Despite the criticisms of Apion and other lexicographers (see above, 3.6), we know that Aristophanes of Byzantium accepted the meaning 'descendants' for νέποδες, listing it with ἱνιες among other equivalents for ἔκγονοι.<sup>36</sup> It is also true that scholars of the sixteenth century, when discussing Ursinus' restoration of Festus, were able to appeal to a comment of Eustathius on *Od.* 4.404 (1502.37, following νέποδες γάρ φασι θαλάσσης αἱ φῶκαι, ὃ ἐστὶ τέκνα), which they read in the form νέπως γὰρ κατὰ τινα γλώσσαν, ὁ ἀπόγονος.<sup>37</sup> The true reading, however, is νέπους, and the gloss in question is probably Aristophanes', as Pfeiffer suggests (cf. above, note 36). There is no support, then, for Ursinus' restoration, other than the etymological context in Festus. This has some weight, to be sure, yet it would be very strange if Aristarchus had gone so far out of his way as to comment on a Latin word.<sup>38</sup> Some other restoration of Festus should be sought.

**3.13** It would also be very strange if Philoxenus had associated νέπους with *nepos* in the sense *luxuriosus*, for which he had a different explanation. He might well, however, have noted the coincidence in the meaning ἀπόγονοι or ἔκγονοι of νέποδες in the Alexandrian poets with the normal meaning of *nepotes* in Latin,

<sup>35</sup> See Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*<sup>4</sup> (Heidelberg 1950), s.v. νέποδες, and the discussion by Pariente (above, note 11), 107–22. Bérard, *Introduction à l'Odyssee* (Paris 1924) 1.198, suggested that *gens humida ponti* in Verg. *Georg.* 4.429 is a rendering of *Od.* 4.404 made with the equivalence of νέποδες and *nepotes* in mind.

<sup>36</sup> Pfeiffer (on Callimachus, Fgt. 533; see above, note 27) refers to E. Müller's publication (*Mélanges de littérature grecque* [Paris 1868]) of new fragments of Aristophanes' Γλώσσαι from an Athonian codex, under ἡλικιῶν ὀνόματα (p. 434). Fresenius (*De Léxeon Aristophaneorum et Suetonianarum excerptis Byzantinis* [Aquis Mattiacis 1875] p. 127) placed it under Περὶ πολιτικῶν ὀνομάτων. See Cohn in *RE* 2 (1895) 100 ff., s.v. "Aristophanes, No. 14."

<sup>37</sup> E.g., Ant. Augustinus, as cited in the Delphin edition of Festus (London 1826); see also Müller's note on νεπόδεσιν ἐρούμη. Augustinus doubted whether <Aristar>chus or <Callima>chus was to be read in Festus, while Scaliger voted definitely for Callimachus when he corrected the manuscripts to give what is now the accepted reading of Callim. Fgt. 222 (cited above); see his *Coniectanea in Varronem* (on *LL* 5.95) as cited in the Bipontine edition of Varro (1788), vol. 2, p. 64.

<sup>38</sup> Müller in his supplementary note (p. 387) supposed that the Alexandrian poets had learned the Latin word in Sicily; see also his *Die Etrusker* (ed. Deecke, Stuttgart 1877), vol. 1, p. 5: "Endlich behaupte ich auch noch, dass wenn bei den Alexandrinischen Dichtern scheinbar Lateinische Worte vorkommen, wie νέποδες für *nepotes* bei Theokrit und Kallimachos, sie ihnen auch nicht von Latium, sondern aus Sicilien zugekommen sind..." Just conceivably, this could be so, but it has no bearing on Ursinus' restoration, which asserts that the borrowing was in the opposite direction.

and he might have stated this fact in the form of an etymology, for he treated the Latin language as a dialect of Greek (see above, 3.3). If we suppose that Philoxenus had said something like Lydus' νέπως ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς ἐτυμολογίας ὁ ἔγγονος λέγεται and had then documented his assertion by quoting Callimachus' Ὑλῆχου νέπους (Fgt. 222), or Ἰασίδος νέποδες (Fgt. 66) or θαλασσαίων νεπόδων (Fgt. 533)<sup>39</sup> or Theocritus' εἰοὶ νέποδες (Id. 17.25) or Apollonius' τεοῖς νεπόδεσσιν (Arg. 4.1745), or several of these passages, his own doctrine on *nepos* 'luxuriosus' would not be impaired, and we could understand how Lydus, knowing the other interpretation of νέποδες in Homer as meaning ἀποδες (above, 3.6),<sup>40</sup> was led astray. And, noting that in Festus too the quotation from Apollonius follows an etymology of *nepos* in its ordinary meaning (*filius filii*), we can then restore the last lines of the article in the Codex Farnesianus, from the point where we left off above (2.11), as follows:

vivunt. quod <nomen ductum ab eo quod natus post patri>  
sit, quam fil<ius, vel quod Graeci posteros, ut Callima->  
chus interpre<tatur, νέποδας dicant, item τεοῖς νε->  
πόδεσσιν <εἰοίμην Apollonius in Argonauticis. Nefas->

For the length of the lines, see above, note 19, and for *interpretatur* in the sense 'render,' Quint. 8.6.44: ἀλληγορία, quam inversionem interpretantur.

**3.14** This restoration will, I think, fit the requirements of both space and context in Festus. It will be consistent with what we know of Philoxenus' activities and theories elsewhere, with the semantic histories of the Latin word *nepos* and the Greek word

<sup>39</sup> This fragment is preserved in a gloss which sounds very much like Philoxenus speaking, *Etym. Gud.* p. 380.20 Sturz: μάταιος· παρὰ τὸ μάτος, ὅπερ εἴρηται παρὰ τὴν ἄτην μάτιος, ὡς φίλος φίλος καὶ φίλαιος (i.e. Φίλαιος), οὕτω μάτιος, ἀφ' οὗ μάτια καὶ μάταιος, ὡς παρὰ τὸ θάλασσα θαλάσσιος θαλασσαῖος. Καλλίμαχος "πολυθαλασσίων μανδότρ' . . ἐπιδών" (which was then corrected by Ernesti from Herodian). Μάτος is a very rare word and μάτιος is non-existent but could be assumed from Homeric *ματίη*. On the derivation of μάτος from ἄτη, compare Philoxenus' methods in his *Περὶ ἀναδιπλῆσαισμοῦ*, by which he understood not merely reduplication in the narrow sense but also extensions of the stem, whether by the insertion of αλ (εἰδάλμιος) or ν (γυνή) or by the prefixing of μ (μάγειρος), or μα (μασῶμαι), or ο (ὄχλος); see Wendel in *RE* on Philoxenus (above, note 20), Col. 197. See H. Kleist's dissertation (*De Philoxeni studiis etymologicis* [Greifswald 1865]), from which Wendel drew, 49–51.

<sup>40</sup> This too could have stood in Philoxenus, who was not averse from citing other theories at variance with his own; see Funaioli, Fgt. 9 (*GRF*, p. 445).

νέπους, and with the remains of ancient scholarship devoted to explaining them. If it is accepted, along with our previous restoration of Festus, in which we followed Lindsay, and with our interpretation of the vexed passage in Lydus, which alone mentions the name of Philoxenus, we shall have thrown new light on the impact on Roman lexicography of that remarkable scholar. The Romans seem to have suppressed his name entirely, at the same time adopting at least some of his etymological theory.

**3.15** It would be interesting and useful to search elsewhere for the influence of Philoxenus on Roman lexicography. While I cannot now undertake this task, I can suggest two lines of approach. The first is to examine carefully Funaioli's fragments of the *Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου* and try to imagine to what Latin context they could apply. Most of them seem to be concerned with purely Greek matters (Fgt. 6, above, 3.3, is a notable exception), and this is natural enough in view of their preservation in Greek lexicographers, but, following Reitzenstein's suggestion concerning the first fragment (above, 3.3), we ought to be able to turn up at least some material for study. Consider, for example, the tenth fragment (from Orion p. 157.11): *ὑπέρινον τὸ σφόδρα λεπτόν· ἰνῶ ἐστὶ ῥῆμα τὸ ἐκκενῶ· ὅθεν ὑπέρινον ἄνδρα λέγουσι τὸν λεπτὸν καὶ κενὸν σαρκῶν*. For the Greek usage, cf. Arist. *GA* 750A 29: *ὑπέρινοι γὰρ γίνονται καὶ οἱ ὄρνιθες καὶ τὰ φυτά*, where *LSJ* render the Greek word 'exhausted (by production).' The Latin equivalent, semantically, would be *exilis*, and when we find in Paulus the gloss (71.4 L.), *Exiles et ilia a tenuitate inarum, quas Graeci in chartis ita appellant, videntur esse dicta*,<sup>41</sup> it seems very likely that here we have another trace of Philoxenus' doctrine. And in this case the doctrine could be right at least to the extent of deriving *exilis* from *ilia*.<sup>42</sup>

**3.16** The other approach is to search through the Roman lexicographers for doctrines which we know were characteristic of Philoxenus. For example, his method of comparing Latin and Greek semantic groups is beautifully illustrated by a fragment

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Paul. Fest. 92.31: *Ilia dicta ab ina, quae pars chartae est tenuissima*.

<sup>42</sup> See Ernout & Meillet, s.v. *exilis*, noting Niedermann's revival of Corssen's theory, based on Paulus 71.4.

which leads us back beyond Festus and Verrius Flaccus to Varro himself (Non. 53.28 M.): Faenus ab eo dictum est, quod pecuniam pariat increscentem tempore, quasi fetus aut fetura; nam et graece τόκος dicitur ἀπὸ τοῦ τίκτειν, quod est parere; cf. Paul. Fest. 76.9 L. (cf. 83.8): Fenus et feneratores et lex de credita pecunia fenebris, a fetu dicta, quod crediti nummi alios pariant, ut apud Graecos eadem res τόκος dicitur. Nonius then continues, Varro lib. iii de Latino sermone: "fenus autem dictum a fetu et quasi fetura quadam pecuniae." Nam et Catonem et ceteros antiquiores sine a littera faenus pronuntiasse contendit, ut fetus et fecunditas; cf. Gell. 16.12.7, citing the same passage from Varro but using *faenerator* as the lemma.<sup>43</sup> All the indicia here point straight to Philoxenus: a monosyllabic verbal root \*fē- deduced from a family of derivatives whose semantic spread is explained by the analogy of Greek τίκτω: τόκος; and in this case modern comparative philology would agree that almost all of the elements concerned are rightly apprehended.<sup>44</sup> Again it seems most likely that Philoxenus was the originator of the doctrine; if so, Varro appropriated it, tacitly, and, while noting the evidence for the sound fē-, preferred the spelling in *fae-* (cf. LL 7.96).

**3.17** These identifications, of course, are at best conjectural, but I think that further study along these lines might lead to some impressive results. Enough has been said for the present to indicate the fascination of the subject.<sup>45</sup> Philoxenus made many mistakes, but he was certainly the most original of ancient linguistic scholars and sometimes anticipated the results of modern philology. As Wendel says (*RE* 20.200), in his fully developed system he represents the high point of ancient etymological theory.

<sup>43</sup> See Funaioli, *GRF* p. 201, Varro, Fgt. 36 = Goetz & Schoell (*Varronis de Lingua Latina quae supersunt* [Leipzig 1910]), Fgt. 57.

<sup>44</sup> See Ernout & Meillet, s.v. *fēcundus* for the IE root \*dhē- 'suckle' seen also in *fēmīna*, *fētus*, and other Latin words including *fēnum* and *fēnus*. Τίκτω (\*τι-τκ-ω), τέκνον and τόκος come from a different root, of course.

<sup>45</sup> Also, I think, to confirm Reitzenstein's opinion of the date of Philoxenus in relation to Varro (see above, 3.1 and note 20). To the evidence just considered (3.16) we should add the observation that the word *rapō* (see above, note 23) is attested only in Varro; see Non. 26.23 M. (L. 38) citing Varro's *Papia Papae*. The word is probably a creation from *rapio* on the model of Plautus' *harpago* (both noun and verb) from ἀρπάζω.