

TOWARDS AN EDITION OF FRAGMENTS:
CITING AUTHORITIES AND THE CASE OF AULUS GELLIUS AND VARRO¹

«An account of Varro as antiquarian is perhaps impossible without assembling as well the numerous fragments of Varro to be found only in Gellius»

E. Gunderson, *Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library*, Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin, 2009, p.11

This brief essay has two purposes. First, it presents the citations of Varro which can be found in Aulus Gellius. Gellius is one of the most important sources for Varro, and so this exercise is important in itself, and as part of the increasing recognition of the need to understand the citing practices of authors when creating editions of fragments. Second, but consequently, the essay will demonstrate the need for a new edition of Varro's fragments and indicate some of the ways in which it might be constructed.

On the issue of citing authorities, in the process of creating the edition of the fragments of the Roman historians, it became clear to us that one of the most significant tasks was to assess the purposes for which various authorities cited their sources. Various assumptions had been made about the nature of individual works, and about the shape of Roman historiography, but to some degree these had neglected the interests of citing sources.²

To take two examples. Fenestella has not been given much credit as a Roman historian, being regarded instead as a rather tedious pedant. However, in his own times he was sufficiently successful to have been epitomised. Moreover, eight of the thirty fragments of his works, which we have taken as historical, were cited by Pliny the Elder in his encyclopaedic *Natural History*. In other words, he provided information which was useful to Pliny, especially on dining and dress, but we do not know the historical context. Nevertheless it is not unreasonable to think that Fenestella may have taken a somewhat moralising view.³

F24 for instance presents the steady growth in the complexity of Italian table stands:

Fenestella *FRHist*, 70 F 24 *ap. Pliny nat.* XXXIII 146

Cornelius Nepos tradit ante Sullae uictoriam duo tantum triclinia Romae fuisse argentea. **repositoriis argentum addi sua memoria coeptum** Fenestella, qui obiit nouissimo Tiberi Caesaris principatu, **ait et testudinea tum in usum uenisse, ante se autem paulo lignea, rotunda, solida nec multo maiora quam mensas fuisse, se quidem puero quadrata et compacta aut acere operta aut citro coepisse,**

¹ I am immensely grateful to Valentina Arena and Giorgio Piras for co-organising the conference at the British School at Rome and the University la Sapienza Rome at this paper which was first presented. This is a lightly revised version of that paper.

² See *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, general editor T.J. Cornell, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013 (hereafter *FRHist*), especially vol. 1 pp. 38-45. On editions of fragments generally, see *Collecting Fragments: Fragmente sammeln*, ed. by G.W. Most, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1997.

³ Fenestella *FRHist*, 70, vol. 1 pp. 489-96.

mox additum argentum in angulos lineasque per commissuras, tympana uero se iuene appellata, tum a stateris et lances, quas antiqui magides uocauerant.

Cornelius Nepos records that before Sulla's victory there had been only two sets of dining-couches adorned with silver at Rome. Fenestella, who died in the last years of Tiberius Caesar's principate, says that **silver began to be added to portable stands within his own memory and that stands adorned with tortoiseshell then came into fashion; shortly before his day, however, they were of wood, round, of one single piece and not much larger than tables; but even during his childhood they began to be square and composite, with a veneer of either maple or citrus wood; soon silver was added to the corners and the lines that ran along the seams; but when he was a young man they were called 'tympana' ['drums'] and then also what earlier generations had called 'magides' ['dishes'] were termed 'lances' ['pans'] on analogy with a pair of scales**.⁴

Here and elsewhere Fenestella refers to the introduction of luxury – so in F25 (*ap. Pliny nat. IX 123*) he records the increasing use of pearl after the conquest of Egypt. This fascination with materials, but at the same time a consciousness of the dangers of luxury, is very similar to what we see in Pliny himself, where the misuse of the wonders of the earth is challenged.

A good example is the section on clothing at *Pliny nat. VIII 194-97*:

Lanam in colu et fuso Tanaquilis, quae eadem Gaia Caecilia vocata est, in templo Sancus durasse prodente se auctor est M. Varro factamque ab ea togam regiam undulatam in aede Fortunae, qua Ser. Tullius fuerat usus. inde factum ut nubentes virgines comitaretur colus compta et fusus cum stamine. ea prima texuit rectam tunicam, quales cum toga pura tironi induuntur novaeque nuptae. [195] undulata vestis prima e lautissimis fuit; inde sororiculata defluxit. togas rasas Phryxianas Divi Augusti novissimis temporibus coepisse scribit Fenestella. crebrae papaveratae antiquiorem habent originem iam sub Lucili poeta in Torquato notatae. praetextae apud Etruscos originem inveniunt. trabeis usos accipio reges; pictae vestes iam apud Homerum sunt iis, et inde triumphales natae. [196] acu facere id Phryges invenerunt, ideoque Phrygioniae appellatae sunt. aurum intexere in eadem Asia invenit Attalus rex, unde nomen Attalicis. colores diversos picturae intexere Babylon maxime celebravit et nomen inposuit. plurimis vero liceis texere, quae polymita appellant, Alexandria instituit, scutulis dividere Gallia. Metellus Scipio tricliniaria Babylonica sestertium octingentis milibus venisse iam tunc ponit in Catonis criminibus, quae Neroni principi quadragiens sestertio nuper steterunt. [197] Servi Tulli praetextae, quibus signum Fortunae ab eo dicatae coopertum erat, duravere ad Seiani exitum, mirumque fuit neque diffluxisse eas neque teredinum iniurias sensisse annis quingentis sexaginta. vidimus iam et viventium vellera purpura, cocco, conchylio sesquipedalibus libris infecta, velut illa sic nasci cogente luxuria.

Marcus Varro informs us, on his own authority, that the wool on the distaff and spindle of Tanaquil (who was also called Gaia Caecilia) was still preserved in the temple of Sancus; and also in the shrine of Fortuna a pleated royal robe made by her which had been worn by Servius Tullius. Hence arose the practice that maidens at their marriage were accompanied by a decorated distaff and a spindle with a thread. Tanaquil first wove a straight tunic of the kind that novices wear with the plain white toga, and newly married brides. The pleated robe was the first among those most in favour; consequently the spotted robe went out of fashion. Fenestella writes that togas of smooth cloth and of Phryxian wool

⁴ The typography represents the conventions in *FRHist* where bold roman font represents a report or paraphrase of the original text.

began in the last years of the divine Augustus. Togas of closely woven poppy cloth have an older source, being noticed as far back as the poet Lucilius in the case of Torquatus. Bordered robes found their origins with the Etruscans. I find it recorded that striped robes were worn by the kings and they had embroidered robes as far back as Homer, these being the origin of those worn in triumphs. Embroidering with the needle was discovered by the Phrygians, and consequently embroidered robes are called Phrygian. Gold embroidery was also invented in Asia, by king Attalus, from whom Attalic robes got their name. Weaving different colours into a pattern was chiefly brought into vogue by Babylon, which gave its name to this process. But the fabric called damask woven with a number of threads as introduced by Alexandria, and check patterns by Gaul. Metellus Scipio counts it among the charges against Capito that Babylonian coverlets were already then sold for 800,000 sesterces, which lately cost the emperor Nero 4,000,000. The state robes of Servius Tullius, with which the statue of Fortuna dedicated by him was draped, lasted until the death of Sejanus, and it was remarkable that they had not rotted away or suffered damage from moths in 560 years.

In this lengthy passage, Pliny begins with a quote from Varro (which we cannot securely attribute to a work). As the passage goes on, Pliny weaves back and forth across time, and whilst not explicitly criticising others for developing new techniques, towards the end there is a hint of condemnation of the amount being spent on robes at the time of Nero, and one might even speculate that the reference to Sejanus refers to another dark moment in Roman history. In this way Pliny separates the object and its uses and distortions. Fenestella, and perhaps Varro too, were thus potentially helpful and in line with Pliny's own practice.⁵

On a more general level, it has long been assumed that the concentration of fragments in the early part of Roman history meant that there was a drastic reduction of information available for the early Republic – Badian called this the hour glass shape of Roman historiography.⁶ It is now not so clear that this is true. Our survey shows that the focus of the citing sources is very much driven by the elucidation of archaic and even earlier Roman history with the Virgilian commentary tradition playing a large role. The distribution of the fragments is only a partial indicator of the shape of Roman history itself.⁷

In these and other ways, the study of the citing authorities is a critical part of the creation of any fragmentary corpus. Looking at another project, the fragments of the Roman orators, reveals a similar need to start from the citing sources, but a very different set of problems. Here one obvious feature is the dominance of Cato the Elder amongst the fragments, which reveals perhaps more about his linguistic peculiarities and perhaps the inclusion of his speeches in the *Origines* (a much disputed problem) which permitted a transmission not available for other orators.⁸ Another obvious challenge is the reliance on Cicero for so much information, but

⁵ See C.J. Smith, *Pliny the Elder and archaic Rome*, in *Vita Vigilia Est: Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick*, ed. by E. Bispham-G. Rowe-E. Matthews, London, Institute of Classical Studies, 2007, pp. 147-70, with references. The study of Pliny the Elder continues to show how complex and interesting his use of his material was; see now *Pliny the Elder: Themes and Contexts*, ed. by R.K. Gibson-R. Morello, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2011.

⁶ E. Badian, *The Early Historians*, in *Latin Historians*, ed. by T.A. Dorey, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 1-38.

⁷ See J.W. Rich, *Fabius Pictor, Ennius and the origins of Roman annalistic historiography*, in *Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome*, ed. by K. Sandberg-C.J. Smith, Leiden and Boston, Brill, forthcoming.

⁸ *FRHist*, 5 Cato, I pp. 213-17; for the most detailed attempt to reconstruct a Catonian speech see *Marci Porci Catonis oratio pro Rhodiensibus: Catone, l'oriente greco e gli imprenditori romani*, introd., ed. critica dei frammenti, trad. e comm. a c. di G. Calboli, Bologna, Patron, 2003.

often either as testimonia, or, when the evidence is presented within a court case, the reliability of the evidence. A further problem is what we do with speeches in historians, where it is quite possible that there is a strong attestation of a speech, but little hope that the actual words are being transmitted. One specific consequence is that it becomes a great deal more difficult to follow the practice of identifying verbatim citations, and that any edition may need to reflect the wider practice of speech acts in Republican Rome. Consideration of this showed the gaps in Malcovati's standard edition, and has encouraged a new edition to be undertaken.⁹

We turn now to a specific case study with regard to Varro and that is the citation practices of Aulus Gellius. Gellius has been an obvious example for understanding the relationship between the group of authors who heavily use previous sources and the original texts. He cites a great deal and at some length. It is clear that he sometimes has the works to hand, and where the original can be checked, his accuracy is clear.¹⁰ At other times he cites at second hand, but he admits as much.¹¹ He cites for specific purposes, often argumentative; so for instance he cites Claudius Quadrigarius, often for his language, but does not cite either Livy or Tacitus.¹²

Gellius' interest in Varro is well known and was identified by Leofranc Holford-Strevens:

Varro is cited for every field of knowledge in which Gellius takes an interest, and from a wide range of his writings: he tells of Sallust in love and Naevius in war, he inveighs against gluttony and prescribes for a banquet, he defines terms of geometry and logic and comment on the caesura of hexameter and trimeter. He is quoted nearly eighty times, in over seventy chapters, and is the likely source for much else; full examination must await a comprehensive modern edition of his fragments.¹³

However, there remains the difficult question of the extent to which Gellius knew Varro directly, and what did he know? Here we are clearly touching on the issue of the nature of Varro's text – what survived and for how long? Gellius himself tells us that he found a reference to a word used by Varro in the *logostoricus Cato aut de liberis educandis* in another source, P. Lavinius (XX 11 4), but Gellius also cites that work himself and without explicit mediation (IV 19).¹⁴

⁹ See Catherine Steel's major project at <http://www.fvro.gla.ac.uk/>; I am grateful to Catherine for involving me in the project.

¹⁰ For instance *Noct. Att.* I 11 1-5 for Thuc. v 70; II 28 3-7 for Sall. *Cat.* 11 3; IV 15 1-2 for Sall. *Cat.* 3 2; III 16 22-23 for Pliny *nat.* VII 40.

¹¹ *Noct. Att.* I 15 18; III 2 12-13; IV 4 2, 3.

¹² See for Gellius' knowledge of historians, M.T. Schettino, *Interessi storici e letture storiografiche di Aulo Gellio*, in «Latomus», XLV 1986, pp. 347-66; Ead., *Aulo Gellio e l'annalistica*, *ivi*, XLVI 1987, pp. 123-45; E. Tinelli, *Per un regesto delle citazioni storiografiche nelle 'Noctes Atticae' di Aulo Gellio*, in «Boll. St. Lat.», XLII 2012, pp. 134-45; *FRHist*, I pp. 69-73.

¹³ L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievements* (revised edition), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003, pp. 159-60; Id., *Varro in Gellius and in late antiquity*, in *Varro Varius: The Polymath of the Roman World*, ed. by D.J. Butterfield, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 143-60. On Gellius generally see *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, ed. by L. Holford-Strevens-A. Vardi, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.

¹⁴ Holford-Strevens, *Varro in Gellius*, *cit.*, p. 148.

Holford-Strevens shows that in one case at least, Gellius may have cited Varro through the intermediation of Verrius Flaccus, noting that the account of Septentriones is closer to what we find at Festus, pp. 454 36-456 11 Lindsay, than the version we have at *de lingua Latina* VII 74-75.¹⁵ This is acute, but we also surmise that Varro repeated himself, which leaves open the possibility that Gellius knew another version of the same account in Varro, which is in fact the one used by both.

Table 1 is a first attempt to put together Gellius' citations of Varro. This presentation underscores Holford-Strevens' relatively positive account of Varro's presence in Gellius. Varro is cited in almost every book of the *Attic Nights* and over half the citations are claimed to be direct. On the face of it, this might give us significant confidence.

However there is another way to look at the evidence as presented here. Table 2 presents the supposedly direct citations ordered by the work. Looked at another way, Gellius has direct knowledge of a very scattered group of works. Even if one extends this to indirect citations, the number of works does not increase greatly.

It would clearly be as illegitimate to regard this as an accurate picture of what works of Varro Gellius had access to as it is to assume that Table 1 proves that Gellius had the 'complete works' of Varro, whatever that might mean in the second century AD.¹⁶ Nevertheless, it is important that as we move forward we try to hold two separate ideas in mind; first that access to Varro may have been patchy (and that is certainly true the later we go in time); and second that a repetitive Varro means that any given citation might be from a different work from the one we expect. In addition, in Table 1 I have left in the form of the cited title in Gellius. Whilst this poses relatively few problems in the examples we see, and we know that ancient titles are cited in a fairly loose way, we should be aware of the significant problem posed by Varro's multifarious and variously named works.¹⁷

There is no reason to deny Gellius' enthusiasm for Varro, and of course his privileged knowledge of Varro is part of his own self-aggrandisement.¹⁸ His demonstration of superior knowledge based around references to Varro in antiquarian agonistic display,¹⁹ and even his own disagreements with Varro²⁰ are part of the establishment of the persona of the antiquarian. We are working within a complex reading culture, where cross-reference and intertextuality are part of the toolkit of an elite group of cultural gatekeepers in shifting definitions of what it was to be Roman.²¹ The multiplicity of opinions were always an essential part of the game –

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 149-50.

¹⁶ G. Piras, *Per la tradizione del 'De lingua Latina' di Varrone*, in *Manuscripts and tradition of grammatical texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Proceedings of a conference held at Erice, 16–23 October 1997*, ed. by M. De Nonno-P. De Paolis-L. Holtz, Cassino, Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi di Cassino, pp. 747–72 gives an indication of the complexity of the situation for some of the texts which survive; for the rest we await the publication of R. Marshall's important work.

¹⁷ N. Horsfall, *Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history*, in «Bull. Inst. Class. St.», XXVIII 1981, pp. 103-14.

¹⁸ Holford-Strevens' identification of a genuine admiration is preferable to the suggestion of a critique, argued by M.L. Astarita, *La cultura nelle 'Noctes Atticae'*, Catania, Università, 1993, on which see his review in «Gnomon», LXVIII 1996, pp. 598-603.

¹⁹ *Noct. Att.* XIII 31, on which see E. Gunderson, *Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 2009, pp. 174-79; *Noct. Att.* XVIII 9; XIX 10.

²⁰ *Noct. Att.* I 25.

²¹ M.W. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1995; S.M. Beall, *'Homo Fandi Dulcissimus': The Role of Favorinus in the 'Attic Nights' of Aulus Gellius*,

indeed it is a dizzying thought for those seeking to establish Varro's views that there is every chance that Varro was cited for an opinion he gave without necessarily agreeing with. The Varro who inhabits the world of Gellius is a construct three times over, the product of Varro's self-fashioning, the chances of survival, and what Gellius chose to make of whatever he had before him.²²

This has clear consequences for what an edition of Varro might look like, and with this I will conclude. An edition of the fragmentary historians has some clear rules. For the most part, chronology rules. Generic expectations are relatively stable, even if they fray around the edges. For the annalists in particular, it was more or less clear how they structured their work, the work was often singular, even if very long, and most citations beyond the purely grammatical are for facts, or opinions on matters of fact (how many dead? who triumphed? And so on). So we have genuine fragments.

The same is largely true of the poets and the dramatists. We are largely recovering genuine quotations, and possibly even more so than for the historians; verses cited for whatever reason, for their grammar or their content, will have been constrained by metre to a degree, and perhaps also have been genuinely more memorable.

For the orators, it is much trickier, since the field of potential fragments is wider, and the reasons to cite are much less clear, and often tendentious. There is much more which appears to be misrepresentation rather than quoting a fact. Moreover, another set of references are records of the off the cuff spontaneous quip, the knock-down put-down, which may have got better over time. An edition of the fragments of the orators is in some ways therefore a survey of the perception of oral culture, of the Republic of speech, rather than its reality.

For whatever we want to call that group who are bundled as grammarians or antiquarians, an edition of fragments poses its own set of problems. One of the most striking is that of borders and our hazy perception of when law stops and grammar starts is just one of the frontier battles such an edition will have to come to terms with. The groundwork for such an edition remains to be done, and it is conceivable that the place to start is actually Varro.

Specifically for Varro, the multiplicity of his works, his opinions and his organizations of knowledge, the awkwardness of the transmission of his work, the highly mediated and contingent nature of the arrival of 'Varro' into later centuries, and the real difficulty of understanding the shape of any given Varronian work are all serious challenges. On the latter, would we have predicted the nature of *res rusticae* if we had had nothing more than Gellius II 20 «this is the way to make *melisones*, which some call *mellaria*, or 'places for storing honey'»? Not only is the Gellian text not the Varronian text, but I imagine we might not have assumed that this responds to a direct question to Merula about how to make as much money as possible out of bees.²³

So any edition of Varro will in fact not really be an edition of Varro in the way that an edition of the *Origines* of Cato is an attempt to present – more or less optimistically – the shape of that specific work of literature. Rather it will need to be an accumulation of the opinions

in «American Journ. Philol.», CXXII 2001, pp. 87-106; W.A. Johnson, *Readers and reading culture in the high Roman Empire: A study of elite communities*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.

²² Gunderson, *Nox Philologiae*, cit., p. 290: «a nonhybridized, nontextual original cannot be located».

²³ G.A. Nelsestuen, *Varro the Agronomist: Political philosophy, Satire and Agriculture in the Late Republic*, Columbus, Ohio State University Press, pp. 204-7 gives a brilliant analysis of what is going on in this passage, which could scarcely have been inferred I think from the fragment.

expressed in Varro – a *tour d’horizon* of the mental landscape of late Republican and early imperial Rome, of what could be thought. A first guess at what it might look like might suggest that it will be doxographical, and much more like an edition of the fragments of a philosophical school, with a large section devoted to grammatical peculiarities.

Such an edition would nevertheless be extremely useful, and breaking free of the impossibility of assigning fragments to books, even if it opened the extraordinarily difficult question of how to organise the fragments afresh, would be liberating. Moreover, one of the observations we may draw from Table 1 is just how necessary this is. Several of the citations are not picked up in the standard editions, and one has to go back past Semi’s unsatisfactory edition to the Bipontina, itself based on Popma’s work of the early seventeenth century. It is remarkable that one of the seminal figures of Roman intellectual thought is so poorly served – until one starts to work through the challenges facing anyone who proposes an edition. What is clear is that the necessary groundwork must start from the citing authorities and an understanding of both the intellectual stimulus they took from Varro’s work and the pragmatic parameters of survival.

CHRISTOPHER SMITH

British School at Rome / University of St Andrews

Table 1

Citations of Varro in Gellius

Gell.	Varro Work	direct quotation	modern reference	independent testimony
I 16	XVII humanarum	yes	XVIII fr. 2 Mirsch	Macr. I 5 5 (book XVII)
I 17	In satira Menippea quam de officio mariti inscripsit.	yes	fr. 18 Bücheler	
I 18	XIV Rerum Divinarum	yes	fr. 99 Agahd = 89 Cardauns	Varro RR III 12 6
I 20		yes	p. 350 Bipont.; 337 Bipont.	
I 22	In satira quae inscripta est Nescis quid vesper vehat	yes	fr. 340 Bücheler	
I 24	In libro de poetis primo	no		
I 25	In libro humanarum qui est de bello et pace	yes	XXII fr. 1, 2 Mirsch	
II 10	[epistula]	no (indirect)	p. 199 Bipont	
II 18	[general reference to Menippeans]	no		
II 20	In libro de re rustica tertio	yes		RR III 16 12
II 21		no		(LL VII 75); cf. Festus pp. 454, 456 L.
II 25	Liber ad Ciceronem de lingua Latina octavus	yes	p. 146 Goetz and Schoell	LL VIII 68 for <i>lepus</i>
II 28		no (indirect)	fr. 1 p CLIII Merkel	
III 2	In libro rerum humanarum quem de diebus scripsit	yes	XVI fr. 2-3 Mirsch	Macr. Sat. I 3 2
III 3	de comoediis Plautinis	no	p. 193 Bipont.	
III 10	In primo librorum qui inscribuntur Hebdomades vel de imaginibus	yes	p. 255 Bipont.	
III 11	in libro de imaginibus	yes	Fr. 69 Fun. = FPR 1 Bachrens	
III 14		yes	p. 349 Bipont.	
III 16	In libro quarto decimo rerum divinarum	yes	fr. 12 Agahd = 98 Cardauns	
III 16	In satira quae inscribitur Testamentum	yes	fr. 543 Bücheler	
III 18	In satira menippea quae <i>Hippokuon</i> inscripta est	no (indirect)	fr. 220 Bücheler	
IV 9	In undecimo Commentariorum Grammaticorum		fr. 4 Swoboda	
IV 16	[general reference to Varronian orthography]			
IV 19	In logistorico quae inscripta est Catus aut de liberis educandis	no (indirect)		
V 4	humanarum rerum lib. XVI	yes	XVI fr. 1 Mirsch	Nonius p. 100 11
V 21	[general reference to Varronian orthography]			
VI 10	Primo epistolicarum quaestionum	yes	fr. 224 Fun.	(Cato for Varro in text)

VI 11	in libris de Lingua Latina	yes	LL x 81	
VI 14		no	fr. 322 Fun.	
VI 16	In satira quam <i>peri edesmaton</i> inscripsit	no (paraphrase)	fr. 403 Bücheler	
VII 5	In satira quae inscripta <i>estdis paides hoi gerontes</i>	yes	fr. 91 Bücheler	
IX 9		grammar	fr. 419 Fun.	LL v 97; RR II 3 7
X 1	Ex libro disciplinarum quinto	yes	p. 202 Bipont.	
X 07		no (indirect)	<i>Ant. hum.</i> XIII fr. 6 Mirsch	
X 15	Ex secundo rerum divinarum	yes	fr. 4 Merkel = 51 Cardauns	
X 21	Ex libro de Lingua Latina ad Ciceronem sexto	yes	LL VI 59	
X 27		no (indirect)		
XI 1	In antiquitatibus rerum humanarum	yes	x fr. 1 Mirsch	
XI 1	In uno vicesimo rerum humanarum		XXI fr. 1 Mirsch	
XI 6		no	p. 375 Bipont.	
XII 6	de sermone Latino ad Marcellum libro secundo	no	p. 203 Goetz and Schoell	
XII 10	In libro secundo ad Marcellum de Latino sermone	no	p. 203 Goetz and Schoell	
XIII 4	In libro M. Varronis qui inscripta est Orestes vel de Insania	yes	p. 255 Riese	
XIII 11	Ex satiris menippeis qui inscribitur: nescis quid super vesper serus vehat	yes	fr. 333 Bücheler	
XIII 12	rerum humanarum uno et vicesimo libro	yes	XXI fr. 2 Mirsch	
XIII 13	Unum et vicesimum rerum humanarum	yes	XXI fr. 3 Mirsch	
XIII 17	E libro rerum humanarum primo	yes	1 fr. 1 Mirsch	
XIII 23	In satira Menippea quae inscribitur <i>Skiomachia</i>	yes	fr. 506 Bücheler	
XIII 29	satira	yes	p. 219 Bücheler	
XIII 31	Librum ex isdem saturis qui <i>Hydrokuon</i> inscriptus est.	grammar	fr. 575 Bücheler	
XIV 7	<i>Eisagogikos</i> , repeated in libro Epistolicarum Quaestionum quarto	no (lengthy paraphrase)	1 p. 195 Bipont.; 1 p. 125 Bremer	
XIV 8	In IIII Epistolicarum Quaestionum	no (indirect)	p. 196 Bipont.	
XV 19	In satira quae inscribitur <i>peri edesmaton</i>	yes	fr. 404 Bücheler	
XV 30	In libro quarto decimo rerum divinarum	grammar		
XVI 8	In libro de Lingua Latina ad Ciceronem quarto vicesimo	yes	fr. 29 Goetz and Schoell	

XVI 9	Sisenna vel de historia	yes	256 Riese	
XVI 12	In libro tertio de sermone latino	yes	fr. 57 Goetz and Schoell	
XVI 16		yes	<i>Ant. Div.</i> XIV fr 17c Agahd = 103 Cardauns	
XVI 17	In libris divinarum	yes	fr. 20b Agahd = 107 Cardauns	
XVI 18		yes	p. 337 Bipont.	
XVII 3	Vicesimus quintus humanarum	yes	XXV fr. 4 Mirsch	
XVII 4		no (indirect)	p. 351 Bipont.	
XVII 18	In libro quem scripsit Pius aut de Pace	no (indirect)	256 Riese	
XVII 21		no (indirect)	<i>ann.</i> III F 2 Peter	
XVII 21	In primo de poetis libro	no (indirect)	p. 259 Bipont.	
XVIII 9		yes		
XVIII 12	Libros quos ad Marcellum de Lingua Latina scripsit	yes	fr. 85 Goetz and Schoell	
XVIII 15	In libris disciplinarum	no (indirect)	fr. 116 Goetz and Schoell	
XIX 8	In libro saturarum qui inscriptus est <i>Ecdemetecus</i>	no	fr. 93 Bücheler	
XIX 10	[general]	no	p. 340 Bipont.	
XIX 14	[testimonium]	no		
XX 11	In Logostorico qui inscribitur Catus	grammar	fr. 37 Riese	

Table 2

Specific Varro's books cited by Gellius

De lingua Latina iii, vi, viii, xxiv

Res humanae i, xvi, xvii, xxi, xxv

Res divinae ii, xiv

Res rusticae iii

Disciplinae v

De imaginibus i

De poetis i

Epistolicarum Quaestionum iv (= *Eisagogikos*)

de comoediis Plautinis

de officio mariti

dis paides hoi gerontes

Ecdemetecus

Hippokuon

Hydrokuon

Logistorico Catus aut de liberis educandis

nescis quid super vesper serus vehat

Nescis quid vesper vehat

Orestes vel de Insania

peri edesmaton

Pius aut de Pace

Sisenna vel de historia

Skiomachia

Testamentum