The Proceedings of the African Classical Associations

University of Rhodesia
Department of Classics

Vol. XIV, 1978
THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE AFRICAN CLASSICAL ASSOCIATIONS is a journal for original contributions in any aspect of Greek or Roman studies. Contributions are particularly welcomed from scholars in Africa.

Material submitted for publication must be type-written, double spaced, and have ample margins. Contributors of articles are entitled to receive 25 copies of their respective contributions free; reviewers receive 10 copies of their reviews.

The price of the current volume is R$5,00. Volumes I (1958)—XI (1968) are available at R$1,00 each; Volume XII (1973) at R$2,00; XIII (1975) at R$4,00. Supplement 1 (Carney, T. F.: A Biography of Marius) costs R$4,00 and microfilm copies can be ordered from Xerox University Microfilms, Michigan, U.S.A.; Supplement 2 (Terence: Hecyra, ed. T. F. Carney) is available at R$1,50. Cheques, etc., should be made payable to: The Treasurer, Classical Association of Central Africa, P.O. Box MP 167, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

Articles intended for publication, books for review, subscriptions, remittances and other communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Proceedings of the African Classical Associations, Department of Classics, University of Rhodesia, P.O. Box MP 167, Salisbury, Rhodesia.
The
PROCEEDINGS
of the
AFRICAN CLASSICAL
ASSOCIATIONS

Vol. XIV, 1978

UNIVERSITY OF RHODESIA
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

PUBLISHED IN SALISBURY, RHODESIA, BY THE CLASSICAL
ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL AFRICA WITH THE ASSISTANCE
OF THE SALISBURY ARTS COUNCIL AND THE SALISBURY
HELLENIC COMMUNITY.

Printed by Printopac, Salisbury, Rhodesia
EDITORIAL

The Proceedings continue to labour under great difficulties, but it is hoped to continue publishing them at two-yearly intervals. Were it not for the generosity of the Salisbury Arts Council, which donated $40, and the Salisbury Hellenic Community, which donated $100, it would not have been possible to publish the current volume.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Professor D. B. Saddington, University of Rhodesia . . . Local Editor
Professor F. R. D. Goodyear, Bedford College, University of London . . . . . . . British Editor
Mr. E. P. Mashaire, University of Rhodesia . . . Assistant Editor
Mr. C. C. Wilson, Salisbury, Rhodesia . . . . . . . Technical Editor
## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. L. PIKE</td>
<td>Hercules Furens: Some Thoughts on the Madness of Heracles in Greek Literature.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. HALL</td>
<td>Ovid, <em>Amores</em> 3. 7(6). 55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. R. D. GOODYEAR</td>
<td>Columella, <em>R.R.</em> 10.185</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. M. COLEMAN</td>
<td><em>Silvae</em> 4.9: A Statian Name-game</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATHER M. WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Observations on the Manuscript Tradition of Tiberianus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. HALL</td>
<td>Manuscripts of Claudian in the U.S.S.R. and Poland</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. HERMAENSEN</td>
<td>The Bread Line through Ostia to Rome</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS


### NOTICES


### BOOKS RECEIVED

UNIVERSITY OF RHODESIA
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

(iii)
HERCULES FURENS: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE MADNESS OF HERACLES IN GREEK LITERATURE

by D. L. PIKE
University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg

It is an interesting fact that two of the simplest, strongest and bravest heroes of Greek myth were both overcome by a fit of murderous insanity, with terrible results. One was the great Ajax; the other was Heracles. In each case a goddess was the immediate cause: with Ajax it was Athena,¹ with Heracles it was Hera (see below); but there is much in the character of both heroes which could lead to insanity without any intervention from above. In Homer, Ajax is somewhat slow-witted but exceptionally brave and strong, second only to Achilles as a warrior;² and in Sophocles he is also arrogant, jealous and uncompromising. These traits have led him to be compared, very aptly, to Shakespeare's Coriolanus.³ A fierce, rigid temperament like this, coupled with outstanding courage and enormous physical strength, may readily commit atrocities under sufficient pressure, lacking the necessary flexibility and wisdom to adapt to such pressure. As for Heracles, his copybook is badly blotted with several unjustifiable and brutal murders, with several insolent clashes with gods, and with at least one disastrous attack of genuine insanity.

The most charitable explanation of such excesses is that an abnormally strong and fearless man has a natural, compelling, and understandable need to express his giant vitality in violent action—action which may, unfortunately, have tragic consequences because of that very vitality. Secondly, such 'Supermen' probably have less inhibitions than lesser men about 'going too far' because few lesser men would dare to oppose or reprimand them. Their huge strength, too, can lead to excessive self-confidence. This strength is dangerous also because, whereas a weaker man in a rage might inflict only minor injuries on his victim, an unusually strong man in a comparable rage may inflict a broken neck or a shattered skull. Whether a fatal assault of this sort can be classed as technical insanity is open to question; but at all events it might appear as such. Its results, moreover, would be no less tragic for being the actions of a sane man.

It is possible that some such considerations are at the back of the tales of Ajax's and Heracles' insanity. In neither case does the hero's mania persist after the crime, and the latter looks more like the result of a passing fit of berserk fury rather than a clinically certifiable derangement.

Apart from Heracles' disturbing clashes with certain gods,⁴ a number of his dealings with innocent human beings seem to indicate a dangerous tendency.

One of the least morally defensible of these incidents was Heracles' murder of Iphitus, the son of Eurytus of Oechalia. According to Apollodorus, Iphitus was an innocent and honest youth, the only one of Eurytus'
sons who took Heracles’ side when the latter was insulted by Eurytus and his family; nonetheless, when Iphitus visited Heracles at Tiryns in search of some lost cattle (or horses in Homer), he was slain by Heracles. Apollodorus states that the crime was committed during another fit of insanity (\(\mu \alpha \nu \nu \epsilon \iota \varsigma \delta \varepsilon \alpha \theta \iota \varsigma\)) (like that in which Heracles killed his own family); but no other author can offer even the ‘unsound mind’ excuse: in the *Odyssey* the poet states that Heracles simply murdered Iphitus, a guest in his own home: ‘savage man; and he feared neither the gods’ vengeance nor the laws of hospitality’ (line 28). The poet implies that the motive for this murder was Heracles’ desire to keep Iphitus’ mares for himself. The whole sorry incident is characterised by selfish greed, cold-blooded murder, and—worse, perhaps, from a Greek point of view—a total disregard for the Zeus-protected laws of hospitality which are so much emphasized in Book 9 of the *Odyssey*. In a primitive age of cattle-stealing such a deed might be acceptable, even admirable; but even the relatively tough ethics of Homeric poetry find it difficult to swallow. In Sophocles’ *Trachiniae*, the Herald, Lichas, after several well-meant attempts to conceal the truth from Deianeira, finally has to admit that Heracles’ killing of Iphitus (and his sacking of Oechalia) was entirely due to the hero’s overmastering passion for the princess Iole. It may be that some pre-literate or lost form of the story provided a more acceptable (political or military?) reason for the death of Iphitus; or the tale may in origin have been, as Apollodorus suggests, another instance (not very comforting as such) of Heracles’ insane tendencies. For Homer and Sophocles, however, the killing of Iphitus was an act of ruthless murder, committed for gain and nothing else.

In the *Trachiniae* another act of violence resulting in the death of a totally innocent man is described; but in this case there are extenuating circumstances. Both Sophocles and Apollodorus agree that Heracles threw Lichas off a cliff only after he (Heracles) had donned the poisoned shirt of Nessus which Lichas had brought him. Heracles, then, was in terrible agony at the time, and presumably suspected (not unreasonably) that Lichas was involved in a plot against him. Still, Heracles’ fearsome strength, running wild, had destroyed another innocent man; thus, Sophocles’ description of Lichas’ death is unsparing in its gruesome detail.

Less clear-cut, from a moral point of view, than either of the two foregoing incidents was Heracles’ killing, in his youth, of his music-teacher, Linus. Apollodorus relates that (presumably during a lesson) Linus struck Heracles, and that the latter, enraged (\(\delta \gamma \iota \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma\)), killed Linus with a blow of the lyre. Heracles was then tried for murder, but was acquitted after quoting a law of Rhadamanthys, to the effect that an act of self-defence against a wrongful aggressor should be pardoned. It is difficult to see, however, why Linus could be regarded as having acted ‘wrongfully’ (note \(\delta \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \varsigma\)) in what appears to have been an ordinary incident of classroom discipline; and it is easy to see that pupils like this Heracles are highly dangerous. Not surprisingly, King Amphitryon’s immediate reaction, in Apollodorus’ account, was to send his son to the cattle-farm to avoid any possible repetition of disaster of this sort. Even before reaching manhood, Heracles’ fearful temper and his abnormal strength had stained his hands with innocent blood.

This potential ‘madness’ is clearly to be seen in a revealing passage in
Apollonius' *Argonautica*, where Heracles' grief at the news of his squire Hylas' disappearance produces in him many of the symptoms of insane frenzy: he breaks out in perspiration, 'the dark blood boiled within him' (1262), and he rushes away at top speed in a completely blind burst of mad energy, like a bull stampeded by a gad-fly (1265). At the end of the passage, he pauses to utter a great cry (1272).

His grief is understandably intense, since he is in the *Argonautica* acting almost as the foster-father of Hylas; but the violent physical expression of grief exhibited by this mighty man is an ominous instance of the perils inherent in such great power when its controls are gone.

Curiously, it is in a play where Heracles appears at his most sympathetic and most noble that his attack of real insanity is most fully treated; Euripides' *Heracles* presents the hero as a tender family-man, a grand benefactor of mankind, a tyrant-slayer, and the innocent victim of the most appalling divine malice. At no point is his madness regarded as the result of a reprehensible tendency in a dangerous personality—it is rather his doom, thrust upon him by his vicious goddess-stepmother, Hera (see below). It has been maintained above that Supermen like Heracles may be expected to 'go mad' (literally or apparently) sooner or later; and in Euripides' play there might appear to be a hint of this in the fact that Heracles kills his family very soon after he has slaughtered the usurping tyrant Lycus and the latter's associates. It would indeed be psychologically probable if Heracles was still somewhat crazed with blood-lust after his purging of the city, and thus likely to fall into real insanity, being in a state of heightened tension and with much blood on his hands. But Euripides probably places the slaughter of Heracles' family so soon after his killing of Lycus simply because he wants to show how disaster can strike a great man at the very pinnacle of his career—for both Euripides and Heracles (574-82) seem to regard the rescue of the latter's family from Lycus as being of more ultimate importance and value than the famous Labours; and so the killing of Lycus represents Heracles at his most useful, most beneficent, and most triumphant. It is dangerous, then, to postulate a deliberate attempt on Euripides' part to show Heracles as a man too prone to blood-lust, just because of the sequence of events in the play. It is, admittedly, possible that Euripides is viewing the action on two different levels at once: the psychological level, on which Heracles' insanity is the direct result of all the gore spilt in destroying Lycus, and the 'mythological' level, on which Heracles' downfall is caused entirely by the malice of Hera. However, the mythological level is so strongly emphasized in the play by all the characters concerned (see below) that it seems most unlikely that Euripides is also trying to make a psychological point.

Such is Euripides' treatment of the worst atrocity ever committed by Heracles—the slaying in a fit of madness, of his own children and (in this play) his own wife. The insanity itself is not in fact a main theme of the play (however strikingly it is presented): it is simply a tragic turning-point in the drama, engineered by Hera and her lackey Iris. The principal themes appear to be the fall of an undoubtedly great man through no discernible fault of his own, the jealousy of heaven (or perhaps more accurately the arbitrary brutality of blind superhuman forces), an examination of the concept of δέκτης, and the profound value of friendship (as represented by Theseus) (1163f.). However, the play is the fullest
source for this incident available, and deserves close attention.

According to virtually every character in the play, madness was sent upon Heracles by Hera. The reason given by Iris for this visitation is that 'the gods will be nowhere, and mortals will be great, if he does not suffer punishment'. Also, Euripides’ audience would have known (although the fact is suppressed in this play) that Heracles did, in fact, become a god in due course; so that Iris’ fears are to some extent justified. Heracles himself blames his disaster on the fact that Hera was jealous because he was the fruit of one of Zeus’ many adulteries with mortal women (1308-10). Heracles, however, is mistaken in his explanation; but Iris (being a goddess) is correct. The truth is that it is Heracles’ greatness, alone, which brings disaster upon him: he towers too high for divine liking, not because he is arrogant, hybristic, ambitious (he is none of those things in the play), but simply because he is great. Thus, even personified Madness (Lyssa) herself expresses total unwillingness to ruin a famous, purifying and pious hero like Heracles (849-54).

His madness, then, is an externally imposed and completely undeserved horror, and shows how bitterly cruel life can be, even for the greatest of men. However, it may seriously be doubted whether Euripides’ view of the incident accords with earlier versions of the story. All the evidence so far considered in this paper suggests that Heracles (like Ajax) was basically a potential madman; and Euripides’ introduction of Hera looks like a typical piece of Euripidean modification—part of a violent attack on the ‘gods’ (or on popular beliefs about them).

It is a great pity that there can be no absolute certainty as to how old the story is, nor whether there were any further details in possible earlier versions which might have clarified the issue. It does, however, seem likely that the very nature of the Superman provides the explanation for the origin of the story, whatever Euripides’ modifications.

To sum up, then, it can be said that exceptionally strong men like Heracles (and Ajax) are dangerous: partly because of their great vitality (which can easily go too far), partly perhaps because of over-confidence and a corresponding lack of normal inhibitions, and partly because a very strong man in a rage can cause far greater damage than a weaker man in a comparable rage. Admittedly, even an act of murder perpetrated by a strong man cannot necessarily be classed as madness: it may in fact be simply a passing fit of berserk fury (dangerous enough as such); but it can appear as an act of insanity to the onlooker. It is suggested here that the foregoing considerations may have been at least partially responsible for tales about acts of ‘madness’ committed by heroes like Heracles and Ajax.

Heracles himself was said to have committed at least three acts of unjustifiable homicide (the killings of Iphitus, Lichas and Linus), all characterised either by sheer greed or by brute strength unleashed by a total loss of temper. However, his worst crime, and the only one which can be said to have been committed in the course of an attack of real insanity, was the murder of his own family. This incident forms the turning-point of Euripides’ Heracles; but Euripides appears to be taking pains to show that Heracles’ madness was forced upon him from outside by the monstrous envy of Hera. Although it is admittedly often difficult, in the study of Greek literature, to distinguish between a totally external Power and a God who is simply a projection of an inner psychological or
emotional drive, Euripides nonetheless seems to have placed the emphasis very heavily on the agency of malignant external forces, and to have gone out of his way to portray his hero in as favourable a light as possible. It is suggested here, however, that Euripides was for his own reasons exonerating Heracles to a degree probably foreign to earlier accounts (now lost) of the incident, and that Heracles was in fact the sort of dangerous hero from whom such apparently lunatic actions could be expected.

NOTES

5. Apoll. 2.6. 1-2.
7. 21. 22-30.
10. Soph. *Trach.* 763-82; Apoll. 2.7.7.
12. Apoll. 2.4.9.
13. 1.1261-72.
16. Cp. with the *Megara* by Moschus (?), in which she is very much alive; so too in Apoll. 2.4.12.
17. V. Ehrenberg, *Aspects of the Ancient World*, Oxford, 1946, 160, describes Heracles’ madness as ‘the very centre of the play’: by this he must surely mean no more than that it is physically in the middle of the play. Much that is of great importance obviously stems from the insanity; but the play is not about madness.
19. Iris 830-2; Amphitryon 1127; Theseus 1191; Chorus 1311-12; Heracles 1303-7. The matter is slightly complicated by Amphitryon’s use of the words θεῶν ὡς αἰτίος (1135): these words could perhaps
be taken to indicate Hera in a cautious way; but Amph. shows no such caution elsewhere; and more likely they mean 'whichever of the gods is responsible'. Whatever their implication, there can be no doubt that Amphitryon entirely blames the Supernatural. He cannot do otherwise: nothing in Heracles' character in the play justifies blaming some inherent defect in the hero himself.

20. The earliest-known possible mention of the story was in the *Cypria* (see L. R. Farnell, *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*, London, 1932, 355).
OVID, AMORES 3. 7(6). 55.

sed, puto, non *blanda* non optima perdidit in me
oscula, non omni sollicitauit ope?

by J. B. HALL
Bedford College, London

So the texts of Munari and Kenney. The crux is a well known one, and neither Housman's defence of *blanda* as ablative (understanding *puella* from line 53) nor the various conjectural assaults on *blanda* (for which see Kenney's app. crit. ad loc.) have commanded general assent. But, if the line is corrupt, must the corruption necessarily be confined to *blanda*? If it must, the number of possible solutions is bound to be limited, and if, in addition, the feeling persists that some reference to the girl's blandishments is needed here, it is hard to see what advance may be made on the unconvincing suggestions hitherto put forward. So let us look wider. Everything from *non optima* onwards is unexceptionable; a third *non* in the first half of the hexameter (heralding a tricolon) looks to be entirely likely; and the particle *at* (not *sed*) is required at the beginning of the couplet to introduce what is surely a bitterly ironic statement (not a question): 'She didn't of course . . . squander kisses on me or try every trick to arouse me.' *puto*, however, although commonly found subjoined to *at* in ironic utterance, is hardly needed to establish the self-evident irony of this couplet, and should, I suggest, in fact be dispensed with. Its intrusion here was perhaps prompted by the very first couplet of the poem, if not also by the frequency of the formula *at puto*. With *puto* out of the way and *at non* opening the hexameter, there is room now for manoeuvre, or, more precisely, for the expansion of *blanda est* to *blandita est*, which is what I suggest stood in Ovid's autograph. The progress of the corruption is obvious: the inclusion of *puto* produced a hypermetric line; *blandita est* was consequently reduced to *blanda est* (preserved now only in Lond. Brit. Mus. Add. 11975 s. xiii, Vat. Chis. H. VI. 205 s. xiv, Oxon. Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 20 (SC 18601) s. xv, and Vat. Pal. lat. 1668 s. xv); and finally *est* was lost by *PS* and the majority of the *β* MSS, as it has also been lost at 1. 1. 15 by *S* and a minority of the *β* MSS and at 2. 9b (10). 47 by *P* and a minority of the *β* MSS. The value, modest indeed but by no means contemptible, of one at least of the four MSS that preserve *blanda est*, Lond. Brit. Mus. Add. 11975, is shown also at 1. 7. 37 (comitantum), 2. 6. 37 (ille), 2. 13. 3 (cum ueniit) and 3. 13. 34 (alte), where in each case it shares the truth with two or three other MSS of the thirteenth century or later. It may also be noted that at 2. 11(12). 15 Vat. Chis. H. VI. 205 shares the true reading *signate* with Francofurt. Barth. 110 (s. xiii) alone of the surviving MSS of the *Amores*.

Columella’s poem on gardens may be uninspired, but it is not generally incompetent. Yet incompetence alone can explain the paradox at 185. Columella is listing various types of lettuce, the Caecilian, the Cappadocian, and the Gaditanan, from his own homeland, Cadiz (cf. 8.16.9 in nostro Gadium municipio). 181ff run as follows:

altera crebra uiret, fusco nitet altera crine,
utraque Caecilii de nomine dicta Metelli.
tertia quae spisso sed puro uertice pallet:
haec sua Cappadocae seruat cognomina gentis.
et mea, quam generant Tartesi litore Gades,
candida uibrato discrimine, candida thyrso est.

Now L. Caecilius Metellus might, if he had wished, have called the Caecilian variety his own, since it was named after him. But for Columella to assert such a claim to the Gaditanan variety would be much as if a Roman citizen, referring to the army, were to say exercitus meus rather than nosier. Further, the thought and expression of 185 seem halting and obscure: it is not at all clear in what sense the lettuce is Columella’s (mea). He cannot reasonably assume that his reader here has also read 8.16.9 or that, if he has, he will remember it.

A solution is suggested by two passages of Columella’s contemporary, Pliny the Elder, in which a singular Gadis appears instead of the usual plural Gades: N.H. 3.7 Gadis inter insulas dicenda est and 4.119 Gadis, longa . . . XII, lata III. If Pliny could use this alternative in prose, it was hardly denied to Columella in verse, and I believe that he wrote:

et mea quam generant Tartesi litore Gadis.

Once the unfamiliar Gadis was corrupted or ‘corrected’ into the familiar Gades, consequential change of generat to generant was almost inevitable. Or, if generat was first corrupted to generant, change of Gadis to Gades would easily follow.

For mea . . . Gadis cf. Cat. 67.34 Veronae . . . meae and Mart. 11.18. 8-9 mea . . . Bilbilis.

Addendum: Gadis (singular) is transmitted at Curt. 4.4.19 and needlessly changed to Gades.
SILVAE 4. 9: A STATIAN NAME-GAME

by K. M. COLEMAN
Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford

Silvae 4 ends with a poem in hendecasyllables addressed to a certain Plotius Grypus. P.I.R.¹ III, 385, attests a Plotius Grypus, a partisan of Vespasian, who was praetor in A.D. 70 and sufficient consul in A.D. 88; presumably he was an older relation of Statius’ addressee, who is described in 4 Praef: as a ‘iuvenis maioris gradus’. I do not intend to discuss the identity of Statius’ addressee, but rather to demonstrate why Statius addressed these ‘hendecasyllabi iocosí’ to someone with this particular name.

Silvae 4. 9 is modelled upon Catullus 14, addressed to Licinius Calvus, in which Catullus expresses horror at the anthology of ‘pessimi poetae’ which Calvus had sent him as a Saturnalian present. Statius likewise criticises Grypus for the tedious volume ‘Bruti senis oscitationes’ (20) which he received from Grypus at the Saturnalia. To stress how insulting he considers this gift, Statius compiles a list 23 lines long of utterly banal traditional presents which he claims would have been preferable to Grypus’ offering.

The name of Catullus’ friend literally denotes a physical characteristic, ‘calvus’ meaning ‘bald’; hence in writing to an addressee whose nomen and cognomen both have anatomical reference Statius appropriately recalls Catullus: ‘Plotius’ is a patronymic derived from ‘plautus’, alternatively spelt ‘plotus’, ‘flat-footed’; ‘grypus’ is a transliteration of γρυπος, ‘hook-nosed’.

G. D. Chase² has shown that names denoting physical characteristics constitute the largest single class of Roman cognomina. However, the sophisticated humour of the poem rests upon a secondary meaning to be read into the name ‘Grypus’. Γρυπος has no application beyond its literal meaning, but its Latin equivalent, ‘nasutus’, besides meaning ‘hook-nosed’ in the physical sense, is also used metaphorically of a critic, particularly a literary connoisseur. Instances contemporary with Statius occur in Martial:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nasutus ninium cupis uideri,} \\
\text{nasutum uolo, nolo polyposum. 12. 37. 1f.} \\
\text{Nasutus sis usque licet, sis denique nasus,} \\
\text{quantum noluerat ferre rogatus Atlans . . .} \\
\text{non potes in nugas dicere plura meas} \\
\text{ipse ego quam dixi. 13. 2. lff.}
\end{align*}
\]

Martial also uses the image of a large nose to illustrate intellectual snobbery in Rome:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maiores nusquam rhonchi: iuuenesque senesque} \\
\text{et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent. 1. 3. 5-6.}
\end{align*}
\]

Evidence also occurs in Phaedrus, who uses the adverb ‘nasute’ in the
context of uncompromising literary criticism:

tu qui nasute scripta destringis mea. 4. 7. 1.

Jokes on proper names are very much to Roman taste. Puns on Greek names are appreciated; Duckworth cites Plautus, *Pseudolus* 655, where Harpax puns on the derivation of his name from αδραζω:

hostes uiuos rapere soleo ex acie: eo hoc nomen mihi est.

Statius accuses his addressee of lack of literary taste; in addressing his accusation to a Grypus, Statius uses the associations of ‘nasutus’ to draw attention to sensibilities which are noticeably lacking in Plotius. Duckworth cites instances of the deliberate choice of inappropriate names in the comic poets; Niall Rudd illustrates the same technique in Horace. ‘Antiphrasis’ was the rhetorical term for this trick, akin to irony but distinguished from it, e.g. by Isidorus, *Orig.* 1. 37. 25: ‘Antiphrasis uero non uoce pronuntiantis significat contrarium, sed suis tantum uerbis, quorum origo contraria est.

The humour in the context of 4. 9 is designed to appeal to an audience sensitive to the inter-relation of Greek and Latin linguistic elements; Statius’ Neapolitan circle, heirs to the legacy of the oldest Greek colony in Italy, would be especially strongly imbued with Greek culture and alive to linguistic associations. The favourite Roman joke of the name-game is transformed by Statius into a sophisticated conceit: because γρυπος had no metaphorical application, Statius expects his readers to recognise and appreciate the subtle calque afforded by identifying γρυπος with ‘nasutus’.

NOTES

5. ibid.
OBSERVATIONS ON THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF TIBERIANUS

by HEATHER J. WILLIAMS
Bedford College, London

I

The first three poems of Tiberianus are preserved for us only in the following manuscript:

H. Harleianus 3685, fol. 25v-26v, a paper manuscript of the fifteenth century which contains also the Aegritudo Perdicæ and a number of mediaeval verses. The poems follow Versus Bedae de die iudicii and are followed by Versus Hudulfi episcopi. This manuscript once belonged to the library of the Augsburg antiquarian and patron of learning, Konrad Peutinger (1465-1547), and is now in the British Museum. Baehrens was the first person to use this manuscript for a text of Tiberianus and made a number of useful corrections to its readings, but he unfortunately made the mistake, perpetuated by Riese and the Thll, of recording that H reads famis at 2.28, whereas it in fact agrees with T in reading fames.

Poem 2 uu. 1-7, 19-20, 27-28 are also found in T. Parisinus 7972, olim Mentellianus, fol. 86, written on parchment in the ninth to tenth century, under the title De Auro; uu. 3-4 are added in the margin in the same hand. The poem is found between verses De asino and de capra. It also includes the works of Horace and has many glosses and marginal notes. It is now in the Bibliotheque Nationale. This manuscript was first brought to light by Holder in Nouum Archiuum (1876), and Riese’s is the only edition to use it.

The relationship between H and T for poem 2 is not clear. T gives only excerpts, and though this manuscript is much older than H, it seems to preserve less of the truth, as in 7 of the 10 cases where the two seriously disagree, the reading of H is to be preferred.

II

Poem 4 survives in seven manuscripts, of which no editor seems to have known more than five:

R, Vaticanus Reginensis 215 (fol. 128v-129r). Written on parchment in the ninth century, it has 143 leaves, with 29 lines to a page, and measures 200 x 162 mm (130 x 115). It also contains the letters of St. Jerome, a Metrica Anthologia and other pieces. It was once in the library of Christina, Queen of Sweden (1626-1689), who bequeathed it to Cardinal Azzolino, after whose death it was purchased in 1689 by the future Pope Alexander VIII. Along with the poems Nomina Feriarum, De Anima (by St. Augustine) and Officia duodecim mensium, poem 4 has been copied from R by B, Parisinus 4883A (fol. 28), olim Colbertinus, a parchment manuscript of the eleventh century. In it poem 4 appears between Sancti Augustini versus de anima and Exemplu diuersorum authorum. It also contains works
by St. Jerome and Pope John XIX. This manuscript is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

P, Parisinus 2772, olim Colbertinus (fol. 53v-54r). Written on parchment in the tenth to eleventh century, the manuscript measures 185 x 135 mm and has 108 leaves. In it the poem follows a letter of "Seneca" to St. Paul and is followed by a poem to a certain (unnamed) senator. The titles have apparently been added later and are in much fainter ink. The manuscript also includes works by Cyprianus Gallus, Quintus Serenus Samonicus (sic), Tertullian, the De martyrio Machabeorum of St. Hilarius, pieces attributed to Ausonius and various religious writings. This manuscript is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Baehrens was the first to use P, but made a number of mistakes in his collation which are also reproduced by Riese. The correct title of the poem in this manuscript is "Ver (sic) Platonis ad (sic) quodam tiberiano inlatinum trans lati." At 4.16 P reads not temptare saram but temptares aram. At 4.18 I think that it reads fulmeneis rather than fulmencis. At 4.26 P reads aspiras, not aspirass. Baehrens also does not record the fact that at 4.31 P reads dissimulique.

S, Parisinus 17160 (fol. 159), a parchment manuscript of the twelfth century. In it the poem follows notes on the Greek alphabet and is followed by a poem by a certain Fulbert. It is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Baehrens's account of the readings of this manuscript, too, is inaccurate. He states that the manuscript lacks a title, whereas in fact the words "Versus Platonis a quodam tiberio de greco in latinum in quibus multa de deo dicit" appear in the margin in very small writing. At 4.14 S reads corpora not tempora, as Baehrens states, and at 4.21 deus not dei.

V, Vindobonensis 143 (fol. 13), a parchment manuscript of the thirteenth century consisting of only 15 leaves. In this manuscript the poem follows one by Peter Abelard praising the Holy Cross, and precedes a poem by a Pope Gregory to the Virgin Mary. It is now in Vienna, and was first used by Haupt.

The following two manuscripts are those unknown to previous editors of Tiberianus:

A, Alenconiensis Bibli. Mun. 12 (fol. 58). Written on parchment in the tenth to twelfth century, it has 187 leaves and measures 310 x 255 mm. In it the poem follows a table of human knowledge and is followed by another table, that of lives of the saints. It also contains works of Boethius and lives of the saints. It is now in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Alençon.

M, Parisinus Mazarinaeus 583 (fol. 188). Written on parchment in the ninth and tenth centuries by several hands, it measures 300 x 205 mm and has 189 leaves, written in two columns. It contains lines 1-12 only. In it the poem follows the Conlatio Abbatis Abraham de mortificacione, one of the seven Collations of Cassianus, and is followed by notes on weights and measures. It was one of the manuscripts of Cardinal Mazarin and is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

R, A, B and M are clearly related as all have the same (unauthentic) title, agree in error in reading effectu in u. 4 and facta in u. 11, and omit semper in u. 2. R, A and B all omit u. 30 and agree in error in reading te in u. 15, fulmineus in u. 18, coruscant in u. 19, dei in u. 21, quasi ratione in u. 26, angustas in u. 28 and qua in u. 31. The presumption is that R, A, and M derive independently from a common source. B differs in no respect from R and clearly is directly descended from it.
P, S and V all preserve u. 30 and semper in u. 2, and have somewhat similar unauthentic titles. They also agree in error in reading corpora in u. 14, (h)oruscas in u. 19 and per concita in u. 32. They therefore derive from a common ancestor. However, the relationship between them is not clear. P is characterised by its frequent incorrect division into words and S and V both have a number of errors of their own, as at u. 25 where S reads iubente and the rest of the manuscripts inuentus, and at u. 13 where V’s astra is apparently a conjecture.

It is interesting that A agrees with P in reading abstrum in u. 13, but this is perhaps an independent error.

The existence of an archetype is to be inferred from u. 13 where Bae­rens conjectured haustus and all the manuscripts are corrupt, suggesting that they have a common source which was illegible at this point. Thus we can tentatively propose the following stemma:

![Diagram of stemma]

but it is impossible to be more precise about the relationships of the individual manuscripts to each other within their particular sub-groups as there is insufficient evidence available.

The attribution of these four poems to Tiberianus is based only partly on manuscript evidence, and external sources and conjecture are also involved.

Poem 1 is attributed in H to “Teberianus” (sic.) For poem 2 we have the evidence of Servius, who cites u. 3 in his discussion of Aen. VI 136 and attributes the words to our poet. There is no author mentioned in T, and H merely says “uersus sogratis (sic) philosophi”. We know, however, from Fulgentius, Continentia Vergiliana p. 154 M, that a Tiberianus wrote a book about Socrates: memores Platonis sententiam, cuitis hereditatem Diogenes Cineus inuadens nihil ibi plus <nisi> aurea lingua inuenit, ut Tiberianus in libro de <deo> Socratis memorar.2

No author is given in H for poem 3, nor is there any evidence by indirect tradition, and the poem seems to have been attributed to Tiberianus simply because it follows poem 2 in H. Its moralizing tone, however, accords well with that of the preceding poem.

Poem 4 is described by R, A, B and M simply as “Versus Platonis de deo”. P, S and V, however, are more specific. P rather confusingly refers to it as “ad (sic) quodam tiberiano.” V describes it as “ad quendam tyberia­num” and S as “a quodam tiberto.” All the manuscripts of this poem call it “Versus Platonis”, and this, too, links it with the philosopher author of poem 2, which is also in hexameters. Poem 1 is, however, so different from
poems 2 and 4 that it is possible that they may not have been written by the same Tiberianus. But this is mere speculation: there is nothing in the words of Servius or Fulgentius to suggest that they knew of more than one Tiberianus.

NOTES

1. Tiberianus has been edited on a number of occasions. Poem 4 was first edited by M. Haupt in *Ouidii Halieutica* etc., Leipzig, 1838. The four poems were first edited together by E. Baehrens in *Unedirte lateinische Gedichte*, Leipzig, 1877, and again by him in *Poetae Latini Minores* III, Leipzig, 1881. Later they were edited by F. Buecheler and A. Riese in the *Anthologia Latina* I, ii, Leipzig, 1906, as numbers 490, 719b, 809-810; H. W. Garrod in *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse*, 1912, and J. W. Duff & A. M. Duff in *Minor Latin Poets*, Loeb Classical Library, 1934. In the course of this discussion I shall be using the numbering of the Duffs' text.

MANUSCRIPTS OF CLAUDIAN IN THE U.S.S.R. AND POLAND

by J. B. HALL
Bedford College, London

Before World War II there were, according to my best information, eight manuscripts containing works of Claudian to be found in the libraries of the U.S.S.R. and Poland; at the present day there are five only, the other three having been destroyed in the course of the war, one in Warsaw and two in Wroclaw (formerly Breslau). 1

1. Of the lost Warsaw MS I have already said what can be said in my edition of Claudian, De Raptu Proserpinae, Cambridge 1969, p.3 note 1. A fifteenth century MS containing the D.R.P., it was known to Birt (ed. of Claudian, Berlin 1892, p.6cl) as Petropolitanus Caesareus (Imperial Library, St Petersburg) A.O. sect. CL N. 7, was transferred from the Public Library in Leningrad to the Biblioteka Narodowa in Warsaw after 1921 and was destroyed during the last war, along with the bulk of the Polish National Library's collection of MSS.

2. The two MSS which were lost in Wroclaw are, by a happy chance, described in some detail in Konrat Ziegler's Catalogus Codicorum Latinorum Classicorum Qui in Bibliotheca Vrbica Wratislauienst Adseruantur, Wratislawiae 1915. The younger of the two, shelf-mark R.77, was dated 1465 and written in Padua (fo. 72v 'Petri de sancto flore est codex iste — & per ipsum scriptus padue anno dni MIIIILXV in contrata del agnus dio'). It subsequently was acquired by Thomas Rehdiger (1541-1576), was bequeathed by his heirs to the town of Breslau along with the rest of his library, formed part of the Bibliotheca Rehdigeriana opened in 1661, and finally, in 1865-66, came into the Stadtbibliothek created by the amalgamation of the Bibl. Rehdigeriana, the Bibl. Magdalenaea, and the Bibl. Bernhardina. No details other than that the MS was 'chartaceus anni 1465' were given by A. Degen, who mentioned it in a footnote on p.2 of the first part of his discussion 'De Cl. Claudiani poetae codice Vratislauiensi membranaceo', Progr. Progymnasium zu Rogasen, 1870 (continued in Progr. Progymnasium zu Rogasen, 1874), but from Ziegler's description we know that it contained the D.R.P., Carmina minora, In Rufinum (erroneously designated De laudibus Stiliconis by the original scribe, but subsequently corrected), and De Bello Gildonico. In its incorporation of the phrase 'C: Claudiani poetae clarissimi' into its inscription to the D.R.P. and its having the elegiac preface to Book III of that poem it shows an affinity to the fifteenth century Vat. Vrb. lat. 657 (RI 5 in my sigla); but the latter MS, it must be added, contains all of Claudian's major poems, whereas the Wroclaw one contained only a very small selection of them.

3. The older of the two lost Wroclaw MSS, shelf-mark M 1438 A, came into the Stadtbibliothek from the library of S. Maria Magdalena (founded 1601). It was assigned to the fourteenth century by Ziegler in his
descriptive catalogue but to the twelfth or thirteenth by Degen op. cit., the thirteenth being the date preferred by Degen’s consultant Martin Hertz and later accepted by Birt (p. cxxi); there is now no knowing who was right. Its ultimate provenance is unknown, though it is perhaps worth remarking that the MS of Ovid’s *Heroïdes* with which it was bound up (this is M 1438 B, written, according to Ziegler, in a different hand from A) had some connexion with Liège in Belgium—not of course that that proves anything about the Claudian MS. It contained the whole of *Claudianus maior* (the large-scale public poems) in Birt’s Series I, the commonest arrangement (p. cxxix), and the *Carmina minora* essentially according to Birt’s Series B (p. cxxxviii). In the programmes mentioned above Degen furnished a full collation of the text up to the end of the Panegyric on Honorius’ Third Consulship, on the basis of which he thought to have demonstrated this manuscript’s close relationship to Heinsius’ ‘Oiselianus’ (= Paris. lat. 18552). His knowledge of the MS tradition of Claudian, however, was not extensive, and the fact of his knowing much more about the Wroclaw MS and the ‘Oiselianus’ than about any other MSS rather led him to exaggerate the degree of affinity. Certainly the MSS have many readings in common, but there are also substantial divergences, and the ‘Oiselianus’ belongs in *Claudianus maior* not to Birt’s Series I but to his Series III (pp. cxxxi-ii) and in the *Carmina minora* to Series C not Series B (p. cxxxix). From Degen’s collations it is evident that the Wroclaw MS offered a text of no exceptional quality, though like most MSS it exhibited the occasional reading worth consideration, e.g. 20. 528 *non fronte serena* (= Heinsius’ ‘Vossianus’), 20. 566 *haristis* (= Schrader’s conjecture), 10. 7 *punxit* (= inter al., Antwerp. 171 and the Krakow MS I shall consider later in this paper) and 7. 101 *uicisset* (= inter al., Laurent. 33. 6).

4. On p. cxxii Birt mentions a MS containing *Claudianus maior* which in his time belonged to the Imperial Library in St Petersburg as Petropolitius Caesareus A.O. Sect. CIL n. 3 but now forms part of the M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in Leningrad as MS lat. O. v. 3.² Birt cites precisely ten not at all revealing readings from this MS (one of them in fact wrong—at 3. 101 the MS has *saciarit* not *saciaret*), and on the basis of this wholly insignificant sample of lections he pronounces for its affinity to Paris. lat. 8080, with which indeed it shares membership of Series I in *Claudianus maior* (neither MS contains the *Carmina minora*).

A more detailed examination would have revealed to him that like MSS of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries generally it is not constant in agreeing with any one other MS, and also that it offers a good many rare and by no means contemptible readings, e.g. 17. 158 *fregere*, 22. 150 *spreuerat*, 24. 259 *taygete*, and 28. 312 *desiiit* (later conjectured by Heinsius). Jeep and Birt dated the MS to the thirteenth century; I would assign it to the late twelfth.

The provenance of the MS is interesting. On fo. 2r there is the entry ‘ex museo P. Dubrovsky’ (noted by Birt). Now Peter Dubrovsky was a Russian attaché in Paris in 1791, at which time he was an energetic purchaser of MSS especially from monastic libraries then being dispersed. There is thus a *prima facie* possibility that Dubrovsky acquired the Claudian MS while in France; and indeed Jeep thought it probable that it came from St. Germain-des-Prés, MSS from which Dubrovsky is known
to have purchased. Whether or not he found the MS at St. Germain is, however, a matter for conjecture; what is certain, as I shall now prove, is that if he did find it there it had not been there for much more than one hundred and forty years.

Among the considerable number of MSS used by Heinsius for his editions of Claudian (1650 and 1665) was one belonging to Cardinal Mazarin (1602-1661) which had been made available to him through the good offices of Gabriel Naudé (Naudaeus, 1600-1653), librarian to Queen Christina, de Mesmes and others (‘Mazariniiani libri copiam fecit clarissimus Gabriel Naudaeus’ are the words of Heinsius’ preface). A full transcript of Heinsius’ collation of this ‘Mazarinianus’ was incorporated into the Sylloge uariantium lectionum which Clerq van Jever contributed to Burman’s edition of Claudian (Amsterdam, 1760). It is a mark of the accuracy of Heinsius’ collating (and the fidelity of van Jever’s transcription) that the readings of the ‘Mazarinianus’ recorded in the Sylloge coincide exactly with those of the Leningrad MS; and conversely, it is a proof of the superficiality of Birt’s acquaintance with the Leningrad MS that he failed to make the identification but pursued his search for the ‘Mazarinianus’, vainly, in the libraries of Paris (p. cxxvii, n.7). There is no need for me now to cite numerous readings to establish the identity of the ‘Mazarinianus’ and the Leningrad MS (to which I shall be giving full coverage in the edition of Claudian I have in hand); a single feature common to both and occurring nowhere else in the MSS of Claudian, so far as I know, will stand for all. The line 20. 25 is absent from the Leningrad MS and in its place, in the margin, is the medieval confection Inferiore uenit, fragor auras ille supernas; precisely this supposititious verse was reported by Heinsius from the ‘Mazarinianus’.

What happened to the ‘Mazarinianus’ between 1651, when the French parlement decreed the sale of Mazarin’s library (which had been open to the public since 1643), and 1791 (?), when it was acquired by Dubrovsky, is not known. Very likely it remained in private hands. Conceivably it passed temporarily into the library of St. Germain-des-Prés. At all events it is most unlikely to have formed part of the Mazarin collection as reconstituted in 1661, since that passed directly to the Bibliothèque Royale, now the Bibliothèque Nationale, in Paris. The MS remained in the Dubrovsky library until 1805, when it was purchased for the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg.

5. From Leningrad we move to Krakow and a MS containing not only Claudianus maior but also the Carmina minora and the D.R.P.3 This is Krakow, Biblioteka Kapituly no. 72 (formerly 71), the first hand of which is of the twelfth century, while a fourteenth century hand has added various passages omitted in the D.R.P. and a fifteenth-sixteenth century hand has revised the whole MS, adding scholia and notes generally. For this information, as also for information about the readings of the MS, I am indebted to J. M. Pawlikowski’s dissertation ‘De Claudiani cod. Cracouiensi commentatio critica’, Cracouiae 1886 (Dissertat. classis philol. acad. litt. Cracou., tom. 12). The MS belongs to Birt’s Series I in Claudianus maior, Series B in the Carmina minora, and in the D.R.P. is to be assigned to my Class β.4 There are numerous interesting readings in Claudianus maior (e.g. 15. 171 Ascitus = Heinsius’ conjecture, 8. 77 cautum = Em and Barthius’ conjecture, 22. 136 Vitricis, cf. Em, 26. 406
animis . . . receptis = Heinsius' conjecture), in the Carmina minora (e.g. c.m. 27. 28 totidem, a renaissance correction in the MS = Heinsius' conjecture, c.m. 30. 174 Achelous abiret, a renaissance correction in the MS = Heinsius' conjecture, c.m. 31. 6 dulces = Barthius' conjecture, c.m. 33. 2 Hesit, a renaissance correction in the MS = Birt's conjecture) and in the D.R.P. (e.g. I. 129 curauit lunatae = my G1 L4 R6, 149 despicet, a late hand = Clauerius in his notes, II. pf. 31 strictos = J3, C1 G1 L4 R6, II. 26 gorganos = J3, C1 G1 R6). In the D.R.P. its closest relations are Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 228 (= C1) and Berlin MS lat. quart. 740 (= G1), then, at a somewhat greater distance, London, Brit. Mus. Harley 2753 (= L4) and Vat. lat. 3290 (= R6).

6. Three MSS containing only the D.R.P. conclude the present survey. The first of these, Poznan, Miejska Biblioteka Publiczna im. Edwarda Raczyńskiego MS 179, dated 1507, was utilised in my edition of the D.R.P., and need not be discussed at length here. Its subscription, which I did not report in my edition, indicates that it was written by one Albertus de Krasnystaw (to the south east of Lublin); its text makes it clear that it has no connexion with the two MSS I must now consider.

7. The only MS now preserved in Warsaw which contains anything by Claudian is Biblioteka Narodowa O(rdynacji) Z(amojskiej) 50, a very large MS which on pp. 521-550 offers a text of the D.R.P. The MS was written in 1448, and its connection with the University of Krakow, then a well known centre of humanism, is clearly indicated by a note on p. 385 which reads: 'Finis Ouidii de Ponto reportatus sub magistro Johanne de Junoslauia per Nicolaum de Tarnw (i.e. Tarnow) in Collegio artistarum'. Subsequently the MS came into the possession of Szymon Szymonowicz (Simonides, 1558-1629), a Polish poet and humanist of note, passing on his death to the Zamosc Academy of which he had been Rector. From the beginning of the nineteenth century until World War II the collection of the Zamosc Academy formed part of the Biblioteka Ordynacji Zamojskiej (Zamoyski Estate Library) set up by Stanislaw Zamoyski; after the war the Zamoyski Estate Library was taken over by the National Library in Warsaw.

BOZ 50 is a typical example of my Class α; it omits II. 118 from its text but adds it in the margin (in the first hand); after III. 360 is the stop-gap verse Omnis honos recti nobis sic fata recessit; and II. 337, which Heinsius had wrongly thought spurious, is by a curious coincidence omitted. Among its more interesting readings are: I. 23 circumfusa = V2, 46 atro = e2 m, 61 longis[que], cf. el; 97 quia = H; 161 pars altera = ψ; 183 scindunt = R2; 227 profundi = M3; 267 non = R13; II. pf. 19 sitientis = R19/30; 24 cantibus = el; II. 95 cinctura = el m, 127 aruis = M3 (p.c.); III. 42 pererrent = el p2; 59 iactet de upertice natam = L5; 149 expectatur = R20; 176 habetur = H; 177 sparsas for laceras in marg.; 202 non = el; 248 subite = R7 u.l.; 268 uitrea; 281 veneris = F15 h P7 (a.c.); 333 meatu = T2; 403 titan for Phaethon; 424 urgebam. Its closest relatives among the older MSS seem to be DS LS LIO Kl W and above all M3, a MS which belonged to Hartman Schedel (1440-1514); among the younger MSS it shows some slight connection with el (once at Altdorf near Nuremberg) but an exceptionally close one with the Wroclaw MS next to be discussed. Features of a distinctive kind shared by these two Polish MSS include: I. 61 longis[que]; 150 latrans; II. 95 cinctura (with el m); 187
tellus for late; 352 maduissae (with R1); III. 4 compellat (compellant M3); 18 sic fatur; 42 pererrent (with el p2); 86 aspevere (with M1 04); 87 orbes (with A2); 176 habetur (with H); 215 illa (with L3); 242 deduxit (with L2); 244 ludo for uoto; 249 pesti for cladi; 333 meatu (with T2); 359 pinum; 403 titan; 414 tu sola (with D M3); 424 urgebam. Between I. 88 and 89, moreover, both MSS (and no other known to me) interpolate the line Tartara sedantur. Rex talibus ora resoluit (cf. Verg. Georg. 4. 452). There are, however, enough differences between them to make it clear that another source or other sources besides B0Z 50 (or its twin) were drawn on by the more recent Wroclaw MS.

8. Wroclaw University Library IV. Q. 57 is dated 1478. It contains the D.R.P. on fos 446r—466v, with 28 lines to the page. The text belongs to my Class \( \alpha \); I. 140 precedes 139 as in various \( \alpha \) MSS; II. 118 stands in the text; II. 336 precedes 335; and between III. 360 and 361 two stop-gap verses are found, Omnis honos recti nobis sic fata recedit and Atque duas lectura faces nemus intrat in alium, the former commonly found and offered also by B0Z 50, the latter rather rare but attested also in C3, O3 and P4 among the older MSS, K3 and L7 among the younger. In general W L5 and L6 appear to be among the closest older relatives of the MS, but an association with M3 is also discernible, though a somewhat more distant one than in the case of B0Z 50. Among its more interesting readings (not shared with B0Z 50) are: I. 46 pecore (with M2/3); 49 strauere (with F5); 85 Tartara (with W); 97 si non; 220 peragi (with L10 in its commentary, R4, A2); 282 potantes tranquiliae (with F1 M1, R25); II. pf. 31 Quot (B0Z 50 appears to have Quod); II. 2 uibrabat (with a); 9 illa tamen nullis; 68 Ermos; 82 longe largiur; 158 Encheladon (a form not mentioned by Neue); 163 transit in; 249 reddit; 254 pignus for tantas; 265 Quo . . . collecti flores; 289 Purpurei; 291 nitido for viridi; 362 ad thalamos; III. 74 prestantior; 105 te nata (= Heinsius’ conjecture); 129 liuentia; 246 ceruixque remissa; 259 senium luctu (also in Leiden 2151, cf. P.A.C.A. 12 (1973), 13-14); 325 facibus nostris; 357 non tamen hec uenerata Ceres; 360 an magis (= V and Heinsius’ conj.).

Particularly interesting in view of the late date of this MS is the fact that it provides evidence of the lasting influence, three hundred or so years after its compilation, of the commentary on the D.R.P. by Geoffrey of Vitry (edited by A. K. Clarke and P. M. Giles, Brill, 1973). So too, I suspect, would B0Z 50, if its marginal and interlinear notes, unlike those of the Wroclaw MS, were at all legible on microfilm. Some extracts from the Wroclaw MS will help to make clear the connection with Geoffrey’s commentary, and also indicate certain features shared with the Statius commentary edited by P. M. Clogan (Brill, 1968). Fo. 446r: Claudius Florentini Imperatoris (sic) Romani tempore floruisse dicitur. poeta clarus suo floruit doctus eloquio ingeniosorum (sic) morum urbanitatibus imbutus qui priscum gesta tanti principis scriberet pro exercitando ingenio presens opus utpote de proserpina ad inferos raptu edidit ut postea Florentini fortia facta satius describere posset. . . . Intentio autem presentis autoris est triplex scilicet ingenii proprii acutio Florentini petitionibus satisfactio et ingenuarum virgineum urginum nubiles annos habentium quo more seruari debent a matribus instructio ne similitur eis contingat ut Cereri in Asiam ad Cibelem proficisce (sic) uti filliam Proserpinam sine tutela derequit et raptam a Plutone postea regrediens domi non inuenit. . . .
enim nos ne Plutonis exemplo alicam rapiamus et propria cautiatus quam
Ceres obseruemus. . . . Vnde et etice supponitur, tractat enim de moribus
matris ad filiam et raptoris ad raptam. The resemblances between this
accessus and that printed on pp. 23-24 of the Clarke-Giles edition of
Geoffrey of Vitry are striking in the extreme; and the correspondences
within the body of notes are no less so. The note on I. 171, for example
(hoc respicit expressionem ignis impetuosi qui tam cito de cauernis egressurus
sicut lapis a tormento mittitur), is almost exactly the same as that in Clarke-
Giles, p. 41; that on I. 191 (quanto enim quis elongatur ab aliquo loco tanto
minorem illius speculatur quantitatem) is very close to the one in Clarke-
Giles, p. 43; and there is a great deal in common between the note in
Clarke-Giles, p. 51, and that with which the Wroclaw scribe introduces
the preface to the second book of the D.R.P.: Comparat . . . autor se
Orpheo Florentinum uero imperatorem Herculi et uolto quemadmodum (?)
Orpheus citarista optimus amissa aput inferos Euridice conjuge sua ab opere
cessauerat . . . Orpheus ergo pre gaudio cissauit ita etiam Clauidius
ostendit se citarisationibus dui cessasse sed gratia Florentini animum suum
ad scribendum rursus applicuisse. The vehicle by which this exegetical
material has been conveyed from France in the twelfth century to Poland
in the fifteenth will have been that perennial manual of instruction the
'liber Catonianus', of which Hartman Schedel's MS, the one I designate
M3, is a typical specimen.

NOTES

1 For information about the fate of the Wroclaw MSS (one of which still
survives, uid. infra) I am indebted to the Director of the Biblioteka
Głowna in Wroclaw, Dr Bartolomiej Kuzak.

2 I am glad to acknowledge the kindness of Dr I. F. Grigorieva in arranging
for me to have microfilm of the MS.

3 I unfortunately omitted to take cognizance of this MS in my ed. of the
D.R.P.

4 Cf. my ed. pp. 55 and 57 n. 2. The first hand omits I. 141-214, III. 279-360
and 438-448; a fourteenth century hand supplied the first and third of
these passages but not the second. The loss of one fo. after fo. 78 has
resulted in the loss of III. 152-271 (= four columns each of 30 verses, the
MS being bicolumnar). There is no preface to Book III.

5 For my information about the history of this MS I am grateful to the
Deputy Director of the Biblioteka Narodowa, Dr Rafał Kozlowski,
whose kindness in arranging for me to have microfilm I am also glad to
acknowledge.
THE BREAD LINE THROUGH OSTIA TO ROME

by G. HERMANSEN

University of Alberta, Edmonton and Rome

What always stands in the way of the understanding of the workings of Roman society is our nearly complete lack of Roman statistics. It stands in our way of estimating the population of Rome, the uncertainty of which is more stressed than dissolved by Brunt's big work on Roman manpower. Brunt is mostly concerned with the time of the Republic, and if one then turns to the Empire it appears that too much faith has been placed in the information of the Regionaries, the descriptive lists of the City of Rome; the figures of these lists have been manipulated and changed for promotional purposes.

The Romans were not really interested in statistics, or rather, they tired easily of them, not the least on account of their cumbersome Roman number system (MDLCXXIII times DXIV?) and tended to use round figures for rhetorical effect.

Closely related to the problem of the population of Rome is that of the grain import and of the daily bread of the Romans, and if the statistics on grain import are as suspect as other statistics, we have at least some of the import granaries left in Ostia; they can be measured and give us a feeling of dimensions, volumes and of the possible.

In Republican times most of the overseas import of grain went through Ostia. Toward the end of the Republic other ports like Puteoli gained auxiliary importance, and Rome's need for port facilities became so desperate that first Claudius, then Trajan, built ports a few kilometres north of Ostia. These new harbours were called Portus.

This expansion, in turn, led to frantic building activities in Old Ostia, during the first three quarters of the 2nd century, and a prominent group of buildings in New Ostia were the horrea, storage magazines. Trajan built three big granaries (horrea mensorum I xix 4, the unnamed horrea III ii 6, and the horrea of Artemis V xi 8), Hadrian added seven plants (I vii 2, I viii 1, I viii 2, I xiii 1, I xx 1, III xvii 1, IV viii 5), but after that impressive contribution of Hadrian only two plants are constructed in Ostia: the horrea Epagathiana I viii 3 145-150 AD under Antoninus Pius, and the large, but unexcavated, horrea Antoniniiana II ii 7 under Commodus. From the time of Claudius are the partly excavated horrea V i 2 in the south end of the City and the Grandi Horrea II ix 3 and 7, the biggest that so far have been found in Ostia. Finally, to include everything, only two, maybe three, horrea are pre-Claudian: V xii 2 from 1st century BC, the small horrea IV v 12 from the early 1st century, and the horrea of Hortensius on the eastern Decumanus V xii 1, dated to 30-40 AD. It is clear that the important part of the storage space was built as an immediate consequence of the new port facilities.

The big, important horrea that were built after the time of Commodus
all went up at Portus. But in order to find out what exactly went on in Portus we need a few archaeological probes.

It is often asked what the horrea space in Ostia meant to Rome,—to what extent was it for the supply of Rome or for local consumption?

One thinks first of all of the grain supply, and what will be said here refers to the grain horrea of Ostia. It is safe to say that some of the horrea in the impressive line of horrea along the river must have been built for the storage of grain alone. The biggest of all the excavated horrea, the grandi horrea, were definitely for grain storage: they were equipped with raised floors to allow air to circulate under the grain; the same kind of floor is found in the horrea Antoniniana, of which only a fraction has been laid free, but which may turn out to be the biggest of its kind in Ostia; also in the horrea I viii 2 there is the same kind of floor. Close to the river is also the so-called Piccolo Mercato I viii 1; south of the Decumanus are Hortensius' and Artemis' horrea V xii 1; V xi 8. Neither the horrea of the mensores nor the neighbouring horrea I xx 1 were set up for grain storage; Rickman (p. 71) believes that the latter horrea contained a market hall.

To these must be added smaller and less important horrea in other parts of the city, but horrea were also used for many other purposes than storing grain. Finally it is to be expected that more horrea will be excavated at the river west of the already excavated area, although not much space is left here. Still, west of Reg. III xvii the east wall of another horrea building has come out.4

What did this storage space mean to Rome, and would it be possible to arrive at a rough figure for the grain storage capacity in Ostia? The grandi horrea have 64 cellae, which in size vary from 4,5 by 7,00 m. to 4,5 by 17,5 m to 5,5 by 10,5 m. The storage capacity of the horrea depends on how high one piles the grain. The cellae offer the same type of storage as the standard farm granaries on the Canadian Prairies, where it is standard procedure to build them so that wheat can be stored to a height of 8 feet (= 2,44 m). This height came naturally at a time when most of the work with the grain was done by hand, as in Antiquity. If the grandi horrea, for instance, had all the 64 cells filled up to the 2,44 m mark, they would hold 5 550 metric tons.5 If piled to the height of 3 m, the storage capacity would be 6 825 tons.

There is no doubt that the grain of the Romans as a rule was shipped in bulk and stored in bulk. This is quite clear from the provisions made by Roman law in cases where grain belonging to different owners was dumped in the same ship's hold without partitions or other kinds of separation (Dig. 19, 2, 31).6

It is also clearly demonstrated by a wall painting in Domitilla's Catacombs in Rome where two naues codicariae are shown while they are being unloaded. One sees here the loose grain in the holds of the boat.7) Thus bulk handling had the consequence that grain was measured over again at every step of the operation, and there was a great need for grain measurers. It deserves also to be noted that many cellae of the horrea are set up for storage of loose grain and to be filled to greater heights than 2,44 m or 8 feet. 31 cellae of the grandi horrea, all the excavated cellae of the horrea Antoniniana, some of the cellae in the horrea I viii 1 and I viii 2, and some
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cellae in the horrea at Claudius' portico in Portus have still preserved their inside door pillars which will hold checkboards, so that the loose grain will be kept back from the door and the door can move freely (see fig. 1).

Fig. 1. Plan of front end of granary cell. Note the pillars on either side of the door. The boards inside the door could cover the whole height of the door, one above the other, and keep the grain away and allow the wings of the door to move freely.

In modern times loose wheat is piled up with mechanical help of elevators or augers or, a generation back, the blowers of old fashioned threshing machines. In Antiquity it was handled by many small men, who could not reach up high inside a granary, but who could carry sacks on their backs or on their heads (as in the loading operation of the Isis Giminiana, Testaguzza p. 226), climb ladders, and walk on movable planks on top of the grain pile. In the horrea at Claudius' portico at Portus (Testaguzza p. 211) the height of the cellae would permit the grain to be stored to about 4 m at the back, and here it would be necessary to climb ladders. The grain level at the front depended on the height of the door opening. These horrea have suspensurae floors and are grain magazines and nothing else. Even though some of the cellae are 7 m high, as was the case in the Piccolo Mercato I viii 2, it is doubtful that grain was piled higher than 3 m. The limiting factor is the height of the doors. It is very unlikely that grain was stored to greater heights than the height of the doors. The window above the door or the loophole in the back of the cella (if any) cannot possibly have been covered; the window would be the only access to a filled and boarded-up granary, and the bottom of the windows is the absolute top limit of grain storage. This is the case in the Piccolo Mercato, where the sills of the window openings above the doors are well below the 4 m mark. What has been discussed above is the ground floor storage capacity. There were, however, upstairs floors in some horrea. The north wing of the Commodan alteration of the grandi horrea has a first floor, served by two ramps. The walls of the wing are 90-110 cm thick. Similar dimensions are found in the horrea in Portus which are laid free and accessible. These walls are strong enough to
support an upper story with a heavy load of stored grain. The other horrea with staircases are Piccolo Mercato I viii 1 and horrea I viii 2, but it is doubtful how much grain could be stored there. A 53-54 cm wall (horrea I viii 2) \(^2\) may have been too thin to support the weight of a 5 by 8 m cella stored with wheat to the height of 3 m, which is 90 tons, nor does the Piccolo Mercato with 60 cm walls\(^3\) seem able to support the 134,75 tons in an upstairs cella 5 by 12 m especially since the ground floor cella had walls that were 7 m high. It seems unlikely when compared to many walls in Ostian buildings which had been reinforced by pillars under load conditions which must be considered much lighter. If those upstairs rooms had grain in them, it must have been a reduced load.

To give a round figure: the grandi horrea, with a storage potential of 6 800 metric tons, if each cella were filled to the 3 m mark, cover an area of 7 200 sq. m. Horrea Antoniniana, with a front of 97 m on the Decumanus, may have gone to the same depth as the grandi horrea and would then measure 9 700 sq. m. Horrea of Hortensius cover 5 000 sq. m (this figure should be reduced on account of its oversize courtyard). Horrea of Artemis 1 800 sq. m. Horrea I viii 2 2020 sq. m. Piccolo Mercato I viii I 4370 sq. m. Those are the evident grain horrea, with a total area of 30 090 sq. m. For our calculations another 10 000 sq. m may be added from three sources: from upstairs storage space, from new excavations further west, or from the already excavated horrea which do not obviously look like granaries, bringing the total up to some 40 000 sq. m, a figure which seems rather high, when one considers that the total area of the excavated horrea is 46 035 sq. m.\(^4\) Whereas the 7 200 sq. m of the grandi horrea have a potential of 6 800 tons, the whole 40 000 sq. m storage potential would be about 37 800 tons. The grain import from Egypt and Africa is recorded as being 60 million modii a year,\(^5\) equal to 381 342 tons. This figure is highly suspect; it is based on a combination of statistics from the time of Augustus and Vespasian, which means that it applies to a time much earlier than the time which is discussed here. If, however it is fairly correct, the 37 800 tons which could be stored in Ostia would be 9,9 % of the yearly grain import to Rome from Egypt and Africa in the first century AD.

In the course of time storage facilities, on a much larger scale than in Ostia, were developed at Portus.\(^6\) Though space was more restricted than in Ostia, as remarked by Meiggs (p. 162), the space given to horrea and other import facilities was more conspicuous than in Ostia. The capacity of the individual horrea in Portus was bigger than what was offered by their Ostian counterparts: the Severan (Lugli), or Marcus Aurelian,\(^7\) horrea at the basin between the two harbours has 29 cellae 5,9 by 11 m and 15 cellae 5,9 by 15 m for a total of 3 210 sq. m on each of the two storeys, or 6 420 sq. m in all. Filled with grain to the 3 m level it would hold 14 200 tons, to the 4 m mark nearly 19 000 tons. It may also be fair to assume that the Romans went on using some horrea space at Puteoli.\(^8\)

What Ostia could mean to the food supply of Rome can only be expressed in a very loose estimate.

The 37 800 tons that could be stored in Ostia equalled the old-style frumentatio of just below 100 000 recipients a year, if the grain was distributed at the old rate of 5 modii a month per person.\(^9\) The figure of 37 800 tons is an ideal capacity, which can hardly ever have been achieved
in real life. Ostia, of course, can only have been a station on the way to Rome, and Ostia's capacity as grain supplier would depend on the turn-over: how fast the grain was in and out of Ostia. The short navigation season would hardly allow more than two round trips Alexandria-Rome, and closer to home the traffic from Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, etc. was running concurrently. By our standards the whole movement was slow—the *codicarii* took three days to bring the grain from Ostia to Rome. If then the slow-down of navigation in winter is considered, it might not be prudent to estimate an annual grain flow to Ostia of more than three times the capacity of the Ostian *horræa*. That would, ideally, mean a grain flow of some 113,000 tons during the year, less than 30% of the alleged import to Rome of 381,342 tons from Egypt and Africa in the 1st century A.D. Some of these 113,000 tons must have been consumed in Ostia by the local population and travellers and visitors. P. A. Brunt (p. 382-83) estimates that each *frumentatio* ration fed two persons, so that 113,000 tons would be the diet of 678,000 persons for a year. If 78,000 rations were retained at Ostia for local consumption, nearly 600,000 Romans could theoretically benefit from the granary capacity of Ostia.


NOTES

1 In the work listed as Brunt in the bibliographical note at the beginning of this article.


3 All dates from ScO I 233ff.; about V xii 2, see Meiggs 122.

4 All Ostian *horræa* are described and their use discussed in Rickman 15ff.

5 The figures used in this and the following calculations are: 1 *modius* = 8,49 litres; with an average bushel weight for wheat of 60 imperial pounds the *modius* weighs 6,355 695 kg.; 1 cubic metre (= 27,21582 bu. @ 27,21582 kg) weighs 748,60955 kg—The cellae of Grandi Horrea: 12 cellae average 4,5 by 9,5 m; 8 ce. aver. 4,5 by 12 m; 8 ce. 4,5 by 7 m;
7 ce. 5 by 10 m; 7 ce. 5 by 7 m; 6 ce. 5,5, by 10,5 m; 6 ce. 4,5 by 10m; 6 ce. 5 by 10,5 m; and 4 ce. 4,5 by 17,5 m; on the grandi Horrea, see Calza in NSc 1921 360ff.

6 I owe this reference to Lionel Casson, who discusses it in his Ships and Seamanship p. 200.

7 Tengström, plate VI, and ref. to Wilpert’s publication of the painting p. 101.

8 Testaguzza, 211 top.

9 Rickman 20.

10 See Rickman plate 1 and 2, where the four cella fronts are shown; the cella vaults have been restored, but the bottoms of the original windows can easily be discerned in the photos.

11 Testaguzza, 192 and 211.

12 Rickman 29.

13 Rickman 20.

14 Becatti in ScO I 70.


18 Meiggs 57.

19 This rate is from the first century B.C. (Brunt 382), and our information from later times is frustratingly inadequate. Frumentatio was later replaced by erogatio panis—bread instead of grain—but details of the system are lacking. An edict of 369, Cod. Theod. 14 17 5, prescribes that each Roman citizen shall receive 36 Roman ounces of bread a day free of charge, which seems to indicate that previously they had to pay for them.

20 Casson, 236ff.

21 Tengström 59, with quotation from Philostratus.
REVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS


Before the publication of this edition the student who wished to read *Troades* with the help of a commentary in English was obliged to use the commentaries, seventy years old and more, by Tyrrell and Paley. The student who was content with an unannotated text might turn to Murray (Oxford Classical Text, 3rd ed. 1913) or Parmentier (Budé ed. 1925) or Biehl (Teubner ed. 1970).

How does Lee’s text compare in quality with the texts of Murray, Parmentier and Biehl? A rough and ready calculation will indicate its comparative quality. I should print a text different from Murray’s in about 132 places, from Lee’s in about 142, from Biehl’s in about 162, and from Parmentier’s in about 176. I cannot therefore say that Lee’s text is a satisfactory one, or even that it is the least unsatisfactory text available.

Consider the nature of these differences. In no fewer than ninety places, where Lee has printed the reading of a manuscript, I should print a conjecture. In a further eighteen places, where Lee has printed the reading of a manuscript, I should wish to obelize. And so, in 108 places out of 142, Lee is prepared to accept the transmitted text, while I am not. Conversely, there are only five places where Lee has printed a conjecture and I should wish to retain the transmitted text.

A statement in the Preface goes some way to explaining Lee’s conservative attitude. ‘For information about ... earlier conjectures I have relied heavily on the Oxford and Budé texts and on the recent Teubner edition of W. Biehl. My debt in general to these works and to earlier commentaries, especially those of Paley and Tyrrell, will be obvious to the reader.’ The debt to Murray, Parmentier and Biehl is obvious indeed; for this explains why so many textual difficulties go unnoticed and so many good conjectures are scorned. These are not editors who may be trusted even to report (let alone accept) the best available conjectures. What is not obvious is who are those earlier commentators, other than Tyrrell and Paley, to whom Lee confesses a debt. Not Musgrave, Heath, Reiske, Matthiae, Burges, Seidler, Dindorf, or Kirchhoff. These are the critics to whom one looks for informed and intelligent discussion (even Burges shows acute intelligence at times), and if Lee owes them a debt he has repaid it ill.

I shall record the five places where I, for once, should play the conservative and Lee adopts a conjecture. (i) at 280, in an astrophic passage of lyrics, the mss have ἐλκτὸν χεστί διπτυχον παρειαν and the first editor, Musurus, wrote ὀνυχεστί, which editors have unthinkingly printed ever since. Musurus’ conjecture gives a choriamb in the first metron of a catalectic iambic trimeter; and a choriamb is not one whit preferable to the resolved cretic which the mss offer. (ii) at 830, again in lyrics, the mss are divided between τεκνον and τοκευν. Stephanus’ τεκνον neatly explains the divergence. But if the text of 829-30 has been correctly restored by Hermann and Bothe (whom Lee and the other modern editors follow), then...
we need an iambus, and Euripides, in the ten other places where he uses this form, scans τεκνων as an anaepaest. If, therefore, we follow Herrmann and Bothe, we must accept τεκνων. (iii) at 879 the mss are divided between δοσων and δοσοί. There is no fault in δοσων, and Canter’s δοσος (which Lee, Murray and Parmentier print) is an unnecessary compromise. There is an interesting discussion by M. W. Haslam, *ZPE* 20 (1976) 55-7, of the wax tablet from the first century A.D. which quotes this passage. (iv) at 1188 Lee calls ὑπνοι τ’ ἐξεινοι ‘flat’ and prints Μυμρο’s ὑπνοὶ τε κοινοὶ, which he supports by reference to the reading λεγος at 1181. At 1181 I should accept the alternative reading πελαγως (cf. Fraenkel on Ag. 233); and Jackson’s defence of ἐξεινοι (*Marginalia scenaica* 87), which Lee has overlooked, is convincing. (v) at 1254 Lee follows Biehl in accepting Herrmann’s deletion of two words, so that 1251-5 may correspond with 1256-9. This may be right, but it is not certain that these verses were meant to correspond, and so I should leave the text untouched.

Lee prints two conjectures of his own. Neither is acceptable. At 288-91 metre shows that the transmitted text is faulty; but since we do not know what the metre should be (the passage is astrophic), we cannot restore the text with certainty. Lee replaces Τρωὰς with γνωρίως and adds a κατ. The text restored by him runs as follows: γνωρίω, ὁ γνωρίως, με. βεβαξα <κατ;/δυσποτικς οἰχομαι ἀ-ταλαινα, δυστυχεστατο/ προσπεποσω κληρω. This is a peculiar metrical sequence: a hemiepes, ending with a proclitic monosyllable, is unhappily sandwiched between dochmiacs and iambics. And attention needs to be drawn to an anomaly in the dochmiac -κες με. βεβαξα κατ: rhetorical pause at divided resolution in the first long, on which see L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968) 265-6. But worse than peculiar is the style. ‘For the emphatic repetition βεβαξα ... οἰχομαι cf. *Ores*. 971f. βεβαξε γαρ βεβαξεν, οἰχεται τεκνω/ προπασα γεννα Πελαγως.’ This quotation, so far from supporting the conjecture, highlights its deficiencies. For while ‘I am gone, I am departed’ is a vigorous repetition, ‘I am gone and I am departed’ is vapid. But Lee’s conjecture goes further than that: ‘I am gone and ill-fated I am departed wretched’, which is unspeakable.

Lee’s other conjecture, τε added after ἄναγγε at 332, also gives objectionable metre: an isolated dochmiac in the middle of iambics. At 550 he proposes, but does not print, <ὑπερ> εδωκεν, which he translates ‘gave in its place’, comparing fr. 360.18, where the verb does not mean (as LSJ also suppose) ‘give instead of’ but ‘give on behalf of’, a meaning which does not suit our passage.

The apparatus criticus is printed not under the text but as a separate item after it. Lee has collated from photographs the only three mss which have any independent value, VPQ. He is more accurate than his predecessors in his reports. But he has not examined Q with sufficient care, for he repeats traditional false reports in the following places (I give the correct report in brackets): 452 (as P), 538 (ὅς* as P, which he also reports wrongly), 597 (ἂδην), 886 (as VP), 1052 (not ascribed to Menelaus), 1118 (as VP), 1230 (as VP). I miss relevant information at 114 (reading of V), 120 (P), and 1305 (Herrmann’s supplement, which is printed, is not men-

* The Editor apologizes for being unable to print accents in the Greek. Please note that ὅς in line 45, p. 28, should have a grave accent.
tioned here). At 879 and 1323 the items in the app. crit. are placed in the wrong order. The layout of the app. crit. is generally clear; but not at 595-600, where the presentation of the evidence for attribution of speakers is bewildering. The following conjectures are wrongly attributed (I give wrong attribution first, right second): 239 (Nauck; Matthiae), 247 (Murray; Kirchhoff), 847 (Murray; Victorius), 1196 (Dobree; Barnes). In the commentary conjectures are wrongly attributed at 350 (Broadhead; Heath and Nauck), 533 (Jackson; Dobree). At 1245 and 1307 readings are ascribed to 'recentiores'. Lee does not explain what he means by this term, and so he leaves the reader to suppose that he is referring to some late and unspecified mss. The fact is that 'rec.' is a silly term devised by the editor of the first Budé volume, Méridier, who defined it as 'leçons de manuscrits inférieurs ou corrections laissées anonymes'. By the fourth volume, which contains Troades, this has been reduced to 'corrections laissées anonymes'. The conjectures in question are not even anonymous; their origins can be discovered by consulting, in the first case, the apparatus of Wecklein, in the second the apparatus of either Wecklein or Murray.

Lee repeats the conventional dating of Q in the fifteenth century. But N. G. Wilson, Gnomon 38 (1966) 337, has shown that the scribe was not born until 1474, so that a date from around 1500 onwards is more likely. Lee's ascription of Neapolitanus II F 9 to the sixteenth century seems to be the result of copying Parmentier instead of consulting Turyn, The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides 54. On p. xxvi the statement that the select plays of Euripides survive in only 'four medieval manuscripts' is a remarkable error.

On the whole the app. crit. is a reliable guide to what is in VPQ. But about the sources of evidence available to us for the constitution of the text it gives a very misleading impression. A large number of verses is quoted in two gnomologies, but the app. crit. excludes all mention of this source. An especially regrettable omission is at 350, where the reading of the gnomology comes closest to what I believe to be the truth. There are numerous quotations of the play by later authors. When the text given by our mss may be suspected or the mss differ among themselves, we need to be shown the evidence of these quotations. It is rarely shown. When so much has been omitted from the app. crit., I begrudge the inclusion of an unmetrical conjecture by the corrector of P at 1039.

I wish that I could say that Lee's deficiencies as an editor were compensated by his merits as a commentator. I shall begin by examining his reliability as a guide on matters of grammar, idiom and style. At 7 I am astonished that he should consider (even though he rejects it) the possibility that τον δικαιον is to be construed with Φρυγών. At 138, although he prints the right reading, he does not know that the alternative reading is not grammatical (cf. Denniston and Page on Ag. 1144ff.). At 188 he feels no qualm about having the pronoun με twice in the same clause, when the sense requires it only once (cf. Page on Med. 1296). At 223 he confuses dative of respect with instrumental dative. He defends ἀφιλά . . . παντων at 287 by claiming that the genitive is 'normal with compounds of α privative'. There is no such normality. The reason why ἀφιλος φιλον (which he quotes) is correct and ἀφιλος παντων is incorrect can be found in Kühner-Gerth 1.401-2. At 241-2, where the mss give τιν ή Θεσσαλιάς πολιν ή Φθαδος σιτης, Hartung deleted the second ή because, in Lee's
words, 'Phthia was in Thessaly'. 'But,' argues Lee, 'η need not connect two mutually exclusive alternatives.' And so, if I were to ask Lee in what city his book was published, I suppose he would not think it absurd to reply 'In London or the capital of England'. At 445 he says 'After 'Αίδου we must understand something like οἶκος'. The word which Euripides uses for the 'house' of Hades is never οἶκος. At 475-6 he says that ἀλλας is better taken with the verb ἔγενεμηγη than with the noun ἄρπημον. That it should be taken with the noun is decisively proved by Ar. Nub. 1203; cf. fr. 360.27, S. Phil. 947 (I do not include Ion 537, where ἄλλας should be read). At 910 he calls μηδέμον the 'lectio difficilior': an unfortunate label, since μηδέμοις, which he supposes to be the 'lectio facilior', is used only in prohibitions or quasi-prohibitions, and is therefore neither more easy nor more difficult but simply impossible. At 951 ἐνθεν cannot mean 'from that point': in tragedy it never stands for ἐνθενε but always has relative force. Here it means, as Tyrrell says, 'to advert to a point' from whence, just as at 647 ἐνθα means 'to advert to a situation' where, a passage which both Tyrrell and Lee misunderstand. At 1300 μαλερα μελάθρα πυρι κατάδρομα, it is unthinkable that μαλερα should be construed as an adverb. The text is mistranslated at 990 (see Tyrrell) and 1052 (where Biehl has misled Lee into translating των ἐρωμενων, 'the beloved', as 'the lovers').

The quotation of parallels does not take up any large part of Lee's commentary. And some of the parallels which he does quote have no right to be quoted at all. Corruptions in the text of Troades are supported by the quotation of corrupt passages at 146-8 (on Hec. 398 see Jackson, Marginalia scaenica 159-60), 731ff. (at Hel. 747 Kirchhoff rightly conjectured οἶδε), 1015 (anyone who examines the evidence for κατοι γε presented by Denniston, Greek particles 564, must conclude, with Porson on Med. 675 [677], that 'Atticis non licuisse γε post το: ponere, nisi alio vocabulo interjecto'; at IT 720 read ατηγυς with Erfurdt). At 70 it was no use quoting IT 813, which is correctly emended in Murray's text; nor at 204 was it profitable to quote IT 203ff., which are unintelligible. At 635 'apposition of whole and part' is illustrated by the quotation of a passage in which two words are not in apposition but are linked by τε.

Lee is apt to express himself carelessly. On 269 'ἀξιος is the Doric form of ἄλις'. It is the Doric form of the epic ἄλις. Sometimes he is not only careless but also mystifying. At 571 he says about the word πους that 'Frisk derives the word from *ἐν-γν-ις giving it the zero grade of the root we find in γεγονος, γενος etc.'. This is not information which the student wants; but if he is to be given it, let him at least be given the name of Frisk's book, so that he can find out what Frisk was talking about. Lee's note on 884 ο γης ογημα κατε γης ἐχον ἐδραν, the opening line of Hecuba's celebrated prayer, reads as follows: 'i.e. ἀγη. Diogenes of Apollonia adapted the ideas of Anaximenes and believed that Air, the primary substance, was the all-disposing power.' A note so expressed is an affront to the able student and a deterrent to the less able. Let them at least be given a reference to Kirk and Raven, The Presocratic philosophers, so that they can find out what Diogenes and Anaximenes really believed and whether this is relevant to the interpretation of the verse. In fact Euripides is alluding not to ἀγη but to κιθηγη: the relevant information is given by K. Matthiessen, Hermes 96 (1968) 699-701. Traditional jargon occasion-
ally contributes a further layer of obscurity to the notes. We hear at 225 of 'a locus conclamatus' and at 422 of 'infinitivus pro imperativo', and at 298 we are told that 'it is tempting to regard aɪθετικας as lectio facilior non potior', which is not even a grammatically correct use of the phrase.

Lee is not a reliable guide on metre. At 99 he has the strange notion that in the anapaestic dimeter elision after the first metron 'destroys the metron diaeresis'. At 226 he says obscurely that 'the pause before the rel. is unusual, hence Nauck's τινα.' I assume that he means that we should not expect a pause (affording hiatus) after a paroemiac, which is simply false. When he adds 'Cf., however, the pause before δς in 285' he shows that he does not know that pause (and hiatus) is what you would expect to find at a change of metre. He makes a fine mess of analysing 513-15 = 533-5 (he cites Dale's analysis of this ode in BICS Suppl. 21.1 (1971) 81, but pays her no heed) and 1289-90. His text of 848-9 has hiatus between iambic dimeters. His text of 1079 and 1087 (lyric iambics) infringes the extended Porson's law; see Parker, CQ 16 (1966) 12-20. At 1186 he offers a literary judgement on the rhythm of the trimeter γυας ἀπολις ἄτεκνος ἀθαλον θητητο νεκρον, which he believes 'imitates the slow, halting speech of an old woman'. This is a strange way to describe the effect of six consecutive short syllables. At 1251 he fails to see that, if these anapaests are lyric (which I do not believe), ἂ must be changed to ἄ. Less culpable errors (since he has the authority of Dale for committing them) are his belief in 'hexamakra' at 144 and 148 (for arguments against this supposed length see PCPS n.s. 20 (1974) 23-4) and his belief in anapaests consisting of three shorts at 136 (Ion 900 and IT 130 are easily emended, IT 220 and 232 are not anapaestic, IT 197 is corrupt).

Lee offers a new interpretation of 150. He argues that σκηττρω Πριαμου διερεδομενο should be taken in a figurative rather than a literal sense ('relying on Priam's royal power, i.e. exercising my prerogative as consort'). In another context such a figurative sense might be applicable; it is not applicable here. Hecuba says 'Once upon a time I led the worship of the gods with the tap of my foot that began the dance, as I leaned on Priam's sceptre'. A confusion of the literal sense (tapping the ground with the foot) and the figurative sense (leaning on a metaphorical sceptre) is unimaginable. These lines do, indeed, harbour a problem. That Hecuba should dance while leaning on a sceptre is a comic idea. And we cannot plead that she needs the sceptre to support her infirmity, for these lines describe the Hecuba of happier days, when she needed no support. We must accept Herwerden's διερεδομενον, so that it will be Priam who leans on his sceptre. It is appropriate that, when the queen begins her dance, the king should be at hand, and that the emblem of royalty should support the immobile spectator.

There is a short Introduction, which discusses the play in general terms and relates it to contemporary Athenian history. Most of what is said here, while not new, is sensible. But it was incautious to repeat Snell's reconstruction of the Alexandros without any hint of the speculative nature of that reconstruction. Not all readers will take note of the brief addendum on p. 286 which records the publication of a Hypothesis of the Alexandros (R.A. Coles, BICS Suppl. 32 (1974)), which shows that Snell was wrong over several details.

I shall end by explaining two passages which not only Lee but also all,
or nearly all, other commentators misunderstand. At 329-30 Cassandra sings κατὰ σον ἐν δαφναίς/ ἀκακτήρων θυητόλο. Lee translates 'It is in your temple, which stands in the midst of bay trees, that I offer sacrifice', adding that 'The bay tree was sacred to Apollo and for this reason his temples are often surrounded by them'. The other commentators offer the same interpretation. But this is not a meaning which ἐν δαφναῖς, in this sentence at least, can bear. The correct interpretation was recognised by the scholiast (μετὰ δαφνών χορεὺω) and by Wilamowitz in his verse-translation ('Durch deine Hallen wall' ich keusch im Lorbeerschmuck'). It is Cassandra herself who is ἐν δαφναῖς, 'crowned with bay leaves', as she is again, in a more explicit description, at IA 759-60. These are the garlands which she flings down at 451 (cf. 256-8). The use of ἐν for 'equipped with', 'clothed in', is quite regular: see Kühner-Gerth 1.463, Denniston on El. 321 and my note on CycI. 360 in CQ 21 (1971) 46. Similar are HF 677 ἐν στεφανοίσθη, Ion 1310 ἐν στεμμασίν, and above all Call. fr. 194. 26 Pf. καὶ Πιθία γαρ ἐν δαφνή μὲν ἱδρυται.

At 457 Cassandra bids Agamemnon embark for home with all speed, ός μὲν τρίων Ἐρίνους τηδέσε μ’ ἐξάξων χθόνος, 'for you will take me from this land as one Erinys of three'. Lee remarks: 'It is interesting that Eur. specifies that there were three Furies. In Aeschylus and even in the IT (cf. 79) they appear to be unlimited in number.' Lee has forgotten that Euripides specifies three Erinys at Or. 408 and 1650. But that is unimportant. Cassandra is not saying (as the other commentators, too, suppose) 'I shall be an Erinys—one of the three', for that would be a pointless thing to say. She is saying that three Erinys will take vengeance on Agamemnon when he arrives home. And those three will be herself, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Incidentally, when Lee adds that 'Tyrrell prints Ἐρίνου as a genitive plural, but this form is without a parallel', he might have observed that Burges prints Ἐρίνουων, and this form is paralleled as a trisyllable at IT 931, 970, 1456, and it may be right here.

There are misprints at the foot of p. 1, in the app. crit. at 257 and 260, in the text at 325 (comma missing), 355 and 1101 (intrusive comma), and 1161, and in the notes at 329-30 (Musgrave's conjecture wrongly accented) and 726. Rough breathing is mistakenly printed for coronis throughout: see Housman, Classical papers 1097-8.

Queens' College, Cambridge. JAMES DIGGLE


This is the fourth edition of the script of a stage play to be published in a series whose stated aim is 'to provide the student with the guidance he needs for the interpretation and understanding of the book as a work of literature.' The editor, R. H. Martin, is a good Latin grammarian of the old-fashioned kind. Although he frequently makes statements like 'it is one of the attractions of Terence's play that it poses an interesting question on which each new reader must make up his mind' (note on v. 992), his heart is clearly more in distinguishing potential from optative subjunctives than in discoursing on the 'themes' of the play, the 'issues' it raises and the
characterisation of the personages or in 'assessing' literary achievement. He performs his task as he sees it in a business-like way, making few major errors and promulgating no contentiously unorthodox theories. 'Students at school and university' will learn something from the edition and suffer no harm.

The introduction consists of four chapters: 'Terence and Roman comedy', 'Terence and the "Adelphoe"'; 'Metre and Scansion'; 'The Text'. There is nothing about the physical conditions of ancient theatres.

The chapter on 'Terence and Roman comedy' is informative and on the whole sensible. I should myself prefer to have seen here less about the supposed aims of particular poets and more about the scenic environment of all the translators of Attic drama, for example, the demand for a continuous performance and the availability of more than three actors. The fact that Caecilius maintained his reputation as the foremost Latin comedian until at least 46 B.C. (Cic. Opt. gen. or. 2) ought to have been mentioned on p. 3; it was surely he rather than Plautus against whom Julius Caesar's famous verses placed Terence; there is no sign of Plautus and Terence being set apart from all the other comedians before Plin. Epist. 1. 16. 6, 6. 21. 4. Martin might now modify his notions about the Roman literary 'establishment' in the light of N. M. Horsfall, 'The Collegium Poetarum', BICS L 23 (1976), 79-95. He tries to place a bet both ways on the subject of the 'Scipionic Circle' (with p. 7 and the note on v. 107 contrast p. 28 n. 4); he ought to have pointed out how dependent modern theories are on a certain interpretation of Cicero's De re publica.

He maintains his old interpretation of Phor. 4-8 (p. 9 n. 2), taking oratio and scriptura to cover both language and subject matter; Terence's point is surely that, since there are no paratragic themes in his comedies of the sort favoured by Luscius, the level of his oratio and scriptura is entirely appropriate to his subject matter and does not deserve opprobrious epithets. Highly debatable statements like 'he (sc. Terence) had the genius to perfect a true Latin style that was not a replica but a masterly equivalent of the Attic elegance of Menander' (p. 10) and 'Latin has an innate tendency to be more rhetorical and flamboyant than simple Attic idiom' could with advantage have been replaced with a rational explication of the ancient sources of such doctrine (e.g. Ter. Haut. 46, Caes. ap. Donat. Vit. Ter. 7, Quintil. Inst. 12. 10. 35-9).

The chapter on 'Terence and the "Adelphoe"' tries at the one time 'to assess the merit' of the Latin script 'in its own right' and to elucidate the relationship between this script and Menander's ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ. Martin believes that both scripts sought a focus in the characterisation of the old men. He seems to me to have allowed himself to be dragged away from his own purposes by recent works whose principal aim was to re-establish the drift of the Greek script. He would have done better to start from Donatus' straightforward account of the characterisation of Micco and Demea (Praef. III 6, notes on vv. 141, 380, 707, 789, 855, 882, 886, 895, 911, 938, 984, 986, 992). The possibility that Terence tinkered with the fabric of the Menandrian original is merely one of many factors with which an interpreter of the Latin script has to reckon. Martin presents the actual evidence for Menander's script clearly and fairly. It should have been pointed out, however, that the Menandrian verse cited by Photius, s.v. σχουμόνος, was ascribed not by Photius but by Dobree to the ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ. This was an
intelligent ascription (although it is unclear how the well-off Demea could be called an ἐργατής) but no elaborate theories on how Menander designed his action should be built upon it. The question of what Terence did with the four breaks made by Menander in the action might have been raised here rather than glanced at obscurely in notes like that on v. 854. Terence’s insertion of scenes from Diphilus’ Συνεκτοθησαυροιτες was also better treated here than in an appendix. Martin appears at times (e.g. p. 29) to be slightly embarrassed by the many modern discussions of Menander’s relations with the philosophers of the Lyceum. The matter is of no great moment to the reader of Terence but Martin could have dispensed some of the verbal fug by pointing out how little in fact the formal ethical doctrines of Aristotle and Theophrastus diverged from the traditional attitudes of property-owning Athenians.

The chapter on ‘Metre and Scansion’ treats a complex matter rather cursorily. Many teachers in late antiquity thought Terence to have written in prose (see, in addition to Lactantius ap. Rufin. Gramm. Lat. VI 564. 8, Prisc. Gramm. Lat. III 418. 8, 426. 11, the way in which P. Ox. 2401 presents the text of the Andria) while some who knew the truth (e.g. Rufinus and Priscian) could give no very good account of their knowledge. Donatus, if the extant Commentum fairly represents his teaching, made his pupils read the plays aloud with careful attention to sense and tone but did not trouble them with metrical intricacies or even expect them to possess the elementary kind of doctrine which Servius assumed in readers of Virgil. In modern times, both before the publication of Bentley’s De metris Terentianis schediasma in 1726 and afterwards, reciters of Terence seem to have got by to their own satisfaction without understanding very much about his metrical structures. Thus to say that ‘the primary purpose of learning to scan Terence is to make it possible to read his lines aloud’ (p. 33) is to genuflect mindlessly before a current educationist dogma. A commentator certainly ought to provide some metrical instruction. This is essential to anyone seeking insight into the way Terence wrote Latin or into how his scripts were corrupted during the process of transmission but the severe limitations set by the gods upon our knowledge need to be constantly recognised. Martin is well aware of the arguments which have raged over the ‘ictus’ of Latin verse (p. 31 n. 3) and yet promotes Bentley’s theory about its operation as more or less accepted fact, even describing the phenomena in terms of the theory (contrast the sobriety of C. Questa, Introduzione alla Metrica di Plauto [Bologna 1967]) and making statements like ‘in this metre metrical ictus and word-accent coincide to a considerable degree, and this seems to lend speed to the line’ (p. 31). Neither Fraenkel’s Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers (Berlin, 1928) nor Maas’s elegant demolition of the main thesis of this book (DLZ 50 [1929], 2244-7 [= Kl. Schr. 588-91]) figures in his bibliography.

Martin deserves applause for writing himself a chapter on ‘The Text’ and for not relegating the matter to the rear of his book. What he writes shows a reasonable acquaintance with research to date but because of its compression and generality it will not much enlighten the curious or facilitate understanding of the many textual discussions in the commentary.

Martin alleges that ‘there was no time at which he (sc. Terence) was not read, studied and commented on’ (pp. 38-9); as a matter of fact the only
Latin writer between the time of Augustus and that of Hadrian who can be shown to have possessed a direct acquaintance with his scripts is M. Valerius Probus. In saying that 'the extant manuscripts belong to two families. The first consists of a single manuscript (designated A . . . ' (p. 39) Martin has distinguished company but will raise smiles among those with an eye for formalistic nonsense. The account of the Bembine codex should have referred to the *scaena* divisions of the individual scripts, the *tituli scaenarum*, the Greek letter *notae personarum* (the comment on v. 997 is consequently incomprehensible) and the careful colometry. Questa's review of S. Prete's study of the Bembine in *RFIC* 101 (1973), 481-7 might have been mentioned at p. 40 n. 2. The account of the so-called Calliopian manuscripts should have named those which preserve Greek letter *notae* or colometry from [Σ] (see recently J. N. Grant, *TAPhA* 105 [1975], 123-53). The papyri Vind. Lat. 103 and Ox. 2401 and the parchment Sangall. 912 should have been mentioned, even though they contain nothing of the *Adelphoe*. The curious would have been enlightened by a list of the errors common to A and [Σ] and a defence of the view expressed in the Commentary (on v. 55) that 'drastic corruption is unlikely in Terence'. The indirect transmission of Terence's scripts is both interesting in itself and in a number of cases where the *Adelphoe* is concerned of practical service in establishing the true text. Martin's account is quite inadequate. He ought to have discussed the relationship of the extant *Commentum Donati* to the lectures which St. Jerome heard, the occasional divergences between the lemma and the text explained and the status of the *legitur* entries. Donatus' predecessors, M. Valerius Probus, Aemilius Asper and Helenius Acro, deserved to be mentioned, if not Eugraphius or the scholia in the Bembine or those in the Victorianus and other medieval codices. The Commentary on 'Act I Scene i', vv. 81, 141, 196 would be less puzzling if preceded by a full discussion of the relationship between the *tituli scaenarum* in the extant codices to Terence's autographs and to stage practice (the conventional view is stated without argument at v. 888). Likewise something on the way parts were assigned to speakers in early dramatic texts would have eased the path of the reader of the notes on vv. 172, 323-4, 343, 353, 850. The illustrations in the codices of the γ sub-family (see most recently J. N. Grant, *CQ* n.s. 23 [1973], 88-103) required more than a passing mention, particularly their link or lack of link with the actual Roman theatre.

Martin lays out the text of the *Adelphoe* more in the way of the medieval codices than in that of the Bembine, marking the speakers with abbreviations of their names rather than Greek letters and leaving rhythmical changes unmarked. He uses Lindsay's odd mixture of late-classical and supposedly second century B.C. orthography. He indicates hiatus and unclassically light syllables but not synizesis, apocope of final -e, non-measurement of final -s or unclassically heavy syllables. He preserves the quite meaningless *actus* divisions which Renaissance editors inserted on the basis of Donatus, *Ad. Praef*. III. He provides an apparatus criticus to the text in Latin and descriptions of the stage movements in English, revealing thereby most clearly his uncertainty of editorial purpose. The apparatus is brief and lucidly arranged. On the other hand it is as defective as Lindsay's in dealing with the indirect tradition; nothing of Donat. *Ad. Praef*. I 6 is reported where the 'didascalia' is concerned and one could go
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on and on with similar complaints about omissions and inaccuracies.

Where A and [Σ] present different readings or the same nonsense Martin has tried to use his brains. Unlike Lindsay's his text is readable. Concern for schoolboy and undergraduate readers doubtless underlies the complacency with which he appears to accept many universally transmitted readings and palaeographically plausible conjectures vulnerable to critical assault. He likes to gossip about the great critics (e.g. Bentley at v. 55 and Housman at v. 263) but his own textual discussions have an apologetic and lifeless air. They often disguise problems with their brevity. Vv. 955-6 as transmitted are metrically as well as semantically difficult and whatever solution might be offered (see most recently J. N. Grant, AJPh 97, 1976, 235-8) it does not help to state vaguely 'the confusion in these lines may have been caused (or at least abetted) by the rapid change of metres.' This begs the question of how much, or how little, metrical knowledge was possessed by scribes of the Calliopian tradition (the Bembine is defective from v. 915 to the end).

Martin's Commentary grapples honestly with the problems of defending and interpreting the text printed. That it often provokes disagreements is of no moment. One could, however, dispense with discursive remarks like that on v. 16 adsidue una, 'the greater the collaboration his critics allege, the greater the compliment he regards it to himself.' The movements the script demands of the actors are usually discussed in an intelligent way. There is occasional speculation about the gesture required, not in every case felicitous; Donatus' note on v. 163, 'huius autem 晔ектою: aut enim stipulam aut floccum mouerat aut summum digitum' has a concreteness and plausibility absent from Martin's 'huius refers to a snap of the fingers, or some such gesture.' The reader is constantly informed of what will be said or done later (vv. 32-4, 55, 65, 73, 90-91, 94-5, 102, 121 etc.). This might be useful to someone preparing himself for an examination containing essay questions about the whole play but there are those who demand that a commentator on a dramatic script be principally concerned with supplying them with what they lack through not being in a theatre watching an actual performance; their enjoyment is not aided by information about what the dramatist is himself withholding. Such readers would also like to know about the way in which the actors were expected to deliver certain speeches: whether, for example, the player of Demea's role at vv. 855-81 had to adopt a mocking sarcastic tone or an entirely serious one. However unanswerable in the state of our knowledge, this is a real question. I very much doubt that 'does this change of heart, if genuine, violate the basic Greco-Roman concept of character?' (p. 221) is a real question or that discussion of such questions educates anyone. Martin's frequent lectures and obiter dicta on Latin syntax are as irrelevant as his omniscient talk of the dramatic future but not uninstructional or seriously detrimental to the enjoyment of the play. One warms to a commentator who in 1976 acclaims 'a good example of indignant or repudiating subjunctive' (on v. 530).

Terence's play presented to Latin-speaking spectators a day in the life of some Athenian7 propertied gentlemen, their women, their children, their slaves and the purveyors of their pleasures. The actors were costumed as such but spoke a variety of Latin. Things peculiar to Roman life occasionally contaminated Terence's picture of Athenian life. Martin is too intent
on ‘assessing the play as a Greco-Roman phenomenon’ to pay proper attention in his commentary either to the overall Atticizing illusion sought by Terence or to the poet’s occasional breaches of that illusion. It would have been more appropriate to talk at v. 175 about Athenian attitudes to Macedonian kings (or even to τιμωρον, as Donatus does) than about ‘regnum in Roman eyes.’ The note on v. 371, ‘Syrus ... is a connoisseur of fish—a Greek trait, not a Roman one’, is otiose to the point of misleading the unwary. Tribulis at v. 439 on the other hand ought to have been discussed in relation to the structure of Roman as well as of Athenian society; likewise tu es patronus, tu pater: ille tibi moriens nos commendavit senex at vv. 456-7 and cliens at v. 529. Martin provides instructive parallels for militiae et domi at v. 495 but fails to point out the slight oddness of the Roman antithesis in the mouth of an Athenian (for whom military service would have been just one of the many reasons for absence from Athens). There is no discussion of the manumission of Syrus and Phrygia at vv. 960-83.

The Commentary contains ‘a good deal of linguistic comment’ attempting to ‘extract from Terence’s words whatever nuances of tone or implication they contain.’ This is a laudable ambition and the indolence displayed in certain other Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics where the problems of verbal style are concerned makes me hesitate to criticise Martin’s efforts. Nevertheless it has to be said that the tone of a comic speech or interchange more often depends on the substance of what is said9 or the way in which the actors move and utter10 than on the poet’s choice or arrangement of words and that Martin’s mode of comment often obscures such factors. Furthermore Martin clearly neither gave himself sufficient time to execute the requisite preliminary investigations in old Latin texts nor received from his patrons sufficient space to develop the requisite arguments about the peculiarities of Terence’s use of the linguistic materials available. His Commentary in this respect suffers from the same basic faults as the Commentum Donati itself, namely a grossly unhistorical view of language and a narrow-minded practicalism. Donatus’ conceptual vocabulary was suited to discussing contemporary public oratory, an activity for which his pupils were receiving a preliminary preparation, rather than comic poetry five hundred years old but he had the native speaker’s feeling for the language Terence had used and he drew on a rich tradition of disinterested scholarly study of Terence’s scripts. Martin’s patrimony is much poorer and circumstances have obliged him to labour with the mean vocabulary of the English B.A. Honour’s School essay, with talk of the ‘colloquial’ and of the ‘emphasis’/‘stress’/‘weight’11 provided by those bedraggled survivors from the rhetorical tradition ‘alliteration’, ‘assonance’, ‘antithesis’, ‘anaphora’ and ‘hyperbaton’.

The speech which Terence puts into the mouth of his comic personages is related to but is not an exact copy of the speech used by propertied Romans in unobserved private discourse in 160 B.C. Martin knows this but does not keep his knowledge sufficiently in the front of his mind. Many a reader will consequently fail to get a correct impression either of the degree to which Terence employed an inherited artificial type of comic speech12 or the extent of his innovations. Martin throws the word ‘colloquial’ around a good deal (Praef. p. vii, Comm. on vv. 77, 142, 157, 196, 224, 392-3, 397, 544, 556, 631, 681-2, 874, 958) without making it at all plain
what he would regard as non-colloquial or accosting the problem of how to isolate 160 B.C. linguistic fashions. His own statements about colloquial English and the examples he gives thereof (see, e.g. Comm. on vv. 178, 388, 403, 523, 544, 786, 791, 942) suggest he is unaware of the levels which must be distinguished within an entity like ‘colloquial speech’ and of how much more subject to change the colloquial registers of any language are than the formal and literary registers. The balance of his linguistic notes is in any case astray. While a commentator on an oration ought regularly to remark deviations towards the colloquial, a commentator on a comic script should rather concentrate on the deviations away from the colloquial.

What survives of pre-Terentian comedy, though relatively scant, enables the modern student to say something about Terence’s linguistic novelties and the tones they imparted to his script. Some were doubtless Terence’s own creations, others current upper-class ‘slang’. Martin appears to have made assiduous use of the lexica of Lodge and McGlynn but his interest in deep-level syntax kept him away from areas more productive of stylistic insights. He fails, for example, to note a number of metaphorical uses of words which occur for the first time in Terence’s scripts and which might plausibly be held to have possessed a voguish or ‘colloquial’ tone in Terence’s day, commonplace though they were to become in all registers of the language by the classical period.

The modern student of Terence’s scripts must at least try to isolate those items of the inherited scenic language which had come to sound old-fashioned in the ears of urban Latin speakers by 160 B.C. At the same time he has to distinguish these from items which readers of classical times found old-fashioned. Martin labels feruit at v. 534 as ‘archaic for classical feruet’ although ThLL would have told him that no other form is securely attested before Cic. Quinct. 38. When lecturing on Terence, Donatus seems not to have distinguished an archaic from a classical period in Latin literature. For him Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Sallust and Virgil were all ueteres. By δείκτα τιμως et sim. (vv. 48, 127, 168, 183, 224, 259, 264, 270, 482, 550, 634, 650, 841, 859, 874, 928, 958) he denoted locutions which one or more of the ueteres used but which he felt his pupils ought to avoid in their own discourse. Martin’s comment on v. 859 uitam... uixi, ... Don. describes the usage as an archaism. Here it gives emphasis to Demea’s statement, is mistaken or at least misleading; uitam uiuere can, I think, be shown to have had for Terence’s hearers in 160 B.C. a tone different from that, say, of uitam agere but Donatus’ feelings in c. A.D. 350 are no evidence.

The familiarity which mid-second century audiences had with the language of tragedy gave Terence a powerful instrument for raising on occasion the level of his comic personages’ discourse. The paucity of our record of tragedy is yet another of the handicaps under which the modern interpreter of Terence must labour. None of the Republican tragic scripts were read even in Donatus’ time and his commentary on the Adelphoe preserves from the tradition only eight references to tragedy (vv. 111, 197, 288, 297, 541, 638, 686, 731). They should all however be taken seriously. One can add to Donatus’ note on v. 638, ‘pepulisti elatum uerbum et tragicō coturno magis quam loquelae comicæ accademodatum’, the observation that while fores puliare is all over the place in comedy fores pellere
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occurs only here, at v. 788, in the paratragic Amphitruo of Plautus (ap. Non. p. 474. 1), and in a fragment of Titinius' Fullones (ap. Non. pp. 217. 21, 366. 17). Martin's note on v. 638, 'Don. may be correct', is thus a sign of mental laziness rather than of critical spirit. Where, as on vv. 787 ff., Martin independently draws attention to elevation of the tone of speech above the normal comic level it is two cases of triple anaphora that he notes.  

Many more interesting stylistic phenomena are ignored. He might for example have paralleled Demea's o caelum o terra o maria Neptuni with Ennius, Ann. 543, Trag. 238, Plaut. Amph. 1055, Trin. 1070, Afran. Tog. 9, Catull. 63, 40, Cic. S. Rosc. 131, Fin. 5. 9, Tusc. 5. 105, Ac. 2. 105 et al. and noted the unusual plural maria; he might further have remarked the unique use of the abstract corruptela in relation to a person and the paratragic tone of the genitive plural liberum. On the other hand consideration of the use in comedy of tandem, reprimere and ad se redire would have revealed the nullity of Lindsay's question about v. 793, 'anuersus tragicus?'

This review has concentrated, as reviews should, on defects. It may be said however that within the terms imposed and accepted Martin has done a job deserving of some praise. For a commentary on a Terentian comedy which would further genuine understanding different terms are required.

University of Manchester.  

H. D. JOCELYN

NOTES

1 Flap like 'Menander frag. 528 might be (but probably is not) the original of this passage (on vv. 84-5) and 'a uniquely rare word' (on v. 766) is fortunately not typical. Martin has a schoolmasterly weakness for irrelevant gossip (see, e.g., his notes on vv. 42, 55, 243, 263, 574) but keeps it under control.

2 Martin has a cavalier attitude to the Latin grammarians; it was Helenius Acro who read hilaré at v. 287, Iulius Romanus who read rure at v. 542; Donatus admittedly erred about v. 559 but Aemilius Asper was right; it was in the de sermone Latino, not the de lingua Latina, that Varro discussed the colometry of vv. 610 ff. (p. 246).

3 Referred to in passing in the Commentary at pp. 104, 123, 149, 220.

4 Not mentioned even in the notes on vv. 265-354, 882-997 or in Appendix I; see now F. H. Sandbach, Hommages à Claire Préaux (Brussels, 1975), 202-4.


6 Donatus imagined that Terence wrote for readers as well as theatre-goers; his remarks about the future course of events are nevertheless comparatively sophisticated (e.g. on vv. 94, 263).

7 The text merely excludes Cyprus (v. 224) and Miletus (v. 654) as scenes of action. Sulpicius Apollinaris (Per. 8) and Donatus (on vv. 175, 183, 685) make the only assumption possible.

8 Contrast the interesting remarks of Donatus on vv. 970, 979.

9 The use which Donatus makes of the ancient concepts of ηθος (e.g. 61, 112, 143, 179, 238, 284, 343, 628, 795, 882, 914) and παθος (e.g. 355, 383, 666, 675) is remarkably intelligent.
See for example Donatus on v. 795.

Contrast the more instructive use by Donatus of the concepts of ἀμφάρος (e.g. 645, 646) and ἀβέλης (e.g. 33, 246, 664, 682, 789, 866).

Donatus' notes on vv. 39, 166, 522, 638, 877 and 903 (the latter two notes cited without proper understanding by Martin) apply the concept of a distinctive κομική λέξις.

When the modern student finds Donatus setting ἄηνωμεν εὐς.sim. against a locution (vv. 33, 68, 115, 192, 228, 256, 276, 329, 374, 476, 559, 713, 790, 849, 899, 916) he has to ask himself whether Cato and the orators of Terence's time would have avoided it as scrupulously as the orators of Donatus' time did.

In the direction of the outrightly vulgar as well as in that of the ortonical. Except, however, occasionally in the speech of soldiers, lenones and slaves Terentian comedy has little that could be called vulgar.

With nowe and similar expressions (vv. 49, 59, 192, 206, 233, 259, 300, 302, 435, 545, 550, 634) Donatus usually marks words and phrases not normally heard in fourth century A.D. discourse (see his note on v. 259) but there had been students who tried to identify locations not used previously in comedy and upon whose work the Commentum Donati drew. Aesthetic comments from Donatus (e.g. bene [591, 693], eleganter [751, 912], honeste [459, 474]) are not as devoid of substance and interest as such comments from the speaker of a modern language would be.

An etymological figure at Virg. Aen. 12. 680 is treated by Servius in precisely the same way.

But not, mercifully, the alliteration and assonance in communis corruptela.


Contrast Plaut. As. 867, Poen. 830, Truc. 671.

Plautus has liberum once (Most. 120), liberorum 4 times; tragedy on the other hand liberum 6, liberorum 4 times.


The philosopher Bion of Borysthenes, contemporary and friend of Antigonus Gonatas, is a rather elusive figure. He may without much hesitation be counted amongst the cynics, but he has links with the academy, the peripatetics, the sceptics, and the Cyrenaics. What original contributions, if any, he made is very difficult to tell, since most of the
ideas ascribed to him are also ascribed to others. Some scholars have
supposed that his influence on thought and on literature generally was
considerable, but it may be that Bion crops up as often as he does not
because he had anything novel to say, but because he was eminently
quotable. Clearly his aggressive and ostentatious personality made
something of an impression in antiquity. Both his manner of life and style
of writing were adversely criticized, the one for hypocrisy, the other for
meretricious adornments. We are not in a position to assess the justice
of these criticisms, since we have little trustworthy evidence about his life
and no extensive portions of his writings.

The fragments of Bion were collected in the last century by Hoogvliet,
Orelli, and Mullach, and treated by Hense in his edition of Teles. But they
have long awaited a searching and systematic study. Kindstrand has filled
the gap, and filled it well. His edition may be given an almost unqualified
welcome.

The book comprises list of works cited, a long introduction in five sec­
tions (life, literary work, language, and style, philosophical standpoint,
influence, principles for the collection of fragments) with two appendixes,
then Diogenes Laertius’ life of Bion, other testimonia (twenty-eight in
number), and the fragments themselves (eighty-one in number), then
commentary (which covers 165 pages), and finally a concordance (with
Mullach) and two indexes.

Since we know little about the titles or indeed the character of Bion’s
works (our sources do not or cannot supply the information), Kindstrand
has very reasonably arranged the material according to subject-matter.
Thus we conveniently see the range of Bion’s interests, which lie almost
entirely within ethics. Kindstrand’s numeration is likely to be accepted as
standard, and I shall adopt it in what follows.

In his dealings with the text Kindstrand is justifiably cautious on the
whole, but occasionally he retains highly dubious sense or Greek, as at
T2A and F56. Two conjectures of his own deserve serious attention, 
παντας at F62A—B, which should be right if Bion’s thought is consistent
(but is it?), and συνειδησιν at F53, which gives excellent sense and has the
support of apt analogies, but is hardly likely to have been corrupted to
δυσσυνιστικ (Kindstrand’s alternative, δυσσυνιστικ, may be pre­
ferred, in spite of its rarity).

The commentary is sober, balanced, and informative. Kindstrand
provides a mass of illustration of thoughts and usage, and he usually gives
some notice to views which he rejects. He is wisely reluctant to make firm
assertions about the provenance of ideas attributed to Bion or about the
obligations to Bion of authors in whose works these ideas recur. Being so
conscious of the extent of our ignorance, he proves a painstaking and
reliable guide through perplexing terrain. Indeed, if he has a fault, it is in
being too conscientious, for sometimes he labours hard to explain what is
perfectly obvious or attempts to find special interest in matters entirely
commonplace.

Here are a few places where his notes are less than satisfactory. T12
The note on πολυς εστι is unclear. Is the meaning ‘great’ a real possibility
or not? T14 It is most unlikely that sale nigro at Hor. Epist. 2.60 alludes to
the occupation of Bion’s father as a seller of salted fish. T16 One is sur­
prised to find LS used as an authority, where TLL and OLD are available.
How does Kindstrand know that at Diog. Laert. 7.18.4 τῶν Ἀκαθήμενων is neuter? It could be masculine. T22 Kindstrand makes extremely heavy weather of τριχειμπόρον. Why it should be of great interest that the verb can be used of comedy I do not see. The application is quite normal. F1 Pace Kindstrand, the words διεσθηλοῦ δὲ τῶν ταρι-χειμπόρον are in the context almost incredibly clumsy if attributed to Bion, rather than Diogenes Laertius. And the fact that διεσθηλοῦ is 'known from Bion's century' proves nothing. If it was used then, it could be used later. F7 F. W. Householder's long-winded explanation of παρωδημοῖ, which Kindstrand seems to accept, sheds confusion, not light. The word means here 'use parody'. F16 Kindstrand leaves the problem of τουτού unresolved. F30 It is by no means certain that Bion is alluding to Menander, let alone quoting him. F55 What exactly makes Socrates' description of beauty 'most interesting'? Altogether Kindstrand uses this term 'interesting' much too freely.

Such criticisms of detail could be multiplied, but even so they would detract but little from the substantial merits of the book. I must add, however, that it contains many minute errors in Greek, Latin, and English, and that not all of them can convincingly be blamed on the printer.

Those who deal with minor authors fragmentarily preserved encounter an almost irresistible temptation to magnify the importance of those authors. Much to his credit Kindstrand has not succumbed, though he is inclined to apologize for Bion and to see the best in him. This cantankerous self-publicizer (for such he seems to me) is fortunate to have found so fair and sympathetic an editor.

Bedford College, London

F. R. D. GOODYEAR


The Casina despite its intrinsic interest as one of the liveliest, the funniest and most musical of Plautus' plays, has never been available with an English commentary. It is also one of the plays of Plautus on which so much has been written in the last one hundred and thirty years, mostly on the relation between Plautus' play and its Diphilean original, the Kleroumenoi (See M. T. MacCary, Hermes 101, 1973, 194n. for a list of some of the major contributions on this problem. Cf. also E. Paratore, Plauto, Sansoni-Firenze, 1961, 96f.). The best available general study of the play in English is that of T. B. L. Webster (Studies in Later Greek Comedy², Manchester, 1970, 161-65). The knowledge won by these numerous studies had not yet led to an easily accessible school and university edition of the Casina.

The edition is intended primarily for use by students at school and university. The Commentary has been planned to supply all the information which the student will need to understand the language and style, the basic techniques of dramatic construction, the stage-craft and the historical background. Reference is made to other plays of Plautus as well as to other relevant works, but no attempt is made to make an exhaustive catalogue of such parallels. There is a section (Appendix 1) dealing with
the prosody and scansion of Plautine Verse. The *Casina* has the added attraction that it has greater metrical variety than any other play of his. A student who can master the prosody and scansion of Plautine Verse as described on pages 211-232 will be able to scan about all of Plautus. For all the cantica in the play a complete metrical analysis is provided in the Commentary immediately following a brief summary of the business of that scene. Special features and technical variations are explained in the notes following the metrical analyses or in the Commentary itself. The book contains also a brief history of the text of Plautus (Appendix II), a Bibliography and Indexes.

This seems to me to be a very successful and helpful Commentary which may well serve as a model for future commentaries on Plautus. The high quality of the book is not surprising when one considers the qualifications of both editors for the job. M. M. Willcock wrote a supplement on Roman Comedy to Laidlaw's chapter on Roman Drama in *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*, ed. Platnauer and others, Oxford, 1968, while M. T. MacCary has devoted much time to the study of the *Casina*. Besides his Stanford dissertation entitled "Servus Gloriosus: a study of military imagery in Plautus", 1969, and an article in *Modern Language Notes* 88, 1973, 1262-87 on "The significance of a comic pattern in Plautus and Beaumarchais", he has also written: (1) "The Comic Traditions and Comic Structure in Diphilos' *Kleroumenoi*, Hermes 101, 1973, 194-208, which is a major contribution to the study of the relation between the *Casina* and its Greek original; (2) "Patterns of Myth, Ritual and Comedy in Plautus' *Casina*" in *Texas Studies in Language and Literature* 15, 1974, 881-89; (3) "The Bacchae in Plautus' *Casina*", *Hermes* 103, 1975, 459-63. In this short article MacCary examines and explains the allusion to the Bacchae in *Casina* 979ff. He believes that the specific reference is to the belief that the women (Bacchae) forced men to sexually assault each other as part of their initiation rites. "Lysidamus was about to say, before Myrrhina reminded him of the suppression of Bacchic worship, not that some Bacchae stole his cloak, but that they forced him to make the attack upon Chalinus in which he has been discovered." This interpretation has been used in the Commentary, but unfortunately the note there is too brief to make this particular reference clear.

One of the problems that have interested scholars in this play is that of its relationship to its Greek original. Did Plautus leave out, as seems to be suggested by the prologue and epilogue of his play (cf. lines 37-41; 62-66; 81-82; 1012-14) a recognition and marriage scene with which the *Kleroumenoi* ended? Did he replace that scene with something of his own, i.e. the false bride scenes which end the *Casina*? These are questions which have been discussed ever since the prologues of Plautus became the subject of scholarly debate more than a hundred and thirty years ago. In his article on "The Comic Tradition and Comic Structure of Diphilos' *Kleroumenoi*" *Hermes* 101, 1973, 194-208 (cf. Introduction to our edition, 34-38) M. T. MacCary summarises the answers given by different scholars to these questions. His one important contribution is the discovery that the *Casina* like the *Rudens*, also based on an original by Diphilos, contains three spectacular episodes. He successfully demonstrates that these spectacular scenes, in both plays, are based upon Greek rather than Roman prototypes. He also finds out that the inconsistencies of the *Casina* and the *Rudens*
resemble each other more than anything else in Plautus. Therefore, although there is much in the *Casina*, as there is in the *Rudens*, that is pure Plautus, the basic structure of the play, including the false bride scenes (which had generally been thought to be not from the original *Kleroumenoi*, but to have been added by Plautus either under influence of native Italian farce or by ‘Contaminatio’ with other Greek plays) seems by analogy with the *Rudens* to be derived from Diphilos’ *Kleroumenoi*, which in turn owes much to the long tradition of Greek Comedy.

The theory that Plautus was responsible for the false bride scenes was logical once it was assumed that the *Kleroumenoi* contained a recognition and marriage scene (Cf. P. Legrand’s assumption in R.E.G. 15, 1902, 376 that the answer to Myrrhina’s question in line 198 led eventually to the recognition of Casina as Myrrhina’s child. Also G. Jackmann’s suggestion in *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Berlin, 1931, 119, that the ring mentioned at 710 played a part in the recognition scene toward the end of the play); for such a scene in the *Kleroumenoi* would not be compatible with a recognition and marriage scene, apart from inevitably slowing up the straightforward movement of the action which was obviously Diphilos’ aim in this play as in the *Rudens* (Cf. Webster S.L.G.C., 163). According to W. Beare (The *Roman Stage* 3, London, 1968, 65) the remark in the prologue to the *Casina* that the young gentleman will not appear in the play because Plautus has broken down the bridge by which he was to return, ‘may merely be a jesting way of saying that the plot (even in the Greek original) did not allow this character to appear’. The inconsistencies of the *Casina*, which have been used to support the theory of ‘Contaminatio’, have been shown by MacCary to resemble those of the *Rudens*, and so must derive from Diphilos also. Moreover most of these so-called inconsistencies have perfectly acceptable dramatic explanations.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this seems to be that in his adaptation of the *Kleroumenoi*, as in the original of the *Rudens*, Plautus did not make major changes. The *Kleroumenoi* did not end with a recognition and marriage scene, but with the false bride scenes as in the *Casina*, though Plautus has certainly added Roman motifs to his Greek setting (Cf. Commentary on p. 188). The recognition consisted, as in Plautus’ play, merely of an announcement to the audience at the end of the play, that Casina will prove to be the daughter of the next-door neighbour and will marry Euthynicus. In the words of Webster (S.L.G.C. 164) ‘the emphasis in Diphilos was not on the recovery of a lost daughter or on the love affair of Casina and Euthynicus but on the battle between Lysidamus and Cleostrata, and the proof of this is the straightforward movement of the action which must derive from Diphilos’.

University of Rhodesia

E. P. MASHAIRE


Hitherto it has been generally assumed that the author of the second of the three Latin translations of Aratus’ astronomical verse was the popular hero Germanicus Caesar. In this new edition of the surviving parts of the
translation,¹ the first to appear since Breysig's second edition of 1899, Dr. D. B. Gain (hereafter G.) 'challenges' this assumption, 'showing that the poem was more probably written by his uncle, the emperor Tiberius' (I quote from the dust-jacket). The case for Tiberian authorship which is presented in section 6 of the introduction does indeed seem rather impressive on a first inspection, while that for Germanic authorship on the other hand appears much less substantial. This is because G., while presenting every shred of evidence that might tell for Tiberius, has curiously omitted most of the evidence that tells for Germanicus. The elder Pliny (H.N. 8. 64. 155) is not cited, Tacitus Ann. 2. 83 is ignored, and there is no mention of Ovid, who addresses Germanicus as patron and fellow poet in Fasti 1. 23-26. Verses 3-4 (doctique laboris/primitias) of our poem being difficult for G. to reconcile with the late date indicated by 558ff. (referring to Augustus' death and deification), he has recourse to the hypothesis that uu. 1-16 and 558-560 were added by the elderly Tiberius to a work he had written many years before. Verses 11-16, however, are not to my mind made easier by this hypothesis.² Not only do they suggest to me that the proem was written together with the body of the poem, but it must seem incredible that the elderly Tiberius could have written nunc uacat audacis ad caelum tollere uultus (uu. 11) amid the preoccupations of imperial office. Far from it being the case then, as G. urges, that 'the evidence does not allow one to say whether the author was Tiberius or Germanicus', the evidence is, it seems to me, overwhelmingly in favour of Germanicus:³ as the epigrammatist Bassus put it in his obituary of Germanicus (A.P. 7. 391, not cited by G.), Γερμανικός δεσπότης.

To the manuscripts listed by Breysig and Baehrens in their editions (they number just over twenty) G. has added a further nine, two of them (Par. lat. 5239 and Argentorat. lat. 275) as old as the tenth century, the rest fifteenth century or later.⁴ It would have been interesting to know something of the characteristics of these new sources of information, even if they proved on analysis to be without authority for the constitution of the text and could thereafter be ignored; but in fact only two of them are ever cited in the apparatus criticus (Egerton 1050 at fr. iv. 83 and Vat. Barb. lat. 76 at 234, 370, 429, 449, 480, 511, fr. iv. 83, 120 and 130), and all nine alike are allocated positions in the stemma codicum with which the introduction opens without any indication of the reasons for their being placed where they are. That G. is an accurate collator I see no adequate reason to doubt,⁵ and that he had good grounds for placing them in the stemma where he did I am also prepared to believe; but any doubting Thomases there may be ought to have had their doubts resolved by full discussion, and it must seem on any consideration pointless merely to list seven MSS (including two tenth century ones) without anywhere revealing anything at all of their contribution to the text.

But this is not all. Neither Breysig nor Baehrens ever bothered to go into the ramifications of the manuscript tradition in detail; and it might have been hoped that G., as being the first to present a comprehensive stemma codicum, and that of some complexity, would have cut away from this traditional insouciance and settled the matter of the manuscripts' affiliations in a definitive way. Far from doing this, he has simply offered a general (and often confusing) discussion of the hyparchetypes O and Z without giving any reasons for attaching the lower branches of the tra-
dition to the higher in the manner represented in the stemma. Moreover, while the various lacunae that characterise the surviving MSS make it clear that broadly speaking they are direct descendants of O and Z, it remains questionable (though the question is nowhere discussed by G.) whether all the true readings found in the manuscripts must therefore either have come from O and Z (or their parent) or resulted from conjecture at stages subsequent to O and Z (or conceivably, in one or two cases but hardly in all, be due to a happy accident). For one who confidently puts forward a stemma in which all is certain, nothing doubtful, this question is more than just academic. How, for instance, did L’V alone acquire the true reading propere at 137 when O and Z (and Lactantius’ MSS) have the false propri? How did AP alone come to offer si at 582 when O and Z have sine? How does inuisit come to be in AE alone at 121 when OE and λ have inuisit? Was it by contamination with a source (or sources) not descended from O and Z, or by a happy accident, or by conjecture? And if by conjecture, at what period? Similarly, within Z (where O is not available), how does L’ come to have rorat at fr. iii. II where Z has rore, and, within O (where Z is not available), how does P alone come to possess the true reading at fr. iv. 1, 2, 6 (almost) and 76, or A alone at 42, or S alone at 57, or τ alone at 84? Where humanist MSS alone preserve the truth, it is easy, and not unreasonable, to presume humanist correction; but is the same explanation likely to apply to MSS as early as the ninth or tenth centuries? If not, is there any credible alternative to conceding that the manuscript tradition is to some extent affected by contamination and the stemma to that extent an imperfect representation of the true position?

The differences between G.’s new text and its predecessors are very numerous—over three hundred divergences of reading from Breysig’s first edition and from Baehrens (together with in each case over fifty changes of punctuation) and over two hundred and fifty divergences from Breysig’s second edition (together with nearly fifty changes of punctuation). Orthographica account for approximately a quarter of the divergences, and they of course are of a relatively trivial nature. Trivial, certainly, but not for that reason contemptible or meriting the cavalier treatment accorded them by G. ‘In spelling I have preferred assimilated forms’, declares G. (p. 10). Why? Because they are generally used in uncritical editions, or because Germanicus employed them? ‘Where I print is accusative plurals, one or both branches of the tradition exhibit them’ (ibid). Is there not a danger here of sacrificing a rational consistency of procedure to mere scribal caprice? What is there about is plurals that justifies their being adopted from one branch of the tradition when unassimilated forms are not? Should not the reader, finally, at least be told where the different forms occur so that he can make up his own mind?

In addition to being thus deprived of enlightenment as to why, for example, ecfundet is preferred to effundet at fr. iv. 36 and 47, or Grotius’ immoti (not designated as a conjecture) to the MSS inmoti at 436, or aequalis (in P alone) to aequalis which is in OZ) at 527, and baffled (but perhaps not surprised) by the appearance of fontis in 220 but fontes in 722, of ignis in 497 but ignes in fr. iv. 25 and 74, of orbis in 515 and elsewhere but orbes in 54, and of partis in 473 but partes in 494 and elsewhere, the reader will find himself denied elucidation as to why tum remis is printed in 154 but trunc
rigor in 293,\textsuperscript{11} and tum tota in 618 but tunc totus in 313, why Atlas is read at 264 and fr. v. 1 when A (the sole witness for fr. v) reads -ans in both places and in the former is joined by E (to which G. defers on a number of occasions), what evidence there is for a nom. form Andromeda (201, 640), and why Andromedan is read at 200 and 357 (against the MSS?) but Cassiepiam at 252 and 662 (with the MSS). It is however welcome to find haud and sed and Hydroconsistently printed, and at last to see in the text of Germanicus the forms Ericthonius (158), Musaeos (220) and hiemps (269).\textsuperscript{12}

The punctuation in this edition is generally satisfactory, and there are distinct improvements over the consensus of Baehrens and Breysig at 259, 369-370, fr. iv. 21-22 (Housman), fr. iv. 54 and fr. iv. 71-72 (also, where Baehrens and Breysig are not quite unanimous, at 218). It is debatable, however, whether the repunctuation of 2-3 is an improvement; at 419 f., 459 and fr. iv. 139 (especially the last) it would be better to drop the commas altogether; in 557 the comma after fuerat is a blemish; and in 455-456 the punctuation should have been such as to make clear the coherence of these verses and their separation from 457.

Baehrens, when he came to edit Germanicus, was his usual impetuous self, and conjectures good bad and indifferent were hastily discharged into his text. More restraint, or less imagination, was subsequently shown by Breysig, whose conservatism led him necessarily to produce a less capricious text than Baehrens had done. In G. there is much more of Baehrens’ manner than of Breysig’s. On the one hand he rejects twenty or so conjectures favoured by both Baehrens and Breysig and returns to the MSS; on the other he imports over sixty new conjectures, including the bulk of Housman’s contributions, where Baehrens and Breysig had followed the MSS. In a further thirty cases or so he adopts different emendations from the consensus of Baehrens and Breysig. Many of these changes, it must be said at once, are for the better; and particularly in cases where Housman has bestowed a discriminating word of commendation on a conjecture or reading, G.’s text reaps the benefit. Where Housman is peddling his own wares, however, G. is too prone to accept the goods with unreflecting gratitude, even to the extent of copying out Housman’s own arguments verbatim from time to time. Such undue deference to Housman G. complements by an undue fondness for his own conjectures; and of the sixty or so new conjectures (including presumptions of lacunae) that he incorporates in his text, he is responsible for no less than twenty three to Housman’s twenty two. There is this difference between them, however, that, whereas all of Housman’s conjectures are possible (but sometimes only just possible, e.g. fr. iv. 133 Phryx rorans) and many certain (e.g. 427 mulcet, 621 pede, 644 non prius, fr. iii. 6 perstringunt, 28 tristissimus (better, I think, than the lentissimus which Housman himself preferred and which G. prints), fr. iv. 32 pigra and 79 erunt mixtus), most of G.’s are unnecessary or improbable and many wrong (his best efforts, I think, are 719 At for Et and the indication of lacunae at fr. ii. 18 and fr. iv. 2; his worst are 256 sed (not printed) which does not scan, 588 Tithonidos (how would he explain Stat. Theb. 1. 5 Sidonios raptus?), fr. iii. 17 instabilita, fr. iv. 137 dum, and the transposition at fr. iv. 149-150).

A judicious editor will print conjectures only when he is certain that they are right: G. prints them when even he admits that they are merely pos-
sible, and, where there are a number of possibilities, he selects from among them on what the commentary reveals time and again to be the most subjective and arbitrary grounds. At 641 Housman's uementi (an unconvincing suggestion, to my mind), though implicitly acknowledged to be but one possibility, is accepted into the text; similarly at 647 G.'s own haec ego non primus (far better is Goodyear's non ego nunc primus) is no more than a possibility; at 651 Housman's augustas is printed (wrongly, I feel sure) but Orelli's ambusto conceded to 'have merit'; at fr. iv. 56 G. simply states 'I have printed tempore' (his own conjecture); at fr. iv. 77 we are merely presented with Ellis' torta memento and a far-fetched palaeographical justification of it by Housman; at fr. iv. 141 we are flatly told 'I have printed unct'; and at fr. iv. 159 the paradoxos, though expressly acknowledged to be possible, is at once deserted in favour of a conjecture by G. himself.

The printing of what is no more than possible, as though it were certain, however, is a practice which in some quarters these days will cause no eyebrows to be raised. Likewise the rejection of the use of the obelus, which even Baehrens employed once in this text but which G. has no use for at all, despite even his occasional uncertainties. Truth and readability merge into one, possibility rises up through probability to culminate in certainty, and in the process the author is reduced to the plaything of the editor. To regard the problems posed by 272f., for example, or 526ff., or 633ff., or fr. iii. 1-2, or fr. iv. 73, or fr. iv. 149-150 as definitively solved by the expedients adopted by G. betokens what seems to me to be an unjustified measure of editorial confidence. Many passages to my mind remain as dark now as they always were (I think for example of 58ff., 450ff., 594, 658ff., fr. iii. 17 and fr. iv. 137), and their darkness is not dispelled by any amount of assurance on G.'s part.

By way of contrast it is pleasing to note the arrival in the text of Germanicus of a fair number of more or less certain emendations (in addition to those previously mentioned): 38 Dictaetis . . . adytis (Heinsius); 66 ulli (Postgate) cognita (Housman), together with Morel's nomen; 119 sine eo (Lachmann); 271 multum (Haupt) accepta (Grotius) epulis (Burman); 338 astrictae (Baehrens); 585 habitatus (Heinsius); 593 unda (Thierfelder); 605 Cancro (Schaubach); 612 exortae (Burman); 613 defluxerit (Grotius); 644 fluxerit (Steinmetz); 676 extulit (Orelli); fr. ii. 4 caeli (Schwartz); fr. iii. 15 flamina (Skutsch); fr. iv. 128 fulmina nimbis (Wakefield); and fr. iv. 152 tenenti (Housman).

The apparatus criticus is generally clear and well set out (the line number 348 is, however, omitted and the printer's arrangement of the note on this line unfortunate; the note on 451 bears no relation to the text; at 599 'reliquit' should be 'relinquit'; at 644 a colon is required and the spacing is bad; at 725 'haec fragmenta' would be clearer than just 'fragmenta'; and at fr. iv. 82 the note is on the wrong page). In its presentation of the readings of the archetype (curiously designated OZ, not Ω), the hyparchetypes, and the individual MSS that from time to time need to be cited it is reasonably full and, so far as I can tell, accurate (at 71, however, sacratast should have been mentioned; at 212 'sed quae Z' should be 'sed quae O'; at 238 and 331 respectively igne and magnisque should have been recorded; at 398 P's demetitur is not mentioned; the variant si is absent at 444, as are quorumque at 511, ut at 710, putes at fr. iv. 55, uel at fr. iv. 59, and praedicit at fr. iv.
107; and pertinent orthographica go unmentioned at fr. iv. 108 and fr. v. 1). Even so, the apparatus remains totally inadequate to the needs of the enquiring reader, who will constantly need to have recourse to Baehrens or Breysig's second edition. The reason for this is that as a matter of deliberate policy (see p. 10) G. has chosen to limit the number of conjectures cited on any particular occasion, generally mentioning one only and consigning any others available to the commentary or to oblivion. This is a most regrettable procedure. If a conjecture merits discussion in the commentary, it should figure in the apparatus also. Thus, space should have been found for 194 retundit (Baehrens), 451 rursum (Grotius), 464 Aque umero totam (Baehrens), 628 nocte (Grotius), 641 metuentis (Orelli), 644 fugerit (Grotius), 647 non ego nunc (Goodyear), 702 sed (Grotius), 709 taurus (Dahms), to instance just a few cases in point. Yet other conjectures are ignored altogether by G. and have to be recovered from the more generous editions of his predecessors. Among such conjectures are: 171 cel-sos (Schwartz), 369 ambobus (Grotius), 385 causat (Orelli, working from BP's causa si), 440ullo (Schwartz), 486 illigat (Grotius), 499 pondere mundi (Grotius) and mundo (Schwartz), 636 tunc orta (Baehrens), fr. iv. 73 luce serena (anon.), 114 pecoris (Iriarte), 152 nota (Grotius). The quality of these conjectures is of course variable, some being distinctly attractive, others perhaps not more than diagnostic, but, whatever their quality, insofar as they serve the function of drawing the reader's attention to uncertainties in the constitution of the text or to problems of interpretation, they deserve to be presented for consideration. An editor is indeed in duty bound to make up his own mind; but he should not also take it upon himself to make up his reader's mind by declining to supply him with relevant information.

The 'first published English translation' of Germanicus (I quote from the dust-jacket) is neither graced by felicity of expression (e.g. at 565 and elsewhere Laniger is rendered 'the Wool-Bearer'; at 697 Chiron's 'breast' is 'marred by bristles'; fr. iv. 59f. '... there are clouds which tend to stay more in the one unchanging place ... '; fr. iv. 91f. 'the atmosphere will be mild at a time when it shouldn't be ... ') nor, and this is of much greater consequence, does it accurately represent the sense of the text as constituted. There are indeed dozens of places where it is obscure or misleading or positively erroneous. The following examples may be instanced: 23 horrifero Aquiline 'the terror-bringing North Wind'; 77 illis languet honos 'in which there is little to please'; 129f. saecula uestra/artibus indomitis tradam 'I will leave this generation of yours to its own devices'; 215 nec totam ille tamen formam per singula reddit 'The individual stars do not, however, represent the whole of his shape'; fr. iii. 6 perstringunt caerula uenti 'winds gently caress the azure sky'; fr. iv. 134f. gelidos flatus caelique fragores/non alio melius signo praedicere possis 'There is no other sign under which you can be more sure of cool winds and sounds in the sky'. Also compare the text and translation of 283, 325, 327, 366, 480, fr. iii. 27, fr. iv. 22ff., to mention but a few cases.

It will give the reader an initial idea of the inadequacy of the commentary if I say that no less than one hundred and fifty conjectures (most of them by Grotius) are printed in the text which receive no discussion in the commentary. Admittedly, many, perhaps most of these are self-evidently correct, and may therefore be thought not to require comment, but such
justification for silence cannot fairly be urged in the case of 145 (cf. Verg. Aen. 5. 825, for example), 302-3, 640, 670, 673, 692, 711 and fr. v. 5, to mention only the most obvious cases.

Failure even to include pertinent data might seem to be a serious shortcoming in a commentator; but such is the general lack of rigour in G.’s discussions of the data that he does include that his omissions tend by comparison to pale into insignificance. Thus, not a few of his notes are confusing or confused; others are over-hasty or fitfully composed; others again are just wrong. The following examples will serve to illustrate these various shortcomings. Unclear or muddled notes: 272-273 (second paragraph); 451 (discussion of the corruption); fr. iv. 133 (pseudo-palaeography). Insufficiently rigorous notes: 124 (for apparently pleonastic -que see Ellis on Arian. Fab. p. xxxix); 292 (spectare = expeciare is attested, cf., e.g., Liu. 9. 10. 5); 335 (is not hunc arguably natural and clear after Sirion?); 508 (might not celsi be transferred epithet? And where is G.’s supplement translated?); 599 (is the paradosis really nonsensical?); 658-659 (the paradosis deserves more consideration); 680 (ThLL 4. 1351 might have been expected to give G. pause); fr. iv. 114 (why no consideration of Iriarte’s pecoris?). Erroneous notes: 26 (facies of course goes with stel- larum, and uerum betokening actuality is perfectly natural); 128 (the reason why the last syllable of abit is long is that the form is the contracted perfect); 283 (ala is thought to be ornamental!); 470 (if G. had ever looked at a lion he would know that the mane may extend down to the chest); 702 (the prosody of surgit is not comparable to that of abit in 128); fr. iv. 42 (primae is absolutely correct, as G.’s own examples show).

I will close with one or two conjectural observations on the text of Germanicus. 27 since the temo is always nearer to the pole than the body of the Wain and therefore is sublime vis-à-vis the rotae, the order tres temone micant sublime rotisque quarternae might perhaps be considered as giving more point in the utterance to sublime (though doubtless that adverb could be no more than an ornamental stop-gap). 63-64 one may wonder whether these lines are in place here since in Aratus the idea they convey is presented earlier. Should they perhaps follow 47? 499 librati foedere mundi? 505 Hydri Crateram <que> or Creterram <que>, cf. 620? fr. iv. 78 Grotius conjectured Phryxeum rutilo pecus ut radiauerit astro (nowhere mentioned by G.). A less violent change would be Phrizeaev rutilo pecudis radiauit (or radiarit) ut astro (sc. Venus). fr. iv. 149-150 without transposing (as G. does) perhaps write... calidus uestigia seruat / Cancri oblica (obliqua) Leo... ? fr. v. 2 for A’s humeris uirtutis Baehrens conjectured numeris uersutus (which G. accepts). More apt to the context, I think, would be numeris rimatus or scrutatus.

Bedford College, London

J. B. HALL

NOTES

1 Its title may originally have been Aratus: Phaenomena, as Dr. Gain very reasonably suggests (pp. 16-17), though I cannot see that this is appreciably superior to Arati Phaenomena, which is what two of the oldest MSS have. The title Aratea, at all events, is correctly stated by Dr. Gain to have no authority.

2 It would perhaps be subjective to urge that uu. 2-4 suggest a living
dedicatee.

3 Line 9 (no matter whether *parta* or *tanta* be read) is no impediment to Germanic authorship, cf. Vell. Pat. 2. 126. 3 with A. J. Woodman’s notes. The phrase *numenque secundes* in line 16 is curious, but since *numen* may be used not only of divine but also of human power or will (cf. Cic. *Post Red. ad Quir.* 8. 18, *id. Phil.* 3. 13. 32, *Liu.* 7. 30. 20), it cannot be considered irreconcilable with the supposition that Tiberius was the recipient of the poem, however it was actually intended to be understood.

4 I note the following errors in the list of manuscripts on pp. 2-3: ‘Bürgerbibliothek’ should read ‘Burgerbibliothek’; ‘Montepesulanus’ should read ‘Montepessulanus’; and ‘Laur. Gad. 89 suppl. plut. 43’ should read ‘Laur. Gadd. plut. 89 sup. 43’. My friend Professor Giovanni Orlandi of the University of Milan has very kindly ascertained for me that the ‘Codex Ambros. D 52 inf..’ which G. looked for in a ‘Collegio Ambrosiano’ is in fact to be found in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, the designation ‘Collegio Ambrosiano’ (or ‘Collegio dei Dottori Ambrosiani’) being the one current in the 17th and 18th centuries. Professor Orlandi further informs me that D 52 inf. is a paper MS of the 15th century (the watermark resembling Briquet 13626, which is found on Milanese paper of 1425), comprises 75 folia in all, contains in what appears to be one and the same hand (1) Auienius’ *Aratea*, (2) on ff. 58r-66v lines 1-430 and frag. iv. 52-163 of Germanicus, and (3) Auienius’ *Descriptio Orbis*, and belonged initially to the Milanese humanist Bonino Mombrizio.

5 I have, for instance, checked the reports of Arundel 268 and find only one small error: at fr. iv. 87 A has not ‘altern. a’ but ‘altern .. t’. It was, further, not entirely accurate to say, p.16, that ‘the poem was anonymous’ in A when A has both an inscription (f. 96r ‘Incipit astronomia arati astrologi filii athenodori et delitophile’—how, incidentally, did this information come into a xiiiith century MS, if xiiiith century it be?) and a subscription (f. 103v ‘Explicit phenomena arati’).

6 Z indeed, with its many interpolations from Auienius, is likely to have been an ancient edition made when Auienius was accessible and there existed the intellectual stimulus to such interpolation. The possible or likely dates of O, Z and Ω (the archetype) are not considered by G.

7 Such questions also arise at lines 83, 116, 171, 194, 199, 234, 273b, 331, 333, 353, 370, 376, 421, 429, 449, 483, 546. In cases where fifteenth century MSS alone are involved, I am of course aware what the answer may be.

8 Cf. also 634 and 712 (for Z) and fr. iv. 63 (for O).

9 G. does indeed casually mention the presence of contamination in the tradition (p. 10), but he goes into no details and the matter is obviously of no interest to him.

10 I note here *en passant* that at least in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries scribes frequently alter -is to -es, but never consistently. On the subject of -is/-es endings in poetry, the paper of M. Pulbrook in vol. 12 (1973), 2-10, of this journal is worth pondering.

11 On *tum . . . tunc* in anaphora (where *tum* is followed by a consonant and *tunc* by a vowel) cf. Housman’s notes on Iuu. 7. 96 and Luc. 4. 624.

12 This is perhaps a not inappropriate place to record the misuse of upper case at 379 and 418.
PETRONIUS ARBITER: Cena Trimalchionis, ed. M. S. Smith, Oxford University Press, 1975. £5.00.

This edition comprises introduction, bibliography, text and apparatus, two appendixes, and indexes nominum, verborum and rerum. The introduction is fairly brief, but deals at least cursorily with most of the usual topics, date, genre, literary background, language, and text. Appendix I is concerned with three questions, whether the author of the Satyrica is the Petronius of Tac. Ann. 16. 18-19, whether he shows familiarity with Lucan's De Bello Civili, and similarly whether he is familiar with Seneca's Epistulae Morales. Appendix II sketches various features of the language of the freedmen in the Cena.

Smith (hereafter S.) observes in his preface that there is 'no up-to-date English edition of the Cena Trimalchionis meant primarily for undergraduates'. Nor indeed is there any up-to-date English edition or commentary meant primarily for scholars or for anyone else. That this gap cries out to be filled is undeniable. To fill it is no easy task.

The number of places per page where Petronius' text is uncertain or in need of explanation is exceptionally high. A light scattering of notes will not make it intelligible. Again, a sane commentator on Petronius must often be prepared to admit defeat: there are places where we cannot tell whether the text is correctly transmitted or not, where allusions lie beyond our grasp, and where the very meaning of the words is unknown. But a commentator should not be defeated in silence, for he can at least explain something of the extent of our knowledge or ignorance. Again, since what we have of the Satyrica is but fragmentary, any comments on the overall plot (if there was one) and on the presentation of character are likely to be hazardous. Much the same applies to genre and style, since the work appears to have no close antecedent or parallel in ancient literature, unless one considers P Oxy 3010 to provide such. And the editor of Petronius today has a special problem, what to do about Fraenkel and Müller. In his later years Eduard Fraenkel too readily convinced himself that he could find previously unnoticed interpolations in ancient texts. His activities in Petronius, though not without some justification, were extremely rash and wilful, but they won considerable credence from K. Müller, whose editions of 1961 and 1965 are now in standard use. Valuable though these editions are, they still need to be employed with great caution, for Müller is not only too ready to excise alleged interpolations but also violent and clumsy in his conjectural emendations. Here then are difficulties in abundance, and, sad to say, they have proved too much for S.

It is lamentable that in a book intended for students scores of matters which demand elucidation receive none. And much of what S. does supply was hardly worth having. Time and again his explanatory notes are insufficient and unclear. Some, and in them pieces of translation, are simply wrong. Again, his textual notes are sometimes indecisive, often based on the merest assertion. And, to make bad worse, the apparatus and commentary seem to have been composed without any firm or consistent relationship one to the other.

Here is a selection of places where necessary comment is lacking. 39.7 bigae et boves. S. should have explained how these terms may have 'some underlying reference to a type of person'. 41.6 puer . . . modo Bromium, interdum Lyaeum Euhiumque confessus. This remarkable use of confiteor
(if the text is sound) required careful analysis. It is essentially different from what we find in passages with which it is commonly listed, Verg. Aen. 2.591 confessa deam, Ov. Met. 3.2 se confessus, and Stat. Th. 2.122 confessus auum. In these cases the subject really is what he discloses himself to be. It is not so in the present passage, where confiteor almost seems to function as se fero, which is hard to believe. Perhaps we may accept the meaning 'admit to the name', strained though it is and hard to parallel. 51.2 admissus ergo Caesarem est. The apparently unique construction with the plain accusative must either be questioned (Heinsius inserted ad) or somehow justified, by analogy in default of parallels. 53.9 Trimalchio cum elogio exheredabatur. Why cum? Why not just elogio? 57.3 bellum pomum, qui rideatur alios. S.'s silence could lead the uninformed to suppose that bellum pomum is standard Latin parlance. Further, one would welcome some discussion here of the application to persons of terms for fruit (cf. Juv. 6. 06 colocyntha and Petr. 39.12 cucurbita). 58.11 bella res est uulpis uda. Is this a proverb or similar to a proverb or does it allude to a fable? 62.3 luna lucebat tamquam meridie. Is meridie nominative? The question is not easy, which is all the more reason why it should not be evaded. 71.11 ne effluent uinum. The extremely rare transitive use of effluo clearly deserved notice. Mention of analogies or cross-reference to discussion elsewhere would have been appropriate. 72.4 uero... nihil malo. Should not something be said on the construction or lack of construction? 76.1 cepi ipsimi cerebellum. S.'s translation 'I was the only thought in master's mind' is not self-evidently correct. It should have been supported by argument.

The errors, misjudgements and infelicities to be found in S.'s text and commentary are too various to classify. Here then is a diverse assortment. 27.1 S. is unjust to Heinsius' perfect otiari. otiantes would linger by circuli ludentium, errantes would wander away. 27.3 'lusu expellite' is unsatisfactory. Why? Bald assertion gets us nowhere. 29.3 ipse Trimalchio capillus caduceum tenebat Minervaque ducente Romam intrabat. S. says that Minerva is 'an appropriate deity to preside over Trimalchio's triumphal entry' and compares Liv. 45.33.1 where she is associated with Mars and Lua Mater as a divinity to whom spoils may be dedicated. This is wildly astray. Minerva appears here as the goddess of learning, smiling upon the young Trimalchio, as might have been apparent from what immediately follows: hinc quemedmodum ratiocinari didicisset deinque dispensator factus esset. Cf. e.g. [Sall.] in Cic. 7 quem Minerna omnis artis edocuit. 30.9 Heraeus' oecarium is not compelling. Would Trimalchio's rather grand dispensator have occupied so humble a room? 32.1 minutissima is quite as apt as minutissima. 38.10 Buecheler's cenaculum is singularly wooden, and certainly deserves no place in the text. S. should have mentioned Heraeus' conductum amongst the likeliest possibilities, but the obelus seems called for. 39.5 If scholastici means 'rhetoricians' here, what does rhetores mean at 39.13? 39.6 Why, in placing those qui se ipsi pascunt under Taurus, should Trimalchio be contrasting himself and his guests? His own sign, as he tells us, is Cancer. 42.1 Is baliscus possible at all? A much more searching discussion was needed. 42.2 laecasin refers to fellatio, not fornicatio. See Housman, Hermes 66 (1931), 408-9=Classical Papers 1180-1. 44.5 Whittick's attempt to salvage the reading of H results in pure gibberish, and should have been consigned to oblivion.
Further, if we are to contemplate Heraeus’ si milia si cilia (he wisely abandoned it), some evidence for the use of such expressions in Latin should be supplied. 45.7 S. considers the possibility that a local magistrate, one Titus, might put ‘famous men’ on show in the local amphitheatre. How or by what authority Titus was to do so is a mystery. 45.10 It is very hard to see why meis should mean ‘my fellow members of the collegium of centonarii’ when ‘my people’ or even ‘my family’ gives perfectly adequate sense. 51.5 Plin. N.H. 35.163 in no way obliges us to suppose that conditura here comes from condio rather than condio. 52.9 Does S. believe madeia perimadeia to be sound or not? His note leaves the matter utterly unclear. 55.6 From one who seeks to instruct students a higher quality of translation is expected than ‘unconquerable on her extraconjugal couch’ for indomita in strato extraneo. Or did Roman ladies have two beds, one for their husbands (lectus domesticus) and one for their lovers (lectus extraneus)? 56.9 A case is not clearly made for emending canalem and pedalem. S. says that the terms would ‘lack the necessary ambiguity’. But some of the other rebuses here lack it equally, which is why they are so inane. 57.3 si circumminxero illum, nesciet quafugiat. S. talks of a figurative use of circummingo here meaning ‘beat up’, and then says that this use ‘must be connected with the reliance on urination as part of magic ritual’ (as at 62.6). At 62.6 the werewolf, before changing shape, circumminxit uestimenta sua. He probably intended either to put a magic barrier around the clothes or to transmute them magically, if the change recorded at 62.8 (lapidea facta sunt) was a result of his urination. But nothing even remotely connected with ‘beating up’ can be extracted from what is said. In the present passage we may guess that the meaning is ‘entrap’ or ‘put a spell on’, but in truth we do not know. 57.3 non mehercules soleo cito feruere, sed in molli carne wermes nascitur. S. most misguided takes in molli... nascitur to refer not to the speaker, but to Ascyltos. What then is the force of sed? Cf. the very similar sequence of thought at 58.4 nec sum natura caldicerebris, <sed> cum coepi matrem meam dupundii non facio. 57.10 S. here prints a very remarkable conjecture of P. A. George, malista, thus: homini malista dignitoso. And at 61.7 he mentions an even more notable effort of the same emendator: non mehercules corporaliter auten [sic]... curai. Are we to suppose that, because a large number of Graecisms colour the language of Petronius’ freedmen, any Greek words, however colourless, may at any time be mixed with their Latin? 58.8 Why does not S. tell us what the obscene solutions to the riddles may be? They are not immediately apparent. 61.2 nescio quid nunc taces does not mean ‘something or other makes you dumb now’, but ‘you are keeping quiet about something or other now’. Trimalchio goes on to say narrab ille quod tibi usu uenit. 61.4 uiderint does not mean ‘they’d better watch it’, but ‘they can see to that’, i.e. ‘it’s their business’. 63.9 No justification is given for seriously considering deletion of sunt Nocturnae here, or for actually deleting at 67.5 Scintilla and at 71.9 monumenti mei. An editor ought to defend his decisions, not shelter behind authority. But we may suspect that S. is incapable of doing so. 64.6 There is nothing clearly wrong with panem semissem here, and it should have been retained. 66.3 S. does not explain de melle me usque tetti as a whole, but only parts of the expression. 67.11 altera diligentiam matris familiae iactat, altera delicias et indulgentiam (H: indulgentiam
Fuller discussion than S. offers is needed. Is *iactat* employed zeugmatically? Can or should *delicias* be taken here to refer to a favourite? And would not *indulgantiam* (which S. prefers) be ambiguous, if an object of grievance is required? 69.5 One wonders whether George’s *morionum fatua* is Latin that Petronius would have used, and also whether S. does not regale us with rather too many of George’s *coups de main*. He crops up again almost immediately at 69.9 with a gratuitous deletion. 73.5 No doubt *seruabatur* (for *perauabatur*) is possible, but we should first consider whether there is any real objection to the correction *perauaporabatur* (cf. 72.3 *sic calet tamquam furnus*). 74.4 *de ucinia* is indeed a little clumsy after *in ucinia* in 74.2, but what reason was there for interpolating the words? 74.13 *at inflat se tamquam rana, et in sinum suum conspuit* (H: *non spuit* Reiske). S.’s note on *... conspuit* is one of his worst pieces of bungling, though responsibility for his confusion rests with R. G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 52 (1962), 231. The Greek equivalent of the proverb about spitting *in sinum* is transmitted in diametrically contradictory forms (with and without a negative) by *Paroem. Gr.* 1.245 and 2.112. *Pace* Nisbet, it is not likely that these contradictory versions were both in use. It is likely enough that the transmission is corrupt. And the first place for correction is *Paroem. Gr.* 2.112, where the negative could easily have dropped out in view of what precedes. Spitting *in sinum* was supposed, as S. notes, to have an apotropaic effect: the conceited and boastful persons to whom according to the paroemiographers the proverb was applied (cf. *inflat ... rana*) presumably lacked a proper superstitious modesty and so refused to spit. Further, as to the present passage, *conspuo* regularly takes a plain accusative (cf. 132.3), not *in* with the accusative. Reiske’s correction commends itself on more than one ground. 74.15 *here proxime seduxit me*. Burman deletes *proxime*. Nisbet (followed by S.) deletes *here* as a gloss on *proxime*, alleging that ‘the ambiguity of the word might have encouraged a gloss’. Since the temporal use of *proxime* is not unusual (cf. e.g. 38.10 and Caes. *B.G.* 3.29.3), while a spatial *proxime* here, serving for *in proximum*, may seem very unusual, one may doubt whether there is any ambiguity. Further, we have some analogies for the redundacy, e.g. Cic. *Ad Fam.* 1.9.20 *proximis superioribus diebus* and Tac. *Ann.* 1.77.1 *proximo priore anno*. 76.5 The deletion would be justified if Trimalchio’s speeches were all carefully articulated and unrepetitive. As things are, it is irresponsible in the extreme.

I will now give some examples of the faults of S.’s apparatus, in itself and in relation to the commentary. 29.5 (and 30.5) S. states in his commentary that Fraenkel’s conjectures are unnecessary, yet records them in his apparatus. In a full apparatus (S.’s is hardly such) unnecessary conjectures are sometimes properly recorded, because they are of interest in one way or another. But S. gives far too much space, here and elsewhere, to Fraenkel’s tinkerings, which are not specially instructive. 31.7 In his apparatus S. says of *et quis ... daret ‘uix sanum’, but vouchsafes no word about the matter in his commentary. 35.4 In the text *pisciculum marinum* is deleted. The apparatus tells us ‘pisciculum marinum susp. Gaselee’. Very well, and who deleted the words? 38.1 Where does *cedria* come from? 38.5 In his apparatus S. says ‘animi susp. Scheffer’, but again not a word in his commentary. 38.16 S. informs us that Buecheler proposed ‘T. uel C.’, but adopts the latter without giving any reason, even though the former would more easily have dropped out after *proscripsit*. 42.2 Why is
Rose’s deletion not discussed? Alternatively, why is it mentioned in the apparatus? 44.9 Exactly the same applies to Süss’ conjecture. 45.10 S.’s report here of Delz’s conjecture at 43.3 conflicts with his apparatus there. 60.9 The remarks on iberam in the commentary are quite inadequate, and not adjusted to the apparatus, where two conjectures are rightly noted. 63.4 A singularly slovenly entry in the apparatus runs as follows: ‘nostrum plures Heinsius: plorantes Müller2: comploratores Delz: nos tum plures H’. The order of items is incorrect, and Müller does not in fact read plorantes, but nos tum plorantes. 68.5 Here we find an equally slovenly entry in the commentary: ‘miscebat: followed by Delz in place of Buecheler’s immiscebat’. Is Buecheler a manuscript authority? And does not immiscebat deserve serious consideration (such passages as Claud. in Ruf. 2.143 give but questionable support to miscebat here)? 68.8 S. prints Delz’s latet without offering any justification or recording in his apparatus that Delz obelized two of the words which follow. 71.11 (and 74.13) Again conjectures are printed without any comment or defence. It really sometimes looks as if the text and apparatus of this edition were the work of someone other than the commentator.

Now some miscellanea. 40.1 iuramus Hipparchum Aratumque comparandos illi homines non fuisse. homines is distinctly odd, and homini no great improvement. If change is needed, omnino seems preferable. Haplography would have set off the corruption. 47.13 et cocum quidem potentiae admonitum ... duxit. S. rightly remarks that potentiae is ‘suspiciously vague’. If, as he says, ‘some word like domini’ has been omitted, it was presumably dominicae. p. 179 It is no great surprise to find that S. has not read Schulze’s Orthographica or, for that matter, that he cannot spell ‘Burman’. Finally, as to S.’s use of modern work on or relevant to Petronius, opinions may in most cases differ, but it is hard to excuse absence of any consideration of P. A. Parsons, ‘A Greek satyricon?’, *BICS* 18 (1971), 53-68, except in the most general and unhelpful terms (pp. xv-xvi).

Having said so much in adverse criticism, I must in fairness state what may be put on the other side. The student will find in this book much information not easily obtainable elsewhere, some perceptive observations on Petronius’ treatment of incident and character, and a few new and plausible ideas. He will also find exemplary caution displayed in appraisal of evidence relating to the date of the *Satyrina* and to possible allusions to Seneca, Lucan and Nero. And his interest may be caught by various aspects of Roman thought and social life, touched on in the commentary. It is in fact quite likely that, when he puts down the book, he will want to learn more. There is certainly much more that he will need to learn.

Bedford College, London

F. R. D. GOODYEAR

NOTICES


With this critical edition of Vergil’s *Eclogues*, the first in English produced in this century and more extensive than any in another language, the author does indeed meet a need which I for one, as schoolmaster and
'teaching academic', have long felt. Largely the fruit of the work involved in his seventeen years of lectures and classes on classical pastoral poetry, it is replete with the information of every kind that a teacher or university or sixth-form student of the Eclogues might look for.

The introduction comprises sections on ‘the pastoral before Vergil’, ‘the chronology and arrangement of the Eclogues’, ‘Vergil’s achievement as a pastoral poet’, ‘the text’, and a useful note on Vergil’s orthography. The commentary on the text itself is as satisfying in its treatment of syntactical, lexical, metrical and stylistic questions and of the chief textual cruces as it is of the subject matter. There is a final note on each eclogue discussing the poem as a whole. A selected bibliography and a short but comprehensive index complete the volume, which is a model of clear and attractive printing.

To be more personal for a moment: having hitherto felt ill at ease about teaching the Eclogues—unable to stir up in myself the enthusiasm which Robert Coleman gratefully acknowledges he has found in his students—I now feel that, thanks to his largesse, I might be able to interest my own students in a poetic genre which, after all, is not only highly sophisticated but also largely alien to modern tastes: some would even say that for its very artificiality the genre quite deserves its present obsolescence. Important as it may have been in the past history of western literature, such appeal as it has now is arguably rather subtle and exotic; the attitudes to life and the values it canonizes are expressed in very different modes in present-day literature.

Nevertheless, what exactly its original function was, what questions it asked and answered by implication at least, what needs it met, what aesthetic, intellectual or other satisfaction it supplied—all this is still worth investigation and discussion, even if we can never be sure we have completely uncovered the mind of the poet or his contemporary audience or readership. Should they wish to follow the current vogue in literary criticism to the further stage of criticising the critics students might find it a worthwhile exercise to compare and evaluate the varying, not to say discrepant judgements passed on the Eclogues and their literary posterity through the ages, from the immediate rapturous approbation of Vergil’s contemporaries to, for example, the stern strictures of Conington and the happy homage of Rieu.

University of Rhodesia

V. I. FALCONER S. J.


This work is essentially a collection of photographs of scenes from Greek vases and similar objects to illustrate “The Greeks at School and Play”, as the sub-title has it. The author states in the Preface that it will serve as a source book for a “pictorial account of the educational environment of ancient Greece”. There are 10 chapters on Mythological Scenes, Literary and Humane Education, Musical Education, etc. These are rarely more than 2 or 3 pages long, but are followed by a classified list of the illustrations on the plates and their current locations. Various indexes and a
bibliography complete the text. The plates contain 425 pictures in black and white.

The introductory chapters are not very satisfactory. They hardly give an adequate account of what is known from non-pictorial sources of the subject under discussion; on the other hand they do not use the pictorial evidence presented on the plates to fill out our knowledge of Greek education in any significant way. Although the book is sumptuously produced the photographs are disappointing. Too many have been included so that it is not possible to single out small details. Since so many are variations of the same scene, it would have been preferable to select fewer and show these in larger format. But the work is meticulously documented and beautifully printed, and will be a valuable book in a school or university library.

D. B. SADDINGTON

EPISTULA RHODESIANA (Salisbury, Rhodesia)

The Department of Classics in the University of Rhodesia continues to issue the above newsletter for teachers of Latin. Volume XI, 1977, contains an article by P. J. v. Aswegen on “Cicero the Correspondent” and XII, 1977, one by G. Hermansen entitled “A Tale of Two Cities that Disappeared” on Pompeii and Herculaneum, and another by G. R. MacKechnie on “Engineering in Classical Times”. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, Epistula Rhodesiana, Department of Classics, University of Rhodesia, P.O. Box MP 167, Salisbury, Rhodesia.
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