



The last line is usually thought to begin with *qui* followed by a verb commencing with *s*, and certainly transcripts of the papyrus show a dot indicating word-division after the *qui*. But this must be erroneous; with a nominative *qui* here no tolerable supplement can be devised, since the framework of the clause *qui posset subiungere morique* will necessarily be thrown totally out of joint. I suggest that the line began with *quis* (dative plural) followed by something like *seruit* (this involves accepting the decipherment of the letter after the gap as *u* rather than *n*); Antony according to Cleopatra is a slave to the realms of Egypt.

*Culex* 370 Scipiadisque duces, quorum devota triumphis  
moenia † rapidis † Libycae Carthaginis horrent.  
rapidis SFCL: romanis ΓV (interpolated).

Everyone now agrees that the corruption conceals the name of some growth of vegetable nature which by covering the walls of Carthage shows their desolation, but none of the emendations so far suggested is remotely plausible, so I venture to suggest *iam spinis*. The combination *spinis horrere*, a natural one, is found in a passage of Columella discussed below, though there used rather differently.

*Consolatio ad Liviam* 303 femina tu princeps, tu filia Caesaris illi  
nec minor es magni coniuge visa Iovis.  
tu concessus amor, tu solus et ultimus illi.

This is addressed to Antonia, the wife of Drusus, who was adopted together with the other children of Octavia and Marc Antony by Augustus. What does *illi* mean in 303? Did Drusus only *think* that she was Augustus' daughter, or did nobody else think this? Clearly the word has come in here from 305; read *alti*, as we have it in 453 *domus... Caesaris alti*.

*Columella* 10.237 haec modo purpureo surgit glomerata corymbo,  
murteolo modo crine viret deflexaque collo  
nunc adapertha manet, nunc pinea vertice pungit,  
nunc similis calatho spinisque minantibus horret,  
pallida nonnumquam tortos imitatur acanthos.

This passage refers to the artichoke, and is read as above in the editions. But of the manuscripts only R (the manuscript discovered by Poggio, since lost and reconstructed from its descendents) has this; the two extant medieval manuscripts, SA, read *spinis imitantibus*. Even without this signpost it should surely be plain that the functionless *que* is a stopgap and that we should read *spinis minitantibus*.

358 nudataque plantas  
femina, quae, iustis tum demum operata iuventae  
legibus, obsceno manat pudibunda cruore,  
sed resoluta sinus, resoluta maesta capillo,  
ter circum areolas et saepem ducitur horti.



then tells Tityrus to search for the cow on his own. What should we expect him to say in 18? That he will not abandon Lycidas in his distress. *Contemptus* (i.e. by Phyllis) looks just right for Lycidas' situation; a means has to be found to apply it to him. Just such a means was evidently found by Burman (editors report him as author of a number of proposals, and I am not in a position to check personally his edition of 1731; I rely on Keene), *cum sis contemptus; quam* and *cum* are continually confused (Housman on Lucan 9.591). Shackleton Bailey (Phoenix 32, 1978, 319) has emended to *quamvis sit tempus* (sc. *abire*) which seems less integrated in the context; he reports Burman's conjecture with *contentus*, not as Keene *contemptus*.

*Ilias Latina* 942 alternis poterant insistere coepta periclis  
nec requies aderat; timor undique concitat iras.

This describes the situation of Achilles and Hector as one chases and one flees. Vollmer, Sitzb.bay.Akad. 1913.3, 127 translates the first line and a half thus, 'ihr Beginnen konnte für beide Todesgefahr bringen und dennoch hörten sie nicht auf'. The rest, as Vollmer agrees, can easily be translated but makes no sense in the context, and I propose to read *timor indeque concitat ira*, <on the one side, i.e. Hector's,> fear, and on the other (i.e. that of Achilles) wrath goad them on. For *inde* used thus without a preceding *inde* see *TLL* s.v. 1113.75 (an ill-sorted collection, but with enough valid examples); I do not know how common the combination *indeque* is, but I have noticed it at Cic. *Tusc.* 1.28. Baehrens had already proposed *ira*.

*Priapea* 32.1 uvis aridior puella passis...  
7 quae suco caret usque putris pumex  
nemo viderit hanc ut expuentem.

In the unmetrical and obviously corrupt line 7 Heraeus suggested that *pumex* was due to the termination of *haruspex* at the end of line 6 and that as part of the emendation of the passage it should be altered to *pulmo* (RhM 70, 1915, 149); but this is very unlikely since *pumex* is a byword for aridity (Plaut. *Aul.* 297, *Pers.* 41, *Pseud.* 75), and nothing could suit the context better. Other emendations too are plainly unsatisfactory. Yet every word seems suitable to the context, and that suggests that the difficulty has most probably arisen from an omission; here is a specimen of the sort of thing that may have dropped out:

quae suco caret usque <eo, cinis sit  
tamquam si bibulus> putrisque pumex,

The lady so totally lacks juice, as if she were thirsty ash and crumbling pumice-stone, that nobody has ever seen her spit. The omission would be accounted for by the leap of the eye from *usq.* to *us*, and the subsequent omission of *que* would be a deliberate attempt to restore sense and metre.

Rutilius Namatianus 2.25

qua tamen est iuncti maris angustissima tellus  
triginta et centum milia sola patet.

Editors do not explain to me the syntax of the genitive here, or indeed the meaning of the phrase; the Adriatic and the Mediterranean separated by Italy are anything but *iunctum mare*. I do however notice that in every translation which I consult either the word 'between' or a synonym is found ('zwischen', 'entre', 'fra'), and I think, since I cannot see any such word in the Latin, that it should be *inter maria*; *int̄ mari* (the last letter lost by haplography) passed to *iūt mari* and thence to what we have.

*Epigrammata Bobiensia* 70

M mutaris et R sedes si, Basse, notarum  
nominis, altae Urbis moenia qui statuit,  
alternasque velis apicum † a se † scribere voces,  
Morulus hac fuerit, qui nunc est Romulus, arte.

Read *apicum rescribere*, to rewrite the interchanged sounds of the letters; nothing more elaborate is required.

'Alcestis' (edited from a papyrus in Barcelona by Lebek ZPE 52, 1983, 1; Parsons-Nisbet-Hutchinson *ibid.* 32; Marcovich ICS 9, 1984, 111)

23 ad natum genitor tristem concurrat et alto  
pectore suspirans lacrimarum causa requirit  
<quae sit...>

The assumption of loss of a line such as I have indicated is the only way to avoid violence to metre (Lebek) or the transmitted text (Nisbet).

*Anth. Lat.* 255 Riese, 249 Shackleton Bailey (*Thema Vergilianum 'nec tibi diva parens'*)

1 dedecus o iuvenum turpisque infamia Teucrum  
qui segnis per bella fores, gens perfida et amens  
<reddere dum nuptam subreptam fraude recusat>...  
7 iamque tuo generi quia semper perfidus extas  
non equidem miror...  
10 nec non aut Veneris pulcra de stirpe crearis  
nec pater Anchises vestrae est aut Dardanus auctor  
gentis.

By the addition of such a line as I have indicated after 2 we can avoid the necessity of violent alteration in 2 like that suggested by Shackleton Bailey, *Towards a Text of Anthologia Latina* (Cambridge Philological Society, suppl. 5, 1979) 36, and also link up the passage better. Aeneas is an abomination, in that he was (causal subjunctive) inert during the war

which took place because (*dum* in a causal sense, as often; see my note on Juvenal 6.176) the Trojans refused to restore Helen. This is the third such suggestion I have made in this paper, and I hope that it may be felt that a general lesson is emerging; that when a passage does not cohere, but every separate item in it seems appropriate, then the problem may well reside in the loss of what once held it together (compare my remarks on Germanicus 59 in CR 19, 1969, 139; the proposal there made was subsequently accepted by Gain, le Bocuffle and Maurach).

In line 6 Shackleton Bailey, rightly for the sense, emends *perfidus* to *proximus*, so that Aeneas is described as 'just like' his fellow-countrymen; but it seems to me that the author is deliberately picking up *gens perfida* from 2, and I prefer to alter *semper* to *compar*. 11 is here quoted with the reading of Riese, but whatever the correct reading in that line it does not affect my proposal for 10, which is *nec natus Veneris; nat'* became *naut*. Aeneas is not the son of Venus, born of fair family; for the present *crearis* see Kühner-Stegmann *Lat. Gramm.* 1, 118-9 (τίκτω and the like are so used with particular frequency; Kühner-Gerth *Griech. Gramm.* 1, 137).

*Anth. Lat.* 694 Riese (Petronius?), 7-8  
lex armata sedet circum fera limina nuptae:  
nil metuit licito fusa puella toro.

'Men who have affairs with married women risk punishment; but if you are content with what is permitted..., you will come to no harm' Shackleton Bailey l.c. 68, who emends to *nocuit*; nearer to the tradition is *meruit*, i.e. the stretching out of a girl (with the *occisus Caesar* idiom; Kühner-Stegmann 1, 766, Hofmann-Szantyr *Lat. Syntax*, 393) incurs no penalty (*nil meruit* as at Tibull. 1.10.5; Plaut. *Asin.* 146 and *Trin.* 1049 are also close).

*Anth. Lat.* 700 Riese (Petronius?), 6-7  
sed sic sine fine feriati  
et tecum iaceamus osculantes.

Shackleton Bailey's *tu mecum* is over-elaborate. Others have altered *tecum* to an adverb (*tractim* Bücheler, *tecte* R. T. Clark). I think that this is right in principle, and that the most plausible adverb is *lentum*. The adverbial neuter is evidently not found elsewhere in this word, but anyone who looks at the selection of examples of this construction in Kühner-Stegmann 1.281 will find no cause for surprise in that<sup>1</sup>).

STANFORD University, California

E. COURTNEY

1) Since this paper was sent to the editor I have been able to see the edition of the *Ilias Latina* by M. Scaffai (Bologna 1982), which however has nothing to say to affect my note on 943.