401

We have here a question which is asked by Agrius, and then, the next moment, answered by the same Agrius. A person replying to his own question in this way is of course not impossible, but if our text really meant to express this, sane would not be the fitting reply, and, above all, we should not expect the repetition of the name Agrius with the second inquit, but inquit alone or a clarification by means of idem or ipse. Thus it seems clear that at some—rather early—point of transmission Agrius has happened to be substituted for Agrasius, either in the first or in the second case.

None of the MSS has any other reading than Agrius in both cases. At I 3, 1, however, I find in Keil's edition (1884) and in his commentary (1894) the remark that instead of the inquit Agrasius of all other MSS, the codex Laurentianus 51,4 and the codex Caesenas have the version inquit Agrius. The error is perhaps to be accounted for in psychological rather than in palaeographical terms. As a matter of fact, exactly this psychological lapsus has happened to Nisard at I 3, 1, since his French translation here exhibits the version 'dit Agrius', whereas the Latin text has inquit Agrasius (M. Nisard, Les Agronomes Latins, Caton, Varron, Columelle, Palladius, Paris 1844, 67). Certainly, the error would arise easily enough as a result of the similarity of the names alone. In the case of I 2, 2, the phrase inquit A... occurs twice, so that either of the cases of inquit could have falsely attracted the eye when the other one was to be written.

This obvious error has escaped the attention of all editors, with the possible exception of Nisard, who in his French translation (p. 63) renders the passage voltis igitur interea... in the following manner: "Eh bien", leur dis-je, "faisons, en l'attendant, application du vieux proverbe: Le Romain triomphe assis", thus making the phrase inquit Agrius appear perfectly meaningful in the second case also, by changing the speaker at voltis igitur etc. However, the Latin text at the bottom of the page is printed in its familiar form, without any addition of inquam or any comment at all.

In future editions of the Res rusticae, either of the cases of inquit Agrius in I 2, 2 should be changed to inquit Agrasius. The only possible alternative would be to add inquam after voltis igitur in the manner suggested in Nisard's translation. Certainly the text in its usual form cannot be accepted.

University of Uppsala

M. Wifstrand Schiebe

NOTES ON THE MINOR LATIN POETS

Carmen de bello Actiaco (Anth. Lat. 1 Riese; also edited by G. Ferrara (1908) and G. Garuti (1958)).

est mihi coniunx
(Part)h(os qu)i posset (P)hariis subiungere regnis
quis()nit nostr(a)eque mori pro nomine gentis
32 vel (Part)h(ica

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXIX, Fasc. 3-4 (1986)

Copyright (c) 2001 ProQuest Information and Learning Company Copyright (c) Brill Academic Publishers 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 Scipiadasque duces, quorum devota triumphis moenia † rapidis † Libycae Carthaginis horrent. rapidis SFCL: romanis Γ V (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 adaperta 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, resoluto maesta capillo, ter circum areolas et saepem ducitur horti.

MISCELLANEA 403

Why should the menstruating girl be called 'bare-footed but loose-robed and with untied hair'? Sed should surely be et.

pomis, quae barbara Persis miserat, ut fama est, patriis armata venenis. at nunc † expositi † parvo discrimine leti ambrosios praebent sucos.

The juice of the plum used to be almost lethal, but is now delightful. That is the basic sense of the passage, though one sees with some astonishment that in the Loeb edition it is translated 'set forth with little risk of harm', as if expositi could refer to poma, and as if parvo discrimine leti did not mean 'with a minute separation from death' (cf. Verg. Aen. 3.685, 9.143, 10.511). Read ex positis; they provide sweet juices instead of juices served up (see Lewis and Short pono I B 8, OLD s.v. 5) with virtual certainty of death. Ex is used as in τυφλὸς ἐχ δεδορχότος etc.; see TLL s.v. 1101.26 sqq.

Calpurnius Siculus 2.32

et mihi Flora comas pallenti gramine pingit et matura mihi Pomona sub arbore ludit.

33 pomona GH, N corr., poma N, pomena P, per am(o)ena V

These lines (there is some uncertainty about the text of 32 also, but that is immaterial for the present purpose) correspond in the amoebean song to 28-9

me Silvanus amat, dociles mihi donat avenas et mea frondenti circumdat tempora lauro.

The correspondence combines with suspicions of the expression matura Pomona to suggest that the subject of 33 should continue to be Flora; so I propose

et matura mihi quot poma sub arbore fundit!

(fundit Baehrens). See what the same speaker says in 72-3

qui numerare velit quam multa sub arbore nostra poma legam, tenues citius numerabit harenas.

3.18 non equidem, Lycida, quamvis contemptus abibo.

Here there are variants quavis, contentus. At the beginning of the poem Iollas asks Lycidas if he has seen his errant cow. Lycidas answers that he has not been paying attention, distracted as he is because of his desertion by Phyllis. Iollas sympathises, and Lycidas replies that he will go into more detail when Iollas has leisure; in the meantime he suggests that Iollas look under the willow-trees. Iollas answers with the line quoted above and

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 contemtus.

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*; *int 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 concurrit 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')
 - 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 Boeuffle 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 \bar{n} aut. 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 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 that¹).

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.