

A
A
0
0
0
5
3
1
7
7
2
2

CRUCES
AND
CRITICISMS.
MARSHALL.

13.9.67

PA

3017 Marshall.
M35c Cruces and
criticisms.

DEC 1 1961

**Southern Branch
of the
University of California
Los Angeles**

Form L 1

PA

3017

M35c

Dr. Ludwig Guntt

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

DEC 1 196



CRUCES
AND
CRITICISMS.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CRUCES
AND
CRITICISMS.

AN EXAMINATION
OF
CERTAIN PASSAGES IN GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS.

BY
WILLIAM W. MARSHALL, M.A., B.C.L., F.R.S.L.,
OF THE INNER TEMPLE ;
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD :
JOINT-AUTHOR OF "THE LATIN PRAYER BOOK OF CHARLES II.;"
AUTHOR OF "PLUTARCH'S LIVES OF THE GRACCHI, TRANSLATED," ETC.

LONDON :
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1886.

[All Rights Reserved.]

51395



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

PA
3017
M352

TO

WILLIAM LEONARD COURTNEY, ESQUIRE, M.A., LL.D.

FELLOW, TUTOR, AND LIBRARIAN OF NEW COLLEGE,
OXFORD,

IN GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE

OF

MANY PLEASANT HOURS PASSED WITH HIM

IN THE

STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY.

CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION	Page ix.
--------------	-------------

GREEK AUTHORS.

I.—ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. II. ix. 4...	3
II. ,, Nic. Eth. V. ii. 9	6
III. ,, Nic. Eth. V. iv. 14	9
IV. ,, Nic. Eth. VII. vii. 2...	10
V. ,, Nic. Eth. X. iv. 2...	12
VI.—PLUTARCH, Caius Gracchus, xii.	13
VII.—THUCYDIDES, ii. 76	14
VIII. ,, vii. 30	16
IX. ,, viii. 29...	17
X.—XENOPHON, Hell. i. 7	19
XI. ,, Hell. ii. 3	22

LATIN AUTHORS.

XII.—CICERO, Ad. Fam. vii. 5	27
XIII. ,, Ad Att. v. 11	29
XIV. ,, Ad Att. vii. 7	30
XV. ,, Ad Att. vii. 11	32
XVI. ,, Ad Att. viii. 3...	35
XVII. ,, Ad Att. ix. 9	36
XVIII. ,, Ad Att. ix. 18	38
XIX. ,, Ad Att. x. 1...	40
XX. ,, Ad Att. x. 8	41
XXI. ,, Ad Att. xi. 6	43
XXII. ,, Ad Att. xii. 2	46
XXIII.—VIRGIL, Aeneid xi. 319	47
XXIV. ,, Aeneid xi. 774	49

1928

General Col.

Sed magis acri

*Indicio perpende et, si tibi vera videntur,
Dede manus, aut, si falsum est, accingere contra.*

LUCRETIUS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following pages contain a collection of original thoughts which have occurred to the Author in his private reading and in preparing pupils for the University examinations. To discussions of this tentative nature the proverb *Quot homines, tot sententiæ* must always be peculiarly appropriate; but it is hoped that the explanations offered in these pages will in some degree conduce to a correct apprehension of the meaning of the passages investigated.

In some instances an attempt has been made to elucidate obscure allusions and to defend the reading of the MSS. The object of other Criticisms is to examine the existing text, and where it appears to be indisputably corrupt, to offer conjectural emendations and to support these by collateral evidence.

It may perhaps be of interest to some readers to learn what method was employed in attempting to solve several of the corrupt passages. By writing the words continuously and in capitals with various abbreviations an approximation was first made to the probable form of an early MS., and the passage was then studied with as little regard as might be to the reading adopted by the Editors. What is meant will be shown more clearly by quoting the following remarks from Professor Ramsay's Prolegomena to his edition of Cicero's Oration *Pro*

Cluentio :—“ It must be remembered that the most ancient MSS. were all written in capitals and continuously, that is, without regular punctuation and without separation of words. There were numerous abbreviations introduced, some of them common and universally recognized, such as a small horizontal line placed above a vowel to represent *m* or *n*, others peculiar to the individual scribe. By paying attention to these matters, we can explain the origin of many various readings which, at first sight, appear to bear no resemblance to each other. ”

It will be noticed that the various Classical authors are by no means equally represented. This is to be explained partly by the fact that most of the suggestions presented themselves spontaneously to the Author's mind ; and partly by considerations relating to the state and value of the MSS. upon which in the case of each author our text depends, and to the amount of critical labour previously expended upon them.

It may perhaps also be asked, why in discussing textual difficulties reliance has not been placed upon a fresh examination of the best extant MSS. In reply it is submitted that by such a course nothing would have been gained. So far as concerns the passages in question, what it is in the power of research to do with existing MSS., has long ago been done and done well ; and the only hope left, failing of course the discovery of older and better authorities, is to attempt to reconstruct from the materials at command the probable form of still earlier MSS. A few instances of such an attempt will be found in the course of the following investigations.

GREEK AUTHORS.

ὡς ἐγὼ συμβάλλομαι τοῖσι ἐμφανέσι τὰ μὴ
γνωσκόμενα τεκμαιρόμενος.

HERODOTUS.

I.

ἐπεὶ οὖν τοῦ μέσου τυχεῖν ἄκρως χαλεπὸν, κατὰ τὸν
 δεύτερόν φασι πλοῦν τὰ ἐλάχιστα ληπτέον τῶν
 κακῶν.

ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. II. ix. 4.

THE origin of the proverb κατὰ τὸν δεύτερον πλοῦν has given rise to much discussion. Aristotle is impressing upon his readers that, where it is impossible to hit the mean between two vices, we should at all events steer clear of that extreme which is most opposed to the mean; of the two extremes one is fraught with danger, the other less so; therefore, as it is hard to hit the mean precisely, we must choose the least of two evils, as the proverb says, κατὰ τὸν δεύτερον πλοῦν.

Now, in this connection it is difficult to see the appropriateness of the proverb if it means "with oars, if not with sails," as the grammarian Eustathius says. His evidence is however in no way contemporary as he lived some fifteen centuries after Aristotle. Nor is the testimony from another source, quoted by Liddell and Scott in the 7th. ed. of their Lexicon in support of this explanation, of much higher value: ὁ δεύτερος πλοῦς ἐστὶ δήπου λεγόμενος, ἂν ἀποτύχη τις πρώτου, ἐκ κόπαισι πλεῖν, Menand. Thras. 2. In fact little appears from this except that the proverb refers to rowing. Now, a merchantman was heavily built and was worked as

a sailing vessel without oars or sweeps ; while men-of-war were fitted with banks of oars, and in action were propelled by oars alone, as we find that before an engagement the sails were taken down and the masts lowered. This passage then, if it proves anything, tends to prove that the proverb was taken from some manœuvre of a man-of-war, probably in action. But its evidence is so vague as to be worth little unless otherwise supported.

The explanation offered by Mr. Williams "making a losing tack" appears more to the point, but even here what is the other of the pair of evils ? The context seems to demand an explanation which shows two evils and a mean which is good between them. The same criticism applies with still more force to a third meaning assigned to the proverb, "on the voyage home, if not on the voyage out;" it is hard to perceive how this phrase, borrowed it may be presumed from the technical language of the Greek laws of bottomry, could be connected with a mean between two extreme vices.

Proverbs, like private letters and despatches, can best be understood by a consideration of the times at which they were originally used or written. In the days of Plato and Aristotle what would be the central point of Greek thought so far as it related to naval affairs ? The engagement at Salamis was practically a land fight on shipboard ; so was that between Corinth and Corcyra except to the Athenian ships. What then were the means which made the Athenian seaman long for the open sea and not for close quarters and straits ; which gave victory to Phormio and those who learnt his secret ; which lent Athens that dominion on the wave that was the

safeguard of her Empire ; and the want of which in the Great Harbour of Syracuse sealed once and for ever the sentence of her fall ? The answer is the skilful tactics of her fast-sailing triremes. Instead of grappling or charging beak to beak, it was the object of the Athenian captain to break through the line, turn rapidly round, and charge, if possible, the side, if not, the stern of the enemy's ship. This *διέκπλους*, as it was called, must have been the theme of much conversation among the people for whom it had done so much, and both Plato and Aristotle must have been familiar with it. An example in later times of the *περίπλους* of a single ship may be found in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus.

Now, *δευτερος πλοῦς* may be translated literally "second charge," on the analogy of *διέκπλους* "the charge through the line," and if this represents the second charge made after first charging through the enemy's line as described above, we have at once a proverb taken from what must have been very familiar at the time, and extremely appropriate to the context. If you cannot hit the mean, Aristotle would then teach, choose the extreme which is fraught with the least danger ; and, as the sailors say in the *διέκπλους*, if you cannot ram the side, ram the stern, but at all events avoid the beak.

It may be added that the proverb is alluded to in three passages in Plato, where Professor Jowett represents the sense by the idea of "second best" or "next best": "But as I have failed either to discover myself, or to learn of any one else, the nature of the best, I will exhibit to you, if you like, what I have found to be the second best mode of inquiring into the cause (Plato. Phædo, 99 D):" "Happy

would the wise man be if he knew all things, and the next best thing for him would be that he should not be ignorant of himself (Philebus, 19 c):” “Therefore, as there is a danger of this, the next best thing in legislating is to have the laws observed alike by one and all (Statesman, 300 B).” It may be remarked however that Aristotle, as we should have expected, appears to employ the phrase in a somewhat more accurate and restricted sense than it bears in the Dialogues of Plato.

 II.

ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἄνισον καὶ τὸ πλεόν οὐ ταῦτὸν ἀλλ' ἕτερον ὡς μέρος πρὸς ὅλον (τὸ μὲν γὰρ πλεόν ἅπαν ἄνισον, τὸ δ' ἄνισον οὐ πᾶν πλεόν), καὶ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία οὐ ταῦτὰ ἀλλ' ἕτερα ἐκείνων, τὰ μὲν ὡς μέρη τὰ δ' ὡς ὅλα.

ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. V. ii. 9.

IN this difficult passage some MSS. read *παράνομον* instead of *πλεόν*, but this does not appear probable, as in ch. i. 8 *ὁ ἄδικος* includes both *ὁ παράνομος* and also *ὁ ἄνισος* with its subdivision *ὁ πλεονέκτης*. Sir A. Grant translates, “But as ‘unequal’ and ‘more’ are not the same, but stand related to each other as part to whole (for ‘more’ is a species of ‘unequal’), so”, &c. He adds that “The only way to give any meaning to this indistinct passage is to consider what is said about ‘more’ and ‘unequal’ to have nothing to do with *πλεονεξία*, but simply to be an illustration of a part included by a whole.”

With all respect to this weighty judgment, there

may perhaps be something to be said for another interpretation which would connect *πλέον* with *πλεονεξία* and *ὁ πλεονέκτης*. In ch. i. 8 we have the division mentioned above of *ὁ ἄδικος* into *ὁ παράνομος* and *ὁ ἄνιστος* with its species *ὁ πλεονέκτης*, while *τὸ ἄδικον* is divided simply and more properly into *τὸ παράνομον* and *τὸ ἄνιστον*. In the next section but one we find that *πλεονέκτης* is a species of the genus *ἄνιστος*, the *ἀδικία* of the latter including both *πλεονεξία* and a selfish avoidance of evil. Now, as *τὸ ἴσον* corresponds to *ὁ ἴσος*, so would *τὸ πλέον* be the natural form corresponding to *ὁ πλεονέκτης*; compare, ch. i. 10 *τὸ πλέον αἰρεῖται*, and especially iii. 2 for *τὸ πλέον* in opposition to *τὸ ἴσον*. Is it not therefore possible to understand our passage as referring to the previous position that *ὁ πλεονέκτης* is a species of *ὁ ἄνιστος*? We should then translate thus: "The unjust has already been divided into the lawless and the unfair. * * * The injustice treated of above (that is the universal injustice, the *ὄλη κακία* of ch. i. 19) is concerned with the lawless. But just as the unfair and the more are not the same but differ as whole and part (for the more is only a species of the unfair), so the present unjust and injustice are not the same but different from the former, the present being as part and the former being as whole; for the present injustice (the particular which in ch. ii. 2 appears to be *πλεονεξία*) is a part of the universal injustice." The meaning of the passage will in brief be as follows; *τὸ ἄδικον* includes *τὸ παράνομον* and *τὸ ἄνιστον*: and the particular injustice (whether it be manifested in the *πλεονέκτης* of ch. ii. 2, or more widely speaking in the *ἄνιστος* which forms the genus) is a

part of the universal injustice, just as in the subordinate division τὸ πλεόν is a part of τὸ ἄνισον. In the same way we might say—animal is related to body, just as man is to animal.

Still even in this way some confusion remains. If *πλεονεξία* is particular injustice, what place is occupied by the remaining part of unfairness? Is the distinction between genus and species lost in ch. ii., and does the writer there really mean ὁ ἄνισος and not ὁ πλεονέκτης? Again, he seems to make τὸ παράνομον in a certain way equivalent to τὸ ἄδικον in the universal meaning (cf. ch. i. 12, πάντα τὰ νόμιμά ἐστὶ πως δίκαια), while in ch. i. 8, παράνομον is of course a species of the genus ἄδικον; yet what can be a broader view of ἀδικία than the ὅλη κακία which is the opposite of ἡ κατὰ τὸ νόμιμον δικαιοσύνη?

“It is no wonder,” says Sir A. Grant on our passage, “that confusion should have been caused when the writer was at so little pains to avoid it;” and it is hoped that it will not seem out of place in conclusion to point out two instances in this book of similarly careless writing that have not it is believed been before remarked. First, in ch. v. 15, what is πρὸς τὴν χρείαν? Does it mean “for all practical purposes” as it appears to be usually taken; or might it not mean “by reference to demand,” as we are told in ch. v. 11, that ἡ χρεία (demand) πάντα συνέχει? The second instance is in ch. vii. 2, where οὐδὲ μοιχὸς, ἐμοίχευσε δέ appears to be taken from the μοιχὸς in the preceding paragraph, it being forgotten that this example was already used in that paragraph in the words καὶ γὰρ ἂν συγγένοιτο—οὐκ ἔστιν. In one of the more carefully written

books no doubt οὐδὲ μοιχός, ἐμοίχευσε δέ would long ago have been omitted as an interpolation.

III.

ὅταν δὲ μήτε πλέον μήτ' ἔλαττον ἀλλ' αὐτὰ δι' αὐτῶν γένηται, τὰ αὐτῶν φασὶν ἔχειν καὶ οὔτε ζημιοῦσθαι οὔτε κερδαίνειν.

ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. V. iv. 14.

THE words ἀλλ' αὐτὰ δι' αὐτῶν γένηται seem always to have been a stumbling block to the Commentators. Sir A. Grant quotes the interpretation of Felicianus, "*sed sua cuique per se ipsa evaserint;*" of Argyropulus, "*sed sua per se ipsa sunt facta;*" of Lambinus, "*sed paria paribus respondent;*" he translates himself, "but result in being themselves by means of reciprocity." Chandler considers that δι' αὐτῶν means "by buying and selling," and Mr. Jackson thinks δι' αὐτῶν γένηται equivalent to "come into their possession," adding the conjecture αὐτὰ ἀ δέι' αὐτῶν γένηται; while Rassow inserts τὰ before δι' αὐτῶν. Others take ἀλλ' as equivalent to ἀλλ' ἢ, "except when the loss or gain is their own doing;" and others take δι' αὐτῶν as parallel in form to διὰ μέσου "in the middle" and αὐτὰ as "exactly as they were."

Since none of these suggestions is considered altogether satisfactory, perhaps it may be permissible to add one more to their number. One of the MSS. has τὰ instead of αὐτὰ, which perhaps points to the fact that the αὐ of αὐτὰ is a separate word, and that the reading should be ἀλλ' αὐ τὰ δι' αὐτῶν γένηται. This would give good sense; "but when

things are neither more nor less, but amount again to what they themselves have acquired," &c. ; which is as much as saying that in an ideally fair bargain it is the nature not the amount of a man's wealth that is changed. For the expression τὰ δι' αὐτῶν as meaning "what they themselves have acquired" compare Nic. Eth. IV. ii. 14, οἷς τὰ τοιαῦτα προϋπάρχει δι' αὐτῶν ἢ διὰ τῶν προγόνων, and the expression not uncommon in the Politics δι' αὐτῶν εἶναι "to be in their possession;" for 'origin' as the idea contained in διὰ we have also Xenophon's αἱ διὰ σώματος ἡδοναί, and διὰ βασιλέων πεφυκέναι: we may compare also Plutarch Tib. Gracchus, VIII, φανερώς ἤδη δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰ πλείστα κατεχόντων, where δι' ἑαυτῶν "in their own name" is opposed to ὑποβλήτοις προσώποις, and δι' ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖν in Xen. Cyr. VII. ii. 24.

It is interesting to remark that in Plato's Republic, VIII, 547, we have the variant readings τὸ δ' αὖ, τὸ δ' αὐτὸ, and τὸ δ' αὖ, τὸ, showing the probability of a confusion between αὐτὰ and αὖ τὰ.

 IV.

ὁ μὲν τὰς ὑπερβολὰς διώκων τῶν ἡδέων ἢ καθ' ὑπερβολὰς ἢ διὰ προαίρεσιν, δι' αὐτὰς καὶ μηδὲν δι' ἕτερον ἀποβαῖνον, ἀκόλαστος.

ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. VII. vii. 2.

UPON this passage Sir A. Grant says, "It is plain that ἢ before διὰ προαίρεσιν in the text must be a mistake," and he quotes one of Bekker's MSS. for καὶ in place of ἢ and adopts this in his translation, saying that it would answer to the expansion of the Paraphrast; but the οὐχ ἐλκόμενος κ. τ. λ, of the

Paraphrast would rather suggest *διὰ προαίρεσιν* without either *καὶ* or *ἢ*. Another suggestion is to read *καθ' ὃ ὑπερβολαὶ* omitting the *ἢ* both before and after; but this is rather a violent change, and moreover leaves no explanation of the alternative given by the Paraphrast *ἢ τὰς φύσει μεγάλας ἀεὶ ζητῶν ἡδονάς, ἢ τὰς φύσει μετρίας ὑπερβαλλόντως ζητῶν*; the first of these is represented in the text of our passage by *τὰς ὑπερβολὰς διώκων τῶν ἡδέων*, but what have we in the text thus emended to correspond to the second alternative? The paraphrase suggests that the passage should mean: "He who with deliberate purpose either pursues excessive pleasures or pursues pleasures in an excessive way," &c.

It is here proposed to make a slight change in the MSS. reading which would give precisely the sense required. If it could be supposed that *δεα* has dropped out before *δια*, we should then have *ὁ μὲν τὰς ὑπερβολὰς διώκων τῶν ἡδέων ἢ καθ' ὑπερβολὰς ἡδέα διὰ προαίρεσιν*, the latter clause of which would exactly answer to the Paraphrast's *ἢ τὰς φύσει μετρίας ὑπερβαλλόντως ζητῶν, οὐχ ἐλκόμενος κ. τ. λ.* It may be urged against this that *ἡδέα* without the article would be uncommon, but as the article is omitted in *καθ' ὑπερβολὰς*, the *τὰ* which we should have expected with *ἡδέα* might also be omitted to correspond. A similar instance may be quoted in Nic. Eth. III. i. 10, *μᾶλλον δ' ἔοικεν ἔκουσίους*, and with a slight predicative force, in construction though not in meaning, *λέγω δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἡδέα τὰ ἱατρύοντα. * * * φύσει δ' ἡδέα, ἃ ποιεῖ πρᾶξιν τῆς τοιαύσδε φύσεως* in this book, ch. xiv. 7.

V.

ἐν χρόνῳ γὰρ πᾶσα κίνησις καὶ τέλους τινός, οἶον ἢ οἰκοδομικὴ τελεία, ὅταν ποιήσῃ οὐ ἐφίεται. ἢ ἐν ἅπαντι δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ ἢ τούτῳ.

ARISTOTLE, Nic. Eth. X. iv. 2.

IF ἢ is retained before τούτῳ, the last clause must mean "either in the whole time or in the last indivisible moment of that time"; but it seems hardly possible to get this out of the Greek. The other sense sometimes assigned to τούτῳ "any particular part of that time" is contradicted by the last sentence of this paragraph καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, κ. τ. λ.

Sir A. Grant follows Michelet in omitting with two MSS. ἢ altogether, translating "May we not say (ἢ) then that it is perfect in the particular (τούτῳ) time viewed as a whole?" This however does not account for the existence of the second ἢ, unless it be supposed that it was a pure mistake arising from the former ἢ.

It may be suggested therefore that for ἢ τούτῳ we should read ἢ οὐτος. If that was the original reading, the corruption in the text might easily be explained. The Ηι might be changed into ΗΤ owing to a misunderstanding of the iota, and the form τούτος arising from that change would almost infallibly be altered to τούτῳ to agree with χρόνῳ. If ἢ οὐτος could be read, the sentence might then be translated, "May we not say it is perfect in the whole time viewed as such?" And we might compare the next chapter of this Book, paragraph 10, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἢ τοιοῦτος. The sense thus obtained is exactly in accordance with the last words of this

section, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ὀψοῦν χρόνῳ λαβεῖν κίνησιν τελείαν τῷ εἶδει, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, ἐν τῷ ἅπαντι.

VI.

καὶ πρὸς γε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἐπεγγελῶντας αὐτῷ λέγεται θρασύτερον τοῦ δέοντος εἰπεῖν, ὡς Σαρδόνιον γέλῳτα γελῶσιν, οὐ γιγνώσκοντες, ὅσον αὐτοῖς σκότος ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ περικέχεται πολιτευμάτων.

PLUTARCHII, Caius Gracchus, XII.

ON this passage there is the following note in Langhorne's Plutarch: "Why the laughter of Gracchus's opponents should be called forced or Sardonic, because they did not perceive his superiority, it does not appear. It might more properly have been called affected if they did perceive it (Routledge's Ed.)." The reasonable character of this criticism is self-evident. It is just possible that Plutarch as a late writer used the word in a loose sense, and even in Homer Od. xx. 301, 2, *μείδησε δὲ θυμῷ σαρδάνιον μάλα τοῖον*, the expression seems to refer to a laugh of secret triumph. Still from Plato Rep. I, 337 and other passages, the explanation of the Scholiast *ὅτ' ἂν τις μὴ ἐκ διαθέσεως γελᾷ* appears to be the more usual one; and the origin of the expression is seen in Virgil, Ecl. vii. 41, "*Immo ego Sardois videar tibi amarior herbis.*"

As the meaning of a forced or unnatural laugh seems so much more suitable to the general context, it becomes interesting to notice how small an alteration would be required to make our passage harmonize with that meaning. In his "Plutarch's Lives of the Gracchi," p. 44, the present author

inserted a note to the following effect upon the passage before us: "With this text 'Sardonic' must mean 'of secret triumph,' as in Hom. Od. xx. 301, 2. The more usual and more suitable sense might be retained by reading *οἱ* or *ὡς* for *οὐ*, as in Thuc. iv. 18, one MS. has *οὔτε* for *ὥστε*; the hazard attending an omission of the negative is however fully admitted."

The author was not at the time fully satisfied with either of these suggestions; and he has to thank a former pupil, whose past successes at the University are a bright augury of his future career, for a much simpler and better emendation. According to this suggestion, we should substitute *ε* for *ο*, and read *Σαρδόνιον γέλωτα γελῶσω εἶ γιγνώσκοντες ὅσον, κ. τ. λ.* The very same confusion occurs in Thuc. vi. 75, where the MS. *Palatinus Heidelbergensis* reads *οὐ* for *εἶ*.

VII.

καὶ μηχανὰς προσήγον τῇ πόλει οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι,
 μίαν μὲν ἢ τοῦ μεγάλου οἰκοδομήματος κατὰ τὸ
 χῶμα προσαχθείσα ἐπὶ μέγα τε κατέσεισε, κ. τ. λ.

THUCYDIDES, II. 76.

THIS sentence occurs in the description of the siege of Plataea. As a protection against the mound of the besiegers the Plataeans erected an additional wall, called in the paragraph preceding that from which our passage is taken *τὸ μέγα οἰκοδόμημα* * * *τὸ κατὰ τὸ χῶμα*. We are then immediately told in the present passage that "the

Peloponnesians brought up engines, one of which when brought up shook down to a great extent a portion of the great building (τοῦ μεγάλου οἰκοδομήματος κατὰ τὸ χῶμα, κ. τ. λ.), and terrified the Plataeans."

Now, what is the meaning of κατὰ τὸ χῶμα in this second passage? Mr. Dale in his translation entirely ignores the words, unless indeed he intends to represent them by the expression "close to the wall." They are commonly taken to mean "by way of the mound," but it may be objected to this that it is difficult to have κατὰ τὸ χῶμα in different senses in two consecutive paragraphs.

It is here suggested therefore that τοῦ should be read before κατὰ τὸ χῶμα, and the expression will then exactly accord with that in the preceding passage. Of course in this case the genitive will be partitive, as in Thuc. i. 30, Theo.-xxv. 224, &c. The change is not a very serious one if we consider that, in the next chapter but one before this, the τῶν of τῶνδε is omitted by one of the best MSS., and the ὁ before βασιλεὺς by four of Bekker's MSS.; and again three chapters later one MS. omits τῶν before προσβοηθησάντων, and another οἱ before μὲν ὀπλίται.

It may be remarked in conclusion that Grote supports the sense thus derived (Part II. chap. xlix): "Archidamus further brought up battering engines, one of which greatly shook and endangered the additional height of wall built by the Plataeans against the mound."

VIII.

τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Μυκαλησσὸν πάθει χρησαμένων
οὐδενὸς ὡς ἐπὶ μεγέθει τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον
ἦσσαν ὀλοφύρασθαι ἀξίῳ τοιαῦτα ξυνέβη.

THUCYDIDES, VII. 30.

THE MSS. seem unanimous in reading *χρησαμένων*, and it is therefore hazardous to attempt conjecture. As the text stands we must understand "the Mycalessians" from *Μυκαλησσὸν*, or *αὐτῶν*, or take the genitive absolutely. In the edition "*Gottleberi et Baveri*," the translation is "*quam Mycalessus accepit*," but in the notes the authors retain the genitive; Mr. Dale translates: "With regard, then, to Mycalessus, which experienced, considering its extent, a calamity not less lamentable than any which happened in the war," &c. It must probably have occurred to every reader of the passage how much simpler it would be if we might read *χρησαμένην*, and there are sufficient reasons for suspecting an error in the text; first, the position of the participle which is a sort of predicate and not between the article and the substantive; secondly, the termination *ον* of *Μυκαλησσὸν*, which would suggest a masculine participle, if any, to agree with it; thirdly, *χρησαμένην* would be separated from its substantive by *πάθει*; and lastly, the next word *οὐδενὸς* and the *τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον* following would suggest a genitive case, for which we may compare Thuc. v. 82, where *Ἀργείων* probably suggested the corrupt *ἀγγελων*. It is also worthy of note that in the very next chapter *ἔς τὴν Ζάκυνθον* is changed by one of the best MSS. to

ἔς τε Ζάννυθον, perhaps for the second reason suggested above, namely the masculine termination in *ον*. These considerations seem to point strongly to *χρησαμένην* as the original word in the present passage.

IX.

ὁμως δὲ παρὰ πέντε ναῦς πλέον ἀνδρὶ ἐκάστῳ ἢ τρεῖς ὀβολοὶ ὁμολογήθησαν.

THUCYDIDES, VIII. 29.

IN the winter of 412 B.C. Tissaphernes wished to reduce the pay of the Peloponnesian fleet, and pay each man three obols and not the full drachma. The Syracusan commander Hermocrates resisted this, but the Spartan officer Theramenes, as he was only instructed to give up the fleet to Astyochus, was indifferent through a mean spirit of jealousy. It was agreed however that there should be paid "a sum [for the whole fleet] larger by five ships than three oboli a man per day." This amounted to three talents a month for every five ships [omitting *καὶ πενήκοντα* with Bekker, &c.].

The difficulty is great to explain *παρὰ πέντε ναῦς*. Mr. Dale's version given above follows Bloomfield, but at best a weak and confused sense is obtained, and the arrangement of paying the fleet proportionately on such a basis would be extremely complicated. On the other hand Göller and Arnold appear to explain the words as "for every five ships," and so identical with *ἔς πέντε ναῦς* of the next sentence; but it seems hard to understand *παρὰ* in the sense of *κατὰ* against all analogy.

Not an uncommon meaning of *παρὰ* is "except," and it is here proposed to translate the passage, "It was agreed that each man should be paid more than three obols except in the case of five ships." It will not be difficult to show both examples of this meaning, and also what ships these five probably were, and the reason why their pay was kept at the reduced rate of three obols.

First, for *παρὰ* in the sense of "except" may be quoted amongst other passages Herodotus ix. 33, *παρὰ ἐν πάλαισμα ἔδραμε νικᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδα*; Isaeus xli. 36, *παρὰ τέτταρας ψήφους μετέσχε τῆς πόλεως*; and Thucydides vii. 77, *παρ' ὀλίγον διέφευγον*. Secondly, in this book, chapter 6, we read that the Spartans prepared for Chios *ἀντὶ τῶν δέκα νεῶν πέντε*. In chapter 17 we find that the Spartan admiral Chalcideus left the seamen of these ships at Chios, and manned the ships with substitutes from that island; and we are told again in chapter 32 that the number of these ships was five.

It is then probable that these were the five ships excluded from the enjoyment of higher pay. For Thucydides expressly says the Spartan commander *μαλακὸς ἦν περὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ*, and this would be one reason for their exclusion. The fact of these five ships being manned by Chians is another reason why they should not be paid at high wages; in chapter 45 of this book Thucydides says that, almost at the very time referred to in the passage before us, Alcibiades advised Tissaphernes to lower the pay of the fleet to three obols; that Hermocrates alone opposed it (this is repeated from our passage); and that Alcibiades replied in the name of Tissaphernes to the States which applied for

money that the Chians were shameless, for though the richest of the Greeks and protected by the aid they received, yet they expected others to risk their blood and fortunes for the liberty of Chios. Surely this passage points to just such an exclusion of the Chian crews on board the Spartan vessels from a high rate of pay, as is hinted at in chapter 29, if the present interpretation of *παρὰ πέντε ναῦς* be accepted.

X.

Ἄρχεδημος ὁ τοῦ δήμου τότε προεστηκὼς ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ τῆς Δεκελείας ἐπιμελόμενος Ἐρασιῶδη ἐπιβολὴν ἐπιβαλὼν κατηγορεῖ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ, φάσκων ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου αὐτὸν ἔχειν χρήματα ὄντα τοῦ δήμου.

XENOPHON, Hellenics I. 7.

It has been much disputed what is the meaning of *τῆς Δεκελείας ἐπιμελόμενος*. Dobree conjectures *τῆς Δεκατεύσεως*, referring to the levying of the tithe in the Hellespont; Mr. Hailstone gives *τῆς Διωβελίας*, and Grote, while approving of Dobree's conjecture, says none of the commentators can explain the text in a satisfactory manner.

But perhaps something can be urged in favour of the MSS. reading. In the first place, where was Deceleia? "Dekeleia was situated on an outlying eminence belonging to the range called Parnês, about fourteen miles to the north of Athens * * *. The hill on which it stood, if not the fort itself, was visible even from the walls of Athens. It was admirably situated both as a central point for excursions over Attica, and for communication with

Boeotia ; while the road from Athens to Orôpus, the main communication with Euboea, passed through the gorge immediately under it (Grote's Greece, Part II. chap. lx.)” When we compare Thuc. vii. 28, “The carriage of provisions from Euboea, which before was effected more quickly overland from Oropus through Deceleia, was now carried on at great expense by sea round Sunium ;” and further when we read that, by the occupation of Deceleia, Athens *ἀντὶ τοῦ πόλις εἶναι φρούριον κατέστη*, we cannot but conclude that Deceleia was regarded as a most important spot in connection with Athenian imports. Agis from his post at Deceleia saw the ships sailing from the Euxine into the Piræus (Xenophon, Hell. i. 1), and it is probable that the Athenians too had used it as a look-out for the corn ships. Nay more, we are told that soon after this Thoricus was fortified for the safe reception of these vessels instead of their sailing on to the Piræus (Grote, chap. lxiii). It is not improbable then, that before the occupation of Deceleia the Athenians used to land some of their cargoes at Oropus, and send them forward to Athens by the same road as that by which the Euboean produce was taken, just as afterwards they sent them by land from Thoricus.

Now, in Boeckh's “Public Economy of Athens,” Bk. iii. c. 4, we find it stated that “The duty was paid upon imported commodities at the unloading (Demosth. Paragr. c. Lacrit. p. 932, 25 sq).” Also that “Custom duties must necessarily have been established by land against Megaris and Boeotia ; for at certain times a total prohibition existed against those countries. * * It is related of Oropus, upon the boundaries of Attica and Boeotia,

that the inhabitants were all plunderers and toll-gatherers, and also raised a duty upon imported goods. * * This might certainly be referred to a duty paid upon entrance into the country, which the Boeotians and the Athenians had at different times collected at this spot; but as Oropus was situated on the sea, and as the importation from Euboea into Attica originally went by way of Oropus, the meaning remains uncertain (Dicaearchus in the Description of Greece, and the verses of Xenon which he has preserved)."

From a consideration of these points it appears not improbable that there might be a sort of custom-house at Deceleia for watching the imports and duties as they went to Athens, and if so the chief officer would be a very fit person to attend to the tolls of the Bosphorus, which would in all probability be brought from time to time to Athens by the same route; and such an official would in that case be a most proper person to institute the prosecution of Erasinides for stopping public money on its way from the Hellespont, and his would be a position "sufficiently exalted to confer upon him the power of imposing the fine of limited amount called *ἐπιβολή*."

It must be remembered that this toll was not a new thing; Mr. Grote says, "The Athenians seem to have habitually levied this toll at Byzantium, until the revolt of that place, among their constant sources of revenue (chap. lxiii.); it would be in existence therefore at a time when Deceleia was in Athenian hands and possibly the seat of a Government office. It is of course admitted that all this is conjectural, but our passage supports the view.

and the stress which Thucydides lays on the capture of Deceleia shows what importance he attached to its possession ; but it was not in accordance with the Greek mind, even as manifested in a Thucydides, to enter into matters of a financial character. It is worthy of remark in conclusion that Thucydides largely ascribes to the injury inflicted by the occupation of Deceleia that scantiness of money, which necessitated the tax of 5 per cent. instead of the tribute, "as their revenues were being destroyed" (*ὄσῳ καὶ μείζων ὁ πόλεμος ἦν· αἱ δὲ πρόσοδοι ἀπώλλυντο*, vii. 28) ; and the words *χρημάτων ὀλέθρῳ* in the chapter before probably refer to the same fact.

 XI.

ἐπεὶ δ' ἦσθετο ἀντίπαλόν τι τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ συνιστάμενον, πρῶτος αὖ ἡγεμῶν τῷ δήμῳ ἐπ' ἐκείνους ἐγένετο· ὅθεν δήπου καὶ κόθορνος ἐπικαλεῖται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόθορνος ἀρμόττειν μὲν τοῖς ποσὶν ἀμφοτέροις δοκεῖ, ἀποβλέπει δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων.

XENOPHON, *Hell.* II. 3.

THIS passage refers to Theramenes, whom Mr. Grote describes as "a long-sighted as well as tortuous politician (*History of Greece*, Part II, chap. lxiv)." The general context will be best shown by quoting a few lines from Mr. Grote's abridgement of this speech of Critias denouncing him : "He must be dealt with not only as an enemy, but as a traitor to you as well as to us ; a traitor in the grain, as his whole life proves. Though he enjoyed through his father Agnon a station of honour under the democracy, he was foremost in subverting it, and getting

up the Four Hundred; the moment he saw that oligarchy beset with difficulties, he was the first to put himself at the head of the people against them; always ready for change in both directions. * * He has well earned his surname of The Buskin, fitting both legs, but constant to neither (Part II. chap. lxy)."

Cobet omits the words *καὶ γὰρ* to *ἀμφοτέρων* as spurious, and with some show of reason. As they stand, they appear entirely untranslatable, though the meaning is clear, for it must correspond to the answer of Theramenes, *ἀποκαλεῖ δὲ κόθορνόν με, ὡς ἀμφοτέροις πειρώμενον ἀρμόττειν.*

Now, there appears to have been one word running in the mind of Xenophon in this part of the chapter, which would perhaps help us to find the word which he wrote, if the passage is genuine, instead of the evidently corrupt *ἀποβλέπει*. In the next sentence we have *μεταβάλλεσθαι*, in the next but one *μεταβολαὶ* and *εὐμετάβολος*, from which we see that the verb *βάλλω* was in the author's mind at the time he wrote this passage. It appears from this not altogether improbable that instead of *ἀποβλέπει* we should have some form of *ἀποβάλλω*. The present passive *ἀποβάλλεται* would certainly be an unusual form, as of course *πίπτω* is commonly employed as the passive of *βάλλω*. Still an uncommon form would tend to confusion in the MSS., and passages such as Hdt. iii. 95, Thuc. viii. 81, Plato, Theæt. 153 E, Aeseh. Ag. 469, Aeseh. Cho. 1012, Pind. O. i. 14, Theo. xviii. 11, and others, might be quoted in support of it; and the passive is sufficiently common in the perfect and aorist. It is not difficult to see, if *ἀποβάλλεται* be the true reading, how the

confusion may have arisen. In the first place the similarity of the letters ΑΑΑ might cause the omission of the first two; there would then be written ἀποβλεται; further confusion may have arisen from a variant reading ἀποβάλλει, the 2nd singular middle, introduced on account of the exclamation ὦ Θηράμενες which immediately follows. The corrupt form ἀποβλεται and this termination -ει might easily result in the ἀποβλέπει of the MSS.

It may also be remarked that in the reply of Theramenes the verb μεταβάλλεσθαι occurs again more than once, showing that a repetition of ideas, such as that which occurs in our passage and the ἀποκαλεῖ δὲ, κ. τ. λ., of Theramenes, is not unsuitable to Xenophon's style of writing. If the above suggestion could be admitted, the requisite opposition between μὲν and δὲ would be obtained; "for the buskin seems to fit both feet, but is thrown off from both;" the buskin when unlaced would no doubt be more easily thrown off than an ordinary shoe, as it was made with straight soles to fit either foot. An emendation such as that suggested above would at all events seem preferable to omitting a sentence, which is otherwise in Xenophon's style, on account of one slight corruption in the text; and we thus obtain sense which accords well with the evident allusion in the passage to the time-serving policy of Theramenes, and the constant changes in his political attitude.

LATIN AUTHORS.

*Multa concurrunt simul,
Quí conjecturam hanc nunc facio.*

TERENCE.

*Sed neque tam facilis res ulla est quin ea primum
Difficilis magis ad credendum constet.*

LUCRETIUS.

XII.

M. itfivium, quem mihi commendas, vel regem Galliae faciam, etc.

CICERO, Ad Fam. VII. 5 (Mr. Watson's Selection, Ep. 27).

CICERO writes this letter to Caius Julius Caesar to recommend Trebatius to his kindness, and says that he was encouraged to do so by a letter which had just arrived from Caesar inviting such recommendation; at the end of Caesar's letter we find the words quoted above.

By "*regem Galliae faciam*" Caesar probably meant only to express in half-jocular language that he would advance the interests of the person named. But who was "*M. itfivius?*" Furius, Rufus, Fulvius, and Orfius have been suggested, but as Mr. Watson says, it is difficult to identify any of them, and it may be added that it is almost as difficult to trace any resemblance between any of them and the word in the text.

There was a certain M. Fonteius who was Propraetor of Gallia Narbonensis from 77 B.C. till 75 B.C.; was defended by Cicero on a charge of misgovernment in Gaul in 69 B.C.; and is most probably the man spoken of as being the cause of Cicero's return to Rome a few months after this letter was written, "*redii Romam Fonteii causa* (Ad Att. iv. 15)." If this was the person named in the

letter, it would give point to Caesar's expression "*regem Galliae*," as Fonteius had already been Proprætor of Narbonnese Gaul and had been prosecuted for his maladministration of affairs in that province.

Now, if the true reading of the original MS. was

M FONTEIVM,

and the FO and first two strokes of the N and the lower stroke of the E became obliterated, we have at once the

M ITFIVIVM

of the Medicean MS. of the eleventh century upon which our text rests, except that the letters IV appear to have been reduplicated.

Lastly, it is not at all improbable that M. Fonteius was not only a client of Cicero, but also his friend, and therefore a person whom Cicero would naturally recommend to Caesar's notice. M. Boissier in his "*Cicéron et ses Amis*" suggests that, though at Rome in the days of Cicero the ancient *clientela* was well-nigh forgotten, yet the numerous professional clients of the great pleaders of the Forum often became also their personal friends and followers, and formed a sort of revived *clientela*; a *clientela* bound not by law or birth but by ties of gratitude, and following not rank but the higher nobility of intellect.

It is impossible in a passage like the present, where the text is hopelessly corrupt, to give or even to entertain any decided opinion; but the evidence for the name of Fonteius would certainly seem to predominate over that adduced in support of any of the names hitherto suggested.

XIII.

In praefectis excusatio iis, quos voles, deferto.

CICERO, Ad Att. V. 11,⁵(Watson, Ep. 31).

THE words "*excusatio iis*" are undoubtedly corrupt, and emendation is the only course open to the commentator. Orelli suggests "*exceptis negotiatoribus*;" Metzger "*excusatio ni sit*;" while Boot accepts the emendation "*negotiator ni sit*." The objection to the first and last lies in their departure from the text; the objection to that of Metzger in the fact that it does not represent what the context seems to require.

It is implied more than once in Cicero's letters that he had a strong aversion to allowing *negotiatores* to occupy the post of Praefect. "*Praefecturam petivit: negavi me cuiquam negotianti dare, quod idem tibi ostenderam*," he writes to Atticus (Ad Att. v. 21), and as this was written only some six months after the letter in which "*excusatio iis*" occurs, it seems not improbable that it was in the latter that he had expressed as he says the same feeling to Atticus. Again, three months later he writes, "*tu me, inquam, rogas, praefectus ut Scaptius sit? alias hoc statueramus, ut negotiatorem neminem* (Ad Att. vi. 2)."

It is then sufficiently obvious what should be the meaning of the clause which is concealed under the corrupt words "*excusatio iis*"; the difficulty is to obtain the sense required with the least departure from the reading of the MS. Adopting NI from two of the emendations quoted above, it having probably first been altered to IN and then dropped

before the preposition EX,—unless indeed we may assume that “*In praefectis*” should be “*Praefectos ni*,”—we have

NIEXCVSATIOIIS,

which, by the insertion of A before v, and the transposition of o to stand before T and of s to stand before instead of after the last I, becomes

NIEXCAVSAOTIISI.

If we now suppose that “*nec*” once stood before “*otii*” and was dropped as being a redundant conjunction after “*ni*”, we have

NIEXCAVSANECOTIISI, etc.,

i.e., “*In praefectis, ni ex causa necotii [negotii], si quos voles, deferto.*” This emendation is slightly supported by a corresponding phrase in a letter quoted above, Ad Att. v. 21, “*si praefectus vellet esse syngraphae causa, me curaturum ut exigeret.*” In conclusion, one passage may be quoted which will show from later history the reason why Cicero objected to place *negotiatores* in office. Tacitus writes, Annals ii. 62, “*veteres illic Suevorum praediae et nostris e provinciis lixae ac negotiatores reperti, quos jus commercii, dein cupido augendi pecuniam, postremum oblivio patriae suis quemque ab sedibus hostilem in agrum transtulerat.*”

XIV.

Illud putato non adscribis “ et tibi gratias egit.”

CICERO, Ad Att. VII. 7 (Watson, Ep. 44).

THIS letter commences with a quotation from a letter of Atticus :—“ Dionysius arrived at Rome on the 18th of December and gave me a letter of

recommendation from you." "This," says Cicero, "is what you write about Dionysius. You do not add (*Illud non adscribis*) 'and he expressed his gratitude.'"

What then is the word which is lurking under the corrupt form "*putato?*"

Boot suggests "*optatum*," "what I so much wished to hear." Now, though Dionysius is mentioned with respect in Ad Att. iv. 15 and vi. 2, and elsewhere, still it does not seem altogether probable that a Roman of Cicero's haughty temperament would "so much wish to hear" of the gratitude of his freedman; even though that freedman was one of whom he says some three months after the date of this letter (Ad Att. ix. 12), "*apud me honoratior fuit quam apud Scipionem Panaetius*."

A much simpler emendation for

PVTATO,

in place of Boot's conjecture "*optatum*," would be

PVTATV.

Compare, on the confusion of 'o' and 'u', Professor Nettleship's Preface to Conington's Persius, p. viii. Ed. 1872. This would give excellent sense. "*Illud puta tu non adscribis 'et tibi gratias egit'*;" "You do not add this for instance 'and he expressed his gratitude to you.'" For examples of this use of "*puta*" may be quoted "*Quinte, puta, aut Publi*," Horace, Sat. II. v. 32; "*Hoc puta non justum est*," Persius, Sat. iv. 9; "*ut puta si legitimus tutor non sit idoneus*," Justinian, Inst. I. tit. xxiii.; "*ut puta mater*," Id. Inst. I. tit. xxvi.; "*Si ille, puta, consul*," Pompon. Dig. l. xxviii. tit. 5; "*ut puta funis*," Seneca, Q. N. l. ii.; "*ut Phoebo, puta, filioque Phoebi*," Auct. Priap. Carm. 37. It is true that the word "*puta*"

appears not to occur in this sense in Cicero's writings, but we find the plural "*putate*" thus used in Phil. ii. 6: "*Cui? neminem nominabo: putate tum Phormioni alicui, tum Gnathoni, tum etiam Ballioni.*" Cf. "*Tu puto haec credis,*" Ad Att. viii. 9. Forcellini remarks on "*Putate,*" "*vulgus utitur adverbialiter pro scilicet, exempli gratia,*" etc.; and as this is a private letter and to his most intimate correspondent, Cicero might very possibly use a word which he would not have thought proper to employ in more serious writing.

 XV.

Unam mehercule tecum apricationem in illo lucrativo tuo sole malim, etc.

CICERO, Ad Att. VII. 11. (Watson, Ep. 47.)

CICERO commences this letter by expressing his astonishment at the course of action pursued by Caesar: "Let him keep his fortune," says he; "I would rather have a little basking with you in that '*lucrativo*' sun of yours than all such tyrannies, or rather I would die a thousand deaths before I would harbour one such thought."

Mr. Watson considers the text hardly capable of explanation, and it seems a matter for regret that so fine a passage should be spoiled by the evidently corrupt word "*lucrativo.*" It is not Ciceronian, and is meaningless in this passage; for Boot's explanation, quoted by Mr. Watson, does not appear satisfactory: "*sol lucrativus dici potuit et is quem Atticus negotiis surripuisset, et is quo ut fruereetur aliquo loci impedimento amoto effecisset.*" There is

also another reading "*Lucretino*," referring to the estate of Atticus near Mount Lucretilis; this is more intelligible, but has probably arisen from a misconception of the meaning of the passage; it is to be much questioned whether the "*apricatio*" here referred to is to be conceived as pleasant; certainly the "*mori*" of the next clause points in another direction, and possibly most Romans as well as Cicero would have been Epicureans enough to prefer the sunny ease of a Sabine villa to the toil and anxiety of such a government as Caesar's.

Now, it seems to be more than probable that the word "*tuo*" fixes the "*lucrativus (?) sol*" as something mentioned in one of Atticus' previous letters. In Ad Att. ix. 10, written on March 18, 49 B.C., Cicero writes, "*Cum ad hunc locum venissem, evolvi volumen epistolarum tuarum, quod ego sub signo habeo servoque diligentissime;*" then he quotes letters in order under the dates of January 23, 25, and 27; February 7, 11, 19, 22, 25; March 1, 4, 5, and 9. Immediately before this Cicero says, "*Sol, ut est in tua quadam epistola, excidisse mihi e mundo videtur. Ut aegroto, dum anima est, spes esse dicitur,*" etc. It is therefore most probable that the letter in which this "sun which seemed to have fallen from the universe" is mentioned, was written by Atticus some few days before that dated January 23, the intervals between the other letters in the list varying from one to eleven days. In this case it might very well be delivered to Cicero, before he wrote on January 19 the letter in which "*lucrativus sol*" occurs, and be lying before him at the time; for Cicero was now in Campania and Atticus at Rome.

These considerations tend to prove that the sun described by the corrupt word "*lucrativus*" is the sun mentioned by Atticus in his last letter to Cicero, where he is alluding to his own ill-health. This is supported by the "*Ut aegroto,*" etc., which follows "*sol excidisse,*" etc., in the one passage, and by the "*mori millies*" following the "*sole*" in the other.

There seems little doubt that we have here the key to the meaning of our passage, and that this "*lucrativus (?) sol*" is the sun mentioned in the letter of Atticus quoted in Ad Att. ix. 10. But it is difficult to see what word or words are concealed beneath the corrupt form in our text. The nearest conjecture which suggests itself is to read E before V, ITE in place of C, and ES after A. This would give us in place of "*lucrativo*" the two words "*leviter aestivo,*" "*leviter*" being of course in the sense of "*parum.*" But probably this conjecture is worthless; and the chief point worthy of attention is that we appear able, from Ad Att. ix. 10, to fix the meaning of the passage, which is perhaps more important than the precise phraseology.

The sense of the paragraph will then be: "I would rather have a little basking with you even under that sickly sun you mention than all such power, nay rather, I would die a thousand deaths before I would entertain one such thought." Cicero would prefer a brief moment with Atticus even on the bed of sickness to all the pomp of tyranny, nay, death itself to harbouring a hope of despotism.

XVI.

“Non accipere, ne periculosum sit, invidiosum ad bonos.”

CICERO, Ad. Att. VIII. 3 (Watson, Ep. 54).

IN the former part of this letter, written to Atticus on the 20th of February, 49 B.C., Cicero has been debating whether he should stand by Pompey, if he left Italy, or should remain at Rome, in which case he must fall into Caesar's power. If he stayed at Rome (he argues) he would do no worse than Philippus, Flaccus, and Mucius did under Cinna's tyranny. But even if he were to take this course, he would be embarrassed by the retention of his *imperium*: for suppose Caesar was well disposed towards him, though of this he was by no means certain; but suppose he was; then he would offer Cicero a triumph. Then follows the sentence, *“Non accipere, ne periculosum sit, invidiosum ad bonos.”*

The meaning that the sentence should bear is obvious: “Not to accept the triumph would be a dangerous course, while my acceptance would bring me into ill repute with the Conservative party.”

Orelli proposes, *“non accipere me periculosum est; accipere invidiosum ad bonos.”* This is no doubt the sense, but the alteration of “*sit*” into “*est*,” immediately followed by the gratuitous insertion of “*accipere*,” is rather an explanation than an emendation of the passage.

Forcellini says that “*non*” is for “*nonne*,” and Hofmann that “*ne*” is for “*ut non*,” “even supposing that.” At the best neither of these explanations seems satisfactory.

Orelli is doubtless right in the conjecture of “*me*” for “*ne*,” but a simpler emendation might perhaps be suggested for the latter part of the sentence. If for “*sit*” we read “*set*” (*sed*), the meaning of the passage appears sufficiently clear without the actual insertion of “*accipere*”; though possibly it was the condensed form of the sentence which caused the confusion. We should then read, “*Non accipere me periculosum; sed invidiosum ad bonos;*” “not to accept it would be fraught with danger; but it (*sc.* my acceptance) would bring me into disrepute with good citizens.” It has also been suggested by a friend that we should perhaps read “*invidiosus*” agreeing with “*triumphus*” understood from the “*triumphum*” of the previous sentence. This would be a simple and effective emendation. In either case the meaning will be, “Refusal on my part would make Caesar my enemy, while my acceptance would bring on me the suspicion of my party.” This agrees well with the next sentence, for which neither Hofmann’s nor Forcellini’s explanation would sufficiently account: “*O rem, inquis, difficilem et inexplicabilem! Atqui explicanda est.*”

XVII.

Volui. N S Q. Egi per praedem, ille daret, Antii cum haberet venale: noluit.

CICERO, Ad Att. IX. 9 (Watson, Ep. 62).

IN this part of the letter Cicero is speaking of certain gardens at Lanuvium, which at one time he thought would be more pleasant than his Tusculan Villa and would cost less than restoring it after its

destruction by Clodius. Then he proceeds to say, "*Volui*," etc.

Accepting Boot's and Orelli's emendation of H. S. Q., the passage is translated, "I wished to buy it for 500 sestertia. I arranged with a surety for him to offer that amount, when he offered the estate for sale at Antium, but he declined to take it;" or, with Mr. Watson, "I applied to a surety to pay the money, as the proprietor offered the estate for sale at Antium." But it may be safely objected that the omission of "*emere*" after "*volui*" without the occurrence of a similar word before it in the letter is at least unusual; and again that the subject to "*haberet*," if not also to "*noluit*," should be "*ille*," that is to say, the surety for the intending purchaser (and not the seller) is made to offer the estate for sale! Boot candidly says that he considers the passage inexplicable.

As no satisfactory emendation seems to have been suggested, it may perhaps be admissible to propose the following: "*Volui H. S. Q. ego per praedem illi dare, Antii cum haberet venale: noluit*": "I was willing to give him 500 sestertia through a surety, when he offered the estate for sale at Antium, but he refused it." The only alterations here required are "*ego*" for "*egi*," "*illi*" for "*ille*," and "*dare*" for "*daret*." That a stop after H. S. Q. should have been inserted will be a matter of no surprise to any one acquainted with the study of MSS.; even when stops began to be inserted, this stop might only be that which would naturally follow the abbreviation "Q." Granted that "*ego*" became changed to "*egi*" the rest would follow easily, "*illi dare*" becoming "*ille daret*" to make

some approach to a construction. The reading here suggested avoids the difficulty as to the subject of "*haberet*" and "*noluit*"; it may of course be supplied from "*illi*." One objection however might be brought against the suggested reading, but an objection which rather strengthens than disturbs it. It might be said that "*ego*" is always emphatic and is therefore out of place here. But in this passage Cicero is expressly emphasizing his hope that "*aliquis meorum*" would purchase the estate at Lanuvium, and says that he himself (*ego istos hortulos*, etc.) had once thought it would be a pleasant and cheap investment. We have in a few lines "*aliquis meorum*," "*maxime meus*," "*ego illud*," "*ego istos*," and "*mihi*" three times; so that the emphatic pronoun is most suitable to the spirit of the passage.

XVIII.

In qua erat ero sceleri!

CICERO, Ad Att. IX. 18 (Watson, Ep. 67).

AFTER describing to Atticus the importunity with which Caesar pressed him to proceed to Rome, Cicero breaks into exclamations of disgust at the companions of Julius: "*Reliqua, o di! qui comitatus! quae, ut tu soles dicere, νεκρία! in qua erat ero sceleri! o rem perditam! o copias desperatas!*"

Now, what is the meaning of "*in qua erat ero sceleri?*" Orelli suggests ἐρεσχελία, raillery; Hofmann "*erat area sceleris*;" and Kayser "*κέρας scelerum*" (Mr. Watson's Select Letters of Cicero). Some emendation indeed is absolutely necessary;

but perhaps one more simple than any of these may be found by an examination of the reading of the MSS. In place of

INQVAERATEROSCELERI,

by supposing that QVA should have been repeated, and by substituting I for the second ER and \bar{v} for the last I, we get

INQVAQVAERATIOSCELERV̄.

The passage will then read: "*Reliqua, o di! qui comitatus! quae, ut tu soles dicere, $\nu\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha!$ in qua quae ratio scelerum! o rem perditam! o copias desperatas!*"

If the above be the true reading, it is easy to see how the corruption arose: QVA being once omitted after the QVA preceding it, ERAT would be taken as the verb; possibly the ER might be repeated in place of the I, and confusion might readily arise between the similar forms of the letters I and \bar{v} .

"*In qua quae ratio scelerum!*" is a very simple sentence, appropriate in sense and in rhythm to our passage, and quite in Cicero's style, which is perhaps more than can be said of the other emendations quoted above. Cf. "*Quae fuit ejus peragratio itinerum!*" Phil. ii. § 57; "*Qui risus hominum!*" Id. § 73. "*Quae tua fuga! quae formido praeclaro illo die! quae propter conscientiam scelerum desperatio vitae!*" Id. § 88. Cf. also Virgil, Aen. vi. 560, "*Quae scelerum facies?*" Instances of "*ratio*" in a similar meaning to that required above are (*vid. Forcellini sub voce*) "*omni ratione tueare,*" Ad Quint. Frat. i. 1; "*ratione docentur et via,*" Or. 33; and "*mea ratio in tota amicitia*
* * * *constans et gravis,*" Ad Fam. iii. 8.

XIX.

*Maconi istud, quod scribis, non mihi videtur tam
re esse triste quam verbo.*

A₁
CICERO, Ad Att. X. 1 (Watson, Ep. 68).

VARIOUS emendations have been suggested for the corrupt word "*maconi*;" Boot gives us *φάρμακον*, and Orelli *ἐνδόμυχον*, "the secret," which was possibly suggested to him by Ad Att. v. 21. It appears probable that both are right in conjecturing a Greek word, and also a word of the neuter gender with which "*istud*" may agree; just as in this letter "*haec*" agrees with *ἄλη*, and "*tua ista crebra*" with *ἐκφώνησις*.

But perhaps a still simpler emendation may be found. It is possible that the original word was not a substantive at all, but an adjective; and that the passage is parallel to a sentence in Ad Att. v. 21, "*γλυκύπικρον illud confirmas.*" In this case it would not be difficult to discover a suitable word without any great departure from the MSS. In place of

MACONIISTUD,

by inserting A, and supposing that the I has been wrongly repeated, we obtain the reading

AMACONISTUD.

This will give us, "*ἄμαχον istud, quod scribis,*" etc. For in early times CH was always written C, as "*Antioocesis*" for "*Antiochensis*," and "*Baca*" and "*Bacanalibus*" for "*Baccha*" and "*Bacchanalibus*;" even Cicero himself seems to have objected to writing "*pulcher*" instead of "*pulcer.*" Cf. Orat. 48, 160. In later times, however, we find that the

opposite custom obtains, and that c is often replaced by CH, even where there is not the slightest reason for such a change.

If the above emendation were accepted, the sense of the passage would run as follows: "The 'insurmountable difficulty,' mentioned in your letter, appears to me not so distressing in reality as it is represented to be—not so hopeless in practice as it is in theory."

XX.

*An qui valde hic in absentes solus tui scelus,
ejusdem cum Pompeio et cum reliquis princi-
pibus non feram?*

CICERO, Ad Att. X. 8 (Watson, Ep. 71).

THIS passage is undoubtedly corrupt, and the following emendations have been hitherto suggested: "*qui invadentis in absentes,*" etc. (Hofmann); and "*qui valide huic obstans ejus solus tui scelus,*" etc. (Kayser). The latter of these makes good sense, but appears rather too far from the original reading; the objection to the former is that it does not furnish us with any tangible allusion.

In 59 B.C. Caesar proposed an agrarian law to provide for Pompey's veterans and for poor citizens. The law was carried in the teeth of the Consul Bibulus and the *optimates*, and Pompey and Crassus were placed on the Commission. Three years afterwards in 56 B.C., when Caesar was absent from Rome, Cicero proposed in the Senate that the legality of the allotment of the Campanian land under the provisions of Caesar's law should be discussed. As Mr. Watson remarks, "No doubt

the object of this motion was a repeal of the laws of 59, and it was thus a direct challenge to Caesar." Pompey apparently showed no signs of displeasure, but Caesar was naturally much embittered against Cicero when he learnt the facts from Crassus at Ravenna. "*Nam hoc senatus consulto in meam sententiam facto Pompeius, cum mihi nihil ostendisset se esse offensum, in Sardiniam et in Africam profectus est eoque itinere Lucam ad Caesarem venit. Ibi multa de mea sententia questus est Caesar, quippe qui etiam Ravennae Crassum ante vidisset ab eoque in me esset incensus.*" Cicero, Ad Fam. i. 9. But the fresh coalition between Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus resulted in Cicero's submission, and apparently in an apology to Caesar, to which Cicero probably alludes under the term of *παλιωδία* in Ad Att. iv. 5; "*subturpicula mihi videbatur esse παλιωδία.*"

Now, such a distinct challenge, such marked opposition to Caesar, was never made before or after by Cicero. He had opposed him in the matter of Catiline and at other times, but never had so openly thrown the glove before him. With his lamentable weakness of character Cicero soon repented the course he had taken, and took refuge in recrimination; but it would be only consistent with that vanity, which accompanies an unstable nature, that he should afterwards boast of the same opposition as an achievement. It is not at all improbable then that he is alluding to it in this passage written some seven years afterwards, and such allusion can be obtained by a very small change in the words. If we read *HVIVS* for *HICIN* and "*absentis*" for "*absentes*," we have all the alteration required;

and the passage will then read: "*Adversabimur igitur? quod majus scelus vel tantum denique? quid turpius? An qui valde hujus absentis solus tuli scelus, ejusdem cum Pompeio et cum reliquis principibus non feram?*" "Shall we oppose Pompey? What wickedness could be greater or so great? What more disgraceful? Shall I, who though alone stoutly resisted Caesar's wickedness in his absence (in Gaul or at Ravenna), not resist it now with the aid of Pompey and the other nobles?" For "*hujus*" referring to Caesar, compare the next sentence "*ab hoc*," sc. "*Caesare*." If Cicero was alluding to his conduct in 56 B.C., he could justly say "*solus tuli*;" for Caesar's decree was for Pompey's veterans, and both Pompey and Crassus were, as mentioned above, members of the commission; and though Pompey showed no displeasure at the time, he afterwards remonstrated with Cicero on the subject through his brother Quintus. One more point may be noticed. Cicero would have been most ready to allude to his opposition to Caesar, if he thought that Caesar's popularity and power were on the wane; and it is remarkable that in this very letter he writes: "*nullo enim modo posse video stare istum diutius, quin ipse per se etiam languentibus nobis concidat.*"

XXI.

Recipio tempore me domo. Te nunc ad oppidum et quoniam his placeret modo propius accedere, ut hac de re considerarent.

CICERO, Ad Att. XI. 6² (Watson, Ep. 80).

THIS is one of those passages which can hardly be emended without a greater departure from the

reading of the MSS. than is warrantable; but it is still interesting to inquire what are the slightest changes by which good sense may be obtained.

“It is extremely irksome to me,” says Cicero, “to remain at Brundisium; yet how can I act on your advice and draw nearer to Rome without the lictors whom the people gave me? While I retain my *Imperium*, they cannot be dispensed with, and yet at the present moment I caused them to mingle for a while with the crowd, staves and all, as I approached Brundisium, to prevent an assault on the part of the garrison. I shall resume them (so the sense of ‘*Recipio—considerarent*’ must run) at the proper time. Write to our two friends, as they wished me to draw nearer to Rome, so that they may consider about this point: I believe they would advise me to resume them (*credo fore auctores*).”

The emendation here tentatively suggested is, “*Recipiam tempore. Modo tu nunc ad Oppium et Quintum, quoniam his placuerit me modo propius accedere, ut hac de re considerent.*” In order to obtain this reading, we must change the o of “*Recipio*” into ā, transpose the D and M of “*domo*,” and read the pronoun “*me*” before the second instead of the first “*modo*.” For “*modo*” in this sense of “only” with the imperative, compare Ad Fam. xvi. 11, “*modo fac, ne quid aliud cures*;” Ter. Ad. v. 3, 59, “*modo facito ut illam serves*,” etc. Next we must read TV for TE. The omission of “*scribe*” or “*scribas*” might be supported by such passages as “*Sed tempore ipso de epistolis (sc. scribebam)*,” Ad. Quint. Frat. i, 2. The next change is the introduction of the names of Oppius and Quintus; Oppius has before been con-

jectured as the correct reading for "*oppidum*" (see Mr. Watson's note); but another name is required to account for the plurals "*his*" and "*considerarent*;" this is now added by the conjecture of QVINTVM from QVONIAM, the similarity of the two words having probably occasioned the omission of the former. With regard to Oppius, Cicero writes (Ad Fam. ii. 16), "*togam praetextam tibi Oppio puto te audisse*," and (Ad Att. ix. 7), "*id me jam pridem agere intelleges ex litteris Balbi et Oppii, quarum exempla tibi misi*;" he was a close friend of Caesar, and a correspondent of Cicero. See also especially Ad Fam. xi. 29, Ed. Graev., from which it appears that Oppius had advised Cicero upon a previous occasion, and that Cicero had a high opinion of his judgment. Compare also Ad Att. v. 1, xii. 19, and xiv. 1. The conjecture of Quintus as the second name might be equally well supported; the unfriendly feeling at present existing between the two brothers would induce Cicero to ask Atticus to write to Quintus for him; in a letter written to Atticus immediately before the one under consideration, Cicero says "*Quintus aversissimo a me animo Patris fuit*" (Ad Att. xi. 5); again in this very letter Cicero tells Atticus: "*Quintum fratrem audio profectum in Asiam, ut deprecaretur; de filio nihil audivi. Sed quaere ex Diochare, etc. Is dicitur vidisse euntem an jam in Asia*," the latter sentence of which probably refers, with all respect to the judgment of Mr. Watson, to Quintus *frater*; as, if it refers to the son, how could Cicero have said that he had heard nothing of him? In any case this appears much like a direction to Atticus where to write to Quintus. Again, shortly after this

(Ad Att. xi. 12) we find Cicero writing to Caesar to disabuse his mind of the idea that Quintus "had given the signal like a clarion for Cicero's departure," though he complains to Atticus of his brother's violent language; so that by implication if Quintus gave any advice it was probably "*propius accedere*." Lastly, for "*placeret*" and "*considerarent*" we have to read "*placuerit*" and "*considerent*;" possibly "*placeret*" was first read in place of "*placuerit*," and afterwards "*considerent*" was attracted into the same tense.

This conjecture of the true reading is only tentative, but it is hoped that it is one step nearer to the truth; and it has at all events the advantage of giving us precisely the sense which the passage seems to demand.

XXII.

Si quaeris quid putem, ego fructum puto.

CICERO, Ad Att. XII. 2 (Watson, Ep. 85).

AFTER mentioning various rumours about the war in Africa, and the ease and confidence of Caesar's friends, Cicero charges Atticus with doing nothing; yet, says he, the question must be answered immediately, and "if you ask my opinion, *ego fructum puto*."

As they stand these words can mean nothing, but apparently, as Mr. Watson says, "some word meaning 'settled' is wanted, referring to the struggle in Africa." Such a word it does not appear difficult to supply from the

FRVCTVM

of the MSS. If for the first v we read A, and

suppose that after F the letter E has been omitted owing to the similarity of those letters, and that the F itself was originally a P, the curve of which had become obliterated, we shall then have as the original form

PERACTVM.

With this reading the passage will give very good sense: "*Si quaeris quid putem, ego peractum puto*;" "if you ask my opinion, I think the struggle is finished." For the form of the sentence we may then compare, with Mr. Watson, Ad Fam. ix, 2, 4, "*ego confectum existimo*;" and for the meaning may be quoted among other passages "*peragenda est fabula*," De Senectute, 19; "*ingenti caede peracta*," Virgil, Aen. ix. 242; "*sacro quod praestat rite peracto*," Juv. xii. 86; and "*opus peractum*," Statius, Silv. i. 1.

XXIII.

*Aurunci Rutulique serunt, et vomere duros
Exercent collis, atque horum asperrima pascunt.*

VIRGIL, Aeneid XI. 318, 319.

THE text of Virgil has come down to us in a state so satisfactory, that it would seem almost profanity in a scholar's eyes to suggest even the alteration of a single letter when the MSS. are unanimous. But in the passage quoted above there is little doubt that we have not what Virgil wrote. In the first place, to quote Professor Conington, "Rom. has the two first letters of 'pascunt' written over an erasure." In the second place, "Neither commentators nor lexicographers appear to explain the

use of ‘pascunt.’” Heyne seems to understand “*pascunt*” to mean “they use for pasture,” but this is without authority; Forcellini quotes Martial for the meaning “of cultivating the land under difficulty, so that the cultivator rather maintains it than is maintained by it (Conington),” but this is “too recondite for a passage like this;” a third way suggested is to take “*asperrima*” as nominative, but it is not at all plausible, as the change of subject would make a very confusing construction.

Relying then on the erasure under the first two letters of “*pascunt*” in one of the best MSS. (Roman), and on the lack of any sound explanation of the meaning of that word, perhaps we may venture to suggest an emendation which only requires the change of the second letter “*a*” into “*o*.” If this change could be admitted, we should then have:—

“*Aurunci Rutulique serunt, et vomere duos
Exercent collis, atque horum asperrima poscunt.*”

In support of “*poscunt*” in the sense of “they lay a demand on,” Ovid might be quoted (Metam. I. 138, 139):—

“*Nec tantum segetes alimenta que debita dives
Posebatur humus;*”

and also Virgil himself (Georgics I. 127, 128):—

“*Ipsaque tellus
Omnia liberius nullo poscente ferebat;*”

both of which passages relate like the present to the earth and its produce; while for “*posco*” with the accusative of that on which the demand is made, and without the accusative of the thing demanded, we have Aeneid I. 666:—

“*Ad te confugio et supplex tua numina posco.*”

Compare also Cicero, Verres II. i. 26, "*Hortatur hospes; poscunt majoribus poculis,*" and Aeneid v. 59, "*Poscamus ventos,*" where see Conington's note.

There is one more confirmation of this reading. In line 325, that is six lines later, two MSS. read "*poscunt*" for "*possunt*;" the probability is that the "*poscunt*" of that line came from the "*poscunt*" of line 319 if this be the true reading.

 XXIV.

*Ipse, peregrina ferrugine clarus et ostro,
Spicula torquebat Lycio Gortynia cornu;
Aureus ex humeris erat arcus, et aurea vati
Cassida.*

VIRGIL, Aeneid XI. 772-5.

IN this passage the difficulties are obvious, but no remedy or adequate explanation appears to have suggested itself to the Commentators. With the most religious respect for the sanctity of the text of Virgil, it is interesting to conjecture how the confusion in the MSS. may have arisen, without presuming to attempt a decided emendation; and in doing so we find ourselves confronted with a possible solution of the difficulty.

We may translate the passage: "Chloereus himself, in all the glory of foreign purple and crimson dye, was shooting Gortynian shafts from a bow of Lycian horn; golden was the bow that hung from his shoulder, golden the helmet upon the seer's head." If the text is to stand, we are reduced to the necessity of supposing that "the bow of Lycian horn" is identical with the "golden bow;" or that Chloereus carried a spare bow of gold in addition to

the horn bow with which he shot ; or lastly, we must suppose that "*arcus*" means "quiver." Not one of these explanations however is at all satisfactory.

First, then, what do we learn from the MSS. ? Professor Conington writes, *Vergilii Opera*, Vol. III. p. 375, Ed. 1871 : "Ribbeck seems right in restoring 'erat' from Med., and one of his cursives (here again we must recollect that Pal. and Rom. are deficient). 'Sonat' would naturally be introduced from v. 652, just as Gud. and some inferior MSS. have introduced 'humero.' * * * The Balliol MS. omits v. 773." "*Sonat*" doubtless came, as Professor Conington observes, from line 652 :—

"*Aureus ex humero sonat arcus et arma Dianae.*"

We may therefore turn our attention to the other reading, that of the Medicean, on which Heinsius' text chiefly rests, which is :—

"*Aureus ex humeris erat arcus,*" etc.

Now, the *varia lectio* of the other MSS. points to a confusion in the original, and we must endeavour to discover the probable form of the word which became so confused, and the reason for such confusion ; what the word was in fact, from which the scribe of the Medicean conjectured "*erat arcus,*" and which was so illegible that the copyists of the other MSS. substituted "*sonat arcus,*" resorting to the not uncommon expedient of inserting a portion of a similar line.

Taking then as our starting point the reading of the Medicean,

HVMERIS ERAT ARCVS,

first, we may conjecture that the word for which ERAT ARCVS was substituted ended in vs ; secondly,

we may conjecture that in the earlier part of the word there was a vowel followed by R, followed by another vowel and T, the first three letters of "*arcus*" having probably been imported from 652; thirdly, the plural "*humeris*" with the *varia lectio* "*humero*" may perhaps give colour to the supposition of a consonant at the beginning of the last word, which caused "*humero*" to become "*humeris*," though "*humero*" may possibly have come from 652 with "*sonat*." From these considerations we may now form a tentative conjecture of the original word. If we allow † to stand for consonant, and * for vowel, the form of the word would appear to be

† * R * TVS.

Turning to circumstantial evidence, it is difficult to say from what part of Etruria Chloereus came, but Arruns who is mentioned with him was possibly from Clusium. It was Virgil's custom in the *Aeneid* to draw the names of his heroes from those of individuals or families in later times, and to make them their ancestors or founders. Cf. *Aen.* i. 288, v. 117, 121-3, &c. Now, from Livy, v. 33, we find that it was Arruns of Clusium who invited the Gauls to cross the Alps, an action which led to the taking of Rome in 390 B.C. The name of this Arruns would probably be sufficiently remembered in Virgil's day to induce him to connect his Arruns not only with Etruria, as in xi. 784-6, but also with the Etruscan city Clusium. If then Arruns came from Clusium, it is not improbable that Chloereus who was fighting near him came from the same city, and in that case we shall be able to discover the nature of the arms he bore. In *Aen.* x. 167-9, in the catalogue of the Etruscan forces, we read:—

“*Sub quo mille manus juvenum, qui moenia Clusi,
Quique urbem liquere Cosas: quis tela sagittae
Gorytique leves humeris, et letifer arcus.*”

If then Chloreus came from Clusium, his armour should consist of “*sagittae*,” “*gorytus*,” and “*arcus*.” In our passage we have “*spicula*” for “*sagittae*,” “*cornu*” for “*arcus*,” and “*gorytus*” is left to be represented either by “*cassida*” or the word hidden in “*erat arcus*.” “*Cassida*” of course has a totally different meaning, and besides the “*ex humero*” or “*ex humeris*” of our passage points to the “*humeris*” in x. 169 as parallel: so that it is in “*humeris erat arcus*” that we have to seek an equivalent to “*gorytus*.” Now, we showed above that from the MSS. we might expect a word († standing for consonant and * for vowel),

† * R * TVS.

Is this very different from

GORYTVS,

and is it impossible that this is the original word, the corruption of which has caused the difficulty in our passage? In which case the line should read:

“*Aureus ex humero gorytus, et aurea vati
Cassida.*”

If then this be the word, what led to the confusion in the MSS.? In the next line before that under discussion occurs the word “*Gortynia*” in a position almost directly above “*gorytus*,” if that be the true reading. These two words, being so similar in form and occurring in the position

GORTYNIA

GORYTVS,

would very probably cause a confusion in the

MSS. As one instance out of many, compare Lucretius v. 468 :—

“*Corpore concreto circumdatus undique saepsit,*”
 where “*saepsit*” according to Lachmann has come from the next line but one beneath and the true reading is “*flexit.*” Cf. also Juvenal viii. 4, where for “*humeroque*” most MSS. have “*nasumque*” from “*nasoque*” in the next line, and Aesch. Supp. 494, Ag. 1216, &c.

Again, if we accept the reading “*gorytus,*” it gives a reason for the omission of line 773 in the Balliol MS., viz., that the scribe’s eye wandered from “*Gortynia*” to the similar word “*gorytus,*” and in consequence he omitted the line. Compare Lucretius v. 585, 6 :—

“*Postremo quoscumque vides hinc aetheris ignes ;*
Quandoquidem quoscumque in terris cernimus
(ignes),”

where the “*ignes*” of line 585 caused the omission of the “*ignes*” of 586 ; an example of the law of Dissimilation, whereas the last quotations were examples of the law of Assimilation.

Moreover, if we could assume GORYTVS to be the true reading, it would not be difficult to see how ERAT ARCVS may have arisen from it, especially if the form was partially obscured by confusion with GORTYNIA. Probably ERAT would be the first conjecture ; the VS would remain, and would suggest a word ending in VS, preceded by a long syllable to complete the metre, and possibly confusion with “*Gortynia*” might have introduced some of the last letters of that word between the T and the S, which would give colour to the introduction of ARC from line 652 ; the remaining letter G may have caused

the change from "*humero*" to "*humeris*." Having then already

"*Aureus ex humeris erat . . us et*," etc., the copyist of the Medicean would naturally refer to line 652,

"*Aureus ex humeris sonat arcus et*, etc., and adopt "*arc*" from that line just as the other MSS. have adopted "*sonat arcus*."

Once more—and an accumulation of circumstantial evidence may at times amount to moral certainty—in the *Thebaid* of Statius, iv. 265 seq., we find a passage evidently imitated from the one before us. In 265 to 269 we have "*Igneus . . igneus*," "*auro*," "*ostro*," "*pictus*," and "*plumis*," answering to "*Aureus . . aurea*," "*auro*," "*ostro*," "*pictus*," and "*plumam*" in *Aen.* xi. 771-777; besides "*Cydonaea*" in the former answering to "*Gortynia*" in the latter, and an allusion in the immediate context of both to the hero's horse and his trappings. Now, line 269 of this passage in the *Thebaid* is:—

"*Terga, Cydonaea gorytus arundine pulsat*."

It appears from this not improbable that Statius found the word "*gorytus*" in our passage, though it must be admitted that this argument is slightly weakened by the fact that "*sonat arcus*" also occurs in the same passage of Statius.

Lastly, "*gorytus*" is interpreted on *Aen.* x. 169 to mean "a quiver," though the more usual meaning of the Greek word is of course "bow-case" or sometimes "bow and arrow case." It is then in *Virgil* the same as "*pharetra*," and thus for "*ex humero*" with "*gorytus*" we may compare "*Gorytique leves humeris*," *Aen.* x, 169; "*illa pharetram Fert humero*," i. 500, 1; "*Pars leves*

humero pharetras," v. 558 ; and "*humero gessisse pharetras,*" xi. 844 : while for the epithet "*aureus*" we have "*pharetra ex auro,*" iv. 138, and "*aurata pharetra,*" xi. 858, 9.

Thus the conjecture "*gorytus*"—however improbable it may appear at first sight—would seem capable of support on grounds both of external and of internal probability. It would at the least afford an explanation of the readings of the MSS., and also of the cause of their corruption ; it would be consistent with the parallel passage in the *Thebaid* ; and it would harmonize well, not only with its epithet, but with the rest of the immediate context.



GUILLE-ALLÈS LIBRARY SERIES.

EDITED BY JOHN LINWOOD PITTS.

Membre de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

THE PATOIS POEMS OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS (First Series), the Norman-French Text, with Parallel English Translation, Historical Introduction and Notes. Demy 8vo. In paper covers, or cloth gilt.

THE PATOIS POEMS OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS (Second Series), the Norman-French Text, with Parallel English Translation, Philological Introduction and Historic Notes. Demy 8vo. In paper covers, or cloth gilt.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, AND THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER, translated into the Franco-Norman Dialect of Guernsey, from the French of LE MAISTRE DE SACY, by GEORGE MÉTIVIER; to which is added a Sark version of the Parable of the Sower; with Parallel French and English Versions. Demy 16mo. Cloth gilt.

WITCHCRAFT AND DEVIL LORE IN THE CHANNEL ISLANDS, Transcripts and Translations of the Depositions and Confessions made in the most celebrated of the local Trials for Witchcraft, as preserved in the Official Records of the Guernsey Royal Court, with Historical Introduction. Demy 8vo. In paper covers.

IN PREPARATION.

THE PRÉCEPTÉ D'ASSISE OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY: comprising the ancient Norman-French Text, edited with Parallel English Translation, Historical Introduction, Analysis, Glossary and Notes; engravings of Seals, Signatures, &c.

CHOICE EXCERPTS FROM THE ROMAN DE ROU, by ROBERT WACE, of Jersey, the famous Norman Trouvère and Chronicler, who flourished in the Twelfth Century; with Parallel English Translation and Historic Notes.

THE DESCENT OF THE SARAGOUSAIS.—A reprint of the old Norman Ballad—including the rare additional verses—with English Translation and Historic Notes.

GUERNSEY:

GUILLE-ALLÈS LIBRARY,

AND

THOMAS M. BICHARD, PRINTER TO THE STATES.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "CRUCES AND CRITICISMS."

Plutarch's Lives of the Gracchi, translated from the text of Sintenis, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, and Appendices. By WILLIAM W. MARSHALL, B.A., of the Inner Temple, late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., paper covers, 1s. 6d., or cloth, 2s. Oxford, JAMES THORNTON. 1881.

"Mr. MARSHALL has succeeded in cutting out of Plutarch a very neat piece of biography and presenting it in a pleasant English dress, with a careful introduction and a few useful Appendices. The English is the editor's, and is very agreeable reading. The Introduction is a clever account of Plutarch, with a critical notice of his work, his merits, and his inaccuracies, together with a summary sketch of the affairs of Rome when the Gracchi came into notice. The student of Roman history will be glad of this small, but carefully edited, account of the two brethren."—*School Guardian*.

The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II.; or, an Account of the "Liturgia" of Dean DUREL, together with a Reprint and Translation of the Catechism therein contained, with collations, Annotations, and Appendices, by the late Rev. CHARLES MARSHALL, M.A., Rector of Harpurhey; and WILLIAM W. MARSHALL, B.A. Demy 8vo. Cloth. 1882.

A few remaining copies may be obtained from THOMAS FARGIE, 21, St. Ann's Square, Manchester. Price, 7s. 6d.

The late Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester, writes (July 9, 1883):—

"I have much pleasure in stating that I regard the work of Mr. MARSHALL and his son upon the Latin Prayer Book of Charles II. as a publication of great importance. The volume has been of much use to me personally; and I believe its value will be felt by all who study it candidly and carefully."

Major-General G. HUTCHINSON, Lay Sec., Church Missionary Society, writes (December 11, 1882):—

"I am glad to be able to say that the Latin Prayer Book has been considered so valuable that we have ordered now twenty copies to send out to our libraries abroad."

FOR SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS SEE NEXT PAGE.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Many important points are elucidated."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"Such persons as are interested in the history of the Liturgy, and in the history of thought in the Church of England generally, will set much store by this book."—*Literary World*.

"A liturgical, historical, and theological work of great value, creditable alike to the care, industry, and scholarly attainments of the editors. No clergyman should engage in liturgical controversy without consulting its pages."—*Church Advocate*.

"The present volume has been published on account of the scarcity of the original Latin Prayer Book of 1670, and also to show what the revisers of that period meant to convey by their words which they 'retained' or 'inserted.'"—*Clergyman's Magazine*.

"This is a really interesting book."—*The Churchman*.

"Would it not be a substantial service to the theology of the Church if the work of the Messrs. MARSHALL were made a text book in theological halls and colleges, and at the examinations held by the bishops? It is a book for all libraries and for all schools of theology."—*Liverpool Daily Courier*.

"We have great pleasure in commending this work as a learned and valuable contribution to our liturgical literature."—*Record*.

"A most valuable and timely volume."—*Rock*.

"We may thank the editors for reprinting what is now a very rare, and always will be a very interesting book to liturgical scholars."—*Church Times*.

"Done with learning and candour."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"The work appears to have been well received in influential quarters, and we are glad to note that her Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept a copy. We also understand that two Archbishops, eleven Bishops, and eight Deans of the Church of England have spoken of it in terms of commendation. These facts show that the need for such a work existed, and that this need has been fully and adequately supplied. We have been ourselves much interested in the volume, and are deeply impressed with its importance. As a work of reference it will prove indispensable."—*Liverpool Albion*.

IN PREPARATION.

A Guide to the Law Examinations in the University of Oxford.

This book is intended especially for the use of candidates for the Examination in the Faculty of Law for the Degree of B.C.L. It will also contain chapters devoted to the legal subjects required for the Honour Schools of Jurisprudence and of Modern History, and to the branches of Law which may be offered in the Final Pass School.

A Primer of the English Law of Property.

This work will contain a brief sketch in popular language of those main principles which underlie the Law of Property, and which should be familiar to all who are concerned with either real or personal property within the jurisdiction of English Law.

University Of California Los Angeles



L 007 586 931 3

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 531 772 2

