13. I do not agree with Quinn 333 that 'crimine' in line 851 refers to Mezentius' cowardice in allowing Lausus to be killed by Aeneas. See also R.D. Williams, CR 11 (1961), 196; Sullivan (above, note 2) 223 and note 11.

14. Lines 855–56 read: 'nunc vivo, neque adhuc homines lucemque relinquo/sed linquam.' Note the finality of 'sed linquam'. Cf. also line 861: 'desine: nam venio moriturus'.

W.P. BASSON

University of the Western Cape

(a) 'TWO NOTES ON PETRONIUS'

(i)

104 [Lichas] 'videbatur mihi secundum quietem Priapus dicere: “Encolpion quod quaeris, scito a me in navem tuam esse perductum.”' exhorruit Tryphaena et 'pu­tes' inquit 'una nos dormiisse; nam et mihi simulacrum Neptuni, quod Bais (in) tetrastylo notaveram, videbatur dicere: ‘in nave Lichae Gitona invenies’. ‘hinc scies’ inquit Eumolpus ‘Epicurum hominem esse divinum, qui eiusmodi ludibria facetissima ratione condemnat’ . . .

The omission of Lichas' dream in 104.4 is perverse (note pari somniorum consensu 106.3) but easily curable by reading 'ceterum Lichas ut (suam et) Tryphaenae somnium expiavit', 'quis' inquit 'prohibet navigium scrutari, ne videamur divinae mentis opera damnare?' . . .
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by a temporal clause not to the speech it answers, but to the preceding one (for it is on hearing that preceding one that Lichas will have become afraid) is vague and clumsy.

The relationship between Lichas' fear and his desire to search the ship is logically a causal one. And this can be effected by giving full force to the adversative and reading *ceterum Lichas [ut] Tryphaenae somnium expravit (et)... inquit.* 'But Lichas (unlike Eumolpus) was terrified at Tryphaena's dream and said (in response to Eumolpus). . . .' 

This gives a clear chronology, a good disposition of motivation, making proper sense of Lichas' speech, and improves Delz's parallel with *exhorruit Tryphaena et . . . inquit.*

110.4 Ego etiam si repositum in pristinum decorem puerum gaudebam, abscondebam tamen frequentius vulnum intellegebamque me non tralaticia deformitate esse insignitum, quem alloquio dignum ne Lichas quidem crederet.

At 109.8 Lichas begins to be friendly with Encolpius again. At 110.4 he will not talk to him. Since the friendship is merely recuperating we cannot explain the emphasis in *ne Lichas quidem* by reference to particularly strong feelings on Lichas' part ('not even Lichas (who liked me a great deal)'). We need therefore to ask two questions: what produces the change in Lichas' behaviour, and why is Lichas emphasised?

The only intervening event which could explain Lichas' change of behaviour is the beautification of Giton (110.1–2). Presumably he now becomes interested in Giton and no longer wishes to bother himself with Encolpius. This provides us with a sufficient reason for the emphasis: no-one is talking to Encolpius (Lichas alone could not provide proof of his *deformitas* if, say, Giton or Tryphaena were still speaking to him), but it is no surprise that neither Tryphaena nor Giton nor Eumolpus speaks to Encolpius. Tryphaena and Giton have returned to an old understanding (note 109.2), and Eumolpus has already shown interest in Giton (note 100.1–2) and has just made remarks about baldness and hair which offended Encolpius (109.8) and which no longer apply to Giton. Giton is now the centre of attraction and only in Lichas' case is this attraction entirely new, so that we might expand the sense here as follows:- 'no-one else was talking to me, and even Lichas (who had not been interested in Giton before) did not believe me worth talking to (as soon as he saw him *repositum in pristinum decorem*).'

It seems to me that to deduce both these expansions (which must give the correct sense) from the text as it stands is not as easy as it should be: essentially there is a contrast between before and after and at least one of the contrasted elements ought to be verbalised. The neatest solution is to read :-

*quem alloquio dignum (iam) ne Lichas quidem crederet.*

This makes it perfectly clear that Lichas' attitude changes, makes it easy to see why, works better as the basis for the deduction Encolpius expresses in the first part of the sentence, and clarifies the stress in *ne . . . quidem.*
NOTES


2. Interpolation is not plausible: while *expiaret* might have come from 105.4, *expiavit* is unlikely to have done so, nor is it apposite. And if (as is quite possible) there was no lacuna between 104.3 and 104.4, there would have been little need for an interpolation.

3. If fr. 30 were to be inserted here this would still hold. But it is not needed: *facetissima ratione* does not entail an example and nothing else requires the supposition of a lacuna.

4. For the anticipation of a word followed by its correction cf. 44.13 where for *sed quare habemus aedilem non trium cauniarum*, H gave *'sed quare non habemus aedilem trium cauniarum'* and Mentel corrected to *'sed quare nos habemus...'*

(b) A NOTE ON THE *ALCESTIS* OF BARCELONA¹

109 *plangere saepe iubet sese natosque virumque*.

Ordering one’s husband and children¹ to lament for one’s death is conceivable (cf. Solon 21 W, Cicero, *FPL* p.77 (Morel)), but *lacrmasque viri peritura videbat* in the previous line makes half of the injunction superfluous. It is made quite inappropriate by *Alcestis*’ attempt to console Admetus in her final speech (esp. 98ff). *Saepe*, too, is awkward, as if husband and children needed continual reminding, or *Alcestis* were in need of continual reassurance (but she is happy and assured: 80ff, 93ff, 111, and in the funeral arrangements following this line: 110ff)³. Altogether more likely (and more suitable for *Alcestis*’ bravery; see 75ff) is:-

\[ \text{lacrmasque viri peritura videbat.} \]
\[ \text{plangere saepe vetat sese natosque virumque.} \]

NOTES


The *Alcestis* of Barcelona is a poem of some 120 hexameters on Alcestis and Admetus. The manuscript is apparently of the second half of the fourth century, the poem probably not much earlier. The ed.pr. is Roca-Puig, *Alcestis. Hexaméres Llains* (Barcelona, 1982). For text & further details see *ZPE* 52 (1983) 31f; for some other tentative textual proposals see F.R.D. Goodyear, *LCM* 9.2 (1984) 28.

2. Sense and the double -que make it clear that *sese* is not object to *iubet* (or *vetat*).
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(c) A NOTE ON MANILIUS 5.604

efflat et in caelum pelagus mergitque volantem
sanguineis undis pontumque extillat in astra.

(Manilius 5.603–604)

'It [the Cetos] spouts forth sea towards heaven, drenches its winged opponent with a blood-stained deluge, and sends in spray the ocean to the stars.'

(G.P. Goold’s 1977 Loeb, whence also the text.)

Exstillo, except for this passage is always used for liquids moving downwards by force of gravity in drips (e.g. tears) and is always intransitive. Given Housman’s note one might pass over the transitive use here, especially as exstillo is not a common word, but the resemblance it bears to its usual sense is so slight, apart from this, that doubts obtrude. Housman cites Vergil Aeneid 3.567 (spumam elisam et rorantia vidimus astra). But the passage is quite different: Vergil’s is a vivid evocation of what is seen in a storm; rorantia astra is not the same as rorat in astra and vidimus makes a large difference. Manilius describes something his sea monster does, and I would compare the simile in the comparable episode in Valerius Flaccus’ epic (2.451 et seqq.) where the monster causes bigger waves than Orion (cum) bipedum flatu (cf. Manilius’ efflat) mare tollit equorum (2.508). For the compound cf. Ennius, Ann. 430–432 W: (venti) fluctus extollere certant.

Exstillat is the reading of M, extollit that of G and L: this is far from giving certainty to the former. On the grounds already indicated I suggest extollit should be accepted. A transposition of the o and i (extillot) could very easily have given rise to exstillat: such phenomena are exemplified in Housman’s preface to Book I (p.Iviii).

NOTE

1. Stillo and extillesco do not help in this.

(d) A NOTE ON TACITUS ANNALS 14.11.3

... namque et naufragium narrabat: quod fortuitum fuisse quis adeo hebes inveniretur ut crederet? aut a muliere naufraga missum cum telo unum qui cohortis et classis imperatoris perfringeret? ergo non iam Nero, cuius immmanitas omnium questus antibat, sed Seneca adverso rumore erat quod oratione tali confessionem scripsisset.

The Loeb translator gives: ‘The object of popular censure was no longer Nero ... but Seneca ...’, which is what I believe the Latin means. But Tacitus
cannot be suggesting that Nero was not criticised any more after the speech just mentioned here. A reasonable suggestion would be that just at this time Seneca and not Nero was criticised (so Grant’s Penguin translation, 1956), but for this one might prefer tum non . . . (vel tale quid): the required sense of iam is not common with past tenses, and non iam regularly means ‘not yet’ (inapplicable here) or (more frequently) ‘no longer’. Alternatively it would be reasonable for Tacitus to indicate that Nero ceased being the sole object of criticism and was joined by Seneca (Horneffer’s 1957 translation), but while it is true that non iam . . . sed can have the force of non solum iam . . . sed (iam s.v. ThLL. 94.51ff) this is only possible where the second element is a recognisably rhetorical heightening over the first. 2 Nor does the separation of the two elements help. Accordingly I suggest reading tam. This would have been a very easy error’ and would give a fine and logically desiderable balance to the distribution of criticism. Certainly Tacitus elsewhere follows non tam with quam, but non tam . . . sed is acceptable Latin 4 and avoidance of syntactic balance is such a feature of Tacitus’ style that its appearance here should occasion no surprise.

NOTES

1. I am grateful to Prof. R. H. Martin for his comments in this matter.
2. Tac. Agr. 44.5; Ann. 4.41.1 non iam de matrimonio sed altius metuens; 13.37.1 are typical examples. Even here non iam generally indicates the replacement of the first element rather than its supplementation.
3. The converse error occurs at Ann. 14.59.4 where Agricola’s iam seems a certain emendation of the MS reading tam (cf. also Val. Flacc. 1.649; 2.485).
4. See Cic. Fin. 1.1.1 (cf. Brut. 15.58); at Livy 38.21.10 non tam is followed by adversative asyndeton (see Hofmann-Szantyr p.591). (sed tu iam . . . non quidem pulsus es sed aberrasti . . . is a likely reading at Booth. Cons. Ph. 1 pr. 5.3; see Bieler’s apparatus criticus.)

F. JONES
University of Cape Town.
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