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THE NATURE OF OCEAN IN THE EARLY EPIC

§ 1 It is never very easy to discard accepted ideas and statements to which we have been long accustomed. One newfound truth however often leads to another. In such cases one must go back to the beginning and follow the trail afresh. It is not claimed that everything in this paper is original: but the argument and the approach to its subject-matter do happen to be original inasmuch as they stem from the topographical study of the Odyssey, to which Trapani and its neighbourhood proved itself to be the key. There are, I am informed, two works in German the findings of which it might be interesting to compare with mine, though I much regret that I have not read them - J. V. Kopp, *Das physikalische Weltbild in der frühen griechischen Dichtung* (1939); and R. Güngericht, *Die Küstenbeschreiben in der griechischen Literatur* (1950).

Until recently I would have said that in Homer, Hesiod, and the Odyssey, two different conceptions of Ocean are to be recognized, of which the earlier, and in some ways by far the more important, has remained not wholly unacknowledged, but, in its implications, almost entirely neglected, from antiquity to the present day. I still think that that is right so far as it goes. But as the result of working at the relationship of Hesiod and the Odyssey(1) on the basis of my topographical findings about the latter, I would now modify what I had already said, in *Hermes* of July 1960,(2) about Hesiod on the one hand, and circumambient Ocean on the other. I would now go a step further and say that in Hesiod, the Iliad, and the Odyssey, the River of Ocean did not run around the inhabited earth. His waters did, but his River did not. There is a distinction and a difference - the neglect of which, though trivial at first sight, has led to a fundamental misunderstanding of the topography of the Odyssey in particular, and the geographical realism of the early epic in general.

‘Homer’s Oceanus’, says Liddell and Scott, s.v. *'κεανός*, ‘is a great river which compasses the earth’s disc, returning into itself, ἀφρόγοος, Iliad 18,399, Od. 20.65; hence represented as encircling the shield of Achilles, II.18,607.’ I have italicized the words I take to be wrong in this definition. The gist of it, supported as it is by the words of Herodotus in ii,21,23 and iv,36, has been accepted axiomatically ever since his day, and repeated in more modern times in practically every dictionary and almost every book ever written on the origins of European history, geography and exploration — very often with the inclusion of that word ‘disc’ or ‘disk’,(3) for which there is no authority in the ancient epic(4) whatsoever.

It was argued in my article in *Hermes* that ἀφρόγοος as an epithet of Ocean in Iliad xviii,309, Od. xx,65, and Hesiod, Theog. 776, does not bear the meaning of ‘flowing back into itself’ traditionally ascribed to it; but that it means ‘flowing backwards’ and refers to the reverse tidal currents flowing out westwards from the Straits of Gibraltar. J. Oli-

---

(1) A paper on that subject (cited H & the O) written nine months previously, was read at the Conference of the Australasian Universities’ Language and Literature Association, Jan. 1961 and published in its Journal AUMLA of May 1961.

(2) In a *Note on ἀφορόγοος Κεανός* (cited *Αφ. Κα.)*.

(3) e.g. Browne, *Homeric Study* 1905 p. 171; Concise Oxford Dictionary, 1929 s.v. Ocean; Evelyn-White, Loeb ed. of Hesiod and the Homerica Hymns, 1920, pp. 87, 135, 137, at foot, etc., etc.

(4) Defined for the purposes of this article as the Iliad, the Odyssey, and Hesiod, W. & D., Theogony, Catalogues.
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ver Thomson in his History of Ancient Geography, C.U.P., 1949, 27, writes: ‘An oceanographer(5) fails to understand how mythical the stream (of Ocean) was... while Hennig (Geographie des homerischen Epos)(6) wrongly refers “back-flowing” to the contrary currents at Gibraltar; and Charybdis also to the tides there, as exaggerated by “Phoenician lies”.

I disagree with Hennig about Charybdis. Otherwise, with a different approach to the problem, I feel sure that Hennig was right and that Thomson was wrong, Odyssean geography, and that used by Hesiod also, was infinitely more accurate and less mythical than has been realised. The tales were mythical, the geography was real.

I have tried to show elsewhere(7) that to the author of the Odyssey, at any rate, the one real River of Ocean was the great east-going Atlantic current, which, running at an average rate of two knots from the Straits of Gibraltar, flows steadily past Bizerta and Cap Bon, then sets south-eastward toward the northern coast of Cyrenaica, then east-southeast, and eastward again, to follow the Egyptian coast, and finally northwards past the coast of Palestine,(8) supplying the Mediterranean Sea with nearly two thirds of the water it loses by evaporation, and forming “the most constant part of all its circulation.”(9)

This Gibraltar current, I shall argue, in Hesiod and Homer as well (though they do not state it so clearly as the poet of the Odyssey),(10) must be the River of Ocean. This was his own eponymous ‘swiftly flowing’ river in his own right as god and father of all rivers.(11) His abode and his fountain-head are in the swirling currents of the Straits,(12) and thence his various waters flow (according to the Iliad he is father of all waters fresh and salt),(13) eastward through the Mediterranean, ‘far beneath the wide-wayed earth’ to supply its many rivers;(14) and westward, with the refluent tides and undercurrents,(15) out into the Atlantic.

The evidence for this is positive and strong. But if it is so, it may well be asked, why has it remained unnoticed for so long?

§ 2. In the first place it was natural, inasmuch as Ocean was father of many waters, that those of them that lay westwards of the Straits, and north and south and east of Europe, Africa, and Asia,(16) should be called the streams of Ocean; and that having no other name, the name of Ocean itself should in the end be extended to them. We can see this trend (which resulted finally in Ocean being pushed outside the Straits altogether) already in existence in Hesiod, the Iliad and the Odyssey. It was perfectly natural to speak of the sun and constellations as

(5) Poor ignoramus.
(6) I was not aware of this when I wrote 'Avt. 'Ωι.ι.
(7) In The Sicilian Origin of the Odyssey, N.Z.U.P. Wellington, New Zealand, 1957 (=SOO); Reality and Allegory in the Odyssey, Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, 1959 (=RAO); H & the O, 1961; The Landfalls of Odyssey, 1955 (published as Ch. III in SOO); 'Avt. 'Ωι.ι., 1960 (8) And the site of ancient Sidon, be it noted.
(10) According to my hypothesis a seaman poet of the Elymi, subject allies of the Phoenicians, and familiar with the sea-lanes which they used.
(11) Cf. Theog. 397 f.; 367 f. and below.
(13) Ili. xxii, 195 f.; according to Hesiod of all flowing waters (see below and in the Appendices).
(14) Theog. 790-1.
(15) Whether or not the ancients are likely to have known about the outgoing saline undercurrent is problematical. See Appendix A.
(16) It would be a bold man who claimed to define the limits of men’s knowledge concerning them in remote antiquity. Pre-historic man appears to have travelled far and wide.
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rising from or setting in the waters of Ocean — a phrase and figure of speech which is still in use with us. Out of the sixteen mentions of Ocean listed in Dunbar’s Concordance to the Odyssey they are so spoken of five times; from ‘the baths of Ocean’ in v, 275 (as in II. xviii, 489); from the ‘gently-flowing depths of Ocean’ in xix, 434; ‘the streams of Ocean’ in xxii, 197 (as in W & D. 566); and simply ‘Ocean’ in the two related passages in xxiii, 244 and 347. In iv, 568 Ocean is said to send the west wind to blow upon the Elysian plain and the νελγαρα γαλης; whilst in Hesiod W. & D. 170 f. the heroes or demigods are said to live in the Ιςλες of the Blest beside deep-eddying Ocean. In no case however either in Hesiod or the Odyssey does the title of the River of Ocean occur in such contexts.

It does occur in II. xviii, 606 f., where the artist Hephaestus draws ‘the great might of the River Ocean’ around the activities of men depicted on Achilles’ Shield. This is an artistic conception in which the ‘great might’ of the Father of Waters is inherent in the streams he has engendered. It is this one graphic touch which, together with the passages mentioned above, constitutes the only evidence for the erroneous definition of Ocean as the ‘great river’ that flows round and round a flat and disc-like world and ever back upon himself, like a whiting swallowing its tail. As handed down to posterity, this concept of a purely external circumambient river was not only naive and primitive in itself, as Herodotus felt: but it did much to lead the 5th century Greeks into a grave misunderstanding of the geographical realities of their own pre-historic literature. They just did not bother their heads about the real River of Ocean through which Odysseus once sailed westwards (in actual fact no doubt) to come to the Straits of Gibraltar and the realms of Tartaro-Tartessus.

In the second place it is at once very easy for such mistakes to be made and very difficult to get rid of them, once they have taken root. History is full of parallels. Homo sapiens, who is also homo credulus, is not much good (historically speaking) at thinking things out for himself. It is much easier for him (cf. Thuc. i, 20 ad fin.) to accept what others tell him, however wrong or ridiculous it may often be. And as a social animal, timid by himself, he is a devil for orthodoxy. Once he has accepted such ideas he will repeat and believe them quite unthinkingly for centuries or millennia, and, especially in his corporate capacity, egoistically condemn and detest any new-found truth that may impugn them.

The question of ‘propaganda,’ to use our modern term, is similarly to be borne in mind. We are all aware of the fact, if we think about it, that homo sapiens is not only homo credulus as well, but homo mendax also. There is evidence, I think, to show that in the earlier days some of the Greeks of Hellas were not altogether unaware that the Odyssey was a Sicilian poem, but more or less deliberately ignored the fact. Such things happen even today amongst those whom Lessing rather innocently described as ‘we, the more refined Europeans of a wiser posterity.’ However this may be, it has in fact come to pass that, the 5th century Greeks having for one reason or another completely misunderstood the topographical method of the Odyssey and, in consequence, the nature of

(17) So also in the Homeric Hymns Dawn ‘rises from deep-flowing Ocean’ (Herm. 185). Selene washes herself ‘in Ocean’ (xxxii, 7).

Ocean in their own epic, they have been followed in their errors so religiously by posterity that, in nearly two and a half thousand years, no one has ever examined the matter realistically, or tried to think it out ab initio, until the energy of Samuel Butler set the process in motion some seventy years ago.

§ 3. It has been argued in detail in my previous publications that Scheria of the Odyssey is ancient Trapani, and that its neighbourhood is at once the land of the Phaeacians and the land of their neighbours and kinsmen, the Cyclopes: that Stromboli is the isle of Aeolus: Castellammare del Golfo and neighbourhood the land of the Laestrygonians: Circe's isle in the Odyssey the low-lying solitary isle of Ustica: the city of the Cimmerians the site of ancient Ceuta: the island of the 'Sirens twain' the twin island of Salina-Didyme: the Planctae, Scylla and Charybdis were drawn, in equally exact detail, from features in the Bocche di Vulcano, it became clear likewise that the Gateway of the Sun in xxiv, 12 could be nothing but the Pillars of Hercules in the Straits of Gibraltar; and the 'streams of Ocean' in the previous line the currents flowing in and from them. I challenge even the most self-satisfield of Fairylanders to refute that statement. It became clear also from Pliny's foreword to H.N. iii that the Αἰγαλέων of xxiv, 11 was Pliny's Album Promonturium on the African coast across the Straits from Tarifa. This passage from Pliny is important enough to be quoted here at some length: 'terrarum orbis universus in tres dividitur partes, Europam Asiam Africam. Origo ab occasu solis et Gaditano freto (i) qua inrumpens Oceanus Atlanticus in maria interiora diffunditur... Quindecim millia passuum in longitudinem quas diximus fauces Oceani patent, quinque milia in latitudinem a vico Mellaria Hispaniae ad promonturium Africae Album (ii), auctore Turranio Gracile iuxta genito. T. Livius ac Nepos Cornelius latitudinis tradiderunt ubi minimum vii M. pass. ubi vero plurimum x. M., tam modico ore tam immensa aquarum vastitas panditur. Nec profunda altitudo miraculum minuit. Frequentes quippe taeniae candidantis vadi carinas territant (iii). Qua de causa limen interni maris multi eum locum appellavere. Proxima autem faucibus utrimque impositi montes coercent claustra, Abila Africae, Europae Calpe, laborum Herculis metae; quam ob causam indigenae columnas eius dei vocant...' (iv).

Please note that of the passages italicised the first and fourth will agree with the Odys-
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sey in placing the 'beginnings and the ends of earth and sea' (πελώτα Ὀκεανίο, xi, 13, πελώτα γαλής, iv, 563) in the narrows of the Straits, hard by the Pillars of Hercules. There also they will be found in Hesiod and the Iliad. We find πελώτα γαλής καὶ ποντόιο in II. viii, 479; πελώτα γαλής Ὀκεανόν τε (ib. xiv, 200, 301); πελώτα γαλής in Hesiod W. & D. 169, Theog. 518 (cf. also 736 f., 807 f. — 'the beginnings and the ends of earth and sea and heaven and Tartarus'). The album promontorium in (ii) proves to be identical with the Αεβαρ; μετροθ in (ii) proves to be identical with the the promontory of Epirus' in the older Liddell and Scott). The 'foaming bands of water' in (iii) are the currents and tidal races (marked on the Admiralty Chart off several of the points, including Pta. Blanca) which have suggested (to the poet) the Rivers of Hades in Od. x, 518 f. and the δευά δεβόα of xi, 157. The fourth passage will agree with Hesiod in placing the scenes of the last three labours of Hercules — the Cattle of Geryon, that is to say (Theog. 289 f.), the Apples of the Hesperides (ib. 215, 274) and the fetching up of Cerberus from the House of Hades (ib. 767 f., cf. II. viii, 366 f.) — not very far (see below) from his Pillars at the entrance to the Straits.

§ 4. (1) It is from Circe's isle of Ustica(22) that Odysseus in Od. x, 487 f. receives instructions from her to sail westward to the House of Hades. If any one should object that the identification of Ustica is not yet 'accepted', I would ask him please to study the arguments and to regard it as an hypothesis to be put to the test. It is certainly westward that Odysseus sails; for when in x, 501 he says 'But who will show us the way, O Circe? For no man ever yet went to the House of Hades in a black ship', she replies (in effect) 'You can't go wrong, my dear Sir! Step your mast, set your sails, sit tight, and the breath of Boreas (El Greco, the N.E. Wind) is bound to bring you there in the end.'

(2) 'When you have passed though Ocean,' she says (x, 508), 'you will come to a low shore(23) and the Groves of Persephone, where are tall poplars and willows that shed their fruit' (as willows do, earlier than other trees). 'There beach your ship by deep-eddying Ocean and go on yourself to the gloomy House of Hades' (512). The Groves of Persephone will have been on the steep slopes of the Mont des Singes on Almina Peninsula, described by Strabo (xvii, 3.6) as πολύθηρον(24) καὶ μεγαλοδάνθρων, and the ἀντι λάξεια (or ἔλάξαξα) the low isthmus that joins the Peninsula to the old site of Ceuta on the mainland. For in xi, 13 f. we are told that he beaches his ship at the πελώτα Ὀκεανίο (i.e. by the southern of the two Pillars of Hercules, formed by the Rock of Gibraltar to the north and the heights at Ceuta to the south — see RAO 75), where was 'the community and city of the Cimmerians' (i.e. at the site of ancient Ceuta in its deeply-eddying bay, the only site for a city in the narrows of the Straits, by which a ship could be beached).(25)

(3) 'Ocean', through which it is said they will have passed in x, 508, will mean the main

(21) The proofs being provided by the contexts, the Admiralty Chart, and the West Coasts of Spain and Portugal Pilot (RAO, Ch. VI).
(22) RAO Ch. III.
(23) RAO pp. 78, 95. See also Van der Valk, Textual Criticism of the Odyssey, p. 98, on the meaning of λάξεια.
(24) It will have been from there very likely that the Barbary apes were taken over to Gibraltar in the first place.
(25) See RAO Ch. VI and illustrations on pp. 48, 76, 79.
eastward-flowing Atlantic current. In 'deep-eddying Ocean' of x, 511, the reference will be to the eddying waters of his supposed sources (Theog. 807 f.). At that point their ship will have made its passage 'through Ocean,' but Odysseus and his men will not in fact have passed completely through his 'streams,' for in xi, 21 (cf. x, 511) they walk on παρὰ δὴν Ὀκεανῶτα for some three miles more before they come 'to the place of which Circe had told them' (xi, 22) i.e. to the foot of Pta. Blanca, the λευκὰς πέτης of xxiv, 11, where was (and still perhaps may be) the mead of asphoded (xi, 539; xxiv, 13), the alleged entrance to the House of Hades, and other more necessary features.

(4) At that point, says Circe (x, 513), Pyrophlegethon and Co cytus flow into Acheron; and, off-shore, 'There is a rock' where 'the two roaring rivers' meet. These rivers of Hades, afterwards famous, here mentioned for the first time in extant literature, are suggested by the 'violent tidal races' spoken of in the Admiralty handbooks, and marked on the Admiralty chart, off the coast in this vicinity. The off-shore rock is very clearly marked, as may be seen in Fig. 7 of R A O. The presumption is strong that the poet of the Odyssey was himself familiar with the detail of these scenes, and used it, as he had used that of others also, with an accuracy of which no one had ever imagined a poet could be guilty. It is in my opinion an extremely refreshing change.

(5) At the end of Bk. xi, 636 f. they walk back to the ship, beached at the isthmus of Ceuta; and the east-going current carries her 'down the River of Ocean,' first with the aid of oars and then with a favouring breeze. In xii, 1 f. they 'leave the stream of the River Ocean' — roughly off the vicinity of Bizerta — and strike out north-eastwards across the open sea back to the isle of Ustica.

(6) Just as Odysseus has been told in x, 508 that his ship will 'pass through Ocean' to bring him to the land of the dead, so in xi.155-9 his mother says to him '<My son how came you here? > ... hard it is for the living to see these things. For betwixt us are great rivers and dread streams' (those referred to in x, 513 f.) 'Ocean first of all' (as in x, 508) 'through which you cannot pass ... unless you have a well-built ship.' Some twenty-two centuries ago, the Alexandrine scholars, thinking that Ocean meant the circumambient 'river' of 5th century tradition, obelized lines 157-9, rejecting them as spurious and 'ridiculous' (see Dindorf p. 488) inasmuch as there could be no other rivers beyond Ocean. Why they were able to regard the rivers of x, 513 f. and the City of the Cimmerians of xi, 13 f. which also lay 'beyond Ocean' (x, 508 f.) as non-obelizable I fail to see. Their opinion has generally been treated with almost religious respect by the English editors and others ever since, but it is in fact plain nonsense. As soon as one starts to think things out and to read the Odyssey and Hesiod with an open mind, it is perfectly clear and obvious that Ocean in the passages under discussion was not the circumambient river, as was afterwards believed; and that the Straits of Gibraltar were in fact all-important in these western tales.

§ 5. (1) It is a little curious that, whereas in the established order of scholarship it is still not quite the thing to mention the Straits of Gibraltar in connexion with the Odyssey, there is no such unwritten law with regard to Hesiod, though even there the subject is treated with a certain wariness. Thus in the Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.v. Oceanus, we
read: 'Ocean begins at the columns of Heracles;' (my italics) 'borders on the Elysian fields and Hades, and has its sources in the west where the sun sets' — i.e. in the Straits of Gibraltar surely, at the Pillars of Hercules, as already stated.

(2) In Hesiod and the Odyssey it has been shown that whereas Hesiod has no knowledge of our version of the Odyssey, our poet has followed Hesiod (up to a point very closely) especially in matters connected with the Straits of Gibraltar. There in both poets is the place of sunset, death, and darkness, the beginning and the ends of earth and sea, the abode of deep-eddying Ocean. There in consequence is the 'navel of the sea' (Od.i, 50) and there in both poets is the isle of Ogygia, now called Perejil Island or the Isle of Parsley, at the foot of Gibel Musa, the mountain of Atlas.

Just as Odysseus in the Odyssey has to pass through Ocean to come to the Pillars of Hercules and the House of Hades, so we read in Theogony 289 f. that Heracles 'slew Geryones on the same day that he crossed the Straits of Ocean (πόρον 'Ὠκεανότης) and killed Orthus and Eurytion in the darksome stalls beyond glorious Ocean' — i.e. not far from the laborum Herculis metae, as Pliny describes the Pillars. So too in 215, 275 we are told of the Hesperides, daughters of Night, guarding their golden fruits beyond glorious Ocean. In 518 we find that they are not very far beyond the πελάται 'Ὠκεανότης. For Atlas stands on his mountain of Gibel Musa, πελάται ἐν γαλής, with the Isle of Ogygia at its foot, just inside the narrows of the Straits(20) πόροι 'Ἠσπερι­δῶν ἀπουράνων, facing the Hesperides, that is to say, somewhere no doubt in the vicinity of Tarifa. In 274 the Gorgons also, we are told, dwell beyond glorious Ocean, not far from the 'Cimmerians' in the Odyssey at the Limits of Ocean (x, 508 f.; xi, 13 f.).

(3) 'Those regions of Ocean' says the above-mentioned article in the O.C.D. with reference to the foregoing tales in Hesiod, 'are the land where reality ends and everything is fabulous.' The tales are fabulous, but, once again, the topography on which they are based is real — as real as it is throughout the Odyssey. Of the last three labours of Hercules, the sites of Geryon's stables and the Garden of the Hesperides lie 'beyond Ocean' just outside the threshold of the Straits. The House of Hades, with the House of Styx above it, and the imagined abyss of Tartarus down below, are inside it, actually in the bowels of the Rock of Gibraltar — not in the Odyssey, curiously enough, but as Hesiod tells the tale (see H. & the O. §§ 6-11).

There is good internal evidence in the Odyssey that its author was a seaman of western Sicily who knew personally the places he describes. I think it may be regarded as certain that he knew Perejil Island and the Straits. We have Hesiod's word for it that his own longest sea-voyage was from Aulis to Euboea (W. & D. 651; cf. H. & the O., n. 29). The knowledge therefore that Hesiod shows of the Straits in general and the interior of the Rock of Gibraltar in particular was certainly not first-hand. Of the very existence of the great caves he was probably quite unaware. So, it seems, was the poet of the Odyssey, who, though he followed Hesiod so closely in other respects (see H. & the O.), sets his House of Hades on the African side of the Straits, wrongly (though in Hesiod's own words) describing the neighbourhood of Ceuta (xi, 15-19) as being as dark and sunless as Hesiod had rightly described the Caves of St. Michael in the interior of the Rock (Theog. 759 f.).

(20) See H & the O §§ 10, 11 and Cat. 48 (in Evelyn-White) ἐντὸς ... πόρος ἑσπεριδῶν. See also Appendix B.
This seems to be good evidence that the tales which Hesiod has bequeathed to us concerning the sources of Ocean in the Straits, the last three labours of Hercules, and the abodes of Styx and Hades, must have come down to him from very ancient sources. For if our Greek-speaking poets or their successors had had any real knowledge of the Gibraltar caves we should surely have had word of anything so dramatic, in one way or another. No further mention of them occurs in European literature before Pomponius Mela (c. A.D. 40). A religious taboo may have been set upon them in remote antiquity though mysterious tales about them lingered on.

§ 6. The poet of the Iliad was not so specially interested in Ocean and the Straits of Gibraltar as was Hesiod, nor had he occasion to speak of ‘passing through Ocean’ or going ‘beyond Ocean’. But like Hesiod he certainly had access to earlier tales and observations concerning them.

(1) When we read at the beginning of Iliad iii of the cranes flying south to avoid the winter cold, and coming to the streams of Ocean, on their way to do battle with the Pygmies, reality will now underlie the tale for us. The real references will be to migrating birds, the Straits of Gibraltar (not that wretched disc-encircling ‘river’), and the Pygmies of west-central Africa and the Niger, not the upper waters of the Nile.

(2) In Iliad viii, 13 f. Zeus threatens to hurl any disobedient god or goddess into misty Tartarus, ‘the deepest gulf beneath the earth,’ ‘with gates of iron and threshold of bronze,’ ‘as far beneath Hades as heaven is high above the earth’. In these lines exactly the same sources — and expressions — are being used as in Theogony 719 f. and 736 f. The references are to that imagined abyss lying far beneath the abodes of Styx, and Hades, Guardian of the Gates, and the subterranean source of Ocean (Theog. 787 f.), all in descending order — all of them in or below the Rock of Gibraltar, as we may now know from the light that Hesiod and the Odyssey shed upon one another.

(3) So too in Iliad viii, 366 f., when Athena says that had she known how shabbily Zeus was going to treat her, his son Heracles, when sent to fetch Cerberus up from Erebus, would never have escaped, so far as she was concerned, from the House of Hades and up the high waterfall of Styx, the references without any doubt whatever (though Homer himself pretty certainly did not know it) are to the Gibraltar caves; and here again Homer’s sources will be the same, or much the same, as Hesiod’s. So too of course will be those of Iliad xv, 36-38 concerning the dread oath of the gods which they swore by the down-falling water of Styx (cf. Theogony 775-806). (We can now see why such dread and sanctity attached to the water of Styx.)

(4) As Styx is called the ‘daughter of backward-flowing Ocean’ in Theogony 776, Eurynome is called the ‘daughter of backward-flowing Ocean’ in Iliad xviii, 399, where in l. 402 Eurynome and Thetis are said to have dwelt in a cave round which the unquenchable stream of Ocean ever foamed.

(5) In Iliad xiv, 200 f. Hera says to Aphrodite that she is going to the πτελώκα πατης (where Odysseus in the Odyssey, let us remem-

(27) In all matters that concern the Straits the impression given, I think, is strong that Hesiod and Homer were just about contemporary — as tradition held.
ber, beached his ship — *Od. xi, 13 f.* — to visit Oceanus, the father of the gods (θεὸς γένεας) and mother Tethys, his wife, who had taken her in, and reared her in their halls, when Zeus imprisoned Cronos 'beneath the earth and the unharvested sea' — i.e. in the imagined abyss of Tartarus, the μύα Χάσμα of *Theogony* 739, far below the region of the Straits (cf. *Theog.* 720 f.).

(6) In *Iliad* xiv, 233 f. Hera asks Sleep to exercise his power upon her husband Zeus. Sleep in 243 f. says he dare not. Any other of the gods he might lull to sleep, even 'the streams of River Ocean,' who, he says, is 'sire of them all' — δὲ περ γένεας πάντες τέκνα. Hera promises however to give him one of the Graces as his bride — and bribe. In 271 f. he makes her swear to fulfil her promise by Earth and Sea (which begin and end at the Straits, *Theog.* 736 f.) and by the inviolable Water of Styx who also dwells there.

(7) To Zeus in 301 f. Hera says once more that she is going to the *νερόναν* τοῦ *Οκεανοῦ*, father of the gods, and mother Tethys. This is a very fine myth (28) and surely a very ancient one — in which Ocean, son of Heaven and Earth and father of all waters, is father also of all gods and goddesses and (possibly) all living things. For such a cult, if so it may be termed, no more appropriate or more dramatic shrine could well be imagined than the Gibraltar Straits.

§ 7. The evidence in Homer, Hesiod, and the *Odyssey* for placing the abode of Ocean

(28) Very much finer than some of the over-praised myths of the classical period. (Note however that Virgil may have been wrong in *Georg.* iv, 382: πάντες τοί might easily refer to θεὸς in *Il.* xiv, 244.) Note also that Hesiod has preferred a somewhat different view (Appendix B).
great river (ποταμός in 12,1) encircling the round flat earth.' (The city of the Cimmerians, I suppose, will have been in 'Fairyland,' like Scheria?) (g) On 157-9, taking up some strange words of Merry's on that passage, he says that '157 certainly looks like a misunderstanding of 10, 513 ff. (O. never reaches the inner rivers of Hades, but stays on the shore of Oceanos).' (But Odysseus does reach the place where these rivers meet (xi, 22; x, 512 f.). And what is meant by 'the inner rivers of Hades? They certainly are not said to be inside Hades — or round it; and are mentioned nowhere else in the ancient epic.)

Enough perhaps has been said, though much more might be. Since Merry's day and since 1947 — and 1949 when the Oxford Classical Dictionary appeared — the Odyssey has been one of the happiest of hunting grounds for classical scholarship, largely no doubt because of its seemingly safe and unrealistic nature. But no intrinsic advance in its study has been made, or could be made, so long as it was based on the assumption that the Odyssey was a poem of beautiful nonsense and the poet a delirious geographical nincompoop. Good scholarship, like good poetry, can never be the result of running away from reality and truth. In this case scholarship simply did not know these qualities were there, residing deep in the poet's very nature. It is sad to think however of the nonsense about the best of poems that is going to be inflicted on the minds of schoolboys and girls and undergraduates (not to mention the 'many' of Thucydides i. 20) no doubt for some time yet to come.

§ 8. Samuel Butler's discovery, so obvious in retrospect, that 'Drepane, sacred home of the Phaeacians' was Drepane or Trapani in N.W. Sicily (29) has led to the discovery, step by step, of other obvious facts; which consign a number of fashionable doctrines about the Odyssey (30) to the waste-paper basket, along with the doctrines that the world began in 4004 B.C. and that flint handaxes fell from heaven. The defences of faith in long-accepted error are always stubborn. But Scheria-Trapani can hardly fail, after a decent interval of time, to be recognized as the pons asinorum to the proper study of the Odyssey. Any one crossing it will at once find himself in fresh woods and pastures new, the quality of which will be proved in the first few nibbles. Mistakes no doubt there may be in the argument, but there is much about which no mistake is possible.

A new light now falls upon the importance of the Straits of Gibraltar in the early epic. We can now see that it was from a real knowledge of those regions that much, if not most, of the substance in the Theogony was ultimately derived (31); and that the poet of the Iliad had access to the same or similar sources, though only a secondary interest in them. The precise nature of those sources we shall never know. But there are certain points of interest about them which invite consideration.

In the first place we can say definitely that it was from men who had first-hand knowledge of those regions that they originated, men whose eyes had seen the 'glorious house of Styx' and peered into the caverns down below, and whose ears had heard the tales of myth and mystery connected with them.
These tales, before they assumed the Greek dress and nature in which they reached our authors, may have been of immemorial antiquity. They may indeed have started with Gibraltar Man thousands and thousands of years ago. The Greek-speaking folk, however, who brought them first to Hellas were in all probability men of the Mycenaean age. To seafaring men who had made their way from the Aegean world to Sicily in prehistoric times (as it is now proved by archeology that they did) the extra thousand miles or so to the Limits of Land and Ocean would have been no great distance, and a very obvious challenge. When Strabo in iii, 2. 13, agreeing with Hesiod and the *Odyssey*, says that Odysseus' expedition to those parts had actually been made, he may have been guessing—in fact he was—but there is no reason whatever to think that he was guessing wrong.

That these sources were essentially Greek long before Hesiod and Homer came to know them seems certain. It is suggested not only by the similarities of substance and expression preserved in the two poets (cf. § 6 above) but by the long lists of more or less fictitious Grecian names such as we find in *Theogony* 233 f., 346 f. and elsewhere. These names we may compare with those in the Nekyia of *Od. xi*, in the Argonautic tales and indeed with the real names in the *Catalogue of Ships*. These surely were characteristic of Grecian poets or 'singers of tales,' who, we may guess, lived many generations earlier than Hesiod and Homer—one of them, I would guess, a poet of fine vigour and imagination, judging by what Hesiod has preserved of him, e.g. in *Theogony*, 674-885.

In the matter of tales, however, that so definitely concern the western limits of the Mediterranean, we must also consider what part may have been played by the Phoenicians of the west—who are affirmed so positively by tradition to have founded Utica and Gades before the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. and yet have failed to leave any satisfactory evidence for archeologists so far to find. In later days they certainly controlled the Straits and their environs; and shared their myths and deities, though not their outer trade-routes, with the western Greeks. Baal Melkart, with his sacred Pillars at Sidon, was identified with Heracles, whose last three labours, like his Pillars in the west, will have been Phoenician quite as much as Greek. Astarte was identified with Aphrodite, as in the high places of Mt. Eryx, and altars were erected to Poseidon at its foot. There was a Hill of Hermes on the flank of Eryx; a promontory of Hermes at Cap Bon. Hermes in the *Odyssey* visits Calypso in the Straits and conducts the spirits of the dead to the House of Hades—a function which is not his in Hesiod or the *Iliad*. There was a White Promontory at Sidon, another at Cap Blanc, and a third— the Leucas Petre, *Pliny's Album Promonturium*, which no one ever mentions but myself—to the west of Ceuta.

For the earlier period in the west, however, it seems best to agree with Mr. B. H. Warmington's conclusions in his book *Carthage* (32), that Phoenicians probably were settled there at Utica and Gades, as tradition says, but in trading-posts only or small mercantile communities, without manufactured wares of their own so far as we can tell, or much interest in the arts of poetry.

§ 9. We come back, then, to the strong probability that it was Mycenaean men, or their descendants in Sicily perhaps, who brought these tales of the Gibraltar Straits to Hellas, either by way of the west coast and the

gulf of Corinth or round Malea. But the possibility still remains that they were also taken in very early days by Phoenician mariners along the coasts of Africa to those of Palestine and Asia Minor, and so back in some measure to the Aegean Greeks. It must not be forgotten that Solomon in the 10th century had his ‘ships of Tarshish’ (suitable at least for the Tartessus trade, wherever else they also may have voyaged): (38) and that the Carthaginians from the 9th or 8th century onwards thought nothing of the voyage of 1500 miles to their Phoenician fatherland. In those eastern regions epic poetry, we are told, was already at least a thousand years old when in the 13th century the Greeks sacked Troy. In the remarks that follow I am indebted to The Epic of Gilgamesh, English version by N. K. Sandars (The Penguin Classics) and I speak with due deference and diffidence. With the caverns of Gibraltar, however, identified as the abodes of Styx and Hades I think a quite plausible probability presents itself that Gilgamesh, like some pre-historic Kilroy, may have been there too.

In the Theogony the Straits of Gibraltar are described as the place of sunset and darkness, sleep and death (759 f.), the Limits of Earth and Ocean (736 f.), the dread House of Hades and the abode of night (744 f.). Here—on Gibel Musa, across the water from the Rock—stands the son of Iapetus, holding up heaven on his hands and head (746-7). Here—at the entrance to the caverns of the Underworld—Night and Day coming close to one another (748 f.) greet one another as they pass, the one going down into the House of Hades, over the brazen threshold, the other coming out (84) Nowhere else, I think, in Greek literature is this conception to be found—a local conception, it would seem, of the setting sun going down into a hollow mountain (35) and the morning sun issuing forth from it.

It will be found—or something very like it—in the Gilgamesh epic. On p. 95 of Mr. Sandars’ version Gilgamesh is said to come to the great mountain named Mashu, that guards the rising and the setting sun, whose twin peaks are high as the wall of heaven and its roots reach down into the Underworld. (This reminds us, at any rate, of Theogony 720 and 728—ἀντάρ ὑπερθεν γῆς δίλαι πέραναι—and of the high peak of Gibel Musa, on which Atlas stood with heaven upon his hands and head—ib. 744 f.) At the entrance to the mountain two Scorpions stand guard, male and female, half man half dragon (cf. Hades πυλάγης and Cerberus); ‘their glory is terrifying, their stare strikes death into men’ (cf. the Gorgons and Medusa’s head). The Man-Scorpion asks Gilgamesh why he has come so far ‘crossing the dangerous waters’ (cf. Od. xi, 157 f.) and tells him no mortal man has ever gone down into the mountain (cf. Heracles). ‘The length of it’ he says, p. 96, ‘is twelve leagues of darkness; in it there is no light, but the heart is oppressed with darkness.’ He opens the gates, however, and Gilgamesh makes his way (pp. 96-7) through ten leagues of pitchy darkness (this reminds us of the dark interior of the Rock and, perhaps, of the distance between Gibraltar and its opposite peak of Gibel Musa) (88) until at last he sights the


(35) cf. Pomponius Mela ii.95 ‘mons Calpe’ mirum in modum concavus; also Theogony 301 f.

(38) Also of the legend that the Gibraltar apes have a secret underground passage by which they disappear to the African coast in cold weather.
THE NATURE OF OCEAN IN THE EARLY EPIC

dawn and at the end of the twelfth league the sun streams forth. From there he comes to the Garden of the Gods, by the edge of the sea, where the trees bore gems and precious stones of all descriptions, analogous clearly in idea to the Garden of the Hesperides, also by the sea, not far from Gibel Musa (Th. 517 f.).

In his interesting discussion of these and similar matters (pp. 44-7) Mr. Sandars refers to the ‘chase of those beguiling will-o’-the wisps of criticism’ — which, however, neither he nor I can wholly forbear to mention. I would certainly agree that such suggestive tales might travel on the lips of men this way and that, from end to end of the Mediterranean (see his p. 45). But I think that the topographical realities traceable in the Odyssey, and through the Odyssey in Hesiod, make their consideration a little more than merely beguiling, now that there is some firm ground beneath our feet.

One other point of interest is that the epic of Gilgamesh (or part of it) was committed to writing (which may still be read), we are told in the third millennium B.C. — as other poems were at Ras Shamra also, in very ancient times. This I think should be pondered carefully by those who make such a cult of the work of Milman Parry that they regard it almost as an accepted law of scholarship that the Odyssey, for example, could not possibly have been written down by the poet who composed it for his serial recitations in the 7th century B.C. One would certainly not deny that the conventions of orally transmitted and largely improvised recitation were maintained in the epic art; and we can add that the mere convention might account for much. But it stands to reason that in an age when writing was well-known, writing and reading might also have been used for composition, and transmission. There would surely be nothing to prevent the best of poets from composing or preparing their recitations in advance and writing them down beforehand, or afterwards, for future reference. The Phoenician script from which the Greek alphabet was derived must have been current in the Aegean, we are told, ‘certainly by the 8th century B.C. and probably much earlier.’

The possibility then cannot be denied that some of these Gibraltar tales may have also reached the Aegean Greeks, by word of mouth or otherwise, from Semitic poetry written down and recorded many hundreds of years before.

APPENDIX A.

Theogony 786-792

This is a passage of much interest as regards Styx and the nature of Ocean, but it has its difficulties. Myths in themselves need not make sense: in fact they are hardly myths if they do. But the words in which they are told must make sense. That is the law of any literature worthy of the name. In Theogony, 784-7, we have been told that Styx’s stream of cold fresh water ‘falls from a high precipitous rock,’ a statement repeated in 792 below. The words that follow in 787-9 are thus rendered by Evelyn-White in his Loeb translation:— ‘Far under the wide-pathed earth a branch of Oceanus flows through the dark night out of the holy stream and a tenth part of his water is allotted to her.’ What exactly he had in mind is to me obscure. Ocean surely in this passage cannot be said or thought to flow at a higher level than Styx and so to ‘allot’ a tenth of his waters to her. The only way to make sense out of 787-

(37) O.C.D. s.v. Alphabet.
92 as they stand, so far as I can see, is to take ἵεροῖς ποταμοῖοι as referring to Styx (as Evelyn-White appears to do) but to read 'is hers' (for his 'is allotted to her') — i.e. is contributed by her (in effect).

To take it thus, however, seems to me very difficult indeed. Nowhere in Greek or Latin literature is Styx ever called a river. She is feminine. Rivers are always masculine — in Hesiod (cf. Theog. 337 ff.; 367 f. ὑδαίνει Ὠξεανῷ) and elsewhere. Our dictionaries, learned and profane, are all wrong in suggesting or saying (as they nearly always do) that Styx was 'the name of a river.' The word Στύξ is never found in the masculine; and the evidence that the 'glorious abode' of Styx in Hesiod and Homer was the Hall of St. Michael in the Rock of Gibraltar, and her water a stream falling or trickling from a high rocky point within it, is conclusive. This water was hers in a local or possessive sense only — cf. Horace's Fons Bandusiae. It is true that she might similarly possess a ποταμὸς but the phrase Στυγάς θᾶνω occurs constantly elsewhere, and Στυγάς ποταμὸς never. It seems to me most improbable that this vertically descending water should be referred to as a 'holy river' in any case: and in the passage under discussion the words ἵεροῖς ποταμοῖοι, in such close proximity to Ὠξεανῷ as they are, should surely be taken as referring to Ocean, the 'perfect river.' If it is so taken the text as it stands does not make sense.

I would suggest therefore that εἰς should be read instead of ἐξ in 788. Lines 784-792 will then mean:— ‘... Zeus sends Iris to bring from that far place the great oath of the gods in a golden jug, the famed cold water (of Styx) which falls from a high precipitous rock. And far beneath the wide-wayed earth it flows' (i.e. her water flows) 'through the black night' (i.e. through the pitch-dark descending caverns down below) 'into a horn of the holy river of Ocean; and a tenth of his waters are her waters. In nine silvery-swirling streams he winds around the lands' (i.e. as father of all fresh-water rivers, Theog., 337) 'and over the sea's wide back' (as father of other streams and currents), 'and then falls into the salty deep, but a tenth of his water falls from that high rock, a great bane to the gods.'

This seems to me a great improvement at very little cost. But in whichever way lines 788-9 are taken the general idea must remain the same, namely that one tenth of the sources of Ocean, far beneath the earth (ἐς Ὠξεανῷ θέμεθαῖς, 816), consists of fresh water furnished by Styx to supply, by some mysterious process, the land rivers of which Ocean is the parent. ἐδάσσεσα in 790 must refer to the Mediterranean only (the Theogony is consistent in this respect — see note 42 below), as it certainly does nine lines before in 181. The words εἰς ἥλιον πέφετε in 791 remain somewhat problematical. At first sight it is the fresh water of Styx which, it seems, would be expected to 'fall into the salt.' But as the tale has come down to us, that is quite out of the question; and ἥλιος is best taken as referring to the Atlantic, into which 'backward-flowing Ocean' (776) falls by way of the reverse tidal currents running westward from the Straits.

That this local Gibraltar myth of Styx as a source of river-waters and goddess of 'the oath' was an ancient pre-Hesiodic and pre-Homeric one, is borne out by the fact that it
crops up in the much earlier Catalogue of Ships — *Iliad* ii. 751-5. There Titaresios in northern Thessaly is said to flow into Peneios, but not mingling with his waters to flow on top of him like oil. ‘For he is an off-shoot of Styx, the dread water of the oath.’ This in its turn raises, or rather suggests, the question whether the ancients may have been aware of the saline undercurrent, flowing out westwards from the Straits, as well as the tidal currents on the surface. It seems not impossible, as fishing boats, in modern times, going into the Black Sea through the Dar-danelles are said to use the inflowing undercurrent by putting down their nets and being towed thereby against the surface outflow. There are however no means of making certain; and mariners of antiquity would in any case be aware that fresh water, such as that of Styx, is lighter than salt, so that, if river-waters differed in their nature, those with the lighter specific gravity would be considered the more Stygian in that respect.

Once the abode of Styx is identified, it needs little imagination to see why her water came to be ‘the great oath of the Gods,’ who in the ancient myth, as recorded in the *Iliad*, were all the sons of Ocean. A number of passages in the *Theogony* acquire a new and exciting quality, when the dramatic reality of their geographical origins is understood. Olympus loses much in the imagination in comparison with the Twin Pillars and the swirling currents of the Western Limits, where was the Gateway of the Sun, the abode of Ocean, the birthplace of the Gods, the beginnings and the ends of Earth, and Sea, and Heaven and Hell with the water of Styx falling through the dark caverns of the Rock into the House of Hades, aptly named, and so to the foundations of Ocean ad the realms of Tartarus below.

**APPENDIX B.**

**Points of Difference in Hesiod and the *Iliad***

As is to be expected in such matters, there is some confusion of detail in these myths concerning Ocean. In the *Iliad* as noted above, Ocean is called ‘the source of all rivers and every sea, all fountains and deep wells’ (xxi, 195). He is also twice called the ‘genesis’ or father of the gods (xiv, 200 f.; 301 f.) and possibly of all living things. No attempt is made to explain these statements or to define the relationship of Ocean, in this concept, with Zeus and the Olympic gods.

Hesiod is either using different sources, or in composing a formal theogony, is being more cautious, for that reason. In the *Theogony* Ocean is no more than father of all rivers (337 f.) and of the salt streams or currents that ‘run over the sea’s wide back’ (790). He himself is the ‘perfect River’ (242,959), whose mansion, as in the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, is at the *πειγαρά Οξεανοῖο*, within the threshold of the Straits.

First there was Chaos, according to Hesiod’s account; then came ‘broad-bosomed Earth, the sure foundation of all things’ (114 f.). Earth first bore starry Heaven to cover her;

---

(29) Cf. *Iliad* ii, 486; Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, p. 120 f. and elsewhere.
(40) With thanks to Mr. Tom Gaskell (*Under the Deep Oceans*) and the Institute of Oceanography to whom my letter of inquiry was referred.

(30) Cf. *Iliad* ii, 486; Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, p. 120 f. and elsewhere.
(41) See n. 28 above.
(42) Nowhere in the *Theogony* are the heavenly bodies spoken of as rising from or setting in the Waters of Ocean. In the *Works and Days* however (as in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*) Arcturus is said to do so.
and thereafter the ‘unharvested sea,’ Πόντος, with his angry waves — to surround her, I would say (131-2). Ocean came later. So also in 808 the sources of the unharvested sea begin at the Straits, at the πελάτα τ’ Ὀκεανοῦ outside them, as Ocean lives within; and in 840-841 we read that ‘Earth and Heaven above, and the sea, and the Streams of Ocean, and Tartarus beneath the Earth resounded terribly at Zeus’s thunderings’ — Πόντος τ’ Ὀκεανῷ τε ὁδοὶ καὶ τάφαρα γαῖς. Πόντος is what we should call the ocean. Oceanus is the τελεωτής ποταμός, himself the perfect river, father and prototype of all other rivers, god of all flowing waters, fresh and salt.

Though not the sire of all the gods, as in the Iliad, Ocean in the Theogony begot, or was grandsire to, a number of minor deities, and monsters, with a very strong local interest for the present discussion of the Straits.

(1) Styx was his eldest daughter, and we know where she lived. (2) Styx’s water was ‘Ogygian’ (806) and her sister Calypso (359) lived on her islet of ‘Ogygia’ across the water at the foot of Gibel Musa (H & the O, §§ 10,11). (3) The Gorgons, as mentioned above, lived hard by the Hesperides (Theog. 274 f.) only just outside the narrows of the Straits. For when Medusa’s head was smitten off by Perseus, Pegasus was born of her blood hard by the springs, or sources (the πηγαῖ) of Ocean, which were inside the narrows of the Straits beneath the Rock of Gibraltar (738 f., 807 f.). (4) Chrysaor, Pegasus’s twin blood-brother, in wedlock with Callirrhoe, daughter of Ocean, begot three-headed Geryones, whom Heracles also slew not far outside the Straits (291.; 979 f.). (5) Chrysaor begot likewise the goddess Echidna, half nymph, half snake, who (like Cerberus, her off-spring, the hound of Hades) was a terrible eater of raw flesh, and like him lived beneath the depths of the earth: ‘There is her cave (301 f.) far down beneath the hollow Rock, far from the immortal gods and mortal men.’ That of course means down beneath the hollow Rock that housed Styx and Hades, with Erebus and Tartarus down below, described by Pomponius Mela some 700 years afterwards as mirum in modum concavus, the hollow cup of Calpe. There far beneath the earth Echidna had her ‘glorious abode’ — her κλητὴ δώματα, as Styx had hers, several stories above her (777). (6) Echidna, in her turn, by Typhaon bore first Orthus, the monstrous hound of Geryones (309); then the hound Cerberus, who lived above her guarding the gates of Hades, a formidable creature (810 f.; 769 f.); and finally Hydra who left her home in the Straits but was also slain by Heracles, in Argos (318 f.). (7) Briareus, Cottus and Gyges (147 f.; 617 f.; 807 f.) together with the other Titan gods (813 f.) were imprisoned in the realms of Tartarus below the Straits, as was Cronos also (851). Typhoeus, leader of the Titans, was the youngest son of Earth and Tartarus (820 f.).

Nor does this entirely exhaust the list. In a word Hesiod’s Theogony is concerned almost entirely with the πελάτα γαῖς and the Straits of Gibraltar, the abode of Ocean.

**

So much in the argument of this paper has been concerned with the tidal races and
THE APPOINTMENT OF QUAESTORS EXTRA SORTEM

In a recent article,(1) E. Badian wondered how far appointments of provincial quaestors in the republican period depended, or could depend, on the choice of their commanders. The available evidence shows that quaestors were generally allocated to their provinciae by lot;(2) and, according to Cicero, in spite of the fortuitous circumstances of these appointments, the association of quaestor and commander (provinciae societas) founded, more maiorum, a particularly sacred kind of clientela: 'praetor quaestori suo parentis loco esse oportet.'(3) However, from his study of the connexion between M. Antonius (procas. 102) and his quaestor C. Norbanus, Badian was able to point out that there is more to this friendship than nos maiorum and the accident of the lot. He suspected, not unjustifiably, that Norbanus may have been appointed extra sortem. Ancestral custom alone cannot explain the relationship between Sulla and

(1) Historia vi (1957), 318-346.
(2) Cic. Verr. ii, 1.34, 37; ad Q.F. i, 1.3; Fam. ii, 19.1; Mur. 18. These include quaestors attached to consuls, praetors, promagistrates, civil as well as military provinces.
(3) Cf. Div. in Caec. 61.
his quaestor L. Lucullus, or Pompeius Magnus and his quaestor C. Memmius, any more than it explains that between Scipio Africanus and C. Laelius (q. 202), or Caesar and M. Antonius (q. 52); and we know that the last two were appointed to these commanders' staffs sine sorte.(4)

Investigation into this matter of quaestorian appointments is inevitably hampered by the paucity of the evidence; but, apart from the case of Norbanus, several other appointments, between 200 and 50 B.C., invite suspicion. That quaestors were, in general, allocated by lot is beyond question; but it may be worth while to consider under what circumstances they were, or could be, appointed without the lot; or whether exemption was allowed on request in some cases and disallowed in others.

A. H. J. Greenidge observed that the quaestorian provinciae were determined, before these magistrates entered on their office, by a decree of the Senate, and the individuals were then assigned to their several departments by lot; although, probably always by a special grace of the Senate, there are instances of commanders selecting their own assistants.(5) Similarly P. Willems, who noted that the senate enjoyed the right to grant a quaestorian provincia extra sortem at the request of the commander, and added his belief that quaestors, and particularly consuls' quaestors, were appointed extra sortem rather more frequently than is expressly mentioned in our sources.(6) G. H. Stevenson noted that 'a general might have some say in the choice of his quaestor.'(7) V. Ehrenberg(8) restates the general 'rule' of sortitio, and adds: 'Nur ausnahmsweise griff auch hier in älterer Zeit der Senat, später die Willkür der Machthaber'—wrongly, I think, interpreting Cicero Att.vi, 6.4, on which this is based, and where Pompeius and Caesar are spoken of as having chosen their quaestors sine sorte. But this later.

To turn to the evidence relating to the extra sortem (=extra ordinem) appointment of quaestors, first, a perplexing passage from Ulpian: 'Ex quaestoribus quidam solebant provincias sortiri ex senatus consulto, quod factum est Decimo Druso et Porcina consulibus. Sane non omnes quaestores provincias sortiebantur, verum excepti erant candidati principis.'(9) — Some quaestors, but not all, used to be appointed by lot. Mommsen interpreted the consular date here referred to as 138/7 B.C., and held that this senatus consultum laid down, in that year, general regulations for the appointment of quaestors.(10) Willems, more convincingly, attributed the S.C. to the first century A.D.(11) In any case, though this passage follows immediately on a discussion of the origins of the quaestorship, the last sentence shows that Ulpian was thinking of the situation which obtained under the Principate. No regular annual exemptions from sortitio occurred under the Republic; not even in the case of the republican antecedents of the quaestores principis — the quaestores consulum. However, the outright nomination by the Emperor of his quaestors (including exemption from the lot) was a direct development from republican practice rather than an innovation: traditionally, prominent figures 'by personally

---

(4) Liv. xxx, 33.2; Cic. Att. vi, 6.4; Fam. ii, 15.4; Phil. ii, 50.
(5) Roman Public Life, 213.
(6) Le Sénat de la Rép. rom., ii, 599 ff.
(7) Oxford Classical Dictionary, s.v. 'quaestors'.
(8) R.E. xiii, 2, s.v. 'Losung', col. 1504.
(9) Dig. i, 13.1.2.
(10) St R. ii, 520.
(11) Loc. cit.
supporting a candidate, materially enhanced his chances of election.\(^{(12)}\) Scipio Aemilianus, for example, 'commended' to the electorate his nephew Q. Fabius, a candidate for the quaestorship in 134. Fabius, duly elected, served under Aemilianus in Spain.\(^{(18)}\) No ancient source states that Fabius was appointed \textit{extra sortem}, but it is difficult to believe that he owed his appointment to the accident of the lot. Similarly, Caesar in 53 supported the candidature of M. Antonius through his agents at Rome; Antonius was then appointed \textit{sine sorte} to Caesar's staff.\(^{(14)}\) In these examples we may see the republican embryo of imperial \textit{commendatio}: the only essential difference being that, under the Republic, \textit{commendatio} need not invariably lead to election, whereas the \textit{quaestores candidati principis} were automatically elected — 'sine repulsae et ambitu designandos' (Tac. \textit{Ann. i.15}) — as well as exempted from the lot.\(^{(15)}\)

The first attested case of a quaestor's appointment \textit{sine sorte} is that of C. Laelius in 202 B.C. — though there is no good reason to believe that this was unprecedented.\(^{(16)}\) For Laelius' appointment, Livy is our only source: 'Laelium, cuius ante legati, eo anno quaestorius extra sortem ex senatus consulto opera utebatur, cum Italico equitatu ab sinistro cornu opposuit (sc. Scipio).\(^{(17)}\) Laelius had served under Scipio Africanus in various capacities, in Spain, Sicily, and Africa from 209 to 203. In 203 he left Africa for Rome where he stood for the quaestorship.\(^{(17)}\) Elected with the support of the Scipionic \textit{factio}, he rejoined Scipio's staff in 202 as quaestor — appointed \textit{extra sortem ex senatus consulto}. Obviously the initiative will have come from Scipio, not from the senate. We may note the casual way in which Livy refers, retrospectively, to this event — which is nowhere else mentioned. There is, on the other hand, ample evidence for hostile political intrigues against Scipio's position around the time of Laelius' appointment;\(^{(18)}\) but no indication that the proposal for Laelius' \textit{extra sortem} appointment would have met, or was likely to have met with any opposition.

The cases of Q. Cassius Longinus (q. 54 or 52) and M. Antonius (q. 52) are well known.\(^{(19)}\) Our source is Cicero: 'Pompeius, eo roborre vir, iis radicibus, Q. Cassium sine sorte delegit, Caesar Antonium' (\textit{Att. vi, 6.4}); and, in an attack on Antonius: 'Quaestor es factus. Deinde continuo sine senatus consulto, sine sorte, sine lege, ad Caesarem cucurristi' (\textit{Phil. ii, 50}). The absence of 'ex senatus consulto' in the first passage, and the presence of 'sine senatus consulto' in the second have suitable quaestor being allocated to this \textit{provincia}. If he had been merely interested in campaigning, he might easily have done so without being elected quaestor. Among the friendly consuls of these years are Q. Fulvius Flaccus (cos. 237) and C. Licinius Varus (cos. 236).\(^{(17)}\) For the career, see \textit{M.R.R. ii}, 578 (Laelius No. 2).\(^{(18)}\) Cf. Scullard, \textit{Roman Politics}, 78-81, and refs.\(^{(19)}\) See above, note 4. For the dates, \textit{M.R.R. ii}, 236; \textit{R.E. iii}, 2, s.v. Cassius, col. 1740.

\(^{(15)}\) The republican practice seems, otherwise, to have continued into the Principate. Governors of the senatorial provinces still selected their own legates (\textit{R.E. xii}, i, sv. 'Legati', cols. 1141 ff.); and though as a general rule quaestors were still allocated by lot (Vell. ii, 111.4; Tac. \textit{Agric. 6}), some appointments were made \textit{sine sorte} (Pliny \textit{Ep. iv. 15}).
\(^{(16)}\) Liv. xxx, 33.2. Fabius Cunctator held two quaestorships (Dessau, \textit{I.L.S. 56}) probably in the early 230s (\textit{M.R.R. i}, 222). One probability is that Fabius sought his (rare) second quaestorship with a view to service with a 'Fabian' consul — by an appointment \textit{sine sorte} — and by so doing, to prevent the possibility of a less
led to the belief that these appointments were carried through by the high-handed, irregular action of dynasts, without the senate's sanction. Thus, Ehrenberg: 'die Willkür der Machthaber.' But Willems, rightly rejecting Phil. ii, 50, pointed out that these appointments must have been made ex senatus consulto — as in the case of Laelius. Willems noted the difference in tone between the two passages, and suggested that Cicero's 'sine senatus consulto' may have been due to lapsus memoriae, or he would not have spoken of the same event, six years previously as though it were the most legal thing in the world. It is more probably an illustration of Syme's famous dictum: 'The Philippics are an eternal monument of eloquence, of rancour, of misrepresentation.'

Close examination of the relevant passages in the Letters will show that Cicero's point in Att. vi, 6.4 has nothing to do with the strong-arm methods of dynasts but with the question of clientela. For whatever reason, Cicero finds it necessary to be apologetic to Atticus and to Caelius Rufus about his delegation of imperium to his quaestor C. Coelius Caldus. In both cases, he uses the same arguments, and almost identical expressions to justify his choice of Caldus as his deputy: there was no one in the province at the time whom he could have preferred to the quaestor 'sine contumelia quaestori.' In spite of his shortcomings, Caldus is after all a 'nobilis adulescens' (Att. vi, 6.3; Fam. ii, 15.4). What follows is clearer in meaning in one letter than in the other, but identical all the same: 'Adde illud. Pompeius, eo robore vir, ii radicibus, Q. Cassium sine sorte delegit, Caesar Antonium; ego sorte datum offende­rem? (Att. vi, 6.4). Postremo non tam mea

sponte quam potentissimorum duorum exemplo, qui omnes Cassios Antoniosque complexi sunt, hominem adulescentem non tam allicere volui quam alienare nolui (Fam. ii, 15.4). The meaning must be: For all their great power and influence, Pompeius and Caesar never miss an opportunity for forming new clientelae. They brought all the Cassii and Antonii into their political fold by specially (sine sorte) appointing a young Cassius and a young Antonius as their respective quaestors. In my case, I did not even have to create my opportunity; it was offered to me by a happy stroke of fortune (sorte datum; cf. Fam. ii, 19.1, 'sors iucunda,' with reference to the same event). Was I to miss such a lucky chance of placing this young noble under obligation to myself by conferring a beneficium on him (cf. Fam. ii, 19.2)? In doing so, I was only following the example of Pompeius and Caesar. Besides, had I not preferred him, he would have been deeply offended; I should have made an enemy of him. To avoid this was in fact my primary aim (Fam. ii, 15.4; Att. vi, 6.4).

There is nothing here to suggest that the appointments of Cassius and Antonius were made against the principles of the boni. They were made sine sorte, to be sure (and sine lege — if there had been a lex, it would certainly have been mentioned by Cicero or someone else), but not sine senatus consulto. It is impossible to believe that Cicero would have omitted from his contemporary correspondence such a popularis measure. As it is, in his first reference to these appointments, two years (at least) after the events, far from any remark of condemnation, he speaks of potentissimorum duorum exemplo. In regard to Phil. ii, 50, this is really a conventional attack on Antonius 'rapacity'. One would have expected Cicero to dwell with gusto on the breach of mos maiorum that is implicit in his 'sine senatus consulto'; as he does, for example, in

(21) The Roman Revolution, 104.
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his similar attack on Vatinius. (22) Instead, after this overbrief, perverted(23) statement, a tirade about rapinae and largitiones.

Cicero himself was, in fact, one of the men who, at Caesar's request, and on Caesar's behalf, supported Antonius' candidature for the quaestorship in 53 (Phil. ii, 49). Antonius (and Cassius) must have been appointed sine sorte with the formal sanction of the senate. A request to this end would have been brought before the senate, and duly granted, it would appear, without any question of opposition.

Such appointments did not depend on demagogic pressure. It would be equally wrong to infer a necessity for demagogic pressure from the provisions of the lex Gabinia of 67 (which empowered Pompeius to appoint two quaestors suo iudicio) as it would be to suppose that only by such pressure could commanders appoint legates of their own choice (Pompeius was also empowered to appoint 15 legates). On the contrary, this law must reflect current practice in regard to the choice of legates and of quaestors sine sorte. The right to appoint two quaestors and fifteen legates with imperium pro praetore, no doubt, required a special enactment; but we know that commanders de facto appointed their normal complement of legates (with the sanction of the senate — a mere formality). (24) We have also noted examples of commanders appointing their own quaestors (one quaestor in each case)(25) by a similar procedure. In any case, Pompeius' appointment of quaestors and legates on this occasion received the formal sanction of the senate (Cic. Vat. 35-36; Dio Cass. xxxvi, 37.1); and Velleius explains (ii, 31.3-4) that it was not the novelty of the provisions of this lex, but the fact that the command was given to Pompeius which aroused the opposition of the conservatives. That the choice of quaestors by commanders ex senatus consulto was not unusual is indicated by Cicero (ad Q. F. i, 1. 3): 'legatos habes eos qui ipsi per se habituris sint rationem dignitatis tuae; ... quaestorem habes non tuo iudicio electum, sed eum quem sors dedit.' This, and its immediate context, would also suggest that such special appointments were seen as being conducive to the important ends of concordia and efficient administration.

The only other direct reference to the appointment of quaestors extra sortem appears in a fragment of Cicero's in Clodium et Curionem: 'Syriam sibi nos extra ordinem polliceri'; on which the Scholiast: Diximus in argumento per illud tempus Clodium fuisse quaestorem. Opimas igitur provincias cupiditati suae blandientem dicit in anime habuisse, quasi hoc ab senatu consequi posset quod ipse rapinarum meditatione gestiret. (28) We cannot be certain whether Clodius was actually promised such an appointment by

(22) Vat. 35: volo audire de te, quo tandem senatus consulto legatus sis. ... tua lege, dicis. Esse igitur patriae certissimam parvacida? ... ne hoc quidem senatui volinquebas, quod nemo umquam ademit, ut legati ex eius ordinis auctoritate legarentur?

(23) Cicero's emphasis here seems, in fact, to be on 'continuo' — as my colleague A. R. Hands points out — implying that Antonius rushed off to join Caesar and to begin his rapinae with indecorous haste, and suggesting that A. rushed off either before receiving the senate's formal sanction for his appointment, or before his colleagues had drawn their lots. While this would in turn indicate that the senate's sanction was a mere formality, it would nevertheless be a lie on Cicero's part: Antonius did not leave for Gaul until April 52 (Ascon, in Milon. 36).

(24) R.E. xii, 1. s.v. 'Legati', cols. 1141 ff.
(25) With the sole exception of governors of Sicily, who were allotted two quaestors (cf. Cic. Verr. ii, 2.11). It was not until 38 B.C., when the number of quaestors had been raised to 40, that consuls were given two quaestors each (Dio Cass. xlviii, 43).
the senate, but the above suggests that he
had hopes of joining the staff of the governor
of Syria extra sortem. We know, however, that
he actually served in Sicily under C. Vergilius
Balbus, to whose staff he seems to have been
appointed by lot.\(^{(27)}\) Did the senate, then,
insist on sortitio?

M. Pupius Piso, one of the consuls of this
year, and a friend of Clodius (cf. Cic. Att. i,
13.3) had been promised Syria as his province
by the senate: 'desponsam homini iam Syriam' (ibid. i, 16.8). No doubt, the idea
was that Clodius would accompany Piso to
Syria as his quaestor — extra sortem ex S.C.
However, this province was not eventually
assigned to Piso: the senate later changed its
mind (ibid. — explained as a rebuff to Piso
engineered by Cicero himself). Syria was
then, apparently, listed by the regular S.C. 
de provincis praetorum among the provinces
to be allotted to the ex-praetors, and drawn
by the ex-praetor L. Marcius Philippus
(App. Syr. 51). This S.C., which was not
passed until late February or early March 61,
would have been followed by the S.C. de prov.
quaestorum and the drawing of lots by the
quaestors.\(^{(28)}\) Thus the sortitio by which
Clodius was allotted to Vergilius' staff would
have taken place after the senate's decision
on Syria (cf. Ascon. in Mil. 46). It may be
that, after this decision, Clodius no longer
wished to share Piso's sors — whatever this
may have been\(^{(29)}\) preferring to draw lots
instead; and that the request for his appoint-
ment as Piso's quaestor extra sortem was then
withdrawn: a fortunate accident of the lot
might still send Clodius to Syria. According
to Cicero and the Scholiast, his motive for
wishing this special appointment would have
been his need of plunder with which to pay
his insistent creditors (Stangl, loc. cit.). This
is, however, stylized invectio (compare, e.g.
against Antonius in Phil. ii, 50). The fact
that Clodius had previously seen service in
the Cilicia-Syria area should be enough of an
explanation — added to his friendship with
Piso (M.R.R. ii, 148,146). On his return
from Sicily, he talked of his Sicilian clientelae
(Cic. Att. ii, 1.5); he may well have hoped as
quaestor, to renew his Syrian contacts.

An alternative interpretation of Cicero's
'desponsam iam Syriam' might be that Piso
was meant to succeed Philippus in 60. The
question of a successor to Philippus would
have been settled early in 60 — when, in
fact, his term was extended (M.R.R. ii, 185).
Cicero's 'Syrian ademi' would then imply,
not the Senate's decree depriving Piso of
Syria, but its intention to do so in the allocations
for 60.\(^{(30)}\) However the case may be,
it seems unlikely that the request for Clodius'
appointment as Piso's quaestor extra sortem
was rejected by the senate: Cicero would
hardly have omitted to mention such a rebuff
to his bitter enemy. The important fact is
that Piso did not go to Syria without Clodius
— i.e. while Clodius went to Sicily sorte
datus.

The indications are, firstly, that all
appointments of quaestors extra sortem, in the
period under consideration, were made ex
senatus consulto; secondly, that the senate's
sanction for such appointments was as much
mere formality as in the case of the appoint-
ment of legati: in the sense that this formal
sanction would have been no less readily
granted (at the request of the commander,
without any question of opposition or any

\(^{(28)}\) Cic. Att. i, 14.5. The only known exception to this
regular order of events occurred in 50 — no doubt under
the stress of impending civil war (cf. Cic. Fam. ii, 17.1).
\(^{(29)}\) It is not known whether Piso actually went to a
province. See Balson, J.R.S. 1989, 68, note 47.
\(^{(30)}\) Assuming that Piso was meant to succeed Philippus,
Clodius' appointment extra ordinem as quaestor consulis in
61 would have taken him to Syria in 60 as proquaestor
(cf. Willems, op. cit. 606 note 1).
necessity for intrigue within the senate) than in the case of legates. The practice whereby commanders selected their own legates suggests that the ideal of harmony-with-efficiency was prominent in official thought and policy in regard to the composition of provincial staffs.\(^{(31)}\) It has been well pointed out that, though the claims of amicitia and clientela may have been the most important factor in determining the commander's choice of officers, many of the latter must have been chosen primarily for their military ability and experience.\(^{(32)}\) It is in accord with such an official attitude that the senate should have urged the suspension of elections for tribuni militum a populo in 171, directing the commanders 'to exercise their iudicum and arbitrium in appointing them' (Liv. xlii, 31.5). It seems, therefore, most unlikely that the senate would have rejected proposals for the appointment of quaestors sine sorte, or would have thought of enforcing sortitio as an almost immutable rule for quaestors, even where the commander concerned held a 'non-military' province— in the latter case, as a means of preventing the official combination of a rapacious pair of friends.\(^{(33)}\) If this had been the case, it would have been a strange attitude indeed, that at the same time favoured a governor's retinue of contubernales as an integral feature of Roman provincial administration.

In general, it is true, quaestors preferred service on the staffs of generals or provincial governors to the purely administrative functions of the Urban and Ostiensis departments. Quaestors were often disappointed when the lot assigned them to duties at Ostia (Cic. Mur. 18; cf. Vat. 12). Most of the quaestors-elect of 202 may well have longed to serve under the great Scipio— for the military experience and possible glory, as well as for the important political contacts which such service might bring them. But to have questioned Scipio's selection of Laelius would, no doubt, have been to question his right to dispense patronage— unthinkable. Such appointments sine sorte must have been accepted without question and automatically sanctioned, on request, by the senate. The principle of sors aequa — that each colleague ought to have an equal chance of appointment to the 'best' and 'worst' provinces alike\(^{(34)}\) — can have been relevant only to magistrates cum imperio. The latter were not, like quaestors, de facto appendages to superior magistrates: 'quaestorian province' was too closely equated with 'commander' in the current idea to admit of such a principle as the basis of the allocation of quaestors.\(^{(35)}\)

From this point of view, the relative rarity of quaestorian appointments sine sorte will have been due, not to the fact that sortitio was an aspect of mos maiorum which the Romans loved dutifully to observe and to enforce (there is ample evidence to the contrary)\(^{(36)}\), but to the fact that quaestors had to be elected by popular vote before being assigned to provinciae: very often commanders would have had no reason for preferring one quaestor-elect to another. The quaestors' own wishes, naturally, also counted: Münzer suggested that Brutus, quaestor in 53, may have been appointed to Caesar's staff sine sorte. But Brutus refused the appointment.\(^{(37)}\) We should expect a preference to

\(^{(31)}\) Greenidge, op. cit. 324; R.E. s.v. 'Legati' loc. cit.
\(^{(32)}\) R.E. Smith, Service in the post-Marian Army, 63-4.
\(^{(33)}\) The quaestor, in any case, had no real power to check his commander's excesses (see, e.g. Greenidge, op. cit. 323-4).
\(^{(34)}\) Cf. Liv. x, 24.12; more generally, x, 24.2-16; vi, 30.1 ff.; xiii, 32.1-5.
\(^{(35)}\) Cf. Greenidge, op. cit. 215, 323-4.
\(^{(36)}\) Cf. Liv. iii, 64.4; vi, 22.6; 30.1 ff.; viii, 16.4; xixvii, 1.7 ff.; Cic. Fam. v, 2.3; Mur. 18; Vat. 12; R.E. xiii, 2, sv. 'Losung', cols. 1499 ff.
\(^{(37)}\) R.E. x, 1. col. 977; Auct. Vir. Illust. 82, 3-4.
have arisen under some such circumstances: where quaestor-elect and commander were already connected by some *necessitudo*, whether a personal, family, or factional connexion (as, e.g., Scipio and Laelius, Caesar and Antonius); where a commander especially wished to attach a particular quaestor to himself (e.g. Cic. *Att.* vi, 6.3-4; *Fam.* ii, 15.4; ii, 19.1-2); where the quaestor was a good soldier and did not belong to a hostile faction (cf. R. E. Smith, loc. cit.); where the quaestor was strongly recommended by a mutual friend (cf. Pliny, *Ep.* iv, 15) — assuming always the willingness of the quaestor to accept the appointment. A commander, if influential enough, might support the candidature of his future quaestor — with success — either personally or by proxy (Val. Max. viii, 15.4; Cic. *Phil.* ii, 49). This may well have occurred far more often than we are told. Pliny (loc. cit.), forecasting the simultaneous consulship and quaestorship of his friends Fundanus and Asinius Bassus, wrote to the former a *commendatio* urging him to choose Bassus as his quaestor. Such a forecast would have been, normally, more difficult under the Republic, but commendations of this kind must have been also a republican feature.

Finally, a list of quaestors, who, though we have no positive evidence as to the method of their appointment, may well have been appointed without the lot. The ‘Fasti quaestorum’ is very patchy indeed; and neither the pre-existence of *amicitia* or *clientela* between a quaestor and his commander nor the fact of a quaestor’s family connexions with the province to which he is appointed can be taken as proof of appointment *sine sorte*. But one cannot but wonder at the coincidence in such cases — if indeed it was coincidence:

C. Furius Aculeo (q. 190). He served on the staff of the consul L. Scipio. The Furii were loyal allies of the Scipiones (Scullard, *Rom. Politics*, 115). This connexion probably explains why Scipio’s enemies prosecuted him along with Scipio (Liv. xxxviii, 55.5).

Q. Fabius (q. 188). He served under L. Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus (*procos.* 188-6) in Spain (Liv. xxxix, 29.4; *M.R.R.* i.366). In this period, the Fabii, Manlii, and Fulvii are known to have been linked by *amicitia* (Scullard, op. cit. 135 ff., 165 ff., cf. 32). The connexion of the Fabii with the Spanish provinces goes back, at least, to the command of Q. Fabius Buteo in Ulterior in 196 (Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 309, 314).

Q. Fabius Maximus (q. 134). Commended to the electorate by his influential uncle Aemilianus, he later accompanied Aemilianus and his private army to Numantia (see above, note 13, Badian, op. cit. 168-9).

Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus (q. 132). He served on the staff of his father-in-law, the consul P. Rupilius, in Sicily, where his uncle Q. Fabius Aemilianus had held command in 149 (*M.R.R.* i, 498,458). That Rupilius summarily dismissed him from the province ‘quia negligentia Taurominitanam arcem amiserat’ is by no means incompatible with an *extra sortem* appointment. For this action Valerius Maximus (ii, 7.3) places Rupilius among those who ‘necessitidum perturpitis vinculis, ultionem vindicatamque laesae, cum ignominia domuum suarum exiguere non dubitaverunt’; but we well know that such a show of oldfashioned *severitas* often went hand in hand with a high degree of astuteness and realism in matters political.

Q. Sertorius (q. 90). Plutarch (*Sert.* 4,1) says that he ‘was appointed quaestor of Cisalpine Gaul’. This was interpreted by Mommsen and Greenidge as one of four *province* held by *Quaestores Italici* (Mommsen, *St R.*, ii, 571; Greenidge, op. cit. 215-6). But this view was opposed by Willems (op. cit. ii, 600 ff.) who held that there can have been no *quaestores Italici*, at this time, apart
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from the Ostiensis, and recalled that the 'quaestor of Cisalpine Gaul' in 84 was Verres, who was, in fact, the quaestor of the consul Carbo. Cisalpine Gaul was at this time part of the provincia of the consuls during their year of office (Smith, op. cit. 18). According to Tacitus (Ann. xi, 22; cf Liv. Per. 15), the number of annually elected quaestors at this time was eight. This would deny the existence of four quaestores Italici at this time.

In 90 (the Social War), Cisalpine Gaul was part of the province of the consul Rutilius who held general command of Northern Italy (M.R.R. ii, 25). Plutarch's narrative shows that Sertorius was an officer under the commander-in-chief who operated in the northern theatre: Rutilius, though the latter is not mentioned. Sertorius had begun his military service under the elder Caepio against the Cimbri and Teutones, and, later in the same war, he had served under Marius (Plut. Sert. 3, 1-3). In 90 he was again associated with Marius, and also with the younger Caepio, both of whom were members of Rutilius' staff. Plutarch normally describes the appointments of quaestors in some such terms: ἀποδειχθεὶς ταμάς ἔλαχος etc., or ἀπεθεὶς ταμάς ἔλαχος etc., (cf. Cic. 6.1; Ti. Gracch. 5.1; C. Gracch. 1.4). Of Sertorius he says: ταμάς ἀποδείχθηκεν τῆς περὶ Πάδον Γαλατίας ἐν δαίμονι, implying that Sertorius was just the man for this post, an able and energetic young soldier. He is probably also to be placed on the list of 'Marian' amici who formed the carefully selected staff of the consul Rutilius (see Badian, art. cit.).

L. Lucullus (q. 88 or 87). He served on Sulla's staff in the Mithridatic War. Plutarch (Luc. 2.1) attests an early and lasting connexion between the two men, dating at least from the Social War in which Lucullus served as a junior officer under Sulla. Plutarch gives details of Lucullus' service in the East under Sulla without mentioning that he was Sulla's quaestor. This we learn from Cicero (Acad. ii, 1). But it is significant that Plutarch, who generally mentions the quaestorships and quaestorian appointments of his biographical subjects of the later Republic, merely indicates in this case the necessitudo between Lucullus and his commander: αὐτὸν δὲ εὐστήθειν καὶ προάστη τά Σέλλας προσηγάμενον, καὶ χρόνεος ἀν' ἀρχής ἐπὶ τὰ πλεῖοντο πέσα σπονδῆς διετέλεσεν (compare Cic. 6.1 etc.).

C. Memmius (q. 77). A legate under his brother-in-law Pompeius in 81 (Plut. Pomp. 11.2; cf. Badian, op. cit. 271), he later accompanied Pompeius to Spain as his quaestor (M.R.R. ii, 93, 98).

M. Crassus, son of the Triumvir, (q. 54). He served on the staff of Caesar in Gaul. His brother Publius had served under Caesar 58-55. The necessitudo in this case needs no comment.

M. Brutus (q. 53). Münzer (R.E. x. 1, col. 977) suggested that Brutus may have been selected sine sorte by Caesar — i.e. to succeed M. Crassus. Brutus, however, refused to join Caesar's staff, and accompanied his father-in-law Appius Claudius to Cilicia instead (M.R.R. ii. 229). Antonius, whom Caesar selected in the following year, seems to have been the last of a series of quaestors appointed sine sorte by Caesar(88) between 58 and 52.

L. A. THOMPSON.

University College, Ibadan.

(88) Plut. Caes. 5.3 must refer to Caesar's appointment of Antistius Vetus (son of the man under whom Caesar had himself served as quaestor in Spain) without the lot, in either his Gallic or his Spanish governorship. See D. R. Shackleton Bailey, C.Q. '60, 257, n. 4.
AN ATHENIAN LAW ON AMBASSADORS?

At Athens none was more zealous in the cause of opposing the efforts of Philip of Macedon than was Demosthenes. When Philip began to move in the direction of Elateia and thereby threaten Athens and Thebes in 339 Demosthenes both proposed that envos be sent to Thebes to coordinate the resistance of Athens and Thebes against Philip and himself served as one of the ten envos who were sent. But in the course of the case which Aeschines finally brought against Ctesiphon in 330 for proposing in 337/6 that Demosthenes be honoured with a crown for his services against Macedon, Aeschines apparently accused Demosthenes of being a 'busy-body'. Demosthenes defended his own persistence in undertaking journeys, enduring difficulties and proposing decrees. He argued that although the great orators of the past had not pursued any cause with undivided energy and attention, but had left some of the responsibility for others and a loophole for themselves to escape through in case of danger, he had been so convinced of the magnitude of the dangers facing the state that he had not hesitated to do everything that he considered necessary. Thus he justified his conduct, although 'in former times the man who proposed an embassy would not have served on it, and the man who served on an embassy would not have been its proposer.'

In the passage quoted above Demosthenes' words have been taken to justify the belief that at Athens there was a law which forbade a man both to be the proposer of an embassy and to serve on it. It is, however, my contention that such a belief is incorrect.

The belief that such a law existed cannot be substantiated by any further positive evidence, and it can be contradicted by a good deal more. Aristides, true enough, in 479 proposed that an Athenian embassy be sent to Sparta, and Cimon, Xanthippus and Myronides were elected. Idomeneus, not generally the most reliable of sources, asserted that Aristides went also, although he was not an ambassador according to the terms of the decree. The position of Aristides could perhaps be explained if the words of Demosthenes are in fact a citation of a law, but if no evidence can be found to prove the existence of such a law then the case of Aristides cannot be taken to substantiate it.

In Callistratus, Aristophon, Cephalus and Thrasybulus Demosthenes has mentioned four orators who flourished at the end of the fifth and in the first half of the fourth century, and it can be shown that several men both proposed the despatch of embassies and served on them. In 420 Nicias proposed the despatch of an Athenian embassy to Sparta and was himself appointed to it. In 377 Aristoteles proposed

(2) Id. 169.
(3) e.g. M. Heyse, De Legationibus Atticis, Göttingen, 1882, 25/4; Prioribus autem temporibus valuisse puto legem, ne qui rogaverat, ut legati mitterentur, idem legatus creator. Cf. Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités, s.v. Legatus.
(5) One would have to assume that Aristides, forbidden to serve as ambassador on the ground that he proposed the decree for the embassy, accompanied the envoys as an assistant. For assistants accompanying delegations v. Thucydides iv, 118.
(6) Thuc. v, 46; Plut. Nicias, x, 2.
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ed a motion that an embassy be sent to Thebes, and was appointed as one of the three envoys, (7) and Philocrates, too, proposed an embassy to Macedon and in 346(8) accepted election as envoy. (8) In none of those instances, nor in the case of Demosthenes in 339, are any charges known to have been made against those who both proposed and served on an embassy or against anyone who proposed for election any man who had put the motion for the despatch of an embassy.

There is then no strong reason for believing in the application of any such law forbidding a man to propose an embassy and to serve on it as well, and the passage of Demosthenes does not require any such belief if it is read with attention to its context. Demosthenes merely wished to explain why he had appeared to push himself to the fore too much in what might have seemed to be a presumptuous manner. (10) Nor is there any reason to suppose that there ever was such a law which was later repealed, (11) for we are nowhere informed of any repeal. (12)

D. J. MOSLEY,
Sheffield University.

(7) I. G. II, 43 = Tod 128 = S. E. G. XVI, 44.
(8) Dem. xix, 12; 229: Aeschines, ii, 18; 91.
(9) Dem. xviii, 21; Aesch. ii, 18; iii, 63.

THE TIMING OF SUICIDE

In a recent defence of his theory of the imposition of distinct penalties for maiestas and perduellio in the early Principate, (1) R. S. Rogers passed over one objection brought against it by C. W. Chilton, (2) the seriousness of which he himself recognised in Criminal Trials, 183, namely that both Tacitus and Cassius Dio appear to be ignorant of any such distinction. The purpose of this note, written in the belief that Roger's view is still tenable in spite of the criticisms levelled against it, is to question the cogency of this objection. We shall admit that there were, indeed, certain persons who, as Tacitus and Dio recount, managed to escape the fullest consequences of a conviction for treason simply by a resort to suicide, but suggest that they may have belonged to a special category of those who had timed their suicide very early, whilst others escaped these consequences (as Rogers claims) by reason of being convicted for maiestas rather than for perduellio; and that the 'ignorance' of Tacitus and Cassius Dio is really a matter of their merging of the latter category with the former, whether through their own carelessness or that of their source.

The erratic nature of Tacitus' account of treason trials has been emphasised in another

(1) JRS xlix, 1959, 90-4, 'Treason in the Early Empire.'
(2) JRS xliv, 1955, 73 ff.
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recent paper (3) by Rogers where he instances how often that author omits (e.g.) the terms of indictment and still more commonly the evidence and testimony which were offered in support of them. Yet the argument of this paper seems to beg an important question. Was there, in fact, behind the erratic treatment of Tacitus a pattern of events as uniform as Rogers seems to imply? In particular, it is surely likely that in some of the 'cases' which ended in suicide, Tacitus could not give the precise terms of indictment, for the simple reason that no terms of indictment had ever been formulated or, at any rate, admitted by a competent magistrate, even this preliminary stage of proceedings having been anticipated by the intended victim's resort to suicide in the hope of saving something from the wreck; and this might especially happen where the latter could (equally with his would-be accuser) estimate the likely result of the charge, if once admitted, in the light of the reception given to an 'unofficial' attack made upon him in the senate (4) — a sinister feature arising from the fact that the senate now acted both as a deliberative body and as a court of law — or because of the known opinion of the emperor, expressed again 'unofficially,' by renuntiatio amicitiae. (5)

Now Tacitus, in asserting that the 'pretium festinandi' (Ann. 6, 29) was secured by those who 'de se statuebant,' does not make clear at what point in time the suicides occurred, whether before or after actual indictment. Ulpian's statement (Dig. xlviii, 4. 11), however, that the trial continued in cases of treason of any 'qui in reatu decedit' is most naturally taken to imply that at least the stage of nominis receptio by the magistrate had been reached; where it had not been reached, it is very doubtful whether a trial would be initiated, at any rate in the early Principate, (cf. P. A. Brunt, Hist. x, 196, and n. 23 on this point in cases of repetundae) and it would generally in such cases of suicide be too late to forbid burial. Such persons, then, as did anticipate the nominis receptio could be quite reasonably described as having gained 'pretium festinandi' and Tacitus, by failing to make clear the timing of the suicide, could (perhaps agreeably to his purpose) imply that it was the emperor who was deliberately encouraging the suicide of those who were already in reatu, whereas in fact an advantage was being seized by those who did not allow themselves to become in reatu at all.

Tacitus' generalisation about the consequences of suicide is appended to the case of Pomponius Labeo. He committed suicide, so, according to Tacitus, Tiberius declared in a letter to the senate, 'quia male administratae provinciae aliorumque criminum urgebatur' (Ann. 6. 29). These charges faced by Labeo are only mentioned after Tacitus has recorded the suicide itself. Rogers, on the basis of the common pattern, would assume that these charges had been formally laid, and he has Cassius Dio, 58, 24. 3, for what that is worth, (6) to support him. But Tacitus' language, surely, is far too vague, apart from this assumption, to allow of any certainty on the

(3) TAPA lxxxiii, 1952, 279 ff., 'A Tacitean pattern in narrating Treason Trials.'

(4) Cf. Tac. Ann. 16, 21-2, where Cossutianus Capito rehearses a long series of charges in the senate against Thrasea, apparently before any actual indictment at all, 'in a speech demanding such an indictment' (Rogers, loc. cit. n. 3 above, 286).


(6) In the same chapters Dio's statement that M. Aemilius Scaurus was convicted of the charges against him is open to doubt, since it is contradicted by Tacitus' statement that he committed suicide before conviction. Rogers, Criminal Trials, 152, appears to favour Tacitus' version; in any case the carelessness as to details in one author or the other is here illustrated.
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matter. His general account rather suggests that it was Tiberius' renuntiatio amicitiae(7) which drove Labeo to suicide, so much so that Tiberius felt bound to justify himself in the senate. Did Labeo leave behind him a letter to the effect that he was well aware that a series of accusations would follow Tiberius' action and observing bitterly that he would at least gain some advantage over those who allowed time for the inevitable delatores to exploit the situation? At any rate, his case may represent a close parallel to that of C. Cornelius Gallus in Augustus' reign, concerning whom it is equally uncertain whether any actual indictment had been effected.*(8)

Rogers himself has listed cases*(9) to show that the mere expression of the emperor's displeasure was regarded as 'primum indicium mali' or 'praenuntiam imminentis caedis contumeliam' (cf. Tac. Ann. 16,7,1; 15,23.5). Much would depend on the character of the individual concerned but to some it might appear common prudence to anticipate the processes of the law, if thereby some of its penalties could be avoided.

Cassius Dio, typically, does not quote Labeo's case or any other to illustrate his remarks on the motives of those who committed suicide (58,15), yet his language in this passage calls for attention. We find that he mentions first the avoidance of insult as the main motive of those who committed suicide, referring to them as those who ἀνακτοροὶ πρὸς τής δίκης τελευτώτων, which seems to imply that the indictment against them had been admitted and their trial begun; but when he goes on to mention the avoidance of confiscation as an additional motive, he refers to those ἐθελοντηθοῦν πρὸ τῆς δίκης τελευτώντων, which is most naturally taken as implying that their trial had not yet begun and leaves open the possibility that not even the stage of nominis receptio had been reached. This variation of language may be coincidental but it may also be connected with a distinction between two categories of people such as we have referred to above, only one of which had, in virtue of their early suicide anticipating the application of the law, any sure hope of saving their property — a distinction which Dio, or his source, was not, however, concerned to make clear or himself failed to see.

In this connection we may turn to another case of some importance where Tacitus fails to make clear the timing of a suicide, namely that of Caecilius Cornutus (Ann. 4,28 and 30). He records that Cornutus was named in the trial of Vibius Serenus, the elder, as having supplied the latter with funds for his treasonable purposes, whereupon 'taedio curarum et quia periculum pro exitio habebatur mortem in se festinavit'. Later he goes on to mention the proposal 'de praemiis accusatorum abolendis, si quis maiestatis postulatus ante perfectum iudicium se ipse vita privavisset', saying that this proposal was introduced 'quia Cornutus sua manu ceciderat'. Rogers here

(7) I use the phrase for convenience, though, as Rogers notes (TAPA xc, 225, n. 2), it seems not to occur in Classical Latin.
(8) Cf. Suet. D.A. 66; Dio, 53,23-4. Both these accounts leave it very doubtful whether Gallus lived to see any actual indictment in the law-courts brought against him, though there is no agreement among modern scholars on the matter, cf. (e.g.) Rogers, TAPA 1959, 229, assuming conviction by a senatorial court, with A. H. M. Jones, Studies in Roman Government and Law, 97 ('the Senate... voted that he be condemned by a court'), cf. De Visscher's view re the trial of Messala (Tac. Ann. 5,68) in a permanent court, the S.C. being only prejudicial. The same is true with regard to Macro, whose will remained valid after suicide (AE., 1957, 250), a fact which, in spite of Brunt, Hist. x, 203, does not necessarily support Chilton's case unless it can be proved that Macro was ever formally indicted. Might not Gaius himself have suggested to Macro that, if he wished to keep his property, he should not inconvenience the emperor by insisting upon a trial (and so, too, with some suicides under Nero)?
(9) TAPA xc, 237 ff.
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supposes (10) that Tacitus' account of the trial does not begin until 4.29, 'sed hi quidem statim exempti', thus assuming that the indictment of Cornutus, as well as that of Serenus, was admitted. But again we may question this assumption, connected as it is with Rogers' view of a single pattern behind Tacitus' account of treason trials, and suppose with no less plausibility that elements of the trial are included in 4.28, 'adnectebatque Caecilium Cornutum' simply representing one of the pieces of evidence used against the elder Serenus which Cornutus feared would become the basis of a later charge against himself. The sentence beginning 'at contra reus...' does, in fact, imply that Serenus was the only defendant at this point and leaves it possible that Cornutus committed suicide before ever becoming reus himself. On this interpretation, indeed, Tacitus' reference to the proposal in the senate 'de praemiis etc.' is irrelevant to Cornutus, since the latter's trial would not have been 'inceptum', let alone 'perfectum'. But Tacitus is quite capable of giving false impressions and of quoting irrelevant instances in support of his generalisations — Labeo, in fact, is a case in point in Rogers' view (11) (perhaps overlooking the 'aliorum criminum,' in addition to extortion, of which Labeo was alleged to have been afraid). Perhaps certain people had tried to claim some reward on the basis of a mere declared intention to prosecute and this had given rise to a debate in the senate concerning the offering of rewards to delatores in general. Certainly, if Cornutus had not been indicted, it is logical to think, as the corollary of our argument above, that no reward would be payable, in as much as he was not technically 'reus' at the time of his suicide.

Now this last point is relevant in considering the well-known difficulty about the statements of Seneca (de cons. Marciae, 22.7) concerning the suicide of Cremutius Cordus. According to Seneca, when Cordus' intention to starve himself to death became known, his accusers 'adeunt consulum tribunalia, queruntur mori Cordum ut interpellarent quod coegerant; adeo illis Cordus videbatur effugere'. This anxiety of Cordus' accusers 'quod e faucibus... educeretur praed' is, as Rogers, Criminal Trials, 86, observes, 'most strange' in view of the rejection of the proposal de praemii accusatorum abolendis, etc. in the previous year (Marsh, The Reign of Tiberius, 292-3, also feels the difficulty and attempts explanations). The text of Seneca here is, unfortunately, somewhat doubtful, but the general sense seems to be that the accusers had not gone far enough with their accusations as to qualify for their reward. (12) They may not, then, yet have effected the nominis recepicio and their anxiety becomes understandable, (13) if, in only the previous year, the case of Cornutus had shown the need to do this. If this is the proper explanation, then not only is Cremutius Cordus' speech in self-defence, as recorded by Tacitus (Ann. 4.34-5), inauthentic in the sense that it was never made in a court of law, but Tacitus'

(10) Loc. cit., n. 3 above, 297.

(11) TAPA lxiv, 1933, 21.

(12) Rogers, Criminal Trials, 86, n. 272 and 275 doubts whether the indictment had yet been admitted. Syne, Tacitus, ii, 517, is ambiguous, 'threatened with a prosecution', cf. i. 397, 'prosecuted'.

(13) One might suppose that the nominis recepicio could be quite quickly effected, before Cordus had completed the slow process of starving himself to death. It may be of significance, however, that Tacitus, Ann. 4.36, says of this year that 'postulandis reis tam continuus... fuit ut feriarum Latinarum diebus praefectum urbis Drusum... adierit Calpurias Salvianus' — who was exiled for his pains. Did Cordus' would-be accusers find themselves faced with a similar difficulty but wisely refrain from resorting to a similar remedy?
use of the term 'postulatus' represents another instance of that imprecision(14) which makes it so difficult to be sure whether he did or did not know about any distinction between the penalties for maiestas and perduellio which may have existed in Tiberius' reign.

A. R. HANDS,
Queen Mary College, London.

(15) I am indebted to Professor J. Ferguson for comment and criticism at a number of points but the usual exceptio applies.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVOLUTION IN ROME OF THE FIRST CENTURY B.C.

In Rome of the second century B.C. the senate directed foreign affairs, controlled domestic politics, saw to military matters and exercised control over state finances. Technically, the citizen body, which passed laws, elected all magistrates and (before 149 B.C.) reviewed all important or capital sentences, was the constitutional sovereign, but in fact control of political life was exercised by the senate — technically merely an advisory council of 300 ex-magistrates holding office for life. 'Monopolising all the state’s magisterial expertise and in constant session, this body was obviously at an advantage over the annually elected magistrates, who were all independent of each other, with no cabinet system available to them. It had the advantage also over the unwieldy popular assemblies, which anyway had no power of initiative in legislation. So situated, by a masterly advance from precedent to precedent, the senate had assumed or actualised extra-legal powers on the grounds of administrative necessity or expediency.\(^{(1)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) An analysis from an administrative viewpoint can be found in K. von Fritz, *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*, 1954, 161-83; an analysis of the control exercised by the nobilitas over the electorate by the gerrymandering of voting districts occurs at L. R. Taylor, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, 1960, 297 f.
manipulate the constitution.(2) In any age of the Republic in the second and first centuries B.C., a small group of noblemen drawn from twenty or so families directed the senate and thus the state of Rome.(3) Nobility was conferred on a man in the second century B.C. by the gaining of a consulship — the highest state office — whether it was an ancestor or the man himself who had achieved this feat.(4)

The consulship was in fact the secret of the power of this controlling clique. It was the climax of a senatorial career and the supreme administrative instrument of the machinery of second century government.(5) Tremendous resources of influence were needed to obtain it, and these same resources consolidated the position once gained. Hence the centuries-long pre-eminence of certain families. The position of power attained by the nobles for the greater part of the second century was in fact the high-water mark of senatorial control of the constitution(6) and was maintained by strict control over the machinery of administration and over administrative personnel. Basically, the problems posed by the administration of the empire lay in providing an adequate and adequately differentiated range of governorships while simultaneously maintaining unity of direction thereof. This had been effected by governing down the other magistracies into subordination to the consulship. The functions of the dictatorship, which originally involved dangerously autocratic mandates of power, liable to promote one noble family far beyond their peers to the destruction of the oligarchy, had been progressively attenuated in the third century and the institution was never employed in the second century.(7) It was something of a tour de force to maintain unity of command in two colleagues, each armed with the power of veto of any of his fellow’s activities, and this was in fact managed only by the most skilful development of the attributes of other parts of the machinery of government. This was done by employing acting-magistrates as part of the routine administration: this gave a fourfold hierarchy in the senior magistracies (consul: proconsul; praetor: propraetor) and an indefinite number of governors all subordinate to consular authority. It also called for no new varieties of posts, and the last increase in mere numbers — the addition of two praetors — in fact took place in 198 B.C.(8) Thus no posts were unfillable by

(2) For an analysis in terms of the manipulation of constitutional procedures see H. H. Scullard, Roman Politics 220-150 B.C., 1951, 12-30.


(5) There were no dictatorships in the second century and the overriding command (imperium maius) was not evolved till the first, so in this century, for the first and only time in the constitutional history of Rome, the consulship was absolutely supreme. Its new importance is reflected in the change undergone by the concept of nobility, previously conferred by curule office (i.e. posts conferring supreme administrative power; curule aedileships, praetorships and consulships), which came in the second and first centuries to be restricted to families whose members had attained consulships: see previous note.

(6) Cf. von Fritz, 220-32; Ch Wirszubski, Libertas as a...

Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate, 1960, 32-3.


(8) Increase in the size of a college of magistrates, e.g. the praetorship, diminished the real power of its com-
cadets of noble families. This limitation precluded gate crashers and the arbitrary operation of prorogation, as the device of continuing a man in any acting capacity was known, enabled those who decided a man's continuance to control that man's attitude. Moreover, a senatorially composed standing court was set up to try offending governors: this gave the inner ring of influential noblemen retrospective control also. And this largely solved the second problem of the administration of empire, namely that of adequacy and suitability of administrative personnel.(9)

The efficiency of the system is best illustrated by the rarity in politics of the 'new man'—i.e. the consul without senatorial ancestors. 15 are known in the last 400 years of the Republic—a rather misleading figure, as the detail of our information about earlier times is not such as to enable a full check to be made. However, a consul from a socially inferior family (C. Terentius Varro) first appears only in 217 B.C.; moreover, where we can check on the social provenance of consulares, the results are striking: in the period when the haughtily exclusive nobilitas was predominant (210-44) —167 years—only 10 such new men appear.(10)

There is thus no more striking feature in the institution of the Principate than the facts that, in the 16 years (44-29 B.C.) which preceded it, there were 32 'new men'.(11) That homogeneity and exclusiveness disappears as a characteristic of the composition of the senate (whose personnel is increased by two-thirds), and that the consulship becomes secondary to an overriding command, more or less disguised under various constitutional cloaks. The Principate, that is, was the triumph of a new administrative class.(12)

The theme of this monograph is the analysis of this triumph by an examination of Republican administration as regards its institutions and its personnel.

Like the build-up of the power of the inner ring of noble families in the senate this development also was largely extra-legal, largely without those extensive changes in constitutional law which, one would expect, would accompany such a drastic change. What is important here is a thorough-going demographic change in the nature of the citizen body—for it was the emergence of a new class, that of the professional soldier, which brought the Principate about. As a result of the devastation of the Second Carthaginian War and of the large-scale elimination of the peasant class by the demands, then and subsequently imposed, of army service

(10) Cf. von Fritz, 225 and n. 17, p. 448 (on Varro); 229 and n. 28, pp. 449-50 (the fifteen novi homines). For further statistics see Scullard, 10-2 and Syme, 10-3.
(11) For the statistics see Syme, 372; M. W. H. Lewis, The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians, 1955, 161-2. For the altered concept of nobilitas under the Principate see Allen, TAPA 72, 1941, 5 & 13-5.
(12) Syme, 2-8; cf. chapters 6, 'Caesar's New Senators', pp. 78-96, and 24, 'The Party of Augustus', pp. 349-68, and V. Ehrenberg, Imperium Maius in the Roman Republic', AJP 74, 1953, 113 f. On the altered status of the consulship under the new dispensation see Syme, 'Consulate in Absence', JRS 48, 1958, 1; G. H. Stevenson, 'The Imperial Administration', in CAH X, 1952, 184 & 213, where it is put: 'Though under the Principate the city magistracies became to an increasing extent sinecures, the fact that their tenure was a necessary preliminary to a governorship generally secured that enough candidates presented themselves' (my italics).
citizens were liable to conscription for 16 years from the age of 17) huge ranches had built up in Italy (mostly in the Centre and South) replacing the displaced mass of smallholders. This change in property distribution had dynamic social effects: the cities of Italy, and especially Rome, became flooded with a dispossessed, now propertiless, peasantry. Equally important was the fact that simultaneously many young men went North to the Po valley, where they were immune from compulsory military service and competition from the ranches (economically superior when the terrain favoured grazier).\(^{(13)}\) Embitterment of social discontent proceeded apace, particularly at Rome, where lack of thought to social welfare, and a catastrophic slump and inflationary retariffing of the coinage caused boundless suffering to the lower orders.\(^{(14)}\)

As only citizens with a stake in the community — in the form of property — were eligible for conscription, the Republic began to run into serious difficulties in raising troops as the second century went on. It was not only that it was difficult to find enough able-bodied men in the requisite property classes in the state register. There was increasing discontent among the peasantry, ruined by being thus pressed into service. The spectacle presented by the Roman armies in Spain — where mutiny, defeat and disaffection are all too well and too frequently attested — illustrates the dangers of the situation: it was proving difficult to provide for minimal administrative needs in security forces for the provinces.\(^{(15)}\) The obvious solution was that of lowering the property qualifications required for conscription. This was done: they were reduced from 11,000 to 4,000 *asses* between 214 and 212 B.C., and from 4,000 to 1,500 between 133 and 125 B.C., the body of 'propertied' citizens being increased by 25% as a result of the latter change — i.e. producing a substantial change in the nature as well as the numbers of the electorate. More than this: the army (which already supplied recruits with weapons and armour) from 123 B.C. provided clothing also. A middle-class militia was thus proletarianised.\(^{(16)}\) The further step of throwing the armies open to propertiless volunteers seemed only a logical development of this sequence of concessions. But it was nonetheless momentous in that it made a profession instead of a civic duty out of military service. And this development was accentuated by the Social and Civil Wars of 91-80 B.C., when commanders, in desperate need of troops, admitted foreigners and provincials into the legions. These were mostly descendants of Roman garrison troops who had settled in Spain after service there. Also, the mass of smallholders had by this time concentrated in the Po valley, creating a vast pool of good man-power in Cis-Alpine Gaul: so there was heavy recruitment from


\[^{(16)}\] Cf. E. Gabba, 'Le origini dell’ esercito professionale in Roma: i proletari e la riforma di Mario', *Athenaeum* 27, 1949, 181-7 and 190-3. The actual census statistics are: 181 B.C., 318,823; 125 B.C., 394,736 — an increase of 75,913, which is almost 25%, and contrasts markedly with the increase of 890 between the census-takings of 136 and 131 B.C. and the drop of 400 between 125 and 115 (for the figures cf. Frank, op. cit., 216-7). Simultaneously the revaluation of the *denarius* pauperised the ordinary legionaries: G. R. Watson, 'The Pay of the Roman Army (The Republic)', *Hist.* 7, 1958, 116-20.
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this region which, though partly Italian, contained a large Gallic element. The rankers of the armies subsequent to these wars were thus, besides being poorly-paid professionals and thoroughly demoralized by the bitterness of the struggles, largely non-Roman in origin and consequently indifferent to the niceties of constitutional issues. This decade of war itself had serious demographic consequences: 300,000 Romans or Italians lost their lives in the Social War of 91-89 B.C.; 20,000 were massacred by Mithridates in 88 B.C.; over 80,000 perished in the Civil Wars of 87-86 and 83-81 B.C. — i.e. Italy lost over 400,000 of her population (mostly in able-bodied men) in a decade.

There was another change introduced along with free volunteer recruitment: with ample supplies of willing manpower to draw on, armies became bigger. The armies that fought out the Social War of 91-89 B.C. were gigantic (in the region of 140,000 men a side each year), of a size quite without precedent in Rome's military history. This necessitated administrative changes. A consular army of the pre-civil war years comprised only 2 legions and could thus be officered by a consul as commander-in-chief, his quaestor and 12 military tribunes. But an army of 70,000 men needed greater differentiation of command. In the first place, the centurions (the senior non-commissioned officers of the time) had gained greatly in importance when the manipular organization of the army was replaced by cohorts by 104 B.C. What the centurions gained in standing, the military tribunes (a post roughly corresponding to that of lieutenant in a modern army) lost, particularly as such posts had enormously increased in numbers. It now became impossible for the young noblemen to monopolize these positions. Anyway, only 24 were elective; the others were filled by the general's appointees. As the new-type armies were much more professional than the old, commanders of skill and experience were required: these attributes took time to obtain and the young noblemen of the first century knew that they would be quickly forgotten if they were long absent from the political life of Rome. So, in the first century, the junior officers of the Roman army ceased to be predominantly young noblemen, for the latter were neither keen on nor desired in these posts. Their place was taken by Italians, enfranchised by the Social War, or Roman citizens of Spanish or Gallic origin. More than this. In the second great bout of Civil Wars (49-31 B.C.) admission to the legions of Rome was even more freely granted. Besides bringing non-citizens into the legions, this resulted in the dropping of the social barriers separating non-commissioned ranks from officers. Service in the legions had come to be very lucrative, and promotion to centurion — where there had long been a regular career — meant that a man had gained the necessary property registration to qualify him for candidature as military tribune. Actually, this process had been in train in a less accelerated form throughout the century,

(17) Smith, 48-9 and 54-8.
(18) G. Forni, Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano, 1953, 183; L. Faret, Storia di Roma e del mondo romano, 1958, 566.
(20) H. M. D. Parker, The Roman Legions, 1958, 30-1; the revaluation of the denarius had meant an increase in pay for the centurions (who now got thrice as much, instead of twice as much, as the legionaries: Watson, Hist. 7, 1958, 116-20), which must have entailed a corresponding increase in prestige.
in that there seem to have been army families (i.e. families which contributed members to the armed forces in each generation). Thus the son of the ranker who had been promoted to centurion himself commenced service at officer level. And fitly too, for a time-expired centurion became a leading member of his home community on his retirement thereto. Thus the place in the legions of Rome previously taken by the cadets of the Roman upper class came to be taken by the sons of the Italian municipal bourgeoisie — and there was much osmosis between officers and men.(22)

To provide further senior staff a new life was given to the long established posts of legate (hitherto an occasional post, generally held in the capacity of administrative aide to the governor) and of prefect (hitherto commander of an Italian or allied force; the enfranchisement of Italians and allies after the Social War necessitated a reformulation of the post’s duties). The legate now came to exercise independent command over one or two legions, subordinate to the commander-in-chief, and the prefect to control engineers or provisions (it is perhaps superfluous to mention the fact that the latter was the post held by Caesar’s friend, Balbus, who had become a millionaire by the end of his term of service). There was one striking feature about these posts: they were established by the commanders-in-chief (Caesar and Pompey made them into independent commands with officially recognized military authority, delegating their own for this purpose — an innovation with obvious applications in civil administration), and were not elective. An elective post might well have been filled by a politician rather than the professional soldiers actually required; and then again the senate, which viewed this development of the administrative capacity of its commanders in the field with increasing concern, could easily have ruined a commander by discontinuing the appointments of his key men. And just as the commander-in-chief would be reluctant to entrust an office of such power to a nobleman with important political connections whose treachery might bring him ruin, so the noblemen were unwilling to become tools of commanders who were nominally only their peers. For progress in the post, which was under the absolute control of the commander-in-chief, involved complete political subordination to the latter and could involve absence from the political front as long as the latter’s campaigns necessitated. So the senior posts too lost their complement of nobles, and thus for the first time in the Republic — the origin of the nobility was in the militarist aristocracy of the fourth and third centuries B.C. — the army administration came to be manned by a group other than that which filled the posts of the civil government. The nobility of Rome largely became a mere land-owning aristocracy of holders of civil posts.(23)

Now this situation had very serious repercussions on domestic politics, because there was thus built up a military career in public service which could lead to high civil honours which it was absolutely outside the power of the senatorial inner ring to influence. The new professional officer class had opportunities for a career within the army, subject to the absolute control of the commander-in-

(22) Smith, 66-9; more fully in Gabba, ‘Ricerche sull’esercito professionale romano da Mario ad Augusto’, *Athenaeum* 29, 1951, 204-5.

chief, leading to a military command with official power of senior authority. At the same time its personnel were indifferent, if not actively hostile, to the senate, and would therefore not hesitate to serve their commanders’ interests—and their own—against those of the senate. Commanders were thus enabled to employ their officers as Tribunes of the People: the officer in question undertook the post as ‘duties on the home front’ to act as agent for his commander-in-chief, absent from politics while serving the state on campaign. More than this. Senior officers might well come to desire a proconsulship or even a consulship because of the opportunity which this office, or its promagistracy, would give them, as governors, to exercise independent military command. It was clearly in the commander-in-chief’s interests to support such men in their ventures into civilian life, as they would constitute important allies there.

This development was doubly pernicious in that there came to develop in the course of the first century two entirely separate military hierarchies. For, as early as Sulla’s time, the importance of a commander-in-chief was in close relation to his ability to provide a staff of trainee marshals (which meant he had to exercise successfully command at frequent intervals over large armies), who in turn ensured his being given further army commands. And the ideological warfare of optimates versus populares, which had started towards the very end of Marius’ career continued its evil effects, in that military families, which provided the professional soldiers, maintained their allegiance to the families of their original leaders. So the conflict of Sullani against Mariani was inherited to some extent by the officers of Pompey and Caesar respectively.

The popularis Marianist movement was by no means sympathetic towards senatorial predominance, so Caesar’s victory confronted the senate with a hostile military hierarchy, solidly supporting its commander, and capable of conducting the civil administration.

This build-up of an entirely new military administration was accompanied by extensive mandates of power to its commanders, these too being adventitious developments whose long-term constitutional results were not immediately seen. In administrative terms, the consulship, an annual office hamstrung by collegiality, simply was not adequate to meet problems repeatedly posed in the emergencies of empire, which called for a single command, of lengthy tenure, not bound by circumscribed functions of area or mandate. No new varieties of official posts had been created since the fourth century (actually 327 B.C.).

With the acquisition of an empire in the interim, coupled with revolutionary demographic and economic changes within Italy, it was becoming increasingly impossible to adapt the machinery originally intended to govern a city-state to the fundamentally changed governmental duties with which it had to cope.

Moreover, there had been considerable change in the customary practice on which

---

(24) Smith, 63, n. 2, and 64-5.
(25) F. E. Adcock, The Roman Art of War under the Republic, 1940, 112-3 and 114.
(26) On the dating of the first use of the ideograms optimates and populares see Wirszubski, op. cit. 39, n. 1; on the cynical and embittered nature of the ideological struggle, ibid. 39-40 and 72.
(27) Syme, 63 and 65.
(28) The consulship and quaestorship date to 509 B.C., the dictatorship to 501; the tribunate and aedilship to 494; the military tribunate with consular power to 444, the praetorship to 366, the elective military tribunate to 362 and the promagistracy to 327.
Republican social and political life was based. There was a practice, widespread in Roman life, known as clientela, which may be translated as 'client-relationship'. Originally signifying the legal obligation existing between an erstwhile owner and his freed slave, it came speedily to develop a moral, extra-legal significance. One put oneself in a man’s clientela by appealing for or merely accepting a good service done by him to oneself; a reciprocal relationship was thereby established, and one was felt to be at once able to request further assistance and also bound to support one’s benefactor at his request. The application of such a relationship to politics is testified from the very earliest date. It developed with the Republic.\(^{30}\) Two new forms were evolved in the second century, both of which empowered the army commander. Commanders operating in the Hellenistic East found communities whose practice it was to regard their various despots as ‘saviours’ or ‘champions’, a concept close to that behind the Roman concept of the patronus. But now whole communities came under the clientela of men who had campaigned or even governed in those regions. Pompey capitalized on this development in the first century B.C., realizing that the backing provided by an empire-wide network of such client-relationships could give its possessor predominance in metropolitan politics. Thereafter such client-relationships became the ambition or acquisition of all the dynasts of Republican politics.\(^{31}\) The second form evolved when the dispossessed urban proletariat was admitted to army service. Prior to this these men, disaffected towards the senate (which, as landowners, had dispossessed them and then suppressed their popular champions, Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, tribunes in 133 and 123-122 B.C. respectively, rendering their legislation abortive)\(^{32}\) and subject to acute economic and social distress (a tremendous slump in the thirties and twenties had followed the boom years of the forties, causing utter economic chaos in Rome)\(^{33}\) had had no-one to look to as champion in their plight. They thus presented a new group in society ready to fall into a client-relationship subordinate to any politician who could effectively assist them where the Gracchi had failed.\(^{34}\) Marius took them into his armies, promising employment, pay, booty, and a land allotment subsequent to service as provision for their future, in return for their services to the state as soldiers in the emergency armies. In this way military client-relationship came into being: the men were dependent on their commander for the booty and land-allotments, which only he could secure for them and which meant their re-establishment in an honoured and secure place in society. This dependence meant that the general was forced into politics, subsequent to his campaigning, to obtain land in Italy for his troops and also that his troops, demobilized as citizens, had to follow him in his further political career.\(^{35}\)

\(^{30}\) E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae*, 1958, 1, 8-13, 155 and 159-60.

\(^{31}\) Ibid. 158, 166, 278 and 289-90.

\(^{32}\) On the suppression of Tiberius Grachus cf. von Fritz, 261-2; on that of Gaius, ibid. 270-1; in general, 271-2; on the connivance at breaches of laws restricting land-ownership by and for the senate cf. Last in *CAH IX*, 16-20; Frank, *ESAR I*, 199; on the growth of disaffection cf. von Fritz, ‘Sallust and the Attitude of the Roman Nobility at the Time of the Wars against Jugurtha (112-105 B.C.)’, *TAPA* 74, 1945, 134-68.

\(^{33}\) Born, *AHR* 73, 1958, 890-902; cf. n. 14 above.

\(^{34}\) Cf. von Fritz, 251-2, who talks about the development of a proletarian mentality.

\(^{35}\) On the epoch-making significance of the emergence of this new form of clientela cf. Gabba, *Athenaeum* 29, 1951, 184-5; on the politicisation of generalship, Last in
The demographic changes of the first century developed this form of client-relationship by altering the composition of the armies. When Sulla's reforms were eventually implemented (c. 70 B.C.) the electorate was all but doubled.\(^{(36)}\) And since the beginning of the century commanders had been lavish in conferring the citizenship upon valorous troops. The electorate was thus heavily adulterated with non-Romans, many of them professional soldiers. The advent of military client-relationship introduced a new dimension into Republican politics without the slightest constitutional change. Army service unified Italian stocks, and gave them at officer level an insight into the realities of metropolitan politics, while the purely Roman citizenry was becoming steadily more aloof from and unsympathetic towards Italian problems.\(^{(37)}\) The citizen soldiery was moreover mostly non-Roman in origin or, if Roman, disaffected towards the senate; its army-service provided it with a life, religions and traditions of its own, and it had a common vested interest in securing the cession to itself of land within Italy. There thus appeared for the first time in Republican politics a homogeneous organized group, bound by a personal oath of loyalty to its commander, and indifferent to constitutional issues.\(^{(38)}\) Some idea of the significance of this development can be obtained from the fact that Sulla executed many thousands of men and confiscated property in 19 Italian towns (in one case the whole town) to settle his veterans, 120,000 in number, in 81 B.C.\(^{(39)}\) There were half a million men settled in this manner in Italy within the half century 81-31 B.C.\(^{(40)}\) The Marian army reforms had given weapons to a disaffected proletariat; as result, the fourth estate, the \textit{HOMO MILITARIS}, which emerged became the predominant group in Republican politics.\(^{(41)}\)

The senate could not finance these massive demobilizations and, as a land-owning aristocracy, was loth to see them come to pass: the struggle with the Gracchi had anyway led to an increased exclusiveness and hauteur — and cynicism — in its attitude. It thus shrugged off an administrative duty in domestic politics, as it had so often avoided facing up to reorganizing the administrative establishment necessary for the overseas dependencies. The commander-in-chief and his staff had thus to engage in complicated civil administration of a most important nature. It is quite clear that the army commanders came to realise their responsibilities in this matter in a way that its own vested interests prevented the senate from doing. After the lesson of the demobilization of Sulla's troops, who used their assignments as real estate and consequently had no long term effect on the distribution of the population, subsequent commanders tried to encourage the re-growth of smallholding by zoning land allotments given on demobilization. In Octavian's time, as a result, there is a large exodus to the provinces of the Italian peasant.

\(^{(37)}\) Scullard, \textit{A History of Rome from the Gracchi to Nero}, 1958, 178.
\(^{(38)}\) M. A. Levi, 'Classe dominante e ceto di governo', \textit{Acme} 1, 1948, 91-2.
population, offset by wholesale resettlement of veterans as permanent smallholders in a largely successful attempt to stay the encroachments of the ranches. This intrusion of the military into civilian administration shows the relative power and effective competence of the two corps of officials, however, and clearly foreshadows the future.

It is therefore little wonder that, with such formidable backing, the army chief managed to secure great extensions of his personal power at command level. The Marian army reform brought unlimited numbers of willing volunteers into the army. This meant that the problem of garrison forces could be squarely faced. Rome had in fact needed what amounted to a standing army of 8+ legions throughout the second century (42,000 men); Sulla in 80 B.C. established a permanent legionary force of 14+ legions in the provinces as the minimal requirement for peace-time security. Forces of this type still contained many conscripts, for the dropping of the property qualification in a slump period meant that, when the inflation of the second century recommenced, with booty pouring in again from successful wars, many more men became eligible for conscription. The volunteer force seems to have been that raised in emergency for a specific campaign: veterans were at a premium because of the urgency of the situation and so the rewards from the campaign had to be high. Disciplinary problems were frequent in these free-booting campaigns, for such the wars often were regarded.

But if the reform solved the problem of the

---

(43) Smith, 3 and 25-6 respectively.
(44) Ibid. 29; 34-7; 46; 51-2; 60-1. On the military indiscipline of the times see W. S. Messer, ‘Mutiny in the Roman Army’, *CP* 15, 1920, 169-73.
(45) Smith, 46 n. 2.
be held in more than one province simultaneously. (47) However, this meant the conferring of power on a single faction for a period long enough to enable it to build up a considerable stranglehold on government. (48) The danger of autocracy was such that this solution was also replaced. Sulla reorganized administrative practice on a constitutional basis in an attempt to eliminate the possibility of the building up of constellations of power by developing aspects of already existent and overworked machinery. He made additions to the establishment, providing for 8 praetors (there had been 6) and 20 quaestors (there had been 10). The promagistracies became once more short-term extensions of magistracies (though after Sulla every senior promagistrate had proconsular imperium) and were strictly delimited. (49) He thus kept the consulship supreme. But to effect his settlement—unpopular even to the senate, who saw intrusion into their circle of privilege imminent—he had to reintroduce the dictatorship, and this not in the attenuated form last used in 202 B.C., but empowered beyond its archaic scope: with absolute power in regard to capital punishment and immune from tribunician veto, (50) without narrowly defined function, it had no time-limited tenure of office. The obvious need for such overriding powers in future emergencies was in this way forcibly emphasized by the freshly set precedent in using them. (51)

The dangers of the imposition of autocracy as result (and the harrowing memories of Sulla’s régime) were such, however, that the senate was loth to avail itself of the institution of the necessary overriding power when a crisis arose which called for it—as soon happened. The suppression of piracy was found to require a Mediterranean-wide campaign, which meant that a single extraordinary commander would have necessarily to operate in the provinces of many regular governors. Baulking at the overriding command, the senate authorised for Pompey a ‘command equal to that of the proconsular governors’. Although the campaign was successfully concluded, incidents took place which showed the administrative weakness of this solution: one governor refused to allow Pompey’s legate to recruit in his province; another fought against Pompey’s legate, who was supported in the fighting by the pirates. Incidentally, Pompey set the precedent of the personal delegation of power to thirteen legates in this campaign, thus showing and recognising the necessity for further diversification of administrative staff. After these scandals there could be no refusal to vote the overriding powers in the next crisis, and they were in fact mooted for Pompey in 57 B.C. when he was given an emergency commission to organize the failing grain supplies for

(47) In the emergencies of the period from the dominance of Marius (107 B.C.) to the dictatorship of Sulla (82 B.C.) recourse was repeatedly had to this device: cf. the consulships of Marius in 104-100 B.C., Cinna in 87-84 B.C. and Carbo in 85-84 and 82 B.C. (T. R. S. Broughton, The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, 1951, under the years in question; cf. T. F. Carney, ‘The Promagistracy at Rome 121-81 B.C.’, Acta Classica 2, 1959, 74). A development of this empowering of one consul over his fellow can be seen in the appointment of the flamen diicus Merula as suffect consul in 87 B.C. The taboos upon his priesthood meant that his participation in the direction of state policy would be negligible: Last in CAH IX, 282. On the lengthening of tenures of promagisterial commands see Carney, op. cit., and Badian, ‘Notes on Provincial Governors from the Social War down to Sulla’s Victory’, PACA 1, 1958, 1-18.


(49) Broughton, op. cit., vol. 2, 746; on the imperium of promagistrates see Smith, 15-6.

(50) As is shown by the case of Ofella (Plut. Sull. 33,4) and the restriction of the tribunes’ powers respectively.

the metropolis. But the problem of effecting a replacement for a general leading an emergency army was being avoided: Caesar obtained for himself a 10 years’ run of power (in 2 block-grants of 5 years each) as proconsul, ceded by the senate to avoid conflict. It merely deferred it — and in the meantime strengthened Caesar’s hand. His solution to the problem of government was drastic: perpetual dictatorial power to provide unity of command, combined with a vast increase in senatorial numbers and with doubling of the adminisrative establishment at sub-consular level: 16 praetors and 40 quaestors in all were now available annually. This meant that he had new administrative personnel ready to step into office, for the posts were filled without difficulty or inefficiency (and served an obvious need).

Although the immediate sequel was the assassination of Caesar as a tyrant and the banning in perpetuity of the dictatorship (44 B.C.), the overriding command, cloaked in various constitutional guises, recurs constantly in the few years which remained to the Republic. The consulship was never again to be the real strength of administrative power. Suffect consuls (i.e. replacements during the consuls’ year of office) became frequent. A spate of new men floods the consular lists. Triumvirs with extensive powers nominate city magistrates (consuls included!) and direct provincial governors, and army officers advance en masse to the highest civilian honours. The assassination of Caesar had altered nothing. A newly structured machinery of administration had been evolved, and a new class — the Italian municipal upper class — had a vested interest in its implementation and in service therein. The radically changed electorate had at last got a radically changed government more representative of its true wishes: the militarist monarchy that is called the Principate.

T. F. CARNEY.  
University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

(56) An indication of its rise to power can be seen by the changes undergone in the course of the first century by the senate, an exclusive governing class in the previous century. Its traditional number of 300 was increased to 600 in 81 B.C. by Sulla (Broughton, vol. 2, 74); further increased to 900 in 45 B.C. by Caesar (who also created new patrician — i.e. aristocratic — families: Broughton, vol. 2, 305-6; Syme, 77), it finally rose to over 1000 under the Triumvirate (Syme, 196). The alteration in the social structure of the senate concurrently effected by losses in the endemic civil wars of the first century B.C. (inter alia 40 executions in 81 B.C. and 300 in 43 B.C.) is assessed by Allen, TAPA 72, 1941, 9-13; cf. Hawthorn, C & R 9, 1962, 53-60.  
(57) The last recorded census-taking of the free Republic listed 910,000 citizens (70-69); under Augustus (in 28 B.C.) 4,063,000 were on the rolls, an increase of nearly 450% (for the statistics and a commentary see Frank, ESAR I, 314-5). The admission of Italic groups en masse into the electoral wards after 88 B.C. first by the Marians, later by Pompey and Caesar, completely altered the situation created by previous gerrymandering; for an analysis cf. Taylor, Voting Districts, 101-31 and 309-15.  
(58) On the wishes of the electorate (otium rather than “libertas”) see Witzubski, 91-3; on the fundamental hostility of the Principate, as a Militiärmonarchie, to the senate see von Fritz, Tacitus, Agricola, Domitian and the Problem of the Principate, CP 92, 1957, 88-97.

When Sir Alfred Zimmern's book was first published fifty years ago, the Emperors of Austria, Germany and Russia sat firmly on their thrones; almost all of Africa and a good part of Asia were divided up among a handful of colonial powers; there was no socialist government anywhere in the world; international political organisations belonged scarcely even to the world of utopian dreams; and there had been no major war in Europe for a century. Zimmern, though more alert than most scholars of his generation to the dangers of modernisation, saw the Greeks through the spectacles of a man of the late nineteenth century. How does The Greek Commonwealth, which has just been reissued by the Oxford University Press as a paper-back, look to the reader of today? Though there were new editions in 1914, 1921, 1924 and 1931, the first of these was the only one to embody changes of any importance; for in 1912 Zimmern left the study of ancient history for wider fields. The present reprint includes two pages of preface by Russell Meiggs, who surveys in his penultimate paragraph some of the directions in which later evidence might have led Zimmern to modify his views. But what we have before us is substantially what was written in 1911. There are of course phrases which date: 'We think of Europe as "civilised." Asia as oriental or stagnant, and Africa as barbarous' (p. 21); 'Manchester would be as sorry (as Miletus at the fall of Syrabis) if the Cape were in foreign hands and we then lost control of the Suez Canal' (p. 31); 'To keep horses in Greece was what to keep a motor-car is with us' (p. 92); 'Mycenaean' is used in a way no longer acceptable, and so on. But on the whole it remains a perceptive and stimulating introduction to Greece and particularly Athens of the half-century before the Peloponnesian War, which in its long final section (pp. 213-419) gets down to the economic 'grass-roots' of classical Greek society better than had ever been done before and at least as well as in most subsequent attempts. The sixth-former or undergraduate whose over-literary approach makes him think of the Greeks as cardboard figures whose activities, fascinating though they may be, have little to do with ordinary human affairs, will get a series of salutary jolts from Zimmern.

Yet there are distortions and blind spots, some of which the author would no doubt have emended had he returned to this book in later life. Exposure of infants, particularly female infants, seems to have fascinated Zimmern. He believes that it led to a permanent imbalance of the sexes in the adult population and to the exaggerated role of male homosexuality. And yet, when we come to think of it, almost every adult male Greek whom we hear of was married, and some, like Socrates, contrived to enjoy the doubtful advantage of two wives at once. And the evidence which Zimmern cites to support his view is presented in a misleading way. The famous papyrus letter recommending exposure of a female infant (P. Oxy. 4,744) was written in Egypt in the year 1 B.C., and in any case both the reading and the interpretation of the relevant passage are doubtful. But this whole misconception about exposure of infants was dealt with by A. W. Gomme, The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C., 1933, 79-82, and need not be further discussed here. Zimmern was of course right in drawing attention to the one-sided masculinity of Greek society (which incidentally he exaggerates when he says that Athenian women never went shopping). But he gives an oversimplified explanation of it.

Again the chapter on slavery — significantly entitled 'The Fellow Workers' (the reference is to Xenophon, Memorabilia ii, 3.3) — is not really adequate. Zimmern conscientiously works out plausible figures for the slave population of Attica (though if he had allowed for the brief expectation of life of his 20,000 mine slaves the ratio of the turnover of slaves to that of citizens would be significantly increased). But he concludes that they did not play a crucial role in Athenian economy. Now he adopts a conjectural figure of 90,000 slaves, out of a total adult population — male and female — of 250,000-300,000. — This is about the same proportion as that of industrial workers to the total adult population of England in the middle of the nineteenth century, when England was the workshop of the world! Again, from many passages in this and other chapters one gets the impression that the relation of slave to master was akin to that between a post-graduate student and his supervisor. So it may have been in the best cases, but what about the rest? Why did 20,000 slaves desert to the Spartans — who were hardly likely to free them and send
them home — during the Decelean War? In fact discussion of this subject has now got far beyond the point at which Zimmern left it, and the student would be well advised to skim Zimmern’s chapter and pass straight on to the admirable collection of papers edited by M.I. Finley.

On p. 345 we find the surprising observation that ‘a Greek city was like a very big school or college’; and we must bear in mind that the school and college which Zimmern knew best were Winchester and New College, Oxford, to which he dedicates his book. This curious similitude spotlights another of his blind spots. He is inclined to see the problems of Greek society as problems of organisation, of finding the most efficient way of attaining generally recognised ends, and to underestimate the elements of conflict about ends. He is admirable on those aspects of Greek public life in which a good committee can be trusted to reach a workable compromise, but weaker on those aspects where compromise is impossible and the outcome must be victory. Hence the Peloponnesian War appears only as an afterthought in a final chapter, and the Few and the Many are never mentioned by name. It is significant of his failure to recognise the competitive side of Greek life that he believes the craftsmen in an ancient city were ‘not competitors at all’, but ‘fellows and comrades, members of the same honoured craft or guild’ (pp. 268-9). Yet what did Hesiod say? καὶ κεραμῖς κεραμεὶς κτῆτε καὶ τέκτον· τέκτων.

But within his limits Zimmern is as fresh and stimulating today as fifty years ago. The Greek Commonwealth is admirable as a first introduction to adult thinking about the Greeks. But it should be supplemented at an early stage by such books as H. D. F. Kitto, The Greeks, M. L Finley (ed.), Slavery, C. M. Bowra, The Greek Experience, G. Thomson, Aeschylus and Athens, and A. H. M. Jones, Athenian Democracy, to ensure a more rounded and balanced view.

Robert BROWNING.

University College London.


This is the third edition, revised and partly rewritten, of this literary study of Greek tragedy. It professes to be a work of criticism in the sense of an attempt to explain the form in which the literature is written. The chapter headings are Lyrical tragedy (Suppl.), Old tragedy (Pers., Sept., P.F.), The Orestiea, The dramatic art of Aeschylus, Middle tragedy (Aji, Ant., El., O.T.), The philosophy of Sophocles, The dramatic art of Sophocles, The Euripidean tragedy (Med., Hipp., Tro., Hec., Suppl., Andr., H.F.), The technique of the Euripidean tragedy, The Trachiniae and Philoctetes, New tragedy: Euripides’ tragi-comedies (Alc., I. T., Ion, Helen), New tragedy: Euripides’ melodramas (El, Or., Phoen., I.A.), Two last plays (Bacch., O. C.). The book does therefore give an interpretation of all the surviving whole plays and has much interesting to say about them; the scale is sufficiently large for many detailed problems of interpretation to be raised and discussed. It is perhaps a pity that modern scholarship is seldom mentioned and then generally only for disagreement (e.g. D. L. Page’s edition of the Agamemnon); as there is no bibliography, the general student would have been helped by a reference to the enormous amount of work which has been done since the war on Sophocles (e.g. Waldock, Whitman, Kirkwood), to R.P. Winnington-Ingram’s detailed study of the Bacchae, Zürcher’s Darstellung der Menschen, which ought to have killed a great deal of the loose talk about character drawing, and to Richmond Lattimore’s most perceptive and enlightening Poetry of Greek Tragedy.

Professor Kitto lays down a number of canons by which to judge ancient tragedy and sees Lyrical tragedy, Old tragedy, Middle tragedy, the Euripidean tragedy, tragi-comedy, and melodrama as a succession of forms with their own aims and therefore standards. The method of grouping would be more satisfactory if it were either purely chronological or purely morphological; at present it is trying to be both. The difficulties of a morphological history would have been even more obvious if the lost plays had been considered. Even without them the scheme produces some strange bedfellows. In Sophocles the Electra is Middle tragedy with the Antigone; and the Trachiniae is put with the Philoctetes. It is true that we have no simple criterion for dating Sophocles like the regular development of the iambic trimeter in Euripides, but the placing of the Trachiniae near the Antigone and of the Electra near the Philoctetes rests on a number of technical facts, and once the juxtapositions have been effected more general likeness in style and conception between the two pairs becomes apparent (the introduction to Chapter VIII suggests that Professor Kitto has now
REVIEWS

seen this). For Euripides we have the reliable criterion of metre as well as many recorded dates, and the position of Trojan Women between Hippolytus and Hecuba, of Alcestis with Helen, of Electra with Orestes flies in the face of our knowledge. Of course Professor Kitto knows that the Alcestis was produced in 438 B.C. and his grouping here is purely morphological, but then the morphology begins to appear unsound. On the Electra Zuntz’ valid plea for maintaining the stylistic date is not even mentioned. The relation between the Euripidean and Sophoclean Electra is discussed on purely general grounds: the hard facts are 1) neither play was produced before the second parabasis of the Clouds, 2) the Euripidean Electra is considerably earlier than the Trojan Women of 415 B.C., 3) the Sophoclean Electra wants to be as near the Philoctetes, 409 B.C., as possible.

The general reader should have been told the essential difference between our knowledge of Euripides and our knowledge of the other two tragedians. Nine plays (if the Rhescus is excluded) have been selected for us according to the same principles as the plays of the other two. The other nine and the considerable number of long papyrus fragments have survived by chance. Equivalent chance survivals of Aeschylus and Sophocles would probably have made a much less tidy scheme.

The fragments of Euripides show up the difficulties of morphological history. The group of tragi-comedies already includes the Alcestis of 438 B.C. with the Helen of 412 B.C., but it must also include the Crenphonies, which was written before 425 B.C., Professor Kitto does not label the Telephus; he would probably call it melodrama. So in his terminology the plays produced together in 438 B.C. would be tragedy (Cretan Women), tragedy (Alcmaeon in Prophes), melodrama (Telephus), tragi-comedy (Alcestis). I should prefer to say: 1. bad woman, 2. wronged woman, 3. camp, 4. good woman; then the parallel with the plays produced in 431 B.C. becomes clear: 1. bad woman (Medea), 2. camp (Philoctetes), 3. wronged woman (Diktytis), 4. satyr play (Theristai).

In these two years the principle is clearly variation.

In 415 B.C. the plays were 1. tragi-comedy (Alexander), 2. camp (Palamedes), 3. wronged women (Troades), 4. satyr-play (Sisyphus). The principle again is variation, but here for once the three tragedies are successive chapters in a single story. Professor Kitto notes this but does not exploit our considerable knowledge of the Alexander and Palamedes. We know enough to see the immense gain that comes to the Trojan Women from the preceding plays: Hekabe, grieving, plotting, and exultant then, now utterly broken; Kassandra, prophesying vainly then and vainly now; Andromache, the widow of Hektor, who had then stood for decent treatment of the shepherd-boy; Talthybios, the herald of the worthless Agamemnon, who allows Odysseus to do his dirty work in the Trojan Women as in the Palamedes. Paris’ moment of glory in the Alexander makes sense of the Helen debate, the most puzzling scene in the Trojan Women: Helen tells the orthodox story, Hekabe (like Herakles at the end of the H.F.) destroys it by modern philosophy (cf. her first words in 884 f.). Kassandra knows the truth (398 f.): ‘Paris married the daughter of Zeus. If he had not, no one would have spoken of his marriage.’ ‘Which would you rather: win the love of a child of heaven or vegetate successfully?’ (Murray)

But the trilogy is unique. The principle of variation can be seen wherever we know the plays that were produced together. For Euripides then at any moment at least three forms of tragedy co-existed and the task must be to write the history of the different forms, as well as saying whether any of them was particularly popular with him at a particular period. Euripides wrote a number of early plays about ‘bad women’ as well as the surviving Medea and Hippolytus and a number of late tragi-comedies besides the surviving I. T., Ion, Helen. These concentrations can be quoted in justification of Professor Kitto’s classification.

Apart from these more general questions there are many interesting points of detail which cannot be discussed here, such as the conception of Dike in the Oresteia, the importance of Creon and the necessity of the enthymeme in the Antigone, Sophocles’ use of the third actor, the unity of ideas in the Andromache. On these particularly Professor Kitto has illuminating things to say.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.
University College, London.

L. P. WILKINSON, Ovid Surveyed, an abridgement for the general reader of ‘Ovid Recalled’. Cambridge University Press, 1962, 13s. 6d.; $2.45.

When the Cambridge University Press issued ‘Ovid Recalled’ in 1955 the author indicated that the work
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was not intended as a contribution to scholarship; but the academic world welcomed it as warmly as the 'Latinate reading public' to which it was addressed. Seven years later we have the present abridgement, which the author has designed for 'Latinless readers'. Inevitably the whole apparatus of documentation, as he says, has had to go; but the enterprising reader who may wish to trace the Latin sources of the one hundred and thirty passages translated can do so by means of an appended index. There is also an index of proper names (selected). And there remain a few footnotes where their absence would be more than regrettable.

The word abridgement sometimes connotes emasculation. This descendant is as vigorous as its parent. In fact the author has incorporated some alterations suggested inter alia by N. I. Herescu's bimillenary volume Ovidiana. The presentation is almost identical, in that we have again three introductory chapters, Early Years, Latin Erotic Elegy, and The Elegiac Couplet, then seven chapters devoted to the works of Ovid, which are followed by two concluding chapters on the Fortleben of the poet: The Middle Ages, and The Renaissance. Also the nine subdivisions of the long chapter, some 50 pages, on the Metamorphoses, have all the same titles.

It was right to emphasize at the beginning the immense importance of Ovid in the cultural history of Western Europe. Undergraduates of today must be almost shocked to discover that for roughly six centuries from about the battle of Hastings Ovid's entrenched position was comparable with that of Virgil. He was lucky to be born when he was; he found at Rome a nest of singing birds; but his patron being Messalla, not Maecenas, 'he never really became, what Virgil, Horace and Propertius became in turn, sooner or later, an Augustan'. From Propertius and Tibullus he learned much in his development of the elegiac couplet to its self-contained perfection; 'Tibullus was the Waller of the Latin elegy; he paved the way for Ovid, its Pope'. As to content, 'Propertius gave his elegy a romantic, Tibullus an idyllic, Ovid a realistic and humorous colouring' [my italics]. These adjectives are essential in any consideration of Ovidian erotic elegy; and W. rightly emphasizes that the world of Roman elegy is a 'conventional world' like that of Restoration comedy; so the moral censors have sometimes missed the target. In the Amores Ovid enjoys and means to enjoy his outrageousness (nequitia) — 'we are to be entertained, not moved'. And we are reminded that Ovid's sly humour is seldom far away; it appears to.

brilliant effect in the sentimental burlesque elegy on the death of Corinna's parrot (i,6). And Venus' Clerk is ever witty and ingenious. 'His account of laying siege to a girl at a race-meeting (iii,2) is surely one of the most witty and spirited poems in all Latin.' W. rightly accords it translation in full; and here be it noted that W. has made nearly all his translations in heroic couplets; 'not', he says, 'because I have any illusions about the possibility of reproducing in English verse the stream-lined neatness of Ovid's Latin... but simply from a hope that rhyme and metre of any kind may prove more palatable to the non-classical reader than plain prose would be'. His translations are, in fact, nearly always brilliantly successful, echoing the bravura of Ovid.

It was the spirit of mischief which drove Ovid towards didactic poetry, and after the squib on cosmetics (Medicamina faciei) — fortunately a MS fragment — he set himself to enrage the conventional by his pseudodidactic poem on the Art of Love (Ars amatoria), which is so often condemned unread, and which Macaulay considered 'decidedly his best work'. W. says it is not a pornographic work, the prurient are in for disappointment; he calls it an Art of Courtship or Gallantry. In any case, with typical Roman hypocrisy, Ovid is here writing about courtiers, well-educated or clever, perhaps, not married or 'respectable' women. Apart from sex instruction, Ovid could here entertain his reader by shoals of mythological parallels (because he wrote for the well-educated) and by the descriptive 'set piece'. Another Ovidian trick was to show the reverse of things; so in the third book of A. A. 'he goes over to the woman's side and gives his advice with remarkably sympathetic insight'. One might expect Ovid similarly to defeat his own aims, as 'Praeceptor amoris', when he published his Remedia amoris in A.D. 1. Here one must quote a retained footnote: 'It is fantastic to suppose that Ovid wrote the Remedia as a sort of recantation of the Art, to appease hostile criticism. He goes out of his way to deride his critics. It is a burlesque of didactic poems about remedies, and a piquant pendant to its predecessor.' (p. 58) I quote further: 'Read by themselves, the Ars and Remedia may be accounted brilliant and entertaining works. Read after the Amores and Heroides they are apt to suffer. Quite apart from the sameness of tone, there is too much rechauffé fare.' (p. 62)

W. treats of Heroides between Amores and Ars with Remedia, but he admits that the dating of
Ovid's earlier work presents insuperable difficulties. He accepts the genuineness of all the twenty-one *Heroides*, though nos. 16-21 differ in consisting of pairs, hero's letter and heroine's reply. This will not worry the Latinless reader, but it may surprise some of the professionals. Metrical peculiarities? Yes, 'but these do not amount to much'. As to sources, they include Homer and Greek tragedy, particularly Euripides, who 'like Ovid, had tended to see things from the woman's point of view'; as to treatment, they betray the influence of the school exercise *ethopoia*. 'The heroines are mainly concerned with scoring points, whether argumentative or emotional.' In the end, we are bored. 'He cannot let well alone, as Seneca remarked.' But again we must remember the aim. 'The *Heroides* were probably not intended to move; they give a display of virtuosity designed to entertain... Nor are the heroines too miserable to make puns. I feel sure that in the *Heroides* Ovid, *a baroque spirit before his time* [my italics], was prepared to risk seeming comic if only he could seem clever.' If the *Heroides* in general end by wearying, there is the liveliness of passion in nos. 16-21. As W. says, 'Here the passion is either awakening or is at its height'. And W. singles out xvii, which depicts the struggle within the soul of Helen against infidelity.

By now Ovid was a middle-aged poet aspiring to other creation. He could not write epic, but the Hellenistic poems we call *epyllia* gave him his inspiration towards weaving his famous tapestry of stories of metamorphosis. 'The idea of linking such stories had already occurred to Callimachus and Nicander: and that of arranging them chronologically had also occurred to others. What was new, so far as we know, was the systematic combination of these two features in one work, and that a work of poetry.' (There is, of course, more than metamorphosis.) There is an amazing wealth of narrative, from the Creation to the apotheosis of Julius Caesar, a huge work (longer, we are reminded than the *Aeneid* or *Paradise Lost*), indebted greatly to the *Aetia* of Callimachus and inevitably written in the hexameter of epic and epyllia. 'But Ovid's hexameter is unlike Virgil's. The gravity, variety of rhythm and expressiveness of Virgil's verse were due largely to heavy elision, but also to pauses in the line and to free use of spondees, whereas Ovid dispensed as much as possible with elision, tended to pause at the caesura or at the end of the line, and was in general more dactylic, sacrificing everything to lightness and speed.' W. writes with great discernment and enthusiasm about 'this masterpiece of Graeco-Roman baroque art'. Baroque art, he reminds us, tends to be grandiose, arresting, theatrical; full of restless and exuberant vitality, it strives after variety, strangeness and contrast — now fantastical, now playful, now picturesque. Indifferent to truth, it claims the right to exaggerate or deceive for artistic ends. And he adds, 'the *Metamorphoses* is "baroque" in conception with its huge extent of ceaseless movement, its variety, its fantasy, its conceits and shocks, its penchant for the grotesque and its blend of humour and grandiosity'. Wit, humour and description enhance a work primarily narrative; and W. notes that the freshness of Ovid's vision is particularly evident in his similes. In this ostensibly chronological work the poet takes creation and the gods, so to speak, in his stride. 'It would have put everything out of gear if he had not accepted the mythological gods along with the legends.' We remember Quintilian's observation: 'lascivus quidem in herois quoque Ovidius.' He was the child of his time.

The last two books of the *Metamorphoses* deal in part with legends of Rome and so in a sense overlapped the *Fasti*, that antiquarian work on which the poet was already engaged. Ovid the man of intelligence, the inquiring spirit, appears notably in this work, which W. calls 'a jumble of astronomy, history, legend, religion, superstition, scholarship, guesswork, and antiquarian lore'. The main sources of inspiration are clear. 'The literary grandparents of the *Fasti* are, on the aetiological side, the *Aetia* of Callimachus, admired of all Roman elegists, and on the astronomical side the no-less admired *Phaenomena* of Aratus. Their father is clearly the last book of Propertius.' But W. is sure that Livy's new work was laid under contribution, since there are verbal similarities in the versions of the stories of the Fabii and Lucretia. 'The *Aeneid* and the history of Livy are the greatest monuments to the Augustan desire to reawaken in the Roman people a pride in their past, but the *Fasti* too could play its part.' Unhappily Ovid strayed from national lore to gross flattery of the Emperor, 'which anticipates the excesses of Silver Age poets'. If one asks how informative is the work, W. replies: 'There is a common idea that the *Fasti* are a source of unique importance for knowledge of Roman religion, but in fact most of the information it gives could be derived from other sources. No, it is as literature that the poem must stand or fall, as a popular introduction to Roman religion.' The metre is changed back to the elegiac couplet, which permitted a rather staccato kind of
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narrative. ‘Here indeed it does excel, with its rapid fire of direct speech, commands, apostrophes, questions, interjection, parentheses, and short dialogue. One is reminded of those stories in Livy where, as the tension increases, he breaks into a panting movement of short sentences.’

The Fasti were never finished, for by A.D. 8 the hostility of Augustus culminated in the removal of the poet from Italy. W. says there are only two tenable theories to account for the punishment; either Ovid became involved in the dynastic tension between the Julians and Claudians, or (more likely) he became undesignedly an accessory to Julia’s adultery. One tends to put together for assessment all the post-exilic poetry of Ovid. The letters from the Black Sea differ (as the poet notes) from the Tristia (written A.D. 8-13) only in that they no longer concealed the recipients’ names. W. treats of Tristia i and ii in a separate chapter; ‘the changing scenes of the voyage give variety to the first book and the second is full-scale apologia. The remaining seven books of epistles may be treated as an entity, for they are all too homogeneous.’ Subject and treatment are monotonous. As W. remarks, ‘The wit that seasoned with its salt the poems of his happier days is still there, but it has lost its savour.’ Gibbon observed that these poems have ‘besides the merit of elegance, a double value. They exhibit a picture of the human mind under very singular circumstances; and they contain many curious observations, which no Roman, except Ovid, could have the opportunity of making’. W. replies: ‘That is true, but the picture is exhibited far too often, while the observations are tantalizingly few.’ As to the curious Ibis, inspired by a lost poem of Callimachus, W. neatly remarks that ‘it has the qualities of the winning entry in a competition in invective set by a literary magazine’.

Many readers will be very grateful for the two final chapters summarizing (almost as fully as the original book) the fortunes of Ovid in the western world. It was only after the Carolingian age that Ovid came into his own; the aetas Ovidiana falls in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The twelfth century was the age of the Wandering Scholars (Clerici Vagantes), whom Ovid suited to perfection. Nevertheless the contemporary puritans could find in Ovid a moral purpose—the Ars amatoria was taken as an aid to chastity—and if no moral were forthcoming recourse was had to allegorisation. The Metamorphoses ‘remained the indispensable source of mythology’. When the local Latin dialects developed into the vernacular languages Ovid became known in translation. Chaucer refers more to Ovid and his works than any other author. And W. notes that both poets ‘discovered in mid-career that their métier was story-telling; and both were intensely interested in psychology, especially that of women’.

The chapter on the Renaissance introduces us to a very large subject; a fascinating chapter, if only for the glimpses of Shakespeare and Milton borrowing from the Metamorphoses and Fasti. All the Elizabethan poets, says W., borrowed from Ovid, but it was Shakespeare who knew best how to value him.

In the lifetime of Milton and Molière the reputation of Ovid began to fade. In the Epilogue W. suggests seven reasons for this decline, at least in England. The bimillenary of Ovid has seen the beginning of a revaluation of one of the greatest literary figures of Western Europe; this sympathetic presentation of the man and his work will encourage it.

The work of abridgement is here skilfully done. There is a slip on page 109 where the denigration of Odysseus/Ulysses is under discussion. Owing to an excision of text ‘denigration of him’ appears to refer instead to Ajax of the last sentence. On page 98 we read: ‘Ovid’s interest in psychology comes out especially in the five soliloquies expressing the conflict in the soul of a woman about to commit a crime.’ In the original book the names of the five, with references, are specified in a footnote. These are trifles.

It would be unfair to end without praise of W.’s elegant translations. They are mainly in heroic couplets. Here is his version in stanza form of the epilogue to the Metamorphoses:

So ends my work, that not Jove’s wrath, nor flame,
Nor steel can vanquish, nor devouring age.
Let come that day, which o’er this mortal frame
Alone has power, to end my pilgrimage,
Yet shall my better part have heritage
Among the stars, indelible my name.
Wherever Rome extends her sway my page
Shall there be read; and if what bards proclaim
Has truth, throughout all time I shall survive in
[fame!]

W. A. LAIDLAW.
Queen Mary College, London.
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Ross continues his series of Aristotle commentaries with an excellent commentary on De Anima. Oddly enough his edition of the same work for the Oxford Classical Texts (1956) is mentioned only on the dustcover of the present volume.

For the text Ross professes himself to be heavily indebted to Forster's edition (Budapest, 1912). There are however quite a few instances where the apparatus criticus is adorned by a first person singular. It would have been useful if the author had included the following list:

1. 403a13 [χαλωθ]  
2. 403a15 τι  
3. 403a29 [τε]  
4. 403b6 <αδ>  
5. 403b9 ἐστιν εἷς  
6. 403b18 <ολα>  
7. 404a29 [τῶν]  
8. 405b28 <διὰ τὸ>  
9. 407a27 ἐχωναί  
10. 407b29 καν  
11. 407b29 γενεσιμένως  
12. 408b7 τι τούτοις  
13. 409a13 [τι]  
14. 409a24 ἀπειρα  
15. 411a1 εἰ δὲ  
16. 411b25/6 ὀμοιοθῆ ὅστιν ἄλληλοις  
17. 412a16 καὶ σῶμα καὶ τούτῳδε  
18. 416a1 <τὸ>  
19. 417a30a <ὅντες, ἐνεργεία ἐπιστημόνες>  
20. 417b4 ἐνεργείᾳ ὅστις τοῦ δόγματι  
21. 418a14 [μέν]  
22. 419b18 καν  
23. 420a4 ἀκοὴ δὲ συμφωνής <ὅστιν> ἄρη  
24. 420a6/7 corruptela  
25. 420a15 [ὅταν καμῆ]  
26. 420a15 ἄλλον ἄδικον  
27. 420a12 ὧδον ὄδ  
28. 420b16 τῷ γαρ ἦδη  
29. 420b21 <δὲ>  
30. 420b26 ἐκόμιον ἄναπαυμένον  
31. 421a32 [ἀπὸ τούτοις]  
32. 421b7 <ἐνεργ>  
33. 422a2 ἀποκαλύπτεται  
34. 422a10 της ἄφθοι  
35. 422a21 τε  
36. 422a32/3 τοῦ .. τοῦ  
37. 422b6 ἄφθοι  
38. 423a2 <τί>  
39. 423a4 ἐνεργείαν  
40. 424b7 ὅπερ ὀδυμῆς  
41. 424b8 <δὲ .. ἄλλον> (?)  
42. 425a17 [κανές]  
43. 425b1 χαλωθ δτι  
44. 426b6 [συμφωνία] (?)  
45. 427a3 [κατά]  
46. 427a18 νοεῖν καὶ φρονεῖν  
47. 428a3 <ἄρα>  
48. 428a15 πότερον  
49. 428a17 ἀλήθευσαν  
50. 428a27 διάτι  
51. 428a29 ἄρα  
52. 430a1 ἐνεργείαν  
53. 430a19/22 [το ... ὦ νοεῖ]  
54. 430b2/3 <φη, τὸ λευκόν καὶ>  
55. 430b17 ἄλλοτέρως ἐκείνως ἀδιάφρατα  
56. 430b20θ ἐνεργείᾳ τῷ  
57. 430b24 τινι μηδὲν  
58. 431a19 <ἡ>  
59. 431a23 δντα  
60. 431a27/8 ΠΑ .. ΑΒ  
61. 431b10 ἔν  
62. 431b13/14 <νοεῖ> — <τίς> — δὲ ηεί κοίλον — [ἐι τίς] — [ἐνεργεία]  
63. 431b15 <δντα>  
64. 434a1 ἄφθοι  
65. 434a28 ἐνεργείαν αὐτὴν  
66. 434a30a vsb 28-29 hic posuit  
67. 434b8 <δὲ>  
68. 434b12/3 [ἀπό τὸν .. ἄφθοι]  
69. 434b13 [καὶ]  
70. 435a25 <ὅτι γὰρ ἔστιν> (?)  

Even for the notoriously difficult text of Aristotle, this, in 1961, is not a poor showing for 85 pages of Greek text cum app. crit. I can only discuss a small selection. The first two rest on the proposition that Aristotle's language in this passage ought to be as mathematical as his thought. This would seem a weak basis for interfering with the combined forces of the codices and ancient commentators: in fact the second clause may very well have been inserted as a corrective of the first because the word χαλωθ was there. No reasons are given for a number of the conjectures, e.g. 3 and 7. Number 4 seems eminently necessary, as do 5 and 6. I am not sure that the attractive change in 427a27 is necessary. The full force of Ross's shrewd approach to the text of Aristotle is contained in the simple change from ἀπειράς to ἀπειρα in 409a24, a reading which did not make much sense before, though nobody cared to admit it. Sometimes his conjectures are little
more than an improvement on a previous attempt. So in 417a30 where Torstrik’s conjecture was on the right track; Ross’s however is less cumbersome and palaeographically more acceptable. In 421b7 Ross following Theiler’s advice (Gnomon 30, 1958, p. 444) has more closely followed the reading of Ce, but he has kept <elao>, which reads more smoothly. Again no explanation is given in the commentary. The changes in 434a28 ff, present (as most of the above) in the edition for OCT, 1956, have been kept despite Theiler’s objections (loc. cit.).

On the whole it must be said that, even after Torstrik’s work, the text in Ross’s hands has become much clearer in several points of detail.

Ross expresses a cautious opinion on the date of the De Anima: ‘... it may well be that the writing of the De Anima was, in whole or in part, done after Aristotle’s return to Athens in 325-4.’ The main argument on which he bases this theory is the frequency of the word ἐπιθέλεσθαι in the works of Aristotle, which seems to show that De Anima was written ‘about the same time’ as Physics, De Generatione et Corruptione and Metaphysics. This opinion is in sharp contrast with the position the author still took in 1949 (Aristotle, 5th ed. revised p. 19) viz. that De Anima III belongs to an early period: Nuyens has been able to convince Ross against Jaeger. It is not here the place to react against Armando Plebe’s objections in Riv. di Fil. e di Istr. Class. ns 40, 1 p. 59 ff., who maintains that ‘la dottrina dell’ ἐπιθέλεσθαι sorge proprio dalla prima problematica platonizzante dell’ Aristotele’ (p. 61). I admit to being sceptical of a conclusion relying so exclusively on one single argument: a more ample discussion of this problem that touches the very heart of Aristotle’s chronology would have been very welcome.

The commentary, strong and succinct, needs little comment. Ross is sparing with references: specifically I should have liked to see references to modern commentaries on the Presocratics, even if this would have increased the bulk of the work. Also the element of polemic has been cut down to a bare minimum, with the result that the comments are readable. The paraphrases or analyses at the beginnings of each section are masterpieces. The list of contents is useful.

One would have liked to see an index to the commentary, including authors and passages quoted, in addition to the index of Greek words, improved since Theiler’s comment (loc. cit.).

O. A. W. Dilke, Horace: Epistles I, second (revised) edition, Methuen 1961. Pp. ix + 156 (with vocabulary 186); 9s. (with vocabulary 10s. 6d.).

Commentaries on Horace are not rare; that Dilke’s book has merited a revised edition after only seven years is proof of its worth. The eleven introductory sections and the 82 pages of notes contain much sane comment, apt quotation and helpful warning against facile misunderstandings. The hard-pressed teacher and the less well-grounded undergraduate will bless this aid. Those who want to dig deeper into the allusions or to appreciate expressive techniques or poetic structures must look elsewhere for their tools; but Dilke’s patient unravelling of political, social and cultural references is well fitted to a text which is the supreme example of a civilized ancient’s engagement in his contemporary world.

To general competence, and to some points which were already excellent (like the note on vi, 1), the second edition has added small improvements on over 30 pages. Some are in response to critics or to recent books and papers (e.g. p. 13 fn. 1; p. 71, synopsis of i; on iii, 10; on iv, 6; on v, 6; on x, 44-5; on xi, 30; on xvi, 23; on xix, 28). It is welcome to have the inaccurate use of ‘cognate’ (accusative) discarded in favour of ‘internal limiting’ at i, 50 and xix, 44; but the old evil lingers at v, 2. A broader outlook is signalled by evidence of fresh reading — but equally by the replacement of ‘Christmas’ by ‘midwinter’ in the note on xi, 18, which shows the influence of sojourn in the southern hemisphere! But sometimes Dilke, with fine intransigence, declines to modify his line: at xiv, 48 he hardens against the possibility of taking piger with bos, on the sound ground that the horse’s fallacy in thinking ploughing a softer option does not mean he cannot think it. But he may still be wrong: piger probably belongs to both bos and caballus (apo koinou). The note on suspensi loculos (i, 56) is substantially new and better; but it still fails to handle correctly the degree of overlap between Latin and the three Greek uses (middle, passive with retained accus., and accus. of respect) and does not mention the accus. of respect with non-passive verbs, like tremis ossa (S. ii, 7.57). The new version might have repaired some omissions (e.g. to p. 9 and fn. 2 add Catull. xliv, 1-5; on vii, 27 why not quote dedit... spernere volgus C ii, 16.39 f.; on xvi, 78-9 one should mention C. ii, 19.14 f.); and it might have found room, among the sporadic references to scholarly discussions, on pp. 2 and 4 for...
Fraenkel's words on coactor and scriptus quaestorius (Horace, pp. 5, 14) and on pp. 5 and 151 for Wistrand's ideas on Actium and xx, 23 (Horace's Ninth Epode etc., passim and pp. 38 f.). Syme's useful remarks on P. Volumnius Eutrapelus (JRS 1961, 26 f.) appeared too late to enlarge the note at xviii, 31.

The saddest feature is the failure to remove positive blemishes. (The somewhat indigestible list which follows must, however, be offset by the assurance that the reviewer for one will still look first in Dilke when halted by obscurity of reference in Epistles I.)

P. 9 and p. 152: is it fair to convict Horace of being bad-tempered on the evidence of xx,25, especially in view of S. i,9 (and vv. 11 f. there); and are Damasippus and Lydia so trustworthy in their rudeness? P. 18 fn. 2 can hardly stand after the scathing words (about someone else) of I. M. Campbell in JRS 1955, 219. P. 32 fn. 1 and p. 117: the length of the first syllable of the type obicio is probably a poetic readjustment, not a direct inheritance of the etymology. P. 32: lingua is irrelevant to the rule it is used to illustrate, and suavis may be catered for (a beginner might object) by fn. 2. P. 33: if anteis has internal elision why cannot deest have internal prodelision? Our beginner might again point to fn. 1. P. 86: duceret (iii, 27) is still given two explanations; 'attraction' and extension of modal value are quite different things. P. 95: a mint-par equation of a talent with £1000 is quite meaningless, the more so since £4500 was suggested as long ago as 1951 (see CR 1955, 316). P. 101: on vii, 38 it is unsafe to cite S. ii, 6.20, where 'lane' is direct object of (normal) audis. P. 110: on esses in x, 50 the reviewer's suggestion is still garbled, and a subjunctive of self-quotation may be less relevant than the colloquial but no doubt frequent quod + subjunctive as a vehicle of Oratio Obliqua (cf. Bell. Hisp. 86)—Horace's words may be equivalent to quamquam fatebar quod... esses. Above all:—on xvii, 10 (p. 132), 'end your years unnoticed' is incorrect for lathe biōsas (the aorist participle is conventional with the aorist of the finite verb lanthanō; hence 'live in obscurity'); on xiv, 22.3 (p. 120), Horace is not 'praising the same estate' in C. ii, 6.13-14—those verses refer to Tarentum; and the note on iv, 3 (p. 88) mangles history so much as to reincarnate Sextus Pompeius after Actium.

The new edition has not been as happy in its proof-reading as the old. Misprints have been introduced on p. 105 line 8, p. 107 line 4, p. 113 sixth line from foot, p. 114 line 18 (read 'laugher'), p. 121 first and fourth lines from foot, and p. 137 second line from foot.

N. E. COLLINGE.

Durham.


SOSTRATOS: The bad tempered old man? I think I know him.

GORGIA: You can't know how bad tempered! His farm is worth about two talents, and yet he works his land with his own hands, with nobody to help him—no servant of his own, no hired labour, no neighbours—but he does it all himself. His greatest pleasure is to see nobody. His daughter is with him most of the time he is working, and she is the only person he talks to. Nobody else at all. Not unless forced to. He says he will only let her marry when he finds her a husband like himself.

SOSTRATOS: That means never.

GORGIA: So give up the idea—you'll only be wasting your time. Bad luck has given the burden of dealing with him to us, his relations. I should leave it that way.

(325-340)

This translation aims at plain informal English suitable for acting. It is attractive in giving Menander's dialogue an authentic air of ease and familiarity, without losing sight of the pace and economy of the original. I share the authors' preference for prose; they use verse for the lively scene in the last Act, where Menander changes both metre and mood, but do not convince me (as they often do earlier) that their choice of style was fortunate:

Too much din

And drink in there. Nobody'll take in

What we are doing. Do it we must. The fellow Has joined the family. If we cannot mellow Him now, the job of putting up with him Will be intolerable.

(901-905)

Some stage directions are provided. They are written 'to assist the reader to visualise the play as it would appear on a modern stage.' Among other
things, the set is supposed to show Knemon's house as if it were 'some hundred or two yards' from the shrine of Pan and the Nymphs, and separated from it by a public road. Menander, however, exploited the fact that in the theatre for which he wrote Knemon's house and the shrine were to be literally next door to each other; and the text reflects this, for instance at 10 ff., 204, 442 ff. and 668 (the first passage appears badly mangled in the form 'He's never made the effort to greet anyone except when he's absolutely forced to speak to a neighbour'). Modern readers and producers can reasonably claim to rethink Menander's lines in their own terms, but translators surely help best by staying within the limits set by the text. Otherwise confusion follows; and in this translation, the beginning of Act III (pp. 28-9) is particularly misleadingly annotated: e.g. the Greek does not admit the view that 'Plangon, hurry up...' etc. is addressed to someone inside the shrine, nor did Menander make the Cook and Getas 'remain outside and busy themselves with the camp fire'. The notion that two doors to Knemon's house were visible in Menander's own first production (p. 13) seems to rest on nothing better than a false interpretation of 516, echoed (and duly repeated in the translation) at 925f.

On the credit side, it is well to recall the translators' problem in coping at all with a text which, though virtually complete in the papyrus which gave it to us, was still in the first stages of being established and interpreted when they began their work. Many points still remain uncertain. Perhaps this review should echo the warning given on p. 14 that the text translated is not that of any single edition, but made up eclectically with the aid of the earlier critical work on the play. On the whole, Hewitt and Pope seem to have used their resources judiciously, though there are errors and misinterpretations which should have been avoided, and at times the translation (understandably) skates over a difficulty which will confront those who use it to help them with the Greek. Readers new to Menander should find the brief introduction interesting and helpful; and this attractively produced publication should add to their number.

E. W. Handley.

University College London.


This recently published Latin grammar has some refreshing novel qualities; in the author's words 'it presents the outline of a carefully reconsidered method of teaching Latin'. An attempt, and a very successful one, has been made to rationalize and streamline the accident. The crushing incubus of Kennedy's 80 tenses - 10 tenses each of 4 regular conjugations, twice over (active and passive) - each in its own ovile, has been dispersed by rational grouping, thus markedly alleviating the task of memorization. The meaning of the tenses are first introduced in English (p. xi), a very necessary procedure if formal grammar in the home language has received the same treatment in English schools as it has in South African. The author rightly insists that pupils lacking a linguistic grasp of English (p. viii) should eschew the study of Latin.

Perhaps the most novel aspect of the book is the change of order in treating the declensions: 3, 2, 1, 4, 5; the third is taken first as offering a richer yield of useful vocabulary, but it has been shorn of most of its terrors resulting from the overnice detail of classification that characterized the older grammars (p. xi refers to the 27 types of third declension nouns in Kennedy).

The idea of offering the sentences for translation in pairs (Latin-Eng., Eng.-Latin, p. ix) so selected as to illustrate each other must have cost much labour; it is well worth a trial. But I wonder whether there are enough exercises; Vocabulary 7 e.g. contains 36 new words; the exercise consists of 15 sentences each way; it is of course possible to use all 36 words in those 30 short sentences; but can they be employed sufficiently frequently to drive home the large number of potential forms (cases, tenses, persons)? I am also inclined to think that smaller units (i.e. shorter chapters) would be preferable. As it is, only 9 chapters in the 3 year course (8 in the 4 year) are done during the entire first term. Shorter units would make it easier for the teacher to set his immediate target and would give a fillip to the study by stressing the consciousness of progress which, according to L. W. P. Lewis, is such an effective aid in all teaching.

The book most usefully serves the purpose of both a 3 and a 4 year course (see p. xiv); the reading lessons (pp. 209 sqq.) have been skilfully graded to correspond with the grammar lessons in the earlier part, thus practising the theory that we learn Latin
to read Latin. The author insists on the importance of Latin word order, firstly by means of a most diverting series of illustrations (pp. 24-26), and subsequently (pp. 295-300) in a more sustained appendix. The types of exercises are effectively varied from time to time (e.g. Ex. 5B; 10B; 25B); a great deal more of this would have been welcome. Now and again there are stimulating obiter dicta (vel quaesita): 'What is difference between multi nostrum and multi nostrorum?' (p. 41) Questions that a bright boy needs must ask have been anticipated, e.g. p. 68 after 'in summa arbo>re', the information is offered: 'the highest tree is arborum altissima.' There are helpful hints on the best methods of tackling certain parts of the work, e.g. a profitable way of acquiring a vocabulary (pp. 83-84).

A few points of detailed criticism are appended:

P. 4 (Ch. 2): 'Sunt milites in via'; rather use urbe which occurs in this ch.; the 1st decl. is not touched upon before Ch. 6.

P. 7 ferox. This adj. as often as not has a favourable meaning (gallant, spirited), which ought to be given since the Eng. derivatives ferocious and ferocity never have that nuance.

P. 41 'se (sese) is both singular and plural'; add 'masculine and feminine'.

Same p. 'tuus your (sing.) and vester your (plur.)' are not unambiguous enough since the singularity (or plurality) may refer to the noun with these pronouns.

P. 44 'Nomen mihi Publio est' surely requires to be remarked upon?

P. 64 It would be safer to say 'after the conjunction ne (and a few others) anyone' is translated by quis quis quid'.

P. 65 Deliberative Question: it would be a better illustration to use a 1st or 2nd conj. example where —em or —eam could not be mistaken for a simple future, or else to use the plur. committamus, and to justify the ways of grammarians to boys by drawing attention to the point.

This is a book that will prove very attractive to use with a bright class; with boys less gifted some lessons will require considerable additional material and help on the black-board. The method and especially the interlocking of the grammar and the reading matter deserves high commendation.

H. L. GONIN.
University of Pretoria, South Africa.


Both books are published in the series 'Modern School Classics'; A. assumes that the pupil will not have read a Greek play before, B. is designed to 'enlarge the range of reading matter available to the middle forms' — in effect it, too, assumes that the reader is coming to Greek tragedy for the first time. Each contains an introduction which deals with the background and origin of tragedy, the Greek theatre, the life and work of Euripides, the myths on which the plays are based (B. has this section in separate introductions to the text) and metre. Each gives excerpts from the text, linked by explanatory passages in English; A. (about 800 lines of Greek) includes some choral and lyric passages, B. (about 500 lines from each play) confines itself to iambic trimeters. In each case the text is followed by notes and a vocabulary. B. has a dozen good illustrations, mostly from vases.

The quality and usefulness of the books is very unequal: B. is quite sophisticated in approach: a serious, though obviously brief, discussion of the origins of tragedy is given, as opposed to A.'s single paragraph, which asserts bluntly that tragedy grew out of dithyramb; B.'s description of costume is vague, but it does not jar as does the statement in A.: 'They wore large painted masks and high-soled boots and padded clothes in order to be conspicuous to the spectators on the topmost row. With masks, facial expression was impossible; so also was rapid movement with a six-inch clog tied beneath a boot. The actors therefore had to rely entirely on their voices.' Even were the earlier part of the statement true, one wonders what was to prevent them from gesturing with their arms.

In editions of this kind, the notes must be of great importance, and here again B. scores. It gives careful guidance on unusual verbal forms and points of syntax, as well as giving a fair running commentary on the action of the play and referring to other authors with whom the reader is likely to be familiar (e.g., in the note to 1.4 of the Helen reference is made to Homer, Vergil and Herodotus). The notes to A. are very much briefer, and it is not easy to
discover the principle on which they are composed: e.g., the reader is told (n. to 1.18) that ἀνδρῶν is a part of ἀνήνη, and (n. to 1.26) that λάβη is a part of λαμβάνομεν. but it is assumed that he will recognise the construction ἃτιον λάβη; knowledge is not however assumed of the ἀποτελέσει ἔνθεκτος construction (n. to 1.270). A. does sensibly explain the use in the text of square and pointed brackets — though one explanation (n. to 1.239) is inaccurately stated — but then begins (n. to 1.239a) to use square brackets in a way which is not explained until the note to 1.311. Again, no explanation at all is given of the line of dots (Murray’s) in the text after 1.961.

Rightly, the editors of both books have not incorporated in the notes discussion of disputed passages: they have generally inserted readings which are translatable, without comment. However, B.’s note to ll. 2-3 of the Helen ignores Campbell’s discussion in CR 68 (1949) 82-3, which points out that the appendix is impossible logic and impossible Greek.

A. is to be congratulated on retaining the line numeration of the Oxford text; B. has renumbered the lines (giving appendices indicating the numbering of the OCT), which is, I think, unnecessary, and will certainly be inconvenient for at any rate the teacher using the book.

Both books will be a helpful introduction to reading tragedy for the student who is fairly new to Greek. A. will need considerable supplementary explanation (and, sometimes, correction) by the teacher, whereas B. could safely be given to the student for private reading: it may perhaps prove especially useful, as a supplement to set texts, to the student who begins Greek at the university.

M. P. FORBER

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland


The last edition of a complete Argonautica was that of Mooney, published in 1912; with regard to the text Mooney, using the same material as Merkel, made no substantial advance upon the editio maior 1854 of his predecessor. Alexandrian poetry is not so richly endowed with extant works that such a situation could be allowed to remain unchallenged indefinitely. An edition, based upon a reconsideration of all existing material — available today in greater quantities than formerly — was an urgent requirement. This requirement has been met, and its conditions fulfilled, by Hermann Fränkel’s new edition published in the O.C.T. series.

Conforming to the standard distribution of contents in this series, the text and Apparatus Criticus occupy the body of the book. An additional feature of this part of the work, and a useful departure from the common practice, is a list, inserted between text and Apparatus Criticus on each page, of references to all relevant passages from the indirect tradition. The text is preceded by a Praefatio Critica, somewhat longer than usual, and written in a clear succinct Latin which should present few difficulties. The volume is terminated by an accurate index of proper names.

In his Preface Fränkel followed the lead of many previous editors in one respect: the opportunity to attempt a solution of the long-standing problem of the προέκδοσις proved irresistible. He supposes that during composition the Argonautica was subjected to a continual process of revision by the author during which he allowed copies to be taken at various times for private use: that the word προέκδοσις refers to one of two editions prepared at some later date and based upon different private copies. The idea of two editions (to say nothing of three), in the strict sense of a completed work, published in the lifetime of Apollonius himself is at last abandoned, and rightly so. Although Fränkel adduces as evidence only works produced in similar circumstances, his hypothesis is eminently sensible and in accord with ancient practice. However an alternative explanation of προέκδοσις seems to be disregarded by Fränkel i.e. that the προέκδοσις might be the earlier of two editions by the same man. Fränkel himself cites as a parallel case the two Aristarchean editions of Homer.

The remainder of the preface is largely occupied by an account of the three types of tradition — ancient (papyri), mediaeval (Mss), and indirect (lexica, scholia, etc.) — on which the text of the Argonautica is founded. After listing all papyri published before his edition went to print, Fränkel undertakes a statistical analysis of the ancient text, as it appears on papyrus. The results of this analysis — 67 new correct readings in 60-1 hexameters — does not speak well for the integrity of the Mss. This result, which Fränkel himself confesses to be inaccurate, is fully borne out by a number of unpublished papyri of the Argonautica on which I am working at present.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The account of the MSS. tradition is essentially a restatement of an article published in Nachr. Gott. Ges. d. Wiss. 1929. In contrast to previous editors who used only 26 MSS. as the basis of their text, Fränkel had 52 at his command. His treatment of the MSS. tradition is the most revolutionary feature of this edition. The MSS. are classified into three families: all three families are descended wholly or in part from a common archetype, well provided with variants. Each family is descended from a no longer extant hyparchetype which Fränkel denotes by the letters m: w: k. In the App. Crit. Fränkel has recorded the readings of the two chief descendants of each hyparchetype i.e. m = Laurentianus 32.9 (L); Ambrosianus 120 (B.26 sup.); w = Soloranus i.e. Laurentianus Gr. 32.16 (S); Guelpherytanus Aug. 2996 (G); k = Parisinus Gr. 2727 (P); Escorialensis iii 3 (E). The text of m and w is wholly descended from the archetype; the relationship between archetype, m, w, and their descendants is represented in stemmatic form. This is not done, however, in the case of the more complex tradition of k, which is dependent partly on the archetype, partly on other unknown exemplars, and was copied originally, perhaps, from a text very similar to that employed by the first hand of L. It would have been an advantage to the layman, if the position of k in the stemma had also been noted, even if only approximately.

At one point Fränkel's account of the tradition seems incomplete, i.e. how far the total dependence of m and w on the archetype extends to their descendants LA SG; for a certain coincidence in peculiar errors between k and A, k and SG, k and S alone or G alone, which Fränkel confesses himself unable to explain, seems to suggest that the MSS. in question are not entirely free from contamination.

— The value of S was recognised by Merkel who regretted that he did not possess a full collation. In this edition it attains its rightful position. Of equal stemmatic value to G, it has preserved a less corrupt text. However, in connection with this Fränkel has failed to mention one or two things which in my opinion have some bearing on the assessment of its worth. S., which is, in all probability, a Planudean MS. (cf. Gallavotti, Riv. Fil. Cl. 1934, p. 362, sq.; Browning, B.I.C.S. 1960, 16 sq.), in several instances (e.g. ii 1015 *leòv* p. corr. S, D sch LA lemma: *leóv* & L, A. corr. S, GPE:) coincides, against the rest of the tradition, in peculiar readings — not, however, errors — with a manuscript D (i.e. Paris. Gr. 2729, vid. Fr. Pr. Crit. p. xiv.) which, there is reason to believe, preserves traces of an old otherwise unknown tradition. Moreover at iv, 474 a correct reading, hitherto attested only by S, is now to be found also in a fragment of papyrus which I have recently published in B.I.C.S. 1960, 45-56. The inference is perhaps that the many readings of S which Fränkel assigns to conjecture are in fact the fruit of collation with an old, perhaps uncial manuscript (cf. Browning, op. cit.). — The myth, current since Merkel, that L preserves by far the best text, is at last exploded, SG being seen to offer a slightly less corrupt text than LA.

When we turn to the text itself, we find, as might be expected, that this too is somewhat revolutionary. (Two sentences from the preface, which are cited below, are clearly indicative of the attitude which Fränkel adopts towards the preparation of the text. 1) 'In textu Apolloniano constituendo permuta novavi, temere quod sciam nihil' and 2) 'Malui tamen pericitari quam declinare officium (sc. emendationis, etc.) aut qua videarentur ferri non posse, sequo animo tolerare.' It might seem at first sight that Fränkel has laid himself open to the charge of attempting to rewrite the Argonautica. But the charge would be without foundation. Fränkel justifies his attitude by pointing to the paucity of textual critics of the Argonautica and the complete reliance of most of these on the authority of L, and indirectly, it seems to me, by the evidence of papyri. Since the time of Mooney (papyri were used by Gillies in 1928) papyri have won increasing recognition as a valuable asset in the establishment of a text. Their use is twofold. They function both as repositories of new readings and as criteria by which the degree of corruption, to which a text has been subject during transmission, may be judged. Papyri of the Argonautica supply approximately one new correct reading in every ten lines. An examination of the indirect tradition leads to a proportionately similar result. Thus the authority of the manuscripts is diminished, and an editor must rely more on his own ingenuity to produce a readable text.

Despite producing a readable text Fränkel has retained a scientific approach to the task throughout the edition. The modern concept of the duty of an editor is that he should not deny his readers the same opportunity as he himself had of choosing among all available readings. This edition conforms admirably to this concept. His Apparatus Criticus, within predetermined limits, is a model of fullness. Its chief feature is, of course, the recording of all useful readings and the peculiarities (eg. lacunae) of
the six Mss. LASGPE. In addition it contains papyrus readings and the evidence of a more complete indirect tradition than has been hitherto used, including, besides the *Etymologicum Magnum* and scholia, the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (passim) and all grammarians who have preserved quotations from the *Argonautica*, e.g. Choeroboscus iii, 1; Helliodorus in Dionysius Thrax i, 955. Moreover Fränkel frequently refers the reader to parallel or instructive passages from other authors, in particular Homer and Callimachus. Conjectures, printed in the text or merely noted in the *App. Crit.*, are recorded in large numbers. Every emendation of merit, from whatever source, seems to have been included. Fränkel’s own conjectures are perhaps even more numerous, and many of them are of considerable interest. These fall into two categories:— 1) conjectures, printed in the text itself; particularly worthy of note are:—i, 767: Mss. are divided. *παρὸς* *διοικεῖν*; S: *διοικεῖ τοι* LA: *νῦν διοικεῖ τοι* PE: Fränkel conjectures with some hesitation, *περιποίητα* *comparing ἑπιστοριάς* Call. Hym. 2,32, the word *περιποίητας* and 11,721 sp. In spite of its boldness it might well be right. i.18: Mss. *ἐκ τῆς κλείουσας* : Brunck *ἐξωκλείουσαν* : Fränkel defends the Mss. reading by ‘per carmina quae etiam exstant’. This explanation opens wide fields for speculation in respect of early Alexandrian poetry in general and the sources of the *Argonautica* in particular. 2) proposed emendations, noted in the *App. Crit.* only, e.g. ii, 830: Mss. *ἐσόντο* *δ’ αὐτής ἄνωτος* ; Fränkel *ἐσόντο* *δ’ αὐτής ἄνωτος*, *comparing Od. 19, 445. iv, 433 Mss. *ἡ ποτε* : Fränkel *ἐπιστεῖ* , (I cannot see the need for this conjecture). iv, 436: Mss. *θελῆμεν* ; Fränkel *θέλημον* .

The text is distinguished by a number of lacunae, not hitherto marked in the text, and line-transpositions which almost invariably bring a distinct improvement in the grammatical structure or meaning of the passages in question, e.g. a lacuna is postulated between *δῆρος* and *ἄρματον* at I. 1, 168, and II. iii, 658-9 are transposed after I. 662. Fränkel proposes to transpose II. iv, 1182-1200 after I. 1169.


This edition must rank alongside Pfeiffer’s Callimachus as one of the great services done to poetry of the Alexandrian period. In particular it is a milestone in the textual criticism of the *Argonautica*. Henceforth the textual critic will no longer be impeded by lack of material nor be hidebound by notions conceived in the nineteenth century; and, while the book is aimed at the scholar rather than the student, it is imperative that anyone who intends to take more than a cursory glance at the *Argonautica* make use of it. Nor is it the text alone which has benefited from Fränkel’s treatment. The time is now at hand for a reappraisal of the *Argonautica* as poetry; for many grammatical difficulties and awkward expressions, formerly ascribed to Apollonius’ lack of ability as a poet, are now seen to be due to the vagaries of a corrupt tradition and perhaps to the almost unique early history of the poem. With this in mind, the author eagerly awaits the publication of Fränkel’s promised commentary. This is perhaps not a perfect edition. But if it does not find favour, it must certainly provoke a reaction.

P. KINGSTON.

London.

Iris BROOKE, Costume in Greek Classic Drama, Methuen, 1962. Pp. x + 112. 30s.

This book, illustrated by the author, is intended as a guide to designers of productions of Greek plays. It begins with a chapter on ‘Textiles and civil attire’, then goes straight into an account of two particular and specialised kinds of clothing, ‘Armour’ and ‘Insignia of gods and goddesses’, the latter being
followed by a subsection on 'Jewellery'. This is followed by a chapter on 'Dramatic costume and footwear', and the last two chapters are on 'Masks' (with a sub-section on 'Headaddresses') and 'Chorus'.

The unwary reader may find himself puzzled by the relationship between the first and fourth chapters. Perhaps he might have been helped if a different, less general, title had been chosen for chapter 4 and if 'Footwear' had been kept for a subsection like those on jewellery and headaddresses. The point is that Miss Brooke's term 'dramatic costume' is limited (not very clearly — clarity is not helped by the first sentence of the chapter, which appears at first sight to raise an entirely different question, that of traditional ideas about the dress of classical drama) to costume which is dramatic (in the general sense of the word) in quality, i.e. which will produce a striking effect, and may be used to dress such characters as kings and princes. As well, this 'dramatic costume', which from this point in the book becomes important, is based on the peplos, a garment which receives only brief attention in chapter I (pp. 28-9).

Once the reader has surmounted this difficulty, there is much of value for the designer of costume for Greek plays. The illustrations are handsome and, more important, very clear, though occasionally it is difficult completely to equate text and illustration, e.g. p. 21: 'The extra material swags out under the lower girdle'—fig. 4 would indicate that the text should read 'over'.

The author has not, it seems, come entirely to a solution of the question whether to give her findings on Greek costume dogmatically or to present the arguments for her statements. This indecision has had its effect on the book: an approach more definitely dogmatic would have allowed her to follow a more schematic arrangement — chapter 4 would then have followed directly upon chapter one, as being also concerned with clothes proper, and perhaps the chapter on the chorus would have been next, with the sections and sub-sections on various accessories collected at the end. The same indecision is apparent in the section on masks: Miss Brooke discusses masks at some length, as they were worn in the classical theatre at various times, but does not give an opinion on whether or not she would herself use them in designing a play.

She is more at ease when she deals directly with classical texts than with modern authorities, though I do not think that the extract from Iliad vi (p. 41) is a telling argument in favour of the statement that helmets were intended to terrify. Even with the Greek sources she is not quite certain: e.g. she refers to a play by Aeschylus called the Okeanids (p. 92) — I take it the Prometheus Bound is meant.

The book, then, is of no great value for the student of Greek drama; for the designer, however, it should prove helpful: the wide variety of costumes illustrated, the useful remarks on decoration and patterns, and the references to learned works on the subject (these might have been collected in a formal bibliography) should make the book an excellent practical guide.

M. P. FORDER.

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.


Mr Gulley tells us in his preface that his publishers persuaded him to make his paragraphs much shorter and to introduce sub-headings. It would have 'eased the task of the reader' still further if they had persuaded him to make his sentences much shorter too — and fewer. No reader ought to be expected to grapple with a book written in the style of this one. In some places it is necessary to read and re-read a sentence before its purport becomes clear. This substantially increases the difficulty of following the argument, and does no service to the author. Any failure on my part to do him justice is therefore partly to be attributed to this cause.

In selecting points for special comment I have chosen those which involve certain basic principles of interpretation.

Mr G. begins with an examination of the theory of recollection as it appears in the early dialogues, in the Meno and in the Theaetetus. In spite of 'the difficulty of deciding where, in the early dialogues, Socratic portraiture ends and Platonic interpretation begins' (p. 3), we are assured that Plato was dissatisfied with Socrates' method as being 'very limited' as a means of gaining knowledge, (a) because 'the discussions are inconclusive', and (b) because there is practically no non-Platonic evidence that Socrates habitually professed ignorance; therefore Plato's purpose in depicting him as doing so is to indicate his own dissatisfaction with his method. I draw attention to this, not so much for its own
sake, but because a similar thesis is tacitly acted upon in connexion with the later dialogues, where it is Plato himself who is represented by Mr G. as struggling, often vainly, to reach a satisfactory conclusion. We find no recognition in the book that many of the subjects dealt with in the dialogues are presented in a dramatic form: all the theories concerned are (with one exception) treated as being Plato’s own, and criticised as such. The exception is the first part of the Theaetetus, which Mr G. recognises ‘is not a direct presentation of Plato’s views’ (p. 77). In his comments on the second part of the dialogue, however, Mr G. takes it for granted that we are dealing with Plato’s own theories: throughout, Plato ‘had apparently assumed that all knowledge was knowledge of individuals by direct acquaintance’ (p. 103), and found it unworkable. Thus at long last Plato comes to realise ‘that definition is not of individuals but of species, not of the particular but of the general’ (ibid.). Even Mr G. recognises that we might well suppose that, by the time the Theaetetus was written, ‘this is hardly a point which Plato needs to be led to realise’. Yet undoubtedly he does need it, though once he is ‘ready to conclude that the sensible particular is unknowable’ (p. 104), ‘the way is now clear for the re-introduction of the Forms as the objects of knowledge’ (ibid.). It is not explained why or when Plato, having once introduced the Forms, was led to discard them, or how long this abandonment of the Forms lasted.

In a similar way Mr G. completely misconceives the situation in the Sophist. It is not the fact that ‘Plato assumes that the main difficulty involved in false statement’ (p. 148) is the apparent contradiction in stating that ‘what is not is’ etc. The difficulty, as is made explicit by the way in which it is introduced in the dialogue, is one which was imposed upon Plato by his opponents’ controversial use of an idiomatic phrase, though Plato naturally takes advantage of the situation to give valuable clues to some fundamental views of his own. One way of saying in Greek ‘to make a false statement’ is λέγειν τὸ μὴ δὲ; and this circumstance enabled his opponents to assert that, since τὸ μὴ δὲ could not be the name of anything, λέγειν τὸ μὴ δὲ amounted not to making a false statement but to making no statement at all, saying nothing at all; and that hence the only possibility was λέγειν τὸ δὲ i.e. making a true statement. What Plato therefore has to do is to insist first of all that the phrase τὸ μὴ δὲ is habitually used as though it had some meaning, which implies that there is something to which the name τὸ μὴ δὲ can properly be applied (cf. 287 c, 299 b, 250 d); he then shows what this is, and at the same time shows how the name needs to be corrected to prevent controversial use being made of it; and this correction is then applied to reformulate the phrase λέγειν τὸ μὴ δὲ. As Mr G. fails to see what Plato is setting out to do, it is not surprising that he finds Plato’s treatment of the matter ‘limited’ and his solution unsatisfactory. Throughout he assumes that Plato is responsible for the way the problem is stated, and therefore that the solution offered is given in Plato’s own terminology and represents Plato’s own complete verdict on the subject. Similarly, Mr G. fails to see that the discussion of philosophers’ views on ‘reality’ is an examination of what they thought τὸ δὲ was the name of (see 243 d, e and 250 e); and in consequence he fails to observe the direct implication, emerging from the later stages of the dialogue, for what Plato’s own view was about τὸ δὲ. Mr G.’s acceptance of the current misinterpretation of the assertion at 259 e that ‘ὁ λόγος has come to be for us through the συμπλοκή of the ἀδόκη’ not unnaturally leads him, as it has led others, into further misunderstanding, including the confusion of this συμπλοκή with the συμπλοκή of noun and verb, and the limitation of the range of statements which are made possible by the alleged ‘weaving-together’ of Forms to true statements — a limitation for which the text itself offers no justification. Nevertheless, although Mr G. misses the main positive contribution of the Sophist, he rightly recognises one useful incidental result for Plato, which I remarked on ten years ago, viz. that by showing that ‘is not’ needs to be corrected into ‘is other than’, Plato provides himself with a defence of ‘particulars’ against opponents who claimed that according to Plato’s theory they could not exist (p. 148); and he is prepared to admit (p. 151) that the principal arguments of the Sophist do not demand that we should assume that in the ‘weaving-together’ of Forms Plato means ‘separate, archetypal Forms in the sense specified in the Phaedo’: ‘concepts’ could be substituted for Kinds or Forms. This is a welcome first step in the right direction, and it may have contributed to Mr G.’s conclusion that ‘it is difficult to find in the Sophist any clear and explicit metaphysical doctrine’ (p. 168).

One of the more important points discussed by Mr G. is the role assigned by Plato to sense-perception. He makes out a good case for Plato’s continued belief in anamnesis (and in transcendent Forms), but draws attention to apparent inconsistен-
cies in his assessment of the cognitive value of sense-perception. Mr G. is also very much concerned with 'the difficulty of reconciling the nature of the Form as an archetypal object which resembles its instances with its function as a universal' (p. 51 & passim). 'If the apprehension of the Form is the result of a generalisation from particulars, it is difficult to see the justification for postulating its separate existence as a perfect archetype.' (ibid.) How real is this difficulty? Is it certain that Plato so nearly equated recognition of the Form with recognition of a 'general characteristic' common to many sensible instances? Mr G. himself draws attention to the early part of the Phaedo where one sensible instance is sufficient for anamnesis (but this he seems to regard as an anomaly), and a fortiori cases where anamnesis is effected by something dissimilar from the Form. But it is not so much the means as the fact of anamnesis which is important for Plato; and it may be a matter of indifference whether many or few — or any — sensible 'copies' are required to bring it about. In some cases (and, we might add, for some people) a plurality of sensible instances may be a help, may indeed be normal, yet may not be invariably necessary; and in the Timaeus there cannot be more than one, for, as Mr G. remarks — though not in this context — the model and the copy are each unique. There may even be occasions, as the Phaedo suggests, when sensible instances, if wrongly treated, or if they obtrude themselves, can be a hindrance. And it is questionable whether Mr G. is right when he claims that in the Symposium Plato emphasises that 'the process of acquiring knowledge of Form is a process of generalisation and abstraction' (p. 45); indeed, a few pages later (p. 52) he writes: 'It is implicit in that theory [sc. the theory of Forms] that no abstraction of Form from sensible particulars is ever possible.' We hear of 'the logical functions which Plato apparently assumed that they [the Forms] could perform' (p. 83), and that Plato 'always assumes that it [the Form] is a universal in the sense that it is applicable to all its sensible instances' (p. 52). The word 'applicable' either tells us precisely nothing, or else it begins the whole question of the relation of Forms to particulars, of knowledge to δεικτέα and sense-perception, and every important point of Platonic doctrine. A more solid and convincing foundation is required than an ipse dixit that Plato 'apparently assumed' that Forms can function as universals. And in what sense could δέικτε ζησον be properly described as a 'universal'?

On p. 59 we read, "The "copies" are too closely and systematically tied to the Forms, and hence similarly sense-perception tied to knowledge, to make plausible a thesis that knowledge is a priori." The parallel propounded in this sentence is false. Two considerations may be mentioned here. (1) It is essential to Plato's theory that there is a close connexion between the Forms and their sensible copies; this for him is a matter of given fact. Indeed, it is most often through these copies, by means of sense-perception, that we are led to knowledge of the Forms. But, as we saw, just as there are some people who need but little prompting from the copies to recover their knowledge of the Forms, so also there is no guarantee that everyone who perceives the copies, even many copies, will pass on automatically to apprehension of the Forms; indeed, the fact that not everyone does so, and that most need special training before they can do so, indicates that sense-perception is not in all cases 'closely tied' to knowledge. The two "ties" are not in pari materia. (2) Furthermore, although there is a close correspondence between particulars and Forms, it is also true that the two are on different levels; and although there may be a close correspondence between acquaintance through sense-perception on the one hand and knowledge on the other, close enough to enable the former to bring about "recollection" of the latter, again, the two are very different in character; and on this ground alone Plato would be amply justified in making such a distinction between them as (to use Mr G.'s terminology) between empirical and a priori. Throughout Plato we find this simultaneous insistence upon connexion and disjunction: Parmenides in the dialogue named after him disliked it; in the passage quoted above Mr G. dislikes it, and prefers to concentrate only upon the connexion.

We find a similar train of thought later in the book (pp. 145 ff.). Mr G. asks 'why the physical scientist is not prompted by sensible "similarities" to a recognition of Forms equally with the philosopher, and 'why it is not possible that in the generalisations which he makes and the theories which he formulates he should never [sic; lege sometimes] be recognising or "recollecting" the nature of Forms and the relations between them'. The answer which Plato would give is a simple one: such a man either cannot or will not make the necessary leap. To assume some "inadequacy of Plato's doctrine", or some "inadequacy of the theory of Forms as the basis of a distinction between a priori and empirical knowledge" is beside the point. Plato is not setting up
some ‘arbitrary’ distinction or barrier; he is merely stating an observed fact. Two men may both start from ‘experience of a visible copy of the model constituted by the Forms’: one will be led to apprehend the Forms and one will not. Perhaps the difference is that the latter cannot get beyond ‘generalisations’, and the making of generalisations is not the apprehension of Forms. To put the matter in more modern terms, we might ask why a particular scientist, confronted with the same remark­able order and system of the phenomenal world as a theologian, does not — if the theologian is right — attain the same faith as the theologian in a personal Creator and sustainer of the universe. It is not Plato who is stopping the physical scientist.

Another way of putting the same criticism would be to draw attention to the perfunctory treatment of the ‘soul’ in Mr G.’s book. There are references to it, of course, and mention is made e.g. of the passage in the Timaeus (37 a-c) which asserts that the soul is an intermediary, able to apprehend both the world of Forms and the sensible world. But it is not allowed to play a really effective part, because no allowance is made for its imperfections. Mr G. assumes that there is invariably as perfect a correlation of the various modes of apprehension in the soul as there is of the external objects apprehended by them; and that is why he is puzzled (and blames Plato) when Plato says some people stop short at δόξα and cannot get as far as ἐπιστήμη.

Mr G. gives us some valuable discussions on the uses of δόξα in Plato, on the different types of Forms (e.g. those which have ‘clear sensible images’ and those which have not), and on the two different applications of ‘limit’ in the Philebus; it is also useful to have Plato’s distinction of ‘being’ and ‘becoming’ within the field of Becoming stressed. In the last chapter, on mathematical knowledge, Mr G. dismisses the suggestion that the purpose of the ‘Forms-are-numbers’ development was to make Plato’s theory consistent with the view expressed in the late dialogues that the characteristics of the physical world are mathematically determined. But another development, he thinks, might have been so designed — the postulate that the objects of mathematical knowledge are intermediate between sensibles and Forms. Since there is no systematic parallelism between the mathematical numbers and the Number-Forms, Plato can now provide for another type of a priori knowledge in addition to that of the Forms, and so ‘keep the science of dialectic which yields knowledge of Forms independent for the most part of the sciences of pure and applied mathematics’. This would provide a metaphysical basis for the formulation of physical theory in mathematical terms. But it is only in the field of mathematical knowledge that Plato provides a distinction between a priori knowledge and empirical knowledge (δόξα) which satisfies Mr G.

The critical and determined reader should, I think, find this a stimulating book, not only for the thorough discussion of some important points, but also because it will prompt him to question the adequacy of principles of interpretation which almost wholly ignore the dialectical character of much of Plato’s work, which necessitate periodical expressions of disappointment at what Plato is doing or failing to do and at his unawareness of how close he is to doing something really profitable, and which involve censure of Plato for taking into account some common experiences of human life.

A. L. Peck.
Christ’s College, Cambridge.


This is a fairly short and a valuable edition of the Monobiblos of Propertius. An introduction of a dozen pages surveys the poet’s life and work, and the background of his work, and here the author cautiously accepts the views that love elegy is a product of the Augustan Age, and that Gallus must be credited with the invention of the genre. Variants from the Oxford text of 1957 are listed, and there is a deliberately brief Sigla. Critical notes are similarly short. Notes on the text fill 60 pages; each elegy is given a preliminary mise-en-scène, often with quotation of parallels from Tibullus, Horace, Virgil or the A. P.; the introduction to the ‘riddle’ (Shackleton Bailey) of xxi is particularly useful. In general, C. takes cognizance of the landmarks in Propertiana, but he rightly claims that the work is not a compilation.

Inevitably it has not been possible always to indicate what Propertius meant. To quote Butler-Barber: The study of Propertius has its undoubted fascination, but it is also not seldom a heartbreaking pursuit. Wisely C. avoids dogmatism; ‘where it has seemed to me’, he notes, ‘that no clear choice
between alternatives was possible I have usually set out the alternatives and left the reader to exercise his own preferences.'

It is perhaps through a dubious optimism that the wrapper asserts that Book 1 of the poet 'contains no very important textual cruces'. The text published is that of Barber's O.C.T., with roughly thirty variants, in six of which C. returns to the reading of O. e.g.

xiii, 17 et cupere optatos animam deponere uerbis

a reading also retained by Richmond and B.-B., whereas Enk produced an array of parallels to support labris (codd. Passerati), a reading which Shackleton Bailey has regarded as 'all but certain'. On the other hand, C. supports Barber in rejecting the reading of O., in iv, 25 f.

non ullo grauius temptatur Cynthia damno
quam sibi cum rapto cessat amore decus (deus O)

and in x, ii

sed quoniam non est ueritus concedere nobis,
accipe commissae manu lactitiae. (concedere O)

In the context of x concedere is clearly appropriate, whether or not we regard the use here as absolute. And in the notoriously difficult couplet xv, 29 f.

nulla prius uasto labentur flumina ponto,
aninus et inuersas duxerit ante uices

he rejects the MSS reading multa prius (Rothstein, Phillimore, B.-B.) which, punctuated with a semi-colon, might appear to provide a reversal of the order of nature to match that indicated in the pentameter.

Twice in the seventh elegy he agrees with Barber in rejecting the reading of O:

xvii, 3

nec mihi Cassiope saluo uisura carinam
saluo Richmond, solito O

and vii, 11

an poteris siccis mea fata reposcere ocellis
ossaque nulla tuo nostra tenere sinu?
reposcere Baehrens, reponere O

Here C. translates: 'ask an account of how I met my end'; and Shackleton Bailey notes 'reposcere' as a necessary correction. Nevertheless, at the end of
exclusi (Lipsius), which B.-B. regard as a needless correction of exclusis (O). In line 22

eturpis et in tepido limine sonnus erit?

we cannot tell whether the threshold is warmed by the body of the lover (Enk) or chilled by the going down of the sun (B.-B.). The house reproaches the door thus:

respondes tacitis mutua cardinibus (26)

where Enk appends the term 'oxymorum'. It is hard to make much of C.'s translation of respondes... mutua, 'respond with sympathy to my complaint'.

In xviii, 9

quid tantum merui? quae te mihi crimina mutant?

C. accepts crista, the best MSS have carmina, which Barber retained in the Oxford text. B.-B. argue that crista refers to the three charges mentioned in the sequel and that the reading carmina is a 'popular but needless conjecture'. And, to mention one more couplet of this famous poem:

pro quo diuini fontes et frigida rupes
et datur inculto tramite dura quies,

C. says of diuini fontes that the conventional epithet seems a little odd beside frigida and dura. B.-B. call it ridiculous. To Enk's list of v.11 Shackleton Bailey would add di magni; but then we are left with an unqualified fontes, which, indeed, might as hopefully be montes (cf. xx, 50 fontibus O, montibus Heinsius).

In xx, the Rape of Hylas, which C. describes as an essay in a Hellenistic genre, he has the good sense to bring forward an old interpretation of 29 f.

ille sub extrema pendens secluditur ala
et uolucres ramo summouet insidias.

To suppose that Hylas grasps the god at the base of the wing (extrema ala) seems grotesque, though Postgate sneers at those who regard 'ala' as Hylas' arm. C. translates 'the boy bends forward (sc. pendens) and shelters his face as well as he can under his arm, and tries to beat off the winged attackers with a bough'. And he reminds us of Juv. xiv, 95 (grandes... alas). Surely this is the right comment.

C. does his best with xxi ('a familiar type of grave epigram') and after all that has been written in elucidation of it he accepts Acca (Scaliger) in 1.6 and rightly concludes that then me (not ne) must begin the line, so that the couplet reads:

sic te seruato possint gaudere parentes:
me soror Acca tuis sentiat e lacrimis.

Enk denied that the sister of Gallus is meant; it is Gallus' fiancée, sister of the fugitive. Postgate, who reads acta with O, notes: soror, my sister.

One is tempted to add other cruces, but it suffices to say that C. meets them squarely. There is little interest shown in matters of metre and prosody; there is no note of spondaic hexameters or of anaphora. Readers are referred to M. Platnauer's Latin Elegiac Verse. There is a footnote (p. 10) listing the percentages of polysyllabic endings of the pentameters of certain elegies, but I cannot see what it proves.

One finds no mention of archaism or sermo coticidianus; on the other hand, attention is drawn to Propertius' peculiar use of the pluperfect tense and to his obscurer ablative: non omnia possumus omnes.

Even those who have Postgate, Enk and Butler-Barber to hand, will be interested in Camps' edition of Propertius Book I.

W. A. LAIDLAW.

Queen Mary College, London.


Convinced that 'the time has come for a more illuminating approach to the reading of Latin texts than has been customary' Bertha Tilly has assembled and edited a number of passages bearing on the story of Pallas, from the last five books of the Aeneid, mainly with the idea that it might serve as a set book for General Certificate of Education Advanced Level examinations (the total number of lines amounting to 633), and partly that it might provide suitable supplementary reading material for sixth formers and first year undergraduates. With the omission of certain excerpts she thinks it might prove worth setting as a prescribed book for Ordinary Level examinations.

After the customary introductory pages on Vergil's life and works, the hexameter etc., appears the text, each passage prefaced by a synopsis in English of its content and context. Explicatory notes follow the text and these in turn are followed by a section of background notes covering points of mainly topographical and antiquarian interest on Alba, Pallantium and the Salii, inter alia. There is a vocabulary at the end.
REVIEWS

For a ‘modern’ approach this book contains too much of archaic flavour: in vocabulary, ‘savage foeman’ (p. xx) for example, and, in content, this testimonial, ‘A great poet Tennyson called him

Wielder of the stateliest measure
Ever moulded by the lips of man.’ (p. xxiv)

The editor’s intention is to avoid display of the sort of erudition that can be disconcerting to the non-specialist reader, the result of which aim has been the virtual elimination of reference to Greek syntax and language and to Vergil’s literary precursors. The last mentioned is most unfortunate since the relationship of the latter half of the Aeneid to the Iliad (as per W. S. Anderson, in T.A.P.A. lxxxviii, 1957) is perhaps more important to the appreciation of these books than is a knowledge of the topography of Latium. In any case the illustrations, reminiscent of pre-War holiday guides, provide little stimulus to the imagination.

The principle, stated in the Introduction, that translation should be bound to the preservation of the Latin word order, has been dutifully followed in the notes, but this does not always make for rapid elucidation of the text: less restricted translation would have been better at viii.509 and xi.177-9.

A few mistakes and omissions demand rectification: pecudumque not pedudumque (p. 2); ‘Aeneas’s (p. xviii) inconsistent with Aeneas and Pallas elsewhere; on viii.114, Qui genus? a note is needed on what normal Latin would require; on viii, 280, the case of Olympos should be stated since Dr. Tilly does not take devexo Olympos as Ablative Absolute; on viii.286, evincit tempora, the editor might better follow E. A. Hahn, T.A.P.A. xc, 1960, i.e. Accusative of Respect rather than retained Accusative; at viii. 606, bello lecta iuventus, the case of bello might be explained for the school reader; at x:52, the use of cum with the Ablative of Manner is improperly explained — Dr. Tilly implies that the omission of cum is poet’s licence; and in the note on x.449 the victory of M. Claudius Marcellus over Viridomarus in 222 B.C. is unhappily set at Syracuse. The Vocabulary is of dubious value as not all words having a peculiar meaning in the text are so explained in the Vocabulary: axis for example, signifies ‘vault’ at viii.28, c.f. the editor’s note p. 35, but the only meanings given in the Vocabulary are ‘pole’ and ‘zenith’.

The Story of Pallas, for all that, is to be recommended as offering the reader an interesting selection of passages that will give some impression of the content and style of the latter half of the Aeneid.

J. E. ATKINSON.

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

C. ARRIUS NURUS (i. q. HARRY C. SCHNUR), Pegasos Totularius, (Oudenaarde, Belgium) 1962, Sanderus. Pp. 80; $ 2.

Let it be divulged immediately for the less horsy among our readers that tolutarius is a somewhat rare word meaning ‘trotting.’

The poems in this little volume are grouped under six headings. In vestibulo we are greeted by a smiling posy of translations (‘Conversa’) of verses by Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Housman, R. L. Stevenson, A. Lang, Ronsard (sonnet à Hélène) and others. On the very first page the succinctness of Latin stands revealed. Goethe’s six verses Ein Quidam sagt ‘Ich bin von keiner Schule!...’ is rendered with essential completeness by

Nulli debitor es Musae nullique magistro?
Macte esto, Cenophron: morus es automatus,
where the descriptive proper name Cenophron (Emptyhead) has a convincing satiric ring.

In the first two Heine poems each has a refrain: in ‘Du bist wie eine Blume’ only the order of the three adjectives ‘so schön, so hold, so rein’ is varied in the last line; but in the Latin version only one of the adjectives is repeated and the refrain effect consequently lost; in ‘Du hast Diamanten und Perlen’ every stanza ends with ‘Mein Liebchen, was willst Du mehr?’ Here the translator introduces variations: ‘O mea vita’, ‘O mea Musa’ and ‘Heu, mea cura’; these are slight variations, but is anything gained by them? Faithful adherence to the refrain would have been fully justified by examples such as Cat. 62, and even by the epyllion 64 (vv. 528 sqq.).

There are many felicitous renderings, e.g. in the Ronsard poem (p. 18/19):

‘Ronsard me celebrait du temps que j’étais belle’
Formosam ardebit me quoque Nasonides,
and

‘Je serai sous la terre et, fantôme sans os...’
At me terra teget, tenuem sine corpore vitam...

R. L. Stevenson’s well known Requiem ‘Under the
wide and starry sky...’ is done into Greek and Latin elegiac couplets.

The second group, the nursery rhymes (‘Gerrae’), are great fun: Miss Muffet, the Old Woman in the Shoe, Mother Hubbard and the Four and Twenty Blackbirds (reminiscent of Trimalchio) have all put on Roman uniform. The mock-heroic rendering of Lear’s ‘The Owl and the Pussycat’ is highly diverting.

Among the ‘Scholastica’ there is an appreciative ‘ad Petronium,’ and in the fourth group (‘Satirae’) one poem about the fraudulent winner of the 60,000 dollar TV question, and another about Eichmann.

The penultimate ‘Bilibilitana’ give us a leaf from Martial and include in six verses the sad tale of Betsy the Baltimore Zoo monkey whose daubs of paint passed solemn muster as works of modern art and, on finding buyers, raised a dowry to buy her a mate — who crushed her to death in brutish embrace. In the final lines poets are warned of a monkey practising for recitations (shades of Asinius Pollio!). — The last poem is devoted to the sputnik dog which anticipated man as cosmonaut.

A much more ambitious ‘Iter ad Septentriones’ (Journey to Norway) in 342 verses concludes the collection — more ambitious, but full of scholarly fun. It received honourable mention in the 1961 Certamen Hoeftianum at Amsterdam.

The writer calls his steed a trotting Pegasus; yet for all his modesty he trots very convincingly and often lifts his feet in the daintiest fashion. In a waggish Praefatio he invites others to follow his example: Latin studies, he remarks, have taken a new lease of life in America, but verse writing is very rarely practised or taught. And this raises a nice question: should a nonversifier review such an opusculum vagulum? Is not the heavy booted agasso out to catch the papilio? The verse of Naevius is being parodied to read laudari a non laudato viro.

We are very pleased that the author has collected these poems from a great variety of journals and other publications; they will long be a delight to many. And may we conclude with a request that the writer offer us a rendering of Rupert Brooke’s ‘Heaven’ (‘Fish, fly-replete...’), which would have to be in hexameters, ne Lucreti manibus sit offensioni?

H. L. Gonin.

University of Pretoria, Republic of South Africa.
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Pindars Pythian Odes:
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R. W. B. BURTON
Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford

This book devotes a chapter to each Pythian Ode, examining its structure and contents as a finished work. The poems are discussed in chronological order of composition, so that the development of Pindar's style and personality may be traced from youth to old age. Special attention is paid to his forms of expression, methods of composition, and modes of thought. Although the book is meant to be read in close conjunction with the Greek text, it is not intended to replace a detailed commentary, since textual and grammatical points are considered only where they are relevant to its main purpose, which is to interpret Pindar's meaning.

Demy 8vo, 224 pp., 35s. net

Virgil: Aeneid III
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The third book of the Aeneid illustrates the epic technique of Virgil in a variety of styles and moods as the poet seeks to describe the first beginnings of the destiny and character of Rome within a framework of Homeric adventure. In this edition, which is designed chiefly for universities and the upper forms of schools, the introduction deals mainly with the content and construction of Book III and its purpose within the plan of the poem as a whole; the commentary aims at explaining Virgilian usage both linguistic and metrical, and at illustrating the subject matter with particular emphasis on literary appreciation of the poetry.
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P. D. ARNOTT
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Both classical scholarship and practical theatre experience are here employed to present a view of Greek play production that modifies, and sometimes departs radically from, currently accepted theories. It is argued that the fifth-century theatre did possess a raised stage; that scene-painting, in the modern sense, was unknown; and that convention was used more extensively than is even now realized. Euripides' growing tendency towards greater stage illusion is examined, and a number of particular stage problems, some never before discussed, are investigated in detail.
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IRIS BROOKE. When Greek drama was at its finest, Greek costume was also at its most decorative and splendid. Here in this book all the available details of this period are given for designers or students in the production of classical drama who may have difficulty in finding authentic costuming, especially for the Greek chorus.
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18s

PLATO’S THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

NORMAN GULLEY. The aim of this book is to trace the development of Plato’s theory of knowledge, beginning with a consideration of Socratic and other influences which determined the form in which this problem first presented itself to Plato.

21s

UNIVERSITY PAPERBACKS

UP 3 GREEK POLITICAL THEORY

ERNEST BARKER

12s 6d

UP 9 PLATO: THE MAN AND HIS WORK

A. E. TAYLOR

12s 6d

UP 24 LIFE AND THOUGHT IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN WORLD

M. CARY and T. J. HAARHOFF

12s 6d

UP 49 THE GREEK VIEW OF LIFE

G. LOWES DICKINSON

9s 6d
ORDINARY LATIN
P. H. VELLACOTT

This is a complete Latin course to lower school-leaving examination level, and beyond. It explains all the main syntactical constructions, and includes a simplified Outline of Accidence. It includes exercises for Revision as well as those appended to each Chapter, Test Papers, Prose Passages, and Vocabularies.

(Latin-English 1800 words, English-Latin 1200 words).

366 pages Photograph, map and line drawings 10s. 6d.

MODERN SCHOOL CLASSICS

Scenes from Euripides' Rhesus and Helen
Edited with an Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by E. C. KENNEDY and A. R. DAVIS.

The Fall of Athens
Selections from Xenophon's Hellenica Books 1 and 2
Selected and Edited by Theodore HORN.

Scenes from Euripides the Trojan Women
Selected by F. Kinchin SMITH and Barbara J. HODGE.

These three volumes are the latest in this series which is specifically designed for the different requirements of the secondary school pupils of today — those who have studied Greek for two or three years and are ready to read their first author either in verse or prose.

Scenes from Euripides' Rhesus and Helen 206 pages Map, 10 photographs and 3 line-drawings 7s. 6d.
The Fall of Athens 110 pages 3 maps and 10 photographs 5s.
Scenes from Euripides the Trojan Women 108 pages 5s.

PAPERS IN LATIN for the first year sixth
S. K. BAILEY

These papers are designed to bridge the gap between the work of the Fifth form and the work of the Sixth. The book contains 25 papers, each consisting of a prose passage for translation into Latin and a prose unseen. Each of the first ten papers also includes two short verse unseens, and each of the remaining papers one long verse passage.

80 pages 4s.

MACMILLAN
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C.2.
THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE AFRICAN CLASSICAL ASSOCIATIONS, a journal for original contributions in any aspect of Greek or Roman studies, will accept such contribution primarily, but not exclusively, from scholars within Africa.

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

Proceedings of the African Classical Associations is published annually in August or thereabouts. Articles for publication must reach the Managing Editor not later than April 30th. Advertising copy should be submitted to him by June 1st.

The yearly subscription rate and/or the price for individual volumes is 16 shillings (numbers of volumes available are limited). Individual off-prints will be sold at cost prices. Cheques etc. should be made payable to: The Treasurer, Classical Association of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Private Bag 167 H, Salisbury, S. Rhodesia.

Articles intended for publication, books for review, subscriptions, remittances and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Publications Secretary: J. E. Atkinson, University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, P. Bag 167 H, Salisbury, S. Rhodesia.
CAMBRIDGE BOOKS ON CLASSICS

FOR SCHOOLS:

An Easy Selection from Cicero's Correspondence
Edited by J. D. DUFF
Second edition, 6s. 6d.

Sodales Duo
A. H. NASH-WILLIAMS
Imaginary stories about boys in Roman times. 3s. 6d.

FOR STUDENT & TEACHER:

The Songs of Homer
G. S. KIRK 40s. net

A History of Greek Philosophy,
Volume One
W. K. C. GUTHRIE 55s. net

Ovid Surveyed
L. P. WILKINSON Paperback, 13s. 6d. net

The Cambridge Ancient History,
Volumes I & II
These revised volumes are being issued in paperbound fascicles to prevent delay in publication. Completed volumes will be issued in due course.

Troy by C. W. Blegen 3s. 6d. net

The Religion and Mythology of the Greeks by W. K. C. Guthrie 6s. net

Greek Settlement in the Eastern Aegean and Asia Minor by J. M. Cook 6s. net

The Cities of Babylonia by C. J. Gadd 6s. net

Anatolia, 4000-2300 B.C. by J. Mellaart 6s. net

Anatolia, c. 1750-1600 B.C. by O. R. Gurney 3s. 6d. net

Minoan Civilization: Maturity and Zenith by F. Matz 6s. net

The End of Mycenaean Civilization and the Dark Age by V. R. D'A. Desborough and N. G. L. Hammond 6s. net

United Kingdom prices shown

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BENTLEY HOUSE, 200 EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W. I