

We easily see the difference between the immortal, prosperous Epicurus and the unfruitful but continually flowering Danaids whose punishment in Hades does not even exist. We also discern the contrast between Epicurus' success and the failure of men who waste their brief lives in futile consumption.

If the aim of commentary is to illumine a difficulty of translation or interpretation in the clearest way possible, the above arguments have the advantage of explaining the Danaid passage in terms of the Latin words in it (as opposed to the Ὠραι who are not) with the aid of other statements of Lucretius. Kenney's note on *aevo florente puellas* is daunting fare, especially for the often Greekless undergraduate, for it implies that a student will not be able to understand Lucretius' meaning without Greek erudition.¹⁴ One will have to know that *tempora* = Ὠραι, that the Ὠραι were portrayed as beautiful women, and that ὥραιος = "beautiful." Here the note seems mistaken as well as erudite; ὥραιος may mean "beautiful" in Pausanias, a writer of the second century A.D.,¹⁵ but LSJ's only references for that specific meaning occur in the Greek Old and New Testaments. This at least calls into question the currency of the meaning for Lucretius' time and earlier. The phrase *aevo florente* is not likely to be a translation problem even for most new readers of Lucretius.¹⁶ However, Kenney's note on it leads the student away from the Latin and creates a difficulty—why indeed should Danaids be beautiful?—where there really is none. It is quite possible that Lucretius' Danaids are beautiful, at least in the sense that all young creatures are (e.g., Pl. *Charm.* 154B9–10), but this is not Lucretius' point here.

GRACE STARRY WEST
University of Dallas

14. By this I do not mean that a knowledge of Greek language and literature would not be helpful in understanding Lucretius' poem generally, but here Kenney's references to Greek words seem to be beside the point.

15. Even here one may doubt, for *ἐτι* suggests that the woman was "still youthful in appearance," a meaning of ὥραιος attested by Plato, Pindar, Xenophon, and Aristophanes (LSJ).

16. Most published translations are more or less literal: e.g., C. Bailey (Oxford, 1936), "in the flower of youth"; R. M. Geer (Indianapolis, 1965), "in the flower of life"; H. A. J. Munro (London, 1913), "in the flower of their age"; F. O. Copley (New York, 1977), "young as flowers"; R. Humphries' "those young and lovely girls" (Bloomington, 1968) seems to anticipate Kenney's interpretation.

"AUSPICIA ET AUGURIA ROMANA . . . SUMMO LABORE COLLECTA": A NOTE ON MINUCIUS FELIX *OCTAVIUS* 26. 1

The text of Minucius Felix *Octavius* 26.1 reads: "Iam enim venio ad illa auspicia et auguria Romana, quae summo labore collecta testatus es et paenitenter ommissa et observata feliciter." Recent translators of and commentators on *Octavius* almost unanimously follow the received opinion and construe *testatus es* both with "(auspicia et auguria) . . . et paenitenter ommissa et observata feliciter" and with "(auspicia et auguria) . . . summo labore collecta."¹ This construction is, however,

1. See, e.g., G. W. Clarke, *The "Octavius" of Minucius Felix* (New York, 1974); J. Beaujeu, *Minucius Felix: "Octavius"* (Paris, 1974). G. Quispel, *M. Minucii Felicis "Octavius"* (Leyden, 1973), ad loc., comments: "*collecta* scil.: abs te." J. P. Waltzing in his classic edition of and commentary on *Octavius* (Bruges, 1909) does not discuss the meaning and construction of *collecta*. I am grateful to Prof. E. Badian for excerpting for me the relevant passages from Waltzing's commentary.

unwarranted syntactically and it produces an odd sense, for it is hardly possible to assert seriously that Caecilius “took great pains” to collect the auguries and auspices (Clarke) or that he collected them “au prix des plus grands efforts” (Beaujeu). Caecilius had adduced at 7. 4 only four exempla,² all of them well known, and he took three of them directly from Cicero *De divinatione* 1. 28–30, 1. 77–78, and 2. 20–22. A *summus labor* indeed! R. Arbesmann keeps closer to the text and translates the phrase in question as “collected with great labor,”³ but this translation, while literally correct, evades rather than answers two major questions: (a) what is the precise meaning of *colligo* in this passage and (b) who had collected the auspices and auguries *summo labore*?

One ought not to forget that “to bring together, to collect, assemble” is only one of the many meanings of *colligo*; it also means “to collect over the period of time, accumulate” and in a more specialized sense “to deduce, infer, gather.”⁴ This is especially true of *colligo* as used in Stoic terminology. The Stoics attributed the weight of proof to the accumulation of evidence;⁵ compare, for example, Cicero *De divinatione* 2. 33 “Ut enim iam sit aliqua in natura rerum contagio, quam esse concedo (multa enim Stoici colligunt)” (numerous examples of *συνπάθεια* follow). In this passage *colligo* has both the sense of “collect, bring together” and of “infer, gather”; the Stoics have collected ample evidence with a view to proving the existence of *contagio/συνπάθεια*, or conversely they infer the existence of *συνπάθεια* from the instances they have collected. In other words, the Stoics arrive at their conclusions on the basis of empirical observation, and then in turn they explain individual cases on the basis of their general theory. It is important to realize that a similar procedure was also applied in augury.

According to Stoic classification, augury formed a branch of artificial divination.⁶ It was an empirical science. From this point of view, the augural theory distinguished between two categories of divinatory signs: (1) the *veteres res*, that is, those signs the meaning of which had been established already in the (remote) past empirically through the process of long-continued observation (*observatio diuturna*)—those signs were recorded in the books of the augurs, their meaning codified once and for ever; (2) the *novae res*, that is, those signs about which the augural books were silent—signs of this kind had to be explained *subito ex tempore*⁷ by means of *ratio* and *coniectura*.⁸

2. “Frequentius etiam, quam volebamus, deorum praesentiam contempta auspicia contestata sunt. Sic Allia ‘nomen infaustum,’ sic Claudii et Iunii non proelium in Poenos, sed ferele naufragium est, et ut Trasimenus Romanorum sanguine et maior esset et decolor, spreuit auguria Flaminius, et ut Parthos signa repetamus, dirarum imprecationes Crassus et meruit et inrisit.” Cf. A. S. Pease, *M. Tulli Ciceronis “De divinatione” libri duo* (Urbana, 1920–23), pp. 135–40, 225–27, 379–80, who has an extensive discussion of the events mentioned by Minucius. Cicero, however, does not mention the battle of Allia in this context (but cf. *Ad Att.* 9. 5. 2).

3. Minucius Felix: “Octavius” (Washington, 1950).

4. OLD, s.v. “colligo.” The English expression “gather,” introducing an indirect statement, offers an instructive parallel.

5. Cf. Pease, “*De divinatione*,” ad 1. 6, 1. 33, 1. 39.

6. On the distinction between natural and artificial divination, see Cic. *De div.* 1. 11, 1. 34, 1. 72, 2. 26; Ps.-Plut. *De vita Hom.* 212; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l’antiquité*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1879), pp. 58–63; Pease, “*De divinatione*,” pp. 70–71; F. Pfeffer, *Studien zur Mantik in der Philosophie der Antike* (Meisenheim, 1976), pp. 88–95.

7. I.e., “without preparation in accordance with the situation,” Pease, “*De divinatione*,” ad 1. 72.

8. See Cic. *De div.* 1. 34 “Est enim ars in iis qui novas res coniectura persequuntur, veteres observatione didicerunt,” 1. 72 “Quae vero aut coniectura explicantur aut eventis animadversa ac notata sunt, ea genera divinandi . . . artificiosa dicuntur. . . . Quorum alia sunt posita in monumentis et disciplina,

It was the accumulation of empirical observations over a long period of time, the work of generations of augurs, that had led to the establishment of *ars divinationis*.⁹ This is the *summus labor* to which Minucius refers. In the passage under discussion *collecta* has the sense of both “collected” and “explained, codified”:¹⁰ “those famous Roman auspices and auguries, which were collected and explained with such great labor, and which on your evidence were neglected with remorseful consequences and observed with success.”¹¹

J. LINDERSKI
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

quod Etruscorum declarant et haruspicini et fulgurales et rituales libri, vestri etiam augurales, alia autem subito ex tempore coniectura explicantur, ut apud Homerum Calchas, qui ex passerum numero belli Troiani annos auguratus est.” For the concept of *observatio* and the distinction between *ratio* and the empirical observation, see also *De div.* 1. 5, 1. 12, 1. 25, 1. 36, 1. 109, 1. 127; P. Regell, *De augurum publicorum libris* (Diss. Vratislaviae, 1878), pp. 3–7; J. Linderski, “The Augural Law,” forthcoming in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, pt. 2.16.3.

9. See Cic. *De div.* 1. 12 “observata sunt haec [i.e., *signa ex avibus*] tempore inmenso et in significatione eventus animadversa et notata. Nihil est autem quod non longinquitas temporum excipiente memoria prodendisque monumentis efficere atque adsequi possit,” 2. 146 “observatio diuturna . . . notandis rebus fecit artem,” *De nat. deor.* 2. 166 “multa praeterea ostentis, multa exitis admoneamur, multisque rebus aliis quas diuturnus usus ita notavit ut artem divinationis efficeret.”

10. The case for this meaning of *colligo* in Minucius Felix is strengthened by the occurrence of the word in an augural context in Servius *auctus* and Ammianus Marcellinus. The former, on *Aen.* 4. 453, tells us that “dira . . . duplici modo colligitur, aut ex signis, aut quocumque modo et quacumque ex parte” (cf. *Aen.* 3. 246, 5. 7). The *signa ex divinis* formed one of the five categories into which the augurs divided the divinatory signs (Festus [Paulus] 316, 317 L.). A *dirum signum* was explained (*colligitur*) either *ex signis* or “quocumque modo et quacumque ex parte,” i.e., either on the basis of the list of *dira signa* contained in the augural books or according to the situation by means of *ratio* and *coniectura*. We have here the old Ciceronian distinction between the *veteres* and *novae res*. For this interpretation, see Linderski, “The Augural Law.” Amm. Marc. 21. 1. 9 argues that “auguria et auspicia non volucrum arbitrio futura nescientium colliguntur [i.e., the auguries and auspices are not effected and understood according to the will of the birds] . . . sed volatus avium dirigit deus, ut rostrum sonans aut praetervolans pinna, turbido meatu vel leni, futura praemonstret.” Cf. Cic. *De div.* 1. 12 and 1. 120 with Pease, “*De divinatione*,” pp. 74–77, 313–23. On the other hand, at *De div.* 2. 67 “atque etiam a te Flaminiana ostenta collecta sunt,” *colligo* has rather the simple sense of “collect, adduce”: “you have also adduced the Flaminian portents,” i.e., in order to show that “C. Flaminius consul iterum neglexit signa rerum futurarum magna cum clade rei publicae” (*De div.* 1. 77).

11. I should like to thank Prof. A. Michels for kindly reading a draft of this note.

MINUCIUS FELIX OCTAVIUS 26. 1

In regard to Minucius Felix *Octavius* 26.1, Professor Linderski is certainly right to protest against the persistent tendency of translators to render the first part of this passage by some variant of “And now I come to those Roman auspices and auguries which you [Caecilius] have collected with extreme pains. . . .”¹ Neither the syntax nor the logic of the sentence permits us to assume that Minucius wished to say that Caecilius had made a supreme effort to collect auguries and auspices.

1. The version of R. Wallis in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4 (Buffalo, 1885), p. 189. As Linderski indicates, this error in translation is not of recent vintage; and already in the German translation of M. Lichtwer (Berlin, 1763), p. 85, we find “Denn ich komme nunmehr auf jene Römische Vogeldeutung und Wahrsageren, die du mit grösser Mühe gesammelt und versichert hast.”