Agamemnon's surrender, viewed this way, gains "human intelligibility." It also demonstrates to Clytemnestra Agamemnon's involvement with Cassandra. This foreshadows her later avowal that one of the reasons she killed her husband was the offense she took at the women he enjoyed as warlord (1438–41, and cf. 1263). Moreover, it brings to the foreground the eternal triangle and its important function in the *Agamemnon,* which presents the appalling problem of the *Oresteia.* For the trio here—Agamemnon, Clytemnestra, and Cassandra—is only one of several such groups of three that will ultimately compel Orestes to kill his mother.

The first triangle, the "destruction (ἄτη) that began it all" (1192), is the adultery of Thyestes with the wife of his brother Atreus (1193), for which the latter took a most horrible revenge. All the males of the next generation are similarly involved, as one triangle brings about the next. There are the two sons of Atreus: Menelaus, whose wife left him for Paris and caused the Trojan war (61–67, and passim); and Agamemnon, who leads that war, alienates Clytemnestra by sacrificing Iphigenia for it (224–29, and passim), and returns with a concubine to face his wife in our scene. There is also the one surviving son of Thyestes, Aegisthus, who takes advantage both of Agamemnon's absence and of Clytemnestra's resentment to fill the empty place in their marital bed; from there he plots his revenge for Atreus' retaliation against his father (1223–25; 1577–1611, esp. 1604). Before long Agamemnon will have paid with his life for having sacrificed Iphigenia and for having returned with Cassandra, as well as for being the son of the slaughterer of Thyestes' children. And the spilt blood will wait for the avenger, Orestes, and the *Choephoroe.*[24]

Of all these groups of three, only the one treated here appears on stage in the *Agamemnon* in a three-actor scene. Because of the recent introduction of the third actor, the audience is likely to have been aware of the potential of such a presentation. The significance of the actors' number, however, is translated into drama only when the king appeals to his wife on behalf of his concubine. And that, as I have suggested, is part and parcel of Agamemnon's yielding.[25]

RAᶜANANA MERIDOR
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

24. See 1646–48. Clytemnestra will kill Cassandra, too, for having been brought by Agamemnon. Her death will also be avenged by Orestes: see 1279–83, 1317–19.

25. I wish to thank my colleagues and friends, Mrs. D. Gera and Dr. N. Zagagi, for their constructive discussion and suggestions; and the referees of *CP* and the Editor for their useful criticism.

SOME PASSAGES IN MAXIMUS OF TYRE

Small words have a nasty habit of disappearing from manuscripts without permission; I begin with a few passages which seem to betray stylistic blemishes due to this cause.

2. 4 (p. 22. 4–6 Hobein):

τὸ δὲ βαρβαρικόν, ὁμοίως μὲν ἅπαντες ξυνετοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατεστήσαντο δὲ αὐτοῖς σημεῖα ἄλλοι ἄλλα. Πέρσαι μὲν πῦρ, ἄγαλμα ἐφήμερον, ἀκόρεστον καὶ ἀδηφάγον κτλ.

It looks as if a connective has dropped out in line 6: Πέρσαι μὲν <γὰρ> πῦρ κτλ.

2. 8 (pp. 25. 16–26. 1 H.):

> Κελτοὶ σέβουσιν μὲν Δία, ἄγαλμα δὲ Διὸς Κελτικὸν ὑψηλὴ δρῦς. Παίονες σέβουσιν μὲν "Ηλιον, ἄγαλμα δὲ ‘Ηλίου Παιονικὸν δίσκος βραχὺς ὑπὲρ μακροῦ ξύλου. Ἀράβιοι σέβουσι μέν, ὄντινα δέ, οὐκ οἶδα· τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα εἶδον, λίθος ἦν τετράγωνος.

> 25. 19 μέν, ὄντινα : μὲν <θεὸν>, ὄντινα Meiser

The absolute σέβουσι in line 19 seems very abrupt; the two preceding occurrences of σέβουσιν (lines 16 and 17) lead us to expect an object here. One understands why Meiser proposed a conjecture, but <θεὸν> cannot do, since it is generic (= "God," "the deity," vel sim.) in a passage where the specific gods of various races are being mentioned. If one requires a supplement, the simplest would be σέβουσι μὲν <θεόν τινα>, ὄντινα δέ, οὐκ οἶδα. This provides the requisite sense and would have been easily liable to omission by haplography, especially when written in uncials with the standard abbreviation of the *nomen sacrum* θεός, thus: ΘΝΤΙΝΑ ΟΝΤΙΝΑ.

25. 7 (pp. 305. 13–306. 2 H.):

> ἥδιστον ἦν θέαμα ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς (πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἔμελλεν;), οὐ διὰ τὴν ξανθὴν κόμην· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Εὔφορβος εὐκόμης ἦν, τῷ δὲ Ἀχιλλεῖ τὸ καλὸν ἥδιστον ἦν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐξαπτόμενον.

Read <ἀλλ’> οὐ διὰ τὴν ξανθὴν κόμην. The argument requires the adversative particle and it seems guaranteed by the parallels on p. 306. 2 ff.: ἥδιστον μὲν <ἐν> ποταμοῖς ὁ Νεῖλος· ἀλλ’ οὐ δι’ ἀφθονίαν ὕδατος . . . ἥδιστον θέαμα ὁ Νεῖλος, ἀλλ’ οὐ τολμῶ κτλ. Omission of ΑΛΛ after εΜεΛΛεΝ is easy enough.

26. 2 (p. 310. 10–14 H.):

> . . . λόγων μὲν πάντα μεστὰ καὶ ψιθυρισμάτων, σοφιστῶν σοφισταῖς συμπιπτόντων, ἔργου δὲ ἐρημία δεινή. καὶ τὸ θρυλούμενον τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὑπὲρ οὗ διέστηκεν καὶ διεστασίασται τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, οὐδεὶς ὁρᾷ.

The iteration of the article in τὸ θρυλούμενον τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθόν proves that τὸ ἀγαθόν was felt to be a quotation or fossilized phrase. Otherwise normal grammar would have led us to expect but one article, τὸ θρυλούμενον τοῦτο ἀγαθόν (τὸ . . . ἀγαθόν being the substantive). Contrast Pl. *Phlb.* 46C τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον πικρῷ γλυκὺ μεμειγμένον. In our sentence τὸ ἀγαθόν is manifestly emphatic. Refrain therefore either from deleting the second τό as a "dittography" (i.e., τὸ θρ. τοῦτο [τὸ] ἀγαθόν) or from placing a comma before τὸ ἀγαθόν, which would artificially separate the phrase from the demonstrative τοῦτο, whose position shows that it must go closely with τὸ ἀγαθόν.

That τὸ ἀγαθόν, "the Good," had become proverbial is clear from a number of passages. Note especially the comic poet Amphis, frag. 6 Kock: τὸ δ’ ἀγαθὸν ὅ τι ποτ’ ἐστίν οὗ σὺ τυγχάνειν / μέλλεις διὰ ταύτην, ἧττον οἶδα τοῦτ’ ἐγώ, / ὦ δέσποτ’, ἢ τὸ Πλάτωνος ἀγαθόν.

In introducing quotations, proverbial expressions, and the like the particle δή is regularly found (as in Pl. *Phlb.*, loc. cit. above). Headlam provides an excellent sampling at Herodas 2. 45; see also Denniston, *GP*², p. 325. It will suffice to cite a few typical instances: Pl. *Gorg.* 514E τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο (a frequent expression); id. *Soph.* 241D καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο; [Pl.] *Ax.* 365B τὸ κοινὸν δὴ τοῦτο . . . θρυλούμενον; Plut. *Lyc.* 10 τοῦτο δὴ τὸ θρυλούμενον. In Maximus compare 37. 2 (p. 428. 3) τὸ καλούμενον δὴ τοῦτο.

In this passage, therefore, the Greek would be more idiomatic if we were to read καὶ τὸ θρυλούμενον <δὴ> τοῦτο "τὸ ἀγαθὸν" . . . οὐδεὶς ὁρᾷ.[1]

28. 4 (p. 337. 6–12 H.):

> ὁ μὲν γάρ φησιν σὺν τῷ ὅλῳ ἰᾶσθαι καὶ τὸ μέρος, καὶ ἀδύνατον εἶναι σωτηρίαν
> παραγίνεσθαι τῷ μορίῳ, πρὶν καὶ τῷ παντὶ ἔλθῃ· ὀρθῶς λέγων, κἀγὼ πείθομαι,
> ὅσα γε ἐπὶ σώματος· ἐν δὲ τῇ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συζυγίᾳ ἀντιστρόφως φημὶ
> ἔχειν· ᾧ γὰρ ἂν τὸ μέρος καλῶς ἔχῃ, ἀνάγκη τὸ πᾶν τούτῳ ἔχειν καλῶς κτλ.

Normal Greek style all but demands ἀνάγκη <καὶ> τὸ πᾶν τούτῳ ἔχειν καλῶς. Compare above, lines 6–7 (σὺν τῷ ὅλῳ . . . καὶ τὸ μέρος) and 8 (τῷ μορίῳ, πρὶν καὶ τῷ παντί). I cite one example from Aristotle, as more would be superfluous, *MA* 699b32–34: ἆρα δὲ δεῖ τι ἀκίνητον εἶναι καὶ ἠρεμοῦν ἔξω τοῦ κινουμένου, μηδὲν ὂν ἐκείνου μόριον, ἢ οὔ; καὶ τοῦτο πότερον <u>καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παντὸς</u> οὕτως ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖον; in Maximus' text the καὶ fell out by haplography with the final syllable of ἀνάγκη.

41. 5 (p. 483. 9–17 H.):

> ἡ μὲν εὐδαίμων καὶ μακαρία ψυχὴ . . . ἄρχει τοῦ ἅρματος, καὶ κολάζει τὰς τῶν
> ἵππων ὁρμάς· οἱ δέ εἰσιν ἀτεχνῶς παντοδαποί, ἄλλος ἀλλαχοῦ θεῖν διωρμημένοι,
> ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀκόλαστος καὶ ἀδηφάγος καὶ ὑβριστής, ὁ δὲ θυμώδης καὶ ἰτητικὸς
> καὶ ἔμπληκτος, ὁ δὲ νωθὴς καὶ ἐκλελυμένος, ὁ δὲ ἀνελεύθερος καὶ σμικρόφρων
> καὶ ταπεινός.

The inspiration for this allegory is of course the familiar myth in the *Phaedrus,* which Greeks of the later periods never wearied of imitating.[2] This sentence is carefully articulated, and the balanced structure is very strict; in the manuscript tradition three of the four ἵπποι have three epithets, one has only two, which is odd. Some adjective or participle has fallen out in line 16 where <καὶ ---> belongs either before or after καὶ ἐκλελυμένος. We cannot hope to recover the exact epithet and must be content with the recognition of a lacuna.

16. 2 (p. 198. 15–16 H.):

> ταῦτά τοι ἐννοῶν, ἡγούμην δεῖν φροντιστέον εἶναί μοι κτλ.
>
> 15 δεῖν del. Davis : δὴ Heinsius : ἀεὶ Hahn

---

1. Headlam, loc. cit., remarks, "τὸ τοῦ λόγου δὴ τοῦτο, 'as the saying goes': such expressions are used adverbially or as objects of a verb, but never appear as the subject of it." This observation has a general validity and would apply here, but an exception can be found at Ar. *Av.* 651–52 ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις / ἐστὶν λεγόμενον δή τι κτλ.

2. For the topos as modified by Maximus, see G. L. Koniaris, "On Maximus of Tyre: Zetemata (I)," *CA* 1 (1982): 103, n. 37.

The reason why scholars have condemned δεῖν is obvious; it seems redundant in combination with φροντιστέον, which itself contains the requisite notion of obligation or necessity. Hence the expulsion of δεῖν as corruption or gloss. In reality, the joining of superfluous δεῖν with verbal adjectives and other expressions of necessity or propriety (e.g., ἀναγκαῖον . . . δεῖν) is thoroughly idiomatic and well attested in the writings of Plato (where its appearance has frequently misled scholars into "correcting" the text). This use of δεῖν is a natural, if mildly illogical, means of emphatic expression and may be compared with the common use of the double negative (in various languages) for similar purposes of emphasis.

As parallels for the occurrence of δεῖν specifically with a verbal adjective, see Pl. *Rep.* 535A ἐκείνας τὰς φύσεις οἵου δεῖν ἐκλεκτέας εἶναι and id. *Epist.* 7. 328B–C ἔρρεψε δεῖν . . . καὶ νῦν πειρατέον εἶναι.[3] Observe that in these passages, just as in Maximus, δεῖν *precedes* the verbal adjective. Furthermore, there is clearly discernible the additional tendency of the living language to conjoin δεῖν with a verb of thinking (οἵου δεῖν ∼ ἡγούμην δεῖν), even where the infinitive would appear to be superfluous. See LSJ, s.vv. ἡγέομαι III. 4 and οἴομαι VI. 2 (where this "superfluous" use of δεῖν is explicitly recognized). In the present passage of Maximus δεῖν never should have been questioned.

23. 1 (p. 278. 9–11 H.):

> ἆρα τοὺς ἐπὶ σκαπάνῃ καὶ αὔλακι πρὸς τῇ γῇ διαπονουμένους, δεινοὺς ἀροῦν,
> ἀγαθοὺς φυτεύειν, ἐν ἀμήτῳ δεξιούς, ἐν ὀρχάτῳ φιλοπόνους;

It has gone undetected that in this sentence Maximus' phrase δεινοὺς ἀροῦν, ἀγαθοὺς φυτεύειν is directly modeled on a verse of Tyrtaeus', frag. 5. 3 West (= frag. 4. 3 Diehl): Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν. Elsewhere Maximus often quotes or paraphrases passages from the classical authors, above all from Homer and Plato, which he introduces specifically to further his argument or thesis. Even of such passages not all have been noted in modern times, for example, 26. 1 (p. 307. 15–17 H.) αὐτὸς δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ, κούφῳ χρήματι καὶ πολυπλανεστέρῳ τῶν σωμάτων, πανταχοῦ περιεφέρετο, which is an obvious echo of Plato *Ion* 534B κοῦφον γὰρ χρῆμα ποιητής ἐστιν καὶ πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερόν; it certainly would have been recognized as such by many an ancient reader.[4] The present case is somewhat different. Neither the source of the language nor the phraseology itself has any immediate relevance to the argument, and we may with reason be suspicious. Probably Maximus neither intended nor wished to be found out.

In this instance we can glimpse the author's style in the making. Doubtless he was proud of the sentence which he had crafted; that he would borrow from the old poet Tyrtaeus is not without interest.[5] But a more interesting case, to my mind, is the following passage, 26. 5 (p. 314. 5–15 H.):

---

3. For this usage, see further my *Studies in Greek Texts* (Göttingen, 1976), pp. 127–29. To the examples there cited add Pl. *Phdr.* 264B, *Soph.* 221A, *Symp.* 185E–86A; compare also Burnet at Arist. *EN* 1142b18.

4. Maximus applies the phrase κοῦφον χρῆμα to the soul, Plato to the poet. Both, however, are discussing Homer, who is explicitly mentioned in each of the two passages. Maximus uses the phrase, of which he was clearly fond, again in 35. 6 (p. 409. 4 H.) of opinion, ἡ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν δόξα, κοῦφον χρῆμα.

5. Plato had done the same thing centuries before: see my "The Platonism of Lycurgus," *GRBS* 11 (1970): 226–29. This particular verse seems to have been moderately well known. In Σ Pl. *Leg.* 629A,

αὐτίκα πεποίηται αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μειράκιον Θετταλικὸν καὶ ἀνὴρ
βασιλικός, Ἀχιλλεὺς καὶ Ἀγαμέμνων· ὁ μὲν ὑπ' ὀργῆς εἰς ὕβριν προφερόμενος,
ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων, ὁ δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς προπηλακισθεὶς μηνιῶν· εἰκόνες παθῶν, νεότητος
καὶ ἐξουσίας. ἀντίθες τοι ἑκατέρῳ τὸν Νέστορα, παλαιὸν τῷ χρόνῳ, ἀγαθὸν
φρονεῖν, δεινὸν εἰπεῖν. πάλιν αὖ Θερσίτης πεποίηται αὐτῷ αἰσχρὸς ἰδεῖν, φωνὴν
ἐπεσβόλος, γνώμην ἄτακτος, οἷος εἶναι εἰκὼν ἀκολάστου δήμου. ἀλλ' ἀντίθες
καὶ τούτῳ ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν, ἡγεμόνα ἀκριβῆ, ἐπιπορευόμενον κτλ.

In line 10 restore the idiomatic particle which has fallen out: <ἀλλ'> ἀντίθες τοι
κτλ. Maximus uses the identical phrase immediately below, line 14 ἀλλ' ἀντίθες
καὶ τούτῳ κτλ., where the καὶ should be noted; it may well indicate that this is the
second occurrence of ἀλλ' ἀντίθες. For repeated ἀλλά with the imperative, see
Denniston, *GP²*, p. 15. Such a corruption is readily explained here: uncial ΑΛΛ
dropped out before AN.

Even granting the correctness of this conjecture (more proof of which anon),
the sense of the passage is affected not at all, and the change is inconsequential. So
at least it would seem. But let us linger a bit over this sentence.

Ἀντίθες τοι, with or without a preceding ἀλλ', has not been recognized for
what it is, namely, an unusual expression to turn up in prose; the little particle τοι
tells us that. "τοι is far commoner in direct statements than in questions, wishes,
commands, or subordinate clauses. . . . In other independent clauses [sc. than
statements] (questions, commands, and wishes) the particle is much less common"
(Denniston, *GP²*, pp. 539, 545). For instances of τοι with the imperative Denniston
refers to Anacreon, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and but one
prose occurrence, Pl. *Gorg.* 461E. In the Platonic passage the phrase in question
is—ἀλλὰ ἀντίθες τοι. That Maximus constantly alludes to and quotes Plato is too
well known to require documentation; suffice it to note that in codex R, the
archetype, Maximus is entitled Πλατωνικὸς φιλόσοφος. Observe now that in our
passage Maximus has just adduced two "types," Achilles and Agamemnon; in the
sentence immediately preceding the one in question he explains his meaning:
εἰκόνες παθῶν, νεότητος καὶ ἐξουσίας. In the Platonic passage (*Gorg.* 461C–E)
Socrates is talking with Polus; he explicitly contrasts himself and others of his age
(unfavorably) with Polus and his contemporaries—πρεσβύτεροι versus νεώτεροι.
In the sentence just before ἀλλὰ ἀντίθες τοι Socrates mentions Athens, where
there exists πλείστη . . . ἐξουσία τοῦ λέγειν. In other words, the same two motifs,
νεότης and ἐξουσία, are prominent in this very passage of Plato.

The accumulation of coincidences, if coincidences they be, would be remark-
able. Assume rather that Maximus had his Plato before him and everything falls
into place, above all the particle τοι, so unexpected in prose with the imperative.
Of course, if this analysis is correct, it becomes far more probable that Maximus
wrote ἀλλ' ἀντίθες τοι (or ἀλλὰ with *scriptio plena:* we could never know) and
not ἀντίθες τοι. Only the inexperienced will wish to see traces of *petitio principii*
in this reasoning.

The story does not end here. For when Plato wrote ἀλλὰ ἀντίθες τοι he was
himself borrowing a poetic phrase. (After all, the τοι wants justification even in
Plato.) Wilamowitz discerned a tragic tone in the expression, and Denniston and

---

which preserves it (also preserved in Olympiodorus *In Alcib.* 1 p. 103 Westerink), it is described as τὸ
φερόμενον . . . ἔπος. I assume that Maximus knew it from a collection of quotations (compare below).

Dodds, apparently independently, discovered the actual phrase in Crates Comicus frag. 17. 1 Kassel-Austin (= frag. 15. 1 Kock). This does not exclude a tragic source for Crates, since in him ἀλλ' ἀντίθες τοι may itself be paratragic. *Fata sua habent locutiones.*[6]

As for Maximus, I consider it improbable in the extreme that he realized that Plato's ἀλλ(ὰ) ἀντίθες τοι was in fact an actual poetic quotation. Rather, what we have before us is another example of Maximus' style in the making. His native ear picked up the elegant phrasing in Plato and he appropriated it. Here, too, where again the expression contains no concept integral to this thesis, Maximus presumably wished his audience to hear the phrase as his own.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the sort of minute stylistic craftsmanship—call it scissors-and-paste technique if you prefer—which has been illustrated above provides an important clue to Maximus' use of his sources. It seems to be widely believed that Maximus was dependent chiefly upon florilegia or manuals for his borrowings; Koniaris states this position most clearly: "Even in cases where Maximus quotes we cannot be reasonably certain that he derived the quotations from original sources; and the Platonic and other 'flashes' of vocabulary and thought in him may well derive to a large extent from secondary sources, from manuals περὶ ἀρεσκόντων, from compilations of excerpts, from abridged versions of texts, etc. Hobein . . . is right in suggesting that a large part of Maximus' text derives not from specific texts but from such θέματα and τόποι that had long ago become common property regardless of their origin: *e trivio plerumque petita sunt quae apud Maximum legimus.*"[7]

I would subscribe to this as a general statement; Maximus certainly must have owed a large debt to handbooks. But if it is maintained that this author never went directly to the original sources, at least in the case of Homer and certain dialogues of Plato, I must disagree. The method of composition illustrated above argues otherwise. Pl. *Gorg.* 461E, to give one example, never found its way into handbook or anthology.

40. 6 (p. 470. 11–16 H.):

ἐὰν δὲ Λεωνίδαν λέγῃς καὶ Ἀγησίλαον, γνωρίζω τὴν ἀρετήν, καὶ μέμνημαι τοῦ Ἡρακλέους, καὶ ἐπαινῶ τὴν εὐγένειαν. εἴθε μοι καὶ τὸ Ἀριστείδου γένος ἦν Ἀθήνησιν, εἴθε τὸ Σωκράτους· ἐτίμησα ἂν τούτους ὡς Ἡρακλείδας, ὡς Περσείδας, ὡς εὐπατρίδας.

Noble birth is at issue and Maximus conjures up by name some of the great old families, or clans, of μυθιστορία. The name εὐπατρίδαι is a generic term for the privileged aristocracy, known to us especially from Athens, and not originally the name of any specific γένος.[8] But Maximus was no historian, and what is wanted here is a proper name to correspond to Ἡρακλείδας and Περσείδας. That εὐπατρίδαι sometimes came to be felt as such, in the course of time, is already

---

6. For further details and evidence, as well as exposition of the relevance of the phrase in the Platonic context of the *Gorgias*, see *Studies in Greek Texts*, pp. 123–24.

7. "Maximus of Tyre," p. 104, n. 38.

8. See on this esp. H. T. Wade-Gery's paper, "Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus," *CQ* 25 (1931): 1–11 (= *Essays in Greek History* [Oxford, 1958], pp. 86–115).

clear from Isocrates 16. 25: ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ πρὸς μὲν ἀνδρῶν ἦν Εὐπατριδῶν, ὧν τὴν
εὐγένειαν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπωνυμίας ῥᾴδιον γνῶναι, πρὸς γυναικῶν δ' Ἀλκμεω-
νιδῶν κτλ.[9] F. Kiechle in *Der kleine Pauly* (Munich, 1979), s.v. *Eupatridai,* states:
"die Eupatridai später, wie die Eumolpiden, als besonderes Geschlecht galten."
See also LSJ, s.v. εὐπατρίδης II, for apparent references to a specific family. Read
therefore what the parallelism requires: ὡς Ἡρακλείδας, ὡς Περσείδας, ὡς
Εὐπατρίδας. We need feel no compulsion to define the term more precisely than
Maximus has.

R. RENEHAN
University of California,
Santa Barbara

9. How Isocrates himself understood Εὐπατριδῶν is uncertain, but irrelevant. The point is that the
Greek of this sentence is such that it naturally suggests a particular family, and the words have in fact
often been so taken.

ROSE WITHOUT MARY

> nam ieiuna quidem clivosi glarea ruris
> vix humilis apibus casias roremque ministrat.
>
> [Verg. *G.* 2. 212–13]

Heyne and others were suspicious of *rorem = rorem marinum,* but later commen-
tators cite Pliny *HN* 24. 101 *ex rore supra dicto*—not a perfect parallel, since it
refers back to *ros marinum* in 24. 99. R. Renehan believes he has discovered a
better one in *Anth. Lat.* 24 Riese (= 11 Shackleton Bailey). But it is in my opinion
highly dubious: see *CQ* 31 (1981): 471–72 and 33 (1983): 301. The desiderated
parallel is, however, to be found where neither Vergil's annotators nor diction-
aries have observed it (so far as I am aware). Ov. *Fast.* 4. 437–42 is a list of flowers
and plants gathered by Proserpina and her companions before Dis interrupted
them:

> has, hyacinthe, tenes, illas, amarante, moraris;
> pars thyma, pars rorem, pars meliloton amat.   440

True, manuscripts and editors are at odds with one another about the reading in
the pentameter. *Rorem pars* is in the Monacensis, not a first-class authority. The
oldest and best witnesses are divided among *rore et, rores pars, flores pars,* and
casiam pars. The last, according to Wormell and Courtney (Teubner, 1978),
comes from Verg. *G.* 4. 304 *thymum casiamque recentis;* but cf. also *G.* 2. 213
above.

Modern editors are eclectic. Frazer (1929), without remark in his commentary,
and Le Bonniec (1970) have *rorem, pars;* Ehwald-Levy (Teubner, 1924) *rores et;*
G. A. Davies in Postgate's *Corpus* (1905) *casiam, pars.* The favorite, however, is a
conjecture of Landi's, *rhoean* (or *rhoien*) *et* (*roien* or *roiē et* are cited from
deteriores), which has been adopted by Lenz (1932), Bömer (1958), and Wormell–