

## REVIEW ARTICLE

### *AEGRITUDO PERDICAЕ* REVISITED\*

For Miss Myra L. Uhlfelder

The *Aegritudo Perdicae* is a remarkable poem, an epyllion narrating, in 290 hexameters, Perdica's incestuous desire for his mother. The boy is first aroused to love, Cupid egging it, in a dream experienced in the god's own grove. Later, on sight of the beloved, the boy's mind produces physical symptoms; these baffle traditional medicine until one time, while Hippocrates is taking the boy's pulse, the mother enters the room and the pulse accelerates, thumping violently. The mother, in an effort to distract her son, summons to the palace a catalog of women more beauteous and beguiling than mythical prototypes. The plan fails. The boy simply deteriorates. Consumed by shame, emaciated, he rehearses the modes of suicide, cherishing the conceit that Cupid, enclosed in his body, must also die when he dies and, in the end, opting for the noose. The poem was probably composed in North Africa in the fifth century A.D. It then lay low until 1877, at which time it promised scholars much to study in the way of sources, motifs, and imitative echoes, but gave them, before all else, a miserably corrupted text to make legible.

Fortune did well to allot such a text to Emil Baehrens, a man of prodigious facility in emendation, who in a short life edited more Latin poetry than the average classicist reads or even knows by title, and who was active, utterly distinguished in fact, in the discovery of manuscripts and the formulation of manuscript traditions. The tradition of the *Aegritudo* is simple. It appears in one manuscript, Harleianus 3685 (H), written a full millennium after the poem itself. Baehrens relied on a transcription of the manuscript made at his instance by E. Maunde Thompson, author of *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, whose blunders in reading an easy script, being his, fairly amaze. In the editio princeps, *Unedirte lateinische Gedichte* (Leipzig, 1877), Baehrens was so busy correcting the Harleianus' superficial errors that he had less occasion to import those wild and arbitrary alterations which are commonly associated with his name. In a second edition (*Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 5 [Leipzig, 1883]), for which he inspected the manuscript personally, he did much more, helped by contributions from E. Rohde, R. Ellis, and K. Rossberg. A. Riese, *Baehrensus*

\**Aegritudo Perdicae*. Recognovit LAURIANUS ZURLI. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: BSB B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1987. Pp. xiv + 24. M 12.50.

I am very grateful to R. Renehan for discussing various passages with me, always to my profit, and for permitting me to present in detail his conjecture in 246-49.

*dimidiatus* and his predecessor in editing, for example, *Anthologia Latina*, followed with a text in his second edition of the collection (vol. I [Leipzig, 1906]). But his innovations were few.

The surprise would come in the person of the third editor, F. Vollmer, the *bête noire* of Housman's preface to *Manilius I*, the very type there, with Vahlen and Buecheler, of a conservative critic. It is known, or ought to be known, that in 1898 the criticism of Latin poetry "touched its nadir" in Vollmer's text and commentary of Statius' *Silvae*. But Vollmer, intelligent and potentially independent, developed for the better and even became, as Housman was willing to allow, "something of a critic." His edition of the *Aegritudo* (*Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 5<sup>2</sup> [Leipzig, 1914]) documents this. The apparatus is admirable: he obtained photographs of H and provided—for he was a first-rate collator—the most accurate reports of its readings. (The standard of accuracy had dipped when a certain Nolte, working for Riese, contrived to misread in nine of the twelve places where he asserted independence from Baehrens.) The text itself is conservative, but not inflexibly so: Vollmer recognized the need to emend, and emended, often plausibly, sometimes conclusively. In the handiwork of the scribe of H Vollmer did indeed receive "admonitory shocks," did indeed find things "of which he could make neither head nor tail"; and such things remain today. It is to his credit that he was prepared to apply the obelus, in which temper he is modern. Baehrens has it but once; and while Riese has it ten times, and Vollmer eleven, Vollmer manifests the more judicious application.

It was appropriate that, some seventy years after Vollmer's Teubner, which included Dracontius, Lorianò Zurli should aspire to devote a new Teubner solely to the *Aegritudo*. Progress has been made in the intervening years; in Italy, in particular, the *Aegritudo* has been popular; scholars there assiduously expound its text, even the youth con it at university, as witness S. Mariotti's edition "scholis Romae habendis impressa" (Rome, 1966). Z. himself is diligent, knows what has been written on the poem, appreciates the state of its text, and is not afraid to challenge or change it. He sees cause to change approximately two hundred words. This scale of correction is not smaller than that in previous editions, but only seems so, because Z. resolutely excludes from citation those readings of an orthographical nature, many the merest trifles, which swelled the count to 387 in Baehrens, 351 in Riese, 299 in Vollmer. He resorts to the obelus in sixteen passages—a reasonable number in toto, though opinions may differ as to where, between emendation and obelization, the dagger should prevail.

†*decuis*† at line 9 is hyperskeptical; surely Rohde's *triste decus* is the answer, and the following *arcere* is sound (i.e., it is proper to keep Venus at arm's length, but it is a "gloomy propriety"; nobody likes doing it). Why print †*incesta*† at 131 when only *causa* (Baehrens), preceded by either *fit* (Baehrens) or *est* (Maehly), can conceivably be the truth? Other passages, crying for an obelus, do not have one affixed. At 260–62 "denique defessos artus ac membra calore / molitur gestare <diu> victusque virorum / sternitur infelix per tota cubilia fusus," Z.'s confidence in his own supplement *diu* is inconsistent with his skepticism at 112 and 162, where he sets in the text merely the scansional scheme of the lacuna, but where the problem is limited to a single word and the possibilities for solving it are circumscribed. Here "gestare †victusque virorum†" would have been wiser. One expects a break after *gestare* and an expression of incapacity, of final inability to do the moving (unless the text be *molitus* ["though he strive"] *gestare* <*nequit* Baehrens), in which case

*gestare* would pertain equally to *molitus* and *nequit* and the break would come after *nequit*). Nor, by the by, does one endorse, with Z., Morelli's idea to take *virorum* in this line as modifying *infelix* in the following. *Sternitur INFELIX*, beginning the line, constitutes a pattern which, when it occurs in Vergil, occurs with *infelix* unmodified: *sternitur infelix* (*Aen.* 10. 730, 781), *labitur infelix* (*Aen.* 5. 329, *G.* 3. 498), *ducitur infelix* (*Aen.* 11. 85), *uritur infelix* (*Aen.* 4. 68). Similarly, at 231, where Z. prints Vollmer's "candidior Chione (haec) pervenit (et) altera Dirce," he should have printed "candidior Chione †pervenit† altera Dirce." *Pervenit*, framed by *veniunt* in 228 and *venere* in 232, makes egregious style in the catalog; those who believe it ousted an epithet, in the comparative degree, of Dirce are seemingly on the right lines. (Vollmer in his index, misled by the comparatives, took *Danae* and *Glauce* in 230, *Chione* and *Dirce* in 231, nominatives all, for ablatives.) For H's *Coigne*, whence Baehrens elicited *Chione* or *Progne*, Z. interestingly accepts the former "propter nominis et adiectivi significatus inter se conexos aptosque." For a play on the etymology of the name itself (Greek χιών, "snow" = Latin *hiems*) he might have compared Mart. 3. 34 "Digna tuo cur sis indignaque nomine, dicam. / frigida es et nigra: non es et es *Chione*." Baehrens, for his part, might have given his alternative as *Procne*, not necessarily because it is the better spelling (cf. Housman, *Classical Papers*, pp. 1144–45), but because it is the better explanation of the corruption: *Procne* > *Progne* > *Progne* > *Cogne*. Note that *Proē* (= *Procne*) virtually invites the absorption of *procerior* (Rohde) into itself, and that the epithet would find an echo in 242 *procero corpore*. At 258 the text should be †*sufficit*†, and "satis ut *Maehly*" should disappear from the apparatus. One objection to Z.'s "satis est . . . ?" is that the question here ought to come in the negative, like "*non sat erant frondes* . . . ?" in lines 2–4.

In a number of places Z. improves the surface of the text by adopting emendations of others, sometimes old and neglected ones, sometimes recent ones: 120 *seu* (tu) (Ellis, Hunt), 126 *Oedipoden* (Hunt), 156 *pulsu* (Otto), 262 *sternitur* (Mariotti). He makes, in the matter of *selectio*, reasonable and sound choices, maintains good readings when he might have reverted to bad ones. But why retail these? Because much remains uncertain or otherwise problematic in the text of this poem, and because "finding faults is the most useful sort of criticism," I concentrate on points of doubt and disagreement. Bulking large among them are Z.'s own emendations, a capital weakness of his edition.

Many decisions in the text are debatable or flatly fail to satisfy. Z.'s dealings with lines 5–6, including the punctuation of 5 and the retention of *at* in 6, leave *hoc* at the beginning of 5 virtually functionless. Another functionless *hoc* appears in 111, discussed below; and a problem involving the word *hoc*, hitherto not seen in that light, exists in 46. In the latter line Z. is staunchly tolerant in maintaining H's *ast* in the text (and in perpetuating Rossberg's *est*, an outstandingly bad proposal, in the apparatus). In *CP* 83 (1988): 340–41 I conjectured that *hoc*, which comes later in the line where nothing is wanted, should replace this unsatisfactory *ast*, which comes at the beginning where *hoc* itself is wanted.

In line 189 *post* is hardly to be interpreted as *postea* with Barbasz and Rizzo. In the parallels cited *post* is always the first word in its line and marks, clearly, the second step in a sequence, as, in 54–55 and 144–45, *et primo* (*primum*) . . . / *post* . . . , whereas here it would be merely loose and transitional. It would also be unmannerly: where else in Latin poetry do we encounter nightfall introduced by "afterward"? Nor does *post* here accord well with the pluperfect *conpresserat*. Furthermore, if *post* = *postea*, *discussa* in the next line must be accepted and, to be accepted, must be interpreted, with Barbasz and Z., as a middle (= perfective *discutiens*), which emphatically it cannot be. Here is the passage in question with a further fault imported, by way of emendation, in 191 (on *aeternaque* in 189 see below):

Roscida post radios aeternaque lumina solis  
 nox tenebris discussa (diffusa *Baehrens*) suis conpresserat omnes,  
*at non te, Perdica, umquam puer ille Cupido*  
 vel partem minimam patitur decerpere (somni),  
 sed solum †tenuit veneranda te casus umbras†.

Where H has *ad ante Perdicam numquam*, and Baehrens had emended to “at iam te, Perdica, puer numquam ille Cupido,” Maehly and Vollmer to “at te, Perdica, numquam puer ille Cupido,” Z. so emends, “putans vero poetam sibi Verg. Aen. 4, 529 ad imitandum proposuisse.” But see Vergil’s wording (522–23, 529–30):

Nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem  
 corpora per terras . . .  
*at non infelix animi Phoenissa, neque umquam*  
 solvitur in somnos . . .

The construction is different: *at non* . . . *Phoenissa* has an ellipsis of the verb, whether it be *carpebat soporem* from 522 or *tacet* from 525, which our passage has not; our passage, to match Vergil, would require *at non Perdicam* (sc. *conpresserat*), or *at non te, Perdica*, would require that *non* throw its force on *Perdicam* or *te*. In Z.’s text *non* throws its force not on the following *te, Perdica*, but on the further following *umquam*, whereas in Vergil *neque umquam* distinctly continues the *non* (sc. *carpebat soporem*) and forms a new colon with a new verb. Were *at non* . . . at all tenable, a closer parallel would have been Sil. *Pun.* 7. 282–87:

*cuncta* per et terras et lati stagna profundi  
*condiderat somnus*, positoque labore dierum  
 pacem nocte datam mortalibus orbis agebat.  
*at non Sidonium* curis flagrantia corda  
*ductorem* vigilesque metus haurire sinebant  
 dona soporiferae noctis.

*At non* here introduces not the ellipsis of Vergil, but the full sentence of the *Aegritudo*, with these three similarities: *puer ille Cupido* (~ *curis flagrantia corda vigilesque metus*) *vel partem minimam patitur* (~ *sinebant*) *decerpere somni* (~ *haurire* . . . *dona soporiferae noctis*). A nightfall passage that uses *at non* naturally implies the contrast “all” vs. “alone”; it need not therefore express either word, though in practice we find “all” twice, “alone” never. Our passage expresses both, *omnes* in 190 and *solum te tenuit* (sc. *Cupido*) in 193.<sup>1</sup> Because 193–95 are an amplification of 191–92, one would expect in 191, if there were a gap in H instead of the letters *ad ante* (= *at* . . . *te*), simply *solum te*, with the second *solum te* to follow in anaphora. *Omnes* and *solum te* . . . *solum te* would then convey the contrast, as, on the introduction of *Perdica* in the previous nightfall passage, “*sola* tibi dulci *numquam*, *Perdica*, quieti / tradidit assiduus ardentia lumina flammis” (104–5) is opposed to *cuncta* (103). For similarities in the two nightfall passages, see below; note for now that *numquam* in our passage, specifically as *numquam*, is defended by *numquam* in 104. (In the same vein, the vocative *Perdica* in 191 might have dissuaded Baehrens and Riese from reading Rossberg’s nominative *solus ibi* . . . *Perdica*, with its pointless *ibi*, in 104.)

1. Z.’s conjecture *sed solum* <ut> *tenuit*, recorded in the apparatus, is markedly inferior to [sed] *solum* <te> *tenuit* (*te* is needed, *sed* is not). For the “stopgap connective” *sed*, see *sed nox* . . . in 101 for *iam* (*iā* was lost to *talía* overhead) and *ac nisi* . . . in 248 for *nam*, discussed below. In Riese’s conjecture, also recorded, the *solus* applied to Cupido is absurdly counter to the emphasis of the passage.

When at 217 Z. says “et (= etiam) si tibi e v. *priore iteravi*” (*et si H*), he emends with equally lamentable consequences. Perdica is remonstrating with Cupid:

tormentis adfige tuis, constringe catenis,  
non fateor. totas in me consume sagittas  
quotquot amoris habes et, si tibi tela furoris  
defuerint, *et si <tibi>* de love fulmina sumas,  
vincere non poteris sanctum, scelerate, Pudorem.

*Et, si* in 216 and *et si* in 217, in the latter of which *et* stands for *etiam*, is inelegant; and the further repeat *si tibi . . . si tibi*, in which the second *tibi*, despite its strong and matching position, has no matching function, is mere ineptitude. Style dictates a different arrangement. The *et* in 216 should connect *consume* with *sumas* in 217, not, as it does now, with *vincere non poteris* in 218. We have in fact a chiasmus: *consume*, followed by *quotquot amoris habes*, which is tantamount to a condition; then, in reverse, *si tibi . . . defuerint*, a condition, followed by *sumas*. Note the responsion in the conditions, *furoris* varying *amoris* (similar in shape and sound), *tibi . . . defuerint* giving the opposite of *habes*. There is simply no place for a further condition in 217, no place in the apparatus therefore, *pace Z.*, for *etiam si* (Vollmer) or *et si vel* (Ellis). This is perhaps a case for the obelus, but the possibility should be raised that *si* conceals *sua*:

tormentis adfige tuis, constringe catenis:  
non fateor. totas in me consume sagittas,  
quotquot amoris habes, et, si tibi tela furoris  
defuerint, *etiam sua* de love fulmina sumas:  
vincere non poteris sanctum, scelerate, Pudorem.

This sense, “you may even take from Jove Jove’s own thunderbolts,” can also be obtained by writing “defuerint, *licet et sua* de love fulmina sumas” (where *et* = *etiam*). The order *sua de love fulmina* is that of Ov. *Met.* 9. 427–28 “donec *sua Iuppiter ora* / solvit,” *Fast.* 1. 612 “et quodcumque *sua Iuppiter* auget ope”; see *Am.* 1. 1. 16 “vix etiam *Phoebo iam lyra tuta sua* est” for the so-called emphasizing reflexive. For the emphasis (with true reflexive) compare 210–12 (Cupid is addressed): “o scelerate, *tuas* si tu paterere sagittas / sique *tuos* ignes in te convertere discas, / ut (= “how”) credas quid possit amor!” It should be observed that the construction of 214–15 (“tormentis *adfige* tuis, *constringe* catenis: / *non fateor*”) prefigures and confirms that of 215–18 (“totas in me *consume* sagittas / . . . et . . . / . . . de love fulmina *sumas*: / *vincere non poteris*”). *Fateor* in 215, looking to *poteris* in 218, must be “praesens pro futuro” or else must be emended, with Baehrens and editors, to *fatear*, “coniunctivus pro futuro,” like *quiescant* in line 1 and “*aestuēt . . . vincentur . . . amabunt*” in *Drac. Rom.* 2. 32–34. Note further, in point of symmetry, that appliances balance the first two imperatives (“*tormentis adfige . . . , constringe catenis*”) and weapons the second two (“consume *sagittas . . . , fulmina sumas*”), creating a chiasmus.

In 253–55, in a catalog of symptoms, Z. contributes *victus* for *famem*:

concava luminibus macies circumdata sedit  
longaque testantur ieiunia viscera *victus*,  
arida nudati distendunt brachia nervi.

This was nothing to propose, let alone print.<sup>2</sup> The fact that *ieiunia undae* can stand for “thirst” (Luc. 4. 332) does not justify *ieiunia victus* for “hunger (for food),” not when the

2. This is a selection; failure to mention an emendation or critical choice made by Z. does not imply approval (or disapproval). His proposals *iram* and *cientis*, printed at 94 and 142, are such as would

result is to deprive *viscera*, meaningless alone, of an epithet and to overbalance *ieiunia*, which already has *longa*.<sup>3</sup> In a characterization of *Fames* Ovid speaks of "cava lumina, pallor in ore" (*Met.* 8. 801 ~ *Aegr.* 250, 253), of "dura cutis, *per quam spectari viscera possent*" (803), which lends support to Baehrens' "*viscera aperta*" in point of meaning if not of wording. That we should have a word (surely not *visa*?) reflecting visibility or a visible condition is also suggested by *testantur* in our passage.

When there is a question of transposition, whether to reorder lines in the text itself, Z. seems to shut his eyes and play the conservative. In three passages, at any rate, he ought to have impeached H's order.

Rohde's transposition of 123 after 125, discussed below, and Vollmer's transposition of 156 after 159 are palmary. In a description of nightfall, 101–12, it is time to recognize that the lines are transmitted in an impossible sequence, that 108–10, in particular, can hardly stand where H gives them. Rohde's transpositions here, known to all editors but printed by none, seem virtually certain. Because Rohde himself said the barest minimum in support, and because the merits of his action are very considerable, it may be *operae pretium* to examine the passage in detail:

iam nox umbriferis per caelum roscida pennis	101
presserat aërios fugientis solis honores	
cunctaque per terras animalia pressa sopore:	103
omnia fessa domat caelestia sidera somnus,	108
flumina quoque tenet nec non maris imperat undis,	109
corpora vel modicam compellit adire quietem:	110
sola tibi dulci numquam, Perdica, quieti	104
tradidit assiduis ardentia lumina flammis.	105
pro dolor! hoc scelus est soli vigilantis amor:	111
nox ipsi maesta est: vigilat metuitque tepetque,	106
suspirat numquam requiem daturus amor.	107
tunc quoque Perdicam tanto premit igne Cupido	112
ut possit nec ferre facem.	

In *Nachträge* to Baehrens' first edition Rohde observed that, by transposing, *tradidit* in 105 would gain a subject, *somnus* in 108—"denn 'nox' aus 101 kann wegen des dazwischen liegenden selbständigen Satzes 103 nicht hierher bezogen werden." He added only that *ipsi* in 106 (specific, i.e., *Perdicæ*) would have point following *vigilantis* in 111 (general); it would ease, that is, the transition from second person (104 *tibi*, of *Perdica*) to third person (106–7 *vigilat* . . . *suspirat*, of *Perdica*). He might also have observed that *hoc* in line 111 would be engaged in real business, as was not the case before. And there is more. Lines 108–10 *must* follow 101–3, of which they are an amplification: 101 *caelum*, 102 *solis* ~ 108 *caelestia sidera*; 102 *presserat* ~ 108 *domat* (109 *tenet nec non* . . . *imperat*); 103 *animalia* (living beings) ~ 110 *corpora*; 103 *sopore* ~ 108 *somnus*; 103 *cuncta* ~ 108 *omnia*. Let no one object that 108–10, coming between 103 and 104, would impair the contrast in *cuncta* (103) and *sola* (104); *omnia* (108) continues *cuncta* (103), and the contrast remains. For *cuncta* . . . *omnia* in successive lines, see 148–49 *omnia* . . . *cuncta*. For the technique of

content only their proposer. The parenthesis which he marks at 157–59 is no answer to Vollmer's transposition of 156 after 159; the subjunctive *parent* in 158, as the passage now goes, is unintelligible. The words *fatusque coerceat*; *detorsit* at 244–45 seem more difficult than Z., or any other editor hitherto, has openly acknowledged. Does a lacuna perhaps lurk?

3. What, by the way, of *longa* in Morelli's "*longaque testantur ieiunam viscera famem*"? Z. is the only editor to honor this with a seat in the apparatus.

amplification, the other nightfall passage, 189–96, supplies a parallel: lines 193–96 there amplify 191–92. That passage, moreover, has clear affinities with this:

101. nox . . . roscida	189–90 roscida . . . nox
102–3 presserat . . . cuncta . . . animalia	190 conpresserat omnes
110 vel modicam . . . quietem	192 vel partem minimam . . . somni
104 sola	193 solum
105 assiduis . . . flammis	196 assiduis . . . flammis
106 vigilat	195 vigilat

The juncture, for example, of 110 and 104 (as transposed) is confirmed by that of 192 and 193. Confirmatory also, in its way, is a piece of external evidence: Verg. *Aen.* 4. 522–32 “Nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem / corpora per terras. . . .” This passage, a distinct model, mentions *silvae* . . . *aequora* . . . *sidera* . . . *lacus* (523–26) before the appearance of Dido (529), just as our passage, on the transposition of 108–10, mentions *sidera* . . . *flumina* . . . *maris* . . . *undis* before the appearance of Perdica. Then there are the effects of verbal placement in our passage, plain and salutary. Notice now the ring composition, 101 *nox* ~ 106 *nox*, and the point of transition in 112, “*tunc quoque* Perdicam . . . *premit* igne Cupido,” where *premit* echoes (*nox*) *presserat* in 102. After the introduction of night and Perdica’s sleeplessness, *tunc quoque* continues in much the same way as *tunc quoque* does in 137, after the prior introduction of *dies* and Perdica’s weakness (132–36). Notice on a smaller scale the following words, serving as links in the development of the thought, all at line’s end: 103 *sopore* ~ 108 *somnus*, 110 *quietem* ~ 104 *quieti*, 111 *amori* ~ 107 *amori*. A sharp antithesis now exists when, immediately following “vel modicam conpellit adire quietem” (110), comes “numquam . . . quieti / tradidit assiduis ardentia lumina flammis” (104–5). The “wakefulness” in 111 is perfectly introduced following 104–5; 106–7 then show what it means for Perdica specifically to be “awake.” *Numquam* (*quieti*) in 104 and *numquam* (*requiem*) in 107 frame the “Perdica” section (104, 105, 111, 106, 107), and the *amori* in 107 (“*suspirat numquam requiem daturus amori*”) constitutes an effective climax to the whole *descriptio*. Compare the climax of the Vergilian version considered above (*Aen.* 4. 532): “*saevit amor magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu*.” Rohde’s restructuring may look complicated but is actually easy and explicable; it presupposes the loss, and subsequent false replacement, of only two blocks of lines: 108–10 and 106–7. A scribe will have omitted the latter when his eye traveled from *amori* at the end of 111 to *amori* at the end of 107. In the case of the former, he may have glanced, after copying 103, which ends in *sopore*, to 104, which ends in *quieti*, tricked by what was lying betwixt and between: the similar, seemingly repetitive *somnus* at the end of 108 and *quietem* at the end of 110.

Who can say that the number of proposable transpositions in this poem has now been reduced to zero? Consider lines 246–49:

Nunc, o Calliope, nostro succurre labori:  
non possum tantam maciem describere solus,  
*nec* nisi das animos viresque in carmina fundis,  
*quae mihi* mandasti iam possum expromere, Musa.

This passage, as it stands in Z.’s text, is at any rate both difficult and problematical; the words *nec* and *quae mihi*, emendations by Mariotti, do not fulfill their intended purpose. In the manuscript 248 begins *ac (a) nitidas*, 249 *iussisti mandasti*. The vulgate has been *tu nisi* . . . in 248, with a full stop after *fundis*; *iussisti*, sometimes obelized, has inspired a number of guesses, mostly poor stuff (*robora* Rohde, *tu si* Ellis, *vim si* Maehly, *at quod* Riese, *iusti* Walter, *sed quae*

Hunt), and it is perhaps a question whether the actual gloss is *iussisti*, as is supposed, or *mandasti*, prompted by *mandas* in 213. Mariotti intended his *quae mihi mandasti* to serve as object of *expromere*, on the model of 213 “*quae mandas non possum dicere*,” not, as a reader unschooled in this crux might initially take it, as relative clause modifying *carmina* (248). No matter: since there is no prior reference to instructions in the poem, since the Muse *has ordered* nothing, *mandasti* is tantamount to gibberish. And where else does one find the Muse addressed by specific name (246 *Calliope*), then by *Musa* (249)? The whole passage in fact, as hitherto constituted, labors under a redundancy. It consists of doublets: thus, with Mariotti’s text, “*Calliope*, I am unable to do it alone and, unless you help, am unable, Muse.” Not only does it repeat ideas, but it goes, with supreme awkwardness, from the specific to the general. In the vulgate text, before Mariotti, 249 came very abruptly, and was in any case unneeded; the thought, indeed, ended convincingly at 248. R. Renehan therefore suggests that we delete 249. He further suggests that 248 would be more forceful if it preceded 247:

Nunc, o Calliope, nostro succurre labori:	246
<nam> nisi das animos viresque in carmina fundis,	248
non possum tantam maciem describere solus.	247

When three consecutive lines begin *nunc . . .*, *nam . . .*, *non . . .*, the stage is set for omission and transposition. Once the *nam nisi . . .* line was transposed, the first word became corrupted by merging with the *non* above it or the *nisi* beside it, leaving a gap to be plugged by the *ac* of H.<sup>4</sup> Someone then understood *ac nisi . . .* as beginning a new sentence: he saw that there was a protasis (*nisi*) without an apparent apodosis; so he fashioned an apodosis, our 249, aided in the endeavor by 213 “. . . *quae mandas non possum dicere* matri.” Manilius 1. 707 provides a parallel. That verse, deleted by Bentley, was added, as Housman notes, “*ab aliquo cui apodosis deesse videbatur*,” an apodosis, that is, to *ac veluti . . .* (705). Renehan’s *nam* perfectly suits the prayer style (cf. Catull. 44. 2, Verg. *Aen.* 1. 65, 731, 6. 116–18 *potes namque*, Hor. *Epod.* 17. 45 *potes nam*, *Carm.* 3. 11. 1–2, Ov. *Trist.* 4. 10. 117 “*gratia, Musa, tibi: nam tu solacia praebes*”), and *nisi das animos . . .* is a variant of the *sine te* formula in hymns and religious contexts.<sup>5</sup> Compare in this poem the invocation of *Nox*, line 117: “*tu nosti quid possit Amor: sine te nihil ille (sc. potest)*”; see also the passages assembled by Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace *Carmina* 1. 26. 9, culminating in *The Book of Common Prayer*, “Collect for the nineteenth Sunday after Trinity”: “*O God, for as much as without thee we are not able to. . .*” (On Hor. *Carm.* 1. 26. 9–10 “*nil sine te mei / prosunt honores*” [*te = Pipelea = Musa*] they remark that the variant *possunt* “deserves the most serious consideration,” quoting

4. Lines 240–60 appear after 79, where H has *ac*, and here, where it has *a*. It may be that *nam*, as *nā*, lost *n* to the margin; and that *a* suffered adjustment to *a(c)* in the one place but not in the other.

5. In point of prayer elements it is interesting to see 246 in the making. *Nostro succurre labori* is the second hemistich of Verg. *Aen.* 9. 404, whereas *o Calliope* comes from line 525 of the same book: *vos, o Calliope*. The name occupies the same metrical position; our poet does but substitute *nunc*, another tag of the prayer style: see Catull. 36. 11, Verg. *Aen.* 7. 37, 641, Prop. 2. 16. 13, Hor. *Serm.* 1. 5. 52–54, Ov. *Ars am.* 2. 15–16.

a scholium in A—"hoc ait quia *sine Musa non multum honoris vult intellegi Lamiae carmina sua posse conferre*"—and, pertinently for us, Prop. 2. 30. 40 "*nam sine te nostrum non valet ingenium*," where, as they say, Propertius is treating Cynthia as a tenth Muse.) The position, in several of the parallels, of *sine te* before the full expression of inability supports, or at least does not gainsay, Renchan's transposed order "*nisi das animos . . . / non possum tantam maciem describere solus*." It is effective, furthermore, to have *tantam maciem describere* directly precede the *descriptio* of decline and diminution, starting in 250, which it introduces.

Even after such specimens there remain passages where further evidence or comment, if it serves to guide our choice a little better, would be welcome. Here are some. (Several of the points made later on the apparatus, particularly on conjectures that should arguably leave it, are also relevant to text and interpretation.)

Line 47: Distressed by the connection, Z. prints, with Mariotti, Vollmer's miniature addition "Antipam <et> satyrus tenuit." The passage concerns Jupiter's amatory metamorphoses as caused by Cupid's arrows; it has, first, gold and Danae (44–45); second, the swan and Leda (46); third, the satyr and Antiopa (47). In *HSCP* 86 (1982): 118, as Z. mentions in the apparatus, I proposed to add a fourth liaison, that of the bull and Europa, between the swan and the satyr, precisely where the difficulty of connection exists;<sup>6</sup> and I observed further that the sequence would then be the very reverse of that at the beginning of the poem, line 3 "non satyrus, non taurus amans, non ales et imber." See now an adespoton in *Anth. Pal.* (9. 48): Ζεὺς κύκνος, ταῦρος, σάτυρος, χρυσὸς δι' ἔρωτα / Λήδης, Εὐρώπης, Ἀντιόπης, Δανάης. This, virtually a school exercise, shows the stock learning behind our author, such as might have committed him, since there were more such amours, to four, these four. The sequence is interesting. In the epigram, as in *Aegr.* 3, gold comes last, which it must do if Δανάης is to fit metrically in the pentameter with the other three names, and if the order of the disguises is to be that of the names, whereas here it comes first (the other position of prominence), receiving the most extensive treatment. Otherwise κύκνος, ταῦρος, σάτυρος represents the same ordering as *cygnus* (46), <*taurus*> (46a), *satyrus* (47). Cupid examines two arrows: the one had caused Jupiter to love Danae; the other had caused him to love Leda and Antiopa (in the traditional text) and Europa further (on the assumption of a lacuna). When, of this second arrow, the author concludes "iam fessa sagittast," *fessa* will indeed have point if the arrow has served not twice but thrice.

Lines 49–53:

"vulnera iam nostrae veteres fecere sagittae,  
nunc nova visenda est." dixit rivumque secutus  
quaerit arundineas scrutatus limite silvas.  
*nec mora, nota deo est: namque* obvia venit arundo,  
quam puer excussam totis radicibus aufert.

Z.'s text is that of H, previously admitted only by Mariotti, except that Z. punctuates with a comma after *mora*. The result is scarcely Latin. The *arundo* needed for *nota . . . est* he must generate, with greater difficulty than he seems to imagine, from *arundo* in the

6. In the interest of balance not only *taurus* but also the name *Europam* will have occurred in the lacuna (so 45 *Danaen*, 46 *Ledam*, 47 *Antiopam*). If the similarity of *taurus* and *satyrus* (*saturus*) did not induce the scribe's eye to jump, causing loss, maybe that of *EurOPAM* and *AntiOPAM* did.

following colon or even from *arundineas . . . silvas* in the preceding line. *Nota deo est* on this showing seems to give a reason for “no delay”; then comes a further reason, marked by *namque*. The latter would better serve as a statement of what happened “without delay” and would better come—on the common meaning *nec mora* = *statim*—directly after *nec mora* and without *namque*. Nowhere else in Latin poetry does a *nam*-clause directly follow (i.e., explain) *nec mora*, . . . (or *nec mora*: . . .). Rossberg’s sorting “*nec mora*: *nota deo* [est] *namque* *obvia venit arundo*,” cited by Z. in the apparatus, offends on that very ground. After *nec mora*, . . . or *haud mora*, . . . one in fact finds either *iam* (Sil. *Pun.* 4. 101, 5. 130, 6. 350, Stat. *Achil.* 1. 558, 741, Drac. *Laud. Dei* 1. 371 “*nec mora, iam venit alta quies*”), or an equivalent like *continuo* (Verg. *G.* 4. 548, *Aen.* 5. 368, Ov. *Met.* 14. 362), or nothing at all (Ov. *Am.* 1. 6. 13 *nec mora, venit amor*). Any temptation to correct the word to *iamque* (after Rossberg), and to assert *namque* in 41 as the cause of error, should be resisted: one never finds *iamque* thus, only *iam*,<sup>7</sup> and never finds *iam* in other than first position after *nec mora*. In Z.’s printed text, even if we could understand *arundo* (“the reed was well known to the god”), the following *namque* (“for it chanced to appear before him”) would pose a contradiction, as R. Renehan points out to me. Renehan suggests that we return to Baehrens’ “*nec mora longa deo est, namque . . .*,” which Baehrens himself printed, but which no editor since has deigned to mention.<sup>8</sup> He notes that *nec mora* itself is not strictly accurate, that *some* time has been devoted to searching: “*rivumque secutus / quaerit arundineas scrutatus limite silvas*.”

Line 67 “*talibus est verbis socios ac voce secutus*.” Apparatus: “*ac Hiller, aut H, et Hunt*.” I proposed *et* for the simple reason that it, not *ac*, is usual in the combination: Verg. *Aen.* 4. 460 “*hinc exaudiri voces et verba vocantis*,” Hor. *Epist.* 1. 1. 34–35 “*sunt verba et voces quibus hunc lenire dolorem / possis*,” Drac. *Orest.* 461 “*evomit in gemitus voces et verba doloris*.” Wölfflin, who gives examples (*Ausgewählte Schriften*, pp. 280–81), knows only one with *ac*, and that from prose: Salvian *De gub. Dei* 6. 17. It should not be thought, incidentally, that *ac* is more likely than *et* to be corrupted to *aut*. Vergil’s scribes confuse *et* and *aut* eight times (in five of which *et* is in the text), *ac* and *aut* never, though Quintilian does once transmit a Vergilian *ac* as *aut*.

Lines 121–27: In a prayer to *Nox*, Perdica’s other self, in the role of objector, seeks to dissuade him, sleepless and lovesick as he is, from going to tell his mother of his desire. Z., modeling the passage with Shackleton Bailey as a dialogue, does not follow Bailey in 122 where he should, but does follow him, evading Rohde’s transposition of 123 after 125 and writing *adgressum* for *adgressus* in 125, where he should not.<sup>9</sup> My own preference would be to read:

des requiem miserando, precor, et posse fateri.	
“at matri narrare nefas.” tamen ibo coactus.	122
“credamus? quibus hoc poteris componere verbis,	124
aut vox qualis erit?” adgressus namque parentem	125
“mater, ave” dicturus ero. “quid deinde?” tacebo.	123
“Oedipoden thalamos matris vult fama subisse	126
incestosque toros, . . . ”	

7. *Iamque* for *iam* is exceedingly rare; see *TLL*, 7:110, 14–26.

8. Only an adjective then should replace *nota*; the verb in Ellis’ “*nec mora nata deo est*,” printed or favored from Riese on, would be a singularity with *mora*, and the whole colon, equivalent to the simple *nec mora*, is exposed to the objection brought by Renehan.

9. In *CP* 77 (1982): 255–56 I noted, against Bailey’s text, that *parentem* should refer to the mother, that *adgressum* (= “attacked”) is not the proper word, and that its meaning in the standard text (“approached”) is paralleled in 176–77. One may punctuate *credamus!*, with Bailey, or *credamus?*, “are we (= am I, the objector) to believe you?”

Z.'s division of 122, "sed matri narrabo?" 'nefas!' 'tamen ibo coactus,'" that of Rohde, designed to allow *tamen* due force,<sup>10</sup> is not convincing, whereas Bailey's *narrare* for *narrabo*—"haud necessario (Courtney)"—is brilliant, the perfect opening of the dialogue. The objecting side of Perdica should indeed say both *at* (*et* H), the *mot juste* for an objection, and *nefas*. For the construction, *nefas* with infinitive, compare 240 *hoc etiam voluisse nefas*, which, beginning the line, is precisely the unit we have here, a full unit of utterance in a passage similarly conveying an internal dialogue. As for the corruption, a scribe coming from *et posse fateri* in 121 will have continued *et . . . narrare*, subconsciously connecting infinitive with infinitive; and *narrare*, at some later point, will have become *narraBO* under the influence of the ensuing *iBO*. What renders the order of the lines in H unattractive is the anticlimax that occurs when, after *tacebo* in 123, the question is asked, in 124–25, "quibus hoc poteris componere verbis, / aut vox qualis erit?" In that sequence one would expect, if anything, a potential "would (could) you be able." But see the superiority of the sequence obtained by transposition: Perdica's one self says "I will go" (122 *ibo*), his objecting self counters "what words will you use?" (124–25 "quibus hoc poteris componere verbis?"); Perdica replies that he "will go to his parent" (or will approach her: 125 *adgressus . . . parentem*, reflecting *ibo*) and "will say 'hail, mother'" (123 "mater, ave" *dicturus ero*, answering *quibus . . . verbis?*). The objecting self's "what then (sc. will you say)?" (123 *quid deinde?*) and Perdica's reply that he "will be silent" (*tacebo*)—that there will be *no words*—come more appropriately if the question "quibus hoc poteris componere verbis, / aut vox qualis erit?" (124–25) has already been put. *Quid deinde?* is the follow-up to that question.

Line 226 "hoc visum placitum matri, non distulit ultra." Shackleton Bailey's transposition and repunctuation belong in the text, not the apparatus: "hoc visum matri; placitum non distulit ultra." Compare Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 3. 419 "*hoc placitum patri. cur autem ascribimus illum . . . ?*" It would be possible, of course, as an alternative to put the dative before, as in 221 *quaerenti placuit*, 244 *nulla tamen matri similis*, and to read *hoc matri visum; placitum . . .*, on the assumption that *mri* was lost to *uirū*, then improperly replaced. It would also be possible to leave the words in their transmitted order: "hoc visum (sc. est): placitum mater non distulit ultra." The latter, by further avoiding ambiguity as to the subject of *distulit*, might interest D. Altamura, who set himself to instruct us to understand *illa* (sc. *mater*) after *non* (*Latomus* 38 [1979]: 684).

Lines 227–28 "[iamque dies ortus clarior nudaverat orbem] / *matronae veniunt* forma cultuque micantes": "Totum v. 227 haud dubie eiciendum opinamur Altamura et ego," writes Z. But it has just been night (189–219),<sup>11</sup> and our poet, like Julius Montanus, positively delights in the epic marking of sunrise (132–33), midday (59–60), and sunset (101–3, 189–90). That *matronae veniunt* follows in parataxis is too apt stylistically to be accidental: Ov. *Met.* 4. 81–83 "postera nocturnos Aurora removerat ignes, / solque pruinosas radiis siccaverat herbas: / ad solitum coiere locum . . .," 7. 100–101 "postera depulerat stellas Aurora micantes: / conveniunt populi . . .," 10. 446–47 "tempus erat, quo cuncta silent, interque Bootes, ad facinus venit illa suum . . .," 15. 665–67 "postera sidercos Aurora fugaverat ignes: / incerti, quid agant, *proceres* ad templa petiti / *conveniunt* ope-rosa dei. . . ."

Lines 275–77 "ferro resecemus amorem? / o demens! †gladio† quibus armis quove vigore / haec manus, ecce, valet librare in vulnera mortem?" In *CP* 77 (1982): 253–54

10. Which it lacked in *en matri narrabo nefas!* (Baehrens in ed. pr.) and *at matri narrabo nefas?* (Ellis).

11. Compare here "*Italia per noctem iuvenis miserandus agebat. / interea matrem nati nova cura premebat*" (219–20), following a speech of Perdica (209–18), with "*italis* Perdica *per noctem cura premebat*" (130), also following a speech of Perdica (117–29), and leading to the earlier sunrise passage (132–33).

I supported Shackleton Bailey's assumption of a question in place of the "imbecillic" *gladio*: "(quid facis,) o demens? quibus armis . . . ?" (I did not there propose *a* for *o*, as Z. reports; my parallels simply contained that interjection.) Two small points in further corroboration can now be made. Within two earlier speeches (117–29, 237–44) Z. assigns parts to Perdica I and Perdica II on Bailey's lead; within the present speech he fails to do so, though the poet is obviously employing the same technique. Compare 272–73 (Perdica I) "letumne bibamus?" / (Perdica II) "*cur, miserande, petis frustra potare venena?*" with 275–76 (Perdica I) "*ferro reseceamus amorem?*" / (Perdica II) "*quid facis, o demens?*" Symmetry speaks for Bailey's question—his interrogative, vocative, and second-person verb. As for his actual verb *facis*, see Verg. *Aen.* 9. 399–401: "*quid faciat? qua vi iuvenem, quibus audeat armis / eripere? an sese medios moriturus in enses / inferat et pulchram properet per vulnera mortem?*" This passage slightly colors ours: Z. enlists it in aid of *quibus armis* and in *vulnera mortem*, but misses the parallel role of *quid faciat?* preceding the parallel doublets *qua vi . . . quibus . . . armis . . . ?* (~ *quibus armis quoque vigore . . . ?*). It is just that the author should recall Vergil, who here, in the Nisus–Euryalus episode, was writing about a youth and unhappy love and death. Line 246 of the poem, as we have seen above, also owes a debt to *Aeneid* 9.

Lines 285–90:

"iam scio quid fugiam: ne te mea vincula perdant!  
da laqueum collo! vel sic cum corpore nostro  
inclusus morieris, Amor. solacia fati,  
hoc tandem, Fortuna, mihi concede precanti,  
ut tumulo scriptum . . . legatur:  
HIC PERDICA IACET SECUMQUE CUPIDO PEREMPTUS."

Perdica, in determining how to take his own life, finds that one means, the noose, particularly disturbs Amor, and is here taunting the god with the idea of it. Z. is the first editor to wish to interpret *vel* as *saltem*. This interpretation and Baehrens' initial *sicco* (*siccū* H) are a waste of space. Rossberg's *sic tu*, which Z. is alone in citing, may yet have value, but only as a pointer. For it was quite wrong of Rossberg to alter *cum corpore nostro* goes ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *inclusus* and *morieris*. Try rather: "[*vel*] *sic (tu)* cum corpore nostro / *inclusus morieris, Amor.*" If *tu* was absorbed by *cū*, *vel* might easily have been created, *ex ingenio*, to mend the meter. *Vel* is weak, even if it be interpreted (as it was before Z.) as *et*; nor should a strong *sic* follow such a *vel*: *sic* belongs at the beginning of the sentence, as in 281 above: "stringamus *laqueum?* sic finis detur amanti."<sup>12</sup> The pronoun *tu* would occupy second position, as in 283–84 "*nec te pavor ullus / terruit*" and 285 "*ne te mea vincula perdant,*" and would produce good effect with *cum corpore nostro*. In articulating the final sentence Z. leans on Mariotti, who adduced Luc. 9. 878–79 "*solacia fati / haec petimus: veniant hostes, Caesarque sequatur.*" If we grant that Mariotti is correct, that the Lucan passage shows that *solacia fati* more probably goes with what follows than with what precedes, we must also grant that it supports reading *haec* for *hoc*. It is a wrongheaded conservatism that maintains *hoc* so. And the "model" ceases to be helpful at the crucial place, the word order of the following *hoc (haec) tandem (tantum), Fortuna, . . .* The words in themselves look as if they should begin their colon.

The apparatus criticus occupies between a third and a half of every page, and it would indeed have occupied more had Z. not taken occasion in the *praefatio* to list H's errors and orthographical distinctions. He thereby relieves it of things

12. Z. makes this *sic . . . amanti* a question, though Baehrens and Riese are as likely right in making it a statement.

like *infoelix*, *praemebat*, *viciati*, *tenere* (*tenerae*), which his predecessors generally did not cite, and of things like *satirus* (*satyrus*), *alis* (*ales*), *Aethenas*, *difussa* (*diffusa*), which they universally did. Sometimes he goes too far. Normally readings like *dixisse* (*dixere*), *incestusque torus* (*incestosque toros*), *factus* (*fatus*), and *docent* (*docet*) are entitled to citation. Sometimes, too, he involves himself in an inconsistency. He will cite *confUdit* for *confOdit*, but not *tUtis* for *tOtis*; *acerUo* for *acerBo*, but not *vocaBit* for *vocaUit*; *dIs* for *dEs*, but not *fatIri* for *fatEri*; *furorE* for *furorEM*, but not *vigorEM* for *vigorE*; *opus et* for *opus sed* (= *set*), but not *frondi sub* for *frondis sub*. Be that as it may, he manifests a familiarity with the ways of scribes, knows, and clearly demonstrates, for example, that they erred under the influence of other words, before and after, in the context. His explanations of errors, though full and minute, can still be supplemented.

At 64 "*inlimes respexit aquas nymphasque recentes*," H's *infimas* was no doubt facilitated by the following *nymphas*-, spelled *nimfas*-. Z. does not say this; the rubric under which he puts the error ("pro verbo proprio verbum subicitur, quod aliud significat") tells what happened but not how it happened. Occasionally he overlooks factors contributing to corruption, though on the whole he is quite alert to them. At 125 *nox* for *vox* is classed "*n* pro *u*"; but it is relevant that the confusion occurs in a passage which begins as a prayer to *Nox* (117, twice), and that *nox* has appeared two further times previously (101, 106). At 169 where the scribe wrote *pulsantibus* for *pulsatibus*, "littera supervacanea" discounts the effect of the directly preceding *quatiENS*. And is "littera desiderata" sufficient for *es* for *est* at 180, given that *TU . . . TU . . . facIS* precedes in 179 and the imperative *indica* does so in 180 itself? Twice he neglects to mention, on any head, what is easily explicable: that *quod superest* in 272 became *quid superest* by virtue of *quid* in 270, and that *haec manus* in 277 became *quae manus* under stress of "*quibus armis quove vigore*" in 276. Elsewhere, if rarely, he oversimplifies. At 92 and 96, *heu* was probably not simply "replaced by" *sed* but existed in an intermediate stage as *seu* (for the confusion of *seu* and *sed*, see Housman on Manilius 1. 657, with the addenda). Again, at 245 *detorsit fessos artus . . .*, H's *retorsit defessos* presupposes not simply "verbum pro verbo subiectum," but these stages: *detorsit fessos* > *retorsit fessos* > *retorsit<sup>de</sup> fessos* > *retorsit defessos*. Superscript letters figure in other corruptions, too. Z. ascribes *riuau<sup>u</sup>que* for *riuum<sup>u</sup>que* at 50 to the similarity of open *a* and *u*, which explains *riuum<sup>u</sup>que* > *riuau<sup>u</sup>que* but not *riuau<sup>u</sup>que* > *riuau<sup>u</sup>que*. He makes no attempt at all to account for *est* for *et* at 8-9 "quid possit nosti pietas et, perfide, mater, / et Paphiae quam triste decus arcere furorem." Here it would seem that someone wrote *sit* above *et* as an aid to construing, which someone later mistook for a correction, combining *sit* (*st*) and *et* into *est*. (*Est* and *sit*, in the form *st*, are often confused; at 271 *nullast* has become *nulla sit* in H.) At least once it might be practicable to change the actual reading of the text. All editors print line 4, with Baehrens, "non tristes epulae, per (post) quas petit aera Tereus," but only Baehrens' alternative, *aethera Tereus*, will explain H's reading *aera ethereus*: thus *aethera Tereus* > *aera<sup>ether</sup> Tereus* > *aera ethereus*; see Verg. *Aen.* 11. 272 "et socii amissi petierunt aethera pennis." It is further pertinent that when *Anth. Lat.* 13. 24 (Riese), a Vergilian cento, appropriates this *petierunt aethera pennis*, it does so in a poem entitled "Progne et Philomela": "dum genitor (= Tereus) nati morsu depascitur artus, / et soror et coniunx petierunt aethera pennis." Sometimes, needless to say, what Z. regards as the original is not, or is probably not, such, and his view of the error accordingly does not serve. In 189-90 "roscida post radios aeterna<sup>ue</sup> (Hiller) lumina solis / nox . . . conpresserat omnes," discussed above in connection with *post*, does not the context favor *alterna<sup>ue</sup>* (Baehrens)? The error involved was explained by Housman himself (on Manilius 2. 520, where he was conjecturing *alterna*

for *etiam*): “*alterna et aeterna uulgo permutantur, etiā autem uix differt ab etiā: haud dissimili errore aegr. Perdic. 189 ex radios alternaque factum est radiosa et namque.*”

Thus unburdened, the apparatus is still no *brevis adnotatio*. Z. is generous, offering much, including exegesis by way of parallel or critical note, as, for instance, his refutation of Vollmer’s *quid superat* at 241. Where he might have made economies is in the citing of conjectures.

One could summarily dismiss 6 *et dirum in* (Barbasz), 25 *nam* (Otto), 124 *quid tu* (Ellis), 148 *homini* (Barbasz), 204 *mox expressa labori* (Ellis), 231 *pervenitque* (Hunt), 248 *ah* (Barbasz). Several conjectures catering to paleography, but otherwise worthless—14 *terra* for *terrat* (Barbasz), 165 *os culum* for *osculum* (Baehrens), 235 *cura* for *dura* (Barbasz)—should suffer the same fate. Shackleton Bailey’s *penitus* (or *imo* or *alto*) for the latter *dura*, while not certain, is yet acute and prudent, infinitely superior per se to *cura*. It is interesting that, in propounding *cura*, Barbasz was more or less consciously desiderating *imo*: “propter curam emisit *imo* de pectore suspiria” (*Eos* 27 [1924]: 38). At 52–53 “obvia venit arundo, / quam puer *excussam* totis e radicibus aufert,” some editors adopt, all editors commemorate, *excissam* (Baehrens). It belongs in oblivion. The wanted word, in view of *totis radicibus*, might be thought to be *evulsam*, with *aufert* meaning “carried off”; but *aufert* is probably poetic for *evellit*, as R. Renehan notes: “. . . a reed which the boy shook (*excussam*) and tore out roots and all.” At 221–23 “multaque quaerenti (sc. matri) placuit sententia talis: / matronas omnes totis e moenibus urbis / ad propriam ↑*venire*† domum,” Z. cites *iubet ire* (Rossberg), which, though fairly easy (*iuetire* would lose *iu-* to the preceding *-m*, and *uetire* would become *venire*, “verbi causa”), is at this point simply inappropriate. It implies that the mother is putting her plan into action when in fact the plan is still in her head; there can be no action until 226 “hoc visum matri; *placitum non distulit ultra*.” *Venire*, the only offense of which is metrical, has thus far repelled certain correction and may indeed be sound. Z. points to three instances in the poem where the normal prosody of *venio* appears, as if to say that this poet knows better. But this poet knows *quōque*, which he has six times, yet still ventures *quōque* twice, a license found elsewhere, to my knowledge, only in Dracontius.

Still other conjectures, more or less paleographical, scarcely earn their place.

Take 32–35:

illic dispersi flores mixtique colores  
ostendunt, *Veneris quid amor; nam* candidus illic  
flos narcissus *amat* veteris vestigia fontis  
et rosa purpureum spargens per prata ruborem.

Altamura conjectured *amans*: “*amans* in hoc versu pro *amat* legendum arbitramur, ut sequens *spargens* confirmare videtur” (*Latomus* 38 [1979]: 684, n. 34). Apparently he supplies *est*. But to do thus would be to break the etymological definition, in which *amat* should be the main verb: compare 269–70 “alma *Venus!* nosti quae sint tormenta caloris / et *quid possit amor; nam mater Amoris amasti*.” Baehrens conjectured *spargit* for *spargens*, logically but ineffectually. Let the force of *amat* continue with *rosa*: “and the rose (manifests love) as it sprinkles. . . .” At 44–45 “Iuppiter *auro* / decidit et Danaen . . . compressit,” *aurum* (Otto), recorded by Z. alone of editors, is wholly unnecessary, as Z.’s parallel attests: Stat. *Silv.* 1. 2. 136 “in hanc vero cecidisset Iuppiter *auro*.” Altamura (*ibid.*, p. 693) explained this *auro*, under compulsion, as “*aureus* (vel *ex auro factus*)” and even conjectured *de auro*.<sup>13</sup> No, *auro* here is compendious for *formā auri*, a “fairly common poetic idiom”; see Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), p. 211 (on

13. This keeps company with *elapsae* at 204, also presumably a conjecture, also unmetrical.

Prop. 3. 22. 36 *bove* = *formā bovis*). In the crux at 202, Baehrens' "... petit ille, *sed* ille" is of suspect Latinity; see Housman on Manilius 2. 185 ("ille . . . , subeuntis at ille"): "at Scaliger, *et libri*, quam particulam Latini ista condicione non ponebant, sed aut *at* aut nullam." Nor can 260 fairly accommodate *fatiscit* (Vollmer). The conjecture requires that the preceding *victus* be a participle, which participle it deprives of an expected ablative complement: Verg. *G.* 1. 180 "neu *pulvere victa fatiscit* (sc. area)," Tib. 1. 5. 67–68 "nec *verbis victa fatiscit* / *ianua*." (Were the participle to stand here, Barbasz' *victusque furore*, as he himself should have observed, would represent the frustration of 238 *vincere certa furem*.) Of Z.'s own conjectures tendered merely in the apparatus, *certam* at 57 would rob *cera*, later in the line, of point. At 121 his contemplated reshuffling to evade two acceptable licenses would move *miserando* to a less acceptable position. His <*pergunt*> *pectore labi* at 204 is ingenious but does not effect an ideal connection (as the standard *lapsa for labi* does) with the following line. His *tacesne*? at 284 is mildly interesting, no more, as is his idea that *tenebris*, which it supplants, was a "notula" framed to explicate *prodant*, not *perdant* (the adopted conjecture), directly below. For the position of *tacesne*—one word, complete sentence, at end of line—he might have compared *tacebo* at 123. At 106 he was similarly activated by a desire to discover "silence," proposing *mediusque silentium*—presumably with an eye to Stat. *Theb.* 4. 683 (though the context there is quite different)—for "vigilat †*mediumque tenetque*† / suspirat numquam requiem daturus amor." The vulgate is *metuitque tepetque*, which Barbasz, objecting to *tepet* = *amat* ("nimis . . . praeceptis ac necopinus est transitus a metu ad amorem" [*Eos* 27 (1924): 34]), sought to refine to *tremuitque*. H's reading *tenetque* is perhaps due, as Z. notes, to *tenet* in 109 (a slightly easier influence if 109 preceded this line, as it would do on Rohde's transposition, discussed above); one need not, therefore, cling tenaciously to the ductus litterarum. The same may be true of *mediumque*, as regards both word and form (accusative -um), if we assume with R. Renehan the following genesis of error. Renehan asks whether the scribe, aware that this is a nightfall passage (101 *iam nox* . . . ) and confirmed in his awareness by *nox* at the beginning of the present line, did not lapse into *medium* because he was thinking of *medium* as a common component in midnight (or midday) passages. This genesis is bold, but plausible. Compare Hor. *Serm.* 2. 6. 100–101 "*iamque tenebat* / *nox medium caeli spatium*," where *tenebat* adumbrates *tenetque* in our corruption.

Z. drafts a professional apparatus, falling short but seldom.

He has, for instance, an irritating habit, where a previous critic has made a correction, of appending *et ego*—"suppose that all of us," said Housman on a like occasion, "wooded fame so strenuously!" At 36–37 he should have credited Vollmer with the parenthesis (Baehrens marked a parenthesis only for 37, Riese marked none and intended none, as his punctuation—semicolon after *ruborem* in 35—shows). At 204 it is impossible to implement "labris (vel labra) *in fine versus Baehrens*" without being told what Baehrens further suggested (*nolunt cedere* or *nolunt promere*). Had Z. told, it would have diminished the originality of his observation "voces *post quae fort. est glossa*," and of his own suggestion *pergunt for voces*, a verb like Baehrens' *nolunt*. (But Baehrens' suggestions, suppressed in his own second edition, were gauche for so much rewriting. His *labr-* forced *pectore*, which has value,<sup>14</sup> out of the text and, once ensconced there itself, succeeded only in anticipating, or overanticipating, *ore* in 205. He thereby created virtual repeats of line 205, clumsy in themselves, and added a poor connection with 205.) At 244 the note "*fatusque acc. voluit*

14. The words are released from the *pectus* only to be blocked by—to "die on"—the lips. Notice that at 171 they are firmly enclosed in the *pectus* and cannot go forth, and Hippocrates discovers their nature only by a rise in the pulse: "invenit Hippocrates, quae *pectore clausa fuere*." Compare, too, the following phrases for speaking: 116 "reddit *de pectore* voces," 177 "reddit . . . pio *de pectore* voces," 208 "dimittit *reserato pectore* verba."

*Vollmer*" compels the inference that Baehrens and Riese took the word otherwise, which they, as they edited, could not have done.

This edition has value as a repository of information: it contains a bibliography, an appendix of metrical and prosodical *notabilia* (missing are the one line which lacks a penthemimeral caesura [22] and the three in which the same caesura cuts between prefix and word [95, 196, 206]), and a full index verborum. The reader has, in fact, everything but a list of *loci similes*, which might have been included in a volume running a mere 24 pages (+ xiv). Many similarities, indeed, still await notice: 34 *veteris vestigia fontis* ~ Catull. 64. 295 *veteris vestigia poenae* (~ Verg. *Aen.* 4. 23 *veteris vestigia flammae*), 42–43 *pharetramque sagittis / plenam* ~ Verg. *Aen.* 5. 311 *pharetram plenamque sagittis*, 140 *iussa citae peragunt* ~ Ov. *Met.* 2. 119 *iussa deae celeres peragunt*, 289 *per saecula longa* = Ov. *Met.* 4. 67, etc. Z. is meticulous, too, in the details: in the ascription of conjectures, for example, by adding those issued by Maehly in 1885 he has established priority in ten places. He has produced, in the end, an edition that can be called useful but cannot be called, *in rebus criticis* at least, unreservedly good: the way forward to something better is a little too often and a little too easily found. Part of the poem's interest is that Heinsius and Bentley and Lachmann never saw it, that its criticism is still in progress. The learner of textual criticism does not feel far removed from its early editing; its text enables him to concentrate on readings, not tradition, encourages him to appreciate the existence of corruptions, and will not let him be, as it would not let Vollmer himself be, stolidly conservative.

J. M. HUNT  
Villanova University