situation. When in O.T. 404–5 the Chorus attributes $\partial \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ alike to Tiresias and to Oedipus, the audience know that Tiresias is entirely in the right; but at that point in the play the Chorus do not know, and they comment impartially on the basis of the things said on both sides at that time. During a later dialogue in the *Electra* itself (871–1057) it is not always clear whether the Chorus support Electra or Chrysothemis, although ultimately they appear to be on Electra's side. Once again, the problem evaporates under examination.

Department of Mathematics, Polytechnic of North London N. B. BOOTH

See the latter part of my 'Sophocles Electra 1082-9', RhMus 119 (1976), 127-33.

BΩCECΘE AGAIN

βιώσεσθε? Or future of βόσκεσθαι? Professor Skutsch (CQ N.S. (1973), 60, 378), calling the contraction $\beta\iota\omega \to \beta\omega$ 'impossible' (but see Ardizzoni's note), insists on the latter; F. Vian in his Budé Apollonius (p.82) leaves the question open. A.R.1.685 ~693 (Polyxo speaking; note the context of 683–8):

πῶς τῆμος βώσεσθε...;
... τάδε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.

Hom.h.Ap. 528 (-30), the Cretans newly arrived at Pytho:

πώς καὶ νῦν βιόμεσθα; τό σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγμεν.

This hymn is used elsewhere in the Lemnos episode: A.R.1.667-8: 345-6 + Od.2.14, 5.3; 1.669:317; 765:153-4; 788-9:9 + Il. 9.200, Od.10.233, b.Cer. 193; 831:38: 838:476-7.

University of St. Andrews

MALCOLM CAMPBELL

AN EMENDATION IN PLUTARCH CONFIRMED

Isidorus Pelusiotes, Epistulae 2.42 preserves an opinion of Plutarch on genuine Atticism: 1

Πλουτάρχω δὲ δοκεῖ τὸ σαφὲς καὶ λιτὸν γνήσιον εἶναι 'Αττικισμόν· οὕτω γάρ, φησίν, ἐλάλησαν οἱ ῥήτορες. Γοργίας δ' ὁ Λεοντῖνος πρώτος τὴν νόσον ταύτην εἰς τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους εἰσήγαγε, τὸ ὑψηλὸν καὶ τροπικὸν ἀσπασάμενος καὶ τῆ σαφηνεία λυμηνάμενος.

The word $\tau \rho o \pi \kappa \dot{o} \nu$ is an emendation of Bernardakis for the manuscripts' reading $\tau \upsilon \pi \kappa \dot{o} \nu$.

This emendation is confirmed by a fragment of Dionysius of Halicarnassus apparently overlooked by editors of Plutarch:³

¹ Plutarch, *Moralia*, ed. F. H. Sandbach (Leipzig, 1967), VII, fragm. 186.

² Plutarch, *Moralia*, ed. G. N. Bernardakis (Leipzig, 1896), VII, fragm. 138.

 Dionysius Halicarnaseus, Opuscula, ed.
 H. Usener and L. Radermacher (reprint Leipzig, 1965) II.214-15. ἄμεινον δὲ τῷ 'Αλικαρνασεῖ Διονυσίῳ ἐπομένους ποιητικὸν μὲν λόγον φάναι τὸν τροπικῆ τε καὶ μεταφορικῆ καὶ διθυραμβώδει συνθήκη συντεθειμένον, ὁποία ἡ Γοργίου τοῦ ἡήτορος φράσις · πρῶτος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ὤς φησι Διονύσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μιμήσεως δευτέρῳ, τὴν ποιητικὴν καὶ διθυραμβώδη λέξιν εἰς τοὺς πολιτικοὺς εἰσήνεγκε λόγους.

University of Western Ontario

IVARS AVOTINS

QUO USQUE TANDEM PATIEMINI?

In his article (CP 71 (1976), 97-105) R. Reneham rightly classes Sall. Cat. 20.9 as a conscious imitation of Cic. Cat. 1.1, but adopts the unsatisfactory explanation of parody. Such parody is, as he notes, without parallel in Sallust and ineptly distracts attention from the vigorous development of Catiline's rhetoric. Elsewhere mimesis is regularly a compliment to the author imitated, often closely functional by reinforcing a point from the parallel of a similar context (e.g. Sall. Cat. 4.1 ~ Pl. Ep. 324 b). Similarly I suggest that here Sallust recalls Cicero's words to illustrate that perversion of vocabulary which is the keynote of Catiline's speech: just as he misuses, for example, the terms virtus fidesque at the beginning of his speech, in stark contrast to Sallust's own definition, so he perverts the famous words of the attack which revealed his true villainy in similar savage indignatio. For such indirect insight into Catiline's warped morality compare Jug. 10, where the hypocrisy of Micipsa is highlighted by the contrast with the noble Cyrus, similarly attempting to reconcile brothers to rule in amity after his death (Jug. 10.4 ~ Xen. Cyr. 8.7.13-14), and, mutatis mutandis, Thuc. 3.38 ff., where Cleon is obliquely criticized by his misuse of Periclean phrases (e.g. $3.38.1 \sim 2.61.2$).

On this interpretation Cicero is subtly complimented, as in a second echo of Cat.1.1 in Sallust, Hist.1.77.15 'vos autem, patres conscripti, quo usque cunctando rem publicam intutam patiemini . . .?' Here Philippus is in a parallel situation to Cicero as he urges the senate to pass the s.c.u. against Lepidus.

St. Hilda's College, Oxford

D. C. INNES

QUINTILIAN 6.3.15-16

nihil autem uetabat et componi materias in hoc idoneas, ut controuersiae permixtis salibus fingerentur, uel res proponi singulas ad iuuenum talem exercitationem. quin illae ipsae (dicta sunt ac uocantur), quas certis diebus festae licentiae dicere solebamus, si paulum adhibita ratione fingerentur, aut aliquid in his serium quoque esset admixtum, plurimum poterant utilitatis adferre; quae nunc iuuenum uel sibi ludentium exercitatio est.

The text of the parenthesis dicta sunt ac uocantur, which has been generally suspected, is defended by M. Winterbottom in Problems in Quintilian (B.I.C.S.