

Suppl. 25, 1970), p.106. He quotes some parallels to *sunt ac uocantur*,¹ but the words remain rather pointless. Moreover *dicta* is unsatisfactory. Subjects, or topics (*materiae* or *res*, the latter of which Winterbottom takes to be understood with *illae ipsae*) cannot be or be called *dicta*. I suggest that the words *dicta sunt ac* conceal the technical term *diasyrticae*. It would have been natural for these mock speeches to be of a derogatory nature, and *diasyrmus* is associated with ridicule, wit, and ironical praise. Aquila Romanus defines it as *eleuatio uel irrisio* (15, *R.L.M.* 26); the life of Caracalla in the *Historia Augusta* quotes as a *diasyrticum dictum* a witty taunt directed against the emperor (*H. A. Caracalla* 10.5–6); and Jerome, attacking Rufinus, writes ‘uidetis nos intellegere prudentiam eius et praedicationis diasyrtae strophis in scholis saepe lusisse’ (*adv. Rufinum* 1.1).

If this emendation is correct, the sentence, the subject of which I take to be *materiae*, would run *quin illae ipsae (diasyrticae uocantur) quas certis diebus etc.* A parenthesis giving a technical term without any introductory word is quite in Quintilian’s manner. Cf. 7.9.2 (ὁμωνυμία dicitur); 8.2.10 (epitheta dicuntur); 8.3.82 (βραχυλογία uocant . . .).

Wallingford, Oxon.

M. L. CLARKE

¹ Macrobius, *Comm. Somn. Scip.* 1.14.6; Plin. *N.H.* pr.24, Virg. *Aen.* 8.271–2; to which one might add from Quintilian himself ‘quod ἀποφθεγματικὸν uocat et est ita’

(6.3.109). Dr. Winterbottom also draws my attention to D.H. *Ant. Orat.* 2, λέγεται τε καὶ ἔστιν, and Julius Victor (*R.L.M.* 395) ‘locis . . . qui communes sunt et appellantur’.

TACITUS, *GERMANIA* 19.1

Ergo saepta pudicitia agunt, nullis spectaculorum inlecebris, nullis convivorum iritationibus corruptae. litterarum secreta viri pariter ac feminae ignorant. paucissima in tam numerosa gente adulteria, quorum poena praesens et maritis permissa: adcisus crinibus nudatam coram propinquis expellit domo maritus ac per omnem vicum verbere agit. publicatae enim pudicitiae nulla venia: non forma, non aetate, non opibus maritum invenerit. nemo enim illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum vocatur.

enim] etiam Lips.: del. Nipperdey

In chapter 18 Tacitus has discussed conjugal virtue among the Germans. In 19.1 ‘paucissima . . . adulteria’ obviously deals with behaviour after marriage; and in § 2 also Tacitus considers married life and the question of second marriages. But the sentence beginning ‘publicatae’ has been taken to refer to prostitution, ‘publicare pudicitiam’ being regarded as an extension of the idea of ‘publicare corpus’.¹

The words ‘publicatae pudicitiae’ are not of themselves inapplicable to married women; so if we are not to be told until we reach ‘maritum invenerit’ that the subject has now changed to behaviour before marriage, this comes with a considerable jolt. Not surprisingly, in this position the conjunction ‘enim’ has been suspected. J. G. C. Anderson in his commentary on *Germania*² mentions and rejects solutions which have been relied on: to omit ‘enim’, or read ‘etiam’

¹ Plaut. *Bacch.* 863, ‘tum illam, quae corpus publicat uolgo suum’.

² Oxford, 1938, p.113.

or 'enimvero' (which, however, Tacitus places as first word), accepting a parenthetical sentence dealing now with the unmarried; or to argue elliptically—the severity towards adulteresses is no wonder, because even the unmarried who offend are not forgiven. (And the sentence is surely too far, or too vividly, separated from 'paucissima' to justify the sequence, adultery is rare; naturally, since the punishment of it is so harsh.) To Anderson continuity of the argument was the most natural interpretation and this was the decisive consideration. But he had two reservations: '*publicata* is rather a strong word to use of a single lapse from virtue, and *maritum* is somewhat loosely used for *alterum maritum*.' But he still accepted the sense 'prostituted chastity'. This I think is mistaken.

For 'publicare' Lewis and Short give, as well as make public property or make available to the public (e.g. libraries, Suet. *Iul.* 44; wild animals, id. *Aug.* 43), publish in a literary sense (e.g. the opening of Pliny's first letter, and elsewhere) or make known, reveal; for this, only two passages in Justinus ('reticenda') and Pliny, *N.H.* 33.1.17, 'publicatis diebus fastis'; then 'corpus publicare', prostitute one's self. In this sense they offer *Bacchides* 863, *Germania* 19, and Quintilian 7.9.4 (in a sophistry). It may seem natural to interpret 'publicare' so here, as coming after a sentence describing the repudiation of a wife for infidelity; but I think it better to infer its meaning from the fact that the sentence which it follows describes the method by which the wife is repudiated 'per omnem vicum', that is, make known to the public. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (in proof) has, for prostitute, only the *Bacchides* and *Germania*; but for make generally known nine examples are cited, from Livy,¹ Val. Max., Seneca,² Petronius, Quintilian, Apuleius, and Ulpian. I find this list of parallels more convincing support than going back to Plautus. I suggest that the problem is solved if instead of 'enim pudicitiae' we read 'impudicitiae'.³ Palaeographically the change is not a large one. 'For in chastity thus exposed there can be no forgiveness; neither beauty nor youth nor wealth could find her a second husband.'⁴ The participle is conditional. The husband is entitled, rather than obliged, himself to punish infidelity; no doubt in any community there will always be some men willing to overlook misconduct. But if the husband does decide to exercise his option of punishing it, by drawing public notice to it in the way just described, the wife is finished. If this reading is adopted, the discussion about adultery can continue without a break.⁵

Oxford

JAMES FETTES

¹ 34.61.16, 'publicato crimine'.

² *Dial.* 3.16.2, 'primum secreta, deinde publicata'; *Ep.* 113.32, 'virtutem'.

³ Dr. Michael Winterbottom informs me that the manuscript Vat. lat. 2964 has 'enim inpudivit'.

⁴ Anderson was willing to accept 'maritum' by itself as equal to 'alterum maritum'. Some might favour adding 'alterum' before 'maritum' in the text,

or reading 'alterum' instead of it (if 'maritis . . . maritus . . . maritum' so close together were thought excessive). This might be rash, but I think 'maritum <iterum>' would not be a violent alteration, and is worth considering as a conjecture.

⁵ I am much obliged to Dr. Winterbottom for criticism of an earlier draft of this article and for help in presenting this one.