

THE COLOGNE ARCHILOCHUS: 'A BEARD COMING'?

- 11 τ]αῦτα δ' ἐφ' ἡσυχίης εὐτ' ἂν μελανθῇ[ι — υ υ
 12 ἐ]γώ τε καὶ σὺ σὺν θεῶι βουλευέσσομεν.

There is no agreement about the supplement at the end of the first line. ταῦτα almost certainly refers to marriage, discussion of which is postponed till something becomes black or turns dark.

Theiler's μοι κόμη¹ ('solange mir das Haar noch schwarz ist') hardly fits the context, and Burkert's βότρυα² with the sense 'when the grapes ripen' ('jetzt ist Frühling') is not convincing. A metaphorical sense for 'grapes' is preferable, e.g. μοι τρύγη or, better, σοι τρύγη (Ebert–Luppe),³ σοι βότρυς (Slings),⁴ 'when you will be old enough to marry'; but the phrase comes with a jolt in the absence of any preparation or immediate follow-up: in the passages of Philodemus and Horace quoted as parallel by Ebert–Luppe⁵ the metaphor is not simply a single word but is extended over two or three lines.

On a different track, and more probable still, are supplements such as νύξ, ὁμοῦ (e.g. Page),⁶ μελανθ' ἤμω φάος (e.g. ci. Van Sickle),⁷ δὴ οὐρανός (Austin),⁸ but there is an inherent implausibility in having the lovers make love in broad daylight and postpone discussion of marriage till darkness falls. Night was the obvious time for lovemaking, as at the Pannychis; Phocylides was not writing love-poetry when he counselled νυκτὸς βουλευέω.

The suggestion of the first editors, Merkelbach and West, 'when my chin turns black' (μοι γένυς),⁹ was offered simply as an example of a supplement that would not violate Porson's law, but it is the most convincing. It gains support from two passages in archaic poetry: (1) Alcaeus fr. 120. 5 ff., a scrap of papyrus where the marginal comment runs, 'This is directed in irony to a man who married before he had a beard': the last line of the poem has πρὶν τὸ γένηον μέλαν ἔμμεναι, 'before his (or your) chin was black'; (2) the well-known description of Pelops in Pindar *Ol.* 1.67 ff. πρὸς εὐάνθεμον δ' ὅτε φῶν / λάχραι νῶ μέλαν γένειον ἔρεφον, / ἑτοῖμον ἀνεφρόντισεν γάμον . . . (where the scholiast uses the verb μελαίνωμαι in explanation: μέλαν δὲ, τὸ μελανθισόμενον ὑπὸ τῆς λάχρης). In both passages the black chin occurs in the context of marriage, and both writers knew the poetry of Archilochus. Expressions such as πρὶν σφωῶν ὑπὸ κροτάφοισιν ἰούλους / ἀνθῆσαι πυκάσαι τε γένυς εὐανθεί λάχρη (*Od.* 11.319 f.) and σκιάσαι γένυν (*A.P.* 12.26.5), where the form γένυς is used, are common. The Pindaric passage tells against Marcovich's translation, 'when my cheeks are sunburned'.¹⁰

The implication that the enterprising lover is a beardless youth creates no difficulty. Theiler, arguing against the supplement, said that lines 17 ff., where the speaker expresses disgust at the withering of Neobule's charms, show that he was an experienced lover; but he might still be a youth, and in any case the

¹ *Poetica* 6(1974), 472, 480.

² *ZPE* 16(1975), 220.

³ *ZPE* 16(1975), 223 ff.

⁴ *ZPE* 18(1975), 170.

⁵ *A.P.* 5.124.1 f., *Carm.* 2.5.9 ff.

⁶ *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* 152.

⁷ *QUCC* 20(1975), 133.

⁸ *ZPE* 16(1975), 220.

⁹ *ZPE* 14(1974), 105.

¹⁰ *GRBS* 16(1975), 9.

lines do not show that he had loved Neobule, simply that he does not want her. He certainly counted himself as one of the *νέοι ἄνδρες* of line 9. It might seem surprising that no 'biographer' of Archilochus, a Critias or the like, seized on the passage to denigrate him as a teenage sex maniac; perhaps Critias felt that he had said enough when he called him *μοιχός, λάγνος*, and *ὕβριστής*; perhaps he saw nothing amiss in the fact that one so young should mention discussion of marriage; it was, after all, only discussion, and the suggestion, made to achieve a more pressing need, was for postponement of that discussion. It was poor farmers like Hesiod or philosophers like Plato who suggested thirty as the appropriate age for a man to marry.

University of Victoria

DAVID A. CAMPBELL

THE SO-CALLED 'VENETUS 8' OF PLATO

A number of enigmatic manuscripts of Plato have been identified during the last few decades. Thus Mercati (*Studi e Testi* 164(1952), 35) showed that *Angelicus* c.1.9 (w), which L. A. Post (*The Vatican Plato and its Relations*, pp. 73 f.) was unable to trace, is identical to *Rossianus* 17(558); N. G. Wilson (*Scriptorium* 16(1962), 393 n.2) proved that the long-lost *Hassistenianus* is no other than the *Lobcovicianus* in Prague University Library (this had already been suspected by H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon*, p.237, n.3) Here is the solution of a third puzzle.

In the *Conspectus Siglorum* and three times in the apparatus of the Budé-edition of *Sph.* (ad 236 c 9; 239 b 1; 266 b 1), A. Diès quotes a manuscript which he calls 'Venetus 8' and assigns to the fifteenth century. Both Post (op.cit., p.80) and Wilson (op.cit., n.4) confess to their inability to identify it.

Yet inspection of the *Commentarius Criticus* of the Hermann-Wohlrab edition, Vol. i, would have shown them that a manuscript also called 'Ven. 8' was collated by Bekker for *Ap.*, *Phd.*, *Cra.*, *Tht.* and assigned the siglum Λ. For *Sph.* and *Plt.* the siglum Λ is given to Ven.app.class. 4. 54, which is a well-known manuscript, appearing in all the lists (Post, p.81; Wilson, no.239; R. S. Brumbaugh—R. Wells, *The Plato Manuscripts*, p.63). It contains the first three tetralogies up to *Phdr.* 253 a 6 and belonged to the well-known Venetian collector Francesco Barbaro (cf. H. Alline, op.cit., pp. 297 f.). Since Bekker (unlike Stallbaum and Schanz) always used the same siglum for the same manuscript, we are able to infer that 'Ven. 8' is in fact Ven.app.cl. 4. 54. Interestingly, Diès also used this manuscript for *Prm.*; there he gives it its correct library reference, calls it G (after Schanz and Burnet) and says that it is from the fourteenth century.

A fairly complete description of Ven.app.cl. 4. 54 given by Schanz (*Hermes* 10(1876), 174–7) explains the origin of the faulty designation 'Ven. 8'. A handwritten catalogue of the Biblioteca (Nazionale) Marciana consulted by Schanz describes our manuscript as 'Class. IV (philosophi) appendix 54. membr. in fo. saec. XIII. S. Michael de Muriano [sic] Nr. 8'. This obviously means that it was no.8 in the library of the monastery S. Michele in Murano, from where it passed to the Marciana (Alline, p.297; E. Mioni, *IMU* 1(1958), 317–43, esp. 330). But Bekker (who must have seen this catalogue as well) mistook the 'Nr. 8' for the library number of the Marciana itself, for in p. clii of vol. i of his edition our manuscript (identifiable by both its siglum and its contents as given there)