

where the original context of the *topos* is introduced with unnamed but obvious reference to Isocrates.

The history of painting which follows is conventional (cf. D. H. *Isai*. 4, p.96 U-R) but again has polemical bite: archaic painters have fewer colours, the greater variety of the classical style is the counterpart of *omnes oratoriae virtutes* alleged in Cato (65) and realized by Demosthenes (35). Compare the truer assessment of Cato in 298: 'intelleges nihil illius liniamentis nisi eorum pigmentorum, quae inventa nondum erant, florem et colorem defuisse.'

*St. Hilda's College, Oxford*

D. C. INNES

Καλάμιδος καὶ Καλλιμάχου τῆς λεπτότητος ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς χάριτος.

## TOO MANY ABLATIVES SPOIL THE BROTH

at inde

prodit anus diuamque uidet lymphamque roganti  
 dulce dedit, tosta quod texerat ante polenta.      450  
 dum bibit illa datum, duri puer oris et audax  
 constitit ante deam risitque auidamque uocauit:  
 offensa est neque adhuc epots parte loquentem  
 cum liquido mixta perfudit diua polenta.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 5. 448-54

The orthodox explanation of the syntax of lines 453-4 is that repeated by the most recent commentator, F. Bömer (P. Ovidius Naso *Metamorphosen*. Buch IV-V (1976), p. 343): 'neque adhuc epota parte ist Abl. absol.; der Gegenstand, mit dem Ceres den Jungen überschüttet, ist *mixta* . . . *polenta*.' The ablative absolute is in itself unexceptionable (cf. *Met.* 5. 172-3, 9. 574-6), but the proliferation of three ablatives in two verses is awkward writing. As transmitted, line 454 is the product of a copyist who, as is often the habit of copyists, was confining his attention to the verse on which he was engaged and still had 'tosta . . . polenta' from line 450 echoing in his head. Unless I am much mistaken, Ovid wrote

neque adhuc epota parte loquentem  
 cum liquido mixtae perfudit diua polentae;

'as he was still speaking the goddess soused him with what yet remained undrunk of the liquid-mixed barley.' For *neque adhuc* = *et nondum* Bömer provides ample parallels; to his examples of substantival *liquidum* add *Moretum* 45.

An English version of these lines which keeps closely to the original is bound to read stiffly; but there is nothing stiff about the Latin as emended, and a reader conversant with Ovid's style would not be disconcerted to find the syntactical complement of *parte* withheld until the following verse. Indeed the word almost cries out to be picked up by a genitive, since there is nothing in the immediately preceding context to which it can be conveniently referred; and the enjambment 'loquentem / . . . perfudit' also helps to discourage the assumption of an absolute construction for the words 'nec . . . parte' (cf. Kenney in (ed.) J. W. Binns, *Ovid* (1973), p. 138 n.116). Analogous if not strictly parallel separation of *pars* from

its genitive is found at (e.g.) *Met.* 3. 94, 11. 533–4; but the construction is better regarded as a special case of the interlaced/enclosing word-order (incorrectly classified by Bömer as hyperbaton) frequently affected by Ovid and other Latin poets. Compare (e.g.) *Met.* 2. 124–5, 5. 81–2, 478–9 (included with other not always very relevant examples in Bömer's note on 5. 447–8), 6. 34–5; Manil. 1. 844, 4. 728–9 (see Housman ad locc.); T. E. V. Pearce, *CQ* N.S. 16 (1966), 143, 149, 163.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## EURIPIDES, *Tro.* 1089–1090

τέκνων δὲ πλήθος ἐν πύλαις  
δάκρυσι κατάορα στένει·

Murray: *κατάορα στένει* locus vix sanus

The various explanations and emendations so far offered for this passage do not seem to have solved its difficulties yet. While it is generally held that *κατάορα* agrees *ad sensum* with the subject of the sentence ('numerous children'), the sense of the adjective itself ('hanging down without support')<sup>1</sup> appears far from satisfactory.<sup>2</sup> Of the conjectures proposed till now<sup>3</sup> only Jackson's *ἀμάτορα*<sup>4</sup> is considered noteworthy by the latest editor of the play.<sup>5</sup> Jackson, however, offers it as a 'fair provisional remedy' only.

I would suggest that *κατάορα* was corrupted from *κατάρροα*. Palaeographically this conjecture is no more difficult than Jackson's and the sense seems to fit better not only the context<sup>6</sup> but also the paraphrase *ἐστεγασμένα πεπυκασμένα τοῖς δάκρυσι* of the scholia.<sup>7</sup> It would be a unique usage of the adjective at this period,<sup>8</sup> but so is, in this sense, that of the verb *καταρρέω* in this play.<sup>9</sup> Other compound adjectives of this type are attested in Classical Greek.<sup>10</sup> Note also *πυρὶ κατάδρομα*<sup>11</sup> in 1300 and the Euripidean<sup>12</sup> *δακρύρροος*.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

RA'ANANA MERIDOR

<sup>1</sup> The adjective is unknown to Classical Greek. LSJ quote A.R. (2. 1041, with *τελαμών*) and Paul.Sil. (*A.P.* 5.260, with *βόστρυχα*).

<sup>2</sup> Jackson, *Marg.Scaen.* p.202: 'The explanation (= children . . . clinging without support to the necks, arms, or perhaps clothes of their mothers) can hardly have been taken au grand sérieux at any time.'

<sup>3</sup> Jackson, loc.cit., mentions *κατ' ἀέρα* Heath, *κατηρεφῆ* Barthold, *καταουαμένον* Wecklein.

<sup>4</sup> Jackson, loc.cit.

<sup>5</sup> K. H. Lee, *Euripides Troades* (1976).

<sup>6</sup> *δάκρυσι* seems to construe with *κατάρροα* more elegantly than with *στένει*.

<sup>7</sup> The scholiast will have understood *κατάρροα* as *κατάρ(ρ)υτα*, cf. e.g. *χίονι κατάρυτα ποταμῖα* in this stasimon, line

1067. The meaning of *κατάρροα*, however, need not be limited to the passive: the children's faces are streaming with tears which stream from their own eyes.

<sup>8</sup> For the adjective LSJ give Philostratus. The noun occurs in Plato.

<sup>9</sup> *Tro.* 15–16: *θεῶν ἀνάκτορα / φόνω καταρρεῖ*. In this sense the simplex is generally used (since Homer, e.g. *Il.* 8.65: *ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα*); frequent; cf. in this play 448–9 (*φάραγες . . . ὕδατι . . . ῥέουσai*) and 994–5 (*πόλῳ / χρυσῷ ῥέουσai*). Note the dative with all the examples.

<sup>10</sup> *περίρροος* Hdt. 1.174, *ἀπόρροος* Antiph. 52.8.

<sup>11</sup> According to LSJ a unique usage of the adjective. The noun is quoted from Suetonius.

<sup>12</sup> According to LSJ.