

NOTES ON SENECA'S *QUAESTIONES NATURALES*

'In spite of the efforts of scholars to improve matters, the condition of Seneca's text remains in many places most uncertain or quite irrecoverable. Again and again one has to be content with conjectures which, while often giving the general sense of a passage, must not be taken as certainly Seneca's words' (Corcoran¹).

1. praef. 5 o quam contempta res est homo, nisi supra humana surrexerit! quam diu cum affectibus collectamur, quid magnifici facimus, etiam si superiores sumus? portenta vincimus: quid est cur suspiciamus nosmet ipsos, quia dissimiles deterrimis sumus?
Traditional punctuation: '... quid magnifici facimus? etiam si superiores sumus, portenta vincimus'.

To vanquish monsters is not such a trivial achievement. Did not Hercules become a god largely by doing just that? And where is the connection between 'portenta vincimus' and 'quid est ... sumus'? Alexander (p. 251) takes *portenta* as nominative ('we are but monsters who conquer'); that is right inasmuch as *portenta* is the subject (predicate), men (cf. 1.16.3 'portentum illud'), not vices; but it can only apply to those who do *not* struggle successfully against vice (*deterrimis*). Even those who do struggle successfully (as distinct from those who no longer have to struggle) have nothing much to boast about. 'portenta <sumus, nisi> vincimus'.

1. praef. 16 quanti aestimas ista cognoscere et rebus terminos ponere: quantum deus possit, materiam ipse sibi formet an data utatur, utrum utro sit prius, materiae supervenerit ratio an materia rationi *sqq.*

rebus cannot mean 'such things' (Corcoran) and cannot here mean 'toute chose' (Olttramare). Sense requires a defining epithet meaning 'divine' and palaeography indicates *caelestibus* (cf. *Ben.* 4.7.2 'caelestium rerum'). The passage concludes: 'sciam omnia angusta esse mensus deum'.

- 1.1.3 vidimus nos quoque non semel flammam ingentis pilae specie, quae tamen in ipso cursu dissipata est. vidimus circa divi Augusti excessum *simile prodigium*, vidimus eo tempore quo de Seiano actum est; nec Germanici mors sine denuntiatione tali fuit.

A large fiery ball in the sky had appeared in Seneca's lifetime more than once. Having told us so, he will naturally proceed to list the occasions. He does, three

¹ Note the following: 'Alexander' = W. H. Alexander, 'Naturales Quaestiones', *Publ. in Class. Phil. of University of California* 13 (1948), 241 ff.; 'Axelson' = B. Axelson, *Senecastudien* (Lund, 1933); 'Corcoran' = T. H. Corcoran, ed. Loeb (1971–2); 'Gercke' = A. Gercke, ed. Teubner (1907); 'Olttramare' = P. Olttramare, ed. Budé (1929); 'Schultess' = F. Schultess, *Annaeana Studia* (1888). Manuscript readings are cited from Gercke's apparatus.
I am grateful to the Editors and to Mr. H. M. Hine of Edinburgh University for allowing me to read and make use of his comments on this paper.

of them, each prophetic of catastrophe. But to the bewilderment of his attentive readers, the words *simile prodigium* imply that these are *not* the occasions to which he has just referred. What then were those occasions, and what did *they* portend? And how should the three appearances mentioned have been 'similar' (a fiery ball is a fiery ball)? The words seem to have been added by someone who felt that *vidimus* (sc. *flammas ingentis pilae specie*) lacked an object.

Haase read more attentively than most. He bracketed the entire sentence 'vidimus . . . dissipata est'.

- 1.5.1–2 nunc nihil ad rem pertinet quomodo videamus quodcumque videmus;
sed quomodo imago, similis reddi debet e speculo. quid autem est tam
dissimile quam sol et arcus, in quo neque figura solis neque color neque
magnitudo apparet?

It is not to Seneca's present purpose to enquire what makes mirror images appear. The fact is that the image has to resemble the reflected object, and the theory that rainbows are mirror images of the sun is thereby disproved.

Corcoran, following Alexander, reads *sed quoquomodo, imago* (Schultess), one of a number of proposals which fail to say plainly what Seneca plainly means: 'sed quomodo <est facies,> imago similis reddi debet e speculo'. For *quomodo* = *qualis* see *Thes.* VIII.1293.23. *facies* and *corpus* are Seneca's terms for the object reflected (1.3.13, 1.5.5, *et al.*).

- 1.7.3 qui quia discernuntur inter se nec satis in vicem speculi *nitent*, incohant
tantum imagines nec exprimunt et ob ipsam viciniam turbant et in speciem
coloris unius abducunt.

In the manuscripts the antecedent of *qui* is represented by *inspectores*, which in all probability stands for *in se toros* (Leo; see Axelson, *Neue Senecastudien* (Lund, 1939), and at any rate refers to the separate surfaces on the knobbly glass rod (s. 1 'virgula solet fieri vitrea, striata vel pluribus angulis in modum clavae torosae'). Why do they not reflect the sun? Because, says the text, they are not shiny enough. Absurd. The glass as such is perfectly capable of reflecting images, as Seneca has just said: 'levis est materia et ad hoc habilis'. But instead of forming a single surface the rod is divided (the addition of *non* (Erasmus) or *vix* (Gercke) before *discernuntur* is to be deprecated) into surfaces too tiny to make proper mirrors. The like happens with raindrops: 1.3.8 'ergo cum multa stillicidia sunt, totidem specula sunt; sed quia parva sunt, solis colorem sine figura exprimunt'. Read *patent*.

I have not suppressed this note, though the gist of it was anticipated by Schultess (p. 10): 'Deinde vix potuit Seneca dicere, illas partes insectas non satis *nitere* in vicem speculi. paulo enim ante levem esse materiam et ad hoc habilem concesserat. immo non satis in vicem speculi *patent*, quia striae sunt angustiores'. *patent* is in Gercke's apparatus, but otherwise nobody seems to have paid attention.

- 1.15.4 at quibus longior mora est et ignis fortior motumque caeli sequens
aut etiam proprios cursus *agunt*, cometas nostri putant, de quibus
dictum est.

etiam om. Δ. Syntax will be salvaged by adding *qui* after *etiam* (Erasmus) or by changing *agunt* to *agens*. But the former expedient links *aut* with *quibus longior* sqq., whereas the sense demands that it be linked with *motumque caeli sequens*.

- 1.16.1 Hostius fuit Quadra, obscenitatis in *scaenam* usque perductae. hunc divitem avarum, sestertii milies servum, divus Augustus indignum vindicta iudicavit, cum a servis occisus esset.

cenam ELO. Editors read *productae*. How were Quadra's obscene practices put on the stage? Oltramare and Corcoran properly refuse to believe that they were represented in a performance, and suppose instead that an audience applied some dramatic lines to Quadra in a fashion illustrated by Cic. *Att.* 2.19.3 *et al.* (see my note ad loc.). If that had been what Seneca had in mind, he would have made himself intelligible. And even if the sense could pass, the wording cannot. *producere in scaenam* may be well enough, but not *producere usque in scaenam*. Where else but on the stage would the thing be 'produced'? How *usque in aliquid producere* (or *perducere*) is legitimately used can be illustrated from this same work of Seneca: 2.12.3 'fulgurationem usque in terras perductam', 5.8.3 'usque in meridiem aura producitur.' I suggest he wrote 'usque in can <iti>em perductae'. *canities* for *senectus* is poetic usage from the Augustans on, also found in post-classical prose. On Seneca's use of poetic vocabulary see Summers, *Select Letters*, p. lii. Its effectiveness here, conjuring up the image of the grey-headed debauchee, is manifest.

- 1.16.9 facinus indignum! hic fortasse cito et antequam videret occisus est. ad speculum suum immolandum fuit.

The exclamation refers to what follows, not, as Oltramare and Corcoran ('Shameful behaviour!'), to what precedes.

- 2.27.4 hic fieri illo quoque modo potest, ut inclusus aer cava nube et motu ipso extenuatus diffundatur: deinde, dum maiorem sibi locum quaerit, a quibus involutus est, sonum *patitur*.

'Résonne en se heurtant aux parois qui l'enveloppent.' 'It resounds from what envelopes [*sic*] it,' Nobody seems to have noticed that the Latin is meaningless. Something like 'ruptis quibus involutus est sonum facit' might represent the sense.

- 2.32.7 summissiora forsitan propius in nos vim suam dirigunt et *ea quae* frequentius mota aliter nos aliterque prospiciunt.

Seneca maintains that all stars influence human destiny, but allows that the planets exert their force from a closer distance than the rest because they are lower down, and with more variety because they are more mobile. But the text bewilders, as it bewildered Corcoran: 'Perhaps the lower stars, and those which look upon us sometimes one way sometimes the other because they change position more frequently, influence us more directly'. The trouble lies in the words *ea quae*. All would be plain without them; but they can be harmlessly replaced by *utpote*, a word which occurs twice elsewhere in Seneca.

- 2.40.4 omnia ista urunt sed genere et modo differunt. quodcumque combustum est, utique et ustum est; at quod ustum est, non utique combustum est. item quod accensum est; potest enim illud ipso transitu ignis ussisse. quis nescit uri quaedam nec ardere, nihil autem ardere quod non et uratur?

quaedam Fickert: *quidem* codd. Gercke obelizes *accensum*. Mr. Hine's answer is clearly right: 'item quod accensum est <utique et ustum est, at quod ustum est non utique accensum est:> potest . . .'

- 3.15.2 sic in terra quoque sunt umoris genera complura: quaedam quae *mature* durentur (hinc est omnis metallorum ortus *sqq.*)

Ultramare, followed by Corcoran, reads *durantur*, perhaps rightly. But the subjunctive is defensible as generic. There is no defending *mature*. It plainly cannot mean 'soon', and the rendering 'il en est que la maturité durcit' requires *maturitate*. Mr. Hine informs me that Erasmus proposed *matura*, which is, as he says, a simpler change.

- 3.15.8 et ex magnis caveis magnisque conceptibus excidunt amnes, nonnumquam *leviter* emissi, si aqua pondere suo se tantum detulit, nonnumquam vehementer et cum sono, si illam spiritus intermixtus eiecit.

'leviter] i.e. leise' Gercke. Scribes confuse *levi(ter)* and *leni(ter)* so often (as at 2.23.1) that the one can freely be substituted for the other whenever there is anything to be gained by so doing. In many cases there is no telling which is right, but this is not one of them; cf. Vitruv. 9.8.6 'aut vehementem aut lenem in ea vasa aquae influentem cursum' (*lenem* HS, *leuem* G).

- 3.20.2 hae causae saporem dant aquis varium, hae medicatam potentiam <hae> aut calorem aut *nimum* rigorem.

hae add. Haase: *aut nimum*: *nimum et δ*. Clearly we are meant to think of excessive heat as well as of excessive cold; cf. 3.24.1 'quare quaedam aquae caleant, quaedam etiam ferveant in tantum ut non possint esse usui' *sqq.* Read 'aut calorem nimum aut rigorem'.

- 3.20.5 aliquam harum habent causam illi lacus, 'quos quisquis faucibus hausit', ut idem poeta ait, 'aut furit aut patitur mirum gravitate soporem'. similem habent vim mero, sed vehementiorem (nam quemadmodum ebrietas, donec exsicceatur, dementia est *et* nimia gravitate defertur in somnum, sic huius aquae sulphurea vis habens quoddam acrius ex aere noxio virus mentem aut furore movet aut sopore opprimit).

For *et* before *nimia* read *aut*, both to set the comparison straight (cf. 'aut furore movet aut sopore opprimit') and because a toper does not as a matter of course fall asleep only after he has dried out.

- 3.26.8 sed difficilis ratio est quorundam, utique ubi tempus eius rei de qua quaeritur inobservatum *sed* incertum est.

eius rei ET: *eius uel Φ sed Φ: uel* EOT. Ultramare and Corcoran add *non* before

inobservatum. Fortunatus, followed by Gercke, achieved the same unsatisfactory result by reading *observatum*. *vel* instead of *sed*, read by Haase, makes much better sense but does not account for the presence of the latter in the codices integri. *seu* will do that. On the common confusion between *seu* and *sed* see Housman on Manil. 1.657 (note and addendum) and Luc. 1.234. Yet another example may be detected in Mart. 12.36.9 (see *CPh* 73 (1978), 293). The purely disjunctive use of *seu* (*sive*) is sporadic and not very common; see Kühner–Stegman, ii.438. Seneca does not use *seu* so elsewhere, but cf. 5.17.4 'ὁριζων sive finiens circulus', *Ep.* 51.1 'quare dixerit Messalla unicum, sive Valgius, apud utrumque enim legi, non reperio' (also again Housman on Luc. 1.234).

3.27.5 solutis quippe radicibus arbusta procumbunt, et vitis atque omne virgultum non tenetur solo, quod molle fluidumque est. iam nec gramina aut pabula laeta aquis sustinet.

Unless we are content to translate 'water-loving pasturages' (Corcoran) or the like, something has to be done about *aquis*, something better than *arvis* (Skutsch). Probably a participle has fallen out after *pabula laeta* (from Lucr. 2.317), as *laxatum* (cf. 3.29.6 'dehinc laxata' [sc. *terra*] 'ire in umorem'), or *victim*, or *madefactum* (parablepsy from *-ta* to *-tū*).

3.27.7 devolutus torrens altissimis montibus rapit silvas male haerentes et saxa revolutis remissa compagibus rotat . . . auctus deinde processu aliquot in se torrentibus raptis plana passim populatur; novissime in *materia* magna gentium *clarus onustusque* diffunditur.

aliquot Gronovius: *aliquo* Φ. The last words have been attempted in all kinds of ways. I suggest 'novissime in maria magna gentium clade onustus diffunditur.' Cf. *Tro.* 229 'haec tanta clades gentium'. *diffunditur* implies that the vast mass of water split up and ran in different directions. Hence the plural *maria*.

3.28.3 deinde ubi litus bis terque prolatus est et pelagus in alieno constitit, velut *admoto malo* comminus procurrit aestus ex imo recessu maris.

Corcoran reads *amota mole* (Warmington), 'just as though an obstruction were removed,' which I believe to be nearer the mark than *amoto malo* (Oltramare), 'comme si elle n'avait plus à craindre de châtement'. But *comminus* suggests a military metaphor; and cf. Liv. 9.37.8 'intra munimenta instruitur acies; delectae cohortes ad portarum exitus collocantur. dato deinde signo . . . proruto vallo erupit acies, stratos passim invadit hostes'. Read *velut amoto vallo*?

4. praef. 10 solebam tibi dicere Gallionem, fratrem meum, quem nemo non parum amat, etiam qui amare plus non potest, alia vitia non nosse, hoc *eum* odisse. ab omni illum parte temptasti: ingenium suspicere coepisti omnium maximum et dignissimum quod *consecrari* mallet quam conteri: pedes abstulit.

The resumptive *eum* (cf. *Thes. L. L.* VII. 2.463.8) can hardly be tolerated. *unum* makes an appropriate substitute. *etiam* in older editions does not, because nobody can hate a vice without knowing something about it. *consecrari* is grotesque, even with *malles*, the former vulgate, more so with *mallet*: 'very

deserving of his preference that it be ranked among the gods instead of being crushed' (Corcoran). *consectari* (vulg. olim) and *contueri* (Skutsch) do not help. *conservari* (Pinceanus *teste* Hine) seems worth reviving; cf. Colum. R. R. 7.12.12 'nec umquam eos quorum generosam volumus indolem conservare patiemur alienae nutricis uberibus educari'. Gallio was perfectly right, says the flatterer, to preserve his mind from the attrition of contact with vulgar persons and things.

4.2.20 nec Rhenus nec Rhodanus nec Hister nec Caystrus subiacent *molo* aestate proveniunt.

molo (*malo* ηL)Φ, *thmolo* T. The Cayster, despite inferiority of size, should hold its ground. It can hardly be the invention of a copyist. Gercke puts his conjecture *subiacens Tmolo* in his text, Oltramare prefers his own, *nec Hebrus subiacens Haemo*, rendering 'les montagnes dont ils viennent'. But where are these mountains in Seneca's text? They are imperatively needed. Perhaps: 'nec Caystrus, <qui montibus> subiacent, Nili modo aestate proveniunt'. If the Nile's summer flooding is to be explained by the melting of snow in the mountains from which it comes, why does this not happen to other rivers which run below mountain ranges?

4.4.1 nam ut *fallar* tibi verum mihi quidem persuadetur, qui me usque ad mendacia haec leviora, in quibus os *percidi* non oculi erui solent, credulum praesto.

quidem et *usque* om. δ. Gercke was right, of course, to read *fatear* (Skutsch), but should have put a comma after *verum*; cf. *Ep.* 79.11 'si verum fateri volo', *Dial.* 7.2.2 'o quam sibi ipse verum tortus a se fatebitur!', 9.1.2 'quare enim non verum ut medico fatear?', *Thes.* VI.337.83, and my note on *Cic. Att.* 12.2.4 'verum si quaeris'. 'sed *quidem* in hac lectione mihi videtur non plane consistere' (H. Geist, 'De Sen. Nat. Quaest codicibus' (diss. Erlangen, 1914) 44). A word seems to be missing: 'mihi quidem <facile> persuadetur'.

os percidi and *oculi erui* await interpretation. The second should, I suggest, be related to the well-known expression *cornici oculum* (*configere, effodere*), i.e. to hoodwink a clever fellow, on which Otto (*Röm. Sprichwörter*, p. 93) cites *inter alia* Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* 5, 18 (p. 211 Kr.) 'impletur in te proverbium illud, quod corvus oculum corvi non eruit'. On *os percidi* it is to be observed that if *os sublini* had been in the text everything would be clear; see Otto, p. 259. Seneca would be willing to have his 'mouth smeared' by lesser falsehoods, but not to have his 'eyes dug out' by whoppers. Symmachus uses *oblinere* in the same connection (*Ep.* 1.3.2) according to Otto's citation, in which however *oblitus* seems to be an error for *sublitis*. Did Seneca write *perlini*?

5.18.10 sic Alexander *ulterior* Bactris et Indis *volet* quaeretque quid sit ultra magnum mare et indignabitur esse aliquid ultimum sibi.

volet cannot mean 'voudra aller,' still less 'will travel fast' (i.e. *volabit*?). Read *ulteriora* (Gercke) *volvet* (sc. *in animo*)?

6.2.1 ego vero hoc ipsum solacii loco pono et quidem valentissimi, quando quidem sine remedio timor stultis est: ratio terrorem prudentibus excutit, imperitis magna fit ex desperatione securitas.

'Car c'est pour les sots qu'il n'est pas de remède contre la peur.' On the contrary, the foolish or ignorant (*imperiti*) do have a remedy—the knowledge that they are doomed beyond possibility of escape: 'sine remedio timor stultis <salutis> est'. For the genitive cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.20.2 'illam obsidionem flagitii ratus'. What reason does for the wise, despair does for the rest.

6.6.2 illud argumenti loco ponit, aquas esse in causa quibus hic orbis agitur, quod in omni maiore motu erumpunt fere novi fontes (sicut in navigiis quoque evenit ut, si inclinata sunt et abierunt in latus, aquam sorbeant, quae in omni eorum onerum quae vehit, si immodice depressa sunt, aut superfunditur aut certe dextra sinistraque solito magis surgit).

in. om. δ. *oneri* δ. The conjectures (Gercke's *vi omni* and others) need not detain us. Corcoran wisely obelizes. Most interpreters make *quae* (*aqua*) subject of *vehit*, but Oltramare translates (though he does not read or propose) *vehunt* (sc. *navigia*). Sense so requires, for in this context *onerum* must surely refer to the ships' cargoes; cf. Cic. *Fin.* 4.76 'cuius generis onus navis vehat', *Thes.* IX.2.644.1. Seneca means (he is quoting the arguments of Thales) that when ships list they take in water, and also, when they are weighed down by their cargoes, the sea washes over the decks or at any rate comes up closer to their level. I suggest 'momine eorum onerum quae vehunt'. The Lucretian word *momen* (= *pondus*) is read by Goodyear in *Aetna* 305, as conjectured by Gronovius. I had better repeat, though I do not understand, from Scultess (p. 28): 'Vestigia litterarum premere non erit idoneum; audacius enim esset momini vel molimini.

6.12.3 quid ergo? numquam flante vento terra concussa est? admodum raro duo simul flavere venti; fieri tamen et potest et solet. quod si recipimus et constat duos ventos rem simul gerere, quidni accidere possit ut alter superiorem aera agitet, alter inferum?

Seneca here gives the views of one Archelaus, according to whom earthquakes are normally preceded by windless conditions because the winds are inside the earth causing the quake. Exceptions however occur.

Gercke saw that a supplement is needed and read: 'admodum raro, <cum> duo simul flavere venti'. But that misses the argument, such as it is. It is unusual for two winds to blow at the same time: but since this can and does occur above ground, there is no reason why one wind should not be blowing below while another blows above. 'admodum raro. <raro> duo' *sqq.*

6.18.7 nam quamdiu sine iniuria perfluit et ex more procedit, nullus est tremor corpori: cum aliquid occurrit quod inibeat eius officium, tunc parum potens in perferendis his quae suo vigore tendebat, deficiens concutit quicquid integer tulerat.

tendebat] -bant *p*, *tenebat* C. The comparison between the earth and the human body is carefully worked out. Currents of air cause the earth to quake, with the result that structures based on its surface disintegrate. Similarly a disorder in the body's interior air causes trembling, with the result that any load the body happens to be carrying collapses. Read 'quae suum vigorem tendebant' ('kept its strength

at a stretch'). Cf. 6.20.6 'potest terram movere aqua, si partes aliquas eluit et adrosit, quibus desiit posse extenuatis sustineri quod integris ferebatur.

6.27.2 aer ipse, qui vel terrarum culpa vel pigritia et aeterna nocte *torpescit*, gravis haurientibus est, vel corruptus internorum ignium vitio, cum e largo sinu emissus est, purum hunc liquidumque maculat ac polluit *sqq.*

The sentence is not properly articulated. *gravis haurientibus est* was expelled by Vasi and Gercke wished to delete *est*. But the torpor of the air cannot be the earth's fault except in so far as the sluggishness and perpetual darkness are due to the enclosure of the air in the earth's interior. In other words *vel . . . vel . . . torpescit* is not a genuine alternative. I think Seneca means to offer three possible explanations of the poisonous quality of this air: pollution by contact with the inner earth, its own stagnation, pollution by fires: 'aer ipse, qui vel terrarum culpa vel pigritia et aeterna nocte torpescens vel corruptus internorum ignium vitio gravis haurientibus est, cum' *sqq.*

6.27.4 oves vero mollioris naturae, quo propiora terris ferunt capita, correptas esse non miror, cum afflatus aeris diri circa ipsam humum exceperint.

The Latin can only mean that sheep are 'of softer nature' in proportion as they carry their heads closer to the ground (than cattle or horses). Seneca, on the other hand, meant that sheep are not surprisingly prone to catch the pestilence, firstly because they are naturally more delicate than the larger domestic animals and secondly because they keep their heads closer to the infected soil. Read 'mollioris naturae <et> quae propiora' *sqq.*

6.32.10 fluit tempus et avidissimos sui deserit; nec quod futurum est meum est nec quod fuit: in puncto fugientis temporis pendeo, et magni est modicum fuisse.

'And to have been a restrained man is of great importance' is one way of dealing with 'et magni est modicum fuisse'. Oltramare's is better: 'et le grandeur de l'homme est de n'en pas avoir été avide.' But I doubt if it has been appreciated that this is one of Seneca's brilliant paradoxes: we cannot possess time—and yet (*et = et tamen*) it takes a great man to be moderate in his demand for it: 'nec quod futurum est meum est nec quod fuit, in puncto fugientis temporis pendeo: et magni est modicum fuisse!'

7.10.3 credamus ignem circumactō turbine accendi et *hunc* expulsum in sublime praebere nobis opinionem speciemque sideris longi.

hunc (ignem) is misleading (at first sight the reader might rather refer it to *turbine*) and superfluous. *hinc*, 'from our (lower) regions', may be offered instead.

7.13.2 nam si illi credimus, summa caeli ora solidissima est, in modum tecti durata et alti crassique corporis, quod atomi congesti coacervatique fecerunt.

How can *corpus* be *altum*? I would read *alta*.

7.21.4 videlicet ille *umidiora* habuit et aptiora ignibus, quae persecutus est; huic rursus uberius fuit et plenior regio, huc itaque descendit invitante materia, non itinere.

aptiora] *altiora* δ. *ille* and *huic* refer to two comets. The first mentioned (*ille*) had appeared in Nero's reign, and travelled eastward and upward; the second, in Claudius' time, travelled westward and downward. This sentence was evidently intended to explain why each of the two took the course it did, but actually explains nothing as it stands. Nor does *fumidiora* (Oltremare) for (*b*)*umidiora* get us any further. I think Seneca must have written much as follows: 'videlicet ille humiliora habuit <inania et altiora> aptiora ignibus, quae persecutus est; huic rursus uberius fuit et plenior <inferior> regio, huic itaque' *sqq.*

Harvard University

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY