

ALCAEUS FR. NI HELEN (LOBEL-PAGE), 15 F.

πόλ]λα δ' ἄρματ' ἐν κονίαισι[
ἦρι]κεν, πό[λ]λοι δ' ἐλίκωπε[ς

'And many chariots were smashed to pieces in the dust . . .' My conjecture ἦρι]κεν seems far more vibrant and vivid than Edgar Lobel's suggestion ἦρι]πεν. Adopting my supplement the Greek will mean that the chariots are not only broken but actually smashed to pieces. This Epic form fits well into a poem that already has so much Epic usage. As to the papyrus, I have had a very close look at it in photographic form, and can confirm that the traces of ink do correspond with κ having been written. Sir Denys Page also looked at the photograph on my behalf and agrees with my findings.¹

Cambridge

CHARLES E. GILLIES

¹ My best thanks are due to the late Sir Denys Page, Miss N. Dunbar of Somerville College Oxford, and Mrs C. E. Thomp-

son, for help in various ways with this fragment.

THE NEW GALLUS, 8-9

. . . atur idem tibi, non ego, Visce,
. . . pl. Kato iudice te vereor.

As far as I am aware, it has generally been taken for granted that 'Kato' in the pentameter must be vocative. The double vocative 'Visce'—'Kato' does not seem objectionable if 'non' were repeated as first word of the pentameter (e.g., as Professor Nisbet suggests, '*non* ego, Visce, / *non* quadrupla, Kato, . . .'). None the less this is unexpected, and it seems at least worth considering the possibility that 'Kato' might be nominative. The most plausible (if not the only) way of accounting for a nominative would be as subject of a relative clause. Further consequences would follow almost inevitably: the word-ending doubtfully read -plā or even -uplā must be neuter accusative plural; we will need the relative pronoun 'quae', and a transitive verb which cannot be more than monosyllabic. These considerations have led me to:

. . . atur idem tibi, non ego, Visce,
quae volt¹ dupla Kato iudice te vereor.

¹ This idea occurred to me before I had seen a photograph, or had been given precise information about spaces and traces. As to length, Mr P. J. Parsons kindly traced out for me 'quae *vult* dupla', pronouncing it half a letter too long. But 'quae *volt*' seems at least as likely (note 'quom' in line 2), and in this scribe's hand would probably save a little space, bringing the restoration within an acceptable range as far as length is concerned (Mr Parsons agrees). The crucial point is whether the trace of what, in my

restoration, would have to be the D in DUPLA is so definite as to rule out this possibility. This trace is described (Nisbet *et al.*, p. 145) as 'apparently a short oblique, descending from left to right, a little above base-level (i.e. an interpunct; or from the right side of A, K, M, R, X)', which leads Nisbet to give most consideration to 'quadrupla'. Mr W. S. Barrett suggests to me that the 'apparent short oblique' might conceivably be a cross-section from the thick base of a D.

'And if you are of the same opinion [sc. concerning the high quality of my verse, accepting *exempli gratia* 'quod si iam videatur'], with you, Viscus, as judge I do not fear the double penalty which Cato recommends.'

It remains to interpret this text. We would probably have to accept that there is a point which now eludes us. But my mind had been running along one of the lines considered by Professor Nisbet, viz. penalties for literary misdemeanours (whether plagiarism or inferior workmanship). A double penalty for *furtum* was well recognized (e.g. Plautus, *Poen.* 1351 'duplum pro furto', cf. Gellius 11.18). One would expect 'Kato' to be the contemporary literary critic, P. Valerius Cato, but there might conceivably be a reference to the opening paragraph of Cato the Censor's *de Agri Cultura* 'furem dupli condemnari' (although this is the prescription of the ancestors rather than Cato himself). Another, more obscure, Cato is just worth considering. The offence would be different—not plagiarism, but trying to foist sub-standard poems on the reading public. Those who made false claims about goods which they offered for sale were liable to a double fine, and Cato, father of Uticensis, held that liability should be extended to those who failed to mention defects in their goods of which they were fully aware (Cicero, *de Off.* 3.65–6, cf. Val. Max. 8.2.1). If one could believe this episode sufficiently famous to be identifiable from such a brief reference, it would give more edge to Gallus' epigram, particularly since Cato too delivered his verdict as a *iudex* (Cicero, *ibid.*, 'is igitur iudex ita pronuntiavit').

In contrast to the above, probably vain, speculation, there seems a fairly clear echo of Gallus 6–7 'carmina . . . / quae possem domina deicere digna mea' in Ovid, *Amores* 1.3.20 (to his mistress) 'provenient causa carmina digna sua'. 'Fecerunt carmina Musae' (6) may also lie behind [Virgil], *Catalepton* 9.59–60 'quae tecum finxerunt carmina divi / Cynthius et Musae' (for the Muses as at least co-authors, cf. Asclepiades, *A.P.* 9.63.4(= 32 G–P) on the *Lyde τὸ ξυγρόν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου*). Finally, for what Nisbet (p. 146) calls 'whimsical facetiousness' in an epigram (presumably) accompanying a collection of longer elegies, one may compare the four-line piece which stands at the head of the second edition of Ovid's *Amores*.²

Keble College, Oxford

A. S. HOLLIS

² The above note presupposes familiarity with the first publication by Anderson, Parsons, and Nisbet in *JRS* 69 (1979),

125–55. I am grateful to several colleagues for discussion, particularly Messrs. W. S. Barrett, P. J. Parsons, and N. J. Richardson.