

The difficulty which West is combating is a very real one, but it is not solved by the removal of *deo*. Virgil's dilemma was that the old ferryman must be as timeless as all the other members of Pluto's establishment, and to achieve this object of portraying an unchanging picture of the machinery of the underworld he has elevated Charon to the rank of *deus*. In Olympus the gods are frozen at the point suitable for the anthropomorphic vision of them: Cupid is always a boy, Apollo young and handsome, Neptune older and more austere. Similarly Charon is frozen just as he has reached (iam *senior*) vigorous old age. He may not be, indeed is not, a real god, but he is a necessary part of the world of the gods and so must share their agelessness.

University of Reading

R. D. WILLIAMS

## TWO NOTES ON PROCLUS

The translation of Proclus' *Commentary on the Republic* by A. J. Festugière<sup>1</sup> includes some useful notes which identify many of Proclus' allusions to earlier authors as well as expounding some of the difficulties in his text and offering parallels. A couple of allusions in the sixth essay of the *Commentary* remain unsatisfactorily identified. In i. 83. 12–18 Kroll Proclus says

πέπονθεν γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ταῦτα τὰ μυθικὰ πλάσματα, ὅπερ ὁ Πλάτων πού φησι τὰ θεῖα καὶ παναγέστατα τῶν δογμάτων πεπονθέναι. καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα τοῖς μὲν πολλοῖς ἐστὶ καταγέλαστα, τοῖς δὲ εἰς νοῦν ἀνεγειρομένοις ὀλίγοις δὴ τισιν ἐκφαίνει τὴν ἑαυτῶν πρὸς τὰ πράγματα συμπάθειαν, καὶ τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων παρέχεται πίστιν τῆς πρὸς τὰ θεῖα συμφυοῦς δυναμέως.

Neither Kroll in his Teubner text nor Festugière has correctly identified the Platonic allusion. Kroll suggests *Rep.* 5. 452a. Festugière points out that this cannot be right and suggests a series of passages in the *Theaetetus*: 172c 4 ff.; 174c 3; 174d 1; and 175d 4 ff. He also adduces a couple of parallels from the *Hermetica*.<sup>2</sup> In fact Proclus here is alluding to Plato's *Second Letter* 314a. πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς καταγελαστότερα there is picked up by Proclus' τοῖς μὲν πολλοῖς... καταγέλαστα: cf. τοῖς πολλοῖς... καταγέλαστος and 'risui' in Festugière's Hermetic parallels and also Menander Rhetor in Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* iii. 337. 28, concerning φυσικοὶ ὕμνοι which are not to be divulged to the multitude. I suspect that the *Second Letter* has influenced all these passages, even if indirectly. This letter, which may be a Neopythagorean forgery, was accepted as genuine in antiquity and much used and interpreted by both Middle and Neoplatonists.<sup>3</sup> Proclus himself discusses the celebrated 'three kings' of 312e in *Platonic Theology* 2. 8–9. The statement in the *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* 26. 8 Westerink that Proclus ἐκβάλλει the Platonic *Letters* cannot mean that he regarded them as spurious, any more than the *Republic* and the *Laws* which he also ἐκβάλλει. The word in its context probably implies exclusion from a list of works in real dialogue-form.<sup>4</sup>

At i. 113. 29–30 Kroll Proclus mentions Homeric comparisons of Athene to Mentor, of Hermes to a λάρος and of Apollo to a ἰεραξ. The transformation of Athene into Mentor is familiar from *Od.* 2. 401 and 4. 653–6. Festugière notes that Hermes is

<sup>1</sup> 3 vols. (Paris, 1970).

<sup>2</sup> Stob. *Hermet.* fr. 11. 4 (3. 57 Festugière) and Asclepius 25 (329. 5 ff. Nock and Festugière).

<sup>3</sup> See H. D. Saffrey and L. G. Westerink, *Proclus: Théologie platonicienne*, II (Paris, 1974), introduction §2, pp. xx–lix: 'Histoire des exégèses de la *Lettre II* de Platon dans la tradition platonicienne'.

<sup>4</sup> cf. L. G. Westerink, *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* (Amsterdam, 1962), p. xxxvii.

compared to a *λάρος* in *Od.* 5. 51. He adds, 'Apollon faucon ne m'est pas connu' and cites *Od.* 15. 525 f. where a falcon is Apollo's messenger (this time the word used is *κίρκος*) and Aristophanes, *Birds* 516 where Apollo has a *ἰέραξ* on his head. In fact Apollo is compared to an *ἴρηξ* (the Homeric form of this word) in *Il.* 15. 237–8.<sup>5</sup>

University of Durham

ANNE SHEPPARD

<sup>5</sup> cf. the quotation of these lines by Aelian, *NA* 10. 14.

## SYMPHOSIUS 42. 1: A LITERAL INTERPRETATION

### Beta

*tota vocor Graece, sed non sum tota Latine*

'...as the name of the second letter of the alphabet *beta* (Greek) is curtailed to *be*. This could be expressed by substituting *quod* for *sed*: "What I am in Latin when incomplete (*non tota*), I am called in Greek complete.'" So most recently Shackleton Bailey.<sup>1</sup> Read rather the verse aloud to solve the riddle. *tota* heard as Greek would be *τωτα*, i.e. *τῶ τα* (*τῶ* being written *τῷ* at this period):

My name is whole (with a TA) in Greek, but I am not whole (with a TA) in Latin.

The strained use of the instrumental dative *τῶ τα* would be objectionable, were the poet writing continuous Greek as such.<sup>2</sup> But as a pun concealed within the Latin word *tota*, this secondary meaning and construction should be tolerated.<sup>3</sup> The conceit is in fact rather clever. What are the chances of *tota* admitting so apt a sense, when heard as Greek, as a result of coincidence alone and not design?

<sup>1</sup> D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Towards a Text of 'Anthologia Latina'*. Cambridge Philological Society supplementary volume no. 5 (Cambridge, 1979), p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> The use of the definite article here, *τὸ τα* = 'a TA', is of course standard usage in the technical Greek of the grammarians.

<sup>3</sup> For a comparable pun involving Greek concealed in Latin see Martial 1. 50: *Si tibi Mistyllus cocus, Aemiliane, vocatur, | dicatur quare non Taratalla mihi?* The poet is playing with the Homeric formula *μίστυλλον τ' ἄρα τᾶλλα* (*Il.* 1. 465, al.). So too in Greek, with a play on a Latin word, *AP* 10. 44. 4 (Palladas): *οὐκ ἐθέλω Δόμινε, οὐ γὰρ ἔχω δόμεναι*.

## ANTHOLOGIA LATINA 24 RIESE

### Amans amanti

Marcent post rorem violae, rosa perdit odorem,  
Lilia post verum posito candore liquescunt (24. 3–4).

*post rorem*, 'after the dew', seems nonsense and Shackleton Bailey<sup>1</sup> has not unreasonably proposed *post florem*, comparing for the idiom Columella *RR* 2. 11. 10 *diebus quadraginta, quibus post florem ad maturitatem devenit*. But *ros* here stands for *ros marinus*, 'rosemary', as in Vergil, *Georg.* 2. 212–13:

nam ieiuna quidem clivosi glareae ruris  
vix humilis apibus casias roremque ministrat.

The poet is not presenting us with a piece of botanical information about the relative

<sup>1</sup> D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Towards a Text of 'Anthologia Latina'*. Cambridge Philological Society supplementary volume no. 5 (Cambridge, 1979), p. 12.