

of those who have tried to emend the passage concentrate on *longus*, and are reluctant to relinquish *spe*: this is largely due to the parallel with Aristotle's account of the character of old men in *Rhetoric* 2. 13. 1389b 13ff., in which (1390a4) they are said to be, among other things, *δυσέλπιδες*. It seems to me that this parallel should not be pressed too far. There is much in Aristotle that is not in Horace, and nothing to suggest close and detailed dependence. The parallel can only be relevant if *spe longus* can be turned into a reasonable Latin equivalent for *δύσελπις*. Otherwise there is no good reason to suppose that *spe* is any less likely to be corrupt than *longus*.

My suggestion is *splenosus*. The word does not occur elsewhere (neither does *dilator*); but *-osus* is still a productive suffix at this time. Horace himself invented *plagosus* and *beluosus*. There are many words with this suffix that are derived from names of parts of the body or diseases and affections thereof, often corresponding to (and no doubt in some cases invented to translate) Greek words in *-ώδης* and *-ικός*: see A. Ernout, *Les adjectifs latins en -ōsus et en -ulentus* (Paris, 1949). Some of these words are found only in late or technical writers, but some are very respectable and classical: note especially *cerebrosus* in Lucilius and *stomachosus* in Cicero. The purer and older Latin *lien*, 'spleen', gives *lienosus*: it would be natural, as *lien* was replaced in ordinary usage by *splen*, for the adjective to follow suit. The Greek equivalent is *σπληνώδης*, which occurs in a literal and medical sense in the Hippocratic writings (*Aph.* 6. 43, etc.).

To us 'splenetic' means 'bad-tempered', but it does not seem to have meant quite the same thing to the ancients. In ancient medicine, the spleen is regarded as one of the seats of *μελαγχολία*, though there is little indication of what effect an over-active spleen is supposed to have on temperament. In popular usage, the spleen seems to be associated with anxiety rather than irritability or melancholy: see Aristophanes *Thesm.* 3, *πρὶν τὸν σπλῆνα κομιδῇ μ' ἐκβαλεῖν*, and Plautus *Casina* 414, 'prae metu ubi sim nescio. | perii! cor lienosum, opinor, habeo, iam dudum salit, | de labore pectus tundit'. If this were the meaning of *splenosus*, it would fit in well with *dilator* and *pavidusque futuri* (Bentley's conjecture, surely right, for *avidusque*).

As regards palaeography, *splenosus* is nearer to *spe longus* than most other conjectures that I have seen, and the fact that the word is rather unfamiliar would render corruption likely.

After I had made this conjecture, I saw that Shackleton Bailey (*Profile of Horace*, p. 102) had recently tried *spe mancus*. This is no doubt better than other attempts involving *spe*; but I think it requires some more pertinent justification than his quotation of *ingenio debilis*. The ablative *ingenio* is an ablative of the part affected, as in *debilis pede*; but *spes* is not a part of the personality; it is a quality in which the old man is lacking. Can one be 'crippled in' something that one does not have? One should incidentally avoid thinking that *mancus* was intended to mean 'lacking', like its derivatives in the Romance languages ('il manque d'espoir', etc.). I am not myself convinced by *spe mancus*, and keep my suggestion in the competition.

Merton College, Oxford

J. G. F. POWELL

A CRUX CRITICORUM (ET INTERPRETUM) IN SENECA THE ELDER'S *CONTROVERSIAE* (2. 4. 12)

The *argumentum* of *contr.* 2. 4 reads as follows (quoted from my own provisional text, which I hope will be published in some years):

Abdicavit quidam filium. Abdicatus se contulit ad meretricem. Ex illa sustulit filium. Aeger ad

patrem misit; cum venisset, commendavit ei filium suum et decessit. Adoptavit puerum <pater>. Ab altero [pater] filio accusatur dementiae.

In §11 Seneca introduces the declamator Fabius Maximus in order to quote a silly *sententia* of his (*ut aliquid iocemur*). The sentence in question consists of a tricolon of such a kind that Seneca immediately after the quotation of it goes on: *Haec autem subinde refero, quod aequae vitandarum rerum exempla ponenda sunt quam sequendarum*. Unfortunately, this tricolon is unintelligible just at the point where the *vitandae rei exemplum* must hide. Fabius speaks on behalf of the father and says, according to the MSS:

Omnes aliquid ad vos imbecilli, alter alterius onera, detulimus: accusatur pater in ultimis annis, nepos in primis, *abdicator nullus*.

Before discussing the nonsensical last part of this tricolon, we have to examine the clause *Omnes–detulimus*, which is difficult and generally misunderstood, as it seems. Cp. H. Bornecque's and M. Winterbottom's translations:¹ 'Tous, faibles, tous, à charge l'un à l'autre, nous vous apportons quelque grief'; 'We have all of us weak ones brought you something to decide, one bringing the burdens of another'.

ad vos of course refers to the court, but who are meant by *omnes*? The following sentence, although corrupt, seems to indicate that *omnes* are the father himself, the little grandson and the abdicated brother (now dead). This is logical, since the father can maintain that three persons are in fact accused by the other son, he himself, his grandson and the dead brother, just as the father says in Cestius Pius' declamation (§2): *Patrem accusat, fratrem infamat, infantem persequitur*.²

Now, interpreters misunderstand *imbecilli* and *alterius*. *Imbecilli* is certainly not nom. masc. but partitive genitive and goes with *aliquid*, which is otherwise almost meaningless.³ The father says that all the three persons involved in the accusation had a weakness, a handicap, *aliquid imbecilli*, namely old age and infancy (as to the dead brother, I will return to him below). Obviously this is a sort of *captatio benevolentiae* or *miserecordiae* for the defence, for *imbecillorum esse aequom misererier* (Lucr. 5. 1023). This is another reason why we ought to identify *omnes* as the defendants, that is, father, grandson, and dead brother – and I underline this only because it is essential for the discussion of the corrupt tricolon to know precisely who ought to be mentioned there.

But since this trio is meant by *omnes*, the translations quoted must be wrong at another point too, that is, *alter alterius onera*. 'One bringing the burdens of another', says Winterbottom, but how can any of these three be said to bring the burden of any other? The grandson is an infant, the brother (his father) is dead, and the father (or grandfather) is the only one really appearing at court, the others being involved in the charge only in an imaginary way.

The translations quoted are entirely out of the question – but what do the words mean, then? There is only one possibility left; it suits the context excellently, pointing forward to the tricolon, but is so hard from the stylistic point of view that it can scarcely provide us with the final solution, only help to see what has happened here in the MSS. *alterius* must be taken as a genitive of definition with *onera*. If it stands alone (which

¹ *Sénèque le rhéteur, controverses et suasoires* (Paris, 1902; new edition Paris, 1932); *The Elder Seneca, Declamations* (Loeb, 1976).

² In accusing his father of *dementia*, the son would blame his disinherited and departed brother for his immoral life in a brothel and question whether the grandson was really the son of his brother, at the same time sneering at his mother, the *meretrix*; cp. §5 or 10.

³ Having deprived *aliquid* of *imbecilli*, both Bornecque and Winterbottom find themselves forced to add something of their own, but neither addition suits the context very well.

I doubt), it refers back to *aliquid imbecilli*, and we should interpret *alter alterius imbecilli onera*: 'We have all come before you bearing the burden of some weakness, one of one sort, one of another'. This goes very well with the following tricolon, where, I think, three different 'weaknesses' are mentioned – but who would be able to understand this *alterius*? It is almost bound to be misunderstood in some way. The consequence of this is that something has probably dropped out after *alterius*, and rather than accept the awkward brevity of the MSS I would read *alter alterius <infirmittatis> onera detulimus*.

Now to the corrupt tricolon. H. J. Müller's⁴ apparatus quotes some older and rather violent suggestions, the discussion of which would be pointless here. I will only consider Müller's own conjecture(s), put into the text by himself and by Bornecque (Winterbottom obelizes the last words of the sentence): *accusatur pater in ultimis annis, nepos in primis <adoptatur, in mediis> abdicatur filius*. These changes are obviously meant to create a tricolon, the silliness of which lies in the fact that *in mediis (annis)* does not represent a weakness; on the contrary. Of course, this text is possible, but we get, in my opinion, a rather unattractive sentence at a high price: the present tense is unnatural for the disinherited son, who was by that time not only *abdicatus* but departed, and not much better for the grandson, who had been adopted (in good time) before his grandfather was accused of *dementia*. Further, the three verbs in Müller's version, differently placed as they are within their respective clauses, blur the form of the tricolon.

We can get an *exemplum vitandae ineptiae* in a much easier way: *Accusatur pater in ultimis annis, nepos in primis, abdicatus in nullis* – because he is dead, a silly manner of expression forced by the parallelism of the tricolon and inspired by such much more normal phrases as e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1. 87 *de mortuis loquor, qui nulli sunt* (cp. Sen. *epist.* 92. 34), or Pliny *HN* 36. 203 *in rebus damnatis quoque ac iam nullis*.

To say that the grandson and the dead brother are accused as well does not seem more peculiar than to imagine, as the father does, that they are, in a way, present at court; neither thought is meant literally.

Uppsala University

LENNART HÅKANSON

⁴ L. Annaei Senecae *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores* (Vienna 1887, Hildesheim, 1963).

WHEAT IN THE ROMAN WORLD: AN ADDENDUM

J. K. Evans' well-documented article, 'Wheat production and its social consequences in the Roman world', correctly makes the point that 'the evidence with regard to wheat yields is at once meagre and plainly contradictory'.¹ The difficulty in assessing yields arises, of course, from the character of the available source material; namely, literary sources. The information comes from the hands of men such as Cicero and Varro who were concerned with matters other than specific data on the cultivation and production of grains, and who probably never sowed or reaped a *modius* of wheat. What was lacking until recently was a bona-fide document from the hands of a farmer or a community intimately concerned with the growing of wheat. We now have one such document, P. Colt 82 of the seventh century A.D., that fills a gap in the evidence for yields for both wheat and barley.

Ironically enough, P. Colt 82 comes from an arid region of the Roman empire, from

¹ *CQ* n.s. 31 (1981), 429. See also K. D. White, 'Wheat farming in Roman times', *Antiquity* 37 (1963), 207.