

saepe (ᾗδη), *montibus* (ὄρεσιν), *arboribus* (ῥῆμα), *terantur* (τριφθεῖσα), *inter se* (πρὸς αὐτὴν), *austriis* (ἀνέμων), *flammai...flore* (πῦρ καὶ φλόγα). Lucretius is translating into Latin verse the Greek prose of Anaxagoras preserved in the *textus receptus* of Thucydides.

The source for the intrusion was presumably the Thucydidean commentator, Antyllos: see Julius Brozka, *RE* 1 (1894), 2643–44 *s.n.* Antyllos 2. Antyllos alleged (Marcellinus, *Vita* 22. 6–8 Luschkat) the considerable influence of Anaxagoras upon the historian. Anaxagoras at 2. 77. 2 becomes a parallel to Philistos at 7. 42. 3. Seclusion will render the context less ‘childish’ than Gomme on Thuc. 2. 77. 4 found it.

The University of Colorado at Boulder

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

ARISTOTLE, *EN* 1144a27–8

The manuscript text διὸ καὶ τοὺς φρονίμους δεινοὺς καὶ πανούργους φάμεν εἶναι gives the unsatisfactory sense ‘which is why we say that even those of practical wisdom are clever and wicked’. Some modern scholars including the Loeb and Penguin translators have rightly adopted the suggestion of J. Klein¹ that τοὺς should be inserted before πανούργους, giving the correct sense ‘which is why we call both prudent and wicked people “clever”’. It has not, I believe, been noticed that this suggestion was anticipated by Aquinas in his commentary on William of Moerbeke’s translation.² Moerbeke’s text reads

‘Siquidem igitur intentio sit bona, laudabilis est. Si autem prava, astutia (= πανουργία): propter quod et prudentes dinoticos (= δεινούς) et astutos (= πανούργους) aimus esse.’

This could be a translation of either text, depending on whether the first ‘et’ is read as ‘even’ or as ‘both’; that ambiguity, together with the lack of the definite article in Latin, here produces an ambiguous sentence. Aquinas’ comment, however, puts it beyond doubt that he understood that sentence in the sense required by the emendation:

‘...si quidem intentio sit bona, huiusmodi ingeniositas fit laudabilis. Si autem sit prava, vocatur astutia: quae sonat in malum, sicut prudentia sonat in bonum. Et quia dinotica (= δεινότης) communis est utrique, inde est, quod tam prudentes quam astutos dicimus esse dinoticos, idest ingeniosos sive industriosos.’

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

C. C. W. TAYLOR

¹ J. Klein, *Das Empirische in der Nikomachischen Ethik* (Brandenburg, 1875).

² *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis in Decem Libros Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum Expositio*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi, 3rd ed. (Turin, 1964).

A NOTE ON CATULLUS 12. 1–3

Marrucine Asini, manu sinistra
non belle uteris: in ioco atque vino
tollis lintea neglegentiorum.

Commentators assert that the left hand is *nata ad furta*.¹ As the poem proceeds this turns out to be relevant, but the impression given by the citation of parallels (or by explicit comment) is that the subject of the poem, theft, is hinted at (if not actually

¹ Coll. Plaut. *Pers.* 226; Ov. *M.* 13. 111; cross references are also made from Catull. 47. 1 to this passage.

defined) in the first two lines, and that *tollis lintea neglegentiorum* merely indicates the object and the victims.

There is a danger of false emphasis here. Use of the left hand does not entail theft, although a context may elicit the connotation. In this case *tollis*... supplies such a context, but nothing before it does: indeed what precedes leads us to expect something else. *Manu sinistra non belle uteris* is clearly pejorative, but not specific. The form of the statement demands explanation, and since *in ioco atque vino* follows immediately the reader naturally assumes that the indication of the setting is part of the explanation. Since Asinius' use of his hands is criticised at a party, the audience surely expects some transgression of table manners² rather than theft:³ the Romans reclined on their left elbows at dinners and symposia and will have used their right hands for eating.⁴

That theft and not table manners turns out to be the point of the poem could scarcely have been predicted. There are passages where right hands are connected with theft,⁵ and Plautus, *Pers.* 890, shows no preference in *vostras furtificas manus*. Where the left hand alone is specified there are other factors involved. In Plautus' *Persa* (225 f.) Sophoclidisca asks Paegnium to show his hand. After one has been shown, Sophoclidisca specifies the left hand because it is the only remaining one (hence *altera*).⁶ In Ovid's use at *Met.* 13. 111, *nec clipeus...conveniet timidae nataeque ad furta sinistrae*, Ulysses chooses the left hand for his piece of abuse because the left hand bears the shield. Lastly there is Catullus 47. 1–2: *Porci et Socraton, duae sinistrae | Pisonis*. The main point is that *sinistrae* is a pejorative version of *dextrae*.⁷ There is a suggestion of unnatural complicity which is much more to the point than any indication that Porcius and Socraton are the agents though whom Piso does his stealing.⁸

The expectations raised by the first two lines ultimately put Asinius in a worse light, since the impressions of general unsocial maladroitness remain even after *tollis lintea*... has given a new and specific slant to *manu sinistra*...⁹

University of Cape Town

F. JONES

² See Nisbet and Hubbard at Hor. *O.* 2. 11, p. 167: *Marrucine* is taken to suggest rusticity (and not to be a cognomen).

³ With the punctuation of *X* (after *uteris*; so Klotz) *manu sinistra non belle uteris* is isolated by the stop and one is given pause to imagine any distasteful use of the left hand (e.g. masturbation: on *laeva manus* see J. N. Adams, *The Latin sexual vocabulary* [London, 1982], 209); *in ioco atque vino* gives a new turn. With a colon after *vino* (as e.g. Ellis and Kroll) table manners are more prominent.

⁴ Palmer's n. at Hor. *S.* 2. 4. 38–9 argues that the actual eating was done not reclining, but prone. The evidence (Plaut. *Mil.* 753 ff.) is a joke pressed too literally, but in any case the left hand seems to have been regarded as 'unclean' in Rome as in many other cultures (and therefore not suitable for eating with); see Adams, loc. cit.

⁵ Catull. 33. 3; Juv. 3. 47–8; Mart. 12. 29. 3 (*tu licet observes dextram teneasque sinistram*...).

⁶ *Illa, altera, laeva*: the increasing specification is a piece of naturalistic rhetoric and explains fully why *altera* (or *illa altera*) was not sufficient in itself.

⁷ Cf. *Eleg. in Maec.* 1. 13; Cic. *Att.* 14. 20. 5.

⁸ *Amicae manus*? See Adams, loc. cit.

⁹ I would like to thank Dr M. Winterbottom and the editors for their comments on this matter.

EVANDER, JUPITER AND ARCADIA

at vos, o superi, et divum tu maxime rector
Iuppiter, Arcadii, quaeso, miserescite regis
et patrias audite preces.

(Vergil, *Aeneid* 8. 572–4)

With these words Evander prays for the safety of Pallas, about to depart with Aeneas for the war in Latium. The gods in general are invoked (hence the plural imperatives)