

as a reference to an individual, i.e. Bion, who although he certainly travelled by sea many times nevertheless cannot be regarded as a typical representative of life at sea. Instead we must, here too, have a more general reference to a people especially connected with seafaring. Even if the inhabitants of Olbia on the Black Sea did not have the reputation of the Phoenicians, there is nothing strange in regarding them as examples of typical sailors, as trade on the Black Sea was of great importance from an early date, and Olbia a commercial centre and a famous port, called μέγα ἐμπόριον (Strabo 7.3.17).¹⁵

To sum up, we can state that Philodemus provides a testimony neither to Phoinix of Colophon nor to Bion of Borysthene, and that the omission of this passage from the testimonies to Bion cannot be regarded as 'un eccesso di abionismo'.¹⁶

Uppsala

J. F. KINDSTRAND

¹⁵ For Olbia as a commercial centre see W. Ziebell, *Olbia. Eine griechische Stadt in Südrussland* (Diss. Hamburg, 1937), pp. 61–75 and E. Belin de Ballu, *Olbia. Cité antique du littoral nord de la Mer Noire* (Leiden, 1972), pp. 58–62 and 108–16 for the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

¹⁶ So Gigante, op. cit. (n. 3) p. 7 and Gigante-Indelli, op. cit. (n. 3) p. 126 n. 31.

I take this opportunity to point out that Polystratus, *De philosophia* p. 36 Crönert (= T27 K.) should probably be removed from the testimonies to Bion, as the text of the papyrus gives the reading τῶι βίῳ instead of τῶι βίῳ; cf. M. Capasso, 'L'opera polistratea sulla filosofia', *CronErc* 6 (1976), 84 and n. 26.

MORETUM 15

tandem concepto, sed uix, fulgore recedit
oppositaque manu lumen defendit ab aura
et reserat †clausae qua peruidet ostia clauis.
fusus erat terra frumenti pauper aceruus:...

15

So E. J. Kenney in the *OCT* Appendix Vergiliana (1966). The same scholar has now given us his *secundae curae* in *The Ploughman's Lunch. Moretum. A Poem Ascribed to Virgil* (Bristol Classical Press, 1984), which was on its way in *luminis oras* when the sibling edition of A. Perutelli, [*P. Vergili Maronis*] *Moretum* (Pisa, 1983), saw the light of day.

Only three words of line 15 are above any kind of suspicion: *et reserat...ostia...*, 'and he unbars the door' (*ostia* poetic pl.), some door, that is, which he, Simulus, *prouidus heros* (line 59), must open to reach a pile of grain not left exposed outside his cottage, but stored somewhere.

clauis (v. l. *clauis*) is semantically unobjectionable in close association with *reserat*: cf. Petronius 94.7f. *Eumolpus...limen egressus adduxit repente ostium cellae...exemitque raptim clauem...reseratis foribus intrat Eumolpus*. But here it strangely over-emphasises the internal security of the cottage, whose only other occupant was the slave-woman Scybale, and she, unlike the usual run of pilfering servants (see Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, C. 2.14.26), was its *unica custos* (line 31). More important, *clauis* usurps the place which sense and style alike require for the substantive qualified by the participle *clausae*. (F. Leo, *ALL* 10 (1898), 438, suggested that it was a substantive. It is indeed easy, as Perutelli observes, to encounter in medieval Latin the noun *clausa* > Old French *close* > English *closet*, parallel to *clausu* > French *clos*. But it is unknown to the extant language of the first century A.D.) Perhaps a scribe's persisting mental image of *clauis* superimposed *clauis* over the name of the closed grain-store, for which Heyne proposed *cellae*, now accepted by Kenney, whose 1984 text expedites the verse as far as *et reserat clausae...ostia cellae*, leaving *qua peruidet*

nailed to the cross of desperation. No convincing sense can be got from it, and suggested emendations, including J. C. Jahn's *qua prouidet*, E. Courtney's *quam iam uidet*, and Kenney's own *quam peruidet*, fail, on one count or another, to satisfy the *arbiter elegans*.

Is the corruption in *qua* (v. l. *qu(a)e*) *peruidet* extensive? Probably not. In the style of the poem a subordinate clause in the middle of the verse comes as a surprise, but suspicion is allayed by line 54 *sit non grata Ceres, quas iungat comparat escas*, with the subordinate (final) clause in the same metrical position.

Few poets, if any, religiously avoid picturesque or descriptive details which are strictly otiose to the sense, and the poet of the *Moretum* is not one of them (cf. e.g. *arsura* 36). The sense requires not that Simulus opens a cupboard *and* examines it, but that he opens a door *in order to pass through to* an adjacent room where his grain is stored (and, probably, his rotary hand-quern also kept):

et reserat clausae qua permeet ostia cellae

= 'and he unbars the door of the closed store-room to pass through' (literally, 'by which way he may pass through'). *peruidet* will then have been an obvious 'correction' of an intermediary *peruieet*. On the quite different topic of ducks, Columella, who is claimed to have read the *Moretum*, no doubt coincidentally observes (8.15.5) *offenduntur, si non sunt libera spatia, qua permeent*.

Forest Hill, Oxford

P. T. EDEN