

great undertaking of the Atreidae is established at the beginning of the sisters' enterprise and stressed at its crucial moment. They give literary colour to the story, and like many such reminiscences in the *Metamorphoses* are intended for the delectation of the learned reader. Finally, it is no doubt by an irony appropriate to their epic undertaking that the bodies of the evil sisters meet with an epic fate: compare 5.27 'laceratis visceribus suis alitibus bestiisque ferens pabulum interiit' with *Aeneid* 9.485–6 'canibus data praeda.../alitibusque iaces', 10.559 'alitibus linquere feris', and *Iliad* 1.4–5 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν|οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι, *Odyssey* 24.292 θηρσὶ καὶ οἰωνοῖσιν ἔλωρ γένετ'.

(iii) *Rufinus and Cacus*

That Aemilianus, the opponent against whom Apuleius' *Apologia* is largely directed, is likened to Vergil's sordid Charon and impious Mezentius is well known (*Ap.* 23, 53 with Butler and Owen's note, 56, 89). It would therefore be no more than appropriate if Rufinus, Aemilianus' alleged accomplice, were also compared to a Vergilian villain. Though unobserved by commentators, this seems to happen at *Ap.* 83, where Apuleius claims to have revealed Rufinus' devious schemes:

patent artes tuae, Rufine, fraudes hiant, detectum mendacium est: veritas olim intersersa nunc se effert et velut alto barathro calumnias emergit.

This passage has much in common with *Aeneid* 8.241ff., where Hercules similarly reveals to the world (though by a more physical means) the cave in which the devious Cacus had hidden his stolen cattle:

at specus et Caci *detecta* apparuit ingens
regia, et umbrosae penitus *patuere* cavernae,
non secus ac si qua penitus vi terra *dehiscens*
infernās reseret sedes et regna recludat
pallida, dis invisā, superque immane *barathrum*
cernatur, trepidant immisso lumine Manes.

'Detectum' in Apuleius seems to echo 'detecta' in Vergil, and 'patet' to echo 'patuere', while 'hiant' may be suggested by 'dehiscens' and the rare noun 'barathrum' occurs in both passages. The implication for the educated auditor or reader is clear: just as Aemilianus is characterized as a Charon by the Vergilian tag 'crudae senectutis' at *Ap.* 53, so Rufinus is to be seen as a Cacus, devious and monstrous, through this allusion to an equally well-known passage of Rome's national poet.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

TWO GIRAFFES EMINDED

In 1880 Spyridon Lambros discovered in the library of the Dionysiou monastery on Mount Athos a manuscript containing, among other things, the missing second book of a compilation of zoological lore made for the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (912–59), generally referred to as the *Sylloge Constantini*.¹ The first book, already known from a manuscript in Paris,² proclaims in its heading that the

¹ Dionysiou 180 = S. P. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos* (Cambridge, 1895), no. 3714.

² Paris supp. gr. 495, edited by V. Rose, *Anecdota Graeca et Graecolatina* (Berlin 1864, reprinted Amsterdam, 1963), ii.1ff.

compilation was based on the epitome of Aristotle's *περὶ ζώων* by Aristophanes of Byzantium, with supplements from the writings of Aelian, Timotheos and others. These supplements are found exclusively in the second book, which Lambros edited, along with the first, for the *Supplementum Aristotelicum*.³ They add greatly to our knowledge of the *περὶ ζώων* by the fifth-century grammarian Timotheos of Gaza,⁴ a work hitherto known only from the so-called *Epitome Augustana*, a selection of 53 unconnected chapters made in the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55).⁵

Among the new fragments of Timotheos was one dealing with the giraffe (*Sylloge Constantini* 2.270 = p. 94.10ff. Lambros), two specimens of which had passed through his home town of Gaza on their way to the emperor Anastasios as a gift from India in A.D. 496. Timotheos comments particularly on the curious gait of the animal. As printed by Lambros the text reads:

οὐδὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ζώοις ὁμοίως εἶχον τὴν βάσιν. ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ ἀμοιβαίως ἐκατέρωθεν πέμπει τὸν πόδα, δεξιῶ τῷ πρόσθεν ὕστερον ἐπάγοντα τὸν ὀπίσθιον· ταῦτα δὲ ὁμοῦ δύο μὲν τοὺς δεξιούς, δύο δὲ τοὺς ἀριστεροὺς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἐν ἰσῶ τῷ μέτρῳ πέμπει.

ὕστερον ἐπάγοντα τὸν Lambros; ἀστερον ἐπάγοντα τὸ D

While this describes accurately enough the characteristic gait of the giraffe (and its only relative the okapi), it is incorrect as regards the rest of the animal kingdom.⁶ Sense, however, can easily be produced by an emendation different from that of Lambros: for the meaningless *ἀστερον* of the manuscript we must read not *ὕστερον* but *ἀριστερόν*. Then we have the familiar picture of quadrupeds moving their legs in diagonal rotation. Compare Aristot. *de incessu animalium* 712a25ff.: μετὰ γὰρ τὸ δεξιὸν τῶν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀριστερόν τῶν ὀπισθεν κινουσιν, εἴτα τὸ ἀριστερόν τῶν ἐμπροσθεν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ δεξιὸν τῶν ὀπισθεν.

The only other classical writer to have remarked on the unique giraffid gait is a surprising one: the erotic novelist Heliodoros, writing probably in the fourth century. He draws the same contrast as Timotheos, though he expresses it less clearly: παρήλλακτο καὶ τὸ βάδισμα χερσαίου τε ζώου καὶ ἐνύδρου παντὸς ὑπεναντίως σαλευόμενον, τῶν σκελῶν οὐκ ἐναλλάξ ἐκατέρω καὶ παρὰ μέρος ἐπιβαίνοντος, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ μὲν τοῖν δυοῖν καὶ ἅμα τῶν ἐν δεξιᾷ, χωρὶς δὲ καὶ ζυγηδὸν τῶν εὐωνύμων σὺν ἐκατέρᾳ τῇ ἐπαιρουμένη πλευρᾷ μετατιθεμένων.⁷ Now it is of course possible that the coincidence between these two writers is the result of independent accurate observation from life particularly since, as we know, Timotheos did have the opportunity to see the beast for himself at Gaza. However, the rest of Heliodoros' lengthy description of a giraffe, although it includes some lively and well seen detail, also contains distortions of such a kind as to suggest that he had not in fact seen a giraffe in the flesh.⁸ Timotheos for his part cannot be regarded as an original or

³ *Supplementum Aristotelicum* Vol. 1, Pars 1 (Berlin, 1885).

⁴ Information about Timotheos and his work is usefully collected by M. Minniti Colonna, 'Timoteo di Gaza', *Vichiana* 6 (1977), 93–102.

⁵ Preserved in Monacensis Augustanus gr. 564, a manuscript of the 14th century, edited most accessibly by M. Haupt in *Hermes* 3 (1869), 1ff. (= *Opuscula* [Leipzig, 1876, reprinted Hildesheim, 1967] iii.274ff.).

⁶ Cf. Sir James Gray, *How Animals Move* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 55ff. For a detailed account of giraffid locomotion, see C. A. Spinage, *The Book of the Giraffe* (London, 1968), pp. 124ff.

⁷ *Aithiopika* 10.27.3.

⁸ The giraffe's head is not quite twice the size of that of an ostrich; its hindquarters are like those of a lion; the slenderness rather than the length of its neck is stressed; it has spots (or scales!) that are brightly coloured.

penetrating zoologist,⁹ and there is at least a possibility that his work was in hexameter verse,¹⁰ in which case it may have been of the same scientific calibre as the writings of Aratos or Oppian. It is, moreover, striking that Timotheos does not mention the giraffe's neck, which surely would be the feature of the animal most likely to stay in the memory of an eyewitness. It would be surprising then if these two writers had independently noticed something that had passed unremarked by more scientific writers since the Graeco-Roman world first became acquainted with giraffes.¹¹ It is also clear that Timotheos was not using Heliodoros, since he includes some accurate details omitted by the novelist and omits others that Heliodoros does have.¹²

The only remaining possibility to explain the similarity is that both writers were deriving information, selectively and not always without distortion, from the same literary source. Who that might have been we can only speculate: Aelian, whose chapter on giraffes is lost, is a possibility. But, since Heliodorus comments that the giraffe was halting in its movement, ἄλκον...τὴν κίνησιν, we can say with some degree of certainty that he was not using the tradition represented by Artemidoros, who was criticised by Strabo (16.4.7) for alleging that the giraffe was a creature of unsurpassed speed. Artemidoros' source was Agatharchides, whose work on the Red Sea is summarized in the *Bibliothēke* of Photios. The text of Photios as printed by his latest editor¹³ says something very strange about the giraffe: τὴν μὲν γὰρ ποικιλίαν ἔχει παρδάλεως, τὸ μέγεθος δὲ καμήλου, τὸ πάχος δὲ ὑπερφυῖς.

What are we to understand by the *thickness* of a giraffe? The obvious correction, τάχος for πάχος, was tentatively suggested long ago by Bekker, but has been languishing in the notes of Müller's *Geographi Graeci Minores*.¹⁴ Comparison with Strabo's strictures makes it absolutely certain.

University College of Swansea

J. R. MORGAN

⁹ Compare the judgements of F. S. Bodenheimer and A. Rabinowitz, *Timotheus of Gaza on Animals* (= Collection de travaux de l'Acad. Internationale d'histoire des sciences, No. 3) (Paris and Leiden, 1948): 'no zoologist but a collector and compiler of interesting notes about animals' (p. 8); 'merely the record of a curiosity...a number of exotic, rare animals are mentioned, such as...the giraffe, but obviously the knowledge of Timotheus about them is not more penetrating than that about the common animals of his country' (p. 13). In fairness, it should be pointed out that these comments are based only on the fragments in the *Epitome Augustana*; the rather fuller treatment of the giraffe in the *Sylloge Constantini* seems to have been unknown to Bodenheimer and Rabinowitz.

¹⁰ Cf. Suda s.v. Τιμόθεος, Γαζαῖος, γραμματικός...ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ ἐπικῶς Περὶ ζῴων τετραπόδων θηρίων τῶν παρ' Ἰνδοῖς καὶ Ἀραβί καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις. Doubt was cast on this report by Diels (reported by Lambros, p. xiii n. 1) and Usener (*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 26 [1892], 1018ff.), who pointed out that no trace of metre or poetic diction survives in the extant fragments. The only way to save the Suda as it stands is to suppose, as do Bodenheimer and Rabinowitz, that we are dealing with a Byzantine prose paraphrase.

¹¹ For earlier reports of the giraffe cf. Diod. 2.51 (from Poseidonios), Strabo 16.4.7 (from Artemidoros), Plin. *NH* 8.69, Dio Cass. 43.23, Opp. *Cyn.* 3.462ff.

¹² Timotheos has material on tail, horns, ears, not found in Heliodoros; but lacks details on neck, head-size, temperament, which Heliodoros does have.

¹³ Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250, 455b; edited by R. Henry in vol. 7 of the Budé text (Collection Byzantine, Paris, 1974).

¹⁴ C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* (Paris, 1855), i.159.