

## NOTES ON PLINY, *NATURALIS HISTORIA* 33–7

The following modern editions are referred to: Sillig (1851); Jan (1860); Mayhoff (1897); Bailey (K. C.), *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on Chemical Subjects* (1929–32); Loeb editions (Rackham, Books 33–5 [1952]; Eichholz, Books 36–7 [1962]); Budé editions (Zehnacker, Book 33 [1983]; Le Bonniec, Book 34 [1953]; Croisille, Book 35 [1985]). Abbreviations include: Urlichs<sup>1</sup> = K. L. Urlichs, *Chrestomathia Pliniana* (Berlin, 1857); Urlichs<sup>2</sup> = K. L. Urlichs, *Vindiciae Pliniana* ii (Erlangen, 1866).

33.1. quippe alibi divitiis foditur [sc. tellus], quaerente vita aurum argentum electrum aes, alibi deliciis, gemmas et parietum †digitorumque† pigmenta.

The second sentence is parallel to the first: *alibi deliciis foditur, quaerente vita* (= *hominibus*, as often in Pliny) *gemmas* etc. It might seem that *digitorum* is either misplaced or corrupt. It has been proposed to change the word order so that it can be construed with *gemmas*; others have suggested emending it to *lignorum* (the most favoured correction), *pictorum*, *tignorum*, or *signorum*. Neither solution is satisfactory. There is really no reason why gems should be restricted to those worn on the fingers, or paints to those used for walls (or for walls and beams, if we adopt *lignorumque*). One might well conclude that *parietum digitorumque* is a gloss (in which the order of the two nouns has been reversed) on *gemmas et pigmenta*.

33.1. persequimur omnes eius [sc. telluris] fibras vivimusque super excavatam, mirantes dehiscere aliquando aut intremescere illam, ceu vero non *hoc indignatione* sacrae parentis exprimi possit.

We are surprised at the earth opening up or trembling, as though it were not possible that these are her ways of showing anger at the maltreatment we inflict upon her.

If the paradosis is sound, *hoc* is nominative, meaning *dehiscere aut intremescere* (we might rather have expected the plural *haec*) and *exprimi* means ‘explicari’ (Hardouin), ‘be explained’, whereas the natural meaning of the word is ‘be expressed’. What is expressed is earth’s anger; so Bergk’s change of *indignatione* to *indignatio* is essential. Bailey’s objection that such a corruption is unlikely can be refuted by 33.18 (where *indignatio*, preserved by B, has been corrupted in the other manuscripts to *indignatione*), 33.48 (where *origo* has been corrupted in B to *origine*), and similar passages. Bailey’s own reading *indignationes* (combined with *possint*) is a rare plural (TLL 7.1.1180.24ff.) which is practically never used of ‘bursts of anger’ on the part of a single agent.

If *indignatio* is adopted, *hoc* will be ablative neuter. This I cannot refute, but I strongly suspect that we should read *hoc* <modo>.

33.5. turba gemmarum potamus et zmaragdis *teximus* calices, ac temulentiae causa *tenere Indiam* iuvat: et aurum iam accessio est.

Bailey and Zehnacker argue that *teximus* must be a present tense, to correspond with *potamus*. But the two verbs are not on the same footing; the meaning is ‘we drink from cups which we have covered (perfect of *tego*) with emeralds’; *texere*, ‘entwine’, is quite inappropriate in sense.

Zehnacker explains *tenere Indiam* as ‘tenir entre nos mains toutes les richesses de l’Inde’. This is undoubtedly on the right lines, but perhaps one can be more specific: the reference may be to drinking-cups with ivory handles. For India as a source of ivory see Virgil, *G.* 1.57, Pliny, *N.H.* 8.7.

33.11. cum corona ex auro Etrusca sustineretur a tergo, anulus tamen in digito ferreus erat aequae triumphantis et servi fortasse coronam sustinentis.

Not even a general celebrating a triumph wore a golden ring; he had an iron one, like the slave who rode behind him holding a golden crown above his head.

‘Fortasse offre un sens excellent: car il n’est sûr du tout que l’esclave placé derrière le triomphateur ait porté une bague; mais s’il en portait une – et c’était *peut-être* le cas – elle était en fer comme celle de son maître’ (Zehnacker). He who believes that would believe anything. But Zehnacker’s argument against Mayhoff’s emendation *prae se* is convincing, and no other has been proposed. There remains the possibility of a lacuna; I suggest *servi fortasse* <*barbari*>. Since the slave was there to prevent the triumphator from getting an exaggerated idea of his own importance (Juvenal 10.41f., ‘sibi consul / ne placeat’), a derogatory expression with *servi* is appropriate.

33.14. sed quod accessit [sc. aurum] ex Gallorum praeda fuit detractumque ab iis in parte captae urbis delubris; Gallos cum auro pugnare solitos Torquatus indicio est.

The translators follow Hardouin’s paraphrase ‘in ea parte urbis quam ceperant’. This is wrong. The correct interpretation is that adumbrated by Urlichs<sup>1</sup> (p. 274), which takes *in parte* as the equivalent of *partim* and *captae urbis* with *delubris*. The extra thousand pounds of gold came from booty taken from the Gauls, partly gold which the Gauls had stripped from Roman temples under their control and partly gold ornaments which (as the story of Torquatus shows) the Gauls were in the habit of wearing in battle.

33.15. Illud quoque obiter indicari convenit ..., aedituum custodiae eius comprehensum fracta in ore anuli gemma statim expirasse et indicium ita extinctum.

The suicide of a temple-keeper destroys evidence about the theft of gold from the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in 52 B.C.

All editors have accepted *custodiae*, which Urlichs<sup>1</sup> (p. 275) describes as ‘beschreibender Genitiv’; this seems a difficult construction, and it is not made easier by the second genitive *eius*. I suggest that *custodem* would greatly ease the construction, but perhaps *aedituum* <*praepositum*> would be more probable. In any case *eius* is the gold, not (as Rackham and *TLL* 4.1555.61) the temple.

33.77. aurum arrugia quaesitum non coquitur sed statim suum est.

Gold mined by the *arrugia* method does not need to be melted but is pure straightaway.

Hardouin explained *suum* as ‘sui quasi iuris, iam purum, integrum’, and *OLD* (sense 10c) lists this passage with three others from Pliny under the rubric ‘containing no other elements’. In these other passages, however, in which *suus* agrees with a noun like *vena* or *colos*, it can have the sense of ‘characteristic’, ‘peculiar’, or ‘appropriate’; ours is the only one of the four in which *suus* is a self-contained predicate. Is *suum* a corruption of *purum*? This is certainly the word we should expect, as at 33.84, ‘ipsum [sc. aurum] purum et incorruptum’; 33.99, ‘purum relinquit aurum’. The corruption of *p* to *s* could be due to perseveration from the first letter of *sed* and of *statim*.

33.82. aurea statua prima omnium nulla inanitate et antequam ex aere aliqua modo fieret, quam vocant holosphyraton, in templo Anaetidis posita dicitur.

modo *B*: illo modo *cett*.

It is not surprising that this instance of *modo* stands isolated in *TLL* 8.1299.29. Sillig was responsible for ousting the vulgate *illo modo*, and he has been followed by all later

editors; it should be restored, but some repunctuation is necessary: *nulla inanitate (et antequam ex aere aliqua illo modo fieret), quam vocant* etc. This will prevent any attempt to construe *quam vocant* with *illo modo*.

- 33.105. vis eius [sc. scoriae] adstringere et refrigerare corpora †acre diest† additur emplastris, ut molybdaena etc.

acre diest *B*<sup>1</sup>: hac re *B*<sup>2</sup>: om. *cett.*

Mayhoff lists six conjectures, of which only two are worth mentioning: *quare his* and *hac de re*, both beginning a new sentence. It is possible, however, that part of the obelized passage goes with what precedes; I suggest *corpora ac re<s>*; *ideo additur* etc.

- 33.120. hoc ergo [sc. secundario minio] adulteratur minium in officinis sociorum, †et uiuis† Syrico. quonam modo Syricum fiat suo loco docebimus; sublini autem Syrico minium compendi ratio demonstrat.

et uiuis *B*: item *cett.*

Two inferior substances that are used for adulterating the true minium of Sisapo.

Neither Jan's *et ubivis* nor Mayhoff's *et vilius* is clearly right as an emendation of *et uiuis*. I suggest *et <t>utius*, which is palaeographically very easy. Adulteration with *Syricum* is 'safer', i.e. more difficult to detect; and Pliny goes on to mention how it can be detected (*compendi ratio demonstrat*).

- 33.121. probatur [sc. minium] auro candente; fucatum enim nigrescit, sincerum retinet colorem. inuenio et calce adulterari, ac simili ratione, ferri candentis lamna si non *sit* aurum, deprehendi.

Methods of testing minium for purity.

'If gold is not available' (Bailey). Should *sit* be *adsit*?

- 33.126. his coticulis periti cum e vena ut lima *rapuerunt experimentum*, protinus dicunt quantum auri sit in ea, quantum argenti vel aeris.

Use of the touchstone for identifying metals in an ore.

If the text is right, *experimentum* must be 'a sample', a meaning which is otherwise unattested (cf. *TLL* 5.2.1655.20f.). Bailey and Rackham adopt Purser's *experi <mento ra>mentum*. This is certainly ingenious, but perhaps a simpler emendation will suffice: *e vena...rapuerunt <in> experimentum*; cf. 9.22, 'praecisa cauda in experimentum', 9.133, 'mergitur in experimentum'. The object of *rapuerunt* can easily be understood from the context, but perhaps *rapuerunt* should be *raserunt*, which would be quite appropriate with *ut lima*; cf. 33.140, 'interradimus alia, ut quam plurimum lima perdiderit'.

- 33.132. igitur ars facta denarios probare, tam iucunda plebei lege ut Mario Gratidiano vicatim *totas* statuas dicaverit.

*totas vel tota codd.*

I do not believe in *totas statuas*, 'full-size statues' (Bailey); the final *s* of *totas* may well have come from the first letter of *statuas*. On the other hand I am not quite convinced by *tota* (sc. *plebs*). What would fit nicely after *vicatim* is *tota <urbe>*; cf. Cicero, *Dom.* 129, 'vicatim...tota urbe'; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.95.1, 'tota urbe vicatim'. Elsewhere (34.27) Pliny says that the statues to Gratidianus were set up 'in omnibus vicis' by the tribes; Seneca (*Dial.* 5.18.1) says 'vicatim populus statuas posuerat'.

- 33.147. L. vero Crassus orator duos scyphos Mentoris artificis manu caelatos HS  $\bar{C}$  [sc. emptos habuit], confessus tamen est numquam iis uti propter *verecundiam* ausum. †sicut† eundem HS VI in singulas libras vasa emptā habuisse.

*Verecundiam* is not (as the translators say) a feeling of shame at his own extravagance but a feeling of respect, awe, at the magnificent workmanship of the cups.

For the corrupt *sicut* Mayhoff substituted *scimus*, and he has been followed by all later editors, although his explanation of the corruption is not very probable. More probable, I suggest, would be *dicit*<*ur*>; for the impersonal, instead of the personal, construction see Kühner–Stegmann i.709.

- 34.2. fit [sc. aes] et ex alio lapide, quem chalcitim appellant, in Cypro, ubi prima aeris inventio, mox vilitas *praecipua* reperto in aliis terris praestantiore maximeque aurichalco.

It is surprising to read that Cyprian copper became ‘of exceptionally low value’ (Rackham). It seems probable that *praecipua* should be *praecipue*: it became cheap, particularly after the discovery of better-quality ores elsewhere.

- 34.56. item [sc. Polyclitus fecit] Mercurium, qui fuit Lysimacheae, Herculem, qui Romae, *hagetera* arma sumentem, Artemona qui periphoretos appellatus est.

For the mysterious *hageter*, ‘leader’, see le Bonniec’s note (p. 222). To match Mercury, Hercules, and Artemon one might expect a fourth proper name. I suggest *Hectora*; for representations of Hector in art see Roscher, *Ausf. Lexikon der... Mythologie* i.1919 (Hector arming himself, *ibid.* 1920.10).

- 34.93. in mentione statuarum est et una non praetereunda, quamquam auctoris incerti, iuxta rostra, Herculis tunicati, sola eo habitu Romae, *torva facie sentiensque* suprema tunicae.

sentiensque *B*: sentientique *cett.*  
tunicae *B*: tunica *cett.*

If *B*’s reading is right, *sentiens* must (as Sillig says) agree with *una statua, sola Romae*. Perhaps this should be accepted, but it is very easy to duplicate one letter and read *Romae*; *torva facie*<*s*> *sentiensque* etc.

- 34.108. atque haec omnia medici...ignorant. pars maior et nominibus \* \* \*; in tantum a conficiendis medicaminibus *iis* absunt.

pars maior et *codd.* *praeter B*: paret *B*    *iis B*<sup>1</sup>: his *cett.*

It seems almost certain that *pars maior et* is the right reading, and that *B*’s *paret* is due to one of those small lacunae which are not uncommon in that manuscript; if so, we can forget about readings like *parent nominibus*, ‘they are governed by names’ (Rackham). But a verb with which *nominibus* can be construed is missing; I suggest *errant* or *falluntur*.

After *medicaminibus* we do not want either *iis* or *his*, but *ipsis* would be very acceptable, to emphasize the contrast with *nominibus*.

- 34.108. iam pridem facta emplastra et collyria mercantur, tabesque mercium *aut* fraus Seplasiae sic †cexatetur†.

pridem *vett.*: quidem *codd.*  
cexatetur *B*<sup>1</sup>: exteritur *cett.*

The subject of *mercantur* is incompetent doctors who cannot make up their own plasters and salves.

No convincing sense can be extracted either from *exteritur* or from any of the emendations which have been proposed, *exsiccatur*, *excitetur* (or *excitatur*), *exhibetur*, *aderitur*. Perhaps *extollitur*, ‘is given a boost’; *aut* I take in the sense of *aut potius*.

- 34.116. quod vitium ut emendetur, duae partes *quam fuere* aceti miscentur urina pueri inpubis.

fuere *B*: fieri *cett.*

Editors have tortured this sentence, changing *vitium* to *vitiatum*, *quam* to *quae*, and *urina* to *urinae*. The only word which is corrupt is *fuere*; we want an expression like *quam acerrimo*, which Pliny has just used of the vinegar employed in making the preparation he is describing. The obvious expression is *quam asperrimi*, an adjective which is used of vinegar at 20.97 (*quam asperrimi*) and 34.175.

**34.131.** sed quodcumque genus [sc. spodi] lavando fit utilius; ...et *media* vis est eius quae vino lavatur.

*Media* ('moderate' or 'mediocre') does not suit the context, and Mayhoff's *eximia* is not convincing palaeographically. The obvious emendation is *medi<c>a*; the expression *vis medica* occurs at 10.12, 20.18, 36.202, 37.58. All kinds of 'ash' are made more useful by washing, but it is ash washed in wine which has medicinal properties; and Pliny proceeds to mention its medical applications.

**34.138.** ut ocius mors perveniret ad hominem alitem illam fecimus pinnasque ferro dedimus. quam ob rem culpa *eius non naturae* fiat accepta.

Man's use and abuse of iron.

*Eius* is *ferri*, not (as Bailey and Rackham), *hominis* (a dative, not a genitive, is required with *fiat accepta*). Hence *non naturae* demands the insertion of a preceding dative with which *naturae* can be contrasted. The best word is *nobis*; this could easily have fallen out before *non*, and it is (I think) confirmed by the fact that, to describe the uses of iron, Pliny has just used nine verbs in the first person plural (beginning with *scindimus* and ending with *dedimus*). This insertion of *nobis* is due to an anonymous scholar reported by Dalecampius (1587); the last editor who thought it even worth mentioning was Sillig.

**35.7.** aliae foris et circa limina animorum ingentium imagines erant adfixis hostium spoliis, quae nec emptori refigere liceret, triumphabantque etiam dominis mutatis ¶et me¶ domus.

The symbols of a triumph remained in the house of the triumphator even after it was sold.

Of the various attempts to emend *et me* (e.g. *ipsae*, *emptae*, *tamen*) the most favoured has been Mayhoff's *aeternae*, which is not convincing either palaeographically or in point of sense. Yet it is quite probable that we want a feminine plural adjective, preferably one ending in *-mae*; I suggest *inanimae*, a word which was liable to suffer abbreviation. I compare Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.69.3, 'etiam muta atque inanima, tectum et parietes'; id., *Hist.* 1.84.4, 'vos pulcherrimam hanc urbem domibus et tectis et congestu lapidum stare creditis? muta ista et inanima' etc.

**35.13.** scutis enim, qualibus apud Troiam pugnatum est, continebantur imagines, unde et nomen habuere clupeorum, non, ut perversa grammaticorum subtilitas voluit, a cluendo.

Pliny rejects the false etymology of *clupeus* but, as the text stands, he gives no very clear indication of what he regards as the true one (from *γλύφειν* = *caelare*); <*insculptae*> *imagines* would make his meaning clear.

**35.48.** sunt etiamnum novicii duo colores e vilissimis: viride quod Appianum vocatur et chrysocollam mentitur, ceu parum multa *dicta* sint mendacia eius.

*Dicta* would be an odd way of saying 'have been mentioned by me', even if it were true (which it is not) that Pliny has mentioned many bogus imitations of chrysocolla. Mayhoff's *ficta* is tautologous with *mendacia*. I suggest <*e*>*dita*, 'have been produced'.

**35.66.** fertur et postea Zeuxis pinxisse puerum uvas ferentem, ad quas cum advolassent aves, eadem ingenuitate *processit* iratus operi et dixit ‘uvas melius pinxi quam puerum’ *etc.*

*Processit*, ‘strode up to the picture’ (Rackham), ‘il s’avança’ (Croisille). These translations show that something is amiss. I should take *processit* in *OLD* sense 12, as if Pliny had written ‘eo ingenuitatis processit ut diceret’. But *processit* in this sense needs some support; I suggest <*longius*> *processit*, quite a common phrase (*TLL* 7.2.1646.79ff.). The comparative *longius* will refer to the story which immediately precedes (§65), in which Zeuxis behaved ‘ingenue pudore’.

**35.72.** ergo [*sc.* Parrhasius], *magnis* suffragiis superatus a Timanthe Sami in Aiace armorumque iudicio, herois nomine se moleste ferre dicebat.

Only Ulrichs<sup>1</sup> (p. 352) comments on *magnis*: ‘*magnis* statt *multis*, weil in *suffragiis* die Bedeutung der Stimmenmehrheit enthalten ist’. I find this difficult to believe and would substitute *multis*, noting that at 36.27 *multitudo*, correctly preserved by B, has been corrupted in the other manuscripts to *magnitudo*.

**35.102.** huic picturae quater colorem induxit [*sc.* Protogenes] *contra subsidia* iniuriae et vetustatis.

Gronovius suggested (a) that *subsidia* may be taken in the sense of *insidias*, an unexampled meaning, (b) that it could be emended to *obsidia*. Although both of these solutions have been adopted by one editor or another, neither deserves much consideration. Mayhoff’s substitution of *ceu tria* for *contra* is ingenious, but *tria subsidia* does not square with the singular *colorem*. Yet Mayhoff, I think, put his finger on the ailing spot: for *contra* I would read *comparans*, explaining the corruption (a) by the *p/t* confusion, (b) by the loss of final *s* before the first letter of *subsidia*.

**35.105.** erat tunc Protogenes in suburbano suo hortulo, *hoc est* Demetrii castris.

It is impossible to equate Protogenes’ ‘little garden’ with the camp of Demetrius. Ulrichs<sup>2</sup> (p. 772) wanted to delete *hoc...castris*; Mayhoff proposed to emend *hoc est* to *non procul a*, but that would be very unusual corruption. Much more probably a supplement is required: *hoc est*, <*non* [or *haud*] *procul a*> *Demetrii castris*.

**35.115f.** decet non sileri et Ardeatis templi pictorem (praesertim civitate donatum ibi et carmine quod est in ipsa pictura his versibus...; eaque sunt scripta antiquis litteris Latinis), non fraudando et Studio divi Augusti aetate, qui primus instituit amoenissimam parietum picturam *etc.*

No feature of Pliny’s style is more striking than his fondness for trailing ablatives absolute; cf. J. Müller, *Der Stil des älteren Plinius* (Innsbruck, 1883), pp. 27–31. We can therefore accept *non fraudando Studio* (if that proper name is right) without qualms, especially as it bears a close resemblance to 18.35, ‘non fraudando magnitudine hac quoque sua Cn. Pompeio’. But it can be accepted only if the whole passage is punctuated as above, with a long parenthesis about the painter of the temple at Ardea, so that the ablative absolute about *Studius* follows both grammatically and logically on *decet non sileri* *etc.* (and not, as in every edition I have seen, on *eaque sunt scripta* *etc.*). Moreover, *fraudando* seems incomplete: ‘cheated of his due’ (Rackham) requires the insertion of something like *sua gloria*; cf. 11.76, ‘mulier... non fraudanda gloria excogitatae rationis’; 32.62, ‘ne fraudulentur gloria sua litora’.

**35.175.** tertio quoque generi [*sc.* sulphuris] unus tantum est usus ad lanas suffiendas, quoniam candorem [tantum] mollitiamque confert (egula vocatur hoc genus). quartum †caute† ad ellychnia maxime conficienda. cetero *tantum* vis est ut morbos comitiales

deprehendat nidore inpositum igni: lusit et Anaxilaus eo, addens in calicem vini prunaeque subdita circumferens, exardescens percussu pallorem dirum velut defunctorum effundente in conviviis.

The fourth kind of sulphur is used especially for lamp-wicks. Instead of *caute* we want a word with which the *ad* phrase can be construed. Isidorus (16.1.10) may have found *aptum* in his text of Pliny (he says 'quantum ad lychnia maxime conficienda aptum'), but he may instead have found another word which he rendered by *aptum*, e.g. *ut<il>e*, which would correspond to *unus est usus* used in the preceding sentence of the third kind of sulphur. Perhaps then *quantum autem utile ad* etc.

People subject to epilepsy can be detected when they smell the fumes of burning sulphur, and these fumes cast a ghastly pallor on the faces of people who are close to them. Editors either tolerate *vis* as the genitive singular, a form which is otherwise unknown outside the grammarians and legal Latin (cf. Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* i.743f.), or else they accept the facile change of *tantum* to *tanta* (so already in the text of Isidorus). Neither expedient is either attractive or necessary; instead, read *cetero <non> tantum* (*non* could easily have been omitted after *cetero*). Pliny might have said 'non tantum vis est ut morbos comitiales deprehendat sed etiam pallorem dirum vultibus inducit'; instead of the latter general statement he gives us a particular example (Anaxilaus handing round fuming sulphur at dinner-parties) which illustrates that general statement.

35.176. aufert et lichenas faciei cum terebinthi resina et lepras; 'harpax' ita vocatur a celeritate praebendi, avelli enim subinde debet.

praebendi *B*: praeuelli (by anticipation of avelli) *cett.*

Sulphur is a cure for affections of the skin.

Rackham translates *celeritate praebendi* by 'the speed with which it has to be applied', but both *harpax* ('the snatcher') and commonsense suggest that the meaning ought to be 'la rapidité de son effet' (Croisille), i.e. the speed with which it removes lichens and leprae. Instead of *praebendi* we want a word of the same sort of meaning as *aufferendi*. I think that Jan found the answer when he made the suggestion (which, according to Sillig, he later withdrew) *prehendendi*; I should prefer *prendendi* as more likely to have been corrupted to *praebendi*. The Latin gerund *prendendi* is then a translation of the Greek ἀρπάζειν. Jan adduced 37.37, where Pliny says that in Syria women call amber 'the snatcher' (*harpax*) because of its powers of attraction: *quia folia paleasque et vestium fimbrias rapiat*; in that passage *rapere* corresponds to *celeriter prendere* in ours.

If the four words which follow *praebendi* are correctly transmitted, the subject of *debet* must be *sulpur*: the sulphur ought to be removed *subinde* (either 'immediately', as Rackham, or 'from time to time', as Croisille), presumably because it is so drastic in its action. But this is no sort of reason (note *enim*) for sulphur being called *harpax*. Surely it is the lichens and leprae which ought, under normal circumstances, to be removed immediately (*subinde*) by the action of the sulphur; if so, for *debet* read *debent*.

36.54. signis e marmore poliendis gemmisque etiam scalpendis atque limandis Naxium diu placuit ante alia; ita vocantur cotes in Cypro insula genitae.

Eichholz changes *in Cypro* to *in supra <dicta>* (meaning the previous line), a violent and unsatisfactory procedure which is, however, intended to solve a real problem: why give the name 'Naxian' to whetstones found in Cyprus? The answer will be found in H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste* (Leipzig,

1875–87), iii.199: ‘Da...die Insel Naxos bekanntermassen heute noch einen vortrefflichen, weithin verführten Smirgel liefert, so ist wohl nicht zu bezweifeln, dass auch das *Naxium* der Alten ursprünglich von dorthier kam und dass man nur später auch andern, von Cypern, Kreta u. s. kommenden Smirgel ebenfalls so benannt hat.’ Our text can be brought into line by reading <etiam> in *Cypro*.

**36.67.** ceciderat eum [sc. obeliscum] Necthebis rex purum, maiusque opus in devehendo statuendove †multum† est quam in excidendo.

multum *B*: multo *cett.*

Urlichs<sup>2</sup> (p. 791) saw that what is required is an aorist passive ending in *-tum est*; he proposed *inventum est*, and has been followed by the majority of later editors. But I think that this can be improved upon both palaeographically and in point of sense: read *motum est*, ‘was put in hand’, ‘undertaken’ (*OLD* sense 11). It is also probable that we should read *statuendo*<*q*>*ue*.

**36.135.** Varro...tradit...Tusculanum [sc. lapidem] dissilire igni, Sabinum fuscum addito oleo etiam lucere.

‘The meaning is uncertain: “will yield a flame even” (Bostock and Riley); “actually gleams” (Bailey); but the former rendering gives an unnatural sense to *lucere*, while the latter statement is not sufficiently remarkable to justify *etiam*’ (Eichholz). I suggest *etiam* <*noctu*> [or <*nocte*>] *lucere*, comparing 2.100, 9.82, 11.98, 16.33, and 21.62; or *etiam* <*in tenebris*> *lucere*, comparing 9.101.

**36.145.** infirmiora omnia eadem in eo quem schiston appellant; in iis commodior croco similis, peculiaris explendis ulcerum lacunis etc.

ulcerum Urlichs<sup>2</sup> (p. 801): oculorum *codd.*

*in iis* yields no sense, since no varieties of ‘schistos’ have been mentioned in the previous sentence. Mayhoff replaced it with a wild conjecture, *oculorum vitiis*; all that is needed is *in us*<*u*>; cf. 19.38, ‘magnificum in usu’.

**36.193.** acies tanta est quacumque ut citra sensum ullum ad ossa consecet quidquid *adflaverit* corporis.

The sharpness of molten glass. If *adflaverit* is not accepted in the sense of ‘splutters on’ (Eichholz), a better emendation than Mayhoff’s *adflikerit* would be *ad-s*<*u*>*l*<*t*>*averit* (‘attacks’), which is quite close to the paradoxos.

**37.18.** quae [sc. murrina] protinus ad hominum usum transiere, abacis etiam escariisque vasis expetitis; et crescit in dies *eius* luxuria.

eius *B*: eius rei *cett.*

The only singular noun in the immediately preceding context is *usum*, but (despite Mayhoff) *eius usus luxuria* is not a convincing phrase. Sillig suggested that from the plural *murrina* we can supply with *eius* the singular *murrini*; this is no doubt possible, but it is less attractive than adopting *eius rei*. If, however, *rei* is suspected of being an interpolation, I suggest *eius* <*generis*>; a few lines later we have *generis eius*.

**37.100.** cognata est et sandastros †pro natura ut† quam aliqui Garamanticam vocant.

pro natura ut *B*: om. *cett.*

Mayhoff reads *proxima natura eius quam* (and makes two similar suggestions in his Appendix on p. 506). Eichholz prefers transposition, with the change of *ut* to *et* (*quam aliqui pro natura et Garamanticam vocant*). No certain solution is possible, but preferable to these, I suggest, would be *pro*<*pe eadem*> *natura ut quam* etc.



37.153. cinaediae inveniuntur in cerebro piscis eiusdem nominis, candidae et oblongae *eventuque* mirae, si modo est fides praesagire eas habitum maris nubili vel tranquilli.

‘They have a remarkable effect’ (Eichholz). Although *eventu* has never been queried, I think that it should be *inventu*, carrying on *inveniuntur* just above: their discovery is a remarkable event because of their reputed prophetic powers. I compare 22.1, ‘mirabilia inventu’.

37.160. eumitren Beli gemmam, sanctissimi deorum, ut \* \* \* Assyrii observant, porracei coloris, superstitionibus gratam.

ut *B*: sibi *cett.* observant *B*: appellant *cett.*

Mayhoff’s emendation of *sibi* to *sui* has been adopted by later editors, who ignore *B*’s *ut* (although they all prefer *B*’s *observant* to the variant *appellant*). If *ut* is right, there must be a small lacuna, e.g. *ut* <*sacram*>. Pliny applies *sacer* to various gems at 37.135, 139, and 179.

37.182. sideritis ferro similis est; *maleficio* inlata aliquis discordiam facit.

*maleficio* *Mayhoff*: amletigio *vel sim. codd.* (*deest B*)

The vulgate *litigio*, revived by Eichholz, is on the wrong tack: both Solinus and Isidorus support *malef-*. Mayhoff’s text, given above, means ‘when introduced into evil-doing’ (Isidorus 16.15.11 says ‘in maleficiis quoquo modo inferatur’), but this is not satisfactory; surely the idea is that the stone itself, like iron, does evil (*maleficus*, says Solinus). So repunctuate: *ferro similis est maleficio* (ablative of respect): *inlata* etc. Pliny has a purple passage about the use and abuse of iron at 34.138ff.

37.201. ergo in toto orbe...pulcherrima omnium est iis rebus quae merito principatum naturae obtinent Italia, rectrix parensque mundi altera, viris feminis, ducibus militibus, <civibus> servitiis, etc.

I have added the word which completes the triad of contrasting nouns; the reason for its loss (after *militibus*) is obvious.

*Aberdeen*

W. S. WATT