

Gronovius' correction *iter in* is printed by the most recent editor G. P. Goold, whose reports of the manuscripts are cited above, in both his Loeb (1977) and Teubner (1985) editions. In his Loeb edition line 88 is translated, 'and established trade-routes between lands unknown to each other'. This emendation has much to recommend it over Housman's *linter*; for a change of subject would spoil the rhetorical articulation of the rising tricolon. But the resulting expression is awkward, and it is not adequately paralleled by Sen. *Nat.* 4.2.4 *harenas per quas ad commercia Indici maris iter est*. Housman notes that no decisive support for either proposal is provided by the parallel at Man. 4.170 *totque per ignotas commercia iungere terras*, but it does suggest a simpler change: *fecit et ignotas inter commercia terras*. The corruption arose when the preposition was mistakenly construed with *commercium*, which intervenes between *iter* and the noun it governs. The word order here is guaranteed by the examples cited by Housman in his note on 1.245, which include one other from Manilius: 5.372 *medios inter uolucrum prensare meatus*.

Columbia University

PETER E. KNOX

SENECA, *TROADES* 1109–10

quis tuos artus teget
tumuloque tradet?

teget *codd.*: leget Bentley

The English critic Bentley first proposed emending the transmitted text of *Troades* 1109 from *teget*, the reading of all manuscripts, to *leget*.¹ Bentley's suggestion subsequently gained wide acceptance and was printed in many later editions of the tragedies, including those of Leo (1878–9), Richter (1902), and Moricca (1917–23). More recent critics have favoured retention of the manuscript reading. Carlsson, for example, underlines the distinctive alliterative quality which the reading *teget* imparts to the line;² and the latest commentator on the *Troades* has produced a spirited defence of the transmitted text:

Andromache has not yet realized the condition of the corpse, and is thinking, not of gathering up fragmented limbs, but merely of the formal requirements of burial. What Carlsson (I p. 50) defends on grounds of alliteration should be retained on grounds of sense: *teget tumuloque tradet* is a doublet of which the second part makes clear the religious meaning of the first, more general, word.³

To the arguments put forward by Carlsson and Fantham, I can now add yet a third. *Teget* should be favoured not only on grounds of sound and sense, but for its

¹ Bentley never produced an edition of the tragedies. However, he did leave marginal jottings on the text which have been collected by E. Hedecke in *Studia Bentleiana* fasc. 2 (*Seneca Bentleianus*) (Freienwaldiae, 1899), pp. 9ff.

² G. Carlsson, *Die Ueberlieferung der Seneca-Tragoedien* (Lund, 1926), p. 50. For an opposing view, see Otto Zwierlein, *Die Rezipitationsdramen Senecas* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1966), p. 193.

³ E. Fantham, *Seneca's Troades. A Literary Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Princeton, 1982), p. 374. Zwierlein in his new Oxford Classical Text of the *Tragoediae* (1986) retains the manuscript reading *teget*. In an earlier discussion of the passage (*Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 4 (1978), 152 n. 51), he has also argued in favour of *teget*: 'In Tro 1109 verteidigt Axelson das überlieferte *artus teget tumuloque tradet* als einen Doppelausdruck analog Verg. Aen. 6.152. *Artus leget* (Bentley) würde die folgende Schilderung – so führt er aus – unpassend antizipieren: Andromache möchte sich ja gern vorstellen, dass die Leiche des Astyanax wenigstens heil ist.'

dramatic and literary qualities. Andromache's pathetic cry at 1109–10 – *quis tuos artus teget?* – is clearly meant to echo her previous words at 969–71:

nos, Hecuba, nos, nos, Hecuba, lugendae sumus,
quas mota classis huc et huc sparsas feret;
hanc cara tellus sedibus patriis *teget*.

The repeated verb *teget* effectively underlines the thematic connections and dramatic contrasts between the two scenes: both develop the motif of solace in burial; yet whereas Andromache's speech to Hecuba (969–71) furnishes the aged queen some respite from grief, her second outburst (1109–10) is striking for its irony and intense pathos. Unlike Hecuba, Andromache can derive no comfort from knowledge that her son will lie covered in his native soil.

Ohio State University

FRANK T. COULSON

A METRICAL QUOTATION IN JULIAN'S *SYMPOSIUM*

ἐπειδὴ δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς παίζειν (ἔστι γὰρ Κρονία), γελοῖον δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ περπνὸν οἶδα ἐγώ, τὸ μὴ καταγέλαστα φράσαι φροντίδος ἔοικεν εἶναι ἄξιον, ὦ φιλότῃς. (306a)

So the modern editions print the opening words of the work more popularly known as the *Caesares*.¹ The *Symposium* begins with what I consider to be a playful encounter between the narrator and his interlocutor, in which the latter's expectations of seriousness in the myth which is to follow are frustrated. This playfulness has not been appreciated by Julian's commentators. I suggest that we have here a concealed trimeter which figures largely in the dynamics of this dialogue (the word *δέ* is to be retained in Julian's text as necessary connective tissue):

γελοῖον οὐδὲν οὐδὲ περπνὸν οἶδ' ἐγώ.

A number of arguments must be advanced to make this attractive suggestion plausible, for language and diction are not exclusively poetic, and there is always a possibility that such a collocation of words is a trimeter only by accident.² Surprisingly, the adjectives *γελοῖος* and *περπνός*, common enough by themselves, I do not find paired elsewhere.³ The juxtaposition of the roots of these words is ultimately traceable to Homer (*Od.* 21.106: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ *γελῶ* καὶ *τέρπομαι* ἄφρονι θυμῷ);⁴ this

¹ Pétau's edition (Paris, 1630) prints οἶδ', but does not distinguish a quotation.

² The use of οὐδὲν οὐδέ to connect adjectives may be abundantly paralleled in Plutarch: *Alc.* 20.8, βέβαιον οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἰσχυρόν; *Cim.* 19.4, λαμπρόν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μέγα; *Cat. Mi.* 53.3, ὑγιές οὐδὲν οὐδὲ δίκαιον; *De curiositate* 521b, σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐπιτερπές; but Plutarch also preserves a quotation from Philemon's ὁ Ἐπιδικαζόμενος (F 23 Kock), *quomodo adulescentes* 35d: ἦδιον οὐδὲν οὐδὲ μουσικώτερον | ἔστ' ἢ δύνασθαι λοιδορούμενον φέρειν. Cf. also Euripides, *Tr.* 733: οὐδ' αἰσχρόν οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἐπίφθονόν σε δρᾶν.

³ There are instances of the close conjunction of the roots *γελ and *τερπ, some in a symposiac context, some not. Most remarkable is a papyrus of a hymn to Aphrodite (Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, epica adespota 9, col. III, line 1): ἀστ[ρ]άπτουσα γελᾷ τ[ε]ρπνοῖσι προσώποις. For symposiac parallels, cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* 622b, συμποσίου δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀστεῖον ἄθλον ἂν καὶ γέρας προθέῃ τῷ παιδιᾷ ἀνύβριστον εἰσηγησαμένῳ καὶ *τέρψιν* ὠφέλιμον καὶ *γέλῳ* τῳ μῶμον μὴδ' ὕβρειν ἀλλὰ χάριτος καὶ φιλοφροσύνης ἑταῖρον; Lucian, *Symp.* 18, διαλιπόντων δὲ ὀλίγον, ὥσπερ εἰώθασι, τῶν παρακομιζόντων τὰ ὄψα μηχανώμενος Ἀρισταίνετος μὴδ' ἐκείνον *ἄτερπῃ* τὸν καιρὸν εἶναι μὴδὲ κεὶνὸν ἐκέλευσε τὸν *γελωτοποιόν* εἰσελθόντα εἰπεῖν τι ἢ πράξει *γελοῖον*, ὥς ἔτι μάλλον οἱ συμπόται διαχυθεῖν.

⁴ This verse is imitated by John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Matth.* 6.7.99 (MPG 57, p. 71), in a passage which condemns popular, comic, entertainments: ὅταν μὲν γὰρ βλάσφημόν τι εἴπωσιν ἢ αἰσχρόν οἱ μῖμοι τῶν γελοίων ἐκείνων, τότε πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνοητοτέρων *γελῶσι καὶ τέρπονται*, ὑπὲρ ὧν αὐτοὺς λιθάξιν ἐχρῆν, ὑπὲρ τούτων κροτούσιν, καὶ τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός διὰ τῆς ἡδονῆς ταύτης κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτὸν ἔλκοντες κεφαλῆς.