

Now, interestingly, Andokides himself refers at a later point in his speech to a slave whom he had handed over for torture (64: τὸν τε παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν παρέδωκα βασανίσαι...). The problem is: Andokides links this episode with his confession *after* a stay in prison; [Lysias] relates it in conjunction with the preliminary court hearing which resulted in Andokides' imprisonment. Moreover, Andokides says that he actually handed over the slave (παρέδωκα), whilst [Lysias] says that the slave was done away with before he could give evidence. (This discrepancy is relatively easily explained, in my opinion: obviously Andokides would not have wanted to remind the court in 400 B.C. of the embarrassing fact that in 415 he had failed to provide the slave concerned, through the latter's demise.) Finally, Andokides says that his evidence (and presumably the promise to supply the slave) was given to the Boule, whilst [Lysias] talks of a Dikasterion (21). How are we to disentangle the versions here? I do not believe total clarity can be achieved.¹⁰ Discrepancies are surely inevitable given (a) the diametrically opposed purposes of both speakers ([Lysias] to calumniate; Andokides to whitewash) and (b) the interval of fifteen years which had elapsed between the crimes and the trial. What I do maintain, however, is that the transmitted text of the [Lysias] passage stating that Andokides spent nearly a year in prison exceeds the degree of divergence which these two factors might lead us to expect. It should be emended if a satisfactory alternative can be found.¹¹

University of Heidelberg

W. D. FURLEY

τιμήσασθαι (22), τιμήματος (23) metaphorically. According to his own narrative, Andokides is not yet being *punished* for anything. In going to prison he is merely paying the *penalty* for not fulfilling the terms of his pledge. Perhaps the speaker is using the strong word τιμᾶω deliberately, in order to heighten the sense of Andokides' guilt at this early stage of the proceedings. He speaks of him as if he were already a condemned criminal.

¹⁰ For what it is worth, I think MacDowell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 178, is probably right that Andokides and [Lysias] must be referring to the same occasion in the matter of the promised slave. However, I do not believe that this entitles MacDowell to conclude that Andokides was *re-imprisoned* after confessing to the Boule because he failed to hand over his slave. MacDowell has not really come to terms with the fact that the speaker's context in [Lysias] 6.21–3, is before Andokides' imprisonment, not after (see previous note). If that is so, then it is Andokides who has distorted the facts when he relates the slave episode in connection with his subsequent confession. He had a good motive for so doing, too: he wanted it to appear that the Council had, in 415, accepted the account of his personal involvement in the Herms' mutilation which he gave at his trial in 400. In fact his confession in 415 probably involved admitting a greater degree of guilt than he was prepared to concede in 400. Shifting the slave episode to the main confession following imprisonment, and simply glossing over the fact that the unfortunate slave had in fact been removed from the scene before he could give evidence, served to lend credence to his story in 400.

¹¹ I would like to express my gratitude to S. C. Todd for many helpful suggestions in connection with this piece.

CICERO, LAERTES AND MANURE

Cicero's Cato, in a passage nicely illustrating that enthusiasm for Greek literature which is said to have come upon him in old age,¹ offers some valuable observations about manure (*Sen.* 54): 'quid de utilitate loquar stercorandi? dixi in eo libro quem de rebus rusticis scripsi; de qua doctus Hesiodus ne verbum quidem fecit, cum de cultura agri scriberet; at Homerus, qui multis ut mihi videtur ante saeculis fuit, Laertam lenientem desiderium quod capiebat e filio, colentem agrum et eum stercorantem facit.'

¹ 'si eruditius videtur disputare quam consuevit ipse in suis libris, attribuito litteris Graecis, quarum constat eum perstudiosum fuisse in senectute' (*Sen.* 3).

Our texts of the *Odyssey* make no mention of manure in relating Odysseus' reunion with his father (24.219ff.), and it has generally been assumed that Cicero misinterpreted the hapax λιστρεύοντα (227),² glossed in the scholia with περιξύοντα καὶ περισκάπτοντα. Still, rare as the verb is, its connection with λίστρον is obvious enough, and any uncertainty about its meaning is removed by the subsequent description of Laertes' activity, φυτὸν ἀμφελάχαινε (242); Cicero ought not to have gone astray. Recently it has been suggested that he did not misunderstand λιστρεύοντα but read into it a feature of contemporary viticulture: 'the process of digging round the roots of vines (*ablaqueatio* in Latin) involved the addition of manure to fertilise the soil (cf. Cato, *Agr.* 5.8 etc.) and Cicero clearly thought this was what Laertes was doing.'³ This approach, while it may save Cicero's credit as a linguist, produces a very feeble piece of reasoning; the argument absolutely demands an explicit reference to manure. This deficiency is the more curious in that another memorable Odyssean recognition scene could have supplied the required testimony that muck-spreading was familiar to Homer (17.296–9), despite Hesiod's failure to deal with the subject.

If we had to do with a less studied composition it might be better to suppose that Cicero's memory had played him false, conflating a passage later in this episode, describing Laertes' reaction to a report apparently implying his son's death (24.316–17),

ἀμφοτέρῃσι δὲ χερσὶν ἑλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν
χεύατο κακὴν κεφαλῆς πολίης, ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων

with Priam's mourning for Hector (*Il.* 24.163–5),

ἀμφὶ δὲ πολλῇ
κόπρος ἔην κεφαλῇ τε καὶ αὐχένι τοιοῦτο γέροντος,
τὴν ῥα κυλινδόμενος καταμήσατο χερσὶν ἔησι.⁴

But undeniably the *De senectute* was not tossed off on the spur of the moment, and it might be thought surprising that it was not pointed out to its author that something was amiss here before the dialogue had achieved too wide a circulation for correction to be possible. Moreover, Pliny is evidently under the same impression (*NH* 17.50): 'Fimi plures differentiae, ipsa res antiqua. iam apud Homerum regius senex agrum ita laetificans suis manibus reperitur.' Did the authority of Cicero's Cato override his own recollection of a memorable passage which he must have known at first hand, or what?

Instead of charging Cicero and Pliny with carelessness, we might consider the possibility that they bear witness to a slightly different text. J. G. F. Powell in his valuable note on this passage has acutely argued that Cicero's *lenientem dolorem*, which seems to lack a counterpart in our texts of the *Odyssey*, might point to πένθος ἀλέξων in *Od.* 24.231 instead of the problematic πένθος ἀέξων. I suggest that Cicero also found an explicit reference to manure: more specifically, that 316–17 in his text (and in Pliny's) had been adapted so that Laertes should not fall short of Priam in expressing his grief by self-defilement. It would be enough to substitute κόπρον μάλ᾽ ἀπολλήν for κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν.⁵

² Thus e.g. Lamer, *RE* s.v. Laertes (434): 'dass λιστρεύειν *Od.* xxiv 227 mit *stercorari* wiedergegeben ist, ist lediglich Irrtum Ciceros'; Helm, *ibid.* s.v. M. Porcius Cato Censorius (145): 'das Missverständnis des homerischen λιστρεύοντα.'

³ J. G. F. Powell ad loc.; see further S. Boscherini, 'Su di un "errore" di Cicerone (*De senectute*, 54)', *QUCC* 7 (1969), 36–41.

⁴ cf. 22.414, 24.640.

⁵ κοπρίζοντα for λιστρεύοντα would also do the trick, exemplifying the common replacement of an out-of-the-way word with something easier. Admittedly, κοπρίζω is only doubtfully

To some this may seem an uneconomical hypothesis. But the abundance of (almost entirely) trivial variants and additional lines attested by papyri and by the mediaeval manuscripts, together with the arguments of the ancient critics, reveal an indefatigable tendency to improve on the transmitted text.⁶ Particularly noticeable among the various forms in which this misplaced creativity found expression is *ad hoc* enhancement by increasing the resemblance of one passage to another partially similar; such mechanical assimilation often betrays a feckless disregard for distinctive features of some importance.⁷ We also from time to time find lines inserted to give greater force to the expression of pain or grief: thus, after *Il.* 8.199 the third-century B.C. **π** 7 (Pack² 819) credited Hera with a gesture involving both hands, while the very slightly later **π** 432 (Pack² 875) had Agamemnon tearing his hair from the pain of his wound at *Il.* 11.272a⁸ Cicero and Pliny, I suspect, used texts in which the Oriental abandon of Priam's mourning had been transplanted to the Ithacan countryside.

Hertford College, Oxford

STEPHANIE WEST

Homeric; at *Od.* 17.299 the MSS are divided between *κοπρίσ(σ)οντες* and *κοπήσοντες*. But though the verb itself is rare, its meaning is obvious.

⁶ *διασκευή* is the scholiasts' term for deliberate alteration of the text, normally with reference to lines judged to be interpolated; see further K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*⁹ (Leipzig, 1882), p. 330.

⁷ Thus, e.g. *Od.* 4.57–8 (= 1.141–2), absent from many of the mediaeval MSS and suspected by Athenaeus, belong to a formal meal with freshly roasted meat and are incongruous after 56 which refers to the production of left-overs for unexpected arrivals. Similarly, the repetition of Menelaus' presentation speech (4.613–19) to follow 15.112 produces, among other difficulties, a very awkward juxtaposition at 119–20, but is fortunately betrayed as an interpolation by its absence from some of the mediaeval MSS and from **π** 28 (Pack² 1106); see further M. J. Apthorp, *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg, 1980), pp. 200–16.

⁸ Such too seems to have been the sense of the line added after *Il.* 23.136 in the third-century B.C. **π** 12 (Pack² 979). On these additional lines see further S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Cologne–Opladen, 1967), pp. 87f., 96f., 176.

A NOTE ON LUCRETIUS 4.1046

One of the most surprising features of the final part of the fourth book of the *De rerum natura* is the peculiar way Lucretius introduces the topic he intends to examine at length. We approach the extensive treatment of love from merely physiological phenomena. The terms *libido* and *amor* are mentioned for the first time at 1045 and 1046 respectively; I would like to focus on the interpretation of those lines and on the meaning of the clausula *dira libido* in the context of the final section of Book Four. Lucretius is talking of *semen*:

quod simul atque suis eiectum sedibus exit,
per membra atque artus decedit corpore toto,
in loca conveniens nervorum certa citque
continuo partis genitalis corporis ipsas.
irritata tument loca semine fitque voluntas
eicere id quo se contendit *dira libido*,
idque petit corpus mens unde est *saucia amore*.

1045

The following lines, 1048–57, enrich with a variety of detail the explanation of the mechanism of attraction put forward for the first time at 1045–6: the wounded falls, as a rule, on the wound itself, and the lover, accordingly, *unde feritur eo tendit gestitique coire/ et iacere umorem in corpus de corpore ductum* (1055–6). There are no hints, so far, of criticism on Lucretius' part; indeed, only from the new paragraph