

## NOTES ON PELAGONIUS\*

The text of the fourth-century veterinary writer Pelagonius, recently edited for the first time this century and greatly improved by K.-D. Fischer,<sup>1</sup> poses many problems for an editor. The Latinity of Pelagonius himself in the epistles which precede various chapters is awkward and difficult to understand. Much of the rest of the work is a compilation, not all of it Pelagonius' own work, based on a variety of sources from the magical to the scientific.<sup>2</sup> The work survives largely in a single manuscript, *codex Riccardianus* 1179, a.1485 (R). In this paper I pass over intractable questions of spelling and concentrate on more substantial problems of text and interpretation, some of which concern punctuation.

## I

110 arboris ulmi partem comburito et in cinerem leuem, id est fauillam quam appellant, tollito et in aqua colari permittito.

So R, but in *cinerem*... *tollito* is not possible. Ihm, followed by Fischer, changed *tollito* to *tundito*, suggesting *terito* and *soluito* as alternatives.<sup>3</sup> *Tundito* (likewise *terito*) is inappropriate, because the fine white ash which *fauilla* apparently indicates (Hoppe<sup>4</sup> compares Scrib. Larg. 122, p. 65.12 S. 'cerui cornua...fornace uruntur, donec in cinerem candidissimum redigantur') is produced not by beating or crushing but by prolonged burning: note Pel. 362 'uel harundines combures et priusquam in fauillam persoluantur sublatis pinsas' (quoted by Hoppe, who oddly substitutes *cinerem* for *fauillam*).<sup>5</sup> *Soluito* would be preferable to *tundito*, as the use of *persoluantur* alongside in *fauillam* at 362 shows; *soluito* would also be closer palaeographically than *tundito* to *tollito*.

But the Greek translator seems to have had *tollito*: see Hipp. Ber. 22.50, CHG i. 117.20 πετέλας ξύλου μέρος καύσας, τήν κόνιν λαβὼν καὶ διηθήσας εἰς ὕδωρ. In this version the next verb διηθήσας has an expressed object (τήν κόνιν), just as in Vegetius' rather free version of Pelagonius (*Mul.* 2.132.9 'expertum dicitur ulmi

\* I am grateful to H. D. Jocelyn for his useful comments on a draft of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> *Pelagonii Ars Veterinaria* (Leipzig, 1980). The work was previously edited in the Teubner series by M. Ihm, *Pelagonii Artis Veterinariae quae extant* (Leipzig, 1892). In the 1920s and 1930s Karl Hoppe published extensively on Pelagonius and his text. Two of his papers referred to in this article are: 'Die Commenta artis medicinae veterinariae des Pelagonius', *Veterinärhistorisches Jahrbuch* 3 (1927), 189–219 (separately published: *Abhandlungen aus der Geschichte der Veterinär-Medizin*, Heft 14, Leipzig, 1927); 'Kritische und exegetische Nachlese zu Ihms Pelagonius I', *Veterinärhistorisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1929), 1–32 (separately published: *Abhandlungen aus der Geschichte der Veterinär-Medizin*, Heft 19, Leipzig, 1929).

<sup>2</sup> See in general Fischer's preface; also id. 'Pelagonius on horse medicine', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Third Volume* 1981, ed. F. Cairns (*ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs* 7, Liverpool), 285–303. Cf. R. Herzog – P. L. Schmidt, *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* v (Munich, 1989), pp. 80ff.

<sup>3</sup> See his note, p. 153.

<sup>4</sup> 'Nachlese I', 23. On the sense of *fauilla*, see TLL, s.v.

<sup>5</sup> For 'burning and reducing to ashes', see e.g. Marc. 27.102 'combusta et in cinerem redacta', 34.80 'combures et in cinerem rediges'.

cinerem leuissimum, id est fauillam, aqua tepenti permiscere') *permiscere* has *cinerem* as its object. If *tundito* (or *soluito*) is accepted, the object of the next verb ((*colari permittito*) has to be deduced from the context.

The simplest solution is to change *in (cinerem)* to *inde*, and to retain *tollito*. *Et inde* is a common combination in Pelagonius (10 times). *Cinerem* now becomes object of *tollito*, just as τὴν κόνιν is object of λαβών, and (*colari permittito*) has the same object.<sup>6</sup> For *cinerem tollo*, of taking up ash, cf. Vulg. Lev. 6.10 'tolletque cineres quos uorans ignis exussit', Exod. 9.8 'tollite plenas manus cineris de camino', and note the use of *sublatos* at Pel. 362, quoted above, of something which is taken up from a fire.

Hoppe's suggested text is: 'ulmi partem comburito [et] in cinerem leuem, id est fauillam quam appellant: tollito et....' This gives some sort of sense, but *comburito in cinerem* is not convincing.<sup>7</sup> In such contexts *in cinerem* is usually associated with another verb rather than the verb of burning (see Scrib. Larg. 122, quoted above, and the passages of Marcellus quoted at n. 5).<sup>8</sup>

## II

**50.2** curabis autem his: bacas lauri numero XX et nitri lib. terito minute et rutae manipulum uiridem cum aceto et oleo laurino tepefacto perunguito caput medium inter aures.

Fischer's punctuation, printed here, makes it impossible to determine how he construes the passage. Does he take *rutae manipulum* as a third, postponed object of *terito* (so apparently Ihm, who places a comma after *aceto*: '...terito minute et rutae manipulum uiridem cum aceto, et oleo laurino tepefacto perunguito caput medium'), or as object of *perunguito*, which would then have a vulgar double accusative construction (the other accusative being *caput medium*, = 'smear the middle of the head with *rutae manipulum*')? For this construction, see e.g. *Comp. Luc.* A14f. 'tinctum ungues subtiles uitria',<sup>9</sup> *Mul. Chir.* 714 'post fomenta hanc unctionem renes perungues'.<sup>10</sup> There are similar constructions in Pelagonius at 235 'marrubium cum ueteri axungia et rustico absinthio permixtum, ungulas perfricabis' and 245.1 'haec uino permixta, omne corpus perfricabis',<sup>11</sup> though these could equally be taken as participial accusative absolutes.<sup>12</sup>

To split *aceto* from the juxtaposed *oleo laurino* as Ihm does is unconvincing. *Acetum* and *oleum* are constantly juxtaposed and coordinated in recipes (cf. 55, 57, 180, 182, 205.2, 256.3, 448.2), and one would need good grounds for separating them here.

There are three possible guides to the interpretation (and hence punctuation) of this passage of Pelagonius: the Greek translation, and the corresponding passages in Vegetius and the *Mulomedicina Chironis*.

<sup>6</sup> An alternative solution, as Professor Jocelyn points out to me, would be to delete *in*, though in that case the two clauses would not be as clearly linked as they would be by *inde*.

<sup>7</sup> *TLL* iii. 1072.64ff. (under *in cinerem*, *in cineres*) cites nothing comparable.

<sup>8</sup> For *redigo*, *soluo*, *dissoluo* et al. used in conjunction with *in cinerem*, see *TLL*, loc. cit.

<sup>9</sup> See J. Svennung, *Compositiones Lucenses: Studien zum Inhalt, zur Textkritik und Sprache* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941: 5), pp. 140f.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. H. Ahlquist, *Studien zur spätlateinischen Mulomedicina Chironis* (Uppsala, 1909), p. 36, Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Lund, 1935), pp. 226ff.

<sup>11</sup> For *perfrico* + double accusative, see Ahlquist, loc. cit., E. Löfstedt, *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* (Lund, 1936), p. 147.

<sup>12</sup> On which see now Anne Helttula, *Studies on the Latin Accusative Absolute* (Helsinki, 1987), especially pp. 79ff.

The Greek (*Hipp. Ber.* 103.15, *CHG* i. 358.18ff.) runs as follows: δάφνης κόκκους κ', νίτρου λίτραν α', κατακόψας λεπτά [= *bacas lauri numero XX et nitri lib. terito minute*], καὶ πηγάνου χλωροῦ δεσμίδιον ἐν μετὰ ὄξους καὶ ἐλαίου δαφνίνου χλιάνας [= *et rutae manipulum uiridem cum aceto et oleo laurino tepefacto*], ἀπάλειφε τὴν κεφαλὴν μεταξύ τῶν ὠτῶν [= *perunguito caput medium inter aures*]. It is obvious that the translator has split the first two accusatives (*bacas lauri* and *nitri lib.*) from the third (*rutae manipulum uiridem*), taking the first two as object of *terito*, the third as object of a coordinated verb (of warming). This would suggest that he read *tepefacto* as *tepefacito*, an imperative coordinated with *terito*. To emend *tepefacto* to *tepefacito* would produce neat Latin syntax, but the Latin would not have much meaning as a recipe. With what precisely would the head be smeared? How would the ingredients in the *terito*-clause be combined with those in the *tepefacito*-clause? Moreover the form *tepefacito* does not occur elsewhere in the text of Pelagonius, whereas the participle is common. The Greek versions are in general a poor guide to the text of Pelagonius, though here it is clear enough that the translator had the same order of words as that in our extant manuscript of Pelagonius.

Of far more importance for the establishment of the text of Pelagonius is the corresponding passage of the *Mulomedicina Chironis*. Pelagonius and the *Mulomedicina* often used a common source;<sup>13</sup> they are independent of each other. *Mul.* 263 runs as follows: 'sic eum curabis. baccas lauri numero XX, nitrum *p* semis, rutae manipulum, omnia haec bene trita cum aceto acro et oleo rosaceo optimo. ex his omnibus praemixtis perungito caput eius et cerebrum.' Here *rutae manipulum* is not separated from the other two accusatives; all three ingredients expressed in the accusative are to be crushed together (*omnia haec bene trita*) with *acetum* and a type of *oleum*,<sup>14</sup> and smeared on the head. It follows that in Pelagonius *rutae manipulum uiridem*, like *bacas lauri* and *nitri lib.*, should stand as object of *terito*, and that the prepositional expression *cum aceto et oleo laurino tepefacto* forms a unit which should be in the same clause as *terito*. One is therefore bound to place strong punctuation, such as a semi-colon, after *tepefacto*. If a comma is placed after *aceto*, with Ihm, the head is smeared only with *oleo laurino tepefacto*. It is however obvious from the *Mul.* that the head should be smeared with a mixture of all the ingredients listed ('ex his omnibus praemixtis perungito'), and this is also implied by the clause which follows in Pelagonius himself: 'et lanatam pellem madentem his medicaminibus pro cerebellari superinponito.'

Vegetius, *Mul.* 2.7.1 follows the *Mulomedicina* (rather than Pelagonius) closely: 'cuius ista curatio est: bacas lauri n. XX, nitri selib., rutae manipulum: quae omnia diligenter trita, cum aceto non acri et oleo optimo rosaceo commixta hieme calefacies perunctoque oleo capite eius....' Since Vegetius is at a further remove than the *Mulomedicina* from the source, he is of little use in helping one establish the text of Pelagonius. The expression *perunctoque oleo capite eius*, on which Ihm bases his punctuation of Pelagonius here (see pp. 145f.), is in fact a rewriting by Vegetius of what he found in the *Mulomedicina*. It should be disregarded by an editor of Pelagonius.

The word order of Pelagonius is slightly unusual in that two objects of *terito* (*bacas lauri* and *nitri lib.*) come before the verb, and the third (*rutae manipulum uiridem*) after

<sup>13</sup> See Hoppe, 'Commenta', §VI.

<sup>14</sup> Pelagonius and the *Mulomedicina* disagree in the type of *oleum* to be used. This is one of various minor discrepancies between the two works (cf. *uiridem* and *tepefacto*, both of which are only in Pelagonius) which suggest that they are independent of each other.

it. But the breaking up of a series of coordinated nouns in this way by the interposition of the verb is not uncommon: cf. e.g. 28 'strofum faciunt et dolore ipso maciem', 34.1 'sanguis sic de temporibus mittitur et de facie', 83 'arum Gallicum tundes diligenter et postea herbam parietariam', 103 'panacis radicem pisatam, uini heminam, olei cyathos III per os deicis aut per narem sinistram', 139 'qui dysuria temptatur aut stranguria', 211.2 'pro cibo gramen accipiat et cicer infusum', 325 'tunc ei aeruginem mittis et acetum modice.'

### III

There is a problematical passage at 183.2, the difficulty of which has not been adequately addressed by editors. I am unable to offer a decisive emendation, though emendation is needed, but feel that it will be worthwhile both to explain the whole passage, and to isolate the phrase which must be corrupt. The sentence division adopted by editors at one point is also undoubtedly wrong.

The passage as printed by Fischer runs as follows:

diuersae quidem passiones equorum, sed signa similia forsitan curantibus uel filocalis erroris adferant aliquid. nam multa in equo similia signa repperimus, cum diuersae et longe a se alienae infirmitates existant. nam cum dicimus equum febrientem caput habere in terram demissum, crebra perseuerare suspiria, haec etiam et dolorem indicant capitis; cum opisthotoni signa peruideris, sperabis roboris passionem; quod et nunc. quibus membra aut sole nimio aut labore deficiunt nec stare possunt, sed complicitis inter se cruribus concidunt, ne dolorem uentris sperans medellas et curas strofo praebeas et non passioni ipsi congruam offeras curam.

Pelagonius' theme is the ease with which errors of differential diagnosis can be made. The symptoms of one disease can be interpreted as those of another, and incorrect treatment adopted. The first example of an error of diagnosis is set forth in the sentence *nam cum dicimus equum febrientem...et dolorem indicant capitis*. The symptoms of fever and *dolor capitis* are the same, and can be confused.

The next sentence, *cum opisthotoni signa peruideris, sperabis roboris passionem*, does not in itself contain a second example of an error, because *opisthotoni* and *roboris* refer to the same condition. The meaning is 'when you perceive the symptoms (of a horse which is) *opisthotonus*, you will think it is the disease of *robur*'.<sup>15</sup> *Robur* (with a derivative adjective *roborosus*) was a late word for 'tetanus', the origin of which is explained (no doubt correctly) by *Mul. Chir.* 316: 'hic erit ligno similis, unde roborosus dictus est' (cf. *Veg. Mul.* 2.88.1).<sup>16</sup> *Roborosus* is equated by the *Mul. Chir.* with *tetanicus* and *opisthotonus* at 315: 'quodcunque iumentum *rouorosum* fuerit, quem quidam *tetanicum* dicunt. hic autem ab aliis *opisthotonus* appellatur.' Originally the Greek terms in this sentence indicated different manifestations of tetanus, but they came to be used indifferently, as is already noted by Celsus: 4.6.1 'neque tamen alius inportunior acutiorque morbus est, quam is, qui quodam rigore neruorum modo caput scapulis, modo mentum pectori adnectit, modo rectam et immobilem ceruicem intendit. primum Graeci *οπισθότονον*, <in>sequentem *εμπροσθότονον*, ultimum *τέτανον* appellant, *quamuis minus subtiliter quidam indiscretis his nominibus utuntur*.' Indeed Apsyrtus felt that there was no need for the two terms *τετανικός* and *οπισθοτονικός*: *Hipp. Ber.* 34.1, *CHG* i. 177.5 *ἵπποτροφούντά σε ἐθέλω εἰδέναι, <ὅτι> ὅσοι λέγουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀρρωστήμασι τῶν ἵππων τετανικοὺς εἶναι καὶ οπισθοτονικοὺς, οὗτοι τετελέκασι πλείοσιν ὀνόμασι περιβάλλειν τὸ συμβαῖνον*

<sup>15</sup> *Spero* here as elsewhere in Pelagonius = 'think': cf. 139, 210.1.

<sup>16</sup> Note G. West (ed.), *Black's Veterinary Dictionary*<sup>15</sup> (London, 1985), 798 '... muscles of the quarters can be felt... hard and board-like.'

καὶ περιέρχους. Significantly the passage which follows this remark is translated at length by Pelagonius (267–70). It is therefore unlikely that Pelagonius intended *opisthotoni* to mean anything different from *roboris*.

Even if Pelagonius was using *opisthotoni* here in its technical sense (for which see *Mul. Chir.* 488 ‘opisthotoni, qui a posterioribus prenduntur’, 318 ‘haec igitur passio neruorum quibus contigerit, ut plurimum a posteriori parte prensi sunt et a priore minus, sic facilissime curantur. qui desidet in lumbos tanquam canis, unde et opisthotonus dictus est. si quem autem robor a prioribus partibus prendiderit...’, *Apsyrtus, Hipp. Ber.* 34.1, *CHG* i.177.23 ἀναπεσὼν δὲ ἐγείρεσθαι πάλιν τοῖς ὀπισθίοις ἀδυνατεῖ, ἀλλ’ ἀνακαθίζει ὡς κύων τοῖς ἐμπροσθίοις, ὅθεν καὶ λέγεται ὀπισθότονος), he would not have been distinguishing two different conditions in the sentence in question, but simply saying that when one comes across the specific symptom described by *opisthotonus*, one automatically thinks of the general condition tetanus.

The error which may be entailed in such a diagnosis is expressed in the next sentence, *quibus membra aut sole nimio aut labore deficiunt nec stare possunt, sed complicitis inter se cruribus concidunt* (I leave aside *quod et nunc* for the moment). The revealing phrase here is *complicitis inter se cruribus*, because by expressing himself thus Pelagonius was unmistakably alluding to a symptom of tetanus. At 294, when listing the symptoms of *robur*, he uses much the same expression, *crura inter se complicitabit*. The general sense of the two sentences *cum opisthotoni... cruribus concidunt* can only be: ‘When you see symptoms of tetanus, you think that the horse has tetanus. (But the same symptoms also befall) those whose limbs are weak from sunstroke or excessive toil, and who cannot stand, but fall down with their legs entangled.’ All of the symptoms described in the second sentence affect those with tetanus, but they may also be a sign of sunstroke or exhaustion. Here then, carried over two sentences, is Pelagonius’ second illustration of an error of differential diagnosis.

It is obvious that the words *quod et nunc* must be corrupt. As an independent sentence (so Hoppe,<sup>17</sup> followed by Fischer) they are meaningless, and look on the face of it like a marginal gloss by someone applying Pelagonius’ remark to his own day. *Quibus* too is an emendation (Sarchiani: *qui* R). The sense requires something such as ‘quod et eis euenit, quibus’, or, more logically, ‘quae (signa) et eis eueniunt, quibus’. The Greek translator seems to have had some such text as this: *CHG* i. 254.12 ἃ συμβαίνει ἐκείνοις τοῖς ζώοις, ἅτινα ἀπὸ πολλοῦ ἡλίου ἢ καμάτου ἐξατονήσουσι, στήναι μὴ δυνάμενα, ἀλλὰ συνημμένοις εἰς ταῦτ’ οἱ ποσὶ καταπίπτουσι. It may just be possible here to understand *euenit* or *accidit*,<sup>18</sup> but *nunc* is impossible to accept in this context.<sup>19</sup> It is not a word which one expects to find in the text of Pelagonius (one other example, in a literary context in the preface to the work (0.1), = ‘as things are’). *Quod et nunc qui* should be obelised.

In the words which follow *complicitis inter se cruribus concidunt* Pelagonius talks of *dolor uentris* and colic (*strofo*). This has nothing to do with tetanus, exhaustion or sunstroke,<sup>20</sup> and it is obvious that he has moved on to another error of diagnosis. A full stop should be placed after *concidunt*, rather than a comma (with Ihm and Fischer). The sense is: ‘do not make an assumption that there is *dolor uentris* and

<sup>17</sup> ‘Nachlese I’, 31.

<sup>18</sup> See Ihm, p. 161 ‘supple *accidit* vel simile verbum’, and Hoppe, loc. cit.

<sup>19</sup> Ihm punctuates ‘quod et nunc quibus membra...’, but the problem of *nunc* remains.

<sup>20</sup> The symptoms of *strophus* are described (e.g.) at *Mul. Chir.* 221. Inability to walk is not among them. The animal runs, rolls (*uolutare*), paws the ground, and keeps on lying down then getting up again quickly.

apply the treatment used for colic, rather than the treatment appropriate to the actual condition, whatever it is.' Pelagonius is implying that there is a readiness to think that an animal has *dolor uentris* when in fact the condition may be something else. The Greek version has this sentence division: p. 254.14ff. ... καταπίπτουσι. μὴ τοίνυν νομίσης αὐτως πόνον εἶναι κοιλίας ἢ στρόφον, καὶ οὕτως θεραπεύσεις, ἀλλὰ τῷ πάθει μᾶλλον τὴν ἀρμόζουσαν προσένεγκε θεραπείαν.

## IV

Perhaps the most difficult passages of Pelagonius are in the epistles at the start of various chapters, because there Pelagonius adopts a pretentious periodic style which sometimes breaks down. An ineptly phrased epistle at 163 has caused editors particular trouble. It requires repunctuating in two places, and the restoration of the paradosis in one place. I print the text of Fischer for the moment:

sit licet inlibatus et omni malitia alienus tuus ille circa generositatem equorum curulium occupatus affectus, sit uoluntas ciuilliter grata et omnibus nota: non enim circo uel uulgi uoluptatibus animum miscuisti nec damna opinionis de alieno spectaculo adquisisti, sed amore priuato equorum et uoluptate iungendi, quam per temetipsum tibi exhibes, florui, quod et nobis est gratum et necessarium tibi ex superfluo. igitur de dorso apud te pauca dicemus, licet cura istius corporis tibi aurigae priuato non adeo sit necessaria, quia curuli equo a labore pars ista corporis aliena est. tamen ut ex omni parte integra inlibataque corpora equorum perseuerent, etiam hanc curam scire te conuenit.

Ihm changed the transmitted *uoluptas* in the first sentence to *uoluntas*, and he was followed by Fischer, who notes (correctly) in the *apparatus* that *uoluntas* and *uoluptas* are often confused, and tentatively suggests that *uoluptas* might be retained. *Voluptas* should never have been removed from the text. The word occurs in two other places in the epistle, referring to the pleasures of horse racing. *Voluptas*, of Astyrius' pleasure or passion (for racing), fits the context better than *uoluntas* 'inclination', and there is no need even to assume that the word has been confused with *uoluntas*.

A full stop should be placed after *necessarium tibi*, and another after *dicemus*. A separate sentence is thereby introduced: 'ex superfluo igitur de dorso apud te pauca dicemus.' The reasons for these changes will become clearer if the whole passage, which is full of difficulties, is translated: 'although that well-known enthusiasm of yours which occupies itself with the noble stock of race horses is unsullied and free from any vice,<sup>21</sup> although your passion is widely pleasing<sup>22</sup> and known to everyone (for you have not associated your interest with the circus or with the pleasures of the mob, nor have you suffered a loss of reputation by being a spectacle for others, but you have flourished with your private love of horses and your pleasure in yoking them, a pleasure which you display on your own account for yourself alone, a thing which both gives us pleasure and is necessary for you)... Therefore it will be superfluous of me to say a few things before you on the subject of the back. Nevertheless, although the treatment of that part of the body is not so necessary for you, as a private charioteer, because in a race horse that part of the body is free from strain, it is still appropriate for you to know about this type of treatment, so that the bodies of your horses may continue whole and unharmed in every respect.'

The *licet*-construction ('although...') which begins the sentence is left hanging

<sup>21</sup> *Malitia* is vague, = 'badness, vice, fault', for which sense see *OLD* s.v., *b* (cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 215 'te ciuem sine mala omni malitia / semper sum arbitratus').

<sup>22</sup> The use of *ciuilliter* here is puzzling. I tentatively follow *TLL* iii. 1219.36, where it is stated that 'videtur uoluisse evitare "vulgo"'.

because of an anacoluthon which causes the main clause to be left out. The force is: 'although your passion for horse racing is morally pure and does not cause you to stoop to circus appearances in front of the mob, *nevertheless it is race horses which are your interest*; you therefore do not need advice about the back, because race horses do not suffer in that part.'

I can see no reason why both editors should have associated *ex superfluo* with *necessarium tibi*. *Necessarium tibi ex superfluo* would be virtually a contradiction in terms: 'necessary to you unnecessarily'. If a full stop is placed after *tibi*, the new sentence beginning with *ex superfluo* makes perfect sense ('it will therefore be superfluous for me to speak to you about the back (because your interest is in race horses)',<sup>23</sup> and the change has the additional advantage of relegating *igitur* from the first word in the sentence to second unit. This is the position which the word has in the only two other passages (both of them epistles) in which it is used (0.2, 1.4).

With a full stop placed after *dicemus*, *licet cura ... conuenit* now becomes a long and completely coherent sentence, containing a *licet*-clause which is picked up by a main clause introduced by *tamen*.

No difficulties remain in the passage, except in the first sentence. The first clause *sit licet ... affectus*, and particularly the words *inlibatus* and *omni malitia alienus*, are picked up and explained by *nec enim circo ... necessarium tibi*: Astyrius' passion for horses is not reprehensible, because he does not make a display of himself in public in the circus. But the clause *sit uoluntas ... nota* intervenes between these two sections, and is moreover difficult to construe. Why is *sit* in the subjunctive? The position of *sit* at the head of the clause is the same as that of the first example of the word at the head of the sentence. The second *sit*, like the first, must be in a *licet*-construction. The first adjectival expression *ciuilitate grata* is easy to fit to the context, but the second, *omnibus nota*, looks like a slightly illogical afterthought. I take the force of the first two clauses to be this: 'although your interest in racing is free from vice, and although it finds wide favour (i.e. because, being *omni malitia alienus*, it causes no offence) – and is widely known'.

I conclude this section with a few remarks on points of Latinity.

For *generosus* (*generositas*) of the sorts of thoroughbred horses used for horse racing, cf. e.g. 302.1 'interdum enim cum copia sanguinis erit, quacunque erumpit et profluit, quod ut ne accidat in generoso custodiemus.'<sup>24</sup>

*Iungo*, of yoking horses (*TLL* vii. 2.653.80ff.), almost always takes an object. For the absolute use here (*uoluptate iungendi*), cf. *Mul. Chir.* 397 'caue ne quis eum molestet et ad laborem aut ne iungat' (also *TLL* vii. 2.654.43ff., 'feri i.q. proficisci'). For *iungo* use of yoking animals specifically for horse racing, as here, cf. *Mul. Chir.* 504 'de curricularibus equis [quis] et de pulueris uexatione omnibus subiugalibus. his qui in curribus iungunt' (= *se iungunt, iunguntur*). The elliptical use in our passage, = 'the pleasures of yoking (sc. horses, for racing)' may have been idiomatic in racing slang.

*Affectus* here = 'pleasure'; it is a synonym of *uoluptas* which follows. This example is cited by the *TLL* i. 1191.11, along with a few other late cases of *affectus circa*.

For *corpus* (*cura istius corporis*) = *pars corporis*, see Fischer's note *ad loc.*

<sup>23</sup> For *ex superfluo* in this type of context (of saying something needlessly), see Pompeius, *GL* v. 237.10f. 'qua ratione hoc dixit? noli putare *ex superfluo hoc eum fecisse*'.

<sup>24</sup> See further *TLL* vi. 2.1799.4ff., 1801.45ff. Note Col. 6.36.3 (*generositas*, used in reference to an *admissarius*).

## V

34.3 qui autem aut tactu auriculae aut uenae, quae in latere est sub armum, putant se posse febrientem intelligere, uerae rationis ignari sunt, quia nec ostendunt se de uenis intellegere febrientem.

The passage, taken from Apsyrus, concerns the question whether fever can be diagnosed by touching certain parts of the body. Pelagonius has introduced the explicit reference to certain veins.<sup>25</sup> Cf. Aps. *Hipp. Ber.* 1.8, *CHG* i. 3.10ff. ὅσοι δὲ τοῦ ὤτος ἀπτόμενοι καὶ πρὸς τῇ πλευρᾷ προστιθέντες τὴν χεῖρα παρὰ τὸν ἀγκῶνα τοῦ ὤμου λέγουσι πυρέσσειν, οὐκ ἀληθεύουσιν οὗτοι. οὐδεμία γὰρ ἀπόδειξις ἐστὶ διὰ τούτων πυρετοῦ.

The *quia*-clause does not seem meaningful. I translate the whole passage: 'Those who think that they can diagnose an animal which is fevered either by touching the ear or the vein which is in the flank under the shoulder, are ignorant of correct reasoning, *because they do not show that they diagnose a fevered beast from the veins*' (or 'they show that they do not diagnose a fevered beast from the veins'). The *quia*-clause, whatever it means, does not correspond to the Greek οὐδεμία γάρ κτλ, which gives good sense ('for there is no demonstration of fever through these means'). Ihm (p. 143) saw a difficulty. After quoting Apsyrus he remarked: 'quibus collatis verba nec ostendunt se de uenis intellegere febrientem recte tradita esse negaverim; fortasse recta archetypi lectio de ueris..., ut dicat: vera signa non intellegunt, nedum veram rationem norint.' This gives some sort of sense, but it is far removed from the Greek. It seems odd that *ostendunt* should have a personal subject (the mistaken physicians) in view of the transition in the Greek at this point from criticism of physicians to an impersonal statement of the nature of their error.

I would suggest that *intellegere febrientem* does not belong in the text, but has somehow been repeated from earlier in the sentence. *Quia nec ostendunt se de uenis* (sc. *febres, febrientes*) would mean 'because they [fevers; cf. *febres* at §1, *febris* at §2] do not<sup>26</sup> reveal themselves from the veins'. This gives exactly the sense required, and corresponds closely to the Greek, once one allows for the fact that Pelagonius has brought in *uenae*. For *se ostendere* of a condition which reveals itself, cf. Pel. 448.1 'quocunque in loco tubera se ostenderint'. The same idiom is found in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*: 276 'ceterae prout se ostendiderint causae', 553 'uidentur enim haec uitia tunc se ostendere', 609 'ragadia in suffraginibus se ostendent.'

The remedy proposed here has the advantage of bringing to light the use of *se ostendunt* which is required by the context, and of exposing the corrupt phrase (*intellegere febrientem*). But there is admittedly a difficulty in understanding a subject for *se ostendunt* from the general context. As an alternative to deletion one might obelize *intellegere febrientem*, on the assumption that the phrase has got into the text in place of a subject (*febres, febrientes*?) which was originally expressed.

## VI

At 132 Fischer conjectures *stercorem* for the MS. reading *stercoris* Ihm): 'adicies in clysterem palumbi stercorem scrp. IIII.' This passage poses a delicate morphological problem. Both *stercorem* (partitive apposition) and *stercoris* are

<sup>25</sup> On this subject, see particularly G. Björck, *Zum Corpus Hippiatricorum Graecorum. Beiträge zur antiken Tierheilkunde* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1932: 5), pp. 85f.

<sup>26</sup> For *nec* = *non* immediately following a relative, see e.g. *Per. Aeth.* 20.6 'itaque Deo iubente sic euenit, ut ad diem, quem *nec* sperabam, ibi uenirem.'

possible syntactically. For the appositional construction, see 429: 'turis masculi scrp. IIII, stercus columbinum scrp. IIII'. For the dependent genitive, see 342 'stercoris columbini lib.'.

-us neuters of the third declension one expects to turn up in vulgar texts occasionally as masculines, with a -us nominative and sometimes -um accusative.<sup>27</sup> But to assume a masculine accusative in -em for a third-declension neuter, whether it had an original -us nominative or another nominative ending, is a different matter. Mørland notes that accusatives such as *pectorem*, *sulphurem*, *luminem* and *piperem* are not found in the translations of Oribasius.<sup>28</sup> With the exception of 146.3 ('stercum caninum ... dabis'), the correct classical accusative is elsewhere preferred in Pelagonius (e.g. 137, 159, 171.2, 182, 240, 310, 418). So *ulcus* and *uulnus* are always correctly used in the accusative. Possible parallels for the accusative *stercorem* could be cited, but they are rare and late. *Stercorem* itself may have survived as Sp. *estiércol*.<sup>29</sup> *Pectorem* and perhaps *uulhere(m)* are found in Gregory of Tours.<sup>30</sup> *Capite(m)*, which occurs twice at *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 9.12<sup>31</sup> and may be found at *Anon. Val.* 74,<sup>32</sup> can be regarded as a rough parallel, though the nominative of the word is not usually in -us. *Pectorem* at *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 1.12 on the other hand is an ablative with false addition of *m*.

These examples, few and late as they are, offer poor justification for introducing *stercorem* into a fourth century text which does not display such errors elsewhere. Moreover *stercore* in *R* comes before an *s* at the start of the next word. The omission of final *s* before another *s* is a widespread phenomenon. In *R* note 175 *rododafni sucum* = *rhododafnis*, 194.2 *senapi seminis* = *senapis*, and compare the inverse examples 459.2 *pecoris sic* = *pecori*, 463 *foliis sem.* = *folii*, 465 *conditis sext.* = *conditi*.

It is best to assume that Pelagonius wrote *stercoris*, that the *s* was left out and *stercori* somehow changed to *stercore*.

## VII

Both Ihm and Fischer print 145 with a superfluous *et*: 'radicis semen teres et cum uino et ut superscriptum est dabis.' The Greek source (Apsyrtus) marginally favours the deletion of the second *et*, in that the addition of the wine is secondary to the crushing of the seed: *Hipp. Ber.* 33.2, *CHG* i. 164.20 ἡ ῥαφάνης σπέρματος τῆς πρωξίμης κνάθους δύο τρίψας, οἶνον ἐπύχεε καὶ χρώ ὡς προερίηται. The general context in the text of Pelagonius itself shows that *cum uino* goes with *dabis*: the preceding section runs 'ypopanacem, quantum digiti minoris extremitas est, *cum uino*, ut supra est, dabis.' *Et ut* = 'even as' does not seem plausible for Pelagonius; it is not a usage found elsewhere in this text. It might appear possible to change the second *et* to *ita*, but *ita ut superscriptum est* is not a Pelagonian expression. There are other cases of intrusive *et* in *R* (deleted by editors): 18 'in mortario tere et puluerem [et]

<sup>27</sup> See H. Mørland, *Die lateinischen Oribasiusübersetzungen* (Oslo, 1932), pp. 66f. for examples from the translations of Oribasius of masculine nominatives *stercus*, *ulcus* and *uulnus*. For *opus* as a masculine, see *CIL* xi. 5265.10; *corpus* seems to be attested only in the nominative as a masculine: *TLL* iv. 999.19ff. For *pectum*, see *CIL* xi. 3571 'reposita est super pectum abunculo suo in pace'.

<sup>28</sup> See Mørland, p. 67. *Stercoram* at *Mul. Chir.* 506 can be disregarded here. The neuter plural *stercora* favoured by the author (see Oder's index s.v. p. 434) has clearly been re-interpreted as a feminine singular.

<sup>29</sup> See V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*<sup>3</sup> (Paris, 1981), p. 117.

<sup>30</sup> See M. Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours* (Paris, 1890), p. 348.

<sup>31</sup> See A. Önnertfors, *Physica Plinii Bambergensis* (Hildesheim, 1975), ad loc.

<sup>32</sup> See J. N. Adams, *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)* (Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement No. 36, London, 1976), p. 90.

reponē in olla uitrea', 215.2 'aut asparagi siluestris radicis – II [et] cum uini ueteris sext. s. decoquito'. By contrast at 6.1 the second *et* is genuinely pleonastic: 'sed et, si necessitas fuerit, et detemporandus.' Fischer also deletes *et* at 260: '[et] certissima cura est.'

The second *et* at 145 should be deleted.

## VIII

At 54 the transmitted text reads: 'si aures doluerint, diligentius curato, ne in saniam conuertatur.' Ihm proposed *in <in>saniam*, but the paradosis was defended by Hoppe<sup>33</sup> and accepted by Fischer.

Evidence can be adduced in support of both *in saniam* and *in insaniam*. The latter is undoubtedly right.

The Greek version (*Hipp. Ber.* 17.3, *CHG* i. 92.4) favours *in insaniam* (τὸν πόνον τοῦ ὠτίου θεραπεύσαι δεῖ, μὴ πως εἰς μανίαν ἐμπίσῃ τὸ ζῶον),<sup>34</sup> as does Vegetius, *Mul.* 2.14.5 'non enim aurium est negligenda curatio, ne ex dolore nimio generetur *insania*.' Hoppe also cites various passages (e.g. Cels. 2.7.26) in which ear ache or the like is said to lead to insanity.

On the other hand the transmitted text in the corresponding passage of the *Mul. Chir.* favours *in saniam*: 528 'si non diligenter curam egeris, sanies sequi solet et difficile sanabitur.' This passage provides the basis of Hoppe's case in support of *in saniam*. Oder, it should be noted, emended *sanies* to *insanies* here.

There are two reasons why *in insaniam* must be right:

(1) Ear ache does not inevitably lead to a bloody discharge. Even if it were believed to have such a sequel, the emission of *sanies* might well have been regarded as a good sign rather than a grave development (note e.g. in different contexts, *Mul. Chir.* 34 'per *saniem* aufertur causa et dolor', 652 'malagma facito et imponito, donec omnis dolor et tumor per *saniem* digeratur'). Pelagonius allows that *dolor* might be caused by a foreign body in the ear (which could conceivably cause discharge), but then talks of cases where there is no visible cause of pain. The whole passage is devoted to the easing of pain (note the conclusion 'usque cum dolor elimetur'), not to the prevention of *sanies*.

(2) If the transmitted text is kept, *conuertatur* has no obvious subject. It could not be *aures* (plural). In the expression *in insaniam conuertatur* the horse would of course be subject.<sup>35</sup> Whereas a horse might be changed into a different state (here insanity; cf. *Mul. Chir.* 327 'solent in rabiem conuerti', with *iumenta* understood as subject), it could hardly be changed into gore. Pelagonius 279.3 (= Col. 6.17.6) 'uel si antequam tumor discutiatur, *in suppurationem conuerterit*' (Col. *conuertitur*), cited by Hoppe as evidence that *in saniam conuerti* was a technical expression,<sup>36</sup> is a false parallel, because the subject of *conuerterit* / *conuertitur* is *tumor*, expressed in the same sentence. Similarly in the expression *in saniolam conuerti* in Cassius Felix, which Hoppe alludes to without giving references, *conuerti* always has a concrete subject:

<sup>33</sup> 'Nachlese I', 19.

<sup>34</sup> *Insania* and *μανία* regularly correspond to each other (*TLL* vii. 1. 1826.62ff.).

<sup>35</sup> A medical or veterinary writer, whose whole work deals with the condition of an *aeger*, can leave the subject unexpressed and the reader will know that he is talking of the patient: e.g. Cels. 3.15.6 'sed haec facile ualidiores faciunt: si inbecillitas occupauit, pro exercitatione gestatio est; si ne hanc quidem *sustinet*...' In veterinary Latin the reader may be left to deduce that the subject of a verb is the horse (e.g. Pel. 50.1 *habuerit*, 294 *complicabit*, al., 295 *stet*, 297 *perfricetur*, 304 *reicerit*). See in general C. De Meo, *Lingue tecniche del latino* (Bologna, 1983), p. 36.

<sup>36</sup> For *in insaniam conuerti* *TLL* vii. 1.1827.4f. cites Itala, *Act.* 26.24 (cod. h).

p. 26.4 'et cum coeperit supra dicta *durities* in saniolam conuerti', p. 35.11 'etenim nimietas uaporis *locum dolentem et tumentem* in saniolam conuerti cogit', p. 43.13 'et cum uideris supra dictas *scrofas* in saniolam conuerti.'

Of these two arguments in favour of *in insaniam*, the second is the more compelling, and I do not see how it could be dismissed. If Pelagonius had used *dolor* in the previous clause, *conuertatur* would have had the sort of subject which might have been construed with *in saniam*. It would be far-fetched to attempt to extract *dolor* from the verb *doluerint*. Since in this case the evidence of Vegetius, the Greek translation and of Latin usage points in the same direction, one is obliged to accept Ihm's emendation.

Hoppe says that *insanies*, introduced by Oder into the corresponding passage of *Mul. Chir.*, is unattested: but see *TLL* vii. 1.1826.21ff. *Insania* was a condition in the horse which gave some concern to *ueterinarii*.<sup>37</sup>

## IX

At 11.1 ('intelligitur autem morbus regius *sic* ex oculis uel maxime') Ihm (but not Fischer) deleted *sic*. This use of *sic* (anticipating *ex oculis*) is widely illustrated by Svennung, quoting this example.<sup>38</sup> Svennung's (unnecessary) punctuation ('intelligitur autem morbus regius *sic*: ex oculis uel maxime') has the merit of illustrating the force of the usage. Cf. e.g. *Mul. Chir.* 269 'si caput doluerit, *sic* intelligas ex grauedine...'

A use of *sic* at 34.1 is much the same: 'febres autem curantur *sic*. sanguis *sic* de temporibus mittitur et de facie.' *Sic* anticipates *de temporibus*, just as in the passages quoted above it anticipates *ex oculis* and *ex grauedine*. The order of *sic*, the prepositional expression and the verb is different in each of the three passages seen so far, but in every case it is easy to imagine a pause (triggered by *sic*) before the prepositional expression. Both Ihm and Fischer needlessly deleted the second *sic*.

## X

I conclude these notes with brief mention of a passage to which I have alluded elsewhere.<sup>39</sup> At 84 Ihm, followed by Fischer, changed the transmitted indicative *feruet* to *ferueat*: 'mittis illud in caccabum cum lini semine et feno Graeco et feruet tamdiu, quamdiu...' The change is unnecessary: cf. the comparable use of the indicatives *feruescunt* and *inferuescunt* at 176 ('spica nardi, uua passa simul in aceto tunsa et cribrata *feruescunt*, atque ita calidum corpori glabro *inponitur*') and 194 ('mixta leuigataque aceto commixto *inferuescunt* et calida...genibus *circumdantur*'). The coordination of (*in*)*feruescunt* with present passive indicatives in these last two passages establishes the nature of the usage. The present passive indicative is constantly used in medical prose from Scribonius Largus and Celsus onwards as a form of directive.<sup>40</sup> (*In*)*feruescunt* and *feruet*, though superficially active, are implied passives (= 'is/are boiled'). The same usage is already found in the early Empire: cf. Scrib. Large. 37 '*miscetur*...deinde in patella aeris Cypri super carbones posita *inferuescit*', Celsus 6.10.4 '...tres heminae ad unam *cocuntur*; tum *adicitur*...leuiterque

<sup>37</sup> See the passages collected by Oder, *Mul. Chir.* index p. 300.

<sup>38</sup> *Untersuchungen zu Palladius*, p. 401.

<sup>39</sup> In 'Pelagonius, Eumelus and a Lost Latin Veterinary Writer', *Centre Jean Palerne, Mémoires V, Textes Médicaux Latins Antiques* (Saint-Étienne, 1984), p. 10 with n. 16.

<sup>40</sup> See Adams, *op. cit.* (n. 39), pp. 8ff.

omnia rursus *feruescunt*'. The example of *feruet* at 84 differs slightly from the examples of *(in)feruescunt*, in that, unlike them, it is coordinated with a present active indicative serving as a directive (*mittis*) rather than with present passive directives. But Pelagonius (or his sources) was quite capable of using different types of directives in coordination with each other: cf. 12 'sanguis de utraque parte ceruicis *mittitur*, ... post uiam lupinam cum melle et aqua cisternina *dato* usque ad sanitatem', 182 'folia ... *inponuntur* diebus quinque, et ... lycio *sanabis*', 217 '*superimponuntur* et, cum necesse fuerit, *cataplasma*bitur', 218 *aestimabis* ... *soluuntur*, 256.2 *ligatur* ... *suffundes*.

University of Manchester

J. N. ADAMS