

contested) etymological connections made between Dictynna and the nets (*δίκτυα*) which were said to have saved her when she leapt into the sea; for the *Ciris* poet and the neoteric source upon which he seems to have drawn, the most important of these would have been Callimachus, *Dian.* 189–203.¹⁴ In light of these connections, an allusive reference to *dictamnus* in the story of *Dictynna* might well have seemed a particularly appealing and appropriate display of Alexandrian literary *doctrina*.*

University of Washington, Seattle

CATHERINE CONNORS

¹³ In the manuscripts of Ptolemy Geographicus, the name for a sanctuary dedicated to Dictynna in Cydonia on the northwest coast of Crete (cf. Herodotus 3.59) is given as *Diktamnon*, or a corruption thereof: see C. Müller (ed.), *Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia*, i (Paris, 1883), 3.15.5. Müller emends to *Diktunnaion*, but if the manuscripts were to record a real alternative name for this place, a connection between Britomartis' ill-fated hunt and the famous healing plant might possibly be part of a tradition extending beyond the work of the *Ciris* poet.

¹⁴ For the etymological connection of the name Dictynna with *δίκτυα*, see also Antoninus Liberalis 40.3, *Scholion* on Euripides, *Hipp.* 146 and 1130, and Pausanias 2.30.3; cf. Aristophanes, *Wasps* 368. A moralizing alternative etymology is offered by Diodorus Siculus at 5.76.3–4. In addition, Strabo (10.4.12) engages in a (possibly misguided) geographical argument with Callimachus over the site of Britomartis' leap; at issue is the possibility of connecting Dictynna with Mt Dicte.

* I would like to thank James J. Clauss and S. E. Hinds for their helpful comments.

A NERONIAN EXCLAMATORY PHRASE

Since Rose collected Petronius' 'adaptions of Lucan' found in the *Bellum Civile*, there has been renewed contention as to whether these adaptations are real or imagined, with George, Sullivan, and now Slater leading the debate.¹

This note, which results from an interest in exclamatory particles, and not from a desire to hunt down parallels, is prompted largely by Slater's statement, 'At this point in the debate there is nothing whatever to be added to the list of the proposed parallels in the *Bellum civile* to the *Pharsalia*' (p. 120). A parallel hitherto unnoticed should be added to that list.

The exclamation *pro pudor* first appears in the Neronian era and most often in political contexts.² The phrase occurs in Seneca (*Dial.* 11.17.4; *Nat.* 4B.13.8), in Lucan (10.47; 10.77), in Petronius (81.5; 123.243), and in *Anth. Lat.* 402 (= Sh. B. 406). Attacking Caesar, Lucan writes,

pro pudor, oblitus Magni tibi, Iulia, fratres
obscaena de matre dedit, (10.77f.)

attacking Pompey, Petronius counters,

pro pudor, imperii deserto nomine fugit
ut Fortuna levis Magni quoque terga videret. (123.243f.)

Too similar, surely, for mere chance. There is more. Of the fleeing Pompey Lucan writes:

heu pudor, exigua est fugiens victoria Magnus (2.708)

¹ K. F. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden, 1971); P. A. George, 'Petronius and Lucan *De Bello Civili*', *CQ* 24 (1974), 119–33; J. P. Sullivan, *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero* (Ithaca, 1985); Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore, 1990). Cf. also Elaine Fantham in George A. Kennedy (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Vol. 1: *Classical Criticism* (Cambridge, 1989), 281–2.

² This association might well go back to Horace's 'Roman Ode' 3.5 where we find *pro curia inversique mores!* (7), and *o pudor* (38). In Ovid (*Her.* 9.111) the later MSS. and Heinsius prefer *pro pudor* to *o*; Bentley, in his note on *Odes* 3.5.38, chides Heinsius for his preference.

Petronius, it appears, had this verse also in mind as he replaced the sympathetic *heu* with the castigating *pro*.³ If the allusiveness of Petronius' outrage is still in doubt, then turn to Seneca:

pro pudor imperii! principis Romani lugentis
sororem alea solacium fuit. (Dial. 11.17.4)

a passage clearly also in Petronius' repertory, and quite probably in Lucan's, but none, I think, would say that Petronius looked only at Seneca without even a glance Lucan's way.

Noteworthy, if for different reasons, is

pro pudor, hoc sacrum Magnus ut aspiceret. (Anth. Lat. 402.6)

This poem is one of the several attributed to Seneca. Once more, *pro pudor* and *Magnus* in the same breath, an indication of Senecan, or, at least, Neronian authorship?⁴

Two final points: that *pro pudor* appears in Lucan's last book may corroborate Rose's belief (p. 94) that Petronius did have knowledge of that book; that *pro pudor* appears twice within thirty lines made it fair game for Petronius.⁵

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

³ It is worth adding here that Lucan seems to have been fond of 'exclamatory *pudor*' as other variants show: *pro dira pudoris / funera* (4.230–1); *pro superum pudor* (8.597).

⁴ The question of authorship is still debated, see (e.g.) Sullivan, pp. 177f. and the references there. Carlo Prato, *Gli Epigrammi Attribuiti a L. Anneo Seneca* (Rome, 1964), in his note on *pro*, characterises the exclamation as 'molto in uso nell'età imperiale' (p. 137). His list of examples of *pro pudor* is unreliable; he omits Seneca, *Nat.* 4B.13.8, and Petronius 81.5; Statius does not use the expression at *Theb.* 10.165, but he does do so at 10.874.

⁵ I thank the anonymous referee for helpful criticisms and suggestions.

BEE IMAGERY IN PLUTARCH

There can be few Greek prose authors who outdo Plutarch in fondness for elaborate similes, and a determination to sustain at length vocabulary appropriate to both objects of comparison within the simile, once it is embarked upon. In the essay *Quomodo adulescens* (*Mor.* 32e) he uses a favourite image, in which a young man aspiring to be educated in quality literature is recommended to follow the example of the bee, which extracts material for its honey from the most pungent plants: ἡ μὲν οὖν μέλιττα φυσικῶς ἐν τοῖς δριμυτάτοις ἀνθεσι καὶ ταῖς τραχυτάταις ἀκάνθαις ἐξανευρίσκει τὸ λειότατον μέλι καὶ χρησιμώτατον, οἱ δὲ παῖδες, ἂν ὀρθῶς ἐντρέφονται τοῖς ποιήμασιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν φαύλους καὶ ἀτόπους ὑποψίας ἐχόντων ἔλκειν τι χρήσιμον ἀμωσγέπως μαθησόνται καὶ ὠφέλιμον. In another such essay (*De recta*, *Mor.* 41e–42b)¹ he elaborates this theme at greater length as follows:

διὸ δεῖ τὸ πολὺ καὶ κενὸν ἀφαιρῶντα τῆς λέξεως αὐτὸν διώκειν τὸν καρπὸν καὶ μιμεῖσθαι μὴ τὰς στεφανηπλόκους ἀλλὰ τὰς μελίττας. αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιούσαι τὰ ἀνθηρὰ καὶ εὐώδη τῶν φύλλων συνείρουσι καὶ διαπλέκουσιν ἡδὺ μὲν ἐφήμερον δὲ καὶ ἄκαρπον ἔργον· αἱ δὲ πολλάκις ἰὼν καὶ ῥόδων καὶ ὑακίνθων διαπετόμεναι λειμώνας ἐπὶ τὸν τραχύτατον καὶ δριμύτατον θύμον καταίρουσι καὶ τούτῳ προσκάθηνται 'ξανθὸν μέλι μηδόμεναι', καὶ λαβοῦσαι τι τῶν χρησίμων ἀποπέτονται πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἔργον. οὕτως οὖν δεῖ τὸν φιλότεχνον καὶ καθαρὸν ἀκροατὴν τὰ μὲν ἀνθηρὰ καὶ τρυφερὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τὰ δραματικὰ καὶ πανηγυρικὰ κηφήνων βοτάνην σοφιστικῶντων ἡγοῦμενον εἶναι, αὐτὸν δὲ τῇ προσοχῇ καταδυόμενον εἰς τὸν νοῦν τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν τοῦ λέγοντος ἔλκειν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ ὠφέλιμον, κτλ.

¹ Cf. also *Mor.* 79d, 145b, 467c, 765d, for similar language and comparisons. A less elaborate example of the comparison is *Isoc.* 1.51–2.