

variety of critics.⁷ Of these restorations Baehrens' *i puer en* (2.12.18), and Heinsius' *respon-di en* (4.8.81) are the only ones to fit a pattern of elegiac usage.⁸

In short, if Propertius' MSS. have, in general, not served him well, his critics, in this particular, have served him less so.⁹

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

⁷ I note the following 1.19.22; 2.12.18; 2.29.30; 3.13.47; 3.16.1; 4.1.81; 4.1.87; 4.1.116; 4.6.40; 4.8.81; 4.9.36; 4.9.70; 4.11.32; 4.11.97.

⁸ Again, I do not suggest that these emendations are correct simply because they accord with usage.

⁹ I thank the editors and anonymous referee for helpful criticisms and suggestions.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT OF SENECA'S *PHOENISSAE*¹

In me arma et ignes uertite, in me omnis ruat
una iuuentus quaeque ab Inachio uenit 444
animosa muro quaeque Thebana ferox
descendit arce: ciuis atque hostis simul...

444 unam E: una A

E's 'unam' is the reading favoured by all modern editors. Either reading is possible in terms of sense and metre, and the choice is not an easy one. The attraction of 'unam' is obvious and consists in the stress which it lays on Jocasta's isolation and vulnerability in the face of 'omnis...iuuentus'. The appeal of 'una' is a little more subtle. It emphasises the coming together of the youth, whether Argive or Theban, in common cause against the aged Jocasta. It is ironical that the two fiercely opposed sides are urged to come together not against a mutual foe but against a defenceless old woman. And even more ironical is the notion of the brothers' uniting to kill their mother: from the beginning of the play they have been portrayed as uncompromisingly hostile to each other; now, bent on the impious act of fratricide, they are envisaged as acting together for the first time, but only to accomplish an equally great or even greater impiety – matricide. The reading of A is attractive not only because of the characteristic irony which it expresses, but also because it heralds the even stronger expression of the same notion in 445 with 'ciuis atque hostis simul...'. One may note also that 'omnis ruat / una' appears to be an echo of Vergil's 'una omnes ruere' (*Aen.* 8.689).

University of the Witwatersrand

MARICA FRANK

¹ The text followed, except at the point under discussion, is that of O. Zwierlein, *OCT* 1986.

KAI FOR ET

The late Sir Roger Mynors, in a letter to Sebastiano Timpanaro quoted in the latter's *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome, 1978), p. 543 n. 15, states that he had wondered 'whether it might be a habit of Latin writers, when they were putting only one or two "parollette" between two pieces of Greek', to use Greek rather than Latin: he invents as an example 'ἦθος καὶ πάθος where logic demanded ἦθος et πάθος'. The answer is that they sometimes did: the present paper will concentrate on the type instantiated by his imaginary example, the use of καὶ for et. I do not claim to have recorded every case, but those I have observed are the following.

Columella, broaching the subject of *uillaticae pastiones*, writes at *De re rustica* 8.1.3

In uilla est quod appellant Graeci ὀρνειθῶνας¹ καὶ περιστερεῶνας...

The Greeks do not speak of ‘poultry-houses and dovecotes’ in one breath, but of ‘poultry-houses’ and ‘dovecotes’. Similarly *ibid.* §4

Rursus circa uillam ponuntur μελισσῶνες καὶ χηνοτροφεία...

When Velius Longus, in his *De orthographia*, discusses the use of *i* as the second letter of a diphthong (*GLK* vii.55), he answers the objections of those who say it is impermissible, ‘uelintque *μνία* καὶ *Θυιάς* trisyllaba nomina esse’ (line 13).² Obviously the conjunction is not itself a *nomen trisyllabum*; in English one would say ‘and maintain that *μνία* and *Θυιάς* are trisyllabic nouns’, but in Latin the distinction of language need not be so rigorous.

The construction is quite a favourite with Gellius. At *Noctes Atticae* 1.20.1–2, expounding the basic concepts of geometry, he states:

Figurarum, quae σχήματα geometrae appellant, genera sunt duo, planum et solidum. (2) Haec ipsi uocant ἐπίπεδον καὶ στερεόν.

The conjunction would be appropriate to a continuous Greek exposition, *σχημάτων μὲν εἰσι γένη δύο, ἐπίπεδον καὶ στερεόν*, but when only the names are intended to be Greek, strict logic requires them to be linked by *et* in Latin and (as in Rolfe’s translation) by ‘and’ in English.

In 10.1 Gellius argues that the sense ‘for the *n*th time’ is more correctly indicated by the accusative than the ablative; in §11 he adds

Graeci quoque in significandis huiusmodi rerum numeris τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον dicunt, quod congruit cum eo quod Latine dicitur: ‘tertium’ ‘quartum’que.

The intended meaning is not ‘for the third and fourth time’, *sensu coniuncto*, but ‘for the third time’ and ‘for the fourth time’, *sensu diuiso*.³ Similarly at 10.24.1:

‘Die quarto’ et ‘die quinto’, quod Graeci εἰς τετάρτην καὶ εἰς πέμπτην dicunt, ab eruditibus nunc quoque dici audio...

At 13.25.20 Homer is acquitted of idle repetition in *Od.* 20.241 ‘quod bis idem θάνατον καὶ μόρον dixerit’; since what Homer wrote (and Gellius has just quoted) is θάνατόν τε μόρον τε, the conjunction καί belongs to the quoting sentence. To be sure the fourteenth-century manuscript Z (Leiden, Vossianus F7) substitutes *et*; but in view of what we have seen there is no need to follow it either here or in the other places where it opposes *et* to the other manuscripts’ καί: *ibid.* §21

“βάσκ’ ἴθι, οὔτε Ὀνειρε”, καὶ “βάσκ’ ἴθι, Ἴρι ταχεῖα...”

Verba duo haec dicebat: ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου (17.19.6).

‘stolidos’ autem uocari non tam stultos et excordes quam taetros et molestos et inlepidos, quos Graeci μοχθηροὺς καὶ φορτικούς dicerent⁴ (18.4.10).

“ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,” καὶ “ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι...” (18.9.9).

¹ So Lundström, and so no doubt Columella.

² When, in discussing the relationship between *z/ζ* and *σδ*, he calls the digraph σίγμα καὶ δ (*GLK* vii.51, lines 6, 12), this may count as a ready-made phrase.

³ The point is lost on Gellius’ editors, who punctuate ‘tertium quartumque’.

⁴ Concinnity would be served by reducing the three adjectives of the middle group to two; I suggest deleting *et molestos* as a gloss.

The usage is also found in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*: 1.8.6

est porro idem *Κρόνος καὶ Χρόνος*.

Athenienses *δεκάτην καὶ ἐνάτην φθίνοντος* soliti sunt dicere (1.16.41).

denique inustos morbo *Ἀπολλωνοβλήτους καὶ ἡλιοβλήτους* appellant ...⁵ (1.17.11).

The establishment of this usage bears on the problem of interpretation in the same author, *In Somnium Scipionis* 2.1.24:

sunt igitur symphoniae quinque, id est *διὰ τεσσάρων, διὰ πέντε, διὰ πασών, διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε, καὶ δις διὰ πασών*. sed hic numerus symphoniarum ad musicam pertinet quam uel flatus humanus intendere uel capere potest humanus auditus; ultro autem se tendit harmoniae caelestis accessio, id est usque ad quater *διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε*.

That is to say (for the moment I leave the last phrase untranslated):

There are, then, five concords: perfect fourth, perfect fifth, octave, twelfth, and fifteenth.⁶ But this number of harmonies relates to the music that either human breath can perform or human ear perceive; the range of the celestial harmony stretches further, to *quater διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε*.

It will be apparent that *καὶ δις διὰ πασών* exhibits the usage under discussion: the strict logic of the sentence requires *et*, yet *καί*, or rather *kai*, is offered (so far as our inadequate published information indicates) even by those manuscripts that substitute *bis* for *dis*.⁷ But what is the range of the celestial harmony, or music of the spheres?

Both recent Italian editors, Luigi Scarpa and Mario Regali, have understood *quater* to modify the entire phrase *διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε*, yielding a sense of four twelfths, or six octaves and a ditone,⁸ generated by a ratio of 81:1. To this there are two objections: that no other source supports so great a range, and that as all parallels show – above all Theon 52.7 Hiller, where *δις διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ τεσσάρων*, obtained by adding an eleventh to an octave, is unequivocally ‘two octaves and a fourth’ – the *τετράκις διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε* that Macrobius must have found in his source is Greek for ‘four octaves and a fifth’.⁹ Indeed, Macrobius himself is so interpreted by more than one writer;¹⁰ the immediately preceding use of *καί* for *et* may seem to justify this view.

To be sure, the cosmic range expected in a Neoplatonist is one tone greater, *τετράκις διὰ πασών καὶ διὰ πέντε καὶ τόνος*, generated by a ratio of 27:1.¹¹ Perhaps

⁵ In the same section we read *σεληνοβλήτους* et *Ἀρτεμιδοβλήτους* uocant; manuscripts offer *er* in Greek letters, cf. Timpanaro, *op. cit.*, pp. 542–3.

⁶ These are the five Pythagorean consonances, generated respectively by the superparticular ratios 4:3 3:2 and by the multiple ratios 2:1 3:1 4:1. Macrobius is following the Pythagorean doctrine that rejected the eleventh for being produced by the superpartient ratio 8:3 (Ptol. *Harm.* 1.6).

⁷ *Bisdiapason* is the normal term in medieval Latin for ‘double octave’ or ‘fifteenth’.

⁸ As if, say, from C_2 to e''' , but in Pythagorean tuning, so that $c'''-e'''$ is the 81:64 ditone (407.8 cents), not the syntonic 5:4 major third (386.3 cents) or the equal-tempered interval of 400 cents.

⁹ Cf. Cleonides 8 (pp. 194.21–195.2 Jan), Porphyry, *In Ptol. Harm.* 118.26–8, 163.31–2 Düring, and passages cited in n. 11.

¹⁰ Th. Reinach, ‘La musique des sphères’, *REG* 13 (1900), 432–49 at 446; J. Flamant, *Macrobe et le néoplatonisme latin à la fin du IV^e siècle* (Leiden, 1977), p. 360. (So W. H. Stahl in his translation, p. 189 n. 14, but in the delusion that the $27\frac{1}{2}$ tones of the interval matched the 27 of the world-soul.)

¹¹ See Plato, *Timaeus* 35b–36d with his commentators: the range is expressly stated by Ps.-Tim. 212.19 Marg, Theon 63.25–64.1 Hiller, Porphyry, *In Ptol. Harm.* 115.29–30, and Proclus, *In Timaeum* ii.187.16–17, 192.12–22, 207.22–3 Diehl; cf. Calcidius 96 (Saturn 27 times as far as the moon from earth). J. Handschin, ‘The “Timaeus” Scale’, *Musica disciplina*, 4 (1950), 3–42 at 13 argues that four octaves and a fifth may be compatible with Plato’s formula; but no ancient writer did so.

Macrobius wrote, and a copyist omitted, *καὶ τόνον*; perhaps the corruption was present in the text of his source. Some have adduced the obscure sentence in Arist. *Metaph.* N 6 (1093b2–4) *καὶ ὅτι ἴσον τὸ διάστημα ἔν τε τοῖς γράμμασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Α πρὸς τὸ Ω, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βόμβυκος ἐπὶ τὴν ὀξύτατην ἐν αὐλοῖς, ἥς ὁ ἀριθμὸς ἴσος τῇ οὐλομέλειᾳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, since the ratio 24:1 would generate four octaves and a fifth.¹² But it is by no means clear that the *οὐλομέλεια* of heaven has, even in Aristotle's understanding, anything to do with *μέλος* in its musical sense rather than *μέλος* 'limb'; Alexander of Aphrodisias (*In Metaph.* 835.16–18 Hayduck) took the number 24 to be the total of the 12 signs of the zodiac, the 8 spheres, and the 4 elements.

Nevertheless, despite these difficulties, in order to posit a range of four twelfths we must suppose that Macrobius did not understand what he was translating. We should indeed be wary of underestimating the ignorance of one whose cumulative multiplication of planetary distances at 2.3.14 would imply a cosmic range of 46,656:1, or fifteen octaves and a tritone;¹³ but his own and other Latin writers' use of *καί* for *et* entitles him to the benefit of the doubt.

Oxford

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVS

¹² Reinach (n. 10), 447; W. D. Ross, *ad loc.* Arist.; Handschin, *loc. cit.*

¹³ Macr. claims in §15 to derive his exposition from Porph. *In Tim.* (fr. 72 Sodano); one may more easily suppose misunderstanding than ascribe such a doctrine to the author of *In Ptol. Harm.* 115.29–30, but even if Macrobius is correct, he is still uncritical.

NOT AT HOME: NASICA'S WITTICISM AND OTHER STORIES

Cicero's discussion of wit in the *de oratore* includes an entertaining story about Ennius and a certain Nasica (whom it is almost certainly wasted energy to attempt to identify) (2.275–6): 'Valde haec ridentur et hercule omnia quae a prudentibus per simulationem subabsurde salseque dicuntur. Ex quo genere est etiam non videri intellegere quod intellegas... ut illud Nasicae, qui cum ad poetam Ennium venisset eique ab ostio quaerenti Ennium ancilla dixisset domi non esse, Nasica sensit illam domini iussu dixisse et illum intus esse; paucis post diebus cum ad Nasicam venisset Ennius et eum ad ianuam quaereret, exclamat Nasica domi non esse, tum Ennius "quid? ego non cognosco vocem?" inquit "tuam?"' Hic Nasica "homo es impudens: ego cum te quaerem ancillae tuae credidi te domi non esse, tu mihi non credis ipsi?"' This anecdote, devitalized by its divorce from a well-known name, finds a place in the *Philogelos*, a compendium of jokes compiled in late antiquity and ascribed to the otherwise unidentifiable Hierocles and Philagrius, (193): *Δύσκολόν τις ἐζήτει. ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὦδε. τοῦ δὲ γελάσαντος καὶ εἰπόντος· Ψεύδῃ· τῆς γὰρ φωνῆς σου ἀκούω – εἶπεν· Ὡ κάθαρμα, εἰ μὲν ὁ δοῦλός μου εἶπεν, εἶχες ἂν αὐτῷ πιστεῦσαι· ἐγὼ δέ σοι οὐ φαίνομαι ἀξιόπιστότερος ἐκείνου εἶναι;*

Like many of the *Philogelos*' jokes this anecdote could be refurbished. The following story was told of William Hobson, a London haberdasher who died in 1581:¹ 'On a time Master Hobson upon some occasion came to Master Fleetewoods house to speak with him, being then new chosen the recorder of London, and asked one of his men if he were within, and he said he was not at home, but Maister Hobson perceiving that his master bade him say so, and that he was within, not being willing (at that time) to be spoken withall, for that time dessembling the matter he went his

¹ J. O. Halliwell-Phillips (ed.), *The Pleasant Conceits of Old Hobson the Merry Londoner* (*Percy Soc.* 9, London, 1843), pp. 36f. The interesting discussion of this passage by Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1990), p. 196, overlooks the classical precedent.