professes impartiality by returning to the theme of the beginning of the sentence, in which the expression *procul habere* occurred.

Since Tacitus' political career had been anything but ignominious, as readers are told in the preface to his *Histories* (1.1.3), his first justification for writing history pointedly uses the same word *consilium* in a quite different context ('inde consilium...'). And his last justification, also appended to his sentence ('sine ira et studio...'), similarly uses *procul habere* metaphorically to profess his own impartiality. Given Tacitus' general Sallustianism, the proximity of the two passages seems too close to be mere coincidence. Moreover, if the allusion is accepted, it can be argued that *causas procul habeo* is not equivalent to *nullas causas habeo*, as Goodyear and others have suggested (*ad loc.*), but means 'I keep at a distance', as does its counterpart in Sallust. We know from 4.33.4 that the incidents of Tiberius' principate could still be live issues amongst Tacitus' contemporaries.<sup>1</sup>

University of Durham

A. J. WOODMAN

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Alyson Wright for a Pandora search and to Ronald Martin for improving an earlier draft.

## NOTES ON DIONYSIUS PERIEGETES

The recent publication of a new edition of Dionysius Periegetes, the first since 1861, and the first ever to provide adequate information about the MS. tradition, has no doubt stimulated many of us to re-read this author, a rotten geographer but a competent versifier and recycler of Alexandrian *flosculi*. The new recension is a distinct improvement on Müller's, and the collection of citations and parallels is a valuable complement to the critical apparatus. Here are half a dozen suggestions for further amelioration of the text.

707 ρεία δέ τοι καὶ τήνδε καταγράψαιμι θάλασσαν.

Van Herwerden conjectured  $\kappa \epsilon \nu$  for  $\kappa \alpha i$ , comparing 881  $\dot{\rho}\eta \iota \delta i \omega s$  δ'  $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \iota \lambda \iota \iota \iota \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \nu$   $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu}$  γαιάων ' $A \sigma i \eta s$ . Indeed, Dionysius does not normally omit the modal particle with a potential optative. But  $\kappa \alpha i$  is desirable for the sense, and if the proclitic is changed to an enclitic the metre suffers. So let us rather write  $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu$ , as in 885  $\dot{\eta} \tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \alpha \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu \ \dot{\alpha} \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \iota \iota \iota \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \iota \iota s$  (where most MSS. give  $\kappa \epsilon \nu$  or  $\kappa \alpha i$ ).

As Tsavari notes, the phrase is modelled on Od. 8.288. But the true reading there is  $i\chi\alpha\nu\delta\omega\nu$ ; the rare verb is preserved in grammatical tradition, 4 and still in some medieval MSS. both of Od. l.c. and of Il. 23.300, if not of Il. 17.572. Cf. Hermann on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Isabella O. Tsavari, Διονυσίου 'Αλεξανδρέως Οἰκουμένης Περιήγησις. Κριτική ἔκδοση (Ioannina, 1990). See reviews by M. D. Reeve, CR 41 (1991), 306–9, and E. Degani, Eikasmos. Quaderni Bolognesi di Filologia Classica, ii (1991), pp. 413–15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> One or two citations have been overlooked: 310 Suda ν 269 (noted by Degani); 537 Et. Gen. s.v.  $\iota \mu \epsilon \rho \tau \eta s$ ; 912 Et. Gen. s.v.  $E \theta \epsilon \iota \rho a$  (= 'Callim. fr. an. 120 Schn.' cited by Tsavari as a model for Dionysius).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Word-end following contracted second biceps (and moreover with a short vowel in the biceps); cf. my *Greek Metre*, pp. 155 and 178. Dionysius has  $\delta \epsilon \tau o \iota \kappa a \iota'$  in the same position in the verse at 372, 541 v.1., 935, 961.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Hesych. ι 1135, St. Byz. s.v. "Ιχανα, Choerob. in An. Ox. ii.222.6, Et. M. 478.47.

A. Supp. 816; Wackernagel, Kl. Schr. 778; Friis Johansen and Whittle on A. Supp. 850. The word is used by Herondas 7.26 and Babrius 77.2, and it seems likely that it should be restored for  $i\sigma\chi$ - at Nic. Th. 471. (Cf. also Call. fr. 178.22  $i\chi\alpha i\nu\epsilon\iota$ .) There is a fair chance that Dionysius, as a poeta non indoctus, was also acquainted with the form and used it. The case is less strong with the later poets Quintus (1.65, 2.399, 4.221, 6.139, 7.317, 451, 13.159) and Proclus (Hymn. 2.6).

813–15 πρὸς ἐσπερίην δ' ἄν ἴδοιο τὴν ἐτέρην (Phrygiam), ἢ κεῖται ὑπὸ ζαθέης πόδας "Ιδης, "Ιλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν ὑπὸ πλευρῆισιν ἔχουσα (-αν nonnulli).

How can Ilios be *under* the flanks of West Phrygia, which is itself described as being below the foothills of Ida? Surely either (" $I\delta\eta_S...$ )  $\dot{\epsilon}\chi o \dot{\nu}\sigma \eta_S$ , or  $\dot{\epsilon}m\dot{\epsilon}$   $\pi\lambda \epsilon \nu \rho \hat{\eta} \iota \sigma \iota \nu$  (cf. 833, 1075). If the latter, the preceding  $\dot{\nu}\pi\dot{\sigma}$  may have contributed to the corruption.

844-5 τῆισιν δὲ περισμαραγεῦντες ἀῆται ἱμερτοὺς δονέουσιν ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτώνας.

Surely  $\hat{\iota}$ μερτο $\hat{\iota}$ ς. Cf. 'Hes.' fr. 75.9f.  $\pi \nu$ ]οιὴ Zεφύροιο χιτῶνα [ὀρνυμένης ἐδόνησε  $\pi \epsilon$ ]ρὶ στήθεσσ' ἀπαλο $\hat{\iota}$ οι, and for the motif also Ov. M. 1.528, Nonn. D. 15.251.

992 οσση δ' Εὐφρήτου καὶ Τίγριος ἔνδοθι γαῖα

For the genitive of  $E \dot{v} \phi \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \eta_S$  Dionysius otherwise has  $E \dot{v} \phi \rho \dot{\eta} \tau ao$  (977, 1003), and in 992 he will have written  $E \dot{v} \phi \rho \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \omega$ , as at 739  $A \rho \dot{a} \xi \epsilon \omega$  (v. 1. -ov).

1051-2 ἀλλ' ἔμπης κατὰ δῆριν ἀμαιμακέτους περ ἐόντας Αὐσονίου βασιλῆος ἐπεπρήϋνεν ἀκωκή.

 $\epsilon \pi i \pi \rho a \dot{v} \nu \omega$  seems not to occur elsewhere, and it is not clear what nuance this prefix would give. I conjecture  $\dot{a}\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \dot{\eta} \dot{v} \nu \epsilon v$ , for which cf. Plut. Settorius 25.5.

Finally, I may perhaps be allowed to recall an emendation previously published but not noticed by Tsavari: 78  $\epsilon \kappa \Delta \iota \delta s A \delta \sigma \nu \iota \eta \delta s$  (for  $-\eta \epsilon s$ )  $\delta \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \kappa \delta \iota \rho \alpha \nu \epsilon \delta \nu \epsilon s$ , which I supported with Nonn. D. 41.390f.  $P \omega \mu \eta \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \zeta \alpha \theta \epsilon \eta \iota \delta \omega \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota A \delta \sigma \delta \nu \iota \delta s$   $Z \epsilon \delta s | \kappa \delta \iota \rho \alpha \nu \epsilon \delta \nu \epsilon s$ .

All Souls College, Oxford

M. L. WEST

<sup>5</sup> Philol. 110 (1966), 165.

## MORE EMENDATIONS IN THE TEXT OF MAXIMUS OF TYRE

These notes continue the sequence begun in 'Some Emendations in the Text of Maximus of Tyre, *Dialexeis* 1–21 (Hobein)', published in *CQ* 41 (1991), 566–71. References to the text are by number, page and line in Hobein's Teubner edition; R is the principal MS., Parisinus graecus 1962, U is Vaticanus graecus 1390, I is Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 4; U and I, being descendants of R (as are all other surviving MSS. of Maximus), offer conjectures not alternative readings. My thanks go again to Donald Russell and David Sedley for salutary comments on earlier and rasher drafts.

## (1) 1.16.2-4

ήγεῖτο γάρ, οἶμαι, ὁ Σωκράτης Αἰσχίνου μὲν φιλοσοφήσαντος καὶ ἀντισθένους ὄνασθαι αν ὀλίγα τὴν ἀθηναίων πόλιν· μᾶλλον δὲ μηδένα τῶν τότε, πλὴν ἡμῶν τῶν ἔπειτα κατὰ τὴν μνήμην τῶν λόγων· εἰ δὲ ἀλκιβιάδης ἐφιλοσόφει,...

 $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\nu$  R:  $\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}o\nu$  Stephanus:  $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\nu\dots\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$  del. Markland