

'fertility' of Hydra (cf. *fecundo vulnere, fertilis*).⁵ Now, this joke sounds much more interesting and paradoxical, if *redundabat* has just reminded us that the *serpens...fertilis* can actually be regarded as nothing but the *sterile* Lernaean marsh.

St John's College, Oxford/Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa SERGIO CASALI

⁵ cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.70 'vulneribus fecunda suis', Germ. 543 'fecundam...hydram', Sen. *H.F.* 529 'colla feracia', 781 'fecunda...capita', *H.O.* 258, 1292, *Ag.* 835 'morte fecundo...dracone', Mart. 9.101.9.

OCTAVIAN AND ORESTES IN PAUSANIAS

M. J. Dewar¹ argues that in Georg. 1.511–4 Virgil may have been drawing a disquieting parallel between Orestes, evoked through an imitation of Aeschylus ('Choeph.' 1021–5), and Octavian, present a few lines above (498ff.).

Pausanias probably supports this suggestion; he shows that the link Octavian–Orestes existed quite early and in a sense favourable to Octavian, even though it may soon have been used in a negative sense by anti-Caesarian propaganda on account of the dark side of the myth. In front of the temple of Hera in Argos there was still visible in the second century a statue representing Orestes, but identified by the inscription as Augustus.² Certainly this parallel Augustus–Orestes was not proposed – and preserved – with polemical purpose in a famous sanctuary and in the Augustan age. Given the resemblance between history and myth and the moral weight of the famous myth itself, it is unlikely that we have to do with the mere re-use of any old statue.

The inscription was most probably engraved during the life of Augustus, probably soon after the vengeance taken at Philippi against the murderers of his 'father' Julius Caesar (42 B.C.). Actually Pausanias says 'the emperor Augustus' (name after 27 B.C.), but he probably wants to be understood readily, and does not quote from the inscription itself.

Rome

NATALE CECIONI

¹ 'Octavian and Orestes in the Finale of the First Georgic', *CQ* 38 (1988), 563–5; 'Octavian and Orestes again', *CQ* 40 (1990), 580–82.

² Paus. 2, 17, 3; see Frazer's commentary (1898) *ad loc.* and 1, 18, 3 about reconversions of ancient statues in favour of living personalities.

A TEXTUAL NOTE ON GALEN, *ON THE POWERS OF FOODSTUFFS* I 1.3 (P. 202.17 HELMREICH)

In *De alimentorum facultatibus*, Book I, Ch. 1, Galen begins his discussion of the powers of foodstuffs by a rough sketch of the opinions of earlier physicians on this subject. He says that according to some of them these powers are only known (*ἐγνώσθαι*) on the basis of experience (*πειρα*), according to others on the basis of a combination of experience and reasoning (*λογισμός*), whereas a third group gave priority of importance to reasoning (202.4–6 Helmreich). Galen proceeds to say that there is considerable disagreement between these physicians on the topic in question and that, consequently, an unbiased testing of their opinions is necessary; this testing should operate by means of argumentation (*ἀπόδειξις*). Now there are two different starting-points for argumentation, i.e. perception and 'distinct thinking' (*ἡ γὰρ ἐξ αἰσθήσεως ἢ ἐκ νοήσεως ἐναργούς*). Then the text printed by Helmreich runs as