

middle of'; an interpretation which he admits runs counter to the meaning of *inter* in combination with a form of *geminus* and spoils the metaphor of a horn springing from the forehead. Wunderlich's forgotten conjecture *geminæ* removes the anomaly, restores to this book its proper ornamentation (painted *frontes*) and makes self-evident the origin of the error.⁴ Wunderlich, however, was bothered by collocation of *inter* followed by *geminæ*: 'iunctura tamen admodum ingrata sic existit. Verbo, locum non expedit'. The *iunctura*, although it appears to have no exact parallel, is not at all displeasing. The closest parallels that I have found are in Propertius, 3.4.18, 'et subter captos arma sedere duces'; and in Ovid, *Tristia* 4.8.11–12, 'inque/securus patria consensuisse mea'. Less relevant parallels are Tibullus 1.6.30, 'contra quis ferat arma deos'; Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.278, 'circum plurima muros accepit patrios': and Horace, *Odes* 3.27.51–2, 'utinam inter errem nuda leones'.⁵ Just as in the Propertius parallel *captos* applies, in sense, to *arma* as well as to *duces*, so in our line the collocation of words is intended to suggest: 'inter *geminæ* [gemina] cornua *frontes*'.

That the *frons* could be painted is confirmed by Ovid, *Tristia* 1.1.8: 'candida nec nigra cornua fronte geras'.⁶ We can assume that the book in our passage has similar decoration in which the 'horns' are highlighted by painted *frontes*.

University of Pittsburgh

D. MARK POSSANZA

⁴ *Observationes et indices in Tibullum* (Leipzig, 1817) pp. 269–70, vol. 2 of Heyne's commentary in n. 2 above.

⁵ Normally when a preposition is separated from its noun by one or more words, it is immediately preceded by an adjective in agreement with the noun: Vergil, *Ecl.* 1.24, 'alias inter caput extulit urbes': 5.84, 'saxosas inter decurrunt flumina valles': see also 9.35. More intricate are the following examples of the interlocking word order of two noun-adjective pairs and a preposition: Propertius 3.2.12, 'camera auratas inter eburna trabes'; 4.8.31, 'altera Tarpeios est inter Teia lucos'.

⁶ This line is usually quoted as the only evidence for *frontes pictae*. But in Seneca, *dial.* 9.9.6, the words 'cui voluminum suorum frontes maxime placent titulique', in addition to being a sarcastic statement to the effect that the books were never opened, may also suggest that the *frontes* and *tituli* were painted, especially since their owner wants to display them in decorative cases, 'armaria <e> citro atque ebores.' And in Martial 3.2.8–9, 'et frontis gemino decens honore/pictis luxuriis umbilicis', *frontis gemino decens honore* may refer to painted *frontes* rather than function as an anticipation of *pictis umbilicis*, since the poet is describing a deluxe roll bedecked with every possible ornament.

TWO 'SYNTACTIC ERRORS' IN TRANSCRIPTION: SENECA, *THYESTES* 33 AND LUCAN, *B.C.* 2.279

Some of the more difficult archetypal corruptions to detect are those that occurred, not when a scribe was mindlessly copying what was before him, but when he was paying some attention to the sense of his text and departed from his exemplar by wrongly anticipating how the sequence of thought would develop. The resulting text may give sense, even though it does not reflect what the author wrote. It is suggested here that such a process led to corruption at Seneca, *Thyestes* 33 and Lucan, *B.C.* 2.279. In the former what was originally the subject of a verb has been transformed into the object; in the latter, the reverse has occurred.

In the opening scene of Seneca's *Thyestes* the shade of Tantalus is dragged from the underworld and is instructed by the Fury to unleash madness on its household (23–4). The Fury looks forward to the actions and suffering of the descendants of Tantalus; the house will be plagued by the results of *ira* and *furor* and crimes will grow in their enormity (25–32). She then continues:

superbis fratribus regna excidant
 repetantque profugos; dubia violentae domus
 fortuna reges inter incertos labet: 33
 miser ex potente fiat, ex misero potens,
 fluctuque regnum casus assiduo ferat.

'Let kingdoms be lost to proud brothers and seek them out again when they are in exile.' In what sense can the kingdoms be said to *seek out* brothers in exile? It could be a specific reference to what is about to be acted out, Atreus' seeking out of Thyestes to exact his revenge, but the Fury's speech at this point is more general in its allusiveness and casts its net beyond the actual events enacted in the play to embrace what happened before and after (see Tarrant on lines 32–53). Lines 33b–36, for example, refer most probably to how first one brother and then the other held the throne.

The sense or appropriateness of 'regna...repetantque profugos' seems to have worried few modern editors, commentators or translators.¹ Daniel Heinsius, however, was far from satisfied with the transmitted text: 'an regna repetunt profugos? sane durum. et quis ferat?' He read *repetat* and removed the punctuation after *profugos* to make *Fortuna* the personified subject. This solution provides a sentiment similar to that at line 36 ('fluctuque regnum casus assiduo ferat'), but also creates a difficulty: the colon 'reges inter incertos labet' is a weak appendage to the preceding sentiment and it seems preferable that 'dubia...fortuna' should belong to this clause. It was probably Heinsius's note that prompted his pupil, the elder Gronovius, to defend the use of the verb: 'eodem iure quo [regna] *excidere* dicuntur illis quibus auferuntur, et *repetere* possunt dici illos in quorum dicionem redeunt'. But this can hardly be called a well-argued defence.

A different solution is to read 'repetantque profugi'. The brothers are the logical subject of 'superbis fratribus regna excidant' and there is no difficulty in understanding *fratres* as the grammatical subject of *repetantque*; cf., e.g., Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 53.9 'si aeger esses, curam intermisisses rei familiaris et forensia tibi negotia excidissent nec quemquam tanti putares...'. It is also more relevant to an important aspect of the family's history and of the play itself, the desire for power, if exiled brothers are themselves described as actively seeking to recover their kingdom.² In support, another dispute between brothers may be adduced, that of Eteocles and Polynices, treated by Seneca in the *Phoenissae*. At line 324 of that play Polynices is described by the messenger as 'regnum repetens frater'. Equally interesting is the speech of Iocasta at 365–86, since it also contains three of the elements found in *Thyestes* 32–3. At 373 she describes Polynices as '*profugusque* regum auxilia Graiorum rogat' and then at 378–9 she says '*regnum* reposcit: causa *repentis* bona est, | mala sic petentis'.³

What we have here is an easy error of a scribe who had the subject 'regna' in his mind when he copied *repetant* and thus wrote *profugos* for *profugi*.

In Book 2 of the *De Bello Civili* Lucan describes a visit of Brutus to the house of Cato in Rome. Brutus has come to dissuade Cato from participating in the civil war

¹ In many English translations the verb is translated as 'call back' or 'recall', but this is too weak for the context. Thomann's translation in the *Der Bibliothek der alten Welt* series (Zurich, 1961) is even weaker: 'Den vermessen Brüdern entgleite das Königtum und falle ihnen als Verbannten wieder zu'.

² On line 33 Tarrant says 'the language fits both Atreus and Thyestes, each of whom returned to power from exile'. The language fits even better if *profugi* is read.

³ For another example of 'regnum repetere' in Seneca cf. *Oed.* 794 '*repetam* paterna regna'.

that has now broken out with Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon and his capture of Ariminum. The final argument of Brutus in his speech is that Cato will be playing into Caesar's hands by entering the fray (273–81):

quam laetae Caesaris aures
accipient tantum venisse in proelia civem!
nam praelata suis numquam diversa dolebit
castra ducis Magni. nimium placet ipse Catoni,
si bellum civile placet. pars magna senatus
et duce privato gesturus proelia consul
sollicitant proceresque alii; quibus adde Catonem
sub iuga Pompei, toto iam liber in orbe
solus Caesar erit. 279

The only major point in this passage that has prompted disagreement among commentators is the meaning of *sollicitant* and the object that has to be understood with it. In his edition 'editorum in usum' Housman comments:

sollicitant ceteros homines, hoc est alliciunt, invitant... quod ipsi consules cum proceribus aliis et magna parte senatus sub Pompeio bellaturi sunt, ea res homines ad illas partes trahit; quibus si Cato vir tantae auctoritatis accesserit, iam omnes eodem se conferre properabunt, ut praeter solum Caesarem nemo futurus sit quin Pompeio serviat.

Such a lengthy comment on the verb on the part of Housman in this edition is itself an indication of a problem. In her valuable commentary on Book 2 Elaine Fantham gives preference to a different interpretation in which she thinks that 'the constitutional issue raised by *duce privato*' makes it 'difficult to take *sollicitant* as "bring over", the usual sense of the word in L[ucan]'. She prefers to understand *me* and to take '<me> *sollicitant*' as the equivalent of '<me> *sollicitum faciunt*'.⁴

There seem to be only two possible choices, given the context. If *sollicitant* means something like 'trouble', then we must understand the object to be *me*; if its sense is 'appeal to/win over', a more general object such as *homines* has to be understood.⁵ The difficulty felt by Fantham in reconciling the prominence given, through '*duce privato*', to the 'unconstitutional' position of Pompey with the sense of *sollicitant* as 'allure' is, I think, illusory; it suits Brutus' (and Lucan's) purpose to emphasise the questionable legal situation of Pompey in order to undermine any possible justification for joining him. It is all the more shocking and paradoxical, then, that men are actually being won over to the Pompeian side in these 'unconstitutional' circumstances. The interpretation espoused by Housman, which has a long history, as he duly acknowledges, can stand and is to be preferred.⁶

⁴ This is the interpretation of many editors and translators (e.g., Weise, Francken, Ehlers, and Luck). Fantham refers to Bourguery for this interpretation, but in the Budé Bourguery takes *sollicitant* in the sense 'wins over' or 'appeals to' and the object of the verb to be 'us' ('*nous sollicitent*') in a general sense (see his note, ad loc.). In her recent translation Braund renders *sollicitant* as 'are incitements' (with no object expressed).

⁵ The waters are muddied by the scholiastic tradition: 'SOLLICITANT te scilicet, ut hoc sequaris' (see Endt, *Adnotationes*); 'SOLLICITANT commovent scilicet te ad bellum' (G. A. Cavajoni, 'Scholia inedita a Lucano del codex bernensis litt. 45 saec. x', *Acme* 28 [1975], p. 95); 'sollicitant, inquit, nos senatus consul et proceres alii, quod quasi omnes sub Pompeio esse videantur' (*Comm. Bern.*, ad 2.277).

⁶ Micyllus gives it as the second of two ways of construing *sollicitant*: 'De Catone intelligendum videtur, non de Bruto, ut sis sensus: senatus et consules sollicitant et instigant te, (scilicet Catonem), ut una capessas bellum et arma, quibus si accesseris, iam nemo restabit liber praeter Caesarem, etc. Aut certe, ut in genere de omnibus accipiatur quasi dicat senatus et coss. communiter sollicitant et impellunt omnes ad arma secum capessenda: quibus si tu quoque accesseris, etc.' Oudendorp is more forthright: 'sed recte Micyllus monuit in genere accipiendum esse, sollicitant omnes, ut solet passim fieri quando casus verbi omittitur'.

The text is improved, however, and the problem vanishes if we read 'proceres alios' for 'proceresque alii'.

pars magna senatus
et duce privato gesturus proelia consul
solicitant *proceres alios*; quibus adde Catonem
sub iuga Pompei, toto iam liber in orbe
solus Caesar erit.

The reasons for the change are twofold. The first relates to a weakness of the standard text; 'proceresque alii' makes a lame climax after the first two subjects ('pars magna senatus' and 'duce privato gesturus proelia consul') in terms of both length and content; contrast, for example, 2.541–3 ('Catilina...sociusque furoris | Lentulus exertique manus vaesana Cethegi').⁷ The second reason is that there is now an explicit and therefore much more pointed antithesis than in the current text; instead of a contrast between Cato and an object such as *homines* that is to be understood as the object of *solicitant*, Cato is contrasted explicitly with the 'proceres alios', just as Brutus contrasts him with *alii* in the same speech at 259 ('accipient *alios*, facient *te* bella nocentem') and, in a different form, at 264–6 ('quis nolet in *isto* | ense mori, quamvis *alieno* vulnere labens, | et scelus esse *tuum*?').⁸ At 279 Brutus is saying that although other leading men may be attracted to the Pompeian side Cato should not be. For if he is, Caesar alone will be free, since *all* men will follow Cato's example. Another result of the change is that the effect of the hyperbole in 'toto iam liber in orbe | solus Caesar erit' is heightened: to designate a specific group ('proceres alios') as those who are currently being won over by the present leading Pompeian supporters as against the more general *homines* renders more effective the exaggerated implication that Cato's accession to the Pompeian side will result in *everyone's* being Pompey's slave.⁹

After reading 'magna pars senatus' and 'duce privato gesturus proelia consul' a scribe took *proceres* to be nominative, since it was well known that these were associated with the Pompeian side, and wrote *alii* for *alios*, perhaps also adding the connective *-que* to *proceres*.¹⁰ The enclitic, however, is omitted in two of the most important ninth-century manuscripts, M and Z (the omission is repaired by a later hand in M), and it is possible then that the archetype read simply 'proceres alii' and

⁷ The organisation of phrases with crescendo effect pervades Lucan's poem. Even when he departs from it, the final element often has some point. At 2.592–3 ('Cappadoces mea signa timent et dedita sacris | incerti Iudaea dei mollisque Sophene') the last subject is geographically more remote than the other two, being to the east of the Euphrates, in territory that the Parthians once thought should be theirs (cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 33).

⁸ It is an antithesis that appears elsewhere in the speech, for at 246–7 Brutus contrasts himself with *alii* at the same time as he contrasts Cato with Pompey and Caesar ('namque *alii* Magnum vel Caesaris arma sequantur, | dux *Bruto* Cato solus erit').

⁹ Much of what has just been said, however, rests on taking the antecedent of *quibus* to be the unexpressed object of *solicitant*. This seems to have been the view of Housman (he says in his note that the object of *solicitant* that is to be understood is 'ceteros homines', i.e. everyone other than Cato) and, with less certainty, of Micyllus (see above, note 6). The alternative, and at first sight the more obvious, antecedent is the multiple subject of *solicitant* ('pars magna senatus...consul...proceresque alii')—add Cato to these (whom Brutus sees as already Pompey's slaves) as a further inducement and all men will be enslaved. I cannot see any objection to this interpretation, but, if the paradox is retained, I prefer the other: the antithesis between Cato and Caesar is more pointed if Cato is linked, not with the leaders of the Pompeian side, but with those who are currently being won over by them.

¹⁰ For the insertion of *-que* to remove metrical problems as a result of corruption or wilful change see, for example, J. D. Morgan, *CQ* 36 (1986), pp. 197f., on Propertius 4.6.74.

that *-que* was added later in the tradition or was present as a gloss in the archetype.¹¹ But since M and Z omit *-que* at other places where it is needed (e.g., at 2.459 and 695), the archetype may indeed have read 'proceresque alii' despite what we must assume to have been the reading of the hyparchetype of M and Z.¹²

University of Toronto

JOHN N. GRANT

¹¹ In this case, the omission of *-que* in M and Z would reflect an intermediate stage between what I suggest was the original reading and what is now the accepted text: 'proceres alios' > 'proceres alii' > 'proceresque alii'. Cf. L. Håkanson, *PCPhS* 25 (1979), p. 37 (re 2.554): 'This is, by the way, an instance where the quality of ZM is conspicuous; they retain the slight corruption *quod* and the correct *hosti*, whereas the other MSS have an interpolation'.

¹² For this part of the text Z and M are derived from a common source; see H. Gotoff, *The Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), pp. 52–5.

THE MENTION OF A CYPRIOTE HERO BY NONNUS, *DION.* 13.432

In his recent book,¹ the well-known Cypriote scholar K. Hadjioannou comes back to a disputed verse of Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 13.432. For a long time the usual text (for instance in the edition of R. Keydell, 1959) has mentioned two obscure Cypriote heroes, Litros and Lapethos: *Κυπριάδας δὲ φάλαγγας ἐκόσμεε Λίτρος ἀγῆνωρ | εὐχαίτης τε Λάπηθος*. Obviously the second is the legendary eponym of the town of Lapethus (north coast of Cyprus). But what are we to say of the first one, Litros? Hitherto the name is unknown, either for a figure or for a city.² Nevertheless we know something which is not very different, in the ancient name of *Λέδρα*, *Λῆδρα*, previous designation of the modern city of Nicosia, which was for a few centuries the capital of a small kingdom in central Cyprus.³ Thus, independently, Pierre Chuvin in his study of the geography of Nonnus⁴ and the present writer in a detailed discussion of the name of Ledra, etc.,⁵ both put forward the hypothesis that 'Λίτρος' is nothing but a light distortion of *Λῆδρος*, which could simply be the eponymous hero of the city (nowhere else mentioned, as is the case with Lapethos). As P. Chuvin observes: 'Les deux formes sont pratiquement homophones: Lapéthos et Lédros auraient été fabriqués de la même façon'.⁶ We thus think that the easy correction here is not misplaced. But now K. Hadjioannou objects that the poet did not allude to the town of Ledra and that the singular ἐκόσμεε cannot support two subjects. On the first point I would answer that the poet is not obliged to afford symmetrical allusions, on the second that the verb is here correctly in agreement with the nearest subject (and preceding it). And what does our Cypriote colleague propose? Another kind of correction by which the first hero completely disappears in favour of a new epithet of Lapethos, the text being: ἐκόσμεε λυγρός, ἀγῆνωρ / εὐχαίτης τε Λάπηθος. The idea is indeed ingenious, but does not convince: the rather negative adjective λυγρός⁷

¹ *Hē arkhaia Kupros eis tas hellēnikas pēgas, tomos s' (VI), Leukosia (Nicosia), 1992, 56f. (in modern Greek).*

² That is the reason why Marcellus, in the 1856 Didot edition, removed the name with a violent correction, and introduced a hero Agapenor.

³ See now *Dictionnaire de la civilisation phénicienne et punique* (under the direction of E. Lipinski), Brepols, 1992, s.v. *Lédra*.

⁴ 'Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques. Recherches sur l'oeuvre de Nonnos de Panopolis' (Clermont-Ferrand, [1992]), p. 89.

⁵ *BCH* 104 (1980), 234–5.

⁶ Loc. cit.

⁷ Otherwise the Nonnus Lexicon edited by W. Peek gives only one reference to this adjective, for 26.73.