

general.<sup>6</sup> This passage has in fact been cited as an example of *peripherés* meaning 'domed',<sup>7</sup> and it is so translated by Roberts.<sup>8</sup>

It therefore seems likely that paragraph 13 of *On Style* refers to domes and that we can date the work to the first century C.E. Although this can hardly be considered scientific proof, this datum should be considered in any future discussion of the dating of the work.<sup>9</sup>

Department of Theology,  
University of Notre Dame

KIM PAFFENROTH

<sup>6</sup> H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th edition, Oxford, 1940) 1392.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 1392.

<sup>8</sup> Roberts (1927), 307.

<sup>9</sup> I would like to thank Dr Schenkeveld for pointing out some of my omissions and errors in a previous version of this paper. This in no way implies his agreement with my conclusion.

### CORNUA AND FRONTES IN [TIBULLUS] 3.1.13

atque inter *geminæ* pingantur cornua frontes  
*geminæ* Wunderlich *geminas* codd.

The transmitted text of line 13, 'inter *geminas*...frontes', has long presented an anomaly in the description of the decorated papyrus roll. If, in the context of book production, *frons* means the flat, round cross section located at either end of the rolled up book (*TLL* 6.1.1362, 84) and if *cornu* means an ornamental projection attached to the ends of the *umbilicus* and extending beyond the plane of the *frons*, then the transmitted text is a physical impossibility.<sup>1</sup> For it is the *frontes* that lie between the *cornua* and not the other way round. In the words of Heyne's paraphrase: 'geminæ frontes inter duo cornua, non duo cornua inter geminas frontes.'<sup>2</sup> Emendation is required not only because an author is unlikely to be inaccurate or imprecise about the physical details of his book but also because the transmitted text can be salvaged only by recourse to tortuous theories about the meaning of *cornu* and *frons*, about their locations with respect to one another, and about the interpretation of *inter* with *geminas*.

Hermann Tränkle, the most recent editor, accepts the definitions of *frons* and *cornu* given above and acknowledges that the *frontes* lie between the *cornua*.<sup>3</sup> Yet he adopts, albeit with serious misgivings, 'inter *geminas* frontes', interpreting *inter* as 'in the

<sup>1</sup> The best analysis of these terms is H. Blümner's 'Umbilicus und cornua', *Philologus* 73 (1914-16), 426-45; the line in question is discussed on pp. 436-7 where Blümner conjectures *intra*. A full bibliography of the controversy about the meaning of *cornua* is given in S. Besslich, 'Die "Hörner" des Buches. Zur Bedeutung von *cornua* im antiken Buchwesen', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 1973, pp. 44-50 but his conclusions are not always reliable. Brief discussion, with good bibliography, of *cornua* and *frons* in E. J. Kenney's 'Books and Readers in the Roman World' in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2: *Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> C. G. Heyne, *Albii Tibulli carmina, Libri tres*<sup>4</sup> (Leipzig, 1817). In the paraphrase Heyne is for the moment assuming with J. H. Voss that *frontes* = the top and bottom edges of the roll ('bases cylindri'). Heyne himself, following P. Burman's somewhat confused note on *Tristia* 1.1.11, wrongly explains *frontes* as the exterior and interior of the protocollon. But after giving his explanation Heyne then confesses perplexity at the meaning of the transmitted text.

<sup>3</sup> *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin/New York, 1990).

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.<sup>4</sup> 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'.<sup>5</sup> 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'.<sup>6</sup> 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

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

<sup>5</sup> 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'.

<sup>6</sup> 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: