

## DISCORDIA TAETRA: APPENDIX

What follows is a list of corrections to my 'Discordia taetra: the history of a hexameter-ending', *CQ* 41 (1991), 138–49. Most of these are owed to the researches of Dr Nigel Holmes, author of the preceding article, and I am most grateful to him for his material, and to the editors of *CQ* for giving me this opportunity for correction; my humble apologies for human error in my pre-CD-ROM era. I am glad to say that none of the article's conclusions are substantially modified by these corrections.

1: To the instances in particular authors, the following should be added:

Lucretius 4.28 *ordia prima*, 5.677 *exordia prima*, 6.184 *lumina nostra*, 6.1225 *funera vasta*. There is also one inexplicable error; for 5.1010 I record the line-ending *conubia laeta*, which does not appear in Lucretius (or anywhere else on the PHI-CD ROM). This gives 60 instances in Lucretius, and the frequency for Lucretius thus becomes 1:130, not 1:137.

Vergil, *Aeneid* 9.241 *moenia Pallantea*. This gives seventeen examples in the *Aeneid*, and the frequency for the *Aeneid* thus becomes 1:582, not 1:618.

Lucan 4.546 *vulnera prima*, 6.708 *pectora plena*. This gives twenty-six instances in Lucan, and the frequency for Lucan thus becomes 1:310, not 1:336.

Valerius Flaccus 4.363 *pascua digna*. This provides a third instance in Valerius, and the frequency for Valerius thus becomes 1:1868, not 1:2803. This makes it closer to the figure for Statius' *Thebaid* (1:1948), and preserves the marked differential with Silius' *Punica* (1:472).

2: Statius, *Silvae* was omitted in the original article. My acquisition since of E. Courtney's Oxford Classical Text (1990) leads me to give the figures now.

Statius, *Silvae* two in 3385 hexameter lines = 1:1693.

5.2.109 *temptamina tanta*, 5.5.74 *munera nostra*.

Three points to note: (i) the overall low frequency is not unlike that for the *Thebaid* (1:1693 ~ 1:1948), (ii) both instances occur in the last book (why?), and the second is a Vergilian quotation (= *Ecl.* 2.48), and (iii) the low frequency of the phenomenon is surely another argument against the interpretation of *nomina caeca* as noun and adjective in agreement at line-end at *Silvae* 2.6.8 (not mentioned by H.-J. van Dam in the extensive and good discussion in his commentary ad loc.).

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON