

## THUCYDIDES' NICIAS AND HOMER'S AGAMEMNON

Thucydides has Nicias to complain to the Athenians in his letter from Sicily (7.12.3):

νῦν δὲ αἶ τε νῆες διάβροχοι τοσοῦτον χρόνον ἤδη θαλασσεύουσαι, καὶ τὰ πληρώματα ἐφθάρται

While our ships are by now soaked,<sup>1</sup> having been at sea for such a long time already, and the crews have diminished.

To this the scholiast comments (p. 378 Hude):<sup>2</sup>

διάβροχοι· σεσηπυῖαι. Ὅμηρος·

καὶ δὴ δοῦρα σέσηπε νεῶν καὶ σπάρτα λέλυνται

'Soaked': rotten. So Homer (*Il.* 2.135):

The shipwood is rotten, and the ropes have loosened

The scholiast is clearly busy glossing a rare word. Here, as elsewhere in the scholia, Homer is cited for just that purpose. There is also an effective tendency to build judgements on a writer's style around the label 'Ὀμηρικῶς'.<sup>3</sup> Curiously, in our case the scholiast seems to have hit upon the right reading of the passage. The detail about decaying timbers in the context of Nicias' letter could not help striking educated Greek readers, who, like Thucydides himself, had Homer at their fingertips, as an echo of Agamemnon's words in *Il.* 2.135. I argue that Thucydides intends the reminiscence to be perceived, and moreover, uses it to trigger off our understanding that the figure of Nicias should be read against that of the Homeric Agamemnon.

Early Greek rhetoric appears to have placed somewhat less emphasis on theory. The role of exemplary model speeches as practical manuals was, consequently, great.<sup>4</sup> Not surprisingly, the themes for these paradigmatic speeches were taken from the familiar Trojan saga.<sup>5</sup> In the course of time, such model declamations were to evolve into a crucial element of rhetorical training, known as *êthopoeia*.<sup>6</sup> Homeric themes, e.g.

<sup>1</sup> I translate 'soaked' (alternatively, 'waterlogged', 'saturated') with Thomas Hobbes, *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War*, ed. D. Greene (Chicago and London, 1989), p. 449, and B. Jowett, *Thucydides* (Oxford, 1881), vol. I, p. 492. See also K. J. Dover in *HCT* IV, 388; J. Classen and J. Steup (edd.), *Thucydides*, 4th edn (Berlin, 1908), vol. VII, p. 27: 'nicht leck, sondern Wasser ziehend'. Cf. [Hipp.] *Aer.* 10; Hesych. Δ 960; Pollux 1.121; and Renaissance commentator Demetrios Ducas, quoted by Classen and Steup, loc. cit. 'Rotten' or 'putrid' of the scholiast is fair enough, anticipating the next stage of decay.

<sup>2</sup> *Scholia in Thucydidem*, ed. C. Hude (Leipzig, 1927; repr. New York, 1973).

<sup>3</sup> See *POxy* 853 VI.14–5, 34–5, VII.27–8, XIII.17, XIX.6 in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (edd.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. VI (London, 1908), with the editors' comment on p. 139; cf. Quint. 5.2.14.

<sup>4</sup> See G. A. Kennedy, 'The earliest rhetorical handbooks', *AJPh* 80 (1959), 169–78, esp. 169–71; id., *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (London, 1963), pp. 52–4; T. Cole, *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore and London, 1991), pp. 81–9.

<sup>5</sup> Gorgias' *Palamedes*: B 11A DK = B.VII.4 Radermacher; Alcidas' *Odysseus*: B.XII.16 Radermacher; Antisthenes' *Ajax*, *Odysseus*: B.XIX.11–12 Radermacher; Hippas' *Trojan Speech* (Nestor's advice to Neoptolemus): A9; A2 = B 5 DK.

<sup>6</sup> H. I. Marrou, *Histoire d'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 6th edn (Paris 1965), pp. 302–5; D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 11–12, 106–28. Definitions of *êthopoeia*: H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München, 1960), I, pp. 407–10; J. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode* (München, 1974), pp. 291–2. For the related device of *prosôpopoeia* see R. Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*,

Andromache or Achilles addressing, respectively, dead Hector or Patroclus, Priam entreating Achilles, remained ever popular with declaimers (Quint. 3.8.53; Hermog. *Progym.* 9.44–6, pp. 20–2 Rabe; Liban. *Progym.* 11).

Recently, a bold attempt to connect Thucydides to the mainstream of model-based rhetorical *tekhne* was made by Thomas Cole, arguing that speeches in the *History* are arranged as paradigms of political oratory.<sup>7</sup> Since the process of training through exemplary declamations was very much ‘Homerized’ from the earliest stage on, it is legitimate to take a step further and explore possible transformations of Homeric motifs in Thucydides’ speeches.

Homer is agreed to have been an important factor for Thucydides,<sup>8</sup> who could not help seeing Homer and Herodotus as his predecessors in declaring that his subject exceeded in scale both the Trojan (1.10.3) and the Persian (1.18.2–3; 1.23.1) wars. To prove this, he draws a frightening list of the components of *kinēsis* (1.23.1–3): duration and intensity of violence, cities devastated, emigration and holocaust, sedition, earthquakes, storms, eclipses, famine (and cannibalism: 2.70.1), plague. The contents of the *History* offers many a parallel with the *Iliad*: plague (2.47.3–2.54), sieges involving construction of walls (2.75–8; 3.18.4; 4.69.1–2; 4.90; 6.99–6.101.3; 7.4.1–3; 7.5.1), battle over the wall (3.22–3: cf. esp. 3.23.1 and *Il.* 12.397–9) and over the ships (7.53), night battle (7.44.1–2), and carnage in a river (7.84.3–85.1: cf. *Il.* 21.7–11, 17–21, 25–6, 233–6).<sup>9</sup> Monstrous Cyclopes and Laestrygonians are hardly mentioned by accident in the Sicilian Geography (6.2.1). The most conspicuous compositional elements of Homer (and Herodotus) feature prominently in Thucydides—that is: ‘catalogues’ (2.9; 2.96–7; 6.2–5; 7.57–9) and speeches, notably military exhortations. The speeches in Thucydides are, famously, literary constructions, which at the same time lay claim to objectivity as he saw it;<sup>10</sup> the principle of *ta deonta* comes from rhetoric (Gorg. *Hel.* 2; Pericles ap. Th. 2.60.5; Isocr. 13.7.8; Pl. *Phdr.* 234E–235A).

The fact of Nicias’ letter, introduced in a manner analogous to a speech,<sup>11</sup> is historically sound. However, the text given in 7.12–15 must be Thucydides’ own

2nd edn (Leipzig, 1885; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), pp. 312, 489–90; Lausberg, pp. 411–13. Note that scholars contradict each other somewhat about what exactly these types of declamation differ in, and which of the two is subordinate to the other—*ēthopoeia* (Volkman) or *prosōpopoeia* (Russell). The distinction was already not too clear to the ancient theorists (cf. Quint. 9.1.45): Martin, pp. 274–6. In any case, the evidence of Hermogenes, *Progym.* 9, pp. 20–2 Rabe, is a decisive argument for classifying ‘Homeric’ declamations as *ēthopoeiai*.

<sup>7</sup> Cole (n. 4), pp. 104–11; cf. Kennedy (n. 4, 1963), pp. 47–51, *pace* Russell (n. 6), p. 112.

<sup>8</sup> See H. Strasburger, ‘Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung’, in H. Strasburger, *Studien zur alten Geschichte* (New York, 1982), II, pp. 1058–97; A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London, 1988), ch. 1; G. Howie, ‘Thukydides’ Einstellung zur Vergangenheit’, *Klio* 66 (1984), 502–32; S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (London, 1987), *passim*; most recently, C. J. Mackie, ‘Homer and Thucydides: Corcyra and Sicily’, *CQ* 46 (1996), 103–13.

<sup>9</sup> I am far from implying that these thematic overlaps undermine the historical validity of Thucydides’ report; cf. K. J. Dover, ‘Thucydides “as history” and “as literature”’, *History and Theory* 22 (1983), 54–63.

<sup>10</sup> A. W. Gomme, *HCT* I, 140–1, 147–8; F. Egermann, ‘Thukydides über die Art seiner Reden und über seine Darstellung der Kriegsgeschehnisse’, *Historia* 21 (1972), 575–602; D. Rokeah, ‘Speeches in Thucydides: factual reporting or creative writing?’, *Athenaeum* 60 (1982), 386–401; J. Wilson ‘What does Thucydides claim for his speeches?’, *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 95–103; Hornblower (n. 8), pp. 45–72; E. Badian, ‘Thucydides on rendering speeches’, *Athenaeum* 70 (1992), 187–90.

<sup>11</sup> See Classen and Steup (n. 1), p. 23.

composition;<sup>12</sup> this is Thucydides 'as literature' at his finest. Yet, it is exactly in this general's speech that a Homeric reminiscence would also help to meet the requirement for *ta deonta*. Nicias' interest in Homer was apparently well-known (Xen. *Symp.* 3.5–6), so to refer to the *Iliad* in a speech would fit well with his character.

'Soaked ships' is a conspicuous detail<sup>13</sup> that invites associations between Nicias' letter and Agamemnon's address to the Achaeans in *Iliad*. The two speeches are suggestively parallel in structure:

Nicias (Th. 7.11–15)	Agamemnon ( <i>Il.</i> 2.110–41)
The situation has worsened dramatically: Gylippus has arrived, a counter-wall has been built by the Syracusans, etc. (11)	Zeus has badly 'deceived' Agamemnon (110–18)
	It is shameful for a more numerous army to lose (119–30)
The enemies have rallied considerable forces (12.1–2)	But the Trojans have got strong allies (130–3)
The Athenian ships are in disorder (12.3–4, 13–14.1), while the enemy's fleet becomes stronger (12.5)	War lasts too long, the ships are in a poor condition (134–5)
	The families left behind (136–7)
The situation cannot be saved by Nicias (14.2) and is likely to get even more difficult (14.3)	The aims of the expedition are not achieved (137–8)
Yet, the army is not to blame, facing so numerous an enemy (15.1)	
A decision must be made by the people, either to recall the expedition altogether, or send reinforcements (15.2); Nicias asks to relieve himself from command (15.1–2)	Withdrawal from Troy 'suggested' (139–41)

The potential implication is double-edged. On the one hand, Nicias (the 'focalizer' of the text) through the covert allusion is made to present his own position in Sicily as that of Agamemnon at Troy. In terms of rhetoric it would mean that his address is constructed along the lines of a Homer-based *êthopoieia*. Nicias' description of the Athenian camp in Sicily as being under siege (7.11.4 *ξυμβέβηκέ τε πολιορκεῖν δοκοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἄλλους αὐτοὺς μάλλον*) corresponds somewhat to the contents of the central part of the *Iliad*. The puzzling pessimism pervading the letter<sup>14</sup> can be seen as part of Nicias' assimilation to Agamemnon. When Agamemnon announces

<sup>12</sup> C. O. Zuretti, 'La lettera di Nicias (Thuc. VII 11–15)', *RFIC* 50 (1922), 1–11; H. D. Westlake, 'Nicias in Thucydides', *CQ* 35 (1941), 58–65, esp. 62; id., *Individuals in Thucydides* (Cambridge 1968), p. 190; Dover (n. 1), p. 386.

<sup>13</sup> See G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. I (Cambridge 1985), p. 131 *ad loc.*: 'Nothing is said elsewhere about the poor condition of the ships; it is a well-observed detail which might be distracting in other contexts but is a forceful illustration here of the lapse of time with nothing accomplished.'

<sup>14</sup> The events of the expedition had not yet given reasons for despair: Westlake (n. 12, 1968), p. 192; Dover (n. 1), p. 386.

that victory is impossible and proposes to abandon the siege (2.110–41), he has no real intention of implementing his own proposal. On the contrary, at the moment of delivering the speech he is fully confident of the Greek success, thanks to the dream the night before. His speech is, admittedly (2.73–4), a provocation, a red herring, to check on the mood of the army (2.73). Nicias' letter adopts the same provocative strategy. By playing up hardships it eventually prompts the Athenians to a positive decision that might change the campaign to the better (7.15.2; cf. 7.11.1; 7.14.4; 7.15.1). That is what Nicias really wants, not permission to withdraw from Sicily.

But there is a sombre ambiguity about Nicias echoing Agamemnon of *Iliad* Book 2. For Agamemnon is, in fact, deceived by his confidence; the dream from Zeus was false. Saying that things turn out badly, the king does not realize that it is true: the Achaeans are destined for a major set-back, and in *Il.* 9.17–28 he will nearly repeat his own defeatist words, but this time in earnest. From this point of view a reminiscence of *Il.* 2.135 becomes a kind of flashback where Thucydides' authorial prescience may be shared by the reader. The irony is that Nicias pretends to be as clever as Agamemnon, while actually geminating his folly. We know, with Thucydides, that the Athenians in Sicily are heading for disaster, but their commander is blind, as if he has forgotten his *Iliad* . . . or has he? After all, Agamemnon was victorious in the end . . .

The story of Nicias' command in Sicily is a tragedy. Although trying hard, he fails pathetically to cope with the situation. Notably, in the last chapters of the Sicilian narrative there is a growing sense of epic heroism about Nicias' demeanour and language. The harangue before the decisive sea-battle (7.69.2), centred around the appeal to ancestral virtues and families, recalls Nestor's exhortation in *Il.* 15.661–6. The way Nicias addresses each Athenian captain, by father's and personal name, and by the name of the *phylê* (7.69.2 *πατρόθεν τε ἐπονομάζων καὶ αὐτοὺς ὀνομαστὶ καὶ φύλην*), has an archaic ring, too. For readers of the *Iliad*, *φύλη* in a military context is a loaded word (cf. *Il.* 2.362–3 for Nestor's counsel);<sup>15</sup> *πατρόθεν* is an even stronger case, linking Nicias' figure to Agamemnon, as the scholiast once again points out (p. 398 Hude):

*πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον* (*Il.* 10.68)

Thucydides leaves the reader with an impression that Nicias' harangues<sup>16</sup> and, generally, his command prove inefficient precisely because they are too Homeric, that is, anachronistic.<sup>17</sup> Thucydides' disappointment is evident in his description of Nicias' mode of address as *ἀρχαιολογεῖν* (7.69.2), which means literally 'to say things out of date', hence pejoratively 'to talk banalities'.<sup>18</sup> To act like an epic hero outside epic is a fatal attitude. But is there a feasible alternative? Nicias probably does the best thing in the given circumstances (7.69.2): he appeals to inveterate values both in a traditional manner and in good faith (7.69.2 *ὠφέλιμα νομίζοντες ἐπιβιώνται*; cf. 7.76). The problem must then go deeper than merely his personal inadequacy.

<sup>15</sup> Kirk (n. 13), pp. 153–5.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Nicias in 7.76 *βοῇ τε χρώμενος ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐκάστοις καθ' οὓς γίγνοιτο*, and Agamemnon in *Il.* 4.231ff.

<sup>17</sup> See D. Lateiner, 'Nicias' inadequate encouragement (Thucydides 7.69.2)', *CPh* 80 (1985), 205, n. 5: 'The Homeric reminiscence underlies the obsolete quality of Nicias' effort.'

<sup>18</sup> See K. W. Krüger (ed.), *Θουκυδίδου ξυγγραφή*, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1861), II.2, p. 66: 'Veraltetes sagen, wie es etwa in der heroischen Zeit angebracht gewesen war'; Dover (n. 1), p. 446; now also LSJ, Supplement, s.v.; Lateiner (n. 17), 204–5.

The tragedy of Nicias lies with his attempt at applying traditional values in a world that has already outgrown them.<sup>19</sup> Homeric heroism would not work in the harsh conditions of the greatest *kinēsis*. Nicias must lose because he only knows how to behave like Agamemnon.<sup>20</sup> Probably he misread the king, being taken in by the poetic *mythōdes*. The bare truth behind the *Iliad* is, according to Thucydides, not different from the politics of his own days: Agamemnon's heroic reputation was grounded on resources (1.9.1) and fear (1.9.3).

Scholars have found it surprising, in the light of a generally unfavourable picture of Nicias, that Thucydides would endorse his *aretē* in 7.86.5.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps the correct way to interpret the celebrated passage is to admit that Thucydides can be at the same time reticently critical and appreciative about the fact that Nicias followed the traditional *aretē*. If it was a mistake, it was certainly a noble one. Thucydides respects the scale of Nicias' endeavour to reproduce the heroic paradigm, not to mention that the overall portrayal of Nicias is by no means unsympathetic (7.76; 7.78.1).<sup>22</sup> Nicias' pursuit of 'every *aretē*' (διὰ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν) corresponds to the formulaic παντοίῃ ἀρετῇ (*Il.* 15.642, 22.268; *Od.* 4.725, 4.815, 13.45–6, 18.205). Moreover, Nicias' assimilation to Agamemnon may be particularly relevant here. For it is brought out in the *Odyssey* (11.397–434, 24.24–34) that it is Agamemnon of all heroes who dies in a manner absolutely inconsistent with his great status (11.397 κῦδιστε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν). He met 'a death most pitiable' (11.412, 24.34), devoid of due honour (24.30–3, esp. 31), so that Odysseus and the audience are emphatically invited to feel sorry for him (11.418). Homeric Agamemnon is slain 'like a bull' (11.411 ὥς τις τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνῃ); Nicias and other Athenian officers are 'cut down' (7.86.2 ἀπέσφαξαν) defenceless. The inherent pathos is clear.<sup>23</sup>

Thucydides works within the tradition of paradigmatic rhetoric that was rooted in Homeric subjects. When Plato makes Alcibiades say that Brasidas could be likened to Achilles, Pericles is comparable to Nestor and Antenor, and so on (*Symp.* 221c6–d1), it seems equally possible that he is referring to oratory as well as to a habit of recent historical writing.

To use *ēthopoeia* in a deliberative speech, such as Nicias' letter is, was regarded in antiquity as a good, but difficult achievement (Quint. 3.8.49).<sup>24</sup> Arguably, in Nicias' letter we may have an early and subtle example of *ēthopoeia*, ingeniously projected into the narrative. Homeric overtones contribute to Nicias' characterization. In Thucydides' Nicias we find a peculiar combination of plotting, defeatism, and valour; Agamemnon as a commander cuts likewise a controversial figure in the *Iliad*. More important, Agamemnon serves as the model through which Thucydides seems to

<sup>19</sup> Lateiner (n. 17), 208–12, esp. 212: 'Nicias exemplifies an archaic concept of *aretē* that no longer applied in a world at war'; cf. Hornblower (n. 8), p. 114.

<sup>20</sup> Note that both Greek commanders become physically disabled during the siege: Nicias through his illness (6.105.2, 7.15.1, 7.77.2) and Agamemnon through a wound (*Il.* 11.268, 272; 16.26).

<sup>21</sup> Westlake (n. 12, 1968), pp. 192–3, 210–11; Dover (n. 1), p. 462.

<sup>22</sup> Thucydides does not criticize Nicias for yielding to Cleon in 4.28.1–3; see Westlake (n. 12, 1968), p. 88. There seems to be a touch of sympathy for Nicias' earnestness in 7.69.2, too: ἀλλὰ τε λέγων ὅσα ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ἤδη τοῦ καιροῦ ὄντες ἄνθρωποι οὐ πρὸς τὸ δοκεῖν τινα ἀργαῖοι λογεῖν φυλασσάμενοι εἶποιεν ἄν.

<sup>23</sup> One may wonder how accidental it is that Plutarch, a sensible reader of Thucydides (*Nic.* 1.1), imagines his Nicias speaking of himself with the words of Agamemnon from Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*, 449–50 (*Nic.* 5.7). The description of Nicias' shield (*Nic.* 28.6) has a 'heroic' ring; for Agamemnon's shield see *Il.* 11.32–7.

<sup>24</sup> See Martin (n. 6), p. 170; Volkmann (n. 6), pp. 312–13. Isocr. 6.110 is given as an example.

express his overall conviction that traditional patterns of political behaviour fall short of success under the pressures of the Peloponnesian war. *Éthopoeia* was, generally, the universal genre where history and poetry met (cf. Quint. 3.8.53). It emerges as a 'borderline' mode of writing that allows for moral sensitivity, intertextual depth, and factual accuracy alike, thus offering the chance to enjoy Thucydides-as-literature without jeopardizing Thucydides-as-history.

University of Exeter

A. V. ZADOROJNYI

*NAM UNGUENTUM DABO: CATULLUS 13 AND SERVIUS' NOTE ON  
PHAON (AENEID 3.279)<sup>1</sup>*

Catullus' cunning dinner invitation to Fabullus continues to generate a rich variety of interpretations of its memorable central image, the promised gift of a certain *unguentum Veneris* (13.12). Three *Latomus* articles, by Littman, Hallett, and Case, have explored possible origins of and uses for that mysterious substance, suggesting, for example, that it might even contain female secretions with powerful aphrodisiac properties, or some other unmentionable sexual lubricant.<sup>2</sup>

Interpretations of Catullus 13 seem to oscillate between the 'Dr Ruth' school of criticism and more restrained readings of light, friendly humour at both Fabullus' expense and the poet's, spicing a delicate compliment made to his mistress' eyebrow (*suae puellae*), whether she is Lesbia or not.<sup>3</sup> The following is offered as a contribution to the debate, in the hope of shedding further light on Catullus' *unguentum* within the poetic context of an elegant, refined, and deftly erotic compliment from her lover.

To make up for his admittedly meagre fare, Catullus rounds off this invitation to Fabullus with two special incentives (13.10–15):

sed contra accipies meros<sup>4</sup> amores  
seu quid suavius elegantiusve est:  
nam unguentum dabō, quod meae puellae

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank my former teacher and long-time friend, Professor D. F. S. Thomson, for citing this suggested Servius-parallel to Catullus' *unguentum Veneris* in his splendid and long-awaited new commentary: *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary* (*Phoenix* Supplementary Volume 34; Toronto, 1997).

<sup>2</sup> R. J. Littman, 'The unguent of Venus: Catullus 13', *Latomus* 36 (1977), 123–38; J. P. Hallett, 'Divine unction: some further thoughts on Catullus 13', *Latomus* 37 (1978), 747–8; B. D. Case, 'Guess who's coming to dinner: a note on Catullus 13', *Latomus* 54 (1995), 875–6. For further comment on the literary aspects of Catullus 13, see G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 122, 127, 463. K. Quinn, *Catullus. An Interpretation* (New York, 1973), pp. 231–2, sees 13 as an invitation to meet Lesbia; G. P. Goold, *Catullus* (London, 1983), p. 239, reads *cenabis bene* (1) as a reply to Fabullus' invitation of himself to Catullus' house (comparing Cic. *de Or.* 2.246 for the formula): '“My sweetheart” must be the Lesbia of happier days . . .'; D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Thoughts on two poems of Catullus, 13 and 20', *Latomus* 30 (1971), 45–55, at 48, saw the poem as a 'compliment to Lesbia and her divine beauty'.

<sup>3</sup> E. T. Merrill, *Catullus* (Cambridge, MA, 1893), p. 59: Merrill's view of the tone of 13 is 'dignity and condescension. . . . The lack of anything but happy feeling in the memory indicates that the poem was written while the love for Lesbia was still untroubled by disagreement of suspicion,—therefore about 60 B.C.' C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus. A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961), p. 133. R. Ellis's support for Lesbia as the *puella* of 13 (*A Commentary on Catullus* [2nd edn, Oxford, 1889], p. 48) seems generally accepted. For Clodia Metelli, see now R. D. Griffith, 'The eyes of Clodia Metelli', *Latomus* 55 (1996), 381–3.

<sup>4</sup> The choice of MSS readings at 13.10 between *meros* (O: e.g. Kroll, Mynors, Quinn, Fordyce, Goold, Thomson) and *meos* (X: e.g. Littman) seems to vary with the interpretation of *unguentum* as either divine or profane.