

THREE RESTORATIONS

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

I THEOCRITUS 14.59-61

- ΘΥ. . . . εἰ δ' οὕτως ἄρα τοι δοκεῖ ὥστ' ἀποδαμῆν
μισθοδότας Πτολεμαῖος ἐλευθέρῳ οἴος ἄριστος. 60
ΑΙ. τὰλλα δ' ἀνὴρ ποιός τις;
ΘΥ. . . . τοῖσιν ἄριστος
εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος . . .

61 ἐλευθέρῳ οἴος ἄριστος codd. et Stob. 4.7.7 (4.250 Wachsmuth-Hense, omitting ποιός, perhaps deliberately, "ne opus esset personarum distinctione" W.-H.): versum om. P: .['].τοισιν ἄριστος Theocriti pap. Antinoensis, saec. 5-6, fr. B. col. 1 recto (see edn. A. S. Hunt and J. Johnson [1930] 34 (text) and note p. 65, with comment in *Introd.* 26-27).

Line 61 is defective in the MSS which carry it, since it has long been recognized that the conclusion ἐλευθέρῳ οἴος ἄριστος is repeated from 60 overhead. If it were not for the help of the papyrus, we would have no idea at all of what originally stood there. Assuming however that the papyrus is a reliable witness in this matter, we have to reckon with a repetition of the last word ἄριστος but with something different preceeding it. Thus Hunt proposed the fairly obvious supplement [ἐνὶ πρώ]τοισιν. Gow (*ad loc.*) criticized this on the somewhat enigmatic ground that this use of πρώτος "would require more defence" than he could supply. Presumably he had in mind what seems to be a fact of Greek idiom that ἐν(ὶ) πρώτοις is used, like *imprimis* in Latin, with adjectives in the positive but not in the superlative degree. If this is so, then an otherwise satisfactory supplement is inadmissible, and we must look for something better. To accommodate the repeated ἄριστος at line-end we might consider a Greek expression corresponding to the familiar use of *inquam* in Latin, where a word is repeated to achieve a desired emphasis, as, e.g., in Cic. *Phil.* 7.15 *cuius ut omittam innumerabilia scelera . . . ut haec, inquam, omittam* and elsewhere. In Greek a natural word to use for this would be ἔφην / ἔφην and the needed point in Thyonichus' reply to the disconsolate Aischinas, who is about to enlist as a mercenary under Ptolemy I to forget his sorrows, may have been conveyed by the conversational phrase ἐν τοῖς followed by the superlative. The text would then be restored as:

- ΑΙ. τὰλλα δ' ἀνὴρ ποιός τις;
ΘΥ. . . . (ἔφην· ἐνὶ) τοῖσιν ἄριστος·
εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος . . .

If ἔφην here, though defensible, is felt to intrude somewhat awkwardly, an

I am very grateful to Mr. M. D. Reeve and Mr. D. P. Fowler for helpful discussion of points in these notes.

alternative supplement is available to achieve the same result and to justify the repetition of ἄριστος. This is to repeat ἀνὴρ from earlier in the line, yielding the restoration:

AI. τὰλλα δ' ἀνὴρ ποῖός τις;
 ΘΥ. <ἀνὴρ ἐνὶ> τοῖσιν ἄριστος, . . .

This is rhetorically effective: Thyonichus, casting about for eulogistic epithets for Ptolemy, begins by reinforcing his first compliment at the end of 60 by repeating the last word ἄριστος introduced in either of the ways indicated, before he launches himself on the conventional sequence of adjectives in asyndeton which follows. The loss of 61b would have been due either to the puzzlement which a scribe or reader might have felt in the presence of the somewhat sophisticated construction of ἐν(ι) τοῖσιν with the superlative, or to the optical error of *saut du même au même*, whether the eye leapt from the first ἀνὴρ to the second or from the ἄριστος at the end of 60 to its repetition at the end of 61, or to a combination of both causes. However this may be, it was certainly the homoeoteleuton of 61 with 60 that caused the loss of the whole of 61 in P.

Two possible objections need to be stated and met.

(i) The construction ἐν(ι) τοῖς with the superlative is only found in verse in a fragment of the comedian Pherecrates (fr. 145.4 Kock), although it is common in Herodotus and Thucydides, as the instances in K.-Gerth 1.28–29 show. It does however occur in conversational passages in Plato, as, e.g., *Crīto* 43c ἦν (ἀγγελίαν) ἐγὼ . . . ἐν τοῖς βαρύτατα ἂν ἐνέγκαιμι or 52a ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Ἀθηναίων ἐγὼ . . . τυγχάνω. It is entirely in Theocritus' manner to dignify a phrase elsewhere only at home in a conversational context by incorporating it in his verse when reproducing a lively piece of dialogue: poem 15 is full of such felicitous adaptations.

(ii) This restoration does not take account of the indistinct traces of a letter, conceivably either alpha, epsilon, or sigma, standing before tau in the papyrus, or of what is said to be an accent-sign placed a little further to the left than might have been expected. No obvious word to fit these traces has however been proposed. Since this scribe offsets several good readings lost in the medieval MSS and recovered by emendation with a number of manifest errors, such as a mis-spelling of ἀτιμοτάται (dat.) with an omega shortly before in line 49, in splendid defiance of metre, it would be misplaced endeavour to attach undue weight to the doubtful evidence of a letter which cannot be identified with confidence and may have been written wrongly anyway.

The form ἐνί, which Theocritus affects, seems to be preferable to ἐν, though this would be acceptable here, since Theocritus does not obey Wernecke's Law, as 15.42, 83, 10.29, 11.79, or 12.33 show, to take examples from poems with a similar degree of lively expression. The

fourth-foot dactyl is however favoured by Theocritus, and if the trace of an accent or breathing-sign in the papyrus is anything to go by, its slight displacement to the left might be accounted for if it was related to the disyllable *évi*. This is however a minor point and may be no more than clutching at straws. It will be enough if this suggestion offers a means of restoring sense to what is otherwise a defective passage.

II LUCRETIVS 3.79–84

. . . et saepe usque adeo mortis formidine vitae
 percipit humanos odium lucisque videndae, 80
 ut sibi consciscant maerenti pectore letum
 obliti fontem curarum hunc esse timorem,
 hunc vexare pudorem, hunc vincula amicitiae
 rumpere et in summa pietatem evertere †suadet.
 nam iam . . . 85

So Bailey, in his Oxford Text of 1921. Whatever once stood as last word in 84, the march of the argument is clear and the rhetoric runs strongly. Often, Lucretius is saying, from fear of death men come to hate life and resort to suicide, forgetting that it is this fear that is the source of their worries, that breaks the bonds of friendship and (accepting *suadet* for the moment) that urges them in effect to overturn family-feeling.

When Bailey came to write his commentary in 1947, he changed his view of this passage, unfortunately for the worse, by removing the obelus before *suadet*. His extended note leaves the reader in no doubt that he felt the force of the two objections to the transmitted text, which are: first, the shift from *oratio obliqua* introduced by *obliti* in 82, which persists as far as the infinitive *rumpere* in 84, after which *hic timor* has to be extracted from 82 to act as subject for the indicative *suadet*; secondly, the threefold repetition of *hunc* in 82–83 which would naturally be taken to show that the infinitives *esse*, *vexare*, and *rumpere* are in parallel, with *hunc timorem* as the subject of all three. This excludes the unattractive interpretation which Bailey adopted, whereby he placed a semi-colon after *timorem* and took *hunc* . . . *hunc* in 83 to mean “one man . . . another (man) . . .” as his translation shows, with the divorce of the last two recurrences of the pronoun from the first.

Though he had reconciled himself to the syntactical dislocation entailed by the switch to the indicative *suadet*, he dutifully recorded and dismissed a plethora of emendations of the last word in the line and clause. All these are arbitrary, as will appear, and where they do not detract from the rhetorical effect, add nothing to it. In itself *suadet* would be used with the infinitive in an authentically Lucretian manner, as at 1.140 *efferre laborem / suadet*, while this verb (without an infinitive) is at home in such contexts, as

in the familiar 1.101 *tantum religio potuit suadere malorum*. Nevertheless this does not guarantee *suadet* here. Without it, sense and syntax would be complete with . . . *evertere*, which would then be under the regimen of *obliti* in 82, and were it not for the need to fill up the sixth foot, nothing would be felt to be missing. This makes it particularly difficult to find the necessary supplement: any ablative stop-gap such as Lambinus' *fundo* (= *funditus*), Lachmann's *fraude*, or Bernays's *clade* is, in the rhetorical context built up around the anaphora of *hunc*, a gratuitous appendage; *sorde* of Diels is worse than banal and unworthy of perpetuation in any apparatus; Merrill's *suesse* does not disturb the syntax but adds nothing, while Ernout's *suasu* introduces the idea of persuasion but as a casual and unwelcome afterthought. Of adjectives agreeing with *pietatem* so far suggested only Birt's *suavem* has any claim to attention: though otiose, the fact that it begins with the same three letters as *suadet* could, I suppose, account for its disappearance. Once *suadet* goes, as it surely must, any supplement to occupy its place needs some element of stylistic distinction to justify it. From this point of view *summam* may be considered, with a deliberate word-play on *in summa* preceding. Lucretius is fond of this mannerism, which may not be much to our taste: for instances see Bailey's *Prolegomena* 7.25 (1.158–159). Some of these are justified by the course of the argument, such as the anagrammatic word-play on *ligna* and *ignis* at 1.912 and 914, where the order of letters which make up words is being discussed. Others are trivial, such as *callida* . . . / *Calliope* at 6.93–94. For the present purpose a useful example is 2.310 *summa tamen summa videatur stare quiete*, though this could be held to be legitimate reinforcement by repetition rather than word-play.

At 3.84 I suggest that Lucretius followed up *in summa* ("in fine") with *summam* as the last word, to drive home his point and round off the period and the verse with this characteristic artifice. If an example of *summa* as an epithet for *pietas* is demanded, Cicero (*ad Fam.* 6.20.2) will supply one: *hic tui omnes valent summaque pietate te desiderant*. The effect of Lucretius' phrase in English is feeble: "and in sum to overturn the summit of family-feeling" but Lucretius has enough instances of this kind of thing to warrant the belief that he might have regarded this piece of verbal sleight-of-hand as acceptable for concluding his carefully constructed period. If Lucretius wrote *summam*, its survival in the MSS-tradition would have been at best precarious. An early reader, ignorant of the stylistic mannerism *e summa* . . . *summam* and desiring a finite verb to govern *evertere* (which stands at some distance from *obliti* in 82) could have substituted *suadet* in his copy. This may have occurred to him the more readily because it has the same two initial letters as the word it will have ousted.

It is worth noting that Bailey toyed with *summam* here (note *ad loc.*), but

coupled it with the further emendation of *e summa* to *ex imo*. His recourse to this second emendation may have led to obscuring the merits of the simple replacement of †*suadet* by *summam*.

III JUVENAL 6.167

. . . malo,
malo Venustinam quam te, Cornelia mater 167
Gracchorum, si cum magnis virtutibus adfers
grande supercilium et numeras in dote triumphos.

167 *venustinam* *Vat. Reg. 2029* (saec. 10/11; *r* in Knoche's sigla), *Valentianensis 410* (saec. 11), *sicut coniec. Bücheler: venustinam PS Arou. R rell.*

Of modern editors Knoche in 1950 and Clausen in 1959 gave the text of line 167 as set out above; Housman in 1905 (and again in 1931) was content to obelize the vulgate reading. He could not have known of the variant in the two dissentient MSS, except in so far as Bücheler had anticipated it by conjecture. Although it is not, as will appear, satisfactory, it may give a clue to the truth.

After disposing of two unsatisfactory types of wife, the rich bride Caesennia (136 f.) and the glamour-girl Bibula (142 f.), Juvenal, with more vehemence than logic, dismisses no less decisively that paragon of old-time Roman virtue Cornelia, because her family pride makes her intolerable. His argument, such as it is, is best served by a sharp contrast, which the name *Venustina* fails to provide, with its suggestions of charm and social grace. These are not in point in this context, where Cornelia is the pattern of strict Roman *pudicitia*. To find an *exemplum* of a *femina impudica* κατ' ἐξοχήν one need look no further than Martial who mentions (2.28.4) one *Vetustina*, a lady (if that is a proper name to call her by) who indulges in deviant sexual practices. If Juvenal wrote *Vetustinam* here, it is hard to think of a better way to express his rejection of Cornelia than by this rhetorical statement of a preference for an unsavoury woman such as Martial describes.

The *Vetustini* have their place in Imperial prosopography. Kajanto (*Latin Cognomina* [Helsinki 1965] 302) registers one woman bearer of this name (*CIL* 8.8903) and 4 men. One of these, Porcius *Vetustinus*, is mentioned in a lengthy inscription from Lambaesis (*CIL* 8.2728) which is dated to ca A.D. 152, only about a generation later than the time when Juvenal was writing *Satire* 6.

Textual truth, or pointers to it, may lurk in unlikely witnesses, but in this case the credentials of the two MSS which are known to preserve this clue to the likely if not certain reading are far from negligible. *Vat. Reg. 2029* is a member of a well-marked cluster of 4 MSS carrying a text of the satires which, if not as sincere as that of P (Montpellier 125) and its

fragmentary congeners, is notably less heavily interpolated than that offered by the rest of the *veteres* which predate A.D. 1300.¹ Vat. Reg. 2029 preserves a number of valuable readings, especially proper names, either uniquely as at 7.235 (*Anchemoli*) or in select and reputable company, as at 6.136 (*Caesennia*, with P); 15.27 (*Iunco*, with the 4/5th century Bobbio fragment and some others), or 3.212 (*Asturici*, with PSW and U). Val. 410, of much the same date, also has its moments of distinction, notably at 8.148, where it gives the correct reading *mulio consul* along with the florilegium from St. Gall and GU, two of the cluster of 4 MSS to which Vat. Reg. 2029 belongs.

Once *Vetustinam* had become corrupted, whether by scribal inadvertence or by design, to *Venustinam*, its further deterioration to the familiar but unmetrical *Venusinam* was almost inevitable.

JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD

¹For an account of a powerful statistical method for identifying clusters of MSS in contaminated textual traditions, such as that of Juvenal, by the application of Principal Component Analysis to arrays of variant readings, see my article, "Non-Stemmatic Classification of Manuscripts by Computer Methods," in *La Pratique des Ordinateurs dans la Critique des Textes* (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique 579, Paris 1979) 73–86.