

extremely rare for a string player to need a new tuning peg.

Stanford justly regards νέω (407) as difficult and cites the emendations νόω (Agar), ἐώ (Tyrrell), and νέην (Düntzer).²

νόω suggests that some kind of deliberation or careful judgment is involved, but ῥηιδίως (407) and ἄτερ σπουδῆς (409) show that the stringing is done quite automatically; it is second nature to the performer.

ἐώ is an unattractive alternative: since it adds practically nothing, its sole merit is that it fits the meter. It is, of course, not un-Homeric.

νέην makes good sense. It tempts one to wonder whether νέω is actually an instance of hypallage. A parallel is provided by “δεῦρο δὴ

ὄρσο, γρηῦ παλαιγενές, ἣ τε γυναικῶν / δμῶδων σκοπός ἐσσι κατὰ μέγαρ’ ἡμετέρων.”³ Here ἡμετέρων is linked grammatically with γυναικῶν but probably belongs in sense with its neighbor μέγαρα.

Actually, however, I believe that νέω goes perfectly well with κόλλοπι if its true sense is understood. The peg is “new,” not to the instrument but to the string. In other words, by a slight extension of the normal meaning, νέω should here be translated “unfamiliar,” a meaning common in the tragedians, as Liddell and Scott point out. Every violinist knows that the chief difficulty with a newly fitted string is that it tends to slip out of tune until it is adequately stretched by the (at first) unfamiliar peg around which it is wound.

D. S. BARRETT

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

NAEVIUS' WIFE

The main purpose of this Note is to correct a thrice-repeated error in *RE* and suggest the deletion of an unwarranted entry. The point at issue is the family relationship between Publius Quinctius and Sextus Naevius, the parties in the lawsuit in course of which Cicero delivered the *Pro Quinctio*. In section 16 of his speech Cicero says: “nam P. Quincti consobrinam habet in matrimonio Naevius et ex ea liberos.”

It will be remembered that Naevius had been in partnership with P. Quinctius' brother Gaius, now deceased. The author of the *RE* article on Gaius Quinctius (*RE*, XXIV [1963], col. 998, s.v. “Quinctius” [6]) states that Naevius was married to “the daughter of a sister (name unknown) of Quinctius,” i.e., to a niece of Gaius (and Publius). In the article on Publius Quinctius (*ibid.*, col. 1006, s.v. “Quinctius” [16]), which is by the same writer, the same relationship is maintained, Naevius being described as the husband of Publius Quinctius' “sister's daughter,” i.e., “niece.” Since this presupposes the existence of a sister of the Quinctii, an entry is made for her, by the same writer (*ibid.*, col. 1104, s.v. “Quinctius”

[58]), where she appears as “(Quinctia?)” and is described as having a daughter who was married to Naevius.

There is no reason to suppose that *consobrina* ever bore the specific, delimited meaning “one's sister's daughter,” “one's niece,”¹ and as this alone would have justified the prosopography given above, the latter should be abandoned. As there is no other evidence that Publius or Gaius Quinctius had a sister, the “(Quinctia?)” entry in *RE* should be deleted.

The evidence for the meaning of *consobrinus* and *consobrina*, including the relationship of these terms to *sobrinus* and *sobrina*, is collected in *TLL* and in the *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae*. It is not entirely clear and consistent evidence, and *TLL* gives no absolute pronouncement or prosopographical analysis. What emerges, however, is that on the whole the words *consobrini* and *consobrinae* were used, and understood by etymology, to mean in the first instance the “children of sisters” (i.e., my *consobrinus* is the child of my maternal aunt). This may be called the strict usage. Alternatively—or more

1. Ausonius at *Parentalia* 20. 2 addresses his wife's sister's son as *consobrine*, but no one would claim that the word denoted this relationship to the exclusion of others.