

folios 35 and 36, where lines 7. 100–84 are omitted. Since this lacuna begins after the last line on fol. 35^v, it would appear at first sight that one or more folios may have disappeared from the manuscript. But since the surviving folios regularly have 25 lines on each face or a total of 50 lines per folio, it is clear that the missing lines are too many to have been included on one folio and too few to have occupied two full folios. It is doubtless, therefore, coincidental that the lacuna begins at the end of the verso of one folio. There are several instances in which individual lines or small groups were omitted by the original scribe, but were added later either by the first hand or by some contemporary scribe. These include 1. 25–26, 1. 88, 8. 54–64, 9. 89, 11. 49, and 16. 9. In addition there are some omissions and changes in the order of lines which are characteristic of various other manuscripts, especially of the Ω or vulgate group (designated Φ by Clausen⁸). Along with Ω Vat. Lat. 5204 omits 6. 126, 8. 7, and 9. 134a, and transfers 9. 119 to a position after 9. 123. It also interchanges lines 9. 143 and 144 (with ϕ VB Par 8070 Mon 23475 Neap 44); interchanges 11. 108 and 109 (with $r(\Xi)_S$); transfers 11. 165–66 to a position after 11. 161 (with pvm s); and omits 14. 1a (with P^1pU^1Fk s). Folio 55^r,

containing lines 11. 110–33, has been so badly defaced that it is illegible in parts. Generous scholia are to be found in the margins throughout the manuscript.

From a study of the omissions and changes in line order listed above, it becomes clear that this codex must be classified as belonging primarily to the Ω group. It has, however, been influenced to some extent from other sources. An interesting example of this is seen in 9. 14. The Vatican manuscript has two lines at this point, neither of which in its original form agreed entirely with the *textus receptus*. The lines originally read: “Praestabat calidi circum lita fascia visci / Bructia praestabat calidi circum lita tibi fascia visci.” The first of these is identical with the reading of Ω and P^2 . In its original form the second was almost identical with the reading of P^1 (with the exception that P^1 omits *lita tibi*). Later the words *circum lita* were expunged from the text of Vat. Lat. 5204. This brought the line into essential conformity with the *textus receptus*. Other examples of the influence of the better manuscripts could be cited, but such instances are relatively rare. In the vast majority of cases this document follows the Ω tradition quite consistently.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

8. W. V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae* (Oxford, 1959), p. 36.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

A VARIANT ON PLATO *THEAETETUS* 186C9

The text of the passage *Theaet.* 186C7–10 runs in the editions: $\Sigma\Omega$. *Οἶόν τε οὖν ἀληθείας τυχεῖν, ᾧ μηδὲ οὐσίας; ΘΕΑΙ. Ἀδύνατον. ΣΩ. Οὐδὲ ἀληθείας τις ἀτυχήσει, ποτὲ τούτου ἐπιστήμων ἔσται; Besides a meaningless οὐδὲ for οὐ δὲ there seem to be no variants in the manuscripts.*

Proclus, however, quotes line 9 in the form: *ἀληθείας γὰρ ἀτυχήσῃς, ὥς ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ γέγραπται* (*In Tim.* 2, p. 82. 27–28 Diehl [Leipzig, 1904]). That he followed the same reading in his lost commentary on the *Phaedo* is proved by the consensus of Olympiodorus and Damascius, who took most of their material from it: Olympiodorus (*In Phaed.*,

p. 25. 12–13 Norvin [Leipzig, 1913]), *πῶς δὴ ἀτυχῇ οὐσίας τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ ἀληθείας φησὶν; Damascius (ibid., p. 101. 15), πῶς ἀτυχῇ τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀληθείας λέγει ὁ Πλάτων; Though this may merely represent the form in which Proclus happened to remember the passage, it is more probably what he read in his own copy.*

The variant certainly deserves to be considered. For the verb, this is the only instance cited from Plato (by LSJ; in Ast's *Lexicon* the word *ἀτυχῶ* is omitted entirely); the adjective in the sense “failing to attain” is not limited to later Greek (Aelianus and Maximus, LSJ), but is also found in Plato *Laws* 7, 781D3–4:

εἰ δὴ δοκεῖ λόγου γ' ἕνεκα μὴ ἀτυχῇ τὸν περὶ πάσης τῆς πολιτείας γενέσθαι λόγον. In the only other case in Plato (*Laws* 10, 905A2) it means "unfortunate."

Adoption of the adjective would in the first place help us to get rid of a slightly awkward future tense. The case of Thuc. 5. 26² (cited by Kühner-Gerth, I, 172), καὶ τὴν διὰ μέσου ξύμβασιν εἴ τις μὴ ἀξιῶσει πόλεμον νομίζειν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς δικαιοῦσαι, is not quite the same, since in the Plato passage the element of expectation does not extend to the protasis.

Secondly, though Proclus does not quote

the rest of the sentence, we may suspect that instead of ἀτυχήσει he read ἀτυχής, ᾧ . . . In most pretransliteration copies this would be identical with ἀτυχήσῃ and almost identical with ἀτυχήσει. It would eliminate the extremely unusual indefinite ποτέ at the beginning of a clause. I have found no comparable case in the meaning "ever"; it occurs once in the rather different sense, "There was a time when . . ." in Demosth. 36. 50.

L. G. WESTERINK

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

JUVENAL 2. 78-81 AND VIRGIL'S PLAGUE

Cretice, perluces! dedit hanc contagio labem
et dabit in plures, sicut grex totus in agris
unius scabie cadit et porrigine porci
uvaeque conspecta livorem ducit ab uva [2. 78-81].

81 confecta Mon 23475 contacta V10¹

Juvenal's denunciation of the effeminate Creticus and his diaphanous clothes (2. 66-82) reaches its climax in lines 78-81. In contrast to the preceding twelve lines, with their rhetorical questions, exclamations, brief dialogue, and staccato sentences, these lines flow smoothly to their end. Their regular caesurae, rhythmic line endings, euphony, and final -ā rhyme suggest Virgilian prosody; and when the subject matter and word choice are considered, it seems that Juvenal did intend to bring Virgil to mind.

In *Georgics* 3. 440-566, Virgil's description of the diseases that can affect sheep (440-77) leads into his poignant account of the plague that swept down from the Alps into Italy,² destroying every kind of animal, making a mockery of man's religion and of his medicine, and finally killing man himself; at least, men rash enough to wear the contaminated fleeces, *invisos amictus* (563), whose limbs were attacked by an *immundus sudor* (564), and finally by an accursed fire: "contactos artus sacer ignis edebat" (566). In describing the sheep's diseases, Virgil begins with the

words *turpis oves temptat* SCABIES (441); in line 469, he advises the preventative slaughter of sickly sheep, before *dira . . . serpant* CONTAGIA; otherwise, the whole flock may be lost: *GREGEMQUE simul CUNCTAMQUE ab origine gentem* (473); just as when the grim plague raged in the heat of autumn, *totoque autumnu incanduit AESTU* (479), killing *genus omne . . . pecudum*, including pigs (*quatit aegros/tussis anhela SUES* (496-97)), and finally sheep: *balatu pecorum . . . / . . . sonant ripae* (554-55), and *ne tondere quidem morbo inluvieque peresa / vellera* (561-62).

Juvenal, I suggest, deliberately recalls Virgil's famous plague in the first two similes that describe Creticus' exhibitionism; *contagio, grex totus, scabie, cadit* (cf. the dramatic and similarly placed *cecidit* in 488), and *porci*, all appear in Virgil's account, as do *amictu* (2. 82) and the sweaty, summer heat: *sed Julius ardet, aestuo* (2. 70-71). Thus Juvenal emphasizes the extent of Creticus' corrupting influence by recalling the Virgilian plague, with its widespread, incurable infection and its horrifying results; the spread of moral perversion being equally insidious.

On line 79, the scholiast quotes Virgil *Ecl.* 1. 50: *nec mala vicini pecoris contagia laedent*; possibly in Juvenal's mind, but insignificant beside the full description of

1. The text of U. Knoche, *D. Iunius Iuvenalis Saturae* (Munich, 1950), p. 10.

2. As seen in the rites of 532-33.