

as seems probable, he has based it on the text of O, support for it from this quarter is very weak, since O at this point clearly does not preserve the reading of fam. 1. Hence, unless there is unreported support for it in fam. 2, the passage should be removed from the text.

In 66. 2, where Bornecque has agier in place of the agier oportet of the other editors, neither reading is duplicated in full by any manuscript of the COgh group. But the presence of oportet in C and oportet in the other three indicates that agier oportet should be preferred to a version which omits oportet.

The reading ex aliis libris found in C for 99. 3, though found only in this manuscript,

is an improvement over the aliis in libris or aliis libris of the the printed editions and so deserves a place in the text.

From the data which have been presented above, it becomes clear that the three new manuscripts of the *Topica* discussed in this paper will be of considerable value to future editors of this work. This is especially true of C, since it is perhaps as much as a half century older than O, hitherto regarded as the best representative of fam. 1, and often preserves a more accurate version of the text of fam. 1 than that to be found in O.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

### P. OXY. 2359 AND STESICHORUS' ΣΥΟΘΗΡΑΙ

The hunt of the Calydonian boar was a popular theme in classical art and literature and makes its first appearance in *Iliad* 9. 529 ff. Artemis, Homer tells us, set loose upon the Calydonians a fierce boar because their king, Oeneus, did not offer to her the first fruits of his land. Meleager, son of Oeneus, gathered together a hunting party and slew the boar. In a subsequent dispute over the beast's hide Meleager slew the Curetes, the sons of Thestius and brothers of Meleager's mother, Althaea.

Among the numerous authors who have treated this topic Stesichorus is to be included. The title of his work and the only lines that could be attributed to it before the emergence of papyrological evidence are provided by Athenaeus at *Deipnosophistae* 3. 95: Στησίχορος τέ φησιν ἐν Συοθήραις. "κρύψαι δὲ ῥύγχος / ἄκρον γὰς ὑπένερθεν." The situation appeared to change in 1956 when E. Lobel, in a volume of Oxyrhynchus papyri devoted to Greek poetry, placed under the heading Stesichorus, Συοθήραι (?), the following fragment, consisting of two adjacent columns:<sup>1</sup>

Column i.  
Θεο]τιάδαι.  
]αρ ὀψιγόνου τε καὶ ἀσπασί-  
οι ]ν ἐν μεγάρ[ο]ισιν· ἀτὰρ πόδας

]τ...αθο. Προκάων Κλυτί-  
ος ]σθαν.  
]ας δὲ μόλ' [E]ὑρυτίων  
]ς τανυπ[έ]πλου  
]ας  
]. Εἰλατίδαο δαίφρονος

Column ii.

ἔνθεν μὲν Λοκρ[οὶ  
ἰζάνον αἰχματαί[  
τέκνα φιλα[  
ηρὲς Ἀχαιοί[  
καὶ ὑπερθύμοι[  
θ' ἱερὰν Βοιωτῖδ[α ν]αίον[  
χθόνα πυροφόρ[ον. ]  
ἔνθεν δ' αὖ Δρύοπ[έ]ς τε καί[ι  
λοι μενεχάρμα[ι

Lobel attributes this fragment to Stesichorus on the grounds that the language and meter are characteristic of him;<sup>2</sup> he also thinks that, if it does belong to Stesichorus, it is almost certain that column i is from the *Συοθήραι*.<sup>3</sup> It consists of a catalogue of individuals; the catalogue includes the sons of Thestius and Eurytion, who have important parts to play in the traditional accounts of the hunt. Eurytion was accidentally killed by Pelias in

1. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XXXIII* (London 1956), no. 2359 (Stesichorus 45 [Page]).

2. On the meter of this fragment, see B. Snell, "Stesichorus' *Συοθήραι*," *Hermes*, LXXXV (1957), 249-51.

3. Lobel's identification has been generally accepted. However, in a review of this volume of the papyri (*CR*, VIII [1958], 17), H. Lloyd-Jones suggests that the fragment might belong to Stesichorus' *Ἀθλα ἐν Πελίᾳ*.

the course of the hunt,<sup>4</sup> and it was with the sons of Thestius that Meleager fought for the boar's hide.<sup>5</sup>

Is there any connection between columns i and ii? Since they both appear on the same fragment, one naturally expects them to belong to the same poem. Yet at first sight there seems to be no connection between the contents of the two columns, and Lobel admits that they may belong to separate compositions. Column ii states that on one side (ἐνθεν μὲν) the Locrians, Achaeans, and Boeotians sat (ἴζανον); on the other (ἐνθεν δ' αὖ), the Dryopes and Aetolians (?).<sup>6</sup> Now in all the accounts of the hunt, the battle over the hide involved only Meleager and the Curetes; both parties were Aetolians,<sup>7</sup> and so it cannot be that the men listed were taking part in that conflict. Is it possible, however, to ascribe to them an activity that is consistent with the story of the boar hunt? In particular, can one ascribe to them an activity that would require them to sit (ἴζανον)? C. M. Bowra suggests that the assembled parties were not combatants in the struggle over the hide but onlookers.<sup>8</sup> But in such a situation it is difficult to see why Stesichorus should have taken the trouble to enumerate the different parties and to assign them to their particular positions (ἐνθεν . . . ἐνθεν).

In classical literature a catalogue of men usually precedes some great endeavor, and it should not be assumed that this catalogue is an exception.<sup>9</sup> But what sort of endeavor would require the men to "sit"? Can ἴζανον have a different meaning? The active form ἰζάνειν can be both transitive and intransitive, and the latter is the equivalent of the middle form ἰζεσθαι. Now ἰζεσθαι, which occurs far more frequently than ἰζάνειν, has the basic meaning of "to sit," but it often has

the semitechnical meaning of "to assume a hostile position." Herodotus uses it of the actions of the Peloponnesians after the battle of Thermopylae, ἰζόμενοι δὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσθμῷ (8. 71); and of the Tegeans taking a position against the enemy, ἰζόμεθα ἀντίοι τοῖσι κατιοῦσι (9. 26). Homer also uses it in this sense, with the additional suggestion of an ambush. In the description of the shield of Achilles he tells how a company of men lie in hiding to steal the cattle of the enemy (Il. 18. 520–22): οἳ δ' ὅτε δῆ ρ' ἱκανον ὄθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι . . . ἐνθ' ἄρα τοί γ' ἴζοντ' εἰλυμένοι αἰθοπι χαλκῷ. Now if ἴζανον in column ii can have this semitechnical meaning, it could be that the warriors are assuming hostile positions not against one another, but against the boar itself. In this case the fragment would belong not to the struggle with the Curetes but to the actual hunt.

The *locus classicus* of the boar hunt is chapter ten of Xenophon's *Cynegetica*.<sup>10</sup> A standard method of the hunt, Xenophon tells us, is to set up nets in passages of forests that provide outlets to grass or water. The boar is then maneuvered into the net, which is guarded by a *subsector* whose task it is to make the actual kill (10. 19): ὁ δὲ τεταγμένος ἔχων τὸ προβόλιον φυλάττει τὰς ἄρκυς. It was such a task that Pliny was carrying out when he did some of his writing (*Ep.* 1. 6): "ad retia sedebam . . . meditabar aliquid enotabamque, ut, si manus vacuas, plenas tamen ceras reportarem."<sup>11</sup> It may well be that Stesichorus has such a scene in mind in column ii; ἴζανον in the semitechnical sense would be an ideal term to use of men taking up their positions at the nets (ἐνθεν . . . ἔθνευ).<sup>12</sup> Now the hunt for the Calydonian boar was conducted on a heroic scale, almost as if it were a military expedition. Homer tells

4. Apollodorus 1. 8. 2 and 3. 13. 2; Aristides 46. 125.

5. The names of the sons of Thestius vary from author to author. The only other source that identifies them as Procaon and Clytius is the scholiast on *Il.* 9. 567: δύο δὲ ἦσαν, Κλυτίος καὶ Προκάων. It is possible that they appear together in Pindar, *Frag.* 343 Snell, line 28: Κλ[υτί]ον Προκάωνά τε.

6. Lobel does not read the Aetolians in his text but in his commentary offers *Αἰτω-λοι* as a restoration of line 8.

7. The distinction between the Calydonians and the Curetes is defined by the scholiast on *Il.* 9. 529: Κουρήτες οἱ ἐν Πλευρώνι οἰκοῦντες, πόλει τῆς Αἰτωλίας.

8. *Greek Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1961), p. 98.

9. Especially in view of the epithets employed: *αἰχματαί*, *ὑπερθύμιοι*, *μενεχάρμα*.

10. For a collection of the ancient evidence relating to boar hunts, see J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines* (Paris, 1951), pp. 297–329.

11. See also Verg. *Ecl.* 3. 75: "dum tu sectaris apros, ego retia servo."

12. For a different theory of the hunt, see G. Huxley, "A Boar in Stesichorus," *GRBS*, VII (1966), 319–20. Huxley suggests that Meleager and his party came upon the boar unawares while it was engaged in unearthing a root.

how the levy for the hunt was made in many cities, πολλέων ἐκ πολλῶν θηρήτορας ἀνδρας ἀγείρας (Il. 9. 544); and Bacchylides calls the participants Ἑλλάνων ἄριστοι (Epin. 5. 111). So it would not be unnatural for Stesichorus to employ an elevated style to describe the deployment of the hunters.

This note does not profess to prove that column ii belongs to the Συνοθῆραι; it simply

attempts to show that it is possible to make sense of the activities described in it within the context of the Calydonian boar hunt and that, on the basis of content alone, the two columns do not need to be separated.

ANTHONY A. BARRETT

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

### MARCUS AGRIPPA'S SON-IN-LAW P. QUINCTILIUS VARUS

For about thirty-five years, P. Quinctilius Varus, the ill-fated commander of the legions destroyed by Arminius in the Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9, enjoyed high favor in the entourage of Augustus. Though his father was on the proscription lists of the Triumvirs and committed suicide in 42 B.C., in the early years of the Principate the fortunes of Varus were already tied to Augustus' through marriage connections close to the imperial house. He was, for example, related by marriage (probably through his sister Quinctilia), to Sex. Appuleius, nephew of Augustus, consul in 29 B.C. and proconsul of Asia in about 23–21.<sup>1</sup> In 21–19, when he was between twenty-five and thirty years of age, Varus was closely attached to Augustus, serving as adjutant to the *princeps* during his tour of the East.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently he held the consulship, together with Tiberius, in the memorable year 13 B.C.—an honor indicative of the signal favor of the emperor.<sup>3</sup> A few years later he married Claudia Pulchra, grandniece of Augustus.<sup>4</sup>

That Varus had been married previously has been generally accepted: the evidence is Josephus' reference to a son of Varus who served on his staff when he was governor of

Syria in 6–4 B.C. Varus' son was old enough to command troops in 4 B.C., when Varus intervened in Judea to suppress disorders there after the death of Herod.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, the *terminus ante quem* for an earlier marriage of Varus is about 25 B.C.<sup>6</sup> Did this earlier marriage already bring Varus within the intimate circle of the imperial family and its growing network of matrimonial alliances?

In this connection, new light has been shed on the career of Varus by a tantalizingly brief papyrus fragment just published by L. Koenen. It contains a contemporary Greek translation, probably from Oxyrhynchus, of the *laudatio funebris* delivered by Augustus in honor of his great colleague and son-in-law Marcus Agrippa.<sup>7</sup> This document is of interest to historians of the Augustan Age because it deals with the powers of Agrippa, particularly his much-disputed *maius imperium*. From it we learn incidentally the startling fact that at the time of Agrippa's death, in 12 B.C., Varus was, like Tiberius, Agrippa's son-in-law.<sup>8</sup> What daughter of the prolific Agrippa did Varus marry? In his masterful commentary Koenen concludes that Varus was Agrippa's son-in-law by virtue of a first marriage to a

1. See U. Weidmann, "Drei Inschriften aus Kyme," *AA*, LXXX (1965), 446–66.

2. W. John, s.v. *P. Quinctilius Varus*, *RE*, XXIV (1963), 908–9.

3. His portrait has been identified on the Ara Pacis Augustae. See, e.g., J. M. C. Toynbee, "The Ara Pacis Reconsidered and Historical Art in Roman Italy," *PBA*, XXXIX (1953), 82.

4. John, *op. cit.* (n. 2), col. 964.

5. Joseph. *AJ* 17. 288; cf. *BJ* 2. 68, where, however, Varus' son is not mentioned in this connection. On Varus' previous wife and son, see von Rohden-Dessau, *PIR*, III (Berlin, 1898), 119.

6. A marriage of Varus before his union with Claudia Pulchra was rejected without adequate grounds by W. John,

"Zu den Familienverhältnissen des P. Quinctilius Varus," *Hermes*, LXXXVI (1958), 251–55; cf. *idem*, *loc. cit.* (n. 4). He thinks the text of Joseph. *AJ* 17. 288, in which a son of Varus is mentioned, is corrupt, and would emend the text to remove reference to a son of Varus. He considers it likely that Varus enjoyed Augustus' favor in 21–19 because he was already engaged to Claudia Pulchra, long before she was *nubilis*.

7. "Die 'Laudatio Funebris' des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus" (= P. Colon. inv. no. 4701), *ZPE*, V (1970), 217–83. I am indebted to Professor G. W. Bowersock for calling my attention to this papyrus, and to Professor Koenen for his kindness in sending me a transcript of the papyrus in advance of publication.

8. Lines 6–7: γαμβρῶν τῶν σὺν.