

or be born with two heads to qualify as a prodigy. Rather, the unnaturalness consists in the wolf's being sighted out of the wild, in a place inhabited by men.<sup>2</sup> This typically involves its penetrating the perimeter of the city, a town, or a camp. While other incidental particulars (e.g., attacks on humans) may be included, the element common to twelve of eighteen wolf prodigies in Livy and Obsequens is this feature, emphasized by the almost formulaic *ingredi*<sup>3</sup> or *intrare*.<sup>4</sup> (*Penetrare* and the weaker *videri in urbe* or *in Capitolio* also

occur.<sup>5</sup>) Often, the wolf's subsequent flight is mentioned.<sup>6</sup>

Horace's encounter, however, has by his own report taken place in the woods and only after he himself has carelessly wandered *ultra terminum* (10–11).<sup>7</sup> The use of the quasi-sacerdotal term by our *vates* is thus somewhat malapropos, but quite in keeping with the playful self-irony that characterizes the whole of this charming piece.<sup>8</sup>

THOMAS A. SUITS

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

2. For the general idea, cf. Lucan 1. 559–60: "silvisque feras sub nocte relictis / audaces media posuisse cubilia Roma."

3. Liv. 27. 37. 3, 32. 29. 2, 33. 26. 9; Obseq. 49 (109), 52 (112).

4. Liv. 21. 46. 2, 41. 9. 6; Obseq. 43 (103).

5. Liv. 32. 29. 2 (*penetrare*); Liv. 3. 29. 9 and Obseq. 63 (123) (*videri*, etc.); cf. also Obseq. 27a (86).

6. Liv. 3. 29. 9, 21. 46. 2, 33. 26. 9, 41. 9. 6; Obseq. 27a (86). The verbs are *effugere*, *evadere*, and *fugari*; cf. *fugit* in line 12 of this Ode.

7. An interesting item in Obseq. 33 (93) concerns the scattering, by a pack of wolves, of the boundary markers (*limites*) set by Gaius Gracchus (cf. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 11. 1). To be sure, this "prodigy" is an isolated case and not typical, but, as my colleague, Professor Allen M. Ward, reminds me, the story seems to have been widely circulated for political purposes; cf. *CAH*, IX, 81.

8. That it is precisely in the central part of this Ode that an ancient reader would have anticipated a note of parody is shown by E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 186.

#### A NOTE ON CICERO *FAM.* 9. 26

Perhaps because it is not perused frequently (being included in only one annotated edition in my personal library), the letter addressed to Paetus, a person keen on dinner parties, still contains a difficult passage, further complicated, in the judgment of editors, by manuscript problems. The moot paragraph (9. 26. 3) reads:

An tu id melius, qui etiam [in] philosophum inriseris, <qui> cum ille, 'si quis quid quaereret,' dixisset, cenam te quaerere a mane dixeris? Ille baro te putabat quaesitum, unum caelum esset an innumerabilia. Quid ad te? At hercule ꝑcena non quid ad te tibi praesertim.<sup>1</sup>

The ingenuity of the editor solves some problems by assuming that "*agebas* is probably to be understood with *An tu id melius*," by bracketing *in*, and by supplying an additional *qui* (construed with a causal subjunctive), thus allowing a logical rendition of the first sentence:

Did your behavior indicate any higher sense of values, when (=seeing that) you mocked even a philosopher when he asked if anyone had a

problem, (and) you said that dinner had been your problem since morning?<sup>2</sup>

The editor indicates that he would translate the next two brief sentences as follows: "The old fool was thinking that you would ask whether there was one universe or an infinite number. What was that to you!" Then he confesses that neither he nor others have solved the subsequent statement:

*At . . . praesertim*. These words cannot be construed as they stand, and emendation is necessary. Tyrrell suggests *At hercule quis 'cena num quid ad te?' tibi praesertim* ('But who on earth would say, "What's dinner to you?—especially to (a gourmet like) you?"). However, this proposed solution has its difficulties. No satisfactory emendation of the passage has appeared so far.<sup>3</sup>

The purpose of the present brief note is to suggest that the text of this sentence could stand without emendation if *cena* be construed as an ablative of respect and if the phrase *quid ad te* be placed within quotes, referring to the question immediately preceding. In English the mooted sentence could read: "But,

1. *Select Letters of Cicero*, ed. A. J. Watson-Wemyss (London, 1960), p. 54.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

3. *Ibid.*

by Hercules, in respect to a dinner the phrase 'What was that to you?' would not [apply]—especially to [a gourmet like] you." Not only would there be no need of emendation, but also the sentence would remain a statement,

as implied by the asseverative *hercule*, rather than an interrogative utterance.

ROBERT G. HOERBER

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

### SOME OBSERVATIONS ON <ΒΙΩΝΟΣ> ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ ΑΔΩΝΙΔΟΣ

There is still much which is obscure in the badly transmitted text of <Βίωνος> 'Επιτάφιος Ἀδώνιδος. This paper will discuss three passages only.

#### I.

Lines 23–27. As given by Gow in his Oxford *Bucolici Graeci*, they read:

δξὺ δὲ κωκύοισα δι' ἄγκεα μακρὰ φορεῖται  
'Ασσύριον βοόωσα πόσιν, καὶ παῖδα καλεῖσα.  
ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν μέλαν αἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἄωρεῖτο, 25  
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶν φονίσσαστο, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ  
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

If this whole passage is to make sense, I should like first to adopt Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones' suggestion that in line 24 the comma be removed from where it stands and put after βοόωσα. The meaning would then be: "crying out in Assyrian fashion (i.e., in a wild Oriental manner; for Assyrian [=Syrian] exuberance, cf. Themistius 24. 301b and Heliodorus 4. 17), calling her husband and child." In line 18 of the same poem, Adonis is again called a παῖς, and in Theocritus 15. 129–32 he is also treated as a husband and as a youngster, so that the hendiadys πόσιν καὶ παῖδα should not bother us, as it seems to have bothered Hermann, Ahrens, and Legrand, who emended it into πολλά.

Line 25, as it stands, makes absolutely no sense. Blood cannot αἰωρεῖται round anybody's navel, not even a goddess', nor can νιν refer to Adonis, as Wilamowitz and Edmonds thought, for in that case we would expect τὸν and not νιν. We should certainly accept Ahrens' emendation of αἶμα into εἶμα, which is supported by the κυανόστολα of line 4 and by Theocritus 15. 134–35: λύσασαι δὲ κόμαν καὶ ἐπὶ σφυρὰ κόλπον ἀνέισαι / στήθεσι φαινομένοις λιγυρᾶς ἀρξέμεθ' αὐιδᾶς.

Finally in line 26 I should like to adopt an old suggestion by an unnamed scholar (reported by Valckenaer) who emended μηρῶν into μηρῶ, the Doric genitive singular (cf. τῶ in line 91); for the plural is both clumsy and inaccurate (cf. lines 7 and 16). It is the blood of Adonis' wound which stained the goddess' bared breast—bared because of her mourning (cf. Theocritus 15. 134–35)—when she clasped him in her arms and kissed him, as we know from lines 7–14 and 40–50. I do not think, therefore that Ahrens' unpoetic and strictly "logical" emendation of μηρῶν into χειρῶν is necessary.

So the whole passage, as emended, should read:

δξὺ δὲ κωκύοισα δι' ἄγκεα μακρὰ φορεῖται  
'Ασσύριον βοόωσα, πόσιν καὶ παῖδα καλεῖσα.  
ἀμφὶ δὲ νιν μέλαν εἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἄωρεῖτο, 25  
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶ φονίσσαστο, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ  
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

#### II.

Line 39. This, as given by Gow, who follows one of the two extant manuscripts, runs: Κύπριδος αἰνὸν ἔρωτα τίς οὐκ ἔκλαυσεν ἄν αἰαῖ; "Εκλαυσεν ἄν, however, is obviously wrong, especially after lines 32–38, in which we are told that everything—mountains and trees, rivers, fountains and flowers—has lamented the death of Adonis and Aphrodite's tragic love for him. Codex V felt this and omitted ἄν; and Ludwig emended ἄν αἰαῖ into ἐν αἰᾶ, which was not accepted by Gow.

I should like to suggest ἄν' αἶαν for the ἄν αἰαῖ of codex Tr. "Across the earth" (cf. *Odyssey* 19. 408, ἀνὰ χθόνα) makes good sense, and the manuscript error can be easily explained, if the last two strokes of N, which was the last letter in the line, faded away, and