

been an exceptional measure dictated by wartime nervous tension (T. Frank, *AJP*, XLVIII [1927], 109 f.).

J. L. Ussing's *libertate privatum* probably represents the reality better than his suggestion that the phrase meant *columnae adstrictum*, which leaves *os* unexplained.

Something which "der keusche Däne" would have been unlikely to suppose (F. Scheidweiler, *RhM*, XCVII [1954], 162), is what, I believe, we are here dealing with, namely, the gross and humorous popular metaphor for mistreatment with which readers of Catullus are familiar (cf. 10. 12, 16. 1, 21. 8 and 13, 37. 8, 74. 5, and especially 28. 9 ff., expressing his ill-treatment by Memmius). The sexual meaning of *columna*, equivalent to the *trabs* of Catullus 28. 10, is well attested. Catullus, in whose time Plautus was much admired (cf. F. Leo, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit.*, p. 136), shows a good deal of coincidence in the popular element of his language with the language of Plautus, as a reading of J. Svennung's *Catullus Bildersprache* makes evident. Cf. H. Bardon, *Latomus*, XVI (1957), 616 f.; L. Alfonsi, *Dionisio*, p. 10 (and compare L. Afranius 410R and Catullus 13. 8).

"Die Alten waren in Eroticis nicht zimperlich" (Kroll); and the topic on which, I suggest, the metaphor was based would not have been too gross for Plautus, any more than it was for Catullus. It was not alien as a subject for jest even to the chaste Muse of Terence (cf. *Ad.* 215, *os praebui*). Catullus' humorously literal amplification of the figurative expression with reference to himself at 28. 10 shows how well-worn as an image of mistreatment the usage must have been. Plautus, who was, like Shakespeare, "ein Meister in solchen scherzhaften Wiederbelebungen verblichener Metaphern" (Svennung, *op. cit.*, p. 15), was using, I suggest, the same figure in the same wryly humorous way with reference to Naevius' experience at the hands of the Metelli as was Catullus with reference to his own ill-treatment by Memmius.

The allusion in this passage is purely Roman, and the suggested pun illustrates once again Plautus' flair for punning independently of his Greek models; cf. G. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, p. 355.

J. F. KILLEEN

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, GALWAY

### FESTUS' SOURCE ON JULIAN'S PERSIAN EXPEDITION

In his discussion of the sources of Festus' *Breviarium* J. W. Eadie, after noting some similarity between the phraseology of the beginning of the chapter (28) on Julian's Persian expedition and the language of Eutropius (10. 16. 1) on the same, remarks that the source itself "is more difficult to determine. . . It is also possible that a written source was used."<sup>1</sup> M. F. A. Brok suggested that Festus was summarizing Libanius *Or.* 18. 248–68.<sup>2</sup> Certainly many of the details in both Festus and Libanius are the same. But the accounts of Julian's decision upon the manner and the route of the journey home from Ctesiphon differ. Libanius (18. 260–66) defends the Emperor's decision, whereas Festus explains that Julian, led astray by a Persian who deserted to the Romans for this

purpose, made his choice against the advice of his companions.

Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* 6. 1) has every detail common to Festus and Libanius, except the explanation of the failure of the army to take Ctesiphon (he omits this completely). His account of Julian's decision upon the return journey agrees with that of Festus. With Libanius he shares not only material not in Festus, but also similarity of phrase, including the words *διώρυγα ναυσίπορον* (Libanius *Or.* 18. 245) of the Naarmalcha canal. This suggests either that Sozomen and Festus followed Libanius and supplemented his account with another version (perhaps the ultimate source of *Or.* 18), or, more likely, that all three writers used a common source and Libanius, since it suited his encomiastic purpose,

1. *The Breviarium of Festus* (London, 1967), pp. 96 ff. The quote is from p. 98.

2. *De Perzische Expeditie van Keizer Julian volgens Ammianus Marcellinus* (Groningen, 1959), p. 13.

inserted a different, less unflattering version of Julian's decision upon the journey home.

The identity of this source is uncertain. One might suggest the Seleucus who had been on the expedition and whom Libanius (*Ep.* 1508, ed. Foerster) urged to write an account of it, which he did if the Seleucus mentioned by the *Suda* as the author of a *Parthica* is the

same man.<sup>3</sup> If this were so, Festus and Sozomen would have used the *Parthica* itself, but for *Or.* 18, which seems to have been written in A.D. 365 (the same year as the letter to Seleucus), Libanius would have used notes supplied by his correspondent.<sup>4</sup>

R. C. BLOCKLEY

CARLETON UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA

3. So O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 273.

4. From *Ep.* 1220. 7-9 it is clear that Libanius did seek information from friends who had been on the expedition.

### MYRRHA'S NURSE: THE MARATHON RUNNER IN OVID?

In an article published in 1967,<sup>1</sup> J. Suolahti discusses the story of the Marathon runner who died after delivering the news of the Greek victory in the words, "Rejoice, we have conquered!" Suolahti suggests that the story in this form may be fictitious and in fact a creation of Lucian, whose *Pro lapsu inter salutandum* 3 appears to be the earliest source for it. The first surviving mention of the Marathon runner occurs in Plutarch's *De glor. Ath.* 347C, including the information that Heracleides Ponticus disagrees with "most" as to the runner's name. According to Plutarch, before he expired the runner cried, *Chairete kai chairomen*—"Rejoice, and we rejoice!" Cobet emended this, substituting the words found in Lucian, *Chairete, nikomen*. The emendation had no real justification, however, since there did not seem to be any evidence before Lucian for these words of the runner. The story itself, however, is plainly older than Lucian; Heracleides wrote in the fourth century B.C. Is it possible that the tradition for the cry, "Rejoice, we have conquered!" is also earlier than it has seemed?

These words do in fact occur before Lucian, and in a most unlikely source. In *Metamorphoses* 10 Ovid tells the unsavory story of Myrrha, who develops a passion for her own father. As soon as Myrrha's old nurse finds this out, she hurries off to her master to offer him the favors—under cover of darkness—of an anonymous but willing beauty. The father accepts readily and bids the old woman bring him the girl. The nurse returns to her mistress

and cries (*Met.* 10. 442 f.): "Rejoice, my child, we have conquered!" ("utque domum rediit, 'Gaude, mea' dixit 'alumna: vicimus!'" ).

The nurse's expression seems somehow incongruous. Editors have been puzzled by it and have felt obliged to comment. In 1822 in his notes to G. Gierig's edition of Ovid (IV, 196), N. Lemaire wrote, "Vicimus, formula exsultantis propter spem certam," but he gave no further examples. M. von Albrecht's 1966 edition of Haupt-Korn-Ehwald repeats the note of previous editions, "der Ausdruck wie 4,356," and B. van Proosdij, in his edition of D. Bosselaar published in 1959, compares 6. 513.

In these passages, however, the word *vicimus* is used as a triumphant exclamation by the nymph who succeeds in tricking the future Hermaphroditus into her fatal pool, and by Tereus once he succeeds in getting Philomela aboard the ship that will carry them both to the privacy he has planned for her rape. In both cases considerable effort and suspense have preceded the "victory"; two contests of wills and wits have been won, and *vicimus* is not at all incongruous in the mouths of the winners.

In *Met.* 10. 442 f., on the contrary, the expression is excessive, as all editors sense. Rather than the long descriptions of deceit and maneuver practiced by the nymph and Tereus, we have five lines in which the nurse makes her proposal to Myrrha's father and he accepts at once (437-41). There is no reluctance, no contest, no suspense. Is her announcement, even as *Ausdruck*, appropriate?

1. J. Suolahti, "The Origin of the Story about the First Marathon-runner," *Arctos*, V (1967), 127-33.