There is in the text tradition of Sappho's poem the variant reading ποικιλόφρον for the first word (cf. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, pp. 4–5, for details) which of course contains the element -φρων "mind." I do not claim that this reading is to be preferred, but I should argue that it does at least suggest that some ancients agreed with my etymology in this poem. It is possible that Sappho did indeed write ποικιλόφρον, and if she did, that would seem to clinch the etymology of Aphrodite.

Alcaeus, her contemporary and compatriot, used it in one of his poems (D 11. 7 L.-P.), so the word was definitely available for Sappho had she wanted it.

I think that all the above indicates that Sappho regarded Aphrodite actually and etymologically as the goddess who deprives one of one's wits.[3]

William F. Wyatt, Jr.

Brown University

3. Z. Phillip Ambrose has made the following interesting observation. Ancient authors were acutely conscious of sound and sound symbolism and hence would avoid potentially distorting etymologies and symbols. Had Sappho, therefore, *not* wanted to suggest the proposed etymology, she would have been at some pains not to point to it by her choice of words. A negative point, perhaps, but one that to me seems to make excellent sense and carry considerable weight.

## TRIMALCHIO'S GAME (PETRONIUS 33)

"... permittetis tamen finiri lusum." sequebatur puer cum tabula terebinthina et crystallinis tesseris, notavique rem omnium delicatissimam. pro calculis enim albis ac nigris aureos argenteosque habebat denarios. interim dum ille omnium textorum dicta inter lusum consumit ...
textorum *H et editores*, testorum *L Memm.*, tesserariorum?

Since the game involves the use of dice (*tesserae*) as well as counters (*calculi*), it must be the *duodecim scripta*, which resembled backgammon, rather than the *latrunculorum ludus*, which was more like draughts or checkers.[1] Trimalchio is not, as he claims, seriously resuming an interrupted contest. No opponent is present or ever was, even behind the scenes, and it is doubtful that the "Twelve-Line Game" could have been played as a solitaire, though that is evidently Trimalchio's pretense. As so often in the *Cena*, he is merely putting on an act to impress his guests, throwing the dice, moving the counters on the board, and muttering certain "sayings."

Editors still print *textorum*, though it has never been satisfactorily explained. Why would Trimalchio "use up all the weavers' sayings," that is, by either cursing or telling little stories, as it seems that weavers did to relieve the tedium of their work? Again,

"sayings of all weaves" or kinds, from an assumed nominative *textum*, is vague and pointless.

Is it rash to suggest that the word needs emendation and can be reasonably emended? The scribe who copied the remote mutual ancestor of H (the famous manuscript from Trau in Dalmatia, saec. xv) and of L and Memm. (two groups of manuscripts) may first have written *tesseris* in full and then, soon reaching *tesserariorum*, he may have abbreviated it to something like *tessorum*.[2] Everyone who has collated Latin manuscripts knows that this was a common scribal practice: a somewhat unusual word was written in full at its first occurrence and if it or its cognate soon recurred this was more or less abbreviated. An example may be cited from the first page of the *Cena* in H: *trimalchio* is written twice (p. 206, lines 4, 19) but it soon becomes *tmalchio* with the suprascript *i* denoting *ri* (lines 21, 23, 34). There is reason to believe that *testorum* (L Memm.) is actually closer to the authentic reading than *textorum* (H), as this manuscript sometimes exhibits -*x*- for -*s*- or -*ss*-: *odixeam, sextercium, sexcenta*.[3] The word *tesserarius*, "dice-player," is probably evidenced in Ammianus 28. 4. 21,

1. See my note in *TAPA*, XCVIII (1967), 325–26, with the references.

2. Perhaps *tessaor(um)* with a small suprascript *e* and *i* to indicate the syllables -*er*- and -*ri*-, respectively. Both of these

signs appear in H, as can be seen in Stephen Gaselee's facsimile edition (Cambridge, 1915).

3. See p. 206, line 42; 207, 11; 209, 28; 212, 40; 213, 3 and 12; 216, 18; 218, 8, ed. Gaselee.

where Gardthausen and Rolfe, following the editio Gelenii (Basel, 1533), printed it, though Clark, with an excess of caution, reproduced *t*.........*s* from Codex Vaticanus 1873.

If this conjecture is acceptable, Trimalchio does precisely what one would expect him to do in the circumstances. He exhausts the full repertory of "dice-players' sayings" to round out his display of expertise. Such appeals to luck or to the dice themselves are of course universal and need no illustration.

ROGER A. PACK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

## *MERCURI, FACUNDE NEPOS ATLANTIS*

Horace's first Ode to Mercury (1. 10) is, in Porphyrion's terse opinion, *ab Alcaeo lyrico poeta*. Critics have long speculated on the extent of the Roman poet's indebtedness, the general sentiment usually favoring his originality.[1] Conjecture is replaced by fact, however, in the case of the first stanza. Hephaestion preserves for us the opening lines of a hymn by Alcaeus, apparently the poem Horace "imitated" (308*b* L.-P.):

> χαῖρε, Κυλλάνας ὁ μέδεις, σὲ γάρ μοι
> θῦμος ὕμνην, τὸν κορύφαισιν †αὔγαῖς†
> Μαῖα γέννατο Κρονίδᾳ μίγεισα
> παμβασίληϊ.

Comparison with Horace's opening lines points up some notable differences:

> Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis,
> qui feros cultus hominum recentum
> voce formasti catus et decorae
>     more palaestrae,
>
> te canam, . . .

Whether or not Alcaeus went on to treat the god's affectionate involvement with mankind's cultural development we may never know. But we can observe two changes of emphasis concerning nomenclature and genealogy. In Alcaeus' initial stanza, though the god is greeted and his immediate parentage explained, he himself is never named. Horace, by contrast, apostrophizes Mercury in his poem's first word. This might well have forewarned a Roman reader that the poem, whatever its Greek elements and even specific borrowings from Alcaeus, was directly concerned with Mercury as god of barter and exchange—the implications of his name. This the poem proceeds to show, on levels ranging from humorous to deeply serious.

The second alteration is of equal importance. Instead of Alcaeus' more expansive look at Zeus's encounter with Maia on Mt. Cyllene, Horace briskly alludes only to the god's maternal grandfather, Atlas. Though commentators offer no reason for Horace's choice beyond the honorific genealogy proper to a hymn, a clue is furnished by Servius Auctus annotating *Aeneid* 1. 741. Virgil has introduced at Dido's banquet the singer Iopas *docuit quem maximus Atlas*. After telling us that Atlas was the son of Iapetus, Servius adds: "hic quod annum in tempora diviserit et primus stellarum cursus vel circulorum vel siderum transitus naturasque descripserit, caelum dictus est sustinere. qui nepotem suum Mercurium et Herculem docuisse dicitur." That Atlas "taught" his grandson is not attested elsewhere. His instruction of Hercules—an easy rationalization for "sharing the burden" of the heavens—is mentioned as early as Herodorus.[2] In literature previous to or contemporary with Horace we can call as further witnesses to the more general allegory of Atlas as astronomer-philosopher Xenagoras,[3] Cicero, Diodorus Siculus,[4] and Vitruvius. Cicero, linking Atlas and his brother, details the tradition which by his time would also have had Stoic and Euhemeristic overtones (*Tusc.*

1. As Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin, 1913), p. 312; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. 162; G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 146 f.; R. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), p. 126.

2. F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 31 F 13 (pp. 218, 504, and supp. pp. 549–50).
3. *FGrH* 240 F 32 (pp. 703, 1010).
4. 3. 60 (cf. 4. 27 for Atlas as teacher of Hercules).