

detail; *manantia* goes well with *inficiunt* and with *fluitare*; its reference is not difficult after the firmly established neuter plurals of 75–77, and the *tremantia* of 77, occupying the same place in the line. Lucretius uses the verb fourteen times, in a variety of contexts.

IV

praeterea magna ex parti mare montis ad eius
radices frangit fluctus aestumque resorbet.
ex hoc usque mari speluncae montis ad altas
perveniunt subter fauces. hac ire fatendumst

* * *

et penetrare mari penitus res cogit aperto
atque efflare foras ideoque extollere flammam
saxaque subiectare et harenae tollere nimbos
[6: 694–700].

The exceptional force and fury of Etna, and its ejection of rocks and clouds of sand, are in large part explained by the force of the sea that lashes its roots. It seems therefore appropriate to read in 698:

et penetrare maris penitus vis cogit aperti.

The penetration is deep because it has behind it the full force of the open sea. *Penitus* is perhaps shared between the mountain and the sea; far within the mountain, and from far out at sea; but this may be overly subtle. It still seems best to assume a lacuna after 697.

L. A. MACKAY

KENSINGTON, CALIFORNIA

THE SALE OF SACRIFICIAL MEAT

In the *Vita Aesopi* the following passage occurs: ἐλθὼν [*sc.* Aesop] οὖν εἰς τὸν μάκελλον τῶν τεθυμένων χοιριδίων τὰς γλώσσας ἡγόρασεν.¹ In Planudes' *Vita Aesopi*,² the same story is related, but Planudes has omitted the detail that the tongues were from sacrificial pigs. Apparently, Planudes did not see any point in mentioning the sacrificial nature of the pigs and thus omitted that detail. Why, then, did the author of the *Vita* specify that the tongues were from sacrificial pigs? That is the problem of this paper. And in the light of the following passages, the whole question of the sale of sacrificial meat may have some interesting implications for the passage in the *Vita Aesopi*.

So far as I know, the text quoted above has never been cited in the debate over a passage of Pliny's famous letter to Trajan concerning the Christians (10. 96. 10). Sherwin-White³ accepts Körte's⁴ emendation: "... passimque venire victimarum <car-nem> cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor in-

veniebatur." Of course, the Aesop passage is in harmony with Körte's emendation. However, the Aesop passage should have been cited, since it may be the case that only in this passage do we have an identifiable person entering a butcher shop and buying sacrificial meat. Moreover, the Aesop passage would be an additional small testimonium for W. Schmid's⁵ emendation of *passim* to *prosicium* or *prosicem*, if tongues may be considered *prosicies*.

Another interesting passage in this connection is found in St. Paul: I Corinthians 10:25 and 28. Apparently, a Christian, on entering a butcher shop, would not know which of the meats were sacrificial and which were not. It would be necessary, one supposes, for someone to inform him. How, then, did Aesop know that he was buying the tongues of sacrificial pigs?

If the author of the *Vita Aesopi* was a lower-class Egyptian of the first century after Christ, as B. E. Perry⁶ maintains, it is tempting to search for some recondite

1. B. E. Perry, *Aesopica* (Urbana, 1952) p. 52, § 51. A similar passage occurs in § 54. Also in the *W Vita*, pp. 90 and 91, the same passage occurs with a few changes which will be discussed later.

2. A. Eberhard, *Fabulae Romanenses Graece conscriptae* (Leipzig, 1872), pp. 259–62.

3. *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 709–10.

4. "Zu Plinius' Brief über die Christen," *Hermes*, LXIII (1928), 481–84.

5. "Ein verkannter Ausdruck der Opfersprache in Plinius' Christenbrief," *VChr.*, VII (1953), 75–78.

6. *Op. cit.*, p. 2: "Neque de ipsa vitae forma primitiva, quod maioris refert, iam dubitare possis quin sit in Aegypto ab auctore aliquo de plebe Nilotica parum litterato . . ." *Ibid.*, p. 5: "... quem [*sc.* auctorem] vixisse probabile est saeculo p. C. n. primo . . ." But see the same author's *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Haverford, 1936), p. 26: "... the most that one may say with certainty is that

explanation of his intention in using the apparently superfluous word *τεθυμένων*. Is there some irrecoverable sly dig, aimed at the early Christians, in the *archetypus vulgaris*? Was Aesop, the favorite of Isis, adding insult to injury by cooking pigs' tongues for his upper-class Greek master, Xanthos? Would the author's Egyptian audience look askance at those upper-class Greeks who ate sacrificial meats—and pigs' tongues at that?

At this point it is advisable to look more closely at the relevant passages in the G and W *Vitae*. In the G *Vita*, Aesop, on the first day, went to the butcher shop and bought the tongues of sacrificial pigs (§51). On the second day, he bought the tongues of *all* the rest of the sacrificial pigs (§54). In the W *Vita*, Aesop, on the first day, went to the butcher shop and bought the tongues of *all* the sacrificial pigs (§51), but, on the second day, he merely bought pigs' tongues, apparently from non-sacrificial pigs (§54).

Which of these two alternatives reports the true reading of the *archetypus vulgaris*? It may be that the W *Vita* has the correct reading. Since Xanthos, Aesop's master, told him, on the first day, to buy something splendid and useful, Aesop bought the tongues of sacrificial pigs, presumably because they were better than those of non-sacrificial pigs. On the second day, when Aesop was told to buy something bad, he bought the tongues of non-sacrificial pigs. This is what the W *Vita* reports and thus it would be only the W *Vita* which understands the point of *τεθυμένων*. Did the G *Vita* then change the details in order to avoid the implication that sacrificial meats were better than non-sacrificial meats? This denigration of Greek customs would be in harmony with Perry's understanding of the intentions of the G *Vita*.

On the other hand, it may have been the

W *Vita* which changed the details in the *archetypus vulgaris* in order to enhance the value of Greek customs. This interpretation would also be in line with Perry's understanding of the W *Vita*. But if this is the true interpretation, why did the *archetypus vulgaris* mention *τεθυμένων* at all?

A second interpretation of these passages is possible, and it may solve the last question. It is possible that the *archetypus vulgaris* mentioned the specification, *τεθυμένων*, merely to indicate that there was a plentiful and extraordinary supply of pigs' tongues in the butcher shop. Aesop would need a great number of tongues to serve all the guests three times on two successive days. And it would be possible for him to do so, since providentially and fictionally there was a great sacrifice of pigs at the time. (As W. S. Ferguson⁷ points out, some of the sacrifices were elaborate. He calculates that 240 victims were sacrificed on one occasion at Athens in 334/33 B.C.) Thus, only the G *Vita* preserves the reading of the original, although it is possible that something has been omitted from the text. The passages from the W *Vita*, on this interpretation, would then be either a correction of the original or merely a mistake.

All this, however, does not explain what the situation was when a purchaser entered a butcher shop. There are contradictions, certainly, between the Corinthians passage, the Pliny passage, and the Aesop passage. According to the Corinthians passage, a purchaser would not know whether the meats were from sacrificial victims or not. In the Pliny passage, it would seem that he did know. In the Aesop passage, if the W *Vita* is correct, the purchaser would value the meat of sacrificial victims over that of non-sacrificial victims and thus the meats must have been readily distinguishable. Did

the *Life of Aesop*, in the oldest form that we know it (i.e. in G), must have been composed, or rewritten, at some time between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D." Also see p. 25: "I think it probable, however, in view of the general character of the book, that the archetype of which we have been speaking was composed sometime in the second century after Christ." The main points which Perry makes in the *praefatio* of the *Aesopica* are that G

is closer to the *archetypus vulgaris* (see p. 22) and that W depends on an *editio scholastica* which has expunged in part the prejudices of the *archetypus vulgaris* against Greek learning and culture.

7. "Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Hellenic League," *Hesperia*, XVII (1948), 134, note.

Aesop's butcher charge more for the meat of sacrificial victims than for that of non-sacrificial animals?

It is, of course, the case that customs varied from place to place and from one period of time to another. If one could state with some degree of certainty what the *archetypus vulgaris* actually read, one could

proceed with greater confidence. As the case stands, however, the problem of the sale of sacrificial meats still awaits its proper solution.

M. ISENBERG

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SENECA MEDEA 556-57

Medea vermag nicht, Jason zur gemeinsamen Flucht zu überreden. Er versucht vielmehr, sie abzuschieben und bietet ihr jedes gewünschte *solamen* zu ihrer Flucht an (539). Als Medea darauf ihre Kinder fordert und Jason gerade dies ausdrücklich verweigert, erkennt sie, wo er zu treffen ist, und kann nun einen versöhnlicheren Ton vor-täuschen:

MED. . . . voce iam extrema peto,
ne, si qua noster dubius effudit dolor,
555 maneant in animo verba: melioris tibi
memoria nostri sedeat; haec irae data
oblitterentur. IAS. Omnia ex animo expuli
precorque et ipse, fervidam ut mentem regas
placideque tractes; miseras lenit quies.
560 MED. Discessit. itane est? vadis oblitus mei
et tot meorum facinorum? excidimus tibi?
numquam excidemus . . .

ken an sie bewahren. Mit "haec irae data [sc. verba] oblitterentur" wies Medea über ihre Person auf ihre Worte zurück, was erstens ein *illa* fordern würde, da ihre Worte ja vergessen sein sollen und daher als weit zurückliegend gekennzeichnet werden müssen (vgl. *si qua . . . verba*, "wenn jemals"), während *haec* auf die Medea weist, die gerade von sich selbst spricht; zweitens würde das Verständnis von *haec irae data* als "vom Zorn eingegebene Worte"¹ einen im Lateinischen unbekannten *dativus causae* fordern. Der Änderung von *irae* in *ira* (was neben *data* fast Kakophonie wäre) ist die von *oblitterentur* in *oblitteretur* [sc. *Medea*] nicht nur aus den genannten Gründen vor-zuziehen, sondern auch, weil Medea selbst den Erfolg ihrer Bitten mit einem verhalten triumphierenden *oblitus mei* quittiert.

HERMANN FUNKE

UNIVERSITÄT MANNHEIM

Er soll also ihre durch den Schmerz verzerrten Reden vergessen und ein besseres Anden-

1. So die *communis opinio* der Übersetzer: z.B. F. J. Miller (London, 1917), L. Herrmann (Paris, 1924), T. Thomann (Zürich, 1961). Die Übersetzung "dies sei meinem Zorn zugut gerechnet" (M. Schmitt-Hartlieb, Tübingen, 1929) würde eine sonst im Lateinischen nicht belegte Übertragung der Junktur "aliquid precibus, famae, consanguinitati, etc.

dare" ("zuliebe tun") auf Appellativa der Gemütsbewegung fordern, was mit Ausdrücken wie (*con*)*donare*, *concedere*, (*at*)*tribuere* wiedergegeben wird. Im übrigen verbiete sich jene Auffassung, weil *verba dare* zu Senecas Zeit auf die Bedeutung "leere Worte machen, täuschen" festgelegt ist (TLL, s.v. *do*, 1675. 11 ff.); so z.B. Sen. *Thyest.* 1056 f.

A NOTE ON HELLENISTIC ORTHOGRAPHY

I. *Ποιέω* in IG II². 774

For most texts, scholars are not able to consult originals but must depend on editors. An instance where editors can be shown to have erred and the Athenian scribe can be shown to have been consistent is therefore worth recording.

IG II². 774 is an Athenian decree, non-stoikhedon, and certainly of *s. III a.* It has

been dated 253/52 B.C. most recently by W. K. Pritchett-B. D. Meritt, *Chronology of Hellenistic Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), pages xxi and 99. For the present study, however, the precise year is immaterial and details of the orthography are the sole concern.

The first fragments to be published (by U. Koehler, *Hermes*, V [1871], 3-4) were the present Fragment *b*, lines 1-24, which comes from the left side; and Fragment *c*, lines