

## NOTES ON LATIN PROSE TEXTS

J. M. HUNT

### I

Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 1. 4. 8: "inmutauit ergo," inquit, "subdidit uerbum ei uerbo, quod *omiserat*, finitim. . . ."

Against *omiserat*, which in the larger context looks to be corrupt, editors cite Madvig's *promiserat* and Hagen's *omissurus erat*. Neither is plausible; and the latter, however much it panders to paleography, I do not fully understand. The sense required for the clause is *quod debuerat dicere*. But given the prominence of *debere* in the preceding discussion—it is in fact the very word at issue—Gellius had every reason to avoid *debuerat* and obtain that sense by writing, as I propose, *opus erat*. Once *opus* had become *onus* (as has happened, for instance, at Plaut. *Amph.* 175 and *Truc.* 470), the resultant *onuserat* would have been diplomatically indistinguishable from *omiserat* (same number of vertical strokes in *nu* and *mi*, as profusely exemplified in G. Friedrich's note on Catullus 3. 16).

### II

In the first and second sentences of *Periocha Liuiana* 30 we read: "(Scipio) in Africa Carthaginienses et *eundem* Syphacem, Numidia regem, Hasdrubalemque pluribus proeliis uicit adiuuante Masinissa, bina castra expugnauit, in quibus XL hominum ferro ignique consumpta sunt. Syphacem per C. Laelium et Masinissam cepit." On this vicious *eundem*, which has imposed on all editors, not an umbra of suspicion seems yet to have fallen. And vicious it is: for it is both insufferable with the first (rather than a subsequent) mention of Syphax and incompatible with the qualifier *Numidia regem*. If editors have tolerated it unflinchingly, the basis of their tolerance is not far to seek. It lies in the compositional nature of the *Periochae* as a whole, and involves a problem which has received almost universal neglect. It is a problem barely touched by the once popular speculations on how this collection might be related to Martial's abridged Livy (as advertised in *Epig.* 14. 190) or, indeed, by external considerations of *Textgeschichte*. Its solution must rest on the internal evidence of the *Periochae* themselves. And that evidence, unless I am gravely mistaken, warrants the conclusion that, as conceived and composed, the *Periochae* were intended to be self-sufficient pieces, merely listing (sentence by sentence) the contents of a particular book and thus showing no interdependence in phraseology or content. They were, in other words, a tabulation rather than a readable digest, and might be consulted in any sequence whatever: a reader seeking assistance turned to the relevant *periocha* and found the contents of its book surveyed as if, virtually, no other book existed. Accepting such a conclusion without further argument, I transfer the *onus probandi* to those who would contest it and return to apply it to *eundem*.

Editors have taken *eundem* in their stride presumably because the name

Syphax occurs in the preceding *periocha*. But so do the names Scipio and the Carthaginians and Hasdrubal: why not, therefore, *idem* Scipio or *eosdem* Carthaginienses or *eundem* Hasdrubalem? That the references to Syphax in *Per.* 29 are too far from the end to make *eundem* at the beginning of 30 intelligible or desirable, one might fairly object. But let that objection be waived and this question be asked. What is the epitomator's practice on such a point? Does he ever, when a name occurs in a preceding *periocha*, mark its first occurrence in a following *periocha* by a form of *idem*? The question is not unreasonably put: given the enormous number of names that occur in more than one *periocha* and given the extent of the collection, where could conditions lend themselves more favorably to such a use of *idem*? And yet elsewhere in the collection never once does the epitomator resort to it. Whoever would henceforth retain *eundem* must first demonstrate that the *Periochae* were not intended to be self-sufficient pieces; he must then explain why the epitomator, if he cherished his *eundem* at all, did not join it to the name alone (rather than spoil its effect by adding *Numidiae regem*); and he must finally explain what property, inviting the epitomator to use a form of *idem* to pick up a reference from a preceding *periocha*, is possessed by this name in this place and not by hundreds upon hundreds of others in similar places.

So much for the diagnosis; now for the treatment. Here I should prefer to rehearse what I regard as plausible approaches to the passage's *sanitas*, and to do so without insistence: for if none of them has, as once (in another connection) W. R. Smyth desired, "the touch of inevitability needed to mark it as true," that may be because, as Shackleton Bailey countered, "the truth does not happen to be inevitable." How then to proceed? We might simply delete the word, or we might delete and transpose as follows: "Scipio . . . [eundem] Syphacem, Numidiae regem, . . . uicit. . . (eundem) Syphacem . . . cepit." By either means we shall obtain, on intrinsic grounds, an equally good text. But it is hard, if we do the former, to see what might have generated *eundem* and induced its false addition. It is easy, if we do the latter, to imagine a scribe who, about to copy the first occurrence of the name, glanced erroneously to the second and thereby committed the interpolation. That the latter remedy reflects the epitomator's usage is proved, if proof be wanted, by *Per.* 125 "seditiones exercitus sui, quas corrupti a Fulvia M. Antoni uxore [note the qualifier with the first occurrence] milites aduersus imperatorem suum concitauerant, cum graui periculo inhibuit. L. Antonius cos., M. Antoni frater, eadem Fulvia conciliante bellum Caesari intulit." But as an alternative to deletion we should also consider verbal emendation. We might, as R. Renehan suggests, assume an assimilation to the case of the neighboring *Syphacem* and read *idem*. Here it ought to be significant that in the MSS the name Scipio has vanished:<sup>1</sup> without it the reference of *idem* would have become unclear, thus provoking the assimilation. In Livy's book, to be sure, the Carthaginians and Syphax-

1. Its restoration is of course mandatory. In printing the passage above I have followed O. Jahn in positioning the name *ad init.*, though three other positions are conceivable and, predictably, three other positions have been advocated. Only Jahn's and that of the *editio princeps*, after *Africa*, affect the corruption as postulated; the other two, having no apparent transcriptional (or other) advantage, I ignore.

and-Hasdrubal form separate units: Scipio may accordingly be said to have conquered the one and *likewise* the other. He may also be said to have conquered the one and *then* the other. That allows, I suppose, the possibility that *eundem* conceals something like *exinde* or *deinde*. "Inter haec uerisimilia latet uerum: eligat lector."

### III

*Periocha Liuiana* 107: praeterea res gestas a C. Caesare aduersus Gallos, qui prope uniuersi Vercingetorige Aruerno duce *defecerunt*, et laboriosas obsidiones urbium continet.

In writing which exhibits the utmost scrupulosity in the use of tenses, it is astonishing that no one has dreamed of changing *defecerunt* to *defecerant*. The change would seem imperative, and so I make it now. The *qui* clause depends upon, and is anterior to, the virtual perfect in *res gestas a Caesare* (i.e., "eas res quas gessit Caesar"); it has nothing to do with *continet*, which merely tells, by a stereotyped formula, what the book "contains." If anyone doubts the anteriority, let him consult *De bello Gallico* 7: he will find that the *defectio sub Vercingetorige* narrated in chapter 4 is later reported to a Caesar who, far from opposing it momentarily, has yet to bestir himself from Italy (chap. 6 "his rebus in Italiam Caesari nuntiatis"). If anyone suffers malaise about a pluperfect within the *res gestas* . . . *continet* formula, let him say why he does not suffer it at, for example, *Per.* 11 "res . . . gestas continet . . . aduersus Lucanos, contra quos auxilium Thurinis ferre placuerat." If anyone finally, in sheer obstinacy, trusts that the confusion of *-erant* and *-erunt*, though incessant in Latin MSS in general, might not be found in those of the *Periochae* in particular, let him heed *permiserant* / *-erunt* at *Per.* 111, not to mention the converse *fuerunt* / *-erant* at *Per.* 120. Whether the mischief arose purely as a *méprise graphique*, or was facilitated by *continet*, the latter is surely what has lulled editors into according the perfect so easy a passage.

### IV

*Epitoma Metensis* 21 and 22: id ubi [sc. uxor Spitamenis] impetrare non potuit, in conuiuio eum coegit, ut † poculum † biberet, eumque defessum somno dedit. at ubi silentium esse sensit, de lecto surrexit et puluinar uiro a capite subduxit. ita gurgulione extenso caput a corpore gladio abscidit et ita cum uno seruulo porta progressa ad Alexandrum in castra deuenit. eam custodes ad regem deduxerunt decoram ornatu ac formae dignitate, ( . . . ) cruenta erat.

On *poculum* O. Wagner (*Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.*, Suppl. 26 [1901]: 129) has this note: "*poculum biberet*, i.e. hauriret; cf. Krebs *Antibarbarus* I p. 215. estne scribendum 'pocula'? fortasse 'poculum' i. est q. 'sopor', c. 99 'poculum uenenatum.'" A dubious explanation, a slapdash conjecture, and a reference scarcely worth a reader's pains. Why should Spitamenes' wife necessarily use the banquet to poison him if she was shortly afterward to commit his murder by decapitation? That she wished for the moment merely to get him very drunk and thereby induce sleep seems a more natural interpretation in itself and finds support in Curtius 8. 3. 8 (our sole other source for the detail), who remarks that Spitamenes left the banquet *uino . . . grauis*. In the text of his recent Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1960), Mr. P. H. Thomas obelizes the word, no doubt because it is too inexplicit, and in the apparatus

supinely perpetuates Wagner's *pocula*. In affixing the obelus he goes too far: the word itself must be sound, and the explicitness which it lacks is more than likely a matter of *amount*. I suggest, therefore, in the sense "drink many a draught," either *<multum> poculum*, which would give the better emphasis, or *poculum <multum>*, which would give the better *ratio corruptelae*. In the latter the scribe's eye strayed from *pocULUM* to *mULtUM*, or the omission might be due simply to the homoeoteuton in *poculUM multUM*. Also possible, unless the style be thought too extravagant, is Renehan's *<poculum super> poculum*.

Before *cruenta erat* something is plainly missing. Editors have thus far desiderated a conjunction, which the context requires to be concessive. But no mere conjunction will produce so neat a repair as the supplement I beg now to offer. Read *dignitate*, *<elsi ueste> cruenta erat*, and the source stands illuminated both of the epitomator's phrase (Curt. 8. 3. 10 *sicuti erat cruenta ueste*, same incident) and of his scribe's blunder (a *coup d'oeil* from *dignitaTE* to *uesTE*). For the phrase again compare Livy 24. 21. 7 *cruentam . . . uestem*. But further, Quintilian 5. 9. 1 ff., where *cruenta uestis* figures large as a *signum* that one may have committed *homicidium*, demonstrates that, for the circumstance, we have secured exactly the right commonplace: compare, for example, Quintilian 5. 12. 3 "caedes a te commissa est: *cruentam uestem* habuisti."

## V

*Epitoma Metensis* 29: in his [sc. uirginibus] fuit Oxyartis filia Rhoxane *omnibus* formosissima.

Several years ago I wrote as follows:<sup>2</sup> "*omnibus* est difficile à défendre à moins que l'on ne l'interprète comme équivalent à *in his*, justification si improbable que M. Thomas a suivi Fuchs en insérant *ex* devant le mot. Il serait plus opportun, à mon avis, de corriger *omnibus* en *omnium*, non seulement parce qu'en abréviation *omniū* et *omnib'*, ou *omniu'* (vu la variation orthographique *b / u*), sont très difficiles à distinguer, mais aussi—ce qui est plus significatif—parce que notre auteur emploie le génitif partout ailleurs où il s'agit de cette construction." As a protest against Wagner's misguided notion (*Jahrb. f. klass. Philol.*, Suppl. 26 [1901]: 131) that *omnibus* is "ablatius comparationis" governed by "superlatius pro comparatiuo," these conjectures were perhaps useful. But their utility has reached its end, and a palinode is now in order. The text was ever faultless, and had merely been awaiting, this long time, its first interpreter. It found that interpreter in R. Renehan, who *in litteris ad me datis*, observing that both *<ex> omnibus* and *omnium* would be otiose after *in his*, proceeded to construe *omnibus* as "datius iudicantis": that is, "to the eyes of all." His interpretation, I have since discovered and am pleased to add, is placed beyond dispute by Curtius 8. 4. 23 f., "Rhoxane . . . *omnium* . . . *oculos* conuertit in se."<sup>3</sup>

Villanova University

2. "Notes sur l'*Epitoma Metensis*," *AC* 41 (1972): 242 ff., at 242. I have discussed other textual problems in "An Emendation in the *Epitoma Metensis*," *CP* 67 (1972): 287 f.; and "Cinq Explications de Texte," *AC* 43 (1974): 355 ff.

3. I am pleased as well to thank Professor Renehan for allowing these *adnotatiunculae* to have the good fortune of his scrutiny.