

Verona palimpsest; the other MSS have *si*.¹ The variant *sed* (accepted by recent editors) receives additional support from the emended version (with ⟨*sed*⟩) of 45. 42. 7 and vice versa. This will seem to some a flagrant example of circular reasoning. It is not; the principle involved is one of general methodological interest, and it seems to me *operae pretium* to explain briefly the steps involved.

In 5. 52. 12 scholars, when the reading of the Veronensis became known, accepted it in preference to the *si* of the other MSS on grounds of sense and style—without knowledge of the conjecture ⟨*sed*⟩ in 45. 42. 7. Thus Conway and Walters, in their Oxford text of Livy, pronounce upon the variant *si* at 5. 52. 12 the verdict “*vix recte*.” Ogilvie in his *Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965) remarks ad loc.: “*sed ab*: Ver.’s reading which gives the effective antithesis *non voluntate . . . sed metu* is to be preferred to N’s *si ab*. . . .” (He might have compared 21. 39. 5 “*non metu solum sed etiam voluntate*.”)² Similarly, in 45. 42. 7 I originally concluded that *sed* was wanted for the stylistic reasons set forth above—but without at first recalling 5. 52. 12. That is, in each passage the reasons for adopting *sed* are (in my judgment) weighty *quite apart from any consideration of the other passage*. If it appears that (1) *sed* is independently probable in both passages, and (2) it is then seen that the two passages are parallel stylistically, then this agreement, as it is not likely to be due to chance, may be legitimately taken as an additional argument in support of *sed* in both places.

ROBERT RENEHAN
Boston College

1. At my request Charles Murgia kindly supplied the following: “The writing of *si* for *sed* is very common in minuscule MSS because the common continental abbreviation for *sed* is *ſ*, in which the comma looks very much like an *i*. I have seen some scribes write *si* for *sed* not tens, but perhaps hundreds of times.” It thus can be seen that *si* for *sed* is a commonplace confusion—but one which is more recent than the Verona palimpsest. Thus, *sed* in the palimpsest should not be explained as a paleographical corruption of *si*; whereas *si* in the later MSS may easily be explained as a corruption of *sed* (especially easy in this sentence, in which *si* has already occurred twice).

2. Strictly, and the fact is significant, *sed* as a possible substitution for *si* in 5. 52. 12 was known, but ignored, long before the discovery of the Veronensis (first brought to light by Mai in 1818). I quote from the variorum edition of Livy edited by A. Drakenborch (Amsterdam, 1738–46), 2:234: “*Si ab hostibus metu relenti sumus] sed ab hostibus* Gaertn. et Fragm. Hav. *Sed male; magna enim emphasis est in repetitione τοῦ si . . .*” With this “*sed male*” denunciation of *sed* contrast Conway and Walters’ “*vix recte*” judgment of *si*. In the interval an old MS had appeared, and that has made all the difference; the *codex velustior, ergo melior* is still much with us.

A NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES’ ΦΡΟΝΤΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ

Aristophanes’ coined word *φροντιστήριον* evidently derives from the verbal stem of *φροντίζειν* and what Charles Peppler long ago characterized as “the usual suffix denoting place”;¹ and among American scholars William Arrowsmith’s “Thinkery” has become a common translation. This derivation is beyond question. Nevertheless, a thorough examination of Attic words ending in *-τήριον* reveals that they are actually few in number, that the suffix itself is by no means the “usual” one to denote place, and that this coinage therefore has a nuance and comic punch hitherto unobserved.

1. C. W. Peppler, “Comic Terminations in Aristophanes,” *AJP* 39 (1918): 173–83. In his edition of *The Clouds* (Oxford, 1968) K. J. Dover also calls attention (p. 106) to the link between *-τήριον* compounds and agent nouns in *-τής* on the analogy of *βουλευτήριον-βουλευτής*, etc. *Φροντιστής* makes its first appearance in *The Clouds* (266).

P. Chantraine points out that compounds in *-τήριον* can be divided into three general groups: names of objects, places, and—later—ceremonies or religious functions.² An investigation of all such words reveals that only a handful are actually Attic; most appear in late, technical writings or in *κοινῆ*.³ Only about a dozen *-τήριον* words denoting place were commonly used by classical authors. Of these, *ἐργαστήριον* is a common term for any kind of workshop.⁴ For the rest, we find that *βουλευτήριον*, *δεσμωτήριον*, *δικαιωτήριον*, and *δικαστήριον* are all specific names for public institutions. *Δεκατευτήριον*, *ὀρμητήριον*, and *φυλακτήριον* are much less common, almost technical, terms. *Χρηστήριον* is the seat of an oracle. It should be noted that all of these are specialized or august locations.

The final Attic examples are words of tragic diction. *Εὐνατήριον* appears three times (Aesch. *Pers.* 160; Soph. *Trach.* 918; Eur. *Or.* 590) and refers in each case to a royal bedchamber. *Οἰκητήριον* also appears only three times. In Democritus (B 171 D.-K.) it is the dwelling place of the soul, and in pseudo-Aristotle (*Mund.* 393a4) of the divine. Euripides plays upon a similar, lofty connotation for ironic effect as Orestes and Pylades abuse the absent Helen (*Or.* 1114):

Πν. τρυφὰς γὰρ ἦκει δειρ' ἔχουσα Τρωκάς;

Ορ. ὥσθ' "Ἐλλας αὐτῇ συμκρὸν οἰκητήριον.

In Aristophanes, *βουλευτήριον*, *δικαστήριον*, and *ἐργαστήριον* all appear with their common meanings. The only other compounds in *-τήριον* denote not places but objects. Thus we find *νικητήριον*, a victory prize (*Eq.* 1253, etc.), *φυσστήριον*, a wind instrument (*Lys.* 1242, plural), *γευστήριον*, a tasting cup (*frag.* 299), and *χληρωτήριον*, an urn for casting lots (*Eccl.* 681; *frag.* 146?). For the most part, when Aristophanes wants to denote a locality—and especially a place of business—he uses not a compound in *-τήριον* but what must surely be the “usual” suffix for this purpose, *-εῖον*.⁵

Compounds in *-εῖον* to denote place abound in classic Attic prose and comedy. A partial list of such words in Aristophanes includes: *βαλανεῖον*, a bathing place (*Nub.* 837, 1054; *Ran.* 1279; *Plut.* 952), *κουρέιον*, a barbershop (*Av.* 1441; *Plut.* 338), *πανδοκεῖον*, an inn (*Ran.* 550), *πορνεῖον*, a brothel (*Vesp.* 1283; *frag.* 273), and even *Θησεῖον*, a temple of Theseus (*Eq.* 1312; *frag.* 567). All of these are basic words for locations or places of business.

When Aristophanes minted the word *φροντιστήριον* he struck his coin on a high-class die. He intended to conjure up such august localities as the *βουλευτήριον* and *δικαστήριον*, not such common, everyday establishments as a *βαλανεῖον*, *κουρέιον*, or *πορνεῖον*. The effect of this coinage becomes especially clear when seen in its context: Στ. ψυχῶν σοφῶν τοῦτ' ἐστὶ φροντιστήριον (94).

Strepsiades' eventual “initiation” into the Socratic school (254–74) has long been recognized as a parody of mystic rites, and the pregnant meaning of the words

2. P. Chantraine, *La Formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris, 1933), pp. 62–64.

3. Words for this study were derived from C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, 1948), checked for completeness against P. Kretschmer, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, 1944). Definitions and general citations are drawn from LSJ; Aristophanic citations from O. J. Todd, *Index Aristophaneus* (Cambridge, 1932).

4. Aristophanes (*Eq.* 744) used it to denote a butcher's shop, Demosthenes (59. 67) euphemistically (?) for a brothel.

5. See Buck and Petersen, *Reverse Index*, pp. 47 ff.

ψυχαι and σοφοί in this line have also been noted.⁶ His solemn awe culminates here in a coined word equally solemn, pompous, and, surely, absurd. K. J. Dover recognizes, though he leaves unexpressed, these qualities when he adopts the translation "Refectory."⁷ The aerobic Socrates maintains an equally lofty establishment, and we ought to recognize that fact.

SANDER M. GOLDBERG
Indiana University

6. In detail, see G. Méautis, "La Scène de l'initiation dans les 'Nuées' d'Aristophane," *RHR* 118 (1938): 92-97; more recently, Dover, *Clouds*, pp. 130-33, and A. W. H. Adkins, "Clouds, Mysteries, Socrates and Plato," *Antichthon* 4 (1970): 13-24.

7. K. J. Dover, *Aristophanic Comedy* (Berkeley, 1972), p. 107.

DALMATIA AGAIN

In a previous volume of *Classical Philology* I argued that the province of Dalmatia was of praetorian rather than consular status for most of Domitian's reign.¹ Further evidence now available² strengthens that conclusion, but at the same time it invalidates one of the arguments advanced in that article.

The recently discovered *Fasti* of A.D. 100 revealed, inter alia, the existence of a second C. Cilnius Proculus (to be distinguished from the senator of the same name, cos. suff. 87) and of a —lius (or —cius) Macer, both suffect consuls in that year.³ It would appear likely that the C. Cilnius Proculus, cos. suff. 87, was the father of the consul of 100 and that it was the latter rather than the former who governed upper Moesia in May, 100.⁴ Furthermore, it is tempting to assign to the son the inscription listing a C. Cilnius Proculus as governor of Dalmatia.⁵ His career, then, would be not unlike that of Q. Pomponius Rufus—praetorian governor of Dalmatia, suffect consul, and governor of a consular province, viz.

<i>Q. Pomponius Rufus</i>	<i>C. Cilnius Proculus</i>
leg. Aug. pro pr. Dalmatiae 94 ⁶	leg. Aug. pro pr. Dalmatiae? 96
cos. suff. 95	cos. suff. 100
leg. Aug. pro pr. Moes. Inf. 99 ⁷	leg. Aug. pro pr. Moes. Sup. 100

1. "The Status of Dalmatia under Domitian," *CP* 59 (1974): 48-50. I am indebted to Dr. C. P. Jones for his comments on that article.

2. F. Zevi, "Nuovi frammenti dei Fasti Ostienses," *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* (Munich, 1973), pp. 438-39; Dalmatia's praetorian status is suggested by Zevi.

3. On the younger Cilnius, see now W. Eck, s.v. "Cilnius (3a)," *RE*, suppl. 14 (1974): 97; and F. Zevi, *LF* 96 (1973): 133, n. 41. For Macer, see W. Eck, "Beförderungskriterien innerhalb der senatorischen Laufbahn, dargestellt an der Zeit von 69 bis 138 n. Chr.," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, edited by H. Temporini, vol. 2: *Principal*, pt. 1 (Berlin, 1974), p. 171, n. 51; idem, s.v. "Macer (7)," *RE*, suppl. 14 (1974): 271.

4. *CIL* 16. 46 (8 May 100). The younger Cilnius' career pattern (suffect consul and governor of a consular province in the same year) would not be without parallels. Q. Petillius Cerialis Caesius Rufus, cos. suff. 70, was in the Rhineland before the end of the year and governed his second consular province (Britain) in 71 (A. R. Birley, *Britannia* 4 [1973]: 183 with n. 21; W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* [Munich, 1970], pp. 115, 117). Sex. Julius Frontinus, who was almost certainly consul in 73 (A. R. Birley, *Britannia* 4 [1973]: 189, n. 56), appears to have been in Britain late in that year (A. R. Birley, loc. cit.; idem, *ES* 4 [1967]: 67; W. Eck, *Senatoren*, p. 119 with n. 36). Three other senators seem to have had similar career patterns, viz., the elder Trajan (cos. suff. and governor of Cappadocia-Galatia in 70), L. Ceionius Commodus (cos. ord. and governor of Syria in 78), and A. Cornelius Palma Frontonianus (cos. ord. and governor of Spain in 99): for the evidence, see W. Eck, *Senatoren*, pp. 115, n. 20 (Trajan), 125 (Ceionius), and 154 (Cornelius Palma).

5. *AE* (1926), p. 123.

6. *CIL* 16. 38 (13 July 94).

7. *CIL* 16. 44, 45 (14 August 99).