prudence or practical intelligence had its established place in Greek thought.[4]
Its definition as αὐτῷ εἰδέναι is not likely to have offended linguistic sensibilities.
Elsewhere in the same context the φρόνιμος is described as περὶ αὐτὸν εἰδώς (1142a1;
cf. 1141a25) or said to know περὶ τὰ ὠφέλιμα, ἀγαθά, συμφέροντα (with the dative of
the reflexive pronoun 1140a25 f., 1140b7 ff., 1141a29 f., 1141b6 ff.). That Hesiod
too has practical advantage in mind may be regarded as certain.

<div align="right">FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN
University of North Carolina</div>

4. Cf. W. Jaeger, *Aristoteles* (Berlin, 1923), pp. 82 ff., esp. 84, n. 1 (= *Aristotle*[2], trans. R. Robinson
[Oxford, 1948], pp. 81 ff., esp. 82, n. 1), where for the φρόνησις of *EN* close contact with the general
usage is emphasized. Jaeger's opinion about the meanings of φρόνησις has not gone unchallenged.
Whether the objections touch the core of his insights need not here be discussed (see, for the *status
quaestionis*, the scrutiny of C. J. Rowe in *Untersuchungen zur Eudem. Ethik = Akten des 5. Sym-
posium Aristotelicum*, edited by P. Moraux and D. Harlfinger [Berlin, 1971], pp. 73 ff.); what matters
is that they do not touch the meaning of passages relevant to our argument.

BUT LIVY SAID *SED*

> . . . legati ab Cotye rege Thracum venerunt, pecuniam ad redimendum filium
> aliosque obsides apportantes. eis in senatum introductis, et id ipsum argumenti
> praetendentibus orationi, non sua voluntate Cotyn bello iuvisse Persea, quod
> obsides dare coactus esset, orantibusque, ut eos pretio, quantum ipsi statuissent
> patres, redimi paterentur eqs.

<div align="right">[Livy 45. 42. 6–7]</div>

The Loeb editor, A. C. Schlesinger, renders the words *non sua voluntate . . . coactus
esset* thus: ". . . saying that Cotys had not voluntarily aided Perseus in the war,
because he had been compelled to give hostages . . ." A correct translation of the
Latin as it stands, and one which makes sense in context. Those who are, on these
grounds, not disposed to entertain the possibility that the Latin may be corrupt
need read no further. In my judgment, however, the Latin of the MSS is not
quite what Livy wrote.

The contrast between free choice and coercion is a favorite one with Livy:
volentes ac non coacti (24. 37. 7); *volentem, non vi coactam* (34. 31. 10). If I mistake
not, Livy regularly makes this contrast a *coordinate* one (that is, a true contrast).
Compare, in addition to the passages just adduced, 8. 23. 1, 21. 39. 5, 29. 3. 11,
30. 33. 6, 31. 33. 5, 31. 41. 2, 38. 9. 10, 39. 25. 5, 45. 12. 2. In our passage, however,
the clause containing the concept of coercion (*quod . . . coactus esset*) is *subordinated*
to the concept of free choice (*sua voluntate*). The transmitted words, therefore, do
not accord with Livy's normal (and well-attested) practice elsewhere; they are
suspicious on grounds of style. The slightest of transcriptional changes will remove
all offense: ". . . non sua voluntate Cotyn bello iuvisse Persea, ⟨sed⟩ quod obsides
dare coactus esset . . ."

How easy it would be for *SED* to drop out after *PerSEA* (and before *quOD*) is
obvious. For a stylistic parallel see 5. 52. 12: "quid horum opus fuit suscipi . . . si
non voluntate mansimus in Capitolio per tot menses obsidionis, *sed* ab hostibus
metu retenti sumus?" In the latter passage *sed* is the reading of the fourth-century

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.

<div align="right">

ROBERT RENEHAN
Boston College

</div>

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 retenti 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 vetustior, 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).