

take definitive measures for the proper organization of Roman Spain.<sup>22</sup> Before that time, it may be, the *provinciae* remained essentially as army commands. When two praetors held these commands, each would in normal conditions stay in one region and would be responsible for its administration. But in war or emergency there had evidently been no rule to prevent a praetor from leading his army outside his provincial territory, even into the territory of his colleague.

G. V. SUMNER  
University of Toronto

22. But the tradition that, when there was a consular governor in Spain, he could include both provinces in his *provincia* was not ended. Otherwise, we should be hard put to account for the operations of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius in 75–74, when he joined Cn. Pompeius in Citerior and fought at the River Turia, Bilbilis, Segobriga, and Calagurris (*MRR*, 2:98, 104), whereas he had hitherto operated in Ulterior (*MRR*, 2:83, 86, 93).

#### EMENDATIONS OF THE *COMMONITORIUM* OF ORIENTIUS

I: 1. 239 ff.

240           hinc fuit, ut dominus prima sub lege iuberet  
              pensari paribus crimina supplicii:  
              pro damno damnum, vulnus pro vulnere, dentem  
              dente lui raptum, lumina luminibus.  
              nec minus ut propriam sub iudice redderet audax  
              alterius cuperet qui rapuisse animam,  
245           iudiciumque reus *non* posset dicere pravum,  
              *parvis* decreta est ultio criminibus.  
              et licet haec melius mutarit gratia Christi,  
              mitia quae potius quam violenta docet,  
              *est* tamen est rectum, quidquid iubet ista vel illa,  
250           seu cito restituas, seu patienter agas,  
              hoc tamen est melior qui Christo vindice gaudet,  
              servet si domino quod dedit ille sibi.

So Robinson Ellis' edition in the Vienna Corpus (1888) and C. A. Rapisarda in his edition of 1958 (his second edition of 1970 and L. Bellanger's of 1903 are inaccessible to me); except that in 246 the former reads *pravis*, a correction in one of our two MSS (A), and in 249 the latter prints *ast tamen* with B.

It is first to be protested that *nec minus ut* in 243 follows on from *iuberet* in 239, calling for a comma instead of the full stop after *luminibus*. *Ne* (Schondonchus) then replaces *non* in 245, so that *-que* connects *decreta est* with *fuit* in 239. The ridiculous *parvis* (*pravis* is just as silly) in 246 is a more difficult problem. Sense demands *congrua*; cf. 2. 274 *factis congrua poena manet*. I suspect that *ēgrua* was misread as *parua*, with some help from *pravum* above, and then changed to *parvis* in order to scan. The couplet thus becomes: "iudiciumque reus ne posset dicere pravum, / congrua decreta est ultio criminibus." In 249 for *est* (*ast*) *tamen* read *lex tamen*: "quidquid iubet ista vel illa lex, rectum est."

## II: 1. 285–86

et *quae nunc* tristi squalabant arva veterno,  
laeta novo rident germine, flore rubent.

The explanation in Ellis' index, "*nunc* pro *modo*," may be right in a way he did not intend. The line will have originally started *et modo quae. modo* (~~h~~) dropped out and *nunc* was added *metri causa*. I prefer this hypothesis to the alternative of simply inverting *quae* and *nunc* (*et nunc, quae tristi, sqq.*).

## III: 1. 299 ff.

300           vivet homo: fletus *est hic* mea verba sequuntur;  
              nam puto sic hominis sors melior fuerat,  
              cum sensu vitae sensum deponere poenae  
              et natum innatis consimilem fieri,  
              quam nunc, peccatis toto dominantibus aevo,  
              extingui vitae, vivere suppliciis.

The editors read *ast hic* (Schondonchus; *en hic* Baehrens), for which substitute *istaec*, seeing *TLL*, 7.2:512. 27 for the combination *iste meus*.

## IV: 1. 447–48

oderit ignotos audax attendere vultus  
seque tamen notis *addere* luminibus.

*Oderit* is jussive and the subject is *femina*. Line 447 has produced a string of unattractive conjectures recorded in Rapisarda's apparatus, including the preposterous *abdere*, which Ellis reads. The right word is *obdere*; for the corruption see *TLL*, 9.2:37. 6. *Tamen notis* = *licet notis tamen*.

## V: 2. 95–96

quidquid id est variis quod vexat corpora saevis,  
dum celeri *vitam* currimus in stadio

Despite *currere iter* et sim. (*TLL*, 4:1511. 28), *vitam* cries for emendation. Translators render *vitae* ("we run our course in the swift race of life," Tobin; "ci affanniamo nella rapida corsa della vita," Rapisarda).

## VI: 2. 149 ff.

              cum tot in his terris peccator munera sumas,  
              in caelis sanctus quae bona percipies?  
150       finge age quod clarum, quod pulchrum, quod pretiosum,  
              et toto magnum quidquid in orbe putas,  
              hoc meritis dandum felicibus, aurea tecta,  
              gemmatos postes purpureumque solum,  
155       ruraque vernanti semper redolentia flore,  
              lacte et melle simul flumina plena trahi.  
              haec quia *conscondunt animos et* mente videntur,  
              inferiora illis crede futura bonis.

What are *illis bonis*? Obviously the promised joys of the life to come, just previously described as "non conspecta oculis, non auribus insinuata, / ipso non sensu

praemeditata prius" (143 f.). With them are contrasted the earthly delights, real or imaginable, of 153–56, to which they will, of course, prove superior.

According to Rapisarda's apparatus the text of 157 was defended by A. Hudson-Williams. I find no such defense in the papers listed under that excellent scholar's name in Rapisarda's bibliography. To me it appears completely indefensible, such sense as it can be made to yield being flagrantly inappropriate, as in Rapisarda's version: "Questi beni, poiche giungono ai nostri cuori e sono visti dalla nostra mente, saranno inferiori—credilo—a quelli che avremo effettivamente." Moreover, *conscendunt animos* = "reach our hearts" is incredible. The conjectures *nec* for *haec* (Martene), *contingunt* (Baehrens), and *confundunt animis commenta* (Havet) are useless. Read "haec quia transcendunt animi quae mente videntur": "because these (material) blessings are surpassed by those which are seen only by the mind, they will turn out, believe it, inferior to those (unseen) blessings."

For *mens animi* see *TLL*, 8:713. 81; a number of examples are cited from Plautus and Lucretius (cf. especially 5. 148 "natura deum . . . animi vix mente videtur"), one from Catullus, and one from Arnobius. *Mens cordis* occurs in the Vulgate.

VII: 2. 319 ff.

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 320 | at parte ex alia blandorum turba piorum,<br>qui nec vexati restituere malum<br>. . . . .   |
| 325 | praecipueque illi, quos Christi in lege paratos<br>excipiunt noctes inveniuntque dies,<br>quisque fuit votum niveam baptismate vestem<br>numquam femineis commaculare toris,<br>corpore nec solo, sed toto et pectore casti, |
| 330 | et qualem lector te meus esse velim,<br>vel <i>iam</i> felices, quae prima est gloria, victis<br>lucis et infidi corporis illecebris,<br>veram quaerentes vitam, pro nomine Christi<br>fundere devotas non timuere animas.   |

Among the righteous at the Day of Judgment the martyrs are naturally present, and the poet gives them four lines, on which thus Louis Havet (*RPh* 26 [1902]: 153): "Sans le contact de *Martyres*, le premier distique est une énigme, et on ne peut deviner que *lucis* équivaut à *vitae*. Sans un *qui*, *timuere* ne se construit pas. La chute d'un distique entier, commençant par *Martyres* et contenant un *qui*, me paraît une hypothèse nécessaire." The first of these two desiderata is quite superfluous. The correct understanding of *lucis* is no great feat of divination, and lines 333 f. leave no doubt as to which category of the elect is meant. But a *qui* is certainly required. The obvious place for it is that usurped by *iam*, a word which can well be spared. To a pious Christian the martyrs could never have seemed *infelices*.

VIII: 2. 353–54

hinc tristes gemitus, illinc pia gaudia *vitae*:  
una in diversis vox erit agminibus.

At the Day of Judgment the righteous will rejoice and the wicked will lament, each body in unison. How are we to understand *pia gaudia vitae* ("the sweet joys

of life," Tobin; "la giusta gioia della vita," Rapisarda)? Is *vita* the life eternal which the Sheep are joyfully anticipating? Anyhow the word seems superfluous and damaging to the antithesis *tristes gemitus* // *pia gaudia*. Read *iuncta* (*iūcta*)?

## IX: 2. 393 ff.

395           haec ego debueram factis tibi tradere, lector,  
                  ut pondus verbis vita probata daret.  
sed quia neglegimus miseri quaecumque monemur  
                  *et* satis est levius *discere* quam facere,  
tu si commendes animo demissa per aurem  
                  omnia quae scriptis sunt numerata meis,  
constanter dicam, caeli statione receptus  
                  discuties saevae vincula dura necis.

Lines 395 ff. offer a non sequitur. The reward promised to those who master the poet's precepts will not be forthcoming *because* these are easier to learn than to practice. Postulating a common confusion between *et* and *haec* we get: "sed quia neglegimus miseri quaecumque monemur, / haec satis est levius discere quam facere." But since Orientius is explaining why he does not practice what he *preaches*, perhaps *dicere* should replace *discere*.

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY  
*Harvard University*

## THE FLIGHT OF HARPALOS AND TAURISKOS

While the famous flight of Harpalos, son of Machatas, to Athens in 324 B.C. has been the subject of much controversy, relatively little has been said about his enigmatic "first flight" of 333, recorded only by Arrian.<sup>1</sup> E. Badian's attempt at "find[ing] a rational explanation"<sup>2</sup> to the problems presented by the inadequacies of Arrian's abbreviated account represents another move to view this and similar episodes "against the background of Alexander's Court,"<sup>3</sup> an admirable approach under most circumstances. In the case of Harpalos' first flight, however, Badian's method appears to have led to overanalysis and to conclusions, admittedly hypothetical, that fail to convince.

Arrian relates that Harpalos, the imperial treasurer, was induced by an evil man, Tauriskos by name,<sup>4</sup> to flee from his post shortly before the battle at Issos. No reason is given for the sudden flight, but it seems clear that the two were, and certainly had been at the time immediately preceding their departure, up to some sort of mischief; the nature of this mischief remains to be determined. Harpalos, for the time, settled in the Megarid; Tauriskos went on to join Alexander of Epeiros and afterward lost his life in Italy under unknown circumstances. The imperial treasury was subsequently divided between two men, Philoxenos and Koiranos,<sup>5</sup> but Alexander is said to have desired greatly the return of Harpalos,

1. Arr. 3. 6. 4-7.

2. E. Badian, "The First Flight of Harpalus," *Historia* 9 (1960): 246.

3. Badian, "Harpalus," *JHS* 81 (1961): 16.

4. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich, 1926), vol. 2, no. 740, s.v. Ταυρίσκος.

5. Berve, *Alexanderreich*, vol. 2, nos. 793, 441, s.vv. Φιλόξενος, Κοίρανος.