contrary to Herodian's habits for him to have discussed the etymology as well.[7] Hence it seems likely that here, as often elsewhere,[8] Orus drew his information from Herodian. If, then, in spite of the principle of *lectio difficilior*, B's Ἡρ$^{\Delta}$ probably represents the original, A's Ἡρόθεος may have resulted from misreading of the superscript and consequent false resolution of the abbreviation.[9]

A. R. DYCK
University of California, Los Angeles

7. For discussion of an etymology in the Καθ. προσ., cf., e.g., H. Hunger, "Palimpsest-Fragmente aus Herodians Καθολικὴ Προσῳδία Buch 5–7. Cod. Vindob. Hist. gr. 10," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16 (1967): 24: καὶ παρὰ τὸ κηλήσω κηλησμὸς καὶ κηληθμὸς ὅπως παρὰ τὸ θελήσω θελισμός, ἣν καὶ θελημὸς ὑφέρπει τοῦ θ̄ ἀτόνου. It is possible that Theognostus' source may have been Herodian's Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας, a work which, in Lentz's reconstruction, abounds in etymologies; cf., e.g., 2:499. 24 Lentz (from Choeroboscus *Orth.* in Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2:209. 1).

8. Cf. F. Ritschl, *De Oro et Orione commentatio* (Bratislava, 1834), pp. 74–75 (= *Opuscula philologica*, vol. 1 [Leipzig, 1866], p. 663).

9. Ritschl's conjecture Δωρόθεος (ibid., p. 74 [= *Opusc. phil.*, p. 662]), the name of an author whom Orus is not otherwise known to have used, is thus rendered superfluous. Note that the two dependent works, *EM* 197. 44 and *Et. Sym.* 66. 6 Berger, both agree with A in the reading Ἡρόθεος. In view of the usual affinity of the *Et. Sym.* with *Et. Gen.* B (cf. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte*, pp. 282–84; Berger, *Etymologicum Genuinum*, p. XIV), it is worth considering whether this conjunctive error with A may provide evidence for contamination. I would like to thank the late Prof. B. Einarson for use of his photographs of *Et. Gen.* (AB) and Mr. J. A. Rogers for help in collecting materials.

ROMANS IN TEARS

No doubt in some nineteenth-century commentary on Cicero's speeches there is a learned essay on displays of feeling by Romans; but I have not discovered it. The history of manners is in our century entirely out of fashion. Without knowledge of manners, however, we cannot picture people in action in the mind's eye, and our reconstruction of event and motive will be to that extent false.

Of course everyone who is the least acquainted with the Romans has often puzzled over the contrast between their very restrained postures and expressions in portrait statues and their continual praise of a rather gloomy decorum, on the one hand, and on the other, the extravagant show of emotions in public by the entire senatorial order, in sackcloth and ashes, or by individuals beseeching the mercy of the court. It is in that style, and certainly nothing that he was ashamed of, that Cicero pleads for a pardon before Caesar, on behalf of his young relative, "with prayers and tears, throwing ourselves at his feet."[1] There is, incidentally, no different conduct encountered in the Roman army, whose soldiers repent of their mutiny weeping, "precibus ac lacrimis veniam quaerebant," and whose commander joins them *flens* (Tac. *Hist.* 2. 29). In the next century, Greeks too behave the same way, supporting the case of a defendant in court with cries and tears.[2]

1. *Lig.* 5. 13; and Titus Brocchus is later present at the trial, in mourning and tears, 11. 32–33; compare Cn. Oppius *flens* entreating his son-in-law the tribune, in public, Cic. *Red. Quir.* 12, and many similar scenes of entreaty.

2. Philostr. *VS* 588; cf. Lucian *Toxaris* 24, the defendant is acquitted, his tiny grandson and the boy's father being in court in mourning "to arouse pity."

The Greeks of the empire, however, were of two minds about crying where it could be seen. Lucian (*De luctu* 12–14) says parents elaborated their mourning over a dead child in the belief that the deceased could sense and enjoy their show of loss. Mothers, says Plutarch, feel they are more looked up to (*Moral.* 609F, they gain κενὴ δόξα) if they indulge in "wild, mad and inconsolable grief . . . , moaning and wailing" in the company of women friends; fathers likewise tear their hair, claw their faces, and howl.[3] But of such conduct a good Stoic like Plutarch disapproved; and when Herodes Atticus, after the death of a daughter, was discovered lying on the floor bellowing with grief, a chance philosopher (therefore the scene is at least semi-public) rebuked him. Such displays were womanish and weak.[4]

Philosophy might reprimand loud, self-dramatizing orgies of emotion, but mentions of them rather suggest that most upper-class people of the empire encouraged and respected them. It was good to be a person of feeling, a positive recommendation to be seen "weeping copiously in his longing" for a friend (Fronto, *Ep. ad Ant. Pium* 7, p. 168 Naber, p. 160 Van den Hout). Quintilian exhorts his students to do as he often does, letting sobs and tears interrupt the delivery of the more tender passages of a speech (*Inst.* 6. 2. 36, *in schola quoque*, "for practice," but still more in real trials). The elder Seneca also recommends practice in making the voice break (*Contr.* 7. 4. 6, "de industria vocem infringere et vultum deicere"). Clear back in the early first century B.C., Cicero reports a similar scene, in which Marius as supporter to an accused man weeps "and helps with his tears," while Antonius the advocate cries as well (*De orat.* 2. 46. 196).

And the listener of course should join in. So Marcus Aurelius wept to hear the plaints of petitioners, even to read the sadder parts of an address;[5] a ferocious governor dissolves into floods of tears before an appeal to his mercy (Philostr. *VS* 512); and the not usually softhearted Constantine and the suppliant citizens of Autun weep together in the contemplation of the latter's financial difficulties and the emperor's so admirable mercy (*Paneg. vet.* 8. 9. 5, *lacrimae gloriosae*).

For a very long time, then—a matter of centuries—and as much in Athens as in Rome, high society approved of exaggerated and paraded grief, a level of display attained only artificially and opposed only by grim Stoics. It recalls the times of Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, of the young Werther, or, later, of audiences that heard, above their own cries and sobs, Dickens reading a death scene. It sheds a little light on the pleasures communicated by the powers of a rhetorician like Nicetes or of a dramatist like the younger Seneca. And it adds a missing detail to our picture of the sort of audience and reaction that ancient authors thought they were addressing.

RAMSAY MACMULLEN
Yale University

3. Lucian *De luctu* 13 and 16; cf. the ostentation of grief by a Roman *gloriosus*, Plin. *Epist.* 4. 2. 3–4., though Pliny condemns it, and the working up of emotion expected by a speaker at a funeral, Menander Rhet., ed. L. Spengel, *Rhet. graeci* 3. 435–36, urging συνοδύρου οὖν καὶ πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ καὶ αὐξήσεις τὸν οἶκτον.

4. Philostr. *VS* 558; cf. 596, the right degree of restraint; and Plut. *Mor.* 113A, γυναικῶδες τὸ πάθος, θῆλυ γὰρ ὄντως καὶ ἀσθενές.

5. Philostr. *VS* 561 and 582; similar to the latter scene, Julian in tears at the wretched condition of a city, Amm. Marc. 22. 9. 4.