

If *pullus*, however, is rendered by its alternative meaning, "a shoot, or sprout,"¹¹ the interpretation becomes more cogent:¹²

Do you know, do you know, what shoot here struck root?
May it have neither head nor feet.

The incantation is in the form of an address to a plant, appropriately in the context of agricultural idiom: *pullus*, "shoot," or "sprout" gives a normal meaning to *agere radices*, namely, "to strike, put forth root(s),"¹³ and *caput* describes the circumscribed base of the plant, where roots spread horizontally;¹⁴ accordingly, *pedes* here refers to vertical growth in the roots. Moreover, the incantation presumably aids the *reseda*'s ability to disperse abscesses and inflamed swellings. Appropriately, the medical context now includes a metaphorical command to the "abscess" or "inflamed swelling" not to spread.

J. H. PHILLIPS
Tufts University

11. See Cato *Agr.* 51, 158. 1; cf. Lucr. 5. 1364.

12. Jones, "Ancient Roman Folk Medicine," p. 472, noted but did not substantiate effectively the possibility of another interpretation, if the alternative meaning of *pullus* was used. Ernout, the most recent translator, kept *pullus* = "chicken."

13. See Varro *Rust.* 1. 37. 5; Col. *Rust.* 5. 6. 8; Ov. *Rem. Am.* 106, *Met.* 4. 254. Elsewhere in Pliny *HN* 16. 129.

14. See Cato *Agr.* 36, 43, 51.

GERMANIA 13. 3 AND 46. 3

haec dignitas, hae vires magno semper electorum iuvenum globo circumdari, in pace decus, in bello praesidium. nec solum in sua gente cuique sed apud finitimas quoque civitates id nomen, ea gloria est, si numero ac virtute comitatus emineat.

[Tac. *Germ.* 13. 3]

Such is the text printed by Winterbottom.¹ Koestermann prints *semper et electorum* in the first line,² the reading of codex E, which Winterbottom does not even report. Koestermann presumably chose *et* as the *difficilior lectio*, and as more suited to the duality of expression which runs throughout the passage. Winterbottom suppressed *et* because by his stemma unique readings of E are worthless. Winterbottom follows in the tradition of Anderson,³ who comments: "Some MSS. (*E* and its congeners) read *magno et*,⁴ which in itself is attractive, the conjunction emphasizing the number and the quality of the members, *plurimi et acerrimi* above, *numero ac virtute* below. Cp. *Dial.* 10 *privatas et nostri saeculi controversias*. But it is unlikely that this group of MSS. alone preserved the genuine tradition." For the use of

1. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Ogilvie (eds.), *Cornelii Taciti Opera minora* (Oxford, 1975); henceforth cited as Winterbottom.

2. E. Koestermann (ed.), *P. Cornelii Taciti Libri qui supersunt*, vol. 2.2 (Leipzig, 1964); henceforth cited as Koestermann.

3. J. G. C. Anderson (ed.), *Cornelii Taciti de Origine et Situ Germanorum* (Oxford, 1938), p. 94.

4. Note that the citation is a slip: E reads *magno semper et*.

electi as an index of quality, Anderson might have compared *Historiae* 2. 61 "civitas electa iuventute . . . fanaticam multitudinem disiecit."

The suppression of *et* by Winterbottom was singled out for praise by Goodyear.⁵ So apparently we have the triumph of science over subjectivism. But there are at least two circumstances in which an editor ignores to his peril a unique *difficilior lectio* of a major witness: if there is contamination in the MSS, and if the archetype had marginal or interlinear variants. In these circumstances, most witnesses tend to choose the *facilior lectio*. About possible contamination in the MSS there is room for dispute, but there can be no doubt that the archetype contained both marginal and interlinear variants: they are visible in abundance in the folia of the archetype that survive for the *Agricola*, and marginal variants abound in the best MSS of the *Germania*.⁶ Most scribes may simply have ignored a variant *et* because they were unfamiliar with the balance of adjective and genitive (it is this inconcinnity which makes *et* the *difficilior lectio*), and because they perceived no need for the word. But *et* is not pointless. A German chief would doubtless have status if his train was large, and even if it was of high quality without being large. But best was to have both, and this is best indicated by "magno semper et electorum iuvenum."

Nevertheless, though *et* emphasizes that both number and quality are at issue, and that both are equally important, this meaning could be perceived even without the *et*. For objective evidence we must resort to parallels. There are to my knowledge only three other passages of ancient Latin where we find *magnus* and *electus* combined: *Bellum Alexandrinum* 30. 6 "maxima et electissima multitudo," *Germania* 15. 2 "electi equi, magna arma" (where recent editors adopt Meiser's *magnifica arma*), and Dictys Cretensis 2. 20 "electos ac magni nominis viros."⁷ *Germania* 15. 2 (where the adjectives are parallel) seems an unconscious reminiscence of 13. 3. The *Bellum Alexandrinum* shares with E's reading in *Germania* 13. 3 the joining of *magnus* and *electus* with *et*; the Dictys shares not only the coordination of the same two words, but the inconcinnity of joining adjective and genitive phrase in attributive position before the noun—not a common construction in any author. I doubt that these resemblances are coincidences.

For purposes of supporting a textual variant, or even a conjecture, it is not necessary to prove direct borrowing. If a stylistic feature can be shown to have existed in authors of the same genre both before and after the time of a passage in question, in the lack of a parallel of equal closeness giving contrary evidence (in this instance, an example of *electus* and *magnus* joined as attributive adjective and genitive phrase without coordination), support is given to the shared feature as authentic. If the parallels provide evidence merely that the feature existed in models of the author, the editor who would reject a variant agreeing with the model or models must explain how the feature managed to pass from the model(s) to the

5. F. R. D. Goodyear, review of *Cornelii Taciti Opera minora*, ed. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Ogilvie, *Gnomon* 50 (1978): 418.

6. See my "The Minor Works of Tacitus: A Study in Textual Criticism," *CP* 72 (1977): 327–35. I retract, however, my insistence on p. 329 that E's *Mallio* (at 37. 4. 5) must have been in the archetype: E tends to assimilate consonants. On p. 334 of that article, I had listed E's *et* at 13. 3 among examples of E's "fairly neutral errors," an assessment which I now retract.

7. The first two parallels are listed by the *TLL* under *electus*. The passage of Dictys was missed by the *TLL*, and has not been noticed by the commentators on the *Germania*. There is one other juxtaposition, of the participle *electos* with *maximis* (Cic. *Tull.* 18), which I cite below.

MS without passing through the authentic text of the author. Conjecture would yet be a possible explanation. The best evidence is provided if a feature can be shown to have existed both in an author's model(s) and in his imitator(s). Then a line drawn in stemmatic diagram from source to imitator would pass through the author's text itself, and assure the reading.

The most likely line of descent for *Germania* 13. 3 is that Tacitus has been influenced by the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, and Dictys has been influenced directly or indirectly by the *Germania*. The *Bellum Alexandrinum* belongs to the Caesarian corpus, which is a generic model of the *Germania* (as witness the *Germania*'s first sentence). It is therefore a known and proper source of influence on the *Germania*.⁸ All of the ways in which the phrase in the *Germania* differs from the *Bellum Alexandrinum* reflect the peculiarities in style of Tacitus: the preference for the positive over the superlative adjective, the placement of an adverb after the first adjective and before the connective (cf., e.g., *Dial.* 6. 2 "plenam semper et frequentem domum," *Dial.* 29. 1 "teneri statim et rudes animi"),⁹ the inconcinnity of balancing adjective with genitive (already in the *Dialogus*).¹⁰ There is therefore no need to seek any other influence besides the one already in evidence in order to justify a phrase "magno semper et electorum iuvenum." The diction is in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*,¹¹ the arrangement is Tacitean.

For purposes of argument, it makes little difference whether Tacitus is influenced directly by the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, or through an author who has been influenced by the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, or if the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and Tacitus share a common source of influence (whether an author or a commonplace). Under either of the latter two hypotheses, all other authors in the line of influence should normally be assumed to contain all features shared by the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and the scribal tradition of the *Germania*. Why, the reader may ask, suppose that there is any genetic connection at all? Could not the usages of *Bellum Alexandrinum* and the *Germania* be independent? No, for the same reason that an isolated tribe on some tropical island could not independently invent the English language. Language is mostly a learned experience, and acts of creation are few and varied. Some pairs are natural pairs, such as "good and bad." Such pairs could be invented many times in many different languages (with equivalent synonyms); even so, most who use the phrase repeat a combination which they have learned, not invented: but so many have used the phrase that it is impossible to trace a single line of genetic relationship for most occurrences. "Large and select" or *magnum et electum* are not natural pairs (as *plurimi optimique* might be). The only other juxtaposition of *electus* and *magnum* listed by the *TLL* is *Oratio pro M. Tullio* 18 "homines electos maximis animis et viribus," with a different

8. I am distinguishing from an author such as Sallust, who, although an influence upon the *Germania*, is, in the narrowest sense of genre, a proper generic influence only on the *Agricola*, *Historiae*, and *Annals*. Many of the resemblances which the *Germania* bears to Sallust's monographs are really resemblances to the *Agricola* imitating Sallust, as I have shown in "The Date of Tacitus' *Dialogus*," *HSCP* 84 (1980): 99–125, esp. 112–16.

9. For the reading *teneri* of b², instead of [et] *virides* [teneri] of Knaut and recent editors, see my "Notes on the *Dialogus* of Tacitus," *CP* 74 (1979): 247–49.

10. For the date of the *Dialogus* (97, the *Agricola* and *Germania* being completed in 98), see Murgia, "The Date of Tacitus' *Dialogus*."

11. Except the conjunction *electi iuvenes*, which is a consecrated collocation, at least since Catull. 64. 78 *electos iuvenes*; cf. also Catull. 64. 4 *lecti iuvenes*, Virg. *Aen.* 5. 729 *lectos iuvenes*.

relation between the two words from the one in question. Concordances, lexica, and indices reveal no other juxtaposition of *magnus* and *electus* in Cicero, Apuleius, Livy (despite the quantity of their extant writing), in poets, not even Virgil, Lucan, Statius, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus (despite the similarity of epic concerns with the concerns of Dictys), or in the Latin Vulgate (despite the frequency of occurrence of *electus*, admittedly in a special sense). Extant Sallust does not even attest *electus* (rather *lectus*: *Hist.* 3. 98B Mb, *Cat.* 50. 2, *codd.* at *Cat.* 59. 3). We find the balance of *magnus* and *electus* (or even *lectus*) only in a corpus known to have been used by Tacitus, in two neighboring chapters of the *Germania*, and in Dictys, whose relationship to Tacitus we shall presently investigate, but which at least shares with Tacitus the larger genre of history. This is not a pattern indicative of independent invention.

If the inconcinnity of linking *magnus* and *electus* as attributive and genitive arose first with Tacitus, it follows that Dictys is directly or indirectly influenced by *Germania* 13. 3. For that the rare occurrence of this inconcinnity should be found coincidentally in Dictys with the very adjectives which Tacitus used challenges the laws of chance.¹² Again the differences from Tacitus reflect Dictys' own style and concerns: a preference for *atque/ac*, and the epic concern for glory (cf. Dictys 1. 16 "magnus atque clarus," 2. 18 "virtutem atque gloriam," 2. 19 "clari atque magnifici ingenti nomine"). That the style of Dictys, or rather the translator Septimius, was influenced by Tacitus has often been stated, but not to my knowledge demonstrated. So Dederich stated: "Alacritatem ac robur Sallustianae orationis sua facere conatus, praecipue brevitati imitandae egregiam felicemque operam navavit. Lubentissime respexit etiam Tacitum, Sallustiani stili aemulum."¹³ Later Meister claimed: "In quibusdam enim antiquissimos Romanorum poetas imitatur, in aliis Vergilium, passim Ciceronem Livium Tacitum Cornelium Nepotem sequitur, maxime autem Sallustium."¹⁴ The greatest attention has been paid to listing Septimius' indebtedness to Sallust. Pratje listed over three hundred passages of Sallust to which he found resemblances in Dictys,¹⁵ and Brünner compiled a similar, though more selective, list.¹⁶ But even among the parallels found between Dictys and Sallust, Dictys sometimes resembles more closely Tacitus imitating

12. The only true parallel which I have found in Dictys is 1. 16 *diurnas vigiliarumque vices*, although it differs from *Germ.* 13. 3 and Dictys 2. 20 in that omission of the connective would substantially change the sense.

The chances of two words' being coincidentally used together anywhere by an author (Dictys) that had been used by a previous author (Tacitus) may be computed by multiplying the total number of occurrences of word A in the author (Dictys) by the total occurrences of word B (in Dictys), and dividing by the total number of words in the author. That these words should be joined in the same stylistic feature would be computed by dividing the number of occurrences in the author of the feature (2) by the number of opportunities for such feature, and multiplying the fraction times the preceding fraction. Although I do not have the figures, the odds against coincidence are very high, as they are any time that as many as three features agree. If author B should be known to be influenced by author A, coincidence becomes all the more improbable. Elimination of coincidence establishes the existence of a genetic relationship, but does not by itself establish the nature of the relationship.

13. A. Dederich (ed.), *Dictys Cretensis* (Bonn, 1833), p. xxxvi.

14. F. Meister (ed.), *Dictys Cretensis* (Leipzig, 1872), p. viii.

15. H. Pratje, *Quaestiones Sallustianae ad Lucium Septimium et Sulpicium Severum Gai Sallustii Crispi Imitatores Spectantes* (Göttingen, 1874).

16. G. Brünner, *Sallust und Dictys Cretensis* (Erfurt, 1883).

Sallust, or a conflation of Sallust and Tacitus, than Sallust alone. Consider the following: Sallust *Catiline* 29. 1 "(Cicero) ancipiti malo permotus" > Tacitus *Agricola* 26. 1 "ancipiti malo territi Britanni" > Dictys 2. 12 "Graecos . . . ancipiti malo territos"; Sallust *Catiline* 5. 4 "alieni adpetens, sui profusus" > Tacitus *Historiae* 1. 49 "pecuniae alienae non adpetens, suae parcus" > Dictys 4. 22 "parcum in suo atque adpetentem alieni"; Sallust *Iugurtha* 6. 1 "pollens viribus, decora facie" > Tacitus *Annales* 15. 48 "corpus procerum, decora facies" > Dictys 1. 14 "procerus, decora facie." In all of these, an element is shared by Tacitus and Dictys that is not found in Sallust. We have then in Dictys a witness to the text of Tacitus, and the crucial evidence that assures the correctness of E's reading in *Germania* 13. 3.

The most serious objection that could be raised to the above line of argument is that we cannot be sure that Dictys is not imitating rather some lost passage of Sallust's *Histories*.¹⁷ I myself reject the suggestion, since the diction *electus* (rather than *lectus*) appears not to be Sallustian, and since the extant passages, combined with the authors' styles, fully justify the claimed progression *Bellum Alexandrinum* > *Germania* > Dictys, as do the known paths of generic influence. The "known paths of generic influence" would suit as well a progression of Sallust > Dictys, but not a progression *Bellum Alexandrinum* > Sallust *Histories* > *Germania* and Dictys. The Caesarian corpus properly influences the *Germania* directly. And although Sallust does sometimes influence the *Germania* directly, most of the Sallustian imitations in the *Germania* are rather reminiscences of Sallustianisms in the *Agricola* (see note 8). In other words, a progression *Bellum Alexandrinum* > *Germania* > Dictys produces a coherent scheme, while the injection of a reconstructed passage of Sallust, besides having no justification, does not fit well with any scheme. If the supposed Sallust is claimed to stand apart, not influenced by the *Bellum Alexandrinum* or influencing the *Germania*, the same problem of improbable coincidence arises against which we have already argued. But at worst, if there should be a lost passage of Sallust or another author which Dictys has imitated, we would still have to reconstruct (by the same processes of reasoning which we have set forth) a passage in that author which differs little from *magno . . . et electorum iuvenum* of *Germania* 13. 3, and which would provide an even closer parallel.¹⁸

It would have taken an extraordinarily sensitive scribe to have conjectured *et* in *Germania* 13. 3, since the text without *et* presents no problems. There are other unique readings of E that merit attention,¹⁹ though they either are not as readily supportable by objective evidence, or they might more easily have been reached by

17. Note that if Dictys were imitating a lost passage of Tacitus, this would not be a difficulty; since such a passage (of *Annals* or *Histories*) would have to be later than the *Germania*, and would itself then be a confirmatory witness to the text of *Germania* 13. 3.

18. At the least, the lost passage would have to display "the inconcinnity of linking *magnum* and *electus* as attributive and genitive": if it did not, we could hardly recognize it, rather than Tacitus, as the model for Dictys. It should also have used *et* as connective, since this is shared by both the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (which presumably has influenced it) and the *Germania* (which it presumably has influenced).

19. Unique, that is, for witnesses used by Winterbottom. My analysis supposes that an editor has already reduced the number of witnesses used to the minimum number needed to embrace all variants. All of the readings to which I refer are shared by a group of MSS which R. P. Robinson (*The "Germania" of Tacitus* [Middletown, Conn., 1935], pp. 203-9) grouped with E as forming the family τ .

conjecture. In the latter category falls E's reading at 46. 3 "solae in sagittis spes, quas inopia ferri ossibus asperant." E has *sola*, reported in the apparatus by Koestermann, but suppressed by Winterbottom. Here I judge that *solae* arose because a scribe was misled by *quas* (which refers to *sagittis*) into believing *spes* to be plural. But *sagittae* constitute a single source of hope. A plural might yet be used if the objects of hope were several, or if Tacitus had wished to magnify the hope, but the closest parallels use the singular. Compare Sallust *Iugurtha* 14. 10 "spes omnis in armis erat," *Germania* 30. 2 "omne robur in pedite" (< *Agr.* 12. 1 "in pedite robur")—not the only parallels, but ones with which Tacitus' familiarity cannot be doubted, since he composed the *Germania* shortly after the *Agricola*, for which he liberally plundered the *Iugurtha*. For other parallels, see especially Caesar *Bellum Gallicum* 3. 14. 7 "cum omnis Gallicis navibus spes in velis armamentisque consisteret," Livy 32. 23. 6 "omnis inde spes <op>pugnantibus in vi et armis et operibus erat," 37. 5. 6 "omnis spes in armis et audacia erat," 39. 1. 7 "omnem spem in armis habentes." Tacitus used *sola* instead of *omnis* in part because of the context (there precedes a list of what the Fenni do not have), and in part for the alliteration.²⁰ Because of elision, *sola in* and *solae in* would be pronounced almost identically, facilitating scribal error. A scribe would pronounce to himself *sol' in . . . quas*, turn to his parchment and write *solae in . . . quas*. After completion of the sentence, the scribe or a corrector might detect the error and expunge the *e* by placing a dot under it. Subsequent scribes might copy *sola*, *solae*, or *solae* complete with dot. The last option might continue through several generations of MSS, with both *sola* and *solae* transmitted.²¹ Although, then, we cannot be sure that E's *sola* did not arise through conjecture, it is yet the sort of reading that could easily survive in a single witness to a corrected codex.

CHARLES E. MURGIA
University of California,
Berkeley

20. R. Renehan suggests to me that *sola spes* may be a variant on the common *unica spes*. But *unica* is not, to my knowledge, found in the pattern (blank) *spes in armis (est)*, which is the model for *sola in sagittis spes*. Further, the examples with *omnis* provide the basis for an argument *a fortiori*: although *unica* would not lend itself to a plural use, *omnis* would; the fact then that the closest models use a singular *omnis* makes it all the more unlikely that with *sola*, a word whose natural connotation is singular, Tacitus would have used a plural. In *Germ.* 46. 3, neither *omnis* nor *unica* would make a good connective, a function which *sola* fills.

21. For the failure to notice expunctions, see Murgia, "The Minor Works of Tacitus," p. 330, on *Agr.* 9. 4 *ostentanda*.

LAST WORDS ON THE *CALCULUS MINERVAE*

"Cassius Dion, le plus prodigue en renseignements, vulnérable aux critiques. . ."¹ Dio's report on the flood of honors and powers bestowed on Octavian between the fall of Alexandria on August 1, 30 B.C. and his return to Rome in the middle of 29 to celebrate his triple triumph is indeed prodigious—and vulnerable. Dio informs us that Octavian accepted "all but a few" of these distinctions,² but he is not

1. J. Béranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat* (Basel, 1953), p. 97.

2. 51. 20. 4.