

The arrow reduces Medea to speechless amazement. The elaborate detail of this scene, with its portrait of the mischievous god of love, is in the best Alexandrian manner. And Apollonius' imagery is striking; he owes it to Sappho (frag. 31. 5–6 L.-P.) τό μ' ἦ μὲν / καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν.³ Medea's passion, which was suggested in her first encounter with Jason, is now explicitly portrayed through the intervention of Eros.

Virgil recasts both these episodes in characteristically purposeful fashion. When Aeneas first appears to Dido, emerging from the cloud in which Venus has enveloped him, the foreign queen is struck dumb (613 *obstupuit*). It is possible to imagine that Dido, like the Phaeacians at the sight of Odysseus, is merely surprised by the sight of a stranger suddenly and miraculously appearing in her city. But the force of *obstupesco* in this context cannot be missed. It did not escape Servius, although he takes no notice of Apollonius: "animo perculsa est, quod iam futuri amoris est signum."⁴ By the time she is set upon by Cupid in Virgil's rendition of the second incident in the *Argonautica*, Dido has already been portrayed as the victim of an overpowering passion. A glimpse of Aeneas has done it.⁵

PETER E. KNOX
Columbia University

3. Cf. A. Turyn, *Studia Sapphica*, Eos Suppl. 6 (Leopoli, 1929), pp. 45–46; G. Privitera, "Ambiguità antitesi analogia nel fr. 31 LP di Saffo," *QUCC* 8 (1969): 71–72 (= *La Rete di Afrodite*, L'Orrizonte 1 [Palermo, 1974], pp. 122–23); and Vian ad loc. Apollonius is not referring only to the loss of speech, although that is implied. Note that in Homer ἀμφοσίη appears only once in each of the epics (*Il.* 17. 695; *Od.* 4. 704), each time with the complementary genitive ἐπέων. Apollonius recovers the word and uses it four times in the *Argonautica* (2. 409, 3. 284, 3. 811, 4. 3), but without the qualifying complement.

4. Modern commentators are silent, with the exception of Forbiger, who quotes Servius approvingly, and J. Henry, who compares Prop. 4. 4. 21 at *Aeneidea*, vol. 1 (London, 1873), p. 792. Austin may have had this in mind when he noted ad loc.: "Dido found it hard to speak, because it was her first sight of Aeneas." That Virgil has the familiar love-at-first-sight *topos* in mind is specifically denied by R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*³ (Leipzig and Berlin, 1915), p. 122, but he misinterprets the parallels in Apollonius. In Propertius and later in Ovid, *obstupesco* is just the right word for this motif: cf. Prop. 1. 3. 28, 2. 29. 25; Ov. *Am.* 1. 9. 38, *Met.* 2. 726, 10. 580. In the *Aeneid*, the word is used at important moments of recognition, e.g., the appearance of Creusa's ghost at 2. 774, a line repeated at 3. 48 when Polydorus speaks from the grave.

5. This interpretation is apparently older than Servius. In Silius' description of Hannibal's armor this same scene is portrayed (2. 412–15): "has inter species orbatum classe suisque / Aenean pulsum pelago dextraque precantem / cernere erat. fronte hunc auide regina serena / infelix ac iam uultu spectabat amico." Silius' ecphrasis substitutes a rational interpretation of the moment for Virgil's suggestive ambiguity. I am grateful to an anonymous reader for *CP* for several helpful suggestions.

APOTHEOSIS . . . PER SATVRAM

The work that begins *Quid actum sit in caelo* and ends *ut a cognitionibus esset* is attributed by the primary manuscripts to Seneca and called either *Ludus de morte Claudii* (Caesaris) or *Divi Claudii apotheosis per saturam*. The former title, that of the related manuscripts V (Valenciennes 411, saec. ix/x) and L (B.L.

Add. 11983, saec. xii¹), has not appealed to commentators,¹ but the latter, that of S (St. Gallen 569, saec. ix/x), has had better luck: even scholars who do not credit Seneca with it regard "satirical apotheosis" as a reasonable gloss on the title given by Dio (60. 35. 3), ἀποκολοκύντωσις (v.l., -κέντω-).²

Unfortunately, *per saturam* nowhere else means "satirical" and does not mean it here. What it means here, as G. L. Hendrickson pointed out long ago,³ is shown by a text close to S in date, a commentary on Boethius' *Consolatio*:⁴

Hos libros *per satiram* edidit imitatus videlicet Marcianum Felicem Capellam, qui prius libros de nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii *eadem specie poematis* conscripserat; sed iste longe nobiliore materia et facundia ei praecellit, quippe qui nec Tullio *in prosa* nec Virgilio *in metro* inferior floruit.

It means "in a mixture of prose and verse."⁵ How far back this sense of *satura* goes is hard to say,⁶ but as Hendrickson again pointed out, Martianus Capella seems to have introduced the figure of Satura because he was writing in a mixture of prose and verse.

It would be unnecessary to repeat Hendrickson's remarks if scholars had merely misunderstood the title in S. In full, however, it reads at the head of the work DIVI CLAVDII INCIPIT ΑΠΟΘΗΟCIC ANNEI SENECE PER SATIRAM and at the end DIVI CLAVDII EXPLICIT APOTHEOSIS ANNEI SENECE PER SATVRAM; and we are now asked to believe that because *per saturam* goes closely with *apotheosis* the intervening attribution to Seneca must be adventitious and therefore has no authority.⁷ The argument seems to rest on a distinction between descriptions and titles, a distinction hard to draw when a title is descriptive. If *apotheosis per saturam* is merely a description, then *per saturam*, whatever it means, can go wherever scribes feel like putting it. Only if the three words originated in some sense as a title need they stand together. On Hendrickson's interpretation, however, they do not mean what they would have had to mean in

1. See F. Buecheler, *Symbola philologorum Bonnensium*, vol. I (Leipzig, 1864), pp. 35–36; the commentary of A. P. Ball (New York, 1902), p. 57; and that of C. F. Russo (Florence, 1948; 5th ed., 1965), p. 17, n. 27. Cf., however, M. Coffey, *Lustrum* 6 (1961): 246–47.

2. See, e.g., H. St. Sedlmayer, "Apocolocyntosis i.e. Apotheosis *per satiram*," *WS* 23 (1901): 181–82; Ball, pp. 57–58; K. Barwick, "Senecas Apocolocyntosis eine zweite Ausgabe des Verfassers," *RhM* 92 (1943): 165; Russo, *loc. cit.*; Coffey, p. 247; *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2: *Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 888.

3. "Satura—The Genesis of a Literary Form," *CP* 6 (1911): 139; cf. B. L. Ullman, "Satura and Satire," *CP* 8 (1913): 192–93.

4. See *Vita* I in R. Peiper's edition (Leipzig, 1871), p. xxxi. Peiper assigns his earliest witness to saec. x/xi; Einsiedeln 179, of which I have consulted a microfilm at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, belongs to saec. x².

5. A marginal note in Einsiedeln 179 (cf. n. 4) reads: "per poetriam, idest per varietatem metrorum; satyricus dicitur reprehensor viciorum." The first part of this comes closer than "satirical" to Hendrickson's interpretation, but the phrase cannot be intended to exclude the prose.

6. The *Historiae per saturam* of Pescennius Festus (Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 1. 21. 13) were probably a medley like Aelian's Ποικίλη ἱστορία; cf. H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1906), p. ccviii. Varro's *Saturae Menippeae* mixed prose and verse, but he is not known to have called them *saturae* for that reason. F. Marx assembles "testimonia de satura" in his edition of Lucilius, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1914), pp. cxx–cxxx.

7. Adventitious according to Barwick, p. 172, n. 22, and Russo, *loc. cit.*; without authority according to R. Roncali, "L'anonima 'Apoteosi del divo Claudio,'" *Belfagor* 29 (1974): 571–73, who strangely declares *Annei Seneca* to be "una aggiunta fuori posto" even though she regards *per saturam*, too, as a later addition. The *Cambridge History* (cf. n. 2) follows Roncali. We are not told why the attribution invaded both S and the common source of V and L.

order to serve as a title equivalent to *apocolocyntosis*; and there is no other reason for thinking that they were designed to serve as a title. *Annei Senece* may therefore be acquitted of suspicion.

M. D. REEVE
University of Toronto/
Exeter College, Oxford

PHYSIOGNOMY IN APULEIUS *METAMORPHOSES* 2. 2

When Lucius' aunt Byrrhena meets him in Hypata, she comments on his physical appearance (*Met.* 2. 2. 8–9):¹

"en" inquit "sanctissimae Salviae matris generosa probitas, sed et cetera corporis execrabiliter ad amussim congruentia: inenormis proceritas, succulenta gracilitas, rubor temperatus, flauum et inadfectatum capillitium, oculi caesii quidem, sed uigiles et in aspectu micantes, prorsus aquilini, os quoquouersum floridum, speciosus et immeditatus incessus."

Many translate the phrase "cetera . . . congruentia" as though it stated that Lucius resembled his mother physically,² but a more precise translation is "the rest of his bodily features correspond."³ If we ask to what they correspond, the logical answer is provided by the preceding clause: his mother's "generosa probitas."

In offering Lucius' physical qualities as proof that he shares his mother's moral virtue of *probitas*, Byrrhena is employing the methods of physiognomy, which claimed (Gell. *NA* 1. 9. 2) "mores naturasque hominum coniectatione quadam de oris et uultus ingenio deque totius corporis filo atque habitu sciscitari." Lucius' portrait was noted as an example of physiognomical method by E. C. Evans,⁴ but a recent study denies the significance of the portrait.⁵ Evans lists passages in the physiognomical treatises where features like Lucius' are discussed:⁶ "gray eyes," for example, "belong to a bold spirit."⁷ But Byrrhena's portrait is not just a

1. The *Metamorphoses* is cited from the Budé edition of P. Vallette and D. S. Robinson (Paris, 1965).

2. Vallette, p. 29: "c'est prodigieux comme on la retrouve exactement"; H. E. Butler, *The "Metamorphoses" or "Golden Ass" of Apuleius of Madaura*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1910), p. 49: "In person, he's her very image."

3. R. Helm, in his bilingual edition (Darmstadt, 1971), p. 69: "das übrige Aussehen stimmt verwünscht genau wie nach der Schnur."

4. *Physiognomics in the Ancient World*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 59. 5 (Philadelphia, 1969), pp. 72–73.

5. F. Opeku, "Physiognomy in Apuleius," *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 1 (Brussels, 1979), p. 469, argues that *Met.* 2. 2 provides evidence only for Lucius' immediate emotions.

6. The principal treatises are [Aristotle] *Physiognomica*, in the Loeb edition of W. S. Hett, *Aristotle: Minor Works*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1936) (= Ps.-Arist.); Anonyme Latin, *Traité de Physiognomonie*, ed. J. André (Paris, 1981) (= *Phys. lib.*); Polemo, *De Physiognomonica* (= Pol.). Polemo is known only in an Arabic version, edited and translated into Latin by G. Hoffman, in R. Foerster, *Scriptores Physiognomonici Graeci et Latini* (hereafter *SP*), 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1893).

7. Evans, *Physiognomics*, p. 73, n. 57 (Ps.-Arist. 812b6); "gray" is a mistranslation: see n. 14, below.