

fugarant hoc enim fatatum erat, unde in argonautico:
 spes una seni quod pellere seuam
 quondam fata luem dederant aquilone creatis [4. 431–32].

The glossator derives neither of these quotations from the *Florilegium Gallicum*. That he therefore had access to a complete text of the *Argonautica* cannot be proven, but internal evidence may, I think, point in that direction. The commentary itself was probably composed at Orléans, where the excerptor of the *Florilegium Gallicum* had been at work during the century previous. Its quotations from contemporary and classical authors are far-ranging and usually demonstrate a well-grounded familiarity with a given text. While most frequently availing himself of writers of the school tradition—Lucan, the *Dicta Catonis*, Ovid, Vergil, Theodulf, the *Ilias Latina*, the *Alexandreis*—the commentator also uses less common works when these are germane to his subject. The infrequency with which he excerpts Valerius (I note only these two instances) is, admittedly, worrisome; one might expect a glossator who had access to a complete text to delineate more clearly basic differences in tone and presentation between the two accounts. On the other hand, the sections quoted in the scholia relate quite specifically to the text of Ovid under discussion, and ill agree with the moralistic, sententious phrases usually culled by the compilers of *florilegia*.

In summary, prior to 1978 the hypothesis of an independent French tradition of the text of the *Argonautica* rested solely on the evidence of the *Florilegium Gallicum* and the meager information preserved concerning the now lost codex Carrionis. Dolbeau's discovery of the library catalog from Lobbes, to quote Reeve, "put a fresh complexion on this matter."¹² The citations from Valerius Flaccus transmitted in the "Vulgate" commentary do not in themselves prove this theory, but they do give additional weight and credibility to it.¹³

FRANK T. COULSON
The Ohio State University

12. *Texts and Transmission*, p. 427.

13. I would like to thank my colleagues, J. Allison and J. Vaughn, for their helpful criticisms of an earlier draft of this article.

JUVENAL 16. 18

"iustissima centurionum
 cognitio est †igitur† de milite, nec mihi derit
 ultio, si iustae defertur causa querelae"

So Clausen. In *CP* 79 (1984): 229 J. P. Sullivan adopts Kilpatrick's *agitur*, substitutes *etsi* for *est*, and punctuates thus:

"iustissima centurionum
 cognitio, etsi agitur de milite, nec mihi derit
 ultio, si iustae defertur causa querelae . . ."

Juvenal is concerned with the predicament of someone who has been physically assaulted by a soldier and has to look for his redress to a military court. The

above reassurance seems to be self-proffered; if it came from an imaginary interlocutor, we should expect *tibi*, not *mihi*. It is contradicted immediately (*tota cohors tamen est inimica*). Sullivan's proposal does not look to me like the right answer to the problem of *igitur*. He evidently takes *iustissima*, as most others have done, for a compliment to the centurions, but that is absurd. The victim could have no reason for so emphatic an expression of confidence in military justice. It is rightly rendered in the Loeb (G. G. Ramsay): "Most right and proper it is . . . that a centurion should pass sentence on a soldier." Also "even in the case of a soldier" would seem to suggest that centurions might try cases in which soldiers were *not* involved.

Let us then come back to Housman's conjectures. He put *inquis* in his text of 1905, published by Grant Richards; so also in the second (Cambridge University Press) edition of 1931, with *inquit* as an alternative in the apparatus. But in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (Postgate), also of 1905, he obelized, recommending *inquis* in the apparatus. *Sed enim* first appeared in his preface of 1931 (p. lvii): "it may be that *sed enim*, postponed as in Verg. *Aen.* II. 164, has fallen out between *-st* and *de mili-*." *Inquis* will hardly do, since the person addressed in verse 8 (*te*) is the potential aggressor (the soldier), not the victim. *Inquit* and *sed enim* are possibilities, neither deserving obloquy, although intrinsically I should prefer a parenthetical *quid enim?* or *quid ni?* to the latter. *Inquit* has the advantage of making it clear who is talking (but *mihi* may be held to do that sufficiently). However, if I were editing, I should do as Clausen did. Where a lacunose line has been botched to make it scan, it is often impossible to go beyond "may be."

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY
Harvard University