

eye (630–38; cf. *Od.* 9. 371–96). At this point, however, when the climax of the story is at hand, involving the trick with the rams and ewes that effects the actual escape, Achaemenides suddenly breaks off, and urges the Trojans to flee (639 “sed fugite, o miseri, fugite”). No doubt he has a point, since Polyphemus and his friends are about to appear; but before they actually do he nevertheless finds time for fourteen more lines, of which ten describe the conditions under which he has been living, and only four refer to the imminent danger. So he could at least have mentioned that final trick, and how he came to be left behind in spite of it.

Or could he? Vergil, I would suggest, deliberately left this part of Odysseus’ story well alone, because this is where the Achaemenides episode breaks down as a possible sequel to *Odyssey* 9. In Homer, six of Odysseus’ companions survive Polyphemus’ onslaughts out of the original twelve. Odysseus’ plan ensures that each emerges safely from the cave, hidden under the middle animal in each group of three; and last of all (9. 444) Odysseus himself escapes, clinging to the fleece of a prize ram. It matters little, then, whether we think in terms of Homer’s six survivors, or of Vergil’s figure (ten?): the notion that anyone could have been left behind by this wily hero in his finest hour is surely inconceivable. There was simply no room for such a blunder in the Homeric story. So although the omission of relevant detail is only to be expected when Achaemenides first blurts out “immemores socii uasto Cyclopis in antro / deseruere” (617–18), his later and more obtrusive silence about that final maneuver may well indicate Vergil’s awareness that hereabouts there was indeed a problem.

E. L. HARRISON
The University of Leeds

SENECA *EPISTULAE MORALES* 66. 12

Mortalia minuuntur cadunt, deteruntur crescunt, exhauriuntur implentur; itaque illis in tam incerta sorte inaequalitas est: divinorum una natura est.

If, as the OCT punctuation implies, and D. R. Shackleton Bailey assumes, the verbs of the first sentence are to be grouped into three sets of contrasting pairs, then the first pair, which lacks a contrast, requires emendation. “Hence the conjectural substitutes [for *minuuntur*] *eminent*, *nituntur*, *muniantur*, *oriuntur*, of which only the last (Ernout’s) is acceptable,” says Shackleton Bailey, according to whom “transcriptional probability demands *minuuntur* < *augentur*, *oriuntur* > *cadunt*.”¹ But the second and third pairs present their contrast in the order “decrease-increase.” So in the first pair less suspicion must fall on *minuuntur* than on *cadunt*, for which a number of possible corrections leap to mind, including *aluntur*.

Even basic assumptions, however, cannot go unquestioned. Seneca occasionally employs a congeries of *three* verbs, roughly synonymous or at least mutually

1. “Emendations of Seneca,” *CQ* 20 (1970): 353. OCT = L. Annaei Senecae “*Epistulae Morales*,” ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1965).

reinforcing: cf., e.g., *Epist.* 71. 27 *mordetur, uritur, dolet*; *Epist.* 88. 29 *despicit, provocat, frangit* and *ure, caede, occide*; *Epist.* 88. 46 *circumstant, alunt, sustinent*. So here the first three verbs *minuuntur cadunt deteruntur* are roughly synonymous, and would be perfectly balanced by three roughly synonymous opposites but for *exhauriuntur*, which is amenable to convincingly simple emendation. By a remarkable coincidence Ernout found the right solution (*oriuntur*), but to the wrong problem. Read: "Mortalia minuuntur cadunt deteruntur, crescunt exoriuntur implentur."

At first sight, *deteruntur* and *implentur* appear not to offer the clearest of contrasts. This could well be due to Senecan *variatio*: cf. *Epist.* 74. 16 "quae cadere non possunt, ne decrescere quidem ac minui." Yet "wear down or away" (*OLD*, s.v. *detero* 1a) and "fill out, fatten (the body, etc.)" (*OLD*, s.v. *impleo* 3b) do make an apposite opposition, here especially if Seneca was primarily thinking of the animal and vegetable life specifically mentioned in the preceding section. As regards structure, a comparable example, with asyndeton separating the contrasting triads which are themselves asyndetic, is to be found at Cicero *Pro Caecina* 33 "cum . . . multitudinem hominum coegerit armarit instruxerit, homines inermos . . . repulerit fugarit averterit." Seneca himself devises a pair of antithetical triads (with *variatio* of the enclosing antithesis) at *De otio* 5. 5 "suapte natura gravia descenderint, evolaverint levia an . . . altior aliqua vis legem singulis dixerit."

P. T. EDEN
London

THE HOROSCOPE OF THE FOUNDATION OF ROME

In *Romulus* 12, Plutarch gives some interesting information about the date of the foundation of Rome. He first says that Rome was founded a. d. XI Kal. Mai., or 21 April, at the festival of the Parilia. This is evidently an old tradition, for the Parilia was celebrated as the anniversary of the foundation of the city. He reports further that Romulus founded Rome on the thirtieth of the (lunar) month on the day of a solar eclipse believed to be the one seen by Antimachus the epic poet of Teos in Olympiad 6, 3. Since the Olympiad year begins in the summer, the two statements combine to give the date 21 April 753 B.C., although in fact no eclipse occurred on that date, nor was any solar eclipse visible at Rome within several years. Now, 21 April 753 B.C. is the date of the foundation of Rome associated with Varro's chronology from his *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*, but thus far Plutarch has made no mention of Varro and must be reporting independent traditions.

He then says that in the time of Varro there lived a man named Tarutius, or L. Tarutius Firmanus, a philosopher and "mathematician," that is, an astrologer, whom Varro asked to determine the day and hour of Romulus' birth. This Tarutius did by reversing normal astrological practice: he studied all the events of Romulus' life and the (mysterious) circumstances of his death, and he gave Varro three dates, of Romulus' conception, of his birth, and of the foundation of