

ἄμεινον δὲ τῷ Ἀλικαρνασεὶ Διονυσίῳ ἐπομένους ποιητικὸν μὲν λόγον φάναι τὸν τροπικῇ τε καὶ μεταφορικῇ καὶ διθυραμβῶδει συνθήκη συντεθειμένον, ὅποια ἡ Γοργίου τοῦ ῥήτορος φράσις· πρῶτος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ὥς φησι Διονύσιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μμῆσεως δευτέρῳ, τὴν ποιητικὴν καὶ διθυραμβῶδη λέξιν εἰς τοὺς πολιτικοὺς εἰσήνεγκε λόγους.

University of Western Ontario

IVARS AVOTINS

QUO USQUE TANDEM PATIEMINI?

In his article (*CP* 71 (1976), 97–105) R. Reneham rightly classes Sall. *Cat.* 20.9 as a conscious imitation of Cic. *Cat.* 1.1, but adopts the unsatisfactory explanation of parody. Such parody is, as he notes, without parallel in Sallust and ineptly distracts attention from the vigorous development of Catiline's rhetoric. Elsewhere *mimesis* is regularly a compliment to the author imitated, often closely functional by reinforcing a point from the parallel of a similar context (e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 4.1 ~ Pl. *Ep.* 324 b). Similarly I suggest that here Sallust recalls Cicero's words to illustrate that perversion of vocabulary which is the keynote of Catiline's speech: just as he misuses, for example, the terms *virtus fidesque* at the beginning of his speech, in stark contrast to Sallust's own definition, so he perverts the famous words of the attack which revealed his true villainy in similar savage *indignatio*. For such indirect insight into Catiline's warped morality compare *Jug.* 10, where the hypocrisy of Micipsa is highlighted by the contrast with the noble Cyrus, similarly attempting to reconcile brothers to rule in amity after his death (*Jug.* 10.4 ~ Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.13–14), and, *mutatis mutandis*, Thuc. 3.38 ff., where Cleon is obliquely criticized by his misuse of Periclean phrases (e.g. 3.38.1 ~ 2.61.2).

On this interpretation Cicero is subtly complimented, as in a second echo of *Cat.* 1.1 in Sallust, *Hist.* 1.77.15 'vos autem, patres conscripti, quo usque cunctando rem publicam intutam patiemini . . .?' Here Philippus is in a parallel situation to Cicero as he urges the senate to pass the *s.c.u.* against Lepidus.

St. Hilda's College, Oxford

D. C. INNES

QUINTILIAN 6.3.15–16

nihil autem uetabat et componi materias in hoc idoneas, ut controuersiae permixtis salibus fingerentur, uel res proponi singulas ad iuuenum talem exercitationem. quin illae ipsae (dicta sunt ac uocantur), quas certis diebus festae licentiae dicere solebamus, si paulum adhibita ratione fingerentur, aut aliquid in his serium quoque esset admixtum, plurimum poterant utilitatis adferre; quae nunc iuuenum uel sibi ludentium exercitatio est.

The text of the parenthesis *dicta sunt ac uocantur*, which has been generally suspected, is defended by M. Winterbottom in *Problems in Quintilian* (B.I.C.S.

Suppl. 25, 1970), p.106. He quotes some parallels to *sunt ac uocantur*,¹ but the words remain rather pointless. Moreover *dicta* is unsatisfactory. Subjects, or topics (*materiae* or *res*, the latter of which Winterbottom takes to be understood with *illae ipsae*) cannot be or be called *dicta*. I suggest that the words *dicta sunt ac* conceal the technical term *diasyrticae*. It would have been natural for these mock speeches to be of a derogatory nature, and *diasyrmus* is associated with ridicule, wit, and ironical praise. Aquila Romanus defines it as *eleuatio uel irrisio* (15, *R.L.M.* 26); the life of Caracalla in the *Historia Augusta* quotes as a *diasyrticum dictum* a witty taunt directed against the emperor (*H. A. Caracalla* 10.5–6); and Jerome, attacking Rufinus, writes ‘uidetis nos intellegere prudentiam eius et praedicationis diasyrtae strophis in scholis saepe lusisse’ (*adv. Rufinum* 1.1).

If this emendation is correct, the sentence, the subject of which I take to be *materiae*, would run *quin illae ipsae (diasyrticae uocantur) quas certis diebus etc.* A parenthesis giving a technical term without any introductory word is quite in Quintilian’s manner. Cf. 7.9.2 (ὁμωνυμία dicitur); 8.2.10 (epitheta dicuntur); 8.3.82 (βραχυλογία uocant . . .).

Wallingford, Oxon.

M. L. CLARKE

¹ Macrobius, *Comm. Somn. Scip.* 1.14.6; Plin. *N.H.* pr.24, Virg. *Aen.* 8.271–2; to which one might add from Quintilian himself ‘quod ἀποφθεγματικὸν uocat et est ita’

(6.3.109). Dr. Winterbottom also draws my attention to D.H. *Ant. Orat.* 2, λέγεται τε καὶ ἔστιν, and Julius Victor (*R.L.M.* 395) ‘locis . . . qui communes sunt et appellantur’.

TACITUS, *GERMANIA* 19.1

Ergo saepa pudicitia agunt, nullis spectaculorum inlecebris, nullis convivorum iritationibus corruptae. litterarum secreta viri pariter ac feminae ignorant. paucissima in tam numerosa gente adulteria, quorum poena praesens et maritis permissa: adcisus crinibus nudatam coram propinquis expellit domo maritus ac per omnem vicum verbere agit. publicatae enim pudicitiae nulla venia: non forma, non aetate, non opibus maritum invenerit. nemo enim illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum vocatur.

enim] etiam Lips.: del. Nipperdey

In chapter 18 Tacitus has discussed conjugal virtue among the Germans. In 19.1 ‘paucissima . . . adulteria’ obviously deals with behaviour after marriage; and in § 2 also Tacitus considers married life and the question of second marriages. But the sentence beginning ‘publicatae’ has been taken to refer to prostitution, ‘publicare pudicitiam’ being regarded as an extension of the idea of ‘publicare corpus’.¹

The words ‘publicatae pudicitiae’ are not of themselves inapplicable to married women; so if we are not to be told until we reach ‘maritum invenerit’ that the subject has now changed to behaviour before marriage, this comes with a considerable jolt. Not surprisingly, in this position the conjunction ‘enim’ has been suspected. J. G. C. Anderson in his commentary on *Germania*² mentions and rejects solutions which have been relied on: to omit ‘enim’, or read ‘etiam’

¹ Plaut. *Bacch.* 863, ‘tum illam, quae corpus publicat uolgo suum’.

² Oxford, 1938, p.113.