

addition is due to the author of *De morb. II* 1 himself. Jouanna argues¹³ that the author's critical attitude towards his model is conceivable only at a time when the doctrine of the model no longer exercised the force of dogma and when philosophic preoccupation with the *ῥηθόρης* of language was widespread. The rhetorically sophisticated character of the argument¹⁴ employed in this passage points in the same direction, and is hardly compatible with Ermerins' theory of a marginal gloss.

Georgia State University

GERARD PENDRICK

Hippocrate, op. cit., pp. 88–92; idem, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 5 (on pp. 228–9); Lonie, *CQ* 15 (1965), 8.

¹³ Jouanna, *Maladies II*, op. cit., p. 134 n. 5 (on pp. 228–9).

¹⁴ On the form of the argument cf. Wankel, loc. cit., and especially the informative note of Wilhelm Fox on Demosthenes, *De corona* 95 (W. Fox, *Die Kranzrede des Demosthenes* [Leipzig, 1880], n. 73 on pp. 300–301)(cited by Wankel).

A NOTE ON THE DATING OF DEMETRIUS' *ON STYLE*

Anyone who studies antiquity is surely accustomed to the tenuousness and often wild variances of the dating of many of our texts. But even if this is taken for granted, the dating of Demetrius' *On Style* seems more problematic than most: the text has been assigned a date anywhere from the late fourth century B.C. to the late first century C.E.¹ Attempts to narrow this wide range have been made using internal linguistic data, but these have not proved definitive, although a late date is now tentatively accepted by most.² But a possibly more convincing argument for a late date may be found in a reference to architecture in paragraph 13 of *On Style*.

In paragraph 13, Demetrius compares the members of a period to the stones that support 'rounded roofs' (*periphēis stegas*). If this refers merely to vaulted ceilings, then this passage will offer us no help in dating, as vaults were known from the early ancient world, as far back as even the fourth millennium B.C.³ This phrase has been taken in this way by at least one translator.⁴ But if the phrase refers to domes, then this would rule out an early date for *On Style*, as domes were not widely known in the west before the first century C.E.⁵ 'Rounded roofs' would seem a more appropriate label for domes than for vaults, especially since *periphēis* can have the more specific meaning of 'spherical', as opposed to merely 'curved' or 'rounded' in

¹ See the introduction by T. A. Moxon, *Poetics of Aristotle, On Style by Demetrius* (London, 1934) x–xi; and W. R. Roberts, *Demetrius On Style* (Cambridge, 1902) 49–64, and his later *Demetrius On Style* (Cambridge, MA, 1927) 257–87, esp. 268–77.

² For the linguistic evidence, see Roberts (1902), 55–9; in the introduction to the 1927 edition, 271–7, he conjectures that it was written in the second half of the first century C.E. by the Demetrius mentioned by Plutarch in *On the Cessation of Oracles*, but even he himself admits that his evidence is slim. An early date (first half of the third century B.C.) is accepted by G. A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, NJ, 1963) 286, following the suggestion of G. M. A. Grube, *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style* (Toronto, 1961) 39ff. A late date (first century C.E.) is accepted by D. M. Schenkeveld, *Studies in Demetrius On Style* (Amsterdam, 1964) 135–48, and more tentatively by G. A. Kennedy, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 1, *Classical Criticism* (Cambridge, 1989), 196.

³ On the history of vaults, see M. S. Briggs, *Everyman's Concise Encyclopaedia of Architecture* (London, 1959) 354–6; on vaults in Roman architecture, see W. L. MacDonald, *The Architecture of the Roman Empire* (2 vols., New Haven and London, 1982) vol. 1, 3–8.

⁴ Moxon, op. cit., 203.

⁵ On the history of domes, see Briggs, op. cit., 109–10; and MacDonald, op. cit., 24, and his detailed discussion of the Pantheon (ca. 125–8 C.E.) 94–121.

general.⁶ This passage has in fact been cited as an example of *peripherés* meaning 'domed',⁷ and it is so translated by Roberts.⁸

It therefore seems likely that paragraph 13 of *On Style* refers to domes and that we can date the work to the first century C.E. Although this can hardly be considered scientific proof, this datum should be considered in any future discussion of the dating of the work.⁹

Department of Theology,
University of Notre Dame

KIM PAFFENROTH

⁶ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th edition, Oxford, 1940) 1392.

⁷ Ibid., 1392.

⁸ Roberts (1927), 307.

⁹ I would like to thank Dr Schenkeveld for pointing out some of my omissions and errors in a previous version of this paper. This in no way implies his agreement with my conclusion.

CORNUA AND FRONTES IN [TIBULLUS] 3.1.13

atque inter *geminæ* pingantur cornua frontes
geminæ Wunderlich *geminas* codd.

The transmitted text of line 13, 'inter *geminas*...frontes', has long presented an anomaly in the description of the decorated papyrus roll. If, in the context of book production, *frons* means the flat, round cross section located at either end of the rolled up book (*TLL* 6.1.1362, 84) and if *cornu* means an ornamental projection attached to the ends of the *umbilicus* and extending beyond the plane of the *frons*, then the transmitted text is a physical impossibility.¹ For it is the *frontes* that lie between the *cornua* and not the other way round. In the words of Heyne's paraphrase: 'geminæ frontes inter duo cornua, non duo cornua inter geminas frontes.'² Emendation is required not only because an author is unlikely to be inaccurate or imprecise about the physical details of his book but also because the transmitted text can be salvaged only by recourse to tortuous theories about the meaning of *cornu* and *frons*, about their locations with respect to one another, and about the interpretation of *inter* with *geminas*.

Hermann Tränkle, the most recent editor, accepts the definitions of *frons* and *cornu* given above and acknowledges that the *frontes* lie between the *cornua*.³ Yet he adopts, albeit with serious misgivings, 'inter *geminas* frontes', interpreting *inter* as 'in the

¹ The best analysis of these terms is H. Blümner's 'Umbilicus und cornua', *Philologus* 73 (1914-16), 426-45; the line in question is discussed on pp. 436-7 where Blümner conjectures *intra*. A full bibliography of the controversy about the meaning of *cornua* is given in S. Besslich, 'Die "Hörner" des Buches. Zur Bedeutung von *cornua* im antiken Buchwesen', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 1973, pp. 44-50 but his conclusions are not always reliable. Brief discussion, with good bibliography, of *cornua* and *frons* in E. J. Kenney's 'Books and Readers in the Roman World' in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2: *Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 31.

² C. G. Heyne, *Albii Tibulli carmina, Libri tres*⁴ (Leipzig, 1817). In the paraphrase Heyne is for the moment assuming with J. H. Voss that *frontes* = the top and bottom edges of the roll ('bases cylindri'). Heyne himself, following P. Burman's somewhat confused note on *Tristia* 1.1.11, wrongly explains *frontes* as the exterior and interior of the protocollon. But after giving his explanation Heyne then confesses perplexity at the meaning of the transmitted text.

³ *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin/New York, 1990).