

a quando non venisse sciacquata.” (p. 347). Since he can make no sense of the passage in Pollux (p. 360) in reference to his own view of the shape of the kothon, his interpretation is dependent entirely on inference. He appends a useful synopsis of the ancient testimony. Miss Scheibler has no trouble contesting Mingazzini’s “pilgrim flask” kothon (see pp. 391–392), but I find her discussion of the “Exaleipton” just as unsatisfying. Until the ἀμβωνες are better accounted for—indeed Miss Scheibler has nothing to offer there, I can see no possibility on a philological basis for accepting any existing drinking cup other than the lakaina as the Spartan kothon.

Petronius C. 50 and a gloss in Hesychius

By G. G. BETTS, Clayton (Australia)

One of Trimalchio’s more gauche outbursts in the *Cena* occurs when he discourses on his Corinthian brass-ware. After an insipid joke on the subject he goes on:

et ne me putetis nesapium esse, ualde bene scio, unde primum Corinthea nata sint. cum Ilium captum est, Hannibal, homo uafet et magnus stelio, omnes statuas aeneas et aureas et argenteas in unum rogom conguessit et eas incendit; factae sunt in unum aera miscellanea. ita ex hac massa fabri sustulerunt et fecerunt catilla et paropsides <et> statuncula. sic Corinthea nata sunt, ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud (Müller’s text).

The odd thing about this passage is not that it is absurd—we would expect this from Trimalchio—but that it seems to have no point whatsoever. Confusion of history, mythology, and anything else causes no surprise, but why should Trimalchio say that he really knows the origin of the term *Corinthea* and then proceed to give an account which appears to explain nothing? If his words are to have any meaning he must have connected the word *Corinthea* with some feature of his ridiculous story about Hannibal and the capture of Troy; this connection seems to be hinted at in the words *sic Corinthea nata sunt, ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud*, but, as far as I know, no explanation has been attempted by modern commentators.

It is curious that Hesychius has a gloss which would explain the passage. This is κόρνινθος· μάζης ψωμός i.e. a piece of μάζα. We have no means of telling whether Hesychius (or rather his authority)

meant *μάζα* in its original sense of 'barley-cake' or in its secondary sense of 'lump', 'mass', a sense which could be used in connection with metals. However, it is significant that the derived Latin form of the word, *massa*, is only used in the secondary sense and very often with reference to metals. Trimalchio uses it in this very meaning (*ex hac massa*) to denote the alloy of metals from the Trojan statues; the individual pieces of metal which the workmen took from this *massa* to make their dishes and statuettes, could be exactly described by the word in Hesychius.

I suggest that Petronius was aware of the word *κόρυνθος* and that in this passage he is representing Trimalchio as either ignorant of, or stupidly ignoring, the obvious connection of *Corinthea* with Corinth, and as putting forward a completely ridiculous explanation of the term. The clue provided in the text, and the basis for Trimalchio's illusion, is the word *massa*. For our purpose it does not matter to what sense of *μάζα* the gloss in Hesychius properly had reference. Trimalchio knows that *Corinthium aes* is an alloy and he wants to explain the term by means of *κόρυνθος*; he conceives the connecting link to be *μάζα/massa* and he tells his story to give this etymology a historical justification; Hannibal melted down statues of bronze, gold, and silver; the result can properly be called a *massa* and the link between *κόρυνθος* and *Corinthea* is established to Trimalchio's satisfaction. His additional remark, *ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud*, which simply amplifies the implications of his use of *massa*, emphasizes the point he is making.

This explanation of the passage would, of course, be easier if *Κόρινθος* and *κόρυνθος* were homophones for Trimalchio as they would be in Modern Greek. It seems very likely that this was in fact the case in the 1st Century A.D., particularly for a person from Asia Minor such as Trimalchio; see Schwyzer, *Gr. Grammatik* 1 p. 183.

Zu Valerius Flaccus 1,45

Von KLAUS ALPERS, Hamburg

Seit G. Thilos Ausgabe der *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus (Halle 1863) hat das Dogma, die Überlieferung dieses Gedichtes beruhe allein auf der Handschrift Vaticanus lat. 3277 (= V) und der Laurentianus 39, 38 (= L), aus dem die vollständigen Humanistencodices stammen, sei lediglich eine Kopie von V, bei den Heraus-