

commission of error) to depart from one's *Vorlage* in any given instance. It is, therefore, impossible to eliminate entirely from consideration the influence that previous editors have had on the punctuation (and other aspects) of the text of Ammianus or Aurelius Victor. Finally, there is one additional consideration that may possibly be relevant to the results of Marriott's first (but perhaps not his second) study, namely the question of genre. The *HA* is, or purports to be, biography, and the author (or at least one of the authors) explicitly takes as his model the biographical writings of Suetonius ('Vop.', *Probus* 2.7) and abjures the style of such writers as Sallust, Livy and Tacitus. In view of the fact that one characteristic of Suetonius' style is the cultivation of the short, declarative sentence, and in view of the fact that Ammianus, for example, models his style on that of Tacitus, one wonders if the significant difference in sentence-length between Ammianus and the *HA* cannot be accounted for on generic grounds. The only control text that Marriott uses that, like the *HA*, belongs to the biographical genre is Aurelius Victor, but he uses him not in his study of sentence-length but in his study of the grammatical category of words that begin and end sentences.

It is unfortunate, then, that Marriott's studies were conducted in a manner that took no account of these decisive considerations. It is still more unfortunate, in the light of these considerations, that Marriott's conclusions have been so widely and so uncritically accepted. Moreover, the unreliability of this sort of study had been pointed out even before the publication of Marriott's article. In an article published in 1964, Tore Janson makes a number of sensible criticisms of similar studies carried out on the philosophical works of Seneca.¹¹ Among the interesting comments that Janson makes (many of which anticipate the objections raised above), is the valuable observation (p. 29) that editors' preferences with regard to punctuation 'seem to be influenced not only by the particular idiosyncracies of the editor but also those of his generation and of his nation, the semicolon, for example, being more used . . . by German than by English and more by early than by modern scholars'. Clearly, therefore, it is not legitimate simply to take whatever editions are readily available and to use the punctuation that they exhibit as the basis for a statistical study of the authorship of the *HA*. We ought to welcome the application of computers and of statistical analysis to problems like that of the authorship of the *HA*, but we need to make sure that we are employing these aids in a manner that leads to valid results.

University of Illinois

¹¹ T. Janson, 'The Problems of Measuring Sentence-Length in Classical Texts', *Studia Linguistica* 18 (1964), 26-36. Compare also the cautious remarks in S.

Ireland, 'Sentence Structure in Aeschylus and the Position of the Prometheus in the Corpus Aeschyleum', *Philologus* 121 (1977), 191-2.

ADDENDUM

(R. R. R. Smith, 'Late Roman Philosopher Portraits from Aphrodisias', pp. 127-55 above).

It is now possible to report that in the 1990 season at Aphrodisias, the missing portrait of the Pythagoras medallion (No. 6, p. 141 above) was identified in a separate head stored in the museum depot. It had been found thirteen years before the medallion, in 1968, in the excavation of the surface levels of the theatre. The head joins the medallion perfectly. It has long hair bound by rolled fillet, a long beard, and a generic classical philosopher physiognomy. It is very close in technique and formal style to the Pindar (No. 1). Publication will follow in *Aphrodisias Papers* III.