

ROLAND JEFFREYS

THE PANEGYRIST is listing those regions from which Messalla will not receive triumphs:

- non te vicino remorabitur obvia Marte*
Gallia nec latis audax Hispania terris
nec fera Theraeo tellus obsessa colono,
 140 *nec qua vel Nilus vel regia lympha Choaspes*
profluit aut rapidus, Cyri dementia, Gyndes,
† ardet arectais aut unda perhospita † campis,
nec qua regna vago Tamyris finivit Araxe,
impia vel saevis celebrans convivia mensis
 145 *ultima vicinus Phoebos tenet arva Padaeus,*
quaque Hebrus Tanaisque Getas rigat atque Magynos.
quid moror? Oceanus ponto qua continet orbem,
nulla tibi adversis regio sese offeret armis.¹

In verse 142 there is a sharp divergence between the readings of F (the fragmentum Cuiacianum),

ardet arectais aut unda perhospita campis

and those of most complete mss, including the earliest, A (Ambrosianus R. 26 sup.),

creteis ardet aut unda caristia campis . . .²

Neither version makes much sense as it stands and every word in each version has at some time been emended.³

A's text contains a metrical flaw in the third foot and two words that seem to be adjectives derived from places (Crete and Carystus in Euboea) that accord ill with one another and are out of place among the Eastern regions referred to in the lines that precede and succeed. Most editors since Scaliger have seen better prospects of reconstructing the line in the superior F.⁴ At the line-beginning A's *creteis* looks like an attempt to produce

¹The text of 3.7.137–148 given by H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin 1990) 41. In v. 142 he prints F's readings but obelizes almost the whole line.

²For the manuscript tradition of the Tibullan Corpus see M. D. Reeve and R. H. Rouse in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1982) 420–425.

³Fuller details in R. L. Jeffreys, *A Commentary on the Panegyricus Messallae* (diss., University of London 1982) 237 ff.

⁴On F and its merits, see Reeve and Rouse in Reynolds (above, n. 2) 424–425; Tränkle (above, n. 1) 8; G. P. Goold, *Catullus, Tibullus and Pervigilium Veneris*² (Cam-

a known name from an unknown (*arectais*) composed of almost the same letters, while confusion caused by the similarity of *ardet* and *arect-* may have influenced the shift in *ardet*'s position in A.⁵ The occurrence of *Cres* at the beginning of v. 9 of the poem may have encouraged the introduction of *creteis* here and its shift to the first position; the motif of hospitality is present in both lines (*hospes*, v. 9; *perhospita* in F's version of v. 142). Scaliger explained *ardet* as a reference to blazing naphtha pools and *arectais* (corrected to *Arecteis*) as an adjective derived from the ancient Mesopotamian city called Arach in the Vulgate (*Genesis* 10.10).⁶ Most critics have accepted *Arecteis* and Scaliger's explanation but the supposed reference to Arach is highly improbable. The correct Hebrew form of the name in *Genesis* seems to be Erech while the Sumerians and Akkadians called it Uruk.⁷ More to the point, in Greek the name appears as "Ορεχ (Septuagint), 'Ορχόν (Ptol. *Geog.* 5.20.7) or "Ορχοι (inscriptions).⁸ Its inhabitants are termed 'Ορχηνοί by Strabo (16.1.6) and Orcheni by Pliny (*HN* 6.123; 130). Salmasius saw a reference to another place, *Arecca vel Aracca* ... *Susidis urbs*, and read *Areccaeis* (corrected by Postgate to *Araccaeis* on the basis of Ptol. *Geog.* 6.3; cf. *Amm.* 26.6.26).⁹ Salmasius too referred *ardet* to naphtha pools, though again Aracca is not explicitly linked with these.¹⁰ Neither Salmasius nor Scaliger could offer a satisfactory explanation for *perhospita*.

Heinsius conjectured *haud una per ostia* for *aut unda perhospita* and attached the whole line to Gyndes. This would be an elaboration of the allusion in *rapidus*, *Cyri dementia*, *Gyndes* to the story told in Herodotus 1.189 (repeated in Seneca *De ira* 3.21.1–5 and Orosius *Hist.* 2.6.4) of how Cyrus, provoked by the drowning of his white horse, diverted Gyndes into 360 canals. Lachmann improved this interpretation with *aret* for *ardet*. The line then ran:

aret Arecteis haud una per ostia campis ...

bridge, Mass. 1988) 187; G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carmina* (Stuttgart 1988) xiii–xiv; F. W. Lenz and G. C. Galinsky, *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres* (Leiden 1971) 7–8 (and works there cited).

⁵J. P. Postgate, "Tibulliana," *CR* 19 (1905) 213–214, at 214.

⁶This place is not explicitly linked with naphtha in the classical sources; Scaliger wrongly identified it with a place in Assyria called 'Αρακηνή, which is (Strabo 16.1.4).

⁷S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago 1963) 27. On the site and its history, see R. M. Adams and H. J. Nissen, *The Uruk Countryside* (Chicago 1972).

⁸M. Rostovtzeff, "Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions," *YCS* 3 (1932) 1–114, at 49.

⁹*Areccaeis* and *Araccaeis* are wrongly referred to Arach in Tränkle (above, n. 1) 230.

¹⁰Salmasius's comments are quoted in the Delphin variorum edition of Tibullus, edited by A. J. Valpy (London 1822) 432. A slip in the apparatus of Luck's edition ([above, n. 4] 92) attributes *aret* to Salmasius.

Many editors, including Lenz and Galinsky, Luck, and Goold, have adopted these readings; Goold translates vv. 141–142: “or where the rushing Gyndes which maddened Cyrus lies parched in its many channels over the plains of Arecta.”¹¹ However ingenious, this solution is unlikely to be correct. In addition to the argument given above against *Arecteis*, there is the fact that “Ὀρχοί lay about 300 kilometres from the Gyndes. Further, *rapidus* would have to be strained into meaning *olim rapidus*¹² and *aret* into meaning *aescit*. Again, while *aret* fits Seneca’s version (*siccum relinqueret*) it does not quite accord with Herodotus (or Orosius), for Cyrus’ intent was not to dry up the river but to weaken its flow. More important, this text eliminates *aut unda*, which is preserved by both F and the complete MSS.

Postgate retained *aut unda* and, in accord with his adoption of *Araccaeis* as a reference to Aracca in Susiana, argued that an adjective, such as *Copratis* or *Oroatis*, derived from a river of Susiana, lay behind *perhospita* and *caristia*.¹³ Thus in his Loeb text he read

aret Araccaeis aut unda Oroatis campis,

and translated vv. 141–142 “or where the rushing Gyndes which maddened Cyrus lies parched, or the waters of Oroatis in the plains of Aracca.” This translation nicely obscures the problem of the verb for *unda*. It cannot be *aret*. This could scarcely be used with special point of Gyndes and then more generally of *unda*. In any case both Oroatis (Strabo 15.3.1) and Coprates (Diod. Sic. 19.18) were mighty rivers. On the other hand, it is hard to understand a verb of flowing from *profluit*, given the intervention of *aret*. Nor would *ardet* help matters.

Any answer to the line’s problems is more likely to be found in Herodotus than in the Bible or Ptolemy. The Herodotean background of this part of the poem has long been recognized. The foundation of Cyrene (v. 139) is recounted in Herodotus 4.150–158 and the curious funerary customs of the Padaei (v. 145) are described in 3.99. In between we have several items culled from the latter part of Herodotus, Book One: Choaspes (v. 140 and 1.188); Gyndes (v. 141 and 1.189); Tamyris (v. 143 and 1.205 ff.) In my view, v. 142 refers to another story from the same book.

In 1.185 we are told that Nitocris, queen of Babylon, in order to slow the progress of any Persian attack on her territory, had canals dug along the Euphrates. These made the course of the river so crooked that travellers

¹¹Goold (above, n. 4) 319.

¹²R. Helm, *PhilWoch* 58 (1938) 891 (review of Lenz’s 1937 edition).

¹³Postgate (above, n. 5) 214; *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri* (Oxford 1915) xiv; text (with brief notes) and translation of *Panegyricus Messallae* in F. W. Cornish, J. P. Postgate, and J. W. Mackail, *Catullus, Tibullus and Pervigilium Veneris* (New York 1913, Loeb Classical Library). Guy Lee (*Tibullus: Elegies*³ [Leeds 1990] 92) follows Postgate’s Loeb text of the line.

sailing downstream were forced to visit the village of Ἀρδέρικα three times in three days.¹⁴ F's *perhospita* will be, as Heinsius once suggested,¹⁵ a corruption of *ter hospita*,¹⁶ but with the sense "thrice a visitor," and *ardet arectais* an attempt to deal with an adjective derived from the name of the village.

The short second syllable in Ἀρδέρικα, the form transmitted in the best MSS, is an obvious problem. However, variant spellings exist, including Ἀρδέρικα (S and V). At Herodotus 6.119, where another place of similar name is mentioned, S and V give Ἀρδερινκά. It is possible that the panegyrist had come across the name spelled in a manner that would scan. In any case, as is well known, Roman poets did permit themselves certain liberties when dealing with intractable proper names and adjectives, especially in the case of foreign words (cf. Priscian *De acc.* 8.3.520, 23k.) Hosius's discussion of the evidence remains fundamental.¹⁷ Vowel length might be adjusted to suit the metre, as Servius notes in connection with Vergil's *Sýchaeus* (*Aen.* 1.343) as against *Sýchaeus* elsewhere. Not infrequently, a consonant was doubled so as to lengthen a preceding short syllable or one of a pair of double consonants removed so as to shorten a preceding syllable. Thus though *Britannus* is the usual form in Latin verse, *Brittannus* is employed in Lucr. 6.1104; cf. the form *Britto* in Mart. 11.21.9; Juv. 15.124. Again, Lucan (4.722) has *Sabbura* (a general of Juba) for *Saburra* (Caesar *BCiv* 2.45; 4.54.) Hosius provides other instances of such doubling of consonants and of the reverse procedure.

I therefore suggest that the panegyrist wrote *Arderiecaeis* or *Arderriccaeis*, either on the basis of whatever text he used or by poetic adjustment. Normally one would be reluctant to invoke such explanations in a conjecture, but the Herodotean detail is too compelling to ignore. *Arderiecaeis* is metrically preferable in that it avoids the five long syllables in one word. On

¹⁴See the sketch (based on Matzat) in W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford 1928) 1.144.

¹⁵Heinsius made his suggestion with the comment, *numerus ternarium pro multiplici ponunt poetae*. This explanation is clearly unsatisfactory and Heinsius himself abandoned his idea in favour of *haud una per ostia*. Heinsius's notes are included in the edition by J. Broukhuisius (Amsterdam 1708); see pp. 455, 464.

¹⁶A's *caristia* may have been derived from a corruption of *ter hospita*. The possibility of confusion at the beginning of the words is suggested by the MSS readings at Lygd. 3.3.14; there A reads *thariste* and it is left to other MSS to include *cariste*, the required invocation of Carystus with its famous marble. This marble contains undulating, greenish veins, which were often likened to waves of the sea (e.g., Stat. *Silvae* 1.5.3, *undosa Carystos*); see discussion and authorities cited in H.-J. Van Dam, *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book 2: A Commentary* (Leiden 1984) 250–251 (on *Silvae* 2.2.92–93). A corrector of v. 142 may have been written *caristia* ... *unda* having in mind this *cipollino verde ondato*.

¹⁷C. Hosius, "De nominum propriorum apud poetas Latinos usu et prosodia," *NJ* 151 (1895) 93–111, especially 99 ff.

the other hand if the poet adjusted Ἀρδέρικκα, the parallels suggest that he is more likely to have doubled the *r* ; he may have felt that the uncouthness of the spondaic word was permissible in an exotic place-name.

Verse 142 will now run:

Arderriccaeis (or Arderiecaeis) aut unda ter hospita campis.

With this text, *aut* is postponed,¹⁸ *profluit* is the verb for all the rivers in vv. 140–142 and v. 142 refers to the Euphrates. I translate, “or where flows the stream that visits the plains of Arderricca three times.”¹⁹

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, ONTARIO
K1S 5B6

¹⁸See M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik. Zweiter Band: Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich 1965) 500; *TLL* 2, 1565, 10 ff.

¹⁹This paper has been developed from material in my thesis (above, n. 3). I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, the late Professor O. Skutsch, for his invaluable advice, and to the anonymous reviewers of *Phoenix* for their helpful comments on an earlier draft.