

PETRONIUS, 62.5.

mibi in animo in naso esse, stabam tanquam mortuus.

Such is the reading of *H*, the *codex Traguriensis*. Among early editors Scheffer and Reinesius accepted *mibi in animo* (= "cogitabam ego mecum in animo") and sought, unsuccessfully, to emend *in naso esse*. Heinsius, after first thinking of *in ano*, preferred to change the text to *mibi en animus* (vel *anima*) *in naso esse*, on the grounds that "omnis paene adfectus animi in naribus collocatur a scriptoribus antiquis". Muncker's contemporary proposal (apud Burmann, n. ad loc.) was *mibi anima in naso esse*, which involved greater change in the text of *H*, but relied on the assumed parallelism with Anacreontea 29: 7—8 Bergk (31. 7—8 Preisendanz) *καδίη δὲ ῥινὸς ἄχρις | ἀνέβαινε, καὶν ἀπέσβην*. This parallelism was later supported at greater length by O. Crusius in *Rhein. Mus.* xlvi, 1891, p. 319, and again in his *Untersuch. z. d. Mimiamben d. Herondas*, Leipzig, 1892, p. 54, on iii. 3—4 (where however he prints *animam*).

Muncker's *anima* has been accepted so unquestioningly by editors of Petronius and by several commentators on Herodas, *l. c.*, that it has acquired almost the status of a MS reading (cf., e. g., the comments by J. B. Hofmann, *Lat. Umgangsspr.*,³ Heidelberg, 1951, p. 51). It is however open to objection both palaeographically and linguistically. The change from *in animo* *H* is not attractive, and since this change itself depends upon the assumption that the reference is to the soul's departure from the body — or its readiness to do so — at death, there should be convincing evidence that this is inevitably the reference intended and that no satisfactory alternative meaning can be found by other emendations. Neither of these objections has been met. The emendation *mibi in animo* <*anima*> *in naso esse* suggested by G. Suess (*De eo q. d. inesse Trimalch. Cenae sermone vulgari*, Dorpat, 1926, p. 73) — which has been virtually ignored, though A. Ernout has quoted it in the *apparatus* of his Budé edition of Petronius — attempts to meet the palaeographic difficulty, but goes no further. On the other hand, E. Paratore (*Il Satyr. di Petronio*, Firenze, 1933, II,

p. 216, n. 5) has criticised the admission of *anima in naso esse* as a Latin proverb by A. Otto (*Sprichw.*, s. v. *nasus*, 2); but he accepts *anima* as due to Greek influence, without discussion of other passages or of the text of *H.* Again, neither the passages listed by Crusius, nor others — such as, e. g., the longer list given by Walter Headlam and A. D. Knox in *Herodas, the Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge, 1922, pp. 119–120 — show convincing parallels for Muncker's suggestion. The classical Greek passages involve much difference of context (as does Anacreontea, *l. c.*), and difference in phrasing in the use of ἐπὶ χεῖλεσι. Latin instances also refer to lips or mouth: e. g., Seneca, *Ep.* 30. 14 and *N. Q.* iii. Praef. 16, *in primis labris* = ἐπὶ χεῖλεσι; Ovid, *Met.* xi, 41–3, *per os*; cf. Pliny, *N. H.* vii, 52. 174, *ex ore*. Reference to the nostrils in the uncertain text of Lucilius (Nonius 427 = 574 Marx) *eduxique animam in primoribus naribus* merely indicates “snorting” with indignation, as shown by the preceding words *Calpurni saevam legem Pisonis repreti*. It seems, in fact, more true to say that, where details are given, “era credenza antica che l'anima uscisse al moribondo dalla bocca” (G. Puccioni, *Herodae Mimiambi*, Firenze, 1950, iii. 4, n.) rather than “uscisse per il naso o per la bocca” (E. V. Marmorale, *Cena Trimalch.*, Firenze, 1948, 62. 5, n.: so also Friedlaender, and cf., among others, Crusius, *Untersuch.*, *l. c.*, and P. Groeneboom, *Les Mimiambes d'Hérodas, i-vi*, Groningue, 1922, p. 98).

In the circumstances, early editors may have been more correct in accepting *in animo* and suspecting *in naso*. I would read *mibi in animo, in nassa esse* — “the thought in my mind was, that I was in a trap”. *nassa*, strictly a “fish-trap” — defined by Festus as *piscatorii vasi genus quo cum intravit piscis exire non potest* — was used metaphorically in common speech of a “dangerous situation”. So Plaut., *Mil. Glor.* 581, *nunquam hercle ex ista nassa ego hodie escam petam* (quoted by Festus): Cic., *ad Att.*, xv. 20. 2 *ex hac nassa exire constitui non ad fugam sed ad spem mortis melioris*: cf. Juv., xii. 123. That it was widely used is shown by its numerous Romance survivals, both literal and metaphorical (Meyer-Lübke, s. v.). In the present context Niceros had clearly “walked into a trap”, since he had himself persuaded the soldier-guest, the *lupus*, to accompany him towards Capua (62.2). The words *stabam tanquam mortuus* and, in § 8, *ego primitus nesciebam ubi essem*, well describe the natural reactions of a man who first

finds himself "in a death-trap" and then, when the *lupus* takes no notice of him but goes off into the woods (§ 7), realises that he is in fact free.

Newcastle upon Tyne G. Clement Whittick*

* Quem locum Petronii arte palmari iam sanatum legimus, quantas turbas peritissimo cuique scripturae Petronianae moverit, inde ab anno MDCCCCIV persecutus sum, quo anno Buechelero Petronii editionem minorem quartum curanti in plagulis corrigendis adfui. locutio igitur *anima in naso* emendatione ex amplissima cognitione litterarum Romanarum tracta Petronii ex textu remota est. Ceterum quo usu apud Latinos *anima in naso* iustum locum sibi reservat, is usus iratum spectat. de qua re cf. Lucilii frag. 574 M. a W. supra allatum: *eduxique animam* eqs. quod ad fragmentum recte intellegendum addidit Marx, Lucil. II p. 214 Latinorum Pers. 5,91 *ira cadat naso*, Graecorum Hom., Od. 24,318 ὀρίνετο θυμός, ἀνά βίνας κτλ., Theokr. 1,18 χολὰ ποτὶ βίῃ κἀθῆται, Herond. 6,37 χολὴν ἐπὶ βίβος. at Petronium 62 his locis addere Marx merito dubitavit. — cf. etiam vocabula ut theodisc. „zornschnaubend“, alia, exitum irae per animae flatum erumpentis in naso ponentia. E. B.

BEMERKUNGEN ZUR CHARAKTERISTIK DER IN DEN ARGONAUTIKA DES APOLLONIUS AUFTRETENDEN PERSONEN

In meiner Abhandlung über den Kybelekult in den Argonautika des Apollonius (Rh. Mus. 97, 1954 S. 75 ff.) bemerkte ich schon, daß dem Dichter nicht das hohe Ziel vor Augen stand, ein Nationalepos zu schaffen. Das homerische Epos stand bei den alexandrinischen Gelehrten in hohem Ansehen, aber gerade aus diesem Grunde hielt man es nicht für ratsam, daß ein Dichter sich unterstehen sollte, Homer gleich zu kommen. In Apollonios' Zeiten gibt es, wie Pohlentz¹⁾ bemerkt, keine heroischen Gefühle mehr. In der bürgerlichen Sphäre der ägyptischen Großstadt hatte man Interesse für materiellen Gewinn und geistige Leistungen, und der Kreis, der sich mit der hohen Poesie beschäftigte, bestand aus intellektuellen Gelehrten mit wissenschaftlichem Interesse. Man versteht also

1) Pohlentz, Kallimachos' Aitia, Hermes (1933), Heft 3.