MORE ON THE TEXT OF
APOLLONIUS OF TYRE

This paper is intended as an annex to my "Apollonius Resartus: A Study in Conjectural Criticism", now on the eve of publication in Classical Philology. There is no need to repeat the references given there or the principles followed in criticizing a tale transmitted, as this one is, in separate recensions. Citation here will be from Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri, ed. Alexander Riese (Leipzig, 1893) – page and line alone denoting the AP recension (from which I draw my major passages), the addition of "B" the B1).

I.

With the three passages assembled here I return to a theme implicit in my earlier paper: Riese's sovereign indifference to internal features of style. "I sometimes wish", sighed Housman, "that Ovid's editors, instead of editing him, would read him". No reader, of that paper or this, should be surprised to learn that Riese was also an editor of Ovid and belonged precisely to the group to which Housman was referring. Yet Riese, if not a careful critic, was still at least a critic. I am pleased to conclude this rubric with a methodological digression wherein, for once, I wrest the balance in his favor.

p. 72, 6 f. omnes quicumque inibant dantes singulos aureos plorantes abscedebant.

inibant is the received correction. To P's impossible ibant the editors are determined to add no more letters than they must – a laudible aim, were they not thereby constrained to disregard AP's usage2). Of the words used ever and again for "entering", never once do we find ineo; instead we find ingredior (21 times), intro

1) A, while contributing to the name of the recension, bears but a third of the tale and no part of it containing the passages here assessed. The reader will be spared confusion then if for these, from the outset, he considers P testis unicus.

2) B's also, for that matter.
(7), and introeo (11). The choice lies then between intrabant, from B’s "omnes qui intrabant dantes pecuniam flentes recedebant”, and introibant"). In so choosing one would be adding, where the editors add in- or i-, potentially no more than -i- or -i-. And please do not retort that i (i) bant or i (i) bant would exist only in the imagination of one seeking to fortify a correction of his own: at p. 93.5 f., where P must render ingreditur, it renders it ĭgd’r.

p. 103.7 f. Erigens se ergo se Tyrius Apollonius his dictis populo alloquitur.

So P. Which shall be the victim? “Erigens [se] ergo se” reads Riese, apparently by the toss of a coin. The real basis for decision here, the only exact parallel in this recension, he altogether misses – p. 88.1 “Erigens se ergo adsedit et ait...”. Read therefore “Erigens se ergo [se]”.

p. 112.5 f. Quique cum adductus fuisset, ait ad eum Tharsia...
The connective enclitic attached to a relative, itself already the connective, is a strange sight. To Riese it is something less: “Quique sic P” says he, obviously proud of having adopted it. Those who pry into still later Latin texts and certain Swedish programs, where support may be found for almost anything, will inevitably find support for Quique. But that is not the issue. The issue is rather this: why did Riese not at p. 80, 12 “Qui (Quique P) dum singulas notat naues”, the one other place where this tradition attests such an enclitic, adopt it and say “Quique sic P”? For fair is fair, and yet there he tacitly deletes.

What then to do? Let –que be either retained or deleted, but in both passages let the course be the same. Only the most cynical of editors, I should think, would retain it without raising in the apparatus (if merely to protect himself) the possibility of deletion. For in AP not simply is such an enclitic the extreme in rarity: relatives as connectives, upon whose function it encroaches, are the extreme in frequency. cum or dum alone such relatives precede by the score. And then there are AP’s scribes, born stutterers and never so much themselves as when they are writing twice what should be written once. On dittography in AP see my earlier paper, rubric IV; and here what would –que be, after qui, but the product of dittography?

3) For the selfsame variation cf. p. 71, 3 introiuit AP, intrauit B.
4) For another test of Riese’s consistency take the infinitius actuus pro passiuo. Contrast the indications of his apparatus at pp. 47, 13 (facere), 59, 10f. (laudare... uituperare), and 110, 8 (comprehendere). Would not a reader, consulting any one of these passages in isolation, have a damaged impression of the style?
I have mentioned certain Swedish programs. A short digression here on Einar Löfstedt, facile princeps of the so-called Swedish School, may perhaps be in point. Löfstedt had an irrational prejudice against conjectural emendation; almost automatically he will dismiss an emendation without a hearing and revert to the MS reading. It is this temper of mind that I reprobate: this boundless confidence even in passages about which had he paused to weigh probabilities, internal probabilities, he might have entertained a doubt. I will not take an unfavorable specimen: I will take a specimen in which initially, and maybe even ultimately, he is right. In Syntactica II, p. 342 f. n. 26, Löfstedt castigates Riese, as I in my earlier paper castigated him, for applying the obelus to p. 112, 2 f. “Mulier mala, ut uidit eam, ... fimo corpore contremuit”. „Der Ausdruck ist sicher richtig“, he smugly announces, no doubt with most of his readers in tow. And why not? On the face of it imo corpore has no blemish, particularly when displayed alongside passages with imis medullis and imis artubus. Yet there are these facts. First, it is not only that on three other occasions in AP (and on two other in B) we meet toto corpore: we meet it amidst phraseology akin to ut uidit ... contremuit. Witness pp. 68, 2 f. “Puella uero, ut haec audiiit, toto corpore contremuit...” (“Puella ut audiiit, toto corpore contremuit” B); 76, 1 f. “Scelerata mulier hoc audito toto corpore contremuit et ait...” (habet B tantum “Scelerata ait”); 77, 6 f. “Apollonius ut audiiit, tremebundus toto corpore expalluit...” (“Apollonius hoc audito toto corpore tremebundus palluit” B). And secondly, in the passage in hand, B answers AP’s imo corpore with toto corpore. Just so: Löfstedt fails to signal that the source of his passage is one recension, AP, and that another, B, happens to interpose a check. In my submission then Riese was not wrong, at least in this work, to suspect the reading; he was wrong, or hyperskeptical, to imagine that, if imo should be corrupt, it would be a corruption of anything but toto. For as I was led to remark: “only let TOTO dwindle to TO and from TO, if misread io, nothing but imo could ensue”. “Iron resolve”, wrote Housman, “may be a good thing in its proper place, but in criticism it is less desirable than perception and consideration”.

II.

Here I broach conjectures on five more passages.

p. 33,3 ff. Et haec dicens respiciens famulos, quos illi puella donauerat, ait "tollite, famuli, hoc quod mihi regina donuit: aurum, argentum et uestem; et eamus hospitalia quarentes".

In view of the plurality of the catalogue – *aurum, argentum et uestem* (cf. p. 32, 10 f. “ducenta talenta auri, argenti pondera XL, seruos XX et uestem copiosissimam”) – we should expect not *hoc quod*, but *haec quae*. The latter we do in fact read in B, even though B omits the catalogue: “... tollite, famuli, haec quae mihi regina donavit...”. In fact, too, the paradosis for AP is P’s *hos quos*, and the editors, intent on saving the letter *o*, have reverentially fabricated *hoc quod*. In vain. The letter *o* is no hallowed relic of an original *hoc quod*. *hos quos* is nothing but a reminiscence, plain and patent, of the directly preceding “*famulos, quos... donauerat*” – the reminiscence of a scribe still under the spell, as well, of p. 32, 11 ff. “Et intuens Apollonii *famulos, quos donauerat*, dixit ‘afferte quaeque (note the neuter plural) promisi’...”.

Without compunction then write *haec quae* for AP. Add this error to the instances of perseverance diagnosed or illustrated in my earlier paper, rubric II, and add further: pp. 17, 9 f. “ciues Tharsis, quos annonae penuria turbat et opprimit, ego *Tyrius Apollonius releuabo*” (*prim* P, i. e. *primus*, due to “*opprimit*”); 17, 11 ff. “Credo... uos... fugam meam celaturos. Scitote... me legibus Antiochi regis esse fugatum; sed uestra felicitate fa-ciente hucusque ad uos sum *delatus*” (*delatus* edd.: *dilatus* A: *celatus* P, due to “*celaturos*”); 23, 8 f. “paupertas quae cumque est suffict nobis” (*quicq*; es P, i. e. *quicumque es*, due to “*quicumque es*” at p. 22, 7)²).


So Riese. But I would put a full stop after *medicos*, letting the relative stand (as frequently in AP) for the sentence connective⁸). I

7) To rubric III, in illustration of my conjecture *tibi*, add p. 17, 8 f. “et ascendens Apollonius tribunal in foro *cunctis ciuius et maioribus eiusdem ciuitatis dixit...*” (*cunctis* A, *citatis* P, i. e. *ciuitatis*, due to the following *ciuitatis*).

8) B’s “At illi...” (*infra*) demonstrates that it is no mere impulse to start a fresh sentence with *Qui...*
would also restrict excision to medici; uenientes seems sound. Compare pp. 42, 1 ff. "Postera uero die uocantur amici. . . , qui-bus convocatis in unum pariter rex ait. . ." and 64, 3 f. B "... famulos misit ad convocandos amicos et patriae principes. Qui conuenientes consederunt". That physicians may indeed "come", once they have been "summoned" (adhibet medicos), is certified by Aegritudo Perdicae 137 ff. (ed. Vollmer, PLM vol. V):

tunc quoque sollicitam monuit maestamque parentem maternae pietatis honos, famulasque uocavit ad se sese iussitque artis † medicinae requiri primores qui forte forent adducere secum. iussa citae peragunt: uitae uenere magistri ingressique fores atque abdita tecta cubantis inueniunt iuuenem postrema clade grauatum et primum quaerunt, quae causa laboris inesset; post uenam temptant; sed haec pulsusque quietus: esse negant causas uitiati corporis illic, etc.

No matter that, by a thoroughly typical difference, B neither has nor reflects uenientes:

Rex ut uidit filiam suam subitaneam ualetudinem incurrisse, sollicitate adhibuit medicos. At illi temptant uenas, tangunt singulas partes corporis: aegritudinis nullam causam inueniunt.

No matter either about the style of uenientes temptantes. (The appearance in AP of two present participles sine copula is respectability incarnate – cf. pp. 8, 11 ff.; 18, 4 ff.; 21, 10 f.; 23, 14 f.; 27,6 ff.; 33, 3 f.; 35, 15; 41, 6 f. As for the present participle with perfective force, see Riese’s index s. participia.) But what about the sense? temptant(es) uenas and tangunt singulas corporis partes form separate procedures, as the passage from the Aegritudo Per­dicae implies, and the one is an illogical subordination to the other9). Correct temptantes therefore (with B supra) to temptant. Did temptantes perhaps arise under the influence of uenientes? If so, it conceivably arose at a time when uenientes and temptant were juxtaposed, before the importation of medici – another to-

9) Cf. p. 51, 5 “Palpat uenarum indicia” in context, as quoted in my final discussion. I cite the Aegritudo Perdicae as a work whose themes instructively mirror those of this episode of our tale. Both works have borrowed from the common stock. Both have a lovesick (and wakeful) adolescent, a solicitous parent, physicians who (because the malady is psychosomatic) at first fail to diagnose it, and suitors who retard the revelation of the inamorato (or inamorata).
ken, however slight, of the genuineness of *uenientes*, the spuriousness of *medici*.

p. 46, 10 ff. Quod cum uideret familia cum clamore et ululatu magno, cucurrit Apollonius *et uidit* coniugem suam iacentem exanimem, scidit a pectore uestes unguibus et primas suae adolescenciae discerpit barbulas et lacrimis profusis iactauit se super *corpus eius* et coepit amarissime flere atque dicere: "cara coniunx et unica regis filia, quid fuit de te? . . ."

This is the form the sentence assumes in Riese's text. The risk it runs of becoming ungainly he has but increased by punctuating "exanimem, scidit"; a stronger stop than that was surely needed. Such a stop is one solution; another, the only other, would be to allow the sentence the narrative length it seems destined to possess and read *et (ut) uidit*. On the improvement gained by subordinating *uidit* to the other verbs I do not dwell. Nor do I waste time counting examples, almost too plentiful for counting, of *ut uidit* in the wider style of AP: I select merely pp. 52, 14 ff. "Magister introiuit cubiculum *et ut uidit* puellam [iam] iuuan, quam mortuam putabat (num putauerat, i.e. putauat?), ait discipulo suo . . ." and 62, 13 ff. "Villicus post moram reedit, *et ut uidit* puellam raptam a morte, deo gratias egit, quod non fecit scelus". Analogous too are passages like p. 62, 5 ff. "Itaque puella cum dominum deprecatur, subito aduenerunt piratae, *et uidentes* hominem armata manu uelle eam percutere, exclamauerunt dicentes . . ." And what more workaday hazard of transcription than the loss of *ut* between *et* and *UIdit?* See p. 80, 9 f. "contigit *ut* om. P) Athenagora" and my conjecture at p. 53, 9 "Et *ut* rogauit", rubric IV of my earlier paper.

In the same passage, moreover, I see no reason to continue acceding to the editorial *corpus eius*. P's *corpusculum*, which it has supplanted, exactly suits the context (*TLL s. u.* 1026.36 ff. "de

10) This approach to *temptant* I owe to R. Renehan. There remains of course an expedient whereby even *medici* might be kept: transposition to "Qui medici uenientes . . .". This I mention mainly as a deterrent to others, since AP nowhere examples, as an alternative to the relative pronoun, the relative adjective with its repeated antecedent noun.

11) Here contrast B's "Subito exclamuit familia, currit Apollonius *et uidit* coniugem suam exanimem iacentem. Scindit a pectore uestes unguibus, primas adolescenciae genas discerpit et lacrimas fundens iactauit se super pectus et ait . . .". Its clipped form – not to underestimate the omission of *et* between *unguibus* and *primas* – renders it of little value in establishing the form of AP.
corpore mortui [notio paruitatis euanuit]”). The diminutive enjoys the immediate company of *barbulas* (genas B) and recurs itself at p. 68, 6 (*corpusculum*)12). Those who nevertheless would balk at *corpusculum* here and *corpus*, of the same “corpse”, on the next page, lines 6 and 10, are obliged to do likewise at p. 43, lines 2 and 4 (“puella . . . puellula”) and at p. 83, 10 ff. (“descendi . . . in litore ad *nauculas* contuendas et inter omnes *naues* uidi *naum tuam*”).

p. 56, 10 ff. audi, mea domina Tharsia, *stemmata originis tuorum natalium*, ut scias, quid post mortem meam facere debes.

Were *stemmata originis tuorum natalium* the MS reading I suppose we might steel ourselves to tolerate it: but it is not: its *originis* is a correction, to date the only correction, of *origine*. This status, unchallenged, it little deserves. Not only does it produce a phrase that is overloaded and, where parallels exist, unparalleled: its foundation on MS evidence is such as would never content a scientific critic. The MS whose reading this is, P, reads also *etate* at p. 1, 5 f. “ad nubilem . . . aetatem”, *furore* at p. 83, 5 f. “texit *furorem* silentio”, *mente* at p. 85, 1 “mihi uenit in *mentem*”, and *pudore* at p. 87, 1 f. “numquam violauit *pudorem*”. Why not therefore infer that *origine*, representing *originē*, was once *originem*? A more honest error, certainly, and one more amenable to correction in general: but what correction in particular?

The temptation to insert *et* between *stemmata* and *originem*13) or to delete *originem* as a gloss on *stemmata* (even though *originem* is the word which, as the “more common”, the primers on textual criticism would bid us delete) we should firmly resist.

If on the other hand we were to delete *stemmata*, the resultant *originem tuorum natalium* would have the sanction of B’s corresponding “natalium tuorum originem” – not to mention at p. 58, 8 f. B’s “originem natalium meorum” (“*stirpem nativitatis meae*” AP) and at p. 69, 10 f. its “natalium meorum originem”. More significant yet is AP’s phrasing of p. 69, 10 f. On the strength of it, and on the assumption that *stemmata* might represent *stemmatum*

12) The compiler of the *TLL* article does not record either occurrence of *corpusculum* in this tale.

13) Or between *stemma*, rather, and *originem*? Such a proceeding, in point of transcription alone, would be surpassingly easy. P’s abbreviate symbol for *et* is sometimes *t* (pp. 52, 14; 53, 9; and 54, 12). Fancy that were so here, and *stemmat* – or, with *stemmata*, *stemmatat* – would almost inexorably lead to the reading of our MS.
(i.e. stemmatum), we might delete tuorum natalium. The passage in AP runs as follows: "audi casus infelicitatis meae uel originem stemmatum considera". Is it mere coincidence that here again P has origine? And B’s “natalium meorum originem”, for its part, proves that stemmatum and natalium are, or at least in the mind of its redactor were, virtually synonymous{superscript 14). Inter haec uersimilia fortasse latet uerum. Provisionally, therefore, let the reader choose as he will: my chief aim has been to divert correction from a false track.

This discussion is an attempt to cast illumination on one of the darkest passages in Riese’s text, p. 51, 7–10. The contextual background of the passage is this. During a sea voyage Apollonius’ wife dies, or appears to die, in childbirth (p. 46, 6 ff.). She is placed in a chest adorned with insignia befitting a filia et uxor regis, and the chest is set adrift on the sea (p. 47, 15 ff.). It soon washes ashore at Ephesus (p. 48, 6 ff.), where a medicus, walking there with his disciples, chances to spot it. Convinced that its beautiful occupant is dead, he hastens preparations for a funeral – p. 50, 4 f. “iubet continuo instrui rogum”. He directs one of his apprentices, an adulescens more gifted than he, to suffuse the body with unguentum. But the adulescens detects signs of life (p. 50, 13 ff.):

At uero adulescens tulit ampullam unguenti et ad lectum deuenit puellae et detraxit a pectore uestes, unguentum fudit et [per] omnes artus suspiciosa manu retractat, sentitque a praecordiis pectoris torporis quietem. Obstupuit iuuenis, quia cognouit puellam in falsa morte iacere. Palpat uenarum indicia, rimatur auras narium; labia labiis probat, sentit gracile spirantis uitam prope luctare cum morte adulte ra et (51, 7) ait “supponite faculas per IIII partes”. Quod cum fecisset, lentas lentoque suppositas retrahere (coepit) manus, et sanguis ille, qui coagulatus fuerat, per unctionem liquefactus est.

The apparatus of a funeral, unguentum and faculae, has thus become the means of a miraculous cure. The woman is all but restored to consciousness. What was an experimental procedure has now to be repeated, detail by detail, before the eyes of the master

14) A slight scruple: the possessive, present in every parallel passage save the last, seems wanted in ours. Its absence from the last can be condoned, the presence of meae in the preceding “audi casus infelicitatis meae” licensing us to understand meorum with stemmatum. Thus it would be possible, did the word order not offend, to limit deletion to natalium.
medicus; the greater precision of the ensuing account (pp. 51, 11 ff.) provides a clue critical to at least one particular of our passage. Within the four lines of p. 51, 7–10 lurk definitely two, probably three, editorial faux pas – the first in fecisset, the second in lentas . . . manus, and the third in per unctionem. These I now consider in order.

Why fecisset? The adulescens issues an order to the famuli, "supponite faculas"; and it is they who, strictly, must carry it out. Compare B's "ait famulis . . . 'subponite faculas per quattuor angulos lentas'. Quibus subpositis, puella teporis nebula tacta, coagulatus sanguis liquefactus est". I therefore conjecture fecissent, "Quod cum fecissent" reflecting B's "Quibus subpositis" (i.e. by the famuli). See pp. 68, 9 ff. "Et uocauit ad se uillicum puellarum et ait ad eum 'cella ornetur (note the jussive) diligenter. . .' Fecit uillicus quod iusserat . . ." and 74, 3 ff. "Puella respondit (sc. uillico) ' . . . in be crustina die in frequenti loco poni scanna. . .' Et cum fecisset uillicus, . . .". And then there are passages like p. 25, 4 ff. " . . . intuens famulos suos ait 'recedite, famuli; . . .'. Et cum recessissent famuli, Apollonius . . . remisit pilam": passages where, instead of facio, the verb of the imperative itself resumes the narration. These too are relevant. But the best parallel in the world is to be found at p. 48, 11 ff. "ait famulis sui 'tollite hunc loculum cum omni diligentia et ad ui lla afferte'! Quod cum fecissent famuli, medicus libenter aperuit . . .". For here again P has fecisset. The proximity, within the same episode, of this passage to ours makes it possible that fecisset in ours is a Perseverationsfehler of fecisset, already a Fehler, in it. Possible I say it makes it, no more, and only because errors of perseveration happen to be unusually widespread in AP: see rubric II of my earlier paper. Otherwise a scribe has merely blundered from fecissent into fecisset15).

lentas lentoque suppositora retrabere (coepit add. edd.) manus.
In this exasperating crux Riese's single dagger almost certainly misleads. Consider taking therefore, with R. Renehan, this different line of attack. A critic's first duty here, as Renehan stipulates, should be to regard lentas as possibly genuine, genuine for both

15) In the false addition or subtraction of the compendium stroke for m or n, perhaps its most common single source of corruption, no MS that I have ever seen is less to be trusted than P. For P's incapacity to distinguish between the third person singular and plural of verbs see, above all, p. 20, 11 f. "In sese glomeratur (glomerätur P) hiems; pariterque morantur (moratur P)/Nubila, grando, niues, zephyri, freta, fulgida, nimbi".
AP and B; its presence in both recensions is unlikely the result of accident\(^\text{16}\). In B’s “subponite faculas per quattuor angulos lentas” Riese had formerly conjectured lecti (“lecti olim scribam”) – a conjecture as shallow as his lectoque (“num lectoque?”) in AP’s “lentas lentoque . . .”. Rather refer the word, where it occurs in both recensions, to fires. The apprentice is concerned that the famuli exercise care; these are to be slow-burning and gentle fires, not consumptive ones\(^\text{17}\). In AP, then, why could they not be “gentle fires gently placed”, lentas lenteque suppositas? suppositas, to be sure, should modify not manus but faculas; it should continue the construction of supponite faculas in the preceding sentence. And so it could, if only we were to delete manus. Now the neighbor of manus in P, before the rude addition of coepit, was retrabere. Might manus not have been interpolated here, consciously or subconsciously, from 8 lines above, p. 51, 2 manu retractat? Or was the scribe perhaps indulging in interpretatio – or interpolatio – in malam partem? Words celebrating the woman’s beauty he had dutifully copied – pp. 49, 2 “puellam regalibus ornatam speciosam”, 50, 8 f. “cum uidisset speciosum corpus puellae super rogum poni”. When he came to copy p. 51, 1 f. “detraxit a pectore uestes, unguentum et per l8 ) omnes artus suspiciosa manu retractat”, he thought he caught a whiff of foul-play. A simple, and in the context natural, misunderstanding of suspiciosa as passive in sense = “mistrusted, suspect” (a common meaning) rather than active could easily have disposed him to misunderstanding below. (And if that is not enough, compare the subsequent speech of the woman herself, p. 52, 9 ff. “Deprecor . . ., medice”, she says, regaining consciousness, “ne me contin-gas aliter, quam oportet contingere: uxor enim regis sum et regis filia”). Maybe the scribe reacted so, maybe not\(^\text{19}\). Good riddance in any event to manus. Renehan proposes to read exempli gratia: ⟨faces (uelfaculas) iussit) lentas lenteque suppositas retrahere [ma­nus], “he ordered them to remove the slow-burning and gently placed fires”\(^\text{20}\). A delicate procedure, in which the order to remo-

\(^{16}\) That it seems unmeaning is, itself, a note of sincerity.

\(^{17}\) In the notion of “gentle fires” lent- is a uox propria (cf. Colum. 7.5.10; 12.42.2; and examples in OLD s. u. lentus 4 b).

\(^{18}\) With Renehan I liberate per from Riese’s brackets.

\(^{19}\) A similarly prurient reaction, Renehan suggests, visited the scribe of F in Plato Meno 76 D: καὶ τῶν ἀπορρωδῶν τὰς μὲν ἄρμοτειν ἐνίοις τῶν πόρων (πόρων F), τὰς δὲ ἐλάττους ἢ μέισους εἶναι.

\(^{20}\) A word about the latinity. faces is preferred for its resemblance, when
ve must soon follow — if there is not to be a cremation — the order
to place\(^{21}\). *faces iussit*, by resembling *fecissent*, serves almost to
explain its own loss. And who could be sure that such a verb as
*iussit*, nearby in the exemplar, did not facilitate the corruption of
*fecissent* into *fecisset*?

We come finally to “sanguis ille, qui coagulatus fuerat, per
unctionem liquefactus est”. This can hardly be correct. P has *per
unctionem* not before *liquefactus est*, whither the editors have
transposed it, but before *coagulatus fuerat*. And it is not mere
*unctio* that causes the coagulated blood to liquefy; it is the effect of
the *heat* generated by the *faculae* on the already applied *unguentum*
that creates the warm, life-renewing vapor — “puella teporis
nebula tacta” B. *per unctionem* should stay where P has it. There
it is manifestly a corruption of (a) *perfrictione*: a slip of the eye
from the *r* in *per* to that in —fr— left *pericitione*, a *nox nihil* bound to
become *per unctio* at the hands of a scribe mentally over­
whelmed by the role of *unguentum* in the procedure (cf. pp. 50,
11 ff. “tolle ampullam unguentii . . . et superfunde”, 14 “tulit am­
pullam unguentii”, 51, 1 “unguentum fudit”). The blood had coa­
gulated because of the cold\(^{22}\). And this is no fond invention of
mine: it is proclaimed as fact by p. 52, 6 ff. “Sanguis uero ille, qui
intus *a perfrictione* coagulatus fuerat, accepto tepore liquefactus
est”\(^{23}\).
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coupled with *iussit*, to *fecissent*; for the variation *faculas/faces* see my remarks supra
on *corpusculum/corpus*. Either understand “them”, *famulos*, as “subject accusa­
tive” of *retrahere* or construe as *infinitius actius pro passivo* (cf. pp. 59, 10 f.
“auduit laudare Tharsiam et suam uituperare filiam”; 108, 8 f. “iubet comprehen­
dere Stranguillationem et Dionysiadem”).

21) I am aware: even a crematory fire, like that at Lucan 3.777 f., can be
“slow-burning”. It is now clear why such a passage would not invalidate our
approach.

22) At this point in the text AP gives the reason for coagulation, but not for
liquefaction; B that for liquefaction (“*puella teporis nebula tacta*”), but not for
cogulation. The reasons for both do not appear in the same sentence until the
procedure is repeated (p. 52, 6 ff., as quoted). The cause and cure depend upon a
contrast, that of cold and heat; *tepor* brings the cure, not *unctio*.

23) Abundant thanks are due my colleague, R. Renehan, for immeasurably
improving a draft of these notes.