

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*³). In so choosing one would be adding, where the editors add *in-* or *ī-*, potentially no more than *-ī-* or *ti-*. And please do not retort that *ī* <*ī*> *bant* or *ī* <*ti*> *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 *īgd'r*.

p. 103,7 f. *Erigen se ergo se* Tyrius Apollonius his dictis populo alloquitur. . .

So P. Which shall be the victim? "*Erigen* [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 "*Erigen se ergo* adsedit et ait. . .". Read therefore "*Erigen 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 deletes⁴).

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 *infinitivus activus pro passivo*. Contrast the indications of his apparatus at pp. 47, 13 (*facere*), 59, 10 f. (*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 reading⁵). 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, 2f. "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, 2f. "Puella uero, ut haec audiuit, toto corpore contremuit. . ." ("Puella ut audiuit, toto corpore contremuit" B); 76, 1f. "Scelerata mulier hoc audito toto corpore contremuit et ait. . ." (*habet B tantum* "Scelerata ait"); 77, 6f. "Apollonius ut audiuit, 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 *īo*, 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".

5) See the strictures of F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus*, vol. I (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 20 ff.

6) *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, vol. II (Lund, 1933).

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 donauit: aurum, argentum et uestem; et eamus hospitalia quaerentes".

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 donauit. . .". 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 perseveration 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 faciente hucusque ad uos sum *delatus*" (*delatus* edd.: *dilatus* A: *celatus* P, due to "*celaturos*"); 23, 8 f. "paupertas *quaecumque* est sufficiet nobis" (*qcūq*; *es* P, i. e. *quicumque es*, due to "*quicumque es*" at p. 22, 7)⁷.

p. 35, 7 ff. Rex ut uidit filiam suam subitanam ualitudinem incurrisse, sollicitus adhibet medicos, qui [uenientes medicis] temptantes uenas tangunt singulas corporis partes, nec omnino inueniunt aegritudinis causas.

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* ciuibus et maioribus eiusdem ciuitatis dixit . . ." (*cunctis* A, *cūctis* P, i. e. *ciuitatis*, due to the following *ciuitatis*).

8) B's "At illi . . ." (*u. 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. . . , *quibus conuocatis* in unum pariter rex ait. . ." and 64, 3 f. B "... *famulos misit ad conuocandos* 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 uocauit
ad 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 uitati corporis illic, etc.

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

Rex ut uidit filiam suam subitanam ualetudinem incurrisse,
sollicite adhibuit medicos. At illi temptant uenas, tangunt
singulas partes corporis: aegritudinis nullam causam inue-
niunt.

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 innamorato (or innamorata).

ken, however slight, of the genuineness of *uenientes*, the spuriousness of *medici*¹⁰).

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 adulescentiae discerpit barbulae 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 needed¹¹). 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] uiuam, quam mortuam putabat (*num* putauerat, i. e. putaūat?), ait discipulo suo. . ." and 62, 13 ff. "Villicus post moram rediit, *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 exclamauit familia, currit Apollonius et uidit coniugem suam exanimem iacentem. Scindit a pectore uestes unguibus, primas adulescentiae 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 *barbula* (*genas* B) and recurs itself at p. 68, 6 (*corpus* B)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 *nauem* tuam”).

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

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. “textit *furorem* silentio”, *mente* at p. 85, 1 “mihi uenit in *mentem*”, and *pudore* at p. 87, 1 f. “numquam uiolaui *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 natiuitatis 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 *stematū*

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 *stemat* – or, with *stemmata*, *stematat* – 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 synonymous¹⁴).

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 adultera 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) ‘. . . iube crastina die in frequenti loco poni scamna. . .’. 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 suis ‘tollite hunc loculum cum omni diligentia et ad uillam 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 *fecisset* into *fecisset*¹⁵).

lentas lentoque suppositas retrahere (<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* (*glomeratur* 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 accident¹⁶). In B's "subponite faculas per quattuor angulos lentas" Riese had formerly conjectured *lecti* ("lecti olim scribebam") – 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 ones¹⁷). 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 *retrahere*. 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 ornamentis ornatam speciosam*", 50, 8f. "*cum uidisset speciosum corpus puellae super rogum poni*". When he came to copy p. 51, 1f. "*detraxit a pectore uestes, unguentum et per*¹⁸) *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, 9ff. "*Deprecor . . ., medice*", she says, regaining consciousness, "*ne me contingas aliter, quam oportet contingere: uxor enim regis sum et regis filia*".) Maybe the scribe reacted so, maybe not¹⁹). Good riddance in any event to *manus*. Renehan proposes to read *exempli gratia: <faces (uel faculas) iussit> lentas lenteque suppositas retrahere [manus]*, "he ordered them to remove the slow-burning and gently placed fires"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 ἀπορροῶν τὰς μὲν ἀρμόττειν ἐνίοις τῶν πόρων (πόρων F), τὰς δὲ ἐλάττους ἢ μείζους 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 place²¹). *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 *perictione*, a *uox nihili* bound to become *per unctione(m)* at the hands of a scribe mentally overwhelmed by the role of *unguentum* in the procedure (cf. pp. 50, 11 ff. “*tolle ampullam unguenti . . . et superfunde*”, 14 “*tulit ampullam unguenti*”, 51, 1 “*unguentum fudit*”). The blood had coagulated because of the cold²²). 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).

University of California at Santa Barbara J. M. Hunt

coupled with *iussit*, to *fecissent*; for the variation *faculas/faces* see my remarks *supra* on *corpusculum/corpus*. Either understand “them”, *famulos*, as “subject accusative” of *retrahere* or construe as *infinitivus actiuis pro passivo* (cf. pp. 59, 10 f. “*audiuit laudare Tharsiam et suam uituperare filiam*”; 108, 8 f. “*iubet comprehendere Stranguillonem 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 coagulation. 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.