

Abschließend möchte ich noch einmal auf den Ausgangspunkt meiner Überlegungen zurückkommen. Der Schluß Köhnkens, daß Theokrit vor Apollonios geschrieben haben müsse, weil im 13. Idyll der Grund für die Weiterfahrt der Argo vernachlässigt worden sei, während die *Argonautika* den Mangel nicht mehr aufwiesen, entbehrt der Grundlage. Kann aber die vorgetragene Interpretation als Beleg für die umgekehrte Chronologie gelten? Ich meine, hier ist Skepsis angebracht. Zwar erweist sich die Technik Theokrits als weitaus diffiziler und könnte deswegen als sekundär erscheinen. Aber dieser Unterschied läßt sich auch darauf zurückführen, daß die Texte verschiedenen Gattungen angehören. Im Epyllion sind unkonventionelle Formen der Handlungsführung heimischer als im traditionellen Großepos. Daher ist es gut möglich, daß Apollonios den kühnen Gleichnisgebrauch bei Theokrit vorfand, ihn als einem Epos unangemessen beurteilte (mochte er auch in eine experimentierfreudige Gattung wie das Epyllion passen) und eine einfachere Lösung wählte.

Göttingen

Hans Bernsdorff

## EIGHT NOTES ON GERMANICUS' ARATEA<sup>\*)</sup>

65–66. *haud procul effigies inde est defecta labore;  
non illi nomen, non magni causa laboris.*

'This is a bold and strange assertion, that the labour of Engonasin has no cause. Aratus says nothing of the kind; he says [64 f.] that its cause is unknown', Housman (p. 502), who proceeds to clinch the point by quoting Avienus Arat. 173 f. *expertem quam quon-*

<sup>\*)</sup> The following modern editions are referred to: A. Breysig (Lipsiae 1899); A. Le Boeuffe (Paris 1975); D. B. Gain (London 1976). The most substantial modern contribution to the text is the article of A. E. Housman in CR 14 (1900) 26–39, reprinted in his *Classical Papers* (Cambridge 1972) 495–515; the page-references which I give are to this reprint.

*dam dixit Aratus / nominis, et cuius latuit quoque causa laboris.* Housman therefore proposed *non ulli* (so Postgate) *nomen, non cognita causa laboris*. This has been adopted by Gain, who makes an unconvincing attempt to explain the corruption of *cognita* to *magni* but rightly points out that an appropriate form of *magnus* has been intruded in some manuscripts at 206 (for *duri*) and 389 (for *flamma*); add 306 (for *etiam*), and see also Gain's note on 550. Indeed *magnus* seems to have been a word which was liable to occur to a scribe seeking to fill a gap left by the accidental omission of another word. In our line, I suggest, an easy loss would be that of *notum* before *non*; i.e. read *non ulli nomen notum, non causa laboris*.

169–70. *hanc Auriga umero totam gerit, at manus Haedos ostendit.*

The Charioteer carries the Goat on his shoulder, the Kids in his hand.

For *totam gerit at manus*, the reading of the O branch of the tradition, the other branch (Z), by one of those strange variations which characterize the manuscripts of this poem, offers *portans inmanibus*. To *totam* Breysig (p. XXII) objects 'neque enim fieri potest ut auriga partem caprae gerat'; he therefore adopts the anonymous emendation *positam* (which Housman p. 496 calls 'capital'), and so does Le Boeuffle. Certainly a participle seems the most promising line, but there may be possibilities other than *positam*. The corresponding passage in Avienus (Arat. 414 f.) has *fixa* (*Capra laevo / fixa umero clare sustollitur*), which renders ἐπελήλαται of the Greek original (Aratus 162 σκαίῳ δ' ἐπελήλαται ὤμῳ). Closer to *totam* than either *positam* or *fixam* would be *fultam*; cf. Ov. Trist. 5.13.8 *umeris fulta*.

298–303. *in terra temptare undas iuvat, aspera sed cum  
assultat lateri deprensae spuma carinae  
tunc alii curvos prospectant litore portus  
301 inventasque †alii† terras pro munere narrant;  
303 ast alii procul a terra iactantur in alto.*

When a storm strikes, some sailors (*alii* 300) are close to land, others (*alii* 303) are on the high seas. This dichotomy is wrecked by the obelized *alii* (301); as Housman says (p. 504): 'This is a foolish distribution, to say that some of the sailors look out for the land and others (who are not looking out) descry it. *aliis narrant* would be reasonable but not elegant: I hardly doubt that he wrote

*inuentasque acie terras.*' The reasoning is impeccable, but I am dubious about *acie*, which adds nothing but what is self-evident; I should prefer the far easier change *illi*, which would point the contrast with the following *ast alii*; the use of an almost superfluous *ille* occurs elsewhere, e.g. 124 (*illa*) and 427 (*ille*).

Gain translates 300 'some men look at the curved harbours on the shore', but *prospectant* must mean 'look out for' (corresponding to περιπατῶντες in the Aratus original 297); and if *litore* is construed with *portus* it becomes otiose (where else could harbours be but on the coast?). Surely *litore* goes with *prospectant* (as at Cat. 64.52 *prospectans litore Diae*, adduced by Goodyear ap. Gain); and this makes sense if *litore* is taken to mean 'inshore waters' (contrasting with *in alto* 303). For this sense of *litus* see E. Wistrand, *Nach Innen oder nach Aussen?* (Göteborg 1946) 38 ff., and E. Löfstedt, *Coniectanea* (Uppsala 1950) 84 ff.

315–20. *est etiam, incertum quo cornu missa, Sagitta  
quam servat Iovis Ales. habet miracula nulla  
si caelum ascendit Iovis armiger. hic †tamen arduum†  
unguibus innocuis Phrygium rapuit Ganymeden  
et telo appositus custos quo Iuppiter arsit  
320 in puero.*

'Germanicus identifies the Arrow as one of Cupid's, and the Eagle, who carried Ganymede off, is appropriately set to guard it', Housman (p. 504).

Some ugly emendations of the obelized passage have been proposed. We can say at once that no suggestion which retains *tamen* in its ordinary adversative use relating to the preceding sentence can be accepted; the context demands *nam* (or *enim* or *etenim*) or no connective at all. This rules out Ellis's emendation (approved by Housman p. 496 and accepted by Le Boeuffle) *tamen aptum*, where *aptum* would have to mean 'suspended from', not (as Gain thinks) 'equipped with' or 'suited to'.

Gain reads his own conjecture *tamen ardens*, the sense being *quamvis ardens*, *tamen innocuis unguibus rapuit*. This is a perfectly possible use of *tamen*, but neither the sense ('burning with eagerness to do Jupiter's bidding') nor the use of *ardens* so soon before *arsit* in 319 is convincing. No more so is Gain's revised view reported in *Gnomon* 50 (1978) 353, n. 12: 'although burning with desire for the boy, the Eagle did not hurt him by tightening his claws around him.'

I suggest *hic et in altum*, where *et* corresponds to *et* in 319; I compare Manil. 1.343 (likewise of the eagle) *magni Iovis ales fertur in altum*. The corruption of *et in* to *tamen* has, I think, occurred again at 659; see note on 657–60 below.

- 647–52. *non ego non primus, veteres cecinere poetae,  
virginis intactas quondam contingere vestes  
ausum hominem divae sacrum temerasse pudorem.*  
650 *devotus poenae tunc impius ille futurae  
nudabatque feris †angusto† stipite silvas  
pacatamque Chion dono dabat Oenopioni.*

The sins of Orion, against Diana and against Chios.

In the first half of 647 Goodyear's *non ego nunc primus* is in my view clearly the best of the emendations reported by Gain; the confusion of *non* and *nunc* is very common indeed.

Line 651 is not so easily emended. 'Angusto here makes no sense and was emended by Housman to *augustas*, "sacred groves"; but this word was not thrown around lightly by members of the imperial family. Orelli's *ambusto*, adopted by Le Boeuffe, is better, but has no appropriateness in this context.' So E. Courtney, CR 28 (1978) 38, who himself suggests *ingesto stipite*, as at [Sen.] Herc. O. 1449. Perhaps; but when I see that the Aratus original (638 f.) has θηρία πάντα / καρτερὸς Ὠρίων σιβαρῆ ἑπέκοπτε κορύνη, I wonder if Germanicus translated σιβαρῆ by *robusto*.

- 657–60. *horret vulnus adhuc et spicula tincta veneno  
flebilis Orion et quamquam parte relictā  
caeli paene fugit, tamen altis mergitur undis,  
Scorpios ardenti cum pectore contigit ortus.*

Orion, still dreading the Scorpion, flees before him.

Gain alters *quamquam* to *tamquam*, and *caeli paene* to *poenae tela* ('as if part of his punishment were still to come, flees its weapon'): drastic changes which do not produce a satisfactory result because *tamen* does not fit. I would keep the transmitted text apart from changing *tamen* to *et in*: 'although part of the sky remains for him to traverse, he almost takes to his heels and plunges into the deep waters when the Scorpion touches the eastern horizon.' For the corruption of *tamen* to *et in* see note on 315–20 above. For the lengthening of a short syllable at the caesura there may be a parallel at 702 *surgit* (text disputed) and at frg. 4.137 *exoritur* (text likewise disputed); in such cases of lengthen-

ing the following word is commonly (e.g. in Ovid; see Haupt-Korn-Ehwald on Met. 3.184) *et* (or *aut*).

frg. 3.19–22. *omnia miscentur cum Piscibus: aspera ventis  
aequora turbatos volvunt ad sidera fluctus;  
imbris incumbit caelum solemque recondit;  
grandine pulsatur tellus, nive moenia durant.*

‘*Moenia* is a most inappropriate word and was altered by Kroll to *gramina* or *germina*, by Morel to *mollia*. But none of these is quite satisfactory either’, says E. Courtney, CR 19 (1969) 140, who proceeds to make a suggestion of his own which he later abjured. A number of other attempts to make sense will be found in Gain’s note; among them, attributed to an anonymous scholar, is what I believe to be the right emendation, (flu)mina. In lines 20 and 22 we have the usual two-fold division of the earth into sea and land; but quite frequently in ancient poetry (and occasionally also in prose, e.g. Liv. 29.27.2 *terra mari amnibusque*) we find a triple division into land, sea, and rivers; e.g. Lucr. 4.458 *caelum mare flumina montes*; other passages are listed in Wilamowitz’s note on Eur. Her. 1296, Gow’s note on Theoc. 17.92, and Nisbet-Hubbard’s note on Hor. Od. 1.34.9. So too, I believe, in our passage. Gain objects to *nive flumina durant* that rivers do not become hard because of snow, but because their waters turn to ice. I answer that *durant* is not genuine but an erroneous repetition of *durat* at the end of line 16. (Such erroneous repetitions are particularly frequent in this tradition; e.g. just above, in line 15, after *descendunt* the manuscripts offer *pluvia*, which has come from *pluvias* in 10 and 13.) The verb which has been displaced by *durant* can only be guessed at; e.g. *abundant* (cf. Lucr. 5.261 f. and 6.267), *crescunt* (*flumina crescunt* ends a line at Verg. Georg. 1.326), or *canent* (cf. Sen. Tro. 73 *nivibus canuit Ide*).

frg. 4.140–43. *ver erit hibernis totum exsecrabile nimbis  
et crebro tonitru t̄iunget† florentia rura  
spesque novae segetis quatientur grandinis ictu  
urenturque gelu.*

The effects produced by Mercury as an evening star.

For the corrupt *iunget* it has been usual to adopt Grotius’s emendation *ninget*, but this, whether taken with what precedes or with what follows, is satisfactorily disposed of by Gain. He himself reads *vincet*, construed with what follows: ‘this [presumably *ver*] will overcome the flourishing countryside’, but *vincet* is far



too imprecise in this context. In fact, no verb is wanted here at all: *crebro tonitru* goes happily with *erit execrabile*, and *florentia rura* is a very apposite first subject for *quatientur* and *urentur*. Of the other parts of speech the only one which seems possible is a conjunction; I suggest  $\langle q \rangle$  *uin et*, which is not uncommon in elevated poetry; see ThLL 5.2.912.68–74. Germanicus has *quin etiam* at 270 and *quin ... etiam* at frg. 4.117.

Aberdeen

W. S. Watt

## EINE ANSPIELUNG AUF AGRICOLA IM EINGANGSKAPITEL DER *GERMANIA*?

Zur tagespolitischen Aktualität  
der taciteischen Schrift über die Germanen

Mit der sich deutlich auf den Anfang von Caesars *Commentarii de bello Gallico* beziehenden Formulierung *Germania omnis* stellt auch Tacitus seiner 98 n. Chr. abgefaßten Schrift über die Germanen eine geographische Beschreibung voran. Anders als Caesar läßt Tacitus diesen Eingangsworten jedoch keine Binnengliederung des Landes folgen, sondern eine Beschreibung der äußeren Grenzen: *Germania omnis a Gallis Raetisque et Pannoniis Rheno et Danuvio fluminibus, a Sarmatis Dacisque mutuo metu aut montibus separatur. Cetera Oceanus ambit, latos sinus et insularum immensa spatia complectens, nuper cognitis quibusdam gentibus ac regibus, quos bellum aperuit* (Tac. Germ. 1, 1). Die Aufzählung beginnt im Westen und schließt einen gegen den Uhrzeigersinn laufenden Kreis<sup>1)</sup>, bei dem die wichtigsten Völker außerhalb Germaniens genannt werden. Durch die Erwähnung von Völkern statt Ländern stellt Tacitus nicht nur einen Einklang mit der von ihm beabsichtigten ethnischen Beschreibung der Germanen her und leitet gleichzeitig schon zu den Autochthonie-Erörterun-

---

1) Ähnlich schon Mela 3,25 bei seiner Beschreibung Germaniens.