Notes on the Appendix Vergiliana

Dirae

71-74  

_ dulcius _ hoc, memini, reuocasti, Battare, carmen._
emanent subito sicca tellure paludes,
et metat hic iuncos, spicas ubi legimus olim,
†cocale† arguti grylli caua garrula rana.

The best discussion of _dulcius_ is that of Goodyear (p. 21), whose conclusion is as follows: «Either _dulcius _ must be emended or else the verse must be removed to some more suitable place. To emend _dulcius _ is not easy. The most likely correction known to me is _tristius_, even though corruption of _tristius _ to _dulcius _ seems in this context psychologically most improbable». _Tristius_ is the word which is used in the two other occurrences of this refrain, at 54 and 75, and the curses which follow 71 are not different in kind from those which follow 54 and 75. What we want, therefore, is a word of similar meaning to _tristius _ which might have been corrupted to _dulcius_. I suggest that _dirius _ presents itself; for _dirus_ used «de imprecationibus, incantationibus» see _ThLL _ V/1 1269,50ff.

Of _cocale_ in 74 Goodyear (p. 18) says: «There is no doubt that […] the poet wrote something like _incolat _ or _occupet_». I think that the best suggestion is _et colat_ (parallel to _et metat_), a conjecture of P. Canal (1839).

86-90  

_hinc ego de tumulo mea rura nouissima uisam,_
_hinc ibo in siluas; obstabunt iam mihi colles,_
_obstabunt montes, campos †audire† licebit._
 †dulcia rura ualete et Lydia dulcior illis
 et casti fontes et, felix nomen, agelli†._
The poet says farewell to the farm which he is forced to leave.

Goodyear’s discussion of this passage (pp. 14ff.) is thorough and excellent. He finds the phrase *campos audire licebit* «fatally ambiguous, able to mean either ‘the plains will be able to hear’ or ‘it will be possible to hear the plains’, and no less fatally obscure. The most likely explanation […] is that the text is corrupt» (in a footnote he rejects three poor conjectures). I suggest *campos*<sup>que</sup> *uidere negabunt*; forms of *uidere* and *audire* are frequently confused (see Shackleton Bailey’s note on Cic. *Fam.* XI 25,1), and for the corruption of *negab* to *liceb* cf. Cic. *Leg.* III 19 *necatus > legatus*, Ov. *Met.* IV 665 *ligat > necat.*

95f.  
*rura ualete iterum tuque, optima Lydia, salue: siue eris et si non mecum morieris †utrumque †.*

Line 96 is usually given up in despair. But the only word in it which is certainly corrupt is *utrumque*, for which no palaeographically probable replacement seems conceivable. Appropriate sense could be obtained by reading *siue eris et si non mecum, morieris amata*, a sentiment which the poet repeats at 102 below, *semper amabo*. I take it that *amata* has been displaced by a gloss *utrumque*, intended (in the sense of ‘in either case’) to refer to the two *si*-clauses.

**Lydia**

31-34  
*et pater haedorum felix semperque beate,*  
*siue petit montes praeruptos saxa pererrans*  
*siue tibi siluis noua pabula fastidire*  
*siue libet campis: tecum tua laeta capella est.*

*Fastidire* is a ridiculous reading, whether taken in its normal sense of ‘scorn’ or in the peculiar *ad hoc* sense of ‘delicatius pasci’ which some scholars have invented for it in this passage; it must be emended. It is tempting to suppose that the line ended with *adire*, but none of the suggestions along these lines can be commended: Scaliger’s *sat sit adire* and Heinsius’s *fas sit adire* both suffer from an inexplicable subjunctive *sit*, Shackleton Bailey’s<sup>3</sup> tentative *praestat adire* from an unconvincing, because unwanted, *praestat*; one would naturally assume that any infinitive at the end of this line is governed by *libet* at the beginning of the next. I would read *uestigare*, a conjecture of J. Maehly which has apparently not been mentioned by anybody later than Baehrens (1880). For instances of this verb with animals as subject see *OLD*, and compare *Cul.* 56 (of a goat) *haec teneras fruticum*

---

<sup>3</sup> «Phoenix» XXXII (1978) 309.
sentes rimatur. Confusion of uuestig- and fastid- is almost as easy as confusion of uuestig- and fastig-, for which see Housman’s notes on Manil. I 616 and II 795.

39-41

sidera per uiridem redeunt cum pallida mundum
inque uicem P h o e b i c u r r u s atque aureus orbis,
Luna, tuus tecum est: cur non est et mea mecum?

So I would read; Phoebi and currus are old emendations of the transmitted readings phoebe and currens. Kenney⁴ comments that it is quite uncertain whether 39f. refer to the departure of the sun or to the arrival of the moon. I think that 39 refers to the return of darkness and 40 to the return (with currus scil. redeunt) of the sun (for the sun’s aureus orbis see ThLL II 1491,26ff.); the moon’s beloved is with her both at the going-down of the sun and in the morning, i.e. all night.

Culex⁵

1-5

Lusimus, Octaui, gracili modulante Thalia
atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum.
lusimus; h a e c p r o p t e r culicis sint carmina docta,
onmis et historiae per ludum consonet ordo
notitiaque ducum uoces.

Some refer haec propter to what precedes, others (reading ut for et in line 4) to what follows. Courtney (p. 44) convincingly argues that neither view makes sense, and proposes (partly after Leo) to change haec propter to at pro re: «this poem is lusus, but at the same time the writer hopes that it has doctrina proportionate to the subject, neither too little nor too much». I find this sentiment very odd, and pro re intolerably prosaic (even in this poem), and I believe that haec, if taken with carmina, is worth keeping; it is therefore propter that requires emendation. Perhaps it should be pariter, referring back to araneoli: «let this song of mine about a gnat be as docta as a spider’s web», docta meaning (a) ‘skilful’ (of a spider’s web), (b) ‘learned’ (of the poet’s carmina). If this is right, araneoli is a genitive singular rather than a nominative plural (editors have been divided on the point).

61

(curae) quae lacerant uidas in imico pectore mentes.

---

⁴ In the text of the Lydia which he contributed to the OCT Appendix Vergiliana, Oxford 1966.
⁵ The following modern editions are referred to: F. Leo (Berolini 1891); C. Pléent (Paris 1910).
(Cares) «that rend greedy hearts within warring breasts» (Fairclough); «'dans un coeur aigri', c'est-à-dire dans le coeur du pauvre qui porte envie au riche» (Plésent, who proceeds to produce parallels for the omission of in). «Mens in pectore sita est», says Leo, who is certainly wrong in adducing Verg. Aen. X 556 and XI 685 to illustrate inimico pectore, because in these two passages the phrase is used of combatants in the heat of battle, and the pectus is that of the subject of the sentence; similarly inimico pectore derives no support from inimica mente at 309 below. If, with Sillig, we change inimico to in iniquo, we introduce a desirable preposition (if we still take pectore as a local ablative), but make no other difference. Perhaps it is pectore which should be changed; I suggest uerbere (for uerbere lacerare cf. ThLL VII/2 824, 72). It is well known that dactylic words are frequently confused, and this very variation (pectora/uerbera) is found at Stat. Theb. VIII 437. For inimicus of «a weapon used to hostile effect» see OLD 3b and ThLL VII/1 1628, 70ff.

94f. o pecudes, o Panes, et o gratissima tempe
† fontis† Hamadryadum.

To replace fontis it is natural, with Housman (p. 565), to look for «a noun in apposition with tempe and signifying ‘abode’ or ‘resort’», like Leo’s hortus or his own frigus (in the sense of sedes frigida); but neither hortus nor (despite Housman’s letter-juggling) frigus has any palaeographical probability. The best suggestion, I think, is saltus; this was proposed in 1902 by S. Allen but has been almost forgotten; Allen adduced Verg. Georg. III 40 Dryadum siluas saltusque.

127f. ... insigni currus proiectus equorum
ambustus Phaethon ...

Insigni («resplendent», Fairclough) is a perfectly credible epithet of the sun’s chariot, and no one would have thought of changing it were it not that currus equorum seems impossible in the sense of a chariot drawn by horses. Heinsius’s ignipedum (for insigni), by giving equorum an epithet, makes it more acceptable as a possessive genitive, but it has no probability. It may be worthwhile to try another approach. The obvious noun to govern equorum is not currus but the humanist correction cursu (ablative of cause with proiectus); then, instead of insigni, I suggest insano, a ‘transferred’ epithet, in support of which I adduce Ov. Met. II 314 (of the story of Phaethon) consternantur equi and Claud. VIII 63 cum procul insanae traherent Phaethonta quadrigae. (On the same lines is Baehrens’s conjecture insueto cursu, a more ordinary expression.)

6 In «CR» XVI (1902) 416; the only mention of it which I have noticed is that of D.F. Kennedy, «CQ» XXXII (1982) 381 n. 63.
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154–156  
*at circa passim fessae cubuere capellae excelsis subter dumis, quos leniter adflans aura susurrantis poscit confundere uenti.*

Most editors have been content with *poscit* in the unusual sense of ‘tries’. Pléasant preferred the humanist conjecture *possit*, but that subjunctive is inexplicable. Perhaps it should be *perstat*, which would give good sense; for *persto* construed with an infinitive see OLD 3b and ThLL X/1 1751,34ff.

167f.  
squamosos late torquebat motibus orbes, \*tollebant aurae uenientis\* ad omnia uisus.

There have been many attempts, mostly violent, to re-write 168. I think that the required sense is «the snake raised his face to confront everything he met», i.e. *tollebat* (parallel to *torquebat*) contra uenientia ad omnia uisus. Adverbial contra occurs at 296 and 315; the usual abbreviation for con (a reversed c) could have been mistaken for a. *Omnia* is the same as *obvia* at 166 and 176.

193–197  
*qui casus sociarit opem numene deorum profuerit dubium, ualuit sed uincere talis horrida squamosi uoluentia membra draconis, atque reluctantis crebris foedeque petentis ictibus ossa ferit, cingunt qua tempora cristae.*

194  *profuerit* Courtney (p. 46) : *prodere sit* codd.

Despite Housman’s treatment of 194f. (p. 567), I would accept Sillig’s *talis* (cf. 186 *senioris*) for the manuscript reading *tales*, and I would tolerate the stylistic and metrical faults of *horrida*.

In 196 Heinsius has apparently been the only scholar to query *foede* (he suggested *auide*), but its meaning is not clear «in hideous fashion», Fairclough). In ThLL VI 1001,76 our passage is grouped together with a number of others (mainly from Livy) in which a body of fighting men incurs disgrace by fighting badly; there can be no such meaning here. Perhaps *foede* should be *saue*.

258–260  
*auperor ultra in diuersa ma g i s, distantia nomina cerno: Elysium tranandus agor delatus ad undam.*

The gnat’s ghost passes from Tartarus to Elysium, which is very different (*diuersa*), and has very different (*distantia*) inhabitants, from Tartarus. It is usual to take *distantia* to mean ‘far off’ (as at 232), but the parallelism with *diuersa* surely suggests otherwise.
The comparative *magis* has no meaning; *diuersa* by itself conveys the comparison between Tartarus and Elysium. I think that it should be *uagus*, a word which this author uses four times elsewhere, including 23 *uagus feror* (cf. Catull. 63,31 *uaga uadit*). At Sen. *Nat.* V 12,5 *uagorum* is the accepted emendation of the manuscript reading *magnorum*.

272-279

nec timuit Phlegethonta furentem ardentibus undis
nec maesta obtenta Ditis ferrugine regna
defossasque domos ac Tartara noce cruenta

275

obsita nec *f a c i e s* Ditis sine iudice sedes,
iudice, qui uitae post mortem uindicat acta.

sed fortuna *u a l e n s* audacem fecerat ante.
iam rapidi steterant amnes et turba ferarum
blanda uoce sequax regionem insederat Ὠρπhei†.

Line 275 has been much disputed. The traditional interpretation is thus expressed by Heyne: «ad quas non facilis aditus, quae non admittunt aliquem nisi iudicium subierit». But, as Leo pointed out, entry to Dis’s realm without being judged is not only ‘not easy’, it is impossible. However Leo’s own view, that the words mean ‘easy of entry were there not a judge’, is intolerably forced. *Nec patulas* (an adjective which is used three times elsewhere in the poem) would be in accordance with the facts, and would be a palaeographically credible change.

In 277 I should adopt Heinsius’s neglected *fauens* for *ualens*; the corruption is of a well-known type (*fau*-> *uaf*-> *ual*->).

In 279 *regio Orphei* is a very improbable phrase. The only conjecture recorded in the editions is Baehrens’s *Hebri*. Perhaps rather *omnem*.

370f.

Scipiasque duces, quorum devote triumphis
moenia †rapidis† Libycae Carthaginis horrent.

The prevailing view is that *rapidis* conceals a word like *harundinibus* (Naeke), *uepreitis* (Haupt), *dumetis* (Baehrens), or *iam spinis* (Courtney†); none of these has any palaeographical plausibility. Preferable, I suggest, is Hertzberg’s *ruderibus*, which could have been reduced (through loss of the *er* symbol) to *rudibus*; this was at one time approved of by Haupt†, but it is never mentioned nowadays.

---

7 «Mnemosyne» s. 4 XXXIX (1986) 402.
8 Opuscula, III, Lipsiae 1875/1876, 75.
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Aetna

68-70

*tum pax est reddita mundo,
*tum *liber cessat uenit † per sidera caelum
defensique decus mundi nunc redditur astris.

After the defeat of the Giants peace returns to the universe.

«Then peace was restored to the sky, which then was free and at rest» is Munro’s translation, but *liber cessat in this sense is impossibly feeble and has not been satisfactorily emended (Goodyear rightly rejects the attempts which have been made). I should bring the line into connection with 54f. *Iuppiter et caelo metuit
dextramque coruscam / armatus flamma remouet caligine mundum; Jupiter now clears away the darkness which he there brought on. I therefore suggest *tum te<ne>brae
cessa<n>t, nitet <et> per sidera caelum (*nitet has been anticipated by Baehrens’s conjecture *nimbo cessante nitet). For the corruption of *tenebrae (via *tebre) to *liber there may be a parallel at Albinovanus Pedo 19 (ap. Sen. *Suas. 1,15) *libris intactum, where I have proposed *tenebris in «Latomus» XLVII (1988) 856.

76f.

uates

sub terris nigros *uiderunt † carmine manes.

To replace *uiderunt (which is impossible with *carmine) Goodyear is inclined to favour either Bormans’s *finnerunt or Baehrens’s *luserunt. More plausible palaeographically would be *dixerunt (*dix > *uid); for this sense of *dicere see OLD 7b, ThLL V/1 979,23 (*carmine dicere at Verg. *Georg. II 95, Val. Fl. II 244).

112f.

*seu nympha perenni

edit humum *limo † furtimque obstantia mollit.

One possible cause of the channels which perforate the earth.

*Limo has been fairly generally accepted, but Goodyear is surely justified in rejecting it as nonsense. Whether he is also justified in substituting Scaliger’s *lima is much more doubtful; he himself admits that «no such extended use of the word seems to occur elsewhere». A much more promising idea is <f>*luvio, a conjecture of A. De Vivo*. On the same lines, but (I think) preferable, would be *riuo; cf. Sen. Nat. VI 7,4 (of underground streams) potest fieri ut aliquam regionem riuus adfluentes exedat. The interchange of *l and *r is «very early and common» (Housman, p. 161).

---

9 The following modern editions are referred to: H.A.J. Munro (Cambridge 1867); R. Ellis (Oxford 1901); F.R.D. Goodyear (Cambridge 1965).

10 In the text of the Aetna which he contributed to the recent revision of Salvatore’s edition of the Appendix (Roma 1997).
206-213
congeries operit saxorum et putris harenae.
quae nec sponte sua ‘faciunt† nec corporis ullis
subiectata cadunt robusti uiribus: omnes
exagitant uenti turbas ac uertice saeuo
in densum conlecta rotant uoluuntque profundo.
hac causa expectata ruunt incendia montis.
spiritus inflatis nomen, languentibus aer.

209 subiectata Postgate ap. Ellis : sustentata codd.

The rocks and loose sand thrown up by the volcano are not ejected of their own accord; it is the winds which are the cause and agent of volcanic activity.

In 208 Goodyear reasonably thinks that quae is more likely to be a nominative than an accusative, and therefore «with some hesitation» accepts Wernsdorf’s saliunt for faciunt, «for it is not undeniably the mot juste here». I suggest subeunt, ‘rise’, ‘ascend’, a sense (OLD 5) which recurs at 467 (accensae subeunt moles) and 481; very similarly at Ov. Met. IX 93 subit has become fugit in some manuscripts.

In 212 Goodyear lists expectata, expectanda, spectata, spectanda as being «all possible, none attractive». I agree: neither the expectations of human beings («can never be a surprise», Ellis) nor their being presented with a spectacle is here in place. One wants an objective ‘scientific’ word, and it is not far to seek in this context of winds: read expirata; cf. 73 (of Enceladus) expirat faucibus ignem and the other passages adduced in ThLL V/2 1903,83ff.

337f. non illam tuidet† Aetna nec ullo intercipit aestu:
obsequitur quacumque iubet leuis aura reditque.

Illem is the dark cloud (334 obscura caligine nubes) which always broods over the summit of Etna.

«The absurdity of uidet […] needs no demonstration», says Goodyear, and mentions three possible replacements, mouet, bibit, and his own ciet. Preferable to any of these, I suggest, would be leuat (the corruption would be not unlike that at Liv. XXXVI 17,5, where leuis- and ulis- are variants); I adduce Liv. XXXVII 41,2 nebula matutina, crescente die leuata in nubes, caliginem dedit.

356f. surgit adoratis sublimis fumus ab aris:
tanta quies illi est et pax innoxia rapti.

When Etna is quiescent and people sacrifice to the gods on the highest ridge, the smoke rises high into the air; so peaceful is the scene (there is no wind going in and out of the crater).
«Innoxia rapii can hardly mean anything but ‘guiltless of plunder’; the sense wanted seems to be ‘unharmed’, which innoxia can by itself have», says Munro. Goodyear likewise confesses puzzlement, but offers no solution. The first step is to realize that *rapii* is corrupt (‘plunder’ has no place in this context), so that *innoxia* can well mean ‘unharmed’. The next is to consider the problem of *illi*, which has no obvious reference; it cannot mean *fumo* (Munro), and there is nothing in the immediately preceding context as it stands (Goodyear believes it to be lacunose) to allow us to take it as *monti* (Vollmer) or as ‘the air’ (Ellis and others). The problem of *illi* would be solved if *rapii* conceals a noun in the dative singular; I suggest that *parti* presents itself. For *pars* = ‘region’ see OLD 12, ThLL X/1 481,9ff.; the interchange of *part*- and *rapt*- is of a well-known type, and is found (e.g.) at Liv. XXIII 36,6 (see Walters-Conway, *ad l.*), Prop. IV 7,59, Verg. Aen. VIII 317, Sil. V 264.

393f. *atque hanc materiam penitus discurrere †fontes† infectae †eripiantur† aquae radice sub ipsa.*

Tainted water found at the foot of Etna shows that combustible materials run deep within the mountain.

Goodyear mentions two ways of obtaining a word to govern the accusative and infinitive *materiam discurrere*: 1. change the corrupt *eripiantur* to *testantur* (so Maehly), which seems palaeographically incredible; 2. change *fontes* to *testes*, which is likewise very difficult. I suggest *utque* (for *atque*) … *noscas* (*nos* > *fon*), with an idiomatic clause of purpose; the use of the general second person is frequent throughout the poem.

In 394 the paradosis is *eripiant(ur)*, with a minor variant *eruptantur*, but Munro’s forgotten *rumpuntur* (or perhaps *erumpuntur*) may well deserve the preference.

450-453 *nam circa latera atque imis radicibus Aetnae candentes efflant lapides disiectaque saxa intereunt, uenis manifesto ut cernere possis pabula et ardendi causam lapidem esse molarem.*

452 *cernere* Baehrens : *credere* codd.

Goodyear regards *uenis* «with suspicion and distaste», for good reason: whether the reference is to veins of rock or to the pores of the stones, and whether it is construed with what precedes or with what follows, it is nothing more than an obscure encumbrance. I wonder if the author wrote <*q*>uiuis … *possit*.

475f. *tum si quis lapidum suum o pertabuit igni, asperior †sopitaes† et quaedam sordida faex est.*
Goodyear doubts whether *summo igni* can be equivalent to *maximo igni* (he rightly rules out both «surface fire» and «fire at the surface of the volcano»), and tentatively proposes *subito*, which does not seem appropriate in sense. If change is needed, the easiest change would be to *saeuo*, which goes well with *pertabuit*; cf. 637 *saeua incendia*, 552 *saeuum hostem* (of great heat). *Saeus*, *suus*, and *summus* are easily interchanged.

In 476 Munro’s *species* seems the best conjecture; others are listed in Goodyear’s footnote.

583f. *excidit huc reduci quondam tibi, perfide Theseu, candida sollicito praemittere uela parenti.*

583 *huc* Goodyear: *hic* codd.

«I can only suppose that *candida praemittere uela* means ‘to send before him (the sight of) white sails’. If, as I fear, the words are sound, poetic licence has here degenerated into abuse of language», says Goodyear. A charitable soul might entertain the possibility that the author wrote *dulcia … signa* (cf. Catull. 64,210), and that *candida … uela* (cf. Catull. 64,235) is somebody else’s explanation of that phrase.

*Ciris*¹¹

152f. *omnia quae retinere gradum cursusque morari possent, o tecum uellem †tua semper† haberes.*

The poet wishes that Scylla had had something to stop her from violating Juno’s shrine when she ran forward after a ball.

Here are some attempts to emend the obelized passage: *tunc, semper, haberes* (Housman, p. 586, but *semper* is completely out of place), *tunc impia* (or *perdita* *haberes* (Baehrens), *tu tempore haberes* (Goodyear), *praesentia haberes* (Courtney, p. 50). *Tunc* gives very good sense; I suggest that it was followed by *sidera* (for the *dip* confusion see Housman, p. 441): «would that all the stars had been on your side (*tecum*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *cum*, sense 2) at that moment»; for *sidus habere* cf. Ov. *Trist.* V 10,45f. *o duram Lachesin, quae tam graue sidus habenti / fila dedit uitae non breuiora meae.* This solution gives a clear and convincing sense not only to *omnia* (the reference of which has been disputed), but also to *tecum habere*, which with other readings is impossibly feeble.

O mihi nunc iterum crudelis reddite Minos, 
on iterum nostrae Minos inimice senectae, 
†semper†, <ut> ante olim natae, te propter eundem 
nunc Amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae.

Carme reproaches Minos with having been the cause of grief first to her daughter Britomartis and now to her ward Scylla.

Lyne makes a convincing case for the emendations adopted above, *ut ante* and *nunc*, which «articulate the sentence in precisely the way we want». For *semper* he reads his own conjecture *sicine* (making the sentence a question); this has little palaeographical probability. Substitute *nempe*, <ita> (*nempe* was suggested by Némethy, but with *in Creta* following); the confusion of *nempe* and *semper* is almost as easy as the confusion of *nempe* and *saepe*, for which see Housman’s edition of Juvenal, pp. li ff., and add Ov. Am. 1 9,251, Ars III 532, Met. VIII 879.

Furtur et incertis iactatur ad omnia uentis, 
cumba uelut magnas sequitur cum paruula classis 
Afer et hiberno bacchatur in aequore turbo.

Scylla is dragged behind Minos’s ship.

Lyne finds *ad omnia* «culpably vague» (he thinks it may mean «in all directions» or «into every eventuality»; Heyne explained ‘ad omnem motum, impulsum uenti’), but does not query its genuineness; he adduces other instances of indefinite *omnia*, as does Leo in his note on Cul.168 (see my note on that passage above). I think that it should possibly be *obuia*; the two words are variants at Catull. 64,109, where *obuia* has always been accepted.

Numquam illam post haec oculi uidere suorum 
purpureas flauo retinentem uertice uittas.

Well might Lyne find *retinentem* ridiculous: «one does not go around all day holding» *uittae* on one’s head. «Never hereafter did the eyes of her kin behold her tying back her purple fillets upon her golden head», Fairclough, translating not *retinentem*, which stands in his text, but *religantem*, which (I suggest) ought to stand there (cf. Stat. Theb. X 644f. *ligatur / uitta comis*).

**Catalepton**

Non defensa diu ‡multum‡ certamine equorum 
optabant ‡grauide quam sibi quaeque manus‡.

30 quam] quod codd.
This is Hippodamia, long protected from her suitors by the victories of her father Oenomaus in the chariot-race.

*Multum* is impossible, whether taken as a genitive plural with *equorum* or as adverbial either with *defensa* («close-guarded», Fairclough) or with *diu* (*multum diu = diutissime*). The most appropriate sense is obtained from the humanist conjecture *uolucrum*, but that has no palaeographical probability (in addition, it would be an unpleasant repetition of *uolucrem* in 26, but that may not be a strong argument in this poem). However, that same sense could, I suggest, be more plausibly obtained from *celerum*; if this were omitted, for an obvious reason, before *certamine*, it might have been replaced by *multum* because of the frequent combination of *multum* with *diu*.

In line 30 it is surprising that *grauidae manus* has been accepted by so many modern scholars in the sense of «hands [of the suitors] laden» with presents for Oenomaus; in addition to the obscurity and weirdness of the expression (*manus optabant*!), there is the point that such presents play no part in the story of Oenomaus. I believe that the line was long ago restored beyond the possibility of doubt by two conjectures, *Graiae* for *grauidae* (Aldine 1534) and *nurum* for *manus*. The latter is the conjecture of Tollius, who adduced Verg. Aen. XI 581f. *multae illam [scil. Camillam] frustra Tyrrhena per oppida matres / optauere nurum* (initial *n* and *m* are easily interchanged). This solution is that which was approved of by Ellis in 1910; in support of *Graiae* he quoted Cir. 412 (of Scylla) *certatim ex omni petiit quam Graecia regno*.

10,20-22  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{necque ulla uota semitalibus deis} \\
\text{sibi esse facta praeter hoc nouissimum,} \\
\text{paterna lora p r o x i m u m q u e pectinem.}
\end{align*}
\]

Sabinus the muleteer had made no vows to the gods of the by-ways except, at the very last, his father’s reins and a curry-comb which is given the epithet *proximum*. Various senses have been given to *proximum*, e.g. «close-by» (the reins, *i.e.* dedicated on the same wall), «the possession of his which was next in value to the reins», «the last comb he had used»; all of these are impossibly feeble. Of the conjectures which have been proposed the only one which deserves consideration is *buxenum*, but it is devoid of palaeographical probability. I suggest *proprium*, which not only makes an excellent partner for *paterna* («his own», as opposed to «his father’s») but assumes a corruption which is quite credible.

---

Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*

5-7

*membra leuat uili sensim demissa grabato*
sollicitaque manu tenebras explorat inerties
uestigatque focum, *laesus quem denique sensit.*

In the darkness Simulus gropes for his hearth, which he eventually finds after being ‘hurt’. Heyne explains *laesus* as «offensa manu ad focum, vel cinere adusta». Kenney takes the latter view («he abruptly discovers what he is looking for by burning himself»), I would take the former (he bumps into it).

16-18

*fusus erat terra frumenti pauper aceruus;*
hinc sibi depromit quantum mensura
*patebat,*
quaes bis in octonas excurrit pondere libras.

In an edition of this poem published privately at Edinburgh in 1947 O.L. Richmond printed his own conjecture *patellae*, adducing Iuv. 4,72 *derat pisci patinae mensura*. This ingenious conjecture deserves not to be lost from the scholarly record, although the received text is adequately explained and illustrated by Kenney.

92-95

*singula tum capitum nodoso corpore nudat*
et summis spoliat coriis contemptaque passim
*spargit humi atque abicit; seruatum ‡ gramine bulbum*
inguit aqua lapidisque cauum demittit in orbem.

«Then he undid each head of garlic from its knotty framework, stripping off the outer skins and scattering all over the floor and discarding what he rejected; the bulb *with the leaves* he kept and dipped in water, then dropped into the hollowed round stone», Kenney, who remarks that the sense is good (the garlic had begun to sprout), but the unaccompanied ablative is impossible. A different view is taken by J. Booth¹⁴, who points out that the bulbs cannot have begun to sprout because they had just been freshly uprooted from Simulus’s garden; therefore *gramine* must denote not sprouts but the original fully grown leaves. Now these must have been cut off right at the beginning of the proceedings; it is inconceivable that they should have been kept to be dipped in water and pounded in the mortar. *Seruatum* must therefore be changed to a word which will «indicate their removal […] rather than their retention. K[enney]’s own uneasily offered *uiduatum* must be on the right lines, but *spoliatum* might also be worth consideration» (Booth). Neither of these conjectures has any palaeographical plausibility; and why mention the stripping of

---

¹³ I refer to the edition of E.J. Kenney (Bristol 1984).

the leaves so late, just before the cloves are popped into the mortar? The disputed phrase must go not with what follows but with what precedes. I suggest *atque abicit secto cum gramine: bulbum*; the discarded heads and membranes join the cut-off (*secto*) leaves on the floor; I put a colon after *gramine* to mark the contrast between what is thrown away and what is used. If I am right, this would be the only line in the poem in which there is a sense-pause after the fifth foot, but I do not regard that as a fatal objection.

Aberdeen W. Smith Watt

---

15 *Elegiae in Maecenatem* (= *Anth. Lat.* 760a R.): in «C&M» XLVII (1996) 274f. I have proposed the following: 10. *ergo* | *ultr*; 29. *amantem* | *euntem* (so dett.); 86. *aduersas* | *inmissas*; in an article forthcoming in «HSPh» C1 (2001), I propose the following: 8. *sed* | *fert*; 50. *omnia* | *carmina*; 68. *consalto* | *confuso* (Delz). *De institutione uiri boni* (= *Anth. Lat.* 644 R.): in «C&M» cit. 267, I have proposed *multis* (for *cunctis*) in line 2. *De rosis nascentibus* (= *Anth. Lat.* 646 R.): *ibid.* 268 I have proposed *pulchris* (for †*talis* †) in line 41.