If we translate *cessatam ducere curam* as 'to prolong their neglect of care', what does this mean in terms applicable to the young Phaeacians? Clearly, Horace is not implying that they (like Lollius and his peers) should be rising before dawn to read philosophy, but he is implying that they are making no effort *ad recte uiuendum* (cf. line 41). Odysseus developed the skills of leadership, resourcefulness, oratory and an inquiring curiosity about the wider world. The young Phaeacians, by contrast, seem to care for nothing beyond the mindless pleasures of Phaeacian court life. They sleep (when of course they cannot be taking care of anything) till midday; then, when they awake, they prolong this avoidance, or neglect, of care by amusing themselves to the sound of music.

University of California at Davis DAVID A. TRAILL
datraill@ucdavis.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000052

CIRIS 288: AN EMENDATION

Scylla's nurse Carme has just learned that Scylla is in love with Minos, who in turn was once in love with Carme's daughter Britomartis and chased her to death. Carme opens her speech with an address to Minos (286–9):

> o mihi nunc iterum crudelis reddite Minos,
> o iterum nostrae Minos inimice senectae,
> †semper aut† olim natae te propter eundem
> †aut† amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae.
>
> oh, Minos, now again made cruel to me,
> oh, Minos, hostile again to my old age,
> … once to my daughter, likewise through you
> … love has brought distress to my frenzied nurseling.

Lyne is probably right to locate the corruption in the three obelized words: 'Barth's *ut* (*semper* <*ut*> *aut*) produces a barely plausible text: "ut semper amor propter te eundem luctum portauit, aut olim natae aut <nunc> insanae alumnae" […]. We must seek a more radical cure. […] *aut* … *aut* seems to me to give the wrong sense […], and *semper* must be corrupt.'[1] For *aut* at 289, Némethy's *nunc*, to match *olim* at 288, is an attractive

[1] R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978), 221. Many editors print Barth's text (for instance, Hielkema, Haury, Knecht, Goold). Others give their own versions: A. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini minores* (Leipzig, 1880), 2.143: *quem per (ut a! olim natae te propter eundem) | hunc Amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae!*; G. Némethy, *Ciris: epyllion pseudovergilianum* (Budapest, 1909), 34: *nempe in Creta olim natae te propter eundem, | nunc amor insanae letum portauit alumnae!*; M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *P. Vergili Maronis Ciris* (Turin, 1930), 63: *semper fraus olim <ut> natae te propter eundem, | haud amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*; R. Helm, *Die pseudo-virgilische Ciris* (Heidelberg, 1937), 37: *semper <obes? mortem per te crudelia fata | attuler>unt olim natae, te propter eundem | hunc amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000258 Published online by Cambridge University Press

correction (*pace* Lyne). For *semper aut* at 288, Lyne printed *sicine ut ante* … ? (building on Scaliger's *nuper ut ante*).[2] Two more objections can be raised against the standard line of correction, which Lyne's conjecture does not eliminate. First, to say that Minos brought grief to Britomartis is surely a gross understatement, for in fact he caused her death, a point Carme is quite clear about (*mihi certe, nata, peristi*, 306). This objection can in principle be overcome by reading *letum* (so R) for *luctum*.[3] Second, since *te propter eundem* is positioned between the references to *natae* and *alumnae*, it should probably be taken to go with the latter rather than with both; accordingly, *eundem* would mean 'the same as mentioned before' rather than 'the same in each case'. The ellipse may not be difficult to make up ('<through you> love once brought distress to my daughter—likewise through you love now brings distress to my nurseling'), yet an explicit reference to Minos at the beginning of 288 would certainly be welcome. While admittedly neither objection is fatal, one may prefer to avoid them if possible.

Let us begin with the second problem. It was already sensed by Helm, who also pointed out a relevant parallel: 'Das te propter eundem gibt erst Sinn, wenn vorher schon etwas von derselben Person ausgesagt ist wie Verg. A. 4, 321.'[4] The Virgilian passage is worth quoting (*Aen.* 4.320–3):

> te propter Libycae gentes Nomadumque tyranni
> odere, infensi Tyrii; te propter eundem
> exstinctus pudor et, qua sola sidera adibam,
> fama prior.
>
> Because of you, the Libyan tribes and the kings of the Numidians
> hate me and the Tyrians are bitter against me; likewise because of you,
> gone is my chastity and my former good name, which alone raised me to the stars.

In addition to the shared verse ending (unparalleled elsewhere in classical Latin poetry), it also has thematic affinities with the *Ciris* context. Both Carme and Dido speak of love ruining women: Britomartis and Scylla suffer because of love either from or for Minos; Dido suffers because of her love for Aeneas. I suggest that there may be one more textual point of contact: *semper* at 288 could be a corruption for *te propter*, prompted by misreading an abbreviation for *propter* as *per*. This would produce a well-balanced line, and the metre can be restored by inserting *qui*, for instance: *te propter qui olim natae, te propter eundem | nunc amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*. In view of Catull. 64.247–8 *ferox Theseus, qualem Minoidi luctum | obtulerat mente immemori, talem ipse recepit*, one might alternatively consider *te propter qualem natae, te propter eundem | talem amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*.[5]

Be that as it may, the first objection is still in place. One could try something like this: *te propter letum* (or *mortem*) *natae, te propter eundem | nunc amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*.[6] Yet, this will have two weaknesses. First, Carme clearly wants to draw a parallel between Britomartis and Scylla, and it would be rhetorically ineffective to say that Minos brought death to the former and (merely) grief to the latter. Second, it

[2] W.S. Watt, 'Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*', *Eikasmos* 12 (2001), 279–92, at 289, following Lyne's interpretation in general and taking up Némethy's *nempe*, proposed *nempe, <ita> ut ante*.
[3] As Némethy (n. 1) does.
[4] R. Helm, 'Textkritische Beiträge zur Ciris', *RhM* 85 (1936), 254–88, at 274.
[5] It can perhaps be objected that the repetition of *te propter* would point to a paratactic rather than to a hypotactic construction.
[6] Cf. Helm's (n. 1) version.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000258 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is in fact questionable whether the kind of distress experienced by Scylla can adequately be described as *luctus*.[7] It may therefore be tempting to write: *te propter qui olim natae, te propter eundem | nunc amor insanae letum portauit alumnae* (accepting R's reading for *luctum*). Indeed, Scylla has just confessed to Carme that she contemplated suicide (*peperissem uulnere letum*, 282), and Carme does consider her as good as dead (*o bis iam exitium crudele meorum*, 292).

This may seem an attractive solution, but it sacrifices a meaningful word that would be perfectly appropriate in such a context—if applied to denote Carme's grief for (the possibility of) the loss of Britomartis and Scylla. Luppe therefore appears to be thinking in the right direction: 'Zu *luctum portauit* ist eigentlich der Dativ ‚mir' zu erwarten. Mein Vorschlag: *ut <nobis> olim natae te propter eundem, | nunc amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae*.'[8] Indeed, Carme is more concerned not with the misfortunes of Britomartis and Scylla as such but with their effects on her own self: *mihi … crudelis reddite* (286), *nostrae … inimice senectae* (287), *tene ego … nequiui … effugere* (290–2). The passage should be read thus, I suggest:[9]

> te propter mi olim natae, te propter eundem
> nunc amor insanae luctum portauit alumnae.
>
> Through you love once brought me grief for my daughter, likewise through you it has now brought me grief for my frenzied nurseling.

Trinity College, Dublin BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000258

[7] According to *OLD* s.v. 2a, *luctus* is 'mournful feeling, grief, sorrow (esp. arising from bereavement)'. This is the meaning at Catull. 64.247 (quoted above), where Ariadne's *luctus* caused by her abandonment by Theseus is paralleled by Theseus' own *luctus* caused by the suicide of his father. Ariadne's grief at 64.199 (*nostrum luctum*) is similarly paralleled by Aegeus' grief at 64.226 (*nostros luctus*). The only exception is 64.71–2 *a misera, assiduis quam luctibus externauit | spinosas Erycina serens in pectore curas*, where *luctus* appears to be used of pangs of love. As G. Trimble, 'A commentary on Catullus 64, lines 1–201' (Diss., Oxford University, 2010), 134 comments, 'the word is not typically used of painful love'. A. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig, 1885), 386 likewise observes that 'luctus […] numquam de amoris maeroribus dicitur', and he may well be right to propose *fluctibus* (a conjecture unduly neglected by recent editors), based on the analogy with 64.97–8 *qualibus incensam iactastis mente puellam | fluctibus* (cf. further 64.62 *magnis curarum fluctuat undis*).

[8] W. Luppe, 'Textvorschläge zur pseudo-vergilianischen ‚Ciris'', *Philologus* 152 (2008), 161–5, at 164. Accordingly, *natae* and *alumnae* would be objective genitives; cf. *TLL* 7.1742.84 s.v. *luctus* II. B.1.b.α.

[9] The contracted form *mi* tends to be avoided in epic, but still there are instances of it in Lucretius (1.924, 3.105), Virgil (*Aen*. 6.104, 123) and Ovid (*Met*. 9.191, 13.503); on the colloquial character of *mi*, cf. recently N. Adkin, '*Mi* in Virgil', *Eranos* 105 (2008/2009), 1–3. The elision can be paralleled, for example, at Lucr. 1.924 (*et simul incussit suauem mi in pectus amorem*) and Catull. 76.26 (*o di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea!*), a line imitated at *Ciris* 524–7 (*illi pro pietate sua … reddidit*). On the elision of monosyllables in *Ciris*, cf. Lyne (n. 1), 18. For the situation in general, P.L. Gatti, *Pseudo Virgilio: Ciris* (Milan, 2010), 161 points out an interesting parallel in Phaedrus 1.28.5–6 (the fox begging the eagle to spare her cubs): *hanc persecuta mater orare incipit, | ne tantum miserae luctum importaret sibi*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000258 Published online by Cambridge University Press