decided to place the image of the bull on his coinage, given its unusual nature, the various meanings that can be attached to it and linked with Julian's personal interests make this all the more likely. Those who find the bull as ruler theory weak because of its obscurity seem to miss the point, for not only are we dealing with the issue of Julian's priorities[18] but also with a possible multiple meaning of the imagery. Thus it could be argued that Woods' suggestion that the bull is a solar symbol can happily coexist with the theory of the bull as symbol of the ruler. Interestingly, Woods explains the solar symbolism of the bull by recourse to the story of Helios' cattle in Homer's *Odyssey*.[19] Thus there is a Homeric root for both the bull as solar symbol and as ruler.

Second, we need to be more nuanced in our understanding of the documented reactions to the coinage. For instance, doubts are raised about the theories that the bull represented the emperor as leader or the starsign of the emperor on the grounds that such 'bland' metaphors would hardly have caused the objections voiced by the Antiochenes. But surely it should be appreciated that the contemporary reactions to the coin are not necessarily based on what the bull really meant.[20] Just as Ephrem credits the Jews with seeing in Julian's imagery the Golden Calf, it is possible that the Antiochenes deliberately interpreted the bull as they wished, in order to attack the pagan emperor. Bowersock famously remarks that 'the meaning of Julian's strange new coinage was quite unknown even then',[21] but it is possible that contemporaries may have understood it very well.[22] It is just that they were also able to interpret it in such a way as to suit their own purposes.

School of History and Archaeology, Cardiff University SHAUN TOUGHER
toughersf@cardiff.ac.uk

[18] As Kent (n. 6), 217, stressed himself.
[19] Woods (n. 1), 167.
[20] This is the position taken, for instance, by Vanderspoel (n. 1), 119.
[21] Bowersock (n. 13), 104.
[22] Vanderspoel (n. 1), 117, makes the same point, though to different effect.

ANTH. LAT. 36 *DE EURYALO*: A SOLE SURVIVING SOLACE?

Unicus Euryalus †meruit† solacia matris;
ereptus matri est unicus Euryalus.

So reads the Teubner text of Shackleton Bailey,[1] who suggests, after explaining in his apparatus that *meruit* is without sense, either *fuerat* (which seems rather plain), or *vivus*, 'quod facile post *-lus* vel *-nus* excidere potuit'; but a second adjectival form seems rather excessive, while not having an expressed verb in the hexameter means that, despite its emphatic positioning at the beginning of the pentameter, *ereptus . . . est* is without much impact. Instead of *meruit*, I therefore suggest the palaeographically similar *mansit*, citing for contextual background Verg. *Aen*. 9.481–3 (words spoken by Euryalus' mother after learning of his death): *tune ille senectae/ sera meae requies potuisti linquere solam,/ crudelis?*[2] *Mansit* would give point to both the

[1] *Anthologia Latina* 1.1*: libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina* (Stuttgart, 1982).
[2] Philip Hardie ad loc. (Cambridge, 1994) compares *Aen*. 12. 57–8 *spes tu nunc una, senectae/ tu requies miserae* (Amata to Turnus) and 8.581 *care puer, mea sola et sera voluptas* (Evander to Pallas); but perhaps also worth noting, mindful of *solacia* in our passage, is 8.514–5 *hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,/ Pallanta adiungam* (Evander to Aeneas).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.330 Published online by Cambridge University Press

repeated *unicus*[3] and *ereptus* (*only* he remained, and he was snatched away) and is supported by such passages as Prop. 2.20.17 '[sc. *iuro*] *me tibi ad extremas mansurum . . . tenebras* and Val. Fl. 6.305 *genitor . . . tibi si manet*.[4] Compare perhaps also the collocation of words at Ter. *Haut*. 540 *huic mansisset unicus gnatus domi*, although *maneo* here refers to continuing to live at home rather than continuing to live.

Hampton School, Middlesex T. J. LEARY
tleary6221@aol.com

[3] For other examples of *Umklammerungstechnik* (*Unicus Euryalus . . . unicus Euryalus*) in epigram, and further bibliography, see E. Siedschlag, *Zur Form von Martials Epigrammen* (Berlin, 1977), 123–4.

[4] See further *TLL* 8.288.63ff. s.v. *maneo* [Tietze].

ERRATUM

The volume index included with *Classical Quarterly*, vol. 53, no. 2, contained an error in the title. Oxford University Press wishes to apologize for this. A corrected version is included as a loose insert with this issue.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.330 Published online by Cambridge University Press