One might maintain that canvassing for support is canvassing for support, whether it is undertaken before, during, or after campaigning for office; nevertheless, I want to stay focused on the precise context within which Livy places Tarquinius' innovation as I now link conjecturally to Livy 1.35.2 a passage from Dionysius of Halicarnassus that itself deals with change in the process of selecting Roman kings.

According to Dionysius 4.40.1–3, before the people formally elected Servius Tullius to the throne, there had been a fixed procedure for the creation of a new king: after the death of a king, the senatorial *interreges* would select a single candidate to succeed to the throne; if the people and the auguries confirmed this choice, the candidate became king; if not, the *interreges* selected another single candidate. This process continued until the single candidate got popular and divine approval. Servius, however, bypassed this normal procedure, eventually presenting himself directly to the people, 'the poorer sort of whom he had won over by bribery and many other ways of courting popular favour'; he had 'gained the affections of the people by certain ingratiating acts' (trans. E. Cary). Dionysius seems to be describing here a change of political behaviour that looks very much like the one Livy locates at the time of Tarquinius Priscus' accession and calls innovatory. If a single candidate was presented to the people with prior senatorial approval, he might (or might not) have nonetheless actively cultivated popular support, but he would have presented himself for popular acceptance already in possession of a prestigious seal of approval. If, on the other hand, a candidate went directly to the people, he would have had to sell himself, or sell himself much harder.

What we seem to have in Livy is a variant of Dionysius' notice, one that ascribes the innovation to the time of Tarquinius Priscus' accession rather than to that of Servius Tullius. Livy is not interested in describing the procedural changes, about which, in any case, he would not have fully agreed with Dionysius, for Livy believed that popular approval of a new king was sought first and only then capped off with senatorial endorsement. What Livy was interested in was the introduction of canvassing tactics that resulted from the procedural changes and especially the political and moral ramifications of those tactics. We typically cannot know how Dionysius' and Livy's positions are related to the positions taken by other Republican annalistic historians whose works have not survived.

Fordham University, New York ROBERT J. PENELLA
rpenella@fordham.edu
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh068

PHILO, LUCRETIUS, AND *ANIMA*

At Philo, *De Opificio Mundi* 21.66 the author tells us that God created Man and upon him *νοῦν ἐξαίρετον ἐδωρεῖτο, ψυχῆς τινα ψυχὴν κάθαπερ κόρην ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ*.[1]

At *DRN* 3.275 Lucretius tells us that the fourth element (the nameless element) of the *animus*/*anima* is *anima animae*.

Commentators on Lucretius give no indication that his striking phrase has any parallels. Commentators on Philo believe that the expression occurs only in Philo. Further, at *DRN* 3.402–16 (especially 406–9) Lucretius draws an analogy between the pupil/eye and the *animus*/*anima*, just as Philo does here. The fact that this very

[1] Philo again uses the expression *ψυχῆς ψυχή* at *Heres* 55.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh069 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unusual expression[2] occurs in these two authors in virtually the same context with the same force and in both the same analogy is adduced guarantees that this is no coincidence.[3]

What inferences may we draw? Did Philo derive the language and the analogy from Lucretius? I know no evidence that he was familiar with the *DRN*.

It seems more likely that Philo and Lucretius are both dependent on an earlier Greek source.[4] We know that the theory of the 'unnamed element' was already in Epicurus and so it seems reasonable to assume that the expression *ψυχῆς ψυχή* already occurred in some Epicurean text that Lucretius and Philo both drew on.

University of Illinois, Urbana HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh069

[2] The phrase *ψυχὴ τῆς ψυχῆς* (with the article) does occur in Meleager (*AP* 5.155). But this seems irrelevant to our passages. Meleager's context is purely amatory.

[3] The analogy in itself is not unique. It is a variation on analogies already found in Aristotle (*Top*. 1.17.108a11; see too *Rh*. 1.6.12.1096b28), *ὡς ὄψις ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ* ; also Philo (*Opif*. 53), *ὅπερ γὰρ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ τοῦτ' ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι*.

[4] A few lines below Philo uses the expression *ὀφθαλμοῦ ὀφθαλμόν* of the pupil of the eye. This phrase he *explicitly* attributes to earlier writers.

AENEID 12.570–1

scilicet expectem libeat dum proelia Turno
nostra pati rursusque velit concurrere victus

Readers puzzle over *victus* since there has been no prior battle between Aeneas and Turnus. Williams follows the traditional view when he writes, 'Aeneas interprets Turnus' avoidance of the single combat as a defeat.[1] We may then choose to hear a sneer in *victus*. But the verse lends itself equally to a different interpretation. *Vincere* is commonly used of persuasion.[2] Thus, 'should I wait . . . till he is convinced to be willing to fight against me'.[3] A similar collocation is found later in this book (833) when Juppiter says, *me victusque volensque remitto*.

University of Illinois, Urbana HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh070

[1] R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Vergil, Books 7–12* (London, 1973), 476.

[2] For example, *Aen*. 2.699, Plaut. *Amph*. 423, Cic. *Clu*. 64, 124; Hor. *Epod*. 17.27; Quint. 1 Praef. 3. Cf. too Greek *νενικημένος*: Hdt. 1.40).

[3] Thus, *rursus* goes with *velit victus* and refers to the beginning of Book 12 where Turnus finally feels the moral pressure and decides to fight against Aeneas.

THE WATERY SOMETHING OF VIRGIL, *GEORGICS* 4.234

bis gravidos cogunt fetus, duo tempora messis:
Taygete simul os terris ostendit honestum
Pleas et Oceani spretos pede reppulit amnis,
aut eadem sidus fugiens ubi Piscis aquosi
tristior hibernas caelo descendit in undas. (Verg. *G*. 4.231–5)

1. Vergil reminds beekeepers to collect honey from their hives twice a year: one batch in early May, when the Pleiades enter the predawn sky, and a second in early

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh069 Published online by Cambridge University Press