refer to wheat; yet although ears of wheat can be cropped, they cannot be sown. I fail to think of any more suitable replacement for *auenas* along these lines.

Another option is to adopt Thomas's *Cererem* and to replace *auenas* with a word that would develop the notion of barren soil. I propose *effetae Cererem sulcis condatis harenae*, 'may you bury wheat in furrows of sterile sand'.[12] We may note that Virgil uses *harena*, 'sandy soil', twice in contexts that speak of ploughing and sowing. In one he instructs that sandy soil should be ploughed later than rich soil is normally ploughed, so that it does not get dried up (*G.* 1.70 *sterilem exiguus ne deserat umor harenam*). In the other he describes how the piles of sandy soil should be levelled over the seeds after sowing (*G.* 1.105 *cumulosque ruit male pinguis harenae*). It is worth noting that *harena* is in both cases defined by an epithet roughly synonymous to *effetus*: *sterilis* or *male pinguis*. In addition, *sulcis … harenae*, 'furrows of sand', can be compared with *cumulos … harenae*, 'piles of sand' (these are, of course, the ridges of the furrows). The corruption is easy to explain: first, (*h*)*arenae* became *auenae*, no doubt under the influence of line 7 *auena*; then, *effetae … auenae* was construed as a direct object with *condatis* (for what else could it be?) and was accordingly 'corrected' to *effetas … auenas*; finally, since this made *Cererem* superfluous, it had to be changed to *Cereris*, to create at least some semblance of sense and grammar.

Trinity College, Dublin BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000423

CIRIS 265: AN EMENDATION*

Carme fears that Scylla is in love with her own father (237–40); Scylla replies that she loves no one she should love, but one of the besiegers—though she can hardly bring herself to utter his name (262–7):

> nil amat hic animus, nutrix, quod oportet amari,
> in quo falsa tamen lateat pietatis imago,
> sed media ex acie, mediis ex hostibus—eheu,
> quid dicam quoue aegra malum hoc exordiar ore? 265
> dicam equidem, quoniam tu nunc non dicere, nutrix,
> non sinis: extremum hoc munus morientis habeto.[1]
>
> 265 aegra *Baehrens*: agam *Z*: ipsa *ρ*: ausa *Sillig*

[12] For collocation of *Cererem* with *sulcis*, cf. Manilius 3.664 *mandant et sulcis Cererem*; more generally, cf. Verg. *G.* 1.223 *sulcis committas semina*. If we take *condatis* to refer to the new owners rather than to the farm, the line will likewise make perfect sense: 'may you plant wheat in furrows of sterile sand'.

* This paper was produced during the term of a Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship funded by the Irish Research Council (project ID: GOIPD/2016/549).

[1] Text from R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978), 80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000435 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Line 265 has one obvious textual problem: Z's *agam* is impossible, ρ's *ipsa* gives poor sense and is either a conjecture or an independent corruption. Most editors, including Lyne, accept Baehrens's *aegra*.[2] Sillig's *ausa* seems in fact preferable (it may even find some support in ρ's *ipsa*):[3] note Verg. *Aen*. 4.283–4 (*heu quid agat? quo nunc reginam ambire furentem | audeat adfatu? quae prima exordia sumat?*), which Lyne aptly adduces.[4] Another point worth making is that *quo ore?* should be taken to mean not 'with what words?'[5] but 'with what face?'.[6] This is the idiomatic sense in which *quo ore?* appears in Cicero (for instance *Verr*. 2.4.26 *in populi Romani quidem conspectum quo ore uos commisistis?*), in Livy (for instance 40.27.11 *quo ore quisquam uestrum … occurret … iis qui …?*) and, perhaps most relevantly, in Terence: *Phorm*. 916 (*nam quo redibo ore ad eam quam contempserim?*), 1041 (*quo ore illum obiurgabis?*) and *Haut*. 700 (*nam quo ore appellabo patrem?*). The rhetorical question evidently implies a negative answer: Scylla does not have the face (= is ashamed) to tell Carme the truth.[7] In English, the idiom can perhaps be rendered as 'how shall I face you, look you in the eye?'. This sense goes well with Sillig's *ausa*: 'how dare I look you in the eye and tell you of this disaster?'.

There is, however, also a second problem, for *quid dicam?*—'what shall I say?'—gives the wrong sense. Scylla knows quite well what to say:[8] she is quite clear about what Carme wants from her (258 *quid tantum properas nostros nouisse furores?*), she has in fact already begun confessing her passion for Minos (264) and she euphemistically refers to it in the second half of line 265 (*malum hoc*). In the next line Scylla uses forms of *dicere* two more times, clearly in response to her own rhetorical question (*dicam equidem*, 'yes, I shall say it', and *non dicere … non sinis*, 'you force me to say it'): these two phrases likewise show that Scylla's difficulty lies not in deciding what to say but in actually saying what she already has in mind. The following passage (268–72) further demonstrates that what Scylla is hesitating to do is not to find *something* to say but specifically to name Minos (and note again 271 *dicendum est*, 'it must be said').[9] Finally, it would be rhetorically preferable if the two questions paralleled each other: the second question—*quo … exordiar ore?*—means 'how shall I look you in the eye as I begin telling you about it?' (= 'I cannot look you in the eye'); the first

[2] A.[E.] Baehrens, 'Emendationes in Cirin', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 105 (1872), 833–49, at 845.

[3] I. Sillig, *P. Virgilii Maronis quae vulgo feruntur carmina Culex, Ciris, Copa et Moretum* (Leipzig, 1831), 244.

[4] Lyne (n. 1), 214.

[5] Cf. Lyne (n. 1), 214: 'How shall I begin?'.

[6] *OLD* s.v. *os*[1] 8b: 'the face as showing or failing to show signs of shame; (pregn.) command of countenance, assurance, "face"'.

[7] R.A. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 2005), 162 n. 18 makes a slightly different emphasis: 'A Roman who was thought to have behaved shamefully could be asked, in tones of incredulity, "with what face" he came into the sight of others […]; the answer could be that he had a "hard" or "iron face" (*os durum* or *ferreum*), one incapable of blushing.' Yet this applies to situations when people are *not* ashamed, as, for instance, in the Cicero example.

[8] Just as Phaedra does (Eur. *Hipp*. 345): πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξειας ἀμὲ χρὴ λέγειν; 'if only you could say for me what I must say!'. On the use of Euripides' *Hippolytus* in the *Ciris*, see D. De Gianni, 'La nutrice di Scilla e la nutrice di Fedra: ispirazioni euripidee nella *Ciris*', *Vichiana* 12 (2010), 36–45.

[9] Again, we may compare Phaedra, who hints to the Nurse that she is in love, but is reluctant to name Hippolytus; unlike Scylla, however, she succeeds in making the Nurse utter his name for her (*Hipp*. 347–52).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000435 Published online by Cambridge University Press

question should mean 'how shall I say it to you?' (= 'I cannot').[10] Once the problem is recognized, the correction suggests itself: *qui dicam?*—'how shall I say it?'.

It is true that the adverbial *qui* had colloquial currency (it is common in Plautus and Terence, for instance),[11] but this does not make it unfit for the present context: as Lyne shows, the speeches of Carme and Scylla feature a considerable amount of colloquial elements.[12] The corruption can be paralleled more than once in Catullus, for instance at 67.17 (*qui* [Puccius: *quid* V] *possum?*) and 37 (*qui tu* [ed. Ald. 1502: *quid* V] *istaec, ianua, nosti?*).[13]

To sum up:

> nil amat hic animus, nutrix, quod oportet amari,
> in quo falsa tamen lateat pietatis imago,
> sed media ex acie, mediis ex hostibus—eheu,
> **qui** dicam quoue **ausa** malum hoc exordiar ore?
> dicam equidem, quoniam tu nunc non dicere, nutrix,
> non sinis: extremum hoc munus morientis habeto.
>
> Nurse, my soul loves nothing that ought to be loved,
> nothing in which some semblance of duty, however false, might lurk,
> but from the midst of the fighting, from the midst of the enemy—alas,
> how shall I say it, with what face shall I dare begin my account of this woe?
> Yes, I shall say it, since you yourself, Nurse, do not permit me now not to say it:
> take this last gift from me as I die.

Trinity College, Dublin BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000435

[10] It seems necessary to take *dicam* and *exordiar* as future forms rather than as (deliberative) subjunctives: the question *quo … ore?* does not mean 'what face am I to assume to tell you about it?' but 'what face shall I have as I tell you about it?', as the Livy and Terence parallels show.

[11] On the colloquial character of *qui*, see e.g. J.N. Adams, *An Anthology of Informal Latin, 200 BC–AD 900* (Cambridge, 2016), 194–5. But note A. Chahoud, 'Idiom(s) and literariness in classical literary criticism', in E. Dickey, A. Chahoud (edd.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, 2010), 42–64, at 44 n. 5, observing that, despite its colloquial currency, *qui* can find place in higher linguistic registers too: 'This phrase [*qui fit*] and similar questions introduced by adverbial *qui* (e.g. *qui potest/potis est?*) are found in early high-register poetry (e.g. Acc. *trag*. 418), in Lucretius (1.168) and in formal prose (e.g. Cic. *Fat*. 38; Sal. *Cat*. 51.24).'

[12] See Lyne (n. 1), 193 on 226 *aegroto*, 199 on 241 *quouis*, 200 on 244 *macerat*, 202 on 247 *digna atque indigna*, 203 on 249 *senio*, 208 on 257 *torques* and *nutricula*, 211 on 261 *odimus*, 215 on 268 *uides*, 241 on 328 *est … nostrum*.

[13] See in general J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal* (Swansea, 2007), 9 (with a list of other possible examples); on the latter context, see esp. J.N. Adams, 'Nominative personal pronouns and some patterns of speech in Republican and Augustan poetry', *PBA* 93 (1999), 97–133, at 115–16. Another possible parallel is Verg. *Ecl*. 2.2 (*nec quid speraret habebat*), where A.S. Gratwick, 'Corydon and his prospects', *CR* 23 (1973), 10 proposed *qui*—which is now printed by Ottaviano in her recent Teubner edition (S. Ottaviano, G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro: Bucolica, Georgica* [Berlin, 2013], 42). S.J. Heyworth, *BMCR* 2014.02.47 objects that 'Vergil does not otherwise use the form'; id., *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius* (Oxford, 2007), 171 shows that at Prop. 2.14.58 *qui* has no manuscript support and should not be printed, observing that 'none of the Augustan poets uses the adverb except Horace in his prosaic hexameters' (after A.E. Housman, 'Butler and Barber's Propertius', *CR* 48 [1934], 136–9, at 139), though he admits that 'Ovid also uses it, but only in poems to be dated to his exile: *ep*. 17.213, and perhaps *tr*. 3.4.21'. It can perhaps be noted that the Virgil of the *Eclogues* is not (yet) an Augustan poet.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000435 Published online by Cambridge University Press