were supposed not to have worn the veil. Consequently he states that Sulpicius Galus divorced his wife for covering her head with her cloak (ἱμάτιον).[25]

We conclude that the disagreement between Valerius Maximus and Plutarch on the issue of whether Sulpicius Galus' wife was divorced for veiling or going unveiled is the result of the very different contexts in which these authors discuss the case. Valerius Maximus, writing at a time of heightened awareness of female modesty and the importance of dress,[26] shapes his discussion in conformance with his own views on the subject, although the issue may have been relatively unimportant in the original case. Plutarch, on the other hand, was attempting to answer the question of female veiling practices in early Rome about which he evidently had little knowledge. The contradiction between Valerius and Plutarch is an indication of the complexity of the issue of the veiling of women in Roman society.

University of Kwazulu-Natal, Durban J.L. HILTON
L.L.V. MATTHEWS
hilton@ukzn.ac.za
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000323

[25] Rose (n. 1), 18 takes this as a simple error on the part of Plutarch. According to Rose, either Plutarch confused *operire* with *aperire* (i.e. he read *capite operto* in his source not *capite aperto*) or this mistake was already present the account he was using. More was at work than Rose allows.
[26] For the policy of Augustus, see Suet. *Aug.* 40.5.

TWO TRICKY TRANSITIVES

The border between transitive and intransitive in Latin was as permeable as the Rio Grande, in principle. In practice however each verb is a special case. In this note I want to draw attention to two verbs, *erubesco* and *plaudo*, whose transitive usage has caused misunderstanding.

1. Cicero, *Pro Caelio* 8 *illud tamen te esse admonitum uolo … ut ea in alterum ne dicas quae, cum tibi falso responsa sint, erubescas.*

This is how the text is printed in A.C. Clark's 1908 OCT and reprinted in R.G. Austin's well-known edition. In his commentary Austin observed that the accusative (*quae*) after *erubescere* is rare in prose, and he referred to the article in *TLL* V 2.821.59–61. Reviewing the third edition (1960) of that commentary in *JRS* 51 (1961), 267 R.G.M. Nisbet offered an alternative explanation, namely that the construction was like that at *Phil.* 2.9, and he referred to Kühner – Stegmann's Latin grammar, II.316ff. To unpack Nisbet's alternative: the phenomenon, as he saw it, was to be explained as what German Latinists call 'relative Verschränkung', whereby in this example the relative *quae* only serves as subject for the subordinate *cum*-clause, and the main verb of the relative clause, *erubescas*, remains intransitive. This construction is actually quite common in Ciceronian prose, and equally commonly it is often misconstrued by modern students, because our own vernaculars are less flexible than Latin. I drew attention to this problem in a recent essay, 'The impracticability of Latin "Kunstprosa"', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J.N. Adams

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (= *PBA* 129, Oxford, 2005), 200–1. My point there was that this idiomatic syntax was often wrongly analysed as anacoluthon (a breakdown in coherent syntactical structure). As chance would have it I too drew attention to *Phil*. 2.9. My point here is that the analysis offered by Nisbet, rightly in my view, still has not secured the assent it ought to have. For in his note on *Aeneid* 2.542 Austin quoted this passage in illustration of Virgil's (uncontroversial) transitive use of *erubuit*, though admitting in a parenthesis that the usage in Cicero was 'possibly transitive'. Perhaps more damagingly, the article on *erubesco* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. 1f, takes the accusative *quae* to be internal (the text is printed with the commas found above). The *OLD* adds what it takes to be another example: Quintilian, *Minor Declamations* 268.11, *quidam, dum hoc erubescunt, cura uacare utique dixerunt*; but why *hoc* there should not be the normal causal ablative ('blush at this'), I fail to see. On balance then, there is no compelling reason to accept that Cicero ever used *erubesco* transitively. This leaves one last point, punctuation: the comma between *quae* and *cum* must be removed. Since other editions of this speech (e.g. I.C. Vollgraff's [1887], J. van Wagenigen's [1908], the Teubners of C.F.W. Mueller [1898], and then of A. Klotz [1915]) omit it, I've a hunch its presence is entirely Clark's work; indeed, it rather suggests that he also took *quae* to be the accusative object of *erubescas* rather than the subject (and nothing more) of *responsa sint*. The transitive use of *erubesco* is originally poetic syntax; that Livy writes *id…erubescendum* at 38.59.11 should not suggest he regarded the verb as transitive (though he might have, if he wrote that book after Virgil and Propertius), since intransitive verbs quite naturally formed impersonal gerundives, e.g. *eundum est*. Poetic syntax brings me to my next example.

2. Statius, *Siluae* 5.3.139–40 *non totiens uictorem Castora gyro | nec fratrem caestu uirides †clausero† Therapnae.*

This is the text of the Madrid MS (M). The main verb has clearly been mangled. E. Courtney in the text of his OCT edition of 1990 printed W.S. Watt's conjecture *auxere*, and mentioned in the apparatus the conjecture of L. Håkanson, *coluere*. In his Loeb edition of 2003 D.R. Shackleton Bailey printed the conjecture of Calderinus, which he discussed on p. 401, *plausere* (Courtney had declined to mention it). *Hinc illae lacrimae*: these consummate Latinists recently engaged in a jolly ding-dong in the pages of *HSCP* 102 (2004). Courtney maintained (p. 446) that it is an iron rule of textual criticism that an unattested usage (here *plaudo* in the sense 'praise' used transitively) should not be introduced by emendation. Shackleton Bailey replied on p. 457 with a repeated justification of his practice. But what both forgot in the heat of battle (as clearly Watt and Håkanson had also forgotten) was that *plaudo* is so attested, more or less, at Persius 4.31 *farratam pueris plaudentibus ollam*. In his note on that text in his 1956 edition, Wendell Clausen argued for the transitive use, in the sense 'praise, approve', though the accusative there is a variant for the ablative; he cited Calderinus's correction in Statius, which probably does not help us much. Still, the MS tradition of Persius supports the usage, and Clausen's text, which he has never altered in two OCT editions, seems to be generally accepted. Unfortunately, once again the *OLD* rather lets us down, and the usage is not noted s.v. 4, because S.G. Owen's 1907 OCT was the preferred edition (Owen printed an ablative, *farrata…olla*), but it is recorded at *TLL* X 1.2366.3–13, where there is a useful collection of secure later examples of this transitive usage (but not the conjecture in Statius). It is not my intention to decide what Statius wrote here, but

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000335 Published online by Cambridge University Press

future editors need to be reminded that Calderinus's conjecture does not introduce an unattested usage.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER
roland.mayer@kcl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000335

IAM EXCLAMATIVUM*

In this note an attempt is made at describing and documenting a syntactical construction that occasionally occurs in poetic and post-classical Latin but has almost gone unnoticed so far. As will be shown at the end, this has sometimes created imaginary textual difficulties. The recognition of this grammatical phenomenon may help us to avoid future editorial and other problems.

Grammars and lexica do not draw attention to the fact that iam (or *iam vero*) is sometimes used to introduce exclamations.[1] To be sure, expressions like *iam vero videte hominis audaciam!* (Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.170) and i*am in opere qui labor, quae sedulitas!* (Plin. *HN* 7 pr. 4) occur quite often and are self-explanatory. But a third, and more interesting, type of this use of *iam* exists: *iam* can be followed by a series of nominatives without verb or exclamatory pronoun.

This type is less common and, what is more, it is often hard to distinguish from such phenomena as simple ellipse of *esse* or anacoluthon.[2] It is clear that one should favour ellipse over exclamation where there have already occurred several instances of the former, as in Plin. *Ep.* 1.10.8 and Tac. *Hist*. 1.2; furthermore, ellipse usually seems the better interpretation when there is no enumeration, as in Virg. *Aen*. 11.213–14 (even if we cannot completely rule out exclamation in Plin. *HN* 29.20 and Tac. *Ann*. 15.41). The distinction between anacoluthon and exclamation is often not clear-cut, as one sentence can contain elements of both. Its first part, up to the point where it breaks off, may carry a degree of exclamatory emphasis that is hard to determine exactly. For example, Virg. *G.* 1.383–7 is usually printed as anacoluthon, but 383–4 may have some exclamatory force. At Petr. 126.17, where editors indicate the weak anacoluthon after positus by a colon, both dash and exclamation mark seem possible instead, and some translators do indeed understand the sentence as an exclamation.

This said, there remains a number of nominal phrases introduced by *iam* whose exclamatory character can hardly be doubted. The following examples almost certainly constitute only a fraction of these, since the very frequency of *iam* makes a

* I wish to thank Gerald Bechtle, Gunther Martin and the anonymous reader for their helpful advice and criticism.

[1] *TLL* VII 1, 117.36–56 c. *particulis (et interiectionibus) asseverativis et confirmativis* does not yield much material.

[2] This does not mean that the question of their distinction is a mock problem generated by the needs of modern punctuation. Punctuation only transfers into writing a decision ancient readers had to make by way of intonation. Cf. the (sometimes misguided) attempts of ancient *rhetores* and *grammatici* to identify exclamations that are not self-evident (e.g. Quint. 9.2.26 on Cic. *Mil.* 47 and other Ciceronian examples; schol. Terent. p. 159.22 Schlee on *Andr.* 766).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000335 Published online by Cambridge University Press