CrossMark

obscurity for its own sake by the use of words other than the most obvious, but here we can see something a little more sophisticated: the connection requires χολή rather than θολός, and this can explain the poet's choice. In context, of course, χολή, which is occasionally applied to fluids other than bile elsewhere,[15] is hardly likely to have given many readers interminable difficulties. Certainly, however, the unusual word choice gives us pause, and allows for another layer of appreciation of the lines over and above their straightforward content. There is no denying that, *per se*, Nicander's peculiar lexicon is an important aspect of his style, but perhaps this passage, in combination with *Ther.* 62 (see n. 12), should encourage us to give more thought to why particular words are deployed in particular places.[16]

Exeter College, Oxford PHILLIP BONE
phillip.bone@classics.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S000983882000066X

[TIBULLUS] 3.7.175: AN EMENDATION

The anonymous panegyrist concludes his prediction of Messalla's future achievements by prophesying that, after his deeds are duly honoured with triumphs, Messalla will be titled the Great (175–6):

> ergo ubi praeclaros poscent tua facta triumphos, 175
> solus utroque idem diceris magnus in orbe.

175 praeclaros *A*: per claros *Scaliger* | poscent *A*: ierint *F*: tulerint *Dyer*: cierint *Lachmann*: noscent *uel* scierint *Postgate*: peperint *Nencini*

Line 175 contains a well-known textual problem: A (cod. Ambrosianus R. 26 sup., the oldest complete manuscript, apparently the archetype of all complete manuscripts) offers a text that is linguistically unobjectionable, but produces a weak sense; F (*Fragmentum Cuiacianum*, the only other independent witness, no longer extant) seems to express a more appropriate idea, but in a way that is not idiomatic. Hence the conjectures.[1]

[15] E.g. at Diod. Sic. 4.11.6, of the hydra's venom.

[16] M. Papadopoulou, 'Scientific knowledge and poetic skill: colour words in Nicander's *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca*', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Nature and Science in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leuven, 2009), 95–119 does not discuss this passage (or include ἰκτερόεις in her list of colour terms, 100–7), but it could be thought to support her general point that colour is an area in which Nicander treads the line between 'science' and 'poetry'.

[1] Still, most editors print either A's or F's reading; to cite some: *poscent*: J.P. Postgate, *Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* (Oxford, 1915[2]), 65; G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies* (Leeds, 1990[3]), 92; *ierint*: F.W. Lenz and G.C. Galinsky, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres* (Leiden, 1971[3]), 155; G.P. Goold, in his revision of F.W. Cornish, J.P. Postgate, J.W. Mackail (transl.), *Catullus Tibullus Peruigilium Veneris* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988[2]), 320; G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina* (Stuttgart, 1988), 94; H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin, 1990), 42; E. De Luca, *Corpus Tibullianum III 7: Panegyricus Messallae* (Soveria Mannelli, 2009), 34; D. Flach, *Tibull*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000713 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A's *poscent* faces two objections. First, *poscere* is too feeble a verb for the context: surely it would have been more appropriate to speak of Messalla's achievements earning or receiving, rather than merely deserving or demanding, due honours.[2] Second, the point clearly must be not just that Messalla's deeds will be worthy of triumphs (which is the implication of *poscent*), but that triumphs will make Messalla the most famous man in the world. These objections may look pedantic, especially as A's text is altogether comprehensible; but we should ask whether even such an uninspired poet as the author of [Tib.] 3.7 would be likely to use language as inexpressive as that at the high point of his panegyric.

F's *ierint*, with Scaliger's *per claros*,[3] avoids these difficulties and seems to make reasonable sense ('after your deeds have gone through a number of triumphs'). Tränkle claims that '*ire per* in übertragenem Sinn („etwas der Reihe nach durchlaufen") in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit recht verbreitet ist, meistens natürlich, wenn auch nicht ausschließlich, mit persönlichem Subjekt'.[4] However, he misses the crucial point that, when *per* introduces a plural noun referring to objects that are not naturally thought of as constituting a series, the noun requires some sort of universalizing qualifier.[5] Bare *triumphos* cannot be used in this way, because a triumph is not normally thought of as merely one item in a series of triumphs:[6] to make sense, it would require something like *plures*.[7]

und seine Fortsetzer (Darmstadt, 2015), 158. L. Fulkerson, *A Literary Commentary on the Elegies of the Appendix Tibulliana* (Oxford, 2017) does not cover [Tib.] 3.7.

[2] Note e.g. that Lee (n. 1), 93 translates A's text as 'when your achievements earn their splendid Triumphs'.

[3] As is shown by H. Dixon, 'The discovery and disappearance of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* of Tibullus', *RHT* 1 (2006), 37–72, F has four potentially independent witnesses, of which the two more important ones are Scaliger's collation in a copy of the Plantine *Catullus Tibullus Propertius* (Antwerp, 1569), now in Leiden University Library (shelf mark 755 H 23), and his reports of F's readings in J. Scaliger, *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Paris, 1577); the other two are Gryphius's anonymous *Catullus Tibullus Propertius* (Lyons, 1573), and the anonymous marginal annotations in a copy of *Catullus Tibullus Propertius Multis in locis restituti* (Paris, 1534), now in Bern University Library (Bongars VI 155). In the *Castigationes* Scaliger presents *per claros* as his own suggestion ([this note], 159: 'Liber optimus habebat *ierint*, non *poscent*. Ergo legendum *per claros*'). His collation reads both *ierint* (attributed to 'c. c.' = 'codex Cuiacianus') and *per claros* (without 'c. c.'): this may imply either that *per claros* is actually Scaliger's conjecture, or that he merely omitted to write 'c. c.' when collating and then erroneously assumed that it was his own conjecture (cf. Dixon [this note], 67). The 1573 edition does not feature F's readings for line 175, but the variants noted in Bongars's copy of the 1534 edition include both *per claros* and *ierint*, which may support the assumption that *per claros* was F's reading. Finally, J. Cujas, 'Recitationes in libros IV. priores codicis Iustiniani', in id., *Appendix* (Paris, 1658), 545–922, at 622 seems likewise to imply that F read *per claros* ('veteres habent membranae. *ergo vbi* [*sic*] *per claros ierunt* [*sic*] *tua facta triumphos*'), though of course this testimony may not be accurate.

[4] Tränkle (n. 1), 242, adducing two parallels, Ov. *Her*. 16.269 *nostra per has leges audacia fortiter isset* and Quint. *Inst*. 1.8.7 [*comoedia*] *per omnis et personas et adfectus eat*, but both are simply irrelevant, since they have *ire per* in a quite different idiomatic sense (*OLD* s.v. *eo*[1] 13b 'to be influenced by, act in accordance with [an example or model]'; *TLL* 5.2.648.5–12 'sequi per exempla alicuius [in vita aut arte]'); cf. E.J. Kenney, *Ovid Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge, 1996), 115.

[5] See the examples in *TLL* 5.2.647.76–648.1, e.g. Tac. *Dial*. 32.2 *per omnis eloquentiae numeros isse*, Arnob. *Adu. nat*. 4.26 *Iuppiter … infamis est isse per innumeras species*, Prudent. *C. Symm*. 1.619–20 *nec … per debita culmina mundi | ire uiros prohibet*.

[6] Cf. in general G. Luck, Review of Tränkle (n. 1), *GGA* 246 (1994), 70–86, at 74: 'Hier kommt man ohne *scierint* (Postgate) nicht aus […]. Andere Erklärungen („wenn deine Taten glänzende Triumphe durchlaufen haben" übersetzt Tr.) lassen sich sprachlich nicht rechtfertigen'.

[7] Cf. Juv. 8.107 *plures de pace triumphos*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000713 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It thus appears that emendation is necessary. The earliest attempt seems to be *tulerint*, which Dyer claims to have found written in the margins of his copy of Scaliger's 1577 edition, marked with 'V. C.' (= 'uetus codex'?).[8] The required sense is probably *OLD* s.v. *fero* 36a 'To get […], win, acquire', which can be paralleled, for instance, with Caes. *BGall*. 21.4 *maximam inter suos ferunt laudem*, Hor. *Sat*. 2.1.11–12 *multa laborum | praemia laturus*, Livy 38.53.11 *unus praecipuam gloriam tulit*. Sen. *Her. Oet*. 1552–3 *uadis ad manes miserandus, unde | Morte deuicta tuleras triumphum* is somewhat different, as it has a more literal sense of *ferre* ('from where you had brought victory over death'), but is worth mentioning. I cannot parallel this use of the verb with an inanimate subject, but *tua facta* for 'you (will have won) with your deeds' seems unproblematic.[9] This is a reasonable conjecture; its only weaknesses are the lack of exact parallels (though there are fairly close ones) and the fact that it fails to account for A's *poscent*.

Lachmann's *cierint* has little to recommend itself.[10]

Postgate's *noscent* and *scierint* may at first sight seem to produce an acceptable text ('when people learn about your deeds through your triumphs'), but on consideration one cannot but see that it is unsatisfactory.[11] To begin with, a plural verb without a subject is weak: in a context speaking of Messalla's worldwide recognition, we might expect it to be accompanied by *omnes* or something of the kind.[12] More to the point, the idea that triumph is merely a vehicle for publicizing the *triumphator*'s achievements is decidedly odd. The feeling that *triumphos* are allotted a merely technical role is reinforced by the fact that, instead of an ablative, we have *per* with an accusative, a construction that is more appropriate to express a purely instrumental relationship.[13]

My last item on the list, Nencini's *peperint* yields an excellent sense ('after your deeds have brought forth triumphs').[14] This metaphorical use of *parere* can easily be paralleled with contexts such as Cic. *Mur*. 22 *haec huic urbi aeternam gloriam peperit*, *Planc*. 7 *honos paritur*, Caes. *BGall*. 6.40.7 *ne ante partam rei militaris laudem amitterent*, Tib. 1.7.9 *non sine me est tibi partus honos*, Hor. *Carm*. 1.2.15–16 *cui laurus aeternos honores | Delmatico peperit triumpho*, Sil. *Pun*. 1.610 *nomina parta triumphis* and especially Verg. *Aen*. 2.578 *partoque ibit regina triumpho*, Ov. *Am*. 2.12.16 *o cura parte triumphe mea*, *Her*. 7.154 *suo partus Marte triumphus*. The only weakness of Nencini's conjecture, unfortunately fatal, is that *peperint* is a non-existent form.

I propose *parient* (175–8):

> ergo ubi **praeclaros parient** tua **facta triumphos**,
> solus utroque idem diceris magnus in **orbe**.
> **non ego sum satis** ad **tantae** praeconia **laudis**,
> ipse mihi non si **praescribat carmina Phoebus**.

[8] [G. Dyer,] *Albii Tibulli opera omnia* (London, 1822), 317 ('*tulerint* forte fortuna vera est lectio').
[9] Taking *tulerint tua facta* as 'your deeds will have brought you' (*OLD* s.v. *fero* 23 'To give, convey, bestow'?) may be an option too, though I find it less attractive.
[10] C. Lachmann, *Albii Tibulli libri quattuor* (Berlin, 1829), 62.
[11] Postgate (n. 1), 65.
[12] Cf. e.g. Catull. 78.3–4 *nam te omnia saecla | noscent*, Ov. *Pont*. 3.2.98 *laudarunt omnes facta*.
[13] Cf. e.g. Ov. *Rem. am.* 706 *signa deum nosco per sua*, German. *Arat*. 378 [*ignes*] *per appositi noscuntur lumina signi*, Luc. 2.6 *noscant uenturas ut dira per omina clades*.
[14] F. Nencini, *Il Tibullo ambrosiano e la critica tibulliana* (Milan, 1929), 39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000713 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While *parient* is made plausible enough by the parallels adduced in the preceding paragraph, the strongest argument can be found in the conclusion of *Catal.* 9, another panegyric of Messalla, on which our passage appears to be modelled (*Catal.* 9.55–60):[15]

> **non nostrum est tantas**, non, inquam, attingere **laudes**;
> quin ausim hoc etiam dicere: uix hominum est.
> ipsa haec, ipsa ferent rerum monumenta per **orbem**,
> ipsa sibi **egregium facta decus parient**;
> nos ea quae tecum **finxerunt carmina** diui,
> **Cynthius** et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie.

The verbal parallels speak for themselves, but it may be worth highlighting two crucial points of contact. First, both panegyrists consider themselves unqualified for adequately celebrating Messalla's deeds. Second, both employ the idea that gods, especially Apollo, are the poet's co-authors. Against this background, it seems likely that *praeclaros … tua facta triumphos* is modelled on *egregium facta decus parient*. True, the fact that *Catal.* 9 reads *parient* does not necessarily mean that the poet of [Tib.] 3.7 would use the same word. But it does show that the verb is entirely appropriate and must indeed have been in the poet's mind as he composed; if he chose to vary his model, he had to have a good reason to do so, and a good substitute for *parient*, not something as feeble as *poscent*.

In terms of palaeography, *parient* can easily account for A's *poscent*: *a* → *o*, *r* → *ſ*, *ı* → *c*. What is more, F's *ierint* could also be explained, assuming that in F's ancestor the word's first letters were damaged, as a scribal correction for [*pa*]*rıent*, or perhaps [*pc*]*ırıent*, the latter of which would only require the transposition of one letter.

Wolfson College, Oxford BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838820000713

UCALEGON (VERG. *AEN.* 2.311–12) AND OTHER BURNING NEIGHBOURS

Verg. *Aen*. 2.311–12 *iam proximus ardet | Vcalegon*. This striking phrase is twice echoed, as commentators observe. The burning neighbour Ucalegon reappears in Juv. 3.198–201 *iam poscit aquam, iam friuola transfert | Vcalegon … | ultimus ardebit quem … .* And the words *proximus ardet* reappear in Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.84 *paries cum proximus ardet.*

Fraenkel suggested that Virgil and Horace both echo the ending of a lost verse of Ennius (E. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford, 1957], 319 n. 1). There is no need to invoke

[15] [Tib.] 3.7 and *Catal.* 9 also have many points of contact outside these passages; see e.g. P. Sommer, *De Vergilii Maronis Catalepton carminibus quaestionum capita tria* (Halle, 1910), 50–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838820000713 Published online by Cambridge University Press