Taking account of these facts, we can now follow the history of the gloss *ἀγαθοεργοί*. It began as an explanation of the word as it appears in Herodotus (so in Diogenianus = Hesychius). Then with a new explanation, of unknown authority, *αἱρετοὶ κατ᾽ ἀνδραγαθίαν*, it is inserted into Timaeus, and in this form is added, with the rest of Timaeus, to the expanded *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων*. Each of the extant representatives of that, Photius and the Suda, adds to Timaeus material from other sources, as is very common; that in Photius need not concern us, that in the Suda is *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων*,[14] and 'Eudemus' duly copies the gloss with this addition.

It is clear that *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων* does not derive from the real Timaeus (and probably not from the interpolated version), much less from the real Eudemus, whatever the chronological relation between them in fact is; nor therefore is it to be linked to the new explanation in Timaeus. It appears in the tenth-century Suda, possibly a fragment of ancient scholarship not recorded elsewhere, but much more probably a comment by a Byzantine compiler who knew that ephors and Sparta went together. That it has anything at all to do with Ephorus is unlikely in the extreme.

Though it is not immediately relevant, one should consider what *ἐκ τῶν ἐφόρων* was intended to mean. The most obvious sense probably is 'selected from the body of ephors'; in that case its author was not familiar with the original passage of Herodotus, and is not likely to have been an ancient scholar. Perhaps possible is 'by the ephors', with *ἐκ* = *ὑπό* (LSJ s.v. III 5);[15] that usage is more likely in an ancient (Ionic?) source than in a Byzantine one, when *ἐκ* even in its basic sense was being replaced by *ἀπό*.[16]

Cove, Minard, Argyll I. C. CUNNINGHAM
i.c.cunningham@btinternet.com
doi:10.1017/S000983881000056X

[14] The change of source is indicated in Adler's edition by a large space. Why she prints *Ἐφόρων* is not clear.

[15] So N. Richer, *Les éphores: études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte* (Paris, 1998), 472 n. 124, who finds this the natural explanation (and sees no contradiction between Herodotus and the Suda).

[16] Cf. e.g. A. Debrunner, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1953–4), 2, 116.

VIRGIL, *ECLOGUE* 4.53–4: ENOUGH OF WHAT?*

Near the end of the fourth *Eclogue* Virgil contemplates his own role as poet in the new age that lies ahead, praying that he may live long enough to sing the praises of the man whose birth he has heralded and that he may do his deeds justice. The text below is from Mynors's OCT:

* I would like to thank Tony Woodman and *CQ*'s anonymous referees for helpful criticisms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000595 Published online by Cambridge University Press

o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima uitae,
spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta!

The Loeb (Fairclough revised by Goold) translates, 'I pray that the twilight of a long life may then be vouchsafed me, and inspiration enough to hymn your deeds!' This is the meaning we intuit, but in the Latin as transmitted *maneat* apparently has three subjects, *pars*, *spiritus* and the understood *tantum* that is the antecedent to *quantum*, and the poet prays for the twilight of a long life, breath or inspiration and sufficient *something* to hymn your deeds. The Loeb translation's excellent sense would be a possible rendering of the Latin if (1) *et* were a postponed *et* rather than something to connect *spiritus* with the antecedent of *quantum* (and postponed *et* feels right in this context if it could only be made possible); and if (2) *spiritus* were a genitive, which metre, of course, forbids it to be.

In theory, of course, we might take 54 to mean 'breath, and enough (of it) to hymn your deeds'. But my own instinct tells me that such an expression would be too loose to be confidently imputed to Virgil or to any other classical Latin writer. Partial, though incomplete, confirmation of this instinct is provided by the Brepols library of classical texts (http://www.brepolis.net), which returns nothing at all comparable to this locution when asked to produce examples of *et quantum* or *quantumque*. I can find no evidence that Roman poets or prose writers ever said 'X, *and* so much of it as to do Y'. This suggests strongly that editors ought to set a dagger on either side of *spiritus*.[1]

What should go in the apparatus criticus? One way of restoring the intuited sense 'inspiration enough to hymn your deeds' would be to assume that *spiritus* is a gloss that has ousted another word, a genitive of metrically acceptable shape. Slightly rarer words for 'breath', such as *flaminis* or *flatus* might do, but I suggest *pectoris*. As a word for 'poetic ability' *pectus* can be found at Ovid, *Fasti* 2.119–20: *nunc mihi mille sonos quoque est memoratus Achilles | vellem, Maeonide,* pectus *inesse tuum*. (Similar locutions indicating the breast as the seat of – often divinely aided – speech are listed in *OLD* s.v. 3(c).) The word in this sense is rare enough to attract a marginal or supralinear note early in the tradition. And one sense of *spiritus*, of course, is 'divine inspiration', a fairly accurate explanation of what *pectus* would mean in the present context.

To sum up: (1) *spiritus*, the reading of the *paradosis*, can be confidently rejected; (2) although the proposed *pectoris* is not the only possibility that deserves consideration and hence should not be promoted to the text, it gives sense, metre and a plausible way of explaining what is transmitted[2] and thus has a claim on a place in the apparatus.

University of Virginia DAVID KOVACS
pdk7g@virginia.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838810000595

[1] The alteration of *quantum* to *quantus* suggests itself, but this is unlikely to be right: the sense we intuit is not 'a great enough spirit to' but 'sufficient spirit to', and for that we need a partitive genitive and a neuter correlative.

[2] For these three tests of a plausible reading or conjecture – sense, formal aspects and power to account for what is transmitted – see M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart, 1973), 47–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000595 Published online by Cambridge University Press