C. Walz's collection (vol. 3, 580 top).[4] And the simplex form of the noun ἄραξις also occurs (Cassius, *Prob.* 25). Taking κατάραξις as a verbal noun with such a meaning makes fine sense; it is derivative of καταράσσω, which is used of the downward rushing of rivers.[5]

*University of Illinois, Urbana* HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000619

[5] Eustathius (in C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* [Paris, 1861], 2.255) appears to make the etymological connection between καταράσσω and καταρράκται.

# NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE *SCRIPTORES PHYSIOGNOMONICI**

Förster, whose edition of the surviving ancient physiognomical treatises is still the standard work,[1] was not afraid to emend the texts so that they agreed in the points in which he thought they should agree. That Adamantius' (Ad.) *Physiognomonica* and *Anonymi de Physiognomonia Liber Latinus* (Anon. Lat.) are both descended from the lost treatise of Polemon the sophist, the former being a paraphrase,[2] the latter using it as its principle source,[3] was grist to his mill. As a result Förster was prone to ignoring the independence and individuality of the authors, especially of Anon. Lat., and of carrying out the process of assimilating the texts too far. On the other hand, of course, where the text of either is evidently in need of correction, its cousin is the obvious first port of call for help. In any case, not even so thorough a scholar could hope to tidy up and correct such a large amount of text, and in this note I should like to propose one or two modest changes to his texts of both these works.

* I should like to thank James Hordern and Simon Swain for their helpful comments on drafts of this note.

[1] R. Förster, *Scriptores Physiognomonici*, vols. 1–2 (Leipzig, 1893). All sigla are his. Also useful, especially as a corrective to Förster (F.), is the edition with introduction, translation, and notes by J. André (And.), *Anonyme Latin Traité de Physiognomonie* (Paris, 1981). G. Raina, *Pseudo Aristotele Fisiognomica, Anonimo Latino Il trattato di fisiognomica* (Milan, 1993), retains André's text and provides a facing Italian translation. See S. Swain (ed.), *Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam* (Oxford, forthcoming 2006) for studies in, translations of, introductions to, and notes on the major Polemonic treatises, in addition to copies of the texts themselves. The Arabic version of Polemon's work, the fullest such extant text, is referred to as Leiden after the MS in which it is found. G. Hoffmann's edition of it, with a facing Latin translation, to which precise references are given, is contained in Förster, 1.93–294. R. Hoyland's edition and English translation in Swain (ed.) will shortly supersede this.

[2] Ad. A1 (1.297.11–12F): διὸ παραφράσαι μὲν τὰ Πολέμωνος εἱλόμην. See Förster, 1.ciii–cviii.

[3] Anon. Lat. 1 (2.3.2–6F): *Ex tribus auctoribus quorum libros prae manu habui, Loxi medici, Aristotelis philosophi, Palemonis* [sic] *declamatoris, qui de physiognomonia scripserunt, ea elegi quae ad primam institutionem huius rei pertinent et quae facilius intelligantur.* See Förster, 1.cxxxi–cxxxii, where he argues that Polemon's influence was the greatest of the three authors mentioned by Anon. Lat.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000620 Published online by Cambridge University Press

## 1. AD. B22 (1.371.1–3F)

*Φάρυγξ τραχεῖα κουφονόου ἀνδρός, φλυάρου, λαβραγόρου· εἰ δὲ εἷς τῶν τοῦ βρόγχου σπονδύλων ἐξέχει, κουφονόου μέν, οὐ μὴν θρασέος εἰς γλῶσσαν.*

A rough throat belongs to a light-minded man who talks nonsense and is a braggart. If one of the vertebrae of the throat protrudes, it belongs to a light-minded man who is not, however, bold in speech.

It is clear that what is being referred to in the second sentence is the Adam's apple. F. prints an emended text of Ps.-Polemon[4] at this point (1.371.10–11F): *εἰ δὲ εἷς τῶν τοῦ βρόγχου σπονδύλων ἐξέχοι*, whereas the MSS. have: *εἰ δὲ ἐκτὸς τοῦ βρόγχου* (an emendation of *βρόχου*) *σπόνδυλον* [sic] *ἐξέχοι*. Anon. Lat. 56 (2.78.2–3F) has: *si singularis vertex tanquam nodus gutturis eminet*.[5] The text of Ad. should therefore be emended to: *εἰ δὲ εἷς* (Anon. Lat. *singularis*) *τοῦ βρόγχου σπονδύλος ἐξέχει, . . .* ('if a single point of the throat protrudes').

## 2. ANON. LAT. 84 (2.113.1–9F)

*μυκτηρισμὸς* subsannatio vel aspiratio est narium et concussio prima vultus ac reductio oris, ut in risu solet fieri vel certe cum indignatione concepta *εἰρωνικῶς* sermone utimur, ut est ille sermo in bucolicis Vergilii: 'Mopse, novas incide faces, tibi ducitur uxor. sparge, marite, nuces, tibi deserit Hesperus Oetam.' qui haec ita dicebat, considerandum in quo statu oris vel motus *σαρκασμὸς* dicitur. hoc vultu qui frequenter sunt absque indignatione, *σαρκάζειν* dicuntur.

*perpetua* F., *plurima* And./ *qui—dicitur* Mo., *et status oris vel motus corporis esse dicitur* L, *Status oris vel motus dicitur* A, *in quo statu oris vel motu fuerit . . . σαρκασμὸς dicitur* F., *Qui haec ita dicebat . . . Considerandum in quo statu oris vel motu σαρκασμὸς dicatur* And.

*μυκτηρισμὸς* is a sneer or exhalation through the nose and a first shaking of the face and drawing back of the mouth, as usually happens while laughing or certainly when we are indignant and use speech *εἰρωνικῶς* ('mockingly'), as in those words in the *Bucolics* of Vergil: 'Mopsus, cut new torches; you are getting married. Scatter the nuts, husband: Hesperus leaves Oeta for you.'[6] Who said this, it must be considered with what position or movement of the mouth *σαρκασμὸς* ('sarcasm') is spoken. Those who have this face frequently without any cause to be indignant are said to *σαρκάζειν* ('be sarcastic').

André's *plurima* is both more apt and closer to the MSS reading than Förster's *perpetua* and should be read instead of *prima* ('a great shaking of the face'). However, the main problem with this passage occurs directly after the quotation of Verg. *Ecl*. 8.29–30, and, although both are aware that the text is defective, neither Förster nor André makes a concerted effort to emend it: the former suggests a lacuna; the latter posits one. The problem is that if those 'who have this face frequently without any cause to be indignant are said to *σαρκάζειν*', it makes no sense to state first that 'it must be considered with what position or movement of the mouth *σαρκασμὸς* ('sarcasm') is spoken', since sarcasm has yet to be defined. What is at

[4] See Förster, 1.cxxiv–cxxx, for the relationship between this and the other texts of the tradition.

[5] It may be worth noting that *singularis vertex tanquam* is not contained by L, A or Mo. Cf. Leiden ch. 23 (1.222.9–10F).

[6] Verg. *Ecl*. 8.29–30 (Damon mocks his rival on his marriage).

[7] It is possible that *indicio* crept in as reflection of *his igitur indiciis quibus* . . . at the beginning of the chapter, 2.128.5F.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000620 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stake is the facial appearance of whoever says such a thing as we find quoted here, and whether his saying it is motivated by indignation. I suggest the following: *qui haec ita dicebat*, *considerandum in quo statu oris vel motu* <*vultus fuerit*>. *hoc vultu qui frequenter sunt absque indignatione*, <*graece*> *σαρκάζειν dicuntur*. ('It must considered in what state of mouth or movement of face whoever said this was. Those who have this face frequently without any cause to be indignant are said in Greek to *σαρκάζειν* ['be sarcastic']'.) *et motu vultus* picks up the shaking of the face mentioned shortly before (as *statu oris* picks up the drawing back of the mouth) and provides an antecedent for *vultu* in the next sentence, with *hoc* referring to the definition of *μυκτηρισμὸς*; *fuerit* must be supplied, as by F.; *graece* is added on the basis of Anon. Lat.'s practice elsewhere (7, 53, 67, 83 *bis*, 85, 88, 91, 104, 107, 108, 123, 129, 131); and *σαρκασμὸς dicitur* is deleted as a near dittography of what is found in the following sentence. Now if the speaker is indignant and sneers while speaking, he is speaking *εἰρωνικῶς*, but if he has no cause to be indignant, he is said to be sarcastic.

## 3. ANON. LAT. 105 (2.128.10–14F)

quo igitur indicio in eo corpore nocentem stultitiam deprehendamus, in quo partim malitiae, partim stultitiae signa sunt, exemplum quod Palemon auctor huius speciei ex homine temporis sui posuit quem sceleratissimum fuisse asseveravit prosequamur.

Therefore by which sign we might detect harmful stupidity in that body, in which there are the signs of both malice and stupidity, let us present an example of this type which our authority Polemon recorded in a man of his own time and whom he asserted was the worst of criminals.

What follows is a catalogue of particular signs, with certain sorts of hair, head, ears, neck, temples, brow, eyes, cheeks, beard, mouth, posture, paunch, joints in hands and feet, colour, eyelids, and voice, and with mention of ugliness, spasms, and beard-nibbling habits. *indicium* is never used singular for plural, or *vice versa*, in Anon. Lat., and indeed at the end of the description of this individual we find the signs listed here referred to as *larga et clara indicia* (2.130.8–9F). Therefore either we should read *quibus igitur indiciis* ('by which signs'), or better still, given the ellipse that would still remain, we should delete *indicio* (leaving: 'Therefore, so that we might detect harmful stupidity in that body . . .').[7] *quo*, in place of *ut*, + subjunctive is found at several places in Anon. Lat., e.g. 10, 2.15.13F; 27, 2.42.4F; 74, 2.96.2F; and especially 104, 2.126.11–13F: *quo igitur magis hoc clarum atque certum sit, respiciamus ad ea animalia* . . .

## 4. *ANON. LAT.* 112 (2.133.12–134.2F)

oculos habebunt (sc. libidinosi et intemperantes libidinum) pinguiores humidos, crura tenuia nervis intenta atque hispida, ventrem pinguem, mentum reflexum <ad> nares ita ut inter nares et mentum cava sit quaedam planities, et quibus vena in brachiis est, et qui in palpebris capillos raros et defluentes habent.

They [sc. lustful men and those who are intemperate in their desires] will have rather glossy and moist eyes, thin, hairy legs which are taut with sinews, a fatty stomach, a chin turned up towards the nose so that between the nose and the chin there is a hollow surface, and they have a vein in their arms, and they have thin eyelashes which fall out.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000620 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A complement for *vena* needs to supplied,[8] and I suggest *clara* ('an obvious vein') on the basis of Anon. Lat. 53 (2.73.6–7F): *sed et venae clarae et enormes intextae cervici idem quod nervi indicabunt*. Cf. Ad. B21 (1.367.7–8F): καὶ οἱ μεγάλα δὲ ἀγγεῖα περὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ πεπλεγμένα ἔχοντες ἐμφανῆ σκαιοί, and B34 (1.388.3–6F): εἴ τις καὶ τὰς περὶ τὸν αὐχένα φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς κροτάφοις οἰδούσας ἔχει, ὡς ἐμφανεῖς εἶναι καὶ αἱματώδη ἔχειν τὴν χρόαν.

*University of Wales Lampeter* I. D. REPATH
i.repath@lamp.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838806000620

[8] In J. André, *Le vocabulaire latin de l'Anatomie* (Paris, 1991), 126–9, there are no examples of *vena* occurring without definition or description. Raina (n.1) translates *quibus vena in brachiis est*: 'che hanno ben in vista la vena nelle bracchia', with a note that Anon. Lat. seems to have a particular vein in mind, to which Hippocrates also refers: *Οὗ ἂν ἡ φλὲψ ἡ ἐν τῷ ἀγκῶνι σφύζῃ, μανικὸς καὶ ὀξύθυμος·* (2.5.16). This reinforces the argument that some form of qualification along the suggested lines is required.

# LUCRETIUS' *DRN* 1.926–50 AND THE PROEM TO BOOK 4

The almost verbatim repetition of verses 926–50 from the first book of Lucretius' *DRN* to the proem to Book 4 in the middle of the work has been a perplexing and controversial issue for Lucretian scholarship.[1] It has often been discussed with reference to and in connection with the transmission of the text and the stage of its completion. The answer, however, as to the transposition of the above verses may not lie in the area of didactic repetition or textual criticism but rather in the Lucretian beliefs about poetics as can be deduced from the poet's own text. Lucretius, in writing his *DRN*, actually transforms into verse the Epicurean doctrine and the philosophic principles on poetry and poetics shared by other Epicureans and in particular by his own contemporary Philodemus of Gadara.

It has been shown that one of the literary principles which characterizes Philodemus' thought is the idea of ἀμετάθετον, that is the impossibility of *metathesis* in poetry.[2] According to this idea, the transposition of verses (or their minor

[1] The repetition of verses in Lucretius is a hackneyed subject and has been variously addressed. For the bibliography and discussions see e.g. W. B. Ingalls, 'Repetition in Lucretius', *Phoenix* 25 (1971), 227–36; A. Schiesaro, 'Problemi di fomularità lucreziana', *MD* 24 (1990), 47–70, who distinguishes between repetition and formulae; M. Gale, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge, 1994), and ead., 'Lucretius 4,1–25 and the proems of the *De rerum natura*', *PCPhS* 40 (1994), 1–17; R. D. Brown, *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura 4.1030–1287* (Leiden, New York, Copenhaven and Cologne, 1987), 5ff. and n. 3 for further references; L. Canfora, 'I proemi del *De Rerum Natura*, *RFIC* 110 (1982), 71–7; E. J. Kenney, *Lucretius*, G&R, New Surveys in the Classics 11 (Oxford, 1995), 7f.

[2] N. A. Greenberg, *The Poetic Theory of Philodemus* (Harvard PhD Diss., 1955; repr. New York and London, 1990), 169–76, 275–6; and id., 'Metathesis as an instrument in the criticism of poetry', *TAPhA* 89 (1958), 262–70; D. Armstrong, 'The impossibility of metathesis: Philodemus and Lucretius on form and content in poetry', in D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (Oxford, 1995), 210–32 is an important study on *metathesis* and its effects on literary texts as presented by Philodemus and Lucretius.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000620 Published online by Cambridge University Press