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/S0009838808000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

systematic search impossible,[3] but they suffice to illustrate the point. (Except for its punctuation, the text is that of the standard editions.)

(i) Lucr. 3.980–1013 (punishments in hell)

nec miser impendens magnum timet aere saxum
Tantalus […]
nec Tityon volucres ineunt […]
Sisyphos in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est […]
deinde animi ingratam naturam pascere semper […]
hoc, ut opinor, id est, aevo florente puellas
quod memorant laticem pertusum congerere in vas,
quod tamen expleri nulla ratione potestur.
Cerberus et furiae iam vero et lucis egestas,
Tartarus horriferos eructans faucibus aestus,
qui neque sunt usquam nec possunt esse profecto!

(ii) Plin. HN *3.40–1 (the beauties of Italy)*

urbs Roma vel sola in ea et digna iam tam festa cervice facies, quo tandem narrari debet opere? qualiter Campaniae ora per se felixque illa ac beata amoenitas, ut palam sit uno in loco gaudentis opus esse naturae? iam vero tota ea vitalis ac perennis salubritas, talis caeli temperies, tam fertiles campi, tam aprici colles, tam innoxii saltus, tam opaca nemora, tam munifica silvarum genera, tot montium adflatus, tanta frugum vitiumque et olearum fertilitas, tam nobilia pecudi vellera, tam opima tauris colla, tot lacus, tot amnium fontiumque ubertas totam eam perfundens, tot maria, portus, gremiumque terrarum commercio patens undique et tamquam iuvandos ad mortales ipsa avide in maria procurrens!...

(iii) Plin. HN *7 praef. 4 (shortcomings of human nature)*

quando homini incessus? quando vox? quando firmum cibis os? quam diu palpitans vertex, summae inter cuncta animalia inbecillitatis indicium? iam morbi totque medicinae contra mala excogitatae, et hae quoque subinde novitatibus victae! et cetera sentire naturam suam, alia pernicitatem usurpare, alia praepetes volatus, alia nare: hominem nihil scire nisi doctrina, non fari, non ingredi, non vesci, breviterque non aliud naturae sponte quam flere!...

(iv) Sil. 14.654–65 (the riches of Syracuse)

non usquam clarior illo
gloria picturae saeclo; non aera iuvabat
†quem scire Ephyren fulvo certaret ut auro†
vestis spirantes referens subtemine vultus,
quae radio caelat Babylon vel murice picto
laeta Tyros quaeque Attalicis variata per artem
aulaeis scribuntur acu aut Memphitide tela.
iam[4] simul argento fulgentia pocula, mixta
quis gemma quaesitus honos, simulacra deorum
numen ab arte datum servantia, munera rubri
praeterea ponti depexaque vellera ramis,
femineus pudor!

[3] For *iam vero*, however, my short list of instances (i, ii) should be complete, as this combination is rare enough for an electronic search.

[4] Even though the corruption in 656 makes the syntax of what precedes somewhat uncertain, editors are surely right in beginning a new sentence here. The comparison of Syracusan to other famous kinds of textiles that stretches down to 660 cannot be continued in 661–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(v) Quint. 10.1.48–9 (literary techniques in Homer adaptable to the four partes orationis*)*

age vero, non utriusque operis ingressu in paucissimis versibus legem prohoemiorum non dico servavit sed constituit? [...] narrare vero quis brevius quam qui mortem nuntiat Patrocli, quis significantius potest quam qui Curetum Aetolorumque proelium exponit? iam similitudines, amplificationes, exempla, digressus, signa rerum et argumenta ceteraque quae probandi ac refutandi sunt ita multa ut etiam qui de artibus scripserunt plurima earum rerum testimonia ab hoc poeta petant! nam epilogus quidem quis umquam poterit illis Priami rogantis Achillem precibus aequari?...

Let me first deal with the simpler cases (ii)–(v). While ellipse of *esse* is a theoretical option in all of these, it is highly improbable for stylistic reasons. All four examples occur in animated enumerations whose vividness is also expressed syntactically: (ii), (iii) and (v) are preceded by rhetorical questions; (v) is even followed by more of those, (iii) by an exclamatory accusative with infinitive; the catalogue of which (iv) forms part begins with another exclamatory nominal phrase and some rhetorical questions (Sil. 14.643–51). A statement of the form 'furthermore / finally, (there are also)…' would in each case produce an anticlimax that cannot, in my judgement, be tolerated.

(i)[5] stands somewhat apart as the only example where ellipse of *esse* is excluded from the beginning on semantic grounds. Instead, it seems to break off after 1012 and could theoretically be seen as a simple anacoluthon. As A. Brieger has pointed out in his 1894 Teubner edition, p. xxi, in Lucr. 2.342–8 and 4.123–6 the construction likewise starts afresh with a relative clause after a verbless nominal phrase. But even editors and commentators who think these passages should guide us in constructing 3.1011–13 often recognise that 1011–12 possess an exclamatory force (as noted above, anacoluthon and exclamation are not mutually exclusive categories). R. Heinze (n. 5) was the first to draw attention to it,[6] and J. Martin first put an exclamation mark after 1012 in his 1934 Teubner edition.[7] However, 2.342–8 and 4.123–6 are much closer to each other than to 3.1011–13[8] and as parallels to the latter they are balanced by the non-anacoluthic passages (ii)–(v) (see below). Finally, 3.1011–13 in itself may be taken more naturally as one uninterrupted whole. One is therefore inclined to follow editors such as K. Büchner (1966) and E. Flores (2002) who place an exclamation mark after 1013.

Be that as it may, all five examples together clearly form a well-defined group: they are similar not only from a syntactical point of view, but also in context and function. As indicated above, they occur in lively enumerations, either in the middle ([ii], [iii],

[5] Apart from its overall syntactical structure, (i) contains two more anomalies: there is an asyndeton between 1011 and 1012, and in 1013 one would expect *quae* instead of *qui*. Good parallels to either anomaly, namely Lucr. 1.455 and 2.500–3 and Sall. *Iug.* 49.5 respectively, are adduced by C. Bailey in the commentary of his 1947 *editio maior* (II, p. 1163) and by R. Heinze in his commentary published in 1897 (p. 191). None of this affects the question I am concerned with.

[6] 'Aber auch ein Verbum ist nicht zu ergänzen: viel eindrucksvoller steht hier, durch *iam vero* wie nicht selten eingeführt, der bloße Nominativ im Sinne eines Ausrufs "und vollends Cerberus!"' (On 'nicht selten', however, see above, n. 3.)

[7] Bailey (n. 5), who, too, refers to the clause as anacoluthon, puts no exclamation mark in his text. In the commentary, however, he concedes that one could be put after 1012.

[8] They both consist of a main clause beginning with *praeterea* that is followed by a relative clause introduced by *quorum unum quidvis*. Their calm reasoning is a far cry from the angry polemic of 3.1011–13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[v]) or at the end ([i], [iv]). Depending on their position, they can provide additional liveliness or serve as a final climax. This climactic function explains why they always come with a certain accelerando, continuing a list of specific items (punishments of famous sinners [i], peoples and parts of Italy [ii], specific weaknesses of small children [iii], precious textiles and their places of origin [iv], specific passages in Homer [v]) on a somewhat more abstract level and in a more summary way.

Finally, all the passages cited have been prone to syntactical misunderstanding. In (ii), (iii) and (iv), ellipse of *esse* is often assumed, as punctuation indicates (and translations confirm): (ii) has mostly been printed without exclamation mark,[9] (iii) is occasionally,[10] (iv) always printed in this way. In (i), where this interpretation is impossible *a priori*, and in (v), where editors were too alert to accept it, the consequences have been more serious. Although Lucretius' text is now mostly allowed to stand as transmitted, many emendations were proposed until the end of the nineteenth century: *qui* was changed to *haec* and to *quid*?; alternatively, lacunae have been assumed after 1010, 1011 and/or 1012. Occasionally, such corrections still do find their way into recent editions.[11] Quintilian's *laudes argumentationis Homericae* have fared even worse: they are still thought to be corrupt today because of their supposed lack of a main verb. Various emendations have been proposed in order to supply one, but without convincing results. Until the early twentieth century, the brutal solution of deleting *quae* or replacing it with *genera* has often been adopted. Part of the attraction of *genera* (which can still be found, for example, in H.E. Butler's 1922 Loeb) was that it also helped to get rid of the difficult expression *quae probandi ac refutandi sunt*. In 1970, M. Winterbottom adduced convincing parallels to show that this relative clause is sound but he still thinks the main clause cannot do without a verb. He seems to find M. Kiderlin's *sunt <nonne sunt>* and his own *<sunt> ut* acceptable but endorses neither in his 1970 OCT where *ceteraque quae probandi ac refutandi sunt* is obelised.[12] Here as in the other cases the exclamatory nature of the sentence should be recognised and the text ought to be kept as transmitted.

Universität Bern MARTIN KORENJAK
martin.korenjak@kps.unibe.ch
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000347

[9] The exceptions known to me are L. Jan and K. Mayhoff's 1906 Teubner edition, the edition by R. König and G. Winkler in the Sammlung Tusculum (1973–2004), and the new Budé (book 3 by H. Zehnacker, 1998).

[10] No exclamation mark is put by R. König and G. Winkler (n. 9). J. Sillig (1852) links the clause to the following accusative with infinitive by semicolon and puts the exclamation mark at the end of the whole construction. An exclamation mark after *victae* can, e.g., already be found in D. Detlefsen's 1867 edition.

[11] A. Ernout's Budé, published in 1948, still has a lacuna after 1011. In a 1997 edition of Book 3 by P.M. Brown *haec* is revived. Besides the unrecognised *iam exclamativum*, the other difficulties of the passage explained at n. 5 may also contribute to the persistence of such unnecessary emendations.

[12] Cf. M. Winterbottom, *Problems in Quintilian*, BICS Suppl. 25 (London 1970), 190. The apparatus of his OCT reads *latet lacuna (post quae?) : sunt <nonne sunt> Kiderlin 1888–4*. I do not understand the reasoning that underlies the first part of this statement. Kiderlin's suggestion is now adopted by D.A. Russell in his new Loeb edition (2001).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000347 Published online by Cambridge University Press