He had called himself and his Roman army descendants of Aeneas on his dedications at Delphi—silver shields, his own battle-shield and the gold crown for Apollo (Plut. *Flam.* 12.6–7)—thus highlighting the connection with revenge for Troy. The notion that the cities of Agamemnon and Menelaus might pay for the downfall of Troy is as old as Homer (*Il.* 4.51–3) and was developed in Hellenistic epigram (*Anth. Pal.* 9.28, 101–4), though not with specific reference to Rome.[7] Virgil, however, has already developed this theme, when he makes Jupiter prophesy that Aeneas' descendants will conquer Macedon, Mycenae and Argos (*Aen.* 1.183–5).[8]

A possible explanation for the failure of commentators to consider Flamininus in this context is that he was judged to be a philhellene. It is true that he proclaimed the liberation of Greece by the Romans at the Isthmia of 196 (Polyb. 18.44–7) and consequently his head appeared on coins (*RRC* no. 546), that he was praised in a paean (Plut. *Flam.* 16.4) and that festivals (Titia) were founded in his honour.[9] However, that liberty implied a Roman political umbrella and even those Greeks who were not attacked as Nabis was soon perceived it as a form of subjection. In three years' time the Aetolians were requesting the Syrian king Antiochus III to liberate them from the Romans.[10] In any case, for Romans Flamininus was one of their foremost commanders, who defeated one major enemy of Rome, Philip V, and turned the Greeks into a front line against the Romans' next major opponent, Antiochus III.[11]

Worcester College, Oxford ANDREW LINTOTT
andrew.lintott@worc.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000496

DIRAE 15: AN EMENDATION*

The speaker of the *Dirae* curses the farm which he is forced to abandon (15–19):

> effetas Cereris sulcis condatis auenas,
> pallida flauescant aestu sitientia prata,
> immatura cadant ramis pendentia mala,
> desint et siluis frondes et fontibus umor,
> nec desit nostris deuotum carmen auenis.

[7] Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 9.152–5 for later epigrams about justice for Troy, also 9.387 (by the Emperor Hadrian), which is closest in sentiment to Virgil here: 'The Myrmidons perished. Tell Achilles that the whole of Thessaly is under Aeneas' descendants.'

[8] Mycenae, of course, had already suffered destruction and subjection by Argos in 468 (Diod. Sic. 11.65; Paus. 2.16.4), when Sparta failed to aid the city. It figures here as part of Argos.

[9] Lintott (n. 2), 177–8. See E. Badian, *Titus Quinctius Flamininus: Philhellenism and Realpolitik* (Cincinnati, 1970) for a biography of Flamininus.

[10] Livy 35.12.6–18, 17.3–9.

[11] See E. Badian, 'Rome and Antiochus the Great', in *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1964), 112–39.

* This paper was produced during the term of a Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship funded by the Irish Research Council (project ID: GOIPD/2016/549).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000423 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The passage as a whole is relatively well preserved, with no essential discrepancies among the manuscripts, but line 15 offers some difficulties. First, it is not immediately clear how to interpret the second-person verb form *condatis*. It may initially seem natural to take it to refer to the speaker's successors as workers on the farm, but these are not addressed in the plural elsewhere. The only possible exception occurs at line 9 (it will be useful to have the whole passage quoted, 9–13):

> impia Trinacriae sterilescant gaudia uobis
> nec fecunda, senis nostri felicia rura,
> semina parturiant segetes, non pascua colles,
> non arbusta nouas fruges, non pampinus uuas,
> ipsae non siluae frondes, non flumina montes.

Here, too, it may initially appear reasonable to see in *uobis* the same group of people, but there is little doubt that it must refer to *senis nostri felicia rura*, which can hardly be anything but a vocative (cf. 33 *ueteris domini felicia ligna*, likewise a vocative).[1] If *condatis* does not refer to people, one may be tempted to accept the humanist conjecture *sulci* and construe the verb as addressed to the furrows.[2] Yet I rather doubt that an address to the farm (or to the grove, as at line 33, or to the springs and the fields, as at line 90) can justify apostrophizing something as technical and down-to-earth as furrows. I think Fraenkel is right to insist on relating *condatis* to the same vocative as *uobis*, that is, *rura*.[3] This interpretation is supported by the fact that the two stanzas are closely analogous (as we soon shall see in greater detail).

The second difficulty is more substantial. As has been highlighted by Thomas, *effetas auenas*, 'exhausted oats', is an impossible expression, since '*effetus* describes the producer, not the product – the bough of a tree, a woman's body, frequently the soil'.[4] Kenney's *aristas* for *auenas* does not solve the problem (of course, it never was intended to).[5] Thomas himself initially conjectured *effetis Cererem sulcis condatis auena*, '[m]ay you plant your grain in furrows exhausted by an oat crop (i.e. fail to rotate your crops)'; but eventually he preferred Shackleton Bailey's suggestion: *effetis Cereris sulcis condatis auenas*, '[m]ay you plant oats in your furrows [which will therefore be] exhausted of grain (i.e., will be unable to produce it)'.[6] At first glance both versions may appear to make some sort of sense, but on closer scrutiny the situations they imply turn out to be rather difficult to imagine. It may be true that 'oats are a crop which bleeds nitrogen from the soil and leads precisely to its (the soil's) being *effetus*',[7] but why plant oats in the first place? Why should the new owners do so now (Shackleton Bailey's scenario)? Why should the old owners have done so before (Thomas's scenario)? Even if we take *condatis* to refer to *rura* rather than to the new owners, as I think we should (*sulcis condatis* will then mean something like

[1] See C. van der Graaf, *The Dirae* (Leiden, 1945), 17–18. Contrast K. Rupprecht, *Cinis omnia fiat: Zum poetologischen Verhältnis der pseudo-vergilischen »Dirae« zu den Bucolica Vergils* (Göttingen, 2007), 149, who takes both 9 *uobis* and 15 *condatis* to refer to 'in der zweiten Person angesprochenen zukünftigen (verhinderten) Nutznießer'.

[2] As van der Graaf (n. 1), 19 does.

[3] E. Fraenkel, 'The *Dirae*', *JRS* 56 (1966), 142–55, at 145.

[4] R.F. Thomas, 'Exhausted oats ([Verg.] *Dirae* 15)?', *AJPh* 109 (1988), 69–70, at 69.

[5] E.J. Kenney, '*Dirae* (*Lydia*)', in W.V. Clausen et al., *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford, 1966), 1–14, at 5. Kenney's conjecture was intended to avoid the awkwardness of taking *Cereris* with *auenas* ('oats of Ceres').

[6] Thomas (n. 4), 70 (translations are Thomas's).

[7] Thomas (n. 4), 69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000423 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'may you receive in your furrows'), the same questions still apply. How has the soil come to be exhausted by oats (Thomas's scenario)? Why should it be cropped with oats now (Shackleton Bailey's scenario)? I am sure it is not impossible to come up with *some* sort of explanation;[8] but this will not do, since, as the line's context shows, we need a straightforward answer.

As we can easily see, both stanzas repeatedly express, for the most part in the most straightforward terms, the very simple idea that the farm should fail to produce its expected product. Apart from line 15, the only difficult line is 9 *impia Trinacriae sterilescant gaudia uobis*, but it is almost certainly corrupt. Giardina's *pinguia … praedia* ('fertile lands') for *impia … gaudia* is I think a plausible correction: the former error will have been fairly easy if we assume *pingia* as a starting point[9] (line-initial $P \rightarrow I$, $ın \rightarrow m$, $g \rightarrow p$), especially after *impia* in line 3; the latter may have involved *prandia* as an intermediate step (and, again, confusion of *p* and *g*?).[10] Yet even if we keep the transmitted text, its difficulty only concerns the subject (which must refer to the farm as a whole, in one way or another), whereas the predicate is absolutely unambiguous ('may it become fruitless'). After this general reference, the two stanzas list the individual domains in which the farm's fertility should fail, in exactly the same order. (1) Fields: 10–11 *nec fecunda … | semina parturiant segetes*, 15 *effetas Cereris sulcis condatis auenas*. (2) Pastures: 11 *non pascua colles*, 16 *pallida flauescant aestu sitientia prata*. (3) Orchards: 12 *non arbusta nouas fruges, non pampinus uuas*, 17 *immatura cadant ramis pendentia mala*. (4) Forests: 13 *ipsae non siluae frondes*, 18 *desint et siluis frondes*. (5) Springs: 13 *non flumina montes*, 18 *et fontibus umor*. This shows that line 15 should be saying, more or less, 'may the fields fail to produce grain'. Lines 10–11 may indicate the manner in which this should happen: seeds are sown (*fecunda … semina*), but produce no crops (*nec … parturiant segetes*).

How, then, can line 15 *effetas Cereris sulcis condatis auenas* be emended? It seems clear that, if it is to fit its context, the line should be saying simply 'may the fields fail to produce wheat' rather than 'may the fields produce oats instead of wheat'. In fact, *auenas* may also be objectionable for another reason: the word is used twice in close proximity, at lines 7 and 19, to refer to the panpipes.[11] Assuming *sulcis condatis* is sound, we should probably aim to restore a text saying something like 'may you receive wheat seeds in sterile furrows [so that they produce no harvest]'. In other words, *condatis* should have as its direct object a word denoting wheat, whereas *effetas* should define a word referring to the soil. One conceivable line of correction would be to adopt Thomas's *effetis* and to replace *auenas* with a word referring to wheat. Kenney's *aristas* does

[8] The most reasonable interpretation I can think of is to take Shackleton Bailey's text as referring to the spontaneous growth of wild oats: 'may you (*rura*) receive in your furrows oats so as to render them sterile for wheat'. But I think this still produces the wrong sense: the point of the whole passage is not that the soil should become unsuitable for farming in some future, but that it should yield no harvest to its new owners already now (and despite all their effort).

[9] The omission of *u* in forms of *pinguis* is fairly common in manuscripts.

[10] G. Giardina, 'Nuovi emendamenti al testo delle *Dirae* e della *Lydia* pseudovirgiliane', *QUCC* 92 (2009), 167–73, at 167. The collocation *pinguia … praedia* is paralleled at Cypr. Gall. *Ios*. 34 *pinguia qui Medium lustrant dum praedia terrae* (referring to the fertility of the land of Canaan). Alternatively, one might consider *iugera*, though it seems weaker palaeographically (cf. Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 7.381 *uertit inexcoctam per pinguia iugera glebam*).

[11] Fraenkel (n. 3), 145 is not certain: 'We do not know whether a fastidious Roman reader would have objected to *avenae* in this line denoting weeds and shortly afterwards (19) the shepherd's pipe.' By contrast, Rupprecht (n. 1), 67 n. 68 sees in *auenis* in line 19 '[e]in gelungenes Wortspiel mit den verdörrten *avenae* (»Haferhalme«) aus *Dirae* 15'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000423 Published online by Cambridge University Press

refer to wheat; yet although ears of wheat can be cropped, they cannot be sown. I fail to think of any more suitable replacement for *auenas* along these lines.

Another option is to adopt Thomas's *Cererem* and to replace *auenas* with a word that would develop the notion of barren soil. I propose *effetae Cererem sulcis condatis harenae*, 'may you bury wheat in furrows of sterile sand'.[12] We may note that Virgil uses *harena*, 'sandy soil', twice in contexts that speak of ploughing and sowing. In one he instructs that sandy soil should be ploughed later than rich soil is normally ploughed, so that it does not get dried up (*G.* 1.70 *sterilem exiguus ne deserat umor harenam*). In the other he describes how the piles of sandy soil should be levelled over the seeds after sowing (*G.* 1.105 *cumulosque ruit male pinguis harenae*). It is worth noting that *harena* is in both cases defined by an epithet roughly synonymous to *effetus*: *sterilis* or *male pinguis*. In addition, *sulcis … harenae*, 'furrows of sand', can be compared with *cumulos … harenae*, 'piles of sand' (these are, of course, the ridges of the furrows). The corruption is easy to explain: first, (*h*)*arenae* became *auenae*, no doubt under the influence of line 7 *auena*; then, *effetae … auenae* was construed as a direct object with *condatis* (for what else could it be?) and was accordingly 'corrected' to *effetas … auenas*; finally, since this made *Cererem* superfluous, it had to be changed to *Cereris*, to create at least some semblance of sense and grammar.

Trinity College, Dublin BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000423

CIRIS 265: AN EMENDATION*

Carme fears that Scylla is in love with her own father (237–40); Scylla replies that she loves no one she should love, but one of the besiegers—though she can hardly bring herself to utter his name (262–7):

> nil amat hic animus, nutrix, quod oportet amari,
> in quo falsa tamen lateat pietatis imago,
> sed media ex acie, mediis ex hostibus—eheu,
> quid dicam quoue aegra malum hoc exordiar ore? 265
> dicam equidem, quoniam tu nunc non dicere, nutrix,
> non sinis: extremum hoc munus morientis habeto.[1]
>
> 265 aegra *Baehrens*: agam *Z*: ipsa *ρ*: ausa *Sillig*

[12] For collocation of *Cererem* with *sulcis*, cf. Manilius 3.664 *mandant et sulcis Cererem*; more generally, cf. Verg. *G.* 1.223 *sulcis committas semina*. If we take *condatis* to refer to the new owners rather than to the farm, the line will likewise make perfect sense: 'may you plant wheat in furrows of sterile sand'.

* This paper was produced during the term of a Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowship funded by the Irish Research Council (project ID: GOIPD/2016/549).

[1] Text from R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978), 80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000423 Published online by Cambridge University Press