The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Notes to the *Agricola* of Tacitus

Alfred Gudeman

The Classical Review / Volume 11 / Issue 07 / October 1897, pp 325 - 332

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00039238, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00039238

How to cite this article:

Alfred Gudeman (1897). Notes to the *Agricola* of Tacitus. The Classical Review, 11, pp 325-332 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00039238

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1897.

NOTES TO THE *AGRICOLA* OF TACITUS.

Agr. 4, 15: *studium philosophiae acrius, ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse.*

The reading of the MSS. is quite generally retained. But 'ultra-senatori,' as an asyndetic epexegetis, wedged in between *acrius* and *hausisse*, which belong together, seems extremely awkward, nor can *ultra* well be separated from the rest of the clause and joined asyndetically to *acrius*. I therefore believe that Baehrens has for once been right in demanding *ultraque* (cod. A *ultra q*), a very easy emendation, the error being due to haplography, but I cannot accept Baehrens' reason for the correction, as the 'asyndeton bimembre,' even of synonyms, for so he regards *acrius* and *ultra*, is common enough in Tacitus.¹

That *ac senatori* 'and a senator at that' is quite inapplicable to the youthful Agricola has been pointed out by Peerlkamp, but with that wanton recklessness, so characteristic of him, he athetizes the entire clause. It seems more reasonable to regard only *ac senatori* as a very natural gloss of some ancient reader which subsequently crept into the text.

Agr. 6, 15: *idem praeturae certior et silentium.*

Among the numerous substitutes suggested for the unintelligible reading of the MSS., such as *otium*, *terror*, *torpor*, *languor*, *secretum*, only *tenor*, the emendation of *Rhenanus*, has met with general favour. It unquestionably gives an excellent sense, and the expression is to a certain measure sup-

ported by analogies in other writers, notably Livy. Cf. e.g. IV. 10, 9 *consulatus eodem tenore gesti* VII. 32, 16, 40, 9 VIII. 38, 11 XXII. 15, 1 XL. 12. Ovid *Her.* XVII. 14. Plin. *Pan.* 91, 6. And yet this conjecture, ingenious as it is, ought not to have been accepted.

In the first place, no one, I fancy, will seriously contend, that the corruption from *tenor* to *certior* has the slightest palaeographical probability. In the second place, *tenor* occurs nowhere else in Tacitus; but to thrust a ἀπαξ εἰρημένον into an ancient author, simply because it happens to satisfy the sense, is a very questionable proceeding and scarcely, if ever, justifiable on any methodical grounds.

Hence, if the passage is not to be given up in despair, as a 'locus insanabilis,' we must find some word which plausibly accounts for the existing corruption and at the same time satisfies what is felt to be the meaning of the author. Such a word, I am convinced, is *rektor*, out of which *certior* arose by *metathesis*, just as we find in a number of MSS. to Hor. *Ep.* II. 1, 105 *certis* erroneously written for *rectis*. *Rektor* and similarly *regere* are often used in the sense of 'to administer,' both in Tacitus and elsewhere. The meaning of the entire passage would then be: Agricola administered (conducted) his praetorship in the same quiet manner as his earlier offices, and in consequence² there was the same dearth of noteworthy features. The collocation of a concrete and abstract

¹ Cf. *Joh. Müller*, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung des Tacitus I. pp. 6 ff.

NO. XCIX. VOL. XI.

² The *et* is epexegetic, as in *Dial.* 36, 10 *leges adsiduae et populare nomen*. See my note to *Dial.* 7, 16 (p. 106).

noun (*rector et silentium*) is peculiarly Tacitean. Not to go beyond the 'smaller works,' we may compare *Agr.* 24, 11. 25, 7. 28, 4. 38, 1 *G.* 7, 15. 33, 7.

Agr. 6, 17: *ludos et inania. honoris medio rationis atque abundantiae duxit.*

A much disputed passage. I shall not here dwell upon the meaning of *duxit* which, in spite of what has been written about it,¹ may, without any violence, be taken in the sense of *edere*, although generally so used only with '*funus, exsequiae*' and the like,² for Tacitus is fond of giving a novel turn to stereotype and formulaic expressions.

Far more serious, in my judgment, are the objections that may be urged against *rationis*, the traditional text. To support it, modern editors are compelled to understand by *ratio* 'shrewd calculation, kluge Berechnung' which, we are told, passes by an easy transition into the meaning of 'economy, Sparsamkeit,' the signification demanded here. Now we may at once admit that *ratio*, a rather Protean word, does frequently come to mean 'shrewd calculation'; we may also grant, that in a man of Agricola's character such 'calculation' would under the circumstances have led him to practise economy, but *ratio* itself never has this connotation, and hence it does not constitute the antithesis to *abundantia* unquestionably intended by the author, particularly when we remember that the self-same *ratio*, in the case of innumerable Roman praetors, resulted in most lavish extravagance at the public games, by which means they hoped to acquire popularity. *Lipsius*, evidently feeling the difficulty just pointed out, read *moderationis* for 'medio rationis.'³ A far more plausible correction, and equally easy, is to write '*medio moderationis atque abundantiae*,' 'mode' being omitted as an alleged dittography of 'medio' (*m̄do*). As for the meaning here assigned to *moderatio*, cp. *Cic. de Off.* I. 27 ext.: *ut in eo moderatio et temperantia appareat cum specie quadam liberali (= longe a luxuria)*, *Tac. Ann.* III. 54, 13: *cur olim parsimonia poiebat? quia sibi quisque moderabatur.*

Agr. 8, 2: *placidius (sc. praeerat) quam feroci provincia dignum est.*

Acidalius proposed *esset*. This has justly

been rejected as unnecessary, but Tacitus very probably did not write *est* at all, for he invariably *omits* the copula after *dignum*, the passage in *H. I.* 15 *est tibi frater pari nobilitate, natus maior, dignus hac fortuna* constituting no exception, for obvious reasons.⁴

Agr. 9, 8: *ubi officio satisfactum, nullam ultra potestatis personam.*

All recent editors, so far as they do not resort to very arbitrary changes, read '*nulla ... persona*,' taking it as an ablative of quality or as a nominative, *erat* being understood in either case. They also assume that the accusative of the MSS. is due to the misinterpretation of '*ultra*' as a preposition. But plausible as this seems, I am inclined to believe with Clemm,⁵ that we have here but another instance of the ellipsis of *agere* so common in Tacitus, e.g. *Agr.* 19, 5 *nihil per liberos servosque publicae rei (sc. egit) H. I.* 84, 1 *Ann.* I. 43, 3 *IV.* 38, 18 *XIV.* 7, 11 and very similar *G.* 37, 10 *medio tam longi aevi spatio multa in vicem damna (sc. facta sunt)*. Equally bold ellipses in the smaller works are: *Agr.* 33, 2 *iamque agmina et armorum fulgores audentissimi cuiusque procursu (sc. aspiciabantur), G. 14, 14 materia munificentiae per bella et raptus (sc. paratur)*. If it be added, finally, that '*personam aliquam agere*' is a construction frequently used by Tacitus (e.g. *H. I.* 30, 4 *II.* 83, 2 *IV.* 2, 3 *Ann.* I. 4, 15 *XIII.* 14, 4. 46, 18. *XVI.* 28, 11), all valid objections to the MS. reading will be removed.

Agr. 11, 11: *eorum sacra deprehendas, superstitionum persuasione, sermo, etc.*

Nipperdey, with that singular perversity and astonishing infelicity which distinguish all his critical contributions to the *minor* works of Tacitus, has boldly athetized the words '*superstitionum persuasione*' as the gloss of a Christian scribe! Schoene cheerfully acquiesced. Others, such as Roth, Peerlkamp, Peter, Andresen, Halm retain the MSS. reading. Their explanations, however, are, if possible, more difficult than the traditional text, and *Maza*,⁶ in his exhaustive discussion of this passage, has had no trouble in refuting them. Wex, Kritz, Ulrichs, Tuecking, Draeger, Gantrelle, Joh. Müller and Maza himself, to mention only these, have accepted *persuasiones*, the

¹ See esp. *Maza*, *Progr. Radantz* I. (1885) pp. 44 ff.—These admirable discussions of the cruces in the *Agricola* seem to have been unduly neglected. Their author unfortunately only lived to complete fifteen chapters, the last programme being published after his death in 1887.

² *H. IV.* 47, 6 *Ann.* XVI. 6, 7.

³ He gave to *duxit* the meaning of *mutavit* and construed it with a genitive after the analogy of '*ratus*,' e.g. *Tac. Ann.* III. 20.

⁴ The same is true of '*indignus*' which takes the copula only in the following passage. *Ann.* I. 42, 16: *si . . . aspernaretur, tamen mirum et indignum erat*, where its insertion is also easily accounted for.

⁵ De breviloquentia Tacitea etc. p. 43 ff. Cp. also *Petzke*, *Dicendi genus Tacitinum quatenus differat a Liviano*, *Diss. Königsberg* pp. 35 ff. (1888).

⁶ l.c. II. 21-26.

very easy emendation of *Glück*, the 's' having been accidentally omitted, owing to the 's' following, a notoriously common source of error. The plural of *persuasio* is also unobjectionable. It occurs e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 94, 30 and Plin. *N.H.* XXIX. 1, 8, 28 D. (not II. 8, 6 as cited by Maxa). The 'asyndeton bimembre,' as remarked above, is quite frequent in Tacitus, but an examination of all instances (Müller's list is not complete) reveals not a single example in which a predicate separates the two objects, as here, or a subject or object is placed between two predicates. The only word allowed to intervene in an 'asyndeton bimembre' is an attributive genitive or personal pronoun and even then *each* member is usually thus amplified, doubtless for the sake of stylistic libration. This being so, I have always felt that Tacitus wrote: 'eorum sacra deprehendas ac superstitionum persuasiones,' the graphical resemblance, not to say identity, between 'ac' and 'as,' the immediately preceding syllable, being responsible for the haplography. By these easy changes, we not only secure a perfectly intelligible text, not in need of far-fetched and improbable interpretations, but also a 'collocatio verborum,' supported by numerous analogies in Tacitus. Cf. e.g. *Agr.* 17 aut victoria complexus est aut bello 42 nec Agricola consilium deerat nec Domitiano exemplum *Dial.* 34 sive accusationem suscepit sive defensionem, and similarly *Agr.* 33 inventa Britannia et subacta G. 11 aut incohatur luna aut impletur *Dial.* 37 intulerit ictus et exceperit, to which passage I have collected still other instances (p. 352).¹

Agr. 12, 16: *patiens frugum fecundum.*

Patiens, when used absolutely, means (1) 'hard, firm, unyielding,' as e.g. *Prop.* I. 16, 29 saxo *patientior Ov.* Am. I. 15, 31 aratrum *patiens* or (2) 'patient, enduring' e.g. Caes. B.C. III. 96 miserrimo et *patientissimo* exercitus Cic. de orat. II. 75, 305 *patiens* et *lentus* Lael. 25, 91 pro Lig. 8, 24 ad Quint. frat. I. 1, 14 ad fam. I. 8, 4 et saep. But in the signification required here 'tolerant of, productive of, yielding,' the only meaning in which Tacitus uses the word, it always takes the genitive. Cp. Lex. Tac. s.v. *patiens* and *impatiens*, esp. G. 5, 3 terra...satis *ferax*, *frugiferarum arborum* [im] *patiens*, *pecorum fecunda*.

Partly for the reason given, partly

prompted by the remarkable parallel passage just cited, some editors have inserted 'arborum' or 'pomorum' before *patiens*; Peter, to get rid of the 'asyndeton gradativum' reads 'pabuli fecundum,' with chiasmus, apparently forgetting that 'pabulum' is quite incompatible with 'tarde mitescunt,' immediately following.² Still others, as Kritz and Schoene, calmly delete *fecundum*, as a gloss, presumably of some chauvinistic scribe! Ulrichs and Cornelissen join *patiens* with the preceding clause. The great majority of editors, however, solve the difficulty by simply placing the comma after *frugum*, assuming an 'asyndeton bimembre.' I should rest satisfied with this solution, which involves no change whatever, were it not for the following consideration. I know of no example where, of two asyndetic adjectives, only one of them has an attributive attached to it. Unless, therefore, we are willing to admit this solitary exception on the ground that 'frugum,' belonging, as it does, to both adjectives, was placed between them, a very common stylistic device of Tacitus, I should prefer to read: *frugum patiens, fecundum*. Such accidental transpositions are extremely numerous in all MSS. The emendation is less bold than the insertion of 'arborum' or 'pomorum,' which are objectionable also on other grounds, and somehow better subserves the function for which the asyndeton is used in this particular passage.

Agr. 17, 2: *magni, duces, egregii exercitus, minuta hostium spes et terrorem statim intulit Petilius Cerialis.*

This passage violates Tacitean usage in asyndetic collocations, for whenever in an asyndetic enumeration, the last member contains a new thought or a more general idea or sums up, it is joined by *et* to the asyndetic group.³ Cf. *Agr.* 13 extr. *domitiae gentes, capti reges et monstratus* fatis Vespasianus G. 30, 5 *duriora genti corpora, stricti artus, minax vultus* (physical qualities) *et maior animi vigor* 44, 5 *rotunda scuta, breves gladii et erga reges obsequium* H. I. 36, 12 *adorare vulgum, iacere oscula et omnia serviliter pro dominatione* IV. 1, 14 *ubique lamenta, conclamationes et fortunae captae urbis Ann.* I. 25, 6 *murmur incertum, atrox clamor et repente quies*. Consistency, therefore, demands 'et *minuta hostium spes*.' Curiously enough, in the parallel passage from the Agricola just cited, one MS. omits *et* before 'monstratus,' in the

¹ According to Maxa l.c. II. p. 24, the insertion of 'ac' or 'et' has long ago been suggested by Schömann, Greifswald Index Lect. 1859-60 p. 7, but this article has not been accessible to me. Andresen, by some curious error, attributed 'ac-persuasiones' to Glück.

² Maxa l.c. II. p. 33.

³ Cf. Jour. Phil. XII. pp. 454 ff. and my note to Dial. c. 37, 18 (p. 348).

present both A and B omitted it. I am also inclined to believe that Tacitus wrote: 'terrorem statim intulit,' the *et* being perhaps the very *et* which strayed away from the place, where we found it to be necessary, or else it is a mere dittography of the *es* preceding. The predicate, moreover, coming before its subject renders the omission of *et* very plausible, at least in Tacitus.

Agr. 17, 8: *et Cerialis quidem alterius successoris curam famamque obruisset: sustinuitque molem Julius Frontinus.*

So our two MSS. But modern editors have with singular unanimity abandoned this reading, the majority being content with bracketing *que*, while others suspect a lacuna, which each fills out in his own way. It does not seem to have been thought worth the while to enquire, whether the *que* may not after all be quite unobjectionable. Andresen—he reads 'sustinuit'—says 'in ipsa verbi collocatione inest gravissima vis adversativa.' This would be an excellent explanation but for the circumstance that the MSS. clearly exhibit *sustinuitque*. Now it can easily be shown that *que* very often has a 'vis adversativa.' If so, the proposed changes will not be correcting a corrupt reading but the *author* himself. This is, however, hardly the function of the critic. Moreover, I can discover no motive for the scribes, who must all have been ignorant of the stylistic observations collected in Andresen's 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatione,' to insert a *que* on mere caprice, not to mention the fact that no one has as yet succeeded in proving the existence of a *single, deliberate interpolation* in the *Agricola*, for such the *que* would be, and in making this statement, I do not overlook the attempts made in that direction by Wex, Peerlkamp, Ritter, Nipperdey, Cornelissen and Schoene. The following selected list of examples at my disposal of *que* = *sed* will, I hope, suffice to vindicate the reading of our MSS.

Cic. de Sen. 20, 77 iam sensus moriendi aliquis esse potest, isque ad exiguum tempus *Vell. Pat.* II. 11 C. Marius hirtus atque horridus, vitæque sanctus II. 24 Sulla neque...nec quod erat in manibus omisit, existimavitque ante frangendum hostem and *Tac.* *Agr.* 14, 10 Didium Veranus excepit isque intra annum extinctus est H. I. 50, 22 et ambigua de Vespasiano fama (sc. erat) solusque omnium...in melius mutatus est *Ann.* III. 18, 12 addiderat...Tiberio et Augustæ...grates omiseratque Claudii mentionem 42, 4 pellicere alam equitum...ut...bellum inciperet; paucique equitum corrupti

(sc. sunt) XIII. 10, 3 Caesar effigiem Domitio...petivit a senatu; sibique statuas...prohibuit XVI. 19, 14 obsignata misit Neroni fregitque anulum. To these and other exx. given in *Lex. Tac.* s.v. *que* (p. 1282^b 1283^a), we should perhaps add *Ann.* III. 35, 6 IV. 4 ext. 29 ext. XI. 35, 9 XII. 14, 10.

Agr. 24, 1: Quinto expeditionum anno *nave prima* transgressus ignotas ad id tempus gentes.

A much molested passage, as may be seen from the following selection of conjectures: 'navi in proxima, aestate prima, gnave prima (neut. plur.), vere primo, marituma, nova perinde,' and, to cap the climax, 'in Clotæ proxima,' to which glaringly improbable conjecture Andresen remarks 'sic optime Nipperdey' and straightway receives it into his text!¹ The few who defend the reading of the MSS. usually interpret the phrase as 'the first vessel sent out at the opening of navigation in the spring,' and, indeed, if *nave prima* could bear no other signification we should certainly have to regard the passage as corrupt. All difficulty will, however, be removed, if we read *primum* (prim.) which scarcely involves any change, but even this is not necessary, for I fail to see why we should not recognise in *prima* simply another example of the well-known use of the adjective for the adverb, a suggestion which I subsequently discovered had long ago been made by *Walch* (p. 303). To the illustrations given by him, *Agr.* 19 primam (primum B *Peter*) domum suam coarctavit *Ann.* XIV. 10 eum...prima Centurionum adulatio ad spem firmavit, add *G.* 43, 23 primi in omnibus proeliis, oculi vincuntur H. II. 96, 1 prima Vitellio tertiae legionis defectio nuntiatur *Ann.* XII. 19, 6 magnarum nationum regibus primam ex similitudine fortunæ...amicitiam esse. Tacitus, it must be admitted, generally places the adjective *before* its noun, unless rhetorical reasons decree otherwise, but among the conspicuous exceptions to this practice, Andresen himself, in the article cited above (p. 20), mentions *primus*.

Agr. 28, 6: tris liburnicas adactis per vim gubernatoribus ascendere et uno remigante, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis...amisissis per incitiam (sc. gubernandi) navibus.

¹ The absurdity of this violent change will become the more manifest, when the conviction has gained ground, as I am confident it will, that the whole chapter is unintelligible except on the presumption of an expedition to Ireland. Cf. *W. Pfitzner*, Progr. Neustrelitz 1893 pp. 34 and Fleckeisen's Jahrb. vol. 153 pp. 560—564.

It has long been recognised that the sense is incomplete and that we require the additional idea of 'back' or 'returning,' for those who, like Peter, take *remigante* = gubernante are sufficiently refuted by the clause 'amissis—navibus,' even supposing that *remigare* could have the meaning which they assign to it. Among the many remedies suggested, such as: 'remigerante; regente; remeante; remorante; refugo uno ante; refugiente; reneante; renatante; velificante; renavigante,' only the last has met with anything like general acceptance, and yet I have always felt certain that Tacitus did not write it. Not because it does not satisfy the evident meaning of the context, for it does, but simply because it would constitute, so far as I have been able to discover, a unique instance of the corruption of a perfectly intelligible and commonplace expression into another word which is as suitable and fitting as the author in this particular case could possibly have chosen. There is, therefore, a very strong presumption that *remigante* is perfectly sound, but if so, the evident corruption now existing must lurk elsewhere. I am convinced that the original is restored by reading: 'uno RETRO remigante,' the *retro* easily falling out, because of the *re*-following, a species of error occurring frequently in the best MSS.

Agr. 34, 12: novissimae res et extremo metu corpora defixere aciem in his vestigiis.

'Corpora' and 'aciem' cannot both be right. The majority of critics retain the latter, changing the text so as to read: 'res et extremus metus torpore,' 'res et extremo metu torpor,' or, by a more radical change 'novissimi nimirum et extremo metu torpidi (torpidam)' while still others abandon emendation and practically rewrite the passage. Now *Wex* (p. 107 ff.) has long since shown, but apparently to no purpose, that 'aciem defixere' in the sense of 'rivetting the line of battle' is not idiomatic Latin. And even if it were, the stubborn resistance therein implied would hardly serve as a source of encouragement for a Roman army. Then again, it is not likely that Agricola, who contemptuously speaks of his opponents as a band of cowards and run-aways who 'non restiterunt sed deprehensi sunt,' would have dignified their ranks by the term 'acies.' Nor can 'aciem defixere' here have the meaning, which it has often enough elsewhere, of 'fixing one's steady gaze upon a thing,' for this among the ancients, curious as it may seem to us, was not the outcome of 'extremus metus,' but of

indomitable courage. Cf. e.g. *Hor.* C. I 3, 18 qui siccis oculis monstra natantia, qui vidit mare turgidum and Postgate's note to Prop. II. 27, 7. If *aciem* must therefore, be considered out of place, probably due to a gloss on *corpora*, this latter must not be molested, and all that is required to restore the passage is to read 'extremus metus,' the 's' being omitted, because of the similarity of the following letter, which error in turn very naturally drew along with it the change of 'extremus' to 'extremo.' This emendation seems to me in every way more methodical than to delete 'et' with *Wex* and others; in fact the presence of the conjunction clearly points to a nominative following. I, therefore, write: 'novissimae res et extremus metus corpora defixere in his vestigiis.'¹ This reading, it may be remarked in passing, is also more in conformity with the laws of prose rhythm which Tacitus, closely following Cicero's Orator and Quintilian, has imposed upon himself, an observation which I hope to establish in detail elsewhere, for the 'numerus Taciteus' seems not hitherto to have been made a subject of investigation.

Agr. 38, 16: ipse peditem atque equites . . . in hibernis locavit,

Read: 'pedites atque equites' or 'peditem atque equitem,' for, fond as Tacitus admittedly is of inconcinnity of collocation, he never, in all the 30 instances of 'pedes' and 'eques' found in his writings, varies the number, except when these words occur in adversative clauses or when in different syntactical relation. When closely joined by a copulative conjunction, they occur either both in the collective singular (7 times) or both in the plural (14 times).

Agr. 43, 13: speciem tamen doloris animo vultuque prae se tulit.

That *animo* cannot well be correct is all but universally conceded,² but the emendations hitherto suggested possess no intrinsic probability, e.g. 'mimo, amictu, ore, sermone' and this is preeminently true of the generally accepted correction of *Ernesti*, who writes *habitu* for *animo*, chiefly, it would seem, because 'habitus' and 'vultus' are not infrequently combined. I have not the slightest doubt that Tacitus wrote: 'speciem doloris animi vultu prae se tulit.' The change is simplicity itself, for the *que* was naturally added when 'animi' had become 'animo,'

¹ This note had long been written, when I found that *Constans*, Rev. de phil. XXI. p. 29 had advocated the same reading, but he gives no grounds for his opinion.

² Cf. esp. *Woelfflin*, Phil. XXVI. p. 154.

though it is also quite possible that *que* is nothing more than a dittography of *pr* (*prae*). With the phrase, cp. *Cic. in Verr. I* 8,21 *cupiebam animi dolorem vultu tegere*, *pro Sest. 41,88 dolorem animi* and especially the remarkable parallel in *Curt. VI* 9,1 (32) *vultu praeferens dolorem animi*.

Agr. 44, 11 ff.: *Et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integrae aetatis ereptus, quantum ad gloriam, longissimum aevum peregit: Quippe et vera bona quae in virtutibus sita sunt et consulari ac triumphalibus ornamentis praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat? Opibus nimis non gaudebat: speciosae non contigerant filia atque uxore superstitibus: Potest videri etiam beatus, incolumi dignitate, florente fama, salvis affinitatibus et amicitiiis futura effugisse.*

This is the reading of our two MSS., but Tacitus cannot have written the passage as it stands. One difficulty has, indeed, long been noticed and many attempts have been made to do away with it, but all were necessarily doomed to failure for reasons which will appear later. Another difficulty, though no less perplexing, has never been felt. I turn to the latter first.

In the first place, I ask, what is the antecedent of 'quippe'?¹ The answer probably would be '*quantum ad gloriam*,' but that is impossible for several reasons. To begin with, this phrase is only thrown in as *parenthesis*. A second far more serious objection is, that the constituent elements which secured such *gloria*² to Agricola are enumerated in the very clause introduced by way of contrast to something that preceded, and significantly joined with '*vera bona*' by '*et...et*.' Again, no *bona*, to which the *vera bona* might be opposed, had been previously mentioned. But if so, then both *quippe* and *vera bona* hang completely in the air, *gloriam* being out of the question, as involving no antithesis. Now this difficulty is removed, if we suppose that the archetypum had: *peregit. Opibus nimis non gaudebat speciosae non contigerant. Quippe et vera bona etc.*' The eye of the copyist passed from OPB to QPP, but noticing his oversight too late for immediate correction, he inserted the omitted *κῶλον*, when he reached the presumable end

of the sentence at '*poterat*.' With this emendation, all the difficulty disappears: 'He did not take delight in excessive riches and, as a matter of fact, resplendent or showy (*speciosus* is an extremely strong word) wealth did not fall to his lot, but, of course, that did not sour a man of Agricola's nature (*quippe*=*enim*, with the usual ellipsis to be supplied in thought), for both the true blessings which consist in virtue and the highest political honours had been his etc.'

This is good Stoic doctrine. The wise and, therefore, virtuous man, is both *dives* and *rex*, even without actually possessing material wealth or royal power.

Having thus restored what, I feel convinced, every unprejudiced reader will regard as the meaning of the author, I proceed to discuss the other crux referred to above. It turns upon the words '*filia...superstitibus*,' and I confess to having been not a little surprised to find, that the very *transposition* which had been advocated on internal grounds alone and quite independent of any bearing it might have upon the present problem, also furnished the key to its solution.

The MSS., it must be observed, make no stop till *potest*, joining *filia atque uxore superstitibus* closely with *contigerant*, a collocation quite impossible. *Wex* tried to get over the difficulty by reading '*speciosae contigerant filiae atque uxori superstitibus*.' As this had absolutely nothing in its favour, editors were driven nolentes volentes, to take the ablative absolute with the '*potest*' clause, but this involved them in other difficulties, from which they endeavoured to extricate themselves in various ways.

Doederlein and *Ulrichs* rightly felt that if this clause is to go with what follows, it ought not to be separated from the other ablatives and, accordingly, the former boldly placed it after *fama*, the latter after *amicitiis*, thus securing an admirable climax; but neither took the trouble to explain the curious dislocation, and their suggestions in consequence were rejected. Another editor, thereupon, in his perplexity maintained that the separation of these ablatives was due to the fact that the '*filia etc.*' clause was an ablative of *cause*, explaining *beatus*, while the others were ablatives of *quality*; forgetting, of course, that this alleged separation is not confirmed by the MSS. But the climax is reached by *Peter* who, in all seriousness, asserts that we have here nothing more than a harsh Tacitean ellipsis, the sentence in full being: '*filia...superstitibus, potest... beatus<excessisse>...effugiens*!' This ab-

¹ Synonymous, as often in Tacitus, with *enim*, which could not have been used here for obvious reasons.

² It may be noted in passing that the Stoics, whose doctrines are clearly here hinted at, probably did not reckon 'glory' as among the *mala* or *ἀδύπονα*, for, as Cicero facetiously remarked (*pro Arch. 11,26*), they never fail to put their names to their treatises 'de gloria contemnenda.'

surdity is not only accepted by *Andresen*, but the author of the 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatio' adds that the words 'filia...superstitibus' are placed at the beginning and separated from their fellows, 'quod illis maiorem tribuebat gravitatem!'

But the ablative absolute under discussion cannot be taken with the 'potest' clause under any circumstances, and that chiefly for two reasons, not to lay too much stress upon the testimony of MSS. in matters of punctuation. One of these had long ago been pointed out by *Selling* and *Wex*, but their argument has been hitherto wholly ignored. It is the simple observation, that Tacitus could never have said that Agricola, while still *living*, was happy, because his child and wife *survived* him. We expect at least 'etiam tum vivis.' 'Nam superstites is demum habet qui mortuus est, non qui moriturus' (*Wex* p. 98). Beside, asked *Selling*, would Agricola have been less happy in escaping the evil days to come, if his wife and child had not survived?

In the second place, the very position of *potest*, separated by a considerable interval from its verb *effugisse* at the end of the sentence, is a clear proof, that it was intended to open the sentence, for this is one of the most characteristic features of the 'collocatio verborum Tacitea.' Out of the thirty instances, given in the *Lex. Tac.*, s.v. *possum* (p. 1141), fifteen of which *Andresen* himself enumerates l.c. p. 2, it will be sufficient to cite: *Agr. 42 posse etiam sub malis principibus bonos viros esse.*

But if 'filia...superstitibus' can neither be joined to *contigerant* nor with *potest*, what becomes of it? The transposition above advocated disposes of this dilemma. In the original text, the above clause followed *poterat*, where it fits in most admirably, the ablative absolute at the end of a 'clausula' being, moreover, of very frequent occurrence in Tacitus, and particularly so in the *Agricola*. *Cp. Dial. 1, 19 G. 28, 9. 41, 8. 46, 11 and Agr. 2, 12. 7, 8. 9, 25. 14, 4. 15, 12. 22, 2. 23, 6. 30, 5.*

We come to the last point to be discussed in this passage, for hitherto the *non* before 'contigerant' has been tacitly accepted as given by both MSS., although modern editors delete it, chiefly on the basis of a marginal note in A.¹ But these glosses have, no MS. authority whatsoever; they are simply the conjectures of Pomponius Laetus and very poor ones at that. In the passage before us,

his critical contribution has been particularly unfortunate, for we have the very strongest reasons for the retention of the *negative*.

In the first place, the deletion of *non* would make Tacitus flatly contradict *Cass. Dio LXVI., 20*, the one other extant writer to mention Agricola at all and from *independent* sources at that. Now making all due allowance for overstatement or exaggerated expression, there can be no doubt that Dio was well informed, when he said l.c. ὁ δὲ Ἀγρικóλας ἐν τε ἀτιμία τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἐν δειρά...ἔζησεν, and yet *Peerkamp* does not shrink from emending the Greek text to bring it into harmony with a purely conjectural reading in the Latin!

But apart from the testimony of the MSS. and *Cassius Dio*, there are also strong *internal* grounds in favour of *non*. For everything that we gather from the biography itself concerning Agricola's personal estate proves him not to have had 'opes speciosas.' Thus, we learn that he lost his patrimony²; that Caligula confiscated the fortune of Agricola's father after his execution is also highly probable.³

Finally Tacitus' repeated references to his scrupulous honesty, his refusal to connive at rascality or share in the time-honoured practice of extortion, his conduct as praetor (c. 6) and the very mention of his not receiving the 'salarium proconsulare'—all point to the fact that Agricola was not a very wealthy man. Last, but not least, it is very difficult to believe that Tacitus could ever have made the editors attribute to him: 'Excessive riches had no charms for him, but such fell to his lot.' How appropriate and significant on the other hand, in a 'liber honori soceri mei destinatus' the statement becomes, if we retain the *non* of the MSS., will be clear from the paraphrase given above. The whole passage, as emended, will, therefore, read thus:

'Ipse quidem...peregīt. Opibus nimis non gaudebat, speciosas non contigerant. Quippe et vera bona...et consulari...praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat, filia atque uxore superstitibus? Potest videri etiam beatus...effugisse.

Agr. 45, 5: una adhuc victoria Carus Metius censebatur et intra Albanam arcem sententia Messalini strepebat et Massa Baebius iam tum reus erat.

Iam is omitted in B and hence the great

¹ Cf. *Heller*, *Philol. LI.* pp. 340 ff., retains the *non*, but his treatment does not touch the points at issue.

² Cp. 7 magnam patrimonii partem diripuit (sc. classis Othoniana).

³ Cp. 4 and *Urbichs*, *De vita et honoribus Agricolae* p. 8.

majority of editors felt justified in bracketing the word, *Gronovius* suggesting *etiam* as an alternative, as if these changes did away with the difficulty, for Tacitus in any case is made to interrupt his enumeration of the evils, which Agricola happily did not live to see, by an incident which could not but have been a cause for rejoicing and gratification; for this notorious informer had been, as early as the days of Claudius, to use Tacitus' own words in H. IV. 50: *optimo cuique exitiosus et inter causas malorum quae mox tulimus, saepius rediturus.* The inconsistency here pointed out is easily disposed of by reading *nondum* for 'iam tum.' Just as *Metius* and *Messalinus* had not yet revealed all the cruelty and rascality of which they were capable, so *Baebius Massa* seems to have kept his well-known evil propensities in check for a while; at the present time he had not yet committed any misdeeds of sufficient enormity to result in an impeachment. But this occurred, as we happen to know, in the year of Agricola's death and resulted in his conviction. Agricola was, therefore, fortunate in not witnessing the reappearance of

this rascal, particularly as his condemnation seems not materially to have weakened his power ('saepius rediturus').

Agr. 46, 7: *admiratione te potius et immortalibus laudibus et, si natura suppeditet, similitudine colamus.*

Nearly all editors have followed *Muretus* in reading *colamus* for *decoramus* of the MSS. 'Decoramus' (Ursinus) may possibly be defended in view of the well-known line from Ennius 'nemo me lacrimis decoret.' But if *colamus* is to be substituted as being somehow more suitable to the simple pathos of this wonderful epilogue, we should at least read: 'admiratione potius...te colamus.' Not only does *te* thus receive its proper emphasis by position, making a 'dichoreic' clausula, but the *decoramus*, if it be corrupt, is thus most plausibly accounted for, J. Müller's explanation that *de* was due to the last syllable of an abbreviated 'similitudine' (similitude) being impossible, because that word is itself but an emendation of *Grotius*, the MSS. having 'militum' or 'multum.'

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from p. 237.)

VIII. THE AGESILAUS.

SINCE Valckenauer first expressed an opinion that the *Agesilaus* was not the work of Xenophon, its authenticity has been much discussed. Perhaps the chief argument on one side has been the style. Critics have said with some reason that in places it reminded them less of X. than of Isocrates. But, just as with the two *Constitutions*, no one that I know of has gone carefully enough through the vocabulary and syntax of the book, comparing them with what we know of X.'s usual way of writing. They have indeed received much less attention than the language of the *Constitutions*, and a few detached remarks are all that seem to have been made on the subject. I will endeavour to examine them somewhat more systematically, though of course not exhaustively.

For our purpose it will be well to divide the book into three parts. The first two chapters are largely, though not entirely, made up of passages taken from the *Hellenics* or at least agreeing more or less *verbatim*

with passages in the *Hellenics*; and, so far as this agreement goes, the style, vocabulary, etc. cannot be used as an argument. These two chapters, therefore, which are yet highly deserving of our attention, I will reserve to the end, taking first chapters 3-10, and then separately chapter 11, the authenticity of which has been more particularly doubted.

In chapters 3-10 we find again a few of the words we have already noticed as Xenophontean. 'ὧς = ὥστε with indicative occurs in 3, 2 (οὕτως ἐσέβητο...ὧς...ἐνόμιζον); ἐνθα 'where' occurs 5, 7: 6, 2: 10, 1; τέκνα 3, 3; πάμπαν 5, 3; μείον 6, 3 and μειονεκτείν 4, 5: 7, 2; εὐφροσύνη 9, 4. But there are very many more of the same kind to be added. I will take the chapters *seriatim*. Λάφυρα is a tragic word unknown to Attic prose, but X. uses it in *Hell.* 5, 1, 24, and either λάφυρα πωλεῖν or λαφυροπωλεῖν in *Anab.* 6, 6, 38: it is used here in 4, 6. In the words ὅστις δ' ἡρέϊτο καὶ σὺν τῷ γενναίῳ μειονεκτεῖν ἢ σὺν τῷ ἀδίκῳ πλέον ἔχειν (4, 5) we have language doubly characteristic of X., for it is his way not only to use σὺν (so