

PLUTARCHEA I

Ἰπό
ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ Χ. ΚΟΝΟΜΗ
Τακτικοῦ Καθηγητοῦ
τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης
Ἐπισκέπτου Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Σχολῆς

In the following note a few queries on Plutarch's *Vitae parallelae* as edited by K. Ziegler (1957-) are raised on minor points with mainly a plea for a greater consistency in spelling conventions. Up to now five volumes of this new Teubner edition have been published (I 1 1957 : I 2 1959 : II 1 1964 : II 2 1968 : III 1 1971) and of these the first volume appeared in 3rd edition (1964) and in 4th (1969) whereas the second in 3rd edition (1964)¹.

Ziegler's edition is indeed an *opus magnum* which evokes admiration for the thorough acquaintance of the editor with the author and for the editor's astonishing erudition and acumen, which enabled him to improve the text on innumerable occasions. Some of his suggestions are brilliant, other are worthy of serious consideration by future editors of Plutarch. On the whole Ziegler has laid future students of Plutarch's Lives under deep obligation and it is amazing how the standard of his scholarship seems to raise with every new volume produced.

A work of such breadth, however, and of such a variety as regards its contents is bound to defeat its editor at some point or other and to make him slip or even err. Considering the limitations of human nature this is understandable and what is surprising — to the present writer anyhow — is the fact that Ziegler very seldom seems to go astray. Disputes concerning the relevant merits of respective manuscripts in establishing the text apart, the main drawback of this edition may for our purpose be summed up here under the heading: *spelling conventions*. On these purports to concentrate the present note which, needless to say, deals with trifles.

To begin with though the proof-reading was on the whole done exceptionally well, a few printing errors remain in the Greek. The most serious of those noticed and still in text are: Them. 10,7 read ὦν (instead of ὡς); Per. 24,9 Δηάνειρα which is the reading of all prose-writers including Plutarch (Mor. 278 f) (instead of Δηάνειρα unless meant to be a poetic form); 24,11 Μιλιτῶ (instead of Μιλτω, see Aelian *V. H.* 12,1 Athen. 13. 576 d schol. Aristid. 3 p. 468 D. Μυρωῶ); 30,4 Μέγαράδε as usually instead of Μεγάραδε² or Μεγαράδε; Nic. 11,3. Alc. 13,4 Ὑπέμβολος Περιθοίδης (instead of Περιθοῖδης); Demosth. 19,1 νεφέλεσσι (instead of νεφέεσσι); Brut. 4,3

1. References to Plutarch's Lives in general are to Ziegler's latest edition but e.g. Lyc. 5,14 (Z.) denotes a reference to Ziegler's 1st edition and Galba 2 (S.) a reference to Sintenis' edition.

2. Probably after the form Ἐφιδναζε (Herodianus 499,8 Lentz).

ἀπαντήσας (instead of ἀναντήσας); Pomp. 28,5 ἐξημεροῦται (instead of ἐξ-εμεροῦται, which surprisingly enough occurs in Sintenis' ed. 3,217 and in Ziegler's 1st edition (1926)¹, and perhaps Ant. 45.4 οἰστούς (instead of διστούς).

A feature of this edition as regards the principles followed in respect of spelling conventions is that the editor decided — following the example of Lindskog — to allow double spellings or forms of certain words to appear in the text. This is to a certain point unavoidable and it is stated as a matter of principle in the *Praefatio* of vol. 1 2 (1969) p. XIX: «De verborum recte scribendorum ratione repetere libet Lindskogii in praefatione editionis anni 1914 verba, quae sunt, severa orthographia sermonem Plutarchi constringere non oportere. Ut exiguum sane lucrum, inquit, ex tali constantiae studio facimus, ita negare quis audeat nos nimia severitate usos res vel ad alias rationes vel ad fontes Plutarchi exquirendos graviores obscurare posse? Quare αἰί: αἰεί, οὐδεῖς: οὐθείς, δυεῖν: δυοῖν, γίνομαι: γίγνομαι, θάλασσα: θάλαττα sim., prout quoque loco melior librorum auctoritas suadebat, scripsi. Ubi autem optimi codices, ut Seitenstettensis, semper vel semper fere unam eandemque formam praebent, hanc in iis quoque vitis, ubi deest meliorum codicum fides, restituere no dubitavi. Sic ἀβελτερία, quod S semper praebet, et φιλονικία², quod saepissime, constanter scribendum esse censui. Atque etiam contra meliorum librorum scripturas veras formas μείγνυμι³ τείσω οἰκτῖρω ἀνδρεία Ἐπαμεινώνδας tacitus restitui».

It should be confessed that on principle I agree with the editor about his plea for uniform spelling in cases like those mentioned above. There is no objection to the forms ἀβελτερία φιλονικία τείσω οἰκτῖρω ἀνδρεία Ἐπαμεινώνδας perhaps even μείγνυμι; but it comes as a surprise to find out that the reading printed was not consistently followed throughout the text. As a result we have (for instance): Phoc. 10,6 φιλονεικίαν; Cat. min. 51,3 φιλονεικίας; or, Phoc. 3,7 ἀνδρίας and ἀνδρίαν (ἀνδρείας and ἀνδρείαν A); Cat. min. 8,2 ἀνδρίαν (ἀνδρείαν Λ) 44,14 ἀνδρίαν (ἀνδρείαν ΛP¹); 73,6 ἀνδρίας (ἀνδρείας Zp); Dio 17,6 ἀνδρίαν (ἀνδρείαν Λ); Lyc. 21,4 (Z.) ἀνδρίαν; 28,1 ἀνδρίαν; 28,6 ἀνδρία; al.; Lys. 7,1 (Z.) ἀνδρίαν; Syll. 17,12 (Z.) ἀν-

1. As will become clear from what will follow some of these printing errors may express the editor's view on some spelling convention, e.g. Περιθόλης etc.

2. For the spelling φιλονικία cf. also *Mor.* V I Hubert-Pohlentz² 1960 p. XXV; but in spite of what the editors say at 787f they print φιλονεικίας. Likewise by Hubert *Mor.* VI, 1971: 617e 629a 713f 716a 736e though φιλόνομος 724b (φιλόνομος T corr. Wytttenbach). In vol. II Nachstädt-Sievekink-Titchener 1971 everywhere the spelling is φιλονεικία.

3. To be noted that the new Teubner edition of the *Moralia* prints everywhere μίγνυμι, μίξις.

δρίαν (ἀνδρείαν L); Ages. 23,8 (Z.) ἀνδρίας (ἀνδρείας G Mor.), etc. where the spelling ἀνδρεία is without foundation; see also G. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, 32 n. 1.

As regards the double spelling of certain forms advocated above we should be reminded that Plutarch's *Lives* were not composed in the order in which they are published and that on several occasions Plutarch refers to another Life as having already been composed. Thus in Theseus 27,8 he refers to his earlier composition of the Life of Demosthenes (c. 19) and *ibid.* 36,2 (c. 8) of Cimon's Life. In Per. 22,4 the author refers to Lys. (c. 16-17) as having been composed, and in Crass. 11,11 to Marcellus (c. 22); in Num. 9,15 he refers to Camillus' Life (c. 20, 4-8) and in Ages. 28,6 to the Life of Epaminondas as already written. Further information on this subject is to be found in Ziegler's article on Plutarch (*RE* XXI, 1951, 899 ff.); in C. Theander, *Zur Zeitfolge der Biographien Plutarchs*, *Eranos* 56, 1958, 12-20 and in C. P. Jones, *Towards a chronology of Plutarch's works*, *JRS* 56, 1966, 66-70. On the evidence available it would seem impossible to justify «uniformity» in spelling conventions of a certain Life as against some other Life, or a group of Lives as against some other group on grounds of chronological sequence.

Perhaps the most likely conclusion would be that there should be *whenever possible* some kind of uniformity in spelling throughout Plutarch's work. With the exception of cases where there is good evidence no variation should perhaps be allowed even where it is known that the spelling of a certain form fluctuates at Plutarch's time. If, for instance, Plutarch wrote ἀνδρεία in the Life of Theseus then it is reasonable to assume that he went on spelling ἀνδρεία, no matter whether the manuscript tradition gives ἀνδρεία or ἀνδρία.

If we had before us a *corpus* of texts coming from the pen of several authors then we might admit dual spellings and stick as closely as possible to our manuscript evidence for guidance of some sort. But as things now are we have, where feasible, to make up our minds whether we are going to write οὐδεις or οὐθείς, δυοῖν or δυεῖν, γίγνομαι or γίνομαι, θάλαττα or θάλασσα, ἀεῖ or αἰεῖ, though the last form belongs to a somewhat different class.

As regards the form οὐθείς it is well known that it appears in early 4th century B. C. and prevails in later Greek (see Meisterhans, *Gramm. der att. Inschr.*³, Berlin 1900, 258-259; Blass-Debrunner (tr. Funk), *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, Cambridge 1961, § 33 G. Grönert., *op. cit.*, 155-157) and that from the 1st cent. B. C. the older form οὐδεις came back into use. Οὐθείς did not, however, die out and Plutarch exhibits in his *Lives* comparatively few

examples which are so well embedded that it is very difficult to do away with it and in all probability they should stay in the text. Forty examples of οὔθεις were noted¹ thus examples with οὔδεις forming by far the greater majority, contrary to the text of e. g. Epictetus where the only form occurring is οὔθεις.

As regards the complex -ττ-/-σσ- both forms occur. This is not surprising as forms in -σσ- began under Ionic influence to replace Attic -ττ- quite early, and by 400 B. C. it is even found in the text of a treaty, whereas an author like Lysias has only 60 forms in -ττ- to 40 in -σσ-. See further Meisterhans³ p. 101-102; Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, § 81; Blass-Debrunner (tr. Funk) § 34 (1). Altogether forms in -ττ- are in the majority in the case of ἤττωμαι², θάλαττα³, πράττειν and its compounds⁴, ἤττων, ἐλάττων, κρείττων⁵, τάττειν and its compounds⁶, φυλάττω⁷, Θετταλία⁸ etc. This may perhaps be partly due to the influence of Plutarch's native tongue

1. Thes. 16,1 οὔθεν (οὔδεν A) where Sintenis gives οὔδεν; Nic. 27,5 μηθεις (μηδεις SY); Alc. 25,6 οὔθεν; Phoc. 19,1 οὔθεν (οὔδεν QFF^a); 26,3 μηθεν (μηδεν PZ); 27,8 μηθεν (μηδεν ZC); 34,8 οὔθεν (οὔδεν Z); Cat. ma. 8,3 μηθεν (μηδεν QZP²); *ibid.* μηθεν (μηδεν P); 11,6 οὔθεν; 21,5 μηθεν; 28,5 μηθεν (μηδεν Z); 30,10 οὔθεν; 37,9 μηθεν (μηδεν PQZ); 65,5 οὔθεν; 69,4 οὔθεν; 70,1 μηθεν; Brut. 57(4),4 μηθεν; Sert. 9,2 οὔθεν; Eum. 8,8 οὔθεις; Tit. 8,9 μηθεν; Alex. 2,5 οὔθεν; Demetr. 2,2 μηθεν (μηδεν); 12,8 μηθεν; 38,11 μηθεν; 43,3 οὔθεν; Ant. 18,2 οὔθεν (οὔδεν L); 22,1 οὔθεν (οὔδεν Π); 30,6 οὔθεν; 42,1 οὔθεν (οὔδεν App.); 83,2 οὔθεν (οὔδεν P); 84,6 οὔθεν; 90(3),3 οὔθεν; 91(4),2 οὔθεν; 91(4),3 οὔθεν; Mar. 23,1 μηθεν; 29,8 μηθεν (μηδεν LG²); 39,8 μηθεν; 40,6 οὔθεν; 46,3 μηθεν; Artax. 29,6 μηθεν; Ag. & Cl. 25(4),2 οὔθεν; Lyc. 6,5 οὔθεν (ἔθεν L); Lys. 12,7 οὔθεν; 26,6 οὔθεν. It is strange, however, to find the form οὔθεις as the only form in *Moralia*.

2. Forms in -σσ- noted: Pelop. 15,7 ἡσσωμένων; 17,10 ἡσσωμένου.

3. Forms in -σσ- noted: Philop. 14,2 ἐν τῇ θαλάσση; 14,3 τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν; Pelop. 15,1 τῆς θαλάσσης; 24,4 μέχρι θαλάσσης; Alex. 17,6 τὴν θάλασσαν; 24,4 τὰ πρὸς θαλάσση; 26,7 λίμνην τε πολλὴν καὶ θάλασσαν; 41,9 ἐπὶ θάλασσαν; 73,1 τῆς μεγάλης θαλάσσης; Caes. 38,3 εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν; 58,10 τῇ ... θαλάσση; 64,3 ἐπιὼν γῆν <τε> καὶ θάλασσαν; Demetr. 32,7 τῆς κατὰ Συρίαν θαλάσσης; Mar. 15,2 πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν; 35,12 ἐπὶ θάλασσαν; 39,7 ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν; Ag. 12,2 πολλὴν θάλασσαν; 12,3 μακρὰν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης; 27,4 ἐπὶ θάλασσαν; Artax. 2,5 ἐπὶ θαλάσση; 8,4 ἀπὸ θαλάσσης.

4. Forms in -σσ- noted: Philop. 12,1 ἐπρασσον; Pelop. 10,7 τῶν πρασσομένων; 32,4 ἐπρασσον; Alex. 24,6 τὰ πρασσομένα; Artax. 20,5 πρασσοντος.

5. Forms in -σσ- noted: Pelop. 27,4 κρείσسونι; Alex. 59,8 οὐκ ἐλάσσονα.

6. Forms in -σσ- noted: Pelop. 6,4 προστάσσοντα; Mar. 41,6 τὰ προστασσομένα.

7. Forms in -σσ- noted: Mar. 40,3 παραφυλάσσω.

8. Forms in -σσ- noted: Pelop. 26,1 Θεσσαλοῖς; *ibid.* 2 Θεσσαλοῖς; *ibid.* 4 Θεσσαλοῖς; Alex. 6,1 Θεσσαλοῦ; 10,2 4 Θεσσαλὸν (proper name); 24,2 Θεσσαλῶν; Caes. 41,7 Θεσσαλικὴν πόλιν; Demetr. 40,1 Θεσσαλίαν; *ibid.* 2 ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ.

as the Boeotian dialect agreed in this respect with the Attic dialect, see C. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, Chicago 1955, § 81. Likewise both forms *σήμερον* Caes. 39,8 and *τήμερον* 44,10 occur; Arat. 26,4 *ἄχρι τῆς τήμερον ἡμέρας*.

Another very complicate case is that of *γίγνομαι* / *γίνομαι* where the latter form is in the majority. The only cases noted where the *-γν-* form occurs are: Thes. 21,1 *γιγνομένην*; Rom. 18,4 *γίγνεται*; Them. 2,1 *γιγνώμενος* (*γενόμενος* Y); *ibid.* 7 *γίγνεσθαι* (*γίνεσθαι* Y); Arist. 15,2 *ἐγίγνοντο* (*ἐγίνοντο* Y); 17,6 *γιγνώμενον* (*γινόμενον* Y); 18,5 *γιγνώμενα* (*γινόμενα* Y); Cim. 18,5 *γιγνομένῳ* (*γιομένῳ* A); Per. 1,6 *γιγνώμενος*; 33,5 *τὰ γιγνώμενα* (*γινόμενα* Y); Nic. 11,1 *γιγνομένης*; Crass. 2,8 *γιγνομένην*; Cic. 20,4 *γιγνομένων* (*γιγνομένων* N *γιομένων* ante corr. N: *γενομένων* Y) where *γενομένων* would perhaps be acceptable; Phoc. 28,2 *γιγνομένη* (*γιομένη* P¹C); Dio 56,2 *ἐγίγνοντο* (*ἐγίνοντο* P¹C); Brut. 49,6 *γιγνώμενον*; Aem. 3,4 *γίγνοιτο* (*γίνοιτο* P); 12,6 *τὸ γιγνώμενον* (*γινόμενον* PC); 19,1 *γιγνομένης*; 25,7 *ἐγίγνετο* (*ἐγίνετο* P *ἐγένετο* Sint.); Pelop. 2,8 *τὸ περιγιγνώμενον*; 11,7 *τὸ γιγνώμενον* (*γινόμενον* KPC); Alex. 31,4 *τὸ γιγνώμενον*; 37,1 *γίγνεται*; 65,7 *γιγνώμενον* (*γινόμενον* Q); Caes. 8,5 *ἐγίγνετο*; 43,6 *γιγνώμενον*; Ant. 24,9 *τῶν γιγνομένων*; Mar. 37,6 *γίγνεσθαι* (*γίνεσθαι* L); 46,3 *τὰ γιγνώμενα* (*γιγνώμενα* G: *γινόμενα*); Arat. 37,2 *τὰ γιγνώμενα* (*γινόμενα* L); Ag. & Cl. 34 (13),1 *ἐγίγνετο* (*ἐγένετο* L¹); In several cases where forms in *γιν-* have been printed there are variants in the manuscripts in *γιν-*, e. g. Cat. ma. 22,4 *γινόμενα* (*γιγνώμενα* Y); Alex. 49,5 *γιομένου* (*γιγνομένου* ΛΜ *γεομένου* C). Ag. & Cl. 20,6 (Z.) *τὰ γινόμενα* (*γιγνώμενα* R), etc.

A similar case is that of *γινώσκω* / *γινώσκω* where, however, mostly forms in *γιν-* occur¹. Forms in *γιν-* noted: Philop. 14,6 *γινώσκων*; Pelop. 9,3 *γινώσκειν*; Alex. 19,7 *ἀναγινώσκοντος*; 23,3 *ἀναγινώσκων*; Caes. 11,5 *ἀναγινώσκοντα*; Demetr. 1,4 *γινώσκειν* (*γιγνώσκειν* P); Ant. 5,5 *ἀναγινώσχεσθαι*; 45,10 *ἐγίνωσκεν*; 47,2 *ἐγίνωσχε*; 58,6 *ἀνεγίνωσχε*; *ibid.* 11 *ἀναγινώσκειν*; 78,3 *ἀνεγίνωσκεν*; Pyrrh. 8,7 *γινώσκειν*; Mar. 37,11 *γινώσκων*; Arat. 1,5 *ἀναγινώσκοντες* (*ἀναγιγνώσκοντες* Π); T.G. 14,3 *γινώσκειν* (*γιγνώσκειν* Π).

1. In several cases where *γιν-* has been printed there are variants in *γιν-*: Arist. 1,4 *γινώσκουσιν* (*γιν-* Y); 24,7 *γινώσκειν* (*γιν-* Y); Cim. 18,7 *γινώσκει* (*γιν-* A); Caes. 10,8 *γινώσκειν* (*γιν-* HC) T.G. 33(12),8 *γινώσκοντες* (*γιν-* L); 35 (14),1 *γινώσκοντος* (*γινώσκοντος* L) Ages. 3,1 (Z.) *γινώσκειν* (*γιν-* Y), etc. For the doublets *γίγνομαι*/*γίνομαι* and *γινώσκω*/*γινώσκω* especially in papyri see G. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, 91-92. On the contrary in the new edition of the *Moralia* the form *γινώσκω* is nearly universal: exceptions noted: 377d *γινώσκουσιν*; 620e *γινώσκοντες*, *γινώσκοντι*; 621a *γινώσκων*; 754d *γινώσκοντας*. The same with *γίνεσθαι* with a few exceptions: 252d *γίγνεται*; 372b *γιγνώμενον*; 631c *γιγνομένην*; 890b *ἐγγιγνομένην*; 901b *τὸ γιγνώμενον*.

From such conflicting evidence undoubtedly no conclusion can be reached. One might be tempted to write everywhere γιγνώσκω as a result of Atticism on the part of Plutarch, but in view of the fact that the same inconsistency occurs in other authors, for instance in Epictetus and partly in contemporary inscriptions, one should refrain from doing so. In the case of γίγνομαι it should be noticed that forms retaining γιγν- are mostly infinitives, participles and optative forms, all of which were at this time slowly dying out and were perpetrated only in the written tradition.

Δυοῖν / δυεῖν is also obscure¹; δυεῖν is generally given² but the form δυοῖν was noted in a few cases: Rom. 21,6 δυοῖν; Crass. 1,1 δυοῖν; 27,2 δυοῖν (δυεῖν SY); 27,6 δυοῖν (δυεῖν SY); Cic. 14,6 δυοῖν (δυεῖν Y); Eum. 11,4 δυοῖν; Pelop. 9,3 δυοῖν; Caes. 2,2 δυοῖν ἀκολούθῳιν; Philop. et Tit. comp. 2,1 δυοῖν ἀγώνῳιν (from Thucydides?); Demetr. 2,1 δυοῖν υἱῶν (δυοῖν Pr.: δυεῖν KL); Lyc. 5. 14 (Z.) τοῖν δυοῖν βασιλείῳιν προστιθεμένῳιν. Puzzling are the variants occurring e. g. Sol. 32,2 δυεῖν (δυοῖν Y); Publ. 8,6 δυεῖν (δυοῖν Y); Crass. 8,2 δυεῖν (δυοῖν N); Demosth. 26,7 δυεῖν (δυεῖν N Phot.: δυοῖν YU); Pelop. 16,6 δυεῖν (δυοῖν PC); Caes. 2,3 δυεῖν (δυοῖν Q); 6,1 δυεῖν (δυοῖν C); 16,4 δυεῖν (δυοῖν C); 23,1 δυεῖν (δυοῖν C); 55,5 δυεῖν (δυοῖν C), etc. These examples perhaps show that the form δυοῖν was the work of several scribes.

Lastly ἀεῖ/αἰεῖ is a somewhat different case as αἰεῖ, an Ionic and older Attic form, may be accepted in quotations mainly from poetry (cf. e. g. Sol. 2,2) or when found in religious context. The following cases, however, are noticed where αἰεῖ is printed though ἀεῖ would be expected: Them. 3,1 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); 14,3 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); 23,5 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); 24,3 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); 28,6 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); Cam. 3,2 αἰεῖ; 7,5 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); Arist. 12,1 αἰεῖ; Fab. 5,2 αἰεῖ (ἀεῖ Y); Crass. 21,7 αἰεῖ (αἰεῖ O: ἀεῖ NSY); Lyc. 25,5 (Z.) αἰεῖ (αἰεῖ S: ἀεῖ L). It is odd that these examples come from a few lives, five examples occurring in the Life of Themistocles. This makes the form αἰεῖ suspect and it may well be that none of these forms of αἰεῖ are genuine³. See, however, A. S. Henry, *CIQ*, N. S. 17, 1967, 267.

Everywhere in the Lives the form μόλις is used, but Alex. 35,9 μόγις and Ag. and Cl. 42(21),3 (μόλις L) occurs⁴.

1. On the ambiguity concerning the forms δυοῖν and δυεῖν cf. «*Philetairos*» (ed. Dain) 225 Δυοῖν παρὰ Δημοσθένει ἀεῖ. Οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι δυεῖν λέγουσιν.

2. In *Moralia* II and IV only two cases of δυοῖν were noted: 667b and 754f. Of these the former is the result of emendation.

3. The editors of *Moralia* IV print everywhere ἀεῖ even emending αἰεῖ into ἀεῖ: 688a, 704b, 708f, 725a, 732d. However, in Diodorus Siculus though ἀεῖ is usually written there are a few examples of αἰεῖ.

4. Also in the *Moralia* μόγις occurs seldom, e. g. 277e μόγις ἀλῶναι; 356f

As the use of preposition εἰς is universal in Cam. 2,10 συνεστάλησαν ἐς τὰ τεῖχη (εἰς Y) should perhaps be συνεστάλησαν εἰς τὰ τεῖχη unless it is a stylistic variant¹.

In the above cases one finds oneself facing the difficult problem of choosing one of the two forms involved or keeping both as Ziegler does. Had the texts under examination where these variants occur been composed by several authors one might accept it without qualms. But as things are the issue becomes obscure. To assume that Plutarch wrote in general according to the conventions prevailing at his time i. e. γινώσκω γίνομαι δυεῖν μόλις αἰεὶ and that future scribes introduced sporadically the older forms γινώσκω γίνομαι δυοῖν μόλις αἰεὶ seems an over-simplification of facts. Though it seems paradoxical that Plutarch would be writing both forms in fact no decision can be reached on this delicate point without a meticulous re-examination of available manuscript tradition.

Since we deal with inconsistencies in forms we may refer to related inconsistencies in punctuation which though of little importance nevertheless are vexing to the reader. For instance besides the vacillation between forms such as Dacerius and Dacier² one may take the case of arbitrary use of diaeresis. The diaeresis as is well known is used to show that a vowel — usually ι or υ — is not combined with the preceding vowel into a diphthong e. g. Ἄχατα Ῥωμαϊκὸς Χαλδαῖστί, etc. It is not therefore indispensable in cases like Γάιος Caes. 46, 1 since the accent shows that the two vowels are kept separated and elsewhere Γάιος is printed, but Κοῖντιον Luc. 5,5 ; 33,6 *al.* should be Κοῖντιον, προιεμένου Rom. 16,2 should be προῖεμένου and προιεμένω Artax. 8,4 should also be προῖεμένω³, etc. Then why Πλαταιίδος Arist. 11,8 but Πλαταιίδα 18,1 ? In II 1 and II 2 we repeatedly meet with the forms Πομπήτος Γάιος etc. where the sign of diaeresis is unnecessary. As regards the υ of I 1 and I 2 it becomes ῖ in II 1 and II 2, for instance: Brut. 6,12 περιῖοντι; Tim. 18,1 διῖσταμένων; Caes. 49,5 περιῖστησιν, etc.

Unlike the obscure εἶργω and εἶργω which occurs in both forms there is perhaps no reason why the forms ἀθρόος and ἀθροῖζω should not be

μόλις ... ἐκτραφήναι. In Diodor. Sic. only the form μόλις is used according to the editor (see Diod., *Bibl. Hist.* rec. Fr. Vogel, 1 Lipsiae 1888, LXI) but 17.60,8 μόλις (μόλις F); 18,44,5 μόλις (μόλις Dind.); 20.66,4 μόλις (μόλις F).

1. In *Mor.* 773d we read: ἐμβαλόντες ἐς τι φρέαρ (εἰς Bn) where again εἰς is expected; 308d ἦκεν ἐς πατρίδα; 350e ἄρας ἐς Μαραθῶνα. Deliberate Ionicisms².

2. The form Dacerius occurs e. g. in I 1 Rom. 28,2; 29,1, but Dacier in Luc. 10,4; again Dacerius in I 2 e. g. Per. 33,8; Cor. 27,6 but in vol. II it becomes everywhere Dacier.

3. And in *Mor.* e. g. 279c προῖστάμενον (not προιστάμενον), 631b προῖέμενος (not προῖέμενος), etc.

written uniformly. Consistency in these forms is recently practised even by editors of Attic authors¹ and Ziegler usually does the same but with some exceptions; cf. e.g. Dio 40,2 ἄθροισθέντων; Brut. 14,1 ἄθροιοι; *ibid.* 5 ἄθροισθέντες; 17,3 ἄθροιοι; 18,10 ἄθροισθέντος; 25,5 ἄθροως; Aem. 31,3 ἄθροιοι; Sert. 16,9 ἄθροως. Πρᾶος, πραότης, πράως is the usual spelling (with a few exceptions noticed Nic. 12,5 πραότητα (app. crit.); Demetr. 19,9 and 23,5; 44,7 πράως; Ant. 71,7 πραοτέρας; 79,4 πραότατον; 83,6 πραοτέρου; Pyrrh. 8,8 πρᾶος; 11,8 and 13,11; 34,10 πράως; Mar. 8,2 πράως; Ar. 10,2 πρᾶος; 52,4 πράως; Artax. 1,1 πραότητι; 2,1 πραότερος; 4,4 πραότητα; 25,4 πρᾶον; 30,2 πρᾶος; 30,9 πρᾶος; Ag. and Cl. 20,5 πρᾶον; 22(1),4 πρᾶον; 23(2),6 πράω; T.G. 2,2 πρᾶος; 9,2 πραότερος; 19,4 πράως; inscriptions, however, give Πρᾶος (Athens 4th c. B. C. and Pergamum Roman times), Plut., *Mor.* 313d Ἀἴλιος Πρᾶος, Πραίχρα (Pagasai 3rd c. B. C.), Πράλλει (Arkaiphia, IG VII 2731 Add. (Arch.)), Πράχοος (Delphi c. 200 B. C.) and it may be found after careful examination that the forms employed by Plutarch are those without the subscript ι². See further Meisterhans³ 64,2; Blass - Debrunner (tr. Funk) § 26 and literature quoted there. Θραῖξ is constantly so written by Ziegler with one exception: Crass. 8,2 Θραῖκες. The last, in view of the fact that inscriptions³ contemporary to Plutarch give sometimes the form ΘΡΑΞ, it is not clear whether this is a deliberate variant in spelling or a misprint.

As regards accentuation Ziegler prints Εὐμένης throughout vol. II 1 and II 2 but Cat. ma. 8,12 Εὐμένους (εὐμενοῦς SY, em. Coraes) and Ant. 60,6 Εὐμένους with the note «*edebant Εὐμενοῦς sec. codd.*» Cf. *Mor.* 184a,b Εὐμένης with the note «*hic et infra Εὐμενης fere omnes: εὐγενής Φ.*» Then Phoc. 25,5 Λεονάτος (κλεονάτος vel κλεοννάτος hic PHMVb); Alex. 21,2 Λεοννάτον (λεονάτον ΛQ λεωνᾶτον P); Pyrrh. 16,14 Λεοννάτε; *ibid.* 12,15 Λεοννάτος, but the perhaps more correct accentuation is found in Eum. 3,4 *al.* Λεόννατον (λεοννάτον: corr. Latte cl. W. Schulze, lat. Eigennamen 32,44).

1. See e. g. K. Widdra, *Xenophontis de re equestri*, Lipsiae 1964, but see P. Chantraine, *Dict. étym.* s. v.

2. The editors of *Moralia* print throughout πρᾶος, etc. See also G. Crönert, *op. cit.* 50 n. 7.

3. See also A. S. Henry, CIQ, N.S. 17, 1967, 261.

4. Λεόννατος (read Λεόννατος) also in Dion. Hal. *Opuscula* 2,81,16 Usener - Raderm. (λεωνᾶτος cum productionis nota P λεωννάτος M λεωνάτος FV) Λεοννάτον Diodor. 17,37,3 (Λεονάτον RX; alioquin semper Λεοννάτος) but the correct accenting Λεόννατος is found at 16.94,4 (Λεόννατος F). Forms like Κάσανδρος, Κασάνδρα Ἀλικαρνασός which occur also in *Moralia* are perhaps scribal errors like cases in inscriptions where double consonants are simplified, see A. S. Henry, CIQ, N. S. 17, 1967, 276 (Μήδισα, Ἀλικαρνασεύς).

Likewise Κρατερός, Demosth. 28,2; Alex. 40,5; Demetr. 14,2, and not the now usually accepted Κράτερος. Problematic is also the form Κλεομένη e.g.: Ag. and Cl. 2,9 (Κλεομένη Fuhr.: κλεομένην), see p. 374 *app. crit.*, as forms in -ην occur many times with other names in -ης of third declension.

In Sol. 26,3 Αἰπεῖαν (αἰπεῖαν Y Et^M: ἔπειαν S) is given for Philokypros' capital in Cyprus. The form Αἰπεῖα is given also by Et^M 721, 47 which depends on Plutarch as it seems, but the correct accentuation is undoubtedly Αἴπειαν (cf. also Herodian. 1,274,41-43 Lentz). This is a well-known name of towns situated on the slopes of steep hills, as the name itself denotes. There was an Αἴπεια in Messenia mentioned by Homer (cf. also Strab. 8,360; Paus. 4,34,5) and another three are enumerated by Stephanus Byzantius s.v., the second one being that in Cyprus quoted by Eustath. 723,24 (Αἴπεια) (see also Oberhammer RE XII, 1, 1924, 95), nowadays τὸ Βουνίν, see e.g. JHS 48, 1928, 193-194. Demetr. 23,3 Κεγχρεάς (κεγχρεάς KLr¹: κεγχρείας P κεγχρειάς r²) should rather be Κεγχρεάς as in Arat. 23,5 Κεγχρεάς (κεγχρεάς G¹Π; κεγχρεάς G²L); 29,2 Κεγχρεάς (κεγχρεάς G¹R: κεγχρεάς G²PL). Ag. and Cl. 25(4),4 Βέλβιναν (Βέλβιναν Coraes: βελβίναν GR βελβι+ναν, β¹ in ras., P βελβῖναν L) may be right in spite of Hsch. β 478 Βελβίνα¹, if modern Βέρβενα is the same place-name². Demetr. 33,1 ἐν Ἴψω (ἐν Ἴψω L^t: ἐν Ἴψῶ L^m) should, as elsewhere (for instance, Pyrrh. 4,4 ἐν Ἴψῶ (ἐν Ἴψω R¹ ἐνίψω K)) read ἐν Ἴψῶ. Ant. 38,3 Φραάτα (πόλιν) (Φραάτα App. Anon.: φραάρτα codd. (φραάρτου K²; Πράασπα Cass. D. Steph. Byz. s. v. Φράασπα Steph. Byz. s. v. Φαράσπα Ptol. 6,2,10 Οὔερα Strab. 11,523)) should perhaps be Φράατα? As regards the «ethnic» Nic. 12,1 Αἰγεστέων and 14,3 Αἰγεστεῦσιν³ this spelling is surprising since, besides literature, the inscriptions give always Ἐγεσταῖοι. The Αἰγ- found also in Mor. 315d ἐν Αἰγέστη (ἐν ἐνγέστη Φ ἐνεπέστη (ss. αἰγέστη m²) F), 834d Αἰγεσταίους is perhaps due to later false connection of Ἐγεστα with proper names Αἰγέστης and Αἴγεστος.

Though the neuter of the adjective χαρίεις printed is generally χαρίεν yet in Sol. 24,3 the form χάριεν occurs; Marc. 21,2 τὸ χάριεν τοῦτο; Alex. 77,8 χάριεν ἦθος⁴. Several times the form ᾧ αὐτόκρατορ occurs (for instance,

1. Unfortunately *P. Oxy.* 1801,42 Βελ[βίν]α does not help, but Theognostos 100,31 gives Βέλβινα and thus W. Luppe, *Philologus* 111, 1967, 87.

2. See Ag. Tsopanakis, *Πελοποννησιακά* 3/4, 1958-1959, 396-400.

3. Αἰγεσταῖοι also in Ael. *V. H.* 2,33 sometimes Αἰγ- is corrected in Ἐγεσταῖοι (Αἰγεσταῖοι codd.) by the Teubner editor of Diodorus, but sometimes is left uncorrected 13,4.3 (Ἐγεσταῖοι Dobraeus); 6,1 (bis); 7,4; 43,1 (Ἐγεσταῖοι A plenumque), *al.*

4. So also *Mor.* 255b, 710f.

Crass. 17,2; Ant. 29,7 (αὐτοκράτωρ KL et e ras. R qui αὐτοκράτωρ habuerat); 64,3; Syll. 35,8 (Z.)¹ which should be corrected to ὦ αὐτοκράτωρ.

Concerning iotacism there is, as usually, a confusion in mss, for instance: Ἐπαμινῶνδας Ποτίδαια δημοκρατεία δουρίου ὑπατία ὑπερίδου ἀκαδημία καδμία ἡρείοις λυκίω ἀγγίτοις, etc. which Ziegler corrects. However, there are some inconsistencies: thus as regards Καλαυρεία the form Καλαυρία is in his 2nd edition throughout corrected except Pomp. 24,6 (Z.) Καλαυρία²; Alc. 13,8 ἑταιρίαν and Ages. 20,3 (Z.) ἑταιρίαν instead of elsewhere correctly adopted ἑταιρεία³. The -ει- is involved in the following examples: Cor. 30,1 τὰς λεγομένας Κλοιλίας τάφρους (κλοιλίας A: κλειλίας U: κοιλίας N); probably Κλοιλ<ε>ίας cl. Rom. 18,5 Κούρτειος λάκκος (Κούρτιος Dion. Hal.). Likewise at Marc. 27,5 τὸν Φλαμίνιον ἱππόδρομον should be printed τὸν Φλαμίν<ε>ιον ἱππόδρομον as in Luc. 37,3 τὸν Φλαμίνιον ἱππόδρομον and Cam. 29,6 τὴν Γαβινίαν ὄδον (Γαβινίαν Anon.: γαβίαν S σαβινίαν Y) should probably be Γαβιν<ε>ίαν ὄδον and in Mor. 280a Φλαμιν<ε>ίαν ὄδον as in Ar. 53,5 καὶ τόπον ἐξελεθμενοι περίοπτον... καὶ καλεῖται μέχρι νῦν Ἀράτειον (Ἀράτειον (cum Paus. 2,9,4) Reiske: ἀράτιον).

The case of προάστειον is much more complicate: Rom. 23,6 τὸ προάστειον; Crass. 1,5 προάστειον; Alc. 32,4 τῶν προαστείων; Cato mi. 48,1 τὸ προάστειον; Ar. 31,5 τὰ προάστεια, al.; Syll. 12,4 (Z.) προαστείων; 14,6 προάστειον; Pomp. 40,8 (Z.) τὰ προάστεια; but. Tim. 22,5 τοῖς προαστέιοις (προαστέιοις: corr. Ziegler); Sert. 6,8,13,7 τοῖς προαστέιοις (προαστέιοις: em. Ziegler); Demetr. 22,4 προαστίων (προαστείων codd.). It seems that in vol. II 1 the spelling switched to προάστιον. In spite of Herodianus II 573.13 Lentz (in *Gramm. Gr.* III 11) προάστειον; εἰ πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος γὰρ κλπ., the correct form may be προάστιον, see Dittenberger, OGIS 483,160 n. 60, G. Crönert, *op. cit.*, 317 and cf. Attic inscriptions which give the form προάστιον (for instance, *Hesperia* 29, 1960, 25 [προ]άστια init. s. IV; IG 11² 1191,19/20 τὸ προάστιον (a. 321/0). On the other hand Hellenistic Greek prefers in similar cases -εῖον in place of earlier -ιον, see Blass-Debrunner (tr. Funk) *op. cit.*, § 111(5). What Plutarch wrote we cannot know, but προάστιον is already in Polybius (IV. 78.9) and Diodorus (12. 68,3; 14.63,1).

1. Also Mor. 172b. As regards accentuation to read λαβέ (not λάβε) Mor. 173e.

2. Corrected is also in Mor. 295e by Bernardakis into Καλαύρειαν (καλαυρίαν codd.), but 846e,f, 851c the new editor prints Καλαυρίαν, Καλαυρία.

3. The form ἑταιρία is printed also by other editors, e.g. C.T. Fischer, *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica* vol. V, Lipsiae 1906, XIX 6.4 ἑταιρίας (ἑταιρείας F).—Ποτίδαια is also printed in *Moralia* 1117e 4: ἐν Ποτίδαίᾳ, and Diod. Sic. passim.

In the case of Συρακόσιοι¹ Ziegler, except where quotations are involved (for instance Eur. fr. 1 D. in Nic. 17,4), gives in I 1, 1 2 the form Συρακούσιοι; surprisingly in vol. II occurs Συρακόσιοι; e.g. Cat. mi. 53,4 Συρακούσιος (συρακουσίος codd.); Dio 3,1 Συρακοσίου (συρακοσίου L συρακουσίου PQ συρακουσίου Z; sic et deinceps) *al.* and so also in II 2, e.g. Marc. 8,11 τὸν Συρακοσίων (συρακουσίων Q) βασιλέα; 14,1 Συρακοσίων etc. Συρακόσιος now seems to have been the form chosen in the first edition by Ziegler; cf. e.g. Pyrrh. 9,2 Συρακοσίου (Συρακουσίου codd.); Ages. 27,2 (Z.) Συρακοσίου (συρακουσίου NL, συράκουσίου G)². Vacillation is perhaps unavoidable in the case of Dioscuri³: thus Thes. 31,1 and 32,6 Διοσκούροις; Aem. 25,2 Διοσκούρους (διοσκούρους KZC: διοσκόρους APQ); T. G. 2,1 Διοσκούρων; Pomp. 2,8 (Z.) Διοσκούρων (διοσκόρων N), but Cor. 3,5 Διοσκόρους (διοσκούρους Y) *al.*, also Num. 13,10 (Z.) τοὺς Διοσκόρους (διοσκούρους G); Lys. 12,1 (Z.) Διοσκόρους.

A somewhat related case: Rom. 28,4 Προικοννησίου (προικοννησίου AM); Alc. 28,3 Προικόννησον (προικόννησον UN sed ι alio atramento N προικόννησον (ι postea add. ν eras. A)⁴. But one may remark that the form Προικοννήσιος was firmly established, whereas the form Προικόν(ν)ησος originated in the false etymology from προῖξ προικός, see Et^M 689,13, and was prevalent in the Byzantine times as it seems, see e.g. A. Pertusi, *Const. Porfirogenito De Thematibus*, IV 9; XVII 36; yet cf. the acclamation Αὐξεί Προκόννησος τῷ αἰῶνι from a 16th c. mss, see Sp. P. Lambros, *Néos Ἑλληνομνημῶν* 1, 1904, 277n. 12. Finally a puzzling form occurs in Cam. 19,9 Καλχηδόνιοι (Καρχηδόνιοι: em. Unger) which I believe refers to the Carthagenians constantly elsewhere written Καρχηδόνιοι (cf. Cam. 19,7 Καρχηδόνιοι instead of this unique form). Plutarch is unlikely to refer at this point to the citizens of an obscure Calchedon⁵ in Bithynia, since he speaks

1. See also G. Crönert, *op. cit.* 94 n. 4.

2. Συρακόσιοι is also the form found in the *Moralia*, Diodorus Siculus and Aelianus.

3. Cf. Dittenberger, *OGIS* 346,4 [Διοσ]κουρίδης Διοσκορίδου and Διοσκορίδης Diod. 19,62,7.9; 19.68,4 elsewhere an admiral of Antigonos, though in Diodorus Διόσκοροι 4, 43,2 *al.* is the form occurring. Διοσκόρων *Res Gestae* § 20. Cf. also *Philetairos* (ed. Dain) 44 Οἱ Διόσκοροι σὺν τῷ υ δταν πληθυντικῶς λέγονται τῷ Διοσκώρῳ δὲ ἐν τῷ δυικῷ ἀριθμῷ ἄνευ τοῦ υ. Moiris s.v. "Ἀνακες καὶ Ἀνάκιον Ἀττικοί, Διόσκοροι καὶ Διοσκορεῖον Ἑλληνας. Διόσκορος is the usual form of a common name in the papyri, see Pr. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch Griechischen Urkunden aus Ägypten* 2,230 and G. Crönert, *op. cit.* 130 n. 2.

4. So Diod. 13, 49,6 Προικόννησον.

5. Its people in Plutarch are Χαλχηδόνιοι, cf. e.g. *Mor.* 302e ταῖς Χαλχηδονίαις though the form Καλχηδόνιοι = Χαλχηδόνιοι occurs elsewhere, cf. e.g. Polyb.

about nations or famous cities (Boeotians, Persians and Greeks, Athenians, Persians, Carthaginians, Trojans, Greeks etc.). The same confusion between Καλχηδών - Καλχηδών e.g. in Arriani *Scripta Minora et Fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1968, Roos - Wirth, p. 211,17.212,7.212,21.

As regards ρρ/ρσ it seems that the latter is preferred in accordance with Atticistic (?) tendency¹. In the case of θάρσος —cf. for this form also E-pictetus and see G. Crönert, *op. cit.*, 133 n. 2—: e.g. Fab. 29,4 καὶ θράσος² γεννᾶ καὶ θάρσος ἀφαιρεῖται; Rom. 18,9 θάρσος; Cam. 41,6 τὸ θαρσεῖν; Arist. 15,4 θάρσους; 16,5 θάρσος; Philop. 9,10 θάρσος; Pelop. 15,7 θάρσος; Caes. 7,7 θάρσους; 44,10 θάρσους; 58,4 θάρσος; Ant. 7,6 θάρσος; Mar. 46,6 θάρσος; Syll. 20,5 (Z.) θάρσος; Otho 12 (S.) θάρσος, etc. Noteworthy form Pelop. 22,2 πυρσότατον (adv.) a form called by LSJ s. v. as tragic and Dorian.

Otherwise usually the Attic forms in ρρ are preferred, e.g. Philop. 11,4 τῷ θαρρεῖν and 12,1 τὸ θαρρεῖν; Pelop. 1,9 θαρραλεωτάτους, 9,13 παραθαρρύννας; Caes. 67,3 θαρραλέοι; Ages. 38,2 (Z.) θαρρύνοντος (θαρσύνοντος NL θρασύναντος G); Pomp. 8,6 (Z.) θαρραλέον (θαρσαλέον Y) etc.— Exceptions noted: Luc. 9,7 ἀνεθάρσησαν; Caes. 44,9 ἐπιθαρσύνοντα; *ibid.* 10 θάρσους; Arat. 10,4 ἀναθαρσοῦσα. Also Caes. 9,7 ἄρρην; T. G. 1,4 ἄρρην.

We now turn to some Latin forms in Plutarch's *Lives*, mainly proper nouns and place - names. For the use of Latin in general in Plutarch's work see A. Sickinger, *De linguae latinae apud Plutarchum*, diss. Friburgi Brigoviae 1883; further bibliography will be cited below where necessary.

Though the accentuation of Latin personal names in their hellenized form may vary³ yet a few examples noteworthy for the place of accent are first mentioned; Luc. 1,7 Σισεννᾶν (τισεννᾶν A) should perhaps be Σισένναν according to the Latin rule and occurrences elsewhere, see W. Schulze, *Zur Gesch. Latein. Eigenn.*, Berlin 1933, 94; cf. Luc. 19,9 Μουρήνας; Cat. min. 21,4 Μουρρήναν, *al.*; Sert. 15,5 Περπένας *al.*, Otho 5 (S.) Σπουρίναν, etc. The explanation for this kind of error on the part of Greek scribes is that they accented the last syllable following the practice employed in Greek personal names like Μιλτᾶς Ἀχιλλᾶς (Caes. 49,4, Pomp. 77,3 (Z.)) Ἀλεξᾶς

IV 39.5 ἄρχει δὲ τοῦ στόματος ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς Προποντίδος τὸ κατὰ Καλχηδὸνα διάστημα καὶ Βυζάντιον ... cf. *ibid.*, 43.8 ἐφ' ἧς ἐστὶ Καλχηδών, *al.* Marmor Parium B 13 περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ Καλχηδονίων; Diod. 20, 111,3 ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ στόμα τοῦ Πόντου παραγενόμενος πρὸς τὸ Καλχηδονίων ἱερῶ στρατοπεδεῖαν περιεβάλετο.

1. Cf. Moiris θάρρος Ἀττικοί, θάρσος Ἑλληνας.

2. Cf. Ammon., *de adf. voc. differ.* 233 Nickau θράσος καὶ θάρσος διαφέρει: θράσος μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄλογος ὄρμη, θάρσος δὲ ἔλλογος ὄρμη.

3. See Blass - Debrunner (tr. Funk), *op. cit.*, § 41(3).

'Αρτεμᾶς 'Ερμᾶς 'Ιωνᾶς, etc., but the form Σισεννᾶν does not as it seems fall in this category¹.

Forms like Cam. 38,2 Τουσκλανῶν (gen. pl.) <Lat. Tusculanus or Aem. 20,4 Μαρρουκινῶν (-ῶν Xyl. ex. Liv. 44,40,5: ῥακινῶν vel ῥακηνῶν libri); Sert. 6,1 Νωρβανοί; Caes. 20,1 Σηκουανοῖς², seem problematic since they ignore Latin prosody. A likely explanation of these forms is that they (Τουσκλανῶν, Σηκουανῶν) were regulated after forms like Λευκολλιανοί κῆποι Luc. 39,2; οἱ Πομπηϊανοί 42,7; Μαργιανοῦ σιδήρου Crass. 24,1; Φρεγγελλανοί Marc. 29,15; Μαριανούς Mar. 13,2, which were in turn regulated analogically after Greek adjectives like ἰκ-ανός πιθ-ανός στεγ-ανός, etc. It seems that a few nouns were regulated after these adjectives, e. g. Γελλιανόν Galba 9 (S.) from Lat. Gellianus³, but otherwise they are accented according to Latin prosody (cf. the examples given above) and only forms ending in -άτης denoting the people of a town, like Φειδηνατῶν πόλις Publ. 22,8; πρέσβεις Παρμητῶν Mar. 27,7 are accented in the last syllable, that is analogically to Greek nouns of first declension.

The case of Ἄκρων Rom. 16,2, Ἄκρωνος Rom. 16,4 and Marc. 8,6, Ἄκρωνα Rom. 16,7 and 30(1),4 *al.* <Lat. Acro -onis-; Κάρβων Pomp. 5,4 (Z.), Κάρβωνος 6,3 *al.* <Lat. Carbo -onis; Κουρίωνα Caes. 31,2, Κουρίωνος Ant. 2,4.5 and elsewhere, Syll. 14,11 (Z.) Κουρίωνος, *ibid.* 12. Κουρίων <Lat. Curio -onis; Λουκούμωνος Cam. 15,5.6 <Lat. Lucumo -onis; Λίβωνα Ant. 7,3; Καπίτωνα Ant. 36,2; Στόλων Cam. 39,6 *al.*; Βουτεῶνα Fab. 9,4; Κουλέωνος Tit. 18,2; Κάτωνος Tit. 18,3 *al.*, etc. is different as we have here a form which is definitely hellenized after the Greek names Ἄγων -ωνος, Γέλων -ωνος, Τρύφων -ωνος, Γλόκων -ωνος, Θέων -ωνος etc.

Galba 25 (S.) Μαρτίαλις <Lat. Martiālis should be accented on the

1. Forms like Mar. 32,4 Βόκχος ὁ Νομάς (ὁ νομᾶ L¹G²) should perhaps follow the Greek examples and be accented Νομᾶς, cf. *Mor.* 268b Νομᾶς (Νουμᾶς Ω) and elsewhere.

2. Now Σηκουανῶν also in Mar. 24,7 (σηκουάνων G¹: σικουανῶν G²PKL).

3. The ending -ιανός, -ιανᾶ (the latter especially frequent in place-names) was in the end regulated by analogy to Greek adjectives. Forms therefore, like Αὐριλιᾶνα Βερεδιᾶνα, both names of castles occurring in Procopius (see Procopii Caesariensis *Opera omnia*, rec. J. Hauray, vol. IV Index Nominum) and many other found there, cannot be correct. Forms like Βαλεντινιᾶνα Βαλεριᾶνα etc. seem to follow the Latin accentuation, but perhaps we should accent Βαλεντινιᾶνα Βαλεριᾶνα etc. Otherwise forms like Ἄγκυριανᾶ Ἄργικιανόν Ἄρκαδιανᾶ Βαλλεσιανᾶ etc. being in the majority show that by Procopius' time the accent had perhaps settled analogically on the last syllable. Otherwise V. Beševliev, *Die Lateinische Herkunft der Kastellverzeichnisse bei Procop.* *Hommages à Marcel Renard I*, Bruxelles 1969, 94-98, especially p. 98.

penultimate according to Latin prosody *Μαρτιᾶλις*¹. Publ. 18,2 Ἄρροντος would suggest a nom. Ἄρρων (which occurs elsewhere, see *RE* II 1895, 1261), but *ibid.* 19,6 Ἄρρων (ἄρρων Y, ἄρρους mor.) is given which probably suggests a nominative Ἄρρους Lat. Aruns². Other forms present a mixture or combine characteristics of both languages, e.g. Num. 8,11 Τακίταν . . . σιωπηλὴν ἢ ἐνεάν; Rom. 14,3 κώνσουλας but κωνσοῦλας Dion. Hal. *A. R.* 4,76,2; Rom. 13,2 ποπούλους (nom. sing.) <populus; Marc. 3,1 Ἴνσομβρες and 4,2 Ἴνσομβρας, but *ibid.* 6,3 Ἴνσόμβρους, etc.

Noteworthy cases of transliteration of Latin forms are: Rom. 1,2 ἰδρυθέντας (sc. τοὺς Τρῶας) περὶ τὸ Παλλάντιον with irrational nasal but later on 18,7 Παλάτιον (παλάντιον UA); 20,5 Παλατίου (παλαντίου codd.); Publ. 20,2 ἐν Παλατίῳ (ἐν τοῖς παλατίοις Y) *al.*; perhaps Παλάτιον which occurs in Diodorus — together with Παλλάντιον (Παλάντιον v.) 15,59,2 — is the only legitimate form from Latin Palatium. Rom. 9,4 Ῥώμην κουαδράταν (κουαδράταν UA: κουαδράτην vel κουαδράτων cet.) it seems that the suffix -αν is taken after the Greek as long, whereas on other occasions it is regarded as short, e.g. Num. 12,2 Λιβίτιναν (Λιβίτιναν Steph. δυβίταιναν, sed. s. s. ου m. 1, S οὐβίδαιναν G οὐβιδιναν L¹ λιβιδαιναν L²); Cam. 5,1 Ματοῦταν <Lat. Matuta; 36,9 Μονῆταν <Lat. Moneta and Dttb. *Syll.*³ 794,2 [Ἴου]ἴαν Τορκουᾶταν, whereas the hellenized form would be κουαδράτην cf. e.g. Rom. 17,1 Φιδήνην <Lat. Fidena; 24,2 Φερεντίνης πύλης; Ant. 17,2 Μυτίνην <Lat. Mutina; Num. 10,8 Κολλίνην πύλην; Otho 7 (S.) Κρεμώνην, Κρεμώνη³ etc. In the case of Fab. 6,1 τὸ Κασινάτον should be accented Κασινᾶτον⁴ cf. agrum Casinatem Liv. 22,13,5 and Brut. 49,3 Καμουλάτος (καταμουλάτος Q); in Galba 14 (S.) Ὀνωράτος should be Ὀνωρᾶτος <Lat.

1. Though in inscriptions the form *Μαρτιάλης* does occur, see T. Eckinger, *Die Orthographie latein. Wörter in griech. Inschr.*, München 1893, p. 49. For the περισπώμενον cf. *Mor.* 278c Ῥουμινᾶλιν (ῤουμᾶναλιν O corr. Bernardakis). Relevant is Diodor. Sic. 14,78,1 Ῥηγούλος for which one would expect Ῥήγουλος and *ibid.* 12,53,1 Πραιτέξτατον for which Πραιτεξτᾶτον would be expected.

2. Ἄρρους is preferable to Ἄρρουνς Dion. Halic. *A. R.* 4,28,2 and elsewhere. The form Ἄρρους occurs also in *Mor.* 250e.

3. Cf. also Λιβιτίνην of Aphrodite *Mor.* 269b; Dion. Halic. *A. R.* 4,15,5. Cf. also Photius, *Bibliothèque* (R. Henry), 6,160 (codex no. 244) where the forms *Μοργαντίνην* and *Μοργαντῖναν* occur.

4. Procopius' (ed. Hauriy) Ἀρμάτος (proper name) should be Ἀρμᾶτος; cf. the forms which occur there: Βαρβᾶτος, Δονᾶτος, etc. In Polyb. VI 23,1 ἀστάτοι should have as nom. ἀστᾶτοι (not ἄστατοι LSJ *Supl.* s. v.) <Lat. hastatus. In Cagnat, *Inscr. gr.* etc. 3,4, 1206 Φλωριανὸς ἄστατος (Jerus.) should be ἀστᾶτος. Likewise τὸ φοσσᾶτον (not φόσσατον LSJ s. v.) <Lat. fossatum. Also *Mor.* 768b Σινᾶτον should be Σινᾶτον as suggested by Bernardakis at 257e. Cf. e.g. *ibid.* 965 c. d. Ὀπτᾶτον, Ὀπτᾶτε.

Honoratus and Caes. 41,3 Τουσκλάνον (τουσκλάνων PHQL² Ταῦσκλον Ziegler cl. Cat. mai. 1,1 Luc. 39,4.43,4 Cic. 40,3.47,1 sed cf. et Pomp. 67,5) should be Τουσκλᾶνον.

Rom. 27,5 *al.* Σκηπίων -ος <Lat. Scipio where η for ι is puzzling (wrongly associated with σκήπτω -σκήπτρον?), but elsewhere the usual form Σκιπίων occurs, e. g. Brut. 6,10 Σκιπίωνα (σκηπίωνα QZL²P²); Aem. 2,5 Σκιπίωνι (σκηπίωνι K¹QZL²); 5,1 Σκιπίωνα (σκηπίωνα PQZK²) *al.*; Tit. 3,3 Σκιπίωνος (σκηπίωνος C), etc. The opposite is the case with φητιαλεῖς: Cam. 18,1 φητιαλεῖς (φητιαλεῖς Y) twice; Num. 12,4 φητιαλέων (φητιαλίων, corr. Sint.); *ibid.* 5 φητιαλεῖς (φητιάλιοι codd., corr. Sint.); <Lat. fetiales, where ι for e is probably due to influence of the ι in the second syllable and one would expect φητιάλεις as in other authors, e. g. Dion. Halic. *A.R.* 6,89,1 Φητιάλεις (φητιάλεις ABb φητιάλεις Ba) and elsewhere *Res Gestae* § 7 etc. Rom. 3,2 Νομήτωρ <Lat. Numitor is also puzzling though it occurs in inscriptions cf. Eckinger, *op. cit.*, 53-54; cf. also Publ. 16,1 *al.* Πορσίνναν (Πορσέννας) Tzetz. Chil. = Cass. D. lib. 4 init. (Boiss.) πορσίνναν Y (sic semper) Porsenam Livius <Lat. Porsenna. The opposite occurs elsewhere i. e. Δομέτιος <Domitius, Τεβέριος <Tiberius in Polybius.

Contrary to the usual practice (namely η <è) in Cam. *passim* we constantly meet with the form Φαλέριοι <Lat. Falerii for which cf. Eckinger, p. 26 f. In Cam. 22,6 twice Παπείριος (<Lat. Papius) we have a case of iotacism as it seems, but in Aem. 5,1.5 Παπιρία (παπυρία Z) is the name of Aemilius' first wife; this with the spelling Παπίριος which occurs in inscriptions¹ shows that perhaps Παπίριος should be written throughout as in the *Moralia* 325 f.

In the case of Norbanus there is at present confusion: Syll. 27,9.11 both Sintenis and Ziegler write Νορβανός but Νορβανοί Sert. 6,1 and Νορβανόν Brut. 38,2; probably the latter spelling should be adopted everywhere.

E for i (as in the well-known case of λεγεών <Lat. legio, cf. Eckinger, *op. cit.*, p. 29 ff. and 37 f.) does occur, e. g. Rom. 21,2 κάρμενα (κάρμινα Steph.) <Lat. carmina; Stephanus' suggestion should in all probability be accepted. cl. *Mor.* 278c τὰ γὰρ ἔπη «κάρμινα» καλοῦσιν and Dion. Hal. *A.R.* 1,31,1 τὰς μὲν γὰρ ᾠδὰς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι κάρμινα. In the case of Brundisium it seems that the editor prefers the form Βρεντέσιον throughout rejecting the alternative Βρεντήσιον, but in a similar case, namely Capitolium, the usual form accepted is Καπιτώλιον (with the variant καπε - in some mss), though in Brut. 18,7 and elsewhere the form Καπετώλιον occurs.

1. The spelling Παπείριος occurs also in inscriptions, see Eckinger *op. cit.* p. 43 and 44. In Diodorus *passim* the spelling Παπείριος and Παπερία 31,27,3 (Loeb) should be corrected.

U before muta + liquida is usually represented by *o* with few exceptions: thus Crass. 9,5 Πούπλιος <Lat. Publius, elsewhere Πόπλιος, cf. Eckinger, *op. cit.* p. 62¹. In other cases *u*=*u*, e. g. Cic. 29,3 Τύλλου *al.* <Lat. Tullus; Cat. mi. 27,3 Μινυκίου (Μινυκίου Steph.: μινικίου codd., Μινουκίου Anon.) <Lat. Minucius (see Eckinger, *op. cit.* p. 65-67); Caes. 12,1 Λυσιτανούς (λουσιτανούς L²) <Lat. Lusitani; *ibid.* 18,1 Τιγυρίνους (τηγυρίνους vel -ρινούς PC, item *ibid.* 2) <Lat. Tigurini, but *ibid.* 22,5 Σούγαμβροι <Lat. Sygambri; Ant. 17.2 Μυτίνην <Mutina; Rom. 26,3 αἱ τε ῥάβδοι βάκιλα καλοῦνται (βάκυλα vulg.) <Lat. bacula (neut. pl.) should perhaps read βάκλα² as the complex *ul* + vowel following a smooth mute usually becomes *λ* + vowel in Greek; cf. e. g. Cat. ma. 1,1 Τούσκλου <Lat. Tusculum; Mar. 14,14 Κάτλον *al.* <Lat. Catulus; Ant. 78.1 *al.* Προκλήιος <Lat. Proculcius; Pyrrh. 21,7 Ἄσκλον *al.* <Lat. Asculum; Caes. 41,3 Τουσκλάνον <Lat. Tusculanum cf. Pomp. 67,5 (Z.) Τουσκλάνω Numa 5,2 (Z.) Πρόκλος Πρόκλω *al.* <Lat. Proculus, etc. and see Eckinger, *op. cit.* 74-75. Numa 22,2 (Z.) Ἰάνοκλον <Lat. Ianiculum perhaps should read Ἰάνικλον (?), a form which occurs in Dion. Hal., *A.R.* 1,73,3 and 2,76,6 whereas at 3,45,1 Ἰανίκολον ἕρος; *ibid.* 3,47,3 τὸ καλούμενον Ἰανίκολον whereas in Mar. 42,4 Ἰανοῦκλον ἕρος (ιαννοῦκλον ΠΚ ιαννούκαλον L^m m²) and Publ. 16,4 Ἰανούκλω (ιανούκλω S (Dion. Hal.): τείχει Y, et. s. s., dein eras. S; cf. Flor. 1,4 (10)) is another unexpected form; see, however, Eckinger, *op. cit.*, p. 39 f.

V is usually equivalent to *ou* e. g. Rom. 3,3 Σιλουίαν <Lat. Silvia, Caes. 37,2 Σερουτίον <Lat. Servilius, *ibid.* 61,8 Φλάουιος <Lat. Flavius etc. cf. Eckinger, p. 82-85, but at other times *β* is used instead of *ou* e. g. Rom. 16,6 Βάρρων <Lat. Varro, Fab. 1,4 Ὀβικούλας (ὀβικούλας S: οἱ ὀκούλας U¹ ὀβικούλα s.s. U² δουικούλας MA); Mar. 28,8 Οὐαλλέριον δὲ Φλάκον <Lat. Valerius Flaccus, etc. but Rom. 9,4 Ἀβεντίνου; 20,6 Ἀουεντί-

1. The form therefore Ἰογούρθαν (bis) *Mor.* 806d and Syll. 3,1 (Z.) is unexpected; Ἰουγούρθαν (?) cf. T. G. 39 (18),1 Ἰουγούρθαν and Lat. Iugurtha. But cf. T. G. 8,7 Σπόριον <Lat. Spurius; 21,7 Νομαντία and Νομαντίων *Mor.* 201e, Νομᾶς *ibid.* 1125d and similar forms elsewhere, e. g. Polybius and Diodorus, Σολπίκιος, Σπόριος, Λοκρήτιος, etc.

2. Unaccented vowels were omitted through syncopation when they immediately followed the stressed syllable. This is true of spoken Latin (cf. the forms *oculus*, *speculum* etc. A form βάκιλα would assume a Latin form *baquila*, but Latin *-qui-* was in Greek rendered by *-κυ-*, e. g. *Aquila* > Ἀκύλας, etc. The form βάκλον occurs in glossaries, cf. e. g. Gloss. Philox. *fustis*: ῥάβδος βάκλον and the diminutive βάκλιον *bacillum* (h. e. *baculum*) CGL 2,255,7 (Goetz). For M. Greek forms, besides the Cypriot βάκλα, see e. g. Meyer, *Neugriech. Studien* 3,13; G. Rohlf's, *Etym. Wört. d. unterital. Gräzität*, Halle 1930, p. 26 and Ἰστορ. Λεξικόν s. v. βάκλο.

νου ('Αουεντίνου Muret : λουεντίνου); 23,3 'Αουεντίνω (ἀουεντίνω M: αύν-
τίνω UA cf. *ibid.* 20,6), Num. 15,3 (Z.) 'Αβεντίνον; Pyrrh. 25,2 πόλιν Βε-
νεουεντόν (βενεουεντόν KL²: βενεβεντόν G βενεούεντον Π βενεντόν L¹) etc.
Cf. Eckinger, *op. cit.* p. 15-16 & 85-87. In view of the fact that *v* is ren-
dered usually by β when at the beginning of the word or between vowels,
whereas it is rendered by *ou* after or before a consonant, one may ask whether
forms like Φλάουτος, Βενεουεντόν and 'Αουεντίνου should be printed Φλά-
βιος, 'Αβεντίνου, Βενεβεντόν respectively. Contrary e. g. Pomp. 29,4 (Z.)
'Οκτάουτον one would expect 'Οκτάβιον etc.; likewise Ant. 11,2 'Οκταουία-
νόν (ὀκταλουνον I¹ γρ ὀκταιουανόν L^m). But there is a great inconsistency
on this point in the mss (e. g. Βήιοι and Ούήιοι) and one should refrain
from altering the forms in similar cases. At Crassus 11,11, however, δούαν
(ὄβαν Marcell. 22,1) should rather be δουαν.

Everywhere Latin *ae* seems to be represented in Greek by *αι* and Zie-
gler did well to write Rom. 16,2 Κκινινητῶν (κενινητῶν libri, Καινηνητῶν
Zon.) since the Latin form is *Cae-* and only occasionally *Ce-*. This should apply
also to Cic. 7,6 Κεκίλιος¹ though elsewhere we have Καικίλιος for instance
Demetr. 3,2 Καικίλιος (κεκίλιος Y), Pomp. 2,8 (Z.) Καικίλιον (κεκίλιον NL)
<Lat. Caecilius. It is good that in his second edition Ziegler accepts Καικι-
λίου in Mar. 4,1 (καικιλίου Π και κιλίου K κεκίλιου L κεκιλλίου G) and 7,1
Καικίλιος (καικίλιος P¹R και κίλιος K κεκίλιος GLP²) like Καικιλιάν Syll.
6,18 (Z.); therefore in Luc. 1,1 should also be Καικιλία <Lat. Caecilia (not
Κεκίλια which Ziegler prints. On this point see Dittenberger, *Hermes* 6,
1872, 139-141; A. Sickinger, *op. cit.* 11; Eckinger *op. cit.* 31-32; D. A.
Russell, *Longinus, «On the Sublime»*, Oxford 1964, 59; W. Sydney Allen,
Vox Latina, Cambridge 1965, 60. Likewise Caes. 26,5 τὸ τῶν 'Εδούων ἔθνος
(αἰδούων Q) the spelling Αἰδούων should be accepted cl. Lat. Aedui. That
manuscript tradition is not reliable in this respect even as regards Greek
words can be seen in Sert. 17,6 Καικίαν (κεκίαν L¹P¹) where a Greek word
καικίας undergoes this kind of change and Cam. 8,6 Λιπαρῶν where *Λιπα-
ραίων* should be written cl. Steph. Byz. s. v. Λιπάρα *al.*². On the transcription
of *ae* with *ε* in mss cf. also Cam. 14,2 Καίδικιος (κεδίκιος Y καίδικος Zon.);
Cic. 50(1),4 Καίλιου Wyt. (κελίου Ald. κεκίλιου libri), Otho 5 (S.) *al.* Κε-
κίνας. At Sull. 9,10 (Z.) τὸν λόφον τὸν Αἰσχυλῖνον <Lat. Esquilinus one would
expect 'Ησχυλῖνον as in Strab. 5,234 ('Ισχυλῖνος in Dion. Hal., *A.R.* 4.13,2),
but the Greek form by which Esquilinus was rendered was not steady.

In cases where two or more letters are involved the transcription be-

1. And to *Mor.* 318b; but *Mor.* 832e Καικίλιος (κεκίλιος Π).

2. See also Ziegler, *RE* XIII, 1, 1926, 719.

comes complicate: thus λλ <nl, e. g. Μάλλιος passim <Lat. Manlius¹; -ns- usually becomes -σ-, e. g. Cic. 7,8 *al.* Ὀρτησίου; Caes. 32,3 Ὀρτησίῳ; Ant. 22,6 Ὀρτήσιον twice) <Lat. Hortensius, but as in inscriptions the form Ὀρτήνσιος occurs now and then. On the other hand the termination -ήσιος, the hellenized form of -e(n)sis following ethnica in -ήσ(σ)ιος which belong to names of cities in -ησσός, was not as it seems completed by this time for all cases and Plutarch quotes in Rom. 20,2 the forms Ῥαμνήνησος <Lat. Ramnenses, Τατιήνησος <Lat. Tatienses, Λουκερήνησος <Lat. Luce-rensens. Cf. also Sickinger, *op. cit.* 19; Eckinger, *op. cit.* p. 113 and 115-116 where he formulates the norm «n vor s fällt aus».

In other cases the double consonants of the Greek form cannot be accounted for from the normal Latin form and perhaps some of these forms are suspect but as this phaenomenon no doubt reflects the instability in the pronunciation of Latin words in Greek no hard and fast editorial policy can be drawn; Publ. 3,4 Ἀκυλλίων (gen. pl.) i. e. Ἀκυλλίων (ἀκυλλίων S¹ ἀκυλλίων S², Y cf. *ibid.* 4,1); 4,1 Ἀκυλλίους, Ἀκυλλίων; 5,1 Ἀκυλλίων; *ibid.* 2 Ἀκυλλίους; 7,1 Ἀκυλλίους <Lat. Aquilius² (as e. g. Ἀκουίλιος *Hesperia Suppl.* V 86,4.33 *al.*); Cic. 27,2 Ἀκύλλιον (Ἀκύλλιον Xyl.: ἀκυλλίον N ἀκυλίον Y); Cat. min. 43,7 Ἀκύλλιον and Mar. 14,11 Ἀκύλλιον, but Cat. ma. 12,1 Ἀκίλιῳ; Tit. 15,2 Μάνιον Ἀκίλιον; Caes. 16,2 Ἀκίλιος; Syll. 12,9 (Z.) Ἀκύλιον. Elsewhere we meet with νν <n or λλ <I³: Cat. min. 53,2.4 Ἀσίνιον (ἀσίνιον I¹P¹, item 53,4) <Lat. Asinius, but Ant. 9,2 Ἀσίνιου and *ibid.* 3 Ἀσίνιον *al.*; Cat. min. 65,10 *al.* Στατύλλιος <Lat. Statilius; Brut. 12,3 Στα<τύ>λλιον, Στα<τύ>λλιος (Στατύλλιον Zie. cl. Cat. min. 65.66.73 et infra 51,5.6: στάλλιον codd., edebant Στατίλιον cum Xyl.); Brut. 39,10.11 (S.) Ἀτίλλιος, but Ziegler prints Ἀτέλλιος (ἀτίλλιος AC Cor. Γέλλιος Zie. cl. Cass. D. 47,24,3-6; sed cf. Cichorius *Röm. Stud.* 245) <Lat. Atilius but Cat. min. 7,3 Ἀτίλιαν; Num. 20.2 (Z.) Ἀτίλιου and Brut. 50,1 *al.* Λουκίλλιος <Lat. Lucilius. Cat. min. 21,4 *al.* Μουρρήναν, Μουρρήνα (μουρρήναν LPQ μουρρήναν P² μουρίναν CF μουρρήναν vel μουρρίναν Z) <Lat. Murena. Luc. 33,3 Σαλλούστιος <Lat. Sallustius. Cam. 39,1 *al.* Λικινίου <Lat. Licinius, but Aem. 9,2 Λικίνιον (λικίνιον Λ) and again *ibid.* 38,5 Λικίνιος (λικίνιος PKZ): cf. also Crass. 1,4 Λικινία, Λικινία and *ibid.* 5 Λικινίαν (λικινία N: λικινία U (ν m¹) λικινία A) *al.*; Crass. 7,8 Σικίνιος <Lat. Sicinius. Likewise σσ <s: Thes. 1,1 Σόσσιε; Demosth. 1,1 Σόσσιε (σόσιε ex σώσιε corr. N: σόσσιε Y); Ant. 34,10 Σόσ-

1. The transcription vacillates also in other authors, e. g. Diodor. Sic. 15, 22,1 Αὔλον Μάλλιον but 15,35,3 Μᾶρκος Μάνλιος.

2. On the transliteration of -qu- in Greek see Ag. Tsopanakis, *Ἀφιέρωμα Τριανταφυλλίδη*, Thessaloniki 1960, 434-435.

3. About λλ <l see also Eckinger 105-107.

σιος *al.* <Lat. *Sosius*, is the regular form for the Greek transcription cf. *C.I.L.* VIII 7066 and Dittenberger *OGIS* 490,2.3 (Apamea) Σοσσίαν... Σοσσίου... In Caes. 18,1 Ἐλβηττίους (S.) Ἐλβηττίους (Z.) *al.* <Lat. *Helvetii* where one would expect Ἐλβητίους¹, but see Eckinger, *op. cit.* 98. Vice-versa there are a few cases where the double Latin letters are written in Greek in one: Otho 5 (S.) Σπουρίναν *al.* <Lat. *Spurinna*; see Eckinger, *op. cit.* 112. This subject of the double consonants in Greek transcriptions from Latin is among others treated by Stam. C. Caratzas, *L'Origine des dialectes Néo-grecs de l'Italie Méridionale*, Paris 1958, p. 87 esp. 105 ff.

—Qui— for which see Eckinger, *op. cit.* 122-125 and Ag. Tsopanakis, *l. l.*, is another group which accepts more than one form in Greek as a result probably of variation in pronunciation at the time: Cam. 36,4 Κούιντος (Κούντιος Ziegler), Luc. 5,5 Κόιντιον (Κόιντον: em. Muret cf. *ibid.* 33,6), Marc. 5,5 Κούίντος (κόντος C) <Lat. *Quintus*, whereas the forms of Latin *Quintius* should be either Κούντιος (i. e. Κυῖντιος, cf. e. g. *Hesperia*, *Suppl. IV* 138 (ca. 200 A.D.), *Hesperia* 11,88-89² Lat. *Quintius*, or Κοῖντιος, as e. g. Tit. 1,1 Κοῖντιος (κόντιος Steph.: κόντος); 10,5 Κοῖντιος (κόντος codd. et Phot.). See Eckinger, *op. cit.* 122. For Otho 5 (S.) πόλιν Ἀκύνιον i. e. *Aquinum* perhaps Ἀκυῖνον which occurs in Strabo 5,237 would be preferable. Ptolemy's 111,1,63 Ἀκούινον is even more remoted from the Latin form. The name of the river Tiber is also a complicate case; besides Caes. 58,8 Τίβερην, for which see Dittenberger, *Hermes* 6, 1872, 134-135 and Eckinger, *op. cit.* 34-35, two forms occur Θύβρις - Θύμβρις for which see Dittenberger, *l. l.*, p. 150 and more recently A. Mommigliano, *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 2, Roma 1966, 622-625 «É pure verosimile che la duplice forma Θύβρις-Θύμβρις del greco risalga a una doppia forma etrusca». Cf. also H. Solius *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 48) Helsinki 1971, p. 62 and n. 2. Of the two forms, according to LSJ s. v., Θύμβρις³ is more used than Θύβρις; yet here it occurs only twice namely Θύμβριν Rom. 1,1 and Otho 4 (S.), whereas elsewhere the form Θύβρις is preferred.

The spelling in oblique cases of Latin nouns in -tor, -toris seems to have been in general regulated after Greek nouns ending in -τωρ, -τορος,

1. Also Strabo's Ἐλουήττιοι should perhaps be Ἐλουήττιοι: cf. Ἐλουήττιοι (Ptolemy).

2. Also *Mor.* 269e τὰς Κουιντιλίας εἰδούς.

3. Cf. Steph. Byz. Θύμβρις, ποταμὸς Ῥώμης, ὃς καὶ Τίβερις. Hsch. θ 870 Θύμβρις ἄνομα ποταμοῦ. Θύμβρις or Θύμβριος was also the name of a river of Troad, see *Glotta* 21, 1933, 86. A surprising gen. Θύμβρεως occurs in *Mor.* 305e and 314f, Θύμβρεος 307d.

see Buck-Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, p. 302; therefore Fab. 13,7 ὃ δίκτατορ (δικτάτωρ: em. Sintenis) should be ὃ δικτᾶτορ. See above p. 10.

As regards the Latin itself one form, namely *velatura*, is to be noted: Rom. 5,4 τὴν δὲ πορθμεῖαν βηλατούραν¹ καλοῦσιν (βηλατούραν B: βιλατούραν UMA); perhaps also *μανίπλα* Rom. 8,7 ἐκάστης (sc. ἐκατοστύος) δ' ἀνὴρ ἀφηγεῖτο χόρτου καὶ ὕλης ἀγκαλίδα κοντῶ περικειμένην ἀνέχων· μανίπλα ταύτας Λατῖνοι καλοῦσιν which is not recorded in LSJ. At Ant. 5,2 εἶτα τῶν ἐπ' οἰωνοῖς ἱερέων (scil. ἀπέδειξε Κουρίων) οὓς Αὔγουρας καλοῦσιν, the form *αὔγουρας* as at T. G. τῆς τῶν αὔγούρων λεγομένης ἱερωσύνης is preferable.

Of the oriental names occurring in the Lives 'Ορώδην Crass. 18,3 (ὀρώδην Om^o): ὕρώδην SU et s. s. Om^m ὕρώδη N ἤρώδην O^v et corr. ex ὕρώδην A: cf. 21,5. 22,2 (twice)); Ant. 33,6 'Ορώδης Cass. D. (passim), Strabo 702 'Υρώδης Polyæn. 7,41 Orodes ap. Latinos; cf. Boissevain ad Cass. D. 39,56,2); Ant. 33,6 'Ορώδου (ὀρώδου App.: ὕρώδου codd.; cf. Boissevain ad Cass. Dion. 39,56,2 (I 496,17)); 37,1 'Ορώδην (ὀρώδην App.: ὕρώδη codd.) *al.*, it may be that the *spiritus asper* is due to confusion with the well-known 'Ηρώδης and that the deciding factor should rather be the Latin transcription Orodes i. e. 'Ορώδης, the spelling which Ziegler himself has printed in the Life of Antony 33,6 and 37,1. For the *spiritus* cf. also *Res Gestae* 32 Φραάτης, 'Ορώδου υἱός, § 33.

The ethnic name Marc. 3,2 Γαισάται if it has anything to do with *gaesum* or *γαῖσον* should be accented Γαισᾶται; see now Chantraine, *Dict. étym. de la langue Grecque*, s. v. γαιῖσος.

As regards word-order it may be said that whenever changes are suggested by scholars these are based mainly on the principle of avoiding hiatus. In the following cases, however, the change suggested in this respect does not affect hiatus. Cam. 8,4 οὐ γὰρ ἦν εἰθισμένον πρότερον ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι γυναῖκα δημοσίᾳ τελευτήσασαν better ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι δημοσίᾳ γυναῖκα τελευτήσασαν which avoids the ambiguity created by the usually edited order; Dio 27,2 ἀπολιπόντες ᾤχοντο τὸν Τιμοκράτην, either ᾤχοντ' ἀπολιπόντες τὸν Τιμοκράτην (cf. Publ. 26(3),4 ἀπολιπόντων...ᾤχετ' ἀπίων) or τὸν Τιμοκράτην ἀπολιπόντες ᾤχοντο (cf. e. g. Cic. 22,8 τὸν Κατιλίαν...ἐγκαταλιπόντες ᾤχοντο); Mar. 32,1 τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὸν ἐνοχλεῖσθαι μὴ βουλόμενος μακρὰν βαδίζοντας, perhaps should read τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὸν μὴ βουλόμενος ἐνοχλεῖσθαι μακρὰν βαδίζοντας; Alex. 39,10 Παρμενίῳ μὲν οὖν τὸν Βαγῶου ἔδωκεν οἶκον, ἐν ᾧ λέγεται τῶν περισσῶν ἱματισμὸν χιλίων ταλάντων εὑρεθῆναι, perhaps ... ἐν ᾧ λέγεται τῶν περισσῶν χιλίων ταλάντων ἱματισμὸν εὑρεθῆναι? The phrase τῶν περισσῶν χιλίων ταλάντων seems also suspect as one would expect περισσὸν χιλίων ταλάντων ἱματισμὸν εὑρεθῆναι.

1. See E. Perfuzzi, *Velum*, *Athenaeum*, N. S. 47, 1969, 257 ff.