3) Fr. 27: cf. Xenoph. Cyrop. I 2, 16, Cicero Tusc. 5, 99; parodied by Catullus 23, 12 ff. Fr. 28: cf. Xenoph. Mem. I 6, 5, Teles ap. Stob. III 1, 98 p. 9 Hense, Cic. Tusc. 5, 90, 97, Horace Sat. II 2, 14 ff. (with scholl. and edd. *ad loc.*), Seneca Epist. 119, 3, 123, 2; in view of these parallels (which could be multiplied), Dahlmann’s assertion (Gnomon 17, 175) that this passage derives from Varro’s personal experience, must be taken with a pinch of salt. Fr. 29: for the meaning, see Müller, 52 ff. and Dahlmann, Gnomon 17, 176; for Ariston’s Ομοώματα, SVF I, 383 ff.

4) Cf. Müller, 2 ff., who compares the language of Varro Rer. Rust. III 2, 7 (p. 6 f.).


6) This identification was first made by Ritschl (Opusc. 3, 482 ff.) and has been most fully argued by Müller (7 f., 31 ff.), many of whose conclusions far outrun the evidence. See also R. Heisterhagen in Dahlmann and Heisterhagen, *Varronische Studien I: zu den Logistorici*, Abh. Ak. Mainz 1957, 4, 5 ff. (127 ff.). Müller and Heisterhagen give references to earlier discussions.

7) This is admitted by Müller himself, p. 8.

8) For Heraclides, see *Cic. ad Att.* XIII 19, 3 f.; for Varro, see Müller, 30 ff., Dahlmann, RE Suppl. 6, 1262, Gnomon 17, 170, *Navicula Chilonensis* (1956), 116 ff., Abh. Ak. Mainz 1957, 4, 20 (142); *ibid.*, 15 ff. (137 ff.). Dahlmann tries to equate the logistorici with the laudationes mentioned by *Cic. Acad.* 1, 8, and if this were true, it would finally destroy any case for associating them with Heraclides. In reality, the evidence is non-existent (see Reid *ad loc.*, Müller, 33 n. 1, M. G. Morgan, *Mus. Helv.* 31, 1974, 117 ff.). But even if the identification were correct, very little would be gained. *Laudatio* usually implies an oration, and if the word were here used to denote a species of dialogue, the only means of finding out in what way it differed from other kinds of dialogue would still be to study the extant fragments.

9) G. Castelli, Riv. Stud. Class. 20 (1972), 5 ff., would identify the ‘Hαρκλείστενον mentioned in *Epist. ad Att.* XV 27, 2 and XVI 2, 6 with the Cato Maior, but this is impossible; the former was not even begun in July 44, when these letters were written, while the latter was completed before May 11 (*Epist. ad Att.* XIV 21, 3) and probably written some months previously.


**A NOTE ON APUL. MET. I 6 (5, 15)**

ece Socraten contubernalem meum conspicio. Humi sedebat scissili palliastro semiamictus, paene alius lurore, ad miseram maciem deformatus, qualia solent fortunae deterrima stipes in triviis erogare.

Lipsius thought that the word *deterrima* did not make much sense, and he suggested *decerrina* 1), which was based on the addition in the margin of F, ·l· d’tmina stipes in triviis; indeed, *decerrina* is a possible transcription of d’tmina. Lipsius’ conjecture

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXIII, Fasc. 3-4 (1980)
has been adopted by many editors in former days and, since Helm I, by all the modern ones 2).

Oudendorp (1786) suggested detrimina 3). This conjecture has been adopted by Gaselee (1915) only. Hildebrand 4) (1842), followed by Eyssenhardt (1868), was the only one to defend deterrima. Van der Vliet (1897) made the suggestion to add ludibria to fortunae deterrima. Till now, there has been nobody to support him. Scivololettò 5) (1959) suggests to read determit (sic), but he himself has his doubts thereabout.

Although Lipsius' conjecture decermina is defensible, I nevertheless incline to maintain the manuscript reading deterrima, as did Hildebrand. I base this preference on the following arguments:

1) Nobody will be surprised when an author makes use of an adjectivum pro substantivo 6). The picture which in this way is put before the reader's mind, is just as much suggestive as when we should have read an adjectivum cum substantivo. This, of course, also applies to an adjectivum neutri generis pro substantivo (cf. Tac. Ann. XII 54 aemulo ad deterrima Ventidio). In Apuleius' Metamorphoses, too, the occurrence of an adjectivum pro substantivo is not scarce: cf. Met. IV 12 (83, 18) nequissima illa; Met. VII 21 (170, 16) misera illa.

2) Moreover, if an author wants to inform the reader of the fact that he or others disapprove of some person or a group of persons—which evidently is the case in Met. I 6 (5, 15)—he may express this disapproval not only by means of his choice of words, but also may very well make use of the neutre (cf. Virg. Aen. IV 569/70 varium et mutabile semper femina 7).

3) Another, even more convincing, argument in support of deterrima is the fact that an author instead of a concrete representation often uses an abstract term with denigrating emotional value 8): cf. Met. V 12 (112, 22) pestes illae (= homines perniciosi) 9); Met. V 28 (126, 9) illud incrementum.

From what is said above, we may conclude that in this passage, instead of the more usual form homines deterrimi, Apuleius deliberately chose to write deterrima, because he had the intention to stress once more Aristomenes' scorn of these outcasts, by means of the gender of the word: deterrima. I think the best translation of deterrima is 'scum', as in Tac. Ann. III 13, 2 ... ut parens legionum a deterrimis appellaretur 10).
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1) Coll. Fest. 63, 19 L. decermina dicuntur, quae decerpuntur purgandi causa.
2) M. Molt, Ad Apulei Madaurensis Met. librum prim. comm. exeg. (Diss.)