

scripsi (idem habet Ar. Byz.), cf. Sym.: προπαλζειν Eren.
 4 κατακοιμίζειν scripsi; quod vocabulum in Erenii verbis
 κατὰ τὴν μίξιν latere neque ignorare debui et W. Bühler cl. Sym.
 assentitur 6 επιμέλειαν scripsi, cf. Sym.: ἐπιμελείας Eren.
 (genetivo πάσης, opinor, deceptus librarius ita scripsit; contra
 Symeonis lectio πᾶσαν ex accusativo ἐπιμέλειαν orta).

Tübingen

Klaus Nickau

 HORACE, *ODES*, i. 32. 15

*o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi
 grata testudo Iovis, o laborum
 dulce lenimen mihi cumque salve
 rite vocanti.*

The above is the last stanza of an ode in which Horace addresses his lyre with a request to sing a *Latinum carmen*. If we are to interpret the phrase *mibi cumque salve* without emendation, we must first decide on the meaning of *cumque*. There appears to be no parallel in Classical Latin for this use of *cumque* in a main clause. It seems best therefore to decide its meaning on philological grounds and then to see whether the meaning so arrived at will fit the present passage. As to meaning, there seems to be fairly general agreement that if *cumque* here is correct, it must mean 'always'. The problem is how can the word come to have that meaning. J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax, Zweite Reihe*, 118-20, takes *-que* as a suffix with a distributive or generalising force, as in *quisque*, and refers to parallels in the Italian dialects and in other I. E. languages. He takes *cumque* as meaning 'jedesmal', 'immer'. The objection to this is that in formations like *quisque*, *-que* is added to the indefinite; even *ubique*, at first sight an exact parallel to *cumque*, may be a compounded of the indefinite *ubi* and *-que*. We find indefinite *ubi* in *sicubi*. With *cumque* on the other hand we appear to have a compound of a temporal relative, *cum*, with *-que*. But it is not impossible that *cum* or *quom* was at an early stage of the language an indefinite, and even if it were not, *cumque* could have been formed by a

false analogy with *ubique* or *undique* i.e. it could have been wrongly assumed that these were compounds of relative adverbs not indefinite adverbs with *-que*. If *cumque* does mean 'always', then its use would in some respects be like that of the English 'ever'. It is normally only in archaic English that 'ever' is used in positive main clauses in the sense of 'always' (see *Oxford English Dictionary s.v.*) i.e. as *cumque* appears to be used in our passage, but 'ever' is most used as a suffix in words such as 'however', 'whoever', 'wherever' which are the equivalents of the Latin *utcumque*, *quicumque*, *ubicumque*. How does *-cumque* come to be a purely generalising suffix without any necessary reference to time? We may suppose that e.g. *ubicumque te vocavero* meant originally 'where at all times I call on you'. *cumque* removes the time restriction and therefore implicitly also the place restriction. 'Where I call on you no matter at what time' can in fact be equivalent to 'No matter in what place I am when I call on you'. In time the original force of *-cumque* in such compounds would be forgotten and it would be considered simply as a generalising suffix, so that it would eventually become perfectly possible to say e.g. *utcumque te illo tempore vocavi*, 'however I called on you at that particular time' without there being felt to be any inconsistency between *-cumque* (originally meaning 'always') and *illo tempore*.

Next, the meaning of *mihi salve*. Does it mean 'Greetings' or 'Farewell'? E. Fraenkel (*Horace*, 169) argues for 'Greetings'. He points out that *mihi salve* corresponds to the Greek *χαῖρέ μοι* and that *χαῖρέ μοι* is normally the formula of greeting at the beginning of a hymn rather than the formula of farewell at the end, which is the simple *χαῖρὲ*. However, *mihi* may have been added simply as a peg on which to hang *vocanti* and not as a reminiscence of the Greek. J. Gow (*Horace, Odes and Epodes*, 202) says *salve* is ordinarily a formula of greeting or farewell. But when used to mean 'farewell', it seems always to be linked with *vale*; and of the two passages Gow refers to, the meaning 'farewell' is impossible in Verg. *Aen.* viii. 301 and not necessary in Verg. *Georg.* ii. 173. Moreover since presumably we are to imagine that Horace after addressing his lyre will go on to play on it, a formula of greeting is obviously more appropriate than one of farewell.

Can we now make sense of this passage if we take *cumque* as meaning 'at all times'? Not if we take *cumque ... vocanti* with Porphyrius as meaning 'whenever I call upon you', *quotiens-*

cumque te vocavero. 'Greetings' or 'Hail, whenever I call upon you' is an odd thing to say in English and it is not obvious that *quotienscumque te vocavero* (the equivalent on this interpretation of *cumque vocanti*) *salve* is less odd in Latin. It can be argued that the addition of *mihi* to *salve* gives *salve* the force of 'accept my greetings'. But 'accept my greetings whenever I call on you in manner due (*rite*)' is an odd thing to say. For (a) we expect the worshipper to safeguard himself against a mistake on each occasion on which he invokes the deity by some clause like *quocumque modo te vocavero*. We do not expect him on one particular occasion to try to safeguard himself against mistakes on all future occasions; (b) *cumque ... vocanti* is not really like the normal safeguarding clause, e.g. Apuleius, *Met.* xi. 2: *quoquo nomine, quoquo ritu, quaqua facie, te fas est invocare*. The normal clause of this type covers the speaker against a mistake in the manner in which he addresses the deity. Our *cumque ... vocanti* does not do this; the deity on this occasion is only required to accept the greetings if they are given *rite*. *cumque ... rite vocanti* offers the worshipper no protection at all. (c) Such formulae are appropriate when the worshipper is asking for help for himself on a particular occasion. They are not appropriate when the worshipper is merely offering greetings, e.g. after the formula from Apuleius quoted above the worshipper goes on: *tu meis iam nunc extremis aerumnis subsiste* etc. cf. Catullus 34. 21-4 and Macrobius iii. 9. 10. These difficulties may be avoided if we take *cumque ... vocanti* as equivalent to *utcumque te voco* (Fraenkel, *op. cit.* 170). But even if *cumque* could bear this meaning (and no evidence or argument has been adduced to show that it can), the sense is not good. Fraenkel translates: 'in whatever manner, provided it is done *rite*, I invoke thee'. But surely the whole point of a saving clause like *utcumque te voco* is to guard against the invocation not being made *rite*. In Apuleius *Met.* xi. 2, for example, the worshipper invokes the goddess under a variety of titles and finishes up with *quoquo nomine ... te fas est invocare*, i.e. 'in case I have inadvertently omitted to invoke you by your correct title, please take it that I have done so'. This difficulty may be circumvented by emending *cumque* to *quique* and taking *quique* as an ablative going with *rite*, 'in whatever manner' (G.W. Williams, C. R. n. s. 8 (1958), 208f). Professor Williams points out that in Early Latin *quisque* had 'a sense close to that of *quisquis* and *quicumque*, and in circumstances which make it clear that the usage belonged to the language of legal institution

and prayer'. But, as Professor Williams himself says, the only certain example of *rite* in the sense of *ritu* is in Statius, *Theb.* xi. 285. The change of *cumque* to *quique* is not particularly easy, and it seems undesirable to change a reading accepted as far back as Porphyry. Nor is the sense particularly good; Horace is not asking for help, but merely offering greetings, and he has no need to guard himself against a mistake in the formula used. It is true that there was a request for help in 3-4, *age dic Latinum, barbite, carmen*, but this is not in point since it comes before the safeguarding clause. Such clauses are intended to prevent a refusal of a request which comes after them.

Two other difficulties present themselves to all the interpretations so far considered. 1. Parallels, e.g. Verg. *Aen.* xi. 97, can be found for the dative *mihi* with *salve*, but it is awkward to have a participle agreeing with it. 2. *cumque* is separated by the main verb of the sentence from the participle which it qualifies, and the fact that it is imprisoned between *salve* and the dative going with it makes one want to take it with *salve* rather than with *vocanti*. These two objections are not in themselves insuperable and the first in fact applies to the interpretation which follows.

This is to take *cumque* not with *vocanti* but with *salve*. This view has the advantage that it enables us to take *cumque* in the sense we would expect it to have ('always') and which Porphyry thought it had. The only mistake which has to be attributed to Porphyry is that of taking *cumque* with *vocanti* rather than with *salve*. If he was unfamiliar with the formula *mihi cumque salve*, it is understandable that he should have been misled by the specious analogy of formulae like that quoted from Apuleius. For this imperative with an adverb cf. e.g. Plaut. *Rudens*, 416 *multum salveto* and Verg. *Aen.* xi. 97 *salve aeternum mihi*. This interpretation has been defended before by e.g. Gow (*loc. cit.*). Gow thinks *salve* may be the equivalent of the Greek *ἰληθι* and would presumably translate 'be gracious to me always'. This translation is rightly rejected in Kiessling-Heinze (*Horaz, Oden und Epoden*, 137f) but this does not mean we have to reject the idea of taking *cumque* with *salve* entirely, merely that we must find a better way of interpreting the phrase. If the formula is an ancient one, we must go back to the root meaning of *salvere*. In Classical Latin *salvere* is usually found in the imperative simply as a formula of greeting with no more sense attached to it than to the English 'Hello', but there are two strands of evidence which show that the root meaning

of the word is 'to be well' and that even in Classical times the Romans were aware of this root meaning. (i) Plautus plays on the word in two passages where it is clear that he takes the root meaning of *salvere* as the opposite of the meaning of *aegrotare*, Plaut. *Truc.* 259-60

As. *salve*. Tr. *satis mihi est tuae salutis. nil moror. non salveo.*

aegrotare malim quam esse tua salute sanior.

and Plaut. *Asin.* 593

Arg. *salve*. Ph. *salvere me iubes, quoi tu abiens offers morbum?*

(ii) *salvus sis*, a phrase about the literal meaning of which there can be no doubt, is used by Plautus as the equivalent of *salve*. We may suppose that when the formula *mihi cumque salve* originated it meant something like 'ever be hale'. We may imagine that Horace attached no exact meaning to it but simply knew it as an archaic formula used in addressing a god. It may be argued that it would be presumptuous for the worshipper to wish a god *salus*. But (a) this perhaps would not have seemed so presumptuous in the days of many petty, squabbling deities and (b) there is in any case no need to suppose that the root meaning of the formula was felt when it came to be applied to a god. It would perhaps be used at first with its full force only between people. Constant use would turn it into a simple formula of greeting and only then would it be used to a god, i.e. as addressed to a god the phrase *mihi cumque salve* had a similar history to the simple *salve*, which can also be applied to a god, but which, if it were applied with the full force of its root meaning would seem equally presumptuous. One merit of this explanation is that it provides a better reason for the presence of the archaism than the other explanations do. There is no strong reason why Horace should use an archaism to describe the circumstances under which the greetings are given i.e. whenever I call on you in manner due, but if we take *cumque* with *salve*, then *rite vocanti* can be taken as giving an explanation of why Horace is using an archaic form of address. As Horace calls on his lyre he enumerates its various attributes. He realises that the language he has used in doing so is reminiscent of the language used by a worshipper in addressing a deity, i.e. that he has been *rite vocanti*. As a result, perhaps half humourously, he throws in an archaic formula reserved in his day for an address to a god.