

READINGS IN HORACE'S *SATIRES*¹⁾

As well as Shackleton Bailey's Teubner text of Horace (reprinted in 1991 with the regrettable misprints of the first edition removed) we now have modern commentaries on the *Satires* by Brown and Muecke, the latter devoting more, and more judicious, attention to the text than the former. We also have an exceptionally helpful discussion of a number of textual issues by Brink. It therefore seems an appropriate time to review some textual problems in these poems. Shackleton Bailey's text has come as a breath of fresh air, and has put in the text or commended in the notes many deserving emendations, as well as a number which should never have been recorded. However, I miss some, and in particular two by A. Y. Campbell which I think should stand in the text. First, 1.3.63–6

*simplicior quis et est qualem me saepe libenter
obtulerim tibi, Maecenas; at forte legentem
aut tacitum impellat quouis sermone, 'molestus'
'communi sensu plane caret' inquitimus.*

Here *at* is Campbell's conjecture (Horace, Odes and Epodes [1953] 199) for *ut*, as read by the manuscripts. Horace has been criticising our tendency to emphasise the disadvantages of the good qualities of our friends; a modest man we call 'dull' (56–8), a

1) In this paper the following works are referred to by author's name alone, or by name and short title: D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Horatius, Opera* (Teubner, 2nd 1991) – D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Profile of Horace* (1982) – R. Bentley, In *Q. Horatium Flaccum Notae et Emendationes* (1711) – D. Bo, *Horati Opera II: Sermonum libri II ...* (Paravia, 1959) – C. O. Brink, *Horatian Notes IV: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of Satires Book I, PCPS 213* (1987) 16 – P. M. Brown, *Horace, Satires I* (1993) – L. Doederlein, third edition (1859) of *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren, erklärt von L. F. Heindorf* – E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957) – A. E. Housman, *Classical Papers* (1972) – A. Meineke, *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (2nd 1854) – F. Muecke, *Horace, Satires II* (1993) – A. Palmer, *The Satires of Horace* (4th 1891) – L. P. Wilkinson, *Housman Society Journal* 1 (1974) 32. – Details are given about other literature as need arises; a parenthetic date indicates an edition of or commentary on Horace or his *Satires* published in the year indicated. I am most grateful for generous and helpful advice given to me at an early stage of composition by Prof. R. G. M. Nisbet, who of course must not be supposed to assent to all my conclusions.

cautious one 'crafty' (58–62). A straightforward man, such as Horace would wish to appear to Maecenas, has only to make an inopportune interruption to be called a 'tactless pest'. In form and content this fits the context beautifully, and eliminates the difficulty which editors have justly felt in the transmitted reading, namely that "it makes (Horace) say that he would gladly interrupt Maecenas when reading or silent" (Palmer). This is not removed by the explanation of Palmer and Brown that *et* connects not *simplicior* and the understood *talis*, but this sentence with the preceding one, which is inconceivable in this asyndetic series of sentences. With the emendation "defect and quality are both clearly stated, instead of being confused" (Campbell).

Next, 1.3.103. Prehistoric men spent their time in fighting
donec verba quibus vox res sensusque notaret
nominaque invenere.

vox res ... notaret Campbell, CQ 39 (1945) 113; *voces ... notarent* codd.

This gentle correction completely clears up the context; how laboured by contrast is the emendation by the young Housman (139; he continued to support it to the end of his days, according to Wilkinson 36) which Shackleton Bailey puts into his text. Lucr. 5.1057–8 *si genus humanum ... pro vario sensu varia[s] res voce notaret* (quoted by Campbell together with *ibid.* 1041–4, 1087–90) is virtually conclusive.

Not certain, as I would consider these, but still deserving of record I would judge Palmer's *populus* <*si*> *sibilat* at 1.1.66 (this too advocated by Housman, according to Wilkinson 38), with *si* replacing *me* offered by the manuscripts; Palmer's motive was the lack of attestation for a transitive use of *sibilare*. I would add suggestions by the same scholar at 1.3.8 (*voce ... resonat qua e chordis quattuor ima*, 'the lowest out of four strings', in place of *quae*, which makes it hard to explain the syntax of *chordis*), 2.4.74 (*invenio*, which appropriately labels Catus or his teacher as the *πρωτος εὑρετης* of the recipe; for the present tense [= *inventor sum*] cf. J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* [1965] 305–6, R. Kühner – C. Stegmann, *Grammatik der lat. Sprache, Satzlehre* [⁴1962] 1.117–9). At 2.8.3 *dictus here illic / de medio potare die* <*es*>. *sic ...* (F. W. Doering [1803], ignored by all editors of this century), while it can hardly be called imperatively necessary, certainly seems to me to warrant a mention; and so too does Boissonade's *nemo dexterius fortuna est* <*te*> *usus* at 1.9.45

(I have failed to discover where this was put forward). This is recorded by Brown; I have discussed the distribution of speakers in this passage in CJ 90 (1994–5) 5.

J. C. G. Praedicow, a Wittenberg schoolmaster who edited Horace in 1806, scored, it seems to me, two notable successes. First, 2.5.103

*‘unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem?’
sparge subinde et, si paulum potes, inlacrima; e re est
gaudia prodentem vultum celare.*

Here the manuscripts read *inlacrimare; est*, the difficulty with which is that in Horace’s time there appears to have been no deponent verb *inlacrimari* (it is attested only by part of the manuscript tradition at Cic. De Nat. Deor. 3.82); otherwise *lacrimari* and *inlacrimari* do not appear before the second century (Justin 11.12.5, Callistratus Dig. 1.18.19.1). One cannot evade the problem by punctuating *inlacrimare, est* (converting *inlacrimare* from a deponent imperative into an active infinitive), because then *et* connects things which it has no business to connect. Praedicow’s emendation has a formidable list of supporters, including Lachmann (on Lucr. 5.533), Meineke, L. Mueller (1891), to mention only those; for the elision involved cf. 1.3.34, 1.5.8, 2.3.86, 2.6.13 and 111.

Second, 2.7. 63–7

*illa tamen se
non habitu mutatae loco peccatque superbe.
65 cum te formidet mulier neque credat amanti,
ibis sub furcam prudens dominoque furenti
committes rem omnem et vitam et cum corpore famam?
evasti: credo, metues doctusque cavebis:
quaeris quando iterum paveas . . .*

64 *peccatque* vel *-ve* codd. *superbe* Praedicow: *superne* codd. 64–5 sic interpuncti Orelli: *superne, cum . . . amanti*. alii 67 *famam?* H. Schütz (1881) tacitus: *famam*. alii 69 *quaeris* cod. Gothanus aliique: *-es* plerique

The adulteress does not have to disguise herself in order to embark on an affair, whereas the adulterer does; *habitu* picks up *proiectis insignibus, anulo equestri / Romanoque habitu* addressed to him in 53–4. Nor does she have to change her physical location, since the affair is conducted in her house (59–61), to which the adulterer has to go (*prodis* 54, *inducis* 56); one may remark that *se mutare loco*,

like *mutata loco* at Colum. 10.154, implies 'to banish oneself from one's habitat' (see TLL 8.1725.44). On the contrary she 'strays from the straight and narrow' (*peccat* taking up the same word in 60 and 62) 'in fine style'; *-que* is used like *sed* after a negative (see Housman on Manil. 1.877), a usage which would invite alteration to *-ve* even without the temptation offered by *mutatve*. Orelli's punctuation (supported by Wiesen, Mnem. 34 [1981] 92) is needed in order to give *mulier* 65 a function and to underline the contrast between the woman's caution (65) and the man's imprudence (66); of course *cum* means 'whereas', not, as Muecke translates, 'since'. The question mark after 67 is not imperatively required, but admirably suits the scolding tone of Davus. The reading of the Gothanus in 69 is recorded by Keller-Holder and Bo, but not by Shackleton Bailey, and has to be taken seriously since this manuscript may, as elsewhere, reproduce the reading of the Blandinianus vetustissimus (see below); it is a much better match for *evasti* than the future tense, which has been assimilated to the intervening futures.

Now see how most editors, retaining *superne*, refer it to the woman-superior position of sexual intercourse mentioned in 50, supposing Horace's adulteress to be contrasted with Davus' whore; as if such a physical word as *superne* could be so combined with such a non-physical word as *peccat*!

Two emendations of Bentley raise an interesting question. First, 2.6.29

'quid tibi vis, insane, et quam rem agis?' improbus urget.

The manuscripts here read *quas res*, which leaves the line a syllable too long. Since *quid . . . insane* is protected by unassailable parallels, the corruption must lie where Bentley diagnosed it, and in favour of his emendation he too produced impeccable parallels. The difficulty is that the emendation transgresses L. Mueller's ordinance (De Re Metrica [21894] 339) that in dactylic verse monosyllables may be elided before short only when they are indeclinable or of irregular inflection, which would cover *s(um) ego* at 2.1.74, 2.7.80. But we must ask about the rational basis of this law; in the real world would Horace in fact have differentiated between *sum* and *rem* for purposes of elision? And when we consider that the great majority of monosyllables is in fact either indeclinable or of irregular inflection, is it surprising that we do not find a transmitted instance of an elision like that of *rem* here? In short, while I

do believe in the need for firm criteria in the field of metre, I believe also that Mueller has drawn the criteria too firmly here, particularly as Horace in his Satires is not attempting to write hexameters of formal polish. One may note that on the same page Mueller remarks an anomalous elision of *quem* before short in Valerius Flaccus, which he tries to eliminate by a bad emendation.

Second is 1.9.30

quod puero cecinit divina mota anus urna.

Here Bentley, displeased by the succession of ablatives *divinā motā urnā*, adopted from Cruquius the emendation *mota divina*, which turns *divina* into a nominative. Shackleton Bailey adopts this with a reference to a discussion by Professor Brink which claims that an elision like *motā anus* at this point of the line is unexampled between Lucilius and Ausonius. When one then consults Brink's authority for this statement, N.-O. Nilsson, *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz* (1952) 18–9, one finds that Nilsson's statement is confined to elision of *ā*. What metrical canon treats *a* differently from any other long vowel? In fact, since Horace has no objection to elision of a long in this position (see 1.6.112, 1.9.76, 2.2.114, 2.3.41 and 220, 2.6.102), this seems to me to be another case in which the criteria have been drawn too strictly, and Bentley's reading will have to be championed on other grounds. One may note that Housman (Wilkinson 46) favoured Jacobs' *aura* in place of *urna*; I have not found where this was published.

Bentley's adversary Alexander Cunningham has never gained much respect from anyone, but I think that one of his ideas deserves attention.

*desine matronas sectarier, unde laboris
plus haurire mali est quam ex re decerpere fructus.
nec magis huic inter niveos viridesque lapillos
sit licet hoc, Cerinthe, tuum tenerum est femur aut crus
rectius, atque etiam melius persaepe togatae.* (1.2.78–82)

The general drift of Horace's argument in 80–2 is that, apart from other disadvantages of adultery, married women are often not even as pretty as more available women of lower social status. But we are enmeshed in a web of problems:

(1) Does *sit licet* go (a) with *inter . . . lapillos* or (b) with *hoc, Cerinthe, tuum* (in which case *inter . . . lapillos* is part of the phrase

nec magis huic tenerum est femur)? I have left 80–1 unpunctuated in the area of uncertainty.

(2) Is *hoc* (a) nominative or (b) ablative (in which case it means 'for this reason', as at 1.1.46 etc.)?

(3) A difficulty which does not seem to disturb the editors, but which does disturb me, is the reference of *huic*. It can hardly refer to Fausta away back in 64, but if it refers to *matronas* why is it singular? Now I notice that the oldest manuscript of Horace, Bernensis 363 (B), omits the word, and I suggest that we should alter it to *his*; we could suppose either that this was omitted after *mag-is* or that it was changed to the singular by someone who referred it to the subject of *sit*.

With this problem either cleared out of the way or somehow discounted, let me start with (1). Suppose we take the first alternative and punctuate (*hoc, Cerinthe, tuum*), then Cerinthus is either a man who wears jewelry or, as Shackleton Bailey (Profile 82) suggests, a jeweler; but in either case that is so irrelevant to the context and so abruptly expressed this it can hardly convince. If we then try punctuating *lapillos (sit, licet hoc, Cerinthe, tuum)*, we soften the abruptness (for we can now compare Sen. Contr. 2.6.2 *quod unguento cena madet, tuum est; quod laxior usque in pedes tunica demittitur, tuum est*), but leave the irrelevance. On either alternative *hoc* must be nominative, so 2b does not enter into consideration until we consider emendation, which we are forced to do.

The first possibility which enters into consideration is *tuo*, found in a few manuscripts and espoused by Bentley and Fraenkel (84–6). Bentley also changes *hoc* to *o*, with slight manuscript support, whereas Fraenkel takes it as ablative. But in either case, as Shackleton Bailey (Profile 82) points out, this approach falls to the objections of Housman (137), which I quote in full. "This reading supposes Cerinthus to be, as Porphyrius says he was, a *prostibulum insignis speciei atque candoris*; well then, *femur Cerinthe* will be *tenerrimum*, *crus Cerinthe* will be *rectissimum*; so it becomes not only pointless but senseless to say, by way of disparaging matrons, that *femur matronae* is not *magis tenerum*, that *crus matronae* is not *rectius*. Further, can one conceive anything more perverse than that Cerinthus, a third term of comparison, should be introduced at all? The question in hand is the relative desirability of the *matrona* and the *togata*; and if reason is to hold her seat *magis tenerum* must mean *magis tenerum quam togatae*". Housman later (Wilkinson 46) acquiesced in reading *tuo* 'than this thigh

of yours, Cerinthus' (whereas Fraenkel had interpreted *hoc* as 'for that reason'); it is not recorded how he got round his own objections.

Another path of emendation must be sought. Let us try Cunningham's (repeated apparently independently by G. Friedrich, Quintus Horatius Flaccus, *Philologische Untersuchungen* [1894] 129). He alters *tuum* to *tuae* ('your darling', as Odes 1.15.32 and in the elegists). This will mean 'A matron among all her jewelry has no finer thigh, even though that thigh belong to your darling, Cerinthus'. The problem about this is that the mention of a particular woman sits uncomfortably with the singular *huic*; but if, as I suggested for entirely independent reasons, *his* should be read, then all is well, and we only have to adjust the above paraphrase to 'You will not find among bejewelled matrons a finer thigh, even though . . .' Cerinthus will then be someone notorious for an affair with some woman; not of course the Sulpicia familiar from the third book of the Tibullan corpus and there associated with a Cerinthus, for Horace would not make such critical mention of the niece of his friend Messala, and evidently the daughter of his friend (1.10.86) Servius Sulpicius, even if chronology permitted the identification. But nothing forbids us to assume that Horace is talking about an earlier amour of the same man, and an identification is attractively economical; the situation in which a young girl like Sulpicia is attracted to an older roué has occurred frequently enough in human history. I propose therefore that we consider reading

*nec magis his inter niveos viridesque lapillos,
sit licet hoc, Cerinthe, tuae, tenerum est femur . . .*

Now another neglected solution.

- vix tamen eripiam, posito pavone velis quin
hoc potius quam gallina tergere palatum,
25 corruptus vanis rerum, quia veneat auro
rara avis et picta pandat spectacula cauda,
tamquam ad rem attineat quicquam. num vesceris ista
quam laudas pluma? cocto num adest honor idem?
carne tamen quamvis distat nihil, hac magis illa(m)
30 imparibus formis deceptum te petere esto. (2.2.23–30)*

In 30 some manuscripts have *patet*, an obvious simplifying interpolation which intended *esto* to stand on its own ('very well'); and in fact maybe we should punctuate with an exclamation mark after

petere, so that this becomes exclamatory infinitive. In 29 the manuscripts vary between *illa* and *illam*, the latter of which is usually read. It must then refer to the peacock, but how can it after *hoc* 24 and the immediately preceding *cocto* 28? Moreover, would this pronoun not naturally refer to the more distant member of the contrasted pair, i. e. the chicken of 24? If Horace did not write *hunc magis illa*, as was proposed by Simonis (*Zeitschr. Gymn. wesen* 19 [1865] 719), someone will have to supply a rational motive why he did not.

It may be useful to review the reasons why some readings and suggestions which appear in Shackleton Bailey's text should not be accepted. At 1.2.36 he follows Markland's *mirator cunni Cupientius alti* in place of the *albi* of the manuscripts. That is simply gross; this adjective could not be combined with this noun to mean 'aristocratic' (not even if the noun is merely an obscene synecdoche for *mulier*), just as *albi* could not be combined with it to mean 'clothed in white' (Brown). But *albi* yields the sense 'aristocratic' perfectly well; see 123–4 *quae neque longa / nec magis alba velit quam dat natura videri*. The poet there opts for a readily available woman who, unlike Roman matrons, does not have soft white skin. In the same context 120

*illam 'post paulo' 'sed pluris' 'si exierit vir'
gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae . . .*

Shackleton Bailey tentatively suggests *avet*. The Thesaurus quotes two instances of anything other than a neuter pronoun as object of this verb. One of them is Cic. Ad Att. 15.11.4, where on consultation we find that the verb is a conjecture and clearly a mistaken one. Shackleton Bailey there notes "Stat. *Theb.* vii 12 seems to be the only classical example of *aveo* governing a noun". Now we turn to Hill's text of Statius and Smolenaars' commentary on this book of the *Thebaid* and find that there too the verb is a conjecture and probably a mistaken one. We must conclude that, harsh as the traditional text is, it is not to be emended in this way. While I am discussing this passage, I must express puzzlement why most editors both of Horace and of Philodemus so adamantly deny that the reference is to AP 5.126 (Philodemus XXV = 3314–9 Gow-Page, Garland of Philip), which in Page's translation runs thus. 'What's his name gives what's her name five talents for a single favour, and has her in fear and trembling, an ugly girl too, goodness knows. Now I give Lysianassa five drachmas for twelve

favours, and what is more I have a better wench and do it openly. The fact must be, either I am out of my senses, or he ought in future to have his manhood chopped off with an axe'. It seems hypercritical to say with Gow-Page on their XXX (this passage of Horace) that the theme of this epigram is "quite different".

At 1.2.64

*Villius in Fausta Sullae gener, hoc miser uno
nomine deceptus, poenas dedit*

Shackleton Bailey and Housman go in different directions, the former adopting the anonymous conjecture (due to Zachary Pearce; see the appendix) *genere*, the latter (Wilkinson 46) opting for Meineke's *genero*. The former is a usage of high poetry, perfectly in place at 1.6.12, 2.5.63 but absurdly inappropriate here, and either makes *hoc uno nomine* much harder to explain. *Sullae gener* is perfectly suitable as an ironical description of the lover of Sulla's daughter, and may be compared with the instances of marital vocabulary applied to unsanctioned intercourse which are collected by J. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982) 159–161, but more particularly with *Submemmianae uxores* Mart. 3.82.2, *provincialia matrimonia* Suet. Iul. 51.

At 2.2.123 *ludus erat culpa potare magistra* Shackleton Bailey adopts Housman's (147) conjecture *captu . . . magistro*. Is drinking as much as one can hold consistent with the frugality inculcated by Ofellus? And how can this be described as a *ludus*? Muecke says that "the sport may simply be the drinking itself", referring to some "parallels" (to which one might add Cic. De Fin. 2.23) which prove nothing. Note those words 'may be'; is it advisable to adopt conjectures of whose meaning one is uncertain? I do not find it difficult to regard this as one of those passages to which we have lost the key (cf. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon* ix), but certainly some form of 'sconcing' seems to fit *ludus*.

We scholars tend to be serious-minded people, and a touch of irony, as here, or humour does not always arouse the desired response in us. Take 2.6.109: the town mouse

*vernilter ipsi
fungitur officiis, praelambens omne quod adfert.*

Bentley in his sober-sided way argued that "hoc parum officiose et vernilter facit, si praelambit quodcumque affert"; consequently with a few manuscripts and John Talbot (who published an edition of Horace at Cambridge in 1699 and whom Bentley does not see

fit to mention) he altered to *praelibans*, adopted by Shackleton Bailey. He quotes Ovid Am. 1.3.43–4, as if the enticements of lovers (and that more or less is the relationship between Atedius Melior and his *verna* Glaucias, Stat. Silv. 2.1.60–1, where Van Dam's note provides more material) had any relevance. The point surely is that the honest country mouse serves up the best food to his guest and contents himself with the inferior (83–9), whereas the town mouse, a city slicker, does indeed personally perform the *officia* like a *verna* – but then in an ironical contrary-to-expectation joke we learn what kind of *verna* (Bentley simply assumes a reliable *verna* to be indicated) and what kind of *officia*. He is one of the *vernae procaces* (66) who regard it as their *officium* to lick the food before serving it (admittedly they usually do this when the dishes are being taken away; 1.3.81 etc.), and is contrasted with the country mouse who serves up the food *ore ferens* (85), but not *lambens*, through sheer anatomical necessity. To put it another way, Horace lets his instincts as a mouse peep through the human veneer under which he is presented. Bentley actually quotes 66 (*vernasque procaces / pasco libatis dapibus*) in support of *praelibans*, though the circumstances are entirely different. Others, following an indication by the scholiasts, have assumed a reference to the duties of a *praegustator*, and if we were dealing with a transmitted reading that would work very well; it would imply that the host had to fear that he might be serving up bait poisoned by the house-owners (see RE s. v. Maus 2402.42).

At 1.5.56–64 much merriment is created by a scar on the forehead of Messius Cicirrus

*at illi foeda cicatrix
saetosam laevi frontem turpaverat oris.*

This scar provokes comparison of Messius to a unicorn (?) or Cyclops. Would not this suggest that it was in the middle of the forehead? Why then *laevi*? And what about the combination *frons oris*, which seemed to Porphyrius to need a note? Consequently Shackleton Bailey adopts Horkel's alteration to *levi ... orbe*, in which *levi* seems very out of place (one would think that a smooth ring would make a *saetosa frons* less rather than more ugly). I would suggest that we might do better to look for something on the lines of *laevi*(*s*) (or some other adjective such as *torvis*) ... *orīs*, 'with its sinister lineaments'. For *orae* so used see Lucr. 4.142 and (somewhat doubtful) 166; one may also recall that it is a technical term for the edges of a wound or ulcer (from TLL

9.2.864.59 sqq. I take Celsus 5.26.31A *inducitur (ulceri) callus et circum orae crassae livent*).

At 1.3.25–7

*cum tua pervideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,
cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum
quam aut aquila aut serpens Epidaurius?*

Shackleton Bailey adopts Bentley's alteration of the absurd (but retained by Brown) *pervideas* to *tu videas*, thus introducing a useless (for 'you' is not contrasted with anyone else) but emphatic pronoun. What the context seems to demand is Palmer's *<vix> videas*. Like Bentley, I was for a time attracted by the reading of Rutgersius (1613) *praevideas*, which has faint manuscript support and would represent a calque of παραβλέπειν as used in the comic fragment quoted by Bentley

τί τᾱλλότριον, ὄνθρωπε βασκανώτατε,
κακὸν ὄξυδορκεῖς, τὸ δ' ἴδιον παραβλέπεις;

However this obscures the distinction between two concepts, (1) to turn a blind eye to something, (2) to fail to see something because of blurred vision; only the latter is wanted here.

Some punctuations in Shackleton Bailey's edition are welcome improvements on what has been current, but others are questionable. Thus 1.2.90 ('kings' require horses to be covered when they buy them, so that they are not misled by their good points and overlook the bad)

*hoc illi recte, ne corporis optima Lyncei
contemplerè oculis...*

Here editors place a colon before *ne* to make it into a prohibitive, which produces disjointed thought and expression. With a comma, it becomes a final conjunction in a clause of the type remarked in my note on Juv. 15.89, one which indicates the purpose not of the subject of the main verb, but of the writer in reporting that action; one might fill out the sense thus, ... *recte, <quod dico tibi> ne...* There are such purpose clauses in the Satires at 2.1.80 (where punctuation with a full stop after 81, as in Shackleton Bailey and Muecke, reveals misunderstanding) and 2.2.112.

Again 2.3.57–8

*clamet amica
mater honesta soror, cum cognatis pater, uxor*

(which I have left unpunctuated in the area of dispute). It seems quite out of place to me to link *amica mater* (φιλη μήτηρ, they tell us) and *honesta soror* (what is the point of this adjective?). I agree with those who think that *amica* inevitably means 'mistress' (contrasted by placement at the end of the line with *uxor*), and that *honesta* contrasts the mother with her. Will it be believed that some argue against this because they cannot conceive that a man could have both a wife and a mistress? And who is straight-laced enough not to enjoy the priority given to the mistress over the relatives? Anyway the resultant punctuation will be *amica, mater honesta, soror* . . .

And finally I have reservations about Housman's punctuation of 1.4.102

*quod vitium procul a fore chartis
atque animo prius, ut si quid promittere de me
possum aliud vere, promitto.*

Housman 143 took issue with this punctuation on two grounds, the former of which he withdrew in his note on Manil. 4.608 (I do not see how he, writing in 1920, could call Suet. Tit. 7.3, mention of which was introduced by Heinze into the third edition of Kiessling's commentary in 1906, a "locus interpretibus Horati ignotus"). The latter is this: "If Horace promises that the vice of malice *shall* be absent from his writings, *and first* from his mind, he proclaims, or words have no meaning, that this vice is, at the time of speaking, present both in his mind and his writings: the future tense with the adverb 'prius' marking two stages can signify nothing else: Lambinus perhaps sees this when he mistranslates 'prius' as 'quod prius est'". He therefore punctuates *animo, prius ut*. However, the Latinity of this was impugned by Palmer LX ("prius is never 'heretofore' including the present. It is 'formerly', 'once [but not now]'", with quotation of the convincing Horatian instances at 1.8.8, 2.3.252 etc.), and I have never seen it defended; it seems to me that Lambinus was exactly right.

On matters of orthography, in 2.3.197 (where *Ulixem* has some support recorded by Bo but not by Shackleton Bailey) and 204 (where *Ulixen* has little support), in the light of Housman, 834 it would seem preferable to adopt the termination in *-em*. At 1.2.44 and 1.3.90 *permixerunt* and *commixit*, both with good authority, seem preferable spellings; but I shall not linger over this.

It is interesting to review the unique or nearly-unique readings of V, the lost Blandinianus vetustissimus. On one side one

notes several palpable interpolations: 1.9.50 *nihil officit* for *nil mi officit* (due to the tendency to substitute *nihil* for *nil*; see Housman 926–7), 1.1.108 *qui nemo* for *nemon ut* (one may note that Housman, adopting the latter, interpreted it slightly differently from either Fraenkel or Rudd, *The Satires of Horace* 274–5, according to Wilkinson 46; but I prefer Rudd’s explanation). At 1.3.131–2 it read *clausaque ustrina / tonsor erat* (with *tonsor* written ‘erasis characteribus’) in place of *taberna / sutor*, thus showing mingled vice (*ustrina*; there are no spondaic hexameters in the *Satires*) and virtue (*tonsor*; we need a profession other than the *sutor* who appeared in 125 and 128). The same mixture appears at 2.3.303 *manibus portavit*, the former right (though in this V has company not recorded in Shackleton Bailey’s apparatus; see Bo), the latter wrong and verging on interpolation; most manuscripts read *demens cum portat*. Pure virtue shines out from 1.6.26 *Campum lusumque trigonem*, 1.3.60 *versemur* (which very appropriately makes Horace himself imply an excuse for the man; this is supported by Brink 21) in place of *versetur*, 1.7.17 *pigrrior* 2.3.156 *Posillam* and 255 *cubital*, 2.4.44 *fecundae* and 2.8.88 *albae*. At 2.3.313 *tantum dissimilem* for *tanto d.* also seems right; we should discount the use of *multum* and numerous cases (e.g. 2.5.80) in which we have *tantum . . . quantum*, but that still leaves parallels in Val. Fl. 5.37, Stat. Th. 10.795 (the fullest discussion of the usage is in C. F. W. Müller, *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs* [1908] 62). Here I digress to consider 316–8 (the mother frog)

rogare
quantane, num tantum (sufflans se) magna fuisset;
maior dimidio? num tantum?

This shows the same use of *tantum*, but should, I think, be punctuated as above. Usually *maior dimidio* is taken to be the reply of the young frog, but it seems too far-fetched to interpret the allegation that a calf is 50% bigger than a frog as a joke at the little frog’s sense of scale. Better attribute all these words to the mother and assume that she makes three attempts to equal the calf’s size, each greeted by a dismissive gesture from her son; this punctuation was advocated by Havet in Lejay’s edition (1911).

To return to V, at 2.7.35 *furis* for *fugis* is probably a psychologically easy minor corruption rather than an interpolation; 2.3.156 *oct. assibus* for *octussibus* is on much the same level, and so is 1.6.68 *neque avaritiam neque sordes nec mala lustra* for *ac mala*. At 1.3.56 we do not have record of its reading, but its ally the

codex Gothanus reads *sincerum furimus vas incrustare* and the Bernensis *fugimus* in place of *cupimus* offered by the other manuscripts; but *furimus* seems a ludicrously over-strong word for the context (Housman on Manil. 5.660, to whom Shackleton Bailey refers, can give it no more than a “fortasse”). On the other hand at 1.2.110 *speras tibi posse dolores / atque aestus curasque graves e pectore tolli* I should judge this reading of VB to outweigh in authority and to be more liable to corruption than the *pellii* of most other manuscripts, which seems to be due mainly to a reminiscence of Odes 1.7.31 *pellite curas*. On 2.7.69 see above.

Finally a few miscellaneous observations.

At 2.1.79 I think that Shackleton Bailey and Muecke have made the wrong choice between *nihil hinc diffingere possum* and *diffindere*, which have roughly equal manuscript support. The reference in 77–8 to biting on a nut, or (more likely) to the fable of the serpent biting on a file, seems to have influenced some editors to prefer *diffindere*, but Trebatius' acknowledgement here that he can find no flaw in Horace's arguments has no real relationship with that. Muecke sees a legal flavour derived from the phrase *diem diffindere* (which is totally different), and translates ‘split off’; but the only meaning which the word possesses is ‘split apart’. In fact both Shackleton Bailey and Muecke, for reasons obscure to me, find it necessary to adopt the weakly-attested *hic*, which the latter leaves untranslated.

At 2.8.30 (Nomentanus had the job of pointing out things which might go unobserved; for we guests ate food with unfamiliar flavours)

*ut vel continuo patuit, cum passeris atque
ingustata mihi porrexerit ilia rhombi*

the subjunctive verb, which none of the editors who adopt it deigns to justify, seems downright ungrammatical to me, since we require ‘when’ (as Muecke and the other translators whom I have consulted), not ‘since’. The weakly-supported *porrexerat* is somewhat better (for the indicative cf. Hofmann–Szantyr 621, Kühner–Stegmann 2.337), but we really want a perfect, not a pluperfect. I therefore propose *porrexit is*, with the pronoun referring back to Nomentanus, last mentioned in 25–6 (despite the problem which Palmer finds with this, he must be intended). This form of this pronoun is defended by 1.9.18 *trans Tiberim longe cubat is* (though not by 1.1.59, where it is the antecedent of *qui*, nor by

2.3.181, where it is formulaic). It is not surprising that in the sequence *itisili* one syllable should drop out.

One case where the text is not in doubt, but not all the issues involved in interpretation seem to have been realised, is 2.8.14–5

procedit fuscus Hydaspes
Caecuba vina ferens, Alcon Chium maris experts.

The meaning here revolves around the various permutations of deriving *maris* from *mas* or *mare* and construing *expers* as masculine or neuter:

(1) Alcon brings Chian wine lacking (neuter) in ‘body’ (*mas*); so J. E. Yonge (1867).

(2) Alcon brings Chian wine not diluted (neuter) with seawater (*mare*); so most editors.

(3) Alcon lacking (masculine) his manhood (*mas*), i. e. a eunuch. This view is usually attributed to Housman (861–2), but was actually put forward by Doederlein.

(4) is the unreal option that *expers* is masculine and *maris* is from *mare*.

I think that it is safe to say that (1) would never have been suggested but for the well-known imitation in Persius 6.38–40

postquam sapere Urbi
cum pipere et palmis venit nostrum hoc maris experts,
fenisecae crasso vitiarunt unguine pultes.

Horace and his first readers could not have relied on the prospect of imitation by Persius in order to clarify the sense. Moreover the context demands that the wine be praised, not disparaged. The third, apart from the difficulty of linking *expers* with *Alcon*, seems to bring the sentence to a weak close, since the *Sperrung* would then suggest that *expers* is emphatic, which it is not; moreover one must again ask whether, but for Persius, anyone would ever have thought of this. The second has the point that it emphasises the quality of the wine; though brine was added to much Greek wine as a preservative like modern sulfites, it was not usual to mix seawater with the best (Pliny NH 14.73; see André’s note in the Budé edition p. 108) Chian variety, Ariusian (Galen 10.833 K). In Persius ‘unmanly philosophy’ must be the primary sense, so this is one of the cases in which, as I remarked in REL 65 (1987) 153, Roman poets amuse themselves by taking a phrase from a predecessor but changing its sense; however, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. Odes 2.5.20 rightly suppose that there is also a pun on *insul-*

sum, which “would preserve the oxymoron with *sapere*”, the point being that the basic sense of this word, from which ‘to have wisdom’ is derived metaphorically, is ‘to have taste’. On the one hand Persius is recalling the *marem strepitum* (4) of the lyric poetry of Caesius Bassus. On the other he is recalling 19–21

*solis natalibus est qui
tinguat holus siccum muria vafer in calice empta,
ipse sacrum inrorans patinae piper,*

where not only the pepper but also the brine-sauce (*muria*, cf. Horace 2.8.53) look forward to 39; in 19–21 Persius is disapproving, in 38–40 he is quoting sentiments of which he disapproves. All this is typical of his dense use of imagery.

Finally, while one must react with astonishment to the unmetrical conjecture (adopted by Muecke, and now also by Heyworth, *Mnem.* 48 [1995] 574!) *clamantibŭs nunc* at 2.3.62 (it is partly explained by the typography of the Teubner edition, in which *Nunc* is placed on a new line as belonging to a second speaker), it is a pleasure to salute Shackleton Bailey's own successes in emendation, such as 1.3.14 *pura* (to his parallels add Catull. 23.9 *purior salillo*), 1.3.31 *diffluit*, and, boldest and most laudable of all, 2.5.55 *quandoque*; presumably an abbreviation *qn̄* or *qnō* dropped out before *que*. One may note that the suggestion to transpose 2.2.38 to follow 22 had already been made by Doederlein.

APPENDIX

The conjecture *genere* at 1.2.64 was put forward anonymously in perhaps the first classical periodical, *Miscellaneous Observations*, two volumes of which were edited in London by John Jortin in 1731–2; these were subsequently translated into Latin and the series was continued in Amsterdam by Burman and Dorville as *Miscellaneae Observationes*. The British Library has two copies of the British production, both with handwritten attributions of authorship which are explicitly declared to come from Jortin's own original, and both give the conjecture (vol. 1 pp. 245–7) to Pearce. I am most grateful to A. C. Dionisotti for verifying the notes about this which I made long ago.

University of Virginia

E. Courtney