

CRITICA VARIA¹

JOHN TRAPPES-LOMAX
trappeslomag@hotmail.co.uk

SUMMARY

Textual suggestions are made at Hor. *carm.* 2.1.20, 2.12.9; Ov. *epist.* 4.134; Verg. *ecl.* 6.16, 7.15, 7.63-4. The syntax of Pers. 3.29 is clarified. An old interpretation of Hor. *carm.* 2.20.6-7 is revived.

RESUMEN

En este artículo se presentan sugerencias textuales a Hor. *carm.* 2.1.20, 2.12.9; Ov. *epist.* 4.134; Verg. *E.* 6.16, 7.15, 7.63-4, se ofrece una aclaración a la sintaxis de Pers. 3.29 y se saca del olvido una antigua interpretación de Hor. *carm.* 2.20.6-7.

KEY WORDS

Textual criticism; Horace; Vergil; Ovid; Persius.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Crítica textual; Horacio; Virgilio; Ovidio; Persio.

Fecha de recepción: 25/02/2018

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 31/07/2018

1. HOR. *CARM.* 2.1.19-20²

iam fulgor armorum fugacis
terret equos equitumque uultus.

The difficulties of *uultus* have long been recognised and are fully expounded by Harrison; as it ‘makes a somewhat odd object to *terret*’, he puts forward the possibility that it may be ‘a corruption of a similarly shaped noun.’ This is surely correct in itself; Harrison’s own suggestion is *pectus*, but we may incline to think that there should be a complete parallel with *equos* so as to give a poetical periphrasis for *equites*; if so, the disyllable that we are looking for has to be *turmas*; for the expression, cf. *carm.* 2.16.22,

¹ My thanks are due for helpful suggestions and criticism to *Exemplaria Classica*’s two anonymous readers and to Dr David McKie.

² The three suggestions in Horace are inspired by S. Harrison, *Horace Odes Book II*, Cambridge 2017.

epist. 2.1.190; there is of course, no direct palaeographical route from *turmas* to *uultus*, but scribes were capable on occasion of substituting one word for another of the same metrical form. Write:

terret equos equitumque turmas.

2. HOR. *CARM.* 2.12.9-11

tuque pedestribus
dices historiis proelia Caesaris,
Maecenas, melius

Horace has just said that Maecenas would not wish (*nolis*) lyric metres to be used to describe past wars or battles (mythological or otherwise) and is going on to say that he would do better to tell (it is tempting to suggest *dicas*) of Caesar's battles in prose. Again the difficulties of *-que* are fully expounded by Harrison, 'It should really express a parallel between *tu* and another previously mentioned person, whereas Maecenas is the subject of both sentences in the poem so far. It can only really be explained here as expressing an implicit contrast between Horace's potential work and that of Maecenas, but it is hard to parallel in this sense.' Harrison suggests *tu ipse*, but the elision of *tu* seems too harsh for the *Odes* and it is difficult to see a real need for the emphatic *ipse*. Perhaps it is best to imagine the poem with a trochee-shaped hole between *Saturni* and *pedestribus*. How would Horace have filled it? No doubt with a decorative epithet; *saeua* and *dira* come into consideration, but have negative connotations which might not suit a laudatory treatment of Caesar's battles; *dura* seems more appropriate and more dignified, and it would not be impossible to confuse *tu-* and *du-*. Write:

dura pedestribus
dices historiis proelia Caesaris,
Maecenas, melius

The sandwiching of *pedestribus historiis* within *dura ... proelia* of course, accords well with Latin poetical style. Of course, read *dirum* rather than *durum* in line 2.

3. HOR. *CARM.* 2.20.6-7

non ego quem uocas,
dilecte Maecenas, obibo

In his comment on this passage, Harrison rejects the interpretation of ps-Acro (*ordo est: Maecenas, non obibo ego, quem uocas dilecte*), followed by some older editors, on the ground that ‘such syntax is unparalleled in Latin’. Against this it could be argued that ps-Acro was a native speaker of Latin and he found the syntax acceptable; furthermore, Jerome has *uos uocatis me Magister et Domine* at *Ev. Joh. 13.13*, where the Greek has two nominatives, so we are not dealing with a Graecism; finally, an additional and strictly classical example of a verb of appellation governing the vocative has long been hiding in plain sight at *Pers. 3.29*, which will be discussed below.

The difficulty in the way of taking *dilecte* with *Maecenas* is this; *tu me uocas* without further qualification means ‘you summon / are summoning me’; in our passage, ‘I, whom you summon / are summoning’ does not fit the context; therefore, *uocas* must have some further qualification, and that can only be *dilecte*; on the other hand, *Maecenas* does not have to be accompanied by a vocative; cf. *carm. 2.7.13; 2.12.11; 3.16.20; 3.29.3* etc. Write:

non ego quem uocas
‘dilecte’, Maecenas, obibo

4. Ov. *EPIST.* 4.133-4

Iuppiter esse pium statuit quodcumque iuaret,
et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.

A. Palmer expounds *marita* thus: ‘**marita**, adjectively used, takes an abl. as in Hor. *carm. 3.5.5 Milesne Crassi coniuge barbara Turpis maritus vixit*.³ But, in the Horatian example, it is clear that we have to do with an ablative absolute (‘with a barbarian as wife’), and our passage of Ovid is the only example of adjectival *maritus* with ablative which either *ThLL* 8.403.77-8 or *OLD s. u. maritus* 1 can adduce, and the absence of similar examples casts doubt on the correctness of the text. Write:

et fas omne facit facta marita soror.

This gives an *ab urbe condita* construction, i.e. the noun and its participle together constitute an abstract idea: ‘marriage to a sister grants (us) complete justification’. Either *facta* was lost by homoearchon after *facit* and *fratre* is a metrical interpolation or else *facta* was simply misread as *fratre* in a context which necessarily brings brothers to mind. It is perhaps worthwhile to note that *ThLL* finds itself using *facta* in its interpretation of our passage (‘*Iuno Iovis fratris uxor facta*’).

³ *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides*, Oxford 1898, 313.

5. PERS. 3.27-9

hoc satis? an deceat pulmonem ducere uentis
 stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis
 censoremue tuum uel quod trabeate salutas?

Commentators have understandably presumed that both vocatives are addressed to the same person, and they accordingly struggle with *-ue ... uel*, where the disjunctives are unintelligible if he has only one friend to greet; thus W. Kissel, *Aulus Persius Flaccus Satiren*, Heidelberg 1990, 405, 'Eine weitere Schwierigkeit unserer Stelle liegt bereits im Wortlaut selbst, scheint doch eine der beide Konjunktionen abundant zu sein.' The problem disappears as soon as it is realised that he has two possible friends to greet; a pair of inverted commas is all that is needed to make this clear. Write:

censoremue tuum uel quod 'trabeate' salutas?

That is, because you greet either your friend (*OLD s. u. tuus* 2a) the censor who is presiding at the *trauectio equitum* or else your friend who is one of the knights taking part; 'trabeate' *salutas* means simply '*amicum quendam in salutatione «trabeate» uocas*'. The commentators differ on whether this is the *trauectio* conducted by the Emperor or (presumably) his deputy at Rome or else a provincial imitation; our interpretation will suit either.

6. VERG. ECL. 6.16⁴

Readers are asked to bear in mind that the suggestions, in postulating accidental loss of a word followed by metrical interpolation, are no bolder than Bentley's generally accepted *Parim: Paris* for the *Parim creat* of the paradosis at *Aen.* 10.705.

serta procul tantum capiti delapsa iacebant

Kraggerud, reviewing previous attempts to explain *tantum*, observes that it has been taken with 1) *procul*; 2) *delapsa* (a) meaning 'merely' (b) meaning 'recently'; 3) *serta*; 4) the line as a whole. Kraggerud disposes of the other possibilities and prefers 2(a) ('having merely slipped off his head' as opposed to rolling further). As Kraggerud observes, this seems to have been the interpretation of Servius, *ut ostenderet non longius provolutam coronam*, which is also quoted with approval by W. Clausen, *Vergil Eclogues*, Ox-

⁴ These suggestions in the *Eclogues* are inspired by E. Kraggerud, *Vergiliana*, Abingdon - New York 2017.

ford 1994. This hardly seems to be a particularly telling detail, and involves Servius in an unconvincing attempt to interpret *procul* as *propter*, *id est iuxta*. One might also query the idea of Vergil writing so incompetently that scholars have evolved so many mutually exclusive exegeses of his meaning. How would Vergil have completed his line? Not with the vague and superfluous *tantum* but with a decorative epithet; in the context of Silenus' head the right word must be *cano*, which has the additional advantage of alliteration with *capiti*; it was lost by homoearchon, and *tantum* is what it appears to be – a feeble metrical filler. Write:

serta procul capiti <cano> delapsa iacebant

Canus is of course a standard epithet for the elderly and their heads; cf. *OLD s. u. 2a*.

7. VERG. *ECL.* 7.4-5

ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo,
et cantare pares et respondere parati.

There are two puzzles here:

1) Why has Vergil been so sparing with his repetitions of *ambo*? His model here is Theoc. 8.3-4 who manages 4 x ἄμφω, while Vergil himself contrives 3 x *ambae* at *georg.* 4.341-2.

2) What is *pares* supposed to mean? If it means *pariter*, it is superfluous; if it governs *cantare* leaving *parati* to govern *respondere*, it would be clumsy in itself as well as being an unnecessary departure from Vergil's Theocritean model where both infinitives depend upon the same participle. The best interpretation would be that of H.R. Fairclough in the unrevised Loeb (London & Cambridge Mass. 1916), 'ready in a match to sing, as well as to make reply'; but there seems to be no precise parallel even at *OLD s. u. par 12*.

These are both pseudo-puzzles. Write:

ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo,
<ambo etiam> cantare et respondere parati.

The third *ambo* was lost by haplography; to restore metre, *etiam* was reduced to *et* and the feeble metrical filler *pares* was extracted from *parati*.

8. VERG. *ECL.* 7.61-4

Populus Alcidae gratissima, uitis Iaccho,
 formosae myrtus Veneri, sua laurea Phoebo;
 Phyllis amat corylos; illas dum Phyllis amabit,
 nec myrtus uincet corylos, nec laurea Phoebi

According to Servius, the text of the commentator Hebr(i)us had line 64 with *Veneris* instead of *corylos*; this repetition of as much as possible of line 62 accords with the canons of poetical elegance and balance, whereby, if *laurea* continues to be accompanied by Phoebus, then *myrtus* should continue to be accompanied by Venus; *Veneris* is rightly preferred by Kraggerud. Servius continues *et ita adserit*: ‘*illas dum Phyllis amabit*’, *non tam necessarium fuit dicere ‘corylos’: perinde enim est ac si dixisset ‘Phyllis amat corylos, corylos dum Phyllis amabit*’. From this we may deduce that all the MSS known to the ancient commentators had *corylos, illas*, but that they would have preferred *corylos, corylos*. So did Vergil. Write:

Phyllis amat corylos; <corylos> dum Phyllis amabit,
 nec myrtus uincet Veneris nec laurea Phoebi.

No Roman poet could resist such repetitions; cf. the numerous examples given by J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1996, 228-31, and 257-8; in this case, as often, there was loss by haplography and the insertion of yet another feeble metrical filler.