

Textual Notes on Horace's *Odes* I-II

Luis RIVERO GARCÍA

Universidad de Huelva

Abstract: this paper offers fresh discussions and new information on the manuscript and printed transmission of the text of Horace's *Odes* I-II.

Keywords: Horace, *Odes* I-II, manuscript and printed transmission, textual criticism.

* * *

Editing such a rich and complex text as that of Horace's *Odes* necessarily raises new perspectives and proposals. We are currently engaged in the critical edition of both the *Odes* and the *Secular Hymn*, once published that of the *Epodes*, and the volume containing the first two Books is already finished. As in the case of the edition of the *Epodes*, the distinctive contribution of our work is that it is based on the full collation of all the extant mss. prior to 1150 (93 for Books I-II), plus the 9 mss. *recentiores* kept in Spain. To all this we add the testimony of more than 100 editions since the *princeps* of Venice 1471-1472 down to the one prepared by Pianezzola's team in Padova (Milano 2024), as well as all the *parerga* and critical papers we know of. This has brought back to light quite a few interesting textual proposals and led us to correct many false attributions that have circulated through the last centuries. Thus the aim and nature of this paper is the same as that of the analogous article about the *Epodes* already published in this journal¹.

* * *

- 1, 15, 19-20²:

tamen – heu! – serus adulteros
cultus puluere collines.

20

¹ RIVERO 2023. Our edition of the *Epodes* is RIVERO, ESTÉVEZ and RAMÍREZ DE VERGER 2024. An abridged version of this paper was presented at the First LITTERA Symposium in Latin Textual Criticism (Univ. of Barcelona, 16th May 2025) and benefited from the debate with some colleagues attending the conference. I want to express my deepest gratitude to prof. Juan A. Estévez for his collaboration and help with this article and with our daily work over the years. Thanks are due also to profs. Rosa Moreno Soldevila and Stephen Heyworth for the suggestions made to the draft of this paper. This article forms part of Research Project PID2022-136988NB-I00, «Edición de poemas de Horacio II», financed by the Spanish Government and «FEDER Una manera de hacer Europa».

² Except where explicitly indicated, I always start from the text that I am defending, which needs not necessarily be the text to appear in our edition (due to disagreement between the editors). For the identification of most of the manuscripts and editions cited in this article, see RIVERO, ESTÉVEZ and RAMÍREZ DE VERGER 2024. In any case, mss. are cited in alphabetical order and grouped chronologically (*antiquiores* down to ca. 1150 + s. xii ex. + s. xv).

• **20** cultus ζ, «*in duobus cod. Bland.*» test. Cruquius (1578, p. 42), dub. Lambinus (1561, 74ⁿ), 1811, def. Nisbet et Hubbard (1970, p. 197) : crinis ^{V^{uac}}, 1713 : crines ζ, 1471-72 : uultus A2^{ulmp}Cs(*quid^{sulnl}*)Ld4^{uac}P17, 1482 : comptus Palmer (1893, p. 100) coll. IV 9.13-14, Lucr., I 87, prob. Campbell : om. C^{ac} •

As can be seen, the reading *cultus* is not a minor variant, and is supported by such important codices as **V6** (VAT. Reg. lat. 1703, s. ix) or **P15** (PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10310, s. ix²)³. However, it has been accepted by only a minority of editors, since most of them have preferred the general paradosis *crines* (viz. *crinis*)⁴.

Ps-Acro is of no avail for our choice:

19. HEV SERVVS ADVLTEROS C(RINIS) P(VLVERE) C(ONLINES)] Serus aut eorum dolore dixit, qui eius causa perierunt, aut certe, qui quantum ad inertiam suam tarde perierit.

20. PVLVERE CONLINES] Hoc est: procuratam capillorum pulchritudinem puluere inquinabis, ut (Verg. *Aen.* XII 99): Et foedare in puluere crines.

That is, in this last passage he seems to paraphrase *cultus* through *procuratam capillorum pulchritudinem* but illustrates it with an instance of *crines*.

The obvious model for our passage is Hom. *Il.* 3, 55 ἦ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος ὄτ' ἐν κόνησι μυγείης, which fails however to prove any of the variants since it presents both κόμη (*crinis*) and εἶδος (*cultus*). Another duly cited parallel for our passage is the aforementioned Verg. *Aen.* 12, 99 *foedare in puluere crinis*, which has traditionally been considered as strong support for *crinis/crines*⁵. Another passage from Horace himself (*Carm.* 4, 9, 13-14) has also been adduced: *non sola comptos arsit adulteri / crinis*, but, as Nisbet and Hubbard rightly state (1970, p. 197), «in fact it could tell in favour of *cultus*; an easy explanation of the corruption would be an ancient scribe's memory, conscious or subconscious, of *adulteri crines*».

³ These are their respective witnesses in detail, as will appear in the *appendix librorum manu scriptorum* of our forthcoming edition: cultus Be5D^lL3Ld^{2ul}Ld4^{pc}Li2Li3Lr^{2u}Lr4LwMpP2P5P6P7P12P13^{2sul}P14P15P18^{ex}Pe^{ac}SV3V4^{2sul}V5V6V13^{2sul}V14(ornamenta uel crines V14^{2s}) Es6 : crines AA2BaBeBrBr2C^{pc}C2EGcHHIL2LdLd2Ld3LiLi2^{2pc}Li3^{2pc}LrLr2Lr3MIMoMo3Mp^sMp2NNwOO2PP3P4P5^{2ul}P6^{2ul}P8P9P11P12^{amul}P13P14^{2sul}P15^{2pc}P18^{sulmp}Pe^{pcmp}RcS^{sul}S3V^{pc}V2V4V5^{sul}V6^{pcam}V7V8V9V12V13VaZ EsEs2 Es3Es4Es5Es6^{mulam}Es7MtMt2.

⁴ Apart from the reading *uultus*, probably a misprint, adopted in the editions of 1482, 1483, 1490, and 1498, only CAMPBELL (1945 and 1953) edited the conjecture *comptus* made by PALMER (1893, p. 100) by comparison with 4, 9, 13-14 *non sola comptos arsit adulteri / crinis et aurum uestibus illitum* ..., and LUCR. 1, 87 *cui simul infula uirgineos circum data comptus*. For these and other conjectures on the text of Horace, the reader should obviously visit the *Repertory of Conjectures on Horace* at the so-called Oslo database: <https://tekstlab.uio.no/horace/intro>

⁵ Inspired in turn on this passage, and referring precisely to Paris, cf. *Ilias Lat.* 321-323 *Vidi puduitque uidere, / arreptum cum te traheret uiolentus Atrides / Iliacoque tuos foedaret puluere crines.*

Let us now have a look at Virgil's whole passage (*Aen.* 12, 97-100; Turnus speaking):

da sternere corpus
loricamque manu ualida lacerare reuulsam
semiuiri Phrygis et foedare in puluere crinis
uibratos calido ferro murraque madentis. 100

While alluding to another Troian (sc. Aeneas), Turnus expresses the lack of masculinity through Aeneas' hair (*crinis*, l. 99), but those *crines* are not just mentioned, since Virgil also presents them as *cultos*, i.e. *uibratos* and *madentis*⁹.

Let us come finally to the source-passage in full, that is, Hector' words of reproach against Paris (*Hom. Il.* 3, 39-57):

τὸν δ' Ἐκτώρ νείκεσσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν:
Δύσπαρι εἶδος ἄριστε γυναιμανὲς ἠπεροπευτὰ
αἴθ' ὄφελος ἄγονός τ' ἔμεναι ἄγαμός τ' ἀπολέσθαι: 40
καί κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν
ἢ οὕτω λώβην τ' ἔμεναι καὶ ὑπόψιον ἄλλων.
ἦ που καγχαλόωσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
φάντες ἀριστῆα πρόμον ἔμμεναι, οὐνεκα καλὸν
εἶδος ἔπ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσὶν οὐδέ τις ἀλκή. 45
ἦ τοιόσδε ἐὼν ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι
πόντον ἐπιπλώσας, ἐτάρους ἐρήρας ἀγείρας,
μιχθεὶς ἀλλοδαποῖσι γυναῖκ' εὐειδέ' ἀνήγες
ἔξ ἀπίης γαίης νυδὸν ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητῶν
πατρί τε σῶ μέγα πῆμα πόληϊ τε παντί τε δήμῳ, 50
δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δὲ σοὶ αὐτῶ;
οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνειας ἀρηϊφίλον Μενέλαον;
γνοίης χ' οἴου φωτὸς ἔχεις θαλερὴν παράκοιτιν:
οὐκ ἂν τοι χραίσμη κίθαρὶς τά τε δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης
ἦ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος ὅτ' ἐν κονίησι μιγείης. 55
ἀλλὰ μάλα Τρῶες δευδῆμονες: ἦ τέ κεν ἦδη
λάϊνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἔνεχ' ὅσσα ἔοργας.

It is obvious that Homer portrays Paris' excessive attention to his look both through κόμη and through εἶδος, but in fact he insists on the latter mentioning it three times, at the very beginning (l. 39), at the middle (ll. 44-45), and at the end of the speech (l. 55)¹⁰. Seen

caesariem 13; fouling the hair in the dust is a standard motif, cf. Pindar, *Nemean* r.68 (in the prophecy of Tiresias), Virg. *Aen.* 12.98. *But that is not in H.'s manner: he is more likely to add a new idea rather than repeat one*» (my stress). Repetition in Horace is much more frequent than has been usually accepted.

⁹ Cf. a similar way of pointing to the excess of *cultus* in Dardanian men at 4, 215-217 *crinemque madentem*.

¹⁰ Thus, it is not exact that «l'insistenza sui capelli [...] corrisponde all'immagine omerica di *Il.* III 54-5» (BALDO 2024, p. 270). It is probably no accident that Ovid, making Paris himself speak to Helen (*Ep.* 16,

editors (e.g. Shackleton Bailey 2001, p. 26 in app.: «fort. recte») and commentators¹⁴. Mayer (2012, p. 167), for instance, presents the reading thus: «The less well attested reading *expeditus* ‘released from’ (*OLD* 2b) is attractive, but it may be owed to Porphyrio, who explains the phraseology thus: *curis autem expeditis pro ‘ipse curis expeditus, id est securus’*. In effect he regards it as a transferred epithet (cf. *TLL* V 2.1619.42-5)». A similar position was that of Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, p. 269), who rejected the «weakly supported» *expeditus* but devote their note to reminding the proper use of the term with a separative ablative, to which end they duly cite, among other passages with *cura*, Ter. *Phorm.* 823 *cura sese expediuit*, and compare also Ter. *Hec.* 291 *rem cognosces, iram expedites, rursum in gratiam restitues*. Although they insist (*ibid.*) that «Bentley failed to make clear that *expeditus* has no serious manuscript authority», and suggest that «the rhyme *curis... expeditis* is very typical of Horace’s Sapphics», they immediately add: «yet this fact might in itself have contributed to a corruption», and to this end they remember Bentley’s suggestion that the corrupt *expeditis* was introduced by «an *eruditulus* who remembered 1. 8. 12 ‘saepe trans finem iaculo nobilis expedito’». In sum, they seem to regret that the nominative lacks any kind of manuscript support in order to adopt it.

The fact, however, is that *expeditus* has been transmitted by more than thirty *antiquiores*¹⁵. But in addition we should remember at least the following passages from Horace himself as far as its construction with a separative ablative (i.e. instead of the prepositional construction) is concerned: 1, 27, 23-24 *uix illigatum te triformi / Pegasus expedit Chimaera*; 3, 24, 7-8 *non animum metu / non mortis laqueis expedit caput* (and, for the separative value, cf. also *Epod.* 11, 25-26 *unde expedit non amicorum queant / libera consilia*). Should a parallel in the passive participle be needed, we could remember (pace *TLL* 5, 2, 1618.47) Apul. *Met.* 9, 5 *tenacissimis amplexibus expeditum hominem*. As for the sense, cf. also Hor. *Epod.* 5, 25 *expedita Sagana*.

1544, 1555, 1555^m, 1560, 1578, 1581, 1608, 1612, 1652, 1663, 1671, 1713, 1731, 1770, 1794, 1945^c, 1953. All the others considered in our edition prefer *expeditis*: 1479, 1492, 1498^l, 1503, 1503^b, 1561, 1566, 1566, 1613, 1616, 1699, 1701, 1721, 1752, 1788, 1792, 1792^c, 1796, 1800, 1811, 1820, 1822, 1825, 1829, 1831, 1848, 1854, 1856, 1856^l, 1868, 1869, 1881, 1886, 1889, 1889^s, 1892, 1894, 1899, 1900, 1903, 1908, 1912, 1912^v, 1920, 1922, 1922^u, 1924, 1929, 1943, 1955, 1959, 1978, 1984, 1990, 1991, 2001, 2004, 2018, 2024.

¹⁴ DUSO 2024, p. 309 does not deal with this term, and NOSARTI (2024, p. 62) edits *expeditis*.

¹⁵ These are the witnesses of both readings, to be found in the append. mss. of our forthcoming edition: *expeditus*
Ba^{pc}Be4Bn^{ac}Br2^{pc}CEHL2Ld2Lr2Lr4^{ul}MLMpMp2NP4P5^{2pc}P8^{2sul}P9P10^{2pc}P11P12^{2ul}P15P17^{pc}Rc^{pc}S3V^{sulam}V
8V9V12V13Va *EsEs2* *Es3Es4Es5Mt* : *expeditis*
AA2Ba^{uac}BeBe3Be5Bn^{pc}Br2^{uac}C2CsDDuFGcHIL3LdLd3Ld4LiLi3LrLr3Lr4LwMoMo3NwOO2PP2P3P5
*P6*P7P8P10P12P13P14P17^{ac}P18PeSS2SeVV2V3V4V5V6V7V8^{2mul}V11V14Z* *Es5^{am}(r̄)Es6Es7*.

We thus prefer the nominative with this apparatus:

- **11** expeditus ζ, *edd. multi, def. Bentley* («uerior uidetur et elegantior», 1713, p. 56ⁿ), *cf. I 27.24, III 24.8 (Epod., XI 25), Ter., Phorm., 823 : et expeditus Rec^{ac} : expeditis ζ, «4 Bland.» test. Cruquius (1578, p. 54), edd. plerique : expiditis Li2* •

* * *

- 1, 28, 21-22:

Me quoque deuexi rabidus comes Orionis
Illyricis Notus obruit undis.

The general paradosis of the mss. in l. 21, and the one adopted by most editors, is *rapidus* (*Notus*), an adjective naturally applied to winds and to any other kind of blow or fluid. As is well known, though, the alternation *rapidus-rabidus* is systematic in the manuscripts¹⁶, although in our passage *rabidus* is only attested by **Ld2** (LEIDEN, Bibl. der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 127, s. xii). As far as we know, it was first edited by Bond (1678, p. 27) with no further indication, and the next editor to adopt it was Müller (1874, p. 33), who defended it in the *Notes* of his 1900 edition in these terms (p. 108): «– *rabidus*; = *furiosus*; *rapidus* = *celer*. Fast alle Hss. haben *rapidus*; an sich passend; vgl. 14, 5; doch erscheint hier neben *obruit* geeigneter *rabidus*, das H. auch Ep. II, 3, 393 braucht. Bekanntlich werden beide Worte in Hss. oft verwechselt, meist zu Ungunsten des selteneren *rabidus*, da die richtige Bedeutung von *rapidus* den Gelehrten des Mittelalters unbekannt war. Dasselbe bedeutet nie „reissend“, während *rapax* ebensowohl für *rapidus* als für *rabidus* steht».

It was also adopted by Petschenig (1883, p. 21), Van der Weerd (1886, p. 33), and Waltz (1887, p. 68), with no comment, and after them by no editor until Campbell (1945 and 1953, s.p.), who considered it in his *Notes* a «coniectura in cod.» (1945, s.p.) and rightly compared the expression *rabiem Noti* at 1, 3, 14. In more recent times it was the reading adopted by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, pp. 331-332) and Mayer (2012, p. 187) in their commentaries¹⁷, and by Shackleton Bailey (2001, p. 31) and Holzberg (2018, p. 292) in their editions.

From the semantic point of view there is of course no objection to qualifying the *Notus* as *rabidus*, as 1, 3, 14 clearly shows, and the adjective itself is not unknown to

¹⁶ To quote only from Books I-II, cf. 1, 12, 9; 2, 9, 12, and see NISBET-HUBBARD (1970, p. 331), with further bibliography.

¹⁷ DUSO 2024, p. 339 does not deal with this term, and NOSARTI (2024, p. 76) edits *rapidus*.

Horace, as *Ars* 393 (*rabidosque leones*) proves. Furthermore, as Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, p. 332) rightly state, «here the variant *rapidosque* has substantial manuscript support, and if it had appeared in the tradition as a whole would no doubt give widespread satisfaction». In support of *rabidus* they then (pp. 331-332) repeat the passages alleged by Müller (*Ars* 393) and Campbell (*Carm.* 1, 3, 14) and to them they add Sen. *Ag.* 484 *quid rabidus [rapidus u.l.] ora Corus Oceano exerens?*, as well as comparison with Verg. *Aen.* 5, 802 *rabiem tantam caelique marisque*, and Ou. *Met.* 5, 7 *uentorum rabies motis exasperat undis* (partially similar would be also Sen. *Thy.* 360-362 *non Eurus rapiens mare / aut saeuo rabidus [rapidus u.l.] freto / uentosi tumor Hadriae*). They also use Müller's argument that *rapidus* «does not suit *obruit* particularly well», and add that this adjective «does not naturally qualify nouns denoting persons, and the wind here is personified as a *comes*».

Thus, some further parallels, that is, other occurrences of *rabidus* with the name of a wind or similar (in addition to the already mentioned Sen. *Ag.* 484), would be most welcome to defend *rabidus* here. One could be Luc. 6, 27 *rabido [rapido u.l.] cum tollitur Austro*. We could also mention Claud. 12, 42 *rabidi [rapidi u.l.] tacete Cori*, or else Auian. 16, 13-14 '*Tu rabidos [rapidos u.l.]*' *inquit 'uentos saeuasque procellas / despicias et totis uiribus acta ruis*, or Boeth. *Cons.* 2, 2, 1 *Si quantas rabidis [rapidis u.l.] flatibus incitus* (and cf. *rabidique [rapidique u.l.] uapores* in Arat. *Apost.* 2, 1177; or qualifying *procella* in Drac. *Laud.* 2, 159 *ut rabidae perturbent cuncta procellae*; *Romul.* 10, 39 *rabidas ... procellas* [Arat. *Apost.* 2, 1084 *rapidas u.l.*; Eug. Tol. *Hex.* 589]; *Romul.* 8, 431 *rabidis ... procellis*). We could also remember Germ. Arat. *fr.* 4, 159 *frigidus at rabidis horrebit Aquarius Euris*, but in this case *rabidis* is Gain's conjecture (1976, p. 51) as against the unanimous *rapidis*. Gain (1976, p. 138) defended it by comparing similar adjectives applied to Eurus as *durus* (Auian. 2, 1693), *trux* (Ou. *Met.* 15, 603; cf. *Ep.* 11, 9), *proteruus* (Ou. *Ep.* 11, 14), *animosus* (Verg. *Georg.* 2, 441), *uiolentus* (Verg. *Georg.* 2, 107), or else the verb *perstrepo* (Auian. 3, 847).

The fact, however, is that, as we have seen, the alternation of the variants *rabid-/rapid-* in the mss. is systematic and thus the parallels adduced are subject to editorial criteria. Furthermore, in view of the invasive nature of *rapidus* vis-à-vis *rabidus* («raro librarii intactum relinquunt», as Housman 1903, p. 40, said on Man. 1, 396), a second thought should probably be given to not a few recurrences of *rapidus* in the current editorial state of Latin texts.

We then propose to edit *rabidus* with this apparatus:

many scholars to suspect it to be a mere typo), although prof. Estévez has found it also in a teaching manual from 1637 written in Czech language (Drexel 1637, pp. 503-504).

The passage of Fronto, however, does not necessarily have been inspired directly by this passage of Horace, but this could not be said about a text by Isidore of Seville duly recalled by J.M. Stowasser in a very short note published in 1892 (Isid. *Syn.* 2, 89, 10-13; ed. Elfassi 2009):

rec. Λ

Alta enim arbor <u>uentis fortius</u> exagitur,	10
<u>excelsae</u> turre <u>grauiori casu</u> procumbunt;	12
altissimi <u>montes</u> crebris fulminibus <u>feriuntur</u> .	13

rec. Φ

Alta arbor <u>uentis fortius</u> <u>agitatur</u> ,	10
et rami eius citius in ruina confringuntur;	11
altissimi <u>montes</u> crebris <u>fulgoribus</u> <u>feriuntur</u> .	13

Independently from the variants with which this text has been transmitted in every recension, it is an obvious remake or paraphrasis of the Horatian model and – for our present interest – Isidore’s *fortius* is a variation of *saeuus*, not of *saepius*²⁴. But the fact is that, following his habitual practice, Isidore cites this Horatian passage again in another work and paraphrases the adverb with the expression *amplius sentire*, which points once again to *saeuus* and not to *saepius* (*Nat.* 30, 5, éd. Fontaine 1960, p. 283 ll. 33-36)²⁵:

Sublimia loca amplius sentire uentorum uel fulminis iniuriam quam humilior terra. Vnde et Horatius: feriuntque summos / Fulgura montes.

²⁴ Following the authority of FONTAINE (1959, p. 168 n. 4), PISCITELLI (1998, pp. 39-40) discards Isidore’s direct reading of Horace and defends that he knew him «attraverso fonti intermedie». Among the instances of borrowings, however, she fails to cite this passage (which is not attested, by the way, in any other «fonte intermedia» as far as I know). However, FONTAINE (p. 168) refers only to the *Epodes* and the *Origines*, and expresses himself in not unequivocal terms: «Il est donc à peu près sûr que les citations des *Epodes* dans les *Origines* ne permettent pas de conclure à une connaissance directe et suivie du recueil horatien de la part du Sévillan». On the contrary, MONTEVERDI (1936, p. 162) had defended that the Spanish authors of the late VII c. (Isidore obviously among them), as against those authors from Italy or Gallia in the same decades, were still familiar with Horace («per loro Orazio non è morto»), and (p. 163) that the situation changed in Spain with the arab invasion. Yet he recognises that there were sporadic mentions of Horace in the authors from VII to IX centuries, but he believes that those mentions were indirect, taken «da Isidoro, o dal grammatico Prisciano, o dai Padri della chiesa [...]». Ma non c’era nulla, *in quei ripetitori*, che venisse da una loro diretta lettura del poeta» (my italics). As can be seen, this aspect of Isidore’s sources remains still to be studied.

²⁵ We owe this reference to prof. Jacques Elfassi *uia* prof. Álvaro Cancela, whom we feel indebted and thankful.

Thus, it seems that we are not dealing with a conjecture but with a variant presupposed by the indirect tradition, much older than any of the Horatian manuscripts arrived to us, as was defended with all good reason by Stowasser (1892, p. 208): «Eine nicht misszuverstehende Autorität, die älter ist als alle Handschriften», and is ratified by Brink (1971, p. 25): «What was anyway a probable emendation thus becomes a probable reading, and should be moved from the apparatus into the text. It is an instance in which the probable indirect transmission is superior to the whole of the Horatian paradosis»²⁶.

But the fact is that another passage could still be mentioned as an indirect support for *saevius*, a passage where Seneca, dealing with the very same moralistic motif, uses the expression *leuius ferit* as the counterbalance of Horace's *saevius* (*Phaedr.* 1123-1125)²⁷:

Quanti casus, heu, magna rotant!
 minor in paruis Fortuna furit
leuiusque ferit leuiores deus;

For another thing, if we give such an importance to Isidore's recreation of our passage, we should at least consider the variant *excelsae* as transmitted by rec. Λ (*Syn.* 2, 89, 12), since it is attested also in some old mss. of Horace²⁸. The variants stem from the confusion between *et* and *ex*, an extremely easy one, especially if *et* is transmitted (as it is in many mss. for this passage) & («ampersand»). We should not forget that such a common word as *et* becomes an intrusive term. As for the meaning, *excelsus* refers to high places or things, and the nuance of sublimity developed mainly among late and Christian authors (*TLL* 5, 2, 1221.11-38).

In our stanza *excelsae* would imply that the first two instances of the *exempla* would be juxtaposed and only the last one would be linked with *-que*, which would be as expectable in Horace as the succession *et ... -que*. It is true that the adjective *excelsus* does not appear elsewhere in Horace, while *celsus* recurs in other three passages (*Epod.* 16, 29, *Carm.* 3, 4, 14, *Ars* 342), but in all of them *celsus* accompanies a proper noun (and, at least in *Ars* 342 and *Epod.* 16, 29, a person or a personified reality: cf. our note to *Epod.* 16, 29). The expression *celsa turris* is also to be found in Ou. *Met.* 3, 61 *cum turribus ardua celsis*; Stat. *Theb.* 5, 352 *scandimus et celsas turres* (cf. 9, 554-555 *celsa*

²⁶ For the – dispensable – paleographic justification of the alternation of *u/p*, see BRINK 1971, p. 24 n. 4.

²⁷ And compare also the expression *uentis clementer agitari* (PALLAD. 12, 5), cited by BURMAN (*ibid.*).

²⁸ For the mss., see below. We do not consider the variant *fulminibus* in rec. Λ, since we have *fulgoribus* in rec. Φ and it is a recurring alternation in the mss., attested by CRUQUIUS (1578, p. 108) for this very passage; cf. also 1, 12, 60.

... / *turris*), and Sil. 13, 104-105 *celsas* / ... *turris*, but *excelsa turris* is not unparalleled²⁹: Sil. 6, 215 *excelsas turris*; 13, 688 *excelsae turris*, and observe especially this passage by Juvenal (10, 104-107):

nam qui [*sc.* Seianus] nimios optabat honores
 et nimias poscebat opes, numerosa parabat 105
excelsae turris tabulata, unde altior esset
casus et impulsae praeceps immane ruinae.

That is, when referring to such a paradigmatic case of the topic as Seianus, Juvenal borrows from Horace (albeit in combination with Virgil's tower of *Aen.* 2, 460-467: see Courtney 1980, p. 465 *ad loc.*, who however fails to cite Horace's passage) the *turris* and its adjective along with the explicit reference to *casus*. Considered together both this passage and those of Isidore, it seems preferable to assume that both of them found *excelsae* in their common model than to suppose that both of them coincided in their *imitatio cum uariatione*. We propose thus this text and apparatus:

Saeuius uentis agitur ingens
 pinus, excelsae grauiore casu 10
 decidunt tures feriuntque summos
 fulgura montis.

• **9** saeuius «*Sorb. cod.*» test. Valart (1770, p. 302), def. Stowasser (1892, p. 208) coll. Isid., Syn., II 89.10 (fortius), cf. etiam Isid., Nat., XXX 5 (amplius), Front., Princ., II 18.3, Sen., Phaedr., 1125, sic Drexel (1637, pp. 503-504), «ed. Rothomag. 1701» (ap. Cunningham, 1721, p. 48ⁿ), an felici errore? item con. Burman (1727, p. 187ⁿ) ad Ou., Ep., XIV 39, Sanadon (1728, p. 308, def. p. 309ⁿ), edd. aliquot, recte def. Brink (1971, pp. 23-25) : s(a)epius Ω, edd. plerique, def. Jahn (1824, p. 227), Keller (1879, p. 144) • **10** pinus Ω : pignus P4^{ac} : primus P13^{ac} • excelsę NwV3V11^{pc} Es3Es5, Cunningham (1721, p. 48), edd. pauci, cf. Isid., Syn., II 89.12, Iuu., X 104-107 : et excelsę Lw : et cels(a)e Ω, edd. plerique, def. Keller (1879, pp. 144-146) : et caelse V7 • **12** fulgura Ω, edd. : fulgora Be3L2Li2^{acmp}LrMoP6P7Rc^{ac} : furgura P17^{ac} : fulmina «uulgati» test. (et improb.) Cruquius (1578, p. 108), 1509, edd. aliquot, cf. Isid., Syn., II 89.13(u.l.), lege Keller (1879, pp. 144-146) • montis ζ : montes Ω •

* * *

- 2, 13, 31-32:

pugnas et exactos tyrannos
 densum umeris bibit aure uulgus.

(ed. Shackleton Bailey 2001)

²⁹ Cf. also TERT. Marc. 4, 7, and for its use with buildings or parts of a building, cf. LUC. 3, 462 (*arces*; cf. VAL. MAX. 5, 3, 3, 83), STAT. Theb. 11, 416 (*tectis*), CORIP. Ioh. 1, 67 (*portas*).

As in the case of 1, 28, 25-26, we are again before a text whose paradox is I am unable to understand as it stands. The manuscripts are unanimous in transmitting *umeris* (usually *humeris*) and this reading has been accepted by most editors, even if the translation «the crowd close-packed with its shoulders» (so Harrison, 2017, p. 165) proves that it is hardly Latin, at least if it is intended to suggest «an avid audience standing pressed shoulder to shoulder» (*ibid.*, and cf. Nisbet and Hubbard, 1978, p. 219 *ad loc.*, who compare the scene with that of a Roman *contio*). Neither is it valid to remind a case such as Ou. *Met.* 14, 360 *densum trabibus nemus* (so Nisbet and Hubbard, *ibid.*)³⁰ or else Luc. 3, 362-363 *robore densae / ... siluae* (so Harrison, *ibid.*), where the ablative properly indicates the trunks of which the forest consists (and hence it was rightly considered somewhat superfluous by Bentley 1713, pp. 122-123 in his note *ad loc.*), while the Horatian *uulgus* does not ‘consist of’ shoulders; nor is it Mart. 6, 38, 5-6 *densumque corona / uulgus* (so Harrison, *ibid.*), where *corona* indicates the circular disposition or way of standing of the thick crowd³¹.

Thus, suspicion about the term, which also confers an asymmetric disposition to the line, started at least as soon as with Bentley («quo tamen illud *humeris*?»), and see below), and merited a «*uix sanum*» in the apparatus of Shackleton Bailey’s Teubner edition (2001, p. 57). The expression *densum uulgus* (or sim.) is not infrequent in poetry: Luc. 2, 201 *densi ... uolgi*; Catull. 68B, 60 *densi ... populi*; Verg. *Aen.* 5, 833-834 *densum ... / agmen* (*Laus Pis.* 38 *agmine denso*); Ou. *Pont.* 4, 9, 24, *densa ... turba* (*Sen. Herc. f.* 827-828; *Stat. Theb.* 8, 691-692; *Mart.* 7, 61, 7; 10, 10, 4). The idea is that there is a huddled crowd, and the ablative (*h*)*umeris* here adds nothing to the meaning of the phrase. However, an adjective seems to be lacking for *aure*, at least if we compare Prop. 3, 6, 8 *suspensis auribus ista bibam*; *Stat. Silu.* 5, 2, 58-59 *bibe talia pronis / auribus*; cf. *Sen. Oed.* 385 *uoces aure non timida hauriam* (but note that both Vergil and Ovid use the phrase *auribus haurire* just as a poetic synonym for *audire*).

The expression *bibit aure* was paraphrased as *cupidissime audit* by Porphirio (cf. *auribus bibere* in Prop. 3, 6, 8 and Ou. *Tr.* 3, 5, 14, cited by Duso, 2024, p. 469, and *aure*

³⁰ Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 8, 329 *silua frequens trabibus*.

³¹ It is not comparable either CORIPP. *Iust.* 2, 315-316 *Certatim toto uulgus micat undique circo, / ut ueniunt densae manicis albetibus undae*, because *manicis albetibus* seems to be an instrumental or sociative ablative depending both from *densae* and from *ueniunt*.

bibere in Ven. Fort. *carm.* 3.6.18, 5.2.50, 10.9.52³²), and this led Bentley (*ibid.*) to propose *auida* with further parallels. However, as Nisbet and Hubbard rightly observed, Porphirio's comment would be superfluous should *auida* have been the genuine reading. But Bentley was thereby following Heinsius in his search for a balancing epithet for *aure*. Heinsius had ingeniously proposed *hilari*, although it does not fit the reverential tone of the stanza (for a similar reason we should reject both *alacri ... ore* or else *alacri ... aure* as edited by Campbell in 1945 and 1953 resp.). To that end it is much better to recover, at least as a diagnostic emendation, the first timid proposal made by Bentley in the same note: *humili* «ut ad *silentium* illum *sacrum & admirationem* referatur», and which of course fits better the social provenance of the *uulgus* and contrasts with the *tyrannos*³³. The enallage *humili aure* is not unparalleled within the oeuvre of Horace himself: *Serm.* 2, 8, 77-78 *tum in lecto quoque uideres / stridere secreta diuisos aure susurros*; *Carm.* 1, 27, 18 *depone tutis auribus*; 3, 11, 7-8 *dic modos Lyde quibus obstinatas / applicet auris*; *Saec.* 71-72 *uotis puerorum amicas / applicat auris* (cf. also fig. *Serm.* 1, 10, 10 *impediat uerbis lassas onerantibus auris*; *Ep.* 1, 16, 26 *his uerbis uacuas permulceat auris*)³⁴.

Furthermore, it is also palaeographically impeccable vis-à-vis *humeris*, and thus it becomes surprising that Bentley mistakenly explained *humeris* «ex Glossa», which seems highly improbable. As a last argument to support *humili* I would add a 12th-c. passage which my colleague prof. Estévez suggested to me (Walter of Châtillon, *Alex.* 1, 81): *Atque hec dicentem uigili bibit aure magistrum*. As can be seen, it seems to combine the aforementioned passages of Venantius Fortunatus and the synesthesia/enallage *uigili aure* of Stat. *Silu.* 3, 5, 34-35 *totasque in murmure noctes / aure rapis uigili*, with a structure somewhat similar to that of Horace (cf. the position of *dicentem/densum... magistrum/uulgus*, albeit with a different function in each case, and cf. also the equivalent position of *bibit aure* in the hexameter and the Alcaic decasyllabic). It shares also both the ending of *uigili* (cf. also Prop. 1, 1, 31 *uos remanete, quibus facili deus annuit aure*) and the symmetric disposition abVBA in the line.

I thus propose to edit *densum humili bibit aure uulgus* with this apparatus:

³² 3, 6, 18 (5, 2, 50) *ut bibat aure fidem, porrigit ore salem*; 10, 9, 52 *pascebar Musis, aure bibente melos*. I owe these passages, as well as that of Corippus before, to prof. Estévez.

³³ It is surely from Bentley that WADE (1731, p. 54) took his idea to edit *tensa humilis bibit aure uolgus* in a sort of 'golden line' but with an undesirable masculine use of *uulgus*.

³⁴ Significantly enough, Virgil does not seem to have used it, but Ovid developed it even further than Horace: cf. e.g. *Ep.* 20, 98 *et uocem memori condidit aure tuam*; *Pont.* 2, 8, 44 *accipe non dura supplicis aure preces!*; 4, 5, 12 *nomina decepta quaelibet aure ferat* (cf. also *Am.* 2, 2, 53; *Ep.* 3, 59; 12, 176; *Ars* 2, 449; 3, 699; *Met.* 10, 382; *Fast.* 1, 179; *Pont.* 1, 2, 127; 4, 5, 1).

- **32** *humili dub. Bentley (1713, pp. 122-123ⁿ, qui tamen auida mal.) : (h)umeris Ω, edd., recte susp. Sh. Bailey (2001, p. 57ⁿ) : hilari dub. Heinsius (ap. Bentley, ibid.) •*

References

Baldo 2024 = *Orazio. Odi*, vol. I, libri I-II, a cura di E. PIANEZZOLA e G. BALDO; testo critico e nota metrica di L. NOSARTI; traduzione di E. PIANEZZOLA; commento di G. BALDO e A. DUSO, Milano, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2024.

Bentley 1713 = R. BENTLEY, *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleii*. Editio altera, Amstelaedami 1713.

Bernsdorff 2016 = H. BERNSDORFF, *Paris' hair and the structure of Horace, Carmen 1.15*, «BICS» 59, 2016, pp. 42-45.

Bond 1678 = J. BOND, *Horatius Flaccus Scholiis Commentarii*, London 1678.

Brink 1971 = C.O. BRINK, *Horatian Notes II: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the Odes, Book II*, «PCPhS» 17, 1971, pp. 17-29.

Burman 1727 = *Ovidius. Opera omnia*, IV uoluminibus comprehensa, cum integris Iac. Micylli, Her. Ciofani, Dan. et Nic. Heinsiorum, et excerptis aliorum notis, quibus suas adiecit PETR. BURMANNUS, Amstelodami 1727.

Campbell 1945 = *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina cum Epodis* edidit, emendavit adnotavit A.Y. CAMPBELL, London 1945.

Campbell 1953 = *Horace. Odes and Epodes*, re-edited with Notes in English supplementary to the Notes of the first edition by A.Y. CAMPBELL, Liverpool 1953.

Courtney 1980 = E. COURTNEY, *A commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London 1980.

Cruquius 1578 = *Q. Horatius Flaccus ex antiquissimis undecim lib. M.S. et schedis aliquot emendatus et plurimis locis cum commentariis antiquis expurgatus et editus opera IACOBI CRUQUII MESSENII (...)*, Antverpiae 1578.

Cuningamius 1721 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Poemata ex antiquis codd. et certis observationibus emendavit variasque scriptorum et impressorum lectiones adjecit ALEXANDER CUNINGAMIUS*, Hagae Comitum 1721.

Drexel 1637 = J. DREXEL, *Brausyrna Lidského Yazyka, celau Abecedau naskrz wyswětlená*, Prague 1637.

Duso 2024 = *uid.* Baldo 2024.

Elfassi 2009 = *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Synonyma*, ed. J. ELFASSI, Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.

Fontaine 1959 = J. FONTAINE, *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, Paris 1959.

Fontaine 1960 = *Isidore de Seville, Traité de la nature, suivi de l'Épître en vers du roi Sisebut à Isidore*, édité par J. FONTAINE, Bordeaux 1960.

Gain 1976 = *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar*, edited with an introduction, translation & commentary by D.B. GAIN, London 1976.

- Harrison 2017 = *Horace, Odes. Book II*, edited by S. HARRISON, Cambridge 2017.
- Holzberg 2018 = *Quintus Horatius Flaccus, Sämtliche Werke*, Lateinisch-deutsch. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von NIKLAS HOLZBERG, Berlin-Boston 2018.
- Housman 1893 = A.E. HOUSMAN, *The manuscripts of Propertius [II]*, «JPh» 21, 1893, pp. 161-197.
- Housman 1903 = *M. Manilii Astronomicum Liber Primus*, recensuit et enarravit A.E. HOUSMAN, accedunt emendationes librorum II III IV, Londinii 1903.
- Housman 1972 = A.E. HOUSMAN, *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, collected and edited by J. DIGGLE and F.R.D. GOODYEAR, I-III, Cambridge 1972.
- Keller 1879 = O. KELLER, *Epilegomena zu Horaz*, vol. I, Leipzig 1879.
- Mayer 2012 = *Horace, Odes. Book I*, edited by R. MAYER, Cambridge 2012.
- Monteverdi 1936 = A. MONTEVERDI, *Orazio nel Medioevo*, «StudMed» 9, 1936, pp. 162-180.
- Müller 1874 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina*, recognovit LUCIANUS MUELLER, Lipsiae 1874.
- Müller 1900 = L. MÜLLER, *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Oden und Epoden des Horaz*. I. Theil: Text und Einleitungen, Saint Petersburg-Leipzig 1900.
- Nisbet 1978 = R.G.M. NISBET, *Notes on the text of Catullus*, «PCPhS» 21, 1974, pp. 92-115.
- Nisbet 1995 = R.G.M. NISBET, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, edited by S.J. HARRISON, Oxford 1995.
- Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 = *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I*, by R.G.M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, Oxford 1970.
- Nisbet and Hubbard 1978 = *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book II*, by R.G.M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, Oxford 1978.
- Nosarti 2024 = *uid.* Baldo 2024.
- Palmer 1893 = A. PALMER, *Notes on Catullus, Horace, Ovid, and Martial*, «The Classical Review» 7, 1893, pp. 100-102.
- Petschenig 1883 = *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Scholarum in Usum*, ed. M. PETSCHENIG, Pragae-Lipsiae 1883.
- Pianezzola 2024 = *uid.* Baldo 2024.
- Piscitelli 1998 = T. PISCITELLI, *Isidoro*, in «Enciclopedia Oraziana», Roma, III, 1998, pp. 39-40.
- Rivero 1996 = L. RIVERO GARCÍA, *Estructura y valor literario del poema ovidiano sobre cosméticos*, in J.L. ARCAZ, G. LAGUNA, A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER (eds.), *La obra amatoria de Ovidio. Aspectos textuales, interpretación literaria y pervivencia*, Madrid 1996, pp. 121-142.
- Rivero 2023 = L. RIVERO GARCÍA, *Textual Notes on Horace's Epodes*, «RaRe» 22, 2023, pp. 215-234.

Rivero, Estévez and Ramírez de Verger 2024 = *Horacio. Epodos*, edición crítica, introducción, traducción, notas, apéndices e índices de L. RIVERO GARCÍA, J.A. ESTÉVEZ SOLA, A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, Madrid 2024.

Shackleton Bailey 2001⁴ = *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* edidit D.R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Berlin-New York 2004.

Stowasser 1892 = J.M. STOWASSER, *Zu Horaz carm. II 10, 9*, «Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien» 43, 1892, p. 208.

Trappes-Lomax 2007 = J.M. TRAPPES-LOMAX, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal*, Swansea 2007.

Valart 1770 = *Q. Horatii Flacci opera ad fidem lxxvi codicum (...)*, curante JOS. VALART, Parisiis 1770.

Van der Weerd 1886 = W.G. VAN DER WEERD, *Horatius. Oden en Epoden*, Leiden 1886.

Wade 1731 = *Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum libri quinque*, recensuit, et ex vetustis exemplaribus, editionibus, & commentariis ad certissimas criticae artis regulas quam plurimis locis emendavit GEORGIUS WADE, Londini 1731.

Waltz 1887 = *Oeuvres d'Horace, (...)* par A. WALTZ, Paris 1887.