The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Two Notes on Virgil and Horace

C. A. Vince

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 7-8 / November 2018, pp 164 - 166

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00011951, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00011951

How to cite this article:

C. A. Vince (2018). Two Notes on Virgil and Horace. The Classical Review, 32, pp 164-166
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00011951

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

their sprightly relative a whimsical way of conveying his reproof. When he said to his daughter 'ambula tamquam uir', what he meant was 'walk like *your husband*'. And what he said to his son-in-law was 'ambula tamquam *uxor*'.

Petron. 41 6-8 dum haec loquimur, puer speciosus, uitibus hederisque redimitus, modo Bromium, interdum Lyaeum Euhiumque confessus, calathisco uuas circumtulit et poemata domini sui acutissima uoce traduxit. ad quem sonum conuersus Trimalchio 'Dionyse' inquit 'LIBER esto'. puer detraxit pilleum apro capitique suo imposuit. tum Trimalchio rursus adiecit: 'non negabitis me' inquit 'habere LIBERVM patrem'. laudauimus dictum Trimalchionis et circumeuntem puerum sane perbasiamus.

I print this passage as Trimalchio would have wished it to be read. Our current texts, with their 'liber esto' and 'Liberum patrem', would show him that half his labour had been lost and half his wit wasted; and if he could consult the translators and commentators he would be grievously disappointed with most of them and thoroughly satisfied with none.

It is likely that many readers have understood the pun in 'me habere LIBERVM patrem', and it is not impossible that many translators have done so; but only two or three of them give proof that they understand it, and a larger number give proof that they do not. Trimalchio is happier dead than if he had lived to see such interpretations as 'dass Bacchus mein Sohn sey', 'the god of liberation is my father', 'I have freed him who frees us from care', 'on ne peut pas nier qu'à présent Bacchus ne dépende

de moi (iocus inter Liberum Patrem et seruum liberum)'. But as to 'LIBER esto', few even suspect that it contains a pun; few of those who suspect it can explain what the pun is; and nobody, not even W. K. Kelly, explains it in terms which would assure Trimalchio that he had not been casting pearls before swine.

There comes in a boy, Dionysus by name, as the sequel tells us, wearing a wreath of vine and ivy, hanging round grapes, and declaring himself now Bromius, now Lyaeus, now Euhius. 'Dionysus', says Trimalchio, 'LIBER esto': that is, assume the character of the indigenous wine-god; be, not Bromius nor Lyaeus nor Euhius, but our Italian Liber. The boy, instructed beforehand, feigns to take the proper name for an adjective and to recognise the formula of manumission; he snatches the cap of liberty from the head of the lately enfranchised boar and claps it on his own. By this pun in action he has performed his master's bidding to the letter: LIBER est, and by logical consequence also *pater*: Seru. *georg.* II 4 '*pater* licet generale sit omnium deorum, tamen proprie Libero semper cohaeret, nam Liber pater uocatur'. Trimalchio's way is now clear to his next pun, 'non negabitis me habere LIBERVM patrem': in the words' first sense as they fall on the ear, 'father Liber is of my household',—and there stands Dionysus with his cap on to prove it; in their after-meaning, as they reach the mind, 'I am a freeman's son',—false within the knowledge of the whole company, and yet not deniable.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

TWO NOTES ON VIRGIL AND HORACE.

Aen. I. 462:

Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.

The key to the exact meaning of this famous verse, in the current interpretations of which *rerum* seems to mean anything or nothing, is to be

found in the observation that the genitive of *mortalia* is *mortalium rerum*. The two clauses are arrows shot at the same mark, in the manner familiar to us in the Psalter; not common in Latin poetry, yet not to be disallowed in any literature. They are: (1) *sunt lacrimae*

mortalium rerum; (2) *mentem mortalia tangunt*. 'Mortality hath its meed of tears: yea, it toucheth the heart to compassion.'

Hor. *Epist.* II. 1, 161 ff.:

Serus enim Graecis admouit acumina chartis
et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit
quid Sophocles et Thespiis et Aeschylus utile
ferrent.

There must be something wrong with the text here. The sentence has no subject; *serus* has nothing to qualify. It is incredible that Horace expected us to cast back for a nominative, to overleap two finite clauses, and find our subject in the object, *ferum uictorum*, of 156-7. In fact, if the text stands, we are required by elementary grammar to adopt *numerus Saturnius* from v. 158 as the subject, which is absurd. Further, the missing nominative has to carry on for at least three verses more, and to serve four more verbs. Of the ensuing sentence Dr. J. S. Reid writes (in a note contributed to Wilkins's commentary): 'It is almost impossible to believe that vv. 166-7 were not written with reference to some person. Ennius Pacuvius or Attius must have been taken as a specimen of the Roman tragic writers.' This seems unquestionable, and it follows that the corruption is deep-seated, and calls for heroic surgery.

Is there any other fault in the sentence as it stands which may help us to locate the error? I submit that the word *acumina* is unsatisfactory; not merely because we have to suppose that Horace wrote *acumina* for *acumen* with no better excuse than metrical convenience, but for a graver reason. If we translate, 'He (*sc.* the *ferus uictor*) applied his mind to Greek writings,' we are ignoring the metaphor; which we do the more readily because we happen to have borrowed the word *acumen* in its metaphorical, but not in its primary or physical, sense. To a Roman, however, familiar with the primary meaning of both verb and noun, the phrase *admouere acumina* (*cf.* *admouere stimulos* in Juv. X. 329, Cic. *Tusc.* III. 16, 35, etc.) must have suggested the image of an insect advancing its sting with intention, or a

man prodding somebody or something with the pointed end of a spear or goad; and this is clearly inapplicable to a diligent Roman (even though also *ferus* and *uictor*) enlarging his mind by the study of foreign literature.

If then *acumina* is suspect, and if the sense demands one of the three names mentioned, we may perhaps find a hopeful clue by noting that, if the name *Pacuius* lost its initial, by an accident not improbable in the hands of a scribe who did not know who Pacuvius was, the remnant would correspond, in respect of four of its seven letters (*acu.i..*), with *acumina*; and that the triple *u* might favour further mutilation, leaving a residue which would be readily expanded into *acumina* to make out the metre. *Pacuius chartis* is indeed impossible as the ending, and looks like the beginning, of a hexameter. But the following verse has, by reason of an uncommon caesura, a beginning metrically transferable to the end; indeed, if *post Punica bella quietus* survived as a fragment, we should naturally suppose ourselves to be reading the latter half of a hexameter verse. Before trying the transposition, however, we have to deal with *admouit*, a transitive verb which, for Pacuvius' sake, we have robbed of its object. I suggest, with diffidence, *admotus*; asking whether *-tus, -ust, -uit* is not a possible sequence of corruption; and whether *Graecis admotus chartis* might not carry the meaning, introduced to, or, attracted by, Greek manuscripts.

Let us then suppose that Horace wrote:

Serus enim Graecis, post Punica bella quietus,
Pacuius chartis admotus quaerere coepit;

that a scribe, whose eye fell from *-is* to *-is* immediately below, made it

Serus enim Graecis admotus quaerere coepit,
but supplied the two half-verses he had omitted at the foot of his page; and that the next man, mistaking the reference marks, placed the end of 161 at the beginning of 162, and *vice versa*. A third copyist, doing his best to sort the jumble, might produce something very like the traditional text.

As for sense, *serus* and *post Punica*

bella quietus go very well together. 'Late in life' (better than 'late in Roman history'), 'in the leisure that followed the Punic Wars, Pacuvius, having his attention turned to Greek literature, began to enquire whether Sophocles, Thespis, and Aeschylus were of any use to him. He also tried his hand at translation,' etc. The scholarship here attributed to Pacuvius explains the compliment already paid to him (v. 56):

aufert Pacuvius docti famam senis;
compare also *senis* with *serus*.

Reconstructions which postulate a long series of blunders are rarely acceptable, and I hardly dare expect acceptance of this one. It is published in the hope that some critic, better versed in the mysteries of the craft, may reach a more satisfactory conclusion from the same starting-point.

C. A. VINCE.

'STATIUS, POGGIO, AND POLITIAN.'

UNDER the above heading Mr. Garrod in 1913 contributed to this Review¹ what he described as 'a new piece of evidence,' which, after being singled out for special notice by Professor A. C. Clark in *The Year's Work* for 1914 (p. 56) as an interesting statement, has now made its way into Professor Phillimore's new edition of the *Silvae* (S.C.B.O., Praef. p. xii) as an ascertained fact, '... id quod felicissimus harum tenebrarum explorator Garrodus comperit.'

For students of Statius the mystery of Poggio's *V(etustissimus)* and what became of it has the same perennial fascination that the mystery of Edwin Drood has for students of Dickens; and any scholar might well be forgiven if in dealing with it he let his imagination run away with him. But just for that reason sober criticism should be on the alert to test every 'piece of evidence' propounded. To some of us the new theory is particularly attractive, for it brings in Heinsius.

Mr. Garrod begins with a supposition. (a) 'It is usually supposed that the *Vetustissimus* ... was found by Poggio in the monastery of St. Gall. ...' 'This is not certain,' he adds, 'but it is probable, and only so far as it is probable ... is the piece of evidence of which I speak cogent.' He then proceeds (b) to argue from three passages in Burmann's *Sylloge*² (1) that *V.* was still at St. Gall in the time of Nicolaus Heinsius and that N.H.

secured access to it for Lucas Langermannus in the year 1651: (2)—this is not explicitly stated, but it appears to be clearly implied—that the MS. was duly collated by Langermannus for N.H., who in 1655 was 'still³ meditating an edition of the *Silvae*,' when the collation was unfortunately lost at sea, with other papers, in a shipwreck.

What an 'intriguing' theory! It reads like a page from a romance. First the rediscovery of the long-lost *V.*, then four years of full fruition (which yet have 'left not a wreck behind'), and then—then the shipwreck, and the precious collation goes down, carrying with it all the fruits of study to the bottom of the deep blue sea. Even the memory of the treasure-trove perishes so completely from the not unretentive mind of Heinsius that fourteen years afterwards we find him asking a friend to examine for him, not the *Vetustissimus* at St. Gall, but the *deteriores* in the Vatican, to clear up his *dubitationes* on a score of passages from the *Silvae*. But to resume.

On (a) Mr. Garrod, while regarding the supposition as probable, speaks—be it noted—with the utmost caution. But it is and it remains a mere supposition, nothing more. Professor Clark—a very weighty authority on all that relates to the literary discoveries of Poggio—takes the opposite view, and with far less reserve: 'I have never,' he writes,¹ 'seen any reason for supposing that

¹ C.R. vol. xxvii. p. 265 f.

² Vol. iii. pp. 283 and 345, and vol. v. p. 532.

³ Why 'still'? Is there any definite statement that he ever did meditate an edition?