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](#)

Notes on Horace Odes, Book I

E. S. Thompson

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 05 / June 1902, pp 282 - 283

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00206227, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00206227

How to cite this article:

E. S. Thompson (1902). Notes on Horace Odes, Book I. The Classical Review, 16, pp 282-283 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00206227

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

pastor' (=mittunt pastorem ad oppida exportantem) beside the plurals 'contingunt' and 'reponunt'; in short the whole sentence is so lucid and well-balanced that it is sure to be called unpoetical and un-Virgilian. Nevertheless I believe the verses were thus read and understood by a poet, and a Virgilian poet, much earlier than any of our MSS. The imitation, like the model, has been corrupted, but in another part: put them side by side and they emend one another.

Calp. v 32—35.

at, si forte uaces, dum matutina relaxat
frigora sol, tumidis spument tibi muletra
papillis.
implebis, quod mane fluat; rursusque
premetur
mane, quod occiduae mulsura redegerit horae.

implebis in u. 34 has no meaning, and Haupt writes 'tumidis spumantia muletra papillis | *implebit*, quod mane fluat' with a strange tautology,—'quod mane fluat implebit muletra dum sol matutina frigora

relaxat'; Vltius' *inde premes* is not much better. Calpurnius is saying what Virgil said and saying it in the selfsame way:

in tenebris, quod mane fluat, rursusque
premetur
mane, quod occiduae mulsura redegerit
horae.

intebis, intrebis, implebis. The loss of *en* before *eb* has again corrupted this word at Manil. iii 645 'lucis aequantia signa diebus', where Scaliger roughly alters *lucis* to *noctes*, Barthius and Bentley more skilfully *diebus* to *tenebris*: *tebris* looked like *iebus*. 'rursus' will of course mean 'vice uersa', not 'iterum': 'in tenebris premetur, quod mane fluat, rursusque mane, quod uesperis'.

A similar echo in later poetry confirms the true punctuation of Aen. iv 683 sq. 'date uulnera lymphis | abluam'. Ovid's imitation met. xiii 531 sq. 'uulnera lymphis | abluere' is quoted by the editors; but add Auson. ephem. 2 5 sq. 'da rore fontano abluam | manus et os et lumina'.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTES ON HORACE ODES, BOOK I.

9. 5. *ligna super foco large reponens*.

The force of *re-* in *reponens* is here something more definite than is given by the rendering 'duly placing.' Two stages of meaning may be observed in the word: (1) (more definitely), placing a thing in exchange for something else; (2) (more generally), placing a thing where it ought to be, 'duly placing.' The present is an instance of the former use; replacing the burnt out logs by new ones, 'making up the fire.' Exactly similar is *reddo* in Pl. Most. 110; the old tiles have come off, *dominus indiligens reddere alias neuolt*. In the next ode comes an instance of the other and more general meaning of *reponere*: *tu pius laetis animas reponis sedibus*; the pious shades are restored to their proper abode, heaven.

20. 10. *Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno tu bibes uiam*: On this passage I had a suggestion to make, which I still think it may be worth while to put forward, although I feel it very possible that Mr. Ensor has hit on what will be accepted as the true solution. But I still feel some hesitation in accepting

a view that implies in the last stanza a distinction between different kinds of expensive wines—'I have Caecuban and Calene; I don't keep Falernian or Formian.' It seems to me more probable that the names are all used generically, and selected to give local colour. Moreover they are carefully paired, Caecuban and Formian being growths of Latium, while Calene and Falernian are growths of Campania, and the chiasmic order looks rather suspiciously ornamental. I should put a note of interrogation after *uiam*; 'do you suppose you are going to drink, etc.' But probably *bibes* should be altered to *bibas*, making the question of the same form as *tu pulses*? (Satt. II. vi. 30) etc. This view would imply that *poto* in line 1 and *bibo* in line 10 are synonymous; but the Editor's remarks (C.R. pp. 113 foll.) raise here a new point for consideration.

37. 4. *tempus erat*. In C.R. III. 75, Mr. T. E. Page illustrates these words by Martial 4. 33. There may also be adduced Livy viii. 5. 3 *tempus erat tandem iam uos nobiscum nihil pro imperio agere*. In all these

places the idea is present that the time is too late, or the occasion is unsuitable, for the proposal to be a practical one; cf. Conington on Verg. Ecl. I 79 *poterat*. It was hardly, perhaps, for the poet to propose a *lectisternium*. At any rate Horace was not driven to use 'erat' by metrical considera-

tions; he might easily have written 'adest' if he had chosen; as likewise it was no metrical necessity that made him omit the preposition in *Scriberis Vario*, when he could so easily have written *Scribere a Vario*.

E. S. THOMPSON.

May, 1902.

AN EMENDATION OF PERSIUS.

hoc satis? an deceat pulmonem rumpere
uentis

stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis
censoremue tuum uel quod trabeate salutas?

Persius, *Satires* iii. 27 sqq.

The correctness of the MS tradition of the last line has long been doubted: but no probable emendation has been proposed. We would suggest for the corrupt *ue tuum* the slight alteration *uetulum*.

As we understand from the Editor of the *Classical Review* that the conjecture has been communicated to him by each of us independently, we gladly accede to his request that it should be published over our joint names.

A. C. CLARK.

A. B. COOK.

A. B. KEITH.

ON TACITUS *AGRICOLA* 28.

A COHORT of the Usipi stationed obviously in West Britain, mutinied, murdered their officers, and seized three galleys belonging to the Roman fleet (in which they attempted to return to their country), 'adactis per vim gubernatoribus.' The MSS. then have 'et uno remigante, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis, nondum vulgato rumore ut miraculum praevehebantur.' Here 'et uno remigante' is of course absurd. The easiest correction seems to me to be *et uno <regente> remigantes*. The one surviving captain steered the first galley, and the others followed it, probably attached by hawsers. Thus they coasted round Britain (it is uncertain whether they went round the Land's End or round Scotland, probably the latter); then apparently they tried to sail in order to cross the North Sea, four were wrecked

on the coast of the Low Countries. Tacitus says 'amissis per inscitiam regendi navibus.' It is no wonder that the ships were lost, as there was only one seaman in the three, but critics have supposed that 'per inscitiam regendi' implies that this surviving seaman was absent from the outset, and have tried to correct 'uno remigante' in this sense (uno refugo, ante suspectis &c., Ulrich, is the best attempt). It is surely not necessary to force the point, and *remigante* is almost sure to be genuine. If Tacitus must be made as consistent as the critics wish, we may write *amissis per inscitiam regendi navibus <duabus>*, or we may, as he tells us that the mutineers were obliged to resort to cannibalism, assume that they had unwisely eaten the skipper.

W. R. PATON.