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](#)

A or AB in Horace. Epod. 17. 24

John O. Rolfe

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 05 / June 2009, pp 261 - 261
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082718, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082718

How to cite this article:

John O. Rolfe (2009). A or AB in Horace. Epod. 17. 24. The Classical Review, 14, pp 261-261 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082718

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

affuistis (*adfuistis* inquit Bodl.); and wrong readings like: I. iv. 13 *vocata*; 18 *quoque*. I. v. 1 *utebantur*. I. ix. 14 *lumen*.

But it is inferior to *P* in such points as these: I. iii. 6 no symbol of a lacuna in Bodl. I. iv. 15 *Liberalium...non om.* Bodl., and so cannot have been the parent MS.

The curious corruption *iudicium* for *risum* in *P* at II. ii. 16 is explained by the reading of Bodl: *omnibus in censorum i. iudiciarium*

(*suprascr.*) *risum remissis*.. In the famous passage in II. vii. 3 where Laberius' prologue is quoted, l. 15.

uno plus vixi mihi quam vivendum fuit is omitted in Bodl., as in *P*: but in Bodl. there is a sign of omission ('h') at the end of the preceding line, so that in the archetype l. 15 must have been added in the margin.

W. M. LINDSAY.

A OR AB IN HORACE. EPOD. 17. 24.

In their edition of 1864 Keller and Holder read in this passage 'nullum ab labore me reclinat otium,' and in the *Epilegomena*, p. 409, Keller says: 'Mavortius (A'g Taurin.), überhaupt die II. Classe nebst M R L r a und Pph.' lesen *a labore*, die III. Classe und γ haben *ab labore*. *Ab* wird richtig sein, *a* falsch trotz B R und trotz Bentleys Vertheidigung. Vgl. *carm.* III 17, 1 und die Bemerkung zu *carm.* IV 10, 6.' On page 593 of the *Epilegomena*, however, Keller changes his mind and writes: 'Es ist doch mit der besseren Ueberlieferung *a labore* festzuhalten, vgl. *Serm.* I 1, 68 *a labris*,' and accordingly the edition of 1899 reads *a labore*.

The question cannot be settled either way by a single quotation. As regards the manuscript evidence, any reliable testimony to *ab* before a consonant is worthy of respectful consideration, especially in a classical poet, and in general the probability of a correction from *ab* to *a* in such a situation is decidedly more probable than one from *a* to *ab*.¹ Moreover, since Keller and Holder's Third Class preserves the original orthography with more fidelity than the other two (see ed. of 1899, p. lxxxii), there is a considerable weight of testimony in favour of *ab*, for the question is after all one of orthography, like that of the assimilation and non-assimilation of prepositions in composition.

As regards Horace's usage, he has *a* before consonants 20 times, and, exclusive of the case under consideration, *ab* 5 times, 'ab Iove,' C. 1. 28. 29; and *Epist.* 1. 12. 3; 'ab se,' C. 3. 5. 43; 'ab dis,' C. 3. 16. 22; 'ab Lamo,' C. 3. 17. 1. That is, he uses *ab*

before *i cons.*, *d*, *l* and *s*. He is consistent in using *ab* only in the case of *i cons.*, and there for a special reason. The formula 'ab Iove' is of very frequent occurrence, even in writers who otherwise use *a* before *i cons.* Ovid has the formula 8 times out of 10 exceptions to the rule of using *a* before consonants; Virgil has it 5 times. On such formular expressions in general see *Archiv für lat. Lex. und Gramm.* x, p. 468 ff. 'Ab dis, ab Lamo,' and perhaps 'ab se,' may also be regarded as formular. Horace has 'a labris,' *Serm.* 1. 1. 68: 'a domo,' C. 4. 5. 12; 'a sole,' *Serm.* 1. 4. 29.

In favour of *a labore* it may be said, that all the other instances of *ab* before consonants in Horace occur in his later writings. Similar changes of usage are seen in Cicero, who gradually discards the use of *ab* before consonants, and in Tacitus, who has 38 cases of *ab* before consonants, of which 33 are in the *Annals*. But on the other hand, 4 of Horace's 5 cases are in his lyric poetry, and the only one in his hexameters is the common formula 'ab Iove.' *Ab labore* occurs in Terence, *And.* 78, and *Hec. pr.* ii 23, *Caes. B. G.* 3. 26. 2. Terence always uses *ab* before *l* and in Caesar the proportion of *ab* to *a* is 20: 8.

While the evidence cannot perhaps be regarded as conclusive, it seems decidedly to favour *ab labore*.. Certainly Keller's published reason for changing his mind does not appear an adequate one. It may be added that 'Bentleys Vertheidigung' consists merely of the remark: 'Sed parvi interest: neque tantillam ob causam editiones convellendae sunt,' a statement not in accordance with modern views on the subject. Keller's 'Bemerkung zu *carm.* IV 10, 6' appears to have no bearing on the question at issue.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

University of Michigan.

¹ Keller himself (*Epileg.* p. 469, on *minitaris-miniteris*) rightly favours this general principle: 'ceteris paribus müsste das viel seltenere *cum* mit dem Indicativ dem häufigen *cum* mit Conjunctiv vorgezogen werden'; and so *passim*.