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](#)

On Albinovanus Pedo Vv. 1–7 apud Sen. Suas. I 15

Roland G. Kent

The Classical Review / Volume 17 / Issue 06 / July 1903, pp 311 - 312

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00208330, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00208330

How to cite this article:

Roland G. Kent (1903). On Albinovanus Pedo Vv. 1–7 apud Sen. Suas. I 15. The Classical Review, 17, pp 311-312 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00208330

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

kept the starry heavens in a cupboard at home and observed the zodiac through the keyhole. Aratus himself never assumes such airs. And what is *duplex stellarum sidus*¹? and what is *uidere aliquem duplici sidere*? The Juntine removes these two last offences by the conjecture '*duplici stellatum sidere*': the first is not even noticed, except that Scaliger, as I have said, declared the verse corrupt and not yet healed. Write

unum quem duplici stellarunt sidere
diui,

'whom alone the gods have set in heaven with a double constellation.' This verb, *καταστέλλω*, occurs nowhere else in any good author, only the participle *stellatus*, as

¹ Sillig joins *unum stellarum*, but the Scorpion is not a *stella*, he is a *sidus* or *signum* containing 19 *stellae*.

at Cic. Tusc. v 8 '*stellatus Cepheus cum uxore*'; but just so, though *auratus* is common, the verb *auro* occurs only in Manil. iv 515 '*cum uitreum findens aurauit uellere pontum*.'

I have disregarded the *munere* which B offers instead of *sidere*, because it is evidently a mere repetition from u. 533. The same mistake is found in the best MSS of Germ. phaen. 91 sq.

seu Bacchi ob munera caesus
Icarus ereptam pensauit sidere uitam,

sidere Z, *munera* and *munere* O. But lest anyone should still try to make something of '*duplici stellarum munere*,' let me further remark that the words are false: the Scorpion has fewer stars than several other signs of the zodiac.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

ON ALBINOVANUS PEDO Vv. 1-7 APUD SEN. SUAS. I 15.

Iam pridem post terga diem solemque relictum,
iam pridem notis extorres finibus orbis,
per non concessas audaces ire tenebras
ad rerum metas extremaque litora mundi;
nunc illum pigris immania monstra sub
undis
qui ferat Oceum, qui saevas undique pis-
tibus
aequoreosque canes, ratibus consurgere pren-
sis.

The fact that no principal verb stands in these lines, which open the selection from Albinovanus Pedo in Seneca Suas. I 15, has given rise to several conjectures. As they stand the verbs *relictum* and *consurgere* are infinitives, but yet not historical infinitives, for the subjects *diem solemque* and *Oceanum* are accusatives.

The change of *relictum* to *relinunt*, which was proposed by M. Haupt and was accepted by Kiessling, while bringing the first four lines into a form readily comprehensible, leaves *Oceanum . . . consurgere* unrelieved. Such an alteration also violates the principle that scribes in making changes tend to displace that which is hard to understand with that which is more readily understood.

The change of *iam pridem*, v. 2, to *iamque vident*, proposed by Gertz and adopted by

Müller, has more to commend it. A scribe might readily have copied the *iam pridem* of the first line for the metrically equivalent *iamque vident* of the second. With this reading the sentence structure becomes clear: *vident* governs an indirect discourse consisting of two parts, *diem solemque relictum*, and *Oceanum . . . consurgere*, separated by the parenthetical adjectival phrases *notis . . . orbis* and *per . . . mundi*. On the other hand the temporal adverbs now give great trouble. If a comma is placed after *vident* and nothing after *relictum*, as in the edition of Müller, we have *iam pridem . . . iamque*, in which the *-que* can connect only the *iam pridem* and the *iam*; and the sense must be, 'They have long been seeing and are now seeing,' etc., and v. 5 *nunc* (sc. *vident*) 'now they see the Ocean,' etc. But such a combination as *iam pridem . . . iamque* is remarkable, to say the least, and the thought thus expressed is too clumsy to be regarded as that intended to be conveyed by the poet.

If we place a comma after *vident*, as before, and insert one also after *relictum*, the postposition of *vident* becomes very awkward, and the *iam* of *iamque vident* would be repeated, not merely strengthened, by *nunc*, v. 5; for the combination *iam nunc* does not admit separation, at least ordinarily, and such a case as he present

one would be out of the question. If a comma is placed after *relictum*, and none after *vident*, then we are compelled, after admitting the remarkable postposition of *vident*, to find an indirect discourse in vv. 2-4. The only infinitive is *ire*, the subject of which would manifestly be the same as the subject of *vident*. Such a construction as this, *vident ire*, with *se* as omitted subject of *ire*, is unusual, and the sense would hardly be appropriate.

There is a slight possibility that *consurgere* is an exclamatory infinitive: if so, vv. 5-7 are complete in themselves. Then we are under the necessity of bringing vv. 1-4 into an acceptable shape. But neither *relinquunt* v. 1 nor *iamque vident* v. 2 is free from objection, as we have seen. Moreover, an exclamatory infinitive expresses indignation (Schmalz, *Lat. Syntax*³ § 161), or 'scorn, indignation, or regret,' (Bennett, *Lat. Gram.* § 334), or 'surprise, incredulity, disapproval, or lamentation' (Lane, *Lat. Gram.* § 2216), and no one of these feelings is appropriate to the sentence under consideration.

To my mind we must, in attempting to restore this passage, proceed on the following suppositions: (1) A verb such as *vident* is needed to give the sense of vv. 5-7, and will be appropriate to v. 1. (2) The *iam pridem* of the second line goes with *extorres*—'exiles this long while from the known bounds of the world.' (3) *Audaces ire*, an adjective with complementary infinitive, is the nucleus around which vv. 3 *sq.* are grouped. (4) The need felt for some such verb as *vident* shows that *extorres* and *audaces* are nominatives qualifying the subject of that verb.

For these reasons any alterations in vv. 2-4 are of exceedingly questionable character. Any insertion of *vident* in vv. 5-7 leaves v. 1 unexplained, and there is hardly any place for it there at any rate. A change therefore if made must be in the first line. Here *iamque vident* may be read for *iam pridem* quite as well as in the second line. The *-que* of *iamque* would then connect with something preceding, not included in the extract; this is no violent supposition, for the passage is manifestly not the opening of the poem.

With this reading, and only with this reading, do the temporal adverbs become clear in meaning. *Iam* v. 1 and *nunc* v. 5 correspond to each other, going respectively with *vident* . . . *relictum* and (*vident*) . . . *consurgere*, and denoting a present state. *Iam pridem* v. 2 shows that the *extorres* has already been applicable to the bold adven-

turers for some time; the *audaces*, unqualified by any temporal expression, denotes their permanent frame of mind.

What now is the evidence of the manuscripts? All agree upon *iam pridem* v. 1 and upon *relictum*, but in the second line there is no such consensus of opinion. A reads *iam quidam*, metrically correct but making no sense. B and V read *iam quidem*, correct neither in metre nor in sense. D (S of Kiessling) and τ (the corrector of T, = Ta of Kiessling) read *iam pridem* according to the latest collation, that of Müller (though Kiessling on the authority of his own collation pronounces them to read *iam quidem*). We must remember that A, B and V are derived from a common source (C), and that D and τ seem to represent another tradition. The variations in the reading may have arisen in this way: *iam pridem* was quite early copied into the first line from the second. Then in an attempt to dissimilate the identical expressions with which the two lines began, *iam pridem* v. 2 became changed in C to *iam quidem*, which remained in B and V, but was further altered to *iam quidam* in A. In D and τ however the original *iam pridem* v. 2 persisted.

I would therefore read the passage as follows:

*Iamque vident post terga diem solemque
relictum,
iam pridem notis extorres finibus orbis,
per non concessas audaces ire tenebras
ad rerum metas extremaque litora mundi;
nunc illum pigris immania monstra sub
undis
qui ferat Oceanum, qui saevas undique
pistris
aequoreosque canes, ratibus consurgere
prensus.*

'And now they see the daylight and the sun left far behind them, they who have this long while been exiles from the known bounds of the earth, in their boldness to go through the darkness through which passage has never yet been granted, to the limits of all that is and to the farthest shores of the world; now they see that Ocean, which bears beneath its lazily moving swells immense monsters, fierce sharks and sea-hounds in all directions, heave to and fro holding the ships firmly in its grasp.'

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA.