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](#)

The Zeugma in Horace *Epode* XV

E. H. Alton

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 04 / May 1905, pp 215 - 217

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000494, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000494

How to cite this article:

E. H. Alton (1905). The Zeugma in Horace *Epode* XV. The Classical Review, 19, pp 215-217
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000494

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE ZEUGMA IN HORACE *EPODE* XV.

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat luna sereno
inter minora sidera,
cum tu magnorum numen laesura deorum
in verba iurabas mea,
artius atque hedera procera astringitur ilex
lentis adhaerens bracchiis,
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion
turbaret hibernum mare
intonsosque agitaret Apollinis aura capillos,
fore hunc amorem mutuum.

In vol. xv. *C.R.* p. 404 ff., Mr. A. E. Housman discusses at some length the instances of Zeugma in Latin literature, and desires to place lines 7 and 8 of the above passage under that category. Careful consideration of his arguments leaves me convinced of the erroneous character of former interpretations: but I am far from being convinced that Mr. Housman's own view is correct. None of the adduced examples is so harsh, none leaves so much to the reader's imagination; only a clairvoyant or Mr. Housman would have seen what Horace intended to say in that which he has said.

I endorse heartily Mr. Housman's exhortation to think, to endeavour to disentangle the thought from the expression instead of supplementing the latter by figments from our own imagination. But I hold that in all examples of Zeugma, there is some respect for logical thought, some law, though the fragmentary expression of that law may seem 'unlaw.' Language is the expression of thought; therefore, thought is the tribunal before which language must be justified ultimately. Latin was a clear medium of expression for thought: this was the very genius of that language. No Roman writer recognised more than Horace the value of correct well-ordered thought, that

Scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons.

He never descends to Persius' *préciosité* of expression, much less to mental puzzles which call to mind the 'altar' of Dosiades or the 'Syrinx' of Theocritus.

Taking Mr. Housman's examples in detail, I find that in all of them the thought is clear: that either the language expresses a specific idea where a generic idea is predominant in thought, or more rarely a generic idea where in thought the emphasis is upon a specific idea.

The examples from Latin literature can hardly be said to be 'more licentious' than the Zeugma which Mr. Housman would have us foist on Horace.

These examples are:—

Virgil *Georg.* i. 92 sq.

Ne tenues pluviae rapidive potentia solis
acrior aut Boreae penetrabile frigus *adurat*.

Virgil is treating of the relation of the weather—rain, sunshine, and frost—to the state of the soil. This relation is in thought at first merely a generic one: we may call it the idea of *affecting* or *rendering*. But when this idea becomes expressed, the proximity of the last of the three subjects specialises and sharpens the generic idea into one of 'affecting with dryness,' 'rendering dry.' It is a case of *Assimilation through Contiguity*.

Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 335–8.

Ante ab occasu dies
nascetur, Indos ante glacialis polus
Scythasve tepida Phoebus *inficiet* rota
quam me relictam Thessalae aspiciant nurus

Here too we have a generic idea of 'changing,' 'affecting' specialised by the context into one of 'affecting with heat (tanning).'

Cic. *ad Att.* x. 4. 4.

fortunam quâ ille florentissima, nos duriore
conflictati videmur (Tyrrell and Purser;
quacum).

Here we have a transition from the generic notion of 'laden' to the specific one of 'crushed'; or if 'quacum' is correct, from a notion of 'meeting' to one of 'meeting with adversity': *duriore* gives the specific colouring.

In [Ov.] *Her.* xix. 111, 2.

Vel pudor hic utinam qui nos clam cogit
amare,

vel timidus famae cedere vellet amor

we have a predominant notion of 'giving way, yielding' specialised by the context into 'yielding to sense of decency.' But would it not be simpler to take *famae* as genitive with *timidus*? Ovid as well as Horace uses this construction. *Cedere*, then, will be taken in an absolute sense 'to die away, cease.' Thus 'Oh that either our

sense of decency which makes our love a secret intrigue, or Love itself, since it dreads Mrs. Grundy, might cease !'

Hor. *Serm.* ii. 2, 11, 13.

seu pila velox,
molliter austerum studio fallente laborem,
seu te discus agit, pete cedentem aera disco.

Here the predominant thought is the generic notion of *playing, tossing something into the air*. The proximity of the second clause, 'seu te discus agit,' gives a special character to the thought as expressed, viz. *ludere disco*.

Lucan vii. 323-5.

Sive quis infesto cognata in pectora ferro
ibit, seu nullum violabit vulnere pignus,
ignoti iugulum tanquam scelus imputet
hostis.

Here we have a variation of the usual phenomenon. The predominant thought is the special one, viz.: 'Murder of *a relative* is to be a merit in your eyes.' The second clause, 'seu nullum violabit vulnere pignus' implies a wider denotation, to use the terms of formal logic: consequently, owing to the proximity of this clause, the connotation of the thought *as expressed* is enlarged into 'Murder of any kind is to be a merit': *i.e.* the generic thought is the one which finds expression.

Zeugma, therefore, considered as an expression of thought, amounts to this: the special character of the context may specialise the expression of a generic thought or, more rarely, the generic character of the context may give a generic expression to an idea in which, for thought, there is a specific character. Now, in *Epodes* xv. 7, 8, according to Mr. Housman there is a double zeugma: two generic notions of 'vexing' and of 'place,' find only specific expression as *turbaret, mare*. This might be illustrated thus:

- (1) Nautae : pecus :: ^{generic notion of 'place.'} sea : fold. .
- (2) Orion : lupus :: ^{generic notion of 'vexing.'} storm : alarm in fold.

Now this, though it is far more complicated than the cited examples, has at first sight a certain plausibility. But closer consideration will show that the thought of l. 7 is too intimately connected to admit of a 'splitting,' by the insertion of some such supplement as *terreret ovilia* or the like. Place a comma after *pecori*, and the result is

nonsense. *Infestus* must be taken with *pecori* and *nautis*, and that too in *one continuous* thought. On the word *infestus* lies the whole burden of the analogy. Orion is the foe of sailors, as the wolf is the foe of the flock. To weaken this link (in syntax as well as in thought) is to weaken the force of the analogy. Mr. Housman seems to see this point in part: he takes *pecori* with *infestus*, and not as a *dat. incommodi* after [*terreret*]. But he fails to recognise that the thought-supplement interrupts this connection. If it were not for this stress on *infestus*, we might ask why Horace had not written something like 'dum *pecudem* lupus.' The sense of this closeness of connection (by means of *infestus*) lies perhaps at the basis of Kiessling's otherwise fatuous remark that 'turbaret hibernum mare' is really a relative clause which had been attracted into the position of a predicative owing to the parallel 'agitaret aura.' Even the time-worn '*infestus foret*' places the emphasis rightly upon *infestus*. Both these views involve barbaric syntax; but Mr. Housman, who would have us 'think,' places an equally severe strain on the thought. We have at one and the same time to hold fast, keep close together, the two terms of the analogy—the wolf's hostility to the flock, and Orion's hostility to the sailor—and to 'split' this connected thought by some such supplement as *terreret ovilia*.

It remains, therefore, either to assume with L. Mueller the loss of two lines, or that there is some corruption. I incline to the latter alternative. There is no Zeugma, and lines 7, 8 form one continuous thought. Mr. Allen (*C.R.* xvi. p. 305) placed his finger on the difficulty when he remarked that *lupus* was corrupt. I suggest that these lines, as originally written, were

dum *pecori lips* et *nautis infestus* Orion
turbaret hibernum mare.

Lips might easily have been mistaken for an abbreviation of *lupus* (*lup̄s*). The proximity of *pecori* would have suggested *lupus* to a monastic scribe acquainted with Is. 11, 6 (Hieron.) '*Habitabit lupus cum agno et pardus cum haedo accubabit*;' just as this same verse was responsible for '*cum bove pardus*' where Horace wrote *cum bove pagus* (*Carm.* iii. 18. 12). The south winds were pestilential to cattle. In Persius—an ardent Horatian—we have

Hic ego securus vulgi et quid praeparet
Auster
infelix pecori (vi. 12).

Virgil *Georg.* i. 444.

Arboribusque satisque *Notus pecorique sinister.*

Claudian, talking of the northern side of Sardinia, says that the North winds are unable to reach the land owing to the barrier of the hills called *Insani Montes* :—

*hinc hominum pecudumque lues : hinc pestifer aer
saevit et exclusis regnant Aquilonibus Austris.*
(*Bell. Gild.* 514, 5).

Hor. *C.* iii. 23. 5 calls the *Africus* 'pestilens.' In *C.* ii. 14. 15, 16 we find

*frustra per auctumnos nocentem
corporibus metuemus Austrum.*

Theocritus ix. 11 shows how the violence of the south wind was dreaded by the herdsmen,

*δαμαλᾶν . . . τὰς μοι ἀπώσας
λίψ κόμαρον τρωγούσας ἀπὸ σκοπιᾶς ἐτίναξε.*

Lines 7, 8 express a single picture of storm as contrasted with the thought of l. 9, in which we have a picture of fair sunny weather : in fact, the contrast is like that in

C. iii. 29. 43-5. It should not be a serious objection to the word *Lips* that it only appears in Pliny and Seneca. This objection would hold equally against such a word as *Apeliotes* (Catullus), which is not found again in any writer before Pliny. The Poet like the man of the street did not observe any fine distinctions between *Auster*, *Notus*, *Lips* (*Libonotus*), *Africus*. Pliny, *Hist.* ii. 46 speaks of all as south winds : a meridiē *Auster*, at ab occasu brumali *Africus*; *Noton* et *Liba* nominant. He says, also, that south winds caused the greatest storms at sea, that they were unhealthy, and were accompanied by rain and copious dew (*Hist.* ii. 48, xviii. 76, 77). That these rain-bringing winds were undesirable we see from Hor. *C.* i. 17 :—

*Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam
defendit aestatem capellis
usque meis pluviosque ventos.*

'Pluvius,' 'umidus' are standing epithets of *Auster* (v. Pliny *l.c.*, Virgil, *Georg.* i. 462, Ovid, *M.* i. 66).

E. H. ALTON.

ON HORACE *EPODE* XV. 5 AND SENECA *HERC. OET.* 335 *sqq.*

I SHOULD leave Mr. Alton's searching criticism of Professor Housman's exposition of Zeugma and his defence of his own ingenious emendation to the reader if I had not long felt that on two of the passages concerned I had a word to say.

On Horace *Epod.* xv. 7 *sq.* I agree with Professor Housman that the commentators' ellipse of *infestus esset* with *pecori lupus* is impossible, and with Mr. Alton that Professor Housman's zeugma, '*Terreret ouilia* or *what you will*' (my italics), is inadmissible. But for the benefit of those who are not prepared to accept Mr. Alton's correction I would point out that there is an employment of *turbare* which will provide the passage of the conception with the bridge which Mr. Alton most reasonably requires. This is the absolute or intransitive usage of Varro, *R.R.* 3. 17. 7 '*cum mare turbaret*,' of Livy 38. 13. 12 '*tum quoque equites in agmen Romanum eruptione facta haud modice primo impetu turbauere*,' of Lucretius 5. 502-4 '*nec liquidum corpus turbantibus aeris auris | commiscet : sinit haec uiolentis*

omnia uerti | turbinibus, sinit incertis turbare procellis' (for further examples see Munro's note on Lucr. 2. 126), and of other writers cited in the lexicons. One passage from Virgil has a special pertinence to the present inquiry.

*inpastus ceu plena leo per ouilia turbans
(suadet enim uesana fames) manditque
trahitque
molle pecus.—Aen.* 9: 339 *sqq.*

Those then who would keep to the tradition here may do so by assuming that Horace's expression slid from one legitimate use of *turbare* to another. Thus '*dum lupus infestus pecori turbaret* (neuter, *sc.* '*per ouilia*' or '*in ouilibus*') et Orion nautis infestus hibernum mare turbaret' (active).

Seneca *Herc. Oet.* 335 *sqq.* should on the other hand be struck out of the list of zeugmas, in which it was included because 'It will not do to supply *inficiet*, since *inficere* unqualified does not mean *to bleach* and does mean *to tan*. Horace says "*albus ora pallor*