

# 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](#)



---

## Horace, Odes III. 27.

Robert Black

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 03 / March 1889, pp 107 - 109

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194302, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00194302](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194302)

### How to cite this article:

Robert Black (1889). Horace, Odes III. 27.. The Classical Review, 3, pp 107-109

doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194302

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

516. I do not apprehend the objection here. If the word *fetichism* is improper, let it be dismissed; but surely the religion of Parthenopaeus attributes some magical and peculiar power to the weapon itself, and we are to regard his opinion as savage and impious. This is what I meant. Why is ἡν ἔχει very weak? The corresponding words in the English do not seem irrelevant or inappropriate.

541. I am not satisfied that ἐπεὶ gives a better point than the MS. ὁρᾷ, or so good. The parallel of vv. 610—611 shows exactly in what sense the hand is said to 'see the possible.' Moreover a 'seeing hand' could much more easily be expressed in pictorial symbol than a 'speaking hand'; if we suppose, as I do, that the meaning of Eteokles here was actually so expressed.

636. The speaker refers to *all* the champions (ἐκείνων plural), because Polyneices is the last, and having finished his report he is about to sum up. Their 'inventions' are the decorations by which they have outwardly expressed their confidence of victory, and which fill so large a space in the report.

The question τίνα πέμπειν δοκεῖ; is no doubt not the continuation to which the previous line naturally leads up. But the speaker intended to finish with ναυκληρεῖν πόλιν. The pause and the question are prompted by the behaviour of the king and the bystanders. To smooth the connexion would injure the effect.

On the remaining notes I will not at present express any opinion. I have merely jotted some queries.—100. Is συγχνός a word of poetic colour? (I have no confidence at all in οὐ κενός, and it does not appear in the school-edition by Mr. Bayfield and myself.)—271. ἐπτατεχνεῖς ἐξόδους: cf. λευκοπηχεῖς χεῖρες?—549. Is the long *ā* in ἀγρεύσαιμ' satisfactory? I admit that κατηλεύσαιμ' is none too clear. A modified explanation of it is proposed in the school-edition.

Of course there is much of interest in the notes which I have not touched at all. The above are merely the remarks which first occur to me. I have to thank Mr. Tucker for his useful criticism.

A. W. V.

### HORACE, ODES III. 27.

My object in writing this note is to clear up a misapprehension which detracts from the refinement and poetical beauty of what I have always considered—though many editors have disparaged it—one of the most charming odes of Horace. I have lately had to give much attention to it, and have been astonished to find how many readers and admirers of Horace are under what appears to me to be a total mistake as regards the significance of certain expressions, such as '*virginum culpa*' (line 38), '*turpe commissum*' and '*vitii carentem*' (line 39), '*impudens*' (lines 49 and 50), '*zona te secuta*' (line 59), and especially '*uxor*' (line 73), which they consider to put the story of Europa on much the same footing as that of Pasiphaë.

The great Bentley (who however was more remarkable for his unapproachable scholarship than for his refinement) evidently favours the common interpretation by proposing to read '*vitio carentem*' instead of '*vitii carentem*,' on the express ground that *vitio* = *stupro*. Orelli objects to Bentley's suggestion, but plainly takes the same view when he gives as his reason for the objection

the fact that '*hoc plurali—vitii—vitatur nimis aperta stupri significatio*,' and quotes, as if it were parallel, the case of Rhea Silvia. To come to more recent editors, such as Messrs. Maclean and Wickham. Among the English representatives, the two named certainly seem to incline towards the acceptance which I shall presently put forward, but while objecting to Bentley's emendation, for its indelicacy, neither of them says outright that it would be an utter misrepresentation. Yet if we consider it, not only is the whole tone of the poem opposed to such an idea, but the circumstances of the case would appear to preclude it, whether we think of the time before the passage across to Crete, or during the passage, or after the landing, since Europa is represented as having long before that repented of her rashness, and the 'monster' is evidently supposed to have vanished immediately on landing. Moreover, the words '*zona te secuta*' are, to my thinking, additional proof, if any were needed, that the 'zone' had not been 'loosened.'

It is now pertinent to ask whence Horace may be supposed to have derived his version

of the legend. From Bacchylides? Perhaps; but unfortunately that poet's *Europa*, if not purely hypothetical, has not come down to us. Is there any other Greek poet whose treatment of Europa's story may have been familiar to Horace? Yes, Moschus; and his poem is within the reach of everybody, though, oddly enough, it is seldom or never mentioned as the source upon which Horace may have drawn.

Now the legend, as treated by Moschus, is entirely opposed to Bentley's view. Zeus, on the passage across to Crete, reveals himself to the repentant damsel, comforts her, promises to marry her on her arrival, and fulfils his promise:—

θάρσει, παρθενική, μὴ δέδοθαι πόντιον οἶδμα·  
αὐτὸς τοι Ζεὺς εἰμι, καὶ ἐγγύθεν εἶδομαι εἶναι  
ταῦρος..... Κρήτη δέ σε δέξεται ἦδη,  
ἣ μ' ἔθρεψε καὶ αὐτὸν, ὅπῃ νυμφῆϊα σείο  
ἔσσεται· ἐξ ἐμέθεν δὲ κλυτοὺς μάλα φύσειαι νῆας,  
οἱ σκηπτούχοι ἅπασιν ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἔσονται·  
ὥς φάτο· καὶ τετέλεστο τάπερ φάτο· φαίνεται μὲν  
δὴ  
Κρήτη· Ζεὺς δὲ πάλιν ἑτέραν ἀνελάζετο μρρφήν·  
λῦσε δὲ οἱ μίτρη· καὶ οἱ λέχος ἔντυνον ὦραι·

And if anybody should think that Europa's language is too strong for the occasion, under the comparatively innocent circumstances in which she has, according to my theory, become involved, I would urge, first of all, that, from the tone of the address at the commencement of the ode, so different from that which Horace adopts towards his '*libertinae*,' '*Galatea*' is evidently of superior stamp, one upon whose notice he would not dream of thrusting an objectionable subject, and who would not consider Europa's contrition by any means excessive.

A maiden, she had allowed herself to be tempted into leaving her home without her father's knowledge or consent; she had irretrievably disgraced herself; nothing was left for her but either to die or to be taken into the harem of some barbaric prince as a slave and a concubine.

The heinousness of the offence may be illustrated by what Nausicaä says when she dreads the scandal which might arise if she were seen with Odysseus in her train, even when all her damsels kept her company; and what would have been thought of her if she had gone away from home alone for an indefinite time?

If however it be admitted that Horace most probably took the main idea from the poem of Moschus, yet the manner of execution is all his own.

And that consideration leads to a few more points in favour, I think, of my own view.

Horace, unlike Moschus, does not endow the bull with speech and so relieve the maiden's fears during the passage; on the contrary, he works the scene up to agony point, and then brings forward Venus (who has, no doubt, received the cue from Jove), accompanied by Cupid, to prevent the distressed damsel from doing herself a mischief, and to break to her the news of the high destiny awaiting her.

This appears to me to be the patent intention of the last two stanzas, in the first of which the re-appearance of the 'monster' is plainly foretold; it accounts for the '*perfidum ridens*' (the '*mocking smile*' which Venus wore from consciousness of her secret), gives an air of pleasant irony to the '*abstineto irarum calidaeque risae*,' and leads up admirably to the climax, '*uxor invicti Jovis*.' Moreover, to my thinking, it tends to clear up the doubt about the proper interpretation of the words '*uxor invicti Jovis esse nescis*,' which—I would venture to suggest—is to be taken as a question or exclamation following naturally upon the hint that the bull is about to return *without* his 'horns' (as is implied by the ironical advice of the preceding lines), with *nescis* employed in a very common sense and construction (cf. *te nescit tangere*, *Od. III. 13, 9-10*, and the famous '*mentiri nescio*') so as to express (moral) incapability, after the fashion of the French '*ne savoir pas*.' 'Canst thou not be wife' (not the wife, who was Juno) 'of irresistible Jove?' Then follows the obvious conclusion: [Of course thou canst] 'Away, then, with sobs,' &c.

Lastly, there seems to be no ground, either in the poem of Moschus or in the ode of Horace, for the supposition that the '*multum amati*' (line 47) signifies more than the fondness felt for any pet animal. All that these poets imply is that Jove, being in love with Europa, tempted her in a momentary fit of madness (*victa furore* = *in a mad freak*), by his beauty, tameness, and affability, to mount upon his back, and then rushed into the sea with her, she merely regarding him as a very nice, tractable 'monster.'

This being so, I attach to the appearance of Cupid, 'with bow unbent,' a different meaning from that which is generally accepted. I take it to signify that Cupid is pretending to have 'done nothing,' and is thus seconding his mother in the 'merry jest' she enjoys until she reveals her secret. To my thinking a *bent bow with no arrow*

upon it would be the clearer sign that a love-shaft had lately been discharged, and an unbent bow would tell no tale at all. It is not until she is electrified by the words

'*Uxor invicti Jovis esse nescis?*' that Europa has any suspicion of the reason for Cupid's presenting himself before her.

ROBERT BLACK.

## NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE *PLUTUS*.

ON l. 277 the Ravenna Codex has the following scholium:—

ἐν τῇ σορῷ: παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις δέκα ἦσαν φυλαί. ἔθος οὖν ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν δικαστὰς καθίζειν· εἴτα ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἐκάστης ἐλάμβανον ἄνδρας πέντε τοὺς ἐπισημοτέρους·  
5 καὶ πάλιν ἐκ τῶν πέντε ἕνα τὸν κλήρῳ λαχόντα ἐποιοῦν δικάζειν. ἀντὶ οὖν τὸ εἰπεῖν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ κληρωθέν τὸ γράμμα καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ὃ ἐστὶν ὁ κλῆρος, δικάζειν σε καὶ δικαστὴν καθίστησιν, ὡς πρὸς γέροντα παρ' ὑπόνοιαν παίζει. Ἄλλως. ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις πολλὰ ἦν δικαστήρια. καὶ ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἐδίκαζον περὶ φονικῶν πραγμάτων, ἐν τισὶ δὲ περὶ δημοτικῶν· ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἶχεν ἓν τι τῶν στοιχείων ἰδικὸν ὄνομα. οἷον ἦν τι  
15 τῶν δικαστηρίων λεγόμενον ἄλφα, ὅμοιον ἄλλο β, ἄλλο δὲ γ, καὶ δ εἰς τὸ ε· δέκα γὰρ ἦν δικαστήρια τὰ πάντα ἐν Ἀθήναις, πρὸ θυρῶν δὲ ἑκάστου δικαστηρίου ἐγγεγραπτο πυρρῷ βάμματι τὸ στοιχεῖον σινι τὸ δικασ-  
20 τήριον ὠνομάζετο. ὅσοι δὲ δικασταὶ ἦσαν ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἕκαστος καθ' ἕκαστον δικαστήριον εἶχε δέλτον, παρ' ὑπόνοιαν δὲ λέγει σκώπτου τὸν γέροντα.

There are perhaps in those scholia of the *Plutus* which I have yet studied, many more interesting corrections than are possible here, but this I have selected as suggesting very plainly the kind of corruption against which one must always guard. The line of the play from which the lemma comes is written in R thus:—

ἐν τῇ σορῷ ννὶ λαχὼν τὸ γράμμα σοῦ δικάζει.

The one long scholium on the first three words will furnish notes for the whole line as well as for the variant *δικάζειν*. (After each note I give the line of the scholium from which it comes.) Thus:—

(a) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ:] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ (6, 7), *in your coffin*, instead of *in the court-house*.

(b) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ:] παρ' ὑπόνοιαν λέγει σκώπτου τὸν γέροντα (22, 23), he speaks by implication with a jest at the old man's cost.

(c) [λαχόν:] κληρωθέν (7).

(d) τὸ γράμμα: τὸ ψήφισμα (7, 8), 'the number'; a late use of *ψήφισμα* = a numerical figure.

(e) [ἐν τῇ σορῷ ννὶ κ.τ.λ.:] οὐ ἐστὶν ὁ κλῆρος δικάζειν σε· ὡς πρὸς γέροντα παρ' ὑπόνοιαν παίζει (8, 9), 'where it is your lot to sit in state,' as addressing an old man he makes fun by implication.

(f) [δικάζει:] δικαστὴν καθίστησιν (9, 'appoints you to the jury.')

(g) [τὸ γράμμα:] ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις πολλὰ ἦν δικαστήρια. καὶ ἐν τισὶ μὲν ἐδίκαζον περὶ φονικῶν πραγμάτων, ἐν τισὶ δὲ περὶ δημοτικῶν· ἕκαστον δὲ τούτων εἶχεν ἓν τι τῶν στοιχείων εἰδικὸν ὄνομα. οἷον ἦν τι τῶν δικαστηρίων λεγόμενον α, ὁμοίως ἄλλο β, ἄλλο δὲ γ καὶ ἐξῆς (10–16). In Athens there were many courts, and in some they decided criminal suits, and in some civil. Each of these courts had one of the letters of the alphabet as a name to distinguish it by; for example, there was a court called *alpha*, likewise another *beta*, a third *gamma*, and so on. The reading καὶ ἐξῆς comes from another codex which, however, goes on to nullify it by the interpolation τὸ δ καὶ τὸ ε καὶ ἕως τοῦ κ. δέκα γὰρ ἦν δικαστήρια τὰ πάντα ἐν Ἀθήναις.

(h) [τὸ γράμμα:] πρὸ θυρῶν ἑκάστου δικαστηρίου ἐγγεγραπτο πυρρῷ βάμματι τὸ στοιχεῖον ὧτινι τὸ δικαστήριον ὠνομάζετο. ὅσοι δὲ δικασταὶ ἦσαν ἐν Ἀθήναις ἕκαστος καθ' ἕκαστον δικαστήριον εἶχε δέλτον (17–22). Before the doors of each court was written in red colour the letter of the alphabet by which the court was named, and all the dicasts in Athens had each a ticket which varied with the court to which he was assigned. It is possible that from ὅσοι is a separate scholium on τὸ γράμμα, in which case the δέ must be omitted.

There remain ll. 1–6 still to account for. The first half is really a scholium on ll. 1166, 67—

οὐκ ἐτὸς ἅπαντες οἱ δικάζοντες θαμὰ σπεύδουσιν ἐν πολλοῖς γεγράφθαι γράμμασιν,