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RESUMEN
En este artículo se proponen más evidencias en apoyo de una antigua interpretación de Hor. carm. 2.20.6-7; se proponen nuevas conjeturas a Juv. 6.010; 12.78; Lucr. 1.14; 5.1442; Ov. fast. 3.573; met. 8.176; Pers. 5.57; y Verg. Aen. 1.329; y se recomiendan las lecturas de Heinsius a Ov. met. 8.176; y 14.491.
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SUMMARY
Further evidence is proposed for an old interpretation of Hor. carm. 2.20.6-7. New readings are proposed at Juv. 6.010; 12.78; Lucr. 1.14; 5.1442; Ov. fast. 3.573; met. 8.176; Pers. 5.57; Verg. Aen. 1.329. The readings of Heinsius are recommended at Ov. met. 8.176; 14.491.
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* I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewers, whose comments have enabled me to make significant improvements to these notes.
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At J. Trappes-Lomax, “Critica Varia”, ExClass 22, 2018, 32-3, I argued in favour of the old (going back to Ps-Acro) but unfashionable interpretation that takes dilecte as dependent on uocas, adducing Pers. 3.29 and Ev. Joh. 13.13. Even more apposite would have been Hor. serm. 2.6.20 Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis. If audio, when it is in effect the passive of uoco (OLD s. u. audio 5), can govern a vocative, so presumably can uoco itself. This confirms that we should punctuate as follows:

non ego quem uocas, 'dilecte', Maecenas, obibo

In view of its extraordinary transmission, it is no surprise that the O fragment is corrupt; however, the general picture at this point is clear: there is the virile retiarius who fights wearing loin-cloth only and the effeminate retiarius who fights wearing a tunic as well. The former keeps his gear well away from the gear of the latter. Our concern here is only with the previously unsuspected word iunguntur; why is the passive iunguntur incongruously paired with the active ponit, although both verbs have the same actual subject and are both placed in what ought to be strictly parallel nec clauses? We may suspect that the correct reading is coniungit (OLD s. u. 2a); con, represented by c with a virgula, was lost, and metre was restored by converting the verb from idiomatic active to clumsy passive. Write:

quid quod nec retia turpi
iungun turtunicae, nec cella ponit eadem 10
munimenta umeri ....
qui nudus pugnare solet?

ExClass 24, 2020, 55-63  http://dx.doi.org/10.33776/ec.v24i0.4972
Thus the text of A. E. Housman, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, Cambridge 1931 (corrected reprint), the point of the passage being that the artificial harbour at Ostia is far superior to any natural harbour. Housman rightly remarks that *igitur* “sententiam pervertit”; he suggests *similis*, but if the natural harbours are, more or less, *similes*, will we not admire them, more or less, *sic*? Better is the simple correlative *illos*; the corruption could hardly be easier, as the abbreviations for *igitur* and for parts of *ille* include *i* surmounted by various - if we may employ non-technical language - squiggles. Write:

non sic illos mirabere portus
quos natura dedit

LUCR. 1.12-15

aeriae primum uolucres te, diua, tuumque
significant initum, percusae corda tua ui;
infe rae pecudes persulant pabula laeta
et rapidos tranant amnis;

It is unlikely that any reader has been entirely satisfied by *ferae pecudes* where *pecudes*, which primarily refers to farm animals, seems incompatible with adjectival *ferae*; C. Bailey takes the expression as an asyndeton¹, but this is not supported by the examples that he gives at 1.159-60, which involve synonyms and near-synonyms rather than terms as sharply opposed as *ferae* and *pecudes*; M. Deufert concludes “halte ich daher, mit gewissen Zweifeln, auf der Überlieferung fest und setze ein verdeutlichendes Komma zwischen *ferae* und *pecudes*”². We may be encouraged to put forward an alternative suggestion by Deufert’s uncertainty and by his insertion of clarificatory punctuation, which Lucretius was not in a position to rely on.

Bentley’s *ferae et* is feeble and entails an unpleasant elision; Wakefield’s *fere* is no more than a space-filler. So what did Lucretius write? *inde* is necessary after *primum*, as the birds are the first to feel Venus’ influence and then all other living creatures do so; there is obviously nothing wrong with *pecudes*. So instead of tinkering with *ferae*, which we know by experiment will lead to no useful result, let us ask ourselves what word Lucretius would have placed between *inde* and *pecudes*. It is here proposed that we should write:

inde aliae pecudes persulant pabula laeta

¹ C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Oxford 1947, ad loc.
There is a precise parallel at 1.116 *an pecudes alias diuinitus insinuet se*, a passage which imports a distinction between human beings and all manner of quadrupeds, whereas in our passage we have a contrast between birds and all manner of quadrupeds; cf. also 1.163 *armenta atque aliae pecudes*, where *pecudes* means all manner of quadrupeds other than *armenta*, as appears from the apposition *genus omne ferarum*; for the idiom, see OLD s. u. *alius* and such examples as Liv. 5.39.3 *circa moenia aliasque portas* and Plaut. *Men.* 174 *saluast nauis .... quid alia armamenta?*, for this use of *alius* in a manner which would be impossible for English “other”. The corruption may be a mere accident; alternatively, somebody may have written something like *et ferae over pecudes* to make it clear that the power of Venus is not confined to domestic animals, and the note then invaded the text.

**LUCR. 5.1440-3**

iam ualidis saepti degebant turribus aeuom,  
et diuisa colebatur discretaque tellus,  
tum mare ueliuolis florebat propter odores,  
auxilia ac socios iam pacto foedere habeabant,

So the MSS. Before assailing the main problem, we should note that Deuffert rightly prefers Weil’s *iam* for *tum* in 1442; possibly *iam* would also be better than *et* in 1441 so as to reinforce the anaphora, but that is by the bye.

Bailey calls *propter odores* “perhaps the most desperate textual crux in the poem”; likewise, Deuffert concludes his exhaustive discussion with “Da keine Konjektur restlos überzeugt, muss es bei Kreuzen bleiben”; it appears to have arisen either by mere chance from the line-ending at 2.417 or because a Christian scribe wished to express his disapproval of the sea-borne trade in luxury goods; cf. Rev. 18.12-13. Without the indirect tradition, we would get no further; however, Servius *ad Aen. 7.804* quotes what is presumably this line-ending as *florebat nauibus pontus*, which is in itself entirely satisfactory. However, simply combining Servius with the MS reading gives a clumsy tautology:

`tum mare ueliuolis florebat nauibus pontus`

---

4 Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Carī ad loc.*
Bailey disposes of the various attempts made so far to correct this, for example the unconvincing mari’... pontus of A. E. Housman⁶. Alternatively, we might write:

iam quoque ueliuolis florebat nauibus pontus

When propter odores displaced nauibus pontus, it left the verb in manifest need of a subject; the scribe had no difficulty in providing that subject by altering quoque to mare, and in so doing he created a mare’s nest for future scholars. The point of quoque would simply be that at the time when fortification and individual land-ownership came in, so also did marine navigation.

It should be noted that D. Butterfield proposes propter et urbes and defends substantival ueliuolis⁷, but the parallels adduced are all of animate objects (lanigerae etc.) and thus not strictly decisive⁸.

Ov. fast. 3.573

et tamen hospitii seruasset ad ultima munus,
sed timuit magnas Pygmalionis opes.

S. J. Heyworth points out that et tamen is unsatisfactory, and that the same is true of et tandem (Krebs) and et tantum (the Teubner text of Alton, Wormell & Courtney); he raises the possibility of “a more radical corruption”, and tentatively suggests et certe⁹. We might prefer something at once more pointed and more likely to give rise to the corruption. Write:

<hospes et> hospitii seruasset ad ultima munus,

Battus, as host, would have carried out to the end the duties of host that he had promised to Anna, but fear of Pygmalion overcame him.

Repetition would have led, as so often, to omission, followed by the inevitable metrical interpolation. J. Wills discusses such combinations of different nouns from the same stem; e.g. fast. 2.808 falsus adulterii testis adulter eris¹⁰.

---

⁸ Cf. also C. Murgia, “The most desperate crux in Lucretius; 5.1442”, CPh 95, 2000, 308.
Ov. *met.* 8.175-7

comitemque suam crudelis in illo
litore destituit; desertae et multa querenti
amplexus et opem Liber tulit.

Such is the modern vulgate. N. Heinsius knew better and printed *deseruit*, attributing it to “quinque ueteres”\(^\text{11}\). However, such is Ovid’s love of trans-caesural repetition that *deseruit* would certainly be right even if it had no MS support at all; the other instances of different but similar words in such variations given by Wills are all mandated by metre\(^\text{12}\). But two other problems affect the last three words: 1) Ovid nowhere else admits an -ae e- elision; 2) *multa querenti* is acceptable in itself, but if Ariadne’s famous lament is to be alluded to at all, something far more pointed would be required. Write:

comitemque suam crudelis in illo
litore deseruit; desertae <litore in illo>
amplexus et opem Liber tulit.

Ovid could not have written anything else; cf. *met.* 2.702-3 ‘*sub illis / montibus*, inquit, ‘*erunt*, et *erant sub montibus illis*, and more generally Wills, *Repetition*, 345. The homoeoteleuton led to omission and metrical interpolation.


audiat ipsa licet, et quod facit oderit omnes
sub Diomede uiros

Once again, this is the modern vulgate. Once again, Heinsius knew better; he printed with some MS support\(^\text{13}\).

audiat ipsa licet, licet ut facit oderit omnes

Once again, we have the sequence: repetition, omission, interpolation. Once again, Heinsius’ text would be certain even if it had no MS support at all. The alternative is to suppose that Ovid deliberately deprived himself of an


\(^{13}\) Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii*, II, 379.
attractive trans-caesural repetition with no other motive than to introduce a pointless metrical anomaly.

This line is mentioned not just for its own sake, but also as relevant to Pers. 5.57, for which see below.

**Pers. 5.54-8**

mercibus hic Italis mutat sub sole recenti
rugosum piper et pallentis grana cumini,
hic satur inriguo mauult turgescere somno,
hic campo indulget, hunc alea decoquit, ille
in uenerem putris;

A number of MSS have *hi .... indulgent*, and the scribes deserve credit for having noticed the anomalous lengthening of the last syllable of *indulget* and for having tried to do something about it; however, in a long sequence of singular pronouns a single plural pronoun is artistically unacceptable. The cure is easy; if one infinitive depends on *mauult* a second should also do so, making one prefer *turgescere* and another prefer *indulgere*; this is then followed by a second pair without *mauult*, wherein one is addicted to gambling and another to sex. Write:

hic campo indulgere, hunc alea decoquit, ille

It may be noted in passing that Persius had no objection to multiple elisions in a single line; cf. e.g. 1.9 *tunc cum ad canitiem et nostrum istud uiuere triste*.

W. Kissel also deserves credit for noticing the anomaly, which seems to be ignored by other editors; however, we may not be convinced by his defence. He argues that poets of the imperial period retained the pre-classical lengthening of 3rd sing. pres. indic. act. of the 2nd conjugation “aus Gründen metrischer Bequemlichkeit” before the caesura. He adduces similar lengthenings at 1) Verg. *Aen.* 1.308 (*uidet*) 2) Ov. *met.* 3.184 (*solet*); 3) 14.491 (*licet*); 4) *Ilias Latina* 966 (*ualet*) 5) “vielleicht auch” Stat. *Theb.* 1.384 (*habet*). If this useful licence existed, we would expect more examples, but even this insignificant list evaporates under examination. 1) Vergil lengthens numerous short final syllables, irrespective of whether or not they were long in earlier Latin; 2) *nubibus esse solet aut purpureae Aurorae*; the lengthening is genuine, but is to be attributed, like the hiatus and the

---

fifth-foot spondee, to the proximity of the Greek-derived purpureae\textsuperscript{16}; 3) see met. 14.491 above 4) nec s|ufferre ualet ultra sor|temque su|premam / stantemque Ae|aciden de|fectis uiribus Hector. Transposing the second halves of both lines makes better sense as well as removing the anomalous scansion\textsuperscript{17}; 5) habens is at least as good as habet and is the reading of the best MS and of the scholiast and of modern editions.

It is noteworthy that F. Vollmer in his voluminous list of real or purported lengthenings of short vowels, adduces only this line from Persius\textsuperscript{18}. Had he seen how easily the anomalous lengthening can be cured, he would no doubt have included Persius in the “ganze Reihe von Dichtern” from the time of Tiberius and Nero onwards who “die ihnen fehlerhaft erscheinende Freiheit ganz gemieden haben”\textsuperscript{19}.

\textit{Verg. Aen.} 1.329

an Phoebi soror, an Nympha|rum sanguinis una?

P. H. Peerlkamp pointed out that the natural sense of the second half of the question is “or are you a descendant of her Nymphs?”\textsuperscript{20} (cf. OLD s. u. sanguis 10): “Iam interrogatio est contumeliosa et ridicula esne ipsa Diana, an nata ex Nymphis Dianae comitibus? Diana pudica, omnem virorum contactum exosa, neque Nymphas habebat matres, neque nates ex incesto Nympharum”. He proposed \textit{an pars Nympharum agminis una?} adducing Stat. \textit{Ach.} 1.900 and Claud. \textit{rapt. Pros.} 3.57-8 for this sense of agmen. However, in Peerlkamp’s version \textit{pars} seems to have no function except to fill up the hexameter and there is nothing to explain the \textit{s} of the transmitted \textit{sanguinis}. E. Baehrens writes “Peerlkampius viam monstravit, qua insistens Ribbeckius [= \textit{P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri I-VI}, Leipzig 1860] proposuit \textit{es agminis}; verum est hoc: \textit{an Nympharum’s agminis una}?\textsuperscript{21} However, both these suggestions import metrical problems. Ribbeck’s lengthening of \textit{es} is unknown outside comedy\textsuperscript{22}; nor are there any examples

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. the similar lengthening at \textit{epist.} 9.141 semiiur occubuit in letifero Eueno, and J. Trappes-Lomax, “Hiatus in Vergil and Horace’s Odes”, \textit{PCPhS} 50, 2004, 154-5 for the way in which the presence of Greek vocabulary licenses metrical anomaly.


\textsuperscript{19} Vollmer, “Zur Geschichte”, 53.

\textsuperscript{20} P. H. Peerlkamp, \textit{P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneidos Libri}, Leiden 1843, I, 45.

\textsuperscript{21} E. Baehrens, “Emendationes Vergilianae”, \textit{NJbb für Philologie und Paedagogik} 129, 1884, 402 n. 6.

of m’s being used to make a heavy syllable in the comprehensive list given by C. Schöffel\textsuperscript{23}.

The metre can be tidied up by making a minute change to Baehrens’ suggestion and reading \textit{exagminis, exagmen} being the Vergilian spelling of the later \textit{examen}\textsuperscript{24}. It should be added that \textit{x} and \textit{s} are confused even in the capital MSS of Vergil\textsuperscript{25}. Write:

an Phoebi soror, an Nympharum exagminis una?


