

mentary nature of this message, Horace's clear implication is, "Therefore admit me [Horace] to your presence now."⁴²

III

By paying heed both to the words of Horace's ode (particularly of its final stanza) and also to the literary tradition, scholars have concluded that Quintilian was right to interpret Horace's ship as representing the *res publica*. In this paper I have argued that by carrying out exactly the same procedures one should conclude that Anderson was right to interpret the ship as representing Horace's wayward and rather unrepresentable mistress. The poem thus raises none of the vexed questions of dating with which scholars have occupied themselves;⁴³ it does, however, provide yet one more example of Horace's characteristic wit. In the preceding ode, 1. 13, Horace is jealous of his mistress' new lover: true happiness, he says, belongs to those whose love is free from all complaints. There follows 1. 14, in which Horace once again depicts himself, not without a certain irony, as a jealous and complaining lover and his unfaithful mistress as a sea-worn craft. It is surely not without an additional irony that the following ode, 1. 15, begins with an unfaithful woman, Helen, being carried across the sea on board ship!

A. J. WOODMAN

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

42. For this interpretation of 1. 25, see F. O. Copley, *Exclusus Amator* (Madison, Wisc., 1956), pp. 58–60; Anderson, "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 98, n. 18; and Cairns, *Generic Composition*, pp. 88–89. Another example of the same thing seems to me to be Rufinus, *Anth. Pal.* 5. 103, where (*contra* Page, "Epigrams," p. 102) the komast says that old age is *already* upon the woman.

43. See, e.g., Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, 1:165–70.

FLY-FISHING AMONG THE ROMANS

namque quis nescit

Auidum uorata decipi scarum musca?

uorato . . . musco Brodaeus et alii

[Mart. 5. 18. 7–8]

Future editors of Martial should not ignore D'Arcy W. Thompson's objection to this line: "*Scarus* cannot be thought of as rising to a fly; neither would seaweed be a tempting bait, nor *muscus* an appropriate name for it."¹ Thompson goes on to surmise that the word for bait, *esca*, "somehow underlies *musco*, or *musca*" (cf. [Ov.] *Hal.* 9–11 "Sic et scarus . . . adsumptaue dolo tandem pauet esca").

This conjecture, although recommended by its content, involves excessive rewriting (*auidos* . . . *scaros* is unlikely to have been corrupted to *auidum* . . . *scarum*).² In order to avoid this difficulty, I tentatively propose another, more economical alternative, namely, that a scribe miscopied *squalum* as *scarum*. Anglers need no biologist to tell them that a fly is a suitable bait to catch a member

1. *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London, 1947), p. 241.

2. The same applies to *alga* (cf. W. Gilbert, "Beiträge zur Textkritik des Martial," *RhM* 39 [1884]: 518–19).

of the carp family, such as the *squalus* (either the chub or a related species),³ a fish commonly found in the Tiber (otherwise *quis nescit* of line 7 becomes somewhat awkward). Furthermore, from a transcriptional standpoint a scribal error of the kind just posited is not surprising, since the name of the wrasse parrot (*scarus*) appears far more frequently throughout Latin literature than its close homophone.⁴ Finally, if my suggestion is correct, it may be possible to determine the true scansion of the first syllable of *squalus*.⁵

RAMÓN BALTAR VELOSO
*Universidad de Santiago
de Compostela*

3. Cf. Thompson, *Glossary*, p. 251. E. de Saint-Denis' discussion of the name of this fish (*Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique* [Paris, 1947], p. 108) does not explain the relationship of Varro's river fish (*Rust.* 3. 3. 9; cf. Colum. 8. 16. 1 Lundström-Josephson) to the shark or dogfish apparently referred to in Pliny the Elder's text (*NH* 9. 78).

4. A case in point: some MSS of Colum. 8. 16. 1 read (*mugilem*) *scarumque* instead of *squalumque*.

5. "Quantité de l'*a* inconnue" (A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴ [Paris, 1959], s.v. *squalus*).

ACHILLES OR AGAMEMNON? A NOTE ON HORACE *EPISTLES* 1. 2. 13

Antenor censet belli praecidere causam:
quid Paris? ut saluus regnet uiuatque beatus,
cogi posse negat. Nestor componere litis
inter Peliden festinat et inter Atriden:
hunc amor, ira quidem communiter urit utrumque.

[Hor. *Epist.* 1. 2. 9–13]

The identity of *hunc* (13) cannot be decided on linguistic grounds, for *hic* may refer to either the former or the latter of two people just mentioned.¹ So we turn for enlightenment to the *Iliad*. And we do so with the assumption that Horace has got the setting right. (After all, he asks us to believe that he has been rereading the poem.) We must therefore start with the intervention of Nestor: τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ / ἤδυεπός ἀνδρόνους (1. 247–48). This, in turn, means that we have to do with the tug of war over Briseis. The fate of the other girl, the daughter of Chryses, has already been settled: she is to be returned to her father (1. 141–44). Now although Agamemnon claims to have tender feelings toward the daughter of Chryses and to rate her even above Clytemnestra (1. 112–15), there is no suggestion that he has any positive feelings about Briseis. He demands her from Achilles simply to assert his own superior status; and later it appears that their partnership has never been consummated (9. 132–34 and 19. 261–63). As for Achilles, while it is true that in this same passage we hear virtually nothing about his attitude to Briseis either, later on he refers to her as his ἀλοχὸν θυμαρέα (9. 336) and declares that he loved her with all his heart—ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον (9. 343). On the strength of these phrases, moreover, Achilles became for the Romans the example

1. See B. L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar*³ (Boston, 1907), no. 307, remarks 1(a)' 1(b).