

## LUCRETIUS 1. 102–105

tutemet a nobis iam quovis tempore vatum  
 terriloquis victus dictis desciscere quaeres.  
 quippe etenim quam multa tibi iam fingere possunt<sup>1</sup>  
 somnia quae vitae rationes vertere possint

Bailey posed the problem succinctly and clearly: 'Though you can be said to "fashion a dream for yourself"', it is not easy to see how you can do it for someone else.<sup>2</sup> He agrees with Giussani: *somnia* = *ineptae fabulae*, which is unexceptionable. But in fact Bailey's objection to the 'literal' meaning of the text is baseless. Dream control was indeed practised in antiquity.<sup>3</sup> An ample discussion may be found s.v. *oneiropompeia* at *RE* 18. 1, 440–8 (K. Preisendanz). Nice examples of the art as practised by the magus Nectanebus are described in Ps.-Callisth. *Alex.* 1. 5 and 1. 8, the former episode including the construction of an effigy (ἐπλασε κηρίον θηλυκόσωμον, in the β and γ recensions). One might still choose to understand *somnia* here as 'nonsense, fairy tales', but it is not possible to dismiss *somnia* = 'dreams' on the usual grounds.<sup>4</sup>

University of Illinois, Urbana

HOWARD JACOBSON

<sup>1</sup> Aside from its obvious virtues, Marullus' emendation *possunt* is probably supported by Claudian's imitation at *Eutrop.* 1. 170 *fingere somnia possunt*, though in Claudian *somnia* is subject rather than object.

<sup>2</sup> The Vergilian line *qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt* (*Ecl.* 8. 108) is the only other example I know of *somnia fingere*. It is, however, not relevant for an understanding of the Lucretian text both because, as Bailey says, it refers the action to oneself and also because it is a traditional description of lovers, here phrased in Lucretian language.

<sup>3</sup> This need not imply that Lucretius believed in it, only that he knew others did. We might also recall Lucretius' interest in the terrifying consequences of dreams elsewhere (1. 133, 4. 34–7).

<sup>4</sup> To Professor Abraham Wasserstein I am indebted for helpful suggestions.

## GALLUS AND EUPHORION

The editors of the new fragment of Gallus<sup>1</sup> draw attention to line 6, 'fecerunt carmina Musae'. They say "'fecerunt" is unusual in such a context, and to a Roman reader would inevitably suggest ποιητής (not used of poets in early Greek); the Muses of Gallus provided craftsmanship as well as inspiration'. It is possible to be more precise: cf. Euphorion fr. 118 Powell:

Μοῦσαι ἐποίησαντο καὶ ἀπροτίμαστος Ὀμηρος

Now van Groningen<sup>2</sup> suggests that this might be completed as 'Quelque chose comme τὸν δεῖνα κλεινὸν ἐποίησαντο.' But why not supply, for example, αἰοδήν? In any event, whether the exact use was the same or not, it looks as if Gallus alluded to Euphorion. This is a piece of information to add to the other evidence for Euphorion's influence on Gallus: Servius on Verg. *Ecl.* 6. 72, al.; Probus, *Ecl.* 10. 50; Diomedes *G.L.* 1. 484. 22.

The fragment of Euphorion itself is an example of an unusual relationship between

<sup>1</sup> R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons, R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrim', *JRS* 69 (1979), 125 ff.

<sup>2</sup> B. A. Van Groningen, *Euphorion* (Amsterdam, 1977), p. 189.

Muses and poet: co-operation rather than inspiration. Mr Hollis<sup>3</sup> has provided one parallel: Asclepiades *A.P.* 9. 63. 4 (= 32G-P) τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου. To which should be added Crinagoras *A.P.* 9. 513. 2 (= 49G-P) ἔγραψεν ἡ Μουσῶν σὺν μιῇ ἡ Χαρίτων. Compare also Pindar *Nem.* 9. 53 ff. Ζεῦ πάτερ/ εὖχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι/σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν; Bacch. 5. 9 f. ἡ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις ὑφάνας/ὕμνον; Crinagoras *A.P.* 9. 239. 4 (= 7G-P) ἔγραψεν ἡ παρ' οἶνον ἡ σὺν Ἰμέροις.

Hertford College, Oxford

D. E. KEEFE

<sup>3</sup> A. S. Hollis, 'The New Gallus, 8-9', *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 541 f. I am grateful to Mr Hollis for discussion.

### THE TEASE IN HORACE, *Odes* 1. 16

In the past most scholars held that at *Odes* 1. 16. 5-21 Horace is making excuses for his own anger. More recently, however, Commager (*The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, p. 138) and Nisbet and Hubbard (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes I*, pp. 202-3) maintained that in this passage the poet is referring to the addressee's *ira* and trying to dissuade her from being angry with him. In my opinion both interpretations contain part of the truth, but both fail to grasp the essential point that the passage is in fact yet another instance of an Horatian tease.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the opening of the ode Nisbet and Hubbard state: 'In the first stanza the lady must already be angry; she is to be allowed to take the most drastic measures against the offending lampoons'. However, I fail to see why one should assume in 1-4 that she would be angry rather than, say, hurt or sad, especially since it appears that Horace actually has to tell her to destroy the poems. Horace here, in fact, tells us nothing definite about her reaction, but two words do seem relevant to his state of mind. The fact that he has written iambics (*iambis*, 3), conventionally used for fierce scurrilous attacks,<sup>2</sup> and describes them in line 2 as *criminosi* (which most obviously means 'abusive, vituperative') suggests anger on his part. Furthermore, the tone of the first stanza, with its complimentary line 1 and conciliatory lines 2-4, seems clearly apologetic, and one naturally imagines that 5-21 are part of the apology, particularly since it is hardly usual or politic when making an apology for attacks on a person to deliver a lengthy lecture to that person on his/her reaction to those attacks.<sup>3</sup> So at 5 ff. the poet appears to be excusing himself by saying in effect that *ira* unbalances

<sup>1</sup> At this point I should perhaps mention that L. A. MacKay, *AJPh* 83 (1962), 298 f., and M. Dyson, *AUMLA* 30 (1968), 169 ff., have suggested that contrary to general opinion the composer of the *criminosi iambi* (2 f.) was not Horace but the woman addressed in the present ode. However, in the opening lines here one automatically assumes that Horace, poet and in particular author of the *Epodes*, was responsible for these *criminosi iambi*, and this assumption surely becomes certainty at 22 ff. (esp. in *celeris iambos* | *misit furem*, picked up by *tristia* and then *opprobriis*), where clearly the poet means that the initial impulse to write the lampoons in question came to him in his youth and he has continued to produce them until the present poem, by which time his anger has abated somewhat. The objections of MacKay and Dyson to this attribution of authorship are, I believe, adequately refuted in respect of language by Nisbet and Hubbard and in respect of tone and situation by this article and common sense.

<sup>2</sup> See Nisbet and Hubbard on line 3, Porph. on line 24, *Ibis* 53 f., 521.

<sup>3</sup> Of course, the vast majority of Horace's readers had and have no way of knowing whether or not 1. 16 was concerned with a real situation, but even if it was, and even if one assumes that the lady was in reality angry, this latter observation still holds good, and, as will become clear, the ode will have teased her as well as other readers.