

ut flebo puer',² it would be a mistake to assume that an unusual usage in so innovative a poet as Horace must be corrupt.³ According to the *ThLL*, s.v. 'inultus', §II.A.2, Horace at *Epist.* 1.2.61 'dum poenas odio per uim festinat inulto' seems to have been the first to use *inultus* 'de motibus animi, doloribus, gemitu, qui iniurias sequuntur', and it would appear from §II.B.1 that at *Carm.* 1.28.33 'precibus non linquar inultis' he is alone in using *inultus* 'de precibus, quae ad ultionem frustra tendunt'.

I think I have said enough to show that the transmitted text is unexceptionable.

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

² Since I have been asked by a reader to elucidate the sense and the construction of this clause, I may say that both the immediate context and the imitation by Claudian indicate that 'inultus' goes with 'flebo', not with 'puer'; cf. standard commentaries such as those of Orelli, Kiessling and Heinze, and Lucian Müller, *ad loc.* I do not know offhand of an exact parallel to the hyperbaton 'inultus ut flebo puer', but cf. *Serm.* 1.4.142-3 'ac ueluti te | Iudaei cogemus in hanc concedere turbam', 2.1.39-41 'hic stilus... | ...me ueluti custodiet ensis | uagina tectus', and 2.3.109-10 'nescius uti | compositis metuensque uelut contingere sacrum'. Numerous examples of far more extreme hyperbata were collected by A. E. Housman, *JPh* 18 (1890), 6-8, *CR* 11 (1897), 428-9, *CR* 14 (1900), 38, *CR* 20 (1906), 39 and 258, *JPh* 30 (1907), 246; for still more examples consult the indices to his editions of Manilius, Lucan, and Juvenal.

³ I want it to be clearly understood that I am *not* saying that any odd expression or bad grammar in Horace may well be authentic; I am rather contending that before one impugns the transmitted text, one should first search for parallels, or failing them, analogues.

HORACE, SATIRES 2.4.61

tostis marcentem squillis recreabis et Afra
potorem coctea; nam lactuca innatat acri
post vinum stomacho. perna magis et magis hillis
flagitat immorsus refici; quin omnia malit
quaecumque immundis fervent allata popinis.

(*Sat.* 2.4.58-62)

Here Horace's Catus lists restorative foods for drinkers. There seem to be two stages of drinking and two corresponding restoratives: the 'marcens' or drooping imbibor may be revived for more by prawns and snails, but not by lettuce, bad for the acidic and vinous stomach, while the man who is further gone needs ham and sausages or anything of that sort from the cook-shops. 'Immorsus' causes some difficulty here. It is usually taken with an understood 'stomachus' and translated 'roused' or 'excited' (with wine), but it is surely better to understand not 'stomachus' but 'potor', giving the elegant balance 'marcentem...recreabis...potorem...[potor] flagitat immorsus refici', with both verbs of restoration having the drinker for object. The sense usually given to 'immorsus' also seems doubtful: 'immordeo' is found only twice in classical Latin and only here in this metaphorical sense, and 'mordeo' in such contexts means not to rouse the stomach but to cause it to smart or sting, hardly the effect of wine - cf. Scribonius Largus 188 '[aconita] mordet autem stomachum et cor adficit', Pliny, *Nat.* 27.133 '[radix] gustu acri mordet'.

The difficulty has been noticed, and some solutions tried. In his recent Teubner text Shackleton Bailey takes 'immorsus' in the negative sense of ἄδηκτος, 'unbitten', quoting the late glossographer Cyrillus (*Gloss. Lat.* 2.218); his note in the app. crit. ('cf. 2.8.8, ubi lactucae inter acria numerantur, qualia stomachum pervellunt') seems to imply that 'immorsus' presents a contrast with the acidic stomach made worse by lettuce, but if my account of the argument of the passage is right this is unhelpful. Some more recent MSS. divide the word to get 'in morsus', but this seems dubious

syntax, whether with 'flagitat' or with 'refici'; Bentley conjectured 'inmorsis', an anonymous scholar 'immersis', both going with 'hillis', but neither of these provides the progress from light to heavy drinking and light to heavy restorative fare which clearly articulates the passage. Latinity and logic may be preserved by reading 'immersus', understanding 'potor', in the sense of 'far gone in drink'. Though 'immersus' is not found elsewhere in this sense, 'mersus' is common enough – cf. Livy 41.3.10 'vino somnoque...mersos', Manilius 5.246 'mergetque in pocula mentem' and particularly Seneca, *Ep.* 12.4, where as in my account of the Horace passage the verb is used of the last stages of intoxication: 'deditos vino potio extrema delectat, illa quae mergit, quae ebrietati summam manum imponit'. 'Immersus', the imbibitor 'drowned in drink', appropriately succeeds and opposes the 'marcens', one who is merely drooping and withering.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

PERSIUS 5.129–31*

...sed si intus et in iecore aegro
nascuntur domini, qui tu inpunitior exis
atque hic, quem ad strigilis scutica et metus egit erilis?

This is the reading of Clausen's OCT,¹ in which no variant for line 131 is recorded in the apparatus.

No doubt the hendiadys 'scutica et metus...erilis' is not impossible,² but it seems to me not to be a well chosen expression. Since the *scutica* belongs to the master, one is tempted to construe *erilis* with both nouns, not just with *metus*. But then the adjective must function in two different ways: 'scutica...erilis' is possessive, 'his master's strap', but 'metus...erilis' is objective, 'fear of his master'. And 'metus...erilis' in this passage receives no support from 'erilis...metus' at Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1069, which means 'fear for my mistress'.

Since Persius obviously meant 'fear of his master's strap', it occurred to me that he might have written

...quem ad strigilis scuticae metus egit erilis?,

so that *erilis* modifies not *metus* but *scuticae*. For similar phrases at the end of the hexameter, cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 7.490 'mensaeque adsuetus erili', and Horace, *Serm.* 2.7.60 'peccati conscia erilis' and *Epist.* 2.2.6 'ad nutus aptus eriles'. It is probable that Persius wrote 'scuticae metus...erilis' under the influence of Horace, *Epist.* 2.2.15, where a slave is described as 'metuens pendentis habena'; it is well known that Persius frequently borrows heavily from Horace, and he certainly does so in this very passage, where 'qui tu inpunitior' is lifted word for word from *Serm.* 2.7.105. The corruption might have arisen from anticipation: SCVTICAEMETVS → SCVTICAETMETVS.

My search to see whether this emendation had been anticipated by a previous critic

* I should like to thank an anonymous referee for several helpful comments on an earlier version of this note. I am also grateful to Dr S. Georgia Nugent for her hospitality while I was doing some of the research for this note.

¹ W. V. Clausen [ed.], *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae* (Oxford, 1959), *ad loc.*

² Persius is not overly enamoured of hendiadys; his only other example of this figure is at 1.77–8 'sunt quos Pacuiusque et uerucosa moretur | Antiopa, aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta', where the constraints of the metre may well have influenced him.