

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 Pacuviusque et uerucosa moretur | Antiopa, aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta', where the constraints of the metre may well have influenced him.

turned up a pleasant surprise. In the *apparatus* of Clausen's *editio maior*³ there is the entry

scutica et VΦ, scyticte et P, scutitet α.

Since my emendation is supported by the reading of the most important manuscript,⁴ which is alone in preserving the truth in four other places in this very satire,⁵ it is at least worthy of serious consideration in constituting the text of Persius.

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

³ W. V. Clausen [ed.], *A. Persi Flacci Saturarum Liber* (Oxford, 1956), *ad loc.*

⁴ From a microfilm of P, kindly furnished by the Bibliothèque interuniversitaire de Montpellier, Section médecine, I have verified that its reading is indeed 'scyticte & metus egit erilis'. One possibility is that in an ancestor of P which read 'scuticae metus egit erilis' the '&' was entered as a variant; another is that P's 'scyticte' is the result of the correction of one of its ancestors against a codex which read 'scuticae metus egit erilis'.

⁵ In verses 87, 105, 112, and 190, as observed by Clausen on p. xvi of his *editio maior*.

NOTES ON QUINTILIAN AND [QUINTILIAN]¹

(i) Quint. 11.3.59

Sed quodcumque ex his vitium magis tulerim quam, quo nunc maxime laboratur in causis omnibus scholisque, cantandi... (57)... Nam Cicero illos ex Lycia et Caria rhetoras paene cantare in epilogis dixit: nos etiam cantandi severiorem paulo modum excessimus (58). Quisquamne, non dico de homicidio sacrilegio parricidio, sed de calculis certe atque rationibus, quisquam denique, ut semel finiam, in lite cantat?

The answer to the basic question, *quisquamne cantat?*, given the rhetoric of the context (perhaps a professorial chestnut of Quintilian's: elements from 11.3.60 turn up at Pliny, *Ep.* 2.14.3), especially emotive in 57, should be that everyone *cantat*, but the form of the question seems to suggest, at first sight, the opposite.

It might be possible to treat it as a loose way of saying, 'Does anyone in his right mind sing...?'. But (a) the crucial idea of propriety is unexpressed; (b) *ut semel finiam*, together with *denique* and the repetition of *quisquam*, indicates a rhetorical culmination: if *cantandum* is less absurd in emotive levels (cf. 58), it follows that the *non dico* here ought to make an exception of *homicidium*, *sacrilegium* and *parridium*, which leaves only *calculis* and *rationibus* to culminate in *in lite*. This is weak in itself, but also (c) demands that *lis* should represent a very trivial business whereas semantically it should include *homicidium* and the rest (cf. Cic. *pro Cluent.* 116, *maiestatis* and *capitis*).

The three difficulties may be removed, and *non dico...sed...* given a more normal (non-excluding) usage² by reading:

...in lite <non>³ cantat?

'Does anyone, not just in (less inappropriate) serious cases, but actually in trivial ones, does anyone, to sum it all up, in any action *not* sing?'

(ii) Decl. Min. 274.4

Non satis putaverunt maiores eas poenas adversus tyrannum constituere quas possit excipere in

¹ I am grateful to Dr M. Winterbottom for his comments on these passages.

² See 10.1.48; 10.7.2; 1.10.35 for Quintilianic exx. Cf. also Pliny, *Ep.* 2.4.2; 7.17.9; 8.6.2; Sen. *NQ* 1 *pr.* 7 (*non tantum dico...sed...*); contrast Pliny, *Ep.* 7.9.9; 9.14.1 where the *non dico* excludes, but where this is also made explicit in the context.

³ Emphasis and rhythm justify this position for the insertion.