

be taken? It can hardly mean, as Godwin<sup>18</sup> tentatively suggests it might, 'people travelling'. And to assume, as most scholars do, that it agrees with *nubes*, to be understood either 'from 268 *nubibus* in the dependent clause' (Munro) or 'from the general sense of the passage' (Bailey) is unsatisfactory: Lucretius has mentioned clouds in 265, using the neuter *nubila*; moreover, 'nor could clouds come to overwhelm us with so much rain, if the ether did not have clouds high-heaped' would be a somewhat odd thing to say. Something is surely wrong with the text. W. S. Watt<sup>19</sup> suspects that *venientes* is corrupt and proposes *umentes* (sc. *terras* from 264) – a proposal which, though palaeographically plausible, is unnecessary and unconvincing: it is unnecessary because the object of *opprimere* does not need to be expressed here any more than it does in 6.285–6 *displosa repente | opprimere ut caeli videantur templa superne*; and it is unconvincing because Lucretius is still being made to say that clouds could not produce so much rain if there were not masses of clouds.

By far the best solution to the problem is provided by Lambinus in his edition of 1570. He proposes *tanti...imbres*<sup>20</sup> for *tanto...imbri*. This puts everything right: *venientes* has a noun with which to agree; and we now have an entirely natural statement: 'nor could such mighty rains come to overwhelm us, so as to make rivers overflow and plains swim, if the ether did not have clouds high-heaped'.

## 6.970–2

barbigeras oleaster eo iuvat usque capellas,  
effluat ambrosiam quasi vero et nectare tinctus;  
qua nil est homini quod amariu' fronde ac extet.

qua *OQ*: quo *F*: quom *Ernout* fronde ac extet (exscet *O*) *OQU*: frondeat extet *F*: fronde vigescat *Bailey*: fronde virescat *M. F. Smith*

*fronde virescat* is suggested by M. L. Clarke<sup>21</sup> in a recent note in this journal. His suggestion is accepted by Godwin in his new edition of Book 6.<sup>22</sup> Neither scholar has noticed that I tentatively proposed the same reading in my Loeb edition of 1982, comparing 1.252. Translate: 'yet there is no green growth which is more bitter to man than this foliage'.<sup>23</sup>

University of Durham

MARTIN F. SMITH

<sup>18</sup> J. Godwin, *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura VI* (Warminster, 1991), p. 114.

<sup>19</sup> *MH* 47 (1990), 126.

<sup>20</sup> Martin attributes the suggestion to Bockemüller.

<sup>21</sup> *CQ* n.s. 41 (1991), 257.

<sup>22</sup> See n. 18 above.

<sup>23</sup> It has been suggested to me that *qua* and *fronde* are improbably far separated, but cf. 3.416, where *hoc* and *foedere* are equally far separated.

## A NOTE ON AENEID 8.514–517

Evander promises Aeneas two hundred of his Arcadians for the war against the Italians, with as many cavalry under Pallas into the bargain; and puts his son under the Trojan leader's command:

hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,  
Pallanta adiungam; sub te tolerare magistro  
militiam et graue Martis opus, tua cernere facta  
adsuescat, primis et te miretur ab annis. (514–17)

Pallas is an only son and, apparently, one born to a father long past his prime; hence,

*spes et solacia nostri* (514) and, several lines further down, *mea sola et sera uoluptas* (581). Gransden notes that 'the models are *Od.* 3.475ff., where Nestor entrusts his son Peisistratus to accompany Telemachus to Sparta, and Apollonius 2.802, where Lycus sends his son Dascylus to accompany Jason. But V. transforms a traditional gesture of heroic courtesy into an expression of the old Roman educational ideals (*sub te...magistro*) as well as an act full of tragic irony, since it will end with Pallas' death...'<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that Telemachus' reception by Nestor at Pylos underlies Aeneas' reception by Evander at the site of Rome, nor is it easy to miss the parallels between Nestor–Evander, and Peisistratus–Pallas;<sup>2</sup> and it may be quite reasonably assumed that the pair Lycus–Dascylus have made their own contribution.

However, the idea that gives Virgil's lines their poignant quality – the idea of an only and cherished son, his father's sole delight and protection in old age, being nonetheless sent forth to battle under the guidance of a senior hero – is nowhere to be traced in the passages adduced from either Homer or Apollonius. To be sure, Nestor is proverbially senile, but in *Od.* 3 he cuts a memorably patriarchal figure complete with sons, daughters, sons- and daughters-in-law, several of whom are named as the narrative unfolds;<sup>3</sup> besides, Peisistratus is assigned no more arduous a task than giving Telemachus a lift to Sparta; and the same is more or less true of Dascylus who, as a local familiar with the area and its ways, is simply urged by his father to act as a safe-conduct for the Argonauts.<sup>4</sup> Of course, Virgil may well have sensed the dramatic potential of these passages and expanded what was an act of hospitality and gratitude into a noble gesture fraught with tragic possibilities; and yet it seems to me that in doing so he had very much in mind another passage from the *Argonautica*, where Apollonius gives a catalogue of the heroes who signed up for the Argonautic expedition.

Τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ Κεκροπίηθεν ἀρήμιος ἦλυθε Βούτης,  
παῖς ἀγαθοῦ Τελέοντος, εὐμμελὲς τε Φάληρος.<sup>5</sup>  
"Ἀλκων μιν προέηκε πατὴρ ἑὸς, οὐ μὲν ἔτ' ἄλλους  
γῆραος νῆας ἔχεν βίοτιοι τε κηδεμονῆας,  
ἀλλὰ ἐ Τηλύγετον<sup>6</sup> περ ὁμῶς καὶ μόνον ἔοντα  
πέμπεν, ἵνα θρασέεσσι μεταπρέποι ἡρώεσσιν. (1.95–100).

<sup>1</sup> K. W. Gransden, *Aeneid, Book VIII* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 150. C. J. Fordyce, *Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII* (Glasgow, 1977), p. 261 and G. Binder, *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1971), p. 74, point out the *Argonautica* and the Odyssean passages respectively as models for Evander's offer.

<sup>2</sup> See G. N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964), pp. 254–5.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, *Od.* 3.32, ἐνθ' ἄρα Νέστωρ ἦστο σὺν νιάσιν...

<sup>4</sup> See *Arg.* 2. 802–5:

ξυνὴ μὲν πάντεσσι δόμοστολον ὕμνιν ἔπεσθαι  
Δάσκυλον ὀτρυνέω, ἐμὸν νεία· τοῖο δ' ἰόντος,  
ἦ τ' ἂν εὐξείνοισι διέξ' ἀλὸς ἀντιάοιτε  
ἀνδράσιν, ὅφρ' αὐτοῖο ποτὶ στόμα Θερμῶδοντος.

<sup>5</sup> It is worth noting that εὐμμελὲς qualifies Peisistratus in *Od.* 3.400. For other Homeric echoes in these lines, see M. Campbell, *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 1981), p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Τηλύγετος is a Homeric epithet, and its meaning was a subject for dispute in antiquity; 'cherished', 'born to him in his old age', 'spoilt darling', 'born away from one's father' are some of the meanings that have been suggested, and all, except, possibly, the last one suit the passage. But Apollonius, as is his wont, may be just hinting at a controversy of Homeric scholarship without, in this particular case, coming down on one side or the other of the fence. See W. Bedell Stanford, 'Τηλύγετος', *CR* 51 (1937), 168, and G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. i, Books 1–4* (Cambridge, 1985), on *Il.* 3.175, but cf. A. Heubeck, S. West and J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. i, Books I–VIII* (Oxford, 1988), on *Od.* 4.11.

The aged sire, the only and cherished son on whom the latter depends for protection, and, in spite of all this, the wish for distinction in war among renowned and brave heroes are all there. Phalerus, whatever Valerius Flaccus chose to make of him in his *Argonautica*,<sup>7</sup> makes his debut in Apollonius' narrative no sooner than he bows himself out of it. But it is like Virgil to have extracted and monumentalized the exquisite pathos inherent in the fleeting appearance and the summary family background of a well-nigh unknown Argonaut.<sup>8</sup>

University of Thessaloniki

THEODORE D. PAPANGHELIS

<sup>7</sup> See 1.398–401, 4.654 and 6.217.

<sup>8</sup> 'Easterners' have been at work on the story of Pallas, arguing that Virgil has modelled it upon an episode from the Mahābhārata in which Arjuna entrusts his son Abhimanyu, a handsome young fighter, to his brother Yudhiṣṭhira. Abhimanyu is killed in the battle, is lamented by both father and uncle, and revenged by the former. The right to disbelieve is, I suppose, as sacrosanct as that to search. On the question, see J. Lallemand, 'Turnus and Duryodhana', *TAPhA* 92 (1961), 98–103 and G. E. Duckworth, 'Une source de l'Énéide: le Mahabharata', *Latomus* 18 (1959), 273–4.

#### HORACE, *EPISTLES* 1.2.42–43 AND TRADITIONAL LORE

Stephanie West suggested in a note in this journal (40 (1990), 280) that the presence of an anecdote in Lodovico Guicciardini's sixteenth-century *L'Hore di Ricreatione* furnishes a parallel for the fable alluded to by Horace, *Ep.* 1.2.42–3: 'Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis: at ille / labitur et labetur in omne volubilis aevum.' The parallels, and a third from nineteenth-century Sicily, allow her to imagine a tale, 'part of Italian traditional lore', already extant in Horace's time and presumably transmitted in rural regions down to Guicciardini and the Sicilian story-teller.

West rightly affirms that 'polygenesis is surely unlikely in this case', but the hypothesis of a millennial oral or peasant tradition is unnecessary. A new edition of Guicciardini's work<sup>1</sup> permits a better insight into his method. Guicciardini (1521–89), born into an aristocratic Florentine family, received a standard humanistic education. He came to Antwerp in 1541 as a merchant, and lived there for the rest of his life. While there, he studied with the humanist J. Velareus, and associated with others, such as Plantin.<sup>2</sup> The natural expectation that he was well acquainted with Horace is confirmed by his quotations from the poet in other items of his collection, including two from the same epistle, within a few lines of the passage in question.<sup>3</sup> It seems clear that Guicciardini framed this story on the basis of the Horatian verses, not on lore gathered from Italian folk tradition.<sup>4</sup> The Sicilian version was most probably influenced by literary transmission as well. Thus there is no evidence that the fable was a part of Italian traditional lore in Horace's time.

Stith Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* is a useful finding-list of motifs, but provides no guarantee of their 'folk' or 'traditional' origin. Self-conscious and highly literate authors like Horace and Guicciardini were able to invent or adapt motifs, changing their form and point. Sayings or stories from standard authors can

<sup>1</sup> Lodovico Guicciardini, *L'Ore di ricreazione*, a cura di Anne-Marie Van Passen (Rome, Bulzoni editore, 1990). This fable is number 208.

<sup>2</sup> Guicciardini, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Guicciardini, op. cit., no. 50 (*Ars poet.* 139); 64 (*Ep.* 1.2.57); 333 (*Ep.* 1.2.40).

<sup>4</sup> Numbers 64 and 333 were already present in an earlier version made by Guicciardini, *Detti e fatti piacevoli e gravi* (Venice, 1565); no. 208, which actually invents a story, does not appear until the first edition of *L'Ore* (Antwerp, 1568).