

latter.¹¹ The visual similarity between lines 5 and 6 is further increased by the occurrence of *sibi* at the beginning of the second half of each line:

5 deuoluit*iletas*acutos*sibi*...

6 ita*q*ut*relictas*ensit*sibi*...

The garbled sequence *iletas* in line 5 may therefore have arisen through parablepsy, a misreading of the letters directly below. In that case, the true reading which it ousted need not have any paleographical resemblance to it.¹² This would entitle us to emend the text purely on grounds of sense and metre.

The conjecture *ipse* improves on previous conjectures by offering an expression which is excellent Latin and common in Catullus. Emphasizing the reflexive relation in Attis' horrific and unnatural act, it is entirely appropriate in context. Moreover, there is a ready explanation of the corruption in the supposition of parablepsy.

Balliol College, Oxford

BRUNO CURRIE

¹¹ Particularly if the *-que* of *itaque* were written compendiously (as my representation below supposes).

¹² For the parablepsy, cf. Catullus 95.5, where the reading of OGR, *Zinirna canas*, is probably influenced by *Zinirna cana* in the line below, and cf. Nisbet (op. cit. n. 7), 98 ad loc.: '*canas* has clearly jumped from the line below, and in such circumstances palaeographical considerations should not be given undue weight.'

MYTHOLOGICAL INCEST: CATULLUS 88

Quid facit is, Gelli, qui cum matre atque sorore
prurit et abiectis pervigilat tunicis?
quid facit is, patrum qui non sinit esse maritum?
ecquid scis quantum suscipiat sceleris?
suscipit, o Gelli, quantum non ultima Tethys
nec genitor Nympharum abluit¹ Oceanus:
nam nihil est quicquam sceleris, quo prodeat ultra,
non si demisso se ipse voret capite.

Here Gellius, also the target of poems 74, 80, 89, 90, 91 and 116, is accused of incest with his mother, sister, and aunt. This accusation is coupled with the only extended mythological reference to be found in the group of short Catullan epigrams 69–116:² not even Tethys or Oceanus can wash out Gellius' crimes. This notion that large bodies of water are unable to wash away the stain of crime is of course a topos going back to Greek tragedy,³ but the individual naming of the two sea-deities seems to make a point—a literary point which is relevant to the invective of the poem.

Oceanus and Tethys appear as a pair in Homer (*Iliad* 14.201 Ὠκεανὸν τε θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύην) and the Hellenistic poets (Callimachus, *Hymn* 4.17, *Ap. Arg.* 3.244), but the author being recalled here is Hesiod. At *Theogony* 337–70 we are given an extensive list of the progeny of Oceanus and Tethys, consisting of rivers

¹ The manuscripts transmit the present indicative *abluit*, but better would be either the subjunctive *abluat* of the Aldine edition of 1502 ('can wash away') or the future *abluet*: in support of the latter are the imitations at Seneca, *Phaedra* 715–16 *quis eluet me Tanais aut quae barbaris / Maeotis undis incumbens mari; Hercules Furens* 1323–6 *quis Tanais ... abluere dextram poterit*.

² This point is noted by D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 103 and H.-P. Syndikus, *Catull: Eine Interpretation III* (Darmstadt, 1987), 67 n. 10.

³ To Sophocles, *O.T.* 1227–9: cf. Syndikus loc.cit. (n. 2) and Coffey and Mayer's commentary on Seneca, *Phaedra* 715–18. It is notable that in both *O.T.* and *Phaedra* the topos refers to incest or quasi-incest, as in Catullus.

and Oceanid nymphs (cf. Catullus' *genitor Nympharum*), but more interesting is *Theogony* 131–6, where the children of Ouranos and Gaia are listed: the eldest of these is Oceanus (133), the youngest Tethys (136). Oceanus and Tethys, then, are an incestuous sibling couple, a feature common enough in the genealogy of the gods, as Ovid's Byblis, herself seeking arguments for sibling incest, recalls (*Met.* 9.499): *di nempe suas habuere sorores: / sic Saturnus Opem iunctam sibi sanguine duxit / Oceanus Tethyn, Iunonem rector Olympi*. Once this idea is introduced, Catullus' attack on Gellius' alleged incest gains greater wit and point, and a motive is provided for a mythological allusion unusual in this type of Catullan poem. Not even the mythologically incestuous couple Oceanus and Tethys can wash out Gellius' incest, though they are guilty of the offence themselves and might be thought likely to connive at it.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

TWO CONJECTURES IN HORACE, *ODES*

I offer here two emendations of the text of the *Odes*, in two passages that make perfectly good sense, offer Latin that is unexceptionable, and have apparently never been questioned.

Otium divos rogat in patenti / pressus Aegaeo, simul atra nubes / condidit lumen etc. (2.16.1–3). None of this text is problematic. But it does contain three peculiarities. First, as far as I can tell, nowhere else in his oeuvre does Horace use *rogo* with the double accusative. Second, the use of the nominative perfect participle as a substantive is rare in classical Latin and may occur only twice elsewhere in Horace (*Carm.* 3.20.16; *Serm.* 1.2.137).¹ Third, and most important, we are struck by the complete absence of definition or characterization of the person who is trapped at sea. This absence is made the more remarkable by the contrast with the Thracians and Medes who are *bello furiosa* and *pharetra decori*, descriptions that set off their current yearning for leisure and peace. Commentators so feel this lack that they routinely add a defining subject in their paraphrases or translations of these verses. Thus, E. C. Wickham offers, 'The trader prays for [bodily] rest, but it is only in the moment of storm',² while Nisbet-Hubbard write (p. 256), 'The *negotiator* ... is driven in a crisis to seek for *otium*'.

These are small objections, but the fact is that one trivial emendation removes them all. For *divos* read *dives*³: even the most acquisitive materialist prays for *otium* when caught in a storm⁴. *Dives* is a word Horace likes, both as adjective and substantive (e.g. *Carm.* 2.18.10, 3.11.6, 3.16.23, 3.29.13). It is a word naturally associated with the

¹ These two examples are cited by Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes: Book II* (Oxford, 1978), ad loc. I know no others. See too Kühner-Stegmann 1.224 ('sehr selten').

² *Horace Volume I: The Odes, Carmen Saeculare and Epodes with a Commentary* (Oxford, 1904), p. 125.

³ The confusion of *e* and *o* is common. For examples in Horace, see e.g. *C.* 3.4.16, 4.14.4, *Serm.* 1.5.78. There are many examples in Lucretius, e.g. at 4.879, 5.1068, 6.589. To be sure, the strictly palaeographic argument will turn on whether Porphyrio (who had *divos*) read Horace in uncials, which we cannot know.

⁴ 'Gods', to be sure, is still implicit. Verbs like *rogo*, *oro*, *quaero* often leave out the external accusative when it is obvious from the context. See e.g. *Stat. Silv.* 3.2.130, *alias ... rogabimus auras* (sc. *deos* or *Aeolum*); also *Verg. Aen.* 4.56–7, 4.451, 8.376–7, 11.101, *Georg.* 1.100–1, *Lucr.* 5.1229–30, *Ovid, Fasti* 4.407–8, *Ars* 1.442, *Stat. Silv.* 1.4.95, *Theb.* 10.66, *Caes. B.G.* 1.11.