NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS/NOTES DE LECTURE

THREE CORRECTIONS IN HORACE'S ROMAN ODES

E. COURTNEY

> *me fabulosae Volture in Apulo*
> *nutricis extra limen Apuliae*
> *ludo fatigatumque somno*
>   *fronde nova puerum palumbes*
> *texere*   (3.4.9–13)

THIS READING IN 10 is both nonsensical (since it contradicts the preceding line) and unmetrical. There is a variant *limina Pulliae*, widely favoured nowadays, but in spite of the sentimentalists it is hard to believe that Horace would have given us the name of his nurse in a context of this fairy-tale atmosphere; we do not want such particularity, which ties us down to the solid earth of reality. Who would think of specifying that Red Riding Hood's granny was named Emily Jones?

We want to start consideration of restoration by establishing how *extra* fits in. If it is a mere statement of the locality in which the doves covered Horace, it is pointless; who would ever have thought of supposing that they covered him *inside* his nurse's house? The word would have a function if it were part of an explanation how the doves had a chance to cover him, i.e., if the original text said something like "as I strayed outside the house." On these lines Lehrs and Schneidewin proposed *extra limina devium*, but the word *devium* does not seem entirely happy combined with *extra limina* and results in too many accusatives linked with *me*. I think we have a parallel which will enable us to recover Horace's words, namely 1.22.9–12:

> *namque me silva lupus in Sabina*
> *dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra*
> *terminum curis vagor expeditis*
> *fugit inermem.*

Consider the similarities: *me lupus fugit inermem, me puerum palumbes texere*; *silva in Sabina, Volture in Apulo*; *ultra terminum, nutricis extra limina*; consider too the similarity of the fairy-tale atmosphere (the wolf is a *portentum*, the covering by doves is *mirum*). Following up this I propose to read *extra limina ⟨dum vagor⟩*.

Now to justify this suggestion. As he was copying 10 the scribe's eye slipped from *limINA* to *IN Apulo* in 9, causing him to write *liminapulo* as the end of 10, with the complete loss of the original wording; *limen Apuliae*

319

is an attempt to convert this to metre. As for *limina Pulliae*, I am unable to determine whether this is an independent effort at correction or an attempted improvement on *limen Apuliae* by someone who realised the flaw of metre and sense in it.

> *vos Caesarem altum, militia simul*
> *fessas cohortes   oppidis*
>   *finire quaerentem labores*
>   *Pierio recreatis antro.*   (3.4.37–41)

Where I have left a blank in 38, the manuscripts are divided between *addidit, abdidit*, and (with various corruptions) *reddidit*. Only a small minority of editors plumps for the first of these, which is indeed inappropriate; as Wickham perceptively explains, it would apply to the strengthening of a community by an infusion of new settlers, and the stress would be on the improvement of the community (not, from the settlers' viewpoint, the provision of a domicile), which is not the point here. The second also does not satisfy; it has too much of the implication of tucking the soldiers away, in a remote or safe nook. Though it has weaker support, *reddidit* is decidedly better, and presumably would suggest the return of weary soldiers to their homes (Tac. *Ann.* 1.17.6 *praetorias cohortes . . . quae post xvi annos penatibus suis reddantur*, *Hist.* 2.69.1 *reddita civitatibus Gallorum auxilia*); this is not the picture which we get of Augustus' settlement of veterans, but we could say that a delicate veil is being drawn by Horace over harsh events. The problem is, why should this ever have been altered to *abdidit* or *addidit* (or for that matter the reverse)? I propose a reading which will account for the textual divergence, namely ⟨di⟩*didit*; this is a perfectly neutral word for "distribution" of soldiers through the towns, and it is also Horatian (*Serm.* 2.2.67).

> *si pugnat extricata densis*
>   *cerva plagis, erit ille fortis*
> *qui perfidis se credidit hostibus*
> *et Marte Poenos proteret altero*
>   *qui lora restrictis lacertis*
>   *sensit iners timuitque mortem.*
> *hic, unde vitam sumeret inscius,*
> *pacem duello miscuit.*   (3.5.31–38)

There is a weakly-supported variant *aptius* for *inscius*, which seduced Bentley into reading *mortem hinc, unde vitam sumeret aptius, pacem ⟨et⟩ duello*, the end of which was varied by the young Housman (*JP* 10 [1882] 188 and 17 [1888] 314 = *Coll. Papers* 1 and 100) into *sumere iustius, pacemque bello*. These suggestions cannot be right; the alterations in 37 are most implausible, and the sentence is made to sputter out into an anticlimax much more feeble than that which Bentley sees in *timuitque mortem*. Gow adds the objection that if the captive soldiers are represented as fearing death from the sword, from which they should have seized life, the first sword is that of

the enemy whereas the second is their own, but perhaps that is pressing the logic too much. However, when Bentley and Housman unite in taking offence, we ought to look closely at its cause. Their objections are three. First, they desire *mortem* and *vitam* to be brought into a closer relationship of contrast. Second, they dislike *ille* (32) followed by *hic* with the same reference. Third (not Bentley) 37–38 seem to be irrelevant to Regulus' point, namely dissuasion of the army's ransom, since as they stand they comprise a disconnected statement about "what is done and cannot be undone, the surrender of the army."

In answer to the first, it seems to me that a relationship can be felt even with an intervening full stop. H. T. Plüss, *Horazstudien* (Leipzig 1882) 263, points out the parallelism between *INers timuit MORTEM* and *INscius unde VITAM sumeret*, with the negative prefixes underlining the helplessness of the captive soldiers; this is a decisive argument for rejecting *aptius* and any conjectured substitute for *inscius*. The second objection is just; the problem is not solved by comparing *Epist.* 1.6.23 or any other passage, nor by any artificially devised interpretation of *hic*, such as the notion that Regulus pretends to pick out one particular soldier; this divorces totally *mortem* from *vitam*. The third is partially justified; the statement of 37–38 goes well enough with what follows and could be defended as leading up to it, but we still cannot find a bridge to what precedes. Finally, as for the anticlimax which Bentley sees in *timuitque mortem*, to my taste these words are pregnant with meaning (again well appreciated by Wickham) and actually make a fine weighty close.

The vulnerable point then seems to be in *hic*, which is duly obelised by Shackleton Bailey in his recent Stuttgart Teubner text of Horace. W. Hamacher in his *Lectiones Venusinae* (1872) changed this to *sic*; the difficulty about this is that by making 37–38 follow on from 35–36 it also makes it harder to see *vitam* as contrasted with *mortem* (this objection does not apply to Hamacher's own constitution of the text, since he also altered *sumeret* to *rumperet*). I think that *nunc* will fit the bill in every respect; if deer demonstrate pugnacity, the soldier who has shown himself a coward will become brave, but in reality (νῦν δέ) he has confounded peace with war (whatever exactly that means; I do not find much illumination in making this sentence a question with Shackleton Bailey), so we can draw the inference that it is pointless to ransom him. *nunc* and *hic* are confused scores of times in manuscripts.

There remains the pleasant duty of thanking those colleagues who have encouraged me to put together these thoughts and given me their counsel, Professors R. G. M. Nisbet, Marsh McCall, and N. Gregson Davis.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIF. 94305–2080