

*EMENDANDA\**

JOHN TRAPPES-LOMAX  
trappeslomax@hotmail.co.uk

---

RESUMEN

En este artículo se proponen más evidencias en apoyo de una antigua interpretación de Hor. *carmin.* 2.20.6-7; se proponen nuevas conjeturas a Juv. 6.010; 12.78; Lucr. 1.14; 5.1442; Ov. *fast.* 3.573; *met.* 8.176; Pers. 5.57; y Verg. *Aen.* 1.329; y se recomiendan las lecturas de Heinsius a Ov. *met.* 8.176; y 14.491.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Conjeturas, crítica textual, poesía latina

SUMMARY

Further evidence is proposed for an old interpretation of Hor. *carmin.* 2.20.6-7. New readings are proposed at Juv. 6.010; 12.78; Lucr. 1.14; 5.1442; Ov. *fast.* 3.573; *met.* 8.176; Pers. 5.57; Verg. *Aen.* 1.329. The readings of Heinsius are recommended at Ov. *met.* 8.176; 14.491.

KEYWORDS

Conjectures, textual criticism, Latin poetry

---

\* I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewers, whose comments have enabled me to make significant improvements to these notes.

---

Fecha de recepción: 15/03/2020

Fecha de aceptación y versión definitiva: 01/10/2020

---

HOR. *CARM.* 2.20.6-7

non ego quem uocas,  
dilecte Maecenas, obibo

At J. Trappes-Lomax, “Critica Varia”, *ExClass* 22, 2018, 32-3, I argued in favour of the old (going back to Ps-Acro) but unfashionable interpretation that takes *dilecte* as dependent on *uocas*, adducing Pers. 3.29 and *Ev. Joh.* 13.13. Even more apposite would have been Hor. *serm.* 2.6.20 *Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis*. If *audio*, when it is in effect the passive of *uoco* (OLD s. u. *audio* 5), can govern a vocative, so presumably can *uoco* itself. This confirms that we should punctuate as follows:

non ego quem uocas  
'dilecte', Maecenas, obibo

## JUV. 6.09-12

quid quod nec retia turpi  
iungun turtunicae, nec cella ponit eadem                   10  
munimenta umeri ....  
qui nudus pugnare solet?

In view of its extraordinary transmission, it is no surprise that the O fragment is corrupt; however, the general picture at this point is clear: there is the virile retiarius who fights wearing loin-cloth only and the effeminate retiarius who fights wearing a tunic as well. The former keeps his gear well away from the gear of the latter. Our concern here is only with the previously unsuspected word *iunguntur*; why is the passive *iunguntur* incongruously paired with the active *ponit*, although both verbs have the same actual subject and are both placed in what ought to be strictly parallel *nec* clauses? We may suspect that the correct reading is *coniungit* (OLD s. u. 2a); *con*, represented by *c* with a virgula, was lost, and metre was restored by converting the verb from idiomatic active to clumsy passive. Write:

quid quod nec retia turpi  
iungun turtunicae, nec cella ponit eadem                   10  
munimenta umeri

## JUV. 12.78-9

non sic †igitur mirabere portus  
quos natura dedit

Thus the text of A. E. Housman, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, Cambridge 1931 (corrected reprint), the point of the passage being that the artificial harbour at Ostia is far superior to any natural harbour. Housman rightly remarks that *igitur* “sententiam pervertit”; he suggests *similis*, but if the natural harbours are, more or less, *similes*, will we not admire them, more or less, *sic*? Better is the simple correlative *illos*; the corruption could hardly be easier, as the abbreviations for *igitur* and for parts of *ille* include *i* surmounted by various – if we may employ non-technical language – squiggles. Write:

non sic illos mirabere portus  
quos natura dedit

LUCR. 1.12-15

aeriae primum uolucres te, diua, tuumque  
significant initum, percussae corda tua ui;  
inde ferae pecudes persultant pabula laeta  
et rapidos tranant amnis;

15

It is unlikely that any reader has been entirely satisfied by *ferae pecudes* where *pecudes*, which primarily refers to farm animals, seems incompatible with adjectival *ferae*; C. Bailey takes the expression as an asyndeton<sup>1</sup>, but this is not supported by the examples that he gives at 1.159-60, which involve synonyms and near-synonyms rather than terms as sharply opposed as *ferae* and *pecudes*; M. Deufert concludes “halte ich daher, mit gewissen Zweifeln, auf der Überlieferung fest und setze ein verdeutlichendes Komma zwischen *ferae* und *pecudes*”<sup>2</sup>. We may be encouraged to put forward an alternative suggestion by Deufert’s uncertainty and by his insertion of clarificatory punctuation, which Lucretius was not in a position to rely on.

Bentley’s *ferae et* is feeble and entails an unpleasant elision; Wakefield’s *ferae* is no more than a space-filler. So what did Lucretius write? *inde* is necessary after *primum*, as the birds are the first to feel Venus’ influence and then all other living creatures do so; there is obviously nothing wrong with *pecudes*. So instead of tinkering with *ferae*, which we know by experiment will lead to no useful result, let us ask ourselves what word Lucretius would have placed between *inde* and *pecudes*. It is here proposed that we should write:

inde aliae pecudes persultant pabula laeta

<sup>1</sup> C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Oxford 1947, *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> M. Deufert, *Kritischer Kommentar zu Lukrezens De Rerum Natura*, Berlin-Boston 2018, 3.

There is a precise parallel at 1.116 *an pecudes alias diuinitus insinuet se*, a passage which imports a distinction between human beings and all manner of quadrupeds, whereas in our passage we have a contrast between birds and all manner of quadrupeds; cf. also 1.163 *armenta atque aliae pecudes*, where *pecudes* means all manner of quadrupeds other than *armenta*, as appears from the apposition *genus omne ferarum*; for the idiom, see OLD s. u. *alius*<sup>3</sup> 5 and such examples as Liv. 5.39.3 *circa moenia aliasque portas* and Plaut. *Men.* 174 *saluast nauis .... quid alia armamenta?*, for this use of *alius* in a manner which would be impossible for English “other”. The corruption may be a mere accident; alternatively, somebody may have written something like *et ferae* over *pecudes* to make it clear that the power of Venus is not confined to domestic animals, and the note then invaded the text.

LUCR. 5.1440-3

iam ualidis saepti degebant turribus aeuom,                    1440  
 et diuisa colebatur discretaque tellus,  
 tum mare ueliuolis florebat propter odores,  
 auxilia ac socios iam pacto foedere habebant,

So the MSS. Before assailing the main problem, we should note that Deufert rightly prefers Weil’s *iam* for *tum* in 1442<sup>3</sup>; possibly *iam* would also be better than *et* in 1441 so as to reinforce the anaphora, but that is by the bye.

Bailey calls *propter odores* “perhaps the most desperate textual crux in the poem”<sup>4</sup>; likewise, Deufert concludes his exhaustive discussion with “Da keine Konjektur restlos überzeugt, muss es bei Kreuzen bleiben”<sup>5</sup>; it appears to have arisen either by mere chance from the line-ending at 2.417 or because a Christian scribe wished to express his disapproval of the sea-borne trade in luxury goods; cf. *Rev.* 18.12-13. Without the indirect tradition, we would get no further; however, Servius *ad Aen.* 7.804 quotes what is presumably this line-ending as *florebat nauibus pontus*, which is in itself entirely satisfactory. However, simply combining Servius with the MS reading gives a clumsy tautology:

tum mare ueliuolis florebat nauibus pontus

<sup>3</sup> Deufert, *Kritischer Kommentar*, 366.

<sup>4</sup> Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari, ad loc.*

<sup>5</sup> Deufert, *Kritischer Kommentar*, 370.

Bailey disposes of the various attempts made so far to correct this, for example the unconvincing *mari'.... pontus* of A. E. Housman<sup>6</sup>. Alternatively, we might write:

iam quoque ueliuolis florebat nauibus pontus

When *propter odores* displaced *nauibus pontus*, it left the verb in manifest need of a subject; the scribe had no difficulty in providing that subject by altering *quoque* to *mare*, and in so doing he created a mare's nest for future scholars. The point of *quoque* would simply be that at the time when fortification and individual land-ownership came in, so also did marine navigation.

It should be noted that D. Butterfield proposes *propter et urbes* and defends substantival *ueliuolis*<sup>7</sup>, but the parallels adduced are all of animate objects (*lanigerae* etc.) and thus not strictly decisive<sup>8</sup>.

OV. *FAST.* 3.573

et tamen hospitii seruasset ad ultima munus,  
sed timuit magnas Pygmalionis opes.

S. J. Heyworth points out that *et tamen* is unsatisfactory, and that the same is true of *et tandem* (Krebs) and *et tantum* (the Teubner text of Alton, Wormell & Courtney); he raises the possibility of "a more radical corruption", and tentatively suggests *et certe*<sup>9</sup>. We might prefer something at once more pointed and more likely to give rise to the corruption. Write:

<hospes et> hospitii seruasset ad ultima munus,

Battus, as host, would have carried out to the end the duties of host that he had promised to Anna, but fear of Pygmalion overcame him.

Repetition would have led, as so often, to omission, followed by the inevitable metrical interpolation. J. Wills discusses such combinations of different nouns from the same stem; e.g. *fast.* 2.808 *falsus adulterii testis adulter eris*<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> In J. Diggle-E. R. D. Goodyear (eds.), *The Collected Papers of A. E. Housman*, Cambridge 1972, II, 436-8.

<sup>7</sup> D. Butterfield, "Emendations in the Fifth Book of Lucretius", *MD* 60, 2008, 188-9.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. also C. Murgia, "The most desperate crux in Lucretius; 5.1442", *CPh* 95, 2000, 308.

<sup>9</sup> S. J. Heyworth, *Ovid Fasti Book 3*, Cambridge 2019.

<sup>10</sup> J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1996, 238-9.

OV. *MET.* 8.175-7

comitemque suam crudelis in illo           175  
litore destituit; desertae et multa querenti  
amplexus et opem Liber tulit.

Such is the modern vulgate. N. Heinsius knew better and printed *deseruit*, attributing it to “quinque ueteres”<sup>11</sup>. However, such is Ovid’s love of trans-caesural repetition that *deseruit* would certainly be right even if it had no MS support at all; the other instances of different but similar words in such variations given by Wills are all mandated by metre<sup>12</sup>. But two other problems affect the last three words: 1) Ovid nowhere else admits an *-ae e-* elision; 2) *multa querenti* is acceptable in itself, but if Ariadne’s famous lament is to be alluded to at all, something far more pointed would be required. Write:

comitemque suam crudelis in illo           175  
litore deseruit; desertae <litore in illo>  
amplexus et opem Liber tulit.

Ovid could not have written anything else; cf. *met.* 2.702-3 ‘*sub illis / montibus*’, *inquit*, ‘*erunt*’, *et erant sub montibus illis*, and more generally Wills, *Repetition*, 345. The homoeoteleuton led to omission and metrical interpolation.

OV. *MET.* 14.491-2

audiat ipsa licet, et quod facit oderit omnes  
sub Diomede uiros

Once again, this is the modern vulgate. Once again, Heinsius knew better; he printed with some MS support<sup>13</sup>:

audiat ipsa licet, licet ut facit oderit omnes

Once again, we have the sequence: repetition, omission, interpolation. Once again, Heinsius’ text would be certain even if it had no MS support at all. The alternative is to suppose that Ovid deliberately deprived himself of an

<sup>11</sup> N. Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis Editio Nova*, Amsterdam 1659, II, 206.

<sup>12</sup> Wills, *Repetition*, 318-19.

<sup>13</sup> Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii*, II, 379.

attractive trans-caesural repetition with no other motive than to introduce a pointless metrical anomaly.

This line is mentioned not just for its own sake, but also as relevant to Pers. 5.57, for which see below.

PERS. 5.54-8

mercibus hic Italis mutat sub sole recenti  
 rugosum piper et pallentis grana cumini, 55  
 hic satur inriguo mauult turgescere somno,  
 hic campo indulget, hunc alea decoquit, ille  
 in uenerem putris;

A number of MSS have *hi* .... *indulgent*, and the scribes deserve credit for having noticed the anomalous lengthening of the last syllable of *indulget* and for having tried to do something about it; however, in a long sequence of singular pronouns a single plural pronoun is artistically unacceptable. The cure is easy; if one infinitive depends on *mauult* a second should also do so, making one prefer *turgescere* and another prefer *indulgere*; this is then followed by a second pair without *mauult*, wherein one is addicted to gambling and another to sex. Write:

hic campo indulgere, hunc alea decoquit, ille

It may be noted in passing that Persius had no objection to multiple elisions in a single line; cf. e.g. 1.9 *tunc cum ad canitiem et nostrum istud uiuere triste*.

W. Kissel also deserves credit for noticing the anomaly, which seems to be ignored by other editors<sup>14</sup>; however, we may not be convinced by his defence. He argues that poets of the imperial period retained the pre-classical lengthening of 3rd sing. pres. indic. act. of the 2nd conjugation “aus Gründen metrischer Bequemlichkeit” before the caesura. He adduces similar lengthenings at 1) Verg. *Aen.* 1.308 (*uidet*) 2) Ov. *met.* 3.184 (*solet*); 3) 14.491 (*licet*); 4) *Ilias Latina* 966 (*ualet*) 5) “vielleicht auch” Stat. *Theb.* 1.384 (*habet*). If this useful licence existed, we would expect more examples, but even this insignificant list evaporates under examination. 1) Vergil lengthens numerous short final syllables, irrespective of whether or not they were long in earlier Latin<sup>15</sup>; 2) *nubibus esse solet aut purpureae Aurorae*; the lengthening is genuine, but is to be attributed, like the hiatus and the

<sup>14</sup> W. Kissel, *Aules Persius Flaccus Satiren*, Heidelberg 1990, *ad loc.*

<sup>15</sup> See Nettleship’s excursus at J. Conington-H. Nettleship, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, London 1875, III, 469-74.

fifth-foot spondee, to the proximity of the Greek-derived *purpureae*<sup>16</sup>; 3) see *met.* 14.491 above 4) *nec sufferre ualet ultra sortemque supremam / stantemque Aeaciden defectis uiribus Hector*. Transposing the second halves of both lines makes better sense as well as removing the anomalous scansion<sup>17</sup>; 5) *habens* is at least as good as *habet* and is the reading of the best MS and of the scholiast and of modern editions.

It is noteworthy that F. Vollmer in his voluminous list of real or purported lengthenings of short vowels, adduces only this line from Persius<sup>18</sup>. Had he seen how easily the anomalous lengthening can be cured, he would no doubt have included Persius in the “ganze Reihe von Dichtern” from the time of Tiberius and Nero onwards who “die ihnen fehlerhaft erscheinende Freiheit ganz gemieden haben”<sup>19</sup>.

#### VERG. AEN. 1.329

an Phoebi soror, an Nympharum sanguinis una?

P. H. Peerlkamp pointed out that the natural sense of the second half of the question is “or are you a descendant of her Nymphs?”<sup>20</sup> (cf. OLD s. u. *sanguis* 10): “Iam interrogatio est contumeliosa et ridicula *esne ipsa Diana, an nata ex Nymphis Dianae comitibus?* Diana pudica, omnem virorum contactum exosa, neque Nymphas habebat matres, neque natas ex incesto Nympharum”. He proposed *an pars Nympharum agminis una?* adducing Stat. *Ach.* 1.900 and Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 3.57-8 for this sense of *agmen*. However, in Peerlkamp’s version *pars* seems to have no function except to fill up the hexameter and there is nothing to explain the *s* of the transmitted *sanguinis*. E. Baehrens writes “Peerlkampius viam monstravit, qua insistens Ribbeckius [= *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri I-VI*, Leipzig 1860] proposuit *es agminis*; verum est hoc: *an Nympharum’s agminis una?*”<sup>21</sup>. However, both these suggestions import metrical problems. Ribbeck’s lengthening of *es* is unknown outside comedy<sup>22</sup>; nor are there any examples

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the similar lengthening at *epist.* 9.141 *semiuir occubuit in letifero Eueno*, and J. Trappes-Lomax, “Hiatus in Vergil and Horace’s Odes”, *PCPhS* 50, 2004, 154-5 for the way in which the presence of Greek vocabulary licenses metrical anomaly.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. E. Courtney, “Some remarks on the *Ilias Latina*”, *CR* 18, 1968, 220-3.

<sup>18</sup> F. Vollmer, “Zur Geschichte des lateinischen Hexameters, kurze Endsilben in arsi”, *Sitzungsberichte der Kön. Bay. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Abhandlung 3, 1917, 35 & n. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Vollmer, “Zur Geschichte”, 53.

<sup>20</sup> P. H. Peerlkamp, *P. Virgilio Maronis Aeneidos Libri*, Leiden 1843, I, 45.

<sup>21</sup> E. Baehrens, “Emendationes Vergilianae”, *NJbb für Philologie und Paedagogik* 129, 1884, 402 n. 6.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. L. Mueller, *De Re Metrica Poetarum Latinorum*, Leipzig 1894, 365.



of *m*'s being used to make a heavy syllable in the comprehensive list given by C. Schöffel<sup>23</sup>.

The metre can be tidied up by making a minute change to Baehrens' suggestion and reading *exagminis*, *exagmen* being the Vergilian spelling of the later *examen*<sup>24</sup>. It should be added that *x* and *s* are confused even in the capital MSS of Vergil<sup>25</sup>. Write:

an Phoebi soror, an Nympharum exagminis una?

<sup>23</sup> Cf. C. Schöffel, *Martial Buch 8*, Stuttgart 2002 ad Mart. 8.40.6.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Housman, *The Collected Papers*, I, 175-80; for the use of *exa(g)men* of persons, cf. Hor. *carm.* 1.35.30-2; Stat. *Theb.* 3.196; OLD s. u. *examen* 2.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Housman, *The Collected Papers*, II, 628-9 and O. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena Critica in P. Vergili Maronis Opera Maiora*, Leipzig 1866, 446 and 452.

