

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## I

## HORATIANA [I]\*

Carm. II 2 1-4

Nullus argento color est auaris  
 abdito terris, inimice lamnae  
 Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato  
 splendeat usu.

Alike Lambinus' 'abditae' and Bentley's the only rational elucidation of the MS reading compel the words 'auaris terris' to mean the miser's coffers: now when Horace says *carm. III 3 49 sqq.* 'aurum *inreperitum* et sic melius situm, *Cum terra celat*, spernere fortior Quam cogere humanos in usus' he is to be sure taking the other side as a poet may, but the parallel does seem to show that 'auaris terris' here must have its natural sense of the mine, 'in her own loins She hutcht the all-worshipt ore' as Comus says. And is not 'inimice lamnae, nisi temperato splendeat usu' or 'auaris abditae terris inimice lamnae' a most dark and helpless way of saying 'open-handed Sallust'? And then how 'inimice' and its train of dependants encumber and overbalance the sentence. If then as seems likely it is in 'inimice' the corruption lies, this is what I would suggest:

nullus argento color est auaris  
 abdito terris, *minimusque* lamnae,  
 Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato  
 splendeat usu.

'Silver in the mine has no lustre at all, nay even when coined it has next to none, without it is burnished by changing hands.' This at least does away with the obscurity and redresses the || balance of the sentence. It is chiefly I suppose because Horace was at no period unread that the corruptions in his MSS seldom lie on the surface, they present a resemblance at least superficial to sense and metre: if 'minimusque' by two common errors became 'inimisce' the further change to 'inimice' was all but inevitable.

Carm. III 5 31-40

Si pugnat extricata densis  
 cerua plagis, erit ille fortis

\* [*JPh* 10 (1882), 187-96]

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2

HORATIANA [I]

[188-9]

qui perfidis se credidit hostibus,  
 et Marte Poenos proteret altero  
 qui lora restrictis lacertis  
     sensit iners timuitque mortem.  
 hic unde uitam sumeret inscius  
 pacem duello miscuit. o pudor!  
     o magna Carthago probrosis  
     altior Italiae ruinis.

In this the reading of most MSS and well-nigh all editions Bentley justly finds fault with the lame climax ‘timuitque mortem’, and ‘hic’ used where the poet should and might have used ‘ille’: he might too have added, what sort of writer is Horace if ‘mortem’ and ‘uitam’ here have nothing to do with one another? But there is this deeper fault in the reading, that it makes Regulus lose the thread of his argument; for what is he debating? not what is done and cannot be undone, the surrender of the army, but its ransom, the matter in hand: his aim is to fence off the perniciis ueniens in aeuum, the flagitio additum damnum, the probrosae Italiae ruinae, and down to v. 36 he is speaking straight to the point; but here with a full stop at ‘mortem’ he loses his way and drifts off into mere exclamation about what is past mending and will remain the same whether he gains his cause or loses it.

But several good MSS, that of Queen’s College Oxford among them, have ‘aptius’ for ‘inscius’, and very many more give it for a varia lectio: Bentley then, accepting this, proposed ‘timuitque mortem Hinc, unde uitam sumeret aptius, Pacem et || duello miscuit’, comparing *carm.* III 11 38 ‘ne longus tibi somnus unde Non times detur’. This removes at once the faults of the passage and saves Horace’s credit as a rhetorician: ‘hinc’ for ‘hic’ is the slightest of changes, *carm.* I 17 14 and 21 13 the MSS have ‘hinc’ where ‘hic’ must be right: but his insertion of ‘et’ has not much likelihood, as he himself tacitly acknowledges on IV 4 18.

But can ‘pacem duello miscuit’ in Horace mean ‘confounded war with peace’? Horace who five times elsewhere uses ‘duellum’ uses it with a marked restriction, always of some single war, never of war in the abstract: the word’s fancied connexion with ‘duo’ was maybe at the bottom of this: war as opposed to peace is ‘bellum’ *carm.* II 19 28 ‘idem Pacis eras mediusque belli’ *serm.* II 2 111 ‘in pace, ut sapiens, aptarit idonea bello’ 3 268 ‘in amore haec sunt mala, bellum, Pax rursum’: if he wants to use ‘duellum’ thus he must use the plural *epist.* II 1 254 ‘tuisque Auspiciis totum confecta duella per orbem, Claustraque custodem pacis cohibentia Ianum’. I will suggest then that Horace here too was true to his custom and wrote ‘pacemque bello miscuit’: ‘u’ and ‘b’ are in his MSS as in others much confused, *carm.* III 23 19 ‘mollibit’ for ‘molluiit’,

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

189-90]

HORATIANA [I]

3

1 20 10 where Munro emends 'uides' for 'bides' or 'bibes', 25 20 Aldus' 'Euro' for 'Hebro' is probably right: 'be' then might well fall out after 'ue', and the senseless 'pacemquello' would be readily altered by the change of one letter to 'pacem duello'.

Carm. III 11 15-20

Cessit immanis tibi blandienti  
ianitor aulae  
Cerberus, quamuis furiale centum  
muniant angues caput eius atque  
spiritus taeter saniesque manet  
ore trilingui.

Perhaps neither 'eius' alone nor 'spiritus manet' alone would be intolerable, but surely the pair of them is more than man can stand: so at least thought Bentley Meineke and || Haupt. Haupt and Meineke however betake themselves to the coward's remedy of declaring the stanza spurious: Bentley perceiving that the alteration of 'eius atque' into a verb for 'spiritus' rids us at one stroke of both inconveniences proposes 'exeatque': he cites instances of 'spiritus exit' but candidly adds 'verum hic notandum est, quod in his locis *spiritus exit* de iis duntaxat dicatur, qui moribundi animam expirant. Quare ad evitandum Ambiguum, utinam Noster scripsisset potius *exeatque halitus teter*'. I propose then 'effluatque' a word which can well be applied to 'spiritus' or the like, Ovid met. VI 233 'ne qua leuis *effluat aura*', Cic. n.d. II 39 [101] '*aer effluens* huc et illuc uentos efficit'. Of all errors 'i' for 'l' is perhaps the most frequent, 's' for 'f' by no means unusual, and if a copyist read or wrote 'essiu atque' then 'eius atque' was not far off.

Carm. III 26 1-8

Vixi puellis nuper idoneus  
et militai non sine gloria:  
nunc arma defunctumque bello  
barbiton hic paries habebit,  
laeuum marinae qui Veneris latus  
custodit. hic hic ponite lucida  
funalia et uectes et arcus  
oppositis foribus minaces.

Of all weapons the one which doors and doorkeepers can best afford to laugh at is an 'arcus' in any known sense of the word: Bentley's 'securesque' however is not likely, no more is Keller's 'et ascias': indeed it surely is plain enough there is no keeping 'et': you can almost count up the available substantives on your fingers and see that none of them will do. But is it a substantive that is wanted?

1-2

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4

HORATIANA [I]

[190–2

Theocritus cited by Bentley has *πελέκεις καὶ λαμπάδες*, and that Horace had this in his head is likely enough; but why then when Theocritus mentions only two sorts of ‘arma’ should he mention three? Surely hatchets alone or crowbars alone are all that is wanted in addition to the torches, and his ‘uectes’ do duty for Theocritus’ || *πελέκεις*. Then as to the symmetry of the sentence: ‘funalia’ has an epithet to itself, and that ‘uectes’ should tally with it is at any rate as likely as not. What I am trying to make out is that here we have a corruption such as Bentley detected in ‘eius atque’, that ‘et arcus’ represents a single word, probably then an imperative co-ordinate with ‘ponite’: can it be ‘et uectes sacrate Oppositis foribus minaces’? ‘sacrate’ with the change of one letter is ‘et arcus’ written backwards: to be sure I know of no quite parallel corruption, but in Propertius (Baehrens) III 5 24 DV give ‘integras’ for ‘et nigras’ precisely reversing the first four letters.

Carm. IV 4 65–8

Merses profundo, pulchrior euenit;  
luctere, multa prouet integrum  
cum laude uictorem, geretque  
proelia coniugibus loquenda.

Many seem to have felt the strangeness of ‘merses, euenit’ followed by ‘luctere, prouet geretque’, yet ‘exiet’ is quite out of the question, and ‘prouit’ and ‘geritque’ are not very taking. And then the unexampled use of ‘euenire’? The MSS vary between ‘merses’ ‘mersus’ and ‘mersae’: ‘mersus’ which has most authority is of course impossible and is attributed by Keller to the Mavortian recension: among those which have ‘mersae’ is Keller’s *liber archetypus* F (= φψ), one of the MSS which preserve for instance the genuine reading ‘rumpit’ *carm.* III 27 5. I think it then not unlikely Horace wrote ‘mersae profundo pulchrius euenit’, like ‘male istis eueniat’ etc.: a copyist misunderstanding the construction might readily write ‘pulchrior’, compare the corruption of ‘ad uentum’ to ‘aduentus’ *carm.* I 23 6. This at all events does away with both difficulties at once.

Carm. IV 12 5–8

Nidum ponit Ityn flebiliter gemens  
infelix auis et Cecropiae domus  
aeternum opprobrium, quod male barbaras  
regum est ultra libidines. ||

Bentley says ‘ideo aeternum opprobrium *quod* sive *quia* male ultra est mariti libidines’, that is he makes ‘obprobrium’ nominative, ‘quod’ = ‘quia’ and refers ‘ultra est’ to ‘auis’: all commentators seem to follow him in the main. You can hardly have demonstration on a point like this; but does not ‘auis et obpro-

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

192-3]

HORATIANA [I]

5

brium ponit nidum' make a strange hendiadys? one would rather expect 'obprobrium' to be placed in apposition. I should be inclined to take 'obprobrium' like 'Ityn' as governed by 'gemens', 'quod' = 'namely that', and refer 'ulta est' to Cecropia domus: 'Cecropiae domus' will then be the 'auis' and her sister: 'lamenting Itys, lamenting too her sister's infamy and her own, their dreadful revenge on Tereus'.

## Epod. 1 7-14

Vtrumne iussi persequemur otium  
 non dulce, ni tecum simul,  
 an hunc laborem mente laturo, decet  
 qua ferre non molles uiros?  
 feremus et te uel per Alpium iuga  
 inhospitalem et Caucasum  
 uel occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum  
 forti sequemur pectore.

The great awkwardness of 'laturo' here = 'laturo sumus' has led Nauck to put a comma after 'laborem' and govern it by 'persequemur': this however only makes matters worse, as 'persequemur otium' means 'Shall I pursue my present stay-at-home life': now it is absurd to make Horace say 'Shall I continue to stay at home or continue to go to the wars'. Another objection, though perhaps not a serious one, I will mention, which applies alike to both interpretations: they make Horace ask a question of Maecenas to whom throughout this poem he is speaking, and then take the words out of Maecenas' mouth and give the answer in his own person. The punctuation I propose then is this,

utrumne iussi persequemur otium  
 non dulce, ni tecum simul, ||  
 an hunc laborem mente laturo, decet  
 qua ferre non molles uiros,  
 feremus, et te uel per Alpium iuga  
 inhospitalem et Caucasum  
 uel occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum  
 forti sequemur pectore?

He then makes Maecenas answer this question by a counter-question, 'roges, tuum labore quid iuueni meo Imbellis ac firmus parum', and everything runs smoothly. Perhaps it is not worth much that Porphyrio's lemma consists of these words thus written, 'an hunc laborem mente laturo decet qua ferre non molles uiros feremus'.

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6

## HORATIANA [I]

[193-4]

## Epod. ix

Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes  
 uictore laetus Caesare  
 tecum sub alta (sic Ioui gratum) domo,  
 beate Maecenas, bibam  
 5 sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra,  
 hac Dorium, illis barbarum,  
 ut nuper, actus cum freto Neptunius  
 dux fugit ustis nauibus,  
 10 minatus urbi uincla quae detraxerat  
 seruis amicus perfidis?  
 Romanus eheu (posterī negabitis)  
 emancipatus feminae  
 fert uallum et arma miles et spadonibus  
 seruire rugosis potest,  
 15 interque signa turpe militaria  
 sol aspicit conopium.  
 ad hunc frementes uerterunt bis mille equos  
 Galli canentes Caesarem,  
 hostiliumque nauium portu latent  
 20 puppes sinistrorsum citae.  
 io Triumphe, tu moraris aureos  
 currus et intactas boues?  
 io Triumphe, nec Iugurthino parem ||  
 bello reportasti ducem,  
 25 neque, Africani cui super Carthaginem  
 uirtus sepulcrum condidit.  
 terra marique uictus hostis punico  
 lugubre mutauit sagum.  
 aut ille centum nobilem Cretam urbibus  
 30 uentis iturus non suis  
 exercitatas aut petit Syrtes noto  
 aut fertur incerto mari.  
 capaciores affer huc, puer, scyphos  
 et Chia uina aut Lesbia,  
 35 uel quod fluentem nauseam coerceat  
 metire nobis Caecubum.  
 curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuuat  
 dulci Lyaeo soluere.

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

194-5]

HORATIANA [I]

7

I am constrained to cite this poem in full, though it now has but one critical difficulty, because I think I can contribute something to its elucidation as a whole. It takes some nerve to say it, but I am much deceived if all the commentators I have read are not strangely out in supposing it written after, not before the battle of Actium: I really think this only wants pointing out to be self-evident. Let us see: vv. 1-6 will square equally well with either view: they are generally taken to mean 'when shall we have a chance of carousing together over this victory of Caesar's': they may just as well mean 'when will Caesar win his victory and set us carousing'. On vv. 7-10 I will only say it seems to me unlikely he would care to say so much about Sex. Pompeius in the full blaze of Actium, but I lay no great stress on this. Vv. 11-16 the tense is generally taken to be historical, if I am right it will be present. Vv. 17-20 are important: the critical hitch in v. 17 need not delay us for the present: vv. 17-18 seemingly refer to the defection of Amyntas and Deiotarus with their Galatians some time before the battle; what do vv. 19-20 refer to? The older commentators say to Cleopatra's flight to Alexandria: if that is so, my theory of course crumbles away, and with it Horace's reputation for a decent style: to announce the defection of || 2000 men out of 100,000, and then in the same breath, as an afterthought, that the world is lost and won! The lines refer then to some naval defection or mishap or mismanagement matching the desertion of the Galli on land: what 'sinistrorsum citae' means perhaps no one will ever know: Bentley suggests it may be some nautical technicality, and if so we need not be astonished at our ignorance, seeing that Cicero did not know the meaning of 'inhibere remis'. What sort of poet now is this who with the thunder of Actium in his ears can dwell on the desertion of a handful of barbarians, and mention the 'hostilium nauium puppes' without saying they are burnt to the water's edge? To proceed: I suppose it is vv. 21-32 that have thrown the commentators off the scent: I shall be surprised if any one familiar with the locutions of poetry finds a difficulty here, but if he does I will cite a parallel: 'The mother of Sisera looked out at a window, and cried through the lattice, Why is his chariot so long in coming? why tarry the wheels of his chariots?' Set that now against 'io Triumphe, tu moraris' cet., and with 'terra marique uictus' cet. compare 'Her wise ladies answered her, yea she returned answer to herself, Have they not sped? have they not divided the prey; to every man a damsel or two; to Sisera a prey of divers colours?' this interrogation being of course in Hebrew poetry tantamount to the strongest affirmation. Horace too returns answer to himself, and the answer is not correct in its details: if these lines are meant as a rejoicing over Actium, then what is the meaning of 'terra uictus'? there was no land-fighting at all, except a cavalry skirmish some days before the battle: a week or so after the battle Antonius' main army laid down its arms without a blow disgusted at the desertion of Canidius. Is that then what Horace means? but if so this poem must

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

8

HORATIANA [I]

[195-6]

have been written a full fortnight after the battle, and that is incompatible with the ignorance vv. 29-32 about Antonius' flight. Truth to tell the poet is trying like the mother of Siseria to cheer himself with glowing anticipations, and finding this unavailing is driven to 'capaciores scyphos'. The last lines vv. 33-8 are generally supposed to inaugurate a carouse over the victory, though Horace takes pains to say that || they do nothing of the kind: 'curam metumque'! why, what anxiety, what fear could Horace have for the conqueror with the world at his feet? that Octavianus' difficulties were not over with Actium may be true as a matter of history, but was Horace the man to say so or this the time for saying it? 'Fluentem nauseam' alone should be enough to show that the poem was written in the breathless hush before the battle, when Italy and the world were in agonies of suspense, 'in dubioque fuere utrorum ad regna cadendum Omnibus humanis esset terraque marique'.

I now come to the well-known crux in v. 17: 'ad hunc' has by far the most MS authority: perhaps an easy and satisfactory correction would be 'at nunc', which Horace as Munro has pointed out probably wrote 'ad nunc'. 'Frementes' must surely belong to 'equos' not 'Galli', see *carm.* IV 14 23 'fremetem mittere equum': it is almost an epitheton sollemne. If there is anything in what I have been saying above, 'nunc' will seem quite necessary to mark the change from dark to the first streak of light.



Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 2

*IBIS* 539\*

Conditor ut tardae laesus cognomine Myrrhae  
orbis in innumeris inueniari locis.

Except that the codices vary between 'conditor' and 'cognitor', 'tardae' and 'tardus', this is the MS reading: modern editors however, Merkel Riese and Ellis, adopt the conjecture of Leopardus 'conditor ut tardae, Blaesus cognomine, Cyrae', that is, may you be a wanderer on the face of the earth as Battus the stammerer was in the years before he founded Cyrene. Such a curse strikes me as strangely tame amidst the wounds mutilation and violent death which the context imprecates; and I feel too another objection: the meaning of the pentameter is surely fixed by trist. III 9 28 'atque ita diuellit diuulsaque membra per agros Dissipat in multis inuenienda locis', and thus our passage must refer to some one who perished by being torn in pieces.

I propose then to interpret the text above given as follows: may you be torn in pieces like the author of the Zmyrna that was nine years in writing, brought to grief by his cognomen of Cinna. True, Virgil's words ecl. ix 35 suffice to show that C. Heluius Cinna the poet of the Zmyrna or Myrrha 'nonam post denique messem Quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem' some years outlived his namesake the tribune murdered in 709/44 by mistake for the conspirator L. Cornelius Cinna. Still I think the plain sense of the words is that which I give them. Whether Ovid dreamt that the tribune and the poet were one, or whether he was humouring a popular fancy, or whether these lines are not Ovid's, let others say.

\* [*JPh* 12 (1883), 167]

Cambridge University Press

0521606942 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman - 1882-1897, Volume I

Edited By J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 3

ON SOPH. *ELECTR.* 564, AND EUR. *I.T.*  
15 AND 35\*

In the second ἐπεισόδιον of Sophocles' *Electra* Clytaemnestra has arraigned Agamemnon in a set speech for the sacrifice of Iphigenia and has challenged Electra to justify his deed: διδάξον δὴ με τοῦ χάριν τίνων ἔθυσεν αὐτήν. Electra in her reply meets this challenge with a counter-question, vv. 563 sq.

ἔροῦ δὲ τὴν κυναγὸν Ἄρτεμιν τίνος  
ποινάς τὰ πολλὰ πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι.

These lines are explained by Hermann to mean 'ask Artemis why she restrained the frequent winds at Aulis': and indeed I do not see what other meaning can be wrung from the Greek: Mr Jebb has rightly abandoned his former interpretation by which ὁ πατήρ, that is Agamemnon, was imported from so far away as the πατέρα of v. 558 to oust the intervening Ἄρτεμις as the subject of ἔσχε. But Hermann's explanation, inexorably demanded by the words, is disastrous to the sense. Artemis did not restrain the winds at Aulis: had she done so, Agamemnon might have laughed her to scorn and Iphigenia would never have been sacrificed. To the ships of the heroic age and the age of Sophocles alike, a calm was no hindrance: they were equipped with oars. What it was that kept the fleet at Aulis we know very well from Aesch. *Ag.* 202 [192] sqq. and fifty other sources; we know that it was not a calm, but contrary winds. I am aware that Ovid in *met.* XIII 183 has blundered into the phrase '*nulla aut contraria classi flamina erant*', but that is in an opus mediis incudibus ablatum: emendaturus, si licuisset, erat. The question to ask of Artemis will then, I think, be this:

τίνος  
ποινάς τὰ πλοῖα πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι

*why gales detained the fleet at Aulis.* Had we before us the series of MSS by which the text was handed down, we should probably find that the inversion of two consecutive letters, a most frequent error, first changed πλοῖα to πολιά; this once done, the difference between λι and λλ is so evanescent that the further corruption πολλά scarcely merits the name of a change.

Misled by this passage, Hermann and others have endeavoured to introduce

\* [CR I (1887), 240-1]