

T. E. Franklino / S. J. Heyworth

Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Horace's *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare**

Abstract: This paper gathers together notes on passages from ten of Horace's lyric poems (offering conjectures as listed): *Carm.* 1.31.1–8 (6: *arbusta*); 1.37.5–8 (7: *tam demens*); 2.1.37–40 (37: *at*); 2.10.21–24 (22: *appares*); 2.12.13–16; 2.13.13–16 (15: *paulisper horrescit*); 2.17.17–30 (19: *seu] te*; 24: *Leti*); 2.18.9–12 (11–12: *deos | supra*); 3.27.13–16 (13: *licet] precor*); *Carmen Saeculare* 29–48 (33–36 after 8 or 24; 44: *iura*). Topics touched on include Horatian usage and word order, the shape of lyric expression, and some patterns of textual corruption, in particular the alteration of *precor* to *licet* (starting from Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 9.503, with discussion of possible cases at 3.405 and 9.480, and *Heroides* 20.9).

Keywords: textual criticism, conjectures, Horace, *Odes*, *Carmen Saeculare*

Carm. 1.31.1–8

Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
vates? quid orat de patera novum
fundens liquorem? non opimae
Sardiniae segetes feracis,
non aestuosae grata Calabriae
armenta, non aurum aut ebur Indicum,
non rura quae Liris quieta
mordet aqua taciturnus amnis.

5

Nisbet / Hubbard mention the alternative manuscript reading *non opimas | Sardiniae segetes feracis* in 3–4, but only to condemn it as an interpolation. To my mind it is a reading superior to the main tradition: beginning the sequence with an accusative helps the reader to see immediately that this is not an independent sentence, but a series of negative answers to the question *quid orat?* And rather than adjacent words in rhyming agreement, *opimas* (which

would easily be corrupted to *opimae* before *Sardiniae*) gives a more typical alternating pattern.¹

They go on to discuss two objections to the text of verses 5–6: first “*grata* and *aestuosae* do not stand in the right relation to each other; one expects the noun to refer to something that is particularly welcome in the heat of the day”. Second (and less significant): “Calabria is not typically associated with cattle” (which is what *armenta* must mean, not sheep). Thus Campbell had replaced *armenta* with *palmeta*; noting that the connexion of palm-groves with Calabria has to be surmised, Nisbet / Hubbard offer *pineta*, but reject it as too far from the manuscripts and not a sign of wealth. Though any woods may be expressive of wealth through signifying the land on which they grow, and stands of palm or pine trees may be pleasing to the owner in alleviating the summer heat, to match *segetes* one looks for a noun suggestive of agricultural production. I conjecture *arbusta*, a more general word for trees, perhaps implying “a plantation of trees on which vines were trained” (*OLD* s.v. 2)—or orchards, given that at *Ep.* 1.7.14 Horace places in Calabria the farmer with a surfeit of pears. The corruption falls into a pattern that I have observed repeatedly in collating the manuscripts of Ovid’s *Fasti*, in which the start and the end of a word is retained, but syllables in the middle are replaced to form another Latin word, e.g., *Fast.* 4.97: *contraxit*] *convertit* Paris B.N. lat.7993; 4.835: *augurio*] *audito* G; 5.45: *fidissima*] *fiducia* Paris B.N. lat.7993; 5.587: *mansisset*] *mentis et* Florence Bibl.Laur. plut.36,24; 6.55: *centum*] *comitum* Cambridge

* Both of us have had the pleasure of teaching textual criticism alongside Stephen Harrison. It thus seems fitting to honour him with a garland of observations and conjectures on a poet with whom he has engaged richly throughout his career. The notes have been written in close collaboration, but the “I” in each case is indicated by the name at the end of individual discussions (an echo of an earlier set of notes—Harrison / Heyworth 1998).

¹ Nisbet 1999, 135–137, 141.

Pembroke College 280; 6.252 *refulsit*] *resedit* G; 6.586 *agemus*] *agendus* D—there are many more.

(Heyworth)

***Carm.* 1.37.5–8**

antehac nefas depromere Caecubum 5
cellis avitis, dum Capitolio
regina †*dementis*† ruinas
funus et imperio parabat.

A number of editors have been content with the adjective obelized here by Shackleton Bailey in his 2008 edition: Wickham, for example, explains that the epithet has been “transferred from the person to her purpose”,² and Nisbet / Hubbard write that “the adjective is defensible, if Horace is saying that to destroy Rome would be a mad act”, before noting that one in fact “expects him to say ‘To think that one can destroy Rome is a sign of madness’; if that is what he means, the transference of *dementis* to *ruinas* is irrational”.³ Palmer conjectured *dementer*: this gives good sense, but leaves *regina* lacking a descriptor. Commenting on the paradox, Heinze rightly notes that Horace “kann sich nicht genug tun in starken Bezeichnungen für den Wahnsinn der Kleopatra: *demens, inpotens, ebria, furor, mens lymphata*”,⁴ and it is to her, we might add, that the adjective ought to refer. Campbell’s suggestion *demens et* and Shackleton Bailey’s *demens, heu* (or *vae* or *iam*) add little. A more profitable approach might

² Wickham 1896, 127.

³ Nisbet / Hubbard 1970, 413.

⁴ Heinze 1930, 156.

be to look for a syllable to precede *demens*, and *tam* presents itself: *regina tam demens*. The loss of the monosyllabic intensifying adverb after *-na* and before *dem-* is far from inconceivable. The collocation *tam demens* is well attested,⁵ and for *tam* qualifying an adjective in Horace, see *Carm.* 1.24.2: *tam cari capitis*.

(Franklinos)

***Carm.* 2.1.37–40**

sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
Caeae retractes munera neniae,
mecum Dionaeo sub antro
quaere modos levioere plectro. 40

In the final stanza of the opening poem of *Odes* 2, Horace interrupts the increasingly epicising subject-matter about which it is hoped that Pollio will write in his *Histories* with an address to his bold Muse. He asks that his poetry draw back from elevated themes of civil war and the mournful strains of a Simonides that are due to the deceased (*Caeae ... munera neniae*). His verse should recall itself to more trifling matters (*iocis*) that are better suited to lyric: Venus' concerns are to be those of Horace's lighter poetry. The adversative with which this stanza opens (*sed*) is not typically used by Horace in the *Odes* to designate such a marked change of direction in contradistinction to what precedes it: *at* is the more apt term. When, at the start of a new stanza, a clear contrast is required, Horace uses *at*, as, for example, at *Carm.* 1.35.25, where the behaviour of the *vulgus infidum* toward *Fortuna* is compared with

⁵ Cf., e.g., Cic. *Cael.* 57, *Mil.* 78, *Marc.* 21: *sed quisnam est iste tam demens?*, *Phil.* 2.64; Sen. *Ben.* 6.21.4, *Ep.* 30.6, 67.4.

the conduct of *Spes* and *Fides*, who attend on her; or, at *Carm.* 2.9.13, where the unending grief of Valgius for Mystes is set against that of mythological figures, famed for their mourning, who did eventually cease from lamentation.⁶ Where *sed* is found at the opening of a stanza, the contrast, such as it is, is considerably less forceful and usually denotes a progression—sometimes in a slightly different direction—in the same train of thought, as for example, at *Carm.* 2.7.13, 3.3.57, 3.4.53, 3.27.17, 4.1.33.⁷ To begin the final stanza of *Carm.* 2.1, a stronger contrast is needed and *at* should be read. The palaeographical difference between these two near-synonymous words need not be of concern as they overlap so much in meaning, and in any case “any monosyllable at the start of a verse may have arisen from any other”.⁸ We ought also to note that Horace nowhere else has *at ne*, but he also does not have *sed ne*.

(Franklinos)

***Carm.* 2.10.21–24**

rebus angustis animosus atque
 fortis appare; sapienter idem
 contrahes vento nimium secundo
 turgida vela.

The poem has begun with the imperatival future *rectius vives*, which is resumed in *contrahes* in the penultimate verse. In the intervening stanzas Licinius has not been addressed; the poem

⁶ Note also the similar use of *at* in *Carm.* 1.28.23 and 2.18.9.

⁷ The adversative *sed* also begins stanzas at *Carm.* 3.6.29, 3.6.37, 4.6.17, though mid-sentence in each case.

⁸ Heyworth 2007, 410 for “Kenney’s Law”, citing Kenney 1958, 65; the corruption occurs at *Ov. Fast.* 4.591: *at] sed* Milan. Ambros. N 265 sup.

neither compliments nor characterizes him. The close would seem to me stronger if it arrived in a less repetitive manner: not with two imperative expressions, but first a moment of encouraging flattery, then the advice for the future. Read *appares*: “In tough circumstances you show yourself spirited and brave; wisely will you also shorten your swelling sails when the wind blows too favourably”. For the change of tense/mood after emphasizing *idem*, cf. *S.* 2.7.22–24: *laudat* | *fortunam et mores antiquae plebis, et idem*, | *siquis ad illa deus subito te agat, usque recuses*, and *Ep.* 2.2.102–105. Before *sapienter* the final *s* of *appares* would easily have been lost.

(Heyworth)

***Carm.* 2.12.13–16**

me dulces dominae Musa Licymniae
 cantus, me voluit dicere lucidum
 fulgentis oculos et bene mutuis 15
 fidum pectus amoribus.

Editors and commentators are right to assert that *dulces* is accusative in agreement with *cantus*. To do so, however, is to oversimplify the elegant play of Horace’s verse and the shifting syntax that he deploys in this quatrain. After three stanzas that treat themes proper to epic and the more recent *proelia Caesaris* (10) of which Maecenas is to speak, Horace turns to himself and to his poetry with the emphatically placed *me*. The first-person pronoun is immediately followed by mention of something sweet (*dulces*) and of things amatory (*dominae*). Whether one reads *dulces* or the alternative accusative ending *dulcis*, the form could agree with *dominae*, respectively as a nominative plural or a genitive singular adjective. Were one to read the former, *dulces dominae*, as a nominative, the reader would

entertain the idea of multiple pleasing mistresses acting on Horace until the singular subject, the *Musa*, forces a syntactical reassessment; were the adjective taken as a singular genitive, the mistress would remain sweet for the reader until *cantus* was met at the start of the stanza's second line.

Similar shifts in the association of words occur with the adverbs *lucidum* and *bene*. In the case of *lucidum*, it is usually understood closely with *fulgentis oculos*, giving the sense “brightly shining eyes”. This is no doubt right, but we might also consider that as one encounters the form *lucidum*, it follows hard on the heels of *me ... dicere*, and could be thought of as an adjective agreeing with *me* or looking forward to an object (e.g. *carmen*) that is never mentioned; perhaps it could even be understood as an adverb taken with *dicere*: Horace's lyrical verses on Licymnia's bright eyes will themselves be pellucid too. As to *bene*, Nisbet / Hubbard note that “Porphyrio seems right to take *bene* with *fidum* (cf. *male fidus*)” as opposed to with *mutuis*; they remark that the “adverb is one of quality (‘properly’) rather than degree (*ualde* Porphyrio)”.⁹ This seems to be rather too quibbling.¹⁰ The adverb can be understood with both: the heart is “virtuously faithful”, as Harrison puts it,¹¹ but their love for one another is also “thoroughly mutual”.

(Franklinos)

***Carm.* 2.13.13–16**

quid quisque vitet numquam homini satis
cautum est in horas. navita Bosphorum

⁹ Nisbet / Hubbard 1978, 195.

¹⁰ For *bene* used to intensify adjective and adverbs, see *OLD* s.v. *bene* 14.

¹¹ Harrison 2017, 152.

caeca timet aliunde fata.

It is for the most part accepted that, while a sailor may be said to have good reason to fear the waters of the Bosphorus, a Phoenician or Carthaginian seafarer has no more particular cause for concern than any other. Lachmann has conjectured *Thynus*, an apt geographical adjective, for one from nearby Bithynia, and Nisbet / Hubbard venture *prudens*; as Harrison notes, they are both “good palaeographically, and the latter is nicely alliterative”. He goes on to observe, however, that there are reasons for not wanting to give *navita* an epithet: first, it is answered by *miles*—without a descriptor—at the start of the next stanza (17), and, second, where the Bosphorus features elsewhere in Horace’s poetry, it is accompanied by an epithet (*Carm.* 2.20.14: *gementis ... Bosphori*; 3.4.30: *insanientem ... Bosphorum*), and so we might expect one here; he considers *Bosphorum* | *toruum* or *saevum* (Delz), as well as complements that have a similar effect: *Bosphori* | *aestus* (Peerlkamp), *Bosphori* | *portas* (Moser).¹²

Another possible approach would be to consider a suitable adverb, leaving *Bosphorum* to stand alone. The sailor fears the Bosphorus, we are told, but is, foolishly, unafraid of other less conspicuous perils (*caeca ... fata*) that lie beyond. Greater emphasis would be lent to the folly of the *navita* by drawing attention to the brevity of his fear, were one to read *paulisper horrescit*. To paraphrase: people are not cautious enough day to day; the sailor is frightened for a little while as he passes through the Bosphorus, but does not attend to danger thereafter. The adverb is not attested elsewhere in Horace, but it is used infrequently in Vergil (*A.* 5.846) and Ovid (*Fast.* 3.1, *Tr.* 2.557) without any concern raised on the part of editors.

(Franklinos)

¹² Harrison 2017, 161.

Carm. 2.17.17–30

seu Libra seu me Scorpis aspicit
formidolosus, pars violentior
natalis horae, seu tyrannus
Hesperiae Capricornus undae, 20
utrumque nostrum incredibili modo
consentit astrum: te Iovis impio
tutela Saturno refulgens
eripuit volucrisque Fati
tardavit alas, cum populus frequens 25
laetum theatris ter crepuit sonum:
me truncus illapsus cerebro
sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum
dextra levasset, Mercurialium
custos virorum. 30

There is a surprising imbalance between verses 17–20, which talk only of Horace’s horoscope, and 21–22, which assert the unbelievable coincidence between those of the poet and Maecenas. This congruence is then reinforced by the structure of 22–30: *te ...*, *me ...*, each of them saved from apparently imminent death by their respective planets. I therefore wonder whether *seu* in 19 has replaced *te*:

seu Libra seu me Scorpis aspicit
formidolosus pars violentior
natalis horae, te tyrannus
Hesperiae Capricornus undae: 20
utrumque nostrum incredibili modo
consentit astrum.

“Either Libra or fearsome Scorpio looks on me as the more violent influence at the time of my birth, on you Capricorn, the master of the waves of the west”. Rain-bringing Libra (Ov. *Fast.* 4.386; Plin. *Nat.* 18.247) or the terrifying image of Scorpio may be the dominant influence on Horace’s horoscope, but in either case they match Capricorn, controller of storms at sea.¹³ The opening line and a half of the next stanza sums up; *utrumque nostrum ... astrum* picks up on the pair of constellations now more easily found in the previous stanza, Horace’s (whether Libra or Scorpio) and Maecenas’s. The lack of verb in the *te tyrannus* clause may have encouraged a scribe to think it a continuation of the repeated *seu* clauses, or perhaps *te* disappeared after *horae*.

Commentators agree that *Fati* in 24 means “Death”: “Here Fate (capital letter: the personification is strong here) means Death (*OLD* s.v. *fatum* 6), often seen as winged in Greek and Roman literature and art (cf. *S.* 2.1.58: *mors [Mors?] atris circumvolat alis* and Nisbet / Hubbard here, *LIMC* VIII.905–6 ...),” as Harrison observes.¹⁴ No one asks why, if Horace means “Death,” he did not write *mortis* or *leti*: in a clause describing avoidance of death, reference to “Fate” seems inept. Usually it is something fixed and unavoidable (as at Verg. *A.* 1.257–258), not fleet or flighty: the wings belong not to Fate, but to Death, who shares them with his brother Sleep.¹⁵ We may contrast the instance of the equation *fata* = death at *Epod.* 17.62: *tardiora fata te uotis manent*, and the similar expression at *Carm.* 3.11.28–29: *seraque fata | quae manent culpas etiam sub Orco*. Moreover, Horace has

¹³ See Harrison 2017, 204, and 203 on the astrology, on which also see West 1998, 123–124.

¹⁴ Harrison 2017, *ad loc.*

¹⁵ See, e.g., Hom. *Il.* 14.231, Hes. *Theog.* 756, Verg. *A.* 6.278: *consanguineus Leti Sopor*; for the wings of sleep, besides many of the images in *LIMC* “Hypnos”, see, e.g., Callim. *Hymn* 4.234, Prop. 1.3.45, Tib. 2.1.89–90, Verg. *A.* 5.861, Stat. *Silv.* 5.4.14.

reader asks “before what or whom?”²¹ and is given an answer when *frater* is reached at the end of the sentence. As for *licet*, that would have to be parenthetical, a Stoic assertion of the accessibility of death,²² but the intrusion is jarring, and suicide otherwise enters Ovid’s account only in the rhetoric of her letter (*nisi tu dederis, non est habitura salutem*, 530) and her second soliloquy (606–607). For the argument that follows, the choice of variant matters less, however, than the fact that *precor* and *licet* have been confused, for whatever reason, in an early medieval manuscript. We believe that the interchange has occurred at least twice elsewhere (Ov. *Met.* 3.405 and Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.13), in each case *precor* being corrupted to *licet*, though in neither are any of the surviving manuscripts reported as transmitting *precor*.

In *Met.* 3, after describing Echo wasting away with love for Narcissus, Ovid tells us that the latter had made a habit of playing with the affections of river and mountain nymphs, and that one of the lads whom he had spurned vengefully curses him; Nemesis fulfils these prayers (*Met.* 3.402–406).

sic hanc, sic alias undis aut montibus ortas
 luserat hic nymphas, sic coetus ante viriles.
 inde manus aliquis despectus ad aethera tollens
 ‘sic amet ipse **licet**, sic non potiaturo amato’
 dixerat: adsensit precibus Rhamnusia iustis.

405

In the *apparatus criticus* of his 2004 edition, Tarrant expresses doubts about *licet* at 3.405, suggesting we might read *precor* instead: “*licet* an sanum nescio; fort. *precor*?” He makes no

²¹ One might compare Hor. *Carm.* 2.17.2–3: *nec dis amicum est nec mihi te prius | obire*, but that provides an implicit gloss on Maecenas’ complaints in verse 1, thus shown to be about ill health. Natural death is not imminent for Byblis or Caunus.

²² Cf., e.g., Sen. *Phaed.* 1183–1184: *non licuit animos iungere, at certe licet | iunxisse fata*, Ep. 117.22.

mention of the variant *licet* in U at 9.503. As the text stands, *licet* has either to be treated as if it were *utinam* or ignored altogether, as translators seem to have done (e.g., Miller / Goold: “So may he himself love, and not gain the thing he loves!”; Hill: “So may he too love, so may he not gain what he has loved!”; Koch: “Che tocchi anche a lui, innamorarsi e vedersi negato chi ama”),²³ or to be understood parenthetically (sc. “So may he love himself [it is allowed], so may he not gain the object of his affections!”). The first of these alternatives is impermissible: *licet* cannot mean *utinam*.²⁴ To ignore the word altogether, since it apparently carries no force syntactically or in terms of meaning, does violence to the text of a poet so meticulous in his lexical choices. The notion that *licet* is parenthetical is decidedly awkward in what is otherwise an impassioned address to the gods, and, if anything, would detract from the emotive curse. The suspicion in which Tarrant holds *licet* rings true, and his conjecture *precor* provides the necessary sense. The anaphora of *sic* in the spurned youth’s words responds to the anaphora in the narrative account of Narcissus’ sporting that precedes them (402–403), and Tarrant’s conjecture, *precor*, would similarly serve to tie the utterance of the praying lad together with Nemesis’ assenting to his words (*precibus*) in 406.

A further possible instance of *licet* replacing *precor* may be worth considering earlier in Ovid’s account of Byblis’ love for Caunus. While she meditates on the impropriety of her

²³ Bömer 1969, 551 comments that *licet* taken with the subjunctive here almost comes to mean “may” (“fere i. q. ‘mag’”), and infelicitously compares 3.193, where the idea of permission granted has a particular sting as Diana tells Actaeon that he has her permission to tell of his seeing her naked, but that this is conditional on his ability to do so: *nunc tibi me posito visam velamine narres, | si poteris narrare, licet* (3.192–193). This is an ability that he will lack after his transformation: “*me miserum!*” *dicturus erat; vox nulla secuta est* (3.201).

²⁴ Shackleton Bailey 1982, 97 notes that *sic amet ipse licet* may be rendered “it could be that *he* will fall in love as I have done”, which, he suggests, “does indeed amount to a wish”; this seems to stretch the sense of *licet* rather a lot. It also provides the lad with a rather feeble imprecation against Narcissus, and makes the assent of Nemesis to his request seem frankly risible.

pertulit ad castas me iaciente manus.

The suggestion made by Kenney²⁶ that *licet* with the present subjunctive is here “equivalent to a polite imperative” seems to stretch the available senses of the modal. *precor* [Heyworth] would place Acontius in the role of a supplicant addressing his deity.²⁷

However, in neither of these cases is the case for a change as strong as at 3.405, and I move to consideration of *licet* in *Odes* 3.27. In the opening stanzas of this poem, a complicated version of the schetliastic propempticon sees the poet wishing that Galatea’s departure be marked by no ill omen—but the very listing of eight such omens seems designed to dissuade her from travelling at all. This culminates in the fourth stanza (*Carm.* 3.27.13–16):

sis (**licet**) felix ubicumque mavis,
et memor nostri, Galatea, vivas
teque nec laeuus vetet ire picus 15
nec vaga cornix.

In his translation, West writes “May you be blest, Galatea—it is possible—wherever | you may prefer to be, and may you remember us always ...”, giving a decidedly awkward sense to the wish. In his own words: “the addition of *licet* is difficult [and] is impossibly tepid in translation, but it seems to be what is meant”.²⁸ Nisbet / Rudd note that the natural meaning

²⁶ Kenney 1996, 184.

²⁷ As elsewhere, Planudes in his metaphrasis gives the required sense, and makes no attempt to produce a precise rendering of *licet*: εἰ γάρ τοι τὰ ῥήματά γε ἀναλογίση, ἄπερ ὁ ληφθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ δένδρου καρπὸς πρὸς τὰς σὺφρονάς σοι χεῖρας, ἐμοῦ βεβληκότος, ἤνεγκεν.

²⁸ West 2002, 224.

of the text of v. 13 as transmitted implies “indifference”, and that this is “incompatible with [v. 14], which must be an independent wish, not dependent on *licet*”. They note that rendering of *sis licet felix* as “may you be happy” is unsatisfactory, presumably since *licet* comes to have no force whatsoever.²⁹ The result of this is that they read it parenthetically following Page³⁰ and Shackleton Bailey. Elsewhere, Nisbet—dissatisfied with the jerkiness of the second word of the sentence being taken as a parenthesis—“with great hesitation” conjectures *ilicet* (“without more ado”) for *sis licet*.³¹ This archaizing form is not found elsewhere in Horace, and its only occurrence with a verb in the subjunctive (Sil. 9.28–29)—a possible parallel offered doubtfully by Nisbet—is in an object clause governed by *iubere*: there is no extant instance of *ilicet* with an independent subjunctive. Woodman tries *si licet* (“if the gods allow”),³² but the parenthesis is misplaced at the start of the sentence, and the sense is hardly clear. In his article on “How Textual Conjectures are Made”, Nisbet mentions his rejection of another approach:³³ “anything like *precor* was too remote to be convincing”; but U’s reading at *Met.* 9.503 suggests that he was wrong to think this, and we commend *precor* for *licet* here too, taking *sis* and *vivas* as dependent on it.³⁴ This fittingly completes the sense of the verse and stanza with a prayer and petition in keeping with the “understated ... endearment”³⁵ demonstrated by Horace for Galatea.

²⁹ Nisbet / Rudd 2004, 324.

³⁰ Page 1909, 381. However, he glosses *licet* with *per me licet*, “‘as far as I am concerned you may’, i.e. though regretting your departure, still I do not wish you ill but well”; the text lacks the words (*per me*) that this emphasizes.

³¹ Nisbet 1989, 92.

³² Woodman 2022, 341.

³³ Nisbet 1991, 80.

³⁴ This is standard Horatian usage: cf. *Carm.* 1.2.30, 1.3.7–8, 1.31.18.

³⁵ West 2002, 224.

The three key passages, then, should read as follows. In each case, *precor* introduces the present subjunctives that constitute substantival object clauses.

sunt superis sua iura; quid ad caelestia ritus 500
exigere humanos diversaque foedera tempto?
aut nostro vetitus de corde fugabitur ardor
aut, hoc si nequeo, peream **precor** ipsa toroque
mortua componar positaeque det oscula frater. (Ov. *Met.* 9.500–504)

sic hanc, sic alias undis aut montibus ortas
luserat hic nymphas, sic coetus ante viriles.
inde manus aliquis despectus ad aethera tollens
'sic amet ipse **precor**, sic non potiatur amato' 405
dixerat: adsensit precibus Rhamnusia iustis. (Ov. *Met.* 3.402–406)

sis **precor** felix ubicumque mavis,
et memor nostri, Galatea, vivas
teque nec laevus vetet ire picus 15
nec vaga cornix. (Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.13–16)

(Heyworth)

***Carmen Saeculare* 29–48**

fertilis frugum pecorisque tellus
spicea donet Cererem corona;
nutriant fetus et aquae salubres
et Iovis aerae.
condito mitis placidusque telo
supplices audi pueros, Apollo;

siderum regina bicornis, audi,

35

Luna, puellas.

Roma si vestrum est opus ...

“As became clear with the publication of the *Acta, vestrum* (37) must refer not to Apollo and Diana, but rather to the Capitoline gods”: so Thomas (on 37–72). The claim is based on 49–50: *vos bobus veneratur albis | clarus Anchisae Venerisque sanguis*, which imprecisely matches lines 103–106 and 119–122 of the *Acta* (CIL VI.32323), where Augustus and Agrippa sacrifice two bulls to Jupiter, then Agrippa a cow to Juno. Even if there is poetic imprecision here, the first part of Thomas’s statement is surely true: the gods prayed to in 45–48 are not only Apollo and Diana, for they are not, out of all the pantheon, the deities to whom Rome’s existence is primarily owed.³⁶ Lines 37–48 are best understood as addressed to the gods in general, of whom Jupiter Optimus Maximus is representative (n.b. 32: *Iovis aerae*; cf. 73: *Iovem ... deosque cunctos*):

Roma si vestrum est opus Iliaequae

litus Etruscum tenuere turmae,

iussa pars mutare lares et urbem

sospite cursu,

40

cui per ardentem sine fraude Troiam

castus Aeneas patriae superstes

liberum munivit iter, daturus

plura relictis,

di, probos mores docili iuventae,

45

di, senectuti placidae quietem,

Romulae genti date remque prolemque

³⁶ Contrast 61–72, where the favour of Apollo and Diana is for the present (and future).

et decus omne.

But why then has Horace confused the picture, and encouraged readers to identify Apollo and Diana as the gods lying behind *uestrum* (37)? If 33–36 were removed, the second person would be separated by a full stanza from the last address (*Parcae, ... iungite fata*, 25–28), and it will be easier for the audience and the reader to await identification of the gods addressed until the main clause is reached in 45: *di*. Another aspect of 33–36 makes its placing odd: Phoebus and Diana have been addressed as a pair or individually, and in various functions, from the opening vocatives *Phoebe silvarumque potens Diana* as far as 24 (where the prayer to Diana that began in 17 culminates): why address the twin gods for 24 lines, and then resume after a gap of eight in which prayers are made first to the *Parcae* (25–28), and then for the fertility of Italy and its climate (29–32). Where transmitted, 33–36 read as an intrusive afterthought, as though Horace, or his chorus, has suddenly remembered to ask Apollo to come in peaceful mode (*condito mitis placidusque telo*): contrast Seneca, *Agamemnon* 326, and Tibullus 2.5.1–10, where the poet begins with the request that he come *cum cithara carminibusque* (2), and Propertius 4.6.69–70, where Apollo’s move from arms to lyre precisely marks the end of the narrative of Actium.

The second half of the poem falls into three 3-stanza sections (37–48, 49–60, 61–72, the first and third unbroken sentences) before the self-referential epode (73–76); but the structure of the first half is more varied and broken, with four stanzas made up of independent sentences (9–12, 25–28, 29–32, 33–36).³⁷ It therefore seems possible that 33–36 have been omitted from their original home and reinserted at a break, but not the correct one. An original home between 8 and 9 would bring as early as possible the request that the gods come in peace and listen. Diana as moon (35–36) would then be followed by Apollo as sun

³⁷ For such analysis, see Thomas 2011, 60–61.

(9–12), and then Ilithyia and the promotion of childbirth and marriage, vital to Rome’s on-going future (13–24). On the other hand, that single sentence from 13–24 is what (in the transmitted hymn) first establishes the pattern of 3-stanza grouping, and it may be that 33–36 belong after 21–24:

certus undenos deciens per annos
orbis ut cantus referatque ludos
ter die claro totiensque grata
nocte frequentis.

The hopes for renewed singing, thrice by day, thrice by night, at future *Ludi Saeculares* would lead elegantly back to thoughts of the chorus on this occasion, with Apollo, the light of the bright day, followed by Luna, the two-horned queen of the night-time stars. At this point the hymn opens out to involve in its prayers also the Parcae (25–28), the land of Italy (29–32); and then all the gods of Rome (37–48). Within this sentence two stanzas that present Rome as produced by the action of the *Aeneid* (37–44) are followed by a formal prayer (45–48), which in the phrase *Romulae genti* not for the first time in this hymn³⁸ recalls Catullus 34 (21–24):

sis quocumque tibi placet
sancta nomine, **Romulique**

³⁸ Besides the commentary of Thomas 2011, see Putnam 2006, 118–119: *silvarumque potens* (1) recalls Cat. 34.9–10: *montium domina ut fores | silvarumque virentium* (and *potens Trivia*, 15); the double chorus looks back through Horace’s *Odes*, e.g., 1.21.1–2, to Catullus’ *puellae et pueri integri* (34.2). In verse 40 *sospite* echoes Catullus’ *sospites* (34.24).

Ancique³⁹, ut solita es, bona

sospites ope **gentem**.

Though 37–44 are not especially rich in verbal reminiscence of the *Aeneid*, it is clear that the basic story and themes of the epic are being revisited here, with special evocation of Book 2, where the city burns and the gods⁴⁰ order Aeneas to lead his household away. There are some disorienting changes of vocabulary, Aeneas becoming *castus* instead of *pius*, the Trojans changing their *lares* rather than transporting their *penates* (*A.* 2.293, 3.148), and *sine fraude* placed as if the sack of the city were perpetrated without deceit rather than Aeneas's departure from it. The commentators give little attention to the phrase that ends the stanza, *daturus plura relictis*. For the most part those who have bothered with these words understand them to mean “about to give more [to the Trojans] than they had left behind”, thus following Porphyrio’s commentary (*ad loc.*):

daturus plura relictis

suis scilicet Troianis, quos secum in Italiam adduxit, daturus plura quam quae in patria amissa reliquerant. *relictis* ergo a nominativo plurali venit generis neutri, quod est “relicta”.

Three aspects to the phrase bother me. (i) *relictis* is awkwardly ambiguous: though *plura* may look for an ablative of comparison, *daturus* seeks a dative, and *relictis* would make an apt reference to the remnant of Trojans who accompany Aeneas and are repeatedly called *reliquiae* in Vergil’s poem (e.g., 1.30, 1.598, 3.87, 4.343, 5.787; cf. also 7.244: *munera, reliquias Troia ex ardente receptas* of the gifts Aeneas sends to Latinus). (ii) The simple verb

³⁹ *Ancique* Scaliger: *antique* codd. “In old-fashioned style” is out of place here.

⁴⁰ Venus directly (2.619), Jupiter with his meteorite (687–704), Vesta in the dream of Hector (289–297), Cybele through the mouth of Creusa (776–789).

dare does not suit what Aeneas does for the Trojans: the power and glory they gain as Romans is granted rather by fate or Jupiter (cf. *A.* 1.279: *imperium sine fine dedi*). (iii) But, in fact, *plura* makes for an evocation of multiple possessions, greater wealth than Troy had: cf. the use of the word in *Ode* 3.16 (*quanto quisque sibi plura negaverit, ab dis plura feret*, 21–22; *nec, si plura velim, tu dare deneges*, 38). This would be a surprising assertion in itself, and in particular from the author of *Carm.* 3.3.49–68, where Juno implicitly contrasts the triumphal power of Rome with the wealth of her ancestor.

I therefore suggest that the text was corrupt already when the comment in Porphyrio was composed, and conjecture *iura* for *plura*: Aeneas is the man who will rule the remnants of fallen Troy, as Poseidon has prophesied in saving him from Achilles at Homer, *Iliad* 20.307–308:⁴¹

νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει
καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.

iura dare is used of Augustus at Vergil, *G.* 4.562, and becomes a common expression for governing in the *Aeneid*. Aeneas uses it of himself at 3.137, as he sets up Pergamea on Crete, and elsewhere we find it of Romulus and Remus (1.293), Dido (1.507), Acestes (5.758), Priam (7.246), and Cato amongst the pious dead (8.670). Horace himself has it at *Carm.* 3.3.44, of Rome ruling the Medes.⁴² If we look for a surprise in the phrasing, it comes in the

⁴¹ “But now the might of Aeneas is going to rule the Trojans, and his sons’ sons, who will come hereafter”. The Romanizing variant γένος πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει [“the race of Aeneas is going to rule the world”] is imitated at *A.* 3.97–98.

⁴² Cf. also *Ars Poetica* 396–398: *fuit haec sapientia quondam | ... | concubitu prohibere uago, dare iura maritis*, a passage closely linked to the *Carmen Saeculare*.

use of the future participle for an expression more commonly found in the imperfect indicative.⁴³

(Heyworth)

Bibliography

- Anderson, W. S. (1972), *Ovid's Metamorphoses, Books 6–10*, Norman OK.
- Anderson, W. S. (1981), *Ovidius: Metamorphoses*, 2nd ed., Stuttgart.
- Bömer, Franz (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen Buch I-III*, Heidelberg.
- Bömer, Franz (1977), *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen Buch VIII-IX*, Heidelberg.
- Harrison, S. J. (2017), *Horace: Odes II*, Cambridge.
- Harrison, S. J. / Heyworth, S. J. (1998), “Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Catullus”, in: *PCPhS* 44, 85–109.
- Heinsius, Nicolaus (1758), *Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*, 2 vols, Leipzig.
- Heinze, Richard (1930), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden*, 7th ed., Berlin.
- Heyworth, S. J. (2007), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford.
- Hill, D. E. (1985), *Ovid: Metamorphoses I-IV*, Warminster.
- Hill, D. E. (1999), *Ovid: Metamorphoses IX-XII*, Warminster.
- Kenney, E. J. (1958), “Notes on Ovid”, in: *CQ* 8, 54–66.
- Kenney, E. J. (1996), *Ovid: Heroides XVI–XXI*, Cambridge.
- Kenney, E. J. (2011), *Ovidio: Metamorfofi Libri VII-IX*, Milan.
- Koch, Ludovica (2007), in: Alessandro Barchiesi / Gianpiero Rosati (2007), *Ovidio: Metamorfofi Libri III-IV*, Milan.
- Miller, Frank / Goold, G. P. (1984), *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols, Cambridge MA.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1989), “Footnotes on Horace”, in: *PCPhS* 15, 87–96.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1991), “How Textual Conjectures are Made”, in: *MD* 26, 65–91.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. (1999), “The Word Order of Horace’s *Odes*”, in: *PBA* 93, 135–154.

⁴³ I am grateful to Rebecca Hughes for the stimulating account of the *Carmen Saeculare* and its relationship to the *Aeneid* that provoked this note.

- Nisbet, R. G. M. / Hubbard, Margaret (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. / Hubbard, Margaret (1978), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. / Rudd, Niall (2004), *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*, Oxford.
- Page, T. E. (1909), *Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum libri IV; Epodon liber*, London.
- Putnam, M. C. J. (2006), *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*, Princeton.
- Rivero García, Luis (2018), *Book XIII of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Berlin.
- Tarrant, R. J. (2004), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Oxford.
- Thomas, R. F. (2011), *Horace: Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1982), *Profile of Horace*, London.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (2008), *Horatius: Opera*, 4th ed., Berlin.
- West, David (1998), *Horace: Odes II*, Oxford.
- West, David (2002), *Horace: Odes III*, Oxford.
- Wickham, E. C. (1896), *Quinti Horati Flacii Opera Omnia: Vol. I*, 3rd ed., Oxford.
- Woodman, A. J. (2022), *Horace: Odes III*, Cambridge.