

Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 66 (2009)

Heft: 2

Artikel: More glosses in Horace?

Autor: Allen, Archibald

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-98984>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 17.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

More Glosses in Horace?

By Archibald Allen, New York

These notes have to do with three passages in the *Odes* which have raised – or, in one case, perhaps ought to have raised – questions about our received text. In asking if old, intrusive glosses might be involved in those questions, I am recalling, of course, the article ‘Glossen im Horaztext?’ which the late Josef Delz published in *MH* 30 (1973) 51–54. Let me hope that he would find these notes of some interest.¹

1.4.5
iam Cytherea choros ducit Venus imminente luna, 5
iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
alterno terram quatiant pede ...

The combination of *Cytherea* and *Venus* is unique. Elsewhere, Horace has *Cytherea* alone (*Odes* 3.12.14, *Cythereae puer ales*), as do other poets, e.g. Ovid (*Am.* 1.3.4; *AA* 2.15, 607; *Met.* 10.717; 14.487; 15.803), Tibullus (3.13.3), Propertius (2.14.24), Virgil (*Aen.* 1.257, 657; 4.128; 5.800; 8.523, 615). May we not well ask if our text is to be trusted?

Bentley was clearly bothered by this ‘Cytherean Venus’, but he noted that the manuscripts’ unanimous reading gets further support from the third century (?) grammarian Marius Plotius Sacerdos who quotes *iam Cytherea...Venus* (albeit with *verius* for *Venus*) to illustrate a *logaoedicum archebulium* metre (H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini* VI [Hildesheim/New York 1981] 544); ruling out emendation, therefore, he defended the text with a somewhat lame appeal to Virgil’s combination, *Phoebus Apollo* (*Aen.* 3.251). Two centuries later, Kiessling-Heinze suggested that *Cytherea* here may be a ‘geographisches Attribut’, like *Delius* and *Patareus*, used of Apollo at *Odes* 3.4.64 (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.345, *Gryneus Apollo*), so that Horace will be describing ‘die Frühlingsepiphanie der Venus auf ihrer Lieblingsinsel’. But Venus’ exuberant spring-time epiphany is surely not to be limited to the island of Cythera.

Where even Bentley refrained from emending, one can make only the most tentative of guesses, pleading error in the earliest transmission of the text. *Venus*, we might imagine, was a supralinear gloss on *Cytherea* which displaced an adverbial adjective:

1 I shall refer to the editions of Richard Bentley (Cambridge 1711) and A. Kiessling & R. Heinze (11th ed. Berlin 1964), and to R.G.M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II* (Oxford 1978).

iam Cytherea choros ducit leuis, imminente luna

«... now the Cytherean *lightly* leads ...» For predicative *leuis* we may compare e.g. *Epodes* 16.48 (*leuis ... lympa desilit*), *Sat.* 2.6.98 (*domo leuis exsilit*), and Virg. *Aen.* 5.838 (*cum leuis aetheriis delapsus Somnus ab astris*); the simple adjective occurs in similar context at *Odes* 1.1.31 (*nympharumque leues cum satyris chori*).

1.10.15

quin et Atridas duce te superbos

Ilio dives Priamus relictio

Thessalosque ignis et iniqua Troiae

castra fefellit

15

What are we to make of the repetitive *variatio* in *Ilio ...|... Troiae*? Is it elegant, or are we to be suspicious of the text? D.R. Shackleton Bailey (*HSCP* 89 [1985] 154) recalled A.Y. Campbell's proposed emendation of *Troiae* to *tranans* and hesitantly offered his own adverbial *circa*, as a reading at least worthy of a «college exercise». With similar hesitation and intent, I would suggest that *Troiae* may be a gloss on an original *regno*:

Thessalosque ignis et iniqua regno | castra

«... hostile to his royal domain». A parallel may be found at 1.15.8, *regnum Priami vetus*, where again *regnum* probably means *regum sedes*, as it evidently does at Prop. 4.1.10, *unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus* (P. Fedeli, *Sexti Properti Elegiarum libri IV* [ed. corr., Stuttgartiae & Lipsiae 1994] Index. Verb., s.v. *regnum*).

2.18.34

aequa tellus

pauperi recluditur

regumque pueris, nec satelles Orci

34

Line 34 contains the poem's sole resolution, at 4th position (-*pue*-). If this seeming anomaly is not worrisome, nothing more needs to be said. On the other hand, we might ask if Horace – master of metrics – had not intended his twenty iambic trimeters catalectic in 2.18 to be wholly free of resolution. Nisbet-Hubbard compare the resolution at *Epodes* 2.61, *has inter epulas*, yet there are two other identical resolutions in that poem, at 35, *pavidumque leporem*, and 57, *aut herba lapathi*, so that the comparison is hardly valid.

The resolution may be removed if we suppose that Horace wrote, not *regumque pueris*, but *regumque proli*, «the earth opens impartially for the poor man and for kings' offspring». The manuscripts' *pueris* will then have been a gloss on *proli*, intended to emphasise (as a glossing *filiis* might not) the mas-

culinity of the plural offspring denoted by feminine singular *proles*. For *proles* elsewhere in the *Odes*, see e.g. 3.6.37–38, *mascula militum* | *proles*, and 4.6.1, *proles Niobeae*.

Correspondence:

Archibald Allen

280 Riverside Drive

New York

NY 10025, USA

archibaldallen@msn.com