

# More glosses in Horace?

Autor(en): **Allen, Archibald**

Objektyp: **Article**

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

Band (Jahr): **66 (2009)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **25.09.2024**

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

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

1.4.5  
*iam Cytherea chorus 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 Frühlingsepiphany 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 (11<sup>th</sup> ed. Berlin 1964), and to R.G.M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II* (Oxford 1978).

*iam Cytherea chorus 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 relicto*

*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 4<sup>th</sup> 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