it does from snowmelt in the mountains. This is emphasized by Ovid's Homeric model (τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες) as well as by Ovid himself in at least two other passages: At *Amores* 3.6.5–8 he rebukes a small rivulet that has turned into an insurmountable obstacle for that very reason, and at *Metamorphoses* 8.556–7 he describes how dangerous Achelous can be at such occasions: *multa quoque hic torrens niuibus de monte solutis | corpora turbineo iuuenalia uertice mersit.*[17]

University of Innsbruck

MARTIN KORENJAK
martin.korenjak@uibk.ac.at
FLORIAN SCHAFFENRATH
florian.schaffenrath@uibk.ac.at
doi:10.1017/S0009838812000420

tears: cf. e.g. *Her.* 10.31–46 (Ariadne on Naxos); *Tr.* 1.3.7–17 (Ovid departing for Tomi). That we should imagine profuse weeping in all such cases seems a probable inference from *Met.* 4.133–44 (Thisbe finds Pyramus dying) where we are explicitly told so: … *exhorruit aequoris instar, | quod tremit, exigua cum summum stringitur aura.* | … | *uulnera suppleuit lacrimis fletumque cruori | miscuit* …

[17] Moreover, only a few lines before the passage under discussion here, at *Am.* 1.7.43, Ovid is dragged along by his wrath *tumidi ritu torrentis*. Again, there are possible Homeric models, namely *Il.* 5.87–92, 11.492–5 (cf. McKeown [n. 1], 2.186) and 16.384–92. The last two of them specify that the torrent comes from the mountains, but it is not snowmelt, but rain that swells it. Closer parallels in other writers are provided, e.g. by Caes. *BCiv.* 1.48.2, Luc. 1.213–19, 4.83–7.

A TEXTUAL NOTE ON PLIN. *PAN.* 49.2*

1 Ille tamen, quibus sibi parietibus et muris salutem suam tueri uidebatur, dolum secum et insidias et ultorem scelerum deum inclusit. dimouit perfregitque custodias Poena, angustosque per aditus et obstructos non secus ac per apertas fores et inuitantia limina irrupit: longe tunc illi diuinitas sua, longe arcana illa cubilia saeuique secessus, in quos timore et superbia et odio hominum agebatur. 2 quanto nunc tutior, quanto securior eadem domus, postquam †eius† non crudelitatis sed amoris excubiis, non solitudine et claustris, sed ciuium celebritate defenditur! (Plin. *Pan.* 49.1–2)

2 eius *codd.*: erus *Lipsius*: eius <aditus> *Liuineius*: *malim e.g.* eius <custos>

Pliny speaks of how much safer the imperial house is now that Trajan is its occupant rather than Domitian. The text at 49.2 as transmitted is plainly corrupt, and all modern editions have adopted Lipsius's tentative *erus*.[1] Nevertheless, this

* My best thanks are due to Kathleen Coleman, Bruce Gibson, and the anonymous reader for their helpful suggestions.

[1] The OCT, Budé, various iterations of Teubners and, most recently, the edition of D. Lassandro (Turin, 1992). Ever since Emil Baehrens claimed *erus* for himself in his 1874 Teubner, there has been some confusion over the attribution of the emendation. It is certainly to be credited

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emendation, palaeographically attractive though it may be, cannot be right. It suffers from two fatal flaws. First, *erus* is the *uox propria* of masters being addressed or referred to by their slaves (*TLL* 5.2.848.74–849.49 [Friedrich]), but hardly exists outside this context. It would be supremely inappropriate for Pliny to use *erus* to refer to Trajan, who refused the title *dominus* and was earlier in the speech praised for that very reason (*Pan*. 2.3). Furthermore, the word *erus* seems to have died out in Classical Latin, its functions eventually being assumed by the broader *dominus*. This is clear both from its lack of descendants in the Romance languages (compare the abundant progeny of *dominus*) and from its pattern of Latin attestation (see *TLL* 5.2.848.61–2). Eleanor Dickey has concluded that the word as a form of address probably 'went out of use sometime after Horace',[2] and although it does make sporadic reappearances later,[3] some of these may only serve to heighten our suspicions here. For example, Statius at *Silvae* 5.1.122 uses the adjective *erilis* of Domitian, the self-styled *dominus et deus* (Suet. *Dom*. 13.2) – almost *ipso facto* evidence that the word is unsuited to a flattering description of Trajan. *Erus* is, in sum, singularly unfortunate in the present context. A word inappropriate in connotation and inappropriate to its time period should not be restored by conjectural emendation, no matter how closely it may conform to the *ductus litterarum*.

We must try a different tack. Let us suppose instead that a word has dropped out after *eius*, a corruption just as palaeographically straightforward and one quite common in the archetype of the *Panegyricus*.[4] In this case we are reduced to diagnostic conjecture, but nevertheless we would like our guess to be possibly right rather than certainly wrong. Livineius's *eius <aditus>* is unsuitable for a different reason; namely, as the proposers of *erus* saw, we must be talking about the emperor, not his house. The preceding sentences guarantee this point, where we read how Domitian's elaborate defences availed him not a jot against his eventual assassination. We want therefore to contrast how Domitian was formerly defended with how Trajan is protected today, and so we need a word that refers to the emperor. *Exempli gratia*, I might propose *eius <custos>*, a word which both picks up on the first half of the sentence (being precisely what makes a home *tutior* and *securior*) and provides the appropriate subject (Trajan himself) for its second half. Although Pliny does not elsewhere use *custos* in reference to Trajan,[5] other authors commonly use the word to refer to political officials and emperors (see *TLL* 4.1576.3–70 [Mertel]). *Custos* would also stand in stark contrast to Domitian's earlier tyranny; compare, for example, Cic. *Q. fr*. 1.1.9: *esse,*

to Lipsius, although he did not actually adopt the proposal into his own text: 'legendum *post-quam ea*: aut vocula deest, *dominus ejus*, talisve: an placet, *herus* legi?' (Quoted from *Caji Plinii Caecilii Secundi Panegyricus cum notis integris Francisci Jureti, Joannis Liveneji, Justi Lipsii … curante Joanne Arntzenio, qui & suas adnotationes adjecit* [Amsterdam, 1738], ad loc.)

[2] E. Dickey, *Latin Forms of Address* (Oxford, 2002), 80.

[3] See e.g. *TLL* 5.2.849.29–30.

[4] A glance through Mynors' OCT up to the present passage reveals instances in 5.2, 11.4, 13.1, 13.4, 14.2, 20.6, 23.1, 23.4, 24.2, 30.4, 34.2, 36.1, 37.1 (*bis*), 40.3, 41.2, 43.4 and 45.3. The second half of the speech is no different.

[5] *Custos* is found in Pliny at *Pan*. 94.1 (in reference to the gods) and at *Ep*. 3.3.4 (of someone to act as guardian of a beautiful boy's morals), 7.21.3 (of one of Pliny's personal physicians), 8.6.7 (in quotation, of a custodian of public funds) and 9.37.3 (of guards to watch over farm produce).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quocumque ueneris, et publice et priuatim maximam laetitiam, cum urbs custodem, non tyrannum*, domus hospitem, non expilatorem recepisse uideatur?*[6] There would finally be a pointed paradox, a favourite Plinian figure in the *Panegyricus*,[7] with the *custos* himself being protected in the rest of the sentence. While this proposal must of necessity remain uncertain, it is clear that *erus* should be removed from our printed texts.

Harvard University TOM KEELINE
tkeeline@fas.harvard.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838812000432

[6] Cf. further e.g. Cic. *Phil*. 3.27 *custosne urbis an direptor et uexator esset Antonius?*

[7] Cf. e.g. *Pan*. 18.2, 21.3, 24.4, 55.3 and 71.4. See too F. Gamberini, *Stylistic Theory and Practice in the Younger Pliny* (Hildesheim, 1983), 394, 443, and on the figure as applied specifically to Trajan in the *Panegyricus*, R. Rees, 'To be and not to be: Pliny's paradoxical Trajan', *BICS* 45 (2001), 149–68.

JUVENAL ON THE POETS

> securus licet Aenean Rutulumque ferocem
> committas, nulli gravis est percussus Achilles
> aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus. (Juvenal 1. 162–4)

In what Alan Cameron has well described as 'a penetrating series of notes on the text of Juvenal' R.G.M. Nisbet proposed 'excussus' for 'percussus'.[1] Nisbet agreed that 'The fatal wounding of Achilles seems an appropriate epic theme, and *percutere* an appropriate verb', but objected that 'there is nothing humorous about *percussus Achilles*', whereas Aeneas and Hylas are treated in derisive or frivolous terms. 'Excussus' ('exposed', literally 'shaken out') would refer to the exposure of Achilles when he was disguised as a girl on the island of Scyros. Cameron now offers support for the emendation. But 'percussus' is right, and indeed necessary to Juvenal's meaning. It is worth examining why this is so, for the insight it gives into his style and quality, and also into his humour: for there is indeed a joke in the second of these lines, and it is a good one, taut and elegant.

Cameron has in fact misunderstood the passage. He translates it, in its unemended form, thus: 'Without much effort you can pit Aeneas against the fierce Rutulian, nor is there any problem in killing Achilles, or Hylas, much in demand,

[1] A. Cameron, 'Young Achilles in the Roman world', *JRS* 99 (2009), 1–22 (all references here are to the first page of the article); R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Juvenal', *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford, 1995), 227–60, reprinted from *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall, *BICS* suppl. 51 (1988) (all references here to p. 231 in *Collected Papers*, pp. 88–9 in the original publication). Nisbet returns to the passage in 'How textual conjectures are made', *MD* 26 (1991), 65–91, at 72 (*Collected Papers*, 338–61, at 344): 'The first thing to do was to localise the corruption: it obviously lay in *percussus*.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press