LUCRETIUS, *DRN* 4.990

> Quippe uidebis equos fortis, cum membra quiescunt,
> in somnis sudare tamen spirareque semper
> et quasi de palma summas contendere uiris
> aut quasi carceribus patefactis saepe quiete. 990

So OQ. The chapter of accidents by which *saepe quiete* displaced what originally stood at the end of line 990 (helpfully set out by David Butterfield in his 'Supplementa Lucretiana', *Arctos* 42 [2008], 17–30 at 28 n. 37) need not detain us here. This note is solely concerned with those missing words or, as I shall suggest, word.

Of the 27 previous attempts to fill the gap, conveniently assembled by Butterfield (op. cit. 28 n. 38) all seem to me to be vitiated by their failure to provide what ought to be the climactic touch to Lucretius' graphic description, the force of whatever verb is supplied being fatally weakened by what is often little more than complementary padding. This defect, it seems to me, is shared by Butterfield's *proruere acres* (op. cit. 29), in which the strong and in itself effective and appropriate *proruere* is robbed of much of its force by the adverbial adjective *acres* usurping the commanding position of the last word in the verse.

I suggest that Lucretius wrote *praecipitare* or *praecipitari*. This word, which occurs six times in the *DRN* (1.251, 2.248, 4.628, 4.1021, 6.292, 6.1040), thrice at the end of the verse, is *uox propria* of headlong motion: compare also 3.1063, where Lucretius' spendid adverbial coinage vividly conveys the abrupt departure hell-for-leather of the rich man, suddenly bored by his town house, to the country: *currit agens mannos ad uillam praecipitanter*. As between *praecipitari* and *praecipitare*, though the transitive use 'drive headlong' (*OLD* 6a) is somewhat more common than the intransitive 'rush headlong' (*OLD* 7), *DRN* 6.1040, describing the action of an iron ring attracted by a magnet, *scilicet ille eodem ferri quo praecipitauit*, perhaps supports *praecipitare*. Sense cannot decide: both readings, I would suggest, are at least worthy of a '*fort. recte*'.

Peterhouse, Cambridge E.J. KENNEY

doi:10.1017/S0009838810000261

HORACE, *ODES* 3.7.21: SCOPVLIS SVRDIOR ICARI

Gyges, a daring Roman merchant, must spend his winter in a harbour in Epirus. Back in Rome his girlfriend Asterie is worried about his fidelity. Yet, the poet/omniscient narrator assures Asterie, Gyges' *constantia* and *fides* are firm. Love messages are sent by the lady of his host's house, but

> frustra: nam scopulis surdior Icari
> voces audit adhuc integer … (*C.* 3.7.21–2)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is well known that rocks and trees are used proverbially both in Greek and Latin to describe not only a hard-hearted, but also a resolute person (Virgil compares Aeneas, unshaken by the desperate pleas of Dido, to an oak tree, *Aen*. 4.438–49).[1] But why does Horace compare Gyges to the rocks of Icarus in particular?

In their note on *C*. 3.7.21 Nisbet and Rudd, in line with Kiessling and Heinze,[2] comment that the individual name of Icarus adds vividness to the image; it also 'suits the context of the eastern Aegean implied in Gyges' voyage'.[3] The Icarian Sea is mentioned in connection with trade at *C*. 1.1.15, and Nisbet and Hubbard observe ad loc. that the association of this sea with strong winds has Homeric provenance (Hom. *Il*. 2.145).[4]

But the geographic significance of the Icarian Sea certainly cannot be pressed very far. As Harrison pointed out: 'he [*sc*. Gyges] is at Oricus in Illyria on the Greek side of the Adriatic, and the island of Icarus or Icaria is in the south-eastern part of the Aegean (the Icarian Sea).'[5] Although this is a valid point, Harrison's own interpretation of *Icari* as an allusion to the name of Penelope's father, Icar(i)us (meant to extend the network of Odyssean reminiscences in the poem), is not very convincing.

While the observation about the effect of vividness achieved by the use of a proper noun in this phrase is certainly correct, the vividness of the phrase, it seems to me, is not achieved through geographic association, but rather through a latent image of Icarus crying for help while drowning near the rocks of the island. Calling upon someone for help while dying at sea was a poetic commonplace. The explanations of the phrase offered by Horace's ancient commentators clearly indicate this. Ps.-Acro says: *metaphora a naufragantibus, quod ita amantis non audiret preces, quemadmodum si a periclitantibus rogentur scopuli* (adducing Verg. *Aen*. 4.438). Porphyrio gives a similar explanation: *surdi autem scopuli periclitantibus dici solent, quod quasi preces eorum non exaudiant*. One instance of the commonplace can be found in Horace's *Epodes* (17.53–5):

> Quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?
> non saxa nudis surdiora nauitis
> Neptunus alto tundit hibernus salo.

Compare Virgil at *Aen*. 4.382–4, where Dido voices her hope for Aeneas' utter destruction:

> spero equidem mediis, si quid pia numina possunt,
> supplicia hausurum scopulis et nomine Dido
> saepe uocaturum.

[1] See A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), s.vv. *saxum*, *scopulus*, *silex*; A.S. Pease *ad* Verg. *Aen*. 4.366 in *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus* (Cambridge, MA, 1935); D.L. Page, *Euripides, Medea* (Oxford, 1938) *ad* 28–9.

[2] A. Kiessling and R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, erklärt von Adolf Kiessling. Erster Teil: Oden und Epoden.* 7th ed. (Berlin, 1930).

[3] R.G.M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 3* (Oxford and New York, 2004) ad loc.

[4] R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1* (Oxford, 1970).

[5] S.J. Harrison, 'Horace, *Odes* 3.7. An erotic *Odyssey*?', *CQ* 38 (1988), 186–92, at 190.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press

About three decades after the publication of *Odes* 1–3, Ovid will describe the end of Icarus using the same commonplace (*Met.* 8.229–30):

> oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen
> excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo.

Not only is Gyges deafer than a rock, says Horace, he is deafer than the rocks that withstood the cries of dying Icarus. It is possible that the image of Icarus crying for help comes from the poetic accounts of his death by Ovid's lost Hellenistic sources, Philostephanus or Callimachus.[6]

University of Cincinnati DANIEL MARKOVIĆ
daniel.markovic@uc.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838810000285

[6] Scholia on Hom. *Il.* 2.145 (1 p. 84 Dindorf; Van Thiel at <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/klassphil/vanthiel/index.html>) give a brief outline of the story of Icarus' flight and refer to Philostephanus and Callimachus' *Aetia* as the main sources (*ἱστορεῖ Φιλοστέφανος καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν Αἰτίοις*). Incidentally, an extant fragment of the *Aetia* (23 Pfeiffer) mentions the Icarian Sea in the context of not hearing one's words: 'just as a Sellus in the mountain of Tmarus hears the sound of the Icarian Sea … you (*sc.* Heracles) did not care at all …' (… *σὺ δ'ὡς ἁλὸς ἦχον ἀκούει | Σ]ελλὸς ἐνὶ Τμαρίοις οὔρεσιν Ἰκαρίης, | … οὐδὲν [ὀπι]ζόμ[εν]ος …*).

IN THE DARKNESS OF HELL: OVID *HEROIDES* 16.211–12

Paris, at *Heroides* 16.207–12, plays up for Helen his supposedly unimpeachable pedigree: his father is no Atreus, his grandfather no Pelops, nor has any ancestor of his merited the dismal fate of a Tantalus. At 211–12, Kenney,[1] with virtually all other editors,[2] prints *nec proauo Stygia nostro captantur in unda | poma nec in mediis quaeritur umor aquis*, and offers the following remarks in his commentary:

> [**211**] **in unda**: he [*sc.* Tantalus] stood in a pool of water which sank whenever he tried to drink, under a tree which bent away whenever he tried to eat its fruits.
>
> **212 in mediis ... aquis** virtually reduplicates *in unda*, which indeed is redundant; if the text is sound this is not O[vid] at his best. Contrast *Am.* 2.2.43–4 *quaerit aquas in aquis et poma fugacia captat | Tantalus*, 3.7.51–2, *A.A.* 2.605–6.

[1] E.J. Kenney (ed.), *Ovid: Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge, 1996).

[2] The editions/commentaries of N. Heinsius, Riese, Sedlmayer, Palmer, Bornecque, Ehwald, Giomini, Dörrie, Kenney and Michalopoulos were consulted. All read *in unda*, only Kenney remarked upon it as a possible problem, and only Giomini offered any alternative manuscript readings in his apparatus (viz. 'in undas A [i.e. Antuerpiensis Plant. 68, *saec. XII*] ab unda *Bodl.* [i.e. Bodl. Can. lat. 1]', neither of which constitutes much of a variant). The case I am querying here is therefore a problem of sense rather than of the manuscript tradition, which on this point seems all but unanimous.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838810000285 Published online by Cambridge University Press