The same, I would like to argue in conclusion, is true when the *scurra* Sarmentus refers to the 'Campanian disease'. He is making a completely trite joke at Campanians that probably belonged to the repertoire of every Roman *scurra*.

Willamette University ORTWIN KNORR
oknorr@willamette.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838812000407

specific humour of *scurrae* see also Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.34–8 and 78–89; K. Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse* (Princeton, 1993), 92–6. On Roman parasites or *scurrae* in general see most recently C. Damon, *The Mask of the Parasite* (Ann Arbor, 1997).

HORACE, *ODES* 3.5.7

Lines 5 to 12 of Horace, *Odes* 3.5 are transmitted, and usually printed, as follows:

> Milesne Crassi coniuge barbara
> turpis maritus uixit et hostium
> – pro curia inuersique mores! –
> consenuit socerorum in armis
> sub rege Medo Marsus et Apulus,
> anciliorum et nominis et togae
> oblitus aeternaeque Vestae
> incolumi Ioue et urbe Roma?

Pro curia inuersique mores troubles. It is difficult to see the relevance of the Roman senate to the matter at issue – survivors of Crassus' defeat who remain in Parthia and their degeneracy – or, in so far as relevance may be found, not to hear an uncharacteristically direct reproach of Horace's betters.[1] In addition, something negative, not positive, is needed to balance *inuersi mores*. A number of commentators (I cannot make out who did so first) have taken *inuersi* to apply, ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, to both nouns.[2] If they be followed we at least have two undesirable things invoked – a senate house and morals both perverted – and so are relieved of one difficulty. But ἀπὸ κοινοῦ should only be brought to bear if *inuersa curia* suits its context, as does for example *mutatam fidem* at *Odes* 1.5.5–6 *heu quotiens fidem mutatosque deos flebit!* As matters stand *inuersa curia* must conjure a building turned upside down or inside out, and that is, in the surrounds of our poem, grotesque.

[1] If the received text is accepted we are bound to the interpretation of ancient scholia, endorsed most recently by Rudd in R. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III* (Oxford, 2004), ad loc.: 'the senate was supposed to represent the honourable traditions of Rome and yet had accepted the behaviour described in vv. 5–12'.

[2] One may take as representative H. Schütz, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus* (Berlin, 1880–3²), '*inversi* ist ἀπὸ κοινοῦ zu fassen' and E.C. Wickham, *The Works of Horace* (Oxford, 1896), 'The force of "inversi" is thrown back upon "curia" after Horace's manner'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000419 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J.J. Cornelissen was the first to set out the problem clearly.[3] He himself conjectured *pro saecula*, which reads well but does not account for the corruption. Only one other conjecture made to date, *pro gloria*,[4] comes at all closer to the paradosis, and I believe we can do better than it, too. Read *pro incuria inuersique mores!* 'Oh the disregard, the perversion of tradition!', with ascending indignation. Though more often said when horses go without fodder or buildings without repair, *incuria* may also designate the sort of negligence committed by the captives of our ode: note for example Cato, *Orat.* fr. 146 Malcovati$^{2-3}$=149 Malcovati^{1} *magna cura cibi, magna uirtutis incuria*; Cic. *Amic.* 86 *quo etiam magis uituperanda est rei maxime necessariae tanta incuria* (by *rei* is meant the cultivation of friendships, held up as a universally recognized duty); [Sall.] *Epist.* 1.1 *ut fabricata sic uirtute parta quam magna industria haberei decet, ne incuria deformentur aut corruant infirmata*. The error to be supposed is an easy one, X and *in*-X being often traditional variants.[5]

Université de Montréal BENJAMIN VICTOR
benjamin.victor@umontreal.ca
doi:10.1017/S0009838812000419

[3] 'Lectiones Venusinae', *Mnemosyne* NS 16 (1888), 293–315, at 305–6.
[4] W.S. Watt, 'Horatiana', *Latomus* 54 (1995), 608–12, at 608–9.
[5] e.g. at Ter. *Eun.* 298 (*fortunatum* and *infortunatum* are both attested); Jer. *Ep.* 40.1.1 (*clementi* and *inclementi* are transmitted); ibid. 119.1.2 (likewise *inconfecta* and *confecta*).

SNOWMELT IN THE ALPS: CORINNA'S TEARS AT OVID, *AMORES* 1.7.58*

In *Amores* 1.7, Ovid has beaten Corinna and now bitterly regrets his atrocity. The elegy's pathos reaches its peak in lines 51–8 where Corinna's reaction is described in a series of no fewer than five nature similes: she first stands pale and out of her senses (simile 1, lines 51–2), then begins to tremble (similes 2–4, lines 53–6) and finally bursts into tears (simile 5, lines 57–8):

> astitit illa amens albo et sine sanguine uultu,
> caeduntur Pariis qualia saxa iugis;
> exanimes artus et membra trementia uidi,
> ut cum populeas uentilat aura comas,
> ut leni Zephyro gracilis uibratur harundo,
> summaue cum tepido stringitur unda Noto;
> suspensaeque diu lacrimae fluxere per ora,
> qualiter abiecta de niue manat aqua.[1]

* We should like to thank the anonymous reader for a number of helpful criticisms and suggestions.
[1] The text follows J.C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes* (Liverpool, 1987, 1989, 1998 and 2005), vol. 1. The passage is carefully analysed by B.W. Boyd, *Ovid's Literary Loves. Influence and Innovation in the* Amores (Ann Arbor, 1997), 124–30. The last couplet as a whole has close parallels elsewhere in Ovid: cf. *Tr.* 3.3.19–20

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000419 Published online by Cambridge University Press