Horace, Pindar and the Censorini in *Odes* 4.8*

DAVID KOVACS

Donarem pateras grataque commodus,
Censorine, meis aera sodalibus,
donarem tripodas, praemia fortium
Graiorum; neque tu pessima munerum

ferres, diuite me scilicet artium
quas aut Parrhasius protulit aut Scopas,
hic saxo, liquidis ille coloribus
sollers nunc hominem ponere, nunc deum.

sed non haec mihi uis, nec tibi talium
res est aut animus deliciarum egens.
gaudes carminibus: carmina possumus
donare et pretium dicere muneri.

non incisa notis marmora publicis,
per quae spiritus et uita redit bonis
post mortem ducibus, non celeres fugae
reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae,

non incendia Karthaginis impiae
eius qui domita nomen ab Africa
lucratus rediit clarius indicant
laudes quam Calabrae Pierides, neque

si chartae sileant quod bene feceris
mercedem tuleris: quid foret Iliae
Mauortisque puer si taciturnitas
obstaret meritis inuida Romuli?

ereptum Stygiis fluctibus Aeacum
uirtus et fauor et lingua potentium
uatum diuitibus consecrat insulis:
dignum laude uirum Musa uetat mori.

caelo Musa beat: sic Iouis interest
optatis epulis impiger Hercules.
clarum Tyndaridae sidus ab infimis
quassas eripiunt aequoribus ratis.

<

>

ornatus uiridi tempora pampino
Liber uota bonos duxit ad exitus.

* I would like to thank James Diggle, Richard Thomas, Tony Woodman, and *JRS*'s two anonymous readers for comments and bibliographical help.

JRS 99 (2009), pp. 23–35. © *World Copyright Reserved*.
Exclusive Licence to Publish: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies 2009

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

14–17 *del. Peerlkamp* 15 celeres fugae Ψ (*accedente* Q): celeris fuga Ƶ (*accedente* λ'): *unde* celeris fugae *Madvig deletis 16–17* | celebres *Harrison* 15–20 *del. Verrall, signo interrogationis post* tuleris 22 *posito* 15 non — 19 rediit *del. Lachmann* 16–17 *post utrumque horum uersuum lacunas singulorum uersuum ind. Campbell* 17 *del. Bentley* | *post h. u. lac. duorum uersuum ind. Meineke* 28 *del. Lachmann* 29–34 *del. Hübner* 33 *ante h. u. lac. duorum uel sex uersuum indicaui* | *uersum del. Lachmann* 34 duxit Ƶ (*accedente* λ'): ducit Ψ γ σχ ΑΓ

I INTRODUCTION

The last major treatment of this poem was S. J. Harrison's 1990 *JRS* article.[1] He addresses three principal uncertainties that, as he remarks, bedevil the criticism of *Odes* 4.8: (a) its having thirty-four lines, making it the only one of Horace's odes whose line-count is not evenly divisible by four, *prima facie* evidence of interpolation; (b) doubt about the identity of the addressee; (c) and the generally low esteem in which the poem has been held. He deals summarily with (a) by athetizing 17 and 33 as proposed respectively by Bentley and Lachmann. One of the purposes of the present article is to revisit this question: in my view none of the proposals for deletion, whether of two, six, ten or fourteen lines, escapes the charge of arbitrariness, and I argue for the constitution of the text printed above.[2] On (b) Harrison has made a strong case for the younger of the two possible addressees, C. Marcius Censorinus. That is in all likelihood correct, but I will argue that the elder Censorinus may play a role in the poem as well. As regards (c), Harrison's analysis does indeed show the poem to be 'a well-conceived, well-finished and allusive piece, relevant to its addressee and cohering well both with the following ode to Lollius and with the purposes of Book 4 as a whole'. But there are questions his analysis does not address. In particular 25–34 make an extraordinary claim that sets them off not only from the preceding lines but indeed from all previous poetry, Greek or Latin, in the laudatory genres — the claim that the poet not only ensures for his subjects that they will be spoken of by those born after them but also alters their status in the afterlife, that the poet unaided can confer on them immortality (e.g. residence in the Blessed Isles) or even godhead. It is hard to know quite how to react to this claim: is it a cynical and outrageous exaggeration of the poet's usual claim, so absurd that it is its own refutation, a tacit admission that immortality is only a poetic fiction? It is hard to avoid this conclusion but hard also to see why Horace should write in a way that devalues the gift he is conferring in this poem and the next. Could it be intended seriously in some fashion or other?

II TEXTUAL ISSUES

Odes 4.8 is the only poem in the entire corpus of the *Odes* whose line-count is not a multiple of four. Obviously poems written in four-line stanzas will observe the rule called the Lex Meinekiana. But the same rule is observed also by poems written κατὰ στίχον, the first asclepiadean (1.1 and 3.30), the fifth or greater asclepiadean (1.11, 1.17, 4.10), and the Ionic decameter (3.12). Poems that are written κατὰ δίστιχον (1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.13, 1.19,

[1] S. J. Harrison, 'The praise singer: Horace, Censorinus and *Odes* 4.8', *JRS* 80 (1990), 31–43. References to Harrison plus page number throughout are to this article. I also refer by author's name to the following editions: R. Bentley, *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (3rd edn, 1728); A. Meineke, *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (1834); J. K. Orelli, *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Opera* (1837); A. Kiessling, *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden* (6th edn rev. by R. Heinze, 1917); F. Villeneuve, *Horace I* (1927); A. Y. Campbell, *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina cum Epodis* (1945); F. Klingner, *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (1970); K. Quinn, *Horace, the Odes* (1980); S. Borzsák, *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (1984); D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Horatius: Opera* (1985); R. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *The Odes of Horace: Book Three* (2004); N. Rudd, *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (2004); C. Sydenham, *Horace: the Odes* (2005).

[2] The apparatus is adapted from that of Klingner.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.28, 1.36, 2.18, 3.9, 3.15, 3.19, 3.24, 3.25, 3.28, 4.1, 4.3, 4.7) also observe it. That these twenty-four poems all have line-counts divisible by four did not happen by chance but because Horace has clearly adopted it as a rule. That rule is violated in 4.8.

The majority of editors who do anything about this infraction assume that it is the result of interpolation.[3] Armed with the supposed knowledge that two or 2 + 4n lines in the poem are interpolated, they proceed to search out two or 2 + 4n lines to excise. But, as I show below, such efforts labour under two difficulties: (a) the evidence against the lines in question is often weak or of such a nature that it would also condemn other lines in Horace whose genuineness no one doubts; and (b) those who diagnose interpolation are for the most part unable to show any plausible motive for it. The latter point is especially striking because the interpolator's hand, according to most modern editors, is to be seen nowhere else in the *Odes*.[4] I propose here to discuss first the deletion of 17 and 33, the most popular of the 'remover of two' positions and the one adopted by Harrison. Then I will examine the removal of six lines (14b–19a, 28, 33) proposed by Lachmann and adopted by Klingner and Shackleton Bailey. I relegate other proposals for deleting two or six lines (as well as proposals for deleting ten and fourteen) to Appendix I. Then I will argue that we should satisfy the Lex Meinekiana by marking a lacuna of two or six verses before the final couplet, a point where the argument calls for something the transmitted text fails to supply.

I begin with the deletion of 17 and 33. Two objections are urged against 17. (1) It confounds the younger Scipio Africanus, who burnt Carthage, with the elder Africanus, who defeated Hannibal. The passage says that neither public monuments nor the defeat of Hannibal *nor the burning of Carthage* proclaim more clearly than the Calabrian Muses (i.e. Ennius) the merits of the man who won his *cognomen* from the conquest of Africa, i.e. Africanus Major. This is a remarkable conflation between the older and younger generation of the same family and it implies that Ennius described the destruction of Carthage, which occurred nearly twenty years after he died. But it might simply be said, as it is by Putnam, that Horace 'magnifies the heroism of Scipio by imputing to him the burning of Carthage'.[5] It is also not the only time when a respectable author makes this confusion: O. Keller points out that Polyaenus 8.16 and Lucian 77.12.7 identify the conqueror of Hannibal with the destroyer of Carthage.[6] More pertinently — since he deals with Roman authors, not Greek — Francis Cairns notes that there are many passages in Latin literature that seem to conflate members of the same family — *Odes* 1.12.33–48 conflates the two Tarquin kings, for example, and Propertius 3.3.8 seems to imply that Ennius described the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus over Perseus, an event Ennius never lived to see, and conflates him with other members of the same family who did appear in his work. This tendency was surely abetted by the Roman feeling for family solidarity.[7] In light of these examples the objection to 17 loses much of its force.

[3] It is worth noting that Meineke himself originally thought that verses had perished: he wished to insert these after 17 and was followed by Orelli. (Meineke's 1854 edition adopts the Lachmann deletion of six lines.) Campbell marks two lacunae of one verse each after 16 and after 17, a suggestion repeated in his 1953 edition. Some, such as Villeneuve and Putnam (M. C. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (1986), 150), simply acquiesce in the transmitted line total.

[4] Klingner deletes 3.11.17–20 but nothing else. Borszák, Shackleton Bailey, Rudd, and Nisbet and Rudd obelize or emend rather than deleting. No other passage in the entire corpus has seemed to recent editors a plausible candidate for excision. Nor is this surprising: hexameters and elegiacs are within the capabilities of a large number of people who might have influenced the textual tradition, but lyric is a rather specialized skill, as Horace himself insisted.

[5] Putnam, op. cit. (n. 3), 150, n. 6. At 151 n. 8, Putnam cites evidence that the statues of both the elder and the younger Africanus were prominently on display, together with that of Ennius, outside the Porta Capena. The linking of these three together would thus be perfectly intelligible.

[6] O. Keller, *Kritische Beiträge zum IV. Buche der horazischen Oden* (1878), 23.

[7] F. Cairns, 'Propertius the historian (3.3.1–12)?', in D. Levene and D. P. Nelis (eds), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography* (2002), 25–44. On *Epodes* 9.23–6, another passage that seems to show such a conflation, see now E. Courtney, 'Four Horatian emendations', *MD* 56 (2006), 177–9, here 178–9.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But — even closer to home — the conflation of the two Scipiones Africani is matched by an equally remarkable conflation of generations in this very same poem. For Aeacus is described in 27, and there alone, as inhabiting the Isles of the Blest. Elsewhere (Pl., *Apol.* 41a; *Gorg.* 524a; Isoc. 9.14; Ar., *Frogs* 464 in some mss.; *Odes* 2.13.22) he is judge of the dead in the Underworld (judge also of disputes among the gods in Pind., *Isthm.* 8.24–5; Isoc. 8.24), and it is his son Peleus (Pind., *Ol.* 2.78) or his grandson Achilles (Eur., *Andr.* 1253–62) who lives in the Blessed Isles. We seem to see a pattern: just as Horace confers on Aeacus the reward belonging to his son Peleus, and by implication on Peleus, known principally as a model of chastity and sometime husband of Thetis, some of the reverence owed to his father, the august judge of the dead, so he confers upon the older Africanus the glory of destroying Carthage that belonged to the younger and on the younger the honour of acquiring for the family its *cognomen* and gaining glory in the pages of Ennius' poetry. The one undisputed instance of generational conflation suggests caution in deleting the other. It must be noted that no attempt is made by Bentley or anyone else to explain why someone would have wished to interpolate the offending line. I discuss below a possible reason for what appears to be a deliberate literary strategy of generational conflation in connection with my *exempli gratia* supplement.

(2) The caesura after the first choriamb of 17 is bridged by the word 'Karthaginis'. Several editors and commentators say or imply that there are no parallels in Horace for this bridging.[8] In fact there are two. Neither, as it happens, occurs in either of the two other poems (1.1 and 3.30) written in pure lesser asclepiadeans, but 2.12.25 'cum flagrantia de|torquet ad oscula', is a lesser asclepiadean just like 17. A similar bridging of an otherwise observed caesura occurs at 1.18.16, 'arcanique fides prodiga per|lucidior uitro', a greater asclepiadean. Bentley, who was the first to excise 17, mentions these exceptions but tries to undermine their force by saying that the offending *de-* and *per-* are really separate words. I know of no evidence that prepositional prefixes, apart perhaps from *circum*, were so felt.[9] A more plausible defence of the two instances of bridging is that they aim at a striking effect, the suddenness of Licymnia's movement of her neck to the kisses of Maecenas (2.12.25–6) or the sudden bursting out of the truth from the lips of a man who has had a drop too much (1.18.16). But the same could be argued for 17: the violation of the caesura is expressive of Carthage's transgressiveness and impiety. Horace, we might guess, is more likely than an interpolator to have permitted himself such a licence.

There is still more to be said against deletion of 17, namely that deletion destroys a stanzaic structure that has all the marks of being intentional. With transmitted 17 retained, there are strong breaks after 8, 12, 24, 28, and 32 and a one-word overlap at 20. Aeacus gets a quatrain to himself, ending with retrospective summary. The deified Hercules and the deified Castor and Pollux get a quatrain beginning with a prospective summary. At 16 there is only the lightest of breaks, since the argument carries on for another four lines, and the final *neque* of 20 binds what has gone before to 21–4. (The close connection between 13–20 and 21–4 will be considered again below.) All this looks like the result of planning, not the accidental result of interpolation. Contrast this with the havoc produced by the excision: here quatrains begin with 'eius qui' (18), 'mercedem tuleris' (22), 'uirtus et fauor' (26), and 'optatis epulis' (30), none of them the start of a thought. The case against 17 is weak.

Editors who delete 33 cite its similarity to 3.25.20, 'cingentem uiridi tempora pampino', and they allege that Horace does not repeat himself so closely. But he does. Elsewhere in Book 4 Horace uses phrases identical with or very close to ones he employed in his earlier

[8] Thus explicitly A. Elter, *Donarem pateras … Horat. Carm. 4,8* (1907), 5; implicitly Kiessling-Heinze, G. Jachmann, 'Calabrae Pierides', *Philologus* 90 (1935), 331–51, here 339, and C. Becker, 'Donarem Pateras', *Hermes* 87 (1959), 212–22, here 213.

[9] By contrast, *Karthago* is a compound meaning 'new city', and its first syllable is a separate word: see *DNP* s.v. Karthago.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

books: see 'mater saeua Cupidinum' (4.1.5 = 1.19.1) and 'sub trabe citrea' (4.1.20, cf. 'ut trabe Cypria' in 1.1.13).[10] One could discount the second as slight. The first, of course, looks like conscious self-reference. But self-reference could be seen in 33 as well, especially if I am right (see below) that Bacchus here figures as the god of poetry, an unmistakable ingredient of his portrait in 3.25. Then, too, if it were not for a desire to excise, Horatian scholars, sensitive to the distribution of epithets, would object to deletion on the grounds that unadorned 'Liber' looks unacceptably bare in the company of 'impiger Hercules' and 'clarum Tyndaridae sidus'.[11] There is much to suggest that excision of 17 and 33 removes genuine Horace and is not a way forward.

The most widely adopted 'remover of six' position is Lachmann's deletion of 15b 'non celeres fugae' through 19a 'lucratus rediit' plus two other verses, 28 and 33.[12] This is adopted by Klingner and Shackleton Bailey, among others. Several reasons for excision have been urged. First, the transmitted text couples the memorials to great deeds with the deeds themselves. The point is well put by Madvig:

> Cum enim hoc poeta dicat, artificum opera cum poetarum comparans, marmora notis publicis incisa non clarius indicare laudes Africani et rerum gestarum memoriam propagare quam Ennii versus, quid excogitari perversius potest, quam ut in hac comparatione cum marmore coniungantur ipsae res gestae Scipionis et hoc dicatur, non marmora *et victorias* melius laudes indicare quam carmina.[13]

Objection has also been made to *eius* since *is* is rare in verse of the high style.[14] (The objections of Bentley, Lachmann and others to 17 have already been answered.) These problems disappear if we make Lachmann's first excision.

But the objections can be met. Pasquali's sensible defence is that Horace means 'not marble monuments, nor the defeat of Carthage inscribed thereon'. Such a usage, he says, is less difficult than it might seem and rendered easier by Roman familiarity with statuary combined with *elogia*.[15] As for *is*, the ban is not as total as it is sometimes claimed.[16] And Harrison (p. 39) has argued that 'Horace is using the rugged prose of the Republican epitaph, which favoured such locutions and particularly the use of the relative pronoun'. The examples he cites of actual epitaphs show the style we find in this passage.

In favour of retention is that deletion comes with a cost. If we eliminate 15b–19a we remove all the references to the Punic struggle, and as a result the reference to Ennius in particular is deprived of its point. Motive too is not easy to establish. It could be argued that the interpolator, noticing the reference to Ennius, decided to provide a justification

[10] Not as striking, though worthy of mention here, are the collocations 'grata compede', which 4.11.24 shares with 1.33.14, and 'quassas ratis', common to 4.8.32 and 1.1.17–18.

[11] Harrison, 42, n. 75 argues that unmodified 'Liber' is perfectly all right, partly because 'Liber' is used elsewhere without epithet and partly because *Liber* itself is an epithet. But the passages urged in support of the first assertion prove nothing because there are other unadorned names in the vicinity (with 'Liber' at 1.12.22 cf. 'Clio', 'Alciden', 'Romulum', 'Pompili', 'Tarquini', 'Catonis', etc. elsewhere in the poem; and 'Liberum' at 1.32.9 is joined by two other unmodified proper names in the same line). As for the second, if it is true that *Liber* is felt as an epithet, then instead of an epithet-less noun we have a noun-less epithet.

[12] K. Lachmann, 'Horatiana', *Philologus* 1 (1846), 164–6, reprinted in J. Vahlen (ed.), *Kleinere Schriften zur Classischen Philologie von Karl Lachmann* (1876), 2.96–100.

[13] J. N. Madvig, *Adversaria Critica ad Scriptores Latinos* (1873), 51.

[14] See B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter: ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (1945), 71.

[15] G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico* (1920), 758. Pasquali calls this a zeugma, but it might more properly be called a hendiadys.

[16] In Appendix II I discuss the attempt of D. Butterfield to excise *eius* from several authors who *prima facie* employ it. Note further that Horace's diction in the *Odes* can sometimes be surprisingly plain: cf. the prosaic *retrorsum*, found in the *Odes* only at 16 and at 1.34.3. The verb *lucror* (19) is used only here in the *Odes* and might therefore be thought suspicious, yet *lucrum* occurs at 1.9.14, 2.4.19, 3.16.12, and 4.12.25.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for it. But without 15b–19a the reference to Ennius makes no sense.[17] Then too the phraseology of 'nomen ab Africa lucratus rediit' is too good to put to the credit of an interpolator.[18] The verdict must be *aut Horatius aut diabolus*.

As for Lachmann's other two deletions, whatever may be said for excising 33 (and I have shown how weak the case against it is), the attempt to impugn the genuineness of 28, a line with no faults of grammar, metre or content, solely because it can be removed without damage[19] deserves to be called what it is, the prosecutorial misconduct of arraigning someone against whom there is no evidence solely because he has no alibi. Only the fact that two further lines needed to be deleted in addition to the four lines of 15b–19a accounts for the square brackets around it. Lastly, if we delete this line, the next, 'caelo Musa beat', which naturally begins a stanza devoted to Hercules and the Dioscuri, is now the fourth line of its stanza.

This brings me to my proposal, that instead of interpolated verses we have to reckon with the loss of two (or 2 + 4n) lines before 33. Is something missing? There are three indications. Firstly, we are nearing the end of the poem. From the beginning this poem has been a gift to Censorinus, a gift whose value Horace claims to be able to name.[20] Horace has claimed that poetry confers immortality, *and that poetry is what he is giving Censorinus*.[21] This is an implicit promise to Censorinus, and yet when we reach the end of the poem, there is nothing, after the promise itself, that fulfils it. Before he utters the promise, Horace tells us that Censorinus is his friend, that he apparently has plenty of art in his house, and that he enjoys poetry. After the promise there is nothing. Several figures are mentioned who have been immortalized by verse, but the implicit promise to Censorinus is still unfulfilled: he has received no word of praise or any mention of qualities in virtue of which he would deserve to be immortalized.[22] In this most Pindaric of poems to omit the *laudandus* omits that which gives sense to everything that precedes. Contrast 4.9, which likewise devotes a great deal of brilliant rhetoric to the poet as purveyor of immortality but which carries through on the promise. In 29–44 Horace praises the mostly civic virtues of Lollius with a hint (perhaps a bit apologetic in view of the *clades Lolliana*) of military prowess. He ends with a list of qualities such as wisdom, ability to endure straitened circumstances patiently, and readiness to die for friends and country, qualities he

[17] Jachmann, op. cit. (n. 8), 346–51 claims that 'Calabrae Pierides' refers to Horace himself, citing Porphyrio's interpretation and three passages in Martial that describe him as a Calabrian. The misunderstanding of these words as a reference to Ennius will then have occasioned the manufacture of 15b–19a. I cannot prove this ingenious thesis wrong, but it is striking that Horace, 'Lucanus an Apulus anceps' as one born in Venusia, never refers to himself as a Calabrian and several times (3.4.9–17, 3.30.10–12, 4.6.27) connects himself with Apulia and its mythical king Daunus.

[18] Harrison, 39–40 notes that an anecdote preserved in Valerius Maximus 3.7.1 has the elder Scipio responding to a charge of corruption by saying that the name Africanus was the only profit he derived from subjecting Carthage to Rome. The motif of 'profit' continues that of *pretium* (12) and is continued by *mercedem* (22).

[19] Becker, op. cit. (n. 8), 214 is explicit about this: 'der geringste Eingriff in den Text ist es [i.e. once we have removed 15b–19a and 33], wenn ein weiterer Vers gestrichen wird — d. h. aber: Vers 28. Einzig bei ihm decken sich Vers und Satz (der Schlußverse 34 ist besonderer Art)'.

[20] One way of avoiding this is to treat the poem as a *pièce d'occasion* written to accompany a presentation copy of *Odes* 1–3. This is the view of Elter, op. cit. (n. 8), and of Quinn, but it lacks plausibility. *Odes* 4.8 does not look like an accidental addition to the book (a book of fourteen poems, on that showing) but seems designed by its position (the middle poem of fifteen, the predecessor to 4.9) to occupy its place and to contribute to the book as a whole.

[21] Elter, op. cit. (n. 8), 4 claims that the gift in question here cannot be 4.8 but must be a collection (i.e. Books 1–3) since *carmina* (11) is a plural. But Horace does not say 'I am giving you poems' but 'poems are what I am capable of giving', perfectly compatible with 'and this poem is my gift to you now'.

[22] cf. Lachmann, op. cit. (n. 12), 100: 'Ueber die ganze Ode will ich beiläufig bemerken, dass sie bei aller Feierlichkeit ein scherzhaftes neckendes Geschenk war, etwa am Geburtstage des Censorinus: denn obgleich sie ihm stolz die Unsterblichkeit zu versprechen scheint, bringt sie doch nichts von ihm auf die Nachwelt, als dass er des Dichters Freund war und Gedichte liebte'. Tastes in such matters differ, but to me a joke like that described here would be on the level of giving your friend an elaborately wrapped package with nothing inside, and perhaps also pulling his chair out from under him as he sits down.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implies are possessed by Lollius. This may seem slight when compared with the praise heaped on the imperial family, but it is generosity itself compared to the *taciturnitas inuida* with which, in our transmitted text, he treats Censorinus.

Quinn ad loc. wants to say that there is a reference in 20–2 to Censorinus' exploits receiving praise in literature (he goes so far as to suggest that the allusion is to an epic poem about his deeds already written), but this is mistaken. The lines do not refer to Censorinus but are general in nature, and the 'you' is not Censorinus but 'one' or 'a man'.[23] This is apparent from the location of these lines between what precedes and what follows. Immediately before 20–2 the example of Scipio shows the importance of poetry to immortality. With *neque* (which is continuative) we move to the generality inspired by this example: 'and if the storied page were to be silent about whatever exploits a man has accomplished, he would not win his proper reward'. This generality is then proved by a further example (the proper punctuation after *tuleris* is a colon): '(for) what would Romulus be if silence born of envy were standing in the way of his merits?' There is a reason why the break at the end of 20 is not complete, why 'neque / si chartae' bridges it over. It is all a single thought concerned with the generality that poetry is necessary for immortality. Censorinus is not being alluded to at all. For a similar instance of the second person later in the poem not referring to the addressee, see 4.9.45.[24]

Harrison (p. 42) argues that Horace has not forgotten Censorinus and that the exempla of immortality reflect indirectly on him and suggest that he too will be immortalized. There is still a gap between the implicit promise of Censorinus' immortality through poetry and the poem we have. He also argues (ibid.) that '[i]t would not do to laud too explicitly the minor victories of an ex-praetor, however grand his lineage, in a book dominated by the triumphs of the Imperial family . . .'. But in 4.9, a poem that praises Lollius and implicitly rehabilitates him from the *clades Lolliana*, Horace manages to use the phrase 'per obstantis cateruas explicuit sua *uictor* arma'. The reader of our poem, I suggest, is still entitled to expect more by the end of it than he gets.

Secondly, in its present context the language about Liber is suspiciously vague. We are told that he brings mortals' prayers to happy conclusions. The absence of any qualification is striking: all prayers, no matter what sphere of activity they pertain to? Contrast the quite specific sphere of activity of the Tyndaridae, who rescue ships from the watery deep. This vagueness at the end makes it hard to escape the feeling that the poem runs into the sand. It is not hard to see why it has been judged boring and a failure[25] on this score alone.

Thirdly, in the last line of the poem there are the variants *ducit* (the Ψ manuscripts and scholia) and *duxit* (the Ƶ manuscripts plus λ'). All editors take the former as original and the latter as secondary and would presumably explain the corruption as an anticipation by a scribe of the 'x' in 'ad exitus'. Still, the Ƶ group is 'on the whole more faithful than Ψ',[26] and if we try out the idea that *duxit* was the original reading, its corruption to *ducit* is easy to explain given the presents in 27, 28, 29, and 31. In view of the number of places in the *Odes* where Ƶ joined by one of the Ψ manuscripts gives the truth,[27] it would be reassuring

[23] It is taken as general by Sydenham. By contrast Rudd italicizes 'you' to suggest Censorinus, though there is no expressed pronoun in the Latin.

[24] Grammar too suggests a general, not a specific reference. In all likelihood *feceris* is a future perfect, and the use of this tense in a clause subordinate to a future (or its equivalent here, *sileant*) marks the clause as iterative and generalizing. On the tense sequences perfect subordinate to present, future perfect to future, and pluperfect to perfect see K.-S. 1.152–3, Gildersleeve-Lodge §567, and 'Bradley's Arnold' §432, and note the example in *Odes* 4.3.1–4 ('Quem tu, Melpomene, semel nascentem placido lumine *uideris*, illum non labor Isthmius *clarabit*', etc.), which is generalizing ('whomever you look on').

[25] As it is by Wilamowitz and others: see Harrison, 31–2 with notes.

[26] R. J. Tarrant, 'Horace', in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Text and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (1983, reprint with corrections 1986), 184. Evidence for this assertion is provided in the next note.

[27] In Book 4, for example, Ƶ with or without the addition of individual Ψ manuscripts, gives the truth in twenty-two places against Ψ (1.11, 1.18, 1.20, 2.6, 4.7, 4.22, 4.41, 4.43, 4.66, 5.13, 5.18, 6.17, 8.1, 9.16, 10.5, 11.7, 12.11, 12.16, 13.26, 14.5, 15.10, 15.18), whereas the Ψ tradition against Ƶ only in thirteen (1.9, 2.2, 2.14, 4.65, 6.10, 8.15, 9.52, 11.24, 13.14, 13.28, 14.1, 14.4, 14.5 *sol*).

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to find that *duxit*, a reading of the more truthful branch of the tradition whose corruption to *ducit* would have been all but inevitable, could be the true reading. In the present state of the text, however, the perfect is hard to accept.

We can give Censorinus the praise and immortality the poem implicitly promises, make Liber relevant to the poem and possessed of a relevant sphere of activity, show the plausibility of the variant *duxit*, and satisfy Meineke's Law by marking a lacuna of two or six verses before 33. Six would be better than two (which would be rather perfunctory). The composer of an *exempli gratia* supplement is hampered by the fact that all we know of the younger Censorinus is that he probably served as *legatus Augusti* (in which capacity he may have had some military success) and that Velleius Paterculus (2.102) describes him as 'uirum demerendis hominibus genitum'. Horace, of course, knew more about him than we do, but he may have felt that his deeds in the public sphere were not as yet a sufficient basis on which to claim immortality. This may be the reason for his strong suggestion (17 and 25–7) that the honours of one generation may be set to the account of the preceding or following generation. He may have credited, as I do in my supplement, the younger Censorinus with some of the characteristics that made his father admirable in the eyes of his contemporaries (he was famous for his brave defence of Julius Caesar against his assassins). The writer of *exempli gratia* supplements, like Johnson's writer of lapidary inscriptions, is not upon oath, so the following, though far below the standard of Horace's missing lines, serves merely to show that the thing, done by an inferior writer, could have been done by a superior. My supplement provides in its first line an explanation for the accidental loss:

caelo Musa beat. sic Iouis interest
optatis epulis impiger Hercules.
clarum Tyndaridae sidus ab infimis
quassas eripiunt aequoribus ratis.

<omni sic faciat *tempore* te mea
uirtutesque tuas pagina uiuere,
Marci: praeside me saecla perennibus
te patremque tuum laudibus efferant,

fidos posthabito Caesaribus metu,
dulci pro patria non timidos mori.>
ornatus uiridi *tempora* pampino
Liber uota bonos duxit ad exitus.[28]

Now Censorinus no longer lacks any mention of the qualities in virtue of which Horace implicitly promises him immortality: my supplement alludes to the elder Censorinus' loyalty to Julius Caesar even in the face of death and the bravery of both men on the country's behalf. Now the mention of Bacchus no longer makes a dying fall: the *uota* in question are the poet's wishes for Censorinus' immortality. Now Bacchus' sphere of influence is no longer vague: he is there to bring to fruition the specific prayer for Censorinus' immortality in Horace's verse. The connections between Bacchus and poetry are well known (see, e.g., *Odes* 2.19 and 3.25 and Nisbet-Rudd, 297–8), so it makes sense that he should answer this prayer. The couplet also ends the poem on a note that is both sympotic and religious, like *pateras* of its first line. And *duxit* makes sense because Horace is confident that the god of poetry has already acted to ensure Censorinus' immortality: the poem, after all, has been written, the *chartae* have not been silent, and that is all that is necessary.

In brief, then, unmotivated interpolation is a less likely theory than accidental loss: the proper verdict for the grand jury to have returned was 'death by misadventure'.

[28] If a two-line supplement is preferred, we might consider 'omni sic faciat *tempore* pagina / te patremque tuum uiuere Daunia'.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

III THE ARGUMENT OF THE POEM

If we accept the transmitted text and mark a lacuna of two verses before 33, the poem falls into three sections of three stanzas each: if six verses have been lost, the last section has four stanzas. The first section (1–12) makes the general contrast between the plastic and graphic arts on the one hand and poetry on the other, ending with the assertion that it is the latter that interests Censorinus and that Horace can supply. The second section (13–24) makes the case that poetry is mightier than any physical monuments at securing the immortality of the great: not only the heroes of the Punic struggles but also Romulus himself owes his immortality to the poetry of Ennius.[29] The third section mentions the Greek hero Aeacus, saved from death and transported to the Blessed Isles by the power of *potentes uates*, and alludes to the deification through poetry of Hercules and the Dioscuri. Bacchus elsewhere belongs to this group, but he ends the poem not as an example of deification but as the god of poetry, who ratifies Horace's desire that Censorinus too shall be immortal.

Let us look more closely at the detail. In 1–12 Horace says he would give his friends works of art if he excelled in the plastic or graphic arts,[30] but he does not, nor does Censorinus desire such gifts. Poetry is his delight, and Horace can provide it and also tell him its value. The contrast between statues or other works of art and poetry is one we find in Pindar, *Nem.* 5.1–5:

> I am not a sculptor, so as to fashion stationary statues that stand forever on their pedestals. Rather, on board every ship and in every boat, sweet song, go forth from Aigina and spread the news that Lampon's mighty son Pytheas has won the crown for the pancratium in Nemea's games.[31]

It should be noted as something to be explained that where Pindar is explicit that statues, which are stationary, are less effective at spreading fame than verse, which is easily transported and can be in many places at once, Horace is not. It is a point Horace seems to have in view at 4.2.17–20, which says that a Pindaric victory ode is a gift more valuable to the victor than a hundred statues. But here he makes no comparison of value between the visual and poetic arts: it is just that he cannot supply the former, and the latter is what Censorinus happens to want and need. In the second set of three stanzas there is a comparison of value between public inscriptions (perhaps on public statuary) and poetry as effective proclaimers of merit, but the reason for the difference in effectiveness is left inexplicit. It is only in the final three or four stanzas that Horace explains why poetry is more effective, and it is an explanation substantially different from Pindar's. Horace says that a *uates* has the power to change the actual status of mortals after their death.

There is a suggestion of this in Horace's treatment of Romulus. What would he be if grudging silence were standing in the way of his merits? The implication is that he would be nothing: Romulus, the founder of Rome, now deified as Quirinus, would not have attained godhead if Ennius and other poets had grudgingly withheld their poetry in praise of him. (The theme of deliberate withholding is Pindaric, but the result of the withholding mentioned by Horace brings us into an entirely different sphere.) He is now a god, but it lay in the power of mortals to obstruct that result.

The argument continues in 25–32 as Horace cites a series of mortals who attained beatitude or godhead thanks to poets. What was formerly implicit now becomes explicit: Aeacus' translation to the Isles of the Blest owes something to his own *uirtus* and *fauor*,

[29] Harrison, 40–1 well points out that the archaic *Mauortis*, which Horace never uses elsewhere, recalls Ennius.

[30] Conceivably he might mean if he himself possessed works of art. But 'non haec mihi uis' is more likely to mean that Horace has no ability as a painter or sculptor. When *uis* means 'quantity' we expect a partitive genitive, as at 4.11.4–5.

[31] Translation by W. H. Race, *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (1997), lightly altered.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but the crucial element is 'lingua potentium uatum'.[32] The retrospective 'dignum laude uirum Musa uetat mori' likewise reposes the power of immortalizing in the hands of the Muse.

This slightly unsettling manner of discussing the immortality of Romulus and Aeacus continues in the next stanza, which begins with a prospective 'caelo Musa beat'. That the Muse alone is responsible for Hercules becoming a god is made explicit by the next word: '*sic* Iouis interest optatis epulis impiger Hercules'. The force of *sic* continues with the description of the Tyndaridae: they too exercise their function in heaven thanks to the Muse. If I am right, some missing lines contained a prayer or wish for Censorinus' immortality. In the final couplet Horace announces that Liber has brought (*duxit*) this prayer to fulfilment. Since he is the god of poetry, it is natural to give him the job of ratifying the poet's prayer. With *duxit* Horace expresses his confidence that his prayer has been heard and answered.

IV *LINGUA POTENTIUM VATUM*

An anonymous witticism has it that in the sixteenth century Purgatory was abolished by act of Parliament.[33] This is witty because not even Parliament's most ardent supporters believe that its writ runs beyond the grave. What was abolished, of course, was the public assertion of the doctrine of Purgatory by the Church of England. It is tempting to think that when Horace says that powerful bards put Aeacus in the Blessed Isles and Hercules and the Dioscuri in heaven, he is wittily perpetrating the same kind of category mistake, attributing to poetry the power to make immortal or divine in reality and not merely on the popular tongue. Harrison (p. 40) does not take this easy mode of interpretation and points out that the word *uates* implies someone with religious authority. I think he is right and I adduce evidence set forth in a long-ago article by A. D. Nock[34] to show that the Romans often spoke as if decrees promulgated by Roman priests or religious boards had the power to determine matters usually thought to be the sole prerogative of the gods. For example, Livy 22.10.2–6 quotes a formula presumably drawn up by the Pontifex Maximus prescribing that certain irregularities in the carrying out of a *uer sacrum* will not count as such and that the sacrifice can be conducted in any way the sacrificer wants. This statement is made without reference to any supernatural authority or to tradition. Likewise, the Senate, acting on the advice of the *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis*, determines that a certain manner of celebrating the Secular Games will be acceptable to the gods.[35] By contrast Greek sources often mention the consultation of an oracle (Delphi or Dodona) or ancestral custom as the basis for determining what the gods will approve.[36]

[32] Another way to read the phrase 'uirtus et fauor et lingua potentium uatum' would be to take the genitive 'potentium uatum' with all three nominatives. But on balance it seems best to interpret as *uirtus et fauor Aeaci*, his goodness and the goodwill he enjoyed (see *OLD* s.v. *fauor* 2): the Muse does not intervene arbitrarily but only in favour of those who are *digni laude*.

[33] [Anonymous], *The Letters of Mercurius* (1970), 85–6. It is, however, widely agreed that the author of these letters is Hugh Trevor-Roper, formerly Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford. Mercurius goes on to say that the Fellows of All Souls College, founded to pray for the dead of the Hundred Years' War, have been deprived of one of their duties by this abolition.

[34] A. D. Nock, 'A feature of Roman religion', *Harvard Theological Review* 32 (1939), 83–96, reprinted in Z. Stewart (ed.), *Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (1972), 1.481–92.

[35] The Senate, of course, took a hand in the making of gods when in 42 B.C. it declared Julius Caesar to be divine. Later Ovid at *ex Ponto* 4.8.55 follows Horace's lead by putting that power in the hands of poets: 'di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt'.

[36] This difference of religious perspective between the Romans and the Greeks, Nock, op. cit. (n. 34) argues, has consequences that last into the Christian era and contribute to the split between eastern and western Christianity. For example in Orthodox churches the formula for absolution is 'May God forgive thy sins: in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost', but in the Roman church it is 'I absolve thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In addressing remarks on the power of the *uates* to C. Marcius Censorinus, whose father[37] L. Marcius Censorinus was a *quindecimuir sacris faciundis*, Horace is perhaps using language that both father and son would have understood. This is the strongest claim Horace ever makes for his poetry. It seems entirely fitting that it should be in a poem at the exact centre of his last book of *Odes* and written in a metre he used to begin and end his earlier three books. It is, to be sure, highly unlikely that Horace actually believed he had the power to make gods. But I suggest that he is putting this claim forward not as a piece of sly Euhemerism but as an exaggeration that is intended to seem at least partly plausible since it amalgamates his own poetic stance with the native traditions of Roman religion.

APPENDIX I: OTHER PROPOSALS FOR DELETION

The Bentley-Lachmann deletion of 17 and 33 is the most popular 'remover of two' position. Another two-line deletion is that of Madvig, who proposed writing *celeris fugae* in 15 (some manuscripts have *celeris fuga*) and deleting 16–17. I transcribe the result:

> non incisa notis marmora publicis
> per quae spiritus et uita redit bonis
> post mortem ducibus non celeris fugae
> eius qui domita nomen ab Africa
> lucratus rediit clarius indicant
> laudes quam Calabrae Pierides.

But although this solution enjoyed the support of Housman,[38] I invite my readers to pause here and try to guess Madvig's meaning, which is in the next paragraph. If learned Latinists have not succeeded in doing so without recourse to Madvig's words, this is no small argument against his conjecture.

Madvig[39] writes: 'Vitam non celeris fugae, hoc est, non fugacem et brevem, ducibus per marmora notis publicis incisa redire, Horatius concedit. Hic genetivus, sive casu, sive quod non intelligebatur, unius litterae mutatione (*celeres*) in nominativum transformatus, cum sic nude posita verba (*non celeres fugae*) sensum non efficerent nec ferri possent, duos versus, in quibus laboratur, peperit.'

But consider the following objections. (1) The genitive of description is not easily intelligible, since the nouns they are supposed to qualify, *spiritus* and *uita*, are separated by five words from the genitives. This is without any parallel elsewhere in Horace: contrast 1.6.2 'Maeonii carminis alite'; 1.36.13 'multi Damalis meri'; 3.7.4 'constantis iuuenem fide'; 4.1.15 'centum puer artium'; 4.9.39 'consulque non unius anni'; 4.11.22 'non tuae sortis iuuenem'; *Serm.* 1.1.33, 'magni formica laboris' and 1.4.17 'inopis me quodque pusilli finxerunt animi'.[40] (2) The collocation *celeris fuga* is a common one, but all the instances in *TLL* s.v. 'celer', 752.17–19 are of literal running away: in Horace see *Odes* 2.7.9 and 2.17.13, but the other instances are similarly clear. The phrase elsewhere thus refers to a swift motion to escape someone, and its use here as a genitive of description in an entirely different sense ('evanescent') is bound to mislead. (3) Madvig is one of the few excisers to supply a motive for interpolation, but he does not explain why the interpolator supplied two lines and why the second, judged in one way, is inept in confusing the second with the

[37] Strictly speaking, we do not know what the relationship was. I use 'father' and 'son' here as shorthand for 'member of the older or younger generation'. My supplement assumes that the two Censorini were father and son.

[38] See A. Burnett, *The Letters of A. E. Housman* (2007), 2.264.

[39] Madvig, op. cit. (n. 13), 52–3.

[40] L. Ricci, *Syntaxis Horatiana, Pars Prior: De Casuum Usu* (1903), 44 adds *Odes* 2.2.6 'notus in fratres animi paterni' and *Serm.* 2.8.84 'redis mutatae frontis'. The former of these is better interpreted as a Greek genitive of cause.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

third Punic war, but judged in another, turns out to be perfectly consonant with the practice of Augustan poets in conflating members of the same family. (4) Lastly, excising two verses here creates the same kind of quatrain havoc as did the excision of 17: stanzas now begin 'lucratus rediit' (19), 'Mauortisque puer' (23), 'uatum diuitibus' (27), and 'clarum Tyndaridae' (31), of which only the last begins a thought. These at any rate are on reflection the reasons why I could make no sense of the pencilled note in my margin '*celeris* Madvig del. 17–18'. So in spite of the weighty *patrocinium* of Housman, I regard this ingenious suggestion as highly unlikely.

Another 'remover of six' is Verrall,[41] who deletes 15–20 and repunctuates 22:

non incisa notis marmora publicis
per quae spiritus et uita redit bonis. 14
si chartae sileant quod bene feceris 21
mercedem tuleris?

But it is doubtful whether the truncated 13–14 can bear the meaning 'Marble graven with public marks *is not the means* by which breathing life returns to good men'.

The sole 'remover of ten', as far as I know, is U. Hübner.[42] He accepts Lachmann's deletion of 15b–19a and also removes the final six lines. But Hübner's arguments against 29–34 are mostly captious: there is, for example, no reason why the apotheosis of Romulus should exhaust the subject of apotheosis or why in what is widely regarded as the most logical and prosaic of the *Odes*, we find a use of *sic* in the sense 'accordingly' to be found elsewhere in Horace only in the *Epistles*. As for his argument that a god who rescues a ship from the bottom of the sea has delayed too long to do the ship or its crew any good, cf. Theoc. 22.17. Furthermore, just as there is no necessary implication in the words, 'He rescued me from the mouth of the lion' that the psalmist was already between the lion's teeth, so 'the Dioscuri rescue ships from the depths of the sea' need mean no more than that the sea depths would have been their fate apart from the Twins' intervention.

Lastly, the only 'remover of fourteen' known to me is H. D. Naylor, who deletes 14–27.[43] He offers no argument.

APPENDIX II: 'ON THE AVOIDANCE OF *EIUS* IN LATIN POETRY'

D. Butterfield has recently published an article with this title in *RhM* 151 (2008), 151–67. Claiming that the genitive singular of *is* was especially avoided in poetry of the classical period, Butterfield restricts himself to *eius* throughout most of the paper, relegating to the end an overview of the other oblique forms of *is*. There are twelve *prima facie* instances of *eius* in poetry of the higher registers (which excludes both didactic poetry and Horace's *Sermones*). These he proceeds to athetize or emend. When he has finished his work he feels justified in saying that 'poets after the age of Lucilius and Accius strictly dismissed the jarringly prosaic *eius*' (p. 165).

Butterfield claims that *eius* is especially rare, but on his own showing the dative *ei* is far less in evidence. To judge from what is transmitted, therefore, the paradigm of *is* is unevenly used. Butterfield gives no reason why this could not be just the way it is, why the attestation of *is* we actually find, with *eius* rare and *ei* virtually non-existent, should not represent the actual usage of the classical poets. The decision to delete and emend *eius* out of existence seems arbitrary. Nor does he explain why scribes are constantly (on his showing) corrupting or interpolating *eius* into the text but not other forms of *is*.

[41] A. W. Verrall, 'Horace, Odes, IV.8. *Donarem pateras*', *Journal of Philology* 17 (1888), 145–51.
[42] U. Hübner, 'Im Unechten Echtes. Zu Hor. Carm. 4,8,33', *Hermes* 132 (2004), 241–3.
[43] H. D. Naylor, *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (1922, reprint 1978).

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The context in some of Butterfield's twelve passages positively resists his attempts to expel *eius*. At Seneca, *Thyestes* 300 it is necessary to the sense, as Tarrant[44] notes ad loc., since otherwise it is unclear that Thyestes' children are meant. There is good reason to retain it at Ovid, *Tr.* 3.4.27, since contrary to Butterfield's opinion *stultus* is not an attributive identifying the son in question but means 'in folly', and without *eius* the sense would be unclear. At Catullus 84.8 there is every reason to attack *liber* but none, as far as I can see, to impugn *eius*, which goes ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with all of the relatives named.

But the most clear-cut example of the manifest rightness of *eius* is also the one most relevant to the present argument, Silius 11.85–7, where Torquatus says:

> en ego progenies *eius*, *qui* sede Tonantis
> expulit orantem et nuda Capitolia consul
> defendit dextra.

The expected antecedent to a relative clause in Latin is *is*: see K.-S. 1.618. The sense of the unemended text is the one we require: 'See, here am I, a descendant *of the man who* expelled the [Capuan] ambassador from Jupiter's temple and saved the Capitolium by his bare right arm'. Butterfield says, 'Let us then write *huius*, anaphoric to T. Manlius Torquatus (whose tale has just been related) with considerable more rhetorical force than *eius* could bear: it is from *this very hero* that the speaker descends'. Yet it was not the younger Torquatus who had related the tale of the elder Torquatus' exploit but the narrator Silius. Butterfield's emendation means that a character in a work of imaginative literature is commenting on words uttered by the narrator to the reader, words no one inside the fictive world can hear. That is absurd. It is clear here that 'eius qui' is a case of the right words in the right construction. The same is just as clearly true of 'eius qui ... rediit'. The word *eius* may be rare in classical Latin verse, but sometimes it is needed. It is rare, but rare is not the same as non-existent.

Butterfield's reasons for deleting 4.8.15b–19a are especially weak. He does not cite or argue against Cairns's article[45] showing that Propertius and Horace were both capable of conflating the elder and the younger Scipio Africanus. He claims that the difference between the lack of word-break in 17 and that at 2.12.25 is that there is a 'quasi-caesura' after the prepositional prefix *de-*, but he gives no other examples of such 'quasi-caesurae'. His own contribution to the case for excision is to object to *rediit* as 'the sole contraction of a fourth conjugation verb in the *Carmina* and *Epodi*', meaning by 'contraction' a perfect in *-ii* rather than *-iui*. But *redeo* is a compound of the irregular *eo* and does not belong to the fourth conjugation.[46] According to the *OLD*, s.v. *eo*, the forms in *-iui* are rare, and to judge from the *OLD* entries for *eo* and its compounds, the forms in *-ii* are the expected ones ('normal seit Plautus' say L-H-S 1.600). So *rediit* would furnish no grounds for suspicion even if it were not protected by *petiisse* at 3.14.2.

These arguments fall far short of proving that *Odes* 4.8.15b–19a are interpolated.

University of Virginia
pdk7g@virginia.edu

[44] R. J. Tarrant, *Seneca's* Thyestes (1985).
[45] op. cit. (n. 7).
[46] Neither do some of Butterfield's other examples: *concupiueris* and *petiuerit* (*Epodes* 3.19 and 6.15) are third-conjugation verbs, and *lasciui* (*Odes* 3.13.8) is not a verb at all.

https://doi.org/10.3815/007543509789744800 Published online by Cambridge University Press