HORATIANA: *ODES* 1. 9 AND 1. 28

I. Horace *Odes* 1. 9 *Vides ut alta* . . .

Horace's Soracte Ode has been the object of copious attention and ingenious manipulation. The time seems to be at once midwinter and early summer, the scene at once rural and urban, the action at once indoors and outdoors. The attempt to reconcile apparent contradictions has produced some remarkably interesting intellectual contortions; too little notice, however, has been taken of the simple and almost certain explanation advanced by H. R. Fairclough in *Some Aspects of Horace* (San Francisco, 1935). Since it appeared in a limited edition of a privately printed book, this is not surprising; but his solution is so eminently sensible, and so credible in respect to Horace's artistry, that it deserves to be brought back to attention. It may not be accepted; Horace long ago noted the reluctance of scholars "quae inberbes didicere, senes perdenda fateri" (*Epist.* 2. 1. 85). But if it is to be rejected, it should be rejected wittingly.

The much-worried contrast, or inconsistency, of rural winter and urban summer is, according to Fairclough, simply not there. Generations of scholars from the northern parts of Europe and North America have viewed the Ode in the light of their own experience of winter, naturally enough. Fairclough, enlightened by the unusual spectacle of high snow on Mt. Diablo, seen from the mild and sunny campus of Stanford, realized that there is no paradox, no discrepancy in *Odes* 1. 9.

The scene, he suggests, is the streets of Rome, the time early spring, when "towards the end of March the cold Tramontana has left snow on Soracte, making it stand out clearly as seen from Rome, since the Tramontana has cleared away the rain and mist that hid it in the winter. For a few days, before the Sirocco begins, there will be a perfect calm, with warm air and sunny skies, and every reason for spending happy hours in the open air again."

This timing is perfectly consonant with Horace's text. The *alta nix* is not deep snow, but high snow, high up on the mountain, fresh and bright and notable. *Nec* does not stand for "and not"; it stands for "but not" (nothing odd about that); *constiterint* does not depend directly on *ut* but follows on after *nec*. In cumbersome paraphrase, "You see the snow high up on Soracte, though it is no longer midwinter, when trees are loaded with snow and rivers stilled with frost."

The mountain is seen from the streets of Rome, not from an indoor apartment; the problem of "picture windows" does not arise. The wind that clears the rain and fog from Rome, and leaves a brief bright powdering of snow on Soracte, like the wind that brings clear bright skies to the San Francisco Bay area, and leaves brief snow on its mountains, is a cold wind. Therefore Horace in his second stanza says, "Let's go indoors, and build up a good fire." We need not question the use of a hearth and wood fuel for heating; the smoke in Roman skies noted by Horace (*Odes* 3. 29. 12) did not come from families huddling around charcoal braziers.

Horace does not say, "Leave the warm fireside now and go philandering in the parks at once." In the third and fourth stanzas he says, "Don't be impatient; in due time the wind will stop and the air will be calm; in a day or so spring will be here, and you will be able to get out in the parks again in the evening." The *nunc* of the last two stanzas does not refer to the same time as the *dissolve frigus* of the second stanza, from which it is separated by the postponing stanzas three and four.

In a more prosaic writer the *nunc* of lines 18 and 21 might have been *mox;* but Horace's imagination leaps ahead to the mild evenings of the coming spring, whose near approach is heralded by the clearing skies and the sudden appearance of snow high on Soracte. *Nunc* is almost "any time now."

The Ode is not broken-backed, nor enigmatic. As one would expect of Horace, it has artistic unity; it expands beyond the moment, but it stems from a single occasion, clearly conceived, and, if it is carefully read, clearly presented.

II. Horace *Odes* 1. 28 *Te maris et terrae* . . .

The scene is a stretch of sand. On it lies the body of a drowned man. A sailor passes by. Someone speaks. That is all the setting Horace gives. Some interpreters talk confidently of a "tomb of Archytas." Horace does not, only of a little tribute of fine dust. Whose is the corpse, and who is, or are, speaking?

The unburied body is most probably, as Porphyrio thought, that of Archytas; otherwise there is little point in the ironic antithesis between the mobility of his spirit alive, and its immobility now he is dead. The gift (*munera*) of ritual dust did not confine the spirit; it liberated the spirit. "With all this sand around you, three sprinkles from a human hand are still needed to set your once wide-ranging spirit free."

If there is a single speaker, he is commonly taken to be either Archytas, or some person unidentified, presumably a strengthless ghost, or he would have sprinkled the releasing sand himself. The ascription to Archytas goes back at least to Porphyrio; many have found it hard to accept, and indeed lines 9–13 *habentque Tartara Panthoiden,* etc., and lines 21 f. *Me quoque,* etc., go oddly in the mouth of an unreleased Archytas, speaking to an as yet undrowned passerby. No arrangement of the poem as a dialogue has carried much conviction; but as a monologue of an anonymous and surprisingly learned seaman, or seaman's ghost, the poem has been held to lack impact, even to lack unity.

The speaker, with an assurance that seems to indicate first-hand knowledge, locates the spirit of Pythagoras in the underworld. What then is his own spirit doing on the shores of the Adriatic, at the time of Archytas' shipwreck? The variety and uncertainty of ancient beliefs about an afterlife make a theologically impeccable explanation impossible, and make it unlikely that Horace's contemporaries would have demanded one. Popular belief accepted the idea of occasional temporary return, for various motives, and that is all that is needed here. This is an imaginative fiction, not a rigorous exposition of dogma.

If there is a single speaker, he need not be anonymous. He must be someone who is acquainted with Pythagorean doctrine, but who rejects it, and who died by drowning in the Adriatic. There is an eminently suitable candidate, Hippasus of Metapontum (D.-K. 18 Hippasos 107–110; E. Wellmann, s.v. "Hippasos [15]," *RE* 8 [1913]: 1687–88), a mathematician, a student of Pythagoras who broke with the Pythagorean school, divulged some of its secrets, was excommunicated, and was given a symbolic burial, as dead to them; he was drowned at sea, well before the time of Archytas. We do not know where he was drowned, but the Adriatic seems probable enough for a man from Metapontum. That he should have a par-

ticular interest in the fate of Archytas is reasonable enough; both are traditionally associated with original work on the harmonic mean.

This ascription will account for the speaker's learning, his attitude to Pythagorean doctrine, his interest in Archytas, and his mention of a similar fate. The poem, I suggest, is a monologue by the spirit of Hippasus, addressed first to the dead Archytas, then to a living sailor passing by unobservant. The heretic gently chides the orthodox Archytas, and, having himself received symbolic burial at the hands of the school, reciprocates decently by attempting to secure real burial for one of its members. The ghost of Archytas presumably can hear the ghost of Hippasus; the passing sailor apparently cannot, which adds a final twinge of pathos to the situation, and maintains the general tone of irony which pervades the Ode, an ironic meditation on the relations of soul and body, mind and matter.

It would have been kind of Horace to include the name of Hippasus. Perhaps he merely overestimated the learning and alertness of his future readers; this would not be the only occasion.

L. A. MACKAY
Kensington, California

THE VOTE OF A BODYGUARD FOR THE CONSULS OF 65

At the end of 66, after the expiry of Manilius' tribunician term but before the end of the year, Manilius was brought on a charge of *res repetundae* before Cicero, who was praetor in charge of the extortion court that year.[1] There were disturbances over Cicero's handling of the case: Dio says that rioting prevented the court from being convened, and Asconius talks of disturbances to Manilius' trial by persons whom Cicero calls *magni homines* and whom Asconius identifies as L. Sergius Catilina and Cn. Calpurnius Piso.[2] It is not clear whether Manilius' trial ever came to anything. Some have argued that Manilius' case never came to trial;[3] others take the view, based on a very corrupt passage of Asconius, that Manilius was brought to trial again in the following year, possibly with a new charge of treason.[4]

In the corrupt passage of Asconius there occurs the clause which is the main concern of this note: "quod ex s.c. ambo consules praesidebant ei iudicio." Perhaps

1. Cic. *Corn.* in Ascon. 62. 15–16 Clark; Plut. *Cic.* 9. 4–6; Dio 36. 44. 1–2. The most recent examinations of the trial of Manilius are by E. J. Phillips, "Cicero and the Prosecution of C. Manilius," *Latomus* 29 (1970): 595–607; and A. M. Ward, "Politics in the Trials of Manilius and Cornelius," *TAPA* 101 (1970): 545–56. Plutarch says the charge was *peculatus* (κλοπή), but Cicero makes it clear (*Cluent.* 94 and 147) that during his praetorship he presided over the extortion court. It is not easy to see why a charge of extortion should be brought against Manilius: see Phillips, "Prosecution," p. 597; cf. Ward, "Politics," p. 549.

2. Ascon. 66C. For the acceptability of Asconius' identification, see Phillips, "Asconius' *Magni Homines*," *RhM* 116 (1973): 353–57; *contra* E. S. Gruen, "Notes on the 'First Catilinarian Conspiracy,'" *CP* 64 (1969): 23. On Catilina's reputation as a disturber of trials by 64, cf. Cic. *Tog. cand.* in Ascon. 86. 25C.

3. They include R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero*[3] (London, 1904), 1:174; M. Gelzer, *Cicero: Ein biographischer Versuch* (Wiesbaden, 1969), pp. 60 and 65; D. L. Stockton, *Cicero: A Political Biography* (Oxford, 1971), p. 71.

4. The corrupt passage is Ascon. 60. 9–15C; the argument that Manilius' trial was resumed in 65 is based on Sigonius' emendation of the corrupt *cum prima pars* to *cum primum apparuisset.* Among those who hold the view that there were two trials are F. Münzer, s.v. "Manilius (10)," *RE* 14 (1928): 1134; T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR*, 2:153; Phillips, "Prosecution," p. 603; Ward, "Politics," pp. 548 ff. The evidence for a charge of *maiestas* comes from Schol. Bob. 119 Stangl; Phillips and Ward do not believe that the charge was altered.