

of the carp family, such as the *squalus* (either the chub or a related species),³ a fish commonly found in the Tiber (otherwise *quis nescit* of line 7 becomes somewhat awkward). Furthermore, from a transcriptional standpoint a scribal error of the kind just posited is not surprising, since the name of the wrasse parrot (*scarus*) appears far more frequently throughout Latin literature than its close homophone.⁴ Finally, if my suggestion is correct, it may be possible to determine the true scansion of the first syllable of *squalus*.⁵

RAMÓN BALTAR VELOSO
*Universidad de Santiago
 de Compostela*

3. Cf. Thompson, *Glossary*, p. 251. E. de Saint-Denis' discussion of the name of this fish (*Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique* [Paris, 1947], p. 108) does not explain the relationship of Varro's river fish (*Rust.* 3. 3. 9; cf. Colum. 8. 16. 1 Lundström-Josephson) to the shark or dogfish apparently referred to in Pliny the Elder's text (*NH* 9. 78).

4. A case in point: some MSS of Colum. 8. 16. 1 read (*mugilem*) *scarumque* instead of *squalumque*.

5. "Quantité de l'a inconnue" (A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*⁴ [Paris, 1959], s.v. *squalus*).

ACHILLES OR AGAMEMNON? A NOTE ON HORACE *EPISTLES* 1. 2. 13

Antenor censet belli praecidere causam:
 quid Paris? ut saluus regnet uiuatque beatus,
 cogi posse negat. Nestor componere litis
 inter Peliden festinat et inter Atriden:
 hunc amor, ira quidem communiter urit utrumque.

[Hor. *Epist.* 1. 2. 9–13]

The identity of *hunc* (13) cannot be decided on linguistic grounds, for *hic* may refer to either the former or the latter of two people just mentioned.¹ So we turn for enlightenment to the *Iliad*. And we do so with the assumption that Horace has got the setting right. (After all, he asks us to believe that he has been rereading the poem.) We must therefore start with the intervention of Nestor: τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ / ἤδυεπ' ἑς ἀνδρόνους (1. 247–48). This, in turn, means that we have to do with the tug of war over Briseis. The fate of the other girl, the daughter of Chryses, has already been settled: she is to be returned to her father (1. 141–44). Now although Agamemnon claims to have tender feelings toward the daughter of Chryses and to rate her even above Clytemnestra (1. 112–15), there is no suggestion that he has any positive feelings about Briseis. He demands her from Achilles simply to assert his own superior status; and later it appears that their partnership has never been consummated (9. 132–34 and 19. 261–63). As for Achilles, while it is true that in this same passage we hear virtually nothing about his attitude to Briseis either, later on he refers to her as his ἄλοχον θυμαρέα (9. 336) and declares that he loved her with all his heart—ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον (9. 343). On the strength of these phrases, moreover, Achilles became for the Romans the example

1. See B. L. Gildersleeve and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar*³ (Boston, 1907), no. 307, remarks 1(a)' 1(b).

par excellence of the epic warrior as a lover. The most significant instance is Horace *Carmen* 2. 4. 2-4, but one also thinks of Propertius 2. 8. 35-36 and Ovid *Amores* 2. 8. 11, *Ars amatoria* 2. 711, and *Heroides* 3.

We conclude, therefore, that in the passage under discussion the man in love is Achilles.² No doubt the natural thing would have been for Horace to present Achilles as consumed by love and Agamemnon by anger. But as Achilles' anger was the motif of the whole epic, that antithesis was impossible; and so we hear of one (Achilles) consumed by love, and both by anger.

An additional point, however, should be made. In the previous sentence we are told that Antenor proposes that the war be brought to an end (by the surrender of Helen) but that Paris refuses to agree (10-11). It might well be assumed that there was a similar structure in verses 11-13; that is, Nestor proposes a reconciliation between Achilles and Agamemnon, but one is consumed by passion and both by anger.³ This, however, cannot be right. For Nestor's proposal is not prevented from succeeding by Achilles' love. Lines 11-13 must therefore function as an explanation: "Nestor hurries to resolve the strife between the son of Peleus and the son of Atreus; [for] the former is consumed by love [for the girl who had been taken away from him] and both alike by anger." From the Stoic point of view both heroes were at fault: "quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achiui" (14).

NIAL R. RUDD

University of Bristol

2. It seemed worthwhile to put this note together; for, although A. Kiessling and R. Heinze (eds.), *Q. Horatius Flaccus. "Briefe"* (Berlin, 1908), ad loc., take *hunc* as Achilles and are rightly followed by O. A. W. Dilke (ed.), *Horace. "Epistles" Book 1* (London, 1954), ad loc., they do not argue the case in detail. Also the majority of modern editors (Schütz, Orelli, Wilkins, Wickham, Morris, Rolfe, Villeneuve, and Préaux) take the opposite view.

3. That is the interpretation of E. P. Morris (ed.), *Horace. The "Epistles"* (New York, 1911), ad 1. 2. 9.

MARTIAL 2. 91 AND 10. 20

2. 91. 3-4

si festinatis totiens *tibi lecta* libellis
detinuere oculos carmina nostra tuos

In a recently published paper I proposed *collecta* for *tibi lecta* on two grounds: that *tibi lecta* does not fit inside the conditional clause *si detinuere oculos tuos* and that Martial would not have claimed the emperor as a constant reader of his epigrams.¹ The second point is, however, invalid. Martial would not have made such a claim when he began 1. 4 with "contigeris nostros, Caesar, si forte libellos," but in 4. 27. 1 "saepe meos laudare soles, Auguste, libellos" and subsequently he has no such inhibition.

10. 20(19). 6-9

illic Orpheus protinus videbis
udi vertice lubricum theatri
mirantisque feras avemque *regis*,
raptum quae Phryga pertulit Tonanti.

1. "Corrections and Explanations of Martial," *CP* 73 (1978): 275.