Muses and poet: co-operation rather than inspiration. Mr Hollis[3] has provided one parallel: Asclepiades *A.P.* 9. 63. 4 (= 32G–P) *τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου*. To which should be added Crinagoras *A.P.* 9. 513. 2 (= 49G–P) *ἔγραφεν ἢ Μουσέων σὺν μιῆι ἢ Χαρίτων*. Compare also Pindar *Nem.* 9. 53 ff. *Ζεῦ πάτερ/ εὔχομαι ταύταν ἀρετὰν κελαδῆσαι/σὺν Χαρίτεσσιν*; Bacch. 5. 9 f. *ἢ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζώνοις ὑφάνας/ὕμνον*; Crinagoras *A.P.* 9. 239. 4 (= 7G–P) *ἔγραψεν ἢ παρ' οἶνον ἢ σὺν Ἱμέροις*.

Hertford College, Oxford D. E. KEEFE

[3] A. S. Hollis, 'The New Gallus, 8–9', *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 541 f. I am grateful to Mr Hollis for discussion.

THE TEASE IN HORACE, *Odes* 1. 16

In the past most scholars held that at Odes 1. 16. 5–21 Horace is making excuses for his own anger. More recently, however, Commager (*The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, p. 138) and Nisbet and Hubbard (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes I*, pp. 202–3) maintained that in this passage the poet is referring to the addressee's *ira* and trying to dissuade her from being angry with him. In my opinion both interpretations contain part of the truth, but both fail to grasp the essential point that the passage is in fact yet another instance of an Horatian tease.[1]

With regard to the opening of the ode Nisbet and Hubbard state: 'In the first stanza the lady must already be angry; she is to be allowed to take the most drastic measures against the offending lampoons'. However, I fail to see why one should assume in 1–4 that she would be angry rather than, say, hurt or sad, especially since it appears that Horace actually has to tell her to destroy the poems. Horace here, in fact, tells us nothing definite about her reaction, but two words do seem relevant to his state of mind. The fact that he has written iambics (*iambis*, 3), conventionally used for fierce scurrilous attacks,[2] and describes them in line 2 as *criminosis* (which most obviously means 'abusive, vituperative') suggests anger on his part. Furthermore, the tone of the first stanza, with its complimentary line 1 and conciliatory lines 2–4, seems clearly apologetic, and one naturally imagines that 5–21 are part of the apology, particularly since it is hardly usual or politic when making an apology for attacks on a person to deliver a lengthy lecture to that person on his/her reaction to those attacks.[3] So at 5 ff. the poet appears to be excusing himself by saying in effect that *ira* unbalances

[1] At this point I should perhaps mention that L. A. MacKay, *AJPh* 83 (1962), 298 f., and M. Dyson, *AUMLA* 30 (1968), 169 ff., have suggested that contrary to general opinion the composer of the *criminosi iambi* (2 f.) was not Horace but the woman addressed in the present ode. However, in the opening lines here one automatically assumes that Horace, poet and in particular author of the *Epodes*, was responsible for these *criminosi iambi*, and this assumption surely becomes certainty at 22 ff. (esp. *in celeris iambos | misit furentem*, picked up by *tristia* and then *opprobriis*), where clearly the poet means that the initial impulse to write the lampoons in question came to him in his youth and he has continued to produce them until the present poem, by which time his anger has abated somewhat. The objections of MacKay and Dyson to this attribution of authorship are, I believe, adequately refuted in respect of language by Nisbet and Hubbard and in respect of tone and situation by this article and common sense.

[2] See Nisbet and Hubbard on line 3, Porph. on line 24, *Ibis* 53 f., 521.

[3] Of course, the vast majority of Horace's readers had and have no way of knowing whether or not 1. 16 was concerned with a real situation, but even if it was, and even if one assumes that the lady was in reality angry, this latter observation still holds good, and, as will become clear, the ode will have teased her as well as other readers.

the mind, blinds those affected by it to the damage that it may bring upon them and is an irrational part of our nature that has been responsible for disasters in the past too.

Line 22 comes as a complete surprise and gives the first indication that Horace is not as serious as he has seemed.[4] When the poet there says *compesce mentem: me quoque...* (= 'restrain *your* anger: *I too* was angry') this must mean that in fact he has just been referring to the woman's anger, since, if he had in mind his own anger at 5–21, *compesce mentem* would be unbearably bald and abrupt, and *me quoque* would be a most odd and illogical progression.[5] So we now realize that he has actually been lecturing the addressee, but with deliberate concealment until this late stage, and in retrospect we see that his remarks at 5 ff. were really rather different in tone. Their implications are rather different too, and by the time the end of the ode is reached Horace has made clear the damage and disaster that the lady's *ira* may cause her (the obvious inference is that if she does not give up her anger he will write more lampoons).

To take lines 5–21 as such a tease seems to me the best way of explaining the great length of that passage, as with this view its extent makes the hoax more elaborate and amusing and heightens the cheek. This interpretation also fits well with the urbane impudence evident elsewhere in 1. 16. For at 22 ff., as an argument for the woman giving up her anger, the poet cites his own willingness to give up his (which was the whole reason for her irate reaction in the first place), but at 26 ff. he actually goes on to add a proviso, and in it he makes a stipulation to which she is hardly likely to accede[6] after his treatment of her – *dum mihi | fias... amica | ... animumque reddas.*[7]

University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg P. MURGATROYD

[4] The positioning of this poem after the serious 1. 15 may well be intended to reinforce subtly the impression (until 22) that 1. 16 is also serious.

[5] cf. the similar remarks on *compesce mentem* and *me quoque* by Nisbet and Hubbard (p. 203), who rightly censure the way in which the conventional interpretation ignored this point. But the reader is, of course, ignorant of the content of line 22 when he encounters the earlier part of the poem and would not otherwise suspect that Horace has in mind the addressee's *ira* at 5 ff. Kiessling–Heinze (Berlin, 1930) claim that *compesce mentem* shows that at 5–21 the poet was really thinking of the woman's anger as well as his own and that those lines are partly a warning and partly an apology. However, with this view *compesce mentem* is still unacceptably bald and abrupt, while a genuine apology at 5 ff. is at variance with Horace's tone elsewhere (see below).

[6] To take *amica* and *animumque reddas* (see Pichon *Index Verborum Amatoriorum* s.v. *animus*, and cf. Plaut. *As.* 141, Ovid *Her.* 19. 18) in a specifically amatory sense (bearing in mind line 1) increases the effrontery.

[7] This note was written in June 1980, before a copy of G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (Yale, 1980), had reached me here. Consequently, until informed by the editors of *CQ*, I was unaware that Williams's interpretation of the Ode (pp. 1–5) seems to be on the same general lines as my own.

SENECAN *SOLEO*: *HERCULES OETAEUS* 1767

Michael Winterbottom (*CR* n.s. 26 (1976), 39) criticizes Costa's edition of Seneca's *Medea* for failing to annotate *sic fugere soleo* (1022).[1] 'Did Medea', he asks, 'habitually escape by chariot – or is this a coy allusion to Seneca's predecessors?' Of

[1] Actually it appears from Costa's note on 1022 (*Seneca: Medea* (Oxford, 1973), 159) that he understood *soleo* to refer to the second of these alternatives ('M.'s serpent-chariot was familiar to many writers', etc.). But, especially given the immediately preceding words in 1021 (*coniugem agnoscis tuam?*), Herrmann's annotation must be correct: *elle a tué Absyrte en quittant la Colchide et Pélias en quittant la Thessalie.*