legion – evidently he must have been a senator.[12] But if *Bagiennus* is a cognomen, then before it we have to find his gentile name, for it is inconceivable that Cicero would have mentioned him only by his praenomen and the very peculiar cognomen accorded him in a later stage of his career. Therefore I suspect that the *pupilli* of the manuscripts could conceal the name *Popillius*. Unfortunately, no connection with the known Popillii can be established.[13]

University of Helsinki   HEIKKI SOLIN

   [12] Now listed in the Supplement of Broughton's *MRR* (Atlanta, 1986), 33.
   [13] After I made this conjecture, I noticed that it had already been proposed by V. Gardthausen, *Philologus* 51 (1892), 518. He failed, however, to explain fully the name form. At any rate, his conjecture deserves to be rescued from oblivion. Strangely enough, it has been banished from the critical apparatuses of most modern editions.

HORACE, *EPODE* 6.16

> cave, cave; namque in malos asperrimus
>   parata tollo cornua,
> qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener
>   aut acer hostis Bupalo.
> an, si quis atra dente me petiverit,   15
>   inultus ut flebo puer?
>
> <div align="right">Horace, *Epod.* 6.11–16</div>

Here Horace gives warning to an adversary of his powers of literary attack, comparing himself with the great iambists Archilochus ('Lycambae spretus infido gener') and Hipponax ('acer hostis Bupalo'). The general sense of the last two lines seems clear: 'If someone attacks me (gifted as I am with the weapons of the iambist), shall I weep like a mere boy?', i.e. 'Am I not to take revenge?'

'Inultus' in line 16 is incoherent with this sequence of thought, for the comparison needed at this point is not with someone who is 'inultus', 'unavenged', but rather with someone who is defenceless or powerless, unlike the formidable Horace. Commentators have recognized this problem, and respond to it by translating 'inultus' not 'unavenged' but 'without taking revenge', construing it with Horace as the subject of 'flebo' and not with 'puer'. This use of 'inultus' is wholly unparalleled; the adjective is elsewhere always used passively of persons or objects unavenged and never in the active sense of 'unavenging'.

Latinity and the sequence of thought are both restored by reading 'inutilis' for 'inultus ut'. 'Inutilis', going with 'puer', would be highly appropriate for a weak and vulnerable boy in this context of anticipated battle (note the military 'petiverit'), for it can have a quasi-technical sense of 'unfit for fighting' (cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 10.794 (the wounded Mezentius) 'inutilis inque ligatus'; Juvenal 15.126, 'imbelle et inutile vulgus'; *OLD* s.v., 1), following a similar use of ἀχρεῖος (Herodotus 3.81.1; Thucydides 2.6.4; LSJ s.v., 2). The omission of 'ut' in the comparison is a favourite colloquial device of Horace, admittedly not found elsewhere in the *Epodes* but frequent in just this type of phrase (with the noun taking the full weight of the comparison) in the *Epistles*: cf. 1.2.41–2, 'qui recte vivendi prorogat horam, / rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis'; 1.7.73–4, 'hinc ubi saepe / occultum visus decurrere piscis ad hamum'; 1.10.5–6, 'vetuli notique columbi / tu nidum servas, ego...'; 2.2.28–9, 'post hoc vehemens lupus, et sibi et hosti / iratus pariter'; 2.2.97–8, 'caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem / lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello'; E. Fraenkel, *Elementi Plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960), 47–8. The corruption of 'inutilis' to

'inultus' is self-explanatory; thereafter 'ut' was added to indicate what was evidently a comparison and to fill out the metre.[1]

St John's College, Oxford   S. J. HARRISON

[1] Some support for 'inutilis flebo puer' might also be derived from the identical word-shape of a similar iambic dimeter at *Epodes* 5.12, 'insignibus raptis puer' (a point which I owe to the anonymous referee for *CQ*).

My thanks for encouragement to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet.

HORATIANA

Odes 1.3.12–16

> nec timuit praecipitem Africum
> decertantem Aquilonibus
> nec tristis Hyadas nec rabiem Noti,
> quo non arbiter Hadriae
> maior, tollere seu ponere volt freta.

There is nothing that renders this punctuation and the standard understanding of these verses (i.e. 'seu tollere seu ponere volt freta') impossible. Parallels can certainly be found (e.g. Cat. 4.19; Prop. 2.26.33). It is however true that this ellipse of *seu* has no good parallel in the *Odes* and the two examples in the *Satires* (2.5.10; 2.8.16) are much easier to tolerate than the use here. Thus, it may be worth noting that a different view of the verse seems possible. Remove the comma from line 16 and take *tollere* with *maior*: 'than whom there is no master of the Adriatic greater at raising or calming – if he desires – the waters.' *Seu* then = *vel si*, as frequently. Horace has a particular affection for infinitives governed by adjectives (as in line 25 of this poem); Wickham provides a lengthy list at vol. 1, pp. 316–17. At *Satire* 2.3.313 *minor* is so used. Finally, the Homeric original here (*Od.* 10.21–2) probably supports this view of the sentence's structure: κεῖνον γὰρ ταμίην ἀνέμων ποίησε Κρονίων/ἠμὲν παυέμεναι ἠδ' ὀρνύμεν ὅν κ' ἐθέλῃσι, in which the two infinitives are governed by prior elements and are part of that leading clause, while ἐθέλῃσι (= *volt*) is not required for the presence of the infinitives.

Odes 1.6.1–2

> scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
> victor Maeonii carminis alite.

Richardson called this passage a *topos amechanos*.[1] Four avenues of approach have been attempted: (1) Dissociate *Vario* from *alite*, taking Vario as dative. So G. M. Hirst, with the ancient scholiasts (*alite* = *auspiciis*)[2] and Kenneth Quinn in his 1980 commentary ('On the wings of epic poetry'. Can the Latin really bear this meaning?). Stylistically, separating the apparently parallel terms is hard, the more so when we consider the frequency of the songbird/poet identification. Further, as we shall observe shortly, *Vario* as dative of agent is difficult. (2) Emend *alite* to *aliti* and take *Vario aliti* as dative of agent. But Richardson has shown that in the *Odes* the only clear examples (eight of them) of the dative of agent are all governed by a perfect passive (participle).[3] (3) Take *Vario...alite* as an ablative absolute. But, as Nisbet–Hubbard observe, 'the word-order would be impossible'. (4) Take *Vario...alite* as

[1] L. J. D. Richardson, *CR* 50 (1936), 118.
[2] *CR* 27 (1913), 24.
[3] Loc. cit. 119. But at *Epist.* 1.19.3 *potoribus* appears to be dative with the present passive.