

suggestion that 'so far as our evidence goes, Callimachus invented (or discovered) Molorchus; his was the first and only full-scale treatment',³² which is echoed in Richard Thomas's suggestion that 'the impoverished Molorchus' was 'a figure possibly invented by Callimachus, and at least lifted by him from total obscurity'.³³ This *argumentum ex silentio* that Callimachus may have invented Molorcus reminds me of nothing so much as the suggestion made a century ago by E. Maass that Eratosthenes had invented Erigone, the daughter of Icarus, and her dog Maera.³⁴ At the time Maass's suggestion could not be falsified, but then the discovery of P. Oxy. 1011 (fr. 75 Pf.) and 1362 (fr. 178 Pf.) showed that this story certainly went back to Callimachus, and as Pfeiffer noted,³⁵ it almost surely went back further still to some Atthidographer. If we take at all seriously Callimachus' claim ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν αἰῶ, 'I sing of nothing without a witness', we shall be quite loath to believe that Callimachus would have invented Molorcus. The analogous case of Hecale, another impoverished rustic who entertained another transient hero on his way to vanquish another vexatious beast, is illuminating. From Plutarch, *Thes.* 14 we happen to know that the story of Hecale went back to the Atthidographer Philochorus, who wrote early in the third century B.C., and hence that Callimachus founded his tale on an earlier tradition. Hence I should think it highly probable that Callimachus founded his story of Molorcus on some earlier work, perhaps a detailed story of Hercules' labours, or perhaps a local history of the Argolid. If the latter, a likely candidate, which we know Callimachus utilised elsewhere in the first book of the *Aetia*,³⁶ would be the *Argolica* of Agias and Dercylus.³⁷

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

³² Parsons, op. cit. 43.

³³ R. F. Thomas, op. cit. 94.

³⁴ E. Maass, *Analecta Eratosthenica* (*Philologische Untersuchungen*, 6, 1883), 124–31.

³⁵ R. Pfeiffer, *Kallimachosstudien* (Munich, 1922), pp. 104ff.

³⁶ Cf. fr. 3 Pf. and F. Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 305, F 4 and 8, and the *addendum* on p. 757, with Jacoby's accompanying commentary, especially p. 19: 'die neuen fragmente 4 und 8 scheinen zu bestätigen, dass diese *Argolika* nicht nur den grammatikern der guten zeit, sondern schon dem Kallimachos unter dem doppelitel Ἀγίας καὶ Δερκύλος vorlagen und dass er dieses buch vielleicht als das zu seiner zeit modernste und ausführlichste (wie für Athen Philochoros) für die vielen argivischen geschichten benutzte, die er besonders in den *Aetia* erzählte'.

³⁷ I am grateful to George Goold, Edward Courtney, and Massimo Gioseffi for information regarding the readings of various manuscripts, to Ihor Ševčenko for a discussion of contractions in Greek manuscripts, and to Richard Thomas for his comments on an earlier draft of this article; also to the Editor for alerting me to the recent note by F. Vian, *REG* 104 (1991), 585, n. 4, where Vian observes that Greek MSS offer only the form *Μόλορκος*. Unlike Vian, I attribute the preference for 'Molorchus' not to 'poètes et grammairiens latins', but to the scribes of their MSS.

BION I, LINES 25–7

These important lines have not yet received an adequate discussion.¹ Aphrodite has been told that her beloved Adonis is dying on the mountainside; she rushes to him in grief, letting down her hair and calling for him. Then, in Gow's text,

ἀμφὶ δέ νιν μέλαν αἶμα παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ᾠρεῖτο, 25
στήθεα δ' ἐκ μηρῶν φοινίσσεται, τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοῖ
χιόνεοι τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀδώνιδι πορφύροντο.

25 νιν Wilamowitz: μιν codd. ᾠωρ. Wil.: ἡωρ. codd. 26 τοὶ Wil.: οἱ codd. ὑπὸ μ.
Lobeck: ὑπομαζοῖ codd.

¹ I shall refer to the following editions and discussions of the passage: H. L. Ahrens, *Bucolicorum graecorum Theocriti Bionis Moschi reliquiae* (Lipsiae, 1855); F. Buecheler, *Jahrb. f.*

Controversy centres upon the emendations of Ahrens – αἶμα to εἶμα in 25 and μηρῶν to χειρῶν in 26 – which make the passage a description of Aphrodite in a typical condition of mourning women, with robe torn and chest made bloody by her own hands. The manuscripts, and most recent editions (here represented by Gow), apparently describe Adonis lying wounded, covered with his own blood; in fact, however, such an interpretation meets serious difficulties. The vulgate says, 'And around him dark blood floated at his navel, and his chest was made scarlet from his thighs, and Adonis' breasts underneath, snowy white before, turned crimson'. The most striking thing about this scene is the behaviour of Adonis' blood. It ἀωρεῖτο; this means 'hung', often with implications of floating (though never of liquid). Asius writes scornfully of the luxurious Samians whose hair ἡωρεῖντ' ἀνέμω (fr. 13.4 Davies). Aratus uses the verb of constellations suspended in the night sky (*Phaen.* 387 and 403; see also Diophilus [-a?] *SH* 391.6), and Maccius, *A.P.* 9.411.3 makes αἰωρεῖται synonymous with ἐκκρέμαται. In [Moschus] 4.74 a 'grievous daemon' hangs or floats over the speakers' heads. The verb is used of clothing (a lion's skin) in Theoc. 22.51 (cf. Hdt. 7.92 δέρματα περὶ τοὺς ὤμους αἰωρεύμενα). Blood can be said to do these things only by the very boldest of poetic conceits, and even then the intended meaning is obscure. Some editors have assigned the verb an unattested meaning derived from its active voice (αἰωρέω = 'to lift'): 'the blood rose,' and by extension, 'spouted up' (so *LSJ* s.v.). The problems inherent in this interpretation are the same as those in a speciously happier reading, the slight emendation of the manuscripts' ἡωρεῖτο to ἡρωεῖτο (proposed first by Camerarius and revived by Fantuzzi); the verb ἡρωέω is found in Homer (*Il.* 1.303 = *Od.* 16.441) in the active voice meaning 'spurt forth' of blood from a wound.² The first difficulty is obvious: why does Bion say 'the blood spurted forth at his navel' when he has twice specified (7, 16) that the wound is on Adonis' thigh, and is about to reiterate the fact in the next line? παρ' ὀμφαλόν must in this case mean not *at* his navel but *to*, or even *past*, his navel; he is lying on his back with his knees up, and the flowing blood spills over his stomach to his chest. Very well; but how does it do this *around* him? We do not read that it went to his navel and *then* around him (i.e. down his sides); the text says that the blood went around him to the navel, as if taking a more leisurely route to Adonis' chest. 'Le sang largement répandu suit des chemins bizarres' (Will). A way out is to translate ἀμφί by 'on'; but when it has this meaning with the accusative it gives only a vague sense of geographical location (*LSJ* s.v. C I 2). ἀμφὶ δέ νιν here can only mean 'and on both sides of him'.

But let us suppose that Bion did write 'And around him dark blood spurts past his navel,' and confront the problems in the next two lines. Here a distinction seems to be drawn between στήθεα and μαζοί; both words are used of both sexes, but the distinction made here sounds odder of a man than of a woman. When the στήθεα and μαζοί of a man are differentiated in Greek it is normally to specify location (e.g. of a wound) on the στήθεα, probably with special reference to the nipple (why would Adonis' nipples have been 'formerly snowy white'?); the difference is insignificant

cl. Phil. 9 (1863), 106–13; J. Camerarius, *Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια* (Haganoae, 1530); M. Fantuzzi, *Bionis Smyrnaei Adonidis Epitaphium* (Liverpool, 1985); A. S. F. Gow, *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford, 1952); C. F. Graefe, *Epistola critica in bucolicos graecos* (Petropoli, 1815); N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988); R. Matthews, *CR* 38 (1988), 217–18 (review of Fantuzzi); C. A. Trypanis, *CP* 67 (1972), 133–4; E. Will, *REG* 76 (1963), xix–xx.

² Graefe, p. 118 suggests ἡρώησε, Matthews, pp. 217f. ἡρώεσκειν, but the use of the middle would be a typically Hellenistic phenomenon; see A. S. F. Gow and D. Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), ii.456 on Phaedimus, *A.P.* 13.22.3.

here, where the same thing is said to happen to both *στήθεα* and *μαζοί* (*φοινίσσομαι* and *πορφύρομαι* are poetic synonyms). We could alternately see in the lines an instance of elegant variation, wherein Bion gives two highly poetic descriptions of the same phenomenon. We would then have to understand (with Fantuzzi, who cites *TGL* s.v. *ὑπομαζοί*) *ὑπό* in tmesis from *πορφύροντο* at the end of the next line, meaning ‘stealthily, gradually’ (*LSJ* s.v. *ὑπό* F III), an interpretation that the distance between the two words makes unlikely. (Besides, the two phrases are too similar for the trope to be really effective.) *ὑπό* is adverbial, and *τοὶ δ’ ὑπὸ μαζοί* means ‘and the breasts underneath’.³ We are left with an almost meaningless distinction between two parts of Adonis’ upper torso. (Incidentally, why are the *μαζοί* mentioned last? If he is lying on his back the blood from his thighs should reach them before it reaches the *στήθεα*. Must we take *τὸ πάροιθεν* to mean ‘before his chest did’?) At least this description agrees with that in lines 9f. of the dark blood (same phrase, *μέλαν αἷμα*, as in 25) trickling over his snowy (*χιόνεος* in both places) flesh.

Trouble remains. We are now in the midst of a description of Aphrodite’s frantic run through the woods and the funereal displays that her grief inspires. If Bion were turning from this description to an update on her *πόσις καὶ παῖς* (24) we would have expected a stronger transition than he achieves with the unemphatic *νυν* (e.g. *ἀμφ’ αὐτόν*; cf. *τήνον μέν* in 18). *δέ* in 25 is also weak for a transition to Adonis, since the poet has been using it (21 and 23) to connect Aphrodite’s various activities.

We have, of course, no right to say that Bion could never have stretched the meaning of this or that word, or was incapable of designing an obscure transition from one subject to another. But the number and variety of interpretative problems, especially in this ordinarily lucid author, entitle us to suspect that Bion did not intend to say what the text reports. What, then, might he have intended to say? The line of thought to which this passage belongs begins at lines 16f. with a mention of Aphrodite’s grief as a wound even greater than Adonis’. We follow her manifestations of this grief as she rushes through briar thickets to the place where he lies dying: she lets down her hair, goes barefoot, wails in sorrow for her beloved. In 25ff. we expect some culminating feature of Aphrodite’s lamentation, something so expressive of the *μείζον ἔλκος* she bears (17) that it will make the antiphonal chorus of Loves change its lament from ‘alas for Adonis!’ (2, 6, 15) to ‘alas for Cytherea!’ (28). In 29 we are told that she ‘has lost her holy beauty’. Were the mussed hair and bramble cuts enough to destroy it? Did it just magically die with Adonis (cf. 31)? Or was it destroyed by something in lines 25–7? Two details, the mention of *στήθεα* and *μαζοί* and the reddening of white skin, suggest that the lines originally conveyed a description of Aphrodite beating her chest in grief, as the narrator told her to do in lines 4f. (*καὶ πλατάγησον | στήθεα*). The suggestion becomes even more plausible when one observes that in several imitations by Nonnus of these lines he applies Bion’s wording to grieving women beating their chests: *D.* 18.331f. *ἐφοινίσσονται δὲ μαζοὶ | τυπτόμενοι παλάμησιν*, 24.185 *τυπτομένων παλάμησιν ἴτυς φοινίσσεται μαζῶν*, 46.279 *στήθεα φοινίξασα καὶ ἀσκεπέων πτύχα μαζῶν*, and 5.375ff. *καὶ πλοκάμους ἐδάϊξεν, ὅλον δ’ ἔρρηξε χιτῶνα, | πενθαλέοις δ’ ὀνύχεσσιν ἐὰς ἐχάραξε παρειάς | αἵματι φοινίξασα, κατὰ στέρνοιο δὲ γυμνοῦ | παιδοκόμων ἐρύθηγε φερέσβιον ἄντυγα μαζῶν* (that these are imitations of Bion is made likely by the rarity of couplings of *στήθεα* or *μαζοί* and the verb *φοινίσσω* in Greek poetry and by Nonnus’ manifest appropriation of Bionian imagery elsewhere). More support

³ A close parallel for the whole expression is *Il.* 4.146f. *τοιοῖ τοι, Μενέλαε, μιάνην αἵματι μηροῖ | εὐφυνέες κνήμαί τε ἰδὲ σφυρὰ κάλ’ ὑπένερθε*.

comes from authors who record breast-beating as part of the Adonia (Sappho fr. 140a.2, Aristoph. *Lys.* 396, Dioscorides, *A.P.* 5.53 and 193, Plut. *Alc.* 18.5 and *Nic.* 13.7, Lucian, *de Dea Syr.* 6), since Bion seems to model Aphrodite's behaviour after that of women celebrating the festival. Theocritus 15.134f. mentions the baring of the breast between two other activities, the loosening of the hair and shrill wailing, that Bion here attributes to Aphrodite. Finally, the distinction between *στήθεα* and *μαζοί* is better suited to a woman than to a man, and the progress of the ensanguinification from the *στήθεα* (upper chest, the part beaten) to the breasts is typical of Greek descriptions of this phenomenon (cf. Nonn. *D.* 5.377f. above beginning 'down from her chest', 'starting from her chest...'). The equation in 29 of lacerated chest to ruined beauty would be especially appropriate for this goddess, the paradigm of female beauty, whose breasts are her particular glory (cf. Rufinus, *A.P.* 5.94.2).

It is difficult to see Aphrodite beating her breast in these lines without emendation. We are stuck with the arabesque tricklings of the blood, and the mention of thighs in 26 is hard to account for. One might add that the navel is not singled out by any Greek author as a casualty of funereal self-dishevelment. With Ahrens's corrections of *αἷμα* to *εἷμα* in 25 (anticipated by Graefe, p. 118: '*εἷμα* posset dici *αἰωρεῖσθαι*, non *αἷμα*') and *μηρῶν* to *χειρῶν* in 26 the lines make perfect sense; all the problems we have had with the text disappear and no new ones arise. We now read: 'And around her the dark robe hung at her navel, and her chest was made scarlet by her hands, and the breasts underneath, formerly snowy white, became crimson for the sake of Adonis.' Some particular remarks: *εἷμα* is most often used in the plural, but cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.538, *Od.* 14.501, *Pind. P.* 4.232, *Aesch. Ag.* 1383, and *Nossis A.P.* 6.265.3. On *παρ' ὀμφαλὸν* cf. *Eur. Hec.* 558ff., where Polyxena, *λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος*, | *ἔρρηξε λαγόνος ἐς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλὸν* | *μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε*. There the preposition with accusative indicates progressive action ('to her navel'); here the meaning is simply 'by (i.e. at the level of) her navel' (compare the Homeric use of the phrase for the location of wounds). *αἰωρέομαι* is an admirable verb for the bunched tatters of the robe that 'hung floatingly' at Aphrodite's waist; presumably she has in her lamentations ripped the garment down the middle, so that half hangs down on either side of her (*ἀμφὶ νυ*), held by the *ζώνη*. For instrumental *ἐκ* see *LSJ* s.v. III 6. 'Ἀδώνιδι' is dative of interest, 'for the sake of Adonis' (Buecheler p. 107 suggests emendation to *πάροιθ' ἐπ' Ἀδώνιδι*, with *ἐπὶ* 'in honour of,' but the dative alone is adequate; cf. *Theoc.* 14.38 *τήνῳ τεὰ δάκρυα*).

The corruption in these lines is easily explained: a scribe with *μέλαν εἵβεται αἷμα* still in mind from line 9 writes *αἷμα* for *εἷμα* in 25; then he or a later scribe, mistaking the passage for a description of the dying Adonis, corrects *χειρῶν* to *μηρῶν* to conform to lines 7 and 16. In fact, if the manuscript reading *μηρῶν* arose not as a simple misreading but as a deliberate correction of what was thought to be an allusion to Adonis' wound, *χειρῶν* is theoretically not the only possible emendation. The imitations by Nonnus (see above) suggest *ἐκ παλάμων* – or better, *ἐκ παλάμης*, which appears three times in Nonnus (though not in contexts of lamentation). Rossbach (*ap. Peiper* p. 623) suggested *ἐκ πλεγῶν* (by which he meant 'beatings,' not 'wounds' as Hopkinson thinks; cf. *Soph. El.* 90 *στέρνων πλαγὰς αἵμασσομένων*). *ἐκ κομμῶν* (cf. line 97 *ἴσχεο κομμῶν*) and *ἐξ ὀνύχων* also come to mind. *χειρῶν*, however, is most likely to be right. *χείρες* are often used in poetic descriptions of breast-beating (cf. *Il.* 18.31, 19.294, *Soph. Aj.* 632, *Eur. Supp.* 72, *Alc.* 87), and the plural of *μηρῶν* is best explained as a correction of *χειρῶν* (Bion would probably have put 'thigh' in the singular, e.g. *ἐκ μηρῷ*, an anonymous conjecture recorded by Valckenaer; cf. lines 7, 16, and 41 – though both thighs, *μηρία*, are washed in 84).

The corrector will have supposed that a predecessor had mistaken one body part for another with a very similar-sounding name.

Even with the emendations, however, alternative readings are possible. Maybe the first two lines describe Aphrodite, but *τοὶ δ' ὑπὸ μαζοί* etc. (with Ἀδώνιδι a dative of possession rather than of interest) describe Adonis – but then the transition is abrupt, and the choice of words (*στήθεα* for a woman's chest, *μαζοί* for a man's) eccentric. Maybe we can, with Fantuzzi, accept *χειρῶν* but keep *αἶμα* – but then we still must deal with the circumambulatory blood and the problematic *ἄωρεῖτο* (*ἐρωέω* is unsuitable for the bleeding accompanying the scratching of the chest). Fantuzzi's objection to *εἶμα* is motivated by M. L. West's observation on Hes. *Th.* 406 that in Greek poetry it is ordinarily mortals who wear mourning that is *μέλας*, while deities normally wear *κυάνεος*. This may or may not be a strict rule – the veil of Thetis at *Il.* 24.95 is described as *κυάνεον*, *τοῦ δ' οὐ τι μελάντερον ἔπλετο ἔσθος* – but if it is, we are not dealing with an arbitrary taboo; *κυάνεος* is a poetic word, hardly ever found in prose (Pausanias 8.42 tells of Demeter wearing a *μέλαιναν ἐσθήτα* in her grief), which comparison to the everyday *μέλας* would naturally recommend to a poet for application to the robes of a god. Fantuzzi objects that the *poeta doctus* would never call the goddess's robe *μέλας* after calling it *κυάνεος* in line 4 (*κυανόστολε*); in fact it is precisely in the style of a *poeta doctus* to exploit the conventions in the way that Bion does here. In *Il.* 5.339ff. Homer explicitly makes the immortal nature of the Olympian gods (and of Aphrodite in particular) depend on their lack of blood; Bion has just made Aphrodite bleed (22, where the thorn bushes pluck her *ἱερὸν αἶμα*). In *μέλαν εἶμα* too, by eschewing the highflown *κυάνεος* that his readers (especially after seeing it in line 4) may have associated with the mourning garb specifically of deities, he chooses a word that draws Aphrodite closer to mortality (cf. *μελανεῖμων* and *μελανειμονεῖν*, used of ordinary funeral attire). Bion will go on to say (31) that Aphrodite's beauty has *died*. With such little touches he makes his reader see the goddess as having left the sphere of immortality and entered the human world with its attendant pain. (It is an old reflex of the Greeks to represent the suffering of divinity as a humanization; one thinks immediately of the Homeric hymn to Demeter, where the goddess in her grief takes on mortal guise and lives with a human family.)

One may still be uncomfortable with *μέλαν εἶμα* in view of the epic formula *μέλαν αἶμα* and its recent use by the poet in line 9. The *repetitio cum variatione* is no accident. By applying to Aphrodite words that recall those he has used of Adonis (compare also *χιόνεοι* in 27 to Adonis' snowy flesh in 10) Bion causes his readers to assimilate the goddess to her beloved as he does in 16f. (his wound in the thigh, hers in the heart), 31 (her beauty has died with him), 65f. (his blood miraculously changes into a rose, her tears to an anemone), and elsewhere.

Trypanis, accepting *εἶμα* but keeping *μηρῶν* (or singular *μηρῷ*), envisions a scenario whereby the goddess, kneeling over the dying Adonis, bloodies her breasts against his thigh – but as she seems not yet to have reached him his appearance would be very abrupt, and Ἀδώνιδι makes a peculiar dative of instrument. It should by now be clear that the emendations of Ahrens not only meet no obstacles, but change an abrupt, confused passage to one of admirable lucidity and usefulness. With them the lines sum up Aphrodite's mourning and pave the way for the next section of the narrative; in addition, the poet is seen to elaborate a favourite theme, the sympathy of the goddess with her mortal beloved, central to the 'Stabat Mater' treatment of Aphrodite that has been emphasized in recent criticism of the poem.⁴

⁴ See V. A. Estevez, *Maia* 33 (1981), 35–42.

A further suggestion: we should perhaps emend *πορφύροντο* to *πορφύρονται*, since the verb does not seem to occur in the middle-passive before Nonnus (e.g. *D.* 7.170, 12.357, and 47.109 – but he uses the active more than twice as often). Cf. Theoc. 5.125 οἶνω πορφύροισι and [Bion] 2.18f, καὶ τόσον ἄνθος | χιονέαις πόρφυρε παρήϊσι. If we wish to keep all three verbs in this sentence uniform in tense, we could then emend *φαινίσσεται* to *φαινίσσεται* (which would allow us to keep the following οἱ of the manuscripts without hiatus), and *ἄωρεῖτο* to *αἰώρεται*. (Ahrens changed these verbs to the present – though he retained the middle of *πορφύρω*, printing *πορφύρονται* – but cf. the tense-change in lines 82f.) If a scribe misread the Doric -οντι as -οντο his successors might have attentively put the rest of the sentence into the imperfect. Nonnus, however, shows a predilection for Bionean forms, of which *πορφύρομαι* may be one, and the use of the middle voice for the active was a poetic affectation not unknown in the Hellenistic period (see n. 2 above); here perhaps on the analogy of *φαινίσσομαι*.⁵

Stanford University, California

JAY REED

⁵ I wish to record my gratitude to Sir Kenneth Dover for looking over a draft of this note.

FUSCUS THE STOIC: HORACE *ODES* 1.22 AND *EPISTLES* 1.10*

Our information on Horace's friend Aristius Fuscus, whom he addresses in *Odes* 1.22 and *Epistles* 1.10, is neatly summed up by Nisbet and Hubbard: 'he was a close friend of Horace's (*serm.* 1.9.61 'mihi carus', *epist.* 1.10.3 'paene gemelli'). He wrote comedies (Porph. on *epist.* 1.10) and seems to have had a sense of humour: it was he who refused to rescue Horace from the 'importunate man' in the Sacra Via (*serm.* 1.9.60ff.). Horace says elsewhere that he was a town-lover, who disliked the countryside (*epist.* 1.10); here he amuses him with an account of the perils of his Sabine estate. Fuscus was a schoolmaster by profession (Porph. on *serm.* 1.9.60 'praestantissimus grammaticus illo tempore'); in *epist.* 1.10.45 Horace teases him for his stern discipline ('nec me dimittes incastigatum ...': cf. *CQ* 9 [1959], 74f.). Fuscus is mentioned with Asinius Pollio and others as a critic who approved of Horace's poetry (*serm.* 1.10.83ff.). He may also have written on grammar; cf. *gramm.* 7.35.2 'Abnesti Fusti (*Aristi Fusci* Haupt, *Aufusti* Usener) grammatici liber est ad Asinium Pollionem'.¹ The purpose of this note is to add a further piece to this picture, consonant with Fuscus' grammatical interests,² namely to argue that Fuscus was also a Stoic, and that his philosophical loyalties are played on in the two poems addressed to him by Horace.

Odes 1.22 begins with two famous stanzas on the man who is 'pure in heart':

Integer vitae scelerisque purus
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu,
nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
Fusce, pharetra,
sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas
sive facturus per inhospitalem
Caucasum vel quae loca fabulosus
lambit Hydaspes.

* My thanks to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet for helpful criticism.

¹ R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 261–2.

² On Stoic interest in grammar cf. E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London, 1985), pp. 117–31.