

anzutasten<sup>4)</sup>, und die Herstellung eines Genitivs nach *πέραν* ist hier ebensowenig erforderlich wie oben nach *χωρίς* in Eur. Bacch. 1210, denn in beiden Fällen haben wir den von uns so oft belegten Gebrauch des Adverbs zur Verstärkung des Verbalkompositums. Es ist außer der leichten Anpassung von *διεπέρασ'* (lies *διεπέρασεν*) an das Metrum an unserer Stelle nichts zu ändern.

Harvard University  
Cambridge, Mass.

Werner Jaeger

### HORACE *SERM.* II VII 75-83

tune mihi dominus, rerum imperiis hominumque tot tantisque minor, quem ter uindicta quaterque imposita haud umquam misera formidine priuet? adde super, dictis quod non leuius ualeat: nam sive uicarius est qui seruo paret, uti mos uester ait, seu conseruus, tibi quid sum ego? nempe	75
tu mihi qui imperitas aliis seruis miser atque duceris ut neruis alienis mobile lignum. quisnam igitur liber? sapiens, sibi qui imperiosus.	80

So far as I am aware, the first scholar to draw attention to a difficulty inherent in the traditional text of this passage was Mr Alan Ker of Trinity College Cambridge<sup>1)</sup>. It will conduce no less to the logical dissection of the text than to the presentation of my diagnostic and reconstructive argument if I describe that difficulty in his terms, which he kindly allows me to quote, as follows. For convenience of reference I attach a letter to each sentence.

4) Die älteren Wörterbücher haben das Wort noch, doch bei Liddell and Scott ist es verschwunden; und *ἀργυρορροτος* ist jetzt allein verzeichnet. Aber die Überlieferung hat in Eur. Her. 386 die für die Chorlyrik erforderliche dorische Form *ἀργυρορρόταν* richtig bewahrt, sie ist gebildet wie Homers und Hesiods *ἀργυροδίνης, καλλιδίνης* Eur. Her. 368 (vom Flusse Peneios gesagt), gleichfalls in lyrischer Umgebung, und *χρυσορόης* Eur. Bacch. 154 oder *χρυσορόας*.

1) In a paper read to the Cambridge Philological Society on 20 Jan. 1955; but Mr Ker informs me that he withdrew this item, and it will therefore not appear in the printed *Proceedings*.

“(a) Davus asks his master ‘Are *you*, Horace, my master? — you, who are really so inferior?’ He goes on: (b) ‘Add moreover that which means no less than what I have just said.’ (c) We therefore expect some reinforcement of the first statement (75—7), and indeed we get it (in 80—82). ‘You who give orders to me are really the wretched slave of another <sup>2)</sup> (i. e. his passions), a mere puppet’. (d) In the intervening passage, however, Davus asks a question which seems irrelevant, viz. ‘What is my relation to you?’ Davus’s relation to Horace is not in point; throughout this whole passage he is talking about his master’s slavery. (e) And even if it were in point, it is strange that the question is not answered.”

Remarking that in 80 editors read *quid*, Ker pointed out that the variant *quod* was well (indeed, better)<sup>3)</sup> attested, and would, at least, get rid of the “irrelevant” question.

But neither is *quod* satisfactory; for “conseruus (tibi quod sum ego)” cancels not only question but apodosis, so that “nempe . . . lignum” becomes the apodosis<sup>4)</sup>; in the result, the conclusion (*tu . . . alii (-is) seruis*) is anticipated by the dogmatic statement now so surprisingly embodied in the second of the two alternative *protases*. It is certainly not Horace who can argue (or express himself) like that; and I remain convinced that all the editors are right in taking “*tibi quid sum ego?*” (I italicise the emphatic words) as the apodosis to that *sive . . . seu*; nothing could be more lucid in itself, and surely one feature which further confirms *quid* is that after “*tunc mihi dominus?*” this is naturally the balancing question. A further confirmation I find in *nempe*; see below, antepenultimate paragraph.

Two other features, however, are not as they should be.

I — Wickham defends the “redundant” *nam* by that regular use of γ&ρ which is now appropriately labelled by Den-

2) Reading the variant *alii*.

3) There is no real force in that, as an argument; e. g. just below, at 83, the reading (*qui*), similarly attested by inferior manuscripts against the best, is admittedly and undoubtedly the true reading.

4) Strictly speaking, objection can not be taken to the resulting relation between *nam* and *nempe*; the dictionaries will give examples both of *nempe enim*, and of *nempe* introducing a conclusion after a conditional protasis. Nevertheless the fact that *nam* has to carry its force across *sive* and *seu* and *quid*, and then be reinforced by *nempe*, before it leads to any such positive sense (*alii seruis*) as can justify *adde . . . ualeat*, is curiously awkward and confusing.

niston “appositional” and illustrated by him in *Greek Particles* pp. 67—8. But Latin is not Greek, and no parallel is cited either from Horace or any other Latin author. A still more significant objection is that our *nam* introduces a question; and that, I venture to suggest, could not be paralleled for *appositional* γ&ρ even from Greek.

II — I now come to what is in my opinion the fundamental flaw of this whole passage. The words *adde super, . . . ualeat* clearly mean that what follows is regarded by the speaker as a new point, and one no less true (or important). Indeed *non leuius ualeat* will normally suggest “is if anything of *more validity*”; and as to that, see below (n. 9). But here the sense “you are not master in relation to me, but a slave yourself” is followed, not by anything new, but merely by a restatement of the same idea in varied terms<sup>5</sup>). Ker, with his eye on a particular issue in 80, had — naturally — for lucidity’s sake toned down (see *a b c d* above) the awkwardness in this far from logical sequence<sup>6</sup>):

80—2 *nempe . . . lignum* is<sup>7</sup>), after all, the answer to *tibi quid sum ego?* But it is equally, and more obviously, the answer to 75—7 *tune mihi dominus?* In conformity with this and all the above considerations I would restore the passage as follows.

78 *adde super, dictis quod non leuius ualeat: nam*  
 75 *tune mihi dominus, rerum imperiis hominumque*  
*tot tantisque minor, quem ter vindicta quaterque*  
 77 *imposita haud umquam misera formidine priuet?*  
 79 *sive uicarius est qui seruo paret, uti mos*  
*uester ait, seu conseruus, tibi quid sum ego? nempe*  
*tu mihi qui imperitas aliis seruis miser atque*  
*duceris ut neruis alienis mobile lignum.*  
*quisnam igitur liber? sapiens, sibi qui imperiosus.*

I have placed 78 between 53—74 and 75—83. *nam* is now no longer a unique instance of an “appositional” use, but

5) “*adde super* suggests the same question from another point of view” — Gow (and cf. Ker’s *c*). But it ought not to; particularly when followed by *dictis quod non leuius ualeat*.

6) e. g. in (a) he ignores *imperiis*; which is, however, one cog in the logical machinery; cf. 81, 83.

7) Formally, it may well not seem so; hence Ker’s (*e*); but logically it does include that answer, and its form is due to the very fact that it is required to revert to 75—7 and specifically answer that (the leading) question.

recognisable as one more example of that well-authenticated idiom by which this particle introduces — and at once<sup>8)</sup>, and without *nempe* or other such reinforcement — a question implying surprise or even sometimes indignation. “Ante-classical and poetical” say Lewis and Short. No, for it will be found in Cicero de Or. I 22, 101. The proper description would be “colloquial”, since it is confined to dialogue; and so here. We may often render “Why, . . .” cf. Wilkins on Cic. l. c. supr., Nixon at Plaut. l. c. infr. Sometimes it does stand to the preceding in the relation of “for”; e. g. Verg. Aen. II 373, Hor. epist. I 1, 76. But often not, because it begins a speech; e. g. Plaut. Poen. 1122, Cic. l. c., Verg. geo. 4,445. Here, evidently, it belongs to the former type.

53—71 develops the idea “you, H., are virtually a slave” (56, 70). (72—4 is just a sort of footnote to that.) Then 78—5—6—7—9—80—1—2 says “I will even go further;<sup>9)</sup> for what about your relation to *me*? Are you, with all your weaknesses and fears, in any real sense my ‘master’? And what, in fact, am *I* to *you*? (Not, really, *seruus* but) ‘substitute’? or fellow-slave?<sup>10)</sup> The answer (*nempe*, cf. below) to all this” (but mainly to 75 *tunc mihi dominus*) “is: You, who command me, are yourself the slave of others.<sup>11)</sup> Who then, if anyone, is free? The man who can command *himself*”.

*nempe* introducing a speaker’s answer to his own question is, of course, quite idiomatic; for H., cf. epod. 12, 22, and in this satire, again below, 107; at epist. I 10, 22 it will mean “sure enough . . .”; *ibid.* 16, 31 “Yes, I feel pleasure, of course” (Wickham, *H. for English Readers*) is the reply by the person addressed.

8) Contrast what has been remarked in n. 4.

9) Observe, he does go further; “non leuius” is the usual understatement. 53—71 you are a slave; 75—7 no, a slave once legally manumitted is free, but no series of manumissions would liberate *you!*

10) The point of these alternative terms is this: “*uicarius* is perhaps the word for me, since if you are a slave, I am a slave’s slave; yet *conseruus* also would suit, since in one respect we are slaves of the same master”.

11) The variants are *alii*, *aliis* (“other people”). On the whole, I prefer the latter, because 75 (*rerum imperiis hominumque*) has already superseded the single proclivity; and cf. (with Peerlkamp) Vell. Pat. II 73 *libertorum suorum libertus, seruorum seruus*.

The first step in dislocation is accidental omission; and the reason for the original omission of 78 was presumably that it is not syntactically indispensable; cf. e. g. epist. II 1. 101, which is certainly out of place.

To return to Mr Ker: I have to thank him for reading, and at one point ridding of a dubious argument, the first draft of this note. And he now authorises me to state that in his opinion my transposition solves his problem.

Cambridge

A. Y. Campbell †

## ZWEI THRAKISCHE BEITRÄGE

### 1. μυσός und μανδάκης

In seinem Aufsatz über das Buchenargument KZ LXXII, S. 1 ff. kommt W. Krogmann S. 17 dazu, das vermeintliche Verhältnis vom mysischen (oder eher lydischen) Wort μυσός zur Sippe von germ. \**bōka*, lat. *fāgus* usw. zu besprechen und, um den Übergang von idg. *bh* zu mys. *m* glaubhaft zu machen, führt er Loewenthals Worte WuS X, S. 155 an: „der lyd. Buchenname μῦσος könnte \**mūzas* gelesen werden, dann gleichfalls in diesen Zusammenhang, sofern aus thrak. \**mūso-s*, \**būzo-s* entlehnt (vgl. thrak. μανδάκης ‘Garbenband’ neben lat. *offendimentum*, Μενδῖς, Βενδῖς neben got. *bindan*)“. Ich brauche hier nicht auf die Wahrscheinlichkeit einzugehen, daß das von Strabo XII 572 als lydisch<sup>1)</sup> bezeugte Wort für ‘Buche’ vom Thrakischen herstamme: es geht mich nur der angenommene Wandel von idg. *bh* zu thrak. *m* an. Daß Βενδῖς Μενδῖς die idg. Wurzel \**bhendh-* enthält, leuchtet mir wenig ein: jedenfalls könnte der Anlautwechsel auf einer Assimilation bzw. Dissimilation zum folgenden *v* beruhen.<sup>2)</sup> Übrigens ist als Ver-

1) μύσον τὴν ἀξίτην. Μυσσοί Hes., worauf Krogmann seine Bestimmung der mysischen Herkunft von μυσός stützt, ist eine *lectio deterior*, wie schon die Verschreibung ἀξίτην für ὀξύτην nahelegt. Das Ethnikon Μυσσοί entstammt einem Mißverständnis gerade der Strabo’schen Stelle, wie jeder Unvoreingenommene zugestehen muß.

2) Ein ähnlicher Fall könnte im μαντζει der Formel auf einem phrygischen Denkmal stecken: εἰ δέ τις τὴν στήλην καθελεί ἢ μαντζει, wohl für (ἀ)φαντζει. Eine andere, mir ungläubhafte Hypothese s. bei Haas, Jahrb. für kleinasiatische Forschung III/1, 1956, S. 130.