polis',[11] not (directly) to those of Iphicrates himself, without regarding this as anything problematic. On the other hand she does recognize in §§15, 29, and 30 a distinct group of episodes 'tutti collocati in Atene', and indeed, within that group, a similarity of tone as well as content between §15 ('When Iphicrates was the defendant on a capital charge he positioned youths who had hidden daggers; they disclosed the handles to the jurors and thereby alarmed them, with the result that they acquitted him out of fear') and §29 ('When Iphicrates was on trial for treason . . . and saw the jurycourt inclining towards the opposition, he stopped his speech and somehow disclosed his sword to the jurors; afraid that he might arm his comrades *en masse* and surround the jurycourt, they all voted for his acquittal'). 'L'immagine negativa che emerge nei due episodi concernenti il processo non è attestata altrove e conduce a pensare a fonti ostili contemporanee allo stesso Ificrate', is Schettino's (entirely apposite) comment here. 3.9.30 shows no signs of having come from the same hostile source, but, as it stands, is equally out of place within 3.9 as a whole. And that is surely because, at some time before Polyaenus recast it in his preferred formulaic manner ('Ἰφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων κτλ), the determining name in the anecdote was not that of Iphikrates but, apparently, Hippias.

Summarizing the duties of the ten Athenian *astynomoi* in the third quarter of the fourth century, ?Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 50.2, writes that they prevent 'the roads being encroached on by buildings and balconies extending over the roads' (τὰς ὁδοὺς . . . κατοικοδομεῖν καὶ δρυφάκτους ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑπερτείνειν). While this in itself can shed no light on whether such concerns had first been addressed under the Peisistratid tyranny, it does reveal that legislation on the subject was in place at the time of writing; and unless it was very recent legislation then—or not carried through into enforcement—there should have been no opportunity for the stratagem that Polyaenus attributes to Iphicrates.[12]

The Queen's University of Belfast   DAVID WHITEHEAD
                                                                    d.whitehead@qub.ac.uk

---

[11] Schettino (n. 3), 217.
[12] I thank the anonymous *CQ* referee for his/her suggestions, including the advisability of making this final point.

HORACE'S *SATELLES ORCI* (*ODES* 2.18.34)

The impartial earth opens for pauper and princes alike, Horace tells the avaricious addressee of *Odes* 2.18:

> nec satelles Orci
> callidum Promethea   35
> revexit auro captus. Hic superbum
>   Tantalum atque Tantali
> genus coercet, hic levare functum
>   pauperem laboribus
> vocatus atque non vocatus audit.   40

Most editors, reading *revexit* in line 36, say that the *satelles Orci* of line 34 is Charon the ferryman, while a few, reading *revi(n)xit*, which is found in half a dozen manu-

scripts, have favoured Mercury.[1] But neither identification is entirely happy when considered in full context.

It is just conceivable that Horace may have thought of Charon as the 'attendant' or 'minion' of Orcus[2] who could not be bribed to ferry crafty Prometheus back from the Underworld,[3] but he can hardly have imagined Charon engaging in activities which properly belong to Orcus himself, the constraining of Tantalus and Pelops and the answering of the poor man's prayer for release from his toils (36–40).[4] Rather, if the *satelles Orci* is Charon, we must refer the following *hic . . . coercet* and *hic . . . audit*, not to their syntactically natural referent, *satelles*, but to *Orci* ('. . . Orcus' minion [= Charon] did not ferry back . . . *He* [= Orcus] constrains . . . *he* hears . . .'), and simply settle for the jarring syntax.[5]

Nisbet and Hubbard prefer the identification with Mercury. Reading *revinxit* (= 'untied'[6]), they acknowledge the lack of evidence elsewhere that Hermes refused a bribe to release Prometheus but think that the 'hint of corruptibility' in *satelles* fits the god's 'general reputation'. And adducing Hermes' role as Psychopompos, they see a 'striking parallel' for the assertion *hic superbum Tantalum . . . coercet* in Horace's hymnic lines on Mercury shepherding the dead, at *Odes* 1.10.17–20:

> Tu pias laetis animas reponis
> sedibus virgaque levem coerces
> aurea turbam, superis deorum
>   gratus et imis.

It may be noted, however, that in the hymn it is the *piae animae* whom Mercury is said to place in their joyful abode, whereas Tantalus was notoriously *impius* and so hardly deserving of the gentle Mercury's shepherding. A more appropriate parallel for *hic . . . Tantalum . . . coercet* may be found in Virgil's account of woeful suicides in the Underworld, whom *novies Styx interfusa coercet* (*Aen.* 6.339). Besides, Mercury is no

---

[1] For discussion, see R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes II* (Oxford, 1978), 310–12.

[2] No other writer calls Charon a *satelles* of Death (by any name), but editors recall that Leonidas has Diogenes address him as Hades' *diakonos* (*AP* 7.67.1 = 2331 G-P). Virgil's *portitor Orci* (*G.* 4.502), cited by Nisbet and Hubbard, will scarcely parallel *satelles Orci*.

[3] For Horace, Prometheus is punished in the Underworld, not on the Caucasian rock. Cf. *Odes* 2.13.37–38, *quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens / dulci laborem decipitur sono* (i.e. the soothing music of Sappho and Alcaeus); *Epod.* 17.67, *(quietem) optat Prometheus obligatus aliti* (in company with Tantalus and Sisyphus). For the possibility that Horace alludes to Maecenas' *Prometheus*, which then will have told of an Underworld punishment, see Nisbet and Hubbard (n. 1), 290.

[4] On prayers to Orcus for release from suffering, cf. Lucr. *DRN* 5.996: (people mauled by wild beasts) *horriferis accibant vocibus Orcum*.

[5] The satellite moon of the planet Pluto is called Charon, and it is tempting to suppose that the astronomer who discovered the satellite in 1978, and so had the privilege of naming it, may have been familiar with this identification, *satelles Orci* = Charon, but that is not the case. James W. Christy relates ('The discovery of Charon', in S. A. Stern and D. J. Thulen [edd.], *Pluto and Charon* [Tuscon, 1997], xvii–xxi) that he wanted first and foremost to name the new moon after his wife Charlene, who was known to her family as 'Char'; he thought of adding 'the "on" [Char-on] to make it sound like an object'. On being reminded that the names of newly discovered celestial bodies must be taken from the nomenclature of classical mythology, he considered a suggestion of 'Persephone' before discovering, to his considerable satisfaction, in a check of the 'ch' entries in 'a dictionary', that there was indeed a mythical Charon. That is how Pluto's satellite got its name.

[6] For this meaning rather than 'tied fast', they cite Colum. 1.8.16, *num vilicus aut alligaverit quempiam domino nesciente aut revinxerit*, and compare Catull. 63.84, *religatque iuga manu*.

more likely than Charon to bring relieving death to the weary pauper. And one may object further that it is hardly fitting to refer to Mercury as anybody's *satelles*, for the word carries somewhat negative connotations, both of character and rank. Horace appears to think of *satellites* as generically bribable: *aurum per medios ire satelles / et perrumpere amat saxa* (*Odes* 3.16.9–10). And Sallust (*Iug.* 65.2) relates how Metellus refused the Numidian Gauda's request for a bodyguard of Roman *equites* because it would have been insulting for *equites Romani* to find themselves serving as *satellites Numidae*.[7]

Sense and syntax both would seem to require that Death, or Orcus, who constrains Tantalus and Pelops and answers the pauper's prayer, is also the one who refused to release Prometheus. Elsewhere, Horace emphasizes that Death cannot be swayed or bribed: Orcus is *non exorabilis auro* (*Ep.* 2.2.178); countless daily hecatombs will not propitiate *inlacrimabilem / Plutona . . . qui ter amplum / Geryonem Tityonque tristi / compescit unda* (*Odes* 2.14.6–9). I would suggest therefore that our difficulty in recognizing Orcus himself as the subject of *revinxit/revexit* arises from a small but distorting textual error. In line 34, Horace will have written, not *nec satelles Orci*, but *nec satelles Orcus*, 'nor, *like a minion* bribed by gold, did Orcus release . . .' For this sort of appositional simile, we may compare, for example, *Odes* 4.4.50, *cervi . . . sectamur ultro* ('*like* deer, we follow'); *Ep.* 1.2.42, *rusticus exspectat* ('*like* a country fellow . . .'); *Ep.* 1.7.74, *decurrere piscis ad hamum* ('*like* a fish to the hook'); *AP* 475, *tenet . . . hirudo* ('. . . *like* a leech').[8]

The proposed reading will circumvent the difficulties which Housman felt with *auro captus*, namely that the one who, like Prometheus, has crossed the Styx can have no gold to offer ('one coin is all that comes to the ferry, no coin crosses'), and that, in any case, Prometheus is 'no type of wealth' but rather 'a type of subtlety'.[9] If, however, we construe *auro captus* with *satelles* in the postulated simile, granting a reasonable hyperbaton, we are free to speculate on Prometheus' non-pecuniary proposal to gain his release from Hades. Horace evidently stresses the god's characteristic *calliditas* here, and so we might imagine that Prometheus tried to bribe Orcus with some sort of crafty promise or tempting secret.[10]

If indeed Horace wrote *Orcus* rather than *Orci* in line 34, the appropriate verb in line 36 is probably *revinxit*, but *revexit* is not to be discarded without due consideration. Occasionally Horace seems to imagine Mors stalking or coming to claim her victims, in the manner of Thanatos in Euripides' *Alcestis*. Thus she pursues the fleeing coward, *fugacem persequitur virum* (*Odes* 3.2.14), hovers over the doomed, *atris circumvolat alis* (*Sat.* 2.1.58), and kicks upon the doors of paupers and kings, *pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas / regumque turres* (*Odes* 1.4.13–14). And of course in

---

[7] Cf. *OLD*, s.v. *satelles* 1, 'One of a bodyguard or escort to a prince or despot, a henchman, attendant (often contempt.) . . .'

[8] Cf. Kiessling-Heinze, on *Ep.* 1.2.42: 'H. liebt diese eigentümliche Verkürzung des Gleichnisses'; ed. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922), 52, n. 1; C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971), 365. For Horace's use of more extensive *comparatio paratactica*, involving whole clauses, see Nisbet and Hubbard on *Odes* 2.12.19 (p. 192), with reference to Fraenkel (above).

[9] *Collected Papers* 1.98 = *Journ. Phil.* 17 (1888), 310–11. To remove these difficulties, and also lessen the syntactic problem of *hic* = Orcus, he emended to *revexit. aure captus hic . . .*: Orcus is 'deaf' sc. to the pleas of Tantalus and Pelops for release. As Nisbet and Hubbard note, however, *aure captus* would imply a permanent hearing disability.

[10] Maecenas' *Prometheus* (above, n. 3) presumably will have had something to say about the god's effort to secure his release.

the present passage Orcus 'hears'—and so surely arrives—summoned or unsummoned to release the poor man from his toils. It is possible, then, that if Horace imagined Orcus carrying off his victims to the Underworld, he may have thought of Prometheus as scheming to be carried back from it, so that *revexit* would yield reasonable sense. On the whole, however, *revinxit* would seem to be the better choice.[11]

Brooklyn College, CUNY and Penn State University   ARCHIBALD ALLEN
archibaldallen@msn.com

[11] Cf. D. West, *Horace. Odes II* (Oxford, 1998), 135 (reading *satelles Orci* = Mercury): '. . . did not unbind, *revinxit*, Prometheus—a typically dense and allusive Horatianism'.

VAIN REPETITIONS? NOTES ON THE TEXT OF OVID, *ARS AMATORIA* 2.593 AND *METAMORPHOSES* 14.240

The two conjectures offered here belong in the same category as one proposed by me many years ago in the text of Ausonius:[1] that of cases where the transmitted reading is not demonstrably faulty but may have ousted one more characteristic of the author.

I

> Hoc uetiti uos este: uetat deprensa Dione
> insidias illas, quas tulit ipsa, dare.   (*Ars Am.* 2.593–4)

On *uetiti . . . uetat*, M. Janka in his commentary on Book 2 of the *Ars* (Heidelberg, 1997) observes; 'die stilistische Gestaltung des Verses mit Allitterationen und Verbalpolyptoton ist auffällig'. Polyptoton is indeed one of Ovid's favourite figures, but this example of it strikes me as being, by Ovidian standards, uncommonly feeble. It is also anomalous: in the standard type of reinforcing polyptoton to which at first sight it seems to belong,[2] a participle is picked up by a finite verb.[3] Here *uetiti . . . este* is imperatival, not participial. Moreover, even if the expression is allowed to pass as an example of the figure, the essential notion of reciprocity[4] is absent.

I am therefore—somewhat belatedly, it must be admitted—moved to wonder whether the general editorial acquiescence in the transmitted text is defensible, and whether what Ovid actually wrote was *hoc moniti uos este: uetat deprensa Dione* eqs.

Admonition is a recurrent feature of Ovid's didactic style: cf. *Ars Am.* 1.387 *hoc unum moneo*, 2.608 *admoneo, ueniat nequis ad illa loquax*, 3.353 *parua monere pudet*.

II

> fugientibus instat et agmen
> concitat Antiphanes: coeunt et saxa trabesque
> coniciunt merguntque uiros merguntque carinas.   (*Met.* 14.238–40)

[1] E. J. Kenney, *PCPhS* 22 (1976), 54.
[2] It is much rarer than the reverse type, of which J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), 323–5 records over 125 examples.
[3] Ibid. 249.
[4] Cf. Austin on *Aen.* 2.160–1.