The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Note on Horace, *Odes*, I. 28

E. S. Thompson

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 07 / October 1896, pp 327 - 328

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204538, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204538

How to cite this article:

E. S. Thompson (1896). Note on Horace, *Odes*, I. 28. The Classical Review, 10, pp 327-328
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204538

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

εἰρήκαμεν) (φαμέν; διὰ δέος) (διὰ τὸ αὐτό; ἔχειν) (ἤκειν.. καταστησόμενοι. There is in M a small gap after ἐνθάδε, but it is probably not due to erasure.

C. 78, 4. Read, with M only, ἄπερ <ἄν> εἰ ἐς τὴν Καμαριναίαν πρῶτον ἀφίκοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι δεόμενοι ἂν ἐπεκαλείσθη.

Eggeling, with characteristic carelessness, did not see this ἂν, but it is quite plain.

C. 82, 1 δουλείαν δὲ αὐτοὶ τε ἐβούλοντο καὶ ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπενεγκεῖν.

Herbst, recognizing that δουλείαν ἐβούλοντο is not Greek (Böhme-Widmann's τὴν αὐτὴν δύνανται δούλωσιν of i. 141 is surely not parallel) supplies ἐνεγκεῖν from ἐπενεγκεῖν, by one of the ellipses that he admires so much in Thucydides. Believing such an ellipse to be impossible, I propose δουλείαν δὲ αὐτοὶ τε <ἐαυτοῖς> κ.τ.λ., so that ἐπενεγκεῖν may belong to both clauses.

C. 86, 3 δεόμενοι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν (σωτηρίαν) μὴ προδιδόναι, νομίσαι τε τοῖσδε μὲν κ.τ.λ.

For τε Hude conjectures δε, but without admitting it into his text. As M gives νομίσαι δὲ with the utmost clearness, Eggeling ought to have recorded it. It is clearly better than the τε of the rest.

C. 89, 6 ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξύμπαντος προύστημεν, δικαιούντες ἐν ᾧ σχήματι μεγίστη ἢ πόλις ἐτύγγανε καὶ ἐλευθερωτάτῃ οὔσα καὶ ὅπερ ἐδέξατό τις, τοῦτο ξυνδιασφῆζειν (ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκομεν οἱ φρονούντες τι, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον, ὅσω κἂν [Hude, for καὶ] λαιδορήσαιμι· ἀλλὰ περὶ ὁμολογουμένης ἀνοίας οὐδὲν ἂν καινὸν λέγοιτο), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι ὑμῶν πολέμων προσκαθημένον.

In the July number of this *Review*, I

explained οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον as for οὐδενὸς ἂν χεῖρον φρονοῖην. During Dr. Hude's recent visit to England, I had an opportunity of placing my explanation before him. He raised two objections: (1) What is the point of καὶ before ἐγινώσκομεν? (2) How can the verb be supplied from the participle, φρονούντες, and not from the main verb, ἐγινώσκομεν? I will add a third. Alcibiades claims, not that he and his party desired to abolish democracy, but that they wished to limit it in some way. They wished to preserve democracy. Now if τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν = τὸ μεθιστάναι τὴν πόλιν, as it must do according to the received text, the meaning ought to be 'to substitute an *oligarchy* for the democracy'—the very idea that he disclaims (δικαιούντες τὸ σχῆμα ξυνδιασφῆζειν). αὐτὴν ought to be δημοκρατίαν: and it can become so only by printing the passage thus:—

ἡμεῖς . . τοῦτο ξυνδιασφῆζειν. ἐπεὶ δημοκρατίαν γε καὶ ἐγινώσκομεν οἱ φρονούντες τι (καὶ αὐτὸς . . λαιδορήσαιμι), καὶ τὸ μεθιστάναι αὐτὴν κ.τ.λ.

When this slight change is made Dr. Hude's objections are no longer formidable. (1) καὶ ἐγινώσκομεν corresponds to καὶ οὐκ ἐδόκει ἡμῖν: 'we knew its worthlessness, and yet did not dare to change its character': (2) καὶ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ. is an addition in parenthesis to οἱ φρονούντες τι: 'we sensible men: yes, I could prove that I am one of them.' A parenthesis often begins with καὶ in Thucydides. Lastly it becomes clear why Thucydides wrote ἐγινώσκομεν, and not ἐγινώσκον.

E. C. MARCHANT.

NOTE ON HORACE, *ODES*, I. 28.

THAT this ode is a monologue seems now generally agreed; but I think scholars would not have taken so long to reach this result if one point had been grasped, which I have nowhere seen stated. It is that the poem is intended for an inscription. It is an ἐπιτύμβιον for a cenotaph, and is thus to be brought into relation with the many poems of this kind (especially about persons lost at sea) to be found in the seventh book of the *Palatine Anthology* (see the introduction to Mackail's *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, pp. 71 sqq.). The following list of epigrams will show the frequency of the topic in the book: by Simonides 496

(κενεοὶ τάφοι) and 510; by Callimachus 271, 272; by Leonidas of Tarentum (3rd century B.C.) 652, 654. Epigram 273 is by 'Leonidas,' but whether the Tarentine or the Alexandrian, who lived under Nero, we know not. The tomb is here called ψεύστης λίθος, and the phrase δοφερῆς κύματα πανδοῖης Ὀρίωνος may be an anticipation (or an echo) of Horace's *deveri rapidus comes Orionis Notus*. Epigram 397 is by Erycius the Thessalian (1st century B.C.) for the cenotaph of a shipwrecked mariner; 404, by Zonas of Sardis (also 1st century B.C.), is spoken by a stranger who gives the 'pulveris exigui munera' to a shipwrecked corpse;

cf. 277 by Callimachus. Epigram 495, by Alcaeus of Messene (*flor.* 200 B.C.), 497 by Damagetus (*flor.* 200 B.C.), 499 by Theaetetus (perhaps 3rd century B.C.), 500 by Asclepiades (*flor.* 290 B.C.), 539 by Perses (*flor.* 300 B.C.) are all inscriptions for cenotaphs in memory of shipwrecked persons. There are many others of doubtful date, or later than Horace. In some of these the word *κωφός* is used to express the 'dummy' monument; 392 *κωφὴν λίθακα*, 395 *κωφὸν γράμμα* (where also note the phrase *συρμὸς Ὠρίωνος*).

If we assume that there was a well-known 'tomb of Archytas' somewhere on the coast, and that the monument to the unknown mariner of Horace's ode stood near it, all follows naturally. An epitaph, it is needless to say, often takes the form of an address by the shade of the dead man, and this is sometimes the case with cenotaphs (e.g. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 500). 'You yonder, Archytas, were drowned and buried: I was

drowned but have not been buried: whoever finds my body, please bury it' is briefly the argument. Two things have disguised the epigraphic character of the poem: its length and its metre. As to the length, it was natural that Horace should yield to the temptation of dwelling on the personality of Archytas. As to the metre, Horace had clearly made up his mind under no circumstances to be seduced into writing elegiacs, and so avoided the metre in which an epitaph would have been most recognizable. He had selected his own function—*princeps Aëlium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos*; he left to his contemporaries and juniors the working out of the problem of the Latin pentameter. It is to be noted that, where (as in *Odes*, iv. 7) he reproduces the last half of the pentameter, he shows no special predilection for what became under Ovid the stereotyped rhythm of it.

E. S. THOMPSON.

NOTE ON THEMISTIUS' PARAPHRASE OF *PHYSICS*, II. 9.

In Themistius' Paraphrase of Aristotle's *Physics*, ii. 9 (Teubner text, p. 201), occur the words: *εἴτε δὲ τῶν φύσει τι γιγνομένων εἴτε τῶν κατὰ τέχνην λαμβάνοις, εὐρήσεις ἂν ὡς φυσικὸς ἐξετάξης, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τὴν ὕλην καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον αἴτιον περιεχόμενον ὁρισαμένους γὰρ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ πρίην, ὅτι διαίρεσις τοιαύδε ξύλων, εὐθὺς ἐμφαίνεται ἢ τοῦ σιδήρου χρεία, καὶ οὕτω μὲν δύνανται [lego δυνάμει] καὶ ἐξ ἐπιλογισμοῦ τινος, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ. τί ἐστιν ὀργή; ζέσις τοῦ περικαρδίου αἵματος δι' ὀρεξιν ἀντιληπτήσεως.*

The necessity of the emendation proposed will appear from the following explanatory translation: 'But whether you take a product of nature or of art, you will find, if you inquire as a physicist, the matter and the necessary cause included in the same definition [*sc.* with the form or essence]. For on defining the work or function of sawing as such or such a dividing of the parts of wood the need of the iron is at once made manifest. And in such cases it is potentially, and as the result of an inference

[*sc.* that the definition involves the matter and the *condicio sine qua non* or necessary cause] but often explicitly [in actuality]. [For example] What is anger? A ferment of the pericardial blood caused by a desire for revenge.'

A period or colon should of course be placed after *χρεία*. The Teubner text as it stands cannot be construed so as to account for the three *καί*'s, and would yield no satisfactory sense if it could. If further confirmation is needed, it is found in the words of the Commentary of Simplicius *ad loc.*: *ἐπειδὴ ἐν πολλοῖς ὁρισμοῖς ἐμπεριλαμβάνεται καὶ ἡ ὕλη ποτὲ μὲν δυνάμει ἐν τῷ τοῦ εἶδους ὁρισμῷ... ποτὲ δὲ ἐνεργείᾳ*. The thought of the passage goes back to Plato, *Cratylus*, 389. Compare the words of Simplicius: *συναναφαίνεται ὅτι ἐκ σιδήρου δεῖ τοὺς ὀδόντας εἶναι*, with Plato, *Crat.* 389 C: *τὸ φύσει γὰρ ἐκάστω, ὡς εἶκε, τρύπανον πεφυκὸς εἰς τὸν σίδηρον δεῖ ἐπίστασθαι τιθέναι*.

PAUL SHOREY.

University of Chicago.