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](#)

Propertius III. (IV.) 22, 3

A. T. Barton

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 04 / April 1893, pp 153 - 153

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00197288, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00197288

How to cite this article:

A. T. Barton (1893). Propertius III. (IV.) 22, 3. The Classical Review, 7, pp 153-153
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00197288

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

(1) that we cannot legitimately supply *ξυνελθεῖν* after *πολέμῳ*; for that in all other cases the infin. or partic. is only supplied to complete some verb that is expressed in the second clause, as in *οὐ μέντοι εὐθύς γε ἀπέστη ἀλλὰ διανοεῖτο*: and (2) that, even if we could, the sense given is absurd. So I suggest *ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ <πολεμοῦντος> πρὸς τὴν...*, and all becomes satisfactory.

Lastly, in c. 75, 6 there has been much dispute over *καὶ μὴν ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία, καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν, ἔχουσά τινα ὅμως τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν κούφισιν, οὐδ' ὥς ῥαδίᾳ ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἐδοξάζετο*. The remarks of Classen and Stahl have been severely handled by Junghahn in his *Studien zu Thuk.* It seems plain that *ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν* is *part* of the *αἰκία*: was it not a terrible thing that highest and

lowest, that Nicias and the humblest camp-follower, should be in the same plight? Yet, as Machiavelli remarks, 'general evils are endured more easily than private ones.' Hence both *ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία* and the special *αἰκία* brought in them *κούφισιν τινα*, namely *τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν*.

But, in order that we may get this sense from the Greek, must we not follow the regular Thucydidean form of expression by reading *ἡ <τ> ἄλλη αἰκία καὶ ἡ ἰσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν*, that the one part may be the complement of the other?

I have still to deal with a few passages in which either the punctuation is wrong or the letters have been confused.

E. C. MARCHANT.

PROPERTIUS III. (IV.) 22, 3.

Dindymus et sacra fabricata inventa Cybebe
(or Cibeles).

This MS. line has been variously corrected, the change which has found most favour being Haupt's *e vite*, for the unmeaning *inventata*.

But a passage in Pausanias, viii. 46, makes it probable that the word which Propertius put before *Cybebe* was *dente*; for Pausanias there says that the face of the Mater Dindymene at Cyzicus (to which Propertius is referring) was made of 'wrought teeth of the hippopotamus.' *Κυζικηνοὶ τε ἀναγκάσαντες πολέμῳ Προκονησίους γενέσθαι σφίσι συνοῖκους Μητρὸς Δινδυμήνης ἀγαλμα ἔλαβον ἐκ Προκονήσου· τὸ δὲ ἀγαλμὰ ἐστὶ χρυσοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀντὶ ἐλέφαντος ἵππων τῶν ποταμίων ὁδόντες εἰσὶν εἰργασμένοι.*

I pointed out this passage to Mr. Robinson Ellis, and proposed to read *fabricata e dente*; but he thinks that would not account for the corruption *inventata*, and that the true reading must be *in dente*. He happily cites 'casus effingere in auro' (the sense being 'in the material of gold'), Virg. *Aen.* vi. 32. So 'caelataque in auro,' *Aen.* i. 640.

What word should precede *fabricata*, is more doubtful. It might be *sacro*, if the point thereof could be discerned. Mr. Ellis cites a curious remark of Aelian's, *Hist. Anim.* vii. 19, on the hippopotamus, *ἀσεβέστατον δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτάμιος ἵππος, γέγεται γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πατρός.*

He suggests that *sacro* might be meant to refer to this habit of the animal, as if his tusks were set apart for use in the goddess' image 'in some connexion with the ideas of piety to parents, which Lucretius associates with her cultus, ii. 614-617.' Otherwise *sacro* seems pointless. But I venture to think the lost word is *secto*, if it be not too wide of the MS. *sacra*. Virgil has 'secto elephanto,' *Aen.* iii. 464. The idea would be 'sections of teeth,' so that *secto* would roughly correspond to Pausanias' word *εἰργασμένοι*. The teeth, if used at all, must have been in sections, or they could not have fitted; so that, if *dente* be right, the idea of *secto* is naturally implied, whether it be expressed or not.

On the other hand, if Propertius wrote *secto*, it could hardly have kept its place when *dente* was once lost, having become thereby unmeaning.

Mr. Ellis says, 'I do not deny that *secto* would be far better in every way; nor is the change very violent. The passage too is obviously one which descended from an early period in a completely vitiated state; *secto* may therefore be considered very likely.'

If we accept these views, the line runs

*Dindymus, et secto fabricata in dente
Cybebe.*

A. T. BARTON.