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](#)

Notes and Suggestions

T. G. Tucker

The Classical Review / Volume 34 / Issue 7-8 / November 2010, pp 152 - 156

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00014050, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00014050

How to cite this article:

T. G. Tucker (2010). Notes and Suggestions. The Classical Review, 34, pp 152-156
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00014050

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

In conclusion of this and in preparation for the next paper, let me say a word in answer to an objection which has reached me privately. The writer is one who speaks with admitted authority on these matters. He says: 'The difficulty in this question is the danger of reasoning in a circle. I hope you will adduce *independent* evidence (i.e. not the evidence of verse itself) for the "intensity" of the words you mention.'

In reply to this I would say: (1) that I began the inquiry with the Interrogatives just because there is explicit evidence in the grammarians, as early as Quintilian, that (as in our modern languages, be it noted) these were differentiated in pronunciation from the Relatives by their *accentus*. If the Demonstratives, in particular, when subjoined to *quis*, etc., are regularly attacked by iambic weakening, I infer that the cause lies in the grouping: the known pronunciation of *quis*, etc., in the ordinary language, its extra intensity (i.e. added force and raised tone) is what depletes the recessive partner in the group.

(2) That comedy conformed to the spoken language, and that no violence was done by Terence and Co. to the ordinary pronunciation of phrases like *Quid istic? ita-me-di-ament, ob-eam-rem* by the position given to them in a verse, I should regard as self-evident; just as in English you cannot alter the pronunciation of groups and phrases (e.g. *How d' you do?*) without making your verse ridiculous. But if it should

be called in question, one could cite the chain of testimony, beginning with Terence's own prologues and continuing through the grammarians (e.g. Keil, Vol. III., p. 418), to the effect that he deliberately lowered the poetical pitch of language in comedy: *Ne sint sonora uerba consuetudinis*, as Terentian. Maur. says.

(3) The objection may be retorted. For if *Breves Breviantes* were a metrical and not a phonetic principle of Latin, why should its effects be visible in single words? How could a metrical law produce *modō, benē, sciō*, etc.? Surely no one supposes that in conversation one said *modō, benē, sciō*, and *modō, benē, sciō* were literary and poetical?

(4) If it is a phonetic phenomenon, it has taken place before the word or group goes into the verse, and the position of the conglomerate in the verse depends on its pronunciation, not *vice versa*.

O how d' you dō, sir?

It is not the verse ictus which puts the accent on *dō*; the phrase is necessarily so arranged to take the ictus of the verse, because its accent cannot be altered without absurdity—especially in colloquial verse.

It is proposed next to follow the clue of the 'Recessives' *hic, ille*, and observe their behaviour when subjoined to some other monosyllables with a view to determining whether these also were not 'intense' in pronunciation.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Glasgow.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS.

A. ATHENÆUS.

In the *Classical Quarterly*, 1908, No. 3, I offered a number of emendations in the text of Athenæus. Repeated reading of that author has further convinced me of the unsatisfactoriness of Kaibel's Teubner text. It is true that the editing is generally cautious, nor can one reasonably object to sundry passages being left entirely unintelligible by an editor who has the rather rare courage to con-

fess 'non capio' or 'non intellego.' Nevertheless—apart from the fact that some of these passages can be rendered intelligible by ordinary processes—there are certain defects of the edition which should prevent it from standing as the last word upon the text of an author who ought to be read much more widely than he is at present. The paragraphing (which is of the greatest moment in Athenæus) is on the whole rational, although there are many places in which

it is positively misleading. More seriously one may complain of the lack of technical judgment sometimes exhibited in the inclusion, or the mention, of a conjecture. It is high time that scholars abandoned the practice of inserting or substituting words which merely 'make sense,' while no ocular or other reason is assigned for the omission or the misreading as we find it. For instance, in 1B it would in any case scarcely be good textual criticism to alter τῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ παρασκευῆς to τῆς ἐν τῷ δειπνῷ παρασκευῆς (a conjecture of Kaibel himself). There is no palaeographical resemblance between δειπνῷ and λόγῳ, and the conjecture is doubly bad, inasmuch as the text is quite sound, the sense being simply 'of the courses described in the narrative.' This, perhaps, is an unusually violent example, and it is a pity that it should face us on the second page. What it betrays is the absence of a rigid technical standard. While Kaibel allowed himself—for personal reasons, as his preface indicates—to be unduly influenced by Wilamowitz, and therefore to print a number of poor and hasty conjectures of that scholar along with the few convincing ones, he must often (it would appear) have devoted insufficient time to the annotations of Casaubon as amplified by Schweighäuser. Thus in 206D we have: Διοκλείδης μὲν ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης θαυμάζεται ἐπὶ τῇ πρὸς τὴν Ῥοδίων πόλιν ὑπὸ Δημητρίου προσαχθείσῃ τοῖς τέλχεσιν ἐλεπόλει, Τίμαιος δ' ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ τῇ κατασκευασθείσῃ Διονυσίῳ τῷ Σικελίας τυραννῷ κ.τ.λ. Since Diocleides did not invent the ἐλέπολις, nor Timaeus the πυρά, but since both of them (like the rest in the list which follows) were merely writers who expressed their sense that such things were θαύματα, I had laboured to the conclusion that what Athenaeus wrote was θαυματίζειται ('makes a wonderment'). After obtaining Casaubon's notes I found that he virtually suggests that word. Yet Kaibel, while feeling and noting the difficulty, has no mention of the suggestion, but prefers to say 'haec omnia audacissime truncata.'

Again the editor is not always apt at an idiom. Thus in 3F ὁ δὲ Χίος Ἴων τραγῳδίαν νικήσας Ἀθήνησιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν

Ἀθηναίων ἔδωκε Χίον κεράμιον. Kaibel's obvious Χίου (sc. οἴνου) is actually less idiomatic, as any reader of the private speeches of Demosthenes should know, than Χίον (with the same implication). So in 75A <ο> συκᾶς φυτεύω πάντα πλὴν Λακωνικῆς he quotes without comment the <καὶ γένῃ> συκῆς of Blaydes. καὶ γένῃ is plausible enough (since ταδὶ λέγων immediately precedes), but συκᾶς πάντα γένῃ ('figtrees of all kinds') is as idiomatic Greek as 'porticus avibus omne genus oppletae' (Varr. R.R. 3. 5. 11) is idiomatic Latin. Nor is his ear very acute for metre. For example, in 397A, in illustration of the point that peacocks were once rare in Greece, Athenaeus quotes Antiphanes, and then adds καὶ Εὐβουλὸς ἐν Φοίνικι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ταῶς διὰ τὸ σπάνιον θαυμάζεται. Kaibel remarks 'Eubuli verba interciderunt,' evidently imagining the words καὶ γὰρ . . . θαυμάζεται to be a weak repetition by Athenaeus himself. Yet it should be obvious that they form the very verse for which Kaibel was looking.

As a final criticism it may be urged that Athenaeus is a lover of humour—certainly an eager collector of the humorous—and his editor should therefore be blessed with a fair appreciation of that quality.

I venture to add the following to my previous notes:

237B-C (Kaibel's text):

δύ' ἐστὶ, Ναυσίνικε, παρασίτων γένῃ,
ἐν μὲν τὸ κοινὸν καὶ κεκωμωδῆμενον,
οἱ μέλανες ἡμεῖς· θάτερον ζητῶ γένος,
5 σεμνοπαράσιτον ἐκ μέσου καλούμενον,
4 σατράπας παρασίτους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανεῖς
ὑποκρινόμενον ἐν τοῖς βλοῖς.

The lines marked 5 and 4 stand as transposed by Dobree. Kaibel notes (1) 'ζητῶ suspectum'; (2) 'ἐκ μέσου corruptum'; (3) 'requiro etiam τὸ σεμνοπαράσιτον' (which, of course, will not scan); (4) 'σατράπας χαχρύσους Dobr(ee).' But as to ἐκ μέσου I am not at all sure that it is corrupt. I believe it to be simply 'Get out of the way!' (i.e. the haughty nabob parasite says to others 'Get out!'). ζητῶ is doubtless corrupt, and ζηλῶ (which would suggest itself at once) is away from the mark. The probable reading,

I suggest, is *σηστῶν*, which gives the required antithesis to *μέλανες*, the two classes being compared to black bread and bread of fine flour respectively. For the rest it is clear that the copyist had (so to speak) parasites on the brain. *παράσιτοι* are so much before his mind that he not only gives *σεμνοπαράσιτον* for *σεμνοπρόσωπον* (and so makes it necessary for some later corrector to eject the article), but also gives *σατράπας παρασίτους* for *σατράπας ἀπροσίτους* ('unapproachable'). Dobree's *ζαχρύσους* is technically too remote.

Read then:

θάτερον σηστῶν γένος,
τὸ σεμνοπρόσωπον, 'ἐκ μέσου' καλούμενον,
σατράπας ἀπροσίτους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανείς
ὑποκρινόμενον κ.τ.λ.

278B (from Archestratus):

τὴν δ' ἄμλαν φθινοπῶρον, ὅταν Τλειὰς καταδύνη,
πάντα τρόπον σκεύαζε, τί σοι τάδε μυθολογέω;
οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἴσε διαφθείρηγ', οὐδ' ἂν ἐπιθυμῆς.

The sense is manifestly 'You can't spoil it, even if you wish to.' Kaibel adopts the *οὐ γὰρ μὴ σὺ διαφθείρης* of Coraes. But why the emphatic *σὺ*? And why the corruption of case? More natural is *σφε*. The process of corruption would be, first *σφε* to *σε*, then an adaptation of the verb (which could no longer be second person) to *διαφθείρη*, and, last, the schoolboy stopgap *γ'* (which was so freely employed by inferior *διορθῶται*).

290B (the cook boasting of his skill):

οὐκ ἄλλὰ τὸ πέρας τῆς μαγειρικῆς, Σύρε,
ἴεῖρμα μόνον εἰδέναι τῶν νομιζομένων ἐμέτ.

K. has *εὐρηκέναι πάντων νόμιζε μόνον ἐμέ*, partly from Schweighäuser, partly from Dobree. But why so far from the copy? Nearer is:

εὐρημ' ἐμόν, μόνον εἰδέναι νόμιζ' ἐμέ.

[*νομιζομένων* probably arose from the combination *νομιζεμε*, while the insertion of the article would naturally follow in an attempt to make sense.]

304B (from Hipponax):

κατέφαγε δὴ τὸν κλῆρον, ὥστε χρὴ σκάπτειν
πέτρας τορείας σὺκα μέτρια τρώγων
καὶ κρίθινον κόλλιχα, δούλιον χόρτον.

So K. prints, simply remarking on the second line 'corruptus et fort. mutilus.' ὥστε χρὴ σκάπτειν τρώγων not

being Greek, and *τορείας* having no meaning, we may emend with

ὥς τέφρην σκάπτειν
πέτρας τ' ὁρείας.

The poor man is reduced to digging (not good productive land, but mere) *τέφρα* and mountain-side rocks. It was natural that in *ὥστεφρήσκαπτειν* the copyist should find *ὥστε*, and the Ionic form in *-η* added to the ease of corruption. The nominative participle is now, of course, correct.

Here, as a digression, may I draw attention to an almost universal misrendering of the passage in Aeschylus, *Agam.* 485 sqq., which is punctuated thus:

τίς ὦδε παιδὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος,
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ'
ἀλλαγῇ λόγου καμῖν;
[ἐν] γυναικὸς αἰχμῇ πρόπει
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναιέσαι.
πιθανὸς ἄγαν ὁ θῆλυς ὁδὸς ἐπινέμεται κ.τ.λ.

How can (*ὥστε*) *πυρωθέντα καμῖν* stand for (*ὥστε*) *πυρωθεῖς καμῖν*? The solecism may be removed by punctuating:

τίς ὦδε παιδὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος;
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέοις πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ'
ἀλλαγῇ λόγου καμῖν
[ἐν] γυναικὸς αἰχμῇ πρόπει.
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξυναιέσαι
πιθανὸς ἄγαν κ.τ.λ.

316E-F (from Pherecrates):

ὅποταν δ'
ἤδη πεινώσιν σφόδρα <. . .>
ὥσπερ τοὺς πουλύποδας
<. . .> νύκτωρ περιτρώ-
γειν αὐτῶν τοὺς δακτύλους.

Wilamowitz offers *σφόδρ' ἄγαν*. The following *ὥς*- rather suggests the loss of *πως*, i.e. *σφόδρα πως*. For the rest the lines may be made normal by reading:

ὥσπερ τοὺς πουλύποδας
δακτύλους νύκτωρ περιτρώ-
γειν αὐτοὺς τοὺς αὐτῶν.

320A (from Archestratus):

σκάρον ἐξ 'Εφέσου ζῆται, χειμῶν δὲ τρίγλαν
ἔσθι' ἐνὶ ψαφάρῃ †ληφθέντα Τειχιόσση
Μιλήτῳ κώμῃ Καρῶν πέλας ἀγκυλοκόλων.

ληφθέντα is wrong in gender as well as in metre, but simply to alter to *ληφθεῖσαν* is not to explain the corruption. Now in 325B Athenaeus says that Archestratus praises *τὰς κατὰ Τειχιοῦ ντα τῆς Μιλησίας τρίγλας*. It

is therefore natural to assume that the form used by Arcestratus was *Τειχιόεις* and not *Τειχιόεσσα*. It is true that Thucydides (8. 28) has *Τειχιούσσα*, and that was probably the usual name. Hence the corruption here. If Arcestratus had written

ληφθεῖσαν Τειχιόεντι,
Μιλήτου κώμη,

it is easy to understand how (especially through some fancied agreement with *κώμη*) there might be substituted

ληφθεῖσαν Τειχιόεσση.

A διορθωτής intended to correct the latter word by means of an adscript *-εντι*, but this was misinterpreted as an *-έντα* correcting *ληφθεῖσαν*. Any-one with an ear will prefer *Τειχιόεντι* in a line already sigmatic enough.

321C: After speaking of the related, but distinct, fish called *σαργιοί*, *χαλκίδες*, and *σαργῖνοι*, the text has:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Δωρίων ἐν τῷ περὶ ἰχθύων φησί,
σαργίνους διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτοὺς καλῶν καὶ χαλκίδας.

This is obviously meaningless, and *διὰ τοῦτ'* has nothing whatever to which we can refer it. The most appropriate sense is that Dorion is 'peculiar' in identifying *σαργῖνοι* with *χαλκίδες*. This meaning is given, not by *διὰ τοῦτ'*, but by *ἰδίᾳ τοὺς*, i.e. *σαργίνους ἰδίᾳ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καλῶν καὶ χαλκίδας*.

337E-F: Cleitarchus relates that the Thebans kept a poor and mean table *παρασκευάζοντες ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις θρία καὶ ἐψητοὺς καὶ ἀφύας καὶ ἐγκρασιχόλους καὶ ἁλλάντας καὶ σχελίδας καὶ ἔτνος· οἷσι Μαρδόνιον εἰστίασε μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πεντήκοντα Περσῶν Ἀτταγῖνος ὁ Φρύωνος, ὃν φησιν Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ μεγάλως πλούτῳ παρεσκευάσθαι· ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐκ ἂν περιεγέγοντο οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέξασε τοῖς Ἑλλήσι περὶ Πλαταιὰς παρατάτεσθαι ἀπολωλόσιν ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων τροφῶν.*

What sense is this supposed to possess? How could Attaginus feast Mardonius 'richly' with such things? No irony is intended, for the meal actually was a sumptuous one. In any case, what has the circumstance to do with the next sentence? Kaibel adopts *ἡγοῦμαι <δ> ὅτι* from Musurus, and

his notes are (1) '*πλούτῳ* del. Meineke ex Herod.,' (2) '*fort. παρασκευάσθαι*.' He says nothing of the strange form *οἷσι* for *οἷς*, and offers no explanation of the appearance of *πλούτῳ*. The sense required is not *οἷσι* . . . *εἰστίασε*, but *οἷς εἰ* . . . *εἰστίασε*. It then appears that *ἡγοῦμαι* begins the apodosis, while the *δ'* of Musurus ruins the meaning. The change of *οἷς εἰ* for *οἷσι* is palaeographically no change at all. For *μεγάλως πλούτῳ* an obvious emendation is *μεγαλοπλούτως*. The only serious corruption, but one of a common type, has been the alteration of an original *ἀπολωλότας* to *ἀπολωλόσιν* to suit τοῖς Ἑλλήσι through a misconception.

Read: *οἷς εἰ Μαρδόνιον εἰστίασε μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πεντήκοντα Περσῶν Ἀτταγῖνος ὁ Φρύωνος, ὃν φησιν Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ μεγάλως πλούτῳ παρεσκευάσθαι, ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐκ ἂν περιεγέγοντο, οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέξασε τοῖς Ἑλλήσι παρατάτεσθαι ἀπολωλότας ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων τροφῶν: i.e.* "If Attaginus had feasted Mardonius and his fifty Persians with these things, I believe they would not have survived, and there would have been no occasion for them to meet the Greeks in battle, for they would already have met their death from eating such food."

463E (from Alexis):

'We are, as it were, let out on a holiday from death into the upper air'

ὅς δ' ἂν πλείστα γελᾷσθαι καὶ πῖναι
καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἀντιλαμβάνεται τὸν χρόνον
τούτον ὃν ἀφείται καὶ τύχη ἴτ' ἐράνου τινός,
πανηγυρίσας ἥδιστ' ἀπῆλθεν οἴκαδε.

Read *τερπνοῦ* for *τ' ἐράνου*.

478D (from Aristophanes):

ἄλλαι ὑποπρεσβύτεραι γράες θασιῶν μέλανος μεστὸν
κεραμευομέναις κοτύλαις μεγάλαις ἔγχεον ἐς σφέτερον
δέμας οὐδὲν ἄκοσμον
ἔρωτι βιαζόμεναι μέλανος οἶνον ἀκράτουν.

It is impossible to make any metre of this as it stands, and K. rightly remarks '*corrupti et mutili*.' Madvig naturally ejected *γράες*, and Toup's *οὐδένα κόσμον* is clearly right. K. himself suggests . . . *μέλανος <φρένας>* . . . in the third line.

If we keep γράες, but alter its position, transpose κοτύλαις in the form κοτύλαισι, and read ἔβρεχον for ἔγχεον, we obtain good anapaestic lines with

ἀλλ' αἶ <θ'> ὑποπρεσβύτεραι θασίου μέλανος μεστών
κοτύλαισι
κεραμευομέναις μεγάλαις ἔβρεχον σφέτερον δέμας
οὐδένα κόσμον
<χαί> γράες ἔρωτι βιαζόμεναι μέλανος <φρένας>
οἴνου ἀκράτου.

For ἔβρεχον cf. 47D. The sense of κεραμευομέναις μεγάλαις is that they were 'manufactured of great size' expressly.

608D :

ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὢν ὁ ποιητής, οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ
ἀνθ' ἐν 'Αλφειβοῖα φησιν. . . .

As everyone has seen, the context makes καὶ impossible. The easiest remedy is κάρτα (which is frequent in Athenaeus, though several times disguised by the copyists). The sentence should run :

ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὢν ὁ ποιητής οὗτος κάρτα ἐπὶ
τὰ ἀνθ' κ.τ.λ.

So 80D: 'Ηγησιάνακτα . . . κατ' ἀρχὰς ὄντα πένητα καὶ τραγῶδόν φησι γενέσθαι ὑποκριτικὸν καὶ εὐχον. Read ὄντ' ἀπηνῆ κάρτα τραγῶδόν . . . And 188D: παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μενελάου συμποσίῳ προβάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ ἐν διατριβῇ ζητήματα, καὶ πολιτικῶς ὁμιλοῦντες τέρπουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ ἡμᾶς.

In point of fact, and in connection with the argument, this statement is 'clean cam.' The whole point is that Homer behaves in a manner quite unlike that of the deipnosophist Ulpian. He does not, like such persons, προβάλλειν ζητήματα as if at a lecture. On the contrary, his diners ὁμιλοῦσι πολιτικῶς (i.e. in a human and practical way). In 190A it is said of such a conversation in Homer οὐ γὰρ ὡς πρόβλημα προτείνει, ἀλλ' ἐπιχαρίτως παρείρας κ.τ.λ. In 186D-E Homer is the poet who teaches us to be seasonable, whereas Epicurus knows neither place nor time, so that we are led μαντεύσασθαι πῶς ποτ' ἄνθρωπος ἐξαπίνης ἔχων κύλικα προβάλλει ζητήματα καθάπερ ἐν διατριβῇ λέγων. Here therefore read: παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μενελάου συμποσίῳ <οὐ> προβάλλουσιν

ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ ἐν διατριβῇ ζητήματα,
<ἀλλὰ> κάρτα πολιτικῶς κ.τ.λ.

T. G. TUCKER.

B. HORACE.

Epod. 5. 87 f.:

venena magnum fas nefasque non valent
convertere humanam vicem.

THERE is little need to discuss the renderings hitherto attempted. Nothing could be more awkward than Orelli's 'magnum fas nefasque humanam vicem non valent convertere venena, i.e. leges divinae, quibus distinguitur fas et nefas, more modoque hominum non valent convertere (in contrariam, i.e. meliorem, partem flectere ac lenire) venena.' On the other hand, to take convertere zeugmatically, with the tortuous construction *venena magnum fas nefasque* (valent evertere, sed) non valent convertere humanam vicem (= 'retribution') is not only to deal with Latin as Latin should not be dealt with, but also to ignore the point of *magnum* and produce a dangerously false statement.

Why should not *humanam vicem* mean 'for the sake of mankind' (= 'to please human beings')? The sense 'Potions have no power to change the mighty law of right and wrong (and its consequences) merely to suit human beings' gives full force to *magnum* and is entirely opposite to the context.

In *Epod.* 17. 42 we have *infamis Helenae Castor offensus vicem* (al. *vices*), where Orelli quotes Cic. *ad Fam.* 1. 9. 2 *nostram vicem ultus est ipse sese*. The dictionaries supply other instances. Doubtless *hominum vicem* would be more usual, but Horace would rather avoid than choose it on that account.

Sat. 1. 3. 117 ff.

I suggest that the difficulties in this well-known passage are removed if we punctuate thus—

adsit
regula, peccatis quae poenas irroget aequas,
ne scutica dignum horribili sectere flagello
(nam ut ferula caedas meritum maiora subire
verbera non vereor), cum dicas esse pares res
furta latrocinii, etc.

i.e. 'for fear you should apply the knout where only the tawse is deserved,