

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](#)



Conjectures

D. A. Slater

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 05 / August 2009, pp 158 - 160

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00005229, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00005229

How to cite this article:

D. A. Slater (2009). Conjectures. The Classical Review, 27, pp 158-160 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00005229

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἀμήχανον μή κοτε ἐν γένηται (so A B C, other MSS. ἐγγένηται).

I thought before of <οὐδὲ> μή κοτε, but I am inclined now to suggest ἐν γενέσθαι (or ἐγγενέσθαι), something like Thuc. 7. 29. 3 ἀπροσδοκῆτοις (active) μή ἂν ποτέ τινα σφίσιν . . . ἐπιθέσθαι, the negative being superfluous in both.

6. 74 The Styx is described: ὕδωρ ὀλίγον φαινόμενον ἐκ πέτρης στάζει ἐς ἄγκος. φαινόμενον coming into sight is a strange expression, and, as φαίνω and φέρω get exchanged, I conjecture φερόμενον. Cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 255c πηγῆ . . . πολλὰ φερόμενη. Water and wind are said φέρεσθαι.

6. 102 Many attempts have been made at emending κατεργέοντες. Has κατολιγωρέοντες ever been suggested? In sense it is very suitable.

7. 169. Should not ἐπιμέμφεσθε κ.τ.λ. be made a question?

7. 173 μεταξύ δὴ for δέ?

7. 209 βασιλίην τε καὶ πόλιν καλλίστην?

7. 219 αὐτόμολοι ἦσαν οἱ ἐξήγγειλαν?

7. 223 ἢ κατάβασις συντομωτέρη τέ ἐστι καὶ βραχύτερος ὁ χῶρος πολλὸν ἤπερ ἡ περίοδος τε καὶ ἀνάβασις.

κατάβασις σ. and β. χῶρος amount to exactly the same thing, except indeed in so far as χῶρος does not mean a way, i.e. a distance, at all and is therefore an unsuitable word. Did not Herodotus write χρόνος? The words after ἤπερ are then used with a common ellipse.

9. 77 Perhaps ἄξιον . . . εἶναι, a construction of which Herodotus makes use.

9. 102 The ἔτι should be transferred not to stand before περιήσαν but to follow ἕως. ἕως ἔτι is frequent.

H. RICHARDS.

CONJECTURES.

Propertius iii. 21. 26.

Inde ubi Piraei capient me litora portus,
scandam ego Theseae bracchia longa viae.
Illic vel studiis animum emendare Platonis
incipiam aut hortis, docte Epicure, tuis;
persequar aut studium linguae, Demosthenis
arma,
librorumque tuos, docte Menandre, sales.

THE text of these lines is admittedly corrupt, and several emendations have been proposed; but, so far as I can ascertain, the most suspicious word has never been called in question at all. It is the allusion to 'the garden' that pulls the reader up short: so that Prof. Phillimore, for instance—who kept the reading printed above in his text—found himself obliged to adopt a conjecture when he proceeded to publish his translation. *Stadiis* (Broukhuyts) for *studiis* is paleographically an easy and obvious correction, but in the sense of 'walks'—'alleys' (Phillimore)—the word does not appear to occur elsewhere; whereas *studiis* is in itself unimpeachable: it supplies just the thought required. 'Haec studia . . . secundas res ornant, adversis per fugium ac solacium praebent . . . pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur.' The garden was, it is true,

one of the sights of Athens, and would naturally attract a follower of Epicurus. So in the introduction to the fifth book of the *De Finibus* it is mentioned as a favourite resort of Atticus: 'At ego, quem vos ut deditum Epicuro insectari soletis, sum multum equidem cum Phaedro, quem unice diligo ut scitis, in Epicuri hortis, quos modo praeteribamus.' But it was hardly the *ιατρειὸν ψυχῆς*, in which Propertius could hope to get his wounds healed; . . . 'lenibunt tacito vulnera nostra sinu' (32 *infra*). The 'mythology' of the place was more likely to revive than to allay his passion.

In short, the context demands a reference, not to nature, but to literature, and we need only consult an Epicurean to obtain the clue.

In the proem addressed to Epicurus, with which the third book of the *De Rerum Natura* opens, occur the following well-known lines:

Tu, pater, es rerum inventor, tu patria nobis
suppeditas praecepta, tuisque ex, inclute, chartis
. . . omnia nos itidem depascimur aurea dicta.

Now Propertius had little enough in common with Lucretius, but as a lover of good poetry he may well have known the whole of this magnificent prelude

by heart. It contains much that would tend to fix it in the memory of an Umbrian. The morbid reflections on death could not fail to appeal to the author of *Quandocumque igitur* and *Sunt aliquid manes*. The three hundred libri, i.e. 'chartae,'¹ which Epicurus left behind him at his death,² were at least as famous as the garden itself, and an allusion to them is, in my view, what Propertius intended here.

In the next couplet we are on more difficult ground. But if 'studium' is corrupt—and the apposition is strange enough to warrant the supposition—it may well be a distortion of 'fulmen.'³

ὄργῃ Περικλέης οὐλύμπιος
ἥστραπτ' ἐβρόντα ξυνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα.
(Ar., *Acharnians*, 531).

The king of orators has as good a right as the king of statesmen, or the king of the gods, to be endowed with the thunderbolt of eloquence. The metaphor is not unknown to prose: 'Stilus nec acumine posteriorum nec fulmine utens superiorum,' Cic., *Orator*, vi. 21. Cf. the use of 'tonare,' Cicero, *Orator* 29 and 'Proinde tona eloquio, solitum tibi' (Virgil, *Aen.* xi. 383); Cic., *Orator*, § 29.

In the next line it is probable that the corrupt 'librorum' (= 'librom') comes from a relique of some *deponent* future, possibly P.'s favourite 'Mirabor,' which has, I believe, already been suggested. Lastly, since 'docte Epicure' is probably sound (cf. Statius' 'docti furor arduus Lucreti'); 'docte Menandre' should perhaps give place to Kuinoel's fascinating conjecture, 'munde Menandre.' The whole four lines will then run thus:

Illic vel studiis animum emendare Platonis
incipiam aut chartis, docte Epicure, tuis;
persequare aut fulmen linguae, Demosthenis
arma,⁴
miraborque tuos, munde Menandre, sales.

Plautus, *Rudens*, 86.

Pro di immortales, tempestatem quouismodi
Neptunus nobis nocte hac misit proxuma.
Detexit ventus villam—quid verbis opust?
non ventus fuit, verum *Alcumena* Euripidi:

¹ Ellis on Catullus, I. 6.

² Wallace, *Epicureanism*, pp. 78-79.

³ fulmen = flumen = flu(d)ium.

⁴ Cf. Sophocles, *Oed. Rex*, 170, φρουρίδος
ἔγχος φ' τις ἀλέξεται.

ita omnis de tecto deturbavit tegulas—
inlustriorem fecit fenestrasque indidit.

In view of passages like the *Bacchae*, 576-689 and *H. F.*, 874 sqq., it may be felt that some generalisation would be more natural in this context, to suggest 'a storm such as blows in the pages of Euripides,' rather than the name of a single character (however demented) from a play that has perished. Such a generalisation might conceivably be conveyed in the words 'ruina (possibly Ruina⁵) Euripidi.' 'Ruina,' in the sense of 'cataclysm,' is used by Cicero (*Pro Cluentio*, 88 and 96), 'Ruinae similiore aut tempestati'; 'Ruina quaedam atque tempestas,' and it is applied by Horace (*Carm.* ii. 19. 15) to the destruction of the house of Pentheus in the play. In the Greek original, which Plautus was probably adapting, either the *ἔνοσις* of *Bacchae*, 585 or the *θύελλα* of *H. F.* 905 may have been travestied thus. And the second syllable of 'vervm' might very easily be lost by haplography before 'RVINA.'

Such a loss would leave us—

NONVENTVSFVITVERVINAEVRIPIDI.

I do not know what evidence there is of the intrusion of marginal glosses into the text of Plautus. But if we may assume that the allusion was explained by a reference in the margin to the 'Alcumenae filius,' it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the editor or corrector reduced the line to metre by interpreting the forlorn A in the text to mean 'Alcumena.' And that would give us the text we have. As it stood, the line had no true 'caesura,' the roughness of the metre suggesting the violence of the storm.

Cicero, *De Oratore*, i. 32. 146.

Verum ego hanc vim intellego esse in praeceptis omnibus, non ut ea oratores eloquentiae laudem sint adepti, sed, quae sua sponte homines eloquentes facerent, ea quosdam observasse atque † *id egisse*: sic esse non eloquentiam ex artificio, sed artificium ex eloquentia natum.

The words 'id egisse' have been variously emended. Perhaps the context requires something like 'collegisse'

⁵ The *Λύσσα* personified of the *Hercules Furens*.

(Nizolius), or 'redegisse' (Bake), to give the sense, 'reduce to a system.' Otherwise the 'ductus litterarum' might prompt the conjecture 'indagasse': 'they have not only noted points as they occurred, but further, *have tracked them out.*' Cicero is very fond of the word in its metaphorical sense, and Mommsen seems to be right in restoring 'indagamus' for 'id agamus' in the *Pro Milone*, xxii. 57.

Juvenal i. 144.

Hinc subitae mortes atque *intestata* senectus.

Mr. Housman's note gives an excellent sense—better far than can be obtained by the theory that the words form a hendiadys, 'The sudden death that overtakes *old* men before they have made their wills',—Juvenal's whole point being that the men never reach old age at all. But it is hard to believe that a writer who uses the word shortly afterwards (iii. 274) in its usual sense would give it an otherwise unheard-of meaning here. To get the sense required we must emend, and if it is the verb that is corrupt, I would suggest '*intercepta*,' 'That is why old age is denied to men.' The verb is a favourite with Ovid, whose usage Juvenal often follows. And a dittography of the last syllable may have transformed '*intercepta*' into '*intestata*.' '*Intentata*' (E. C. Corelli, *C. R.* xix. 305) is palaeographically easier, but the word is perhaps less effective.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, iii. 454.

Hic tibi ne qua morae fuerint dispendia tanti,—
quamvis increpitent socii et *vi cursus* in altum
vela vocet possisque sinus implere secundos,—
quin adeas vatem.

For the difficulties of the Vulgate see translations and commentaries. Virgil has brought his voyagers to Cumae, on the Campanian coast, and as their ultimate destination is Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, a wind that would serve them well is the S.S.E., *i.e.* in pure Latin 'Volturnus' or 'Vulturnus' (Lucretius v. 745; Pliny ii. 47. 46. § 119; Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, ii. 229 *et seq.*).

Do the words italicised—both of them abnormal in this context—conceal the rare word 'Vulturnus,' which would be so singularly appropriate here? Cf. 'supra,' line 70, 'Lenis crepitans vocat Auster in altum.' If the initial V were lost by haplography, the suggested corruption might easily develop. In 'rustic capitals' the syllables VL and VI are almost indistinguishable,¹ and VL TVRNVS would tend to become VI CVRSVS by the same process, which transformed 'Pal-aestinique' into 'palam est vidique' in the MSS. of Statius, *Silvae*, ii. 1. 161, and which led to the variants 'alter Apollo' (R), and 'alter ab illo' (P) in Virgil, *Eclogues*, V. 49.

D. A. SLATER.

Cardiff.

¹ See M. Chatelain's preface to the Leyden edition of the *Codex Oblongus* of Lucretius, p. vii.

HIDDEN QUANTITIES.

'No one will wish to deny that there is still, and always will be, a deal of uncertainty regarding hidden quantities, that there are many cases where the evidence is so meagre or so conflicting that our conclusion is scarcely more than arbitrary. Indeed some matters about which our books agree are nothing like so certain as would appear from this agreement.' These words, coming from so high an authority on this subject as Professor Buck (*Classical Review*, vol. xxvii., June, 1913, p. 123), deserve to be carefully pondered by those who undertake the responsibility

of introducing indications of hidden quantities into school books; for it is exceedingly difficult to draw the line between these doubtful cases and the 'cases about which there is no reasonable doubt, even if recent books do differ.' What the *modus operandi* of the writer of school books ought to be must be determined mainly by didactic considerations, as to which opinions will differ. I personally am not satisfied with the spirit of Professor Buck's note indicating his readiness to 'teach dogmatically some quantities which are really doubtful.' But what we are