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](#)

Two Corrections of Latin Poets

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 02 / March 2010, pp 125 - 126

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00079488, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00079488

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (2010). Two Corrections of Latin Poets. The Classical Review, 14, pp 125-126 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00079488

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

other: that is to say, the reading of the MS. from which Pithou drew the v.l. of 430 as I have copied it from *D'Orv.* was in some way confused, particularly in *-cta* of *tincta* being separated from *tin-*; and *superest* was written in the margin of the line before (429). This appears to me a strong confirmation, of my conjecture in vol. ii. of the *Corpus* now editing by Prof. Postgate *Nunc exstincta [diu] superestque Neapolin inter.* Another conj. of mine *uncis* (508) published in the *Journal of Philology* in 1887 p. 309 nearly coincides with *D'Orv.* *unco*, where MSS. give *unctis*.

465 *Et tuto specularis omnia collis* C.
e tuto Scal. and so *D'Orv.*

476 *Asperior sopitae et quaedam sordida*
faex est C.

Scobis iis seems to be new, but is not a good correction.

487 *Quippe nihil reuocat curtis nihil ignibus*
obstat C.

curuis (*D'Orv.*) is a correction made independently by *D'Orville* himself, and also by *Munro.* (1867).

519 *Quae tripidat certe uerum tibi pignore*
constat. C.

D'Orv. has *uerum certo sibi*, wrongly, but *sibi* looks like a corruption of the genuine reading *tibi*, which is only to be found in C, of which MS. Pithou had no knowledge. *Rehd.* has *Quae trepidant uerum ubi pignore constat*, and so *Arund.*, except that it gives *ibi* for *ubi*. Both omit *certo*, and even C has *certe* wrongly. Whence did Pithou

draw *certo* and *sibi*? *certo* is in Scal. who prints *uerum ubi certo p.c.*, but Pithou may have got it from a MS., since it is found in Sloan 777; or possibly *certo* may come from Scaliger, *sibi* was Pithou's own conjecture.

585 *Tu quoque Athenarum carmen tam nobile*
sidus

Erigone sedes uestra est philomella can-
oris

Euocat in siluis

C.

D'Orv. has here three notes, *crimen* for *carmen*, an old emendation; *uestras* for *uestra* in which is printed in Pithou's text (1590), *Deuocat* for *Euocat*. Little is to be got, I think, from either (1) or (3); but (2) is suggestive.

Suppose the original corruption of the v. to have been

Erigone sedes uestras en philomela
canoris

we may reconstitute it thus

Erigone's, dequesta sen[em]; philo-
mella canoris

dequesta is found in Val. Fl. V. 448 *secum dequesta labores*, Stat. T. I. 404 *notos dequestus*, xi. 627 *Talia dequestus: senem* is of course *Erigone's* father *Icarius*; see the story in *Hygin.* Fab. 130.

Of the remaining variants not much is to be said: *Arte* (594) *torpet* (609) *Illos seposuit* (643) are in Scaliger, *tremendum* (612) was conj. (1826) by *Iacob*, *minimo* (618) and *concremat* (623) by *Auratus*, *purae* (645) by *Haupt*, *rura* (645) by *Heinsius*.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

TWO CORRECTIONS OF LATIN POETS.

PROPERTIUS III. (IV). iv. 3 sq.

This couplet should be read

magna, uiri, merces: parat ultima terra
triumphos:

Tigris et Euphrates sub iuga uestra fluent.

tua iura the MSS. I reserve the proof for a paper of 'Vindiciae Propertianae' which is nearly completed.

Silius Italicus, vii. 268 sqq.

Intellectus erat Fabio Tyriosque uidebat
dictator saeuire dolos; sed non uacat aegre
inuidiam gladios inter lituosque timere
et dubia morsus famae depellere pugna.

The subject of this passage is the attempt of Hannibal to bring Fabius into odium by not ravaging his private estate. The corrupt lines 269, 270 were printed in the last number of the *Classical Review* with Bothe's alteration of *aegre* to *aegram* which Baur has placed in his text. I will begin by quoting a parallel from *Lucan* 7, 137 sq. (which *Silius* very likely had in his mind), which will support some portions of the traditional text 'sed non uacat ullos | pro se ferre motus: urbi Magnoque timetur.'

We see then that the line and a half gives a clear and for *Silius* a satisfactory sense.

The clamorous voice of war drowns the

whispers of self-interest, and Fabius has no time to attend to apprehensions of unpopularity. If *aegre timere* could be used for having a 'sickly fear,' the tradition might stand; but no scholar has ventured to impose such a meaning on *aegre*. Heinsius proposed *aegro*, of which the best that can be said is that it is a shade less unsatisfactory than *aegram*, and *acrem*, a superfluous epithet. Conjecture has hitherto attacked the corruption by the wrong route. It is a

similar one to that found in Lygdamus [Tib. iii.] 5, 11 where for *ignes* the MSS. have *egros*. We should accordingly read '*ignem* | *inuidiae*.' This metaphor is an extremely common one. It is enough to refer to the passages cited by the lexicons under *flamma* ('qui in eadem flamma inuidiae fuisset' Cic. Or. 3, 11), *conflare*, *inflammare*, *ardere*, *flagrare*, *conflagrare*, etc.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON HORACE, *SERM.* 1, 4, 26 AND 2, 3, 4,—*SANUS AB* AGAIN.

IN those cases of disputed reading where the testimony of the manuscripts is not decisive the grammatical usage of the Latin writers in general, and of the writer in question in particular may fairly be taken into account. On that ground the reading *ab* avaritia in *Serm.* 1, 4, 26 seems preferable to *ob* avaritiam, although the latter has found favour with almost all recent editors. The inconcinnity of *ob* avaritiam aut misera ambitione, to which Bentley objected, was justified by Orelli to his own satisfaction, and apparently to that of others as well, by citing Sall. *Jug.* 22, 2 *ob* eadem artis a Micipsa, non penuria liberorum, in regnum adoptatum; Liv. 38, 39, non tam *ob* recentia ulla merita quam originum memoria; Tac. *Hist.* 2, 49 quidam militum iuxta rogam interfecere se, non noxa neque ob metum, though the question may still fairly be raised whether it is in Horace's manner. The example in Lucil. xxx. 82, M. Quae non spectandi studio sed *ab* omni taetri impulsu ingressast would be more pertinent, even although *ab* with the abl., instead of *ob* with the acc. is used in connection with an abl. of cause.

A much more weighty objection to the reading *ob* avaritiam is that, so far as I know, the construction *laborare ob* aliquid is not found in the extant Latin literature, while *laborare ab* occurs, for example, in Varr. *R.R.* 2, 2, 17 a frigore et aestu ne quid laboraret curandum; Caes. *B.G.* 7, 10 ne *ab* re frumentaria laboraret; *B.C.* 3, 9, 5 illi omnia perpeti parati maxime a re frumentaria laborabant; *Bell. Afr.* 5 ne (Caesar) circumventus a tergo *ab* equitatu hostium laboraret; Plin. *N.H.* 32, 133 a frigore laborantibus (eodem uti prodest).

The other constructions which occur with *laborare* are *ex*, which is frequent in Cicero,

and the simple abl. It may be noted that *ex* with the abl. and *ab* with the abl. are frequently found with approximately the same meaning and with the same verbs. So especially to express cause. Horace himself elsewhere uses the simple abl.: in *Serm.* 1, 2, 76 tuo vitio rerumne labores nil referre putas? In *Serm.* 1, 2, 38 ut omni parte laborent (moechi) is slightly different, but of the same origin. Cf. *Carm.* 3, 22. 2 laborantis utero puellis and see below.

The construction with *ab* seems to have arisen from such uses as *doleo ab oculis* and the like. See *Classical Review*, xiii, p. 303, for the close connection of the two uses, and compare the two examples from the *Sermones* of the simple ablative, which are cited above. *Laborare ab* may well be a connecting link in the development of the causal force of *ab* with the abl., which, though much less common than was formerly assumed, and in fact comparatively rare, is by no means unexampled. See *Archiv für lat. Lex. und Gramm.* x, p. 504 f, and the example from Lucilius which is cited above. It is noteworthy that the fully developed causal force is a favourite construction with Varro, who also furnishes an instance of *laborare ab*. The construction *laborare ab* may belong to the language of everyday life, and perhaps especially to the *sermo castrensis*.

In *Serm.* 2, 3, 4, at *ipsis Saturnalibus*, instead of *ab*, seems to be the most generally accepted reading. The decision is ordinarily made on the ground of the sense of the passage, but its correctness is supported by the testimony of grammatical usage as well. Horace has the acc. with *fugio* some 27 times. The abl. alone is used in *Carm.* 2, 2, 15 nisi causa morbi *fugerit* venis et aquosus albo Corpore languor, and *ab* with the abl. only in *Serm.* 1, 1, 68 Tantalus a labris