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](#)

On Trajection of Words or Hyperbaton

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 30 / Issue 5-6 / August 1916, pp 142 - 146

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00010428, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00010428

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1916). On Trajection of Words or Hyperbaton. The Classical Review, 30, pp 142-146 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00010428

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ejus Callimachus in suo poemate est usus exordio; sive vulgare, quo Cretenses fallaces appellabantur, sive [Migne has *sine* by a misprint] furto alieno operis in metrum rettulit.'

I cannot enter here on the question whether the *Χρησμοί* or the *Μῶως* was the origin of the words in the Syriac commentaries; but surely Mr. Nicklin cannot be right in his forced repunctuation of Diogenes Laertius, by which he would show that the *Μῶως ἡ Παδάμανθος* was written in verse. The order of the words seems quite decisive against him, and in favour of Gressmann. Nor can I here try to trace to which work the several fragments belong (see Diel, *Frag. Pre-Socr.* p. 493). But who was the Cretan poet regarded by them as a prophet, 'who was thought by some to be Maxenidus'? (Ishodad on *Titus* i. 12). 'It is a confusion with the letters that make Epimenides,' says Dr. Rendel Harris; but I am bound to say that two eminent Syriac scholars in Oxford, whom I consulted, cannot see any great resemblance between this word and Epimenides when written in Syriac. But Professor Margoliouth has made an interesting suggestion. Finding that the MS. of Ishodad which he possesses gives the name as *MKSNNIDUS*, he conjectures from Clement, *Protrept.* II. 37, Ζήτει σου τὸν Δία . . . ὁ Κρήσσοι διηγῆσεται, παρ' ᾧ καὶ τέθραπται· Καλλίμαχος ἐν Ὑμνοῖς· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ᾧ ἄνα, σείο Κρήτες ἐτεκτῆναντο· τέθνηκε γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς, that the name is a corruption

of the words *μαχος ἐν ὕμνοις, μαχος* being mutilated from *Καλλιμάχος*. He also suggests that Callimachus, who appears to be the oldest authority for the story, may have got it from Euhemerus; a view which receives strong support from Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* I. 119, 'Ab Euhemero autem et mortes et sepulturae demonstrantur deorum'; and that the account of the wounding of Zeus by the boar, for which this Syriac commentary is apparently the only authority, was a confusion with the myth of Adonis; and that the statements of the Syriac writers are of post-Clementine origin. He also thinks that it is certain from Clement, *Strom.* I. xix. 91, that he cannot have known the lines attributed to Minos; for in quoting Acts xvii. 22-28 he mentions Aratus only. I must leave this question to those who have studied the relations between the Syrian and the Greek theologians. But I may perhaps be allowed to express a doubt whether these quotations ought to be written back into hexameters at all, even as pseud-epigrapha. This raises a wider question; and I only set out to show that the position of Dr. Rendel Harris and Mr. Nicklin is difficult to maintain, and that the lines which they have printed are not a genuine fragment of the philosopher Epimenides.

J. U. POWELL.

*St. John's College,
Oxford.*

ON TRAJECTION OF WORDS OR HYPERBATON.

INTELLIGENCES trained from the outset to regard the succession of words as the ultimate arbiter of their construction, to expect the subject to precede its verb and the object to follow it, to tie the prepositional phrases which now do duty for cases to the words that they define or determine, and to conform to all the other rigid conventions of expression which an absence or a paucity of inflexions involves, and by this training of necessity habituated to view order as the basis of syntax, receive from such a line as that of Lucan VIII.

343 'ab *Hyrcanis* Indoque a litore *siluis*'¹ a severe but wholesome shock. How desperately this shock is resented the attempts at its emendation show: *Phasis* Withof and *nulsos* Schrader for *siluis*,

¹ Like Professor Conway in his article 'On the Interweaving of Words with Pairs of Parallel Phrases,' *Classical Review*, xiv. (1900) pp. 357 *sqq.*, I use italics to show the correspondences of the words in question, not the punctuation marks employed by Madvig *Adversaria* 2 p. 71 and others after him, with their misleading modern associations. The effect of such marks is not to reunite the separated words but to disjoin the rest.

Indorum limite for *Indoque a litore* Burman. Exact parallels to our disturbing passage may be found in Ovid *Met.* 8. 9 'inter honoratos medioque in uertice canos,' Manilius 1. 429 'discordes uultu permixtaque corpora partus' (with Housman's note), and again in Lucan 5. 800 'fertur ad aequoreas et se prosternit karenas.'

Collections of such dislocations of order have been made at various times.¹ But no classification, so far as I know, has been attempted. I propose therefore to state briefly the conditions or restrictions to which they appear in general to conform.

In doing so I shall not take account of arrangements of words in single sentences, such as the separation of connected words or the inversion of the members in pairs of corresponding words (*chiasmus*), that we find strange but which are an integral part of the rhetorical machinery of Latin speech, although such arrangements are sometimes included under *Hyperbaton*.² Further I shall for the most part deal with trajections by which a word or word-group is moved not merely from the place but also from the 'clause or sentence where we expect to find it.

i. The prime condition of *hyperbaton* is this: that to a mind accustomed to regard the import of inflexions and to consider sentences as wholes, the *construction*, and therefore the sense as determined by the construction, must be *obvious*, or, in other words, there must be no real ambiguity. If this is not the case, as it would seem to be in an insignificant minority of instances, the liberty of trajection has been abused.

Within single sentences we may next note as specially disturbing to our notions of propriety

ii. The appearance of *prepositions* at some distance from **their** cases.*—Copa

4 'ad cubitum raucos excutiens calamos,'

¹ E.g. Professor Housman has several copious ones in his notes on Manilius and elsewhere.

² E.g. in Kühner's *Lateinische Grammatik*, ed. Stegmann, vol. ii., pt. 2, pp. 618 sqq.

³ Their immediate postposition as in Lucr. 1. 841 'ignibus ex' is a different matter and does not concern us here.

Ovid *Met.* 2. 524 'Argolica quod in ante Phoronide fecit' for *ante in* or *Phoronide*

ante, Prop. 3. 4. 18 'et subter captos arma sedere duces' but **not** Prop. 3.1. 4, as some think, because of *. It may be noted that in these trajections the limitation of *vi.* (below) is generally observed.

Hi. *Copulating* and contrasting *conjunctions* introducing coordinated sentences may be *postponed*.—This is so common that it excites no surprise, except with *que* or *ue* whose enclitic character and the accident that in Latin texts they are printed as an appendage to the preceding word make the licence appear greater than in the case of *et* or *aut*. How frequent, for metrical convenience, is this postponement in the pentameters of Tibullus and Ovid we are all aware.

iv. *Relatives* and *conjunctions* introducing *accessory* or *subordinated* sentences may be *postponed*.—This is common enough, even in prose, with certain conjunctions, especially *cum*. So also with *quod*, *si*, *ne*, *quoniam*, etc. The extent of postponement does not seem to matter, provided the main verb does *not precede* the conjunction. So the prose writers and, in general, the poets. An exception in Ovid *Her.* 3. 19 'si progressa forem caperer *ne* nocte timebam' where also *nocte* belongs to the *si* clause, Madvig *l.e.*

To come to connected clauses or sentences.

v. In *diro* *KOVBOP* constructions, such e.g. as we have in comparisons, a noun or verb may, contrary to expectation, appear in the subordinate instead of in the principal member of the expression.

Ov. *Her.* 12.26 'quam pater est illi, tam mihi *diues* erat.' In Hor. S. 1. 3. 9 sq., a passage which I have already fully discussed in the *Classical Review*, xv. (1901) 303 'saepe uelut qui | *currebat* fugiens hostem,' *currebat* appears in the place of *currit*, i.e. 'saepe *currebat* uelut qui *currit*.'

vi. *Adjacent* single words or *indivisible phrases* may exchange places and so get just outside their own clauses or sentences. The frequent variation in the succession of words connected syntactically, as noun and attribute,

verb and object, doubtless facilitated this trajection.

Lucan 5. 321 '*hic fuge si belli finis placet ense relicto*,' i.e. '*fuge, hic ense relicto*,' 3. 679 '*hostilem cum torserit exeat hastam*,' 7. 685 sq. '*quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos tam misero Fortuna minor*,' 1. 14 '*hoc quem ciuiles hauserunt sanguine dextrae*.'

Hor. S. 1. 5. 72 '*paene macros arsit dum turdos uersat*,' 2. 1. 60 '*quisquis erit uitae scribam color*,' ib. 3. 211 '*Ajax immeritos cum occidit desipit agnos*.' Virg. *Aen.* 2. 303 sqq., '*arrectis auribus adsto | in-segetem ueluti cum flamma furentibus Austris | incidit . . . stupet inscius . . . pastor*.' The sense requires '*adsto ueluti, in segetem cum*, etc., *stupet pastor*.' Lucretius 3. 843

'*et si iam nostro sentit de corpore postquam | distracta est*,' 5. 177 '*natus enim debet quicumque est uelle manere | in uita*' and many other places, from amongst which I cite two I had explained by hyperbaton before I had formulated this limitation, Catullus 66. 77 sq. '*dum uirgo quondam fuit omnibus expers | unguentis*' (*Classical Philology* 3. 257 sqq.) and Ter. *Andr.* 971 sq. '*num ille somniat | ea quae uigilans uoluit?*' (ib. 10. 263 sq.), *uigilans* belonging to *somniat*.

Within a sentence also the simple interchange of two words will often restore a normal order. So in Horace *carm.* 3. 4. 19 sq. '*ut premerer sacra*

| lauroque collataque myrto' and Tibullus 1. 1. 24 '*io messes et bona uina date*.' Allow the shift, and there is nothing remarkable in the reference of the attribute to both the nouns. So with a genitive Lucan 8. 367 sq. '*illic et laxas uestes et fluxa uirorum | uelamenta uides*.'

The expression '*indivisible phrase*' must be construed with some liberality. As examples take Horace S. 1. 10. 19 '*nil praeter Caluum et doctus-cantare*

Catullum,' and Silius Italicus 11. 459 sqq. '*sed quos pulsabat Rhypaeum ad Strymona nerui | auditus-superis-auditus-monibus-Orpheus | merito fulgent clara inter sidera caelo*' where the phrase fills a whole line.

vii. Words which are obviously in close syntactical connexion may be moved still further apart if they occupy corresponding positions in the verse.

For the hexameter in addition to Lucan 8. 343 and the parallels already adduced see Manilius 1. 262 '*ut sit idem mundi primum quod continet arcem*,' Lucan 9. 232 sq. '*nam quis erit finis si nec Pharsalia pugnae | nec Pompeius erit*,' ib. 636 sq. is similar but easier '*hoc habet infelix cunctis impune Medusa | quod spectare licet*.'

For the pentameter see Catullus 66. 18 '*non ita me diui vera gemunt iuerint*,' Ovid *Tr.* 1. 8. 24 '*supremo dum licuitque die*,' id. *F.* 1. 263 sq. '*inde, uelut nunc est, per quem descenditis (inquit) | arduus in ualles et fora cliuius erat*.'

viii. Sometimes an obviously unfinished expression is interrupted by the interposition of a word or indivisible phrase.

Lucan 7. 33 '*tu uelut Ausonia uadis moriturus in urbe*,' ib. 797 sq. '*ac ne-laeta furens scelerum spectacula perdat | inuidet igne rogi miseris*,' Statius *Theb.* 9. 135 sq. '*uidit quamquam undique crebrae | Hippomedon ante-oraminae*,' cf. Ovid *Met.* 4. 436 sq. '*nouique | qua-sit-iter, manes Stygiam quod ducat ad urbem, | ignorant*.' This licence is in principle the same as Ennius's '*saxo cere comminuit brum*' which is perverse enough, but wholly clear of ambiguity.

The chief subject, if in the *nomina-tive*, may be thus deferred. So in the hyperbaton which I have argued should be restored to Propertius 2. 32. 33 sqq., where the construction is somewhat complicated by an *ἀπο κοινοῦ* '*ipsa Venus quamuis corrupta libidine Martis | nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit | quamuis Ida Rheas pastorem dicat amasse | atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam*,' that is '*ipsa Venus . . . in caelo semper honesta fuit nec minus (in c. s. honesta fuit)*

Rhea quamuis Ida etc. *American Journal of Philology* 17 pp. 37 sqq.

ix. Lastly there are cases where words belonging grammatically to the latter of two connected sentences or words are placed in front of the former, for the sake of emphasis.—So in coordinated sentences Terence *Ad.* 917 'tu illas abi et traduce,' Manilius 4. 534 'se quisque et uiuit et effert.' In both cases a normal order would have been less effective. In Lucretius 3. 196 'namque papaueris aura potest suspensa leuisque | cogere ut ab summo tibi diffluat altus aceruus' *papaueris* has for the same reason been moved from the subordinate to the principal clause.

These are the chief points observable in the treatment of hyperbaton by Latin poets; and in the consideration of particular instances they ought none of them to be excluded from our view. The same passage may combine more than one kind of displacement as several of the examples already given will show; and the explanation of any single displacement need not necessarily be single. The order adopted by the writer may be dictated by more than one consideration. The analysis of particular passages must be left to the student. But two of the harsher hyperbata may with advantage be examined here.

Juvenal 3. 309:

qua fornace graues, qua non incude catenae?

This verse is a rearrangement of 'qua fornace, qua incude non catenae graues?' *Non* has been moved in front of *incude* (vi.) and *graues* has been placed in the first half of the hexameter so as to correspond with *catenae* (vii.). Apropos of Juvenal the hyperbaton propounded with some hesitation by Mr. Housman at 4. 115 sq. 'caecus adulator dirusque a ponte satelles dignus Avicinos qui mendicaret ad axes' will be a case where vi. has been at work to move a *ponte*, already mentally figured as in front of the *dignus qui* clause, still further from *mendicaret*.

The second passage, Lucretius 3. 992 sqq., is one on which I and others have wasted our pains:

sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem
quem uolucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
aut alia quauis scindunt cuppedine curae.

If *uolucres* means 'birds,' then *uolucres* is corrupt, because in 984 Lucretius has said '*nec Tityon uolucres ineunt Acherunte iacentem*' and if birds do not tear the giant, still less do they tear the lover. But *uolucres* does not mean 'birds'; it is the adjective epithet of *curae*, as *anxius* is that of *angor*. Says Lucretius 'There is no Tityos prostrate in Acheron and devoured by birds of prey. The real Tityos is the man with us who is prostrated by love or other passions'—for 'in amore iacentem' compare Tibullus 2. 5. 109 sqq. 'et mihi praecipue, iaceo cum saucius annum | et (faueo morbo cum iuuat ipse dolor) usque cano Nemesim'—'and whose breast is torn by winged anxieties.' For the image in *uolucres* compare Hor. *carm.* 2. 16. 11 sq. '*curas laqueata circum | tecta uolantis*' and Theognis 729 sq. *φροντίδες ἀνθρώπων ἔλαχον πτερὰ ποικίλ' ἔχουσα | μυρόμεναι ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ βίотου*. Lucretius has framed his sentence with great art; but comprehension has been thrown off the track by the addition of the clause *atque exest anxius angor* which, like those of which specimens are quoted under ix., has no effect upon the main construction 'quem uolucres curae in amore iacentem lacerant aut alia quauis scindunt cuppedine.' Neglecting the parenthetical insertion, *uolucres* and *curae* in the following line are seen to be in corresponding positions (vii.). Compare for their separation *raucis*—*cicadis* in Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 12 sq. 'at mecum ²raucis tua dum uestigia lustrō | sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.'

Of all the users or abusers of hyperbaton Ovid, true to the character which the elder Seneca *Rhet. Contr.* 2. 2. 12, gives of him, is, as Madvig l. c. and Munro on Lucr. 3. 843 have said, one of the most licentious. The sense however even with him is usually perspicuous, provided that the words are read¹ and not simply surveyed. So in *Am.* 3. 5. 11-14 'candidior niuibus tum

¹ 'Man darf auch eins nicht vergessen: der römische Dichter konnte auf ein Publikum von Hörern rechnen und ein sinngemässer Vortrag ist oft der beste Kommentar,' R. Hildebrandt, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Gedichtes Aetna*, p. 28.

cum cecidere recentes, | in liquidas nondum quas mora uertit aquas; | *candidior* quod adhuc spumis stridentibus albet | et modo siccata *lacte* reliquit ouem.' We may not unreasonably disapprove of the separation of *candidior* and *lacte*; but to call it an obscurity is to ignore the *candidior niubus* of the preceding couplet. Four lines further down

'atque iterum pasto ²*pascitur ante* ¹cibo' we have a licentious change in the meaning of the verb and a false chiasmus; but the sense is perfectly obvious to one who has read the '*reuocatas ruminat herbas*' of the previous line.

A word in conclusion on the causes or motives of hyperbaton. One of these is a reaching after *emphasis*. Examples of this have already been given and more might be added. Ovid *Ibis* 3 sq. '*nullaque quae possit scriptis tot milibus extat* | *littera Nasonis sanguinolenta legi*' might have been '*nullaque Nasonis scriptis* | *extat littera quae possit*' but for the insistence of the writer. Thus

Horace marks the prominence of his *mea* in *Ep.* 2. 2. 20 sqq. '*dixi me pigrum proficiscenti tibi, dixi* | *talibus officiis prope mancum ne mea saeuus* | *iurgares ad te quod epistula nulla rediret.*'

But the feeling for rhythm and regard to the balance of speech-groups had much to do with producing hyperbaton. In its milder forms trajection of words was recognised by the ancients themselves as a legitimate stylistic device, Cicero *Orator* 230, Quintilian *Inst.* 8. 6. 65; and Professor Conway has rightly drawn attention to this side of the matter in the paper already cited *Classical Review* l.c. p. 358a.

It may be added that here too Rome followed in the wake of Alexandria;

Callimachus *fragm.* 445 οὐδ' ὄθεν οἷδεν
ὁδ' ἐύει θνητὸς ἀνὴρ, Theocritus 29. 3
κ' ἡ γὰρ μὲν τὰ φρενῶν ἐρέω κέαρ ἐν
μυχαῖ.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool,
July 7, 1916.

SOME CRUCES IN VIRGIL RE-CONSIDERED.

Eclogue i. 69.

A PAPER by Mons. L. Havet in *Revue de Philologie*, vol. xxxviii. (1914), reopens the discussion of a classical difficulty. Meliboeus, resigning himself to exile, indicates the end of the earth by four points (Africa, Scythia, the Oaxes, Britain), and then adds a half-despairing hope of future repatriation:

en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite tecum,
69 post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor
aristas?

M. Havet begins by remarking that 'for Servius and all the ancients *aristas* means *messes*,' particularising Claudian. This is rather a misleading selection: if it were merely an opinion held by scholars who lived 400 years later than Virgil, it would not be of decisive, though still of considerable, importance. But it is clear from an imitation in *Troades* 76 that Seneca so understood Virgil:

et Sigeis trepidus campis
decumas secuit messor aristas.

This passage also disposes of Conington's objection 'that *aliquot* would naturally distribute *aristas*, whereas the equivalent to *messis* is the plural *aristae*, not the singular *arista*.'

Seneca's authority is peculiar in literary questions which have to do with the Augustan writers, because of his father's extraordinary lifetime. Old Seneca was only about fifteen years junior to Virgil; he might have been familiar with the first, and any subsequent, editions of Virgil's works, and with the earliest generation of commentators. All this fund of firsthand information, recorded in his phenomenal memory, he represented to his sons.

I find it impossible to pass by Seneca's testimony in favour of *aristas* = *messes*. And this word once established in meaning, the weak point is defined. It is *aliquot*. *Aliquot aristas* 'several summers' is, as M. Havet (and others) have argued, a shocking bathos for Virgil. But I cannot sympathise with his opinion that *mirabor* is unmeaning.