

# 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](#)



---

## In Propertium Retractationes Selectae

J. S. Phillimore

The Classical Review / Volume 30 / Issue 02 / March 2016, pp 39 - 42

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00009756, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00009756](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00009756)

### How to cite this article:

J. S. Phillimore (1916). In Propertium Retractationes Selectae. The Classical Review, 30, pp 39-42 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00009756

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

‘By piercing small holes (at the sides) through the shell of the tortoise.’

Moreover, the two *διά*’s, as it appears, are not without some warrant after all.

Compare the very similar loss of an initial vowel in *Hymn. Dion.* 55, where *διε κάτω* figures absurdly for *δι’ ἀκάτωρ*, ‘good boatman.’ Cf. *ἄκατος*, *ἀκάτη*, a certain correction made by Baumeister, as I learn, from Allen and Sykes, and by me in 1896. Codex M. has *δι’ ἐκάτωρ*.

*Hymn. Aph.* 252

νῦν δὲ δὴ οὐκέτι μοι στοναχῆσεται  
ἐξονομῆναι  
τοῦτο μετ’ ἀθανάτοισιν, . . .

I have recalled here the traditional *στοναχῆσεται*, not that it is right, but because it is valuable amid the welter of conjectures, headed by Martin’s *στόμα χείσεται*. This *στόμα χείσεται* (‘still the best correction,’ Allen and Sykes) is not only wrong in itself—no poet ever could, or ever did, say anything about the capacity of Aphrodite’s mouth—but has succeeded in turning the remedial efforts of every scholar who has attempted the passage since in the wrong direction. All play variations on *στόμα*: *στόματ’ ἔσσεται*, Clarke: *στόμα λήσεται*, *στόμα πείσεται*, Ilgen: *στόμα πλήσεται*, Matthiae: *στόμα χήσεται*, Buttmann, who also produced the unpardonable atrocity

*στόμ’ ἀχῆσεται*, selected by Allen and Sykes with rare judgment as ‘the only one’ (after Martin’s) ‘which deserves a bare mention’: *στόμα ἦσεται*, Mr. Shackle and also myself in 1896. Probably we should both agree that this is even better than Martin’s suggestion, as indeed it is for the reason given above. All the same, I am afraid it must be abandoned with the rest, and I hope Mr. Shackle will excuse me for saying that his further suggestion of *χ’ ἦσεται* is quite impossible, not so much because *ἦσεται* is necessarily *Ῥῆσεται* [*Ἐκπιεν Ῥῆσατο* (ι 353) tells no more against *Ῥῆσατο* than *προσέειπεν ἄναξ* against *Ῥάναξ*], but because *κε* could not occupy the position in any early epic line. Even the enclitic pronoun *μοι* in this line is out of place, unless *οὐκέτι* can bear as much emphasis as ‘Never more’ in the mouth of Poe’s raven (v. *Homericæ*, a 37). Consequently *οὐκέτ’ ἐμοί* would be a good reading here.

For the rest, bidding a long farewell to the will-o’-the-wisp *στόμα* and keeping in mind *στοναχῆσεται*, I would read or indeed restore

νῦν δὲ δὴ οὐκέτ’ ἐμοί στοναχῆς ἄτερ  
ἐξονομῆναι  
τοῦτο μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι, . . .

‘But now no more can I without a sigh name that among the immortals.’

T. L. AGAR.

## IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.<sup>1</sup>

THE 10th poem of the Fourth (or Fifth) Book is a specimen, as are the 2nd, the 4th, and the 9th of Propertius’ design for a series of aetiological elegies in the manner of Callimachus; which design he announces in the verse:

sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca  
locorum. (IV. i. 69.)

A site and a story connected with the site: such is the idea. The story is presented in the simplest frame, just a

couplet or so for a headpiece and tail-piece. In the *Tarpeia* (IV.) a single couplet at each end serves; in the *Hercules and Cacus* (IX.) the introductory couplet seems to be missing. *Jupiter Feretrius* (X.) has its framework complete, but confronts the commentator with an initial difficulty of interpretation.

nunc Iovis incipiam causas aperire Feretri  
armaque de ducibus trina recepta tribus.

What does *aperire causas et arma* mean? Even if we allow that *causas* = *αἷτια*, why *aperire*?

The solution is extremely simple:

<sup>1</sup> Continued from *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., Nos. 1 and 3, and vol. xxix., No. 2.

the word *aperire* calls aloud for the lost word. Read :

nunc Iovis incipiam *clausas* aperire Fere tri.

*Clausa* = *penetrare* is well known as a low-Latin word (see Ducange); it makes its appearance shyly as a classical noun for the first time in the Berlin *Thesaurus*, where are cited Titinius, *Com.* 61 (Ribbeck,<sup>3</sup> *Com. Fr.*, p. 167) :

in foro aut in curia posita potius quam rure  
apud te in clausa,

and *Moretum* 15 :

et reserat clausae, qua pervidet, ostia clavi

(a line which has some doubtful points, but *clausae* is fairly certain); also Corippus, *Joh.* VII. 175 :

nunc pariter miseros caperet fors (*read* nos)  
saeva sepulcri clausa.

These scanty attestations may be reinforced by at least one other : for the word survives also in another passage of Propertius, III. xiii. 9 :

haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas,  
where there appears no sufficient reason for changing the MS. reading.

It was naturally rare in literature, because the synonym neuter ('*clausa domorum*,' etc., Lucretius) was usually more convenient, and much more distinguished; however, there may well be yet other instances of it obscured by corruption.

Here, I take it, the '*clausae* of Fere trius' mean the adyta, the secret chambers of the temple, where the trophies are preserved : '*aperire clausas et arma*' is therefore no very violent zeugma. Propertius does poetically what Augustus did actually, as recorded in Livy IV. 20 : his metaphor is the same here as in IV. x. 11, if Burmann's reading be adopted there : '*Palatini reseramus Apollinis aedem*.'

Then begins the recital of the three famous dedications. Romulus first :

imbuis exemplum primae tu, Romule, palmae  
huius, et exuvio plenus ab hoste redis.  
(*primae codd. ceteri, primo F<sup>1</sup>.*)

Mr. Richards has justly objected to *primae*, for which he substitutes *primus*. But does not the word *opimus*, so strangely absent from an account of the *spolia opima*, insist to be restored just here ? According to elegiac parallelism, *plenus* in the pentameter suggests

that *opimus* was in the hexameter. One may suggest that the scribe, instead of copying :

*palmae* tu, Romule, *opimae*,

miswrote

*palmae* tu, Romule, *palmae*,

and this at the next stage was patched into

*primae* tu, Romule, *palmae*,

But the restoration of *opimus* (in whatever case) does not complete the cure of the couplet. If *imbuis* is sound, *hoc templum* looks much more probable than *exemplum*.

Then *huius* is altogether intolerable : there is no antecedent word to justify the pronoun *hic* at all ; and, if there were, the mere position of *huius* is an outrage. *Vivus* would be possible ; but the emphasis of position would better suit *primus* ; and, as any list of abbreviations will show, the compendious symbols for the words *primus* and *huius* are not unlike each other.

In fine, I suggest that Propertius wrote :

imbuis hoc templum palma tu, Romule, opima  
primus et exuvio plenus ab hoste redis ;

but *eximio* (Fv) is not at all an impossible reading, although all editors have scorned it. Livy VII. 37 shows that it has a certain technical fitness for this context : *praeter militaria alia dona aurea corona cum et centum bubus eximioque uno albo opimo auratis cornibus donat*. And *ut* for *et* is not improbable.

v. 23 :

Cossus at insequitur Veientis caede Tolumni.

A queer ablative this, and of none the less questionable Latinity because colloquially we say in English 'come next with.' Perhaps

Cossus at *inficitur* Veientis caede Tolumni.

v. 30 :

nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti  
cantat, et in vestris ossibus arva metunt.

Since Vei is the town, not the people, it has no bones. In *ossibus* is not *inter ossa* : what in *ossibus* means is exemplified by III. xvii. 9 :

veteres custodit in ossibus ignes.

Read :

et in vestris *sedibus* arva metunt.

The first syllable of *sedibus* was written with the compendium for *sed*; consequently the next scribe saw before him nothing but *vestrissibus*, and the juxtaposed *ss* inevitably suggested *ossibus*. *Sedes*, 'habitation,' is a very favourite word of Virgil's.

v. 31:

forte super portae dux Veiens astitit arcem  
(*Veius codd. corr. Dempster.*)

colloquiumque sua fretus ab urbe dedit.

Nothing is cited to justify *arx portae* being 'the fortification crowning the gate,' as Rothstein takes it. Probably it should be

*fronte* super portae dux Veiens astitit *acer*.

In the pentameter there is yet another oddity: *fretus* apparently put for *confidens*, with no ablative. Hertzberg, of course, welcomes this freak, and lovingly consigns it to his *Quaestiones Propertianae* with the words 'Vides brevitatem et nervos'—as the man said when he pointed to the cripple.

Heinsius' *fractus* has little probability: *fretus* is in itself a likely word enough, if we can discover an ablative to express Tolumnius' warrant for his confidence. Draw out this antithesis:

*ab urbe* contrasted with *campo*;  
*colloquium dedit* contrasted with *concurrere*.

On what is he *fretus* to contrast with *forti*? Perhaps *astu fretus*, perhaps *loco fretus*: in the latter case, *sua* will be a stopgap; in the former, a misreading.

vv. 37, 8:

Romuleas F D<sup>2</sup> } iuvere F D } manus: desecta  
Dii latias D V } vivere N V } Tolumni.  
Di latias N f }

cervix Romanos sanguine lavit equos.

*Di* is surprising enough, considering that this is Feretrius' benefit performance, but still more surprising is the v. 1. *Romuleas*; in fact, suspicion enough to justify a post-mortem on the text of the passage. Kuinoel, noting this variant, says it is a gloss: which was exceptionally stupid of Kuinoel, for what human being in what age or country would gloss *Latias* by *Romuleas*? It is no gloss, but a true variant. What happened was this: Propertius wrote

*Romuleae vicere manus*;

this was miswritten

*Romuleae vivere manus*;

next, no sooner was *vivere* misread as *iuvere* than *Romuleae* must be changed into an accusative to follow suit; and finally the corrector with a little knowledge, finding no subject for his *iuvere*, emended to

di Latias iuvere manus.

And then all was peace: the secret was safely buried; had not the marginal variant luckily escaped to tell the tale . . . and to be disbelieved. I do not flatter myself that I have now secured a hearing for his report, even now. Few will defend formal nonsense; but let the stopgap, falling ever so far short of probability, just barely escape the category of gibberish, and it may call and count upon the whole deadweight of human inertia to save it from being dislodged. For the critic-with-little-courage will die to defend the inventions of the corrector-with-a-little-knowledge.

v. 45:

nunc N v }  
nec F L } spolia in templo tria condita: causa  
haec D V } Feretri.  
hinc v }

46:

omine N v }  
crimine cett. } quod certo dux ferit ense ducem.

47:

seu quia victa suis umeris huc arma ferebant

48:

hinc Feretri dicta est ara superba Iovis.

(V. 47: huc *Broukhuyzen*: haec *codd.*)

What does *causa Feretri* mean? The reason why Jupiter is called Feretrius? But this interpretation not only strains Latinity, but misses the connexion between two things, viz. *spolia opima* and Jupiter Feretrius, which connexion, announced in vv. 1, 2, forms the subject of the poem. What we need is the *ἄριστον* why the *spolia opima* are enshrined in that particular temple and no other. One gets this by reading

haec spolia in templo tria *condi* causa Feretri  
omine quod certo dux ferit ense ducem.

The infinitive with *causa*, instead of a relational clause, is good enough Latin:

exx. gr. Virg. *Aen.* x. 90, Lygdamus II. 30, Phaedrus, III., *praef.* 6 (where see Schwabe's note).

There were two etymologies for *Feretrius* (see Plutarch, *Romulus* XVI., and Marcellus VII.) *ferire* and *ferre*. The ending *arma ferebant*, then, is above suspicion. But something in the line remains questionable.

When one reads in Silius Italicus, that faithful echo of so many Propertian phrases,

est, Orfite, munus  
est, ait, hoc certare tuum, quis opima volenti  
dona Iovi portet feretro suspensa cruento  
(V. 166-8)

it tempts to imprudences, such as to conjecture *Iovi feretris* for *suis umeris*. But this would be an error; the tray which Romulus used, *fabricato ad id apte ferculo* (Liv. I. x. 6), is not essential; the essential is that the victor must himself carry the spoils, *ipse . . .*

*spolia . . . gerens (ibid.): suis umeris* is therefore unimpeachable. But not so is *victa*. Can *victa arma = victi ducis arma*? I do not believe it could mean anything but 'the defeated side.' The word apparently needed here is *vota*. The general vows the spoils, as in vv. 15, 16:

votis occupat ante ratis,  
'Iuppiter, haec hodie tibi victima corrueat Acron':  
voverat

The *vota ante rata* are his *omen certum*; and after his victory he bears in person the spoils which he has vowed:

seu quia vota suis umeris huc arma ferebant.

Broukhuyzen's *huc* or Heinsius' *huic* for *haec* is absolutely necessary to the notion of the poem, viz. the connexion of a site and a story.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

*University College, Glasgow.*

#### ARISTOTLE, *METAPHYSICS*, X. (I.), 6: 1056B 27-32.

ὀλίγα δ' ἀπλῶς τὰ δύο· πλῆθος γάρ ἐστιν ἔλλειψιν ἔχον πρῶτον. διὸ καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἀπέστη Ἀναξαγόρας εἰπὼν ὅτι ὁμοῦ πάντα χρήματα ἦν ἄπειρα καὶ πλήθει καὶ μικρότητι· ἔδει δ' εἰπεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ 'καὶ μικρότητι' καὶ ὀλιγότητι· οὐ γὰρ ἄπειρα, ἐπεὶ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐ διὰ τὸ ἕν, ὥσπερ τινὲς φασιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ δύο.

THIS passage has generally puzzled interpreters. Bonitz dismisses the matter with a laconic 'nec magis ea intelligo, quae Anaxagorae obicit b 28-32'; and Barthélemy St. Hilaire, remarking that no explanation is given by Alexander, concludes that as the MSS. furnish no variant, the passage remains profoundly obscure. Nor does Mr. W. D. Ross by his rendering contribute a thoroughly satisfactory solution. His version runs: 'For this reason Anaxagoras was not right in leaving the subject with the statement that all things were together, boundless both in multitude and in smallness—where by "and in smallness" he meant "and in fewness"; for they could not have been boundless in fewness, since it is not one, as some say,

but two, that make a few.' It is true that the translator by construing the words ἔδει δ' εἰπεῖν . . . καὶ ὀλιγότητι as parenthetical and definitory of μικρότητι, succeeds in imparting a certain unity of structure to the passage, the clause οὐ γὰρ ἄπειρα etc., following naturally upon the statement that precedes the parenthesis, and supplying the called-for explanation. But on material grounds it is difficult to accept the translation of ἔδει δ' εἰπεῖν as 'he meant,' and there seems no special linguistic reason why this form should have been used rather than the familiar βούλεται, ἐθέλει. Of course the special difficulty of Ross's translation consists in the fact that it involves Aristotle in what appears to be an absurd interpretation of Anaxagoras' position. That Anaxagoras should have asserted the impossibility of a limit to smallness is in itself intelligible (though not a conclusion Aristotle could have accepted without special reference to the important distinction of δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, *Metaphysics* 1048b 14-17), and is sufficiently attested by the remains (Diels, *Vorsokratiker*, fr. 1 and 3). But that