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 on Phaedrus

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 05 / June 1906, pp 257 - 259
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995611, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995611

How to cite this article:
A. E. Housman (1906). Notes on Phaedrus. The Classical Review, 20, pp 257-259
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995611

Request Permissions : Click here

CAMBRIDGE JOURNALS

Downloaded from http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR, IP address: 130.216.30.115 on 03 May 2015

that has *eam*. All other codd. give *cadem*. Such forms are often confused. If for *eadem* we read *eodem*, both the construction and the sense become apparent: the money found its way back to the source from whence it came.

iii, § 3, (Müll. p. 271, 24). It might be nearer the tradition of the MSS. to follow editors here in putting a full stop at *susceperat*, and then to commence a new sentence with *Atque minus etiam*. The codd. have *susceperat quo minus*. The *quo* is undoubtedly wrong, and has obviously been accommodated to the *minus* which follows it. I had previously (*C.R.* xviii, 25) suggested *quod* or *quoniam minus*: perhaps *quando minus*. But *at* may have dropped out after the last syllable of *susceperat* whereupon *que* would readily become *quo*. Cp. 293, 20 where editors now read *A Q. Apronio*, instead or *quo Apronio*, the readings of the Vatican palimpsest, or *Atque Apronio* which is found in Lg. 42 and Par. 7776.

iii, § 66 (p. 296, 5). *Quid est hoc? populi Romani imperium, populi Romani leges, iudicia*, in *socios fideles, provinciam suburbanam?* This is the reading of Müller, following Halm. The preposition *in* is found in no MS. and all except Lg. 42 omit *socios*. The vulgate is *leges? iudicia? socii fideles? provincia suburbana?* Instead of *populi Rom. leges*, we should probably read *praetoriae leges* (cp. 276, 31): Lg. 42 has. p̄r. But a deeper corruption seems to lurk in *iudicia*,—probably an omission *ex homoeoteleuto*. I suggest *Quid est hoc? populi Romani imperium? praetoriae leges? iudiciali* iure iudicare *socios fidelis, prov. sub.?*

ibid. § 196. (p. 351, 3). *Quid poscit? Attendite et, vos quaeso, iudices simul aequitatem praetoris attendite.* Müller here gives the right punctuation: *vos quaeso* is parenthetical, and *quaeso* governs *vos* in the accusative (pro Roscio § 11). Other editors take *vos* as a vocative and punctuate accordingly. The doubt may have led to the inversion *iudices simul*, which occurs only in Lg. 42 and was received into the text first by Zumpt, who ridicules the vulgate *et vos, quaeso, simul, iudices, aeq.* But the emphasis is on *simul* (after the parenthetical *vos quaeso*), and this seems to be one of the many cases (*C.R.* xvi. p. 402, note) in which the authority of Lg. 42 is not to be followed, as regards the order of words, against Par. 7776 and the other codd. The point is, however, an extremely difficult one to decide. I have recently called attention to the fact that in some places the authority of Lg. 42, representing the Cluni codex, is reinforced by the extant fragments of the Vatican palimpsest (Am. Journ. Phil. xxvi, p. 428). The manufacture of what may be called transposition variants seems to have been quite an industry with the copyists of our MSS. In the Second and Third Books of the Verrines, for instance, there is an average of two on every page of the Teubner text.

W. PETERSON.

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.
March 1906.

NOTES ON PHAEDRUS.

I 15.

in principatu commutando ciuium
nil praeter domini nomen mutant pauperes.
id esse uerum parua haec fabella indicat.
asellum in prato timidus pascebat senex.
is hostium clamore subito territus 5
suadebat asino fugere, ne possent capi.
at ille lentus 'quaeso, num binas mihi
clitellas inpositurum uictorem putas?'
senex negauit. 'ergo quid refert mea
cui seruiam, clitellas dum portem m e a s?' 10

meas in the last verse is said to mean *solitas*. It must mean more than that, it must mean *nullas praeter solitas*; and then the word is overburdened, if the ass was not. The best adjective to give the required sense, 'dum ne plures clitellas portem', was also the easiest to confuse with *meas*:

clitellas dum portem *u* n i c a s.

u disappearing between *m* and *n*, the remaining *nicas* is the same thing as *meas*. At Il. Lat. 573 *ut meus* is corrupted to *unicus*, at Ouid. ex Pont. iv 3 16 *unica* to *uinea*, at Hor. carm. ii 18 14, I agree with Dinter, *uineis* to *unicis*; for the explanations of 'satis beatus unicis Sabinis' given by Madvig adu. crit. ii p. 54 and by Haupt opusc. iii p. 578 are both refuted by Lucian Mueller.

In our fable the *mea* of u. 9 made it easier for the scribe, and harder for Phaedrus, to write *meas* in u. 10.

I do not see what purpose is served by the conjecture 'clitellas *cum* portem meas' which Lucian Mueller and Havet adopt from Bergen, and I do not even know what it is intended to mean. If it does not alter the sense of *meas*, it is without effect. If it does, it would seem to signify 'since I am not to be rid of my load', which has no relevance to the preceding conversation: it implies that the ass had asked 'num mihi, si tecum fugero, clitellas detracturus es?'

III 17 5–11.

Minerua admirans quare sterilis sumerent 5
interrogauit. causam dixit Iuppiter:
'honorem fructu ne uideamur uendere'.
'at mehercules, narrabit quod quis uoluerit,
oliua nobis propter fructum est gratior.'
tum sic deorum genitor atque hominum
sator: 10
'o nata, merito sapiens dicere omnibus'.

genitor V (and N?), *gentium* PR. If Phaedrus falls into the hands of this generation of Germans, we shall find *gentium* in the text and this note in the commentary: 'Die Ueberlieferung der besten Hss. ist ohne Tadel: vgl. Verg. Aen. viii 36 gente deum, x 228 (Catull. 64 23, Sil. xiii 862) deum gens, xi 305 gente deorum, Hor. carm. i 3 26 gens humana, Manil. i 236 gentes hominum atque ferarum'. Meanwhile the editors read *genitor* with the inferior authority. But 'deorum genitor atque hominum sator', as the words are usually understood, is a phrase of the same sort as Alschefski's 'singulis bubus priuisque tunicis' in Liu. vii 37 2: 'ridicula prorsus copulatio' (to adapt Madvig's comment) 'usitati uocabuli et antiqui, ut deorum Iuppiter genitor sit, hominum autem sator, hoc est genitor'. For *genitor* and *sator* mean the same: πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, which is *pater diuomque hominumque* in Ennius, is *hominum sator atque deorum* in Virgil. Virgil and Ennius both say *diuom pater atque hominum rex*, the two nouns meaning different things; but if the notion is repeated, so is the word: Rutil. i 49 *genetrix hominum genetrix que deorum*. I know one parallel, which is presented by the MSS of Ovid in fast. v 157 sq. 'ne non imitata *maritum* | esset et ex omni parte secuta *uirum*'; but there *uirum* lies under the suspicion of having come from u. 156 'uirgineo nullum corpore passa *uirum*': Gierig and Madvig propose *suum*, Postgate *ducem*, and at Luc. v 300 the fragmentum Bobiense has *uirum* for the *ducem* of the other MSS.

Lucian Mueller accordingly alters *genitor* to *coepit*. But the verse is to be understood as if punctuated thus:

tum sic, deorum, genitor, atque hominum
sator.

tum sic genitor 'then thus spake her father' (and he begins *o nata*): to this is added in apposition Virgil's phrase (Aen. i 254, xi 725) *hominum sator atque deorum* with its words rearranged to fit the iambic metre. For the misleading position of *deorum* compare ii prol. 10 'dictorum sensus ut delectet uarietas', that is 'dictorum uarietas', and iv 19 28 'non est legatos regis non dimittere', that is 'non est regis non dimittere legatos'; Mart. viii 32 7 sq. 'haec a Sardois tibi forsitan exulis oris, | fratre reuersuro, nuntia uenit auis' (exulis nuntia), Germ. frag. iv 107 'haec eadem fundens praedicet Aquarius imbrem' (imbrem fundens, haec eadem praedicet), Ouid. amor. iii 5 18 'iterum pasto pascitur ante cibo' (iterum pascitur cibo ante pasto), Val. Fl. i 265 sq. 'placido si currere fluctu | Pelea uultis, ait, uentosque optare ferentes' (si uultis Pelea optare currere): see also what I say below on app. 13 1. Il. Lat. 572–4, which I mentioned above for another reason, will serve also as an example of hyperbaton, 'precor, o pater optime, dixit, | ut meus hic, pro quo tua numina, natus, adoro, | uirtutes patrias primis imitetur ab annis' (ut meus hic natus imitetur), and so will ib. 319 'quem, tali, postquam conspexit, uoce locuta est'.

IV 9 3–12.

cum decidisset uulpes in puteum inscia
et altiore clauderetur margine,
deuenit hircus sitiens in eundem locum. 5
simul rogauit, esset an dulcis liquor
et copiosus. illa fraudem moliens:
'descende, amice; tanta bonitas est aquae
uoluptas ut satiari non possit mea.'
inmisit se barbatus. tum uulpecula 10
euasit puteo nixa celsis cornibus,
hircumque clauso liquit haerentem uado.

No Roman ever said *simul* in such a case, nor any Greek ἅμα, nor any Englishman *at the same time*. To change the punctuation with C. W. Nauck and take *simul* as *simul atque* (simul rogauit, illa 'descende') is equally unlike the discourse of ancient or modern man. Write simus, that is ὁ σιμός: Theocr. viii 50 σιμαὶ ἔριφοι, Verg.buc.

x 7 *simae capellae.* The descriptive nickname is in Phaedrus' manner: verse 10 *barbatus,* i 1 6 *laniger* for *agnus,* 11 6 *auritulus* for *asellus,* iv 4 3 *sonipes* for *equus.* Lest *simus* should here be thought superfluous since *hircus* is the subject of the immediately preceding sentence, compare i 17 6 sqq. '*ouis* damnata falso testimonio | quod non debebat soluit. post paucos dies | *bidens* iacentem in fouea conspexit lupum'. *simus* is corrupted to *simul* in the best MS of Ouid. met. xiii 214.

App. Perott. 13 1–5.

per aliquot annos quaedam dilectum uirum
amisit et sarcophago corpus condidit:
a quo reuelli nullo cum posset modo
et in sepulchro lugens uitam degeret,
claram assecuta est famam castae uirginis.

1. Lucian Mueller, followed by Havet and Gow, alters *per* to *post* in order to avoid a tribrach of this form in the first foot: for the same reason, and no other, he changes ii prol. 2 and app. 3 17. Mr Havet defends the text in those two places, but says that *per* in this verse is 'suspectum propter sensum'. Not at all: the construction is 'uirum per aliquot annos dilectum', as Verg. Aen. ix 85 'multos dilecta per annos'. Such an order of words is legitimate even in prose: Liu. iii 1 4 'T. Quinctii ductu et auspicio agri capti priore anno aliquantum a Volscis esse' = esse aliquantum agri T. Quinctii ductu et auspicio priore anno a Volscis capti.

5. In place of *uirginis,* which is too jocose even for the improbity of Phaedrus, Mueller writes *mulieris.* Rather coniu-
i
gis: this confusion (ciugis, uginis) recurs at Ouid. met. xv 836. *castitudinis* is equally near to *caste uirginis,* but Phaedrus would hardly use the word.

App. Perott. 14 5–8.

maerens propinquos contulit se in hortulos, 5
quos ultra paulo uilla splendidi diuitis
erat acceptura uirginem e matris sinu,
parum ampla in urbe uisa quod fuerat domus.

uilla ditis splendida Bothe: I should prefer

uilla splendens diuitis.

ens absorbed by *end* leaves *splenddiuitis.* Horace epod. 1 29 has 'uilla candens' at the same place in the verse.

App. Perott. 17

premente partu scrofa cum gemeret iacens,
accurrit lupus et obstetricis partibus
se posse fungi dixit, promittens opem.
quae uero nosset pectoris fraudem improbi
suspectum officium repudiauit malefici 5
et 'satis est' inquit 'si recedas longius'.
quod si perfidiae se commisisset lupi
pari dolore fata deflesset sua.

8. '*parens* (or *impar*) *dolori* (or *priuata prole*) fata deflesset sua', '*partus* dolore fata *conplesset* sua', '*raptos* (or *rapi*) *dolose feta* deflesset *suos* (or *parta* deflesset sua)'. Far be it from me to affirm that any single verse in the whole appendix Perottina is certainly sound; but this verse can at any rate be construed, and yields a more pointed sense than any of the conjectures. It means as it stands 'gigni doloribus mortem deflesset suam', she would have wept to find that her travail was bearing no fruit but her own destruction: dolor non prolis uitam sed matris exitium pariturus fuit. For *dolore* instead of the usual *doloribus* see Plaut. Amph. 1100 'sine *dolore* peperit' beside 879 'pariat sine *doloribus*'.

A. E. Housman.

THE EARLY NUMERALS.

That the early Indo-Europeans counted on their fingers is evident from the numeral-words and from the decimal character of the numeral system. But it is my belief that the decimal system represents an advance in the arithmetical art, and that it was preceded by a more primitive system, of which some traces may still perhaps be discerned.

This theory is not *a priori* wholly improbable, if we may judge by the analogy of those backward peoples of our own day who still remain in a primitive state of culture. It is well known that such peoples find counting extremely difficult; and many tribes cannot count above three or four, or even two.[1] The Indians of Brazil have words for One, Two, and Three, while Four and all higher numbers are simply 'Many'. Many Australian tribes can count up to Four, but everything after that is 'Many'. Not all Australian tribes have reached even this

[1] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*[4], i. ch. vii.