

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](#)



Elucidations of Latin Poets

A. E. Houseman

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 08 / November 1901, pp 404 - 406

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031164, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031164

How to cite this article:

A. E. Houseman (1901). Elucidations of Latin Poets. The Classical Review, 15, pp 404-406
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031164

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

far the commonest was -εύεσθαι, and *λυμω-νεύεσθαι*¹ was used by Polyb. v. 5. 8 οἱ μὲν οὖν λυμωνεύόμενοι ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα συν-βούλευον. It may seem strange, but not to those who know something of the freedom with which these verbs were coined. This to the Thesaurus is merely 'the reading of several MSS. for λυμαινόμενοι'—who finding λυμαινόμενοι would write λυμωνεύόμενοι!—while Liddell and Scott make it worse by adding *de suo* '=λυμαίνομαι.' It is no more equivalent to λυμαίνομαι than χαριεντίζομαι to χαρίζομαι: λυμαίνομαι is transitive, while λυμωνεύομαι and χαριεντίζομαι are intransitive and formed from λυμῶν and χαριείς: and that is just the point which critics often, and the Dictionaries with them, fail to recognize. There will be room presently for another list.

In Meleager's epigram Stadtmueller ought to have accepted my correction *ἀνευρεῖν*. Jacobs, I find, had already proposed *ἐφευρεῖν*, but there was no reason for objecting to

¹ The Ionic (προ)λεσχηνεύεσθαι (Heraclit., Hippocr., Hdt.), implies a genitive λεσχηνος, though not necessarily a nominative λεσχήν.

ἀνευρεῖν: in fact it was in illustrating the phrase *ἀνευρίσκειν σοφά* (Eur. *fr.* 267, *Trag. fr. adesp.* 488, 509) that I made the correction originally. *ἀνευρών* cannot stand; we must in any case have had ἐγὼ ὁ σοφὰ μόνος ἀνευρών, and *φαμί* cannot of course mean 'I speak.' The phrase as restored is of a common type, as when Parrhasios (Ath. 543c) asserts of himself εἰ καὶ ἅπιστα κλύουσι, λέγω τάδε· φαμί γὰρ ἤδη τέχνης εἰρησθαι τέματα τήσδε σαφῇ χειρὸς ὑφ' ἡμετέρης, ἀνυπέρβλητος δὲ πέπηγεν οὖρος.

When giving a list before, of words like φύζα (*C.R.* xiv. p. 112), I ought to have corrected Hesychius ρύζα: βία. ἢ τοῦ τόξου τάσις. It should be ρύζα βιοῦ: ἢ τοῦ τόξου τάσις, as on the next page ρυσίαν βολάν: τὴν τῶν τόξων τάσις, like τόξου ῥῦμα in the *Persae*. If he had given any other explanation, it would not have been βία but ὀλκή. For ἀροτόν: τὸν ὀλκὸν τοῦ Ἑκτορος, ἢ τὸ ἀντίσταθμον. Αἰσχύλος Φρυγί it will be evident from Hom. X 351 and the schol. (Nauck p. 84) that we should read ἀρ υ τ ὄ ν or ἐρυτόν.

W. HEADLAM.

ELUCIDATIONS OF LATIN POETS.

III

HORACE EPODE XV 1—10.

Nox erat et caelo fulgebat luna sereno
inter minora sidera,
cum tu magnorum numen laesura deorum
in uerba iurabas mea,
artius atque hedera procera adstringitur
ilex
lentis adhaerens brachiis,
dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion
turbaret hibernum mare
intonsosque agitare Apollinis aura ca-
pillis,
fore hunc amorem mutuum. 10

Since it is nonsense to say 'dum lupus turbaret mare,' the construction of 'dum pecori lupus' is commonly explained by the note 'scilicet infestus esset.' Such explanations are easier written with the hand than entertained in the head. For a wolf to cause storms at sea is doubtless difficult; but not more difficult than for the same adjective to serve as attribute to one noun and as predicate, with *esset* understood, to another. 'Pruissime' says Madvig 'primum ad infestus auditur esset, deinde idem adiectivum

sine esset cum Orione coniungitur, subiecto alio uerbo, quod nullo modo fieri potest.'

Bentley was too busy corrupting the tenses of the verbs to examine the construction of the sentence; and the only editors, so far as I know, who have seriously considered it are Peerlkamp, Lehrs, and Lucian Mueller. Peerlkamp, ever in chase of the spurious, ejected verses 8 and 9, the latter of which he did not understand: this leaves 'dum pecori lupus et nautis infestus Orion, | fore hunc amorem mutuum,' an omission of *esset* without parallel in Horace, as Lucian Mueller has observed. Mueller himself writes 'man könnte das Ueberlieferte nothdürftig vertheidigen, wenn man hinter Orion interpungirte und zu u. 7 *esset* ergänzte. Dann stände turbaret intransitiv, wie Aen. vi 800 et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili, Lucr. ii 126 corpora quae in solis radiis turbare videntur und sonst..... Allein die Auslassung von *esset* wäre sehr hart und ohne Beispiel bei Hor., auch wird man nur ungern u. 8 vom Orion, der zu Anfang des November untergeht (i 28 21), trennen.' Therefore he prefers the proposal of Lehrs, to assume the loss of two verses between *lupus* and *et nautis*, 'in der noch ein oder

zwei Beispiele von stets unveränderten Dingen erwähnt waren.'

What we have here is a brachylogy of that sort to which they have attached the name of *zeugma*. Aeschylus *supp.* 1006 sq. writes *μὴ πάθωμεν ὧν πολλὸς πόνος* | *πολλὸς δὲ πόντος εἶνεκ' ἡρόθη δορί*, Euripides *Ion* 1064 sq. *ἡ θηκτὸν λείψος ἡ λαμῶν ἐξάψει βρόχον ἀμφὶ δειρήν*, Pindar *Pyth.* iv 185 sq. *οὔτε ἔργον οὔτ' ἔπος ἐκτράπελον κείνοισιν εἰπὼν*, Virgil *georg.* i 92 sq. '*ne tenues pluuiæ rapidiue potentia solis* | *acrior aut Boreæ penetrabile frigus adurat*,' Cicero *ad Att.* x 4 4 '*fortunam, qua illi florentissima, nos duriore conflictati uidemur*'; and the meaning of Horace's words is the following: '*dum lupus pecori infestus (terreret ouilia, or what you will), et Orion nautis infestus turbaret hibernum mare*.'

I think the examples quoted above are enough to establish this interpretation; but I will further cite the following instances, because they are even more licentious, because one of the boldest is Horace's, and because the others are either neglected or misunderstood. They differ from *epod.* xv 7 and resemble *Cic. ad Att.* x 4 4 in that the notion omitted is rather opposite than parallel to the notion expressed.

The first occurs in a context very like our own: *Sen. Herc. Oet.* 335-8.

ante ab occasu dies
nascetur, Indos ante glacialis polus
Scythasue tepida Phoebus inficiet rota,
quam me relictam Thessalæ aspiciant nurus.

That is '*Indos glacialis polus (refrigerabit or the like) Scythasue Phoebus tepida rota inficiet*.' It will not do to supply *inficiet*, since *inficere* unqualified does not mean to *bleach* and does mean to *tan*. Horace says '*albus ora pallor inficit*,' but that is no defence of '*polus Indos inficiet*' for '*inficiet pallore*.'

Ovid *her.* xix 171-4.

uel pudor hic utinam, qui nos clam cogit
amare,
uel timidus famæ cedere uellet amor.
nunc male res iunctæ, calor et reuerentia,
pugnant:
quid sequar in dubio est: hæc decet, ille
iuuat.

Prof. Purser translates 'would that this shame which now compels us to a secret love, or our too fearful love could bring itself to surrender and be known (lit. surrender to publicity),' words which seem neither to cohere with the context nor to make sense in

themselves nor to be reconcilable with the Latin: how can *famæ cedere* mean 'surrender to publicity'? how can *utinam pudor famæ cedere uellet* mean anything at all? and when Hero wishes 'that her shame could bring itself to be known' has her language any thought behind it? The sense required is 'would that love would vanquish shame or shame would vanquish love; instead of which they now wage an equal conflict, and I know not which to obey': no other meaning will be tolerable, and if the words do not contain it they must be altered till they do. Bentley therefore proposed '*uel pudor hic utinam, qui nos clam cogit, amor, | uel*' etc.; but '*clam cogit*' alone has no fit sense. The construction of the text is '*utinam uel hic pudor, qui nos clam amare cogit, (amor cedere uellet), uel amor famæ (i.e. pudori).*' *fama* means good reputation, honest name, as in *amor.* iii 14 36 '*si dubitas famæ parcere, parce mihi*,' and stands for the same thing as *pudor* in 171 and *reuerentia* in 173: *calor* in 173 is identical with *amor* in 172.

Hor. *serm.* ii 2 11-13.

seu pila uelox
molliter austerum studio fallente laborem,
seu te discus agit, pete cedentem aera disco.

That is, as Lambinus explained, '*seu pila te agit, (hude pila), seu discus, pete aera disco*'. Similar, but much easier, is *epist.* i 3 23-5 '*seu linguam cauis acuis, seu ciuica iura | respondere paras, seu condis amabile carmen, | prima feres hederæ uictricis præmia*', where '*feres hederæ præmia*' is the apodosis only to the third of the three protases, for ivy is not the meed of *causidici* and *iuris-consulti*.

Lucan vii 320-5.

sed, dum tela micant, non uos pietatis imago
ulla nec aduersa conspecti fronte parentes
commoueant: uoltus gladio turbate ueren-
dos.

siue quis infesto cognata in pectora ferro
ibit, seu nullum uiolabit uolnere pignus,
ignoti iugulum tamquam scelus imputet
hostis.

That is '*siue quis in cognatum ibit, (scelus imputet), siue in non cognatum, huius caedem imputet tamquam scelus*': *imputo* as in *Suet.* *Ner.* 36 '*coniurati . . . dixere causam, cum quidam ultro crimen faterentur, nonnulli etiam imputarent* ('claimed credit for it'), tamquam aliter illi non possent nisi morte succurrere dedecorato flagitiis omnibus'. Caesar is urging his soldiers to spare no enemy who faces them: 'if you strike a

kinsman, count the crime a distinguished service; if one who is no kinsman, count the deed a service no less distinguished than if it were a crime like the other.' Parricide committed on Caesar's behalf will naturally constitute a claim on Caesar's gratitude, and he further promises to regard the killing of any Pompeian as no less meritorious than parricide.

It is not likely that such things could happen in formal prose; and I do not defend the MSS, for instance, at Liu. xxx 4 5 'proinde, seu ipsi staret iam sententia, <promeret>, seu consulendus Hasdrubal et Carthaginenses essent, consuleret', or Cic. pro Sex. Rosc. 22 'cum eodem tempore et ea, quae praeterita sunt, <sanet> et ea, quae uidentur instare, praeparet'.

Now listen to the fashionable commentator Kiessling, for whom the multitude have deserted their old favourite Orelli.

infestus sc. *foret* gehört ἀπὸ κοινῆς auch zu *lupus*, aber die ursprünglich als Attribut gewollte Bestimmung *qui turbat hibernum mare* ist um des Parallelismus mit dem folgenden *agitaret aura* willen zum Prädikat geworden, und hat dadurch ein leises Anakoluth bewirkt.

This fabulous narrative is a specimen of the 'sympathetic exegesis' which is supposed to have arisen in the last twenty years of the

19th century; though in point of fact it flourished high at the century's beginning in Cicero's philosophical works, amidst great though temporary applause, under the auspices of Goerenz. The engine was invented to protect corrupt passages from correction: let a text be impeached as bad grammar or nonsense, and the commentator instantly overflows with fictitious details of the disorder which he alleges to have existed in the author's mind: they may seem incredible, they may lack all confirmation, but he is a sympathetic interpreter and you disbelieve him at your peril. This practice of concocting fictions at a moment's notice, instead of stopping and thinking, or trying to think, is naturally attended with a certain amount of moral and intellectual damage; and often when the sympathetic interpreter arrives at a passage which is not corrupt, but only difficult, and which really wants interpreting, the event proves that his bad habit has crippled his powers of interpretation. Instead of probing the difficulty to find its solution, he resorts to the easier and more familiar expedient of smothering it under a cascade of figments; and the office of interpreter devolves upon the unsympathetic.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

VINDICIAE PROPERTIANAE.—II.

(Continued from p. 44.)

I PASS to places where my readings have been criticised through their having been wholly or partially misconceived.

I begin with a re-punctuation:

II xxii. 17 sq.

uni cuique dedit uitium natura: creato
mi fortuna aliquid semper amare dedit.

I understand this passage, and have always understood it, in the same sense as my critic, as meaning that every man is born with some frailty, and that the congenital frailty of Propertius is to be always in love. Accordingly I am concerned with nothing but the observation [that 'otherwise [viz. unless I adopt an interpretation which is clearly incorrect] the change is aimless.' Strictly speaking there is no change; for the vulgate punctuation of Propertius has no warrant in tradition, and we are free in all respects to punctuate as the sense requires. Nor is

it aimless. That *fortuna* and *natura* may in this connexion have the same sense of 'destiny' is well known and may be proved from authors nearer to Propertius than Seneca; e.g. Lucretius 5. 77 'expediam qua uiflectat *natura* gubernans' and not a page off 'quod procul a nobis flectat *fortuna* gubernans' (107). But when we have the choice, it seems better to allow *creato* to go with *fortuna* whose sense it helps to determine than with *natura*, which certainly stands in no need of its support (Lucr. ib. 871 'at quis nil horum tribuit *natura*'). The pause after the last trochee is quite Propertian. Turning over the pages of this second book my eye lights on viii. 15 'uisus? an usque,' xxviii 9 'Venus ipsa? peraeque.'

The second re-punctuation which is regarded as detrimental is that of III xi. 34, to which I refer here because of the important principle which its consideration