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](#)

Némethy's *Tibvllvs* and *Lygdamvs Albii Tibulli Carmina: accedunt Sulpioiae Elegidia*. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit Geyza Némethy, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMV. 8¾ × 5½. Pp. 348, Sewed. Kron. 6. *Lygdami Carmina: accedit Panegyricus in Messallam*. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit Geyza Némethy, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMVI. 8¾ × 5½ Pp. 180, Sewed. Kron. 3.

Samuel Allen

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 09 / December 1906, pp 449 - 456

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00995313, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00995313

How to cite this article:

Samuel Allen (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 449-456 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00995313

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to the third word in the sentence—a very doubtful expedient), in the latter the word *ergo* is obelized, and an ‘antiqua forma’ *erego* is suggested (‘*vix erego*’) in the note. If the editor has so strong an objection to this kind of hiatus, why should he even suggest the introduction of it in Rud. 1202 (‘*vix opino*’) and also in a passage where hiatus would be far more objectionable, Stich. 290? Does he hold that *opinor* is not a genuine Plautine form? Nor do I see justification for the suggestion of *minat* and *ludificemus* in Stich. 21, 578. In Truc. 91 *nudius* gives a better rhythm than *nudiu*. Why does the editor object to *siquis* in Stich. 182? Such forms are now generally recognized (cf. *siquidem* side by side with *siquidem*, etc.): in Stich. 715 Prof. Lindsay himself introduces it (with a protest) where it is not necessary in the opinion of other

recent editors. Nor do they agree with him in Most. 217, where he accepts Klotz’s conjecture; the scansion in *senecta* is unobjectionable in the first foot of the second colon of the iamb. septen.

I have noticed a few questionable spellings: *i* is a common error for *e* in the Ambrosian, and therefore may well have figured in P too; if so, the *mulieri* of B in Most. 256, the *virtuti* of Truc. 495 have no weight, and the *miis* of Pseud. 764 may not be an ‘antiqua forma’ but simply an error. Consistency in this matter is difficult, especially in a work of this compass; but I do not understand why Prof. Lindsay prints *periet*, Stich. 497 (A) but not *propetno*, *ibid.* 425 (A), *uein* Pseud. (324 (A) but not *ei*, *ibid.* 326 (A).

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

NÉMETHY’S *TIBVLLVS* AND *LYGDAMVS*.

Albii Tibulli Carmina: accedunt Sulpiciae Elegidia. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit GEYZA NÉMETHY, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMV. 8½ × 5½. Pp. 348, Sewed. Kron. 6.

Lygdami Carmina: accedit Panegyricus in Messallam. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit GEYZA NÉMETHY, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae Sodalis. Budapestini. MCMVI. 8½ × 5½. Pp. 180, Sewed. Kron. 3.

THESE are two of a series of ‘Editiones Criticae Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum a Collegio Philologico Classico Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae publicis iuris factae.’ They are welcome contributions to our knowledge of associated authors of whose entire remains no complete annotated edition had appeared since that of Ludolph Dissen, published in 1835, and no longer up to date.

The two volumes are, we are told by the editor, a *πάρεργον* of a larger work written by him in Hungarian on Roman Elegy, during the preparation of which he had often wished that someone else had previously done what he thereupon undertook.

The first volume comprises what the editor considers the genuine remains of Tibullus, viz. Books I. II. and IV. ii.–vi.

NO. CLXXXII. VOL. XX.

inclusive, xiii. and xiv. (according to the traditional division), to which he has added the Elegies of Sulpicia, Book IV. vii.–xii. inclusive, as being required for a right understanding of some of the others. The second volume includes the Elegies of Lygdamus, Book III., and the anonymous Panegyric on Messalla.

The editor has rearranged the poems of Tibullus and of Sulpicia in what seems to him to be their chronological sequence, a proceeding which he has endeavoured to justify in an Appendix of eleven Excursus. First, under the Heading ‘Marathus’ come I. iv, viii, and ix; under the Heading ‘Detestatio belli’ I. x; under the Heading ‘Delia’ I. iii, i, v, ii, and vi; under the Heading ‘In natalem Messallae’ I. vii; under the Heading ‘Ambarualia’ II. i; under the Heading ‘Sulpiciae Elegidia’ poems IV. viii, ix, x, xi, xii, and vii; under the Heading ‘Tibulli Elegidia de amore Sulpiciae’ IV. ii, iii, iv, v, and vi; under the Heading ‘In natalem Cornuti’ II. ii; under the Heading ‘Nemesis’ II. iv, vi, and iii; under the Heading ‘In natalem Messalini quindecimviri’ II. v; and, finally, under the Heading ‘De amica innominata’ IV. xiii, and xiv. In the Excursus three moot questions have been entirely ignored: viz. (1) ‘Was Tibullus the Albius of Horace?’—the ‘immitis Glycera’ of whose Ode I. xxxiii Mr. Némethy thinks

G G

may have been the 'amica innominata,' beloved after Delia and before Nemesis (he supposes); (2) 'Is Elegy xiii of Book IV. addressed to the "amica innominata" genuine?' and (3) 'Did Tibullus accompany Messalla to Aquitania?' The statement in the anonymous 'Vita Tibulli'¹ that the poet was a 'contubernalis' of the general in the Aquitanian Wars, and the words 'non sine me est tibi partus honos' of I. vii. 7 (where the writer is represented as complacently taking credit to himself for a share in the exploits of the man whom he is eulogizing) Mr. Némethy appears to have accepted unhesitatingly, notwithstanding that 'me' has been suspected by eminent scholars; and the geographical difficulties of I. vii. 3-4 and 11, 12 he has passed by without comment, giving no explanation of why the Atax, the chief river of Gallia Narbonensis (which has been settled for many years) should tremble at the approach of the conqueror of Aquitania, and suggesting no reason why in connexion with the conquest of the latter province should be mentioned the Arar and Rhodanus which flowed eastward thereof. Mr. Némethy's arbitrary arrangements, instructive though they may possibly be to a stranger to their subject-matter, are not convenient for persons wishing to refer to particular passages either of the Text or of the Commentary; and, by alteration of the order in which (there can be little doubt) the contents of Books I. and II. had been arranged for publication by the poet himself, deface a literary monument.

The vexed question, Who was the author of III. i.-vi., Mr. Némethy does not discuss, merely stating as his opinion that 'Lygdamus' was a pseudonym of one who was certainly not a foreigner but a Roman, as he infers from III. i. 1-2, and a man of good family, because in iv. 60 the poet says 'nec gaudet casta nupta Neaera domo,'—'casta' being interpreted 'honesta' (a questionable interpretation)—and in vi. 59 *sq.* contrasts with himself a rival of low birth by using the words 'fugit nostrae conuiuia mensae Ignotum cupiens uana puella torum.' The supposition that 'Lygdamus' was a freedman, and possibly Propertius' freedman of that name,² is not mentioned.

The anonymous 'Panegyric on Messalla' Mr. Némethy attributes to Propertius as a youth of some eighteen years, an opinion for which he argues in a treatise entitled 'De

auctore Panegyrici in Messallam,' and here reprinted. This opinion he supports by an enumeration of instances of similarity (1) of use of abstract nouns for concrete; (2) of use of certain phrases and of certain words, *e.g.* of *ponere uestigia* for *ponere pedes*, of *addere* for *imponere*, of *deficere* for *desinere*, of *nare* or of *natare* for *nauigare* with reference to the same person, Ulysses, and of *properare* (active) and of accumulation of negatives; (3) of sentiments sometimes expressed in similar words; (4) of treatment of the same mythological subjects; (5) of description of the stillness of the world during celebration of sacred rites; and (6) of lot in life and of reverse of fortune of either poet, as revealed by himself. The coincidences adduced³ are, no doubt, remarkable; and the work of the panegyrist, if viewed as a *youthful* production, may have been, as Mr. Némethy deems, somewhat too severely criticised; but, whether, when set side by side with the 'Cynthia, facundi carmen *iuuenale* Properti' (Martial xiv. 189), it shews any real trace of the true Propertian genius, is a problem which Mr. Némethy has not faced. If the poet Lygdamus, writing under his own name, was (as has been supposed possible) a freedman of Propertius, it is quite conceivable (the editor of this Journal has suggested) that he might have got possession of some unpublished or privately published juvenile hexameter verses of his former master, and have annexed them to his own elegies in the place in which the 'Panegyric on Messalla' is found in the MSS. of the Pseudo-Tibullian poems.

The Text is based on the codex Ambrosianus (A), but to whom Mr. Némethy is indebted for a knowledge of the tradition, is not stated. He gives no list of previous editions used by him; the name of Aemilius Baehrens, the discoverer and the original collator of cod. A occurs in the former volume only as that of an editor of the 'Poetae Latini Minores,' and in the latter volume only as that of a proposer of two conjectures; and the edition of Edward Hiller, who re-examined that MS., is mentioned only in a preface to the latter volume, and there in acknowledgment of the use made of its *Index Verborum*. Into the Text, whencesoever derived, Mr. Némethy has introduced several conjectures of his own, more than one of which, in the judgment of the present writer, are probably restorations of the words of the original.

¹ Referred to and partly quoted in the Excursus.

² *I.e.* formerly his slave, lent by him to Cynthia; see Propert. IV. (V.) vii. 35-6, viii. 37, 79, 80.

³ Several of which were pointed out by Dr. Postgate in his *Select Elegies of Propertius* and in his *Selections from Tibullus and Others*.

In I. i. 25 he reads

'*Hic modo iam possim contentus uiuere paruo,*'

from his own conjecture, all the MSS. having *Iam* for the first word, except the *excerpta Parisina* which has *Quippe*. He considers this proved to be true by line 35 '*Hic, sc. in agro meo, 'ego pastoremque meum lustrare quotannis (soleo),'*—where, he says, '*interpretes hucusque adverbium hic non potuerunt explicare,*' ignoring Dr. Postgate's simple correction '*Hinc*' = '*de meo pecore exiguo.*'¹ In either line *Hic* is quite otiose; and here perhaps we ought to read '*Inque modo possim contentus uiuere paruo.*' Such a general expression as '*to live on a little*' is rather out of place among a number of particular instances of the poet's limited means.

In I. i. 43, 44

'*Parua seges satis est, satis est requiescere lecto,*'

which is the reading of codd. AVGC,² the *excerpta Parisina* having '*Parua seges satis est uno requiescere lecto*' he reads from his own conjecture '*tuto*' for the second '*satis est.*' The '*origo corruptelae*' is, he says, '*haplographia—est tuto—est uto—est uno*'; in archetypo Ambrosiani certe fuit lacuna quam librarii suppleuerunt bis ponendo *satis est.*' This seems plausible: *lecto* wants an epithet such as *toto* in line 44 has.

In I. ii. 73, 74

'*Et, te dum liceat teneris retinere lacertis, Mollis et inculta sit mihi somnus humo;*'

which is the reading of codd. AVC, cod. G having '*mollis in inculta,*' he reads *et in dura* '*ex mea coniectura*' he says, though it is that of Dousa, fil. But would Tibullus' companion have been satisfied with '*the hard ground*' as a couch? May not '*inculta humo*' be ablative absolute, meaning that, the ancient Roman poet, like the modern Scotch bard while he had his '*arms about*' his '*dearie, O,*' would let such '*war'ly cares*' as the tillage of the soil '*a' gae tapsalterie, O?*'

In I. iii. 7

'*Non soror Assyrios cineri quae dedat odores,*'

¹ See *The Journal of Philology*, Vol. xxviii. p. 152 (1901); and compare *Moretum* 16, 17 '*Fusus erat terra frumenti pauper aceruus; Hinc sibi depromit quantum—*'

² V being the codex Vaticanus, G the Guelferbytanus, and C the Cuicacianus of Scaliger now in the possession of the present writer.

instead of '*dedat*' he reads *reddat*, '*mea coniectura*'—which is, he says, a conjecture of Heyne. *reddat* however (for which he propounds no '*origo corruptelae*' seems palaeographically unlikely; and *dedat* may possibly be (as Broukhuyzen suggested) a corruption of *fundat*, notwithstanding Heyne's objection '*Verum si hoc a Tibulli manu fuerat, quomodo tam obuium uerbum in illud deprauari potuit?*' Had *fundat* written *fūdat* happened to be immediately between *perusta* of line 6 and *sepulcra* of line 8 (its actual position in the codex Cuicacianus) the downstroke of *p* of *perusta* might have coalesced with *f* of *fū* and so have formed a character the lower part of which became merged in *l* of *sepulcra*, with the result that *fū* was misread *de*.

In I. iv. 43, 44

'*Quamuis praetexens picta ferrugine caelum Venturam amiciat imbrifer arcus aquam;*'

So read by codd. AC (variants for *amiciat* being *annuntiat*, *admittat*, and *annutet*, and variants for *imbrifer* being *nimbifer* and *nubifer*) he reads from his own conjecture '*Portendat pluuias imbrifer arcus aquas*'—supposing that in the archetype there was *Venturam annuntiat*, originally a gloss, *Ventura annuntiat*—for which he compares *Corp. Glossar. Lat.* (ed. Goetz) IV. p. 378, *portendit = uentura significat*, and V. p. 474 *portendit = futura nuntiat*; also *Plin. N.H.* II. lx. 150, and *Propert. III. v. (IV. iv.) 32*. This conjecture is more ingenious than probable.

In I. vii. 13, 14

'*An te, Cydne, canam, tacitis qui leniter undis*

Caeruleus placidis per uada serpis aquis;'

in order to get rid of '*the intolerable pleonasm*' of *tacitis undis* and *placidis aquis*, instead of *tacitis* he reads *tractis*, comparing *Curt. Ruf. III. iv. 8*: '*Cydnus . . . leni tractu e fontibus labens puro solo excipitur; nec torrentes incurrunt, qui placide manantis alueum turbent; itaque incorruptus . . . ubique fontibus suis similis in mare euadit;*' and *ibid. i. 3* '*(Marsyas amnis) liquidus et suas dumtaxat undas trahens.*' This seems an almost certain conjecture: *leniter* requires a participle (as *Lachmann* perceived when he suggested '*tactis qui leniter uluis*') and in *tractis* we have one both suitable and probable.

In I. vii. 35, 36

'*Illi iucundos primum matura saporis Expressa incultis uua dedit pedibus;*'

where *incultis* the reading of all the MSS. is not easy of explanation, he reads instead thereof *insuetis*,—comparing I. iv. 48. The ‘origo corruptelae,’ is (he says) *insuetis*—*insultis*—*incultis*. This seems a right remedy for a hitherto unsuspected corruption.

In I. ix. 25, 26

‘Ipse deus tacito permisit leue ministro
Ederet ut multo libera uerba mero;’

he reads *laeue*, a vocative very awkward here. Perhaps the proper correction would be *luce*, used complementary (as it were) to *nocte* implied in ‘somno domitos,’ v. 27. So Propertius IV. vii. 89–91, says ‘Nocte uagae ferimur, nox clausas liberat umbras . . . Luce iubent leges Lethaea ad stagna reuert.’

In I. x. 37, 38

‘Illic percussisque genis ustoque capillo
Errat ad obscuros pallida turba lacus,’

which is the reading of codd. AVGC, the *excerpta Parisina* having *percussis*, he reads *perfossis*, supporting it by Ovid. *Pont.* II. viii. 66 ‘Et patiar fossis lumen abire genis’—the ‘origo corruptelae’ being, he says, ‘ex *perfossis* propter similitudinem litterarum *f* et *s*, *o* et *ci* in scriptura minuscula factum est *percussis*. Genae hoc loco caueas oculorum significat,—ut Propert. III. xii. 26, “Exustaeque tuae mox, Polypheme, genae”; et IV. v. 16 “Cornicum immeritas eruit ungue genas.”’ This conjecture seems preferable to *Liuiineius’ pertusis*.

In I. x. 55, 56

‘Flet teneras subtusa genas; sed uictor et ipse

Flet sibi dementes tam ualuisse manus,’

instead of the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον¹ *subtusa* (which, as explained by Lexicographers to mean *paulum tusa* cannot, he justly remarks, have any appropriateness here) he reads *obtusa* meaning ‘manibus aut pugnibus uerberata,’ and cites Plaut. *Cas.* V. i. 8 ‘obtuso ore,’ and V. ii. 50 ‘obtundit os mihi’ To this however, long ago suggested by Scaliger, who cited Lucil. ‘obtusore pugil, piscinensis, reses,’²—it may be objected that, notwithstanding the passage cited from Lucilius and the two passages cited from Plautus (to which might be added Plaut.

¹ The statement of Lewis and Short that *subtus* occurs in Boëth. *Geom.* i. p. 1180 as an epithet of *angulus* is false.

² At p. 135 of his ‘Castigationes in Catullum Tibullum Propertium, Lutetiae 1577;’ but discarded by him in favour of *subfusa*; ‘facile diuinatu,’ he wrote, ‘quare pudicitia expugnata erubescat.’

Amph. II. i. 59 ‘Sum obtusus pugnibus pessime’) *obtus* ought to have meant in the time of Tibullus not so much ‘bruised’ or ‘thumped’ as ‘blunt’ or ‘dull,’ a meaning not suitable here. The true reading here may perhaps be *contusa*—i.e. the abbreviation *cō* was perhaps mistaken for the contraction *sb*. In a passage of Claudian, *De Bello Gildonico* 134 sqq., occur, along with other expressions reminiscent of expressions occurring here (e.g. ‘Rescissae uestes et spicae passim Serta iacent’ and ‘uino calefacta Venus’), the words *contusa genas* used of ‘Africa,’ personified and represented as having her cheeks ‘bruised’ or ‘thumped’ by herself in her grief.

In IV. ii. 23

‘Hoc solemne sacrum multos hoc sumet in annos,’

which is the reading of codd. AVGC, the lost *Fragmentum Cuiacianum peruetustum* having (*teste Scaligero*) had *haec sumet* and some codd. deter. having *hoc fumet*, he reads from his own conjecture *huic fumet*. But, as was pointed out by Heyne, “‘fumare in multos annos’ non bene diceretur;” and the best correction is perhaps Scaliger’s *consummet* (= *consumet*, an overwritten horizontal stroke denoting a second *m* having been omitted, and an abbreviation or a contraction of *con* having been mistaken for an abbreviation or for a contraction of *hoc* or of *hec*). In Senec. *Herc. Fur.* 1039 (not cited by Scaliger) occur the words ‘*consumma sacrum*.’

In IV. vii. 2.

‘Tandem uenit amor qualem texisse pudore
Quam nudasse alicui sit mihi fama magis;’

which is the reading of codd. AVGC, adopting *pudori* an alternative reading of cod. A, in which the line is repeated, he reads ‘sit mihi, Fama, magis,’ paraphrasing ‘qualem occultare magis pudori sit mihi quam alicui aperire;’ and for the allocation of Fame personified he compares Stat. *Silu.* I. ii. 28, 29. (In line 9 is printed ‘famae’ not ‘Famae.’) This view is not unlike that of Heyne, who suggested that the order of the words might be ‘fama me eum amorem texisse sit mihi magis pudori quam me eum nudasse alicui.’

In III. i. 12 (Lydd.)

‘Indicet ut nomen littera facta tuum,

the reading of all the MSS.—instead of *facta* he reads from his own conjecture *rubra*—‘fastigia’ of the preceding line having (he

supposes) caused a scribe to write *fabra* afterwards 'corrected,' *rubra* would supply a good sense wanting in the vulgate.

In III. vi. 4 (Lygd.)

'Saepe tuo (sc. Liberi) cecedit munere uictus amor ;'

he writes 'Amor ;' comparing Propert. III. xvii. (IV. xvi.) 3, 'Tu (sc. Bacche).' This may be right.

In Pan. Mess. 21, 22

'Et uagus e terris qua surgere nititur aer
Huic et contextus passim fluat igneus aether,'

—which is the reading of all the MSS. except that cod. C has *a terris* and *ignibus* and codd. AV have *Hinc* and the codd. deterr. have *ut* in the second line—he reads '*Ut . . . Hunc et complexus*' etc., *Ut* being, he says, a conjecture of Heins and *Hunc* a conjecture of his own. But has not he changed the wrong *et* into *ut*? Why did not he write '*Et . . . Hunc ut complexus* passim fluat igneus aether'? *Hunc complexus*, in support of which are cited Lucret. II. 1066 and V. 470, and also might be cited Manil. I. 148 '*Summaque complexus stellantis culmina caeli*'¹—would be satisfactory if it could be shown how *plexus* became *textus*. Quaere, read '*Huic ut coniectus*,' for which might be compared Ovid. *Tr.* IV. i. 83 '*coniectaque uincula collo*'? Or was Broukhuyzen right in reading '*Hinc ut contextis* passim fluat *ignibus* aether'?

In Pan. Mess. 142, of which there may be said to be two traditions, viz.—'Cretaeis ardet aut unda Caristia (or 'Charistia') campis' of codd. AVGC, and 'Ardet Arectais aut unda perhospita campis' of the lost *Fragmentum Cuiacianum peruetustum*, adopting Lachmann's 'aret' and Heyne's 'parum hospita' he reads 'Aret Chaldaeis ante unda parum hospita campis' sc. 'Gyndes, Chaldaeis and ante being conjectures of his own. 'Gyndes enim,' he says 'Babyloniam perfluit.' But did that river flow through Chaldaea properly so called, as known to the Romans? and does ante account for the false quantity of 'ardet aut,' or 'parum hospita' for the strange *Caristia* or *Charistia* of codd. AVGC?

In Pan. Mess. 149, 150

'Te manet inuictus Romano Marte
Britannus
Teque interiecto mundi pars altera sole ;'

he reads *infra uecto*, which seems a right emendation of a corruption not hitherto suspected. 'Nam,' he says, '*infra uecto recte significat solem infra terras nostras antipodibus lucentem, ut supra, uers. 67, "Seu supra terras Phoebus seu curreret infra."*'

In Pan. Mess. 175

'Et ferro tellus, pontus confunditur aere,'

which was the reading of codd. AVGC, the codd. deterr. having 'confunditur,' he reads from his own conjecture *proscinditur*. This may be right: a contraction of *pro* may possibly have been mistaken for a contraction of *con*.

Mr. Némethy suggests² two other changes.

In Tib. I. i. 47, 48

'Aut gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit,
Auster

Securum somnos igne iuuante sequi,'

which is the reading of codd. AVC, cod. G and the *excerpta Parisina* having *imbre*, he would read *imbre sonante*. This was proposed by Baehrens in 1878 and was cited as his proposal by Hiller in 1885. Nearer however to the tradition would be *igne micante*.

In Pan. Mess. 205

'Seu matura dies celerem properat mihi
mortem,'

which is the reading of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum peruetustum*, all the other MSS. having *fato* instead of *celerem*, he would read *fati*. The same suggestion had *teste Dissenio* been made by Huschke. Quaere, is *celerem* a misreading of *certam*, to which, taken as a participial adjective *fato* might have been a gloss?

In I. v. 39, 40 for

'Saepe aliam tenui; sed iam cum gaudia
adirem

Admonuit dominae deseruitque Venus ;'

Mr. Némethy has printed 'sed, cum iam,' without any note of explanation, thus, maybe inadvertently, placing these words in the order in which one expects to find them. The construction however of *admonere* with a genitive of the thing and without any case of the person reminded is very rare, except with the accessory notion of *admonition*, and *deserere* is used absolutely elsewhere perhaps only in military or in legal phraseology. It may therefore be suggested that here *iam* i.e. *id* is probably

¹ Cited by Dr. Postgate in *The Journal of Philology*, xxv. p. 62 (1897), where he proposed to read here '*hinc ut praetextus*.'

² In Addenda to Vol. II. pp. 176 and 179.

due to a misreading of *me*, i.e. *m'*; and that what Tibullus wrote was 'Saepe aliam tenui; sed *me*, cum gaudia adirem,' etc.

Mr. Némethy's Exegetical Commentary is (as might be expected) based mainly upon that of Dissen, of which it might be called both an abridgement and an enlargement, many lengthy disquisitions having been omitted, and many new illustrations having been added to what therein appeared, and herein re-appear without any acknowledgement of their sources. Information given to the literary world seventy years ago may perhaps be considered to have ere now become common property; but this would hardly apply to illustrations which appeared for the first time in the year 1903 in a book entitled 'Selections from Tibullus and Others, edited by J. P. Postgate, Litt.D.' and published in London. Some of these added illustrations may have occurred independently to Mr. Némethy; but, whether such is the case with all, any person, who shall have compared the notes in both works on (to particularise only a few passages) I. iii. 80; vii. 40; x. 43; II. i. 55; v. 79; vi. 2, 11, 12, 36; III. i. 26; ii. 18; iii. 10; and IV. xiii. 12, can judge for himself.

Among passages, Mr. Némethy's treatment of which deserves special notice, are the following.

In I. iii. 11, 12

'Illa sacras pueri sortes ter sustulit, illi
Rettulit e triuiis omnia certa puer;'

Mr. Némethy follows Scaliger in joining *e triuiis*, like an epithet, with *puer*, and compares I. v. 56, 'post agat e triuiis aspera turba canum,' which he takes as 'canes qui in triuiis esse solent.' It might be objected that *pueri* of the hexameter has no *e triuiis* epithet, and that Tibullus could have written, had he so wished, '*E triuiis pueri*.' Quaere, did he? *sacras*, surely a strange epithet for the '*sortes*' of a street fortune-teller, the *ductus litterarum* would allow of having been a mis-reading of *triuiis* and *Illa* might possibly have been a correction of *Et*, either a mis-reading of *E* or a result of *haplography*. '*omnia*' of cod. V, not '*omina*' of cod. A in *rasura*, Mr. Némethy adds, is the right reading here, '*nam oraculum sortis*,' he observes, '*non uocatur omen*,' cf. Cic. *de div.* II. 83 and 85, '*ubi sortes et omina optime discernuntur*,'—an observation made by H. Belling, whose name is not mentioned.

In I. iii. 17, 18

'Aut ego sum causatus aues, dant omina
dira,
Saturniue sacram me tenuisse diem;'

reading thus with codd. AVGC *dant* (in support of which is appositely compared Petron. *Sat.* cxxii. 177, 8 '*omina laeta dedit*') rather than *aut* of the other codd., and *Saturniue* (an old conjecture mentioned by Broukhuyzen) instead of *Saturni* or *Saturni aut* of all the MSS., Mr. Némethy takes *dant omina dira* as a parenthesis,—a construction to which the present tense of the verb is an objection. Quaere, may not '*aves dant omina dira*' be taken as the actual words of the *causatio* so far as it refers to *aves*?

In I. vi. 42

'Stet procul aut alia stet procul ante uia;'

so read by all the MSS. except that cod. G has *atque* instead of *aut*, Mr. Némethy reads ('ex coniectura Rabi,' he says) '*Stet procul aut alia se occulat ante uia*.' The true reading is perhaps '*Stet procul aut alia se ferat ante uia*'—*se* having been mistaken for *st* a contraction of *stet*, and *ferat* for *procul*, i.e. *fe* for a contraction of *pro*, *r* for *c*, *a* (open) for *u*, and *t* for *l*, common errors.

In II. i. 13, 14

'Casta placent superis; pura cum ueste
uenite,
Et manibus puris sumite fontis aquam;'

following Dissen Mr. Némethy takes *puris* *manibus* as datives, and explains '*puris* per prolepsin "ut purae fiant."' A more correct explanation is that of Dr. Postgate, who comparing Soph. *Oed. Col.* 469, cited by Schulze, *πῶτον μὲν ἱερὰς ἐξ ἀιφύτου χοῆς κρήνης ἐνεγκοῦ, δι' ὅσιων χειρῶν θιγῶν*, says 'the hands must be clean before the holy water for the lustration is touched; the water now mentioned is used not to cleanse but to sanctify.'¹ It would be strange if *puris* in the pentameter were proleptic and not *pura* in the hexameter, no more here than in I. x. 27, where the same phrase '*pura cum ueste*' occurs.

In II. ii. 17–22

'Vota cadunt; utinam strepitantibus aduolet
alis
Flauaque coniugio uincula portet Amor,
Vincula quae maneant semper dum tarda
senectus
Inducat rugas inficiatque comas.
Hic ueniat Natalis auis prolemque ministret
Ludat et ante tuos turba nouella pedes;'

¹ J. P. Postgate's *Selections from Tibullus and Others*, p. 105.

which is the reading of codd. AVGC, except that codd. VGC have 'uincula que et maneat' in line 19 and cod. G has 'Hęc' in line 21, Mr. Némethy explains 'uota cadunt' to mean 'uerba uotorum ex ore Cornuti uouentis excidunt, i.e. uota nuncupantur;' and 'utinam strepitantibus aduolet alis . . . Amor' he explains to mean 'poeta optat ut Cornuto uota nuncupanti boni auspicii (bonae ausis) loco Amor alatus appareat.' This explanation of 'uota cadunt'—different from that usually hitherto given by editors, viz. that *cadunt* = *eueniunt* (in support of which no better parallels have been cited by them than I. vi. 85 'haec aliis maledicta cadant' and Ter. *Adelphi* IV. vii. 22 'si illud quod maxime opus est iactu non cadit')—has the merit of not requiring 'uiden' ut' of the codd. deterr. to be substituted for 'utinam'; and with it the words 'utinam . . . comas' might be understood as the wishes of Cornutus himself,—the poet's wish in that case being expressed in the concluding distich, which adopting Heins' conjecture *Hac . . . aui* Mr. Némethy reads as 'Hac ueniat Natalis aui prolemque minisset Ludat et ante tuos turba nouella pedes.'

In II. iv. 37, 38

'Hinc fletus rixaeque sonant; haec denique causa
fecit ut infamis hic deus esset Amor;'

Mr. Némethy reads from the conjecture of Broukhuyzen *nunc* for *hic*, but omits to state that he also conjectured *erret* (as in II. v. 106). Similar statements of only half the emendation (it is curious to observe) appear in the editions of Baehrens and of Hiller.

In II. v. 30

'Garrula siluestri fistula sacra deo,'

Mr. Némethy takes the 'siluestri deo' to be 'Pani—inuentori fistulae' comparing Virg. *Ecl.* iv. 32, 33 'Pan primos calamos cera coniungere plures Instituit.' Pan however has already been spoken of by name, and after him Pales; and the better opinion perhaps is that the god here alluded to is 'Siluanus, tutor finium' (Hor. *Epod.* ii. 22), 'aruorum pecorisque deus' (Virg. *Aen.* viii. 601);¹ a Roman deity to whom many of the attributes of the Greek god Pan were transferred.¹

In III. ii. 17, 18 (Lygd.)

'Pars quae sola mei superabit corporis,
ossa

Incinctae nigra candida ueste legent,'

¹ J. P. Postgate's *Selections from Tibullus and Others*, p. 127.

'Incinctae' Mr. Némethy explains as *discinctae*, *non cinctae*, *tunicis recinctis*. 'Nihil enim,' he says, 'in sacris nexi aut uincti esse debebat;' cf. Seru. ad Verg. *Aen.* ii. 134, 'piaculum est in sacrificiis aliquid esse religatum'; and he cites Tib. I. v. 15, 16, Ovid *M.* vii. 182, 3, Suet. *Aug.* 101. 'Incinctus igitur,' he continues, 'hoc loco non significat succinctum, sed discinctum, cuius significationis hucusque unum exemplum erat notum apud Isid. *Orig.* x. 151, de muliere grauida: "Incincta, i.e. sine cinctu, quia praecingi fortiter uterus non permittit," unde Gallice mulier grauida uocatur *enceinte*. Ego addo Ouid. *Fast.* v. 675 "Huc uenit incinctus tunicam mercator," ubi agitur de mercatore festo Mercurii sacris operante et ob id ipsum discincto, quod fugit interpretes.' This explanation, probably the right one (will Mr. Némethy be surprised to hear?) was assigned to *incinctae* here by Dr. Postgate in his *Selections from Tibullus and Others*,² and was suggested for *incinctus* in the Ovidian passage by F. A. Paley in his edition of *P. Ouidii Nasonis Fasti* published in 1860,³—a suggestion subsequently quoted by G. H. Hallam in his edition of *The Fasti of Ovid*.

In III. iv. 35 (Lygd.)

'Ima uidebatur talis inludere palla;
Namque haec in nitido corpore uestis erat;'

Mr. Némethy, in common with previous editors, takes *talis inludere* as 'de ueste longa pedes feriente;' but he does not explain

² Dr. Postgate's words are: '*incinctae*, with their robes ungirded. Suet. *Aug.* 101 tells us that Augustus' ashes were gathered up by the principal members of the equestrian order in ungirded tunics, "tunicati et distincti pedibusque nudis" . . . This word has usually the sense of "girded," and so most edd. take it here. But the evidence of facts and probability tends another way. The Romans would be well acquainted with the ceremonies which Lygdamus is describing; and, even if the negative compound had never been used before, it would have no ambiguity for them. Compare Lucan viii. 787 "et *inustus* ossa medullis," where no one could fail to see that "inustus" means "unburnt," though it occurs nowhere else in this sense. But there is reason to believe that *incinctus* "ungirded" was in vulgar use, as Isidore assigns this sense to explain *incincta*, a pregnant woman, whence is derived the Fr. *enceinte*.'

³ F. A. Paley's words are: '*incinctus* Gierig takes here for *cinctus*, and Keightley compares "incinctos Lares," ii. 634. Perhaps it means "ungirt," with the tunic allowed to fall low, for so the *institores* or pedlar-merchants dressed, as we know from Prop. V. (IV.) ii. 38, "mundus demissis institor in tunicis." As in the middle ages, the Roman merchants had a distinctive dress; and are said to have carried a purse at their girdles.'

why it is not *talis alludere*, as in Stat. *Theb.* ix. 336 'extremis alludent aequora plantis,' and elsewhere. For that purpose neither of two passages compared by him, viz. Tib. I. vii. 46 and Propert. III. xvii. 32 is to the point; nor is a third passage, where, he says, Lygdamus is imitated, viz. *Ciris* 144, 'suspensam gaudens in corpore ludere uestem.' *Talis inludere* does not mean the same as *in talis ludere*. In another passage sometimes cited, viz. Hor. *Sat.* I. iv. 138, 9, 'ubi quid datur oti Inludo chartis,' the early editors Baxter Gesner and Zeune and (alone perhaps among recent editors) the late Arthur Palmer rightly explained *inludo chartis* as being equivalent to the paraphrase of an ancient Scholiast '*perdo chartas scribendo*,' i.e. 'I mock paper' by scribbling on it and so disappoint, as it were, the paper when I tear up my abortive attempts, it being impossible to get out of *inludo chartis* Orelli's rendering 'quasi ludens conicio in chartas.'¹ That being so, it might be contended that here the meaning of *talis inludere* cannot be 'to play on (or against) the ankles,' but must be 'to mock, trick, make game of the ankles' by now concealing now revealing them, and so to disappoint, as it were, the ankles, by failing to cover them as the *palla* would if it reached the feet, as in Val. Flac. i. 385, or swept the ground, as in Ovid *M.* xi. 166. But here probably we ought with Cyllenius to read *talis alludere*, what it has been stated he had found in a MS. of his own. The distich was suspected by Heyne²; and certainly *namque* looks suspicious.

A few places which present difficulties of

¹ See R. Y. Tyrrell's review of 'Wickham's Horace, Vol. ii.' in *The Classical Review*, Vol. v. p. 170.

² 'Pallam,' he wrote, 'expectabam in Apolline; quandoquidem is proprius deo amictus (cf. *supra* II. v. 8) olim omnino uatibus, hinc citharoedis communis. Verum in ea describenda laborare adeo Tibullum' [Lygdamum] 'aegre fero. Pentameter saltem friget uel maxime.'

construction or of sense have been passed by without comment, e.g. I. ii. 31 'non labor hic,' I. iii. 9 'Delia non usquam,' I. iii. 26 'memini,' I. iv. 63 'carmina ni sint,' II. vi. 10 'et mihi facta tuba est,' III. iv. 39 'ueniens,' III. v. 3 'autem,' a prosaic conjunction found nowhere else in the Tibullian sylloge, only once in Propertius, viz. at II. xxxii. (III. xxx.) 29 (where possibly it is a corruption of *aliter*, and only once in Virgil, viz. at *Aen.* ii. 101 (where possibly it is a corruption of *animo*).

The two volumes do not show that Mr. Némethy has taken as much pains as presumably he might have taken to ascertain and to recognise the views of others on points of doubt or of difficulty. On the whole however the result of the Hungarian scholar's 'labor sane iucundissimus,' notwithstanding some drawbacks, will to many be of real value for elucidation of the poems of authors who have been long undeservedly neglected.

It is much to be regretted that, whereas in the second volume there is an 'Index Lygdami' and an 'Index Panegyrici,' both avowedly adapted from Hiller's 'Index Verborum' of the whole sylloge, the editor did not add to the first volume an 'Index Tibulli' and an 'Index Sulpiciae.'

The books (badly sewed) are printed in clear type on good paper with wide margins; but the revision for the press has been inadequate, and there are numerous errata besides those noted in the *Corrigenda*.

The length of this article will, it is hoped, be deemed justified by the consideration, that the Editor of this Journal, for reasons which can be appreciated, has suffered to go unreviewed in it some important contributions to the subjects treated—such as his *Selections* to which references have been made, and also his edition of *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres* in the new Series of Oxford Classical Texts with brief critical annotations.

SAMUEL ALLEN.

PHILLIMORE'S TRANSLATION OF *PROPERTIUS*.

Propertius. Translated by J. S. PHILLIMORE, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. 12mo. Pp. xii + 184. 3s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR PHILLIMORE in his preface to this translation points out that the text

which he has here followed differs in some respects from that which he issued from the Clarendon Press in 1901. The variation consists mainly in the larger number of conjectures now admitted into the text. This change he defends (if it needs defence) adequately, by insisting on the difference