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](#)

Postgate's Propertius *Sexti Properti carmina* recognouit Joh. Percival Postgate. London, G. Bell and Sons: Cambridge, Deighton, Bell and Co. 1894. 4to. 3s. 6d. net.

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 07 / October 1895, pp 350 - 355
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202357, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202357

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 350-355 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202357

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ἄλλος ὁμιλος ὁ ἐκ τῆς γῆς : ἐκ, closely joined to ὁ and governing τῆς γῆς, ought to contribute something to our idea of the manner of the people's presence on the shore ; the theory draws ἐκ outside of that idea and attaches it to the idea of glancing with the mental eye.

Could not all the above passages except *Philoc.* 1076 be explained more easily, on the analogy of ἀφ' ἱππων μάχεσθαι, as implying that the presence of the person where he stands has an effect beyond the spot where he stands? Thus in Greek 'we sat down *from* the hill' would imply 'we sat down (intending our sitting to be effective away from where we sat) *on* the hill'—i.e. as watchers. So in *Thuc.* 6, 32 the people on the shore who joined their prayers to those of the men on board are called 'the people *from* the shore' because, so to speak, their presence on the shore permeates the space from thence outwards—in virtue of the sound of their prayers. And in *Eur. Phoen.* 1009 στὰς ἐξ ἐπάλλεων, Megareus by saying, 'I will go and stand *from* the battlements' means 'I will go and stand

(with a view to action beyond) *on* the battlements'—for he will let his corpse fall thence into the cave.

Thus the duty of ἐκ or ἀπό would be merely to hint that the person's presence is one which emits some influence or activity beyond the spot he occupies ; no distinct idea need be supplied with the preposition such as *watching from*, *throwing from* ; indeed the hint is so subtle and momentary that we make too much of it if we try to state it explicitly at all.

As to *Philoc.* 1076 εἰς ὅσον τὰ τ' ἐκ νεὼς στείλωσι ναῦται, may this be merely an example of the ordinary pregnant use of ἐκ (which is surely on the face of it naively expressive enough to need no deriving from a mental tendency to glance over an interval)? The mast, as Dr. Jebb points out, would be lying down : so that it and the tackle might perhaps be felt to be *in* the ship, and would have to be taken out of it and set up.

E. H. DONKIN.

POSTGATE'S PROPERTIUS.

Sexti Properti carmina recognouit JOH. PERCIVAL POSTGATE. London, G. Bell and Sons: Cambridge, Deighton, Bell and Co. 1894. 4to. 3s. 6d. net.

SINCE the annus mirabilis 1880 there has appeared no edition of Propertius but Mr Vahlen's insignificant revision of Haupt in 1885. So long ago however as 1881 Dr Postgate in his *Select Elegies* furnished one fourth of the poems with the best explanatory commentary they yet possess ; and among the many critics who have handled this author in the last fifteen years he has been one of the busiest. He now issues, as part of his *Corpus Poetarum* and simultaneously in a separate form, this recension and apparatus : a work full as important for the criticism of the text as any edition of the century after Lachmann's, Baehrens' and Palmer's.

Dr Postgate's own emendations are over a hundred in number. The best in the book is at IV i 93 'quippe Lupercus, *avi* (*equi* MSS) dum saucia protegit ora, | heu sibi prolapso non bene cauit equo,' which is admirably neat : now at length one can form a picture of what happened, and Lupercus has

something sensible to die for, like his brother Gallus who 'in castris dum credita signa tuetur | concidit ante aquilae rostra cruenta suae' : *avis* is corrupted to *equis* at IV xi 102. The correction of II vii 20, already published in the *Select Elegies*, 'hic erit et patrio nomine (*sanguine* MSS from 14) pluris amor,' seems certain ; and so does IV ii 12 'seu, quia uertentis fructum praecipimus anni, | Vertumni rursus *credis id* (*credidit* MSS) esse sacrum,' and the minute correction III xix 6 'flamma per incensas citius sedetur aristas | fluminaque ad fontis sunt (*sint* MSS) reditura caput.' II xxiii 22 'nolim furta *pigenda* (*pudica* MSS) tori' is convincing to me and superior to Baehrens' conjecture *pudenda* which ought however to be mentioned. II xiii 55 'illis *formosus* (*formosum* MSS) iacuisse paludibus, illuc | diceris effusa tu, Venus, isse coma' is attractively simple and favoured by κείται καλὸς Ἀδωνις ἐν ὄρεσι, though it must be allowed that 'formosum *lauisse*' or 'civisse' is more strictly pertinent to the context. II xxiv 1 'tu *quereris* (*loqueris* MSS) cum sis (so codd. rec. for *sit*) iam noto fabula libro' seems more satisfactory than Baehrens' transposition 'sic loqueris,

cum tu,' and one or the other must be right. IV xi 101 'moribus et caelum patuit: sis (sim MSS) digna merendo, | cuius honoratis ossa uehantur auis' is in my judgment a true correction: certain I hesitate to call it because it depends for its validity on my transposition of 67 sq. and 71 sq. to precede this couplet: perhaps too the right reading may be *fi*. At II xxix 27, in the MS text 'ibat et hinc castae narratum somnia Vestae,' the *hinc* is meaningless and Jacob proposed *in*; but this ellipse, as I think Dr Postgate himself has somewhere observed, does not appear to allow a descriptive epithet: he reads *intactae*, which may well be right, though *incanae* (Verg. A. v 744 canae penetralia Vestae) would be as near the MSS. In III xi 56 the reading 'non haec, Roma, fuit tanto tibi ciue uerenda, | dixi, aut (dixit et MSS) assiduo lingua sepulta mero' seems as good as any yet suggested; and in 58 '*femineo* (*femineas*) timuit territa Marte minas' is likely enough, though Dr Postgate does not improve it by writing *extimuit*. At IV i 57 '*munera* (*moenia* MSS) namque pio conor disponere uersu' is at any rate a lighter change than Mr L. Mueller's *munere...uersus*. II ix 44 'nunc quoque erit, quamuis sis inimica, nihil' (*eris...nihil* MSS) and IV x 19 'idem eques, e (et MSS) frenis idem fuit aptus atratis' are worth considering. At I xii 10 the conjecture 'num me deus obruit? an quae | lecta Prometheis diuidis herba iugis' accounts well for the MS variants *diuidit* and *diuitis*, though *diuidit* is better in itself. In II xxxiv 13—16 the MSS have 'tu mihi uel ferro pectus uel perde ueneno; | a domina tantum te modo tolle mea. | te socium uitae, te corporis esse licebit, | te dominum admitto rebus, amice, meis.' The phrase '*socium corporis*' is unintelligible, and Dr Postgate writes *pectoris* in 15 and *corpus* in 13: *pectus* however is there a better word than *corpus*, and the fault is easier mended by transposing the *socium* and *dominum* of 15 and 16, 'te dominum uitae, te corporis esse licebit, | te socium admitto rebus, amice, meis.'

In a good many places however Dr Postgate's conjectures have no apparent advantage over his predecessors'. Thus at I ii 13 '*litora natiuis persuadent picta lapillis*' his *resplendent* is to say the least neither nearer to the text nor apter to the sense than Bachrens' *praeifulgent*. At IV ix 3 '*uenit et aduictos pecorosa Palatia montes*' his *ad intactos* is further from the MSS than Lachmann's *ad eductos*, which he

does not mention, and has no superiority in meaning. In III xxi 19 sq. the vulgate 'cum fessa Lechaeo | sedarit placida uela phaselus aqua' was amended by Guietus to *Lechaei*: Dr Postgate writes *Lechaea* (adj.). The earlier conjecture is the more probable: scribes would have less temptation to alter *Lechaea*, especially with so many similar terminations in the neighbourhood to protect it. At III xiii 39 sq. '*corniger atque dei uacuam pastoris in aulam | dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oues*' some interpolated MSS, wrongly as it seems, have *cornigerique*, which Palmerius explained to mean Pan; Dr Postgate alters this further to *crinigerique* and refers to Tib. II iii 11 sqq. where Apollo is described as keeping the herds of Admetus. What in the world have the herds of Admetus to do with this picture of the primitive pastoral life of mankind? At II xxx 20 'et petere Hyrcani litora nota maris' Dr Postgate writes *muta* and adds 'coll. Sen. H.F. 540.' It cannot be pretended that *muta* is nearer to the MSS than Lachmann's *nuda* or so near as Hertzberg's *nauta*: its superiority must depend on the support it gets from Seneca. Sen. H.F. 540 (536) is 'et mutis tacitum litoribus mare.' Because Seneca applies *mutus* to the shores of one sea, does it follow that Propertius applied it to the shores of another? Besides, Lachmann quoted *litora nuda* from Statius: why does not that prove that Propertius wrote *nuda*? II xxxii 33—36 runs as follows: '*ipsa Venus, quamuis corrupta libidine Martis, | nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit, | quamuis Ida Parim pastorem dicat amasse | atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam.*' There is no such story about Venus and Paris, so editors regard *Parim* as a mistaken gloss and generally understand Anchises to be meant: Schrader proposes *Phrygem*, Haupt *palam*, Bachrens *suum*. Dr Postgate mentions none of these, but writes 'fuit, | quamuis Ida, Rhea, pastorem dicat amasse' cet., and says in the *Cambridge University Reporter* 6 Dec. 1892 'the reference is to the fable preserved in Theocr. xx 40 και τὸ, Πέα, κλαίεις τὸν βουκόλον, Tertullian ad nat. i 149 Cybele pastorem suspirat.' But others, as we have seen, think that the reference is to the fable preserved in Iliad B 820 sq. Αἰνείας, τὸν ὕπ' Ἀγχίση τέκε δὲ Ἀφροδίτη | Ἰδης ἐν κρημοῖσι θεὰ βροτῶ εἰνηθείσα, Theocr. i 105 εἰ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος, ἔρπε ποτ' Ἰδαν, | ἔρπε ποτ' Ἀγχίσαν, xx 34 sq. ὅτι Κύπρις ἐπ' ἀνέρι μῆγατο βοῦντα | καὶ Φρυγίους ἐνόμεισεν ἐν ὥρεσι: Dr Postgate must

therefore give some reason why he believes that the person meant is Rhea, whose name is not in the MSS, rather than Venus, whose name is; and it must be a strong reason, if it is to justify a dislocated order of words which has no parallel in Propertius for violence unless you accept Dr Postgate's emendation of III xix 19 *sq.* At II xxxiv 39 the MSS have '*non Amphiareae prosint tibi fata quadrigae*,' which Munro simply emended '*Amphiaraëae p. t. f. quadrigae?*' Dr Postgate writes '*Amphiarea tibi non prosint fata quadrigae*,' to which there is no objection except the needless violence of the change. But then he adds in his note '*alii alia aut numeris durissimum uersum aut Amphiaraeae nouum uerbum excurrentes*.' It is not a '*nouum uerbum*' but occurs in Strabo ix p. 399 τὸ 'Ἀμφιαράειον μαντεῖον: that however is not the point: the point is that the proper adjective in -εος from 'Ἀμφιάραος is 'Ἀμφιαράεος and nothing else, whether it occurs or not; just as the proper adjective from Μενέλαος is Μενελάεος (Prop. II xv 14). Because Euphorion chooses to frame 'Ἀμφιάρεος out of 'Ἀμφιάρης the normal formation is not therefore outlawed from that day forth. Dr Postgate himself at Catull. 68 74 reads '*Protesilaeam Laudamia domum*' in the teeth of the MSS, which have *Protesileam*, and adds no note about '*nouum uerbum*.'

Some of Dr Postgate's alterations are to be blamed as needless. For example, at IV vii 85 '*hic Tiburtina* (al. *Tiburna*) *iacet aurea Cynthia ripa*' he writes *Tiburne tua*, which means just the same as *Tiburtina* and is further away from all the MSS: he says indeed on p. 78 of his pamphlet 'On certain MSS of Propertius' that *Tiburtina* is post-Augustan, but that is an error. Another conjecture of this sort he defends at praef. p. vii. IV x 41 *sq.* describe the encounter of Claudius and Viridomarus: '*genus hic Rheno iactabat ab ipso, | nobilis e rectis fundere gaesa rotis. | illi uirgatis iaculantis ab agmine braxis | torquis ab incisa decidit unca gula*': Dr Postgate in 43 writes '*illi, ut uirgatis iaculans it ab a. braxis, | torquis*' cet. This conjecture removes no real fault which the MS reading possesses. The text is both grammatical and intelligible. The verb *decido* serves as the passive of *decido*, and such verbs can take the constructions of a passive: Ovid met. v 192 '*a tanto cecidisse uiro*,' Sil. iv 543 '*huic cadit infelix niueis Varenus in armis*.' *illi* then is dative of the agent (or if you like of the recipient) and signifies Claudius,

which nothing forbids, for Viridomarus has just been called *hic*. All danger of mistaking *illi* for the possessive dative and referring it to Viridomarus is precluded by the presence of the genitive *iaculantis*. The verses therefore mean '*illi (Claudio) torquis iaculantis (Viridomari) decisa est ab incisa gula*.' There is indeed a difficulty in *uirgatis braxis*; but Dr Postgate's conjecture does not remove it.

Some alterations are even injurious. III ix 37 *sq.* '*non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos | Cadmi, nec semper proelia clade pari*.' Propertius will not mourn over the fort of Cadmus collapsed into the ashes of the last generation, and the fight where the slaughter was one-sided at length: *nec semper pari = et non semper pari = et tandem impari*. This is that sack of Thebes by which the Epigoni broke the precedent of *Καδμεία νίκη* set by the Sparti and followed by the sons of Oedipus. Thebes was sacked so often that the words '*cineres paternos*' are useful if not needful to tell us that the sack by the Epigoni is meant; and I should have thought too that this was poetical, to say that the falling fortress blent her ashes with those of her former defenders. But if the significant *paternos* is to go, what does Dr Postgate put in its place? *repentes*: a useless epithet and a form not known to exist. For an inflexion of *repens* he can only cite *repenti*; and that from Lucretius. III xvii 1—4 '*nunc, o Bacche, tuis humiles aduoluimur aris: | da mihi pacato uela secunda, pater. | tu potes insanarum ueneris compescere fastus, | curarumque tuo fit medicina mero*.' In 2 Dr Postgate writes *placatus* for *pacato*, in 3 he proposes either *infensae* or *fluctus*: these conjectures are all unnecessary and the first is downright harmful. The second distich means as it stands 'thou canst quell the disdain of the frantic fair (exhibited for instance at IV viii 72), and thy liquor heals the lover's grief': wine can make an angry mistress kind or a slighted lover tranquil: this is tersely repeated in the next line '*per te iunguntur, per te soluuntur amantes*.' What Propertius now seeks from Bacchus is the second of these boons, tranquillity; therefore when he says '*da mihi uela secunda*' he specifies the favour asked by adding '*pacato*.' Dr Postgate refers to Ovid fast. iii 789 *sq.* '*mite caput, pater, huc placatae cornua uertas | et des ingenio uela secunda meo*': but if that passage shows that Propertius wrote *placatus* it also shows that he wrote *mitis*.

At II xvii 11 *sq.* the MSS have 'quem modo felicem invidia admirante ferebant, | nunc decimo admittor uix ego quoque die.' Dr Postgate writes *adridente* and says 'corr. nos cf. Mart. v 6 5.' Martial there invokes on a friend the extravagant blessing 'sis invidia fauente felix,' may you be prosperous but escape envy; just as Ovid Ibis 121 *sq.* invokes on an enemy the extravagant curse 'sitque, quod est rarum, solito defecta fauore, | fortunae facies inuidiosa tuae,' may you incur envy though wretched. Whether Propertius when prosperous escaped envy I do not know and it does not matter, for certain it is that he never said so here. If he were lamenting the loss of general goodwill, there would be some sense in the remark that he was formerly unenvied. But what he is lamenting here is the loss of Cynthia's favour; so the remark would be not merely irrelevant but perverse, because in real life envy is the measure of prosperity, and the way to describe supreme felicity is not to say that you were not envied but to say that you were: usque ad inuidiam felix. The sense therefore requires the very opposite of *adridente* (Ovid depicting Invidia in met. ii 775 *sqq.* writes 'risus abest, nisi quem uisi mouere dolores'), some such word as Heinsius' *maerente*. If the meaning and the ductus litterarum were all we had to think about I should confidently propose *lacrimante* (Ovid *l.c.* 'uixque tenet lacrimas, quia nil lacrimabile cernit'): one letter misplaced gives *acrimante* which is barely distinguishable from *admirante*; but the MS reading may have come from *admirare* four lines above.

Very few of Dr Postgate's alterations are without diplomatical probability, like *sortes* for *longas* at III vii 60, where the best correction seems to be Francius' CAS<TAS>. On conjectures merely suggested in the notes it would not be fair to dwell; so I will only say that the proposal *ille* for *iste* at I ix 32 recognises a difficulty which all other editors have overlooked; that *strinxerat* for *triuera*t in IV vii 10 may well be right; and that the conjectures at I v 7, II i 10, vii 18, xxviii 22 and III xvi 16 are injudicious.

Two changes of punctuation deserve praise: one at III xix 21 where Dr Postgate appears to have discovered what has escaped previous editors, that *uenundata* is neut. plur. and not fem. sing.; and another at IV i 18—20 where a strong stop is placed after *sacro* and a light one after

equo. Two on the other hand are detrimental. The first is at II xxii 17 *sq.* 'unicuique dedit uitium natura creato: | mi fortuna aliquid semper amare dedit,' i.e. 'to every man at his birth has nature assigned some frailty, and the frailty she has assigned to me is to be always in love': in this connexion *fortuna* is just the same as *natura*: Sen. nat. quaest. v 18 8 'nimis delicate fortuna nos tractat; nimis dura dedit nobis corpora, felicem uoletudinem.' Dr Postgate punctuates 'natura; creato | mi fortuna' cet., which means (or else the change is aimless) 'to every man has nature assigned some frailty, but my frailty of being always in love was assigned to me after my birth by fortune, not by nature.' What is the drift of this fanciful distinction, to which Propertius makes no further allusion? It has nothing to do with the theme of the poem; nay it even snaps the thread of argument: 'you ask *why* I am always in love: love knows no *why*; why do fanatics gash themselves with knives?'—here come our verses, and if they set up a distinction between the origin of Propertius' *uitium* and the origin of other folks' *uitia* they are incoherent. The second change of stops to which I referred is at III xi 34 *sqq.* where Dr Postgate punctuates thus: 'totiens nostro Memphi cruenta malo, | tres ubi Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos | una; Philippeo' cet. What then is the normal number of shores required to rob a man of three triumphs? and how many places would you have expected Pompey to die in? Dr Postgate in praef. p. vi cites IV vi 68 'una decem uicit missa sagitta rates' to justify the antithesis of *tres* and *una*. There is nothing absurd in the antithesis of *tres* and *una*. The numerals do indeed create the antithesis, but its absurdity resides not in them but in the substantives, which are the names of things between which no antithesis is conceivable. And even if you removed the antithesis by removing *tres*, *una harena* would still remain intrinsically absurd, because a man cannot be assassinated on two shores nor be 'robbed of his triumphs' piecemeal.

At II xxxiv 29 'aut quid *Crethei* tibi prosunt carmina plectri' the letters of the MSS are defended with the remark '*Cretheis* Homeri mater.' The objection to this is that Homer is named at 45, neither alone nor in company with others already named (in which case the repetition might be intentional), but in company with Anti-

machus who has not been mentioned before.

I come now to the most important feature of this recension, its transpositions. Since Lachmann in 1816 undid at once the good and evil deeds of Scaliger, the duty of transposition has been much neglected by editors of Propertius; and Dr Postgate's is the first text of the century (Gruppe and Carutti do not count) to employ this method of emendation as freely as another. On the proper limits of transposition in a book like this there may well be two opinions. As a *Corpus Poetarum* is a work of reference and chiefly meant for the general reader, there is some disadvantage in admitting even the most certain trajections; and in Dr Postgate's pages I fear the general reader will be led a weary dance after sundry verses in such poems as III vii or IV i. On the other hand transpositions are hard to judge of unless they are set before the eye; and a large page presenting more than 200 lines at once affords too good an opportunity to miss. I should not therefore say that there was here too much transposition if the new arrangements, however violent, were anything like certain: but many of them are not; and in some places Dr Postgate has tried to do what cannot be done. It is idle, for instance, to pretend that any transposition of IV v 21—62 can come so near certainty as to earn a place in a text. Here is a mere string of precepts: you might almost as well profess to rearrange the *Sententiae* of Publilius or the Proverbs of Solomon. One or two points are certain, e.g. Propertius never put 45 *sq.* where the MSS put them; and there is no harm in suggesting a better sequence, but it should stay in the notes. Dr Postgate's rearrangement is moreover ill-judged in some of its details, as in the collocation of 41 *sqq.* after 58. The poems IV i and xi also, where the task is less hopeless, undergo several transpositions which are neither necessary nor salutary.

The most salutary of the new transpositions is that by which III xix 15 *sq.* are placed before 21 so that the passage runs 'crimen et illa fuit patria succensa senecta
| arboris in frondes condita Myrrha nouae,
| tuque, o Minoa uenundata Scylla figura
| tondens purpurea regna paterna coma': thus without the change of a word the second distich acquires a construction and a strengthened sense, and the two examples of unfilial passion are brought into telling contrast. In II iv, where Mr Birt placed

15 *sq.* after 8, Dr Postgate further puts 9 *sq.* (ill punctuated however) to stand after 14 to which they clearly belong: the two couplets had exchanged their stations. Again in III iv he seems to be certainly right in removing 19 *sq.* from their present position and probably right in placing them before 11. In I xv he brackets 29—32 as alien from their context: this is the simplest way to connect 33 *sq.*, as they must be connected, with 25 *sq.* II x 7 *sq.* he likewise marks as out of place, which they plainly are. He may too be right in ejecting from III vii the four verses 21—24 about Argynnus. His rearrangement of IV iv 1—14 is probable in the main, but is accompanied with needless alteration and does not remove all the roughness of the passage, which appears to be mutilated.

Some of Dr Postgate's transpositions are only slight variations on the transpositions of others, now for the better, now for the worse. In IV vii, where Schrader had brought 35-38 into contact with 73-76 by placing them after 76, Dr Postgate places them before 73, which improves the sequence of thought. Again in III vii, where it had been proposed to put 43-66 and 17-18 between 10 and 11, Dr Postgate more aptly puts them between 8 and 9. But in the same elegy, where Scaliger proposed the arrangement 9-16, 67-70, 25, Dr Postgate spoils it by the more complicated transposition 9-12, 67-70, 13-16, 25. Scaliger's sense is 'Aquila and Neptune, why did you shipwreck Paetus? Nereids, you should have saved him from drowning: restore his body to the land.' That is the natural order; but Dr Postgate reproaches the Nereids for not saving Paetus before he reproaches Aquilo and Neptune for wrecking him; and makes the command 'reddite corpus humo' include Aquilo, to whom it does not apply; and in order to do this transposes more verses than need transposing. Take again III xi 47 *sqq.* '47-68 ita ordinauimus, 51-58 (Housm.), 47-48, 67-68, 59-60 (Pass.), 49-50, 65-66, 61-64.' Dr Postgate's predecessors had restored coherency to the passage at the expense of only five transpositions, 51-58, 65-68, 59-60, 47-50, 61-64: he has modified this arrangement by separating the two distichs 47-48 and 65-66 from the verses which follow them in the MSS. As to 65-66, the place which Dr Postgate finds for them is a good place, though I think the best place is between 60 and 47: the only objection is that they will do very well where they are. But his transposition of 47-48 distinctly injures the sense. Without that

dislocation the passage runs thus: 'did Rome fear a woman's threat of war? what has become of the spoils of Hannibal? What avails it to have banished Tarquin if we must bear a woman's rule?' What Dr Postgate has done is to transpose the mentions of Hannibal and Tarquin, and make Propertius name Tarquin's expulsion in connexion with invasion and Hannibal's overthrow in connexion with tyranny.

IV vii begins 'There are such things as ghosts': 3-5 'Cynthia namque meo uisa est incumbere fulero, | murmur ad extremas nuper humata uiae, | cum mihi somnus ab exequiis penderet amarus.' Dr Postgate, praef. p. v, like others before him very justly objects to such a vague and useless designation of place as 'extremas uiae,' and proposes to transport hither 81-82, so that we get 'uiae, | pomosis Anio qua spumifer incubat aruis | et numquam Herculeo numine pallet ebur.' I for my part do not think that 81-82 can be spared from their context, since the 'hic' of 83 appears to presuppose some more definite indication of locality than is supplied by the 'pelle hederam tumulo' of 79; but that point I do not press. The main point is that the transposition removes only one of the difficulties in verse 4 and leaves two: *murmur uiae*, which Dr Postgate wishes to understand as *murmur fluminis*, and *humata ad murmur* 'buried near a noise.' I have now little doubt that Propertius wrote 'murmur ad extremas nuper humata tubae' 'newly buried to the drone of the funeral trumpet': so he has *extremo rogo*, *extremo puluere*, *extremi funeris*; and there were two easy ways from *tubae* to *uiae*.

I have said already that it would be unfair to dwell on mere suggestions in the notes, so I will make no remark on the proposed transportation of II i 37 sq.

There are one or two changes of orthography: thus this is probably the first edition of Propertius to give the spelling *Suebus* at III iii 45. The effect of this however is rather spoilt by the occurrence of *Philetaeus* only seven lines below and again at IV vi 3.

Hitherto I have spoken only of Dr Postgate's own proposals; but after all the chief feature of the edition is the industry and judgment with which he has used the studies of his predecessors. The vulgate text is here improved and even transformed not only by many corrections published since 1880 but by many dating from the eighteenth or seventeenth century, neglected or expelled by Lachmann and only in part restored by Baehrens. Often too Dr Postgate gives back to earlier critics emendations which till now have been wrongly assigned. He is however himself in error in saying at III ix 9-19 'interpunximus,' for the punctuation in question was the vulgate down to 1829. At IV iv 13-14 and once or twice elsewhere he omits to mention the first author of a transposition which he adopts.

The MSS employed are Baehrens' with the addition of Holkhamicus 333 and, from IV xi 17 to 76, Parisinus 8233 and Vrbinae 641. Dr Postgate has injudiciously complicated his apparatus criticus with two new signs, Δ for DV and Φ for AF or FL. The value of such signs is that they save space, their drawback is that they task the memory. When O is used for AFDV the saving of space is considerable and the good outweighs the bad. But when Δ is used for DV the space saved is too little to excuse an additional emblem; and Φ will be still more of a nuisance to the general reader, since it means one thing from I i 1 to II i 63 and another from II xxi 3 to the end.

It is interesting to see the difference between this recension and the Select Elegies of 1881, and to note how much which was then explained is now emended. That the change is for the better I cannot doubt: true, many alterations are to my thinking unsuccessful, and import a good deal which is wrong and a great deal which is doubtful; but the general result is a text which I should call not only nearer but much nearer to the truth than any which has gone before it.

A. E. HOUSMAN.