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](#)

Vindiciae Propertianae.—II

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 08 / November 2001, pp 406 - 413

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00031176, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00031176

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (2001). Vindiciae Propertianae.—II. The Classical Review, 15, pp 406–413
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00031176

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

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 κοινῶν 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] there is no change.' 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 ui flectat *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

involves. For the same reason I quote the criticism in full, with the note from the praefatio (to the separate edition of Propertius) to which it refers.

"'At putide *tres*—*una* inter se opponuntur'—immo, si uis, putidissime modo poetae cum Graeci tum Romani totiens in hunc modum numeris luserint, modo Propertius ipse ita dixerit '*una* a *decem* uicis missa sagitta rates.'"—Praef. p. vi.

"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 uicis 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."

Now there is a strong family resemblance between this criticism and those of the immortal Lord Dundreary (a creation of the late Mr. Sothorn not yet, I hope, forgotten) upon certain of our English proverbs. '*Birds of a feather | Flock together*. Absurd, 'pon my word. *Flock together*; of course they do. It would be a dashed silly bird that would go and flock in a corner by itself!' The same treatment may be applied to any kind of literature with interesting results, as for example to the following:

Now, of my threescore years and ten,
Twenty will not come again.¹

No more will the 'fifty' for that matter.
Or to the following:

Buoyed on the heaven-heard whisper
Of dancing leaflets whirled
From *all* the woods that autumn
Bereaves in *all* the world.²

Why not 'From all woods in the world' or 'From the woods in all the world'? δις τὰν ἡμῶν ἔπεν ὁ σοφὸς — — Or, to come back to Propertius (III xv. 39 sq.)

tibi gloria Dirce
ducitur, in multis mortem habitura locis.

Why not ask 'and how many places would you have expected Dirce to die in?' I confess that in all these cases my own

sympathies would be with the poet rather than the critic.

The criticism appears to consist of two parts, of which the first is that 'the substantives are the names of two things between which no antithesis is conceivable.' Then I suppose that the statement 'reportauit tres triumphos ex una harena' of a general who gained triumphs by conquering three times on the same shore, would involve an inconceivable antithesis. The second count is that the statement attributed to Propertius is 'intrinsically absurd.' To this it will be, I imagine, answer enough to show, firstly, that, if by 'intrinsical' we understand literal absurdity, intrinsically absurd expressions abound in language and literature; secondly, that, if we regard the meaning intended, this, whatever else it may be, is by no means absurd; and thirdly, that the 'absurdity,' such as it is, may be explained if it cannot be justified. With the first point I have already dealt in part. I will, however, add some words translated from an excellent little book,³ published since the criticism was penned, and which have a special relevance to the passage before us. 'It is not only quite natural psychologically that a man in passionate excitement should use strong words, even when they run counter to his object; but it is also psychologically quite true and established by experience that the stronger his language the stronger is the effect upon his hearers, who consider far less *what* is said than with what force and to what end it is said.' Now this poem of Propertius, which deals with the saving of Rome from Cleopatra, is pitched throughout in a high key of excitement; and more than one expression in it might be blamed as literally 'absurd.' Let verse 44 [ausa] 'baridos et contis rostra Liburna sequi' serve as an example. Cleopatra we know from Horace '*dementis* ruinas funus et imperio parabat.' But no one has ever supposed her so 'demented' as to have pursued Liburnian galleys with Nile barges. Secondly, the thought is not absurd, unless cavil make it so. 'One day,' says the poet, 'stripped Pompey of all his glories:' the glories of Pompey being symbolized by the three triumphs which to Roman eyes were the most striking feature of his career (cf. Cicero de diuin. 2. § 22, Velleius 2. 53. 3, Lucan 8. 814, Petronius 123 v. 240 and elsewhere) and the day of his death symbolized by the shore on which was left his headless corse: 'iacet ingens litore truncus.' And it is Proper-

¹ *A Shropshire Lad* (II). The italics are mine.

² The same (XLII). The italics are mine.

³ F. Polle *Wie denkt das Volk ueber die Sprache?* 2nd ed., 1898 p. 26.

tian; II. xi. 3 *sq.* *omnia*, 'crede mihi, tecum uno munera lecto | auferet extremi funeris atra dies' upon which it might be asked 'what was the normal number of biers required to carry all the charms of Cynthia?' Lastly, it is not difficult to assign the reason why it would not have occurred to Propertius that the phrase is 'intrinsically absurd.' For some reason or other numbers and their relations have long had a strange fascination for the human mind. In the case of the ancients this fancy often issued in antitheses which seem somewhat inept or inane to us, because we have lost the feeling which informed them. This I called in my praefatio 'playing with numbers' and illustrated by the trifling opposition of *una* to *decem* in the poem upon Actium. But more noticeable instances can be produced. I will cite one. Of the elegies of Propertius' predecessor Cornelius Gallus, one pentameter alone survives. It describes how the Hypanis of Scythia separates Europe from Asia; '*uno tellures diuidit amne duas.*' Now unless we are prepared to maintain that it requires more than one diameter to divide a circle into two, or more than one diagonal to bisect a parallelogram, we must admit that, from our point of view, the antithesis in '*one river dividing two continents*' is destitute of significance.

III. ix. 37 *sq.*

non flebo in cineres arcem sedisse paternos
Cadmi nec semper proelia clade pari.

Here for *paternos* I read *repentes* which is characterised as 'a useless epithet and a form not known to exist.' Whether '*repenti fulminis ictu*' in Lucretius (5. 400) is a sufficient warrant for the acc. plur. is a question I would leave to the reader;¹ but my citation should have saved the adjective from the reproach of 'uselessness.' I understand the passage, as I understood it in my *Select Elegies of Propertius*, to allude to the destruction of the royal palace at the birth of Dionysus and the death of Semele. I there compared Stat. Theb. 3. 183 *sqq.* '*ueteris cum regia Cadmi | fulmineum in cinerem monitis Iunonis iniquis | consedit*' (cf. ib. 10. 902 *sqq.* quoted in the same place). So far then from my epithet being useless, it is

¹ The same reader will doubtless be able to determine whether it is a satisfactory interpretation of the text to say it refers to the sack of Thebes by the *epigoni* and that the falling fortress is supposed to blend its ashes with those of its former defenders, as soon as he has succeeded in unravelling the relationship between the *cineres* and the other assumed actors in the scene.

absolutely necessary to fix the allusion. It is their 'suddenness' which distinguishes the ashes caused by the lightning-stroke from the ashes of the burning town.

The extent of the influence of Lucretius upon Propertius is an interesting subject upon which I could wish I had the space to enlarge. I have come to think it greater than I did formerly. My emendation of IV i. 57 (which Mr. Housman has commended) owes a good deal of its probability for me to the parallel of Lucr. 1. 47. In this very poem (III ix) verse 7 and possibly verse 5 ('*quod nequeas*') seem to me unlike Propertius in expression and reminiscent of Lucretian phraseology 6. 959 *sqq.* '*non omnia . . . rebus sint omnibus apta*, 5. 543-5, 5. 836 '*quod potuit nequit ut nequeat quod non tulit ante.*' Mr. Nairn in this journal (1899 p. 393) has recently defended Jacob's conjecture at III vii. 46 '*in terra nil ubi flare potest*,' by what he rightly calls a remarkable parallel from Lucretius 6. 138 *sqq.* The chief objection which I felt to this conjecture, that the use of the infinitive is strange to Propertius, obviously loses much of its force if Propertius is imitating Lucretius with whom such infinitives are very common.

I proceed to another passage where the question of literary borrowing or reminiscence is involved:

III. xvii. 1 *sq.*

nunc, o Bacche, tuis humiles aduoluimur
aris:
da mihi placatus uela secunda pater.

The MSS. have here *pacato* which it is proposed to take as 'tranquillized.' I have no objection to this if it can be got out of the Latin. But no parallel is forthcoming (for III. xiii. 25 can hardly count). *Pacata mente* Lucr. and the like I know: but they are not near enough. If *pacato* could be the abl. of *pacatum*, the text might stand. I do not expect however any one to maintain this. There is additional awkwardness in having *pacatus* in agreement with *mihi*: it more properly refers to the stilled sea (*pax maris*, Lucan) and winds (Lucr. 5. 1230 '*uentorum paces animasque secundas*'). It is urged however that to remove the idea of tranquillizing from the second line will be 'positively harmful.' How this can be maintained I cannot see. Propertius first addresses the god of wine in all humility and desires his favour (verses 1, 2): in the next three lines he explains how Bacchus might help him, and in v. 6 he prefers his

special request 'tu uitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, meo.' Why should it be said that v. 2 *must* anticipate v. 6?

My conjecture *placatus*, the palaeographical facility of which is not contested, was based upon the belief that Ovid in *Fasti* 3, 789 *sq.* and its vicinity, as in countless other places, had Propertius in his mind. The subject of both passages is the same,—namely Bacchus, though the main topic is not. The particular exploits of the god which Propertius says he will sing of on some future occasion and which Ovid says he can not sing of now, are more or less the same. Bacchus' wonderful birth, his Indian conquests, his destruction of Pentheus, of Lycurgus, his transformation of the pirates into porpoises are referred to by both poets in their most characteristic styles. The couplet which I cited from Ovid is the following 'mite caput, pater, huc placataque cornua uertas | et des ingenio uela secunda meo.' It contains three verbal coincidences with the couplet and poem which we are considering: *pater—uela secunda—cornua* Prop. v. 19 'per te et tua cornua uiuam.' The similarity seemed to me too great to be the work of accident, and I considered it in accordance with critical method to emend the *pacato* of Propertius' manuscripts by the aid of the *placata* of Ovid's text. But it is objected that if the passage shows that Propertius wrote *placatus*, 'it also shows that he wrote *mitis*.' And in the same way it shows that he wrote *caput* and *que* and *uertas* and *et des* and in fact that he was the author of Ovid, *Fast.* 3. 715 onward.

I pass on to another couplet in the same poem:

ib. 17 *sq.*

dum modo purpureo . . mihi dolia musto
et noua pressantis inquinet uua pedes.

For the missing word the MSS. have either *numen* (N, DV) or what appears to be an abbreviation of *numine* (F, correctly reported by Baehrens) or *numere* (L partly in erasure): the editors with rare unanimity import into the text the old conjecture *spument*. Now in accordance with a canon of critical method which was laid down in the first of these papers, no emendation of a text can be accepted unless there is evidence that the confusions or corruptions which it postulates are elsewhere attested for the history of that text; and since in the case of *spument* there is no such evidence forthcoming, that emendation must

pass for what it is, a licentious alteration. The palaeographical considerations adduced in my monograph 'On Certain Manuscripts of Propertius' p. 41 were of sufficient force to convince the late Professor Palmer who had previously printed *spument* in his text. Palmer's own suggestion, never published, I believe, was *manent*, very near to the letters but failing to give the sense required. In the monograph referred to I wrote, too generously, of *spument* that it gave an 'excellent sense.' It does not. Propertius promises to honour Bacchus by cultivating his cherished trees, provided (the stipulation is humorous) a satisfactory vintage makes it worth his while. This *spument* does not express. All must 'foams' in the vat, whether a gallon or a tun. Hence when a Latin writer uses *spumare* of a vintage such as Propertius here desires, he adds words that make his meaning clear; Virg. G. 2. 6 '*spumat plenis uindemia labris*,' Columella de re rustica 10. 431 *sq.* '*ferueat ut lacus et multo completa Falerno—exudent pingui spumantia dolia musto*,' to which we may also add Manilius 3. 662 *sq.* Hence Ovid says Trist. 3. 10. 71 *sq.* '*non hic pampinea dulcis latet uua sub umbra | nec cumulant altos feruida musta lacus*' and the author of the Aetna 271 '*horrea uti satura et tumeant ut dolea musto*.' To give this sense I conjectured *cumulem* which appeared best to satisfy the indications of the MSS.: but the first person stands in need of some apology and perhaps we should read *cumulet*, the subject being the 'grapes' of the next line. It is however possible that we should restore *tumeant* from the Aetna whose author seems to have been acquainted with Propertius.¹

III xiii. 39 *sq.*

corniger atque dei uacuum pastoris in aulam
dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oues.

Very likely I was hasty in assuming that Apollo tended the flocks of Admetus as well as his herds, and in objecting to the position of *corniger* and the position of *atque*. But I would claim that my correction was at the least an attempt to give some coherence to the passage, whose connexion with its context I will now proceed to indicate. Propertius is singing of a happy golden age when the relations of gods and mortals were more intimate than at present, and *more suo* he gives his subject an erotic turn. He

¹ Since the above was printed, I find *tumeant* in Prof. J. S. Phillimore's just published text of Propertius and the reference to the Aetna in his note.

speaks first of goddesses 'nec fuerat nudas poena uidere deas' thinking perhaps of the shepherds Anchises and Paris: and then he turns to gods. In those days they loved mortals and shepherded flocks and in the absorption of their passion forgot when the night drew in and it was time to drive their charges home. Compare the oblivion of his proper task which Love induces in the Cyclops Theocr. Id. 11. 12 πολλάκι τὰ ἰδῆες ποτι τῷ λίον αὐταὶ ἀπήνθον | χλωρὰς ἐκ βοτάνας, ὁ δὲ τὰν Γαλάτειαν αἰεῖδον | αὐτεῖ ἐπ' αἰῶνος κατετάκετο φηκυέσσας. It is to some such legend as that of Apollo and Admetus that Propertius must here allude.

IV x. 43 sq.

*illi uirgatis iaculantis ab agmine bracis
torquis ab incisa decidit unca gula.*

For the first time an interpretation of the text has been given which is consistent with Latinity. For whether we like it or not, we must admit Mr. Housman's construction of *illi* as a sort of dat. of the agent with *decidit* to be linguistically possible. Unfortunately this is not enough; and to say that there is a difficulty in *uirgatis*—*bracis*, a not so very extraordinary instance of the Propertian ablative, while allowing none in *ab agmine* is to strain off the gnat and gulp down the camel. This phrase must mean that 'he hurls' or 'poises his javelin' or whatever else *iaculantis* may mean, *from the ranks*, just as in Virg. Aen. 9. 375 'conclamat *ab agmine* Volscens.' Now this Gaulish chieftain was not in the ranks: for the combat was a *μονομαχία* and took place in front of the armies. It appears necessary to print again the passage of Plutarch Marcellus 7, which describes the scene: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ κατιδὼν ὁ τῶν Γαλατῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ τεκμηράμενος ἀπὸ τῶν συμβόλων ἄρχοντα τοῦτον εἶναι, πολλὸν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἐξελέσας τὸν ἱππὸν, ἅμα τῇ φωνῇ προκλητικὸν ἐπαλαλάζων καὶ τὸ δόρυ κραδαίνων κ.τ.λ. In order then that *ab agmine* may attain the sense desired, a verb of motion is required, such as we have in Ov. Fast. 4. 313 'haec ubi castarum *processit ab agmine* matrum' and this my *iaculans* it supplies. I do not deny that *ab* may mean '(being) away from,' but that it can mean it here.

Certain of my emendations were defended at the time of making in a paper read before the Cambridge Philological Society. The paper has never been published; and so I repeat as much of it as is relevant here,

shortening where possible and omitting references to derelict conjectures.

I ii. 9–14.

*aspicequossubmittathumus[formosa]colores,
ut ueniant hederæ sponte sua melius,
surgat et in solis formosius arbutus antris,
et sciat indociles currere lympha uias.
litora natiuis [persuadent] picta lapillis
et uolucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.*

The text of these lines, addressed to Cynthia who is too fond of adorning her person, is 'Nature cannot be improved upon.' The theme is capable of two slightly different expressions. The perfection may be absolute or comparative. Nature's work is consummate; or it is better than the work of Art. 'How beautiful is the flower-strewn ground—the running stream.' Again, 'The ivy grows better wild—so does the arbutus. Wild birds sing sweeter than tame.' The sense of line 13 might then be either the sea shore of nature is very beautiful, or it is more beautiful than that of Art. We shall reckon it in favour of the first view that the arrangement of the passage suggests it. Absence of the comparative in 9, its presence in 10 and then in 11, its absence in 12 and then in 13, and its presence again in 14 gives the chiasitic order so dear to the Roman writer.¹ A stronger argument is the dismal failure of the attempts to introduce the second view by giving *picta* its literal meaning, 'in pictures,' the first and worst of which was Kindschner's 'restinguunt.' These all separate *picta* from *litora* in order to obtain an accusative, 'natural pebble-strewn shores are superior to painted ones'—in itself enough to condemn them. But this is not all. The thought so introduced is irrelevant. Propertius is speaking not of imitations but of improvements of nature. He does not mean that Cynthia's face should not be painted in the studio, but in the dressing room. Once more *picta* appears to be fixed to the metaphorical sense by the parallels of Ovid (Amores 2. 11. 13 sq.) 'nec medius tenuis conchas *pictosque* lapillos pontus habet: bibuli litoris illa mora est,' and Lucretius (2. 374 sqq.) 'concharumque genus parili ratione uidemus | *pingere* telluris gremium qua mollibus undis | litoris incurui bibulam pauit aequor harenam.'

It is clear then that with the majority of Propertian critics we should construe *picta* with *natiuis lapillis* and seek in *persuadent*

¹ A noteworthy example is Lucr. 6. 601 sqq. Compare my remarks in the Journal of Philology, vol. 24, p. 146 note.

some verb meaning 'are brilliant' or the like. The two best conjectures hitherto proposed are Hertzberg's *praeuolent* and Baehrens' *praeuolent*, which would both be best understood to mean 'shine on their edge' or *marge*. It was the palaeographical improbability of these conjectures which led me to propose *resplendent*; *resplendent* was confused with *respondent*: cf. Manilius 5. 720, Dirae 40. And *persuadent* is simply '*respondent*' with two constant confusions ($e=a$, $n=u$) and the letters transposed.

Hertzberg urges the appropriateness of *prae*; we may with equal justice press the claims of *re*. Compare Aen. 12. 741 '*fulua resplendent fragmina harena*' and the '*re-lucentis calculos*' of the Clitumnus Plin. Ep. 8. 8. 2.

I. v. 7

non est illa uagis similis conlata puellis,
molliter irasci non sciet illa tibi.
quod si forte tuis non est contraria uotis
at tibi curarum milia quanta dabit!

For '*collata*' O N has '*conlata*' which in any case is nearer to the truth. But this participle is justly suspected. We want to be told under what circumstances Cynthia is unlike women of the town, not that she is unlike them if compared. The sense required is that of II. 34. 9 '*Lynceu, tune meam potuisti perfide curam | tangere? nonne tuae tum cecidere manus?*' And it is given by the slight change '*contacta*,' a sense of the word for which compare Ov. Trist. 2. 252 '*aequid ab hac omnes rigide summouimus Arte, | quas stola contingi uitaeque sumpta uetat?*' It is to be observed that '*collata*' has occurred 26 lines before, in the same part of the verse.

I. xii. 9 sq.

inuidiae fuimus? num me deus obruit, an
quae
lecta Prometheis diuidit herba iugis?

The palaeographical superiority of my *diuidis* (the MS. variants are *diuidit* and *diuitis*) is admitted. In point of sense it has no less the advantage. For with the second person *herba* advances a step towards personification, and thus forms a better antithesis to the personal *deus*. Not only so; but the harshness of the use of the verb in the sense of 'causes division' is mitigated to a certain extent. The apostrophe of the inanimate is a phenomenon far from rare in Latin poetry. Sometimes it is appropriate, sometimes, at least

from our point of view, it is not. Here, I think, it is as appropriate as in III. vii. 26 '*Paetum sponte tua uilis harena tegas*' where the third person would have fitted the metre just as well.

In the confessedly corrupt passage II. xxxiv. 13-16.

tu mihi uel ferro *pectus* uel perde ueneno :
a domina tantum te modo tolle modo.
te socium uitae, te *corporis* esse licebit
te dominum admitto rebus, amice, meis.

I transposed the similar substantives in 13 and 15 reading *corpus*, *pectoris*. It is said that *pectus* is better in the first line. I must demur. If *ferro* had stood alone, this might be allowed, but *ueneno* follows, with which *pectus* agrees less well. The proper antithesis in this connexion to my *mistress* is *myself*, and it is well known to Latin scholars that *corpus* often does duty as a stronger *se*. I need not labour this point. The appropriateness of '*socium pectoris*' is not challenged. So I will just note as more or less close parallels for the idea Ovid Tr. 4. 4. 72, Manilius 2. 630, Stat. Theb. 2. 364.

On Mr. Housman's own proposal to interchange *socium* and *dominum* in the second couplet, I need at present only say this, that I cannot accept it on the ground that it would bring *socium* too near to the *socium* that I believe must be read in 17, my note upon which I will now transcribe.

II. xxxiv. 17 sq.

lecto te solum, lecto te deprecor uno ;
riualet possum non ego ferre Iouem.

The only comment on 17 that I know is Paley's 'You are the only man I would refuse, and the only thing I would refuse you is my Cynthia.' The English translator apparently takes *solum* as an adverb and wisely omits it 'from my mistress, my mistress only I beg you to keep away.' This translation reveals another phenomenon, *deprecor* constructed with the ablative. It is not wonderful that Heinsius proposed *de lecto*, though that too is unexampled. The sense is clear from 18 'I cannot bear the rivalry of Jove:' the word is coupled with *riualis* by Catullus 579 '*riuales sociei puellularum*' if we accept the most natural interpretation. Such rival-partners, says Propertius, in Cynthia's favours, he and Lynceus can never be. 'te socium' for '*tuam societatem*' resembles in its fate '*ego nupta*' for '*meae nuptiae*' IV. 4. 59 which had disappeared from the text of Propertius till Baehrens restored it after Luetjohann. The same sense and use, with

no pronoun inserted, occurs in Seneca Ag. 696 'aerumnae meae | *socium* recusant.' The change is of the slightest; *socius* is frequently written *sotius* in our MSS. and *t*, *i* and *l* are continually being confused. *Lecto* is dative as in the passages of Ennius cited by Gellius VII. (VI.) 16. 9, 10 'quibus seruitutem mea miseria deprecor', 'ego meae cum uitae parcam, letum inimico deprecor.' In the present case the failure to observe this construction has protected a Propertian form of the dative 'uno' from the assaults of conjecture. [I append the note in Rothstein's commentary '17 *Deprecari* wird in dieser Bedeutung mit einem abstrakten Objekt verbunden; am Stelle von *te deprecor* kann man sich etwa *tuam societatem deprecor* denken, aber gerade durch die Vermeidung des Abstraktums gewinnt der Ausdruck an Kraft.' This is an excellent note upon *te socium*; but, alas, the text has *te solum*.]

On two places which could not be treated shortly, viz. II. xxxii. 33-40 and III. xix. 19 sq., I have already said all I need elsewhere, in the American Journal of Philology vol. 17 pp. 30-44 and *ib.* vol. 18 pp. 74 sq. 'On the alleged confusion of Nymph names with especial reference to Propertius I. 21 and II 32. 40.'

I have sometimes been asked the meaning of my correction in IV. i. 33.

quippe suburbanae parua nimis urbe
Bouillae
et, qui nunc nulli, maxima turba Gabi.

My *nimis* is of course to be taken with *suburbanae*. Bouillae was too close to the city when the city was young. Propertius extracts a point from an adjective which seems to have been a sort of standing epithet of Bouillae. The 'dangerous proximity' here meant may be illustrated from Aristophanes Nubes 214 sqq. Στρ. ἀλλ' ἡ Λακεδαιμῶν ποῦ 'στιν; Μα. ὅπου 'στιν; αὐτῇ. | Στρ. ὡς ἐγγὺς ἡμῶν. τοῦτο νῦν φροντίζερε, | ταύτην ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀπαγαγεῖν πόρρω πάνυ. Compare also the expression in Virgil's celebrated 'Mantua uae miserae *nimum* uicina Cremonae' Ecl. 9. 28.

I consider in conclusion a place which I left only half-emended in my text, but have since corrected¹

IV. ii. 35 sqq.

est mea et aurigae species cum uerbere, et
eius
traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo,

suppetat hoc: pisces calamo praedabor et
ibo
mundus demissis institor in tunicis.

The MSS. have 'est etiam aurigae species uertumnus et,' and the vulgate has a full stop after *equo*.

The signs of corruption in this passage are very obvious as soon as it is closely scanned. In the first place we have the extraordinary statement that Vertumnus is 'a form of an *auriga* and also of a *desultor*.' If *Vertumnus* is regarded as the proper name, the statement is meaningless: if it be a common name, the assertion that certain kinds of *aurigae* and *desultores* were named *uertumni* stands in sad need of corroboration. In either case it is wholly irrelevant to the context as will presently appear. But there is yet another difficulty. Everyone must have felt the clumsiness of the vulgate text of 37, 'suppetat hoc pisces calamo praedabor.' The last three words express the meaning briefly but perfectly; and what purpose do 'suppetat hoc' serve? We may get rid of the difficulty in the form *hoc* by accepting Heinsius' *hic*; but then we have to explain why Propertius, meaning 'suppetat calamus, hoc pisces praedabor' or 'suppetat hic calamus, pisces pr.', should have chosen to write what he has: and the superfluity still remains.

Now the text of Vertumnus' address to the poet is given in 21 'opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris' and it is developed beyond possibility of mistake in the following distichs. 'In the *Cōa uestis*' he says 'I shall appear as a light o' love, in the *toga* as a man, as a haymaker with a sickle in my hand: I once wore armour, and was a fine military figure, with a basket on my head a manifest harvester.' And so on (25-34) Not only does the context that precedes our four lines speak so clearly, but what follows is equally plain: 'with a *staff* I shall play shepherd, and with a *flower basket* I shall be taken for a *rose-seller*,' and, to go back to the last of our couplets, 'with a *rod* I shall be a fisherman and in a loose tunic a spruce *com mis voyageur*.' It is clear then that the sense of our passage must be this. 'With the outward sign of a driver I shall be an *auriga* and with the outward sign of a circus ride a *desultor*.' These outward signs are not on the surface of the traditional text at present but they are not far below it. To take the *desultor* first, 'suppetat hoc' will supply his characteristic emblem without the change of letter: we have only to make the not very audacious assumption that *hoc* is use

¹ See *Classical Review* for 1897 p. 405.

δεικτικῶς 'this object.' The object referred to I think must be the *pilleus* or felt cap which Hyginus Fab. 80 assigns to the *desultor* and with which he is invariably represented in works of art. Some may dislike the pause after the second arsis of the hexameter. But Propertius uses it elsewhere in the fourth book of his elegies, viii. 69, x. 41. I pass on to the charioteer. His sign may be extracted from the unintelligible *vertumnus*; the driver must be accompanied with his *whip*, *cum uerbere*; *uerber* as in Ovid Met. 14. 821 'consendit equos Gradius et ictu | uerberis increpuit.' It is easy to see how this corruption arose: in the letters *cum uer* < *ber* > *e t* was written for *c* and the last

of the two similar syllables omitted. The resulting *tum uer* suggested, in this context inevitably, the metrical stop-gap *uertumnus*. To Mr. Housman belongs the credit of having first suspected the vapid 'est etiam.' His suggested remedy was *mentiar*. But my correction 'est mea et' does not change a single letter except the commonly confused *e* and *i*, and it has the advantage of not making *species* a plural. The distich means then: 'My appearance is also that of the charioteer when I have whip in hand and of a circus rider if I am supplied with *this*.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

THE NEW 'CODEX OPTIMUS' OF MARTIAL

THE twelfth-century MS. (L), recently acquired by the Royal Library, Berlin (lat. fol. 612) from Lucca, is older by a considerable interval than the other MSS. which exhibit the better text of Martial, a text that can be traced to the recension or edition published by Torquatus Gennadius in 401 A.D. It is therefore worth while to examine the peculiar features of this 'codex optimus' with sufficient minuteness to discover what light it can throw on the archetype of this family, technically known as the B^A family, of our MSS. of Martial (see p. 309 of this year's volume of the *Classical Review*).

Were it not that the other representatives of the B^A family (P, Q, J, F) are, all of them, Renaissance copies, L would hardly be entitled to so much consideration. For it is nothing but an ordinary twelfth-century MS., neither better nor worse than the average codex of its time, by no means free from careless errors and written on a poor quality of vellum. The transcription has been divided in equal portions between three scribes:—

(1) foll. i–xix, containing Books I to V, xxxix. 7,

(2) foll. xx–xxxvii, containing V xxxix. 8–IX lxix title-heading,

(3) foll. xxxviii–end,¹ containing IX lxix. 1–end.

These three transcribers worked simul-

taneously, as we see from the awkward gaps (of a whole column and more) between the portions allotted to them; and, as is so often the case, the first of the three shews superiority both in penmanship and intelligence.

The contrast between his work and that of his immediate successor is very marked. The second transcriber produces a bad impression at the outset by the slovenly writing of his first page and the omission (until V liii) of the title-headings of the epigrams. He has an irritating habit of misreading the word he has to copy and transcribing it wrongly, only to correct it the next moment. For example, in V lv. at v. 2 quare] plane corr. quare; v. 4 ore] ove corr. ore; and when he leaves uncorrected absurd errors like *ad lateres* for *adlatres* (V lx, 1), *ridere barba* for *redire Narbo*, we have no hesitation in writing him down with Dogberry. One of his deviations however is so curious as to make us wonder whether there was not a marginal variant in the original. At VI xliii. 7 sqq.:

Quondam laudatas quocumque libebat ad undas

Currere nec longas pertinuisse vias,
Nunc urbis vicina iuvant facilesque recessus,
Et satis est, pigro si licet esse mihi,

our Dogberry has written in the third line *regressus* but has immediately substituted for it *recessus*, which is the reading not only of the B^A family, but also of the inferior C^A family and of the Anthology MSS. (the A^A family). Less interesting is his *pectore*,

¹ The MS., as we have it, ends at XIV clvii. 1, the last leaf (fol. lvii) having been lost.