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](#)

Belling on Tibullus *Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull. H. Belling*. Berlin, Weidmann: 1893. 8vo. pp. 97. 3 Mk. *Quaestiones Tibullianae*, scripsit Henricus Belling. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Askenischen Gymnasiums. Berlin: 1894. Progr. no. 51. 4to. pp. 26.

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 74 - 78
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201170, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201170

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 74-78 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201170

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

index which ought to be noticed in future editions of Liddell and Scott are, ἐνσελεῖν τινὰ εἰς ὄρνῃν (v 26), 'to entrap into a sale'; κατατέμνειν τινὰ (v 12), 'to cry a person down'; παιδαγωγεῖν (v 2), 'to delude'; and προσπερικόπτειν (v 2), 'to appropriate in addition,' or (if an accusative of the person follows) 'to plunder afresh.' This last is a new compound.

Englishmen have done much for the

recovery and restoration of the text of Hyperides; and scholars in France, Germany, Holland, Italy and Sweden have contributed a good deal towards the study of the subject. Both of the works here noticed will doubtless serve to extend the interest which it has already inspired in England and elsewhere.

J. E. SANDYS.

BELLING ON TIBULLUS.

Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull. H. BELLING. Berlin, Weidmann: 1893. 8vo. pp. 97. 3 Mk.

Quaestiones Tibullianae, scripsit HENRICUS BELLING. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Askenischen Gymnasiums. Berlin: 1894. Progr. no. 51. 4to. pp. 26.

THESE two pamphlets are a remarkable performance. They contribute new ideas towards the solution of the most vexed questions of Tibulline criticism. The most important of these may be thus distinguished and arranged. 'Except the lost Cujacian fragment (F) all the known codices of Tibullus descend from a single copy of an injured exemplar (t); the injuries of this exemplar were chiefly in the first and last lines of a page; the copyist of t supplied the missing portions where and as he could; not only did he interpolate here, but also where the exemplar contained repetitions or redundancies that offended him.' The following statement from pp. 42 sq. of the first pamphlet will show how the author applies the first three theses to the explanation of the existing text:—

"After i. 2, 25 a pentameter was lost in t. *The scribe went on with the next hexameter 25a.* In i. 4, 44 only the end was left 'imbrifer arcus aquam.' *The scribe supplied 'uenturam admittat [or annuntiat].'* In i. 5, 33, only the end was left 'hunc sedula curet.' *The scribe supplied 'et tantum uenerata virum.'* In i. 5, 47 only the beginning was left 'haec nocuere mihi.' *The scribe supplied 'quod adest huic diues amator.'* In i. 6, 42 only the end was left 'stet procul ante uia.' *The scribe supplied 'stet procul aut alia.'* In i. 6, 72 only the end was left 'proripiarque uias.' *The scribe supplied 'immerito propriis.'* In i. 7, 56 only the beginning was left 'augeat.' *The scribe*

supplied 'et circa stet ueneranda senem.' After i. 10, 25 a whole couplet was lost. *The scribe went on with the pentameter 26.* In ii. 1, 58 only the beginning was left 'dux pecoris.' *The scribe supplied 'hircus auxerat hircus oues.'* In ii. 2, 21 only the end was left 'prolemque ministret.' *The scribe supplied 'hic ueniat natalis auis.'* After ii. 3, 14a apparently a whole pentameter was lost. *The scribe went on with the hexameter ii. 3, 14b.* In ii. 3, 14c apparently only the end was left 'obriguisse liquor.' *The scribe supplied 'lacteus et mixtus.'* In ii. 3, 34 only the beginning was left 'imperat.' *The scribe supplied 'ut nostra sint tua castra domo.'* After ii. 3, 74 a hexameter was lost. *The scribe went on with ii. 3, 76.* In ii. 4, 22 apparently only the end was left 'et Coa puellis.' *The scribe supplied 'hic dat auaritiae causas.'* In distich ii. 4, 37 sq. only the beginning of the hexameter was left 'hinc fletus rixaeque sonant.' *The scribe supplied 'haec denique causa fecit ut infamis hic deus esset amor.'* After iii. 4, 64 apparently a hexameter was lost. *The scribe went on with the pentameter 66."*

That in the majority of these passages (to which others are afterwards added) the tradition is corrupt will be admitted by everybody.¹ The author would further maintain that it has been corrupted in a particular way. In five out of the above passages i. 4, 4; 5, 33; ii. 1, 58; 3, 14c; 4, 38 are metrical faults of the same kind; and in other respects they evince the same handiwork, e.g. in the use of the pronoun *hic* i. 5, 47; ii. 2, 21; 4, 22, 37, 38 and cf. iii. 6, 23 'deus hic.' It is necessary in fairness to the writer's case to cite together the examples of apparently uniform interpolation;

¹ Except K. P. Schulze whose ignorance of prosody is a ground of just astonishment to the author, p. 11 n. 2, p. 14 n. 3.

but conviction one way or another can only be reached by an examination of the passages in detail. Of these the first treated is i. 4, 44. The writer begins an able discussion by proving that in '*picta ferrugine*' ('*picea* f. *uulg.*') 43 and in '*imbrifer arcus*' 44 the tradition is perfectly sound. Passing on to 44 '*admittat*' *uulg.* is shown to be intolerable: '*amiciat*' A(mbrobianus) and '*anutiāt*' V(atricanus) point to an '*ānūtiāt*' in the archetype: which, corrupted in other copies (for Belling accepts the views of Baehrens and Magnus that certainly more than one were made), has produced (through '*ammittat*') the '*admittat*' of y (Lachmann's A, Heinsius' '*codex Archiepiscopi Eboracensis*') d (Lach.) e (Lach.) and again the '*annuntiet*' of ς (the '*inferior*' MSS.). Now '*uenturam annuntiat*' has two marks of an interpolation, fair sense and faulty diction. It is the offspring then not of error, but design. This, we may add, is confirmed by observing that '*annuntiat*,' is ecclesiastical Latin with vulgar pronunciation (cf. Fr. *annoncer*). '*uenturam*' must fall with '*annuntiat*,' for, passing over the question of its appropriateness which Belling denies, a verb is wanted, and a verb cannot stand in the position of '*annuntiat*.' Here then it appears to me to be reasonably certain that half a pentameter has been interpolated by some incompetent hand. I think the same may be said of i. 6, 72 on which it is well pointed out that the interpolation is based on the corruptions '*possum*' 70, ['*putat*' and] '*ducor*' 71, and '*proripior*,' already present in the archetype, and of ii. 3, 14c. It remains to consider the grounds of these interpolations. First it should be noticed that they consist not of single words, but of halves of verses. The first change any copyist might have attempted under any circumstances; not so the latter. And, taking account of the quality of the interpolator's work, I agree with the author that there was some patent ground of offence in the text to drive him into original composition. Illegibility is such a cause, obvious and adequate, though others might be thought of such as the dislike of tautology which will be considered below. In these three passages then interpolation replacing illegibility appears to be a reasonable explanation of our text. In the following corrupt passages the same hypothesis is not without some plausibility, i. 3, 50 where *repente* is inconsistent with the '*nunc Ioue sub domino*

caedes et uulnera semper' though it is hardly credible that the interpolator would have hit upon that word, and it is more likely that he wrote '*reperte*' i.e. '*repertae*' which some of the ς indicate. B. proposes '*nunc mare nunc longae (or 'terrae') fata uiae properant*'—a verse which has naturally found no acceptance. If his meaning is right, '*terrae mille pericla uiae*' would give it better. In i. 5, 33 '*uirum hunc*' shows something is wrong; and Belling here and at 7, 56 attacks the use of '*ueneror*,' but, like other critics, I cannot see why. No doubt the word had a special religious and ceremonial application as he shows from a large collection of passages; but it was not always so limited. It would be curious to see how he would show that a word inappropriate to Messalla here is appropriate to '*concupitus*' *et q. s.* in Ovid *Ars* ii. 307 *sq.* In 5, 47 '*quod adest huic diues amator*' is certainly corrupt and most probably interpolated; but the mischief does not stop here. A couplet at least has been lost in which Tibullus passed from the fatal charms of his mistress ('*haec nocuere mihi*') to the deadly injury which the '*lena*' had done him. Is it credible that in the same couplet he wrote '*haec nocuere mihi; <sed iam dominam tenet alter>*' (B., or any other stopgap you please) *uenit in exitium callida lena meum*? On i. 6, 42 B.'s objections to previous suggestions are pertinent; and his own view, and supplement '*luminibus parcens*,' may possibly be right. But the hypothesis of dittography is not untenable; and the second '*stet procul*' arouses suspicions. We might guess the original to have been '*stet procul aut alio segreget ante uiam*' or something of similar sense. i. 7, 56 is not above suspicion nor the remedy of ς and Baehrens, '*uenerata*,' a certain one; but our embarrassments do not end here, as we have to face the uncertainties of reading and connexion in the following verses. Perhaps here too a couplet has been lost. B.'s observation that the pentameter would naturally refer to the death-bed of Messalla has been refuted by others; and the note (p. 35) that *circum* (*circa*) is elsewhere a 'post-position' in Tibullus is seen to be irrelevant when the passages are examined. Nor is our way clear in ii. 3, 34, though the sense of B.'s alternative for the MS. reading which is most obscure '*exemplo uiuere disce dei*,' would fit the passage very well. In the other passages the assumption of interpolation appears to be mistaken. ii. 1, 58 I have discussed in the *Journal of Philology*

xx. pp. 313 *sq.* The first 'hircus' seems to be a gloss, and the line should be read 'dux pecoris *curtas* (Waardenburgh) auxerat hirtus opes' (W.). In ii. 2, 21 'hic' should be 'hinc' whose sense I fear it could not have here; the couplet is quite intelligible if we read 'prolesque' and in 22 'ut' (ς) for 'et' with Baehrens. The unusual construction 'ministret—ut' is not likely to have been interpolated, whereas the changes 'et' and 'prolem' are quite intelligible. In ii. 4, 29 'addit' or 'indit' should be read for 'hic' ('hinc' ς) 'dat,' the Paris excerpta have 'praebet auaritia causas' and the last two words are certainly genuine. ii. 4, 38 B's arbitrary objection to the words attached is that 'Amor eis tantum rebus infamis factus dici potest quae *ad Amorem auctorem*' [the italics are mine] 'referuntur.' Why should not Love be discredited through no fault of his own? For 'hic' read 'nunc' with Broukhusius and all difficulty disappears. 'hic deus' may be, as Belling suggests, a reminiscence of ii. 1, 79. The four omissions of whole lines can at most be assigned only corroborative value. They may be due to injury, but they certainly do not prove it.

To sum up this portion of the argument, interpolation provoked by injury to the archetype has not been made probable for more than a few passages: but this is not a refutation of the hypothesis of injury; for the corruptions as the omissions, which are undoubted, may be due to such a cause.

The theory of pagination which it is sought to connect with these and other phenomena of our MSS. is that the archetype consisted of 71 leaves, half of the last being blank, of writing with 14 (or 13 or 15) lines on a page. On these variations from it criticism has naturally fastened. In his *Quaestiones* p. 6 the author does indeed cite an inconstancy from the Ambrosianus, which twice has 21 instead of 22 lines to the page. But the probability of such a fluctuation, which decreases as the number of lines is diminished, cannot be great for a page of 14. He claims—and herein he has had somewhat less than justice from his countrymen—to have the probability of his theory judged in the gross. To this end I have examined the MS. tradition of Tibullus with the following result. Leaving out of the reckoning merely clerical mistakes I found as a rough estimate that 33 cases of serious and 12 of less grave corruption which might be ascribed without improbability to injury in the archetype fell within the lines which

would begin and end the page on the author's theory, while 20 and 7 respectively were included in the intervening spaces. If however these corruptions were evenly distributed, the latter should exceed the former in the ratio of 6 to 1, or in other words the totals should be for the former 10 instead of 45 and for the latter 62 in place of 27. It may be said that a minute investigation, which cannot be undertaken here, would reveal the hollowness of these figures; but until then we cannot reject the hypothesis, however artificial we may think it. My own impression is that it contains a *vera causa*, though not yet detached from irrelevant surroundings. It would certainly gain in probability with the acceptance of the last of the four positions distinguished at the beginning of this article. The removal of apparent tautology is admissible as an explanation of the change in iii. 6, 23 'quales his poenas *qualis* quantusque minetur' (so F, 'deus hic' the rest) and iv. 1, 40 'hic aut hic tibi' (F, 'hic aut tibi' the rest); *ib.* 205 'seu matura dies *celerem* properat mihi mortem' (so F, 'fato' AV which however introduces, though less obviously, a tautology). B. also assumes it to explain the variants in the following places where it is improbable, arbitrary or inadmissible; i. 1, 25 'iam modo iam' altered to 'i. m. non'; 43 'satis est' omitted by V because there were dots under it in the archetype; 7, 49 'centum' written for the first 'genium'; i. 3, 4 'modo nigra' written for 'precor atra' (but why was the first 'atra' altered and that violently instead of the second?); 9, 40 the second 'sit' was altered to 'sed' (!); ii. 1, 67 'interque greges' is the original and 'quoque inter agros' A ('quoque inter greges' V) descend from the conjecture of the scribe who objected to 'greges' before 'armenta' (he does not seem to have minded the thrice repeated 'inter'!); iii. 2, 24 for 'diues' the scribe suggested 'pinguis' which occurs in some ς; 4, 4 'uotis' was written for 'uanis' because of 'uani' in 3; 4, 65 omitted because of 'saeuus amor' in 66 (the omission is clearly accidental); 66 'saeua' F altered to 'posse' because of 'saeuus' (!); 6, 21 'non uenit' for 'conuenit' and 'seuerus' for '-os' due to a misunderstanding of 'nimium nimiumque'; iv. 1, 112a is omitted in some ς because the genuine (!) double 'saecula famae' was athetized by the scribe; 5, 16 for the same reason 'hac' after 'post hac' disappeared in ς and was replaced by 'nos.' I am afraid this collection only shows the

inexperience of the author in dealing with manuscript evidence. The rest of the *prolegomena* calls for but brief notice. In pp. 74—90 passages where other sources of corruption are said to have been at work are passed under review. Heyne's conjecture in i. 6, 7 is rightly approved and the appropriateness of 'patera' in iii. 6, 3 justly disputed. In i. 1, 41 'igne' is rightly defended; perhaps also 'magna' in v. 2 of the same poem, though the authority for the easier 'multa' is strong. In i. 2, 19 the question between 'derepere' Fris. exc. and 'decedere' AV is one not of taste but authority. B.'s treatment of i. 5, 69 *sqq.* where he would have it that 'mea fata' (the almost universally accepted correction of 'furta' MSS.) 'timeto' must be understood in the same sense as 'metuit qui fata puellae' iv. 4, 11 is entirely mistaken; 71—74 belong to the next poem. The same may be said for i. 9, 23 *sq.* where apparently we should read 'celari' for celanti' and iii. 5, 11 'aegros' (vulg. 'ignes' bringing sick men to temples to steal the 'sacra,' which is all the words could mean, would be a farfetched sort of villainy). This portion concludes with the proposition that 'An mehreren Stellen haben Herausgeber das handschriftlich überlieferte *ipse* ohne zwingenden Grund aufgegeben.' These passages are i. 2, 58, ii. 3, 59, 4, 36, iv. 13, 8, and i. 5, 74. The reader may judge for himself. The last five pages concern themselves with the composition and authorship of the last two (three) books. He believes that the 'Sulpicia Cyclus' iv. 2—6 was written by Tibullus himself and that these and all the rest of books iii and iv were found amongst the effects (*Nachlass*) of Tibullus at his death. We are to suppose then that a copy of a panegyric of Messalla, the works of the unknown poetaster Lygdamus, love epistles which the poet wrote for Cerinthus and the *billets doux* of Sulpicia were given to the world as Tibullus' immediately after his death and during the lifetime of his patron Messalla! It is a wonder we are not told they were edited by Messalla himself in one of the lapses of memory which it is said afflicted his later life. Like others, I cannot bring myself to believe the Sulpicia Cyclus is by Tibullus. Not only is the metrical treatment different (thus hyperdisyllables at the end of the pentameter are ten times as rare as in the second book); but they impress one as the work of a different mind. But then I cannot believe that iv. 7 is by the same author, though Belling after Ehwald says that the construction of v. 4

is 'decisive.' This is a good instance of the inattention with which arguments are manufactured. It is quite possible of course that the writer of 'Exorata meis illum Cytherea Camenis Attulit in nostrum deposuitque sinum' intended the words to be construed 'attulit, deposuitque in nostrum sinum' with a Tibulline postponement of *que*; but it is also perfectly possible that he or she intended 'in nostrum sinum attulit, deposuitque' or again 'in nostrum sinum attulit-disposuitque.' Most probably he or she did not think of the matter at all; for how else could the words be arranged in a pentameter? But suppose Belling and Ehwald are right, what then? Have we enough of Sulpicia's verse to be sure she was not influenced by a member of her circle whom Quintilian places at the head of the elegiac poets of Rome? Again I cannot believe that iv. 14 is genuine. Fifteen years ago I thought I had shown (*Journal of Philology* ix. pp. 280—286) by an elaborate argument, condemned by B. apparently at second hand, that Tibullus could not have been its author; and coming again to it after a long lapse of time I can form no other conclusion. It is full of coincidences with Tibullus; and yet there is *nothing distinctively Tibulline* about it. The same thoughts are handled and the same language used, but in the manner of an inferior artist. Thus in 13, 14 alone the composer drew from i. 3, 89 *sq.* and 5, 39 *sq.*; in 24 from i. 5, 58 and 4, 71 *sq.* Besides this the piece contains a quantity of verbal and other agreements with Propertius, such as is not found in the genuine work of Tibullus. Repetitions and reminiscences of themselves and others occur of course in the work of original poets, but not thus congested and without the transmuting touch. He who borrowed thus wholesale from Tibullus and Propertius was not a Tibullus any more than he was a Propertius. Set this composition aside, and there is not the slightest evidence for assigning to him any part of the omnium gatherum of the last two books. If, as appears most probable, it was compiled after the death of Messalla in A.D. 3—by the way Belling's attempts (pp. 64 *sqq.*) to show that in iii. 5, 17—20 Lygdamus did not imitate Ovid are most unfortunate—twenty years or more had then elapsed since the poet's death and a piece which bore the poet's name might easily have found its way into a collection, the last piece of which was Domitius Marsus' epigram on his death. Critics would have condemned it long ago but for the ascription in v. 13.

The device however was not difficult to hit upon. Its inventor would have shown more penetration had he seen that it is not like Tibullus, though it is like Propertius, to refer to himself by name, except where, as in epitaph (i. 3, 55) or inscription, the name is indispensable, and that Tibullus has only once used the rhythm of the verse which ascribes it to him, in the very place (i. 9, 83) from which, as I believe, the idea of this ascription was derived.

Of the *quaestiones Tibullianae* pp. 3—18 consists of answers to the objections of reviewers (Cr., Magnus, Rothstein), of which I have taken account in the foregoing. Next follow some corrected statements of the reading of A. I may quote i. 3 *title*

egrotet (not *egi utet*); 12 *omina* A ex. corr.; 9, 19 *O uiciis*; iv. 1, 82 *artos*; 165 *rigentem* (*m* sec. ma. in ras. potest fuisse *s*); iv. 12, 2 '*uideas*' agreeing with V. The last four pages are filled with a transcript of Hein-sius' excerpts of certain fifteenth century codices, preserved at Berlin (MS. Diez. B. Sant. 55, d.) '*ut aliquando quid e codice y traditum sit, comperiatur.*' From the transcript it may now be seen how justly they have been neglected. In conclusion we may express the hope that the author of these two pamphlets will not abandon the critical investigations for which in many respects he appears eminently qualified.

J. P. POSTGATE.

HARTLAND ON THE LEGEND OF PERSEUS.

The Legend of Perseus, by E. S. HARTLAND, F.S.A., Vol. I. Nutt: London, 1894. 7s. 6d.

To review a work of which the first volume alone has appeared is a matter of difficulty and is not altogether fair to the author, when, as in this case, the volume contains merely the author's facts and not the conclusions which he thinks they point to. It must suffice therefore now briefly to point out the importance and interest of this book. As for its importance, enough of Mr. Hartland's work has even now appeared to show that it is one of the most learned contributions to folk-lore which has ever been produced by an English scholar. The volume contains only facts, but facts in such abundance that they are a monument of industry and learning. The interest of the book is threefold. First, it appeals to the student of folk-lore: an incident (the supernatural birth of the hero) in a world-wide story is shown to have its parallel in a world-wide custom (that of endeavouring to cure sterility by means of drugs, charms, etc.). What inference Mr. Hartland will draw from this remains to be seen: the facts seem enough to show both that the incident might have been suggested to any number of story-tellers independently, and that a tale containing the incident would

find everywhere suitable soil in which to take root. Next, the volume appeals to the student of apologetics: he will find Mr. Hartland quoting from the legends of all countries a number of instances of supernatural and miraculous conception. The origin of the belief enshrined in these legends is apparent from Mr. Hartland's account: the belief in the power of curing sterility is world-wide; springing from it is the belief in parthenogenesis produced medicinally or miraculously—this belief is apparently less widely spread; and finally there is the belief that heroes, founders of dynasties, and men-gods must have differed in their birth, as in their life and death, from other men, and therefore must have been miraculously born of a virgin—this last belief is apparently the least widely spread of the three. What is to be inferred from these facts, Mr. Hartland again does not explicitly state. Finally, the classical student will be interested in Mr. Hartland's book: the legend of Perseus takes him under Mr. Hartland's guidance back to primitive savagery and forward through folk-lore to modern times. The book, which forms the second volume in a new series, entitled the Grimm library, is, like all books issued by Mr. Nutt, beautifully got up.

F. B. JEVONS.