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 Catullus *Gai Valeri Catulli Carmina*, recognovit IOH. P. Postgate. Londini: Bell, 1889. 3s.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 07 / July 1890, pp 310 - 312
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190560, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190560

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 310-312 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190560

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

from the Ambrosian MS.; the reason is that they were written in *minium* and were washed out when the parchment was prepared for the reception of the book of Kings. The number of passages in which less extensive but still very valuable improvements may be made in the text of Plautus is naturally greater; an example is *Captivi* iv. 3. 7, where we must now read

Núnc ibo ut pro praefectura meá ius dicam lárído.

How far astray criticism may go if based on imperfect collations of MSS. may be seen from the common reading (based on Geppert):

Núnc ibo ut properem in praefecturam, út ius dicam lárído.

The true reading in *Capt.* iv. 4. 5 is still not clear; but it is certain that Geppert read wrongly.

On the other hand there are a number of Plautine lacunae in regard to which the

Apographon will doubtless disappoint hopes of far-reaching improvements in the text (so especially in the *Trinummus* and in the last scene of the *Casina*); in such passages it is however at least satisfactory to know definitely that there is no chance of restoration from the Ambrosian MS.

This work of Studemund was a labour of love, which must have cost him both time and money. During his life he earned the gratitude of scholars by the courtesy with which he was ever ready to communicate his readings in answer to enquiries; now that he has been removed by an untimely death it is only possible *grata eius virtutem memoria prosequi*.

It would not be right to conclude this notice without a word of recognition to the publisher and printer of this handsome volume, which appears to have been produced regardless of expense and is a model and masterpiece of typography.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

POSTGATE'S CATULLUS.

Gai Valeri Catulli Carmina, recognovit ION. P. POSTGATE. Londini: Bell, 1889. 3s.

It is an open secret that this dainty little volume forms the first specimen of Mr. Postgate's projected *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. It belongs to that convenient sort of critical edition with short foot-notes, which is common in Germany, but rare in this country. Critical editions are of two kinds: the larger (such as Mr. Ellis's Catullus) contain a full apparatus criticus, and are addressed to scholars who are working exhaustively at the author in question or at minute points of language, spelling, literature, etc., upon which it is important to have the MSS. evidence about the smallest trifles: the smaller critical editions, like this of Mr. Postgate, give variations only in passages where serious doubt can arise. It is important that the evidence such as the larger critical edition contains should be once for all collected; but to most readers it is not important that they should be confronted with all these details. On the other hand the use of such a book as Mr. Postgate's is highly stimulating, and far preferable to a plain text. The variants at the foot of the page serve as danger signals; they indicate that it is

not all safe ground over which we are passing; they excite curiosity and reflection and render reading more thorough and effective than would have been the case had a plain text only been used. Mr. Postgate, whose recension is based on Schwabe's second edition (Weidmann, 1886), follows Schwabe in giving the main variations of O (the Oxford MS.) and G (the Sangermanensis, Paris 14137), which represent the Verona archetype, and when they agree are indicated as V. In lxii. the readings of T (Thuanus, which contains this poem only) are quoted. The other MSS. are rarely mentioned. It is questionable whether it would not have been better to cite them occasionally either specially, as Schwabe does, or under some general sign; for it is clear that they do in many cases preserve the genuine tradition, which has been corrupted in V, and that the pedigree of MSS. as given by Ellis (prolegg. to ed. crit. p. lix.) is substantially correct. Thus their exclusion is likely to mislead; e.g. ii. 13 *ligatam*, Mr. Postgate's note is '*ligatam* Prisc. I. 22, *negatam* V.' As a fact *ligatam* is the reading of seven of Schwabe's and eleven of Ellis's manuscripts; and the evidence is hardly fairly stated by referring it to Priscian. It might indeed be argued that

all these MSS. represent a recension of some Italian scholar who got the true reading from Priscian, but that is far from probable. In li. 5, *misero quod*, for which V has *miseroque*, is the reading of several MSS., and it cannot be said to be proved that such a reading is due solely to the Italians, as the omission of its source in the note would lead us to infer. At any rate if Mr. Postgate holds that a large number of these numerous slight corrections of V were made by Italian scholars, it goes a long way to prove Mr. Ellis's position that the early Italian scholars have done more for the text of Catullus than their successors, of which Mr. Postgate says 'contra ipsum Ellis acerrime pugnabimus.' (Notable examples are xxxiv. 3, 23; xlv. 7; xlviii. 4; lxi. 158, where it might have been stated that *seruiat* is the correction of Pisanus.)

Mr. Postgate dedicates his book to Mr. Ellis, and fully recognises his great services to Catullus. Indeed there is no scholar to whom the present generation in England owes more than to Mr. Ellis: he has taught us to study the classics with a thoroughness almost more than German, and with that enthusiasm and genuine love of learning which shrinks from no labour, and refuses to take account of no consideration even the slightest. It is by such patient toil that the pathway towards the truth is extended. Mr. Postgate's recension holds a middle place between the conservatism of Mr. Ellis and the wild adventurousness of Baehrens, and is typical of the cautious soundness of good English scholarship. The editor has introduced the following emendations of his own: ii. 7-8 *et solaciolum sui doloris, | credo, et quo gravis acquiescat ardor*, which is convincing. x. 26 *istos: commodum enim: uolo ad Sarapim*, this seems too abrupt; I think *commode* is right. xxix. 20 *eine Galliae ultima et Britanniae?* is clever but rather remote from the MSS. xxxi. 13 *liquidæ* for *lidie* is convincing. xxxviii. 2 *et, <ei>, laboriose* pleases me less than Sillig's *et <est> laboriose*; *est* might easily be absorbed into *et*. lv. 29 *quos iunctos, Cameri, mihi <ut> dicares* is an improvement. lxii. 22 *complexum* for *complexu* I do not like, as it involves a change of construction. *ib.* 53 from *acoluere* T, for which V has *coluere*, Postgate reads *a, coluere*, where the interjection is to my ear rather abrupt. Emendation by the insertion of interjections, *a, o*, and *ei*, one of the favourite devices of Baehrens, should in my opinion be used very sparingly, and I cannot think that Mr. Postgate is wise in following Baehrens in reading *tacita, a,*

quem mente requirunt in lxii. 37. lxiii. 63 *ego enim uir* is highly ingenious for *ego mulier*; but after Ellis' note I incline to think the MSS. reading genuine. lxiv. 11 *prora* is introduced (O has *proram* in the margin by a later hand); but the sense given is weak, *prima* the reading of the depreciated Datanus is more forcible. (Here it might have been stated that *Amphitrite* is the present reading of O, not a mere conjecture of Ellis. The line above the final *e*, which shows that *Amphitriten* was the original reading is very faint.) *ib.* 16 *illa (quaque alia?)* is read after Munro. *ib.* 109 for *lateque cum eius obuia (omnia) frangens* Postgate reads *late casu cuncta obuia frangens*. Here *cuncta* is harsh. I suggest *lateque comeis cadit obuia frangens*. Mr. Ellis has just communicated to me a new emendation of his own of this line for publication: he reads *late quaeuis cumque obuia frangens*. lxvi. 59 for *hi dii uen ibi uario* Postgate reads *inde Venus, uario*. I propose *diuini hic uario*, supposing *hic* ('here in heaven') to have been glossed *ibi*, and then to have been transposed before *diuini*: for *diuini caeli* then cp. Prop. I. xviii. 27 'diuini fontes.' lxvii. 12 *uerum, is mos populi, ianua quippe facit* is hardly convincing. lxviii. 142 *opus for onus* is neat, as it gives the meaning 'thankless task' which Munro saw to be required. lxxiii. 4 *immo taedet obestque et magis atque magis* surely is not right, for besides being awkward, it leaves the *etiam* of the MSS. unaccounted for, and *nihil fecisse benigne* (l. 3) seems to have no construction. More probable is the reading of Avantius, adopted by Ellis and Schwabe, *prodest: immo etiam taedet obestque magis*: cp. Ovid. Trist. III. iv. 8 'non prosit potius, si quis obesse potest.' xcix. 15 *poenam misero proponis amoris* for *amori* seems unnecessary; *misero amoris* = *mihi misero amanti*, is quite in the manner of the Latin poets, see Postgate's Propertius intr. p. xc. cxiv. 6 *salutis laudemus commoda, dum ipse egeat* is attractive. cxv. 1 *uester for instar* is ingenious, but it is hard to see how the common *uester* should have been corrupted into the harder and rarer *instar*. In vi. 7 a neat alteration in the stopping is made, but I cannot approve of *moechatur mentula? certe* (xciv. 2); no question is required in place of the effective ironical affirmative 'that is certainly the function of a mentula.' The parallels quoted by Ellis and Baehrens make against Mr. Housman's *aperit for perit* in lxiv. 282.

I venture to call Mr. Postgate's attention to the following points where I do not feel quite convinced: xlv. 9 and 18 it seems

necessary to read either with Ellis *dextram*, or with Schwabe *dextra* in both places. lxiv. 100 Ritschl's *fuluore* for *fulgore* is doubtful, for though *fulvus* is often used of gold, the colour *fulvus* was tawny rather than pale. lxiv. 140 *miseræ* V should perhaps be kept; Mr. Postgate reads *miseram*: but *iubeo* with dative though rare is accredited. lxv. 1 *defectum* O for *confectum* G seems doubtful. *ib.* 9 I fancy the defective line as preserved in D can hardly be due to an Italian corrector, who would never have left the line incomplete. Read: *adloquar, audiero numquam t<e> uo<ce> loquentem*. In lxviii. 65 *imploratei* Schwabe for *implorate* V is surely preferable to *implorata* ω, though Schwabe has abandoned it in his new edition.

In an exacting work like this a few errors have naturally escaped the editor. In ix. 1 it should be stated that all MSS. have *e* except O, which omits it, whence Baehrens read *o*. li. 8 the supplement assigned by Postgate after Schwabe (ed. 1886) to F. Ritter, and by Ellis to Heyse, who prints it in his text, seems to have been first made by Doering in his edition of 1834, to whom Schwabe (ed. 1866) assigns it. *ib.* 11 it should have been stated that the reading in the text *geminæ* is Schrader's conjecture, and is not found in any MS., as the note might lead one to infer it is. lxiv. 119 for 'Bucchel.' read 'Buechel.' lxvi. 7 *limine* was conjectured by Heinsius before Baehrens. *ib.* 91 *siris* should apparently be assigned to Lachmann not Haupt; here also the MSS. reading is omitted: add *vestris* V. lxviii. 118 *qui tamen indomitam* is the conjecture of Heyse not Heinsius. *ib.* 128 *quam quæ* was printed in the edition of Avantius long before Voss. In lxxi. 1 the corrupt MSS. reading *uiro* (whence *iure* Palladius' restoration in the text) has been omitted in the note. lxxvi. 23 for *nom* read *non*. Frag. vii. in Ou. *Trist.* II. 429 *ea* not *eo* is the right reading.

I conclude with a few suggestions, bronze, I am afraid, for gold. v. 6 perhaps *dormi-unda* should be written, as thus the effective *u* alliteration is increased. vi. 12 read perhaps *nam mi te ualet ista nil tacere*. viii. 15 read *re re* from the Cuiacianus, 'what real life': cp. Cic. *Sest.* § 71 'respirasse homines uidebantur nondum re.' xxv. 5 I suggest *cum dira nauitas hiemps ostendit oscitantes*, i.e. gaping half drowned in the water, gaping and swallowing the water: cp. Hom. *Od.* xii. 350 πρὸς κύμα χανὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι, Prop. II. xxiv. 27 'naufragus

ebibat undas,' *ibid.* III. vii. 52 'miser inuisam traxit hiatus aquam.' xxix. 20 read *hunc Galliae timent et hunc Britanniae*. lv. 9 read *auersas sic ipse flagitabam* 'with my own lips I kept asking them as they turned away.' lxi. 129 punctuate *satis diu | lusisti: nucibus lubet | iam seruire Talasio*. lxii. 63 read after T partly, with Muretus, *tertia pars patris est, pars est data tertia matri*: cp. Mart. XIV. 174, 2 'pars est una patris, cetera matris habet.' lxiv. 16 read perhaps *illa haud multa alia* for the nymphs did appear occasionally, though not frequently, to mortals. *ib.* 118 as Minos and Pasiphae had four daughters (Apollod. III. i. 2) I propose *ut consanguinearum amplexum*. *ib.* 122 read *aut ut eam Diae deuinctam lumina somno*. Here *Diae* fell out on account of the neighbouring *Diae* in the line before: cp. lxvii. 27 where I think Ellis rightly reads *unde unde*, and see Palmer, Ovid's *Heroides*, pref. pp. xxvii—xxxi. *ibid.* 344 read perhaps *cum Phrygiae Teucro manabit sanguine tellus* cp. *Culec* 306 'Teucra quom magno manaret sanguine tellus.' *ib.* 368 here GO have *madescens*, and a British Museum MS. *polixene*. Read *alta Polixeniane madescens caede sepulchra?* The graphic question would imply that the prophesy will surely take effect. *ib.* 387 *reuisens* has, I think, crept in from 376. Read *reuertens* 'returning from heaven to earth': lxvi. 12 as Syria not Assyria seems to have been the country devastated read *uastatum finis iuerat ante Syros*. *ib.* 28 read *quo nil fortius*. *ib.* 77 read *quicum ego, dum uirgo quondam fuit omnibus expers, | unguentorum una milia multa bibi*. A Paris MS. 8236 (Roszbach p. vii.) has *unguentorum*. I take *omnibus expers* as 'free from lovers': cp. Plaut. *Pseud.* I. v. 83 'amoris expers.' lxviii. 156 read *domus usque in qua* cp. xlv. 14. xlviii. 2 (Postgate's *illa in qua* is paleographically improbable). lxviii. 157—160 as *domina* (156) must be the mistress of the house (Ellis), not Catullus' mistress, whom he would not mention slightly as *domina*, and then more fully in 157—160, I transpose the couplets and read *et longe ante omnes—mihist. et qui principio nobis te transdedit Anser, a quo—bona*. xcv. 4 I offer the following supplement: *milia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno | <stans pede uerbosus carmina composuit>*. Cp. Hor. *Sat.* I. iv. 10. Horace often imitates Catullus, slightly varying his expressions, e.g. sup. 1=A. P. 388: see Munro, *Criticisms* pp. 42, 210, 236, 243.

S. G. OWEN.