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HILBERG ON THE OVIDIAN PENTAMETER.


This book is a natural, if in some ways a perverted, outcome of the many-sided study of Ovid which has marked the last forty years. Since the appearance of Merkel's Tristia and Ibis in 1837 hardly a corner of the vast Ovidian domain has remained unexplored. Both the Tristia and Ibis have been set on a new footing by the editions of S. G. Owen (1889), and my own (1881), each of them not only read but carefully and minutely studied by Hilberg: the Pontic Epistles were published by Korn with a full app. crit. of MSS. in 1869; the Metam. with a complete collation of the Marcianus also by Korn in 1880; subsequently Zingerle, Riese, who has given a complete collation of the Neapolitanus, and Magnus, have again edited them; Magnus indeed by various programmes, and a continuous series of thorough-going disributes in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, has perhaps done more than any other critic to adjust the respective claims of the MSS., a task of no little difficulty in the case of the Metamorphoses. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides. Even the Halieutica fragment has obtained an admirable editor in Birt, whose monograph will remain unsurpassed in the history of Ovidian criticism, though on a scale not comparable with the same editor's recently published Claudiian (1892); Palmer and Sedlmayer, Palmer especially, by his often jealously ignored but indisputably admirable emendations, have revolutionized the criticism of the Heroides.

Of all these works, so far as they touch the pentameter, Hilberg has availed himself, and his readers will find in him—for the work contains little short of 900 pages—very detailed discussions of a large number of lines in which the reading is doubtful, and into which conflicting considerations enter. This indeed is not the primary purpose of the book, but it is perhaps the most interesting, and at any rate has the advantage of calling the reader's attention to some of the most crucial questions, so far as these occur in pentameters.

The primary object of Hilberg's work is to elicit the laws which guided the poet in arranging the words in his pentameters. Any one at all versed in the Elegiac poems of Ovid, and a fortiori such as have practised the composition of Latin elegises (in these days mainly Englishmen), arrive, after a very short study, at the conviction that the rules by which the Ovidian pentameter is regulated are of the strictest, most rigid kind. That elision is of the utmost rarity—that the first half of the line begins preferably with a dactyl—that if it begins with a spondee, the spondee is not one complete word, but part of a word which is continued into the second foot—that the last syllable of the first half is preferably a naturally long syllable—and this syllable rhyming with the last syllable of the second half—so much becomes, to a really careful student, clear after studying the poems, as exhibited in most of the post-Heinsian editions. He sees that those Greek licences, e.g. allowing a word of three four or five syllables to end the line, and admitting the last syllable to be indifferently long or short, which Catullus Tibullus and even Propertius still permitted themselves, are studiously avoided by Ovid, indeed are almost entirely relegated from his most finished poems. When he takes up the Pontic Epistles, the relaxation of these rules accompanies an obvious decline in the poet's powers and genius. I should suppose that most very close students of Latin metric—especially if they have studied Lucian Müller's de re metrica, the newly appeared second edition of which book I here-with commend to my readers' notice—will have formulated for themselves the above, or most of the above, rules as distinguishing Ovid's pentameters from those of his predecessors. The question is whether it is possible to go farther; whether we can formulate these and perhaps other rules with sufficient precision to be able to pronounce by an appeal to them which of several pos-

1 Except the Med. Fac. exhaustively edited by Kunz in 1881.
sibilities presented by the MSS. must be right. This is the point raised by Hilberg, and no one who has not examined his book ought to pronounce in a hurry on the question.

He lays down eleven laws:—

A. The position of the word must not violate the prosodial and metrical laws of Ovid.

B. The more or less emphasized words should, if possible, be represented by their position in the pentameter.

C. The natural order of the words is observed so far as A and B permit. It is only within the most rigidly defined limits that this order is broken through in favour of law H (that the pentameter should begin with a dactyl).

D. An adjective stands before the substantive or pronoun with which it agrees, so far as this is consistent with A B C H J.

E. Short vowels at the end of the pentameter are avoided.

F. Appended st (est) is preferably found at the end of the pentameter.

G. The first half of the pentameter ends preferably with a syllable long by nature, not by position.

H. The first foot is, if possible, a dactyl.

J. If the first foot is a spondee, it should not form a complete word.

K. Adjective and substantive agreeing with it are, if possible, in different halves of the pentameter.

L. The verb is placed as early in the pentameter as is consistent with the other laws.

The first criticism which I would offer on this, is—that it is scarcely a right use of the word 'law' (Gesetz). The exceptions to most of the rules above drawn out are very numerous indeed, and it is just in this that Hilberg fails to carry conviction. Take F. He first obtains from a large number of examples proof of the tendency of Ovid to place st (est) at the end of pentameters, especially after a short å or c: then proceeds to insert it in places where it has no support from the MSS. e.g. Fast. ii. 719, 720

Ille iacens pronus matri dedit oscula terrae.

Crediunt offenso proculibusse pede.

1 And of hexameters. Thus A. A. i. 655, 6 Iustus utque fuit: neque enim lex aequirior ullast Quam necis artificia arte perire suam: where Hilberg remarks 'hier ist es Merkel, welcher das längst eingesarkte 'st zu neuem Leben erweckt,' and adds that, however, such appended 'st is rare at the end of hexameters, the syllable being in thesis, as opposed to the pentameter, the last syllable of which is in arsit.

Merkel in his later editions altered this with the best MSS. to Creditus. Hilberg goes a step farther and adds 'st after pede. I do not think this is right. There are other instances of the participle creditus used in this somewhat rare manner, i.e. as = in quo creditus est 'and was believing in doing so to have stumbled and fallen.' Nor can I believe that in Ibis 456 Victor ut est celeri uiictaque uersa pede the poet really wrote Victor uti celeri uictaque uersa pedest, by which entirely unsupported alteration the verse is brought into harmony not only with F, but also with C and E.

In the well-known passage of the Remed. Amoris 476, where Agamennon describes Briseis as only differing from Chryseis by a syllable—

'Est,' ait Atrides, 'illius proxima forma, Et si prima sinat syllaba, nomen idem'—

two MSS. give idem est. Can any one say that idem is right, idem est wrong? or reversely? Surely nothing is gained by Hilberg's 'laws' for determining such a question. All we can safely do, is to observe Ovid's general use, primarily in the A. A. and Rem., then in the Amores and Heroides: subordinately, and with a great deal of reservation, in his later and much inferior works. For I must come to what most lovers of the poet will, I think, agree with me in enforcing, and there is hardly any point which I would so earnestly press upon the attention of the ingenious writer I am reviewing as this—that the works of Ovid's prime ought to be judged by a different standard from those of his decline—especially from the Tristia and Pontic Epistles. Licences or irregularities which we have reason to think were absolutely unknown in the finer works of his adolescence and early manhood were very likely to find admittance in the comparatively uninspired elegies of his later years when the misery of his sudden and unexplained banishment combined with the dismal surroundings of Tomi to depress his spirit and freeze the genial current of his Muse. But Hilberg not only equalizes all the Elegiac poems as teaching us the 'laws' of Ovid's pentameter, but admits works of very doubtful
genuineness, such as the Nux, the later Heroides, and the Consolatio ad Liviam, to rank on a par with the genuine. So un-critical a course is the more surprising, as the task of eliciting ‘laws’ is easier and simpler if these doubtful works are kept aloof. The Consolatio, in particular, bears on its face the signs of extraneous authorship, and the numerous discussions which its peculiarities have provoked would better have been spared and must be considered intrusions in Hilberg’s volume.

To return to F. The following passages seem to me to have drawn from Hilberg a wrong conclusion.

Her. xii. 73, 4
Ius tibi et arbitrium nostrae fortuna salutis
Tradidit, inque tua est vitaque morsquo
ipsa nihil: pavidost lingua retenta metu.

‘In some MSS.’ says our critic, ‘the ’st after tua is wanting, and it should be unhesitatingly removed, for where ’st does not obviate hiatus or lengthen a vowel (pedest etc.) Ovid only admits it in the inner half of the pentameter in those very rare cases where a misunderstanding would arise without it.’ To this I must demur. The ’st seems to me absolutely required. Let us take another case.

Am. i. 7, 20
Ipsa nihil: pavidost lingua retenta metu.

Hilberg would remove ’st for the above reasons and because it should naturally follow, not precede, retenta, as laid down in ‘law’ C. Here we see the arbitrariness of the procedure. Because in a large number of instances est (st) follows the participle to which it belongs, a ‘law’ results that it should always do so, except where some palpable reason exists for neglecting it. Then the cases where the ‘law’ is violated are pronounced to be wrong. But what is the in every way more probable decision? We notice (1) that the verb to ipsa is omitted: here is a reason why in the sequent clause it should not be. (2) est (st) is avoided after -u, therefore it is unlikely to have been placed after metu at the end of the line. If, then, it was inserted at all, it can only be after pavido. So much a priori: then, what is the evidence of MSS. Hilberg states nothing on this point; and I am not sure even that the readings of the two earliest, the Puteaneus and the Sangallensis, are known: for we still desiderate a thorough collation of MSS. in this, the most exquisite of all Ovid’s poems, as also in the Ars Amatoria. Strange that the two works which made the poet famous in every province of the Roman Empire should still lack a completely adequate edition: while the Heroides, in every way an inferior work, should have been thought worthy of a collation as exhaustive as the works of Horace. I venture to hope that this task may still be undertaken by some one of the increasing band of palaeographers whom Oxford and Cambridge are training.

Trist. iii. 10, 9, 10
At sum tristis hiemps squalentia protulit
ora,
Terraque marmorost candida facta gelu.

It might be expected that Hilberg would follow the line of reasoning adopted in Am. i. 7, 20 and omit ’st. Not so: it is required, he says, to prevent a misapprehension. Without ’st, it might be thought that both hiemps and terra were subjects to protulit. To the conclusion, that ’st is indispensable, most readers will assent: but the ground alleged is inadequate; nor is it much helped by the wish to avoid ’st after gelu. For Hilberg himself admits that in two cases, A. A. i. 552—

Terque fugam petiit: terque retenta metu
est.
Horruit, ut sterilis agitat quas uentus
aristae—

and Pont. iv. 1, 14 manu’st, Ovid has permitted this collocation. One is tempted to ask, are there no others? Yet if there are only two, the law is broken: and, so far as MS. evidence goes, it is quite doubtful whether in Trist. iii. 10, 10 the poet adds ’st after marmoreo or after gelu. And do not let us forget that the ‘laws’ depend ultimately on MSS.: and that these vary constantly and cannot be said to give any certain sound, at least on this point of ’st.

Coming to another line discussed on p. 413, Trist. i. 6, 6—

Si quid adhuc ego sum, muneris omne tui est

(which line is part of the page facsimiled from the best MS. of the Tristia, the Laurentianus (L), in S. G. Owen’s edition), it appears to me very questionable whether st (est) should be omitted on the showing of the facsimile. It is true that est is not in the line as written at first: but omne tui est is unmistakably written over, and Hilberg
speaks unadvisedly when he says that there is a doubt as to the meaning of $t$. It can mean nothing but est, as Owen, of course rightly, explains.

An interesting rule which is formulated on p. 414 deserves close consideration. It is in reference to final i (in cases where the quantity is indifferently long or short, mihi tibi sibi). Hilberg lays down this rule: Ovid omits $st$ (est) where final i rhymes with i in the first half of the pentameter, e.g.

Rem. Am. 228
Aeger, et oranti mensa negata mihi
Trist. ii. 104
Cur inprudenti cognita culpa mihi?
Trist. ii. 208
Alterius facti culpa silenda mihi
but Rem. Am. 582
Est opus : auxilio turba futura tibist
Fasti i. 480
Siste precor lacrimas ! ista ferenda tibist
Fasti iv. 456
Nec mora ' me miseram ! filia,' dixit, ' ubist ?'
Pont. ii. 9, 72
Et tamen his gravior noxa fatenda mihist
Pont. ii. 10, 10
Vel mea quod coniunct non aliena tibist.

A similar rule is enunciated for final a on p. 416: that is to say, where such a rhymes, st(est) is omitted. But here the case seems more doubtful: at any rate the MSS. exhibit very great fluctuation. Meanwhile I need not say how greatly such questions affect palaeographical research. When a MS. of first-rate importance, like the Trinity College (Cambridge) codex (G) of the Ibis, or Owen's L of the Tristia, comes to light—and of the immense weight of both codices Hilberg's pages afford the most abundant evidence—its readings not only do not stand on a parallel with ordinary MSS., but rank among the ultimate standards by which such points as Hilberg raises have to be judged. Conversely, one of the subordinate yet real gains from so thorough a book as his is lies in the clearness with which it exhibits the intimate connexion of palaeography with almost every point of philological research—orthography, metric, grammar, mythology, archaeology.

It is time to turn to another section of our critic's book. We may take law C, which enforces that the natural order of the words in the pentameter is kept so far as is consistent with other laws, notably $H$ (that the pentameter begins with a dactyl). Here again it seems to me that the works of the poet do not all stand on the same level.

In the Amores and Ars Amatoria the order of the words in the pentameter is, speaking generally, as nearly the natural order as metrical considerations permit. In the Heroides this is not so: the pentameters are more complex in construction, and the arrangement of the words less direct and simple. This is, as might be expected, equally, perhaps more, true of the Tristia and Pontic Epistles. On the other hand the Fasti show a return to the plainer and more direct order of the Amores. I shall attempt to prove this by examples.

The following are taken from the Amores:

Damnabitque oculos et sibi uerba dabat
Non caret effectu quod ualuere duo

Centum sunt causae cur ego semper amem
Siue rudis, placita es simplicitate tua
Haec melior specie corporis, ills sapit
Me miserum ! quare tam bona causa meast?
Maesta erat in uultu : maesta decenter erat
Tu tamen ante alios, turtur amice, dole
Apta quidem dominae, sed magis apta mihi
Aerati postes, ferrea turris erat
Liber et Alcides et modo Caesar habent
Egressum tectis, pulcher Iule, tuis
Perdere : non ego sum stultus, ut ante fui.

The following from the Ars Amatoria:

A pereant, per quos munera crimen habent
Vir mala dissimulat, teetius ills cupit
Quamuis sit mendax, Creta negare potest
Perprime temptatam nec nisi uictor abi
Oscura deinde dabit, deinde rogabit emas
Ut fragilis glacies interit ira mora
Perprime temptatat nec nisi uictor abri
Ut fragilis glacies interit ira mora
Perprime temptatam nec nisi uictor abi

Casus inest illis, hoc erit artis opus
Sit tua cura sequi, me duce tutus eris
Ut fragilis glacies interit ira mora
Perprime temptatam nec nisi uictor abi
Casus inest illis, hoc erit artis opus
Sit tua cura sequi, me duce tutus eris

Albis egit iter descuitque patrem
Nil opus est illi qui dabit arte mea
Perfer et obdura l postmodo mitis erit
Dummodo sit diues, barbarus ipse placet.
In all these the words follow an order almost identical with the order of prose. I suppose that it will be a surprise to many who have never looked into the matter to find that Wordsworth's theory, that the natural order of words in poetry is the right one, is confirmed by the two most highly finished poems of Ovid. It is difficult to see why this should not be equally true of the Heroïdes, where the subject is the same, love. But the difference, which makes itself felt on the shortest comparison, is marked and unmistakable. The reason, I imagine, lies in the different way in which the same passion is presented. The Greek heroines who speak in the Heroïdes plead their cause (generally, not to be forsaken by their lovers) with all the arguments which feminine rhetoric can urge. It is no wonder that their language should at times become artificial like their reasoning, or that rhetoric should employ its usual methods of antithesis, inversion, and the other arts by which the diverse phases of passion find their habitual expression. Whereas in the Amores we have short idyllic scenes or phases of a lover's life. It is the poet-lover showing us his own feelings as directly and plainly as he can: a male and highly sensuous nature expressing his not too refined or ideal emotions in words which convey their meaning without reservation or ambiguity. In the A. A. this is even more decidedly true. In this Manual of Love for the use of Men and Women, Ovid never beats about the bush; his precepts are straightforward and delivered in the most straightforward words: take away the single element of obscurity, the mythological allusions, which strike a modern reader so grotesquely, and the work is intelligible to the least cultivated understanding. When we come to the Tristia the case is very much altered. Here alone such involutions of clause, as

Si quis, qui, quid agam, forte requiret, erit,
such poor antitheta as
Inque suis amat hunc Caesar, in hoste probat,
or such inversions as
Quam tribuit terris, pacis an ista notast?
become, if not frequent, at least not uncommon.

This difference of style in different works is not recognized by Hilberg, and, so far as it goes, seems to diminish the weight of his conclusions. But the reader of his Gesetze must judge for himself, and will, at any rate, be certain to learn much from the long array of examples by which each 'law' is illustrated, even if the exceptions seem to him too numerous to allow of such a term at all.

The value of a book like this is not to be gauged by the amount of conviction which it produces. It is much to be able to show (for instance) that spondees at the beginning of pentameters are not nearly as common as dactyls; that an isolated spondee contained in one complete word with a pause in the sense after it is very rare indeed. It it quite another thing to be told that these inductions from a number of instances constitute a 'law': at best they can only be considered guiding rules.

I will now touch on some points in which I feel myself to be in direct antagonism with the views of Hilberg. Some of these relate to the Ibis. There are two pentameters in which MSS. agree to place quamuis after the verb to which it refers.

45 Non soleant quamuis hoc pede bella geri.
58 Non soleant quamuis hoc genus ipse sequi.

In the second of these, G (the Galeanus) gives Quamuis non soleam, against metre. Hilberg, full of his 'law' C, that the natural order is to be looked for, seizes on this fact, and transfers G's quamuis non soleam to 45, writing then Quamuis non soleant. With every wish to give G its full weight as a unique testimony, I confess this seems to me unjustified and improbable.

Flebat ut est infans fumis contactus amaris
De tribus est cum sic una locuta soror.
Why not cum sic de tribus est?

NO. LXXVII. VOL. IX.
De tribus at the beginning of the first half of the line a designed antithesis to una at the beginning of the second?

96 Qui scit se factis has meruisse preces.

Hilberg denies that se scit, which is found in several of the best MSS. including the Turonensis (T), can be right. Why? Because there is no emphasis on se and because scit se is the natural order. I cannot feel this to be at all convincing: and I notice that Mr. Housman,1 the most recent editor of the poem, prints se scit.

Two cases, where I have been the first to make a conjecture subsequently made by others, must not be passed over in silence. One is in A. A. ii. 307, 8:

Ipsos concubitus, ipsum uenerere licebit
Quod iuuat et quaedam gaudia noctis habe.

On p. 393 of the American Journal of Philology for 1892 I emended this: et quae clam gaudia noctis habet (or habes), constructing Quod iuuat with ipsum. 'licebit uenerere ipsos concubitus ipsamque voluptatem coitus et gaudia ueneris quae tacet (taces).’ Hilberg has made this identical emendation, p. 653 of his Gesetze (published in 1894), punctuating however with a comma after licebit and writing the pentameter

1 In fasc. 2 of Postgate’s Corpus Poctamn Latinorum.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

EDITIONS OF CLAUDIAN BY BIRT AND KOCH.


An adequate critical edition of the last of the Latin poets has long been desired; and it is a tribute which he well deserves. For although his graces are often of the engine-turned order and his lustre metallic, yet in power and range and deftness of poetical expression he recalls the best ages of Rome while the purity of his Latinity and his mastery of metre, wonderful in any case in a foreigner, are almost miraculous in a successor of Ausonius. It is however to his historical importance, not to his poetical merits, that we owe the editions now to be passed under review.

The first of these editions is in scope and method a truly ‘monumental’ work, indispensable to every student of Claudian. Of its mere contents even it is not easy to give an adequate account within the limits of a review. The two hundred and thirty pages of prolegomena each containing forty-seven square inches of print as against forty-two in this article, to say nothing of the difference in type, deal with every topic in which any reader of the poet may be supposed to take an interest. Its divisions are as follows. I. On the life and writings of Claudian and contemporary history (tem-