

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](#)



Some New Works on Propertius (1) *Sex. Propertii elegiarum Libri IV. recensuit Carolus Hosius*. Pp. xiv + 190. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 1.60 unbound; M. 2 bound. (2) *Ad Propertii Carmina Commentarius Criticus*. By P. J. Enk. Pp. xi + 365. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme et Cie., 1911. (3) *The Manuscripts of Propertius*. By B. L. Ullman. *Classical Philology*, VI. 3. Pp. 282–301. July, 1911. (4) *Propertiana*. By B. O. Foster. *Matzke Memorial Volume*. Pp. 100–110. California: Stanford University, 1911.

H. E. Butler

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 05 / August 1912, pp 168 - 171
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00200188, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00200188

How to cite this article:

H. E. Butler (1912). *The Classical Review*, 26, pp 168-171 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00200188

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

σύριγγας appellāmus (= 3), *Abdera visitur* (= 2), *apud Plātonem lēgitur* (= 2), *fūrias Eὐμενίδας* (= 3), *Βασιλέα et reliqua* (= 2), *ātque Cyclādas* (= 1).

He compares the scansion *Cyclādas*, *Arātus*, *emblemā*, *problēmā*, *idōlum* in the verses of Venantius Fortunatus.

The most surprising statement, of which Harmon says that 'at first sight it seems almost incredible,' is that in the combination *qu* the letter *u* may count as a syllable. In the case of some words this is said to be the regular practice: thus *equus*, *aqua* and *quies* are always treated as trisyllables. The

scansion *āquā* is indeed found in Lucretius (VI. 552, 1072) and in Ennius, and Lindsay has remarked in reference to the scansion of *loqui* in Plautus that 'possibly it sounded to Plautus as something like a trisyllable.' It is, however, more surprising to be told that the same principle applies to *qui*, *quibus*, etc.; also that the *u* not only counts as a syllable, but also bears the accent. It would be interesting to know if C. U. Clark in his *rhythmica distinctio* of the author takes the same view.

Harmon emends a number of passages in the light of his conclusions. It may be remarked that in some passages where he says *scripsi*, the correction appears from C. U. Clark's

notes to be the reading of one of the inferior MSS., or of an early editor. Several emendations of other scholars are shown to be supported by the rhythm, which is also decisive in sundry questions of punctuation. The supplements of Gelenius, the authenticity of which has been doubted, are vindicated by the rhythm, and therefore must have been taken from the lost Hersfeld MS., fragments of which now survive at Marburg. Perhaps the most interesting service performed by the new test is to show that the speeches in Ammianus are the composition of the author himself. This is true even of the warning of Procopius to Ursicinus (XVIII. 6. 18), which is said to have been written *notarum figuris*, i.e. in cipher. Harmon gives some amusing examples to show that Romans and barbarians alike, even soldiers on the field of battle, all use the cadences which Ammianus affects and use them in the same proportion. He refers to the view of Glover 'that Ammianus, unlike other Latin historians, does not *make* speeches for his characters to deliver,' and says triumphantly 'so unequivocal is this evidence that I should as soon think of maintaining the authenticity of the speeches in Virgil as of those in Ammianus.'

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

SOME NEW WORKS ON PROPERTIUS.

- (1) *Sex. Propertii elegiarum Libri IV. recensuit CAROLUS HOSIUS*. Pp. xiv + 190. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 1.60 unbound; M. 2 bound.
- (2) *Ad Propertii Carmina Commentarius Criticus*. By P. J. ENK. Pp. xi + 365. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme et Cie., 1911.
- (3) *The Manuscripts of Propertius*. By B. L. ULLMAN. *Classical Philology*, VI. 3. Pp. 282-301. July, 1911.
- (4) *Propertiana*. By B. O. FOSTER. Matzke Memorial Volume. Pp. 100-110. California: Stanford University, 1911.

DR. HOSIUS has produced a highly conservative text of Propertius for the Teubner series, replacing the somewhat unsatisfactory recension by L. Müller. He adopts the now generally accepted views of Baehrens as to the relative value of the MSS., though, following Postgate, he admits the *Codex Holkhamicus* (L) to a well-deserved place beside the *Cod. Vossianus* and the *Cod. Laurentianus*. I have no wish to traverse this view in detail, though I regard it as doubtful, especially after reading Richmond's article, entitled 'Toward a recension of Propertius' (*J. Phil.* 31, 163), whether D and V are genuinely entitled to so important a place in the *Apparatus*

Criticus. Dr. Hosius has examined the great bulk of the *Codd. deteriores*, and with a sigh announces that his labours have been in vain, save in so far as they confirm the views of Baehrens. That he is justified in this view few will doubt. His opinion as to the state of the text is that of all conservative editors of Propertius. 'Quod mare coniecturarum abundans qui auget, ne aquam in aequor fundat, timendum est; certe cautio summa ut adhibeatur, ipsa haec congeries adnotationumque silua moment neue in textum recipiatur nisi quod plane certum sit. Sed quid, quaero, certum est in hoc poeta qui omnium paene feruentissimus sua animi amorisque concitatione abreptus, quae coniectunt, obscurat et praetersilit, diuersa uariaque coniungit, imagines confundit et detorquet, metaphoris aequo audacioribus certum cogitationis et sermonis tenorem turbat, uerba et grammaticam sui aevi interdum nouat et transformat? Qui clarum concinnum constantem iubet esse scriptorem, a Propertio absteineat. Quid poetae licuerit uel quid libuerit, qui diiudicare uult, quaestionem adit magnae aleae, quam aliter alius arbiter soluat. Itaque in textu reconstituendo, quod explicari posse ullo modo putauit, retinui ueritus tamen scriptori absurda et absona uindicare.' That there is much truth and sound sense in this statement few will deny, but still fewer will deny that Dr. Hosius's counsel is the counsel of despair, or admit that Propertius was quite so foolish as a poet or quite so eccentric in his views of the Latin language as Dr. Hosius's text would make him appear. The recension is, in fact, disappointing. It throws little or no fresh light on Propertius, and is in many respects reactionary. Much is retained that is wholly unintelligible, and the obelus is conspicuous by its absence. It is impossible to believe that Propertius wrote: 1. 2. 25 *non ego nunc uereor, ne sim tibi uilior istis*. 1. 15. 29 *multa prius uasto labentur flumina ponto*. 1. 16. 13 *has inter grauibus cogor deflere querelis* (Scaliger's emendation *grauius—querelas* is not even mentioned). *Ib.* 38 *quae solet ingrato dicere tota loco*. 1. 20. 13 *duri montes*. 2. 7. 15 *comitarent*. *Ib.* 20 *sanguine*. 2. 22. 48 *cur recipi, quae non nouerit, illa uetat*. 2. 23.

24 *nullus liber erit, si quis amare uolet* (Foster's emendation *si quis liber erit, nullus amare uolet*, might at least have been mentioned). 2. 24. 4 *aut pudor ingenuus aut reticendus amor* (meaningless unless followed by a query). 2. 32. 6 *Appia cur totiens te uia ducit anus?* 3. 8. 19 *quam non iniuria uersat*. 3. 7. 22 *poena minantis aquae*. *Ib.* 46 *nil ubi flere potest*. 3. 17. 27, 8 *Naxon—Naxia*. 3. 18. 9 *his pressus*. 4. 1. 65 *quisquis*. (Cf. 1. 125 *Asisi*.) 4. 2. 28 *corbis in imposito pondere messor eram*. *Ib.* 39 *pastorem ad baculum possum curare*. 4. 4. 47 *pugnabitur*. 4. 5. 64 *per tenues ossa sunt numerata cutes*. (Cf. the equally incredible 2. 13. 25 *sat mea sit magna si*, etc.) 4. 11. 39, 40 *qui Persen proauis simulantem pectus Achilli | et tumidas proauo fregit Achille domos*. *Ib.* 66 *consule quo facto tempore rapta soror*. There are other passages where the conservatism of Dr. Hosius has led him to nearly equal extravagance. I do not claim that all these lines admit of certain or even plausible correction; but I do contend that in all these lines the reading is almost undoubtedly corrupt. There are other passages, again, where it is quite certain that there is very serious corruption. For instance, 2. 8 is quite incoherent as it stands. There is much to be said for avoiding bold transpositions in a standard series like that of Teubner; but it is equally absurd to print such an elegy as if it were correct as it stands. Again, the first 4 lines of 2. 18 have little or no connexion with what follows. Even if Dr. Hosius objects to temerity such as that of which I myself have been guilty, *i.e.* printing these four lines as a separate elegy, it would have been well to mention that Rossberg regarded the lines as displaced. It would also be interesting to know on what grounds Dr. Hosius justifies the retention of 2. 30. 19-22 in the place assigned them by the MSS. The same may be said of 3. 7. 21-24 and 3. 59, 60. Something again is clearly very wrong at 3. 15. 10. Either the order of the lines is wrong or some couplets have fallen out. The fact that here the MSS. begin a fresh elegy points to the latter alternative. Without multiplying points such as these, which make me regard the recension as seriously defective, I will turn to

the better features of the text. The emendations admitted are generally well chosen, while the *Apparatus Criticus* is clear and full. It contains, however, a number of corrections which do little save cumber the page, and there are also a few serious omissions. In 3. 9. 16 Mr. Richmond's ingenious *Triopos* for *propria* might have been mentioned, and it might also have been pointed out that *purgabitur* (4. 4. 47) is also found in *Codd. dett.*, although the late Mr. Huleatt's conjecture was published previous to that discovery (see Richmond, *J. Phil.*). Professor Housman's *Artacis—Hylaeis* might have been noticed in connexion with 1. 8. 25, 6, as might Rothstein's punctuation *multa prius* in 1. 15. 29. In 1. 20. 32 the conjecture *Enhydriasin* also might have been mentioned. Such omissions are bound to occur in any text, and probably Dr. Hosius has considered these conjectures and omitted them deliberately. Their omission is, however, rendered more noticeable owing to the fulness of the *Apparatus* and the trivial nature of some of the suggestions included. The book contains good indices, notably an *index metricus et prosodiacus*, which should be useful.

It is with regret that I find myself unable to say anything good of Mr. Enk's commentaries, which has obviously been a labour of love. This bulky volume was presented as a thesis for the doctorate at Leyden University. It is a stately tome, printed in heavily leaded type on thick paper, the weight of which is hardly atoned for by the clearness of the print. Every passage that has ever provoked an emendation in Propertius receives attention, and many conjectures which might be reasonably conceived to have received decent burial are exhumed. The whole method of the work is out of date and the waste of space is enormous, for the volume contains little that is original or illuminating. It is for the most part a mere compilation. There is no justification in collecting a number of emendations of some particular passage by *uiri* more or less *docti*, merely for the purpose of stating without argument one's agreement with this or that correction. And yet this is what Mr. Enk too often does. And, where he does

argue the case, his arguments seldom contain anything that is novel, and still more rarely anything really instructive. The conclusions at which he arrives are frequently sensible enough, but that does not justify their presentation in such a form or at such tedious length. It would be waste of time to discuss Mr. Enk's interpretations of particular passages. It will amply meet the needs of the case if I cite some of the few original contributions to the restoration of the text. They will speak for themselves.

I. 5. 1, 2. This couplet should be regarded as the concluding distich of the preceding poem. 8. 13 *aut ego tum uideam tacitos subsidere uentos*. 9. 31 *illis nec silices nec possunt sistere quercus*. 10. 11 *sed quoniam non es ueritus confidere nobis*. 19. 19 *quas uiua mea te possit sentire fauilla*. II. 16, ll. 11 and 12 are placed after 1. 6, II. 17, 18 after 12. (The sense thus given is good, as is not infrequently the case when elegiac couplets are shuffled, but there is no serious difficulty about the accepted order.) 20. 8 *in Sipylo*. 24 *et lecti*. 28. 56 *imus Auernus*. III. 19. 17 *laesus* for *matris*. I do not think it likely that any of these alterations will be regarded as seriously advancing the restoration of the text. It may be added that Mr. Enk frequently adopts emendations by other scholars, which are, to say the least, 'temerarious.'

Mr. B. L. Ullman, of the University of Pittsburgh, has published an interesting paper in *Classical Philology* (VI., July, 1911) on the subject of the MSS. of Propertius. He shows that F was written between 1379-1381 and argues with some cogency that it is 'a granddaughter of A,' its immediate parent being the MS. known to have been possessed by Petrarch. He also expresses the view that all existing MSS. of Propertius are descended from either N or A. There is to my mind nothing improbable in this assertion; there is no certainty that DV contain any trace of an independent tradition; as regards the other *Codd. dett.* two opinions are held; Dr. Hosius regards them as valueless, while Mr. Richmond believes that he can trace independent elements in various late MSS. Much fuller informa-

tion as to the readings of these MSS. is required before Mr. Richmond's theory can be regarded as probable. In the meantime his position has been somewhat shaken by the concluding pages of Mr. Ullman's article, in which he deals with certain of Mr. Richmond's arguments. He also deals faithfully with the undoubted errors of M. Simar's article in the *Musée Belge* (XIII. [1909], 80), entitled 'Les MSS. du Properce du Vatican.'

Mr. B. O. Foster, of the Leland Stanford University, publishes notes on various passages in Propertius in a volume dedicated to the memory of J. E. Matzke, late Professor of the Romanic languages in the Leland Stanford University. On 2. 15. 7-10 he urges that *fletis* is the true reading in 1. 7, and would emend 1. 10 to *ne subeant uestris pocula nigra labris*. 'Uestris,' he argues, 'coming to be contracted *ûris*, was miscopied *utis*, a *uox nihili* which was then emended to *tuis*, a change which made necessary the transposition with *labris*, to mend the metre, and gave us the verse as it stands in our MSS.' On 3. 9. 8 he urges that *palma nec ex*

aequo ducitur ulla iugo is the true reading and would interpret as follows: 'All things are not equally fit for all men, nor is any palm fetched down from a level ridge.' This he takes to mean that nobody 'wins a prize of victory for achieving just what his neighbour achieves. Our mountain must be a ridge of many peaks, some higher, some lower, each of which when appropriated by some one poet confers on him a peculiar distinction of his own.' The argument is ingenious, but does not save Propertius from the charge of hopeless obscurity. In 3. 17. 38 he urges that for *libatum libabit* should be read. The corruption was perhaps owing to confusion of the contraction for *libabit* (viz. *libab* with a cross stroke through *b*) with that for *libatum* (*libat* with an apostrophe over *t*). It is undeniable that a future is required in this couplet, but it may be urged that the conjunction of *libabit* and *fundens* is a little weak. *Stabit* for *templi* would perhaps give better sense. It is conceivable that *templi* might have crept in from a marginal note.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

SHORT NOTICE

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-5 and 1909. Division II.: Ancient Architecture in Syria, by H. C. BUTLER. Division III.: Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria, by E. LITTMANN, D. MAGIE, D. R. STUART. Section A.: Southern Syria. Part 2: Southern Haurân. Section B.: Northern Syria. Part 2: Il Anderîn, Kerrâtin, Marâtâ. Part 3: Djebel Riha and Djebel Wastaneh. By W. K. PRENTICE. Leyden: Brill, 1909, 1910.

THE Princeton papers are a little complicated in arrangement, but no doubt it is intended to sort them before binding. We can hardly find fault with details, when such pains are taken to publish betimes; a good example to the French in Delos. The district covered by these sections is one which deserves

more attention than it has had; not that the neglect lies at any scholar's door, it is due to Turkish obstacles. The few travellers who have visited it have not been there for architecture; so a great part of Mr. Butler's section is new. As is already known, domestic building is that for which the Haurân is most instructive; and this expedition visited some seventy sites, many of which were not near enough to modern villages to have been demolished. The ruins are not so good as in the mountains; still, there are fine examples of Roman and Nabataean work to be found. The most striking architectural device is corbelling, which is used everywhere to support roofs, floors, and stairs. There are also many fine arches. There are some remains of military work; the fort at Koser il-Hallâbât and the tower of Sabhah, almost complete, are not the only good specimens.