

---

Review

Author(s): William R. Nethercut

Review by: William R. Nethercut

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 98, No. 2 (Summer, 1977), pp. 188-189

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/293725>

Accessed: 16-06-2015 18:50 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

where "Syrus" should be read for "Geta"; p. 199 (on 672): *alienam* is better taken, I think, to mean "belonging to someone else (i.e. in law)."

The edition is also issued in paperback.

JOHN N. GRANT

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

WERNER EISENHUT. *Propertius*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975. Pp. xviii + 314. DM 67- (*Wege der Forschung*, Bd. 237)

Seventeen articles provide a helpful review of critical disputes in Propertian scholarship from 1887–1970. Of particular enjoyment are the famous debates between Max Rothstein and Friedrich Leo (1900) over the effect of Comedy and Greek literature upon Propertius, and between Erich Reitzenstein and Günter Jachmann (1935–36) on interpolation or psychological continuity in Elegy 2.15. In both, the contending positions may be divided between those (Rothstein and Reitzenstein) who attribute primacy to the individual quality of Propertius' verse over parallels in other authors, and, again, those (Leo, Jachmann) who warn that Propertius did not write in a vacuum. The give-and-take is pungent: a real *Erklärer*, says Rothstein, "brings to light" more than literary background; Leo expresses regret that Rothstein seems to have taken his criticisms so personally—especially in view of the fact that "I have held back my own opinion of his work"! Leo acknowledges that, of course, Propertius has elevated comic materials: "Wem muss man solche Trivialitäten sagen? Ich hoffe keinem künftigen Kommentator eines römischen Elegikers!" In the second debate, Jachmann finds that Propertius 2.15.23 and 25–26 parallel Tibullus 1.1.69 and 2.4.1–6 (3.11.13–16), respectively: the lines in 2.15 must therefore be an interpolation, for Propertius would not have used *two* verses from another poet within two straight couplets (See Vergil, *B.* 8.58, from Theocritus 1.132–34, while *B.* 8.59–60 come from Theocritus 3.25–27; also D. Knecht, *AC* 32 [1963] 491–512 on Vergil's borrowing within his own works!). Beginning here, Jachmann finds increasing discontinuity in 2.15: doves have nothing to do with chains, and how can Cynthia chain Propertius if she is to be in the same chains with him? Reitzenstein effectively refutes such nit-picking by demonstrating the psychological development, *Gefühlsentwicklung*, which informs 2.15 from start to finish.

The earliest paper in this collection (from *WS* 9 [1887] 94–105), by Emil Reisch, will be of interest now that more than one voice is being raised in defense of Lachmann's partition of book two (cf. O. Skutsch *HSCP* 79 [1975] 229–33; J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius* [Cambridge 1976] 7; M. Hubbard, *Propertius* [London 1974] 41 and 44). Reisch raises several additional possibilities for the interpretation of 2.13.25: among

these, he asks very sensibly whether *quandocumque* may not be sufficiently vague to mean that Propertius would be satisfied if, at some *indefinite* time in the future, he ends up having written three books. And it is good to see the introduction to Hermann Tränkle's *Die Sprachkunst des Properz*, which delineates the several levels upon which Propertius draws to create his lively textures. Three papers which appeared first in English are given German translations: A. K. Lake Michels' sensitive analysis of 1.22 (from *CP* 35 [1940] 297-300), and two by F. Solmsen, on Propertius' literary relationship to Horace (*CP* 43 [1948] 105-9), and to Tibullus and Vergil (*Ph* 105 [1961] 273-89); W. Wili's investigation of Propertius 2.1 and Horace, *C.* 2.12 (*Festschrift Tièche*, 1947) rounds out the study of Propertius' interaction with his contemporaries.

The Editor, Werner Eisenhut, contributes a solid introduction which ties together nicely the progress made in Propertian studies, and he adds his examination of the opening verses of Elegy 4.6 (*H* 84 [1956] 121-28), as well as the interesting *Deducere Carmen* (*Festschrift Rhode*, 1961, 91-104) in which he shows that Propertius 4.1.71-74 combines for the first time the ideas of spinning wool and singing. There are also general essays by Theodor Birt on Cynthia (1922), on the unity of the four books by Heinz Haffter (1970), on Propertius' support of Augustus' foreign policy (Arethusa is *proud* Lycotas is fighting in Asia!), by Hans D. Meyer (1961), and, by Karl Keyssner (1938), a survey of passages in Propertius in which, as in 1.3, the poet is drawing upon actual works of visual art.

WILLIAM R. NETHERCUT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

GESINE LÖRCHER. *Der Aufbau der drei Bücher von Ovids Amores*. Amsterdam, Grüner, 1975. Pp. 105.

As printed out in the Vorwort, two American students, James Hofstaedter and Curtis Lawrence, preceded Prof. Lörcher in defining the structure of the first two books of Ovid's *Amores*. These two doctoral dissertations, Hofstaedter's on book 1 (1972) and Lawrence's on book 2 (1973), were done under my direction; hence, I have a special interest in the problem.

After a brief introduction in which she summarizes what little work has been done on the organization of Ovid's *Amores* (1-14) and after an equally brief discussion of three problems which affect such an undertaking, the unity of 2.9 and 3.11 and the authorship of 3.5 (14-25), she presents a *Strukturskizze* for each of the three books preceded by a 22-24 page rationale.

Of the three, I found her analysis of book 1 by far the most convincing. Her views on book 1 are based on those of A. Gassman, who had developed them in an unpublished seminar paper "Komposition und