that it is not a question of "seek" but of "follow." In 3.83-84, Richter (p. 40) for: *i unc-hunc* suggests *hic-hic* (sc. *timor*) and thus manages to save *suadet*. I reject this change, as I do Bailey's semicolon at the end of line 82; the anaphoric *hunc* (tricolon) makes all four infinitives depend upon *obliti*, and, for me, *suadet* is corrupt. In 6.1192-95, Richter (pp. 139-43) replaces *frigida* by *rigida* (reasons not persuasive, and cf. *rigida morte* of 1196), and *in ore iacens rictum* (*in ore iacens* from Nonius, and *rictum* Lambinus), through assumed (and impossible) confusion in majuscules, emerges as *in archiatri tactum*. But Lucretius does not generally latinize Greek words (contrast with Cicero) — *homoeomerian* in 1.830 and 834 is another matter — nor use such a rare and specialized word. Bizarre!

Future editors of Lucretius will no doubt find items here and there in this monograph which may be of interest or use to them. But were an edition of Lucretius to come out incorporating all of Richter's proposals, I doubt that it would please anyone save its editor.

Harvard University *J. P. Elder*

Bernhard Coppel. Das Alliusgedicht. Zur Redaktion des Catullcorpus. (Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften. Neue Folge, 2. Reihe, 48.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1973. Pp. 194. DM 54 (cloth); DM 46 (paper).

Coppel's "Alliusgedicht" isn't "68b," as it is often called (i.e. 68.41-160, as opposed to the first 40 lines — "68a" — in which the addressee appears to be Mallius or Manlius, not Allius), but the whole poem. His title thus begs the question of unity and by-passes the problem of the two different names (*Mallius* can only be turned into *Allius* by the unattractive expedient of reading *mi Alli* at 68.11 and 40). Essentially, the book is a study of a group of related topics in "68a" aimed at validating the assumption of unity and presented as a contribution to our understanding of the collection as a whole ("zur Redaktion des Catullcorpus"). The topics discussed are the nature of the misfortune which has overwhelmed "Allius" (Coppel's answer is that, with Catullus away in Verona, "Allius" and his circle find that life in Rome bores them to death — the tragic rhetoric attributed to "Allius," i.e., is a display of *urbanitas*) and the nature of the requests "Allius" makes of Catullus (Coppel argues that line 10 is a request for "subjectiv-erotische *ludicra*" and lines 27-30 a request for a generous supply of books by other writers). According to Coppel, Catullus says No to both requests: he hasn't any books to send, and he isn't in the mood for subjectiv-erotische *ludicra* — his brother's death has put an end to that; instead "68a" is accompanied by what Coppel calls a "*carmen maestum*" (the term picks up 65.12 *semper maesta tua carmina morte canam*); this is "68b" *stricto sensu* (68.41-148), which is followed by a tail-piece (68.149-60 — "68c" for those who distinguish these lines from the rest of "68b"). Coppel adds a chapter ostensibly on the nature of the unity of Poem 68, but again chiefly concerned with "68a," and a final chapter on the Catullan collection (his conclusion is that "ein grösserer Teil des Gesamtwerkes, wenn nicht das ganze, ist . . . in einer unbestimmbaren Anzahl von Teilpublikationen erschienen" [p. 183]); the collection as we have it, according to Coppel, is the work of a later editor. There is a two-page table of contents, but no index.

Like so much recent work on Catullus, Coppel's monograph contains things most scholars will accept without much protest (either agreeing with Coppel, or recognizing a familiar opinion that has acquired respectability with the passage of time) and things at which many will boggle (his interpretation of 68.27-30, his theory of

piecemeal publication by Catullus). Coppel is not a man with a bee in his bonnet. Rival theories are neatly tabulated and patiently discussed. I think here and there he shows poor judgment. His style is "wissenschaftlich" — clear enough, if one takes pains with it, but hardly limpid.

Coppel presented his thesis in 1969. Text and references have been updated, we are told, to the end of 1971, but it is obvious that Coppel has not been able to make more than casual notice of (for example) the views expressed in my commentary (1970); since then, the problem of Poem 68 has been reopened by Wiseman ("Catullus, 'poem 68'," in *Cinna the Poet*, 1974). The problem of the nature of the collection has been discussed by me (*Catullus: an Interpretation*, 1972) and more recently by Ernst A. Schmidt, "Catulls Anordnung seiner Gedichte," *Philologus* 117 (1973) 215-42. One almost wishes it were possible to declare a five-year moratorium on work on Catullus, so that we could all catch up.

University of Toronto *Kenneth Quinn*

Hermann Harrauer. A Bibliography to Propertius. (Bibliography to the Augustan Poetry, II.) Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg, 1973. Pp. xviii, 219. No price listed.

Hermann Harrauer launched his *Bibliography to the Augustan Poetry* in 1971, with a 90-page volume listing 1128 recent (and important not-so-recent) publications on the *Corpus Tibullianum*. Vol. 2, issued in 1973, provides Propertiana with the same sort of coverage. In purely physical terms, *A Bibliography to Propertius* is less *tersus atque elegans* than its predecessor. It consists of 1833 entries and requires 219 pages to record and index them; furthermore, it employs a larger, rather less attractive, point-size type and leading (i.e. space between lines of type) — and as a result features an average of barely fifteen bibliographic entries per page, approximately six fewer than *A Bibliography to the Corpus Tibullianum*. Yet such prodigality of paper has its compensations: wheras Vol. 1 proved a strain, Vol. 2 seemed a veritable balm to this classicist's sore eyesight.

As Harrauer states in his preface, the bibliography essentially follows the same principles of organization as the first volume. Aiming at completeness, especially in regard to literature of post-1900 vintage, it catalogues works under sixteen general headings and gives individual titles chronologically within each of these categories. The form of each entry (referred to hereafter in this review by the number which Harrauer has assigned to it) remains the same as that found in Vol 1: Harrauer has continued his practice of putting the date before the author's name at certain intervals for easier reference; reviews of any publication which to him merit attention are listed after it, in italicized print, for the reader interested in the work's critical reception. The volume further resembles its Tibullan precursor in devoting a good one-third of its pages to three indices, *locorum*, *rerum et nominum*, and *auctorum* respectively.

There have been some changes made in both emphasis and presentation of bibliographical material, but these are largely welcome ones. Harrauer has deliberately paid more attention here to literature published prior to 1900 and, in recognition of the many problems connected with Propertius' language, included many more Latin words as entries in the second index. He has re-phrased several rubrics so that they represent a wider variety of writings or more accurately reflect the nature of their contents: e.g. he has altered "Monographs on [Tibullus]" to "Studies

in [Propertius]" and replaced "Literature on Single Elegies/. . Select Passages" with "Critical and Exegetical Studies on Single Elegies /. . Selected Passages." And he has added a new, separate, heading for "The Composition of Books and Elegies."

Still, *A Bibliography to Propertius* contains much which frustrates the serious researcher in the field of Propertian elegy. I share the opinion voiced by R. Ball, in his review of Vol. 1 (CW 66 [1972] 105-06), that a bibliography of this sort would be far more helpful if it summarized — in the fashion of *L'Année Philologique* or *CW*'s own surveys — the contents of each entry. Harrauer's logic in categorizing publications often struck me as both inconsistent and misleading. For example, #1466, E. Courtney's "The Structure of Propertius' Book III," *Phoenix* 24(1970)48-53, appears under "IX. The Composition of Books and Elegies." Yet Courtney's earlier, similar, "The Structure of Propertius' Book I and Some Textual Consequences," *Phoenix* 22 (1968)250-58, resides, as #1434, in "VIII. Critical and Exegetical Studies on Selected Passages" along with such composition-and-structure studies as #1377 (Grimal), #1420(Skutsch), #1430(Burck) and #1436(Nethercut) — on the grounds that these discussions treat specific passages in individual elegies as well. Admittedly one can ascertain the double identity of these works by consulting the "composition of books" entry in the second index, but I would judge it more sensible to accord them two separate billings. After all, Harrauer does see to it that certain other publications — e.g. #136= #1657(Lieberg) and #569= #1654(Steidle) — are cited, with a different number each time and appropriate cross-referencing, under more than one rubric. In addition, the second, "subjects and words," index, which Harrauer has taken pains to expand, also lacks what I would deem crucial entries and references. It surprised me to find no entry for either Umbria or Etruria, despite the sizeable quantity of publications on Propertius' geographical background enumerated under several headings. The "psychoanalysis" entry contains no reference to #568, J. P. Sullivan's well-known 1961 essay on 1.1; the "exclusus amator" entry none to #1049, W. S. Anderson's "Hercules exclusus," which argues convincingly for the humorous use of the motif in 4.9.

Presumably Harrauer is directing this series of volumes at the English-speaking scholarly world, which has never before (well, in the case of Tibullus, hardly ever before) been treated to bibliographies of these authors with rubrics and index entries in its native tongue. But ironically his errors of commission and omission in this volume give Anglophonic readers, and Anglographic scholars, special cause for complaint. Several works cited are of 1970-1972 date; Harrauer even mentions K. Sedlbauer's 1973 Vienna dissertation on *Kulturgeschichtliches bei Properz*(#157a) and choses as his authorized text the Teubner edition of R. Hanslik(#396), which had yet to appear as his volume went to press. Nevertheless, he neglects to note five English-language publications on Propertius listed in the 1969 volume of *L'Année Philologique*, including four American Ph.D. dissertations — those of R. E. Braun (Texas), J. K. King (Colorado), E. P. Menes (Princeton) and C. Saylor (California-Berkeley). Then there are his annoying misspellings, far more numerous than those in Vol. 1. Harrauer would do well to enlist the aid of a discerning, native English speaker on Vol. 3.

To sum up, a work which amply testifies that the so-called minority preferring Propertius is a vocal and verbal one, but which could be more precise and illuminating in its testimony.

Boston University *Judith P. Hallett*

Burton Raffel (tr.). Horace. The Art of Poetry. A Verse Translation with an Introduction. With the original Latin text of Horace's Ars Poetica, a prose translation and biographical note by James Hynd, notes by David Armstrong, and an Afterword by W. R. Johnson. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1974. Pp. xii, 83 (also in paper). $6.00 (cloth); $1.95 (paper).

This edition of the *Ars Poetica* yokes the talents of four *Arion* contributors to present a modern audience with a readable and living Horace.

The book's focal point is Burton Raffel's literary, rather than narrowly literal, translation of Horace's *Ars* into a vigorous and contemporary poetic idiom. Raffel's earlier translations (ranging from Old English to Thai and Indonesian poetry) have included the well-received Horatian versions in *Horace: Selected Odes, Epodes, Satires, Epistles* (New York 1973).

Raffel's verse rendering is followed by the Wickham-Garrod OCT Latin text of the *Ars* (without critical apparatus) and James Hynd's accurate and literal prose translation which divides the poem into 149 numbered sentences for easy reference. David Armstrong's notes (would that space allowed a greater number!) are insightful and are linked to Hynd's literal version rather than Raffel's freer poetic version. Hynd's biographical note might have mentioned the recent article "*Ars Poetica*" by D. A. Russell in C. D. N. Costa (ed.), *Horace* (London 1973) 113-34.

Deserving special mention among the supplements to Raffel's version is W. R. Johnson's concluding essay ("Afterword: Making It New Again"). Johnson corroborates the lively, complex *persona* of Horace which Raffel's interpretative translation projects: the image of Horace as a sophisticated, undogmatic, and dialectical poet. The distorted, neoclassical image of the Horace of the *Ars Poetica* as a dogmatic dictator of literary "rules" overemphasized one side of the dialectical coin (the necessity of poetic *ars* and *disciplina*) at the expense of Horace's equal insistence on *ingenium*, poetic inspiration, and a refined madness. Johnson's reading of Horace has profited from C. O. Brink's elucidation of the poetic method of "Horatian dialectic" in his *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge 1971). Horatian dialectical tension resolves the falsely opposed polarities of unity vs. variety, discipline vs. genius, and *utile* vs. *dulce*.

Raffel's verse translation itself avoids un-Horatian slavish literalism (*A. P.* 133-4: *nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres*) and attempts to capture the essence, spirit, and especially the poetry of his model. Those classicists offended by Raffel's modernistic typographical layout (requiring nearly twice the English lines to translate Horace's Latin), occasional vulgarisms, and copious anachronistic updating of Horace's allusions (as in his rendering of *A. P.* 409 by "It takes two to tango/well"; or as in his version of *A. P.* 374 ff.: "It's like jangling drummers/banging Beethoven's Fifth/when the party's gay/and everyone wants to sing") should be partially disarmed by Raffel's stated intentions. He seeks to create a translation that can be enjoyed as English poetry with its own rhythms, sound-patterns, and expressive force. Literal fidelity to the Latin should be sought in Hynd's prose version. As poetry, Raffel's verses are often of high merit when read aloud to appreciate the rhythm, the wedding of sound and sense, and attention to assonance and alliteration. Raffel's verse is particularly moving when he translates such Horatian "lyrical" passages as *A. P.* 58-72 (pp. 11-12), 160 ff. (pp. 13-16) or 309-407 (pp. 27-28). Some may judge that Raffel courts too modern and too "undignified" a muse to match the difficult blend of Horatian *gravitas* and *iocus* (*A. P.* 222; cf. 226 *seria ludo*). Such reservations, though, merely raise anew the very thorny question of the philosophy of translation

IL-MAY 1976
OL. 69, No. 7
HOLE No. 1387

CONTENTS

Published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, Inc.

THE CLASSICAL WORLD