

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](#)



Index Verborum Vergilianus *Index Verborum Vergilianus*. By M. N. Wetmore. Pp. viii + 554. Henry Frowde. 25s. net.

E. C. Marchant

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 01 / February 1912, pp 24 - 26

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199317, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199317

How to cite this article:

E. C. Marchant (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 24-26 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199317

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

'uim ingeni.' In the *pro Plancio* neat conjectures are § 54 'interrogatus' for 'rogatus,' § 59 'exhibes' for 'habes,' and especially § 97 'a Vibone *ad* Brundisium.' This passage has apparently hitherto been construed as if the necessary 'ad,' supplied by Mr. Clark, had been present. In § 35 'statuis,' with the ejection of 'splendor etiam Planci,' is rather bold, and § 70 it is questionable whether 'conuoces' is an improvement on the reading 'uoces.' But these are small things, and the present writer's judgement may be at fault.

Dr. Peterson discusses in his preface the vexed question of the authenticity of the speeches delivered by Cicero immediately on his return from exile. He admits that they have faults of expression: but as we know that such speeches were composed by Cicero, he justly contends that it is more reasonable to suppose that the speeches we possess are those speeches, than that those speeches have utterly disappeared, and that the extant speeches are forgeries which have taken their place. The fact that Cicero composed these speeches hastily, and in a state of mental perturbation, is enough to account for weaknesses of style such as are not found in his finished productions; and a strong argument for their genuineness is that in the *clausulae* they conform to the same rules of rhythm as the other speeches. Further, many flaws of diction attacked by Wolf and others are due to the corrupt state of the text as then known, and have been removed largely by the help of the excellent ninth-century Paris manuscript, which has been collated afresh by Dr. Peterson. The editor has intro-

duced many of his own emendations into the text, some of which are known already through his two papers in the third and fourth volumes of the *Classical Quarterly*. The following are perhaps the most striking: in *Senatu* § 9 'P. Lentulus consul *populi Romani* fuit.' § 13 'non consilium, non dicendi copia.' § 35 '*consors* non imperi sed doloris mei': *ad Quirites* § 19 'id omne manet': *de domo* § 62 'scilicet eos consules uocabant.' *Sest.* § 110 'nihil sane Actaei iuuabant anagnostae (sane atte, MSS.). This is excellent. The scornful use of the Greek adjective is effective. It is a pity that Dr. Peterson should have offered an alternative and weaker conjecture. I notice a few doubtful points. In *de domo* § 20 the conjecture 'patrimonium, uim' ascribed to Mr. Clark was made by Nägelsbach (Orelli). In *harusp. resp.* § 62 the corrupt reading of the MSS. is printed 'Potentiae nuntiabatur terrae motus cum quibusdam multis metuendis rebus.' I suggest 'cum quibusdam multisque metuendis rebus,' 'accompanied by certain circumstances which caused terror to many.' In *Sest.* § 7 the reconstruction 'pro illa necessitudine,' etc., seems to be too long: that of Mommsen, usually accepted, is surely better. In *Balb.* § 19 'qua lege uidemus *rite* esse sanctum' the conjecture 'rite' hardly explains the 'satis' of the MSS., and what little meaning it has is redundant. I suggest 'ratum esse et sanctum'; the 'et' may have fallen out before '-se,' and 'ratum' have been misread.

The well-printed plain text of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* will be useful in schools where plain texts are in favour.

S. G. OWEN.

Christ Church, Oxford.

INDEX VERBORUM VERGILIANUS.

Index Verborum Vergilianus. By M. N. Wetmore. Pp. viii + 554. Henry Frowde. 25s. net.

IN 1904 Mr. Wetmore issued an announcement that he was engaged in preparing a Lexicon to Vergil. By May, 1909, he had ready for press about

a thousand pages of manuscript, when he met with a cruel reverse. For though his announcement had been sent to Merguet, it was only now that he heard of Merguet's intention to begin forthwith the publication of a similar Lexicon. A comparison of the published portion of Merguet with Wetmore's Index leads

to the conclusion that the American might safely have challenged comparison with the German scholar. Mr. Wetmore showed the spirit of the true scholar and the chivalry of a generous rival when he decided to withdraw his *Lexicon*, and to substitute for it a complete *Index Verborum*. Erythraeus and Rueaus are now done with, so far as students of Vergilian diction are concerned, and Mr. Wetmore becomes the sole court of appeal.

Both Wetmore and Merguet base their works on Ribbeck's text edition of 1905. Mr. Wetmore includes everything usually found in the *Appendix*, disregarding only *Est et Non*, *Vir bonus*, and *Maecenas*. Merguet omits also the *Priapea* and *Dirae* (with *Lydia*); and Birt's edition of the *Catalepton* makes the omission of the *Priapea*, at least, a serious matter. Again, Merguet states, in a general way, that he notes variants found in editions other than Ribbeck. Mr. Wetmore, on the contrary, tells us exactly what variants of the manuscripts and editions he takes into account; and throughout the index he informs us where the important variants that fall within his scheme are to be found. And unimportant variants (e.g. those of spelling) are indicated by a dagger [for which expression I take leave to substitute hereinafter 'dagged']. In general no reference is made to the manuscripts of the *Appendix*. The forms in the *Index* are arranged in column in the usual paradigm order, italics being used where the first form does not occur. The total number of examples is appended to each word. Under test the plan proves easy to follow and the index convenient to use.

The editions of which Mr. Wetmore takes account, besides Ribbeck of 1895, are Ribbeck of '94, Ladewig-Schaper-Deuticke, Conington-Nettleship-Haverfield, Thilo, Benoist, and Gossrau. Manuscript variants are noted only if they appear in any of these editions. For the *Appendix* Ellis and the *Culex* of Leo are also brought in. In using the book three inconveniences appear to arise from the limits within which Mr. Wetmore decided to work. (1) Some words are merely dagged when there exists a variant which might turn out

to be important. Thus *amaror* (*G.* 2. 247) and *morti* (*A.* 9. 599) are merely dagged. On the other hand, *ad in litus arenosum ad Libyae* (*A.* 4. 257) gets no dagger. We are told only that Conington and Gossrau omit it, a piece of information that one does not greatly value, since Servius and Bentley already did that. Ribbeck's *aversi* at l. 412 of *A.* 9 is dagged. This symbol covers *aversi*; but it hardly covers *adversi*, which the great majority of MSS. have, especially as, at l. 761, Mr. Wetmore chronicles both *aversos* and *adversos*, because there Ribbeck, following Bentley, reads the former. (2) The variants noted by ancient commentators or found in quotations are not to be got from the book, though they may be of importance to the student of Vergil. Thus you will not find any indication of Quintilian's reading at *Ec.* 4. 62, where *parentes* and *cui* without even the dagger merely indicate that Mr. Wetmore's editions do not differ; nor of *insomnis* at *A.* 3. 151, nor of many another well-known ancient variant. (3) In the case of the *Appendix* the curious result may follow from Mr. Wetmore's rules that the reading of all MSS. is suppressed, and a conjecture takes its place. Thus a dagged *et* is catalogued for *Sabinus ille* 6, though Ellis thinks that the *neque* of the MSS. may be right, in spite of Catullus and Scaliger. For *Socer, beate* l. 4 Scaliger's *ei* is given, where the MSS. have *et*, which is defended by Bücheler, but rejected by Birt. Of course all this carping means merely that the *Index* must be used with caution, and that its limitations must be borne in mind.

Many interesting and some surprising phenomena occur in the book. Mr. Wetmore takes *armis* in *A.* 4. 11 and 10. 735 as from *arma*. Does anyone think so, after reading Henry's note on the former passage with the delightful story about the Siamese envoy and Queen Victoria? Again, all Mr. Wetmore's authorities regard *quo* as twice interrogative in *Ec.* 9. 1, and all read *Androgei* at *A.* 2. 393. Mr. Wetmore takes *meus* for nominative in *A.* 6. 835, and has no doubt that *meum* and *meorum* are both neuter genitives in *dulce meum* (*A.* 4. 318) and *dulce meorum* (*A.* 12. 882). For the examination of small but vexed

problems of reading—such as *aer, aether; despicio, dispicio; limina, numina, munera, lumina*—the data lie ready to hand. One can learn at a glance where *quicunque* suffers *tnesis*; and where *nil* is just *nil*.

Incidentally Mr. Wetmore has rendered very great services to Vergilian syntax by classifying the constructions of conjunctions and prepositions, and the uses of word-groups and correlatives. His articles on such words as *postquam, an, ne* are models of succinct information. The various uses of pronouns are distinguished. *Ullus* as a substantive, for instance, is separated from *ullus* as an adjective; but, oddly enough, adjectival *quisquam* is not separately mentioned (see *A.* 875 and 877). Lastly,

those who aspire to emend Vergil will do well to consult the *Index*. It is, for instance, new to me and astonishing to find that *quibus* from *quis* does not become *quis* in any certain case throughout the Vergilian corpus. In one solitary instance *quis* is read, and that is only *Culex* 210; and even there it is not what the MSS. give.

Enough has been said to indicate the important and lasting results for which Mr. Wetmore has paved the way. It remains only to add that the accuracy of the book is beyond praise. Testing the articles up and down, I have not found a single false reference.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

EPISTOLAE OBSCURORUM VIRORUM.

Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum: the Latin text, with an English rendering, notes, and a historical introduction by F. G. STOKES. Chatto and Windus, 1909.

NOT many books have the honour to make history; but this is one of them. It grew out of the intellectual ferment which came just before the Reformation; and it had no small share in bringing the Reformation about. To-day it is perhaps difficult for us to conceive how scholasticism held the minds of men in bondage; but the effects of the bondage are clear enough. The brains of men were busy with 'weaving cats'-cradles out of moonshine,' to use Mr. Stokes's phrase: they were only emancipated by passing through much tribulation. Sloth, gluttony, and ignorance had corrupted the religious orders. Scholasticism was so decayed that it despised even scholarship; as Erasmus puts it, 'It is not for the dignity of holy writ, our profession, that we should be compelled to follow any grammar rules,' and they certainly lived up to this principle.

Sing, Muse, what was the spark that set such a fire ablaze! The Jew Pfefferkorn: a man ignorant and bigoted, who, baptised as a Christian,

thought to win grace by persecuting his fellow Jews. He procured an order to burn all Jewish writings which might be subversive of Christianity; and he was carrying it out when a new actor appeared on the scene. This was the great scholar Reuchlin, who knew some Hebrew, and addressed to the Emperor a confidential report, judicial and temperate, distinguishing those books that might be considered dangerous from those that were not. This report came out; and in a short time all Europe was in a tumult, Pfefferkorn and his party abusing Reuchlin, Reuchlin defending himself, and everyone else taking one side or another. The Dominicans attacked Reuchlin at Rome, and he defended himself; and so the fray went on, till in 1515-16 a little volume appeared, by an unknown hand, called *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum ad venerabilem virum magistrum Ortuinum Gratium Daventriensem*. The title of the book was meant to recall Reuchlin's little collection of letters addressed to him by his friends, *Clarorum Virorum Epistolae latinae graecae et hebraicae variis temporibus missae ad Joannem Reuchlin Phorcensem*: and thus the unlucky Ortwin von Graes, no mean scholar himself, was made immortal as the butt of this biting satire.