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](#)

Claudius Rutilius Namatianus *Claudius Rutilius Namatianus*. Mit Einleitung und kritischem Apparat herausgegeben Dr Georg von Heidrich. Pp. 56. Wien und Leipzig, 1912.

C. H. Keene

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 04 / June 1913, pp 141 - 142

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00005102, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00005102

How to cite this article:

C. H. Keene (1913). Review of Britta Hufeisen, and Robert J. Fouser 'Introductory readings in L3' The Classical Review, 27, pp 141-142 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00005102

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS NAMATIANUS.

Claudius Rutilius Namatianus. Mit Einleitung und kritischem Apparat herausgegeben von DR. GEORG HEIDRICH. Pp. 56. Wien und Leipzig, 1912.

AMONG the very considerable number of editions of Rutilius that have appeared, comparatively few grapple with the important task of explaining the writer's meaning. Some are mainly devoted to determining the text; others, as for example that of A. von Reumont who writes under the name of Itasius Lemniacus, discuss chiefly topographical questions; and others again, as for example that of Vessereau, deal with details about the various persons mentioned in the poem, or furnish a bibliography.

Gibbon, in his *Miscellaneous Works*, speaks slightly of the difficulties presented by Rutilius. He refers to Burmann's work as 'one of those Dutch editions *cum notis variorum* in which the text only peeps out amidst a heavy mass of commentary. The 700 verses of Rutilius are spread over 200 quarto pages crowded with the remarks of Simler, Castalio, Pithaeus (*sic*), Sitzmanus, and Barthius. Yet Rutilius is not a difficult author; once or twice only I should have been glad of an explanatory note; I looked for it in vain, but knew commentators too well to be surprised at the disappointment.'

Most readers of Rutilius will be inclined to think that Gibbon has underestimated the difficulties presented by that author, and will turn with interest to a fresh accession to the small number of editions furnished with a running explanatory commentary. Dr. Heidrich proposes to supply such a commentary for German readers, but the part of his work now published contains only the Latin text he adopts, concise critical footnotes in Latin, and an Introduction of 34 pages in German, comprising a history of the two existing manuscripts and a brief account of previous editions. His place of residence gave him easy access to the Vienna manuscript (*V*), which is the most valuable

authority for the text, and enabled him to collate it at leisure, with the result that he has been able to supplement or correct previous collations in some respects, though not apparently in any that materially, or indeed at all, affect the sense.

He agrees with recent editors in attaching considerable importance to the *editio princeps* (*B*), published at Bologna, as a useful auxiliary for determining the text in addition to the two existing MSS. *B* seems to be based not on *V* but on the same MS. as *V* was derived from, which in its turn was copied from the Bobio MS. The Roman MS. (*R*) is probably a copy of another copy of the Bobio MS., so that both *V* and *B* are copies of the same copy of the Bobio MS., and *R* represents a different tradition. Some years since Hosius in a valuable article in the *Rheinisches Museum* gave a full collation of *R* and appraised with judicious care the relative values of *V*, *R* and *B*, and this estimate has since been practically accepted as an important guide in determining the text.

Dr. Heidrich does not offer any conjectural emendations of his own. His text is of a decidedly conservative character, and he retains the reading of the MSS. in a considerable number of passages where recent editors have admitted a change. One can well suppose that he will give good reasons for the course he has adopted; but for a statement of those reasons it is necessary to await the appearance of the explanatory notes of the full edition, which presumably will deal with the difficulties that have led other editors to admit various emendations. The critical notes accompanying the text now printed contain no discussion, and merely give concisely the various readings.

The poem of Rutilius attracts the reader not so much for its poetical merit as for the colours of truth and nature with which, as Gibbon says, he describes the objects that come under his observation as he conducts us by a distinct and easy road along the coast

of Etruria. His various allusions, geographical, historical and biographical, give scope for and indeed call for a considerable amount of annotation, so that an adequate appreciation of Dr. Heidrich's edition, which aims especially at supplying this want, cannot be formed until the part of his work containing the explanatory notes has appeared.

However, the thoroughness and care with which the part of his work now before us has been done justify a confident anticipation that the work as a whole will prove a useful help in the study of this little-read author.

C. H. KEENE.

University College, Cork.

A NEW EDITION OF PETRONIUS.

Petronii Saturae et Liber Priapeorum.
Rec. FR. BUECHELER, ed. quintam
curavit GUIL. HERAEUS. I vol. 8vo.
Pp. 282. Berolini apud Weidmannos,
1912. M. 3.40.

THE publisher of this standard text of Petronius could scarcely have found a more suitable scholar to put in charge of a new edition than Dr. Heraeus, who is already known as the author of two valuable works on the subject: *Die Sprache des Petronius und die Glossen*, Leipzig, 1899, and *Petronii cena Trimalchionis nebst ausgewählten Pompejanischen Wandinschriften* in his *Sammlung vulgärlateinischer Texte*, Heidelberg, 1909.

Dr. Heraeus has interpreted his duties as editor of another man's work in a most conscientious manner: he has not inserted even his most attractive conjectures in the text, but has kept them in footnotes; and the reader has to remember that such notes couched in the first person (e.g. *vereor ne plura desint*) are the ideas of Buecheler, while the new editor's remarks are in the third person with the addition *Her*.

The general tendency of the edition is in a conservative direction: a tendency which could already be seen in operation in Buecheler's fourth edition, in which a return was made to the manuscript readings in a considerable number of cases. Here, in the opinion of the present writer, a distinction of some importance has to be drawn: for while on the one hand the *Traguriensis*, which alone contains the complete *Cena*, seems to be a very good copy (though itself late) of an early codex, the rest of the book is contained in poor and mutilated MSS.: even the earliest, the *Bernensis*,

is not reliable, and Scaliger's Leyden copy (which contains far more in bulk than any of the rest) is distinctly the result of a bad tradition. While therefore Dr. Heraeus deserves praise for his adherence, wherever possible, to the text in the *Cena*, it appears as if in the rest of the *Saturae* he might have been more bold: to take a single instance, to which reference has lately been made for another purpose by Professor Housman, it is surely absurd in 141, where Eumolpus is relating the various instances of cannibalism that have occurred in prolonged sieges, to leave in the text the reading, '*Saguntini oppressi ab Hannibale humanas edere carnes,*' and to relegate *obsessi* to a footnote.

Perhaps the greatest service which Dr. Heraeus has rendered to readers of Petronius is his slight but effective elaboration of the *adnotatio critica*. He has on the whole resisted the very strong temptation to add to the list of conjectural emendations, though he has included a fair number by Novák which do not seem of first-rate importance; and he has added some very apposite parallels both with classical authors and with glossaries and inscriptions: these are a real contribution to Petronian criticism and exegesis. A few references to articles in the learned journals dealing with individual points are also very welcome. He mentions in several places the work of Löfstedt, whose great knowledge of late Latin has served him in good stead when dealing with the *sermo plebeius* of earlier days: future editions will have to contain some references to the new work of Emil Thomas, *Studien zur lat. und griech. Sprachgeschichte*, which contains much sound sense on many of