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](#)

Max Bonnet on the Latinity of Gregory of Tours *Le Latin de Gregoire de Tours*. Par Max Bonnet, Chargé de Cours à la Faculté des Lettres à Montpellier. Paris, Hachette, 1890. (Pp. 1–787.) 15 fr.

H. Nettleship

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 10 / December 1892, pp 451 - 453

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186949, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186949

How to cite this article:

H. Nettleship (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 451–453 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186949

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Pollio's acceptance when he came to Rome in the autumn of B.C. 39 to appeal for his assistance. The words *tu mihi* (*Ecl.* 8, 5) introduce that appeal, which is perfectly clear though made indirectly; when Virgil begins 'do thou, I pray' and then goes on 'O shall I ever be allowed to sing thy fame?' he means 'do thou, I pray, make it possible for me to pursue my poetic task,' or in plain words 'get me back my farm.'

To this original collection were subsequently added Eclogues 1, 6, and 9, all of which are directly connected with Virgil's trouble about his farm, and the tenth which is expressly stated to be written last; the present first Eclogue was then placed in its present position, thus dedicating the complete collection to Octavian, and in this form the Eclogues were perhaps published while Virgil was in Southern Italy, the error of Propertius, who describes them as written *subter pineta Galaesi*, being thus accounted for. Finally when Virgil writes, *Georg.* 4, 565,

*carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi,*

the reference in the first line is to the original collection of purely pastoral poems which began with the words *pastorum Musam* (*Ecl.* 8, 1), and in the second line to

the present collection which began with *Tityre...* (*Ecl.* 1, 1).

The views thus summarized are set forth with great vigour, considerable lucidity and some acute criticism of particular passages. The demolition of the theory that B.C. 41 must be the date of the first Eclogue may be considered as complete. The attempt to show that the Eclogues consist of two collections is ingenious, but it is obvious that the *data* are insufficient for anything like proof. For instance, though it is easy to see in *carmina*, *Ecl.* 8, 12, 'a collection of poems,' and in *Georg.* 4, 565 an allusion to a double collection of Eclogues, yet it is equally easy to fail to see anything of the kind. The book is however one which is essential to all who are specially interested in the problem with which it deals, and ordinary students will find in it much which will help them to more fully understand and appreciate the Eclogues. Scholars, however, of the old verse-making pre-German era will read one passage with grim satisfaction. A German critic, whose commentary on the Eclogues may be had from Teubner's, is quoted on p. 92 as desirous to complete the sense of *Ecl.* 10, 36 by adding some such line as this—

'quanta tum forem felicitate beatus.'

T. E. PAGE.

MAX BONNET ON THE LATINITY OF GREGORY OF TOURS.

Le Latin de Gregoire de Tours. Par MAX BONNET, Chargé de Cours à la Faculté des Lettres à Montpellier. Paris, Hachette, 1890. (Pp. 1-787.) 15 fr.

M. BONNET's work, the result of eight years' labour, is a great contribution to a subject which, as he says, can only be exhausted by the combined labour of a number of specialists. A great contribution it is, such as demands the grateful and respectful recognition of scholars. I shall only attempt in these pages to give some account of its contents, and to summarize its main results.

The Introduction consists of nine sections, which treat of: (1) the subject of the work, (2) the various works of Gregory, (3) the manuscripts of the *Historia Francorum*, (4) Gregory's mother-tongue, (5) the Latin spoken in France in the sixth century A.D.,

(6) Gregory's literary education, (7) his ignorance of grammar, (8) the general ignorance of the age, (9) the principles of criticism to be applied in establishing his text. The rest of the book falls into five books, each including a number of sections: I. on Phonetics, or the changes of the Latin vowels, diphthongs and consonants during the first six centuries A.D.; II. on changes in the Latin vocabulary during the same period; III. on Morphology, i.e. changes in declension and conjugation, derivation and composition; IV. on Gregory's syntax; V. on his style.

The best way to give the general reader an impression of the scope and contents of M. Bonnet's book will perhaps be to summarize the Introduction, in which are set forth the results which it is the object of the succeeding discussions to substantiate in detail.

Gregory of Tours was brought up, if the expression may be allowed, among Latin surroundings. His mother-tongue was Latin, but there is nothing to prove that he did not understand Celtic. The language of the Franks he probably did not know beyond a few words. The Latin of his childhood was what is roughly called popular Latin; but what is exactly meant by this phrase? M. Bonnet's answer to this question is one of the most important things in his whole book. There is no absolute distinction at any time between popular and literary idiom. 'Personne ne songera à nommer la langue du peuple en France, d'une part, et la langue littéraire, de l'autre, deux idiomes, comme on le fait pour le latin. Si l'on veut se faire une idée de ce qu'on appellerait avec quelque raison une langue populaire, qu'on songe au patois du midi, à la langue d'oc, en présence du français. Là on a des dialectes possédant assez de caractères communs pour être considérés à juste titre comme formant une langue distincte de celle qu'on écrit et qu'on apprend à l'école et au régiment, le français. Mais dans le nord de la France, qu'appellerait on la langue populaire? Qu'entendrait on par le français populaire? Ces mots ne signifieraient rien; aussi ne les emploie-t-on pas. Ce qui existe, ce sont d'abord des patois ou dialectes; c'est en second lieu ce que nous appelons en France l'accent, c'est-à-dire une teinte de dialecte qui se fait sentir surtout dans la manière de prononcer la langue commune; c'est enfin, et particulièrement là où les patois ont cessé d'exister, une variété infinie de modifications... de cette langue commune ou langue nationale. Il est évident que tout cela ne constitue pas une langue à côté de la langue, ni une langue dans la langue. Les patois ont tous, avec la langue régnante, des rapports assez étroits pour se reconnaître en elle sans peine, et ils représentent, non pas une seconde unité, mais la diversité, la pluralité en face de l'unité. Les influences du dialecte local sur la langue commune sont aussi nombreuses que les dialectes eux-mêmes, et infiniment variables en intensité. Enfin, prétendra-t-on qu'on puisse opposer au bon français, sous le nom de français populaire, un mélange dans lequel entreraient les parisianismes ou les provincialismes de la classe bourgeoise; les fantaisies de l'argot des collégiens, des étudiants, des militaires, des comédiens, une quantité, si grande soit-elle, de fautes de prononciation,... enfin, ces expressions et ces tournures assez nombreuses dont on se sert sans scrupule en parlant et qu'on évite en

écrivant? C'est pourtant tout cela, tout ce qui, à Rome, correspondait à cela, qu'on prétend enfermer dans cette dénomination de latin populaire; c'est à cela qu'on prête les caractères d'un véritable idiome.'

The Italians who came to France brought their Latin with them, each clan probably its own Latin, merchants, officials, legionaries, agriculturists, professors. 'Les négociants avaient leur vocabulaire, les artisans le leur, les agriculteurs de même; chacun avait aussi une prononciation et des formes de langage différentes selon le niveau de son éducation.' In the same way the French who learned Latin must have differed in rank, in occupation, and consequently in language. 'Le partage d'une nation en lettrés et en illettrés, en savans et en ignorants, est une fiction; nul n'est impeccable, et personne n'ignore l'existence d'une règle.'

It is easy also to exaggerate the degree of fixity which attaches to a written language. The literary idiom, like the spoken idiom, which it always to a certain extent represents, is liable to change. On the other hand, the spoken language has never been independent of the written; the laws of the latter are not entirely without their effect. The pronounciation of Latin, it is true, went on changing; but here again it would be wrong to draw a hard and fast line between the Latin of the educated and that of the uneducated. 'La prononciation qu'on appelle vulgaire était sans doute à peu de chose celle de tout le monde. Ce qui était vulgaire, c'était de laisser percer cette prononciation dans son orthographe.' The same considerations apply to the degeneration of Latin declension, conjugation, and syntax, as well as to the enlargement and alteration of the Latin vocabulary.

The Latin of Gregory's written works, though falling far short of classical purity, is less affected by barbarisms than other writings of the same epoch. It reflects a conflict between the natural incorrectness of his everyday conversation, and the ambition of the imperfectly educated man. For (as he himself assures us) he was ignorant of grammar, and, though conversant with the Bible in a pre-Vulgate version, and with much Christian literature, his classical reading seems hardly to have gone beyond some Vergil and a little Sallust. In all this he is only a child of his age: an age in which the tradition of liberal culture had almost died out.

While the manuscripts of Gregory's minor works (to the previous accounts of which M. Bonnet adds something) are comparatively

late, and leave the text in consequence somewhat uncertain, those of the *Historia Francorum* represent, in large part, a copy written as early as the seventh century, and therefore nearly contemporaneous with the historian himself. The untutored Latin of Gregory was often corrected by the copyists of the Carolingian era, but a modern editor will endeavour where possible to restore the truer, though less grammatical, text.

Such are the general theories upon which M. Bonnet bases his great study of Gregory's Latinity. It would be impossible within these limits to follow him through the details of his analysis. But it may perhaps be worth while to remark that the incorrect uses of prepositions with cases (e.g. *cum* with the accusative), though it had begun very early, as the Pompeian inscriptions testify, is not one of Gregory's weaknesses. The form *eclesia* for *ecclesia* (Bonnet p. 157), which he often uses, is found on an inscrip-

tion of Vienne of the date A.D. 557 (*C.I.L.* 12, 2085) and on one of Aix (*C.I.L.* 12, 5787); in Africa too it is not uncommon. Other omissions of consonants (as e.g. in *operiens*, *oportunus*) may be paralleled by *ofensa* (Narbo, *C.I.L.* 12, 4975) and *oficio* (Vienne, *ib.* 2169). The substitution of the fourth for the third conjugation in *innectire*, *suggestire* etc. (Bonnet p. 431) may be illustrated by *gemire* in a French inscription of the end of the fifth century (Orange, *C.I.L.* 12, 1272) and another at Vienne of the year 579 (*ib.* 2094). The confusion between *quem* and *quod* (p. 509) may be illustrated from an Aix inscription of the third century (*C.I.L.* 12, 2461). But the accusative absolute, to which Gregory and other writers of his epoch have no objection (p. 561), is not found in any of the French inscriptions edited in the twelfth volume of the *Corpus*. It appears, however, in Africa as early as the age of Diocletian (*C.I.L.* 8, 4551, 8924).

H. NETTLESHIP.

TAYLOR'S WITNESS OF HERMAS TO THE FOUR GOSPELS.

The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels.

By C. TAYLOR, D.D., Master of St John's College, Cambridge. London: C. J. Clay & Sons, Ave Maria Lane. 1892. 4to, pp. viii. 148. 7s. 6d. net.

It is generally thought that the *Shepherd* of Hermas is of little or no value for the history of the Canon. The nature of the work indeed does not lead us to expect any very distinct references, much less quotations. It is, says Bp. Lightfoot, 'equally devoid of citations from the Old Testament and the New.' Nevertheless Dr. Taylor has been led to think that its testimony to the Gospels is strong and convincing, and that it says in effect that the number of the Gospels was actually and necessarily four, as Irenaeus said after it. Dr. Taylor was led to his inquiry by his examination of the *Shepherd* undertaken for a different purpose, namely to ascertain the relation between it and the *Didaché* and to decide which borrowed from the other. The result of that examination was that Hermas not only used but used up the *Teaching*, so that anything very striking in the latter was sure to be found in some disguise or other in the former. A point of great importance resulted from this investigation, namely 'the discovery of

his [Hermas'] way of using his authorities. He allegorizes, he disintegrates, he amalgamates, he plays upon the sense or varies the form of a saying, he repeats the words in fresh combinations or replaces them by synonyms, but he will not cite a passage simply and in its entirety.' Now finding in the *Teaching* reference to 'the Gospel of our Lord' Dr. Taylor naturally asked: Is there any disguised trace of the word 'Gospel' in Hermas? The answer was found in the words *ἀγγελία ἀγαθή* in *Vis.* iii. 13, 2. The words are found in connexion with the third vision of the lady who represents the Church. In the first vision she appears as an aged woman representing the Church under the old dispensation. In the third she is young and joyous. The reason of this is given in the interpretation. When to one in sorrow there comes *good tidings*, *ἀγγελία ἀγαθή*, he forgetteth his former sorrow. Now as the thing represented is the Church under the Gospel, it seems clear that these words are used as a synonym for *εὐαγγέλιον*. Then follows the statement: 'Whereas thou sawest her seated on a bench (*συμφέλλιον*, = *subsellium*) the position is a firm one, for the bench has four feet and stands firmly; for the world likewise is compacted of four elements.' The reasoning seems so inept that it would