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](#)

A French Edition of the *Mosella* of Ausonius *La Moselle d'Ausone*. Édition critique et Traduction française, précédées d'une Introduction, suivies d'un Commentaire explicatif, et ornées d'une carte de la Moselle et de fac-similés d'éditions anciennes, par H. de La Ville de Mirmont, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux. Bordeaux, 1889. Gr. Gounouilhou, pp. cclxxv + 141. 4to. 10 frcs.

J. E. Sandys

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 10 / December 1893, pp 456 - 458

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199068, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199068

How to cite this article:

J. E. Sandys (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 456-458 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199068

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

τῶν—with V and B:—42, 7 ὁ τετραχόρδων, 42, 22 om. εἶσιν (probably also the first hand in M), 54, 9 om. ἐκ, 54, 16 συνεστηκότα—with V, B and the first hand in M:—40, 13 δειρημένην, 42, 5—7 om. ὅταν—δύο, 44, 9 ταῦτα παρά, 44, 20 om. ὅτι, 45, 17 τῶν, 45, 18 ἐμμελεῖς, 45, 26 ἐναλλάξει, 46, 11 διάτονα, 46, 23 ἐκμελής, 46, 33 om. δ', 47, 21 om. τό, 48, 26 διατόνου, 49, 10 om. ἐπὶ—μόνον, 49, 11 διάτονον, 49, 14 οὐδέ, 49, 22 δέξυ, 50, 11 om. καί, 51, 11 συναμφότεροι, 51, 24 om. τό, 51, 25 om. ὁ δ', 52, 5 om. δέ, 53, 27 ἀσύνθετον, 54, 3 ἡμιτόνιον, 54, 14 μέρους, 55, 12 καὶ μεγέθει, 59, 32 γίνεται, 60, 1 om. διά, 64, 2 τοιοῦτο. To these must be added the forty-seven passages mentioned above and collected in Westphal's Prolegomena, Section III., where the reading of S is wrongly given, and in reality falls under one of the above heads. It will thus be seen that the carelessness of the original collator has completely obscured the true relation of S to the other MSS. Some difficulty occurs with regard to the form in which S shows acquaintance with the text of V. We might have supposed from the fact that with the first hand in V it omits διαστημάτων 22, 19, τῶν 46, 7, and ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ τόνου μία 49, 32—all of which lacunae are filled by the corrector of V—and from the fact that with V before correction it reads ἀφικνουμένη 13, 26, ἐλαττοῦσι 22, 10, ἀσυνθέτον and συγκειμένου 55, 12, 16—though these errors are corrected by the second hand—and also agrees with the first as against the second hand in V in one or two minor readings, that the MS. had been copied from V before the corrector had made the above-mentioned alterations: but this possibility is precluded by the fact that it incorporates *e.g.* the

readings of Vb ἐπεχείρει 4, 4, προστυγχάνει 18, 33, βαρύτονον 39, 30, τάξιν καὶ γάρ 66, 19, besides some others of less importance, and fills up from Vb lacunae in 26, 8, 45, 16, 51, 28, 54, 23, besides inserting το βαρύτερον in its text from the margin of V in 44, 17. In the absence of further information as to the work of the various hands in V the question must be left undecided.

It remains to note that Westphal in a short preface withdraws his former statements as to the instrumental accompaniment in Greek music, and the so-called 'Terzentonarten' (= συντονολυδιστί and μιξολυδιστί).

The editor laments on p. 10 the number of addenda and corrigenda rendered necessary by careless printing: his list is however very incomplete. A serious fault in the Greek text is the failure of the so-called 'fragments' of the rhythmic to correspond accurately with the sections of the translation in Vol. I., beginning at § 55.

H. STUART JONES.

[Since the above was written, the French excavations at Delphi have brought to light the text of a Paean to Apollo with the musical score. It may be hoped that the discoverers will see their way to issuing an early publication of this monument, from which results of the highest importance may be expected. The so-called 'Musical Papyrus of Euripides' recently edited by M. Wessely (see *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, v. 65-74, and an article in the *Revue des Études Grecques*, 1892) is disappointing in its results. It contains only a few lines of the *Orestes* in a very fragmentary state.]

A FRENCH EDITION OF THE *MOSELLA* OF AUSONIUS.

La Moselle d'Ausone. Édition critique et Traduction française, précédées d'une Introduction, suivies d'un Commentaire explicatif, et ornées d'une carte de la Moselle et de fac-similés d'éditions anciennes, par H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux. Bordeaux, 1889. G. Gounouilhou, pp. cclxxv + 141. 4to. 10 frcs.

AN apology is due to the editor of this handsome volume for the long delay that

has accidentally elapsed between the date of its publication and the appearance of the present notice. The edition was completed in the space of thirteen months (March 1888—May 1889), and the editor has since found time to produce a translation of Apollonius Rhodius which was noticed last year in the *Classical Review* (vi 392).

The text of Ausonius, after having been long neglected, has of late years had ample justice done it by the publication of two critical editions, that of C. Schenkl in the

Monumenta Germaniae Historica (1883), and that of R. Peiper in the Teubner series (1886). The French edition of the *Mosella* is fortunate in appearing after the completion of the labours of the German scholars above-mentioned. In the absence of any first-hand knowledge of the MSS, the editor has on these points to rely entirely on the evidence collected by Schenkl and Peiper, and by Böcking, the author of the first critical edition of the *Mosella* (1845).

His own *forte* lies in an exhaustive acquaintance with the printed editions of his author. These are enumerated and described with the minutest care, and their textual variations registered with the most punctilious precision. We are even presented with exact reproductions of the title-pages of the sixteenth century editions of Avantius, Ascensius, Kerver and Vinet but we would gladly have welcomed in place of all these a *facsimile* of a single page from the best MS of the *Mosella*, that of the tenth century in the Library at Saint-Gall.

The *Introduction*, which extends over 275 pages, is mainly confined to textual and bibliographical matters. It is in fact a history of the printed text of the *Mosella*; while, for all discussion of the various points of literary interest raised by the poem, the editor refers to a Latin thesis which unfortunately is not included in the present volume.

The topography of the poem is happily elucidated by means of an excellent map, for which we are indebted to the editor's colleague, M. Jullian. All the ten tributaries of the Mosella mentioned by Ausonius are clearly marked; one alone being misprinted, *Erubis* for *Erubris*. Almost the only places on the stream to which the poet actually refers are apparently those now known as Trier, Neumagen and Berncastel; in fact, it seems probable that, in travelling to Trier from Bingen, where he left the Rhine and the Nahe, the only part of the Mosel which he visited was that between Berncastel and Trier. Böcking, who is best known as the editor of the *Notitia Dignitatum* and has been already mentioned as the first critical editor of the *Mosella*, was born further down the stream, at Trarbach. His interest in his native river lends a peculiar vividness to his notes on the varieties of fish which, according to the poet, were to be found in its waters. As a youth, Böcking had seen the sturgeon (the *silurus* of Ausonius) captured in the Mosel, and had also witnessed the water-frolics of

the fishermen, which are the modern counterpart of the scenes described as 'dulces... pompas,'

'remipedes medio certant cum flumine
lembi' (200 ff.).

The French editor is no less susceptible to the influence of the *genius loci*, not however in connexion with the poet's theme but with the poet's birth-place on the Garonne. When the vines of the Mosel remind Ausonius of those of his native stream,

'sic mea flaventem pingunt vineta Garum
nam' (160);

his latest editor, writing at Bordeaux, observes:

notre vin de Bordeaux devait avoir au iv^e siècle la réputation qu'il n'a retrouvée en France qu'au milieu du xviii^e siècle, alors que le maréchal de Richelieu, gouverneur de Guyenne, le mit à la mode. Mais Ausone est le premier à faire l'éloge des crus du Bordelais.

The last sentence of his commentary runs as follows:—

Malgré ses promesses, Ausone ne consacrera plus d'œuvres à Trèves et à son fleuve; mais une des dernières préoccupations de sa vieillesse sera de chanter Bordeaux et son fleuve bouillonnant qui imite le flux et le reflux de la mer.

And elsewhere he thanks his printer and publisher,

pour donner à ce livre cette irréprochable élégance qui aurait ravi le bon Bordelais Ausone.

The main strength of the *Commentary*, which extends to nearly one hundred pages, lies in the notes on the subject-matter, especially on points topographical, historical or piscatorial. Thus, in the notes on ll. 88, 130, we learn that the name given by Linnaeus to the common trout, *salmo fario*, arose from a mistake in the Juntine edition of Ausonius, which has *fario* instead of *sario*; also that *sario* is really the salmon-trout, the Latin name for the common trout (in l. 88) being *salar*. Occasionally a little more research would have made the commentary still more satisfactory. In the note on ll. 308—310,

'vel in arce Minervae
Ictinus, magico cui noctua perlita fuco
allicit omne genus volucres, perimitque
tuendo,'

the editor says: 'Scaliger et Vinet font observer que l'on ne trouve dans les auteurs anciens aucune mention de cette chouette magique'; but this 'magic owl,' which

seems to have formed part of one of the statues of Athena on the Acropolis, appears to be obscurely referred to by Dio Chrysostom (*Orat.* 12, 6), and by Hesychius *s.v.* Πλαῦξ ἐν πόλει. Both of these passages may be found in Overbeck's *Schriftquellen*, nos. 677—8, with references to the modern literature of the subject under no. 679. Elsewhere, the editor quotes Ampère's criticism on the poet's beautiful description of the vines on the banks as seen reflected by the evening light in the quiet waters of the river:—

‘quis color ille vadis, seras cum propulit
umbras
Hesperus, et viridi perfundit monte Mosel-
lam!
tota natant crispis iuga motibus, et *tremuit*
absens
pampinus, et vitreis vindemia turget in
undis’ (192—5).

The criticism ends with the words:—‘ce sont des vers manières mais charmants.’ It may be interesting to add that the words printed in italics used to be specially admired by the late Poet Laureate.

Below the text we have a translation in French prose, which appears to be generally clear and accurate. In l. 65, however, the manuscript reading *usque*, which is deliberately retained in preference to *utque*, remains untranslated; and in ll. 50—53 it is difficult in the words italicised to reconcile the rendering with the text:—

‘ast ego, despectis quae census opesque
dederunt,
naturae mirabor opus, *non cura nepotum*
laetaque iacturis ubi luxuriatur egestas.’

‘Quant à moi, dédaigneux des splendeurs qu’ont procurées la fortune et les richesses, j’admirerai l’œuvre de la nature et *non pas ce luxe chère des dissipateurs*, ces excès fous d’une indigence qui se réjouit de sa ruine.’

Under the translation we find, in double columns, various readings from the MSS on the pages to the left, and emendations proposed by critics on those to the right. These are very fully recorded; but, although the edition was prepared in 1888—9, the editor does not appear to have seen the criticisms on Schenkl's text contributed by Mr. Robinson Ellis to *Hermathena* in 1886,—the first article in vol. vi. He would there have found further support for his own view that in l. 257 *fractis...flagellis* should not be altered into *tractis*. He would also have probably welcomed the correction of l. 316:—

‘spirat enim tecti testudine †chorus achates’

where Mr. Ellis proposes *chlorus achates* (the green agate). The French editor, quoting Pliny's statement respecting the *lapis magnes*,—‘compertum tanto meliores esse quanto sint magis caerulei,’ himself proposes *caerulea cautes*, which can hardly be accepted, unless we are prepared to agree in the editor's view that *cautes* and *lapis* are synonymous. A pointed crag and a stone are scarcely convertible terms.

It is a matter of regret that an edition planned on so extensive a scale should still be incomplete. In the commentary the illustration of the language of the poem takes a subordinate place. For all this we are referred to the Latin thesis above-mentioned, which apparently includes quotations of parallel passages from earlier and later Latin poets. Similar quotations have already been collected in Peiper's edition, where, however, one obvious parallel is omitted. ‘Nec laudem affecto, veniam peto’ (l. 445) is clearly an echo of the passage in Ovid's *Tristia* i 6, 31:—

‘et veniam pro laude peto, laudatus abunde
non fastiditus si tibi, lector, ero.’

J. E. SANDYS.

THE AKHMÎM FRAGMENTS.¹

I.

THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

It is now nearly a year since the first publication of the apocryphal treatises discovered at Akhmîm. Editions or accounts

¹ Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire sous la direction de M. U. BOURIANT. Tome Neuvième.

1^{er} Fascicule, pp. 93—147. *Fragments du*

of them have appeared by almost all the well-known theologians who are concerned with these matters, and it is a suitable occasion to review the discussion so far as it has proceeded.

The first point of importance to notice is

Texte Grec du Livre d'Énoch et de quelques Écrits attribués à Saint Pierre. Éd. BOURIANT. [Editio Princeps.] Paris. 1892.

3^e Fascicule. *Reproductions en Héliogra-*