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](#)

Gudeman's Latin Literature of the Empire, Vol. II *Latin Literature of the Empire*. Selected and edited, with revised texts and with brief introductions by Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania. Vol. II. Poetry. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers.) Pp. x, 494. Price \$1. 80.

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 05 / June 1900, pp 268 - 270

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082779, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082779

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 268-270 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082779

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

A good instance of a bold and useful map is No 11 dealing with the empire and career of Alexander the Great. It is, however, desirable to remember that the actual empire of Alexander existed only for a moment. On the other hand the kingdoms of the Successors, after the wars of settlement, did attain considerable permanence, and were important factors in Roman policy for 150 years. Rightly therefore does Freeman in his *Historical Geography* give a map [vi] of the four great kingdoms about 300 B.C., and call particular attention to them in maps iv, viii. But Dr. Rothert, I regret to say, gives no map of the great Successor-kingdoms in their prime. And, when he comes (No 19) to 'die Unterdrückung der Diadochenreiche,' his maps merely illustrate the campaigns in several important wars. Egypt and the Syrian part of the Seleukid realm do not come in at all. And the maps of the Mithridatic wars do not help matters.

It seems a pity too that the last map of the Roman Empire is merely devoted to

showing its extent in 117 A.D. Of the various administrative subdivisions, of the tendency of East and West to part company, of the gradual falling-away of the provinces, of the short-lived recovery of some of them under Justinian, there is no recognition whatever.

In short, while this book is a most elegant and attractive companion in the reading of the ancient writers (or some of them), it is not possible to regard it as seriously concerned with history as history. And it is not only fair but necessary to say this, for the volume is only the first of a series reaching down to modern times. Dr. Rothert has laid us under an obligation by the production of so well-executed a collection of maps. I only wish that he would modify his selection of subjects in a more strictly historical spirit and thus increase the utility of what is undoubtedly an excellent design.

W. E. HEITLAND.

GUDEMAN'S *LATIN LITERATURE OF THE EMPIRE*, VOL. II.

Latin Literature of the Empire. Selected and edited, with revised texts and with brief introductions by ALFRED GUDEMAN, University of Pennsylvania. Vol. II. Poetry. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers.) Pp. x, 494. Price \$1. 80.

THIS is a companion volume to the Prose selection reviewed in the *Classical Review* of last year, and follows the same plan. A brief account of the contents may be of interest.

The *Pseudo-Virgilian* poems come first: the *Culex*, *Copa*, *Moretum*, and *Lydia* are given in full, and there are four extracts (about one-third of the work) from the *Aetna*, including the introduction and the episode of the *Pii Fratres*. Of *Manilius* over 1,100 lines are printed; the selections include the introductions to the first four books, the description of the milky way and the comets, and the myth of *Perseus* and *Andromeda*. *Phaedrus* is represented by about a third of his works. *Seneca* is well represented—especially his *Agamemnon*, of which 500 continuous lines are given. The next longest selection is one of about 300 lines from the *Troades*. Several of the

well-known choruses are given (e.g. the 'ultima Thule' passage from the *Medea*, and the one on the power of love from the *Phaedra*). In all there are about 1,400 lines. The *Octavia* is given entire, but later, as post-Senecan. *Persius'* prologue, with the first and fifth satires follow. From *Lucan* we have about one-seventh of the *Pharsalia*. The selections given are: the introduction (l. 1-182), the conference between *Brutus* and *Cato*, the mutiny of *Caesar's* troops, the first 300 lines of the 7th book, and *Pompey's* murder, with the lament of *Cornelia*, and *Cato's* eulogy of his fallen leader. Next come the third and sixth eclogues of *Calpurnius*, with which is the fourth of *Nemesianus*, and the *Octavia*, as explained above. About an eighth of the work of *Silius* is given, including almost the whole of book 3 (except the catalogue), the episode before *Cannae* in which a son kills his father, the eulogy of *Ennius* in the 12th book, and the first 150 of the 15th. From *Valerius* we have the parting scene and council of the gods from the 1st book, the *Hesione* episode from the 2nd, the *Medea*-scenes from the 6th and the first 520 lines of the 7th. This is about a sixth of the whole work. *Statius* is represented by

5 siluae (the psittacus, Lucani genethliacon, and prayer for sleep among them), 180 lines of the Thebais (Parthenopaeus' parting from his mother, and the grove of sleep) and all but the last 150 of the Achilleis. Of *Martial* about 850 lines are given, books one and ten having the lion's share. Of the apophoreta only those of literary interest are cited. Of *Juvenal* we have all but 40 lines of sat. 1 and the whole of satires 3, 7, 10 and 14. The *Pervigilium Veneris* is printed next. The *Ausonius* selections are: the introduction of himself to his readers, the first part of the ephemeris, the stenographer, the poems on the deaths of his father and his wife, the Minervius poem, the protrepticon to his grandson, and the Mosella in full—in all, a little over 800 lines. From *Claudian* we have three of the shorter poems, the beginning of I. in Rufinum, the preface to III. de consulatu Stilichonis, the gigantomachia and the whole of the de raptu Proserpinae—nearly 1,500 lines.

Different editors would no doubt make different selections, but there is very little that one would wish changed in the one before us. As the editor felt bound to include *Juvenal*, it seems a pity that he gave none of the sixth satire a place here. But surely it would have been better to consult practical utility rather than academic completeness and exclude both *Juvenal* and *Martial*. The latter has been 'selected' often enough. There is too much of *Valerius*' seventh book: at least, what has been printed seems to have made it impossible to give the description of Jason's fulfilment of Aeetes' demands, and the account of the actual winning of the fleece in the next book. And *Statius*' *Thebais* hardly gets its rights. The fact is, too much space is occupied by the 'perpetui nunquam moritura uolumina Sili,' who does not deserve, in a book of this kind, the respect he must receive in a *Corpus*.

I would fain believe that a mere selection of this kind will have a very stimulating effect upon those who have not hitherto read these later Latin authors, but I find it hard to do so. What seems to me a real desideratum is an edition with explanatory notes, and these brief. At present, generally speaking, the editions to be used are plain texts or voluminous modern or sixteenth and seventeenth century editions. Even *Langen's Valerius* is greatly spoiled by long lexicographical notes (quite useless to those who, not having yet read that author, wish to amend their ways) and ex-

planations of points that an intelligent reader can easily settle for himself. Whether Professor Gudeman intends to add a volume of explanatory notes I do not know, but there is no hint of it in the preface. Indeed he has not taken such pains with this volume as lead one to expect it. The apparatus criticus seems to me too brief: yet it is certainly not reliable. It purports to give 'the more important deviations' from the 'basic texts,' the reading adopted by Professor Gudeman standing first, in a bracket, and the letter ω being added in case of its being supported by the reading 'unius codicis uel plurimorum.' I have tested it in reference to four authors, in whom I take special interest, with these results. For *Persius* only three variants are recorded, two of them of no more importance than the variation of 'tu' for 'tum' and 'et' for 'ast.' Much more important are 1. 57 where 'protenso' is read, whilst *Jahn-Buecheler* 1893, the basic text, has 'propenso,' 5. 59 'fregerit' (*J.-B.* 'fecerit'), 176 'ducit' (*J.-B.* 'tollit'), of all which the apparatus says nothing. One of the notes is actually wrong: 'tu ω] tun' should mean that *J.-B.* reads 'tun' in 5. 146, which is not the case, as it has 'tu.' The same kind of mistake occurs on *Lucan*, 7. 130. The note is 'mortis ω] et mors.' But the basic text (*Hosius*) has the same reading as Professor Gudeman. Again, on 179 of the same book, we have: 'ululare patres et sanguinis ω] patres et cunctas.' To say nothing of the way in which *Hosius*' reading is stated (as if, where our editor has 'ululare,' *Hosius* had nothing), the addition of ω is wrong here. No MS. reads 'ululare,' a correction of *Oudendorp's*, in 179, though in 180 *MVU* have it, and Professor Gudeman seems to have confused the two facts. In this last line (180) Professor *Postgate's* correction 'dementibus' is accepted, but wrongly printed as two words. Much the same has happened in regard to *Valerius* 7. 230. Here Professor Gudeman cites my suggestion 'cluseris,' as though it were his adopted reading, before the basic 'cluserit.' As he does not cite the rest of my conjecture, and 'cluseris' is nonsense without a further change (as Mr. Bury has seen) I turned with curiosity to the text, where I found, after all, the basic text holding its own! Ten lines below is this line:

i precor atque uanum pro me dimitte timorem

where *Heinsius*' 'uanum' has been adopted

instead of the basic 'illum' without the necessary correction of 'atque'! For the copious selections from Silius only three variants are given, though the Teubner text admits of a good deal of 'revision.' As an actual fact in two places which Professor Gudeman has left unaltered, Bauer has himself recanted in his preface to the second volume. But apart from this, 9. 145-6 is surely sheer nonsense as it stands, and I cannot believe that both 'alta' and 'altae' should stand in 10. 530.

The brief introductions give all that is necessary, but might have been made a little more interesting. For example, in that to Silius, reference might easily be made to p. 350 where stands one of Martial's epigrams, addressed to that poet. In the summary of the contents to the *Punica*, it is not enough to say that the main theme of book 13 is the fall of Capua. This will not help the reader who finds the only extract from the book entitled 'The Sibyl's

Prophecy.' The fact is, more than half the book describes Scipio's interview with the shades—an episode the more interesting as Silius here follows Homer rather than Virgil. It is strange to find a passage from Valerius' second book labelled 'Arrival of the heroes at Colchos': it is in reality the Hesione episode at Troy. Another, from book 6, is headed 'Medea's first view of Jason.' Anyone familiar with Val. knows that he differs from Apollonius in making Medea meet Jason on his way up from the ship—in book 5.

Most of these slips are of no very great importance, but one is a little surprised to find them in a work which cannot after all have made great demands upon the editor's time and trouble. I can only hope that Professor Gudeman will make his book really serviceable by publishing a third volume containing brief explanatory notes to his selections.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura libri sex ed. A. Brieger. Ed. stereotypa emendatio. Teubner. 1899. Pp. 84, 230. M. 2.10. This amended edition shows considerable improvement upon that of 1894. The book is enlarged by an appendix of 23 pages, from which we regret to learn that the slips and misprints which disfigured the previous edition were in great part due to an illness of the editor. We do not know what limits Messrs. Teubner set to revision; but we are sorry to see that the triple numeration of lines and the unmetrical alterations *furentibus auris* (5. 410) and *speciessque ponenda* (6. 83) still survive. On the latter passage it is fair to add that in point of sense Brieger's reading is right, and that Giussani, who defends the manuscript reading against him, neither in his commentary nor in his review of this edition, *Rivista di Filologia* (1900, p. 209), betrays the slightest consciousness of the fatal flaw in the emendation. The appendix does full or nearly full justice (Mr. Housman's article in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxv. appears to have been overlooked) to the more recent contributions to Lucretian criticism.

In it, references to Giussani's Italian commentary figure largely as we should expect. I may here be allowed to touch upon one place

where the two scholars are at issue about an emendation of my own. At 4. 193 sq. I proposed (*Journal of Philology*, xxiv. p. 139) 'primum quod paruola causa | sat procul a tergo quae prouehat atque propellat, | quod superest ubi tam uolucris leuitate ferantur' with the sense that 'the *idola* which bodies give off can pass over vast spaces in a marvellously short time *since* (= ubi) they are so light that the smallest impulse (*i.e.* whatever it is that causes them to be detached from the bodies that give them off) is enough to send them flying great distances through space.' I fail then to see why Giussani complains in his note that I give no reason why a small cause suffices to impart a very great velocity while in the *Rivista* (p. 178) his words imply that I take *sat* with *procul*. The criticisms of another distinguished exponent of ancient philosophy, the veteran Professor of Greifswald, F. Susemihl, have also left their mark on the new edition. Susemihl had complained in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, (Aug. 5, 1895), that the emendations cited were not consistently assigned to their first authors. Now, says the editor, 'non paucis locis emendatorum antiquiorum nomina infra afferam et praeterea non raro egregias Lachmanni coniecturas, quas olim