

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](#)



Holden's Life of Timoleon *Plutarch's Life of Timoleon*, with introduction, Notes, maps, and lexicon by the Rev. H. A. Holden. University press, Cambridge, 1889. Pp. lxxxv. and 274. 6s.

Joseph B. Mayor

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 1-2 / February 1890, pp 22 - 26
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189413, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189413

How to cite this article:

Joseph B. Mayor (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 22-26 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189413

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ously dated but never, I believe, assigned to 451 B.C., the year before Kimon's last great expedition to the East. It is very startling to be told that 'from Aegina the first Greek commercial centre in Egypt, Naukratis, was established,' and not less startling to find Megakles, the bridegroom of Agariste of Sikyon, represented as grandson of Megakles the opponent of Peisistratos, pp. 235, 236. Mr. Shuckburgh is not a safe guide in regard to the Alkmaeonidae; he apparently thinks that Xanthippos by descent belonged to that family (p. xxxvi.). The notes on Athenian constitutional matters leave something to be desired. Olneis, p. 187, is only a misprint, but the remarks on the Kleisthenic reforms and on the position of Strategi and Archons are not adequate or correct; and the notes on the date of the Plataean alliance, p. 167, are unsatisfactory. The first note seems to incline to the conventional date 519 B.C. and does not fairly state Grote's argument for 509 B.C. or thereabouts: the second note treats the conventional date as doubtful and gives practically Grote's argument against it. To describe the Spartan kingships as a 'double monarchy' is obviously inexact, and courts of 'international arbitration' is an overstatement for the institutions of Artaphernes in Ionia. That the Ionian Amphiktyony was religious and had 'nothing in common with a political league' (p. xiii.) is an aberration, which the note on p. 89 partially corrects. The antithesis is, however, not strictly applicable. 'Der Schwerpunkt des Alterthums ruhte in dem Gedanken dass politische und religiöse

Interessen zusammenfielen.' This statement of Nissen's is only unsatisfactory inasmuch as it takes the conscious antithesis of 'politics' and 'religion' for granted in antiquity.

We shall never perhaps get in English a satisfactory method of transliterating Greek proper names. Scholars at present have abandoned the old Latin equivalents and forms without venturing to the exact reproduction of the Greek originals in English letters. The result is an extraordinary and mongrel nomenclature. All perhaps that can be expected of individuals is that they should be consistent in regard to each particular name. Mr. Shuckburgh should make up his mind between Skythians and Scythians, Cambyses and Kambyases, Darius and Darios (Dareios?), Aristides and Aristeides, and so on. Further, if he writes 'Herodotos' he ought not to write 'Olorus.' 'Histiaios' and 'Hekataeos,' 'Odeium' and 'Olympeion' belong to different systems of transliteration: 'Ajax' and 'Pollux' come in strangely among the Greek forms generally adopted. In regard to translations, there is not much to find fault with, but *ὑποθερμοτέρον* is not well rendered by 'somewhat bitter' nor *ἐξέωγκωτο*, *ἐξωγκωμένοι* by 'puffed out (up).'

It was superfluous to duplicate the note on *λέγειν*, p. 176. Deliune, p. 43, and Mytileneas, p. 239, are obvious misprints; but on the whole, considering the great number of different types employed and of references given, the accuracy of the printing is highly to be commended.

R. W. M.

HOLDEN'S LIFE OF TIMOLEON.

Plutarch's Life of Timoleon, with Introduction, Notes, Maps, and Lexicon by the Rev. H. A. HOLDEN. University Press, Cambridge, 1889. Pp. lxxxv. and 274. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN has already edited the lives of Themistokles, Nikias, the Gracchi, and Sulla, in a manner which has received high commendation in America, France, and Germany, as well as in England. The companion volume which has just been issued has all the merits of its predecessors, exhibiting sound scholarship, sobriety of judgment and the most unwearied industry. The original authorities are throughout carefully compared and no

later contributions to his subject seem to have been overlooked. The thoroughness and completeness of the work will be seen from a mere statement of its contents. After a pleasantly written preface, in which high praise is bestowed upon Mr. James Rhoades's *Timoleon*, there follows (1) the introduction of fifty pages on the primary and secondary sources of information which were accessible to Plutarch for his biography, and the proof, based mainly on a careful comparison with the language and matter of Diodorus, that the chief authority used by the former was Timaeus; (2) a chronological table of Sicilian affairs from B.C. 740 to 337; (3) the text (pp. 1—47); (4) explanatory notes

(pp. 51—151); (5) critical appendix (pp. 155—179), containing (a) an account of MSS.; (b) a very full bibliography, and (c) various readings; (6) indices (pp. 182—274), (a) of matters, (b) of authors cited by Plutarch, (c) of grammatical constructions, followed by a list of unusual words &c. which occur in the biography, and (d) a complete lexical index, in which five different marks are employed to distinguish words of special interest.

Having stated the general character of the work, I shall endeavour, as far as I can, to fulfil the second duty of a reviewer, when he comes across a really good book, and that is to add any suggestions which may be of use in view of a second edition.

The first point I would note is as to the arrangement: would it not be more convenient to give at any rate the various readings under the text? It is a nuisance to have to refer backwards and forwards from text to notes and again from notes to readings and occasionally to index. Under the head of misprints I have noted the following: p. lvii. n. 99 for *ὑπερπῆνεσε* read *ὑπερπῆνεσε*; p. 72, l. 5 for *s.v. μή* read *s.v. οὐ*; p. 76 in note on *ἀνατείνειν* read *ἐπανάτασις* and *-σεις* for *ἐπανάστασις* and *-σεις*; p. 219 add reference under *δυνάστης*; 274, l. 6 for *ατε* read *ἄτε*. With these may be reckoned the slip in p. 59, note on iii. 11 *μήτε προσιόντα τοῖς κοινοῖς ἔτι* 'although he had not yet taken part in public business,' which of course should be 'though he was no longer taking part &c.,' referring to his retirement from public life after his brother's death. Here also may be mentioned the occasional inconsistencies between the explanatory and critical notes, or between the notes and index. Examples may be found on p. 83, where the preference seems to be given to Amyot's rendering of *ὀψόπωλον*, 'vivandière,' but in the index the right rendering is given without alternative: xxvii. 1, 3 *τὸ μὲν ἔρος...πρὸς τὰς τροπὰς συνῆπτε τὸν καιρὸν* is rightly translated in the index *conectebat*, but the only note on the passage is a reference to xxv. 4, where it is quoted as an instance of the meaning *accedere*: xxvii. 6 *παρεγγυόντων ἄγειν* is translated in the note 'urging him to lead them on without delay,' but in the index more correctly 'to pass the word (of command) along the line': viii. 3 in the text *μέν* is inserted with Sintenis², but in crit. not. p. 170 good reason is given for its omission.

Dr. Holden tells us that 'the latest recension of Sintenis forms the basis of his text,' but that he has himself exercised an indepen-

dent judgment, availing himself both of Sintenis's collation and also of that of an Italian MS. (M^c). published by C. T. Michaelis. I think he is perhaps inclined to err in the same direction as Sintenis by being too 'sparing in the introduction of good conjectural emendations.' Thus in iv. 3 Blass' *βαρέως δὲ φέρων* seems required instead of *δέ*, the sentence, though long, not being so complicated as to make Plutarch oblivious of its construction. In v. 15 the MS. reading *φωνὰς τε δεινὰς καὶ κατὰρας ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρᾶσθαι* seems to need such an insertion as the *προέσθαι* of Blass. In ix. 1 Dr. Holden keeps *σπεύδοντες ὥς τὸ πέλαγος διαπλέοντες ἐκομίζοντο παρὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν*, which he explains in the note 'making haste, as they were crossing the open sea,' but the synchronistic tenses seem to imply a contradiction. How can they be coasting along at the same time that they are crossing the open sea? In the critical note Dr. Holden mentions the suggestion *διαπλεύσαντες* (I suppose with the omission of *ὥς*), and himself suggests 'si quid mutandum, ὥς διέπλευσαν, ut sensus sit *postquam celeri cursu sunt emensi pelagus*.' Either reading would do, but *σπεύδοντες* must be taken, I think, with *ἐκομίζοντο*. ix. 34 (the Corinthians thought it impossible to overcome the Carthaginians and the force under Hiketas) *ἢ στρατηγῆσιν ἤκοιεν* 'which they were come to take the lead of.' But can the plural be used of all the Corinthians (*πᾶσι* just above)? Is not Madvig's emendation *συστρατεύσοντας* necessary? xvi. 28 (the assassins employed by Hiketas who mingled with the crowd surrounding Timoleon) *ἐγγυτέρω κατὰ μικρὸν ἐπεχείρουν*. Dr. Holden translates this '*propius accedebant ad rem aggrediendam*,' but I do not see how the Greek will bear it. Surely we must read with Madvig *ἐπεχώρουν*. xxxvi. l. 32 *ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἱερὸν ἰδρυσάμενος Αὐτοματίας ἔθενε, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν οἰκίαν ἱερῷ δαίμονι καθιέρωσεν*. No editor seems to have found any difficulty in the phrase *ἱερῷ δαίμονι*, but the epithet is very much out of place: Dr. Holden would hardly translate 'the Holy God' with Grote. Plutarch referring to the same circumstance (*Mor.* p. 542 E, quoted here by Dr. Holden), says that he dedicated his house, not *ἱερῷ*, but *Ἀγαθῷ, Δαίμονι*, and surely that is what we should read here: *ἱερῷ* has slipped in by mistake from the line above. Dr. Holden has a very attractive emendation on the difficult passage: xxx. 44 *τῆς δίκης αὐτοῖς ἀπολογουμένης τῇ Τιμολέοντος εὐτυχίᾳ ἐπιτιθεμένης*, for which he gives *ἀπολεγομένης τὴν Τιμολέοντος εὐτυχίαν* and translates, 'punishment being laid upon them when they renounced T.'s success.'

This would do admirably if spoken of the deserters who suffered at the hands of the Brettians the penalty due for their sacrilegious plunder of Delphi; only, since it was T.'s good fortune which had so far saved them from the punishment due to sacrilege, I should prefer the literal 'good fortune': when they deserted, they put away from them this protecting fortune. But could so strong a word as ἀπολέγεσθαι be used of those who were acting under orders from Timoleon himself (xxx. 3. 25 and 42)? Certainly in their case the reading suggested by Bernardakis, ἀπομονομένους τῆς T. εὐτυχίας, would be more appropriate. Another emendation of Dr. Holden's, ἐξ ἧς εἰσέπλει (for ἐπλει) τὰ ἐπιτήδεια (xviii. 1), seems to be almost certain. On the other hand I see no reason for the suggested omission of τῶν πολιτῶν in xxiv. 1, ἐπιρρεόντων πανταχόθεν εἰς αὐτὴν τῶν πολιτῶν, where the translation is 'by the continual stream into it from all quarters.' But why should not Plutarch speak of 'its citizens streaming into it from all quarters,' whether we understand 'its citizens' of new-made citizens, or of the original citizens who were now returning from exile?

I go on now to the explanatory notes. On Proem l. 14 it would have been better to refer to Zeller, i. p. 836⁴, or some other history of philosophy, than to give Langhorne's confused and erroneous note on the εἶδωλα of Democritus; and I think συμφέρονται is hardly = *accidant*, but refers to the combinations of εἶδωλα which may present themselves to us. In l. 6 is it necessary to understand ἐκείνων either of 'those lives' or 'the lives of them'? It is a long way from βίωσι, and may be more simply translated 'those men,' like αὐτῶν in the next sentence. iv. l. 5 ὁ ἵππος πληγὴν περιπεσὼν means of course 'being wounded,' as in the examples cited; the translation 'receiving a cut' is ambiguous. vi. 2 ἵνα πράττωμεν δοκιμάσαντες, the note and index agree in the sense 'comprobo': is it not rather 'that we may act after full examination'? the figure which follows bears upon want of *discrimination* in eating. vii. 3 while Timoleon was busy about the expedition letters came to Corinth from Hiketas μηνύοντα τὴν μεταβολὴν αὐτοῦ, is it right here to say that 'αὐτοῦ is used for the reflexive'? the clause is written from the point of view of the Corinthians. iv. l. 15 δεδοῖτες μὴ πάθωσι οἷα καὶ πρότερον ὑπὸ τῶν συμμάχων ἀποβαλόντες τὴν πόλιν, is it necessary to follow Held in connecting ὑπὸ with ἀποβαλόντες? Surely it is simpler to translate 'fearing that they should receive from their allies the same treatment as before,

when they lost their city.' ix. l. 17 λόγους τοῖς πραττομένοις ὁμοίους 'proposals as bad as his proceedings.' Is it not rather 'of the same tenor as his negotiations with the Carthaginians,' i.e. having for their object the exclusion of Timoleon from Sicily? *ib.* l. 20 κοινωνὸν εὖ διαπεπραγμένων ἀπάντων 'a partner in all his successes.' I think it is better to take the gen. as absolute. x. l. 2 τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ περαίνειν ἀπειθῶν; 'for what would he *gain* by withholding compliance?' rather 'what could he *accomplish* if he refused?' xi. l. 1. οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι τοῦ Τιμολέοντος ἀνηγμένον χαλεπῶς φέροντες ἐν τῷ κατεστρατηγῆσθαι διατριβὴν τοῖς Ῥηγίνοις παρέιχον, εἰ Φοίνικες ὄντες οὐκ ἀρέσκοντο τοῖς δι' ἀπάτης πραττομένοις, Dr. Holden takes διατριβὴν with ἐν τῷ κατεστρατηγῆσθαι (furnished amusement in their being outwitted); but is not the source of the amusement their *indignation* at being outwitted? I should therefore take χ.φ. with ε.τ.κ. xii. l. 27 ἐπιπορευόμενος 'visiting,' rather, as in the example quoted from Plut. *Alex.* c. 31 and often in Polyb., 'going through the ranks.' xiv. l. 8 ἐθέωντο πολλὴν ἐν ἀσθενέσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ προδῆλοις τὴν τῶν ἀδῆλων αἰτιῶν καὶ θείων δύναμιν: here the note is 'πολλὴν...ἀσθενέσι...προδῆλοις are all predicate-adjectives.' It would be difficult to give a predicative force to προδῆλοις: one pair of attributes ἀνθρώποις καὶ προδῆλοις are opposed to another pair ἀδῆλων καὶ θείων. xvi. l. 55 οἱ πεμφθέντες κατὰ τύχην πυθόμενοι μέλλοντα θύειν αὐτὸν ἦκον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν: here the note is "'as their good fortune would have it" to be taken with μέλλοντα θύειν not with πυθόμενοι, as the English translators suppose.' Dr. Holden's strictures on the English translators are in general richly deserved, but here I think *they* are more in the right than *he* is. How can it be said that it was 'their good fortune' which brought the assassins to the temple at this time, when it led to one of them being killed on the spot and the other at any rate failing in his aim? Dr. Holden refers to iii. 1, but there is no more reason to translate κατὰ τύχην 'good fortune' there than here, or in xxxi. 31, where it is rightly rendered 'as it happened.' It has much the same force as ἀπὸ τύχης (l. 52, below), which is rendered '*forte fortuna*,' though I see no reason for adding that 'it is to be taken with σωτηρίαν.' Plutarch is continually dwelling on the providential good fortune which accompanied Timoleon. In each particular case it is a seeming accident (κατὰ τύχην) which contributes to the carrying out of the Divine will. xx. l. 22, θανμάζοντες τῆς θαλάσσης τὴν εὐφύιαν καὶ τῶν

χωρίων τὴν κατασκευήν, 'expressing their admiration of the convenience of the sea and the situation of the adjacent buildings.' I cannot think that these were so likely to have engaged the attention of the soldiers who were fishing, as the 'productiveness of the sea' (Blass) and the 'construction of the forts.' Just below they go on to speak of πόλιν τοσούτους ἐξησκημένην καλοῖς, and in xxii. we are told how Timoleon razed to the ground the royal forts, not sparing them, as Dion had done, διὰ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν τῆς κατασκευῆς (here translated 'architecture' by Dr. Holden). xxi. l. 20 ἀνατραπέντων: scil. ταῖς ψυχαῖς 'losing heart.' But is the word used in this sense by itself? Why not simply 'being overthrown,' as in Plut. *Pomp.* p. 643 Καῖσαρ τοῦτον ἀνέτρεψε καὶ κατέβαλεν? xxv. l. 21, μαινομένου παρ' ἡλικίαν: Dr. Holden approves Amyot's version 'plus téméraire que son âge ne portait.' It might have been well to support this by quoting other passages where παρ' ἡλικίαν has the same force, as Plut. *Vit.* p. 181 (of the aged Fabius), δρῶν τὸν Φάβιον εὐρώστως παρ' ἡλικίαν διὰ τῶν μαχομένων ὠθοῦμενον. xxvii. l. 17, λευκάσπισι: here we are told that 'the Sacred Band of Carthage was armed with huge shields covered with elephant hides'; would it not have been more to the point to explain that shields were painted of different colours for the sake of distinction, and that there was a regiment of white-shields in the Macedonian army? xxvii. l. 23, συνιδὼν τὸν ποταμὸν αὐτοῖς ταμιεύοντα τοῦ πληθους τῶν πολεμίων ἀπολαβεῖν ὅσοις ἐθέλοιεν αὐτοὶ μάχεσθαι: "that the river was controlling for them how many they should single off from the entire host and engage at one time." The middle (ταμιεύεσθαι) is generally used in this sense...The infinitive ἀπολαβεῖν depends, as an indirect object, upon ταμιεύοντα in the same way as after verbs of giving.' I should rather translate 'perceiving that the river portioned out their work to them and so cut off from the multitude of the enemy as many as they themselves might choose to fight with.' For the construction of συνορᾶν with inf. cf. 2 Macc. 4. 4, συνιδὼν Ἀπολλώνιον μαίνεσθαι. In the passages cited in the note ταμιεύεσθαι is used because the agent portions out to himself: here it is the river which is supposed to do so to others. xxvii. l. 42, τῷ πάθει παρὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὸν ἐνθουσιασμόν οὕτω διατεινόμενος: Dr. Holden translates π. τὸν ἀγῶνα 'because of the inward struggle.' I should prefer to take ἀγῶνα in its ordinary sense, joining it with ἐνθουσιασμόν by hendiadys, 'raising his voice in his excitement

owing to 'the intoxication of the combat.' xxxvii. l. 19, ἐφ' ᾧ οἱ σοφισταὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων τῶν πανηγυρικῶν αἰὲ παρκαλοῦν πράξεις τοῖς Ἕλληνας, ἐν αὐταῖς ἀριστεύσας: here Dr. Holden refers to Isocrates 'whose πανηγυρικός was an urgent appeal to the Greeks to combine against their common enemy the Persians'; but it could hardly be said that Timoleon had realized these hopes. Grote more appropriately speaks of 'that which rhetors like Lysias had preached in their panegyrical harangues, that for which Plato sighed in the epistles of his old age—the renewal of freedom and Hellenism throughout Sicily.'

No two minds will be agreed as to the exact amount of notes required. I should have thought some unnecessary, while on the other hand there are points left unexplained which might either cause perplexity to an ordinary reader or which at any rate would justify further illustration. Such are the account of the attempted suicide of Mameercus xxxv. l. 34 πρὸς τι τῶν βάθρων δρομῶ φερόμενος συνέρρηξε τὴν κεφαλὴν; the change of construction in xxxv. l. 22 ἧς μὴ προσάψαιτο μηδὲ κατακοσμήσειεν; the antecedent to ὅθεν in xxxv. l. 7; the way in which the mail-clad Carthaginians were impeded by their tunics xxviii. l. 23; the force of γοῖν, ib. l. 40; the asyndeton with εἶτα xxii. l. 5; the odd phrase τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔτος ἱσταμένου θέρους εἶχεν ὥραν xxvii. l. 1; ἐμβαλὼν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος viii. l. 17; the distinction between τύραννος and δυνάστης; above all the hopeless sentence xxii. l. 17 foll, where I think the difficulties should at any rate have been more fully pointed out, e.g. ὑπήκουε, without any previous mention of invitation given. If emendation is despaired of, it would at any rate have been some slight solace to the reader to know that he had the sympathy of the editor in his just indignation at a writer, not being an Aeschylus or a Browning, who could leave his ideas in such an undeveloped state.

One of the best features in the book is the lexicography; see the excellent articles on φιλοχωρεῖν p. 51, ἀποθεωρεῖν p. iii. foll., ἀνατείνειν p. 76, προχειρίζεσθαι p. 259. Here and there the classification of meanings might be improved: thus the phrase ἀνηγόρευον ὑπὸ κηρύκων is given as an example of the use of ὑπὸ with active verbs = 'owing to,' p. 269, and ἐμβαλὼν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος is given as an instance of the meaning *hostiliter ingredit.*

As the index claims to be complete it may be as well to note the following omissions: ἀκρος xii. l. 44, γηράω iii. l. 24, ἡλικία xxv. l.

23, ὥδή xiv. l. 16, ἐφέλκεσθαι xix. l. 33; and why is ὁστρειογραφῆς untranslated?

The list of unclassical words used by Plutarch (p. 196) needs revision: such words as παραλαμβάνειν, παράλογος are thoroughly classical.

These are the gleanings which I have been able to pick up in my examination of a book for which the thanks of all lovers of classical literature are due both to Dr. Holden and to the Cambridge University Press.

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

ELLIS'S COMMENTARY ON CATULLUS.

A Commentary on Catullus. By ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. University Reader in Latin Literature. Second Edition. (*Clarendon Press.*) 16s.

A more than common interest attends the appearance of this book. It is in the first place the outcome of thirty years' continuous labour, and as such it takes its place naturally in the short list of permanent classical works which have maintained for this generation the best traditions of English scholarship. Further, Mr. Ellis, who it is fair to conjecture has here closed, for the present at least, his series of works on this subject, is also the father of Catullian literature in this country: and it is not given to many men both to initiate and to consummate for their own age a subject so large and worthy as the poems of the impassioned and divinely-gifted Veronese.

In the Preface, which is new, Mr. Ellis traces the literary history of Catullus from the revival of letters to the present day. It is a chapter of extreme interest, having for its main object the vindication of the merits of the early Italian correctors of the text—an essay in short upon the theme that 'that age was best which was the first.' On this subject Mr. Ellis speaks with an authority which it would be an impertinence in us to criticise. His remarks come as a timely counterblast to a since published eulogy of Scaliger, 'who ('by his Catullus etc.') first taught criticism to walk in the road in which it should go' and 'reclaimed it from the hap-hazard guesswork' in which 'the Italians had been the great offenders' (M. Pattison, *Essays*, i. p. 160—2). One wonders whether the essayist had overlooked the preface to Scaliger's rather scrubby little edition (Geneva, 1577), in which 'Deum testem laudo, ne integrum quidem mensem illis tribus poetis recēsendis impēdimus.' This is a custom which our English editor happily has honoured in the breach. But

when Mr. Ellis goes on to complain that 'for the recovery of the *vera manus* of Catullus disappointingly little has been effected since the Renaissance,' we wish to suggest that the reason lies as much in the poet as in his critics. *Non cuivis homini.* The peculiar quality of Catullus's genius offers unusual difficulties to the emendator, as a glance at the twenty-fifth or twenty-ninth poem will show. For Catullus never wrote save under the impulse of vehement emotion and he has hardly left a line that does not bear the impress of his passionate personality: yet at the same time he had all Wordsworth's gift of using the commonest words in a far from common way and, like Wordsworth, he was content to draw his inspiration from 'the common things that round us lie'

fratresque unanimos anumque matrem

and to strike the ἀφαντον φῶς of poetry from the crudest matter:—

istos qui in platea modo huc modo illuc
in re praetereunt sua occupati.

Suppose the latter half of such a line as 'haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia' had been mutilated beyond recognition, which of the critics would have been Catullus enough to supply the words we know the poet to have written? And, yet, what words could suggest the long procession of 'to-morrow and to-morrow and to-morrow' better than this simple 'alia atque alia'? If the critics had been more mindful of what Mr. Ellis happily terms the 'inimitable spontaneity' of Catullus, they would have been less prone to 'madly thrust' on this rare poet the coat of a bourgeois Horace, a blatant Ovid or a knowing Martial, and would not, on the strength of a quotation from one or other of these writers, have fathered upon him such readings as 'furta' for 'facta' (23, 10), 'ducentum' for 'disertus' (12, 9), or 'vividae' for 'Lydiae' (31, 13). One is glad to remember that a modern