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](#)

Two Editions of the Germania of Tacitus *Cornelii Taciti de Germania*, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Map, by Henry Furneaux. Clarendon Press: 1894. 6s. 6d.

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 06 / July 1895, pp 326 - 329

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202242, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202242

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (1895). Review of Henry Furneaux 'Cornelii Taciti de Germania' The Classical Review, 9, pp 326-329 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202242

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is something of a paradox to question, on obvious and elementary grounds, the soundness of the method employed by a scholar such as Dr. Postgate, of whom I certainly wish to speak with all respect. The only apparent explanation is that the concentration in one view of that which before was scattered will make the strength or weakness of a method manifest for the first time in a striking fashion.

There are of course minor considerations which cannot be entirely forgotten. A Corpus is not the happiest place for extensive innovations, least of all for those which make reference difficult: and it must be confessed that the maze of figures is baffling in certain elegies. Even when the scattered lines have been found, the reconstruction of

a passage in the old order, and the recovery of the old connexion of thought, takes time which one might have wished to spend otherwise. These are real disadvantages, and will long remain so. No doubt, if the new order comes to be accepted as the standard, the inconvenience will have been simply that which is involved in every change. Such a view is probably too sanguine. But after all, in spite of some drawbacks, a warm welcome is due to such an important and suggestive piece of work as Dr. Postgate's *Propertius*.

Some remarks upon the new text of Ovid, which also presents features of interest, are unavoidably deferred for the moment.

T. W. JACKSON.

Oxford.

(To be continued.)

TWO EDITIONS OF THE *GERMANIA* OF TACITUS.

Cornelii Taciti de Germania, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Map, by HENRY FURNEAUX. Clarendon Press: 1894. 6s. 6d.

THE aim and scope of this volume are clearly indicated in the editor's preface. Originally undertaken with a view to the requirements of the higher forms in schools, it was considerably enlarged in the course of preparation; and in the form in which it is published—on a scale uniform with Mr. Furneaux's well-known edition of the *Annals*—it certainly has all the appearance of being an exhaustive and really comprehensive edition. The editor apologizes for the 'incompleteness which thorough students will easily detect' in his work, but he may be assured that they will rather admire the thoroughness with which it has been executed. Especially will they appreciate the moderation and self-restraint that have gone to the shaping of a book which might have easily been made more bulky, but hardly more useful. It is not really indispensable for an editor to incorporate in his commentary the views of every one who has preceded him,¹ or to read and cite the title of every German monograph that

bears on any point connected with his subject; but while not pretending to original authority in matters outside the special province of classical study, Mr. Furneaux deserves credit for making a most judicious use of the best available materials in the domain of archaeology, law, and history, as well as for illuminating the text of the treatise with the light of his own scholarship. The result is that he has omitted nothing, so far as I can judge, essential to the realization of the wish which he set before himself in editing the *Germania* for English readers,—the wish namely, 'constantly to indicate its importance, almost as great to us as to the Germans themselves, as bearing on the early history of so many of our institutions, and to illustrate from these as much as possible.'

The *Germania* is just such a paper as might have been read to a 'Royal Geographical Society,' had such a society existed at Rome towards the end of the first century of our era. It is improbable, indeed, that it was based upon any extensive personal travel in the country itself: though there are passages which give the impression that the writer is speaking as an eye-witness of what he describes. Mr. Furneaux is right in pointing out that Tacitus 'lays no claim to independent knowledge' but professes to state only what

¹ One sentence in a note on p. 63 will be considered by many a pleasing contrast to some recent editions: 'Several other alterations of the text have been suggested.'

he 'received' from others (*haec...accepimus* 27 § 3). But much had been done under Domitian and Trajan to make Germany better known to the Romans; and apart from what he may have been able to gather at Rome from those of his countrymen who had served there, or who had traded with the interior, Tacitus may have had opportunities of acquiring information more or less at first hand if, as is sometimes supposed to be the case, he included the German border in his travels during the years in which he is known to have been absent from the capital (A.D. 90-94). In his section on the 'Purpose of the Treatise,' Mr. Furneaux gives his weight to the suggestion that the *Germania* was not undertaken without a political reference. Much is often said of the ethical motive which was also obviously at work, and which comes out in many phrases where the stern moralist implies a contrast between German virtue and the laxity of German manners (see introd. p. 30); but the political purpose should also be noted. Trajan had called a halt in the forward policy of his predecessor: he seems to have 'considered that the existing position was perilous, and that circumstances might make the German race formidable even for aggression.' It may well have been in support of the imperial policy that Tacitus produced his treatise, written partly, at least, with the aim of 'familiarizing the public mind with the vast extent and overwhelming numbers of the tribes of Germany, the climatic, physical, and economical obstacles to its invasion and subjugation, the heroic courage of its people, and the blows which they had inflicted on Rome during more than two hundred years without any substantial conquest of their territory.' *Regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas*; and the historian is forced to own 'in words that at the end of another century must have seemed prophetic, that only the internal discords of the race could avert the destiny which was hurrying the Roman Empire to its destruction' (33 § 2).

Much the most important part of Mr. Furneaux's admirable introduction is that contained in section vi.—the 'Account given by Tacitus and its Value.' We have here a comprehensive summary—with valuable references to modern authorities—of the subject-matter of the treatise, both in its geographical and ethnological aspect and also as containing an account of the political, moral, and social condition of the

early inhabitants of Germany. In his description of their institutions, the editor is careful to emphasize those points in the text which disclose the germs of much that we can recognize as developed in later society, alike in Germany and in England: see especially pp. 20-1 and 26-7, where Kemble, Freeman, and Stubbs are drawn upon for illustration. Similarly, in his explanations of the text, his wide reading has enabled him to include a considerable amount of material that will be of special interest to English readers, as gathering up the results of recent investigations into points of archaeological and legendary lore. He never allows himself to be drawn beyond the limits of legitimate commentary, but on the other hand nothing is omitted that is essential to the adequate interpretation of the text.

For the ordinary matter of commentary, Mr. Furneaux expresses his indebtedness to recent German editions, such as those of Schweizer-Sidler and Zernial. I shall subjoin here a few remarks on what appear to me to be doubtful points of interpretation. It seems misleading to describe the abl. abs. in 1 § 1 as having 'the force of a causal sentence,' unless we assume an ellipse and take *cognitis* as giving the reasons Tacitus has for the description he is furnishing. In dealing with the difficult passage at the end of ch. 2—*ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim*—Mr. Furneaux fails to take note of the weighty grounds on which H. J. Heller has recently proposed (*Philologus* 1892, p. 340 *sqq.*) to reverse the traditional explanation, and to take *nationis* in the wider, *gentis* in the narrower, sense. The intention of the passage seems to be to indicate that the collective name 'Germani' had a different origin from that of collective names developed out of the designation of some single tribe (*gens*) occupying high place among the peoples of the district to which the collective name comes to be applied. In contrast, for example, with Ἀχαιοί or Ἕλληνες, the term 'Germani' was applied as a generic and racial appellation (*nationis nomen*) from the first. It was, in fact, devised by the Gauls to characterize the 'shouting warriors' (*gair*, *clamare*) who had dispossessed them of their lands; and the invaders accepted the appellation, applying it in turn to their kinsfolk on the other side of the Rhine, on whose support they still depended to further intimidate (*ob metum*) their Gaulish neighbours. And so it came in course of time to be adopted—

still as an artificially constructed designation (*invento nomine*)—in the home country itself. I shall only add that it might be better to read (with Novak) *cum omnes* for *ut omnes*: *ut* may have been occasioned by *ita* preceding. In 7 § 3 *signa quaedam detracta lucis* is taken (with Müllenhoff and most editors) of the weapons which symbolized the presence of the gods, e.g. the lance of Wuodan, the hammer of Donar, etc.: I have seen it suggested somewhere that the *signa* were sacred banners fastened to spear-shafts, on which such emblems were represented. There seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the MS. *ut turbæ placuit* (11 § 3) in the sense of ‘as soon as the crowd thinks fit.’ The point seems to be that the crowd is the master of the situation till the priests ‘constitute the meeting’ by a call for silence: the haphazard character of the proceedings up to that stage is what is meant by *Illud ex libertate vitium*. The emendation *ut turba placuit* adopted by Mr. Furneaux and others (‘when the crowd is thought sufficient’) would seem to imply the interposition of some form of presidential authority at an earlier stage, and can hardly be supported by *ut campus, ut nemus placuit* in 16 § 3. The collocation in 14 § 4 (*epulæ et quamquam incompti largi tamen apparatus*) makes it difficult to take *epulæ et...apparatus* as a hendiadys: though that is better than to make *apparatus*, with others, a genitive of quality (*et = eaeque*). In view of such parallels as *Hist.* i. 88 *luxoriosos apparatus conviviorum* and ii. 62 *exhausti conviviorum apparatibus*, it might be proposed to read *epularum* for *epulæ et*. An interesting explanation of *eosque [specus] multo insuper fimo onerant*, in 16 § 4, was suggested to me by a description of certain curious caves recently discovered near the racecourse at Goodwood which appeared in the *Daily Graphic* of 6th April, 1895: they are supposed to have been originally excavated to serve the purpose of subterranean repositories such as those which Diodorus Siculus mentions in speaking of the ancient Britons, and their excavation may have led to the discovery of the value for purposes of top-dressing of the chalk manure thus accumulated. In 22 ad fin. *salva utriusque temporis ratio est* is surely not ‘the regard paid to either time (the advantage accruing from it) is secured’: *ratio* = ‘conditions’ or ‘bearings,’ and the meaning is that they have the full advantage of both methods of deliberation, the drunk and the sober. Cp. Cic. *pro Cluent.* § 141

exposuit utriusque rationem temporis. In 31 § 1 the use of *haud perinde* can scarcely be explained without assuming the usual ellipse,—here ‘atque eae quæ modo commemoratae sunt’: see Gerber and Greef, p. 1106. In support of Mr. Furneaux’s interpretation of *adhuc* in 38 § 1 (*propriis adhuc nationibus*) I may refer to the explanation of the contrast between *natio* and *gens* given above: the Suebi not only consist of various *gentes* (tribes occupying different geographical situations) but they are moreover composed of different ‘stocks,’ with various names, but known collectively as ‘Suebi.’ Among minor matters I may refer to some rather faulty renderings of the Tacitean *tamquam* and *velut*: e.g. 8 ad fin., where ‘nor as if they were deifying mortals’ (for *neq tamquam facerent deas*) fails to express the ‘subjective reference’ implied: the translation should rather be ‘with no idea of.’ So *velut deo imperante* in 7 § 2 is inadequately rendered ‘as if ordered by the tutelary god’: while there is an unnecessary reticence about ‘as if were hellish’ for *velut infernum* in 43 ad fin. In 8 § 3 Vespasian is mistakenly put for Vitellius, as also in the Suetonius reference there given. And in 45 § 6 Halm’s misprint *interiacent* for *interlucent* has been somewhat carelessly adopted in the text. From such mistakes, however, the book is otherwise remarkably free; though I may be permitted the further criticism that the editor sometimes follows the Germans in their bad example of over-punctuation, e.g. in the unnecessary commas after *locis* and *civitates* at the opening of ch. 30, and again after *animi civitatum* in 8 § 1.

It is on its critical side that any limitations which the editor may have imposed on himself are at all conspicuous in the volume, and his apology for ‘incompleteness’ perhaps not altogether superfluous. It was of course inevitable that the text adopted should not differ much from that of Halm, which indeed is followed throughout, except in seven places specified in the preface, p. vi. But there is work to be done among the MSS. of the *Germania*, and a note on introd., p. 2, in which a reference is made to a forthcoming edition of the *Agricola*, prompts the hope that Mr. Furneaux may still intend to undertake that work himself. It would certainly be interesting to see the results obtained by recent editors of the *Dialogus* worked out for both the other minor treatises. Possibly the constitution of the text would not be seriously affected

thereby, but additional light would certainly be thrown on the inter-relationship of the existing codices. Mr. Furneaux seems to accept the view that the representatives of the X family are of highest rank; but Schefczik (whom he nowhere names) anticipated Scheuer in proving for the *Germania* that the Y archetype must have contained the more genuine tradition.¹ The editor might have brought out the fact that the *Hummelianus*, the *Monacensis*, and the *Stutgardiensis* all belong to the Y family (Scheuer, p. 3): the first-named codex stands to the *Germania* in the same relation as the *Ottobonianus* (E) to the *Dialogus*, while the claim of the Stuttgart codex to primary rank has been quite recently revived in Germany.² Mr. Furneaux seems nowhere to cite specifically *Vaticanus* 4498 (Δ), though he promises to deal with it in his edition of the *Agricola*; it is of little importance for the text as we now have it, but it has an interest of its own for the question of inter-relationship of the codices. The same is true of the two manuscripts at Vienna (*V* and *V*₂): Mr. Furneaux is hardly right in saying that these MSS. 'appear to have been unnoticed' by editors of the *Germania*, for the readings of the first are given by Massmann, while those of the second have been transcribed by Huemer, with the result that *V*₂ has been shown to be nearly related to the *Hummelianus* (Scheuer, pp. 15—17 and 26—7). Reference to the material which recent research has made available might have rendered Mr. Furneaux's critical apparatus fuller (if somewhat more cumbersome) and also occasionally more correct in points of detail—of small importance in themselves, but of interest for the question under discussion. Thus in 2 § 2 (*nisi si patria sit*) the true state of the case is that while ACDM give *nisi si*, B has *nisi* and HV₂S *nisi sibi*. Further down in the same chapter the reading *conditoremque*, adopted from H by Holder, is also found as a correction in *V*₂ and S: ABCM give *conditorisque* and D *conditoris*. Again in 35 § 1, while ABHMSV₂ all agree in *obtenditur* (*optenditur* B), CAD unite in showing *oblendere*, as also *propriis* for *populis* in 40 § 2, and *nec* for *non* in 44 § 3. At 45 § 1 CAD have *in ortus edurat* for *in ortum edurat* AB: HSV₂ show *in ortu*

sedurat, though a later hand in *V*₂ corrects this to the reading of CAD, while M gives *mortu sedurat*.

W. PETERSON.

P. Cornelii Taciti Germania. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, by R. F. DAVIS. Methuen and Co. 1894. 2s.

Tacitus, Agricola and Germania, with Introduction and Notes, by H. M. STEPHENSON. Cambridge. 1894. 3s.

THESE handy volumes have been published almost contemporaneously with Mr. Furneaux's larger work, but enter into competition rather with Messrs. Church and Brodribb's well-known little book, which has so long held the field for English students of the minor works of Tacitus. Both are scholarly productions. For the *Germania*, Mr. Davis's edition is specially admirable, and ought to do much to make the treatise better known in our schools. In his succinct introduction, the editor deals with the historical and ethnographical matter of the treatise in a way that shows that he has made excellent use of his authorities, whom he has evidently studied at first hand. The critical appendix is proof that textual questions have received a due share of consideration. Mr. Davis's notes are of a high order of merit, and always judiciously concise. As against Mr. Furneaux, he seems right in interpreting *primum* in ch. 3 as 'the greatest' instead of as 'the prototype' of brave men; and his explanation of *utriusque temporis ratio* ch. 22 *ad fin.* is also to be preferred. But he gives a wrong interpretation of *concessis animalibus* in ch. 9: cites some misleading parallels in support of the erroneous view that in ch. 5 *satís* is a dative: interprets *condicere* in ch. 11 as to 'announce,' though the meaning of 'contract' can hardly be absent: is not so accurate as to *veste distinguuntur* in ch. 17: and does not hit on the suggestion that *principibus* in ch. 22 may = *ducibus*. On the other hand, Mr. Davis supplies some very neat renderings of difficult phrases, which however need not be further particularized. His book has been prepared with great care: I have noted only one misprint, *Agr.* ii. for xi. on p. 31.—Mr. Stephenson's book includes the *Agricola* as well as the *Germania*, a treatise already separately edited by Mr. Davis, and always more likely to command attention in schools. His introductions are somewhat meagre, and are 'borrowed almost

¹ *De Taciti Germaniae apparatu critico*, Troppau, 1886, p. 12 sqq.

² Unter den erhaltenen Handschriften der Germania des Tacitus ist Stuttgarter Handschrift die beste: J. Holub, Weienau, 1895.