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](#)

Preston and Dodge's *Private Life of the Romans*. *The Private Life of the Romans*. By Harriet Waters Preston and Louise Dodge. Boston [1893]. Pp. 167. 12mo. Price \ \$1.00.

W. A. Merrill

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 08 / October 1894, pp 372 - 373

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188754, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188754

How to cite this article:

W. A. Merrill (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 372-373 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188754

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

neither has the *subscriptio* found in M and certain other MSS. Dr. Genthe points out that another MS at Erlangen has the *subscriptio*, but does not enter into this matter further. The *Erlangensis* described [No 304] is by two hands using the same original. The second of these wrote only the part viii 134-ix 146. The normal number of lines to a page is twenty-eight, but a few pages have twenty-nine. Dr. Genthe (pp. 13-4) ingeniously infers that twenty-eight was the number in the archetype also. Besides the corrections of the first hands [m^1], who are shown to have revised their work, three other sets of correctors [m^2 , m^3 , m^4] are clearly distinguished. Of these the earlier ones used either the same or a closely connected MS as their basis, while m^4 draws from a different source, and probably employs conjecture as well. The clearness with which these various correctors are distinguished adds not a little to the value of the dissertation.

The derivation of E from the Pauline recension is clearly shown, and seems to admit no doubt. So also its peculiarly close relationship to B. Its relation to the mixed MSS, such as U and G, is also well discussed with much advantage. It appears that G is more nearly connected with BE

than with the other Paulines, and that G is nearer than U to BE. B and E themselves agree in a remarkable manner. Not only do they very often unite to differ from the other MSS, but in misplacement of lines and peculiar order of words they show a striking concurrence. It may be added that the first readings of B, altered in the MS, often stand unaltered in E. Dr. Genthe holds that B and E are copied from the same original, and that E is the better copy of the two. He adduces weighty reasons for believing that they are not copied from the original of M or from M itself. And he rejects,—rightly, I venture to think,—the view [Hosius, *praef.* p. xiv] that MB[C] may perhaps be directly derived from the original MS of Paulus. He allows that M may be a direct copy of Paulus: but the rest are derived from him in an indirect manner. In this he agrees with Wotke, and I believe this will become the received view.

To enter into details here would require far too much room. But I think I have said enough to show that an interesting and important addition to Lucan literature has been made by Dr. Arnold Genthe.

W. E. HEITLAND.

PRESTON AND DODGE'S *PRIVATE LIFE OF THE ROMANS*.

The Private Life of the Romans. By HARRIET WATERS PRESTON and LOUISE DODGE. Boston [1893]. Pp. 167. 12mo. Price \$1.00.

TEACHERS of Latin have long desired a small manual to illustrate Roman private life for their students, and this spirited and inspiring little book will be warmly received. Heretofore there has been practically nothing but the antiquated translation of Gallus, the translation of Guhl and Koner, which for various reasons was an inconvenient book, and the dictionaries which had the defects of their qualities. In this book we have a readable and interesting sketch of the subject. The six chapters describe first the family, then the house and everyday life, the children, slaves, guests, clients, freedmen, their food and clothing, agriculture, and finally travel, transportation, and amusements. Tables of weights and measures and an index conclude the

book. The treatment is sympathetic, and in a clear running style, enlivened also by comparison with modern Italian customs gathered from the personal observation of the authors. Some may think this is carried too far when *confarreatio* is compared with a 'Catholic wedding with pontifical high mass.' The materials of the book are drawn from Marquardt, Friedländer, and Becker-Göll; and many of the numerous woodcuts are credited to Rich, and a few to Baumeister and Seyffert-Nettleship. Some of the illustrations are not altogether good. In the 'process' view of the Roman House after Schill (p. 24) the names of the parts of the house are altogether illegible. The picture of the Roman Bath (p. 49), said to be from an ancient painting, dates back some three hundred years only, and has no more authenticity than any picture invented in modern times.

As a second edition of the book will undoubtedly be called for, it may be well to

call attention to a few matters *passim* which demand correction or at least reconsideration. Some statement of the principle followed in marking the long vowels of the Latin words should be made; and if, as it appears, the short vowels are left always unmarked, the reader should be put on his guard. In *sūcinum* on p. 149 the quantity of the penult is more important and harder to remember than that of the antepenult; *iūgum*, p. 111, is certainly wrong. In *manum suam* 'into his hand' for the *manus* of the husband is hardly good Latin: Gaius, l. 136, has 'in viri sui manu,' but it is safer to omit the pronoun altogether as may be seen by comparing the passages cited by Heumann, *röm. Rechtsquellen*⁶ 330. On p. 3 the derivation of Cicerones from 'chick-pea growers' is over-confident, as is also the statement on p. 5 that daughters had a *praenomen* of their own, which remark should be qualified by what is said in Seyffert-Nettleship, p. 412. Nothing is said by our authors about the custom of numbering daughters. The association of *quiratio* (p. 19) with the mortuary cry may be correct; yet as the word occurs but once (Livy 33. 28) we must interpret the noun by the verb *quirito* which was originally the cry for aid by the distressed citizen. The

'mortuary proclamation' could hardly have given the primary signification to the word. *Carmen necessarium* (Cic. *De Leg.* 2. 59) is hardly a 'species of hymn'; *carmen* might with more propriety be called a chant or rhythm. A modern analogue is the sing-song recitation of the multiplication table by school children. In Tac. *Ann.* 4. 9, which describes the funeral procession of Drusus, the verb is *spectarentur*; to translate this 'walked' is scarcely justified (p. 20). English 'aes' for Latin *as* occurs twice on page 140; but the book is in general very free from misprints.

Those who have followed the *Atlantic Monthly* articles by H. W. P. and L. D. on various Roman worthies will find the same warm treatment, and freshness of style in this little book, which is doubtless more readable than it would have been if written by professed philologists or archaeologists. It is a work which may profitably be put into the hands of young students, and should find a place in all public libraries. It will be particularly valuable as a companion to courses of lectures in Roman private life, such as are given in several American universities.

W. A. MERRILL.

University of Indiana.

GSELL'S REIGN OF DOMITIAN.

Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Domitien
par STÉPHANE GSELL. (Paris: Thorin.)
8vo. pp. 392. 1894. 12 Frs.

THE account of Domitian's reign contained in this volume was originally written as a 'thèse de doctorat' for the Faculty of Letters of Paris. The author does not say whether it has been since revised or expanded, but for its original purpose I may say at once that it seems to me to possess just the merits which such a work should possess. The writers of such theses (we have them or something like them in England) seem to me to be liable to one of two errors. They are apt either to aim at the fabrication of epochs and the sonorous disclosure of sweeping novelties, or they painfully concentrate laborious attention on some possibly correcter view of an insignificant trifle. In either case, in the desire to be original, they reveal their inability to grasp the proportions of things and to master the matter which forms their sub-

ject. M. Gsell seems to me to have avoided these errors. He has given us a well-digested account of Domitian, with a careful collection of facts and authorities both ancient and modern, and an estimate of the man which, whether right or wrong, is sober and suitable. He shows that he is the master, not the servant, of his matter and that, when he tries original work, he will at least be able to start well equipped. For scholars his book will have the value that many good digests have at the present day: it is a convenient summary to which one may turn for a judicial account of what has been well said about Domitian. Its fault, of course, is its length—rather a common fault in some French books, but that is partly the result of its careful quotation of references and treatment of detail. Were it shorter, it would doubtless be more interesting to read, but it would be less useful as a summary.

F. H.