

# 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](#)



---

**Ussani's *Odes of Horace Le Liriche di Orazio*.  
Commentate da Vincenzo Ussani. 2 vols. Torino: E.  
Loescher. 1900, 1901. Fr. 4.80.**

J. G.

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 03 / April 1902, pp 179 - 180  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205799, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00205799](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205799)

**How to cite this article:**

J. G. (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 179-180 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205799

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

of a thing. In his admirable *Pindar* Mr. Gildersleeve has accustomed us to these rather Delphic deliverances, but in a grammar they are less welcome. Krüger in his *Grammar* and in his notes on Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, is really a better model of brevity.

In conclusion I will note a few points of detail. § 20 'the omission of  $\omega$  in prose is passionate or late': is not 'passionate' rather too strong for many cases? *Δισχίνη* is more often brusque or slighting. Call it 'unceremonious.' § 27 in *εἰ κατασκαφεῖη τῶν τειχῶν* . . ἐπὶ δέκα σταδία 'strictly speaking τῶν τειχῶν is the partitive genitive dependent on κατασκαφεῖη,' and yet Mr. Gildersleeve is explaining quite truly that ἐπὶ δέκα σταδία is a sort of subject. § 36 there is no mention of the special use of neuter adjectives with article = abstract substantive. § 41 the use of abstract for concrete is illustrated by Shakespeare's 'What trade art thou?'; but is not this, like 'what height are you?' 'what use can I be?', got at by omitting *of*? § 87 under 'omission of verbal predicate' οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ, if not the Platonic ἄλλο τι, seems to deserve mention. Though 'individual syntax' is not dealt with, one would expect it to be mentioned (§ 102) that plural verbs with neuter plural subjects are especially frequent in Xenophon. Generally speaking more indications of 'individual syntax' would be welcome and in a work on this scale not out of place. § 142, if we have a section for transitive verbs used intransitively, might we not have one too for intransitive verbs used transitively (δύναται δούλωσιν, ἀχθομαι ἕλκος, ἐθάρρει

τούτους, ἐξίέναι τὴν χώραν)? § 156 'νόμους τιθέναι to be a νομοθέτης . . (for those who desire legislators), νόμους τίθεσθαι, to make laws for one's own state.' Yet Solon certainly νόμους ἔθηκε for his own state and Demosthenes says of himself ἔθηκα νόμον in reference to Athens. Is not the real point that a legislator or a small number, autocratic or parliamentary, τίθῃσι, while the state or people as a body is said τίθεσθαι? The legislator makes laws for others, the people for itself. § 194 can it be said that οὐκ ἐὼ implies any 'anticipation of the future' like εἰμι? § 282 or that there is any 'imperative sense' in ἀλλὰ γὰρ τάλῃθ' εἰρήσεται and other such future perfects? § 295 should not intransitive participles (λήξαν' ἔχει) be specially mentioned, as being more remarkable in their use than transitive ones? § 323 one doubts whether in such phrases as διεμάχον τὸ μὴ θανεῖν we ought to call τὸ μὴ θανεῖν *object*. § 374 should not μὴ δῆρ' ἀδικηθῶ and μὴ σε κιχείω be explained as due to an imperative or quasi-imperative meaning (= μὴ μ' ἀδικήσῃτε etc.) on the same principle that Mr. Gildersleeve himself gives in § 382? § 384 the meaning sometimes belonging to τί πάθω; 'what *else* can I do? how can I help it? of course I shall,' is not distinctly stated. So often in Lucian, who lies beyond the limits of this book, τί ἂν πάθοιμι;

To facilitate reference it would be a great convenience in future volumes to have the sections marked at the top of each page, as they are for instance in Goodwin.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

#### USSANI'S ODES OF HORACE.

*Le Liriche di Orazio*. Commentate da VINCENZO USSANI. 2 vols. Torino: E. Loescher. 1900, 1901. Fr. 4.80.

IN this edition of the lyrics of Horace, the books are arranged in chronological order, so that the first volume contains the Epodes and Carm. i., the second Carm. ii. iii. the Carm. Saec. and Carm. iv. I have not examined the work minutely, but if I may express an opinion after turning to some thirty different passages in various parts of both volumes, I should say that this is, in the main, a conservative Orellian edition, in which the English student will not find much that is

new to him, at least in the way of interpretation. In the criticism of the text there are some few novelties. The introduction to vol. i. contains a collation (for the lyrics only) of a codex in the Laurentian library at Florence, *Strozianus* 117. It is described by Bandini as being of the nineteenth century with additions in a hand of the eleventh or twelfth century. The collation is confined to those passages which are referred to in the *discriptio codicum* prefixed (at p. lxxxiii) to Keller and Holder's new edition (1899). It is a good MS. but has no readings of special interest. Signor Ussani has printed in his text a few emendations of his own: viz. at

Carm. i. 32, 15 *dulce lenimen mihi usque salve*, notwithstanding the hiatus: at Epod. 5. 87 *magum uenena fas nefasque non ualent*, where *magum* is gen. plur.: and at Carm. Saec. 26 *quod simul dictum est stabilis deorum Terminus seruet* where the emendation is

supported by a quotation from Accius (Priscian vi. 80) *veter fatorum terminus sic iusserat*. These proposals will perhaps not command universal assent.

J. G.

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

*The Private Life of the Greeks and Romans.*

By HARRIET W. PRESTON and LOUISE DODGE. Sanborn: Boston, U.S.A. Pp. 167. 2s. 3d.

THIS little volume, in paper covers, is what its size and title indicate—a brief account, suitable to beginners, of the details of ordinary Roman life, the house and household, food and clothing, amusements and agriculture. We have two or three such little manuals already in English, but we need not enter into comparisons. It is enough to say that the volume, as a whole, is well done, the material judiciously selected and the facts stated clearly. There are, of course, defects, as there must be in any such work. The 'Avernine Lake' is an odd title. The epithet 'provincial,' applied to Pompeii, seems inconsistent with either ancient Italy or modern America, however intelligible in England. The statement that a Roman road ran from Carthage to Spain and Asia is a little dubious, and an alleged branch road from the Via Egnatia which led to Antioch must have been one of those tails that wagged the dog. The long vowels, marked to help the beginner, are marked somewhat inconsistently and need revision. The illustrations distinctly need reinforcement. One or two things are not quite plain. In particular the Roman house. I cannot think that anyone will grasp the relationship between, firstly, the primitive Alban hut-urn, figured in the text, secondly, the primitive house described in the text, in which the smoke of the fire curls out of the *atrium* aperture in the roof, and thirdly, the ordinary house of classical times. In fact I am inclined to doubt whether these three things have so much to do with one another as is often asserted, and I do not see how the case is helped by a reference to the primitive straw huts of the present-day Campagna. Our authoresses would, I think, have gained more by leaving the primitive house alone, and by introducing instead one or two

of Dr. Mau's excellent Pompeian sketches of the classical house, which their own illustrations do not shew very well. However there is really not much for any sort of censor to criticize, and the volume as a whole suggests to me a different kind of reflection which does not especially concern it, but which I may nevertheless be allowed to append in this place. It is time, I think, that books on the subject of Roman Private life, should take fuller account of archaeology. For the most part these books, whether large treatises like *Gallus* or the *Sittengeschichte* or abridgments for beginners, like the specimen before me, are more linguistic than archaeological. Their first aim is to explain the words relating to Roman private life which occur in Roman literature. They are a sort of methodical dictionary to a special class of technical terms. Of course they are sometimes more than that. But they are not so much more as one could wish: they seldom get to the full idea of describing life as generally lived by Romans. Let me give one or two examples. These books describe, briefly or at length, the jewellery of the Roman. They tell us that jewels were worn on the wrist or arm or elsewhere: they mention the jewels in favour, the prices paid for some special pearl or tiara and so forth; but of the art of the jewellery no word is said and the really important matter is left out. For if it matters at all from the literary point of view to know that Cynthia or Lesbia wore pearls, it matters much more to know the fashion of them. If it is interesting to a literary student to recollect that the Alexandrine literature influenced Roman writers, it is not amiss to trace the concomitant influence of the Egyptian goldsmith. And if anyone desires to realise the actual life of the educated Augustan, he can hardly venture to miss its artistic setting and be content, for jewels, with a catalogue of precious stones, a list of the limbs on which they were worn,