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](#)

Hosius' *Gellius A. Gelli Noctium Atticarum libri XX: post Martinum Hertz edidit Carolus Hosius.* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipzig, 1903. Vol. I., pp. lxiv., 378; Vol. II., pp. 372. Vol. I. 3s. 6d., Vol. II. 3s. 2d.

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 01 / February 1905, pp 65 - 66
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991340, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991340

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 65-66 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991340

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

quaint and classical ring about them ; the same judgment applies to occasional words and expressions, e.g. 'Weapon-game' (B. i. Ode viii.), 'Twy-formed' (B. ii. Ode xx.), 'leg-bones' (B. ii. Ode xx.), 'air-way' (B. i. Ode iii.), 'down-slide,' 'make him happy die' (B. i. Ode xxvii.), 'otherwhence,' 'spilth of wine' (B. ii. Ode xiv.), is Shakespearian (*Timon of Athens*, ii. sc. 2), but 'spilth' is not an attractive word, nor do 'T'attest,' 't'entwine,' 'Thoul't,' please the eye or the ear.

In B. iv. Ode ii. 'Watery Tiber's groves' is clearly a misprint for 'Tibur's.' In the same Ode 'gives praise' scarcely gives the force of 'dicit,' which contrasts the living voice (vox viva) of the poet with the dumb praise of statues,—the 'infantes statuæ' of ii. Sat. v. 40.

In B. i. Ode i.

Mountains of money move him not,
Timorous to be a sailor brave'

seems to miss the irony of 'pavidus'; you cannot bribe him to become (not a brave sailor, that would be impossible, but even) a timid sailor. Were it not for the word 'timorous' one might have supposed that Mr. Green had adopted the reading 'impavidus' of which Orelli very properly writes, 'Qui substitui voluerunt "impavidus" antithetorum vim et poetæ sensum non perceperunt.' When, however, Orelli describes 'pavidus' as a 'frequens nautarum epitheton,' even the Baltic fleet would repudiate the epithet as true of all sailors; nor is Orelli's explanation of 'pavidus' as meaning 'periculis semper expositus.' I am afraid that the epithet 'brave' has been introduced as providing 'wave' in the next line with a rhyme.

As specimens of Mr. Green's successful translations, I give two, to which many more might be added :

B. ii. Ode vi.

'That spot, those happy hills, they bid thee wend
Thither with me. There thou, when comest the end,
On the warm ashes of thy poet friend
Shalt duly shed a tear.'

and B. ii. Ode ix.

'Not always do the cloud-born rains
Stream down upon the miry plains,
Nor fitful storms the Caspian sea
Vex always with their tyranny,
Nor on Armenia's shore,
Friend Valgius, stands the dead dull show
Year-long, nor lab'ring bend them low
Garganian oaks to northern blast
Always, nor leaves down-falling fast
Doth widow'd ash deplore.'

Mr. Green's version of B. i. Ode xxiv. also well expresses the tender pathos of the original, and B. i. Ode xxx., a graceful little Ode, is gracefully rendered. Graceful also is Mr. Green's version of B. iii. Ode xviii., though as elsewhere one misses the article, and 'digger's toes' adds yet another to the lines that have suffered for the sake of a rhyme.

There remains the pleasing task of thanking and congratulating Mr. Green on his good work done in a good cause. To translate a selected and small number of the Odes of Horace, as did the late Lord Derby, must have been to a scholar of his calibre an agreeable pastime; to face all the Odes, attractive or unattractive alike, as Dr. Francis, Mr. Green, and some others have done, is a far more arduous undertaking.

One must not omit to mention the 'Apologia' which Mr. Green has written to justify his position as a translator of Horace. No such 'Apologia' was needed, but it imparts an additional charm to the volume, being as conspicuous for its elegance of diction as it is for its modesty of feeling.

He has added one more name to the list of those who have found in the serious studies of their youth a delightful recreation of their advanced years. Nor will he, we feel confident (however much the Philistine may rage), be the last to illustrate the truth of Cicero's words, 'Haec studia pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur.'

E. W. BOWLING.

HOSIUS' GELLIUS.

A. Gelli Noctium Atticarum libri XX: post Martinum Hertz edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Leipzig, 1903. Vol. I., pp. lxiv., 378; Vol. II., pp. 372. Vol. I. 3s. 6d., Vol. II. 3s. 2d.

NO. CLXV. VOL. XIX.

THE earlier Latin authors are receiving a good deal of attention at present. New editions of Ennius (by Vahlen), of Lucilius (by Marx), of Varro's *Menippean Satires* (by Buecheler) have followed each other in quick succession; and of the grammarians

F

who preserve these fragments of early literature, Nonius and Gellius have been re-edited and a Teubner edition of Varro's *de Lingua Latina* is being prepared by Goetz and Schoell.

The new Teubner text of Gellius is an abridgment of Hertz's large edition (Berlin, 1883-5). The cumbrous *apparatus criticus* (with the Supplement published by Kuhn in 1894) has been reduced to compact and convenient shape, a reduction which will doubtless in time be imitated in the case of all the larger critical editions of classical authors. Once that the history of a text's tradition has been traced with certainty, editors should discard the separate MSS. and confine themselves to archetypes. To mention a copy's divergence from the archetype's reading, unless the variant is expressly stated to be a *lapsus calami* or a mediaeval monk's conjectural emendation, is merely to obscure the evidence submitted to the reader's judgment and to encourage the unsound argument which was once in fashion: 'So-and-so may be the right reading, for it is found in this-or-that codex and therefore has manuscript authority.' As if a scribe's blunder had any more authority than a misprint or a Carolingian abbot's emendation were likely to be better than a modern scholar's!

The possibility of the discovery of new MSS. of the *Noctes Atticae*, or of marginal collations of lost MSS., does not seem to be quite remote. In particular the readings of the lost *codex Buslidianus* (the only MS. known to have contained the whole work) may at any moment be unearthed from marginalia inscribed in some sixteenth

century printed text, and students in foreign libraries should be on the look out. They must, however, bear in mind that marginal citations of the *codex Buslidianus* may have originated in Carrio's published account of its readings. Thus in Nicholas Heinsius' copy of Gellius (in the Bodleian Library, with press-mark 'Linc. 8.° F. 79') the marginal note on XVII. ii. 16 figurat[i]one] 'ita Buslid. lib. Vulgo figura,' is of no importance, for there are other marginal references to Carrio. The 'v(etus) c(odex)' whose collation occupies the greater portion of the marginalia seems to agree with the earlier printed editions (Hertz's *e*), e.g. I. vii. 2 antea adierant] 'antea didicerant.'

But Hosius' edition is not by any means a mere re-arrangement of Hertz's materials. As was to be expected from so distinguished a scholar, there are many improvements of the text.¹ And there is an excellent Introduction in which Gellius' sources are enumerated with a full discussion of the question whether the '*Noctes Atticae*' furnishes (like Nonius' '*Compendiosa Doctrina*') clues to the true arrangement of the Republican literary fragments. The answer is in the negative, as might be expected from Gellius' own account (which Hosius' investigations confirm) of the composition of his work (N.A. Praef. 2, 11 sqq.). When will scholars abandon the foolish habit of preferring to disbelieve, rather than believe, what an ancient author expressly tells us?

W. M. LINDSAY.

¹ The student will find some more in Heraeus' careful review of the new edition (in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* of Sep. 10).

HALE AND BUCK'S *LATIN GRAMMAR*.

A Latin Grammar. By W. G. HALE and C. D. BUCK. Ginn and Co., Boston, U.S.A., and London. Pp. xi + 388. 1903. 4s. 6d.

It is difficult within the limits of a brief review to do justice to a book like this. It is the joint product of the work of two eminent scholars, one of them probably the foremost Latinist of the United States; and it represents an enormous amount of thought and labour. Yet it raises grave doubts whether, with all its merits of

accurate work and refined scholarship and its suggestiveness to the advanced scholar, it is likely as a whole to serve the purpose for which it is intended. It is designed to cover the field of 'High School Latin' and to be limited thereto, that is, it is a book for the use of boys and girls of from 14 or 15 to 18 or 19 years of age. For this purpose the Syntax seems to the present reviewer too cumbrous and difficult to understand, if at least the first object of a school grammar should be to lead to a practical mastery of the language concerned