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](#)

Ellis' *Aetna Aetna*. By Robinson Ellis, LL.D., Corpus Professor of the Latin Language and Literature. Oxford 1901.

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 02 / March 1902, pp 128 - 130

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0020560X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0020560X

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 128-130 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0020560X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

some length, as on the difficult passage 6. 7-22, they throw light on the darkness. In this passage Dr. Gow has not only found a consistent and reasonable explanation of the text but also achieved the even more difficult task of understanding and stating in an intelligible form the view taken by Orelli.

The lines in which the text differs from recent editions are not very many, but although some of the readings may not ultimately stand, it is distinctly in advance of its predecessors. In 3. 10 we have Dr. Postgate's *si* for *qui*, and this correction will surely be accepted as certain. The same corrector's *et quantis* for *atque aliis* in 6. 111, is less convincing, though the MSS. text is undoubtedly corrupt. In 3. 103, Dr. Gow accepts Professor Housman's transposition of *voces* and *sensus*, getting the sense which long ago Fröhlich vainly endeavoured to extract from the MSS. readings. In 5. 15, the omission of *ut*, supported by some MSS., is in all ways an improvement. In 6. 14 Dr. Gow will not have *notante*, and his own suggestion of *quid autem* seems to deserve more attention than he ventures to claim for it. In 3. 120-121 he successfully defends the text against Palmer's unhappy *nunc vereor* and others. Now that it is well established that *non vereor ut* for *non vereor ne non* is not sound Latin, there should be no difficulty in taking *ut caedas* as a substantival clause. Indeed, as the clause precedes the main verb, it is hard to see how a living sense of the Latin could ever find any difficulty in the passage. In 6. 126, Munro's *pulum* for *lusum* is perhaps unnecessary. In face of such a construction as *ludere aleam, ludere par impar*, the construction here seems to be the same as in *post ignem aethera domo | subductum* and *memor mutatae togae*. This view must, however, assume that *trigon* may mean the game as well as the ball.

On 5. 38, Dr. Gow suggests that the journey to Brindisi is commemorated by the ode on Murena's augurship. The journey can hardly have taken place earlier in the year than February, while the ode (3. 19) seems to refer to January. Possibly, however, even at Formiae a north wind in February might make a man shiver with Paelignian cold

‘fremeret saeva cum grandine vernus
Juppiter.’

On 5. 16 Dr. Gow's suggestion that *viator* is not a passenger on the boat but a traveller on the towpath is strongly supported by the contrast between *viator* and *navita* in *Car.* III. 4. 30-32.

I will note a few trivial points on which I venture to disagree. It is not quite accurate to say that ‘Caesar's park ... was ... a good way down the river from the Pons Sublicius,’ and the apparent implication that Horace would cross by that bridge to see his sick friend, real or imaginary, can hardly be accepted. He would probably cross by the Pons Aemilius and so by the Lungaretta and up the Janiculum. Dr. Gow states somewhat too roundly that ‘the construction *dignus qui* does not occur in Augustan poets,’ but it is true that in the one notable exception, *Aeneid* vii. 653, there is a special reason for its adoption. In 4. 23 we cannot actually understand *mei*, for *scripta mei* will hardly stand. How often it happens that the word of the ellipse is not definitely conceived. On 4. 63 would it not be more accurate to say that Cicero's usual formula is not *hactenus haec* but *haec hactenus*? In 2. 8 the metaphor of *stringat* is as likely to be from gathering fruit or reaping ears of corn as from stripping leaves off trees. I will only add that Dr. Gow's edition is one which no Horatian will choose to be without.

J. SARGEAUNT.

ELLIS' *AETNA*.

Aetna. By ROBINSON ELLIS, LL.D., Corpus Professor of the Latin Language and Literature. Oxford 1901.

THIS very complete and exhaustive edition includes a critical recension of the text based on a new examination of MSS., a prose translation facing the text, and an exegetical

commentary as well as elaborate prolegomena dealing with the history of the poem and the MSS. in which it is preserved. It is a model of criticism at once brilliant and cautious, giving full weight, and yet no more than is due, to diplomatic tradition on the one hand and to the imperative claims of language and metre on the other. It

has been the fortune of this poem to have amongst its editors intemperate champions of both of these schools. It has had, on the one hand, editors like Baehrens who are ready to employ conjecture not only in correction of MS. tradition when in conflict with the acknowledged laws of language syntax or metre, but in removal of such idiosyncrasies as may well be characteristic of individual writers, and in the assimilation of the natural diversities of style to a uniform standard. It has had, on the other, its Sudhaus who in blind adherence to MSS. translates right through Latin which in the sixteenth century would have been universally pronounced to be impossible and therefore corrupt.

The admirable edition of Munro (1867) which made such an epoch in the criticism of the poem, strange to say, approximates in some passages to the exponents of the latter view. For instance in 504ff. he keeps to a without changing a letter: the result is:

eminet examen: plagis ardentia saxa,
scintillas procul esse fides, procul esseruentis,
which he persuades himself is Latin and means 'the fact that burning stones, that sparks are far away, far away, as they fall to the ground,¹ is a proof that this is caused by blows.' In the present edition the passage runs:

Emitat examen plagis, ardentia saxa
Scintillant: procul este pedes, procul este ruentes,

which is translated 'at each blow a swarm of sparkles shoot out, the burning rocks flash fire: away, swift feet, away with all your speed.' Here we have at least Latin and English, though *ruentes* is hardly the word one would have expected for 'with all your speed.' Indeed, *ruentes* seems to be better taken with the succeeding words *incolumi feruore cadunt*.² His reading and explanation of v. 507

vix uncis quisquam fixo dimoverit illas
is greatly to be preferred to the *iunctis* and *fuso* of Munro, whose conjectural skill throughout has hardly maintained the brilliant promise of *Hyla* and *Ladonis* in the opening lines of the poem.³

¹ *Ruentis* we take to be a misprint for *ruentes*.

² D'Orville's *procul este, sudas, procul este, tridentis* is too violent a desertion of the MSS., but it is very attractive—just the forcible-feeble way in which the minor poet would have described the uselessness of stakes and levers in getting rid of the lava; and it falls in with Prof. Ellis's conjecture *uncis*.

³ In many other places, conspicuously in 493, 502, 535, Munro elicits from his reading a meaning which can hardly be found in it.

NO. CXXXIX. VOL. XVI.

Among the places (which are numerous) in which Prof. Ellis has either convinced us that he has restored the true text or at least has made a more plausible suggestion than other editors we would give a high place to his *ducit namque omnis hiatus* 96, *novent* (for *movent*) *hoc plura necesse est* 148, *gyros* 324, *rigent* 384, *crispantur* 393, *bruta* 409, *carbo* 411, and especially his brilliant and certain vindication of the hitherto misunderstood reading of the MSS. in 212 *spiritus inflatis nomen, languentibus aer*, where he shows that 'two conditions of imprisoned air, in tension or in subsidence, are contrasted,' the former being called *spiritus* (something like our 'gas,' except that it does not connote anything inflammable). His distinction he proves by passages from Seneca, to whose correspondent Lucilius Junior the poem seems to be rightly attributed. It would be interesting here to give a few of the arguments by which the Editor has supported his conjectures, but this would demand far too much space, and we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the book itself. Less probable but very interesting are the following: *quidquid et infernist, falsi consortia adhaerent* 84, *ingens* for *ignes* 188, *itis* for *istis* (*ipsis*) 271 (where, however, we prefer Baehrens' *sic audis semper quaevis res carior ipsis*), *niuis in sese* 283, *bruta* for *tutu* 409, *haud equidem mirum scateret* 456, *simans* 494, *rhydas* 531, *artem* 553.

The number of passages obelised is considerable. For instance, in 23 he prints *quidquid in antiquum iactata est fabula carmen*. Would it be rash to suggest (in a desperate passage) that we have here a ἀραξ εἰρημέων *fabile*, which would certainly have been corrupted into *fabula*? As the best MSS. add *et* after *quidquid*, we might perhaps read *quodque et in antiquum iactatu est fabile carmen*, which would mean 'ay, everything that can be uttered has been hitched into some lay of old.' Verses 79, 80 are thus printed:

[Mentiti uates stygias undasque canentes]
Hi Tityon tpoena stravere in iugera foedum.

Now it seems to us that he might have avoided both the *athetesis* and the *obelus*, without calling on conjecture more than he is constantly obliged to do in this difficult and very corrupt poem. He might have given his own excellent *ualles* for *uates* and Scaliger's *canesque* for *canentis* (*canes* = *Furias*), correcting with Unger *foedum* to *setum*: the phrase *poena...setum* is strongly supported by Aen. vi. 598 and other

passages quoted by the Editor. *In iugera* in the sense of 'over whole acres' seems quite possible in such a poem. At all events *ualles* (as well as *adierunt* for *viderunt* in 77) is deserving of a place in the foot-notes. The Editor, who is unusually free from bias in favour of his own conjectures, has relegated both suggestions to the Commentary.

In 52 in reading *per inertia* for the *que tertia* of the MSS. he has given the most poetical suggestion that has been made; but there is much to be said for Suringar's hypothesis of a gloss. The passage (51-53) might have run originally

Impius et miles metuentia cominus astra
Provocat admotisq; deos ad proelia signis.

In 69, *tum Liber cessata* (*cessat* or *celsa* MSS.) *venit per sidera*, no satisfactory parallel for *cessata* = *quiescentia* is given in the notes: it is not the same as *cessata...spectacula* in 389. In the puzzling passage 292, which so well illustrates the difficulties besetting the poem, and which he gives as *nam veluti sonat urna ciens Tritona canorum*, we prefer Munro's *sonat hora duci Tritone canoro*. It has strong MS. authority, *ora duc* of C, and the musical Triton might have sounded the hour for a *naumachia* such as that in Suetonius, *duci* being the Emperor. *Sonat urna* might, of course, easily have been corrupted into the *sonatura* of the Vatican *codex*, but could a hydraulic machine be called *urna*, and would not *ciere* be a somewhat strange word for setting the Triton going?

It will be seen from these necessarily few and brief quotations, that, if there is nothing in the present work quite so certain or so brilliant as the Editor's *ne frit quidem* for *nec erit quidem* in Plaut. *Most.* iii. 1. 61, yet there is still much to charm those who are still capable of being delighted by an ingenious and scholarly emendation and who find a high pleasure in following the arguments by which it is supported. In this respect the Commentary is extremely full and complete, and as much so in the defence of the conjectures of others (e.g. the *trecenti* of Buecheler and Sudhaus in 579) as of the Editor's own.

The date and authorship of the *Aetna* are fully discussed in the Prolegomena. He rejects the claims of Cornelius Severus, Manilius, and Virgil. The date, he holds, must be subsequent to Virgil and probably

before the Silver Age, possibly in the reign of Augustus, but most probably in the later Claudian or early Neronian era. He thinks it may be plausibly assigned to Lucilius Junior, the correspondent of the younger Seneca, with whose works, and in particular the seven books of *Natural Questions*, the poem shows a close and very intimate agreement.

As to the MSS. of the *Aetna*, the great question is, what is the relative value of CS on the one hand and of the Gyraldinian variants on the other. C is the Cambridge-tenth century *codex* first completely collated by Munro. S is the *Fragmentum Stabulense*, an eleventh century *codex* containing most of the *Aetna*, once in the Monastery of Stavelot, now in the National Library of Paris. The Gyraldinian readings refer only to vv. 138-285; they belong to a very early *codex* now lost, but used in the sixteenth century by Silius Gyraldus. Baehrens makes of these readings a first-class as compared with other MSS., C and S included. Prof. Ellis in a very well sustained argument shows the absolute superiority of C, and of S (which agrees very closely with C), not only to all the fifteenth century MSS., but to the Gyraldinian variants. Of the variants plainly not due to conjecture the editor gives many examples, the most interesting of which are the following: (α) 226 *ingenium sacrare caputque attollere caelo* against *sacra per ingentem capitique attollere caelum* of C; compare the curiously parallel phrase of Seneca (*Nat. Quest.* Pref. to Bk. iv. § 10) *ingenium consecrare*: (β) 213 *nam prope nequicquam pars est violentia* against *par est* of C, for *parsest* is a corruption of *persest* (*per se est*) the admirable conjecture of Wagler: (γ) 165 *aquasque* against *-a quaeque* of C, for the variant leads to the now generally accepted emendation of Munro, *ocuatque*. But in addition to these Prof. Ellis gives other classes of variants, some plainly wrong, some hardly intelligible, many imperfectly or wrongly reported, and very many such as could have been made (some, as we have seen, have actually been made) by well-trained scholars. He has certainly established his thesis that when the Gyraldinian variants are in marked antagonism to CS we are bound to give our first consideration to CS, our second to them.

R. Y. TYRELL.