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](#)

Wickham' Horace, Vol. II *The Works of Horace*. Vol. II. The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica by E. C. Wickham, M.A., Master of Wellington College, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1891.

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 04 / April 1891, pp 169 - 172
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00178916, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00178916

How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 169-172 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00178916

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα κατέλυσε Καλλικράτης κ.τ.λ. Cleophon is credited with the first introduction of the diobely; Callicrates with increasing it to three obols. Surely κατέλυσε is inappropriate. A man who increased a payment from two obols to three could not be said to abolish the earlier payment. I propose κατηύξησε; the compound does not occur elsewhere, but it would naturally have the sense of 'corruptly' or 'wastefully increasing'; cf. *Politics*, ii. 1271a, 3 καταδωροδοκούμενοι καὶ καταχαριζόμενοι. The passage raises other points of interest. Mr. Wyse suspects διεδίδον and proposes διεδίδοτο. But if Cleophon held a financial office (as is probable from *Lys.* xix. 48) the active voice would be appropriate. Dr. Beloch has argued with much ingenuity that Cleophon was for some years a member of the board of πορισταί (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxix. pp. 249 ff.). The use of the word διεδίδον and still more the use of the verb πορίζειν in this passage confirm his argument. Lastly it is not quite certain that the δωβελία is to be identified with the Theoric distribution. Dr. Beloch (*ib.* pp. 239 ff.) argues that the two obols referred to in *Ar. Ran.* 140 and the δωβελία so frequently mentioned in inscriptions really denote the dicast's fee, and that it was reintroduced in 410 at the rate of two obols. This theory is confirmed by the reference to Callicrates quoted by Mr. Kenyon. At the same time the use of the word πρῶτος seems to point to the introduction of a new institution, and not to the restoration of an old one.

L. WHIBLEY.

C. 25.—As regards the story of Themistocles and the Areopagus, if it is true, there arise more difficulties as to chronology than those mentioned in Mr. Kenyon's note. Thucydides says (i. 137) that Themistocles was brought by a storm to Naxos on his flight to Asia at the time of the siege of that island by the Athenians. No one dates this siege later than 465 (Pierson); Schäfer puts it in 466, Krüger even in 473. And yet, according to this story, Themistocles was in Athens in 462. It is not possible to suppose that Themistocles had been intriguing with Ephialtes against the Areopagus for some years previously, and that some time elapsed between his ostracism and the fall of the Areopagus; for the two events are immediately connected in this version.

GEORGE F. HILL.

c. 52. ἂν μὲν ὁμολογῶσι, θανάτῳ ζημιώσοντας, ἂν δ' ἀμφισβητῶσιν, εἰσάγοντας εἰς τὸ δικάστηριον. In the editor's note this is interpreted so as to agree with the statements in the lexicographers, who understand ὁμολογῶσι of the confession of the accused. A writer in the *Saturday Review* for March 21 points out that the true rendering of the passage is, 'There are also appointed by lot officers called *The Eleven*, whose functions are to take charge of prisoners, and in the case of those arrested for thieving, robbery, or brigandage, to inflict, if they are unanimous, the penalty of death, or if they disagree, to bring them before the ordinary court.'

WICKHAM'S HORACE, VOL. II.

The Works of Horace. Vol. II. *The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica* by E. C. WICKHAM, M.A., Master of Wellington College, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1891.

THE first volume of Mr. Wickham's Horace, which appeared in 1874, bore evident traces of being a labour of love. It did not profess to make substantial additions to our knowledge of Horace or of Latin, but it was appreciative and elegant, and contained in the way of translation some examples of highly ingenious and delicate phrase-making. Faculties of this nature sink into quite a

subordinate place when an editor comes to deal with the *Satires* and *Epistles*, which are full of difficulties for the interpreter and present still (in spite of much that has been urged to the contrary) some passages where the art of textual criticism must be brought to bear on the words of the poet. It is not surprising that an admirer of the *Odes* should be even somewhat repelled by the *Satires* and *Epistles*, and that he should feel that qualities of mind valuable in handling the one are of little use in dealing with the other. It would have been hard indeed for Mr. Wickham to make his second volume as acceptable to the world of teachers and of learners as his first was. The first volume

entered on a comparatively unoccupied field as regards English editions; in the long interval which elapsed before the appearance of the second volume, its ground had been thoroughly explored by two eminent scholars and all its material had been thoroughly sifted and analysed. The *Satires* by Professor Palmer and the *Epistles* by Professor Wilkins, though appearing in a series which does not profess to aim so high as the Clarendon Press, must be at once seen to represent a far higher standard of scholarship than Mr. Wickham's edition. He has made abundant use of the materials of both editors, but has not caught the spirit of either. There is a certain apathy and lack of interest in his work which contrasts greatly with the enthusiastic search for truth which characterises that of Professors Palmer and Wilkins.

In *Sat.* i. 3, 120

Nam ut ferula caedas meritum maiora subire
Verbera non vereor

we have a reading which, as long as it stands in the text of Horace, is a standing argument that there is no such thing as a science of grammar. If *vereor ut* may in one passage in Latinity and in one only—for the alleged parallels are obviously irrelevant—signify 'I fear you will,' then any deviation from any grammatical rule in any case and in any author is admissible. What should we say if we were told that in one passage only in English literature 'I have my doubts about his succeeding' meant 'I fear he will succeed'? Now the case is far stronger against the possibility that a Latin writer should use *vereor ut caedas* in the sense of 'I fear that you will scourge' against the consentient practice of Latin writers of all ages and conspicuously against his own.¹ Yet on this passage Mr. Wickham does not even mention Palmer's conjecture of *nunc* for *non* which completely restores the sense and saves the grammar. He quotes in mitigation of the violation of grammar (which he calls 'the departure from the usual rule which would have required *ne* instead of *ut*') a passage in which *ut* is not in syntactical connexion with the verb of 'fearing' at all; and he says that an obviously untenable rendering proposed in the *Journal of Philology* 'may be right.' Here, again, is a note which makes one think the editor had not his own text before him when he was writing it; or is it possible

¹ Cp. O puer, ut sis vitalis metuo *Sat.* ii. 1, 60; *ne* quid deperdat metuens aut ampliut *ut* rem i. 4, 31.

that any one has proposed to read *in chartis*? The passage is *Sat.* i. 4, 132

ubi quid datur oti

Illudo chartis.

The note is:—'*Illudo chartis.* The depreciatory use of "*ludo*" of a man's own compositions (as in *Sat.* i. 10. 37, see on *Od.* i. 32. 2) with the addition *in chartis*. Horace is giving a final account of his writing of *Satire*. It is his playful and childlike method of self-rebuke and self-instruction.' But is it not a playful and childlike way of explaining a very difficult expression *illudo chartis* to treat *illudo* as if it were *ludo*, and *chartis* as if it were *in chartis*? The difficult phrase *illudo chartis* has been rightly understood by a scholiast and rightly explained by Palmer who quotes him; Mr. Wickham explains a phrase *ludo in chartis*, which, if any Latin writer had used it, would not seem to require explanation. If he really holds that *illudo chartis* = *ludo in chartis* he should have said so, and should have adduced reasons for holding this view, and examples supporting it.

In i. 5, 89

venit vilissima rerum

Hic aqua, sed panis longe pulcherrimus

surely the antithesis shows that the meaning is 'here you have to buy the worst water in the world,' not 'here water, the cheapest thing in the world, has to be bought.' Mr. Wickham follows Orelli in the latter explanation, and does not mention the former.

One naturally turns to i. 6, 75 and thus finds one's old friend *octonis referentes Idibus aera* which of course may be right; but if I had no better argument against *octonos...* *aeris* than that it introduces a new *s* into a verse where there are already as many as we want of that letter, I should prefer to fall back on the good old plan that I liked the old *mumpsimus* better than the new *sumpsimus*.

Just as Mr. Wickham explained *illudo chartis* as if Horace had written *in chartis ludo*, but without suggesting that *illudo chartis* could really be the same as *ludo in chartis*, so in the very vexed passage i. 6, 12, 6 where V. has *lusumque trigonem*, a reading which has been accepted by most editors since Bentley demonstrated the ineptitude of *rabiosi tempora signi*, he gives in his text *lusumque trigonem*, but renders it in his note 'the game of three, a game of ball.' But *ludum* would have been the word used for 'a game'; the words must mean 'the (game

of) ball already played by me.' This is the poet's brief way of mentioning that he had already played a game of ball though he had not mentioned it. He writes that 'Munro thinking *trigon* was the ball itself would either take *lusum* as a participle = *elusum* "cheated, left in the lurch," or alter it to *pulsum*.' Hence Mr. Wickham seems to think if *trigon* is not the ball itself *lusum* may be something other than a participle. What then is *lusum*? If Horace meant to speak of a 'game' he would certainly have written *ludum*.

In i. 9, 36

et casu tunc respondere vadato
Debebat

Mr. Wickham says that *vadato* is dative. But *respondere* in this sense is always used absolutely, and elsewhere *vadatus* is always passive 'held to bail.' Hence it seems far better to take *vadato* as an impersonal ablative 'bail having been given for his appearance,' like *intestato*, *inauspicato*. It was the feeling that *respondere* must be absolute and *vadato* passive which led Bentley to read *vadatus* 'having been held to bail.' What was needed for the defence of the text was an *exact* parallel to *vadato* taken as an impersonal ablative absolute. This Mr. Palmer supplied by adducing *hoc quod satisdato debeo* Cic. *Att.* xvi. 6, 3, 'security having been given.' This would seem to settle the question, but Mr. Wickham does not mention it.

ii. 2, 123

Post hoc ludus erat culpa potare magistra.

One looks to this verse to see how an editor will treat the comment of Porphyryon. Mr. Wickham's observation is 'His explanation suggests, though it does not say, that *culpa* had some technical sense.' Mr. Palmer's is 'This shows he simply knew nothing whatever about it, and one feels strongly disposed to agree with the latter view. But let not the delightful rendering of M'Caul lack our humble tribute, 'each person took as much as he pleased, *restricted only by the feeling that excess was culpable*!' Perhaps *imbibed* instead of *took* would render this version perfect as a reproduction of the spirit as well as the manner of Horace.

In ii. 8, 6 no notice is taken of a nice grammar point; *leni fuit Austro captus aper* means 'there was a boar caught' &c. not 'the boar was caught' &c., a rendering into which the uncautioned learner will certainly fall.

The *Epistles* do not present the same kind of difficulties as the *Satires*, and Mr. Wickham would seem to have felt more interest in his task of editing them. The tone and topics are often very like those of the *Odes*, and if the editor has not always satisfactorily traced the train of thought, he is in this matter as successful as his predecessors have been or his successors are likely to be. But in explanation and criticism he does not seem to have much of his own to offer, and does not always seem to choose the best of the suggestions of others. Surely *olus omne* (i. 5, 2) is not 'a mess of vegetables'; *ingenuis* i. 19, 34 demands a note such as Mr. Wilkins has given, and the same may be said of *deserat* i. 20, 10; and in rendering *honoratum Achillem* (A.P. 120) 'the time-honoured character of Achilles' he has suggested an impossible meaning for the participle. Again, Haupt's *victo ridens* seems an almost certain correction of *victor violens*, a most unmeaning expression, in i. 10, 37. This conjecture however Mr. Wickham, though he does not accept it, at least mentions; an honour which he might have paid to a conjecture which has found so much favour in recent times as Ribbeck's *momen* for *nomen* in A.P. 253.

Of many of the notes we have nothing to say except that while they are useful and good, as far as they go, they are neither so useful nor so good as those of the edition by Mr. Wilkins which already holds the field. A comparison of the two editions will settle this question; we have formed our opinion on an examination of several passages containing matter of interest from the point of view of the grammarian and the student of history and archaeology: among these are *maiora minorave fama* Ep. i. 11, 3; *utroque pollice* i. 18, 66; *puteal Libonis* i. 19, 8—9; *frater ut alter* ii. 2, 87; *palus divi* A.P. 65; *cantor* A.P. 155; *quarta persona* A.P. 192.

The last few years have been rather rich in floating comments on Horace in the magazines both German and English. Messrs. Housman, Postgate and Palmer have all made interesting and instructive suggestions, some of which at least deserved to be mentioned in a large and handsome edition like the present. I will mention only one here—a suggestion made by Mr. Housman on a much vexed passage—which seems to me as convincing as it is simple, and which could not fail to be interesting to students of Horace. He thus punctuates A.P. 60—

Ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos,
Prima cadunt ita verborum, vetus interit
aetas,
Et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigent-
que.

Thus an extremely minute change even for the modern reader—no change at all in the tradition of the MSS.—restores coherence to a passage which has puzzled the commentators from Bentley down, while there is nothing either in the construction thus

emerging or in the rhythm which is not conformable to the manner and practice of Horace.

Mr. Wickham has certainly produced a handsome and useful edition of the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace: and, if we cannot say that he has contributed much to the knowledge of Horace or of Latin, perhaps that is because the field has been so recently and so thoroughly gleaned.

R. Y. TYRELL.

RAWLINS' AND INGE'S *ETON LATIN GRAMMAR*.

The Eton Latin Grammar, for use in the higher forms. Second Edition, by F. H. RAWLINS and W. R. INGE (John Murray, London, 1890).

THIS book, which has now reached a second edition, is intended for those who have already mastered the rudiments of Latin. 'Our object has been to explain the facts already learnt, and at the same time to add to the stock of knowledge already acquired and to carry the learner upward to the higher scholarship' (preface by the authors). This programme is carried out by an elaborate treatment of Latin *accidence* on a philological basis, and a syntax of average scope. Obligations are acknowledged to King and Cookson's *Sounds and Inflections*, Henry's *Grammaire Comparée*, Brugmann's *Comparative Grammar*, and Schweizer-Sidler's *Latin Grammar*, second edition. The present edition is said to have been 'thoroughly revised,' and the Headmaster of Eton claims in an introductory notice that it is suitable not only for school use but also for students and scholars generally.

A glance at its contents suggests a number of questions of grave moment to the cause of classical education, which however it is impossible to discuss adequately within the limits of a review.

(1) Is grammar a means or an end in school study? Some teachers are using all their efforts to hasten the day when the pupil leaves off mumbling the dry bones of *Accidence* and commences reading the literature. They attempt to limit the amount of grammar to be learnt to what is really essential, and to present that limited amount in the most perspicuous and digestible form. The facts of grammar may be divided into three classes: (a) those necessary for reading a

language, a surprisingly small quantity; (b) those necessary for writing or speaking a language, a moderate quantity; (c) those necessary for answering grammar papers, an indefinitely large quantity, which however may be indefinitely reduced in proportion as examiners become more enlightened. At Eton it would seem that views of this kind find no favour. The fifth form boy, who ought to have mastered the essentials of *accidence*, is confronted with a grammar, in which he makes the acquaintance of 'the special forms used in Comedy and those in vogue in the silver age,' not to mention a liberal selection from inscriptions. Are the true ends of classical study furthered by a school grammar which gives as endings of the nominative plural of the 2nd declension *-ī, -īs, -ēs, -eis* (pp. 34, 37), and of the genitive singular of the 5th declension *-ēī, -ēī, -ēī, -ē, -ī, -ēs* (p. 31)?

(2) If two grammars are to be used in a school, ought there not to be some organic connexion between them? Would it not have been wise to make the advanced course strictly supplementary to the elementary, and to treat the knowledge acquired in the latter as a point of departure? Had this been done the authors would have lent powerful aid to the cause of organization and concentration in school work—surely one of the questions of the day. They have preferred to write an independent book. The whole matter of *accidence* has been thrown into the philological crucible, to emerge in a new and more formidable shape. Syntax is treated *ab initio*, the simplest definitions and rules being repeated.

(3) Is the attempt to initiate the pupil into the mysteries of scientific philology consistent with a simple and practical treatment of the facts of *accidence*? Take an