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](#)

***The Bellum Catilinae* of C. Sallustius Crispus, edited on the basis of Schmalz's edition, with Introduction and Vocabulary, by Charles G. Herbermann, Ph.D. Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, Boston, U.S.A.**

Edward Capps

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 323 - 324

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186330, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186330

How to cite this article:

Edward Capps (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 323-324 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186330

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HARTMANN'S FRATERNITY OF ROMAN GARDENERS IN THE YEAR 1030.

Urkunde einer römischer Gärtnergenossenschaft vom Jahre 1030, mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen, herausgegeben von LUDO MORITZ HARTMANN. Freiburg in Brigg. (J. C. B. Mohr), 1892, 4to. pp. 19. Pr. 2m. 80 pf.

THE document here printed, with elaborate notes and introduction, by Dr. Hartmann, contains the ordinances drawn up by a body of gardeners in Rome, eight 'honesti viri,' or free tradesmen, when forming themselves into an association, in the year 1030. The attention of the editor seems to have been first attracted to it by a note in Gregorovius' *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*. (Vol. IV.⁴ p. 430). Speaking of the way in which the ancient guilds, or trade-societies, came to seek the protection of great men as patrons, Gregorovius had cited these present ordinances. He could only do so from a bad transcript (MS. Galletti, 8048) in the Vatican, and not inexcusably calls it a barbarous document. As far as the Latin text goes, he might have still called it so, even after Dr. Hartmann's assiduous labours; for these gardeners, honest men, like Sigismund four centuries later, had certainly souls above grammar. The original MS., which is a scroll, having two versions of the rules written one inside and one out, is in the possession of the Canons of Santa Maria in the Via Lata at Rome. Through the good offices of the Commendatore De Rossi (to whom this monograph is dedicated) a more exact copy was obtained by the editor, and this was further revised by the Austrian Librarian, Dr. Starzer. From its length, or intrinsic importance, the document might seem hardly worth so much trouble. It merely sets forth, in extraordinarily bad Latin, how these gardeners

enrolled themselves as a fraternity, and chose a prior of their lodge (*schola*), one Amatus, a 'vir magnificus.' Details follow, respecting the settlement of disputes by an appeal to the prior, granting leases, and the like. The real interest lies in its date, near that 'beginning of the eleventh century' to which Brentano referred the drawing-up of the earliest guild statutes about which we have any certain information in this country. In an able and interesting introduction, Dr. Hartmann traces the continuous existence of these trade-societies from early classical times to the break-up of the Roman empire. He shows how they were repressed by Trajan, encouraged by Severus, chartered by Constantine (among whose 35 recognized trades, by the way, that of the gardeners counts as one); and how, in course of time, the Christian Church gradually took the control of them which had once been held by the state. He does not exaggerate the importance of a study of the history of guilds, which the labours of Mommsen, and the various editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* have done so much to facilitate. To take but one example, let any one consider the light thus thrown on St. Paul's remonstrance in 1 Cor. vii., about brother going to law with brother.

It would be presumptuous to suggest to the author of *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Verwaltung in Italien* fresh authorities for his subject. But as England has been called the native home of guilds, he might gain some additional information from the records of them collected by the late Mr. Toulmin Smith, or from the more recent works of Professor G. Baldwin Brown and J. Malet Lambert.

J. H. LUPTON.

The Bellum Catilinae of C. Sallustius Crispus, edited on the basis of Schmalz's edition, with Introduction and Vocabulary, by CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D. Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, Boston, U.S.A.

IN the short Introduction, the work of the present editor, is found the fanciful assumption that Sallust drew largely upon Terentia, the former wife of Cicero, for facts concerning the conspiracy. No one now believes that Sallust married Terentia. Still less is the editor warranted in drawing inferences as to Sallust's feeling toward Pompey from the 'charge'

that the latter had authorized the murder of Piso—a charge that the historian himself leaves 'in medio.' We miss in the Introduction an account of the conspiracy, correcting Sallust's misstatements and chronology. The student is left to believe that the 'first conspiracy' rests on as good authority as the second. Sallust's chronology is corrected in two points in the notes, but in general the editor is hardly more careful than the author in such matters (see chron. tab.).

We notice three expurgations in the text, though the editor claims to take it without change from Schmalz. The well-known commentary of the

German edition has been translated with few omissions; but it has been enlarged and improved by the addition of biographical and historical matter and references to American grammars. We generally recognize in the notes the clearness and directness of the German editor (but see on 49, 4). Occasionally a comment has lost point in translation (e.g. *opulentia*, 52, 9; *quoquo modo*, 23, 4; *equidem ego*, 57, 15; the last is the more serious in that nothing is said later on about the unusual usage of *equidem* with verbs of the second and third persons). Sometimes the American editor deviates from the original and goes wrong (e.g. on *fecere* 3, 1, which S. takes absolutely; on *habentur* 6, 3, which doubtless = *sese habent*; on *mos est* 30, 4, which is not found in Caesar, and others). Rarely Schmalz is set right (e.g. on *patratum*, 18, 8). Several of the more doubtful explanations of Schmalz are retained: the indicatives in indirect discourse (27, 4; 50, 3) may be explained as non-essential parts of the quotation; the subjunctive *effugiatis* 40, 3 is rather of 'characteristic result'; and *dignitati Lentuli* 52, 32 clearly means 'the official position of L.' Two instances of mistranslation occur: *ne* the interjection 52, 27 is rendered 'forsooth' (*fürwahr*), and *fugitivus* 56, 5 is said to be a 'nickname' (*Schimpfwort*).

In spite of these and other errors, however, the book may be strongly recommended to younger students.

EDWARD CAPPS.

Yale University.

The Works of Horace. Edited, with Explanatory Notes, by THOMAS CHASE. Revised Edition. Philadelphia, 1892.

MOST teachers who, during the last decade, have continued to use Chase's *Horace*, have done so chiefly because they recognized the advantage of putting before their students all the works of Horace in a single volume of convenient size and shape. They have all, I presume, felt called upon to apologize for its many serious faults. We have now before us a new edition, which proposes to remedy these faults and to modernize the book. The article on 'The Metres of Horace' has been entirely re-written and improved, but is not yet in all respects trustworthy. For instance, the representation of the first foot of the Asclepiadean verse by $\bar{\cup}$ leads to a suspicion that our editor is drawing his ideas from some work on Greek metres, rather than from observation of the actual usage of Horace. Similar slips are made in the treatment of the Pherecratean and Glyconic verses, in the Sapphic strophe and elsewhere. With these exceptions the metrical schemes are correctly given, but it would have been well to indicate the irrational feet and the catalectic verses by the conventional signs.

Most of the important editions of recent years have been added to the list of those consulted, but, with the exception of Kiessling, no extended use has been made of the later editions, and the last volume of Wickham, unfortunately, does not seem to have been used at all. Greenough is omitted from the list of names preceding the notes, but is quoted in the commentary. The value of the commentary has been materially enhanced by the addition of references to Gildersleeve's *Grammar*.

In orthography many variations from the old edition will be noticed. We find, for instance, the unassimilated form in such words as *adsideat*, *contegia*, *nectectis*, *inlinere*; -is for acc. plur. of i-stems (the length everywhere marked, as a sort of danger-signal, to prevent disaster); the unaspirated

form in *umerus*, *umor*, &c.; and Vergil is now written instead of Virgil. But one regrets to find *j* retained.

As regards the text, suffice it to say that our editor is conservative. Such alterations as are admitted show, for the most part, increased respect for the authority of the MSS., e.g. *Od.* i. 17, 17 *hinc*; ii. 17, 14 *gigas*; iii. 27, 13-14 *vivas, vetet*; *Carm. Saec.* 70-72 *curat*, &c.

One finds most to censure in the commentary. A few instances must suffice: the note on *Od.* i. 2, 25 '*Divum* (a contraction of *divorum*)', is, in the year 1892, to say the least, surprising. It looks like a reminiscence of Anthon who, by the way, in the old edition was soberly cited among the authorities. *Od.* i. 13, 13 *Non, si me audias, speres*, &c., our editor translates 'you cannot, or will not, hope.' This of course should read 'would not hope,' but it is such an improvement upon the note of the old edition (viz. 'This more emphatic negative is often used in prohibitive sentences instead of *ne*,') that we ought perhaps to feel grateful rather than critical. There is similar looseness of rendering in *Od.* iii. 3, 66; 23, 16-19, &c. On *iniciat Od.* i. 17, 26 (wrongly cited as in vs. 16) we find: 'The hard *i* makes the vowel in "in-" long.' This might be pardoned as a mere oversight, if the same error were not repeated in the note on *principium Od.* iii. 6, 6. Of course *syllable* is meant, not vowel.

Epod. iv. 9 (*Videsne*) *ut ora vertat huc et huc euntium liberrima indignatio* is translated 'turns the faces of the passers-by hither and thither (away from you).' That is, to take a modern instance, an upstart struts along our streets, dressed in the loudest plaid, with a collar up to his ears, with arms akimbo, and, as he passes, all look away from him! Surely those who explain this passage thus are not close observers of human nature. The key to the meaning of *vertat* here is found in *Sat.* ii. 8, 35 *Vertere pallor parochi faciem*, i.e. changed, over-spread. An old friend, or rather foe, meets us again in the comment on *Sat.* i. 10, 21 *O seri studiorum! quine puletiis difficile et mirum, Rhodio quod Pitholeonti contigit?* 'A mixture of a relative sentence and an interrogative sentence: because you think,—and can it be that you think?' Greenough calls this *quine* the 'despair of grammarians.' It does not seem to me so hopeless a case. It should be observed that *ne* is appended to interrogative words only when they are such as have also non-interrogative meanings, e.g. *uterne*, *Sat.* ii. 2, 107; *quone*, *Sat.* ii. 3, 295; *quantane*, *Sat.* ii. 3, 317. (For in spite of the recognition given to *numne* by Schmalz in Müller's *Handbuch*, and by others, Ritschl was probably right in denying its Latinity.) The *ne* is appended, then, only to show that, in the particular case in hand, the interrogative use is intended. Without the *ne* in this passage, *qui* would ordinarily be felt as a relative pronoun. The *ne* shows at the outset that we have the interrogative adverb. *Qui* is used = 'why,' as in *Sat.* i. 1, 108 (for which reading see Wickham's note); the mode is used as in *Sat.* i. 4, 70 (*cur metuas?*) and the meaning of the passage is: 'O you blockheads! Why should you think that such a wonderful thing, &c.' I hope to discuss this and related questions more fully at another time. In *Sat.* i. 6, 116 *Cena ministratur pueris tribus*, Mr. Chase thinks we have 'a variety of the instrumental abl. rather than a dat. of agent, which dat. Horace uses only with passive participles.' What would he say of *quae scribuntur aquae potioribus Epist.* i. 19, 3?

A more favourable account may be given of the literary notes. They are as a rule appreciative and helpful. Translations and explanations are judiciously offered. The introductions and arguments are