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](#)

Cocchia's *Tristia* of Ovid *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium* libri quinque. Revisione del testo e commento a cura di Enrico Cocchia. G. B. Paravia, Torino — Roma — Milano — Firenze — Napoli. 1900. 2 lire.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 01 / February 1901, pp 63 - 64

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0002953X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0002953X

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 63-64 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0002953X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

mépris d'H. pour le personnage. 2. Hybrida...Persius, expression méprisante. 31. compellans...cuculum, reproduction d'une injure usuelle. 35. hunc regem iugulas, expression familière, à sa place, étant donné l'adversaire.'

In the following ten pages every other satire is treated in the same way; then we have eleven similar pages on 'l'expression concrète et pittoresque,' and so on for nearly fifty pages more. There are chapters of the same sort on 'l'emploi des noms propres' (pp. 283-322), on philosophy in the *Satires*, and on 'la genèse et la valeur des idées morales,' but even M. Cartault's industry was unequal to compiling an index. I should admire this industry more if it led to any discoveries, but it does not. M. Cartault's opinions, after all, are the same as those of every casual reader. Here is one of his conclusions (p. 140):

'En résumé, la caractéristique du raisonnement dans les S. est la suivante: H. évite la structure rigoureuse de l'argument, qui donnerait à ses S. une apparence dogmatique. Le raisonnement n'a jamais chez lui, lorsqu'il parle en son propre nom, sa forme scolastique complète. Il faut souvent le deviner sous une confidence personnelle, sous une anecdote, etc. Mais il est de la plus haute importance de le restituer mentalement pour l'intelligence des S. Quant à sa valeur, elle est très inégale. Bien qu'aimant beaucoup la discussion, H. n'est pas un puissant raisonneur, un de ces logiciens impeccables, qui ne disent que des choses justes et justement enchaînées. Il raisonne parfois à côté et il se contente de paraître, sur le moment, n'avoir pas

tort. Il est fin, ingénieux; il ne se préoccupe point de construire des démonstrations définitives et qui résistent à toute attaque. Il n'approfondit pas volontiers; il se borne à jeter des idées toujours intéressantes et qui piquent la curiosité, mais qui parfois, à la réflexion, sont contestables et auxquelles on voudrait des assises plus solides.'

This opinion is the result of forty-two large and closely-printed pages of laborious analysis, but I must confess that, for my part, I was convinced before I had read the whole chapter.

The book, it will be seen, is a series of running commentaries, each written from its own point of view. The chief *cruces* are usually discussed in footnotes, in which M. Cartault displays a meticulous knowledge of every German criticism. At I. 1,108 (*qui nemo ut auarus*) he thinks there is a lacuna of some lines. He would omit 4, 11 and rearrange the lines 8-12. At 6, 14 he proposed *negante* for *notante* some years ago and repeats the suggestion here. At 10, 66 he proposes *quam rudis e Graecis inlati carminis auctor*, which would refer to Ennius. These, I believe, are the only novelties in criticism. In exegesis I do not observe any novelties at all. I should, however, call attention (1) to some very interesting remarks (pp. 16-20) on Horace's social position when he returned to Rome after Philippi and his relations with Hermogenes, the *ambubaiarum collegia* and all the other Bohemians of the great city: and (2) to M. Cartault's discussion of Horace's use of proper names. He is emphatically of opinion that Horace satirised living persons under their real names.

J. Gow.

COCCHIA'S *TRISTIA OF OVID*.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque. Revisione del testo e commento a cura di ENRICO COCCHIA. G. B. Paravia, Torino — Roma — Milano — Firenze — Napoli. 1900. 2 lire.

THIS handy edition of the *Tristia* deserves high praise: the editor shows good judgment and good scholarship. The text is

explained in short notes printed beneath it. The brief preface gives an accurate account of the Lorenzian MS., and of Politian's collation of the two lost MSS. rediscovered by myself in the Bodleian library. The preeminence of the Lorenzian MS., and of the family allied to it, is insisted upon, and doubts suggested by Thomas, *Revue Critique*, 1890, p. 46, are summarily dismissed.

Cocchia draws attention to the excellence of the emendations of Gronovius and Bentley, 'which' he says 'present the character not only of perfect evidence but of true genius, qualities which appear to be quite absent from or forgotten in the more recent criticism.' Heinsius deserved to be mentioned with these giants of criticism: for Heinsius did more for Ovid's text than any other scholar. Cocchia follows Bentley in the following places: iii. 5, 3 *nec*; iv. 3, 34 *non es? at* [tacitly]; v. 1, 16 *praemoneo, non est*; v. 5, 32 *consilio fugiunt aethera, Ponte, tuum*; v. 12, 53 *si qua*. In ii. 296 *uir*, and iv. 4, 47 *uiam* he follows Bentley it is true, but the readings have been subsequently discovered in MSS.

The text is a fresh recension, based on the materials collected in my edition. In doubtful passages, the MSS. reading is given along with the conjecture admitted into the text, reasons being sometimes assigned, sometimes not. The notes are concise, but adequate; no parallel passages are quoted. Though brief, these notes leave little untouched that calls for comment.

The handling of the text is not always fortunate: thus i. 1, 21 Riese's unnecessary conjecture *legendus* is printed, without one word to suggest that it is a conjecture, or that the MSS. reading is *legendum*, which is certainly right. In the same poem line 26 *peior* is printed without comment. This reading has poor authority: and *maior* the reading of the better MSS., though harder, appears to be right, and should have been mentioned. The meaning is, 'Do not defend yourself, a bad case will become more difficult through your defence.' i. 1, 112 *ii qui* printed in the text, is incorrectly stated to be the reading of Guelf. and Vat. These MSS. have *hii qui*, which stands not for *ii qui* but *hi qui*, which I have restored to the text. i. 6, 2 *Battis* is incorrectly printed for *Bittis*. v. 5, 45 *nata pudicitia est, moris probitasque fidesque* the reading of AGHPV is printed; though it seems to be hardly Latin. *Morum*

would be required. I have edited *oris*, which still seems to me most probable, and should certainly have been mentioned.

I proceed to notice a few points in the commentary. i. 2, 55 *et mandare suis, aliquā et sperare sepulcrum*, is printed, with the note *aliquā* 'in qualche parte sicura.' The editor goes on to remark that its indefinite meaning precludes us from taking *aliqua* as the object of *mandare*, and that if it were the object, it would be necessary to change *sepulcrum* into *sepulcra*. But *mandare* positively requires an object, and the meaning is 'to give some poor instructions to one's kinsfolk.' i. 2, 83 *obligor ut tangam* is wrongly explained '*obligor* scil. *votis*.' i. 2, 101 the extraordinary reading *quolibet et minimis domui si favimus illi* is introduced: *quolibet* is explained as an ablative of means: 'if I have supported the imperial house by any act even in the smallest matters.' This seems hardly possible, and there is no difficulty about the best attested reading *quod licet et minimis* 'a thing which the humblest may do.' On ii. 94 the court of the *centumviri* is wrongly described as a criminal court. ii. 95 *res quoque privatus statui sine crimine iudex* means that Ovid acted as an arbitrator in *iudicia privata*. The note is misleading: '*iudex* come uno dei giudici invitati dal pretore a far parte del suo tribunale.' ii. 478 *ut male velle sequens sciat et revocare priorem* is an ingenious restoration: it is explained as 'to follow up and design damage to the opposite side.' iv. 10, 80 the editor follows me in restoring *matris proxima busta tui* as against the usually accepted conjecture of Heinsius *matri—iusta*. Heinsius objected to *busta ferre* as *vix Latinum*. The editor correctly explains 'portai al sepolcro le ceneri'; but as he never quotes parallels, he does not attempt to support this. The justification I think is to be found in Lucan viii. 850 *summusque feret tua busta sacerdos*: cp. ix. 67 *numquam dare busta licebit*? where however some MSS. have *iusta*.

S. G. OWEN.

STEWART'S HOMILIES OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

Thirteen Homilies of St. Augustine on St. John xiv., with translation and notes. By H. F. STEWART, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1900. 4s.

THE Latin patristic writers have suffered terrible things at the hands of their English

translators. In each of the three well-known series of translations instances may be found of divines who have ventured, on the strength of reminiscences, perhaps somewhat dim, of classical Latinity, to render into English writings of the third or fourth century. Countless passages have been