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](#)

Sudhaus' *Aetna Aetna*, erklärt von Siegfried Sudhaus. Teubner, 1898.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 02 / March 1899, pp 130 - 134

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042669, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042669

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 130-134 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042669

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

rest of the *syllōs Riccardiana*, have been published since the death of Tonelli, appearing in the years 1859 and 1861, but that they are excessively rare, so rare that, to the best of his belief, only two copies are in existence, of which one is at Berlin, and the other in the National Library at Florence. He informs me that Dr. Willmanns, chief librarian of the Berlin Library, has undertaken to edit anew the letters of

Poggio. It is to be hoped that this will not be long delayed. Pages in the catalogues of our libraries are taken up by the successive editions of Poggio's scandalous *facetiae*, or of his *risqué* letter upon the public baths of Baden, but his letters generally, which throw so much light upon classical literature, are still not accessible to scholars.

A. C. CLARK.

NOTES ON QUINTILIAN.

THE object of the present paper is to point out several misstatements that have been made in regard to the usage of Quintilian.

I. ETSI.

Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*² § 305 says this Conjunction is not found in Quintilian ('nicht bei Quint.'). Landgraf, Note 427 b to Reisig's *Vorles. über lat. Spr.* p. 269 says it is wanting in Quintilian ('bei Quintilian fehlt *etsi*'). *Etsi*, however, is found in Quintilian 8 times, 7 times with the Indicative and once with the Subjunctive: *Ind.* i. proem. 19; 5, 28; ii. 5, 19; vii. 8, 7; ix. 1, 19; 2, 100; xi. 3, 18. *Subj.* v. 13, 3.

II. DUMMODO.

Dummodo did not find favour with either Tacitus or Quintilian. Gudeman, *Dialogus*, p. 257 says that it occurs only two times in Tacitus. Bonnell Meister and Hild in a note to Quint. x. 3, 7, say that *dummodo* is not found in Quintilian ('*Dummodo* findet sich bei Quint. nicht, sondern nur *dum*, oder *modo*, oder *si modo*,). These latter particles occur frequently in Quint., but it is a mistake to say that *dummodo* is not found at all, for he uses it in i. 6, 8: 'at quae o solam habent, dummodo per eandem litteram in infinito exeant,' etc.

III. IGITUR.

Neue, *Formenlehre*,³ p. 975 says that in

Quintilian *igitur* begins the sentence 12 times. In point of fact, however, it is the first word in the sentence 16 times; it begins a book twice: i. 1, 1; viii. 1, 1; a chapter, once, v. 14, 1; a paragraph, once, ii. 14, 5; a section, 8 times, i. 9, 2; ii. 11, 3; iii. 8, 24; v. 12, 22; vii. 10, 3; viii. 3, 42; x. 1, 46; xi. 3, 153; and is placed elsewhere 4 times, i. 6, 44; ii. 14, 5; vii. 1, 3 and ix. 2, 44. Its use, therefore, in an important position is to be noted.

Quintilian's statement (i. 5, 39) in regard to the varying position of *igitur* at the beginning of a sentence is well-known: 'Maximos auctores in diversa fuisse opinione video, cum apud alios sit etiam frequens, apud alios numquam reperitur.' Quintilian's own usage therefore is interesting in view of the above remark: he uses *igitur* 16 times in the first place, 114 times in the 2nd and 25 times in the 3rd.

IV. ITAQUE.

Neue, *Formenlehre*,³ p. 975 says that in Quint. *itaque* is found in the 2nd place in the sentence only 6 times. In point of fact, Quint. places it thus 12 times: i. 1, 14; v. 8, 57; vi. 3, 28; vii. 2, 45; viii. proem. 3; 16; 3, 20; 35; 4, 12; x. 4, 3; xi. 1, 63; 85. (A new example in prose is Mart. *Praef.* to viii. line 5 Gilbert).

EMORY B. LEASE.

SUDHAUS' AETNA.

Aetna, erklärt von SIEGFRIED SUDHAUS. Teubner, 1898.

THIS new edition of *Aetna* will be received by most English scholars, if I am not mistaken, with very mixed feelings. They will

be grateful to the German editor for the large amount of scientific illustration drawn from ancient no less than modern authorities which he has brought to bear upon the acknowledged obscurities of the poem; they will be amazed at the extravagant self-con-

fidence with which he assures his readers that what all scholars have agreed to consider corruptions of the MS. tradition are not only defensible as a possibility, but sound as a fact.

It is to be remembered—and the fact has to be stated emphatically—that *Aetna* has been edited in comparatively modern times by no less a scholar than H. A. J. Munro. When Ribbeck was preparing his first edition of the *Appendix Vergiliana* (published in 1867), he asked Munro to collate for him the MS. in the Cambridge University Library containing the *Culex* (Kk. v. 34). This MS. contains also *Aetna*. Munro, as might be expected, made a collation of *Aetna* also; the interest which the excellence of the MS. was sufficient to arouse by itself, combined with the scientific character of the poem and his own Lucretian studies, led him on to examine the other MSS. of *Aetna* and to publish a new edition of the text with a complete commentary in the same year in which Ribbeck's *App. Verg.* appeared. This was the first time that a full collation of C (the Cambridge MS. above mentioned) had been published: Haupt indeed had obtained many of its readings before and had seen its unique importance, but no thorough and complete collation of it was extant before this edition of Munro's in 1867.

Munro's work, which had fallen rather coldly (considering his unrivalled eminence) even in England, was unacceptable to Haupt, who thought his own contributions to the criticism of *Aetna* had not been sufficiently appreciated in it. The fact, I think, was that starting from a constant and immediately present inspection of the *one* unimpeachable authority for the text of the poem, Munro kept as closely to this as he possibly could, never admitting any emendation, except where he thought it absolutely necessary, and continually recurring to the excellence of C, where its readings (shown for the first time in a perfectly clear form) in comparison with corrections based on inferior MSS. were undeniably right, or at least superior to any of the proposed corrections. The general tone might be called conservative, that is to say, so far as the rules of criticism permitted.

So far as I know, the only other revision of the text up to the present time is that of Bährens in the second volume of *Poetae Latini Minores*. This was in most respects a retrogression. Bährens, who in spite of undoubted ingenuity, was on the whole reckless in his manipulation of Latin poetry,

had not the time or the patience to weigh the many crucial passages of *Aetna* with a care at all proportioned to their difficulty; his revision is therefore marred by many doubtful transpositions of lines, and by the admission of emendations which are often unnecessary, sometimes transparently wrong. On one point, where Munro had sounded a warning note—I mean the value of the MS. known as Gyraldinus, Bährens, like Haupt, failed to see that the warning was required, and that the readings reported as coming from the Gyraldinus were not always to be treated as if we had any *certainty* of their provenience. Nothing seems to me to be so strong a proof of Munro's critical discernment as his hesitation on this point. Some of these Gyraldinian lections, it is true, are so illuminative as to carry conviction, or something like conviction, e.g. *Ingenium sacrare capitque attollere caelo* for the corrupted tradition of the MSS. *Sacra peringentem capitque attollere caelum*; others are very like clever guesses; some, in my opinion, no few, are guesses without cleverness, and even misleading. On this point I have said something in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*, xvi. pp. 297 sqq.

It must be, then, in comparison with Munro's edition that we shall best estimate the value of the new edition of Sudhaus. And in one respect I am perfectly ready to acknowledge the superiority of the later work. Sudhaus has done excellent service in bringing to the elucidation of *Aetna* a variety of scientific materials never accumulated before. He has a learned and very instructive introduction on the volcano, as exhibited in the writings of Greek philosophers, especially Posidonius, whose views we know tolerably from the large fragments imbedded in Strabo and other writers. He has very apt and always most interesting citations from modern explorers of *Aetna*, Vesuvius, and similar mountains, by which the statements of the Roman poet are confirmed, and placed in a clearer (I hardly dare say, clear) light. He is completely at home with the nearly aequaeval work of the younger Seneca, the *Natural Questions*, and has called attention to many parallels between them and *Aetna*, which may be worked in different ways, but cannot be set aside or ignored. In these points his edition shows a marked advance on that of his earlier rival.

When we turn to the inner and more vital questions—more vital, because all interpretation must be based on such preliminary—what is the real condition of the text of the

poem? how are the MSS. related to each other? is *any* weight to be given to the fifteenth century copies, e.g. the Rehdiger and Vat. 3272? are the reported lections of the Gyraldinus *always* to be accepted? we cannot give an answer in any way so satisfactory. Sudhaus follows here what to some may seem a safe but to the present writer appears an uncritical line. The Cambridge MS. (C) is so much earlier and in every way so much superior to all others (for the Stabulensian fragment, though not far removed in age is much spoilt by time, and hardly comes into close competition) as to stand alone as an unique authority. This, since Haupt and Munro, is universally acknowledged; and Sudhaus is right in so far as he follows them and accepts it as his primary source for reconstituting the text. But it happens that for one portion of the poem certain readings exist which purport to come from a MS. more ancient than either C or Stab. The MS. itself has long been lost, and all the attempts of Nicolas Heinsius to rediscover it in Italy were fruitless. It was, however, extant in the sixteenth century, and was copied by Lilius Gyraldus; nor, after what Munro has written, pp. 31, 32, can anyone reasonably doubt that some part of the readings ascribed to it are genuine and may be accepted as real restorations of corrupt lines. This is all that we can do with safety, all that Munro thought we could do with safety. But Sudhaus, following C elsewhere as a perfectly trusty guide, and even defending its readings where most scholars have pronounced them wrong, forsakes his trusty guide throughout the above-mentioned section and adopts instead the so-called Gyraldian variants. Thus in 142 where C gives *Incomperta uia est operum tantum effluit intra*, Sudhaus prints *I. u. est : aer tantum effugit* ultra on the strength of Gyr. alone, and even this not precisely, for Gyr. is stated to have had *aeri* not *aer* : in 161 where C gives *Fallere sed nondum tibi lumine certaue retro*, Gyr. is said to have had *Falleris et nondum certo tibi lumine res est*, and this is printed by Sudhaus, though it has every look of a sixteenth century correction : 223 C gives *Digna laborantis respondent praemia curis*, and so the Paris and Escorial excerpts : yet Sudhaus, following the marginal jotting reported from Gyr. prints *Pigra laboratis r. p. c.*, two changes for the worse. But this question, which radically affects the reconstitution of the poem, is too large to be more than touched upon here. Yet I do not shrink from the avowal I have expressed before,

and see no reason to alter, that Munro's hesitation as to some of the Gyr. variants is short of the probable fact: C is to be treated as our primary authority *throughout* the poem, and only rarely to be corrected from the marginalia (for such they are) known as Gyraldian in the 150 lines where we possess them.

But this is not the point in Sudhaus' edition against which the strongest objection lies. It is even more assailable on the two grounds of Latinity and metre. I mean that his exegesis does violence to the ordinary use of the Latin language and to the rules of prosody: that in order to retain the 'überlieferung,' i.e., the text of the MSS. as we have it in its least corrupted form, words and sentences are forced to bear meanings which a sound criticism repudiates as impossible.

C gives 375 *sqq.* thus :

Sepe premit fauces magnis extracta
ruinis

at. tur

Congeries clauditque uias luctamur ab imo
Et scisso ueluti tecto sub pondere praestat
Haud similis teneros cursu cum frigida
monti

Desidia est tutoque licet discedere montes.

It does not require much knowledge of Latin poetry to see almost at a glance that 377 is slightly, 378 deeply corrupt, or that two sequent vv. did not end with *monti*, *montes*. The combination of *scisso ueluti tecto sub pondere* is inartistic, the possibility of extracting *any* sense from *aut similis teneros cursu* more than questionable. Jacob altered *scisso* to *spisso*, the present writer suggested *tectos* for *tecto*, which at least accords with a well known rule of palaeography, *s* dropping out before another *s* in *sub*.

Sudhaus prints as follows :—

Saepe premit fauces magnis exstructa ruinis
Congeries clauditque uias luctamine ab imo,
Et spisso ueluti tecto, sub pondere praestat,
Haud similis teneros cursu, cum frigida
monti

Desidia est tutoque licet discedere, uentos.

In this, against his usual custom, he admits three emendations *luctamine*, *spisso*, *uentos* : yet with a strange inconsistency retains unaltered *haud similis teneros cursu*; with what meaning? 'as under a close roofing, it makes the winds beneath its weight appear no longer like themselves, but weakened in their course.' *Haud similis, teneros cursu*. Has, then, Cobet lived in vain? Are we to be told

that nonsense is sense, medieval corruptions the pure Latin of the first century, A.D.? If anything is certain in *Aetna*, it is that the 'überlieferung' is here vitiated, and that to force a meaning out of the passage as it stands in the MSS. is to act in defiance of all sound criticism.

394-5 :—

Atque hanc materiam penitus discurrere fontes
Infectae feripiantur aquae radice sub ipsa.

The word *eripiantur* is thought by most editors corrupt, and has been variously corrected. I have myself suggested *crispan-tur* which De Rooy has shown to be particularly applied to the ruffling or rippling motion of water. Mähly proposed *testantur*. Our new editor boldly retains *eripiantur*, explaining (apparently) of bringing the water up to the surface slowly and with effort. But the passage which he cites from Vitruvius does not bear out this meaning, and the use of ἐξαρπασθῆν in Plato's *Timaeus* is not really parallel. A similar doubt attaches to the word *coritur* 408 *ubi coritur igni* (1) as to its occurring = *cooritur* (2) as to its meaning, which according to the new editor is 'rises to grapple with.' In 429, *Sed genus hoc lapidis—certissima signa coloris—*

Quod nullas adiunxit opes, et languit ignis, elanguit, though Jacob seems to have been the first to make the correction, is so completely confirmed by a large number of similar palaeographical instances as to leave no doubt with any one at all familiar with MSS. Sudhaus, however, retains *et languit* 'ist auch der Feuer erloschen' with little, or at least, a very weak meaning. Equally uncritical (may I not say impossible?) is the view that *extra*, in the difficult passage 458-9, *Haud equidem mirum, facie quae cernimus extra,*

Si lenitur opus, restat, is abl. fem. of *exter*: classical usage is pronouncedly against such an hypothesis.

462 *sqq.*

*Nam simul atque mouet uires turbamque minatus
Diffugit exemploque solum trahit ictaque ramis
Et graue sub terra murmur demonstrat at ignes.*

In these verses, which follow each other continuously in C, most editors agree that 463 is wrong, or at least that

after it a line or lines have fallen out. 463 bears on its face one error, *exemplo* for *extemplo*, which is actually found in the Rehdiger MS.; and the smallest familiarity with MSS. is enough to make the interchange of the two words intelligible. *Ictaque ramis*, though it has nothing in itself impossible, may also be affected by the vitiation which attaches to this part of the poem, e.g. it might be *ictaque raris* or *actaque rimis*. But whatever it was, it does not cohere with the surrounding words. The difficulty is heightened by the uncertainty as to the subject of the sentence. Possibly it is *lapis molaris*, possibly the *mons* itself. Munro marks a lacuna after 462, and obelizes *ramis*. Sudhaus retains the reading of C exactly as it is, and translates 'For as soon as it [the lava-stone] sets its powers in motion and threatening turmoil escapes, and draws with it the ground following its initiative (*exemplo*), as well as the substances struck upon by its branching veins' (*ramis*). Surely this is perverted ingenuity, the desperate resource to which a wrong and uncritical theory reduces its believers. What, indeed, is the good of studying MSS. or training our students in palaeography if it does not lead to a saner result than this? It is not difficult to see that if this kind of exegesis is to carry the day, most of the labours of past generations must go for nought, and philological criticism be reconstituted.

If I find it impossible to accept Sudhaus as an interpreter, I am equally incapable of accepting him as a metrist. In 107 C gives

Ut crebrer introrsus spatio uacat acta charibdis

where Munro prints

Ut crebro introrsus spatio uacuata charibdis

The new German edition gives

Ut crëber (introsus spatio uacat acta charybdis)

316

Eminus adspirat fortis et uerberat humor.

Fortis is supposed to be nominative, agreeing with *humor*; and we are referred to the introduction, p. 86. There we find quoted as similar 496, *ac primum tenuis imas agit ulteriores*, where *tenuis* is explained by Sudhaus as nominative singular, but by most critics and Munro as acc. plur., 522 *constat* before *eademque*. But on looking at the passage

Nam uelut arguti natura est aeris et ignis
Cum domitum est constat eademque et corpore saluo

it is obvious that *constat* is wrong as regards the structure of the sentence, and that it is an error of MSS. for *constans* (so Haupt and Munro independently) perhaps through *constas*.

Again, can any one believe, in a poem framed on the most careful rules of metric, that 129 *Hospitium fluvium haut semita*, or 291 *seu fortè flexere caput* can be right? The former indeed is not the exact 'überlieferung,' for C and other MSS. give *aut*, not *haut*. But if it were the exact tradition, if five other MSS. of equal antiquity with C, repeated it in precisely the

same form, ought it to be pronounced, I will not say the genuine reading, but even a possible one? The question begins to be really vital, unless we are prepared to upset the conclusions which centuries of painful study have formulated, and to which most classical scholars have been trained from their earliest boyhood. If the school of criticism which Sudhaus's *Aetna* represents in an extreme form is to dominate the rising generation of interpreters of Greek and Latin poets, it is not difficult to see what will be the issue. Nothing in language will be too obscure, in metre too outrageous, not to find some supporter.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

GUENTHER'S *EPISTULAE*; TISCHENDORF'S *SYNOPSIS*; BUTLER'S *LAUSIAC HISTORY*; GELZER'S, HILGENFELD'S AND CUNTZ'S *NICENE COUNCIL*.

1. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXV. *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae ex recensione OTTONIS GUENTHER.* Pars II. *Epistulae* cv-cxxxiv, Appendices, Indices. Vindobonae, Tempsky. MDCCCLXXXVIII.
2. TISCHENDORF. *Synopsis Evangelica.* Editio septima, novis curis auctor et emendator. Berlin, Mendelssohn. 1898.
3. *Texts and Studies*, edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D. Vol. VI. No. 1. The *Lausiaca History of Palladius*, by DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER. University Press, Cambridge. 1898.
4. *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina sociata opera ediderunt H. GELZER, H. HILGENFELD, O. CUNTZ.* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) Leipzig, 1898.

1. DR. GUENTHER here completes his edition of the *Collectio Avellana*.

Letters 1-40 refer chiefly to the strife of Damasus and Ursinus for the Roman bishopric in 367, Ep. 2 being the petition of the Luciferian presbyters Faustinus and Marcellinus to the emperors (383-392). Letters 41-50 refer to the Pelagian Controversy, and seem to come from the archives of Aurelius of Carthage. Letters 51-55 are letters of Pope Leo I., written in June and August 460. Letters 56-104 belong to the pontificates of Simplicius, Felix III., and Gela-

sus I. (468-496), except that Epp. 82-93 are of Justinian's times, Ep. 82 falling as late as 553. Epp. 105-243 are to and from Pope Hormisdas between 514 and 521. Ep. 244 is the letter of Epiphanius of Salamis concerning the twelve precious stones of Aaron's breastplate. The Appendix is of four documents, one on the heresy of Dioscorus (451), the others on that of Acacius in the Henoticon controversy. The usual indices follow.

Some of the letters are extant elsewhere, and nearly all have been published before; but this is the first critical edition of the collection as a whole. The Codex Avellanus (Vatic. Lat. 4961), on which former editors have chiefly relied, proves to be a mere transcript of the Codex Vaticanus (Vatic. Lat. 3787) which Dr. Guenther follows.

2. Only changes need notice in so familiar a book as Tischendorf's *Synopsis*. In this seventh edition Dr. Oswald Cramer follows the text of Tischendorf's eighth edition, and adds the readings of Westcott and Hort. Tischendorf's Prolegomena and Apparatus are left practically untouched, on the principle *sint ut sunt aut ne sint*. The additions are trifling.

3. Dom Cuthbert Butler contends that the *Historia Lausiaca* as printed by Rosweyd is a composite work. One part of it is the *Historia Monachorum* of Rufinus: but this he proves to be translated from a Greek