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](#)

Bury's '*Gibbon's Decline and Fall.*' *Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.'* Edited by J. B. Bury, MA. London, Methuen & Co.

J. S. Reid

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 01 / February 1902, pp 64 - 66

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205398, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205398

How to cite this article:

J. S. Reid (1902). The Classical Review, 16, pp 64-66 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205398

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

que recoquere taedium esset, ne obscurarem.' I confess I am not clear what his aim has been. Even a slight examination of this Thesaurus will show that it contains a number of copyists' errors which might, and I think should, have been removed. Amongst those that I have noticed are the following: '*Geomantia* qui de terra diuinant.' (Read *geomantici*, a form like *geometrici*). '*Palin iteratum*.' Read '*iterato*' or '*iterum*'. '*Offibebant* (uel *officiebant* ubi *offig.* Buech.) *claudabant asseris* (*seris*). Read *offibulabant*. '*Perproclius* plus procline' and '*Perproclius* plus procline (*l.-ue*)' are two glosses evidently of the same origin and should be combined. *perprocluius* would satisfy the indications, but we should probably strike out the *per* as a dittograph.

On the other hand it is not clear that in '*sic uoluere Parcae sic cogitauere fata*' '*cogitare*' should be emended. It may be a case for the note of admiration which is used for such entries as '*telluerunt*: genuerunt feruerunt (!),' the glossator having mistaken the form for a perfect. I do not know what there is wrong with '*crurarium* (!) σκελόδεσμον.' The word is just such a one as a comic dramatist might have invented. Prof. Goetz I am glad to see gives *u* only when he transcribes the glosses, though he writes *u* and *v* in his own Latin. This inconsistency is matched by his printing of words with initial *i*, *j* together, but those with initial *u*, *v* separately.

J. P. POSTGATE.

BURY'S '*GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL*.'

Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.' Edited by J. B. BURY, MA.
London, Methuen & Co.

MR. BURY has benefited the whole world of scholars by his new edition of Gibbon, whose history touches at some point or other the pursuits of every student of the past. The editor has set himself the task of shewing what fruit has been gathered by later explorers of the vast territory in which Gibbon laboured. If English scholars had been called on to vote for one man to address himself to this undertaking, the selection of Mr. Bury would probably have been made with unanimity. Introduction, notes and appendices are replete with information and criticisms, partly supplementing, partly amending, the text and notes of the original. As concerns all matters of the first importance, and many minor topics, the student can, by the aid of the editor's additions, at once set himself right about antiquated or incorrect opinions. Naturally, not all minutiae in respect of which Gibbon has erred or is defective, have been touched upon by Mr. Bury. To bring Gibbon face to face at all points with the learning of to-day would call for the labour of a great syndicate of scholars, and it may be questioned whether the toil would be repaid. We may safely say that the present editor has achieved more than any one else could have accomplished, single handed. The want of further help will be more felt by

the reader in those portions of the work which touch on the early history of Christianity than anywhere else. Perhaps a general survey of Mr. Bury's additions to Gibbon will deepen an impression which is common among students of the earlier part of his period, viz. that the decay of the Roman empire is still, in the main, unexplained.

The editor's Introduction is full of interest. In the days of youth and haste, it is easy and common to see in the rise and fall and change of historical judgments little more than mystifying permutations and combinations of data. Here the young scholar may read of real progress. There are of course in this able Introduction things to which exception may, and will be taken. For instance, I should dispute the judgment that in Tacitus, as opposed to Livy, 'brilliance of style and accuracy of statement' are not 'conspicuously divorced.' Perhaps, however, the word 'conspicuously' may be taken to save the statement. By Tacitus, of a surety, the divorce is more subtly veiled than by Livy. A doctrine not easy to understand is that the philosophy of history has for its function 'not to solve problems, but to transform them.' How are insoluble problems 'transformed'? Why trouble to transform them if their solution is not thereby advanced? The words to which I have taken exception occur in a passage where doubt is thrown on the possibility of attaching any definite ideas to the terms

'progress' and 'retrogression.' The passage would have been read with pleasure by Sextus Empiricus. Sceptics in all ages have traded on the difficulty of defining relative terms. The delusion, if it be a delusion, of a better and a worse in human affairs is as necessary to the existence of history as it is to the continuance of society. Another matter which has given me pause, is Mr. Bury's description of Gibbon's attitude towards the Church. First there is mention of 'scorn for the Church emphatically expressed,' which 'spiced his book.' Then we hear of 'his classical moderation of judgment' and 'his temperate mood' in dealing with Christianity and Mahometanism. Soon, Dean Milman is very severely condemned for charging Gibbon with having made 'a bold and disingenuous attack' on Christianity. The condemnation of Milman is phrased far too strongly if Gibbon really did spice his book with scorn for the Church. After many readings, I am unable to see that he is open to this charge. He can describe with eloquence, and even with something approaching to ardour, the great virtues that displayed themselves within the Church, and the failings of the Christian and the secular worlds fare pretty much alike under his hand. His love for derogatory anecdotes (particularly when they are indecent) drawn from all sources, is conspicuous; it may be that the savour of malice is stronger when these happen to relate to Christian leaders, but here the unfairness seems to end. That there was much in the early history of Christianity which he failed to see goes without saying. Before passing away from the Introduction, I would specially call attention to the [able discussion of the authorship of the 'Secret History' attributed to Procopius. Also to the clever removal (by a change in punctuation) of a real difficulty in the text of Gibbon, which the editor has been the first to discover. The correction (p. xliii.) is one that merits the epithet 'palmary.' And this is not the only place where emendations of the text, more or less important, have been found to be necessary.

There are one or two matters of convenience concerning which I will permit myself to express regret. The references to ancient authors have been to a great extent modernized and brought into accordance with the divisions in recent texts. It is a pity that this has not been carried out with entire completeness. Prentice hands might have done the work under the editor's direction. The same applies to the verification

of quotations, and of inferences drawn from them. Much has been done, but not all. Occasionally, changes made are in themselves not quite right, as in Vol. i. p. 2, where Tacit. *Annal.* l. ii, (an error for 1, 1) is altered to 1, 11. Still, many thanks are due for the verifications which have been carried out.

In the subjects on which Mr. Bury has had to touch in his notes and appendices, there is great diversity, and in many of them great complexity. His accuracy of statement is, all things considered, quite remarkable. The tests I have been able to apply have revealed very few, and almost no important errors. I will indicate some amendments that are needed in the first volume. There is no proof that Caesar enlisted the Alaudae in the year 55 B.C. (p. 9). In speaking of Epicurus, Gibbon quotes Diog. Laert. 10, 10, as evidence to shew his reverence for the gods. Mr. Bury thinks this a misunderstanding of the passage; but a reference to it and its context proves Gibbon's inference from it to have been correct (p. 31). The destruction of the temple of Isis and Serapis at Rome, mentioned by Valerius Maximus, 1, 3, is referred by Gibbon to the year 50 B.C., whereas Mr. Bury supposes that Valerius speaks of a 'first demolition' in 219 B.C. (p. 32). Marquardt rejected this date as impossibly early, and supposed the consul Aemilius who destroyed the temple to be the conqueror of Perseus, a view condemned by Preller, who accepts the same date as Gibbon. The erection of a shrine to Isis and Serapis at Rome in 219, or even in 168 B.C. seems incredible. The name Tarantus, given by Gibbon as a nickname of Caracalla, should be corrected after the better texts to Tarantas (p. 127). Although the story of the campaigns of Severus in Britain, as given by Dion Cassius, is to a large extent fabulous, there is nothing incredible in the assertion that 50,000 men were lost in operations of the utmost difficulty, spread over three years (p. 129). It should have been mentioned that Dion Cassius, who was well placed for forming an opinion, regarded the extension of taxation as the aim of Caracalla's famous enfranchising ordinance (p. 157). The statement on p. 189 that after the time of Solon the ratio of the Euboic to the Attic talent was about 4 to 3 does not appear to be quite in accord with the view of the best authorities on the subject. In Appendix 10 several restatements are desirable. It is doubtless true that 'the view that the name *princeps senatus* held its

ground until a few years ago, when it was exploded by Mr. Pelham,' but it is not quite all the truth. Mr. Pelham's article in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. 8 (the reference is not given by Mr. Bury), extended and reinforced the arguments of Mommsen. 'Augustus discharged the functions of censor repeatedly; not, however, under that name, but as *praefectus morum*' (p. 455). Dion Cassius and Suetonius do tell us that Augustus accepted the office of *praefectus morum*, and also that of *praefectus legum*; but it has been shewn on the evidence of the 'Monumentum Ancyranum' that they are wrong. 'Augustus at first intended to found the principate as a continuation of the proconsular imperium with the consulate.' The word *continuation* here is an awkward Latinism, and it does not even quite correspond in sense with the Latin *continuatio*. Is it altogether accurate to say that in 23 B.C. the princeps 'replaced the consular power by the tribunitian (rather *tribunician*) power which had been conferred on him for

life in 36 B.C.'? This would seem to imply that he rested content with the *tribunicia potestas* as bestowed in 36; but it was in some manner placed on a fresh basis in 23. 'After this (i.e. 23 B.C.) he filled the consulship only in those years in which he instituted a census.' But Augustus was not consul in the two years later than 23, during which he carried out the census, although, as he himself tells us, the *consulare imperium* was exercised by him for the purposes of the census.

The later portions of Mr. Bury's work are even more valuable to the student than the earlier, in proportion as the sources of information become less accessible. The appendices to the seven volumes present the results of immense study and research. They deal with about 150 separate heads. Information and opinions are not merely compiled, but critically weighed, by one who is himself a most distinguished investigator of the period of which he here treats.

J. S. REID.

REPORTS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—MICHAELMAS TERM, 1901.

On Friday, October the 25th, the Provost of Oriel (the Vice-Chancellor) read a paper on 'The Homeric infinitives in *μεναι* and *μεν*, and on the forms *ἐμμοπε* and *ἐμέας*.' The views expressed in the paper have appeared in the appendices to his recently published edition of the *Odyssey*.

Mr. POYNTON, of University College, read a paper on 'Sir Henry Savile and his transcript of the *Opuscula* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.' Sir H. Savile was the scribe of Bodl. Gr. Misc. xxxvi so far as it contains fragments of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He copied the MSS. of Dudit at Breslau in the spring of 1581: the annotations and conjectures are by his hand and are not derived from Sylburg. The transcript shows that much in the text of Dionysius Halicarnassius which is ascribed to Sylburg was really due to Andreas Dudith.

On Friday, November the 1st, notes were read by Mr. H. RICHARDS, of Wadham College, on 'Plato's *Theaetetus*, p. 152 E and p. 175 C': and by Professor COOK WILSON on '*Nik. Ethics* vii, xiv, 2.' [p. 23 sup.]

On Friday, November the 8th, the Society met to discuss certain recent theories on the Mycenaean question: the discussion, which was opened by Professor GARDNER, and carried on by Messrs. MYRES, G. C. RICHARDS, MACAN, and FARNELL, turned mainly on the question of the origins of Mycenaean culture, its connections with the North, with Egypt, and with the East, and on the possibility of the 'Mycenaean' period in Crete being coincident with the Hellenic.

On Friday, November the 15th, a paper was read by Mr. J. A. SMITH, of Balliol College, on the 'Classification of Greek Verbal Forms.' The paper was in effect a plea in favour of recognizing as a basis of syntactical discussion of Greek idiom the principle now fully established by Comparative Philology that no attempt was made in the Indo-Germanic verb system to indicate time. All suggestion of time-notation should, it was contended, be eliminated from our syntactical terminology. Such suggestion as is now contained in terms like 'tense,' 'present,' 'future,' originates from and perpetuates a misconception of the primary meaning of so-called 'temporal' and 'modal' forms. The separation between 'temporal' and 'modal' forms is itself in principle erroneous. Syntactical analysis should start with the principle that all variation of form in the verbal system had for its main purpose to signify different 'aspects' (to use a term of Slavonic grammar) of the general meaning of the verbal stem. Such 'aspects' are, e.g., momentariness, continuance, repetition, inception, &c. The only indubitable mark of time is the Augment, which is of late origin.

Starting thus we should avoid the necessity of explaining many constructions (as is frequently done at present) by the supposition of rhetorical artifice ('historic present,' 'gnomic aorist,' &c.), and should also possess the clue to the occurrence of different stems within the same verbal system (e.g. *δρᾶν*, *δρᾶσα*, *ιδεῖν*). The consequences of this general principle have been partly worked out by Delbrück and Herbig, and have proved so enlightening that