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](#)

Sandys' History of Classical Scholarship *A History of Classical Scholarship*. By J. E. Sandys. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. xxviii + 498; xiii + 523. 61 portraits. 8s. 6d. each.

Alfred Gudeman

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 2009, pp 112 - 116

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003176, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003176

How to cite this article:

Alfred Gudeman (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 112-116 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003176

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

REVIEWS

SANDYS' HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP.

A History of Classical Scholarship. By J. E. SANDYS. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Two vols. 8vo. Pp. xxviii + 498; xiii + 523. 61 portraits. 8s. 6d. each.

WITH the publication of these two stately volumes, extending from the Renaissance to the present day, there is brought to a close the first *complete* survey of classical scholarship extant in any language. Works of so comprehensive a range, for the record here unfolded covers a period of more than 2500 years, have hitherto been 'made in Germany,' and on this account alone the author is to be congratulated for having broken the time-honoured spell. The first volume, published in 1903,¹ appeared in a second edition in 1906, and closed with the name of Dante. In the meantime the author had issued his *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning* (1905), an appetising 'gustatio' for the richly-laden banquet to follow.

The second volume opens with an account of the Revival of Learning in Italy and of Italian scholarship down to the sixteenth century (pp. 1-156). Passing by a few pages devoted to Spain and Portugal, which of all the countries of Europe have been least fertile in classical scholars, France is taken up from 1360-1600 (pp. 165-218), then England (pp. 219-250) and Germany (pp. 251-273) for the same period. A similar arrangement obtains for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—Italy (pp. 280-282, 373-384), France (pp. 283-299, 384-398), the Netherlands (pp. 300-352, 441-466), England (pp. 352-358, 401-439) and Germany (pp. 359-370). The third volume treats of German scholarship in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (pp. 1-273), the nearly 300 philologists being, however, distributed according to the subject-matter dealt with, to wit, editors of Latin or Greek classics, archaeologists, etc., a division apparently conducive to synoptical clearness,

¹ Reviewed at length in this journal, vol. xviii. pp. 271-276, 316-321.

but involving some inappropriate inclusions and necessitating at times the discussion of the work of the same man in widely separate places. It is here, too, that the author has often mentioned living scholars, whereas we are told in the preface that he purposed doing so only in a very few cases, such as Weil and Comparetti, 'where complete silence would have been unnatural,' but I submit that on such a plea a goodly number of illustrious philologists of Europe, happily still living, ought in justice to have been also included. The rest of the volume is taken up with the scholars of other nationalities—Italy (pp. 241-247), France (pp. 248-273), Holland (pp. 275-291), Belgium (pp. 292-309), Scandinavia (pp. 311-352), Greece and Russia (pp. 353-392), England (pp. 393-449) and the United States (pp. 450-470). The work closes with a brief retrospect (pp. 471-476) over the entire field covered in the three volumes, followed by addenda, including ten scholars who passed away while the book was in press.

Of the more than 1200 classical scholars recorded in the volumes before us, Germany leads with more than 400 names, 'proximus, sed longo intervallo proximus' comes England with more than 200, Italy with over 180, France with 150 and Holland with nearly 100 names. The list is well-nigh exhaustive;² in fact, many writers are treated at greater or less length whom one would hardly expect to find here, but, owing to the extremely liberal interpretation which Dr. S. gives to the term 'classical scholarship,' he has been free to admit the Latin poets of modern times, authors like Chaucer, Rabelais, Macchiavelli, Ben Jonson, statesmen and publicists of classical proclivities and humanistic enthusiasts generally.

To marshal this vast amount of information in such a way as to avoid throughout the monotony of a biographical dictionary was perhaps an impossible task. By the insertion,

² Of omissions I note in particular Papebroch, J. A. Symonds, Johannes Schmidt, F. Dümmler.

however, of anecdotal details, human touches and countless other items of more or less relevancy, Dr. S. has succeeded in overcoming this all but insuperable difficulty to a large extent, and, in consequence, he has produced for the most part an eminently *readable* book. Five chronological tables, a complete list of *editiones principes*, more than sixty well-executed portraits with a scrupulously exact account of their provenience, a select bibliography,¹ and last, but not least, two indexes of subject-matter—one for each volume—greatly enhance the value and usefulness of this magnum opus. These indexes constitute quite a feature of the book, for, apart from their exhaustiveness, Dr. Sandys has, besides many items of interest, included under the names of the ancient authors² the most noted editions of their works from the *editio princeps* down to the present day. The expediency of *two* separate and elaborate indexes seems to me, however, open to question. The author and the publishers probably thought that vol. ii. could thus the more easily be sold separately, and for that reason presumably the volumes are not distinguished numerically on the cover. But I can hardly imagine on what grounds any reader even remotely interested in the subject would be willing to purchase a torso!

If we look to the execution of the work as a whole, it may be said without exaggeration that we have a survey that is absorbingly interesting and highly instructive, and, above all, exhaustive and accurate, qualities the more noteworthy because

Dr. S. had no *complete* records at his disposal, except for the Renaissance in Italy and for Germany, but even Bursian does not go beyond the year 1882. Errors of omission or commission and misprints are, considering the myriad details, astonishingly few and far between, and so rarely misleading that I prefer to communicate such as I have noticed to the author privately, lest their enumeration in this place convey the false impression of untrustworthiness, and thus do an injustice to a work which is an honour to English scholarship, and which will remain for many years to come one of the few indispensable books in the field of classical learning.¹

¹ A few trivial details, however, it will be well to point out here. Vol. ii. p. 71: For Sextus Pompeius read Sextus Pompeius *Festus*, or simply *Festus*. p. 114: For Tabula *Isiaca* (the same misprint occurs in the Index) read *Iliaca*. p. 209: No mention is made of Casaubon's famous and still useful dissertation, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*. p. 219: Richard de Bury and Petrarch were hardly 'kindred spirits.' p. 297: Mabillon's description of Magliabecchi as 'a walking museum and a living library' (*museum inambulans et viva quaedam bibliotheca*) is not original, but a literal translation of the compliment which Eunapios, *Vita Soph.* p. 456^a,² paid to Longinus: βιβλιοθήκη τις ἦν ἐν ψυχῷ καὶ περὶ παρὸν μουσείον, a fact which also escaped L. Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandl.* i. p. 21. p. 317: read 10 instead of '14 years later,' for Grotius died 1645. p. 328: The six letters of Bently, published by Haupt, *Opusc.* iii. 89-107, are all addressed to Burman, *not* to Graevius. p. 441: P. Cornelius Severus is surely not 'the *reputed* author of the Aetna,' this ascription being a mere conjecture, found in a worthless Italian MS. On the same page Dr. S., following a long exploded notion, still attributes three Ps. Platonic dialogues (viz. Axiochus, Eryxias and *περὶ ἀπερῆς*) to Aeschines Socraticus. Vol. iii. p. 82: Bonnell's *Lexicon Quintil.* is fairly complete, but certainly in no sense 'admirable.' p. 164: Sauppe's library is now at Bryn Mawr College (Pa.), *not* at Columbia Univ. p. 173: The words 'an edition of the Metaphysics of Aristotle and Theophrastus, with the ancient scholia,' are misleading, as the τὰ μετὰ τὰ φύσικα of the latter are preserved only in meagre fragments, while the scholia belong to the former only, being not very ancient at that. pp. 317 and 362: If Heracleides Ponticus (for Ps. Heraclitus) be retained, 'Pseudo' ought at least to have been prefixed, for the author of the Homeric Allegories was certainly very much later than his alleged namesake, the famous pupil of Plato and Aristotle. p. 409: Why Donaldson is styled 'the principal (?) author of a work on The Theatre of the Greeks' is not clear to me.

¹ Full bibliographical details are accumulated in the footnotes, but unfortunately these are too frequently so vague as to be of little use to one who hasn't access to a British Museum catalogue. Thus, to mention but one typical instance out of many: Vol. iii. p. 195⁷, we are told that a bibliography of Traube's writings was compiled by P. Lehmann. I fancy, there will be but few readers who will guess that the author refers to *Rendiconti della Reale accademia dei Lincei*, xvi. (1907), pp. 351-361, for the revised reprint in Traube's *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, i. (1909), pp. xlviii-lx, had not yet been published when the above note was written.

² Owing to an oversight, only two modern editions of Sallust are cited, the most important being omitted at that, though mentioned III. 200.

In view of the transcendent merits of this work, it may seem invidious, as well as captious, to draw attention to one defect which characterizes the volumes before us, but it is too conspicuous to be passed by in silence. I mean the deplorable lack of a proper proportion or perspective in the treatment of a very great number of scholars. In the first place, no system or consistent plan is discernible in the use of brevier and long-primer type. Over and over again philologists of decidedly mediocre achievements are given undue typographical prominence, while many famous scholars are as often undeservedly dismissed in a few lines of brevier type. This discrepancy would be partially explained by a conjecture, which I am somewhat reluctant to advance, even though it may seem warranted by the facts. The author appears to have been intent on making out as good a showing as possible for the philological activity of every nation throughout the various centuries. Where genuinely great scholars at any one period existed in abundance, their achievements could easily be allowed to speak for themselves, but where classical scholars of the first magnitude were sadly lacking, as is the case in Italy during the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries, in France during the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries, in Belgium and Greece, and—'tis true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true—also in the United States, Dr. S. unfortunately felt called upon to raise mediocrity to the *n*th power by giving to many an unjustifiable *spacial* prominence. Such a procedure undoubtedly does infinite credit to his cosmopolitan generosity and kindness of heart,¹ but it seems not quite compatible with the true function of an objective historian.

In order to substantiate so sweeping a charge, I append a list of names according to,

¹In the biographical portions the author also acts on the principle of *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, grave faults of character and conduct being often either ignored, as *e.g.* in the case of Lenormant, or merely alluded to in passing. The only noteworthy exception is *Filelfo*, who is said to have 'combined the accomplishments of a scholar with the insidiousness and the brutality of a brigand,' but how few Renaissance scholars, if judged by their moral character, would 'escape a whipping'?

the space allotted to them, those printed in *italics* being grossly overrated, while those cited in ordinary type have not received the attention to which their well-known achievements in the field of classical learning unquestionably entitle them:

3 lines— $\frac{1}{8}$ page: Cuiacius, B. Rhenanus, Middleton, Borghiss, de Rossi, d. Fabretti, Heindorf, Westphal (3 lines!), A. Kuhn, Nipperdey (5 lines!), Ahrens (12 lines), Steinthal, Studemund (12 lines), U. Köhler (3 lines), P. Tannery (3 lines!), Traube.

$\frac{1}{2}$ p.— $\frac{2}{3}$ page: Melanchton, Camerarius, Perizonius, Valckenaer, Kaibel, L. Spengel, Kirchhoff.

$\frac{2}{3}$ p.—1 p.: Turnebus, *Dorat*, A. Johnston, *Strada*, Du Cange, Gronovius, *Dempster*, Prantl, Usener, Rohde, *Gantrelle*, *Nisard*, *Benoist*, *Graux*, *Waddington*, *Rayet*, Grote, Bücheler, Zeller.

pp. 1—1 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Nizolius*, D. Heinsius, L. Vossius, *Duport*, *Barrow*, *Damm*, J. F. Christ, *Creuzer*, *Goethe*, Lehrs, *Nutzhorn*, *Cornelissen*, *Falster*.

pp. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ —2: *Sigonius*, *Macchiavelli*, *Lambinus*, *Vives*, *Salmasius*, *Downes*, *Bacon*, *Twining*, *Dawes*, *Montfaucon*, *Le Clerc*, *Lobeck*, A. Schäfer, *Gennadios*, *Kennedy*.

pp. 2—2 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Pomponius Laetus*, *Robortelli*, *Dolet*, *Rabelais* (2 pp. brevier), *Linacre*, *Lipsius*, *Selden*, *Parr*, *Jebb*, *Köchly*, L. Müller.

pp. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ —3: *Ascham*, *Buchanan*, *Ritschl*, *Roersch*.

pp. 3—3 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Saville*, *Winckelmann*, *Willems*.

pp. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ —4: *Scaliger*, *Mabillon*, *Milton*, *Gesner*, *Niebuhr*, *Lachmann*.

pp. 5: *Casaubonus*, *Herder*, *Boeckh*.

pp. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$: *Lessing*, being exceeded only by *Petrarch*, *Bentley*, and F. A. Wolf!

This list—it might have been indefinitely augmented—in the mere juxtaposition of names speaks a sufficiently eloquent language, but one or two points may still be noted. I do not begrudge the *four* pages given up to the paleographer *Mabillon*, but if he be entitled to them, how can it be possibly justified that *L. Traube* is dismissed in eighteen lines of small type?! A full page in brevier is taken up with a synopsis of

Nutzhorn's *Die Entstehungsweise der homerischen Gedichte*. This book is mainly negative and polemical in character, and marks no real advance toward the solution of the problems in question. But granting that 'its patriotic spirit makes it (for our present purpose) a characteristic product of the scholarship of Denmark'—a very curious justification, by the way—how are we to account for the fact that *Kirchhoff's* epoch-making contribution to the Homeric question is only accorded four lines? Fully *three* pages are devoted to the Belgian *Willems*. His ponderous volumes on the Roman Senate certainly are a vast thesaurus of facts, but the conclusions which he draws from the documentary evidence are, as Mommsen has shown, extremely often hasty, fanciful, or due to misinterpretation. But if this work be deemed worthy of half a page of panegyric, what shall be said of the fact that the monumental *Staatsrecht* of Mommsen must be content with two lines?!

Belgium is accorded a separate chapter; the 17½ pages (partly small print) are distributed among *eleven* scholars, and the account of their alleged achievements is throughout pitched in a highly eulogistic key, the author following all too complacently the fulsome biographies of national writers. In the case of *Roersch*, Dr. S. seems himself to have had some slight misgivings, for, after devoting three pages of large type to him, we are treated to the following apologetic epilogue: 'His administrative duties left him little leisure for any work on an extensive scale. But he was fully capable of producing works of far larger compass, any one of which might have ensured him a permanent place in the history of the scholarship of his country.' Surely this is to have greatness thrust upon you with a vengeance! If potential erudition, latent capacity and κτήματα ἐς ἀεὶ, which were never composed, are to entitle a philologist to an extensive consideration in a history of classical scholarship, it is impossible to understand how Dr. S. succeeded in forcing so glorious a record into the Procrustean bed of two volumes! *Nève* is the author of an interesting but discursive work on the history of learning in Belgium, beginning with Erasmus(!), but omitting—incredible dictu—J.

Lipsius! He is styled a man of considerable note—*two* pages are accorded to him, and yet his published work was chiefly confined to *oriental* languages and but incidentally touched on classical subjects! But if Belgium (since 1830), which did not produce a single classical scholar of first rank, is thus handsomely treated, and practically the same is true, as already remarked, of Scandinavia and of Greece, the space allotted to the classical scholarship of the United States (pp. 450–470) is—pudet dictu—simply ultra-generous and undeservedly flattering. So unpalatable a truth must here be the more emphasized, because coming from any other than an American source (for 'caelum, non animus mutant qui trans mare currunt') the motive for giving public utterance to it might be misconstrued, if not resented. Among the American philologists of the past there were certainly many men of profound erudition and general culture, of singular personal charm, magnetic personalities, in fact, and brilliant teachers, who succeeded in instilling into their pupils not only an abiding love for the humanities, but also a deep affection for themselves, which repeatedly found outward expression in subsequently published biographical sketches. It was upon these that Dr. S. unfortunately mainly relied, but such *laudationes funebres* constitute no more unbiassed documents for the historian to-day than they did in the days of Cicero and Livy. Scholars like F. D. Allen, Merriam, Hayley and Earle, to judge by the publications which they have left behind them, would presumably have produced more works of a high order, had not a cruel fate cut them off in the prime of life. But the literary output of the others was almost without exception wholly devoid of originality, independence, imaginative insight and critical acumen. Anthon and A. W. Allen, Greenough and Lincoln and Harkness, Drisler and Short and Lewis, Felton and Hadley and Woolsey—to mention only these—were one and all skilful compilers of lucrative school editions and grammars and dictionaries, the frequently wholesale adaptation of the work of foreign scholars being usually indicated by the ominous semi-euphemism 'based on the

edition of so-and-so.' Not a single contribution marking genuine progress, no work on an extensive scale, opening up a new perspective or breaking entirely new ground, nothing, in fact, of the slightest scientific value can be placed to their credit.¹ Unquestionably the most valuable legacy of these scholars is not to be sought in their books (some of them, indeed, published but little), but in the goodly number of brilliant pupils still living, 'qui olim nominabuntur, nunc intelleguntur,' so that some future edition of this work or some future Sandys will not be open to the criticism of a candid reviewer of

¹The Greek Lexicon of Sophocles and the work of C. Beck, 'the Petronian scholar,' are only apparent exceptions, for both of these Harvard professors were born and educated abroad. Nor can Seymour's *Life in the Homeric Age* be exempted, except in the eyes of loving friends. Whitney, the only philologist of genius whom America has produced in the past, was unfortunately in no proper sense a classical scholar.

having grossly exaggerated the achievements of the United States in the field of classical scholarship.

But regret, as one must, that a glaring inequality of treatment, a lack of discriminating appraisal or proper evaluation is too conspicuously in evidence in these volumes, the incontrovertible fact remains, as remarked at the outset, that we now possess, thanks to the profound learning and the indefatigable labour of one man, as exhaustive a record of the representatives of classical scholarship and their works as one could desire. There cannot be the slightest doubt that these volumes will pass through several editions in the near future, and that the distinction of being translated into a number of foreign tongues will also be accorded to them in due time.

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

Munich.

THE ROMAN LAW OF SLAVERY.

The Roman Law of Slavery. By W. W. BUCKLAND, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Fellow and Tutor of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1908. Pp. xii + 735.

THIS work, as its sub-title indicates, deals with the condition of the slave in private law from Augustus to Justinian, and is not concerned, except incidentally, with the freedman. The topic of slavery occupies a peculiar position in the modern study of Roman law. So long as the main interest was the application of Roman law as a living system, slavery was of no importance, because obsolete. But now that the interest is chiefly historical, it has become of the greatest moment to the student, since it permeates every department of the ancient law, of which it is, as our author with a little exaggeration observes, the most characteristic part. Hence while there was no need for it, there was no comprehensive treatise on this

topic as a whole, and since the change in point of view the want of such a treatise has been felt.

Mr. Buckland has supplied this want with a completeness that deserves the highest praise. We can say of his work what we can say of no other English work on Roman law, that it is the standard book, and will be necessary to the library of every one whose study of Roman law extends beyond the Institutes.

Part I. is logically arranged. After an interesting first chapter, in which the definition of slave is discussed, chapters ii. and iii. treat of the slave regarded as a chattel, chapters iv. and v. of his non-commercial relations, chapters vi. and vii. of his commercial relations apart from the peculium, chapters viii. and ix. of his commercial relations in connexion with the peculium, while the remaining chapters of this part are devoted to special cases such as those of the *servus vicarius*, *hereditarius*, *fugitivus* and many others.