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](#)

***Adversaria Critica in Sophoclem.* By F. H. M. Blaydes. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 6 Mk.**

F. W. Hall

The Classical Review / Volume 15 / Issue 03 / April 1901, pp 182 - 182
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00029966, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00029966

How to cite this article:

F. W. Hall (1901). The Classical Review, 15, pp 182-182 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00029966

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

intimacy with critics, who never could have written one of his Odes, has become a sad reality. I am becoming a 'scholar' in name exactly because I am ceasing to be so in fact.

Moreover, amid all the bulk of comment which I have now read, what excites surprise is the exceedingly minute proportion of anything which is really valuable. Book after book comes to me and I read it with a natural desire to find something which I may use to improve my own notes. Anything worth having I am selfishly eager to appropriate, but unfortunately I find very little that I care to steal. My edition remains a small book not because I could not long since have made it a large one, but because I cannot find anything more to put in it. 'This little School-book' is consequently the remark generally made about it by critics who weigh literature by pounds avoirdupois, while scholars agree that one who prefers Horace to what the *grammaticorum turba* has said about him is unworthy of serious discussion. Yet surely even German erudition might recognize a poor Englishman's work rather than assert that *tenebit* in 1, 7, 21, is 'corrupt' and suggest that *latebris* 'might do' in its place. Or again when it is said that *redemptor frequens cum famulis* 3, 1, cannot mean 'with a throng of workmen,' a reference which I give to Ter. Andria 1, 1, 81, *cum illis qui amabant Chrysidem una aderat frequens* might serve to prove the opposite. The use of *notus animi paterni* (2, 2, 5) as = 'noted for affection' is allowed to be unparalleled in Horace (for 4, 13, 21 is

rightly explained otherwise) but surely the explanation of *animi paterni* as a simple gen. of quality deserves notice. Macaulay's illustration of *incedis per ignes | suppositos cineri doloso* as an image drawn from walking 'on the thin crust of ashes beneath which the lava is still glowing' deserves a place in any notes. A knowledge of Wickham's school edition (p. 330) would make even a boy recognize the folly of altering 3, 4, 46 *urbes regnaque tristitia* into *umbras*. The explanation of *tuis ignibus* 3, 7, 11 as = Gyges, though this use of *ignis* 'is not found elsewhere in Horace,' and the use of the plural seems altogether exceptional, would surely be modified by fuller acquaintance with the problem. A glance at Milton's phrase

'A multitude, like which the frozen North
Poured never from her frozen loins,'
might give a critic pause before he condemned *Germania quos horrida parturit fetus* as 'abgeschmackt,' so that *motus* is preferable, or indeed the whole stanza should be rejected.

There are numerous other instances where the editor might at least have learnt something from several English commentators on Horace. I do not for one moment maintain that their views or my own have any special merit, but I respectfully submit that they deserve consideration, and that the emendations, erasures and obelizations of Bentley, Peerlkamp and similar critics are not the only part of classical study which deserves to rank as real scholarship.

T. E. PAGE.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Adversaria Critica in Sophoclem. By F. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 6 Mk.

THIS volume is a supplement to the author's edition of Sophocles and is similar in scope and character to his *Adversaria* on Aristophanes which were noticed recently in this *Review*. It contains a large number of fresh conjectures by Mr. Blaydes himself, together with a selection of conjectures made by others and readings from the Paris codices 2787, 2886, 2711. The notes are interesting and useful but the survey of the field of Sophoclean criticism is tantalisingly incomplete. Hardly any account is taken of Jebb's recently published editions.

F. W. HALL.

Onomasticum Taciteum composuit PHILIPPUS FABIA. Annales de l'Université de Lyon II. Droit, Lettres; fascicule 4. Paris: Fontemoing, 1900. Pp. 772. 8vo. 15 francs.

THIS handsomely printed volume is what it professes to be, neither more nor less. It contains all the proper names occurring in the works of Tacitus, with all the passages where they occur appended in full or nearly in full, and some brief footnotes exhibiting manuscript variants or conjectures of importance. It is therefore more than an index: on the other hand, it makes no attempt to give biographies of persons named or indications of books where bio-