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](#)

Commentationes Woelfflinianae. Leipzig, Teubner. 1891. Mk. 8.

E. C. Sihler

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 07 / July 1892, pp 325 - 327

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186366, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186366

How to cite this article:

E. C. Sihler (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 325-327 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186366

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

well calculated to stimulate the student's interest. The index of proper names has been enlarged. And the attractiveness of the book has been materially increased by eight beautiful cuts taken from gems, coins and paintings, and by clearer, brighter pages. The book can hardly be called a scholarly edition of Horace, but it has its good points and will be welcomed.

H. C. ELMER.

Cornell University.

Luciani Menippus et Timon, with English notes by E. C. MACKIE, B.A., late classical master at Heversham Grammar School. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge University Press. 1892. 3s. 6d.

MR. MACKIE prefaces his edition (which is based on Dindorf's text) by some readable excursions on Lucian's life and style, on his attitude to Greek religion and philosophy, and on the two selected dialogues. He defends the *Menippus* as a genuine work of Lucian. The notes would have been improved if the annotator had remembered that he was writing for schoolboys. Too often we find him stringing together parallel passages on the slightest excuse, and even where the illustrations are relevant the point illustrated is frequently not specified—a fatal omission in notes intended for boys. Thus in the note on ἀσφοδῆλον (p. 75) six parallel passages are referred to, but there is no indication of the point of comparison, which appears to be merely the occurrence of the word in these passages.

Under the head of irrelevance we might include most of the illustrations from Dante—which (left without a word of warning) tend to mislead rather than enlighten by introducing non-classical ideas. This for example on Cerberus (p. 73):

‘Clawed are the hands with which

He tears the spirits, flays them, and their limbs
Piecemeal disparts.’

More serious are actual inaccuracies, and these are not wanting. Thus on καὶ δὴ we find the misleading statement (p. 67): ‘They help to cut short the previous conversation (something like the Tacitean *ceterum* after a digression).’ In p. 75 it is said that Charon ‘seems to have had a special dread of Heracles, cf. *Æn.* VI. 392 *Nec vero Alciden, dc.*’ As Vergil immediately afterwards names Theseus and Pirithous in the same connexion, he gives no support whatever to Mr. Mackie's statement.

On the words τῶσαν ἐπιθείσα Mr. Mackie makes the extraordinary suggestion (p. 83): ‘Perhaps the ἐπί has the force of “placing upright” which is allowed only to the great king, and endeavours shortly afterwards to support this new sense of ἐπί in composition by a passage in which neither ἐπί nor ἐπιτίθημι appears.’

On ταραχοπωλοῦντας, *Menip.* § 17, Mr. Mackie follows Liddell and Scott in connecting the word with embalming (though he introduces a vulgarism of his own in a reference to ‘spirits of wine’). May we not better take the word in its natural sense = *selling salt fish*?

There is a curious note on Νέστωρ (p. 88): ‘the aged counsellor of the Greeks who had seen three generations of men (*i.e.* presumably 300 years).’ Why three generations should be presumed to be 300 years is not explained.

On μετοικεῖν, *Men.* § 18, which is clearly nothing but ‘change their abode,’ Mr. Mackie says (p. 88): ‘There is of course an allusion to one who is technically known as a μέτοικος, a “resident alien.”’

I need not dwell on cases in which a note seems required and we do not find it. Every edition must have some such omissions. It is a pity however that

Mr. Mackie in speaking of the *Vitarum Audito* (pp. xxxi. xxxii.) missed the fine point (noticed by Heitland in his preface to the *Piscator*) that *Plato* is not put up for sale at all.

One other point I must object to, viz. the habit of introducing foreign or slang expressions where English equivalents could have been found. What boy would be wiser for ‘cavalier servente’ given as the representative of θεραπευτικοί (p. 76)? Why is ἐν τῷ μέρει translated à leur tour and ἐν μέρει vicissim? Why descend to such a vulgarity as ‘Socrates goes about “button-holing” people’ (p. 17)? or ‘the first gives the man a “tip” to say he is out’ (p. 133)?

It is only fair however to say that the notes to the *Timon* seem to me to be generally an improvement on the notes to the *Menippus*.

G. C. M. SMITH.

Commentationes Woelflinianae. Leipzig, Teubner. 1891. Mk. 8.

THIS is a collection of fifty-two short papers by as many contributors, all of whom have also been collaborators in Eduard Wölflin's *Archiv für Lat. Lexicographie*. These papers are printed in a volume of 408 pp. Of course most of these papers are abrupt, and for a full appreciation require a familiarity with particular spheres to which the present reporter cannot lay even a remote claim.

The volume is a well-deserved honorary tribute apropos of Wölflin's sixtieth birthday.

The three English scholars whose papers are added to those of continental scholars are John E. B. Mayor, Henry Nettleship, and Robinson Ellis, all of whom employ Latin as the medium of communication. L. Havet of Paris uses his native French. T. W. Beck of Groningen, the solitary representative of the Netherlands, writes German.

Surveying residences of the contributors we note that Bavaria proper is represented by Munich (4) Memmingen, Landshut, Augsburg, Amberg, Nuremberg, Erlangen, Tauberbischofsheim, Spire (2) Landau, Würzburg; Baden by Heidelberg and Karlsruhe; the rest of Germany is represented by Bremen, Cologne, Kiel, Greifswald, Hildesheim, Halle, Giessen, Strassburg, Göttingen, Berlin, Breslau, Brunswick, Camenz, Hörter in Westphalia. Lund represents Sweden. Austria has contributors in Vienna (7) Innsbruck, Graz and Krakau. After the septennium of the *Archiv*'s activity in collecting matter the present papers may fairly be considered an aftermath and a concluding volume of that concerted effort.¹

Nine of the papers or 17 per cent. of the whole employ the medium of Latin.

Of papers referring to particular writers or literary forms the following may be mentioned.

Zur frage der Calliopianischen Rezension des Terenz by K. Dziatzko. D. concludes that it was not earlier than in the 5th century A.D. that Calliopius prepared an edition of the Comedies of Terence, with pretty incisive changes. This text was very readable and thus either became the archetypus of many MSS. or at least materially influenced many others, the Bembinus alone (prima manus viz.) being free from this influence.

L. Havet (*Les Anapestes de Lucilius*) claims that the versification of L. was more varied than has been hitherto supposed, and that it included anapaests. In this paper Havet resorts to editing some of the fragments in his own way, in some cases with conjectures.

¹ Since the above was written, the *Archiv* has come to life again.

Zander (*De Homoeoarcto Saturniorum versuum*) discusses alliteration in the S.v. Copious examples are adduced from Saliaric formulae, from fragments of Livius Andronicus, *C.O.L.*, Elogia of the Scipios, Naevius, etc. Zander has traced alliteration in 41 Saturnian lines.

F. Böckel (*zu Cicero ad Atticum*) applies lexical observation of Cicero's usage to the task of suggesting emendations in various passages. *Ad Attic.* 2, 7, 1, he suggests *quippe abscisam* for *quia abscideram*; 13, 22, 4 for *militia est: mortis instar est* (militia does not seem particularly objectionable); 7, 7, 1 for *illud putato: illud perusitatum* etc.

M. Hertz, the veteran Latinist of Breslau, contributes *Ein Paar Horazische Kleinigkeiten*, critical notes, e.g. to maintain *minuere* in *Ep.* 8. 17.

Sat. i. 3, 7 *Bacchê!* not *Bacchae*, probably mockery of the style of the professional singer Tigellius.

Epp. i. 7, 5 sq.

dum ficus prima calorque

Dissignatorem decorat lictoribus atris, suggests an instructive excursus on some funeral customs of Rome.

Of similar bent is Otto's paper on Propertius.

Four papers deal with Caesar and correlated questions. *Zum Bellum Alexandrinum* by G. Landgraf, chiefly dealing with textual matters drawn from a Florentine MS. Landgraf is noted as one of the scholars who claim that they are able to present Asinius Pollio as the author of the *Bellum Africanum*. H. Schiller (*Zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern*) expresses his dissent from current views (Menge) as to the original publication or editing of Caesar's *Gallie War*. In general it would seem wise to lay stress not on the literary or military, but on the political aspect of the commentaries: cf. *Classical Review* 1890. Schiller emphasizes *voluit* in the familiar passage, Cicero *Brutus* 75: *dum voluit alios habere parata unde sumerent qui vellent scribere historiam*—as if a consummate politician would propound his primary motives. With the prejudice of this view Schiller approaches Hirtius *B.G.* viii. praefat. 5 'sunt editi ne scientia tantarum rerum scriptoribus desit, preferring *decesset* Schiller is right in rejecting the positive manner in which Menge operates with possibilities of editing, e.g. 'Dass Hirtius das 8. Buch zugefügt und sich sonst aller Aenderungen und Zusätze enthalten habe, ist nicht denkbar.' What a pity that *Denkbarkeit* is so inconveniently subjective!—The present reporter fully agrees with Schiller in his view of the following matter, viz. that in *Bell. Alex.* 3, 1—2 and 19, *a nobis* is not a conclusive proof that Hirtius did not write the *B. Alex.*, because he did not himself serve in that campaign. It is really immaterial whether H. wrote *a nobis* or *a nostris*.—To this we add the paper by W. v. Hartel: *Die Caesarausgabe des Hirtius*. It is undeniable that the preface of Hirtius viii. cannot well be made to fit the literature extant; it is equally difficult to propose a solution that will compel assent.

Hartel believes that Hirtius actually did write some commentarius which gave a comprehensive but summary sketch of Caesar's further career, but that this book soon became obsolete on account of the more explicit accounts of Caesar's continuators which have reached us. The question as to the authorship of the *Bellum Africanum* is something entirely distinct.

T. Melber writes on *Des Dio Cassius Bericht über die Seeschlacht des D. Brutus gegen die Veneter*. While more detailed the paper presents results

substantially similar to those given in the *Trans.* of the American Philol. Association for 1887, including the suggestion that in his Atticism Dio Cassius indulged in the *licentia* of imitating the naval descriptions of Thucydides.

Stowasser's paper on *Surus*, is really an attempt to interpret a line of Ennius (323, M).

Unu' surum Suru' ferre! tamen defendere possunt. 'Einzig erduldet den Knittel der Syrer; doch weiss er zu stehen.'

Surus, eudgel, and *Surus*=Σύρος, elephant, viz. Indian elephant.—The paper is a good example of the difficulties attending the editing and interpreting of Archaic Latin buried in little bits in the Grammarians and Lexicographers.

W. Schmitz prints a facsimile of some pp. of Codex Bernensis 611 exhibiting a specimen of ancient stenography.

Space forbids commenting on the many other literary papers which extend even to media et infima Latinitas. Not only are Cyprian and Lactantius, Amianus, Boethius and Ausonius discussed, but the Renaissance even is reached in a paper by Wotke: 'Zwei kleine Beiträge zur Renaissance-Literatur,' on the Italian Brippi, d. 1450., and on a short opusculum by Petrarcha: 'de casu Medae miserimae.'

R. Schoell writes on the poet Maternus, mentioned in the *Dialogus* of Tacitus as one of the interlocutors, the representative of poetry. He appears as an author of Roman dramas also. Schöll attempts to define the character of these plays from the meagre indications.

Of Sittl's pages on *Archaismus* one may truly say: 'last but not least.' The sense of complete command of the general theme, the ripe judgment manifested, the taste and discernment shown, the lightness of touch—all combine to make this one of the most delightful of all the papers. *Au reste* I quote one of Sittl's concluding remarks: 'among the pre-classical authors Terence holds so independent a position that his influence must not be confounded with archaism. His comedies indeed for considerably more than one thousand years furnished the manual of conversational Latin.'

A number of the papers are chiefly lexical and phraseological in their sphere.

A. Funck points out many Vergil references in the Glossary Cod. Vat. 3321. Suchier discusses *quietus* in *Romanischen*. There is an oddity that the Romance tongues show a secondary form also *cuite* (old French), or *quite*; *quiti* (Prov.) *quito* (Span.) *quito* and *chito* (Ital): side by side with *cheto*, *queto*, *quel*, *queru*.

H. Blase, *Unus* bei dem *Superlativ*. This idiom per se is familiar enough. The paper in greater part takes up the view that *unus* in Plautus, at least in a number of instances, has the sense of the indefinite article, *un*. Blase's comment rather makes for denying this particular usage.

P. Geyer, *Loco=ibi*. At one time *loco* was used=statim, and also=ibi; the latter being the primary meaning. This was preserved in Italy and Africa alone, whereas the temporal meaning was perpetuated elsewhere.

G. Goetz, *Lexicalische Bemerkungen* on: Acanthis, Acalanthis, Carduelis, Cardellus. Collifana. Scruta, Grutae, Scrutarius, Grutarius.

John E. B. Mayor of Cambridge (*Addenda Lexicis Latinis*) prints a list of some 43 Latin words not found in Lat. lex. (*vacillanter* to *xerostyrax*) from Fathers, Medieval chronicles, Lat. Grammarians, etc.

Henry Nettleship (Oxford) (on *cognomen* and

cognomen) illustrates the employment of these words with copious citations, holding that they are not used as mere doubles of *nomen* but that they mean either a *nomen adiectivum*, an additional name, or sometimes the *only* name; although even then they are not strictly identical with *nomen*.

But the considerations of time and space bid us bring these summaries to a close.

E. G. SIHLER.

Franz Bopp, sein Leben und seine Wissenschaft von Dr. S. LEFMANN. Erste Hälfte.—Berlin, Reimer. 1891. Mk. 8.

THE commercial object of appearing at the time of the Bopp centenary probably explains the fragmentary state of this work. Otherwise there seems no reason that it should not have appeared as a whole. A properly critical review of the present instalment is impossible and must be deferred till completion. An account of Bopp's life down to the year 1832 is given in a sympathetic and readable manner which leaves little to be desired. Indeed we fancy most readers will be surprised at finding the prosaic life of a scholar capable of such fascination. The second

half of the volume (separately paged) contains a collection of the letters between (1) Bopp and Windischmann (2) Bopp and A. W. v. Schlegel, followed by certain public documents and letters from other correspondents. In these, especially the correspondence with Windischmann, will be found the most valuable part of the work. Bopp's answers to A. v. Humboldt do not appear, so presumably they are not accessible. This is greatly to be regretted as from the stimulating nature of the latter's epistles the replies should be worth reading. As far as the treatment of Bopp's 'Wissenschaft' is concerned we reserve judgment until Dr. Lefmann completes his task which we hope he will speedily accomplish.

The outward style and finish of the book is praiseworthy. A fairly well executed portrait as frontispiece appears to have been taken from an old-fashioned engraving. Type and paper are good but unfortunately the unconscionable number of misprints detracts greatly from these advantages. To avoid misconception we may add that we include neither such vagaries as may be due to the author's own theory of how his language should be spelt, nor those in the correspondence which may possibly represent slips in the original letters.

NOTES.

ÆSCH. *Ag.* 312, 313.

τοιοῖδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι
ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι.

If *πληρούμενοι* is to be taken as passive and as agreeing with *νόμοι* ('Such are the ordinances....by succession accomplished,' Sidgwick), then *ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου* ought also to refer to *νόμοι*. But one ordinance did not receive the missive flame from another. If, on the other hand, *πληρούμενοι* is to be taken as middle and as agreeing with *ἄλλος* in the sense of 'torch-bearer' ('Such are the torch-bearers which I have ordained, by succession one to another completing the course,' Verrall), then we should expect the words to agree in grammar, as in sense, with *λαμπαδηφόρων*. Read *ἄλλου παρ' ἄλλου*, 'ordinances accomplished by one torch-racer's receiving the flame from another.'

[EUR.] *Rhesus* 856—860.

EK. χρόνον μὲν ἤδη συμμάχοισι χρώμεθα
οἶσον περ ἐν γῇ τῇδ' Ἀχαικὸς Λέως,
κοῦδ' ἐν πρὸς αὐτῶν οἶδα πλημμελεῖς κλύων.
ἐν σοὶ δ' ἄρ' ἀρχώμεσθα; μή μ' ἔρωσ' ἔλοι
τοιοῦτος ἵππων ὥστ' ἀποκτείνειν φίλους.

Hector is indignantly protesting against the insulting charge, brought by an ally, that he had killed Rhesus for the sake of his horses. The reading *μή μ' ἔρωσ' ἔλοι* gives an impossible sense: Hector does not and cannot pray that he may not con-

ceive the desire to kill Rhesus for the sake of his horses, for the simple reason in the first place that Rhesus is already dead and the horses are far out of reach. What is wanted is a second indignant question. For *ΕΛΟΙ* read *ΕΧΕΙ*, and put a note of interrogation after *φίλους*.

[EUR.] *Rhesus* 804, 805:—

XO. ἡνίοχε Θρηγὸς τοῦ κακῶς πεπραγότος,
μηδὲν δυσοῖζον πολέμιους δρᾶσαι τάδε.

Nauck takes Musgrave's *δύσοιζ'* οὐ into the text; but remarks, 'videtur alia requiri medela.' The Charioteer has, in the previous line, bitterly insisted that the death of his master was no enemy's doing, but a treacherous murder. The Chorus beg him not to utter such a reproach. Compare the subsequent words of the Chorus (950), when the real author of the death is revealed:—

μάτην ἄρ' ἡμᾶς Θρήκιος τροχηλάτης
ἐδένασ', Ἐκτορ, τῷδε βουλευσάι φόνον,

and read in 805, for ΜΗΔΕΝΔΥCOIZΟΥ, ΜΗΔΕΝΝΑCHICΟΥ, *i.e.* μὴ δεννάσης οὐ. When once *μηδὲν* was falsely written, the meaningless NACHIC (easily read ΔACHIC) would be 'corrected' into ΔΥCOIZ, suggested by line 724, τί λάσκων; δυσοῖζων.

F. B. JEVONS.