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](#)

W. T. Arnold on Roman History *Studies of Roman Imperialism*. By W. T. Arnold, M.A. Edited by Edward Fiddes, M.A., Special Lecturer in Roman History. With Memoir of the author by Mrs. Humphry Ward and C. E. Montague. Manchester: University Press, 1906. 9" x 6". Pp. cxxiii+281. Portrait. 7s. 6d. net. *The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great*. By W. T. Arnold, M.A. New Edition revised from the author's notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1906. 8½" x 5". Pp. xviii + 288. Map. 6s. net.

H. J. Edwards

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 02 / March 1908, pp 49 - 52

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00001001, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00001001

How to cite this article:

H. J. Edwards (1908). The Classical Review, 22, pp 49-52 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00001001

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

NOTE ON SOPHOCLES, *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*, 1218, 9.

IN the new volume (V) of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, p. 31, we read in lines 100-2 of the second Paean:

... παρθένοι χαλ-
κέα κελαδεύντι γλυκὺν αὐδῶ
νόμον.

This recalls an attempted emendation of *O.T.* 1218, which I thought of in 1884, but have never published:

δύρομαι γὰρ ὡς
περίαλλα χαλκέων
ἐκ στομάτων.

The editors of the papyrus observe (p. 87) that χαλκέα at first sight is not a very appropriate epithet to apply to the song of maidens!

But they do not cite Hes. *scut. Her.* 242, 3:

... αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες εὐδμήτων ἐπὶ πύργων
χάλκεον ὄξυ βῶν.

The maidens are winding about the rocky paths of Pindus and Parnassus, and must exert their lungs in order to be heard.

It is also just worth noticing in this connexion that in another fragment, ix. 48, p. 75, the adverb *περίαλλα* occurs:

... ὁ πόντιος Ὀρσοφαινὰ νιν
περίαλλα βροτῶν τέν.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

ALASSIO, December 13, 1907.

CORRESPONDENCE

To Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

It may be of interest to your readers who were informed in vol. 21, page 234 of Ruhnken's comparison of Lucr. 4.588 with the epigram in the *Greek Anthology*, iv. 12, p. 474 (=ix. 823 Jacobs), that Wakefield, in the edition of Lucretius with Bentley's manuscript annotations, shows that the great master had noted the parallel. Furthermore, Wake-

field discusses Ruhnken's proposed emendation quite at length. Munro did not take the notice over into his edition, passing it over as he did much with which Wakefield has burdened, rather than illustrated, his author.

W. A. MERRILL.

University of California,
Department of Latin, Berkeley.

REVIEWS

W. T. ARNOLD ON ROMAN HISTORY.

Studies of Roman Imperialism. By W. T. ARNOLD, M.A. Edited by EDWARD FIDDES, M.A., Special Lecturer in Roman History. With Memoir of the author by MRS. HUMPHRY WARD and C. E. MONTAGUE. Manchester: University Press, 1906. 9" x 6". Pp. cxxiii + 281. Portrait. 7s. 6d. net.

The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great. By W. T. ARNOLD, M.A. New Edition revised from the author's notes by NO. CXCI. VOL. XXII.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH. Oxford: Blackwell, 1906. 8½" x 5". Pp. xviii + 288. Map. 6s. net.

WHAT William Thomas Arnold was we realise from the memoir written by his sister (Mrs. Humphry Ward) and his friend Mr. C. E. Montague. We see the grandson of 'Arnold of Rugby' growing to manhood amid all the interests and influences of a remarkable family, a strong, poetic, enthusiastic soul, keenly alive to all the best of life and literature. From Rugby he went

in 1871 to Oxford, destined not to reach the first class in Moderations or 'Greats,' but making at last his mark in the brilliant essay on Roman Provincial Administration, which won the Arnold Prize in 1878, and is now reprinted. The next year Arnold left Oxford, where he had settled as a lecturer and private tutor, to join the staff of the *Manchester Guardian*; and he soon proved his value to its readers, by his command of foreign languages and literature, and by the application of his keen intelligence to local topics. Manchester, indeed, became a part of him, as did everything else that he set himself to study.

Few journalists have so completely effaced themselves as he, for (as Mr. Montague says) he 'took anonymity seriously'—so seriously, that 'when he left the city, few of those who had read him for seventeen years can have heard of his name.' And among all the *ἐργα* and *πράξεις* of a busy life, he held fast to Roman history. In 1881 he undertook to write a handbook on the early Roman Empire; but his work was not of the handbook order, and this first project was soon given up for a larger scheme, 'an exhaustive history of the early Empire, for which the whole of the original evidence and all that has been written on it should be passed through the sieve of a serious scholarship. For the rest of his life he worked at Roman history, penetrating pretty soon to the austere region where all the companionship is that of a few specialists.' But his eyes were open to other interests besides his own, for he was the first to prophesy to his sister the success of *Robert Elsmere*, and he was always ready, always eager, to help others—young colleagues, young scholars, young Frenchmen. Twenty years ago he was at work in his own thorough way to secure a proper understanding and appreciation of things English on the part of those French graduates who were to be teachers of their fellow-countrymen. And how grateful the Frenchmen were for the help and encouragement of one who was himself 'a living proof of the excellence of English civilisation and culture'!

For the seven chapters now published Mr. Fiddes has written a brief introduction, which tells us what history meant to

Arnold—politics rather than personalities—and how he worked. Of the chapters themselves three are concerned with constitutional questions—the foundations of the Imperial power (I.), the Senate (II.), and the domestic policy of Augustus (V.). The subjects are not new, and it is not reasonable to expect any striking novelty of treatment; but no one can study these pages without realising that Arnold's judgment was sound, and that his style, though not altogether attractive, was natural and straight-forward, taxing neither writer nor reader. There is not—and modern writers of history so often cause it!—a sense of weariness at the end of a paragraph, and of utter weariness at the end of a chapter. Now and again he has a happy turn of phrase to sum up a character or a policy. 'Fate made Octavian a great innovator, but he was a born conservative.' 'The Emperor's three chief secretaries had the income of millionaires and the influence of chancellors, while all the time their legal status was below that of a freeborn Roman beggar.' 'Agrippa was one of the master toilers of the world.' The essential character of the compromise with the Senate (Arnold is against the notion of a real 'dyarchy') by means of which Augustus nursed the infant autocracy is carefully, and on the whole successfully, discussed. We are never allowed to forget that the basis of the Imperial power rested upon the control of the provinces: 'directly it had become possible for a man to govern his province, as Pompey governed Spain, from Rome, the Empire had in fact appeared'—the Republican localisation of provincial command was at an end, the cosmopolitan idea superseded the municipal.

In the other chapters, which have to do with provincial organisation, Arnold is at his best. He certainly possessed a remarkable capacity for ethnology and geography, and he has handled the problems of Gaul, Spain, and the East, with a thoroughness which shows that this part of his history would have been the most congenial to himself, and the most useful to the student. The science of empire, as the memoir reveals, had something of a fascination for him on the one hand; the sense of nationality appealed to him at

least as strongly on the other: and the play of these two forces would have kept his work true and trustworthy. We can imagine the accomplishment as we look at the pathetic aposiopesis.

That certain phrases and passages would need revision was to be expected; but the instances of such a need are surprisingly few. The editing, on the other hand, is by no means satisfactory; the book need not have been hurried through the press, and yet hurry is the kindest excuse we can suggest for the omissions and the blunders that confront us. A work of this kind, to be really useful, should be provided with inset headings to its paragraphs, and with a detailed analysis, by means of such headings, at the beginning of each chapter. It is a pity that the editor was not authorised, or advised, to supply the deficiency in the present instance: luckily, Arnold himself, with a regularity that cannot be the result of chance, contrives to make the first sentence of each paragraph a compendium of what follows.

The editor has contributed a bibliographical note, which may be found useful. He has also added to the foot-notes, which, though good enough in themselves for the most part, are not printed as they should be. Latin and English sentences jostle each other in the same type; so that authorities, translations, and inferences are all mixed up together, and the general impression is confused and unsatisfactory—and altogether unworthy of that clearness which was one of Arnold's finest characteristics. The printing of the notes reveals the most surprising ignorance, or indifference, on the part of the proof-corrector. There is hardly a Greek sentence without some trifling, but annoying, inaccuracy; and havoc is made of a Greek epitaph on p. 238. Latin is somewhat better treated, but by no means immune from penalty. What can be said for the accuracy of a serious book which admits such strange persons as 'Gaius Gracchias,' 'Pausanius,' 'Ncpas,' 'Vell Pater' and 'Trollops' (poor Anthony!); and such atrocities as 'legati legiones,' 'repetition,' 'tribunnt'; and which solemnly informs us that the central 'potion' of the Provincia was pure Celtic?

In all that appertains to editing, the new

edition of Arnold's *Roman Provincial Administration* offers a striking contrast. Dr. Shuckburgh devoted himself to the task with all the skill and sympathy of his scholarship; and his work was barely done last summer when he too was numbered among the dead.

Shuckburgh saw clearly the virtue of his friend's book—'the best introduction to the subject which could be put in the hands of a student when beginning a serious study of Roman history'—and what he did was to establish its usefulness afresh, by rewriting a little here and there, by expanding the notes and the bibliography from Arnold's own references, and by supplying a full index. Dr. G. B. Grundy has prepared a clear and serviceable map.

Thus re-equipped, Arnold's prize essay will receive a warm and worthy welcome everywhere. The whole theme is so intimately connected with later history, so close a counterpart of our own imperial experience to-day, that we are almost compelled to make a study of it. What Arnold has written enables us to appreciate two main principles. On the one hand, among all the differences of race, of constitution, and of relationship with Rome, there is the gradual tendency towards one municipal type: on the other, the unalterable fact that 'east is east, and west is west,' in the Roman empire as in our own, and that nationality may find its real first-beginnings (as in the west) or its fuller development (as in the east) under imperial rule and security. And, while we are not allowed to neglect general principles, we are reminded also on every page that history is no less concerned with details and particular instances: the law of history does care for trifles.

Mrs. Humphry Ward tells us in the memoir that her brother's essay won, as soon as it was published, the admiration of that severe critic, Mark Pattison, for the 'extent of reading' which it implied, and for the 'exactitude' of its execution: and Arnold's annotations and corrections, diligently added up to the end of his life, illustrated and emphasised both these merits. A survey even of the headlines to his paragraphs will show how clearly his mind moved: a study of the paragraphs themselves

and of the notes will show that he too knew how to 'divide and conquer.' Indeed, arrangement is that wherein he chiefly excels, and wherein his work may best serve others for information and for example. The style of his youth is always vigorous and effective, but scarcely impressive: to say of it, as we have said above of his later style in the chapters on imperialism, that it taxes neither writer nor reader, is its truest commendation.

The volume is fairly well printed, but there are a good many mistakes, of which the worst that we have discovered is 'incomptability.'

We may fitly conclude this notice by quoting from the memoir the appreciation of Arnold which one of his French friends,

M. Filon, wrote for the *Débats*. 'In the continuous effort to understand public questions, wherein he acted as a guide to so many others, Arnold was himself guided by the spirit and method he had acquired through his Roman History research. Is not Roman History, indeed, the best school for the politician? And to speak more generally, does not the whole secret of good journalism depend upon the application to the men and events of the passing hour of the same critical processes which we apply to the men and events of 2,000 years ago? The ordinary journalist is an advocate, the good journalist is a historian. Arnold was that man.'

H. J. EDWARDS.

THE VOCABULARY OF GREEK LITERARY CRITICISM.

The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. By Larue van Hook. Chicago: University Press, 1905. Pp. 51.

No careful student of the Greek literary critics can fail to have been struck by the wealth of their technical vocabulary. The excellent dissertation under review confines itself to that part of Greek critical terminology which is obviously and consciously metaphorical. But even so, the author has to deal with a great variety of terms, which he classifies as borrowed from (1) nature (including water and its properties; heat and cold; light and darkness; weight, height, and length; flowers), (2) the human body (its condition, appearance, dress, care, etc.), (3) athletics, war, and the sea, (4) youth, age, and sex, (5) social status, (6) the sense of taste, (7) deities and religion, (8) the theatre and festivals, (9) the disposition and morals, (10) the trades and arts (including household management; roadmaking; medicine; weaving, spinning, and embroidery; carpentry; metal-working; engraving; architecture; painting and sculpture).

Under these comprehensive headings a large amount of valuable material is brought

together with much care and discrimination. The Greek literary critics are made to throw light upon one another, and are further illustrated from Latin sources (Cicero and Quintilian especially) and by various modern parallels. The results are summed up in three verbal indices: Greek, Latin, and English. Some particularly interesting parallels are drawn from Ben Jonson, while under *χολός* Roger Ascham is aptly quoted: 'Carmen hexametrum doth rather trot and hobble than run smoothly in our English tongue.' It is a disputed question where, when, and how the term 'sophomore' originated; but the academic youth of America cannot fail to appreciate the use of the corresponding adjective in the following context: '*μεπρακίωδης, puerile, affected, foppish, sophomoric.*' Under *ὄγκος* there will be found an important correction of Volkmann's statement that 'das Wort *ὄγκος* bezeichnet bei den Rhetoren keineswegs, wie unser Schwulst, etwas schlechtes, sondern das os magnum, die sublimitas.'

Naturally in a first work, and one of this wide compass, a few slips are to be found here and there. On p. 8 Hegesias should hardly have been ranked among 'great critics,' nor on p. 29 should the *Ars Rhetorica* be