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](#)

**Bailey's *Lucretius Lucreti de rerum natura libri sex*,
recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit
Cyrillus Bailey, collegii Exoniensis socius. Oxonii, e
typographeo Clarendoniano. No date. Pp. 248. 2s. 6d.,
3s., and 4s.**

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 07 / October 1900, pp 367 - 368

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083190, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083190

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 367-368 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083190

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

BAILEY'S *LUCRETIVS*.

Lucreti de rerum natura libri sex, recognovit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit CYRILLUS BAILEY, collegii Exoniensis socius. Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano. No date. Pp. 248. 2s. 6d., 3s., and 4s.

THIS work is not ill done; but to compose a good text of Lucretius is now an easy task, and it might have been done better. Some care, some judgment, and some independence are shown here, but not quite enough.

To begin with, the *adnotatio critica* is not merely *brevis* but defective and therefore misleading: it lulls the reader into a false security. No one would guess from this edition how unstable a foothold the MSS really afford. For instance, it is hardly fair to conceal that in vi 103 they have *pepides* instead of *lapides*, especially when you mention that they have *vigna* and *igna* instead of *tigna*. Mr Bailey says that he has often omitted 'mera errata quae simili modo omnes correxerunt'; but he has omitted much else, and robbed many critics of the credit due to them. Thus vi 402 *eas tum* is a noteworthy correction first made by Lambinus: Mr Bailey neither mentions Lambinus' name nor divulges that the MSS have *aestum*. In some places he even adopts conjectures which are probably erroneous without warning us that they are not in the MSS, as v 1160 *medium peccata*, vi 804 *domus*. And in this last verse it is useless to record that Lambinus reads *febris* instead of *seruis* unless you record at the same time what the MSS read instead of *domus* and how he emends their reading: there is a similar oversight at v 1189, where Mr Bailey alters *nox* to *sol* without altering *sol* to *ros* in 1192. He often assigns emendations to those who are not their authors: i 356 sq., iii 306, 684 sq., iv 308, v 531 *siet*, 545, 614, 947 *late*, 1006 *cum*, vi 793, 927, 972 *amarui frondeat*, 1195 *in ore*. Elsewhere the assignment though literally right is essentially wrong. iii 7017 '*lammina* Lachmann, *iam mina* O Q.' Quite true; but the honour is due to those correctors who centuries earlier restored *lamina*, not to Lachmann who finished the correction. So at i 32, ii 275, iv 804, 1096. I have noticed a misprint in the text at v 31 and in the note at vi 977.

The recension is what would be called NO. CXXVI. VOL. XIV.

conservative; and in one particular it is rightly so. Lucretius' text contains an unusual number of corruptions for which no plausible remedy has been found: in such places Mr Bailey generally retains the MS reading and marks it as corrupt. It would be well if he had done this even oftener, and not printed such futile conjectures as ii 547 *sumam hoc quoque uti* or v 1006 *navigiis* or 1010 *aliis*. In other places he adopts changes which only injure the text, as i 122 *permanent* (as if *corpora* could *permanere*) or iii 717 *sincera ex* (as if *sincera* could mean *illibata*); or wooden conjectures like v 396 *ardens*; or such outrageous innovations as a dative *aquai* in i 453 and a postponed *et* in vi 800. But after all, what most disfigures this text is the retention, as if genuine, of corruptions expelled by our betters and restored by our contemporaries. Lachmann is half a century in his grave; and German criticism, having at length plucked up courage to follow its own inclination, like the Israelites when they saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mount, is gradually slinking back to the heel of its old master, our countryman Gilbert Wakefield. Mr Bailey has not altogether yielded to this reaction, but he does not resist it very stoutly: too often *ἔστι τοῦ λέγοντος, οὐδ' ὅποι' ἀνὴρ ἐννοῦς τὰ καὶνὰ τοῖς πάλαι τεκμαίρεται*. He returns for instance to the MS reading iii 420 '*digna tua pergam disponere carmina uita*' (*cura* Lachmann Munro Brieger, *perpetua...uita* Bernays). Why? Because Mr R. Heinze has lately served up anew, without saying whence he took it, the explanation given, '*nullo iudicio*' as Lachmann said, by Wakefield a hundred years before? Again, Mr Bailey accepts the traditional reading ii 342 *praeterea* etc. To this Lachmann made two objections: Mr Brieger, who is much fonder of refuting Lachmann than of reading him, has endeavoured to answer one of these, and has forgotten all about the other: that is his way. If Mr Bailey thinks that Mr Brieger has defended the anacoluthon, well and good; but what does he, and what does Mr Brieger, suppose to be the meaning of the Latin adverb *praeterea*? Mr Brieger's services to Lucretius, and his intellectual superiority to Mr Heinze, are so very considerable that one neither desires to insist upon his faults nor to blame a subsequent editor for following one who is by no means

the worst of guides; but the mixture of negligence and confidence with which he controverts Lachmann is, to use the mildest term, inappropriate. Mr Bailey seems to have detected this sometimes (e.g. iii 198, iv 858-876), but at other times it escapes him (e.g. i 454, v 110-234). At iv 632, where the MSS have *umidum*, he prefers *umectum* to *umidulum*, which he does not mention. Does he believe Mr Brieger's assertion that 'Lucretius adiectiuis deminutiuis

non uti solet nisi quantitatem significantibus'? It is not true.

Mr Bailey says in his preface that he has been sparing of original conjectures because he does not wish to inflict new wounds upon the text. This estimate of his own talent in that department is certainly modest and seemingly correct. He prints only one emendation, and it is *intust*. Better one than two.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

BRIEFER NOTICES.

Euripides Iphigenia auf Tauris, herausgegeben von DR. SIEGFRIED REITER. Leipzig. G. Freytag. 1900. (Pp. xx., 126, 6 engravings; price 1 M. 20 Pf., bound 1 M. 60 Pf.)

AN excellent school book, thoroughly equipped. The constitution of the text shows scholarship and judgment. It is in fact as good a text of the play as is to be found anywhere. The explanatory notes, which are not copious, consist largely of idiomatic translations which throw clear light on the character and force of the Greek words and phrases. The critical appendix is the least satisfactory part of the book. It professes to give the more important deviations from the MSS., but many which are left out are more important than some which are given. Of the four emendations proposed by the editor himself 414 *βροτῶν* omitted, 452 *συμβαίη*, 'ν for *συμβαίην*, 454 *ἀπολαύσειν* for *ἀπόλανσιν*, 1260 *ἀπενάσσαθ'* ὁ for *ἀπενάσατο* (Barnes *ἀπενάσσατο*)—the two first have been made long ago, though probably no other editor would be content with the metre of 414 thus shortened as the equivalent of that of v. 399 in the strophe. As an instance of the independence and at the same time the soundness of the editor's judgment, may be mentioned the adoption of Mekler's beautiful ὅπ' *ἀφθελκτον* (which Reiter translates *mundtot*) for *ἀπόφθελκτον*, at v. 951, an emendation which, however, Wecklein regards as third-class. Noticeable also is his punctuation of vv. 6 f.; where he puts a comma after *Εὐρύπος* and another after *ἄλα*.

E. B. ENGLAND.

Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte, 1888-1898, verzeichnet und besprochen von ADOLF BAUER. (München, Beck, 1899). Pp. 574.

DR. ADOLF BAUER has undertaken to render account of the contributions to Greek History which have been made between the years 1888 and 1898. The extension of research in the spheres of Archaeology and Epigraphy, the multiplication of histories and monographs, the dissipation of results in learned periodicals will explain the magnitude of the task; and the record of ten years' work, which has hitherto been a section in a *Jahresbericht*, now appears as a volume of nearly 600 pages. That anyone should carry through a study so minute and so laborious constitutes in itself a claim on our gratitude; and Dr. Bauer's book must serve a useful purpose for those who desire to know what work has been done in different branches of Greek History. At the same time one cannot but regret defects which seriously diminish the value and usefulness of the book. With a thousand or more separate works and articles cited in the footnotes, nothing is done to facilitate reference; there is only one brief index of authors' names and there is not even a detailed list of contents prefixed to the chapters. On the other hand Dr. Bauer undertakes the impossible in attempting to give a digest and appreciation of so many diverse books and studies. Controversial criticism seems out of place in what should have the neutral character of a bibliography. Full lists of works and articles classified according to subject, brief abstracts of contents in the case of the more important