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](#)

Hartmann on Phaedrus *De Phaedri fabulis commentatio scripsit* I. I. Hartmann. Lugduni-Batavorum: S. C. Van Doesburgh. 1890. 125 pages.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 29 - 32
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184574, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184574

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 29-32 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184574

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

It is astounding to see these lines quoted as a specimen of perfect poetry. They have merit no doubt; they are excellent in form and musical in sound, but directly you try to picture to yourself the scene represented their utter absurdity and want of taste is obvious. Imagine walking through a meadow and meeting first a yellow ram, then a scarlet ram, and then a ram whose fleece 'blushed sweetly' with purple! An infant with its first paint-box could hardly produce a worse picture.

In chapters 4 and 5 the writer goes on to show very carefully and successfully that Horace is never imitated and rarely mentioned by other contemporary poets. He especially repudiates all attempts to prove that Propertius ever borrowed a word from him. In chapters 6 and 7 he discusses Propertius, for the fire of whose amatory verses he has the strongest admiration. These chapters serve to introduce chapter 8 which deals with the *Odes* of Horace in which love forms the subject. He sufficiently demonstrates that, as Propertius was a true devoted and passionate lover, so the *Odes* exhibit no real passion. This is however merely slaying the slain. Surely no one imagines that a real history of Horace's amours can be extracted from the *Odes*. The subject once attracted the attention of a certain 'Teuffelius, doctor Tubigensis,' and sundry 'very grave' Germans (*gravissimi nostri Scholastici*, Orelli, *Excursus to Od.* 1. 5) have debated it, but perhaps it is best wisely left among the *περίεργα* of classical study.

In conclusion I must say that these criticisms give an unfair impression of the book.

It is distinctly a good and stimulating book. After attacking many things in it I must fully acknowledge its great ability, and so imitate the writer of it, who, after attacking particular passages of Horace without mercy, in a brief and judicious 'Epilogue' gives a very just and kindly verdict on his general merits as a poet. He denies him inspiration—*non ἐνθεος est Horatius; placida ei mens est et, ut ita dicam, tepida; flammæ ignesque nunquam sensit* (p. 195). He considers that he suffers from the faults to which all imitators are liable—*multa reperiuntur tanquam complementa numerorum, multa inania, multa quæ, quod ad sententiam attinet, cum ceteris carminum partibus aliquo modo certant*. On the other hand he fully recognises the literary skill which has won the admiration of so many generations of educated men; he acknowledges that no one has ever succeeded in embodying the precepts of a common-place philosophy in words so golden and everlasting—*sententias finxit morales revera ære perenniores, quæ, dum sermonis elegantiae et venustati sua laus stabit, discentur et recitantur. Nam sit sane Horatii philosophia humilis omnique careat magnificentia, at egregius ejus est sermo: mediocritatem quidem commendavit Horatius, sed iis eam exornavit laudibus ut vere aurea fieret*.

In a postscript the writer says '*æqualium nonnulli, si libro meo perfectio bonæ frugis aliquid inesse pronuntiaverint, impense lætabor*.' He may certainly 'rejoice heartily,' for, although those who only read this review may perhaps find more chaff than 'good grain,' those who are induced to read the book itself will find exactly the reverse.

T. E. PAGE.

HARTMANN ON PHAEDRUS.

De Phædri fabulis commentatio scripsit I. I. HARTMANN. Lugduni-Batavorum: S. C. Van Doesburgh. 1890. 125 pages.

THIS is a clever book; its writer has made a thorough study of Phædrus, and thrown much new light both on the text and on the literary questions connected with the fabulist. The work is divided into six chapters. The first discusses what is known of the poet's life; and the reader will feel grateful for the careful sifting by which facts have been discriminated from surmises. It would appear that Phædrus was not a

Greek or Macedonian by birth, but a barbarian, of what nation we can never know, and his mother a slave to some Macedonian master in Pieria. The prevalent theory is rejected that the troubles to which Phædrus so often alludes were brought upon him by something that he had written; this, it is shown, rests upon a misinterpretation of iii. præf. 40,

ego porro illius semita feci viam,
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat,
in calamitatem deligens quaedam meam:

which does not mean 'selecting some so as

to bring misfortune upon me' but 'selecting some fables (of Aesop) which were suitable to my own misfortunes.' In illustration it is suggested that i. 17, the fable of the wolf and the sheep, is a fable of Aesop which has been altered by Phaedrus to suit his own circumstances, and that the reference is to some suit in which he was cast by a *calumniator* for a sum of money which he did not really owe. L. Müller has questioned the genuineness of the appellation *Augusti libertus* given to Phaedrus in the *codex Pithoeanus*; but the writer successfully maintains its authenticity. *Libertas* was not lavishly bestowed by Augustus on unworthy persons as by his successors, so that to be *Augusti libertus* was an honour of which Phaedrus might well be proud; and consequently Müller's argument that the poet would not have thus advertised his humble origin falls to the ground.

Chapter II. deals in much detail with the literary merits of Phaedrus; his object in writing fables; the sources of the fables; and the differences in the contents and complexion of his earlier and later work. Chapter III. is concerned with the relation which he bears to the later paraphrast or prose fabulist Romulus. The conclusion is that Romulus must have had sources other than Phaedrus. Chapter IV. discusses some general corruptions in the text. It is maintained that the *promythia* and *epimythia*, or 'morals' of the fables, are all or nearly all later additions, and not the work of the poet ('aut omnia aut tantum non omnia a lectoribus, quorum alius alio fuit stultior ineptiorque, ficta et inuitissimo Phaedro affixa esse' p. 53). In the older MSS. in many cases these 'morals' exist in prose only, and not in verse; hence we may conclude that the original archetype had no 'morals,' but that these trite truisms were appended in prose by way of illustration in the margin at some period by a 'learned' reader, and subsequently versified by some no less erudite adventurer. How easily such a process of transference from prose into Latin senarii may be effected is amusingly illustrated by a few highly prosaic examples. Such a line as

in partes omnis tres diuisast Gallia

would to most of us be vocal with memories of our Gallic troubles in childhood, and is quite as poetical as the verse of Phaedrus

hi cum cepissent ceruum uasti corporis.

Or again, Justin. *instit.* i. 1. 3 'iuris praecepta sunt haec: honeste uiuere, alterum

non laedere, suum cuique tribuere' would still be recognised by lawyers if dressed up as

suum tribuere cuique, honeste uiuere,
non laedere alium, iuris haec praecepta
sunt,

though the wildest enthusiast would never dream of hailing Justinian and Tribonian as poets.

Chapter V. opens with a very unfavourable estimate of Bentley as an editor. Bentley's edition of Phaedrus was put together in great haste (Monk's *Life of Bentley*, ed. 1830, p. 513 foll.), a fact which the writer hardly seems to have sufficiently considered. It is true that Bentley is bold and often unsatisfactory, but language such as that at the bottom of p. 81 is too strong: 'Putaret enim eum fuisse magistellum aliquem pusilli animi, qui totum fere diem in corrigendis puerorum exercitationibus occupatus cum fuisset, quod temporis reliquum esset insumeret antiquis scriptoribus ad decantata quaedam grammaticae praecepta purgandis.' However the author makes a decided point against Bentley in censuring his fondness for inserting short words; a long list of such insertions is given, e.g. ii. 1. 1 *super iuuencum stabat deiectum leo*: Bentley writes *iuuencum <ut> stabat*. iii. 4. 1 *pendere ad lanium quidam uidit simium*: Bentley proposes *quidam <ut> uidit*. iii. 5. 2 *Aesopo quidam petulans lapidem iniegerat*: Bentley suggests *Aesopo <ut> quidam*; and many more. A careful consideration of the passages here adduced (pp. 84 foll.) in which Bentley has contrived to insert supplementary words proves, not that those words are necessary to the sense, but, what it is highly important to note in studying Phaedrus, that fabulist's abruptness of style and fondness for anacoluthia. It may seem strange that the great critic did not discern this simple truth; but we must not forget that Bentley lived in an age when exact criticism was still largely in its infancy, and grammars and lexicons were still very imperfect; that he was one of those great revolutionary leaders to whose boldness and tenacity of purpose we owe it that classical scholarship has been enabled to shake itself free from the prestige of authority, so that a manuscript reading is no longer regarded with reverence merely because it is ancient, but is tested by literary and grammatical canons. Bentley may have gone too far, but it is due to such restless scepticism as his and that of a few scholars like him that any considerable advance has been made.

In this particular instance, with the fuller information of nearly two hundred years at our backs, we can see that Bentley was wrong; but his very error has been mainly instrumental in assisting us to the discovery. Had not abruptness been a leading feature in the style of Phaedrus, any one of these proposed insertions might have been regarded as plausible, but underlying the long series of passages where Bentley proposed to insert supplements we now perceive a law, and prefer to believe that the text is genuine, and the poet's writing is terse and disjointed; as indeed one would naturally expect to be the case with a writer of fables, a class of composition which especially demands precision and brevity. It might be interesting to contrast the different ways in which Roman writers enforce moral truths; some, like Phaedrus, Persius and Tacitus, excel in conciseness, while the more rhetorical school, whose pleasure is in diffuse amplification, is represented by Cicero, L. Seneca and Juvenal.

A further serious charge urged against Bentley is that his method was first to devise with amazing fertility his continual alterations in the text, and then to resort to lexicons to gain support for his innovations, and consequently that much of his learning is but borrowed plumes, as is shown by the circumstance that confirmatory passages are often quoted by him in the order in which they appear in Stephanus' *Thesaurus* (p. 92. The same change is made in Hare's *Epistola Critica* pp. 75, 77, where Stephanus is called 'familiaris eius,' and p. 83). But this argument does not carry conviction. No conscientious scholar, however marvellous his memory, will trust to it when he commits himself to print; he will naturally go to the best books of reference of his own day. Bentley may have used Stephanus' collections to support his emendations; but that his learning was merely the learning acquired from lexicons ('Richardum quendam Bentleium, uirum in uoluendis lexicis satis diligentem' A. Alsop, quoted with approval p. 89, see Monk's *Life of Bentley* p. 74) it seems surprising that any one should now seriously affirm. There has never lived a corrector of the classics so brilliant as Bentley; no other scholar has possessed in the same degree that remarkable combination of acuteness and learning which enabled him to make, not emendations, but certain restorations of numerous passages where hitherto all had been darkness. Such was his tact for discerning corruptions that no one can afford to neglect what he has

written; where he has erred his mere errors are instructive. Bentley, like N. Heinsius or Withof or Schrader, is one of those suggestive critics, the immense value of whose work is in no way depreciated by the fact, which was inevitable, that their genius has often turned to too audacious flights. The rest of chapter V. is taken up with a defence of certain passages against alterations proposed by Bentley; the writer has made good use of the clever but acrimonious *Epistola Critica* of Hare (London, Tonson 1726).

Chapter VI. opens with some interesting and well-considered remarks on the special failings of Phaedrus. His obscurity and poorness of style are justly censured, p. 97: 'Haud raro enim quod dicendum erat enuntiare non potuit, sed multo labore et sudore protulit aliquid quod tam esset ineptum obscurumque ut uix ullus e uerbis eius sensus extorqueri possit; saepius etiam πρὸς τὸ κεχρηδὸς τοῦ ῥηθμοῦ aliquid inseruit uocabulum a loci sententia alienum.' Keeping this characteristic clearly in view the author defends several passages against emendations which aim at stylistic improvement. He is particularly successful with i. 5. 8, where the genuineness of *fortis* MSS. is established against Withof's conjecture *socius*. In one case, in spite of what is urged, I still consider that emendation is required: i. 4. 7

et quem tenebat ore dimisit cibum,
nec quem petebat potuit adeo attingere.

Hartmann defends *adeo* as a piece of innocent padding, which 'uersum hiantem supplet, nil praeterea' (p. 98). But such an excuse opens a formidably wide door to the defence of all that is unintelligible in MSS. In this passage for *adeo* I suggest to read *ideo*; 'though the dog dropped the food in his mouth, he could not any the more on that account secure the reflected food.' A single letter reduces the passage to sense.

From p. 107 to the end of the book is occupied with the author's original proposals. In i. 13. 1 for *sera dat poenas turpes paenitentia* the alteration *serae paenitentiae* seems unnecessary: the old reading will translate if the ablative be treated as ablative of circumstance: 'repenting late, he pays a disgraceful penalty.' In ii. praef. 10 (p. 111) the conjecture *doctorum* for *dictorum* is neat: and so is that in iv. 16. 2 (p. 118),

barbam capellae cum inpetrassent ab Ioue,
hirci maerentes indignari coeperunt,
quod dignitatem feminae aequassent suam.

'Praestaret, ut opinor, aequasset suae;
barba enim capellis data, Juppiter digni-

tatem feminarum marium aequauerat dignitati.' In appendix 21. 7 *cum circumspectans errore haesisset diu* the conjecture *circumspectans omnia* is probable. An apparently certain transposition is suggested on p. 121, in appendix 8. 14, *nec cadere in illum credit tantam audaciam*; this verse seems misplaced, and ought to follow line 21 *uirum ut in re atroci* etc.

The book is learned and instructive; and can be safely recommended to all who care for the study of Latin poetry. I finish by quoting a passage of unusual interest, where the writer enlightens us as to the method pursued by his master Cobet in training his pupils. Considering what affinities there were between the minds and methods of those two consummate critics, Bentley and Cobet, one cannot help feeling it rather strange that so strong an attack upon the English has come from a pupil of the Dutch scholar.

'Saepe in memoriam incundissimi temporis redeo quo et ipse et amici Cobeto praeceptore utebamur; is enim lege iubente cuique nostrum honorem Academicum petenti locum aliquem proponebat quem domi uitio purgare conaretur. Moris autem tum erat amicos omnes de eo secum deliberare ut laboranti opem ferre possent. Primum ergo Nouas Variasque

Lectiones inspiciebamus: haud enim raro accidebat ut summus uir, tam suorum quam alienorum inuentorum immemor, locum discipulo emendandum proponeret quem ipse ante multos annos felicissime persanasset. Si nihil in Lectionibus opis erat proprio erat ingenio utendum: conueniebamus ergo quaerebamusque. Nonnumquam unus e nobis statim rem acu tangebatur, sed multo saepius accidebat ut omnes frustra caput scalperemus. In summa ergo rerum desperatione quam accuratissime locum propositum perlegebamus, i.e. sub unoquoque uerbo aliquid uitii latere suspicabamur. Cum de corruptelae sede inter nos constabat, ea utebamur ratione qua fieri non potest quin multae simul nascantur coniecturae, quarum alia solet esse absurda, alia paulo absurdior: uocabulum enim suspectum litteris describebamus uncialibus, ita cetera omnia uocabula ei fiebant similia. Cum inuentum erat quod satis placeret omnibus, de solida nocte haud paruum partem uino gaudioque dabamus. Postridie qui primus uinulum (*sic*) edormitasset ad Bibliothecam currebat et ab illo libro, quem postea aut numquam aut rarissime inspecturus erat, auxilium petebat, Stephani thesaurum dico, ex eoque excerpebat quidquid in rem praesentem faceret; praedaeque ad amicum iam instantis periculi metu sollicitum allata de uespertino illo uel nocturno inuento breuis conscribatur commentatio. Illam deinde Cobeto recitabat; candidatus, in qua Herodoti puta uel Thucydidi locus ita emendaretur scilicet ut testes afferrentur Nouum Testamentum, Lycophronis Alexandra, Eunapius. Nihil tum iucundius erat quam Cobetum audire ridendum iocantemque (pp. 90, 91).'

S. G. OWEN.

PETERSON'S TENTH BOOK OF QUINTILIAN.

M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus. A revised text, with Introductory Essays, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and a Facsimile of the Harleian MS., by W. PETERSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 8vo. pp. lxxx. 227, price 12s. 6d.

THE Tenth Book of Quintilian is not an easy book to annotate satisfactorily. The text is not in a satisfactory state, and frequently requires discussion. The vocabulary and the syntax are those of the Silver Age, and the attention of the student has to be called constantly to departures from classical usage. There are numerous references to the technical terms of rhetoric (all the more perplexing to the tiro because they are often incidental), which have to be explained, sometimes at length. Finally the book includes a rapid critical survey of almost the whole of Greek and Latin literature; and if the editor is not to

content himself with barely referring to dictionaries and handbooks, he finds himself embarrassed with an overwhelming mass of material. It is doubtless the last difficulty, the burden of which is in exact proportion to the learning of the commentator, that has left the purchasers of the first part of Professor J. E. B. Mayor's edition sighing for the completion of a work, which the Christmas vacation of 1872 was to have seen achieved. Principal Peterson has grappled with his task on all sides, with no little energy and success. The main contribution which he has himself offered to the settlement of the text lies in the use which he has made of the *codex Harleianus* 2664. The excellent *codex Ambrosianus* is unfortunately deficient for the whole of Book x. The *codex Bernensis* is similarly wanting as far as x. 1, 107, the copy from which it was taken having large *lacunae*, which are indicated by blank spaces in the Bernensis. In an early copy of the latter, the *cod. Bambergensis*, the *lacunae* are filled up by another but an early hand, known as G,