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](#)

**The Letters of Sidonius *The Letters of Sidonius*.
Translated, with introduction and notes, by O. M.
Dalton, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Pp. clxxxiv + 86; vol.
ii.= 268. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. 3s. 6d. net.**

A. Souter

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 05 / August 2015, pp 154 - 155
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00048654, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00048654

How to cite this article:

A. Souter (1915). The Classical Review, 29, pp 154-155 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00048654

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tions, besides occasional illustrations of his thought. In the text itself I do not feel reconciled to the method of printing quotations from Latin poets straight-forward like prose.

In the mass of detail involved in the notes, perfection is naturally unattainable; but oversights and errors are commendably few. References to the text are wonderfully accurate: on p. 12, however, *omnia* of 6, 4 is not referred to its right line. If in the opening sentence of letter 22 for *speciosis* the *petiosis* of *p* is to be recorded, then *spetiosis*, which is clear in Chatelain's facsimile page from *b*, should also be given. At the obstinate passage in letter 21, 10, it is unfortunate that the note is wrong in recording *adieretis* as the reading of *b*: it is clearly *adieritis* in Chatelain. There is a slip too at the close of the thirteenth book; for it is not enough that the note

should say '*post VALE in P subscriptio haec Ragambertus quamvis indignus laicus barbatus hunc codicem scripsit*': the words '*Explicit liber xiii. ep̄larum Senecae*' intervene in a line between '*Vale*' and '*Ragambertus*.'

The text of Seneca's letters cannot, in face of many puzzling passages, be pronounced at all definitely established; but there is at least sufficient basis in the collations furnished by Herr Hense's edition to justify the hope that we shall in the near future obtain a recension of the text, accompanied by that adequate kind of commentary on the life, the philosophy and the style of the author which British scholarship is fitted to produce.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

THE LETTERS OF SIDONIUS.

The Letters of Sidonius. Translated, with introduction and notes, by O. M. DALTON, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Pp. clxxxiv+86; vol. ii.=268. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. 3s. 6d. net.

It appears that no complete translation into English of the letters of Sidonius has ever been published, and this is one justification for the existence of the book under review. But it is easy to find others. It may be truly said that Sidonius is an interesting figure, and that his writings are of importance to the classical scholar, if only because he is such a persistent imitator of Statius and the Younger Pliny. There are probably few authors so likely to tempt the classical scholar to transgress beyond the limits of A.D. 150. For, though the Christian 'taint' is there, it is very unobtrusive, and Sidonius, bishop though he was, could probably have passed a much stiffer examination on the Latin poets than on the Scriptures. The publication of the comparatively recent critical editions of Lütjohann and Mohr (the latter in the Teubner series) is a fresh reason

why an English translation of the letters should have been attempted; and it may be at once said that Mr. Dalton has produced an admirable work from every point of view, in what must be regarded as the most beautiful and satisfying series of translations of the classics that has ever appeared.

The introduction, to which are appended a bibliography and a list of correspondents, with biographical notes, is of necessity long, occupying in fact a third of the total work. The author and his works, as well as his environment in the widest sense, are discussed with fulness of knowledge and in a very interesting and attractive way. Mr. Dalton has not neglected the opportunities which work in the British Museum gives to become a master of the bibliography of his subject, and no one would guess from his literary style that his duties were almost exclusively concerned with the externals of books. A few notes on this part of the book may be given. On p. vii one is offended by the spelling of *stilus*, which is given correctly in another part of the book; the monstrosity '*Caius*' (p. xi), like *coena* (p. lix), *prediatores* (p. cxxviii),

seems very hard to kill; there are several places where the printing is hardly worthy of the Clarendon Press (pp. xix, xxxiii, xcii, clv); on p. lxxix, n. 2, 'seventh' is surely a mistake for 'sixth,' the date of St. Benedict's *Rule*; on p. lxxxi Faustus' 'work' on Free Grace is referred to, but Gelasius speaks of *opuscula*, and in the first note on the same page the volume of the *Corpus* should be given, whether xi. or xvi.; on p. lxxxvii, add § 8 to the chapter vii of Ammianus; on p. lxxxix, n. 2, a ! is wanted at the end; on p. xcvi the source of the expression *lunicata quies* (Mart. x. 51, 6) might have been given; on p. cviii the wearing of silk in Gaul might have been illustrated from the sermons of Caesarius of Arles; on p. cxii and elsewhere the name 'Filimatus' is so spelt, because the defective spelling of a Merovingian seventh or eighth century archetype is reproduced; the name is, of course, Greek in origin, and should be written 'Filemintius'; the proper names in Sidonius should, in fact, be overhauled by some one who has made a special study of that subject; on p. cxii it might have been as well to say that, although papyrus was not 'adapted' for use on both sides, it was nevertheless frequently so employed; on p. cxvi, n. 1, and elsewhere, the important work of Roger, *L'Enseignement des Lettres Classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin*, ought to have been mentioned; on p. cxxv, n. 1, l. 5 from foot, 'xi.' should be 'xiv.'; on p. cxxxiv no reference to the special use of *quia* and *quod* should have been made, as it was much older than Sidonius' time, and in no way confined to Gaul; on p. cxliii it would have been well to give the reference to the passage in Cassiodorus where he alludes to Sidonius; on p. clii the number of the Madrid manuscript is not given; on p. clviii, l. 16, 'xviii.' should be 'lviii.' In the list of correspondents the best modern edition of the surviving works should always have been mentioned, for instance, under Eucherius and Claudianus Mamertus; the result of the omission to do this

is that the non-expert reader never knows whether such works survive or not.

It would be impossible to praise the quality of the translation too highly. It may be doubted if more care and good sense have gone to the production of any modern translation of a classic. The general level is such that it has not proved possible to select any passages as superior to the greater part of the work. The skill of the translator appears in his rendering of such a letter as the thirteenth of Book VIII. And yet it has not been possible to agree everywhere with the translator's view of a passage. For example, in that very letter, § 1, *sine invidia potentem* means, not 'a man of influence who makes a blameless use of power,' but 'a man of influence who never arouses envy.' Again, in the fourth letter of Book VI., *isto deductam ante aliquot annos istique distractam* means, not 'that some years ago she had been brought here before being removed elsewhere,' but 'that some years ago she had been brought here and sold here,' this sense of *distracto* being found as early at Tacitus, but of course more naturally employed of property sold in lots. In the eighteenth epistle of the seventh book, § 3, surely *liberum* means 'outspoken' and not 'a lover of freedom.'

The notes hit the happy mean between prolixity and meagreness. I do not know that I quite understand 34, 1: at 50, 2 Cassiodorus' *Institutio* should have been employed in illustration; at 51, 1 the spelling Tyrannius might have been mentioned, and a decision come to between the two; at 102, 1, a view is expressed with regard to the meaning of *contestatiunculae*, which is not exactly in harmony with that stated by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* s.v.

In conclusion it ought to be mentioned that this work, which ends with a good index, is informed throughout by a loving knowledge of modern France.

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen.