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](#)

***Kleine philologische Schriften* von Theodor Bergk.
Herausgegeben von E. Peppmüller. II. Band. Zur
griechischen Literatur. Halle a. S., Buchhandlung des
Waisenhauses. 1886. Pp. xcv. 813. 12 mk.**

F. B. Jevons

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 08 / October 1887, pp 234 - 235

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183283, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183283

How to cite this article:

F. B. Jevons (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 234-235 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183283

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Mr. Bryans, as a practical schoolmaster, knows by instinct the scale on which his notes should be; and this is a great point. The notes seem on the whole to be about the right length, and to touch the right points: occasional divergences from what is strictly necessary are pardonable and even welcome, as e.g. the collection of uses of *quin*, p. 41, or the more superfluous note on the gerund, p. 59.

The following may be perhaps improved in another edition. P. 32. *in vicem*, not 'for a turn,' but like *in numerum*, *in versum*. P. 34, 2. *eo ut* cannot mean 'for this reason that': the *quo* is comparable to *non quo*. P. 40, 7. *qua spe* is better explained as 'by hope of which' like *is terror*, 'fear of that.' To say *spes* = 'hopes' is misleading. P. 41, 11. 'ought to be imperf.' is unfortunate: the usage is normal. P. 41, 3. *posse* imperf. inf. is surely wrong: it is oblique of *potest*, the imperf. *remanerent* is due to the past *respondit*. P. 44, 13. *obessent* is suboblique simply, not 'attracted.' P. 54, 18. in *satis profectum* (like *satis factum*), the *satis* is subject.

A. S.

Ovid's Tristia. Book I. Edited by S. G. OWEN. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a thoroughly scholarly edition, to which the editor has devoted enormous pains, and no small amount of research. The value of the latter, which is chiefly conspicuous in the treatment the poet's autobiography, and in the editing of the text, it hardly falls within the province of a reviewer of schoolbooks to estimate. We may say however that the introduction is in its handling of facts complete, clear, and able: and judgment is shown in the selection of readings. The author has presented a tolerably complete picture of Ovid's life and the circle of his friends; and has made out an exceedingly good case for the conjecture that the poet's exile was due to his complicity with the intrigue between Julia and Silanus. The least satisfactory part of the introduction is the section on the literary value of the *Tristia*. The editor too much takes the tone of an advocate for his author. For example it is going too far to hold up to our admiration Ovid's expression of affection for his loving wife. Whatever the poet was, he was not a family man: and the consolation to his wife is as hollow as can be. When he tells her to imitate the empress, we see the object of the letter: and we cannot agree with the taste or the truth of the remark that the poor woman 'deserved a happier but not a better husband.' It is still worse when the editor justifies the querulous unmanliness of the *Tristia* by the remark:—

'There is as much of sorrow as of happiness in the world: and it is the function of the poet to sing of the sadder aspects of human life as well as the happier.'

and refers us in a note to *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt*. No human being really feels that Ovid got more than he deserved: and it gives one a positive shock to find, brought into comparison together, the unspeakable line of the great poet, which has touched the very springs of feeling for centuries, and the *me miserum's* and a *quotiens* of the shallow selfish libertine who had a gift for verses.

Apart from these faults of taste—which we have dwelt on disproportionately—the introduction is good and valuable. Our only misgiving is, that the evidence of erudition is so considerable as to be terrifying to the schoolboy: and we should have preferred to have first the complete scholar's edition of the book, where such erudition would have been in place, and then an abridged one for schools, with much fewer references. The same remark applies to

the *apparatus criticus* of the text: for the easy elegiacs of Ovid are chiefly read in those parts of a school where critical editions are superfluous.

The notes seem very thorough, and though long on the whole, are not prolix or irrelevant. A great deal might be learnt from them by any reader: though no doubt the fourth or fifth form boy (who will probably use the book) will find much that might without loss be concealed from him. It must also be said, and this is the real merit of the notes, that he will really find what he wants.

We have marked one or two details where improvement might be made, chiefly in grammatical points, where the editor is generally very careful.

i. 79. A note is quoted of Professor Nettleship's about the imperfect subjunctive of past time, in a way which suggests that it is an unusual use. One scents a survival of the once common but erroneous theory that the imperfect subj. refers normally only to present time. There is again a want of clearness in the note on i. 125, *si ferres . . . futurus eras*, which simply means 'had you been carrying . . . you would have been,' *futurus eras* being the same periphrasis for past conditional as *futurum fuisse* in *or. obl.* See also p. 70 note on 14.

i. 88. The word *restrictis* is a pity. It is only true in the sense in which all consecutives are restrictive. It is better to confine the use of the word *restrictive* consecutives to the well-marked class of which examples are *ita omisi ut leviter tangerem, ita abii ut portam tamen non clauderem*.

iii. 47. Why should *praecipitata* be middle? The middle (i.e. true reflexive) use is clearly employed by Augustans; but need not be violently introduced where the common passive meaning is natural and sufficient.

But these are very small points in seventy pages of notes which are unusually accurate and complete.

A. S.

Kleine philologische Schriften von THEODOR BERGK. Herausgegeben von R. Peppmüller. II. Band. *Zur griechischen Literatur.* Halle a. S., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 1886. Pp. xcv. 813. 12 mk.

THIS volume, which is a library in itself rather than a book, would require to review it the learning of another Bergk and the space of a whole magazine. All that it is possible to do is to note the contents briefly. More it is unnecessary to do, for the volume contains nothing which has not been published before. Less must not be done, because many of Bergk's minor writings on Greek literature are not included in this volume; and there is a danger lest students not knowing its contents should buy it for the sake of some dissertation which it does not contain. What has been Herr Peppmüller's principle of selection it is difficult to discover, for several of the treatises which he has republished might well have been excluded to make room for others which he has not printed and which, from his preface, there seems to be no great likelihood of his printing in collected form hereafter. Some papers have been absorbed in more solid works and therefore did not require reprinting. The *Heraclitea* for instance has been absorbed in Mr. Bywater's *Heraclitus*; the *Eratosthenica* by Hiller; the *Callimachea* in O. Schneider's edition; while Bergk's own History of Greek literature contains all that is valuable in the *Recension von K. O. Müller's Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, the paper *Ueber das älteste Versmass der Griechen*, the *Commentatio de tabula Iliaca Parisiensi*, and the treatises *Ueber die Einheit und Untheilbarkeit des erstens Buches des Ilias* and

Wann beginnt die Alexandrische Periode. Others are now antediluvian, as for instance *das Zeitalter des Babrius*, which argues that Babrius belongs to the Alexandrine period and which has been exploded by Eberhard and Crusius long ago. The review of *Rüstow-Köchly's Geschichte des griechischen Kriegswesens* has no interest since the book reviewed has ceased to be read. Other reviews, however, such as that of Böckh's *Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, and of Meier's *Diäteten* (together with *die Attischen Schiedsrichter*) contain matter which still requires to be read and utilized, e.g. Bergk's lucid and plausible view of the Naucraries. In the paper *Ueber den Amtseid der Attischen Archonten* we have Poll. viii. 86, *ἄμυνον δ' οὗτοι πρὸς τῇ βασιλείᾳ στοᾷ ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου ὅφ' ὃ τὰ ταμεία, συμφυλάξουσιν τοὺς νόμους* emended into *ἐφ' οὗ τὰ τόμια σὺνδς, φυλάξουσιν*. And the *ἀνδρίας χρυσῶς ἰσομέτρητος* which was the fine inflicted on an archon for receiving a bribe is explained by Bergk to mean a figure of gold weighing as much as did the silver with which the archon was bribed. The reprint from the 'Rheinisches Museum' zur *Aristotelischen Politik der Athener* is known to all who are interested in the reforms of Solon. The *Verzeichniss der Siege dramatischer Dichter in Athen* contains an attempt to reverse the common opinion that the results of the dramatic contests at Athens were recorded contemporaneously on stone. The paper *Ueber die Beschränkungen der Freiheit der ältern Komödie* ascribes the restriction of the liberty of comedy to the reactionary religious party at Athens. The most important section in the book is the *Empedoclea*, consisting of reviews of Karsten and Stein, conjectures and a commentary on the Proem—all indispensable to the student of Empedocles. Finally, there remain to be mentioned some emendations of Parmenides, the dissertation *de Aristotelis libello de Xenophane*, another *de Chrysippi libris περὶ ἀποφατικῶν*, some *Hermesianactea*, *Theocrita* and *Epicharmea*, papers on *die Aufgabe der Alterthumswissenschaft*, and *die Geburt der Athene*, and some *Miscellanea*.—F. B. JEVONS.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes, &c.

By the Rev. J. J. LIAS. (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools.)

THE merits and demerits of this volume are mainly negative. At least its positive merits lie beyond the horizon of a classical review. A clearly and carefully written introduction, good illustrative matter in many of the notes, and a number of well chosen references sending the student to accessible and trustworthy sources for further information, are distinct merits, and will ensure the commentary an extended use. We regret all the more that the strictly exegetical matter must be pronounced disappointing. We much doubt whether a theological student, after going through the epistle with this commentary, will have learnt much of the science of exegesis proper, of that close grappling with the idiom and thought of the Greek text which is the pith and marrow of fruitful study of the New Testament. And, while the notes embody the results of many standard authorities, we miss any reference to much of the best recent work both at home and abroad. For example, we see no trace in these notes of any use of Canon Evans' contribution to the Speaker's commentary. *Μεμέρισται δ' Χριστός*; is discussed as though Canon Evans' note had never been written: the much disputed question of *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* (7. 21) is decided, not, as it ought to be, on philological grounds, but by general considerations on the nature of Christian liberty and the like. Again Canon Evans' brilliant treatment of the N. T. use of *ἵνα* should, if not adopted, at least have

been noticed in the many crucial passages which this epistle contains. In the difficult verse x. 29 *ἵνα* is, apparently without misgiving, rendered 'by what right,' a meaning *ἵνα* surely cannot bear. Throughout, there is a tendency to miss points of scholarship.

More seriously objectionable is the note on vii. 34, *καὶ μεμέρισται*, where Tischendorf is misquoted with the result of misrepresenting his meaning; and Jerome is made to say the opposite of what his words really mean.

We do not then consider Mr. Lias' commentary to have contributed much to exegesis. At the same time it contains, as we have said, much useful illustrative matter, and the notes are invariably clear and concise.—A. R.

Three Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine.

Translated with Analyses by F. H. WOODS, B.D., and J. O. JOHNSTON. D. Nutt, 1887. Pp. xxvii. 242. 4s. 6d.

THE three treatises are the *De Spiritu et Littera*, the *De Natura et Gratia*, and the *De Gestis Pelagii*. They form part of the work for the Honour School of Theology at Oxford, and the two editors are both of them Lecturers in Theology, the one at St. John's, the other at Lincoln and Merton. The text adopted is that of the Benedictine edition, deviations from which are generally noted in the margin. This is the second translation of these treatises into English during the last fifteen years. In 1872 they appeared in the translation of the works of S. Augustine then being published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh. That edition of them, made by Dr. Holmes, claimed to be first rendering of them into English. One obvious advantage which the volume before us has over the other two is its convenient size; and another is that it can be bought separately, and does not involve the purchase of several other volumes. A further advantage which it has over its predecessors lies in the careful and full analyses which precede the treatises. But the editors would probably have done well if they had followed Dr. Holmes in giving headings both to the chapters and the pages. Such things coax the listless reader to persevere, and are a real help to the genuine student in finding quickly some topic for which he is hunting. Clearness, however, is gained in another direction by placing the references to Scripture in the margin against the quotation, instead of in a heap at the bottom of the page. But only in a single instance is attention drawn to the difference between Augustine's Latin text and the Vulgate (*prævaricationis gratia* for *propter transgressionem* in Gal. iii. 19.) Where Augustine's text allows it, Scripture is given in the words of the A. V.

The translation reads smoothly, and comparison with the original in passages taken at random shows it to be accurate.—A. PLUMMER.

De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin par AD. REGNIER. Paris, Hachette, 1886. 8vo. pp. xviii, 212. 6 fr.

IN the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries France took the lead in Greek and Latin lexicography; witness Budé, H. and R. Estienne, Ducange. Didot did much to recover the lost credit of his country, and of late Quicherat, Riemann, and Goelzer (*Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la Latinité de Saint Jérôme*, Paris, Hachette, 1884) have entered into friendly rivalry with Georges, Wölfflin, Paucker, Rönsch, and other Germans who have largely enriched our Latin lexicons during the last quarter of a century.