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](#)

**Translations of the *Aeneid* by Rhoades and Sergeant
The Aeneid, Books I.—VI. Translated into English
Verse, by James Rhoades. Longmans, 1893. 5s. *Book
IV. of the Aeneid for Repetition*, with an English
Version, by J. Sergeant, Assistant Master at
Westminster. Printed for the School and sold in
Ashburnham House, Little Dean's Yard. 1893.**

T. E. Page

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 09 / November 1893, pp 415 - 418

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00198804, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00198804

How to cite this article:

T. E. Page (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 415-418 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00198804

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

non-Phoenician signs, including ω , is found in the oldest inscriptions of the Milesian colony, Naukratis.

(v.) As ω appears in the oldest inscriptions of Miletus and Naukratis (about 650 B.C.), the still older expansion of the alphabet by $\phi\chi\psi$ must have been complete as least as early as 700 B.C.

(vi.) The fact that the *digamma* is not inscriptionally attested for the Ionic dialect presupposes a condition of the language, which cannot be placed later than 800 B.C. To this period, if not an earlier, the invention of the numeral alphabet must be ascribed.

Our curiosity next leads us naturally to inquire what are the author's views on (1) the problems raised by the utilization in the various local alphabets of the Phoenician symbols for the sibilants, (2) the origin of the 'complementary' signs, (3) the divergent arrangement and values of the symbols for $\xi\chi\psi$ in the Eastern and the Western group of alphabets. As to the sibilants: *zajin*, according to Larfeld, was taken over by all branches of the alphabet to represent the soft *s*-sound; only its name was changed to $\xi\eta\tau\alpha$, by assimilation to the following $\eta\tau\alpha$, $\theta\eta\tau\alpha$, and not by confusion with the name *ssade*. *Samech* very early became $\xi\iota$, though some alphabets, long resisting the innovation, continued to write $\kappa\sigma$, $\chi\sigma$. For *ssade* and *schin* Larfeld contends that both signs were taken over by all the Greeks to denote cognate sounds, but that as in the further development of the language the originally differentiated sounds gradually approximated each other, one portion of the Greeks took one symbol (M) and another the second

symbol (Ξ) for exclusive use. As to the 'complementary' or non-Phoenician signs, Larfeld decisively rejects Deecke's derivation of these from the Cypriote syllabary. The symbols (Φ or φ) for ϕ and *koppa* were originally identical: the gradual differentiation of the one into $\Phi = \phi$ and the other into $\varphi = \text{koppa}$ must be taken as an incontestable fact, in spite of any kind of phonetic connexion. $X + = \chi$ Larfeld derives from forms of *Tau*; and Ψ from Υ . The Ω he regards as a too obvious differentiation of O to admit of any other hypothesis.

With regard to the solution of the question, which order of the complementary signs was original and which secondary, it cannot be said that Larfeld has advanced the problem beyond where Kirchhoff left it. He does indeed postulate for Miletus the adoption of the $\xi\phi\chi\psi\omega$ as early as the 9th century B.C., and he assigns as the only possible reason for the incomplete adoption by the West of these Milesian innovations the special phonetic relations of this part of the Greek world; but even so the alteration in value (Western $X = \xi$; $\Psi = \chi$ for Eastern $X = \chi$, $\Psi = \psi$) and in order remain unexplained.

The latter part of the treatise is devoted to an admirable analysis of the formulae used in the various classes of Inscriptions. The 'Tabulae zum Formelwesen des Attischen Psephismen' and the 'Formulare attischen Epheben-inschriften' are marvels of ingenious compilation.

E. S. ROBERTS.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE *AENEID* BY RHOADES AND SERGEAUNT.

The Aeneid, Books I.—VI. Translated into English Verse, by JAMES RHOADES. Longmans, 1893. 5s.

Book IV. of the Aeneid for Repetition, with an English Version, by J. SERGEAUNT, Assistant Master at Westminster. Printed for the School and sold in Ashburnham House, Little Dean's Yard. 1893.

THE second of these books is a novelty: 'cribs' are common enough in our Public Schools, but this is the first one which has been published 'by authority.' Presumably the words 'for Repetition' are intended to

save the character of the book. Its publication, however, is wholly to be deprecated. There is no reason why a boy should learn for repetition anything which he is not reading or has not read in Form, and all translations, except poetical ones, are baneful. They encourage that habit of 'getting up' a book in order to score marks in Examination, which is a parody on classical education. The object of that education is to train a boy to use his own wits, first by making out the meaning of an author, and then by endeavouring to express that meaning in fresh words of his own. Transla-

tions kill all this and the better they are the worse they are, as any one knows who has read Sophocles with a Form which is in possession of Prof. Jebb's otherwise admirable editions. It is simply impossible, when boys have such a book in their hands, to get them to think for themselves at all. A *réchauffé* of the Professor is all that is to be got from them, but myself I prefer a plain joint freshly cooked to any warmed up dainties. As a translation, Mr. Sergeant's work is very good, if it were not disfigured here and there by the use of those affected archaisms which are supposed to indicate culture and to win the hearts of young dons examining for scholarships. For instance, what is 'spilth'? Or why should plain words like *conjugium vocat* be turned into 'She cleped it a marriage'? What is the Latin for 'the lurdans,' or how many quilts has a bed, so that unhappy Dido should be 'laid on the quilts'?

The work which Mr. Rhoades has accomplished has evidently been a labour of love. He has performed his task with the most scholarly care, and has brought taste and skill to the rendering of each phrase. For example in 4. 110 *sed fatis incerta feror* what could be neater than 'but I | Drift doubtful of the fates,' or in 4. 595 *quae mentem insania mutat*, 'What madness warps my wit'? He has however set before himself as his ideal 'absolute fidelity to the original' and the result is, what it must necessarily be, that his Blank Verse is fettered and confined. It lacks Miltonic majesty and we miss what Tennyson calls 'the long roll of the Hexameter.' At times too his ear seems to deceive him, for it is surely impossible to end an English Iambic with 'Anna nathless,' and however good fidelity is, it should not lead the translator into such a line as

'now too the interpreter of heaven, by
Jove' 4. 356.

To give the reader however an opportunity of forming his own judgment on these two translations I propose to take several passages in the Fourth Book which will at once illustrate them and also, I hope, be found worthy of discussion on critical grounds. *R.* and *S.* will indicate these two books and *C.* Prof. Conington's edition.

11—13.

*quem sese ore ferens! quam forti pectore et
armis!
credo equidem, nec vana fides, genus esse
deorum:
degeneres animos timor arguit.*

S. 'What a mien is his, how puissant his chest and shoulders! Of a surety I believe him—yea and of warrant—to be of heaven's line. Cowardice bewrays the soul of the churl.'

R. 'what a mien
He bears! what strength of breast and
shoulder! I
Deem him—no idle fancy—sprung from
gods:
Fear proves the base-born spirit.'

Both translators here follow Conington, who with misplaced ingenuity takes *armis* as if from *armi*. But firstly the chances are very great against Virgil using the ambiguous form *armis* except from the ordinary word *arma*; he can use the ambiguous form because no one would *naturally* take it as the abl. of *armi*; the 'deeds' (cf. *arma virumque*) of Aeneas were famous, not his 'shoulders.' Then again Dido is struck by two things in him: (1) by his noble look, (2) by his noble exploits as exhibited in the story just told. It is on the latter however that she chiefly dwells; it is his 'brave heart and deeds' which make her believe 'his birth divine,' because 'fear convicts base-born souls.' Mark the antithesis between *forti* and *timor*, *genus* and *degeneres*, which both *S.* and *R.* ignore, as they are compelled to ignore it when they once render *forte pectus* 'a fine chest.' The sense demands *armis* from *arma*. Thirdly, assuming that *forte pectus* can mean 'a puissant chest,' is *fortes armi* applicable to a man? Dido is not appraising a horse 'with fine chest and fore-quarters,' and it is no use quoting, as *C.* does, l. 589 *os umerosque Deo similis*, for there to write *armos* would be obviously absurd, and Tennyson's 'O noble breast and all-puissant arms' is quite different, being natural where Enid is gazing at her sleeping husband and also justified by our common use of the word 'arm' e.g. in such phrases as 'the arm of the Lord,' to which the Latin use of *armi* presents no parallel.

142. *infert se socium Aeneas, atque agmina iungit.*

R. 'Aeneas moves to meet them, joins the troop.'

S. 'Aeneas made him of her fellows, and led up his company.'

'Joins the troop' is certainly wrong, but *R.* follows *C.* and Sidgwick, who says 'joins the troop' i.e. to himself, a variation for 'joins himself to the troop.' Aeneas does not join the troop but joins Dido and as he

does so 'unites their retinues,' who pair off together behind him and the queen. Who would accept *agmina iungo* as a rendering of 'I join the army'? But 'Virgilian variation' is made to explain much nonsense.

256. *haud aliter terras inter caelumque
volabat
litus harenosum Libyae ventosque
secabat.*

R. 'thus he flew
Twixt earth and heaven o'er Libya's
sandy shore,
And clove the winds.'

S. 'Even so...he flew along Libya's sandy waste.'

Both are right in preferring the construction *volabat litus* to *C.*'s hopeless "as dividing the shore from the winds," i.e. flying close to the shore so as to be, as it were, between it and the winds.' But why should we adopt either of these views when *Med.* reads *AC* and *Pal. AD* before *Libyae*, making perfectly clear sense? See Henry and authorities in *C.*'s own notes.

337. *pro re pauca loquar.*

R. 'Brief my words to meet the need.'

S. 'Hear a few words apt hereto.'

S. is enigmatical. *R.* follows *C.*, who says that *pro re* is "as circumstances allow," the meaning being that the urgency of the case admits only a short reply.' As a matter of fact Aeneas speaks for thirty lines and his reply is longer than Dido's attack, so that he can hardly plead 'urgency.' *Res* is here 'the matter of her charge,' 'the charge': Aeneas says 'I will now briefly deal with the charge' (cf. Sall. *Iug.* 102. 12 *pauca pro delicto suo verba facit*) and accordingly so proceeds to deal with it, his first words about not hiding his flight answering her first words about concealing it. The objection to this rendering is that it is stiff and prosaic. Exactly so. Aeneas has behaved like a blackguard and pleads like a lawyer. He casts about for an *exordium* l. 285, and here his opening words 332—336 are a formal *captatio benevolentiae*, after which he in due course proceeds to deal with the accusation and *pauca* implies no urgency but is the ordinary 'few words' of every orator.

382. *spero equidem mediis, si quid pia
numina possunt,
supplicia hausurum scopulis.*

R. 'I hope indeed that on the mid-sea rocks,

If aught the good powers can, thy lips
will drain

The cup of suffering.'

S. 'Of a surety I hope, if the powers of righteousness be not grown feeble, thou wilt drain the cup of punishment on the reefs of the sea.'

The use of *pia* here deserves notice. *C.* merely says that as *pietas* expresses the dutiful feeling of men to gods so in passages like this it is used of 'the reciprocal feeling of the gods to men.' This is true but inadequate. The gods regard the good (l. 603 *pios respectant numina*) but this *pietas* in the gods may be either (1) 'righteousness' to which men when wronged may appeal for vengeance (cf. 2. 536 *di, si qua est caelo pietas quae talia curet*; 6. 529 *di talia Grais | instaurate, pio si poenas ore reposco*), or (2) 'tender mercy' and 'pity' (cf. 5. 688 *si quid pietas antiqua labores | respicit humanos*). It is obvious here that *R.*'s rendering 'the good powers' is wrong just as in 6. 529 he wrongly renders *pio ore* 'with pure lips'; to the ancient mind men have a right to pray for vengeance and the righteous gods are bound to answer their prayer.

457. *praeterea fuit in tectis de marmore
templum
coniugis antiqui, miro quod honore
colebat
velleribus niveis et festa fronde
revinctum.*

R. 'which she
With wondrous honour tended,
wreathed about
With snow-white fleeces and with
festal boughs.'

S. 'Where she did exceeding service, a shrine engirt with snowy wool and wreaths of holiday.'

No commentator seems to touch this curious passage. Fillets of wool and boughs were commonly used in worship, and so in honour of the dead, cf. 3. 64 *stant Manibus arae | caeruleis maestae vitis atraque cupresso*. But mark the difference between that passage and this. There we have *caeruleae vittae*, here *vellera nivea*; there *atra cupressus*, here *festa frons* (which certainly suggests 'joy,' cf. 2. 249). Instead of the usual 'dark fillets' and 'gloomy cypress' Dido decked the chapel dedicated to her husband with 'snow-white fleeces' and 'festal boughs.' She did exactly the opposite of what was usual, and that is why the honor is called *mirus*, 'wonderful.' Prob-

bly she intended to symbolize that to her the dead was not dead—that he was still her living love and that death could never part the bridegroom from the bride. Anyhow, whatever the idea suggested, it is clear that the honour paid to her husband's memory was as 'wonderful' as it would be with us for a mourner to wear white instead of black.

689. *inficium stridit sub pectore vulnus.*

R. 'the sword *grides* fixed within her breast.'

S. 'The sword *grided* deep in her breast.'

So Sidgwick has 'the sword fixed deep *grides* within her breast,' and apparently he takes the translation from Lee and Lonsdale. No passage could show better the danger of translations. Somebody gives '*grides*' for *stridit* and the rendering is at once accepted by everybody as removing all the difficulties of the passage, just as people swallow a patent medicine in blind faith that it will cure every disease. It is not necessary in the least to understand what Virgil means or what you mean yourself, all that a student now-a-days needs is to render *vulnus stridit* 'the sword *grides*' or '*grided*,' and he will get full marks in any Examination. But what do the words 'the sword *grides*' really mean? Sidgwick says that *strideo* expresses 'a sharp hard sound as of hinges, swords, teeth, spears, whizzing arrows, woods in a gale, etc.,' and Tennyson speaks (*In Mem. c.* 106) of

'the wood which *grides* and clangs
Its leafless ribs and iron horns,'

but how can a sword planted in a human breast make a 'sharp hard' sound or do anything whatever which can be expressed by the word '*gride*.' I have seen a clown in pantomime bore a hole through a man with a huge gimlet, and at each twist 'the implanted weapon *grided*' and squeaked and gave forth 'sharp hard' sounds to the huge delight of the gallery, while I, in my folly, thought that it was fooling, but now learn that it was true to nature. The next heroine who stabs herself on the stage should take a hint from Virgil and give instructions to the stage-manager that, as she sinks lifeless to the ground, a sharp, hard, and '*griding*' sound should seem to issue from her breast. The front row of the stalls should also be reserved for commentators on Virgil in order that they might judge of the effect.

Bowen renders 'the death-wound sobs,' and cf. Celsus 5. 26. 9 (quoted by Deuticke) *pulmone icto spirandi difficultas est*. What exact sound *stridit* describes is uncertain, but Virgil clearly describes some effect caused by the wound, probably not so much the 'hissing' or 'gurgling' of the blood from it, as C. suggests, for this is inconsistent with *sub pectore*, as a deep, harsh, grating sigh which seems to come from the very centre of her bosom where it is pierced with the sword.

T. E. PAGE.

BRUGMANN'S INDO-GERMANIC GRAMMAR.

Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen und Altpersischen), Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Lateinischen, Umbrisch-Samnitischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen, und Altkirchenslavischen. Von KARL BRUGMANN, Ord. Professor der Indogerm-Sprachwissenschaft in Leipzig. Zweiter Band, Wortbildungslehre, Zweite Hälfte, erste Lieferung: Zahlwortbildung, Casusbildung der Nomina (nominal declination). Pronomina. Pp. 463-846. Strassburg. 1890. 10 Mk.

Id. Zweite (Schluss-) Lieferung. Verbale Stamenbildung und Flexion (Conjugation) pp. 847-1438. 1892. 14 Mk.

Id. (Translation) Morphology, part II. Numerals, inflexion of nouns and pronouns. Translated from the German by R. SEYMOUR CONWAY, M.A. and W. H. D. ROUSE, M.A. London. 1892. Pp. xii. 402. 12s. 6d.

DR. BRUGMANN'S great work is finished. The first volume, dealing with the sounds, appeared in 1886 (*Classical Review* I. p. 62), and the first instalment of the second, dealing with the formation of stems, in 1889 (*Classical Review* III. p. 172). Now we have the 'first and second halves of the second part of the second volume' (in England we should call them the third and fourth volumes), dealing with the inflexions of nouns and pronouns (1890) and of verbs