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](#)

Livy, Books I. and II. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. B. Greenough. Ginn and Company. 6s. 6d.

M. T. Tatham

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 67 - 68

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018480X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018480X

How to cite this article:

M. T. Tatham (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 67-68 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018480X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

I may here take the opportunity of assenting to Prof. Tyrrell's criticism of the rendering in my translation of *Fam.* xii. 10, 2, and admitting that *ut arbitrar-entur* is expegetical of *persuasum erat*, and the second *ut* correlative to *ita*. The translation should therefore be modified accordingly.

On the whole it must be said that Prof. Tyrrell has given us an interesting and stimulating sixth-form or undergraduate book, and it is to be hoped that this divagation will not prove to have been any delay to the greater work for which he is even better fitted.

G. E. JEANS.

Cicero's Ausgewählte Reden erklärt, von KARL HALM. Vol. iii. in *Catilinam et pro Archia*. 13th edition by G. Laubmann. pp. 140. 1 Mk. 20.

ANY volume of this edition of Cicero's speeches is too well known and appreciated to need commendation. I may say however that since the later editors of the *Catilinarian* speeches, C. F. W. Müller, H. Nohl and A. Kornitzer have, after A. Eberhard and C. A. Lehmann, shown the superiority of the MSS. family α over β , a new revision of the text has been made for this edition. $\alpha = a$ (Mediceus) + A (Ambros.), $\beta = b$ (Benedictoburanus) + i (Indersdorfiensis) + s (Salisburgensis).

R. C. S.

Vergil, Aeneid X, by S. G. OWEN, M. A. Macmillan & Co. (Elementary Classics). 1s. 6d.

THE text follows Deuticke's revision of Ladewig's *Aeneid* (1889), but the editor has occasionally exercised his own judgment. There is a vocabulary at the end, pp. 71–110: and notes, pp. 33–70, including English analysis of the various divisions or paragraphs of the poem. The notes are generally short and to the point. The reader is referred, not very frequently, to Roby's *Grammar* on points of syntax and the like. Is this not too advanced a book for young boys, for whom the edition is presumably intended? In v. 188 *Crimen amor vestrum, formaeque insigne paternae*, Mr. Owen takes *Amor* as vocative; but his explanation of this obscure passage is not more satisfactory than that of his predecessors, most of whom take it as nominative. The book is thoroughly trustworthy and suited to its purpose.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

T. Livii ab Vrbe Condita Libri. WILHELM WEISSENBOERN'S erklärende Ausgabe, neu bearbeitet von H. J. MÜLLER: (i.) Buch viii.–x., fünfte Auflage (2 Mk. 10 Pf. Berlin 1890); (ii.) Buch. xxii. achte Auflage (1 Mk. 50 Pf. Berlin 1891).

ALL who have worked upon Livy in the way of explanation have found great assistance from the commentary of Weissenborn and Müller. These new editions now brought out by Prof. Müller will be very welcome. In the former (fifth edition of Books ix. and x.) considerable alterations have been made in the commentary; in the latter, though the notes bear traces of a careful revision, much less has been altered. In the recension of the text great weight has been given to the authority of Madvig, and although Prof. Müller has not always been able to accept his conjectures he has generally agreed with him where he has suspected traditional readings. In Books ix. and x. the text has been emended in several places; in Book xxii. there was much less to be done and what has been done brings the text in more important points into closer correspondence with that of Madvig, just as Madvig brought his last edition of that book into closer correspondence with

the text of Weissenborn. In his preface to this book Prof. Müller expresses a hope that the text has now attained to something like finality.

M. T. TATHAM.

Livy, Books I. and II. Edited with Introduction and Notes by J. B. GREENOUGH. Ginn and Company. 6s. 6d.

THE editor tells us in his preface that 'the essential object of studying Latin is to learn to read Latin with readiness and accuracy; that the proper method of *learning to read* is to *try to read* in the form and order in which the author presents his ideas and conceptions and with as little translation into the vernacular as possible. This is especially true of Livy,' and accordingly the book 'is edited with a view to that object and that method.' Other points on which notes are often written 'have been made subordinate to the presentation of Livy's exact ideas as they lay in his mind, and the precise order in which he intended to present them.' The editor also warns us that he has avoided 'the customary method of exhaustive comment on irrelevant topics.' Here he seems a little hard on his contemporaries. But whatever may be the faults that Mr. Greenough sees in others, his own method of commenting is, for Livy at least, a very good one. I cannot find that he has left any grammatical difficulty untouched, and the historical comment, though purposely brief, is never absent when it is wanted. There is besides a useful Introduction on Livy as a historian and a writer.

The book is excellently printed, and is bound in cloth, not merely stuck into the cover. The notes are at the foot of the page.

I have noticed the following points:—

On Bk. i. ch. 1 § 2 Mr. Greenough explains *casibus...variis* by 'through various vicissitudes; they were alike spared but their later destiny was different.' Surely *variis* (or 'various' in English in such a context) does not imply this, but means only that Aeneas and Antenor each passed through varied adventures. '*Per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum Tendimus in Latium*' certainly does not imply that Aeneas and his men had a different set of adventures each.

In the note on § 4 of the same chapter there is the misprint *Segeste* for *Segesta*.

On *Quirites* i. 13, 5 the editor says 'according to Livy both peoples were called so. It is more probable that the two words were independent, and had nothing to do with Cures.' All that Mr. Greenough means is that *Quirites* had nothing to do with *Cures*.

In his note on the oath made by sacrificing a pig with a flint weapon, i. 24, 9, Mr. Greenough compares *Iovem lapidem iurare*, but it seems probable (see Strachan-Davidson's *Polybius*, Prolegomena viii., where the subject is thoroughly discussed) that in this formula *lapidem* is not in apposition with *Iovem*, and that the stone in that ceremony was not symbolical of Jupiter.

On i. 26, 6 *Lex horrendi carminis* the note translates *carminis* 'purport.' Would not 'formula' be more correct: 'The law with its terrible formula'? *Carminis* is explained by 'formula' in ch. 24 § 6 (wrongly referred to in this note as 24 § 7).

'Fisticuffs' reads strangely in the note on ii. 29, 4.

On ii. 36, 1 *velut ea res nihil ad religionem pertinisset* the note is not clear as to the exact meaning of *religionem*. It is explained successively 'the religious character of the proceedings,' which is interpreted to mean 'the desecration of them,' and 'a religious

difficulty.' The last explanation seems to me the best, but they are given as if identical.

On ii. 52, 3 *diem dicunt* it is said 'i.e. as tribunes bring in a bill against them before the *comitia tributa*.' This is probably inaccurate, the word *comitia* being strictly applicable only to assemblies of the whole *populus* (which the tribunes could not convene) and not to a *concilium plebis*.

In ii. 65, 2 *post principia* is ordinarily explained 'to the rear,' but Mr. Greenough appears to take it differently.

M. T. TATHAM.

Lucani sententia de deis et fato, by J. E. MILLARD. (Utrecht, Beyers.)

THE author of this dissertation belongs to Stuttgart, and the paper is an exercise for a Doctor's Degree in the University of Utrecht.

Mr. Millard handles his subject with great thoroughness and zeal, and on the whole with marked success. A right understanding of Lucan's attitude towards the gods, fate, fortune, divination, death, life, the human soul, and so forth, is most necessary to all who would judge of the poet in relation to the ideas and influences of his time. All these matters are treated by Mr. Millard with more or less fullness. The evidence is clearly and fully stated, and even a reader who does not accept all the writer's views will be grateful to him for furnishing materials for independent judgment.

The conclusions at which he arrives are summarily these. Lucan casts aside the common or 'Olympian' gods, and employs in their stead the gods of the Stoic system; but is often constrained by poetic needs and his own political sentiments to bring in gods of more personal existence, cruel and full of hatred to mankind. These gods, though very powerful, do not themselves take a direct part in the action of the poem: they are not portrayed as a universal moving cause. As a Stoic, Lucan attributes to fate supreme power: in ordinary affairs, in the overthrow of Pompey and the Commonwealth, fate is all-powerful. Yet under the influence of prevalent notions and poetic needs he drops the Stoic and often represents fate as a god, acting, changing its mind, resisted—sometimes even checked—by men. Fate and fortune are often mentioned together; and Lucan, like the mass of mankind, confuses the two notions, though they are strictly speaking essentially opposed. Fortune is a personal goddess playing a leading part. Lucan is indignant at her cruel malignity and her favour for Caesar. As a Stoic, Lucan firmly cleaves to a belief in possible foreknowledge of the future through various modes of divination, in none of which does he express any doubt. In his utterances on death and the human soul, life after death, etc., Lucan again modifies philosophic tenets by admixture of popular opinions.

Let me quote the most important sentence from Mr. Millard's concluding section:

Vis autem ipsa in scaenam prodians, omnia humana gubernans, est fatum, quod saepe fere ut deus personalis et cogitans in poemate incedit. Sed necessitate poetica coactus, poeta fato assimilat Fortunam, quae personaliter depicta, fere partes deorum Homeri agit. Per multis locis autem poeta sibi non constat et fatum Fortunamque rursus alio sensu adhibet, carmine sine dubio nimis festinanter confecto..... etc.

If I may add a word about his reference [pp. 84—5] to some words of mine [Haskins' *Lucan*, Introduction § 35 c], I would say that his version 'mihi fatum et fortuna notiones Stoica et Epicurea videntur' does not fairly represent my 'To me it

seems that his *fatum* and *Fortuna* are as Stoic and Epicurean.' By putting in 'as' I meant to signify that the relation between the two notions was much what might exist between a Stoic and an Epicurean contemplating the one notion resulting from the frequent confusion of the two notions. I put it too briefly and not too clearly. I did not see all that Mr. Millard has shown me: but I have only to thank him for his candid criticism here and his kind word on p. 2. Hastily as I was compelled to write in 1886, I am glad to find that I was not far from the truth.

W. E. HEITLAND.

Theoderic the Goth, by THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. (Heroes of the Nations Series.) London and New York. G. P. Putnam. 1891. 5s.

A LIFE of Theoderic could naturally be entrusted to no better hands than those of the author of 'Italy and her Invaders,' whose name is sufficient guarantee for an attractive style combined with soundness and accuracy. The work of course goes over much of the same ground as the larger history, but it is by no means a mere abstract of it. The story of Theoderic's reign in Italy is indeed told at rather greater length than in the earlier work, though of course with less citation of authorities, and includes much new matter, among which the account of his measures for the revival of agriculture deserves special mention. The task of welding the fragmentary authorities into a popular and connected narrative without giving too much play to imagination is indeed difficult, but Mr. Hodgkin has achieved it with marked success. He has not however confined himself to a mere biography of his hero; he has also briefly described the fall of the Western Empire, the early history of the Goths, and the later fortunes of the Gothic kingdom, while the volume closes with an account of the Theoderic of Saga. In such a book we expect the merits of the hero to be somewhat exaggerated, and Theoderic has of late years received more praise than is perhaps really his due. His statesmanship can indeed hardly be overrated, and Mr. Hodgkin rightly insists that the fall of the monarchy was due not to any fault of its founder but to 'a continuation of adverse events,' chiefly of course to the fact that Theoderic died without leaving a full-grown Amal heir; but, when he maintains that the Gothic king was actuated by pure desire for the welfare of his Roman subjects, he perhaps goes too far. That Theoderic could be cruel and faithless when his interests seemed to need it, we see from many instances, and it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that his moderation was simply the result of policy. Mr. Hodgkin's work is in general distinguished for its accuracy, but, when dealing with matters somewhat removed from his main subject, he sometimes falls into mistakes. Thus on p. 65 he says 'Aspar and his three valiant sons fell,' but only two of Aspar's sons were killed according to any account, and according to Candidus only one. On p. 95 the statement that the dynasty of Theodosius had lasted 86 years is an arithmetical blunder, as 379 from 455 leaves 76. On p. 152 he says that there were three praetorian prefects in the West, 'one for the Gauls, one for Italy, and one for the city of Rome': the last however was not a praetorian prefect. On p. 282 he speaks of the Emperor Anastasius as consul in 517, but the consul of 517 was another Anastasius: see *C.I.L.* v. 8120 (2). Again it is surely an oversight on Mr. Hodgkin's part when he places the expedition of Theodemir against the Eastern Empire as late as 474. That expedition took place during the reign of Leo (*Jo. Ant.* 206, 2) and Leo died in