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](#)

Schmidt's *Catullus C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis Carmina*. Bernhardus Schmidt recognouit. Tauchnitz. Lipsiae. 1887. 4 Mk.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 03 / March 1888, pp 70 - 71

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192133, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192133

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 70-71 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192133

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of quieter feeling in the *Epistles*, of *vates tuus*.

Slight flaws, of which these are specimens, are scarcely perceptible in the general fidelity and beauty of the workmanship. They are mentioned not as detracting, in any degree worth mentioning, from the value of the book. But a translation, unlike an original poem, which is not always improved by 'adding and altering many times,' admits of an almost indefinite approach to perfection. One may wish Lord Justice Bowen many seasons of such leisure as he has so well employed, not only to complete his work,

but to make that which he has already accomplished even still more deserving of a permanent place in English literature. There can be no more happy or liberal employment of leisure for one who is at once a finished scholar and a true literary artist than thus to restore the *vita et spiritus* to the great writers of the past, to reveal them in a new light to those who knew them before, and to diffuse their influence over many to whom they would otherwise be a sealed book.

W. Y. SELLAR.

SCHMIDT'S CATULLUS.

C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis Carmina. BERNHARDUS SCHMIDT recognovit. Tauchnitz. Lipsiae. 1887. 4 Mk.

THIS latest edition of Catullus contains, besides the text of the poems, *prolegomena* and *apparatus criticus* of an extensive and detailed kind, amounting in all to cxxxvi pages. The editor has evidently made a long and very careful study of Catullus, and his views, which are in some cases new, uniformly imply considerable examination of the latest writers on the subject; for which reason, as well as for its excellent typography and fine appearance, (I speak here of the larger edition, the smaller omits the *Prolegomena*, and cannot stand comparison with Schwabe's edition of 1886,) the book deserves a large circulation wherever the world-famous poems of the Veronese are read.

I will begin with some of the principal changes in the *text* which Schmidt has introduced.

i. 9. After Fröhner,

Qualecumque tuo, patrone, uerbo,

which certainly removes the difficulty of *patrona uirgo*, but involves a rather harsh asyndeton: *habe . . . Qualecumque . . . maneat*.

vi. 7. *Ecquidnam tacitum? cubile clamat*.

xxi. 11. *A te mi puer et sitire discet*, after Munro.

xxii. 7. *membranae* is retained (as by Munro), but not disconnected from *v. 8*, in which I think most scholars will agree with the new editor.

xxviii. 6. After this *v.* Schmidt marks a lacuna of one verse, explaining *expensum* as part of a sentence to this effect, 'or have

you expended more than you received?' This idea is not new, and was virtually suggested by Clumper, *Misc. Phil. et Paed.* II. 147.

xxix. 9. Sillig's *haut idoneus* is retained. The editor says he could never persuade himself that Catullus wrote *aut Adoneus*. For my own part nothing will ever persuade me that Catullus *could* have written anything so tame, and so defective in significance, as *haut idoneus*. I suggest, if *Adoneus* is thought impossible, that *Adonius*, either as adjective agreeing with *columbus*, or as substantive, may be right. The form Ἀδώνιος was largely used by the comic writers, Aristophanes, Cratinus, Plato, Pherecrates.

xxix. 21. Munro's emendation,

Et huicne Gallia et metet Britannia?

is accepted as 'reliquis omnibus longe praeferenda,' but with *metit* for *metet*. On the other hand, in 23 the extraordinary word *putissimei* is adopted, quod uellem explicasset Schmidtius. Possibly a modification of Munro's conjecture may seem to some more likely—

Eone nomine, urbis ob luem suae,
Socer generque, perdidistis omnia?

'was it for this, to humour the abomination of his native Formiae, that ye ruined all?' *urbis suae* = Formiarum, as Horace speaks of *In Mamurrarum lassi deinde urbe manemus*, *Sat.* i. 5, 37. There would thus be a fine irony in making the wealth of the world pander to this bankrupt upstart of *Formiae* (*Decoctoris Formiani*, Catull. xli. 4).

xxxvii. 10. *ropionibus* (=mentulis) is accepted, as recently by Schwabe in his edition

of 1885. If Bücheler is right, however, the first *o* of *ropio* is short, *Rhein. Mus.* xxxv. 399. I confess (with Schöll) my doubts as to this new reading; certainly it cannot rank with *mulio consul*, Bücheler's discovery in Juv. viii.

xi. 5. *An ut peruenias in ora vulgi?* is bracketed as possibly spurious, for reasons which seem to me very unconvincing.

xlii. 13. *Non assis facit* Schmidt for *facis* of MSS. This seems very probable: but it cannot be called necessary.

lvii. 7. *lecticulo*, with Bährens: I cannot think rightly: *uix sincerum sonat*.

lxiii. 63. Wilamowitz' explanation of *Ego mulier* as ἐγὼ ἡ γυνή is adopted. If, however, this view is right, it seems strange that all the three following nominatives should equally prefix *ego*. Surely this uniform *ego* points to a uniform relation of *all* four to the subsequent verse.

lxiv. 196. *Quas ego me miseram* for *uae misera*.

273. *lenes* resonant.

287. *caris* for *doris*.

lxv. 9. *Alloquar, audiero*, etc., is rejected, and on a ground which is certainly of weight, the repetition of *loqui* (*loquentem*).

lxvii. 12. *Uerum istud populi uana loquella facit*.

lxvii. 33. Schmidt defends *percurrit*, (which Cluverius changed to *praecurrit*), on the plea that the streamlet *Gazza* which runs through Brixia joins the Mella, and might have been considered anciently a branch of it. This is ingenious, and perhaps true.

lxviii. is treated as one poem with two breaks, after 40 and 148, not as two distinct poems. This is practically my view: 'Prooemio et epilogo tamquam inuolucris utrimque includitur,' p. cxxvi.

39. Schmidt retains (as I do) *posta est*. He also agrees with me in keeping *dominam* in 68, accepting my explanation in opposition to Munro's, which indeed Munro himself seems to have retracted in the *Journal of Philology*, viii. 333. I am a little hurt that my conjecture in the very disputed v. 118, *Qui actutum* for *Qui tum*, passes unnoticed. This curious adverb is constantly corrupted in MSS., *ac* separating from *tutum* and then falling out; and the sense thus obtained is excellently in keeping with the passage.

157. *Et qui, quam primo nobis terram dedit, aufert*. Schöll, and Vahlen, (in a

Berlin programme), have argued for the genuineness of *terram dedit aufert* against all former editions. Schmidt follows them, altering *Et qui principio* as above.

lxxiii. 4. I own my surprise to find that Bücheler's *Prodest* is still thought doubtful. Doubtless many other words are possible; but is any so likely? Schmidt prefers Munro's *Iam iuuat*.

In the account which our new editor gives of the MSS. I have found nothing new. In the main he accepts Bährens' view that *G* and *O* are practically sufficient for the constitution of the text; yet acknowledges the falsity of the view which Bährens holds with equal tenacity, that all not *O* is either *G* or a copy of *G*. Of the Datanus, on which I have always laid great stress, his opinion is wavering; he does not seem to feel the force, first noticed by Fröhner, and always to me irresistible, of the *unique spellings* which this MS. presents. On the other hand, he follows me in drawing important inferences from the *Bononiensis*, written in 1411; and, speaking broadly, is not disposed to discard all the 15th century MSS. with Bährens, between whom and Schwabe's edition of 1885 he seems to hold on this point a middle place.

The most original part of Schmidt's volume is the discussion of the poet's life. Since Schwabe's *Quaestiones* nothing so full, to my knowledge, has been attempted. I hope to consider the whole of his views in the new edition of my Commentary now preparing, and cannot do anything like justice to them here. I may, perhaps, however, say that the fault of this highly interesting monograph (for such it really is) lies perhaps in an over-readiness to accept unsubstantial or insufficient proofs, and to build upon them as if they formed a perfectly solid foundation. The excellent and completely original treatise of the Scandinavian Edward à Bruner, to which I was the first to call attention in my edition of 1867, has at last received its due acknowledgment; and even the humblest contributions from his own country, some of them, I must needs say, of *very* little worth, come in for their meed of recognition in his *prolegomena*. Englishmen will be glad to see how greatly our editor has availed himself of the *Elucidations* of Munro, and (I may with all modesty add) my own edition.

ROBINSON ELLIS.