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](#)

Bennett's Dialogus of Tacitus *Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus*, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes by Charles Edwin Bennett, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Cornell University. Ginn and Company: Boston and London. 1894.

H. Furneaux

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 48 - 49
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201066, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201066

How to cite this article:

H. Furneaux (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 48-49 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201066

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

thesis which seems hardly intended to be so balanced, and on rules of usage of possibly later Tacitean development. Again, 'Porcio Catone' would not be a strict antithesis to 'Appium Caecum,' and if a second name were added to one so well known, it would probably be the praenomen, as we should rather say 'Marcus Cicero' than 'Tullius Cicero'; nor again does 'calescit' for 'clarescit' seem required in 36, 2; and the received reading in 2, 15 might be defended against the insertion of 'quam' (after Vahlen) by supposing that Aper desired that his ability should seem fortified by thorough professional study rather than by general literary culture. Also Dr. Gudeman will have a large array of opponents to his view (on 21, 28), that the verses of Cicero 'examined in the light of formal development mark a very noticeable advance upon

the thought-laden lines of Lucretius or the artificial hexameters of Catullus.'

Attention should be called in conclusion to the very valuable and exhaustive bibliography and indexes, the latter contributed by Mr. Edmiston and Dr. Muss-Arnolt.

Also a few misprints may be pointed out: sestertia for sestertii (p. 86, l. 9), divur for divum (p. 103, l. 11), ii. to be inserted before 43 (p. 123, l. 5), Germaniam for Germanicum (p. 142, l. 17), Ann. for H. and alia for alii (p. 152, l. 24), 54 for 51 (p. 161, l. 11), omit fatetur (p. 258, l. 5), after 'and' insert 'son' (p. 264, l. 25), voluerunt for voluere (p. 329, l. 29).

It would be a great convenience to readers if in future issues the notes were bound separately from the introduction and text, so as to save the constant trouble of turning backwards and forwards.

H. FURNEAUX.

BENNETT'S *DIALOGUS* OF TACITUS.

Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes by CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in Cornell University. Ginn and Company: Boston and London. 1894.

THIS edition, published shortly before that of Professor Gudeman, had nevertheless the advantage of a previous study of the materials collected for that work, and is to a great extent based on it, but is obviously from its size and price intended for the use of a very different class of readers.

The introduction, in twenty-eight pages, covers most of the subjects of the larger work and does not appear anywhere to differ from its conclusions. It needs only to be said that it is throughout concise and clear, and fully suitable to the needs of school classes. The text and explanatory notes are comprised in seventy-seven pages, the differences of reading, so far as they are noticed, being left to a critical appendix of two pages, and an index of proper names and short index to the notes complete the volume.

The text in a large number of places reproduces the readings mentioned above as originated or adopted by Professor Gudeman, but in a still larger number differs from it, and not unfrequently approaches that of Halm, but may on the whole be called indepen-

dent. In apparently two places only does Professor Bennett introduce a conjectural reading of his own. One is in the corrupt words at the end of c. 6, where he reads 'quamquam quaedam serantur' &c., presumably on the supposition that 'quaedam' had been corrupted into 'quae diu' and thence to 'alia diu.' On the whole Gudeman's supposition, that 'grata' had dropped out before 'gratiora,' or Nissen's, adopted by Peterson, seem better to bring out the antithesis. The other is in the beginning of c. 38, where he reads 'exsistit,' in place of the more generally adopted 'extiterit,' the latter, though nearer to the MS. text, involving a subjunctive with 'etsi' contrary to otherwise uniform Tacitean usage. It is somewhat a pity that in neither case does he give in a note the argument in favour of his emendation.

The commentary is clear and useful as far as it goes, but perhaps hardly sufficient for the needs of young scholars, who would probably need considerable assistance in attacking for the first time the difficulties of this dialogue. The critical appendix might also with advantage have been made fuller, so as to indicate more nearly the extent to which the MSS. have been departed from.

Also in an edition intended apparently for schoolboys to use in class work, English school-masters would certainly in general

prefer that the notes should be at the end of the volume rather than at the foot of the page.

One or two misprints may be noted, as in the note on c. 28, 8, 'avaros producit' for

'producit avaros' (in a verse quotation), and in the text of c. 30, line 8, the omission of 'prius' (see the note *ad locum*).

H. FURNEAUX.

BLAYDES' FRAGMENTS OF THE GREEK TRAGEDIANS.

Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta scripsit et collegit FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, LL.D., Aedis Christi in Universitate Oxoniensi quondam alumnus.

AFTER a lifetime's devotion to the critical study of Greek dramatic poetry Dr. Blaydes is anxious to 'bind up his sheaves.' All scholars will sympathize with him in this desire, and will readily allow the excuse he gives for not having fulfilled the good resolution which he had formed of revising his work before allowing it to appear:—

'Has lucubrationes meas propositum mihi erat retractare, ut quae nimium festinanter ac parum considerate scripta essent castigarem, nonnulla levioris momenti materiaeque criticae copiam aliquando uberiorem reciderem; sed quominus hoc facere possem obstant senectus iners ac valetudo non satis firma.' (Preface.)

Yet it is matter for regret that so much darnel should be left amongst the grain. For it is this admixture which has hindered so materially the acceptance of Dr. Blaydes' labours, at least by his own countrymen. Only German perseverance can unweave the tangle of things good, bad, indifferent,—probable, possible and impossible, which are brought together by this author's ingenuity and industry. He seems to be incapable of cancelling what he has once set down. Else a scholar whose judgment often shows itself to be at bottom clear and sound, could never commit to print so many things which savour not of 'iners senectus' but rather of 'calida juvenas.' Why, for example (p. 108), when he has invented the quite possible dochmiac line κλύεθ', ὀράτε, δεῦρ' ἀλάστωρ περὶ φοβερός αἵματος, should he have allowed to stand the tuneless and unmetrical first attempt, κλύεις, ὄρας νῦν κλύεις νῦν ἔργον φοβερόν αἵματος? (P. 108). Why admit so many lines without caesura and so many objectionable trisyllabic feet? Or why should he at once quote Soph. *O.C.* 481 and deny that Soph. could have used μέλισσα for μέλι? (P. 37).

NO. LXXV. VOL. IX.

Some latent feeling both of the extent of corruption and of the uncertainty of all conjecture seems to betray the critic into the illusion that by heaping together many conjectures he can come nearer to the truth. The 'ductus literarum' is certainly not always an infallible guide, but where that clue fails, the word selected, to be at all probable, should at least be 'inevitable' in point of sense. Can this be said, *e.g.*, of the following?

'Aesch. *Fr.* 372 (D) (ὑψηλὸν †ἡβάσασα τεκτόνων πόνον) ἡβάσασα] ἡβήσασα Heath. ἀμφιβάσα Paleius. Fort. ἐξήστωσα, ἡίστωσα, ἐκκέασα, ἡ φθείρασα, αὐτ' ἐς τείχισμα?' The notion required by the context is that of *bringing low*. Has ἡμύσασα (transitive) never been tried?

A volume of *Adversaria* is at best somewhat dreary reading. It is seldom that such brilliant sparks shine out amidst the endless hammering as Conington's (Aesch. *Fr.* 98 D)

ἀλλ' ἄρης φιλεῖ
αἰεὶ τὰ λῶστα πάντ' *ἀπαριθμεῖεν στρατοῦ

(πάντα τὰνθρώπων MSS.), or Scaliger's αἰμόρρυτον κούρειον in Soph. *Fr.* 132 (D), or R. Ellis' ἐς φρ[άτορας] in the new fragment of Eur. *Antiope*.

The mention of Conington reminds me that forty years since he set me as an exercise to correct Aesch. *Fr.* 238 (D)—

ἄδων ταῖς ἀγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων
λέκτρων αστεί μὴ βλεμμάτων ῥέποι βολή.

My attempt was:—

*ᾤδ' *ἄν *τις ἀγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων
λέκτρων *ἐτοίμη βλεμμάτων *ῥέποι βολή;

'Would the eye-glance of maidens unattainted of marriage-rites incline so towardly?'

I do not 'stake my reputation' on it, but I still think that it bears comparison with the suggestions (partly his own) which