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](#)

De Nugis Curialium Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*. Edited by Montague Rhodes James. (Anecdota Oxoniensia). Oxford, 1914.

C. C. J. Webb

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 04 / June 2015, pp 121 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00048435, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00048435

How to cite this article:

C. C. J. Webb (1915). The Classical Review, 29, pp 121-123 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00048435

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to protest against the careless use of 'after' and 'with'? II. 294, 'The Ablative is the regular construction after comparatives in negative expressions.' (The examples show that 'before' would be rather more suitable: *hoc nemo doctior* shows the more usual order.) II. 199, 'Accusative of Inner Object with Neuter Pronouns': e.g. *si quid erro*. Why deprive 'with' of its sociative force? It is curious by the way that in a book devoted to the careful study of language, and especially of the cases, our own case-phrases should be used somewhat loosely.

Professor Bennett's explanations generally carry conviction. In one place he seems to me to adopt a very improbable account of the origin of a construction. II. 298 he says that the 'Ablative of Time after Which . . . seems to exist by implication in the omitted antecedent of the relative in such expressions as Ter. *And.* 104, *in diebus paucis quibus haec acta sunt*; Cic. *R. A.* 20, *quadriduo quo haec gesta sunt, res ad Chrysogonum defertur*.' This latter 'passage means "within four days from what time these things took place," i.e. *quo* is here equivalent to *ab eo tempore quo* (the antecedent of *quo* obviously cannot be *quadriduo*).' In the Terence passage and other similar passages he thinks we have 'a case of formal attraction merely. In strictness the correct form would have been: *paucis diebus quo*, i.e. *paucis diebus (ab eo tempore) quo*, but the analogy of *quadriduo quo* (which must represent the origin of our idiom) would naturally lead to a *paucis diebus quibus*, when the antecedent was plural. [Note that B. calls *diebus* the antecedent to *quibus*, which

is inconsistent with the statement about *quadriduo*.] In other words, the Romans themselves seem with time to have lost consciousness of the true nature of the idiom.' Is there not a more natural explanation, one which involves no such assumptions? The 'Ablative of Time within Which' is, as Professor Bennett says, 'a direct outgrowth of the Ablative of Time at Which.' They shade off into one another, so that *uno die* may mean 'on a single day' or 'in the course of a single day.' Hence such a sentence as *Diebus X, quibus materia coepta erat comportari, omni opere effecto exercitus traducitur* (Caes. *B.G.* IV. 18, 1) does not seem different in type from *Eodem die illum vidi quo te*. Compare the English 'I saw him in the course of the same day that I saw you' with 'In the course of the ten days in which the collection of the timber began the whole structure was finished, etc.' The meaning is not 'ten days after,' but 'not more than ten days after,' 'within the ten days.'

I have called attention to a few points in which the book might perhaps be improved in a second edition. But none of these is of any great importance. It will be useful, not only to those who are working specially at Early Latin, but also to those whose main interests are in the later literature. There are, of course, differences between the syntax of Plautus and that of Cicero, but the main features of the language are the same. It is a great satisfaction to have in English a work on this scale to which one can turn for evidence in case of doubt.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School.

DE NUGIS CURIALIUM.

Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*.
Edited by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES.
(Anecdota Oxoniensia). Oxford, 1914.

THE *editio princeps* of Map's book, *On the Trifling Pursuits of Courtiers*, was published in 1850 for the Camden Society by Thomas Wright from the only MS.

known—one of the late fourteenth century, which belonged to John Wells, a monk of Ramsey, known as an opponent of Wycliffe, and in his day Prior of the students at Gloucester Hall in Oxford. This MS. is now in the Bodleian Library. Sixty-four years later, the Provost of King's has presented us with

a new edition. The text is vastly improved; but it is disappointing that Dr. James should not have seen his way to giving us, out of his stores of legendary lore, a fuller commentary upon the contents.

Map borrowed the title of his book, but apparently nothing else, from the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury. He compiled it, as Dr. James shows (p. xxvii) between 1180 and 1194, and incorporated in it an earlier and much more widely popular work of his own, the *Epistle of Valerius, dissuading Ruffinus from Marriage*. Written in a somewhat difficult Latin, the *Distinctiones quinque de Nugis Curialium* are full of curious information; of legends, Welsh and other (Map lived near the Welsh border), and of interesting sidelights thrown on contemporary history from his personal experience. In the present review I shall mainly confine myself to observations on the text and on the use of older authors.

On p. 3 Dr. James's suggestion that *coruis* and *ceruis* should be transposed is supported not only by the medieval verses to which his note refers, but by the original passage in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii. 153. On p. 73 Dr. James notes that the MS. reads *brekenianc* for Brekeniauc; but he does not mention that it also gives the last syllable of other Welsh names in the immediate context, *Wastiniauc*, *Nagelauc*, and *Madauc*—as *anc*. In a note on the margin of the Bodleian copy of Wright's edition, Dr. J. Gwenogvryn Evans conjectures that *Lenem* in the same passage should be *Levem*, and identifies (no doubt correctly) this *aqua uicina stagno Brekeniauc* with the Llyfni river, which issues from Brecknock Mere and runs into the Wye. He would also read (I do not know on what grounds) *Uagelauc* for *Nagelauc*.

Dr. James has proposed a number of excellent emendations in the text of the MS. I should like to venture on a few additional suggestions of my own. I have in every case verified Dr. James's readings in the MS. On p. 26. 4, I would read *auarissime* for *amarissime*, on p. 87. 18 *uirgini* for *origini* (I cannot understand the sentence as it stands; the 'virgin' intended, if my emendation

be right, I should guess to be St. Catherine of Alexandria, *cuius ortu decorata gloriatur Graecia*, as the sequence in the Sarum missal says). P. 155. 4 (in the *Epistle to Valerius*, where the text of the Bodleian MS. can be checked by other MSS.) the reading given by Dr. James as that of DT, *humilis*, is surely right. Moreover, I should not wonder if this were the original reading of the Bodleian MS. The word as it stands has certainly been partially rewritten in much later ink. The marginal alternative to *sullimis*, which Dr. James reads (with a query) as *similis*, I cannot so interpret; I think it is *suilinus* (= *suillinus*), and I take it that this word (= piggish, unclean) was read instead of *sullimis* by those who read *mundus* (= pure) instead of *humilis*; it would thus be equivalent in sense to *incestus* in the preceding clause; but *humilis* and *sullimis* give a much better sense. On p. 159. 18 the sense clearly demands the omission of *et Filio*. On p. 242. 10 if Dr. James's correction *soluisset* for *soluit* be accepted, I should also read *alius* for *aliquis*. But the sense may be 'Perhaps there are kings who don't pay their just debts,' with a hit at an individual, possibly Richard I. (who seems to me far more likely than his father to be the *Appollonides* of p. 205. 4). On p. 243. 30, I should read *delictum* for *delicti*.

Dr. James has supplied in many cases the sources of direct quotations; to these may be added Ps. i. 4 for *Non sic impii, non sic* on p. 130. 16. No suggestion is made as to the reference to St. Gregory on p. 24. 10. If nothing nearer can be found, I would propose *Moral.* vii. 1, 2. Dacianus, on p. 46, is the magistrate under whom St. Vincent suffered martyrdom. The expression *homo nauci* (p. 92) Map had presumably come across in Priscian (I. 204). It is more difficult to guess whence he knew of the word *nefrendem* (p. 207. 19), his explanation of which (*adolescentem et virginem suam*) differs somewhat from that found in the passages of classical authors in which it is known to occur—none of them, moreover, likely to have been within his knowledge. With the quotation from the *Didache* on p. 146. 18 cp. Abelard, *Serm. de Eleemosyna* (ed. Cousin, i. p. 552). On p. 205. 7 the reference to

Virgil *Ecl.* viii. 10, might have been added.

One or two observations may be added, suggested by the few—the tantalizingly few—notes which Dr. James has given us. On 20. 27 Dr. James tells us that he has been unable to find in Richard Simon's *Novae observationes ad text. et verss. N.T.*, cap. 20, a passage to which Fabricius refers for a treatment of the quotation, *In quacunque hora ingemuerit peccator, saluus erit*. But Fabricius is merely referring to a remark of Simon's in the chapter in question to the effect that Lucifer of Cagliari (by whom, says Fabricius, the text is quoted and attributed to Ezekiel) often confirms the readings of the Codex Bezae. If Fabricius however is, as I suppose, referring to the passage of Lucifer quoted in the same note by Dr. James, he expresses himself badly. For Lucifer merely cites without naming the writers, first the old version of Isa. xxx. 15, and then Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Dr. James regards *In quacunque hora*, etc., as a reminiscence of the latter passage coloured by the former; I should have put it the other way round.

Dr. James's footnote to p. 61-7 is misleading. The objection to the Waldensian's saying, *Credimus in matrem Christi*, was surely not that 'the phrase was Nestorian,' but that it placed the Virgin Mary on a level with the Persons of the Trinity. On 157. 16 it would have been clearer to explain that in St. Jerome the treatise of Theophrastus on marriage is merely called *aureolus Theophrasti liber* (T.'s golden little book), whence Aureolus came by misunderstanding to be regarded as its proper name. On 177. 3 I imagine that (as, I gather from Dr. James' note, Liebrecht thought) *matre morphoseos* is merely a mistake for *metamorphoseos*, used as the rule of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*. I should be inclined to translate: 'taught by the "Metamorphoseos" (sic) he consents through a drug of his own administering to forget his usual way of life.' The MS., by the way, has *edoctus*, not *doctus*.

Haurit ex apotheca Scille furorem in the preceding line is a reference to Ovid, *Metam.* xiii. 967. On 207. 10 it is curious that Dr. James should not have noted that Map, in saying that Ethelred II. was called *consilium* 'quia nullius erat negotii,' as one who was always deliberating, and never acted, inverts the usual story that he was called *Unready*, because he lacked *rede* or counsel. In 242. 16 I feel sure that the MS. has *stannum* (as Wright read), and not *stancium*, as Dr. James thinks.

I have noticed three trifling misprints: 'frequentur' for 'frequenter,' p. 24. 5; '1 Reg.' for '2 Reg.' in the marginal reference, p. 237. 9; 'III' for 'III8' in the reference to Fabricius on p. 263.

Resisting the temptation, as leading me beyond the sphere of the *Classical Review*, to dwell on the evidence supplied by Map that 'German militarism' was a familiar theme in the twelfth century, and that our pacifists would have found a sympathiser in Louis the Fat of France, if not in Map himself, I will end by calling attention to a curious observation of our author's on the spelling of *euangelium*. As is well known, this word was generally at that date written a double *u* in the first syllable; and Map remarks of the cynical verse, *Iupiter esse pium statuit quodcumque iniaret: Hoc est zabuli* (i.e. Diaboli) *sic euangelium ab Euan, u consonante, quod est furor interpretatum (unde Bachus Euan dicitur) non Euuangelium Domini Ihesu, posito bis v. vocali, ab eu, quod est bonum, quod abstinentiam docet a malis et in bonis instanciam*. This attempt to distinguish two spellings as appropriate to a good and bad sense of the word is parallel with Hugh of St. Victor's attempt to distinguish *mathesis* and *matesis*, or John of Salisbury's to distinguish *máthesis* and *mathésis* on the same principle; see my note on John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, i. 9.

C. C. J. WEBB.

Magdalen College, Oxford.