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](#)

Neméthy's *Ciris Ciris epyllion pseudovergilianum. Edidit, adnotationibus exegetiris et criticis instruxit* Geyza Némethy, academiae litterarum Hungaricae sodalis. Budapestini, sumptibus academiae litterarum Hungaricae. 1909. 8vo. Pp. 159. 3 kronen.

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 07 / November 1909, pp 224 - 226
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003930, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003930

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 224-226 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003930

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

comments on the name, it is not clear where *Μωδαίου* comes from; from Koechly *Μωλαίου* would appear to be the MS. reading. In any case, as the *Μωδαίος* of the B.M. fragment was evidently an Indian (since Bombus and other followers of Dionysus were shooting at him), it seems fairly certain that he and the *Μωδαίος*—*Μωλαίος* of the 'Dionysiaca' were the same person. Thus the reading of the

earlier editors, wherever derived from, is shown to be correct; and as Modaeus was not a character of much importance, his occurrence in both the B.M. fragment and the 'Dionysiaca' is a link of some value, and perhaps tends to support Kenyon's conjecture that these epic fragments are from the 'Bassarica.'

H. I. BELL.

REVIEWS

NEMÉTHY'S CIRIS.

Ciris epyllion pseudovergilianum. Edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit GEYZA NÉMETHY, academiae litterarum Hungaricae sodalis. Budapestini, sumptibus academiae litterarum Hungaricae. 1909. 8vo. Pp. 159. 3 kronen.

CONSIDERING how serious a business it is to edit the *appendix Vergiliana*, and how much care and labour and capacity would be needed to make any signal advance on the studies of the nineteenth century, it is surprising that so many scholars should think themselves called upon to undertake the task. The last four years have brought us one whole edition and the best part of another; here begins a third, and there is a fourth preparing. One opens these successive volumes without expecting much, and if the new editors merely abandoned the gratuitous errors of the old it might well content one; but the three last texts of the *Ciris* are before me, and in u. 90 they all present as usual that time-honoured absurdity, the conjecture *somnia sunt*.

Mr Némethy, like Mr Curcio, provides his recension with a commentary, and fully half of it is devoted to the collection of verbal parallels. These are very numerous, and some of them, I suppose, have never been adduced before: certainly some should never be adduced again. At 141 he reads 'nulli non' and compares Verg. *georg.* iv 453 'non . . . nullius'; 432 'forma uel

sidera fallas' he derives from Hor. *carm.* ii 8 10 sq. 'fallere (i.e. peierando) taciturna noctis signa'; on 73 'coniugium . . . uiolauerat Amphitrites' (Neptunus in Scyllae amore) he says 'ex Catull. 67 23-4 "sed pater illius gnati uiolasse cubile Dicitur" et Ou. *am.* ii 7 17-8 "Cypassis Obicitur dominae contemerasse torum,"' as if fathers were married to their sons or maids to their mistresses. He trusts to printed texts, and they yield him parallels which are illusory. For example on 165 he has this note: 'gelidis Edonum Bistonis oris, ex Lucr. iv 830 (he means 545) "et gelidis cyni nocte oris ex Heliconis" et Calu. fr. 11 B "frigida iam celeri superata est Bistonis ora"' (four lines below he repeats this verse and calls it 'Calu. fr. Ius 12 ed. Baehrens' for variety). I will give what the MSS give, and we shall see what happens: 'gelidis Edonum Bistonis honoris, ex Lucr. iv 545 "et ualidis necti tortis ex Heliconis" et Calu. fr. 12 B "frigida iam celeris uergatar uistinis ora."' On the other hand he misses parallels which deserve citation. At 27 'felix illa dies' he does not quote *laud. Pis.* 159 or *Aetn.* 636, but he does quote Manil. v 568 'felix illa dies redeuntem ad litora duxit,' though anyone who reads that verse in its context and attempts to make sense of it will discover that *illa* agrees with *litora*. At 71 'infelix uirgo' he quotes Manil. v 587, Verg. *buc.* 97 (he means 47 and 52), and 'Calu. fragm. 9 (ed. Lucian. Mueller),' but he forgets 167

of the *Ciris* itself: then when he comes to 167 he forgets both 71 and his note on it, and quotes only 'Calu. fragm. 9,'—this time ' (ed. Baehrens).'

In its explanatory part the commentary is less puerile than Mr Curcio's, but still elementary and superficial. Nothing hitherto obscure is elucidated (for the interpretation of 360, though right, is not new), and grave difficulties are let pass unnoticed or shouldered aside by the rudest alterations. There are 14 pages of 'adnotationes criticae,' in which things already said in the commentary are said over again, and parallels which were cited at full length are cited at full length a second time. But the MSS are nowhere enumerated, and lections are taken indiscriminately from all. The crudest interpolations of L and U,—*blandaue* for *laudate*, *cateruas* for *marinas*,—are printed without mention of a variant. Within the first hundred lines the conjectures *suspexit* 7, *libeat* 20, *currum* 26, *exterrita* 48, *uiserit* 50, *patria* 53, *infestare uoraci* 57, *castae* 73, *uixit eratque* 86, are smuggled into the text behind the reader's back. If Mr Némethy, for any reason or for none, is dissatisfied with the tradition, he will change *curae* to *sumant*, *cetus* to *uestros*, *lauro* to *circum*, *inde alias* to *hinc feminis*, *aereas* (i.e. *aerías*) *turres* to *Phoebeas* t. (though there was only one *turris Phoebea*), 'studio *iactabat* inani' to *seruabat* (in spite of Verg. *buc.* ii 5), and 'diem mortalibus *almum*' to *egit* (in spite of *Aen.* v 64). He says that 215 'caeruleas sua furta prius testatur ad *umbras*,' which is simplicity itself, 'explicari nequit,' and writes *auras*, as if that were easier. He alters *hic* to *ac* in 490 because 'sensu caret,' though it has the same sense as in Catull. 64 269. At 508, for *et tamen*, correctly used, he substitutes *at tamen*, used incorrectly, in the opinion that the latter is adversative and the former is not. His first page will furnish a fair sample of his procedure. The verses 12–15 should probably run somewhat as follows:

quod si, mirificum genus o Mes<salla decusque>
mirificum saeculi (modo sit tibi uelle libido),
si me iam summa sapientia pangeret arce,
<quae>
quattuor antiquis heredibus est data consors . . .

o *Messalla* is Mr Leo's (the MSS have NO. CCV. VOL. XXIII.

omnes and no more), *decusque* (i.e. mirificum saeculi genus et, modo uelis, decus) and the lacuna are mine. Mr Némethy avoids the worst mistake of the current editions, *edita* for *est data*, but he commits worse of his own:

quod si mirificum <sophiae> nemus omne <tenerem>
(mirificum, Valeri, modo sit tibi nosse libido),
si me iam summa sapientia pangeret arce,
quae tribus antiquis heredibus est data consors . . .

I need not remark on the artless violence of *sophiae* and *Valeri* nor on the absurdity of one man occupying a whole grove; but who are these *three* joint heirs of the citadel of wisdom? The three legatees of Epicurus, 'Hermarchus, cui scholam, et *Amynomachus Timocratesque*, cui (he means *quibus*) *rem familiarem reliquit*.'

But it is at 125 that he appears in the worst light. A few years ago he proposed in Verg. *buc.* iv 47 the conjecture 'concordes stabili fatorum *nemine* Parcae' instead of *numine*. It was objected that 'concordes stabili firmarant numine Parcae' occurred in the *Ciris*. Now therefore he corrupts this verse to match the other, *formarant nemine*, and so deprives u. 124 of its construction.

Concerning the authorship of the *Ciris* Mr Némethy holds the least tenable of all opinions: he ascribes the work to a 'falsarius' who wished to pass it off as Virgil's. If I wished to pass off as Virgil's a composition of my own, I should not describe myself in its second verse as a disappointed politician, nor besprinkle it from end to end with those diminutive forms which Virgil did his best to banish from poetry. Mr Némethy's ability to determine the authorship of a Latin poem may be estimated from his pamphlet on *catalept.* xiii. He prints in that piece these three iambic trimeters, two of which owe their peculiarities to his own conjectures,—

stant in uadis caeno retentae turbido,
neque in culinam ad uncta nouendialia,
cinaede Pediatu tuae liquere opes,—

and he assigns it, thus embellished, to Horace.

Works of this sort are little better than interruptions to our studies, and Mr Némethy was ill-advised in attempting a task

so much beyond his powers. It appears from his preface that he is an ardent and even flamboyant Hungarian patriot; so to Germans and Croats his book may possibly

afford a pleasure whose Croatian name I do not know, but whose German name is *Schadenfreude*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

BURY'S GREEK HISTORIANS.

The Ancient Greek Historians. By J. B. BURY, Litt.D., LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1909. Pp. x, 281. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS volume, which contains the Lane Lectures delivered at Harvard last year, gives 'a historical survey of Greek historiography down to the first century B.C.' It displays the same brilliant power of expounding the results of a mass of erudition which appears in the author's *History of Greece*; and to that work it forms a valuable supplement, revealing the foundations upon which the building was erected. Indeed, the *History* may be thought to go too far in concealing the processes of construction. For example, the student there reads a sketch of the politico-historical views of Thucydides and his party—the pre-Solonian *πάτριος πολιτεία*, the sequence of demagogues and the rest; but only from the present book will he gather that this sketch is derived mainly from an interpretation of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. Even in this book the references to the Greek authors might with advantage be more complete.

The reconstruction of the work of the early Greek historians mainly concerns the specialist, essential though it is as a background to the humanity of Herodotus and the originality of Thucydides. But the ordinary student will find that for the criticism of the two great historians Professor Bury's three lectures supersede all previous handbooks. Herodotus's great service (apart from literature) 'consisted probably in the collection of unwritten material concerning modern history: this floating matter he wrought with masterly skill into a framework of facts constructed by predecessors.' His

scepticism, Prof. Bury holds, is wholly pre-Sophistic, and learnt from Ionia; sometimes, indeed, he takes 'the inventions of Ionian *esprit*' too seriously. Both his faith and his doubt are *naïf* and instinctive. The greatest complaint against him is his incompetence in military history.

Prof. Bury will have none of 'Thucydides Mythistoricus.' Mr. Cornford denies Thucydides either a clear idea of causation or the vocabulary to express it. (How, by the way, can one translate αἰτιον δ' ἦν οὐχ ἡ ὀλιγανθρωπία τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἡ ἀχρηματία, i. 11, without allowing to the writer both the notion of cause and the recognition of economic factors in history?) Prof. Bury admits the shifting meanings of αἰτία and πρόφασις, but urges that the 'various use of the word does not imply any confusion of thought; we use the word "reason" with similar elasticity; the context decides the sense.' He proceeds to defend Thucydides' account of the causes of the war. The independence of Megara did not weigh heavily with Corinth; on the contrary, in 433 Corinth was ready to do a deal, and sacrifice Megara in return for a free hand in dealing with Corcyra: this is the meaning of the diplomatic language of i. 42. 2. War once decided on, the grievance of Megara was brought to the front; the alliance of Athens with Corcyra could not be represented as illegitimate, though it was the first effective cause of the war. Mr. Cornford well explains the motives of Athenian policy in regard to Megara and Western aggrandisement; but as that policy never became effective, Thucydides follows his method in saying nothing about it. His view of history, Prof. Bury argues, was purely rationalistic. In style he was influenced by the drama, as by rhetoric; but *Hybris*, *Peitho*, and *Eros*