

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](#)



Henri Estienne

Arthur Tilley

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 06 / June 1894, pp 251 - 251

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188365, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188365

How to cite this article:

Arthur Tilley (1894). Henri Estienne. The Classical Review, 8, pp 251-251 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188365

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

instructive. 'Et mehercule tenacius rapit inperii disciplinas teneritudo primaeva: virtus, cum cito inchoat, diutius perseverat. nempe *virentibus ramis* artifex rusticandi alienum germen includit, ut novella praesegmina coagulo libri *uvidioris* (?) inolescant. audio in edomandis equis *aevi*, ut ait [vates], *inscios aptius essedis colla subiun[gere]*.' *Laud. in Grat.* ch. 6 (Seeck p. 331). (*uvidioris* is Kiessling's reading for the MS. *ubidiovis*.)

Verg. *Ecl.* iv. 46.

(c) *Talia saecula suis dixerunt currite fuis* Concordes Parcae.

The same speech (ch. 9) shows that Symmachus did not regard '*Talia saecula*' as vocative, as some moderns and Servius have done, whatever his view of the accusative may be: 'Et vere, si fas est praesagio futura conicere, iamdudum *aureum saeculum currunt fusa* Parcarum' (*Laud. in Grat.* ch. 9, Seeck p. 332). W. C. F. WALTERS.

HENRI ESTIENNE.

PROFESSOR ENGLAND has done well to defend Henri Estienne from the charges brought against him by Prof. Tyrrell and Dr. Sandys. Had they been better acquainted with that great man's life and character, they would, I feel sure, never have brought them. Prof. England has perhaps forgotten that a similar accusation used to be current against Estienne's edition of Plutarch, until recently it was disproved by Sintenis, who showed that every one of Estienne's conjectures could be traced to some MS. or other. Estienne, like all the

other editors of his time, did not give references to the authorities for his readings, but he was quite incapable of inventing readings.

In conclusion, why do Englishmen persist in calling him by that absurd name 'Henry Stephens'?

ARTHUR TILLEY.

[A reply from Professor Tyrrell to Professor England's article has been received too late for publication in this number, and will appear in July.]

SCHULZE'S EDITION OF BAEHRENS' CATULLUS.

Catulli Veronensis liber, recensuit Aemilius Baehrens. noua editio a K. P. SCHULZE curata. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1893. Pp. lxxvi, 127. 4 Mk.

THE first edition of Baehrens' Catullus, which now that the second has appeared will fetch fancy prices, was in the rigour of the term an epoch-making work. But it exhibited a text of the author much corrupted by unprovoked or unlikely or incredible conjecture; so that the task of revision was delicate, and the choice of a reviser was not easy. It was not easy; but scholars who are acquainted with the history of Catullus' text and with the metres he wrote in, who know how to edit a book and how to collate a manuscript, who are capable of coherent reasoning or at all events of consecutive thought, exist; and to such a scholar the task might have been allotted.

It has been allotted to Mr. Schulze, who says, 'Munus nouae huius libelli editionis post praematuram Aemilii Baehrensii mortem curandae ita suscepi, ut quoad fieri posset quam plurima eorum, quae ille ad Catulli carmina et recensenda et emendanda contulisset, retinerem ac seruarem.' Out of Baehrens' conjectures Mr. Schulze has found it possible to retain six. The first of these is the merely orthographical correction 2 6 *lubet* for *libet* or *iubet*. Two more are specimens of Baehrens' most despicable trifling: 6 9 *heic et illeic*¹ for *hec et illo*, as if forsooth that were a less and not a greater change than the old *hic et ille*; and 21 13 *nei* for *nec* instead of the usual *ne*, as if *nec* were not a perpetual corruption of *ne* in the MSS. of authors who never wrote *nei* in their lives. The three others, 68 139 *concupit*, 100 6 *egregie est*, 111 2 *ex nimis*, are

¹ The text has *illei*, whether from a misprint or from an improvement of Mr. Schulze's.