

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](#)



Hildebrandt's *Studien auf dem Gebiete der R xs01D2mische Poesie und Metrik*. I. Vergil's Culex.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 09 / November 1887, pp 274 - 276

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00182137, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00182137

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 274-276 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00182137

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of the accused and his advocates, that of the accuser, the course of procedure, the order of speeches, the character of the judicial sentence, &c.; and he finishes the essay with two chapters on the characteristics of eloquence most preferred at Rome and most adapted to Roman character. Under all these headings are grouped interesting notices of forms and customs ingeniously and laboriously extracted from casual allusions in Cicero's letters, speeches, or rhetorical works, or from Plutarch, Quintilian and others, *e.g.*, about the preliminaries, the open-air pleadings, and the varying place of the tribunal, the crowd surrounding it (though it is hardly fair [p. 52], to take Plautus' description of it as correct), the officers of the court, the forms of procedure, challenges of jury (p. 85), its numbers (p. 87), the limit to length of speeches, the duration of trial (as with us, till lately, rarely longer than a day) (p. 20), its adjournment (corresponding to our new trial or appeal), the indirect remuneration of counsel, forbidden to receive pay (p. 178) (a theory perpetuated at the English and French bars as well as in other modern professions). All these are interesting topics well brought out and well worth comparing with modern customs. As regards the conduct of the case M. Poirét argues (in opposition to Madvig) that the order as a rule was, first, pleadings, then witnesses, then the *allocutiones*, though this order was often varied.

Chapter vi. 'On the orators,' contains some interesting passages, especially (pp. 136-9), some remarks on the rhetoricians who succeeded the orators, and, inheriting their gift of utterance, 'continued speaking when they had nothing to say,' and their treatises, which he wittily describes as 'inventories of the effects of deceased oratory,' (*des inventaires après décès*), an apology for some of Cicero's weaknesses and inconsistencies (pp. 155-173), and some amusing satirical observations on the professional disinterestedness of unpaid advocates (pp. 174-181).

The remarks on Cicero's oratorical style are discriminating, and the allusions to Mommsen's indiscriminating disparagement of him (pp. 135, 237, 254) no less pungent and to the point.

In Chapter x., *urbanitas* and *gravitas* are put down as the most distinctive features of Roman Eloquence, the one justly attributed to intimate relations between the magistrate, *judices*, and pleaders, similar to those that exist between our barristers and the judge, and such as did not exist at Athens; the other to the national character. On the other hand, the comparative weakness of the Roman in genuine vehemence and in the real pathetic style, as compared with the Greek, is ascribed mainly to the absence of that thrilling element of judicial oratory, the impending sentence of death (p. 278). It should be added that the *judices* at Rome were more select and educated or more luxurious and corrupt, demanded a more polished, artistic and pleasing style, and were not so likely, as the larger number of mixed Athenian jurors, to be carried away by 'the pathetic.'

The book, however, though interesting, is not always quite trustworthy, owing to some careless interpretations of certain passages or too hasty inferences from them. Some of these inferences are, to say the least, startling. What evidence is there that it was frequent or even possible in Rome for a presiding judge to play the advocate and actually leave his place on the bench to plead? (p. 71). The evidence adduced is (i.) a statement of Plutarch (*Pl. Cic.* 9, cf. Forsyth's *Cicero* I., 81), that Manilius' trial was purposely fixed by Cicero for the only remaining day of his prætorship, that he might help his cause, and a further statement that the people asked him to

act as advocate for him and that he did so act; but as Manilius' trial was eventually postponed, it was surely more likely that Cicero pleaded for him after he had ceased to be prætor than that he did so on the last day of his office and the first day of the trial at which he himself presided; (ii.) a remark of Asconius (*Pro Cornelio Fr. Argum.*) that Cicero, in the year of his prætorship, defended C. Cornelius. But Asconius goes on to say that Q. Gallius *exercuit hoc iudicium*. So there is at least no evidence that he or any one else acted as prætor and advocate in the same case. And (iii.) Cassius (p. 72) may have been famous as a judge for his strict insistence on the *cui bono* argument, but it only rests on Asconius' authority that, as *questor iudicii*, he pressed this argument on the judges (*præibat iudicibus ut quaereretur cui bono fuisset*), and even this only goes a very little way towards the conclusion suggested. That the prætor could exercise influence by his control of procedure and in the choice of court, jury, and time of trial, and, indirectly, by showing his sympathies, is true; but it is very doubtful whether Cicero means more than this in his impudent boast (*Cic. Att.* 1, 4, 2) of having gained popularity by the condemnation of Macer, when tried before him; which reminds us of a saying reported of a modern judge that he had only lost two cases since he became a judge.

Similarly the reader will be surprised to read on p. 154 that Hortensius '*finît par mourir d'une maladie causée par son intempérance de parole*,'—no doubt a very proper punishment for such intemperance, but hardly to be established as a fact by Cicero's remark (wrongly quoted), *Hortensii vox extincta fato suo est, nostra publica* (*Brut.*, 96, 328). Another curious mistake seems to have been made on p. 267, where Cicero's mock-modest remarks on his own *Oratiuncula p. Deiotaro*, which he was sending to Dolabella (*Ad. Fam.*, ix., 12), are regarded as a severe criticism on Brutus' speech for the same king alluded to in *Brut.*, 5, 21, and consequently as proving that Cicero's praise of Brutus' eloquence was ironical,—a mistake quite incomprehensible if the whole letter be read, except on the assumption that for the moment Cicero's own speech was entirely forgotten.

A few other smaller errors or doubtful points might be pointed out, but they do not detract materially from the merits of the book, which ought to be one both interesting and useful to classical students.—J. E. NIXON.

HILDEBRANDT'S *Studien auf dem Gebiete der Römischen Poesie und Metrik*. I. VERGIL'S *Culex*.

THIS is an elaborate attempt to find the true *Culex*. The really critical part, the part which is valuable in itself and is in a great degree new and original, is to be found in sections I.—V. I will give as briefly as I can an abstract of the main arguments.

After the self-disparagement of *Cul.* 1-10, the pompous invocation 11 *sqq.* to Apollo and the Muses is unnecessary. It is also an obvious imitation of the Exordium of the *Aetna*. Consequently it cannot be by Vergil; though it bears unmistakable traces of imitation of Georgic i. Looking at the diction of 11-44 we seem to trace a Christian. *Sancte puer* (v. 26), which Catullus applies to Amor, could not be applied by a contemporary to the young Octavius. It could only be addressed to him from the standpoint of a later time, when he was recognised as a god. That it is however meant for *this* Octavius (not Musa, nor any ordinary man) is clear (1) because the poet's disclaimer of any attempt to write an

heroic poem implies a superior, no doubt a *great* person, to whom such an offering would be acceptable; (2) *meis allabere coeptis* is copied from *audacibus adnue coeptis* of Georgic i., which is similarly addressed to Augustus; (3) *Gloria perpetuum lucens* bespeaks a man of high consideration.

Returning to 1—10, this Exordium also cannot be by Vergil; *iocos musamque = musam iocosam*, *Pondere culicis famaque = pondere famoso c.* would be from him, even at sixteen, impossible.

The real *Culex* begins with *Propulit e stabulis ad pabula laeta capellas* (45). From this to 57 (omitting, however, v. 50, which betrays an inexact observation of the goat quite alien to the real poet of the *Culex*) is by Vergil; changing, however, in 57 *praestanti* to *prostanti*. (This suggestion I have anticipated, *Journal of Philology* for 1886, p. 256.)

The section 58—97, in which a country life is eulogised, is quite out of keeping with the accurate nature-painting of the opening section. It smells of the lamp, and is an obvious copy of the famous *O fortunatos nimium sua si bona norint* of Georgic ii.

The real *Culex* meets us again at v. 98, and continues to v. 109. In this section only four changes are required, 99 *capras* for *curas*, 106 *restabant* for *residebant*, 108 *hibiscis* for *in umbras*. *Haud procul ipse exit* for *ut procul asperxit*. The rest is quite Vergil.

But with v. 110 begins once more the interpolator. He betrays himself partly by the suddenness with which we are told that the scene (hitherto apparently Italian) is laid in Boeotia; partly by the rush of mythological allusions — Agave, Pans, Satyrs, Dryads, Naiads, Orpheus, Demophoon, &c., &c.; followed by a long list of trees (seemingly based on Ovid *Metam.* x. 90).

The genuine poem begins again at 157, and continues uninterruptedly till 201. Vv. 202—204 are interpolated, as is shown (1) by the renewed pedantry of the mythological allusions; (2) the expressions *equos quatit, in fessos requiem dare comparat artus*; (3) the omission of any mention of the goats being driven to their afternoon-pasture, an indispensable preliminary in any exact observer of goat-nature, and one which Vergil (as we know from *Geor.* iii. 335) would have taken care to supply. But 206—209 are genuine; and with 209 ends this, the largest and central section of the genuine *Culex*.

Of the remainder of the poem, 213—414, only a few lines are Vergil's. The rest, occupied as it is with a lengthy description of the Infernal Regions (vv. 213—222, 232—384), is a subsequent addition. Vergil, even at the age of sixteen, could never have made his Gnat describe itself as *praeda Choronis* while yet unburied. Yet how can it describe Tartarus, as it does, *without* such burial? As a whole, this episode, whilst feebly copied from *Aen.* vi., is greatly influenced by Christian ideas of Hell and Purgatory. It is difficult to say when it was written; possibly later than St. Augustine.

There are, however, pieces of this large section which are genuine. Vv. 210—212, 223—231, in which the Gnat complains of the goat-herd's ingratitude, and begs for a return of kind offices, *i.e.* in effect for a tomb, are a necessary sequel to the death of the serpent and the subsequent sleep of the rescued goat-herd, and may be accepted as Vergil's. Also 385—394, with a verse made up of the beginning of 395 and end of 411, then 412—414 form an unobjectionable finale.

Thus, after immense excisions, is obtained an ultimate *Culex* of 96 lines, symmetrically marked off into a centre or Omphalos of 48 vv. and two side-wings of 24 vv. each.

It is probable that few Englishmen will be prepared to accept a result so very sweeping. I must confess, for my own part, with all respect for Dr. Hildebrandt's care and ingenuity, that I cannot feel the sharply-marked difference of style which he finds in the genuine and non-genuine portions of the poem. If the work was written at all by Vergil, it would only be natural that a juvenile performance would present inequalities. If, again, any part of it was written by him, we should hardly expect the Vergilian portions to stand out against the non-Vergilian in the particular way which Dr. Hildebrandt supposes. For, in the first place, the work of Vergil at sixteen or eighteen would not necessarily be like his later verse; and, in the second, any one who added on to what he found of Vergil's would be more likely to catch the general style of *all* his works than the particular style of the *Culex*; the consequence of which would be, that the spurious portions were marked off from the genuine by a more elaborate rhythm, in which the caesuras, pauses and language of the Georgics and Aeneid were unconsciously or unavoidably imitated, producing a palpable inequality.

Again, is it true that we can distinguish two kinds of nature-painting in our *Culex*? Dr. Hildebrandt makes much of this, and recurs to it from time to time with great complacency. The poet of the one was an exact and minutely faithful copier of what he saw: the poet of the other was a closet-student, writing from the inspiration of his books and his night-lamp, and only painting as he had read. On the whole, I deny that any such sharp distinction exists here either. The assertion seems based on the description, 48 *sqq.*, of the goats browsing now in the woods and brakes, now in the valleys; now cropping the arbutus-berries, now raised on their hind-legs to seize a willow or alder bough. The passage is no doubt pretty, and will probably recur to most of those who read the poem through. But it does not seem to me more exact than the passage about trees which Dr. Hildebrandt condemns as spurious. Were I asked, indeed, to select what I consider the nearest approach to a minute word-picture, I should single out vv. 137—156.

Looking at the residuary *Culex* from the point of view of symmetry, we come upon another difficulty. If the sections were as carefully marked off from each other as Dr. Hildebrandt supposes

<i>Side-wing.</i>	<i>Centre.</i>	<i>Side-wing.</i>
(12 + 12.	12 + 12 + 12 + 12.	12 + 12),

in which, it will be observed, each of the parts is a multiple of 12, the uniformity of this segmentation would probably have been for greater clearness marked by some mechanical contrivance. Now granting that, after a time, this was lost or at least obscured, it would for all the time that the memory of it lasted, prevent any additions of so extensive a kind as we must suppose; for Dr. Hildebrandt's residuary original *Culex* is only 96 lines out of our extant 414. A forger would surely take care that his additions were not so violently out of proportion to the sum of what he found. If the *Culex*, say for two or three centuries, consisted of not more than 100 lines, the Christian who forged the additions (for this is the hypothesis) would never have swollen it out to more than 400.

I pass to a different part of the work, the emendations. These are numerous enough—more, indeed, than I for one can think at all necessary. Is it part of the present fashion to recur to the old style of Burges, who, it is said, carried 50,000 emendations with him in his carpet-bag?

The best of Dr. Hildebrandt's conjectures, I think, is in 172, *lucem iaculatur for lucens maculatur*; this is really clever, and may be right. Ingenious, too, is *Spiritus accessit uentis* in 189 for *excessit sensus*. The others do not, in my opinion, attain to anything like probability. But it will be seen from the analysis given above that our author does not deal with the text of more than one half of the poem. He seems, too, by no means master of all that has been written on the *Culex* within the last ten years; at least no reference is made to my articles in the *American* and *Cambridge Journals of Philology*, *A. J. Ph.* iii. pp. 271—284, *Camb. J. Ph.* vol. xv. p. 250 sqq.—ROBINSON ELLIS.

P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis recognovit OTTO GÜTHLING. Teubner series. 1886.

DR. O. GÜTHLING, who is known to Vergil students by his recently-published *Curvae Vergilianae* (Liegnitz, 1886), has been entrusted with the editing of the new Teubner text of Vergil, a task which he has performed with wise conservatism. His edition is well printed, and issued separately in two parts, one containing the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, the other the *Aeneid*; and is moreover furnished with a concise apparatus criticus, containing the chief Ms. variations and most probable emendations. It forms a valuable appendage to Ribbeck's edition, as it contains the more recent contributions to the criticism of Vergil, which are scattered about in pamphlets and periodicals. Of three new MSS. noticed, the *Pragensis* supplies some important readings; the *Oenopontinus* and *Daventriensis*, in the words of the editor, 'plane inutiles sunt ad emendanda Vergili carmina,' and this verdict seems just, though in *Aen.* xii. 208 Dr. Güthling rather inconsistently, and perhaps unnecessarily, accepts *vivo* for *imo* from the cd. *Daventriensis*. Much use has been made of the late Dr. Schaper's labours; and his clever emendation *certe for Cretae* has been printed in ec. i. 65. The editor's own emendations are rare; the ingenious *ulli for ullae* in *Aen.* xi. 567, deserves special notice. Dr. Güthling has discharged his duty with caution and acuteness, and has given us a text which deserves to become popular.—S. G. OWEN.

Eclogues of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, by C. H. KEENE, M.A. Deighton, Bell & Co. 1887.

MR. KEENE is already known as the editor of a selection from Ovid, and this little book will add to his reputation. The introduction discusses the authorship of the *Eclogues*, the date of the authors, the different MSS. and editions, and idyllic poetry generally. The literary criticism is perhaps rather heavy; 'the Mantuan bard' is a poor periphrasis for Virgil; but in dealing with matters of fact the editor is accurate and sensible. Mr. Keene does not profess to have contributed much to the criticism of the text; he follows generally Glaeser's edition of 1842; important various readings are given in critical notes inserted between the text and commentary. The explanatory notes are good and useful. No difficulties are passed over, and the solutions suggested are generally right. There are naturally slips here and there; *levat copul* (i. 10) is surely mistranslated; *tereti* (iv. 152) certainly is so; *iugera* (iv. 119) in *dum iugera versat arator* should not be translated 'broad acres,' but rather *long*, if 'acres' is to have any epithet at all. A note should have been given on an irregular form of condition which occurs ii. 71 and elsewhere, and on the irregular sequence of tenses in iv. 32, 33. The spelling of such forms as *coena*, *querula*, *bacca*, should be corrected in a new edition;

but above all the note on p. 18 of the introduction: there is a hacknied line of Juvenal which all editors of school-books should keep in mind, and which might prevent vagaries of this kind. These defects do not impair the substantial value of the book which should prove very useful in the middle forms of schools.

Selections from Tibullus and Propertius, by Professor G. G. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D. Clarendon Press. 6s.

THIS edition contains about six hundred lines of Tibullus and twice as many of Propertius, with introductions and notes. It is written in the first instance to meet the wants of students in Glasgow University; and the editor also wishes to do his part to "rescue from comparative neglect the best portions of two of the most fascinating and suggestive of Latin poets." This neglect is not so general or complete as the preface would give one to understand: there are schools and universities where Propertius at least receives as much attention as he deserves; for, when all is said, Propertius is not a Virgil, and must give way to Virgil and Virgil's peers if the multiplication of modern studies makes it impossible to study all the Latin poets. The biographies of the two poets are well written, and tell one shortly the little which is known or can be guessed with tolerable certainty about them. The account of the MSS. might have been omitted: students who read selections are not likely to care about the history of the text. The text given is in the main that of Palmer, as Professor Ramsay shares his belief in the superiority of the Neapolitan MS. Each poem is divided into paragraphs, and the drift of each paragraph is given in an English heading—an arrangement which does not improve the look of the page, but certainly facilitates the task of the student. The explanatory notes are copious, clear and sensible. Many of the longer notes on Tibullus are taken from a commentary published by the late Professor W. Ramsay, now out of print; they show erudition, but they are too long, and would be more in place in a Dictionary of Antiquities. On Propertius the editor has had the advantage of Professor Palmer's advice; a remarkable reading of his is printed on p. 80 (III. 18, 21). The least satisfactory notes are those on points of syntax: *hodiernè* cannot stand for *hodie* (Tib. 1, 7, 53); nor can *veneranda* be used in an active sense (*ib.* 56). The indicative in general conditions, though of course perfectly regular, seems unfamiliar to the editor. There are a number of trifling misprints which might have been removed by a short study of the proof-sheets; the same line of Horace, for example, is quoted twice (pp. 106, 235), and there are three variations of text in six words. The editor is fond of quoting English poetry, and generally quotes it appositely, but he does not always assign his quotations to their right owners; it was not Herrick who said, 'There is no armour against Fate.'

We see that Professor Ramsay thinks very poorly of Munro's contributions to the study of Propertius; see especially p. 363. Now Professor Ramsay has a perfect right to disagree with and to disprove Munro's conclusions, but the tone which Professor Ramsay chooses to express his disagreement, will seem to many to be ill chosen.

Titi Livii historiarum Romanarum libri qui supersunt ex recensione IO. NIC. MADVIGII. Quartum ediderunt IO. NIC. MADVIGIUS et IO. L. USSINGIUS. Vol. II. Pars. I.

THIS is a continuation of the fourth edition of Madvig and Ussing's well-known text, containing books xxi.