

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](#)



***Theoderic the Goth*, by Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L.
(Heroes of the Nations Series.) London and New York.
G. P. Putnam. 1891. 5s.**

E. W. Brooks

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 68 - 69
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184823, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184823

How to cite this article:

E. W. Brooks (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 68-69 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184823

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

difficulty.' The last explanation seems to me the best, but they are given as if identical.

On ii. 52, 3 *diem dicunt* it is said 'i.e. as tribunes bring in a bill against them before the *comitia tributa*.' This is probably inaccurate, the word *comitia* being strictly applicable only to assemblies of the whole *populus* (which the tribunes could not convene) and not to a *concilium plebis*.

In ii. 65, 2 *post principia* is ordinarily explained 'to the rear,' but Mr. Greenough appears to take it differently.

M. T. TATHAM.

Lucani sententia de deis et fato, by J. E. MILLARD. (Utrecht, Beyers.)

THE author of this dissertation belongs to Stuttgart, and the paper is an exercise for a Doctor's Degree in the University of Utrecht.

Mr. Millard handles his subject with great thoroughness and zeal, and on the whole with marked success. A right understanding of Lucan's attitude towards the gods, fate, fortune, divination, death, life, the human soul, and so forth, is most necessary to all who would judge of the poet in relation to the ideas and influences of his time. All these matters are treated by Mr. Millard with more or less fullness. The evidence is clearly and fully stated, and even a reader who does not accept all the writer's views will be grateful to him for furnishing materials for independent judgment.

The conclusions at which he arrives are summarily these. Lucan casts aside the common or 'Olympian' gods, and employs in their stead the gods of the Stoic system; but is often constrained by poetic needs and his own political sentiments to bring in gods of more personal existence, cruel and full of hatred to mankind. These gods, though very powerful, do not themselves take a direct part in the action of the poem: they are not portrayed as a universal moving cause. As a Stoic, Lucan attributes to fate supreme power: in ordinary affairs, in the overthrow of Pompey and the Commonwealth, fate is all-powerful. Yet under the influence of prevalent notions and poetic needs he drops the Stoic and often represents fate as a god, acting, changing its mind, resisted—sometimes even checked—by men. Fate and fortune are often mentioned together; and Lucan, like the mass of mankind, confuses the two notions, though they are strictly speaking essentially opposed. Fortune is a personal goddess playing a leading part. Lucan is indignant at her cruel malignity and her favour for Caesar. As a Stoic, Lucan firmly cleaves to a belief in possible foreknowledge of the future through various modes of divination, in none of which does he express any doubt. In his utterances on death and the human soul, life after death, etc., Lucan again modifies philosophic tenets by admixture of popular opinions.

Let me quote the most important sentence from Mr. Millard's concluding section:

Vis autem ipsa in scaenam prodians, omnia humana gubernans, est fatum, quod saepe fere ut deus personalis et cogitans in poemate incedit. Sed necessitate poetica coactus, poeta fato assimilat Fortunam, quae personaliter depicta, fere partes deorum Homeri agit. Per multis locis autem poeta sibi non constat et fatum Fortunamque rursus alio sensu adhibet, carmine sine dubio nimis festinanter confecto..... etc.

If I may add a word about his reference [pp. 84—5] to some words of mine [Haskins' *Lucan*, Introduction § 35 c], I would say that his version 'mihi fatum et fortuna notiones Stoica et Epicurea videntur' does not fairly represent my 'To me it

seems that his *fatum* and *Fortuna* are as Stoic and Epicurean.' By putting in 'as' I meant to signify that the relation between the two notions was much what might exist between a Stoic and an Epicurean contemplating the one notion resulting from the frequent confusion of the two notions. I put it too briefly and not too clearly. I did not see all that Mr. Millard has shown me: but I have only to thank him for his candid criticism here and his kind word on p. 2. Hastily as I was compelled to write in 1886, I am glad to find that I was not far from the truth.

W. E. HEITLAND.

Theoderic the Goth, by THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. (Heroes of the Nations Series.) London and New York. G. P. Putnam. 1891. 5s.

A LIFE of Theoderic could naturally be entrusted to no better hands than those of the author of 'Italy and her Invaders,' whose name is sufficient guarantee for an attractive style combined with soundness and accuracy. The work of course goes over much of the same ground as the larger history, but it is by no means a mere abstract of it. The story of Theoderic's reign in Italy is indeed told at rather greater length than in the earlier work, though of course with less citation of authorities, and includes much new matter, among which the account of his measures for the revival of agriculture deserves special mention. The task of welding the fragmentary authorities into a popular and connected narrative without giving too much play to imagination is indeed difficult, but Mr. Hodgkin has achieved it with marked success. He has not however confined himself to a mere biography of his hero; he has also briefly described the fall of the Western Empire, the early history of the Goths, and the later fortunes of the Gothic kingdom, while the volume closes with an account of the Theoderic of Saga. In such a book we expect the merits of the hero to be somewhat exaggerated, and Theoderic has of late years received more praise than is perhaps really his due. His statesmanship can indeed hardly be overrated, and Mr. Hodgkin rightly insists that the fall of the monarchy was due not to any fault of its founder but to 'a continuation of adverse events,' chiefly of course to the fact that Theoderic died without leaving a full-grown Amal heir; but, when he maintains that the Gothic king was actuated by pure desire for the welfare of his Roman subjects, he perhaps goes too far. That Theoderic could be cruel and faithless when his interests seemed to need it, we see from many instances, and it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that his moderation was simply the result of policy. Mr. Hodgkin's work is in general distinguished for its accuracy, but, when dealing with matters somewhat removed from his main subject, he sometimes falls into mistakes. Thus on p. 65 he says 'Aspar and his three valiant sons fell,' but only two of Aspar's sons were killed according to any account, and according to Candidus only one. On p. 95 the statement that the dynasty of Theodosius had lasted 86 years is an arithmetical blunder, as 379 from 455 leaves 76. On p. 152 he says that there were three praetorian prefects in the West, 'one for the Gauls, one for Italy, and one for the city of Rome': the last however was not a praetorian prefect. On p. 282 he speaks of the Emperor Anastasius as consul in 517, but the consul of 517 was another Anastasius: see *C.I.L.* v. 8120 (2). Again it is surely an oversight on Mr. Hodgkin's part when he places the expedition of Theodemir against the Eastern Empire as late as 474. That expedition took place during the reign of Leo (*Jo. Ant.* 206, 2) and Leo died in

Feb. 474. But such small points are no real blemish and Mr. Hodgkin's book deserves a hearty welcome as an attempt to popularize an important and neglected period of history, nor is it without instruction even for advanced students.

E. W. BROOKS.

A History of Greek Literature from the earliest period to the death of Demosthenes, by F. B. JEVONS, M.A. Second edition, 1889. pp. xvi. 525. 8s. 6d.

THE second edition of Mr. Jevons' excellent volume is a reprint of the first (1886) with the addition of an appendix on Fick's theory of the Homeric dialect and recent 'expansionist' theories, and a series of examination questions. The greater part of the appendix on Fick and the expansionists consists in a quotation from an article by the writer in *J.H.S.* (1886) on the rhapsodizing of the Iliad. Mr. Jevons maintains that the 'aggregationists' (the school of Lachmann, now practically extinct) and the 'expansionists' reverse the actual order of proceedings. Only in the earliest times was the composition of a long poem possible because only then could the requisite number of auditors be assembled night after night to listen to it. Fick's theory Mr. Jevons only partially adopts, maintaining that there was a trans-literation from Achaean or Aeolic to Ionic only to a certain extent, and that even to that extent the Iliad was not Ionized at one time but only piecemeal by the rhapsodists. To these latter he assigns a far-reaching influence on the construction of the present text. The Homeric hymns are a collection of invocations with which the rhapsodists prefaced their recitations. If the god or hero in whose honour the rhapsodist was about to recite did not happen to be referred to in Homer, the rhapsodist, after giving the invocation, boldly inserted an appropriate reference to him in the text. Thus he accounts for Z 130-141 (description of the worship of Dionysos). Again, the habit which the rhapsodists had of rounding off their recitations by a few lines to complete the extract accounts for some of the discrepancies, comp. e.g. E 575-579 with N 656-659. The latter may have been added by a rhapsodist to finish off a recitation of N 330-655. Other inconsistencies may be due to the rhapsodist inserting a line or two of explanation necessary for understanding the extract. Mr. Jevons finds examples of this in Ξ 30-40 and Π 69-86.

Finally, Mr. Jevons contends that, whereas we know on good evidence that the Iliad was rhapsodized and we have thus a *vera causa*, while we have no evidence that it was expanded, we are bound logically to exhaust the consequences of the rhapsodizing before considering the action of purely hypothetical causes. Whatever may be the value of Mr. Jevons' ingenious contributions towards the solution of the Homeric question (which is after all insoluble), and they seem to me to be of no slight importance, the broad and liberal spirit in which he deals with it deserves recognition. It may be contrasted with that of some critics (mostly German I suspect), who, as he caustically remarks, 'examine the Homeric poems as they would a candidate's dissertation for a degree, and have no hesitation in rejecting the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey for not knowing his Homer.'

As the first edition came out before the birth of the *Classical Review*, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few remarks on the book generally. It is divided into two parts, Greek Poetry and Greek Prose, and the aim is rather to give a conspectus of the development of Greek Literature than to deal with the subject biographically. Of course the two methods

run together to a great extent, but the former is, I think, more interesting and more philosophical. 'Classical Greek Literature is the proper introduction to literature generally because in it the laws which determined its development are simple and can be easily traced.' The reason why Greek Literature clings so closely to and so clearly represents the civilization of the time at which it appeared is because it was originally composed for the ear and not for the eye, for a public that listened and did not read. To this cause is traceable much of its excellence, e.g. its 'lucidity,' its avoidance of needless repetition, its consciousness of itself as an art.

R. C. S.

Tabellarisk oversigt over den Latinske litteraturs historie, by BASTIEN DAHL. Published by Cammermeyer, Christiania and Copenhagen, 1891.

THE special feature of this synopsis of the history of Roman literature is that, in place of a chronological classification of the authors, the writings are separately classified according to their subject-matter in parallel columns and at the same time in historical sequence, so that each meets the eye in its proper relative position both from the literary and historical point of view. Alongside of these columns we have, in chronological order, an apt selection of historical landmarks, not merely dates but likewise names and events, and especially events of importance in relation to literature. There are few faults, even of omission, except that the Christian literature is entirely left out, notwithstanding that the chronology is carried down to the fall of the Western Empire. Not only is the Christian theology excluded, but the Christian poets (even Prudentius) disappear. The author should rather have taken pains, even at the expense of an additional column, to mark the gradual emergence of the new schools from the age of M. Aurelius onwards. It is likewise to be regretted that some more or less questionable dates are given without a note of interrogation. For instance, B.C. 184 is assigned as the birth-year of Terence. This implies what is surely impossible, that he had made his name as a dramatist and formed his style at the age of 17 or 18 (for the *Andria* was produced B.C. 166). The statement of Nepos (on which the author presumably relies), that Terence was contemporary (*aequalis*) with Scipio minor, need not be taken to mean that he was no older; and the contrary is affirmed e.g. by Fenestella and Santra (in Suetonius *de poetis*). The date B.C. 55, which is given for the birth of Juvenal, depends on an isolated statement (in one manuscript, the cod. Barberini), the authority for which is not established. The *Dialogus* of Tacitus is dated A.D. 96, the year of Domitian's death. As regards this we have only the historian's statement that he published nothing during Domitian's reign; but his words rather suggest that he had written something (therefore, the *Dialogus*) before that emperor came to the throne (A.D. 81). Hyginus (*libri grammatici*) is dated circ. 120 A.D.: an earlier date is more likely, since veterans of Vespasian (who died A.D. 77) were still living when the work was composed. The date assigned to Terentianus' work on prosody, 'circ. 292 A.D.' is too late, perhaps by a century; that writer quotes among his 'exempla novella' Septimius Serenus, Annianus and Altius Avitus, who are of Hadrian's time or not much later. Terentianus was placed at the close of the third century solely on the ground that he cites Petronius; it is strange that the author leaves him there, while he has rightly removed