

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](#)



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.

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 06 / June 1894, pp 251 - 257
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188377, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188377

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 251-257 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188377

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 praesegetina 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 saecla* suis dixerunt currite fuis Concordes Parcae.

The same speech (ch. 9) shows that Symmachus did not regard '*Talia saecla*' 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 *libet* 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 *concipit*, 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.

somewhat above the low average of Baehrens' conjectures.

But the emendations which place Baehrens next to Haupt among the post-Lachmannian correctors of Catullus are the things which Mr. Schulze has not found it possible to retain. Take for shortness' sake the 64th poem only. I will not be unreasonable and complain that Mr. Schulze omits Baehrens' correction of v. 73 *illa ex tempestate ferox quo tempore*; because I know that Mr. Schulze has never seen or heard of that correction. It occurs in Baehrens' commentary, and Mr. Schulze has not read Baehrens' commentary. That I affirm securely: if you ask 'whence then did Mr. Schulze learn (p. 97) that Baehrens had proposed *prompta* at 68 39?' I reply that he learnt it from Schwabe's edition of 1886; and if you ask 'how does he know (p. v) that Baehrens abandoned in the commentary some of his earlier conjectures?' I reply that he knows it from Iwan Mueller's *Jahresbericht*. For if he had read the commentary he would not merely know that Baehrens abandoned some conjectures but he would know which those conjectures are; and he does not. He still represents Baehrens as proposing *quaecumueis* at 64 109, though Baehrens in the commentary said 'quam formam minime latinam non debui olim exemplis male fidis deceptus recipere.' And this barbarous and repudiated depravation, and the frivolous *heic* at 269, are all of Baehrens that Mr. Schulze finds it possible even to mention within the 400 verses of the 64th poem. The transposition of 216 and 217, *nascente* in 275, *incultum cano... crinem* in 350, *residens* in 387, *Amarunsia* in 395,—these may be found at least recorded in the editions of other scholars, but not in this book which bears on its front 'recensuit Aemilius Baehrens.' The transposition is accepted both by Riese and by Postgate, the emendation of 350 by Riese Postgate and Schwabe, the emendation of 387 is approved by Schwabe and accepted by Riese and Schmidt: but no vestige of these corrections survives in the monument reared to their author's memory by the Oedipodean piety of Mr. Schulze.¹

Baehrens' are not the only emendations which Mr. Schulze finds it impossible to retain or even to record. Which is the finest correction ever made in Catullus I will not undertake to say; but one of the first half-dozen is Froelich's 'non est sana puella nec rogare | qualis sit solent *aes* [et MSS.] imaginisum,'

¹ 'Tam bene de poeta suo meruit, ut dignus sit, cuius memoria pie colatur,' p. v.

which Baehrens of course accepted. Mr. Schulze ousts it for 'nec rogare | qualis sit: *solide est imaginosa.*' But no reader is likely to waste a glance on these Berlin goods if Froelich's restoration is left glittering in the apparatus criticus; so Mr. Schulze does not leave it there: he suppresses it. *Quaecumque adeo possunt afferre pudorem*, says Ovid, *illa tegi caeca condita nocte decet.*

One clue Mr. Schulze appears to possess: if he sees the name of Lachmann he follows it, 'errabunda regens tenui uestigia filo.' I say advisedly *the name*. At 63 5 he expels the emendations of Auantius and Bergk and writes 'deuolsit *ile*': it is not sense, but it is Lachmann's. A still more pleasing instance of simple faith occurs at 63 74 where Mr. Schulze reads with Lachmann 'roseis ut huic labellis sonitus abiit *celer.*' Lachmann himself, 'uir egregius' as Haupt calls him 'et multo quam imbecilli capiunt maior,' had a reason for adding *celer*: his theory of the pagination of the archetype made this verse the 18th line on the 41st page, while the 18th line on the 39th page was 'aliena quae petentes velut exules loca *celeri,*' whence he took the hypermetrical word to repair the deficiency here. But Mr. Schulze does not hold Lachmann's theory, for on p. lxiv he retains a note of Baehrens' which says 'tota ista numerorum singularum in V paginarum paginarumque uersuum computatio a Lachmanno instituta et ab Hauptio [quaest. Cat. p. 39-49; op. I 28 sq.] multis defensa ad nihilum recidit'; nor is it through inadvertence that he retains this note, for he has taken the trouble to write 'ab Hauptio' where Baehrens wrote 'a Hauptio' and to add the reference to the opuscula. He has abandoned then the basis of Lachmann's conjecture, but to the conjecture he adheres; and why not? its merit is not that he thinks it has a basis but that he knows it is Lachmann's. Again, when Lachmann has emended a passage, Mr. Schulze allows no one to improve Lachmann's emendation, because he does not know whether the improvement is an improvement and he does know that it is not Lachmann's. At 66 58 the MSS. have '*gratia* Canopieis incola litoribus,' Lachmann emended *Graia*, and Baehrens improved this to *Graia*, which Lachmann of course would have adopted, as any one can see who turns to his note on Lucr. i 477 or remembers, as Haupt says, 'quotiens ex antiquae scribendi consuetudinis recordatione maxime Lachmannus in Catulli carminibus fructum cepit.' But no painting of

the lily for Mr. Schulze, who ejects *Graia* and replaces *Graia* in the text. I do not know all the salutations with which his idol will hereafter welcome him to Elysium, nor durst I write them down if I did; but from what happened to Eichstaedt and Forbiger I can tell that *mancipium* and *simius* are two of them. At the end of the note however Mr. Schulze ventures on a suggestion of his own: 'fortasse *grata*.' It is news then to this editor of Catullus that for 300 years no text was printed with any other reading than *grata*: history for him begins with 1829: he supposes Scaliger and Heinsius and Bentley and the rest of them went on content with *gratia* till Lachmann came upon earth to tell mankind that it was a trisyllable.

This brings us to Mr. Schulze's own emendations. One of these, *monendum est te* for *monendum est* at 39 9, is no worse than the *monendum te est* and *monendus es* of others, so that the odds against it are only two to one. Then in several places he writes *uoster* where the MSS. are divided between *uester* and *noster*. Catullus may of course have used that form, but this divergence of the MSS. affords not the slightest ground for thinking that he did: *uester* and *noster* are interchanged not in his text only, but in all authors whose MSS. are medieval; and they are interchanged not because those authors wrote *uoster* but from the cause exhibited in Mr. Schulze's own note at 71 3: 'ur̄m VM: nr̄m g.' At 10 25 sqq. Mr. Schulze punctuates 'quaeso, inquit, mihi, mi Catulle, paulum | istos: comoda nam uolo ad Serapim | deferri,' but omits to say whether this means 'I wish my emoluments to be carried to Serapis' or 'I wish to be carried to Serapis in an obliging frame of mind.' Finally he emends 29 20 thus:

hunc Galliae timent, timet Britannia.

Two metrical solecisms in one line.

Baehrens' spelling, which was bad, Mr. Schulze has corrected as well as he knows how. He knows how to spell *sicine nequam* and *condicio*; so these words are rightly spelt. He does not know how to spell *umidus iucundus sodalicium* or *multa*; these words therefore retain their Baehrensian forms.

Baehrens' apparatus criticus was, as usual, a model of lucidity and order. Take a few examples of what it now is. At 68 140 the text has 'noscens omniuoli plurima furta Iouis,' where 'furta' is an old and generally accepted correction for the 'facta' of the

MSS. An editor who knows his trade expresses this fact by writing 'furta *uulgo*, facta V.' Mr. Schulze's note is 'plurima facta VM plurima furta *uulgo*': to occupy the printer he writes 'plurima' twice where it ought not to be written at all; to delay the reader he puts the note wrong end foremost. At 113 2 is a still wilder scene: text, 'Maeciliam: facto consule nunc iterum': note of a competent workman, 'Maeciliam *Lachmannus*, Meciliā G, Mecilia O, Maecilia *uulgo*, Mucillam *Pleitnerus*': note of Mr. Schulze, 'Mecilia OM Meciliā G | facto VM | Maecilia: facto *uulgo* Maeciliam: facto *Lachmannus* Mucillam: facto *Pleitnerus*.' Another revelation of the amateur encounters us in such places as 64 386: the text is 'saepe pater diuum templo in fulgente reuisens,' which is the MS. reading, so that of course there should be no note at all unless some conjecture is to be mentioned: Mr. Schulze writes 'reuisens VM.' Why not 'saepe VM, pater VM, diuum VM, templo VM, in VM, fulgente VM'? Elsewhere Mr. Schulze's ignorance of how things are done and inability to learn have made his notes completely unintelligible, and a reader who wants to know what the MSS. give must consult another edition. Take 61 46 sq.: text, 'quis deus magis est amatis petendus amantibus': note, 'amatis VM magis a magis *Scaliger* ancxiis *Hauptius* magis est amatis *Bergkiius*': problem, what is the MS. reading? From other editions you learn that it is 'magis amatis est.' These are the sights which may now be seen in what was once the apparatus criticus of Baehrens: for appropriate comments I refer the reader to Cic. *Phil.* ii c. 41.

Now for the prolegomena. The prolegomena, I need not say, were the kernel of Baehrens' edition. In them he demonstrated, what no one suspected before but every one acknowledges now, that the Oxoniensis (O) and the Sangermanensis (G) are the authorities on which the text of Catullus rests. All that is now in dispute is whether the other MSS. are quite useless, as Baehrens held, or only almost useless, as his opponents hold. His prolegomena are thus the chief landmark in the criticism of Catullus' MSS., and there were two reasons why they should have been kept intact: their intrinsic merit, and their historical interest. Errors they may contain; and Bentley's Horace and Lachmann's Lucretius contain errors, but Mr. Schulze has not yet been invited to revise those works.

Baehrens held that G and O are the only

copies ever made of the lost archetype V, and that the other MSS. (ς) are all derived from G. His disputation ran as follows. When G and O disagree, ς almost always side with G; and they side with it not only in corruptions but in false conjectures which its corrector has introduced and which they cannot have got from any ancient MS.: therefore ς are derived from G. On the other hand all ς , or nearly all, often agree in one reading when G and O agree in another: therefore ς , except perhaps the Datanus, are not derived straight from G but from an apograph of G containing conjectures. The few instances where ς agree with O against G are partly due to true conjectures in this apograph, partly, where the difference is very minute, to accident: the Santenianus (L) has marginal readings taken from O, but whether O was ever transcribed entire he doubts. Where G and O and ς all three differ, the reading of ς is conjectural. As to the Datanus (D), which has at least one interpolation from Thomas Seneca, none of its readings (*postquam*, *demostres*, etc.) are necessarily genuine but may be sham-antique: sometimes, like almost all other MSS., it gives better readings than GO, but these are conjectures: it is so interpolated that he does not trouble to decide whether it comes straight from G or through the same apograph as the others, for from G it comes: else why does it agree with G in error where O preserves the truth, and why, above all, does it reproduce almost every reading of G's corrector? questions which also apply to the rest of ς . He then discusses the marginal variants found in G: these must have been in the archetype because the scribe of G says he had only one exemplar: many of them appear in ς , which shows that they had most of them been copied into the apograph of G from which ς are derived.

Baehrens' arguments are now expunged, and in their place stands printed matter composed by Mr. Schulze. He sets out to demonstrate that all our MSS. come from a single codex, and fills more than two pages with passages which prove, or do not prove (the very first is 'I 5 *est pro es* codd. omnes *sinceri*' where of course '*sinceri*' just begs the question), what might have been proved in two lines: I notice that this form of exercise is now much in vogue with amateurs who wish to be critics and think this is the way. The archetype, he holds, was four times transcribed: one transcript is O, another G: 'librorum OG praestantiam magnus numerus locorum ostendit, quibus

soli [my italics] *ueram lectionem aut certe meliorem quam ceteri omnes* [mine again] *codices praebent.*' The list begins 'I 9 *quod OG* ς *plerique: quidem* ς *complures,*' and contains '42 22 *nobis OG* ς *plerique: uobis* ς *pauci*' and '61 100 *uolet OG* ς *plerique: nolet D, nollet AL*': Mr. Schulze is proving what is indisputably true and denied by nobody, and yonder is how he proves it. Then follow a number of places where ς agree with g (*i.e.* the corrector of G) in opposition to OG, and then (p. xliii) these incredible words: 'uel hac re eorum opinio refutatur, qui, ut Baehrensius et qui eum secuti sunt, omnes ς ex G fluxisse opinentur. nam cum codd. ς saepe cum G facere supra uideremus, qua re illi ut ς ex G descriptos esse putarent inducti sunt, hic non minorem numerum locorum congressimus, quibus ς eum g consentiunt.' And pray what is g? simply the corrector of G: the fact then that ς agree with the corrections found in G proves that Baehrens was wrong in supposing ς to be derived from G! This is no malevolent fiction of mine: it is what Mr. Schulze has written and Messrs. Teubner printed. But in the next sentence Mr. Schulze faintly remembers what g is, so he says that if the corrections in G are derived, as he holds, from some lost copy of the archetype, 'manifestum est fieri potuisse ut etiam ς non ex G, sed ex eodem illo codice correcto fluerent': *fieri potuisse!* so evaporates our refutation of Baehrens. 'Atque adeo g ς inter se conspirant, ut ex eodem codice interpolato descripti esse uideantur': yes, and Abraham and Isaac were so much alike that they appear to have been brothers.

Next we have places where ς agree with OG against g; then 'Og ς saepius contra G facere uidemus,' and of this 'frequent' phenomenon five examples are given, one of which is an example where it happens, and four of which are examples where it does not happen; then passages where D and the rest of ς desert G and agree with O are quoted, legitimately, though in stupefying disorder, to prove that ς are not derived from G. Some of these are places where G is wrong and ς are right, on which Mr. Schulze remarks (p. xlvi) 'qua in re ut sane concedendum est facile fuisse librariis uitia illa corrigere, ita mirum est, quamuis sescenties in transcribendis corruptelis scribas summa religione uti uideamus, illas a *cunctis* [Mr. Schulze's italics] felicissime esse correctas.' *Cunctis!* why, who ever dreamed of maintaining that each of the scribes made these corrections for himself? Baehrens, as

I have related, held that ζ were all derived from a single apograph of G, and that all corrections common to all ζ were derived from that apograph. But because Messrs. Teubner allow Mr. Schulze to maul Baehrens' work out of all recognition, he appears to think that he can with equal ease obliterate it from human memory. Then passages are quoted where ζ have the reading which by comparing O we infer to have been G's original reading now erased by the corrector g. All these examples of ζ agreeing with O against G are of course valid *prima facie* objections to Baehrens' theory. Baehrens' answer was 'taliam, si falsa sunt, mero casui adtribuas: sin recta, aut casui aut Italorum ingenio.' This perhaps is not plausible; but on the other hand Mr. Schulze has no ground for concluding 'praeter duo illa apographa codicis V, G et O, tertium sumendum est, ex quo deriuati sunt g ζ , uel potius, cum inter hos quoque D quidem et qui cum eo consentiunt et M insignem obtinere locum uideamus, quartum.' All readings which ζ share with O they may have derived from O.

But in order to prove that ζ are authorities independent of O and G Mr. Schulze now quotes a page and a half of readings from ζ which he thinks better than O's and G's. They are all obvious conjectures, except one which is an exploded corruption, one in which he misreports the MSS., one which is probably interpolated from Quintilian, and the following two: '65 16 *Battidae*] *bactiade* B ζ pauci: *actiade* O, *aciade* G. 66 5 *sub Latmia*] *sublamia* B: *sublamina* O, *sublimia* G ζ plerique.' But *bactiade* may be a conjecture, as that was one of the many ways they spelt this name in the 15th century; and *sublamia* may be no more than a corruption of *sublamia*. Therefore Mr. Schulze is mistaken in saying 'nonnulla ea habent expressae sinceritatis signa, ut facere non possimus quin eis fidem habeamus.' Against the view that the good readings in ζ are conjectures he has this notable argument: 'nemo quidem credit, eundem correctorem, quem aliis locis hominem indoctum cognouimus, hic illic mira sagacitate optimas correcturas suo ingenio inuenisse.' *Eundem correctorem!* Remember that on p. xlvi it suited him to assume that readings common to all ζ must, if conjectures, have been made by each scribe for himself: now, when for instance at 64 120 he finds one MS. and one only giving *praeoptaret*, and giving it merely in the margin, he assumes that this reading must, if a conjecture, have been

made by the scribe of the common archetype of all ζ .

Then we deal particularly with the two MSS. which Mr. Schulze regards as holding an 'insignem locum' among ζ . First D, which 'ceteris codicibus hisce praestat locis': the places are 23 in number (and in several of them, since the list is of Mr. Schulze's making, other MSS. read just the same as D), some of them obvious conjectures, some bad corruptions, one probably interpolated from Seneca, one in which Mr. Schulze contradicts his own apparatus criticus, and these two,—1 2 *arrida*, 25 11 *insuta*, the latter of which is worth something if it is really in the MS.; but these two readings are not found in D by other collators and rest on the testimony of Mr. Schulze; and if any one, after hearing what I shall shortly say about M, chooses to accept Mr. Schulze's testimony, let him. Then follow passages, proving nothing, where D 'optima tradidit' in company with OG or O or ζ ; then our old friends the 'priscae uerborum formae' which are no doubt D's most plausible feature; but Mr. Schulze has drawn up the list, so it contains eleven which are also found in G or O or both: it is true that what he set out to prove was that D is not derived from O or G but from a separate apograph of V; but that was some pages back, so he has forgotten it. Lastly, crown of glory, 'uersum 65 9 paene solus tradidit,' *alloquar audiero numquam tua loquentem*. Then are duly enumerated D's faults, its blunders and interpolations, among the latter 68 47 *omnibus et triviiis uulgetur fabula passim*, which would do D even greater credit than *alloquar audiero* but for the mischance that we know it was written by Thomas Seneca.

'Neque minus insignem locum inter ζ codex M tenere mihi uidetur, qui et ipse magnum numerum bonarum lectionum praebet': this is the Venetus excerpted by Ellis. There follow two pages of these 'bonae lectiones,' many of which of course are bad (one of them is 68 50 where M has the false *alii* and the right reading *Alli* is in O!), while of those which are not bad only one is peculiar to M. True, the reader would never guess this, for Mr. Schulze only notes the agreement of other MSS. in about a third of his examples, and leaves you to draw the false inference that in the other two thirds, where he does not note their agreement, they do not agree: in another writer this suppression of facts would argue fraud, but no such hypothesis is necessary in the case of Mr. Schulze.

Not one of the readings quoted has any sign of genuineness. But 'accedunt priscae formae': e.g. *Bithynia*, *Phrygia*, *coetus*, *labyrinthis*, *cachinni*! Others of these are not peculiar to M but found also in O or G or both or ζ : the reader has guessed, before I tell him, that Mr. Schulze sometimes states this fact and sometimes conceals it. Others contradict his apparatus criticus, as 23 1 *seruos*. *Neptunus* at 31 3 and *antenne* at 64 234 are not the readings of M but merely Mr. Schulze's interpretation of its readings: it has *neptūnus* and *antēne*, which are identical with the *neptunnus* and *antenne* of other MSS. 'Etiam in his lectionibus complures sunt quas non ingenio scribae deberi manifestum est, ut'—then one of Mr. Schulze's lists, comprising for instance 76 18 *extrema*, which is undisguisedly a conjectural accommodation of G's and O's *extremo* to the gender of *morte*; and 25 5 *oscitantes*, which is in G, so that Mr. Schulze need not be at all afraid of our imputing it 'ingenio scribae.' These readings, he placidly continues, are confirmed by the fact that most of them are found in other MSS. (such is the 'insignis locus' occupied by M), 'whence we may readily infer that the good readings peculiar to M are also derived from V.' On this logic it is the less necessary to comment, because there are only two good readings peculiar to M. They are *thuniam* for *thimiam* at 31 5 and *hinsidias* for *insidias* at 84 2. And these two—does my reader flatter himself that he has lost by this time the power to wonder at anything? I promise to amaze him now—these two readings, the only two good readings peculiar to M which Mr. Schulze can find, are not in M at all. They are figments of Mr. Schulze's. A facsimile of M has been issued by Count Nigra and may be seen at the British Museum: the handwriting is beautifully clear and the ink is beautifully black: and M gives *thimiam* and *insidias* just like any other MS. We see then that Mr. Schulze the collator is in no way inferior to Mr. Schulze the critic, Mr. Schulze the metrist, and Mr. Schulze the logician. And with such a collation of such a MS. has Mr. Schulze sullied Baehrens' apparatus criticus from end to end. Worse: whereas he says that M is derived from V, he exhibits it throughout as an independent authority, and you find 'arido VM' at 1 2 and you find 'dabis VM' at 116 8 and you find 'VM' on every page between.

Last comes the question of marginal variants in the archetype. Mr. Schulze has taken Baehrens' list of the variants in G,

and has mixed up with it all the variants he can find in ζ and especially in his precious M; and he, who has himself collated that codex, has done so without discovering what is patent to every one who sets eyes on the facsimile, that nine tenths of its variants are from a later hand. It is clear, he then proceeds to say, that these variants found their way into M and ζ not from G but from some other MS.: 'nam cum G octoginta omnino praebat atque inde ab c. lxxvii nullas, M 155 per totum librum Catullianum aequaliter distributas habet.' If you say you have three sons at a school where there are 100 boys, Mr. Schulze will ask whether you are the father of the remaining 97, and if you disclaim the honour he will tell you that in that case you cannot really be the father of the three. But he has another argument: 'quodsi omnes ζ ex G descripti essent, ponendum est singulares codicum O, M, B, L, aliorum duplices lectiones a scribis horum librorum fictas esse; id quod uel propterea fieri non potest, quod multae earum in textu aliorum extant codicum.' First, observe the ratiocination: because many of the variants in OMBL etc. are found in the text of other codices, therefore the variants in OMBL etc. which are not found in the text of other codices cannot have been invented by the scribes of OMBL etc. Secondly, it is not true that the hypothesis which derives ζ from G compels us to suppose that these marginal variants have been invented by the scribes of the MSS. in whose margins they occur: what one naturally supposes is that the variants in the margins of MBL etc. (I do not know what O is doing here, nor does Mr. Schulze) have been taken from those other MSS. in whose texts they occur; and this is what Mr. Schulze must disprove before he will persuade any one that these variants come from the archetype. But he cannot disprove it: all he can do is to say 'nam si [30 9] in B inde al idem, in GDL inde, in O idem legitur, quis dubitet, quin in communi archetypo, codice V, duplex illa scriptura fuerit?' That V had the ditto-graphy is possible, since O has one reading and G the other; but B proves nothing unless Mr. Schulze can show that it did not get its *inde* from G and its *idem* from O. He however, as if he had proved his point, sails away with 'iam cum M et B neque ex O neque ex G fluxisse certum sit.....,' and concludes 'itaque ea quoque, quae de uariis lectionibus codicum Catullianorum exposuimus, etiam codices deteriores quos uocant in recensendis poetae carminibus adhibendos

esse aperte docent.' Yes, and if I had been in Venice a week before Mr. Schulze and had scribbled conjectures of my own in the margin of M while the librarian's back was turned, Mr. Schulze, who cannot tell one handwriting from another, would have copied them all into his list, and they would now adorn pp. liv—lix of his prolegomena,

and he would be maintaining that M got them from the archetype.

Such are the contents of a book which carries on its title-page the name of Aemilius Bæhrens and the monogram of B. G. Teubner.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

JEBB'S GROWTH AND INFLUENCE OF CLASSICAL GREEK POETRY.

The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry. By R. C. JEBB, Litt. D., M.P. Macmillan and Co. 1893. Pp. xvi. 290. 7s. net.

PROFESSOR JEBB has published in this volume the course of eight lectures on the poetry of Ancient Greece which he delivered in 1892 at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Beginning with a brief sketch of the rise of Greek civilization, he proceeds to discuss the early epic as it appears in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the Hesiodic poems, the lyric with a special lecture on Pindar, and the Attic drama, concluding with an essay on the permanent power of Greek poetry.

The foundation upon which the course of lectures was delivered is a Lectureship of Poetry, and the subject is dealt with in no narrow or scholastic spirit. That one of the first of living scholars should address himself to a popular exposition, in so clear and simple a form as this, of the principles and masterpieces of Greek poetry, is a sign of the times no less interesting than welcome. The study of Greek in the old sense is on its trial as an important part of humane education; it seems certain that within a few years it will cease to be any necessary part of the best type of school or college course. Those who believe that this change is a change for the better rest their case largely on the broad distinction between scholarship as a means, a set of gymnastic exercises for certain faculties, and scholarship as an end only worth following for itself. The compulsory study of Greek is not so much being forced out or argued down as melting away, but the study of Greek for the mere love of it is making extraordinary advance: perhaps it is not going too far to say that Greek has never been studied so much as now, nor on the whole so well.

And indeed it is when a distinguished scholar steps out of the charmed circle and in some such way as this communicates his results to a larger public than that of scholars, that he puts his own achievement to one of its highest tests. That there is a sense in which the technique of scholarship, like the technique of all acquirements, is an end in itself, an 'energy' in the Aristotelian sense, no one would deny. But it is an energy subordinate and ancillary in its nature, and if pushed higher only develops into pedantry. Scholarship as an end in itself is not a technique, but a spirit; its ultimate value to its possessor no less than to the world at large may be measured by the extent and force of its effect on the whole of life. The power of simple, true, and melodious expression is one of the first ways in which this effect should manifest itself. A life spent among the masterpieces of literature has been somehow spent wrongly if they have not saturated the scholar with something of their own virtue.

But further, it is in such popular treatment of the classics as these lectures supply that even more certainly than in commentaries or technical discussions the distinction is clear between the really fine scholar and the scholar who is only of the second order. The one thing is after all very much a matter of industry, of verifying references, where you can continually approximate to exactness by merely taking pains enough, and even the pastime of conjectural emendation is a game played by strict rule. But to put in intelligible language the exact truth about a Greek author, or about any aspect of the Greek life and spirit, is a work not only of acquirement but of genius. There is perhaps no subject in the world where the inexact truth is so easy to reach; none certainly where, when reached,