

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](#)



Merry's Fragments of Latin Poetry *Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry, from the earliest times of the Republic to the Augustan Age*, edited with Introductions and Notes by W. W. Merry, D.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. Pp. 260. Price 6s. 6d.

A. S. Wilkins

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 05 / May 1892, pp 219 - 221
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00185695, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185695

How to cite this article:

A. S. Wilkins (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 219-221 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185695

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

this book. The note '*em=en*' (373) is surprising, considering the work that has been done upon this little word (Brix, Ribbeck, Richter); for *dum* there is a good dissertation (Elste) and a very good one (Richardson), either better than Ramsay's *Excursus*. The notes on *quom* are full enough, but seem to have been written without the help of Lubbert's collection of examples or Hale's discussion of *quom*. The notes on *quod* and *quia* should have been taken from Zimmermann, not from Brix. The 'interrogative *nam*' appears to be traditional, but there is no such thing. On p. 79 the editor condemns the whole prologue and says that it is 'assigned by Ritschl to the middle of the 1st century B.C.' This is hasty; what Ritschl says is that *in its present form* it must have been written not far from 607, *i.e.* near the middle of the *second* century B.C. And is there authority for a curtain rolled down to the stage in the theatre of Plautus?

It must also be said that there is at times a lack of scholarly precision of statements. Thus the doubled letter of *repperi* (761) is said to be due 'perhaps' to one cause, 'perhaps' to another, 'perhaps to both.' In the *Intro.*, p. xx., the spondee is not 'almost invariable in 5th' place; the table on p. xxi. gives 90 non-spondaic 5th feet in 327 vss. The editor has confused feet with word-feet. In regard to the hiatus no two men have ever agreed, and one may say almost anything with impunity, but it is distinctly wrong to treat hiatus at the caesura of iamb. senar. as if it were gen-

erally admitted, and to class monosyllabic hiatus among those 'which are far from being generally accepted.' The notes on *tamen* seem to be inconsistent with each other; two different uses of *quod sciam* appear to be confused (265); on *uti adseruentur* (115) the editor hesitates between Brix and Sonnenschein, but without taking into account the possibility that it may be an independent subjunctive, as in *Liv. i. 18, 9*. The explanations are sometimes hasty and fanciful, not so much wrong as regardless of philological method: *e.g.* the explanation of the spondee in the even feet and of the caesura; *opus est* (159) is said to take the abl. because the original meaning was 'there is work to be done with' (cf. Wölfflin's *Archiv*, II. 2); *eccum* (169), 'the acc. depends upon *ecce* as if it were *uide*'; the explanation of *nonne* (714) looks like a mere guess and is wholly wrong.

It is in no spirit of condemnation that these errors or questionable statements are pointed out; rather it is because this book contains so much good work that it is capable of becoming a useful edition of the *Captivi*. Editions of this type, which seems to be a favourite one in England and to be suited to the needs of University work there, are not always strong upon the side of text or of philological criticism, but they are always convenient for their commentary on points of antiquities, and this volume may be brought by revision in a second edition within this most useful class.

E. P. MORRIS.

Yale University.

MERRY'S FRAGMENTS OF LATIN POETRY.

Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry, from the earliest times of the Republic to the Augustan Age, edited with Introductions and Notes by W. W. MERRY, D.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. Pp. 260. Price 6s. 6d.

AN editor, to whom students young and old owe so much as to the Rector of Lincoln College, can hardly escape being measured by a comparative standard. One is tempted to regard this volume of *Selections* as a plea for arrest of judgment on the high crime and misdemeanour of not giving us more Aristophanes, or completing

the larger edition of the *Odyssey*; and to consider whether it may pass as a legitimate set-off. But after all, even a successful editor retains some right of free choice for his future action; and it is fairer to look at this book in itself, and not as postponing the desiderated *Wasps* or *Peace*. There can be no doubt that Dr. Merry has set himself to meet a real want, and that he has done what he has attempted admirably. There was no book published in England, nor, so far as I know, abroad, which served as a convenient text-book to be put into the hands of students attending lectures on early Latin poetry. Bishop Wordsworth's

well-known volume gives at once too little and too much, even if it was not almost excluded by its cost. Bährens' sixth volume does not touch the tragic or comic poets, and Ribbeck's two volumes are much too cumbrous and costly. Dr. Merry's book is just what was wanted. But—to get rid at once of grumblings—it seems to be a matter for regret that in giving us so much he did not give a little more. He has 'made no attempt to present a critical text, or to settle questions of metrical arrangement.' This is all very well for the student who is guided by a competent lecturer, for the teacher will of course have access to the critical authorities, and will use them to control the text-book; but it is rather hard upon the meritorious class who study by themselves. Dr. Merry has reprinted the texts as they are given by Ribbeck, Riese or Bährens with rare deviations, and hardly ever lets us know what the reading of the MSS. is, and why or by whom it has been altered. Doubtless he regards these editors as great authorities, but he may be assured that his own judgment would be valued quite as highly by English scholars as that of any of them, and far more highly than that of a most industrious but most reckless critic like Bährens. At all events, it would have been an immense addition to the value of the book if we had had in all cases the reading of the MSS. at the foot of the page, and the name of the author of the accepted emendation. It is true that the MSS. of the different sources are often extremely corrupt, and that emendation is both imperative and uncertain. But nothing is gained by disguising this. Mr. Sidgwick has shown in his *Oresteia* how well what is needed can be done even for schoolboys; and very few schoolboys will be among Dr. Merry's readers.

To give examples:—in *Carm. Sal.* ii. *prae tet trementi* is printed without a hint that it is due solely to an emendation by Bergk, which is now generally rejected (cf. Jordan, *Krit. Beitr.* p. 219, Stolz, *Verbalflex.* i. 26). In App. Claud. i. the order of the words is purely conjectural; so is the reading of Marc. iii. In Liv. Andr. 28, 2 the MSS. give *duona eorum*: the text printed has *advenit servae*. In *ib.* 32 *paucus* is very doubtful, and certainly has no authority. In 22 *corpus* is substituted for *peius*. In all these cases (and their number could be increased) there is something to be said for the change: but it would have been better that it should have been said. The same holds good of the selections from Ribbeck's fragments of

the scenic poets. It is surprising however that Dr. Merry did not accept Bücheler's excellent *illaesae* for *in sese* (Naev. *Lyc.* i.) approved by Ribbeck (*Coroll.* xii.). The reading in Naev. *Tunic.* i. seems very doubtful, and hardly metrical. In *Iphig.* there is not a trace of authority for either *velod* or *med.* In the *Saturae* of Ennius two or three readings of Bährens are adopted with little necessity, and without warning; yet sometimes his text is departed from, e.g. *nam tibi munimenta*, where Bährens (keeping closer to the MSS.) has *namque tibi monumenta*. In Accius *Med.* ii. Ribbeck's *sicut lascivui* is by no means near enough to the traditional *sicut inciti* to be received with any confidence: in Acc. *Andr.* iv. his *quei* is extremely doubtful.

With regard to the explanatory notes, Dr. Merry's practice, except indeed in the quality of what he gives, is not quite consistent. On the earliest fragments he is fairly liberal, and so he is again when he comes to Lucilius. Elsewhere he is very sparing. In many cases the brief and altogether excellent little introductions almost do away with the need of footnotes, but this is not always the case. Even if the use of the dictionary is assumed—and it is not always in the earlier notes—this will not remove all difficulties of syntax or metre, on which many who will read the book will look for help. It is rarely and with much diffidence that one is tempted to differ from some of the explanations. On Enn. *Alex.* iv. 6 the absence of a comma after *mei* leaves the sentence very obscure: and the punctuation of the last line of Pacuv. *Teuc.* iii. makes a note necessary. The second of the epigrams assigned to Ennius needs a word of explanation as to its subject. In Pacuvius *Nipt.* viii. *subinis* needs a note as much as any of the words that are so favoured. The notes on Lucilius are particularly good. But there is an unsolved difficulty as to the mention of Congus in xxvi. 1. Dr. Merry says his name 'must represent the average citizen.' This is certainly what the context in Lucilius suggests. But where Congus is elsewhere mentioned, it is as a man 'curiosus et diligens eruendae vetustatis' (Schol. Vet. on *Planc.* 24, 58), and as an authority on history. The solution seems to be suggested by *de Orat.* ii. 25, where Cicero, quoting a similar line in which D. Laelius is mentioned, explains that Lucilius meant 'neque ab indoctissimis se neque ab doctissimis legi velle.' This Congus must have been a man of at least some general culture. After all it

perhaps admits of doubt whether the Congus of Lucilius was the same man that we hear of from other sources. Cicero in *de Orat.* i. 256 represents Antonius in B.C. 91 as going to Congus for instances from history and information on points of law. In B.C. 54 he speaks of him as dead (*Planc.* l.c.), in a way which suggests that he had but recently died. The latter date makes it necessary for us to put his birth as late as we can, consistently with the way in which Antonius speaks of him. We can hardly suppose him to have been much younger than Antonius, or to have been born much later than B.C. 140. Even to put him as early as this would imply that he was about eighty-five when he died. On the other hand, the twenty-sixth book of the *Satires* of Lucilius is confessedly the earliest of all, and was composed about B.C. 130. It seems pretty clear that the Congus of Lucilius was the unlearned father of a learned son; and if so Dr. Holden's note on *Planc.* l.c. will have to be rewritten.

On metrical questions Dr. Merry abstains as a rule from pronouncing an opinion, and follows his authorities; but here too more independence of judgment would have been welcomed. Yet in Naevius *Inc. Fab.* i. 3 the scansion of Ribbeck seems far better

than that which is silently substituted. In *Acc. Epig.* v. *datur bona* as an equivalent for an anapaest calls for discussion. In Varro *ŏvos lúpas* vii. it is a pity not to recognize the unmistakable octonarians, and in *ib.* ix. the scazons are queerly accented. In Varro *Sexag.* xiii. and xiv. the trochaics are similarly evident, though apparently not recognized. In *Marcopolis* iii. 1 the reading *emissum íntímō* restores excellent metre, whereas *íntímō míssum* as printed is impossible. In *ib.* *Est Modus* i. 3 *hoc hílaritatis* is misprinted *hoc hílárítatis*. In *Aborig.* i. and ii. a word on the metre would be acceptable.

But on the whole Dr. Merry has done admirably what he has attempted. If it is true, as he says, that most of the work of interpretation has been done before, it is no less true that it has been done in a way which makes it not very accessible, and in some cases by no means attractive to English students. He may rest assured that he has succeeded in making the study of these fragments more easy and more interesting, and if in a future edition he helps towards making it more critical, we shall be still more thankful.

A. S. WILKINS.

SELLAR'S HORACE AND THE ELEGIAC POETS.

The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age, by W. Y. SELLAR, M.A., LL.D., late Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh and formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, with a Memoir of the Author, by ANDREW LANG, M.A., and a portrait. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1892.

THE volume on Horace and the Elegiac Poets completing the late Professor Sellar's valuable and fascinating studies in Latin poetry will be heartily welcomed by all classical scholars, and by that far larger class which, without claiming scholarship technically so called, feels a lively interest in Ancient Literature. To the latter the volume before us will be the more acceptable because it is not so likely as works of its kind often are to disturb their preconceived judgment or to demand a modification of traditional beliefs. The eminent scholar, whose death only a little more than a year ago was so deeply deplored by the world of

letters, in this his last volume seems to have desired to avoid avenues of criticism which, however attractive, would have led him out of his main road. He has put before us with that elegance of style which we are accustomed to expect from him a view of Horace not very different from that which the man of the world forms or accepts. Those who have read in the *Classical Review* for last January and February (vol. vi. nos. 1, 2, p. 28), Mr. Page's discriminating notice of Hartman's *De Horatio poeta* will have seen what startling views may be propounded about the literary value of Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes*; nor is opinion much more homogeneous concerning the genesis and true character of the *Satires* and *Epistles*, or the whole question of the relation of the poet to his materials and to his predecessors. These topics are very slightly treated in the present work, and the place of Horace among genuine poets is assumed to be generally conceded. We must all agree with Professor Sellar that we owe to