

# 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](#)



---

## *The Eclogues of Calpurnius. Rendered into English Verse by Edward J. L. Scott. (Bell and Sons.) 3s. 6d.*

E. D. A. Morshead

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 07 / July 1891, pp 327 - 328

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179181, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00179181](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179181)

### **How to cite this article:**

E. D. A. Morshead (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 327-328 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179181

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

vision of Maclean. At first sight Professor Lindsay's handy and well printed volume appears welcome enough, but it needs no very careful examination to show that it does not fairly represent American scholarship. It contains all the *Satires* except the sixth and ninth, which, with some lines here and there in the others, are omitted because the editor wished 'to make the best work of Juvenal readable without awkwardness even in mixed classes.' The text is said to agree in the main with that of Bücheler's edition of Jahn, which of course is based on *Cod. P.* A list of 45 places is given in which Professor Lindsay has adopted other readings than those of Bücheler; this list is supposed to be complete, but one may doubt it from the fact that in *Sat.* iii. 78 he reads *miseris* (to be sure from the *schedae Arovienses*) where Bücheler has *iusseris* with *p a (erasa P)*. Professor Lindsay never states his reasons for departing from Bücheler; yet omitting nine of the 46 passages (as being places in which *P* is illegible or which differ merely in minor matters of punctuation from Bücheler), it appears that, out of the 37 which remain, twenty-two are departures from *Cod. P.* It is difficult to see on what principle these differences are to be justified, especially in the matter of spelling, where for instance he prints *pendentis*, but not *exanimis* nor *felicitis* nor *praeagnas*. In not one of the 22 passages has he anything new to offer us, and in seven he stands alone of recent editors in the readings he adopts. Two of these are in spelling (i. 122; vii. 134); two in orthography (vii. 121; viii. 176); three in words. In the first of these he reads *illic* for the adverb *illi* (v. 42) with Heinrich and the last century editions. In viii. 68 he gives *primum*, with the remark that several editors have *primum*, the fact being that Salmassius's emendation has been adopted by all modern editors except Heinrich. In viii. 239 he reads (again only with Heinrich) *gente* for *monte*. It is to be supposed that he has himself read vi. 296 and ix. 131, though he does not print them.

The commentary has the merit of brevity, and the statements made there are in general correct. But it does not seem to be based upon that close study of the habits of style and expression of the author which ought to be one of the first steps in the preparation of an edition. Only in one passage has the writer of this notice observed any reference to this matter—in iii. 247, where on *pinguia crura luto* is the hardly necessary remark, 'Notice the omission of the verb; common in Juvenal,' without a single cross reference. In only three or four places is there any note on the language of the Silver Age, and here again there are no cross references to speak of. In syntax a good many constructions are named, but none explained, and there are hardly any references to grammars, or to parallels in other authors. Professor Lindsay seems fond of Roby's somewhat questionable theory that *tanti* and *quantis* were originally locatives; he repeats it three times (iii. 54, 225; vii. 45; and no cross references). He accepts Weidner's notion that in i. 70 we should understand *eo* with *sitiente*, and consider *viro* a dative, an explanation so harsh that nobody else has ever adopted it. In iii. 54 he remarks that *non* is rarely, as here, used for *ne* and refers to Hor. *A.P.* 460; he might have added several other parallels from the same author and from later ones, and explained why, in xiv. 48, he felt it necessary to read *ne* with inferior *codd.*, instead of *nec* with *P.* On *eloquio* in vii. 139 he remarks that both *dat.* and *abl.* are used with *fidere* and *confidere*; true enough, but why not say in what authors, for in Juvenal we cannot tell from this passage nor from xiv. 58 (not referred to) with which case we have to deal?

We come finally to the best part of the book—the

treatment of the *Realien*. Juvenal is a fine field for the study of private antiquities, and the editor has made much of his opportunity. The explanations are correct and to the point. There are further nearly a hundred woodcuts, illustrative of the subjects discussed, carefully drawn and clearly printed. No statement, however, is made of the ancient sources from which they are taken—an aggravating omission. But it is evident that many of them are from the American reprint of Guhl and Koner, issued by the same publishers. None of these, consequently, are later than 1875, an unfortunate circumstance in several instances, especially in the case of the plan of the Forum. Again in several cuts the letters which served as keys for explanations in Guhl and Koner are here retained, though the explanations are not fully given; for example in the house of Pansa (which differs somewhat from the plan in the last edition of Overbeck) and in that of the Roman camps. But on the whole the pictures from ancient sources are excellently chosen and described. Not so much can be said for the modern ones. The familiar picture of the crowded Appian Way was a good choice, for almost every person and thing in it may serve to illustrate a line in Juvenal. But what has Claudius behind the curtain to do with the fourteenth *Satire*, and from whence came the wondrous portrait of an Irishman in a wreath, which forms the frontispiece and is labelled Juvenal?

MORRIS H. MORGAN.

Harvard University.

**The Eclogues of Calpurnius.** Rendered into English Verse by Edward J. L. SCOTT. (Bell and Sons.) 3s. 6d.

THIS translation was undertaken 'at the urgent request' of Prof. Robinson Ellis, who could doubtless justify urgency for the study of Calpurnius. His choice, in any case, of a translator was most fortunate: Mr Scott is really something like a master of octosyllabic verse, into which he has translated the seven undoubted *Eclogues*, discarding the four now usually ascribed to another hand. Not even the grace of Mr Scott's translation can conceal the fact that Calpurnius' *Eclogues* are almost slavishly imitated from Virgil's. But by his choice of metre Mr Scott has given a certain bright freshness to his translation which the original *Eclogues* can hardly be said to possess. In a word, Calpurnius has imitated Virgil where Virgil is least original and most indebted to Theocritus; and yet Mr Scott has given to his translation of Calpurnius much of the grace of original poetry. Here and there, it is true, his skill fails him; as e.g. in *Ecl.*; iv. ll. 27-8:

certe mea carmina nemo  
Praeter ab his scopulis ventosa remurmurat Echo.

'For past a doubt not one my strains  
Repeats, except the Echo's sigh,  
Reverberating from yon bluff.'

Neither 'sough' nor 'reverberating' suits the gentle re-echoing of a pastoral strain. Again, in *Ecl.* vi. l. 44-5, 'a pendent tusk is lain' is doubtful English, and self-contradictory: in *Ecl.* iv. l. 136 English readers of Keats and Tennyson will find it hard to endure the classical correctness of 'Oreads.' But these are slight flaws: here is Mr Scott at his best, in one of the best passages of his original—(*Ecl.* iii. ll. 55-62):

I am that Lycidas, whose voice,  
You vowed, could make you oft rejoice

To hear its tones, on whom you rained  
 Delicious kisses unrestrained  
 Full many a time; nay, thought not wrong  
 To interrupt my half-heard song,  
 Seeking once more to kiss in play  
 My lips, as o'er the reeds they stray.  
 Ah grief! and could you in the end  
 To love of Mopsus condescend!  
 His feeble Muse, his rough-toned speech,  
 His scrannel straw's ill-grating screech!  
 Whom follow you, whom, Phyllis, fly?  
 Far goodlier man, they say, am I,  
 Than e'er was he; that this is so,  
 Your own lips told me long ago.

Like most poets, Calpurnius is least good when he is most courtier-like: correspondingly, Mr Scott is at his best in rendering 'the happy country tone', while his verse falls flat in compliments to Caesar. It may be well to call his attention to a curious slip on p. 7, whereby the river Ladon appears instead of the shepherd Lygdon.

E. D. A. MORSHEAD.

#### Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten.

Fürschüler bearbeitet von Dr. GEORG AUTENRIETH.  
 Mit vielen Holzschnitten und zwei Karten. Sechste verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: 1890. 3 Mk.

AUTENRIETH'S *Homeric Dictionary* has been an eminently useful book, as is shown by the six large editions of the original, published in seventeen years, and by the translations into several languages. The book is known too well to need either praise or blame for its general plan. The later editions have thrown off several of the fads of the original work, such as the unpractical arrangement of the words, according to the forms which happened to be in Homeric use, a somewhat excessive indulgence in oriental illustrations applied to the Homeric age, and the Latin translation of most words. A considerable number of woodcuts and some 'family-trees' have been added.

The author endeavours to give the results of recent research, and does so in the main. The broom could be used more freely on some rubbish,—to clear away such etymologies as those for "Ἡρη and κέ. Whether true or not, such derivations have no place in an elementary book. In some very minor matters the book shows the absence of a minute revision. For instance, in the first edition, the author began marking the quantities by adding a parenthetical note, as ἄλλοτε [ \_ \_ ], ἄλλοτε [ \_ \_ ], even though, as in these cases, the quantity of each syllable was distinct. But presently the simple device of marking the quantity of the doubtful vowels only commended itself and was adopted. In the five new editions of the work, however, the [ \_ \_ ] etc. stand just as they did in the first. So, too, some false accents, as ἀγορήτης, have been handed down. The woodcuts are not conveniently arranged for reference. For instance, under πεμπάβολα we have a scene in which no πεμπάβολον is visible, but in which two youths are roasting meat. This cut should stand under ὀβελῶνι, where a reference is given to πεμπάβολα [sic.]. From the first edition is inherited 'πᾶρά, ᾧ κ 242,' where the note that παρὰ is πᾶρά in κ 242 is based on old editions. Bekker in 1848, and almost all editors since, read παρ ρ'. The statement that ἀργυρότε(α) is found only in the *Iliad* overlooks ω 92. To see γλαυκάπις Ἀθήνη explained as owl-eyed, is almost amusing; especially since this is not an unconscious survival from an earlier edition. In the fourth edition, 'owl-eyed' is said to be due to a misunderstanding of ancient commentators.

But this is not the place for a list of errata; and

while the book before us is not perfect, nor of such convenient form as Dr. Keep's translation of an early edition, it has been greatly improved and is well adapted to its use.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

**Georgii Cyprii Descriptio Orbis Romani**, accedit Leonis Imperatoris Diatyposis genuina adhuc inedita. Edidit praefatus est commentario instruxit H. GELZER (Lipsiae: Teubner). pp. lxxii + 247. 3 Mk.

THE 'Description of the Roman World, by George of Cyprus' is the topographical list better known as the first of the 'Notitiae Episcopatum' published by Parthey and often quoted by writers on Byzantine geography. The present edition is something more than a revised and accessible text edited by a competent and experienced scholar, though it possesses these very considerable merits. Its chief feature is its editor's treatment of the second part of the list. In an elaborate preface he points out that the list really falls into two parts, each containing about 500 names. The first part is really a list of bishoprics for the diocese of Constantinople and gives, in the usual fashion of an Episcopal notitia, the provinces and sees of the metropolitans, autocephali, and bishops within the area indicated. The second part does nothing of the sort. It includes some of the East and the relics of Byzantine power in Italy, Africa, and Spain at the time of its composition, and it deals with them as civil not ecclesiastical districts. It mentions towns not bishoprics, civil rather than ecclesiastical dignitaries, fortresses rather than holy cities, *βεγέωνες* and *σάλτοι*, not Episcopal dioceses. Hence Dr Gelzer concludes that the second half of the Notitia is really a secular document, with one or two ecclesiastical notes introduced by a later hand. The conclusion seems very probable. It is true, as Prof Ramsay points out in his new book (*Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 93), that as a rule Zeno's principle was carried out and each city had a bishopric, and that the ecclesiastical and civil topography was often identical. It is possible also that Dr. Gelzer has, in his arguments, not made quite enough allowance for this resemblance. Still, the differences which he points out are so marked that his theory seems tolerably certain. Dr. Gelzer then goes on to settle the authorship and date of the work. A note in the two principal MSS. states that the whole Notitia was compiled by one Basileios, while the Cyprian section is said to be by one Γεώργιος ὁ Κύπριος and, as the Cyprian section belongs to the second part of the work, that writer may be assumed to have written the second part. The date of Basileios or at least of the first part is fixed by internal evidence to the early part of the ninth century and the date hitherto usually assigned, A.D. 883, on the authority of a note in one MS., is set aside as intrinsically improbable and devoid of good authority. The date of the second part is, of course, not necessarily the same as that of Basileios; indeed it seems to be a good deal earlier, somewhere about A.D. 600. If this be so, the second part will have to be considered far earlier than the ordinary *Notitiae Episcopatum*. There are one or two difficulties in the way of this, notably the difficulty that the Byzantine empire was not the same from A.D. 600 till A.D. 830, and it is strange that Basileios should not have taken this into account. However, Byzantine writers did sometimes do such things, and Dr. Gelzer's theory appears to have most weight on its side. It is not the only contribution he has made to our knowledge of the treatise, for he has added copious topographical notes on the second part, and has also edited, in better shape than had been pre-