

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](#)



Henry's *Livy XXVI Livy XXVI*. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by Robert Mitchell Henry, M. A., First Classical Master, Royal Academical Institution, Belfast. London: Edward Arnold, 1906. Pp. xxviii+182 (one map). 2s. 6d.

J. P. P.

The Classical Review / Volume 20 / Issue 02 / March 1906, pp 124 - 125

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00993880, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00993880

How to cite this article:

J. P. P. (1906). The Classical Review, 20, pp 124-125 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00993880

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to be a dialogue. A statesman complains of a poet that he attacks harmless people, but is of no help against public enemies. The poet replies. (Here again I see no fair explanation of *me remorsurum petis* in l. 4.) Ep. 7 and Ep. 8 explain themselves, but it should be remembered that the speaker is not necessarily, or even probably, to be identified with Horace. Ep. 9 is a cry of disappointment for that, after the naval victory at Actium, a victory on land did not immediately follow or seem likely to follow. (Then why *terra marique victus hostis* in l. 27?) Ep. 10 is a parody of a propempticon: Ep. 11 a parody of the erotic elegy. Ep. 12 is a sort of distorted elegy, the complaint of the too-much-beloved. Ep. 13 is a comic protest, with parody, against gloomy vaticinations. Ep. 14 is a humorous defence of the elegiac lover, who is again comically presented in Ep. 15. Ep. 16 is 'a political elegy of an ironical, sarcastic, parodistic cast, composed about the time when

Virgil was finishing his lofty song of joy in country life.' In Ep. 17 Canidia is not a real person. 'Horace is trying to represent, with humorous irony, the failure of some enterprise, in which he had taken part, in the form of a parody of a tragic catastrophe.' Ep. 1 is a sportive declaration that Horace, though a very poor politician, was not going to retire to his Sabine farm, but was resolved to stay in Rome and assist Maecenas in his arduous work as *praefectus urbi*. The *navium propugnacula* are not real but only figurative, and the 'epodic' character of the piece lies in Horace's humorous criticism of himself. This summary does not include Mr. Plüsz's criticism of the customary interpretations. They are frequently more cogent than his own alternative explanations, but it does not occur to him that the fault may lie in Horace himself who has failed in carrying out his own ideas consistently.

J. Gow.

HENRY'S LIVY XXVI.

Livy XXVI. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices by ROBERT MITCHELL HENRY, M. A., First Classical Master, Royal Academical Institution, Belfast. London: Edward Arnold, 1906. Pp. xxviii + 182 (one map). 2s. 6d.

THIS is a scholarly and workmanlike edition. The notes indeed might be terser (106 pages to 63 of text) and more attention paid to textual difficulties, e.g. at 27 § 16, 31 § 2, 38 § 7 Madvig's emendations should at least have been mentioned. But Mr. Henry's commentary is as a whole pertinent and helpful, and I have noticed few actual mistakes. In 6 § 1 *pro uallo* 'on the rampart' is substantially correct, but *pro* in such phrases means properly 'in front' and is a precious relic of the original adverbial sense of the so-called 'prepositions'. 11 § 12 *error* 'variation.' Livy 1. 24. 1 is a nearer parallel for the sense 'discrepancy' than the poetic quotations of T. W. D. (Prof. Dougan). 19 § 11 'et ipsi'] There is a very similar use in c. 42. 8. The form of this note is unsatisfactory. For as Mr. Henry has just said that here there may be a lacuna in the text, the similarity must be very hard to prove. In 42 § 8 'paeninsula excurrit ipse in quo etc.' the pronoun plays the same sort of rôle

as in e.g. 'Mens cuiusque is est quisque.' 21 § 10 *Nasum* comes from Νᾶσος the Syracusan form of Νῆσος. 35 § 10. 'paratuos.' A question asked in the first or third person usually (though not invariably) goes into the Infinitive in Oratio Obliqua. A good specimen of a useless note. In the future the infinitive is used without exception in all rhetorical questions, as Riemann long ago pointed out. This is by no means the only thing about Oratio Obliqua which the authors of current English American and German grammars have to learn. ib. *esse*] 'represents *sunt* "are to be." *esse* depends on *posse* like the other infinitives. *elici* in c. 7. 1 is different. 39 § 22 *foribus*. 'Door' and 'gate' are confused (so again at 46 § 6) 41 § 22. If *suboli* was to have a note, it should have been said that its proper meaning 'young shoot' was clearly present to the historian as 'uelut accisis recrescenti stirpibus' shows. 44 § 5 *qua cuique*. To say that 'cuique is attracted into the relative clause' is to suggest that it is scarcely intelligible in that clause, which is controvertible, and that it has been moved from the main clause, which is more questionable still. 45 § 3 *caliginem*. In Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 405 the word does not refer to 'dizziness' as here. 47 § 2 'captivus'] = *captis*:

cf. *uastam* = *uastatam* c. 35. 5.' The cases are not parallel, for *captivus* means belonging to *capti*, but *uastus* does not mean belonging to *uastati*. 49 § 1 *piget* 'it would be tedious, cf. c. 22. 6 n.' [impudentem esse]. *piget scribere* means rather 'I refuse to write, nolo scribere.' 51 § 14 *iactabant* 'threw out sneers.' 'Sneers' is not in the word, which is applied to any free or irresponsible utterance. Mr. Henry's spelling is correct in the main, and as his work is intended to satisfy the needs of both Pass and Honours candidates in the Royal University of Ireland, we must congratulate him on his courage in printing *u's* alone, thus anticipating the recommendation of *The Classical Association* that '*v* and *u* be continued in use to distinguish the two sounds of Latin *u* in books intended *only for beginners*.' He is, unless I am mistaken, the first in his island to shake himself free from the old tradition. Mr. Henry's introduction contains amongst other matter some pages of historical and literary criticism. The analysis of Livy's sources and his methods of dealing with them is sober and sensible; but some other judgments fly wide. From Praef. § 7 'ea belli gloria est populo R. ut

cum suum conditorisque sui parentem Martem potissimum ferat, *tam et hoc gentes humanae patiantur aequo animo quam imperium patiuntur*' he infers that 'Livy's patriotism is a mellow and on the whole kindly feeling which, while it honours Rome above every land on earth (praef. 3), *yet feels that other nations have their place to fill*.'¹ What is there in the Latin to warrant the English? What further is gained by saying that Livy, the historian, would have dealt differently with the battle of Actium from Virgil, the epic writer, and Horace, the lyricist? What bearing has 'Vergil's noble picture of the Nile,' *Aen.* 8. 712 f. (which affords more than one indication of being taken from some actual work of art), upon that 'deep human feeling' which is denied to Livy? Mr. Henry takes too superior a tone, when he speaks of the 'somewhat plebeian outburst' of Horace c. i. 37. The victory of Cleopatra's Armada would have meant as much to Rome as that of Philip's to England. Actium was not Mafeking.

J. P. P.

¹ The italics are mine.

BURGER ON MINUCIUS FELIX AND SENECA.

Minucius Felix und Seneca. Von Dr. F. X. BURGER. München: Beck, 1904. 8vo. Pp. 65. M. 1.50.

CLASSICAL scholarship has always been unenviably prolific in certain so-called 'Questions' which chronically or periodically disturb the serenity of philologists. The question as to the Tacitean authorship of the *Dialogus*, it is true, after many vicissitudes, has now been given its quietus and the Dictys problem no longer seriously disturbs our reflections; two others, however, have entered the present century with Antaeian powers of invigoration. The 'Homeric Question' bids fair to remain upon the scene, as long as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are read, and a similar perenniality appears to be vouchsafed for the problem, whether the 'aureus libellus' of Minucius Felix antedated or succeeded the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian, with all the consequences which the acceptance of either hypothesis involves.² The great majority of

scholars has been inclined to favour the former view, but since Harnack's³ vigorous and uncompromising advocacy of the latter, I am not so sure but what 'ἐπένευσεν εἰς ἐκείνον ἡ βουλή πάλιν,' for the contingency that both works might after all be strictly contemporaneous and independent of each other has never been seriously entertained by any critic of repute. And yet a plausible case might be made out for this hypothesis, were it my province to undertake this task, for the author of the dissertation under notice does not directly concern himself with this phase of the controversy, and it is doubtless for this reason also that he has refrained from drawing the valid conclusion from his results to which I shall refer at the close.

It is Dr. B.'s purpose to ascertain just what is the extent of Minucius' indebtedness to Seneca, a fact long since universally admitted, but never accurately and exhaustively

² 'Bibliographie de Minucius Felix' in *Le Musée Belge*, 1902, pp. 216-261.

³ *Die altchristliche Literatur bis Eusebius*, vol. ii. pp. 324-330.

² More than 150 articles have so far been called forth by this short treatise. Cp. J. P. Walzing's