

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](#)



Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem. Cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis. Iterum recensuit Carolus Kempf. Leipzig: Teubner. 1888.

H. T. Peck

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 09 / November 1891, pp 428 - 429

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167782, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167782

How to cite this article:

H. T. Peck (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 428-429 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167782

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Cilicia, but in Phrygia, and on the former page the reference to Vitruvius (on ἡχεῖα) should be i 1, 9 and v 5. Lastly, in the article on φυλοβασιλείς, we are told that 'we have no information as regards their number'; and it is considered 'not unreasonable to infer' that the number was four. But, even previously to the discovery of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, it was known, through the quotation from it in Photius, s.v. ναυκραρία, that four was the number, and a passage in Pollux (viii 111) had been corrected accordingly by altering an unintelligible δὲ into an intelligible δ, to indicate that number.

The new evidence from the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία is added in an Appendix containing a series of supplementary articles mainly by Mr. Wayte and Dr. Hager. The greatest care has evidently been bestowed on this supplementary matter, which enables us to gain a comprehensive view of the points in which the treatise confirms or corrects our previous knowledge. The only slips I have observed are on ii p. 1068*b*, where we are told that the ἐπιμελητῆς τῶν ὑδάτων is mentioned in Ἀθ. πολ. c. 43, whereas the title there is ὁ τῶν κρηνῶν ἐπιμελητῆς. It is added that this ἐπιμελητῆς is apparently not mentioned elsewhere, though, as a matter of fact, κρηνῶν ἐπιμεληταί are mentioned by Aristotle in the *Politics*, 1321*b* 26, in a passage where Athens is doubtless in the author's mind, though not expressly named. Again, on p. 1070*a*, it is suggested that the law referred to at the end of c. 16 originally ran as fol-

lows: ἐάν τις ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἐπανιστῆται ἢ συγκαθίστη τὴν τυραννίδα, ἄτιμον εἶναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος. It is then added that 'probably in the Ἀθ. πολ.' (presumably the passage as above restored) 'the word τυραννεῖν was written above ἐπὶ τυραννίδι and a copyist inserted the phrase lower down in the text.' This apparently means that τυραννεῖν displaced ἐπὶ τυραννίδι and the latter was thereupon transferred to the next clause, thus accounting for the order of the words in the MS., τυραννεῖν in the first clause being followed by ἐπὶ τυραννίδι after ἢ in the second; but the suggestion might perhaps have been expressed with greater clearness.

These however are but trifling flaws in a work on which a vast amount of learning and labour has been lavished by some of the ablest scholars in the United Kingdom. The price of the work in its present form necessarily puts it out of the reach of many students; but it will be duly valued by scholars both at home and abroad. Its high standard of general excellence can hardly fail to ensure its finding the place which it amply deserves in every reference-library in the United Kingdom and across the Atlantic; while, on the continent, it will no longer be possible (even accidentally) to ignore its existence in future editions of the *Bibliographie der klassischen Wissenschaft*, the publication of which has laid scholars throughout the world under a new obligation to Professor Emil Hübner.

J. E. SANDYS.

Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem. Cum Iulii Paridis et Iulii Nepotiani Epitomis. Iterum recensuit CAROLUS KEMPF. Leipzig: Teubner. 1888.

In the thirty-four years which have intervened between the first recension of the text by Dr. Kempf and this, his latest work, one finds comparatively few contributions to the study of Valerius Maximus. The one brilliant exception is, of course, the edition by Halm; but, this apart, there is little that is worth recalling. A few somewhat speculative suggestions by Elschen, Gelbcke, and by Kempf himself, and some emendations of the Paridian epitome by Du Rieu, are really all that any one will readily remember. Hence, in taking up the present volume, it is with the work of Halm alone that we most naturally compare it, with an interested recollection of the very pungent criticism that Kempf's earlier recension called forth from the by no means unwilling pen of the rival editor.

Halm's introduction to the text was in fact not more noteworthy for the learning and felicitous acuteness of some of his conjectures than for the very summary though courteous exploitation of the shortcomings of the earlier edition, of which, it will be remembered, he marshalled a formidable list, some

indeed—particularly those involving errors of transcription and orthography—being sufficiently obvious to have attracted the attention of a much less practised eye; and it cannot be said that Halm passed them over with a particularly gentle touch. Therefore, perhaps the most interesting feature of Kempf's final recension, and one that all who remember the controversy of 1865 will turn to with the greatest curiosity, is his reply to the strictures of Halm, now answered after that scholar's death and after the lapse of more than twenty years.

That the reply should be temperate and kindly in its tone was a thing to be expected, both from the circumstances of the case and because the old *furor grammaticus* that raged so merrily from Salmassius to Nauck has now gone out of fashion. What one might perhaps less confidently have looked for, is the very free and frank confession of the errors both of commission and omission in his former edition—errors for which he asks indulgence because due to lack of experience in manuscript collation. Students of Valerius Maximus would probably find it easy to overlook much greater slips than those for which their leniency is invoked, remembering as they do the peculiar difficulties presented by the Bern manuscript, with its numerous and exasperating erasures, its com-

plex and inconsistent corrections by the three later scribes, and the other interpolations of uncertain date and authorship. The reviser of the text, however cautious he may be, can scarcely expect to escape the animadversion of his successors. It is thus that Kempf retaliates upon Halm with an attack that is of the true *tu quoque* sort. Halm had spent much time in Bern in careful study of the codex; his friend Wilmanns had personally made for him a list of readings from the Vatican MS.; yet notwithstanding all this care, Kempf, who has been allowed to borrow the Swiss codex, finds it an easy matter to show instances of oversight on the part of Halm no less obvious, though much less numerous, than those which exposed his own recension to criticism. Some of the corrections in the present edition are worth mentioning, e.g. in the passage i. 6. 2, where Kempf's old reading from the Bern codex (*concionante seivunxit*) was overlooked by Halm, who noted **clu*il*, conjecturing *cluxit*, which Kempf himself has now accepted; in iv. 7. ext. 1, where Halm had, apparently in despair, adopted the conjecture of Foertsch, *et hora a Dionysio constituta veniam qui acceperat supervenit*, but where Kempf now establishes Madvig's reading *et eam qui acceperat supervenit*, i.e. *et hora supervenit et eam qui acceperat*, though for convenience of reading this is hardly as good as that of C.B. Hase, *qui eam acceperat*; and in vi. 7. 3, in which Halm incorrectly read *prosequetur*, noting *sequetur* from B, but ignoring the *persequetur* of Kempf, which is from the *persequetur* of the Bern codex (the first hand).

On the whole, however, it cannot be truly said that the corrections and additions to the work of Halm are sufficient to impair the authority of the text that scholars have now been using for two decades; and it is perhaps not too much to say that some of Kempf's alterations in his own former readings are distinctly no improvement, substituting as they occasionally do an unintelligible for a quite intelligible lection. A good instance of this is afforded by the much disputed passage (v. 3. ext. 3) which Kempf in his recension of 1854 gave in the body of the text as doubtful, but cleverly suggested the reading *vix vitalis vita hominum* from Cic. *Lael.* 6. 22 *cui potest esse vita vitalis* etc., without, however, clearing up the difficulty involved in the following *exeret*, for which, it may be remarked, the Torrenian edition reads *exstat*. Halm's admirable remarks on this passage (Praef. xvi.) amounted, it may be remembered, to a demonstration, proving beyond question that the *hominum extar extollit* cited by Kempf from the Vienna codex was a pure misreading of *hominum extar et tollit* i.e. *hominum exstaret* (= *esset*). In the present edition, Kempf alters his own text, if anything, for the worse, and clearly sins against logic in permitting such an impossible reading to stand as *beneficii commercium sine quo vix vita hominum exeret tollit*, which he himself marks with an asterisk. At times he has allowed the most unsatisfactory of his former readings to stand such as *itaque qui amara suggillatione* of vi. 9. 12; while the best of the corrections noticeable in the new text are really those of Halm, e.g. *catenatae cervicis totius tunc fori ora clausurunt* vi. 2. 3), or of Madvig, who furnishes what is perhaps the best of all the emendations, in the well-known passage over which so many editors have given way to despair (vii. 2. ext. 10), but which is now made beautifully simple by the reading *a caritate istud pater, ab usu Philippus*, etc., in place of Halm's *avus o Philippus*, as given by the Vienna codex.

H. T. PECK.

Columbia College.

D. Junii Juvenalis Satira Septima. Texte Latin, publié avec un Commentaire critique, explicatif, et historique, par J. A. HILD, Professeur à la faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. Paris, Klincksieck, 1890. 3 fros.

A gracefully written exposition, which, although offering and professing to offer little that is new, will be found useful to students and attractive to literary readers. The editor has grappled conscientiously with the difficulties of the text, and intersperses very sensible remarks on the weakness of the composition, which he justly regards as inferior to that of several other of Juvenal's pieces. One error should be mentioned. On pages 30 and 32 the *Lectioes Ausonianae* are attributed to Julius Caesar (J. C. and C.) Scaliger insted of to Joseph Justus.

H. N.

De Apulei Quae fertur Physiognomia recensenda et emendenda. Scripsit RICHARDUS FOERSTER. Leipzig, 1887. 1 Mk. 20.

THIS essay (thirty pages in length) is reprinted separately from the supplement to Jahn's *Jahrbücher*. Foerster begins by denying, quite rightly, that the *Physiognomia* edited by Valentine Rose can be the work of Apuleius of Madaura. The Latin style alone is sufficient to put this hypothesis out of court. He proceeds to discuss afresh the relations of the existing manuscripts to their lost archetype, and then gives a series of emendations, based partly on the Greek of Adamantius, partly on independent conjecture. A considerable number of these will probably be accepted. The following are suggested as possible improvements. Apuleius p. 117 l *pupillae oculorum iaciantes et porrectae vanitatem delegunt*. *Iaciantes* cannot be right, as some word is wanted corresponding to *εὐπρύς* in the Greek, and Foerster therefore proposes *late patentes*. Perhaps *lâtescentes*. P. 122 8 *niger* (so Foerster rightly for *sinister*) *circulus si fuerit rubrus in univdis oculis.....magnum hominem et sapientem.....declarat, iuxta pueros*. Foerster proposes in *pueros dementem*. But *iuxta* in this Latin may mean 'with regard to.' Ti. Donatus on *Aen.* 4. 371 *tanta mala iuxta me commissa sunt*: ib. *Aen.* 5. 6 *aliquid mali.....iuxta salutem Didonis esse commissum*: Faustus Reiensis *Epist.* p. 6 *iuxta substantiam Dei.....scriptum*. The true correction may perhaps be *iuxta pueros* [*furiosum*]: or, if *iuxta* be an adverb, *iuxta puerorum, puerorum* being formed on the analogy of *virosus* and *multi-erosus*.

H. N.

The Evagoras of Isocrates, with an introduction and notes by HENRY CLARKE, M.A. Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 2s. 6d.

THE notes in this edition are sufficiently full, and instructive and profitable both with regard to the language and subject-matter. It may be regretted that no notes are given to the *ῥῶθεσις*, an interesting piece of ancient literary criticism, possessing some interest and demanding some explanation. I note but few and unimportant omissions in the notes on the text. To the note on *κινδύνων* in § 2 might be added a reference to § 65. On § 7 (*ὑπερβάλλῃ*) add reference for the active to § 13, for the middle to § 41. On the same section it might be noted that the agent with *δουλευτέον* is expressed in the accus. rather than the dative because the dative might be mistaken for the indirect object after *δουλευτέον*. (Similarly in the passage xvii. 56 cited in the note on § 75 we have the accusative *μεμνημένους* rather than the genitive, to avoid collision with the genitive *τούτων* that follows it.) On § 8 a reference should be given to Dr.

H H