

# 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](#)



---

## Haverfield's Revision of Conington's Virgil, Vol. I *Conington's Virgil*. Vol. I. Eclogues and Georgics, Fifth Edition, revised by F. Haverfield, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford; London, George Bell and Sons. 1898. 10s. 6d.

T. E. Page

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 06 / July 1898, pp 306 - 312  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032637, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00032637](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032637)

### How to cite this article:

T. E. Page (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 306-312 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032637

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

be that great power, provided that "doing as one chooses" is accompanied by "doing as is advantageous" is both a good thing—and this is, as it seems, "great power": but, if this condition is absent, great power

appears to be a bad thing and to signify little.' This rendering is quite different from those given by Thompson, Stallbaum, Deuschle-Cron and others.

E. C. MARCHANT.

### HAVERFIELD'S REVISION OF CONINGTON'S VIRGIL, VOL. I.

*Conington's Virgil.* Vol. I. *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Fifth Edition, revised by F. HAVERFIELD, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford; London, George Bell and Sons. 1898. 10s. 6d.

THE first volume of Conington's *Virgil*, which had previously been re-edited by Prof. Nettleship, now appears in a fifth edition, which has been entrusted to the care of another Oxford scholar, Mr. F. Haverfield. The three names which thus appear upon the title-page suggest some natural regrets, but the succession of editors, though rapid, is a worthy one—*uno avulso non deficit alter aureus*—and long may the University preserve the 'golden' chain of Virgilian critics undeteriorated and unbroken.

The appearance of this volume must also be hailed with satisfaction not only as a proof of the permanent value of Conington's work but also because the demand for its publication seems to show that the *Georgics*—'the best poem of the best poet,' as Dryden calls them—do still find students, in spite of the efforts of schoolmasters and examiners to relegate them to obscurity in favour of the *Aeneid*. Doubtless the imaginative power of the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* and the splendid rhetoric of the Fourth are unsurpassed, but elsewhere in *Virgil* there is nothing which can rival the *Georgics*. Written at the average rate of one line a day they represent the most perfect artistic work of the greatest artist in words whom the world has ever seen. They deserve, but in comparison with the *Aeneid* have not received, the most careful criticism, so that the appearance of a new edition of what will be for long the standard English authority about them seems a fitting occasion to draw attention to certain points in which Conington's judgment may reasonably be questioned and this edition improved. There is all the more cause for doing so since, when an edition has secured general acceptance by its merits, there is a

strong tendency to elevate it into a sort of 'canonical' book and—as I have often experienced personally—to treat any dissent from its conclusions as a sign of presumption and almost heresy. To the classical student, however, a contented acquiescence in authority is fatal, and it is far better to err greatly than to accept blindly. Nor probably would any man have been more indisposed to consider his own judgment as final than Conington himself, and indeed, even where the grounds for a decision appear clear and cogent, he often seems to shrink too sensitively from expressing a definite opinion, for fear lest he should pre-judge a case on which the last word has not yet been spoken. Criticism moreover on a writer so subtle, so suggestive, and often so ambiguous, as Virgil cannot in every case hope to obtain finality, nor can any commentator hope to avoid mistakes which a fresh, though less competent critic, may be able to emend. It happens, too, that my own school edition of the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* synchronizes with the publication of Mr. Haverfield's more important volume, but as my own work will not naturally come before scholars a notice of the latter in the *Classical Review* seems a fitting opportunity for referring to those points in which Mr. Conington's opinion seems, either to Mr. Haverfield or myself, to need correction.

Before, however examining these points in detail it ought to be said generally that Mr. Haverfield's very delicate task of revision has been excellently performed and with a degree of self-effacement which, while it greatly adds to the convenience of the reader, should not make him overlook the labour and learning which are required to produce a result at once so simple, accurate and clear. By breaking up the original notes into short paragraphs he has much improved their lucidity, to which also a much improved type greatly contributes, while throughout he has made a great number of short additions of his own on

special points, which are of high value. The following instances will illustrate their character:

Grammatical—

*E.* 1, 18 *qui deus*; 1, 67 *en unquam*; 3, 21 *non redderet*?; 4, 62 *rideo* with dat.; 5, 66 *ecce* with acc.; 8, 102 *rivo* = *in rivum*; 9, 53 *oblitus* passive; 10, 12 *ullus* = *ullo modo*; *G.* 1, 203 *atque*; 1, 263 use of perf. *impressit*; 3, 258 the *dativus energicus* (a new terror!); 3, 384 *primum* with no *deinde* or other particle to follow; 4, 117 *ni traham...canerem*; 4, 159 *saepta domorum*.

On special words—

*E.* 7, 33 *sinum*; *G.* 1, 14 *cultor*; 1, 93 *penetrabilis*; 1, 247 *intempesta nox* (an admirable note); 1, 360 *carinae*; 1, 470 *obscenus, importunus*; 1, 498 *Indigetes*; 2, 104 *neque enim* = 'nor indeed'; 2, 364 *immitto*; 2, 403 *olim cum*; 3, 12 *palma* = 'victory'; 3, 560 *abolere*; 4, 443 *pellacia*; 4, 445 *nam quis*?

Orthography—

*E.* 3, 84 *Pollio*; 4, 229 *thensaurus*; 4, 243 *stelio*.

Botanical, Historical, &c.—

*E.* 2, 18 *vaccinium*; *G.* 4, 271 *amellus*; 3, 338 *alcyon*; 4, 307 *hirundo*; 4, 511 the nightingale; 13, 25–33; 3, 31–33 not *ex post facto*; 3, 38 *Ixionis angues*; 4, 48 burnt crabs; 2, 161 the Lucrine harbour; 2, 171 Octavian in the East; 2, 479 earthquakes producing earthquake waves in Italy.

His chief defect is too great tenderness in dealing with the notes added by Nettleship and the incorporation of fresh *Marginalia* from the same hand. These, as is well known, largely deal with rather minute textual and orthographical questions so that for non-technical students they often rather mar the effect of the commentary. Not one person in a thousand who reads Virgil cares at all how the MSS. spell *sed*, *haud*, and *obliquus* while, when a note on the orthography of *formosus* occurs eleven times within the first seven *Eclogues*, the feeling aroused is almost indignation. Such notes have their value, but their place is not in the commentary on an incomparable poem. They ought to be omitted or relegated to an Appendix, and then room might be found for some much-needed notes on some of the marvellous merits of the *Georgics*. True, the student ought to find these out for

himself, and it might be called impertinence in an editor to draw attention to them, but the plain fact is that they usually elude the observation of the general reader and often are but imperfectly grasped even by scholars. Two illustrations must suffice. The first is Virgil's use of *personification*—the art by which he gives feeling and personality to every creature, animate or inanimate, which he describes, not merely to bees and cattle but to plants and shrubs, even to wines, as a careful study of the wonderful passage *G.* 2, 88–109 will show. The second is his astounding mastery over metre, which in the first *Georgic* may be illustrated by a greater number of passages than can be quoted from any Latin poem of twice or four times the length, although the average reader is only dimly conscious of the existence of half of them while only devoted study can reveal the fulness of their perfect art.

Appended are notes on some of the passages in which Conington seems to his editors or myself to need alteration or amplification. Even put most tersely they run to some length, but the interest of the subject is sufficient excuse. Conington is referred to as C., Nettleship as N., and Haverfield as H.

*E.* 1, 46. *ergo tua rura manebunt*. *Ergo* here—*admirationis cum maerore coniunctae exclamatio*, Orelli—needs illustration from Hor. *Od.* 1, 24, 5 *ergo Quintilium...*, and S. 2, 5, 101 *ergo nunc Dama sodalis nusquam est*. In the next line C.'s description of Virgil's farm as 'covered with stones' quite misrepresents *lapis nudus* = 'bare rock' which crops up and 'overspreads' (*obducat*) the pastures.

1, 65. H. rightly reads, and well explains, *cretae* (not *Cretae*) *rapidum*; but line 67 the purposely disjointed character of the shepherd's broken utterance demands notice; it is quite in Virgil's way cf. 3, 93; 9, 2.

1, 71. H. makes *barbarus* and *impius* excellently clear.

2, 18. *ligustra* 'privet.' So C., but surely Martyn's 'white convolvulus' or 'bindweed' (cf. *ligo*) fits sense and derivation better.

2, 28. *tantum libeat tecum mihi sordida rura...* H. rightly quotes Martial, but should do so more fully, and refer to Friedlander on 1, 49, 27 for *sordida* in a distinctly good sense.

2, 30. *viridi compellere hibisco* i.e. *ad viride hibiscum* C. But C.'s quotation 'Hor. *Od.* 1, 24, 18 *quam...nigro compulerit Mer-*

*curius gregi* is fallacious, for (1) surely the use of the dat. after *compello* when it describes driving an individual to join a flock is entirely different from its use when it describes driving the flock to the particular thing on which it feeds, and (2) the omission of the words *virga aurea* vitiates the quotation altogether, for they afford an exact parallel to *viridi hibisco*, if we render with 'a green switch of *hibiscum*,' and 10, 71 shows that the plant was used for making baskets and therefore might furnish a switch.

2, 47-50. It should be noted that there are probably *two* bouquets; the first is of flowers of contrasted hue mixed with scented plants, and the second, described in inverse order, of scented herbs and contrasted flowers. In 50 the difficult epithet *molliā* applied to *vaccinia* needs a note; surely Wagner's *quae coloris teneritate sensum mollior afficit* is right.

3, 79, 80. All discussion of these difficult lines is practically wanting in C.

4, 4. The note on *Cumaei carminis* is excellently re-written by H.

4, 11. *decus hoc aevi*. H. rightly notes 'may mean "This glory of the age"', as it certainly does. C. gives 'this glorious age,' comparing Lucr. 2 16 *hoc aevi quodcunque est*, which is not parallel, *aevi* depending on *quodcunque*.

6, 2. Delete the full-stop after *Thalia*. The sentence is 'At first my Muse was pastoral..., (but) when I began to sing of kings etc.'

6, 33. H. with H. N. gives *his exordia primis*, but would Virgil use this rare device twice in a few lines (cf. 19 *ipsis ex vincula sertis*), with such a rare word as *ordia*, and where confusion with *exordia* was certain?

6, 34. *omnia et ipse tener mundi concreverit orbis*. C. accepts Munro's 'elastic globe of ether,' but *omnia et ipse* = *τά τε ἅλλα πάντα καί*, and the earth is the only truly central object which can be contrasted with 'all other things.' Again *concreverit* better describes the formation of a central mass than of an unsubstantial enveloping ether. Again *tener orbis* naturally leads up to *tum durare solum*.

6, 70. *Aspice seni*. H. rightly takes *seni*, not of antiquity as C. does, but of 'the venerable old age...generally associated with poets.'

8, 38-42. Macaulay's famous praise of these lines (*Life and Letters*, 1, 371) should be quoted in any edition.

9, 3. H. has an excellent note on *possessor*

'a word associated with violence,' e.g. *Sullani possessores*.

9, 25. H. with H. N. reads *antesinistra*, a *ἄπ. λέγ.*, on the authority of Servius. 'Learned' poets no doubt like technical terms, but they use them with judgment, and a word so hideous as this is impossible. It is not criticism but eccentricity to split *exordia* into two and join *ante sinistra* into one word.

9, 23. *dum redeo*. H. rightly renders 'until,' this usage being certain.

G. 1, 4. H., with H. N., rightly refuses to follow C.'s identification of *lumina* with Liber and Ceres.

1, 20. *et teneram ab radice ferens, Silvane, cupressum*. C. writes '*ab radice* with *ferens*, condensed, as Cat. 64, 288 *tulit radicitus*.' This is to me without meaning, and when I turn to Ellis on Catullus I am equally mystified. He writes 'in Virgil however *ab radice* seems to be "from the root upwards," whereas *radicitus* is rather "torn from the roots": in other words *tulit radicitus* is the more pregnant expression.' Surely the god of forestry is carrying a 'young cypress' taken up from the roots, i.e. so as to bring the roots away with it, in order that he may transplant it. It is the sign of his work, which certainly was not to pluck young trees from their roots!

1, 28. *venias*. H. rightly 'thou comest,' not as C. 'become'; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1, 2, 30 *venias precamur...Apollo*. This use of *venio* is pictorial and illustrates its use in Aen. 5, 344 *gratior et pulchro veniens in corpore virtus* and 5, 373 *qui se | Bebrycia veniens Amyci de gente ferebat* (cf. 5, 400), where editors raise needless difficulties.

1, 36. The use of *nam* needs a note. After mentioning earth, sea, and sky, Virgil says '(I do not mention the fourth division of the universe) for hell etc.,' but this usage is not always clear, and in 1, 77 C. in consequence quite misses the point. There on *urit enim lini*...he writes 'The general sense is that the same crop invariably repeated, will exhaust the soil etc.' This is wrong, for every one knows that the same crop cannot be repeated invariably, and the whole paragraph is on 'alternation' or change, which land *must* have and may get (1) by the costly method of fallowing (2) by rotation of crops, e.g. by following wheat with vetches and lupine (but not with flax, oats, etc.) 'for flax and oats exhaust the soil,' though, Virgil adds, even these crops may be planted if you do not stint manure. The whole passage is strictly coherent and absolutely clear.

1, 80. *ne saturare fimo pingui pudeat sola, neve.* The rugged rhythm of this rude precept needs to be noted.

1, 104-117. This disputed passage needs clearer treatment. The great point to notice is that it is in two accurately balanced halves of seven lines each, one beginning with *quid dicam...qui* the other with *quid qui*, one describing irrigation of light dry soil, the other draining of a rich wet one. This is certain, and therefore Mr. Long's view (quoted by C.) that *male pinguis harenae* in the first half is = 'too stiff soil' is hopeless, while in the second half *bibula deducere harena* is almost necessarily = 'drain by the use of sand which drinks up the water,' the reference being to *closed* drains (= our 'sub-soil drains'), made by digging a trench, half filling it with sand, gravel, &c., and then filling it in, as described in Columella 2, 2, 10 and Theophrastus, *C.P.* 3, 7.

1, 106. *rivosque sequentes.* H. with H.N. reads *recentes* against all authority and in defiance of Homer where cf. *ὄχεργός* and *ἡγεμονεύει*, while the pursuing water at last 'outruns its guide' (*φθάσει δὲ τὲ καὶ τὸν ἄγοντα*). A worse alteration was never made.

1, 169 *seq.* Much in C's description of a plough needs revision. The common drawing of a plough as given in Smith's *Dict. of Ant.* is from Martyn and so, I suppose, 150 years old. It sadly needs amendment and causes needless difficulties, e.g. what does C. mean by 'The plural *dentalia* is used by this poet (Virgil), but it is probably nothing more than a poetic license'? *Dentalia* is plural because the word describes two pieces of wood fastened on each side of the *buris* and holding the *dens* at the point of convergence, while at the other end they pass into the *aures*, together with which they form a *duplex dorsum* exactly as described by Virgil. A handy classical friend rigged me up a little model which showed them admirably.

1, 206. *vectis* = 'voyaging' 'while sailing.' C.'s difficulty as to the use of the past part. in a present sense is imaginary. Four similar instances occur in this Book, 293, 339, 442, 494. H. adds a note which shows this, but leaves C.'s comment, causing some confusion.

1, 243. *sub pedibus* = 'beneath our feet,' opposed to *nobis sublimis* 'above our head.' C. writes '*sub pedibus* is to be connected with *videt*, the feet being those of Styx and the Manes; but *videt* is not to be pressed, &c.' Anyone who tries to realize these ghosts looking at a pole beneath their feet

will see how impossible it is. What, too, about the feet of Styx?

1, 277. H. on *Orcus* = "Ὀρκος is excellent.

1, 281-283. C. has a vague note on 'Greek rhythm,' but the rhythm of these three lines deserves most careful study. The double hiatus between *i* and *i*, *o* and *o* in the first is startling and in marked contrast with the triple caesura in the second. The first line—which must be read slowly—marks slow upheaval, the second ponderous settlement of mountain upon mountain, and then comes the miraculous third line—*Ter Pater extractos deiecit fulmine montes.* First the long gigantic effort then the consummate ease with which it is reduced to nothing could not be better expressed. Yet among all the comments on Virgil has anyone ever seen this third line noticed? I never did, and yet I think Virgil must have been very proud of it.

1, 299. *nudus ara*, 'without the upper garment,' C. and all editors. But if so, why did the wags in Virgil's time scoff at the line? No one could laugh at you for telling a ploughboy to take off his jacket, but they could if you told him to 'strip.' Is not Virgil thinking of a ploughman wearing only the *cinctus*? Cf. *cinctuti Cethegi* Hor. *A.P.* 50 = *nudi Cethegi* Lucan 6, 704.

1, 322. Much cleared up in H.

1, 356. *continuo, ventis surgentibus, aut freta ponti.* H. gives *continuo* = 'immediately, in quick succession,' and suggests that it might be = *αὐτίκα* 'for example.' The meaning is clear. *Continuo* goes closely with *v. surgentibus* 'the moment the winds begin to rise'; cf. 169 *continuo in silvis* 'while still in the woods'; 3, 271 *continuoque ubi* 'from the moment when,' and above all 4, 254 *continuo est aegris* 'from the moment when they sicken,' where Virgil is describing the first symptom of disease as here the first sign of wind.

1, 362. *densis alis.* 'looks like a mistranslation of *τιναξάμενοι πτέρω πυκρά*,' C. I cannot easily believe in the 'mistranslation.' Surely Virgil deliberately alters Aratus to a phrase which fits in with the *military* words *agmine magno* and *exercitus*.

1, 467. H. has a most interesting note to show that there was no solar eclipse in B.C. 44.

1, 500. *iuvenem* = Augustus. H. has a good note; the use of the word by both Horace and Virgil is too marked to be accidental. The emperor clearly liked it.

1, 513. H. with H.N. reads *addunt in spatium* and says 'The Berne scholia explain thus: *propria vox circi, equi enim cursus*

*spatio addere dicuntur.* I cannot understand text or comment.

2, 47. H. has *se tollunt in luminis auras*. Surely this merely irritating alteration of a well-known Lucretian phrase is inadmissible.

2, 53. *sterilis, quae stirpibus exit ab imis*. Remove the comma after *sterilis*. The shoot is not 'barren' in itself, but even when overshadowed makes efforts to produce something (line 56). It 'springs barren from the bottom of the trunk' because wanting light and air; plant it out and it will show that it is not barren.

2, 62. *cogendae in sulcum*. C. 'drilled into trenches,' comparing *cogere in ordinem*, but that = 'reduce to the ranks.' *Cogendae* is not used in a military sense here, but marks the strong effort needed, cf. *labor* preceding and *domandae* following.

2, 93. *tenusque Lageos*. Certainly not 'a thin light wine' as C., but, as Servius, *penetrabilis quae cito in venas descendit*. A wine which will 'presently try your legs' is not a 'thin light wine.' Perhaps = 'subtle'; it looks light and tastes mild, but beware!

2, 123. *aera vincere summum arboris*. C.'s explanation is perplexing. Is not *aer summus arboris* simply = *summa aëria arbor* 'the heaven-towering tree-top,' which the archer 'conquers' by shooting over it?

2, 187. *huc summis liquuntur rupibus amnes*. 'The sentence gives the reason for the moisture of the land so placed,' C. No, but it gives the reason for its fertility. There is moisture but not stagnation and the rivers bring with them 'fertilising mud.'

2, 192. H. rightly refers to Prof. Robinson Ellis in Cat. 39, 11, for the 'fat Etruscan.'

2, 247. *at sapor indicium faciet, manifestus et ora*.

*tristia temptantum sensu torquebit amaro*

Editors discuss at length the readings *amaro* and *amaror*, but the real interest of the passage is in the imitative character of the second line. Especially if *temptantum* be pronounced strongly, the line clearly mimics the action of a person who has tasted something which he wishes to spit out. Many, of course, will call such a view fanciful, but the occurrence of such a line in a writer with such a sensitive ear as Virgil cannot be accidental. Unfortunately Hyginus discovered *amaror*, and so Virgil's comic line became merely a subject for critical controversy.

C. says '*manifestus* seems plainly to go with *faciet*.' Yet surely it is not the clearness of the taste which Virgil wishes to

bring out, but the clearness of the visible effect on the taster. The comma should undoubtedly be after *faciet*.

2, 279. H. rather boldly doubts whether the arrangement of vines like an army is the arrangement in *quincuncem*, chiefly because 'the exact nature of the manipular system is disputed,' and 'it had certainly vanished before Virgil's time.' Yet Virgil must have had the *quincunx* before his mind, for he clearly has Varro i. chapter 7 before him, as he gives exactly the same reasons for his arrangement as Varro does for the arrangement in *quincuncem*, viz. (1) symmetry, and (2) that it affords the maximum of light and space. As a matter of fact, too, the *quincunx* arrangement is the one which will give each plant most room, as a mathematician demonstrated to me with a number of pennies. Quintilian too refers to the *quincunx* arrangement as combining the greatest beauty with the greatest economy of space.

2, 302 seq. C. explains *insere* = *intersere*, though *interserere* occurs three lines previously and *inserere* in this Book is regularly = 'engraft.' But the error of his view is shown in 312, where he has '*non a stirpe valent sc. vites*,' for the vines are strong from the root and might shoot again, but, if you engraft the olive on the oleaster, the olive after a fire, being burned below the graft, cannot shoot again. For *caesae* . . ., cf. Job xiv. 7.

2, 341. H. rightly reads and supports *terrea*.

2, 350. *halitus*. C. 'probably from the evaporation of the water.' Rather *halitus* is used strictly = 'breath': the plant gets nourishment from the water; then begins to breathe; then 'plucks up spirit' (*animos tollent*).

2, 362. *parcendum teneris*. 'Deal gently with the young.' Surely the 'personification' here and in numberless instances deserves notice.

2, 389. *oscilla mollia*. H. explains 'made of wax or wool.'

2, 499. C.'s remarks, as though the rustic who does not 'pity the poor' showed 'selfish indifference,' are needless. He does not pity the poor simply because there are no poor to pity, as there are no rich to envy.

3, 70. *semper enim refice*. C. has '*Enim* here seems to be added for emphasis. The words are to be connected with what follows.' This is wrong, as is the remark of Servius that *enim* here has no force, and that of Pierius that it is = *itaque* ('for' = 'therefore'!). 'You will always be needing

to change some of your herd,' says Virgil, 'for (*i.e.* because) continual renewal is essential to prevent degeneration in a herd.' Instead of writing *semper enim reficienda sunt corpora matrum*, he writes vigorously *semper enim refice*.

3, 76. *et mollia crura reponit*. C. writes 'The meaning of *reponit* is very doubtful.' H. strikes out 'very,' but the meaning is not doubtful at all. The colt picks up his feet clean, and puts them down as though he would not bruise a daisy. C.'s own explanation at the end of his note is right.

3, 82. *color deterrimus albis*. Has any one seen a white race-horse of repute? The 'white horses' of Homer are surely white as being divine, and literary tradition then kept up the phrase 'with white horses' = 'at utmost speed,' in defiance of fact.

3, 82. *duplex spina*. See Liddell and Scott *s.v.* ὀσφύς.

3, 140. *non illas* needs its force bringing out more clearly.

3, 141. *salto superare viam*—'to be taken with what follows of clearing, *i.e.* leaping out of the road.' This is unintelligible to me. What is to 'clear, *i.e.* leap out of the road'? Surely the phrase is simply = 'gallop' or 'canter' along a road.' Either to ride a mare in foal fast along a road or let it get excited and gallop in the fields is bad.

3, 193. *sitque laboranti similis*. 'So Hor. *Od.* 2, 3, 11, *obliquo laborat lympba fugax trepidare rivo*, the stream being forced to bend, like the horse here,' C. Surely *laboranti* is not in the least = 'forced to bend,' but describes the horse 'chafing' 'struggling to get his head.' It ought carefully to be brought out in this elaborate passage that the comparison is not merely between the horse and the North Wind, but between the horse first walking soberly, then breaking into faster movement, and finally into a furious gallop, and the N. wind rising by similar steps into a tornado. The whole passage is worked out with the utmost care. Like many other passages in Virgil it needs explaining simply. Unfortunately if an Editor writes a clear and simple note every one says 'Oh, that is as plain as a pikestaff,' and the true road to reputation is learned obscurity.

3, 217. *dulcibus illa quidem illecebris*. C. gives '*illa quidem* having the force of *quamvis*, "she wastes them away, though with a tender passion."' The use of *ille quidem* practically = *quamvis* is well known, but surely here it is a strengthened form of *ille* pleonastic, used to draw marked attention

to the subject—'she does not allow them to remember groves or pastures as she stands, look you! in her sweet witchery.' The sight of groves and pastures is alluring, but when they look at her it is forgotten. Cf. l. 500 *sudor, et ille quidem moriturus frigidus* 'sweat, aye and, mark you, when death approaches a cold sweat,' where C. says 'compare 217' but the explanation of *ille quidem* = *quamvis* cannot hold.

3, 267. *saxa per et scopulos et depressas convalles*. Professor Robinson Ellis on Cat. 65, 23, says that 'the interruption of the dactylic movement by a spondaic rhythm expresses a sudden check.... The rapid flight is arrested, and after a time becomes slower.' Surely this is not so here. The opening dactyls express the leaps and bounds of the animals over 'boulders and rocks,' the balanced spondee of *depressas convalles* mark their smooth even gallop along the valley. Conington seems to agree in this view.

3, 400–403. Notes on cheese admirably re-written by H.

3, 518. Sellar's admirable illustration of *fraterna morte* from Georges Sand must be inserted in every comment. It is worth sheets of ordinary notes.

4, 39. *fuco et floribus*. H. rightly not 'pollen' but 'propolis'; an important point.

4, 74. *spiculae exacuant rostris*. Must be 'sharpen their stings with' or 'against their beaks.' This is of course inaccurate, but H. notes Sidgwick's remark that bees rubbing their bodies with their legs to remove dirt may be the origin of the error. The same suggestion was made to me independently by a scientific friend to whom I applied.

4, 85. *usque adeo obnixi non cedere, dum gravis aut hos | aut hos versa fuga victor dare terga subegit*. C. notes "we might have expected *subegerit*, and Kennedy regards *subegit* as = *subegerit* by Syncope. No doubt where the sense of *purpose* is clear *dum* would be followed by a subjunctive, but *obnixus* does not describe purpose so much as the actual attitude of a warrior who plants his feet and will not budge (Livy, 6, 12, 8 *obnixos stabili gradu hostium impetum excipere*), and Virgil simply records the fact that the leaders do so hold their ground. So too H.

4, 86–87. *hi motus animorum*.... 'Here Virgil's humour breaks out, relieving what would otherwise be mere exaggeration,' C. The humour is obvious, but what about the pathos? Remembering what *pulveris exigui iactu* must suggest to a Roman ear (cf. Hor.

*Od.* 1, 28, 35 *iniecto ter pulvere*), and how Virgil, throughout the *Georgics*, loves to use phrases which may be taken first literally and secondly with a deeper human meaning, I cannot believe that he wrote these wonderful lines without some thought of the 'passions and rivalries' of human life, which are all laid to rest for ever 'with the flinging of a little dust.' True, Varro and Pliny prescribe this 'flinging of dust' with absolutely no secondary meaning, but they were not poets.

4, 2. H. rightly notes that Virgil is describing two sorts of bees, the common brown bee and the Ligurian.

4, 153. *consortia tecta | urbis habent* 'hold dwellings in common'; so H. also. C. had 'have dwellings united into a city.'

4, 170 *seq.* C. has a long note on the disputed point whether this famous comparison is an exaggeration. Of course it is; Virgil himself notes the fact line 176; it is exactly in his power to describe these tiny creatures in heroic verse that the poet finds his pleasure and pride. Is not Shakespeare's famous description of bees exaggeration? Is not 'the tent-royal of their emperor' an exaggerated phrase? Doubtless it is kind of Pope and Heyne (not Heine) to defend Virgil here, but their defence is not needed.

4, 227. *angustam*. It should be clearly shown that this reading and *ora fove* 230 stand or fall together. The reading *angustam....ore fave* ('Pour approcher de la demeure auguste des abeilles il faut s'être purifié et garder le silence,' Benoit) is so good that it cannot be neglected, and perhaps there is no passage in the classics where such slight textual alteration produces two such excellent readings. For myself I do not see much point in *angustam*, and prefer the humorous dignity of *angustam....ore fave*.

4, 244. *immunis*. 'The drones have not performed their *munus* of labour,' C. Surely the word is = *ἀσύνβολος*; the drones sat at a feast provided by others without 'paying their shot.'

4, 250. H. gives *foros* = 'passages,' probably rightly; not 'rows of cells' as C.

4, 337. *caeseriem effusae*. H. retains C.'s note on this construction, and adds H. N.'s note at the end of it. This is very confusing. Surely no one doubts the active (or middle) force of the participle in these cases; in an Appendix to my edition of *Aen.* 1-6 I collect the instances in those books, and when printed together they seem irresistible.

4, 455. H. rightly prints *ad meritum*. Nothing else will put this passage straight.

T. E. PAGE.

#### PAGE'S EDITION OF THE *BUCOLICS* AND *GEORGICS*.

*P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica*, with introduction and notes by T. E. PAGE, M.A. Macmillan (Classical Series), 1898. Pp. xl., 386. 5s.

MR. PAGE sets out to rescue the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* from the unmerited oblivion into which they have fallen at our public schools. The editor is worthy of the task, and the task itself is a worthy one, if it really be the fact that 'young students seem now to limit their reading of Virgil chiefly to the *Aeneid*, while his other writings are comparatively neglected.' There are indeed some who think that Virgil is too subtle, too fine, too difficult, to be of the slightest educational value to any but the very best sixth form boys: and personally I confess to believing that the best fate that could befall the poet himself and the public school boy, is that Virgil should be banished from our class-rooms for a century. But if he is to be read, then by all means let the *Georgics* be read at least as much as, if not more than, the *Aeneid*. For in them the poet writes always from his heart; and if his agriculture

is somewhat remote from our own (Mr. Page, by the way, takes occasion to point out that in one respect at least he was in advance of at all events the eighteenth century, p. xxxvii.), it is not more remote from reality than is his fighting: and if the school-boy learns any moral lesson at all from what he reads it is better that he should learn to admire the glory of labour than the tinsel of mock chivalry.

In the introduction Mr. Page gives an able and fairly concise appreciation of Virgil as a writer on the country, but I cannot help thinking that his 293 pages of notes are somewhat excessive in quantity. He most admirably illustrates Virgil from Virgil, but very often at extreme length, and while he seems to feel (alas, very rightly) that the average school-master will in all probability teach his boys too little, he himself is apt to try to teach them too much. The notes, too, are overburdened with translations, often of a most superfluous nature (e.g. '*rudentes* "bellowing" or "belling," '*caedunt* "slay," '*reges* "kings"'), which, from an educational point of view are simply