

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](#)



New Editions of Livy *Titi Livi* A.U.C. Libri: ed. pr. curavit Gul. Weissenborn, ed. alt. curavit Gul. Heraeus. Pars V., Fasc. 1, Lib. XXXIX. and XL. 8vo. Pp. xvi. + 112. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. 85 pf. stitched, or M. 1.25 cloth. *T. Livi* Periochae omnium librorum. Fragmenta Oxyrhynchi reperta. Iulii Obsequentis prodigiorum liber, ed. Otto Rossbach. Photo reprod. of portion of Papyr. Oxy. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. M. 2. 80 stitched; M. 3. 20 cloth.

W. C. F. Walters

The Classical Review / Volume 26 / Issue 03 / May 2012, pp 98 - 100
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00199779, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00199779

How to cite this article:

W. C. F. Walters (1912). The Classical Review, 26, pp 98-100 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00199779

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

perhaps be illustrated by Calp. iv. 139, where the term of life allotted to man *mortale* (*pensum*) is contrasted with the everlasting life of the gods (*perpetuo caelestia fila metallo*). The somewhat unfamiliar use of *mortali* would account for the change to *letali*. If the archetype had *letali* it is hard to see why *mortali* should have ousted that word.

He is doubtless right in adopting *Perdit* in Nem. iv. 22, for *Perdunt* of N, which implies a nom. sing. *spinum*. *Perdunt* may be a dittography from the preceding line and was in any case the more readily introduced because the two other verbs in the clause are plural.

In Calp. iv. 91 *fructificat* of G (N reads *frutificat*) is retained by an over-

sight, though Barth's conjecture *visurae*, which is adopted in the preceding line, requires *fructificant*.

For the most part Signor Giarratano confines himself to printing without note or comment what he considers best among the readings appearing in the MSS. or proposed by previous editors. His full statement of the authorities, however, and his judicious appraisal of their value, not only enable the student to judge the merit of the reading adopted in each case, but also furnish to him the necessary apparatus to work with should he be dissatisfied with the reading presented and wish himself to essay the task of emendation.

C. H. KEENE.

NEW EDITIONS OF LIVY.

Titī Livi A.U.C. Libri: ed. pr. curavit GUL. WEISSENBORN, ed. alt. curavit GUL. HERAEUS. Pars V., Fasc. 1, Lib. XXXIX. and XL. 8vo. Pp. xvi. + 112. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. 85 pf. stitched, or M. 1.25 cloth.

T. *Livi* Periochae omnium librorum. Fragmenta Oxyrhynchi reperta. Iulii Obsequentis prodigiorum liber, ed. OTTO ROSSBACH. Photo reprod. of portion of Papyr. Oxy. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910. M. 2. 80 stitched; M. 3. 20 cloth.

IN this edition of books XXXIX. and XL. Dr. Heraeus continues the revision of the Weissenbornian edition of Livy, where the late M. Mueller left off, yet the Praefatio Critica is relative to Madvig's text; why this is so I cannot say. Anyhow, the consequence is that the reader must not expect so much information about the text as is given by the late Anton Zingerle (whose review of this vol. appeared in the *Wochenschrift* of May 6 after his lamented death in December last); in fact, the Preface is often obscure without reference to Zingerle's or Drakenborch's edition. Placed too where it is, and printed in the usual consecutive way, it is difficult to use; moreover, it needs revision, having

several misprints¹ (e.g. on p. xi the note on c. 21. 11 comes after the note c. 22. 10; the figure xxxiv. should come before 2 one line higher) and a misstatement or two (e.g. the reading of Lov. 2 at XL. 12. 5 according to Zingerle and Drakenborch is *reliquum*, not *reliqui*); also space is often needlessly taken up with friendly notices of Novák's vain suggestions, while the note on XL. 55. 4 is intelligible only when one discovers through Zingerle that Heraeus is rejecting Novák's *rex*.

The general characteristic of the critical notes is, like Zingerle's, a preference for the cdd. recs., especially Lov. 2, Harl., and Mead. 1, and for

¹ Other misprints are these: P. iii, for Cap. III. 1 write Cap. III. 2; p. vi, insert 11 before *pecuniae*; p. vii, XLIII. should be XLII.; p. viii, XLVIII. 1 should be XLVIII. 2, and 9, 3 should be 9, 4; p. ix, for VI. 3 write VI. 4; at the bottom of p. xi, correct further by changing 49 to 4; and on the same page, in the note on c. 34. 14, K should be H; p. xiii, line 2, write *ib.* for 2; in the 3rd line, 2 for *ib.*; and in the 6th line, 4 for 3; and in the 7th, XLVI. for XLV. It would also be more convenient for use if pp. iv-viii were headed 'Lib. XXXIX.,' and pp. ix-xvi 'Lib. XL.,' instead of all being headed 'Libri XXXIX. et XL.' The hopeless passage in XL. 52, 5 and 6 is obelised, but is neither wholly Moguntine nor, as in Zingerle's text, wholly emended, nor is the Moguntine text given in the preface.

the 'traditional text' against the lost Moguntine codex and the Moguntine edition. With Zingerle Heraeus prefers — what is a dactylic clausula—*si mens sana fuisset* (XL. 6. 4) to *si mens sana esset*, and rejects Madvig's *depugnatum est* (Ib. 34. 9) for the surely impossible subjunctive *depugnasset*, but Heraeus gets rid of the ugly *Asiageni* at XXXIX. 44. 1 for *Asiatico*. In his own conjectures the editor becomes bolder as he proceeds, and though, as is usually the fate of conjectures, few are convincing, they are generally worth careful consideration: one of the best is the transference of *per* (XXXIX. 42. 9) from before *saepe* to before *lasciniam* where it is needed; convincing too is *Mesembriamque* (XL. 58. 8) for *meridianam regionem*.

Another characteristic is the condemnation of words as being non-Livian such as *amandarent* (XXXIX. 13. 6), of M against *ablegarent* of cdd. recc., but as we have less than a quarter of Livy's A.U.C. the argument does not seem strong unless supported by some other evidence such as is given in the interesting note on *fidiora*¹ (Praef. on XL. 3. 4). There are in the preface other valuable notes and use of Insc. and of other new evidence, but Heraeus is not quite right in saying that no one has noticed the parallelism between Liv. XXXIX. 26. 9 and Cic. *de Rep.* I. 66 *nimis meracam libertatem*; for Lewis and Short have done so under 'merus,' though indeed their rendering of Livy's *meram* by 'immoderate, excessive' scarcely suits even *nimis avide* for which it was perhaps intended.

The thoughts suggested in reading an able and learned edition like this are mainly two: (1) Is it not time for some one, instead of merely revising a Weissenbornian or Madvigian text and the conjectures unearthed from learned periodicals, to overhaul the Drakenborchian MSS. and examine others afresh? Zingerle did 'yeoman's service,' at least in this decade, by examining the edd. vett., but we want also the best at any rate of the cdd. recc. The indefatigable Luchs has left little to be

done in this respect for the 3rd decade; and Vattasso urged this for the 4th decade as I pointed out in my review of his Roman fragments.²

(2) Has due consideration been given to the possibility that some of the numerous verbal differences such as *confisus* and *fretus* (XXXIX. 51. 4), *inflatis* and *ferocibus* (Ib. 30. 5), *iactaret* and *uenditaret* (Ib. 43. 9) between M and the recc. or between M and B may be due either to Livy himself or such early and responsible editors as the Symmachi. At any rate, the style of the variants and those two notable examples *priorum* (XXXIV. 36. 6) and *ait* (Ib. 37. 5) for *iratorum* and *promuntiat* respectively in the Roman fragments suggest some such possibility, and that some of these variants have crept into M itself; this consideration makes me hesitate to accept Heraeus's excellent improvement *inuios montis*³ *Ballistae saltus* on Gltlbauer's brilliant emendation *Suis montii Ballistaeque saltus* (XL. 53. 1) of the Moguntine ed. *inuios montes uallesque saltus*, for *saltus* looks like a mere variant of *montes*, especially with the *-que* in that position.

Iulius Obsequens, whose 'Prodigia' from Livy is before me in the other volume under review, suggests too that *Caietae* and *Formis* at XL. 2. 4 are mere variants of a similar character, and that there is no lacuna, for I. O. has only *Caietae*. Obsequens has so far not proved fertile for Livian emendations, and even misled Drakenborch at XXXIX. 22. 5; nor have the Oxyrhynchian fragments apparently done anything except confirm W. Schulze's spelling of *Faecenina* (XXXIX. 9. 5), as Heraeus points out. But it is very convenient to have the Periochae in a single volume with these and Obsequens, and we are deeply grateful to Professor Otto Rossbach for his excellent and handy edition, with its instructive preface, an up-to-date apparatus criticus at the foot of the pages, and a combined index of the three items of the book. This is certainly how the Periochae should be studied; when they are prefixed singly to parts of a different

¹ *fidissimus*, however, occurs at XXVII. 5. 5.

² *Classical Quarterly*, July, 1907.

³ But *montes* in text.

author's work, as in the older editions of Livy, neither their historical work nor the critical value of their evidence for his text can be so fairly judged.

I am still puzzled as to the exact meaning of the publisher's 'geheftet'; yet a 'Teubner' has its advantages

when one is collating MSS., for a few of the loose pages can be taken away with one, and thereby the bulk of the daily bag of tools can be gratefully reduced.

W. C. F. WALTERS.

University of London-King's College.
November, 1911.

SHORT NOTICES

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. LIV. S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistolarum, Pars. I (Epp. 1-70), ed. I. HILBERG. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. vi+708. Vienna: Tempsky, 1910. M. 22'50.

IT is impossible to review an elaborate critical edition of a classical author till the *prolegomena* in which the editor explains his method have appeared. Dr. Hilberg of Czernowicz, to whom this important part of St. Jerome's writings has been entrusted, is reserving this information for his third and last volume. Nothing can be made of the vague critical notes of Martianay and Vallarsi, and so we have no standard of comparison; but it is clear that Hilberg is a careful and intelligent editor. As we should expect, his readings do not vary widely from those of the admirable Vallarsi, to whom he does an injustice in using only one symbol for the readings of former editors. The secular Vallarsi has stated his opinion of his Benedictine predecessor very clearly, and Martianay was, in fact, one of the weaker members of the Maurine congregation. It is, therefore, a pity that Hilberg often fails to discriminate between the cases in which he and Vallarsi stand together, and those in which he has Vallarsi and Martianay against him. The former are numerous and important, and it is misleading to allow the reader to suppose that Hilberg has been the first to ascertain the truth. The MSS. in fact are so good that their number does not cause much perplexity, and Hilberg is able to say that he has had to make few conjectures. While Vallarsi had access only to Italian MSS., the new editor has been fortunate in finding one at Lyons, imperfect it is true, yet of considerable

extent, which dates from the sixth century, and others in several libraries almost as old. This goodness of MSS. renders the Latinity less interesting; we have St. Jerome, the scholar and rhetorician, speaking with his own voice, and not the Jerome, encumbered with an old and quaint translation, with whom we are familiar in the Vulgate. Now that we have the beginnings of an authoritative text, though one in which changes will be less frequent than in many patristic writers, we shall be better able to appreciate Grützmacher and Brochet and the other modern scholars who have devoted themselves to the inexhaustible and always interesting Jerome.

E. W. WATSON.

Excavation of the Roman Forts at Castleshaw (near Delph, West Riding). By SAMUEL ANDREW, Esq., and MAJOR WILLIAM LEES, V.D., J.P. Second Interim Report, prepared by F. A. Bruton, M.A., with Notes on the Pottery by James Curle, F.S.A. With forty-five plates. (Manchester University Press.)

CASTLESHAW is a little Roman fort on the hills between Manchester and Huddersfield, close to the Roman road which connected Yorkshire with South Lancashire and, if a modern identification may be allowed, almost exactly over the Stanedge Tunnel. Mr. Bruton, working on behalf of Messrs. Andrew and Lees, conducted some excavations here in 1907, and he continued his good work in 1908. His report on the results of the former year was issued some time ago; now he describes the finds of 1908, and, as they are rather few, adds a good deal of general discussion of matters suggested