

summer, that we could not distinguish Mosul, though high enough to have had a fair view of it had the atmosphere been clear. It seemed like entering another world to exchange the withering blasts of the plain for the invigorating air of the mountains. During our stay there the thermometer averaged 75° in the morning, 85° at noon, and 81° in the evening. To us, accustomed to a temperature that for some weeks had seldom been as low as 100° at noon, it seemed like the refreshing coolness of a spring morning in our native land.

The Yezidees were heartily glad to see us leave on Monday evening. We reached Mosul on the forenoon of the next day, having rested about three hours at Khorsabad.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT EDITIONS OF CLASSICAL AUTHORS.¹

Furnished by an Association of Teachers.

AMONG the serious disadvantages to which the editors of the higher classics in the United States are subjected, is one which results from the inadequate preparation of the student for college. From a variety of causes, many lads join a collegiate institution without an accurate acquaintance with the grammatical principles of the classical languages. Passing one or two years with a private teacher, or in an academy, possibly with frequent interruptions, they repair to the higher Seminary, where, instead of entering on a course of elevated classical reading, they are compelled to study the elements, and to plod over a weary and unprofitable course, without ability to enjoy the delightful entertainments which might be spread out before them. The student should employ the four collegiate years, so far as they are de-

¹ Titus Livius. Selections from the first five books, together with the twenty-first and twenty-second books entire. With English Notes for Schools and Colleges. By J. L. Lincoln, Professor of Latin in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1847, pp. 329.

The Germania and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with Notes for Colleges. By W. S. Tyler, Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages, Amherst College. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam. 1847, pp. 191.

Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, with Notes. By R. D. C. Robbins, Librarian in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: William H. Wardwell. 1847, pp. 417.

voted to the classics, in canvassing the higher points of grammar and philology, and in becoming familiar with the principles of rhetoric, philosophy and morals, so far as they are legitimately connected with the study in question. The rudiments ought to be mastered at an earlier stage. In studying a piece, like the Oration on the Crown, when the whole time of a student is needed to investigate questions of law, of history, of legal antiquities, etc., the weightier matters must be neglected or passed over lightly, because common grammatical constructions are not familiar, at least to a considerable portion of a class. Three years, instead of one year or one year and a half, are imperatively demanded in the preparatory course. It is folly to expect that classical studies will ever flourish in the United States, till parents and guardians are wise enough to *insist* upon this fundamental preparation in the case of their children and wards, and until *numbers* cease to be the main test of the prosperity of a literary institution. When the quality of the education, not the number of those who are enrolled or matriculated, comes to be the distinguishing characteristic of a seminary, be it preparatory, collegiate or professional, then there will be an adequate motive and encouragement for putting out able editions of the profounder treatises of the masters of ancient wisdom.

Another serious disadvantage which the editors of the classics experience, is the want of large libraries. This,—which is almost the first necessity of a collegiate institution,—is not unfrequently the last which receives earnest attention. Spacious and sometimes not very slightly edifices are erected at great expense, professorships are founded, large collections in natural history are secured, observatories are built, while the library presents a most meagre aspect of empty shelves or of worthless duplicates. Means are provided for studying the heavens and the earth and the regions under the earth, while the records of man's intellectual and moral history are unknown or uncared for. That all the departments should be filled with able and accomplished teachers is an obvious and well understood proposition. But the relation between ability in a professor and a goodly library is not so much pondered. It is forgotten that a great and valuable library is the *genius loci*, the guardian spirit around a literary institution, the inspirer and nurse of generous purposes and high resolves. What has a more quickening influence upon an ingenuous scholar than the well ordered files embodying the wisdom and learning of past ages! The dusty alcove, the time worn parchment, the brazen clasp, the uncouth device, are full of thought and stirring reminiscences. What, on the contrary, can be more depressing than the sight of an ill-furnished, ill-assorted, poverty-stricken library? It is a great shop with-

out any tools, a vast laboratory unprovided with an instrument or a machine.

Besides, properly to edit a classical author requires an apparatus of books which is utterly beyond the means of most of our scholars. All the original sources of information, all the preceding editions, good, bad or indifferent, (for the poorest work may supply, indirectly, valuable hints) ; all the historical, or antiquarian or geographical productions which may serve as sources for illustration, or clear up a doubtful point, should be within reach. As it is, the classical editor, in this country, must often depend on second-hand authorities; he cannot refer to the original source; he is unable to verify his quotations by the context of the original; he must run the risk of depending on a proof which perhaps was selected for another purpose. A difficult passage must remain unresolved, because no copy of the book which he urgently needs is nearer than Göttingen or Leipsic. No one knows so well as he, who would thoroughly accomplish a task of this nature, how many books are needed, and how important for his purpose that they should be easily accessible.

The founders and patrons of many of the universities in Europe have entertained more enlightened views and proceeded on a wiser course. The buildings have been a matter of secondary importance; the library, Mss. and other literary treasures are secured by all means and first of all. The Royal Library in Berlin, e. g., is an unimposing building with no pretensions to beauty, yet it contains about half a million of books, and nearly five thousand manuscripts. The university of Heidelberg is a plain and comparatively small edifice, yet it has one hundred and twenty thousand volumes and many inestimable manuscripts.

Another disadvantage results from the want of earnest sympathy and of fraternal coöperation. With honorable exceptions, the classical teachers in our country, labor independently, and without much substantial aid or active sympathy from those engaged in similar pursuits. Nothing exists among them, like that bond of hearty union which connects the students in the natural sciences. These are really citizens of a scientific republic, where kind wishes and effectual aid are not limited by oceans, or by dissimilarity of language or manners. This estrangement of feeling, or rather the want of earnest sympathy, among the great body of our classical teachers, is owing to ecclesiastical barriers, or to ignorance, or to unfounded prejudices which mutual acquaintance would dissipate, or to the pressure of personal duties real or supposed. Whatever may be the cause, the effect is to be deplored. Rival and hurried editions of the same book are published.

An editor, urged possibly by the representations of those who may have a pecuniary interest, neglects to compare his views with those of other scholars and publishes a volume which may be disfigured by serious mistakes, or which furnishes few evidences of the *limas labor et mora*. Another consequence of this want of cordial coöperation is seen in the indifferent quality of our literary criticism. The notices and reviews of classical works, with a few marked exceptions, are brief and superficial, composed of exaggerated praise or indiscriminate censure. It is sometimes forgotten that one of the best evidences of real friendship which can be given, as well as of paramount regard to the interests of truth and learning, is fair and impartial criticism. As it is, many of our professed critical notices must be regarded as the work of a partial and friendly writer, who had little leisure, or inclination, or ability, to go into the subject with thoroughness and discrimination. In this way the general standard of scholarship is depressed; classical learning is undervalued, and sometimes, as in the case of ill-considered censure, unscholarly and unchristian feelings are fostered. Still it should be remarked that there are some indications of the prevalence of a better method. The scientific and searching criticism, which characterizes German scholarship, is gradually introducing a change in this particular.

We may further remark that the serious disadvantages to which our classical scholars are subjected, are relieved by some things of a contrary nature. If there are few authorities or sources for reference, there may be greater self-reliance and a more independent judgment. Where consultation is impossible and desired literary helps are denied, the powers of invention may be sharpened, and the mind, thrown upon itself, may act with an energy impossible in other circumstances. Our very loss may be followed by gain. Compelled to study the naked text, we may ascertain the true sense by a careful comparison of the author's own words, or by an instinctive tact or feeling. If copious commentaries and ingenious emendations are not at hand, we may reach the same results by the road of history, or by comparison of different and distant sources of proof. More striking illustrations than are found in the books, or in modern editions of the classics, may be disclosed in the fields of geography or topography as they are now explored. By means of the commercial and missionary enterprise, which so much characterizes our times and our own country, new light is thrown both upon the classical and sacred page. We do not possess libraries or manuscript treasures, but we may send out living and learned explorers. American travellers and missionaries, impart, by their researches, a new significance to the pages of Josephus and Philo,

and to parts of the writings of Herodotus and Xenophon. As the missionary agent enters upon his field of labor in the central portions of Asia Minor, in Macedonia, in the countries around the Black Sea, and in other regions, we may anticipate still richer discoveries.

Again, if libraries and manuscript authorities are denied us, we may find a substitute, in part at least, by personal study and examination. Some of our professors and teachers have added to their qualifications for editing the classics by visiting the scenes where the great writers of Greece and Rome lived and died—scenes made immortal either as the cherished homes of genius, or by delineations to whose truth and felicity two or three thousand years have borne witness. The actual sight of a place not only serves to correct mistakes and add to the positive amount of knowledge, but imparts a vividness and freshness to a thousand objects seen before only in dimness and shadows. No one can follow Virgil, without a new sense of his tenderness and grace, from the "*dulcia arva*," near Mantua, to the beautiful valley of the Clitamnus, where the rivulet springs clear from the limestone rock, or to the hill where the Tiber must have first caught his eye, "*multa flavus arena*," or to that other hill, overlooking the Campus Mavortis, where the same river glides "*leni flumine*" by the "*tumulum recentem*" where the young Marcellus was laid with many tears, or down to sweet Parthenope and the "*sedes beatas*" with their purple light and eternal spring. Who can gaze, without a fresh interest in Livy, on Padua and the adjacent regions, on the battle-field at the lake Thrasimene, "*loca nata insidiis*," or on the "*clivum Capitolinum*," and the thousand objects around more wondrous in their decay than in their former glory? What a reality is given to the descriptions of the lyric poet by the sight of Soracte, still covered with its wintry crown of snow, of the Sabine hills, of the "*præceps Anio*" at Tivoli, of the Vatican with its "*playful echo*," of the Via Sacra, or of Terracina "*impositum saxis late candentibus*?" No one can wander over the Roman forum without feeling a new force and reality in the words of the great orator, who, as he spoke, was surrounded with everything fitted to illustrate his sentiments and inflame his eloquence.

The same remarks are applicable, in a greater or less extent, to Athens and Greece. Exact local knowledge illuminates the page of the ancient classic and historian; we see new reasons to trust in the honesty of their descriptions and to admire the felicity of their diction. Sometimes a single word is a picture; a little paragraph or stanza imprints on the memory and imagination a scene which actual sight confirms and illustrates. The teacher, who has gazed on these consecrated spots, can never forget them, and will find the knowledge thus acquired

invaluable whether in oral instruction, or in the reproduction in print of the classic page.

The want of a good school edition of Livy, which had been felt for several years, is now supplied by the valuable work of Prof. Lincoln. The present edition has appeared under the most favorable circumstances. The text of Livy had been very unsatisfactory; little improvement had been made in it since the time of Drakenborch. For the purpose of improving it, Car. Fred. Alschefski, a distinguished German scholar, with great patience and perseverance had collated the most valuable manuscripts of Livy, particularly the Paris and Florentine, and as the results of his investigations has furnished a text as far as the thirty-fourth book with important emendations. His text of the first decade was very critically examined in two long and elaborate articles by Prof. Weissenborn, of Eisenach, who in a spirit of candor, adduces reasons for rejecting some of the readings of Alschefski and for substituting different ones. Various other articles, too, had been written on the emendations of Livy, some of which had been reviewed by Alschefski himself. Such was the rigid scrutiny to which the text of a portion of Livy had been subjected just before the present edition was commenced, and such the materials accessible. Prof. Lincoln, too, had just enjoyed the advantages of several years' study in Germany, where he had prosecuted still more extensively his classical studies. He had also visited Rome and other principal cities of Italy and made himself familiar with the localities which are so constantly occurring in the author before us. These are the peculiarly favorable circumstances under which Prof. Lincoln entered upon the preparation of the present edition of Livy; and the result cannot have disappointed the high expectations that might have been reasonably entertained.

The text, which embraces 194 pages, consists of selections from the first five books, together with the twenty-first and twenty-second books entire. The notes occupy 108 pages, and are followed by a geographical index, and also an index to the notes. Two valuable maps accompany the volume, one exhibiting the route of Hannibal over the Alps; the other is a plan of Rome according to Becker. Instead of "selections" from the first five books, we think two or three of the first books entire would have been preferable. With the portions selected there can be no fault; if any selections are to be made, they are probably the best. But it is our decided conviction that the student will know more of Livy as a writer and a historian by reading one or more books continuously, than by reading the same amount of

extracts. The twenty-first and twenty-second books very judiciously make a part of the text. They contain an account of the bold adventures of Hannibal in crossing the Alps and of his wars in Italy with the Romans, forming the most interesting parts of the Second Punic war.

The notes illustrative of the text give evidence that the editor has well understood his author, and judiciously appreciated the general wants of the student. He has not done for the student what the student should do for himself; he often refers him to sources where information may be obtained on points which need elucidation, leaving him to make his own investigations, instead of having everything carefully drawn out and adjusted for him. While the notes illustrate sufficiently the geography, history and antiquities, they are particularly full on the grammatical construction of the language. This is as it should be; for the development of the genius and idioms of the language have been far too much overlooked both in our editions of the classics and in our systems of teaching. Of the grammatical subjects treated in the notes, the attention devoted to the modes and tenses deserve to be particularly mentioned. The remarks on these are not merely in the shape of abstract canons; they are of such a nature as to bring out the shade of thought as it lay in the mind of the author. Nothing can be more valuable than this. The student needs to be able to view objects from the same point of observation as the writer himself did. But how can he do this, until he can understand the force of the terms or symbols by which the author describes his own position? There are delicate shades of thought, particularly in languages as philosophical as the Latin and the Greek, which can be fully detected only by a nice appreciation of the force of the modes, tenses, particles, position of words and sentences, etc. We give a few specimens of the happy and thorough manner in which the editor treats the subject of modes and tenses. On page 200, he is illustrating the use of *ausi sint*, in the sentence *tantum—creverant—ut—ausi sint*, and remarks that according to the rule for the succession of tenses, the imperfect *auderent* would be used here. He then "proposes the following rule as applicable to the present passage, and many others in which the Perf. Subj. in a clause denoting a *consequence*, follows a *past tense*. The Imperf. Subj. is used when the writer proceeds in the *historical order*, from the *cause to the consequence*, and wishes to represent the latter as resulting from the former. The Perf. Subj. is used when, on the contrary, the writer *argues from the consequence back to the cause*, and states the latter in order to determine and establish the former. To illustrate in the present instance: Livy does

not intend to represent *historically*, the fact of one daring to attempt hostilities against the Latins as a *consequence* of the increase of their power, but rather to state that fact, in order to make clear to his readers how greatly that power had increased; in other words he does not develop, *historically*, the consequence out of the cause, but rather, *speculatively* establishes the cause, by stating the consequence. Hence the Perfect. On the other hand, in the very next sentence, Livy uses the Impf. *esset*, because he there wishes to represent *historically*, the settlement of the boundary, as the *consequence* of the peace, which has been agreed upon."

Cujus — *venissent*, page 205. "Livy wishes to represent the parents themselves as *declaring that they had come* to the festival; if he had simply intended as a writer to mention the *fact of their having come*, he would have said *venerant*."

Quia — *factum est, quam quod* — *diminutum sit*, p. 227. "*Quia* and *quod* both denote a cause, but Livy in using *quia* with the indicative *factum est*, gives a cause which he himself holds to be the true one; and in using *quod* with the subjunctive *diminutum sit*, a cause which is alleged by some one else, or a merely supposed cause. We must ascribe, he says, the origin of liberty to the *fact* of the consular government being made an annual one, rather than to the *alleged circumstance* of any falling off of the power which the kings had possessed."

Duxissent — *judicaverint*, p. 304. "We have the Pluperf. and the Perf. both in dependence upon *facturum esse*. But Livy seems to have used the Pluperf. *duxissent* and the Perf. *judicaverint*, because it was in accordance with the feelings of the Neapolitans and with the style of their present address, to express by *dux*. something already *past*; and by *judic.* to give to the conception as much *actual reality* as possible."

Notwithstanding the fulness and pertinence of Prof. Lincoln's grammatical illustrations, there are still other points to which the attention of the student might have been profitably called; such as the general omission of *ut* in the oratio obliqua, the change from the subjunctive to the infinitive in the same kind of discourse, according as the idea to be expressed contains a command, or is a mere statement in the narrative form (see page 12, line 30, *mollirent*, etc.); on what principle *ne* after words of *fearing*, loses its original force and acquires the meaning of *that* (p. 18, l. 14); the force of questions made by such particles as *ne nonne*, etc. These points and many others might have been touched upon without any material increase of the size of the volume, and thus new and interesting features of the language

would have been brought before the student, the very existence of which he might never have observed. It is not sufficient that all these principles may be found in the grammar; few students will apply them unless their attention is called particularly to them. A valuable service would also have been rendered, if the editor had adverted occasionally to the use of new words by his author, and the revival of old ones. Some few words used almost exclusively by Livy are given on page 228.

We have noticed a very few statements, in regard to the correctness of which there may at least be ground to doubt. On page 205, line 4, *ecquis* is said to be compounded of *en* and *quis*. The best among the more recent authorities, however, consider it as compounded of the strengthening demonstrative particle *ce* and *quis*, *ce* being changed before *q*, into *ec*; see article *ce* in Freund's Lat. Lexicon, also Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. II. p. 8 and p. 341. In the same paragraph, *ecquis* is said to give "to direct questions a negative meaning," i. e. that the questions in which *ecquis* is used imply a negative. That this is often the case is readily admitted; so questions asked by *quis* often imply a negative; but that *ecquis* does not with any uniformity imply a negative, may be shown by numerous examples; see page 78th of the present volume, *ecquid sentitis, in quanto contemptu vivatis?* Virg. *Æ.* III. 341, 2; *Æ.* IX. 51; Cic. in Cat. I. 8, *ecquid attendis, etc.?*

On page 201 is the following note: "*Cum legisset*, having made her a vestal. It is worth while to remark that this construction of *cum* with the Plnp. Subj. is usually thus to be translated by the *Perf. active Participle*. So also generally the *Latin past Part.* with a substantive in the construction of Abl. absolute." The first part of this statement holds properly, only where the subject of the principal and dependent clause is the same. In the sentence, *Cum intonuisset, multitudo ipsa se sua sponte dimovit*, we cannot translate, "having uttered these commands in a voice of thunder, the multitude withdrew," for the verbs have different subjects, that of *intonuisset* being Appius. The second part holds only when the action indicated by the Abl. absolute, is performed by the subject of the verb standing in connection with the Abl. absolute. Hence in the sentence *foedere icto, trigemini arma capiunt*, we cannot translate, "having concluded the league, the three brothers take arms," because the action denoted by *foedere icto* was not performed by the *trigemini*; but in the sentence, *Dictator, recuperata ex hostibus patria, in urbem rediit*, we can translate, "the Dictator having recovered his country from the enemy returned to the city," because both actions are performed by the same subject.

On page 202, the 212th line of the second book of the *Æneid* is referred to for the purpose of showing that *agmen* has sometimes the sense of *together*; but such cannot be the meaning of Virgil. By the expression, *agmine certo Laocoonta petunt*, he simply means that "they go directly (in a straight course) to Laocoon." See Forbiger's *Virgil*; also Wagner, and Crusius' *Lexicon to Virgil*.

The remarks on *similis* and *dissimilis*, p. 210, seem to imply that there is ground for the rule often laid down, that these words, in relation to persons, take the genitive when resemblance of character is denoted, but the dative, when external resemblance is meant. No such principle we think can be well established. Cicero almost invariably uses the genitive of persons with these words, whether the resemblance be that of character or of appearance; in respect to things the genitive and dative are used without any difference of meaning; see Krebs' *Antibarbarus*, p. 727: also Dr. Siedhof in *Bib. Sac. Aug.* 1847, p. 422.

On page 311, in explanation of the expression *me dius fidius*, the editor refers to Zumpt, 361, Note, where *fidius* is considered an old form for *filius*, and the subject of some word understood, as *juvat*, and *me* as the accusative pronoun governed by it. The other mode of explaining this expression should have been referred to, at least. The latter represents the expression as arising from the intensive demonstrative particle *ce* changed into *me*, the same as *me* in *mehercule*, *mecastor*, etc. and *dius* or *deus* and *fides*. This seems to us the more reasonable explanation. See Freund's *Lat. Lex.*, articles *ce* and *fidius*; also Hand's *Tursellinus*, Vol. II. p. 342; Krüger's *Lat. Gram.* 251, Anm. gives both explanations.

The work seems to have been printed with great accuracy. Only a few typographical errors have been noticed: p. 205, line 21, *venerat* for *venerant*; p. 256, l. 1, *οἰκὸδμηα* for *οἰκὸδμημα*; p. 275, l. 12, Georg. for *Æneid*; p. 280, l. 35, *agrees* for *agreeing*; p. 283, l. 27, *suo* for *sua*; p. 290, last line, *seen* for *see n.*; p. 295, l. 12, *transversis* for *transversis*.

This volume gives cheering evidence that a higher tone of philology is appearing among us; and every friend of classical learning will welcome it as a valuable auxiliary in awakening new interest in the critical study of the Latin authors.

The *Germania* and *Agricola* of Tacitus, which Prof. Tyler has given to us in so attractive a form, are the most interesting of the writings of their distinguished author. The *Germania*, although containing some pictures too highly wrought, as well as some things about

which the historian had not sufficient information, has nevertheless been generally admired for the fidelity and exactness with which it is executed, and for the lively descriptions which it gives of the customs of the ancient Germans; and the *Agricola*, the plan of which was probably, to some extent, drawn from Sallust's philosophical history of Catiline, will ever be viewed as a model of biography.

The critical helps furnished by Prof. Tyler will give interest to these treatises and make the study of them still more profitable. The style of the author is very concise, sometimes obscure, making such helps particularly necessary. There are also idioms not found in the writers of the Augustan age, to which the attention of the student needs to be called; indeed, as the editor justly remarks, "few books require so much illustration as the *Germania* and *Agricola* of Tacitus."

Prefixed to the text is a spirited and well written life of Tacitus, which in addition to his biography, illustrates the difference between his style and that of the writers of the Augustan age, and the changes which had taken place in the language and habits of the Roman people. The text is mainly that of Walther, though other German editors have been consulted, and their readings adopted, where the sense or the usage of Tacitus seemed to require it. We have compared several of the most disputed readings with some of the best authorities, and in almost every instance find that the text has high authority in its favor. On page 36, line 5, we suppose that *ipso* is omitted before *solo* through mistake, as it occurs in a note on p. 124, where the passage is quoted.

The notes give evidence of having been prepared with great care and diligent research. The editor has had access to some of the best helps, and has made a judicious use of them. The notes, in a historical point of view, are all that could be wished; they are to some extent, also, grammatical; but we feel that in this respect they should have been much more full. Until the course of education in our preparatory schools shall be more systematic and thorough, and our colleges make higher demands of those whom they admit to their halls, so far as respects the accuracy of their elementary training, no editor who may prepare college editions of the classics, can feel himself warranted in dispensing with grammatical annotations. The editor has also pointed out in his notes the poetic and later or post-Augustan usage of the author. This is a valuable feature. It illustrates at once the connection between the change in the character of the people, and the change in their language. With their "simplicity of character," their simple and natural style disap-

peared. What the editor has so appropriately done with respect to the later and poetic idiom of his author, he might with great propriety and profit have carried still further, and have embraced the new words which were not in use till after the period of Augustus. New ideas or new modes of conception, require new words as well as new modes of expression. The age of Tacitus was marked by the introduction particularly of many abstract terms; it would have been well, therefore, to have pointed out such words as *conglobatio*, *dignatio*, *diversitas*, *irritatio*, *conversatio*, *jactantia*, *ultio*; so too *conjugales*, *ejectamentum*, *irritamentum*, *incuriosus*, *enormis*, *subfuscus*, *illaccessus*, etc., none of which were used till after the age of Augustus.

We will notice the few points in the notes to which we have taken any exception, although in regard to some of these there will doubtless be a difference of opinion among scholars. In endeavoring to settle the reading of the word *erumpat*, chap. 1, the editor says (p. 88) that others read *erumpit*. But to show that *erumpat* is the correct reading, he remarks that Tacitus oftener uses the subjunctive mode after *donec*, and in proof of it refers to *separet* in chap. 20. It would have been better to have referred to a passage containing an idea similar to the sentence in which *erumpat* stands, e. g. An. 2, 6. *Rhenus servat nomen et violentiam, donec oceano misceatur*, or to Germania, chap. 35. *donec in Cattos usque sinuetur*. The words *sinuetur*, *misceatur* here quoted, and *erumpat* of the first chapter of the Germania, are evidently in the subjunctive contrary to the usage of the best Latin writers, and are to be noticed as a peculiarity of Tacitus. But to corroborate the use of the subjunctive in these instances by referring to *separet* in chap. 20, or to *absolvat* or *faciat* in chap. 31, is, at the least, questionable authority. These last three words contain a future idea, or a degree of indefiniteness, and hence, if the present tense were used, the subjunctive would be expected in any author; but the three former words mentioned above, contain no idea of futurity, but express simple, absolute facts, and hence the subjunctive is a peculiarity. Besides, such a mode of settling the text is an unsafe one; for if carried out it would change the indicative in the sentence *donec — cohortatus est*, Agric. 36, into the subjunctive.

In explaining the word *perinde* (p. 89) in the sentence *possessions et usu haud perinde afficiuntur* (Germ. 5), the editor says it means "not so much as might be expected, or as the Romans and other civilized nations." According to this interpretation some ellipsis is to be understood. But Hand (Tursellinus, Vol. IV. p. 454), who is the very highest authority, says that, while the grammarians think there is some recondite ellipsis in such passages, he sees no cause or necessity

for it. He would therefore interpret the above passage as follows: "The possession of gold does not have so great an influence over the Germans that they can be said to be affected by it, i. e. they have no strong inclination for gold."

Perinde in the sentence *mare perhibent ne ventis quidem perinde atollit* (Agric. chap. 10) is defined on page 149, "not so much, sc. as other seas." This Hand would interpret as above: "That the sea is indeed disturbed by the winds but not greatly, i. e. that the sea is not greatly disturbed even by the winds."

Adhuc in the sentence *gens non astuta nec callida adhuc secreta pectoris licentia joci*, is explained (p. 108) "to this day, despite the degeneracy and dishonesty of the age. But perhaps — *insuper* or *etiam*." This is too indefinite. *Adhuc* is not unfrequently used in the sense of *adeo* (Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. I. p. 165), to give emphasis to a word, and here is to be connected with *secreta*, "they disclose the very secrets or even the secrets of their breast." The same explanation is to be given to *adhuc* in the passage, *cetera similes Batavis, nisi quod ipso adhuc terrae suae solo et coelo acrius animantur* (Germ. XXIX.). The editor (p. 115) makes *adhuc* here equivalent to *insuper, praeterea*, but remarks that Gruber makes it limit *patriae suae* — "by the soil and climate of a country still their own." But *adhuc* like *adeo* is sometimes joined with *ipse* to give it greater intensity, which we think is the case here; hence it can be rendered in the connection: "they are made more courageous by the influence of their very soil and climate even."

On page 106, *as* with the accent stands for *as* without the accent, the latter only meaning *as* or *as if*.

In remarking on the passage, *plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare fiduciam potius morum quam arrogantiam arbitrati sunt* (Agric. I.), the editor says (p. 136) "*ipsi* is Nom. Pl. as usual with the oblique case of the reflexive pronoun," and referring to Andrews and Stoddard's Gram. 207, 28. The remark here made as well as the statement referred to in the grammar, seem to us likely to mislead the student; or if they should not mislead him, they would certainly not enable him to understand the use of *ipse* in connection with the reflexive pronoun. Whether *ipse* is in the Nom. or in some oblique case depends on the thought to be expressed. If the subject of the verb is to be contrasted with some other subject, *ipse* is put in the Nom.; but if the object of the verb is to be contrasted with some other object, *ipse* is connected with the object, in such a case as the construction requires. In the passage before us, *ipsi* is in the Nom. because the writer wishes to say that most men thought it a mark of conscious in-

tegrity, that they themselves should write their own biography rather than that others should do it for them; but had it been his intention to say that most men thought it a mark, etc. to write their own biography rather than that of some one else, he would not have used *ipsi* in the Nom. but *ipsorum*, which would be in apposition with *suam*, which stands instead of the genitive. See Krüger's Lat. Gram., § 417 seq.; Ramshorn, § 157, 1, e; Kreb's Guide, 127; Madvig, 478.

The view which we have taken of the difficult passage, *At mihi nunc narraturo vitam defuncti hominis, venia opus fuit* (Agric. I.), is slightly different from that given by the editor. The note on this passage (p. 138) implies that Tacitus actually asked pardon for presuming to write the biography of Agricola, "he timidly asks pardon for venturing to break the reigning silence." On this passage, we would suggest in the first place, that the word *nunc* does not refer to the *point* of time when Tacitus is about to write, but to the present time in general, including that in which Domitian lived, being opposed to the past time implied in *Ac plerique . . . obtrectationi fuit*. In the second place, we suggest, that *opus fuit* is to be taken hypothetically, as in such phrases as *longum fuit*, 'it would have been better;' such a construction seems to be required by the following hypothetical *petissem*. The connection of thought would then be: former biographers were not under the necessity of making an apology even in writing their own biographies, but I at the present time (*nunc*), even in writing the biography of a man already dead, would have been under the necessity of asking pardon, which I would not have asked, had I not have been about to describe times so cruel and hostile to virtue. Tacitus does not say that he actually asked pardon, but only that in the times of Domitian it would have been necessary. The actual present i. e. the particular time at which he writes is indicated by the words, *Nunc demum redit animus* in Chap. 3. which justify the hypothetical view taken of *opus fuit*. This is the explanation given in Jahn's *Jahrbücher für Philology*, Vol. 42, p. 275.

We have noticed a few instances where we think the conciseness of the statement would prevent the student from fully comprehending it. This is a fault, it must be confessed, into which the constant reader of Tacitus would be very likely to fall. Thus (p. 100) "*Vel — vel = whether — or, merely distinctive; aut — aut = either — or, adversative.*" Some additional remark is here needed to make the distinction clearly understood, as, in the formula *vel — vel*, one may choose between any of the particulars named, e. g. *vel pace vel bello*, either in peace or war (just as he may choose); but in the formula *aut — aut*, if one is denied the other is affirmed, e. g. *aut Caesar aut nullus*, either Caesar

or nothing, if not Caesar then nothing, (only one can be true); see Key's Lat. Gram. 1444. The same feature of conciseness may be noticed on page 108. "Referantur. We should expect *referant* in another writer but not in Tacitus." Now in order that this may be well understood, it should have been added: and the *quas* which is now the subject of *referantur*, would become the object of *referant*. The objection to the note as it now stands is, that the student would be likely to infer, that *referantur* is to be translated as if *referant* were in its place, not imagining that any change of subject was intended. On p. 167 *nisi si* is said to be equivalent to *nisi*; but it is undoubtedly true that *nisi si* is stronger than *nisi*, and signifies *unless perhaps*, and is often therefore used in an ironical sense; see Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. III. p. 240.

As Tacitus, like Sallust, differs from other writers in the use of particles, the mode of forming and connecting sentences, and in the arrangement of words, it would have been well if these subjects had received some attention. A few remarks on these points would lead the student to discriminate more closely between the style of different authors. We close our remarks with many thanks to Prof. Tyler for this very valuable contribution to classical literature, hoping that he may give us other portions of the same author. The mechanical execution of this volume is worthy of the highest praise. We have seen no edition of the classics published in this country, which looks more attractive.

The next work, the title of which we have given at the head of this Article, is from the Codman Press, and is edited by Mr. R. D. C. Robbins, whose name is well known to the readers of this Journal. A few years ago the same press put forth this treatise with useful notes by Prof. Packard of Bowdoin College, a second edition of which has already been exhausted. We are prepared, therefore, to welcome the appearance of the new volume before us,—so beautiful in its mechanical execution.

In the language of Tully we may say: *multas ad res perutilis Xenophontis libri sunt*. They are works no less distinguished for their delicacy, simplicity and elegance than for their utility, and are indeed worthy of the exhortation which the great Roman added in respect of them: *hos legite, quasso, studioso*. Like the writings of Plato, these productions of Xenophon may be considered as a splendid tribute to the wonderful genius and lofty morality of Socrates. The varied accomplishments of these two devoted disciples are conspicuous in all that has reached us from their hands, and we find them ac-

knowledging with gratitude the one source to which they were indebted. Acting, as they ever did, on the principles they had learned from Socrates, and constantly advocating them in what they wrote, they have thus made it necessary for one who would rightly estimate their own conduct and writings, carefully to study the character and views of their great master. All that can be known of Xenophon compels us to believe that his account of Socrates is the one from which the student should receive his first impressions of the philosopher. Thus derived, these impressions will prepare his mind for the idea he will receive of this sublime character, when he shall afterwards repair to

"the olive grove of Academe,
Plato's retirement."

First, Xenophon, the practical, then Plato, the imaginative. This is the order of nature.

We therefore thank Mr. Robbins that he has first given us "Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates."

The text is that of the German edition by Kühner of 1841. It seems to have been reprinted with care, and we believe few errors exist in it which are not corrected at the end of the volume. For his choice of this text, the editor deserves the highest commendation. It is a revision by one of the first Grecians now living, whose task was assigned him by Jacobs and Rost. They selected him to edit this work as a contribution to the *Bibliotheca Graeca*. How judicious an editor Kühner is, appears from the principles on which he proceeded in preparing this book and his edition of Cicero's Tusculan Questions.

In his commentary, Mr. Robbins has given proof as well of his sound learning as of careful and wide research. His work is precisely such, in its general features, as will secure to the editor the gratitude of thoughtful, earnest, and patient students, for whose wants the book was prepared. To this class of students, the present volume will furnish such aid and encouragement in the critical study of Greek, as few works yet published in this country are able to give. It will teach our young men what is meant by high and generous scholarship, as the kindred works of Pres. Woolsey and Dr. Lewis are now doing. We see with great satisfaction, that the philosophy, the allusions to history and antiquities contained in this book, as well as its grammatical and rhetorical structure, are all faithfully investigated. The selections from the works of the preceding editors are very judicious; and the authorities to which he refers in the various departments of criticism are names from which the best scholars would make

no appeal. The frequent comparison of the Latin with the Greek, — a province of every editor and teacher of the ancient classics, but which has hitherto been almost universally neglected in this country, forms a commendable characteristic of this volume. We hope it will not remain singular in this respect. As the work proceeds, the commentary is less extended and minute, not because the annotations are unequally labored, but in accordance with an excellent plan of the editor. By the first part of his work, he intends to prepare the diligent student himself to solve many of the difficulties which he afterwards meets, and intimates this by constant reference to what has preceded.

Some errors will be found to have occurred in the printing of the notes; but these are not often of such a nature as to perplex or mislead the intelligent reader. We have examined with care some seventy pages of the commentary, and on this portion subjoin a few remarks.

1. 1. 1, p. 172. *τίσι ποτί.* With this use of an adverb of time after the interrogative in Greek might have been compared the use of an adverbial phrase of *place* in English and Latin. See on 1. 1. 20. So also the Eng. *over* and Lat. *-cumque* are employed as a suffix to relative words. Page 173. *τοιιάς τις*, Eng. *something such*. This concurrence of idioms and in the case of numerals with *τίς*, is worthy of remark.

1. 1. 4, p. 176. "*οἱ πλείονοι*, Lat. *plerique* or *vulgus*." The former word is the term commonly used by Cicero in such a connection as the present.

1. 1. 5, p. 177. *ἄγλω* [*Ἀγλων*], *ὅτι ἂν προέλεγε* is given by "*Patet igitur non eum praedicturum fuisse*, as the editor has rendered it in English. *An census me suscepturum fuisse*, Cic. Cat. Maj. 23. Same page. "*ταῦτα*. The Latin method of using the Sing. *hoc* is more logically definite, but the Greeks seemed to prefer to extend the thought by the use of the plural." Where the plural of the pronoun is used of a general truth, the precise form of the idea seems to be, *cases like this*; the use of *ταῦτα* when a single fact, is referred to, occurs infra 3. 6. 6, and is there well explained by supposing that the sentence as made up of several words controls the form of the pronoun. So too when the adjective is in the predicate. For a striking instance of this, vid. Hdt. Clio, 4.

1. 1. 11, p. 182. "*ἰδεῖν* here construed c. gen. of participle, to preserve a unity of construction with the parallel phrase *λέγοντος ἤκουσεν*." An exact appreciation of this anomaly. Cic. also gives us Orat. pro Leg. Manil. 3, *appetentes gloriae—atque avidi laudis fuistis*,

where the use of the Adj. in one part induced the use of the participle in the other. So too, perhaps, *ibid.* c. 19 in hoc bello—[et]—in hoc imperatore esse. Comp. Virg. Ecl. 7. vv. 65 et seq. Page 184. κόσμος. To the valuable note on the philosophical use of this term, might have been added a reference to Plin. Hist. Nat. 2. 3, and Cic. de Nat. Deor. 2. 22.

1. 1. 18, p. 189. *potentium* for *potentiam*. Page 190. περί πλείονος ἐποίησατο. We should have been glad to see here a strict analysis of this phrase, so frequent in our author. Comp. the English *to make much, more, etc. of*.

1. 2. 1. “πάρν μικρά κακτημένος, *having very little;*” better, *though he had very little*, the clause being concessive.

1. 2. 8. εἰ μὴ ἄρα. The exact meaning of these particles here is admirably developed, and the present note is one of many which show on the part of the editor a just appreciation of the subtleties of the discourse.

1. 2. 12. In the sentence beginning with “Ἀλκιβιάδης, the son of Clinias,” an error in printing has destroyed the sense.

1. 2. 14, p. 202. ἀπὸ κνάμου. So also the material of which anything is made, or from which it is derived, is denoted by ἐκ. Comp. Anab. 1. 5. 10. Matth. Gr. Gr. § 373. b. obs.

1. 2. 15, p. 202. “καὶ ὄντε οἶω προεῖρησθον, Lat. *ac tales essent*.” This should be, *et quum tales essent*, as the editor has given it in English; or it should not have been separated from the foregoing.

1. 2. 24, p. 207. πολλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν. On this use of the conjunction—contrary to our own idiom—with numeral words and adjectives denoting intrinsic attributes, we here have a very acute observation. We adduce, as instances of the same usage in Lat. Cic. Orat. 1 in Cat. 4, *multis ac summis viris*; pro Leg. Manil. 16, *tot et tantas res*. This peculiarity is explained also by Zumpt, Lat. Gr. § 756, but we think less philosophically.

1. 2. 27. “τῷ is the *abridged* form of the Dat. of the indefinite pronoun τίς.” So Kühn. Larger Gr. § 33. The forms του τῷ, are plainly from ΤΟΣ ΤΗ τό, softened in meaning, and denoting something conceived of as indefinite.

1. 2. 29. Κριτίαν μὲν. The use of μὲν in this place is admirably and satisfactorily accounted for.

1. 2. 32. Ἐδήλωσε δέ. With this absolute use of this word might well have been compared the Aristophanic δέξει *it will appear*, Ran. 1261. In some instances, however, a definite Subjunctive may be drawn from the context; as, Anab. 2. 6. 21.

1. 2. 34. “speech.” From the adjuncts of this word, we infer that the editor has here used it as a participial noun.

1. 2. 37, p. 215. τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων. Given by *alia id genus*. We find in the lexicons *id genus alia* quoted from Varro, de Ling. Lat. 7. 7. Cicero uses, if we may trust our impression here, *alia ejusmodi*. In ad Quintum Fr. Ep. 2. 1. 1. 4, he uses *alius ejusdemmodi*, and in Orat. p. Marcel. 3, we find *res ejusmodi*, and in Lael. 12, *quidvis ejusdem generis*. Cicero sometimes, and then apparently by Græcisth, uses *genus* in the Acc., but we think it is not his usage to employ it as above.

1. 2. 58. περὶ πατέρων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγενῶν τε καὶ περὶ φίλων. On these words we have a somewhat long note based on Kühner's. The *τε* after *συγγενῶν* Morus disapproves, and he is followed by Schneider. Bornemann is unwilling to exclude it, and refers us to 3. 10. 5. Its repetition there, however, seems to have arisen from connecting the several attributive words *in pairs*. If the received text here be genuine, we see no difficulty in the literal version of the passage, *concerning fathers as well as other relatives and also concerning friends*.

1. 2. 55. "Ὁὐ διδάσκων. For the use of the participle to indicate design, see Kühn. Gr. § 312. 4. c." This should have been, For the use of the *future* participle, etc.; this use of the *present* participle being rare and here deserving a remark as constituting an exception to the usage referred to.

1. 2. 61. ὠφέλει. The analysis of the regimen of this word is exact, and the explanation of the secondary Acc. here will furnish a useful hint to the student.

1. 2. 61. εἴαν τις φανερός γένηται κλέπτων, is rendered, "if any one is clearly caught in the act of theft;" which in Greek would be, εἴαν τις ἐπ' ἀποφώρῳ ἀλῆ κλέπτων. Translate, *if it appear that one has stolen, if one be convicted of theft*. See Kühn. Larger Gr. § 810. Rem. 3; Matth. Gr. § 549. 5.

3. 1. 1. Ὅτι δὲ τοὺς ὀρεγομένους—τοῦτο διηγῆσομαι, "for the ellipsis with ὅτι," etc. It is perhaps better to consider the expression as complete in itself, ὅτι δὲ, etc. being explanatory of τοῦτο; as infra 4. 7. 1, ὅτι δὲ καὶ—νῦν τοῦτο λέξω. Comp. also 4. 2. 1, ὡς προσεφέρετο, σὺν διηγῆσομαι. This seems to be a favorite form of expression with our author in introducing a new fact, or in proceeding to establish something he has asserted. Comp. 1. 7. 2; 4. 6. 1; 7. 1. 1, and Cyrop. 8. 8. 8; 881.

3. 2. 7. "λίθος, etc. frequently used for the plural (collective)." The coincidence of the Greek and English idiom here deserves notice.

3. 3. 3. Καὶ ὅς. On this formula, often used by Xenophon, we

should have been pleased to see a full note. See on 1. 4. 2. This use of *ὅς* as a demonstrative, as well as that of the prepositive *ὁ* in the formulas, *ὁ μὲν* — *ὁ δέ*, and in *ὁ δέ* alone in transition, is a relic of early usage and is treated of by Buttman with great acuteness, Larger Gr. § 75, marg. note and R. 3. With *καὶ ὅς*, cf. *ὅστε* and on the connective particle here, see *ibid.* § 149, under the latter word. The Greek retained the form of the demonstrative, but softened its meaning; modern languages have modified the form in most cases and then appropriated it to the new idea; cf. Eng. *that, this, the*; Lat. *ille illa*; Ital. *il la*. But compare with the Greek our use of *that*, both as a demonstrative and a relative.

3. 3. 14. “*Ἱππικῶν*, sc. *τέχνης*, horsemanship.” This form of the Adj. would forbid an ellipsis of *τέχνης*, and the context shows that by *τοῦ Ἱππικῶν*, the *cavalry*, *οἱ ἵπποις*, are here designated. So *supra* 3. 3. 2.

3. 4. 9. “*ἀμφοτέρους εἶναι προσήκει*; cf. § 8, *τὸ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζειν* — *ἀμφοτέροις ὀμαι προσήκειν*. The former is perhaps the more usual construction.” These cases seem to differ essentially. In the former *ἀμφοτέροις* is the subject of the Inf., and the object of *προσέκει* is implied; in the latter, *τὸ κολάζειν* with its adjuncts is the subject of *προσέκει*, and *ἀμφοτέροις* is its object. Had the article, which in this case is used before *κολάζειν*, been omitted, the difference would then be one of construction merely. The present form seems to have been chosen to avoid the ambiguity which *ἀμφοτέρους* would have occasioned.

3. 5. 10. *τροφήν καὶ γένειον*; to the passage here referred to in Homer, might well have been added, *εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν*, — *ἔτι ζῆ*; LXX. Gen. 43. 26; and *valet atque vivit*, Terent. Cf. Anab. 3. 2. 13, where the natural order of the idea is preserved.

3. 5. 11. “*Εἰ δὲ βούλει* (sc. *ἀναμνηστικομένῳ ἄν*), lit. if you please, let us,” etc. If the ellipsis be supplied answering to this English, the verb must be in the “Subj. adhortative,” Kühn. L. Gr. § 259, 1. a.

3. 5. 24. *λανθάνεις μὲν — ὅτι — λέγεις*. This construction, so anomalous, is very admirably explained.

3. 6. 1. *παῦσαι ἐλκόμενον*, to stop his being dragged, is translated, “to withdraw him from being dragged.” Perhaps *σπάσαι* was in the editor’s mind.

3. 6. 4. “*Ὡς ἄν τότε σκοπῶν*, elliptically for,” etc. This use of the participle with *ὡς* and *ἄν*, is idiomatic. Cf. Anab. 1. 1. 10, *ὡς περιγενόμενος ἄν κ. τ. λ.*; and *infra* 4. 4. 4, with *ἄν*. See Matth. § 598. 1. b. The construction above is *equivalent* to the resolution by means of the finite verb and *ἄν*.

3. 6. 11. "τῷ βουλευμένῳ, *cuilibet* or *cuius*." So Kühn. ad loc. "ὁ βουλόμενος est *cuius*." This is a competent, but not exact translation. We believe the Greek and Latin coincide here only in *τι βούλει* and *quodvis*.

3. 6. 12. The choice of readings in this passage between *σκάπτομαι* and *σκέπτομαι* is made on sound principles. We are glad to see in this note and elsewhere, the name of Pres. Woolsey cited as an *authority* in matters of Greek criticism. The readers of Plato's *Gorgias* among us, will thank Mr. Robbins for availing himself of an opportunity to render this just tribute of respect to accurate and liberal scholarship.

We should be glad to adduce from these excellent notes many passages, which scholars will receive with unqualified approbation, but with a few words more we must resign the book to the grateful student.

Commentaries prepared in accordance with the principles which the editor of the present work has followed, will do much towards securing from our students that honorable place which is so justly due to the highest human wisdom embodied in a language which was moulded by the very laws of beauty. To the attentive study of these ancient treatises thus edited, we look with more confidence than to any other human means for the liberal and exact culture of our young men, and for the redemption of our scholars from the influence of that seductive, but vague and irreverent philosophy which already numbers among us many willing votaries. We wish the intrinsic worth of the best portion of classic literature were better and more generally known. In the writings of Plato, of Xenophon, fellow-disciples of him,

"Whom well inspired the oracle pronounced
Wisest of men;"

and in the works of Cicero, the admirer and often the imitator of both, many of the most important principles of morality which religion has sanctioned are distinctly brought to view; and some of the most awful truths which religion has revealed, are there shadowed forth. For reasons, to which we have already adverted, the "*Memorabilia of Socrates*" have a peculiar claim on the early and serious attention of the young student, whom we would further remind that the greatest of natural theologians learned his most valuable lessons from this book; and that the acute Cousin and the profound Jouffroy in stating what was the foundation of human belief could only enunciate in modern phrase the simple truth recorded here as having fallen from the lips of Socrates three thousand years ago.

This, we believe, is Mr. Robbins's earliest offering at the shrine of classical learning. We thank him that he has brought so valuable a gift with that modesty of manner and thoughtfulness of spirit, which are fitting in one who would edit *Xenophon the Athenian*. We ask to accept it as the earnest of future contributions; hoping that amid the duties of the honorable office he has been called to assume as the successor of the lamented Stoddard at Middlebury College, he will yet find leisure to aid by efforts like the present, the cause to which he now devotes his ability and his learning.

ARTICLE X.

MISCELLANIES.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY.

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

In All Saints' Church, opposite St. John's College, Henry Kirke White was buried. His remains are deposited on the north side of the chancel. On the opposite end of the church a white marble tablet has been inserted in the wall at the expense of the late Mr. Kirk Boott of Lowell, Ms. Within a medallion, in bas-relief, is the portrait of White, beneath which are some commemorative lines from the pen of Prof. Smyth of Cambridge. Mr. White's rooms were in St. John's College, near the eastern gate of the easternmost quadrangle. Trinity Church, a handsome Gothic building at the south end of Sidney street, contains monumental tablets in honor of Henry Martyn, Rev. T. T. Thomason, and of the patron and endeared friend of both, the late Rev. Charles Simeon. On Mr. Simeon's tablet are the usual dates, and the words, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." So great was the hostility to Mr. S., in the early years of his ministry, that it was necessary for his friends to guard him in going to and returning from church. For many years before his death, he was universally esteemed and greatly beloved. His audience sometimes amounted to 2000 persons. His successor, the Rev. William Carus, who is also a fellow of Trinity College, is a clergyman like-minded, and exerts a very happy religious influence upon many of the youthful members of the university. He occupies Mr. Simeon's rooms near the chapel of Trinity College. Mr. Simeon's remains were interred in the Fellows' vault of