

COVINO'S MANILIUS, BOOK I.

Covino's edition of the first book of Manilius.
Torino: Rour. 1895. 3 Lire.

THIS is a translation into Italian prose, accompanied by the Latin text, of that section of Manilius' poem in which he describes the earth and sky according to the geographical and astronomical ideas of his time. It has, besides, copious notes dealing with the different stars passed in review by Manilius, the mathematical difficulties which his semi-scientific reasoning occasions, and sometimes with the obscurities of the text.

It is disappointing to find so little notice of Manilian criticism since Bentley. The edition of Jacob, published in 1846, is not even mentioned in the preface, still less any of the numerous works which have appeared on Manilius within the last twenty-five years. Prof. Thomas' *Lucubrationes Manilianae*, which contains a complete collation of the Gemblacensis, the best MS. of the poem, does not seem to be known to the author, nor my own *Noctes Manilianae*, which followed upon the publication of Prof. Thomas' work. All this is the more to be regretted, as the difficulties of the poem are notoriously great, and a translation based on a text in which so much is ignored of the highest critical importance is, from the philological point of view, an anachronism. On the other hand, from a scientific stand-point, M. Covino's version can hardly claim the same authority as the excellent French version, executed in the latter part of the eighteenth century, of Pingré.

Judging from the length of the astrono-

mical notes, I conclude that the author's view was rather to present to his countrymen an introduction to the astronomy of the ancients as represented by a poet of the late Augustan epoch, than to anything of a more purely critical or philological kind. This end to some extent he has secured. The translation is fairly faithful, and the student of astronomy as now known will find much that is modern worked up into the notes by way of supplementing the statements of Manilius. The author, too, is not without views of his own, e.g. on 101 *Arderent terrae* which he is certainly right in explaining (as Creech did before him) of volcanic fires; and it is obvious that in scientific matters he is no tiro: this may account for the somewhat lengthy appendix on the planetary system.

The episode of Perseus and Andromeda from B. v. would, I think, have more wisely been omitted. It merely adds to the bulk of the book and has no special connexion with B. i. Nor can much be said for the planisphere at the end of the volume, which is too confused to be of any great service.

I take this opportunity of calling attention to the important dissertation of Boll *Studien über Claudius Ptolemaeus*, the last section of which deals with Manilius. It forms part of the twenty-first supplemental volume to Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* and is mainly occupied with the *Tetrabiblos*, an astrological treatise of which Boll promises a new edition.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

GARDNER'S JULIAN.

Julian, Philosopher and Emperor, and the last struggle of Paganism against Christianity, by ALICE GARDNER. 8vo. Putnam. 1895. 5s.

THE 'Heroes of the Nations' Series aims at 'picturing the National conditions of the selected periods around the central figure of some representative historical character.' It is a picturesque method of writing history, which gives an advantageous platform of appeal to the general reader. But

for success three things at least are indispensable—right selection of subject; vivid grasp of 'the hero's' personality; and just comprehension of the age itself. It was inevitable that Julian should sooner or later find a place in this gallery of national portraits. His historical importance is not comparable with that of men like Aurelian, Diocletian, Constantine, or Theodosius; and it cannot in truth be said that he was a 'representative historical character,' or embodied any 'National ideal.' Of the motley

figures who make up the procession of the Roman Emperors, Julian is among the most eccentric and unexpected; but his personality is vivid and arresting, and illuminated as it were by every variety of natural and artificial light. The meagre literary record, by which most emperors must be interpreted, suddenly becomes copious; and the spokesmen on either side—Ammianus and Libanius, Gregory Nazianzen and Basil—concentrate attack and defence upon the person of Julian; the Church historians—Rufinus, Orosius, Philostorgius, Socrates, Sozomen, Zosimus—retail the current anecdotes, with which Christians whetted their indignation against the Apostate; Eunapius, Athanasius and Cyril assist delineation from a different side; and Julian himself has left a larger body of writing than survives from the hand of any other emperor. He stands too at the last parting of the ways, and his brief tenure of power announces the final surrender of Imperial Paganism to Christianity.

Miss Gardner has brought to her task intelligence, candour, and sympathy, and has read up her authorities with commendable diligence; but the subject is 'got up' only, and not mastered, so that the book fails in historic breadth and perspective, and in any large appreciation of the deeper vital issues which were in course of determination. This defect tells seriously on composition, and breaks all sense of unity. Details of the intrigues of Constantius' subalterns in Gaul (p. 82) are foreign to the main theme, and merely distract attention. The sketches of university life at Athens (p. 53) and the digression on the Roman Post (pp. 254-7) should form an illustrative background of knowledge, instead of being patched in as obvious summaries from de Julleville, Capes, and Studemann. The excursus on the Cynics (p. 283), who are oddly introduced as 'originally a Pre-Socratic sect,' is more redolent of the fourth century before than after Christ, and partly by irrelevance, partly by omissions, fails to revivify the age of Julian. But these, except from the artistic side, are minor blemishes.

A much graver fault is that the writer, in her very anxiety to be fair, continually finds herself at the mercy of the last speaker; and having no guiding clues through the mazes of a complicated period, vacillates among uncertain and often conflicting verdicts of censure or approval with such results as these. 'The dealings of Constantius, especially with his ill-fated eldest

son, are hardly to be viewed as uniformly those of a strictly moral and religious man. We may add that he postponed his baptism till he was at the point of death' (p. 119)!! 'It is quite possible that Constantius may have acted with some statesmanlike purpose when he determined on making this progress. Even if it were not so, it was surely a laudable curiosity that made him desirous of a personal inspection of the great sights of the Eternal City' (p. 119). So in the final summary of his character (p. 161), deserved condemnation loses itself in mild apology, just as, in the discussion of Julian's contemptible *Oration to Constantius*, one line of wholesome censure is recanted through a page of weak extenuations (pp. 103-4). Julian was not a court rhetorician, paid by the piece for his compliments. These sycophant *Orationes* are a bit of mean and tawdry adulation, of a piece with the calculated dissimulation, under which for years Julian masked his hatreds and his hopes. The excuse for them lies not in literary conventions of the day, but in the instinct of self-preservation, which made falsehood and flattery a condition of survival. It is creditable to him that they did not corrode his nature more irremediably.

But besides this want of historic nerve, the writer fails signally to grasp the larger moments, social and political, which were shaping and determining the course of events. In all history the main forces are social and economic. The economic conditions of the century are left untouched, and that which was incomparably the greatest social factor of the age, the development of Christianity, is viewed only in its most superficial expressions. Church history, instead of being apprehended in its larger aspect, is read only through the little feuds and personalities that come into direct collision with Julian: Aetius and Athanasius by this reading become persons of about equal importance. The constructive work of the Church, which was re-modelling society, and among other things dividing east and west, is entirely ignored. In the east, the victory of Christianity over Hellenism was virtually achieved; in the west the very different struggle with Paganism was still active. But of this distinction there is no hint; nor any indication that Julian's Oriental Hellenism was as far removed from Western Paganism as from Christianity itself. If any reader should ask the natural question—What relations had Julian to Rome and the Senate of Rome?—he could not extract materials or

even suggestions for an answer from this volume. An extract will best show the limitations of view that naturally result: 'There was little scope in the Empire at that time for anything like state-craft. There were no rival foreign powers to be dealt with by skilful diplomacy, unless we may regard the relations of the border states between the Roman and the Persian Empires as furnishing a field for that art. If they did, the field was not skilfully cultivated by Julian. And in domestic affairs, there were no distinct political parties to be balanced against one another, and dealt with by measures of compromise or of subjugation. There were, of course, ecclesiastical parties, but Julian would have disdained to steer between them.' And this can be written of the half-century preceding the division of the Empire, within immediate sight of the transplantation of the Goths and the irruptions of the Huns, at the moment when Roman hold is relaxing over Britain in the west and Mesopotamia in the east, the very years which determined the severance and the eventual character of Greek and Roman Christianity. This is to read history through the spectacles of Julian, and it would be hard to find a ruler who, with the same amount of spirit and intelligence, more profoundly missed and misinterpreted the true drift of the age in which he lived. It may be that the times were not conducive to greatness; but had the great man been there, the opportunity was well nigh unexampled. A great constructive statesman, throwing himself upon the forces of Christianity, might have reshaped the crumbling Empire into a solid unity, homogeneous in faith as well as in military and secular administration. A 'Holy Roman Empire' stretching from the Forth to the Euphrates, united in an effective faith and loyalty, would have been invulnerable to the barbarian. Julian's reactionary blindness exacerbated the forces of dissension and helped to destroy the last possibility of union. His 'state-craft' sees no deeper than the surface agitations, which touched himself. Sensitive to criticism and rasping in analysis, he never penetrates below the symptoms to the deeper forces which they implied. The forces of Christianity represented themselves to him as mere wrangles of illiterate agitators, quarrelling for place and power, bids of ecclesiastical partisans for ends of solid advantage; Homoiousian and Homoousian, Homoean and Anomoean distinctions were a noise of words, undeserving of serious valuation;

the Christians themselves were perverse sectaries, mostly dupes or hypocrites, misled, mainly through want of education, by noisy charlatans. And the history of the fourth century, read under prepossessions of this kind, never can be made intelligible. Impatient dismissal of the vital issues of Christian controversy and Christian polity may be 'refreshingly redolent of a lay mind' (p. 15), but will miss more than half of the meaning of the age.

The best chapters in the book are those (such as chaps. ix., x., xi.) which narrow to the consideration of Julian's personal actions and opinions. They contain interesting work, though the general estimate of his literary compositions seems much too favourable. After attempting to extract coherent meaning from the survey of his 'pregnant little treatises on *King Helios*, and *The Mother of the Gods*,' we are relieved to find on the last page that they are a 'twilight of obscure speculations.' It was rather clever (if true) to get them written in three nights and one night respectively, but it was a want of wit to let these pages of hurried and fantastic jargon go beyond the eyes of Maximus, or some other fond 'foster-father of my babies' (*Ep.* 40, 417*a*). His 'Pastoral Epistles' are taken (pp. 196-206) with not less seriousness, shall we say, than Julian took himself. This is true to life, and from the side of Christianity significant; but for 'Julianism' and its hopes, the true commentary on them was after all the one priest and a goose at Daphne (*Mis.* 362)! And one cannot quite forget companion effusions, such as that to Libanius: 'O speech! O intellect! O composition! O distribution! O treatment! O arrangement! O materials! O language! O harmony! O combination!' O Gemini! O Julian! as Professor Gildersleeve aptly appends. The truth is that his views of life were formed from books and sophists, not from enlarging intercourse with men, or touch with facts. 'In him the bookworm never dies,' whether his pen is busy with literature, or politics, or religion.

Julian's legislation is carefully handled, but Palace economics, personal activities upon the bench, and reform of postal abuses do not go to the heart of things; they are traits of the excellent, though somewhat fussy, official, not of the world-Emperor. To speak of 'his achievements' as 'almost unique in character,' to search for possible peers in 'military genius' among Alexander the Great, Charles XII., Epaminondas, Timoleon, and Oliver Cromwell

(p. 113), and to conclude that 'as a philosophic idealist who was also a great military leader, there is hardly a name, except perhaps that of Epaminondas, that we can place besides his' (p. 91) shows want of balance. Even the trite comparison with 'his hero-model, Marcus Aurelius'—the phrase palls with iteration (pp. 87, 102, 233)—is strangely misconceived; the life of Marcus was 'one of action' from the first (p. 91); at eighteen he became consul and Caesar; the five-and-twenty years during which he toiled at Imperial administration left upon Roman Law an impress that still abides; while his long Marcomannic Wars probably secured to the Western Empire two added centuries of independence. On the other hand not one fragment of the work of Julian outlived the hour of his death, except the Gallo-German frontier and the wrecks of the cause he loved, and did to death; his alienation of Christian Armenia and his eastern campaigns were portentous blunders, which could not be retrieved. 'The secret' of his eulogized success is traced finally to 'the possession of an iron will' (p. 114). Iron will lies deeper than mere physical courage and impetuosity of temper, and is remote from the restless neurotic personality of Julian; what of good metal was in him was mercury, not iron. There is no iron in the tinsel of his letters and orations, none in the acrid spleen of the *Misopogon* and *Caesars*, none

in the schoolboy pedantry of his manifestoes *To the Athenians* and *The Alexandrians*, none in the disputatious Rescript on Education. In the field of action 'iron will' does not lock itself up in bedrooms, and pray for a shooting star (see p. 136), while the legionaries are acclaiming 'Augustus'; nor does it carry on a duel for empire with irresolute parleyings at Sirmium, or inspecting entrails at Naissus. If it is liable to such weaker accesses of doubt or superstition, self-restraint at least forbids their publication to the world.

The relegation of Notes to the end of each separate chapter is an inconvenient arrangement; and proof-correction, which has left such blemishes as 'manifestatoes' (p. 152) and 'turn the machine into a blockade' (p. 148), seems hardly to have extended to proper names or Greek. Variants such as Rhaetia—Raetia, Allemanni—Alamanni, Osroene, Bathnae, Hieropolis, Magentius, Mentz, Cronica (= Κρόνια) are distressing, and the Greek scholar must face a shock at each new chapter heading. Perhaps p. 73 is the worst—with AUC for AUG, 'the Christian monogram between A and W' (!), ἀκραγμοσύνης κολιτεία καιδείαν in three successive lines, and seven misplaced or omitted accents. Even the accent of Χρίστος is depraved (p. 309): Greek should either be banished, or presented in scholarly dress and type.

GERALD H. RENDALL.

WALTZING ON ROMAN COLLEGIA ARTIFICUM.

Étude historique sur les Corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident, par J. P. WALTZING. Tome I. *Le droit d'association à Rome. Les collèges professionnels considérés comme associations privées*. Charles Peeters, Louvain. Pp. 525. 1895.

ALTHOUGH it is impossible to ascribe finality to any work based on epigraphic evidence, it is yet possible to recognize where a nearly final analysis of one department of such evidence, so far as it has been collected, has been made. This is the character which we shall probably be willing to ascribe to Waltzing's work when it is finished; for, if the merit and completeness of the discussion be adequate to the scale

on which it has been undertaken—and from the specimen before us we have no doubt that it will be—the only function left to an inquirer into the nature of the Roman guilds will be that of conjecture, no doubt a valuable function but one from which the exigencies of his present task have compelled our author to abstain. If such a thing as over-sobriety be possible we may justly charge him with it. It is almost painful to see what a wealth of evidence is required to lead to attenuated, sometimes negative and always accurate conclusions, how manfully the attractions of analogy are resisted and how frankly the insignificance of the objects of this world-wide association is expressed; for, if these conclusions are final, the Roman guild is not a very valuable contribution to the social,