
In the Preface Professor Testard points out that this book is not intended as "un ouvrage d'érudition", but that its main purpose is to make the reading of St. Jerome easier for non-specialists. As such, it may be regarded as completely successful. Since the scope of the book does not require an exposition of new points of view, Testard does not supply us with them.

Occasionally, Testard draws attention to later dates in history which refer back to the age of St. Jerome (Francis of Assisi, Francis of Sales, the Reformation, Newman). Sometimes he rather sharply criticizes modern conditions, e.g. when he remarks that "les savants" are not to be mixed up with "ces mannequins du new-look doctrinal, que sont certains clercs avantageux, en mal d'une raclée" (p. 98).

His detailed description of St. Jerome as a translator, exegete, historian, controversialist, correspondent etc., is followed by 44 passages from St. Jerome's œuvre (pp. 109-237). All of them except five are taken from the Correspondence. Although the passages are in French, Testard did not translate them himself. For the passages from the Correspondence he follows the translation of Labourt, for the Sermon on the Nativity that of Dom Antin and for the four remaining pieces the translation of Bareille, which is less recent than the other ones. Testard's choice does full justice to the diversity of St. Jerome's work. I missed only the famous dream (Ciceronianus-non Christianus) in this anthology.

No explanatory notes have been added, which might be inconvenient to non-specialists. A sentence like "Je ne connais pas Vital, je rejette Mélèce, j'ignore Paulin" (p. 116) is likely to present difficulties. And would it be clear what St. Jerome means when he, with regard to the schism of Antioch, writes to the Pope that he follows the latter's "collègues d'Egypte"? (p. 116).
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For two Latin scholars of lively mind there can be few amusements more pleasurable than to make conjectural emendations in a corrupt and obscure author. Messrs Diggle and Goodyear must have enjoyed themselves immensely in emending Corippus, as we see from their
arch allusion to their ‘litterae colloquia convicia’; but whether the fruits of their happy half-hours should have been presented to the world at £ 4.0.0 a copy is quite another thing. It is in fact not easy to see what purpose this edition serves. Corippus is a very wretched poet; those who read him will read him for the subject matter, on which the editors say not one word. His work is of literary interest (so says the dust-jacket) because of its numerous debts to earlier Latin poetry: nine tenths of these are passed over in silence. Thus the edition is rigorously confined to textual criticism; and since there can be very little recensio in a text depending on one manuscript, emendatio (and that entirely conjectural) is the only field in which contribution can be made. The present editors have made many conjectural emendations, none of them foolish, many attractive, some no doubt correct. But many have appeared before in the 35 pages of print which they have already given to the subject, and it is hard to find just cause why the few remaining should be published in so sumptuous a form.

The preface outlines the history of the text. The first editor, Mazzuchelli, is spoken of slightingly—‘vir in codicis scriptura detegenda magis expeditus quam in corruptelis agnoscendis’. Since some hundred corrections of Mazzuchelli’s are accepted by the editors in the first book alone compared with eight of Diggle’s and one of Goodyear’s, this judgment seems less than generous. True, many of his corrections were easy and obvious; but all emendations look much easier once someone else has made them.

The apparatus criticus is copious, indeed unnecessarily so. There is very little to be gained by reporting such variants as smirneus for Smyrnacus, virgilius for Vergilius, libicas for Libycas, coniux for coniunx, sotius for socius, alumpnus for alumnus and the like; they cast no light on the text, and serve only to illustrate spelling habits of the late middle ages. The task in which the editors have the most earnest desire to shine is in emending or in selecting the best from other men’s emendations. This is a very hard task for two reasons. First, the text is very corrupt; secondly, the poet is a miserable hack. Consequently a good Latinist is in constant danger of correcting the text as if it were a student’s copy of verses; he can often make a verse better without much difficulty, but he may not thereby bring it nearer to what the author wrote. To make an emendation plausible, one should show that such mistakes as those postulated do in fact occur in the author concerned or elsewhere, and that the emendation is consistent with the author’s usage, while the transmitted text is not. The guiding principle of the edition does not emerge clearly in this connexion: Mazzuchelli is blamed for not making the poet sing ‘Calliopeio sermone’, and the editors