READING SILENCE: THE BOOKS THAT NEVER WERE

In the days of the *res publica litterarum*, the ability to read Latin gave access to a wide range of scholarly work in both humane and scientific subjects. From the early eighteenth century, however, the rise of vernacular writing and publishing began to erode this common space. Correspondence between scholars began to move to the vernacular; there are well-documented cases of spoken Latin being resorted to when scholars met, but national differences in pronunciation often rendered this ineffectual. Meanwhile, some vernaculars came to acquire international status: first French, the standard language of diplomacy, and then (and now) English. In the twenty-first century, the emergence of the Internet, accessible scholarly databases and automatic translation are making it easier to re-establish a *res publica litterarum*, but it is still difficult to investigate, and so to learn from, the scholarly literature published in foreign languages. Occasionally, however, translations offer the monoglot scholar a glimpse of other worlds. One such translation was that made by Myles Burnyeat and Ruth Padel of Alexander Gavrilov's article on silent reading in antiquity.[1] Gavrilov's article brought together a survey of the ancient evidence and modern work on the nature of reading. His rethinking and fresh perception produced a revisionist interpretation of a passage of Augustine which had long been taken for granted as showing that reading aloud had been dominant in antiquity. Gavrilov demonstrated conclusively that the received opinion was wrong. In so doing, he not only argued for a new interpretation, he exposed a long period of silence: the inert silence of assumption, in which nothing had been said (or perhaps even thought) on a point which was assumed to be settled. In this paper, I want to offer Alexander Gavrilov a study of another kind of silence: that of books which never appeared. This is an exercise, then, not in silent reading, but in reading silence. My subject is, to make it clear at the outset, not those ancient works which have not survived, but the scholarly works which for one reason or another we are now unable to read.[2]

---

[1] A. K. Gavrilov, "Techniques of Reading in Classical Antiquity", *CQ* 47 (1997) 56–73, with a "Postscript" by Burnyeat at pp. 74–76.

[2] On the ancient works, see most recently the brief survey by the scholar/publisher R. Stoneman, *Books We Might have Known* (London 2010). R. Birley, *Sunk Without Trace: Some Forgotten Masterpieces Reconsidered* (London 1962), considers six works of English literature once famous but long forgotten.

Mammoths of the silent world: lexica and dictionaries

How does one find books which have never appeared? How can an invisible region be mapped? Anyone who has investigated the history of scholarship is likely to have encountered references to unrealised projects. Many scholars, whether in universities or outside them, have dreamed of producing a great work – an edition of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, perhaps, or a new dictionary of Latin or Greek. The great fictional exemplar of this kind of project is the "Key to all mythologies" obsessively worked on by the desiccated scholar Edward Casaubon in George Eliot's novel *Middlemarch*.[3] "Key" was in fact the name of a scholar whose career began in the period in which Eliot's novel is set, c. 1830, and who from the late 1840s till his death in 1875 worked on a large Latin-English dictionary. Thomas Hewitt Key was the first professor of mathematics in the University of Virginia, and then professor of Roman literature in another new institution, the University of London. In 1832 he became professor of comparative grammar and headmaster of the University's junior department. Key was introduced to comparative philology by his short-lived colleague Friedrich Rosen (1805–1837), a pupil of Franz Bopp, and from him took the idea of "crude-form analysis" of words. Key's dictionary was planned to be organised on this basis (i. e. listing stems rather than words as lemmata). By 1852 he had reached the letter C, but progress was slow; four years later Key abandoned the crude-form listing principle, and in 1865 he engaged the immigrant German classical scholar Wilhelm Wagner to work with him on the project. The two men fell out (one suspects that Wagner challenged some of the absurd etymologies for which Key was notorious), and little more was done. On Key's death in 1875 his son arranged with Cambridge University Press for the publication of the fragments, but the task turned out to be much bigger than had been anticipated, and the material was published by the Press with only minor editing in 1888.[4] The editor (J. S. Reid) and the Press must have been disheartened first by the appearance of the new Latin dictionary of Lewis and Short (1879), and then by reading the first annual report of the *Archiv fur lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* (1884), which announced

[3] R. Travis, "From 'Shattered Mummies' to 'an Epic Life'… in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*", *IJCT* 5 (1999, 3) 367–382; E. Hale, "Sickly Scholars and Healthy Novels", *IJCT* 17 (2010, 2) 219–243.

[4] J. S. Reid (ed.): T. H. Key, *A Latin Dictionary* (Cambridge 1888); D. J. McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press,* 3: *New Worlds for Learning, 1873–1972* (Cambridge 2004) 107, where for 1878 read 1888. Other rejections are also mentioned at pp. 107–108.

the plan for the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, to most of whose 250 sections scholars had already been assigned.[5]

Lewis and Short's dictionary was an American product commissioned by Harper Bros of New York; it was published simultaneously in the UK by OUP from stereotype plates shipped over from the USA. This unusual arrangement stemmed from the failure of a project conceived in the earlier 1870s, a Latin-English dictionary planned by Henry Nettleship of Oxford and J. E. B. Mayor of Cambridge. This fell through, and in 1875 Nettleship agreed to continue the work alone; but it proved too much for him, and the material assembled was published in 1889 as *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*. The deal with Harpers was presumably seen as a stopgap, to give OUP a position in the market till Nettleship's book was ready. A work on this scale is of course especially liable to non-completion, but the risk was increased in this case by the plan to make the dictionary *de novo*, and not, as nearly all British and American classical dictionaries were, by translating or adapting a German original.

The examples discussed so far already indicate factors likely to prevent books from being completed. In the case of large lexica and dictionaries, the sheer size of the job made this very difficult. In 1829 J. E. Riddle was asked by Oxford University Press to translate Scheller's large Latin-German dictionary (5 vols, 1804), and offered to do so over two years; he kept to schedule, and the book appeared in 1835. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott were commissioned to translate Passow's Greek-German lexicon in 1836; the first edition of "Liddell and Scott" was published in 1843. Thomas Key, like Liddell and Scott, had to fit his lexicographical work in between other occupations, but his initial obsession with the "crude-form" system probably increased his burden. Liddell and Scott were close friends who worked together well; the Mayor–Nettleship collaboration fell apart soon after it began. Earlier on, the Greek-English lexicon prepared by George Dunbar and Edmund Barker had suffered from a lack of genuine collaboration and from Barker's lack of judgement in controlling his material; a weakness already displayed in his contributions to the translation of the Stephanus Greek lexicon published by Abraham Valpy between 1816 and 1826.[6]

---

[5] By a curious coincidence, Key's brother-in-law Richard Troward was the author of a reverse vocabulary of Latin (*Latinum inverso ordine vocabularium*), which survives as a 282 pp. MS: University College London, Special Collections, GB 0103 MS LAT 18.

[6] E. H. Barker and G. Dunbar, *A Greek and English Lexicon* (Edinburgh 1831). For Barker and Dunbar, see their entries in: R. B. Todd (ed.), *Dictionary of British Classicists* (Bristol 2004); Barker is well portrayed by D. J. McKitterick in "Publishing and perishing in Classics: E. H. Barker and the early nineteenth-century book trades", in C. A. Stray (ed.), *Classical Books: Scholarship and Publishing in Britain since 1800, BICS* suppl. 101 (London 2007) 7–33.

Of some earlier lexicographical projects we have only distant glimpses. For example, the scholarly radical Gilbert Wakefield apparently planned, while in prison in the 1790s, to assemble a Greek-English lexicon, but died before he could get very far with it. A similar project is reported of the Cambridge scholar Edward Blomfield, the talented younger brother of C. J. Blomfield, who died prematurely: in this case we know that a specimen was printed and circulated, though no copies have been found. News of Blomfield's project apparently discouraged an Oxford man, Alexander Nicholl, who had also planned such a book. In the late 1850s, J. W. Donaldson was beginning a Greek lexicon, incomplete on his death in 1861. Wakefield's and Blomfield's projects predate the earliest published Greek-English lexicon, that of John Jones.[7] All these large projects were begun by single individuals, as was the never-completed Greek lexicon of Adolf Deismann later on.[8] Several factors militating against completion are already apparent, then: the size and nature of the task, the weakness or mortality of authors/editors, and the risks of collaboration.

The role of publishers

Another reason for the non-publication of works is simply their rejection by publishers. The standard biographical treatment of scholars consists of an account of their life and work, backed up by a bibliography. But in many cases, behind the latter lurks a list of works unwritten, unfinished or unpublished. Similarly, behind the list of academic posts occupied is hidden another, of those unsuccessfully applied for. A posthumous eulogy may remark on the long and loyal service of a scholar to his or her institution; the list of applications for external chairs throws an ironic light on such praise.

Some examples of rejected works are relatively well known because of the fame of their authors, which has led to intensive and repeated attention from biographers. A good example is A. E. Housman, whose new text of Propertius was offered to Oxford University Press, then Cambridge University Press, then Macmillan, and rejected by them all. After Housman's death in 1936, his friend and executor A. S. F. Gow burnt the manuscript, in accordance with Housman's wishes. The fact of its rejection has been known for some time, but the offer to three publishers in succession has not. The additional information has come from the use of publishers' archives, which in turn belongs to the interaction between the history of scholarship and of books. In the case of OUP, we now know that Housman's proposal was sent to the Oxford Latinist Robinson Ellis, who wrote a lengthy report advising against publication. (He also sent Housman

[7] J. Jones, *A Greek and English Lexicon* (London 1823).
[8] A. Gerber, *Deissmann the Philologist* (Berlin – New York 2010) 61–103.

a long letter, presumably summarising his report, and in his innocence was surprised when Housman appeared not to be grateful for the gesture.)[9] At Cambridge University Press Housman's proposal similarly failed, despite support from the leading Cambridge Latinist J. P. Postgate, with whom he was later to engage in scholarly disputes.

Postgate himself had two proposals rejected by OUP. The first was for an English translation of Madvig's *Verfassung und Verwaltung des Römischen Staates*, offered in 1881, the year when the first of its two volumes was published in Leipzig. The Press's policy was not to publish translations, which it felt to be below its dignity, unless they were needed for the teaching of Oxford undergraduates. This also explains the persistent refusal of the Press to publish a translation of Fustel de Coulanges' *La Cité Antique* (1864), which was offered to them three times by as many individuals in the period 1868–1890.[10] In the light of the explanation given to him of this policy, it is curious that two years later, in November 1883, Postgate offered a translation of Pindar's Nemean Odes. He was asked to send in a manuscript, and did so; but in January 1884 the offer was declined, on the ground that the translation was "too fragmentary for independent publication". The willingness of the Delegates to consider the manuscript may have been influenced by two factors. First, Postgate's brother, recently drowned in Oxford, had been an undergraduate at Pembroke, the college of Bartholomew Price, the OUP secretary with whom Postgate corresponded, and who suggested that his offer would be welcome. Second, Postgate was secretary of the Cambridge Philological Society from 1879, was sent complimentary copies of OUP classical publications, and offered to collate comments for the revision of both Lewis and Short and Liddell and Scott (interleaved copies were sent to Cambridge in 1881). Postgate, clearly, was someone the Press wished to treat with respect.

The larger the scale of the project, the more likely it is to collapse before publication can be achieved – as we have seen in the case of Key's dictionary. A striking example is the edition of Polybius commissioned by OUP in 1767. The Oxford scholar allotted the task resigned two years later and it was given to Philip Williams of New College. Williams's work on the edition was facilitated by his appointment as a Fellow of Winchester College, the oldest of English public (i. e. private) schools, where he had no teaching responsibilities but had access to an excellent library. It was only in the early 1790s, however, that he began sending material to the Press

[9] D. J. Butterfield and C. A. Stray (eds.), *A. E. Housman: Classical Scholar* (London 2009) 11, 100, 114 n. 46, 187 n. 121; C. A. Stray, "Classics 1780–1896", in S. Eliot (ed.), *A History of Oxford University Press* 2 (Oxford 2012).

[10] T. C. Barker, who had offered in 1868, published his translation in London in 1871 as *Aryan Civilisation*.

for printing. Meanwhile, Schweighaeuser's edition (8 vols, 1789–1795) was being published. When Williams's edition was completely printed, the press decided to add Schweighaeuser's index to it, but in 1804 they decided this was impracticable, and then abandoned the book altogether. Williams returned the money he had been paid to make the edition, and the printed sheets were destroyed.[11] This sad story shows how a large project undertaken by an individual can run into trouble, depending in part on their other commitments; also how a slow project can be overtaken by a speedier rival. But the method of commissioning is also relevant. In this period, OUP's standard procedure was to select an author and then commission a young Oxford graduate to make a text on the basis of an earlier edition, obtaining new manuscript evidence where possible, from the Bodleian Library or from libraries on the Continent, and adding or copying a Latin translation for Greek texts. In most cases this method proved effective, but there were occasions when we find the Press attempting in vain to find out what had happened to books commissioned over a decade earlier. In one case, the records show that anxious rebukes were sent to a graduate who had been allowed to borrow a manuscript: did he still have the manuscript? and had it been damaged while in his care?[12]

Much of the material used so far has come from the archive of Oxford University Press; let me turn to Cambridge University Press to see how many unpublished books can be found in its records. The minutes of the Press's Classical Sub-Syndicate (committee) for 1900–1910 record over a dozen rejections. Some rejected books were later offered to other publishers: thus a handbook of Greek metre by J. W. White of Harvard, declined in 1910, was published by Macmillan in 1912. A. W. Smyth, whose offer of a study of "a numeral law in the *Iliad*" was declined in 1911, had it published by Longmans in 1914 as *The Composition of the* Iliad.[13] As with Housman's new text of Propertius, the sequence of proposals shows that books were often offered first to one or both of the university presses, and only if rejected by them to the respectable but less prestigious house of Macmillan.

The CUP archive throws light on the difficulties caused by J. E. B. Mayor (1825–1910; professor of Latin 1872–1910), whose vast learning was not

---

[11] Williams's proof copy survives in Winchester College Library; it is a large folio of over 1000 pages, and the extreme difficulty of adding Schweighaeuser's substantial index (730 pp.) helps to explain the abandonment of the book.

[12] See Stray, "Classics 1780–1896" (n. 9).

[13] Smyth was a learned amateur (he was librarian to the House of Commons). His book, subtitled "An essay on a numerical law in the *Iliad*"; claimed that the poem had originally consisted of 13,500 lines in 45 segments of 300 lines each. The book was genially ridiculed by T. W. Allen in *CR* 28 (1914, 7) 230–231.

accompanied by an ability to organise it, nor to collaborate efficiently with others. In 1878 the press published an edition of books 3 and 4 of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* by Mayor and J. R. Lumby, which reached a third edition in 1891. In that year, they asked Lumby to work with Mayor again to bring out an edition of the first two books. His reply was forthright:

> …one portion of the conditions renders the work impossible. I value highly Prof. Mayor's work when it is done, but I don't know how to get it done. After innumerable promises that he would do something for these books, now, at the end of 6 or 8 years, the commencement of his part of the work is as far off as ever, nor do I think the case would be different in 8 years more. Further waiting for him must be undertaken by some younger man than I. I withdraw from all further connexion with the proposed edition.[14]

Mayor we have already met as the defaulting collaborator of Henry Nettleship on the OUP Latin dictionary; both cases point to the interaction of two causes of failure – the risks of collaboration, and the inability of some individuals to collaborate. Such cases throw an interesting light on collaborative works which *have* been published. A famous example is Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon, the work of two friends who, having completed the first edition (1843), went on, with the help of German and American scholars, to produce five more editions before Scott's death in 1887 and another two before Liddell's in 1898. In any comparison of the two projects, however, we must remember that Mayor and Nettleship seem to have planned to make a dictionary *de novo*, whereas Liddell and Scott began by translating Passow's lexicon.[15]

Diversions from scholarship: politics and religion

Another Cambridge scholar, Richard Jebb (1841–1905), was very different from Mayor. His famous edition of Sophocles appeared between 1883 and 1896 at roughly two-year intervals. Jebb was a methodical writer who worked from a template already established for his first volume. He also had the advantage, while professor of Greek at Glasgow from 1875 to 1889, of being free for half of every year, when he returned to Cambridge and worked on his edition. Yet the final volume of his Sophocles, covering the fragments, never appeared, largely because from 1891 till his death he represented his university in Parliament.[16] When he died in 1905 Jebb had done very

[14] CUP archives, Cambridge University Library, Pr. b. 13 g, J. R. Lumby to C. J. Clay, 4 June 1891.

[15] Passow's name appeared on their title page till the fifth edition of 1861.

[16] He had been elected regius professor of Greek there in 1889.

little work on the fragments, which after being given for completion to the dilatory Walter Headlam (d. 1908) were eventually edited by A. C. Pearson (3 vols, 1917). The Sophocles fragments were not the only project to be undermined by Jebb's parliamentary duties. In the 1890s, George Macmillan, of the publishing firm of that name, suggested several books to Jebb, some of which he agreed to write, but none of which ever emerged into the light of day. One was a history of Greek literature, designed at first as one, later as three volumes. In the late 1890s, OUP proposed using the text of Jebb's Sophocles editions for their new Oxford Classical Text series. CUP blocked this proposal, but later on raised the possibility of an OCT of Sophocles incorporating the fragments. Jebb's career illustrates, then, both the curtailment of scholarly work by non-academic commitments, and the role of competition between publishers in blocking publications.

The specifics of Jebb's case are perhaps unusual, but in a sense they constitute a replay of a pattern common earlier in the nineteenth century. Until religious restrictions were removed in 1871, Oxford and Cambridge dons worked in an environment where the shadow of the Church of England was cast over the practice of scholarship. This shadow had begun to lift from the mid-1850s, but in the first half of the century, men had been promoted from college fellowships to church positions. Consider the editors of the *Museum Criticum* (1813–1826), J. H. Monk and C. J. Blomfield, and of the *Philological Museum* (1831–1833), Julius Hare and Connop Thirlwall. By 1830 the first two were bishops, and remained so till they died in the 1850s. The second two also gained Church preferment, Thirlwall eventually becoming a bishop. After leaving their university (they were all Cambridge men), they ceased to publish on classical topics, with only two exceptions. In the 1840s Monk, a disciple of Porson who had produced two editions of Euripides plays while still in Cambridge, brought out two more, though anonymously. This may reflect an original plan to continue the work of the master by attempting a complete edition of the poet. The other exception is Thirlwall's *History of Greece* (8 vols, 1835–1844). Thirlwall began this after being given a rural church position in 1834, and continued it after being made Bishop of St David's in 1840. In this case too, therefore, an original plan encouraged continuing work despite ecclesiastical preferment. The overall pattern remained, however: the tendency to recruit talented classical scholars into the Church curtailed the prosecution and publication of scholarly work.[17]

[17] Monk and Blomfield were the best-known examples of the 'Greek play bishop', a category first identified in those precise terms in 1857, but discussed earlier on. See A. Burns and C. A. Stray, "The Greek Play Bishops", www.oxforddnb.com; idem, "The Curious History of the Greek Play Bishop: An Essay in Victorian Episcopal Taxonomy", forthcoming.

It could be said that both orthodoxy and heterodoxy discouraged scholarly work: orthodoxy led to church positions, while heterodoxy could lead to expulsion from the college and university posts which gave time for scholarship. Paradoxically, however, such expulsion could promote scholarly publishing, by forcing expelled scholars to make a living from books. A notable case is that of Frederick Paley, who was expelled from Cambridge in 1846 after being accused of converting a fellow-student to Roman Catholicism. In the next twenty years Paley produced a long series of books, including editions of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Hesiod, Theocritus and Propertius. His productivity arose from necessity, especially after he had a wife and three children to support.[18]

Towards a history of silence

There is perhaps something paradoxical about speaking about silence – especially if one's speech destroys its own subject, as with Thomas Carlyle. Charles Darwin remembered in his autobiography that

> [Carlyle's] talk was very racy and interesting, just like his writings, but he sometimes went on too long on the same subject. I remember a funny dinner at my brother's, where, amongst a few others, were Babbage and Lyell, both of whom liked to talk. Carlyle, however, silenced every one by haranguing during the whole dinner on the advantages of silence. After dinner Babbage, in his grimmest manner, thanked Carlyle for his very interesting lecture on silence.[19]

Carlyle took from Goethe the notion that we begin to err as soon as we speak; silence is golden. Being Carlyle, however, he made the point at excessive length, relegating even good talkers to silence. In this paper I have suggested that a particular kind of silence, that of unpublished books, deserves the attention of historians of scholarship. Just as the history of failure complements that of success, so the stories we can tell of the scholarly works we can read is given an extra dimension by what we can find out about those we cannot read. This silent world, which ignorance renders homogeneous, once explored turns out to be (as one might, after all, expect) as full of variety and nuance as its sibling, the world we knew already.

---

[18] One might think that Catholic scholars had larger family burdens; but Paley's contemporary the Anglican Richard Shilleto, barred from a college fellowship not by religion but by marriage, had 12 children. His work as a private tutor prevented him from publishing much, and his unfinished edition of Thucydides I was completed by Paley after his death.

[19] Ch. Darwin, *Autobiography*, ed. N. Barlow (London 1902) 112. Thomas Carlyle, Scottish man of letters; Charles Lyell, geologist; Charles Babbage, mathematician and inventor.

In his discussion of the reception of Robert Chambers's *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (1844) in London society, James Secord declared that "There is no history of silence".[20] Silence is an absence of sound (or in this case, writing), but an absence that can be looked for, characterised and measured. Its nature and the shapes it takes can be identified from the presences (e. g., of discussion, writing, publication) which surround it, precede or follow it. A productive way of finding such shapes is to look behind the scenes of public discussion and publication, to find patterns of failure, rejection, abandoned projects and so on. To take just one of the examples discussed above: it would be simple enough to state, on the basis of published books, that Fustel de Coulanges' *La Cité Antique* had little impact in England in the last quarter of the 19th century. The series of offers of translations made to OUP shows that such a statement needs serious qualification. One way to identify the nature of such silences is to take a clearly-defined area such as an academic topic, or a published series – as in Graham Whitaker's examination of the Oxford Classical Texts that were proposed, planned or commissioned, but which for one reason or another never appeared.[21]

Another strategy which could be adopted is to look for a particular kind of silence. One might, for example, look for cases of expurgation, where texts or sections of texts are removed out of concern for their predicted effect on particular kinds of readers.[22] An obvious example is that of Juvenal, whose sixteen satires have often shrunk to thirteen in published editions. The best-known English edition, that of J. E. B. Mayor, offers a curious contrast between the editor's characteristically massive accumulation of evidence and his refusal to include Satires 1, 6 and 9 in the book. Mayor was a compulsive collector of parallel passages and annotator of books, as can be seen from his copies of English, Latin and Greek dictionaries, and he had large stores of evidence on the three excluded satires; he simply did

---

[20] J. A. Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago 2000) 158. On how this history might be written, Secord is silent, though he later (515) suggests that every reading "partially covers those that came before". Secord was apparently unaware that another Cambridge historian, Peter Burke, had previously published "Notes for a Social History of Silence" in *The Art of Conversation* (Cambridge 1993) 123–142.

[21] G. H. Whitaker, "What You Didn't Read: The Unpublished Oxford Classical Texts", in C. A. Stray (ed.), *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning 1800–2000* (London 2009) 154–167.

[22] Very little has been published on this topic, a notable exception being K. J. Dover's "Expurgation of Greek literature", in: *Les études classiques aux XIXe et XXe siècles: leur place dans l'histoire des idées* (Geneva 1980) 55–82. See S. J. Harrison, C. A. Stray (edd.), *Expurgating the Classics* (London 2011).

not publish them. Of even greater concern to nineteenth-century sensibilities were the epigrams of Martial. When the OCT series was being planned in the mid-1890s, his text was dealt with in a unique way: W. M. Lindsay, the scholar commissioned to assemble an OCT, was also contracted to make a volume of *Epigrammata Selecta*.[23]

In some cases, work which is known in one period becomes forgotten later on. Birley's book deals with works which have simply fallen out of fashion. Other relegations to silence are the result of deliberate policy. Alexander Gavrilov himself has played a part in bringing back to notice the work of Russian scholars who had earlier been dismissed or exiled in the Stalinist era.[24] There have been cases where scholars whose work was celebrated in their lifetime have become largely unread in the following generation: two examples in Britain are Richard Jebb and Gilbert Murray. In both cases, however, an increasing interest in the history of scholarship has helped to bring them back to the attention of scholars, if not to a wide readership.[25]

I have written so far as if scholarship belonged either to the world of speech or of silence; but of course the matter is not so simple. A long continuum runs from silence to the peaks of fame, where we find work which is not just known, but celebrated. The progressive aspect of scholarship leads to works which were pioneering in their time becoming discarded as their results are absorbed into later studies. When Fraenkel's massive edition of the *Agamemnon* appeared in 1950, it was widely seen as a permanent milestone in the study of the play. The view within its publishers, OUP, was that it would never go out of print: but it did so in 2003. An earlier OUP book also seen as a landmark, Syme's *Roman Revolution* of 1939, like Fraenkel's, retains respect for its learning, and (unlike Fraenkel's) for the style in which its learning is conveyed. Syme's book, however, has long been recognised as a powerful and brilliant expression of a particular style of historiography, one which focused on Rome, not Italy, and on elites, not their social inferiors. The book has not fallen silent, but its voice has

---

[23] OUP archive, CPCO 1044. Lindsay did not produce the selection, and the task was passed to two schoolmasters, who drew on Lindsay's full OCT, and also assembled an expurgated school edition. The *Epigrammata Selecta* was uniquely anomalous – even in appearance, since though it followed the OCT format, it was bound in green rather than in brown.

[24] А. К. Гаврилов, *О филологии и филологах: статьи и выступления разных лет* (СПб. 2011) [forthcoming]. [*On Philologists and Philology: Articles and Speeches of Various Years* (St. Petersburg 2011)].

[25] For Jebb, see P. E. Easterling, "The Speaking Page: Reading Sophocles with Jebb", in: C. A. Stray (ed.), *The Owl of Minerva: The Cambridge Praelections of 1906*, *PCPS* supp. 28 (2005) 25–46; for Murray, see Stray (ed.), *Reassessing Gilbert Murray* (Oxford 2007).

become one among many. The argument of this paper has been that behind the conversation carried on between such books, and such authorial voices, is a realm of silence occupied by other books which – for reasons I have tried to explore – have never joined that conversation.

Christopher Stray
Swansea University
Institute of Classical Studies, University of London

Откликаясь на статью А. К. Гаврилова “Чтение про себя в древности”, автор рассматривает еще один вид “тишины” – книги, которые не были изданы. Предметом архивного исследования стали некоторые нереализованные проекты английских филологов классиков XIX–XX вв. В качестве продуктивного подхода к созданию “истории тишины” автор предлагает рассмотреть причины, приведшие к незавершенности тех или иных начинаний (напр., масштабность лексикографических проектов, разногласия между сотрудниками, необходимость участия в неакадемической деятельности), а также выстроить модели провалов и отказов от публикаций. В качестве особых видов “тишины” автор выделяет также купюры по цензурным соображениям или судьбы книг, которые некогда считались вершиной филологических достижений, но постепенно утратили свой приоритет.