

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for ***The Classical Review***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Clark's Edition of the *Pro Milone M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad iudices Oratio*. Edited with introduction and commentary by Albert C. Clark, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford. 8s. 6d.

S. G. Owen

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / March 1896, pp 118 - 119
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203429, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203429

How to cite this article:

S. G. Owen (1896). Review of R. Y. Ebied, and M. J. L. Young 'Some Arabic legal documents of the Ottoman period from the Leeds manuscript collection' The Classical Review, 10, pp 118-119 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203429

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CLARK'S EDITION OF THE *PRO MILONE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad indices Oratio. Edited with introduction and commentary by ALBERT C. CLARK, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford. 8s. 6d.

THIS finely printed book stands on a different footing from the numerous school editions that have appeared of this popular speech; the teacher rather than the beginner will be grateful for it. As would be expected from the author of the Oxford Anecdote on the Harley MS. of Cicero, Mr. Clark's chief concern is with the text. He has sifted the sources, gathering his results in a succinct apparatus criticus, and has produced a new revision, which no one in future can afford to neglect. Yet he has in no way overlooked the other departments of the editor's task. The introduction of fifty-nine pages comprises the following subjects: (1) the authorities for the events of the year B.C. 52, (2) an historical introduction, (3) the sources of the text, (4) the style and composition of the speech, (5) the orthography of this edition. Then follows the text and commentary; after which are printed the commentary of Asconius with notes, and the Scholia Bobiensia without notes. Lastly there are four appendices: (1) on the date of the trial of Milo, (2) on the trial of the two tribunes, (3) additional readings from P, the Turin palimpsest, (4) a mediaeval argument of the speech. The book closes with three indices.

It will be gathered from this analysis that special attention has been paid to historical questions. In this respect the work is masterly, especially in the introduction, where the editor's wide knowledge of Cicero enables him to invest the characters of the narrative with life-like personality. Milo's wife Fausta, the great lady with a 'seamy' past, Curio the 'creature of impulse,' the dialectic of Hortensius, the gibes of Caelius, the pathos of Cicero, that great master who could work upon the feelings as a musician on the strings of a lyre, are specimens of vivid touches and sympathetic criticism, inspiring for its interest, and true, as being drawn from ancient texts.

The commentary, which I have compared with several others, contains but a small amount of that traditional stock matter which is handed on from editor to editor. As Mr. Clark has produced a new text, so,

as far as that is possible, he has written a new commentary, a commentary which enables the reader to appreciate with a thoroughness impossible before the delicacies and intricacies of this laboured speech. The notes consist of discussions and vindications of the readings accepted in the text, illustrations of matters of rhetoric, showing a careful study of Quintilian and of all questions connected with the growth of Cicero's style, and remarks on Ciceronian uses of words, based specially on Krebs-Allgayer's *Antibarbarus*. It is therefore clear that the greater part of the matter is new; and indeed, excepting Dr. Reid's *Academics* and Dr. Wilkins' *De Oratore*, no English edition of Cicero appears to have added so much to our knowledge.

The classification of the manuscripts has been performed with clearness. Mr. Clark's own position is that the Harleianus is the best. Though, like all eleventh century MSS., it contains corruptions, glosses, and interpolations, it presents them in a more rudimentary and distinguishable form than the other MSS. In order to prove the superiority of the Harleianus, the claims of the other MSS. are examined in detail. After dismissing the so-called interpolated, and amongst them the Oxford, MSS. as worthless, about which there is no question, Mr. Clark demonstrates that amongst these sinners must be reckoned the Salisburgensis, which, without sufficient inquiry, has been treated as a serious authority, but which is clearly interpolated and conflated. There thus remain P, the Turin palimpsest, of which only a few fragments are preserved, and the so-called German MSS., H, Harleianus, T, Tergernseensis, and E, Erfurtensis. To P Mr. Clark attaches considerable importance, though not the extreme value that some critics ascribe to it. But so little of the speech is contained in this palimpsest, that the really interesting question is the settlement of the claims of the German MSS. To most modern editors, including Baiter and C. F. W. Müller, E has seemed of primary importance. This view Mr. Clark combats in much detail, and establishes, in my opinion convincingly, that 'E' is a "contaminated" MS., being a mixture of two recensions. It has been copied from the same source as T, but corrected by superscriptions and additions

drawn from H or a similar MS.' and 'its chief importance is that it throws light upon the archetype of T, the two MSS. seeming to check each other.' This dethronement of E leaves H and T as our authorities; of these H is far superior to T, which is itself the *parens deteriorum*.

Mr. Clark has therefore been guided mainly by H, and consequently his text differs widely from those in general use. The extraordinary excellence of H is obvious to any one conversant with MSS., and a general revision will be necessary of the current school editions of the Milo by the light of Mr. Clark's book. The following are specimens of the improvements introduced into the text from H:

§ 53 *superiorem se fore putabat Milo* (for *putarat*), 'the imperfect denotes that it was a "fixed idea" with him.'

§ 57 *quid opus est terrore* (for *tortore*)? 'the alteration to *tortore* is...due to *tortorem* and *tormentis* infr.'

§ 68 *te, Magne, tamen, ante testaretur, quod nunc etiam facit* (for *antestaretur*). The new reading makes it no longer necessary to distort the meaning of *antestaretur*.

§ 74 *calcem, caementa, harenam conuexit* (for *arma*). This fine restoration is justified in an elaborate note: *harena* was 'the most important ingredient in a *caementicia structura*'; cf. Vitruv. ii. ch. iv. in *caementi-*

ciis structuris primum est de harena quaerendum.'

§ 75 *ut sororem non modo uestibulo priuaret, sed omni aditu et lumine* (for *limine*). This is clearly right: he interfered with her lights: Mr. Clark quotes Dig. viii. 2, 15 *si modo sic faciat ut lumini noceat*.

§ 85 *regiones* mehercule ipsae, quae illam beluam cadere uiderunt, commosse se uidentur (for *religiones*). By *regiones* is meant the *Albani tumuli atque luci*.

§ 90 *ille denique uiuus mali nihil fecisset, cui mortuo unus ex suis satellitibus curiam incenderit* (for *qui mortuus uno*). This brilliant restoration is based on *qui mortuo unus* the reading of H. The confusion of *qui, cui* is common, e.g. in the MSS. in Catull. 1, 1.

§ 95 *eam . . . suam se fecisse* (for *eam se fecisse*).

These examples are enough to show the solid nature of the work; nor have I space to register the editor's fresh conjectures (e.g. §§ 35, 42), restorations (e.g. § 91), and judicious excisions of adscripts from the text. Enough has been said to indicate that this is one of the most serious of recent contributions to Latin literature; if accuracy acuteness and freshness count for anything, it cannot fail to give an impetus to the study of Cicero. S. G. OWEN.

OWEN'S EDITION OF THE *DE ORATORE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis De Oratore. Liber Primus. Edited on the basis of Sorof's second edition by W. B. OWEN, PH. D., Professor in Lafayette College. The Student's Series of Latin Classics: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn, 1895.

THE idea of including in this series some of the works of Cicero which are less commonly read in our colleges is a very good one. The writer, however, has for some time been of the opinion that the best editions of the classics for the use of American students are on the whole not those which are based on some particular German edition; and this impression is somewhat strengthened by Professor Owen's book.

We have first an Introduction of 33 pages based for the most part on Sorof, but with a section on the style of the *De Oratore* which is entirely the work of the

American editor. Especial attention is given to the subject of *libration*, that is to 'the balancing of related parts of sentences, and the grouping of ideas and synonyms in pairs.' This section is well and thoughtfully done, although in some cases the wording is not so clear as might be desired; and the Introduction as a whole is excellent.

The Notes are somewhat uneven in character, the grammatical references in particular being somewhat elementary for the class of students for which the book is evidently designed. For instance, there are no less than three separate references (pp. 87, 94, and 109) to the use of the fut. perf. ind. in conditional clauses, and the student is referred to his grammar for 'the use of the plural for the singular' in *nos*, and for the subj. in an indirect question. Such translations too as 'within these few days'