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](#)

Plasberg on the *Hortensius* of Cicero *De M. Tullii Ciceronis Hortensio dialogo* scripsit Otto Plasberg. Lipsiae : Gustavus Fock. 1892.

L. C. Purser

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 10 / December 1892, pp 448 - 450

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186925, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186925

How to cite this article:

L. C. Purser (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 448-450 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186925

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tion to the fact that we need not be afraid of apparent hiatus before the word *homo*: cf. above on 316.—717 Brix's note on *quemquem*, *quemque* requires to be entirely recast; it is based on a confusion of relative with indefinite meaning; in passages like Men. 522 *ut quemque conspicio*, Capt. 501 *ubi quisque vident*, Mil. 1264, Pseud. 1312, Rud. 1359 etc. *quisque* has its ordinary meaning 'each'; but in passages like Mil. 156, 160 *quemque videritis*, 460 *quemque uidero* (add 1391 *quaque aspexerit*), Capt. 797 f. *ad quemque icero* the word is relative (= *quisquis*). It is very strange that the attention of Brix himself was never directed to this note which he allowed to stand in three editions.¹—736 I cannot agree with Brix that *quaero*=*quaeso* in *quaere meum patrem, tecum simul ut veniat ad me*; the meaning is simply 'seek (try to find) my father, in order that he may come with you'; whether

¹ Is it evidence that even eminent scholars are not always thoroughly alive to the essential point of difference in meaning between *quisquis*, *quicumque* on the one hand and *quisque*, *quivis*, *quisquam* on the other? That the latter in their ordinary use stand in sharp contrast to the former as non-relatives is a point generally obscured by grammars.

Langen so understands it ('Beiträge' p. 291, not 736) is perhaps not quite clear.—744 The passage quoted in the critical appendix to justify the indic. *arbitrare* is not to the point; the question is whether the indic. can stand in dependence on a *verbum nesciendi*; cf. my note on Rud. 385.—763 should have no comma at *mihi*.—764 there seems to be no reason to prefer *arcessat* to *accersit* (MSS.); see my notes on Rud. 1056 and 356.—896 the reading *quin suspirabo plus sescentos in dies* is almost certainly wrong.—913 *ellebori unguine* is quite unsuitable, as Schoell says; hellebore was drunk, not made into ointments. The MSS. have *iungere*: I propose to read *iugero* 'an acre of hellebore.'

Some misprints will have to be corrected: 172 *Elocuti's* (with ictus); 185 *Vter* (without ictus); 224 *cura* (ditto); 255 *hercle* (ditto); p. 37 the note on 323 refers to 303, instead of 302; 396 *lubidrio*; p. 53 the numeration of four notes is wrong; p. 54 in note on 571 'bis 557' for 'bis 577'; 576 *siest* for *si est* or *sist*; 584 *periuriis*; 621 *Quid* (without ictus); p. 107 in margin 624 (for 625), 734 (for 739), 735 (for 740).

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

PLASBERG ON THE *HORTENSIVS* OF CICERO.

De M. Tullii Ciceronis Hortensio dialogo scripsit OTTO PLASBERG. Lipsiae: Gustavus Fock. 1892.

It is a frequent source of jokes against anatomists that they are credited with an ability to construct an organism, given a tooth or some equally minute portion. The re-construction of lost works of literature from a few fragments, which are preserved in dictionaries or grammars, may lend itself to similar merriment: but happily not so in the present case, as the fragments of the *Hortensius* are fairly numerous and direct evidence is forthcoming on some points relating to the main features of the dialogue. The great literary and moral merits of the essay, which effected the conversion of a St. Augustine, justify every attempt to discover all that can be known about it. There is indeed no reason to be altogether without hope that it may be still discovered in some library: but meanwhile we must thank Herr Plasberg for the careful thought he has bestowed on the extant fragments, the learned and on

the whole satisfactory sketch he has made of what was probably the course of the dialogue, and the admirable manner in which he has fitted the fragments into the framework which he has constructed.

Perhaps the most important point in the pamphlet is the confutation of Schenkel's view that the *Hortensius* was unknown in the Middle Ages. There is no doubt that many allusions to a dialogue *Hortensius* really refer to the *Lucullus*: but in two instances at least Herr Plasberg shows that this is not the case. Bertholdus in his 'Annals' under the year 1054 (Pertz V. 268) relates a vision of Herimann, Abbot of Mehrerau, which proves that the latter must have read and re-read a *Hortensius*, and from what is stated of the contents of the book it is certain that it was not the *Lucullus* and was the *Hortensius*. Again, from some scholia on a Cambridge MS. of the *Academica* noticed by Dr. Reid (*Acad.* ed. 2, pp. 67—8), William of Malmesbury (*circ.* 1140) did not confound the *Hortensius* and the *Lucullus*. Hence too the practical result that when we find a *Hortensius* o.

Cicero in any catalogue of MSS. we should not hastily say that it must be the *Lucullus*.

The dialogue was composed in April 709 during Cicero's stay with Atticus in the country seat at Nomentum; hence there is little or no reference to the *Hortensius* in the *Letters to Atticus*. It is supposed to have taken place in the house of Lucullus at some time between 689 (the date of Cicero's speech for Cornelius) and 694 (the date of the death of Catulus). The interlocutors were Catulus, Lucullus, Hortensius and Cicero. Passing from admiration of the villa of Lucullus and its works of art to the consideration of books as more conducive to real education and culture, Catulus treats of the poets and Lucullus of historians. Hortensius then delivers a panegyric on the one study that is really valuable—eloquence, with allusion to many of the chief orators. This is followed by a discussion between Catulus and him, the former defending philosophy, the latter attacking it on the ground of its abstruseness and difficulty (formal logic he especially despises), the ambiguity that hangs round all its tenets, the diversity of views held by the most eminent thinkers, and the little practical effect it has had on the moral lives of the philosophers. Hortensius appears to think that philosophy, or the love of wisdom, should be directed to procuring elegance and refinement in all the material adjuncts of life; and he maintains these views with an acrimonious energy similar to that with which Callicles in the *Gorgias* maintains somewhat similar 'common-sense' opinions. Indeed it is not altogether impossible that Cicero may have had that declamation of Callicles before his mind (cp. Frag. 33 Btr. *Quae est igitur philosophia, Socrate?*), as the fragments show (e.g. 9, 74, 90) reminiscences of Plato. Cicero replies that much of the hostility to philosophy is due to insufficient preparatory training, both moral and intellectual, on the part of those who attempt to study it: and then proceeds in a long oration to prove the necessity of the study of philosophy. We all desire to be happy, but are led astray by false notions that happiness lies in glory and riches, by the allurements of pleasure and by the fear of death. Philosophy clears away these erroneous ideas, frees us from the tyranny of passion, proves to us the worthlessness of the body, and gives us good hopes that after death we shall enjoy either the sleep of extinction or the bliss of immortality.

In the details Herr Plasberg is often instructive. His reference of Frag. 37

bellum cum mortuo gerunt to the literary war which was raging round the memory of Cato is highly probable. We think he labours in vain (p. 25) to lay down rules for the (sporadic) use of the plural with *utrumque* in Cicero. He argues with considerable probability that in the *Lucullus* §§ 13, 144 (*seditiosi cives, tribuni*) the reference is to Cornelius the tribune whom Cicero defended in 689; and with great learning he explains Frag. 17 *se ad extremum pollicetur prolaturum quae se ipsa comest quod efficit dialecticorum ratio* by a quotation from Julianus Pelagianus (ap. St. August. x. 726 ed. Migne) *non igitur sum pharmacopolae similis, ut dicis, qui promittebat bestiam quae se ipsam comesset* i.e. the polypus, cp. Hesiod *Op.* 522 and Lucilius 1042 ed. Lachm. He very fairly transfers Frag. 32, which is usually assigned to the *Hortensius*, to the beginning of the 3rd book *De Republica*. In criticism his conservatism is most laudable. Thus in Frag. 82 *quod alterius* (probably a comic poet) *ingenium sic ut acetum Aegyptium, alterius sic acre ut mel Hymettium dicimus* he justly refuses to transpose *acre* to the previous clause and substitute *dulce* or *mite*, cp., with Baiter, St. Augustine *De Vita Beata* ii. 14 (= i. 966 ed. Migne), *ut ait ille de melle Hymettio; acriter dulce est nihilque inflat viscera*. He refuses to alter *ut Cicero* in St. Augustine *Principia dialecticae* c. 6 (= i. 1412 ed. Migne) *Stoici autumant, quos Cicero in hac re ut Cicero inridet nullum esse verbum cuius non certa explicari origo possit*, though Haupt's *cerritos* is most attractive. He justly defends *talibus* in *litteris talibusque doctrinis* (Frag. 9) by reference to *Tusc.* i. 71, *De Orat.* ii. 185; *factus* without any addition such as *sublimis* in Frag. 44, *in interitu Romuli qui obscuracione solis est factus*: in Frag. 88 *aptissime* (wrongly altered to *artissime*) by the apt quotation from Val. Max. ix. 2 extr. 10. However he need not have added *ista* in Frag. 33 *Quae est igitur philosophia, Socrate?* We should suggest to read *horum* for *eorum* in Frag. 32 to mark the antithesis to *istorum*; and perhaps Frag. 27 might be altered to *quantum inter se homines stud <iis dissid> entes moribus omnis vitae ratione differant*.

He breaks a lance with Dr. Reid over *Acad.* ii. 61 *Tunc, cum tantis laudibus philosophiam extuleris Hortensiumque nostrum dissidentem commoveris, eam philosophiam sequere* &c., where he expresses agreement with the view held by Krische that the reference is to the conversion of Hortensius at the close of our dialogue. This may be true: but he is not quite fair to Dr. Reid,

who considers (p. 44) that Hortensius in the *Catulus* gave a *résumé* of the history of philosophy in order 'to show that the New Academic revolt against the old Academico-Peripatetic school, as viewed by Antiochus, was unjustifiable.' Herr Plasberg does not consider the point of view from which the

résumé was made (si Hortensius in *Catulo* nihil protulit nisi quaedam de memoria philosophorum decerpta—id quod statuit Reidius), and then asks, How can Hortensius be said to have been moved from his position of dissent?

L. C. PURSER.

SONNTAG'S VIRGIL AS A BUCOLIC POET.

Vergil als bukolischer Dichter, von M. SONNTAG, Oberlehrer am königl. Friedrichs-Gymnasium zu Frankfurt a/Oder. Leipzig. B. G. Teubner. 1891. Pp. 249. 5 Mk.

THE writer combats with great ability the commonly accepted view of the date and order of the Eclogues. 'The placing of the first Eclogue in the year B.C. 41 is the original mistake of all attempts at arrangement hitherto made.' The process of settling troops as colonists and the surveying and division of the territory assigned them, involving as it did the setting apart of *loca publica*, *pascua*, *silvae*, *loca sacra* and such properties as for some special reason were left in the possession of their original owners (*fundi concessi*), is shown by careful consideration of authorities to have been a long and tedious one. Even in the republican period, when the numbers to be settled were comparatively small, *triumviri coloniae deducendae* were appointed with authority for three years (p. 35), which may therefore be considered the average time necessary for the completion of their task. Now Mantua was not included in the territory originally granted to the veterans, and it was only after the territory of Cremona had proved insufficient (*i.e.* after it had been carefully surveyed and the various *exempta* and *concessa* determined), and consequently at a comparatively late period, that the trouble about Virgil's farm could have arisen. The visit to Rome which he took in consequence was made in the autumn (cf. *Ecl.* 1, 37, where Amaryllis leaves the ripe apples hanging in his absence), and the Eclogue represents a *spring* scene (cf. l. 14), so that its earliest possible date is B.C. 40. But it is impossible, for the reasons given above, that by the autumn of B.C. 41 the settlement of the veterans could have advanced so far that the occupation of Mantuan territory had by then commenced. More probably during the troubles of B.C. 41 and the early part of 40 things went on

very slowly and no real progress was made until after the peace of Brundisium, so that the appearance of the *agrimensores* at Mantua may be placed in the spring of B.C. 39, and Virgil's visit to Rome in the autumn of that year. At that time both Octavian and Pollio were in Rome, and we know on the authority of Servius, the *Scholia Bernensia* and the *Scholia Danielina*, that it was Pollio who introduced the poet to Octavian, an introduction which could not have taken place in B.C. 41 when he was distinctly opposed to Octavian, but which was perfectly easy in B.C. 39 when he was in high favour and had just returned from his victory over the Parthini. The date of the first Eclogue is thus brought down to the spring of B.C. 38.

Further, accepting a note of the *Scholia Danielina*, which on *Ecl.* 9, 10 explains *carminibus* by a reference to the *carmina quibus sibi Pollionem intercessorem apud Augustum conciliaverat*, and *Ecl.* 8, 11, *accipe iussis carmina coepta tuis*, taking the plural *carmina* strictly and not merely as referring to the single Eclogue, the writer asks what were the 'poems' of which Virgil thus asks Pollio's acceptance, which Pollio had urged him to write and of which the eighth Eclogue is the last (cf. *a te principium tibi desinam*). First come the second and third Eclogues, which are purely experimental imitations of Theocritus; with these goes the fifth Eclogue which refers to them and is also purely Theocritean, the view of Nettleship that Daphnis represents Caesar being strongly opposed (p. 122); the fourth is necessarily included and is an attempt to raise bucolic poetry to a higher level (l. 1 *maiora canamus*) in accordance with a suggestion of Pollio's, who found the second and third somewhat lacking in elevation (cf. *non omnes arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae*); the seventh completes the collection, and the eighth though written last was placed at its head. It was this collection which Virgil presented for