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](#)

Zielinski's *Clauselgesetz* Das *Clauselgesetz* in Cicero's *Reden*. Von Th. Zielinski, Prof, an der Universität St. Petersburg. Leipzig: Th. Weicher, Dieterich'sche Verlags - Buchhandlung. 1904. Pp. 253. M. 8.40.

Albert C. Clark

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 03 / April 2005, pp 164 - 172

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000214, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000214

How to cite this article:

Albert C. Clark (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 164-172 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000214

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ZIELINSKI'S *CLAUSELGESETZ*.

Das Clauselgesetz in Cicero's Reden. Von TH. ZIELINSKI, Prof. an der Universität St. Petersburg. Leipzig: Th. Weicher, Dieterich'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung. 1904. Pp. 253. M. 8.40.

PROFESSOR TH. ZIELINSKI, of St. Petersburg, who is well known to students of Cicero as the author of a charming work *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig, 1897, has made a very remarkable discovery concerning the character of the Ciceronian clausula. From statements which he makes he appears to have been working upon the subject since 1894. His conclusions have been formed as the result of a truly gigantic piece of work: viz. the examination of all the clausulae in all the speeches of Cicero, 17,902 in number. These he has analysed, classified, and reduced to forms, and has finally discovered that they are based upon a principle which can be readily comprehended. The clausula follows a law, and if this is broken, then the clausula is faulty. It may at first be thought that the writer is suffering from an *idée fixe*, caused by prolonged poring over statistics. I have, however, studied his system with care, tested his examples, and examined in the light of his rules several speeches upon which I am myself working, and have come to the conclusion that, whatever the ultimate explanation of his law may be, it is a very valuable instrument which cannot be neglected by any critic, while it enables every reader to discover fresh charms in Ciceronian prose.

Since the subject is, very technical and has not received much attention in this country, it may be well to state briefly some theories of ancient writers concerning the rhythm of prose, and the results arrived at recently by other inquirers.

Metrical prose was, of course, not an invention of the Romans, but came to them from Greece. Thrasyarchus of Chalcidion, well-known to us from the *Republic* of Plato, is said to have been the first person to aim at metrical effect by the use of favourite rhythms. Quintilian (ix. 4. 87) speaks of him as the 'discoverer' of the paean. The same foot was preferred by Aristotle, who thought that the 1st paean (— ◡ ◡ ◡) was most suitable at the beginning of a sentence, and the 4th paean (◡ ◡ ◡ —) at the end. Both of these are metrical equivalents of

the cretic (— ◡ —), as Cicero points out when commenting upon the rule of Aristotle (Orator § 215). Demosthenes had certain favourite rhythms. Thus Norden shews that in the First Philippic the predominant forms in the clausulae are the ditrochaeus (or dichoreus), dispondeus, cretic + trochee, choriambic + trochee. His love of the cretic was noticed by Quintilian who quotes as examples of his *severa compositio* (ix. 4. 63) τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις from de Cor. 1, and μηδὲ τοῦτόν from Phil. iii. 19. The use of *numeri* was pushed to an extreme by Asiatic writers. Cicero says that they put in words merely to complete the rhythm: 'apud Asiaticos numeros servientes reperias quaedam verba quasi complementa numerorum' (Orat. 231). Their writings were marked by excessive partiality for certain rhythms, by carefully balanced clauses (ισόκωλα) and ὁμοιοτέλευτα, the delivery being as Cicero says a chant, or sing-song (ululanti voce more Asiatico canere Orat. 27).

The Asiatic school became popular at Rome. Cicero in a famous passage (Orator 214) after saying (modum) unum est secuta Asia maxime, qui dichoreus vocatur, quotes from a speech of Carbo

'quicumque eam violassent, ab omnibus esse ei poenas persolutas,' dichoreus . . . deinde, 'patris dictum sapiens temeritas filii comprobavit.' Hoc dichoreo tantus clamor contionis excitatus est ut admirabile esset. Quaero, nonne id numerus effecerit? verborum ordinem immuta: fac sic, 'comprobavit filii temeritas,' iam nihil erit.

The use of rhythm was avoided by the Atticists, such as Caesar and Brutus: by archaic writers such as Sallust and apparently by Tacitus. The favourite rhythms of Livy differ, as will shortly be shewn, in an interesting particular from those of Cicero. The composition of Seneca and Pliny and that of the various imitators of Cicero is rhythmical and follows more or less the Ciceronian rules.

Cicero on various occasions and especially in de Or. iii. 173 sqq. and Orat. 204 sqq. discusses the nature of *numerosa oratio*. The gist of his remarks is that, while the orator should not fall into poetry, or *numeri* pure and simple, his discourse should be *similis numerorum*. Thus (Orat. 222) referring to the sentence of Crassus

missos faciant patronos, ipsi prodeant,

he says that but for the stop after *patronos*, it would form a senarius. He would prefer *prōdēant ipsi*.

Besides *numeri*, he says, *concininitas* is necessary: i.e. the various *commata* and *cola* must be carefully balanced. The most important part of the sentence is the end or *clausula*: cf. de Or. iii. 192 'clausulas diligentius etiam servandas esse arbitror quam superiora, quod in eis maxime perfectio atque absolutio indicatur.' In a verse the beginning, the middle, and the end are equally important, and a blemish anywhere is promptly detected: 'in oratione autem pauci prima cernunt, postrema plerique.' He elsewhere (Orat. 216) defines what he means by *clausula*. He says 'hos cum in clausulis pedes nomino, non loquor de uno pede extremo: adiungo quod minimum sit, proximum, superiorem, saepe etiam tertium.' He recommends for use in the *clausula* in the first place the cretic, and secondly the paeon (— — — —), which is its metrical equivalent. Of the spondee he says that it is not 'funditus repudiandus,' and that it has 'stabilem quandam et non expertem dignitatis gradum.' I pass by the remarks which he makes about the use of other feet.

I also omit the rules laid down by Quintilian, since they appear to be based upon those of Cicero, while his examples, many of which are highly interesting and shew keen insight, are chiefly taken from Cicero's writings. I also pass over various remarks made by grammarians and rhetorical writers, with a single exception: which, in view of Zielinski's canon, possesses peculiar interest.

Terentianus Maurus (290 A.D. circ.) says of the cretic

optimus pes et melodis et pedestri gloriae:
plurimum orantes decebit, quando *paene in ultimo*

obtinēt sedem beatam, terminet si clausulam
dactylus, spondeus imam nec trochaemum
respuo:

bacchicos utrosque fugito, nec repellas tribrachyn.

plenius tractatur istud arte prosa rhetorum.

It will be noticed that he speaks of a *sedes beata* for the cretic in the *clausula*, viz. *paene in ultimo* before — — — —, — —. This statement is practically identical with Zielinski's law, which I shall shortly set forth.

During the last 25 years various writers have dissected the Ciceronian *clausula*.

The first writer upon the subject was G. Wüst (1881), who in his work '*de clausula rhetorica*' etc. tabulated the results arrived at by an examination of 18 speeches, leaving the others to those blessed by leisure or to whom 'natura ferream quandam constantiam dedit.' He shewed clearly that while some *clausulae* were extremely common, others were very exceptional, e.g. the *clausula heroica*, condemned by Quintilian. Thus he only found two cases of this in the speeches used by him viz. Cat. 1. 14. *cumulasti*, Mil. 91 *volitarunt*, where the unsyncopated forms remove the faulty rhythm. So in 1895 I read *volitarunt* in Mil. l.c., which Zielinski refers to as being the only occasion upon which any editor has made an alteration on metrical grounds. The results of Wüst's discussion were somewhat desultory, and his chief claim to praise lies in the fact that he was the pioneer. He was followed by several investigators who proceeded by one of two methods. One school, the most eminent member of which is M. Bornèque (1898), took as its watchword the theory that the metrical form of the last word in the *clausula* determines the metrical form of that before it, e.g. he took an iambic dissyllable, and tabulated all possible feet found before it, e.g.

oras	} ferant.
ingere	
amoveant	
ore	
scripserint	

He took his illustrations from the letters *ad Fam.* some of which are wholly rhythmical, such as those to Lentulus, while others are only partially so. Those to Atticus are, of course, not rhythmical. His conclusions were not satisfying. Frequently he says that no conclusion is possible, or that all the forms seem possible. His tables, however, are exceedingly interesting when compared with Zielinski's forms, the results being the same though the terminology is different. The other school represented by E. Müller, *de numero Ciceroniano*, 1886, Norden in his important work, *die klassische Kunstprosa*, 1898, and Ju. Wolff, *de clausulis Ciceronianis*, 1901, insisted upon the connexion of Latin rhythmical prose with Greek, and endeavoured to collect types or forms of *clausulae*. They also made important contributions to our knowledge of Ciceronian prosody. Wolff found that there were 4 chief forms of the *clausula*, viz.

— — —	ditrochee
— — — —	choliambic
— — — — —	dicretic
— — — — —	hypodochmiac

These writers shewed that a particular foot might, as in verse, be replaced by its metrical equivalent, e.g. a cretic by a molossus (— — —) or an epitrit (— — — —, or — — — —): just as Cicero had pointed out that a cretic was the metrical equivalent of a paeon. Wolff indicated various devices used to produce favourite rhythms, e.g. the use of *-que* and *atque* in a clausula, the latter word being constantly found in the clausula before a consonant, whereas elsewhere it is seldom used except before a vowel. He illustrated the use of synaloepha, elision, hiatus, contraction (e.g. *nīl, comprehēdo*), and shewed how the evidence of the clausula threw light upon such questions as the gen. in *-ii*, and *-i*.

Zielinski, who in a review of my edition, vol. VI. Oxford Class. Texts (Deutsche Literaturz. 1901, p. 1556) hinted at certain conclusions of his own regarding the *clausula*, now thought it time to publish his secret. This he did briefly in a review of Wolff's work (D. L. 1901, p. 3243), where he points out that both the ditrochaeus, and the hypodochmiac of Wolff are preceded by a cretic base, like his other two forms. There is really, therefore, only one form of the clausula, viz. a cretic (or its metrical equivalent) followed by a trochaic cadence consisting of from 2 to 5 syllables.

This view he has developed at length in the present work. His investigations are mainly concerned with the *clausula*, since this is the point in the sentence where the rhythm becomes most palpable. It is, however, obvious, as is indeed stated by Cicero and Quintilian that the *cola* are governed by the same rules, though not with equal stringency. This subject he promises to discuss in a later work upon what he terms the '*durchgehender Rhythmus*' or '*constructiver Rhythmus*,' which, from the hints which he throws out, promises to be of a most fascinating character.

The strength of Zielinski's arguments is based upon statistics. He has classified all the examples, and is always ready with percentages. He quotes in full all the rarer cases. He is thus enabled to speak with authority, and to talk of laws, where his predecessors could only speak of favourite forms.

The theory is briefly this. In every clausula there are two parts, a basis, and

a cadence. The basis consists of a cretic, or its metrical equivalent, the cadence varies in length, and is trochaic in character.

Form 1. — — — | — —.

This is the simplest and favourite form (4184 exx., 23 p.c.). In it no metrical licenses of any kind are allowed, i.e. no molossus, or resolution of long vowels. The last syllable, of course, is doubtful, as in verse.

Form 2 { — — — | — — | — —.

The basis has two¹ forms, viz. the weak — — —, and strong — — —. Of the first he finds 1991 exx. (11.1 p.c.). Of the second 1297 exx. (8. p.c.). It is an interesting point in tracing the development of Cicero's rhythm that in his later speeches he shews marked preference for the cretic basis as against the molossus.

Thus while in the Verrines Zielinski finds — — — 479 exx., — — — 399, in the Philippics the figures are — — — 514, — — — 161.

Form 3 { — — — | — — — | — —.

Of the weak form he finds 1787 exx.: of the strong 1586.

So far the question is one of the greatest possible simplicity. No metrical license of any kind has been admitted, beyond the recognition of the two forms of the basis. Yet these three Forms at once account for 10,845 out of 17,902 clausulae, or 60.3 p.c. They are denoted by Zielinski as *V*, or *Verae* clausulae.

If for a moment we glance at previous theories, we find that the result of Zielinski's tables is to establish the canon of Terentianus Maurus, concerning the *sedes beata* occupied by the cretic *paene in ultimo*. Form i is that connected by Quintilian with Demosthenes, i.e. *πᾶσι καὶ πάροις—μὴδὲ τοῦτέῳ* (34 exx. in Phil. i), and appears in the emendation made by Cicero upon the involuntary senarius of Crassus, viz. *prōdēant ipsi*. It coincides with the second of Wolff's forms viz. the choliambic. Form ii is the dicretic recommended by Quintilian who says '*sed et se sequitur creticus*' (ix. 4. 107) and quotes Lig. 38 *servārē quā plūrimōs*. It is the 3rd form of Wolff. Form iii is the ditrochaeus

¹ Zielinski throughout indicates the weak forms by ordinary numerals, and the strong by the same numerals more heavily leaded, e.g. 2 and 2. For the sake of clearness I use Roman numerals, e.g. ii, for the strong forms, and Arabic, e.g. 2, for the weak.

so dear to the Asiatic school, the stock example being the previously quoted clausula of Carbo, viz. *filii comprobavit*. It is Wolff's 1st form + a cretic basis.

Before I pass on to other clausulae, it is necessary to make an important distinction: viz. between the Form and the Type. The Type is fixed by the caesura, or division of words within the Form. Thus to take Form i _ _ _ | _ _

Here there may be a caesura after the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th syllable, or, which is somewhat rare, the whole clausula may consist of one word without caesura. This is denoted thus

$\overset{\sim}{\alpha} \quad \overset{\sim}{\beta} \quad \overset{\sim}{\gamma} \quad \overset{\sim}{\delta} \quad \overset{\sim}{\epsilon}$

- e.g. 1 α = indicaretur, 310 exx.
 β = non oportere, 679 exx.
 γ = morte vicistis, 1231 exx.
 δ = civitas possit, 256 exx.
 ϵ = restituti sint, 24 exx.

These statistics shew that γ is the predominant type of i, so that the characteristic clausula is e.g. *morte vicistis*.

A similar result is given by the statistics for 2, the characteristic type being e.g. *cessit audaciae*. Both 1 and 2, therefore, exhibit the γ type.

Form 3, however, is chiefly δ in type. In the light form 86 p.c. cases are δ in character: in the strong 59 p.c. The characteristic types are *filii comprobavit*, or *me semper feceritis*.

I now pass on to the next class, viz. *L* (= *licitae*), i.e. those clausulae of fairly common occurrence, in which a slight license, such as is allowed in poetry, has been taken. Of this there are two kinds.

(a) $\sim$ can be used in place of any - syllable.

Thus to take Form i. Here we have

$\overset{\sim}{1} \quad \overset{\sim}{2} \quad \overset{\sim}{3}$

For any of these long syllables two shorts can be substituted, e.g.

1^1 = *făcĕrĕ cō|netur*: 1^2 = *ĕssĕ vĭdĕ|atur*:
 1^3 = *cōmmōdī | cādĕrĕ*: $1^{1,2}$ = *făcĕrĕ pŏtū|isti*.

The same process is allowed in Forms 2 and 3.

It is noticeable that in all these *L* clausulae the type is more strongly pronounced than in the *V*. Thus in *V* 1 the γ type is found in 49 p.c. of the cases: in *L* 1^1 the percentage of γ is 56, in *L* 1^3 63, and *L* $1^{1,2}$ is exclusively γ .

(b) The second license consists of the substitution of an epitriton for the cretic in the base. Of this there are two forms: viz. the weak form _ _ _ is replaced by a choriambic _ _ _ _ , and the strong form _ _ _ by _ _ _ _ . This is denoted by *tr.*, e.g. 2 *tr.* = *hōspītis injūriās*, and ii *tr.* = *pūblicē sūb|scribītūr*.

The *L* class includes, in addition to these cases where a metrical license has been taken in Forms 1, 2, and 3, Form 4 (iv), e.g. *spīritūm pĕrtīmĕscĕrem, libĕrtās vēstrā tōllītūr*, which on account of its comparative rarity (380 exx.) is not placed among *Veræ clausulae*. This like iii is δ in type, especially in the weak form. In this the percentage of the δ type is 70.7, and in the strong form 47.5.

The *V* and *L* classes together embrace 15,620 exx. out of 17,902 cases, i.e. 86.8 p.c. The remaining clausulae are thus classified.

(3) *Malae* (*M*), 1103 exx., (6.1 p.c.)

These include Forms 5 and 6, which are so metrical in character as to resemble poetry, e.g.

5. *dē pātrīs mŏrtĕ quāērĕrĕtūr*
v. lĕgēs mūtārĕ nŏlĕrunt
 6. *cūrīā prŏptĕr ābstĭnĕntĭām*
vi. dāmnātŏ tē rĕfĕrrĕ nŏlūt

or rarer resolutions, e.g.

$1^{1,3}$ *făcĭlĕ pĕrspĭcĭo*.

(4) *Selectae* (*S*), 930 exx., (5.2.)

This is an exceedingly interesting class for several reasons. Its characteristic is the substitution of a spondee for the trochee immediately after the base, e.g. *cōnsūlēs dĕsignātī*. The *S* clausulae generally belong to Form 3 (617 exx.) in which the type is exclusively δ . They are used chiefly for emphasis. Zielinski compares the *S* clausula to the stroke of a hammer, cf. Verr. v. 117 *includuntur in cārcĕrĕm cōndĕmnātī*. Though rare in Cicero, this clausula becomes very common in Livy. This difference between oratorical and historical rhythm exactly corresponds with Cicero's remark, Orat. 212. *cursum contentiones magis requirunt, expositiones rerum tarditatem*, i.e. the rhythm of oratory is trochaic, that of history spondaic.

(5) *Pessimae* (*P*), 248 (1.4.)

These introduce a new substitution, viz. that of a dactyl for a trochee either

(a) in the basis,

P^1 _ _ _ _ | _ _ . 54 exx.

(b) in the cadence,

P^2 — — | — — | = 87 exx.

P^3 — — | — — | = 107 exx.

The last of these, P^3 , is the *clausula heroica*, condemned by Quintilian ix. 4. 102, 'quia finem versus damnamus in fine orationis.'

This accounts for 17,902 clauses. There remain 29-clausulae outside the fold.

The *bona fides* of Zielinski is strikingly shewn by the list of exceptions which he allows, since many of this little flock are not really black sheep, but only need a stroke of the brush to become white. Thus he includes Verr. 116 and 120 *Timarchidi numerasse*, Cat. 1. 14 *hoc scelus cumulasti*, Mil. 91 *toto foro volitarunt* where the unsynopated forms at once give $S3^3$, viz. — — | — — | — —, a clausula of which he allows 35 cases. Another case is Clu. 44, *Martialium removeri*, where *M* gives *demoveri* (= V 3). The most interesting to me is Clu. 180 *feri potuisset*. This passage as printed by all editors runs as follows

quaerebant homines quonam modo fieri
pōtūissēt.

This passage occurs in a part of the speech where *M* is defective, which was recovered from the Cluniacensis Poggii.¹ The word *quaerebant* does not occur in a French transcript (Σ) made before the MS. passed into the hand of Poggio, nor in the earlier Italian transcripts. It occurs first as an addition in a late copy ψ , written by the second hand, and then passed into the ordinary MSS. It is, therefore, obvious that *quaerebant* is a conjecture for a missing verb, which should come at the end of the clausula.

I have tried to state these results in the simplest possible form. There are many complications which arise in the course of the discussion, which Zielinski handles with great skill and subtlety. He lays down a number of laws, some of which have already been incidentally mentioned, e.g. those concerning the prevalence of the γ and δ type in particular forms. The most important of his laws appear to be the following.

(1) The type of a clausula depends upon the relative frequency of the words necessary for its construction.

(2) The ictus of the clausula harmonises with that of the word. This is a principle

¹ I refer to my newly published work *The Vetus Cluniacensis Poggii*, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Classical Series, Part X., 1905.

of the utmost importance, and to Zielinski the very corner-stone of his system. There is nothing which he would resent more than the charge that he was endeavouring to force stubborn material into a mould. His contention is the clausula is the natural result of the form and accent of Latin words. A Roman 'lisped in numbers, for the numbers came.'

(3) There is naturally a tendency to equipoise or balance between the long and short syllables. If this balance has been disturbed in any way, there is a tendency to redress the inequality. Corollaries of this law are

(a) the 'jumping-off law' (*Anlaufgesetz*), which ordains that, wherever the first long in the base is resolved into two shorts, the preceding syllable must be long;

(b) the 'law of the two shorts,' which commands that, wherever in the clausula two shorts replace a long, they are preceded either by a long syllable, or, if this is not possible, e.g. in 1^2 , by a caesura. This is why 1^2 , the *esse videatur* clause is always γ .

(c) When — — stands for —, the two shorts must not be divided between two words (*Auflösungsgesetz*).

By the help of these laws he decides some very complicated questions which arise in the case of the clausulae which may be claimed by rival forms, e.g. *commodi cadere possit*.

Is this 1^2 or iii^3 ?

If 1^2 , then we have — *i* cadere possit, in which case the ictus is at variance with the natural accent *cadere*. If iii^3 , then ictus and accent agree, i.e. — — | — — | — —. It is, therefore, iii^3 .

So again in e.g. *pertinere videatur*.

Is this 1^2 or 3^3 ? If 3^3 , then we have *pertinē[r]ē vidē[at]ūr*, against (c). It is, therefore, 1^2 .

I do not pretend to vouch in any way for the various laws enunciated by Zielinski. I would only say that they seem to have a rational basis and to fit the facts. What I value chiefly are his statistics, which it is difficult to gainsay. As a rule he gives these very fully and then draws general conclusions. In one case he amuses himself and the reader by inverting this order. The line of argument there adopted is so striking that I venture to quote it.

The problem is one which can never have presented itself to the human brain, viz. to divine by the aid of general principles how many times the clausula *S ii viz.*

should occur in the speeches of Cicero. Zielinski, of course, knows the answer, but resorts to *a priori* considerations before producing his statistics.

His first principle is what he terms his 'Law of Correspondence,' *i.e.* that the variations, *i.e.* the *L* and *S* clausulae, tend to model themselves upon the typical or *V* forms, *i.e.* $S\ ii : S\ 2 = V\ ii : V\ 2$. Here *S* ii is the unknown quantity or *X*. The other quantities are known. *S* 2 occurs 235, *V* ii (in round numbers) 1300, and *V* 2 (also in round numbers) 2000 times. So $X : 235 = 1300 : 2000$, the result being 152. This, therefore, is the number of times when *S* ii should occur if this were the only law in operation. But there is another force which must be taken into account: *viz.* that of equipoise, which tends to maintain a balance between long and short syllables. This must obviously tend to diminish the number of occasions upon which we might otherwise expect to find this combination of long syllables. How shall we determine the strength of this force? This can be ascertained by the statistics concerning *S* iii. If we start with a similar equation, *viz.* $S\ iii : S\ 3 = V\ iii : V\ 3$ ($S\ 3 = 500$, $V\ 3 = 1800$, $V\ iii = 1600$) we get the formula, $X : 500 : 1600 : 1800$, the result being 444. The actual number of *S* iii clausulae, however, is 116. The law of equipoise, therefore, has in *S* iii reduced 444 to 116. It will, therefore, reduce 152, the expected number for *S* ii, in the same proportion, *i.e.* $X : 152 = 116 : 444$. The result is 40. Zielinski then produces his statistics, which reveal 44 cases. Various adjectives might be applied to this method of reasoning: none will question its ingenuity.

So much for the theory of the clausula. There remains the fascinating subject of what Zielinski terms the constructive or pervading rhythm. This corresponds to the *concinuitas*, or *numerosa compositio* of ancient writers. I would prefer to call it the rhythm of the *colon*. This Zielinski proposes to deal with in a subsequent work. He, however, makes frequent references to it, and it is easy to see on what lines the investigation must proceed. It is clear that the *numerus* of the colon is identical with that of the clausula. This appears from *e.g.* Orator 230, where Cicero is quoting a period from his speech *pro Cornelio*, where he says 'compositi oratoris bene structuram conlocationem dissolvas permutatione verborum.' The whole effect he says will be lost (*perierit tota res*) if the collocation is changed, *e.g.* if for

neque me divitiae movent, quibus omnis Africanos et Laelios multi venalicii mercatoresque superarunt (*L* 1²)

we write 'superarunt mercatores venalicii' (*P* 3)

or, in the next colon, if for

e Syria Aegyptoque vicerunt (*V* 1 γ)

we substitute 'e Syria Aegyptoque' (*MS.* iii²),

or, in what follows, if for

ab aliquo video perfacile Deliaeo aut Syro potuisse superari (*L* 1²)

is written 'potuisse superari ab aliquo Syro aut Deliaeo' (*P*²).

Zielinski considers the chief difference to lie in the fact that in the clausula the rhythms are more strongly-marked and their laws are more rigid. There is also a new principle at work. Whereas the clausula is autonomous and not affected by other clausulae, each colon is in relation to other cola and influenced by them. A special point of interest which at once appears is that in the cola the harsh rhythms, *S* and *P*, are more frequent than at the end of the sentence. Quintilian (ix. 4. 70) makes some very suggestive remarks. He says—Quaedam etiam clausulae sunt claudae atque pendentis si relinquantur, sed sequentibus suscipi ac sustineri solent, eoque facto vitium quod erat in fine continuatione emendatur. 'Non vult populus Romanus obsoletis criminibus accusari Verrem' (*S* 1): *durum si desinas*, sed cum sit continuatum iis quae sequuntur . . . 'Nova postulat, inaudita desiderat' (*V* 2): *salvus est cursus*.

Here the harsh rhythm (*S* 1) is redressed by *V* 2. Zielinski compares the next sentence.

Includuntur in cārcērē cōdēmnāti (*S* 3): supplicium constituitur in illos, sumitur de miseris parēntībūs nāvārchōrūm (*S* 3): prohibentur adire ad filios, prohibentur liberis suis cibū vēstītūmqūē fērrē (*V* iii).

Here after two blows from the hammer (*S* 3), the sentence terminates musically with *V* iii.

Sometimes the cola are arranged in strophes *abab*, *e.g.*

Cat. ii. 3 quam multos . . . qui quae ego
deferrēm nōn | crēdē|rēt (ii)
quam multos qui propter stūl-
titiām | nōn pū|tārent (3 tr.)
quam multos qui ētīlām dē-
fēndē|rēt (ii¹)

quam multos qui propter im-
probitātem fāverēt (3 tr.).
Mur. 62 petūnt āliquīd | pūbli | cāni
(3^{tr}. β¹ δ)
cave quicquam habeat mō-
menti | grātī | a (ii δ)
supplices aliqui veniunt mīseri
et | cālāmītō | si (3^{tr}. β¹ δ)
scelestus et nefarius fueris si
quicquam misericordia ad-
ductūs | fecē | ris (ii δ).

It is obvious that this subject will in the future render a rich harvest to the inquirer.

Zielinski now proceeds to the second part of his discussion: viz. the application of these conclusions. He considers

i. Orthography and prosody.

I pass hastily over these, merely mentioning some points of interest. A short vowel may remain short or be lengthened before e.g. *br*, *cr*, *gr*, *tr*, as in poetry. A vowel before *sc*, *sp*, *st* is lengthened. Synizesis is frequent, e.g. *dēsse* is always a dissyllable, both *vemens* and *vehemens*, *reprendo* and *reprehendo*, *nil* and *nihil* occur. The spellings *reccido*, *redduco*, *reliquus*, found in Lucretius, are everywhere demanded by the evidence of the clausula, e.g. Phil. ii. 10 *lege reductus*. Zielinski points out that, although *reliquus* has disappeared from the MSS., we have a trace of it, Phil. xiii. 2, where for *reliquorum* (so V) the D family give *belli quorum*. To this I would add from the same speech § 47 where I have conjectured

reliqui veniant] bellum quod veniant hv:
(velim quo venias b: quod venias t).

Both forms of the genitive in the second declension are found, viz. *-i*, and *-ii*. The form in *-i*, e.g. *iudici Iuniani* seems to be almost invariable in substantives. At least Zielinski quotes no exceptions. The form *-ii*, however, seems naturally required in the famous clausula of Carbo, *filiū comprobavit*. In proper names, *-ii* seems frequently used, e.g. Mil. 70 *morte Clodii sentiatis*. This is interesting, since Müller always gives *-i* in the case of proper names, and *-ii* in that of substantives.

Both *periculum* and *pericūlum* are found, but *vinculum* appears to be Cicero's form, not *vinculūm*. He also uses *gratīs*, not *gratis*. Finally, the clausula gives evidence for *Caecina*, e.g. Caec. 17, *Caecinae nupsit*.

ii. Textual Criticism.

This is for me the most interesting part

of the discussion, and it was on account of the bearing of Zielinski's law upon textual questions that I was forced to study his book. He says that in the future it will be as impossible to edit Cicero without a knowledge of the clausula as to edit Plautus without a knowledge of Plautine metre. This is, of course, a strong statement, but it contains much truth.

He warns the student not to be too eager to remove rare rhythms by emendation, since what is rare is not necessarily bad, e.g. *Sii*, of which there are only 40 exx., and bad clausulae, e.g. the *clausula heroica*, are sometimes permissible. Certain conclusions present themselves, viz.

(a) Where there is a good clausula, the presumption is that the text is so far sound. Where there are two families of MSS. and one gives a *V* clausula, and the other *M* or *P*, there is reason for preferring *V*. This gives us a clue in innumerable cases where there is a variety in the collocation, and shews that sometimes the right reading is given by the inferior MSS. No one MS., therefore, should be slavishly followed, however good it may be.

(b) When a conjecture gives a rare clausula, the probability is against it. When it gives one for which there is no parallel, the chances are 18,000 to 1 against it.

(c) When there is other ground for suspecting a passage, fresh evidence is supplied by a faulty clausula.

Zielinski goes through all the passages of which he is aware in which the evidence of the clausula is for or against a disputed reading. He uses the text of Müller throughout, and in the case of those speeches published in vol. VI. of the Oxford text quotes my variants.

I single out one or two instructive cases.

In Cat. iii. 22. the usual reading is

ut homines Galli vestram salutem suis opibus auteponerent, id non divinitus esse factum putatis, praesertim qui nos non pugnando sed tacendo superare potuerunt.

Potuerint Madvig.

Here the MSS. reading gives 1² (772 exx.): Madvig's conjecture yields *M* iv.^{2.4}, being the only example of that clausula. The 18,000 to 1 rule, therefore, applies here. Zielinski approves of Eberhard's proposal to excise *praesertim* . . . *potuerunt*, which produces *V*3. This, however, is a violent change, and the goodness of the clausula is in favour of the MSS. reading. I am inclined to think that *potuerunt* is

right, and that Cicero preferred the indicative to the more usual subjunctive on rhythmical grounds. This opens up a large field for inquiry, viz. the influence of rhythm upon grammatical construction. I would refer *e.g.* to

Fam. 1. 7. 10 qui plus opibus armis potentia valent, profecisse tantum mihi videntur stultitia et inconstantia adversariorum ut etiam auctoritatem iam plus valerent.

Here I have often been puzzled by the sequence? Why not *valeant*? I now see what I take to be the reason, viz. *valerent* = *V* 3, *valeant* = *P* 2.

Cat. iii. 3 previously quoted. Here Halm excised *quam multos . . . putarent* while Madvig expelled *quam multos . . . faverent*. Both *cola* are defended by the strophic arrangement. They may be pleonastic, but they are musical. The order of the strophes, viz. *abab* is against the reading of the best MSS. which give *credērent, defendērent, putārent, favērent*, i.e. *aabb*.

Mur. 83 consulem . . . fortuna constitutum ad amplexandum otium, scientia ad bellum gerendum, animo et usu ad quod velis negotium.

Halm here remarked that rhetorical symmetry required a verb with negotium to balance *amplexandum* and *gerendum*. The clausula is a bad one, viz. *M* vi¹. If *transigendum* were supplied that would give *V* 3.

I add one or two small points upon which curious light is thrown, *e.g.* Cat. iv. 3 nec (v.l. neque) misera sapienti. The law of equipoise makes *nec* better than *neque* before *misera sapienti*.

Clu. 42 suo salvo capite potuissent $\Sigma = 11.2$
salvo capite sū|ō potū|issēt *M* =
PP (no base);

Cat. 1. 20 consūlīs iēris | sūstī|nēbō MSS.
edd. = *L* 3¹, but wrong 'Anlauf,' and against 'Auflösungsgesetz.' Zielinski proposes *ivēris*, which gives *V* 3.

In a number of cases a reading not known to Zielinski removes a harshness, *e.g.*

Pomp. 42 saepe cognovistis. = *S* γ, a wrong type, the *S* clauses being δ.

Zielinski conjectures *cognostis*. This is the reading of *Harl.* 2682 (*H*). *Ib.* 68, qui inter tot annos unus inventus sit, quem socii in urbes suas cum exercitu venisse gaudeant.

This gives *iv^{tr}γζ* (10 exx.). *H* has inventus est . . . venisse gauderent = *V* 1.

The evidence of the clausula is particularly unfavourable for the Dutch school of critics who have wildly indulged in the use of brackets. For them it is, according to Zielinski, a 'divine judgment,' to be compared with the evidence furnished by finds of papyri in the case of Greek authors.

iii. The Higher Criticism.

viz. questions of authenticity.

It has been found that the percentage of various clausulae in Cicero is

$V = 60.3 + L 26.5 + M 6.1 + S 5.2 + P 1.4$. This gives us a canon of authenticity for Ciceronian works. In a genuine writing we should expect to find that $V + L = 86$ p.c.

Zielinski compares with this formula similar formulae obtained from portions of Livy xxi, and Pliny, Panegyricus, equal in length to Cic. pro Caecina. The results are

	Cicero	Pliny	Livy
<i>V</i>	60.3	50.9	9
<i>L</i>	26.5	30.7	8
<i>M</i>	6.1	8.5	20
<i>S</i>	5.2	6	40
<i>P</i>	1.4	3.6	22

i.e. $V + L$ in Cicero = 86.8, in Pliny = 81.16, in Livy = 17.

$M + S + P$ in Cicero = 12.7, in Pliny = 18.1, in Livy = 82.

To compare with these results (a) the spurious *Controversia in Sallustium* (b) the *de domo* (c) the *pro Marcello*, we find the following percentages

	Controv.	Dom.	Marc.
<i>V</i>	22	60.7	52.5
<i>L</i>	28	28.1	35.8
<i>M</i>	27	5.8	4.2
<i>S</i>	14	4.5	6.6
<i>P</i>	11	.9	.9

i.e. $V + L$ in the *Controversia* = 50, in *de Domo* = 88.8, in *Marc.* = 88.3.

$M + S + P$ in the *Controversia* = 50, in *de Domo* = 11.2, in *Marc.* = 11.7.

It will be seen that the speech *de domo* conforms almost exactly with the Ciceronian canon. The other *post reditum* speeches yield similar results. In the *pro Marcello* the *V* and *L* clauses together come to 88 p.c., but the proportion of *L* clausulae to *V* is rather higher than elsewhere, resembling, as Zielinski points out, the canon for Pliny. As the speech is short and was delivered under peculiar circumstances, this slight deviation cannot be considered an argument against its genuineness.

Zielinski concludes by comparing the two versions given by Cicero and Sallust respectively of the letter sent by Lentulus to Catiline.

In Cicero (Cat. iii. 12) this runs thus

Quis sim scies ex eo quem ad te misi
(S 3): cura ut vir sis et cogita quem in
locum sis progressus (S 3): vide ecquid tibi
iam sit necesse et cura ut omnium tibi
auxilia adiungas, etiam infimorum (L iii²).

Sallust (Cat. 44) gives it thus

Quis sim ex eo quem ad te misi cognosces
(S ii): fac cogites in quanta calamitate sis
et memineris te virum esse (L 3'): consideres
quid tuae rationes postulent (L ii¹): auxilium
petas ab omnibus etiam ab infimis
(M 4²⁻³).

It cannot be doubted that the version in Sallust is more authentic. Cicero has recast the words of the conspirator and made them rhythmical.

Zielinski does not examine the prose of Tacitus. I, however, took the trouble to examine the clausulae in four highly elaborate chapters of the Annals where we might expect to find rhythm if anywhere, viz. iii. 4 and 5, the funeral of Germanicus, *ib.* 54, the letter of Tiberius to the senate concerning the growth of luxury, and xiv. 5, the attempt upon the life of Agrippina. These contain 26 clausulae, of which 6 are *verae*, 5 *licitae*, 4 *S*, and the rest *M*, *P*, or *PP*, several not being reducible to any form, e.g. iii. 54

nēquē mētūs ūltrā nēquē pūdōr est
īntra Itālīam dōmināntībūs
dīvītēs sātīas īn mēliūs mūtēt.

In these chapters, therefore, the percentage is

$$V + L = 45.$$

$$S + M + P + PP = 55.$$

Zielinski concludes his work by a learned discussion of the Latin accent, a question in which he is deeply interested. The subject is too large and too technical for me to deal with it here. His central points are the coincidence of the accent with the metrical ictus, and the connexion of his laws with the character and genius of the Latin language.

The question which will at once suggest itself to every reader of this review is, to what extent modern Latin Prose conforms to the Ciceronian canon? The inquiry is a painful one. I have shrunk from applying the test to versions of which I am myself guilty. I have, however, examined some published versions by a well known master of the art, and find an alarming number of *M*, *S*, *P*, and *PP* clausulae. I greatly fear that most of the oratorical prose which we and our predecessors have written may, if this test is applied, which I greatly deprecate, be found to conform with the system, not indeed of Cicero, or of Pliny, but possibly of the Anonymus who produced the *Controversia in Sallustium*. What then are we to do? Shall we turn deaf ears to the *Clauselgesetz*, or must we rewrite our Latin Prose?

ALBERT C. CLARK.

[CORPUS POETARUM LATINORUM (FASC. IV).]

Corpus Poetarum Latinorum. Edidit IOHANNES PERCIVAL POSTGATE. Fasc. IV. quo continentur Calpurnius Siculus, Columellae liber X, Silius Italicus, Statius. Londini, sumptibus G. Bell et filiorum, 1904. 4to. Pp. xiii. + 197-430. 9s. net.

THE new volume of the Corpus presents the same features as its predecessors. There is the same lucidity of arrangement, and the same careful apparatus criticus. If to some the text appear to be over-emended, it must be remembered that the aim of the editors is to produce a readable text, not a critical edition; an aim which is eminently reasonable in the case of a book destined for the purpose of general reference. This con-

sideration disarms that criticism which is jealous as to the admission of conjectures. How far particular conjectures are probable is a matter of special enquiry.

The Fasciculus contains Calpurnius Siculus, Columella Bk. X, Silius Italicus, and Statius. The preface begins with some generous words (provoked by the strictures of Ehwald) as to the merits of Baehrens as a critic: for in spite of his glaring defects Baehrens had some merits besides his curious astuteness. Though he damaged every text that he touched, there were for him lucid moments: he had at any rate one great virtue, which distinguishes him from many smaller men: he did his own work bravely, collating collecting and sifting materials,