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](#)

Bennett's *De Senectute M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute*. With notes by Charles E. Bennett, Professor of Latin in Cornell University. Boston: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn. 1897. Pp. viii. + 129. Sixty cents.

M. S. Slaughter

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 06 / July 1898, pp 320 - 321
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00032704, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00032704

How to cite this article:

M. S. Slaughter (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 320-321 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00032704

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Euripides to Plautus: and even though further research may show that some of the piers do not rest on a very secure foundation, the general result of his enquiry seems likely to be established.

From one point of view the upshot of this treatise is disappointing. Little or nothing is here done to reduce the apparently fortuitous concourse of metrical atoms to order and unity. Indeed, the general tendency of Leo's procedure does not seem to lie in that direction. But it would be premature to pronounce finally on this point until the continuation of the treatise (promised on p. 112) is forthcoming. Meanwhile, however, I confess that I am not satisfied with his treatment of the cola

commonly called trochaic (e.g. $_ \cup _ \cup _$) and the colon $_ \cup \cup \cup _$, frequently found in connexion with cretic verses. Leo contents himself with maintaining that they are of 'cretic character' or a 'constituent part (*Bestandtheil*) of cretic verse.' But this does not enable us to see a unity, unless we are told how the apparent trochaics can be reduced to cretics, or (it might be suggested) the apparent cretics to trochaics. I am far from intending to imply that such a reduction is impossible; but Leo has not given it, and perhaps was precluded from giving it by his antagonism to the 'rhythmical' school of Westphalia.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

BENNETT'S *DE SENECTUTE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute.
With notes by CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Professor of Latin in Cornell University.
Boston: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn.
1897. Pp. viii. + 129. Sixty cents.

PROFESSOR BENNETT has given us an edition of the *De Senectute* that is admirable for its brevity and conciseness. In an introduction of but four pages he tells the essential facts about the Dialogue. In the commentary his aim is to give only such information as the student needs in order to understand the text. Most of his comments have to do with questions of language-interpretation and are unusually clear. We should be glad, however, for more references to the grammar in a book intended for comparatively elementary students.

With most of the syntactical notes it is easy to agree, although in a few cases a different explanation might be preferred. Reid's suggestion on *cui qui pareat* (i. 2, 7) brings out the thought better: *unde discerem* (iv. 12, 20) is characteristic rather than purpose; the mood of *scandant* (vi. 17, 19) is subjunctive regardless of the indirect discourse; the note on *quicquid agas* (ix. 27, 11) is inadequate, and the statement that many editors explain *serendis* (vii. 24, 30) as an ablative absolute is rather non-committal. Among many interpretations that deserve to be commended, that of *quid est enim* (ii. 5, 20) seems particularly happy, and the note on *cum...fuisset* (vi. 16, 13) which is founded on the classification laid

down by Professor Hale in his 'Cum-constructions' (pp. 184—189, American Edition), is a model of clearness and completeness.

We are disappointed at the scarcity of literary comment and should welcome references to Latin and English literature, since the *De Senectute* so readily lends itself to this sort of comparison. To make room for such references we could well dispense with the too frequent translations found in the notes. Sentimental Tommy's search for 'hantle' must not be made too easy or he loses the desired training.

The absence of quantity-marks over the long vowels and the relegation of the running English analysis to the commentary, where it properly belongs, leave nothing to mar the beauty of the text page. The loss of a hyphen at the end of line 21, p. 28, is the only error in printing that has been noticed. *Fuissem* (p. 121, line 9) is doubtless a mistake in quotation for *essem*.

The text is mainly that of Mueller, but the critical material which has appeared since 1879 has been utilised and Bennett's text differs from Mueller's in about fifty places. Bennett's own contribution is *exerceri videbamus for mori videbamus* (xiv. 49, 18). Most editors simply omit *mori*, although a few defend it. Some conjectures accepted are; Lachmann's *noenium* for *non enim* (iv. 10, 25), Bernay's *plusque* for *postque* (iv. 10, 26), Ribbeck's *Lupo for ludo* (vi. 20, 19), Reid's *quoniam* for *cum* (xix. 68, 22), Bergk's *dacrumis* for *lacrumis* (xx. 73, 19).

In vi. 17, 21 the text is improved by reading *facit* *facit*, with Baiter, for *faciat* *faciat* of Mueller and most of the manuscripts. In v. 14, 16 *suasissem* is changed to *suasi*. *Sed*, following Madvig's suggestion. On rather scant evidence, though not unsupported, Bennett reads *te*

i. 1, 1 : *consolatione*, ii. 4, 9 : *fuera in arce*, iv. 11, 29 : *ne sint*, xi. 34, 8 : *vi evelluntur*, xix. 71, 24. The text is altered by simple transposition in i. 2, 6 : ii. 4, 31 : v. 15, 23 : xx. 73, 15 : xxiii. 82, 6.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

University of Wisconsin.

TWO EDITIONS OF CAESAR.

C. Iulii Caesaris Belli gallici libri vii. A. Hirtilii liber viii. recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit HENRICUS MEUSEL. Berolini, Weber.

C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii ex recensione Bernardi Kübleri. Vol. i. de bello Gallico. Vol. iii. pars prior, commentarius de bello Alexandrino rec. B. KÜBLER, de bello Africo rec. Ed. Wölfflin. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1894, 1896. M. 2. 20.

THE manuscripts of Caesar fall into two classes, rather like the manuscripts of the Acts of the Apostles : that is, one class contains a number of individual words, phrases, etc., which are absent in the other. Until recently, the shorter version was held both in the case of Caesar and in that of St. Luke to be the more genuine, and Nipperdey's characterization of the longer Caesar MSS. as interpolated was generally accepted. Lately there has been a revolt in the criticism of both authors. Blass has tried, with indifferent success, I fancy, to sustain the correctness of the longer version of the Acts : others with better fortune, have restored the reputation of the 'interpolated'

MSS. of Caesar. The grounds for the latter revolt are perhaps better justified than those on which Blass rested. Since Nipperdey, the MSS. of Caesar have been more carefully collated and the lexica of Merguet and still more of Meusel have illustrated the style and diction of the great Roman. Hence it has become generally accepted that the 'interpolated' MSS. deserve full consideration, with the melancholy corollary that all the manuscripts even of the Gallic War have been seriously corrupted at an early date. I need not further criticize the editions named at the head of this paragraph than to say that they represent the revolt against Nipperdey. Mr. Kübler's text is not yet completed but it is a valuable addition to the Teubner series and contains a noteworthy 'Praefatio' of some length. Mr. Meusel's work is terser in form and more attractive in appearance and is thoroughly worthy of recommendation as a scholarly and judicious edition. Both books have convenient indices and maps.

F. H.

AD LUCANI LIBROS MSS.

IN fasciculo M. Maii h. a. Doctissimus WALTER C. SUMMERS aliqua dubia movet de lectionibus MSS. Lucani, quae ego quantum sciam et potero solvam. Potissimum improbat quod saepius meae collationi codicis Montepessulani addidi diversum Steinharti testimonium, eoque, ut ait, lectori optionem dedi, utra lectio, mea an Steinharti, vera esset. Allatis quibusdam locis subiungit (p. 229, col. i.) : 'was it not worth while to have these points definitely settled?' Et paulo ante me dubitasse de mea ipsius collatione dicit ; 'nor is Dr. Francken always

confident of the accuracy of his own statements.' In hanc partem afferuntur vii. 303, ubi in annotatione commemorans, ubi lectio *parata* exstaret, dixi : 'in V et fort. in M.' Nempe sic retulit Steinhart, sed id mihi dubium videri ex verbis apparet ipsis.

ix. 605. dixi 'de M. dubito.' M. scribit *versum* bis, secundum me utroque loco habet *quam*, secundum Steinh. altero loco legitur *qua*. De hoc Steinh. testimonio me dubitare dixi : de M. dubito an *non* habeat *qua*, certe altero loco habet *quam*.

ix. 749. 'exquireret causis' lectionem ἀμερπov