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](#)

Peterson's Dialogus of Tacitus *Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus*, a Revised Text with Introductory Essays and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D., formerly scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 1893. 10s. 6d.

H. Furneaux

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 106 - 108

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187608, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187608

How to cite this article:

H. Furneaux (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 106-108 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187608

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

very delightful. It has perhaps a trifle of the encyclopaedia hardness of literary quality. A liquid style doubtless cannot be expected in a dictionary. And yet, bearing in mind that rather dreary purpose with which the work was originally written, it is sur-

prisingly easy. And, as a clear presentation in short compass of the evolution of Roman politics, it is quite unique in its field.

H. P. JUDSON.

University of Chicago.

PETERSON'S DIALOGUS OF TACITUS.

Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, a Revised Text with Introductory Essays and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by W. PETERSON, M.A., LL.D., formerly scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 1893. 10s. 6d.

ALL Latin scholars, especially those who are students of Tacitus, will feel deeply grateful to Dr. Peterson for having followed up his well-known edition of Quintilian Book x. by one of a treatise so nearly related to it, and hitherto so conspicuously neglected by English scholars generally: and their gratitude will be the more complete by reason of the thorough and exhaustive manner in which all the questions relating to the Dialogue have been treated.

The Introduction, in ninety-one pages, embraces the following subjects: i. The question of authorship and date; ii. Substance and scheme of the Dialogue; iii. The interlocutors and their parts; iv. Style and language; v. Manuscripts; vi. Bibliography.

The first head deals with one of the most vexed questions of literary criticism, on which Dr. Peterson has given us a full narrative of the controversy and a critical judgment grounded on it. It has been generally seen that the question of date closely affects that of authorship; for the *Germania* and *Agricola* were written at the beginning of Trajan's rule, and the difference of style between them and the Dialogue is too great to be accounted for by mere difference of subject, unless we also suppose them to be separated from it by a considerable interval of time; and those who, like Andresen, treat this work as written in the time of Nerva, would consider its Tacitean authorship at least extremely questionable.

Again, it is generally assumed that the sentiments are too outspoken to have been published at any time under Domitian. On

the other hand, the date at which the Dialogue purports to have taken place has been generally fixed, on data furnished by c. 17, somewhere from A.D. 75-78, at which date Tacitus calls himself 'iuvenis admodum,' an expression which he would hardly use if he were writing as soon afterwards as the time of Titus. Dr. Peterson's conclusions on these points will very generally commend themselves. Inasmuch as the 120th year from the death of Cicero cannot be made to square with the sixth year of Vespasian, he prefers to take the latter as the most definite date, and to assume the Dialogue as held in A.D. 74, at which time Tacitus was probably about twenty years old. Nor does he consider it impossible that the treatise should have been written and perhaps even published under Domitian. That prince had his good period, like Nero,¹ and there is no difficulty in supposing literature to have been fairly free at such a date as A.D. 84-85, by which time Tacitus, who had meanwhile filled two magistracies and had become a senator, might well look back on himself as having been 'iuvenis admodum' some ten years previously. With this chronological arrangement most of the difficulties disappear, and full space is left between the Dialogue and the *Germania* and *Agricola* for such development of his peculiar style as Wölfflin, Dräger and others trace continuously throughout all his writings. The fact that there is more difference of style between the Dialogue and the *Germania* or *Agricola* than between either of them and even the *Annals*, may well have been due to the difference of subject, and to the obvious desire of the writer to advocate by precept and example a nearer approach to the Ciceronian model than the prevalent fashion of his age prescribed. Making this allowance, we may admit that Dr. Peterson has shown by very careful study a great many points of contact between the Latinity of this treatise and that of the Silver Age generally and of the

¹ See Suet. *Dom.* 9.

later writings of Tacitus in particular¹ which have not had the attention which they deserve: and his reasoning in favour of the Tacitean authorship of the treatise will add much weight to the conclusion which the majority of recent scholars have already reached.

The scheme or plan of the treatise has been almost as much discussed as its authorship. It is hardly possible here to draw attention to more than one or two points in the editor's extremely thorough treatment of this subject. He holds that the reason of the decay of oratory is the chief topic of discussion, and that the apparently disproportionate proportion of the treatise as a whole which is given to this, its proper subject, is to be explained by the mutilated condition of the work, and the great lacuna,² which has deprived us of the close of the argument of Messala, and of apparently one-ninth of the whole treatise, and has caused much difficulty in apportioning the remainder. Dr. Peterson argues that there is no second lacuna in c. 40, that Maternus is the speaker throughout chapters 36-41, and that he is intended to be the principal person in the treatise and the representative of the author's own opinions.³ It is also argued that he has been wrongly identified with the σοφιστής of that name, mentioned by Dio as put to death by Domitian in A.D. 91, and may probably have died before the date of the composition of the treatise. The Maternus of this treatise certainly could not rightly be so described; but it is perhaps easier to suppose that Dio is inaccurate than that two literary men of the same note and similarly free-spoken were flourishing at the same time. This however is an open question.

Another point to be noticed in the Introduction is the extremely full examination of the manuscripts of this treatise. Dr. Peterson starts from the labours of Michaelis, Baehrens, and Scheuer, with especial recognition of the advance of the last upon his predecessors,⁴ but has himself carefully gone over the whole ground again with the addi-

tional examination of a manuscript in the British Museum ('Harleianus'), hitherto neglected but of considerable interest; and has thus given us a superior critical edition of the text to any which has hitherto appeared.

A very full bibliography of the literature of the treatise completes the Introduction.

The notes, which are very scholarlike and complete, cannot here be adequately discussed; but a few words may be said of some of the instances in which Dr. Peterson has himself originated emendations of the text.

(1) In c. 3, 9, 'intelleges tu quidem quid' certainly gives a better sense and construction to the passage than Halm's 'leges inquit quid,' and is far less violent than the suggestions of Nipperdey or Bährens.

(2) In c. 3, 22, the alteration of 'adgregares' (which could only stand with a somewhat violent insertion of 'ut') to 'adgregando' is well supported by analogies as a probable resolution of a misunderstood abbreviation.

(3) In c. 5, 12, the insertion of 'contigit' is more questionable, and at least requires more explicit demonstration of the way in which it might be supposed to have dropped out.

(4) In c. 5, 13, 'hos' as a correction of 'eos' is perhaps simpler than, and preferable to, the usual 'vos.'

(5) In c. 21, 4, 'alii omnes' is very possibly the right version of what has become 'alios' by a misread abbreviation.

(6) In c. 22, 21, 'insolentia' is better coupled with 'oblitterata' than is the MS. 'olentia,' and the word is supported by Cic., Quint. and Gell.

(7) In c. 25, 8, 'in quae nimirum' for 'si cominus' (or 'quominus') is extremely bold and needs more defence in the note. The MS. text is plainly corrupt, but no emendation seems as yet to deserve to win its way into the text.

(8) In c. 26, 12, 'facetis hominibus' for 'sicut his clam et' seems again too conjectural to be admissible into the text, however legitimate for suggestion in a note.

(9) In c. 27, 7, 'nec nunc' for the MS. 'nam nec' or 'nam et' may fairly stand on equal ground with the other emendations, though none can be altogether approved.

(10) In c. 32, 15, the insertion of 'huius' after 'ius' strongly commends itself. The homoeoteuton is one which a writer might well have tolerated, and on which a copyist might very easily blunder.

(11) In c. 37, 37, the reading 'vellicent'

¹ See pp. xlvii. foll.; liv. foll.

² See c. 35.

³ Dr. Peterson might perhaps with advantage have dwelt more on the evident touches of satire in the representation of the style of Aper, especially the pedantic subtlety by which he endeavours to show that the great Greek orators are moderns and Cicero one of the present generation. He almost reminds us in some points of the Thrasymachus of the *Republic*; and the question 'who is an ancient?' carries us back to Hor. *Ep.* 2, 1, 35.

⁴ A review of Scheuer's treatise, by Dr. Gudeman, will be found in *C.R.* vi. 316, foll.

for 'velint' rests on a possible supposition of misunderstood contraction, and the word has in other authors the meaning here given to it, but the sentence so read seems on the whole somewhat weak and pointless.

(12) In c. 39, 12, the insertion of 'audiendis' derives some support from a blank space left in one MS. which seems generally to have been overlooked, and, with the slight change 'patronis' for 'patronus,' gives good sense.

As a sample of good discussion of a difficult point, attention may be drawn to the notes on the chronological difficulty in c. 17. It might perhaps be worth while to compare the slighter but somewhat similar difficulty of dates in *Germ.* 37, where 'sescentiesimum et quadragesimum,' which does not look like a round number, is either to be so taken or as an inaccuracy for A.U.C. 641, and 'ducenti ferme' has to stand for 210 years. If we add the slight errors of reckoning in Ann. 3, 31, 1; 12, 25, 3; 14, 64,

1 (which it is difficult to take as all due to copyists), it would seem to show some tendency in the author to chronological inaccuracy.

As a small point to alter in another edition, Draeger has been wrongly followed in giving 'proelior' as a new word (see the reference in the note on c. 37, 32). Also it does not seem quite clear on what principle Dr. Peterson uses italics in the emendations of text, and it might be better to restrict them uniformly to cases in which words supposed to have dropped out are inserted.

It is much to be hoped that this treatise, evidently (to judge from the number of recent editions) not unpopular in Germany, may be henceforth rescued from its most undeserved neglect in England. An abridged edition for schools would be needful to effect this object, and would probably cost Dr. Peterson little trouble in preparation.

H. FURNEAUX.

LINDSAY ON THE SATURNIAN METRE.

W. M. LINDSAY, *on the Saturnian Metre* (*American Journal of Philology*, Vol. xiv. No. 2).

MR. LINDSAY has grappled with a thorny subject in undertaking to determine the real nature of the Saturnian metre. The extant specimens are derived almost wholly from citations by the grammarians, not uncommonly open to the suspicion of being corrupt, or from inscriptions, in which a certain amount of illiteracy on the part of the inscribers is at times a disturbing element. The theoretical explanations of the grammarians are shaped by their incapacity to look at any metrical question except through Greek spectacles. Hence it is little wonder that of the two most recent treatises on the Saturnian metre (both published in 1892) one emphatically pronounces it quantitative, while the other assumes it to be accentual. M. Havet, the author of the most elaborate and (as far as collection of materials goes) valuable work on the question (Paris, 1880), declares that no poet before Commodianus (*circa* A.D. 250) ever attributed the slightest importance to accentuation; and now again Mr. Lindsay finds accentuation to be the prime determining principle. There is obviously

room for a fresh examination of the whole question on sound scientific methods; and this is what Mr. Lindsay has given us. Whatever other results his inquiry may have had, it is certainly a fine specimen of the way in which such an inquiry ought to be conducted.

It is clear that we have abundant evidence of the quantity of words as used in the comic dramatists; and the whole burden of proof lies upon those who would assert that this was not the quantity which was observed in Saturnians. Forms like *Luciōm*, *itāque* have no intrinsic probability, and must be established by strong evidence before we can accept them. On the other hand there is so much evidence that the ordinary accentuation of a Latin sentence was observed by Plautus and Terence, that there is a strong presumption in favour of its holding good also in Saturnians. We shall therefore naturally start with reading Saturnians according to the current rules for quantity and accent, until we are forced to do otherwise.

Mr. Lindsay begins his inquiry by reprinting all extant Saturnian verses. As the number does not reach 150, this does not take up much space, and it is very convenient, not only for reference, but also