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 Tenth Book of Quintilian *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus*. A revised text, with Introductory Essays, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and a Facsimile of the Harleian MS., by W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D., Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 8vo. pp. lxxx. 227, price 12s. 6d.

A. S. Wilkins

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 32 - 34
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184586, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184586

How to cite this article:

A. S. Wilkins (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 32-34 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184586

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

tatem feminarum marium aequauerat dignitati.' In appendix 21. 7 *cum circumspectans errore haesisset diu* the conjecture *circumspectans omnia* is probable. An apparently certain transposition is suggested on p. 121, in appendix 8. 14, *nec cadere in illum credit tantam audaciam*; this verse seems misplaced, and ought to follow line 21 *uirum ut in re atroci* etc.

The book is learned and instructive; and can be safely recommended to all who care for the study of Latin poetry. I finish by quoting a passage of unusual interest, where the writer enlightens us as to the method pursued by his master Cobet in training his pupils. Considering what affinities there were between the minds and methods of those two consummate critics, Bentley and Cobet, one cannot help feeling it rather strange that so strong an attack upon the English has come from a pupil of the Dutch scholar.

'Saepe in memoriam incundissimi temporis redeo quo et ipse et amici Cobeto praeceptore utebamur; is enim lege iubente cuique nostrum honorem Academicum petenti locum aliquem proponebat quem domi uitio purgare conaretur. Moris autem tum erat amicos omnes de eo secum deliberare ut laboranti opem ferre possent. Primum ergo Nouas Variasque

Lectiones inspiciebamus: haud enim raro accidebat ut summus uir, tam suorum quam alienorum inuentorum immemor, locum discipulo emendandum proponeret quem ipse ante multos annos felicissime persanasset. Si nihil in Lectionibus opis erat proprio erat ingenio utendum: conueniebamus ergo quaerebamusque. Nonnumquam unus e nobis statim rem acu tangebatur, sed multo saepius accidebat ut omnes frustra caput scalperemus. In summa ergo rerum desperatione quam accuratissime locum propositum perlegebamus, i.e. sub unoquoque uerbo aliquid uitii latere suspicabamur. Cum de corruptelae sede inter nos constabat, ea utebamur ratione qua fieri non potest quin multae simul nascantur coniecturae, quarum alia solet esse absurda, alia paulo absurdior: uocabulum enim suspectum litteris describebamus uncialibus, ita cetera omnia uocabula ei fiebant similia. Cum inuentum erat quod satis placeret omnibus, de solida nocte haud paruum partem uino gaudioque dabamus. Postridie qui primus uinulum (*sic*) edormitasset ad Bibliothecam currebat et ab illo libro, quem postea aut numquam aut rarissime inspecturus erat, auxilium petebat, Stephani thesaurum dico, ex eoque excerpebat quidquid in rem praesentem faceret; praedaeque ad amicum iam instantis periculi metu sollicitum allata de uespertino illo uel nocturno inuento breuis conscribatur commentatio. Illam deinde Cobeto recitabat; candidatus, in qua Herodoti puta uel Thucydidis locus ita emendaretur scilicet ut testes afferrentur Nouum Testamentum, Lycophronis Alexandra, Eunapius. Nihil tum iucundius erat quam Cobetum audire ridendum iocantemque (pp. 90, 91).'

S. G. OWEN.

PETERSON'S TENTH BOOK OF QUINTILIAN.

M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus. A revised text, with Introductory Essays, Critical and Explanatory Notes, and a Facsimile of the Harleian MS., by W. PETERSON, M.A., LL.D., Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrew's University. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 8vo. pp. lxxx. 227, price 12s. 6d.

THE Tenth Book of Quintilian is not an easy book to annotate satisfactorily. The text is not in a satisfactory state, and frequently requires discussion. The vocabulary and the syntax are those of the Silver Age, and the attention of the student has to be called constantly to departures from classical usage. There are numerous references to the technical terms of rhetoric (all the more perplexing to the tiro because they are often incidental), which have to be explained, sometimes at length. Finally the book includes a rapid critical survey of almost the whole of Greek and Latin literature; and if the editor is not to

content himself with barely referring to dictionaries and handbooks, he finds himself embarrassed with an overwhelming mass of material. It is doubtless the last difficulty, the burden of which is in exact proportion to the learning of the commentator, that has left the purchasers of the first part of Professor J. E. B. Mayor's edition sighing for the completion of a work, which the Christmas vacation of 1872 was to have seen achieved. Principal Peterson has grappled with his task on all sides, with no little energy and success. The main contribution which he has himself offered to the settlement of the text lies in the use which he has made of the *codex Harleianus* 2664. The excellent *codex Ambrosianus* is unfortunately deficient for the whole of Book x. The *codex Bernensis* is similarly wanting as far as x. 1, 107, the copy from which it was taken having large *lacunae*, which are indicated by blank spaces in the Bernensis. In an early copy of the latter, the *cod. Bambergensis*, the *lacunae* are filled up by another but an early hand, known as G,

while a later hand, marked as *b*, made other additions, doubtless from a different and a much inferior source. Mr. Peterson thinks that he can prove (and he has certainly made out a good case) that the Harleianus was copied from the Bambergensis after it had been completed by the additions of *G*, following however the readings of *b* rather than the original hand, and that the important complete MSS. *Florentinus* and *Turicensis* are transcribed from it. 'In every place where Halm uses the formula "F T soli ex notis," H. will be found to correspond.' It seems probable that the Harleianus came into the possession, but how we cannot say, of the library of the Cathedral at Cologne, that thence it was borrowed by Graevius, that after his death it was purchased by the Elector of Hesse Darmstadt for his library at Düsseldorf, and that Büchels the librarian of Düsseldorf sold it to Lord Oxford. It is at least possible that it was the MS. found by Poggio at St. Gall, through which Quintilian first became known to the scholars of the Renaissance. The discovery of the MS. is of great interest; but as it is clearly a copy of an extant MS. it cannot be said to be of great critical importance except for three or four pages at the beginning of the work where *B* is deficient. More value attaches to the Paris MS. *Nostradamensis*, which seems to have been an independent copy of the source of *Bernensis*, and two other Paris MSS. *Pratensis* and *Puteanus* of later date, but derived from an original *Beccensis*, which if extant would probably be at least as valuable as *Bernensis*. The numerous xvth century MSS. are of interest as showing the gradual improvement of scholarship, but of course their distinctive readings cannot rise above the rank of more or less successful emendations.

Mr. Peterson's critical notes cover some forty pages. He has made much use of the valuable papers by Kiderlin and Becher, and has studied carefully the very numerous criticisms offered incidentally in recent periodicals. In chap. 1, there are 28 instances in which his text differs from both Halm's and Meister's, besides about twice as many in which he agrees with one of these critics as against the other. Some of these may be worth discussion. In § 2 he is right in keeping *tamen* 'after all' of the best MSS. (there might have been a reference to Madvig's *de Finibus* p. 833 for *quae quoque*), and in § 3 in omitting *est*. In § 16 it might have been better to follow Meister: I doubt the suggested explanation; § 19 is open to doubt,

but the loss of *ut* seems more probable than the addition of *s*: *tractemus* on the other hand is well defended after Becher. In § 38 the uncertainty of the MS. tradition is certainly against, rather than in favour of, the words 'quibuscum vivebat' being a gloss. There seems no good reason for following Kiderlin in rejecting *etiam* in § 42, but in § 44 Becher has admirably established *atque*, and *parcos enim qui sunt* seems pretty certain. In § 59 Quintilian's usage of *adsequi* hardly warrants the retention of the indicative. In § 61 the weight of authority (Mr. Peterson does not quote *G*, which is against him) is decidedly in favour of *spiritus*. In § 70 the excision of *mala* greatly improves the sentence, though there is something to be said for *mala illa*. (Is *iudicia* quite sound? The note gives no adequate parallels, and is not clear in its wording.) In § 72 *prave* is certainly right. I doubt whether § 85 is sufficiently parallel to § 88 to make us hesitate about *ei*: Mr. Peterson's own note on the latter passage shows this. For *elegea* (§ 93) he is right in following the best MSS. It is very hard to defend *non* for *nisi* in § 94, especially in face of the *mihi* of Prat. and Put. In § 100 *suae* seems pretty certain. In § 101 *commendavit* is not quite satisfactory, but it is better than *commodavit* which Halm conjectured. In § 102 Kiderlin's conjecture is an excellent instance of the importance of following the guidance of the better MSS., and in § 103 his suggestion has been wisely followed. In § 104 *exornat* is rightly retained: I should have more doubt about rejecting *omnia*; the usage of Quintilian strongly supports it. The addition to *B*'s reading in § 115 is very doubtful. In the critical note on § 123 there seems to be some error, but the subjunctive is rightly defended. In § 128 Wölfflin's *obliqua* is excellent, and that carries *recta*.

It will be seen that there are several important improvements of the text, even if we subtract what may be considered doubtful. The only suggestion of his own which Mr. Peterson introduces in the text has not the merit of convincingness: 'debent tamen sic dicere' can hardly bear the meaning 'they ought to be able (from their previous training) so to speak.'

To the diction of Quintilian Mr. Peterson has given due attention, and there are many useful hints to the student. In § 2 'fuerit' might have had a note, and in § 8 the note on *cuiusdam* is hardly well expressed, nor are the examples quite parallel. In § 12 a reference to Roby's *Grammar* might have

been added on *quicumque*. In § 19 the quotation on *sive* is unhappily chosen, and will confuse a reader. The note on *nec utique* in § 20 (cf. § 57) is, I think, misleading: 'not necessarily' is a better meaning. If Prof. Palmer's quotation given on § 33 had been verified, the reference (iii. 8, 23) would have been inserted, and his slip of memory ('imber' for 'aurae') corrected. The usage of *tum--tum*, which is often misunderstood, might have been explained on § 46. On § 99 the note on 'vellent' is quite misleading: the translation 'had been desirous' with a reference to Roby § 1532 would have been much more helpful. There is not much of a parallel, by the way, in the epigram of Plato on Aristophanes, quoted at the same place. In iii. 3 the subjunctive is surely final rather than consecutive. On § 26 the causal force of *cum* with ind. is very doubtful. A passage from the *De Oratore* is quoted with a wrong interpretation on iii. 31, and with the right one on iv. 1. Mr. Peterson seems to be unduly hard upon the doctors, and upon Quintilian too, on iv. 3; surely 'similes medicis secantibus' means 'like doctors when they cut,' not 'who are in the habit of cutting.' The meaning given to *flecus et transitus* 'intonations and stops' is very inadequately supported, though Mr. Peterson is right in noting a difficulty in the ordinary interpretation.

The technical terms of rhetoric are as a rule thoroughly well treated. The editor knows his *De Oratore* and *Orator* (accidentally confused on § 8) as well as his Quintilian, and quotes happily. Whether the quotations are not sometimes too long is a question on which those will speak most positively who have least experience of the difficulty of staying one's hand, when every additional line adds to the parallelism of the passage with the text. On § 12 the reference to the book of the *Ad Herennium* is omitted.

The literary history is also treated with adequate but not excessive fulness. Two or three slips may be corrected, which have escaped notice. The note on § 22 will certainly lead students to believe that Aeschines wrote the *Contra Timarchum* in reply to the *De Falsa Legatione* of Demosthenes. On § 42 an English reader would like a reference to Macaulay's Essay on Sir W. Temple in addition to, or even instead of, that to Hipp. Regault. The date of Peisandros is too definitely given for our information. It would have been worth while saying something more about Eupho-

riion and his 'cantores.' In § 61 the word 'not' has slipped in wrongly before 'received.' Eupolis (§ 66) was probably 39 not 36 at the time of his death. The order 'Afer Domitius' is not quite limited in Cicero to his letters: cf. *De Orat.* ii. 253, 283. It is very doubtful whether the Flaccus whom Martial addresses (in i. 76, not i. 77) was the poet of the *Argonautica*: cp. Friedländer's discussion in *Sittengeschichte* iii^b 449—a section omitted in the latest edition. On § 96 Caesius Bassus who died in the eruption of Vesuvius is confused with Iulius Bassus, a friend of Ovid's at least 70 years earlier. On § 120 a reference should have been given for the death of Iulius Secundus: the date given is only a deduction from the probable date of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, and it is possibly several years too late. The note on Livius Andronicus would have gained in accuracy by a more careful consideration of the passage of Festus (p. 333) on which the last sentence is apparently based, or by referring to L. Müller's Ennius p. 30, a reference which would also have improved the note on *vates*. In v. § 4 Mr. Peterson is probably right in supposing Servius Sulpicius to be referred to, though the practice of paraphrasing solely from verse seems a curious one for an orator distinguished for *acumen*.

I have left myself no space to speak of the excellent Introduction. With a little expansion here and there it would serve as an introduction to a complete edition of the author, a task which a phrase in the preface leads us to hope that Mr. Peterson is contemplating. Meanwhile he might be doing good service in a humbler way if he would issue a school-text of this book, than which few furnish more profitable matter for college lectures, or for the work of a sixth form. On one point he seems to have missed the force of an argument. If an Englishman were to write 'I have heard that "fettle" is a Lancashire word,' this would not suggest that he was a Lancashire man by birth. Is it strange that the same argument has been applied to the way in which Quintilian speaks of 'gurdos'?

But I must not let the last word on this edition be one of difference of opinion. It is a work of great industry, of sound judgment and of ripe scholarship, a valuable contribution in a department which has been too much neglected by English scholars, and it deserves a hearty and a grateful welcome.

A. S. WILKINS.