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](#)

Owen's Edition of the *De Oratore M. Tulli Ciceronis De Oratore*. Liber Primus. Edited on the basis of Sorof's second edition by W. B. Owen, PH. D., Professor in Lafayette College. The Student's Series of Latin Classics : Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn, 1895.

John C. Rolfe

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 02 / March 1896, pp 119 - 120

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203430, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203430

How to cite this article:

John C. Rolfe (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 119-120 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203430

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

drawn from H or a similar MS.' and 'its chief importance is that it throws light upon the archetype of T, the two MSS. seeming to check each other.' This dethronement of E leaves H and T as our authorities; of these H is far superior to T, which is itself the *parens deteriorum*.

Mr. Clark has therefore been guided mainly by H, and consequently his text differs widely from those in general use. The extraordinary excellence of H is obvious to any one conversant with MSS., and a general revision will be necessary of the current school editions of the Milo by the light of Mr. Clark's book. The following are specimens of the improvements introduced into the text from H:

§ 53 *superiorem se fore putabat Milo* (for *putarat*), 'the imperfect denotes that it was a "fixed idea" with him.'

§ 57 *quid opus est terrore* (for *tortore*)? 'the alteration to *tortore* is...due to *tortorem* and *tormentis* infr.'

§ 68 *te, Magne, tamen, ante testaretur, quod nunc etiam facit* (for *antestaretur*). The new reading makes it no longer necessary to distort the meaning of *antestaretur*.

§ 74 *calcem, caementa, harenam conuexit* (for *arma*). This fine restoration is justified in an elaborate note: *harena* was 'the most important ingredient in a *caementicia structura*'; cf. Vitruv. ii. ch. iv. in *caementi-*

ciis structuris primum est de harena quaerendum.'

§ 75 *ut sororem non modo uestibulo priuaret, sed omni aditu et lumine* (for *limine*). This is clearly right: he interfered with her lights: Mr. Clark quotes Dig. viii. 2, 15 *si modo sic faciat ut lumini noceat*.

§ 85 *regiones mehercule ipsae, quae illam beluam cadere uiderunt, commosse se uidentur* (for *religiones*). By *regiones* is meant the *Albani tumuli atque luci*.

§ 90 *ille denique uiuus mali nihil fecisset, cui mortuo unus ex suis satellitibus curiam incenderit* (for *qui mortuus uno*). This brilliant restoration is based on *qui mortuo unus* the reading of H. The confusion of *qui, cui* is common, e.g. in the MSS. in Catull. 1, 1.

§ 95 *eam . . . suam se fecisse* (for *eam se fecisse*).

These examples are enough to show the solid nature of the work; nor have I space to register the editor's fresh conjectures (e.g. §§ 35, 42), restorations (e.g. § 91), and judicious excisions of adscripts from the text. Enough has been said to indicate that this is one of the most serious of recent contributions to Latin literature; if accuracy acuteness and freshness count for anything, it cannot fail to give an impetus to the study of Cicero. S. G. OWEN.

OWEN'S EDITION OF THE *DE ORATORE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis De Oratore. Liber Primus. Edited on the basis of Sorof's second edition by W. B. OWEN, PH. D., Professor in Lafayette College. The Student's Series of Latin Classics: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn, 1895.

THE idea of including in this series some of the works of Cicero which are less commonly read in our colleges is a very good one. The writer, however, has for some time been of the opinion that the best editions of the classics for the use of American students are on the whole not those which are based on some particular German edition; and this impression is somewhat strengthened by Professor Owen's book.

We have first an Introduction of 33 pages based for the most part on Sorof, but with a section on the style of the *De Oratore* which is entirely the work of the

American editor. Especial attention is given to the subject of *libration*, that is to 'the balancing of related parts of sentences, and the grouping of ideas and synonyms in pairs.' This section is well and thoughtfully done, although in some cases the wording is not so clear as might be desired; and the Introduction as a whole is excellent.

The Notes are somewhat uneven in character, the grammatical references in particular being somewhat elementary for the class of students for which the book is evidently designed. For instance, there are no less than three separate references (pp. 87, 94, and 109) to the use of the fut. perf. ind. in conditional clauses, and the student is referred to his grammar for 'the use of the plural for the singular' in *nos*, and for the subj. in an indirect question. Such translations too as 'within these few days'

for *in his paucis diebus* (p. 144), and 'as to the fact that' for *quod* (pp. 116 and 168) are out of place in a book of this character, or indeed in any edition of a Latin author.

Some of the syntactical notes are not in harmony with the latest views on the subject: for example, p. 84, *fuit cum...arbitraretur*: 'the ind. in such sentences marks of course the simple fact'; p. 102, *concesserit* and p. 173, *suaserit*: where one should no longer refer without comment to the statement of the grammars that the pres. and perf. subj. do not differ in meaning, after the careful investigation of Elmer (*A Discussion of the Latin Prohibitive*); p. 90, *confirmavit*: where the note on the use of the perf. ind. is not satisfactory; p. 122, *optaret*: this passage is rightly cited by Schmalz (*Antibarbarus*, ii. p. 200) as an

instance of the use of the acc. and inf. which is the natural one in the connection; p. 126, *postulet*: 'the more usual construction being *ut* with the subj.' Add 'in the writers of the Classical Period,' and cf. Schmalz, *Syntax*, § 228. Also open to objection are the notes on *quodam* (in § 14); on *quod sentio* = *sensa* (p. 114); and on *satis...factum* (p. 156).

The book ends with a Critical Appendix, the usefulness of which in a work of this class may perhaps be questioned. The student for whom the grammatical references are designed could make no use of such an Appendix, while more advanced students would prefer to use a complete *apparatus*.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

BOSANQUET'S COMPANION TO THE REPUBLIC

A Companion to Plato's Republic; for English Readers, by BERNARD BOSANQUET, M. A., LL.D. Rivington. 1895. 5s.

THIS book is not at all what one might have expected from its title and from the fact that (as we learn from the Dedication) it is the outcome of a series of University Extension Lectures. Far from being an easy introduction for the use of schoolboys, it might rather be described as an attempt to explain the logical and metaphysical difficulties of the *Republic*, as viewed from a Hegelian stand-point. That is, the author dwells upon that aspect of the Dialogue which, to nine out of ten readers, is the least useful and the least interesting. I think too that many of his readers would find the difficulties of the original rather increased than diminished by the explanations here given. Those, however, who are not frightened away by such phrases as 'sensed' (= τὰ αἰσθητά), 'categories of the understanding,' 'atomistic theories of society,' 'unified sense-perception,' 'the real nature of the soul lies in a simplicity to be attained not by unification but by abstraction,' 'Plato takes the position which is at once absolutely practical and absolutely critical,' 'a significant negative is always a concealed positive and therefore asserts a content and does not embody bare not-being,' 'the primitive undiscriminated flux or continuum of sensation'—such readers must recognize the

honesty and ability of the writer and will, I think, find much that is suggestive and stimulating in his comments.

The two main points which Mr. Bosanquet seems to set before himself are (1) to guard his readers against being misled by Davies and Vaughan's translation (which he takes as his text-book), where it attributes to Plato a more advanced technology than he really was master of. Compare for instance p. 156, where, in his comment on the words used by D. and V., 'the conditions of health and disease,' he adds 'literally "the healthy and the unwholesome." There is nothing about "abstract" or "qualified" or "correlative" or "object," or "member of relation," or "relative term" in the whole section we are considering. Yet the use of this technical language may not only be necessary, etc. Perhaps he is inclined to insist too much on this, and his own literal translations are at times both awkward and obscure; but he certainly compels us to remember that Plato had to invent expressions for what appear to us the most familiar abstractions, and he sometimes corrects carelessnesses into which the earlier translators had fallen. As the second main object of the book, I would specify the warning against confounding the pictorial expression with the philosophical meaning, in regard to such questions as the nature of the soul, the future life, the divine personality, etc. It is the 'shadowed hint' on such points which