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](#)

Cicero's Oratory in Relation to his Rhetorical Studies 1
***De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetorids* thesim Facultati**
Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L.
Laurand. Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xx, 116.
Fr. 3. 2 *Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron, avec*
***une Esquisse de l'Histoire du 'Cursus,'* Par L. Laurand.**
Paris: Hachette et Cie 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxix, 388. Fr.
7.50.

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 1909, pp 121 - 123

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003231, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003231

How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 121-123 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003231

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

perhaps ἀμέτροις or ἀλλοτρίοις. Cod. M. 6; if, as Sudhaus plausibly suggests, ἔχθρα is a blunder for καχεξία, we must transpose and write οἶον <καχεξία> νόσος κτλ. Cod. M. 30; read perhaps τὸ δὲ λέγειν <ὅτι> 'οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθὴς λόγος', ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν' ἔστι γὰρ πρᾶγμα κτλ. Cod. M. 41, ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἀταξία κτλ.: rather than change ἀκολασία to ἀταξία twice, and add ἀταξία the third time,—as the editor proposes,—I should prefer to excise ἀκολασία twice. Cod. M. 42, the restoration proposed by the editor,—ὡς τὰ πολιτικά ἢ ἀνομοίως for ἡ τὰ π. ἢ ἀνόμοια,—has much probability, but why did he not go further and change the next ἡ to καί, to correspond with the other sentence-endings?

R. G. B.

Aristotelis de Animalibus Historia. Textum recognovit L. DITTMAYER. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxvi + 467.

Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles. Von GUNNAR RUDBERG. Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1908. Pp. xxvi + 107.

It is safe to say that the new Teubner text marks a considerable advance in the study of the 'History of Animals.' The latest and best of previous editions was that of Aubert and Wimmer, of which Mr. Dittmeyer speaks in eulogistic terms, and to which, as his footnotes show, he is largely indebted; but, as regards their use of the manuscripts, Aubert and Wimmer were open to the criticism that 'criticis eorum ad-

notationibus non omnino fides haberi potest.' We may trust that in this respect the Teubner edition will prove reliable; and the editor claims that he records 'codicum A^aC^a (i.e. the representatives of the best family) omnes lectiones varias.'

Mr. Rudberg's 'Textstudien,' however, make it pretty certain that even the new Teubner text is not to be regarded as final. Mr. Rudberg deals mainly with William of Moerbeke's translation of the *Hist. An.*, giving a transcription of William's rendering of Book I. with the manuscript variants. He examines William's language and method of translation, and investigates the relation in which his Latin stands to the various Greek manuscripts. And finally he draws certain conclusions regarding the genealogy of the sources for the text—a problem which Dittmeyer, in his 'praefatio,' leaves untouched. Mr. Rudberg postulates an archetype, as representative of the first period of the text's history; as representative of the second period, he assumes the two archetypes which were the immediate sources of the two main families generally recognized (viz. A^a etc., and P etc.); close to this second period he places x, the source of William's Latin translation; and in the third period falls the division into the two families A^a, P. Whether these broader conclusions win acceptance or not (and they seem to require further proof), this careful study of William's style and value should prove indispensable to future investigators of the text of Aristotle. R. G. B.

CICERO'S ORATORY IN RELATION TO HIS RHETORICAL STUDIES.

1. *De M. Tulli Ciceronis Studiis Rhetoricis* thesım Facultati Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L. LAURAND. Paris: A. Picard et Fils. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xx, 116. Fr. 3.
2. *Études sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron, avec une Esquisse de l'Histoire du 'Cursus.'* Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1907. 8vo. Pp. xxxix, 388. Fr. 7.50.

THESE two books, taken together, give an interesting and able estimate of Cicero as

a student of rhetoric and as a master of oratorical style.

The topics discussed in the Latin thesis are as follows:

I. What value did Cicero set upon the art of rhetoric? The conclusion reached is that he did not, as has sometimes been supposed, depreciate studies of this kind, but simply maintained that they must be conjoined with natural gifts, practice, and a well-stored mind.

II. What did he owe to 'the ancients'—to Plato, Isocrates, the disciples of Isocrates, Aristotle, and the earlier Peripatetics (Theophrastus especially)? The general answer to these questions is sought in Cicero's own avowal, 'ego me saepe nova videri dicere intellego, cum pervetera dicam, sed inaudita plerisque' (Cic. *Or.* 3, 12), while the warning is added that we must not assume him always, or even often, to have gone direct to the original sources.

III. What did he owe to authorities nearer his own time,—to Hermagoras,—to Asiatic and Rhodian rhetoricians,—to Stoic, Academic, and Latin writers? The answer suggested is that he drew his material more freely from recent than from ancient teachers.

IV. What did he himself contribute to the art of rhetoric, and how far did his opinions undergo modification? M. Laurand holds that Cicero was no slavish follower of the text-books he used, but that his true self appears not only in the style of his rhetorical writings, but in the stress which they lay on appeals to the sense of mirth and to the emotions generally, in the importance attached to the popular verdict as helping to determine the rank of an orator, and in the broad view taken of the general training which an orator needs. And as for modification, it would be strange indeed if his views did not change and develop during the thirty or forty years, spent in the practice of oratory, which separate the 'De Inventione' from the 'De Oratore,' the 'Brutus,' and the 'Orator.'

It is this practice of oratory which forms Cicero's chief distinction. Among all the ancient writers on rhetoric, he was by far the greatest speaker. Accordingly, in the French *Études* which accompany the Latin dissertation, he is studied in relation to the style of his published speeches. The result is highly interesting and instructive. Cicero is here seen at his best, whether the topic under discussion is the purity of his language (in regard to choice of words or to grammar), or his oratorical rhythm, or the variety of his style. M. Laurand pays much attention to a point superficially so trivial, but really so characteristic, as the end-rhythms of the Ciceronian sentence.

Alike from his theory in the *Orator*, and from his actual practice in his speeches, it is clear that Cicero had his favourite endings (particularly the dichoreus, e.g. *persolutas, comprobavit*; and the cretic, e.g. *curiam, [de]cernitur*). Following in the wake of Zielinski and other inquirers, M. Laurand marshals under this heading a large number of facts, which he discusses with much acumen and independence. He is quite alive to the vagueness, vacillation, and inconsistency by which modern analyses of the Ciceronian clausulae have often been marked; but he has no difficulty in showing that definite principles, or at all events preferences, are involved, and that there is a real accord between the precepts of the *Orator* and the practice of the speeches. He also subjoins an interesting appendix on the 'cursus,' or those regular cadences which mark the end of phrases (or members of phrases) in Latin prose from the classical period to the time of the Renaissance.

In pp. 284–295 Cicero's 'temperatus' (as applied to style) might perhaps have been compared with εὐκράτος, which (and not κοινός) is given by the Florentine manuscript in chapters 21 and 24 of Dionysius' treatise *De Compositione Verborum*. On p. 125 reference is made to the fact that while rhyme is pleasing to the modern ear in verse, it is displeasing in prose. It would, however, not be safe to assume that the ancients generally liked their prose to be loaded with those assonances (ὁμοιοτέλευτα) which are the forerunners of our modern rhyme. Cicero, no doubt, loved them, as his speeches clearly show. But would a Greek really have admired such a sentence as: 'Ubi sunt, C. Pansa, illae cohortationes pulcherrimae tuae, quibus a te excitatus senatus, inflammatus populus Romanus non solum audivit sed etiam didicit nihil esse homini Romano foedius servitute?' Here again Dionysius, in the same work, helps to give us the true point of view. Assonance is good, but not when it degenerates into jingle; when variety comes into conflict with monotony, variety must be preferred. Dionysius saw clearly that an inflected language, while rendering great freedom of word-order possible without any sacrifice of clearness, needs this variety

all the more because of the monotonous effect of its recurring case-terminations. Consequently he says (*de Comp. Verb.* c. 12), 'We must not hesitate to change the cases of nouns (since, if continued unduly, they greatly offend the ear), and we must constantly, in order to guard against satiety, break up the effect of sameness entailed by placing many nouns, or verbs, or other parts of speech in close succession.' On this ground, Dionysius would have condemned the collocation, 'excitatus senatus, inflammatus populus Romanus.' Very probably he would also have taken exception to the reiteration of *s* sound. 'Sigma,' he says,

'is a letter devoid of charm, disagreeable, and positively offensive when used to excess. A hiss seems a sound more suited to a brute beast than to a rational being. At all events, some of the ancients used it sparingly and guardedly. There are, indeed, cases in which entire odes have been composed without a sigma' (*de C. V.* c. 14).

While it is possible that M. Laurand's two volumes might occasionally have gained by being brought into still fuller relation with Greek literary theory, it is certain that their general execution shows great competence.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

OXFORD ANTHROPOLOGICAL ESSAYS.

Anthropology and the Classics. Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford by ARTHUR J. EVANS, ANDREW LANG, GILBERT MURRAY, F. B. JEVONS, J. L. MYRES, W. WARDE FOWLER. Edited by R. R. MARETT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908. 8vo. Pp. 191. Twenty-two figures. 6s. net.

THE volume before us is of good omen. One might on verbal grounds suppose, as Mr. Marett remarks in his preface, that Anthropology and the Humanities were co-extensive, but in practice they have been widely sundered. The six lectures here published were given last Michaelmas Term at the instance of the Committee of Anthropology with the avowed object of bringing the two subjects together, of 'inducing classical scholars to study the lower culture as it bears upon the higher.'

Oxford may well be proud of the list of classical scholars who answer to the call of Anthropology; she could command authorities at first hand on well nigh every branch of the subject. Dr. Arthur Evans lectured on *The European Diffusion of Primitive Pictography and its Bearings on the Origin of Script*; Mr. Andrew Lang on *Homer and Anthropology*; Professor Gilbert Murray on *The Early Greek Epic*; Dr. Jevons on *Graeco-Italian Magic*; Professor Myres on

Herodotus and Anthropology, and Mr. Warde Fowler on *Lustratio*.

Instead of attempting to resume or criticise the varied contents of these lectures—a task manifestly impossible in brief space—we may be permitted to ask and answer the question: 'Does the volume before us approve the new venture?' Will the normal classical scholar or student laying it down feel that Anthropology can really illuminate the Classics, or is Anthropology only the last straw imposed on the already overburdened camel?

Take Mr. Warde Fowler's *Lustratio*. When a man reads

dum montibus umbrae
Lustrant convexa,

he needs no Anthropology to tell him that *lustrare* is a word of magical beauty; if he can feel anything in language he can feel *that*. But why is *lustrare* so moving, so stately, so religious? Just because it has in it two elements, the purgational, the processional. *Lustratio* is the slow perambulation, the 'beating of the bounds' to purge your newly won clearing from alien, hostile spirits. Anthropology gives back to a word—hackneyed for Cicero to the mere 'review' of an army—its primitive colour and atmosphere. Knowledge of this sort makes language worth learning and life worth living.