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](#)

***Discours de Cicéron contre Verres : Livre IV. De Signis.* Par Émile Thomas. Paris: Hachette. 1887. 4 fres.**

J. S. Reid

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 07 / July 1888, pp 210 - 210

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192996, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192996

How to cite this article:

J. S. Reid (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 210-210 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192996

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

dition and civilisation of Gaul at the date of Caesar's arrival. The notes upon geography, chronology and military affairs are well done, but there might with advantage have been more notes on syntax, and some of those given are not correct. Mr. Bell, for instance, is quite in error about the use of *se* and *is*. On § 3 I must join in the protest already made (*C. R.* i. 233b) against the statement that *is* ought to be *se*, or that 'the strict rule would require' *se*. There is no such rule. It is no doubt to gain clearness that Caesar uses *is* here and in similar cases, *i.e.* when referring in a dependent sentence to the subject of the principal sentence: cf. 14 § 2, *eo invito* and 37 § 1, *finis eorum* (Madv. 490c obs. 3; Roby § 2268). When however the editor says, 'Caesar very frequently uses *se* and *suus* in reference to the subject of the dependent clause,' he states the rule, or rather ordinary usage, as if it were the exception; the ordinary usage being, of course, that *se* and *suus* are used in reference to the subject of the dependent clause as well as in reference to the subject of the principal sentence. It often happens that the context alone can decide who is meant by any particular *se* or *suus*. What Caesar does is to use *is* where we might expect *se*, *suus*, and not the converse. Again, on 13 § 4, *ne ob eam rem aut suae magnopere virtuti tribueret aut ipsos despiceret*, the note is '*ipsius virtuti* and *se* would have been more strict Latin.' Caesar is more correct than his critic. We might perhaps expect *se ipsos* for *ipsos*, but *ipsum* alone for *se ipsum* is found in the best writers (Madv. § 490c. obs. 4; Riemann, p. 22 note 2).

R. C. SEATON.

Discours de Cicéron contre Verres: Livre IV. De Signis. Par ÉMILE THOMAS. Paris: Hachette. 1887. 4 frs.

A SHORT time ago M. Thomas published an attractive little edition of the same book, with brief notes and some woodcuts and maps (see *C. R.* vol. i. p. 72). The present volume is on a larger scale, and is uniform with an excellent edition of the *De Supplicis* previously published by the editor. M. Thomas is one of the most accomplished Latin scholars who have been produced by the great revival of classical studies in France which the present generation has witnessed. His scholarship is finished and exact; he is fully abreast with recent research; and he writes in a style which is always lucid, and very often pointed. An introduction of a few pages deals with the MSS. evidence for the text and with the chief peculiarities which the book presents. The Latin text is accompanied by a few critical notes and by elucidations which are not indeed so numerous or extensive as those in the editions of Halm and Richter, yet often touch on important matters which they pass by. In the constitution of his text M. Thomas is thoroughly cautious; wherever possible he gives the readings of the codex *Regius*, clinging even to its orthography, though he is forced to reduce it to something like uniformity. Like many other editors, M. Thomas does not stop to inquire whether it is probable that Cicero wrote two forms like *Heracli* and *Heraclii* in the same speech. If the authority of the *Regius* is good for *repperire*, which is printed several times, why not for *Appollinis* and many other things which are rejected? M. Thomas ventures on very few emendations of his own, perhaps a dozen in all. Of these only one is absolutely improbable; the rest are all scholarly, and two or three are highly attractive. Particularly may be mentioned the suggestion *ex aede Liberae arietinum caput illud pulcherrimum* for the corrupt *parinum*, which may easily have come from *arietinum* written in error *parietinum*. The few remarks which follow are given in view of a new

edition of the book, which will no doubt speedily be demanded.

The misprints are few, but in notes on §§ 102, 3, *Schwalz* is printed for *Schmalz* and *Nopt* for *Nohl*, and at the end *Jepp* for *Jecp*. The system of marking by italics the omissions of the *Regius* is not consistently carried out: see particularly § 27. Some of the *dicta* concerning usage need modification. In § 4 *ad aedem* is not the equivalent of *in aede*, nor is it ever so in Cicero. Pliny, speaking of the very same statues which Cicero mentions here, states in one place (36 § 39) that they were *ad aedem Felicitatis*, in another (33 § 69) that they were *ante aedem*, the two phrases conveying the same sense. § 7, *cuiusque modi*: from the statement that Cicero in his later speeches avoids the adverbial expressions compounded with *modi*, *eiusmodi* should have been excepted. § 25, the assertion that *non . . . uerum* is used and not *non modo . . . uerum* to mark the hypothesis as impossible cannot be maintained; *non modo* certainly occurs in circumstances precisely similar. § 30, the note seems to overlook the existence of the word *factor*. § 47, *quoquam*, like *aliquamulti* in § 56, is really indefensible, though still generally accepted; the former has as much, or as little, in its favour as *quodquod* and *quodquam*, now universally abandoned, while the latter originated in the age of Gellius, and is formed on the false analogy of *aliquamdiu*. § 53, *si quaeritis* occurs in two other passages of the speeches, viz., *Verr.* 5 § 173, and *Rab. Post.* § 11. § 86, there are many parallels to the description of a citizen of a *civitas stipendiaria* as *socius*; it is doubtful whether it can be even described as incorrect. Those who lived under any kind of *foedus*, whether *aecum* or *inicum*, might well be called *socii* as against the *dediticii*. § 87, Draeger's statement about *donec* in Cicero, accepted by M. Thomas, is not quite exact. § 118, *cui nomen Arethusa est*: 'avec les noms de personnes, Cicéron dans cette construction emploie toujours le datif: voir Reisch § 345 et Draeger § 193, 1.' Draeger however says, 'bei Cicero finde ich nur: *Verr.* 3, 31 [§ 74] *cui Pyragro nomen est*. Sonst setzt er den Nominativ.' Reisch's (or rather his editor Haase's) contention that, if *Arethusa* had been a Roman name, it would have been in the dative, is quite baseless. In *Verr.* 3 § 74 the reading is not quite certain; in the speeches the only other passage, whether with dat. or nom., is § 119 of this speech (a few lines lower): *cui nomen Achradina est*. Cicero in fact uses other forms of expression for the purpose as a rule. § 136, *quibuscum*: 'telle est la construction régulière de *nubere* au passif.' In reality the examples in Cic. are about equally divided between the *cum* construction and the dat. § 137, *cum fueram*: 'action répétée; dans ce cas, Cicéron emploie toujours l'indicatif.' But at § 48 M. Thomas had rightly said *cum . . . uenisset* was used 'pour indiquer une action répétée.' § 147, it is very doubtful whether Cic. did avoid *quocum*; it stands still in *Deiot.* § 39, *Rab. Post.* § 19, and a good many other passages. Ib. *ac germanum*: if M. Thomas will read C. F. W. Müller's critical notes on *Verr.* 2, 5, 34, and on *Caec.* § 18, with my note on *Aead.* 2 § 34, he will find reason to doubt whether Cic. ever wrote *ac* before *g*.

J. S. REID.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Libri Quinque. Ed. TH. SCHICHE. Vienna: Tempsky. 1888. Mk. 1.20.

A VOLUME of K. Schenk's series of Greek and Latin texts, which is rapidly becoming known in England. Two volumes edited by Schiche have already been noticed in this *Review*, one containing Cicero's *Cato Maior* and *Laelius*, the other the *De Officiis*. The pre-