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](#)

Verrianische Forschungen, Reitzenstein von R.. Breslaue Philologische Abhandlungen, Vol. I., Heft 4. Breslau, Koebner, 1887. 116 pp. 2 Mk. 40.

H. Nettleship

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 10 / December 1887, pp 307 - 308
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018432X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018432X

How to cite this article:

H. Nettleship (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 307-308 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018432X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in coetu familiarium recitavit; and speaks of his practising oratory and composition with assiduity from his earliest years. The words *Romanam flebilis historiam* Sonntag would explain not of actual historical works written by Octavius (though he left some), but of the loss of a central figure in the history of the time which his death would effect. The words *super esse patri* would have a natural meaning as referring to Octavius' death within three years from that of his adoptive father J. Caesar.

It is not impossible that this is an old view revived. It certainly deserves attention. The rest of the pamphlet is not worth much. In particular I dissent strongly from Sonntag's disparagement of the graceful epigram *Si mihi susceptum fuerit decurrere munus*, which, with Niebuhr, I have always thought quite worthy of Vergil.—ROBINSON ELLIS.

Étude sur Quinte Curce, sa vie et son œuvre, par S. Dosson, Professeur à la faculté des lettres de Clermont-Ferrand, &c. Paris: Hachette and Co. 1887. 9 fr.

THIS is an admirable work: learned, well arranged, clearly argued, complete. To read it would be an unmingled pleasure, if one could turn aside at will to follow up the side-paths of inquiry everywhere suggested by its fruitful pages.

The first part is devoted to preliminary discussions. The apocryphal theory is dismissed, and the authenticity of the *History of Alexander* is established, in a neat and judicious criticism. The date of the work, long a vexed question among scholars, is discussed with enviable fulness and lucidity: M. Dosson arrives at the same conclusion as Müttzell, Vogel and Teuffel, that it belongs to the early years of Claudius; and I can hardly believe that this conclusion will ever be shaken. At the same time it seems to me that it might be quite as strong if some of the evidence were less confidently pressed. Next an attempt is made to determine the identity of the author. Here a probable conjecture is all that can be attained. M. Dosson with great probability identifies the author with the Curtius Rufus spoken of by Tacitus and the younger Pliny. This I have always thought a very reasonable view; but why it should be so unreasonable (see p. 49) to hold that the rhetorician named by Suetonius may also be the same person, I cannot as yet see. It is a further conjecture, no doubt, and devoid of evidence strictly so called: but so is the other identification, and in neither case is there, so far as I can see, any serious objection to the conjecture, provided we understand that it is a conjecture and no more. The Professor proceeds to show how natural it was for a *Life of Alexander* to appear in the Rome of the first century A.D.

The second part, headed 'Quinte Curce historien,' opens with a treatise of the various materials existing in Curtius' time for a history of Alexander. These are shown to have been very plentiful and of various kinds; and then comes what is perhaps the most important section of the work, the inquiry into the materials actually employed by Curtius, the proportions in which they are severally used, and the methods followed by him in their use. To attempt any detailed criticism of this inquiry is out of the question here, nor do I feel competent to the task; but I will say that I believe the results on the whole to be correct and arrived at by legitimate processes. I must however remark that in this part of the work also I doubt whether M. Dosson is not at times too confidently definite in his conclusions, whether he does not expect from his method more than it is capable of yielding. Many points turn up in the

course of the book to minimise this feeling of doubt: but I confess that, though weakened, it still remains.

The third part contains an inquiry into the character of Curtius' talent. Chapters 1–3 'Q. C. peintre, orateur, moraliste' are brilliant, descriptive and critical essays, thorough and clear-sighted and in the very best style of French elegance and brightness. For scholars' reading it would perhaps be better if passages were more freely quoted in the original, and printed in parallel columns, as is done in the second part. The fault of the work in fact is that it is rather too neat; for I cannot imagine that it is in any case meant for the 'general reader.' But the scholarship is there sure enough; and such masterly handling of great masses of material, admirably selected and grouped, is seldom seen: I know of nothing in English to equal it save the writings of Professor Sellar. Chapter 4 'Q. C. écrivain' is also an excellent piece of work, but in § 1 (language) the need of frequent and tabulated quotations is very perceptible. Of this part of the book I may say in general that the analysis of the influences of the conditions of Roman life in the Claudian period, of the rhetorical schools, of the contemporary philosophy, of the recitations and of education and habits generally, on the writers of the time, their canons of composition, their tone of thought, and their mannerisms of style and diction, is in the highest degree fruitful and suggestive. The results of the whole inquiry are summed up in a clear and judicious chapter with which the main body of the work appropriately ends. M. Dosson remarks with truth that if Livy is to be styled the Vergil of history, Quintus Curtius may be called his Lucan. Indeed the affinity, not less striking than the difference, between Curtius and Lucan, has been often present to my mind: and I believe that there is room for an interesting dissertation on this subject.

M. Dosson concludes his labours with two extremely valuable and learned appendices; the first containing an exhaustive account of the MSS. of Curtius, the second a dissertation on the traces of Curtius in ancient writers, his complete disappearance for several centuries, his reappearance and the diffusion of his work in the Middle Ages. To so voluminous and learned a book on a special subject a copious index would have been a welcome addition. The 'table des matières' at the end is a poor substitute for such.

In reading this excellent treatise one cannot but feel how much English scholarship suffers from the paucity of similar works among ourselves. The true value of the study of literature cannot be fully known till it is seriously and methodically established by a combination of critical lucidity and sound learning, such as we find in the 'Q. Curce' of Professor Dosson.

W. E. HEITLAND.

Verrianische Forschungen, von R. REITZENSTEIN. *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, Vol. I., Heft 4. Breslau, Koebner, 1887. 116 pp. 2 Mk. 40.

THIS essay, which students of ancient Latin scholarship will find very serviceable, consists of five chapters and a few excursuses. In the first chapter Dr. Reitzenstein undertakes to refute the theory of Müller, Gruppe, and Hoffmann, that the last or second parts of each book or letter¹ in Paulus and Festus were added by Festus to the original work of

¹ Müller observed that in the first part of each book there is a tendency to regard not only the first but the second letter of each word; in the second it is not so.

Verrius, whether from materials supplied by Festus himself or by other works of Verrius. The argument of chapter II. is that the single glosses often give indications of having been extracted in groups from the same works, and afterwards distributed among the various letters; thus (as Hertz pointed out) many of the glosses on proverbs may have come from Sennius Capito: the continuous glosses on names (e.g., *Caeso, Caesar*, p. 57; *Lucius, Lycius, Luceres, Lucani*, p. 119; *Opiter, Opitulus, Opitulata*, p. 170; *Mamercus, Mamurius, Mamers, Martialis, Mamilia turris*, p. 130) may in like manner go back to some one authority, perhaps Varro. The same reasoning holds good with regard to the groups of glosses which illustrate points of antiquities. Again, the same notes often occur under different glosses, probably from the conscious effort of Verrius to spare his readers trouble.

The same correspondence between groups of glosses under different letters may, it is argued in the third chapter, be observed in the second parts of some letters. And some of the series of glosses on Cato and Plautus may be analysed into smaller groups.

The fourth chapter contains an attempt to prove that the alphabetical order originally contemplated by Verrius in each letter had been disturbed, not probably by Festus, but through an early confusion in the redaction of the book by Verrius himself.

In chapter V., Dr. Reitzenstein mentions a number of the most important authorities which it is probable that Verrius used at first hand.

The aim of the whole essay is to show the homogeneity of the work abridged by Festus, and the improbability of the hypothesis that this very poor scholar made any additions to the work of Verrius. Without entering into details we may say at once that in our opinion Dr. Reitzenstein has succeeded, especially by the close reasoning in Chapter I., in raising a strong presumption in favour of his view, though proof is perhaps not attainable.

Dr. Reitzenstein is also, we think, quite successful in demonstrating the existence of homogeneous groups of glosses under different letters, and right in referring them respectively to the same authorities.

The analysis of Catonian and Plautine glosses into smaller groups was undertaken at the suggestion of Studemund. It appears to us to rest on a more shadowy foundation than, no doubt, Dr. Reitzenstein would admit. His case is far the strongest in the case of the Plautine glosses, but even here the evidence is not conclusive. The point which he tries to make is this: that under the letter *C* (Paulus, p. 60-62), we find three groups of Plautine glosses, in which the plays are respectively quoted in alphabetical order, (1) *Curionem—Crumena*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides*—(twice), uncertain plays; (2) *Corinthienses—Celassis*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides, Casina* (thrice), *Cistellaria, Miles* (four times), *Stichus*; (3) *Custoditio—Cudere*: uncertain except in one instance. And corresponding to the second series under *C* is a series under *A* (*Adarinti—auca*): from *Aulularia, Casina, Miles, Menaechni, Poenulus, Rudens, Trinummus*.

After the letter *C* Dr. Reitzenstein admits that the smaller groups of Plautine glosses quite vanish. But even under *A* and *C* he is obliged to make some assumptions which (is it owing to English "beef-mindedness"?) we are unable to accept. To make the gloss *Corinthienses* refer to the *Aulularia*, (559 *Corinthiensem fontem*), our author says it is impossible that Plautus can ever have used *Corinthienses* for the inhabitants of Corinth. Now *Atheniensis* is common instead of *Athenacus*; may not *Corinthiensis* have been used in

the same way by Plautus for *Corinthius*? If so, there is no necessity to think of the *Aulularia* here. *Conivolis* is referred to the lost part of the *Cistellaria* on hardly any evidence. *Cogitatio*, we are asked to believe, must have come out of the *Miles*, though it is not given in the MSS. either there or anywhere else in the remains of Plautus. *Clientam*, again, must come from the *Miles*, though, it might, on our author's own showing, come equally well from the *Poenulus* or the *Rudens*. *Capulum* must again refer to the *Miles*, because Nonius refers to *capularis* in this play in his gloss on *Capulum*. But *Capulum* might be a gloss on Lucretius's *ire ad capulum*. In his remarks on the Plautine series under *A*, Dr. Reitzenstein assigns *audilavi* on a conjecture of Bergk's to *Miles* 211, though it actually occurs *Stichus* 167. He then asserts that Paulus's words (p. 28), '*advelitatio*' *iactatio quaedam verborum figurata ab hastis velitaribus*, refer "zweifello" to *Rudens* 525, *equidem me ad velitationem exerceo*. True, Turnebus thought this was possible. But Dr. Reitzenstein can hardly mean that Verrius took *advelitationem* as one word. If Verrius read *velitationem*, then the gloss has been transferred by an error from *V* to *A*, (for *me advelitationem exerceo* is untranslatable), and nothing is proved for the letter *A*. If the passage in the *Rudens* is referred to, *advelitatione* must be read (against the authority of *A* and *B*) in the text of Plautus. This was recognised by Turnebus. The gloss *auctor* feminine, it is assumed, refers to *Trin.* 107, or *Stichus* 129. It may equally well be meant for Vergil's *auctor ego audendi*, which is a stock quotation in the grammarians for the feminine use of *auctor*. The first point in dealing with Paulus is to remember, not only that he is a worse epitomist of a bad epitomist, but also that whole masses of Latin prose and poetry have perished.

In all this, as indeed in other parts of the book, we think Dr. Reitzenstein far too much inclined to mistake mere presumptions for certainties. This fault is conspicuous in the fourth chapter, which is a mere attempt to prove what cannot either be proved or disproved. We miss, by the bye, any mention either in this chapter or elsewhere of Verrius's original division of each letter into *libri*. The destruction of this arrangement by Festus is, no doubt, responsible for much of the obscurity which besets the whole subject.—H. NETTLESHIP.

Mélanges Renier. Recueil de travaux publiés par l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des sciences historiques et philologiques) en mémoire de son président Léon Renier. Paris, Vieweg. 1887. pp. lx, 468. 15 fr.

THIS memorial volume opens with a short sketch of Renier by Desjardins, which is followed by a full bibliography under the three headings of *Livres Classiques, Travaux de Vulgarisation, and Travaux d'Érudition*. Under the last head Renier's works and occasional writings on epigraphical subjects are carefully detailed. The essays themselves are the work of some thirty different scholars. Those on classical subjects comprise the following topics: 1. The author of *c. Aristogit. I* and his acquaintance with Athenian institutions, by H. Weil. (Weil questions the ignorance imputed to the writer of this speech by J. H. Lipsius, *Leipziger Studien*, 1883). 2. Observations on the Text of the *Œconomicus*, by Ed. Tournier. (A number of emendations, some of them of a very drastic character and making seemingly too little allowance for free and even loose writing, the former intentional the latter unin-