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](#)

Shuckburgh's *Translation of Cicero's Letters The Letters of Cicero*: the whole extant correspondence in chronological order, translated into English by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, M. A., late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In four volumes: Vols. I. II. III. George Bell and Sons. 1899 and 1900. 5s. each.

W. Wakde Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 2009, pp 421 - 423

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083463, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083463

How to cite this article:

W. Wakde Fowler (2009). The Classical Review, 14, pp 421-423 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083463

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Latin would give as *sacra geminum fumum edentia ex uno uapore* (i.e. *ardore*, a far from uncommon use of the word). *Gemina fumantia* is in fact a perfectly legitimate expression for what is 'divided in smoking,' or 'when it comes to smoke.' The writer intended to say there were two *sacrifices* although there was only one *fire*, and in *uapore* he chooses the best word to give this because it carries no idea of flame. For beyond doubt the legend represented the flame as well as the smoke as being divided: Pausanias says in his wooden way *τούτοις δὲ ἐναγίζοντον τὴν φλόγα ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀπ' αὐτῆς καπνὸν διχῇ διαστᾶσθαι*. I conclude with 18 sq. the place whose discussion stands first in this dissertation, 'quis non Argolico defeuit Pergamon igni | inpositam?' Franke's enallage (*Res Metrica Aetnae carminis*, p. 48) is approved, and the text said to be for *Pergamo ignem inpositum*. It is hard to say whether the original or the adoptive parent of this enallage has done more towards confusing the issue. The first compares 'Claud. Paneg. Theod. 13, "reducem notis imponit habenis, d. i. notas habenas reduci imponit,"' as if the driver of a chariot was usually harnessed, and the second cites

Vergil Aen. 10, 74, ('Das einfachere wäre "Pergamon igni circumdatum" gewesen,') as though 'imposing' and 'circumposing' were convertible notions.

That the use of enallage in Greek and Latin writers often produces expressions which to the modern sense are irrational, no one would admit more cheerfully than myself: in fact I have lately dwelt on this very subject elsewhere.¹ But there are limits, and not arbitrary limits, to the operation of this principle. And when scholars include among enallages places like Lygdamus, [Tibullus 3] 3, 2 'blandaue cum multa tura dedisse prece' because '*multa tura cum blanda prece*' is a very possible expression, and like 4, 42 (*ib.*) 'edidit haec tristi dulcia uerba modo' because the corrupt manuscripts of Tibullus, but no editor that I am aware of, read thus for 'dulci tristia,'² the only result is to bring scholarship into contempt.

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ Preface to the English translation of Bréal's *Essai de Sémantique*, p. xxxi.

² Dr. Hildebrandt himself prints 'dulci tristia'; but I must suppose by inadvertence.

SHUCKBURGH'S TRANSLATION OF CICERO'S LETTERS.

The Letters of Cicero: the whole extant correspondence in chronological order, translated into English by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, M. A., late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In four volumes: Vols. I. II. III. George Bell and Sons. 1899 and 1900. 5s. each.

A TRANSLATION of the whole of the Ciceronian correspondence is an undertaking of such magnitude, that if it be only carried out adequately, even without transcendent merit, a critic may well feel himself disarmed. These three volumes contain about 700 letters out of the whole 930, and the rest are to follow: the labour must have been great, for on the whole a high standard of excellence is maintained.

We naturally look for two chief qualities in a good translation of a classic—readableness, and fidelity to the original. I have read through the whole three volumes, and have found them decidedly readable: wearisome of course they are at times, but so are the originals: they often are awk-

ward or embarrassed, but as a rule this is so where Cicero himself is perplexed or disingenuous. Mr. Shuckburgh, growing weary over the letters from exile or the unprofitable ones to Appius Claudius, drops unconsciously below the normal level of his style. But the letters to Atticus (especially those written in happier times), which after all are the most difficult to reproduce, because their manner is unique in literary correspondence, are adequately rendered: and the tender little notes to Tiro are given with a simplicity that will charm every reader. Cicero's varying moods, his different mental attitudes towards different correspondents, constitute of course the main difficulty to a competent translator. Mr. Shuckburgh has evidently tried to reflect these, and succeeds more and more as he advances, owing to the intimate knowledge he has gained of his author's personality in the course of his great undertaking. Of the letters of Cicero's correspondents, and especially of Caelius, I cannot speak so confidently: I miss in the latter something of the jaunti-

ness and frivolity which Caelius has so strikingly in common with Horace Walpole. But on the whole, if the object of the translation be to give the English reader a chance of following the inner working of a complicated period of history, and of a singularly interesting and lovable human mind, in the most wonderful series of original papers that history has to show, it would be ungracious to deny that it goes a long way towards complete success. It is possible that scholars too may profit by it: for it is difficult to read the whole correspondence through in the original Latin without having the attention continually distracted by questions of text and interpretation: yet it is of immense advantage, once in a way, to pass the whole of the letters in review in the course of a very few days.

Secondly, in regard to detail it is not easy to judge fairly of such a large mass of translation as this. The style, as has been said, is sufficiently good to make the volumes readable; but if a particular letter be compared with the rendering of the same in Mr. Jeans's translation of Mr. Watson's selection, it will be seen at once that Mr. Shuckburgh falls short of the standard of neatness and elegance reached by Mr. Jeans, and is also less judicious in his distribution of paragraphs—a matter of some difficulty in the translation of these letters. We may however freely allow that the same care and pains cannot be bestowed on 900 letters as on 150, unless the work is to occupy half a life-time. There are, of course, a certain number of slips and misprints; and in some few cases dates have got wrong, as in *Att.* ii. 9, and ii. 12. This last-mentioned letter was written on the afternoon of the Cerialia, April 19, as Cicero himself says, yet it is here headed April 12, and on p. 99 April 18 is given as the Cerialia, and an unnecessary note added as to the apparent slowness of Cicero's movements. On p. 100 of this first volume May 6 should be May 3, and on p. 208, note, Jan. 14 should be Jan. 15. In one instance I have found important words omitted, viz., in sec. 1 of the letter to Caesar enclosed in *Att.* xi. 9; and this seems ominous, for there may be more such omissions, and there is no fault to which a rapid translator is more liable. But the general standard of accuracy is well maintained, as might be expected from so competent a scholar as Mr. Shuckburgh.

On the vexed question of translating Greek words and expressions into French, our translator differs from Professor Tyrrell

and Mr. Jeans, who are very positive that it should be systematically done (see the interesting remarks of Mr. Jeans in the preface to his translation of Mr. Watson's selection). In his own preface Mr. Shuckburgh says, 'I have refrained generally from attempting to represent his Greek by French, partly because I fear I should have done it ill, and partly because it is not in him as in an English writer who lards his sentences with French.' It is almost confined to the letters to Atticus, to whom Greek was a second mother tongue, and is often, I think, a quotation from him.' In the words I have italicised, I am inclined to think that Mr. Shuckburgh makes a good point; Cicero's Greek never seems unnatural to those familiar with his letters, while the French in Mr. Jeans's translation often seems to mar the general effect of ease and familiarity. The bilingual interchange of thought between Cicero and Atticus has no exact equivalent in modern literature, and it may be wiser after all not to attempt to reproduce it artificially.

The order of the letters is in the main (see Pref. p. vi.) that of Tyrrell and Purser; but undateable letters, chiefly testimonials, are printed by themselves at certain stages of the work, and hence it is that the numbering does not exactly correspond with that of the Dublin edition, which is likely to remain for long the standard one for British scholars. A comparative table of numbers at the end of the whole work may help to remedy this, and it is also to be hoped that a complete *index nominum* may be added. Some mention, by the way, should be made, before the work comes to a close, of the labours of O. E. Schmidt, to whom all students of the letters are so deeply indebted, especially in regard to their chronological order.

To Messrs. Tyrrell and Purser Mr. Shuckburgh acknowledges his great obligations, and his explanatory notes, which are carefully selected and, for the most part, clearly expressed, often closely follow those of the Dublin editors; but in some dark passages he does not hesitate to say that they have given him no light, and he not unfrequently rejects both their emendations and interpretations. At the very outset, for example, he reverts to the MS. reading in *Att.* i. 1 *fin.*, and translates eius ἀνάθημα, as does Schmidt in his charming little work on Cicero's villas (p. 35). Other examples will be found in *Att.* ii. 14, iv. 2, vii. 13 b, *Fam.* vii. 28, and 33 *fin.* Once or twice Mr. Shuckburgh has advanced a conjecture

of his own. He ingeniously connects together *Att. v. 11 fin.* and *Att. v. 4 fin.*, reading *aufers* for *auser* in the former and *nummariam* for the unintelligible Greek letters in the latter, in which he supposes Cicero to be joking about his economy of paper—the numerous letters to Atticus costing him so much (*tu vero aufers ducentos, i.e. nummos*). In *Att. xi. 25* will be found an elaborate conjecture in the puzzling passage about Terentia's will, which is hardly likely to be accepted by scholars. In *Att. iv. 17* the difficult passage about the *judicium tacitum* is explained in a new way which is not very easy to understand: *consilia ... quae erant omnibus sortita* = the panels already allotted to them all (*omnibus* being taken as dative). In *Att. ix. 9*, where the proverb about Dionysius at Corinth is quoted, Mr. Shuckburgh is surely wrong in refusing to allow the identity of the proverb with the story alluded to in *Tusc. Disp. iii. 27*, and in *Fam. ix. 18*. Cicero must be allowed to explain himself here, and what he means is that the Optimates, though practically, like Dionysius, in exile, would not drop their old selfish ambitions on that account. In *Fam. ix. 16*, *7 miniati Iovis* should not appear as *Iupiter Miniatus*, as if *miniatus* were a cult-title of the god.

Lastly, the brief introductions to each

volume are just sufficient to put the unlearned reader in touch with the letters that follow, and they are free from any strong bias or prejudice in dealing with the great political controversy of Cicero's time. It is interesting to note how completely, among scholars at least, Cicero has of late been reinstated in the old position which he occupied before he was dethroned by Drumann's persistent bitterness and Mommsen's unjustifiable contempt. Far too much weight was given to Mommsen's strictures: it was not recognised that Mommsen has never been a sound judge of individual character, and that his transcendent merits as a historian rest on very different grounds. The consequence has been a very strong reaction against Mommsen's judgment both of Cicero and Caesar, and at present we are apt, on the one hand, to make too little of Cicero's weaknesses, and on the other to swallow whole the old Plutarchian myth that Caesar had planned out his *ruparvis* twenty years at least before it came. A translation of the whole Ciceronian correspondence, enabling us to survey it completely in a week, may do something to enable the ordinary reader to correct these errors.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

DETLEFSEN ON PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY.

Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, von D. DETLEFSEN. Berlin, Weidmann, 1899. 2 M. 40.

DR. DETLEFSEN tells us that he has here brought together some of the observations and general conclusions to which he has been led by more than forty years work on Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*. All that he writes is marked by a complete familiarity with every line of his author, and though he sometimes attributes more meaning to small things than can fairly be found in them, his book should be useful as a general introduction to Pliny and also to students of any particular group of books. A good account (pp. 8–20) of Pliny's life and method of work leads on to an analysis of the *Naturalis Historia* itself, and especially to a close comparison of the *indices* with the books to which they belong. Dr. Detlefsen's view is that most writers on Pliny have considered

him too much as the man of learning, the compiler and arranger of extracts from many books, and too little as the imperial officer, whose duties in different parts of the empire gave him wide opportunity for acquiring knowledge at first hand. The part played by Pliny's personal observations he has therefore been specially anxious to disentangle. Taking the books on botany, agriculture, &c., in separate groups, he shows their plan and relation to the chief authorities, and traces any clues that lead to Pliny's own probable contributions. Pliny's boast in his preface, § 17, that he has included much matter not to be found in his predecessors' books—*adiectis rebus plurimis quas aut ignoraverant priores aut postea invenerat vita*—betokens a habit of mind of which frequent signs appear in the later books. Again and again by such expressions as *vidimus, scio, comperimus, postea compertum* (following a citation from Cato) Pliny lays