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](#)

Texts of Cicero

J. S. Reid and J. S. Reid

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 5-6 / June 1887, pp 135 - 139
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00183465, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00183465

How to cite this article:

J. S. Reid and J. S. Reid (1887). Texts of Cicero. The Classical Review, 1, pp 135-139
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00183465

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of the choral metres as his readers are likely to learn. Indeed his discretion in not attempting determinations for which there are no sufficient data might well be imitated in more ambitious works.

The German book is a text only, without explanatory notes. Below the text is a pretty full *apparatus criticus* of MS. readings and conjectures. With a class sufficiently advanced for critical work it might be used at the lesson; for preparation something else would of course be necessary. It is injured, I think, for its purpose by some strange licences. Surely it is not desirable to put into the text readings possible perhaps, but such as neither are established, nor are likely to be; as for instance at v. 11:—

ἀνδάνουσα μιν
[ᾧπερ μεγίστων ἐκ πόνων σῴτειρ' ἔφυ]
φυγῇ πολιτῶν τῶνδ' ἀφίκετο χθόνα.

The verse in brackets is invented to stop a gap, which most people do not suppose to exist, and τῶνδ' for ὧν is an alteration, to say the least, very uncertain. For a critical lesson a doubtful passage like this should be printed as in the MSS.—At v. 155 we have

εἰ δὲ σὸς πόσις
καινὰ λέχη σεβίζει,
σοὶ τότε μὴ χαράσσου.

The MS. κείνῃ τότε is probably wrong, but to call κείνῃ 'a gloss' is purely arbitrary, and, if the learner believes it, will prevent him from understanding what a gloss really is; nor do I see how the amended text can properly be translated.—The suggestion of ὡς φίλ' ἐγὼ προσανδῶ for ξέω φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὔδα (182) should have been made, if anywhere, certainly in the notes.—The interpretation of γινώσκειν καλῶς (228) as an infinitive absolute, before it is to be considered, must have better illustration than ὡς εἰπεῖν.—The best suggestion which I have noticed is κόρην for πατρός in 942 (943 spurious). But could σὴν κόρην mean 'thy bride'?—It would be a good service to print the *Medea*, or any part of Euripides, with a strictly conservative text and a complete *apparatus criticus*, in fact as Wecklein has printed Aeschylus. If the editor would bring his book nearer to this, it would, I think, be more useful than in its present shape.

A. W. VERRALL.

TEXTS OF CICERO.

- M. Tulli Ciceronis libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant*; vol. ix. *Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*; 50 Pf. vol. x. *De Officiis*; 80 Pf. ed. Th. Schiche, Leipzig, Freytag.
M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Selectae; vol. i. *Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*; 30 Pf. vol. ii. *In Q. Caecilium Divinatio, in C. Verrem Accusationis, Lib. iv. v.*; ed. H. Nohl; 80 Pf. Leipzig, Freytag.

THESE volumes are part of a *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum* now appearing under the general editorship of C. Schenkl, with whom at first J. Kvičala was associated. The series is especially intended for use in schools, and, for that purpose, will prove a formidable rival to the Teubner series of texts; for other purposes the two series do not come into competition. The volumes are printed in excellent type, and on paper pleasant to look at and to handle, though too thin, and the prices are extremely moderate. There is in each case a brief

introduction and a small *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the page, an advantage not possessed by the Teubner volumes, where the very full critical notes are placed apart from the text in the front of each volume. The editing is careful and competent. I have made a general examination of all the four books mentioned above, and have read carefully the editions of the *Cato Maior* and the *Laelius*. The names of the editors are well known to all who busy themselves with Ciceronian scholarship. It is a matter of course that opinions should differ as to the judgment exercised by an editor who is restricted to the selection of a very few topics for comment, whether the comment be critical or explanatory. The few criticisms therefore that I am about to offer must not be taken as detracting from the opinion I have already expressed as to the general value of the editions. Schiche has everywhere exercised sound and independent judgment. He is judiciously conservative and takes no notice of such extravagant *atheteses* as those put

forward by Lütjohann in a paper on the *Cato Maior* (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxvii.). Perhaps a few more indications might have been given as to the doubtfulness of MSS. readings which run counter to the ordinary grammar of Cicero. Thus *e.g.* in *Off.* 1, 73 *nilhil minus* is very properly corrected, after Wesenberg, to *nikhilo m.*, but in 1, 116 *orti maioribus*, in 2, 75 *leges proxumae quaeque*, and in 3, 106 *ne quaeratur latebra periurio* are left unnoticed; so too the subjunctive *agas* in *Cato Maior* § 27 (*decet...quidquid agas agere pro viribus*) though very hard to justify, is left untouched.

Cato Maior § 4 *consolatio*: though this is the reading of the two best MSS., the context demands the *consolatione* of the secondary MSS.; Schiche has no *n.*—§ 13 *quarto nonagesimo anno*: the reading of *P* is more in accord with Cicero's usage than that of *L*, which inserts *et* after *quarto*.—§ 16 *etiam ipsius Appi extat oratio*: the MSS. reading is *et tamen*, and there is not the slightest reason for changing it. The sense is 'and apart from that,' 'and putting that aside,' and the usage is quite characteristic of Cicero; see the references in the note to the passage in my edition.—§ 27 *nec nunc quidem vires desidero adolescentis*: this compels us to take *nunc quidem* as = *viv γε* 'now at least,' which has the effect of making Cato imply that he does expect to regret the loss of his youthful strength when he is a little older. As this is contrary to the whole drift of the context, it is necessary to read with some MSS. *ne nunc quidem*.—§ 28 *est decorus senis sermo quietus et remissus*: Madvig's *seni* is not mentioned, though much preferable; cf. *Plin. ep.* 3, 1, 2 *senibus placida omnia et ordinata conveniunt*.—§ 49 *mori uidebamus in studio dimetiendi paene caeli C. Galum*: what sense can there be in saying 'we were accustomed to see C. Galus dying (by inches?) in his occupation of almost measuring out the sky?' MS. *P* omits *mori*; this in *L* has probably taken the place of *uiuere* which fell out owing to the similarity of its first letters to those of *uidebamus*. This suggestion has already been made by Iwan Müller, who refers to § 38 in *his studiis laboribusque uiuenti*.—§ 58 *natationes*: read without comment. As *L* has *aenationes* and *P* *nationes* with *ta* written over, my reading *uenationes* is as near to the MSS.; it is also more probable on other grounds.—§ 58 *id ipsum utrum libebit* (in a parenthesis): no note on this, though in Nauck, Sommerbrodt, and in my edition the difficulty of the reading is indicated. MS. *P* has *unum*, *L* *utrum*; both readings have arisen out of *ut* (which is in

the *editio Ascensiana*) to which *um* was added by dittographia from *ipsum*; the unintelligible *utrum* then passed on the one hand into *unum*, on the other into *utrum*.—§ 73: in the bit from Ennius '*nemo me lacrumis decoret*' it is surprising to find no mention of Bergk's famous emendation '*dacrumis*.' Many scholars have raised doubts as to the true readings of the quotation from Ennius in § 14, but Schiche notices none of them.

J. S. REID.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae remanserunt omnia. Recognovit C. F. W. MUELLER. Partis ii. vol. iii. Leipzig, Teubner, 1886. 2 Mk. 10.

MUELLER's edition of Cicero is one of the most considerable recent works in the field of critical Latin scholarship. For knowledge, skill, industry, and conscientiousness there are few living scholars who can be placed in comparison with him. He founds his text, in the minutest matters as well as in the greatest, on the widest study of the peculiarities of Ciceronian MSS., and the most intimate knowledge of Ciceronian and general Latin usage. His critical notes do not merely record various readings; frequently by laborious collections of examples and by apt quotations or by suitable exegesis they justify the selection he has made. The net result is a fairly conservative text; but suspicious Latin is very seldom allowed to pass without warning. The present volume contains the twenty-seven speeches (including the *pro Scauro* and *pro Marcello*) which come last in order of delivery. To the 569 pages of text there are 129 closely packed pages of critical notes. A minute review of such a work could only take the form of something like a new critical edition of the speeches with which the editor deals. A very little examination of the book will convince a competent reader of its high value; he will then place it on his shelves as an indispensable adjunct to Baier and Halm (*Orelli ed.* 2). Mueller's edition does not entirely supersede this work, because, although he often uses MSS. which the former editors had not at hand, he has not space to give full collations. In connexion with many matters of Latinity affecting the text of other authors besides Cicero, Mueller provides material of great value. His own emendations are very few, and all of them simple and unpretentious. They are nearly all improvements on the readings of the MSS., but the passages are

generally of such a nature that it is possible to emend in many different and equally plausible ways. 'Facile est hariolari' says Mueller at one point, but it is often far from easy to urge cogent reasons in favour of one particular correction rather than others. In *Planc.* 91, Mueller's em. *recuso* for *desino* is really more probable than the ordinarily accepted *debeo*; *r* was first miswritten *d*, and the word then altered to the nearest compound verb with *de*;—a kind of error to which there are a good many parallels. In § 45 again, *bonorum omnium odium*, the word *odium* is a better correction of *vim* than *iram*; for *odium* being like *omnium* excepting one letter would easily fall out and be replaced by *vim*, and *ira* is generally used by Cicero either of the gods 'who do well to be angry,' or of reprehensible human passion; it is moreover rare in the speeches. Mueller is right in objecting to the phrase *oppido desperare* as un-Ciceronian in *Pis.* 84 *Thessalonicenses*, *cum oppido desperassent, munire arcem coeperunt*, but *de oppido* would be a more probable change than *oppido se defensores*.

I cannot follow our editor in his tendency to change all instances of *me te se* dependent on the genitive of the gerund, to *mei tui sui*. The accusative is, as is well known, a somewhat archaic usage. Can any one who has paid close attention to the rhythm and collocation of words in the Ciceronian sentence believe that *tui* was written in *De Orat.* 2, § 16: *ita sum cupidus in illa longiore te ac perpetua disputatione audiendi ut...*? Somewhat similar considerations apply to conjectures such as *salute danda* in *Lig.* § 9 for *salutem dando*.

A systematic and deliberate editor like Mueller naturally gets from time to time a little impatient with the 'glossematum venatores' as he once calls them, and he now and then cannot refrain from sarcastically indicating to them some prey which they have failed to mark. If one-tenth of the passages pounced on by the gloss-hunters as spurious were really so, then the gloss-makers were the most ingenious men of whom history has left any record. The art of constructing phrases which could be used like wedges to drive apart and yet hold tight the words of the real text must have been one of inconceivable nicety. A patient examination of the text of Cicero conducted by a competent scholar who has read and re-read his author from end to end must lead to a conviction that the deliberate interpolations are very few and far between, and that the number of those which are due to accident is in-

definitely smaller than has been supposed by a large number of recent critics. Some of Mueller's remarks bearing on this subject are much to the point. On a proposal to eject some words in *Sest.* § 6 he exclaims: 'miram sedulitatem hominum talia inculcantium!' Here again is a lesson much needed by the critics of Cicero's text who will not see to what shifts an advocate with a bad case must needs be sometimes driven: 'quam inani verborum sonitu, quam futtili ac paene absurdo argumentandi genere saepe Cic. usus est, credere nolunt viri docti.' Again: 'si ita scripsit Cic., non laudo, sed multo tamen melius scripsisse contendendo quam quae viri docti substituerunt.'

The following remarks concern entirely the *Pro Sestio* and the *Pro Balbo*, speeches which I have had occasion to study minutely and recently. The consideration of the *Pro Sestio* brings home the fact, too often forgotten, that Cicero has, even in his speeches, many markedly different styles. What greater contrast could there be than that between the laboured, mechanical and rhetorical, but often grand, rolling and imposing periods of the *Pro Sestio*, and the brief, pointed, pithy sentences of the *Second Philippic*, which make straight for the throat of the antagonist (to use a pleasant phrase not uncommon in the ancient rhetorical schools)? Those critics who will not take account of contrasts such as these must of necessity often go astray. The speech for Sestius was evidently written and re-written and corrected a score of times over, and the uneasy conscience of the author has clouded it with obscurity and artificiality.

Sest. § 5 *si modo id consequi potero*. Müller wishes to insert *dicendo* before *consequi*, but the phrase as it stands is a set one and recurs frequently with slight variations, such as the omission of *id* or the substitution of *potuero* for *potero*. Five *exx.* are given in my n. on *Acad.* 1, § 8; of course *Imp. Cn. P.* § 2 *si quid in dicendo consequi possum* is different.

§ 16 *omni inaudita libidine insani*, MSS.; for the last word *exsangvis* (adopted by M.), *infamis*, *exhausti*, *enervati* etc. have been conjectured. Rather *insanientis*.

§ 17 *proditores*: I still hold *perditores* to be a necessary alteration, for reasons given by me in Dr. Holden's edition *ad loc.* The admirable work of Dr. Holden seems not to have been in Mueller's hands.

§ 22 *sermonis ansas dabat*: there seems to be no reason why *sermonis* (altered by M. and most edd.) should not stand as a defining genitive to *ansas*.

§ 24 ita domus ipsa fumabat ut multa eius sermonis indicia redolent: read *sermone sane digna redoleret*.

§ 42 effusam illam ac superatam Catilinae...manum: M. with nearly all editors changes *superatam*; but surely Cicero may be allowed to speak of Catiline's force as having been 'routed and overcome,' as he speaks elsewhere of a fleet having been 'conquered and overcome' (victa atque superata, *Verr.* 2, 5, 98). Whether he wrote *effundere manum* for *fundere* is far more doubtful, though the question is, I think, unnoticed by the editors. *Effusam* probably is for *ecfusam*, and the *ec* is a dittographia of the *et* which precedes it. So in § 91 *ex feritate* passed into *ex eferitate* and *ex efferitate*.

§ 50 ille (Marius) vitam suam...ad rei publicae fatum reservavit: *fatum* is the generally accepted emendation of Pantagathus for *ratum*; but *rectionem* (which I conjectured *ap.* Holden) gives better sense and would easily, by the dropping of the *c*, and the writing of the final syllables by contraction, pass into *ratum*. *Rectio* is twice joined with the gen. of *res publica* elsewhere in Cic.

§ 70 Lentulus...causam suscepit: Mueller in an excellent note defends *causam* 'the cause' against Halm who reads *meam causam*. His defence of the greatly disputed words in the next §, viz. *ingredior iam* in *Sesti tribunatum*, is equally good.

§ 77 commodo aliquo proposito (not in MSS.) aut largitione: rather insert *ostentata* after *largitione*, comparing *Leg. agr.* 2, § 10.

ib. nulla contione advocata, nulla lata lege concitatum nocturnam seditionem quis audivit? *Lata* is not in the MSS. and is unsuitable for the reason I urged in Dr. Holden's edition, that the turmoil might be expected to arise before the law was passed or while it was being passed, not after it had passed. Either *recitata* (in the codex Gemblacensis) or *promulgata* (Lambinus) is preferable.

§ 84 quid uti faceret? senatum obsideret...? Certainly *ut* must have fallen out after *senatum*.

§ 110 nihil saneate libelli: this, the reading of P, points to *nihil sani e libellis*; with the *e* was combined a variant *a*, and *ae* altered to *a te*. I do not see why Mueller should take account of the words *iuabant anagnostae* inserted before *libelli* in some recent corrected MSS., which lead him to the conjecture *nihil suavitates iuabant anagnostae*. I am glad to see that he

defends *philosophorum reculam* in the same §.

§ 133 ut illius meae proscriptionis.. tubam Vatinius, sese scriptorem esse diceret: *tubam Vatinius*, *sese* is an acute em. of M. for the *toumbuam essese* or other like nonsense of the MSS., and I have no doubt that the idea of it, if not the precise form, is right. M. does not quote *Fam.* 6, 12, 3 *tuba belli ciuilis* (applied to *venia*).

§ 137 splendorem confirmare: this is the conjecture of Bake, adopted by Mueller tacitly. It is one of the few instances of any importance in which he has abandoned the MSS. without indicating the fact. *Senatum proximorum ordinum splendore confirmari voluerunt* is really better Latin and more likely to have been written by Cic. than the correction.

Pro Balbo § 3 recte se dare: M. adopts this conj. of Madvig, but I am convinced that *omnia recte se dant* is not Ciceronian Latin; see the note in my edition, p. 102, which was not in Mueller's hands while his text was being printed; but he courteously quotes it in his preface.

§ 5 Carthagine esse opessum: M. adopts (as I did) this em. of Madvig, but without comment. The reading to which the MSS. point is *Carthaginem isse possessum*, and this may after all be right. *Possidere* is certainly used of lands or places taken from the enemy; cf. *e.g.* *Mur.* 34 *possemo regno*; *Tac. An.* 14, 21 *Achaia, Asia...possessa*; *Plin. n.h.* 4, 39 *toto oriente possesso*. For the supine with *ire* cf. *Cic. Att.* 8, 4, 3 *Brundisium ire desertum* (of Pompey); *Caes. b.g.* 5, 26, 2 *Treveri magna manu ad castra oppugnatum venerunt* (where the *ad* should probably be ejected). But it may be urged that though the general or the whole army may be said to have proceeded to occupy Carthage, the phrase is not suited to an individual of inferior rank. Velleius, however, says of one of his ancestors (2, 16, 2): *tantam fidem praestitit ut...Herculaneum cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Comp-samque occuparet*. Even if *possessum* were changed to *opessum*, I should prefer to keep *Carthaginem isse*, comparing *Sall. Jug.* 103, 1 *Marius proficiscitur in loca sola obsessum turrin regiam*. I may mention that there is no record in the historians of any siege of Carthago nova at the time indicated, which must be (if Cic. can be trusted) prior to the battles of the Sucro and the Turia. Nor is it likely from the circumstances of the war that any such siege took place. Possibly *Carthaginem* is an error for *Calugurrim*. The forces of Pompeius did besiege this town

just before the battles (Liv. *Epit.* 93) but were driven away by the Sertorians.

§ 6 *pietas in rem publicam*: this conjecture (for *tas* in etc. of MSS.) which I put forward in my edition, has, I am glad to see, been arrived at and adopted independently by Mueller.

§ 11 *ille ille vir*: Madvig, on the strength of inferior MSS. ejected one *ille* and Mueller follows him wrongly. The repetition is quite in Cicero's style, as is shown by Jordan on Caecin. § 14.

§ 26 *nihil magis* (Lambinus for *nihil m.*): Mueller is right in adopting this; Cicero no more said *nihil magis* than he did *multum magis*; nor, I may say, did any other Latin writer of repute; see my note on *Acad.* 2, § 58. *Nihil minus* has been generally abandoned in *Off.* 1, § 72; that passage and this are, I believe, the only two in Cicero where good MSS. give *nihil* with a comparative.

§ 39 *qui...ab omni studio sensuque Poenorum mentes suas ad nostrum imperium nomenque flexerunt*: I venture to think that these much disputed words are given correctly in the MSS. Why may not *sensus Poenorum* mean 'feeling for their fellow-Punians,' if Cicero can write, as he does, *virtutis certamen* for *certamen contra virtutem*, and *dissensio huius ordinis* for *d. ab hoc ordine*? So Justin 29, 4, 5 has *Romanorum bella* for *bella in Romanos*. For the general drift cf. Val. M. 7, 3, 7 *animum suum a Poenis ad Romanos coegit revocare*; Liv. 5, 42, 8 *abalienaverant ab sensu rerum suarum animos*.

§ 47 *si tanta bella attigisset quanta gessit et confecit* (sc. Marius): *attigisset* is an infelicitous correction of *egisset*. I have not the slightest doubt that the old em. *legisset* is correct; there is an allusion to the tradition that Marius used to pour ridicule on the generals who learned their art from books. See Sallust *Jug.* 85, and the references in my note on *Acad.* 2, § 2.

ib. *a re publica bene gerenda impediretur*: I cannot think it possible (as Mueller does), that Cic. would construct *impedire* with the simple ablative, omitting the preposition.

§ 48 *cum...quaestio venisset*: the use of *venire* 'to come about' (in other than future tenses) to which Mueller objects, is rare but well attested; cf. *Imp. Pomp.* 15 *cum venit calamitas* (left unchanged by M.). The passage given by Georges: '*haec ubi veniunt*' seems to come from *Verr.* 2, 5, 12 where the best MSS. have *eveniunt*.

ib. *ternos: trecentos* is proposed by Ihne *Hist.* V. 163 (Eng. ed.), not noticed by M. Ihne's long argument seems to me baseless.

§ 50 *Avennensem foederatum*: for the unintelligible *Avennensem* I propose *Vasiensem*, a word which occurs in inscriptions to designate a citizen of Vasio, one of the two chief towns of the Gaulish Vocontii, who were certainly *foederati*. *Vienensem*, of which I formerly thought, will not do because the Allobroges were *dediticii* not *foederati* (Liv. *epit.* 61, Strabo 4, p. 203).

J. S. REID.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

I.

Eugippii *Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, ed. P. Knoell, Vienna, 1885. 22 Mk.

It is a striking proof of the immense resources of Germany that, besides all the activity expended upon the Classics in the stricter sense, there should be carried on at one and the same time three such undertakings as the *Vienna Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.*, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and the collection of materials for *Latin Lexicography* in Professor Wölfflin's *Archiv*. It is true that the last-mentioned, after being conducted for three years on a subsidy from the Munich Academy of £25 per annum, seems to be on the point of expiring;

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

but the wonder is rather that it should have gone on so long as it has. An Englishman cannot help asking what we have at all parallel to any one of these enterprises. I am afraid that Dr. Murray's great *Dictionary* is all that we can show; and that belongs to a different sphere. Yet systematic undertakings of this kind react upon the nation that gives birth to them. Besides the positive results obtained, they serve to train and practise a whole army of collators and editors who are ready to turn their hands to anything, and who have gained their experience not at second-hand or by mere theorising, but by direct work at MSS. and texts. In saying this I do not of course mean to imply that I regard the Germans as infallible: the present article

L