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](#)

Apulejus von Madaura und das römische Privatrecht.
Von Fritz Norden. 196 pages, 8vo. Published by
Teubner, 1912. 3 marks 50 pf.

H. E. Butler

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 08 / December 1913, pp 282 - 283

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00006284, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00006284

How to cite this article:

H. E. Butler (1913). The Classical Review, 27, pp 282-283 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00006284

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

sensible, sober and convincing treatment of this fascinating but perilous subject. Cicero's own account of the clausula is rightly taken as the proper clue to the labyrinth, and M. Laurand's readers (unlike Prof. Zielinsky's) are neither bewildered by a huge mass of statistics nor (if they know anything of Latin phonetics) shocked by impossible theories of the pronunciation of final and other syllables. Since the publication of Mr. Clark's *Fontes Prosaе Numerosae* many additions have been made to the bibliography. They are all recorded on the opening pages of this brochure, which I would recommend to anyone who thinks of taking up this line of research.

W. M. LINDSAY.

Apulei Psyche et Cupido cura LUDOVICI C. PURSER. 8vo. Pp. 41. Published by Philip Lee Warner for the Medici Society, Ltd. (Riccardi Press Books). 6s. net.

THE Riccardi series of classical texts has been enriched by the addition of the *Cupid and Psyche* of Apuleius, a work peculiarly suited to an *édition de luxe*. It is an exquisite little volume, for which no praise can be too high. If there be anything to regret, it is that Mr. Lee Warner has not thought fit to print the whole of the *Golden Ass*. The text is that of Dr. Purser, already noticed in the *Classical Review*, and is printed continuously without division into books and chapters, a practice which, though it would be regrettable in a text produced for the professional scholar, is eminently justified in an edition of this kind owing to the added beauty which it gives to the page.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

A Companion to Latin Studies. Edited by Sir J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A. Second Edition. 141 illustrations and 2 maps. Pp. xxxv+891. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. 18s. net.

IT is a testimony to the usefulness of the *Companion* that a second edition

should have been called for within two years of its publication in 1910. The changes introduced have been, of necessity, but slight; some of the more technical articles have been revised, four modern illustrations have been substituted for older ones, the bibliographies have been brought up to date, and a few misprints and slips have been corrected; the pagination remains the same. But we notice that at least four slight errors to which attention was called in our review of the first edition (*C. R.* xxv, pp. 260 ff.) still remain; and Professor Ridgeway is hardly to be congratulated on the tone of his reference (p. 34, last line) to the most thorough book in the English language dealing with prehistoric Italy.

ERNEST E. GENNER.

Jesus College, Oxford.

Apulejus von Madaura und das römische Privatrecht. Von FRITZ NORDEN. 196 pages, 8vo. Published by Teubner, 1912. 3 marks 50 pf.

IN this painstaking book Herr Norden has attempted to show the light thrown on Roman law by the works of Apuleius. To do this he takes various departments of Roman law, and proceeds to illustrate them by every possible passage in Apuleius that can be conceived to bear on them. The result is a volume which suffers grievously from prolixity, but provides a sound and sensible commentary on legal questions and phrases in the works of Apuleius. It will be useful to the student of Apuleius to a far greater extent than to the student of Roman law, and it is perhaps a pity that it has not been cast more definitely into the shape of a legal commentary on the works of the philosopher-rhetorician of Madaura, on the lines of Abt's commentary on the magical points raised by the *Apologia*. There are not on the whole many passages in Apuleius which are of any real importance for the student of Roman law. The most interesting passages are perhaps two passages in the *Apologia*, one of them till recently the only evidence for the existence of birth-registers previous to

the reign of Marcus Aurelius, now supplemented by the discovery of a *diptychon* at Cairo (148 A.D.), the other informing us that the *praefectus urbis* was assisted in his court by a *consilium consularium*. The position of Pudens, Apuleius' young stepson, as Apuleius' accuser in the trial, is also interesting. He was represented by his uncle, Sicinius Aemilianus, on the ground of his youth. Here Herr Norden makes a serious error in his interpretation. He asserts that Sicinius Aemilianus became the *tutor* of the *impubes* Pudens after the death of Pontianus, and that it was in virtue of his capacity as *tutor* that he appeared for him in the trial. He forgets, however, that Pudens was not *impubes*. There is some doubt as to when Pudens took the *toga virilis*, for Apuleius is not consistent on this point. But whether Pudens was given the *toga virilis* before the marriage of Apuleius and Pudentilla (cf. cc. 73 *ad fin.* and 88), or, later, as is implied in c. 98, there can be no doubt that he was no longer a minor at the time of the trial. We have, therefore, a case of *cura*, not of *tutela*. Again, to take a very different question, Herr Norden seems to me to be at fault in his treatment of the curious passage dealing with Pontianus' legacy of linen to his discreditable wife, *ut intellegatur iratus potius aestimasse eam quam oblitus prae-terisse*. Herr Norden would insert *extraneam* before *aestimasse*. This seems to weaken the force of the passage. *Aestimasse* means that Pontianus 'formed an estimate of her,' and the context shows clearly enough that this means 'estimated her at her right value.'

The book is, however, a useful piece of work, for which students of Apuleius, at any rate, have reason to be grateful.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

THE WORKS OF ARISTOTLE.

De Motu Animalium; De Incessu Animalium. By A. S. L. FARQUHARSON. Translated into English under the editorship of S. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. 2s. net.

THE *De Motu Animalium* (which many have regarded as spurious) deals with the essential nature of animal movement. The *De Incessu* treats of the various kinds of locomotion in animals and the different ways in which it is carried out, that is to say, why 'some animals fly, some swim, some walk, and others move in various ways.' The latter work, therefore, is an anatomical and physiological treatise, whereas the *De Motu* deals, in one of its aspects, with a fundamental problem of Biology, namely, the nature of living as contrasted with lifeless things. Thus we meet with the comparison (so often made since) between the movements of animals and those of automata, and it is noteworthy that Aristotle appears to have reached a generalisation which in modern Biology has found expression in the statement that 'Life is adjustment.' 'In the automaton and the toy waggon,' he says, 'there is no change of quality [but] in an animal the same part has the power of becoming now larger and now smaller, and changing its form, as the parts increase by warmth and again expand by cold by and change their quality.' The translator interprets this sentence to mean that the body's motions are produced 'physiologically' and not 'mechanically,' but this attempted explanation seems to us to mean less than Aristotle's original statement.

Aristotle distinguished three kinds of movements in animals: firstly, voluntary movements, which included locomotion and the ordinary movements of the body; secondly, non-voluntary, in which were included sleep, waking and respiration; and thirdly, involuntary movements, by which were meant those of the heart and of the 'generative organ.' The heart was regarded as the efficient cause of movement, the seat of the senses and the organ of the soul which directed all movement, being a final cause. The heart and the generative organ were apparently held to be in a sense separate vital organisms, the former for the reason given, and the latter because it gave rise to seminal potency. Hence these two organs were supposed to possess a unique kind of movement.

Aristotle's views on animal locomotion as set forth in the *De Incessu* are obscure