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](#)

Cicero's Fourth Verrine Oration *Cicero's Fourth Verrine Oration*. Richter-Eberhard, revised (4th edition) by Hermann Nohl. Teubner, 1908. (*Cicero's Rede gegen C. Verres*. Viertes Buch für den Schul- und Privat-Gebrauch erklärt Fr. von Richter und Alfred Eberhard in Vierter Auflage bearbeitet von Hermann Nohl.)

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 05 / August 1909, pp 168 - 169

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003553, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003553

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 168-169 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003553

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and then those that are specifically Christian. The special portion deals first with the life and teaching of Jesus, paying particular attention to the infancy narratives, then with the Pauline, and finally with the Johannine theology. When we remember how in this subject in particular far-reaching hypotheses have been erected on the flimsiest evidence we may well be grateful for a work so cautious in its method, so free from prejudice and desire to make out a case, so

moderate in its conclusions. If a word of criticism may be permitted on this painstaking and balanced enquiry it would be that on some points needless concessions are made to the method which he submits to such careful examination. In view of the really wild statements which are industriously circulated in England at the present time it would be a good thing if the book could be translated.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

CICERO'S FOURTH VERRINE ORATION.

Cicero's Fourth Verrine Oration. Richter-Eberhard, revised (4th edition) by HERMANN NOHL. Teubner, 1908.

(*Cicero's Rede gegen C. Verres.* Viertes Buch für den Schul- und Privat-Gebrauch erklärt von Fr. Richter und Alfred Eberhard in Vierter Auflage bearbeitet von Hermann Nohl.)

THIS is an up-to-date edition of a useful and well-known volume. Apart from the commentary, the most valuable feature of the work is H. Nohl's critical appendix, consisting of 14 closely printed pages, in which the editor undertakes to say to advanced students the last word that can be said on the problems of the text. With these he shows a thorough familiarity. It is perhaps a little odd that the appendix should be introduced by a somewhat obsolete 'stemma' of the MSS.—very slightly altered from that which appeared in Nohl's edition of 1885. If this were the place for proof, it could easily be shown that G¹, for example, does not deserve the place which Nohl continues to assign to it in his classification (v. *Journ. Phil.* xxx. p. 183). And indeed there is no longer any reason—as the editor seems himself to have realised in practice—for citing G¹, G², Ld. at all in connection with the detailed criticism of Books IV. and V. They have been superseded by the identification of their first parent S (Par. 7775). Of this MS., however, Nohl has little to say that is good. He considers it a copy of R (Reg. Par. 7774 A), and pronounces it to be 'für die Kritik der 4 Rede wertlos.' After this *ex cathedra* pronouncement, it may well surprise even a casual reader to find that Nohl's practice does not accord with his theory, and that, as a matter of fact, he almost invariably cites the readings of S, as given in the Oxford text, along with those of R. The citations are in the main correct, though there is a wrong attribution in § 102 (*at minime mirum* S) and *ex iis* S must be a misprint at § 106. On the other hand, the authority of S should have been invoked for *at videte* § 151 as it is for *modo ut bona ratione* § 10, *ipsi se* § 87, and elsewhere.

The excuse for Nohl's attitude to S is that he is dealing with S only so far as the Fourth Book is concerned. This sort of piecemeal work has of course its disadvantages: it is just as if a student were to attempt to deal with the criticism of the Verrines as a whole, though competent in only a portion of the text. Considering, however, that the emergence of S has sufficed to banish from his critical apparatus all references to G¹, G² and Ld., of which he made so considerable a use in his first edition (1885), Nohl need not have protested so strongly against the statement that S 'must be elevated to the very first rank among MSS. of the Verrines.' His view that S has no authority independently of R may be compared with the facts as set forth in *J. Ph.* xxx. pp. 195 *sqq.* And even if S were merely, as Nohl thinks, a copy of R, and therefore practically superfluous for Books IV. and V. (where R still exists) it is different in the case of the earlier books, which no longer form part of R. For these books (*i.e.* the *Divinatio*, the *Actio Prima*, and Lib. I.) S gives the key to the whole situation, along with its copy D, and the mention of this fact—so carefully ignored by Nohl—should be enough to justify the place claimed for it by recent students of the text of the Verrines as a whole (v. *J. Ph.* xxx. 163 *sqq.*).

A good deal of Nohl's otherwise laudable endeavour to secure a true text is spoiled by his inability to understand a point of view that differs from his own. He becomes in places even satirical. I take as an instance § 125. The mistake of attributing *erant* to the MSS. instead of *erat* was made by Nohl himself and will be found on p. 63 of his 1885 edition. In this error he was preceded by Eberhard, and followed by C. F. W. Müller: it is repeated even in the Halm-Laubmann edition (1900). Now that Nohl has reminded us that, as stated already in the Zürich edition, the MS. reading is *erat*, not *erant*, there is all the less reason for deleting the words to which most German editors have taken exception in this part of the speech—*quod erat eius modi ut semel vidisse satis esset*. They may even be made to serve

as a lesson in construing. Nohl asks incredulously 'Worauf soll sich der Sing. (*erat*) beziehen?' The answer is to be found in the *id* at the end of the paragraph. Perhaps the following method of setting forth a disputed passage may commend the MS. reading to impartial students:

'Etiame gramineas hastas—vidi enim vos in hoc nomine, cum testis diceret, commoveri: quod erat eius modi ut semel vidisse satis esset, (in quibus . . . plus quam semel) etiam id concupisti?'

A similar inability to allow for the anacolutha of what may have been intended to represent rapid rhetorical utterance (such as is exemplified in the accusative *gramineas hastas* in the passage just quoted) and a tendency to standardise, as it were, all such passages by the application of a schoolmaster's rules of grammar may be discovered in Nohl's note on § 127 where the only explanation (*Cl. Rev.* xviii. p. 211) which stands by the manuscript tradition (*quod . . . certe non sustulisset*) is contemptuously rejected. This passage may be noted also as illustrating a much-needed improvement in German editions of Latin texts. It is difficult to over-estimate the harm that has been done to learners by the abuse of commas. A German will never say, with Cicero, *si quis eorum qui adsunt forte miratur*; he will insist, with Nohl, on a comma after *eorum*, and another after *adsunt*. This sort of thing has always seemed to me to obscure the fact that the words interpunctuated (here *eorum qui adsunt*) form a single concept. In the last sentence of the passage under consideration, Nohl's 1908 edition has *Nunc enim, quod scriptum est inani in basi, declarat quid fuerit*. This is bad enough, but not so bad as the editor's previous texts, where one more comma is inserted after *declarat*. There is therefore some progress here in the matter of commas, just as there is at § 36 where Nohl now prints *compone hoc quod postulo*, instead of with a comma after *hoc*, as he did in 1907. But it ought to be obvious that, on any rational system of punctuation, the construction of the sentence quoted above from § 127 should not be obscured by any commas at all.

It would be comparatively profitless to contrast Nohl's latest edition with the excellent school text which he published in 1885: the field of criticism has been largely extended since that date, and valuable results have been obtained which are now common property. But as recently as 1907 Nohl produced a third and revised edition of his earlier work, (Freytag, Leipzig). He was probably not so well-served then as he is now in the latest results of criticism, and it is interesting to compare what he puts forward as final in 1908 with readings to which he had given the authority of his name in the year immediately preceding. Thus he now reads *eius modi* (§ 6) for *huius modi: modo ut* (§ 10) for *modo*: at § 22 he restores to the text, though evidently with

hesitation, the passage *ita C. Cato— aestimata est*, which he had previously omitted: at § 25 he reads *locupletissima et amplissima* instead of as formerly *locupletissima*: § 36 *hic iudices* in place of *hosce iud.*: § 43 *despoliaretur si emeris? quid erat quod*, etc., instead of *despoliaretur? Si emeris quid erat quod*. This improvement Nohl attributes, by the way, to Baiter, whereas it is really the reading given by Lambinus. In § 48 words previously omitted are restored to the text—*de patellis pateris turibulis*: § 54 a change for the worse is made at the opening of the section, where there should be no parenthesis, the construction being obviously consecutive,—*ne existimetis . . . videte*, etc.: *ibid. et pateris* is added to the text, and *interim* is substituted for the MS. *tamen*: § 67 *id sibi—abstulisse* is quite rightly substituted, in accordance with MS. authority, for the *id ab se—abstulisse* of previous editions: § 102 *unam eligam* for *eligam*: § 104 *legibus ac* for *legibus aut*: § 122 *picta praeclare* for *picta*: § 124 *cludendum* for *claudendum*: § 128 Schlenger is rightly cited: in 1907 he was called Schlenge (Vorrede to the Freytag edition, p. 4): § 144 *istius* is altered to *fuisse* (after *commonefaceret*, to vouch for which reading the despised and rejected S is cited as well as p). Most of these changes are improvements and their adoption since the publication of the 1907 edition is an indication that Nohl has profited by the recent work of other students of the Verrines.

Nohl lays claim to the most scrupulous accuracy, even in matters of detail. He goes so far as to chronicle the fact (p. 162) that whereas the Richter-Eberhard 3rd edition, which he is revising, has 'pervenit res ad istius aures, nescio quo modo' he has decided (quite correctly) to omit the comma. But his critical appendix is by no means free from errors, of which the following may be cited as examples: § 14 *si libidini non feceris* is wrongly credited to Madvig: it occurs in the *Leidenensis*. § 29 '*tuam a . . . istius β.*' This is exactly the opposite of the fact, *tuam* being found in pδ (β) and *istius* in RS (α): § 35 *ut* is given in the notes, but the text has not been altered to correspond, and *uti* still appears: § 55 *de istius pallio* is credited to Zumpt, though there is MS. authority for the reading: § 64 the references should be 3, 77 and 3, 129 instead of 2, 77 and 2, 129: § 104 the last note (*has in his* is wrongly included in this section, and should be transferred to § 106: § 107 *deklararant* is a misprint for *deklararunt*: § 140 the note '*illius a, istius β*' is misplaced, it should come first in the section: § 146 the note on *aliqui* is also in the wrong order it ought to precede that on *P. Caesetius*.

W. PETERSON.

M^cGill University, Montreal,
March, 1909.