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](#)

Pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae Clark's Cicero: *Pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae*. Second edition. Oxford Classical texts.

H. W. Garrod

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 5-6 / August 1922, pp 127 - 128

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016693, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016693

How to cite this article:

H. W. Garrod (1922). Review of Jean-Loup Lemaitre, Michel Dmitriev, and Pierre Gonneau 'Moines et monastères dans les Sociétés de Rite Grec et Latin: Études publiées avec le concours de la Fondation Singer-Polignac' The Classical Review, 36, pp 127-128
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016693

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the Latin and the Etruscan alphabets is the fact which Dr. Hammarström, following Schulze, has established, by a careful examination of the statements of the ancient grammarians, that the Latin names for the letters of the alphabet, and consequently the English names for them (except of course that of the letter H), are derived from the names which the Etruscans gave to the letters. It is unlucky that this very important exposition is obscured by the use of a new and curious term *lautieren* from p. 20 onwards, which is finally explained on p. 27; it means to pronounce a letter which denotes a liquid or a fricative with its own sound only, not adding any vowel before or after.

Incidentally the author discusses, generally with convincing effect, many problems of the history of the Greek alphabets, such as the double value of the symbol X in the Eastern and Western groups, although here and there the scantiness of the evidence, as for the earliest value of the symbol H, drives the writer back into the region of conjecture.

If I am right in taking it for the author's first published work it deserves a cordial welcome for its scholarly care

and completeness, although like the work of most young scholars it is often rather obscure. An eager student often fails to realise that the rest of the world, even that section of it to which his work is especially addressed, may not be familiar with many technicalities in local use; and that what to him seems a natural form of expression may be only a piece of lecture-room slang, by no means intelligible outside. How many English readers, I wonder, would see through the phrase 'the red alphabets,' followed a good many pages later by 'the blue alphabets' and 'the light blue alphabets'? A search through Kirchhoff showed that the writer meant by these phrases merely the alphabets used in the districts which Kirchhoff had, in his alphabet-map in 1887, marked with these particular colours! No doubt the names 'Eastern' and 'Western' are far from satisfactory; but they at least suggest some part of the truth.

The reader must be prepared for the old riddling symbols 'bez.' and 'ev.'; though 'm.E.' and 'resp.' appear to be mercifully absent. But 'm.a.W.' in the sense of the Latin *nempe* after a full stop is a new terror to life!

R. S. CONWAY.

PRO MILONE, CAESARIANAE, PHILIPPICAE.

Clark's Cicero: *Pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae*. Second edition. Oxford Classical texts.

THE first edition of this volume of the Oxford text of Cicero appeared as long ago as 1900. Since that date a good deal of important material has accrued, and the first edition has, as the editor says frankly, become more or less obsolete. The present edition, as might be expected by anyone who knows the course of criticism in the last twenty years, and the nature of Professor Clark, is not so much a revision as a new book. When it is said that the new book possesses all the qualities which habitually distinguish Professor Clark's work, it is, perhaps, sufficiently praised; and the most useful task which a reviewer can perform will be to indicate the main lines of divergence from the earlier

edition. For this purpose not much need be said of the Caesarian Orations. In these the Apparatus is based upon the same MSS. as were employed in the earlier edition (for our first knowledge of many of which we are indebted to Professor Clark), the *a* family being, however, reinforced by the all-important Holkham or Cluny MS. In the *Milo* we work back to the Cluny MS., through the Excerpts of Bartolommeo di Montepulciano, and the variants offered by the second hand of the Paris MS. 14749 (Σ). These two sources supply the principal part of the new material for the Apparatus of the second edition, reaffirming the outstanding importance among the other codices of Harley 2682. The only other additions to the MSS. which Professor Clark previously employed are (1) the Laurentian XXIII.

Sin. 3 (which owes its interest to the fact that it is the best representative of the class of MSS. current in Italy before Poggio brought home the Cluny MS.), and (2) Marcianus 255, the best of the *recentiores*.

The new text of the *Philippics* is based upon a fresh collation of *V*, the Vatican MS. *H* 25. At the same time, the reconstitution of the *D* family is carried through somewhat differently from what was attempted in the first edition. Collations are presented of two Vatican MSS., 3228 and 3227, of the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively. Of these the latter is collated fully only for the later speeches, where the need is serious, and where the Apparatus is further reinforced by the (Paris) Brussels MS. 14492. The Codex Regius, *l*, is now regarded by Professor Clark as derived from Vat. 3228, and accordingly ceases to be a primary authority for the reconstitution of *D*.

Having reconstituted *D*, Professor Clark sets himself a task in which he takes characteristic enjoyment. Both

D and *V* go back to a single archetype. *V*, as is well known, is a three-column MS., and Professor Clark can tell the reader how many lines there were to the column in its exemplar, and how many letters to the line, and all else that might be expected from the author of the *Descent of Manuscripts*. But he is not going to rest at that. He can do the same by the common original of the *D* MSS.; and he applies his *ratio arithmetica* to the reconstitution of the Archetype with all the gaiety of a mature scholarship.

The new text is not unaccompanied by new essays in textual emendation. These I may leave the reader to search out for himself. But among new and ingenious suggestions I may perhaps single out Phil. V. 13, *Cydam amo Cretensem*, where the supplement *amo* illustrates a type of emendation for which Professor Clark has, I think, a particular fancy.

People hate buying second editions. But this one is necessary and worth it.

H. W. GARROD.

ALLITTERATIO LATINA; OR, ALLITERATION IN LATIN VERSE REDUCED TO RULE.

Allitteratio Latina; or, Alliteration in Latin Verse reduced to Rule. By WALTER J. EVANS, M.A. Pp. xxxiv + 195. Williams and Norgate, 1921. 18s.

PENTAMETERS have commonly an internal rhyme; Virgil is alive with alliteration, some of it (the archaic) so thumped that even Conington—whose ear was wooden—remarked upon it. Roiron explored the symbolic significance of it in his *Imagination auditive de V*. But since we read little aloud and learn less by heart, even in Virgil we neglect the colours of the pattern of sound. Just as the Philistine will hear nothing in English verse but the rhymes, so we have been apt to recognise nothing but quantity in Latin verse. Mr. Evans sets out to show that Rhyme (which term includes all sorts of alliteration) was a necessary part of the Latin poet's business; and to draw out the rules which governed it. Accept or refuse his results, his book does give a

new insight into the mysteries of *compositio uerborum*. But it leaves many puzzles to solve. Was Rhyme in Latin a surface feature, strictly regulated, as in Welsh? or an ubiquitous, but unobtrusive grace, like alliteration in English? Of course, good verse in English is no more free in alliteration than in quantity. A lay ear may only detect rhyme and prosody, but an adept is aware of the vowel-play and consonant-play. Was it so in Latin? Every schoolboy learned to scan, but would he perceive—or be expected to perceive—defect of 'rhyme'?

Rhyme being understood in the widest possible acceptance, Mr. Evans allows (p. 5) that it is 'difficult to construct a long line without a single rhyme,' and that the minimum of rhyme required was low. (Why he should call 'meretricious' whatever exceeds the minimum, I do not see.) This is the point against which *Advocatus Diaboli* will direct the sceptical attack.