

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](#)



Moor's Translation of the *De Oratore Cicero de Oratore* Book I. Translated into English, with an Introduction, by E. N. P. Moor, M. A. Methuen and Co. London. 3s. 6d.

A. S. Wilkins

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 118 - 119
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187682, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187682

How to cite this article:

A. S. Wilkins (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 118-119 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187682

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MOOR'S TRANSLATION OF THE *DE ORATORE*.

Cicero de Oratore Book I. Translated into English, with an Introduction, by E. N. P. MOOR, M.A. Methuen and Co. London. 3s. 6d.

MR. MOOR'S action in preparing and publishing his translation of a part of Cicero's *de Oratore* consisted of two stages: and if we measure these by Kant's canon, which requires that a righteous act should be such as might be willed law universal, we must regard these two stages differently. That a master reading with a good sixth form a book like the *de Oratore* should translate each lesson on paper and read his version to the class, is an act of virtue which cannot find too many imitators. For the difficulty in producing an adequate translation lies not so much in particular phrases, of which a rendering may be jotted down in the margin of the text, but in maintaining a high level of dignity, of smoothness and of purity of language, through the whole of the long and stately periods, a task in which boys need the careful and well-prepared help of the teacher. But if such translations were too generally published, the temptation would be strong to make them the substitute for individual effort on the part of boys and masters alike. Each new translation has to justify its existence by its superiority not only to anything which already exists, but also to anything which is likely to be produced in the ordinary course of school-work. It is no matter of surprise that Mr. Moor should have hesitated long before publishing, and have done so at last with reluctance. Just in proportion to a translator's appreciation of an author, will be his sense of dissatisfaction with his own attempts to reproduce him. Hence the more gratitude is due to Mr. H. F. Fox for having overcome this reluctance, and induced Mr. Moor to publish his translation. The translation is one which manifestly rises so much above the ordinary level that its publication was more than justified: it was demanded as a boon not only to pupils but to teachers. Every one must have his own ideal of translation; some sacrifice being inevitable, opinions may and must differ as to the direction in which the sacrifice should be made. The great pleasure, with which I have read Mr. Moor's version, is due to the extent to which his practice agrees with my own conviction as to the extent to which the

form as well as the precise meaning of the original should be retained. Mr. Moor confesses some doubt as to whether it might not have been wiser to take Addison or some other English classic as a model and to have written the translation in his style. It is possible that the result—*periculosae plenum opus aleae*—might have justified the attempt: it is much more likely that the translation would have come far less near to its aim, that of producing the same effect upon an English reader that the original produced upon a Roman reader. As it is, the style is that of vigorous and idiomatic English, very pleasant to read, but undoubtedly it is English dominated and moulded by the Ciceronian period. So far as this is wrong, Mr. Moor has been unsuccessful: in my own judgment, it is entirely right, and he seems to me to have been remarkably successful. Of course there may often be room for difference of opinion as to whether the best English equivalent for a particular phrase has been chosen: e.g. 'civil law,' which has a kind of technical sense, seems to me not so good a rendering of *ius civile* as 'law of the land.' At the end of § 184 another word might have been chosen than 'impertinence,' which recurs immediately, as representing a different Latin word. In § 257 'subjects' is not so good a rendering for *causas* as 'cases.' In § 226 'hedonistic' strikes me as too technical for the context. In § 219 'a moving air of passion' is not happy for *tragoediae*. In § 137 a point is missed by rendering *cuiquam novum* 'new to you.' We certainly ought to have been spared forms like *Caius* and *Cneius*. But these and similar points are mere trifles, hardly worth notice except for the remarkable accuracy as well as felicity of the translation as a whole.

Mr. Moor rightly calls attention to the service which such a rendering may do to students in their Latin prose composition. Time could hardly be spent better, especially by those who have not sufficient tuition at their command, than by reading large portions of this back into the original. This practice would give not only a *copia verborum* but also a sense for Ciceronian rhythm, which could hardly be otherwise attained. Dr. Reid's translation of the *de Finibus* would be even more valuable for philosophic prose, but the subject-matter is naturally less varied.

The excellent introduction gives just what is necessary to put the reader into the right position for appreciating this, the greatest of Cicero's treatises, and not a little shrewd criticism. A few notes on special difficulties would have been welcome; but probably the

book is intended to be used not with a plain text, to which it would be an inadequate supplement, but along with some annotated edition.

A. S. WILKINS.

TWO BOOKS ON PLATO.

Platon : sa philosophie : précédée d'un aperçu de sa vie et de ses écrits, par CH. BÉNARD, Ancien Professeur de Philosophie. (Paris : Alcan. 1892.) 10 frs.

Platonstudien von DR. FERDINAND HORN. (Wien : P. Tempsky. 1893.) 6 Mk.

M. BÉNARD has succeeded in producing an excellent book. His object is to give a comprehensive survey of the whole of Plato's philosophy, and thereby, as he states in his preface, to refute the opinion which is still only too prevalent in more countries than France that Plato's system is an enigma and Plato himself a Sphinx. Accordingly M. Bénard's attitude is on the whole conservative rather than critical, and the method of exposition he adopts synthetic. He treats the Platonic system under three heads, Dialectic, Physics, and Ethics, an arrangement, it will be seen, similar to Zeller's. But the book does not challenge comparison with Zeller's *Plato*—being intended, as the author is careful to explain, rather for the 'enlightened public' than for the professed student of philosophy. Consequently we miss in it the exhaustive fulness of detail which marks the great German authority, but we get in its place a lucidity and freshness of style and arrangement which will commend it to the attention of teachers and students of all classes.

But though the scope of his work precludes full discussion of vexed metaphysical questions, M. Bénard is careful to note the most important points at issue, and to indicate his opinion regarding them; and especially is he careful to point out where his more cautious judgment is unable to assent to the daring theories of M. Fouillée.

The main value of the book, however, will be found to lie rather in its treatment of the less knotty problems, where the method of the author is more adequate to the matter of discussion.

Dr. Horn's *Studies* have, as the name

implies, an entirely different aim. Instead of a comprehensive survey of the contents of the Platonic dialogues as a whole, and a synthesis of the results, we find here a series of separate essays on selected dialogues. These are arranged in three groups: the first contains the *Laches*, *Protagoras*, *Gorgias*; the second the *Lysis*, *Charmides*, *Euthydemus*; the third the *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Phaedo*, with the *Meno* and *Philebus* as appendix. The argument of each of these dialogues is set forth in detail, followed by a general criticism of their philosophic contents and relations, in accordance with which, as the author explains, the grouping is determined. Hence the above order is not to be taken as necessarily identical with the historical order; on the contrary, the second group must as a whole precede the first in point of date.

The larger proportion of the book is naturally occupied with the *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, and *Phaedo*, which Dr. Horn appears to think are to be placed in this order, since they express respectively the romanticism of philosophic youth, the maturity and power of middle age, and the other-worldliness of life's declining years. If this determination is meant to indicate a corresponding divergence in the dates of composition, the author must expect to find many dissentients from his opinion. But though such results must be regarded as at least very questionable, there is much valuable criticism in the discussions which precede.

The most interesting part of the book, however, in the eyes of many Platonic students will be the concluding fifty pages, which are devoted to a vigorous attack against the Platonic authorship of the *Philebus*.

Dr. Horn is evidently a critic of the most radical type, who outdoes even Schaarschmidt in his 'chorizontic' fervour. He finds in the *Philebus* quite a score of inconsis-