

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](#)



***P. Corneli Taciti Germania*. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, by R. F. Davis. Methuen and Co. 1894. 2s. *Tacitus, Agricola and Germania*, with Introduction and Notes, by H. M. Stephenson. Cambridge. 1894. 3s.**

W. Peterson

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 06 / July 1895, pp 329 - 330

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202254, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202254

How to cite this article:

W. Peterson (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 329-330 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202254

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

thereby, but additional light would certainly be thrown on the inter-relationship of the existing codices. Mr. Furneaux seems to accept the view that the representatives of the X family are of highest rank; but Schefczik (whom he nowhere names) anticipated Scheuer in proving for the *Germania* that the Y archetype must have contained the more genuine tradition.¹ The editor might have brought out the fact that the *Hummelianus*, the *Monacensis*, and the *Stutgardiensis* all belong to the Y family (Scheuer, p. 3): the first-named codex stands to the *Germania* in the same relation as the *Ottobonianus* (E) to the *Dialogus*, while the claim of the Stuttgart codex to primary rank has been quite recently revived in Germany.² Mr. Furneaux seems nowhere to cite specifically *Vaticanus* 4498 (Δ), though he promises to deal with it in his edition of the *Agricola*; it is of little importance for the text as we now have it, but it has an interest of its own for the question of inter-relationship of the codices. The same is true of the two manuscripts at Vienna (*V* and *V*₂): Mr. Furneaux is hardly right in saying that these MSS. 'appear to have been unnoticed' by editors of the *Germania*, for the readings of the first are given by Massmann, while those of the second have been transcribed by Huemer, with the result that *V*₂ has been shown to be nearly related to the *Hummelianus* (Scheuer, pp. 15—17 and 26—7). Reference to the material which recent research has made available might have rendered Mr. Furneaux's critical apparatus fuller (if somewhat more cumbersome) and also occasionally more correct in points of detail—of small importance in themselves, but of interest for the question under discussion. Thus in 2 § 2 (*nisi si patria sit*) the true state of the case is that while ACDM give *nisi si*, B has *nisi* and HV₂S *nisi sibi*. Further down in the same chapter the reading *conditoremque*, adopted from H by Holder, is also found as a correction in *V*₂ and S: ABCM give *conditorisque* and D *conditoris*. Again in 35 § 1, while ABHMSV₂ all agree in *obtenditur* (*optenditur* B), CAD unite in showing *oblendere*, as also *propriis* for *populis* in 40 § 2, and *nec* for *non* in 44 § 3. At 45 § 1 CAD have *in ortus edurat* for *in ortum edurat* AB: HSV₂ show *in ortu*

sedurat, though a later hand in *V*₂ corrects this to the reading of CAD, while M gives *mortu sedurat*.

W. PETERSON.

P. Cornelii Taciti Germania. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, by R. F. DAVIS. Methuen and Co. 1894. 2s.

Tacitus, Agricola and Germania, with Introduction and Notes, by H. M. STEPHENSON. Cambridge. 1894. 3s.

THESE handy volumes have been published almost contemporaneously with Mr. Furneaux's larger work, but enter into competition rather with Messrs. Church and Brodribb's well-known little book, which has so long held the field for English students of the minor works of Tacitus. Both are scholarly productions. For the *Germania*, Mr. Davis's edition is specially admirable, and ought to do much to make the treatise better known in our schools. In his succinct introduction, the editor deals with the historical and ethnographical matter of the treatise in a way that shows that he has made excellent use of his authorities, whom he has evidently studied at first hand. The critical appendix is proof that textual questions have received a due share of consideration. Mr. Davis's notes are of a high order of merit, and always judiciously concise. As against Mr. Furneaux, he seems right in interpreting *primum* in ch. 3 as 'the greatest' instead of as 'the prototype' of brave men; and his explanation of *utriusque temporis ratio* ch. 22 *ad fin.* is also to be preferred. But he gives a wrong interpretation of *concessis animalibus* in ch. 9: cites some misleading parallels in support of the erroneous view that in ch. 5 *satís* is a dative: interprets *condicere* in ch. 11 as to 'announce,' though the meaning of 'contract' can hardly be absent: is not so accurate as to *veste distinguuntur* in ch. 17: and does not hit on the suggestion that *principibus* in ch. 22 may = *ducibus*. On the other hand, Mr. Davis supplies some very neat renderings of difficult phrases, which however need not be further particularized. His book has been prepared with great care: I have noted only one misprint, *Agr.* ii. for xi. on p. 31.—Mr. Stephenson's book includes the *Agricola* as well as the *Germania*, a treatise already separately edited by Mr. Davis, and always more likely to command attention in schools. His introductions are somewhat meagre, and are 'borrowed almost

¹ *De Taciti Germaniae apparatu critico*, Troppau, 1886, p. 12 sqq.

² Unter den erhaltenen Handschriften der Germania des Tacitus ist Stuttgarter Handschrift die beste: J. Holub, Weienau, 1895.

entirely' from German editors: it was no part of the editor's aim to compel school-boys to interest themselves in the archaeological and ethnological questions suggested by the text. Hence probably it results that for the *Germania* Latham's notes are sometimes quoted in connection with such matters when later authorities would have carried greater weight. The same considerations have debarred the editor from dealing seriously with textual problems. But there is much interesting matter in Mr. Stephenson's notes, though they sometimes (e.g. *Germ.* i. and ii.) err on the side of diffuseness. A schoolboy will be apt to stare when he reads that 'the aphasia of modern society has practically robbed the

English language of the word *awful*' (p. 126): on the other hand he will be amused by 'the imperious Baumstark' (p. 118) and such notes as those on *matrimonium* (p. 136) and *calida* (p. 138) must plainly have been intended to divert him. Space forbids me to add anything further, except to remark that on ch. xx. Mr. Stephenson falls into the common error of interpreting *sordidi* of a discreditable kind of squalor, whereas it seems to point only to an obvious feature of rural life: that *exigitur* in ch. x. means 'demanded' rather than 'tested': and that the reference to Quintilian on p. 151 should be ix. 3, 1.

W. P.

REID'S EDITION OF THE *PRO MILONE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad indices Oratio. Edited for Schools and Colleges by JAMES S. REID, Litt.D. Cambridge University Press. 1894. 2s. 6d.

SCHOLARS will welcome this addition to the admirable series of speeches and other works of Cicero edited by Dr. James S. Reid. Few of the speeches of Cicero, whether as regards style or matter, were more worthy of Dr. Reid's attention than the highly-laboured oration which he delivered, or rather published, in defence of his friend Milo; and if our admiration of the cleverness and brilliance of the oratory is somewhat damped by the knowledge that Cicero broke down through nervousness in the delivery of it, and so rendered himself open to Milo's well-known taunt about the lampreys of Marseilles, we have the satisfaction on the other hand of knowing that the speech as we have it came forth from the hand of Cicero with the most perfect literary and forensic finish which he could put on it. The popularity of the speech, educationally, is evidenced by the fact that no less than five English editions of it have appeared in the space of two years: a new issue of the late Mr. Purton's edition itself forming a volume in the Pitt Press series; the Clarendon Press edition by Mr. A. B. Poynton; another Clarendon Press edition, important for the text, by Mr. Albert C. Clark; the volume in Messrs. Macmillan's red series by Mr. F. H. Colson; and now the edition by Dr. Reid, in which the Pitt Press

appears (like the Clarendon) as competing with itself.

All these editions have merits of their own; all have been written with a view both to school and college use. But a glance will show that Dr. Reid's book stands on a different level from the rest. It is not properly a school-book; it is not written mainly with a view to boys, or the practical needs of teaching. It is essentially a book for scholars; and its great feature is the remarkable care and completeness with which the delicacies of Ciceronian, or Latin, diction are illustrated from the language of the speech. Not that matters of historical interest are passed over. There is an admirable introduction. Each historical, legal, or other point in the argument which absolutely requires explanation is explained shortly—very often too shortly—or a reference given to an explanation to be found elsewhere. But the brevity, almost the curttness, with which this is done makes it apparent that the main object of the commentator is not to exhibit in a tempting or suggestive form the intellectual food to be extracted from the matter, or the general literary qualities of the speech, but rather to use its language as a peg on which to hang careful and exhaustive statements as to the usage of the best Latin authors on nice points of diction. Thus Dr. Reid's editions are much more than editions of particular speeches: they are important contributions to our scientific knowledge of the language. But the very