

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](#)



Lehmann's Edition of Hofmann's Letters of Cicero *Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero* erklärt Friedrich von Hofmann. Erstes Bändchen. Sechste Auflage, besorgt von Karl Lehmann. Berlin: Weidmann. 1892. 2 Mk. 70.

L. C. Purser

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 46 - 47

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00196805, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00196805

How to cite this article:

L. C. Purser (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 46-47 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00196805

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

LEHMANN'S EDITION OF HOFMANN'S LETTERS OF CICERO.

Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero erklärt von FRIEDRICH HOFMANN. Erstes Bändchen. Sechste Auflage, besorgt von KARL LEHMANN. Berlin: Weidmann. 1892. 2 Mk. 70.

THIS is a most careful and conscientious revision of a standard work; but owing to the efforts which the reviser takes to hide his light under a bushel, his full merits may perhaps fail to obtain their deserved recognition. Since the publication of his *Quaestiones Tullianae* in 1886 Lehmann has been recognized as one of the best exponents of Cicero's *Letters*. He has been prosecuting extended researches into the criticism of the *Epistles to Atticus*, and in this edition he has not only introduced us to several new MSS. but he has also given a summary of the conclusions he has reached as regards the relations of all the MSS. to one another. On this something may perhaps soon be said when his detailed work on the subject is published. In this edition he warns us against excessive devotion to the finds of recent years and he is justly cautious in introducing emendations into the text. Yet we cannot help thinking that he has been too daring in reading *Att. v. 15. 3 modo si me amas, si te a me amari vis, adsis tu* for *modo si me amas sim annuus, adsis tu* [most MSS. *sit annuus*: Malaspina's MSS. *sit annuus*], though no doubt such appeals to mutual devotion often occur (*Fam. iii. 9, 2, Att. i. 20. 7*): also in the many lengthy insertions he makes which *may* have been something like what was originally written and which are all carefully thought out and in a measure explain the several corruptions (generally on the principle *ex homoeoteleuto*), but which ought not to be read, at least in a school edition, e.g. *Att. vii. 9. 3 Nobis autem ut quidam putant nihil est timendum magis quam ille consul. 'At sic malo, inquires, quam cum exercitu.'* Certe: sed istud ipsum <reipublicae est perniciosum>: sic o magnum malum! putat aliquis. The words in brackets are Lehmann's addition. Surely Boot's proposal to read '*sic malo*,' even though not quite satisfactory, is better than that: though we confess to having a strong leaning to the simplest of all the suggestions, that of Tunstall, *istud ipsum 'sic'* (omitting o) 'that "thus" of yours.' To the dangers to which this principle of addition may lead L. shows that he is himself alive

when in his note on *Att. i. 16. 9 aut metuendo ignavissimi* he emphasizes the fact that this addition of Lambinus is only a conjecture. If these additions are given in the text, careful indication ought to be made that they are only conjectures either by printing the words in italics or by some other device. Similar additions L. makes in *Att. v. 15. 3 Plura scribam <cum constitero: haec sciebam> tarde tibi redditum iri: Att. viii. 3. 6 Non accipere <periculosum est ab hoc, accipere>, ne ('granted that not') periculosum sit invidiosum ad bonos* [due to Klotz]: *x. 8. 1 quod fieri <nec honestum nec tutum>* [some MSS. have *quod fieri non debet*, perhaps rightly]: *ix. 11a. 3 me et pacis et utriusque vestrum <amicum ad vestram> et ad civium concordiam accommodatissimum esse.* The establishment of this reading is one of the finest arguments in the *Quaest. Tull.* pp. 96—100. He warmly approves of, but does not read, Tyrrell's addition *Coriolani fuga* in *Fam. v. 12. 5*. Other good emendations of L. are *Att. iv. 1. 5 ab infimo* (sc. gradu) [MSS. *ab infima*]: *Att. viii. 3. 2. non futurus <sit qui fuerit>*, cp. *Fam. vii. 3. 4 vetus enim, est, ubi non sis qui fueris non esse cur velis vivere.* Not so acceptable are *Att. iv. 2. 2 dolor et magnitudo odii* [MSS. *dolor et magnitudo* or *doloris et magnitudo*]. Probably the reading of the Oxford *q* is the right one, *doloris magnitudo*, the insertion of a superfluous *et* being a common error in MSS. (cp. O. E. Schmidt *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Ciceros* p. 281 on the frequency with which a superfluous *et* is inserted by the first hand of M at the beginning of the MS.: Schmidt conceives it to be due to a misunderstood mark of punctuation): *Att. viii. 3. 5 an quo amando?* [aut quomodo Malaspina's MSS.] comparing *Att. vii. 13. 3*. The latter reading is probably the right one; and in passing it may be noticed that Malaspina's contributions to the criticism of the *Letters* have been unduly neglected latterly, e.g. *prorogator* in *Att. viii. 3. 3* is most probably the correct reading, not *propagator*, as the archetype was written in uncials: and *ix. 9. 4 διάγραμμα* in the sense of 'schedule,' 'inventory,' 'detailed statement' (cf. Demosth. xiv. 21, xlvii. 36, 43 and Dio Cass. xlv. 53) is certainly the best attempt made to explain the difficult *digamma*. This emendation is advocated by Malaspina but due to some one else, perhaps Lambinus. In *ix. 18. 2 heros Celer* (MSS.

ero sceleri) 'that great hero, your father-in-law' may perhaps be right. Cicero does use *heros* in our sense of 'hero' (*Att.* i. 17. 9: iv. 3. 5: xiv. 6. 1), but, if the conjecture is right, we must suppose that Atticus in one of his letters mentioned (no doubt ironically) some exploit of this Q. Pilius Celer. But it is simpler to accept Lambinus's *Eros Celeris* 'Pilius's slave Eros.' For *s* final omitted cp. *Fam.* xv. 15. 1 *praetere* for *praeter eos*.

Lehmann is always ready to cordially accept the conjectures of others: and it is no small feature of his edition that he has adopted Bosius's conjecture *λαλαγεῖσθαι* in *Att.* ix. 18. 3 which is at once explicable when we notice that at this time (cp. ix. 7. 5: x. 2. 1) Cicero had in his head the epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum (*Anth. Pal.* x. 1). At viii. 12c. 4 he adopts Boot's *Sicca abs te* [MSS. *sic adpoete*] and x. 8. 3 the same scholar's *Tanta esse poterit indignitas nostra?* which is the reading of the Torenseianus Z, while *Tacita* of the Italian MSS. involves taking *indignitas* 'unworthiness' in the unusual though not impossible sense of 'indignation.' Another good reading adopted from Z is x. 8a. 1 *non possum dissimulare mihi famam quoque, quamvis sit falsa, falsam agnoscere magni esse* [M omits *falsam agnoscere*]. He ought to have adopted Boot's *malim* for *malum* in *Att.* ix. 18. 3, a reading the full excellence of which even Boot himself does not appear to have seen, viz. that it does away with the only example which the grammarians had left of the pres. subj. in a prohibition addressed to a definite individual: cp. Madv. *Opusc. Acad.* p. 485. In i. 19. 10 he rightly omits *si* after *potius* with Tyrrell, vii. 3. 12 adopts Mommsen's *appetierimus*, and ix. 13a accepts Madvig's *posse mihi viderer*. Where no satisfactory emendation has been suggested L. retains the reading Hofmann had adopted, e.g. i. 16. 3 (*ipse nullam et salva*): iii. 5 (*Thurii*): ix. 18. 1 (*iram huius in absentes*). He is wrong in not accepting the reading of the second hand of M in *Att.* viii. 3. 4 *Invite* [M¹ *in te*] *cepi Capuam* and adhering to Hofmann's *non recepi*: for, as Prof. Tyrrell points out, Cic. uses the adverb *invite* in *De Orat.* ii. 364. But he is probably right in accepting Nipperdey's conjecture in x. 8. 5 *contendimus* for *condimus* of the Italian MSS. In *Harl.* 2491 (a MS. very like the Hamilton MS. at Berlin, which is the copy Poggio made in 1408) we find *nec ostendimus* which points to *ne contendimus*. Possibly too he is right in reading viii. 12. 2 *imparatam* ('the province which

had been already assigned me without asking my consent') for *imparatam*: and in defending the MS. reading *iudicata* in ii. 12. 3 by comparing x. 8b. 1, *Fam.* vii. 33. 2 for *iudicare* = *decernere*.

No less valuable are Lehmann's contributions to a better interpretation of the received text. Space does not admit of mention of more than a few of the important notes which have been added in Part III. He accurately explains *Et tamen* (*Att.* x. 8. 6, *Fam.* ix. 9. 3), which had been a stumbling-block to Hofmann and Boot, as affording a second and stronger form of argument, 'and be that as it may,' 'putting these considerations aside,' an explanation similar to that given by Madvig (*Fin.* ii. 84) and Munro (*Lucr.* v. 1177). And he has certainly given the correct interpretation of *Att.* x. 8. 4 *Itaque nunquam id egit ut Hispaniae per se tenerentur* 'Pompey's policy was never the preservation of the Spains for their own sake,' he never made his Spanish provinces his main position, they were not in his eyes essential possessions but only accidental ones, and their loss made little difference in his plans; supremacy by sea was what he aimed at. For *per se* in this sense L. compares *Fin.* i. 25 *per se esset virtus...expetenda*. In *Att.* vii. 3. 11 he is wrong in explaining *aliquis* as referring to Caesar: for though doubtless *aliquis* is occasionally used when referring to a definite individual whom the writer does not wish to name (cp. *Planc.* 85), yet it is impossible to take it in this sense here owing to *illi* preceding. His objection to translating *tantum modo ut* (*Fam.* xvi. 12. 4, cp. *Att.* ix. 10. 4) 'provided only that' and his preference for 'Heaven grant that' introduce at best a needless distinction. Perhaps also he pushes too far his readiness to accept asyndeton of two words (cp. *Quaest. Tull.* pp. 23—26) when he wishes to read x. 8a. 1 *Dolabellam Tulliam*, xiii. 19. 2 *Balbus Oppius*. We are quite unable to follow him in explaining *Fam.* xiv. 7. 1 *id est Apollini et Aesculapio* (words which are certainly a gloss and probably were originally *A. aut Ae.*) as a reflection on the excessive zeal in religious matters which Terentia was likely to display in rendering her thanks to two gods.

But whatever points there may be where in disagreement is possible, they are very few and seldom admit of more than divergence of individual opinion. On the whole Lehmann's edition is one of the most valuable contributions to the criticism and elucidation of Cicero's correspondence which have appeared recently. L. C. PURSER.