

# 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](#)



---

## Schmidt's *Briefwechsel des Cicero*. Second Notice *Schmidt's Briefwechsel des Cicero*

R. Y. Tyrrell

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 10 / December 1894, pp 466 - 467

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018922X, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X0018922X](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018922X)

### How to cite this article:

R. Y. Tyrrell (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 466-467 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018922X

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## SCHMIDT'S BRIEFWECHSEL DES CICERO. SECOND NOTICE.

As we gave our readers in the October number of the *Classical Review* some estimate of the work of Dr. O. E. Schmidt on the correspondence of Cicero, we desire to supplement our former notice by a selection from the readings which he has introduced into the 13th and 14th books of the *Letters to Atticus*, the text of which he has reprinted in full. We number the letters according to Baiter's edition.

## XII.

6.2.—For πάντα φιλόδημον he suggests πάντα φιλοδαίμονα.

9.—For villa he reads with M ulla, and with the same MS. in 10 *testamento* for the generally accepted *Tisameno*, for which Bos. claims the authority of Z. A leading principle of Schmidt's text is the adherence to M whenever it can be defended, and the rejection in nearly every case of readings, however attractive, which rest on the authority of the Bosian *codices*.

46.—*tantummodo occultius* for *tantummodo octius* M.

49.2.—*ad Ciceronem* M for *ad Caesarem* vulg.

## XIII.

1.2.—*efficis* M, *quod si efficis* C, *sicunde* Schm.

2.1.—*et tamen Pisonem* M, *examina Pisonem* Schm.

4.1.—*et quidem puto* M, *de Tuditano idem* Schm.

17.1.—*aliquid non imperassem igitur aliquid tuis* M, *aliquid novi; imperasses vellem igitur aliquid tuis* Schm.

20a.4.—*in toto* M, *in Bruto* Schm.

23.3.—*quam habere qui utar* M, *quam habere quin utar* (which he does not explain) or *quam non habere qui utar* Schm. The latter emendation gives an excellent sense. The usual insertion of *laetor* or *gaudeo* is quite inconsistent with the tone of the letter. Cicero does not smugly congratulate himself that he is comfortably off, but rather confesses his pecuniary embarrassment and professes his comparative indifference thereto. Schm. however prints in his text the unexplained *quam habere quin utar*.

33.3.—*expecto negotium* M, *de Spurio si cui negotium* Schm.

*Ib.*—*vide etiam* M, *videlicet* Schm.

34.1.—*viii K iul. M, viii K vesperi* (written *ues.*) Schm. So in 41 *fin.* he reads *commeat vesperi* (*ues.*) for *commeatus* of M.

40. 1.—*ut fultum est* M, *ut futilum est* Schm., a supposed quotation from Ennius *frag.* 374 :

*saeviter suspicionem ferre falsam futilumst.*

*Ib.* 3.—*ad saxa acrimonia* M, *ad Saxa Acronoma* Bos. vulg., *ad Saxa summa acrimonia* Schm.

42 *fin.*—*eatur* : ΜΙΑΚΟΡΔΟΥ M; *eatur* : μίαςμα Κόδρον Schm.

46.3.—*cretionem testibus praesentibus* M is well defended by Schm. against the Bosian *liberam cretionem testibus praesentibus*. On the other hand when he assigns to the interpolator certain words in the beginning of *Att.* xiii. 47 which are found in Z1 but omitted in M, he seems to overlook the fact that the two passages stand on an entirely different footing. The words in 47 are testified to by Lambinus not by Bosius, and the scraps of verse, the *disiecti membra poetae*, are far too characteristic of Latin comedy to be the work of a fifteenth century interpolator. Moreover Schmidt's conjecture, *pepigit Oppius* for *tetigit omisi* of M, is a violent correction and gives a poor sense.

49.2.—*libenter odisse* M, *libere odisse* Schm.

51.1.—*ne ridicule micillus* M, *ne ridicule micidus* Schm.

We have no intention of discussing all the above suggestions, but we may briefly estimate a few of them. The following among his conjectures seem to deserve careful consideration, if not acceptance : 23.3 commented on above, 33.3 *videlicet*, 34.1 and 41 *fin.*, 40.1 where *futilum* should probably take the place of *fultum*, though we do not go further with Schm. in his view of the meaning of the passage. The best are those on 40.3 *ad Saxa summa acrimonia*, on 49.2 *libere* for *libenter*, and on 46.3 where he gives good reason for believing that *cretio testibus praesentibus* was the technical name for a certain method of formal acceptance of an inheritance which permitted the employment of a proxy and did not demand the personal attendance of the legatee. He further holds that there was no such expression as *cretio libera*, which is not found in the Roman jurists or glossaries.

Perhaps his worst conjectures are those on 51.1 and 42 *fin.* In the former he introduces a very unlikely word in *micidus*, for which he quotes '*micidiores* hoc est *minores*' (sc. *termini*) from Gromat. vet.

321.24. We believe that we have here one of Cicero's ἀπαξ εἰρημένα diminutives which are so frequent in the letters, and that the passage should run *fui nec ridicule amicillus nec mehercule scripsi ac si πρὸς ἴσον ὁμοιόvque scriberem*, 'I was not [in my letter to Caesar] the humble friend to an absurd degree, nor yet was I hail, fellow, well met with him.' *Amicillus* would come regularly from *amicus* as *tantillus* from *tantus*, *haedillus* from *haedus*, *auricilla* from *auricula*; and the word as a ἀπ. εἰρ. would be very likely to suffer corruption.

As to μίασμα Κόδρου, we have given our own view of the words hidden under ΜΙΑΚΟΡΔΟΥ in the *Classical Review*, vol. iv. p. 451 (Dec. 1890). Of the conjecture of Schm. we would say a few words. It is not true, as Schm. assumes, that μίας was either an alternative form or a *Nebenform* for μίασμα. It is an error for μίασμα in the Hesychian lemma μίας ἥ

μιασμός, which should of course be μίασμα ἢ μιασμός (μιασ-μα or -μος). Moreover, when Schm. explains μίασ(μα) Κόδρου to mean 'ein Kodrusmord,' we should like to ask (1) why Caesar should be called Codrus, (2) why μίας should be written for μίασμα, and (3) how 'a pollution of Codrus' could afford the same meaning as these words which he gives as an explanation of the Greek phrase, 'ein Frevel der nicht dem Caesarismus nütz, sondern die republikanische Opposition stärken wird.'

'I meant by *Impenetrability*,' says Humpty Dumpty in *Through the Looking Glass*, 'that we've had enough of this subject, and that it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life.'

'That's a great deal to make one word mean,' said Alice in a thoughtful tone.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

#### FREESE'S PRO MURENA.

*M. Tullii Ciceronis pro L. Murena oratio ad iudices.* Edited with introduction and notes by J. H. FREESE, M.A. London, Macmillan & Co.: 1894. fp. 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

WHEN an edition so admirable as that of Mr. Heitland is already in possession of the field, a new edition of the same speech has to justify its existence by some distinctive characteristics. Mr. Freese says that his is intended for a less advanced class of readers. His commentary appears to differ from Mr. Heitland's mainly in keeping the critical notes separate from the rest, in giving translations somewhat more freely, and in furnishing the substance of grammatical rules as well as references for them. On all these points Mr. Freese has undoubtedly taken thought for the wishes, and perhaps also for the interests, of young students. He says that he has abstained from consulting Mr. Heitland's notes, setting thereby an excellent example. There have been too many instances recently of rival editors, who have used very freely editions which their own are intended to displace, and have satisfied such consciences as they may have with a bare acknowledgment that they have done so. Mr. Freese has chosen the better way; and if there is a good deal of common matter, this is obviously due to the use which each editor has made of the

admirable edition of Halm (now reedited by Laubmann). Mr. Freese's introduction is clear and sufficiently complete. It is astonishing that so good a scholar should have allowed the slip *Decius Junius Silanus* to have passed uncorrected. The phrase 'Catiline and Antony' on p. xiv. will inevitably confuse the easily confounded schoolboy, especially as there has been no previous reference to C. Antonius. If he has read of a Basilica, he will be astonished to find the statement that the Roman courts were always held in the open air: and he will find some difficulty in reconciling the phrase 'loose gown' with his conception of a tunic: he may even be led to think that the senators wore their broad stripes on their togas. The source of the wealth of Crassus in speculative purchases is referred to misleadingly; and the probability of his complicity in the so-called first Catilinarian conspiracy is much too summarily disposed of. But on the whole the introduction is well suited to its purpose. The notes are clear and to the point, and on doubtful questions the view taken is always sensible and capable of defence. If any teachers have found that Mr. Heitland's commentary is rather above the class of students with whom they may wish to read this speech, Mr. Freese's edition may be used by them with some confidence.

A. S. W.