

## CAUSERET'S RHETORIC OF CICERO.

*Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron*, par CHARLES CAUSERET. 8vo. 245 pp. Paris (Hachette), 1886. 4 fr.

THIS elaborate and comprehensive treatise deserves the warmest welcome from all who are interested in the study of the rhetorical works of Cicero. It supplies in the systematic form of a well-arranged manual of rhetoric an almost complete conspectus of all the technical terms used by the greatest of Roman orators in treating of those matters of rhetorical criticism on which he has still a pre-eminent right to a respectful hearing.

The Introduction (pp. 1—34) briefly reviews the rhetorical works of Cicero, states the general aim of the treatise, and gives some account of the modern literature of the subject. The first part of the treatise itself (pp. 37—80), deals with a variety of preliminary details, such as the three classes of speeches, deliberative, forensic and epideictic; the contrast between *θέσις* and *ὑπόθεσις*; and the *status causarum* with all their subdivisions. The second (pp. 81—206) treats of the five parts of rhetoric, *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *actio* and *memoria*, with the subordinate details of each. The conclusion (pp. 207—210) dwells on the difficulties encountered by Cicero in his endeavour to translate into Latin the technical terms of the Greek rhetoricians; and points out the scrupulous pains that he spent on surmounting those difficulties instead of shirking them by a mere transcription of the original, such as is not unfrequent in Quintilian, and extremely common in Latin rhetoricians of later date and of minor importance. The volume closes with a comprehensive index of Greek and Latin words, a separate index of Latin phrases, and a clearly arranged table of contents.

The author shews a wide acquaintance with the Greek and Latin writers on the subject, and occasionally intersperses his quotations from their pages with interesting and suggestive criticisms of his own. He thus presents us with more than is promised on his title-page; for, while Cicero remains 'the essential object and the centre' of his work, it may fairly claim to be what the author calls 'une étude comparative des termes de la rhétorique et de la critique

littéraire, en usage chez les Grecs et chez les Romains.'

M. Causeret appears to have used no other editions of the rhetorical works of Cicero besides those of Piderit. If he had consulted others, it might have lightened his labour in collecting illustrative references from the Greek and Roman rhetoricians; and have saved him from falling into occasional error. It is also a pity that he has not used the latest edition of Volkmann's *Rhetorik* (1885) instead of that of 1874. He might thus have avoided attributing to that writer (on page 150), views on the early history of the three kinds of style, the *genus dicendi tenue*, *grave* and *medium*, which he now no longer holds (p. 532, edition 1885); nor would he have assigned the treatise *περί ἑρμηνείας* to Demetrius Phalereus: the only German who has recently endeavoured to maintain that hypothesis having been conclusively refuted by one of his own countrymen (*ib.* 538). M. Causeret has carefully collected the passages in which Cicero compares the rhetoric of the schools to a peaceful pageant or the drill of the parade-ground, and the practical eloquence of public life to battle under a burning sun; further illustrations may be found in a pamphlet on the metaphors from military life in the rhetorical works of Cicero, Quintilian and Tacitus, which was probably published too late to be of use in the preparation of this part of his work (D. Wollner, Landau, 1886). He omits to notice the frequent use of illustrations from the arts of painting and sculpture in the criticism of oratorical style, which is touched upon in my edition of the *Orator*, pp. lxxiii and 5. It is quite as curious, in its way, as the modern mannerism of borrowing metaphors from painting, such as 'light and shade,' in the criticism of music; and metaphors from music, such as 'tone' and 'harmony,' in the criticism of painting.

The general value of the work is so great that it is not impaired to any serious extent by the small inaccuracies that have found their way into some of its numerous details. M. Causeret is aware that there was more than one Ernesti; as a matter of fact there were three: J. A. Ernesti, the editor of Cicero and Tacitus (1707—1781); A. W. Ernesti, his nephew, an editor of Livy (1733—1801); and J. C. T. Ernesti, the

compiler of the *lexicon technologiae Graecorum et Latinorum rhetoricæ* (1756—1802). On p. 156, he rightly calls the first of these (the author of the *Clavis Ciceroniana*), *l'aîné des Ernesti*; but, on p. 14, the author of the *lexicon technologiae* is misleadingly described as *l'illustre latiniste Ernesti*, a designation which inevitably recalls the first and far the most distinguished of the three. On p. 13 we have the singular spelling *eloquutio*; on pp. 47, 48, *stylus*; on p. 175, *moestitia*. On p. 7, *silne*? is misprinted; on pp. 9, 31, 33, the *praenomen* of Piderit is printed *Wilhem*. On p. 49 it is said that *declamatio* does not occur in the works of Cicero, whereas it is found in *pro Murena* 44, *pro Plancio* 47, and in *Tusc. Disp.* 7; the statement was probably meant to be confined to the rhetorical works alone. On p. 98, *venae*, which is sometimes coupled with *viscera* 'the heart,' is itself explained as meaning 'proprement les entrailles; d'ou: les sentiments intimes de chacun, teneat oportet venas cuiusque generis, ætatis, ordinis,' de *Or.* i § 223; but the author might have found a better rendering in Prof. Wilkins' note: 'he must have his finger on the pulse, i.e. he must be familiar with the character.' On p. 115, *Or.* 127 only explains the use of *extenuare* in the peroration, but the word itself is not to be found there; it occurs among the figures of speech in § 137. On p. 127, *Brut.* 32 and *Or.* 175 are both of them quoted in support of the statement that, according to Cicero, the credit of being the first to introduce rhythm into prose belongs to Thrasyarchus of Chalcedon, *et surtout à Isocrate*; whereas the first of these passages, which assigns the credit to Isocrates, is tacitly corrected in the second, which assigns it to Thrasyarchus (cf. pp. lxx and 196 of my edition of the *Orator*). The reference to *De Or.* iii 190, on p. 131, is not really (as is implied), an instance of *fluens* being contrasted with *rhythmicus*. On p. 135 the last reference for *orbis* (*verborum*) should be *Or.* 234. In *Or.* 173, quoted on p. 139, *brevitas* is applied to syllables, not (as stated) to periods.

*Acquiescere* in *Or.* 199 is not a true parallel to *conquiescere* in *De Or.* iii 191; for the latter alone refers to the close of the period, while the former is applied to the audience (p. 141). To the references for *minutus* on p. 149 may be added *Or.* §§ 39, 231. In the quotation from Macrobius on p. 151, *luxuriatur* is omitted after *Symmachus*. The instance of the metaphorical use of *sanguis*, quoted as from Quintilian (x 1 § 115) on p. 157, is itself simply a quotation from the *Brutus* 283, *verum sanguinem*

*deperdebat*. On p. 159 *naturalis color* (*Brut.* 36) ought to be *naturalis non fucatus nitor*. On p. 161 another instance of the metaphorical use of *excelsus* may be added from *Or.* 119; on the same page the *Orator* is accidentally called a 'dialogue.' To the examples of *argutus* on p. 162, may be added *Or.* §§ 38, 39, 42, and (*argute*) 98. On pp. 174—5 *nitidus*, *incultus* and *horridus* are quoted from *Or.* 36 as applied to style; they are really there applied to paintings. On p. 175 for *impexis* read *impexa*. For the metaphorical use of *flores* (p. 180), add *Brut.* 17 § 66. On p. 181, on metaphor, prefix iii to *De Or.* 38, 156. On p. 183, *commoratio*, complete the reference to *ad Herennium* (iv 45 § 58): and, on the next page, in the account of *extenuatio*, insert *ad Her.* iv 38 § 50. Lastly, on p. 188, add *plerumque* before *convertimus* in the quotation from *Aquila Romanus*.

M. Causeret has frequent occasion to quote the Greek rhetoricians for parallels to Cicero's technical terms, and for other purposes. Most of these quotations are thoroughly to the point, but the first of them is somewhat injudicious. For the etymology of *ῥητορικὴ* we are told on p. 37 to consult the anonymous scholiast on Aphthonius (ii 8, Walz): *ῥητορικὴ εἰρηται ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥυθδὸν [ῥυθδῆν] λέγειν, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ συνηγορεῖν τῷ νόμῳ· ῥήτραν γὰρ τὸν νόμον φασὶν οἱ Δωριεῖς*. This is carefully translated into French without even a passing note of exclamation, and without a syllable of protest against the scholiast's astounding ignorance of the obvious formation of so simple a word. Again, Hermogenes (*περὶ στάσεων*, ii 138, Spengel) defines *στοχασμός* as *ἀδήλου πράγματος ἔλεγχος οὐσιώδης ἀπὸ τινος φανεροῦ σημείου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὑποφίας*. But M. Causeret, in quoting this passage on p. 66, accidentally omits *οὐσιώδης*, which is expressly explained in the *scholia* (iv 210, 7, Walz), and wrongly translates *πρόσωπον* 'physiognomy' instead of 'person,'—a sense in which it is repeatedly used in the preceding pages of Hermogenes, e.g. on the previous page, *διαίρησιν τοίνυν ὁρθῶς ὁ τὴν τε διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν τε προσώπων καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἐτι τὴν λεγομένην στάσιν ἐπιγνούς τοῦ ζητήματος* (cf. iv 211, 22 Walz). In connexion with *στάσεις*, M. Causeret might have noticed Aristotle's *ἀμφισβητήσεις* (Cope's *Introduction to the Rhetoric*, pp. 397—400).

The Greek equivalents for Latin technical terms are usually given with correctness; but, in quoting *παράτησις* and *κάθαρσις* as equivalents for the rhetorical figures *depre-*

*catio* and *purgatio*, it ought to be clearly explained that these terms are not really found in the Greek rhetoricians themselves as actual names of 'figures' (note on *Orator*, p. 147). As the Greek for *exercitatio*, it is better to accept *γυμνασία* from Aristotle than *γύμνασις* from Pollux; but *μελέτη*, as M. Causeret is aware, is in some respects better than either. As an equivalent for *eloquentia*, *λογιότης*, which is found in Philo and Plutarch, should give way to some such phrase as *ἡ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δεινότης*, which has better authority. *Oratio commentata* is rendered, on p. 46, not only by *λόγος μεμελετημένος*, which is right; but also by *περισκευμένος*, which ought to be altered either into *προϋσκευμένος* on the analogy of Thuc. viii 66, *τὰ ῥηθισόμενα αὐτοῖς προϋσκεπτο*, or into *ἐσκευμένος καὶ παρεσκευασμένος* (cf. Dem. *Meid.* § 191). On pp. 17, 56, where *ὑπόθεσις* is explained 'quod est ὑπὸ τὴν θέσιν,' there is no point in the use of the accusative for the dative. In contrast to *ὑπόθεσις*, or *quaestio finita*, the regular word, as M. Causeret is careful to show, is *θέσις*, or *quaestio infinita*; and among the many instances of this contrast are Cic. *Top.* 21 § 79 and Quint. iii 5 §§ 5—7. These references are quoted in the latest edition of Liddell and Scott, s.v. *θέσις*, V 2, where however *ἄρσις* is wrongly written for *ὑπόθεσις*. As an equivalent to *verba coagmentata* on p. 126, M. Causeret gives *εὐπαγῇ*, referring to Demetrius *περὶ ἐρμηνείας* (iii 300, Spengel); but *εὐπαγές* is there used not in the required sense of 'nicely adjusted in connexion with

one another,' but of a single word that has a proper euphony in itself, being in the mean between *λείον* and *τραχύ*. The true equivalent is *συννηρμοσμένα*, cf. Dion. Hal., *de comp. verb.* 23, *τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐπιτηδεύως συννηρμόσθαι*. The same author might have supplied parallels to Cicero's *conglutinatio verborum* (note on *Orator*, § 78). On p. 143, *circumscriptus* as an epithet of a period is not quite satisfactorily rendered by *συνεστραμμένος*. It might be better perhaps to resort to a phrase combined with *περιγραφή* in the sense found in Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium* 32, *τῷ τούτου κρότῳ καὶ τόνῳ καὶ λέξεων περιγραφαῖς καὶ συνεχείαις ἀποδείξεων*. On p. 155, the reference for *ἄδρός*, *ισχνός* and *μέσος*, as epithets of style, should be to p. 72 (not 71) of Johannes Siceliotes. On p. 128 the accent of *νόμος* is misplaced, and on p. 184 *ἐξουθενισμός* is twice misprinted as *ἐξουδενισμός*. Lastly, on p. 193, the rhetorical term *κλίμαξ*, which is a much more elaborate figure of speech than might be supposed from the modern application of the word, is too curtly dismissed (note on *Orator*, p. 139). Possibly, while hastening toward the close of his task, the author may have found himself compelled to forego the temptation of lingering any longer over his labours, feeling, like the poet of the *Georgics*, that, instead of embarking afresh on an inviting theme, it was already high time for him

To furl the sail, and turn the prow to land.

J. E. SANDYS.

## THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

### II.

Eugippii *Vita S. Severini*, ed. Pius Knoell, Vienna, 1886. 24 Mk. 40.

THE interest of the *Vita S. Severini* is of an altogether different kind from that of the *Excerpts from S. Augustine*, and to most readers will be far higher in degree. It gives a glimpse such as is not obtained anywhere else of the state of the border provinces on the break up of the Roman Empire. Severinus spent the greater part of his active life (452—482 A.D.) in the province of Noricum Ripense. He was regarded as a sort of oracle not only by his own countrymen but by the surrounding barbarians; and among those who came to consult him

was the young Odoacer just before his descent into Italy. His tall form, clad in rough sheep-skins, had to stoop in entering the saint's cell, and he was greeted with a prophecy of his coming greatness. We see the unfortunate provincials so entirely deserted that there are scarcely troops enough among them to pursue a band of marauding banditti. They are obliged to admit the barbarians into their cities. Rugians, Heruli, Goths, Alamanni are constantly making forays into their territory, or pass through it unceremoniously, as if it were their own. The Romans fly from city to city in search of peace, but in vain. At last, in 488, a command comes from Odoacer that the population should migrate bodily into Italy, and in accordance with the wishes