

# 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](#)



---

**Tyrrell and Purser's *Letters of Cicero*, Vol. IV *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*. Edited by R. Y. Tyrrell, Litt. D., Regius Professor of Greek, Trinity College, Dublin; and L. C. Purser, Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. Vol. IV. Dublin University Press. 1894.**

G. E. Jeans

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 42 - 44

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201042, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00201042](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201042)

**How to cite this article:**

G. E. Jeans (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 42-44 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201042

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

forms to elegy is treated at some length: the question of Alexandrianisms is here very prominent and, though the absence of any extant Callimachean model gives to the diatribes of a long series of scholars on lxxviii. an inevitable fluctuation and uncertainty, the really salient characteristics of the poem—distinguishing it from every other existing Roman elegy—are well brought out.

The *conclusion* emphasizes the difference between the first division of Catullus' poems (i.—lx.) and the rest. The Alexandrian influence is far more perceptible in this

latter and much larger portion than in the more purely lyrical. Little weight however can be attached to Bährens' theory that Catullus began with imitating Sappho and the Aeolian school and only later at the suggestion of Calvus (why not Cinna?) came to Alexandrian models: equally problematic is the counter view that lxxv., lxxvi., lxxviii. preceded the lyrics. Few, I think, can doubt that the *candida diva* of lxxviii. is Lesbia; and if so, it must have been written late.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

### TYRRELL AND PURSER'S *LETTERS OF CICERO*, VOL. IV.

*The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero.*  
Edited by R. Y. TYRRELL, Litt.  
D., Regius Professor of Greek,  
Trinity College, Dublin; and L. C.  
PURSER, Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of  
Trinity College. Vol. IV. Dublin  
University Press. 1894.

THE great work of Professor Tyrrell and Dr. Purser proceeds at a sufficient pace, if we allow its scope and dignity. The first volume appeared in 1879, and was re-edited in 1885; the second in 1886; the third in 1890. The present volume brings us down to Letter 544 (*Fam.* xiii. 16), the last before the death of Tullia. As there are only about 320 letters remaining, covering a period of just two years and a half—letters for the most part of no great length or difficulty—and as the need for excursions and long introductions diminishes with the advance of the work, we may perhaps fairly expect that the whole will be completed in one more volume, to appear about 1898. The editors themselves must be very glad to be getting at last in sight of land.

I have already, on more than one occasion, been permitted to express the general appreciation of this work in the *Classical Review*; I need, therefore, now only deal with a few special features of the present volume, and note some selected passages.

In the critical department a change has been made in accordance with the suggestions of Mendelssohn in his edition of the *Epp. ad Fam.* published last year, and very meekly accepted by the editors (*benigne admoniti*, p. 445). This consists chiefly in the substitution of P, a codex in the Paris

Library, which was very slightly treated in vol. i., ed. 2. p. 82, for T, a codex in the Library of Tours, described in detail, *ib.* p. 78. In vol. ii. p. lx. it was maintained with much emphasis that T was not descended from P, but the editors have now very frankly withdrawn from their position, convinced by Mendelssohn's arguments. The other changes are the discarding with contempt of a Harleian MS. used formerly, and the citation throughout of a Palatine MS. (598), which had been already described, vol. ii. p. lxxxiii. but is now treated as a more important authority (p. c.).

It is most unfortunate that the text and notes seem to have been finally printed off and dismissed before the introductory part was written at all. On p. lxxxv. the editors warmly express their obligations to O. E. Schmidt's work (1893), and say: 'if we had had the advantage of his guidance when originally arranging the order of the letters, that arrangement would have been much improved.' Accordingly the order and dates of the letters in the text are often adversely commented on, sometimes in Part I. (e.g. p. liv.), sometimes in Part III. of the Introduction—a most perplexing and irritating arrangement, which is made worse by not being specially pointed out anywhere.

The same explanation seems necessary for the absence of notes where they are greatly needed. For example, on Letter 304 (*Att.* vii. 11), any one might well be astonished to find no note on *tota haec Campana*, which necessitates either a forced meaning to be given to *haec*, or the theory that *Campana* (the Med. reading for *Campania*) was used of the Roman *Campagna* before the Augustan

period. The discussion of this will be found on p. xiv., but there is no reference to it in the notes. Again there is a cursory explanation of *Caelianum illud* in Letter 398 (*Att.* x. 12), but it is only defended and treated fully on p. xl., to which there is no reference in the note. So also the difficulty about Balbus entering the senate (*Letter* 396; *Att.* x. 11) is only discussed on p. lxvii. Surely all this confusion might well have been avoided. A preface is often, perhaps generally, the last written part, but it ought to be written before the subjects it is intended to modify are put out of hand.

I will now select a few passages in which the view taken by the editors seems to call for some discussion.

*Ep.* 333 (*Att.* viii. 3, 4).—They here, quite rightly, I think, accept the reading *invite* (for *in te*) *cepi Capuam*, with the marginal<sup>2</sup> of the Med., pointing out not only how easily *ui* (here, by the way, misprinted *ni*) would fall out as a dittography after *in*, but also that Boot's objection to *invite* as not Ciceronian ignores the *inviti*us of an undisputed passage, *De Or.* ii. 364. There would be no definite objection to the word, even if it were never found.

*Ep.* 340 (*Att.* viii. 9).—Very strong reasons are given why the first part of this letter (§ 1, 2) 'should *probably* be detached from the succeeding part, and included in the collection as a substantive letter, coming after *Att.* ix. 11 A (366).' The main difficulty is to see why what is 'probable' should not have been printed accordingly.

*Ep.* 364 (*Att.* ix. 9).—On the disputed passage, *tuum digamma videram*, there is a curiously inconsistent note. The editors say, 'Let us add a guess. Could  $\Delta$  have been written originally in mistake for the closely resembling  $\Lambda$ , which stands for  $\lambda\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\nu$  or "balance" in *Att.* xv. 17, 1?' This obviously gives no explanation of the *digamma* of the text, since it cannot be supposed that they imagine  $\Delta$  to be the form of a digamma. But at the end of a long note, they 'think with Malaspina, that Cicero wrote  $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\alpha$ , schedule'; a perfectly good word which they might very well have accepted into the text, and omitted the unmeaning 'guess.'

*Ep.* 365 (*Att.* ix. 10).—On the comparative force of *iure* against *recte*, the editors take the view of Boot, after Manutius, for which I also have contended in my note, that *recte* must convey more moral approbation than *iure*. In the next sentence but one, they refer *hunc primum mortalem esse* to Caesar, as Mr. Froude did, but (in his case)

without much appreciation of the fine balance of the question. The remark here, however, that *extingui* is more appropriate for Cicero to use of Caesar than of Pompeius, is worth consideration.

*Ep.* 383 (*Fam.* viii. 16), *conturbare rationes*.—Prof. Tyrrell quotes me as rendering 'to make our fortunes so utterly bankrupt,' and thinks that the technical sense need not be pressed. He is quite right, but unfortunately for me, at any rate, he seems not to possess the second and largely revised edition of my translation, in which, seven years ago, I had anticipated this criticism, by altering into 'to break up our fortunes.' I gladly acknowledge the courtesy of Prof. Tyrrell's references to my translation, but it is unfortunate that, both here and elsewhere, he does me some injustice by being seemingly not aware of my revised edition.

*Ep.* 402 (*Att.* x. 16).—The Med. reading is *novum*, with *nedum* written above; other MSS. have *nedum* only. The natural inference is that *nedum novum* was the original text, and that one or other word dropped out from similarity. But the editors, after Wesenberg, read *non modo novum*, a defensible reading, I think, but not defensible on the ground that *nedum* 'could not be so used by Cicero.' This is outdoing Boot, who merely says that Cicero himself *does not* so use it. This raises an important point of criticism of the letters. I think it should strongly be maintained that most of Cicero's correspondents were just as good authorities on the ordinary rules of usage as himself; and that while in discussing a shade of meaning the usage of the author is important, in the question of the admissibility of a word in Latin a letter from one Roman gentleman is as good as if it were from Cicero himself. If Balbus and Oppius (*Att.* ix. 7 A) used it, it was presumably good Latin. Moreover, the parallel of *Fam.* vii. 28 is entirely ignored. I venture to think that in my note on the passage I have fully shown the appropriateness as well as the possibility of *nedum*.

There are several other passages which I had marked in reading for discussion, but it is impossible in such a matter to be exhaustive, and I must end with some minor criticisms. I feel it only due to apologize for the trivial nature of some of these, as upon a work of such magnitude and ability, but the editors will probably be willing to admit that such criticisms are, when just and courteous, of nothing but a helpful nature.

The book then is excellently printed—like all the Dublin University Press Series—as a whole, but occasionally might be improved. In particular, when the notes on a letter begin on the second column, the division of letters should be marked, which is not the case at present (see, *e.g.* pp. 63, 102). The misprints are few, and show careful reading for press; of the dozen or so (mostly unimportant) which I have marked, no less than three actually occur in the list of *Corrigenda* itself!

Tastes must, perhaps, be allowed to differ about such forms as ‘Antony’ and ‘Pompey,’ even in a work addressed to scholars only, though the terrible hybrid ‘Cn. Pompey,’ might frighten any one. They cannot be allowed to differ about ‘the battle of Pharsalia,’ which occurs *passim*. The vulgarism ‘try and’ for ‘try to,’ which was supposed to have been banished to ladies’ novels, occurs twice (pp. xli. lii.). The spelling ‘ecstasy’ (p. 150), which still haunts the same region, may uncharitably be ascribed to the printer. The unscholarly spelling *reicio* occurs in many places (pp. 49, 79, 80, etc.), though the correct *reicio* is given also (pp. 161, 265). οἷος πέπνυται (p. 143) should be οἷω πεπνύσθαι. The forms *ii, is*, are retained, as by most editors, but *eis* survives in one place (p. 320), and is strongly confirmed by being a correction for *meis*.

I can hardly help thinking that there are some signs of flagging, excusable in the editors of a fourth large volume. This is not without a good effect in toning down the too exuberant facility in proposing new

‘guesses’ which was noted in the preceding volumes, so that nearly (not quite) all the proposed emendations in this seem meant for serious consideration, and many of them will probably win their way to general acceptance. But there is a distinct falling off in the energy which in the preceding volumes provided nearly every Greek word in the Letters with something like an adequate equivalent in form as well as in meaning, by the use of Latin, French, or some technical or proverbial phrase. There are many such here also, as εἰστομαχῶς, ‘with *sang froid*,’ bellum ἀσπονδον, ‘a war à *outrance*,’ ἀθηντικῶς, ‘a *bona fide* statement,’ and so on. But numbers of the Greek words and phrases, such as ἡπηρεσία (p. 133), βεβίωται and πρόβλημα (p. 289), ζῶλος (p. 292), πάντα περὶ πάντων (p. 434), and many others, are either ignored altogether, or rendered by some very tame and *banal* equivalent. Prof. Tyrrell cannot be allowed to fall off from the standard he himself has done so much to raise.

In conclusion, it should be added that the notes are enriched by some valuable comments from Dr. J. S. Reid, probably the highest English authority on Ciceronian Latin, which are interspersed (‘*sine ulla solennitate*,’ as Professors say at Oxford) much in the manner of Munro’s comments in the notes to Mayor’s *Juvenal*. Excellent instances are the comments on *motum* and *ad ceteros* (*Att.* viii. 4), *meam mansuetudinem* (*Att.* viii. 5), *fuere infantia* (*Att.* x. 18). In nearly every case I am happy to find myself in complete agreement with Dr. Reid.

G. E. JEANS.

#### GUDEMAN’S *DIALOGUS OF TACITUS*.

*P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus.* Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Exegetical and Critical Notes, Bibliography and Indexes, by ALFRED GUDEMAN, University of Pennsylvania. Boston, U.S.A. Published by Ginn & Company. 1894.

THE unmerited neglect with which English scholars have hitherto passed over this treatise has at length been signally redressed; for it is only within the present year that the valuable edition by Principal Peterson has been noticed in these pages (*C.R.* March 1894, p. 106), and another on

a considerably larger scale has now to be reviewed. At a time when so many ripe scholars are content to employ their talent only on short school-books, it is refreshing to find one who is willing to give the labour of many years<sup>1</sup> in bringing together his own research, and that of almost all others who have at any time busied themselves on this dialogue. The amount of labour expended by him may be inferred from the fact that the Prolegomena extend to 138 pages, the text with its apparatus of critical notes to 55, and the commentary and

<sup>1</sup> The Preface states that it was begun as far back as 1888.