wenn auch gelegentlich etwas überspitzte, Interpretationen glaubhaft gemacht 1).


---


After Mr. S. B.’s previous works on the text of Cicero’s letters to Atticus, including the edition of the books IX-XVI in the OCT, now the first two volumes of his edition with translation and commentary have been published. The expectations most readers will have held are not likely to be disappointed: we have decidedly been enriched with a work of great value.

The author’s researches on the manuscript tradition, while yielding nothing new about the Ω family, divided still into Σ and Δ (whereby Constans’ assumption of a group Π independent from Σ is implicitly rejected), have led him to abandon his former position concerning the W remains, and to accept the theory earlier advocated by Halm and Clark among others, viz. that the Cratander readings derive, if not from W itself, at least from a manuscript in the same “transalpine” tradition. As to the first publication of the letters, Mr. S. B. cogently argues that the *XI volumina* mentioned by Nepos, far from being identical with the eleven books of E, formed a collection probably made by Atticus himself for the use of some friends and other interested people; the rest of the correspondence, deemed unimportant by the addressee or less flattering for himself, appear to be added and edited after his death. Mr. S. B.’s attitude towards the views of Carcopino in this and other respects is definitely negative. The introduction further contains a sketch of the relations between Atticus and Cicero, in which the characters of both men are, on the whole, equitably and satisfactorily delineated.

The text with (selective) apparatus and face-to-face translation is followed by a sound philological and historical commentary,
in which also several conjectures are accounted for. Most of these are at least well-founded, some striking. Of course there remain points of doubt. The discussion on the precedence of I 5 and I 6 is not fully conclusive. On the one hand, the author seems right in maintaining that the way Quintus' attitude towards Pomponia is mentioned in both letters points to priority of I 5. On the other hand, Cicero's announcement of his father's (?) death does sound very cool, the decease of Atticus' grandmother and the betrothal of Tullia being not wholly comparable cases. The arguments adduced by Mr. Stewart (cited by Mr. S.B. on p. 68 of vol. I) to prove Asconius in error when he places the death of Cicero's father during the son's candidature for the consulship met with one difficulty. Supposing Asconius had got the impression that the present manuscript order of the letters was chronological, would it not have been natural for him to assume that I 3 was written at the end of 65? Compare nos hic te ad mensem Ianuarium (Ianuariam in the text must be a misprint) exspectamus with Ianuario ineunte, ut constituiisti, cura ut Romae sis of I 2, which is evidently of 65. Likewise I 4 then ought to date from the first half of 64 (repente abs te in mensem Quintilem recepii sumus), and I 5 and 6, clearly near each other in time and contents, from the end of the year, i.e. 64, when Cicero was no more in petizione. This is therefore not an obvious explanation of Asconius' statement. Moreover, if pater in I 6 is right, there remains the somewhat remarkable coincidence that Cicero's pater and frater should have died almost simultaneously. Could it not be then that in I 5 (being the first of the two letters) Cicero is writing more fully on his nephew's death and adds the exact date in I 6? Mr. S.B.'s objections, "would he (Cicero) not have added quod praeterieram, and why should Atticus need to know?", look a little nugatory.

As one of the few cases where one hesitates to accept the author's suggestions one could mention II 14, where the much better attested probem seems preferable to probe. In the present writer's opinion the irony probe must of course contain does not present itself very naturally after et tamen. Why probem should be "stilted" I fail to see: the double antithesis gains its full force, as can be seen from the rendering "am I under these circumstances (tamen) to applaud your advice? Still (tamen), I will see what I can do". In IV 3 the correction proposed by the author, to read nobilitati crediturus, seems needless: that the manuscript reading nobili points to the same person as invidi et perfidi (consilio), i.e. Hortensius, is made the more probable if one compares III 8 ei crediderim quem esse nefarium non putarim.

When I conclude by calling attention once again to several fine