

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](#)



PLINY THE YOUNGER. . H. Zehnacker (ed.), N. Méthy (trans.) *Pline le Jeune: Lettres. Tome II, Livres IV–VI.* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé 399.) Pp. ix + 233. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011. Paper, €45. ISBN: 978-2-251-01459-3.

C.L. Whitton

The Classical Review / Volume 63 / Issue 01 / April 2013, pp 125 - 127

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X12002661, Published online: 01 March 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X12002661

How to cite this article:

C.L. Whitton (2013). The Classical Review, 63, pp 125-127 doi:10.1017/S0009840X12002661

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

PLINY THE YOUNGER

ZEHNACKER (H.) (ed.), MÉTHY (N.) (trans.) *Pline le Jeune: Lettres. Tome II, Livres IV–VI.* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé 399.) Pp. ix + 233. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2011. Paper, €45. ISBN: 978-2-251-01459-3.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X12002661

This second instalment of Z.'s Budé, replacing Guillemin's set, follows the same principles as the first, for which see E. Lefèvre, *CR* 61 (2011), 149–50, and Z.'s spirited apologia in *BMCR* 2009.08.15. Again the text is newly constituted but prudent, with fresh punctuation and a cleaner apparatus. There is no further introduction; the hundred-odd pages of commentary are crisp and tuned primarily to *Realien*. In all this is a welcome addition to the Budé collection and, given the lack of detailed modern work on *Epistles* 4–6, to Plinian scholarship. The criticisms that follow range mostly from minor to minute, apart from an opening lament at typos in the text (**5.6.45** *tibi* for *ibi*, **5.10.2** *rupe* for *rumpe*, **5.19.6** *peregrinatinem*, **6.10.3** *sino nomine*).

Epistles 1–9 has fared well enough in transmission and Z. is justifiably conservative, defending the paradosis at, for example, **6.18.2** *piis* and **6.22.4** *defenditur*. At **5.6.15** he prefers *prominulam* (M) to *pro modo longam* (βγ), with good reason, but some comment on rhythm (inconclusive on its own) and stemmatics is needed, given that both support the latter reading: Z. nowhere informs his reader that α (represented here by M) and γ share an archetype against β, making this passage a test-case for contamination (cf. G. P. Goold, *Phoenix* 18 [1964], 324). At **5.6.21** he again follows M, now less persuasively, with its phantom *porticum aliam*: we are surely looking back at the colonnade of §§15–18 and its views (cf. 2.17.5; to the alternative solutions discussed one can add Sherwin-White's excision of *aliam*).¹ At **5.8.11**, by contrast, Z. opts for *et hoc ipso diuersa quod maxima* (γ), 'subobscure' at best,² especially with the translation 'et que suffit à séparer leur importance' (part of a non-sentence in the French); better, surely, *quo maxima* (M) 'and different in the very respect in which they are greatest'. In **5.16.2** *nondum annos XIII impleuerat* he appeals to the 'unanimity' of the MSS and assumes that Pliny got the age wrong (an inscription shows that it should be XIII), when we need only excise a single stroke to fix it. G. Liberman (*BMCR* 2009.07.16, 2009.09.44), though overenthusiastic for intervention and misguided in many of his criticisms, was right that unanimity hardly rules out error in the archetype (see too M. Deufert, *Hermes* 136 [2008], 68–71); in any case, unanimity is a less compelling argument after 5.6, by which time VBF have all given out. The MSS are agreed too in **6.24.1** *quam multum interest quid a quoque fiat*, given by Z. with the translation 'Qu'il est important de connaître les actes dont chacun est l'auteur!'; but the letter and common sense clearly demand the opposite, 'what difference it makes to an action who performs it!'. G. Carlsson, *Zur Textkritik der Pliniusbriefe* (1922), p. 70, found defence against emenders in Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.1 *quid quoque flexu ... dicendum* ('with what inflection each phrase should be delivered'), the Latinity of which stands or falls with Pliny's here (*quo quidque* Spalding).

¹A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary* (1966), ad loc.

²G.E. Gierig, *C. Plinii Caecilii Secundi Epistolarum Libri Decem* (1800–2), ad loc.

In orthography too the MSS merit a little less credence (here, as in many respects, Z. keeps company with Schuster's Teubner): which is more likely, that P. wrote for example **5.17.6** *adolescentes* but **6.20.7** *abeuntis* (both acc. pl.), or that spelling has been inconsistently 'improved' in transmission? The same goes for the gen. sg. of nouns in *-ium/-ius* (e.g. **5.8.6** *studii*), where rhythm demands *-i* often, *-ii* never (S.E. Stout, *Scribe and Critic at Work in Pliny's Letters* [1954], pp. 138–9). Conversely, the indexes in B, an interesting peculiarity, deserve more consistent reporting in the apparatus: compare for example **4.27** 'Pompeio *F* : *om. codd.*' with **5.2** 'Calpurnio *F* (*B in indice*) : *om. MBγ*', where the indexes have 'Adpompei•falconem' and 'AdcalpurN' flaccum' (as reported by F.E. Robbins, *CP* 5 [1910], 477–8); and why not mention that in **4.3** B has *hadrianio* in the text, 'adrianum' in the index?

The translation, supplied for this second volume by N. Méthy, is flexible, lively and precise, and Pliny's adventurous turns of phrase are generally well captured; *tutoiement* is now the rule. Just a few quibbles: **4.14.6** *et sane* is not 'et pourtant' but 'and indeed' (as 1.14.9, 2.19.6, etc.), adding another reason for not sending just selected highlights; **5.2.2** 'une simple lettre, sans plus' misses the pun in *steriles*; **5.3.7** *mihi modestior constantia est* means 'my resolve is too restrained' (a pointed blend of determination and diffidence), not 'j'ai un force de jugement trop limitée'; **5.6.20** *contra*: not 'en face de' but 'aligned with' or simply 'at' (cf. 2.17.5, 21, *OLD contra* 12b); **5.6.22** 'un platane tout proche': surely 'le platane le plus proche'; **5.6.40** *argutior* ≠ 'trop minutieux'; **5.6.41** 'les choses': better, 'ces choses'; **5.17.3** *commendabat* ≠ 'soulignait'; **5.19.9** *quantum sufficiat eunti in tua*: 'une somme suffisante pour arriver chez toi' is improbably bland; better a sententious parting compliment, 'as much as necessary for a guest of yours' ('vox animi amico fidentis', as Gierig saw); **6.16.19** 'jeunes esclaves': *seruolis* is affective, no marker of age (cf. 2.17.22, 3.16.8); **6.19.5** *quoque sint plura uenalia efficiunt*: 'et le résultat est que le prix de ce qui est à vendre monte' renders the old conjecture *pluris*, adopted by Guillemin but not by Z.; senators are reinvesting in Italy 'and causing a rise in the number of properties for sale'; **6.33.11** 'mon Discours pour Ctésiphon' misses (as do most) the qualification *ut inter meas* (*OLD ut 22*), 'an *On the crown*, so far as any of my speeches could be', and ignores *iterum dicam* (cf. §1 *ut inter meas pulchram*). Finally, a glance back at Z.'s fine translation in vol. 1 to note that **2.1.3** *reseruatus* modifies Verginius, not Nerva, and that **2.13.8** *daret* is not present tense.

The commentary is likewise accurate and well judged, with a conservative leaning. Sherwin-White's commentary is a constant resource and punchbag ('quoique dise Sherwin-White' becomes something of a refrain), complemented by selective bibliographical *aggiornamento*. A few specifics: **4.21.1** 'Helvidius Priscus le Jeune' should read 'Helvidius le Jeune' (the cognomen is not attested); **5.1.3–4** 'assez sèche' seems arbitrary for the tone of §5 *ut uoles*: *uoles enim quod aequissimum*; **5.6.31** Sherwin-White was right on *porticus ante medium diem hiberna, inclinato die aestiua* (warm a.m., cool p.m.: cf. 2.17.10); **5.6.33** (on *cupressis ambitur et tegitur*) 'le premier verbe suggère plutôt des cyprès laissés à l'état naturel' seems fanciful; **5.8.9–10** '*illa* désigne l'art oratoire, *haec* l'histoire': the wrong way round, I think, and in any case this famous crux demands bibliography (see now A.J. Woodman, *From Poetry to History* [2012], p. 234); **5.19.6** Zosimus' *longa peregrinatio* cannot have been 'un simple aller-retour': he left *ante aliquot annos* and returned *nuper*; **6.2.3** irony is not self-evident; **6.4.1** Calpurnia's miscarriage in 8.10–11 is scant reason to speculate 'qu'il s'agisse, dans le cas présent aussi, d'une affection de manière gynécologique' (!); **6.11.3** scions of the old aristocracy like Fuscus and Quadratus inhabit 'un milieu auquel il n'a lui-même pas vraiment accès': a striking statement, but is there any substance to it?; **6.16.20** the Suetonian rumour that Z. quotes has Pliny the Elder committing assisted suicide, not being assassinated; **6.22.4** *ille*

'péjoratif': not just a change of subject?; **6.32.1** *continentissimus*: Z. writes about Stoics, but fiscal prudence is a stock Plinian virtue (e.g. 2.6.5, *Pan.* 3.4).

Literary comment is sparser, though Z. shows a good sense of Pliny's style (e.g. **6.22.4** on false parallelism). On intertextuality he is variable: allusivity is stated as fact in **4.15.1–2** (Cic. *Lael.*) and **6.31.15** (Rut. Nam. *De red.*), neither conclusive to my eye, while in **4.11.7** *nunc ad Vestam, nunc ad ceteros deos manus tendens* Z. wonders optimistically about a 'souvenir lointain' of Sempronius Gracchus fr. 61 Malcovati *quo me miser conferam? quo uortam?* (one might rather think forward to Tac. *An.* 12.65.3 *modo ad deos, modo ad ipsum tendere manus*). Yet the striking similarity of **4.11.2** *facis enim ex senatoribus professores, ex professoribus senatores* to Juv. 7.197–8 *si fortuna uolet, fiet de rhetore consul;* | *si uolet haec eadem, fiet de consule rhetor* (with analogous *commutatio*) meets with determined caution ('rien n'est moins sûr') and **5.3.2** *facio non numquam uersiculos seueros parum* passes without comment (cf. Mart. 1.35.1, 10.20(19).1–2 [the Pliny epigram]; also Cat. 16.8, quoted in 4.14.5). It is odd that most but not all addressees earn comment: nothing, for instance, on **4.2** Attius Clemens or **4.8** Maturus Arrianus (the latter is noticed, now as Arrianus Maturus, in the notes on **6.2**). Last and least in a very clean volume: 'III, 13, 2' > 'II, 13, 2' (p. 129), 'II, 15' > 'II, 11, 15' (p. 135), 'Aug<o>ustakis' (p. 142), *alia minora*.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge/Freie Universität Berlin

C.L. WHITTON
clw36@cam.ac.uk

SUETONIUS

HURLEY (D. W.) (trans.) *Suetonius: The Caesars*. Pp. lxii + 370, maps. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 2011. Paper, £10.95, US\$14.95 (Cased, £32.95, US\$44). ISBN: 978-1-60384-313-3 (978-1-60384-314-0 hbk).
doi:10.1017/S0009840X12002673

Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* has been very well served by translations in English. Following those of Holland and Thomson, J.C. Rolfe's masterly Loeb appeared in two volumes from 1913–14. Since then H.M. Bird (1930), Graves (1957) and C. Edwards (2000) have all tried their hand at the task with scarce improvement, although Edwards has perhaps supplanted Graves' paperback in convenience for scholars working with the Teubner Latin text, despite the unfavourable reviews by K.R. Bradley (*Latomus* 61 [2002], 486 and 696–702, rightly pointing out how Edwards' translation is vitiated by a less than full command of Suetonius' style and the literature on him). This is not to mention the partial translations of the last six *Lives* in commentaries by G.W. Mooney (1930), D.C.A. Shotton (1993), and B.W. Jones and R. Milns (2002). One must ask, then, whether there is any need for another translation.

What separates H. from these other authors is her authoritative expertise: none in his or her career has focussed so specifically on Suetonius, or is so significant a name in the field of Suetonian studies. H. has previously written two important commentaries on these *Lives* in particular (see *CR* 45 [1995], 171–2; *CR* 52 [2002], 22–3) and continues to publish papers on Suetonius (see e.g. her contributions to E. Buckley and M. Dinter [edd.], *A Companion to the Neronian Age* [2013] and T. Power and R. Gibson [edd.], *Suetonius the Biographer* [forthcoming]). The appearance of a