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](#)

C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Civili. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit Dominicus Bassi.

A. G. Peskett

The Classical Review / Volume 32 / Issue 5-6 / August 1918, pp 125 - 125

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00011689, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00011689

How to cite this article:

A. G. Peskett (1918). The Classical Review, 32, pp 125-125 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00011689

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

examined by a number of collators. For the *pro Archia* we have two moderately good MSS. and a number of *deteriores*, which add little to our knowledge. The criticism of the *pro Milone* has entered upon a new phase in recent years owing to the emergence of the Harleian MS. 2682, and the evidence concerning the readings of the lost *Cluniacensis* supplied by the marginalia in Par. 14749 (Σ).

Professor Pascal, the general editor of the series, is responsible for the text of the *de Re Publica*, while Dr. Galbiati has composed the Preface and a collection of *testimonia*. The Preface is a careful piece of work, in which a very full account of the bibliography is to be found. One omission of some importance is to be noticed, viz. the valuable transcript of the palimpsest published by Van Buren in the Supplementary Papers of the American School in Rome, vol. ii. (1908). Pascal's revision of the text is thoroughly scientific. His treatment of passages omitted by the first hand in the palimpsest is especially satisfactory. In opposition to Halm and some other editors, who supposed that supplements of the second hand were due to conjecture, he holds that they were added by a corrector who had before him the model from which the palimpsest was copied. He has also made several interesting suggestions. The edition, therefore, can be warmly recommended.

Dr. Colombo has made ample use of the material furnished by Harl. 2682 and the Oxford editions founded upon it. His own method is eclectic, and generally conforms with that followed by Klotz in the new Teubner edition (1915). It is somewhat singular that he makes no reference to the new light furnished by the *Cluniacensis*, especially as its readings are fully quoted in recent German editions, including that of Klotz, which he has used. His Preface to the *pro Archia* contains a reference to a new edition of the speech (1915) by Professor Émile Thomas of Lille, the *doyen* of Ciceronian scholars. Professor Thomas, according to information received by the reviewer, was in Lille at the time of the German occupation, and presumably is still there. It is pleasant to think that the veteran

scholar has found solace in literature during so dark a period.

A. C. CLARK.

Corpus Christi College,
Oxford.

IV.

C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Civili. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit DOMINICUS BASSI.

THIS is a neat well-printed edition, forming a volume of a new *Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum*, published by I. B. Paravia of Turin, under the general editorship of C. Pascal. It contains a short critical appendix and an index of proper names. The text suffers from the limitations that Signor Bassi imposes on himself: '*in hac editione curanda codicum lectionem quantum potui secutus sum, hominum doctorum coniecturis quam minime indulgens.*' A few instances may be given. In I. 3¹ he reads *laudat Pompeius atque*, etc., with no mention in the appendix of *promptos*, which most, if not all, recent editors place before, after, or for, *Pompeius*. 3³ *completur et[ius] comitium*, no mention of Madvig's *et ipsum* or of the ingenious *clivus* of Linker, Menge, and du Pontet. 4³ *adulatio atque ostentatio sui et potentium*, which seems senseless. My edition records Dr. Reid's plausible emendation *potentia eorum* for *potentium*. II. 35⁴ nothing to show that *prohibebat* is not in the MSS. III. 37¹ Signor Bassi, though attaching considerable value to E, notwithstanding the judgment of Heinsius on that MS. confirmed by Mr. du Pontet, rejects its probably correct reading *biduo* (or *biduum*) *in castris stativis moratus* for *biduum castris*, yet oddly enough in 76¹, where DET have *veteribus suis castris consedit*, he prefers the *in castris* of LUVF. 42⁵ he reads *frumentumque omne . . . per equites comportavit*, disregarding all the MS. readings, though E has rightly *in Petra* (= *Petram*) *comportavit* and others *in porta*. In III. 54⁵ he retains in the text apparently without a qualm of conscience the unknown word *vespeciariis*. Enough has been said to show that the text is often unsatisfactory, and the critical appendix too brief to be of much value to the serious student.

A. G. PESKETT.