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](#)

Holder's *Bellum Civile C. Ivli Caesaris belli civilis*, libri iii.; recensuit Alfred Holder. Leipzig, Teubner, 1898.

A. G. Peskett

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 01 / February 1899, pp 59 - 60

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042426, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042426

How to cite this article:

A. G. Peskett (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 59-60 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042426

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

value for their bearing on the history of literary writing are Nos. 6 and 31, which offer examples of hands closely approximat-

ing to the literary type, dated respectively B.C. 10 and A.D. 88.

ARTHUR S. HUNT.

HOLDER'S *BELLUM CIVILE*.

C. Iuli Caesaris belli civilis, libri iii.; recensuit ALFRED HOLDER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1898.

THIS edition of the *Bellum Civile*, framed on the same general plan as the edition of the *Bellum Gallicum* published by the same editor in 1882, aims at restoring as far as possible the actual text of the archetype whence the existing MSS. were derived. Three MSS. have been collated for the first time for this edition: E now in the British Museum, dating from the eleventh century (see Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, Septième Livraison, Planche 50A 1), V now at Vienna, of the early twelfth century, and U a Vatican MS. of the eleventh or twelfth century. Use is of course also made of the two MSS. X and Y (here rechristened D and Z, with the disregard of convenience so general among foreign scholars) that were first collated for B. Kübler's edition of the *B. C.* published in 1894. The relative value of these and other better known Caesarian MSS. Holder promises to discuss at length on some future occasion.

At the foot of each page Holder gives a conspectus of the readings, and not content with this he reproduces in the text the exact reading and spelling of the archetype. Hence we meet with such words as *pr<a>esidium*, *pr<a>emittere*, *pr<a>eda* on almost every page, because the writer of the archetype is supposed from indications afforded by the MSS. to have usually omitted the *a* of *prae*. Hence, also we find Holder's text occasionally adorned with such striking features as '*c<a>e[n]t[u]r[i]atis*,' '*ablat<t>i[n]*,' '*inuis[slat]iatis*.' Again, if, when a passive infinitive is required, some MSS. present the active, others the passive form, Holder concludes that the archetype had the termination *-ei* and prints accordingly; so, too, a dative termination *-ei* is supposed to harmonise the variations between the dative and ablative frequently found in the MSS. e.g. *Caesare* and *Caesari*. It is difficult to see what object is gained by thus disfiguring the text with inconsistent variations. What, for instance, is gained by

printing *excussat* in iii. 16 and *excusare* in iii. 20, or *relicum* in i. 32 and *reliquum* in i. 54, or *pollicerei* and *polliceri* within the space of five lines in i. 11, or *naueis* three times in i. 56 and *naues* in i. 57? These eccentricities make the book a difficult one to read however useful it may be for reference.

So-called 'emendations' are inevitable in a new edition of a classical author, and there are a few in this book mostly contributed by F. Bücheler. Suggestions by other scholars are as a rule only mentioned where the editor thinks fit to adopt them, for the rest he would doubtless refer his readers to that appalling work Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum*. Bücheler's alterations are often ingenious but seldom convincing. His *quadrina* for *quadraginta* i. 17 is tempting, reducing as it does the magnitude of Domitius' promises to reasonable dimensions. Few will accept *inope re* for MSS. *inopere* (most editors *inopiae* after L) in i. 48. The attempts to make a connected whole of the faulty chapter ii. 29 cannot be considered successful. The clauses *civile bellum: genus hominum quod id liceret libere facere et sequi quod uellet*, if read and punctuated thus, and viewed in the light of the context, inevitably suggest an oblique construction, yet the next clause *legiones hae, quae parulo ante apud adversarios fuerant* dissipates our illusion, nor does the last sentence but one with Bücheler's *multi de* and *commenteique* at all resemble the hand of Caesar. Bücheler's *in Petram* iii. 42 for *in porta* (*in petra* E) is attractive, but what are we to say of Holder's *qui fuerant ab alebribus* in the sadly mutilated opening sentence of iii. 48? Does he seriously think that there was a class of commissariat officials in Caesar's army styled *ab alebribus*?—for this is the only interpretation that I can attach to the words. Some other suggestions due to Bücheler are plausible, such as *frus* (= *fruns* = *frons*) for *fructus* in iii. 58, *spatiis* for *portis* iii. 70, *sua manu* for *usu et manu* iii. 86. The alteration of *suetissime* into *quietissima* in iii. 75 instead of the *serissime* of other editors seems to me to make no sense.

In conclusion we may express a hope that

Mr. Holder may go on to edit the narratives of Caesar's continuators, discarding the eccentricities which make his *Bellum Civile* so unpleasant to read, eccentricities which are

almost absent from his *Bellum Gallicum*, and may also give us his promised inquiry into the value of the MSS.

A. G. PESKETT.

HOFMANN AND STERNKOPF'S SELECT LETTERS OF CICERO.

Ausgewählte Briefe von M. Tullius Cicero, erklärt von FRIEDRICH HOFMANN. Erstes Bändchen. Siebente Auflage besorgt von WILHELM STERNKOPF. Berlin, Weidmann. 1898.

THE lamented death of Lehmann, who seemed likely to prove the chief architect of the restoration of the Letters of Atticus, has compelled the publishers to entrust the preparation of the seventh edition of this standard selection to Herr Wilhelm Sternkopf: and they have put it into good hands. Sternkopf is best known by his valuable treatises on the chronology of various portions of Cicero's Correspondence (50-49 B.C., Marburg Diss. 1884: 68-60, Elberfeld Programm 1889: 48-47, Dortmund Programm, 1891: 59-58, Jahrb. 1892: on the dates of Fam. xv. 20, 21, Jahrb. 1893, a most solid piece of reasoning) and by some critical remarks in Jahrb. 1894. Since the 6th ed. of Hofmann's Selections, three most important works on Cicero's Correspondence have been published, viz. Mendelssohn's Crit. ed. of Fam.: Lehmann's 'De epp. ad Att. recensendis et emendandis'; and O. E. Schmidt's 'Die Briefwechsel Ciceros' from 51 to 44, not to speak of many articles by other eminent scholars, especially Gurlitt. Of all these Sternkopf has availed himself, and done his work admirably, adopting the latest theories and criticisms which are of substantial value, especially those bearing on chronology; yet altering as little as possible the notes of the previous editors. The volume is materially increased in size, and is characterised throughout by a soundness and judgment which will maintain the high reputation which the selections have so long deservedly held.

Sternkopf adopts Leo's theory (advanced in 1895) of the publication of the Epp. ad Att., viz. that Atticus had in his possession 11 bundles of Cicero's correspondence dating from Cicero's consulship to his death; and that Nepos saw these bundles (cf. Nep. Att. 16. 3), but that Atticus did not publish this correspondence. Some subsequent

editor (about 60 A.D.—after Asconius) reduced this material to the 16 books which we now possess, adding some of Cicero's early letters and omitting those of the last year of his life. The Epp. ad Fam. were published first by Tiro (as Gurlitt as shown) in separate small volumes, some perhaps formed according to the nature of the subject matter (e.g. xiii. Letters of Introduction. This was probably the actual *συναγωγή* referred to by Cic. Att. xvi. 5. 5); some, again, according to the correspondent to whom they were addressed (e.g. iii. Letters to Appius); and about the 4th or 5th century the collection in the form in which we now have it was made of all the letters which could be collected at that time. Sternkopf has utilized Mendelssohn's and Lehmann's works to set forth their views of the relative value and position of the MSS. of the correspondence—views which have won on the whole general acceptance.

The alterations of the text of the 6th edition are many. By far the most important is the restoration of the MSS. reading in Fam. viii. 1. 4: 'Ego, qui scirem Q. Pompeium Baulis *embaeneticam facere* ('taken to the boat business') et usque eo, ut misererer eius, *esurire*,' etc. This is defended by the inscription from Baiae referred to in *Cl. Rev.* xi. 367 L. Caecilius Dioscurus curator augustalium Cumanorum duplicarius et perpetuus *embaenitariorum trierum pisciniensium*. These words, as Mr. Walters says (who refers to this passage of Cic.), must relate to makers of fishing boats which were used on the *piscinae* attached to large villas such as were possessed by Nero at Baiae and Severus Alexander. For the phrase Sternkopf compares *piraticam facere* (Red. in Sen. 11), *naviculariam facere* (Verr. v. 46). Another very happy restoration, of an eclectic nature, is the much vexed passage Att. xi. 6. 2-3, *Reliquo tempore me domo tenui* [So Hofmann cp. Red. in Sen. 29: de Domo 6]. *Ad Oppium <et Balbum scripsi>* [Cratander, Wesenberg and Lehmann] *ecquonam cum his placeret modo prius accedere* [Sternkopf]. The