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](#)

Livy, Book I., and Livy, Book II. With Notes by J. Prendeville. Re-edited and partly rewritten from a revised text by J. H. Freese, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co. London : George Bell & Sons : and New York, 1892. 1s. 6d. each.

M. T. Tatham

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 10 / December 1892, pp 460 - 461

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00186998, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00186998

How to cite this article:

M. T. Tatham (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 460-461 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00186998

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Beq de Fouquières and Mr. F. maintain, but that the squares themselves were called anciently πόλεις, and later χώραι. The *Dictionary* likewise gives in full the proofs that hemming in the enemy was of the essence of the game. Of all these passages a portion of one only is quoted by Mr. F., and that, significantly enough, in the Latin version (ἡ τέχνη τῆς παιδιᾶς ἐστὶ περιλήψει δύο ψήφων ὁμοχρόων τὴν ἐτερόχροον ἀνελεῖν, *Pollux* ix. 98). The Latin passages bearing on Latrunculi, collected originally by Salmasius and Hyde, are set out at sufficient length; but in adapting them to Mr. F.'s theories some very forced interpretations occur. Thus we read in Isidore's *Orig.* xviii. 67: 'Calculi partim ordine moventur, partim vage. Ideo alios ordinarios, alios vagos appellant. At vero, qui omnino moveri non possunt, incitos dicunt.' The plain meaning of this is, that there were at least two kinds of pieces, some moving with greater freedom than others; if not also a third class, the *inciti* or immovable, as Mr. Tilley suggests (*Class. Rev.* VI. 335). Mr. F. decides, on subjective grounds, that the pieces must have moved all alike: so much the worse for the facts.

'I apprehend therefore,' he says, 'that the passage merely means that all the pieces move both in an ordinal or straight line, forwards, sideways, and backwards, and in a diagonal line; and that those that "cannot move" are called by such a name, and are then taken off' (p. 50).

This is subsequently explained to mean that

'All the pieces, though moving only one square at any time in any direction, could *leap* over an adversary occupying a contiguous square, provided the next square were open, as in draughts, but without taking it.'

After this we need not follow Mr. F. in

his examination of the passage from the *Panegyric on Piso*. To do him justice, he is right in the main as to the sense of *alligare*, meaning to attack. A piece which was *alligatus* was not necessarily lost; it might escape as long as it was attacked by only one enemy, but was taken off the board when caught between two. Like most writers on the subject, he has failed to distinguish between *ligatus* and *similis ligato* (*Paneg. Pis.* 189). The identity of the Greek πόλεις and the Roman latrunculi is not yet proved; where they differed was probably, as Mr. Tilley has well pointed out, in the more military character of the Roman game.

We have considered Mr. F.'s book exclusively from the classical point of view, and have had occasion to criticise his mode of dealing with Greek and Latin authors. In other respects we have found his work full of interesting matter. He professes to teach us 'how to play' these games; and this is a point we must confess not to have put to a practical test. Much of the information about Egyptian games is not to be found elsewhere. Under this heading the author's obligations are freely acknowledged to the late Dr. S. Birch and to Mr. P. le Page Renouf, of the British Museum. Mr. Renouf (*quem honoris causa nomino*), in a letter otherwise filled with Egyptian and Oriental learning, ventures on the following remarkable statement: 'It is, I believe, quite true that the original word for pawn was *paon* (peacock).' In Sanscrit, where the word first appears, as elsewhere, 'pawn' has always meant simply 'foot-soldier': the Italian *pedone* gives the typical form I of which Sp. *peon* and Fr. *pion* are contractions.

W. WAYTE.

Livy, Book I., and Livy, Book II. With Notes by J. PRENDEVILLE. Re-edited and partly rewritten from a revised text by J. H. FREESE, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co. London: George Bell & Sons: and New York, 1892. 1s. 6d. each.

IN these two little volumes 'the text, with slight variations, is that of Weissenborn (Teubner 1889).' Each contains about twelve pages of useful and clear introduction, of which the first seven or eight dealing with the life of Livy and sources of early Roman history are identical. Each also has two maps, one of Rome and one of its environs. The notes are clear and to the point, and will be found to give the necessary assistance to careful readers. They are not intended for the lower forms of a public school.

In the Introduction it is stated that according to Tacitus in *Ann.* iv. 34 'Augustus nicknamed' Livy 'Pompeianus.' All that Tacitus there puts into the

mouth of Cremutius is the statement that 'T. Livius.....Cn. Pompeium tantia laudibus tulit ut *Pompeianum cum Augustus appellaret*,' 'called him a Pompeian'—which is quite a different thing.

On p. xix. of the Introduction to Book ii. it is said that the *comitia curiata* 'was exclusively patrician.' Such, it is true, was its original constitution, but subsequently (perhaps on the expulsion of the Kings) the plebs was enrolled in the curies and was therefore capable of voting in the *comitia curiata*.

On p. xx. of the same Introduction it is said that the tribunes and aediles of the plebs were probably elected by the *comitia tributa*. It is added that 'the plebeians alone had the right of voting in this assembly.' This is probably inaccurate. The plebeian magistrates were elected by a *concilium plebis tributum*, and not by the *comitia tributa* which was an assembly of the whole *populus*, patricians as well as plebeians.

In the note on i. 14, 3 it is said that *inde non modo commune sed concors etiam regnum duobus regibus fuit* (i. 13, 8) implies that 'there existed a feeling of latent distrust.' But how can it imply this?

In the note on i. 21, 5, "*Argeos pontifices* : 'the Argive chapels'." *pontifices* which has got in by a slip of the pen should be erased. The word is of course the nominative to *vocant*.

In the note on i. 26, 7 (*hac lege duumviri creati*), *qui se absolvere non rebantur (ea lege) ne innoxium quidem posse, cum condemnassent* is translated 'who imagined they could not acquit even a guiltless person after they had found him guilty.' In the subsequent comment the editor explains this so as to give it some meaning; but he has not noticed that he has left *duumviri* without a verb. He should have translated : 'When the judges, who thought that according to that law they could not acquit the man even if innocent, had passed sentence on him.'

In ii. 30, 4, *suo vehemens* (if it means anything at all) cannot mean 'which was in its own nature uncontrollable.' The text and notes have not been brought into harmony here.

On p. 48 of the same book a full stop has got into the middle of a sentence in the fifth line from the bottom.

Nec in praesens modo ii. 42, 7, requires, I think, a note to show that it is to be taken with *vicit*.

M. T. TATHAM.

Thirteen Satires of Juvenal. Translated into English by ALEXANDER LEEPER, M.A., LL.D., Warden of Trinity College in the University of Melbourne. New and revised edition. Macmillan, 1892.

DR. LEEPER informs the reader that this translation is a new version of the rendering originally brought out by him in conjunction with Dr. H. A. Strong, now Professor of Latin in University College, Liverpool. Dr. Leeper's translation is interesting not only as being accurate and spirited, but also as being honestly written in the English of the last two decades. It strikes one occasionally as needlessly harsh and crude, sometimes because the author is over anxious to be literal, sometimes because he is too careful to employ short English words; e.g. (p. 116) "'Let go the cable,' cries the owner of the corn or pepper that has been bought up." The celebrated passage in the seventh satire *Satur est cum dicit Horatius Euhoe* etc. is thus given (p. 41) : "He has dined has Horace when he shouts his 'Evoc.' Your heart admits not of divided interests—what room is there for a poet's frenzy, unless the only restlessness they feel is that of inspiration, unless they career along in the train of the Lords of Cirra and Nysa? It was the creation of a great mind (agitated, if you will, but not about the price of a blanket) that vision of chariots, and horses, and faces celestial, and of the Fury's form when dazing the Rutulian. Were Vergil left without a slave and decent lodging, then every snake would tumble from his locks: his trumpet would be hushed, and sound forth no impressive notes." 'Agitated' is not strong enough for *attonitiae*, nor is 'dazing' an adequate equivalent for *confundat*, nor 'impressive' for *grave*. And surely 'his locks,' 'his trumpet' should be 'her locks,' 'her trumpet.'

The following may be cited as a favourable specimen of Dr. Leeper's general style:

P. 11. *Quid Romae faciam?* 'What am I to do at Rome? I do not know how to lie. When a book is bad I cannot praise it and beg the loan of it. I am a dunce at astrology, and as for guaranteeing a parent's demise, I neither will nor can. I have never inves-

tigated the entrails of frogs: conveying to a married lady an admirer's presents or messages—others know how to do (? this). No rogue shall ever have my help; and so I go out in no governor's suite, just as though I were a cripple—a useless lump with a withered hand. Who has a friend now, unless he be an accomplice, unless his fevered heart throb with the guilty secret his tongue may never tell? He who has made you the repository of an honourable secret—nothing is what he thinks he owes you, and nothing will he ever pay you.'

H. N.

P. Cornelius Tacitus, erklärt von KARL NIPPERDEY. Zweiter Band. Fünfte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Georg Andresen. Berlin. 1892. Mk. 2.70.

A NEW issue of this excellent edition will be welcome to all students of Tacitus. The general merits of the work are already so well known and appreciated that it is only needful to say a few words on the special characteristics of the fifth revision of it.

The editor states in the Preface that the text differs from that formerly adopted in eighty-nine places, of which nearly half are either restorations of the Medicean text where it had previously been departed from, or are due to recent collation of the manuscript. In forty-seven remaining places a conjectural reading has been substituted either for the Medicean text or for some previously adopted conjecture. Thus Madvig is now followed in reading 'militare horreum' for 'militarium' in 14, 33; in inserting 'paci' rather than 'cladis' in 15, 13; and in reading 'aut redierat plebi spes' in the corrupt passage in 15, 40. Dr. Andresen also now follows Halm in adopting Prammer's insertion of 'melius' in 14, 20. Several new emendations originate from the editor himself, among which may be noticed the insertion of 'populi' before 'Romani' in 12, 60, and that of 'Domitiae, Neronis' before 'amitae' in 13, 27; the reading 'strepitu' for the corrupt 'repetitum' in 14, 61, the insertion of 'consentitur' after 'consequentibus' in 15, 54. The additions to the commentary amount to about ten pages in the whole volume, and are suggested chiefly by what has been brought forward recently by Mommsen and other eminent authorities. A few errors may be noticed which have still survived this latest revision: (1) in p. 24, note on 11, 18, 14, for 'Flavus,' 'Italicus' should apparently be read; (2) in p. 70, on 12, 29, 1, for ii. 89, read ii. 81; (3) in p. 71, note on 12, 31, 7, the Worcestershire rather than the Gloucestershire Avon should be mentioned; (4) in p. 78, note on 12, 40, 9, for H. i. 61, read H. i. 64; (5) in p. 145, note on 13, 39, 17, for H. iii. 71, read H. iv. 71; (6) in p. 189, note on 14, 24, 12, for Luc. iii. 273, read iii. 373; (7) in p. 224, note on 14, 65, 14, for H. iii. 20, read H. ii. 20.

H. FURNEAUX.

P. Corneli Taciti Agricola, edited with introduction, notes, and critical appendix by ROBY F. DAVIS, B.A., formerly scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, assistant master at Weymouth College. Methuen & Co. London. 1892.

THIS edition is intended for the use of schools, and for boys beginning to read Tacitus; and the introduction and notes are on a scale suitable for such readers, and will probably be found to answer well to their requirements. The stages of the conquest of Britain before the time of Agricola might perhaps with advantage have been more fully given in the introduction, so as to throw light on the narrative in c. 13 foll., which is obscure from its brevity; and some connected view of the campaigns of Agricola