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](#)

Gsell's Reign of Domitian *Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Domitien* par Stéphane Gsell. (Paris: Thorin.) 8vo. pp. 392. 1894. 12 Frs.

F. H.

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 08 / October 1894, pp 373 - 373

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188766, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188766

How to cite this article:

F. H. (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 373-373 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188766

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

call attention to a few matters *passim* which demand correction or at least reconsideration. Some statement of the principle followed in marking the long vowels of the Latin words should be made; and if, as it appears, the short vowels are left always unmarked, the reader should be put on his guard. In *sūcinum* on p. 149 the quantity of the penult is more important and harder to remember than that of the antepenult; *iūgum*, p. 111, is certainly wrong. In *manum suam* 'into his hand' for the *manus* of the husband is hardly good Latin: Gaius, l. 136, has 'in viri sui manu,' but it is safer to omit the pronoun altogether as may be seen by comparing the passages cited by Heumann, *röm. Rechtsquellen*⁶ 330. On p. 3 the derivation of Cicerones from 'chick-pea growers' is over-confident, as is also the statement on p. 5 that daughters had a *praenomen* of their own, which remark should be qualified by what is said in Seyffert-Nettleship, p. 412. Nothing is said by our authors about the custom of numbering daughters. The association of *quiratio* (p. 19) with the mortuary cry may be correct; yet as the word occurs but once (Livy 33. 28) we must interpret the noun by the verb *quirito* which was originally the cry for aid by the distressed citizen. The

'mortuary proclamation' could hardly have given the primary signification to the word. *Carmen necessarium* (Cic. *De Leg.* 2. 59) is hardly a 'species of hymn'; *carmen* might with more propriety be called a chant or rhythm. A modern analogue is the sing-song recitation of the multiplication table by school children. In Tac. *Ann.* 4. 9, which describes the funeral procession of Drusus, the verb is *spectarentur*; to translate this 'walked' is scarcely justified (p. 20). English 'aes' for Latin *as* occurs twice on page 140; but the book is in general very free from misprints.

Those who have followed the *Atlantic Monthly* articles by H. W. P. and L. D. on various Roman worthies will find the same warm treatment, and freshness of style in this little book, which is doubtless more readable than it would have been if written by professed philologists or archaeologists. It is a work which may profitably be put into the hands of young students, and should find a place in all public libraries. It will be particularly valuable as a companion to courses of lectures in Roman private life, such as are given in several American universities.

W. A. MERRILL.

University of Indiana.

GSSELL'S REIGN OF DOMITIAN.

Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Domitien
par STÉPHANE GSSELL. (Paris: Thorin.)
8vo. pp. 392. 1894. 12 Frs.

THE account of Domitian's reign contained in this volume was originally written as a 'thèse de doctorat' for the Faculty of Letters of Paris. The author does not say whether it has been since revised or expanded, but for its original purpose I may say at once that it seems to me to possess just the merits which such a work should possess. The writers of such theses (we have them or something like them in England) seem to me to be liable to one of two errors. They are apt either to aim at the fabrication of epochs and the sonorous disclosure of sweeping novelties, or they painfully concentrate laborious attention on some possibly correcter view of an insignificant trifle. In either case, in the desire to be original, they reveal their inability to grasp the proportions of things and to master the matter which forms their sub-

ject. M. Gsell seems to me to have avoided these errors. He has given us a well-digested account of Domitian, with a careful collection of facts and authorities both ancient and modern, and an estimate of the man which, whether right or wrong, is sober and suitable. He shows that he is the master, not the servant, of his matter and that, when he tries original work, he will at least be able to start well equipped. For scholars his book will have the value that many good digests have at the present day: it is a convenient summary to which one may turn for a judicial account of what has been well said about Domitian. Its fault, of course, is its length—rather a common fault in some French books, but that is partly the result of its careful quotation of references and treatment of detail. Were it shorter, it would doubtless be more interesting to read, but it would be less useful as a summary.

F. H.