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](#)

Q. Asconii Pediani Commentarii. Recognovit A. C. Clark. (Oxford text).

E. Seymer Thompson

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 01 / February 1909, pp 21 - 22

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00002481, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00002481

How to cite this article:

E. Seymer Thompson (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 21-22 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00002481

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The great number of illustrated types raises the work far above the average. It is a real joy to have placed before one's eyes this rich collection of choice pieces, and one cannot lay the volume aside without feeling the need of a lively expression of gratitude to the

author, who has known how to dispose his unwieldy and difficult material in a thorough-going and charming manner.

ERICH PERNICE.

Greifswald.

SHORT NOTICES

Q. Asconii Pediani Commentarii. Recognovit A. C. CLARK. (Oxford text).

As editor of Asconius, Mr. Clark shews himself a worthy successor of Manutius, Madvig, the 'sospitator Asconii,' and Kiessling and Schoell, who so named Madvig. His work marks the limit of what scholarship can at present do for the author, and will probably remain the standard text for a long period of time. As in his other undertakings, Mr. Clark has proved himself unwearied and successful in the pursuit of evidence, and judicious in his use of it. Even a destructive critic (a rarity now, but not unknown) could find here little material for the exercise of his art. The conditions attached to the series in which the book appears must of course have cramped Mr. Clark a little. A bibliography of editions, pamphlets and articles relating to Asconius would have been a boon. In the construction of it some matter worth taking into account would probably have come to light. I do not think, for instance, that Mr. Clark refers to a Breslau program on the codices of Asconius, by Schmiedeberg (1905) which I have seen quoted.

Little or nothing could be added to the information about Asconius given by Kiessling and Schoell, which is here conveniently repeated. It is curious that a passage in Silius Italicus (12, 212-4) referring to a Pedianus of Patavium as distinguished both in arms and in letters during the time of Hannibal, should still be taken as good evidence of the noble descent of our Asconius. Silius invented the names of his minor combatants as freely as Virgil, and we can often see a reason for his inventions, as when he introduces a Galba and a Piso side by side

(10, 403). The Pedianus of Silius was no doubt suggested by our Asconius, but the mention of literature at Patavium in that age shews how mythical the figure is. The name *Antenorides* applied to Pedianus by Silius is national, not personal.

Mr. Clark's valuable researches on the text are embodied in the account given in the preface of its history since Poggio made his famous raid on St. Gallen. A curious and interesting history it is. Mr. Clark argues that the Madrid transcript of Asconius is Poggio's own and his case seems to be a good one. In the choice of readings for his own text, Mr. Clark brings into play all the sound and thorough scholarship which his previous work has led us to expect from him. Of his own suggestions, some are obviously right, many more are probable and not one flouts the requirements of the passage or the laws of Latin. More than this can rarely be said of a text. The lacunose condition (in parts) of the transcripts from the lost St. Gallen MS. makes emendation often difficult. Of matters which have given me pause in Mr. Clark's *apparatus criticus* I can only mention a few. In § 3 Asconius refers to the privilege whereby members of a Latin community could become Roman citizens by rising to office in their town:—*ut petendo magistratus civitatem Romanum adipiscerentur*. Here *petendo* is written by Mr. Clark for *petendi* or *peti*. But Asconius can hardly have supposed that mere candidature for a magistracy was sufficient. A. Augustinus proposed *gerendo*, which gives the required sense. Perhaps Asconius wrote *obeundo*. In § 13 there is in the codices *idem provinciam deposuerat ne sumptui esset oratio* (or *oro*). The reference is to Scaevola the pontifex, at

the time of his consulship. For *oratio* Manutius wrote *aerario* and Mr. Clark suggests *populo Romano*. But the word required seems to be *ornatio*, the technical phrase for expenditure on the equipment of a magistrate for his province. When Scaevola went to Asia after his praetorship he refused to accept the ordinary grant from the treasury. He was still of the same mind, but (apparently) unable to supply the money for himself. At § 32 there is mention of a law passed by C. Cornelius the tribune of 67 B.C. 'ut praetores ex edictis suis perpetuis ius dicerent.' Asconius adds *quae res eum* (so MSS.) *aut gratiam ambitiosis praetoribus qui varie ius dicere assueverant sustulit*. For *eum* Mr. Clark gives *studium*. But *studium* is too like *gratiam*; a word of opposite sense is needed, such as *telum*, which is often metaphorically applied to powers or privileges capable of being used out of spite. The praetors contradicted their edicts in order to do damage to their enemies as well as favours to their friends. At § 84 Mr. Clark wishes to read *submisisse capillum* for *immisisse c.*, on the strength of Plin. ep. 7, 27, 14, *reis moris est summittere capillum*. But in this sense *immittere*, *submittere*, *demittere*, *promittere* are all equally good. See the 'Thesaurus,' s.v. *barba*, and particularly fragm. 47 of Sisenna there quoted.

Considerations of space compel me to part unwillingly here from Mr. Clark's book, which is sure to receive elsewhere the extended examination it deserves.

J. S. REID.

APOLLODORUS' (OF DAMASCUS) ΠΟΛΙΟΡΚΗΤΙΚΑ.

Griechische Poliorketiker von RUDOLF SCHNEIDER. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908. (51 diagrams.)

THIS edition of R. Schneider (Göttingen) has, with Preface, a note on Apollodorus Damascenus, Trajan's *magister fabrum*, builder of that Emperor's bridges, forum, odeum and gymnasium, and victim of the Imperial exiling and execution. Procopius (*De Aed.* iv. 6), Dio Cassius (lxix. 4. 1) and Spartianus (*Hadr.* 19. 13) refer to him; the last-men-

tioned gives Hadrian's commission to Architect Apollodorus for a statue to the Moon. The chief codices followed for the text are Parisini M. and P. with the Vaticanus (V.). The editor has drawn on C. Wescher's *Poliorkétique des Grecs* (Paris, 1867) and Ernest Lacoste, *Les Poliorkétiques d'Apollodore de Damas. Traduction, Revue des études grecques*, iii. Paris, 1890. A (diffuse) translation into German is followed by an index and the 51 diagrams of storming apparatus. A σκάνδαλον *in limine* is ὑπελάλησα, translated *habe ich . . . durchgesprochen*, but the sentence is awkward: πᾶσιν (ὑποδείγμασιν) ὑπελάλησα καὶ ὑπουργὸν ἀπέλυσα. For ὑπολαλέω L. and S. give as authorities only: Greg. Nyss., Byz., Math. Vett. and Eustathius, authors that land us in the fourth and later centuries. True, Apollodorus of Damascus is unknown to the List of Authors in L. and S., who give no such word as ὑπολατρεύω; still, ὑπελάτρευσα suits the context (ὑπουργὸν ἀπ.) better than ὑπελάλησα, 'chattered in an under-tone, murmured, whispered.' Among the strange words (for which the Damascene apologises) are: ἀρίς, drill (?), κατάσσω (= κατάγνυμι), μάγγανον (Kloben am Flaschenzuge), the dim. σιαγόνιον (a LXX word), (τὰς καλουμένας) ψιάθους, (die sogenannten) 'Jalousien.' Of these the first only is known to L. and S. as occurring in our author, on whom it is, perhaps, a little hard that his name does not figure on R. Schneider's brochure cover, though he designed the Forum and Column of Trajan (and the bridge over the Danube)—works imperishable.

Scholia in Ciceronis Orationes Bobiensia,
Edidit PAULUS HILDEBRANT. Leipzig.
1907 (Teubner Text).

SOME readers of German periodicals bearing on Classical studies may remember that the Editor of this volume has been engaged in controversy with some other German scholars interested in the subject. That a few weaknesses in the book have been indicated I am not disposed to deny. But nevertheless the Editor has achieved a most laborious task in a manner which, on the whole, entitles him to gratitude. The preface gives an elaborate