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](#)

***P. Cornelius Tacitus*, erklärt Karl von Nipperdey. Erster Band, ab excessu Divi Augusti i.–vi. Neunte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Georg Andresen. Berlin, 1892. 3 Mks.**

H. Furneaux

The Classical Review / Volume 7 / Issue 1-2 / February 1893, pp 74 - 74
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0019691X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0019691X

How to cite this article:

H. Furneaux (1893). The Classical Review, 7, pp 74-74 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0019691X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

P. Cornelius Tacitus, erklärt von KARL NIPPERDEY. Erster Band, ab excessu Divi Augusti i.-vi. Neunte verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von GEORG ANDRESEN. Berlin, 1892. 3 Mks.

SIMULTANEOUSLY with the appearance of the fifth edition of Vol. ii. (see *Class. Rev.* vi. 461) we have to welcome the ninth of Vol. i. It is of course superfluous to speak generally of the excellence of a work which is probably better known and more highly appreciated than any other edition of any part of Tacitus. The text of this edition differs from that of its predecessor in twenty-two places, in most of which the Medicean reading has either been more accurately ascertained, or has been replaced where it had formerly been set aside. Perhaps the most important of these changes is that Dr. Andresen no longer thinks it necessary to read the name of the Ampsivarii for that of the Angrivarii in 2, 8; 22; 24. Also in the three places in which the name of Iulus Antonius is mentioned (1, 10; 3, 18; 4, 44) he now reads it as 'Iullus,' a form found in MSS. of Dio and in inscriptions (*C.I.L.* vi. 12010), and from which it is easy to explain the corrupt form 'Iulius' in the first Medicean MS. The commentary occupies a few pages more than that of the last edition, and has undergone considerable revision in many places, especially, as the editor notes in his Preface, in the portions relating to the campaigns of Germanicus. On these he considers the chief new light to have been thrown by Knoke's work (see *Class. Rev.* i. 277), but accepts his conclusions with due caution. On the locality of the defeat of Varus (1, 61), the question is left open between his view and Mommsen's, while as to the site of Idistaviso (2, 16), and that of the subsequent battle (2, 19), his opinion is accepted more unreservedly. Many new inscriptions and other details of information will be found in places too numerous here to mention. H. FURNEAUX.

C. J. César. Guerre des Gaules, traduction nouvelle avec notes et un index géographique, par JUSTIN BELLANGER. Paris: Thorin, 1892. 437 pp.

It is rash for an Englishman to criticize a translation in a foreign language, but, so far as the present writer can judge, M. Bellanger seems to have succeeded in the object he sets forth in his preface, that of providing a French 'Caesar,' which should be readable with pleasure by ordinary Frenchmen. There is, no doubt, a demand for such a book in France. The French are keenly alive to the history and antiquities of their country. Their archaeological societies are numerous, not perhaps so over numerous as our own in England, but adequate, vigorous, and appreciative. The conquest of Gaul by Caesar is an old object of study with them; it has attracted their attention under the Empire and under the Republic. Accordingly a literary translation, if correct (as that before me seems to be), should have a wide success. In England, of course, the book has less place, but it is worth a brief note here, in case there be any who care to hear of it.

F. HAVERFIELD.

J. César. Commentaires sur la Guerre des Gaules, par E. BENOIST et M. S. DOSSON. Paris: Hachette, 1893. pp. xvi. + 764.

THIS edition, with footnotes, maps, indices, and all other due apparatus, is apparently intended for what we should call school use. It was commenced twenty years ago by M. Benoist on a larger scale, and, since his death, his material has been adopted by M. Dossou. It appears to be a thoroughly sound and scholarly piece of work.

F. HAVERFIELD.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

PRIMITIVE HERA-WORSHIP ILLUSTRATED FROM THE EXCAVATIONS AT ARGOS.

(Continued from No. 10, Dec. 1892, p. 474.)

WE reserved for this second notice the mythological evidence arising from Dr. Waldstein's discoveries and more especially from the primitive votive terra-cottas figured in pl. viii. 'As to the purpose which these terra-cotta images served, there can hardly be a doubt,' says Dr. Waldstein, 'that they were votive offerings to the goddess as Hera Teleia, presiding over marriage, married life and child-birth. Hera is above all things the goddess of marriage.'

At first sight this seems plain and simple enough. Hera the bride, Zeus the husband, the centre of her cultus the canonical *ἱερός γάμος*. But note a strange thing: the

temple is called the Heraion, within it is the statue of the goddess, about it the statues of her priestesses—where is Zeus? To put it shortly—nowhere, unless we take account of the cuckoo sitting on the sceptre. Nowhere until comparatively late days are Zeus and Hera *ὁμοβόμωι*. At Olympia they have separate temples (that of Hera long preceding in date that of Zeus) and separate festivals. At Crete we hear nothing of Hera, at Samos nothing of Zeus. Their names are nothing akin. At ancient Dodona Zeus has his own proper shadow-wife, Dione, a real Greek goddess-helpmeet; for man makes the gods in his own image. H. D. Müller told us all this decades ago (1857) and yet, such is the force of habit, such the magic of Homer, that we still believe that Zeus and Hera were married from all time. But Homer himself knew, or rather was dimly haunted by the memory