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](#)

***C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Civili*, ed. Guil. Theod. Paul. Vindobonae et Pragae. 1889. (Editio maior). 90 Pf.**

A. G. Peskett

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 05 / May 1889, pp 213 - 213
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194879, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194879

How to cite this article:

A. G. Peskett (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 213-213 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194879

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

by Nonius, Macrobius, Isidorus, or even by those prose writers who admired the poet and sometimes quote his other works, e.g. the two Senecas. They are however not unfrequently worked into the diction of subsequent poets (this part of the subject is fully treated by Zingerle) and even into inscriptions, p. 8. Thus in a *titulus* which records the completion of a monument by one L. Valerius Aries, freedman of a certain slave-merchant called Zabda, the two vv. *Trist.* i. 11. 11, 12 are thus quoted

SEV. STYFOR. EST. HVIC. STYDIO. SIVE EST.
INSANIA. NOMEN
OMNIS. AB. HAC. CVRA. CVRA. LEVATA. MEA. EST

where the MSS. of Ovid give

Seu stupor huic studio sive est insania nomen,
Omnis ab hac cura mens releuata mea est.

I see that Ehwald accepts as right in a passage of the *Metamorphoses* (viii. 237)

Garrula ramosa prospexit ab ilice perdx

the new reading which Keil found in a grammatical treatise, *limoso elice* (Gramm. Lat. V. p. 587). Naturalists I suppose would agree in thinking it more likely that a partridge would be seated on a muddy field-drain than a many-branched ilex: yet in spite of Madvig's support (*Advers. Crit.* II. p. 81) a doubt still lingers in my mind in favour of the common reading, in which I believe all known codices of the *Metamorphoses* agree.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Civili,
ed. GUIL. THEOD. PAUL. Vindobonae et Pragae.
1889. (Editio maior). 90 Pf.

THIS is a new volume of the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum*, of which C. Schenkl is the general editor. It consists of a revised text of the *B.C.* with a critical preface of over 50 pages in which the editor records the most important variations of the MSS., the chief alterations proposed by other scholars and a number of new readings of his own, many of which are introduced into the text. Those who have compared in the *B.G.* the readings of the second class of MSS. with those of the first class will readily understand what scope there is for emendation in a text which has to rest on the former class alone, and will hesitate to charge Herr Paul with undue rashness. The chief MSS. available for the *B.C.* are Ursinianus (*h*) and Riccardianus or Florentinus (*l*), of the xith cent., and Thuanicus (*a*) and Vindobonensis I (*f*), of the xiith cent. The readings of the first two are preferred where they differ from those of the others. The editor's emendations, so far as I have observed them, generally improve the sense though they sometimes depart rather widely from the original. I add some remarks on a few passages. In i. 1 §2 Paul brackets the words in *civitate* with most editors, without explaining their origin. I suggest that they were originally a late marginal gloss meaning 'in the city' for the more correct *in urbe*; an equally barbarous hand may have written *latitatis* as an explanation of *invisis* 'unseen' in iii. 4 §4. i. 3 §1 he inserts *audaces* after *laudat*, thus making the sentence contain two words, *audax* and *segnis*, not elsewhere used by Caesar; *promptos*, proposed by Pantagathus, is more likely to have dropped out before *Pompeius*, or one might suggest *alacres* before *atque*. i. 5 §1 he writes *soluta sceleratorum audacia* and introduces the same word *sceleratorum* in iii. 109 §6 for *et latronum*, where perhaps no change is required. i. 11 §2 for

peracto consulatu Caesaris he has *parto consulatu Caesari*, which is distinctly not Caesarian Latin. In i. 25 §6 he does not notice Col. Stoffel's explanation (*Histoire*, i. 250). In i. 40 §7 *ab equitibus* is altered on insufficient grounds to *ancipiti*. In ii. 23 §1 for *biduoque et noctibus tribus navigatione consumptis* he accepts Ciacconius' *biduoque et nocte in navigatione consumpta*, probably rightly as regards the preposition, but the very form of the phrase indicates that a longer time than usual was spent on the transit. In iii. 46 §6 I do not share his objection to *omnino*. In iii. 71 §3 he makes nonsense of the passage by altering *hoc nomen obtinuit* to *hoc nomine abstinuit*. Enough has been said to show that Herr Paul's changes in the text must not be accepted without careful examination: at the same time the book is one that no future editor can neglect as it contains many useful criticisms and some highly probable corrections. The type is admirably clear, and readers of Nipperdey and Dinter (1875), who often spell a word in different ways on the same page, will appreciate the uniformity of the orthography. Herr Paul indulges in the curious declension nom. *Madvig*, gen. *Madvici*. A. G. PESKETT.

Livius XXI-XXIII. mit Verweisungen auf
Cäsars bellum Gallicum für die Bedürfnisse der
Schule grammatisch untersucht von DR. FRANZ
FÜGNER. Berlin 1888. pp. 160.

DR. FÜGNER is an ardent admirer of Livy. In the *Jahrbücher für Philologie* for 1886 he earnestly advocated that in the *Über-Secunda* of the gymnasia Livy, and preferably his third decade, should occupy as definite and fixed a place as is that held by Caesar in the *Tertia*. This work is undertaken, as the preface declares, with the purpose 'of making the language as well as the syntax of Livy better known, and of bringing him into higher honour among the schools than he now enjoys,' and also of 'gaining new friends for Livy in the schools and of lightening the labours of old friends.' With this in view the editor has made a careful and statistical study of these three books of Livy, giving a comparison of the usages of Livy and of Caesar. Beginning with the arrangement of the sentence, as a whole and in parts, he proceeds to examine the cases in their different uses. The number of the different uses is given and, except in the more common ones, the places of occurrence are given. The prepositions are then taken in order, and these are followed by an examination of the use of tenses and moods. The infinitive, which is happily treated not as a dependent clause but as a noun, has a very full consideration, with a careful analysis of the more than 1200 instances in these books.

The examination of the gerund and the gerundive shows that Livy did not conform to the principle laid down in the grammars in treating of the instrumental and modal ablative, that the gerundive is generally used instead of a gerund with an object. Over against 22 instances of the gerundive stand 27 instances of the gerund with an object. In comparison with Caesar, Livy favours the ablative, for he has 97 cases to Caesar's 25, and he uses the ablative without a preposition 76 times to Caesar's 4 times. On the other hand Caesar employs the genitive with *causa* or *gratia* 53 times to Livy's 13 times.

The comparison of dependent clauses shows an interesting difference between Livy and Caesar in the use of the subjunctive, the latter inclining much more to its use. For instance, Livy employs *cum* historic with the subjunctive 194 times, Caesar 245 times. *Postquam, ubi, ut* &c. = 'as soon as,' are used