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](#)

Holmes's Caesar's Conquest of Gaul Caesar's *Conquest of Gaul*, by T. Rice Holmes. Pp. xlii + 846. Macmillan & Co. 1899. 21/-net.

A. G. Peskett

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 1900, pp 463 - 465

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00082093, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00082093

How to cite this article:

A. G. Peskett (1900). The Classical Review, 14, pp 463-465 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00082093

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

mate connection with political history.' But he interprets this principle so liberally in letterpress and illustrations alike that as a matter of fact there is no side in which the book is stronger. It is not

merely a record of the facts of Greek Politics. It is a stimulating introduction to the study of Greek Life.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

HOLMES'S CAESAR'S CONQUEST OF GAUL.

Caesar's Conquest of Gaul, by T. RICE HOLMES. Pp. xlii + 846. Macmillan & Co. 1899. 21/- net.

WHEN readers of the admirable 'History of the Indian Mutiny' heard that Mr. Holmes was publishing a work on Caesar's Conquest of Gaul they were prepared for an eloquent narrative based on a careful study of the existing sources, but it is safe to say that they were not prepared for the remarkably learned and exhaustive work that Mr. Holmes has given them. Some perhaps would scarcely have thought that the subject could admit of a volume of nearly 850 closely printed pages. Yet large as the book is, such is the vigour and vivacity of Mr. Holmes' style that there is not a page in it that is devoid of interest, though in one or two portions a certain amount of excision and compression would be desirable. To review the book properly one would need to be what Mr. Holmes himself is, not merely a scholar but a trained historian and antiquarian, as well as a competent authority on the art of war. All that I can do is to indicate the general plan of the work and to call attention to a few leading points.

Mr. Holmes begins with a disquisition on the busts of Caesar, and expresses a decided preference for the bust in the British Museum, while he admits that there is no evidence for the authenticity of this or of any of the so-called busts of Caesar. He claims however that this bust, whether Caesar's or not, 'represents the strongest personality that has ever lived,' and he proceeds to dilate with considerable ingenuity on the qualities that must have been possessed by the original. I doubt however whether physiognomy is so true an index to character as it is often assumed to be. After some other preliminary matter we come to Part I in nine chapters (the first chapter being introductory) which gives an extremely well written and interesting narrative of the Gallic campaigns, the British episode being scarcely touched as foreign to the

main subject of the work. This portion occupies 162 pages. I venture to suggest that this part might with advantage be published in a separate form; it would make an excellent book for schoolboys to read in connexion with their study of the text, for it would help them more than any book that I know to realise the ever present interest and the military and political significance of this great period of Roman expansion. In accuracy it is superior to Mr. Froude's narrative, and I think it is not inferior to it in style.

The second part comprising the rest of the book deals with questions of Gallic and Gallo-Roman History relating to the foregoing narrative. Of this the first section consisting of about seventy closely printed pages is concerned mainly with the credibility of Caesar's narrative; in this section Mr. Holmes deals with every attack that has been made on Caesar's veracity, and comes to the conclusion which naturally commends itself to unbiased readers of the Gallic war that Caesar had no adequate motive for misrepresenting in any important particular the events of his Gallic campaigns, and that in fact he did not misrepresent them. It is in this section that I think more compression was desirable; Maissiat, Sumpff, Eichheim and others seem to be scarcely worth the space devoted to the refutation of their peculiar views.

The next section of nearly eighty pages treats of the ethnology of Gaul. This is one of the most important parts of the work and can be adequately reviewed only by a professed ethnologist. If the results are somewhat nebulous the fault must lie with the inherent difficulty of the problem and must not be charged to any lack of patient investigation or critical sagacity on the part of the writer. The task is one that, as Mr. Holmes pathetically observes, requires 'such a combination of moral and mental qualities as is hardly to be found in any one man—enthusiasm, indefatigable zest for research, sagacity, judgment, common sense, perfect

clearness of head, lucidity in exposition'; and even if these qualities could be found combined in a single person, some of the ethnological problems would, he adds, still remain insoluble for want of evidence.

The third section is purely geographical and occupies over 180 pages. All the tribal and other local names occurring in the Gallic War are treated alphabetically, some of them at great length. It may suffice to state that Mr. Holmes provisionally identifies the Aduatucorum oppidum with M. Falhize, he discusses fully the site of Alesia and concludes with the statement that 'no sane man who has studied the subject will ever again deny that Alesia stood upon the plateau of M. Auxois,' he identifies Bibracte with Beuvray, Cenabum with Orléans, Gorgobina doubtfully with S. Parize-le-Châtel, Portus Itius with Wissant, Uxellodunum with Puy d'Issolu. I merely add that though I find it hard to abandon my former view that Boulogne is Portus Itius I fully admit the strength of the arguments that Mr. Holmes adduces in favour of Wissant.

Section IV (pp. 515-547) deals with matters 'social, political, and religious,' and contains much that is of interest. I may refer particularly to the articles on the Druids and on the supposed democratic aspirations of the Gauls.

Section V (pp. 548-562) relates to various matters suggested by the introductory narrative of Chapter I, the most important being the chronology of the Celtic invasion of Italy, and the history of the Cimbri and Teutoni. Mr. Holmes agrees with Professor Rhys that the word Cimbri has nothing to do with Cymry, and with respect to their nationality he accepts with the necessary limitations the orthodox view that the Cimbri were a Teutonic race. He discusses the date of Caesar's birth and agrees with most modern scholars in assigning it to the year 102.

Section VI (pp. 563-606) is military. The most important articles in this section are those on that thorny subject the position and advancement of the centurions, on the agger, and on Caesar's order of battle. The first of these contains an exhaustive criticism, marked by Mr. Holmes' usual acuteness and common sense, of the different views that have been proposed. He accepts with some hesitation the theory of Rüstow, the main features of which are that there were ten classes of centurions and that the *primi ordines* were the six centurions of the first cohort. Mr. Holmes also holds the reason-

able view which has the support of Mommsen that a centurion had not in practice, whatever the theory may have been, to pass through every grade in the list of centurions before reaching the highest place. I have only space to refer the reader to his discussion of Caesar's order of battle and of the construction of the agger, both points of much interest.

The next section is the last and the longest occupying 216 pages. It contains a number of articles—about 80—discussing various points relating to the narrative of Caesar's campaigns. This section by itself would almost furnish matter for a commentary on the Gallic war. I may briefly refer to the article on Caesar's bridge over the Rhine as this subject has given rise to an endless controversy in which I have taken a slight part. Mr. Holmes' criticisms are acute, as always, but he fails to arrive at any certain conclusion on many of the points involved. He thinks that downstream 'there were two *sublicae* to each couple of piles, both sloping forward and at the same time obliquely against the stream, —one from right to left, the other from left to right,' and with regard to the arrangement upstream, he is inclined to agree with Napoleon that piles were driven in vertically in a triangular form. It seems to me that Mr. Holmes is very probably right about the lower *sublicae*, but that the V-shaped arrangement of the upper *sublicae* is not borne out by Caesar's language, as I have remarked elsewhere (*Class. Rev.* xiii. 462). I notice that in referring to my remark in my edition of Book iv. that I did not understand what meaning Long attached to the word *aries* Mr. Holmes says that if I had read Schneider's note I should have known what Long meant. I can only say that the words *pro ariete subiectae* undoubtedly denote some kind of prop or buttress, and in Long's diagram there is no prop or buttress of any kind whatever. Schneider's note is quite beside the mark. To say that a triangular arrangement of piles driven into a river has any resemblance in form or action to an *aries* is to my mind absurd.

In the chapter on Caesar's campaign against the Helvetii Mr. Holmes discusses at unnecessary length the phrase *latus apertum*. It is quite certain that *latus apertum* was a recognised phrase for the right flank because the shield was worn on the left arm, but it is equally clear that the phrase might be used in a more general sense of either flank which from the

configuration of the ground or other obvious cause was exposed to attack. At Pharsalus Caesar's right flank was *apertum* from both points of view. In his comments on the particular meaning of the words in B.G. i. 25 I fear that, owing possibly to dulness of perception, I fail to see what distinction Mr. Holmes proposes to draw between the MS. reading *latere aperto* and the conjectural reading *ab latere aperto* (see pp. 617 and 619). To me they both mean exactly the same thing, just as *dextra* and *ab dextra* can be used indiscriminately. Whether the *latus* in this particular case was the right or left flank is a different matter which I do not propose to discuss.

I observe that in two quotations Mr. Holmes has adopted a wrong reading, B.G. vi. 38 (p. 582 line 15) *ad* for *apud*, and B.G. iv. 17 (p. 701 line 16) *certius* for *artius*; in his translation of the latter passage for 'clearly' read 'closely.' On p. 712 I regret to see that he tries to defend the corrupt

reading *erant et virtute et numero pugnando pares nostri* (B.G. v. 34). Most MSS. have *pugnandi* and some editors propose *studio* for *numero*; I suggest that Caesar wrote *et virtute et numero et studio pugnandi* and that the words *et studio* were omitted by accident at an early stage of the MS. tradition.

In concluding this brief and inadequate notice of Mr. Holmes' work I must again express the great admiration that I have for the service that he has rendered to all students of Caesar. His grasp of the whole subject is extraordinarily comprehensive; he has a considerable knowledge of military science and military history; he displays a singular power of acute and penetrating criticism and a strong faculty of common sense, while the lucidity and vigour of his style lend a charm even to the least interesting portions of his subject.

A. G. PESKETT.

CORPUS POETARUM LATINORUM, FASC. III.

Corpus poetarum Latinorum a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et breui lectionum uarietate instructorum edidit IOHANNES PERCIVAL POSTGATE. fasc. III. pp. xi, 195. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1900. 9s.

In this third instalment of the new *Corpus Poetarum* there are seven poets with an editor apiece: Grattius revised by Dr Postgate, Manilius by Mr Bechert, Phaedrus by Dr Gow, the *Aetna* by Prof. Ellis, Persius by Mr W. C. Summers, Lucan by Mr Heitland, and Valerius Flaccus by Prof. J. B. Bury. These tasks are as various in difficulty as in length. The MSS of Persius and Lucan may almost be called good; Grattius is mutilated, but otherwise his plight is none of the worst; Manilius' corruptions are multitudinous but not profound; Valerius has nearly as many, and they are very much deeper; in Phaedrus the scribes have behaved as they always did behave when they had the popular iambic given them to copy; and in the *Aetna* they have proved that it is possible to copy hexameters as disgracefully as any one ever copied iambics.

In a few places where the text of Grattius is generally altered Dr Postgate adheres to it, sometimes well, 123 and 231 *neu*, some-

times ill, 390 *amaram*; but he oftener alters it where others retain it. Among these changes the punctuation of 100 (*stat fama*) is good so far as it goes, but not sufficient; the stop at the end of 99 must be abolished to let *dic* govern the accusative *Arcadium* . . . *senem* . . . *Dercylon*. The conjecture *stent* for *sic* at 421 would be very probable if Mr H. Schenkl's *duc* were not more probable still. Some of the rest, e.g. 400 *falso*, are neither necessary nor desirable; and others I do not clearly understand. At 291-5 the note says 'interpunximus,' but the punctuation differs in no essential particular from Wernsdorf's: the punctuation of 530-2 on the other hand is new to me, except that I had hit on it myself, but is not assigned to any author. Mr Ellis contributes one good emendation, 304 *fetus*. Several deleterious changes are adopted from Bæhrens and others: I take the first, which lies across the threshold of the poem: '*prius omnis in armis | spes fuit, et nuda siluas uirtute mouebant | inconsulti homines*' is altered to *inermis*, Barth's conjecture, which Barth himself withdrew. Primitive men, before Diana taught them *artes*, put all their trust in weapons, *omnis in armis spes*, and roused the woods with prowess unhelped by skill, *nuda uirtute*; '*manuum mira freti*