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](#)

Livy, Book XXII *Livy, Book XXII*. Mabcus S. Dimsdale, M. A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. 2s. 6d

W. T. Lendrum

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 08 / October 1889, pp 360 - 362

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195708, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195708

How to cite this article:

W. T. Lendrum (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 360-362 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195708

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

proofs offered for the Divine Existence really prove something else; that which Cleanthes adduced from the benefits bestowed on men should come under the head of Providence; those of Chrysippus, from the perfection of the universe, the orderly movements of the heavenly bodies &c., should come under the head of the Divine Nature.' Cicero in his haste spoke of deferring all to the 3rd section but, without observing it, has followed his authority as regards Chrysippus and treated of him in the 2nd section. In §§ 39-64 Cicero deals with the mythological argument which is divided into two parts. The 1st, contained in §§ 39-41, 43-52, 61-64, is an extension by Cicero himself, perhaps with the help of some antiquarian treatise, of the sorites which Carneades used to dethrone the divinities of the Pantheon. In this we find frequent reference to the Second Book. The other part, contained in §§ 42, 53-60, treats

of the inconsistency of the traditions, and the consequent multiplication of homonymous deities. Dr. Reinhardt approves of the re-arrangement of the chapters in my edition and agrees that this latter part is to be traced to an Alexandrian source or sources. He considers that it has no relation to the Second Book, and has really nothing to do with the question in debate. I think he is perhaps too summary in denying any philosophical value to this section. The general proposition, that the popular belief in matters of religion is self-contradictory, might fairly be used and probably was used by Clitomachus against the Stoics, when they professed to defend the popular belief: but perhaps Dr. Reinhardt is right in holding that it would be unjust to Clitomachus to suppose that he could have burdened his treatise with all the examples cited by Cicero.

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

LIVY, BOOK XXII.

Livy, Book XXII. MARCUS S. DIMSDALE, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. 2s. 6d.

THIS book consists of some 230 pages, of which 72 contain the text: the remaining 158 pages are devoted to (i.) Introduction I.: on sources of Livy's narrative (pp. vii.-xii.): (ii.) Introduction II.: on the style and grammar of Livy (pp. xii.-xvi.): (iii.) 132 pages of notes: (iv.) four appendices on historical or geographical points.

Introd. I. contains little that is new, except indeed the statement that Tacitus was born in '54 B.C.' (p. xii.).

Introd. II. is mainly taken up with an adaptation of some of Madvig's remarks upon certain peculiarities of Livy's periodic structure—his tendency to throw the logical apodosis into the form of a dependent clause, usually with *quom*, and to conclude the period with an apodosis that does not logically follow its grammatical protasis. *E.g.* i. 7, 5: 'quom eum . . . sopor oppressisset . . . Cacus . . . *quom avertere eam praedam vellet . . . aversos boves traxit.*' When it is said that 'in this book there is no good instance of such a sentence' (p. xiii.) the editor has overlooked 20, 8, 9: 'ubi frustra teri tempus animadversum est . . . *quom in naves se recepissent . . . legati venerunt,*' and quotes

instead 13, 3, and 18, 8, in neither of which does his view appear to be correct. In the former passage—'hi nuntiantes . . . Capuae potiendae copiam fore, quom res maior quam auctores esset, dubium Hannibalem . . . tamen . . . movere ut'—the 'quom' needs not be 'causal' at all, but, as the 'tamen' following suggests, adversative, and the period may be perfectly regular; and in the latter (too long for quotation) the note on '*agens cum magistro equitum . . . est profectus,*' 'the present participle does not go well with *profectus est*' suggests a want of familiarity with the silver-Latin use of pres. part. in an aoristic sense, *e.g.* Sall. *Jug.* 113: 'diu volvens, tandem promisit' (cf. Dräg. ad Tac. *Ann.* 35: 'prae-monente Narcisso, verba fecit'). In this connection we may note a similar want of appreciation of Livy's use of pf. part. for aor. (cf. Dräg. *Einleit.* § 110) in 41, 2: 'ad mille . . . caesi, non plus centum Romanorum . . . occisis,' where Mr. Dimsdale, in spite of Müller's 'während . . . würden,' has nothing to say.

We now reach the notes. These may be described in the main as an expansion of Weissenborn, sometimes indeed with a perverse omission of really important matter. Thus on 8, 6, Weissenborn writes: '*Consul,* dass nur dieser den Dictator ernennen könne, stand fest: s. 4, 31, 4, vgl. *Caes. B.C.* 2, 21.

Momm. *Str.* 2, 131, 145 ff.' 'That the praetor could not choose a dictator is certain,' echoes Mr. Dimsdale, omitting, however, the valuable references. On 11, 6, the note is simply *vetustate*, 'abl. of cause': but the peculiar character of this example certainly demands the addition of W.'s parallels: '4, 19, 6: 23, 3, 21: 53, 2: 23, 3, 10' (cf. a good note of Fausset's *ad C. Clu.* 35). Once again: 22, 18: 'acta per eundem ordinem, quo si . . . ageretur': Weissenborn's note is: 'quo si: n. quo acta forent si, s. 21, 2, 6: 24, 8, 18: u. o. Der ganze Satz soll das vollständige Gelingen der List in das rechte Licht stellen': where Mr. Dimsdale has: 'the fulness of expression is characteristic of the whole sentence, being intended to express the completeness of the success of the stratagem,' but he gives neither the explanation nor the illustration of the syntax.

Another provoking characteristic of this edition is the writer's habit of repeating himself. A few examples must suffice. On p. xvi. he writes: 'the gerundive is used in the sense of a present participle': on p. 85: 'the ablative of the gerund is often used by Livy and Tacitus with a meaning more nearly approaching that of a present participle than of an ablative of manner or means': on p. 111: 'the ablative of the gerund is often used by Livy with a sense approaching more nearly to that of the present participle than to that of an ablative of manner or means.' A note of four lines on *foret*, p. xv. is repeated almost verbally on p. 100. His remark on *alius*, p. 90, reappears on p. 104: that on *animos*, p. 138, l. 18, on p. 142, l. 2. The note on *satis* (p. 84) recurs four times, twice indeed in the same page (p. 137). So we have three explanations of *iustus* = 'regular,' of which two are within three lines of each other (p. 142).

We proceed to give a few miscellaneous comments on notes or the absence of notes. In 10 the scholar's instinct has not led Mr. Dimsdale to point out the interesting note of archaism, which sounds here so appropriately, in '*si nocte, sive luce*' (for the classical *sive . . . sive*), in complete accord with Plautine usage. In the same section he explains *lege* = 'modo': but is not 'lex' the regular formula for 'ritual' in archaic Latin? cf. *C.I.* 807: 'aara leege Albana dicata.' On *devias calles* (14, 8) he has the unnecessary comment: *devius* 'out of the way': but he does not notice, what Nonius has called attention to, the gender of *callis* in Livy. In chap. 1 he has no

thing to say on *nequiquam* in Livy (l. 2) nor in *nunc . . . nunc* (l. 2) for the classical 'modo . . . modo' (cf. Riemann, p. 213), nor on *postquam . . . videre* (l. 9), Wölfflin's conjecture ('nicht nöthig,' *Kuhn*, p. 212) for 'viderent.' On *petitusque* (l. 10) the note is 'que: and so': that is all: yet it is both easy and instructive to point out how 'que' bears this force (cf. Tac. *Ann.* xii. 9: 'despondeturque Octavia') which it shares with the 'inferential' τε in Greek (cp. *Class. ad Thuc.* i. 4: τό τε ληστικὸν ὡς εἰκὸς καθήκει). Similar is 'super cetera = praeter cetera' (p. 93). What is the use of this? Does *super* properly = 'praeter'? Mr. Dimsdale is silent. Turn to page 11: a young student might well look for a note on 'eam diem' (l. 9), on 'perpopulato agro' (l. 14) compared with 'depopulatur agrum' (13, 1), on the almost articular '*unius coloniae*' (l. 18) compared with 'id unum pignus . . . omnium etc.' (22, 5): but he will look in vain. Again on p. 29 he will get no help on the agreement of *bina* (l. 4) in 'bina et selibras,' nor on the construction of 'ducentis . . . plures' (l. 5), nor on Livy's use of the plqpf. 'posita fuerant' (l. 18), which, though 'quite correct' here, is not correct in 13, 1, 'dimissi fuerant' (cf. Riem. p. 167-171).

P. 92 (6, 4): *infesto veniente* 'we should say "his charge." We should rather say 'charging with drawn sword.' *Venire* is a 'vox bellica,' as in Lucretius' sounding line 'ad confligendum venientibus undique Poenis' (iii. 83), referring perhaps to this very battle, and it is well suited to the tone of Livy's splendid description of 'nobilis ad Trasumennum pugna.' In any case Mr. Dimsdale, after Riemann's elaborate discussion of 'this adverbial use of the adjective' might find something better to say than that 'it is commoner in poetry,' R. p. 83, following Nägelsbach, draws an interesting distinction between e.g. 'maestam sedentem' and 'serus redeas.'

P. 105. 'Similis with the dat. implies similarity of appearance, with the gen. similarity of nature.' How does Mr. Dimsdale explain Livy's innovation 'vero similis' for the classical 'veri'? Quite a little literature has grown up around the construction of 'similis.' Madvig's view (*Fin.* v. 5, 12) is summarized by Roby, 1317: but later critics (Seyffert-Müller, *Lael.* p. 488 and Reisig-Haase, 616-21) have modified his conclusions, and the results are thus stated by Schmalz: '*Similis* mit Genetiv steht da, wo die Aehnlichkeit eine allgemeine und umfassende, *similis* mit Dativ, wo sie nur bedingt ist, oder annäherungsweise statt-

findet,' and he contrasts 'patris similis' with C. *Ac.* 2, 118, 'huic in hoc similis,' where Mr. Reid notes the growing prevalence of the dat. in later Latin.

Two lines further on, 'in oculis, "before his eyes."' If it was worth while translating these words at all, they are worth translating correctly ('within his view') because Livy a little later (14, 3) says 'sub oculis' of the same thing.

P. 106 (12, 11), 'morae i.e. morae esse. Morae is a predicative dative.' This is almost certainly wrong. The passage runs 'qui nihil aliud, quam quod impar erat imperio, morae ad remp. praecipitandam habebat,' and it evidently means 'who was only prevented by his inferior position from, etc.' not, 'who regarded his inferior position as the only obstacle in the way of, etc.', which would be the meaning, if *morae* were dat. For, if there is any meaning in terms, the predicative dative can only go with *habere*, when that verb needs further predication, i.e. when it means 'to regard as . . .', not when it means 'to possess.' Hence *morae* here is probably gen., as Roby (p. xlviii.) suggests, comparing C. *Verr.* 4, 64: 'ut aliquid esse morae.'

P. 107. 'Capuae potiundae. "potior" with acc. — not in Cicero,' but cf. *Tusc.* 4, 66: 'in eis ipsis potiundis': so Caes. *B.G.* 2, 7, 2, 'spes oppidi potiundi.'

P. 132. 'erogaretur' "was voted from the treasury," which is exactly what it was not; hence the tense. Render: 'since there was some hesitation about getting the money voted.'

P. 134. 'admodum = circiter.' Wölfflin renders 'gerade,' 'volle.' In any case this non-classical use of the adverb should be noted.

P. 135. 'ablegatum, "despatched" in a military sense; not "banished." This would have been *relegatum*.' This is more than is meant by Müller (= weit entfernen, militärisch = abkommandieren. Stärker ist *relegare*), who has expanded Weissenborn's perhaps correcter note 'weit wegenden, 39, 13, 6.' *ablegare* is regularly used as a stronger *removere*, 'nur in böser Absicht' (Krebs), and its military sense (Wölfflin) is questionable. In any case Livy would not have hesitated to use it of exile, inasmuch as it was he who set the example of this late-Latin use: cf. 27, 9, 3: 'extra Italiam in exilium ablegare.'

P. 136. 'in actione minime popularis: in actione = in agendo: "as he was not at all popular as a speaker."' This is quite wrong. It is of itself improbable that Fabius, who

was dictator, five times consul, and princeps senatus, was deficient in oratorical powers, even if Livy had not given us several specimens of his eloquence. What Livy says is: dictator contionibus se abstinuit, 'since he would have been unpopular in supporting his policy before them,' and so he continues, ne in senatu quidem aequis auribus audiebatur. Müller's note (in actione = agendo: 'als Volksredner'), though correct as his paraphrase 'wenn, etc.' shows, is less clear than Weissenborn's original comment: 'in actione: hypothetisch: da er, wenn, etc.'

The list of inaccuracies has been by no means exhausted, but we have no space for more. Just half the book has been as yet considered, and no opinion is passed upon the last sixty pages of the commentary, the four appendices, or the index. We merely add, that so far as we have gone, Mr. Dimsdale pays little or no attention to the criticism of his author. Accepting Müller's text without a murmur, he follows him even in such tasteless and unnecessary corrections as Rupert's 'ad gemitus vulneratorum' (5, 4) for P.'s 'vulnerum,' which might be held to suit the tone of a highly-strung passage: Fügner (*Liv.* xxi.-iii., p. 9) well supports Dräger's view that 'vulnerum' is objective, like the 'ictus corporum' which follows it, by quoting V. *Aen.* 2, 704: 'lacrimas dilectae Creusae.' Moreover, while Müller marks every emendation either by italics or an asterisk referring to a very full 'Anhang,' our editor, who has nothing of the nature of an *apparatus criticus*, constantly allows his readers to pass over unsound ground without a warning: cf. 19, 11: 'turbati, temptata pugna,' where P. has 'turbati et temptata.' This incorrect use of the conjunction, so common in Tacitus (*An.* xii. 13: 'levitate et quia') and Thucydides (vii. 73, 4: ἀναπαυμένους τε καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς οὐχίας) occurs several times in this book, but Mr. Dimsdale cares for none of these things.

We are sorry not to speak more favourably of the work of a scholar of ability, but the book appears to us to be a mistake from the beginning, because there is already a superfluity of school editions of this particular book of Livy, and the only excuse for another would be that it marked a real and decided advance beyond them, such as would require a serious and long-continued study of the author. It will be seen that we do not find this in the work before us.

W. T. LENDRUM.