

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](#)



Caesar's Army, by Henry P. Judson, University of Minnesota. Ginn & Co. Boston, 1888. 3s. 6d.

C. Oman

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 06 / June 1889, pp 274 - 275
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195265, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195265

How to cite this article:

C. Oman (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 274-275 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195265

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the received reading is vindicated. Finally we are to follow Wachsmuth in altering the punctuation, starting a fresh sentence at *ἴθεν τοῦ κατὰ*, and expunging the full stop after *διεληλύθαμεν*.

(viii) 27 B. *σὺν οὖν ἔργον λέγειν ἔν, ὃ Τίμαιε, εἴη τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐπικαλέσαντα κατὰ νόμον θεοῦς*. So Hermann. *ἐπικαλέσαντα* is the reading of A, which omits *εἴη*: the other MSS. give *καλέσαντα*, and some of them place *εἴη* just before, some just after *ὃ Τίμαιε*. Rawack makes out a good case for *λέγειν ἔν, ὃ Τίμαιε, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικεν, εἴη καλέσαντα*.

(ix) 40 C. Rawack's suggestions in this difficult sentence are as follows. (1) *Ἰν καὶ περὶ τὰς τῶν κύκλων πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐπανακυκλήσεις*, he applauds 'Dielesii egregiam coniecturam' πρὸς (adverbial) for περὶ. But surely the ambiguity and cacophony of this can hardly be endured. (2) *προσχωρήσεις* should be *προχωρήσεις*. (3) for *ὅποιοι τῶν θεῶν* read *ὅποιοι τῶν θεῶν*—a clear improvement. (4) The words *μεθ' οὐστινας...πέμπουσι* are 'explicanda magis quam emendanda.' Rawack takes *ἀλλήλοισ ἡμῖν τε* together.

(x) 33 A. *προσπίπτοντα ἀκαίρως λυέι*. For *λυέι* read *λυπέι*: but the argument is not convincing.

(xi) 33 D. Read *ξυντιθείς*, not *ξυνθείς*.

(xii) 41 E. *ὄργανα χρόνου* is rightly defended against *χρόνων*.

(xiii) 66 A. For *πάντα τοιαῦτα* read *πάντα ταῦτα* or *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα*.

(xiv) 70 D. *ὅσων ἔνδειαν* is maintained against Hermann's *ἴσον*.

(xv) 86 C. *κακῶς* is to be rejected before *δοξάζεται*. Next follows the appendix of 'testimonia,' pp. 40-81.

Herr Rawack makes effective use of his Proclus, and his criticism is sober and scholarly: some of his corrections will, if I mistake not, be adopted by future editors.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

The Republic of Plato: Book X. By B. D. TURNER, M.A. 4s. 6d.

THE tenth book of the *Republic* is a little unmeaning when taken by itself, and when Mr. Turner pleads as the justification for a separate edition of it the theory that it formed no part of the original scheme but was 'a pendent or supplement,' the answer is obvious that supplements are usually very incomplete without that which they supplement, though it may be tolerably complete without them. For a school-book the earlier parts of the *Republic* are certainly better, and if any one above the years of a schoolboy is beginning the study of Plato's philosophy it would hardly be worth his while to begin with the last book. Mr. Turner's notes, which deal mainly with the Greek, though other things are not neglected, seem to be fairly full and accurate. A good deal of attention is given to grammatical matters and they are usually treated with good knowledge and judgment. In the words *τὸ δὲ νῦν μοι περιὰ τοῦ εἰπέ* (604 A), where Mr. Turner justifies the use of *τό* as a demonstrative, he seems hardly to see the difficulties in the way of taking it so here, the chief of which is perhaps the fact that, when so used in Attic, it always (I think) points to something preceding, not following. Is there any example of such a use as this would be? When he remarks on *οὐδ' ἂν ἤξει* (615 D) that 'the future indicative with *ἂν* is a rare but undoubted usage in Attic Greek,' Mr. Turner can hardly mean by 'undoubted' more than that he thinks we ought not to doubt it, for he must be well aware that there have been and are great doubts on the subject. In his note on *καὶ τοῦτο προστήσασθαι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ βίου ὡς βέλτιστον ἔχοντα*

(599 A) he translates the verb by 'put this forward as the aim' and then explains it as '=sibi proponere,' which seems another thing. Surely the translation is the more correct of the two and the word means 'make it the profession of his life' in the strict sense of the word 'profession.' The statement on 599 C that 'εἰ when interrogative is followed by οὐ' seems too brief and unqualified a canon. He regards the obscure words in 615 C *τῶν δὲ εἰδῶς γενομένων καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον βιούτων* as probably right and does not mention the conjecture of Cobet, *ἀπο-γενομένων*, which had occurred to me independently. If it or anything like it were right, the two participles would of course refer to two distinct sets of children.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

Xenophon, Oeconomicus. H. A. HOLDEN. Fourth Edition. 1889. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN is to be heartily congratulated on the fact that his excellent and scholarly commentary on Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, which first appeared in 1884, has so soon reached its fourth edition—the best possible proof of its usefulness and merit as a school book. On the whole the editor has made but little change in the present edition: he has 'adopted one or two emendations in the text, and introduced a considerable number of corrections and additions in the notes and lexicon.' Most of these alterations however are relegated to an Addenda and Corrigenda of some thirteen pages, and for their suggestion Dr. Holden acknowledges himself chiefly indebted to two recent works on Xenophon, the one Dr. J. J. Hartmann's *Analecta Xenophontea*, the other a small edition of the *Oeconomicus* by M. A. Jacob, on both of which he bestows high praise. Dr. Holden's own work has now reached the somewhat unwieldy size of 440 pages of introduction, notes explanatory and critical, and lexicon compared with 84 pages of text. Surely therefore in a future edition we may look for very considerable compression in the notes, as the *Oeconomicus* is a dialogue which, however elegant and interesting as illustrative of Greek agricultural and social life, is after all somewhat limited in its scope.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

Caesar's Army, by HENRY P. JUDSON, University of Minnesota. Ginn & Co. Boston, 1888. 3s. 6d.

MR. JUDSON'S little book consists of 125 pages, of which 17 are occupied by maps. It is on the whole a useful piece of work, though not containing much original matter: but the straightforward way in which borrowings are acknowledged almost atones for their frequency.

Mr. Judson divides his book into three main heads, the organization, tactics, and equipment of the army of Caesar. His other sections, on Caesar's fleet and Caesar's enemies, are too short and sketchy to require notice.

The chapter on the organization of the Roman army in the last years of the Republic contains plenty of solid information, but passes over a great many disputed points without any allusion to their uncertainty. For example Mr. Judson simply says in regard to the numbering of the legions that "Roman legions were designated by numbers, probably according to priority in formation." This completely omits the two tiresome facts that on the one hand Caesar had legions (*e.g.* the *legio Martia*) which seem to have had no numbers, while on the other duplicate numbers appear, owing to each imperator taking account of his own troops only, *e.g.*

Antony and Octavian and Lepidus had each a *legio* I, II, and so forth.

So again, as to the effective strength of a Roman legion, Mr. Judson observes that "Rüstow estimates the average force of a legion throughout Caesar's campaigns at from 3,000 to 3,600 men. Göler puts it at 4,800, besides 300 *antesignani*. These estimates cannot be far from the truth." He seems to regard 3,000 and 5,100 as numbers so close together that they can be practically looked upon as one. As a matter of fact they represent two such different methods of reckoning, that choice must be made between them. No one ever supposed that a legion consisted of 10,000 or 2,000 men.

Another point in which Mr. Judson seems to go astray is his use of the phrase 'tactical unit.' He defines it very rightly as 'a body of troops by the combination of several of which a higher unit is formed.' But he then proceeds to use it not only for the component parts but for the ultimate whole. For example, he speaks of the Roman legion and the modern corps as 'tactical units,' whereas they are the highest organizations complete in themselves, and not divisions of any larger body.

Of the difficult question concerning the relative rank of the centurions in a legion we have a very fair statement in pages 10-12, but no definite conclusion is arrived at. For our own part we cannot help thinking that the difficulty merely rests on a loose use of the word *ordo*. We hear of centurions *primorum ordinum* who are almost certainly the *pili priores* of the ten cohorts. There being six centurions per cohort, we should have six 'ordines' of them. Yet an officer promoted for bravery is said to be raised *ab octavis ordinibus* to the command of the first cohort of the legion. These would seem to imply that there must have been eight *ordines*, but we think that the words must be taken to mean merely the eighth place in the legion, *i.e.* the position of *octavus pilus prior*. The natural order of promotion would have been from that rank to

septimus pilus prior, the first place in the seventh cohort, but Caesar sent up his *protégé* over the heads of six of his seniors.

The tactical chapters in Mr. Judson's book seem to give much less opportunity for criticism than those on organization. We should doubt his account of the British chariot tactics, which seem too complicated for practical use, nor is it quite fair to say that "the heavy infantry furnished by the allies (*auxilia*) in a Roman army were rather used to make a show of force, than for much important service in battle." But the general drift of the chapters is good, and we notice several apposite comparisons drawn from modern warfare, *e.g.* that of the average fight between a Roman cohort and a Gallic phalanx to the well-known struggle between the 7th Fusiliers, in line, and the two Kazan battalions, in column, at the battle of the Alma.

The maps at the end of the volume seem to be taken from Napoleon III.'s *Life of Julius Caesar*, and require no original criticism. The engravings of military subjects are, as is unavoidable, mainly drawn from works of art executed during the Empire, and cannot therefore be implicitly relied upon as showing the dress or armament of the Republican times.

C. OMAN.

Grammatik der Lateinische Sprache, Bearbeitet von Dr. H. SCHWEIZER-SIDLER, und Dr. ALFRED SURBER, Erster Theil. Halle, 1888. This little book (of only 215 pages) is a new recension of Schweizer-Sidler's *Latin Elementar und Formenlehre* published in 1869. The importance of the present volume is that its writers have entirely recast their theory of Latin morphology in accordance with the procedure of the new school of Comparative Philology. It is much to be hoped that some competent English or American scholar will either translate the book into English, or write an original work of the same character.

H. N.

NOTES.

PERSIUS III. 43.—Mr. Housman is known as a bold and skilful surgeon—not one to 'croon charms over wounds that need the knife.' But this is not a passage for trenchant handling. After quoting Conington, whose translation 'the ghastly inward paleness, which is a mystery, even to the wife of the bosom' is naturally open to an attack from the side of literal common sense, he says, 'I can imagine no worse nonsense than *inward paleness*. What is paleness? It is one among the outward symptoms of inward disorder, nowhere else in the frame of a living man. When a man is dissected then his inward parts may have this colour or that: till then they have none at all.' No doubt Mr. Housman is strictly within his rights to refuse all colour to a man's inward parts until he is dissected; but can he 'imagine no worse nonsense' than the 'lily-livered' of Shakespeare or the 'white-livered' of the common parlance? Are we to be allowed no *μεταφορά*—no transference of the outward sign to the inner seat of emotion? This transference of the external manifestations of a feeling to its internal origin is turned to good effect by Persius here. There is the outward sign of fear or guilty consciousness—the pallid face; but worse than that is the inward paleness which dares not betray itself by any outward manifestation. Confusions of

the literal and metaphorical are almost too common to need illustration. I have quoted on p. lxxii. of the Introduction to my *Selections from Propertius* several examples. One I may cite here, Ovid *E. P.* 2, 5, 38, 'sed sunt tua pectora lacte et non calcata candidiora niue.' Here Mr. Housman is bound by his own argument to take the reference to be to the outward fairness of the breast, not its inward fairness (or candour) of which alone Ovid is thinking. In spite of all strivings after an etymological explanation, *λευκαῖς πηθασαῖτα φρασίν*, Pind. *P.* 4, 109, I think still refers to Pelias' mind 'disordered' by the passions which bring pallor to the cheek. Mr. Housman and I are agreed about the construction, though I venture to doubt whether *I. 124, Eupolidem pallere*, 'to have Eupolis on the cheeks,' altogether justifies *ulcus pallere*: but emendation I think I have shown is not needed.

J. P. POSTGATE.

* * *

S. JAMES IV. 2.—*ἐπιθυμείτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε φρονεῖτε καὶ (ἡλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμείτε*. This is the reading and punctuation of Westcott and Hort, agreeing in essentials with Alford, Tischendorf and the more recent editors. The R. V.