imperfect understanding of the subject and sources often misapprehended. In the resulting perplexities the essential postulate of criticism, that the original text will have made good sense, falls to the ground.

A comparison of Book 2 in this edition (59 pp.) with J. Martha's of 1928, leaving aside spelling and a few inadvertances, shows me sixteen divergences, mostly insignificant. But on 42.0 with Martha I prefer Davis's conjecture *qui* to *quam*, and on 90.27 would with R. keep *indulgenter* ('lovingly'), which Martha obelized because he did not understand it. On 45.5–6 R. secludes a citation from Terence, as advocated by P. G. McC. Brown in 1997.

I have noticed four misprints: 7.8, 38.40, 41.8, 45.13. Only the third (*et* for *est*) does any harm.

The apparatus criticus is once again exemplary: technically flawless, lucid, economical, carefully researched, judiciously selective, but reasonably hospitable. Very seldom can I find anything to cavil at, but there should be something to account for the quotation marks on 44.16–18 (actually owed to Muretus). The note on *ne* (69.11), '*fort*. <ut> ne, *ut monuit Wesenberg*', might surely have been spared: see *OLD ne* 12, adding Prop. 3.11.24, Ov. *AA* 1.428. In common with others, R. obelizes *Chius Postumius* (a pleasure-seeker) on 71.25, referring, however, to *RE* sv. Postumius (53), where Münzer offers an explanation of the cognomen and an identification. Both are speculative, but neither that nor the corruptions in certain manuscripts justifies rejection of the name, which has good manuscript authority and is perfectly admissable.

An *index nominum* and an *index locorum* (i.e. passages cited by Cicero, listed under their authors) conclude.

Despite its stylistic merits, *De Finibus* is an arduous and sometimes frustrating read. R. generally suffers in silence, but once (p. 159) lets exasperation show: 'in iis quae sequuntur videtur Cicero rem mirum in modum implicuisse'. But the attractive format of this edition, especially the free use of paragraphs, appreciably helps.

Ann Arbor, MI D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

MOPPING UP OPERATIONS

A. Bouvet, J.-C. Richard (edd., trans.): *Pseudo-César,* Guerre d'Afrique (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxv + 143, map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. Cased, frs. 295. ISBN: 2-251-01399-7.

N. Diouron (ed., trans.): *Pseudo-César,* Guerre d'Espagne (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cix + 196, maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01413-6.

Bouvet's Budé edition of the *Bellum Africum* appeared in 1949 to favourable reviews, including one by C. O. Brink in this journal (N.S. 1 (1951), 183–5). Now Richard has undertaken the somewhat awkward task of revising it, with the constraint (p. v) 'Notre tâche était donc limité'. Misprints have been corrected and there are twelve pages of 'complément bibliographique', while the text itself is virtually unchanged,

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.49 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the exception of the adoption of two emendations of Timpanaro and one of Sblendorio Cugusi. While reviewers' proposals have generally been adopted, it is a pity that R. did not listen to Brink's suggestion that the work of E. Löfstedt should be taken into account. R. has unfortunately missed some vital studies, most notably: W. Hering, *Die Recensio der Caesarhandschriften* (Berlin, 1963); V. Brown, *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's Civil War* (Leiden, 1973); B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles*, Vol. I (Paris, 1982), pp. 35–51; M. Winterbottom in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), pp. 35–6. Nor does it give one much confidence to find that the first four principal manuscripts described are still wrongly dated, and that two Dresden manuscripts have shelf-marks now long out of date. But then, how can one so complain when Oxford is still selling the century-old edition of Du Pontet?

By contrast, Diouron's edition of the *Bellum Hispaniense* is a completely fresh undertaking. It has a gratifyingly extensive introduction, divided into five sections: *Le Corpus Césarien*; *La Guerre d'Espagne*; *Aspect historique*; *La langue et le style*; and *Les manuscrits*. After the text and facing translation, there are extensive notes (pp. 41–158), concluding with an *index nominum*, an *index rerum*, a *tableau chronologique*, and four maps. To one (like this reviewer) not closely conversant with the minutiae of Spanish topography and the general characteristics of the inhabitants, or with the details of Caesar's campaign, all of this adds up to a highly useful and commendably thorough piece of work on D.'s part.

The constitution of the text itself, as has long been known, presents many challenges. The Latinity is often bewildering, often just tedious, and the reader is not likely to be impressed by two ostentatious references to Ennius (23.3 = Skutsch 480; 31.7 = Skutsch 584) or one to *Achillis Memnonisque congressus* (25.4). As a result it is never easy to decide what the author might have written. To her credit, D. (unlike Richard) has read the works of Hering and Brown on the manuscripts, but even she is totally unaware of the magisterial description of the manuscripts in Munk Olsen. This latter would have saved her from mis-dating four of the seven principal manuscripts: S is saec. X^m^ (not X–XI); N is saec. XI–XII (not XI); M is saec. X–XI (not XI–XII); and T is saec. XII^ex^ (not XI). In addition, D. seems not to have noticed the fascinating discovery made by Virginia Brown (pp. 78–81): a twelfth-century manuscript in Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B.451 (Munk Olsen p. 46, item [C.23]), containing almost the complete *corpus Caesarianum*, including the *Bell. Hisp*. (fols 165^r^–170^v^) as far as 37.3 *quarto die*. As it is a copy of M (Florence, Biblioteca Laurentiana 68.8), which ends with 22.5 *petiit*, this means that an editor should use it as an important witness from 22.5 to 37.3.

Despite the advantage of much previous work done on the interrelationships of the main manuscripts, the text given by D. offers few surprises. There appear to be only two readings of the editor's own. The first is 16.2 *secumque extulerunt culcitas ad fossas explendas* [the manuscripts read *culcatas* or *cultatas* or *calcatas*], with the mysterious note in the apparatus criticus: 'culcitas *ego* praeeunte Jal'. A footnote explains 'nous préferons adopter la suggestion de P. Jal', apparently meaning that Jal (who went over the text for Budé) made the suggestion to her personally. If so, the apparatus criticus should read simply 'culcitas *Jal*'. The emendation may seem quite odd at first sight, and it is not at all supported by the parallels D. adduces, with the remark 'ce terme . . . n'est pas usité dans un contexte militaire'. But there is a striking confirmation in a passage of Vegetius not noticed by her, *Epit. rei milit.* 4.23, where the author mentions the usefulness of *culcitae* [mattresses] in blunting the effectiveness of battering rams: *Aduersum arietes etiam uel falces sunt plura remedia. Aliquanti centones*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.49 Published online by Cambridge University Press

et culcitas funibus chalant et illis obponunt locis, qua caedit aries, ut impetus machinae materia molliore fractus non destruat murum. The only other emendation is 25.6 *quorum pugna <non> esset profecto dirempta*, where the whole passage is so lacunose that it is hard even to guess at what might or might not have been written. (Klotz's *quorum <certamine> pugna* can hardly be as lightly dismissed as D. imagines.)

The finest writing in the whole work comes at the very end, where Caesar goes to Seville and berates the locals for their ingratitude and perfidy in a speech which still chills the blood. Clearly someone (the author himself possibly) was present and took careful notes. With such an elegant savagery, it is very hard to imagine that the great prose stylist could possibly have said what D. attributes to him (42.4): *Vos iure gentium et ciuiumque Romanorum institutis cognitis*. We should surely read either *gentium et ciuium* (with NV) or *gentium ciuiumque*. The speech breaks off with *Quarum laudibus et uirtute*, the last words transmitted by the surviving manuscripts. In the apparatus criticus D. observes *non nimis multa deesse uidentur.* No explanation is given for what seems to me to be a highly dubious assertion.

Overall this should prove a most useful edition of the *Bell. Hisp.*, even though there is clearly still much work to be done on the text itself. The book is attractively laid out, without the usual annoyance of modern Budé editions, where the notes are divided between the text-page and the back of the volume, while misprints are few—I noticed only 4.4 *propre* (*prope*); 8.4 *constitua* (*constituta*); 25.1 *eumdem* (presumably *eundem* is meant); 32.7 *lectitam* (*lecticam*); 38.3 *accesssus* (*accessus*).

Amherst College PETER K. MARSHALL

LOCALIZED LIVY

G. FORSYTHE: *Livy and Early Rome. A Study in Historical Method and Judgement*. Pp. 147. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-515-07495-3.

Readers of Livy will find here a regrettably atavistic publication from a scholar who has produced much better work (e.g. his commentary on Calpurnius Piso [Lanham, 1994] and his school edition of Livy 39 [in the Bryn Mawr series, 1994]). This monograph is focused on places in the first decade of Livy where L. in some way refers to or assesses his sources of information. Forsythe has an admirable aim: to move past Luce (*Livy. The Composition of His History* [Princeton, 1977]) and the primarily literary analyses indebted to Luce, to determine how to use L. as a source for early Rome. The result is disappointing.

F. first lays out his elaborate system of classifications: the places where L. discusses sources become 380 'records', sorted four different ways: by 'type', signifying three levels of complexity in the language characterizing the information given; by 'form', referring to outstanding verbal, semantic, or grammatical features; by 'method of resolution', meaning how L. decides what to believe about the information; and by 'subject matter', of which F. recognizes six possibilities. Each of these four areas has its own set of 'codes': for example, the 'type' of a passage can be S for simple, C for complex, or Cm for complex multiple, where 'simple' means the information is governed by a single word or phrase (e.g. 'ferunt', 'traditum est', 'satis constat'), 'complex' means that more than one of these occurs, and 'complex multiple' indicates multiple introductory or qualifying words (p. 14).

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.49 Published online by Cambridge University Press