cited not *TLL* 9.2.635.45–9, adverbs of measure used with *onero* 'a partire da Agostino' (or rather Columella 4.21.2), all of them *ad quid*, but 8.71.4–17, *maxime* used 'ubi adi. poni poterat'. At p. 55, in context 7.4 = 241.21 *memorat rem gestam*, despite resembling the second half of a Saturnian, has rather a forensic than a military ring; cf. Cic. *II Verr.* 1.88 *Milesiisque rem gestam renuntiarat*. Nevertheless, one can but wish that P. will go on to produce a full edition of Fronto, making use of technological advances such as the multispectral imaging that has revolutionized the study of Herculaneum papyri.

Oxford LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni301

VEGETIUS

M. D. Reeve (ed.): *Vegetius:* Epitoma rei militaris. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Pp. lx + 180. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-926464-3.

First, a warning. I had asked Professor Reeve's advice while investigating Vegetius' prose rhythm and had answered his queries on Thesaurus material. Since he also kindly sent me a copy of the book, I am ill placed to criticize it objectively; but it is clear enough that this edition of the *Epitoma* is greatly superior to its predecessors.

The main advance is in our knowledge of the manuscript tradition. There are more than two hundred witnesses, investigated, with a remarkable variety of approaches, in two earlier articles, 'Editorial Opportunities and Obligations', *RFIC* 123 (1995), 479–99 and 'The Transmission of Vegetius's *Epitoma rei militaris*', *Aevum* 74 (2000), 243–354. R. has three families, ϵ (ruthlessly weeded), δ (clarified by discounting contaminated witnesses and rightly dissociated from ϵ), and β (once represented by a single manuscript, now by two). A clearer picture of δ also shows that it ended at 4.39.1. Fortunately its place is taken by ϕ, the descendant of a δ manuscript, which supplied the missing ending from yet another source. For the main part of the text agreement of any two families against the third almost always gives the better reading. Each family occasionally preserves the truth when the others agree in error, ϵ most often, β very rarely. Doubtless there was manuscript conjecture and coincidental error; but there will also have been variants in the archetype. For instance, at 2 cap. 13 *de centuriis atque vexillis peditum,* preconsonantal *atque* usually serves rhythm; is it chance that ϵ omits *peditum* to give Vegetius' favourite clausula? But the same heading at 2.13 tit. has *peditum* in all families. Perhaps, then, *peditum* was an addition to the archetype in both places. At 3.12.1 one might even speculate about authorial variants: *explora* of $\epsilon\beta$ fits the patch of second person instruction in this part of Book 3, rare elsewhere (see D. Schenk, *Flavius Vegetius Renatus, Die Quellen der* Epitoma Rei Militaris [Leipzig, 1930], pp. 59–61); δ's equally Vegetian *convenit explorare* might be an attempt to remove a potentially tactless imperative (admittedly others remain).

R. sees traces of authorial revision in two places where the manuscripts agree. The last sentence of the summary that prefaces the whole work is strangely isolated. Editors have deleted or transposed it to the beginning of 1.1, where it connects well with the following sentence, badly with the one before. R. sees the summary as a consequence of the amalgamation of the separately published first book into a larger work, with the final sentence intended as a link to the specific themes of Book 1. The whole summary is then out of place. Transposition to the end of 1 prol. is possible;

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but Book 1's theme begins at 1 prol. 5. Perhaps it never found its proper place. At 2.15 Meineke suggested transposing Sections 8–9 to follow Section 5 and deleting from the beginning of 2.15.6 *prima acies principum, secunda hastatorum armis talibus docetur instructa*; R. follows, remarking 'secundas . . . Vegetii curas hic Meineke pro prioribus'. Milner's simple transposition is another possibility; but R.'s view gives an explanation for the displacement.

The introduction, in English, discusses not only textual questions but also such matters as author and addressee. There are some new arguments here; but the discussion of the tradition is more descriptive. Arguments for many claims must be sought in the earlier articles. The introduction also handles larger textual questions, such as the articulation of the text (the discussion of the chapter headings is particularly important) and the character of the archetype. R. thinks it need be no later than a copy put into circulation by Vegetius. This does not mean that there is no place for conjecture; but certainly where the archetype's reading is certain, corruptions are neither many nor deep.

The text's presentation is uncluttered and readable, with light punctuation, helpful paragraphs, few critical signs. The only misprint I noticed was 4.8.4 *machinamanta*. Thankfully Önnerfors's section numbers are retained, with a few minor alterations (the index s.v. *exspargere* has not kept up, with 3.18.15 for 3.19.1). Tidiness has costs: conjectural additions like *nota* at 3.12.7 appear without brackets; the deleted first draft at 2.15.6 (see above) is removed to the apparatus rather than bracketed within the text.

The apparatus is clear and informative, positive when reporting the families, negative when reporting isolated readings of single manuscripts. Although simplified and selective, it seems to deliver more useful information than Önnerfors, even on spelling and morphology, in which it is complemented by an index. The level of reporting is very consistent; but one point might mislead. Some forms are regularized according to the general picture of Vegetius' usage given by rhythm or manuscripts; but sometimes variants are reported, e.g. 2.20.4 'nil β: nihil $\epsilon\delta$', while the favoured form is elsewhere printed conjecturally without warning, e.g. 4.9.1 *nil* (consistency requires 'nihil $\epsilon\delta\beta$'). For accuracy I compared selected conflicts of reporting with Önnerfors for the ϵ manuscripts B(ern Burgerbibliothek 280) and M(unich clm 6368): Önnerfors was correct twice (3.8.14 *repellet* ϵ, 3.20.15 *passos* ϵ), R. eleven times (2.3.3 *demittit* B, 2.5.5 *porro manere* ϵ, 3.8.12 *igitur* M, 3.10.18 *firmata* ϵ, 3.15.4 *passus* om. ϵ, 3.20.19 *defundetur* B, 3.20.22 *verum* B, 3.20.27 *strenuissimis* ϵ, 4.9.2 *ad* ϵ, 4.14.2 *de* ϵ, 4.17.7 *aspiciant* ϵ). R.'s silence at 3.20.15 is probably deliberate; he warns us on pp. xl–xli that he suppresses worthless variants in ϵ. This certainly gives a clearer apparatus, although a fuller reporting of ϵ's implausible variants might have helped us in judging its plausible variants. We cannot rely on Önnerfors for this: for instance, neither editor reports the ϵ variants 1.1.5 *prudentiamque*, 2.4.5 *exercitos*, 2.15.1 *corno*. Some guidance is offered on textual questions, occasional parallels and frequent references to a third article, 'Notes on Vegetius', *PCPS* 44 (1988), 182–218. For some reason discussions in 'Editorial Opportunities' are rarely mentioned (e.g. p. 494 on 3.6.14, pp. 496–7 on 3.19 tit.).

The text differs from and generally improves on Önnerfors in nearly 200 places (more if you count spelling and morphology). Much hardly affects the sense; but note, for instance, 3.15.5 *volueris aciem tenuare*, 4.8.5 *equosque deterere*, 4.9.5 *cataractas tegendas*, 4.41.4 *nive*. On several decisions there is still room for debate—a few are discussed below; but major advances are now unlikely (some points might become

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni302 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clearer with a satisfactory edition of the *Mulomedicina*). This is, then, likely to remain the standard edition for some time. All we need now is a Loeb.

Some points of detail. **1.5.4** *non tam staturae rationem convenit habere quam virium. et ipso Homero teste non fallimur* (*fallitur* $\epsilon\beta$). Is δ's *fallimur* not a conjecture? It would be better if e. g. *monemus* had come before. The unsatisfactory *fallitur* might be authorial error, as though the previous sentence had contained *dux peritus eligit* (β adds *hoc quisquis effecerit* before *et*); someone (surely Vegetius?) who had forgotten the construction of the previous sentence also added literary adornment at 3.21.6. **3.18.14** R. rejects the transposition of the chapter division to before *tamen ars belli* (better before 3.19.2 *cavendum*), explaining the ungrammatical text that follows the title as an anacolouthon; but that leaves a chapter whose first paragraph is irrelevant to its heading. Once the chapter headings had been entered in the text, misplacement could hardly occur; but between writing them for the table of contents and creating the fair copy, it would be easy enough. A scribe (or Vegetius) might have been confused by the apparent suitability of *superventibus* to the chapter description. Similarly the heading to Chapter 4.46, which would begin better at 4.45.4, is placed before a sentence in which *alto et libero mari* might have seemed appropriate to *aperto marte* of the title. **4.1.2** 'tutissimo *melius abesset*'. Perhaps *tutissima*. **4.38.12** *Aparcias* rightly defended. Add that ἀπαρκίας is known to *LSJ* and that the spelling is transmitted for other Latin writers.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae NIGEL HOLMES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni302

AGAINST THE ACADEMICS

K. SCHLAPBACH: *Augustin:* Contra Academicos *vel* De Academicis. *Buch 1. Einleitung und Kommentar.* (Patristische Texte und Studien 58.) Pp. viii + 254. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. Cased, €74. ISBN: 3-11-017811-7.

This reviewer's concern that, because Therese Fuhrer's outstanding 1997 commentary on Books 2 and 3 of Augustine's first extant work, the *Contra Academicos*, did not embrace Book 1, no other commentary on the latter might be attempted for some time (*CR* 49 [1999], 82), has been allayed by S.'s book, which originated as a Zurich doctoral dissertation in 2001, under Fuhrer's supervision. S.'s work appears in the same series as, and follows the format of, Fuhrer's commentary, using, but not including, W. M. Green's 1970 critical edition in the Corpus Christianorum series (a list of corrigenda of that edition, and of S.'s deviations from it, is provided on pp. 219–20), and providing a detailed exegesis of Augustine's text. S.'s twenty-five-page introduction sensibly does not deal with several of the general issues (historicity, date, title, textual tradition: see further p. 3 n. 8) discussed by Fuhrer.

Book 1 of *Contra Academicos*, as S. admits (p. 1), is held in low esteem by most modern critics, who find its arguments naive and tedious, and prefer to concentrate on Augustine's confrontation of Academic scepticism in Books 2 and 3. Against this entrenched position, S. contends persuasively that the value of Book 1, whose chief interlocutors are Augustine's two students, Licentius and Trygetius, lies in its propaedutic rôle: it is an introductory exercise in philosophical method, especially in

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni302 Published online by Cambridge University Press