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During his Gallic campaign, Julius Caesar was also engaged on a second front: in a controversy over the standardization of Latin, a process that disciplined a heterogeneous Italic dialect into the rule-bound Kunstsprache that continues to be taught today. Around 32 surviving fragments contribute to the reconstruction of C.’s De analogia, a treatise in two books composed inter tela volantia, as Fronto reports (Garcea’s T1), most likely in the spring of 54. Compared to his decisive Gallic victories, C.’s grammatical interventions seem more like inconclusive skirmishes in a continuous struggle that stretched back beyond Accius and forward to Priscian’s Institutio, to say nothing of Valla and later reformers. Many of C.’s proposals have not found widespread acceptance: for instance, turbonis (for -inis, F21), partum (for -ium, F23), buic dominatu (for -si, F24), and huius die (for -ei, F26). Far from being central to the grammatical tradition, C.’s work often survives through unfavorable citations, especially through Pliny the Elder’s Dubius sermo, which may be responsible for nearly half of what survives.¹

¹ Aristoteles in Fes. Zum Wert der arabischen Überlieferung der ’Nikomachischen Ethik’ für die Kritik des griechischen Textes, Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 49, Heidelberg 2012.

² Eight fragments (F8, F13–17, F21, F23) are explicitly attached to Pliny (quoted via Capcr or Julius Romanus), while G. plausibly identifies a further four (F10, F12, F22, F28) from the same source, to which one might another three (F18, F27, F33). In this respect, G.’s work provides an important supplement to Della Casa’s edition of the Dubius sermo (1969).
Nevertheless, C. ranked intellectual achievement over its military counterpart, or at least so he allegedly flattered Cicero, to whom he credited victories greater than any triumph (Plin. Nat. 7, 117): "quanto plus est ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promovisse quam imperii." The two genitives in -ii, if in fact C.'s own, may take a stand in these debates. The *duplex* for *i*-stem genitives was an analogical spelling defended by Varro (fr. 252 Fun.) that began to replace the older -i in the first century BCE. That readers may now take such controversial forms in stride attests to the lasting influence of grammatical discourse on the development of Latin. In a milieu where the «whole theater» might jeer a false quantity (Cic. De or. 3, 196), such linguistic choices mattered and may reflect broader cultural transformation.

Garcea has provided not just a commentary on C.'s fragments but a profoundly informed and reliable guide to the entire tradition of linguistic debate to which they contributed. This encompasses C.'s contemporaries, principally Cicero and Varro, as well as five centuries of later interlocutors, including Pliny the Elder, Julius Romanus, Charisius, Augustine, and Priscian. G.'s explication of fundamental grammatical concepts, such as *usus* and *natura* (32 n. 6, 185–96, 194–98), ratio and *consequentia* (15–16, 39–41, 100), the κανόνες ὀρθογραφίας (31–33), and ancient word classes (35–39), will make essential reading for anyone interested in ancient linguistic thought. G. also has much to offer cultural historians, for instance about ancient conceptions of the alphabet (133–40) and the phenomenon of ‘neo-Atticism’ (119–24), and linguists, for instance about the evolution of *i*-stem orthography (201–22) and the development of the fifth declension (232–33). Contributing much that is new, G. also synthesizes an array of recent scholarship and editorial work, much of it taking place outside Anglo-American universities, that has advanced our understanding of the grammatical tradition far beyond where it had been left by the likes of Barwick, Collart, and Dahlmann.

To gain a sense of the vitality of the discipline, one can gratefully peruse the ‘Bibliographie des grammairiens latins’, curated by G. online, or consult some of the recent books that similarly provide a good point of entry, including Samantha Schad’s ‘Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology’ (2007), Wolfram Ax’s ‘Quintilian’s Grammatik’ (2011), and Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter’s ‘Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric’ (2012).

At the same time, G. contributes greatly to the study of Late Republican intellectual culture, reminding us that the *De analogia* was not written primarily as a grammatical treatise, even though it came to be taken as such, but engaged with several incipient disciplines, including rhetoric and philosophy, and addressed a
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1 How much of Pliny to attribute to C. remains controversial (93ff), but prose rhythm, elsewhere a valuable clue (87), is consistent in this section with Caesarian authorship. Scanned with or without a bisyllabic genitive, the passage yields a popular Ciceroan clausula (cretic trochee or hypodochmiac) found elsewhere in C.’s rhetorical fragments. The spelling is unlikely to be Pliny’s (cf. Char. p. 99, 11–15 B.), but could have easily arisen with copyists. Might Charisius, however, have had C’s bisyllabic genitive in mind when citing the doublet *ingenii and imperii* (p. 178, 11 B.)? By contrast, G. suggests that C. was opposed to the gen. s. in -i (F4; cf. p. 100).

diverse audience that may have included senatorial heavyweights and Gallic aristocrats.

For G., the work’s principal foil is Cicero, its dedicatee, whose scant attention in the *De oratore* to the mechanics of *pura oratio* provided a gap to fill and a doctrinal bias to redress. As a result, stretches of G.’s text can profitably be read as a commentary on passages of Cicero’s *Rhétorica* (e.g. 42–46 on *Orat.* 155–62; 60–68 on *De orat.* 3, 39; 69–76 on *De orat.* 3.48–51; 87–97 on *Brut.* 233). While the dialogue between C. and Cicero takes center stage, G. also devotes many pages to Varro (*36*). In the process, G. sheds light on the vocabulary of rhetorical evaluation, such as *elegans* (69–76, esp. 72 n. 99), *purus* (53–60), *suavis* (63–64), and *subtilis* (70 n. 89), which played an important role in elite self-definition and literary polemic. G.’s work helps to show, for instance in the case of Cicero’s subtly dismissive claim that C. spoke *elegantissime* (*Brut.* 252; p. 86ff), how such terms worked effectively as keywords, offering an illusion of general consensus, while concealing substantive disagreement over doctrine and emphasis.¹ In its attention to the vocabulary of linguistic evaluation, G.’s work complements recent books by Roman Müller (*’Sprachbewusstsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike’, 2001*) and Brian Krostenko (*’Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance’, 2001*).

The book divides into roughly equal halves: the first a discursive introduction to C.’s grammatical thought and intellectual context, parcelled out over six chapters; the second the edition proper, containing text, illustrative material, translation, and commentary on five testimonia and 35 fragments (with *F33–35* designated *incerta*). The lengthy introduction enables G. to confront a range of theoretical and historical issues up front that would be harder to address in a line-by-line commentary, though occasional cross-references may make the latter harder to use on its own. Chapter 1 places C.’s grammatical scholarship in relation to his political activity at large. Comparing the *De analogia* to other Caesarian projects, such as his ambition to codify the civil law, found a public library, and reform the calendar, G. sees evidence for a populist stance of *aristocratic inclusiveness*.

Redistributing war booty was central to the *imperator’s* power and function, and in these projects C. seems to be extending his role as a benefactor to cover important cultural goods as well. G. intriguingly suggests that the audience for the *De analogia* may have included Gallic aristocrats who were experiencing a situation of *‘partial language shifts’* (4). Whether C.’s appeal to *ratio* was an attempt to *‘democratize’ Latinitas* is open to question. A language regime justified by *ratio* may just be as exposed to elite control as a system grounded on traditional practice or appeal to some external factor, such as Varro’s *natura*. Emphasis on *ratio* might conduce to a transfer of linguistic power from elite amateurs to specialists under elite control, as transpired under the empire.

G. identifies several forces placing Latin under pressure: the spread of urban culture to the Italian periphery after the Social War and the transformation of Rome under an influx of allies and foreigners. Like many of his contemporaries, C. saw this as a sociolinguistic decline (διαστασία) from the golden age of *Latinitas* represented by the Scipionic era. Rather than simply roll back the linguistic clock to the second century, C. makes contemporary usage the basis for linguistic reform. To decide between competing forms (*e.g.* *polis* vs. *pollen*), C. appeals to the principal of *ratio*, *‘the laws of analogy that lie at the very

¹ Another term that provides useful leeway, as G’s evidence might suggest, is *praecellus*, which slips between denoting linguistic precision and social prominence or implying their equivalence (*e.g.* 87 on *Brut.* 253).
heart of the idea of a linguistic system» (9). Underlying this practice is a view of language as governed by conventional agreement, which differed from Varro’s view of language as partly determined by nature.

In other words, C. sought to reduce the amount of linguistic irregularity without straying too far from contemporary usage. The result, purified usage (recta consuetudo, δεδοκιμασμένη συνήθεια), attempted to satisfy the twin virtues of Latinitas, linguistic correctness, and explanatio, the clarity achieved by using familiar forms. There is thus a tension at the heart of C.’s system, insofar as Latinitas demands forms (e.g. soleo, solere, *solui) that are to be rejected by explanatio. G. differs from earlier commentators, however, over how much innovation C. was willing to tolerate, tending to distance himself from the most outlandish attributions: Pompeii (F4), ens (F32), and mortus (F32). The first, G. argues, was a redactio ad absurdum, while the second and third may have been mentioned by C. as theoretically possible without being approved for use.

In Chapter 2, G. dates the treatise to early spring in 54, supported earlier by Hendrickson. On this account, it took only a few months for Cicero’s De oratore (November 55) to reach C. in Cisalpine Gaul and for him to prepare a response before rejoining his army across the Alps in the spring. Chapter 3 turns to C.’s grammatical doctrine itself, providing a summary of the contents of the treatise in relation to earlier grammatical theory. G.’s command of difficult source material and analytic depth are fully evident, yielding a succinct and valuable introduction the early Roman grammatical thought that will be a point of reference for years to come. Chapters 4–5 investigate C.’s relationship with Cicero’s rhetorical work, shedding a great deal of light on both authors’ views, the language of stylistic evaluation, and contemporary rhetorical culture at large. The dispute between them turned on the evaluation of elegantia, constituted by the twin virtues of correctness (Latinitas) and clarity (explanatio). Chapter 6 examines the philosophical context, especially Philodemus and the Attici Romanorum.

While Cicero tended to downplay purity and clarity in favor of ornatus (De or. 3, 37–38), C. appears to have regarded elegantia as the sole criterion to which all else was subordinate (F1A). Where Cicero tended to regard linguistic correctness as a product of natural talent and upbringing, C. aimed to show that it was subject to knowledge and rational consideration. G. enlarges this general picture, first outlined by Hendrickson, by discussing further differences, for instance the acceptability of neologisms (83–86) and the evaluation of sermo cotidianus (87–90). Among his grammatical findings, G. suggests that a distinction between orthography and morphology may have been important for the work’s structure and argues that C. generally sought to emphasize a noun’s stem vowel (e.g. omitting the -i in dat. sing. senatu, p. 228).

In presenting complex information about a fragmentary text, the edition achieves high standards of accuracy and clarity in comparison with its predecessors, Funaioli (1907), Klotz (1927), and Papke (1988). Following Funaioli’s practice, G. helpfully presents illustrative or parallel material in smaller type beneath the fragment itself. G. reserves the largest type for verbatim extracts and distinguishes these from words attributed indirectly to C., printed in italics, which may vary in status from paraphrase to quotation. The bibliography of primary sources (257–63) and index of manuscript sigla (291–96) ease the reader’s task. While no new fragments have been brought to light, G.’s novel arrangement

1 Cf. G. L. Hendrickson, CPh 1, 1906, 97–120.
reflects a persuasive theory about the work’s original structure and brings together fragments that are helpfully read in conjunction (e.g. F22–23). In constituting the text, G. has benefited from new editions of the grammarians, independent judgment, and a thorough knowledge of grammatical theory. The improvements on Fun. mainly affect the quoting sources rather than C.’s *ipsissima verba* (but cf. F3, F28). Even where the text itself may not differ from previous editions, the scrupulous apparatus gives ample space to alternatives and prompts further reflection. It is difficult to do more than hint at the riches of the commentary.

Among the passages given noteworthy textual attention are: Pomp. *GL* V 108, 1–14 (p. 133, esp. *Accium*); Prisc. *GL* II 14, 13 Victorino (p. 141); Quint. *Inst.* 1, 7, 21 (*inscriptionio* (p. 148); Char. p. 172, 10ff B. (p. 199); Char. p. 141, 25ff B. (p. 238). In F3, Holford-Stevens’s *debeo<n>nt* had been anticipated in the sixteenth century and accepted by Keil. In the quotation of Cledonius (*GL* V 48, 22–71 p. 156f), the reading *guidam* is Bertsch’s conjecture for *quia*. In F8, G. differs from previous editions by attributing a second full sentence to C. *(non quoniam nescientes*…). For the text of Varr. *Ling.*, 10, 21 (p. 168), readers should compare Taylor’s edition (1996). In F12, *<disp>utant* may be preferable to *<p>utant*, which is a hair too short for N’s lacuna and does not differ appreciably in meaning (cf. *TLL* V, 1 1445, 8ff). In F14, Wölfflin’s *sce<gg>ri* written in the margins of Nipperdey’s edition at the TLL Institut, may be worth considering alongside G.’s *scectio<sue>*. In the quotation of [Aug.] *Reg.* *GL* V 520, 22–50 (p. 249f), G. prints Martorelli’s text without indicating its many innovations. In connection with F2, it may be worth comparing Aelius Aristides’s (*Rhet.* 2, 10, 1) μήτε ὠνόματι μήτε ῥήματi χρησθαι ἄλλως πλὴν τοίς εκ τῶν βιβλίων. Among his linguistic proposals, G. suggests that *-nis* (4th decl. gen. s.) may be a Sabinism (225 n. 238) and that *-e* (5th decl. gen. s.) may represent an intermediate stage between *-ei* and *-i* (233).
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Während zu den Büchern 2 und 3 von Ovids *Liebeskunst* seit Ende der 1990er Jahre neue enzyklopädische Kommentare veröffentlicht wurden,1 die den Geniestreich Ovids im lebhaften Diskurs der jüngeren Forschung verankern, lag für das erste Buch bis 2003 lediglich der solide und entsprechend viel benutzte *short commentary* von Hollis aus dem Jahr 1977 vor.2 Gut ein Vierteljahrhundert später hat Rosalba Dimundo (hinfort: D.), Latinistin an der Universität Bari, nun eine Monographie zu *Ars 1* publiziert, die sie nach Anlage und Umfang zwischen Kurzkommentar und enzyklopädischer Werkexegese angestiehelt hat. Es ist in
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