

Citation style

Riggsby, Andrew M.: review of: Alessandro Garcea (ed.), Caesar's "De Analogia". Edition, Translation, and Commentary, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 19 (2015), p. 331-333, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v19i0.2669, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

ALESSANDRO GARCEA, *Caesar's De Analogia*. Edition, Translation, and Commentary, Oxford: OUP, 2012, xiv + 304 pp. ISBN 978-01-9960-397-8.

We have perhaps fewer than 150 of the *ipsissima verba* of Caesar's *de Analogia*. Only four of the fragments contain at least one full sentence, and more than a third of the total concern the inflectional morphology of particular words, mostly third-declension nouns. It is striking, then, that G(arcea) has been able to write a 300-page book on the subject, and even more striking that it is a good and interesting one.

The opening pages (3-124) offer six substantial chapters, which provide general historical and intellectual background to *de Analogia* (part I) and a more focused discussion of the nature of *elegantia* and its role in Late Republican debates over the role(s) of public speech (part II). The former part includes G.'s commentary on the five *testimonia* and the latter that on three clearly programmatic fragments of the work (his F1A, 1B, 2). The long part III then gives texts with apparatus, English translations, and extensive commentary on the remaining 33 fragments. The work concludes with bibliography, general index, and a compendium of the numerous primary sources (including individual manuscripts) cited.

G. demonstrates a number of important points in his introductory chapters. Caesar's work is pitched at the level of and in dialogue with the likes of Cicero's *de Oratore* and (after the fact) his *Brutus* and Varro's *de Lingua Latina*, not the dogmatic and pedagogical grammar texts which preserve so many of our Caesarian fragments. Caesar's linguistic intervention (as well as that of the other texts just cited) is ultimately a political act. In that context it should not be surprising that there are parallels between Caesar's linguistic and political programs; both employ inclusive leveling and rationalization. More specifically, Caesar adopts one of the several minimalizing approaches to language and oratory available at the time (which, G. rightly insists, are not to be conflated as is often done). The theoretical position advanced in *de Analogia* is one that, by and large, Caesar seems also to adopt in practice. On most of these points, G. is staking out positions (correctly) within existing debates. His more distinctive contribution is thus in the commentary in which he seeks to resolve what he reasonably describes as an "inconsistency between a general attentiveness to the 'external' function of *De analogia* and an unsatisfactory knowledge of its 'internal' content (vii)."

For any text preserved in the fashion of this one, there will always be questions about the accuracy of later paraphrase. Additionally, a number of the fragments, especially the more extensive ones, treat Caesar along with

other sources, and it is not always straight-forward to tell what information is to be attributed to Caesar himself. A commentator's natural urge is perhaps to identify as much as possible as belonging to his chosen subject. G. several times shows the integrity to reject the possible Caesarian provenance of bits of information when the evidence so requires (e.g. 94-5, 179, 205).

This interweaving of sources and the simple exiguity of the Caesarian fragments mean that there is rarely any point in attempting to interpret Caesar's text purely on its own. Rather, G. reconstructs whole strands of linguistic debate from Hellenistic times to Caesar and his contemporaries to Pliny the Elder and sometimes on to the scholastic grammatical tradition. It is often only within this elaborate context that we can even tell what kinds of claims Caesar is making. Then, as Caesar's basic meaning is being established, we also automatically get some sense of his relative position-taking. So, for instance, at a very general level, Caesar's style of analogy serves to sort out already-existing forms of expression, while Varro's allows logical principle to create entirely new ones (chapter 3c). This is very much in line with Caesar's apparent general view that linguistic correctness is not only pragmatically but logically subordinate to clarity (chapter 6). To pick a single other, more technical, example at random, G. can show that Caesar's distinction between *Albani* and *Albenses* (F8) is probably not meant to illustrate a general semantic naturalism, but is merely a contingent fact about that particular doublet.

The interpretation of the text in the broadest sense involves intersection with other, contested areas of Roman studies such as the nature of *popularis* politics (50) or the mechanisms of Romanization (4; explicit attention to the "Romanization" debates might have been helpful here), so no one will ever be in agreement with all of G.'s premises (or those of any commentator). This leaves some room for disagreement—as there will likely always be—for instance, about who precisely stood to benefit from defining proper Latin in the way Caesar does. In the long run it would presumably include the soon-to-be Romans of what was still not yet Italy (so G.), but the more immediate beneficiaries would be, I would think, peninsular Italians who were already juridically Roman, and in fact differed from the peripheral Roman elite only in subtle ways like accent. That is, we should perhaps think more at this point about Cicero's less talented brethren, rather than Valerius Troucillus. However this may be, G.'s positions are always reasonable, the issues he identifies are the important ones, and his presentation of the evidence is both detailed and scrupulous.

The text is written in dense, but ultimately understandable style; its translation into English does not seem to have resulted in any particular difficulties. In addition to dealing with the complexities of the ancient grammatical tradition, G. also deploys a certain amount of modern linguistic terminology, including the frequent use of IPA transcription when a

phonetic point needs to be made. As a whole this is not only a learned but also a thoughtful contribution to our understanding of this text, and will be an invaluable contribution for those who wish to place *de Analogia* in its proper contexts, both of the long grammatical tradition and the politics of its day.

ANDREW M. RIGGSBY
University of Texas at Austin
ariggsby@mail.utexas.edu