Garcea, A.


This book is based on the author’s _thèse d’habilitation_ “Inter tela volantia. Le De Analogia de César et le débat sur la langue à la fin de la République”, which was submitted at the Sorbonne in 2007. Although the thesis has been thoroughly revised, the publication is still primarily a monograph on the linguistic debates of the late Republic: the edition, translation, and commentary promised by the title only occupy the second half of the book (pp. 125-256); its first half consists of an introduction (pp. 1-46) and a long chapter on “Cicero, Caesar, and the _Oratores Elegantes_” (pp. 47-124).

In the introduction, G. first discusses the political, linguistic, and intellectual context of _De Analogia_ (pp. 3-18) and then turns to Caesar’s education (pp. 19-23), the date (pp. 24-6) and title (pp. 26-9) of _De Analogia_, and Caesar’s “Grammatical Stance” (pp. 30-46). G. gives a solid account of the primary and secondary literature, but readers whose primary interest is Caesar’s _De Analogia_ will be disappointed by the fact that G. offers no orientation on the literary form of the work or its relation to Caesar’s style. Later, in his commentary, G. mentions that _De Analogia_ contained _clausulae_ (p. 87, n. 35), he discusses the identity of the interlocutor who is addressed in F11B (p. 191), and he observes that some of the doctrines attributed to _De Analogia_ are incompatible with Caesar’s usage in the _commentarii_ (e.g. p. 246). A systematic account of these and other observations would have been instructive and could have shed some light on the purpose of _De Analogia_.

More importantly, some of G.’s conclusions remain unconvincing. G.’s view that _De Analogia_ is a highly political text, which was addressed to the elite of Gaul and served to ‘democratize’ the Roman language and make it accessible to everyone, may seem plausible at first sight, because the ancient sources and our modern perception focus on Caesar’s political and military achievements. However, a look at Caesar’s other fragmentary works and some passages in Cicero’s correspondence (e.g. _Att._ 13.52.2) shows that Caesar took a keen interest in literature, language, and philosophy and could have written _De Analogia_ out of purely intellectual interest. Moreover, the extant fragments of _De Analogia_ do not support G.’s interpretation. The question preserved in F11B (one of the few verbatim quotations) points to a fairly abstract and theoretical discussion and suggests that _De Analogia_ was a dialogue like Cicero’s _De Oratore_ or _Brutus_. Such a work would have hardly helped Gauls or other non-native speakers of Latin to become accepted members of Roman society. If Caesar’s
primary audience had been the “members of the higher ranks of Gallic society” (p. 4), he probably would have written a practical manual of the Latin language and he would not have bothered to use *clausulae*, devise a dialogue, or praise Cicero as the *princeps* of Roman eloquence (F1A-B).

The second part of G.’s book, which aims at reconstructing Caesar’s dialogue with his contemporaries, partly overlaps with the introduction because it continues to explore the intellectual context of *De Analogia*; partly, it functions as an *addendum*, for it is only here that we learn about a possible Epicurean influence (pp. 114-24) or about Caesar’s relation to Alexandrian scholarship (pp. 103-9) and the movement of Atticism (pp. 119-24). G. quotes, translates, paraphrases, and discusses extensive portions of Cicero, Varro, Philodemus, and other authors, and sometimes we lose sight of Caesar’s *De Analogia*. This is particularly true of pp. 49-77, which are about Cicero’s emphasis on *ornatus* and provide detailed information on the orators mentioned in his *Brutus*: much of this reads like a *Materialsammlung* for a future commentary on Cicero or a new edition of *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, but has little bearing on Caesar’s work.

G.’s edition of *De Analogia* is an improvement over the earlier editions by G. Funaioli (*Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*, vol. 1, Leipzig 1907), A. Klotz (*C. Iulius Caesar. Commentarii*, vol. 3, Leipzig 1927), and R. Papke (*Caesars De Analogia*, Diss. Eichstätt 1988/1993) in so far as it provides a full and up-to-date apparatus. In several other respects, however, it falls behind the earlier publications. A first weakness concerns the classification of the fragments. Funaioli and Klotz put the fragments into three groups, viz. fragments explicitly attributed to book 1 (frr. 1-5 K.), fragments explicitly attributed to book 2 (frr. 6-11 K.), and *incertorum librorum fragmenta* (frr. 12-31 K.). This procedure was also followed by Papke, who added a fourth category, viz. *incerta* (pp. 301-18). G., on the contrary, only employs two categories: he classifies three fragments as *incerta* (F33-5) and follows L. Lersch (*Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten*, vol. 1, Bonn 1838) in arranging the rest of the fragments by subject matter (e.g. “I-stems and consonant stems”, “the participle”; cf. pp. 30-1). In so doing, he creates the impression that Caesar’s work was organized like a modern grammar, although we know very little about the way in which Caesar arranged his material.

More problematic is G.’s handling of *incerta* and *dubia*. Ffr. 12 and 31 (Klotz), which Papke rightly classified as *incerta*, are presented as genuine (F29-30). Caes. *carm.* frr. 3-4 (Klotz) feature among G.’s *incerta* (F34-5), although they are examples of poetic licence and are more likely to come from Caesar’s poems or from one of the tragedies of Caesar Strabo. F4, which attributes the genitive *Pompeii* (sic!) to Caesar, is unlikely to represent Caesar’s views and probably results from a confusion with the grammarian Caesellius (cf. Cassiodorus *GL*).