exaggerated (p. 66, n. 284-7; cf. WS 73, 115-7. Correlate p. 65, n. 282 on Marius' constitutionalism; see also Carney, The Flight and Exile of Marius, G & R (NS) 8, 98ff.).

The study suffers however from defects as a consequence of its method of presentation. Excessive brevity in places renders the narrative obscure (e.g. 52f.). Certain information which one would regard as essential to the narrative is confined to the footnotes, such as the shortcomings of Metellus' military policy in Africa (n. 139) and its unpopularity with the Roman middle-class (n. 150), which is essential for understanding the election of Marius and a military reform providing 'abundant, expendable man-power' (p. 29); or the change in the political climate which hastened the conclusion of the African war (n. 157)—i.e. the announcement that 'equestrian vested interests in Transalpina were threatened', which deserves more prominence in a chapter, one of the finest in the monograph, devoted to Marius as figurehead of big business interests in foreign politics (Ch. V, 25ff.). Marius' Italian policy (p. 46 and n. 214; n. 250 and n. 274) deserves fuller treatment in the text of the narrative itself in view of Carney's thesis that Marius strove for a solution of this and other problems and had 'a more realistic attitude to enfranchisement' (p. 71), and as part of a defence against some prevailing views (cf. O.C.D. as representative: he 'does not seem to have had any special policy'; and his career shows 'the extent to which purely personal questions came to dominate Roman politics').

This leaves no doubt however, nor is it the intention that it should, as to the basic merit of this scholarly monograph. Prof. Carney is well acquainted with the entire range of publications on Marius and his times, and he has made a thorough study of the extensive literature in Italian. But the abiding value of his biography of Marius consists in the last resort in the reconstruction achieved after careful and penetrating analysis of the early materials and historical tradition.

The technical execution leaves nothing to be desired. Two tables are added—on the extent, mostly secondary, source material and on the non-existent source material—followed by a detailed stemma Marianum at the end.

University of South Africa.

C. P. T. NAUDÉ


The reading of this thesis took me right back to Leiden. Not simply because it was written there, and 'defended against the objections of the Faculty' in the historic Senaatszaal on the Rapenburg, but because it carries with it all the flavour and the atmosphere of the place. It is a study in the history of classical scholarship, but more especially of classical scholarship in the Netherlands; to be precise, in Leiden. The three central personages, Cluverius, Ryckius, and Perizonius, were all three Leiden men: the first was Geographicus
Academicus to the University, the two last were both in succession Professors of Eloquence and History. And they are not the only ones. We also renew our acquaintance with men like Scaliger, Vossius, and others. It is very gratifying, therefore, to hear that the Leiden Faculty conferred on the author the doctorate with the coveted epithet *cum laude*. In my opinion the epithet was fully justified; this thesis was written in the best traditions of Dutch scholarship.

The author's aim was to investigate how scholars from the days of Petrarch up to the beginning of the 18th century judged of the truth, or otherwise, of the traditional legends concerning the origins and early history of Rome, this theme being notorious as a touchstone of a man's critical abilities in general, and of his over-all approach to ancient history. Surely, if a scholar could swallow the complete legend of Romulus and Remus with wall, wolf and virgin, he could swallow anything. The mediaeval approach to this problem had already been reviewed by men like Graf (1882), while Barbagallo (1926) and Ciaceri (1937) had covered the historiography of the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries. There remained then the awe-inspiring gap stretching over four centuries, from the beginning of the 14th till the beginning of the 18th century. No one had evidently so far had the courage or the patience to take up the ‘admittedly strenuous task’ (as the author himself somewhere calls it) of reading his weary way through all those shelves-full of Latin tomes on Roman History and Antiquities which have been collecting dust over the past couple of centuries. We all know from personal observation that there is hardly a single type of literature for which fewer slips are made out at the librarian's counter. It is, to all intents and purposes, a forgotten literature.

But there is more to it than that. ‘The fact that no detailed investigation has yet been made of the study of early Roman History during the 14th to the 17th centuries is, if I am not mistaken, in keeping with a trend in modern historiography to dismiss the work on Greek and Roman history of this period as of no great value’ (p. 2). This is the anvil on which the author has struck some of his most forceful blows; time and again he takes modern authors to task for the unverified and, in fact, completely groundless statements they publish concerning the critical work done by scholars of the 16th and 17th centuries on Roman history. It has been one of his main tasks to destroy thoroughly the impression usually given, that no historian before Perizonius (with the exception only of Valla) had made any worthwhile contribution to the study of Roman history. In this aim, I think, he has succeeded admirably; and among several names which he has, in a sense, rescued from oblivion, that of *Philip Cluver* of Danzig, later of Leiden, stands out. Cluver, or Cluverius, may be called the key figure of this thesis. ‘Modern scholars, through their neglect of Cluverius and their preoccupation with Perizonius and de Beaufort, have built up a completely erroneous view of the study of early Roman History during the 17th century’ (p. 107).

The first chapter gives an interesting account of the views put forward as to the origins of Rome by Petrarch, Boccaccio, Sabellicus and *Valla*, the last named emerging as the only one daring enough to express ‘independent and unshackled’ criticism. Then follows a very good chapter on the 16th century, with due appreciation, first, of the valuable (and mostly underrated) work done
by the antiquaries of that era like Sigonio (1524-1584); next, of the revival of
Euhemerism, especially as personified in 'that remarkable and curious figure',
Guillaume Postel (1510-1581), the author of probably the most original (and
most fantastic) theory about the origin of Rome ever put forward. Our
attention is drawn to the pioneer work on Roman chronology done by the great
J. J. Scaliger; but for all he contributed to the subject under discussion, I feel
the whole reference (and especially the footnotes!) might have been shorter.
One of the most interesting trends of 16th century scholarship was the
'nationalistic' trend, and I am grateful for the attention it has received; in illus­
trating this, the author takes us right into the original Spanish and Portuguese
of men like Ocampo and De Faria y Sousa. We certainly cannot complain of
being served with second-hand goods! The rise of the scientific monograph at
that time is illustrated by the case of the Italian Ferrarius (1518-1586), and then
we are introduced to men like Temporarius, Risobonus, Patritius, and Bodinus,
who all took an independent view of the reliability of the ancient sources,
and were in that sense forerunners of the scepticism of the 17th century. 'The
foregoing discussion reveals the significant fact that an important contribution
to the study of early Roman history was made by scholars who had broken
with the Humanistic tradition and who (consequently) displayed greater
freedom towards the ancient writers . . . It seems as though historians who
wrote universal or national histories, subordinating a discussion of early Roman
history to the greater scheme, tended to display greater freedom towards the
ancient authorities than those scholars who confined themselves to Greek and
Roman antiquity . . . .'

Chapter III, The History of a Theory, is undoubtedly the pièce de résistance
of the whole work. In tracing the origin of the carmina-theory concerning the
preservation of the earliest sources of Roman history later put forward by
Perizonius, the author has here erected a first, and, I think, a lasting monument
to a man who has hitherto been sadly neglected by historians of classical
philology, namely Philip Cluver of Danzig (1580-1623), one of Scaliger's
pupils at Leiden, who afterwards in his three great works on ancient geography
laid the foundations of scientific historical geography. In the opening chapters of
the third book of his Italia Antiqua (1624) he gave a surprising and completely
original view of early Roman history, which should for ever have earned him
a place of honour amongst the pioneers in this field. He was the first to recog­
nize that the Greeks had an active part in shaping the legends (Aeneas,
Romulus) which 'in the absence of factual knowledge, were employed to give
Rome an early history', referring his readers to Evander and the Pelasgians
as the most probable prototypes. Quoting Livy and Plutarch, Cluverius
maintained that neither the Greeks nor the Romans possessed any trustworthy
information concerning the times previous to the great fire of 390 a.c., and
that Diocles Paphethius, the first historian of Rome, 'merely conflated a tale
which sounded probable . . . .'

'The honour, for such it is, for first casting doubt on the credibility of early
Roman history does not belong to de Beaufort, nor to Perizonius, nor to one
of the sceptics of the second half of the 17th century, but to Philip Cluverius
who was dead before the first quarter of the 17th century had run its course.
His achievement is the more remarkable if we consider that he wrote with a pure 16th century background, long before the sceptical attitude of the second half of the 17th century compelled historians to reconsider every aspect of their subject. Nor was he a mere destructive critic like the Pyrrhonists or de Beaufort; on the ground of the evidence of a number of ancient writers he builds up a reasoned and coherent view of early Roman history (p. 64).

After excellent sketches of the two great forces in 17th century intellectual circles, viz. Cartesianism and the so-called Pyrrhonism—here again, I felt, the footnotes might have been less copious—we come to Jacob Perizonius (1651-1715) and Theodorus Ryckius (1640-1690), both, in succession, Professors of Eloquence and History at Leiden, and both of them relatively conservative in their outlook, trying to defend the intrinsic historical truth of traditional early Roman history against the radical criticism of Cluverius and the men of the Pyrrhonist school. The personal relations between these two men are—I believe, for the first time—brought out clearly, and Ryckius' influence on the views held by Perizonius established beyond doubt, by means of their (hitherto) unpublished correspondence in the Leiden University Library. I cannot help regarding this particular piece of research (pp. 82-85) as one of the very highlights of the thesis. It is a sheer delight to follow the sure thread of the argument, and to see this important historical fact emerging into clear daylight from the pages of those long forgotten letters dating back to 1684. This is real first-hand research work, with which Dr. Erasmus has done Leiden University both credit and good service. It was not only Ryckius, however, who suggested to Perizonius his famous theory of the ancient 'carmina' as unwritten sources of early Roman history: it was a concept 'well known and widely accepted in the 17th century, particularly in Dutch and Frisian historiography with which Perizonius was well acquainted' (p. 97). Several excellent pages are devoted to a detailed discussion of this aspect of the matter, taking us into fields seldom or never touched upon by classical scholars. One feels again that this thesis could not have been written anywhere better than in Holland. It is hard to decide whether the subject was better fitted to the place, or the place to the subject. Moreover, one senses behind it all the expert guidance of Prof. Dr. W. den Boer. The author could not have desired a better library or a better guide. And for those readers in Holland, in South Africa, and in North America who cherish warm affections for the old 'Middelnederlandse Literatuur' it will be a real joy to discover here, in a classical thesis, old and well-beloved names like the Rijm-Kroniek of Melis Stoke and the Spiegel Historiael, both of the 13th century.

Extraordinarily interesting I found the reading of the Fourth Chapter, where the author introduces us to two further traits of 17th century scholarship, namely Euhemerism (now full-blown) and comparative linguistics, the one rather an aberration, a curiosity, the other a beginning of great things, but both influenced by the advanced study of Hebrew and other oriental languages, and both contributing their part to the further investigation of the origins of the city of Rome. I must, however, make this remark, that I have not been able to discover exactly how this chapter links up with the previous one; I am afraid the connection has not been made clear enough, and the reader finds
himself—at least, I found myself—rather puzzled and confused. But this will probably be my fault. In any case, attention is focused here on the Romulus-legend, and we are presented with the interesting, sometimes positively amusing, theories of men like Vossius, Gronovius, Cluverius, Dodwell, Minutoli, Salmusius, and, in more detail, of Perizonius again. We see the latter as a man of moderation, accepting the gist of the Romulus-legend in the face of the extreme scepticism of his day, because it satisfied the threefold test he applied to all historical data. He is also satisfactorily cleared of the charge, brought against him by Schwegler in 1867, that in his study on Romulus (1709) he failed to apply the general theory on Roman history he had propounded some 25 years before. The chapter concludes with a lively collection of 17th century etymologies of the names Romulus and Remus, Rhea Silvia and Illia.

The thesis is rounded off with a last chapter in which all the above lines are drawn through to the oft-quoted Louis de Beaufort and his Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire romaine. This is followed by a lengthy summary in Afrikaans, a good bibliography, and an Index of Proper Names.

Next to the clarity of its reasoning, the best quality of this study is, perhaps, the brevity of the whole, in spite of the extreme thoroughness with which it is written. It is certainly no mean accomplishment to have telescoped a history spanning 400 years within the space of something more than 100 pages.

It bodes well for the future of classical studies in South Africa if work of this standard can be produced by the alumni of our universities.

University of Stellenbosch.

A. M. HUGO

** *  *


Summary: This first volume of the editio princeps of D. G. van der Keessel's Prælectiones Iuris Hodierni ad Hungonis Grotii Introductiorem ad Iurisprudentiam Hollandicam (A. A. Balkema, Amsterdam/Cape Town 1961) is edited by a panel of professors of Pretoria University, the Latinist Prof. H. L. Gonin being responsible for the fluent Afrikaans rendering and jointly responsible for the constitution of the text.

Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

(Horatius, Ars Poetica 343-4)

Hierdie pragwerk, wat die voorlesinge oor die (toenmalige) hedendaagse reg na aanleiding van De Groot se Inleiding tot de Hollandse Rechtgeleerdebeyd in Afrikaans vertaal bevat, behoort algemene byval te verwerf, want dit het
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