the last word on the 'fabulae praetextae', she has done scholars and students of Roman drama a truly great service.

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

LUCILIUS

G. MANUWALD (ed.): *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit*. (Zetemata 110.) Pp. 206. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 3-406-48470-0.

The fifteen chapters (ranging from six to eighteen pages long) that comprise this slender volume were papers originally read at a symposium on 'Lucilius—Identität und Alterität', which was held at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg i. Br. in mid-February 2001; the interesting topic of this symposium is to be understood in the wider context of Eckard Lefèvre's stimulating research project, based in Freiburg, 'Identitäten und Alteritäten. Die Funktion von Alterität für die Konstitution und Konstruktion von Identität'—a project, which has already given us the valuable *Identität und Alterität in der frührömischen Tragödie*, ed. G. Manuwald (Würzburg, 2000).

The papers are arranged in alphabetical order of the authors' surnames, and discuss—at different levels of detail and depth—various aspects of Lucilius' work and ideology as projected from his fragments and the views of other ancient authors (mainly Horace) about him. The topics dealt with in this volume, which seems to have been prepared only three months after the actual conference and appeared in the same year as it, are: general overviews of Lucilius' position in the changing morality, the violent political events, and the Hellenophile culture of his turbulent times (Werner Krenkel, Eckart Olshausen, Carl Joachim Classen); Lucilius' debt to (and reworking of) Aristophanes (Bernhard Zimmermann), Callimachus (Andreas Bagordo), and New Comedy (Ulrike Auhagen); Lucilius' portrayal of the city of Rome (Eckart Schäfer) and women (Karin Haß); Lucilius' views on friendship (Ursula Gärtner), literary criticism (Severin Koster), politics (Eckard Lefèvre), and Roman tragedy (Gesine Manuwald, the editor of the volume); Lucilius' use of Greek words (Thomas Baier); and his satire on 'The Journey to Sicily' (Stefan Faller). The frustratingly fragmentary status of the satirist's extant corpus makes it easy to understand why only Faller's paper focuses on a specific Lucilian poem.

The scope of this review does not allow for a detailed discussion of the strengths (and, in some cases, the weaknesses) of these papers. All the contributors have an inspiring and thought-provoking point to make, even when the concept of 'Alterität' does not feature prominently in their argumentation (this is the case in most contributions), and even when they merely regurgitate well-known material; but readers can decide for themselves whether or not this volume as a whole has anything ground-breaking or provocatively original to say about Lucilius, especially in the absence of any new fragments of his satires. I will, therefore, confine myself here to a couple of editorial suggestions.

No attempt has been made to group these scholarly contributions under thematic categories which would give the contents of the volume more coherence and sharper focus, and would create a fruitful dialogue between juxtaposed discussions of the same (or of similar) themes (or passages) in Lucilius. The lack of sub-sections is an

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.88 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important omission, because there are very few cross-references between contributors in this volume. Fortunately, the lengthy *index locorum* (pp. 197–201) partly compensates for this editorial oversight, since it easily shows which Lucilian fragments are discussed by which contributors (there is no *index rerum*). Furthermore, instead of a general bibliography at the end of the volume, there are individual lists of books and articles at the end of each paper; this choice may have allowed for a more speedy publication of the conference's proceedings but has also created unnecessary bibliographical repetition of the standard Lucilian editions and some frequently cited studies on Lucilius. But these are trivial misgivings when compared to the striking absence of an editorial introduction discussing the perils of constructing 'Identität' (let alone 'Alterität') out of the scanty remains of a poet devoted to the elusive and flexible genre of Roman satire. Can I find the 'real' Lucilius amongst isolated one- or two-line statements, which may have been made ironically or may have enabled Lucilius merely to strike a pose or may have been uttered by a character other than Lucilius in a fictional context of questionable relation to reality? Would I find the 'real' Lucilius even in a complete poem narrated in the first person singular? Why should I assume that ostensibly explicit statements found in fragments such as 671–2 M = 650–1 W = 656–7 K ('publicanus vero ut Asiae fiam, ut scripturarius / pro Lucilio, id ego nolo, et uno hoc non muto omnia')—a couplet that occurs at the beginning of the editorial 'Vorwort' and is discussed by no fewer than three contributors—clearly reveal Lucilius' sense of 'Stolz', and demonstrate that he was well-aware of his 'Individualität'?

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

A CICERONIAN COMPANION

J. M. May (ed.): *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Pp. xiii + 632. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €150/US$174. ISBN: 90-04-12147-1.

'Companions' are potentially most useful things, convenient vade-mecums which contain most of the information one needs when beginning to work on an unfamiliar topic: with a companion, there should always be a sense of 'this is the book you have to have (or have access to)'. It is not the (primary) job of a companion to advance knowledge; rather, it should state the *communis opinio* and give a sense of the point scholarship has reached. On these criteria, the book under review succeeds admirably: it can be confidently recommended to students as a first port of call, and scholars will find it indispensable for a reason that I will come to at the end of this review.

The contributors are for the most part well-known American Ciceronian scholars: there are no British or German contributors (though J. Wisse of Newcastle University has written two chapters). Professional Ciceronians will be interested in the list of contributors, which helpfully states what everyone is currently working on. The editor, J. M. May, has assembled an able team, though in places one wishes that they had been able to read each other's contributions, and also that they had been given firmer editorial direction in matters of presentation (e.g. on whether to refer to Cicero's works by Latin or English titles, and on whether to use B.C. or B.C.E.).

The book opens with three introductory chapters: a standard account of Cicero's

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.88 Published online by Cambridge University Press