acute in Poem 68, where Allius is extravagantly praised for—in effect—playing the morally indefensible rôle of pimp or go-between. Similarly, the romanticized images of Lesbia as 'goddess' in the first part of 68b are undermined by the more 'realistic' estimation of her character in the latter part of the poem. Finally, Poem 116 suggests a renunciation of 'frivolous neoteric aesthetics' in the light of the political and ideological corruption represented by Gellius' sexual escapades, attacked in the preceding invective sequence.

For S., then, the 'message' of the elegiac *libellus* as a whole is that language has become—in the mouths of power-hungry politicians—irredeemably corrupt. But the language of poetry is correspondingly dishonest, and under such circumstances, 'the only recourse . . . is silence' (p. 123). Paradoxically, this is poetry about *not* (any longer) writing poetry. The climax of S.'s study is a rich and challenging—but, for this reviewer, ultimately unconvincing—reading of Poems 68a and b (for S., separate but closely interrelated poems). S. stresses the themes of the *domus* and children/childlessness reflected especially in the Protesilaus/Laodamia and Hercules *exempla*, and reads the pair of poems as a diptych centring on the conflict between 'the aesthetic dedication required of the serious writer' and familial obligations. The tension is left unresolved at the end of 68b; but the combined effect of the two 'halves' of the diptych (of which 68a must be read as later in chronological sequence) is to suggest—like 116, in S.'s reading—a repudiation of art in favour of duty to the family. Is this really the case, however? We need not, as S. would have us do, equate the speaker's protestations of temporary incapacity with complete renunciation; and the extravagant praises of Allius in 68b need only be read as self-consciously false if the reader refuses the invitation to question traditional canons of morality which the poem arguably offers. The rôle of the reader is perhaps not quite so clearly prescribed by the rhetoric of the text as S. would have us believe.

A brief summary like this cannot do justice to the subtleties of S.'s argument, nor to the many striking and suggestive readings of individual poems offered *en route*. S. is always challenging and thought-provoking, even when she ultimately fails to convince. Despite its idiosyncrasies, this is a book which I would urge all serious students of Catullus' poetry to read and engage with.

Trinity College, Dublin MONICA R. GALE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni281

CICERO'S *TOPICA*

T. REINHARDT (ed.): *Marcus Tullius Cicero:* Topica. Edited with a Translation, Introduction, and Commentary. Pp. xvi + 435. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £74. ISBN: 0-19-926346-9.

We can be grateful to Tobias Reinhardt for his book, which constitutes a highly significant contribution to our understanding of one of the most intriguing of Cicero's works. In his introduction (pp. 3–72) R. first analyses the rhetorical background to Cicero's interest in the strategies of argumentation called τόποι or *loci*. He then sketches a history of them and finally deals with theoretical questions linked to the origin of Cicero's source and the legal context of the treatise. A philologically impressive chapter on the transmission of the *Topica* (pp. 73–112) introduces the text, which is accompanied by an elegant translation (pp. 115–75). The commentary (pp. 177–370) is based on a remarkably detailed integration of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni282 Published online by Cambridge University Press

philosophical, legal, and philological notes, which together provide a comprehensive insight into the multifaceted complexity of the treatise. R's work ends with a very useful bibliography (pp. 371–412), an *index locorum*, and the general index (pp. 413–435).

What R. has produced is surely the most thorough and scholarly challenging exploration of Cicero's *Topica*. And I certainly recommend this book as a must for any scholar interested in the subject. A review, however, is also intended to indicate points of disagreement or aspects that the reviewer would have done differently. I fear that this review will be no exception. If, on the one hand, I stress once again the depth of R's analysis and his remarkable attention to the details of the *Topica*, on the other hand I have a main criticism that concerns the general orientation of his analysis. In his preface, R. correctly points out (p. viii): 'Owing to this interdisciplinary nature of the book, a commentator attempting to pay equal attention to the various aspects of the *Topica* is in constant danger of producing an indigestible cocktail of obscure erudition.' I appreciate R.'s attempt to limit obscurity by combining a general note with a line-by-line discussion in his commentary. Yet this is not enough to the overcome a certain fragmentation in his analysis. Reading his work, I felt that R. does not pay enough attention to the main questions of why scholars should still be interested in Cicero's *Topica*, and what its real value is for the classical tradition and, possibly, also for the modern theories of argumentation where the concept of τόπος or *locus* is still crucial. I believe that these are essential points that should be dealt with at length in a work like R.'s, where his aspirations surely go beyond a critical edition and commentary of the *Topica*.

Contrary to what R. claims at p. 193, I believe that in order to understand this book of Cicero's, it is fundamental to examine the relationship between Aristotle's τόποι and what Cicero considers as Aristotelian τόποι. The main point here is that Cicero did not simply write a book about *loci*, but claimed that these *loci* were linked to Aristotle. As I have pointed out elsewhere (S. Rubinelli, '*Τόποι* e ἴδια nella *Retorica* di Aristotele', *Phronesis* 48(3) [2003], 238–47), it is by comparing the different uses of τόποι in Aristotle and Cicero that the epistemological value of the method emerges. From this point of view, however, it seems to me that what R. has produced follows a more 'traditional' way of approaching the *Topica.*

The treatise has intriguingly captured the interest of scholars in the last century. Very often, however, scholars have focused more on speculative issues raised by passages of the book than on its ultimate meaning. Most of the literature attempts to give a name to the author of the list of *loci* discussed by Cicero, and to understand the meaning of Cicero's words when he says that the jurisconsult Trebatius, to whom the book is dedicated, had found *Aristotelis Topica quaedam* in Cicero's library at Tusculum (*Topica* 1). For clear historical and philological reasons, I fully recognize the value of understanding whether or not Cicero had a book by Aristotle in his library and whether his source was Antiochus of Ascalon or Philo of Larissa, or someone else. However, the current lack of evidence about Cicero's sources leads me to disagree with concentrating too much on this matter. Regardless of the name behind Cicero's source, it is more important to capture the nature of the source itself and to contextualize it within the framework of Aristotle's work on the subject.

R., in his book, offers a wider analysis of the *Topica*, yet he still considers the works of Aristotle rather marginally. In his introduction, R. explores the context of Cicero's *Topica* by considering prominently the post-Aristotelian tradition, and presents a short history of the τόπος where, however, the main section is devoted to the rhetorical tradition after Cicero and the Anonymus Seguerianus. The analysis of

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni282 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aristotle's work on τόποι is condensed in a rather sketchy way in fewer than five pages. As such, it does not help the reader to appreciate the nature of the methodology pioneered by Aristotle, and its possible use or development in the work of Cicero. Again, in commenting Cicero's *loci* individually, R. neglects to point out relationships with the work of Aristotle that could, however, be highly significant for a grasp of the essence of the *Topica*. Just to quote an example, in *Topica* 8 Cicero introduces a group of *loci* that are drawn from without (*extrinsecus*) and are opposite to the *loci* attached to the subject under discussion (*loci in eo ipso de quo agitur haerent*). R. correctly notes that the former group is linked to the pre-Aristotelian and Aristotelian non-technical proofs. What he does not note, however, is that in *Rhetoric* B23, at 1398b19–1399a6, Aristotle speaks of a τόπος ἐκ κρίσεως which closely resembles the idea behind the *loci* drawn *extrinsecus*. But Cicero, differently from Aristotle, separates these *loci* from the others. There must be a reason behind this separation, which should be explored in its historical context. This could provide precious insight into the relationship between Cicero's list of *loci* and the list of τόποι discussed by Aristotle in *Rhetoric* B23.

Despite my comments above, I want to conclude by stressing once again that R.'s work is certainly the most successful work on Cicero's *Topica* to date. I am convinced that it will spur further scholarly interest in this sophisticated and still somehow enigmatic book by Cicero. However, there is more to be done to give the *Topica* its full credit. I believe that more investigation is needed, especially, as I have suggested above, in its relationship to the texts of Aristotle. How the author of this review would do this . . . is another story!

University of Lugano/University of Leeds SARA RUBINELLI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni282

LUCRETIUS V

G. CAMPBELL: *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution. A Commentary on* De Rerum Natura *Book Five, Lines 772–1104*. Pp. xii + 385. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £63. ISBN: 0-19-926396-5.

This is a welcome and constantly revealing commentary on 332 lines from Lucretius' account of the early history of this world and the human race in Book 5 of the *De Rerum Natura*. Lucretius' prehistory and its sequel are of compelling interest, since we have no such an extensive and fascinating recreation of this archaeology of human civilization from any other sources, either Greek or Roman. C. has chosen to comment on one of the most interesting passages in the *DRN*. *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution* has a short introduction and two appendices: one a Table of Themes in Ancient Accounts of Creation, Zoogony, and Anthropogony, the other a Table of Themes in Prehistories and Accounts of the Golden Age, including the accounts of Columbus, De Léry, and Montaigne of the 'noble savages' discovered in the 'New World'.

This is the second monograph published by Oxford University Press that is devoted to a discreet argument in Lucretius' *DRN*. It is dedicated to Don Fowler, who wrote the first. This is Fowler's treatment of *Lucretius on Atomic Motion: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura 2.1–332*, pubished posthumously by Oxford in 2002. Like C.'s *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution*, Fowler's commentary began life as an Oxford

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni282 Published online by Cambridge University Press