clearer with a satisfactory edition of the *Mulomedicina*). This is, then, likely to remain the standard edition for some time. All we need now is a Loeb.

Some points of detail. **1.5.4** *non tam staturae rationem convenit habere quam virium. et ipso Homero teste non fallimur* (*fallitur* $\epsilon\beta$). Is $\delta$'s *fallimur* not a conjecture? It would be better if e. g. *monemus* had come before. The unsatisfactory *fallitur* might be authorial error, as though the previous sentence had contained *dux peritus eligit* ($\beta$ adds *hoc quisquis effecerit* before *et*); someone (surely Vegetius?) who had forgotten the construction of the previous sentence also added literary adornment at 3.21.6. **3.18.14** R. rejects the transposition of the chapter division to before *tamen ars belli* (better before 3.19.2 *cavendum*), explaining the ungrammatical text that follows the title as an anacolouthon; but that leaves a chapter whose first paragraph is irrelevant to its heading. Once the chapter headings had been entered in the text, misplacement could hardly occur; but between writing them for the table of contents and creating the fair copy, it would be easy enough. A scribe (or Vegetius) might have been confused by the apparent suitability of *superventibus* to the chapter description. Similarly the heading to Chapter 4.46, which would begin better at 4.45.4, is placed before a sentence in which *alto et libero mari* might have seemed appropriate to *aperto marte* of the title. **4.1.2** 'tutissimo *melius abesset*'. Perhaps *tutissima*. **4.38.12** *Aparcias* rightly defended. Add that ἀπαρκίας is known to *LSJ* and that the spelling is transmitted for other Latin writers.

*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* NIGEL HOLMES
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni302

## AGAINST THE ACADEMICS

K. SCHLAPBACH: *Augustin:* Contra Academicos *vel* De Academicis. *Buch 1. Einleitung und Kommentar.* (Patristische Texte und Studien 58.) Pp. viii + 254. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. Cased, €74. ISBN: 3-11-017811-7.

This reviewer's concern that, because Therese Fuhrer's outstanding 1997 commentary on Books 2 and 3 of Augustine's first extant work, the *Contra Academicos*, did not embrace Book 1, no other commentary on the latter might be attempted for some time (*CR* 49 [1999], 82), has been allayed by S.'s book, which originated as a Zurich doctoral dissertation in 2001, under Fuhrer's supervision. S.'s work appears in the same series as, and follows the format of, Fuhrer's commentary, using, but not including, W. M. Green's 1970 critical edition in the Corpus Christianorum series (a list of corrigenda of that edition, and of S.'s deviations from it, is provided on pp. 219–20), and providing a detailed exegesis of Augustine's text. S.'s twenty-five-page introduction sensibly does not deal with several of the general issues (historicity, date, title, textual tradition: see further p. 3 n. 8) discussed by Fuhrer.

Book 1 of *Contra Academicos*, as S. admits (p. 1), is held in low esteem by most modern critics, who find its arguments naive and tedious, and prefer to concentrate on Augustine's confrontation of Academic scepticism in Books 2 and 3. Against this entrenched position, S. contends persuasively that the value of Book 1, whose chief interlocutors are Augustine's two students, Licentius and Trygetius, lies in its propaedutic rôle: it is an introductory exercise in philosophical method, especially in

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni303 Published online by Cambridge University Press

definition. At the same time, it has a protreptic function, announced in the proem (1.1.4) by an allusion to Cicero's *Hortensius*, and developed, as S. demonstrates, by the autobiographical insert in 1.1.3 (with Augustine's use of himself as an *exemplum* of conversion to the philosophical life), the tailor-made dedication to Romanianus, Augustine's patron and the grandee of his native Thagaste (but now in financial difficulties), the portrayal of Licentius, Romanianus' son, as a philosophical enthusiast who should impress his father, and, last but not least, the rôle played in the work by the search for an adequate definition of wisdom's relation to happiness.

It is usually assumed that the *Hortensius* permeates Book 1, and the modern editions of A. Grilli and L. Straume-Zimmermann derive several fragments of Cicero's lost work from it. S., in a careful discussion (pp. 13–25) influenced by some recent discussions (by A. C. Dionisotti, A. Laks, and others) of fragments in classical scholarship, admits the importance of *Hort*., but argues against the extensive presence of verbatim extracts in Augustine's book, suggesting instead that Augustine incorporates points of view ('Positionen') from Cicero's speech. This sceptical approach reverts to C. F. W. Mueller's 1898 edition, where only 1.3.7 is adjudged to contain a fragment of *Hort*. But it is difficult to quarrel with S.'s argument. And that argument reveals new subtleties in Augustine's relation to *Hort*. Thus Licentius' concluding account of the sage (1.8.23) reflects themes of the conclusion of Cicero's speech in *Hort*., a link that S. notes (pp. 205–6) but could have developed. *Hort*. sets the parameters of the discussion in *C. Acad*. 1, inasmuch as the arguments of its interlocutors are implicitly defined by their proximity to, or deviation from, it.

S.'s commentary is painstaking and efficient. Its merit lies in its scope. It deals soundly with the philosophical arguments, but it also contains a wealth of well-judged detail on Augustine's Latin style and syntax (see especially pp. 27, 44, 51, 56, 73, 89, 103, 121, 163, 180), with due attention to *clausulae* (cf. Index s.v. 'Cursus'). The aptness of the allusion to Virgil, *Aen*. 9.310–13 at 1.1.4 is shrewdly noted: Iulus, like Licentius, is sending a message to his father (one hopes that Licentius had more success). S. is persuasive when she argues that we cannot infer that positions adopted by interlocutors in the dialogue represent Augustine's own views (p. 136). Such care for the text enhances the reading of the work that S. offers. So do her departures from Green's edition. Many of these are matters of punctuation: in the most significant case, she is surely right to read the final sentence of 1.9.24 as a question, underlining the paragraph's theme that the discussion has not been conclusive, but can and should be pursued further. And the return to Migne's reading *perceptum* (instead of later editors' preferred *perfectum*—both readings have manuscript authority) at 1.7.19 is a welcome restoration of the undoubtedly correct text. This is the work of a fine Latinist, demonstrating—if, indeed, there is any need—that Augustine is too important and skilled a writer to be left to the tender mercies of theologians.

One philosophical issue that S. might have discussed is Augustine's unthinking identification of Cicero's dogmatic scepticism in his *Academica* with Carneades' position, which, Cicero himself suggests, did not argue that we can know nothing or that we should always withhold assent, a view that Arcesilaus and Carneades found to be no less dogmatic that that of their dogmatic adversaries. Neglecting this does not damage the essence of S.'s analysis, but the corrective is necessary if Augustine is to be appropriately situated in the history of the reception of ancient scepticism, where his distorting influence was considerable (see M. Frede, *Essays in Ancient Philosophy* [Oxford, 1987], pp. 212–20).

That said, this commentary—a reference to the note on *arx philosophiae* (p. 213)

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni303 Published online by Cambridge University Press

might have been added to the excellent thematic index—is a highly competent and perceptive study, that deserves to take its place alongside Fuhrer's work as essential reading for all students of Augustine's philosophy and his reception of Cicero.

*University College London* G. J. P. O'DALY

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni303

## SYMMACHUS: *LETTERS* III

A. PELLIZZARI: *Commento storico al libro III dell'epistolario di Q. Aurelio Simmaco.* Introduzione, commento storico, testo, traduzione, indici. (Biblioteca di Studi Antichi 81.) Pp. 348. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-115-9.

It has long been noted that the letters and speeches of Symmachus provide a fascinating window onto the *mentalités* of the late Roman senatorial aristocracy, a factor expertly elucidated by John Matthews in his *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, AD 364–425* (Oxford, 1975). Nevertheless, Symmachus remains a formidable author, particularly for students intimidated by the austerity of Otto Seeck's edition (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi* 6.1 [Berlin, 1883]). The situation is improving, however. His *Relationes* (his official correspondence from his term as *praefectus urbi* at Rome in 384–5) were translated into English long ago (R. H. Barrow, *Prefect and Emperor* [Oxford, 1973]), and I am reliably informed that an English translation of his entire output is in hand. J. P. Callu's Budé edition with French translation and commentary now encompasses Books 1–10 of his letters. Meanwhile the Italian series, in which P.'s volume appears, includes studies of Books 2–6 and 9. Such endeavours update Seeck both in terms of providing a revised text, and in locating his writings in a late antique social context that has itself been the subject of reconsideration in recent decades.

P.'s study of Book 3 does not pretend to be a new edition: his text, with only minor emendations noted ad loc., is that of Callu's Budé (*Symmaque, Lettres II [livres III–V]* [Paris, 1982]). Indeed, the Latin text and Italian translation (which regrettably are not printed on facing pages) take up only a fraction of the volume (pp. 247–303). P.'s explicit aim is to provide a historical analysis of the letters, which he accomplishes both in the massive commentary itself (pp. 63–244) and in a lengthy introduction (pp. 21–57). There are also useful indices of names and topics, modern authors, and ancient literary, legal, and epigraphic texts, as well as a very helpful table (pp. 58–60) that lists each letter's recipient, purpose, and date (for which P. gives not only his own conjectures, but also those of Seeck and Callu).

The commentary itself is extremely comprehensive, and not simply in terms of its citation of ancient sources and modern scholarship (this latter impressively up-to-date and international). Each group of letters to a particular recipient opens with a summary of that individual's career and his dealings with Symmachus. Such entries complement and update the information about these figures presented in, for example, the first volume of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1971). The discussions of specific letters not only explore pertinent historical points about the setting and significance of each text, but also examine the literary and historical allusions they contain. It is in the commentaries to individual

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni303 Published online by Cambridge University Press