death is quickly reported. Again in 1.2.1 'Apud Helvetios longe nobilissimus fuit et ditissimus Orgetorix', Orgetorix's demise (1.4.4) is foretold by the marked use of the perfect. Contrast 1.3.5 'itemque Dumnorigi Haeduo, fratri Diviciaci, qui eo tempore principatum in civitate obtinebat ac maxime plebi acceptus erat', and 1.9.3 'Dumnorix gratia et largitione apud Sequanos plurimum poterat et Helvetiis erat amicus'. Since the imperfect is the normal aspect with stative verbs, it is not marked, and it would go too far to say that its choice requires that Dumnorix was still alive when Caesar wrote the words. Nevertheless, those who believe that Books 1–4 were published separately or, at least, before Books 5–7 (as O. argues, based on a sharp increase in the use of the present of narration in 5–7) can take comfort in the failure to use perfects here, since Dumnorix does not die until 5.7.7. On the marked use of the perfect, see Servius' comment on *Aen*. 1.12 *urbs antiqua fuit*.

The most controversial claim of O. is that the present of narration (historical present) 'is an alternative tense form to the narrative perfect alone and not to the imperfect'. It is true that verbs of accomplishment and achievement are invariably used in the present with the meaning of the perfect. But that is not true of stative verbs. O. quotes *BG* 6.39.1–40.6, in which he concedes that *est*, *est*, *credunt*, *censent*, and *confidunt* could have been expressed through imperfects. Such examples O. treats simply as exceptions. But it would be better to conclude that the present of narration is undefined as to aspect, and the aspect comes from the '*Aktionsart*/situation type'. Examples of use for the imperfect are nevertheless relatively rare, in part because, when it is desired to stress the imperfective, it is always clearer to use the imperfect itself.

University of California, Berkeley CHARLES E. MURGIA

DE ORATORE

J. M. MAY, J. WISSE: *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator (*De oratore*). Translated, with introduction, notes, appendixes, glossary, and indexes*. Pp. x + 374. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £32. ISBN: 0-19-509197-3 (0-19-509198-1 pbk).

Classical rhetoric, once an almost forgotten thing, has returned to fashion, and not just among classicists. Appeals to ancient rhetorical theory are increasingly found in a wide variety of academic endeavors, from communications studies to literary theory to musicology. Yet the fruits of modern scholarship are not easily grasped, and outsiders to the classicists' domain have good reason to lament the difficulty of their access to it as they struggle to make do with translations that are themselves increasingly outdated. A new, annotated translation of *De oratore* is thus very welcome, especially when it is the product of two such well-known laborers in the rhetorical field as May and Wisse.

The present work surrounds their new translation with an extensive introduction to ancient rhetoric in general and to Cicero's rhetoric in particular, a significant bibliography, and various appendices and indices. A few features of the introduction are especially noteworthy. Readers will find good discussion not just of who Cicero's speakers are but why and how their rôles in the dialogue particularly suit them (pp. 13–16), and an astute warning not to snatch facts and opinions, however quotable, from Cicero's evolving argument in a work he designed for continuous reading (pp. 18–19). An analytic summary of traditional rhetorical doctrine provides good

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.99 Published online by Cambridge University Press

access to ancient orthodoxy and a perspective on what makes *De oratore* special (pp. 26–38), and a detailed synopsis makes it easy for readers to find their way through the intricacies of Cicero's discussion (pp. 43–48). The translation itself includes running headers, integrated headings, and copious explanatory notes, and among the three appendices is a 'List of Readings' that, by recording departures from the Latin of Kumaniecki's Teubner edition and from the standard Leeman–Pinkster commentary, will explain the occasional surprise for those using the translation as a crib. The glossary is a somewhat mixed bag of technical terms, but it is followed by a valuable index of names and places that are identified, explained, and keyed to their appearance in the text.

The introduction and notes are helpful and reliable, though there are some idiosyncrasies. An insistence on rendering 'officia oratoris' as 'activities of the orator', for example, is justified in a fussy, pedantic, and ultimately unhelpful note (p. 29 n. 37). Contrast the elegance of Harry Caplan's corresponding explanation in the Loeb *ad Herennium* (p. 6 n. a), which provides precisely what readers need to know without overindulging the commentator's ego. M. & W. sometimes focus too narrowly on the business at hand. Though conscientious at tracing internal references and connections among the disparate parts of *De oratore*, they are reluctant to look beyond the work before them. The curious account of Roman oratory embedded in Cicero's preface (1.12–20), for example, begs for comparison with the *Brutus*'s more emphatic attempt at literary history. That discussion was, admittedly, still a decade away, and there will always be some hesitation to explicate an earlier text with reference to a later one, but modern readers, especially inexperienced readers, can profit from being pointed to the development of Cicero's thought.

The translation seeks to capture the easy elegance of the original, and it is largely successful in this aim. Thus, to take an example almost at random, 'Exierant autem cum ipso Crasso adulescentes et Drusi maxime familiares et in quibus magnam tum spem maiores natu dignitatis suae conlocarent . . .' becomes 'Crassus had also brought with him from Rome two young men, both very good friends of Drusus, in whom their elders then placed high hopes for the preservation of their political standing . . .' (1.25). Strengths and weaknesses here are characteristic: making Crassus the subject is a good way to handle *ipso*, but 'their political standing' for 'dignitatis suae' is not so good a rendering. 'Their' is awkwardly ambiguous and 'political standing' is too personal, since the point at issue is the political position not of individuals but of the optimates as a group. Sometimes the translators' grasp of Roman rhetoric seems much firmer than their feel for the nuances of Roman literary and political culture. Yet on the whole, they succeed in reproducing the experience of reading Ciceronian sentences and grappling with Ciceronian thoughts. Modern students of rhetoric will be truly and rightly grateful to them for doing this so well.

Los Angeles SANDER M. GOLDBERG

ESSAYS ON THE *AENEID*

H.-P. STAHL (ed.): *Vergil's* Aeneid. *Augustan Epic and Political Context*. Pp. xxxiii + 324. London: Duckworth (in association with The Classical Press of Wales), 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-2808-9.

This book contains an introduction and fourteen essays. Each essay is supposed to treat a passage of the *Aeneid* considered 'important for understanding the epic, and

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.99 Published online by Cambridge University Press