of proof'; a footnote observes, as though it were pertinent, that the sorites is called a *genus interrogationis*; and H. irrelevantly adduces Aristotle, *SEl* 179a35. In § 54 Lucullus would indeed grossly misrepresent the Academic argument were '*eosdem*' at [53.28] to signify numerical identity (so p. 213); but it does not and he does not. On § 60 H. comments that that 'the passage is not easy to understand and requires a detailed analysis' (p. 218). The analysis contains some unconvincing remarks about the alleged 'esoteric teaching' of the New Academy, and it ends with an interpretation which I do not understand (p. 220). In § 60 there is, for once, nothing to worry over. Lucullus turns briefly to the Academic practice of arguing *contra omnia* and *pro omnibus*. The practice is supposed to be the best—perhaps the only—path to the truth. Then what truths have the Academics discovered, asked Lucullus. And answer came there 'None'. The rest is drollery.

Luc. is a difficult work, in parts outrageously difficult. A reader will grasp at any straw in the wind. H.'s commentary has faults; but it is generally competent and often enlightening. It does not supplant Schäublin et al., and it does not replace Reid. But it need not blush to lie beside them on the shelves.

University of Geneva JONATHAN BARNES

DE FINIBUS

†L. D. Reynolds (ed.): *Cicero,* De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis). Pp. xxiv + 233. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased, £18.99. ISBN: 0-19-814670-1.

After the late Mr Reynolds's editions of Seneca (*Letters* and *Dialogues*) and Sallust in the Oxford series, the merits of this one come as no surprise.

Faithful to a no longer binding tradition, R. has put his preface into clear and elegant Latin. His text rests on seven manuscripts of his choice (eight are listed, but presumably B and E, being twins, count as one?) out of some 150 extant. Their relationships are duly established and illustrated from their readings. How much here is additional to Madvig's great work (3rd edn, 1876) and how much in divergence from it is perspicuously set forth. As for what came between: 'After Madvig investigation of these matters progressed step by step; scholars in various ways paved the way for the presentation of these manuscripts (*ad hos libros edendos*). But nobody has attempted a thorough (*funditus*) re-examination of the whole matter.' A footnote supplies a summary of such past contributions. Only a fellow specialist could properly evaluate these eighteen authoritative pages. There follows a list of thirty-two editors and eighty-one scholars referred to in the edition, with bibliographic accompaniments.

And so to the text. I think R. as an editor might fairly be described in a now topical phrase: a compassionate conservative. Not a dedicated upholder of traditional nonsense, though occasionally letting it lie unmolested, but 'happiest in conjectures "of the type commonly called brilliant—neat and pretty changes of a letter or two" ' (*CP* 74 [1979], 77) and very seldom advancing one of his own; that said, an intelligent and independent judge. Anyway, critical genius would be wasted on the *De Finibus*. Not only is the manuscript tradition better than most, but since Madvig and others before and after him removed its detectable errors, that is by the beginning of the last century, little was left to do. For the problems that remain the author is evidently for the most part responsible. As usual in his philosophical treatises, Cicero wrote in a hurry, from

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.48 Published online by Cambridge University Press

imperfect understanding of the subject and sources often misapprehended. In the resulting perplexities the essential postulate of criticism, that the original text will have made good sense, falls to the ground.

A comparison of Book 2 in this edition (59 pp.) with J. Martha's of 1928, leaving aside spelling and a few inadvertances, shows me sixteen divergences, mostly insignificant. But on 42.0 with Martha I prefer Davis's conjecture *qui* to *quam*, and on 90.27 would with R. keep *indulgenter* ('lovingly'), which Martha obelized because he did not understand it. On 45.5–6 R. secludes a citation from Terence, as advocated by P. G. McC. Brown in 1997.

I have noticed four misprints: 7.8, 38.40, 41.8, 45.13. Only the third (*et* for *est*) does any harm.

The apparatus criticus is once again exemplary: technically flawless, lucid, economical, carefully researched, judiciously selective, but reasonably hospitable. Very seldom can I find anything to cavil at, but there should be something to account for the quotation marks on 44.16–18 (actually owed to Muretus). The note on *ne* (69.11), '*fort*. <ut> ne, *ut monuit Wesenberg*', might surely have been spared: see *OLD ne* 12, adding Prop. 3.11.24, Ov. *AA* 1.428. In common with others, R. obelizes *Chius Postumius* (a pleasure-seeker) on 71.25, referring, however, to *RE* sv. Postumius (53), where Münzer offers an explanation of the cognomen and an identification. Both are speculative, but neither that nor the corruptions in certain manuscripts justifies rejection of the name, which has good manuscript authority and is perfectly admissable.

An *index nominum* and an *index locorum* (i.e. passages cited by Cicero, listed under their authors) conclude.

Despite its stylistic merits, *De Finibus* is an arduous and sometimes frustrating read. R. generally suffers in silence, but once (p. 159) lets exasperation show: 'in iis quae sequuntur videtur Cicero rem mirum in modum implicuisse'. But the attractive format of this edition, especially the free use of paragraphs, appreciably helps.

Ann Arbor, MI D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

MOPPING UP OPERATIONS

A. Bouvet, J.-C. Richard (edd., trans.): *Pseudo-César,* Guerre d'Afrique (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxv + 143, map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. Cased, frs. 295. ISBN: 2-251-01399-7.

N. Diouron (ed., trans.): *Pseudo-César,* Guerre d'Espagne (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cix + 196, maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-01413-6.

Bouvet's Budé edition of the *Bellum Africum* appeared in 1949 to favourable reviews, including one by C. O. Brink in this journal (N.S. 1 (1951), 183–5). Now Richard has undertaken the somewhat awkward task of revising it, with the constraint (p. v) 'Notre tâche était donc limité'. Misprints have been corrected and there are twelve pages of 'complément bibliographique', while the text itself is virtually unchanged,

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.48 Published online by Cambridge University Press