supports the 'ideological' purpose of the text. If there is no Epicurean message possible (as, for example, is the case with *Aeneid* 6, being about a journey to the underworld), the Lucretian 'references' are not an evocation of Epicurean philosophy, but something more complex, called by G. 'oppositio in imitando' (n. 49)—a term she borrows from G. Giangrande (*CQ* 17 [1967], 84). The range of the imitations G. assembles includes close parallels, but also very loose ones (the latter often introduced with phrases like 'may owe something' or 'may have been suggested by'). She certainly could have provided the reader with a more systematic typology of references (as does e.g. R. F. Thomas, op. cit., p. 117). Sometimes G. decides to mention only briefly instances that are worth more discussion, e.g. (pp. 79–80) the imitation of *DRN* 2.144 in *Aen*. 9.459 ('prima novo spargebat lumine terras . . . aurora'): one could certainly have a closer look at Lucretius' and Virgil's usage of 'novus' and 'primus' (see Servius, Wakefield and Munro, ad locc.). But on the whole, her treatment of passages in Virgil is good—note, for instance, the discussion of Venus and Mars in *DRN* and in the *Aeneid* (pp. 74–5). The parts that deal with Horace are somewhat more difficult to judge. There are, of course, well known parallels, e.g. between *DRN* and *Odes* 2.16 and 3.1 (where G. finds herself following in the footsteps of, among others, V. Pöschl and H. P. Syndikus). But there are not as many close imitations of Lucretius in Horace as there are in Virgil. G. compensates for this deficiency with more or less self-contained discourses that describe the relation between the genre of satire and didactic epic (pp. 101–15) and the 'philosophy' of Horace (pp. 122–31). Those parts are neither fish nor flesh: they are not exhaustive, but at the same time too extensive to be a mere introduction to the discussion of the actual imitations.

Despite this criticism, the book is useful, and readers of one of the poems G. deals with who want to know more about a possible reference to Lucretius should consult not only the relevant commentaries, but also G.'s dissertation. The book is well produced, with only few misprints and occasional errors (the text she reads in *Ecl*. 6.33 varies between 'ex omnia' on p. 33 and 'exordia' on p. 183, and there is a superfluous 'sic' in n. 23).

University of the Saarland CHRISTOPH CATREIN

ASPECT IN CAESAR

F. OLDSJÖ: *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative*. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Latina Upsaliensia 26.) Pp. 544. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 91554-5076-8.

This is a published thesis. It is a superior thesis, but its virtues—care in surveying prior scholarship, clarity and fullness in explaining terminology and method, warning the reader what it proposes to do, doing it, and then telling the reader what has been done, striving for completeness—make it, for most Latinists, a tedious book, especially in its first 175 pages, where the groundwork is laid. The ratio of words to conclusions is large, and the reader is given few enticements to make him think that his labor will be worth the effort. I recommend that the reader go directly to pp. 489–93 (Part 5), where the conclusions are summarized. I quote from three paragraphs from that summary, which will give an idea of the book's aims and style.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> This study analyzes the functions of tense, aspect, and *Aktionsart*/situation type in Caesar's narrative. Part 1 defines tense, aspect, and *Aktionsart*/situation type as universal semantic categories . . . The need to distinguish between diachronical morphological observations and synchronic functional observations is emphasized, since the overall stem division into infectum and perfectum is not reflected in the functions of all the tense forms. Only the imperfect and the perfect are aspectually opposite . . .
>
> 'Part 2 delineates systematically the workings of the perfective and the imperfective aspect in Classical Latin by looking at aspectual conflicts between choice of aspect and the phasal character of situations . . .
>
> 'Part 3 presents and analyzes excerpts made from Caesar as well as from four other historiographers: Livy, Velleius Paterculus, Florus and Eutropius. The comparative analysis gives a general picture of the use of tense forms in narratives . . . The excerpts . . . make it possible to show statistically that the present of narration is an alternative tense form to the narrative perfect alone and not to the imperfect.

Aspect (whether an action is presented as incomplete or complete) is determined by tense (imperfect versus perfect in Latin historical narrative). '*Aktionsart* deals with the phasal character of situations indicated by verb roots' (p. 138). Verb roots (in which prefixes count) may be stative—that is, normally describing a state (like *esse*, *patere*)—or may be dynamic, describing a process (as *tenere*), an accomplishment (as *facere*), or an achievement (as *interficere*). Both accomplishments and achievements are telic (having an inherent end phase), but the former implies duration, the latter is punctual. The same four phases of state, process, accomplishment, and achievement may be shown by 'situation type', which 'describes the compositional phasal character of the verb together with its immediate context, such as subject, objects, and attributes'. For instance 'Ann walked in the park' is dynamic but atelic, and so describes a process, while 'Ann walked to school' is telic with duration, and so describes an accomplishment, and 'Ann walked into the school' is presumably punctual, and so describes an achievement. The importance of the distinction is that (in Latin) stative stems and situation types most naturally (in past time) are found in the imperfect, and so the use in the perfect should be marked, while accomplishments and achievements most naturally occur in the perfect, and so imperfects are marked.

O. does a good job on pp. 206–41 of showing the effect of the imperfect on normally telic verbs—the imperfect 'cancels the end phase', with the results in meaning being iterative/intensive, progressive, or conative. The last, however, is regarded as arising not from the phasal conflict, but from analysis based on the wider context (which lets one know that the process was unsuccessful).

'Perfective aspect and stative situation type' is treated on pp. 242–51. The only effect that O. there recognizes is an occasional ingressive meaning. He therefore misses something. Most of us are familiar with the use of *vixit* to mean 'he is dead'. The meaning relates to the expectations of the reader/hearer to the permanence of the subject. When Eutropius (6.12.3) said of Mithridates 'Regnavit annis sexaginta, vixit septuaginta duobus', the word means 'he lived', because there would be no expectation that Mithridates could still be alive in Eutropius' day. But if a contemporary of Mithridates were to say 'Mithridates vixit', the meaning may be 'Mithridates is dead', since there could be an expectation of his permanence to the time of the speaker. Caesar never uses *vixit*, but he does use *fuit* and *fuerunt* in ways which, in the proper environment, seem marked. In *BG* 1.53.4, we find: 'duae fuerunt Ariovisti uxores, una Sueba natione, quam domo secum duxerat, altera Norica regis Voccionis soror, quam in Gallia duxerat a fratre missam: utraque in ea fuga periit'. The use of *fuerunt* instead of *erant* in the stative verb seems to indicate the impermanence of the wives, whose

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/53.1.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press