book is enthusiastically written with some idiosyncracies of style: the common convention that authors are referred to in the present tense is ignored ('Athenaeus added . . .', etc.). Twelve lines on p. 54 are repeated on p. 55, n. 13 on p. 146 has lost its opening line or lines, nn. 4–6 on p. 156 are missing, while nn. 13–15 are repeated on p. 157. The page references in the Index of Passages Discussed are regularly out by two or three pages (for p. 149 read p. 151, etc.). There is a full bibliography but no general index.

University of Otago JOHN BARSBY

DE PETITIONE CONSULATUS

G. Laser (ed.): *Quintus Tullius Cicero:* Commentariolum petitionis. *Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert.* (Texte zur Forschung 75.) Pp. vi + 200. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001. Cased, DM 64/SFr 58. ISBN: 3-534-14485-6.

This edition, translation and commentary of the *Commentariolum petitionis* attributed to Quintus Cicero poses a problem for a reviewer in an English-language journal. To judge from its conscious sacrifice of philological minutiae (p. 1), its minimal indulgence in prosopographical or institutional detail (for which the reader is often referred to *Der neue* or even *Der kleine Pauly*), and the space devoted to exposition of essential, but mostly elementary background information rather than to the exploration of problems of interpretation, this book is evidently directed chiefly not at the scholar but at intermediate students. Consequently, however well this book meets its primary pedagogical purpose, its value is necessarily somewhat limited for scholars—who alone in the anglophone countries will have the inclination and the linguistic competence to read it.

This is not to depreciate the quality and interest of the ideas that appear herein. Major themes include the claims that clients were free agents who could not simply be commanded to further an electoral campaign; that the Republic was a fictive (or not-entirely-fictive) 'face-to-face society', demanding continual communication and interaction between political leaders and a politically active urban citizenry; and that a well-integrated plebs normally acquiesced in the leadership of the Senate provided that at least symbolic gestures of solicitude for its *commoda* were forthcoming. These views represent important strands of the current lively debate on the nature of the Republican political system. However, there is little if anything of significance here that did not appear in L.'s notable dissertation ('*Populo et scaenae serviendum est:* Die Bedeutung der städtischen Masse in der späten Römischen Republik', Bochum 1997) and a subsequent article on clientage in the *Comm. pet.* (*GFA* 2 [1999], 179–92). In general, L.'s views tend to be simply asserted here (with a wave toward this earlier work) rather than substantiated, even when controversial (e.g. pp. 182–3); at the same time, L. evinces a kind of airy disregard for the rest of the current debate, even where it bears directly on his subject. Fergus Millar's 'democratic' thesis of Republican politics goes unmentioned; Alexander Yakobson's challenge to traditional views of plebeian impotence in the *comitia centuriata*, first published in 1992, is passed over much too lightly (p. 18 n. 30—below a page on which we are told that the equestrian centuries

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.362 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and First Class were usually unanimous); Egon Flaig's dismissal of voting-assemblies as mere 'consensus-ritual' is ignored.

More mysterious, however, is the omission of work on the *Comm. pet.* itself. Presumably A. Yakobson, *Elections and Electioneering in Rome: A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic* (Stuttgart 1999), several parts of which are focused on the evidence of the essay, and R. Morstein-Marx, *ClAnt* 17 (1998), 259–88, appeared too late to be mentioned. But L. overlooks entirely Dante Nardo's monograph on the authenticity of the work and the manuscript tradition (*Il 'Commentariolum Petitionis': La propaganda elettorale nella 'Ars' di Quinto Cicerone* [Padua 1970]) which, along with that scholar's comprehensive Mondadori text of 1972, raised study of the *Comm. pet.* onto a new plane. In the commentary to §§8–10 and 19 the prosopographical studies conducted by Claude Nicolet and his seminar receive negligible attention (indeed, two are omitted: J.-M. David et al., *ANRW* I.3 [1973], 239–77, and C. Nicolet, in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston* [Paris 1974], pp. 381–95), while the onomastic emendations there championed (§9 *Fanniorum*; §10 *Scapulas*, after Du Puy) are passed over even in the apparatus. (To be sure, they have been criticized: P. Harvey, *AJPh* 101 [1980], 116; F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine* [Rome, 1985], pp. 380–1.) Among other things, these omissions make L.'s treatment of the vexed old question of authorship (pp. 5–7 and throughout the commentary) largely *passé*. As to purpose, L. considers the work a kind of *aide-mémoire* for Marcus alone, not intended for publication or even a wider audience (pp. 5, 191), but does not trouble to answer Nardo's and Brugisser's arguments for its tactical, persuasive use, circulated among a circumscribed group of influential people.

Even without reference to the 'new' manuscript introduced by Nardo (the *Monacensis* 361), L.'s text is broadly serviceable for students, since he restricts himself to deciding—quite sensibly—between earlier editors' suggestions. Unfortunately, however, three of the most notable novelties introduced by D. R. Shackleton Bailey in his 1988 Teubner, the most recent major edition of the work (with afterthoughts added in the same scholar's 2002 Loeb), make no appearance here either in apparatus or commentary: specifically, *ab honoribus nov<orum>* at §14 (for Squarzaficus' *ho<min>ibus novis*) and the vindication of readings of the older family of manuscripts against Manutius' emendations at §9 (*Caucilium* for *<Caec>ilium*—rejected, however, by Nicolet) and §51 (*qui idem* for *qui<n> idem*)—this last a move with real significance for interpretation of the essay. These very places also reveal the inadequacy of L.'s apparatus, which gives no notice that the supplied text in each case is actually the product of early-modern emendation, and indeed at §51 explicitly, but wrongly, attributes the adopted reading to a near-consensus of manuscripts. Unfortunately these are not the only signs of haste. At p. 8 the designation of the families of manuscripts given in the text is the reverse of what is shown on the accompanying stemma. At p. 173 *amicorum* at §46 is defended as a 'correction' by Eussner when in fact it is (as L.'s apparatus rightly shows) universally transmitted by the manuscripts, while Eussner's correction was in fact to *amiciorum*—which L. rejects (but Shackleton Bailey now adopts).

In sum: for scholars the chief interest of this edition may lie in tracking L.'s position in the current debate about the *res publica*. In textual matters, one will still consult Nardo and Shackleton Bailey first. And we must still await a detailed scholarly commentary to ground further progress in interpreting this enigmatic text.

University of California, Santa Barbara ROBERT MORSTEIN-MARX

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.362 Published online by Cambridge University Press