important omission, because there are very few cross-references between contributors in this volume. Fortunately, the lengthy *index locorum* (pp. 197–201) partly compensates for this editorial oversight, since it easily shows which Lucilian fragments are discussed by which contributors (there is no *index rerum*). Furthermore, instead of a general bibliography at the end of the volume, there are individual lists of books and articles at the end of each paper; this choice may have allowed for a more speedy publication of the conference's proceedings but has also created unnecessary bibliographical repetition of the standard Lucilian editions and some frequently cited studies on Lucilius. But these are trivial misgivings when compared to the striking absence of an editorial introduction discussing the perils of constructing 'Identität' (let alone 'Alterität') out of the scanty remains of a poet devoted to the elusive and flexible genre of Roman satire. Can I find the 'real' Lucilius amongst isolated one- or two-line statements, which may have been made ironically or may have enabled Lucilius merely to strike a pose or may have been uttered by a character other than Lucilius in a fictional context of questionable relation to reality? Would I find the 'real' Lucilius even in a complete poem narrated in the first person singular? Why should I assume that ostensibly explicit statements found in fragments such as 671–2 M = 650–1 W = 656–7 K ('publicanus vero ut Asiae fiam, ut scripturarius / pro Lucilio, id ego nolo, et uno hoc non muto omnia')—a couplet that occurs at the beginning of the editorial 'Vorwort' and is discussed by no fewer than three contributors—clearly reveal Lucilius' sense of 'Stolz', and demonstrate that he was well-aware of his 'Individualität'?

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

A CICERONIAN COMPANION

J. M. May (ed.): *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Pp. xiii + 632. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €150/US$174. ISBN: 90-04-12147-1.

'Companions' are potentially most useful things, convenient vade-mecums which contain most of the information one needs when beginning to work on an unfamiliar topic: with a companion, there should always be a sense of 'this is the book you have to have (or have access to)'. It is not the (primary) job of a companion to advance knowledge; rather, it should state the *communis opinio* and give a sense of the point scholarship has reached. On these criteria, the book under review succeeds admirably: it can be confidently recommended to students as a first port of call, and scholars will find it indispensable for a reason that I will come to at the end of this review.

The contributors are for the most part well-known American Ciceronian scholars: there are no British or German contributors (though J. Wisse of Newcastle University has written two chapters). Professional Ciceronians will be interested in the list of contributors, which helpfully states what everyone is currently working on. The editor, J. M. May, has assembled an able team, though in places one wishes that they had been able to read each other's contributions, and also that they had been given firmer editorial direction in matters of presentation (e.g. on whether to refer to Cicero's works by Latin or English titles, and on whether to use B.C. or B.C.E.).

The book opens with three introductory chapters: a standard account of Cicero's

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.89 Published online by Cambridge University Press

career by May, a discussion of 'rhetorical education in Cicero's youth' by A. Corbeill, and an account of 'Ciceronian oratory in context', again by May. Corbeill's chapter is largely concerned with *Inv.* and *Rhet. Her.* He argues that *Rhet. Her.* comes at a later stage of development in a teacher or curriculum, and that its author is concerned to conceal his debt to Greek theory because to acknowledge it would pose a 'threat to the convergence of moral and political authority at Rome' (p. 42); whether or not one accepts this, the chapter brings out well the contrasting ways in which Greek rhetoric is integrated in the two texts. May's chapter on the social context of oratory, an expansion of an earlier article, concludes with a notably fine description of what a Roman oratorical performance would actually have been like (pp. 66–7).

We then have six chapters on groups of speeches, with one (Corbeill's) on a theme: A. Vasaly on the speeches down as far as *Leg. Man.*; R. W. Cape Jr on the consular speeches; A. M. Riggsby on the *post reditum* speeches, broadly interpreted to mean all the speeches from the period 57–49 B.C.; Corbeill on invective; H. C. Gotoff on the *Caesarianae*; J. Hall on the *Philippics*; and J. W. Crawford on the lost and fragmentary speeches. This scheme is a reasonable one, but results in the unfortunate exclusion of *Sul.* and *Arch.*, which fall between Chapters 5 and 6; *Mur.* is also omitted, because Cape restricts himself to the speeches that Cicero published together in 60 as a corpus. Vasaly argues (pp. 82–7) that it was Cicero's delivery, not his style, that Molon toned down; no doubt he had something to say on both, and we should also bear in mind that if *S. Rosc.* was published after Cicero's visit to Molon, then Molon may have influenced it. Cape argues (pp. 113–20) that the speeches of the consular corpus mentioned by Cicero at *Att.* 2.1.3 should be considered as a unit—a good idea, even though some of the speeches are lost. However, his long discussion assumes throughout that the speeches were published in exactly their original form of three years earlier, and this begs the question. In the absence of explicit evidence either way, should we place the composition of the speeches in the context of their original delivery or in the very different context of their original publication? The question seems to me to be an open one, with large implications for the purpose of these speeches, and Cape's failure to consider this point in detail (Helm's work is dismissed in a footnote on p. 154) causes his entire discussion to rest on a doubtful premise. (On a smaller point, he wonders, like other scholars, why *Rab. Perd.* was included in Cicero's corpus rather than *Mur.* [pp. 118–19]; surely the answer is that *Mur.* had already been published?) Riggsby's chapter is one of the best in the volume, and deserves to be widely read. Rather than looking at the *post reditum* speeches individually, he takes a fresh look at some of their characteristic themes, noting, for example, how they tend to dwell on a small number of recent events, the Catilinarian conspiracy, the Bona Dea scandal, Clodius' tribunate, and Cicero's recall (but not his exile!); and Riggsby finds that the remoter past is given a similarly selective treatment. There is much good material here, and Riggsby sheds a fascinating light on Cicero's psychology and inconsistencies. Next is an important treatment of invective by Corbeill, who argues that invective identifies someone as unfit for the community, and hence serves to limit improper behaviour by the élite. Gotoff follows with a fuller and more useful introduction to the *Caesarianae* than is to be found in his commentary on those speeches. He suggests (pp. 255, 265) that the setting of *Deiot.* was not a formal trial but an inquiry into the king's loyalty prior to Caesar's projected Parthian expedition; hence (among other things) the lack of a recorded verdict. Hall gives a clear introduction to the *Philippics*, recapitulating the work of C. W. Wooten and W. R. Johnson, and commenting on major themes. Crawford's chapter is a revision of the introductions to her editions of the lost and fragmentary speeches.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.89 Published online by Cambridge University Press

At this point we move on to the rhetorical works of the 50s and 40s. Wisse starts with an account of the intellectual background of these works, attempting to recover Roman attitudes to things Greek and steering a mid-course between the extreme positions of Jocelyn and Gruen (I would, however, dispute his argument that *Mur.* presupposes knowledge of Stoicism [p. 331], and that the speech suggests that acceptance of Greek culture was dominant [p. 336]); we are then given stimulating accounts of rhetorical theory, the quarrel between rhetoricians and philosophers, and Atticism. Wisse also provides the following chapter on *de Orat.* This covers the same ground as the introduction to his and May's translation of this work: we are encouraged to see *de Orat.* as its original readership would have seen it, as idiosyncratic and surprising. Next comes E. Narducci, with a penetrating chapter on *Brutus* and a more perfunctory one on *Orator* (both notably well translated from the Italian by May). Finally, there is a chapter by R. N. Gaines on *Part.* and *Top.*, the first of which is taken to represent rhetorical philosophy and the second philosophical rhetoric; *Part.* is plausibly seen as an Academic philosophical enquiry into the nature of rhetoric rather than as instruction in rhetoric for Cicero junior.

At the end of the volume G. A. Kennedy gives a quick survey of Cicero's oratorical and rhetorical legacy to the nineteenth century (it is good to see W. Guthrie's eighteenth-century translations being appreciated on p. 497)—then at last we come to the great asset of this collection, C. P. Craig's bibliographies. What we have is (i) a quite brilliant survey of all the work done on Cicero's speeches and rhetorica between 1974 and 1999 (the previous such survey, by R. J. Rowland Jr, terminated in 1974); (ii) a fifty-eight-page bibliography covering everything published during this period, and many important works from before and after; and (iii) complete bibliographies for every relevant work of Cicero, keyed to (ii). (i) gives an intelligent summary of every significant book and article, summarizes important debates like that over the publication of Cicero's speeches (pp. 515–17), and gives useful suggestions for the future direction of research in the several areas. (ii) and (iii) together, on the other hand, will save scholars the task of working through twenty-six volumes of *l'Année philologique* every time they wish to undertake research on a particular speech or rhetorical work of Cicero. These sections alone make this Companion indispensable. But for the whole volume, publisher, editor, and contributors are to be heartily thanked.

University of Leeds D. H. BERRY

THE CASE AGAINST CICERO

M. C. Alexander: *The Case for the Prosecution in the Ciceronian Era*. Pp. xii + 370. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, US$70/£44. ISBN: 0-472-11261-9.

Cicero's well-known preference in the law courts for speaking on behalf of the defence, rather than the prosecution, has unfortunate consequences for our view of Roman judicial cases: we know a good deal about the kind of oratory employed by the defence, but far less about the typical tactics of the prosecution. Michael C. Alexander's new study sets out to redress this imbalance by exploring a selection of Late Republican legal cases from the point of view of the prosecutor.

The book consists of thirteen chapters, eleven of which focus on individual cases in which Cicero spoke on behalf of the defence. In each of these eleven, A. examines the legal basis for the prosecution and tries to establish what we can deduce about the

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.89 Published online by Cambridge University Press