of this backdrop, offering some discussion of the meaning of 'fragment' in his introduction, though his citation, for example, of Glenn W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen, 1997) simplifies the discussion there into rather pedestrian advice about editorial criteria. For the most part, B. presents himself instead as a rather straightforward continuator of Enrica Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (first published in 1930; fourth edition Turin, 1976, by which time the title had acquired the clarifying addition of *liberae rei publicae*), which replaced Henrich Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Zurich, 1842), but only up to the end of the Republic. B.'s volume, a revision of part of his 1999 doctoral thesis at the University of Turin, collects fragments and *testimonia* for twenty-two orators active under Augustus; in his introduction, B. promises a second volume that will cover the reign of Tiberius.

For each orator, B. provides a useful bibliography, followed by a brief biographical résumé. *Testimonia*, individually numbered, follow. Next come any fragments, isolated to the extent possible, likewise numbered individually, and given pride of place at the top of the page; a fuller citation of the text in which they appear is given below in smaller type that makes it clear what really matters here. Unlike Malcovati, B. offers a facing translation of all ancient texts. Each section ends with a commentary; some of these are fairly long, and the mountains they make are not always more interesting than the inspiring molehills.

Any such project occasionally seems a little ridiculous. Thus, for example, Lucius Arruntius pater F6 enshrines the fact that the man once said 'Ready'. The most memorable bits typically are jokes (this, of course, is why they were not forgotten in the first place), such as 'Galba's brain has a lousy apartment' (C. Sulpicius Galba T35), though this was said not by but of one of B.'s twenty-two. Does an aggregate of such things really offer a picture of oratory under Augustus? Probably not. Anyone in search of such is surely better served by reading, straight through, Seneca the Elder's *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae* (the latter are the source of many of B.'s fragments) or the later reflections of Quintilian (B.'s other major source)—or, for that matter, the invented speeches in Livy. Nevertheless, B. has offered a handy reference, useful, perhaps, more to prosopographers and historians than to Latinists, though the latter will surely find here moving evidence of how silent even Latin's Golden Age can be, as well as a reminder that Virgil (shown on the cover!) and others lived in a world of words that extended far beyond the edges of the literary page.

University of Pennsylvania SHANE BUTLER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni291

TAKING DECLAMATION SERIOUSLY

E. GUNDERSON: *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity. Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Pp. xii + 285. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Cased, £45, US$65. ISBN: 0-521-82005-7.

Rhetoric and declamation have become increasingly popular in the past two decades, but Gunderson's monograph is the first on Roman declamation since that of Bonner (S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* [Liverpool, 1949]). G. is somewhat cautious about the popularity of his book, a recognition of the fact that declamation is a subject is often mentioned by scholars, but there are not

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that many who take it seriously or work on declamation in detail, and thus G.'s audience may not be as wide as it deserves to be. Nevertheless, G. deserves a place among standard treatments of the genre (notably Bonner and D. A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* [Cambridge, 1983]).

In this book, G. continues a project begun in his earlier works ('Discovering the Body in Roman Oratory' in M. Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity* [Oxford, 1998] and *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World* [Ann Arbor, 2000]), exploring the construction of masculinity through speech, this time within the medium of Roman declamation, focusing on Roman identity. The book is mostly concerned with the Imperial period; nevertheless, G. does look back to Cicero, which is useful in that he is most people's starting point when it comes to Roman public speech. G.'s Introduction sets up the field of exploration in a clear way and allows the reader to understand how G.'s interpretation is new and challenging: his readings of the 'literary criticism' in and about declamation are particularly good, forcing the reader to question their preconceptions of the genre. Chapter 1 is concerned with memory and what it means to look back at the past (particularly for the Elder Seneca), also the relationship between past and present, both historical and rhetorical, and begins to link masculinity and speech, an issue central to G.'s argument in this book and the rest of his *oeuvre*. Chapter 2 explores the relationship between fathers and sons through declamatory themes, and the construction and subversion of paternal authority, and looks at ideas of corporeality and dismemberment: the body as text and metaphor using the example of Cicero and his death, amongst others. Chapter 3 explores some of the relationships between declamation and the real world. Chapter 4 uses sanity and insanity to continue to explore father–son relationships. G. also brings in the link between speaking and masculinity before concluding that declamation is important, has a rôle to play in public speech, and should not be written off. Chapter 5 examines the declamations concerning the *Miles Marianus*, which are concerned with homosexual rape and murder, developing the interest in gender hitherto expressed, before moving into the consideration of more theoretical questions. Chapter 6 returns to the relationship between fathers and sons particularly with respect to declamations concerning incest, although parricide (a frequent topic of declamations and an interesting way to explore father-son relationships) is not given any systematic treatment, possibly to avoid being seen as overly Freudian. G. concludes as he began, excellently. He coherently ties together the predominant themes, and ends by saying that his work is not an end in itself but a beginning, an attempt to open up the field for other scholars, which needed to be done.

G. takes declamation seriously rather than writing it off as 'schoolboy play', and is thus part of a growing trend in scholarship to rehabilitate the genre. On occasion (particularly in the Introduction and Conclusion) G. sees declamation as unreal, frivolous, and tied up with the decline of public speech at Rome to some extent, although this is a rhetorical strategy. G. repeats 'traditional' interpretations in order to subvert them. While this may not be the kind of interpretation many readers are familiar with, the challenging of preconceptions must always be welcomed as part of a vibrant scholarly world.

In the body of the text, there are times when the reader may feel that G.'s interpretation is theory-led, rather than letting the texts modify his theory. The high proportion of theory and a reliance on jargon in the book can make it hard to read. In addition, while G. is strong on the conceptual framework of declamation, how it ties in with a Roman view of the world, such a sociological view of rhetoric may well be a

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

new experience for many, but it should not be dismissed. There is little on the relationship between declamation and rhetorical theory, although this is a fault G. shares with many scholars; at least he is open (p. 90) about eschewing such readings.

On p. 2, *POxy.* 2400 is third century A.D. rather than B.C., which damages G.'s argument somewhat; on p. 105, for 'Hermogenes' read 'Hermagoras'; also on p. 129, differentiating between the Augustan declaimer Hermagoras (a pupil of Theodorus of Gadara) quoted by the Elder Seneca and his namesake from Temnos, known for his innovations in rhetorical theory, would be a great aid to the general reader and thereby remove any possible confusion.

In Appendix 1, 'Further Reading', and the main Bibliography there is some bibliographic confusion: the survey article attributed to Fairweather is in fact by Sussman. Fairweather's article is entitled 'The Elder Seneca and Declamation' (which can be found in the same volume of *ANRW*). To further confuse the matter, the page numbers of the work cited are in fact those of Fairweather's article, whereas Sussman's bibliography appears on pp. 557–77.

Nonetheless, these quibbles should not detract from a work that, while occasionaly frustrating, is a worthy re-examination of the subject. Most of the book's shortcomings are best understood as a challenge to the scholarly world to take up G.'s baton, an outcome I am sure that he and others would welcome.

University of Leeds ADRIAN T. FURSE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni292

ARATEA

D. M. POSSANZA: *Translating the Heavens. Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. (Lang Classical Studies 14.) Pp. xiv + 279. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 2004. Cased, €70. ISBN: 0-8204-6939-4.

In this study of Germanicus' *Aratea*, D. Mark Possanza endeavors to understand the poem not simply as a translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena* but as a 'second original', a work of literature in its own right. Drawing on the methodology of modern translation studies, he is interested not in determining the accuracy (or lack thereof) of the Latin poet's version of the famous Hellenistic work, but rather in describing and interpreting the ways in which Germanicus creatively transposes Aratus' poem into a new context, the literary discourse of the late Augustan period.

Germanicus was not trying to produce a literal translation of his Greek source (as P. points out, no Latin translator ever engaged in such a pedestrian pursuit), as is clear from the many changes he made *vis-à-vis* the *Phaenomena*. These range from small-scale adjustments and variations, through factual corrections (as a true *poeta doctus*, Germanicus used commentaries, from which he learned about the Greek poet's astronomical errors) to jettisoning Aratus' section on weather signs, which the Latin poet apparently replaced with a discussion of astrometeorology. Even if the resulting poem is still very close to the original and easily recognized as a translation, its tone and the worldview it presents are, as P. discusses in detail, greatly different from those found in Aratus. Crucially, Germanicus dispenses with the central idea of the *Phaenomena*, namely that the stars are signs put up by Zeus to give guidance to humans in the context of an orderly cosmos ruled by divine providence. Instead, the Latin poet views the constellations not as a divine semiotic system but as a world of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni292 Published online by Cambridge University Press