speaker's bitterest enemy. (I also cannot quite bring myself to believe that Clodius's *apparitores* would have provided handouts of the haruspices' response: 171.) K. Morrell reconstructs Cato's possible line of argument for the legitimacy of Clodius' legislation (which would seem incidentally to let Caesar's consular legislation off the hook). There follow two pieces on the fragmentary history of delivery (J. Hilder on the *Ad Herennium* and A. Balbo on *suavitas,* in particular) and an argument by C. Rosillo-López that *sermo* is worthy of consideration as public speech despite its informality.

In a paper that seems poorly fitted to the final subsection of the book ('Gender'), H. Beck reminds us of the lost sensory experience that must have enveloped the audience of much Roman oratory — funeral orations in particular, with their striking resurrection of the dead, their songs, chants, and possibly the burning of fragrant woods and spices. (Alas, this last is only a conjecture (267, 280), an example of the evidentiary difficulties faced by such sensory reconstruction.) Finally, three papers do in fact focus on gender: C. Pepe discusses funeral eulogies for women, especially the distinction between those for members of aristocratic families and the more ordinary women celebrated in our celebrated epigraphic samples, the *Laudationes Turiae* and *Murdiae*; B. Gladhill recategorises the lamentations and tearful testimony of Clodius' wife Fulvia as nothing less than 'oratory' (308), apparently because they were public and evidently had an strong emotional effect on the trial; and J. P. Hallett urges the inclusion of Cornelia, *mater Gracchorum,* in *FRRO* on the strength of a surviving fragment of a possibly authentic letter, although, as the editors drily note in the Introduction, 'there is no evidence that she ever spoke in public' (14).

The two volumes should not be expected to present a coherent vision of the contexts and ideological content of non-Ciceronian republican oratory. This is no shortcoming if the goal be understood as one of directing the attention of a wide variety of scholars with a large range of expertise to many dimensions of a complex phenomenon. These volumes are clearly intended as preparatory to the publication of the *FRRO* corpus, which will provide the basis for further advances in our understanding of that phenomenon and its history. In the meantime, one might regret that even in the second volume, explicitly dedicated to fragments, the editors let slip an opportunity to prompt a focused debate on the very definition of a 'fragment'. Steel and her collaborators hold in *FRRO* to a precise but narrow definition ('a faithfully transmitted excerpt copied from a text which was published by an orator and records the exact words which he spoke … on the occasion': 4), yet many of the contributors explicitly or implicitly reject this definition in their papers — explicitly in Corbeill's case (12, 189), but implicitly also, apparently: Goh, Rosillo-López, Gladhill, Hallett and perhaps others as well. Collectively the papers in this volume may problematise the editors' own definition of 'fragment' more than validate it.

University of California, Santa Barbara ROBERT MORSTEIN-MARX
morstein@classics.ucsb.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435820000933

GESINE MANUWALD, *CICERO, AGRARIAN SPEECHES. INTRODUCTION, TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. liv + 480. ISBN 9780198715405. £110.00.

Delivered in January 63 B.C.E., Cicero's three preserved speeches *De lege agraria* have been primarily used as a historical source by scholars, who have usually not given them their due as literary and rhetorical pieces. The recent renewed interest in Roman deliberative oratory has led to several important studies on the speeches in the last fifteen years, but a modern translation of the *Agrarian Speeches* was still direly wanting: J. H. Freese's Loeb English translation dates back to 1930, A. Boulanger's Budé French translation to 1932, and S. McElduff's 2001 Penguin offers only extracts. And aside from E. J. Jonkers' 1963 commentary, which focuses on economic realities, A. W. Zumpt's Latin commentary of 1861 remains the only one to deal with the three speeches as a whole. With this book, Gesine Manuwald provides a new English translation, a revised Latin text and the first full-scale commentary on *De lege agraria* in a modern language, with a scope wide enough for any classicist to find what s/he needs to make full sense of these discourses and open new venues of inquiry.

Building on V. Marek's Teubner edition (1983), M. offers a revised Latin text — although her work is not an edition *per se*. M. improves on Marek's *Agr.* in several places — either by selecting

other readings (e.g. 2.81 *E*: *quem per iter qui faciunt*), by deleting unnecessary additions (e.g. 1.20 *optandum*, 2.55 *eis*), by choosing better emendations (e.g. 2.71 Boulanger's *in Salpinorum pestilentia*) or by rejecting constructions that Marek considered valid (e.g. 2.4 *extrema* † *tribus* † *suffragiorum*). All these choices are convincingly explained in the commentary, and M.'s text, given with a selective apparatus, offers what can currently be considered as the most authoritative and usable version of this difficult and poorly transmitted set of speeches. M.'s translation is highly readable and stays usefully close to the Latin (M. describes it as a 'guide to the facing Latin text'). It will be tremendously helpful for those of us using Cicero's *Agr.* as teaching material.

In her fifty-four-page introduction, M. offers a meaningful account of the political context, and covers the procedural, rhetorical, and philological grounds relevant to the speeches. She takes a clear (and, in my opinion, fully convincing) stance in the debates regarding the speeches' publication, Cicero's strategies and the variations in style and content between the senatorial and popular venues (e.g. xl). M. rightly stresses the double political significance of the orations: with two speeches (*Agr.* 1 and 2) delivered just after Cicero had entered the consulship, and the third serving as a reply to the vicious attacks which followed the first *contio* (*Agr.* 3), the three *Agrarian Speeches* offer unique examples both of consular inaugural speeches and of the rhetorical strategies used by a Roman magistrate to repel an obviously popular bill. M.'s synthesis thus gives a comprehensive view of *Agr.*, and is particularly useful when it deals with legal technicalities (the bill itself, the agrarian laws in general, the procedure of the *contio*: xiii–xxxi).

M.'s commentary is thorough without being overwhelming — which it could easily have been, considering the wealth of historical, legal and social material the speeches contain. Everything is done to make the commentary usable and pleasant to read. Outlines of the speeches are provided (112, 185, 420), and each large section of the speech is introduced by a summary. The comments themselves deal extensively with the historical, rhetorical, legal and philological aspects of *Agr.*, and never burden the reader with information that is not strictly relevant. M. does not neglect the linguistic aspects of the speeches either, and provides helpful grammatical and lexical insights.

As such, M.'s *Agrarian Speeches* offers not only an essential tool for further research in the field, but also a much needed reference book for teaching these speeches.

Sorbonne Université, Paris CHARLES GUÉRIN
charles.guerin@sorbonne-universite.fr
doi:10.1017/S0075435820000362

GIUSEPPE LA BUA, *CICERO AND ROMAN EDUCATION: THE RECEPTION OF THE SPEECHES AND ANCIENT SCHOLARSHIP*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp. xiii + 394. ISBN 9781107068582. £90.00.

CAROLINE BISHOP, *CICERO, GREEK LEARNING, AND THE MAKING OF A ROMAN CLASSIC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. x + 359. ISBN 9780198829423. £75.00.

The demise in 2019 of the literary critic Harold Bloom could be understood as a definitive blow to the concept of the canon. In his *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (1994), Bloom championed the traditional Western canon as a body of sublime literature whose greatness and superior aesthetic value were self-evident and could not be discussed: Homer, Plato, Shakespeare, Kafka, Dante, Goethe, among others. Bloom's critics pointed out that his canon was mainly a list of 'dead white males' (with the lonely presences of Jane Austen and Virginia Woolf).

Bloom insisted that aesthetic judgments constituted the only criteria for admission into the list. No reader would question the literary value of *War and Peace* or *Pride and Prejudice*; but, as the two books under review here posit, admission to the canon demands conscious strategies of self-representation and preservation of one's own works. Entering a canon demands hard work; as Giuseppe La Bua and Caroline Bishop argue, Cicero was willing to pay the cost (although Cicero would probably be disappointed to learn that Bloom included only one of his books, *De natura deorum,* in the canonical list).

So how do you become a classic? In *Cicero and Roman Education*, L. B. studies how Cicero's oratorical output was put into writing and became canonised throughout the centuries as a source of good Latin (*Latinitas*) and of elite identity and morality, particularly as a model for young male