

pp. 25 and 31) has missed the importance of Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram*. (See now I. N. Wood, 'Avitus of Vienne: the Augustinian Poet', in R. W. Mathisen, D. R. Shanzer [edd.], *Culture and Society in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources* [Aldershot, 2001].) His second chapter provides sample commentary on *SHG* 4.429–92 and 514–40 (onset and retreat of the Flood), and 5.526–703 (crossing of the Red Sea) (a text would have been helpful). This bristles with somewhat mechanical statistics on *iuncturae* as *spolia*, as well as on Avitus' lexical preferences. In Chapter III.1 A. reviews Avitus' use of pagan and Christian descriptions of floods and storms (pp. 221–49). Some were plundered (the Heptateuch poet, the *Carmen de Providentia Dei*, and Claudius Marius Victor), others not (Proba and Dracontius, pp. 229–301). Avitus also used Valerius Flaccus (p. 238), Seneca's *Quaestiones Naturales*, and many other texts. A. notably sharpens the picture provided by Peiper's (often over-optimistic in regard to Sidonius) *index fontium*. In Chapter III.2 (pagan and Christian 'Referenztexte' in *SHG* 5) A. expounds the mixture of pagan and Christian sources used to describe the flight of the Jews from Egypt (pp. 249–301). Here there are longueurs and improbabilities. Two instances of *vox* and the similarity of *nube columnam* and *nube columbam* seem forced evidence for Avitus' use of Juvenecus' treatment of Jesus' baptism to describe the column of light (pp. 254–5). 'Ausbeuten' (p. 280) and 'kontaminieren', without deliberate evocation of the source text (pp. 281, 287), characterize Avitus' composition. Since he both plunders *tesseræ* for his *opus sectile* without care for original context and uses choice finds with intent, instances of the former practice do not merit laborious description. They merely attest reading and belong among the *fontes* of an edition. The point of A.'s often over-detailed expositions of similarities is often unclear. (For instance, pp. 257–8, where Avitus uses *Aen.* 9.33 and the Heptateuch-poet 438 uses Claudian, *6 Cons. Hon.* 571 to describe the Jews' first sight of the Egyptian army, simply involve different sources.) Some examples may be miscategorized (e.g. p. 282 *SHG* 5.610 and *Aen.* 6.163, hardly a significant thematic imitation). Many are tenuous, dependent on one unexceptional word (p. 309). A. puzzlingly sometimes (p. 328) treats *Carm.* 6, the *De consolatoria castitatis laude*, as if it were part of the *SHG*. The last section (pp. 323–46 on Sidonius and Prudentius) is livelier and of greater interest (though the useful discussion of *SHG* 4.563–573 missed Anon. *Expos. in Apocal.*, *PL* 17.815 C, where Noah's carrion-eating raven is identified as the Jews). A. has many fine points to make in this book, but they are buried deep in material that many will find hard going. He has missed opportunities to confront the poetic with the prose Avitus (e.g. p. 50 misses *Contra Arrianos* 26, p. 10.27–36 and *SHG* 4.173–186). There is insufficient broad argumentation, generalization, and drawing of clearly defined conclusions. For specialists only.

Cornell University

D. R. SHANZER

CICERO THE PHILOSOPHER

J. LEONHARDT: *Ciceros Kritik der Philosophenschulen*. (Zetemata 103.) Pp. 229. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1999. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-406-44729-5.

This book, a revision of the author's Munich *Habilitationschrift* of 1993–4, is about how we should read Cicero's philosophical treatises. As such, it is of interest to those

© Classical Association, 2001

who want to understand the philosophical writer, as well as to those who want to study the philosophical doctrines discussed. There is no book-length treatment of these issues in any other modern language which is similarly clear and informative.

The study falls into three parts. The first is devoted to the standard method of presentation in Cicero's *Philosophica*, the *disputatio in utramque partem*, and to the question of how seemingly conflicting statements Cicero makes at various places about his own stance as a philosopher can be reconciled with each other, once they are read as elements of a broader strategy of commenting on the philosophical issues discussed in the work in question. Leonhardt shows how Cicero's preferences for certain views come out in the length of the two opposing speeches, in the dialogical exchanges between two speeches, and in the concluding remarks after a *disputatio*. L.'s observations yield their most interesting results in cases like *Div.*, where it is doubtful what Cicero's own views were. Here the view promoted by Schofield ('Cicero for and against Divination', *JRS* 76 [1986], 47–65), that Cicero in fact neither believes in divination nor doubts its existence, receives further support. Moreover, further arguments are offered against the view that Cicero temporarily abandoned allegiance to the sceptical Academy in favour of an Antiochean position in his middle period. One weakness of this chapter is, it seems to me, that it does not attempt to take Cicero more seriously as a philosopher. The differing proclamations of scepticism, plausibly explained on p. 80, could have been contextualized with Pyrrhonian sceptical practice; they would have looked less like a *literary* device then. Another quibble I have is with how L. conceives of Cicero's programme of reunifying rhetoric and philosophy. He makes no mention of the fact that, for Cicero, just as philosophy should be informed by rhetoric, forensic practice should in turn be informed by philosophical training. A more flexible model of how the two combine seems more plausible, and could further strengthen some of the points made by L. (cf. e.g. his disagreements with Schäublin, pp. 90–2).

In the second part, L. moves away from the more external features of the narrative to a close reading of some critical discussions of philosophical doctrines. Here his focus is primarily on the way in which forensic techniques of representation and refutation are applied to philosophical topics. This section succeeds both in explaining a number of odd turns in the narrative that *Quellenforschung* had been struggling with, and in exemplifying what 'bringing rhetoric and philosophy together' concretely meant for Cicero (in this instance, I would add; see above). L. concentrates on *Fin.* 2, and makes a good case for how new light can be shed on the puzzles of the text if one reads it against the background of techniques of refutation in the speeches. L. also shows that, in principle, the same techniques which Cicero uses to demolish Epicurean ethics in *Fin.* 2 are also in evidence in Torquatus' exposition in *Fin.* 1, where they are used to support the Epicurean position (pp. 111ff.). He then broadens this further by showing that forensic argumentative technique is also used when Cicero argues for or against Stoic tenets (in *Fin.* 3/*Parad.* and *Mur./Fin.* 4 respectively). At times one has the impression that some of the more recent philosophical literature on Epicureanism has been neglected; at pp. 99ff., where L. considers the question of why Cicero allows the discussion of kinetic and katastematic pleasure in *Fin.* 2 to be interrupted by a discussion of Epicurus' attitude to *luxuria*, I wonder whether this digression is not partly motivated by the fact that Cicero knew he was misrepresenting the Epicurean distinction and wanted to divert attention from this. Epicureans would hardly have accepted that they commit an equivocation by calling both types of pleasure 'pleasure', and it is on the grounds that the distinction between the two pleasures is less

clear-cut than Cicero presents it that the Epicureans would have rejected the charge of equivocation as unjustified.

In the third part, which I shall not discuss in more detail, L. looks at the so-called *Carneadea divisio* and related divisions, and considers the question of how employing such a template for discussing possible views on the *summum bonum* creates certain distortions of the views it is applied to, not only in Cicero but in other texts, too; here the reader may want to compare K. Algra's article on the same topic in B. Inwood, M. Mansfeld (edd.), *Assent and Argument—Studies in Cicero's Academic Books* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 1997), which was published too late to be taken into account by L.

An eminent Latinist once remarked to me that Cicero's philosophical writings are boring, and that only in the speeches do we see Cicero at his best—he was relying on a distinction L. effectively explodes.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

TOBIAS REINHARDT

GERMANIA

J.-W. BECK: *'Germania'—'Agricola': Zwei Kapitel zu Tacitus' zwei kleinen Schriften. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Intention und Datierung sowie zur Entwicklung ihres Verfassers*. Pp. 190. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1998. Paper, DM 39.80. ISBN: 3-487-10742-2.

In March 1990 the last general election was held in the German Democratic Republic. This election was one of the prerequisites for German reunification in so far as the 'Volkskammer' (People's Chamber) voted on joining the Federal Republic of Germany. Just at that moment, Margaret Thatcher, then prime minister of the United Kingdom, invited leading historians to a conference at Chequers, her country seat, desiring information about Germany and the Germans (p. 61). Jan-Wilhelm Beck raises the question of why Tacitus' *Germania* should not have had a 'similar function for the leading circles in Rome', i.e. to supply 'the natural desire for information' (sc. as in the case of the British premier), 'when all eyes were on the new Emperor (sc. Trajan), who remained on the Rhine, and when, astonished that he would not move, they discussed whether it was feasible and reasonable to launch a German campaign' (p. 61). B. asks further why, then, the *Germania* should not, even against the *communis opinio*, have been composed as a political memorandum early in A.D. 98 (p. 34), i.e. before the *Agricola*, usually held to be Tacitus' first work (more likely to have been written late in 98 or early in 99, according to B. [pp. 99–100]).

These and similar questions are posed in two chapters dealing with the *Germania* (pp. 9–62) and the *Agricola* (pp. 63–123). In two appendices on *Germ.* 33.2 (pp. 124–46) and 37.4 (pp. 147–85) B. makes extensive use of the secondary literature, but fails, however, to explore new sources. In the chapter 'Literary Work or Tendentious Pamphlet' B., after an introduction (pp. 9–13), examines the purpose of the *Germania* (pp. 14–41) and, with carefully discrimination, Tacitus' attitude towards the Germanic question (pp. 42–59), which is disputed especially in 33.2. He thus concludes that the *Germania* is neither a political pamphlet aimed at Domitian's anti-Germanic propaganda (p. 24), nor a portrayal of customs and manners (*ibid.*),