

H. has produced an extremely useful and reader-friendly commentary on a fascinating play that deserves a wider readership. Anyone engaging in scholarship on the play will find this rich new resource indispensable.

University of Arizona, Tucson AZ  
 christed@email.arizona.edu

DAVID M. CHRISTENSON

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000665

C. SMITH and R. COVINO (EDS), *PRAISE AND BLAME IN ROMAN REPUBLICAN RHETORIC*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2011. Pp. xi + 248. ISBN 9781905125463. £50.00.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* pairs praise and blame, and rightly so: the same *loci* provide material for each, and both developed within a subtype of oratory, epideictic and invective, which together characterize the *genus demonstrativum* (*Her.* 1.2.2; cf. *Ar., Rhet.* 1368a.33–7). Modern treatments, however, have so often considered them separately that the very title of the volume under review promises a welcome contribution. In particular, after the pioneering work of Süß on Greek ethos (1910) and the book by Koster (1980), who catalogued the main motifs of Greco-Roman invective, modern scholarship has taken two important turns. ‘Praise’ is also receiving some attention, though a monograph remains a *desideratum* at least since 1975 (cf. MacCormack); and Roman invective has been studied separately from the Greek, in an attempt to discover its peculiarities within its literary and cultural contexts. This effort has produced helpful contributions: for instance, after Nisbet, in his commentary to Cicero’s *In Pisonem*, demonstrated how Roman invective ‘often shows more regard for literary convention than for historical truth’ (1961: 193), Corbeill concentrated on the social dynamics of the members of the élite (1999), arguing that mostly Romans believed the content of invective and seeing invective attacks as a series of examples of what a Roman is not (2002: 199); while Riggsby (1997) considered invective as a zero-sum game, in which Romans, whether or not they believed the specific contents of blame, aggressively negotiated their prestige.

The twelve essays in this volume (collected from a conference held at the University of St Andrews in 2006) differ from one another in scope, some being focused on specific speeches and some on broader themes. To the former group belong five contributions. Harries analyses Cicero’s blame of Naevius in *Pro Quinctio* and of Fannius in *Pro Roscio Comoedo*, showing how the legal context accounts for the techniques of invective; Tempest takes a fresh look at the *Divinatio in Caecilium*, demonstrating that Cicero’s reinvention of *topoi* from Attic oratory displays confidence and challenges Hortensius’ authority; a similar use of Greek models animates Rosillo López’s reconstruction of Cicero’s (lost) epideictic *Epistula ad Caesarem*; Tatum considers Cicero’s exceptionally diverse means of invective in *Pro Caelio*, both to neutralize the invective of the prosecution and to vilify Clodia; while praise and blame in the political development illustrated by the fourteen *Philippics* is the subject of Manuwald’s paper, which compares Cicero’s blunt *dramatis personae* with more nuanced portrayals of the same characters from his contemporaneous letters.

The other seven essays focus on themes. Covino moves beyond Cicero and shows how *laudationes funebres*, regardless their falsifications, helped to support the ruling class, while Rees conducts a useful survey of the evidence about *laudationes iudiciales*, explaining how the adversarial nature of Roman courts and rhetorical practices favoured false witnesses; Hölkeskamp’s contribution moves beyond Cicero and surveys the Republican orators’ strategies of self-construction. His argument, which makes a good addendum to Corbeill’s explanation of invective, is twofold: the distance between orators and the people was embedded in an endemically Roman system of merit and reward; and the traffic of praise and blame continuously renegotiated the boundaries of this system within the political and cultural hierarchies of Roman society. Steel reads *Pro Plancio* and *In toga candida* against the *Commentariolum petitionis* to document how Cicero adapted the conventions of electoral campaigns to his own needs; van der Blom analyses both Cicero’s choices and use of family *exempla* for praise and blame and his ways of substituting for his own lack of illustrious ancestors. Less related to the title of the volume is Saeger’s contribution on Cicero’s use of false dilemma in *Pro Roscio Amerino*, *Pro Cluentio*, *Pro Caelio* and *Pro Milone*, but his sensitive readings complement Craig’s 1993 work on dilemma. The best essay in the volume is by Jehne, who asks two questions: ‘What kind of blame were Roman *contiones* willing to bear?’ and,

'How did orators try to make their points if they wanted to argue against the people's opinion?' Jehne demonstrates that orators could succeed by dividing the audience, as Cicero did in *De lege agraria*, or by accusing the audience of apathy, as in some speeches reported by Sallust, or by displaying joviality and innocence, like Caesar and unlike Bibulus and Scipio Nascica; but he also shows that misplaced attempts to blame the audience could be fatal and counter-productive.

As a whole, the volume collects some useful essays, which will be required reading for scholars working on those themes or speeches they analyse; but the engagement with the 'praise and blame' of the volume's title and the contribution to the larger debate varies. Three indexes (passages, general and names) follow the bibliography and help to navigate the volume. Perhaps the biggest disappointment is the introduction. It tends to flatten rather than to enliven the conversation between essays; but especially, it fails both to tie the single contributions to the larger debate and to bring out the originality of the collected papers (the summaries at pp. 3–6 are often unhelpful and at times misleading).

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
lgrillo@email.unc.edu

LUCA GRILLO

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000677

J. BRISCOE, *A COMMENTARY ON LIVY, BOOKS 41–45*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012. Pp. xx + 823. ISBN 9780199216642. £95.00.

This volume is the final instalment of Briscoe's series of commentaries on Books 31–45 of Livy (the first published in 1973). It is a thorough and valuable companion to the last extant pentad. Books 41–45 are a particularly difficult part of Livy to work with, not least because of the lacunose nature of the text. Compared to the first and second decades of Livy's history, they have received relatively little scholarly attention, though hopefully the appearance of this commentary will go some way towards rectifying that. The commentary, along with its previous volumes, is aimed at a scholarly audience, and assumes familiarity (at the very least) with the Teubner edition of Books 41–45 produced by B. in 1986. In order to get the most out of this volume, readers are also expected to be acquainted with the 1909 edition of Books 41–45 by Weissenborn and Müller, as well as Oakley's commentaries on Livy's first decade and Walbank's commentaries on Polybius.

The introduction starts with a concise discussion of sources, which includes a useful table of correspondences between passages in Livy and Polybius. It continues by setting out the problems of establishing the text of Books 41–45, which B. had already tackled in his Teubner edition. The text derives entirely from a single, fragmentary manuscript of the fifth century, the Vienna codex (V), and there are frequent and lengthy lacunae, with a very problematic text in the surviving parts. The introduction is also valuable for its guide to the outbreak of the Third Macedonian War, troubled by issues of dating, as well as apparent contradictions and misunderstandings in Livy's account (and that of Polybius). B. also offers, as he has in his previous volumes, a chronology, setting out how he has worked through the intercalations of the Roman calendar and arrived at a comprehensible dating of the events from 178 to 167 B.C. The last section of the introduction deals with the levy and distribution of the Roman legions in service, continuing the discussion started in the previous volume. In a departure from the usual arrangement of his commentary introductions, B. has chosen to omit a section on 'Language and Style', now viewing his earlier analyses in that area as potentially 'over-schematic' (1, n. 1).

The appendices continue the work started in the commentary on Livy 38–40, providing more information on the tenses of the subjunctive in *oratio obliqua* and the use of the terms proconsul and propraetor. There is also an appendix on the functions of the peregrine praetor. Addenda and corrigenda to this commentary and the previous one are also included. A substantial amount of the commentary is devoted to notes on the text of Livy, and it functions in this way as a companion to B.'s Teubner edition. B. has chosen to acknowledge and correct the errors of this edition in his individual notes throughout the commentary — which can make it rather a difficult read. Nonetheless, B.'s discussion of the textual problems is absolutely necessary for any serious study of Livy. His insights into the syntax are also helpful, as well as the frequent comments on technical vocabulary and Latin usage.

B. is also very good on legal and constitutional issues, and his consistent attention to prosopographical detail will also be valuable for students of Roman history. His discussions of the