

fact, Pompeians exhibit swiftness more often than Caesar does. Their brand of *celeritas*, however, is typically misdirected or poorly thought out — the Ilerda campaign is an example — whereas Caesar wins not because he is faster than his enemies but because he is smarter (22), a truth the reader comes to (courtesy of G.'s unpacking) through the *B.Civ.*'s deployment of diction, narrative architecture and focalization. This book teems with similarly important observations.

Although G. concentrates on close readings of selected passages, he is also good on the shape of the *B.Civ.* taken as a whole. He observes the false closures that characterize Book 1, and he emphasizes how false or unsatisfactory conclusions mark the construction of all three books. G. is of course aware that the *B.Civ.* is unfinished, but he makes a good case for Caesar's unwillingness, in the very design of the first three of however many books he ultimately planned to write, to allow his readers any sense of final stability or security until Rome's community is restored on sound Caesarian terms.

The book's introduction is best left unread. It works too hard (and unnecessarily) in insisting on its own originality and in complaining about the absence of nuance on the part of too many prior critics of Caesar. M. Rambaud especially comes in for censure (although his still important book is cited throughout). It is easy to forget that Rambaud, more than most, appreciated Caesar's artfulness, even if he did not celebrate it, and in any case did not have at his disposal the highly refined discourse of twenty-first-century criticism. Any of us can be reductive, after all. G. himself asserts that 'the *BC* in fact is not a piece of propaganda, but a work of literature, and in literature allusions can count as political gestures and advance an ideological program' (7): yet here we have a notion of propaganda that can only be described as simplistic, in the way that Rambaud's *déformations* are often formulated in terms that are too simple to be entirely satisfactory. But forget all that. Everything after the introduction is sophisticated, erudite and genuinely helpful.

My only serious disagreement concerns ch. 5, where G. argues that Caesar depicts the Pompeians as barbarians. Here G.'s claims about Roman prejudices against foreigners could have benefited from the nuanced and now indispensable treatment recently advanced by E. S. Gruen in *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* (2010, perhaps a bit too late for G. to have seen it). In any case, in this chapter I am unpersuaded by G.'s critical method. In the *B.Gall.*, Gauls do things that are stupid or cruel. So also, in the *B.Civ.*, do Pompeians. But does the application of, say, *crudelis* or *crudeliter* in both works suffice to demonstrate barbarology? I rather doubt it. A couple of slips. On p. 33 G. notes that, for Caesar, the Romans' failure at Utica in Book 2 'must be attributed to Curio's *adulescentia* (but he was no *adulescens*)'; quaestor in 54 B.C., however, Curio remained in his thirties at the time of his death and so could quite correctly be denominated an *adulescens*. On p. 127 Faustus Sulla is designated Pompey's brother-in-law; Pompey's brother-in-law was in fact P. Sulla, consul-designate for 65 B.C. and a Caesarian partisan.

The fundamental and recurring message of the *B.Civ.* is simple to the point of monotony: Caesar is better than the rest of us, and his enemies are appalling. He is, to recycle a phrase from Daniel Dennett, the centre of gravity in his own narrative. And it is only through the close reading of his narrative that Caesar's *B.Civ.* impresses, through its intricate and artistic propaganda — pure but unsimple. G.'s study is superb at teasing out its complexities.

Victoria University of Wellington

jeff.tatum@vuw.ac.nz

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000690

W. JEFFREY TATUM

A. GARCEA, *CAESAR'S DE ANALOGIA*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. xiii + 304. ISBN 9780199603978. £70.00.

In this thoughtful and interesting study, a revision of a 2007 *thèse d'habilitation*, Alessandro Garcea has added considerably to our understanding of both Caesar and his grammatical and rhetorical theories, and of the textual and political culture of the mid-first century B.C.E. as a whole. The *De analogia*, a work in two books written after Caesar's publication of his *Comentarii de Bello Gallico*, which was dedicated to Cicero prior to the publication of *Brutus* in 46 B.C.E. (in which work it is praised: 'de ratione Latini loquendi accuratissime scripserit', *Brut.* 253), may well have served as a response to Cicero's own grammatical theories as set out in his *De oratore*, of 54 B.C.E. The work survives only in a small number of fragments (if a somewhat larger number of *testimonia*), but was one that must have participated actively in the vibrant intellectual and textual culture of some of the Republic's most chaotic years. G.'s work — to construct a work of

considerable importance through a paucity of evidence — is therefore, of necessity, a challenging one; the end result, although hardly perfect, is certainly a welcome and worthwhile one.

After a brief preface, the work is divided into three parts, each part further subdivided into smaller parts, moving more or less from the general (matters of introduction and context) to the specific (the fragments and *testimonia* themselves). Part I ('Introduction') provides both background and context to the *De analogia* as a whole: a section entitled '*Inter tela uolantia*' (I.1) presents the backgrounds of Caesarian and linguistic politics, as well as matters of eclecticism, polemics and analogy. The next subsection (I.2) turns to the writing of *De analogia* as a whole, from Caesar's intellectual education to the title of the treatise. The final section of Part I (I.3) presents G.'s understanding of Caesar's grammatical positioning, from questions of orthography to derivation and inflection, to analogy and conventionalism. This section concludes with an Appendix on Cicero's *Orator*. G. handles the material with an ease that inspires confidence in his reader (and indeed, he has established himself as a competent wrangler of this work), but a slightly more transparent presentation of argument and endpoint at the start of this section would have been helpful. Nowhere in this work are we given a concise and straightforward summary of the most basic details of *De analogia*: its likely date, its dedicatee, its rôle in the textual politics of the late Republic (that is to say: why it is important) and the state of the fragments.

Part II of the work ('Cicero, Caesar, and the *Oratores Elegantes*: Recreating a Debate at a Distance') is similarly split into three subsections, which endeavour — as the title suggests — to engage in the difficult task of attempting to recreate, through often less-than-helpful sources, an ancient rhetorical debate from a distance of some two millennia. The first subsection (II.4) examines the rhetorical doctrine of *elegantia* as reconstructed from both theory (of the *uirutes orationis*) and, then, literary texts (Cicero's *De oratore* and *Brutus*). The next subsection (II.5) is where G. first turns to the relationship between Cicero's many rhetorical works and the *De analogia*, following then with somewhat more general discussions on the command of linguistic change, the Alexandrian tradition, and Caesar as a prose writer. Finally (II.6), G. turns to the influence of Roman Epicureanism on first-century rhetoric and grammar, with discussions of Philodemus' concern for purity and clarity and, finally, Caesar's ('supposed') Neo-Atticism. As with Part I of this work, I found all of the information presented in Part II both interesting and highly valuable; again, however, I found myself occasionally at a loss as to how G. imagined this all to be coming together in terms of his overall work. There are connections to all of this, to be sure, but they could have been made far more explicit — especially for the reader who is not an expert in the prose culture of this time. There is too much here of importance, I think, to risk discouraging the non-specialist.

Part III of the work ('Texts, Translations, and Commentary') is both the longest (at close to 130 pages) and most important and, in a sense, the most frustrating upon which to offer comment. These twenty-three sections are exhaustively researched and painstakingly presented; and for that, G. deserves only high praise. However, where this reader would have liked some kind of clear presentation of what the *De analogia* might have looked like as a whole, at the moment it had been handed from Caesar (and how awkward would this have been?) to Cicero, I found a somewhat dizzying array of *testimonia* presented thematically — '*I as Consonans duplex* (F4)'; '*The Mutae at the End of a World* (F7)'; '*Case and the Paradigmatic Role of the Ablative* (F120)' — rather than with care to the original order, or, as it were, literary sense, of the text as a whole.

In sum, this impressive work would have benefited throughout from a clearer presentation of its content — and importance — to the non-specialist, and, perhaps, a clearer explanation of the logic of presentation and, in particular, the rationale behind the presentation of the fragments and *testimonia*. Nevertheless, this is a very fine and important new study, one that bears the marks of painstaking scholarship, and one that will be exceptionally valuable to the specialist in late Republican prose and intellectual culture.

University of Washington, Seattle  
scstroup@u.washington.edu

SARAH CULPEPPER STROUP

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000707