The sociological part looks at the construction of society and how is it regulated by law and customs. The analysis of how definition and re-definition of central political offices (tribunate, consulship), terms (e.g. *nobilitas*), and status (citizen, senator, consular) influenced events and shaped future events shows the great extent to which Cicero used abstractions and philosophical tools to promote his own agenda. It is also here that G. looks at Cicero's complex understanding of law and justice: Cicero's views of the challenges to Roman legal practice and, essentially, to justice lead into a discussion of Cicero's innovative usage of oratory to mete out justice where the legal system has failed (e.g. in the *in Pisonem*, pp. 181–90) and of the dichotomy between natural and positive law in Cicero's speeches. After a dissection of the term *humanitas*, this part ends with an analysis of the three 'Caesarian speeches', the *pro Marcello*, the *pro Ligario*, and the *pro Rege Deiotaro*.

In the final part on theology, Cicero's employment of all aspects of divine and religion is examined in order to understand his handling of the dilemma of choosing between exceptional individuals such as Pompey (and Cicero himself) and the needs of the civic community of equals. G.'s introduction to and schematization of Rome's civic religion (246–54) sets out the religious questions, the traditional answers developed over time, and the alternative answers. This illustrates in an exceptionally clear way how civic religion at Rome was based on evolved (and evolving) practices and that the traditional practice was never the only one available. G. himself makes the link between the religious and the political realities, arguing that the late Republican picture is one where traditional beliefs and practices were challenged by alternative views and agendas which led them, ultimately, to break down. This underlines the current trend of seeing these two spheres of Roman public life as intertwined, and the subsequent chapters support this idea.

Many of the ideas and concepts taken up are well known to any Ciceronian scholar, some even to non-specialists, but G. provides a theoretical superstructure to these themes which allows them to be understood as part of a broader system, not simply as ideas used for any particular situation even if they were carefully chosen in each instance to have an impact on the immediate situation. One of the many strengths of the book lies precisely in the systematization of Cicero's many usages of concepts and ideas to demonstrate how they fit into a grander scheme of understanding the world and all its parts, a scheme in which Cicero and his views play a central rôle. While Cicero does not explicitly describe such an overarching system to his ideas, G.'s analysis makes it clear that the various elements can be made to fit together and it suggests that Cicero could have thought of them as such.

One of the best aspects of this book is the clear signalling of when Cicero is innovative and when not. We tend to take Cicero as representative of far more than his unusual background (for a consular senator), unusual career trajectory, and unusual oratorical talent warrants — a fact which G. duly notes (11–14). But what could have been interesting would be to see to what extent his conceptualizations hit home with his audience. While the analysis is admirably strong on the philosophical, literary and religious contexts, we hear little of the responses to Cicero's speeches in their historical context (the Conclusion (385–90) makes an attempt but from a Ciceronian perspective). Were his audiences persuaded by his elaborately constructed ideas or rather by his brilliant delivery? It may be unfair to ask this question when it is so difficult to answer, but some discussion of the problem would have benefited the analysis.

The book is eloquent and well structured, which helps the reader to get through the rich material and aids further thinking on both individual elements and the entire project. Another strength of the book is that it invites discussion and one does not have to agree with all the analyses or conclusions to benefit from this extravaganza of ideas. Indeed, G.'s systematization of Cicero's concepts and ideas proves an original and clever approach to Cicero's oeuvre and one with which any serious Ciceronian scholar must engage.

Wolfson College, Oxford HENRIETTE VAN DER BLOM
henriette.vanderblom@classics.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000652

D. MANKIN (ED.), *CICERO, DE ORATORE III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Pp. xi + 346. ISBN 9780521593601 (bound); 9780521596572 (paper). £60.00/US$99.00 (bound); £23.99/US$38.99 (paper).

De Oratore is generally considered the most sophisticated of Cicero's treatises exploring the theory of rhetoric: as he states at the beginning of Book 1, it is a more polished (*politius*) and perfected

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000664 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*perfectius*) treatment of the subject than his youthful *De Inventione* (*De Orat.* 1.5). In spite of this, a commentary on this text, which as the blurb rightly states, 'is one of the masterpieces of Latin prose', primarily geared towards advanced students of Latin, has long been awaited. David Mankin's commentary on Book 3 — the first full commentary of the text to appear in English since A. S. Wilkins' nineteenth-century edition — is, therefore, an extremely welcome addition to the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series.

M.'s objective, as he states in his preface, is 'to provide an accurate and readable text as well as what seems necessary information about its syntax, usage, and style, its historical, literary, and philosophical background, and the subtle and often unexpected progression of its thought and argument' — and in this he succeeds. The introduction is divided into a series of sections which cover the essential information for students coming to the text for the first time. Section 1 of the introduction posits the *De Oratore* within the context of Cicero's political and literary career at the date of its composition in 55 B.C. (1a), before offering an overview of the first two books (1b), and a detailed introduction to the content and arguments of Book 3 (1c). As such, there is nothing particularly new in this section, although the claim that Cicero had not abandoned public life (4) could have perhaps been fleshed out with reference to Cicero's assertion, elsewhere, in his post-exilic works that he was engaging in public life from a different angle (e.g. in the preface to *De Divinatione* 2), rather than seemingly perpetuating the view that the *De Oratore* was simply a *solacium*, and the product of an involuntary *otium* forced on Cicero after Luca (the implication of the discussion on p. 1; *contra*, see A. D. Leeman and H. Pinkster, *Cicero De Oratore Libri in Kommentar 1* (1981), 17–21). The second section examines the work's literary and historical background discussing its dialogue form (2a), and the political context of the *De Oratore*'s dramatic setting in 91 B.C. (2b), before establishing the scene and *dialogi personae* (2c). The subsequent section is devoted to the theoretical background, sketching first the schism between oratory and philosophy (3a), and secondly the technical and philosophical systems of rhetoric (3b). Section 4 then turns to the topic of prose rhythm and style to examine the word choice and periodic structure of Crassus' speech in Book 3 (4a), and to clarify and supplement Crassus' account of prose rhythm in 3.178–98 (4b). It is here that M. makes his most original and interesting contribution to the scholarship on *De Oratore* by suggesting that the clausulae attributed to the *diologi personae* perhaps reflect the preferred rhythmic patterns of the real-life speakers: Cicero, he argues, 'may have wished his audience to hear not his own rhythmic "voice", but the "voices" of an earlier and now silent generation' (48). Finally the fifth section provides a succinct overview of the manuscript tradition, which, in short, can be divided into two main classes: the *Mutili* (*M*) and the *Laudensis* (*L*). Also important for M. are the *testimonia* (*T*) found in the works of other ancient authors, as well as the derivative MSS (*D*), and the conjectures of earlier editors and more recent studies.

The core of M.'s edition is his Latin text and the lemmatic commentary of *De Oratore* III which follow. It is beyond the scope of this review to discuss the text and commentary at length, but a couple of examples may help. Primarily, M. bases his text on *M*, *L* and *T*, typically preferring *T* to *M* and *L*, and more often following *L* to *M*. However, all of these have been updated so that they take into account the norms of Late Republican Latin (thus e.g. at 22 'hesterno die' (*D*) is preferred to *L*'s 'hesterna die'), as well as Cicero's rhythmic preferences (thus at 115 M. follows *M* in keeping 'facere' in the clausula 'praeterea facere possit' because its omission (as in *L*) would produce a choriamb + spondee). The result is a careful attempt to improve *L* and *T* which continues the efforts to correct K. Kumaniecki's *apparatus criticus* in the 1969 Teubner edition (cf. Renting's list of corrections in J. Wisse, M. Winterbottom and E. Fantham, *M. Tullius Cicero, De oratore libri III: A Commentary on Book III, 96–230* (2008)).

The commentary itself is very well designed to guide the reader through the intricacies of Cicero's dialogue: copious subheadings, coupled with a corresponding outline of *De Oratore* III (333), guide the reader through the material, while explanatory notes help the student understand the key points of discussion at each stage. Students who are not familiar with Cicero's language and style will benefit from the attention M. pays to these areas; rhetorical terms and their usage are also usefully listed in a separate index. In short, M.'s commentary is a valuable and needed contribution to the study of Cicero's *De Oratore*. It is useful for background information, straightforward in its analyses and explanations, and sensible in its treatment of the text. Continuing the tradition of the Greek and Latin Classics series, it offers an invaluable resource for a close reading of the Latin text. But as the first rhetorical work to appear in the series, it will

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000664 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make essential reading not just for Latin students and first readers of the text, but for anyone with an interest in the history of rhetoric.

University of Roehampton KATHRYN TEMPEST
k.tempest@roehampton.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000664

S. CULPEPPER STROUP, *CATULLUS, CICERO, AND A SOCIETY OF PATRONS: THE GENERATION OF THE TEXT*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv + 308. ISBN 9780521513906. £60.00/US$99.00.

This is a complex, rewarding book which walks the (fault) line between the literary criticism of texts and the cultural history of the ways in which those texts were thought about as they were produced, circulated and received. Stroup's focus is 'dedicated' texts: for Catullus, not only poem 1 in which the poet 'gives' the *libellus* to Cornelius, but poem 16 in which he 'threatens to rape' Furius and Aurelius, and for Cicero the technical writings, especially *de Oratore* and *Brutus*. Textual dedications are evidence for events in a social world, but they are also themselves actions within a literary one.

In the Introduction, S. explains that the 'Society of Patrons' she envisages is 'isonomic', composed of members of roughly equal social status. Members of this society were 'patronal-class' (cf. the oratorical sense of *patronus*), writing for each other in a system of reciprocal exchange *of texts*, rather than either giving or receiving texts in exchange for any non-textual, especially financial, return. This is not a book about Roman patronage.

Part I argues that three key terms are used by Catullus and Cicero with similar coded 'textual' meanings. *Otium* (ch. 1) is not just 'leisure' but specifically time dedicated to literary activity: for Cicero, permitted or even forced 'time off' from public duties. *Munus* (ch. 2) indicates a text given to a dedicatee in the expectation that further texts will be given in response (e.g. Cat. 68.149), and *libellus* (ch. 3) is identified on somewhat slimmer evidence as designating a text as it slips out of its author's control (his anxiety indicated by the diminutive) and into the wider world of 'publication' beyond the dedicatee or S.'s Society.

Part II aims to show how the 'display' of oratory in the forum is 'textualized' by Cicero in his dialogues on oratory, 'complex textual encapsulations … of elite public performance' (145). Ch. 4 examines the Roman problem with such performance: oratorical activity enhanced an orator's high status, but simultaneously threatened it, since it risked aligning him with others whose performance offered pleasure to the watching public — actors, gladiators, prostitutes. This is not a new insight, but S.'s discussion well supports her contention that Cicero's increasing distrust of the Roman people as an audience was a central motive for his turn from delivering speeches to the masses to writing dialogues for a literate few. Ch. 5 treats his 'textualization' of specific aspects of oratorical culture: the *tirocinium fori* in *de Oratore*, with its cast of more experienced and younger orators, and the relationship with the 'live' forensic audience in *Brutus*, which transforms that audience into a reading culture of sympathetic *patroni* in a 'paper forum'.

Ch. 6 argues that the gift-exchange of oratorical services among *patroni* is textualized in Cicero's treatises, both in the give-and-take of the dialogue form, and in the way that dedicated dialogues stand in for delivered speeches, responding to obligations and implicitly requiring further textual dedications in return. S. compares the acts of dedication in Catullus 65 and 68: she needs to show what is distinctively oratorical about Cicero's use of this more widespread trope of textual exchange, and perhaps her (fascinating) discussion of a fragment of the fifth-century B.C. Dionysios 'Chalcous' puts rather disingenuous stress on the fact that Dionysios is attested to have been 'a *rhetor* as much as an elegist' (177). However, S. valuably emphasizes the way in which references to requests from the dedicatee become an 'excuse' for writing, convincingly linking this to similar moves in Cicero's rhetorical openings (*pro Caelio*, *pro Balbo*) in which the orator describes himself as obliged to speak, thus pre-empting accusations that he is eager to indulge in status-lowering display.

Part III identifies a third 'intersection' between the two authors' practices (207), the ways in which they imaginatively 'materialize' their texts as objects capable of doing something in the world. Ch. 7 looks at the Catullan text as fetish, here a term covering poems which 'function as' (223) various objects and actions: gifts and social contracts, but also kisses and assaults. In ch. 8, reworking an earlier article, S. focuses on *Brutus* and its personification of *Eloquentia* as a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000664 Published online by Cambridge University Press