By addressing the utilitarian function of praise in ancient oratory, Manuwald offers a subtler reading in 'Ciceronian Praise as a Step towards Pliny's *Panegyricus*' (85–103). Especially revealing is Cicero's tactical and hortatory praise of Pompey in *pro lege Manilia*, of Caesar in the *pro Marcello*, and of Octavian in the *Philippics*. In all three, Cicero amalgamates eulogy and protreptic to commit his *laudandi* to the civic policies and communal good of his own vision and to motivate them to follow up or to undertake virtuous deeds. The parallels with Pliny emerge persuasively even before Manuwald draws them out in her conclusions.

Gibson moves the discussion to laudatory literature in Pliny's time ('Contemporary Contexts', 104–24). Despite the absence of theoretical discussion on epideictic rhetoric, he argues, praise and blame operate 'on the ground', fuelled by the social centrality of praise in Rome. The prefaces of Tacitus' *Dialogus*, *Agricola* and *Histories* and Frontinus' *Aqueducts*, and Dio Chrysostom's *Kingship Orations* provide comparable intersections of eulogy and political theory. Gibson rightly notes that perceived overlaps between Pliny and these authors result from elaborations of a common tradition rather than from conscious imitation. But Gibson also reveals strong thematic and verbal echoes between the *Panegyric* and imperial praise in Martial and in Statius' *Silvae*, which belie Pliny's claim that Trajan's reign breaks cleanly from the empty eulogies of emperors past.

Hutchinson's 'Politics and the Sublime in the *Panegyricus*' (125–41) purports to 'explore the nature of sublimity in the *Panegyricus*' (125). It is hard to gauge the direction and contribution of this essay because the sublime is never clearly defined. Elegant points about Plinian metaphors of size (e.g. Trajan's physical height as 'symbolic elevation', 133) are lost in a mire of highly subjective identifications of 'the sublime' in isolated sentences, as in 52.6: 'the simple language of *dedit*, with no *nobis*, rises into grandeur, made more sublime by the preceding renunciation and Trajan's understated *bene facias*' (132). Even incidental remarks, such as the lack of construction mayhem in the city (51.1), are evidence of the sublime: 'the image has a suggestion of grandeur, but verges on the parody of a military campaign or an earthquake' (128; compare Roche's illuminating discussion of the same passage, p. 49).

In 'Down the Pan: Historical Exemplarity in the *Panegyricus*' (142–74), Henderson follows the stream of historical models and anti-models that pervade almost each chapter of the speech. While Henderson's distinctive style occasionally obfuscates fairly obvious points ('whereas Domitian's *name* disappears but for its two bows early on, so that insistently vindictive disappearing *of* the monster into oblivion can feature extensively as the vituperative flipside of the binary rhetoric of praise', 143), it frequently soars up Pliny's sleight of hand ('if the emperor doesn't fulfil his vows, they won't play ball' (147), discussing the prescriptive function of senatorial praise). Several of the exempla detected by Henderson, including Nerva as Anchises to Trajan's Aeneas, (150); Tiberius' patronage of Sejanus echoing Nerva's adoption of Trajan (150); and Pompey lurking under a digression on the Nile (159–60), open up attractive intertexts beyond the domain of oratory.

In 'Afterwords of Praise' (175–88), Rees rectifies a common misconception about the reception of the speech. The position of the *Panegyric* as the head of the fourth-century anthology known as *XII Panegyrici Latini* has long encouraged the impression that it constitutes the ultimate model for all subsequent eulogies. Rees, however, shows that the *Panegyric* is not traceable in these later speeches as their verbal, thematic, or ideological template; the primacy of Pliny's speech in the manuscript is not recognition of its achieved status but an attempt to ensure, by precedent, the respectability of the panegyric project and to showcase by contrast the subsequent panegyrists' original contributions to the genre.

University of South Florida ELENI MANOLARAKI
emanolar@usf.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000822

C. HEUSCH, *DIE MACHT DER* MEMORIA*: DIE ‚NOCTES ATTICAE' DES AULUS GELLIUS IM LICHT DER ERINNERUNGSKULTUR DES 2. JAHRHUNDERTS N. CHR.* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 104). Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2011. Pp. xiii + 482. ISBN 9783110245370 (bound); 9783110245387 (ebook). €119.95.

The subject of this book, a light revision of Heusch's Düsseldorf *Habilitationsschrift*, is Gellius' concern with *memoria*, a word of frequent occurrence in his work, but also a topic with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

resonance in modern Germany, where she documents a vogue for the study of cultural memory as of something in danger of being lost. Her erudition, amply displayed in unashamedly dense footnotes — she repudiates the contrary practice 'in (amerikanischen) wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten' (ix) — extends beyond antiquity to French and German philosophy as applied to culture and literature; references abound particularly in ch. 2, where in one sentence (42) she cites Jan Assmann, Ricœur, Halbwachs, and Husserl, and ch. 3, where she discusses Aleida Assmann's exposition of the difference between *Speichergedächtnis* and *Funktionsgedächtnis*, before admitting that unlike the collective *Speichergedächtnis*, the *memoria* invoked by Gellius is nearly always assigned 'einem konkreten Subjekt' (100). No doubt those English-speaking readers who claim to rise above the intellectual ground floor of empirical fact will find it hurtful that, whereas the contributions of Anglophones to classical scholarship are liberally recorded in her bibliography, the only general writings in English listed on either cultural or literary theory are two articles on intertextuality and quotation by Heinrich Plett.

Having in her introduction reviewed the 'Stand der Gelliusforschung' and demonstrated the significance of her topic for times she deems not altogether unlike the Antonine age, H. next examines the place in Roman culture of *memoria*, the collective memory of ancestral *exempla* in which the living sought to be included, but also the training of individual mnemonic powers. Gellius becomes the focus in the massive third chapter (49–189), which examines in great detail his references to memory and its means of preservation and cultivation, his modes of citation, his purposes in citing, the truth or fiction of claims to quote from memory, his quotations from Greek in the original, in translation, or both, his suppressions of intermediate sources, the extent of his reading, and his encouragement of memorization. Ch. 4, on the Graeco-Roman culture of memory, is also long (191–301); after a brief survey of Antonine culture in general, H. considers the implications of Gellius' title before examining bilingualism in the *Attic Nights* and in Antonine culture generally; she then very perceptively discusses the phenomena known as Atticism and archaism, reviews the 'Protagonisten der griechisch-römischen Bildungskultur' as portrayed in the *Attic Nights*, and analyses the means by which things Greek and Roman are brought into relation with each other by comparison or synchronism.

This brings her to ch. 5, 'Das Bildungskonzept der ‚Noctes Atticae' im Schnittpunkt griechischer und römischer Traditionen' (303–402); after noting the parallels for the dedication to Gellius' children, she compares the place of *otium* in Gellius, Cicero, and the younger Pliny, noting the increased importance of learning as the chief employment of free time, and considers the rise of popularizing works such as the *Attic Nights* and the *Konversationslexika* current in Germany since 1796, observing the range of information Gellius provides in the way of 'enzyklopädische Bildung' but also the predominance of grammar (in its broad ancient sense) and rhetoric. She then turns to medicine, which demonstrates Gellius' concern for usefulness, unravels his somewhat complex attitude to philosophy, and elucidates the moral as well as intellectual components of his 'Bildungsbegriff', ending the chapter with a brief survey of his influence on European humanists.

Finally, a brief 'Fazit und Ausblick' brings us back to the theory of cultural and individual memory before noting the traditional and the innovative features of Gellius' work and pointing future scholarship towards the study, not only of particular chapters, but also of the relation between its literary form and its time of composition, to determine whether, in content and structure, he played a greater part in the development of the late antique encyclopaedia and the medieval *artes liberales*.

This is a very rich book, which read from cover to cover, footnotes and all, amounts to a serious monograph on the *Attic Nights* at large; rather than express the conventional hope for an English translation, which would be difficult not only because of the many references to German culture, I urge students of Gellius not familiar with German to learn it. There is such a wealth of sound sense and good comment that it seems churlish to look for points of disagreement; nevertheless, I do not find in Gellius' complaint that Nigidius Figulus seems to have written rather to assist his own memory than to instruct his readers (*NA* 17.7.5; likewise Stilo at 16.8.3) 'Zurückhaltung gegenüber der Mnemotechnik' (171), but rather frustration at finding mere heads of argument when he sought a methodical exposition. On bilingualism in Late Antiquity (223–4): I miss a reference to Libanius' complaints about the defeat of Greek culture by Latin. At *NA* 11.8.4 (221–2) does Cato mean that Postumius ought to have learnt Greek properly, rather than that he should have stuck to Latin? The poem cited from Hartmann Schedel's *Weltchronik* (p. 400 n. 255) was lifted from the Brescia Gellius of 1485.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book is attractively presented, though I have noted wrong Greek accents in σόφιαν (101), ἀντίστρεφον (266; correct on 364), and wrong word-division in 'archaisier-enden' (244).

67 St Bernard's Road, Oxford LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS
aulus@gellius.demon.co.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000834

O. SPEVAK, *CONSTITUENT ORDER IN CLASSICAL LATIN PROSE* (Studies in language companion series 117). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. Pp. xi + 318. ISBN 9789027205841 (bound); 9789027288516 (ebook). €105.00/US$158.00.

It is well known that Latin word order is variable, but the factors underlying this variation are not well understood. Spevak's important contribution, which is based in part on her *habilitation*, aims to shed light on this topic from a pragmatic perspective. The approach is that of Functional Grammar (with its notions Topic, Focus, Tail, Theme, contrast and emphasis), combined with aspects of Functional Sentence Perspective (contextual dependency). Despite the theoretical background, the author insists that the aim is 'not to apply a theory to Latin constituent order but to try to understand more about it' (12). Data are taken from Caesar, Cicero and Sallust, though other authors are used when they illustrate a point. S. asserts in the introduction that 'constituent order is … determined by and indicative of (i) the role of a constituent within the discourse to which its sentence belongs …, (ii) the speaker or writer's estimation of what the addressee knows and expects, and (iii) how important the speaker and hearer consider a constituent within the overall communication' (1). And this view is reiterated in the conclusion: 'Latin constituent order obeys pragmatic rules of placement' (285).

In some cases, S.'s remarks and analyses between the introduction and the conclusion agree with these assertions. For instance, she argues (225) that determinants for noun + adjective sequences are pragmatic. When the adjective is contrastive, emphatic, or part of a contextually dependent noun phrase, it precedes the noun. Adjectives that are unmarked for pragmatic function are usually found post-nominally. But in other cases, these assertions do not hold. For example, in the section on *ad te litteras misi* it is stated 'we cannot decide about saliency of a constituent judging from the position it occupies in a sentence' (140). At the end of the discussion of verbo-nominals (e.g. *castra moueo*, *terga uerto*), S. concludes 'it would be inappropriate to try to establish a relative ordering of the verb and the noun of verbo-nominal constructions because their behaviour is in a direct relationship with their syntactic capacities and their semantic properties' (131). At another point, S. states 'there is no one-to-one correspondence between syntactic patterns and pragmatic values; in other words, one syntactic pattern can encompass several pragmatic values' (116).

The range of grammatical structures studied is impressive, and as such the investigation is more ambitious and ostensibly more systematic than previous functional accounts. I point out a number of issues. First, the sheer number of topics covered means that relatively few Latin examples can be given as evidence (per structure). For example, in her discussion of the analytic passive, e.g. *factus est*, *est factus*, etc. (149–54), S. includes and discusses only 4.5 per cent (12/265) of her available data, and rather briefly at that. While it is impossible to discuss all tokens in the text, it would have been useful if the author had included the references for the absent tokens, so that we might scrutinize these for ourselves. Secondly, some topics are not discussed in sufficient detail to merit inclusion. The analysis of the word order in noun phrases exhibiting 'Fixed Formulas' (e.g. *res gestae*, *nauis oneraria*) is a case in point. It is only sixteen lines long (excluding her three examples), and the author vaguely concludes 'there are different degrees of "fixedness" of lexical units, and I leave their typology for further research' (229). This is hardly systematic, and it might instead have been consigned to a footnote or scrapped altogether to make way for more illuminating topics. Some of the material is extraneous. Ellipsis, which concerns not constituent *order* (the title of the book!) but rather constituent *realization* more generally construed, is given an analysis of approximately ten pages (96–106). Though the analysis is interesting, the space could instead have been given over to material that actually concerns word order.

The previous literature has been assimilated well for the most part. But 'the common opinion … that Latin imperative sentences distinguish themselves by having the verb *constrained* to the initial position [my italics]' (205) is not found in Devine and Stephens' *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information* (2006). They actually say that imperative verbs are 'often initial' (2006, 149), 'but imperative sentences still show a lot of word order variation, which is due to variation

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435812000834 Published online by Cambridge University Press