something to question. The treatment of Martial's sexual language, for example, is generally accurate and helpful, but it does occasionally fall into some of the usual traps. The discussion of 6.64 confuses the categories 'effeminate' and 'pathic'; for the distinction between them, consider Sen. *Contr*. 2.1.6 (*incedentem ut feminis placeat femina mollius*) and see my *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford and New York, 1999), pp. 142–53. And, *pace* the editors, the Philaenis of 7.67 cannot be called a 'Lesbian'. The epigram imagines her sexually penetrating both males and females, and in a text which the Watsons aptly adduce as a parallel (Sen. *Epist*. 95), hypermasculine females strikingly similar to Philaenis are said to penetrate only males (*viros ineunt*): there is not even a mention of homosexual practices. See now the discussion of B. Brooten's *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago, 1996) in D. Halperin's *How To Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago, 2002).

What is lost in an anthology of Martial must be acknowledged. In a graduate seminar on Latin epigram which I recently taught, whose centerpiece consisted of an entire book of Martial followed by a selection from the Watsons' anthology, more than one student was struck by the ebbs and flows and cyclical patterns within Book 1 in subject matter, tone, poem-length, and meter: one spoke perceptively of a 'musical' quality. Even the Barwickian experience of extracting a 'cycle' out of its context, and then looking at that handful of poems together to explore how they vary a common theme, is not possible for readers of this anthology. Still, anyone seeking a richer understanding of any of the epigrams included in the Watsons' collection will benefit from their lively and sensitive commentary.

City University of New York CRAIG WILLIAMS

TACITUS' *DIALOGUS*

R. MAYER (ed.): *Tacitus:* Dialogus de oratoribus. (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.) Pp. x + 227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Paper, £15.95 (Cased, £40). ISBN: 0-521-46996-1 (0-521-47040-4 hbk).

The *Dialogus* receives here its first significant commentary in English since Gudeman's lengthy edition of 1894 (his fuller second edition of 1914 is in German). Many developments welcome a fresh look, including the now accepted authorship of the work and the general consensus that it was composed early in the second century. The increasing scholarly interest in imperial declamation will also profit from a reliable guide to the treatise.

Mayer's volume follows the usual format of the green and yellow Cambridge series: full introduction, new text (without apparatus), commentary. The introduction succinctly covers the expected ground, but inevitable quibbles arise. Along with most modern scholars, M. sees the *Dialogus* as Tacitus' justification for abandoning oratory in favor of the writing of history (pp. 16–18); perhaps so, but there is no clear evidence for such a change of heart on Tacitus' part, and Maternus himself (or, indeed, Cicero) shows that the public orator can simultaneously be a significant literary figure in other genres. More fanciful is M.'s dating of this disenchantment to the aftermath of the trial of Marius Priscus in January 100, a suggestion that moves, like Tacitean innuendo, from hypothesis to fact in the space of one page (pp. 7–8). By contrast, Murgia *HSCP* 84 (1980), 119–21 had compared the long speeches delivered at Priscus's trial with remarks in the treatise (19.2, 20.1, 38, 41.4) to support a date before 100. Despite M.'s confidence, and his silence over Murgia's counterclaims, either suggestion remains equally possible.

M. also presents as fact the commonly held notion that it is Tacitus' own 'highly original' idea that eloquence flourishes best in turbulent political times (p. 17; *passim*). Yet even the young Cicero follows the analogous tradition that *eloquentia* finds its origins in strife. As the great civilizer that separates human beings from beasts, *eloquentia* served to tame greed and its manifestation in the unchecked use of physical strength (*Inv. rhet.* 1.2; cf. *De or.* 1.32). And when the mature Cicero's *libertas* in speaking came to be threatened by changing political circumstances, his dismay anticipates even more closely Maternus' claim for how a changed political system effects a change in rhetoric. In the so-called Caesarian speeches, Cicero notes how Caesar's dictatorship requires a new form of oratory. At *Deiot.* 40, his pleas before Caesar no longer need to rest on rhetoric, he says, but on the *misericordia* of which he knows Caesar capable. There is clear pathos in this remark, if not irony (cf. *Lig.* 30–1). In his private correspondence, Cicero jokes to Paetus that now that he has lost his 'reign in the forum' he has decided to open a school of declamation (*Fam.* 9.18.1). The subject matter of these declamations is trivial: to another friend he quotes Accius in comparing rhetoric at home with using 'weapons against birds, not armed adversaries, and with no glory' (*Fam.* 7.33.1). It is intriguing how this situation anticipates the dichotomy between sincere political oratory and private declamation that dominates later laments about rhetorical decline in the empire.

The introduction continues with a concise outline of the form of the treatise, an economical account of the controversy over authorship, and remarks on style. Each section provides a model of clarity and concision on complex issues. The following section, on 'The Layout of the *Dialogus*', invites additional comment (pp. 31–44). M. here assumes that Tacitus has structured the treatise in such a way as to lead naturally to its climax, namely Maternus' final explanation for oratory's decline. M. is sensitive to what motivates each step in the dialogue, and is especially keen to show that the entire dialogue is itself figured as a kind of trial (pp. 39–40; *passim* in the commentary). If we probe this analogy, however, then who presides as *iudex*? None other, it would seem, than the *princeps* Tacitus, whose authorial *auctoritas* allows him to assert as truth what his dialogue only suggests: that in the political arena, each actor has no more independence than do the interlocutors to whom Tacitus gives voice. Hence the form itself of the dialogue constitutes further proof of Tacitus' desire to provide, as Syme has it, an 'epitaph on Roman oratory'. In light of this position of the author as manipulator, it is difficult, despite M.'s counterclaims (pp. 43–4), not to see Maternus' final speech, with its praise of the lack of political dissidence under the principate, as ironic. The work begins, after all, with ominous foreboding that Maternus' poetry may give offense to 'the feelings of those in power' (2.1; for a recent full account of Maternus' final speech as 'doublespeak', overlooked by M., see S. Bartsch, *Actors in the Audience* [Cambridge, MA, 1994], pp. 98–125).

The commentary constitutes the essence of this work, and it is superb. Designed for the advanced student, it treats exceptional instances of diction, grammar, and style principally through recourse to the standard specialized works (e.g. *TLL*, Kühner–Stegmann, Hofmann–Szantyr, Woodcock), and frequently cites the main scholarly works on particular passages (this coverage is particularly spotty, however, on American scholarship). M. also negotiates the student well through the verbal virtuosity of Tacitus' interlocutors, who use the topic of rhetorical artistry as an excuse for displaying their own talents. His many fine points include the distinction between *variatio* and grammatical necessity in changing constructions (6.4); sensitivity to the humorous banter that occasionally underlies the debate (e.g. 14.4, 16.4); the ways in which an interlocutor's style reflects and supports his main claims (30.4–5 on Messalla); and numerous comments on not only the use but also the effect of such commonly recurring features as unusual word order, tricolon, and anaphora. In fact, a particularly distinctive feature of the commentary is M.'s unwillingness simply to identify stylistic phenomena. Gudeman and others had already noted exhaustively the places where Tacitus echoes Cicero's treatises, especially *Brutus* and *De Oratore*. M. is excellent in suggesting the ways in which these variations and complications of the Ciceronian model, in both language and setting, enhance an understanding of the *Dialogus*. To cite one example: the interruption of Messalla at §14 is, we are told, meant to recall not only Alcibiades' intrusion into Plato's *Symposium* but also that of L. Furius at Cicero's *De Republica* 1.17. With these literary antecedents established, M. proceeds to show how the interruption functions internally: (i) since Messalla is stepbrother to the *delator* Regulus, it is politic that he not be present at the critique of contemporary oratory; and (ii) the debate has reached a stalemate at this point, and a new perspective must be introduced for the argument to proceed further. The student of intertextuality will have much to ponder in M.'s remarks.

University of Kansas ANTHONY CORBEILL

APULEIAN ROLE-PLAY

S. FRANGOULIDIS: *Roles and Performances in Apuleius'* Metamorphoses. Pp. 197. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 3-476-45284-0.

This book is a somewhat tantalizing contribution to studies of Apuleius' novel, a text that has become the site of so many scholarly discussions on narratological strategies and authorial intentionality. F. detects a pattern in the narrative structure that might, if applied inflexibly, have reduced the story lines to a rather constricting model of semiotic abstraction. F. can, within his theoretical framework, produce some intriguing insights into selected dramatic episodes, some more persuasive than others and not all equally or obviously indebted to the Greimasian model he has adopted.

F. starts out by proclaiming allegiance to A. J. Greimas's post-Proppian structuralist approach which allows meaning to surface by ascribing certain rôles to 'actors' in the narrative. This approach shifts the focus of interpretations to underlying structures—put crudely, how stories tell themselves—thus marginalizing the search for what model (or models) of narration the author is consciously manipulating. The Greimasian actants are figures or can be forces that initiate or hinder the action towards specified goals. They can in turn function as senders, receivers, helpers, and opponents in relation to the desires and aversions of others, and in tension with their own perceptions of the parts they play.

F. demonstrates that actant rôles can shift or mirror each other regardless of the goals and motives of the characters and concepts that play them out. This process reconstitutes relationships and redistributes power and initiative simultaneously. In the first chapter, 'Unwittingly Successful Performances: The Triumph of Magic', F. reappraises Aristomenes' rôle as helper of his old friend Socrates and opponent of the witches Meroe and Panthia. However, Aristomenes is ultimately manipulated by these