

their period of specialization, and highly recommended for anyone interested in the problems and prospects of writing the cultural history of Rome.

University of Southern California
habinek@dornsife.usc.edu

THOMAS HABINEK

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000639

M. AMBROSETTI, *Q. CLAUDIO QUADRIGARIO ANNALI. INTRODUZIONE, EDIZIONE CRITICA E COMMENTO* (Bollettino dei classici, supplemento 25). Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2009. Pp. 425. ISBN 9788821810145. €60.00.

In addition to works aiming, wholly or partly, to replace Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* — Chassignet, *L'Annalistique romaine* in France; Beck-Walter, *Die frühen römischen Historiker* in Germany; a team, led by Tim Cornell and of which I am a member, *Fragments of the Roman Historians* (forthcoming) in Britain — there have been, particularly in Italy, a number of studies of individual historians — Forsythe on Piso, Santini on Hemina, Walt on Macer, Perutelli on Sisenna (cf. *JRS* 97 (2007), 300–2), Laconi, only four years previously, on Quadrigarius. Ambrosetti here presents a full-scale edition of and commentary on the fragments of Quadrigarius, comprising a wide-ranging introduction (9–74), a critical edition, preceded by detailed lists of manuscripts for each citing author (see further below) (77–118), commentary (121–374), bibliography (375–408), and a selective index (409–23).

In the edition A. retains both Peter's numeration of the fragments and his often arbitrary attribution to specific books of fragments for which a book number is not preserved, even though she sometimes argues a contrary case. Thus since frs 70–72 all come from Book 8 and A. believes that fr. 70 refers to the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus in 167 B.C. and fr. 71 to either L. Valerius Flaccus, censor in 184–3 B.C., or Q. Fulvius Flaccus, censor in 174–3 B.C., and that fr. 72 corresponds to Livy 45.1.2, she assigns fr. 67, concerning the alleged Rhodian embassy of 169 B.C., to Book 8, though in the edition it appears under Book 7 (and frs 70–2 continue to follow frs 68–69, which relate events of 146 B.C.). In fact no fragment has both a certain or probable context in the second century and a book number until fr. 73 (137 B.C.) and the only safe course is to place frs 62–69 under the heading 'Books 7–9'. Worse, A. includes, with Peter, fr. 12, the account of Valerius Corvinus' duel with a Gaul, even though she agrees that it is not the work of Quadrigarius (thus, most recently, Oakley and Holford-Strevens) and relegates her commentary on it to an appendix.

Elsewhere A.'s ideas about the context of a fragment do not affect its position. She implausibly thinks that fr. 1 refers not to the battle of the Allia but to the participation of the three Fabii, sent as ambassadors to Clusium, in a battle with the Gauls. And her suggestion that fr. 46 refers to Fabius Verrucosus' campaign in Liguria is clearly wrong: Fabius' colleague M'. Pomponius Matho fought in Sardinia, not Liguria.

A. thinks that the letter of the consuls of 281 B.C. to Pyrrhus (fr. 41) is based on genuine archival material and shows that Quadrigarius made use of documentary sources. The whole story may be unhistorical, but in any case it is much more likely that the letter is Quadrigarius' own invention.

An editor of fragments cannot be expected to master the textual tradition and collate the manuscripts of each citing author (ten in the case of Quadrigarius) and for the most part must rely on existing editions. In three cases, however, A. has gone further. For Aulus Gellius she has collated Par. BNF Lat. 13038 (but not Cambridge, Clare College 26; see Marshall in *Texts and Transmission*, 177), for Nonius the photographs of the MSS used by Lindsay held at the University of Genoa (she also reports the citations, almost certainly fake, in the *Cornucopiae* of Nicolò Perotti), for Priscian all the MSS of the eighth and ninth centuries containing the fragments of Quadrigarius. For the rest her lists of MSS are taken, with suitable adaptations, from standard editions. This procedure can have unfortunate results, as is clear from the entry for Livy. For Books 6–10 and 25 she has used the OCT, for 31–40 my Teubner edition. In the sigla for Books 6–10 Walters and Conway cited their MSS just as 'Mediceus', 'Parisiensis' etc., without shelfmarks, and A. does the same; for the fourth decade, on the other hand, she virtually copies my list of sigla, but interprets my 'Fragmenta, Vat. Lat. 10696' and 'Fragmenta, Bamb. Bibl. Rei Publicae Class. 35a' as 'fragmenta codicis ...': the fragments are what remain of MSS of Late Antiquity; A.'s formulation implies that what were once MSS Vat. Lat. 10696 and Bamberg Staatsbibliothek Class. 35a have been reduced to fragments. And I wonder whether she expands some but not others of my abbreviations because she is unable to make anything of the latter.

A. overloads her apparatus in two ways: she includes entries for what are purely matters of orthographic convention and provides what Frank Goodyear used to call ‘voting lists’ (e.g. fr. 9 ‘*incolumiores* Hosius Marshall Julien ... *incolumiores* Hertz Peter¹⁻² Chassignet Beck-Walter Laconi’); the name of a modern scholar should appear in the apparatus only if he or she was the first to propose a reading. (Similarly, the introduction and commentary contain rather too much conscientious reporting of earlier views; I should say that A.’s knowledge of the bibliography is formidable.)

The commentary discusses the context of each fragment, but is largely concerned with matters of language and style and it is this which is A.’s main strength. She makes full use of *TLL*, Kühner–Stegmann and Hofmann–Szantyr, and provides a mass of information which will provide a firm basis for future work on Quadrigarius’ Latin; she draws the material together in the final chapter of the introduction (61–74), but there is more to be done (my remarks in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (2005), 66–9 merely scratch the surface).

The criticisms above should not obscure the substantial merits of A.’s work. It is a matter of regret that it was not available when I was preparing the entry on Quadrigarius for *Fragments of the Roman Historians*; but even if it had been, the difference of scale would have made it impossible to make full use of A.’s material. It is a book of solid and traditional *filologia classica* and it is hard to think that, in the present age, it could have been produced anywhere other than Italy.

University of Manchester
John.Briscoe@manchester.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000640

JOHN BRISCOE

I. GILDENHARD, *CREATIVE ELOQUENCE. THE CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY IN CICERO’S SPEECHES*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Pp. vii + 454. ISBN 9780199291557. £89.00.

The title of Gildenhard’s ambitious work immediately attracts the reader, but what exactly is meant by ‘creative eloquence’? Is it about Cicero being a bit too creative with the truth or does the book concern a particular area of his oratory in which Cicero is particularly talented? Rather, as G. quickly begins to explain, the title refers to Cicero’s conceptual creativity and is meant to encapsulate a wide array of abstract concepts and ideas employed across Cicero’s speeches and related to his theoretical works.

The aim of the book is not to look for philosophical doctrines in Cicero’s speeches as sign of his own philosophical beliefs or the ways he employs them for rhetorical purposes, but instead to analyse and then discuss Cicero’s use of concepts and ideas to formulate original views and interpretations and to situate these in the cultural context of Cicero’s time. A few examples illustrate some of the elements in G.’s analysis: Cicero’s use and development of terms such as *boni*, *natura*, *humanitas* and *fortuna*, his employment of conceptual ideas such as natural law, the relationship between the city of Rome and the empire and the relationship between gods and humans, and his reliance on abstraction and definition to carry through his oratorical argument. These examples are by no means exhaustive as the book is dense with ideas (Cicero’s and G.’s) and discussions of how Cicero made them work in day-to-day speech situations.

The book is organized in three parts — Anthropology, Sociology, Theology — each with an introduction and four chapters. Although clearly well versed in the terminology and discussions of these disciplines, G.’s discussions are never an attempt to press down a modern theory over Cicero’s text and it is to G.’s credit that his usage of anthropological and sociological terminology is always used with a clear focus on describing and analysing Cicero’s concepts and ideas in their ancient setting.

In the first part on anthropological themes, G. explores the various ways in which Cicero describes human beings and uses such descriptions to create relationships or distance enemies from himself or groups of people. One theme is Cicero’s construction of his own public *personae* and those of others in relation to concepts such as *fortuna* and *natura*, and G. argues (73) that describing someone as a ‘human being’ allowed Cicero to re-evaluate someone not to traditional ideas of rank and status (e.g. *nobilitas* — here it would have been nice to see G.’s response to M. Robb, *Beyond Populares and Optimates* (2010)) but to criteria formulated and manipulated by Cicero to categorize this person as ‘good’, ‘bad’ or ‘in-between’. Here, G. picks up on existing studies into specific instances of Cicero’s re-categorization of his friends and enemies, but takes the further step of showing how Cicero’s strategies and tactics run across his oratorical oeuvre. G.’s treatment of the slippery term *natura* is particularly illuminating.