

sharing drafts is one kind of performance, writing letters about sharing your drafts is another: so how can we be sure we have escaped the hall of mirrors that is Ciceronian self-representation?

G.'s simple chapter titles ('Cicero', 'Horace', 'Pliny') belie the book's deep historical grounding. Ch. 4, on Horace, opens with a sweeping survey of Hellenistic rhetorics of revision that thinks carefully about why Hellenistic poets did not allude nearly so often as Romans to that act. The chapter's close readings of Horace form a fine complement to the previous one on Cicero, focusing on the way his image of poet as censor joins the morality of composition and revision with its aesthetics, and finding in Horace's tortured relationship with shameful but necessary revision an example of Hellenistic values of composition being digested by Augustan literary culture. It cannot be quite right that 'Rome was conditioned in the legal and social sphere by referral to written charters' (100–1), and, with a nod to formation of canon under Augustus, the political again weighs heavily on the discussion. But there is much of interest and value here on Horace and revision.

Genetic reading returns in the chapter on Pliny and his idea of the public. Here G. deftly steps back to trace from Ovid, through Martial, the developing idea of a public, and to draw out from Pliny's letters two reading publics: the genetic, who have been privy to the process of composition, and the general, among whom the final product circulates. The former serve as a model for the latter. This is a new and interesting take on the well-trodden ground of Pliny's letters on *recitatio*. G. is careful (and right) to note that Pliny's idea of the general public is most important as a rhetorical construction, 'articulating a ... legitimacy that comes from being general, from the illusion of speaking to and for all' (125) — but by talking so much about his genetic readers, he in fact mandates them as a model for the general public to aspire to.

Roman accounts of their own writing have long been either neglected as secondary to a high literary project, or mined for historical accounts of technology and practice. What G. shows is that the motifs and rhetorics around composition were not only vital to the social functions that literature performed as a cultural practice, but that they could be closely aligned with fundamental ethics and politics of the context in which the literature was created and consumed. Where this volume succeeds (and it frequently does) it is because questions prompted by modern critical theory have been answered with carefully historicized close readings.

In this sort of cultural study, which proceeds by taking a modern concept and searching for it in antiquity, it is hard to know who is luckier: the scholar who finds her anachronism exactly, or the one who finds in its absence a productive revelation about what the ancients had in its place. Both volumes take this approach, with misses among the hits, but together they significantly advance our awareness of the extent to which processes of textual creation were theorized and explicated by Roman authors. In the study of ancient literary and book production this approach is perhaps the most attractive, and also most laced with pitfalls: consumption and production of text are, after all, what we do, and just as it is a great labour to shuffle off the preconceptions of the ebook and the industrially printed codex and really think oneself into the mindset of the *volumen* and *codex*, so Gurd and McGill apply themselves to the great labour of thinking their way into ancient ideas of authorship, composition and finished-ness very different from our own. Both should now be standard works on their subject, and neither — as each acknowledges — will be the final word.

Columbia University  
jah2220@columbia.edu

JOSEPH A. HOWLEY

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000653

F. HURKA, *DIE ASINARIA DES PLAUTUS: EINLEITUNG UND KOMMENTAR* (Zetemata: Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 138). Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2010. Pp. 336. ISBN 9783406608094. €78.00.

*Asinaria* has traditionally provoked an abundance of disparaging assessments. Charges of loose construction, confused and contradictory plotting/intrigue, unmotivated character entrances and the like have long been cast at Plautus, as well as additional moral disapproval of Demaenetus' surprising transformation from empathetic helper in his son's romantic relationship to *senex amator* demanding a night of sex with Agyrippus' innamorata. In his revised Mainz dissertation, Hurka admirably tackles the play's formidable issues in what is a most welcome new scholarly commentary on *As.* H. forgoes printing his own Latin text, and defers to Danese's (2004) excellent critical edition. Instead, H. produces a table of readings (306–8) that notes where he

departs from the texts of Leo and Danese, mostly on relatively minor matters of orthography, word order *et sim.* (no new readings are offered).

This volume contains a substantial Introduction of around fifty pages, which begins with a thorough review of scholarship on *As.* (13–25). H. ably summarizes the various views of the play's composition, from hypotheses of contamination (e.g. Hough) to the proposal that *As.* may be an original Plautine creation (Vogt-Spira), a possibility that H. does not dismiss out of hand. A second, regrettably brief, section (26–35) of the Introduction aims to place *As.* in its Roman theatrical context, with accounts of Plautus and his world; the play's probable date (assumed to be early in Plautus' career and roughly contemporaneous with *Miles Gloriosus*, usually dated to c. 206/5 B.C.); the occasion of performance; stage, actors and costumes; the Roman audience; music; gender rôles ('In der *Asinaria* sind die Frauen stark, die Männer schwach' (33)); the conflict between generations; and masters and slaves (i.e. the play's 'Saturnalian' aspects).

A greater part of the Introduction (36–61) is given over to discussion of the relationship of Plautus' play to its supposed Greek original: that is, the non-extant *Onagos* of Demophilos, a playwright unknown apart from the prologue of *As.* (11: 'Demophilus scripsit'). H. deploys the standard methodology of analyst approaches to Plautus, whether these aim at reconstructing a lost Greek source-play or establishing the originality of Plautus, and so he cannot escape sometimes making tenuous assumptions about the practices and tastes of a (hypothetical) Greek playwright and audience *vis-à-vis* those of a supposedly less aesthetically sophisticated early Roman theatrical milieu. Those sympathetic with analyst criticism of Plautus will find much of interest in H.'s full discussion, especially where the more problematic scenes of *As.* are concerned. Finally, H. offers an overall assessment of *As.* (62–3) that is sound, if unremarkable: Plautus has followed the essential plot of his Greek source, even if he has in some instances compromised its presumed structural coherence and dramatic logic by adding his usual touches (metatheatre, musicality, carnivalesque inversions etc.), while also working under the strong influence of native Italian improvisational theatre and its assumed predilection for farce. So too, Plautus is shown to have Romanized his performance *passim* to please his own audience. H. mostly avoids broad-brushing and typecasting Plautus' audience and theatre as inferior to its Greek counterparts (though this is often implicit in analyst criticism), and concludes his Introduction with the insistence that Plautus ultimately should be appreciated on his own terms: 'Die *Palliata* darf als eigenständige Ausdrucks- und Kunstform nicht vorrangig nach den ästhetischen Maßstäben der *Néa* begriffen werden. Der Gedanke der *aemulatio* war Plautus fremd' (63).

The greatest strength of H.'s work is its line-by-line commentary. In all, H. provides c. 220 pages of detailed and often insightful commentary on this play of 947 lines. The commentary on each 'Act' and 'Scene' opens with a useful overview of plot developments and other dramaturgical matters. In the line-by-line analysis, lemmata are printed as full lines rather than phrases or individual words, and each lemma is subdivided by subject matter in boxed caps: DRAMATURGIE, SPRACHE, METRIK, TEXTKRITIK, REALIEN and (more rarely) BÜHNENPRAXIS. Typical is H.'s note on *As.* 504–5, the opening lines of the spirited dialogue between Cleareta the *lena* and her daughter Philaenium, who has confessed that she has genuine feelings for her client Agyrippus. Here, under DRAMATURGIE, H. comments, 'Im Affekt der Fragendopplung (vgl. auch den Pronomenkontrast *ego ted* und die verschließende Alliteration) wirft Cleareta ihrer Tochter die Missachtung des mütterlichen *imperium* vor: Die Kupplerin beruft sich bei ihrer unmoralischen Forderung (Philaenium soll sich wie eine *meretrix* verhalten) auf die moralische Verpflichtung der Tochter, wie sich Demaenetus in I 1 bei seiner unmoralischen Unterstützung seines Sohnes auf die moralische Verpflichtung des Vaters gegenüber seines Sohnes (siehe besonders 65)'. H.'s brief but perceptive comments on the two parents' symmetrical misappropriation of moral authority in their relationships with their children is thus set off clearly for the reader's convenience from four other notes *ad loc.* that address specialist issues of language and text.

An Appendix of three sections follows: (1) transmission of the text (287–90), with a focus on the arrangement of *As.* 893–903; (2) lists (291–303) categorizing all instances of hiatus (as '*logischer*', '*sprachlicher*', '*affektischer*', '*emphatischer*', '*metrischer*', '*prosodischer*' *et al.*) and iambic shortening in the play's iambo-trochaic verse, along with analysis of the play's single *canticum*; and (3) commentary (304–5) on the acrostic Argumentum. The volume concludes with a conspectus of metres (327), an extensive bibliography for *As.* (309–25), and a judicious and serviceable index/glossary (329–36). Overall, this is a well-organized and edited book, admirably free of slips and formatting problems considering the complexity of the typescript; one especially conspicuous error, however, is the inexplicable change from 'Kommentar' to 'Untersuchung' in the even-numbered page headings beginning at the commentary for line 545 (200ff.).

H. has produced an extremely useful and reader-friendly commentary on a fascinating play that deserves a wider readership. Anyone engaging in scholarship on the play will find this rich new resource indispensable.

University of Arizona, Tucson AZ  
 christed@email.arizona.edu

DAVID M. CHRISTENSON

doi:10.1017/S0075435814000665

C. SMITH and R. COVINO (EDS), *PRAISE AND BLAME IN ROMAN REPUBLICAN RHETORIC*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2011. Pp. xi + 248. ISBN 9781905125463. £50.00.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* pairs praise and blame, and rightly so: the same *loci* provide material for each, and both developed within a subtype of oratory, epideictic and invective, which together characterize the *genus demonstrativum* (*Her.* 1.2.2; cf. *Ar., Rhet.* 1368a.33–7). Modern treatments, however, have so often considered them separately that the very title of the volume under review promises a welcome contribution. In particular, after the pioneering work of Süß on Greek ethos (1910) and the book by Koster (1980), who catalogued the main motifs of Greco-Roman invective, modern scholarship has taken two important turns. ‘Praise’ is also receiving some attention, though a monograph remains a *desideratum* at least since 1975 (cf. MacCormack); and Roman invective has been studied separately from the Greek, in an attempt to discover its peculiarities within its literary and cultural contexts. This effort has produced helpful contributions: for instance, after Nisbet, in his commentary to Cicero’s *In Pisonem*, demonstrated how Roman invective ‘often shows more regard for literary convention than for historical truth’ (1961: 193), Corbeil concentrated on the social dynamics of the members of the élite (1999), arguing that mostly Romans believed the content of invective and seeing invective attacks as a series of examples of what a Roman is not (2002: 199); while Riggsby (1997) considered invective as a zero-sum game, in which Romans, whether or not they believed the specific contents of blame, aggressively negotiated their prestige.

The twelve essays in this volume (collected from a conference held at the University of St Andrews in 2006) differ from one another in scope, some being focused on specific speeches and some on broader themes. To the former group belong five contributions. Harries analyses Cicero’s blame of Naevius in *Pro Quinctio* and of Fannius in *Pro Roscio Comoedo*, showing how the legal context accounts for the techniques of invective; Tempest takes a fresh look at the *Divinatio in Caecilium*, demonstrating that Cicero’s reinvention of *topoi* from Attic oratory displays confidence and challenges Hortensius’ authority; a similar use of Greek models animates Rosillo López’s reconstruction of Cicero’s (lost) epideictic *Epistula ad Caesarem*; Tatum considers Cicero’s exceptionally diverse means of invective in *Pro Caelio*, both to neutralize the invective of the prosecution and to vilify Clodia; while praise and blame in the political development illustrated by the fourteen *Philippics* is the subject of Manuwald’s paper, which compares Cicero’s blunt *dramatis personae* with more nuanced portrayals of the same characters from his contemporaneous letters.

The other seven essays focus on themes. Covino moves beyond Cicero and shows how *laudationes funebres*, regardless their falsifications, helped to support the ruling class, while Rees conducts a useful survey of the evidence about *laudationes iudiciales*, explaining how the adversarial nature of Roman courts and rhetorical practices favoured false witnesses; Hölkeskamp’s contribution moves beyond Cicero and surveys the Republican orators’ strategies of self-construction. His argument, which makes a good addendum to Corbeil’s explanation of invective, is twofold: the distance between orators and the people was embedded in an endemically Roman system of merit and reward; and the traffic of praise and blame continuously renegotiated the boundaries of this system within the political and cultural hierarchies of Roman society. Steel reads *Pro Plancio* and *In toga candida* against the *Commentariolum petitionis* to document how Cicero adapted the conventions of electoral campaigns to his own needs; van der Blom analyses both Cicero’s choices and use of family *exempla* for praise and blame and his ways of substituting for his own lack of illustrious ancestors. Less related to the title of the volume is Saeger’s contribution on Cicero’s use of false dilemma in *Pro Roscio Amerino*, *Pro Cluentio*, *Pro Caelio* and *Pro Milone*, but his sensitive readings complement Craig’s 1993 work on dilemma. The best essay in the volume is by Jehne, who asks two questions: ‘What kind of blame were Roman *contiones* willing to bear?’ and,