

inclusion in Peter's edition. The two passages ought to be judged according to the same criteria: either the Pliny passage should have been included or the Tacitus passage dropped.

The Tacitus passage cited above should be marked ** (not *), since it only mentions Sulla's name, not his memoirs. The same correction should be made to fr. 20 (= fr. 18 Peter). The translation reads 'comme il le raconte lui-même dans ses *Mémoires*', but this phrase corresponds to just one word in the Greek: φησὶ (183). One fragment marked * cites Book 10 of Sulla's memoirs, so no star symbol should be given (fr. 17 = 16 Peter). Notwithstanding these inaccuracies, the single and double star annotation adopted in this volume introduces an extra layer of rigour and clarity to the single star system of Peter's edition. A triple star annotation might have allowed the inclusion of fragments such as the letter written by Sulla to his future *magister equitum*.

I would prefer to see a more inclusive approach to the attribution of fragments. Texts which mention a book citation within a given author's work will always hold pride of place, but less secure fragments (even the more recent attributions which cannot boast Peter's patronage) should also be included in future collections so that the reader can at least judge the potential scope of a lost work.

University College Dublin

A. G. THEIN

G. L. CAMPBELL, *LUCRETIUS ON CREATION AND EVOLUTION: A COMMENTARY ON DE RERUM NATURA BOOK FIVE, LINES 772–1104*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xii + 385. ISBN 0-19-926396-5. £60.00.

For the last forty years or so Lucretius has been well served by editors, and there are now serviceable editions of most of the books of the *DRN*, while there has been a spate of enlightening works on the philosophical, and particularly the Epicurean, background. Book 5, with all its scientific and anthropological complexities, has always been a difficult text to get to grips with (*experto credite*), and Gordon Campbell's volume is a welcome attempt to focus attention on an important section of this book, and to dissect it with the aid of the many relevant insights of modern scholarship. (An indication of the modernity of this work is the number of online references in the footnotes and commentary.) The lines concerned (772–1104) deal with the origin of life on earth and the growth of civilization, up to primitive man's use of fire and the development of cooking. We are offered an introduction, the text, a translation, a detailed commentary, and two extensive appendices. The introduction includes an alert discussion of Lucretius' relationship with earlier theories of creation and zoogonies, particularly of course what we know or can surmise of Empedocles' and Epicurus' beliefs, in formulating his own anti-teleological world view. C. argues well for a compromise approach to Lucretius' ideas on evolution: Lucretius is anti-evolutionist in stressing the fixity of species, and evolutionist in showing that the human race has become differentiated from animals by an evolutionary process (8). Similarly C. argues against the fashionable critical dichotomy 'primitivist' and 'progressivist' as applied to Lucretius, on the grounds that the terms are unhelpful and that Lucretius 'attaches no absolute values to prehistory' (11). Another good feature of the introduction is a summary discussion of the Epicurean theory of the origin of language — a more detailed account is to be found in the commentary. Here we do have quite a lot to go on, both in the surviving works of Epicurus himself and in other Epicurean sources. C. rightly stresses the importance of this element in the tradition Lucretius inherited, as there is clear evidence that Epicurus himself associated the development of language with early man's concept of the gods and of justice and piety (283–4). This is altogether a thorough and helpful analysis of the question of early speech.

The text is supplied with a fairly full apparatus, and a spot-check of the following translation shows it to be accurate and readable (my quibbles are trivial). The following commentary forms the main section of the book. Visually this is clearly laid out and attractive to read (features not to be found in many commentaries), and the notes are learned and well argued, with due allowance made for opposing views in difficult areas. Another welcome feature is that all Greek citations are translated, as this will widen the readership which can profit from this book. The subject-sections of the commentary have each a general introductory note, and the balance of the discussions is understandably tilted towards issues of philosophy, ancient science, and anthropology, rather than grammatical and lexical details — though C. is not deaf to the aural effects of Lucretius' verse, e.g. his frequent and deliberate use of onomatopoeia. C. also has his views on textual problems, with some discussions of cruces, even if only to endorse readings

accepted by most editors (e.g. 947 n.). There are two appendices which will add to the book's usefulness as a springboard for further work on ancient ideas about prehistory and anthropology. One is a table of themes in accounts of creation, zoogony, and anthropogony; and the other a table of themes in prehistories and accounts of the golden age. They contain exhaustive lists of references to writers both ancient and more recent, in parallel columns, 'DRN / Epicurean' and 'Others'. The bibliography is comprehensive, though Heinze's edition of *DRN* 3 is oddly missing from the list of commentaries: surely this still remains one of the best editions of a single book of the *DRN*.

Many books which are converted from PhD theses show evidence of their origin in certain awkwardnesses and a lack of unity. In this one the transition is fairly seamless, except that it is occasionally a bit overloaded with long lists of secondary authorities. But this is not a serious criticism, and it is more relevant to stress the enthusiasm and grasp of his material which the writer shows throughout. Lucretius' most difficult and most interesting book deserves this analysis, and C. has done a good job on it.

The book is well produced, maintaining the high standards of its series, and I have noticed only a few trivial typos (e.g. 135, 288, 358, 376).

University of Birmingham

C. D. N. COSTA

J. M. MAY (ED.), *BRILL'S COMPANION TO CICERO: ORATORY AND RHETORIC*.
Leiden: Brill, 2002. Pp. xiii + 632. ISBN 9-0041-2147-1. €150.00.

Companions to ancient literature or divisions thereof continue to proliferate: this one on Cicero's oratory and rhetorical works is a solid contribution to the genre. The bulk of the chapters offers, in chronological order, surveys of individual work or works of Cicero which together provide a comprehensive account of most of his speeches and his rhetorical treatises. These are supplemented by accounts of rhetorical education in Cicero's youth, invective, the intellectual background to Cicero's rhetorical works, and his oratorical and rhetorical legacy. The emphasis thus is more on Cicero's oratory as a textual phenomenon than on oratory within a political or forensic context.

The quality of the individual chapters is high. I found Riggsby on the *post reditum* speeches and Hall on the *Philippics* particularly stimulating; both stress the extent to which Cicero attempted to rewrite difficult political circumstances in which he found himself into coherent and plausible alternative narratives which brought out his authority and control. In the period after his return from exile, Riggsby suggests, this involves a denial of the stability of the so-called first triumvirate, to be replaced by a situation in which Cicero is closely aligned to Pompeius and distanced from Caesar and the co-operation between Pompeius and Caesar is thus undermined. Hall posits a 'rhetoric of crisis' in the *Philippics*, through which Cicero evokes an overwhelming threat to the state centring on the activities, and character, of Antonius and which demands an immediate and unanimous response from the Senate if disaster for the *res publica* is to be averted. Cape, too, offers a convincing reading of the speeches from 63 B.C. which stresses the unity of the consular orations. The *Catilinarians* need to be read within this wider corpus, in which Cicero was attempting to illuminate his suppression of the conspiracy through other aspects of his behaviour as consul. Thus his actions against Catilina become part of those of a consistent *consul popularis* who has attempted throughout his year of office to defend the state and people against a variety of extra-constitutional threats, be it agrarian legislation, the re-opening of issues from the past which should remain closed, such as the death of Saturninus or the Sullan proscriptions, or the threat of military action as offered by Catilina. On the rhetorical treatises there are useful surveys of *de Oratore* by Wisse and of *Brutus* and *Orator* by Narducci and a challenging reappraisal of *Partitiones oratoriae* and *Topica* as important theoretical works located at the interface between rhetoric and philosophy.

If there is a criticism of the volume it must be in terms of coverage. The companion format would suggest a desire for a comprehensive approach, but there are some strange gaps. In the case of the speeches, this seems in part due to the chronological periods the editor has chosen. Cape's chapter on the consular speeches is followed directly by Riggsby on the *post reditum* speeches: so no room for *pro Sulla*, *pro Archia*, or *pro Flacco*. More generally, the contributors' desire to establish clear frameworks for understanding the relationship between speeches leads to the sidelining of those which do not fit. So there is relatively little on the *pro Murena*, which Cicero