

Gesellschaft wird in einer nicht gänzlich begründeten Weise verhandelt. Der größte Verdienst der Untersuchung liegt in der sorgfältigen Analyse der Frauengestalten des Werkes. Besonders interessant ist, daß die Verf. das Heldentum in Beziehung zu Frauen setzt. Dadurch daß die Verfasserin das Epos unter dem Gesichtswinkel der Frauengestalten des Werkes betrachtet, gelingt es ihr, die *Argonautika* in ein wirklich neues Licht zustellen.

Marja-Leena Hänninen

M. TULLI CICERONIS *Scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Fasc. 23. Orationes in P. Vatinius testem, pro M. Caelio. Edidit T. Maslowski. Stutgardiae et Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. 1995. ISBN 3-8154-1195-5. cxxi, 56 S. DEM 89.

It is a great pleasure to be able to announce the publication of a new volume in the Teubner series of Cicero's works. Here we have now a new edition of two speeches delivered in the spring of 56, the third volume of Cicero's speeches published by T. Maslowski after the *post reditum* - volume of 1981 and the *Sestiana* of 1986. I am not sure what to think of the *in Vatinius* as an oratorical achievement, but the *pro Caelio* certainly shows Cicero in very good form, and this speech has always been spoken of with approval. There are, in fact, some marvelously witty things to be found here, for in instance some of the comments made in reference to Clodia (e.g. *muliere non solum nobili verum etiam nota* § 31; *nec enim muliebres umquam inimicitias mihi gerendas putavi, praesertim cum ea quam omnes semper amicam omnium potius quam cuiusquam inimicam putaverunt* § 32); moreover, the merits of the structure and the contents of the speech in general can be discerned much more clearly now after the important study of W. Stroh (*Taxis und Taktik. Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden* [1975] 243ff., duly referred to by Maslowski, p. xi f.).

The manuscript tradition especially of the Caeliana is somewhat complicated, and there is a long *praefatio* of more than 100 pages. The principles on which the edition is based are given in a condensed form on p. cv f.: in both speeches, Maslowski has been trying to find out the reading of the archetype of the family ω , using in addition in the *Vatiniana* the testimony of the Bobbio scholiast, in the *Caeliana* what can be reconstructed of the lost Cluny ms. C (on which see p. xliii ff.) and fragmentary sources (two palimpsests and a papyrus). In practice this means that Maslowski relies heavily on the readings of the *Parisinus* 14749 (v), copied from a manuscript of the ω family by Nicolaus de Clemangiis († 1437) who also had the Cluny ms. at his disposal for corrections (cf. p. xlv f.; the combination is referred to as C^v); thus e.g. in § 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, 24, 30, 34, 57. In many cases this produces good results if compared with the edition of J. Cousin (Budé 1962). Note e.g. § 9, *togam virilem dedit* (*virilem togam* Cousin; this gives "numeros potiores"); § 19 *iaciebant* (interesting and plausible); § 24 ... *Dionis* ...; *habitabat apud Titum, ut audistis, Dio* (*habitabat is apud Titum ... Dio* Cousin). On the other hand, relying on C^v in § 57 leads to the text *in qua inusitatae libidines, luxuries, omnia denique inaudita vitia ac flagitia* as against *in qua lustra, libidines, luxuries, omnia denique inaudita vitia ac flagitia* in the text of Cousin. At first sight *inusitatae libidines* may seem attractive, but in fact there are things which speak for Cousin's text: with the reading *lustra*, there is the forceful alliteration, and the "law of increasing members" is followed, or

at least not disobeyed; moreover, plain *luxuries* sounds rather lame and out of place after *inuitatae libidines* (*inuitatae* cannot, for more than one reason, refer also to *luxuries*, which is used by Cicero only in the singular; cf. Verr. 2, 5, 80). So I think that Cousin's text is to be preferred here. (The same view is advocated also in TLL VII 2, 1885.)

To go on to some passages in which the text is not constituted mainly according to **CV**, there are some attractive or at least commendable innovations as compared to Cousin. In § 4, there are no longer brackets around *quam cernitis*, and in § 5, *Praetuttiani* is at last read without hesitation. In § 10, *id* in *id hoc loco defendo* (*[id]* Cousin following Havet) is perfectly all right, and in § 12, *at* in *at studuit Catilinae* (*studuit Catilinae* Cousin) is needed, as a possible criticism of Caelius' behaviour is introduced. In § 14, Maslowski reads *facilitatis* with the mss., whereas Cousin had introduced the unnecessary *facultatis* proposed by Madvig; in § 25, Maslowski rightly follows the mss. in reading *accederet* (*accideret* Cousin). However, there are also details of which I am not so sure. In § 10, the addition of <quo> after *annus* is surely more than useful (*secutus est tum annus, causam ... Catilina dixit* Maslowski); in § 27, *scilicet* in *scilicet si fas est defendi a me eum* (Cousin with some mss.) seems to me to be much more in keeping with the tone of the passage than Maslowski's *si licet, si fas est* (there is some ms. authority for this, too). In the same paragraph, I think that Cousin was right in deleting *in hortis fuerit* (note that this produces a series of three objections introduced by *qui*, which seems to be enough). In § 31, where some emendation is needed in the passage beginning with *necare eandem*, the constitution of the text does not yet seem satisfactory in all respects; *quodam modo* (*quam CV*) in *sollicitavit quos potuit, paravit quodam modo, locum constituit* at least sounds a bit awkward.

Recent Teubner volumes regularly include sections on *testimonia* which are very useful for those wishing to study the fortunes of a certain text. In this edition some *testimonia* referring to the Vatiniiana in general are quoted on p. 2f., whereas no *testimonia* referring to individual passages are given under the text - for the simple reason that passages of the *in Vatinium* are never quoted or imitated by later authors (except of course the Bobbio scholiast). As for the Caeliana, now and then quoted by later authors, quite a few *testimonia* appear under the text, but, on the other hand, there is no section on general *testimonia*, which seems a bit surprising, since at least both Quintilian and the *Rhetores minores* have some more general references to the speech, and it could have been useful to have them collected as well. As for the *testimonia* given below the text, they certainly constitute a most valuable tool for future research, having been collected with great care. Of course there is in some cases the question of what should be regarded as a *testimonium* and what simply as a coincidence (for instance, I am not sure whether the passages in Minucius Felix and Augustine, quoted at § 6 and 8 really have been formulated with Cicero's text in mind). Moreover, the collection is not entirely complete (although, Cicero having been quoted so often, it is of course hard to imagine a complete collection of *testimonia*): for instance, the words *ut eum paeniteat non deformem esse natum* are quoted from § 6, and commented upon, by Servius on Vergil's *Bucolics* 2, 25; parts of § 8 and § 13 are quoted by Augustine (cf. H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* [1967] I p. 43); from § 22 and § 67, there are quotations by Ennodius, adduced only in § 6 (see MGH, *Auctores antiquissimi* VII p. 10 and 21). Finally, it is perhaps a bit misleading to mention Orosius 1, 12, 10 at § 18, for Orosius is quoting a famous passage from Ennius

which he has no doubt picked up somewhere else than from Cicero.

To get to the end at last: although there are some minor details in the text on which there could be some disagreement, and although there are some omissions in the *testimonia*, the overall picture one gets from this edition is that of quality and reliability. The author has done a good and useful job, and all interested in Cicero should be thankful. It is only to be hoped that he is going to continue with his work on Cicero.

Olli Salomies

BARBARA STRÄTERHOFF: *Kolometrie und Prosarhythmus bei Cicero und Livius. De imperio Cn. Pompei und Livius 1, 1 - 26, 8 kolometrisch ediert, kommentiert und statistisch analysiert. I-II. Druckerei R. Festge, Oelde 1995. ISBN 3-00-000383-5. 938 S. DEM 115.*

Ausgangspunkt zu diesem in vieler Hinsicht interessanten und nützlichen Buch - die gekürzte Fassung einer Münsteraner Dissertation - sind die kolometrischen Arbeiten Eduard Fraenkels ('Kolon und Satz' I und II; 'Nachträge zu Kolon und Satz II'; 'Noch einmal Kolon und Satz'; nähere Nachweise hier S. 928f.) aus den Jahren 1932 bis 1965 und die darauf basierende Monographie 'Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos' (1968). Wie die Verfasserin betont, hat man in der Forschung die Arbeiten Fraenkels "zu wenig berücksichtigt" (S. 23; vgl. T. N. Habinek, *The Colometry of Latin Prose* [1985] 9 über die "lukewarm reception" der "Leseproben"). Ihre Absicht ist, "nach den objektiven Kriterien, die Fraenkel erarbeitet hat, die kolometrische Gestalt dieser Texte zu erfassen", diese Texte ferner dann "im Hinblick auf Klauseln und ihre Anläufe zu untersuchen", um damit schließlich zu einer "genauere(n) Bestimmung des stilistischen Verhältnisses des Livius zu Cicero im Bereich des Periodenbaus und der Rhythmisierung" zu gelangen (S. 1); die hier vorliegende Arbeit "soll die Methode Fraenkels vertiefen und erweitern", um "die Richtigkeit der Art und Weise, in der Fraenkel Stellen aus Ciceros Reden kolometrisch und rhythmisch interpretierte, aufzuzeigen" (S. 52); ein Ergebnis ist "die Bestätigung der Methode Fraenkels" (S. 923).

Es war nun ohne Zweifel angebracht, den Themenkreis wieder einmal aufzugreifen, da auf dem Gebiet der Kolometrie und der damit zusammenhängenden Fragen der Klauseltechnik noch einiges unklar ist. An dem Begriff 'Kolon' (sowie auch an dem Begriff 'Komma'; vgl. u.) ist auffallend, daß es sich einerseits um einen in der Forschung ganz geläufigen Begriff handelt, andererseits aber um etwas, wessen Existenz normalerweise nur vorausgesetzt wird, ohne daß man sich dabei über die Notwendigkeit einer Definition Gedanken macht. Bezeichnend ist etwa, daß in dem (von Sträterhoff nicht zitierten) Buch von H. u. K. Vretska, *Marcus Tullius Cicero, Pro Archia poeta. Ein Zeugnis für den Kampf des Geistes um seine Anerkennung* (1979), das insofern dem vorliegenden Buch ähnlich ist, als auch hier eine Rede Ciceros kolometrisch analysiert (sehr anschaulich!) vorgelegt wird, zwar öfters von Kola und Kommata die Rede ist, diese Begriffe aber nirgendwo näher definiert werden (nur soviel lernt man auf S. IX, daß ein Kolon länger ist als ein Komma; auf Arbeiten Fraenkels wird nicht verwiesen). Die allgemein zu beobachtende Abgeneigtheit, die Begriffe zu definieren, wäre verständlich, wenn hier alles klar wäre, aber so ist es ja ganz offensichtlich nicht (und das ist gewiß