

kind of drama to assist the polis through rough times:"...what it would mean under circumstances in which the city's survival depended upon warlike heroism, upon manliness in the traditional sense." (pp. 120–21). In the *Frogs*, it becomes clear that this is not the case, but instead the society needs quite traditional values, as presented by Aeschylus. Euripides, who was an indispensable help for Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians*, and who manages to save himself in the *Thesmophoriazousai* loses out to Aeschylus, who upholds martial heroism. And this is the case, although Aristophanes himself is shown closer to Euripides than Aeschylus, as N. states in the conclusion of his study.

In the concluding chapters, N. compares the Platonic Socrates and criticism of poetry with Aristophanes (rather strangely, since the *Clouds* is excluded from the previous discussion), and he decides that Aristophanes anticipates the Platonic criticisms. The role of drama is not to teach actual means of ruling but to point out the correct guidelines to a just and righteous goal.

The ideas and views in this book are sometimes refreshing and interesting – I especially liked the treatment of the *Acharnians* with the discussion of the justice and justification of democracy and the pondering of the meaning of the frogs in the *Frogs*. On the other hand I found the book very difficult to read and some of the conclusions remain rather obscure and, frankly, unoriginal (but then, everybody knows, how difficult it is to say something genuinely "novel" about ancient literature).

Another problem is that, after reading the book twice, it remained unclear to me, what really was the focus of the study. I think it is self-evident that Aristophanes also depended on tragedy and that he had a political agenda, so it is not difficult to become convinced of the results of the study. But then again, it must be stated that the author is a scholar of political science, which makes his approach somewhat divergent from that of a philologist.

Tiina Purola

M. TULLIUS CICERO: *Scripta quae manserunt omnia*. Fasc. 17. *Orationes in L. Catilinam quattuor*. Recensuit T. MASLOWSKI. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. In aedibus K.G. Saur, Monachi et Lipsiae 2003. ISBN 3-598-71187-5. lxvi, 108 pp. EUR 68.

Those interested in the speeches of Cicero will be pleased to note the appearance, in 2003, of this new *BT* volume of Cicero's *Catilinarians*, edited by T. Maslowski, a distinguished Ciceronian scholar. Those who have had to absorb this specimen of Cicero's rhetoric at school and thought they would never care to return to these particular speeches might well use this occasion to renew their acquaintance with them. To be truthful, I do not think Cicero is quite at his best in these speeches (and there are perhaps a bit too many instances of expressions of the type of *furor* and *pestis*), but certainly the *Catilinarians* offer much of interest (note, e.g., the fact that we have here speeches delivered both in the senate and to the people).

At the beginning, there is a thorough and informative *Praefatio* (p. v–liv). Of his more recent predecessors, Maslowski mentions only Nohl, Clark and Reis. Clark's *OCT*

edition is spoken of with approval (p. x, and cf. e.g. xxxix; on the other hand, note p. xxxv, on Clark ignoring ms. **i**). As for the ms. tradition, the bottom line of the exposition presented here does not seem to be too much at variance with that by M.D. Reeve and R.H. Rouse in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (1983) 62ff., but it is good to have the details set out in depth. Moreover, there is the spectacular fact that there are now, in addition to the mss., also four (or rather three, see p. xi) papyri, mentioned only in passing in *Texts*.

The textual history of the *Catilinarians* is fairly complicated, there being contamination between the mss. belonging to the three classes of mss, **α**, **β** and **γ** (cf. the stemmata on pp. xxxiv, xxxviii and xlv). In any case, it seems clear that this division into classes goes back all the way to (late) antiquity (e.g., p. xl). However, it can be established that they all have a common archetype **Ω** (p. xlvi); it seems remarkable that the same also goes for the important papyrus **B**(arcinonensis) which covers much of bk. i and all of bk. ii (p. xlvii).

This may well furnish the explanation for the fact that, in the end, the constitution of the text here does not differ so much from that of Clark. Let me note here some of the divergencies which I observed. First of all, it seems that Maslowski has, in some cases, given preference to readings dominating in **β** and **γ** over those in **α** (but note the constant presence of contamination). This seems to be more or less the case at least in 1. 9 (*nostro in numero*; better than *in nostro*); 1. 12 (*Italiam denique totam*; good); 1. 16 (*quotiens vero*; better than without *vero*); 1. 16 (*hoc tibi*); 1. 19 (*qui* instead of *quia*; clearly preferable); 1. 30 (*auctoritatem secuti*); 3. 3 (*exponam breviter, Quirites*); 3. 17 (*tanta in* [instead of *in tota*; clearly preferable, as *tanta* adds force to the comparison with *in privata domo*] ... *inventata atque deprehensa*). I should say that in all these passages M. has improved upon his predecessor. – The Barcelona papyrus is the source of the following divergencies: 2. 3 (*rei p. utilitas*, this word not appearing in the mss.; because of the parallel with *huius imperi severitas*, the addition is clearly more than useful; note also that *r. p. u.* comes only after *h. i. s.*); 2. 8 (*ne in uno quidem angulo* replacing *ne ullo quidem in angulo* [but I liked the collocation of *in* before *angulo*]); 2. 25 (*equitibus Romanis populo Romano* replacing *equitibus Romanis*, only **B** having *Romano*; surely a mention of the Roman people is of the essence here); 2. 20 (*raedis* which has some attractions beside *lecticis* [also in **β γ**] taking the place of *praediis*).

Of the divergencies based on something else, I noted 1. 4 (*verum tamen*; the *tamen* seems to add some force); 1.16 (*tamen ... potes* reintroduced into the text); 1. 27 (*sic* being added from Quintilian; but he may well be quoting from memory); 1. 31 (*hic* [most mss.] being reinstated, with a reference to good parallels); 2. 3 (clauses beginning with *quam multos* rearranged); 2. 5 (*prae his copiis*); 2.9 (*esse fateatur* removed; of the excellence of this, I am not sure); 2. 12 (*quid ut* replacing the conjecture *quin ut*); 2. 15 (*levandae* instead of *relevandae*; good); 2. 19 (*magnam concordiam maxima <in> multitudine* replacing Clark's *magnam concordiam <ordinum>, maximam multitudinem* which is lame and does not respect the "law of increasing members"; but I have the feeling that there is still work to be done on this passage); 3. 6 (*educuntur*; **C**. *Cethegus* [person introduced for the first time]); 3. 8 (*discriptum*; very good); 3. 12 (*et vide quid* instead of *vide ecquid*; but the *et* does not seem very desirable); 3. 25 (*atque... omnes* rehabilitated); 4. 2 (*sella curulis* put back in the text but placed before *sedes honoris*; but

isn't the result a bit too naïve to have been said in the senate? I think Muretus had good reasons for thinking that *s. c.* is a gloss); 4. 8 (now we have *multos una dolores*, etc.; but it is disturbing that the mss. have *multas uno dolore*); 4. 11 (*vituperatione prohibebo*; but the mss. point to some serious trouble); 4. 13 (*cum <iure> avum*; the addition seems indispensable); 4. 13 (<*minus*> dropped); 4. 20 (*esse iudico turpem*; Clark had dropped *esse*, apparently because it appears in different collocations in the mss.).

In addition to the text, there are also great number of *testimonia* both to the speeches and to individual passages; these will be of great service to scholars. Of course, here and there one could add a *testimonium* or two; for instance, a passage from 1. 25 is quoted by Boethius (*Comm. in Aristot. περὶ ἔρμ.*, ed. Meiser vol. ii p. 344), from 1. 27 by Augustine (H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* [1967] I 45), from 2. 11 by one of the *Panegyrici* (A. Klotz, *RhM* 66 [1911] 545). – At the end, there is an "Appendix orthographica" and an index of names. – In the whole volume, I observed only one misprint, 'testimionium' on p. xxxii.

This edition, based on very solid scholarship and criticism, will from now on no doubt be regarded as the standard edition. The editor must be congratulated upon his achievement.

Olli Salomies

The Cambridge Companion to Ovid. Edited by PHILIP HARDIE. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-77281-8 (hb), 0-521-77528-0 (pb). 408 pp. GBP 47.50 (hb), 15.95 (pb).

Even those who do not specialize in Ovid or even in Roman poetry must have noticed that Ovid has been receiving a lot of scholarly attention in the last ten or fifteen years. This has clearly resulted in the upgrading of Ovid's status as a poet, previously thought of by many as an author mainly suited to being read in school as an introduction to 'serious' poetry and in need of being commented upon mainly on points of mythological prosopography. But in Ovidian scholarship, times have changed, and it is thus no wonder that one can now add this *Companion* to the monographs dedicated to Ovid in recent years. On the other hand, one may be a little surprised of the fact that the year 2002 produced not only one but two *Companions* to Ovid, for in addition to the Cambridge one there is now also *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by B. W. Boyd and also published in 2002. (One is reminded of the fact that the Cambridge and Brill *Companions* to Virgil appeared almost simultaneously a few years ago.)

Now the term *companion*, used as here in reference to the study of an author, leads one to think of something to be placed on a somewhat higher level than what would be called an *introduction*. But in fact this volume has also been conceived as "an introduction to basic aspects of Ovid's works and their reception", as one reads in the *Preface*; on the first page of the volume, under the heading "*The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*", there is a somewhat modified version of this, for here one reads that this book is also designed as an "accessible handbook for the general reader who wishes to learn about Ovid". But in both places, higher aims are also announced.