

with the following, rather telling statement: "What it [Lucian's dialogue] really represents is a cultural contest whose top prize is the right to entertain, the right to control the politics of a multi-coloured performance culture" (p. 160).

Lada-Richards has done excellent work. The book shows how central dance was in antiquity and how it was, on the one hand, admired and esteemed, and, on the other, despised and criticized. The book is not only about pantomime, although its focus is on this dance form. It is also about the discourse of being and becoming a member of a society that emphasizes literary culture and the talent in performing one's education. The division of the text into chapters could have been different; especially the second part of the book would have benefited from a smaller number of chapters and a larger number of subchapters. The author's style seemed at points somewhat heavy to a non-native speaker of English, but it also gives the book a personal touch, a welcome feature in academic writing. Most importantly, though, *Silent Eloquence* makes a pivotal step towards dance being taken as a meaningful academic subject.

Manna Satama

Cicero: Catilinarians. Edited by ANDREW R. DYCK. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2008. ISBN: 978-0-521-83286-1 (hb), 978-0-521-54043-8 (pb). XVII, 282 pp. GBP 45, USD 85 (hb), GBP 17.99, USD 34.99 (pb).

Many classical scholars belonging to the older generation may have had to face Cicero's *Catilinarians*, or at least *Catilinarian* 1, for the first time at school, this having been the first bit of Cicero they had to peruse. From the point of view of Cicero and/or the *Catilinarians* this is not necessarily a good thing, for one could describe Cicero's performance right from the beginning (with *Quo usque tandem abutere* and all the rest) as a bit on the heavy side, and I am quite sure the text as a whole will have left quite a number of teenagers with mixed feelings and perhaps even the wish never to return to this particular work again. It could, then, be argued that it would be preferable to have one's first taste of the *Catilinarians* at a more mature age. Reading the four *Catilinarians* with some attention is certainly worth the trouble, for both the subject itself, the fact that we have here speeches delivered both in the senate and before the people, and many other features (e.g., some of the material in *Cat. IV*) make this collection most interesting reading. It is thus with satisfaction that one observes the publication of this commentary, aimed at "advanced undergraduates and graduate students", by one of the most eminent Ciceronian scholars.

The format is pretty much what one would expect it to be. In the Introduction, we have notes on Catiline himself, his conspiracy, and on the speeches (publication, language and style, etc.). At the end, there are three Appendices dealing with the historical sources cited in the commentary, the date of *Cat. 1* (the "common view" that the speech was delivered on 8 November being maintained), and with prose rhythm. As for the text of the speeches, it seems to be based on that of Maslowski with some modifications listed on p. 21. To comment upon a detail or two, I am not sure that it was a good idea to dispense with <iure> in 4,13, for the advantages of this addition seem to me more than obvious (there seems to be no point in L. Caesar simply observing without comment that his maternal grandfather had been killed along with his son). In 1,20, *aliquas in dubitas ... abire in aliquas terras* seems to me most unat-

tractive (*aliquo* in § 17, adduced in the commentary, is in my view a bit different). In 2,24, the reading *urbes* in *urbes coloniarum ac municipiorum* (corresponding to *tumulis silvestribus*) seems to me practically meaningless, and perhaps something should have been done about this, especially as Dyck himself has an even better emendation than *arces*, which Garatoni offers, namely *muri* (relegated to the commentary). In the note on the text of 3,22, the phrase "*ieiecit Mommsen*" for what is normally formulated as *delevit* seems to have been inspired by *ieiecit ex urbe*, cited on the same page in the note on the text of § 24.

As for the commentary, I must say that I found it very impressive, especially considering that writing a good commentary on an ancient text is surely the most difficult task a philologist can face. Even if the author is in total command of the material, there is always the question of what to comment upon and what to leave out, and even in this case one might argue about a detail or two. One might, for instance, ask whether it was really necessary to say on p. 153 that *iis* (in 2,20 *Sulla sit iis ab inferis excitandus*) is "the dat. of agent", or (p. 190) that *norat* is contracted from *noverat*. On the other hand, one would have liked to have the author's opinion, e.g., on *nam* in 2,21 (*nam illud non intellego quam ob rem* etc.), where *nam* does not seem to have its most common meaning 'for' but perhaps rather that of something like 'moreover' (*OLD* 4).

But these are of course minor details which do not obscure the fact that in my opinion we are dealing with an excellent commentary which offers elucidation where elucidation is needed, and a nice balance between philological and historical matters. All the books have most informative separate introductions, but there are shorter introductions also to various sections within the books (e.g., p. 113 on *Cat.* 1,27–32, a most impressive passage). The author, too, has a gift with words; note, e.g., the comment on *mediocriter labefactantem* in 1,3 (this is said "not so much in extenuation of Gracchus as in contrast to Catiline's graver threat"). I also liked, e.g., the note on 1,28 ("the *maiores* were appealed to by C(icer) as an authority on a variety of topics"); or that on 2,18 ("*impudens* ... applies to those who pursue their individual interests at the expense of the norms of society"); or that on 3,10 ("*ne longum sit* ... assures the reader/listener that C(icer) is coming to the point"). In the commentary on 2,10, the dative *mihi* (in *qui mihi accubantes in conviviis* etc.) receives the splendid comment "**mihi** keeps C(icer) present as the (disapproving) observer but is not to be rendered in English" (authors of Latin grammars might wish to take note of this).

Of course there are also details one could argue about. On p. 86, it is said that *ipsi* in 1,10 (in *cum illi ipsi venissent, quos ego ... venturos esse praedixeram*) means "in person", but my feeling is that something like "exactly those persons" would come closer to what Cicero is saying. On p. 97, I find it hard to understand the comment "Here it becomes clear" etc. on 1,16 (*si hoc ... oppressus*). As for *etiam atque etiam* in 2,27, I have always thought that it means something like "again and again", but on p. 161 we are told that it means "earnestly" (which of course may amount to pretty much the same thing). In the commentary on 3,9, concerning the prophecy of the Sibylline books regarding the three Cornelii (a passage which in my opinion must prove that the Cornelii Cinnae were also patricians, though this is not explicitly attested anywhere), the author (p. 179) wonders "How did Lentulus find out about the prophecy?" He further observes "It does not sound like the kind of thing the *quindecimviri* would report publicly", this leading to the suggestion that Lentulus may have been a member of the board. But in the actual passage, not only the *fata Sibyllina* but also the *haruspicum responsa* are adduced as sources for this story, and in my view the formulation *se esse tertium illum Cornelium, ad*

quem regnum ... pervenire esset necesse (note especially *illum*) cannot be interpreted otherwise than as showing that *everybody* knew about the story.

Olli Salomies

The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius. Edited by STUART GILLESPIE – PHILIP HARDIE. Cambridge University Press, New York 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-84801-5 (hb), ISBN 978-0-521-61266-1 (pb). XIV, 365 pp. GBP 55, USD 95 (hb), GBP 19.99, USD 36.99 (pb).

The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus. Edited by A. J. WOODMAN. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2009. ISBN 978-0-521-87460-1 (hb), 978-0-521-69748-4 (pb). XVI, 366 pp. GBP 60, USD 90 (hb), GBP 18.99, USD 32.99 (pb).

This is a review of two companion volumes from the *Cambridge Companion* series. Discussing these two in the same review can be justified on the grounds that 'companions' or 'handbooks' tend to present similar sets of qualities and problems, especially when they belong to the same series like these two. In such a volume, one expects the contributors to master their subject, and as it is not usual to offer new and original arguments, the most important thing to be expected from a chapter in a companion is easiness of consultation and clarity of exposition.

There is an inherent inconsistency in the established aim of the companion volumes (stated explicitly on p. xv in the *Companion to Tacitus*). First, the authors of chapters should manage to say something that is accessible and interesting to the non-specialist (ranging from the hypothetical general reader to scholars working on other aspects of antiquity). At the same time, however, the authors should cover their field adequately, report the views of previous scholars and preferably also make their personal voice heard. Reviewing recent scholarship and providing a useful account of the topic for the non-specialist are not necessarily goals easily compatible with each other. Recent scholarship in most cases makes sense only as a reaction to the views promoted by previous generations, and reporting the entire tradition together with modern viewpoints in an article of average length while holding on to the ideal of clarity may prove an impossible task.

The results of this can be seen in that too often the chapters fail to present their basic information lucidly enough to provide the non-specialist (say, a university teacher coming from some other area of ancient scholarship) with a quick and easy review of the central topics. They may serve as state-of-the-art reports for readers familiar with the subject, but if they are limited to this they fail to serve one of the two explicit aims of companions.

Given these doubts regarding the nature and goals of companions it is a pleasure to note that in both volumes there are many good chapters that do succeed in combining these two aspects.

In the second part of the Tacitus volume, dedicated to Tacitus' works and entitled "Texts", I would like to single out the chapters by Thomas (on the *Germania*), Goldberg (on the *Dialogus*), Malloch (on the Claudian *Annals*) and Keitel (on the Neronian *Annals*) as good expositions of their subjects. Griffin's chapter on Tacitus as a historian (in the third part entitled "Topics") is one of the most interesting in the whole volume. The chapter by Oakley on language and style is rewarding even to the not insignificant number of people for whom Tacitus'