finally noticing that «etymological observation is not an erudite excrescence in poetic discourse, but rather allows the assurance of a link between past and present (…) and the entertaining of a spirit of complicity between the poet and his reader» (p. 224).

Andrea Filoni's paper analyzes the role of etymology in Apollodorus' treatise *On the Gods* and in its reader Porphyry of Tyre, in a contended evolution towards a more 'scientific' kind. According to Apollodorus' view, establishing the correct etymology of the names and epithets of the gods is fundamental to fully understand their nature. After an overview of the «philological scenario», starting with the 'solar theology', following with the place of Apollodorus' *On the Gods* or the stratigraphy within the 'solar theology', Filoni analyzes how these treatises deal with Apollo's epithets (Νόμιος, Λύκειος, λυκηγενής, λυκοκτόνος, Σμινθεύς): to conclude that «in Apollodorus' ΠΘ, etymology seems to behave 'scientifically' (…): there are some predetermined 'rules' along which it is acceptable to move and to reach results» (p. 272).

'Part IV: Etymology and Word-plays.' In Valentin Decloquement's paper the author's explicit aim is to read Ptolemy Chennus' *Original Inquiry* «through its own intellectual context, by comparing it to other contemporary technical texts, but also to Byzantine sources, in order to understand the *gap* introduced by Ptolemy between discursive tools that were consensual and a result which disturbs that consensus» (p. 283). «Etymology is one of the principal tools used in the *Original Inquiry*» and Decloquement proposes «an exhaustive typology of the etymological devices we can find in the treatise» (p. 282). He then deals with four case-examples, «based on an interaction between etymological and exegetical practice» (p. 284), pointing out that «it has often been argued (…) that Ptolemy's text is a clever entertainment destined to test the readership's knowledge and ability to discern the authentic from the fake: I would like to (…) show that the *Inquiry* is polemical in that it disturbs the consensus and has a critical eye on its author's own cultural background» (p. 284). He concludes (p. 295)

that «this text questions in a critical way the intellectual tools of its time». There is a final appendix with a typology of the etymological arguments in this treatise.

Simone Beta's paper takes «its start from some satirical examples in order to demonstrate how these very wordplays have been used by other anonymous poets (not only during the imperial period, but also in Byzantine times) in order to teach the Greek language and its literature through the bizarre tools of enigmatic poetry» (p. 305). With this in mind he discusses epigrams and wordplays (Meleager, Diogenes Laërtius, Ammianus and others), riddles and wordplays (charades, plays on meter), finally concluding (p. 318) that «it is intriguing to think that the polished skill of playing with words, first developed by classical comic playwrights such as Aristophanes (…), eventually reached the schools and the students of the later Byzantine empire through the many, playful epigrams of the Greek Anthology».

'Final Pages.' After an informative list of contributors, the books closes with four detailed and very useful indices (*Notionum*, *Nominum*, *Verborum*, *Locorum*).

Salamanca   *Juan Luis García Alonso*

Dominic H. Berry: *Cicero's Catilinarians*. New York: Oxford UP 2020. XXV, 276 S. 9 Abb. (Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature.).

Even though Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations* are among the best known and most widely read texts among Cicero's writings, there has not been a book-length study of them in any language until recently, as Dominic Berry notes in the preface (p. xiv) of this new monograph, which provides just that. Berry is a specialist in Ciceronian rhetoric and particularly these speeches, of which he had already published an annotated translation ('Oxford World's Classics', 2006).

In this book Berry sets out to provide contextual information on the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE and Cicero's *Catilinarians* as well as his interpretation of these speeches (cf. p. xiii). To support the former aim, he not only offers a historical overview (Ch. 1: 'The Patrician and the New

Man'; pp. 1–55), but also a timeline (App. 1: 'A Catilinarian Chronology, 108–57 BC', pp. 225–231), maps of Rome and Italy (pp. 246–248) and a collection of the words attested for Catiline (App. 2: 'Catiline's Surviving Words', pp. 232–239) as well as a selective overview of instances of the reception of these speeches (Ch. 6: 'Catiline in the Underworld and Afterwards', pp. 194–224); in line with the latter aim he presents a description of his premises (Ch. 2: 'What Are the *Catilinarians*?', pp. 56–82), followed by a detailed interpretation of all the speeches (Ch. 3: 'Denouncing the Living/Dead Catiline: The First *Catilinarian*', pp. 83–116; Ch. 4: 'Persuading the People: The *Second* and *Third Catilinarians*', pp. 117–163; Ch. 5: '*Pro Cicerone*: The *Fourth Catilinarian*', pp. 164–193).

The main methodological difficulty when approaching any speech by Cicero (and also those of other Roman Republican orators had these been preserved in full) is that the surviving text is generally not a precise transcript of the words spoken on the occasion. Apart from a few well-known exceptions of speeches for which it is attested that they were never delivered or not given in the extant form, it is a long-standing question in scholarship to what extent the oral versions have been revised for publication and how this process of revision affects the interpretation of the surviving texts. For the *Catilinarians* Berry subscribes to the view that they were edited for publication in 60 BCE (cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3), three years after the delivery of the utterances on which they are based, and that substantial changes have been made in some cases, leading to a mixture of original material and later additions (ch. 2). While it is clear that Berry regards the speeches as later compositions based on what was delivered in 63 BCE, the description of the level of revision varies: he both states that the material representing what Cicero originally said «on a rough calculation may conceivably amount to as much as 90 percent of the total» (p. 81) and that «Cicero does it by means of speeches that blend public utterances he made at the time with material he composed afterwards. … the result is a complex literary creation that serves the author's purposes well» (p. 87), described as «inauthentic speeches with a self-justifying agenda that can be read and enjoyed both as authentic speeches and as the later creations that they are» (p. 86).

In any case, since Berry maintains that the speeches relate both to 63 and 60 BCE, he argues that there are two ways of reading them, which he calls 'Approach A' and 'Approach B' (pp. 87–89). 'Approach A' implies reading the texts as if they had been delivered in their surviving form in 63 BCE; 'Approach B' means reading them as pieces crafted in 60 BCE. Such a distinction has been implicitly applied by other scholars; yet, it has not been set out so clearly and maintained so consistently. Berry claims that previous studies have followed 'Approach A' (p. 88); and this has been the dominant mode of interpretation, although it has been acknowledged that the existing texts are revised versions, albeit with some uncertainty as to when and to what extent changes were made. Berry's view on these questions (while he does not regard it as a necessary precondition for following his approaches) enables him to distinguish between two sets of interpretations responding to different contexts and assumptions. Essentially this means that the texts «may be interpreted both as persuading the listening public of 63 that the conspirators should be suppressed and as persuading the reading public of 60 that their suppression was a necessary and indeed praiseworthy act» (p. 89). Even though the clear distinction between the two approaches might sometimes seem slightly schematic, the advantage of this method is that it explicitly outlines the strategies and consequences of different types of reading.

Concurrently, Berry intends to identify elements most likely to have been changed in the revision process. This investigation and the aim to read the resulting products in two different ways vary in prominence in line with the situation for each speech. Like others before him, Berry assumes the largest amount of changes for *Catilinarian 4*, which he analyses as composed of utterances made at different points in the Senate meeting to which it belongs as well as later additions (pp. 176–177). Because of the contradictions noticeable in the existing speech, when, for instance, one passage seems to come from the introduction of the debate before any views are voiced (Cic.

Cat. 4.6) and another to comment on proposals by senators already made (Cic. *Cat.* 4.7), Berry states: «We have to conclude, therefore, that Cicero was not particularly concerned to make his speech appear authentic, by helping his readers to situate it within a precise context within the debate». (p. 174). Since in one of his letters Cicero says, as Berry also notes (pp. 62, 101), that one reason for publishing speeches is the intention to provide models for aspiring young orators (Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3), one would expect that, even if they are later compilations, the speeches are composed in such a way that they appear as if they could have been delivered on the day (cf. also p. 87). Admittedly, the case is particularly difficult to make for *Catilinarian 4*; still, Berry's statement that Cicero was happy to let such incongruencies stand feels somewhat unsatisfactory, especially in the light of his main aim to interpret the speeches as coherent wholes from the perspectives of both 63 and 60 BCE.

Along the way Berry provides a helpful and comprehensive overview of information relevant for reading the *Catilinarian Orations* and also introduces new pieces of evidence into the debate. These items are two inscribed bowls, which Berry interprets as pieces used in electoral campaigns in 63 BCE to influence voters by handouts of food, although he acknowledges the possibility that these bowls might not be authentic (pp. 20–25, 240–245 [App. 3]), as well as «[t]hree series of coins … struck to commemorate the defeat of Catiline» (p. 52), which Berry reads as proclaiming a view of the effect of crushing the Catilinarian Conspiracy that is similar to Cicero's (pp. 52–54). These items are interesting and exciting since they might enlarge the material on the events in 63 BCE beyond the main sources of Cicero's speeches and Sallust's historical monograph; nevertheless, their interpretation has to remain hypothetical; and if these pieces are accepted as evidence, they contribute to illustrating the historical background rather than to assisting the interpretation of Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations*.

Moreover, Berry rightly notes that in 60 BCE Cicero was engaged in a number of writing projects to publicize his view of his consulship, including an epic on his consular year (p. 67). In that context Berry argues that the famous line *o fortunatam natam me consule Romam* (F 12 *FPL*[4]) comes from a version of *Catilinarian 3* (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3.2) rather than of *Catilinarian 2* (pp. 158–159). Whether Cicero's speeches selected for publication were replicated in the epic in an extended way must remain uncertain, but such a line could indeed only be inserted at a point in time at which it has become clear that the Catilinarian Conspiracy will be contained successfully.

The appendix assembling 'Catiline's Surviving Words' (App. 2) is welcome as it gives a 'voice' to Catiline in the same volume in which Cicero's speeches against him are discussed. The section basically includes the known passages relating to Catiline's speeches in line with standard collections (as in H. Malcovati's edition: *ORF*[4] 112), plus the exclamations ascribed to Catiline in Cicero's *Catilinarian 1* (Cic. *Cat.* 1.13; 1.20) and a letter written by Catiline 'quoted' in Sallust (Sall. *Cat.* 35); at the same time Berry states that «[t]he two orations that Sallust puts into the mouth of Catiline (*Cat.* 20.2–17, 58.1–21) are excluded because they are inventions» (p. 232). Although this assessment is true, similar doubts may apply to the letter or any words quoted by Cicero as allegedly spoken by Catiline, and most of the other passages do not give 'words' of Catiline verbatim and rather provide information about contexts in which he is said to have spoken or summaries of what he is believed to have said.

As regards the main body of the work, the discussion of the *Catilinarian Orations* in their historical context, the book provides all the relevant information in a single place and is eminently readable, clearly and fluently written, with all Latin words and sentences translated and all technical terms explained. Thus, it not only engages with sometimes technical scholarly discussions and makes a significant contribution to the debate, but can also serve as an introductory volume for students, presenting key information on the *Catilinarian Orations* and their historical and literary context as well as the methodological issues of approaching Cicero's speeches. As the chapter titles indicate, Berry goes through all

four speeches sequentially, outlining interpretations according to the two different approaches and discussing for each oration their respective structure, indications of revisions, engagement with the audience, argumentative strategy and rhetorical features.

Whatever readers may think of some of the interpretations of detail put forward (such as the relevance of the new evidence introduced or the assignment of particular passages to specific stages in the writing process), anyone interested in Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations* and in the methods of composition and publication of Cicero's speeches will want to consult this book not only for its straightforward and comprehensive outlining of the overall context, but also for the methodological discussions and for its stimulating interpretations. Reading the book will provide a lot of food for thought, and one can only hope that it will prompt similarly detailed studies on other important Ciceronian speeches.

London   *Gesine Manuwald*

Ellen Oliensis: *Loving Writing/Ovid's Amores*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 2019. VII, 202 S. 75 £.

Ovid would approve of the slimness of this volume, which nonetheless manages to include a broad array of provocative readings of his *Amores* between its covers. O. proposes a reactionary reading of the collection, eschewing intertextual approaches to the poems, as well as considerations of gender and power, which have been prevalent in most recent criticism of Roman elegy. Instead, without explicitly saying so, she hearkens back to the New Criticism, explaining her approach in a brief 'Prelude' to her four chapters of explication (p. 3): «My aim here is not to contest the important work these approaches have generated, but to provide a complement to it by exploring the collection from within and on its own terms». Or, as O. puts it later, she relies on two strategies: the first (p. 52–3) «is reading poems *in situ* and in sequence»; and the second is «to downplay the intertextual and metapoetic (the authorial/Ovidian) dimension of the *Amores*». There is much

to be said in favor of a sequential reading, especially if one considers how the physical act of reading the *Amores* in three papyrus rolls would have proceeded, a consideration that O. does not mention. Divorcing the poems from their literary and cultural contexts, however, is more problematic.

This approach is pursued in the following chapters, as O. first describes and then explores the distinctions that she intends to exploit between the external author, whom she calls 'Ovid', and the poet and lover of the poems, whom she calls 'Naso'. That process begins with a reading of Cupid's epiphany in *Am*. 1.1 from which Callimachus, Propertius, and all their company are absent. In O.'s reading, Ovid manipulates Cupid's appearance to reverse the reader's expectation that love leads to poetry. O.'s 'Naso' is a poet first, who is brought to love secondly. 'Naso' is thus imbued with a different character than Ovid by what O. terms «the authenticity effect» (p. 8), which bears a striking resemblance to what critics once called «persona». There are moments when this approach bears fruit, as in O.'s discussion of the prefatory epigram to Book One and the somewhat puzzling use of the «Alexandrian footnote», *dicitur*, in the final line (p. 35 f), which creates only the illusion of allusion. But it is particularly ineffective when she turns to poems such as *Am*. 2.18 and 3.9 (pp. 39 ff), in which it is hard to ignore the intrusion of a poet named Ovid. O. does concede the difficulties here, but it is hard to make out the import of her conclusion (p. 46): «On this reading, Naso is invoking his authorial standing, cashing in on his Ovidian connection, as it were».

In the following chapter, O. takes this form of analysis to a different level, subjecting *Am*. 2.6 on Corinna's parrot to a reading in its relationship to the immediately preceding *Am*. 2.5 and the two poems that follow. What occupies her here, O. asserts (p. 54), are «the lateral interactions between Naso's love life and his poetic ambitions». She sees *Am*. 2.6 as a corrective to the seamier *Am*. 2.5 on his mistress' improprieties at a dinner party (p. 68): «Read in conjunction with *Amores* 2.5, the parrot elegy appears to respond to Naso's need to reclaim his self-possession after the sordid excitements of the dinner party