

poems at least in part. But if she does not echo Catullus, that does not mean that she has not read him. An absence of echoes, or indeed an absence of evidence, does not always indicate that an author was not known in a given period. That is a lesson to be drawn from Condorelli's book: most Catullan scholars thought that our poet was not read in the sixth century, since there was practically no evidence, but now Condorelli has demonstrated the contrary. Her book should have lasting influence on our field.

DÁNIEL KISS  
 Universitat de Barcelona  
 kiss@ub.edu

MALTE HELFBEREND, *Ciceros Rede "Pro L. Cornelio Balbo", Einleitung und Kommentar*, Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft. Beihefte N.F. 13, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, 239 pp., 99.95€, ISBN 978-3-11-079560-8.

The speeches of Cicero delivered during the year after his return from exile exhibit a clear development, from the often bombastic and proud rhetoric of the first two, in which he offered his thanks before the senate and people of Rome, to the self-conscious reticence that he employed, particularly after the meeting at Luca in April 56, to avoid offending the power trio of Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus. In part on account of these rhetorical maneuvers—however necessary they may have been in context—and because of lingering if long-dispelled doubts about the authenticity of the first four, these orations have largely suffered from decades, even centuries, of neglect, with scholars mining the texts for legal and historical information rather than treating them as unified and coherent works of persuasion.<sup>1</sup> In recent years this lack has been addressed by a series of detailed commentaries.<sup>2</sup> In the case of *Pro Balbo* several editions of the text exist, some with minimal notes, but commentaries on the speech are scarce.<sup>3</sup> The most substantial of these include Reid's edition of 1878 in English and Rubio's of 1954 in Spanish, both of which cover grammatical, legal, and textual matters, but in

<sup>1</sup> For a concise history of the authenticity debate regarding *Post reditum in senatu*, *Post reditum ad Quirites*, *De domo sua*, and *De haruspicum responsis*, see R.G. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De domo sua ad pontifices oratio*, Oxford 1939, xxix-xxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> *Pro Caelio* offers the significant exception to this general neglect, as does Nisbet's commentary on *De Domo Sua* (see previous note). As with Nisbet, the following works have appeared with Oxford University Press: R.A. Kaster, *Cicero: Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius*, 2006; L. Grillo, *Cicero's "De Provinciis Consularibus Oratio"*, 2015; G. Manuwald, *Cicero: "Post Reditum" Speeches. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2021; A. Corbeill, *Cicero, "De haruspicum responsis": Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2023. See too T. Boll, *Ciceros Rede "Cum senatui gratias egit". Ein Kommentar*, Berlin 2019.

<sup>3</sup> For critical editions without substantial commentary see Helfberend 226-7.

smaller compass than Helfberend.<sup>4</sup> His commentary makes thorough use of these texts, as well as of the 2004 rhetorical analysis of the speech by K.A. Barber.<sup>5</sup>

An additional factor contributing to the general neglect of *Pro Balbo* is its superficially inconsequential subject matter. Like the more famous *Pro Archia*, the crime alleged is a single man's improper entry into the citizen rolls—a charge dismissed with apparent ease in both cases—but unlike in *Pro Archia* Cicero does not have an excuse here for offering in place of a proper argument an eloquent and full-blown exposition of the importance of literature in maintaining the Roman state. Instead, *Pro Balbo* treats legal niceties that remain obscure despite centuries of scholarly effort, such as what it means for a state allied to the Romans to have been made *fundus* and whether Gades enjoyed that status (treated by Helfberend throughout, esp. 17-22, 82-3), the nature of the treaties forged between Gades and Rome, and the validity of the *Lex Gellia Cornelia*, by which military leaders received the right to bestow citizenship upon deserving soldiers. Helfberend is especially impressive in explicating this latter area, in particular in his notes on sections 32-3, where interpretation is hampered by a series of textual problems, for each of which he surveys the various solutions offered by previous scholars.

Despite these considerable hindrances to a complete appreciation of the speech, Helfberend argues for its importance by following the lead of Cicero, who stresses in his *peroratio* that the prosecution is not so much interested in punishing Balbus as in shaming those in power with whom he is allied, in particular Pompey (the speech closes with the following: *postremo illud, iudices, fixum in animis vestris tenetote, vos in hac causa non de maleficio L. Corneli, sed de beneficio Cn. Pompei iudicatueros*). As Helfberend details in the commentary, approximately one-quarter of the speech concentrates on the *auctoritas* of Pompey, in language echoing Cicero's encomium of the general in *De Lege Manilia* from a decade earlier. By offering a defence of Pompey, and to a lesser extent Caesar, Helfberend sees the speech as providing a snapshot of Roman politics as it develops from a republican to a monarchical conception of government (2-3, 22). It is an intriguing coincidence that Octavian will come to name Balbus as suffect consul for 40, the first person of non-Italian birth to reach the office.

The volume consists of an Introduction (1-26) and Commentary (27-225), followed by a Bibliography of works cited (226-36) and a limited *Index rerum* (237-9). Helfberend includes no text of the speech, deriving his lemmata from Maslowski's 2007 Teubner (accompanied by Maslowski's helpful continuous numbering of lines). After a brief consideration of the speech's date (September

<sup>4</sup> J.S. Reid, *Pro L. Cornelio Balbo oratio ad iudices*, Cambridge 1890 (a still useful school edition); L. Rubio, *M. Tulio Cicerón, Defensa de L. C. Balbo, introducción, edición y comentario*, Barcelona 1954; the edition of G. Bonfiglioli was not available to me (*M. Tullio Cicerone, Orazione "Pro L. Cornelio Balbo", con introduzione e commento*, Milan 1933), but Helfberend notes that its scholarly exposition is minimal.

<sup>5</sup> *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo*, New York-London 2004.

56, with Gelzer), the introduction turns to Balbus's associations with military leaders, particularly Caesar and Pompey, and the events that led to the trial. Representing the prosecution was an unnamed Gaditanian who had at some point obtained Roman citizenship, subsequently lost after incurring *infamia* (*Balb.* 25, 32, 41, with Helfberend's notes). His motivations are unknown, but Cicero asserts that enemies of the triumvirs are the true instigators, and it is surely relevant that a successful prosecution will have restored the accuser's civic privileges. Cicero takes frequent opportunities to attack the man's ignorance, at one point providing an amusing minilecture on Latin semantics (*Balb.* 36; I would add to Helfberend's contention that Cicero intends by quoting Ennius's *qui erranti comiter monstrat viam* not simply an allusion to Pompey's "kindly" offering of citizenship but more fittingly—and ironically—the tag describes in the immediate context Cicero's "gentle kindness" in correcting his Gaditanian opponent's insecure grasp on Latinity).<sup>6</sup> In the one place that Cicero seems to praise his opponent's skill, in his ability to scatter throughout his speech elements that might incite the envy of the judges toward Balbus (56: *illa in omni parte orationis summa arte aspergi videbatis*), Helfberend has a convincing note on how this sentence clashes with Cicero's otherwise scornful treatment and so follows Lambinus in making an attractive textual emendation (*ad* 56.568-571; the entire note displays well Helfberend's wide-ranging approach, as he offers also an attractive semantic reading of the two *ut* clauses that occur in the same sentence).

We are better informed on those speaking for the defence: Pompey, Crassus, and Cicero. Helfberend astutely observes how Cicero characterizes the trio as corresponding to rhetorical expectations, with Crassus presenting the facts (*docere*), Pompey tricking out his turn with oratorical adornment (*delectare*), and Cicero rousing emotions in his customary role as final speaker (*movere*; 75-7);<sup>7</sup> this closing position is particularly fitting for Cicero in light of his treatment of the theme of *invidia*, which both Balbus as *civis novus* and Cicero as *homo novus* would have experienced personally.

After an admirably concise overview of the complicated legalities involved in the case (17-22) Helfberend offers a few pages on the textual transmission of *Pro Balbo* (23-6). The commentary proper provides detailed treatment of the oration's many textual *cruces* and lacunae, not infrequently offering superior readings to those in Maslowski. Particularly compelling are the adoption of Peterson's conjecture in the OCT at 3 (*recte procedere*) and the suggested repunctuation at 6. This feature of the commentary is especially helpful since Maslowski died before finishing his edition and as a result the reasoning behind his readings is often opaque. As a result, a separate listing of Helfberend's disagreements with

<sup>6</sup> For a similar although not identical motif see C. Craig, "The *Accusator* as *Amicus*: An Original Roman Tactic of Ethical Argumentation", *TAPA* 111, 1981, 31-7.

<sup>7</sup> The first sentence of *Pro Archia* contains a similar allusion to rhetorical theory in its listing of the tricolon *ingenium*, *exercitatio*, and *ratio*, "the formulaic requisites for an orator" (H. Gotoff, *Cicero's Elegiac Style: An Analysis of "Pro Archia"*, Urbana 1979, 99).

Maslowski would have been useful. In constructing his apparatus it is also unclear why Maslowski occasionally recorded readings from manuscripts outside **PGEH** that have no clear independent value, as well as from early printed editions.<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting, however, that in his Teubner of *De haruspicum responsis* Maslowski accepted readings from descendants of **H** (there not represented singly but as a group under the single siglum  $\zeta$ ) that quite possibly did not arise from humanist conjecture (e.g., *har. resp.* 40: *divinitus*; 47: *C.*; 53: *conivebant*). It is not unreasonable to suspect that Maslowski, who had a demonstrated interest in **H**, was investigating the independent value of its descendants while preparing the edition of *Pro Balbo*.<sup>9</sup> This hypothesis becomes more probable when one considers that for his final Teubner he chose to refer to these manuscripts individually, in particular those whose owners could be identified: **A** (Giovanni Aretino), **J** (Poggio), and **S** (Bastiano Foresi). Helfberend for his part judges that the independent readings in **H** (and as a result its alleged descendants) are not outside the realm of independent conjecture (25-6); nevertheless he includes consideration of its readings throughout his commentary. The subject merits further investigation.

The meat of the volume of course lies in the commentary, and the remainder of my remarks, necessarily selective, will treat these notes. If I choose particular instances in which I disagree these should not be interpreted as detracting from the thoroughness and uniform excellence of Helfberend's exposition. I cite according to section and line number of Maslowski's text. **1.3**: I would have welcomed a comment on the odd sequence *cum ... cum ... tum*, which Reid *ad loc.* notes as "unpleasant to a modern ear, but ... common in Latin;" how accurate is Reid's claim? **1.4**: here and elsewhere the notes would have benefitted from J.N. Adams's series of articles on the role of Wackernagel's Law in Latin prose (surprisingly, none of Adams's publications appear in the bibliography).<sup>10</sup> **3.19-20**: aptly citing Powell, Helfberend offers no possible explanation for the striking sixteen-word hyperbaton (*quae ... maior*); could Cicero be meaning to echo Crassus's oratory (cf. the not quite so dramatic example at *de orat.* 3.4 "*haec tibi est excidenda lingua*"). Cicero has an analogous imitation of Clodius at *har. resp.*)?<sup>11</sup> **9.71-2**: similarly, Helfberend here aptly points out the similarities between this sentence, characterizing the authority of Pompey in granting

<sup>8</sup> M.D. Reeve, who supplied for the Teubner the preface that Maslowski did not survive to write, confesses bafflement over several of Maslowski's choices (*M. Tullius Cicero: Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 24: Oratio de provinciis consularibus, Oratio pro L. Cornelio Balbo*, Berlin 2007, vi-vii).

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. "Some Remarks on London, British Library, MS Harley 4927 (H)", *RhM* 125, 1982, 141-61.

<sup>10</sup> Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula "esse" in Classical Latin, Cambridge 1994; "Wackernagel's Law and the Position of Unstressed Personal Pronouns in Classical Latin", *TAPA* 92, 1994, 103-78.

<sup>11</sup> J.G.F. Powell, "Hyperbaton and register in Cicero", in E. Dickey, A. Chahoud, eds., *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge 2010, 163-85. For Clodius in *har. resp.* see A. Corbeill,

citizenship, and that of Gorgias describing the dead in his *Epitaphios* (frg. 6.1 D.-K.) but does not postulate any significance to the allusion (by contrast, his discussion of Cicero's reminiscence of Demosthenes's *First Philippic* at 9.76-9 follows Weische in showing how Cicero does not simply adopt, but adapts, the formulation of his predecessor; cf. his discussion of an Aeschines allusion at 47.458-60).<sup>12</sup> **18.162**: Reid does not in fact say that Cicero particularly ("vor allem") uses the collocation *summi honores* to describe political offices but that this is the "only meaning"; if this is true, *Catil.* 3.23 is not a true parallel and so Reid's conjecture of *honorem* (not in Maslowski's apparatus) deserves serious consideration. **19.164-5**: a convincing discussion of why *itaque ... idcirco* does not constitute a pleonasm. **23.207-8** has a good note (following Barber) on the unusual use of *hostis* and the proper names of peoples in the collective singular (e.g., *Gaditanus*) in order to underscore the importance of individuals, like Balbus, to Roman military success; an excellent example of Cicero manipulating idiomatic grammar to make a rhetorical point. **27.247**: despite the resulting hyperbaton it is difficult to agree with Helfberend in construing *magister* rather than *ius omne nostrum* with *mutandae civitatis*; while the former does indeed echo the sarcastic characterization of the prosecutor at 20.177-80, the latter both suits better the immediate context and, more importantly is picked up again in the next sentence (*iure enim nostro neque mutare civitatem quisquam invitus potest neque...*). **32-3**: Helfberend treats thoroughly and clearly the scholarship on the vexed question of the meaning of the clause *SI QUID SACROSANCTUM EST* in the treaty with Gades and its possible applicability to the *Lex Gellia Cornelia*. **32.315** offers an excellent defence of the manuscript reading *si quidem* (retained by Maslowski) over the widely accepted conjectural emendation *si quid*. **57.585-7** gives a tantalizing but vivid glimpse into how envy circulates among Rome's inner circles: outside Balbus's hearing, the envious "bite at him" at dinner parties and "pluck at him" at less formal social gatherings (*circuli*); here a reference to O'Neill's 2003 article on *circulatores* would have provided a helpful context.<sup>13</sup> **65.656**: the use of *et* here for *etiam* is unusual in Republican Latin prose, although J.B. Hofmann cites other occurrences of this meaning when *et* occurs explicitly in combination with *simul* (*ThLL* V, 2.913.84-914.5);<sup>14</sup> in the *Pro Balbo* example the phrase *simul et illa* seems to anticipate the opening of the next sentence, *tum etiam illud cogitare*.

Helfberend has succeeded admirably in his aim to produce a commentary that examines the complicated legal and political history lying behind Balbus's

"Clodius's *Contio de haruspicum responsis*", in C. Gray, C. Steel, eds., *Reading Republican Oratory: Reconstructions, Contexts, Receptions*, Oxford 2018, 180-3.

<sup>12</sup> A. Weische, *Ciceros Nachahmung der attischen Redner*, Heidelberg 1972, 86-7.

<sup>13</sup> P. O'Neill, "Going Round in Circles: Popular Speech in Ancient Rome", *CA* 22, 2003, 135-66.

<sup>14</sup> H. Anton, *Studien zur lateinischen Grammatik und Stilistik*, Erfurt 1869, 46 notes the peculiar circumstance that in Cicero *simul et illud* occurs in conjunction only with the verbs *cogitare* and *dubitare* (cf. here *illa ... omnia ante oculos vestros proponite*).

case while also providing a detailed philological and stylistic analysis of Cicero's language and argumentation. The resulting work constitutes a worthy addition to the list of new commentaries on the hitherto neglected corpus of Cicero's *post reditum* orations.

ANTHONY CORBEILL  
University of Virginia  
corbeill@virginia.edu

LEE M. FRATANTUONO, R. ALDEN SMITH, *Virgil, Aeneid 4: Text, Translation, Commentary*, Mnemosyne Supplements 462, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2022, xi+982 pp. \$280.00, ISBN 978-90-04-52143-8.

This commentary on Vergil's *Aeneid* 4 for the *Mnemosyne Supplements* series is the fruit of the third collaboration between Fratantuono (who is primarily responsible for the commentary) and Smith (introduction, text, and translation). As the authors point out in the preface (XI), they are planning to produce a commentary on *Aeneid* 9. Their first two commentaries for the same series were devoted to Books 5 (2015) and 8 (2018) and, while these books reach the length of roughly 800 pages each, the present volume goes generously beyond it. In a sense, this is to be expected given the wealth of scholarship devoted to *Aeneid* 4, admittedly one of the most popular books of Vergil's epos.

The volume opens with a helpful introduction that gives an overview of the interpretative trends on *Aeneid* 4. It also discusses various points such as the tripartite structure of Book 4 and its position within the economy of the *Aeneid*, the unfinished status of Vergil's revision, the characterisation of Aeneas and of Dido, the main intertextual and intratextual allusions, and the Augustan socio-political context as well as the analogy between Dido and Cleopatra. The introduction is followed by a succinct note on the manuscripts (38-42), and then by the text accompanied by a parallel translation into English. The text offered follows the same format as the commentaries on Books 5 and 8 and is provided by a rich critical apparatus. Smith and Fratantuono explain that they inspected afresh the manuscripts that previous editors credited with textual value (41) and, in so doing, they were often able to correct misreported readings. This is no small accomplishment and they should be thanked for their efforts. Nonetheless, readers with different skills and knowledge of the *Aeneid* will use this commentary, and it would have been useful to offer (perhaps in an appendix) a more detailed description of the witnesses discussing their classification than the information available in the note on the manuscripts. A similar point about accessibility should be made about the apparatus. This follows the same approach as in Geymonat's essentially positive apparatus (1973 = 2008, rev. ed.), and some of the readings reported are mere corruptions rather than significant variants. This makes one wonder whether