

cittadino in rapporto a quella dell'uomo etico al tema delle sei forme di costituzione; dal tema poi della migliore costituzione al tema del numero dei governanti fino ad affrontare, infine, il tema delle forme della regalità e i due tipi della costituzione eccellente, individuate nel regno e nell'aristocrazia.

La traiettoria di senso del libro III della *Politica* di Aristotele lascia in eredità al lettore il convincimento dello stringente rapporto che lega e collega mutuamente la condizione prospera della città con la migliore costituzione (ἄριστη πολιτεία) *quoad* fondata sulla virtù (ἀρετή) del cittadino e, massime, del governante. Un'architettura sussidiaria, questa, che esplica la fondazione etica e aretologica della politologia aristotelica, alla luce della domanda radicale su quali siano le qualità che effettivamente contribuiscano al governo della città: una questione tanto centrale nell'economia del pensiero politico dello Stagirite che, proprio solo in questo contesto, si afferma l'urgenza di profilare nella sua specificità una *filosofia politica* (il sintagma φιλοσοφίαν πολιτικὴν occorre, infatti, soltanto nel nostro libro, a 1282b23, nell'intero *corpus* dell'autore).

Tiziano F. Ottobrini

Cicero: Agrarian Speeches. Introduction, text, translation and commentary by GESINE MANUWALD. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2018. ISBN 978-0-19-871540-5. LIV, 480 pp. GBP 110.

Cicero's originally four *Agrarian speeches* play a prominent role in the corpus of the Arpinate as his inaugural orations as consul. The first two of these Cicero later included in a σῶμα/*corpus* of ten consular speeches (plus a further two short *quasi ἀποσπασμάτια legis agrariae*) by which he wanted to promote his image as a high-minded statesman (XXXIII–XXXV; cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3, which is Manuwald's *testimonium* 3 [2–3, with commentary on 106]). Today, Cicero's first speech before the senate lacks the *exordium*, the second one before the people survives virtually intact, the main argument of a further one is extant (numbered nowadays as the third oration, which it probably was, but we cannot be absolutely certain of this), another one is completely lost (these last two are the two 'chips'/'snippets' mentioned above).

Despite their great significance, these orations have unfortunately received rather meagre modern comment – especially in the last fifty years – and even then mostly piecemeal. Against this background, M.'s impressive full-scale commentary, “paying attention to textual and linguistic difficulties, the rhetorical and argumentative structure as well as the historical context” (X), is more than welcome and will establish itself as a new *fundamentum* for all future study of these speeches. Furthermore, it provides relevant *testimonia* with translations (2–9) and a revised text with selective critical apparatus and facing translation (10–103; the *versio Anglica* is accurate, as far as I can judge as a non-native speaker). The Latin text is basically based on Václav Marek's *Teubneriana* from 1983, but M. has corrected and/or changed the text – usually for the better – after detailed discussion of the respective variants and by taking into account conjectures and other suggestions proposed over the last 35 years (e.g. 149, 163, 200, 233, 237, 260, 453). A plausible conjecture of her own is *iam* for *quam* at *leg. agr.* 2.48, but only mentioned in the commentary (296).

The introduction (IX–LIV) gives a concise overview of previous scholarship (IX–X) and a balanced, full picture of the historical background of the speeches, especially of Roman agrarian

laws and their legislative process (X–XXXI). Its second main focus is on Cicero’s political and rhetorical strategies which are well elucidated (XXXVIII–L), and while the Arpinate’s biography is treated rather cursorily (XXXII–XXXIII), there is no lack of good and recent biographies on Cicero (and M. mentions them, of course). As regards the old problem of whether the extant versions of the speeches differ from the originally delivered ones, M. unbiasedly examines the *status quaestionis* and opts for a *non liquet* (XXXV–XXXVIII and some relevant passages in the commentary).

The commentary (105–454) is extensive, as each page of the Latin Teubner-text gets about seven pages of notes. The profoundness of its information not only offers the necessary more basic explanations for the “wider readership” (V) this edition is also addressed to (e.g. 115 on *Propontis*, 236 on *ne* following verbs of hindering, 285 on *Tyrus*), but beyond that also stands out with many fine and detailed observations: See, e.g., 124 on *certa pecunia*, 213 on διαβολή, 237 on συμπλοκή, 243 on *reus*, 246–7 on *lex curiata*, 287 on unkingly behaviour, 369 and *passim* on the interweaving of style and content. Additionally, it is bolstered by frequent references to Kühner-Stegmann’s grammar and to the *OLD* – but very rarely to the *TLL*. Moreover, each contextwise coherent section of the commentary is preceded by a synopsis of its main aspects and Cicero’s rhetorical tactic applied, and – like the decreasing layers of a Russian doll – M. narrows the focus as she moves forward to the details of each single paragraph to be explained (e.g. 116–7 on *leg. agr.* 1.1–26 > 1.1–13 > 1.1 or 402–3 on 2.98–103 > 2.98–99 > 2.98).

The bibliography (455–476) is not limited to mainly Anglophone titles, but French, German and Italian as well as Spanish, Latin and Polish treatises are duly taken into account too. The book closes with *indices nominum et rerum*, but in particular the too scanty index of subjects, restricted to realia (479–80), can do the richness of M.’s commentary no justice. Luckily, there are a few blank pages at the end of the book where readers may supplement their own entries, such as for rhetorical figures, schemes, tropes, and persuasive technique: 126, 159, 166, 181, 237, 244, 395, 401, 405, 410, etc.; for ‘character assassination’: 121; for ‘positive conspiracy’: 180; for use and structures of tenses: 140, 202, etc.; for *multum* as intensifier: 447; for *clausulae*: 149, 176, 259, 294, 346, 418, 454, etc.; for technical terminology: 194, 206, 234, 264, 438, 449, etc.; for textual criticism: 155, 197, 212, 280, 289, 406, 444, etc.; and for many more.

It lies in the nature of a commentary that one reader will miss this aspect and another one that detail. So, for example, within the list of previous editions, besides L. d’Amore’s older commentary (Milano 1937–1938) on *leg. agr.* 1 and 2, the more recent one by M. Geigerle (Milano-Roma-Napoli 1964) on all three orations could have been adduced too. The instances where the future tense of forms of *ire* is, contrary to classical usage, marked with *-e-* in many or all of the mss. (F 3: *veniet sub praecone*; 2,67: *inietur enim ratio*) could have been discussed. M.’s interesting remarks that the proposed *lex agraria* contained provisions favourable to Pompeius (XXVII, 145, 171) could perhaps have been pursued further. Although M.’s delineation of the textual transmission (L–LII) is sound, the two Parisian editions by Iodocus Badius Ascensius (1511 and 1522) are not mentioned, so that at least novice scholars will surely be puzzled by the abbreviation *marg. Ascens.* in the apparatus to 2.67. The remarks on the editorial subscription are put a bit cautiously (L–LI: “an early editor had access to a copy that he believed to come from ... Tiro”) and are too sketchy – given that it is one of the oldest subscriptions to a Latin ms. we know of, made by Statilius Maximus (2nd century AD) who used the edited text of an unknown even earlier scholar, both having collated Tiro’s exemplar of the *Agrarian speeches* (for more details see O.F. Mulholland, *AUC Philologica* 2, 2017, 15–27).

But to bring forth more examples like these would be nitpickingly criticizing a work of more than solid scholarship in which typos are (almost) non-existent.

To sum up: Philologists and historians of the ancient world as well as scholars from neighbouring disciplines will be grateful for an excellent addition to the growing number of modern commentaries on Cicero's orations. With interest in rhetoric and argumentation as well as in the dissemination of political ideology through speech and literature reviving in recent years (cf. V), Cicero's *Agrarian orations* have finally received their due: M.'s fine *opus* will enable its readers to understand the orations *De lege agraria* better and to appreciate them more deeply than before.

Marc Steinmann

CHRISTER HENRIKSÉN: *A Commentary on Martial. Epigrams. Book 9*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012. ISBN 978-0-19-960631-3. XLVI, 440 pp. GBP 127.50.

This is a very important and exemplary book. It was originally presented as a doctoral thesis at Uppsala University and published in 1998–9. The second edition is completely revised, and H. has taken wide account of the lively discussion occurring since 1999; he also recognizes having changed his own opinions on many questions of the interpretation of Martial's poetry. In the Introduction, taking in consideration all relevant literature (not just that written in English, not showing a tendency to the 'splendid isolation' of Anglo-Saxon scholarship), he deals with several important issues. He shows with good arguments that the ninth book has to be dated to late 94/early 95 (p. XIII), and here one cannot but follow him. In addition, he deals with metrical issues. Very important are his considerations on the picture Martial gives of Domitian, and he stresses its positive features in contrast to that of Tacitus and Suetonius; indeed, he pays considerable attention to the Emperor, i.a. focusing on such topics as Domitian's military campaigns. In general, H. takes up many important historical issues. He is also well versed in questions regarding social history.

The edition itself consists of the text, an introduction to it, and a more or less exhaustive commentary, where he provides thorough surveys of previous discussions. It is really a verily remarkable accomplishment that all sorts of classicists, both philologists and historians, not to speak of literary historians, will use with profit and predilection.

Heikki Solin

ANDREAS WILLI: *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2018. ISBN 978-1-107-19555-4. XXXI, 713 pp. GBP 120.

L'origine del verbo greco costituisce un argomento estremamente vasto e un'opera che affronti tale argomento non può prescindere dalla conoscenza approfondita dei sistemi verbali di tutte le lingue indoeuropee, sia da un punto di vista morfologico, quanto da un punto di vista sintattico. Gli studi svolti in passato sui singoli argomenti sono innumerevoli, sia dal punto di vista monoglottico del greco, sia da quello della linguistica storica indoeuropea. Fra di essi troviamo i nomi di illustri stu-