

BOOK REVIEW

Fragmentary Republican Latin III-V. Oratory. Edited and Translated by GESINE MANUWALD. Loeb Classical Library 540-42. Cambridge and London, UK: Harvard University Press, 2019. Pp. lxxiii + 503; xii + 473; xii + 454. Hardback, \$28.00 ea. ISBN: 978-0-674-99723-3, 978-0-674-99724-0, 978-0-674-99715-7.

[DISCLOSURE: the reviewer was co-editor with Gesine Manuwald of the first two volumes in this series.]

The Loeb Classical Library's ongoing commitment to editions of fragmentary texts has produced, among recent volumes, nine devoted to *Early Greek Philosophy* (LCL 524-32) and three to *Fragments of Old Comedy* (LCL 513-15). In turning now to the Romans, *Fragmentary Republican Latin* aims not simply to replace E. H. Warmington's venerable *Remains of Old Latin* but to include a much wider variety of genres and to reflect current standards for the presentation and analysis of their *reliquiae*. The task was relatively straightforward for the series' first two volumes devoted to Ennius, since the corpus of Testimonia and Fragments is reasonably well established and scholarly inquiry has developed along reasonably clear lines. Presenting the fragments of oratory is both technically and conceptually much more difficult. Who is an orator? What, exactly, is an oration? What constitutes a fragment? Since references to speeches in our sources vastly outnumber verbatim quotations, the usual distinction between testimonia and fragments is difficult to maintain. And what about the speeches attributed to various figures by historians, where the occasions described may be significantly more historical than the words reported? What is an editor to do?

Catherine Steel's new project, "Fragments of the Republican Roman Orators" (<https://frrr.gla.ac.uk>), finesses the problem by focusing broadly on "the surviving evidence for public speech," which is not quite the same as the evidence for public speakers. That was the focus of Enrica Malcovati, whose four editions of *Oratorum romanorum fragmenta* defined a corpus of 176 orators (just over half the number mentioned in Cicero's *Brutus*) from Ap. Claudius Caecus in the early

3rd century to Messalla Corvinus in the late 1st. It was a major achievement, but even the best work of the 1950s may disappoint contemporary expectations and prove inadequate to contemporary needs. Now comes a worthy successor, which is similarly text-oriented. Gesine Manuwald largely adopts Malcovati's structure and preserves her numbering system, but she offers considerably more than a translation of *ORF*. Headnotes are enlarged and updated. Cato is missing (reserved for a separate Loeb volume to include all his fragmentary works), but the corpus is otherwise expanded with the addition of nineteen more orators selected either because, like Cicero's son-in-law C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (no. 142A), Cicero said he spoke particularly well (*Brut* 272), or, like P. Cornelius Cethegus (no. 80A), because Cicero says he was influential (*Brut.* 178). A looser definition of "fragment" also allows Manuwald to add material. So, for example, the single fragment of Aemilius Paullus (no. 12) in *ORF* (a quotation drawn from Valerius Maximus) now has eight companions as Manuwald quotes or paraphrases reports of Paullus' oratory found in Appian, Livy, Polybius and Plutarch. The result is an immensely useful collection as the editor's combination of detailed knowledge and good judgment provides easy and reliable access to a broad swathe of important information, both primary and secondary.

A caveat is nevertheless in order. Though the Loeb series now encourages scholarly annotation and Manuwald makes full and productive use of that license, its format can obscure the philology behind editorial decisions. It is thus not within the purview of *FRL* to distinguish the *inquit* with which Gellius, fond of quoting archaic texts, introduces the words of Scipio Africanus (*NA* 4.18.3 = F 3 *ORF*) from Livy's *inquit* introducing his (almost certainly reworked) version of the same speech (*Liv.* 38.50.10-51.12), which in Manuwald becomes F 3A. Nor does Loeb style foreground textual problems, however significant. The sudden death of Scipio Aemilianus in 129 BCE, for example, was for that very reason suspicious, but besides a passing reference in Cicero (*De or.* 2.170), the only Republican source is a fragment of Laelius' eulogy for his late friend. It survives in the Scholia Bobiensia to *Pro Milone* (F 22), where the key sentence is (maddingly) corrupt. That led Malcovati, exercising an editor's discretion, to print *cum †eo morborum temouit† et in eodem tempore periit*, but since *FRL*'s policy is to reproduce the edition of its source, Manuwald prints Stangl's emended text, *cum isto modo mortem obiit*. A footnote acknowledges the emendation, but the translation "because he died in that way" receives no corresponding acknowledgment. Why might such considerations matter? All these new Loeb volumes make technically difficult material accessible to an ever-widening range of users. While that is itself

a major contribution, some such users will lack experience negotiating the quirks and pitfalls of fragmentary evidence and its presentation. They may need to be reminded (and certainly need to know) that quotation marks in Livy differ in value from those in Gellius or that Stangl, but not necessarily Laelius is the one so non-committal about the manner of Scipio's death. It would be good for difficulties of interpretation to be as well presented as the texts themselves.

One final note. The project necessarily breaks into three volumes (Loebs have size limitations), but while each volume includes the contents of all three, Manuwald's palmary introduction and bibliography appear only in the first and the index of orators in the third. Readers will want all three volumes on the shelf. And they will be very glad to have them.

SANDER M. GOLDBERG

University of California, Los Angeles, sander@humnet.ucla.edu