

Citation style

Zetzel, James E. G.: review of: Andrew R. Dyck (ed.), Cicero, Pro Marco Caelio, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, in: Exemplaria Classica, 18 (2014), p. 261-264, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v18i0.2486, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

ANDREW R. DYCK, ed. *Marcus Tullius Cicero: Pro Marco Caelio*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. 218, ISBN 9781107843482

Readers of Andrew Dyck's Green and Yellow editions of *In Catilinam* and *Pro Sexto Roscio* will not find large changes in approach in his new edition of *Pro Caelio*. Dyck is a careful, thorough, and reliable scholar; his introduction covers the necessary background to the law, the trial, and the *dramatis personae*, as well as (what one also expects from him) some discussion of style and prose rhythm. He has also constructed a careful text, accepting emendations perhaps more than I would, but all reasonable. He gives detailed outlines of the sections of the speech and elucidates Cicero's rhetorical strategies. His commentary is very precise, giving many cross-references to other Ciceronian examples of usage as well as to *OLD* and Gildersleeve-Lodge.

In most cases, the previous paragraph would be all the review that is needed, but in this instance it is not. Dyck himself raises the main question in his preface: why a new student commentary on *Pro Caelio* when it is one of those rare speeches where a good commentary in English already exists? R. G. Austin's commentary was originally published in 1933, and the most recent (third) edition was published in 1960¹; the text was taken from Clark's (excellent) OCT, and changes from the second edition were made only by adding a set of additional notes at the end of the third. As Dyck rightly points out (ix), Austin's commentary is not always easy to use, particularly since important material is relegated to the appendices, and it does not always address the problems faced by current students. On the other hand, this is, so far as I know, the first Latin Green and Yellow to compete directly with a comparable Oxford Red, and the most compelling reason to recommend Dyck over Austin—for both commentaries have their merits, and both editions deserve respect—is the price. As I write, the CUP website lists the price of Dyck's edition at \$34.99, and the OUP lists Austin ed. 3 at \$82.00. But comparison between the two is necessary and inevitable, and such comparison is not always in Dyck's favor.

Much as one welcomes a more affordable student edition that provides excellent assistance as well as value, Dyck's edition, like Austin's, has its weaknesses of which anyone assigning it to students should be aware. For the sake of comparison, I have taken §13 from Cicero's speech, part of his characterization of Catiline. On the first sentence, Dyck points out that the thought is

¹ On Austin and his commentaries, I am very much indebted to John Henderson, "The Way We Were: R. G. Austin, *In Caelianam*," in R. Gibson and C. Kraus, eds., *The Classical Commentary* (Leiden, 2002) 205-234.

repeated from the previous section, with a cross-reference to his earlier note, followed by noting that Cicero uses the comparative without an object of comparison as an intensive, again with a cross-reference to his earlier note on the same phenomenon at §6b. He also notes that *quodam tempore* alludes to “Catiline’s loss of favor after C. revealed his plotting in the senate.” Austin has no note on the sentence as a whole, but links *clarioribus viris* to *quodam tempore*, suggesting that the unnamed individuals may be Caesar and Crassus, and that this might point back to 66-65 rather than, as Dyck would have it, to the opening months of 63. In this, I incline to Austin’s point of view: Cicero is not being so precise in referring to his own unmasking of Catiline, but he is trying to show how much support and even affection Catiline once received. Austin here also points out that Fronto cited this passage, with its repeated *quis*, as an example of *epanaphora*. In subsequent notes, Dyck pays close attention to the historical background, the opposition of *civis* and *hostis*, and the use of *taeter* as an epithet for *hostis*. He dilates on the meanings of some words and phrases (*admirabilis*, *versare*, *servire temporibus*), he points out repetition of ideas within the passage, and he connects the pursuit of varieties of friendship in campaigning for office to a passage in *De Officiis* on the same topic. Austin too talks about *taeter*, but in connection with its medical use, as in *In Cat.* 1.11; he too explains *temporibus* and *admirabilis*, but translates the sentence using *versare*. He also discusses the meaning of *tristis* and the morphology of *facinerosus* and *audaciter*. He quotes part of the parallel description of Catiline from Sallust, again cites Fronto, and also adduces an epitaph in Gloucester Cathedral for the meaning of *obsequium*.

With the possible exception of Gloucester Cathedral (in Austin’s home town), nothing said by either scholar does not contribute in some way to understanding Cicero’s words, but Dyck’s notes are, here as elsewhere, more limited in range. This was a famous passage, an example of high rhetoric; if I were writing a commentary on it and had the space, I would quote Fronto rather more than Austin does, and I would also say more about the repetition and antitheses. Austin has a few sentences on the rhetoric in his note on *tristibus* and gives references to the *Orator*, Quintilian, and Norden’s *Antike Kunstprosa*. Dyck has nothing on the topic here, and even in his useful discussion of Ciceronian rhetoric in the preface, there is nothing that I can see about this passage. Austin also reminds the reader, not only here, of the parallels in Sallust. Dyck, in short, sticks to the principle of explaining Cicero from Cicero, one that I agree with in theory; however Dyck follows this rule so closely that he excludes much else that is relevant or that places this speech, or Ciceronian rhetoric, in a broader context. There is nothing wrong with what he says, and indeed I learned much from the commentary that is not in Austin; but there are losses too.

What struck me most about the notes on *Cael.* 13, however, is not so much what Dyck or Austin says that the other does not, but that neither one

says anything at all about the style and rhythm of the passage as a whole: not just the brilliant set of rhetorical questions at the beginning of the section and the equally impressive set of adverbial phrases (*cum tristibus severe...*) at the end, but that the two sets balance one another and that within each set there are parallel pairs of prepositional phrase + comparative adjective (the rhetorical questions) or prepositional phrase + adverb (the phrases) that are balanced against one another, often producing rhyme and often isosyllabic (thus *in rapacitate avarior . . . in largitione effusior*, each 5+4 syllables; or *cum tristibus severe, cum remissis iucunde*, each 3+3 syllables). This failure surprises one in Austin, who is much more inclined to explain stylistic brilliance or irony. It does not surprise one in Dyck: when he does comment on stylistic technique, he generally does no more than label it.

At times, moreover, what they see is different. Dyck's greater emphasis on historical or biographical context sometimes is irrelevant to one's understanding of the speech (e.g. the detailed prosopographical note at §32 on Cn. Domitius, the president of the court), but at times adds point and texture to Cicero's words: on Appius Claudius Caecus' indignant reference to his aqueduct (§34), Austin merely identifies it, while Dyck shows that Caecus is assimilating himself to an *aquariolus*, a slave who brought water for whores. On the other hand, on the famous phrase Cicero uses to describe Clodia, *muliere non solum nobili verum etiam nota* (§31), Dyck gives a cross-reference to an earlier discussion of *nobilis* (in its technical sense) and adduces the Funeral Oration as parallel to *nota*. Neither half of this is useful or even relevant; what Austin gives is a much more interesting parallel to uses of *nobilis* to describe prostitutes.

Clodia, inevitably, brings one to Catullus—but not in Dyck's edition. The sum total of what he says on that score is a single sentence in the introduction at the end of his discussion of Clodia (p.14): "Since antiquity Clodia has also been identified as the Lesbia of Catullus' love poems (Apul. *Ap.* 10), an identification widely accepted by scholars but contested in some quarters; the question is complex and cannot be settled here." The sentence is accompanied by a footnote including references to the work of Wiseman and Skinner on either side of the question. Yes indeed, it is not certain which Clodia should be identified with Lesbia, but even Wiseman, who opposed the traditional identification with Clodia Metelli, knew that it was *a* Clodia and that the sisters had similar characters and experiences (including incest with their brother). The prosopographical problems will never be definitively solved: not just Lesbia, but whether either or both of the Caelius and Rufus in Catullus should be identified with the M. Caelius Rufus of this speech. But that is no excuse at all for leaving the evidence of Catullus out entirely. Austin noted (in his long discussion of *urbanitas* on §6) that "The best picture of what was meant by the *homo urbanus* as a type may be seen in the poems of Catullus," and he was absolutely right. But not on this passage, not on the caricature of Clodius, not on any of the passages about Clodia does Dyck say anything worthwhile

about the manners and language (other than a reference to Krostenko) of the social circles in which Caelius, Catullus, and both Clodias moved. It is hard to imagine any reasonable explanation for Dyck's reticence in this regard, and there is certainly no excuse for it in a book intended for use by students. Indeed, there are times when one suspects that Dyck has no sense of his audience at all. His preface begins abruptly with a very technical discussion of the charge of *vis* and the nature of the *quaestio* procedure, and it is hard to imagine an aspect of this speech less likely to draw a student (or even scholar) into the book. (Anecdotal evidence: one student I know, on starting to read Dyck's introduction, turned back a page thinking something was missing. It is, but that was apparently deliberate.)

In some ways, the sheer dullness of Dyck's exposition and his avoidance of anything that calls for aesthetic judgment or historical speculation is a real gift to someone using his edition in a classroom: he has done all the dirty work, and leaves the fun parts to the teacher (although I rather doubt that was his intention). But a further feature of this edition, almost certainly the fault of Cambridge University Press and the editors of the series rather than of Dyck himself, will remain an obstacle to classroom use. In the first place, the organization of the lemmata: most of the time, notes are introduced with a long lemma shortened to unintelligibility by heavy ellipsis. Thus, the second sentence of §39, which occupies 6 ½ lines of text in Dyck's edition, is reduced to six words: *ego, si quis . . . atque ornatum puto*. And although there are further bold-faced lemmata that excerpt bits of this sentence, there are also subordinate comments (e.g. on *robore*) that have no head-word to place them in the text and which will require the student (and the teacher) to flip madly back and forth between text and commentary to understand what Dyck is talking about. What is more, finding one's place in the text is even harder than finding one's place in the commentary. In his earlier edition of the *Catilinarians*, each section of the text was provided with line numbers, which were used in the commentary for greater ease of reference. No such line numbers here (or in Dyck's edition of *Pro Roscio*); and it might be noted that the sentence that takes 6 ½ lines in Dyck takes 8 lines in Austin and the OCT, and that in this edition the bottom margin of the page is smaller, and on average 1-2 more lines of text or commentary are jammed into the page than in earlier Green and Yellows. That, as I say, is obviously not Dyck's fault, but it is a serious problem in using this edition, particularly in a class. I will certainly use it, since despite what I have said in most of this review, what Dyck gives us is serious, careful, and reliable, and his work shows very clearly what Austin's commentary lacked. But Dyck's book is not only less expensive than Austin's; thanks to the Press, it is also much cheaper.

JAMES E. G. ZETZEL
jez2@columbia.edu